Some Aspects of the Kaumudīmitrāṇanda

- V. M. Kulkarni

Rāmacandra, one of the celebrated disciples of Ācārya Hemacandra, carried out his literary activities in the second half of the twelfth century A.D. He wrote, besides other plays, three prakaraṇa type of plays:

1. Rohiniṁrgāṅka
2. Kaumudīmitrāṇanda
3. Mallikāmakaranda. Of these, Rohiniṁrgāṅka is all lost but for a small, single passage, cited by the author himself in the Nātyadarpana (a work on Sanskrit Dramaturgy by Rāmacandra himself and Guṇacandra, another disciple of Hemacandra written jointly) with the introductory remark:

यथा बास्रमुदुपये येहीप्रमणाऑभिन्य ग्रहणे प्रत्येकस्तुत्वः — "मूगाक्षु प्रति वसन्तः — कमार । मा शाक्षिष्यः ।
उमताप्रेमसंरण्ट्वादि, आस्थिते यद्यन्ता ।
तत्र प्रत्युक्तमिदास्तु, ब्रह्मार्पि खळु कालोऽि ॥

It is cited to illustrate the third Sandhyahga of the Mukhasandhi, called Parinyāsa. Rāmacandra has adopted this verse, without acknowledgement, from Bhartṛhari's Śṛngāraśataka (v. 75, N. S. ed)

In translation it means:

“When women through impetuosity (of flurry) of intoxicated love set about some task, even God Brahma is indeed unable (lit. afraid) to place an obstacle in their way. (Then what to talk of others?)”

2. Mallikāmakarandananāta: This play is available in full. It is published by L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad.

3. Kaumudīmitrāṇanda. This play too is available in print.

In this article it is proposed to draw the attention of readers to some striking aspects of this prakaraṇa. Before proceeding with this topic, it would not be out of place to take note of Keith's observations regarding “The Decline of the Sanskrit
Drama’”4: “The audience for whose approval a poet looked was essentially one of men of learning who were intent on discerning poetic beauties or defects, and who had singularly little idea of what a drama really means.” For the decline of the drama, he adds, “the ever widening breach between the languages of the drama and those of real life” has greatly contributed and further points out “the impossibility of the production of real poetry, not to mention drama, in dead languages.”

Now, the audience was essentially one of learning and that the Prakrit languages were no longer spoken languages is no doubt true but to say that ‘they had singularly little idea of what a drama really means’ and that Sanskrit too, like the Prakrits, was a dead language is rather unfair and unjust. Although Sanskrit was not the language of the masses, it certainly was the language of a class, though limited, of a highly educated and cultured men of learning and that like the poets they very well knew what a drama according to Bharata means. Bharata gave the highest importance to rāsas in drama: ‘na hi rasādṛte kaścid arthaḥ pravartate.’ (Everything in drama is oriented towards creating rasaḥ.) Aśhīnavagupta and following him Rāmacandra, hold that ‘rasāḥ nātya-prānāḥ’ (Rasas are the very life, the very essence of drama.) His charge that ‘Subordination of action to description, and the degeneration of the description into a mere exercise in style and in the use of sounds’ is exaggerated. That way it may apply to some earlier poets as well. To tell the truth, Indian poets and dramatists and their poetic and dramatic works should be judged by norms and criteria laid down by Indian writers on poetics and dramatics and not by western standards or principles. It would certainly be unjust and unfair to evaluate the Indian authors and their works by applying western principles or standards.

Kaumudimitrāṇanda is a prakarana type of drama in ten Acts. It mainly deals with the love-story of Mitrāṇanda, the son of a wealthy merchant by name Jinasena, a resident of Kautukanagara, and Kaumudi, the daughter of the Kulapati (head of a monastery). Mitrāṇanda and Maitraya after the shipwreck come to the island of Varuṇa. There they free from imprisonment the Siddha King
who was nailed to a tree by Varuṇa suspecting him to be desirous of his wives who are not seen even by the sun (aśūryāmpaśya). Kaumudi, the daughter of the Kulapati falls in love with Mitrāṇanda at first sight and reveals to him the fact that the ascetics in the monastery are pseudo-ascetics and that the fate of her husbands so far to fall and perish into the well hidden under the bed in the nuptial chamber. In his case smitten by love she proposes to run away with him carrying with them the treasure collected from her former 'husbands' to Laṅkā. In Laṅkā the plight of the pair would have been miserable since Mitrāṇanda is taken for a robber by the city police if Mitrāṇanda, had not saved the yuvarāja (crownprince), Lakṣmipati, from death by snake-bite with the aid of the magical lore, called hālāhalaḥhari vidyā given to him to revive the dead by the goddess Jaṅguli on the occasion of his (Mitrāṇanda's) marriage with Kaumudi.

