CHAPTER VII

KUNTAKA ON VIKRAMORVASHIYA

While explaining the 'Padavakrata' or 'poetic beauty of the word' Kuntaka says:

"In a poem where the prepositions and indeclinables are employed only to suggest Rasas as the sole essence of a poem as a whole, we have what may be called another type of word-beauty."\(^1\)

He adduces a stanza\(^2\) from Kālidāsa's Vikram, as an example:

"While all of a sudden I have suffered severence from my beloved which is unbearably painful, here the fresh clouds appear making the days so genial by mitigating their intense heat."

Here Kuntaka observes: "There are two factors here which equally possess an irresistible capacity to excite one's agony, namely, separation from the beloved and the advent of the rainy season. Both of them are described here as converging at the same time by the force of the
two particles $ca... ca...$ ('and'). This force is indeed like
the southern breeze which fans the fire of sorrow bursting
at once into flame. The result is an ineffable literary
charm.\(^3\)

The king is reviling his fate. Anandavardhana has
also quoted this as an example of 'the suggestiveness of
indeclinable conjunctions'.\(^4\)

Kuntaka discusses another kind of artistic beauty as:

"There is also another kind of artistic beauty. It
glows with the natural as well as the acquired skills of
the poet. It results in imaginative original creations
which are extraordinary."\(^5\)

The gist in the words of K.Krishnamoorthy is: "The
poets do not give existence to things non-existent in the
world; only they endow such superior and original excellences
to things which merely existed before, that a unique appeal
of beauty to connoisseurs is invariably brought about....
Things in the world have mere existence. But they are
given such a heightened extraordinary beauty or shade of
charm that they begin to appear as if they are entirely new."
Their natural state is completely concealed and a new splendour comes to be attached to them making one think that they were invented right then for the first time. It is this fact which confers the title of 'Creators' on the poets. So it has been said (by Anandavardhana):

"In the boundless realm of poetry the poet is the sole creator; therein all things revolve in the manner of his choice."\(^6\)

In this manner, there are two divisions in this artistic beauty of the content of poetry. One is 'natural', and another one is 'superadded'. In this 'superadded' kind, "though it is concerned first with embellishing the subject on hand, it cannot be really anything other than figures of speech. That is the reason why the number of divisions and subdivisions which they involve are manifold."\(^7\) As an instance Kuntaka cites a verse\(^8\) from the Vikram:

"Was the moon of lovely brightness her creator? Or Madana himself who joys in love and love alone? Or the vernal month? For how could an aged anchorite who has grown dull through the study of the Vedas, and who has withdrawn himself from all worldly pleasures, fashion such a lovely form?"
In this verse the poet intends to convey the damsel's uncommon radiance, voluptuousness showing forth unique charms, and extraordinary perfection of figure and delicacy. And therefore he chooses separate agents for her creation, each endowed with perfectability in question by his sense of propriety as well as power of imagination; with the result that she is fancied as an altogether new creation. This fact is illuminated by the emphatic pronoun 'himself' which is to be construed with all the three causal agents. One (the moon) who is himself the abode of loveliest radiance can naturally be credited not only with a great interest proper to his good nature, but also with a capability of a very high order in creating an effect full of that quality (i.e. radiance). Similarly, one who is himself the sole abode of all voluptuous love shares the same kind of propriety with the work of creating a figure full of that endowment (i.e. voluptuous love). So also one who is himself the home of all flowers, can naturally be expected to make a creation also full of extreme delicacy. In the second half of the verse, the poet negatively shows that all these three endowments would be impossible of conception through any other agency. This fact is further illustrated as follows: Since he is dulled by Vedic chants, the mythical Creator cannot be credited with the skill of fashioning a radiant figure. Since
he is impervious to sensual attractions one can only believe that he should be averse towards the making of a figure of voluptuous love and since he is far too old, he should be properly considered to be against the very idea of a delicate or a loving person. Hence throughout this verse the poet has utilised the figure of speech called 'poetic fancy' with a view to endowing his subject under description with an extraordinary imaginative charm. Now that spontaneous beauty of fancy gets added strength by a free association with the beauty of another figure, namely 'poetic doubt' and the two together bring about a heightened splendour of the subject. All these illustrates the point that the poet displays an extraordinary creative ability in depicting his subject, here, viz., the beauty of the heroine and makes one feel as though the whole thing were invented for the first time on earth.  

And further while explaining the simile if informed by an inventive and delighting play of genius, can acquire unique splendour due to the creative art and infuse the hearts of connoisseurs with aesthetic pleasure, Kuntaka again cites this same stanza as an example. 

The particle 'Nu' indicates the unsettled mind of Purūravas. It is believed that Urvaśī is born from
the thigh of Narayana. But here his agency is rejected. To reject the agency of Narayana the adjectives, 'Vedabhysajasajda', 'Visayavyavirattakautuhala' and 'Puranah' are given which suit the situation.

In 'Kanta dyutih' there is also the other readings as 'Kantiprabhah' and 'Kantipradah'.

This shows the extraordinary creative ability of the poet. This verse has quoted by Mamma for the figure Sasandega. Ruyyaka and Visvanatha have quoted for Atisyokti. And also Dhanañjaya has cited for Alambana Vibhaya.

Kuntaka classifies things described in poetry as sentient and non-sentient and further subdivides them into primary and secondary:

"Subjects of poetry described in all their undimmed propriety and beauty of nature come to be classed under two heads, namely the sentient and the non-sentient. Of these, the first class can be subdivided again under two heads - 'gods etc.' and 'lions etc.' These may be either primary or subsidiary in the poet's treatment."
At the time of explaining the special features of the primary subject-matter, he quotes two stanzas from the *Vikram*., which consist of 'love-in-separation':

1. "Has she through her power remained invisible in anger? But she will not be angry long. Has she flown up to the heavens? But her heart yearns in ever fresh love for me. While even the foes of the immortals cannot wrest her, while in my presence. And yet she is quite invisible to mine eyes! What fate is this?"¹⁹

And 2. "If she were to touch the earth with her feet here in these woodland spots whose sandy soil is showered over by the clouds, then would I trace her lovely footprints marked with the Alaktaka dye, pressed deep in the soil at the back owing to the heaviness of her hips."²⁰

