CHAPTER VIII
KUNTAKA ON ABHIJÑĀNA-ŚĀKUNTALA

After dealing with the 'Kārakavakrā', Kuntaka proceeds to deal with 'Sahkhya-vakrā' or 'the beauty of number.' He gives the definition as:

"If the poets transpose the numbers to achieve the special poetic charm we have what is called as 'beauty of number'."

It means to bring poetic charm, poets use some specific number, instead of some other number and this change pleases the connoisseurs.

Kuntaka illustrates this with a verse² from the Abhiśāk. of Kālidāsa:

"...We (O) bee! are undone through search for truth (regarding her); you, indeed, are blessed."

Here the poet has used deliberately the plural 'we' instead the singular 'I', denoting Duṣyanta.
The plural number shows the distance whereas the singular implies intimacy. The poet means to say that Duṣyanta being an intelligent human being had to remain unsuccessful whereas a mere bee, an ignorant and worthless creature could go very near Śakuntalā and attain success in kissing her. Thus the plural number has generated poetic beauty.  

In the third chapter, after the refutation of the statement made by Bhāma, Udbhāṭa and Daṇḍin about Rasavadalaṅkāra, the definition of Rasavadalaṅkāra given by Kuntaka is:

"That adornment of figure of speech, which functions like 'Rasa' because it suffuses poetry with 'Rasa', is designated as 'Rasavat' inasmuch as it causes poetic appeal to connoisseurs."

And gives the same verse as an example. The English version of the whole verse is:

"You touch repeatedly her quivering eye the corners of which are tremulous; hovering near her ear you sweetly hum, as though whispering a secret (of love); in spite of her waving her hand you drink her lower lip, the very essence
of enjoyment; (whilst) we, (O) bee! are undone through
search for truth (regarding her); you, indeed, are
blessed."5

The bee moved towards Śakuntalā when she was engaged
in watering the plants. Then jealous Duṣyanta who was
standing behind the trees saw this and addressed the bee
as above.

Here Kuntaka says. "The attribution or superimposi-
tion of the lover's behaviour on to the bee is a figure
of speech, viz., metaphor which, in its turn, endows
exquisite charm to the Rasa or sentiment, viz., the
erotic, here."6

Duṣyanta has manifested his desire through the bee.
The bee acts as a person in the view of the poet.

Duṣyanta was bewitched by the beauty of Śakuntalā.
He was desiring to enjoy its essence. At the same time
the bee was moving round her face. When he saw it, he
became jealous. Because, what he wanted to do, had been
done by the bee. He thinks that the bee was his rival.
The word 'Bahuśah' attempts at indicating his envy.7
The lines of first, second and third stanza indicate the desire of the lover towards his beloved. 'Moving at corners of the eyes is the sign of beauty' and 'kissing of the lower tip' acquires an important place in the love-sport.

Stating the disappointment of Duṣyanta, the last line suggests the status of the human beings. A man is different from the other animals. He must act according to his status in the society. But the animals can do anything at any time. So, Duṣyanta says "we are undone through search for truth." Here some think that the word 'we' is used for 'I', probably to show that the great never address themselves in singular.

On the other hand, Kālidāsa's intention seems to deliver a message to the whole mankind. In every moment a man's behaviour should have some propriety and limit. He cannot behave indiscriminately like an animal. Hence also, the poet might have had used as 'we' instead of 'I'.

Containing the Śṛṅga-rāṣṭasa this verse delights the readers.

There are five figures of speech in this stanza.
Those are: The natural actions of a bee are described with poetic charm and hence we have 'Svabhāvokti'. In the second line, the act of humming of the bee has been conceived as whispering some secret in her ears and thus there is 'Utprekgalāṅkāra'. And also this stanza contains 'Samāsokti' because by the comparison of the adjectives, the description of the bee explains the behaviour of a lover. The bee (Upameya) is explained to be successful than the king (Upamāna) and it gives use to 'Vyātirekāṅkāra'. In the first three lines it is imagined as the bee kissing her. So, here is 'Kāvyaliṅga'.

Ānandavardhana has quoted this verse for the utilisation of a figure of speech as an accessory to sentiment, in his work Dhvanyāloka. Hemacandra also has quoted this in his work Kāvyānusāsana, while explaining the varieties of Rasas. Viśvanātha has also quoted this for while explaining Alakṣyakramavyāṅgyadhvani.

While explaining a variety of Padavakrata or 'poetic beauty of the word', Kuntaka adduces a stanza from Kālidāsa's Abhiṣak. as an example:

"The face of the damsel, with eyes of lovely eyelashes, was though somehow raised, yet not kissed (the face) which
had its lower lip covered with fingers, which was distressed in (uttering) words of prohibition and (hence was) charming and which repeatedly turned towards the shoulders."

Kuntaka remarks. "Here the hero (Duṣyanta) is so much distraught by his first impulse and his memory is so completely filled by the fascinating beauty of her moon-face with all its attendant graces that he regrets very much his missing the joy of her kiss at the first instance. It is the force of the particle Tu (but) which is capable of suggesting the crowded feelings culminating in the hero's repentance and thus promotes the beauty of the passage in an extraordinary fashion."\(^1\)

Here, the indeclinable 'Tu' suggests the repentance of Duṣyanta. We can draw a picture of Śakuntalā only by this description. This shows the extraordinary genius of Kālidāsa, the master poet.

According to some this is an example of Svabhāvokti, Kāvyalinga, and Śrutivṛttvanuprāsah.\(^2\)

Kuntaka classifies things described in poetry as sentient and non-sentient and further divides them into primary and secondary.\(^3\) While explaining the special
features of the secondary sentients he quotes a stanza from the Abhiṣāk, as an example:

"Whose glance is now and then fixed on the pursuing chariot in a manner graceful owing to the turn of his neck, who has entered to a great extent the fore-part of (his) body with the hinder half through fear of the descent of the arrow (and) who has strewn (his) track with the half-chewed Darbha-ślades dropping from his mouth opened through exhaustion, moves, observe, much more in the sky (but) little on the earth, owing to his lofty boundings."

Dusyanta pursued a stag while he was hunting. By the fear of death it was running fast. The picture of this stag is described beautifully.

'Dattadrśtiḥ' here, is also a variant reading as 'Baddhadrśtiḥ'. It is better to take as 'Baddhadrśtiḥ'.