The King in gratitute entrusts the pair to the minister Kāmarati, who, however, is enamoured of Kaumudi and is very envious to get rid of her husband. The opportunity is given him by a human sacrifice which a feudatory by name Vijayaravarmā of the king wishes to perform. Kāmarati sends Mitrāṇanda to him as upahāra-puruṣa (victim) but Maitreya luckily recognises him. Maitreya was his companion. He had won the favour of Vijayaravarmā by curing him with the aid of a magical herb. Kaumudi in the meantime is expelled from the minister's house by his jealous wife and wanders until she meets Sumitrā, daughter of a merchant, and her family. Vajravarman, a chief of the abotigines, captures them all. One Makaranda, who turns out to be a friend of Mitrāṇanda, is also brought to this Vajravarman.

A letter from Lakṣmipati inquiring about the welfare of Mitrāṇanda and Kaumudi is received; and Kaumudi takes advantage of this letter and includes Vajravarman to celebrate the marriage of Makaranda and Sumitrā—who have fallen in love with each other at first sight. The three then have an adventure at Ekacakra town with a Kāpālika who persuades the women to go into a 'pāṭālabhavana' (subterranean apartment) while he asks Mitrāṇanda's heep against a Vidyādhara, described as strongly desirous of women.
He (the Kāpalika) breathes life into a corpse which takes a sword in its hand but Mitrāṇanda by a magic formula induces it to strike the Kāpalika who suddenly disappears. Next, Makaranda has to establish before yuvarāja Laksñipati his claim to his own carawan, which a certain Naradatta claims (wrongfully). The dispute is settled by the arrival of Vajrasvāmin and Mitrāṇanda. Finally husband and wife are united at the residence of the Siddha King. The story of Kaumudi and Mitrāṇanda forms the main plot whereas that of Sumbīrā and Makaranda, the byplot.

In the āmukha (=prastāvanā, Introduction) to his Kaumudi-Mitrāṇanda we are told that he is a pupil of the great Hemacandra; he is proficient in writing a hundred prabandhas (literary compositions) he is always and ever diligent in writing poetical works, he has composed the prakarana type of drama, called Kaumudimitrāṇanda; it is a treasure of a thousand Kutūhalas (curiosities; Kutūhala-what excites curiosity, anything pleasing or interesting, Kutūhala); it excites-evokes-stimulates-enkindles all kinds of sentiments-rasas- and feelings-bhūvas; and adds that it is his (Rāmacandra’s) second rūpaka (dvityam rūpakaṁ); [Satyaharīścandra being his adirūpaka-first rūpaka].... there are episodes and incidents in plenty that would, one after another, excite the curiosities of the (trained) audience; of course, it is for the Stage-director (Sūtradhāra) to decide whether is overflowing with rasas and whether there are many situations and episodes that would excite feelings. In reply to the assistant’s (nāṭa) statement the Stage Director says:

What to say (=there is no need to say anything) about the prakarana overflowing with rasas.

Are there not many great poets, Murāri and others like him, who are ever diligent in composing plays-dramatic poems—that are sweet on account of their skillfulness in new and novel (and striking) modes of speech? But I doubt if there is any other poet than Rāmacandra who is capable and skilled in creating various rasas to their highest-point, which are the very life and soul - the essence - of dramatic works. Moreover, “The dramatic compositions (of other poets), like sugarcane, progressively diminish in rasa (1 Sentiment 2 Juice); but Rāmacandra’s dramatic poem
grows progressively sweeter and sweeter still."

The assistant (nāṭa) contemptuously says:

"These days there are writers who borrow words and ideas (from earlier poets) and thereby attain fame. Consequently, how can the good people trust them?"

The Stage Director replies: "My (good) friend, this question does not arise in my case. In this matter the intelligent and wise contemporary men alone are the authority."

This Introduction (āmukha) reveals the boasting nature of Rāmacandra and his rather low opinion of his predecessors like Murāri, and his self-confidence that no critic can point an accusing finger at him for plagiarism or literary theft, and that his works, imbued as they are with rasas, make interesting reading and give delight to the readers. Again, in the Second Act we have the following remark of Maitreya:

अहे सम्पूर्णतुल्लालनुबन्धः प्रबंधः

- Act II, V. 6, l. 11 (p. 19)

"O, how rich is his dramatic composition presenting curiosities, one after another?"

This remark (and similar remarks in his other plays) reveals that the poet Rāmacandra was intensely emotional and self-conscious and that it was difficult for him to escape his own shadow and maintain a purely objective attitude in his writings. In writing this prakarana Rāmacandra had in mind Bhavabhuti's Mālati-mādhava. It is not surprising, therefore, if he consously or rather unconsciously follows this trait revealed in Bhavabhūti's writings.

Rāmacandra's References to his favourite deity-
Lord Rṣabha

Rāmacandra was a devout Jain. It is, therefore, natural that he should give expression to his deep reverence to Rṣabhadeva, the ādi-īrthajñaka of the Jains. In the Nandi verse he says:

यः प्राप्त निवृत्ति क्लेशानुभृत्य भवार्यवे ।
तस्मै विशेषकिमित्रजय त्रिधा नामिभुवे नमः ॥
(Tr. I pay homage in three ways to Lord Rṣabha, that peerless of matchless friend of the whole world who, after having experienced sufferings in the ocean of worldly existence, attained emancipation—final beatitude.)