In the first one, here afflicted Purūravas is speculating the disappearance of his beloved Urvasī. At first he thinks according to her gentle nature. She may be hiding somewhere nearby in anger. But very next moment disavows this reason. And then he properly reflects that she may have gone back to heaven or the demons may have kidnapped her. But here also he fails to come to certainty. Without knowing the cause of her invisibility he reaches
to the highest peak of despair and it gives use to the sentiment of love-in-separation.\textsuperscript{21}

The poet depicts him as he was thinking step by step about the cause of her disappearance. At the beginning naturally he ponders over the cause of her disappearance and it is that of her being angry with him. But due to her gentle nature it appears to be not correct. Further he fancies she might have flown to heaven. As she was a nymph of heaven his fancy is proper. Here also he fails, because of her affectionate mind on him. After these two seem to look ridiculous, the doubt of her having been kidnapped plagues him. But this reason also seems to him as impossible. Because while she stands with him no one can dare to touch her. His thought, in this manner shows his self-pride. Thus his consideration of the pros and cons goes on variently. But he was unable to know the cause. At last he reviles his misfortune. Here, his position of despair gives use to the sentiment of 'love-in-separation'.

Concerning the second stanza Kuntaka says - "When he says, 'should my beloved perchance touch the earth with her feet', he is in a hopeful mood. He is hoping for the possibility of union with her. So he is thinking wishfully -
since rains have poured on the soft sand of the forest
groves, and since her hips are heavy, her foot prints
should be clearly visible, the heel-mark deep and the rest
of the foot-print coloured red in an easily noticeable row.
But since he misses this sight altogether, it further adds
to the poignancy of his despair, which excites more lamenta-
tions bordering on lunacy as revealed in the play in
question."

When he fails to indentify the cause of the disappea-
rance of Urvāśī, he starts to seek her trace, though he
knows it is impossible. Because the celestials never touch
the earth though moving upon it. This exertion of
Purūravas informs how he was bewitched by Urvāśī.

After dividing the things described in poetry into
sentients and non-sentients, he points out that non-sentients
like water, tree, flower and spring etc. also become sources
of kindling of sentiments. And he affirms this from a
verse of the Vikram.

"Already the five-arrowed god has pierced my heart
which is difficult to be withdrawn from its desire for the
unattainable; what then when the mango-trees of the garden,
whose pallid leaves have been blown away by the Malaya
breeze, are showing fresh sprouts?"
It is a faith that the blossomed mango trees and the Malaya breeze are also the stimulants of love. In his Aucityavācārācarcā, Kṣemendra has quoted this verse, while explaining Nāmaucitya. According to M. Shiva-kumaraswamy here the figure of speech is Kāvyārthapatti.

Kuntaka refuses to accept 'Rasavat' as an independent Alāṅkāra:

"Rasavat is not an ornament because there is nothing palpable apart from it which is adorned by it, and because the literal meaning of that word itself is contradicted."

While stating why Rasavat cannot possess the Alāṅkāratva Kuntaka points out: "The word Rasavat and the meaning connotated by it are not congruous and this is another reason why the term Rasavatālaṅkāra cannot be justified. First of all the word Rasavat is explained in the possessive sense with the suffix Vat, so that a compound may be formed thereafter with the word Alāṅkāra. The last compound may be explained in an adjectival sense also, namely, 'one and the same thing not only possesses Rasa but is also an Alāṅkāra.' In the first alternative the question remains to be answered, 'what matter is involved
therein over and above the Rasa in question? If the reply is that it is the poem only, even then the question of finding something other than that to locate the existence of Rasa remains unanswered. Since no such second entity is noticeable anywhere, one cannot affirm any Alāṅkāra like Rasavat in relation to a non-existing entity. Thus in the method adopted by the rhetoricians in defining an Alāṅkāra called Rasavat, there is an inherent discrepancy between the term and its meaning. Perhaps this discrepancy inherent in both the senses of the compound seen above may be sought to be removed by referring them to some other examples."30

To show this he cites two verses from the Vikram as an instance:

1. "That slender one, and the tender leaves wetted by the clouds her lower lip washed by her tears; not decked with blossom, as it is past its time of flowering; it is she with her ornaments cast aside; since the bees are not humming to it, she has been silent in anxious thoughts. So it is that irascible one, who having spurned me, now seems to be stung with remorse."31

And 2. "The rippling wave is her arching brow; the fluttering line of birds her girdle; drawing along its
foam, which is as it were her garment loosened through anger, it flows meanderingly, avoiding the many obstacles in the way, like my beloved who stumbles along as she remembers my faults; so surely that irascible one has been transformed into this river."

Here Kuntaka's opinion runs thus: "It may be said that in these the presence of both Rasa and Alāṅkāra is clearly perceptible. Therefore there is nothing difficult in distinguishing them as separate here. Hence in the explanation involving a Saṣṭhi-tatpuruṣa i.e. 'Alāṅkāra of that which is Rasavat', there is no incongruity between the term Rasavat and the meaning conveyed by it. The Alāṅkāra is only a means towards the enhancement of Rasa and the quality of Rasavat is conditioned by it (Alāṅkāra). Even if we understand the compound in an adjectival sense, there is no discrepancy is alleged. To explain: In these two examples both the creeper and the river are existants. The hero whose heart is overfull with pangs of separation from his beloved, is wont to look upon everything as an embodiment of his beloved. Naturally he indulges in attributing similarity with his beloved to the things seen or in superimposing their identity with his beloved. These two tendencies are vitally the two Alāṅkāras, simile and metaphor, divided by the poet. Apart from these which
Here is the lamentation of Purūravas who has gone mad by separation from his beloved. In the first example the creeper is ascribed on Urvaśī. Here R.N.Gaidhani observes: "The king fancies in the creeper the likeness of Urvaśī. This he elaborates in the verse. The creeper presents a close comparison with Urvaśī in repenting mood for having spurned his prostrations. The penitent Urvaśī would be constantly shedding tears which flowed down washing along her lower lip. She would be devoid of any ornaments on her person, for she is a lady in separation. Even anxious for reconciliation, she would keep silent lest she should give him a fresh offence. In the case of the creeper the raindrops dripping down her foliage are the tears washing down her lower part. The creeper is undecked (i.e. bereft of) with flowers - her ornaments - since her flowering season is long past. Naturally, no bees are drawn to her and she is devoid of the sweet buzzing of the bees, which is considered to be the sweet notes of the creeper. The creeper is silent. Urvaśī is mute with sad thoughts, having disregarded his prostration."34