The description of the antelope is very natural. This shows the keen observation of poet Kālidāsa. This is considered to be the best example of 'SVabhāvōkti', even though Kuntaka refuses to accept it as a separate Aṅkāra. And also here is the figure 'Utpreksā'. Mammaṭa and Hemacandra have quoted this for 'bhavānaka rasa'.

The figure 'Drṣṭānta' is defined by Kuntaka as:

"When another idea is pointed to on the basis of its factual similarity (to the idea on hand) without explicit use of expressions like Iva, we have Drṣṭānta or poetic analogy."²⁶

As an example he cites a stanza²⁷ from the Abhīsāk:

"A lotus, though encased in moss, is charming; the speck, though dark, heightens the beauty of the moon; this slender lady is more attractive even with the bark; what, indeed, is possibly not an embellishment to lovely forms?"

In the hermitage of Kañya, Duṣyanta hiding himself behind the trees observes Śakuntalā's extraordinary beauty and appreciates as above.

Here, only the first three lines form the example for Drṣṭānta. The last line of this can be taken for the figure Arthāntaranyāsa. It is interesting to note that Kuntaka is the lone critic who quotes this verse as an example of Drṣṭānta. According to him the last line contains the Arthāntaranyāsa.²⁸
The finding of others differs considerably. Rāghavabhāṭṭa finds Arthāntaranyāsa and Mālāprtiṣṭūpamā. And he says in the second line there is the fault of Prakramabhāṅga.

This stanza is quoted by Amṛtānandayogin and Viśvanātha as an example of Mādhuryam in Nayikālankāra as an example of Mādhuryam in Nayikālankāras.

After defining and explaining with illustrations the Drśṭānta-alāṅkāra, Kuntaka deals with the 'Arthāntaranyāsa' or 'Corroboration'. He gives its definition as:

"On the basis of similarity between two main sentence-ideas or imports, when (along with the one on hand) the other one is also described, it should be understood as the figure Arthāntaranyāsa or 'corroboration' because it corroborates the first idea."

As an example he cites a stanza from the Abhilāṅgā:

"Undoubtedly she is capable of being wedded by a Kṣatriya, since my honourable mind has a longing for her; for to the good, in matters that are subjects of doubt, the inclinations of (their) hearts are the (deciding) authority."
Here, to corroborate a particular statement 'Sakuntala is fit to be married by me', a general statement 'Satāṁ hi sandheṇapadesu...' is adduced.

And also as the definition of Bhāmaha this is the best example of Arthāntaranyāsa. Because using the word 'Hi' it is indicated that the second half is the reason for the occurrence of the first half and it corroborates the meaning of the first half.

Here the saying 'the noble mind of mine' of Duṣyanta shows his self-respect. And the second half shows his full confidence in his pure mind.

Amṛtānandayogin has quoted this stanza as an example of 'Vicārah' which is one of the Nātyālankāras. Hemacandra quotes in his Kāvyānuśāsana as an example of 'Matih'. Dhanañjaya has also quoted this for 'Abhilāṣa', one of the Daśāvasthāṇ.

When Kuntaka takes up to explain the Alāṅkāra 'Apahnuti', he defines it as:

"With the object of endowing a unique form to the subject-matter described, when its actual nature or form
is suppressed or concealed, we get the figure of speech known as 'Apahnuti' or 'poetic concealment.'

He quotes as an example a verse from the Abhiśāk:

"Your having arrows of flowers (and) the moon's having cool rays - both these are observed to be not true in the case of persons like me. The moon discharges fire with rays charged with cold; you also make your arrows of flowers of adamantine strength."

Here is the Dharmamātrāpahnutiḥ. Here the natural features of the moon's beams and Kāma's arrows are denied to them in a charming way. Moon's beams are considered to be wholly cool. But here they are fancied to be scorchingly hot. So also, the arrows of Cupid are thought to be made of flowers and hence delicate and soft. But here they are fancied to be extremely hard and injurious.

It is interesting to note that Kuntaka is alone in finding 'Apahnuti-alāṅkāra' in this verse.

In the fourth chapter of his Vakroktijīvita, Kuntaka explains many varieties of the 'Prakaraṇavakrata'. One of them is:
"When a poet is constructing a plot of his own, based though it might be on a well-known source, if he succeeds in infusing even a small streak of originality, the beauty gained thereby will be singular; even as an episode too can shine forth as the vital essence of the work as a whole, brimful of sentiments reaching their utmost limit."\textsuperscript{45}

The essence of this variety is, in the words of K. Krishnamoorthy: "Even in a well-known plot based on epics like the \textit{Mahābhārata} which may be described as a store-house of renowned and varied stories and as an ocean full of sentiments, since there is no other consideration to decide between the relative beauty of the several stories contained therein, a poet should select only such themes as are capable of evoking sentiments and moods and generating a sense of wonder in the readers. He should see also that the theme so selected will give full scope for the exquisitely aesthetic, original and matchless inventive power of his genius. When a poet thus achieves such an exquisite artistic beauty in his episode, he succeeds in delighting the assemblies of all poets and tasteful critics."\textsuperscript{46}

As an example for this variety of \textit{Prakaranavakrata\texttt{a}}, Kuntaka quotes significant incidents from the \textit{Abhi.Sāk.} of Kālidāsa, which is based on the story depicted in the \textit{Mahābhārata}.
There is significant difference between the episode of the *Mahābhārata* and the plot of the *Abhīṣek* of Kālidāsa. Anybody can notice the poetic skill and genius of Kālidāsa. He increases the poetic beauty here, by making changes in the original story. The curse of Durvāsas and the incident of the ring are the novel themes invented by the poet. The curse of Durvāsas envelops the whole story. A covetous, cruel and uncivilised Duṣyanta has been changed by Kālidāsa as a religious, kind and civilized person. The curse of Durvāsas is a rear-ground for this. In the *Mahābhārata* he refuses to accept Śakuntalā, though he remembers her. But in the drama, the veil of curse covers his memory and makes him forget her. The incident of the ring is to recognize her.