In the course of the developement of the plot he respectfully refers to Lord Rṣabha half a dozen times:

1. p. 25: तदनं परे भगवतो नामेयस्य पादः शरणम्।
2. p. 51: नामेयस्य तदा पदानि शरणं देवस्य दुःखांचिछः।
3. p. 90: कथमेव सक्त्तदेवतातात्तिककल्याणे नाभिसुन्दर्वेद्यायनस्तयतत्तिके।
4. p. 91: दृष्टान्ताभिसुतस्य न: प्रभयतु श्रेयासि तेजसि च।
5. p. 123: स्मार्य निष्ठितकलेशं देवं नाभिसमुद्धवम्।

There is one reference to the very sacred mantra in which (five) paramesthins are paid homage to by the Jains. (The five dignitaries are: 1. Arhat 2. Śuddha 3. acārya 4. upādhyāya and 5. sādhus):

अपिनाम कोष्प्यपावं संभेतु, तद्हे परमेश्विनाय पवित्रं मनं स्मरणि।

“If any calamity is likely to visit or befall, I remember the sacred mantra in which five dignitaries are paid homage to.”

At another place the temple of Kātyāyant is described in such a way as to produce disgust (p. 45, v. no. 12), and the Śaivite School of Kāpālikas who indulged in the offerings of animals and even human beings is targetted. Probably, the poet here betrays the influence of Bhavabhuti who in his Mālāti-Mādhava mentions how Kapālakundalā carries away Mālatī, the heroine of the play from her bed-chamber to be immolated and sacrificed before the goddess Karālā Cāmunḍā by her teacher Aghoraghanta.

Kaumudimitrāṇanda: a Prakarana

Bharata and after him many writers on Dramatics have defined the various types of Drama (rūpaka) in their works. The Daśarūpaka of Dhanamjaya is very popular with the commentators on Sanskrit dramas. Following their tradition we reproduce below the definition of a Prakarana given by Dhanamjaya:

अथ प्रकरणे वृत्तांवित्तं लोकसंश्रयम्।
अमात्यविप्रविज्ञामेकं कुर्वचच नायकम्॥
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Now, in a prakaraṇa the subject matter should be invented, and should be drawn from worldly life (lokasamāśrayam); the playwright should make a minister, a Brāhmaṇa or a merchant the hero; he should be of the type called ‘dhīrāpraśānta’ (self-controlled and calm) undergoing some misfortune (Sāpāya) and striving after (tatpara) dharma (virtue) kāma (pleasure) and artha (wealth). The remaining features or characteristics—such as Sandhi (junctures) or praveśaka (introductory scenes) or rasas (sentiments) are as in the nātaka. The heroine (nāyikā) is of two kinds, the high-born wife of the hero or a courtezan. In some plays there is only the high-born lady, in some the courtezan, and in some plays, both; the high-born lady is (always) indoors (abhyaantarā), the courtezan out of doors or without (bāhyā) and the two never meet (nātikramo’ nayoh). Owing to these three kinds (of the heroine) the prakaraṇa is of three kinds or varieties. The mixed variety abounds in dhūrtas (rogues).

Thus the Kaumudimitrāṇanda is a Śuddha (Unmixed, not contaminates by another woman’s contact) prakaraṇa where the heroine is Kaumudi, the daughter of Kulapati—the head of a monastery. Incidentally, Māltimādhava, where there is the heroine, Mālati, the high-born maiden. Tarangadatta (now lost) where a courtezan alone is the only heroine is equally a Śuddha prakaraṇa. The Mṛcchakaṭi, however, is a Sarūkīra (mixed) prakaraṇa—where we have both types of heroine, Dhūtā, Cārudatta’s wife is a high-born nāyikā; Vasantasaṇā, a courtezan is another and most noteworthy heroine. And further, this play is full of dhūrtas (rogues) as well.

In the play under our study, Kaumudi, the most-beautiful woman, daughter of Kulapati is the heroine; Mitrāṇanda the son of a
devout Jain householder Jinaḍāsa who is fabulously rich by birth and is a citizen of Kautukamāṅgala nāgara is the hero. Mitrānanda is portrayed as self-controlled and calm (dhīra-praśānta) and striving after dharma, artha (wealth) and Kāma (pleasure). Kaumūdi falls in love with the hero at first sight. Disregarding the interests of her own father who and his followers are pseudo-ascetics but, in fact, robbers. Her father apparently marries her to rich Sārthavāha merchants whenever they visit him. Poor fellows fall into the well, covered under bed, in the nuptial chamber and perish. She elopes, with the treasure collected from the supposed husband’s, with the hero. Calamities after calamities visit both of them. They bravely face there calamities and are ultimately united and enjoy pleasures of love. This account forms the main story—main plot, and the story of Makaranda, the hero’s trusted and beloved friend and Sumitrā who are destined to be married, by lucky accident come together. The story of Makaranda and Sumitrā constitutes the byplot and furthers the cause of the main hero.

