

Some Aspects of the Kaumudīmitrāṇanda

- V. M. Kulkarni

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

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

यथा वाऽस्मदुपज्ञे रोहिणीमृगाङ्गाभिधाने प्रकरणे प्रथमेऽङ्के — “मृगाङ्गं प्रति वसन्तः — कुमार ! मा शङ्किष्ठाः ।

उन्मत्तप्रेमसंरम्भाद्, आरभन्ते यदङ्गना ।

तत्र प्रत्यूहमाधातुं, ब्रह्माऽपि खलु कातरः ॥’

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

In translation it means :

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

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

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

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 *rasas* in drama : ‘*na hi rasādṛte kaścid arthaḥ pravartate.*’ (Everything in drama is oriented towards creating *rasaḥ*.) Abhinavagupta and following him Rāmacandra, hold that ‘*rasāḥ nāṭyaprāṇāḥ*’ (*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 *prakaraṇa* type of drama in ten Acts. It mainly deals with the love-story of Mitrāṇanda, the son of a wealthy merchant by name Jināsena, a resident of Kautukanagara, and Kaumudī, 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 (*asūryampāsya*). Kaumudī, 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 *yuvārāja* (crownprince), Lakṣmipati, from death by snake-bite with the aid of the magical lore, called *hālāhalaharī vidyā* given to him to revive the dead by the goddess Jāṅguli on the occasion of his (Mitrāṇanda's) marriage with Kaumudī.

The King in gratitude entrusts the pair to the minister Kāmaratī, who, however, is enamoured of Kaumudī and is very envious to get rid of her husband. The opportunity is given him by a human sacrifice which a feudatory by name Vijayavarmā of the king wishes to perform. Kāmaratī sends Mitrāṇanda to him as *upahāra-puruṣa* (victim) but Maitreya luckily recognises him. Maitreya was his companion. He had won the favour of Vijayavarmā by curing him with the aid of a magical herb. Kaumudī in the meantime is expelled from the minister's house by his jealous wife and wanders untill 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 Kaumudī is received; and Kaumudī 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 Ekacakrā town with a Kāpālīka who persuades the women to go into a '*pātālabhavana*' (subterranean apartment) while he asks Mitrāṇanda's help 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 Lakṣmīpati 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 Kaumudī and Mitrāṇanda forms the main plot whereas that of Sumitrā and Makaranda, the byplot.

In the *āmukha* (= *prastāvanā*, Introduction) to his *Kaumudī-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 *prakaraṇa* type of drama, called *Kaumudīmītrāṇanda*; 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-*bhāvas*; and adds that it is his (Rāmacandra's) *second rūpaka* (*dvitīyaṃ rūpakam*); [*Satyahariścandra* being his *ādirūpaka*-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 (*naṭa*) statement the Stage Director says:

What to say (=there is no need to say anything) about the *prakaraṇa* 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 (*naṭa*) contemptually 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 :

अहो समृद्धकुतूहलानुबन्धः प्रबन्ध ।

- 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) reveal 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 *prakaraṇa* Rāmacandra had in mind Bhavabhūti's *Mālati-mādhava*. It is not surprising, therefore, if he consciously 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-tīrthaṅkara* of the Jains. In the Nandi verse he says :

यः प्राप निवृत्तिं क्लेशाननुभूय भवार्णवे ।

तस्मै विश्वैकमित्राय त्रिधा नाभिभुवे 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 wordly 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 : तदतः परं भगवतो नाभेयस्य पादाः शरणम् ।
- (2) p. 51 : नाभेयस्य तदा पदानि शरणं देवस्य दुःखच्छिदः ।
- (3) p. 90 : कथमयं सकलदेवताधिचक्रवर्ती नाभिसूनुश्चैत्याभ्यन्तमलङ्करोति ।
- (4) p. 91 : दृष्टिर्नाभिसुतस्य नः प्रथयतु श्रेयांसि तेजांसि च ।
- (5) p. 123 : स्मरामि निश्चितक्लेशं देवं नाभिसमुद्भवम् ।

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

अपिनाम कोऽप्यपायः संभवेत् तदहं परमेष्ठिनाम पवित्रं मन्त्रं स्मरामि ।

“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 Kātyāyāni 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 Bhavabhūti who in his *Mālātī-Mādhava* mentions how Kapālakuṇḍalā carries away Mālātī, the heroine of the play from her bed-chamber to be immolated and sacrificed before the goddess Karālā Cāmuṇḍā by her teacher Aghoraghaṇṭa.