V.V.Mirashi and N.R.Nevlekar make a pertinent observation: "Such is the *Mahābhārata* tale, plain, unvarnished, and rather crude, out of which has been created by Kālidāsa a wonderful work of art, like a beautiful image carved by a sculptor out of a rough, shapeless piece of marble. Due to constant interpolations Vyāsa's story appears ill-constructed, with no sense of proportion and little regard for propriety, but Kālidāsa, gifted as he was with poetic vision, saw in it the germ of an excellent tragi-comedy. He, therefore, took it up and shaped it a new, recreating
it characters and adding others. To follow Kālidāsa in his almost miraculous transformation of the rough material on which he worked, to note carefully the results of his humanising touch upon it, to study diligently where he changed, what he omitted and what he added in the original story to make it suitable for dramatic treatment is to appreciate his psychological insight and his technical skill. This is the only way to the real comprehension of his greatness as a dramatist and to the intelligent enjoyment of his play as an immortal work of art. The story as narrated in the Mahābhārata belongs to a by-gone age when man had just emerged from the grouch of barbarism and stepped into the dawn of civilisation, when lower animal instincts still lingered in his mind, clouded his sense of propriety and blunted the edge of his reason. Hence some of the incidents described therein would have appeared to the people of Kālidāsa's time, as highly improbable, if not altogether impossible, and some of the sentiments expressed as offensive to good taste. In Vyāsa's legendary tale both Puṣyanta and Śākuntalā seem to be actuated by sordid selfishness; hence it was necessary touch up their character, so that they might be the worthy hero and heroine of a high-class drama: the former-noble, exalted, brave, modest, scrupulous and prompt in answering the call of duty; the latter attractive by youthful simplicity
and artlessness, shy in her love, gentle in her anger, tender by nature, sensitive to an extreme and a paragon of chastity. If we compare the Śakuntalopākhyāna and Śākuntala the first difference that strikes us at first sight is the invention by Kālidāsa of the curse of Durvāsas which blighted the king's memory, and the ring of recognition which restored it to its original freshness. The first device serves a two-fold purpose. The Duṣyanta of the Mahābhārata strikes us as abandoned to lascivious passion, wanting in moral courage to face boldly the consequences of his act, and so egoistical as to have no regard for the rights and feelings of others. Though he knew full well that the sage Kanva would be back from the forest in couple of hours' time, he did not wait for his return to solicit his blessing, but taking advantage of his absence he persuaded his inexperienced (Mugdha) foster-daughter, with flattering words and false promises, to surrender her virginity to him. But when his lust was satisfied, his heart leapt into his mouth for fear lest the sage, though tranquil by nature, should justly take offence at the unwarranted liberty he had taken in spoiling his innocent child and defiling the sanctity of his penance-grove. Possibly his anger might burst forth like a flame of fire and consume him. In a hurry he left for his capital before Kanva returned and never cared to remember, much less to fulfil, the word he had pledged to
his daughter. When she after seven years, stands before him in the court with her son, he refuses to own her as his wife for fear lest the courtiers should whisper among themselves as to how the king, himself pining for an heir to the throne, could have forgotten his own son, so bright, and his own wife, so lovely, for seven years and not brought them himself from the hermitage in pomp and splendour. Since he could not explain his seven years' neglect, they might suspect the whole affair as dubious. If a voice from heaven had not burst forth in favour of Śakuntalā, he would have turned out his guiltless wife and guileless son callously. Such a low-minded libertine who with his eyes open does great injustice to an innocent soul merely to save himself in public form the charge of wilful desertion, has been metamorphosed by Kālidāsa through the magic touch of Durvāsas' curse into a chivalrous, magnanimous, god-fearing and affectionate hero. That curse smiles him with forgetfulness of his love affair with Śakuntalā, and therefore, though otherwise conscientious and strict in the observance of his duty towards all, he refuses to receive her into his harem through fear of contaminating his soul by the touch of another's wife. It is this curse which makes the court scene in Act V very touching on account of the struggle between two equally powerful forces, one urging upon the king to do what is lawfully right, the
other dissuading him from doing what is morally wrong. In Act VI we see the king in a paroxysm of grief at the sight of his own ring which not only reminds him of his beloved, but fills his mind with remorse at the wrong he had done her unwittingly. In Act VII we see the effect of the curse in the pathetic sight of the heroine, worn out by sorrow and penance, pale and emaciated, and with her love purified of all carnal desires. Thus though the curse has subjected both to mental suffering for some time, yet like gold ore smelted in a fiery furnace, it has brought out the intrinsic nobility of their heart. It has also created intriguing situations that baffle our expectations and rouse our curiosity, and make the plot highly interesting. The second purpose, apart from the element of dramatic conflict, which Kālidāsa had in view in inserting the incident of Durvāsas' curse, was to bring home to our mind that love inspired by external charms has the taint of sensuality in it and is, therefore, of a low type. It is only when it is tested in the furnace of tribulations that all its craving for self-indulgence is burnt away like dross, and then it is sublimated into a spiritual affection with a keen sense of moral obligation in place of a burning desire for carnal gratification. Such disinterested and sublime love is the backbone of human society, upon which depend its maintenance, its healthy growth, and its uplift; hence Kālidāsa has painted it in other works also."(p.291-93).
Herein, Kuntaka observes: "In the play, *Abhijñāna Śākuntala*, we see (in the hero) a recollection of the sweet feeling of Śākuntalā's matchless beauty in her exquisite youth as soon as he sees her (when she removes her shroud) in a way which does not rule out the possibility of rejecting her as a wife of another person. Śākuntalā does everything to revive his memory by relating intimate incidents of their first honeymoon when both were filled with deep love for each other, the incidents which are at once so intimate and delicate that they are bound to infuse confidence. The reason why Duṣyanta is unable to recognise her even after listening to it is a mystery left unexplained in the original *Mahābhārata*. For explaining it adequately with a cogent reason, the poet has invented the episode of the curse of sage Durvāsas. Durvāsas is a sage blind to all soft feeling and highly irate by temperament, one who flies into a rage even at the slightest fault. In that episode of Durvāsas, it is seen that Śākuntalā is completely overwhelmed by the unbearably deep pangs of her first separation from her lover; and as she is lying in her cottage in such a state, there comes this great sage at her door-step flies into a fit of anger at being unnoticed and pronounces a curse:

"He whom you are thinking of with such raptness that you cannot see me, a sage arrived, let him not recall you,
though reminded like one drunk who cannot, a talk his own."

