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Āmukham

Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti saṅkrāntavakroktirahasyamudrāḥ.
Te’śmatprabandhān avadhārayantu kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham.

Bilhaṃśasya.

Gunadośān aśāstrajñāḥ katham vibhajate janaḥ.
Kim andhasyādhikāro’sti rūpabhedopalabhīṣu.

Kāvyādarśah.

Śabdārtha-śāsana-jñāna-mātreṇaiva na vedyate.
Vedyate sa hi kāvyārtha-tattvajñaireva kevalam.

Dhvanyālokaḥ.

Girāṃ pravṛttir mama nīrasā’pi mānyā bhavitṛī nṛpatēṣ caritraih.
Ke vā na śuṣkāṃ mṛdam abhrasindhu-sambandhinīṃ mūrdhānī dhārayanti.

Bilhaṃśasya.

Pavitram atrātanute jagad yuge śmrṭā rasaksālanayeva yatkathā.
Katham na sā madgirām āvilām api svasevinīṃ eva pavitrayiṣyatī.

Śrīharṣasya.
The book has a very long story and a sad one too. Throughout the book--here, there, and everywhere--I have explained why it was composed and who are the *adhikārin*s. It is an outcome of fifty years of studies and research in the field of Sanskrit scholarship. But it was written in America where I did not have enough bibliographical resources easily accessible. So many of the statements and quotations are derived from the memory. *Anabhyāse viṣam śāstram!* Moreover, I have been completely out of touch of Sanskrit studies during the last 25 years, which I have gainfully utilized in the service of Library Science and building up of a worthy collection of Indic studies at the University of Missouri - Columbia.

The book was written in 1977. It was a kind of *śokah ślokatvam āgataḥ*. During the academic year 1978/79 I was in Mysore on sabbatical. Even there my main focus was TULIP--*The Universal/Union List of Indian Periodicals*. It was my earnest desire to locate a worthy collaborator for Bhilaha. I found one. He was super--par excellence. But he had his own problems and delayed, and delayed, and delayed, and ultimately abandoned the assignment.

Finally I got the typescript back to Columbia. It was revised and retyped. It was sent back to an able editor in India. He was recommended by one of my closest and trustworthy friends. He did not do anything! Maybe it was beyond his limited knowledge. Maybe it was not his field. Then I got it sent to a publisher. He demanded sixty thousand rupees just for production--all the editorial and proofreading work had to be extra and beyond.

When I asked the publisher in terms of the return, rupees and paisa, he had no answer. Then I got the typescript sent to another editor. He demanded Rs. 15000/- just for editing it! I had no money to squander in that manner.

Once for all, I abandoned all the hopes of ever getting a generous collaborator inspired by the same spirit that had been prompting me all along. There was none there who was for *dharma, artha and kāma* with equal division and preponderance.

I was born and brought up in India and continuously lived there for thirty three years before I came to America for advanced studies and research and a Ph.D. By now I have lived in America for three decades. It is my home. I have a firm conviction, based on my own personal experience, that many people in India imagine that every tom, dick, and harry in America is rolling in dollars. There is no poverty, no squalor, no want. There is no needy person. All are well to do. Even a mazdoor drives a car!

When I arrived in this country for the second time in 1965, one of my friends in India wrote to me to the effect that at that point I was in a country of plenty and abundance and thereonwards I won't feel any monetary need. I wrote him back to the effect: "Yes, it is true. Every house in America is blessed in its courtyard with a Tree of Dollars. The householder has just to get up in the morning and shake the tree. The dollars just shower until the shaking stops!"
America may seem a land of plenty for those who have never toiled and suffered here, but it is built by the bones of toilers and joined by the blood, sweat, and tears of the sufferers. America has been made what she is. It was not discovered the way she is now. The wealth of America has been drawn from the bosom of the Mother Earth. It is not fallen down onto the earth from the open skies. Neither is it an imperial creation. Well, this was an aside. Maybe some eyes get opened wide enough to realize and perceive the truth.

Once again and for the last time, I got the typescript back to Columbia. It was in February 1990. Thirteen precious years were wasted in this mirage. Originally as the book was composed all the Sanskrit text "matter" was in Devanagari and also transliterated in Roman following the International standard uniform code.

One of the main reasons of my trying so very hard to get the book published in India was to keep the price within the limits of the budgets of Indian libraries, who may be the major buyers. The prices of goods and wages are so high in America that those who have never been here can never realize it in full. Yet I was left with no choice. The book is now produced in America, the country of trees showering dollars. Even if the book is distributed at cost price, an average Indian library may find it difficult to buy it. And how will they realize its value? No bookseller would like to promote its sale. It won't bring lucrative commission and means to persuade the librarians. We have had a very sad experience with TULIP. Libraries all over the world have acquired it, but not even a single library in India found it worthy to give it a place on its shelve! How sad!!

The greatest problem still to be tackled was the provision of diacritical marks. Until about six months ago I could not even dream that the modern computer technology, as it was available to me here in Columbia with no active studies, reading, writing, and research in Sanskrit would enable me to insert all the diacritical marks. However, it did, thanks a million to Mr. Greg Johnson of the Computing Services of the University of Missouri at Columbia. But all the Sanskrit matter in Devanagari had to be eliminated. It could not be composed here. It is presented only in transliterated form.

This book is then a product of the latest developments in the field of computer technology. If there was ever a case of "from pillar to post," this was it. I don't think it is a perfect production. There are many flaws. My knowledge of Sanskrit has now receded into the background. It does not have the same sharp focus. Yet I decided to bring the work out as it is.

Until the world of Sanskrit learning finds a dedicated selfless scholar who possesses all the knowledge which has been an instrument here, plus all that is still lacking, the reader can stay with this publication.

The reader will observe that a great deal of stealing has been committed by some "scholars" from my previous work on Bilhana, whose plagiarism has been criticized by me. Yet I give full freedom to any Sanskrit pandit to edit this work, revise it and publish it. There is no copyright!
Viśvanātha Ṣāstrī Bhāradvāja, I think, is no more there to see his criticism. But Misra will certainly see. I don't think it will serve any useful purpose. He has already reached the top of the Mount Everest. He cannot go any higher. But he will certainly come down in the eyes of those who have been misled by him. So a copy will be sent to Tübingen.

Some very serious literary charges have been levelled in this study against Mr. B. N. Misra and his so-called gurus at Tübingen, if there were any. We request an inquiry. We cannot believe a German University, much less Tübingen, could award a Ph.D. degree on what is presented by Misra in his book. The University owes an explanation. If they cannot justify the award of a Ph.D., they owe a word of apology to the Sanskrit World of Learning. This unscholarly writing cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. This has been an objective of writing this book.

With these short notes I conclude my Āmukham. I need not repeat all that has been stated throughout the book.

**Satyam eva jayate.**

Columbia, MO
Murari L. Nagar
Gandhi Jayanti
Sāhityacharya (1940)
(2 October 1990)
An Appreciation

_Bilhaṇa’s Vikramaṇkadevacarita and its neo-expounders_

During my sojourn in the U.S.A. in 1991, I was pleased to see a scholarly work entitled _Bilhaṇa’s Vikramaṇkadevacarita and Its Neo-Expounders_ by Dr. Murari Lal Nagar. It is a treatise on criticism, a class by itself. It criticizes mainly the works of Dr. B. N. Misra and Pt. Vishvanath Shastri Bharadvaja on _Vikramaṇkadevacarita_. Dr. Nagar had edited the poem as a youth in 1945 and composed a brief glossary naming it the _Caritacandrikā_. Both the critics unfairly utilized the writings of Dr. Nagar without any acknowledgement whatsoever. Bharadvaja assigned the _Candrikā_ to an ancient writer of the thirteenth century though it was written by Dr. Nagar in the middle of this century and the composer is still alive and well and is working at the University of Missouri at Columbia in America. In many places both the critics ignored the explanations of _Caritacandrikā_ and gave their own which are less acceptable, or not at all acceptable.

Again, Dr. Nagar finds their suggestions to replace the words of Bilhaṇa by their own to be unnecessary impositions. He also shows many other errors in their works while refuting their explanations which are not befitting true scholarship. He is afraid that the future generation is bound to be misled in the wrong direction, shown by the critics, in understanding the great poet Bilhaṇa judiciously. This caused immense pain in the heart of Dr. Nagar who had undergone a hard labor to give his edition the best possible form internally as well as externally. He has listed the passages where the poet is misunderstood and also those where his (Dr. Nagar’s) rightful explanations were ignored by these critics giving way to the wrong ones. He was so disgusted with this unacademic performance of these scholars that he raised his tone beyond due limits in condemning them explicitly or implicitly. He reminds us of “Śokaḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ,” while describing his excruciating pain caused by the wrong handling and mistreatment of the great poet. I would like to replace his sentiment with my own composition as follows:

_Asatprauḍhyanṛtājñāna-duṣṭaṁair dūnaçetasāḥ._
_Kāvyopaplavaśaṅkotthaḥ kopo granthatvam āgataḥ._

I examined the points of disagreement very carefully and gave suggestions to change wherever necessary. I agree with Dr. Nagar in so many places. While advancing his views, he has discussed them in a very vivid language, citing authoritative statements from various sastric disciplines to lead the reader along convincingly to the just goal. He has the ability of catching the subtle meanings in the poem, which are hidden from the mind of an ordinary reader. He does not want to twist the meaning of the words or to replace them according to his own sweet will and pleasure, but tries faithfully to derive the meaning as the poet himself intended. In fact, he has in the book confessed his inability to get the meaning in some places as a true researcher ought to do, without trying to extract some sort of a meaning by hook or crook. And he does not hesitate to admit his own errors of judgment crept through his limitation of knowledge as a yout
h in his early twenties when he prepared his previous work. His patience and perseverance to bring the truth to light is highly praiseworthy. He was so anxious to bring out the correct text of Bilhana’s immortal poem that he took an arduous journey to Jaisalmer long ago in order to collate the readings in the light of the additional data made available since Drs. Bühler and Jacobi copied the entire manuscript in just a week in the year 1974. The wrong interpretations of Misra were felt so worthless by Dr. Nagar that he held doubts about Misra’s getting the degree on the basis of the published booklet. He entered into lengthy correspondence with the authorities of the University of Tübingen wherefrom Dr. Misra claims to have received the degree. The authorities could not solve the riddle and have admitted that Misra has no legal right to call himself a DOCTOR.

Such a work, as this is, is essential to stop the mouth of irresponsible persons parading in disguise as the scholars and critics. A true scholar should analyze carefully and try to talk sense. Dr. Nagar’s work will be a good lesson to irresponsible critics and a supply of instruments in the hands of the conscientious writers to expose the pretenders in public. Moreover, it will show an ideal path to the researchers in the pursuit of scientific methodology for literary and textual criticism.

I will be very happy to see this work of a rare type widely circulated and be able to provide immense bliss to the lovers of Sanskrit throughout the globe.

Dr. Ladukeswar Satapathy  
Professor (retd.)  
Sanskrit University, Puri  
Orissa, India.
Dvitīyam Āmukham

It is a pleasure, very great pleasure for us to present the second revised edition of Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita and Its Neo-Expounders to the lovers of Sanskrit around the world. The first edition though quite limited in the total number of copies went out of print so fast! It was simply amazing!! But on the second thought, we believe it was not at all amazing. The occurrence of this phenomenon will be attributed to the subject of the book rather than the writer.

Mahākavi Śrīharṣa has sung:

Pavitram atrātanute jagad yuge

And our own poet Bilhaṇa too:

Girām pravṛttir mama nīrasāpi

In our first Āmukham we had stated: "The book has a very long story and a sad one too." It was narrated in brief. In spite of our best efforts we could not find even a single scholar to collaborate. Most of them were eager to serve the second puruṣārtha. There was none there who could just come forward for the first one only.

The entire book was composed in just seven months in the year 1977. I did not have enough bibliographical resources in Columbia, Missouri. Columbia is not Kāśi. Many of the citations were drawn from my memory. Many statements were made without proper verification. I was diffident. Why I alone? Even our great poet Kālidāsa-- one of the greatest poets to have appeared on this earth ever--had this to say about himself:

Ā paritoṣād viduṣām sādhu na manye prayogavijñānam.
Balavad api śikṣitānām ātmanyapratyayaṃ cetaḥ.

Nevertheless I ventured. The book was published after a wild wandering for thirteen years from the U.S.A. to India and back to the U.S.A. and back to India, etc.

But surprising are the ways of God Almighty. Bilhaṇa was pleased. He bestowed a boon upon me for my devotion. A great scholar in the person of Dr. Ladukeswar Sastpathy came to Columbia to live, though temporarily, with his son, a physicist at the University of Missouri, Columbia.

We are reminded of another great Sanskrit poet, Kavitākāminthāsa Bhāsa about whom another poet has sung:

Sūtradhārakṛtārambhair nāṭakair bahubhūmikaiḥ.
Sapatākair yaśo lebhe Bhāso devakulair eva.
What did Bhāsa say? He assured us:

Dvāpād anyasmād api madhyād api jalanidher diśo'pyantāt.  
Āntyā jhaṭītī ghaṭayati vidhir abhimatam abhimukhībhūtaḥ.

So Vidhi became abhimukha. He brought an abhimata right to my home! It was like Bhāgirathī Gaṅgā flowing into our own courtyard.

Dr. Satapathy went through the entire book. Though no more possessing the best athleticism or the best eyesight, he went through the entire work letter by letter so meticulously that the outcome was simply a miracle.

Once again, it was not a miracle at all. It was after all Bilhaṇamahākaviyaśoguṇagā na. The poet’s spirit was behind all of us in this pravṛtti.

In my view the original appearance of the entire book was a case of śokāḥ ślokatva m āgataḥ. According to Dr. Satapathy, it was a case of kopo granthatvām āgataḥ. He is a poet too. He has composed and entered a śloka in his review of the book just presented. He has put a seal of approval on my writing. He has corrected many of my errors. I am highly thankful to him.

I wish Dr. Satapathy had stayed in Columbia permanently. But what is permanent in this phenomenal world? He has many other commitments in India. He may be invited to adorn an honored chair of Śastracudāmani in Sanskrit Vidyāpīṭham in his hometown of Jagannāthapurī. It will be a case of ratnam kāñcanam anvagāt. We wish him the best.

This Āmukham is getting quite long. I must stop now. However, I am very happy and satisfied that this second revised edition goes out into the world with greater confidence and assurance instilled into my pen!

Sarve bhavantu sukhināḥ sarve santu nirāmayāḥ. 
Sarve bhadrāṇi paśyantu mā kaścid duḥkhabhāg bhavet.

Columbia, MO                               Murari Lal Nagar
1 January 1992                              Aspiring to remain in service of
Happy New Year                              Mahākavi Vidyāpati Bilhaṇa
Introduction

The Background

The Vikramāṅkadevacarita mahākāvyā of the great Kashmirian poet Bilhaṇa is one of the best (if not the best) historical poems in Sanskrit literature. It follows a new path in poetic composition and blazes a new trail scarcely witnessed in earlier poets. Bilhaṇa himself declares:

Praudhiparakṣeṇa purāṇarṇi-vyatikramāḥ śāhgyatamaḥ padānām.
Atyunnatisphoṭitakaṅcukāṇi vandyāni kāntākucamaṇḍalāni.

And also

Sahasraśaḥ santu viśāradānām vaidarbhalīlānidhayāḥ prabandhāḥ.
Tathāpi vaicitryarahasyalubdhāḥ śraddhāṁ vidhāsyanti sacetaso'tra.

Dr. Johann Georg Bühler (1837-1898, of Bombay and finally of Vienna) became the first scholar in modern times to recover the poem from modern-day oblivion and place it before the learned world. With regard to the "recovery" of the poem and its value, he wrote in January 1874: [IA 5 (March 1874):89].

I have succeeded in seeing a portion of the famous Bhandar of the Oswal Jains of this town (Jaisalmer, Rajputana) and have obtained already results which repay me for the tedious journey, and the not less tedious stay in this country of sand, bad water, and guineaworms.

Dr. Bühler edited the work and got it published with his learned Introduction in the Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series (as no. 14) in the year 1875. Once again he emphasized the value of the work [p.46]:

As soon as I recognised the importance of the MS, I resolved to copy it out myself. My time at Jesalmir was limited. But with the help of my companion Dr. H. Jacobi of Bonn, who kindly lent me his assistance during my whole tour in Rajputana, the task was accomplished in seven days.

The Carita was prescribed for the Sāhitya Ācārya Examination (Pt.I) of the Government Sanskrit College, Banaras (now Sanskrit University, Varanasi) for the first time in 1940. By that time I had already studied Sanskrit for about 12 years and had read most of the works by great Sanskrit writers like Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Daṇḍin, Māgha, Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti, Śrīharṣa and Subandhu, etc., some at the venerable feet of great Sanskrit gurus in Banaras and some through my self-study.
As an act of dharma and also for svântaḥ sukhâya I used to teach Sanskrit to students junior to me every day for about seven hours. In July of 1939 I was requested to teach the Carita. However, I had no time. That was my final year in the University and I had to maintain my first position in the final examination. So I did not want to teach. Nevertheless, two of my close friends, who had to study it as part of their curriculum, prevailed upon me. I had no choice. That was my first acquaintance with this great work. My association with Bilhaṇa, which began then, is still continued even after 37 years. [This writing goes back to 1977].

The two friends were regular students of the College and were studying the work with an old professor there, who was not at all able to grasp the true meaning of many verses. For example, he interpreted the word śauṇḍīryam as madyapāyītvan! It won't be inappropriate to say here now that he was Pt. Gangadhar Shastri Bharadwaj, a brother of Vishwanath Shastri Bharadwaj, who subsequently edited the work and got it published with his own commentaries from the Banaras Hindu University. If Bilhaṇa could hear how his poetic muse was molested by this great pandit, he would have certainly cried in despair. It was truly the murder of Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū.

As we proceeded further in our study, we got more and more enchanted by the poem. The taste of honey is appreciated only after it is tasted. The more we taste, the more we enjoy. We got closer and closer to the poet. Vāgdevī started to shower her blessings on us—more and more, as we went ahead.

We struggled for hours and hours to get some sense out of a senseless reading. If the specific reading happened to be totally meaningless, it created less problems, because we could easily conclude that it was wrong. But when a reading apparently seemed correct—by virtue of its being correct grammatically—it created more problems. It was like a lie which looked like truth and could not be easily detected. We would call it sa ṣatyāyamānaḥ asatyām! It was like a sugar-coated bitter pill—seemingly innocent but giving a bad taste later in the mouth!

One of the greatest causes of the unintelligibility of the text was the corruptness of the edition we were using. Dr. Bühler's first edition of 1875 had gone long out of print. The then available edition published under the name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Pt. Rāmaśūdramāhā Pūtakaḥ sarvataḥ prathamam anyathā mūlasamśodhane'smatkṛtāh cirapariśramaḥ kaṣṭānubhavavac ca abhāvakotāveva tiṣṭhet. [Prastāvanā, p.7]

And Shrī Viśvanātha Śaṅkara Bhāratī had the same opinion with regard to that edition, which he expressed in his edition.

Dvitiyam—Kāśīsthajñānanaṁdaṁ laḥhitakṛtibhir guruvyāñāṁ sammataḥ asammatyā vā tannāmnā prakāśitam atīvāśuddham iti śrīguruvyāñāṁ dṛṣṭi

And

Kālakramād būlarasāṃskaraṇe samāptim āsādite kāśīstha-Jñānamaṇḍal a mudrāyantrālayān mahāmahopādhyāya-paṅcitapravara-guruvara-Śrī-Rāmā-vatāraśarmanāmānāmā sampāditam prakrāṭahākāvvyasya saṃskaranāntaram ca prakāśabhāvam āntīyata. Param atra saṃskaraṇa'pi [?] pūrvasaṃmakararaṇa-śuddhīnām nirākasya kā kathā [?] navanaṃyaśuddhyantarānyapi locanapathā tithitāṃ prāyānti, yataḥ sahādayānām cekhidyate cetaḥ. Atra śrīmatāṃ guru varyānām nāma saṃyoga manasi vicikitsām utpādayati. [Vol. I, Bhūmikā, p. 3]

-------------------

Misra also expresses the same kind of opinion on R’s edition:

5. Vikramāṅka-deva-caritam...Rāmā-vatāra-Śarmanā saṃskṛtam [ed. by Rāmāvatāra Śarmā]. Benares: Jñānamaṇḍala Press, 1978 [i.e.=1921]. 1,4,2, 153p. This edition, which is full of inaccuracies, seems to have been associated by some one with the great name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍita Rāmāvatāra Śarmā. [p. 111].

-------------------

They did not get my sarcasm! Have you, Mr. Misra, verified it?

fn.

The learned pandit Sharma tells us in his short introduction of one and a half pages, which too is full of numerous errors, that he has corrected Bühler’s errors as far as practicable. We took his word to be true and correct. It was a Herculean task—a Bhāgīrath paṛṣaṇa to bring the River Gaṅgā of Bilhāṇa’s Muse on to this earth once again. It was found to be a very difficult task indeed.

-------------

1  1 ———— Bh makes a very funny statement here:— locanapathāṭiṭhitāṃ prāyānti. Mistakes, errors, and blunders cannot be compared with atithis, the guests! Bh continues: yataḥ sahādayānām cekhidyate cetaḥ. Nobody would be tormented in his mind by seeing his guests! Bh just likes the words! He does not care about their meaning!! His bhāvā is always what he wants to get. It is none of his business if his words lead to that bhāva or not! This is called Bhāradvāja-raacanā-śailī. [This is a footnote. Not properly displayed.]
However, gradually we became disillusioned and realized that the text of Sharma as presented in his edition suffered from many inaccuracies. It may sound like bragging (ātmaśāghā), but sometimes we had to spend several hours--even days--in trying to reconstruct a word or a sentence. How could we even dream that Dr. Bühler's text would have been rather distorted by Śarmā!

Fortunately one of our friends chanced to see Bühler's edition with one of his classmates. He compared only two readings of Sharma's text with those of Bührer and reported them to me. It was great delight and reassurance. There was clear evidence that Bührer's edition was much superior. However, the student who owned that rare copy of Bührer's edition would not lend it even for a day! There was so much distrust:

Lekhanī pustikā nārī (dārāḥ) parahaste gatā gatā.
Āgatā daivayogena naṣṭā bhaṛṣṭā ca marditā.

The owner was not ready to part with it even for a moment. So we could not see it. I tried my best, but could not procure another copy. I was terribly anxious to see it, but my anxiety remained unfulfilled. I got busy in other pressing engagements and the Carita went to sleep.

But the same poem was prescribed for the second year of the Acarya Examination the following year. The same friends came to me once again and I had to teach them. These friends were highly intelligent and contributed a great deal toward the correct interpretation of the text. Here was a clear evidence to show how teaching is a cooperative enterprise and how intelligent students contribute enormously toward the enrichment of the teacher's knowledge. It was truly saha vīryam karāvāhāi.

In January 1941 a great ambition was fulfilled. I saw the edition of Bührer in the same Library which might have been the karmakṣetra of Bh provided he had made it. What a great delight it gave! The readings which we had reconstructed after a very hard labor of hours and days were found to be right there in their correct form! This fact clearly demonstrated what a criminal havoc Sharma had wrought. We were terribly distressed when we realized how irresponsible Sharma's work was. It generated a nauseating feeling.

I concluded that in spite of Bührer's edition, the correct and complete sense would not be obtained without studying the historical literature and other manuscripts of the poem. The former I could obtain to my fullest satisfaction in my own College Library. But for the MSS. we had to go out. I obtained a "MS" from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. When it arrived it did not look like a conventional manuscript at all! It was copied on a large size thick modern paper. Of course, it was in Bālabodha (Devanāgarī) characters but it seemed to be a bālakārtī (a child's work). I did not understand why the Institute had to get such an expensive "bond" executed for that seemingly cheap MS. But a deeper study, closer examination, and a comparison with the footnotes of Dr. Bührer's text enabled me to conclude that it was the transcript prepared by Drs. Bührer and Jacobi in Jaisalmer.
Nagar’s Edition:

I decided to go to Jaisalmer for a comparative study, collation, and a direct verification of the text with the original J MS. As already reported in my Introduction, the text stood almost corrected by the time I reached Jaisalmer. Many of my conjectures were proved to be true after verification. Many of the lacunae in Bühler’s text were filled with the original readings because they were not lacking in J MS. It was a perfect MS. Of course, many of the errors committed by the press-copyist of Bühler were already corrected with the help of P long before I saw J.

Regarding the authenticity of J MS, Bühler says in his Introduction (pp.45-46):

The preservation of the MS is in general excellent...The MS has been written with great care and has been corrected and annotated...I fear, however, that some at least of the little lacunae and mistakes, which had to be filled in and corrected when the work was printing, are owing to the inaccuracy of our transcript and not that of the writer of the old MS. [This is called honest and sincere scholarship!]...I have to thank Vamanacarya Jhalkikara for several emendations, which he suggested while copying my transcript for the press and his brother Bhimacarya for some other corrections given in the addenda.

It took almost five years for me to complete the editorial work, write the Introduction and compose the Caritacandrikā. The work was published in 1945. Its first reviewer, Dr. H.D. Velankar commented:

This is a critical edition of Bilhaṇa’s Vikramāṅkadevacarita which is a Mahākāvya in 18 sargas. The present edition is based mainly upon the Jesalmir manuscript, from a copy of which Dr. Bühler first published the poem in the Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series in 1875. The editor has also consulted two other MSS, which are, however, only copies of the Jesalmir manuscript. Dr. Bühler’s edition as also the Benaras edition by Pandit Ramavatara Sarma published in 1927 are utilized by the editor in preparing this edition. It contains an exhaustive Introduction written in simple elegant Sanskrit, furnished with footnotes giving full references for the various points raised and discussed by the editor. In the Preface, also written in Sanskrit, which precedes this Introduction, the editor fully and clearly explains the material and plan of his edition. At the end of the text of the poem, the editor has given a brief explanation of difficult words in the poem, giving it the name Carita-candrikā. This Candrikā, we are told, includes the very brief gloss written in the margin on the old Jesalmir manuscript. A complete alphabetical index of the stanzas in the poem is given for the first time in this edition, after the Candrikā. At the end, an alphabetical list of important proper names and subjects, a copper plate grant of Vikramaditya VI (the hero of the poem), reproduced from EI. XII, pp. 142 ff, and three genealogical tables are supplied, all of which immensely add to the utility of the edition.

It is indeed a great pleasure to find that the editor has greatly improved upon the earlier editions and has given us a more reliable text of the poem with the
The importance of the restoration of the text of all such works for the task of reconstruction of ancient Indian history can never be overrated. The present attempt of Shri Murari Lal Nagar, therefore, will be greatly welcomed by all scholars interested in the study of Sanskrit poetry and Indian history. To the latter the text of the poem, as constituted by him on the basis of authentic manuscript material available, can serve as a satisfactory basis of study. In this respect this edition registers a definite advance over the earlier attempts of both Dr. Bühler and Pandit Ramavatara Sharma. The Edito Princeps of Dr. Bühler, highly useful in many ways, suffered obviously from defects resulting from the inadequate and unsatisfactory character of the materials then available. The attempt of Pandit Ramavatara Sharma that followed also failed to improve upon the text of Dr. Bühler. In fact his text is definitely more unsatisfactory as compared to that of his predecessor.

In the Introduction the Editor has treated in detail the life history and literary merits of the author of the poem. His defence of the poet's unhistorical treatment of a historical subject is spirited, though candidly speaking, unconvincing and similarly is his attempt to defend the poet's originality in points of common thoughts and expressions which he shares with Kalidasa.

Besides a critical Introduction and a brief though none-the-less useful glossary explaining important and difficult words and incorporating most of the notes in the scribe's own hand on the ancient Jaselmere manuscript, the editor has appended an index of important persons and places mentioned in the text, the text of the famous Epigraphic Record of King Vikramaditya VI reproduced from Epigraphia Indica, and Genealogical Tables of the Lohara and Calukya families. These features have considerably added to the usefulness of the edition.

Even Misra (with his tiny little knowledge and a totally insensitive mind) was able to perceive the value of N's ed. as late as 1976:
This ed., which has invariably been referred to by me as editio secunda, is in fact a great improvement on the previous edd. by way of collating the MS, thoroughly recording the text variants, emendatory and conjectural readings. A detailed account of the critical apparatus has been given in the twelve pages of the prastāvanā. An elaborated introduction of forty pages, an alphabetical list of proper names, an index to the verses, an extensive gloss, a map of the Chola and Chalukya empire, a reproduction of the Nilgunda copper plate inscription of Vikramaditya VI, dynastical tables of the Lohara, Chola and Western Chalukyas, and a concordance of important king-names make this edition still more useful.

Misra is not specific about the authorship of Candrikā. Probably he did not misunderstand and! Or, did he not want to pronounce any judgment?

Until 1945 I was merely a Sanskrit student. My knowledge of English was quite limited indeed. I was a product of the ancient system of Indian education. If I had adequate command over English, I might have written my "Introduction" in English which might have reached a wider audience. My edition was published in only 300 copies which might have gone out of print very soon. However, I could not think of a revised edition because I switched over to Library Science in 1945. Since then, Sanskrit and Library Science have been to me like my two eyes. It is difficult to say which one is closer to my heart!