And in the words of Śaṅkar Paṇḍit: "The king fancies..."
that the creeper is like his Urvasī. The creeper has its leaves wetted by the rain water; he thinks it is Urvasī shedding tears of remorse. The creeper is past its time of flowering and is now flowerless; the king fancies it is Urvasī without ornaments, remorse preventing her from dressing well and decorating her person. As there are no flowers, no bees are humming about the creeper; he thinks it is Urvasī dumb with anxiety. Thus he sees Urvasī who having disdained to be reconciled is now struck with remorse.\textsuperscript{35}

In the second verse the river is ascribed on Urvasī. Here R.N.Gaidhani observes: "The love-lorn king as he stands on the bank of the mountain river, notices it rapid and muddied with rain-waters. It presents a close similarity with certain actions of Urvasī whenever she was angry. He, therefore, advances the supposition that the river is none other than Urvasī herself transformed into that form. He gives a sustained Utpreksā or Poetical Fancy which is imagining of an object under the character of another. Cf. Sambhāvanamthotpreksā.\textsuperscript{36}

Ānandavardhana has also quoted these two stanzas in his Dhvanyālōka.\textsuperscript{37} The verse 'Tanvemegha...' has quoted by Vāmana for Samāhitālankaṇāra, in his work Kāvyālankaṇāra-
And as the opinion of M. Shivakumaraswamy, the figures of speech Slesa and Kavyaliṅga are in the verse 'Taraṅgabhrūbhāṅga...'.

According to Kuntaka Sahokti as defined by Bhāmaha, together with Samāsokti should not be regarded as a figure of speech. Because it includes the features of other figures and it is devoid of beauty. He quotes the definition and the example as given by the ancient theorist viz. Bhāmaha:

"When two simultaneous actions relating to two different subjects are both denoted by one and the same word, it is a figure of speech called Sahokti (193) e.g.:

With quarters bleak by snowfall and inspiring close embraces, night get lengthened now along with the amours of lovers."

Here Kuntaka opines: "Here again, the ground of poetic appeal is the fact of mutual similarity which we observe between the two subjects (viz. Prastuta and Aprastuta); and hence the figure of speech in question is Upama itself. For, in the absence of such attractive similarity also, we would be driven to admit the figure of Sahokti in such plain statement as 'The teacher reads with the student' and 'The father stands with his son', though they are devoid of all beauty."
Then, Kuntaka gives his own definition of the *Sahokti* as:

"When in order to enrich the beauty of the subject described, two subjects are simultaneously described in one and the same sentence, the learned regard it as a figure called 'Sahokti' or description of concurrent occurrence." 

For example he cites a stanza from the *Vikram*:

"O Lord of mountains, have you seen that lovely woman, beautiful in all limbs, in this charming forest, severed from me?"

Here the main sentiment is *Vipralambhaśṛṅgāra* and the passage could yield two meanings, both of which heighten the main sentiment. That another meaning is in the reply of the Mountain to the King:

"O Lord of all kings, I have seen that lovely woman, beautiful in all limbs, in this charming forest, severed from you."
Here Kuntaka observes: "It might well be asked how Śleṣa or Paranomasia does not come into the picture here when to separate meanings are arising. Our reply is: Of the two meanings, if either or both happen to be primary, we may regard it as Śleṣa. In the present instance, such is not the case. The multiple or double meanings are all only secondary here to a significance altogether different. Further, in Slesa, one and the same word, like the light of a lamp, reveals two meanings simultaneously; or two words and two meanings simultaneously; and its greatness lies in this equivocal power. But in Sahokti the word's relation to double meanings is only secondary (and not primary); it is only the sentence as a whole which is re-iterated in different tones that reveals a second meaning. Hence, here iteration of the word acquires primacy. If in the above example, 'O Lord, etc.', it is held that the touch of Śleṣa is possible in a part of the sentence at least, there is nothing wrong in such a position too.

For, our opinion is that one figure of speech can by all means cause another figure of speech to become subsidiary to itself. Hence, in this example, we can see the subsidiary presence of Śleṣa in a part of the sentence while the primary import of the whole would remain Sahokti only. It might again be objected that if re-iteration of the words is the cause of the second meaning, the etymological meaning of
Sahokti will become inapplicable to such an instance, because there is no simultaneity in the iteration of the words at all. But that is not sound. For, the designation of the figure is only 'concurrent iteration' and not 'concurrent grasp of meaning'. Hence the two iterations closely associated with each other lead to the beauty of the meanings (sequentially understood), and there is nothing unjustified in their being designated as Sahokti.

"This itself has been designated by some as Samāsokti, by some others as Sahokti; because its content satisfies the definitions variously given of these two figures by different writers."46

The love-mad Purūravas is asking the mountain about his beloved. This shows the superb genius of Kālidāsa who composed both the question and answer in a single sentence.

In the fourth Unmeṣa of his Vakroktijīvita, Kuntakā describes the varieties of Prakarapavakrata. While explaining the sixth type of this Vakratā he says:

"Another type of beauty in respect of Acts etc. is instanced when the beauty is so exclusive to an Act that it cannot be attained by any other Act, either preceding..."
or following, in the play and the Act thus serves as a touchstone in its own way of the ruling sentiment in the play.\textsuperscript{47}

It means, by flourishing with the ruling sentiment, the particular act becomes more charming than other Acts. To illustrate this Kuntaka quotes the fourth Act of the \textit{Vikram} which is called as 'Unmattanka.'

Here, the love-mad Purūravas is depicted. Purūravas and Urvaśī are sojourning in the Mount Gāndhamādana, to enjoy their honey-moon. One day Purūravas gazes at a Vidyādhara damsel, while she is sporting on the sands of the Māndakini. By this enraged Urvaśī enters the grove of Kumāra forbidden to women, not reckoned the courtesy of Purūravas and immediately transformed into a creeper. For this sudden disappearance Purūravas becomes mad and roams about the grove in search for her. This scene manifesting the sentiment of love-in-separation beautifies this Act.