Kaumudīmitrāṇanda : a Prakaraṇa

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

अथ प्रकरणे वृत्तमुत्पाद्यं लोकसंश्रयम् ।

अमात्यविप्रवणिजामेकं कुर्याच्च नायकम् ॥

धीरप्रशान्तं सापायं धर्मकामार्थतत्परम् ।
 शेषं नाटकवत्संधिप्रवेशकरसादिकम् ॥
 नायिका तु द्विधा नेतुः कुलस्त्री गणिका तथा ।
 क्वचिदैकेव कुलजा वेश्यावापि द्वयं त्र्यचित् ॥
 कुलजाभ्यन्तरं बाह्या वेश्या नातिक्रमोऽनयोः ।
 आभिः प्रकरणं त्रेधा संकीर्णं धूर्तसंकुलम् ॥

Now, in a *prakaraṇa* the subject matter should be invented, and should be drawn from worldly life (*lokasamśrayam*); the playwright should make a minister, a Brāhmaṇa or a merchant the hero; he should be of the type called '*dhīraprasānta*' (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 *naṭaka*. The heroine (*nāyikā*) is of two kinds, the high-born wife of the hero or a courtesan. In some plays there is only the high-born lady, in some the courtesan, and in some plays, both; the high-born lady is (always) indoors (*abhyantarā*), the courtesan 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 contaminated by another woman's contact) *prakaraṇa* where the heroine is Kaumudī, the daughter of *Kulapati*—the head of a monastery. Incidentally, *Māltimādhava*, where there is the heroine, Mālātī, the high-born maiden. *Tarangadatta* (now lost) where a courtesan alone is the only heroine is equally a *Śuddha prakaraṇa*. The *Mṛcchakaṭika*, however, is a *Samkīrṇa* (mixed) *prakaraṇa*—where we have both types of heroine, Dhūtā, Cārudatta's wife is a high-born *nāyikā*; Vasantasenā, a courtesan is another and most noteworthy heroine. And further, this play is full of *dhūrtas* (rogues) as well.

In the play under our study, Kaumudī, the most-beautiful woman, daughter of *Kulapati* is the heroine; *Mitrāṇanda* the son of a

devout Jain householder Jinadāsa who is fabulously rich by birth and is a citizen of Kautukamaṅgala nagara is the hero. Mitrāṇanda is portrayed as self-controlled and calm (*dhīra-prasānta*) and striving after *dharma*, *artha* (wealth) and *Kāma* (pleasure). Kaumudī 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 these 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 'Kutūhalsahasra-nidhānam' and '*nīśṣeṣa-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 '*Kutūhala-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 *nīśṣeṣa-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 (*Śṛaṅgāra-rasa*). The hero is '*dhīra-prasānta*'. 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 Vijayavarmā'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 (*bhayānaka*) *bībhatsa* (*Disgust*) of marvell or wonder (*adbhuta*), when occasion arises he depicts the sentiments of *roudra* (the furious) and the pathos (*karūṇa*). One very convincing illustration of the depiction of the *bībhatsa* 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.

Kaumudīmītrāṇanda : Appreciation

Kaumudīmītrāṇanda 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 gem of mysterious power. Again, Maitreya has won the favour of the King's vassal by curing him by a magic herb. Kaumudī is attracted to Mitrāṇanda, her prospective husband by the love-charm he had received from Varuṇa. She and Mitrāṇanda flee to Laṅkā. There the pair would have been in miserable plight. Since Mitrāṇanda is taken for a thief by the city police. Mitrāṇanda, however cures prince Lakṣmīpati with the aid of the *hālāhala-hārī vidyā* (lore) from death given to him to revive the dead by the goddess Jāṅgulī on the occasion of his marriage. In Act VIII Mitrāṇanda by a magic formula induces the corpse in whom the Kāpālīka has breathed life and which takes a sword in its hand, to strike that wicked Kāpālīka, who, however, overcome 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 Śandhi*, but our poet Rāmacandra introduces it in almost each and every *Sandhi*. Kaumudī 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 Laṅkā. They go through several ordeals but are ultimately united as husband and wife.