I worked in the University of Delhi Library from 1947 to 1951. I had a dream to visit the United States of America since my early youth. The dream came true and I found myself with my wife in the New World by the end of 1951. We spent full five years in the U.S.A. working and studying. We came back home in 1956. I remained busy with my new job with the India Wheat Loan Educational Exchange Program of the Foreign Service of the United States of America in New Delhi under which 1.5 million dollars worth of American books were donated to approximately 100 institutions of higher learning in India.

Around 1958, circumstances prompted me to think of a new and revised edition of the work (Vik.). I inquired with almost all the leading manuscript libraries of the world whether any new manuscript of the Vikramāṅkadevacarita was found in the meantime. The response was negative. However, I worked on the Vikramāṅkahyudaya of Someśvara Bhūlokamalla, the son and successor of Chālukya Vikramāditya VI. It was subsequently published in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series of Baroda as no. 150.

I learnt that Pt. Vishwanath Shastri Bharadwaj of the Banaras Hindu University was working on the Vikramāṅkadevacarita. In order to avoid duplication, I wrote to him to the following effect:
I have been working on the Vikramāṅkadevacarita of Mahākavi Bilhana for many years. Now I want to bring out a revised edition of the work. I have learnt that you are also working on the same poem. There is no point in two people working on the same poem when there are thousands of unpublished literary gems still buried among bundles of manuscripts in our old libraries.

It will be a great service to the cause of Sanskrit scholarship if you take up some other work. However, if you insist on working on the same, i.e. Vikramāṅkadevacarita, I will withdraw and work on some other poet. You have all my best wishes for a total success.

His reply was anything but pleasant. He said:


Dear Murari Lall[!] Ji,

I am glad to acknowledge the receipt of your card [?] dated the 27th of December, 1959, which I could find on the 26th of January, 1960, on returning from a long tour of two month's [!] duration in Madhya Pradesh. I was in need of two manuscripts and knowing that they could be had in M.P., I went there and witnessed a great collection of old and precious manuscripts at Bajrangarh [!] and other places. Our Indian Government should be keen enough to procure such collections otherwise the old and precious store is sure to be ruined. But experience shows that the work under-taken [!] by our Government in this respect is only showy and in spite of high expenses, no solid work has yet been done. [not true!]

Regarding Bilhana's Vikramankadeva Charit, I, first of all, thank you very much for your earnest wish of my success; for the prayer of an aged man like you, is promptly accepted. I, hereby, inform you that the book being prescribed and not being available in the market, the Sahitya Research Committee of the Banaras Hindu University, [!] entrusted me with the work of editing it with Samskrit and Hindi commentaries [!] for the use of the examinees. Accordingly the 1st seven cantoes [sic] of the same are already out and the 2nd part, containing the remaining cantoes is under the press. [!]
I know there is much unattended in the field of Samskrit literature, more than any one [else?]. Being born in a family of highly learned Samskrit scholars, I have had the good opportunity of seeing and going through such manuscripts which others can never even dream of. My work is neither duplicating nor a hindrance [!] to yours or to that of the Samskrit Academy of the Osmania University. Besides, I do not appreciate the idea that a work commenced by a particular man must not be touched by others, though the beginner may be slumering [!] for years together.

No doubt, you have done a great deal in connection with the critical study of the history of the period, but there is much to be done in other respects and may the Almighty give you strength and energy to accomplish it.

I am very thankful to you; for your work has been of great use to me in bringing out my new edition, though I have accepted different readings at some places. [!]

We should appreciate the idea of the people of foreign countries who complete a big work jointly without grudge. I may tell you that I used to teach a German student on the recommendation of my revered Guru, the late Prof. P. Sheshadri, who only learnt from me how to read different metres. When I came to know from him that four of them had come from Germany to accomplish one work jointly and were studying it in different phases, my heart's joy [!] knew no bound.
Again thanking you for your edition of Vikramankdeva Charitam.

Yours sincerely

[Sd. V. N. Shastri]

Shriman Pt. Murari Lall Ji Nagar
M.A., etc. etc. etc. [!]
24/4 Railway Colony
Kishan Ganj
Delhi-6

I wrote to him immediately:

24/4 Railway Colony
Kishanganj
February 5, 1960

Dear Shri Bharadwaj:

Thanks for your letter. I would not say anything about your work until I see it. I shall appreciate if you kindly send me a copy per VPP.

You are sadly mistaken if you think that I am an "aged" man. I was only 22 when I edited the Vikramāṅkadevacarita and so I might be even younger than your eldest child! I am born and brought up in Banaras (76 Ramghat) in a family exactly like that of yours. Therefore I share all your experiences and thoughts. As regards the Western practices, I know about them too, since I have been to England twice and have lived in the United States of America for full five years!

I am sending herewith a copy of the Vikramāṅkadevacarita with Prabodhinī commentary (canto 1), which is really Prabodhinī and I have learned many things from this. For example, Nandaka is Kaustubha Jewel (p. 2). The commentator is Rāmacandra Śarmā Pāṇḍeya, M.A., Vyākaraṇācārya, Gaekwad Research Fellow of the BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY. No wonder the students curse the people who have prescribed such an "unintelligible," "uninteresting" work for their examination. I wish we could stop such devices of making easy money!

Please return the book after you have gone through it!

Thanks again,

Sincerely yours,

Murari L. Nagar
Pt. Vishwanath Shastri Bharadwaj
17 Golagali
Banaras-1
Dear Shri Bharadwaj Shastri,

I am not sure whether you received my last letter sent some time ago, because I am still awaiting its reply. I was so anxious to see your edition, yet you did not send it. Ultimately I asked one of my friends in Banaras to send me a copy. I have gone through your work (first part only) and congratulate you on your excellent performance. You have really increased the bulk of the edition.

There are certain points which I wanted to bring to your kind notice. First of all, I would like you to know that the gloss Caritacandrikā is my own work! On page 7 of the Preface (called Prastāvanā) the last para clearly tells who is the author of the tippani, i.e. Caritacandrikā. The work was so insignificant to me that I did not like the idea of glorifying myself by mentioning "I". Whereas years and years were spent in the research pertaining to Vikramāṅka and Bilhaṇa, the writing of the gloss was a quick affair and so trivial!

Dr. Bühler too refers to the marginal gloss of Jaisalmer MS. Certainly no MS. of that (small) size could contain all the Caritacandrikā in its margins. Lines 21-22 on P. 7 of my description of Caritacandrikā state:

Antarbhāvitataṭtipāṇīkā saīśā "Candrikā" tanīyasyapi granthārtham ujjvalayiṣy atūti viśvasimaḥ.

Is it not clear from this statement that the Caritacandrikā is different from Jaisalmer's "tippani," that the Caritacandrikā contains the "tippani," and that the container and the contained cannot be one and the same?

On page 209 of my edition, where the Caritacandrikā begins, I have given a foot-note:

* Įdraśicinadvayāntarvartinī ṭippanī
  Jaisalameragranthasthetyavagantavyam

and the quotations in the Caritacandrikā from Jaisalmer's ṭippani are preceded and followed by (i.e. enclosed within) the sign *, e.g. * Rādhā Viṣṇubhāryā * (p.209), * abhi prāyo'nyatrollikhanam * (p.210). I have also given Hindī-paryāyāh. Do you think the words of Hindi which I have given here and there did exist in the 12th or 13th century? Furthermore, at the end of the Caritacandrikā I have given the date V. 2001--. Did you see it? What does it mean?

Well, I am very much grateful to you for whatever nice things you have said about my work on the whole. If you think that the editor of the poem or the writer of the gloss Caritacandrikā has understood the poet to any extent, I can assure you that your work does not lead him even one inch further! While I was a student in Banaras and was e
engaged in editing this work, I went from door to door begging for the correct meaning
of the obscure words. None was able to help me! So I wrote "Asya padasyārtho nāvag
amyate". Your big commentaries are typical of what other pandits used to say in Banaras (e.g. śroṭāṇāṁ iti vastuviplavakṛtāḥ prayēṇa ṭīkākṛtāḥ).

I don't know what is the purpose in explaining, for example, a word "sūtikāgṛham" by another word "ariṣṭam". For such work our forefathers have been saying: "Maghavā kī ṭīkā Bīdaujā!" In spite of the best of your efforts, all my obscure words still remain obscure. Your big commentaries do not throw any new light on the text. Your grammatical friend might have been able to give the prakṛti and prayāya of an obscure word like aksūna, yet it does not convey the meaning desired by a sahādaya. For such vaiyākaraṇaṇakāśicī/ś we have: Vadantu katiciddhāṭḥ kaphapacāṭhī varṇacāṭāh.

You have given a map of 11th century India. Would you kindly tell me what sources you have used in preparing it?

You may think that I am too severe in this letter. Yes, I have a reason to do so. In your first and the only letter to me you have brought in the western practice into the picture. You have involved them to justify your action. I just wanted to know whether you have followed the Western or Eastern practice in stealing the map which was prepared by a poor Sanskrit student after spending a great deal of his time, money, and energy. Of course, you were very cunning in the art of stealing since you got it copied by hand. It was not a machine-copying. The man who copied it might have guessed your act of theft! Did he? You say that you have changed my readings and adopted your own in many places; otherwise you have followed those of my edition. Don't you think it was your moral duty to have indicated all those verses where you differed from me? There are many verses where your readings are just misprints--sheer mistakes--total blunders. Who has to take the credit for them? For example, your reading in verse 16 of canto 5 is unconvincing. If your theory is accepted we will have to say that the expression Rāmasya bāṇena hato Vālī is preferable to Rāmeṇa bāṇena hato Vālī.

There are innumerable verses where we find the text totally distorted in your edition. I hope your second part will eliminate all such blunders.

Wishing you all the success.

Yours,

Whatever you may regard.

I never received a reply to the above! Since then I remained engaged in many other literary activities. I worked on a Union List of Learned American Serials in Indian Libraries (ULLAS), which took full five years. I also edited and published the Kalpalatāviveka of an unknown author.

In 1965 I returned to the United States and spent most of my time in working on the "History of the Baroda Library Movement" and the "Indo-American Library Cooperation."
While working for the South Asia Studies Program at the University of Missouri Library in Columbia, I saw the complete set of Bharadvaja's three-volume edition. He had stolen quite a good deal from my work [see Misra's criticism of Bharadvaj's work. p. 112].

Then I saw Musalgaonkar's monumental work (a tiny little booklet). He, too, through his wife, had plagiarized and stolen a good deal of information from my edition. I wonder why people copy from other's works and do not even acknowledge! Probably they think that the author from whom they are stealing might have left this world long ago, or, that he would not be able to see the act of stealing even if he were still alive.

Bharadvaj wanted to steal from my Caritacandrikā. So he mischievously assigned the work to an ancient commentator who antedated 1286 V. (i.e. 1229 A.D.). How could a modern man write such an erudite commentary? This reminds me of another incident back in 1962. I was visiting the Sanskrit Department (Manuscripts Section) of Osmania University in Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh. A friend of mine named Shri Anantacharya Dewal, who had studied with me in Banaras, introduced me as the editor of the Vik. (Banaras, 1945) to one of his senior colleagues named Shri Viraraghavacharya.

The latter could not believe it. He would not believe it! He said: "Such a young man could not be the editor of that work. He must be quite an old man." Well, there are two reasons for his disbelief. When I edited the Vik. I was very young. I was the first student in the history of the Government Sanskrit College, Banaras, whose work was published in such a prestigious series as the Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavan Texts. And secondly, God has blessed me with excellent health and I look at least 10-12 years younger than what I am. Be that as it may, I continued to work on the Vikramāṅkde vacarita as the time permitted, because Bharadvaj's work was nothing but a guide (or misguide) to the student examinees.

Comments on Bh's Edition

Some preliminary remarks about the work of Bharadvaj will be in order here. My father was a devoted orthodox Brāhmaṇa and a great Vedic scholar. Every morning he used to pray in a loud and clear voice: Gurave namah. Śrī parama-gurave namah. Śrī parāt parama-gurave namah. Śrī parāt paratara-parama-gurave namah, etc., i.e. I bow down to my guru, I bow down to my grand guru; I bow down to my great grand guru; I bow down to my great great grand guru, and so on and so forth.

In countries like India, and in the communities which are not yet totally ruined by the unwholesome influences of Western traditions and in which things occur even now as they used to be in ancient days, marriages are still arranged. In societies where a long courtship precedes the actual marriage, the girl may come to know almost, say, all the aunts and uncles of the boy. However, when the girl sees the boy for the first time only after the marriage, as is the case when marriages are arranged because the families follow the same old orthodox Indian tradition, there is no possibility of the girl's getting acquainted with the family members of the boy. After the wedding ceremony is completed, the groom (husband) leads his newly-wed wife to the audience, including rel
atives, and offers his respects by bowing down to each and every one of his elders. The girl follows him and bows down to whomsoever the husband bows down. She does not know at all the person to whom she is paying her homage. It is merely a ritual—just because the husband bows down to the person, it is her duty to follow suit!

Visvanatha Sastri Bharadva, the great editor and commentator of Bilhana’s Vikramāṅkadevacaritam concludes his "Kiṅcit Prāstāvikam" with the following words:


So, among others, Bharadva salutes also Śrī Rāmanātha Dīkṣita and says that he was highly obliged to him (RND) in so many ways since he (Bh) studied his (of RND) work (pustaka/lekhā). We are not sure which particular Ramanatha Dikṣita Bh is referring to. If he means the same person who is cited in my work, then Bh is deceiving the world! My Rāmanātha Dīkṣita did not publish the pustaka or lekhā BH is alluding. At least I did not consult any of his published books. He was my fellow-scholar at the Govt. Sanskrit College, Banaras, where both of us were recipients of the Sadholal Research Fellowship and conducted our own individual research.

In the Sarasvati Bhavan Library of the College, I found a booklet in Tamil. Since I could not read it, and my friend Shri Ramanatha Dikṣita could read it, I requested him to translate it for me. The subject was unknown to him and the language was unknown to me! The original author had written it as an essay for some examination.

Well, we sat together. Dīkṣita dictated in Hindi whatever he could gather from the original Tamil. It was in many ways a new interpretation of the matters and topics studied and reported by Western scholars like Bühler and their Indian copyists (copy-cats) like Dvivedi. It was an enchanting work.

In my "Bibliography" of the works consulted (Vikramāṅkadevacaritasya Aithāsikat attva-Nirūpane Sahāyakā Granthāḥ), I had cited the above translation as follows:

(19) LIFE. The Life and Times of Chalukya Vikramaditya VI, A.V. Venataram (Tamil), Translated into Hindi by Shri Ramanatha Dikṣit, Sahitya Shiromani, Sadholal Research Scholar, Benares.

The same work has been cited by Bharadva in his "Pariśṭam Gha. Vikramāṅkdev acarita-mahākāvyasya Vikramādityasya ca Varṇanātmakā Lekhā Granthāś ca," appearing at the end of his V. 1, in the following words:

The above "Anuvāda" has been viewed so far by only two persons in this wide world—Shri Dīkṣita and myself. It is still in my possession in the original form as it was written by me as early as 1940. I don't know where and how Bharadvaj saw this! And we don't know either where he got the English title! We can understand him saluting Dīkṣita as a matter of courtesy, but we don't know why he had to say that he saw Dīkṣita's book even though he did not see it! Also let it be noted that he has given no imprint, because it was never published!!

Since he did not actually see the work of Dīkṣita and still he claims that he saw it, therefore, we can conclude that he did not see any of the books listed by me, but he only reproduced my list. It was not necessary for him either to study those works. That is a fact. Anyone who goes through my elaborate "Introduction," and goes through what Bh has reproduced in his edition, will be fully convinced that Bh has not made any extension of the boundary of the field of the historical knowledge covered by the Vik. and discussed by any of the previous writers who preceded him.

Bh says that he saw Kalhana's Rājaratanaṅgini (original Sanskrit) as well as Stein's Kalhana's Chronology of Kashmir (translation). Had he done so, he would not have made Kṣitigarbha a sahodara bhrātā, a real brother of Subhaṭa (see 18:47).

We get much useful information from this great researcher, who was a member of the Sanskrit Sahitya Research Committee of the Banaras Hindu University, and who got this great assignment of editing the Carita from this Committee, as to how to prepare bibliographies and how to list the sources consulted. He is VIDYĀVĀGISH! (See his letterhead).

We learn from Bh that the city of Bombay is the home of two Royal Asiatic Societies—and he consulted two journals—one titled the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay" and another called "Journal of the Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society, " listed as no. 10 and 11 respectively by him.

Bh also consulted Indian Antiquary, page 325. It was not necessary for him to mention the vol. no. or date of a set consisting of more than 50 volumes!

We could go on and on and on like this. What we want to prove here is that he did not consult any of the books he has listed. He merely prepared the "Bibliography" to help the students! That is fine. But then why to say that he studied those? This is anything but honest scholarship.

A product of plagiarism is easily detected. Misra notes in the following words the theft committed by Bh [p.112]:

No v l. is recorded expect [sic] cases where the editor has come up with his own conjecture. Other features, viz. index to verses and proper names, geneal
logical tabs., map, inscription etc. have been mostly reproduced, as such, from the editio secunda. (stress added)

Bh professes to have helped the examinees (students) by writing a simple yet brief commentary. How simple is his commentary can be easily realized when we find an original word (of the poet Bilhaṇa) like "sūṭikāṛgha" explained by a synonym like "ariṣṭām!" This is called in popular parlance "Maghāvā kī tīkā bīḍaujā."

Again Bh interprets "viplava" as "ṇīmba" (Vik. 6:9). Even a beginner in Sanskrit, and even in modern Hindi, knows what "viplava" is. The question arises: How many know "ṇīmba?"

Great poets have beautifully described such great "commentators":

Durbodhaṃ yad atīva taddhi [vi] jahi tasaṭṭhartham ityuktibhiḥ
Spaṣṭāḥṛṣatiṣvāstvitrīṁ vidadhāi vyarthaiḥ samāśādikaiḥ.
Asthāne'nuṣayogibhiścā bahubhir jalpair bhramaṃ tanvate
Srot+rṇām iti vastuviplavakṛtaḥ praeyeṇa tīkākṛtaḥ.
(Ascribed to Bhoja)

Let us see another attempt of Bh to "simplify":

Bhaṅgas taraṅga ūṁr vā striyāṁ vēcir athormisu.
Mahatsūllolakalollou... (ityamarah).

So kallolāḥ can be rendered as mahāṅtas taraṅgaḥ. It is ridiculous to gloss kallolāḥ by ullolāḥ unless one wants to instruct the student in a more difficult synonym, or perhaps one's own pedantry! The former is much more common, better known-- (pracalita) than ullolāḥ. Also, we would like to know what is the gain in explaining prthvyāḥ by prthivyāḥ. It is simply piṣṭapesanām.

The easy way Bh steals from N and then interprets Bilhaṇa reminds us of Bhāravi's following sadūkти:

Viṣamo'pi vigāhyate nayaḥ kṛtārthadhā payasāṁ ivāśayaḥ.
Sa tu tatra viśeṣadurlobhāḥ sad upanyasyati kṛtyavartma yaḥ.
[Kirāṭārjunīya. 2:3]

How much N and his friends had to struggle to bring some sense out of a seemingly nonsense created by R! And Bh just takes it over without any acknowledgment whatsoever. However, where N has failed, Bh had no brain to improve the text or solve the riddle.

Bilhaṇa says:

Sāhityapāthonidhimanthanotham karnāṁṛtam rakṣata he kavīndrāḥ.
Yad asya daityā iva luṇṭhanāya kāvyāṛthcaurāḥ praguṇībhavanti.
The poet had in his mind writer-pretenders like Bh in his mind. Bh copies from N e d. prfoufusely, yet he professes to have improved N’s text. The present work will provide innumerable examples of the depth of knowledge of Bh and demonstrate how bea utifully he has improved the text!

Bh admits that N has worked really hard to get the correct reading. He does have some good words for N's ed. Yet he attributes certain errors to it. He says: “Paraṅcāṭrāp i yatra tatra sampādanañarabhasād anayakāranād vā pā ha-bhedanirnaye pramādo jāta i va drśyate.” He cites three example to prove his point. The first example cited by Bh is Asmarad dviradānavāriṇā.

And the great scholar-pretender declares with all the vehemence at his command: It yatra teneti pā hāṭ tasyeti pā haḥ sādhutaraḥ pratibhāti. We don’t know what Bh means by sādhutaraḥ.

All the MSS. (J & A) and all the texts (B, N, & R) have "tena". There was no doubt. There was no question. There was no scope for any deliberation and determination as to the correctness of the reading. Under the circumstances the reading "tena" is acceptable to all! We fail to understand what authority does any editor, much less Bh, have to change the reading unnecessarily! It is unwanted, uncalled for, and unjust. Further more, how can anyone conclusively assert that "tasya" is preferable to “tena?” If so “R āmena bānena hato Vālṭ.” “Dvi radadānavāriṇā” is only an instrument. The agent or kartā is Vikrama. He polluted the sea (water) through "dviradānavāri.” It seems Bh suffers from inferiority complex and just wants to show off. We can only remind him:

Śūro’si kṛtavidya’si darśanīyo’si putraka.  
Yasmin kule tvam utpanno gajas tatra na hanyate.

Modern historical and critical research is different from what Bh is familiar with, if at all, he is familiar with anything substantial.

Bh gives the following verse as the second example where N is alleged to have errored in his opinion:

Hastadvayṭgāḍḥagṛhaḥtalola-dolāguṇāṇāṁ jaghane vadhūnām.  
Asamvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe kimapyaḥbudd ucchvasito manobhūḥ. [7:29]

There is a famous ukti:

Nāndhrīpayohara ivātitarāṁ prakāśaḥ no gurjarīstana ivātitarāṁ niguḍhāḥ.  
Artho girām apihitaḥ pihitaśca kaścit saubhāgyameti Marahaṭṭavadhūkucābhāḥ.  
[quoted in Bālabodhinī Comm. on Kāvyaprakāśa., v.45]

Thus if the vital organs (of the bodies) of the ladies would become totally naked, it would be obscene. There would be bhūbhasa scene and not the continuity of śṛṅgāra.
No decent woman would like her jaghana to be totally naked in public. In reality, the jaghana had become just a little bit bare, because the knot or tie of her sari (wearing apparel) had become loose and it had just slipped a little! There is no need to make the jaghana totally naked, completely bare. The purpose is served, and in a better way, if it is seen just a little bit bare. And the question again comes up: What is the authority to change? A change is thought of only when what is existing does not make enough sense! Lakṣaṇā comes only when abhidhā gets bādhita!

Bh’s third example is yasyā bhrātā (18:47). It is discussed in full length in its proper place. [pp. 245-249] Here we can only say that it would have been much better if Bh had kept quiet!

In one place Bh accuses Nagar of carelessness (pramādaḥ) in determining the correct reading (of the text) due to haste in editing or some other reason. In another he alludes that pitfalls (skhalanam) abound in abundance in the process of the reconstruction of the text on the part of N. His actual words are "skhalanam varīvartī." Here we have anīluk which is enjoined by ‘Dhātor ekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhīhāre yañ.’ It is explained as: Paunahpunyam bhṛṣārthaḥ ca kriyāsamabhīhāraḥ = repetition of act or the intensity thereof. Therefore, "skhalanam varīvartī" will mean atiṣayena vartate, sut arām vartate, atyartham asti, bhṛṣam asti (that the mistakes abound, occur time and again etc.). Is this justified? How many cases can Bh cite? Seeing all the blunders he has himself committed, we don't know which pratyaya should be used in regard to him!

Nothing succeeds like success. Once all the three volumes of Bh were published, he got elated. He lost his mind. In his third volume his ātmaśālāghā knew no bounds. On p. 3 of his Bhūmikā (in Vol. 3) he says:

Jaba Sva. mānanīya Sarmā jī ke [ guruvarya of Vol.1 has now become only Sarmājī] saṃskaraṇa kī pustakeµ aprāpya hone lagīm taba yaha āvaśyaka t hā ki isa

This is not true. The edition was not becoming aprāpya. In fact the students who studied this poem for the first time used to curse the authorities of the Government Sanskrit College, Banaras, for having prescribed such a work, the available edition of which was so poor and intrinsically so defective. They used to charge (of course, jocularly) that the edition was not being sold so it was prescribed in order that the "old paper" (raddī) could be disposed of! Also mark "hone lagīm" not "ho gaiµ!"
The writer assumes quite a lot! He is inflated with false sense of success.

Whosoever may be the writer of the above passage, he has demonstrated his abundance of knowledge. I don't believe it is the writing of Bh. In my Introduction I have narrated the circumstances which led me toward the study of this immortal work. The writer of the above passage makes Mangaladeva Sastrī as the kartā, and Nagar only as the karaṇa! This is a misrepresentation of facts and distortion of truth! Here are my words in Prastāvanā: [p.10]

I. 1940 Varṣāt Kā. Rā. Saṃ. Ma. parīkṣāyām pāṭhyatvena nirdhāritam itiddam carita

The editorial duties, on his own request were assigned by me to Pt. Murari Lal Nagar, Sahityacharya, then working as a Sadholal Research Scholar in the Sarasvati Bhavan Library, Benares.

The writer (surrogate of Bh) reaches the highest peak of his vain glory when he takes the courage and declares:
Kucha sthalo para isa tṛtiya saṃskaraṇa meṃ bhī mujhe pāṭhabhedam meṃ parivartana karanā parā hai jo vicāra vinimaya ke anantara āvaśyaka pratīta huā.

He gives three examples, already discussed.

And then he makes a general bold statement:

Isa prakāra prāyaḥ sabhī sargom meṃ thorā bahuta pāṭhabheda karanā āva śyaka huā hai.

This is anything but an honest and true scholarship, not worthy of one who claims to be a member of the Sanskrit Sahitya Research Committee of a great educational institution like the Banaras Hindu University founded by Mahāmanā Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.

We have discussed the above three verses in their proper context in full detail and have shown how hollow is the claim of Bh! It is merely a bālacāpalam. His action reminds us of a great saduṅkti of our own poet Bilhaṇa:

Kurvantu ṣeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham.

We are also reminded of another nītivacana:

Mūrkho'pi śobhate tāvat yāvat kiñcina bhāṣate

True scholarship and due morality demanded that Bh should have indicated all the cases wherever he had changed N’s text so that the discerning critics might have seen for themselves how true was his claim! If the three cases cited by him provide any evidence, the conclusion is irresistible that it is the despicable destruction rather than commendable construction which Bh has wrought! And yet he is proud of his achievement.

One last point before we turn to Mahāpaṇḍitarāja Mahāmahima Miṣramahārāja. There are innumerable features that are totally objectionable in Bh. As an example we can state that the prose order of Bh is many times arbitrary, to say the least. No sahṛda ya will accept it. It is neither khaṇḍānvaya nor daṇḍānvaya. It is probably Bhāradvāj ānvaya, i.e. manaḥ pūtaṃ samācaret. Or, we may call it vitaṇḍāvādānvaya. It is befitting his total personality and accomplishments.

Misra’s Magnum Opus

The above background is presented here just to assure the readers that the present writer is not a beginner in this line (Sanskrit studies). I have studied Bilhaṇa probably more than any other scholar in modern times.
In 1977 I chanced to see the Studies on Bilhāṇa and his Vikramāṅkadevacarita by B. N. Misra. The learned author has featured his degrees on the title page as follows:

Ph.D. (Tübingen).

Apparently Misra is a Doctor of Library Science, too! So he is a double doctor!!

The Preface tells us:

The investigations [!] submitted here have grown from a study [?] of Bilhāṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita (Vcar.), which I undertook under the guidance of Professor Paul Thieme.

A tree grows from a seed. As compared to the tree, the seed is very, very small indeed. If these "investigations" (totalling only 135 pages) have grown from the "study," we don't know how small the "study" would have been!

In Chapter I, a number of textual improvements are proposed. Even if not each of them will be accepted, it will emerge from my treatment that our MS. tradition, scanty as it is, shows more doubtful readings as [?] seems to have been realized (for example: by Bühler, Vcar., Introd. p. 46). At least in two cases, the text, as it stands, cannot give a true picture of the historical events described (see p. 8 on 4.119c (in Bühler's ed. 4.118c (a) and p. 10 on 5.78a (b).

-----------

(a) and (b) both are absurdities of the highest kind on the part of Misra!

-----------

It is hoped that the treatment of certain lexicographical items [?] in Chapter I I, [!] will not only help the understanding and interpretation of Bilhāṇa, but will be welcome as a small contribution to the history of the Sanskrit vocabulary in the late Middle Ages. Now-a-days it will [?] generally be accepted that the usage of individual poets is more differentiated than commentaries that rely exclusively on works like Amarakośa or even the PW. make us realize.