Here Kuntaka observes: "We find therein a singularly unique aesthetic appeal which enraptures the hearts of connoisseurs; an appeal due to the exquisite heightening of the ruling sentiment of love-in-separation by the poet's
rich accumulation of all the sweet antecedents and ensuants exclusive to that Rasa. Thus, in the beginning of that Act itself, we read:

King (in frenzy) - O villain, stop! stop! Where are you going, carrying away my beloved? (Seeing) What? Jumping into the sky from the mountain peak, is he shooting arrows at me? (Observing carefully, in tears) Alas, how I am deceived!

This is only a new rain-cloud, not an armed demon proud; this is a rain-bow just stretched out and not at all the demon's bow; this, again, is a heavy down pour of rain and not a shower of arrows shot; this is lightening, bright like a line of gold on the touchstone, not my dear Urvashi.

The above outburst reveals the mad frenzy of the king in love. It appears to him that he could well withstand and counter even the proud attack from a demon fully armoured and twanging his big bow, but he is powerless against the attack of the new cloud; that even a volley of sharp arrows would not pierce into his heart so painfully as this downpour of rain. 'Even a fleeting lightening in the sky which vanishes the moment it is seen, possesses
some steadiness for a split second allowing its sight; but in the case of my beloved, even such a momentary steadiness of the lightening has become unimaginable. What am I to do? This inner purport of the king is suggested by the passage taken as a whole. In this connection, the verses already cited and commented upon, namely,

(i) May be in her anger she is invisible by her magic...

(ii) Should my beloved touch the earth with her feet...

(iii) Frowning with its waves as with brows...
and so forth should also be read and appreciated."^48

Further, of course, he got his beloved with the help of the 'Sāṅgamaniya' gem. Thus having the primacy of the sentiment of love-in-separation this IV Act possesses the special importance than the preceding or following Acts. The genius power of Kālidāsa is marvelous here. Same as the fourth Act of the Abhi.Śāk., this Act also got popularity. And also obtained abundant comments, such as:

1. "... exceptional in the whole range of Sanskrit literature." And "the fourth act on the madness of Purūravas is unique in this sense."^49
2. "This act is a kind of melodrama and is quite exceptional in dramatic place."\textsuperscript{50}

3. "The fourth act is quite exceptional in the whole range of Sanskrit literature."\textsuperscript{51}

4. "... the matchless fourth Act of the play..."\textsuperscript{52}

5. "The separation from Urvasī unhinges Purūravas and he loses his reason. His imagination weaves strange fancies when he sees friends and enemies in birds and beasts, in mountains and rivers. Kālidāsa's lyrical genius is seen at its best in designing this act in the form of an opera—all song and music, laying bare the turmoil in the hero's mind, whose monologues present his mixed feelings ranging from breathless longing to an agony of disillusion. Nowhere in the history of Sanskrit drama do we find a parallel to this scene. Here is a masterly presentation of the sentiment of love-in-separation, which was won the admiration of critics all over the world. (Cf. Walter Ruben, "Kālidāsa" Berlin: Akademic Verlag, 1957, p.70; S.K.De, "A History of Sanskrit Literature" Calcutta: Calcutta University, 1947, p.139). Even the hero's madness, as one critic observes, "is rather a temporary exaltation than a perversion or aberration from his natural state". (Sri Aurobindo, "Kālidāsa", Second Series, Pondicherry: The Aurobindo Ashram,1954,p.56)\textsuperscript{53}
6. "Fallen into the love of Urvaśī, Purūravas gone mad by her separation. Kālidāsa secured unique popularity in painting the various mode of inconsistency talks of the crazy Purūravas, which indicates his deep love. This Act proclaims the poet's supremacy of the imperishable description in the kingdom of imagination. There is no one like Kālidāsa who expatiated the numbed option of the man in the beautiful verses. One can say the IV Act itself is the pith of this drama. Instead of the external attraction or complicated incidents here appears the beautiful flow of emotions."^54

7. "It should be noted that this Act has excellent appearance in the field of whole Sanskrit drama."^55

8. "Including the operatic dancing and singing, the description of nature, and the opportunity in exhibiting the various sentiments and unequalled charming filled with the supremacy of the pathetic sense, it can be said that no other Sanskrit drama is equivalent to this Act."^56

Thus, flourishing with the ruling sentiment of love-in-separation this Act strikes us most.
NOTES AND REFERENCES
CHAPTER VII.

1. रतादिष्ठयं यथायमुखर्षनिमंत्रयोः। वाक्यशैलीविदत्तचेन सापरापदवक्ता।
-V.J. II.33

2. अथेवपदे तत्तथा विवेयः। प्रियया ग्राहनम्: हुदुः सहो मे। नववारिधिरोद्याट्टमि-
शिपितत्वम् व निरालपत्तर्यः।
-Vikram. IV.3.
Transl. C.R.D.

3. "अथ द्रवी: परस्परं हुदु: तद्विद्वीर्यांसाध्यसद्यसमस्तमित्वोः। प्रियविरहस्यावलोकयत्वः तद्विद्यालङ्कारम् प्रतिपदनप्यर्म "व" - शब्द-
द्वितियं वदाध्यसमस्तमित्वा बिन्दुदाध्यविद्याकालम् ज्ञातसमावित्वात्
सम्बंधृतं कारणम् वाक्या वदाध्यसद्यसामान्यकार्तिप्रतीक्षात् प्रतीयते। "हुदु" - "हुदु:"
शब्दमयम् व द्रवीत्वा ग्राहनम्।
-V.J. p.222
Transl. K.K. p.407

(1) "तत्तथा प्रियया विवेयस्ववाय भदुः तहो मम शकपदे
शेषवै कार्यारोपयेत उपस्थितः। नववारिधिरोद्यात्नि निरार-
लपत्तर्यः। दिवसादिरामणि यक हुदुः विरहिनितीय वतापत्तर्यः
इतिभावः।"
-The Commentary of कोषेश्वरि.