Such was the curse flung on Śakuntalā. And at once the sage was moving out. Yet when he was appealed to by the two friends of Śakuntalā, the great sage yields to the extent of limiting the duration of his curse to the sight of signet ring given by the king to his beloved. And when the daughter of sage Kaṇva is on her way to meet her beloved, the ring which adorned her tender shoot-like finger slips down without her notice somewhere in the waters of a meandering river which she had entered for bathing. And mistaking the glittering glow of the ruby set in the ring for a juicy lump of flesh, a fish swallows it. In course of time, the fish gets killed by a fisherman who catches it and the ring recovered by him is at last presented to the king himself. Such an art of plot-construction may surely be regarded as the best repository of literary sentiments. Thanks to it, the entire play has acquired a unique beauty. Again, in proper time, we have the incident of the song outwardly reviling the bee, whose inner significance is caught by the king, though his memory has been blacked out by the curse of the sage; deep down in his mind we notice that traces are still left of the old love in Duṣyanta on account of which he is very much upset:
"Seeing things lovely and hearing sounds sweet, if a happy man should get so disturbed, it means his mind is recalling unawares the deep impressions of a previous birth."

Here the beauty of such a recollection of Śakuntalā (so deep down in the layers of his subconscious), at once guileless and charming, appeals very much to the hearts of connoisseurs. What is more, she is turned down later, her story and ring of recognition are dismissed as false; the account of her marriage with him and pregnancy given by sage Kaṇva's disciple is discredited and the king is seen in a fit of anger. Then, even transgressing the limits of natural shyness, her veil is removed from her face suddenly. Yet the king is under the illusion that she is another's wife. Though her bubbling youthful charm, superior to that of all the women seen by him so far, impresses him very much as much as her narration, sweet like the strains from a lyre, of intimate incidents of her association to bring back his memory, incidents such as excursions in the forest grove, still he shows the rudeness of rejecting Śakuntalā. Such rudeness too becomes understandable only by the intensity of his later repentance at the termination of the curse, a repentance which is indicative of the depth of his unmitigated love for her
in his heart. And it is most appealing to the connoisseurs. And in devising the end of the curse, the poet prefaces it with a description of the intense wretchedness of the king's mental state who is suffering feverishly the pangs of unbearable separation after the dawn of his memory of the forgotten incidents. Synchronising with it comes the recovery of the lost ring too which again delights the readers very much. The chamberlain of the king observes:

"Gone are all his personal decorations with but a single armlet on his left fore-arm; his lips are reddened by his heaving sighs and eyes sore by sleeplessness due to worry. Only because of his natural grace his slimness remains unobserved even like a gem's when well polished."

"He hates beauty, he shuns daily company of his ministers, and rolling about in bed, he passes his nights keeping wide awake. Out of courtesy when he talks with queens, he commits slips of the tongue many a time and gets embarrassed for long."

Here the epithets given to the king are full of artistic beauty. There is artistic beauty of 'number' instanced in the word 'Gotreşu' (where the plural number
is idiomatically used to refer to a single name of a rival). These add to our aesthetic appeal. When the king, looking at the picture of his beloved drawn by himself, speaks gallantly of his sweet recollection with the deep impress of his darling:

"O bee, if you date to touch any more my darling's lip so red as 'Bimba' fruit, and softer than shoots of softest plants, and kissed but gently even in my wild amours, I shall jail you within a lotus bud."

The speech directly appeals to our hearts even as he is speaking.

If this exquisite episode invented by the genius of the poet were not to be there in the play, the unbearable fact of the king's forgetting his wife without any reason would have become a source of blemish as much in the play as in the original story of the Mahābhārata itself."

Thus, this curse becomes the life of the whole episode. If Kālidāsa did not make this change, the story would have become lifeless. The story would not have progressed further. The curse, which is responsible for the liveliness of the drama becomes an example for the Prakaraṇa-vakrata.
NOTES AND REFERENCES
CHAPTER VIII

1. कुर्विन्ति काव्यवैचिन्द्रियविवक्षापरतं—नत:।
   यज संबंधविन्यासं तत्र संबंधविन्यासं विप्र:॥
   -V.J. II.29

2. वर्ष तथाप्रेयसः मधुकर नराश्च खुलू कृत्ति॥
   Transl. A.B.G.

3. आतापि एवंडेव अन्तत्रात्मगतप्रतिष्ठानाशर्तं तात्सत्यप्रतीतश्च
   बहुवनान् प्रयुक्तम्।
   -V.J. p. 227

4. रासन वर्तितां सर्वत्रात्मविवाहत:।
   योगलाह: स रासवर्तितात्मविवाहत:॥
   -V.J. III.16
   Transl. K.K. p.455.

5. चलापाल्लो दुर्दोष: स्मृति बहुसो देशपुरवतरी
   रक्ष्यायत्ताय तन्नैत मृदु क्षणिनित्वं:॥
   कर्म व्याप्तवर्तय: पिबाति रत्नसूक्लवस्मध्यः
   वर्षं तर्त्तवन्देशा मधुकर हरास्त्रं खुलू कृत्ति॥
   Transl. K.K.

6. प्राणान्वते: शुच्यारस्त भृगुरमरोपितका-तत्तुल्लान्तो
   (ल्पये) रसवदन्तं क्रमतस्मातिन्यादवात।
   -V.J. p.240
7. "The King is now deeply in love and grown so hopeless that he cannot tolerate near his beloved the presence of even a bee, whom he takes as a rival and envies (R). बहुत: many a time. This is indicative of envy."

- THE ABHijnāNA SĀKUNTALA OF KĀlidāsa.
  Ed.by - A.B.Gajendragadkar (A.B.G)
  Second Ed.(Revised) 1934.

8. Read:

"The first line indicates चेतुनमयं, the second रावसकयं and the third अधयुम्बन. The King imagines the bee is doing all these and envies him".


9. (1)."Tremulousness of the eye (Compare चुप्पनमयं) is a sign of beauty". - A.B.G. p.240
(2). In the Śṛṅgārasatāka while saying the beauty of a woman:

"मृदुपुर्णेत् कुष्ठ-वत्ताक्ष: कोटम्: ! and हिसैनेन भादेन य लक्ष्याम भिषया !
पराप्पुशरस्यकाठकौधीयः !!