The secondary source material, dealt with in Chapter III, comprises a quantum of quotations from Vcar. in the five important Subhāṣita-s [!], viz. Subhāṣitar atnakoṣa (Srk); Saduktikaraṇāṁṛta (Skm.); Sūktimuktāvalī (Smk.); Sārṅgadhara apaddhati (Śp.); and Subhāṣitāvalī (Subh.). As far as can be made out, the readings of the anthologies are inferior [!] or deliberate changes (cp. e.g. on 16.2). In fact the readings offered by the anthologies can hardly help us to correct the MS. readings. An exception may be formed [!] by 8.37c; 8.71d and 16.51c. Some readings in the anthologies are due to the distinct intention of rendering a given verse a more general application (cp. on 16.44, 51, 52; 17.11, 12). Curiously enough, some of Bilhāṇa’s verses are quoted in anthologies anonymously. These are marked in the table of concordance of quotations on pp. 65-68.
The most interesting result of Chapter IV, [?] is the proof that Vidyākara quotes Bilhaṇa’s Karnasundari (cp. verse 39) on p. 81 whereby Kosambi’s argument regarding the time of Vidyākara in so far as it is based on his not knowing Bilhaṇa (cp. Srk. Introd. p.xxxiii), is shown to be invalid. Verses not verifiable in the extant works of Bilhaṇa, but ascribed to him in the anthologies, have been taken either from oral tradition of single verses or from works of his which are altogether lost. Four of the verses ascribed to Bilhaṇa (cp. vv. 14, 64, 71 and 79) treat the subject of the Rāma-story. This may seem interesting in connection with the Vcar. 18.94 and Bühler's assumption of Bilhaṇa's having composed Rāmāstuti (a proper "Rāmacarita" with Bilhaṇa as an [!] author seems rather unlikely). On several occasions the verses treated here show affinity in style or vocabulary with the extant work [?] of Bilhaṇa and these as such have been discussed critically. Not in all cases the genuineness of the ascription to Bilhaṇa is warranted by such further evidence.

Chapters V and VI, give or retrieve [!] available information on Bilhaṇa and his works, with a view to revive interest in this poet and his works and to facilitate future research thereby.

I express my deep sense of gratitude to my revered teacher Professor Dr. Paul Thieme, who has given me the benefit of his great learning by going through the entire text of Vikramāṅkadevacarita with me as well as his valuable guidance in making this work presentable...To Dr. A Wezler, who always helped me in academic and other matters, I express my gratefulness. Had it not been for Miss Angelika Ilsch's excellent typing accuracy, this dissertation would never have attained its present, almost flawless [!] presentation. I would like to take this opportunity of warmly thanking her for her co-operation...

It is a disrespect to the great name of Paul Thieme to call him the "revered teacher" for this type of trash product!

-------

B.N. Misra

G.N.Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha, Allahabad
1st September, 1976

Naturally I thought that since the work was done under the guidance of such a great German scholar as Dr. Paul Thieme and since it had earned Mr. Misra a Ph.D from such a great University as Tübingen, it would certainly contain some substance in it. But I was totally disappointed. The more I read, the more disgusted I became. I could not resist the urge to offer my honest and sincere criticism of the work. The present study is an outcome of that urge. The reader may not find any coherent, orderly narration here, because it is a criticism of a work which in itself lacks coherence and order. Our attempt here is only to expose the hollowness of the unworthy and misguided comments of Misra, Bharadwaj and others and uphold the worthy muse of mahākavi Bilhaṇa. T
he order adopted is, however, that of Vik. itself so that some sort of sequence is maintained.

The question arises why I felt such an irresistible urge to offer my criticism of Misra's work. He was not the first one to practice plagiarism and murder the muse of Bilhaṇa. Many others had preceded him and had practiced it. Bh had done it. Musalgaonkar had done it. Then why to single out Misra? The answer lies in the fact that Misra had crossed the limits of academic discipline and decorum. His was the worst performance. His ignorance could be matched only by his arrogance. Of all the scholars who have ever worked on the Carita, Misra probably knows the least. Yet he pretends that he knows everything. He finds fault not only with his predecessors, but even with the poet himself. My criticism of Misra incidentally brings in also the performance of both Bh and Musalgaonkar. So this writing is a kind of "Sokaḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ!"

The question still remains unanswered: "Why one should get so much disturbed if Bilhaṇa is misinterpreted by someone else?" Well, it gives an honest critic the most severe pain to see such a great poet like Bilhaṇa being wrongly interpreted and his muse molested. The following sukti demonstrates this fact:

Yadyapi na bhavati hāniḥ parakṛtyāṁ carati rāsabhe drākṣāṁ.
Anucitam idam iti kṛtvā hā hā hā heti khidyate cetaḥ.

Hence my attempt to show the hollowness of Misra's critique of Bilhaṇa and to expose the vain glory in which Misra and the other neo-expounders of Bilhaṇa have held themselves.

The "investigations" of Misra on the Vik. remind us of Don Quixote de la Mancha, who imagines himself to be a knight (hero), and with a view to revive the institution of Knight-errantry, sets out on a mission of adventure with his squire (deputy), mistakes a windmill to be a giant and attacks it only to be a subject of ridicule of his squire and other spectators. Misra creates doubts and imagines problems (where none exist), and then tries to solve them unnecessarily. Most of his attempts are nothing but jalatāḍanam and mudhā prayāsah.

The argumentative statements of Misra run very much like the following:

1) 2+2 cannot make four. They make five. So let us read 2+2 = 5.

2) Wherever there is smoke there is fire. In this ayogolaka (red-hot ball of iron) there is no smoke. So there is no fire. And so let us lift it! He asks us to lift it.

3) A horse has four legs. A cow too has four legs. Therefore, this horse is a cow!

Misra himself ignites the fire. And then he shouts "fire", "fire"! He takes a bucket, puts the fire out, as it were, and declares himself to be a hero!
Many a time he destroys a load-bearing wall while attempting his "fire-fighting" enterprises and the whole building tumbles, and crumbles, and gets turned into rubbles.

Misra’s attempts at emendations remind us the story of a man who was walking lonely in a sandy desert. The sun was burning hot overhead. And the sand below was burning hotter. The man took off his shoes and put them on his head. That was HIS way of saving himself.

Misra would like us to believe that he is not a "single" doctor but a "double" doctor. See the title page of his magnum opus. Fortunately for the mankind he is not a Doctor of Medicine. Had he been a physician and surgeon, his methodology of treatment would have been as follows:

A patient comes to his clinic. The patient is suffering from only a simple common cold! Instantaneously Misra would cut out and throw away his heart and replace it with that of a monkey!! Then he would ask the patient to go home, drink a lot of juice, and go to the bed permanently!!!

"Investigators" like Misra have been well depicted by a poet:

Gañayanti nāpaśabdaṁ na vr̥ttabhaṅgam kṣayaṁ na cārthasya. 
Rasikatvenākuliaṁ veśyāpatayaḥ kukavyayaḥ ca.


Bilhaṇa knew that there would be many Misras in this world. He already predicted their display of false erudition.

1. Kuṇṭhatvam āyāti guṇah kavināṁ sāhityavidyaśramavarjiteṣu. 
   Kuryād anārdreṣu kim aṅganānāṁ keśeṣu kṛṣṇāgurudhūpavāśaḥ. [1:14]

2. Vyutpattir āvarjitakovidāpi na raṅjanāya kramate jaḍānām. 
   Na mauktikacchidrakarī śalākā pragalbhate karmanī taṅkikāyah. [1:16]

   Te'smatprabandhān avadhārayantu kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham. [1:22]

4. Alaukikollekhasamarpaṇena vidagdhacetaṅkaṇapaṭikāsū. 
   Parīkṣitaṁ kāvyasuvārṇam etal lokasya kaṇṭhābharaṇaṭvatvam etu. [1:24]

In December 1977 I wrote to a friend in New Delhi to send me two copies of Misra’s magnum opus by air. I felt an irresistible urge to bring Misra out in his true colour. The books arrived in early January of 1978. I was fortunate to see the beautiful "jacket" designed by S.K. Berry. The book-jacket is also called "dust-jacket." It protects the book from the "dust" after the book comes out of the press! In the case of Misra’s book this "dust" jacket is doubly meaningful. It serves two purposes. It protects the book not only from the [future] external dust in the air, but it also covers the work from its internal (inherent) dust (dirt) already contained therein. It is so beautiful and functional. I
was also able to get more information about—an inner view of—this great author and critic. The dust-jacket reads:

Bilhana’s *Vikramāṅkadeva-carita* is one of the fine pieces [!] of the Sanskrit historical *kavyas*. The text was edited, for the first time, by Georg Bühler on the basis of a single manuscript discovered in a Jain Bhandara at Jeselmer (Rajasthan). At places [!] where the manuscript reading was not clear to Bühler, he has [!] to come up with his own conjectural readings and thus raised [?] textual problems. At the outset, some such problems have been discussed in the work and an extensive use of both external and internal evidences has been made for the first time to arrive at a convincing conclusion [!].

Attempts in interpreting the text, in the hands of modern scholars, have been dubious [?] at places where the poet’s usages of particular words has(?) been interpreted freely. A lexicographical study of some such vocables would help in proper understanding of the text on one side and make a [n?] humble contribution to the Sanskrit lexica on the other.

For easy dissemination to the scholars, [!] a comprehensive bibliography of Bilhana’s work has been appended to the work which would of course retrieve essential information on the poet and his works. [Just to increase the bulk!]

The author, who has taken only specimens of these problems and discussed them in the present work, is keeping himself busy in giving wide treatment to these in his critical edition of the *Vikramāṅkadeva-carita* in near future [!]. B. N. Misra, being the youngest son of the great Sanskrit scholar Late Pandit Kamala Kant Misra, was born at Allahabad in 1935. He took his M.A. (Sanskrit) from Banaras Hindu University in 1963. After serving in B.H.U. for a number of years, he went to West Germany in 1969 and did his Ph.D. in 1972 under one of the foremost Sanskritists of the West - Professor Paul Thieme - at the University of Tübingen.

Having worked at the University Library at Tübingen for three years as Assistant Librarian in the Oriental Section and going through an examination in library science, Dr. Misra has shaped his career as a distinguished oriental librarian. He undertook extensive tour to the libraries and oriental institutions in Europe and Russia.

Dr. Misra has contributed many articles in research journals and guided research scholars for Ph.D. in Sanskrit philology. He is working at the G.N. Jha Research Institute, Allahabad (at present on deputation to the Nepal German Research Centre at Kathmandu). Besides, Dr. Misra was offered many distinguished assignments from universities and institutions abroad. [Did he accept them?]

The "dust jacket" declares that "an extensive use of both external and internal evidences has been made for the first time [?] to arrive at a convincing conclusion." But, alas, we do not find these conclusions convincing at all! Rather, we believe, they are mis
leading. The reader will examine the comments of Misra and our criticism thereon. We hope that will help in the correct understanding of Bilhaṇa's poetic muse.

We are reminded of some immortal words of Kavikutaguru Kālidāsa:

Tam santaḥ śrotum arhanti sadasadyaktihetavaḥ.
Hemnaḥ saṃlakṣyate hyagnau viśuddhiḥ śyāmikāpi vā. 1:10

Also our own poet Bilhaṇa has expressed his sincere wish:

Ullekhalīghaṭaṇāpaṭūnām sacetasāṁ vaikaṭikopamānām.
Vicāraṇānopalapāṭikāsu matsūktiratnāṇyatīthiḥbhavantu. [1:19]

There are 6 chapters in Misra's work:

1. Specimens of Textual Difficulties,
2. Some Lexicographical Points of Interest,
3. Secondary Source Material relating to Vikramāṅkadevacarita,
4. Verses ascribed to Bilhaṇa in Anthologies,
5. Mention of and Quotations from Bilhaṇa in other works, and
6. Bibliography of Bilhaṇa and his works.

Our criticism is mainly on the first three chapters because it is there that Misra tries to show his extraordinary calibre (which in reality does not exist at all) and attempts to improve upon not only the work of other scholars, but even upon Bilhaṇa himself! Other chapters are not directly related to the main theme of the pretended work! They merely increase the bulk of the booklet. Let us examine Misra's "Investigations, inventions, and discoveries" one by one.

Before we begin our critical study of the great performance of this great "investigatore", it would be appropriate to declare in the most categorical terms that B.N. Misra has no legal right whatsoever to bear the title "doctor". My extensive correspondence with the University of Tübingen has proved that he did not receive the degree! The correspondence is presented here as an evidence. Misra's Magnum Opus & the University of Tübingen

The "Preface" is dated 1st September, 1976 and was written from G.N. Jha Kendriya Vidyapeeth, Allahabad. The title page shows that he ["Doctor" Misra] was working with Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, New Delhi.

Misra begins his "Preface" with the following words: "The investigations submitted here have grown from a study of Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita (Vcar.), [Misra does n
to make any distinction typographically between the author and the title] which I undertook under the guidance of Professor Paul Thieme." The title page shows that he had already received his Ph.D. degree. Naturally I became curious to know whether the 135 pages comprising the small booklet represented his total DISSERTATION submitted to a German University for a Ph.D. On October 17, 1977 I wrote to the Librarian of the University of Tübingen:

I would like to have a xerox copy of the thesis presented by Dr. B.N Misra for a Ph.D. from your University. He says that he worked under the guidance of Prof. Paul Thieme. The work is published under the title: Studies on Bilhanā and his Vikramāṅkadevacarita (New Delhi, 1976).

I don't know if what is published is all that constituted his thesis, or the published version is a selection. In any case, I would like to know whether I can get a xerox copy of the thesis, and, if so, what would be the total cost including air mail postage.

The reply came in German. It was dated October 26, 1977:


Translated freely into English, the above would read:

In response to your letter dated 17-10-77 we are sorry to inform you that Mr. Misra has not yet submitted his thesis to us [!]. However, we are trying through a colleague of our Library who is at present in India, to get in touch with Mr. Misra and later let you know about it. Since we do not expect our colleague to be back before Dec. 1977, we will be able to give you news in January '78 at the earliest. We request you to be patient and we remain--with friendly greetings. Yours....

I could not grasp the meaning in full. My curiosity was not satisfied at all. I was still wondering whether the full dissertation was available in Tübingen University and whether it was submitted originally in German. It was my assumption that a German University would insist on the dissertation being written in German. Later I learnt from a UM C faculty member, who had just returned from a year's work in Germany, that one could write the dissertation there even in English.

I could not understand why the lady-librarian, whom I wrote, had to get the needed information from the author through a common friend visiting India! There was a lack
of understanding. I wish I knew German or the lady would write to me in English. I wrote to her once again on Nov. 18, 1977:

I am not sure if we are talking about the same Mr. Misra. Since I do not read German, I had to take help from a friend of mine. It is not clear from your letter whether Mr. Misra has submitted his dissertation to your University and has already received the degree. The Misra I am talking about has already received his Ph.D. from Tübingen as evidenced by the title page of his book already published. (New Delhi, K.B. Publications, 1976. 135 pp. Some pages from his published dissertation are enclosed for your verification).

I am an Oriental scholar and have devoted all my life to the study and teaching of Sanskrit. Bilhana is very close to my heart. And so is the German scholarship, which, in a way, led the modern world in Sanskrit studies. I have the greatest regard for both of them.

This is the most irresponsible work in Sanskrit I have ever seen in my whole life. I am pained to see that the author attributes it to the guidance of German scholarship! It is a disgrace to any Sanskrit scholar. To say that it was prepared under Dr. Paul Thieme is insult added to injury.

I am not sorry that Mr. Misra has stolen a lot of information contained in my work published as early as 1945, when I was merely a youth in my early twenties. I am not sorry either that he passes a good deal of earlier published data as his own, a criminal plagiarism. I am sorry that he does not understand the point at all and blames him unnecessarily just to parade his pedantry.

I will appreciate it very much if you kindly clarify whether this Misra has received the degree from Tübingen and if he prepared the dissertation under Dr. Paul Thieme. I want to see the whole dissertation as it was submitted to the University of Tübingen.

With profound regrets and apologies for having caused this trouble to you.

Before I could mail my letter, just reproduced above, I received another letter from her dated 14.11.77 along with photo-copies of the preliminary pages of the book, which by the way, I already had with me. Here is what she wrote:

In Erganzung unseres Schreibens vom 26.10.77 konnten wir Ihnen heute mitteilen, dass die gesuchte Dissertation von Herrn B.N. Misra inzwischen in Tübingen vorliegt. Leider durften wir die Arbeit aus urheberrechtlichen Gründen nicht für Sie fotokopieren, da das Werk im Handel noch erhältlich ist. Wir haben das Titelblatt und das Vorwort für Sie kopiert und diesem Schreiben beigefügt. Diesen Kopien können Sie auch die Verlagsangabe entnehmen....

Translated into English, the above would read somewhat as follows:
As a supplement to our letter of 26-10-77 we are able to inform you today that the dissertation of B.N. Misra is at this time available in Tübingen. Unfortunately, we are not able to copy it because of the copyright laws, since the work is presently available in the book trade [i.e. still in print!]. We have copied the title-page as well the preface for you and from these copies you can see the bibliographic information.

With kind greetings.

I wrote to her:

Before I could mail my letter of November 18, I received your kind letter of 14-11-77 along with photocopies of the preliminary pages. I was myself going to send them to you as I have indicated in my accompanying letter.

I have the book here. I am going to send you a detailed reply soon.

Thanking you so much,

Her reply came promptly:


I had the same problem of understanding her letter once again. This time I went to a senior professor of German, who translated the letter for me, which was not clear even to him:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter of 18 November, 1977 and thank you for it. According to the information of Professor Dr. Paul Thieme with reference to the copy which you have of Misra: Studies on Bilhaña... it is a question of the complete dissertation. We have forwarded your letter in original to Professor Dr. Thieme, Spemannstr. 14, 7400 Tübingen and hope that he can contribute to the clarification of this matter.

Consequently I wrote to Dr. Paul Thieme on March 6, 1978:

Please find herewith a copy of a letter dated 7.12.77 from Ms. Heidemarie Griewatz. I will appreciate it very much if you kindly favor me with your reply.

Thanking you so much,

I never received a reply!
On September 25, 1978 I visited Tübingen with my wife. I met everyone there who might (or could) throw some light on the matter and solve the riddle. All my efforts proved fruitless. It was certain that the Misra in question was not yet a DOCTOR legally!

I wrote to Dr. Thieme on Sept. 27, 1978:

I visited your town and the University last Monday September 25 but did not have enough luck to be able to see you. Probably you were out of town because we tried to get in touch with you over the phone the whole afternoon Monday and Tuesday morning too. [Did he really want to avoid me?]

I am sorry to bother you. The matter may seem very small, but it is quite important. Ms. Heidemarie Griewatz knows the whole story. Now Dr. George Baumann too knows.

Whether a particular person was awarded the degree should be of no concern to another scholar, but since Mr. Misra has written a very irresponsible piece of work and since it crosses the limits of decency and fair scholarship, and since also he says that the dissertation was prepared under your guidance, I thought it desirable to verify the facts.

I am not sorry that Mr. Misra has stolen quite a good deal from my writing. That kind of plagiarism is not an uncommon phenomenon in the literary world. Many have been guilty of this sin in the past. I am sorry that Misra has not understood the poet at all! Misra is a pretender.

I would not have bothered over the above fact either, but the reason why I am troubling you is this: I could not allow Mr. Misra's "baby talk" remain unchallenged. I felt an irresistible urge to write a criticism of what Misra has written. I have written almost 150 pages. The book is going to be published in India as soon as I arrive there. I don't want to go on record for making a statement which may be challenged at a later date.

The question is: Did you guide him to write what he has written? I cannot believe it!

Please send your reply to my address in India.

Thank you very much,

Once again there was no response whatsoever! What does this continued silence mean? I was left wondering.
In the middle of January 1979 I received the following letter from Tübingen:


Ich hoffe, dass Ihnen mit diesen Angaben wenigstens einigermaßen gedient ist, und bin mit freundlichen Grüßen.

Translated into English, it would read:

Among the letters handed over to me by my predecessor, I found a letter from you, dated 21st September, 1978. To your question "whether one Mr. B.N. Misra earned his 'Ph.D.' degree," I can only answer you and say that Mr. Misra according to our records has compiled a thesis on "Studies in [!] Bilhana and his Vikramankadevacarita" and that on 29.5.1972 the oral examination took place (Main subjects: Indology; Subsidiaries, Library Science and Comparative Theology--Main reporter Prof. Thieme.)

As you certainly know, it means that Mr. Misra, at least according to German standards, has not yet received the right to bear his title. (stress added). That is possible only after he has handed over the prescribed copies of the printed dissertation and finally after the degree has been formally conferred on him.

I hope that with these statements your queries have been answered.

And this is what I wrote to Dr. Klein:

Thank you very much for your kind letter of Jan. 9, 1979.

I only wish I knew German. My question still remains unanswered: Did Mr. Misra really qualify for the degree? From what you have written I can only gather that he wrote a dissertation and took the "oral defence" as well. The only formality that yet remained to be gone through was the submission of the prescribed copies of the printed dissertation.
The question is: The book is already printed. Why did Mr. Misra not submit the prescribed number of copies to the University? Does he not care to see that the degree is conferred on him--even in absentia--and that he has the legal right to call himself a DOCTOR?

You say that he has not yet received the right to bear the title. But the book published by him bears this very title on the title page!

You may wonder why I am so insistent! Well, I believe no university in the world, much less Tübingen, would give him a doctorate on such a trash. And let me add that my conviction is based only on what is contained in the book published.

I want to know definitely if the so-called dissertation was accepted as worthy of the degree and if Mr. Misra passed the oral. From what you have stated the reply seems to be in the affirmative. Then why is Prof. Paul Thieme continuing to observe silence? Was there none else in the Committee of Examiners?

Please enlighten me in full details. I will appreciate.

Thanking you,

I received the following letter from Dr. Klein dated 27-3-1979:

Some time after having received your letter of February 14th I will try to reactivate my English in order to enlighten you in full details, even if the affair cannot--as it seems to me--be wholly clarified.

Now let me answer your questions in the order of your letter:

1) It seems to me that you understand German rather good: Mr. Misra did not really qualify for the degree as he has missed up to this day to submit the prescribed copies of the dissertation. He delivered his dissertation the 18th of February 1972, passed the "oral" the 29th May 1972, received a "preliminary certification" the 12th of June 1972 and since this time didn't anything else happen here at the Dekanat; although we wrote him (Varanasi -5) several times.

2) Why Mr. Misra did not submit the copies, even if the book is printed, is a question which can be answered perhaps by Mr. Misra, but not by us. We also cannot understand why he renounces to get the legal right to bear the title.

3) We also see that on the title-page of the printed book, of which you sent us some copies, "this very title" can be seen-- but what can we do here, even if
the book is--as you write--a trash? We only can say to you that, what Mr. Misra delivered as dissertation (we do not know whether this is identical with the printed book or not), was accepted by the two "reviewers", Prof. Thieme and Prof. de Simone. Whether Prof. Thieme has reason to say anything to this affair or not, also is a question not to be answered by us.

I hope that these specifications suffice for you.

And this is what I wrote to Dr. Klein finally on April 9, 1979:

Thank you for your kind letter of March 27, 1979. I am fully satisfied. You have totally clarified the matter.

If Misra submitted his "dissertation", passed the "oral" and also obtained a "preliminary" certification, he is a de facto doctor, if not de jure.

Whether the "published" book is worth the degree is besides the point, as you have ably pointed out.

There is nothing that we can do about the matter we have discussed so far.

My criticism of Misra's work, running to more than 200 pages (entitled "Bilhana's Vikramankadevacarita and its Neo-expounders") is getting ready for the press. Now I am in a better position to expose the hollowness of this imposter.

The following may be added as a footnote to the above:

While Mr. Misra was conducting his "Investigations" in Tbingen, another scholar was working on the same poet in Varanasi, (India), the ancient home of Sanskrit learning. His name is Priyatama Chandra Shastri, and he earned "Vidyavaridhi" (Ph. D.) from the Sanskrit University, Varanasi. The title of his "sodhaprabandha" is VikramAnka deva- caritasya Sathityikam Sarveksaman. We don't know if the work is published yet or not, but we have acquired a xerox copy. Limitations of space do not permit us to present even the highlights of this work. Suffice it to say that if try to condemn and criticize this book another book will emerge of the same size. We still wonder how any University, much less Sanskrit University in Varanasi could award a Ph.D. on such a shallow and hollow work. It does not deserve even an M.A. Research scholars like Shastri should find a good guru who might open their eyes and guide them as to how to prepare a true and worthy thesis.

Incidentally, Priyatama Chandra Shastri acknowledges the debt of one Dr. Chandrika Prasad Shukla, because his krti among others was helpful to PCS. I have not heard of any work on Bilhana by CPS. Let us find out. PC's "Bibliography" does not describe this work.
CHAPTER I

SPECIMENS OF TEXTUAL DIFFICULTIES

[1] Misra begins his learned discourse with the following:


The verse in reference is:

\[ \text{Uttarjanśkena muhuḥ kareṇa कृतकृत्वेक्षणाबध्वलक्षाḥ.} \]
\[ \text{Rūṣā niṣedhanniva ceṣṭāṇि ḍikpālavargasya nirargalāni. [1:48]} \]

We do not know what, if any, "difficulty" is here. The great lexicographer Amara lays down: lakṣāṃ lakṣyaṃ śāravyaṃ ca. Both lakṣa and lakṣya are equally correct, legitimate, and acceptable. They are both derived from the same root-- lakṣa ālocane. (10th class, ātman. set). Ghaṅ gives us lakṣa, while Ṛyat gives us lakṣya. We can have eva from both.

Apte, Monier-Williams and all other lexicographers explain as well as illustrate both:

Prāpnotyāśu param śthānam lakṣāṃ mukta ivāśugaḥ.
Pratyakṣavad ākāśe lakṣāṃ baddhvā.
Utkarṣaḥ sa ca dhanvinām yad iṣavaḥ siddhyanti lakṣe cale.
Darpeṇa kautukavatā mayi baddhalakṣyaḥ.

There is nothing wrong. It is all ghaṭātopo bhayaṅkaraḥ on the part of Misra. Misra cites the following on lakṣya and lakṣa:

01:48b  कृतकृत्वेक्षणाबध्वलक्षाḥ.

12:05  Gavākṣarandhrair avalokayantī lakṣīkṛtā kāpi manobhavena.
18:30 Krīḍāvātāyanakṛtapadasyaiva lakṣībhavanti
[The above two have been listed twice unnecessarily by Misra.]

07:73 Kāmaḥ sampratī bāṇamokṣarasiko
lakṣyeṣvalakṣyeṣu ca.

12:76 Sthalaviluṭhitabāṣpavyaktīlakṣyaiḥ kaṭākṣaiḥ.

13:19 Ghanoparodhāt taralākṣi lakṣyate.

13:52 Jarāvimukteva mṛgākṣi lakṣyate.

13:55 Svabhāvanilāḥ katham atra lakṣyatām.

17:04 Kvacin na durbhikṣam alakṣyata kṣitau.
[We don’t know why Misra has included such verbs here!]

18:81 Durlakṣyatvam kaliyugṛśām prāpīte brahmadhāmnā.

We do not understand either why Misra had to give so many examples. Did he want to exhaust the universe? Of course, not, because we have many more such examples, e.g.:

Pañçeṣuḥ calalakṣabhedavidhinā garvaṃ samārohati.
[7:72]

It was all

Yena kena prakāreṇa prasiddhaḥ puruṣo bhavet.

So, Misra’s conclusion that lakṣa is a case of wrong orthography is absolutely wrong, since lakṣa is a legitimate and grammatical variant of lakṣya.

Bilhaṇa says:

Jigṛśavah ke’pi viṣītya viśvam vilāsadīkṣārasikāḥ kramena.
Cakruḥ padaṃ nāgaraḵhaṇḍacumbi-pūgadrumāyāṃ diśi daksiṇasyāṃ.

Nirviṣenāpi sarpeṇa kartavyā mahatī phaṇā.
Viṣam bhavatu mā vāstu sphaṭātōpo bhayaṅkaraḥ.
[ghaṭātōpo bhayaṅkaraḥ ityapi pāṭhaḥ.]

Here is a discussion on nāgarkhaṇḍa by Misra [p. 33]:

47
nāgarakhaṇḍa- (1.64; 15.6). possibly written for nāgarṣaṇḍa- (cp: above p. 9 on khaṇḍa-/-ṣaṇḍa-), is unknown to the dictionaries (cp. remark in Eng. rend. on 1.64). Since nāgara- is quite common as a designation of a kind of ginger, nāgarakhaṇḍa- might be taken as "piece of ginger" (cp. Stein's remark in Eng. Trans. of Rājat. 7.194). A close examination, however, shows that the word is a name of a creeper from which a particular betel leaf was taken [when?] or the designation of this betel leaf itself. [It is common (or uncommon) to take a rope to be a snake! But a close examination, however, shows that the rope is a rope and not a snake!! We find it difficult to accept the type of research Mr. Misra has performed. The Caritacandrikā had explained this as early as 1945!]

Characteristic seems Vcar. 1.64:

nāgarakhaṇḍa-cumbipūgadruma
"arecanut trees touching nāgara-khaṇḍa" (15)

Misra's footnote

15. Description of areca-nut trees kissing betel-creepers here, and betel-embracing the areca-nut trees elsewhere (cp. Ragh. 6.64; Viddha, 4.11). symbolizes love union. Cp. also

15.6ab subhaṭaḥ pramadākarāṛārptaḥ [!]

dalayan nāgarakhaṇḍavāṭīkām.

"A soldier cracking a nāgarakhaṇḍa roll (Hindi: bīṛā) [!] offered him by the hand of his beloved one."

Other occurrences of this word: Sambhukavi, Anyoktimuktālata (KM.2), v.6: pakvaṁ nāgarakhaṇḍapallavam "a ripe sprout [leaf?] of the nāgarakhaṇḍa" Skm. 2081, ascribed to Rājaśekhara: paṁnam nāgarakhaṇḍam ādrasubhagam "a green beautiful leaf of the nāgarakhaṇḍa."