(2) "The King explains his adverse fate in bringing
upon him miseries one following closely upon
another. Already he is suffering separation from
his beloved, which is extremely unbearable. But as if,
this is not sufficient, and fate has his way by sending
now the rainy season with charming days inviting enjoyment
due to the absence of excessive heat. This passion-excitng atmosphere renders the pangs of separation all the more unbearable. य-य - The repetition of य shows simultaneity or immediate succession of two events connected by them."

-THE VIKRAMORVASIYA OF KALIDASA.
Pub: THE ROYAL BOOK STALL,
BUDHAWAR PETH, POONA, 2. p.156.


5. अपरा सघवार्थप्रिवकळातिनी || निर्भितवृत्तित्वोतलोकातित्रांत्तगोयरा || -V.J. III.2.
Transl. K.K. p.415

6. "यन्न वर्णमानस्वस्य: पदार्थयः कविवभिमृत्यः सत्त: जिथ्यते, केवल सत्तात्वाते भ्राताः परिसुरताः तेषाँ तथाविषयः कीर्तित्वम्: युनाराधीयते, ध्वेन कामिष्य हुद्धार्द्वारे राज्यात्माधिरोपयते। तद्देव सत्तात्वाते भ्राताः परिसुरतः: पदार्थस्य कीर्तित्वमिकः: शोभातिविभाविस्न: वित्रास्तित्विविशेषेऽभियते, ध्वेन तत्तनन्नात्य-मन्नोद्धारिणार्यावात्तवास्तितितिररूपानुवक्षण निम्नवासात्मासत्सवस्येण तत्कालोन्निश्चित इव वर्णीयदार्यम परिश्यन्तविशिष्टम प्रतिपण्नते, ध्वेन विधातुवृव्यदेशसमातता प्रतिपण्नते कथयः। तद्देवाचकम् - अपराकाव्यारूपे कविवेच प्रजापति:। यथातै रोपते विषयं तद्देव परिवर्तते।"
-V.J. p.230
7. तदेवमाहायाः पैदं सा प्रसुत्विद्विधितिविधायपकारत्त्वितरिकैः
नान्या काशिन्द्रपरते। तस्माद बहुविधन्तकाः पुनःद्रातित्तथंतत्
विताविवहराः परिदृश्यन्ते॥

-अव. प. 120

8. अस्यः सरवधृशः घुजामारकः स्वं न मदनो मातो न पुछाकाः।
वेदां माथाः कर्त्त न विषयवात्तकोकृताः
निमित्ताः प्रभुव-प्रहोरमिधं सर्वं पुराणो नूँनिः॥

-विक्रांम. 1.10.
Transl. C.R.D.

9. "अः कान्तायः: किमं राष्ट्रानमाहायमविलाससम्पदाः
पदं व रसवत्त्तमाणं मधुमाणं देवं सौभाग्यं प्रतिवा दियं प्रतेकं
तत्परशं दुर्गाया-दुर्गाया-शुभमित्तपञ्चायानामवाद्यां शूष्कं पृथ्वीमिव
निमित्ताः द्वितिकतिष्ठम्। तत्तद् कार्यानुसन्धायेऽपि विवेकादिर भवेन विश्वानसे
स्वयं इति संवेदयमानमेव तूतो समुद्ररथवति। व: विल तान्यमेव
कान्तानुसरत्तस्य सौवन्नमुत्तापमात्रार्थितवात् कामित्तमेकारणकृत
केलोपन-नम्। यत्र स्वमेव श्रुण्याईशरसत्तत्त्व रक्तीलवेदेव
रथवत्त्तमायात्वं नौपिथ्यं भजते। यथा न्यमेव नुपाकसत्तत्त्वाविचारायात्मेव नौपिथ्यं
भजते। अत्र न्यमेव रथवत्त्तमायात्मेव नौपिथ्यं भजते। अत्र न्यमेव नुपाकसत्त
स्थायिकायात्मेव नौपिथ्यं भजते। कृमार यथा सर्व: समुपिथः। तथा
घोषितसः व्याकरणश्चेत ब्रजयात्तत्स्य कान्तिमहादिएपीक्षे
नुपातित्तथापदितः। यस्मात् वेदां माथाः दुर्गाया-दुर्गाया-विषयवात्तकोकृतवादाः।
रसवत्त्तमाणं विहितममयम्। पुराणवत्त्तमाहायमात्रार्थितयेव। प्रजायते। प्रतीयो।
तदेवमुप्रमये लक्षणोद्विन्दकाः: कविन्य वनसीमर्य स्तुताः। कमायकाकोऽक्षेत्रविविधयते
कार्यानुसन्धायेऽपि विवेकादिर भवेन विश्वानसे। तत: अः न्यमेव
मधुमाणं दुर्गाया-दुर्गाया-दुर्गाया-दुर्गाया-विषयवात्तकोकृतवादाः।
सम्पदां महामद्यमेकारणमाहायमाहायमात्रार्थितयेव। तस्दैवतम्चारणमेकारण
के नूँनिः। अन्त: स्वायमावसीन्द्रमहिमाः। त्यस्मेव तस्मात्
सम्पदां महामद्यमेकारणमाहायमात्रार्थितयेव। तस्दैवतम्चारणमेकारण
के नूँनिः। अन्त: स्वायमावसीन्द्रमहिमाः। त्यस्मेव तस्मात्

11. Read:
   (1) "नू" is used in asking a question mixed with doubt."
       -Vikramorvasiya of Kālidāsa.
   (2) "An interrogative particle implying some doubt
       or uncertain ty."
   (3) "नू" expresses the sense of guess or conjecture.
       (Cf., नू: वितर्क)
       -DRAMAS OF KĀLIDĀSA
       Pub: Motilal Banarasidass, Bungalow Road, Jawahar-
       Nagar, Delhi-7. p.18-19.