The āmukha (Introduction) claims that this rūpaka (play) is ‘Kutūhalasahasra-nidhānam’ and ‘niśṣeṣa-rasa-bhāva-pradīpakam’.
When we go carefully through the whole play we notice that most of the incidents are Kathā incidents. They excite our interest, curiosity and in that sense they are ‘Kutūhalasa-Sahasra-nidhāna’ but one must admit that they hardly form dramatic incidents.

The other claim made in the āmukha on behalf of the poet that ‘it is niśṣeṣa-rasa-bhāva-pradīpaka’ is rather exaggerated. Every reader would agree with us when we say that there is a lack of humour throughout the play. May be, the poet is serious by nature and consequently he simply cannot create humour or humorous situations. Being a muni, possibly he felt it rather awkward and improper to portray vividly the erotic sentiment (Srangāra-rasa). The hero is ‘dhīra-praśānta’. By his very nature he is against fighting a war. For example, towards the end of the sixth Act we are told of the impending war-night attack by the enemy on Vijayavarma’s army. But the next Act informs us why the fight as such does not take place between the two warring groups. We have instead a scene which excites the sentiment of fear.
It is rather easy for Rāmanadra to depict the sentiments of fear (bhayaṁaka) bibhatsa (Disgust) of marvell or wonder (adbhuta), when occasion arises he depicts the sentiments of roudra (the furious) and the pathos (kaṛiṇa). One very convincing illustration of the depiction of the bibhatsa sentiment may be cited here. The description of the temple of Kātyāyani (Act IV V V-12-3, pp 45-46) is very graphic and creates disgust in the mind of the readers or spectators when the play is enacted on the stage.

Kaumudimitrāṇanda : Appreciation

Kaumudimitraṇaṇda is an extravagantly fanciful composition. The supernatural or magical element plays a dominant role throughout the play. It presents so many marvellous incidents appealing to the audience and contributing to the sentiment of wonder or the marvellous (adbhuta-rasa) right from the beginning to the end. Thus the Siddha King nailed to a tree by Varuṇa, the regent of the ocean, is set free from imprisonment by means of a jem of mysterious power. Again, Maitreya has won the favour of the King’s vassal by curing him by a magic herb. Kaumudi is attracted to Mitrāṇanda, her prospective husband by the love-charm he had received from Varuṇa. She and Mitrāṇanda flee to Lanka. There the pair would have been in miserable plight. Since Mitrāṇanda is taken for a thief by the city police. Mitrāṇanda, however cures prince Lakṣmipati with the aid of the hālāhalara ṛi vidyā (lore) from death given to him to revive the dead by the goddess Jānguli on the occasion of his marriage. In Act VIII Mitrāṇanda by a magic formula induces the corpse in whom the Kāpālika has breathed life and which takes a sword in its hand, to strike that wicked Kāpālika, who, however, overcomes with fear, disappears. Act X ends happily with husband and wife united in the residence of the Siddha King by the efforts of Maitreya. The various marvellous incidents mentioned above excite the sentiment of wonder (adbhutarasa) in the spectators/audience. According to Bharata, the sentiment of wonder should be introduced in the concluding nirvāhaṇa Sandhi, but our poet Rāmacandra introduces it in almost each and every Sandhi. Kaumudi and
Mitrānanda, the hero and heroine of the main plot are somewhat impressive but Sumitrā and Makaranda, the hero and heroine of the by plot are not effectively depicted. Kaumudi and Mitrānanda, with rich treasure, flee to Lanka. They go through several ordeals but are ultimately united as husband and wife.

Rāmacandra's Style: Rāmacandra is at his best in sperinkling his dramatic poem with witty and wise sayings—throwing light on the human nature. Excepting some long descriptive stanzas which are rather tough and difficult he may be said to be fond of Vaidarbhi style. His dialogues are, as a rule, lovely, brisk and crisp. His prose is lucid and easy to understand. It must, however, be admitted that a large number of words he, possibly, deliberately uses that are obscure or rarely used. By way of example a few of them are listed in the foot-note. Both of his claims that his play is ‘Kutūhala-sahasra-pradhāna’ and ‘nīśheṣa-rasa-bhāva-pradhāna’ are well qualified—with one single exception. He fails to create hāṣya-rasa (sentiment of laughter, or humour). It is very likely that Rāmacandra by his very nature and temperament was serious and therefore did not see observe the lighter side of human life. We add at the end a number of his Subhāṣītas and Sudhā-syandi sūktas to give readers an idea of his observations of human nature, especially men, women, robbers, etc.

Modern scholars like Keith, De, Raghavan judge the play by applying modern western, norms and standards and describe it as ‘wholly undramatic.’