Even in Rājat. 7.194 nāgarakhaṇḍa- "a particular betel leaf" (thus tr. R.S. Pandit is superior to "ginger piece." (tr. M.A. Stein).

In fact nāgaraṣaṇḍa- is in modern Gujarati language a designation of a particular betel leaf. It seems necessary, then, to correct the orthography of our MSS. [!] (nāgarakhaṇḍa) and read nāgaraṣaṇḍa-, when [?] it means "betel creeper or leaf." [We do not agree at all!]

Probably nāgaraṣaṇḍa- corresponds to what in Hindi is known as nāgaripān, cf. Hindī - Śabdāsāgar, vol. 5, s.v. This is considered to be a superior quality of betel in some areas of the Indian subcontinent. Cp. the Gujarati saying: pāṇamāḥi nāgaraṣaṇḍa pāṇa "amongst Pāṇ (Piper betel) Nāgaraṣaṇḍa is the [best] Pāṇ." Karpūravallī, Vcar. 9.6 0, in Hindi known as kapurti [sic], is another variety of betel, yellowish, hard, and full of veins, but of good taste and smell.
nāgaripān and kapurśpān are perhaps cultivated betels and liked by the eaters for their particular smell, i.e. of ginger and camphor respectively.

How about Tāmbūlām kaṇṭutikṣtam uṣṇamadhuram?

Misra seems to have had a good deal of trouble understanding the text and makes an excellent display of his wonderful flights of imagination, soaring high up in the skies. To us all that seems redundant.

"Nāgara is nothing but "nāgavallī." We have numerous uses of these two words in Sanskrit literature. For example, Bhūlokamalla Someśvara (III) in his Vikramāṅkābhyudayā:

Sammukhopaviṣṭayā kucataṭavisravastavasanayā dayiyayā diyamāna karpūra kastūrī kā- vimiśra cūrnāvaliptakaparakipāṇḍura- nāgarakhaṇḍapamāṇīlikah. [p.25]

Misra says that "khaṇḍa" is not correct, and so it should be replaced with "śaṇḍa." He just shows his lack of knowledge of Sanskrit literature. "Khaṇḍa" is correct--as correct as "śaṇḍa." It means "multitude", "assemblage", "group", etc. Apte also gives examples containing expressions like "tārakuṇḍasaya." Bhūlokamalla Someśvara too has nāgarakhaṇḍa. In brief, "nāga" and "nāgara" are synonymous.

Is it too early for Mr. Misra to know that JMS frequently interchanges kha and śa? We don't know if he knows even today the birthplace of Bilhaṇa. It is not Khonamukha but Khonamuṣa. Until N appeared all, repeat ALL thought it to be Khonamukha. Do you get the point, Mr. Misra?

For Misra's enlightenment we may cite one more khaṇḍa in:

Nārikelaphalakhaṇḍatāṇḍava-kṣuṇṇatatkuharavāvivīcayaḥ.
Yatra yānti marutaḥ smarāstratām dhūtapakvakadalsamārddhayah. [5:22]

Khaṇḍa and śaṇḍa both are correct and appropriate, grammatically and by usage. Misra's suggestion to throw one out and adopt the other is uncalled for. cf. Discussion on 1.64.

* * *

Regarding the word pratiṣṭhā in:
Āraktam argharpaṇatparanām siddhāṅganānām iva kuṇkumena.
Bimbaṁ dadhe bimbaphalapratiṣṭhāṁ rājīvinījīvitavallabhasya. [1:35]

Misra has the following learned discourse [pp.35-36]:

Pratiṣṭhā-"likeness, sameness" is an idiomatic use of Bilhaṇa, not recorded in lexica:

The trouble with Misra is that he proceeds with a pre-conceived notion. He wants to find out in Bilhaṇa and in his own little "lexica" what his mini-mind dictates. The question is: Why to interpret pratiṣṭhā as "likeness" or "sameness" here? Pratiṣṭhā is to be t
aken here in the sense of "pre-eminence, superiority, high rank or position, fame, celebrity." (Monier-Williams).

1:35cd
bimbam dadhe bimbaphalapraśṭhām rājvinījīvita-vallabhasya.

"The orb of him who is the lover of lotuses [male or female?] (i.e. the sun) took the likeness of a bimba fruit." 1.41... ātapatram....kuraṅganābhītilakapraśṭī hām... samār ohati, "the umbrella climbs up/ aquires the likeness of a tilaka of musk."

There are some instances where pratiṣṭha is used in its literal [?] sense, as a derivat on of prati-sthā "to stand against", meaning "footing, standing": 1:57ab kṣmābhṛtkulān ām uparī pratiṣṭha hām avāpya "having gained footing above the family of the kings/mountains"; 1.66cd

Viṣṇoḥ pratiṣṭhēti vibhīṣaṇasya rājye paraṃ saṃkucitā babhūvuh

"They shrank / refrained from [entering] however, with respect to [why not into?] the kingdom of Vibhīṣaṇa (Ceylon) [thinking]: it is the standing point [or establishment ?]/ domain of Viṣṇu."

Cp. also 3.17; 16.29: para pratiṣṭha "firmest stand"; 1.79: kulapraśṭha "firm stand of a family"; 18.59: śāstrapratiṣṭha "firm footing in the [traditional] teaching." [Misra is wrong: It is not 18.59 but 18.56. He did not even proof-read properly] It seems that pratiṣṭha- in the sense of "likeness" is derived from "reflection [in a mirror]", [not necessarily] lit. "what takes its stand [in the mirror]". Compare. 6.48ab

Pratiphalaṇānibhāt sahasrabhāsā maṇimayapalyayanapraśṭhītēna...
"by the sun, sitting under the pretext of reflection, on the saddle made out of jewels". [pp.35-36].

[This example has no relevance here, none whatsoever.]

Although N's Caritacandrikā translates pratiṣṭha hām as sāmyam, it can also mean pada m. Bh puts it better. He says "pratiṣṭha hām savarṇatvāt sārūpyam", i.e. tādāmyam, abhe daḥ.

We don't have to insist that it means "likeness", "sameness", and that it is an idiomat ic use, or that we have to bring in a "mirror" or "image" or "reflection" to prove our poi nt.

Incidentally Misra has also discussed the meaning of saṅkucita with reference to 1:6 6 where it occurs with pratiṣṭha in the above-quoted para (p.30).

The word 'saṅkucita' has many meanings. It may be taken here to mean 'narrowed' or 'cowering'. It can be better explained in context. Here is the full verse:

Dvāpakṣamāpālaparamparānām dorvikramād utkhananomukhās te.
Viṣṇoḥ pratiṣṭheti Vibhiṣanasya rājye param saṅkucīḥ babhūvuh. [1:66]

The kings of the Cālukya dynasty were bent upon uprooting all the rival kings of the island-countries. However, they spared the kingdom of Vibhiṣanā simply because it was founded by Lord Viṣṇu, having appeared on this earth in the form [incarnation] of Śrī Rāmacandra.

We have used the word "spared." We can put it in a different way: They did not dare touch the Island of Śrī Lāṅkā. But for the fact that it was founded by the Lord Himself, the Cālukya kings would have certainly conquered the Island of Śrī Lāṅkā as well!

We have another use of "saṅkucītha" by Bilhaṇa: Lāṅkāpateḥ saṅkucitam yaśo yat. 1:27. Here it means merely "narrowed down, not allowed to spread far and wide."

We would like to stress once again that Misra misses the essence of the word pratiṣṭhā which has a very profound meaning. The following meanings may be noted:

Base for support:
Dharma viśvasya jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā.

Firm basis:
Apratiṣṭhe Raghujyeṣṭhe kā pratiṣṭhā kulasya naḥ.

Foundation site:
Lokasya nābhīr jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā.

An object of glory:
Tyaktā mayā nāma kulapraṭiṣṭhā.

Installation, inauguration, or the consecration of an idol or image:
Calācaleti dvividhā pratiṣṭhā jīvamandiram.

Also Prāṇapraṭiṣṭhā.

The following verse provides an excellent opportunity for Misra to display his great vītaṇḍāvāda:
Yasyāṇjanaśyāmalakhaḍgapaṭṭa-jātāni jāne dhavalatvam āpuḥ.
Arātināriśarakāṇḍapāṇḍu-gaṇḍasthalīnirluṭhanād yaṣāṃsi. [1:71]

Misra says:

"Whose fame...became white, I fancy, because of its rolling (nih-lu (h) (33) on the cheek, white as sugarcane stalks (34) [from grief], of the wives of the enemies.

He adds footnotes:
33. Cp. nirlu (h) ana- : 5.3
34. For whiteness of (ripe) sugar-cane stalks cp. e.g. Viddh. 1.32/33...[?] paripākāpāṇḍurāṇām śarakaṇḍānam. [Note: Misra's quoted word is śarakaṇḍa, yet he translates it as "sugar-cane stalks."]

Misra tries to demonstrate his prākāṇḍam pāṇḍityam which is like a šaśa-śṛṅga!

This is an utprekṣā, that is: a poetical fancy, not a description of a real happening. The poet imagines the fame (actually: "the fames") of the king to roll/wallow on the cheeks in a feeling of exuberance, like say, those horses of verse 1.67 (cp. also 7.37). In reality "fame" is always thought to be white by nature, it need not become white. [p.41].

We are not sure if Mr. Misra understood the poet. Even if he did, whether his readers would understand Misra. At least we fail to understand. Misra has omitted the following words from his quoted verse: Aṅjanaśyāmalakhaṇḍgapa aṅṭāṇī--the fame is generated from (born out of) the (blade of) sword which is as dark as the aṅjana for the eye (Hindī kājala). Now the "effect"

Collyrium or black pigment used to paint the eye-lashes. Cf. Aṅjānāṇāṁdhasya lokasya jāṇāṅjaṇasaḷākāyā.
Cakṣurumālitaṇi yena tasmai Pāṇinaye namaḥ.

(kārṣṭya) derives its qualities (like color) from the cause (kārṣṭya). That is the law of the nature. If so, how could the fame become white if it is born of a black substance? It must turn out to be black! The poet explains and provides the reason: aratindīṣarakaṇḍaṁ apāṇḍu-gaṇḍaṁsthalṁiru hanād. Yes, Mr. Misra, the fame HAD TO BE TURNED WHITE, of course in the kāvyā-saṁsāra, not in your world; not in mine either. You are truly a mugdhaṁroṣaṁ. You have not explained the word mugdha on p. 38 of your book. Did you ever read Amara: Mugdhaṁo sundara-mūḍhayoḥ.

And, by the way, we don't know what Misra means by the term "nature." Does he mean "the inherent character or basic constitution," or "a creative and controlling force in the universe?" Or, something else? Is it a natural phenomenon? Could we conclude then "that it is white like snow and can be verified by our eyes?" Does Misra have any means to prove its nature?

Here is some information for an antevāsin of German gurus:

Sadyāṁ karasparṇam avāpya citram raṇe raṇe yasya kṛpāṇalekāh.
Tamālaniṁ śāradindupāṇḍu yaśas trilokābhāraṇaṁ prasūte.
Kāvyapraṅkāśe visamālaṅkārodhāraṇaṁ idaṁ.

According to the Bālabodhini commentary on Kāvyapraṅkāśa this verse occurs as no. 62 in the first canto of Navasāhasāṅkacakarita of Padmāgupta Parimala.

Atra kāryaṅkaraṇayōḥ yaśaḥkṛpāṇayōḥ pāṇḍuranīlākhau guṇau viruddhāviti visāmā laṅkāraḥ. Taduktam Nidarśanakāraṁ. Kāraṇagunāḥ kāryagunān [svajātīyaṁ iti śeṣaḥ]
Incidentally we may remark here that we have not tried to study or criticize what Bh has done or undone with regard to the ascription of *alaṅkāras* to Bilhana's compositions. We are not fully prepared at the moment to do it, and the subject is beyond the scope of the present study. However, our curiosity prompted us to see what *alaṅkāra-śāst ra-pāṇḍityam* is demonstrated by Bh in this instance. And here is a quote from Bh:

> Aṇjanena saha khaḍgasya śyāmalatvena sādṛśyadarśanāt gaṇḍasthalyāḥ pāṇḍutve na śarakanḍena sādṛśyāccopamā.

**How simple! How innocent! How inocuous!**

The generations of students to come shall be really helped by the great service rendered by Bh. We are once again reminded of *Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapā ham*.

Bh tells us in his "*Kiṅcit Prāstāvikam*" [p.3]:

> Śrīmanto Baṭukanāthaśāstri-Khistemahodayā Em. E. Sāhityacāryā Rājakṛṣṇa saṃskṛtamahāvidyālayasyaśāhityaśāstrādhyāpakāḥ sāśirvādam dhanyavādān ar hanti, yair āmūlacakulam Saṃskṛta-Hindī-vyākhyāsaḥitaṃ lekharūpam idam nib hālya baḥuṣu sthaleṣu, višeṣato'laṅkāraniveśe kavimātragamy-a-durūhavicārān ām nirdeśam kurvadvhir atra guṇādhikyam utpāditam. [This is merely an atiśa yokti, which is saṃśayokti as well].

Truly it is said: One sparrow does not make the summer. But then we have *Sthālīpul ākanyāya* too. If we take the above example as a rule rather than an exception, then we can declare without any fear of contradiction that Bh has done a great disservice to the poet and his readers.

This is not guṇādhikyam but saḥṛdaya-hṛdaya-vidāraṇam, vācaka-pravaṁcañanam, and hā dḥik kaś am. Bh should have known that this is much more than upamā. *Upamā* is based as the root of all the *alaṅkāras*. We don't know if our "Vidyāvägīśa" has ever come across the following sadukti:

> Upamaikā śailūṣi samprāpya vicitrabhūmikābhedān. 
> Raṅjayati kāvyarange nṛtyantī tadvidām cetaḥ.

The word "jāne" should have opened the closed doors of the mind of Bh!

All this shows that Bh is not an adhikārin at all.

Apparently Bh not only did not study the *Kāvyaprakāśa* (an advanced text) but he did not study even the *Sāhityadarpañā*. 
Tathā coktaṃ Sāhityadarpañe:
    Guṇau kriye [vā] cet syātām viruddhe hetukāryayoh. 69
    ... ... ... ... tad viṣamaṃ matam. 70
    Sadyaḥ karasparśam avāpya citraṃ...
    Atra kāraṇarūpāsilatāyāḥ 'kāraṇagunā hi kāryagunam ārabhante' iti stiter vir
    uddhā suklayāsasā utpattīḥ.

    [Naĩ Dillī: Pāṇini, 1982. p. 593]

    Misra misses here the essence of the poetic charm in a miserable manner. A barber
    cannot be a farmer. Misra might have acquired some knowledge somewhere, but he is
    totally unfamiliar with the kāvyamārga. He is completely sāhitya-vidyāśrama-varjita.
    It is for critics such as Misra that Bilhana sang long ago:

    Kunthatvam āyati guṇaḥ kavānām sāhitya-vidyā-śrama-varjiteṣu.
    Kuryād anārdreṣu kim aṅganānām keṣeṣu krṣṇāgarudhūpavāsaḥ.

    Although, according to Misra "in reality 'fame' is always thought to be white by natu-
    re" yet it was expected to turn out black--it had become black--because it was born of
    a black substance (kāraṇa--aṅjanaśyāmalakhaṇaṇa). So the poet had to find out a
    reason for its turning out white.

    Misra p. 41, lines 17-18.

    Mr. Misra ought to have known that this is a play and display of viṣama alaṅkāra, no
    t just utprekṣā alone! Viṣama is the real vicchitti, real camatkāra. Misra's philosophy o
    f life is--"The easiest is the best." But it is not always true.

    Let us resume our study of Mister Misra: We have learnt at this advanced age, after
    having studied Sanskrit for about five decades, for the first time through Misra that śa
    rakāṇḍa is sugar-cane!

    Apte explains śara as "a kind of white reed or grass." [Probably Mr. Misra uses this
    "sugar" in his tea!]

    cf. Kuṣakāśaśaraiḥ parṇaiḥ suparicchāditām tathā.

    Śarakāṇḍapāṇḍuganḍasthalā.

    Mukhena Sītām śarapāṇḍureṇa.

    And for "śarakāṇḍa" Apte says: a reed-stalk.

    In Śabdakalpadruma, we read:
Tr̃naviśeṣaḥ, kāṇḍa iti Hindībhāṣā. Tatparyaśāḥ iṣuḥ, kāṇḍaḥ, bāṇaḥ. muṇjaḥ, tejanaḥ, guṇḍrakaḥ, iti Ratnamālā.


We know at least this much that sugarcane is not used to make mauṇji-mekhalā. cf. mauṇji-bandhāt prabhṛti. Vik. 18:81.

Explaining this very word (śara) N wrote in his Caritacandrikā: "Śaraḥ--Gundras tej anakah ityamarah. Sarahari iti khyātaḥ. Kāṇḍa daṇḍaḥ. Either Misra did not see it, or disdainfully rejected it.

It is true that "sugar" is regarded white occasionally, when a special kind is meant, like "puṇḍraka-śarkarā"--Dveśyaiva kesām api candrakhanḍavipāṇḍurā puṇḍraka śarka rāpi. (Vik. 1:20). We say "occasionally" because we have the "brown" sugar too. But the stalk is green, never white. It is only when it is turned into edible sugar, that we have some color like brown or white.

The following verse is discussed by Misra in his own inimitable way:

Cālukyavāṃśāmalamauktikaśrīḥ Satyāśrayo'bhūḍ atha bhūmipālaḥ. Khadgena yasya bhṛkuṭikrudheva dviśaṃ kapālāṇyapi cūṇītāni. [1:74]
He says:

For- *mauktikaśrīḥ*, "splendour of the pearl", (in all edd.) read *mauktikah śrī-* and construe śrī- with *satyaśrayah* as an honorific word, which is fully confirmed by the parallel stanzas, e.g. 1:68 *Śṛśtailapāḥ*, 1:79 *Śṛṣṭajasimhadevaḥ*. For the wrong [*?] orthography cp. below on 7:29c; Chap. II, n. 48; Chap. IV, v. 66 [p.1]

It seems Misra possesses some unseen power of forcing the construction the way he wants, even when there is no need at all to go against the *pūrvaśṛṣṭya*. He reminds us of a great sadukti:

Mṛktumbhabālukārandalh-pidhānaracanārthinā.

Dakṣināvartaśaṅkho’yaṁ hanta cūnakrtō mayā.

In trying to mend a hole in an earthen pot, caused by a sand pebble, alas, I broke into pieces--I powdered--a conch-shell possessing a *dakṣinā avarta* (having turns to the right from left--a very valuable object). The great tragedy here is that the *mṛktumbha* (earthen pot) did not have any hole to begin with! Misra punches a hole just to fix it!!

If we connect *śrīh* with *Satyaśraya*, the text would read:

Cālukyavāṃśāmalamauktikāḥ śrīsatyāśrayo’bhudi atha bhūmpālaḥ.

The metre *upajāti*, a union of Indravajrā and Upendravajrā, demands that there must be 11 *aṅgas (or varṇas, or syllables), including conjunct consonants*) in each quarter. If we represent the two quarters as given above, the first will have only 10, while the second will have 12! If we forcibly take "śrīh" to the first one, we will take away all the "splendour" from the *kavi-ukti*. We will do a great injustice to the poetic genius of Bilhaṇa. It will be a literary crime also because there will be a faulty construction (composition). We will generate impurity where there was absolute purity.

Both Bh and Musalgaonkar have rendered the verse as it should be done. "Va mśa" means a dynasty as well as bamboo, which produces the pearl. So the compound should be dissolved as: *mauktikasya śrīr iva śrīr yasya saḥ*. The entire beauty, splendour, and meaning are lost if we force the word *śrīh* merely to be an honorific word just to satisfy the genius of Misra! "Śrīsatyāśrayaḥ" won't get any more *śrīh*. It is unfortunate that some *mugdha* pen-holders who are totally *sāhitya-vidyā-srama-varjītāḥ* try to interpret great poets such as Bilhaṇa and in this process misinterpret them and misrepresent the truth. And it is more painful when they claim to be not only research scholars but also research guides!

Misra cites as an example "Śṛśtailapāḥ" and "Śṛṣṭajasimhadevaḥ". He forgets "Hārīta" and "Mānavya" (1:58) and "Āhavamalladeva" and "Trailokyamalla (1:87). We don't have to have the honorific prefix "śrī-" everywhere. And the question is: Where do we bring it from? We cannot rob Peter to pay Paul! Moreover, *mauktika* is a *nitya*
napuṣsaka word (i.e. it can never be used in either masculine or feminine). Amarasimha's nāma lingānuṣāsanam unequivocally dictates: atha mautkikam. Therefore, we can not have Cālukya vāṃśāmalamauktikāh as Misra ordains. If the reading is changed against the authority of the MS., we will be making Bihānaka commit a literary crime!

* * *

Misra is miserably confused here:

Prthvībhujaṅgāh parikampitāṅgīṁ yaśahpattolluṇthanakelikārāh. Vidhrtya Kāncīṁ bhujyor balena yaś Colarājaśriyam ācakarṣa. [1:115]

Misra expounds the verse as follows [pp. 39-40]:

"Who, as the paramour of the earth (= as a king) snatched/raped by the strength of his arms the royal fortune/the Fortuna of the kingdom of the Colas, whose army (27) had been shaken/whose limbs had started to tremble, (28) after he had opened (29) Kānci (30) /her belt, indulging in the sport of robbing (ud with luṇ h) it (the capital)/her (the Fortuna) of its flags/of her [white] cloth (dress) that was its/her [white] fame/honour.

Misra's footnotes:

27. An army consists of four aṅgas; thus aṅga - stands here for caturaṅga- 'army'

28. I take kampita - to be p.p. of the causative kampaya - when applied to the army [kampayita?] and p.p. of the root kamp when applied to the body of Fortuna. [Is this grammatically possible? We are not competent enough to judge. Even if it is, why it is necessary at all?]

29. Read vivṛtya instead of vidhrtya; [why?]. cp. Bühler, Introd. p. 45 on the difficulty of distinguishing "dha' and "va" in the MS.

30. The capital of the Colas.

This is the most disgraceful translation of a Sanskrit poem I have ever seen. How involved it is!! Only the scholars of the calibre of Misra could grasp the meaning. Others will fumble for ever! They will constantly grope in the dark!! Let us try to understand Misra, if we can:

Misra's words applicable to the prakṛta (upameya):

Who, as the paramour of the earth (= as a king). snatched, by the strength of his arms, the royal fortune of the kingdom of the Colas, whose army had been shaken, after he had opened Kānci [city] indulging in the sport of robbing (ud with luṇ h) it (the capital) of its flags[?] that was its fame.

His words applicable to the aprakṛta (upamāna):
Who, as the paramour of the earth [?] raped, by the strength of his arms, the Fortuna of the kingdom of the Colas [?], whose limbs had started to tremble, after he had opened her belt [?] indulging in the sport of robbing her (the Fortuna) of her [white] cloth (dress) that was her honour.
The above words can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Words of the Poet</th>
<th>Misra's Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prakṛtam or Upameyam</td>
<td>Aprakṛtam/Upamānam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yāḥ prthvībhujāṅgaḥ</td>
<td>Who as the paramour of the earth (= as a king)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ācakarṣa</td>
<td>snatched raped [!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhujayoh balena</td>
<td>by the strength of his arms same [!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parikampitāṅgfīm</td>
<td>the royal fortune of Fortuna of the kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colarājyaśriyam</td>
<td>the kingdom of the kingdom of the Colas, whose limbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colas, whose army had had started to tremble been shaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vidhṛ[ṛ]līya Kāñcīṁ</td>
<td>after he had opened her Kāñcī belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaśāḥpātolluṇṭhanah-kelikāraḥ.</td>
<td>indulging in the sport of sport of robbing (ud with luṇṭḥ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with luṇṭḥ it (the her (the Fortuna) of capital) of its flags her [white] cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that was[?] its (dress) that was her [white] fame. honour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We hope we have represented the interpretation of Misra correctly. If so, Misra has done a ignoble disservice to the poetic genius of Bilhaña.

Here we have a play and display of the figure of speech called "samāsokti". We don't know if Misra reached the bottom! Did he find the tattvam of the ukti at all? Of course, not!

Caritacandrikā explains:


Bh comments:

Anvayah:
Yaḥ yaśaḥpaṭolluṇṭhanakelikāraḥ prthvībhujaṅgaḥ bhujayaḥ balena Kāṇcīṁ vidhṛt ya parikampitāṅgṛīṁ Colarājyaśriyam ācakarṣa.

Vyākhyā:

Yaḥ prasiddho, yaśaḥ Colakṛtir eva paṭas, tasyolluṇṭhanam utkṣepaṇam apaharaṇaḥ eva kelis tām karotīti, yaśaḥpaṭolluṇṭhanakelikāraḥ, prthvyāḥ prthivyāḥ bhuj aṅgāḥ patiḥ kāmukaś ca, bhujayor balena, Kāṇcīṁ tannāṁnāṁ nagāṁ raṣaṇāṅca, v idṛṣṭya jītvā pragrhyā ca, parikampitam aṅgaḥ [or aṅgāni?] yasyā [!] sā, bhayen a premṇā ca kampa- yuktām, Colarājyasya śriyam lakṣmīṁ lalāṅcā”cakarṣa”krṣṭ avān. Atra nparājaḷakṣmī vyavahāre prakṛtasya viṭkatṛtkasya kāṇcī-parigrheṇa haṭhād anyasādhāraṇanāyikā- samākaraṇarūpasāprakṛta-vyavahārasya bhedasam āropāt samāsoktir alaṅkāraḥ. We don't know why Bh has “aprakṛta” twice and "pra kṛta" not even once!

Both M and Bh have missed the significance of aṅga in the prakṛta sense.

This just shows the extent of the literary contribution made by Bh. He is only a prati lipika. If Caritacandrikā did not have it, how could he have it!

And Gajānana Śāstri Musalgāonkar explains this as follows:

Anvayāḥ:

Yaśaḥpaṭolluṇṭhanakelikāraḥ prthvībhujāṅgaḥ yaḥ Kāṇcīṁ vidhṛtya parikampitāṅgṛīṁ Colarājyaśriyam bhujayor balena ācakarṣaḥ. [Prose order of Bh is much better as far as the location of bhujayor balena is concerned].

Vyākhyā:

Yaśa iti. Yaśa eva = Colakṛtir eva, paṭaḥ = ācchādānam, uttarāyaṇastra [!] iti yā vat, tasya lujṭhanam = apaharaṇaṁ, tasya keśaṁ = krīḍā, tāṁ karotī tachīṭaḥ, prthvīvibhujāṅgaḥ = kṣiṭṭaḥ kāmukaś ca, yaḥ Āhavamalladevaḥ, Kāṇcīṁ Colarājadhānīṁ, me khalām ca, vidhṛtya = grhītva, bhayena premṇā ca parikampitāṁ aṅgāṁ yasyāḥ sā tāṁ = veṃmānaṣaṭāṛāṁ, Colarājyaśriyam = Colanṛpatilakṣmīṁ aṅganāṁ ca, bhujayaḥ = bāhvoḥ, balena = śaktīṁ, ācakarṣa = ājahāra; Atra Colanṛpatirājaḷakṣmīvyavahāre [!] kāmukakartṛkasya Kāṇcīparigrheṇa haṭhād anyasādhāraṇāyikāsamākaraṇaṁ pasya aprakṛtāvyavahārasya abhedasamāropāt samāsoktir alaṅkāraḥ. [A copy of Bh]

In Hindi too Musalgaonkar uses uttarāyaṇastra (orhanṭ). We don't understand why he is afraid of removing the adhoṣṭvastra, i.e. the lower garment (the sari)!

Musalgaonkar is another copy-cat! He too misses the significance of aṅga! Kāmad ughā hi mahākavīṁ vāco bhavanti, but Locanābhyaṁ viḥīṇasya darpanāḥ kim kariṣy ati!
Even though all the above interpretations and explanations were available to Misra, he totally fails to understand the poet and displays his poverty of knowledge in the most miserable manner. Translated into simple English, the above verse would read:

Ahavamalla, who was the paramour of the earth (feminine) [i.e. king] and was fond of enjoying the sportive play of robbing the rival kingdom of its cloth-like fame, drew towards himself, by means of the force of his arms, the Śrī [power] of the kingdom of the Colas, whose seven constituent elements (king, minister, allies, treasury, nation (country or territory), fortifications and the armed forces) were all shaken to the bone, after he had seized (plundered or stormed) the city of Kāṅcī, the capital. This is prakṛta, the reality.

We get aprakṛta by śabda-śakti and liṅganirdēśa. Caritacandrikā, Bh and Mk all have explained the verse pretty well. But Misra interprets the verse in a way that is not acceptable to us at all.

We believe Misra was not able to grasp the true meaning of the poet's words! The word ācakarṣa is quite significant. According to Apte, ā + kṛs = [a] to draw towards, attract (fig. also) [b] to deprive, take away by force, snatch. So ācakarṣa in prakṛta take s "b" meaning, while in aprakṛta it takes "a" meaning. We are afraid that Misra, a great disciple of a great German scholar, has missed the boat! He is still standing on the shore. We are not sure whether Misra knows that here is a play and display of a figure of speech called samāsokti, that is, the action of a lover is super-imposed on the king. The words bhujāṅga, aṅga, pa ollun hanakeli and Kāṅcī (in the sense of raśanā or mek halā) the feminine gender of śrī, the root vi-dhā, and finally the root ākṛṣ all are extremely significant.