12. "Some take पुराणमुनि to mean Brahmadeva. But it goes
    clearly against the context. Besides Brahmadeva
    had created lovely things like the moon etc., and
    he could have easily created उम्मी. No doubt,
    lovers are sometimes described as thinking that
    the ordinary Brahmadeva could not have created

13. Read: (1) "वेदांतयातः: - Who is dulled by his Vedic
    studies; whose sense of beauty is all blunted by-
    constant application to the Vedic studies. An ascetic
    cannot conceive such a ravishing beauty of form, nor
impare it to others. Cf. अनुवाक्पत्ता बुदिनीश्वा तत्त्वाध्याद्विंति। Mr. Pandit overshoots himself when he remarks: 'It is apparent that in Kalidasa's time the study of the Veda was not regarded as anymore edifying, to the mind or the body than it is at present. विषयाचूर्तीत्वा तौ विषयं:। ापृत्तं कात्तव्यं यस्य:। Who has withdrawn his desires or attachment (कौतुहल) from objects of senses. Whose taste for sense-objects is deadened. Before a person can embark upon asceticism, he is required to renounce all worldly pleasures. As such, he cannot create, much less himself imagine, a thing of beauty, a joy for ever. पुराणो मूलिः। -- The ancient sage.'


2. "वेदांतम्याशायं को वेदांतम्याशेन बहु मन्द:। मलिन इत्यादि:। न तु यत्र वदुत्त कान्तिम:। विषयाचूर्तीत्वा कौतुहलो विषयेभ्यं: शून्यानिमित्य:। व्यापृत्तं नियुक्तं कौतुहलं यस्य स तथौत्त:। न तु मदनवद्यागार-रताभिनं:। पुराणो जीर्णं। तौ काँचमण्डरित:। मुनिभववस्यो नारायणं:। मनोहरं लावण्याशिक्षणमेधमिदं रूपं निर्माणं सृष्टं कथे न प्रभेनेत।। कथे न इत्यादिशे।। न प्रभेददित्वं:।' - The Commentary of पुराणमिर्दिराजीया.

3. "वेदांतम्याशायं: insensible to all other pleasures owing to the study of the Vedas, i.e., incapable of appreciating the beauty of women. विषयेभ्यं:। व्यापृत्तं कौतुहलं यस्य:। विषयं means worldly pleasures or objects of sense. पुराण अन्तरं, त उल्लं, न प्रभेनेत।। न प्रभेददित्वं:।' - R.N.K. Op.Cit. p.19.
14. "The other reading वांक्षि प्रुषाः would mean 'possessed of lovely brightness! वांक्षि प्रुषाः would accord well with no doubt, but वांक्षि प्रुषाः is also a good reading showing that the moon, being possessed of a vast amount of कान्ति, can well afford to bestow it upon others.'


15. Vide: K.P. of Mammata Tenth Chapter.

16. "अन्तः पुराणजापतिनिमित्ततेऽवांसम्पर्यवन्धः उक्तः।"


"अन्तः पुराणजापतिनिमित्ततेऽवांसम्पर्यवन्धः।"

-S.D. of Visvanatha. द्घन्निपिङ्खः: p.2000


18. भावानामपरिलाङ्गावालोकितवुद्दरस्य।
केतनानां बजानां व स्वल्पं दिविःस्य स्मृतम्।
तत् पूर्वं पुराणचार्यवा द्रापामेव विभिन्निते।
पुराणदिश्यत्रमृतिप्रथमायते-नेत्रयोगतः।"

-V.J. III.5-6.

19. "विशेषमप्रथमप्राध्यायिता दीर्घं न सा कृप्यति
स्वर्गायोपतितता भृगु-मथि पुनर्मायार्त्स्या मनः।
तात्तो हर्षेन विकुलावदिषोपि न व मे शक्ता: पुरावर्तिनी
सा वात्यतमनोपरं नयनयोगतिति कोष्ठं विधि:।"

-Vikram. IV. 2.
Transl. C.R.D.
20. \[\text{पद्यः पृष्ठादृशु मुमतः यदी ता सुमात्री कैक्षाह्तातिकाता वनस्थलीयः।}
\[\text{परावृतनता गृहनितम्यतया ततोद्वया}\
\[\text{हृदयं वारुष्याद्वितीयवल्कः।}\
- \text{Vikram. IV.6.}
\[\text{Transl. C.R.D.}

21. \[\text{अ राक्ष वल्लभविरहैधारवश्वाविश्वाग्यात्तितद्वापावित-}
\[\text{मनिविनिनित-}
\[\text{निवारपरसंतायामनियपरिपत दिनपि तातातिकविकल्पोनिविल्लयकणमनमनकलोकन-}
\[\text{कारिण्यमहामायैं तदासादनन्यासम्भवन्तेऽनेनायतनिविल्लवदनत्तत्ता रसः परः}
\[\text{परिपृष्ठाद्वितीयपृष्ठाद्वितीयपृष्ठाद्वितीयपृष्ठाद्वितीयपृष्ठाद्वितीयपृष्ठाद्वितीय}
\[\text{पृष्ठाद्वितीयपृष्ठाद्वितीयपृष्ठाद्वितीयपृष्ठाद्वितीयपृष्ठाद्वितीय}
- \text{V.J. p. 236}
\[\text{Transl. K.K. p. 425.}

22. \[\text{अ वद्यः वद्यः केदारित्व पृष्ठाद्वितायमवित्ता तल्पारित्तिः}
\[\text{संभात्ये। गंधर्वविरलतत्ततिल्कृताकारसिकतातु वनस्थलीयः}
\[\text{गृहनितम्यतया तस्यः: परावृत्ततत्तमेते नितरवामुद्भितस्वाना}
\[\text{रसायनपरवत्तया सम्प्रयोगिताभिषेकविन्यासपरवत्तया हृदयेत, तस्मानः नेताय-}
\[\text{निरियतरिवेक तुता समुज्ज्विल्लिता, या तदुत्तायाक्ष्योत्तस्वितिलिपिताना}
\[\text{निमित्ततमदेभु।}\
- \text{V.J. p. 239}
\[\text{Transl. K.K. p. 425.}

23. \text{Read: 'Celestials never touch the earth, even while}
\text{moving upon it; that\textquote SingleSpace is not to be believed.\textquote SingleSpace}

24. \[\text{ज्ञानामयेतत्तता तल्लत्तकुमसमधुभृतिनामेवविद्य स्वरूपः}
\[\text{रसोदूमिनियमथविनिधनन्युर्वर्तनीयतामगाहे।}\
- \text{V.J. p. 282}
25. \[\text{दृष्टि} \text{मुलभल्यविभागानारुतिवारः} \]
\[\text{प्रथममध्य मनों ने पु-यबान: दिखिति।} \]
\[\text{किसिम क्योंकि मलयावासी मुनिलाटापुरिपै-} \]
\[\text{स्वपनसहकारेदीशिप्रयक्तुरै} \]
- Vikram, II.6.
Transl. C.R.D.