To judge by Indian standards and criteria, we should first keep in mind, it is unfair and unjust to compare this late playwright of the 12th century with master poets like the unimitable Śtṛdraka or the great Bhavabhūti. His drama does not certainly come up to the normal standard but at the same time does not fall far below the Indian standard. Following Bharata and Abhinavagupta, Rāmacandra clearly says “Nātyaprānāh rasāh”. He has portrayed all the rasas excepting the hāṣya rasa. But he failed to make either vīra or śṛṅgara as the dominant (pradhāna, aṅgī rasa and other rasas supportive to it. Even then we feel that it would be fair to rank Rāmacandra as a second rate poet.
Rāmacandra's Thoughts

Rāmacandra sprinkles, now and then, his Kaumudimitrāṇandā with Subhāṣitas. They embody his thoughts about the nature of women, about love, about fate, about men good and bad, and quite a few arthāntaranyāsas which are worth remembering; not to be forgotten. A list, not quite exhaustive, of such Subhāṣitas and Śudhā-Syandi Sūktas is added at the end. Here a few of his Subhāṣitas and Sūktas embodying his thoughts about the nature of women, about love, about fate and the habit of robbers (cauryavṛtti) and Sūktas are freely translated for the benefit of those who are not acquainted with Sanskrit:

1. The mind of women who for the sake of a man whom they have seen just for a moment (who fall in love with him at first sight) who desert their own Kingmen who are so very familiar, and who are so friendly and favourable (benefactors), if at all God Brahmā alone knows. (3.3; p.97)

3. It is this god of love (or Love) itself that effects or brings about fortunateness (saubhāgya - good fortune or luck) and beauty (caṅgima=soundarya) among lovers. It is the moon, and the moon alone, who produces (make ooze) water in the moonstones which are hard or compact by nature. (3.9, p. 30)

9. Those women, being blinded by love, consider their lives worthless — trivial like grass — deserve to be counted first among the heroes - heroic personages. (4.4, p. 49)

12. Even if one falls in the ocean, or thrown down on the earth from the sky again obtains possession — regains — wealth, provided he remains alive. (6.1, p. 63)

26. If by an act of kindness you oblige a wicked or cruel person he is bound to do injury by retaliation. A lion who is ensnared — Clit. for whom a snare is spread) and is soon to meet his end, kills that very person who tears asunder that share. (10.16, p.125)

Sūktas

2. Any dress (or apparel) suits a person who is naturally handsome. (1.18 Second half, p. 12)
Note: this line reminds one of Kālidāsa’s beautiful *arthāntaranyāsa*;

3. For embodied beings nothing is dearer than their own life. (6.5, 1st half)

1. खण्डित्वकविनिर्मितिः बङ्धुभागः परिचिताः हिताकरः च।
भिक्षुपीठां महिलाः मुण्डलां मानसं बेंबो॥
(क्षणदृश्यनिर्मितिः बङ्धुभागः परिचिताः हिताकरः च।
मुण्डलां महिलां जनानि यदि मानसं ब्रह्म॥) -3.3, पृ.27

2. कायः पि अंगलाडी भूसिंजः भूसिंजः हरिणीः
भूसिंजः उन कायः पि भूसिंजः अंगलाडी॥
(कालाऱ्णि अक्षयाःः पृथ्वीः पृथ्वीः हरिणीः
भूसिंजः पुनःः कालाऱ्णि भूसिंजः अक्षयाः॥) -3.6, पृ.28

3. एसो सो (पा.भ.अनुगो)चिक्षा दपहसु चड़ा सोहनः-चीगम-गुणाईः
चंदो विचः अण वाणीः (?मणीः) कहि-कचिधीसु (?बंधुः) सलिलाई॥
(एत्य एव (पा.भ.अनुगो) एव देवानु घट्यति सोहणे-चीगमगुणान्
चंद्र एव जनयति मणीः कहि-कचिधीसु सलिलाई॥) -3.9, पृ.30

4. सुहिगानान् दृष्टयो यदयति नात्रम्
तदाश्वारामार्थकां विद्यार्थिकां पदायसी॥ -3.12, पृ.33

5. दहर्विचैः चेत एव परम्पुरेहि मणिनिगमभिलामणाओ
क्रिया चोते कुलबालाताः गोहिलाइ कहाइ॥
(देवतैः चेत एव परम्पुरेहि मणिनिगमभिलामणाओः
क्रियाचोते कुलबालासि गोहिलाइ कहाइ॥) -3.15, पृ.37

6. अत्यत्वं च महत्वं च वित्तोपि लतमीश्चते
कव्ये तत्तुः श्रद्धार्तृतैः कव्ये तिर्यं वत्तः॥ -3.18, पृ.37

7. अस्तादिबाजवत्नं प्रदेशनिर्यतमस्य समासमि
वोदाः कुलबालितेव मित्रसुलमिति दितलक्षी॥ -3.22, पृ.29

8. खणितोऽवेदिकाय गयायामभिलामणाओः
कुलबालितेव चिरालितेव एव इतिविदि
(क्षणामहिन्द्रप्रियजनप्रेमेनिर्देशितला महिला
कुलबालितेव मुन्नति वानादेवा किल प्रकृति:॥) -8.3, पृ.42
अनुसंधान-१७ • ८७