In the table presented above (showing Misra's interpretation) we do not see the equivalent of the king on the aprakṛta or upamāna side; i.e. there is no kāmuka or lover denoted by the word bhujāṅga.

We don't know how "ācakarṣa" (in the aprakṛta sense) could mean "raped". "Rape" is not a sign of valor. It is a display of brutal force. The word itself is abhorent. We fail to understand also how one could "rape" with the strength of one's arms!

We don't see any anyāṅganā (sādhāraṇanāyikā) here to represent the beloved lady in the aprakṛta or upamāna side who is gotten "raped" by Misra! On one, prakṛta or upameya, side Misra has "royal fortune" (both words beginning with small (lower case) letters. On the other side, i.e. aprakṛta or upamāna, the same "fortune" has been capitalized, with a definite article "The" having been prefixed. But both the "fortunes" belong to the kingdom of the Colas. There is no human person whom Misra could get "rape d."

Abhinavabilhaṇa Misra [that is how we have named Misra] in his profound scholarly way tells us that when Āhavamalla "opened" [!] the city of Kāṅcī (the capital of the Colas), the army of the kingdom of the Colas was shaken. And in his equally unequalled, superior style, he gives a footnote: "An army consists of four aṅgas, thus aṅga stands here for caturaṅga army."
According to Monier-Williams, aṅgam = (a) a limb or member of the body; (b) a division or department (of anything), a part or portion, as of a whole; as saptāṅgam rājya m.

And according to the same authority, rājyāṅga = 'limb of royalty' a requisite of legal administration (variously enumerated as 7, 8, or 9, viz. the monarch, the prime minister, a friend or ally, treasury, territory, a stronghold, an army, the companies of citizens, and the Puro-hita or spiritual adviser). Amara says:

Svāmyamātyasyaḥruṣtoṣa-rāṣṭradurgabalāṇi ca.
Rājyāṅgāni prakṛtayaḥ paurāṇām Śrenayoḥ pi ca.

[Pauraśreṇibhiḥ sahāṣṭāṅgam api rājyam--Rāmāśramī]
And this is how Kāmandakiya enumerates them:
Śvāmyamātyāṣaḥrāṣṭram ca durgaḥ kośa balaṃ suḥṛt.
Parasparapakārīdam saptāṅgaṃ rājyam ucyate.

One of these seven (or 8 or 9) aṅgas is the army (senā), which has four sub-divisions:

Hastyaṣvarathapādātāṃ senāṅgāṃ syāc catuṣṭayam.

That is, there are four divisions of senā, viz. hasti (elephants), aśva (cavalry), ratha (chariot), and padāti (infantry).

Misra’s interpretation here is unacceptable. Parikampitāṅgīm is a viśeṣana and qualifies Colarājyaśriyam, which is the viṇiṣya. It is a Bahuvrhi compound-- pari kampitāṅgāni aṅgāni yasyāḥ sā tāṃ.

Now here yasyāḥ (pronoun) connects with Colarājyaśṛṭḥ: (substantive), i.e the divinity (feminine) of the Cola kingdom (the Fortuna of Misra). So the limbs are hers and not of the army. The question is: When Āhavamalla seized Kāñca, whether the army alone was shaken, or all the other parts of the kingdom too were shaken? We would like to know from Misra whether the king was not shaken, whether the ministers too were not shaken, whether the allies too were not shaken, whether the treasury too was not shaken, whether the entire territory of the Colas too was not shaken, and whether the fortifications too were not shaken? And whether the people too were not shaken? Only the army was shaken! Would it be correct to say so? Let it be repeated that the army [or the armed forces] is only one of the seven aṅgas of the rājyaśṛṭī. The fact is that when all the other constituents were shaken, the army too was shaken. The army is just one constituent element and is already included in the rājyaṅga.

It is to be remembered that unless and until we have a clear and specific mention of the word senā (army), the mere term aṅga cannot stand for the caturaṅgasenā. This is not interpretation. It is all sāhasikasya karma.
We would like to know from Misra why *āṅga* here could not stand for *pāṇcāṅgo rāj anayāḥ*, five-part state-craft:

Sahāyāḥ sādhanopāyāḥ vibhāgo deśakālayoḥ.  
Vinipātapratīkāraḥ sindhiḥ pāṇcāṅga iṣyate.  
*Śabdakalpadrumaḥ*

Or *Ṣaḍāṅgo vedāḥ*? Or *Saptāṅgam rājyaṃ*? Why only *balaṃ*?

Misra tries to surpass our ancient great Indian writer Bhāskarācārya:

Vayam iha padavidyām tarkam ānvīkṣikīṃ vā  
yadi pathi vipathe vā vartayāmaḥ sa anthāḥ.  
Udayati diśi yasyāṃ bhānumāṇ saiva pūrvā  
na hi taraṇīr udīte dikparādhīnavaṇttih. He reminds us of another *sadukti*:

Uṣṭrāṇām ca vivāheṣu gītām gāyantā gardabhāḥ.  
Parasparam praśaṃsanti aho rūpam aho dhvaniḥ.

Whatever Misra says is right! He also reminds us of the great poet Śrīharṣa:

Sāhitye sukumāravastunī drdhaṇyāyagrahagranthīlī  
tarke vā mayi samvidhātāri samām līlāyate Bhāratī.  
Śāyyā vāstu mṛdtāraccchadavati darbhāṅkurāṅ āśṭṭā  
ḥūmir vā hṛdayaṅgamo yadi pāthis tulyā ratir yoṣītaḥ.

Misra claims to be proficient in grammar as well as literature! He says that Āh avamalla raped [!] the Fortuna! And that too "by the strength of his arms." We need not tell Misra that the beloved lady likes her lover draw her towards him by holding her in the girdle [kāṇṭī] after having been deprived of her sārī or *adhovastra*, the lower garment. She enjoys this *keli* (game, or play, or sportive act) on the part of her lover. Her limbs are trembling not because of any fear of danger, but because of the emergenc e of the passionate desire to get engaged in sexual intercourse accompanied with or preceded by kissing, embracing, etc. This is a *sāttvika bhāva*. She is not raped.

Here is some information on *kampa* for the enlightenment of our *mugdhaśirom anī* Misra Maharaja, the great neo-expounder, from *Sāhityadarpāne tritīyaḥ paricched aḥ* [1982 reprint of 1922 ed. of Nirmaya Sagar Press, p. 145]: Rāgadveṣaśramādibhyāḥ kampo gātrasya vepathuḥ. Fn gives another reading of "Ga" ms.

Vepathur yathā

Rāgaroṣabhayādibhyāḥ kampo gātrasya vepathuḥ

*bhayādibhyāḥ* is a better reading as compared to *śramādibhyāḥ*!
Yathā

Mā garvam uduhva kapolatā cākāstī
kāntasvahastalikīta mama mañjarīti.
Anyāpi kim na khalu bhājanam īḍrśīnām
vairī na ced bhavati vepathuḥ antarāyāḥ.
[Refer this to pattravallim kapole]

Rāgād yathā

Vāramvāraṁ tirayati dṛśor udgamaṁ bāspapūras
tatsaṅkalpopahitajādimastambham abhyeti gātram.
Sadyah svidyatayam aviratotkampalolāṅgulikaḥ
pāṁr lekhāvidhiṣu nitarāṁ kampate kim karomi.

Evam roṣādibhir āhyam. Iti "Ga."

Misra is not satisfied with vidḥṛtya! He asks us to change it to vivṛtya. And all this on orthographic grounds! (p.39). The suggestion is not acceptable. Bühler might have indicated the difficulty in distinguishing dha from va (because of similarity), but I have in my possession even today (Oct. 14, 1977) a perfect photo-copy of J. I have just now compared the text once again. Dhṛṣ is clearly visible here. It is as clear as crystal. It cannot be mistaken or misunderstood for vṛ under any circumstances--none whatsoever. We have no right to change the reading unnecessarily and arbitrarily and thus make meaningful words lose their sense. It is a great disservice to the poet. It is an absolute negation of honest and true scholarship.

Misra translates his chosen word as "after he had opened." We fail to understand how the city could be opened! The act of opening is not compatible even with the girdle (kāṇcī), which is always open, i.e. visible. The lover does not have to "open" the girdle to proceed further in the course of rati prasaṅga, i.e. sexual intercourse. We would like to know from Misra if he has ever heard the following sadukti and if he knows what it means:

Praśānte nūpurārāve śrūyate mekhalādhvaniḥ.
Kānte ratipariśrānte kāminī puruṣāyate.

If Misra does not know what is mekhalā he can look it up in one of his lexica [!]. He will know that it is synonymous with kāṇcī. Yes, girdle is an ornament worn over the sāri (lower garment). Here it is used by the lover to draw his beloved (lady) towards himself, to bring her close to his own self. The original word, the word of the poet, vidhṛtya has a dual meaning, equally or even more relevant when applied toward the city:-having laid siege on, having seized, stormed, conquered, plundered, taken possession of, occupied it. We don't know how vivṛtya could give even one of all these meanings!

Undoubtedly, Kāmadughā hi mahākavīnāṁ vāco bhavanti: The sayings of the great poets are divine wish-cows; they would give any boon (meaning) we pray for. A
nd one can derive more than one meaning from a word, yet the \textit{prak\_ti} (root) and \textit{prat yaya} (ending) must admit--have the inherent power to denote the desired meaning. We cannot ask a dead barren woman to deliver a child through her womb!

The poet says: "Ya\_ [bhujayo\_ balena] K\_\_n\_c\_m vidh\_tya Colar\_jya\_sriyam \_\_cak ar\_\_a." Just as a lover draws (attracts, brings closer physically as well as emotionally) his beloved lady towards him by holding her in her girdle, so the King \_havamalla acquired the Cola kingdom by seizing the city of K\_\_n\_c\_, the capital of the Colas. The fall of the city of K\_\_n\_c\_ signalled the defeat of the Cola king and the victory of the Calukyas over the Colas, their inveterate enemies.

How did the lover bring his beloved lady towards him? By holding her in her \textit{k\_\_n\_c\_} (girdle). Girdle became the physical means or instrument in the action of drawing her towards him. She had to be brought close! How? By pulling her. Through what? Through the girdle! This is the meaning. Misra should know that the girdle is not a "belt".

And ladies in India don't wear a "belt" over their saris. It is tied by a knot [See \textit{bandhan\_t} in the verse \textit{--n\_\_v\_\_ svaya\_\_n bandhan\_\_t} or tucked under a petticoat. A belt is removed before the garment can be removed. But the \textit{k\_\_m\_n\_} continues to wear her \textit{k\_\_n\_c\_} throughout her \textit{rati-prasa\_\_ga}. Misra does not tell us how she is drawn by the lover towards him. It is also to be remembered that that part of the body which is right below the front of the girdle is extremely delicate. It sends the message directly to the mind. It serves as the power-source--a means of electrification. Once the lover touches that part, the beloved loses her own self! Read the following:

\begin{quote}
\textit{N\_\_v\_\_m prati pranihit\_ tu kare priy\_\_a sakhyah\_ \_p\_\_m yadi k\_\_cid api smar\_\_m.}
\end{quote}

And

\begin{quote}
\textit{N\_\_vimoks\_ hi mok\_\_a.}
\end{quote}

Also

\begin{quote}
\textit{K\_\_nte talpam up\_\_gate vigalit\_ n\_\_v\_\_ svaya\_\_n bandhan\_\_t v\_\_\_s\_\_a\_\_a slathamekhal\_\_gunadh\_\_\_t k\_\_cid nitambe sthitam. Et\_\_\_at sakhi vedmi kevalam aham tasy\_\_\_ga\_\_sa\_\_ge puna\_\_h ko\_\_sau k\_\_smi rata\_\_ ca k\_\_m katham iti svalpa\_\_ me na sm\_\_tih.}
\end{quote}

\textit{S\_\_ki\_\_mukt\_\_v\_\_t, 86:17 [Kasy\_\_pi]}

We don't know wherefrom Misra gets the "flags". We don't see any! He is \textit{praj\_\_aca k\_\_u} in a sense of the term. [See his discussion on \textit{carmacak\_\_u}, pp.31-32]. Or, maybe he is confused. He may have in his mind the following verse:
Misra might have argued: Wherever there is Kāñcē there are the flags. So there are flags even in 1:115!

Kāñcē padātibhir amuṣya vilunṭhitābhūd
devālayadhvajapaṭāvalimātraśeṣā.
Luṇṭākalupanikilāmbaraḍāmarāṇām.
kaupānakārpanapareva purāṅganānām. [3:76]

August Haack translates the above verse (1:115) as follows:

Although Mr. Misra was breathing German air, he did not consult the German translations. He was aware, but did not procure them.

Dieser König zog die Schutzgöttin des Colareiches an sich, als er durch die Gewalt der Arme die Stadt Kāncē erstürmte, deren Glieder in zitterndes Bewegung versetzt waren, weil er sich ein Speil aus dem Zerreissen ihres Ruhmesgewandes machte.

Re-translated into English, the above would read somewhat as follows:

This king pulled the patron goddess of the Chola kingdom toward him, as he stormed, by the force of his arms, the city of Kāncē, whose limbs were made to tremble, because he made a game of tearing her royal garment.

I don't know German. Therefore, I cannot determine how faithful is the translation in English of German, the original of which is Sanskrit. Assuming that the English rendering is the correct representation of the German, we would declare without any hesitation that the German translation has totally murdered the sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū. It is a disgrace to Indo-German scholarship. Cf. Bilhaṇa’s another poetic gem quite similar to the above (1:115):

Taṁ vibhāvya rabhasād upāgataṁ kṣmābhujāngam upajātasādhvasā.
Lolavārinidhinīkauṇḍalā drāvidākṣitipabhūr akampata. [5:28]
(a play of Samāsokti).

Explaining the verse:
Avikṣamāṇa sadrśam guṇair mama kramāgata śrīr iyam āśrayama purah.
Payodhimadhyaṭhitapotakūpakasthitā śakuntīva muhuḥ prakampate. [2:31]

Misra says:

mama may either be construed with sadṛśam or guṇaiḥ. This kind of construction is styled in Sanskrit kākāṣigolakanyāya-, lit. "the manner [! maxim?] of a crow's eye-ball", a curious term [?] arising from the common belief in India that the crow possesses but a single eye [-ball?], which may readily be transferred from one eye-socket to the other. [p.1]

This is another attempt on the part of Misra to create an aura of his learning. We are reminded of another meaningful sadukti:
Asthāne'nupayogibhiśca bahubhir jalpair bhramaṁ tanvate.

Misra refers to "kākāṣigolakanyāya." We don't know how this "maxim" could be termed as a "term" and how it is "curious"! However, that is aparā kathā. The main point is this. If we take Misra's application of the maxim here as valid, the word "mama" will have to appear as sandwiched in between the two words, "sadrśam" and "guṇaiḥ", just as the crow is said to possess one eyeball in between the two eye-sockets, and which, as a result, could be shifted left or right. But here the case is totally different. The poet's words are "sadrśam guṇaiḥ mama." We don't know how Misra wants to construe these three words: "mama guṇaiḥ sadrśam"? Or "guṇaiḥ mama sadrśam"? The second one is the only correct interpretation. The first one is ridiculous. The hārda of the poet is: By virtue of his qualities he is comparable or equal to me.

If we say "mama guṇaiḥ sadrśam", then the question arises: "sadrśam" of whose? Does Misra want to repeat "mama"? i.e. "mama guṇaiḥ mama sadrśam." That will be an inappropriate interpretation. How and why? Well, the appreciation of poetry is an art of feeling and not a science for verifying facts. It is kāvyārtha-bhāvanā-paripakva-buddhi-vibhava-mātra-vedya. Misra may be aware of the following ukti:

Savāsanānāṁ sabhyānāṁ rasasyāsvādanaṁ bhavet.
Nirvāsanās tu raṅgāntaḥ-kāṣṭhakudyāśmasannibhāḥ.

Of Dharmadatta, as cited by Viśvanātha Kavirāja in his Sāhityadarpaṇa (Nirnaya Sagar ed. 1922. p. 84).

Also

Kaviḥ karoti kāvyāni rasāṁ jānanti paṇḍitāḥ.
Kanyāsuratacāturāṁ jāmātā vetti no pitā.

We don't know if Misra is aware of another maxim which may not sound as "curious" to him as the one referred to by him. It is "dehalalipakanyāya," 'a lamp placed on the threshold lights both the sides.'

If Misra wanted to know the true application of the maxim kākāṣigolakanyāya, he should have referred to "adhītaveda'smi kṛtaśrutagamah", where "asmityaham arthe'vyā yam" or "uttamapurusaikavacanam" of as bhūvi is applicable both to the left and to the right. We can interpret "aham adhītaveda'smi" or "aham kṛtaśrutagamah asmi." It is all improper to talk about astī sentence and asmi sentence, as Misra does. "Adhītavedaḥ" is a Bahuvrīhi compound and so is kṛtaśrutagamah.

As far as "śramo'sti bhūyān itihāsavartmasu" is concerned, we have to bring mama by adhyāhāra and the same adhyāhāra will bring mama for guruṣvajñaśvimukhaṁ sadā manah.

We have just discussed a verse:

Vidhṛtya Kāṇcīṁ bhujayor balena
yaś Colarājyaśriyaṁ ācakarṣa.
This too is a very fine example of kākāśigolakanyāya or dehalidīpakanyāya. The words "bhujayor balena" could be connected either with what precedes or what succeeds.

* * *

Misra introduces another vitanḍāvāda regarding graha and āgraha in:

Alaµ vi§ādena karo§i kiµ mukhaµ kavo§ÆaniúÅvÁsavidh¦sarÁdharam. 
Abh¥§Êavastupratibandhinám ahaµ krtágraho nigrahaÅya karmanám. [2:38]

On the above Misra says:

2.38d Ægraha- , is used in the sense of "stubborn wish, persistant [sic] resoluction [resolutio n?]", hence krtágraha, "he who has formed a firm resolution." Contrast Hindi āgraha, meaning "request".

We don't know what is the authority for Misra to say that Hindi āgraha means "reques t!"

Cp. āgraha- 5.18, 9.130, 10.87 (emend litlavagāhagraha- to litlavagāhāgraha-); durāg raha "bad (ill-abvised) [i.e. ill-advised] resoluotion". 3.52; 4.115; 6.7; 7.12; 16.42. [p. 2]

But we do not agree at all. Misra refers to many passages where Bilhañá has used the word "āgraha." So he wants that the word "graha", which makes even a better sense in "graham utsasarja" etc. should be discarded. Once again Misra misses the essence. Cf. graha-kalitam ivāgrajam [6.55] Graha = seizing, holding, any state which proceeds from magical influences and takes possession of the whole man! "Graham" makes a better sense here. It is in the above sense alone that the second half acquires a better meaning in Nisargaramye'pi vices ite yad atiprasaŋgo rasabhaṅgahetuḥ. [10.87]

Although Misra indulges in jugglery over "graha" and "āgraha" and wants us to discard one in favor of another, we may submit the following verse that contains both the words in one place:

Na śaśāka nirākartum agrajasya durāgraham. 
Rājyagrahagṛhitānām ko mantraḥ kiṃ ca bheṣajam. [4:115]

Would Misra discard one here too? We don't know what Misra would do in such cases.

* * *

On the verse
Adhitavedo'smi kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ śramo'sti bhūyān itihāsavartmasu.
Guruṣvavajñāvimukhāṃ sadā manas tad abhyapayo'tra mayā na durlabhaḥ.

[2:39]

Misra presents a discourse, which is only his bālacāpalam:

2.39a

kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ of the MS. may be interpreted (cp. p. 1 on 1.74a) as standing for kṛta ṣṛutāgamaḥ. [why?]. If this interpretation is accepted [why?] as it is by the 3rd ed. the construction would be:

Third ed. is not brahma-vākya! That it is not an absolute authority is proved here times without number. Bh is merely a copy-cat. Also, we fail to understand how Bh is the third ed.! It is the fourth.

"I am [the] one who has studied the Veda, who has heard (from an authoritative teacher) the tradition, rather much exertion/strenuous work (bhūyān śramaḥ) has been done (kṛtaḥ...asti) [by me]..."

*   *   *

The word order seems rather strange, [| we do not expect kṛtaḥ before śrutāgamaḥ, because kṛtaḥ belongs in the asti sentence, while śrutāgamaḥ belongs to the asmi sentence. The interpretation of Bühler and ed. sec. (kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ), therefore, is to be accepted:

This is one of those rare instances where Misra talks sense and follows B and N. No, he takes away by one hand what he gives with another! See below!

*   *   *

adhitavedo'smi kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ śramo'sti bhūyān itihāsavartmasu

"I am [the?] one who has studied the Veda, who has done (executed) the tradition of the sacred texts (i.e. of the śruti) there exists rather ample exertion [undergone by me] on the paths of the lore of stories."

An objection against this might be raised. The expressions adhitaveda- and kṛiaśrut āgama- [sic] amount to the same thing, there would be a tautology (paunaruktya or piṣ apeśaṇa).

A possible way to remove this tautology is to emend śrutāgama- into smṛtāgama- , "t he smṛti tradition." The king would refer to his study of the Veda (veda), of the Dharm āśāstra (smṛtāgama) and the Epics (itihāsa). [p. 2]

This is all mattrapralāpa. According to Monier-Williams, smṛti means the whole body of sacred tradition or what is remembered by human teachers (in contradistinction to
śrutī or what is directly heard or revealed to the Rṣis). In its widest application, this use of the term śmrīti includes 6 Vedāṅgas, the sūtras both śrauta and grhya, the law books of Manu, etc. [also] the itihāsas...Smṛta does not mean this body of knowledge! If smṛti in its widest sense includes itihāsa too then there will be paunaruktyadośah! What is śrutam? Anything heard, that which has been heard (especially from the beginning) knowledge as heard by holy men and transmitted from generation to generation, or tradition or revelation. Cf. Kālidāsa:

Śrutasya yāyād ayam antam arbhakaḥ.

Another sādūkti:

Śrotṛaṃ śrutenaiva na kuṇḍalena.

Śabdakalpadrumah: śrutam (śrūyate sma yad iti) śāstram.

Śrutam śāstrāvadhiṣṭayoḥ [iti Amaraḥ.] Vedas, including smṛtis: śrutam śāstrāṇī, Vedāṅgāni, darśanāni ca, itihāṣaḥ, purāṇāni ca.

Our own poet Bilhana too in 18:77:

Dātā parākramadhanaḥ śrutapāradṛśvā

Elsewhere we have explained in greater detail the nature and contents of the MS. A. [My edn. p. 4 (Prastāvanā)]. It belongs to a different lineage (kula-parampara) altogether. Although it gives many acceptable, alternative readings-- sometimes much more desirable than those of J, we cannot accept them if we have to preserve the purity (a sāṅkaryam) of our mūlagraṇthaḥ (arche-type), because, as the Lord Himself has instructed us in the Bhagavad-gītā, saṅkarō narākāyaiva. "Kṛtaḥ śrutāgamah" is the reading of A. Bh has no scruples. We cannot say whether he knows what are the Principles of Textual Criticism. He accepts the reading of A so light-heartedly. Of course, we (N) too have accepted A readings in certain [!] cases, but it was only when there was no alternative--none whatsoever. The great poet Śrīharṣa, (the composer of Naśadhiṇyaśrutō) has benevolently instructed us:

Niṣiddham apyācaraṇīyam āpadi kriyā satī nāvati yatra sarvathā.
Ghanāmbunā rājapate hi picchile kvacid buddhair apyapathena gamyate. 9:36

Also the smṛtis prescribe: Āpatkāle maryādā nāsti.

"Kṛtaśrutāgamah" of J cannot be converted into "kṛtaḥ śrutāgamah" or kṛtaś śrutaga mah because the J text does not read that way! "Kṛtaśrutāgamah" will be only a bahu vr̥ti compound. We are not composing the poem. We are only interpreting it. To prescribe "smṛtāgamah" will be a svacchandācāraḥ. "Smṛtam" can never mean the tradition of smṛtī! It is a useless effort.
Furthermore, we have to consider the following point. The entire family of J [P, B, R & N] has accepted the reading "kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ". Only "A," which belongs to another family and is thus an external entity, an outsider, so to speak, has "kṛtaḥ śrutāgamaḥ." Bh prefers this reading of A, but gives no reason. Here we have a foreign element. J's reading is lost forever as far as Bh is concerned, even though it [J] is better and preferable. Cf. what precedes: adhitavedo'smi.

It is interesting to see the "anvaya," prose order, designed by Bh. Here is an exact reproduction of what he has done:


Bh has forcibly brought "san" in; has taken "kṛtaḥ" from the first quarter to the second; and has taken "asti" from second to the third; and has made "pariśramaḥ" out of "śramah". We fail to understand what is the use of this "drāviḍa-prāṇāyāma," the round-about way.

*                                *                       *

On the verse:

Sa somavannetracakorapāraṇām cakāra gotrasya yad ujjvalānanah. 
Yathocita soma iti kṣamāpates tataḥ prasannād abhidhānam āptavān. [2:58]

M says that rūpaka is preferable here, and adds: "the implied comparison (upamā) is of the prince and the moon, while the eyes are equated with cakora birds (ed.ter. correctly: upamārūpakayoḥ sankarāḥ)" [p.3]

We believe neither Bh nor Misra is right. First of all, the comparison is not implied (vyakta), but denoted (abhihita) in soma-vat by the suffix vat (enjoined by Pāṇini--Tena tulyam kriyā ced vatiḥ).

Secondly, Bh’s conclusion - upamārūpakayoḥ saṅkarāḥ and its approval by Misra both are wrong. Such saṅkara of two alaṅkāras occurs only when there is neither a supporter (sādhaka) nor a detractor (bādhaka) for either of them occurring in one and the same context. Mammaṭa makes this point very clear:

Ekasya ca grahe nyāya-doṣābhāvādaniścayaḥ.

Dvayor bahūnām vā alaṅkārāṇām ekatra samāveśe’pi virodhāt na yatra yugapad a vasthānam, na caikatarasya parīgrahe sādhakaṁ taditarasya vā pariḥāre bādhakam asti yenaikatara eva parighhyeta, sa niścayābhāva- rūpo dvitiyaḥ saṅkarāḥ. [Kāvyaprakāśa: 10th Ullāsa, 140 Vyṛtti]

In the present case (netracakora), we do have a sādhaka, viz., somavat. Since somavat is definitely an upamā, we have to accept upamā in netracakora also because the two are inter-related. Appayyadīksita has dealt with a pertinent case in his Citramāṁ sā and has arrived at the same conclusion:
Astraśvalāvalīdhapratibalajaladher antaraurvāyamāṇe
senānāthe sthite’smin mama pitari gurau sarvadhanvīśvarāṇām.
Karnālaṁ sambrāmeṇa vraja Kṛpa samaraṁ muñca Hārdikya śāṅkāṁ
tāte cāpadvītiye vahati rāṇadhurāṁ ko bhayasyāvakāśāh.

Atra Droṇasyauryaṇopopamā pratibalajaladher ityatrotpamāyāḥ sādhike tyupamādvay
am api saṅjātaparamparam (Citra- mīmāṃsā, Rūpakapra karaṇam. Chowkhamba, 197
1. [pp. 227-280])

So the upamā in somavat should be taken as a sādhikā for the upamā in netracakora
. Hence, Bh is wrong when he says that there is a saṅkara of upamā and rūpaka here.
Misra is doubly wrong because he declares that rūpaka is preferable. [Nagaraja Rao]

Commenting on the verse:

Bhiṣagbhir āpāditasarvabheṣajaṁ vitṛrakṣāvidhimāṇḍalākṣatam.
Viśāradābhīḥ prasavocite vidhau niranramgotravadhūbhīr aṅcitam. [2:80]

Misra dictates:

2.80a
For vitṛrṇa-, "bestowed", (all ed.) substitute vikīrṇa-. "thrown about, scattered", whi
ch seems to be more suitable. vikīrṇa also in 6.10--vikīrṇa...samīra-- "the breezes scatt
ered by".

We fail to understand how breezes could be scattered.

Cp. also 18.14 śīlā viprakīrṇāḥ" the rocks that were scattered." 18.6--kīrṇakarnaṁṛta "
by which nectar for the ears is scattered". aḵṣata- "uncrushed grain", as an object of u
d-kṛt, compare 2.83 aḵṣatotkaraiḥ "by the throwings up of uncrushed grain. [p. 3]

Vitṛrṇarākṣāvidhimaṇḍalākṣatam:

Vitṛrṇa is accepted by all--from J to Bh. Misra recommends vikīrṇa for it. Caritacan
drikā explains: vitṛrṇāni rakṣāvidhayya maṇḍalānyakṣṭāś ca, the latter two words going
back to J gloss. Vitṛrṇa = datta. Cf. ĺaradvitṛrṇasauḥbhāya [16:3]. We have already
conferred upon Misra the title of "Abhinavabilhaṇa," because he does not explain or t
ry to improve. He straightaway composes. Certainly rice can be scattered (vikīrṇa); b
ut we don't know how maṇḍala (circular formations) could be scattered!