Rāmacandra's Style : Rāmacandra is at his best in sprinkling 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.⁵ Both of his claims that his play is 'Kutūhala-sahasra-pradhāna' and 'niśṣeṣa-rasa-bhāva-pradhāna' are well qualified—with one single exception. He fails to create *hāsyā-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 or observe the lighter side of human life. We add at the end a number of his *Subhāṣitas* 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 Śūdraka 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 "*Nāṭyapraṇāḥ rasāḥ*". He has portrayed all the *rasas* excepting the *hāsyā rasa*. But he failed to make either *vīra* or *śṛṅgāra* 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 *Kaumudimitrāṇanda* 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 moon-stones 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. (I.18 Second half, p. 12)

Note : this line reminds one of Kālidāsa's beautiful *arthāntaranyāsa*;

। किमिव मधुराणां मण्डनं नाकृतीनाम् । *Śākuntala* 1.20.d

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

कौमुदीमित्राणन्द-प्रकरणान्तर्गतानि महाकविरामचन्द्रस्य सुभाषितानि

१. खणदिदृजणनिमित्तं बंधुअणं परिचिअं हिअकरं च ।
मिल्लंतीणं महिलाण मुणइजइ माणसं बंधो ॥
(क्षणदृष्टजननिमित्तं बन्धुजनं परिचितं हितकरं च ।
मुञ्चतीनां महिलानां जानाति यदि मानसं ब्रह्मा ॥) - ३.३, पृ.२७
२. काणं पि अंगलट्ठी भूसिज्जइ भूसणेहि तरुणीणं ।
भूसिज्जइ उण काणं पि भूसणं अंगलट्ठीए ॥
(कासामपि अङ्गयष्टिः भूष्यते भूषणैः तरुणीनाम् ।
भूष्यते पुनः कासामपि भूषणं अङ्गयष्टिना ॥) - ३.६, पृ.२८
३. एसो सो (पा.भे.अणुरओ)च्चिअ दइएसु घडइ सोहग्ग-चंगिम-गुणाइं ।
चंदो च्चिअ जणइ वाणीसु(?मणीसु) कढिणबंधिसु(?बंधेसु) सलिलाइं ॥
(एष स (पा.भे.अनुरग) एव दयितेषु घटयति सौभाग्य-चंगिमगुणान् ।
चन्द्र एव जनयति मणीषु कठिनबन्धेषु सलिलानि ॥) - ३.९, पृ.३०
४. स्नुहीगवार्कदुग्धानां दृश्यं यदपि नान्तरम् ।
तथाप्यास्वादपार्थक्यं जिह्वाऽऽख्याति पटीयसी ॥ - ३.१२, पृ.३३
५. दइएहिं चेअ परंमुहेहिं मयणगिभिभलमणाओ ।
कारिज्जंते कुलबालिआउ गहिलाइं कज्जाई ॥
(दयितैः चैव/एव पराङ्मुखैर्मदनाग्निविह्वलमनसः ।
कार्यन्ते कुलबालिका ग्रथिलानि/ग्रहिलानि कार्याणि ॥) - ३.१५, पृ.३७
६. अल्पत्वं च महत्त्वं च वस्तुनोऽर्थित्वमीक्षते ।
क्रव्ये तरशुः श्रद्धालुर्न क्रव्ये त्रिदशां पतिः ॥ - ३.१८, पृ.३७
७. अस्ताद्रिमाश्रयन्तं प्रदोषसंहतसमस्तवसुसारम् ।
बोद्धारं कुलवनितेव मित्रमनुसरति दिनलक्ष्मीः ॥ - ३.२२, पृ.२९
८. खणमित्तदिदृपिअयणपिम्मभरुब्भिभलाओ महिलाओ ।
चिरपरिचिए वि मिल्लंति बंधवे एस किर पगिदि ।
(क्षणमात्रदृष्टप्रियजनप्रेमभरोद्विह्वला महिलाः ।
चिरपरिचितानपि मुञ्चन्ति बान्धवानेषा किल प्रकृतिः ॥) - ४.३, पृ.४२