26. Read:
1) "Because the sight of the mango trees with their fresh tender sprouts and the touch of the gentle Malaya breeze are very potent excitants of the passion of love and immensely intensify the torments of the already suffering, miserable victim of love".

2) "The mango sprouts, the Malaya breezes are an excitant of love".

27. "अत् प्रारम्भ यथा मेधे मन: पू-यबान: तुलत्तत्वाध्यक्षानारुतिवारः
शक्ति विकीर्तिति, किमुित लीलोधान सत्यार्थमलयालिनादोलित
वालपत्तैरुसुसु दशिप्रयति तुवसे. मदुनिं पू-यबानामथियान-
विधिनिमोऽविद्विनमेव।"
- Auclityā of Kṣemendra. p.12

Ed.by:- M.Shivakumarswamy
Prasaranga, Bangalore University, Bangalore, p.37.
29. अलौकिके न रसवतः परस्यारुप्तिभासतनातू।
स्वप्नादितिरिक्तस्य शब्दार्थर्गोतिरपि॥
-V.J. III. 11
Transl. K.K. p.430

30. अस्मे (दृष्णानंतरम्) उपन्ययते - शब्दार्थसुभूतयोगी ।
शब्दार्थयोगरविभा-नाभिशेषोरसमन्यवाच्य रत्नदलकरारोपयल्लिन्तरित।
अस्मि अति निष्ठाति यस्येति भुतपुरुषं विषयिते तस्यालक्षण इति
श्रुतिसमालं। फृष्टादि, रस्वार्ष्ट्रासायनकारस्य विशेषण समातो वा।
तत्र पूर्वस्मृत्ति पश्चि - रत्नादितिरिक्तो निमन्त्युद्ध पदात्मन्त्रां विषये
यस्यावलक्ष:। कायम्येति चैतु, तत्रापि तद्वय्यतिरितिक।
कौशली पदारथाय रत्नदलकरार्यपदेः: साक्षात्तर प्रतिपदे?
विषयालितिरित्व: पदार्थां न कृषितु परिघोषते यस्तदनःनक्षरं इति
व्यवस्थितभाषादायित। तद्विमुक्तलक्ष: माणि रसवदलकरस्य
शब्दार्थसंगृहितां कायम्येति। यदि वा निर्देशानात्तरविष्क्लया
समासहितेयेवपि शब्दार्थसंगृहितायोजना विषयेते॥
-V.J. p. 239-34
Transl. K.K. 434.

31. तत्वी भेषलाशान्तत्त्वतः धौतात्यथेवाः: अ:|
गुणयोगमयेति: स्वकताविशेषाय विशालन्तः प्रोक्ततिः।
अन्तःथेत्योगविभासिता मुख्यां शब्दार्थिना माणि
वाक्यो मामवधूस्म पादपितिः जातातुतपेव सदा॥
-Vikram. IV.39.
Transl. C.R.D.

32. तत्त्वमभुवनं(विशेष!) विवृत्तिशिरनो|
विकर्षितो वै वसन्नमस्तरमभाषितः।
यथायथ याति स्वरितमभिसन्धाय बशो-|
नासाहेवेणय प्रयत्तिः सत परिणात॥
-Vikram. IV.28.
Transl. C.R.D.
33. अत रसयांवमिण्वकार्य प्रकट पृथिभाते। तस्मान कथाविवादिपि
तद्रिकर्त्य युक्तृहरम्य। तेन रससतोलकार इति अतिसमास पेशे
शब्दार्थायोऽनन्तिर्दिवसणितान्त्यमु रससयांवपरिप्रकार्यारससी
तनिन-वन्धुमय रसयांवम्य। रससतोलकारार्थे प्रतिविद्यामात्रापेशे
क्रिया इति विचारसमाधिपु बसित अतिसमासम्य तथा वैत्योऽवदायणः
अथ तत्तत्त्वोद्घोदिन अविश्वासवेग वल्लभावितात्न करणया नामकर्य
तन्त्रे (निर्देशसे १) मेव पदार्थपरस्म वकलमयलोक्यतः तल्लकम्य
समारोपण तदन्त्त्वमाप्यारोपण वेदायमालकायार्न विनान
नेतापित आर्कारण घटते, तल्कस्वाव्यत्चाः।
-V.J. p. 148


35. Vide: THE VIKRAMORVASIYAM DRAMA IN FIVE ACTS
By: KALIDASA
Ed.by : SHANKAR P.PANDIT.
GOVERNMENT CENTRAL BOOK DEPOT, BOMBAY. p.114.


37. See, Supra: Anandavardhana on Kālidāsa, Chapter-II. p.22

38. "अत्र पूर्वतोत्तरालामःर्कयः: तादृशन्य मृत्युः। तेष्व नतो-
व्यः स्वपन्नापि।"
KĀVYĀLANKĀRASŪTRA-VRITTI OF VĀMANA.
Ed.by: SRI PT. KEDARANATH SHARMA,
Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashana, VARANASI-221001.
नेतापित आर्कारण घटते, तल्कस्वायत्चाः।
Read:
"लतामवलोक्य ततानुष्ठानस्यतत्त्वविज्ञविन्नानात् -
लम्बोदरशयस्याभिनवणम् ततानुष्ठानस्यतत्त्वविज्ञविन्नानात् पुरुषः
केवल लतानुष्ठानस्यतत्त्वविज्ञविन्नानात् ततानुष्ठानस्यतत्त्वविज्ञविन्नानात् । - कामयेन:


40. समासोकित: ततोकितच नालज्ञवतया मता |
अलङ्कारान्तररूपं शोभायुन्यतया तथा || |
-V.J. III. 51.