10. See,
"रतितस्तिकम् the all-in-all or the very essence of enjoyment. Lovers set a very high value on Adharapāṇa. Hence, the idea अधर पता means to kiss. The idea is based on the fancy that the lower lip contains nectar or honey, which can be drunk." - A.B.G. p.240.

11. "पृथप्तम ध्यायेन सुरायसमनि वेधवरे !" के अनुसार इस यथा में उर्फ के त्यथा पर वर्ण का प्रयोग हुआ है।"
  "वन्द्रकला" हिन्दी टीका.
12. Here, Raghavabhatta says — "बहुवचन स्वसिद्धिपूजा। आस्थाय वर्गेशार्थ भवेत। प्रकाश विवरणमयम् तरस्त्रिलक्षणिकारः।" — Op.Cit. p.241

(2) "The plural in this case shows disrespect, instead of the usual respect, for the King does not think highly of himself for having lost what he imagines the bee has gained, and such use of the plural is common in literature. The idiom has come down in the vernacular too, as when we say — "तू मात्र शताण, आर्मी काय मूर्ख आरूत्तम्" where the plural-आर्मी is indicative of the speaker's disrespect for himself." — A.B.G., Op.Cit. p.240.

13. Read: (1) अत व्यतिरेकः भाविन्दनादः स्वभावाः कायमात्रां विविधानां समासोपकारसंविनासातः। — The Vimala Commentary

(2) "अत तृतीयस्यनुमुद्धनापरम्परापरापराभेदकारः समासोपकारसंविनासातः। वर्त्ततनावेशादि हता: तं सु: कृत्ति: इत्युपाधिकारविविध मयसंस्कृतः। शरणाप्रवर्तितिवध मयस्थिनिरहणप्रकारात्मकारः। हेतुवेदोपन्यासादः वाक्यप्रसंगस्थितः: कायमायपायकरः

रचनाप्रभावीपायकरः इत्यारं अंक्रारणां परस्परनैरपेक्षेऽवृत्ति:। — विशेषकृतः।

(3) "आरोप्यथे चुम्बतीति। श्रेष्ठः। तथं हतत्रचे कृत्तिति व्यतिरेकः। नीलोत्पलादिभाजनस्य भाविन्दनादः। भ्रमरस्वाभावसे

प्रवन्तयेद् हेतुवेदोपन्यासात्मकारः। तत्वं कृत्तितवर्त्तमतिकृत्तितिकायमायपायकरः। आयुर्विकारादेशो राजनात्मायमणि।।" — Raghavabhatta. Op.Cit. p.242
In this verse four figures of speech are interwoven beautifully. Firstly, we have a realistic description, possessed of poetic charm, of a bee as it acts towards a person, when disturbed while sucking the honey of a flower. This constitutes the figure Svabhāyokti or Natural Description. Secondly, the description is so worded as to suggest to us the behaviour of a lover towards his sweet heart in private. This constitutes the figure Samāsokti or Modal Metaphor. Thirdly, the act of humming sweetly near the ear is fancifully conceived as whispering confidences into the ear; the constitutes the figure Utpreksā or poetic fancy. Lastly, with reference to the common object in view, the bee is said to be successful, where as the hero is disappointed; this constitutes the figure Vyatireka or Excellence.

- V.V. Mirashi and N.R. Navlekar, p.253-54.

14. Read: "अन ति भारतभाववाचिततलकारो रसानुगण: ।
- Dhy. p.62

15. हें says - "अन भारतभाववाचिततलकारो रसपर्यावलोकनि निदो रसोपकारी।"
- Hemachandra p.256

16. "अन हेंत: इति न पुनः हु: ये प्राप्तवन्त: 'इति इति हनु प्रकृते: ।"
- S.D. of Visvanātha मयुर्य परिचेष्ठ: p.232

17. Vide Supra. Chapter VII. p.231
18. मुहुर्मण्यतिकलूत्ताधिरोच्चः
प्रतिज्ञाधारविकल्पवाभिःभासमूः
पुरुषस्वरूपिणि पथमलाखयः
कृष्णपुण्यनभासेन युःभिमूः तु
-Abhi. Śāk. II. 22
Transl. A.B.G.

19. "अन नायकस्य प्रथमभिनिष्ठविद्ययुग्मत्वस्तत्रमृति धर्मस्वरूपिणि तत्तत्तमृतिविद्ययुग्मयेव निर्दिष्टायम् यत्। शब्दः कामपि वावयकृतास्तेऽद्वितीयः।
-V.J. p.222
Transl. K.K. p.408.

20. (1) "स्वमाधृवर्णितः। श्रृतिवृत्तयुपास्तृ। कथमपत्यस्य प्रति
पिशौकमर्यादायस्य देववोपासानात्कायपिनिःसमृः।"
(2) "अन त्वमाधृवर्णितः-कायपिनिः - श्रृतिवृत्तयुपास्तृ
अतिकृतः।" The Vimala commentary.
(3) "अधरोप्यत्वाद शब्ददयस्य दचनचक्षवक्तव्यः प्रकृतेष्वः
श्रावधारक्ष्य निम्नाधिकेतर्या पुनस्ततःवदभावसःधक्षारः।
सृगुण रत्नके सुः स्वमाधृवर्णितः।"
-V.J. of Kuntaka. III. 5-6
Vide: Supra, Chapter VII. p.136 fn 18

21. V.J. of Kuntaka. III. 5-6
Vide: Supra, Chapter VII. p.136 fn 18

22. गृहितामुिभिर्मण स्यन्दनेऽदर्तन्वंकविक्तः
पर्याप्तमेव प्रशास्तः सर्वभावाद भृत्तमा पूर्वकायमृः
देयः ऐवंतःः: अवतिमथ्यूतिभिम् कृष्णवतः
पश्योद्धरतवतःविविषयन्ति बहुतरे स्तोकेश्वरः प्रयातिः।
-Abhi. Śāk. I. 7.
Transl. A.B.G.
23. Read:— "The stag was running fast and the chariot was closely following him. In order to judge how far the chariot had arrived, the stag was repeatedly fixing his gaze on the chariot with the turn (क्षण: ) of his neck. This made him appear very graceful. The propriety of वर्णति (riveted, fixed) is that it was not merely a casual glance that the stag was casting at the persuing chariot, but that it was stead fastly looking at it now and then. The very life of the stag depended on the distance that he would be able to maintain between him and the chariot. Consequently he had occasionally to fix his gaze very carefully, on the chariot in order not to allow it to come within dangerous neighbourhood. दल्लुःचिति: is therefore, better than दल्लुःचिति: which is rather tame."