९. वीरेषु गणनां पूर्वं परमर्हन्ति योषितः ।
यास्तृणायाभिमन्यन्ते प्राणान् प्रेमान्धचेतसः ॥ -४.४, पृ.४२
१०. देसं वयंसि विसमं सहन्ति णिव्वं(?) भमन्ति दुहिआओ ।
तहवि महिलाण पिम्मं दइयम्मि न सयणवग्गम्मि ॥
(देशं व्रजन्ति विषमं सहन्ते दुःखं(?) भ्राम्यन्ति दुःखिताः ।
तथापि महिलानां प्रेम दयिते न स्वजनवर्गे ॥) -४.५, पृ.४२
११. मा विषीद कृतं बाष्पैः फलं मर्षय कर्मणाम् ।
सत्यं विषादशोकाभ्यां न दैवं परिवर्तते ॥ -४.१७, पृ.५०
१२. समुद्रे पतितस्यापि क्षिप्तस्यापि नभस्तलात् ।
पुनः संपद्यते लक्ष्मीर्यदि प्राणैर्न मुच्यते ॥ -६.१, पृ.६३
१३. अभिमुखवर्तिनि वेधसि पुण्यगुणवर्जितानि सर्वाणि ।
द्वीपान्तरस्थितान्यपि पुरः धावन्ति वस्तूनि ॥ -६.४, पृ.६५
१४. संपत्तिर्वा विपत्तिर्वा रेहन्ती दैवमीक्षते ।
एवमप्यर्धितान्येषु पुंसां क्लैब्याय केवलम् ॥ -६.७, पृ.६७
१५. निष्काक्षमुपकारेऽपि विश्वोत्तीर्णां सतां क्रिया ।
अप्रकारस्तु यस्तस्य तत्र ब्रह्मापि मन्थरः ॥ -६.८, पृ.६७
१६. पञ्चषाः सन्ते ते केचिदुपकर्तुं स्फुरन्ति ये ।
ये स्मरन्त्युपकारस्य तैस्तु बन्ध्या वसुन्धरा ॥ -६.९, पृ.६७
१७. दैवादुपस्थिते मृत्यौ क्षीणसर्वप्रतिक्रिये ।
तथा कथञ्चिन्मर्तव्यं न मर्तव्यं यथा पुनः ॥ ६.१६, पृ.७३
१८. अपत्यजीवितस्यार्थे प्राणानपि जहाति या ।
त्यजन्ति तामपि क्रूर मातरं दाहहेतवे ॥ -७.७, पृ.८३
१९. विसंवदतु वा मा वा शकुनं फलकर्मणि ।
तथापि प्रथमं चेतो वैमनस्यमुपाश्रुते ॥ -८.४, पृ.९०
२०. परस्य शर्मणः सत्यं प्रत्यूहो हरिणीदृशः ।
भवेऽपि तद्यदि क्वापि तदा वा एव हेतवः ॥ -८.१०, पृ.९४
२१. सरसिजनवनमपबन्धं दिशो वितमसो दृशः प्रकटभावाः ।
अवतरति नभोमित्रे वसुधायां कस्य नानन्दः ॥ -९.१, पृ.९९
२२. जनुषान्धा न पश्यन्ति भावान् केवलमैहिकान् ।
ऐहिकामुष्मिकान्कामकामलान्धाः पुनर्जनाः ॥ -९.३, पृ.१००
२३. विरलविपदां कथञ्चिद्विपदो हर्तुं समीहते लोकः ।