We do not want to go against J gloss unless it is absolutely unavoidable. However,
maṇḍalākṣata could be suggested as an alternative reading to be considered for maṇḍ
alākṣata.

The last word in this verse (aṅcitam) ignites Misra’s power of argumentation (vitaṇḍā
vāda). He says:
On --aṅcitam (ed.sec. and ter), see below chap II n.2. [p. 3]. And the "note" expounds:

Cp. 2.80d for arcitam in MSS. (?) and ed. pri. aṅcitam in ed. sec. (followed by ed. ter) is done needlessly by the editor, obviously in silent reference to Pāṇ. 6.4.30 and 7.2.53, yet Bilhaṇa has no example of aṅcīta in this sense. [p. 26]

Let us see what these words mean:

arc = To adore, worship, salute, welcome with respect.  
It also means to honour, i.e. decorate and adorn.

aṅc = Also means worship, honour, reverence, adorn, grace.

aṅcīta = Honoured, adorned, graced, graceful, handsome.

Some examples of the use by great poets:

Dordaṇḍāṅcitamahimā;

Gateṣu līlāṅcitavikrameṣu;

Kanakācala-saṅkāśa-devatāyatanāṅcīte;

Api khaṇjanam aṅjanāṅcīte.

Aṅcitābhyaṃ gatābhyaṃ.

Here are the variant readings of the word under discussion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>reads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>arccitam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>arcitam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>aṅcitam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bh</td>
<td>aṅcitam but interprets pūjitam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>arcitam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>acitam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J has arccitam. However, J gloss has bhūṣitam, meaning thereby that the reading ought to be aṅcitam, which is also madhuratara. So N adopted it. Linguistically both mean the same. However, the primary meaning of arcitam would be pūjitam, "worshiped" while that of aṅcitam would be bhūṣitam, "adorned." N did not adopt this "in silent reference to Pāṇ," as Misra puts it [p. 26]. I am amused by the use of the word "silently" by Misra. He is very fond of the word "silent" or "silently." He expected N to announce every change by beating the drum. On p. 63, under 16:51(c) he says: "ed. sec. changed silently--". On p. 26, note 2, he says "obviously in silent reference." He says further: "Yet Bilhaṇa has no example of aṅcīta in this sense." We don't know what he means by the word "this"! He professes to know everything, yet he forgets that Na hi sa rvaḥ sarvaṃ jānāti: Everyone does not know everything! His statements are always i
ndicative of authority. Maybe he means "stealthily" and uses a word to make it appear as innocent.

Ātmavat sarvabhūteṣu yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati.

Anācitam is explained in J gloss by the word bhūṣītam in 2:80. Now arcitam does not mean bhūṣītam in its primary sense.

Misra says Bilhana had not used the word anācitam anywhere in this sense. If by the word "this" he means "bhūṣītam", Misra ignores the following verse:

Anena nūnam jaladheṣu samuddhṛtam vicitaratnāṅkuradanturaṃ payaḥ.
Anekavarṇāṅcitam anyathā katham payomucā nirmitam indrakārmukam. [13:21]

In 2:80 Bh forces anācitam to mean pūjitam, but Caritacandrikā has already put bhūṣītam. And this word goes back to J gloss, i.e., J gloss too has bhūṣītam. Bh had no justification in accepting the reading of N and rejecting his meaning. We are instructed: Vā garthāviva sampāktau. The word and its meaning go together. Bh rejects the reading [vāk] of B presented by J, but accepts his meaning (artha) i.e., pūjitam. B & G translate the word in question "arcitam" by "worshiped." So they follow Bühler's text.

In 13:21 B & G avoid the issue. They translate the verse as follows:

By this (cloud) certainly the water, bristling with variegated gems, had been raised from the ocean; otherwise, how was the multicoloured rainbow made by the cloud? [In any case, the translators do not go to Pāṇini to settle the dispute!]

On p. 29 Misra discusses "anācitam." He translates it as "marked (characterized) by." I have put it as viśiṣṭam (in Candrikā). But it can mean bhūṣītam as well. MW puts "distinguished" as a meaning of anācitam.

We are not sure if Misra had seen the following saduktis of our own poet, Bilhana:

Ityudaṅcitavilāsarasānām. [11:67]

and

Udaṅcitabrūlatikāpatākam akāraṇād eva mukham cakāra. [9:84]

Misra tries to exhibit his erudition:

Viveśa subhrūr atha sūtikāṛgham pradhānadaivajñānivedite dine.
Samullasadbhiḥ śakunaiḥ sahasraśaḥ samarpayantī nṛpater mahotsavam. [2:81]

He says:
2.81d
samarpayantī nrpater mahotsavam, "offering the king a great festival", genitive far [i.e. for] dative: In later [!] Sanskrit, the use of genitive instead of dative is found with increasing frequency. This is due to the influence of the vernaculars in all of which the genitive has taken over the function of the dative. Further examples from our text are:

2.89a
akathayad avanīndor nandanotpattivārttām "told the king the news of the birth of the son";

9.31ab...
smaraḥ...asyāḥ kathayām babhūva...."the god [God?] of Love told her..."

9.73b...
sakhīnām kim api bruvāṇā...."saying something to [her] girl friends";

9.93a
pradarśayām āsa tataḥ kumāryāḥ

Misra's carmacakṣuṣṭi are functioning here in a normal way. He says [in a fn]: "kumāry āḥ is a conjecture cf [i.e. of] ed. sec; Bühler has in accordance with the MS. kumāryā m which is not construable."

But on p. 16 he discusses the same reading. This time even his carmacakṣuṣṭi fail him.

then he [who? Should be she! The subject pratihārarakṣī is a woman Misra, and not a man!!] showed to the maiden....."

9.94
yasya... maurvīravāḥ ... pāṭālatalasthitānāṁ...kathayām babhūva

"whose bowstring twang told those who dwell on the bottom of the Pāṭāla....";

13.50ab
samarpayāṁ āsa payāṃsi... jaladhīḥ payomucām "the ocean offered water to the clouds." [pp.3-4]

But Macdonell says:

Genitive--frequently (instead of the dat. of the indirect object) with verbs of giving, telling, promoting, showing, sending, bowing, pleasing, being angry. (Sanskrit grammar. p. 193). [examples:]

mayā tasyābhayam pradattam.
kim tava rocate eṣāḥ?
mamānatikruddho muniḥ.
Misra says: "In later [?] Sanskrit the use of genitive instead of dative is found with increasing frequency..."

We don't know what Misra means by "later" and which specific vernaculars he is referring to. He did not specify the period when this transition took place or even started.

Pāṇini clearly declares:

Caturthyarthe bahulaṃ chandasi (śaṣṭhī syāt) (2.3.62).
([In the sense of] caturthī in the Vedas.)

So we have śaṣ hī even more frequently in the Vedas than in the classical Sanskrit. Is the Vedic language also later? Later to which language? Which vernacular influenced it? Misra merely asserts; he does not prove.

*   *   *

Let us study Misra's comments on:

Caṅcaccāraṇadīyamānakanakaṃ sannaddhatadhvani
sphūrjadgāthakaluṣṭhyamānakaraṭi

The correct reading for the second caraṇa is: ...kara i [and] prārabdha..., i.e. there are two compound words here--

1. sphūrjadgāthakaluṣṭhyamānakaraṭi, and,

2. prārabdhanṛtyotsavam. (or nṛtto?)

There is a padaccheda in between the two in J.

The elephants are not dancing. They are just being robbed (taken away) by the singers. The dance is performed by the dancers.

This correction was done only in December 1982. However, Bh has had two separate words all along-- another play of ghunāksaranyāya! Misra could have very well seen it if he did not have the primary intention of displaying his erudition everywhere.

Pūṇam maṅgalatūrīyaadundubhiravair uttālavaitālikā-
śālgālaṅghitaapūrvapāṛthivam atha kṣmāhbhart āśīd grham.

[2:90]

He says:

For caṅcat- (all edd.) read carcat- , and for -kara i - "elephant" in b read with Bühler -kara am "A kind of drum." For discussion of this pāda [?] cp. Chap. II on root lu . [pp. 45-46] [p. 4]
Bühler is wrong. Misra is doubly wrong when he rejects N's (i.e. J's) reading and follows the path of one who has no knowledge of direction! J has "kara cheduler, very clear, absolutely and unquestionably. Furthermore, J gloss puts "hāthi" as a synonym for "kara i". So there is no doubt that the meaning "elephant" antedates 1286 V. (1229/30 A.D.)!

Misra says on pp. 45-46:

The MS. reads kara i-, which would be "elephant." If this is adopted, no acceptable sense can be worked out from the text: "where elephants were being robbed" cannot be twisted into "were carried away" (i.e. fascinated [by the singers]) as interpreted by Eng. rend., apart from it that elephants are not known to enjoy music. (stress added)

Misra has a fn no. 41 on the word "fascinated," which reads as follows:

"To fascinate in Sanskrit would be mano (acc.) hṛ. A mano (acc.) luṇḥ h in the sense of "to fascinate" would, of course, be unexceptionable" [!]. [We don't know what Misra means by "unexceptionable"!]

We don't know where he gets his knowledge from! How does he know that elephants do not enjoy music? Who told him so? We wish he had read some books on elephants before he made such a statement.

Mātaṅgallā of Nīlakaṇṭha, 8:4, clearly states: gāṇapriyam [gajam]. Also 11:40: viṇ ādigātapriyayah [gajah].

In the Pratijñāyaugandharāyana ascribed to Bhāsa, Udayana is described as catching elephants by luring them by means of the sound of viṇā.

Gajaṃ tam ahaṃ viṇādvitīya ānayāmi. (I act)

and

Śrutisukhamadhurā svabhāvaraktā karajamukhollikhitāgraghrṣṭatantṛī. Rṣivacanagateva mantravidyā gajahṛdayāṇi balād vaśīkaroti. [2:12]

Here is a beautiful translation of Purāṇa-Bilhaṇa's Muse rendered by Mr. Misra! What a contrast!! Misra's words are:

"The king's palace...was one in which gold was being given to alternately [?] reciting bards, in which the sound of singing was connected (continuous), in which the male singers were bursting forth (loud songs) in which drums were beaten, in which a festival of dancing had started." [p.45]

We don't know what is the Sanskrit equivalent here [of Bilhaṇa] which Misra has translated as "alternately." Caṇcat is the only word that could be thought of (Misra's favorite phraseology!).
So all the elephants were removed by Misra. The singers did not get them at all. They were left only with the drums to beat and make loud noise of music!

We are not sure if Mr. Misra had ever seen the following immortal composition from the pen of Kavikulaguru Kālidāsa:

Janāya śuddhāntacarāya śaṃsate kumārajanmāṃtrasammitākṣaram.
Adeyam āsīt trayam eva bhūpateḥ śaśiprabhaṃ chatram ubhe ca cāmare.

Let us now consider Misra’s remarks on caṅcat:

Misra recommends carcat for caṅcat. It is merely avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram. There are innumerable verses in Sanskrit literature beginning with caṅcat. One has just to go through the indices of the anthologies. And let us remember: Here we are talking in terms of the word caṅcat in the beginning only. It may take a lot of time, money, and energy to find the word in the middle or end, unless and until we consult concordances of the words of great poets, or compile them if these are not available in the published form, and then study them.

We fail to understand why Misra wants to discard caṅcat in favour of carcat which latter is terribly harsh and karṇaka u and cannot equal the former in beauty. There are many verses which show that Misra’s suggestion does not carry any weight. For example,

Caṅcaccandrakarasparśa-hārṣonmīlītatārakā.
Aho rāgavatī sandhyā jahāti svaym ambaram.

[Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa. Kiṣkindhā, 30:45]
And

Caṇḍacakolāṅcalāni pratisaraṇarayavyaṣṭaveṇīni bāhor
vīṣeṣād daksīṇāsyā pracalitavalarṣphālakolāhalānī.
Śvāsatṛtyadvacāṃsi drutaṃ itararaktksiptalolālakāṇi
srastasraṇāഞy praṃadom dadhati mrǥadṛṣām kandukakṛṭitānī.

Subhāṣitaratnakoṣe anurāgavrajāyā.

And yes, we should not forget the following sadukti from Bilhana himself:

Puṣpair bhrājiṣṇubhāstraṅkarāṇim agaṇitaiḥ śākhinaḥ ke na yātaiḥ
caṇḍacannistrimśalekhāmayaṃ iva bhuvanaṃ bhrīgamalābhir āste.
Traṅkṛṇyākāndacandrāprarhaṇanibidotsāhakanduladosnāḥ
puspeṣor jāitraṣastraṅvaryatikaravidhayē sādhu sājjo vasantaḥ.

[7:68]

Misra ought to have seen two more occurrences of caṇḍat in Vik. itself.

Yasminnurvīpatigṛhatates tuṅgimā varṇyate kīm
tasyāś caṇḍacaturavananīhūṣitānekebhūmeḥ.
Jāne yasyāṃ Kusumadhānuṣaḥ svargarāmāmanāṃsi
kṛṭāṅvātāyaṅakṛṭapadaṣaivasvākṣibhavanti. [18:30]

And

Yenodīcyāṃ diśi gatavataḥ vantosau gīṛṇdraś
caṇḍacanḍipatiyāṣakhurakṣodalekhaṅvataṃsāḥ. [18:54]

And here is one more caṇḍat from Venīṣaṃhāra:

Caṇḍadbhujabhramitacandrādābhīghaṭa-
saṃcūrṇitoruṣugalasya Śyodhanasya.
Styāṇavanaddhaghanaṃṣonitaṃpanāṃir
uttāṃsasyisyatā kācāṃs tava devi Bhīmaḥ.

The following verse is cited by Ṣobhākara as an example of "vyājastutih":

Caṇḍa caṃbati kāṅcaḥcaralumkhaṃ kaṇṭhāṃ kṣamābandināṃ
no muṇcatyaṣacalendravakṣasya ciram līḷāṃ samālambate.
Kim cālliṅgati dikaṭāṇi vítanate kṛṭāṃ bhujaṅgaiḥ saṃam
kṛtir mānaṃ apāṣya paśya taruṇī dhik ceṣṭitais tāvākī.
[ceṣṭate tāvākī?]  

Ṣobhākara adds:

Atra kṛṭipriyatamātvamukhaṃ nindayā sarvavyāpitvam iti stutir laksyaṃe.

This poet too did not know as much as our Misra did!
Śobhākara has cited one more verse, which begins with the word cañcat. I am referring to it only to show that the attempt on the part of Misra to discard Bilhana's cañcat is unscholarly. The verse is:

Cañcatkañkabhramarabhārāma-rāmāmukhāmbojaparamparaśāh.
Itastataḥ [sic] yatra sarāṃsi śobhām gharmaprasādād dviguṇām avāpuḥ.
Cited as an example of "samādhiḥ."

Let us consult one more authority. Monier-Williams says: Bhvādi cañcati = to leap, jump, move, dangle, be unsteady, shake, Bhartṛ.; Venīs.; Ṛtus.; Gīt.; Kathās.- etc. [Note "etc."]

The word is extensively used by so many great poets and dramatists. Therefore, the contention of Misra that it is seldom used does not hold good. We can only say:

Na hyeṣa sthānor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati.

And

Locanābhyyām vihīnasya darpaṇaḥ kim karishyati.

And we would like to ask Misra where in the world is this carcat used? Is there a single verse which starts with this carcat so dear to Misra? We have not come across any! Sri Misra might have read certain kāvyas not known to us so far where it occurs, but we have never heard of them until now.

Also, what is the meaning of carcat? MW gives the following meanings: carc, cl I. ..cati, to abuse, censure, menace, Dhatup. xvii, 67; to injure, xxviii, 17. Later are given the forms and meanings of carcayati, which are not relevant to us here. Which of these meanings does Misra want here for carcat?

And let us see what Apte says:

carc I.10.U. (carcayati-te carcita) to read, read carefully, pursue study. --II.6.P. (carc ati carci- ) to abuse, condemn, censure, menace.--2 To discuss, consider, investigate. --To injure, hurt.--4 To anoint, smear.

We don't know which of these meanings does Mr. Misra want to apply here?

* * *

The word sāmrājya is discarded by Misra in the following verse. He does not believe in imperialism. He is satisfied with "capacity."

Aurvāgnitapāthodhau candanasyandavāsitāḥ.
Śītopacārasāmrājyaṃ bhejur malayanimnagāḥ. [4:6]
He says:

sāmrājya-, "rulership, empire"... śṭopacārasāmrājyam bhejur malayanimnagāḥ "the rivers of the Malaya [-mountain] acquired rulership in cooling treatment (in the medical sense) [why?]: i.e. "they became royally potent", may just be possible. Easier would be to read sāmartyam, "capacity": [they acquired capacity] for the cooling treatment. Cp. 4.120d sāmartya-, "capacity." [p.6]

Many a time, we find it terribly distressing even to listen to the unreasonable suggestions made by Misra. He wants to replace sāmrājyam by sāmartyam. The idea is not acceptable. We throw away cintāmaṇi and get a piece of pebble in return. Misra forgets that he is not the poet. An "empire" and all the glory inherent therein is million times better than just plain "capacity." Mūrko’pi śobhate tāvat yāvat kiṃcīna bhāṣate!

We don't understand how sāmartyam has the capacity to replace sāmrājyam here!

We wonder whether Misra is serious when he makes such incongruous suggestions. We firmly believe that many of his "emendations" are "insult added to injury," or kṣat e kṣāram. He proceeds with the assumption that there are many "textual difficulties." He tries to solve them for the ignorant. He might have misled some but he cannot mislead all especially those who are guru-kula-kliṣṭa, i.e. who have done some real work in the field and are, therefore, better equipped. This is all extremely tragic.

Bilhaṇa himself had predicted such childish blabberings from critics such as Misra:

Ananyasāmānyagunatvam eva bhavatyanarthāya mahākavīnām.
Jñātum yad eṣaṃ sulabhāḥ sabhāsā na jalpam alpapatibhāḥ kṣamante. [1:23]

We can once again remind misra: Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanam! No one has the right to destroy a beautiful poem if he is unable to understand the exquisite words of great poets like Bilhaṇa.

* * *

Bh is another neo-expounder. We don't know how much did he understand the poet. Here is an example:

Kakubhāṃ bhartṛbhaktānām prccchantīnāṁ nrpasthitim.
Vidravantam ivābhāntam atyantatvaritaḥ padaib. [4:40]

Bh interprets "kakubhāṃ prati dhāvantam iva," running towards the directions!

The messenger was coming towards Vikrama, i.e. the bank of Krishna.

"Sa tatkṣaṇāt parimāna-mukhaṃ sammukhapātinam."

says Bilhaṇa: 4:37.
The dāta was running away from the direction of Kalyāṇa, the Chalukya capital. He was not running toward the direction (dik). He was running away from the north and going toward the south:

"Dadarśa rājadhānītaḥ pradhānam dūtam āgatam."

[4:37].

The directions--diśah-- (depicted to be female, beloved of the King Āhavamalla) were anxious to get the news of Āhavamalla. The messenger did not have the courage to tell them of the death of their lord, their lover, Āhavamalla. So the messenger was running away from them and not running toward them! Bh has supplied his own avyaya--indeclinable particle "prati." "Kakubhām diśam dīso digaṅganāḥ pratiyarthah. [4:37].

From the 6th vibhakti he has jumped back to the 2nd and then supplied his own "prati." He is kartum akartum anyathākartum samarthah. Is he not? But in reality here the genitive (or the possesive) case is used in avajña or tiraskāra or disregard. It may be far as well. "Kakubhām vidravantam," running away from the directions, being afraid of them, "dīso'nādṛtya gacchantam." Bh forgets that prati will demand dvitīyā and not ṣa ṣ ā ṣ hi.

W.D. Whitney in his Sanskrit grammar (Cambridge, Mass, 1923, p. 100) says:

297 (d): A genitive, instead of an ablative, is sometimes found used with a verb of... fearing.

He gives as an example a quotation from the Mahābhārata: bibhīmas tava = we are afraid of thee.

The messenger is coming toward Vikrama from the opposite direction. A significant word of the poet is: sammukhapātinam! The distance between the directions (diśah) and the messenger is increasing. He is not going toward the directions!

Let it be repeated:
Here we have "Ṣaṣ hī cānādare." Pan. 2.3.38. This sūtra gets anuvṛtti from "Yasya ca bhāvena bhāvalakṣaṇam." "Anādare gamyamāne sati yasya kriyāyā kriyāntaram lakṣyat e tasmāt ṣaṣ hisaptamyau stāḥ." As an example, we have "Rudati rudato vā prāvrājīt. Rudantam putrādikam anādṛtya saṁnyastavān iti bhāvāḥ."

Mammaṭa gives an example of similar ṣaṣ hī:

Gāmārūhammi gāme vasāmi naaraṭṭhiim na jāṇāmi.
Nāariṇaṃ pāṇo haremi jā homi sā homi.
Kāvyaparatā.

*    *    *

Misra presents an amusing situation in the following verse:

Kuṇṭhiṅkṛṭṛiśastraṣa tasya vajropamākrteḥ.
Bhāgyānām eva me doṣād eṣa jātāḥ pariksāyāḥ.

Pāṭhāntaram--

Madbhāgyadoṣād evaiṣa jāne jātāḥ pariksāyāḥ. [4.83]

Discussing the above, Misra says:

The MS. has two versions:

I. Bhāgyānām eva me doṣād eṣa jātāḥ pariksāyāḥ.

II. Madbhāgyadoṣād evaiṣa jāne jātāḥ pariksāyāḥ..

In the second one the 5th syllable of c is long, which is against the metrical rules given for the śloka. The first one removes this blemish and must, therefore, be considered to be a deliberate improvement (made by somebody [!], who noticed the poet's slip, [!] afterwards) Cp. blow [sic, i.e. below!]

Like Mr. Misra indeed!

Yes, Misra knows quite well how to blow his own śaṅkha.

The MS does not have two versions! It seems Misra did not notice the first occurrence of the expression "pāḥāntaram," in 1:102 Viśrṇakarṇā and 1:103 Karṇe viśrṇe, where Caritacandrikā explains:

Pāṭhāntaram: Mahākavaya uktam evārthaḥ bhāṅyaṭareṇa bahudhā nirūpayanti. Jainasampradāye tad eva pāṭhāntaram ityucyata iti manyāmahe. Atra pāṭhāntara- pa dena tad eva bodhavyam na tu pāṭhāntararūpo'rtho' bhipretaḥ. [p. 217]

With regard to the metre (5th syllable etc.), what Misra says is not tenable. There are many anuṣ up verses where the 5th syllable is long. For example:

Āryāṃ viparyastam api prabhavanti na bādhitum.

In the anuṣ up chapter of the Vṛttaratnākara, one can see numerous varieties where exceptions are found to the general rule that the 5th syllable should always be a laghu. Hence the second reading is not any deliberate improvement on the first.

And the question is: Which of the two is an "improvement" over the other? According to Mr. Misra the second version is to be rejected. If someone like Misra detected that Bilhāṇa had committed an error, his revised version should succeed and not precede! In other words, the correct version follows and does not precede. Truly speaking, many of Misra's statements remind us of the following sadukti:

Bahu jagada purstāt tasya mattā kilāham.
It is really painful to see the extent of Misra's mastery of traditional Sanskrit scholarshi
p. It is not becoming of his family if it was what he has publicized in his "dust jacket."

For Misra's enlightenment we are presenting below some "SPECIMENS" of the case
s where Bilhaṇa, i.e. Purāṇa Bilhaṇa has erred in the opinion of Misra!
Here is a bright light which might help Misra to see things in their proper perspective.

**Uktam evārtham bhaṅgyantareṇa pratipādayati kaviḥ:**

Śīśupālavadhe tṛṭīyaḥ sargaḥ:

Prasādhitasyāsyā Madhudson'hūd anyaiva lakṣmīr iti yuktaṃ etat. Vapuṣyaśeṣe'khila lokakāntā sā'nanyakāntā hyurasītarā tu. 3:12

Kapāṭāvistṛṇamanaḥsvarāṅsthalaṣṭhitaśrītīlaṇasya tasya. Ānanditāśeṣajanā babhūva sarvāṅgasaṅgīnaya paraiva lakṣmīḥ. 3:13

The great commentator Mallinātha explains:

Prāyenāikārthamapyanekam ślokam uktiviṣeṣa- lābhāl likhanti kavayaḥ. Yathāha Naiṣadhe-ādāveva 'Nipāya'-(1:1) ityādi ślokadvayam; tathā 'Svakelīsa' (1:23) ityādi ślokadvayam ceti.

Thus my statement with regard to "Jainasampradāye" is not correct. It is a universal phenomenon, not confined to the Jain tradition.

*       *       *

Misra turns out to be an historiographer all of a sudden. Let us see his performance in this field.

Iti sa manasā niścītyārtham Culkyaśikhāmaṇiḥ
śravaṇayaṣaraṇim bhīḍhand bherīrvaṇeṣa vinirayaḥ. Api ca kupitaḥ kṣāmbhṛtsenaṅgajaṣu niyeṣubhiḥ
katiṣu vidadhe dhairyadhvamṣam na sāhasalāṇchanaḥ.

[4:119]

Misra indulges in his characteristic *jalpa*:
Bühler reads *kupito kṣmābhṛt*--which is, of course, impossible. [Bühler does not read! It is the Printer's Devil, Mr. Misra! And you are cheating the world!!] Ed. sec., folowed by ed. ter., silently changes to *kupitāḥ*.

We don't know why Misra always gives *karto'ravam* to Bh, who is merely a copy-cat!

Better sense results if we read *kupita*- instead of *kupitāḥ* and compound [i.e. compoun]d it with *kṣmābhṛt*:

\[c api ca kupitakṣmābhṛtsenāgajesu \text{[sic]} \text{nijeśubhiḥ}\]

\[d katiṣu vidadhe dhairyadhvaṃsaṃ na sāhasalāñchanaḥ]\

"and in how many elephants of the army of the enraged king (that is Somadeva) did Vikramāditya not cause crumbling of fortitude by his arrows?"

Misra then expounds, and compounds [i.e. mixes] fancy and facts together:

The expression "arrows" is strange as a battle with his brother, at this point, cert ainly did not take place; cp. 5.5 and 6 (6). Perhaps we should amend *nijerṣubhiḥ*: "by his jealous ones (his male elephants that smell the king's elephants in their stables star t to trumpet, whereupon these get afraid)"(7) *Irṣu* for *Irṣyu* is a common misspelling (se e Apte. s.v. *Irṣyā*, *Irṣya*, *Irṣyu*), Cp. also above on 1.48b (lakṣa for lakṣya).

Note that Vikramāditya, though in distress about the bad behaviour of his elder brother Somadeva, is himself not "enraged " (*kupita*) [!] neither can he be designated, as yet, as *kṣmābhṛt* (king): verses 116-117. Somadeva, of course is "enraged", becaus e his younger brother leaves the town spontaneously--and obviously, without giving du e notice--with an army: 5.3-5 (cp. in particular *kvathammanāḥ* in 5.5, said of Somadev a).

It is difficult to accept Misra's arguments. He thinks that he knows everything. Vikrama cannot be enraged! Somadeva, of course, is enraged!! He is justified.

Misra's footnotes:

6. Battles with other kings ensue only after Vikramāditya has crossed the Tungabhadrā (5.18), the southern frontier of the Cālukya kingdom.

7. As to the jealousy (irṣyā, aṣāyā, amarṣa, roṣa) of the male elephants, cp. Ragh. 4.23 (aṣāyā); Siś. 5.32-36, 42 etc. [p.8]

It is anything but an honest and true scholarship to criticize an editor (or writer) on t he basis of his text alone and not to consider his "Corrigenda and Addenda," or "Errata ," as integral parts of the text. Truly it is said:
Gacchataḥ skhalanāṁ kvāpi bhavatyeva pramādataḥ.

Hasanti durjanās tatra samādadhati sajjanāḥ.

Honest and sincere scholarship demands that before we start studying a book in a systematic manner, especially for a critical, scholarly research, we must look for the "Errata" if there is one. It is our moral obligation. Even if we don't take such a prudent step to begin with, we must try to search for an "Errata" if we think that there might be an error.

Once again Misra tries to display his scholarship! Even though Bühler's text reads kupito, his "Corrigenda and Addenda" (line 14) tells his readers, who are equipped with an unbiased mind, to "read kupitah for kupito!"

It is painful to see that Misra has failed even to follow the most rudimentary principles of literary criticism and editorial responsibility. We wonder how he would be able to guide others! May God bless his disciples! It will be only a case of andhena niyamā nā yathāndhāḥ.

Here is one more evidence to support the conclusion that Misra did not consult the "Corrigenda and Addenda" of B. His German gurus did not teach him even this little thing.

On p. 29 of his magnum opus, Misra cites:

udañciromañcatayā samantataḥ
sa śāityasamparkam iva nyavedayat.

and adds a footnote (no. 7) Ed. pri. samam tataḥ.

Yet the "Corrigenda and Addenda" of the same ed. pri. asks us to read "samantataḥ" for "samaµ tataḥ," giving credit to Bhımāchārya for this correction! I would call it distortion of truth and misrepresentation of facts! We get hurt to see the way Misra displays his Sanskrit scholarship.