(2) "बल्लुःचिति:—with his eyes fixed (upon the chariot).
Note V.L. दल्लुःचिति: which with the word मृणः: suggesting frequent interruption in the steady fast look, is to be preferred."

24. Read:-
(1) "This stanza is a beautiful example of त्वमायोपिति"

(2) "अन्तः स्वभावोपितिकिरत्ज्ञारः" —The Vimala commentary.

(3) "अन्तः मृगश्य स्वभावव्याख्यात प्रयोगः स्वभायोपितिकिरत्ज्ञारः " —किशोरकेली.

25. Vide:— THE POETIC LIGHT OR किव्याप्रकाशा OF MANNMATA p.86.
Pub: Motilal Banarasidas, Bunglow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi-7.
26. वस्तुताम्बं समाक्रिक्षय यद-यथोपद्धतम्।
                              इवाधासम्प्रे तत्र दृष्टान्तः सौदभिषीतो॥
                             -V.J. III.53.

27. सरसितभलतापिद्धे शैयलेनापि रम्यं
               मलिनमिपि हिमांगोऽन्धकम् लक्ष्मीं तनोति।
               इयमभिक्षमोऽह वल्लेनापि तत्वी
               किमिव हि मुहुरणा मण्डने नागृतीनाम्॥
                             -Abhi. Śāk. I.18.
                           Transl. A.B.G.


29. Read:-

(1) हीनमहीनं स्वर्गस्य वेषित सामान्यस्य सर्वक्षवाद्वारा-तरंगः।
               मुहूर नवदो रसावकः: प्रपोते वार्षिकमुखार्यः: तनुः
               सर्वविद्यार्य-ज्ञेय-तलकत्योमकार्यः कर्त्येन संबन्धेन लक्ष्मीं-स्वर्गविशालमात्राविषयर्थसम्बन्धीपति
               नात्रारायणायस्य ध्वनयति। अत्र पादिके तात्त्वारणांनिम्न्यं रम्यलक्ष्मीं
               विषम्यानोऽयेमान्यामात्राप्रतिविसृतम्। वृत्तपुज्ञासंदेशकानां
               प्रासायम्: तुलिनः। अधिलक्ष्मायोऽऽविभिन्नः। तंकः।
               सम्वेदनापि लेखनस्तुकी उननेि। गुण-आधारणाचतुरा क्वतिश्च वक्तव्ये।
               मलिनोऽवलम्भुः। अनेन मयुष्यं नामात्यतन्त्योऽऽन्तः।

(2) "इत्यत्व-तर-यथोपयमादित्यर्मः।"
               -The Vimala commentary.

(3) "This stanza is quoted in S.D.3.97 to illustrate मयुष्यं, which is defined as "स्वर्गविशालमात्रायमयुष्यं" रमणीयतः।"

(4) K.T.Pāndurangi says - "Here the figures of speech are Arthāntaranyāsa and Pratīvastūpamā."
ABHIJNAHA SĀKUNTALAM. (San.Text & Kan.Trans.& notes)
Pub: 'Prasaranga' Bangalore University, Bangalore p.235.

30. See:
"हिमालोकाः सन्तरस्य मल्ललक्ष्मी शोभा तननीति। अयर्द्विषा—
शोरेव। आधोपनाथयाहूः वारनाथाम्बिनाः। अध ये कलक्ष्योपमान-
त्वयस्तीतिवायनाम्। तस्य योगमानत्भंत्येन संबन्धमुनयोरतंतरिति
वायनाम्। किं ये कलमणि मल्ललक्ष्मीप्राणते द्वाभनादिकुमारस्यायपत्।
हिमालोकमाति संबन्धे लक्ष्मी तननीतिव वर्तभन्त्यारायणवाः। लक्ष्मी
तनोतीत्व अहिमालोकीति संबन्धे लक्षमेपतारायणाधारिति संबन्धे
कुमारस्यायपत्। हिमालोकप्रवस्यायपूर्वतात्त्ववाचयादेव। (२) कारणस्यानां
वलोकिती शब्दस्यानां—
न्यायाः। वायुययो वदक्षमकारमिति द्वितीयमेव हि क्रिया कारकानित्ववेत्—
हुयाः। तेन वायुक्षमहोर्दिकिति। लक्ष्मी तनोतीत्व तामान्यस्यायपत्तेन
प्राणतिनिर्देशम् अयामदेशादिपरिहाराय "गिमरिकिरमाली हृदारो
लक्ष्मणापि। इति।"

   Op.Cit. p.360
(2) S.D. of Visvanātha.
   -विदिपरिच्छेदः: P 254-64

32. वायुययो-तर्विन्यातो मुख्यातिपत्तात्त्वः।
    सौंधनितर्विन्यातः: य: समर्थत्वाहितिः॥
    -V.J. III.54

33. "अंगवं धार्मिराहक्षमा
    यदार्थमाणामिनिषादए" में मन।॥
    सतां हि सच्चेदायेश्वरस्य
    प्रमाणात्त्वः कस्चिद्वित्तिः॥
    -Abhi. Śāk. I.20.
    Transl. A.B.G.
34. Vide,
हि शब्देनाथपि देवत्यं प्रमाणाद्वृत्ति सिद्धाये।
अयमयान्तर्न्यायः तत्र व्यवहते यथा॥
-भामाहा II.73.

Read:-

(1) According to K.T. Pāṇḍurangi, this is the example of Punaruktavādābhāsa.

(2) "अयान्तर्न्यायः काव्यलिङ्गम् चालकारी॥"
- The Vimala commentary.

(3) Gajendragadkar says - "This stanza is quoted in D.R. as an instance of अभिलाष or longing, which is the first of the ten stages of अयोग (absence of union) and is thus defined- "अभिलाषः स्नाता तत्काले सत्ामें नुस्तने। भूते भूते वा" 4.53." -A.B.G. Op.Cit. p.239.