९. बीरपु गणने पूर्व परम्परांत योगिता।

वास्तवान्यमित्रयोगदान प्राप्ती, प्रेमान्यीमन्वयते। || -४.७, पृ.४२

१०. देवस्व विशम व सहिं विन्यम्। भर्तिक्रम दुञ्चिद योगिता।

तद्हपि महिलाय रिम दयामय न सावतान्यम।

(देवस्व ब्रजती विशम सहते दुञ्चिद) ध्यामान्य दुञ्चितात्।

तथार्थ महिलाय प्रेम दयामय न स्वजनन्योः। || -४.५, पृ.४२

११. मा सिद्ध कृत्त्वा बापेयो। फलं मर्य कर्मणां।

सत्यं बिश्वाशोकाय। न देवं परिवत्ते। || -४.१, पृ.५०

१२. समुंदे परिस्थताय विश्वास्यं। नभक्षतात्।

पुंः समुद्रं लक्ष्मीयं। द्वैत निन्यम मुच्यते। || -६.१, पृ.६३

१३. अभिभुवनित्वं वेदानी पुण्यविश्वास्यं।

लाभान्यं महाबन्धनं पुरुषं। धारणं वस्तुं। || -६.४, पृ.६५

१४. संपत्तियां विश्वास्या शेषनाथ। दैवमोहन कर्तः।

एवमंयाविधायों कल्याणं केवलम्। || -६.७, पृ.६७

१५. निर्षाकमुक्तकोभी पुरुषं विश्वास्यं।

अप्रकारसं वस्तस्ते तत्र ब्रह्माण्यं मन्त्रं। || -६.७, पृ.६७

१६. ज्ञेयं। सते देवविधुकः कुमारित।

ये स्त्रयुक्तकस्यैवरूपं कथयं वस्तुं। || -६.१, पृ.६७

१७. देवविधुरस्ये पृथ्वी। क्षेत्रवैस्किष्ट्येऽधिते।

तथा ब्रह्मनिर्वाचनं। न भावं यथा पुनः। || ६.१६, पृ.७३

१८. अभिभवनित्वायं। प्राणान्यं धरार्त।

त्यजनं ताप्यं कृतं मात्रं दानेऽधितव। || -७.७, पृ.८३

२०. विसबद्धू वा च सा वा शुकुयं। फलकर्मणं।

तथाय। प्रथमेऽदेवं बैमन्युष्याः। || -८.५, पृ.१०

२१. परस्य: शरणं। सत्यं प्रत्यथो हरिणीद्रशः।

भवेदित्वं। तद्हि काव्यं। तदा वा। एवं हेतु। || -८.१०, पृ.७४

२२. सर्वजननन्यमनस्बन्धं दिशों। वित्तमायं।

अवटार्त। तद्भवन्यं। बुधार्येन। कस्य नन्दः। || -९.१, पृ.९९

२३. जनुयानम्। न प्रयत्नं। भावानु। केवलमन्यितम्।

ऐहिकामणुष्यकामकालां। पुरववन्यं। || -९.३, पृ.१००

२४. विश्वास्यं। कथितिविद्यं। हर्व। समीतो। लोकः।
अनुसंधान-१७ • ५८

प्रतिपदनविषयं पुनरूपेऽति मातापि निवेदयम् || -९.१०, पृ.१०८

२४. परस्मादुपकरणं यं सौधीपि ब्रीडवहं सताम्।
तत्सामस्तदुपकरस्तु दुरोत्तवं पशूतिपि || -१०.२, पृ.११३

२५. सर्वथा कैतवं निन्दं प्रवदति विपश्चितः।
केवलं न विना तेन दुःसाध्यं वस्तु सिद्धितः || -१०.५, पृ.११६

२६. कूर्ते कृतोपकार्यं प्रत्यपकार्यं कल्पते भूषः।
विचित्रतपाराविनाशः प्रणीतति विग्राहकं सिद्धः || -१०.१६, पृ.१२१

२७. अंकार्यं कुर्वाणुपकार्यं कोषपि शक्यते कर्त्ताम्।
संतानं फलस्मृतमुखः कर्षेति धात्वीधीयस्तवम् || -१०.१७, पृ.१२५

२८. नरं दिनं न श्रयं प्रक्रयं न चर्या, स्वतं न च चालकालवस्तकान्तभोगः।
श्रद्धुनुजार्यं सुतांधरं दालोपी, लोकांपारं कुर्दे नन्तु चौर्यवृत्तिम् ||
-७.३, पृ.७९

२९. ऐदिकामुखिकानं कल्लेशाकृतिवृत्तिकाम्यं।
स्वीकृताशास्त्रं दुरंभं कोष्यस्यस्यस्तरं जनाः। || -७.४, पृ.७९
सुधार्थस्वद्दं-सूक्तकानि

१. निजभुजदण्डण्डां हि वणिणां दशिणेपार्जनं मण्डलं न तु खण्डनम्।-पृ.६

२. प्रकृतिमुभों पाते वेषो यदेव तदेव वा। - पृ.१२

३. पुन्न्यां प्रेमप्रस्थिलदिवारं खलु मनः। -पृ.४१

४. सत्यं विवादशोकायं न देयं पवितरते। -पृ.१०

५. सर्वशास्त्रपाराविनाशं सर्वनाशिन्यं प्रेमस्यपूर्वकारिणां प्रणाणा न विवादवैधुयं
महेषम्। - पृ. ६४