Even if Bühler had not corrected his text by means of his "Corrigenda and Addenda", N would have read kupitah for kupito, because the succeeding letter (conjunct consonant) "kṣ" of "kṣma" won't allow it to be read as "kupito." Misra sees something unusual about this change. According to Misra, N should have made a great fuss about it. True scholars don’t waste their precious time in such simple and obvious, grammatical or typographical errors which are inconceivable by their very nature and are incompatible with common sense. N was not paid on "per-page" basis. The total remuneration (monetary compensation) he received from the Government Sanskrit College (Banaras) for the entire work lasting more than five years was only Rs. 200/-. He had to spend more than that amount in just taking a trip to Jaisalmer, staying there for 18 days and hiring an assistant. His real gain was the honor, prestige, and recognition. He was the first student whose work was published in such a prestigious series as the Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavan Texts.
Since N was not paid monetary compensation on the basis of the total number of pages, and since he did not want to display his erudition, he did not think it appropriate to waste his time in discussing such obvious grammatical or printing errors.

"Nijersubhiḥ" by itself cannot mean "trsyaḷugajaiḥ" unless Misra makes it mean that through his super power. The poet makes a general statement. Vikrama's march signalled the defeat and destruction of the courage and fortitude of all the enemies of the Chalukya kingdom. "Kṣmāḥṛt" here does not mean Someśvara Bhuvanaikamalla, but "prati-nṛpatayāḥ" in general as explained by Caritacandrika (p. 233, line 19). Probably Misra did not see it.

Everywhere we see Misra exercising and displaying his enormous power of emendation whether it is needed or not. We don't say that Vikrama is enraged with his elder brother; he is enraged with all his enemies. The poet has already alluded to this idea in an earlier verse:

Mayā nipṛtyamānās te nibidam Draviḍādayah.
Āryam viparyastam api prabhavanti na bādhitum. [4.118]

It is not proper to even imagine that as soon as Vikrama's elephants departed from Kalyāṇa, Someśvara's elephants got terrified! These two groups of elephants did not do well separately. They had been living and fighting together (with their common enemies) for a long time--all along. Therefore, to assume that "his male elephants that smell the king's elephants in their stables start to trumpet, whereupon these get afraid" is not justifiable. How truly it is said: "Little knowledge is a dangerous thing!"

We don't know who has designated Vikrama here as kṣmāḥṛt (king)! Vikrama decided to leave Kalyāṇa, and left it. Even up to the end of canto IV there is no actual fight between the two brothers. The canto ends with the statement that without Vikrama the kingdom of the Chalukyas became bare and sullen, lonely and deserted. In the beginning of canto V, Bilhana says that Vikrama took Simhadeva (the younger brother) along with him. It is in the 5th stanza of this canto V that the dispatch of the troops by Someśvara to capture Vikrama is mentioned. So it is not proper to bring the fight in before it really took place.

* * *

With regard to

Tām vidhāya katiciddināni sa preyasīghusṛṇapaṅkilāṁ nadīṁ.
Colasammukham agāhatāhavaprāptidurlalitabāhu āraham. [5:18]

Misra comments:

-āhavaprāptidurlalitabāhu-, "whose arm was spoiled by the obtaining of fight", see ms not intelligible. Read, therefore, āhavāprāptidurlalitabāhu-, "whose arm was spoil
ed by not obtaining fights", i.e. unruly because of not getting fights, like a child that was fondled too much or kept from exerting itself and hence gets restless. [p.9]

Because your antahkaraṇa is still ajñānāndha and no guru has as yet enlightened it, Mr. Misra!

Ajñānāndhasya lokasya jñānāñjanaśalākayā 
Cakṣurunmilitam yena tasmai śirigurave namaḥ.

We do not agree at all! Āhava-prāpti-durlalita-bāhuḥ does not mean "whose arm was spoiled by the obtaining of fight." Misra tries to get what does not exist in the mūla and then complains. He assigns one specific meaning to the word in reference and then runs away dissatisfied. The result is frustration. Or, does he act deliberately in this manner so that he could suggest an emendation?

Specifically, Misra goes here by the literal meaning of the word "spoiled" (= durlalita); rather he takes "spoiled" in one specific sense of the term and overlooks all the other meanings that the term conveys even in English. "Spoiled" here does not mean "ruined" or "laid idle" and so made out of use, etc. The verb "spoil" here means to "impair the disposition or character by over-indulgence or excessive praise"; "to pamper excessively."

Let us see what Apte says: Durlalita = spoilt by fondling, fondled too much, hard to please; (hence)...naughty...

The arms of Vikrama had become used to getting into the battles to such an extent and with such frequency that they were restless when they were not engaged in the battles! Fighting had become their second nature. They refused to keep quiet in the absence of battles. Just as a pampered child, excessively attached to his, say, toys, always wants to play with them, so was the case with Vikrama. He wanted to remain fighting always--remain engaged in battles forever--constantly with no respite at all.

We wonder if Misra had read the following:

Udāraśautyakarasah kṣamāpatiḥ 
sa nirvinodah samarotsvaṁ vinā. 
Samāpitāśeṣamadāndhabhūpayor 
asevakatvaṁ bhujyor amanyata. [17:8]

*              *              *

Vik. is one of the most significant historical poems in Sanskrit literature. Pt. Viśvanātha Sāstrī Bhāradvāja attempts to show off his competence in historical matters as well. The following verse may be cited as an example to show the nature of his historical knowledge:

Ālupendram avadātvikramas tyaktacāpalam asāvavardhayat. Dīpayatyavinayāgradūtikā kopam apraṇatir eva tāḍṛśām. [5:26]
Wherever and whenever N has presented an historical fact and has authenticated it by documentary evidence, Bh has conveniently copied it and has incorporated it beautifully into his writing without any acknowledgment whatsoever. Where due to the insufficiency of the data or lack of evidence N has not been able to ascertain the facts or make full identification, Bh uses his exceptional skill and totally avoids the problem. He does not move even one inch further! Vik. 5:26 names a king of Ālupa [country?]. The name is not yet identified. Bh says in an extra-ordinary fashion "Ālupasya deśavi śeṣayendraµ rājānam!" We don't know how the reader is helped. And how can we be sure that it is a deśa? It could very well be the name of a people like the Madra-s, or Āndhras, or a dynasty like Cola or Cera, or Pāṇḍya!

Here is another example that demonstrates how Bh fails in historical interpretation. Bilhaṇa says:

Yasyotsaṅge kulasarid asau Nīlakaṇṭhaprasūtā [18:9]

*Candrikā* stops with "Śivaḥ" only with regard to "Nīlakaṇṭha." While "nabhah-saṅgi -gaṅga" was Nīlakaṇṭ ha = Śiva-prasūtā, Vitastā (river) was not! Yet Bh says so. In reality "Vitastā" originated from a mountain called Nīlakaṇṭha (and not Śiva)!

We are not sure if Bh's literary interpretation is always acceptable. Let us see:
Vyāpṛtaravipatāṃ śīlīmukhāṃ Keralakṣitipavāmacakṣuṣāṃ.
Pūrvakalpitam asāvadārasyād gāṇḍapāliṣu nivāsāṃ aśruṇāḥ. [5:27]

Śīlīmukha. Bhāṃśa knows that śīlīmukha means "arrow" as well as "bee". See his comm ents on 5:72: "Śīlīmukhā bhūṇā bhramarāś ca. Alibāṇau Śīlīmukhau ityamaraḥ." Nevert heless he did not apply the "bee" meaning in 5:27a. Candrikā says: "Śīlīmukhiḥ bāṇa iḥ bhramariś ca. Bh and Banerji-Gupta both miss the point. They take only one mea ning, i.e. arrows. They probably forget that here śīlīmukha means both "arrow" as well as "bee". How the bees are attracted toward the face of a beautiful woman is well de picted by Kālidāsa in his immortal work Abhijñānaśākuntalam. (Act I):

Calāpāṅgāṃ drṣṭim sprāṇiti bahuṣo vepathumatiṃ rahasyākhyāyīva svanasi mṛdu karṇāntikacaraḥ.
Karaṃ vyādbhunvatāḥ pibasi ratisarvasvam adharam vayaṃ tattvānveśān madhukara hatās tvam khalu kṛtā.

Our own poet Bilhaṇa too has vividly delineated this bhramarabādāḥ:

Kācit kṣiṃpanṭi madhupam viṣantam itas tataḥ pāṃśaroruhena.
Bālye kṛtāṃ kandukatāḍaneṣu śramaṃ mṛgākṣi bahu manyate sma. [10:61]

Kṣipto mukhāḥ śāṭcarāṇas tarunyā viveśa hastāmbujakoṣam asyāḥ.
Tasmād vidhūto mukham ājagāma lajjā kataḥ svārthaparāyaṇānāṃ. [10:62]

Both Bh and B & G ought to have studied the entire carita before they began the ex position of 5:27. Vik. 10:28 presents another enchanting example of śīlīmukha:

Guṇaṃ dadhāne madhunāryamāṃ manasvināṃ mānasabhedadakṣe.
Śīlīmukhaśreṇir upaiti saṅgam puspe ca kandarpaśarāsane ca. [10:28]

Coming back to the main point: Arrows don't stay. They fly past or pierce through. The black color of the bees becomes the means for the imagination of the tears on the c heeks.

We have another verse depicting the same idea:

Pāṇau padmadhiyā madhūkakusumabhṛantyā tathā gandayor nīlendivaraśāṅkayā nayanayor bandhūkabuddhyādhahe.
Līyante kabarśuś bāṇdhavajanaśvāmohajātasprāḥ durvārā madhupāḥ kiyanti sutanu sthānāni rakṣiṣyasi.
[Kasyāpi]
[In Śūktimuktāvālī. Kusumāpa[va?] cayādipaddhati. 65]

Here is one more verse where Bh presents an interpretation which we find unacceptable:

91
Tvadbhiyā giriguhāśraye sthitāḥ sāhasānka galitatrapā nṛpāḥ.  
Jyāravapratiraveṇa tāṁ api tvaddhanuḥ samarasāṁmi bādhate. [5:40]

Bh points out that "giriguhāśu ye" is a variant reading. No doubt, but if you remove the word "āśraya", i.e. refuge, half of the charm of the poem is lost! Bilhaṇa's poetic muse does not permit us to adopt it.

Bh believes that he can interpret any word the way he wants. He is a "Vidyāvāgīśa!" He comments on:

Gāhate'tra dhṛtakārmuke tvayi prōtīdānam api bhōtīdānatām.  
Tena tasya mahāṭ vilakṣatā yan na vṛti guṇapakṣapātītām. [5:58]

B had made "yatāra" of "yanna" which was copied by R. N has "yanna" because J has it. However, Bh takes the reading of B & R and makes special efforts to interpret the verse, especially the last quarter, in his own way. In other words, Bh rejects even J! He comments:

Tena kāraṇena yatra yasya Drāviḍarājasya viśaye... guṇapakṣapātītām vṛti jānāsi dhārayasyaṁyarthāḥ... Yasya kṛte vṛti guṇapakṣapātītāvä vartate.

This is all unnecessary. Bh tries to interpret yena kena prākāreṇa which is not justified. The reading "yatāra" is not desirable. It cannot be taken to mean "Yam Drāvīdam prati tava Vikramaṁkasya guṇapakṣapātaṁ". The dīta does not brag about the qualities of his master, who is, or at least wants to be, humble. These guṇas (qualities) belong to Vikrama.

The pakṣapāta of Drāviḍarāja for Vikrama owes its origin to the excellent qualities of the latter. The reading ought to be "yanna", i.e. "yad na" (yad =if). What the messenger tries to tell Vikrama is this: If you (Vikrama) do not realize that he (Drāviḍarāja) is fond of your qualities, and therefore wants to give his daughter to you in marriage, then he will feel embarrassed (mentally disturbed or disappointed). He would feel that he was misunderstood, i.e. his offer was not taken in the spirit it was given.

We are reminded of Bhāravi’s one charming sadukti:

Vṛtasprhāṇāṁ api muktibhājāṁ bhavanti bhavyeṣu hi pakṣapātāḥ.

Āstāṁ tāvat, Prākṛtam anusarāmaḥ.

Bh forces "yatara" to mean "yasya viśaye" and turns "vṛti" to mean "dhārayasi"! Here it is not Vikrama, let it be repeated, who is "guṇapakṣapātin," but it is the Cola King who is "guṇapakṣapātin." The qualities belong to Vikrama and not to Colarāja! Colarāja is offering his daughter in marriage to Vikrama, because the former is influenced by the qualities of Vikrama. In fact, Vikrama has invaded the territory of the Colas. We don't know how Bh could force such an interpretation on us and create a situation wh
ich is painful. We are reminded here of a passage in Through the looking glass by Lewis Carroll:

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean--neither more nor less."

"...The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be the master--that's all."


Bh just wants to show his skill. If a reading is found correct and true upto B, i.e., J, P, and B, N had adopted it because it is the reading intended by the poet himself. Now R has distorted it in many places because R did not know any better. The first word in line 4 is "yanna." R makes it "yatra" unnecessarily. We even don't know whether it is a deliberate attempt or just a misprint! Bh adopts it and then takes pains to justify it.

Banerji and Gupta are satisfied merely with substituting words for words--makṣikāst hāne makṣikā. They agree to "yanna", and explain it in the same way. Bh goes in his own way, but we are left wondering to what extent did they comprehend the true meaning.

"Atra" here does not mean "in this capital of the Cola kingdom" as Bh would like us to believe, but in the territory belonging to the Colas. Vikrama did not advance upto the capital of the Colas.

* * *

Misra as an Historiographer

Misra presents a very lengthy discussion on the following verse:

Tatra dakṣīṇataṇe kṛtaṁ kṛtasthitih Kuntalendur avalokya tadbalam.
Bāhum āhavasahasradikṣitāṁ vandate sma paricumbati sma ca. [5:78]

He expounds:

\textit{kṛtaṁ kṛtasthitih}...In 5.56 the messenger of the Cola king proposes (?) Vikramāditya to return (\textit{ni--vṛt}) [from the Cola country he has invaded] and to take his stand in the vicinity /proximity (\textit{upāntavartmani})--obviously of the Cola country. This vicinity/proximity is defined as \textit{tuṅgabhadrāyā mudrita}, "sealed by the Tungabhadrā." Whether we understand and sealed (\textit{mudrita}) in the sense of "marked" (\textit{cihnita}) or "sealed off, closed" (cf. 11.1 9 \textit{amudrita} "unsealed; unrestrained"; Karṇasu. 4.5,6 mudrita "closed, sealed") the northern shore of the Tungabhadrā, which lies outside the Cola country, but in its immediate vicinity (\textit{upāntavartmani}), must be meant [?]! The peacetreaty [sic] the Cola king proposes and which he wants to cement by offering his daughter to Vikramāditya as a wi
fe, can be concluded only--it seems obvious--when Vikramāditya has left the country: only on this condition the Cola king's "gift of friendship" (that is the giving of his daughter in matrimony) cannot be looked at as a "gift of fear" (verse 58). This is borne out by the following description of the Cola king's army reaching the Tungabhadrā, putting up a camp alongside its shore (verse 76) and enjoying bathing in the river (verse 77): this would be impossible if King Vikramāditya had himself with his army occupied the southern shore. Consequently the reading of all the editions in verse 78 dakṣiṇata e kṛtasthitih kuntalenduḥ ..." the moon of the Kuntalas having taken his stand on the southern shore," cannot be correct. We have to amend dakṣiṇata e kṛtasthitih and construe it with tad balam. Thus we get:

a  tatra dakṣinataḥ kṛtasthitiḥ
b  kuntalendur avalokya tad balam/

"The moon of the Kuntals having seen [from the northern shore] his (the Cola king's) army, that had taken its stand on this southern shore"

Afterwards messengers are sent (verse 80) of course across the river. [pp.10-11] [How do you know Mr. Misra?]

In brief, Misra suggests that the compound word kṛtasthitih be turned into a napumṣa ka word and be made to qualify the army (balam) of the Cola king! He is mistaken. J does not support him at all! The J gloss has "san," ruling out any possibility of treating it anything but a masculine-ending compound. Also in the sentence "tatra dakṣinata e kṛtasthitih" the word kṛtasthitih is so sandwiched in between that it is impossible to take it out even if it were possible. Southern shore was not a part of the Chola empire. Misra has not advanced even one convincing sound argument to support his theory that could be accepted.

Misra has full freedom to make his own guesses and to believe that Vikrama was stationed on the north shore and the messengers were sent across the river (p. 11).

Misra talks of the messengers only. Does he mean to say that both the parties were stationed on respective two different shores and the entire marriage ceremony was performed! We cannot believe so.

This Misra is Abhinavabhilana. He has the right to create his own srṣṭi.

Apāre kāvyasamsāre kavir ekāḥ prajāpatiḥ.
Yathā’smai rocate viśvam tathaiva parivartate.

Misra too can be creative, especially when he has reached such a high position. Let us see what N says on p. 39 of his Upodghāta:

Vikramādityasāmrājyasīmā: Dakṣinasyāṃ ātuṅgabhadrāyā uttarasyāṃ Narmadāṃ yāvat tatsāmrājyam vistṛtam abhavat. Tungabhadrā-Kṛṣṇasaṅgamād uttarato Godāva
Vardhā saṅgamaṃ yāvatab, tataś cāgre etām Vardhānadvīm yāvat saralarekhāyāṃ ākṛṣṭāyāṃ Cālukyā [sām] rājya-prācyasīmā nirdhāryeta.

His empire extended from the Narbuddā southwards to the Tungabhadra; and from the junction of the latter with the Krishna, if a line be drawn northwards more or less in a straight line to where the Wardha meets the Godavari and continued up this affluent, we shall have marked the eastern boundary of the Chalukya Empire. [Ancient India. pp. 138-39]

Here we see Misra, playing the role of an historiographer for the first time, discussing historical facts and trying to improve upon all the editions, including Bilhana himself.

In the beginning of Canto 5, we see Vikrama leaving Kalyāṇa [5:1]. He has a fight with the army dispatched by Someśvara, his elder brother. Vikrama achieves victory [5:8]. He advances towards Tungabhadrā, away from Kalyāṇa [5:10]. He reaches the river [5:10]. He plans an attack on the Colas [5:18]. He stays in Vanavāsa manḍala for some time. He advances towards the kings [5:23] of Malaya country. Jayakeśin succeeds. Ālupa king is augmented [5:26]. Kerala is attacked [5:27]. The land of the D raviḍa king is shaken. And finally the messenger from the Draviḍa king comes to the court of Vikramāditya [5:29]. See pages 25 and 26 of the Upodghāta of Nagar.] N als o contains a map delineating the contemporary boundary between the two empires of the Cholas and the Chalukyas. A map from Krishnaswami Aiyangar's Ancient India appears as an appendix at the end of this book.

Misra wants us to believe that the River Tungabhadrā itself was the dividing line between the two empires. If so, he is far removed from the reality. Vikrama had entered right into the territories of the Colas. He was asked to retreat back toward the river. Both armies met on the South Bank itself. Vikrama did not cross the river. He did not go across to the North Bank.

Misra is very quick in suggesting emendations. He creates an aura of his great learning and tries to show that he knows not only Sanskrit but also other European languages. But he forgets his own rules and regulations. He makes improper suggestions even overlooking the demands of Sanskrit prosody. We don't know what a havoc he would have wrought on the Vikramāṇkadevacarita had it been a prose work! He asks us to remove the visarga of "kṛtaśthitiḥ" [5:78.1], make it a neutral (napuṣaka) compound and force it to qualify "tad balam," the army of the Chola king. He forgets that the metre here is Rathoddhatā, which demands ra-na-ra-la-ga, that is the caraṇa must end in guru. Not that Misra is totally unaware of the needs of the specific metrical composition. See his comments on 16.9, p. 61, at the bottom, and p. 62.

Misra may advance a counter-argument and say: The rule vā pādante tvasau g vakr ah (= a syllable is counted as guru at the end of a pāda despite its laghutva for metric purposes). Therefore, no harm is done to the metre even when kṛtasthitih is changed into kṛtaśthiti. But that is a rule which may be restored to if a mahākavi has already composed that way and not to cater to the whims and caprices of every Tom, Dick and Harry.
We find it difficult to leave this topic. Delivering his learned discourse on *kṛtaśthitiḥ* (5:78a), as presented above, Misra has pronounced his judgment and said: "This would be impossible if king Vikramāditya had himself with his army occupied the southern shore." He puts a severe limit on the length of the shore of Tungabhadrā! It was not a pond. It was a mighty river, *Dakṣināpatha-jāhnavī*. Its shore stretched for miles and miles, 400 miles to be exact.

Did Mr. Misra read Bilhaṇa's *ukti* in verse:

The reader is invited to have a look at the map appearing at the end of this book. *Dakṣ iṇa ta a* does not necessarily mean South bank. It can mean only the right bank as opposed to the left bank, determined on the basis of how the river flows!

> Sindhutṛanilayānurodhatas tat tathā balam avāpa dīrghatām.  
> Antarakṣapitarātribhir jainaiḥ prāpyate sma nṛpamandiraṃ yathā.  [5:76]

Everyone wanted to camp quite close to the river bank. Consequently the stretch of the army got so lengthened that people had to travel many nights to cover the distance between their respective camps and the royal camp--before they could reach the Royal mandiram.

* * *

Another unreasonable suggestion of Misra is about:

> Raṇarabhasāvilāsakautukena sthitim atha bibhrad asau yaśovataṃsāṃ.  
> Vidhihatakadurāgrahād akāndे gatam aśrnod Draviṇendram Indrādhammi.  [6:7]

Misra says:

> Interpret *raṇarabhasāvilāsakautukena* not as instr., "by the curiosity for the sport of battle fury", but as loc. *kautuke*, "in the curiosity...", and following negative particle *na*, see above remark on 3:60d. [p.5 & 11]

Misra’s suggestion to read *kautuke* and separate *na* (p. 5) is incongruous because no true warrior can ever lose interest in the battles. We have already discussed

> Udāraśauryaikarasaḥ kṣamāpatiḥ sa nirvinodaḥ samarotsavaṃ vinā.

and

> Colasāṃmukhamagāhatāhava-prāptidurlalitābāhurāgraham.

Misra’s interpretation [on p. 5] is:

"not exhibiting continuance in (= continuous attachment to) the glory-wreathed (= glory-rewarded) curiosity (= desire) for the sport of battle fury".
The above interpretation goes against the very grain of vīrarasa and cannot be even entertained as a sound suggestion.

The following may be interpolated as a special note. The author is indebted to Pt. N agaraja Rao for this contribution.

Misra also violates the basic rules of Sanskrit grammar.

If Bilhaṇa wanted to say what Misra makes him do, he would have to say "abibhrat," because the "naṁ" freely used, goes only with the verb. Obviously, Misra's suggestion betrays his total ignorance of the grammatical rules of Negation (niṣedha). He does not know the difference between paryudāsa and prasajyapratiṣedha. If the meaning suggested by Misra was desired by the poet, he would resort to paryudāsa, where samāsa of naṁ and bibhrat is compulsory:

The author is indebted to Shri Nagaraja Rao of Mysore for this grammatical discussion.

Prādhānyāṁ syād vidher yatra pratiṣedhe'pradhānatā.
Paryudāsaḥ sa viṣṇeyo yatrottarapadena naṁ.

Since such samāsa has not been used, if we allow Misra to have his way and split ka utuke na, then it would be a case of prasajya pratiṣedha where the free naṁ gets invariably connected with the finite verb:

Aprādhānyāṁ vidher yatra pratiṣedhe pradhānatā.
Prasajyapratiṣedho'sau kriyāya saha yatra naṁ.
[Vyaktiviveka, II Vimarśa]

Therefore, if we accept Misra's suggestion, we will have to construe Kautuke na asīt not, which will mean that the king did not hear...etc. So, Misra's suggestion cannot be accepted.

*                        *                       *

Plagiarism can be quite subtle. For instance:

Narapatitanayaḥ kayāpi kopa-sphuritaradacchadalekhayāluloke.
Prakaṭitapaṭupaṅcānālīlā-kalakilakiñcitam ikṣaṇāńcalena. [6:19]

Bh recommends that this verse should come earlier. I agree. The poet has already ended an episode--viewing of Vikrama by the damsels of Kāṅcī. Then why to bring a related (or identical) idea once again?

Misra appropriates the above idea from Bh as his own without any acknowledgment. This is called anyāyapāṃṣam ātmasātkaṇaṇam. Here are Misra's words [p. 11]:

Verse 19 describes--like the preceding verses 12-17--the behavior of one particular girl at the sight of the king, while verse 18 gives a comprehensive finishing statement: iti.
..abhavad...vilásah... "thus was the playful behaviour [of the beautiful women of the town]..." The order of the verses 18 and 19 should, therefore, be inverted.

Misra knows that vilása can be used as a substantive (noun) and that it means playful behavior. Still he forgets this fact while discussing Tavāṇgavallikusumair and makes vi lásaih as vikālaih (an adjective)--one more illogical attempt like so many others on the part of Misra!

Honesty, sincerity, and truthfulness demanded that the credit ought to have been given to Bh in this case. But Misra wants to take all the credit for himself! He condemns Bh freely wherever the latter has erred, but he does not commend him where he (Bh) has improved! This is not a characteristic of an "investigator," but that of an alligator. Misra had his own reason. If he had ascribed this improvement to Bh, then he would not have been able to dupe the University and get the degree.

Misra continues:

āluloke "was looked at" in 19a is peculiar as it cannot be derived from ālokaya-, "to look at", of which the perf. pass. would be ālokayāṁ cakre, but must be taught [or thou ght?] to belong to ā - lok (Dhātup. 1.76 lokr darśane): ālokate, not met with outside grammatical works and possibly a grammatical fiction.

N has no padaccheda between yā and lu. However, Candrikā says: luloke drṣ aḥ, which is wrong, according to Rao. It should be āluloke. J has a clear sign, [ss i.e. avag raha] visible even today, directing us to read āluloke. Although Bh does not have in the text the sign of dirgha, i.e. avagraha "ss", yet in the commentary he puts āluloke sam drṣ aḥ. He does not criticize N for 'luloke'! How to criticize such an ancient great scholar antedating 1286 A.D.! Misra also has overlooked the error of N. Or, was he reticent for a change! Shri Ladukeshwar, however, says it is right.

* * *

Misra wants to change Bilhaṇa's words to accommodate Bh's views! Let us study:

Katicid api dināni tatra nīṭvā pariṣaрабhūmiṣu bhūribhir vilāsaiḥ.
Caraṇatalaniviṣṭaduṣṭavargaḥ puram avalokayati sma Gāṅgakuṇḍam. [6:21]

Misra presents his outstanding stand:

nīviṣ a - does not mean dalita-, "torn asunder", as it is glossed in ed. ter. What is expected in this context caraṇatalaniviṣ aduṣ avargaḥ, "by whom the crowd of the evil ones was... by the soles of his feet", would be nipīṣ a-, "crushed." The sounds [?] p and v appear to be easily confounded by Jain writers, cp. ed. sec. Prastāvanā, p. 3. [p. 12] [Are they copying a written text or writing what is being heard?]

Misra may recall:

Yādṛśaṁ pustakaṁ drṣṭaṁ tādṛśaṁ likhiṁaṁ mayā.
Just because Bh translated "niviṣa" as dalita it does not mean that we must discard his word and change Bilhana's thought into what we want him to tell us. We have to try to understand what he tells us. We are merely śrotārahah and not racayitārahah. Niviṣa means "lying, or resting, or sticking, or staying in (loc. or comp.)" Monier-Williams. Misra is always ready to destroy first what is already there and then reconstruct his own. He does not want to interpret the poet's words. He wants to put his own words into the poet's mouth.

Misra recommends that niviṣa be changed to nipiṣa = "crushed!" If we merely want to say "crushed by the feet", we don't have to bring in "tala", sole or bottom. Caraṇan nipiṣa would easily express the desired meaning. So "tala" would become redundant. "Tala" serves us better if we have to say 'under the feet.' Also the word "nipiṣa" is not in the usage of the poets. "Nipiṣa" is the current (pracalita) and hence the correct for m. On this ground too Misra's recommendation is to be rejected.

Once again Misra tries to be an historiographer. Here is his discussion on:

Atha katiṣucid eva daivyagat parigalitesu dineṣu Colasūnoh. Śriyam aharata Rājigābhidhānaḥ prakṛtivrodhahatasya Veṅgināthaḥ. [6:26]

Misra shows his prakṛti:

The expression prakṛtivrodhahata- might mean according to Bühler (Introd., p. 35 and note 3) either: "slain in consequence of a disagreement (virodha) with his subjects (prakṛti)" or "killed (by Rājiga) in consequence of an inveterate enmity"; There is a third possibility, however: yaśovirodhi- in 6.62 means "what is in conflict with a good name", i.e. "disgraceful", dharmavirodhi- in 6.65 means "what is in conflict with sacred tradition", i.e. "impious." Hence prakṛtivrodhi- in 6.27 would mean "who is in conflict with nature", i.e. "unnatural." This fits well as a qualification of Somadeva, who indulges in an unnatural hatred towards his brother.

We don't know how Somadeva's hatred toward Vikrama could be called "unnatural." Our response to Misra would be --mukham asti vaktavyam. Does Misra want to tell us that Adhirājarājendra was killed by Somadeva? We cannot even dream that Misra would turn out to be so senseless! We simply fail to understand him.