(4) "अन्त सामान्येन विशेषार्थस्योपर्यायान्तर्न्यायालोकारः।
तथा यथा सत्यमात्रत्वमिच्छिल्ल ध्वनितम्।"
-विनोरकेली.

(5) "अन्त मत्यसिध्ये कथिति सामान्योपतेरस्मुसारसात।
तथा यथा सत्यमात्रत्वमिच्छिल्ल ध्वनितम्।"
- Raghavabhaṭṭa. op.cit., p.

35. Read:(1) सन्तो धिम्मन: प्रवृत्तित स्मारकाल्पनाक्रिकाचतीत्यथ:।
तदोज्जी: - श्रीतिः, तदाचार: तथैय च चिंतमान:।
सम्मुखः सकल्पजः कामो धर्ममालमिन्ते सताम॥
- The Vimala commentary
(2) तथाह मून: - "साक्षृद्ध आत्मन: तुरितवेच ये इति। तथा य अस्यार्यज्जूनलाप्तार्य अदन्तकरणस्य लक्षणपूर्वतात्वकादियमकर्थः क्षणपिरित्योऽविद्यत् भावः: " - किशोरकेली।

(3) "प्रायम्या राजा दृष्टियत को अपने निब्धकलय मन पर पूरा भरता है। उनका अन्तःकारण इतना परिवर्त है कि वह आत्मार्थ पर प्रयूःत नहीं हो सकता, उत्त: वे अनूचित वस्तु के पारे अभिलाभा नहीं कर लेते। मूल जी ने भी अपनी प्रस्तुति में आत्मपूर्णित को धर्म का मूल स्रोत है - "आत्मपूर्णित व" (२) ५) इसी टीका ने गोविन्दराज ने गर्व का भी यह वचन उद्धित किया है - "वैकल्पिकं आत्मपूर्णित: प्रमाणम्" जिसका तात्पर्य है कि विकल्प विवेचन में आत्मपूर्णित हि प्रमाण है।
- वन्द्रल।

(4) "The test that is referred to in this stanza is the test of instinct or intuition. It is common experience that instinct sometimes guides us better than any external considerations. To be able to say that a particular course of conduct is right, because one is inclined towards it, required great confidence in the righteousness of one's mind, for it is tantamount to saying that no evil thought would ever enter it. That the king was able to say so is indicative of his stainless character and pure mind..... The latter half of the stanza also occurs in Kumārila brahmatāsa’s Tantravārtika: "यथा स्वायत् तवणकरे भेष्य यथा वैकल्पिकादियमकर्थः। एव कालिको तत्स्यातूत्त: यथा भौदिरिदात्मपूर्णित:। एव व विद्ययनादिनिमार्थं प्रभुपूर्वते कीतिभिधितिपितः। सत्ता हि सन्देशरेषु वस्तुपूर्णाप्रमाणमतः घण्यपूर्वतः॥"p.133 (Benares S.Series)".
In his explanation, C.K. Venkataramayya says:—
The modern'scholar Sri S.K. Belvalkar's comments are not justifiable that this sentence shows the pride of Dusyanta. And " .......... his egoistic logic which demands that what ever he wishes must be right because he wishes it".

36. See:— *Alahā. Sang.* of Amrtanandayogin.
    -Op.Cit. p. 253

    -Op.Cit. p. 250

38. D.R. of Dhanañjaya

39. अन्यायमयृत्वम् क्व वर्णनीयस्य वर्तनःः
    स्वस्यापन्त्योऽवस्यामपन्त्यैतिरत्वम् मता॥
    -V.J. III.59.

40. तत् कुमुडगर्तां शीतरिमितवद्यमंत्रो:
    दण्डिदामवधायं दृष्ट्यते मल्लिकेशु ।
    विद्वृत्तिः हिम्मर्तिनिमि हुम्मर्तिनुष्ठातः
    रसस्यपि कुमुडङ्गान्तु कृतारिकरोषं॥
    Transl. A.B.G.

41. Read:— (1) "That Love possesses flowers for his arrows is a convention well-known in Sanskrit literature. These arrows are variously mentioned. Vide —
Jayadeva gives a different list of these in his Gita Govinda 10

In the Mandasore stone inscription of Kumāragupta (437-438 A.D) another five flowers are said to have formed the famous flower arrows of love:

Inscription Indicarum Vol.III (Gupta Inscriptions No.18 St.40) p.83. A stanza of Sūryaśītakirti quoted in JITṛkārtam (No,3789) speaks of the five arrows as follows:

42. See,"in erotic poetry, the cooling rays of the moon or the cooling objects such as sandal or southern breeze etc., are often spoken of as having a heating effect. Cf. in this connection, Urvāsi's love-song in act.II

Pub: MOTILAL BANARASIDASS,
BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHAR NAGAR, DELHI-7 p.287.
43. "अन्न भण्डारितै विश्वविद्यालयवादवादवादम् अपि नवमृत्तिकानां विवधम्।
यस्मादैववादम्, कुलमार्गवादम् वस्मातमुखितं कुलमार्गवादार्थमवादम्
तदिशमार्गितिकरिकार्यमवादम्।"
-V.J. p. 234

44. (1) "अन्न काय्यपरिक्रणा लघू-विरोधामास-परिणामोपयोगम् केवल-पृथ्वीनिनाशा
अलक्ष्यम्।"
-The Vimala commentary.

(2) According to K.T. Pāṇḍurangi - here the figures of speech are Kāvyalinga, Rūpaka, Upama and

(3) "कुलमार्गवेदनात्यन्त वेदव्यापत्त्रां ध्यातित्तम। अनां तीनि श्लोक्तर विश्वासायि
कार्यकलारणा लघूकर्मम् कुमेण हिमभेदितिनिति
गुणद्रव्योर्विरोध्। विश्वस्मय स्वरभववादामासात्त्वम् वर्षिकाया
प्रकोटप्रभुयालंकार, कुलेशु यद्वा वार्तवादार्थसिद्ध: कथितं
प्रकृतियोगीनिति परिणामम्। आरोग्यामुख्य प्रज्ञापोषितव
परिणाम:। इति तलक्ष्यम्।"