६. प्राणेष्वभो नापं वस्तु प्रेमपार्वं वपुष्यातां। -पृ.६६

७. उपनिता अपि हि विष्णुः प्रतिहिष्यनं देवतादर्शनम्। पृ.९०

८. अवतरित स्वयोपक्षे वस्तुधार्यं कस्य नानदः। -पृ.९९

९. परस्मादुपकरणं यं सौधीपि ब्रीडवहं सताम्। -पृ.११३

१०. प्रसन्नति मयं धार्यं जातो न कस्य युगदयं। -पृ.१२४

११. कूर्तेकृतोपकार्यं प्रत्यपकार्यं कल्पते भूषः। -पृ.१२५
On Sthātús' ca rātham in the ṛgveda 1.70.7

- M. A. Mehendale

RV. 1.70 is a hymn of Parāśāra addressed to Agni. It consists of eleven, or according to another mode of counting (adhyananatah), of six stanzas. The seventh (or the fourth) stanza reads as:

vārdhān yāṁ pūrviḥ kṣapó vírūpāḥ svatūs' ca rātham rūtrapavitam.

The first half of the line offers not much difficulty and can be rendered as "whom (Agni) many nights (and dawns), of different forms, may strengthen." The difficulty is presented by the second half. There we have ca after sthātus which apparently looks like the genitive sg. of sthātr-what is stationary' (stāvara). But, after ca, there is no word in gen. sg. with which it could be coordinated. Scholars, therefore, felt that a mistake had occurred in the transmission of the text and that the text has to be read as sthātuṣ carātham (i.e. carātham to be read as one word, and not two, ca rātham, as in the Pada text). Max Müller2 defended this suggestion and Oldenberg (Noten) agreed with him. In support of the suggestion to read carātham occurs twice in the RV. viz. at 1.58.5 (sthātuṣ carātham bhayate paratīnah) and at 1.68.1 (sthātuṣ carātham aktūn vyūrnot). As regards the form sthātur, Max Müller observes that it could be the old nom. acc. sg. of neuter noun in -tr. In later Sanskrit, however, we get the form sthātr'. Neither Max Müller nor Oldenberg tells us how they understood the line with the reading sthātuṣ carātham.2 In the two RV. passages 1.58.5 and 1.68.1 referred to above, Śāyāna interprets the two relevant words as sthāvaraṁ... jaṅgamaṁ ca. In 1.58.5 the word sthātuh has to be nom. sg. Śāyāna treats it as a form derived from the stem sthātu. But he does not tell us how sthātuh
can be acc. sg. in 1.68.1.

Geldner accepts the suggestion of his predecessors to treat carátham as one word, but he interprets sthátúḥ differently. He takes it as gen. sg. of sthátṝ-. Hence, in his opinion, the original reading was not carátham, but caráthäm⁶ (gen. M.). For this emendation of the text he finds support in stanza 3 of this hymn (1.70) where we read gárbhas ca sthátāṁ/gárbhas carátham.⁷ “(Agni) who is the embryo of those that stand still and of those that move”. He borrows from this stanza also the word gárbha for the interpretation of the stanza under consideration which he renders as: “Whom they strengthened during many dissimilar nights (and days⁸), (him who is the embryo), conceived at proper time, of all⁹ that moves and stands”.¹⁰

All western interpreters thus agree in treating carátham as one word. Not only that, Max Müller is quite confident that “there can be no clearer case of corruption in the traditional text of the Rig-veda than, for instance in I, 70. 4 (= 7)…”¹¹ I do not share M. Müller’s confidence. In my opinion, the author of the Padapāṭha has correctly interpreted, the Samhitā text before him and separated ca rátham as two words. He certainly knew the phrase sthátús carátham which occurs twice before. In spite of that he chose to separate ca rátham since he interpreted rtápravītam as adjective of the word rátham which occurs immediately before it, and not of any other word like gárbha borrowed from a different stanza. On the other hand, he apparently borrowed carátham for the understanding the present stanza. This borrowing is easily understandable as sthátús carátham is a set phrase. The passage is an example of ellipsis, the full text being sthátús (carátham¹²) ca rátham rtápravītam.

As regards rtápravītam, Geldner takes it to be an adjective going with the noun gárbha supplied by him¹³ “den zur
rechten Zeit empfangenen (Keim)”. This is very unlikely. 
ṛtāpravīṭam as an adjective 
ṛtham makes good sense. The 
chariot (in the form of Agni) was set in motion, was impelled, 
by 
ṛtā (i.e.by the hymn 14 recited by the seer while performing 
the sacrificial rite). The use of 
Pravīta in the the context 
of driving a chariot is attested in the Mahābhāṣya. Patañjali 
while commenting on Panini 2.4.56 cites as an example 
pravīto 
rathah.15

The line, therefore, may be translated as : “Whom (i.e. 
Agni) many nights of different forms (and many dawns), 
as well as what is stationary (and what moves), may strengthen, 
(Agni who is) the chariot16 set in motion by the hymn”.