- प्रतिपदनवविपदां पुनरुपैति मातापि निर्वेदम् ॥ -९.१०, पृ.१०८
२४. परस्मादुपकारो यः सोऽपि व्रीडावहः सताम् ।
तस्याप्रत्युपकारस्तु दुनोत्यन्तः पशूनपि ॥ -१०.२, पृ.११३
२५. सर्वथा कैतवं निन्द्यं प्रवदन्ति विपश्चितः ।
केवलं न विना तेन दुःसाध्यं वस्तु सिध्यति ॥ -१०.५, पृ.११६
२६. क्रूरः कृतोपकारः प्रत्युपकाराय कल्पते भूयः ।
विरचितपाशविनाशः प्रणिहन्ति विपाशकं सिंहः ॥ -१०.१६, पृ.१२५
२७. अपकारं कुर्वाणैरुपकारः कोऽपि शक्यते कर्तुम् ।
संताप्य फलसमृद्धाः करोति धान्यौषधीस्तपनः ॥ -१०.१७, पृ.१२५
२८. नक्तं दिनं न शयनं प्रकट्य न चर्या, स्वैरं न चात्रजलवस्त्रकलत्रभोगः ।
शङ्कानुजादपि सुतादपि दारतोऽपि, लोकस्तथापि कुरुते ननु चौर्यवृत्तिम् ॥
-७.३, पृ. ७९
२९. ऐहिकामुष्मिकान् क्लेशान्कुक्षिसौहित्यकाम्यया ।
स्वीकुर्वन्नास्ति दुर्मेधाः कोऽन्यस्तस्करतो जनः ॥ -७.४, पृ.७९

सुधास्यन्दि-सूक्तानि

१. निजभुजदण्डाभ्यां हि वणिजां द्रविणोपार्जनं मण्डनं न तु खण्डनम् ।-पृ. ९
२. प्रकृतिसुभगे पात्रे वेषो यदेव तदेव वा । - पृ.१२
३. पुरन्ध्रीणां प्रेमग्रहिलमविचारं खलु मनः । -पृ.४१
४. सत्यं विषादशोकाभ्यां न दैवं परिवर्तते । -पृ.५०
५. सर्वथाप्यपारव्यसनकान्तरपतितेनापि प्रेक्षापूर्वकारिणा प्राणिना न विषादवैधुर्यं
माधेयम् । पृ. ६४
६. प्राणेभ्यो नापरं वस्तु प्रेमपात्रं वपुष्मताम् । -पृ.६६
७. उपनता अपि हि विपदः प्रतिरुध्यन्ते देवतादर्शनेन । पृ.९०
८. अवतरति नभोमित्रे वसुधायां कस्य नानन्दः । -पृ.९९
९. परस्मादुपकारो यः सोऽपि व्रीडावहः सताम् । -पृ.११३
१०. प्रसरति मधौ धात्र्यां जातो न कस्य गुणोदयः । -पृ.११४
११. क्रूरः कृतोपकारः प्रत्युपकाराय कल्पते भूयः । -पृ.१२५

On Sthātús' ca rātham in the R̥gveda 1.70.7

- M. A. Mehendale

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

**vārdhān yām pūrvī'ḥ kṣapó vírūpāḥ sthātús' ca rátham
ṛtāpravītam.**

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.¹ The difficulty is presented by the second half. There we have **ca** after **sthātús** which apparently looks like the genitive sg. of **sthātr**-what is stationary' (*sthāvara*). 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 **sthātús carátham** (i.e. **carátham** to be read as one word, and not two, **ca rátham**, as in the Pada text). Max Müller² defended this suggestion and Oldenberg (Noten) agreed with him. In support of the suggestion to read **carátham** occurs twice in the R̥V. viz. at 1.58.5 (**sthātús carátham bhayate paratrīṇaḥ**) and at 1.68.1 (**sthātús carátham aktū'n vyū'rṇof**³). As regards the form **sthātúr**, 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**⁴. Neither Max Müller nor Oldenberg tells us how they understood the line with the reading **sthātús carátham**.⁵ In the two RV. passages 1.58.5 and 1.68.1 referred to above, Sāyaṇa interprets the two relevant words as **sthāvaram... jaṅgamam ca**. In 1.58.5 the word **sthātúḥ** has to be nom. sg. Sāyaṇa treats it as a form derived from the stem **sthātú**⁶. But he does not tell us how **sthātúḥ**

can be acc. sg. in 1.68.1.