(4) "अन्न एक मूल एक विशेष वक्तव्ये मद्यद्विप्रितम् सामान्ये
वस्मातमुखितं कुलेशु वस्मातमुखितम् यद्वा वार्तवादार्थसिद्धम्
तदादृशू: कथितं प्रवृत्तियोगीनिति परिणामम् आरोग्यामुख्य
प्रकृतियोगीनिति परिणामः। इति तलक्ष्यम।। वस्मातमुखितम्
वस्मा वस्मातमुखितम् वार्तवादार्थसिद्धम् हृदयानेर्वस्मात
वार्तवादार्थसिद्धम् काय्यपरिक्रणा, हिमभेदितिनिति
प्रकृतियोगीनिति परिणामम्।
दु:ष्टान्तद्वारा वस्मातमुखितम्
विश्वासायिक काय्यपरिक्रणा, हिमभेदितिनिति
प्रकृतियोगीनिति परिणामम्।
केषात्त्वमिश्रितमः काय्यपरिक्रणा, हिमभेदितिनिति
प्रकृतियोगीनिति परिणामम्।
- किशोरकेली।
45. इतिप्रथमप्राप्तापि कथाविचित्रवर्णनि
उत्पादनलाभवादन्या लतिति वक्तत्ता॥
तथा यथा, प्रबन्धस्य सकलस्या प्रीमितम्।
भावित प्रकरणं काहकासिद्धसिद्धिनिर्देश।
-V.J. IV. 3-4
Transl. K.K.P. 540.

46. विख्यातविचित्रवृक्षाकरणकायम् (ने) महाभारतायी रसमये-
गुडितायाम्यि कथाया कथयितुतराध्यरविचित्रसिद्धकाहिकल्पकामितम्
तदर्शवत् (शेष) रसायनकारकर्मविभाजनसृजयिति अतिशुद्धि नित्यविकासमुद्रभी-
लिततमुखितनिम्नाननिमितति निवर्त्तियाननि।
तदत्ययः
विकर्ताकरणं प्रकरणेन व्यवहरतः करतः राज्यविनाशपतियोऽपितो-
करणमायहि॥
-V.J. p. 249

47. अभिभाषामायले नातेक इतर तत्त्वादितरस्य कारणविशेषकथैतनेन्द्रकाय-\nकालात्मकतालाभवादकालसमै निर्माणशुष्कमाहु तुमूलमः॥
विख्यातविचित्रवृक्षाकरणकायम् भारतस्य रसपरिवर्तनभूतापृंगितातियुतिररिविविचि
विख्यातविचित्रसिद्धकारणकायम् वर्णपुरुषविशेषमाहु तत् महतावतः पुनः हृदयान्ति विवरण-
कारणनेत्रविचित्रसिद्धि अथात् राज्यविनाशपतियानूपकृृः।
करणायामुख्यस्य मुनेत्रवाकृः शायमुखादिविवातः करतः॥
तत्र ति प्रकरणकाण्डः महत्तपः
किल प्रभावप्राप्तात्तत्वातिकातिकाति विचारः यहृदः वार्तेविवाहान्तः करणायामृति-
रूपः (लेखिताः) प्रायःकृत प्राख्यावः।
विख्यातविचित्रवृक्षाकरणकायम्
साधनीयाः वैदिक न मायमेवस्वतः॥
स्मिरिष्यति तवाः न स बोधित्वायाः तत्
करतः प्रमातः प्रमाय कृतामिति॥
-IV. 1.
इत्यः गण्यता । तद्युत्पादनग्रामवेश्यां तद्वीय्यां (अनुनीतं) प्रवास्यमानोदपि 
मुनिवृङ्गः पियतम्याताकं गृहलीयकं किलोत्तरां (पाप) वसाना (वतिम) गम्याश्रित ।
प्रवेशः प्रति यान्त्रिक गृहलीयकं गृहलीयकं किलोत्तरां (पाप) वसाना (वतिम) गम्याश्रित ।

रूपाणिक वीणां भूतराशिय विज्ञान ग्रहानि
प्रूपुस्वीणिति ध्वजाकोटिपितम्यः ।
प्रेतस्व प्रवेश नन्दिनीति नन्दिनीति व्रतमार्गमानस्त
भावार्थमणि जननान्तरसः इद्दानि ॥

- VI.2.

अन सूक्ष्मताम्बोधकानिन्दिनीर्मिते भावार्थमणि जननान्तरसः इद्दानि।
अवरः च द्रव्यविभाजणेऽध्वजाकोटिपितम्यः
महार्थाविभाजणेऽध्वजाकोटिपितम्यः।

मनामुलकासनकालस्तारायामस्थापनस्वतां गृहलीयकं (चुप) गम्याश्रित ।
तथा विश्वकालस्तारायणां प्रवेशार्थीकं व्रतमार्गमानस्त
व्यायामविविधश्रीमात्राः भृतमार्थायामस्त
रागः शास्त्रायामस्तारायामस्त वरसदः चक्षुस्बद्धानृताः
शापवशातां शुद्धां भ्रमर्ममहामहाभ्रमान्ति ॥
वृत्तादिनं सहस्रक्रमी व्याप्त

- VI.6.
रामेश्वर यथा पूरा प्रकृतिभर्ण प्रत्येक सप्ताहें
शुच्युपाल्यानवित्तिनिर्बत्तिमयारुपिना रत्नकर.
दारविषयक उत्तम वासयुपितामण्डिपुरस्योऽयताः
गोत्रेषु स्थापितत्तदा भवति व प्रेमदाहिनयुपसूत 
- VI.5.

अन रामही विशेषाकृता, गोत्रेश्वरिष्टि वधककोऽस य हिरहणगित रत्नकरारः।
रामोदि स्तव्यतिकेतीकालेख्यालोकमानविलोचनस्य समरणात्मकः
दयितादसुभुज्ञुप्रीत साहूकरामनमः।

अविलष्टबालालकेश्वलभोजनीयः
पीत महा सदयेष्व रतोत्तवेष्व।
विभाषेण स्तुति च भुमर चित्तयुः।
तव कार्याय भक्तोदर्शनस्यसमस्त ।
- VI.20.

इत्युदात श्रवणादिनीयः।
अविलष्टादेहपुनः उत्साहयुपिलावेय ललितम द्रव्यमण्डिपुरस्य
विद्याश्रव्यमितिहासासारस्य रुपस्यापि विलुक्तारिति
निमित्तारितावलयसह।

-V.25, p.545-46
Transl. K.K. p.541-44.