Agni is strengthened by the offerings of clarified butter 
(obtained from cowmilk) and of fire-wood. Hence he is said 
to be strengththened by one that moves (cow) and one that 
is stationary (tree). This is specifically referred to in stanza 
9 of the hymn (gōṣu prāśarīṁ vāneṣu dhīse “you value 
the cows and the woods”17).

Foot-notes
1. In the above translation, the words pūrvīḥ kṣapō virūpāḥ are treated 
as nom. pl. Oldenberg (Noten) considers the other possibility of treating 
them as acc. pl. possible. Geldner prefers this other possibility and 
translates : “Whom they reared during many dissimilar nights (and 
daybreaks)”
2. SBE Vol. 32 (1891), pp. LXII-LXXIV. According to him, the suggestion 
was made by Benfey, Bollenssen, Roth and others. He does not give 
references. It is difficult to know whom he refers to by ‘and others’. 
Roth (BR dictionary s.v. carātha) gives reference to Benfey's Sāmaveda 
Glossar (1948). There Benfey shows his preference to consider carātham, 
instead of ca 
rātham, to be the original reading. Roth seems to 
favour this suggestion. Bollenssen (Die Lieder des Parāscara, ZDMG 
22, 1868, p. 596) also considered ca 
rātham to be an error for 
the old reading carātham. I am thankful to Prof. H. P. Schmidt 
for conveying to me the information from Bollenssen and to Mrs. 
Madhavi Kolhatkar for supplying to me the information contained 
in Benfey’s Glossar.
3. Also slightly differently at 1.72.6 (sthātrāṃ carātham ca pāhi) and 1.70.2 (gārthaś ca sthātārīn gārthaś carāthām).
4. Though Max Müller translates all the other passages cited by him in this connection.
5. Alternatively Sāyaṇa looks upon sthatuś as abl. sg. of the stem sthātr-, cf. yud vā sthātur anantaram carathāṃ bhayaate.
6. Or even carathām although this involves change in accent.
7. In 1.70.3 also, Gellder prefers to read cāratām.
8. As noted above, according to Goldner, pūrvīḥ ksapō virūpāḥ are acc. pl. forms.
9. This translation would be all right for st.3 of the hymn where we have sthātāṃ and carāthām both gen. pl. forms. But in our stanza sthātuḥ is gen. sg. and not pl. Gellder, in his translation of the present stanza, alos unnecessarily transposes the words sthātuś carāthām “alles dessen, was geht und steht”. In stanza 3 he has it right “dessen, was steht und .... was geht.”
10. L. Ranou (Études Védiques at Pāṇinēenees, Vol. 12, pp. 16 and 39) also borrows the word gārtha from st. 3 and, like Gellder, takes rtápravita as adj. of this noun “(Agni, germe) conçu de’ Ordersacre. But he considers sthātuś carāthām as nt. sg. forms.
11. SBE. Vol. 32 (1891) p. LXXII, Max Müller goes on : “But although I have no doubt that in I, 70, 4 the original psed said sthātuś carāthām, I should be loath to suppress the evidence of the mistake and alter the Pada text from ca rātham to carāthām. The very mistake is instructive, as showing us the kind of misapprehension in which the collectors of the Vedic text were liable...” “But, as shown in this paper, the author of the Padapātha has not misapprehended the text before him. Moreover, the author of the Pada text was not one of “the collectors of the Vedic text”.
12. Also in the first half of the line ksapō stands for ksapā usrāh. The author of this hymn seems to take delight in ellipsis since we have to assume it twice in this stanza as well as in st. 1 (as understood by the author of the Padapātha) cf. Gellder, Translation. f.n. on 1.70.1b). 10 and 11.
13. Lüders (Varuṇa II. pp. 624-625) thinks ṛtápravita qualifies Agni.
14. For this meaning of ṛtá, see Lüders, Varuṇa Vol. II, p. 421 ff.
15. Pataṅjali also cites forms such as pravita ‘charioteer’ pravetum ‘in order to drive’ from the root vi-to drive’.
16. Cf. RV 3.11.5 aṅgir... tūrṇi rāthah sādā nāvah Agni the over new quick chariot.” Agni is compared to a chariot in 3.15.5 : rātho
na sásnīh “victorious like a chariot” 10.176.3 rátho ná yó r abhīvṛtaḥ
“covered like the chariot of a traveller.”

17. It seems from the following stanza (8) that the seer is addressing
the hymn to the evening fire. (cf., Ait, Br. 8.28, and RV. 10.88.6).
Hence, the use of the word ksapāh ‘nights’ is stanza 7. In the evening
the sun is established in the fire. This is achieved by the evening
rites. Since, this has now been achieved, the seer in stanza 8 says
that the Hotṛ has become successful. Hotṛ does not refer to Agni
as assumed by Geldner. Since the evening rite was performed to establish
the sun in the fire, and since it has been accomplished, the seer
concludes the stanza by saying that the Hotṛ has made true all the
sacrificial acts (kṛnvaṁ viśvāṁ apāṁsi satyaḥ).