Geldner accepts the suggestion of his predecessors to treat **carátham** as one word, but he interprets **sthātúh** differently. He takes it as gen. sg. of **sthātr-**. Hence, in his opinion, the original reading was not **carátham**, but **caráthām**⁶ (gen. M.). For this emendation of the text he finds support in stanza 3 of this hymn (1.70) where we read **gárbhas' ca sthātā'm/gárbhas' caráthām**.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 **sthātús' 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 **sthātús' carátham** is a set phrase. The passage is an example of ellipsis, the full text being **sthātús' (carátham)¹² 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. **ṛtāpravāṭm** as an adjective **rātham** makes good sense. The chariot (in the form of Agni) was set in motion, was impelled, by **ṛtā** (i.e. by the hymn¹⁴ recited by the seer while performing the sacrificial rite). The use of **Pravāṭa** in the context of driving a chariot is attested in the Mahābhāṣya. Patañjali while commenting on Panini 2.4.56 cites as an example **pravāṭo 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 strengthened by one that moves (cow) and one that is stationary (tree). This is specifically referred to in stanza 9 of the hymn (**gōṣu prāsartīm vāneṣu dhiṣe** “you value the cows and the woods”¹⁷).

Foot-notes

1. In the above translation, the words **pūrviḥ kṣapó vīrūpāḥ** 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, Bollensen, 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. Bollensen (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 Bollensen and to Mrs. Madhavi Kolhatkar for supplying to me the information contained in Benfey's Glossar.

3. Also slightly differently at 1.72.6 (**sthātṛñ carátham ca pāhi**) and 1.70.2 (**gárbhas ca sthātā'm gárbhas caráthām**)
4. Though Max Müller translates all the other passages cited by him in this connection.
5. Alternatively Sāyaṇa looks upon **sthatús** as abl. sg. of the stem **sthātṛ-**, cf. **yad vā sthātur anantaram caratham bhayaate**.
6. Or oven **cáráthām** although this involves change in accent.
7. In 1.70.3 also, Geldner prefers to read **cáratām**.
8. As noted above, according to Geldner, **pūrvīḥ kṣapó vīrūpāḥ** are acc. pl. forms.
9. This translation would be all right for st.3 of the hymn where we have **sthātā'm** and **caráthām** both gen. pl. forms. But in our stanza **sthātūḥ** is gen. sg. and not pl. Geldner, in his translation of the present stanza, also unnecessarily transposes the words **sthātū's carátham** "alles dessen, was geht and steht". In stanza 3 he has it right "dessen, was steht und was geht."
10. L. Ranou (Études Védiques at Pāṇiníenees, Vol. 12, pp. 16 and 39) also borrows the word **gárbha** from st. 3 and, like Geldner, takes **ṛtāpravīta** as adj. of this noun "(Agni, germe) conçu de' Order-sacre. But he considers **sthātús carátham** 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 poet said **sthātús carátham**, I should be loath to suppress the evidence of the mistake and alter the Pada text from **ca rátham** to **carátham**. The very mistake is instructive, as showing us the kind of misapprehension to which the collectors of the Vedic text were liable..." "But, as shown in this paper, the author of the Padapāṭha 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 **kṣapó** stands for **kṣapá usrāḥ**. 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 Padapāṭha) cf. Geldner, Translation, f.n. on 1.70.1b). 10 and 11.
13. Lüders (Varuṇa II, pp. 624-625) thinks **ṛtāpravīta** qualifies Agni.
14. For this meaning of **ṛtá**, see Lüders, Varuṇa Vol. II, p. 421 ff.
15. Patañjali also cites forms such as **pravītā** 'charioteer' **pravetum** 'in order to drive' from the root **vi-** 'to drive'.
16. Cf. RV 3.115 **agnir... tūrṇī ráthaḥ sádá návaḥ** Agni the over new quick chariot." Agni is compared to a chariot in 3.15.5 : **rátho**

na sásniḥ “victorious like a chariot” 10.176.3 **rátho ná yór abhī’vṛtaḥ** “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 R.V. 10.88.6). Hence, the use of the word **kṣapáh** ‘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 (**kṛtvān víśvāny apāmsi satyā**).