41. तथ्यकालिकः यथा वस्तुदर्शामाफः |
ताकन्याध्य नतान्तररूपः तथा ||
हिन्दुत्तरतत्त्वादियो गान्ताचार्यविन्दः
उद्दित्ताराध्य: यामिनिः कामिनिः प्रेमितम: सदा || |
Transl. K.K. p. 519

42. अन्त परस्यरस्यसम्भवन: मनोहारितानिबन्धः न भिषु- |
धर्मारूप तद्भवः, "भिष्यते ततेषायः पञ्चित", "दुःखे |
सह पिता पितृकोऽन्नन्" इत्यादिः शोभायुन्यवेदः 
ता रङ्गाः ।
-V.J. p. 329
Transl. K.K. p. 519

43. यथा श्लेष्यास्मात्रताः वर्णनीयार्थं विवेदः |
उद्क्षिप्यपद्धरणः सा ततोकितः सताः मताः || |
-V.J. III. 52.

44. लक्षितिमृत्युः नाय भृष्टा खर्वाकृतिः न धार्मिका |
रामा रम्या वनोढ़िश्य मध्य विरहिता 
तवत्या ||
-Vikram. IV. 27.'
Transl. C.R.D.
45. "The Sahitya-Darpapa quotes this verse as an instance of Trigata, where the verse contains both the question and the supposed reply. The words are so chosen that a slight change of construction gives out the reply. Cf. निम्नलिखितायें सति त्वया विरहिता मया दृढ़पतितस्य सति स्पर्शिताति व. तन्त्रमययत समानम्।
- S.D. VI. 257. The verse is also found in the राम. III. 64.29. Where Rāma utters it under similar circumstances and with a like result. It is very probable that the prototype for this search by Purūravas is Rāma's quest for Sītā. Here the words of the King are really echoed by the mountain in the same order; but the insane king takes it to be a reply given by the mountain. The word of address: सभितितम् नाथ is construed in two ways. (1) The mountains (धितिम् )
(2) the Kings. Hence the query and the reply are."

46. नन वर्णकार्यसंमेलन शेषायुक्तेः कथा न भवतीति २ अभिधीयते ।
तः यस्मात् दृष्टेरवत्स्य वा शुक्रभाषे शेषे्: । अनु पुनर्रथवादिः
भावात् हृदा द्वयोर्व सौक्ष्ये् गुणभावे् प्राचार्यपरवेदनातानातात्
अन्यच्च तापिन्देशैव शुद्धेन गुप्तत् पुरोपकाशब्दरूपयुक्ताणां शब्दरूप
द्वयुक्ताणां वेदिति शब्दस्तर सामान्याया् विश्वेषे् । सहीकाले
पुनर्रथवादिःशास्त्रायुक्तेः (व) वाक्येन पुनः पुनर्रथवामात्या
वर्तन्तपुरुषाणां विस्त्थ्रे्, तस्मात्वृत्तितं शब्दस्तरः प्राचार्यानातात्
प्रतिपदे्। (यदि) "सौर्ध्विति नाथ" इत्यादि वाक्येकथे शेषायुक्तेः
सम्बादीरुप्ये्, तथापि न करिवद्वेषः यस्मात् करण्डश्रेणीयातात्
क्वपिद्युक्ताणां गम्यतीति । अन्य वाक्येकथे शेषायुक्ताणां, शुक्रभावे्
पुनः सहीकाले्। (नन) तदया गुप्तार्वात् वर्तन्तपरायांतात् सहीकाले्
शेषायुक्ताणां विस्त्थ्रे्, प्रश्नाणां नैतिकता् । यस्मात् सही
विति विरुपसत्वता् न पुनः पुरस्तिप्रतिरतिः। हेतत्तथानाथभावाभिधान
मेय (ते) प्रतिपद्युक्ताणां प्रतिरतिः न किंचिदं संबद्धम्
कैरिच्वेदेः समासोऽतिः सहीकाले्: कैरिच्वेदेः।
अधान्यानीतां विचित्रितत्प्रेतन्तरभेदां। ॥
-V.J. p.225-30

47. यशाण्तरसान्याण्यकृतिः कौशिकिः।
पुर्वोत्तरायण साध्यायं: कौशिकिः कृत्यां।
-V.J. IV, 10.

48. तत् हि पुर्वोत्तरात्ताताधारण (विवाहाभाव) भाष्यसंस्करणा
विवेचने् भाष्यासादिः स कौशिकिः (शुद्भूयुक्त) देः: रतानिन्दर
परिप्रेयः परर्तिःैं: यः न केवल प्रकरणानाते प्रव्याख्या
कामनीतिककारानाताः। तथा व तद्युक्तम् एव।
Ram (संस्कृतम्) - आ दुरारम्भो तिष्ठ तिष्ठ। कव नू खु न प्रिययमामामाय गद्धति (विलोक्य) कर्यं शैवालिकरातु गमन- मुख्यत्तप बायामामिभिन्नति (विमाय लक्ष्यम्) कर्यं विनेत्वयोऽपिनम् -

नवजलयं: सेण्टोद्यं न हृदप्तनिनाय:।
मुरधुरिर्दुराकुट्टेन न नाम शरातनम् ॥।
अयम: पुद्यारसारो न बायामम्यरा।
कल्यामिक्षिषरिगम्या विनु: प्रिया न ममायरी॥

अनन्दोऽभिन्तोऽन्मादस्यास्यम् शारीः कवः कर्यं: सिसिजितकोषः
- दण्डो दप्तायथं नकारोऽर्ग श्रेष्ठतिकारो न त्यस्य नवाम्मोदि
इति, नायकिनवयोऽर्गि न तथा मयारागः कुर्माय यथायमसारथ्यागिनिकार
इति। यि व नमति वा भुवः सौदामिन्या: अन्नोक्षभुतनष्टाया:
क्षणान्तरे दर्षनमतायोऽर्ग, तथावर्य।सन्ति: सामाजिकोऽपिनि प्रियाया:
तर्कमिकामिति वाक्षिन्यारो वाज्येऽन प्रतिपाद्यते इति तिष्ठेऽविष्टे विशादी
त्यादि। "पद्माया"-भिनि, "तरंगे"-त्यादि: (च) प्रायुक्तमात्रमात्रमिनि
सन्देहम्।

-V.J. p. 256-67
Transl. K.K. p.559-60.
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