In 6.26 we should have to understand: [What a beautiful English! It is pardonable to borrow Misra's phraseology since he was breathing German air] "slain by conflict with nature", which does not seem to make sense. I propose to read instead of prakṛtivirodhi-hatasya rather: prakṛtivirodhi-hatasya "who was slain by an unnatural one," that is a relative who thereby acted towards him in an unnatural way. [an absurd idea!] It may be noted that also historically a palace intrigue led by a relative of the king is rather more likely than a rebellion of the subjects. This latter point may be the reason that the Eng. rend. interprets: "distressed by the revolt of his subjects." But hata- obviously is not "distressed", rather only "slain, killed."
How about expressions like hā hato’smi mandabhāgyaḥ and Vayam tattvānveṣān madh ukara hatās tvāṁ khalu kṛtā!

It is not necessary to make "virodhi" of "virodha." As Caritacandrikā explains: Pra kṛtivirodho naisargikavairāṁ tena hatasya. We can interpret it only in the sense that Rājīga was an inveterate enemy—"yeṣāṁ ca virodhaḥ śāśvatikaḥ," "ahinakulam," or "kā kolūktyam." We can disregard the other meaning, the rebellion of the subjects, because that will be a weak point as far as Vikrama’s action is concerned. It will go against our own nāyaka. Rājīga suspected, rather apprehended, interference once again by Vikrama. So he aroused his brother Someśvara. The poet calls Rājīga as galitānayasyaḥ. [6:38]

Yat syād anucitam vastu nāyakasya rasasya vā. Viruddham tat parīyāyam anyathā vā prakalpayet.

"Pra kṛtivirodhaḥatasya": Bühler thinks that this means that the brother-in-law (Cola sūnu) of Vikrama was killed by the rebellion

Bühler does not identify Cola sūnu, but he was Adhirājarājendra. of the people, the subjects. But the poet uses the same expression at the end of the following verse prakṛti virodhinam asya Somadevam (6.27). Here and earlier, in both the places, "prakṛtivirodha" means only the natural enmity like ahinakulam or kākolūktyam, as stated earlier.

We cannot interpret "prakṛti" as the subjects (prajāḥ) or the people; nor the rebellion or uprising of the people. Also we have to note the following: Rājīga killed Adhirājarājendra on account of his natural or inborn enmity. Here the expression "prakṛtivirodha hatasya" is set in between "Rājigābhīdhiḥānāḥ" and "Veṅgināthah." So according to Deh all-dipakanyāya, the death was caused by Rājīga, who was Veṅgināthā. We do not believe that the people of the Cola kingdom first revolted, then killed Adhirājarājendra and then invited Rājīga to occupy the throne.

Bh renders the expression "prakṛtivirodhaḥatasya" in a way that leaves everything vague:

Prakṛtīnāṁ prajānāṁ prakṛteḥ svabhāvasya vā virodhenā prātikūlyena vaireṇa vā hatasya māritasya.

We don’t believe that Adhirājarājendra was killed by his own subjects. Unless all the subjects wanted Rājendracola to be the ruler, they would not have killed their own king. In any case, the allies of Adhirājarājendra must have been very weak. He did not have enough support. However, Banerji and Gupta attempt to translate the passage thus:
Then after the lapse of a few days, as Fate would have it, the lord of Veṇgi, named Rājiga, carried away the goddess of royalty of the prince of Cola who was distressed by the revolt of the subjects.

We are left wondering if the translators really understood the poet!

Also the word "punah" may have some significance. When Vīrarājendra died, Rājiga had a chance to capture the throne. Vikrama intervened and placed his brother-in-law Adhirājājendra on the throne. On the departure of Vikrama Rājiga killed Adhirājājendra and usurped the throne. He was afraid Vikrama might thwart his plans once again. So he entered into alliance with Somadeva.

Bilhaṇa says: *Anucitam amunā...*[6:38]

Criticizing the poet, Bühler remarks: "Bilhaṇa, in uttering this statement, forgets that his hero had formed a matrimonial alliance with the same Chola race."

We believe this is an unjust criticism. There is nothing wrong in entering into an alliance with the enemy. "War" is not the only way to deal with the enemy. *Sandhir nā v igraḥo yānām...Sandhi*, alliance, is the first of the six guṇas of diplomacy or statecraft (*ṣādguṇyo mantraḥ*). Bühler himself forgets that it is one thing to accept the daughter of an enemy (king) to cement the bond of friendship, and it is something else to enter into an alliance with an inveterate enemy to subdue one’s own younger brother. In offering his daughter in marriage, the Chola king Vīrarājendra had virtually surrendered.

Let us hear what the poet himself says:

1. *Sandhibandham avalokya niścalam...* [5:62]

2. *Rājyam uddhrtaṁ anarthapaṅkaṇaḥ kanyākāvitaṁ rāṇām ananyata.  [5:79]

This was one of the wisest strokes of diplomacy on the part of Vikrama to develop friendship with the most powerful enemy of the Cālukyas. War and peace both are to be practiced by a ruler. We have already seen how so many rival kings gave their daughters in marriage to Vikrama. That was certainly a prudent way to extend his sway over his political enemies.

Bilhaṇa says:

*Kanyāpradānacchālataḥ kṣitāḥ sarvasvadānam bahavo'sya cakruḥ.*

The king who gives his daughter to an enemy in marriage is certainly not the absolute victor in the deal. Vikrama himself did not want to fight with his brother at all. Otherwise, he would not have left the kingdom, the capital city of Kalyāṇa. He had already declared:

*Tyāgam eva praśaṁsanti guror utpathagāminah.* [4:117]
Mayā nipīdyaṁnās te nibīḍam Draviḍādayah.
Āryam viparyastam api prabhavanti na bādhitum. [4:118]

The question is what would have happened to the entire Cālukya kingdom if Vikrama mādiya had not been strong enough and was not able to defend his ancestral territory from the onslaught of two enemies, hitting him hard in the front as well as the back? If Rājīgā had come out absolutely victorious from this war, the Cālukya kingdom would have been completely wiped off then and there and forever!

We are reminded of the story of a frog named Gaṅgadatta who invited his enemy (a vicious cobra) in his home (well) to take revenge from his own dāyādas. The story ends with:

Bubhukṣitaḥ kim na kāroti pāpam kṣīṇā narā niṣkaraṇā bhavanti.
Ākhyāṭi bhadre priyadarśanasya na Gaṅgadattaḥ punar eti kūpam.

Let it be stressed once again that Vikrama entered into alliance with an enemy for peace, while Somesvara entered into an alliance with the enemy for war, and that too with his own younger brother! It is unfortunate that Bühler did not see any difference in these two types of alliances. He simply overlooked the art of diplomacy. Na hi sarvaḥ sarvam jānatī.

Misra's Misdirections

Misra displays his critical judgement once again on pages 12-13 of Chapter I, with regard to the word druti in Asitavilasitena (6:51). This is how he accomplishes this camatkāra:

Instead of Bühler's (ed. pri.) navendranīla- the MSS. [!] and subsequent edd. have navendranīla-

This is a very strange type of construction. Why so much prominence is given to Bühler? We don't know. The MS. comes first. All other editions come thereafter. Bühler is in-between.

We wonder if Misra knows the difference between "MS." and "MSS." Here we have only one MS.

c gaganaṅgirita ī navendranīla-
d drutiśatanirjharadhiṁṭa reje //

"the top of the mountain of the sky (lit. which is the sky) shone like bearing a hundred cascades of fresh meltings of (blue) sapphires (= of just molten sapphires)."

While druti-, "melting, molten substance," here fits well as qualification of nirjharas-, "cascades", it should be changed into dyuti- [?] in 11.41a ketakadrutinibham mahaḥ... ind
It seems Misra has only one flower! We cannot make a paste for the entire world with one flower! Time and again we find it difficult to understand Misra.

a nikṣipyap.........................
b ātmadyatīṃ dadhati pāṇḍuratām pradīpāḥ /

"having thrown down their own lustre (dyuti) the lamps are taking on whiteness (becoming pale). [p.12-13]

The very first question that comes to our mind is this: If a reading "fits well," why should it be changed at all? Misra has not given any reason except citing another verse.

There is something wrong (in Misra's text) in the above paragraph, beginning with "While" and ending in "flower" (6 lines). At least it is not clear to us. We fail to find any connection between the group of words ending with the first dyuti (line three of the paragraph) and another group of words beginning with "in 11.41a" and ending with "flower"! What does Misra want us to do here? What is his vidheya?

Misra cites ketakadrutinibham [11:41a] in support of his change. The complete verse is

Ketakadrutinibham bhuvanāntas tanmahaḥ prakṛtiśītalām indō.
Kasya no vapuṣi candanalepaḥ kāṇṭitaḥ ca guṇataḥ ca babhūva. [11.41]

This change is dictated on page 17. The above text (in the quoted para) (...ketakadrutinibham...) contains the word druti even as quoted by him! However, in translating it he says: like the shine (dyuti)! Did he read druti as dyuti, or changed it in the course of translating? The question of questions still remains--Why?

Misra asks us to compare 11:87. It contains dyuti. We fail to understand how this dyuti in 11:87 will help him to change druti into dyuti in navendranīdruti (6.51) and ketakadruti (11.41). The whole discussion is not clear to us at all. In our opinion this citation (of Nikṣipa) is irrelevant, because we need the word dyuti there, as it means the "rays" there, rather than the "lustre" only. The fact is that indranīlā and ketaka themselves are turned into drava or druti. They are to be liquefied! The lamps are not! It is a kavīndrokti and only a sahṛdaya can understand it.

And, by the way, Misra translates the word nikṣipyap in 11:87 as "having thrown down." He runs away with the very first meaning he gets in the dictionary! He does not have the patience to go up to the end and consider all the available meanings. Apte gives the following meanings for this word nikṣip: "To throw or cast down, put or place down; To entrust, commit, consign to the care of; To deposit, place as deposit; To give or hand over, grant, bestow (on)."
Misra did not realize that the *dyuti* was too precious to be "thrown down," It was entrusted to the care of *gaṇḍaphalaka*!

We hope Misra had read Kālidāsa:

Dīnānte nihitam tejaú savitrevā hutāśanaḥ.

Āstām tāvat, prakṛtām anusarāmaḥ. Let us resume our main theme. Once again we find Mr. Misra engaged in *avyāpāresu vyāpāram. Druti* is not the qualification (quality) of *nirjhara* (as Misra wants us to believe); it is the substance itself that constitutes the *nirjhara*. To put it differently, the lustre of *indranila* does not constitute the cascade; it is the liquefied *indranila* itself that is showering!

Moreover, if we accept the reading as *ketakadyutinibham mahāḥ*, of the two words *dyuti* and *nibham* one becomes redundant. "Ketakadyuti" itself will give the whole meaning by virtue of the *upamita-samāsa* (*ketakasya dyutir iva dyutit Yasya tat*). Similarly *ketakanibham* will give all the desired meaning (*ketakasya nibhā kāntir iva nibhā yasya a.*) So, by suggesting a baseless reading, Misra is not only spoiling the beautiful idea of Bilhana, but also making him commit a blunder of *paunaruktya* (tautology).

To change *ketakadruti* into *ketakadyuti* will be a murder of the poetic genius of Bilhana. The rays of the moon are cool by their very nature. They are like liquefied *ketaka* flowers. Such rays become the ointment (paste) of sandalwood for the body of every one by virtue of their lustre as well as the soothing quality. To say *ketakadyutinibham* will be an utter nonsense. How? Why? A *bhāvuka kavi* alone can understand. One has to go and ask some real guru who knows. *Upadeśyanti te jñānāṁ jñāninas tattva-d arśinaḥ.* Saṃskṛta is divine.

Saṃskṛtam nāma daivī vāg anvākhyātā maharsibhiḥ.

We are reminded of the following *Sadukti*:

Ajñānāndhasya lokasya jñānāñjanaśalākayā.  
Cakṣur umālitaṁ yena tasmāi [śrī gurave] namaḥ.

An infant takes every woman to be its mama. Misra would remove all the *druti* from *Vik.* We don't know what he did with *kṛtradravaiś candrakarair ivāplutaḥ* [2:79], and *drāvitaspha ikāśila*. [11:38]

Mr. Misra may know:

Savāsanānāṁ sabhyānāṁ rasasyāsvadanaṁ bhavet.  
Nirvāsanās tu raṅgāntaḥ kāśṭhakudyaśmasannibhāḥ.

Misra is advised to read the following:

Drāvitasphaṭiśaśailaviṭāṅka-sphaḥaranirjaraparamparayeva.  
Pūrītā śaśirucā bhuvanaśrīr mānapaṅkam anudat pramadānāṁ. [11:38]
Jalāśayā yatra hasanti santataṃ navendranīladravanimalodarāḥ [kāḥ?]
Śrāvatsamutsāritameghakardamam Kalindakanyāhradamecakaṃ nabhaḥ. [2:6]

Commenting on 12:45a (p. 18) Misra uses the word "preposterous" to characterize Bīlaḥāṇa's kavītā-vicchitti. To us Misra's attempts seem to be more than preposterous!

Misra expects us to accept his Ketakadyutinibham mahaḥ! Poor critic! He did not realize that it would be the total negation of sahṛdayatvam. Dyuti will cover only kānti and not the guṇa as well. Bīlaḥāṇa says: kāntiṣa guṇataṣca babhūva. Maybe Misra did not understand the poet. If he is satisfied, well fine. Let him remain satisfied. But the true lovers of Bīlaḥāṇa's vyutpatti and vicchitti will never agree. They will remind Misra once again of Bīlaḥāṇa's own sadukti:

Kuṇṭhatvam āyāti guṇah kavīnām sāhityavidyāśramavārjiteṣu.

And here is our favorite poet Murari:

Daivīṃ vācāṃ upāsate hi bahavaḥ sāraṃ tu sārasvatam jānīte nitarāṃ asau gurukulakliṣṭ o Murāriḥ kaviḥ.
Abdhir laṅghita eva vānabhaṭṭaiḥ kintvasya gambhīratām āpātālanimagnapīvaravapur jānāti manthācalaḥ.

Also we have

Śrīlā-Vijjā-Mārulā-Morikādyāḥ kāvyam kartuṃ santi śaktāḥ striyo’pi.
Tattvam vetṭum vādino nirvijetum viśvam vaktuṃ yāḥ pravīṇaḥ sa vandyaḥ.

Why This Book?

Misra really needs some real guru who could open his eyes and show him the correct path. Otherwise there will be constant chaos. The "dust-jacket" of his book tells us: "The author, who has taken only specimens of these problems and discussed them in the present work, is keeping himself busy in giving wide treatment to these in his critica l edition of the Vikramāṅkadevacarita in [the] near future." If the whole work is going to be like the "specimens" we see here, we simply shudder at the thought of the amount of unworthy writing that would be scattered all over the Sanskrit world in India and abroad. It will be a disaster as far as the Sanskrit scholarship is concerned. It will be a disservice to the cause of Sanskrit studies in general and to Mahākavi Bīlaḥāṇa in particular. Let us save the world from this calamity. Let us persuade Misra to acquire the basic knowledge of literary criticism, before he wields his pen on a great poet like Bilh
This has been an objective of our undertaking this study of Misra.

Another "emendation" suggested by Misra relates to:

Bahubhir abhihitaiḥ kim adbhutair vā
bhayajananam Bhuvanaikamallasainyam.
Raṇarasacalitam vilokya keśām
alabhata cetasi nāntaram vikalpaḥ. [6:53]

Misra says:

For ranarasacalitam, "moved towards [why not "by" or "for?"] the taste of battle", substitute ranarasaavalitam, "addicted to the taste of battle” [!] valita- from the root val in the sense of "to turn to, to be drawn to, to be attached to" (Apte, s.v. 3). Ca and Va in the MS. is [!] difficult to distinguish (cp. Bühler, Introd. p. 45). [p. 13]

Misra talks as if he has seen the J MS.!

Misra recommends that we discard calitam and adopt valitam. We cannot agree. The trouble with Misra is that he interprets Bilhana's words arbitrarily and unreasonably --the way he wants. He breaks the whole glass, as it were. And then like a child he wants to put it together. He translates raṇarasacalitam as "moved towards the taste of battle." The question is why to construe that way? "Raṇe yaḥ rasah utsāhah (see Candrika) tena tasmād vā hetoḥ calitam, moved forward because of, on account of, in order to fulfill, the intense desire to get engaged in the battle." That is the meaning.

Bh translates correctly: "raṇasya yuddhasya rasenotsāhena calitam samāpatantam."

However, Misra has taken a correct stand regarding:

Dviradapatir amuṣya śatrusenā-bhaṭāmukhapadavimardakelikālaḥ.
Jhaṭiti raṇasaraś cakāra lakṣmī-karaḍhṭavibhramapuṇḍarīkaśeṣam. [6:88]

Misra states:

Bühler (ed.pri.) reads in b kelikāraḥ (against kelikālaḥ of second and third editions, which do not mention his reading), and -puṇḍarīkakośam in d- against puṇḍarīkaśeṣam (second and third edd., which in this case mention Bühler's reading) [!] kelikāraḥ in b is certainly preferable.

Misra's punctuation marks are baffling.

a. dviradapatir amuṣya śatrusenā-
b. *bha amukhapadmovimardakelikāraḥ*

"His (Vikramāditya's) leading elephant making (-kāra, i.e. playing) the play of crushing the lotus flowers that were the faces of the soldiers of the enemy army", is an allusion to the well known sportive nature of elephants.

Misra displays here his knowledge of the elephants!

What about his statement asserting "that elephants are not known to enjoy music." supra, 82. ///change the page no.///

a famous example: Megh. 1.2 vaprakrīḍā- parinatagaja-, more suitable than: "His...elephant, the god of death in (for) the play/game of crushing..."

Seeing that Bühler's reading is not even mentioned (8), we may even consider the -kā laḥ of the second ed., taken over by the third ed., to be due to a slip of pen.

- ṣeṣam in d (against Bühler's koṣam) seems to have the support of the MSS. and alone makes good sense:

Misra always writes "MSS." Does he really know the difference between "MS" and "MSS." or he deliberately uses the plural? We are generally concerned here only with "J", i.e. only one MS.

c ....raṇasaraś cakāra lakṣmī [-]/

d karadhṛtavibhrampuṇḍarīkaṣeṣam/

"...he (the elephant) turned the pool that was the battle, into one in which there was left only the lotus held by the hand of Lakṣmī (the goddess of Fortune)."

...puṇḍarīka koṣam. "he turned the battle-pool into one in which the lotus calix was held by the hand of Lakṣmī," would not express the idea, necessary in this context, that this was the only lotus left. [pp.13-14]

Misra's Footnote

8. Cp. also 1.115... yaśahpa olluḥ hanakelikāraḥ, "indulging in the sport of robbing the dress that is (white) fame"; 16.52 tuhinagirita ṭikelikāraḥ samīrāḥ, "the winds indulging in sports on the slopes of the snow mountain."

This is the first instance (6:86) where Misra has improved the reading of N by pointing its deviation from B, without the support of J, and then concluding that it was a slip of pen on the part of N. This improvement is owed to M. This is called ghuṇākṣara-ny āya.
N inherits "kālaṁ" from R! Of course, this is an error on the part of N, but can be explained not only by the fact that the press copy for N was the R itself, but also "kālaṁ" was much more charming and yielded alliteration. N was caught in the trap unawares! This is a case of a lie that seemingly appears like the truth! We have named it Śatya yamānam asatyam. This shows how one is easily misled by a lie which does not seem to be a lie. Even though the specific reading is not genuine, one cannot suspect its being corrupt, because it makes a good sense by itself.

We would like to know from Misra where does the third edition mention the reading of B? "Kelikālaṁ" of N is certainly an error, realized today, on Oct. 25, 1977! J has "kelikāraṁ" and so naturally, or as is expected, B should have the same. It has.

Misra too can talk some sense. Everything has a first. This is Misra's first sensible talk! The above discussion merely proves the truth of our age-old saying: To err is human! Or,

"Gacchataṁ skhalanāṁ kvāpi bhavatyeva prāmadataḥ."

No man is infallible. After I had written the above, I saw once again the unworthy ed. of R [for which Bh had said:... sati ravikaranikarapraveśe kuto'ndhakārasya sambhava h! It has keli kālaṁ, i.e. its own creation! It does not reproduce what B has. So N got himself caught in the trap laid by R! This is called Svayaṁ naṣaṁ parān nāsyati.

Śeṣaṁ comes from J. "Kośaṁ" is the creation of Bühler's fertile brain. We don't know how Misra got the evidence that "šeṣaṁ" seems to have the support of the MSS. [p. 14]. He did not consult any MS of Vik. His "seems" denotes his supposition, because N goes back to J. However, M is not explicit on this point. He is equivocal.

It is useless to talk about Bh because he is only a copycat, a cheat and a liar.

* * *

We have yet another recommendation from a controversial critic for emendation in:

Iti bhramatsaurabhamāṁsalena nimīlitāṁ malayānilena.
Abhūc ciraṁ bhūmigrasthitānāṁ pralāpamālā priyakāṅkṣināṁ.
[7:14 Kulakam]

Here is another display of Misra's profound knowledge. He says:

nimīlitā-", having been closed", does not make sense here. What is required, [!] is a participle meaning "tormented"

(=vyathita, glossed in ed. ter.). Hence read nipdoṭa- Ānipīlīta- Ānipīlīta. [p. 14]

Once again we are reminded by our ancestor-gurus--jivat kaver āśay na varṇāniyāḥ = Don't try to interpret the poet who is still alive. We hesitate to put our words into Misra's mouth. However, we have no choice.
Probably what Misra wants us to learn here is: nipīḍīta is derived from nipīḷita, which in turn is derived from nipīḷita. If so we can bow down our head not in reverence but in shame and say: mugdha-mataye namāḥ. The original word of Bilhaṇa is nimīlīta. We fail to understand how 'm' gets turned into 'p'! A reader of these lines is bound to reach one of the two conclusions: Either this writer (N) is a dumb fool or Misra is not honest and reliable.

Misra shows here his superb knowledge of "philological linguistics." We fail to understand what is the connection between "nimīlīta" (the starting point) and "nipīḍīta" (Misra's end product!)

The trouble with Misra is that he wants to judge Bilhaṇa by the time-worn, traditionall, hackneyed, common standards of literary interpretation. If a word used by Bilhaṇa is not found in a modern dictionary, Misra gets alarmed. We should always keep in mind that Vīkṣ. as a whole was unknown to the modern lexicographers until 1875. Bilhaṇa does not profess to follow the tradition in a blind manner. He himself declares:

Sahasraśaḥ santu viśāradānāṁ vaidarbhalīlānidhayaḥ prabandhāḥ.
Tathāpi vaicitryarahasyalubdhāḥ śraddhām vidhāyanti sacetaso'tra. [1:13]

Also

Praudhiprakarṣena puraṇarīti-vyatikramaḥ ślāghyatamaḥ padānāṁ.
Atyunnatisphoṭitakaṅcukāni vandyāni kāntākucamaṇḍalāni. [1:15]

Those who are born and brought up in the tradition of only the conventional poets like Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, and Māgha cannot easily appreciate the beauties of a poet like Bilhaṇa, who was a pioneer in his own right. Bilhaṇa wanted to set his own standards. He wanted to follow his own path. The work of restoration is a very delicate task. At the very first attempt, Misra tries to destroy whatever exists. Then he wants to build a new. This is not reconstruction and restoration. This is destruction and distortion.

N translated nimīlītāṁ as paripīḍītānam. Bh copied it and said vyāthitānāṁ! Monier-Williams gives some better meanings: For example, "having closed the eyes." Apte gives other meanings too like "benumbed" and "stupefied." Nimīlītānāṁ really denotes intense pain causing the sufferer to close the eyes. Nimīlīta does not exclusively mean "having been closed" as Misra puts it. It has many meanings. And we should never forget the great dictum:

Kāmadughā hi mahākavīnāṁ vāco bhavanti.

Atha ca

Yā dugdhāpi na dugdheva kavidogdhṛbhir anvaham.
Misra has no value for the anuprāsa. He does not care for mādhuryam. There is a world of difference between nimilītanām and nipiditānam. One has to develop the art of appreciation of poetry to become a sahṛdaya.

The same type of rashness is displayed once again by our neo-expounders, Bh and Misra:

Saundaryam indīvaralocanānām dolāsu lolāsu yad ullalāsa.
Yadi pramādāl labhate kavitvaṁ jānāti tad varṇayituṁ manobhūḥ. [7:20]

The reading of N and that of J and P is "pramādāl labhate." Forcibly and arbitrarily B has made it "prasādāt." Bh rejects the former and accepts the latter, i.e. "prasādāt." Then he creates his own world of imagination. He explains "prasādāt" by "Sarasvaty anugrahāt." He criticizes Caritatandrikā, which has tried to explain "pramādāt anava dhānatām paritvajjyeti bhāvah." Bh argues that "pramādāt" is an error of the scribe and gives certain Puranic story to support his argument, which still remains unacceptable to us. We still don't know how prasādāt could specifically mean "Sarasvatyanugrahāt!"

However Bhākara has "prasādāt."

Probably this is the only instance where Bh has gone against Caritatandrikā (that great ancient glossary!) and is bold enough to disagree openly. He says: Caritatandrikā ā- ippani-kārasya 'pramādāt anava dhānatām paritvajjyeti bhāvah!' [!] ityapi cintyam."

Misra presents a lengthy discussion on the reading. He unnecessarily goes to Pāṇini. N had no intention to get Pāṇini involved here for the final decision. Let it be stressed again that J has pramādāt. Also Smk. has pramādāt as attested by our self-glorified research scholar, Mr. Misra [p. 53].

We can see in the following example very clearly to what extent the editors and commentators can take liberty with the poet:

Dolāsu yad dolanam aṅganānām yan mallikā yac ca lavoṅgavāyuḥ.
Sā viśvasaṁmohanadīkṣitasya mukhyāṅgasampat kusumāyudhasya. [7:21]

Bh does not like "yat yat." He tries to replace the two words with "yā" and "yaśca. He did not like the original reading and would have loved to replace, but refrained from doing so on account of the unavailability of other reading, as if wherever he has changed a reading and ruined the text, he had some support! But he forgets that "yat" here is "Sāmānye napumṣakāṃ." In order to match with "sā" (singular), "yat" must be in singular too. This matching can be performed better if the gender is not changed.

If Bh had seen Monier-Williams (p. 807, col. 3) he might not have been confused. MW says:
Sometimes the relative \textit{yad}, with or without its demonstrative, appears to be used \textit{re dundantly} to eke out the metre, or perhaps to give force to the noun with which it is connected, even the neut. sing. being occasionally thus used in connection with words of a different gender and number, and the relative being itself almost untranslatable (e.g. \textit{yan maraṇaṁ sośyā viśrāmaḥ}).

But Bh belongs to a class of arm-chair "researchers" whose primary instrument is as 

\textit{vācyoyukti}. They don't want to search. They just want to re-search. They believe and practice \textit{manahpūtam samācaret}. They don't have to prove. They just dictate.

*           *           *

Misra's genius soars high up when he discusses:

\textit{Hastadvayygadhagṛhītalola-dolāgunānāṁ jakāhane vadhūnām.}
\textit{Asaṁvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe kim apyabhūd ucchvasito manobhūḥ.} [7:29]

He remarks:

\textit{asaṁvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe}: it is difficult to construe this as a compound, for the hips of the women (\textit{jagāhane vadhūnām}) are not first "uncovered" (\textit{asaṁvṛta-}) and then "loosing their linen dress" (-srastadukūlabandha-) as we have to understand according to \textit{Pāṇ.}, 2.1.49. Better is the conjecture of \textit{ed. ter.}: \textit{asaṁvṛte srastadukūlabandhe}, "[the hips of the women] having been uncovered, their underwear [!] having gone."

Because you are a \textit{mugdha-śiromaṇi}!

Because he is \textit{mugdatara-śiromaṇi}!!

Misra talks about their underwear. We are not sure if they wore underwears!

Easiest, and therefore best, would be to interpret the tradition [?] as: \textit{asaṁvṛta[s] srasta dukūlabandha} and construe \textit{asaṁvṛtas} with \textit{manobhūḥ} "love, unfettered." Cp. above p . 1, on 1.74a. [pp. 14-15]

Notice how Misra's \textit{padam} ends without any \textit{vibhakti}! He brings Pāṇini again and again. But here Misra overlooks \textit{Subtiñantam padam}!!

Following the footsteps of Bh, Misra recommends that we should read \textit{asaṁvṛte srastadukūlabandhe}, or better make it \textit{asaṁvṛtaḥ} and connect the word with \textit{manobhūḥ}? Misra merely provides one more example of \textit{gaḍḍalikāpravāhanyāya} when he recommends that Bh's conjecture be adopted, which is unjustifiable. It is to be noted that both the "restorers" have overlooked the word "\textit{bandha}", i.e. knot = tie. \textit{Asaṁvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe} is a \textit{bahuṣrūhi} compound qualifying \textit{jakāhane}. Whatever is "\textit{asaṁvṛta}" and "\textit{srasta}" is not \textit{jakāhane} or \textit{dukūla}, but the \textit{dukūlabandha}. The knot gets untied or loosened and then the garment (that part of the garment) [not their "underwear" as Misra tells us!] slips down. If the \textit{jakāhane} gets totally \textit{asaṁvṛta} (naked) there will be \textit{rasabhaṅga} and not the continuity of \textit{sṛṅgāra}. It will be a great interruption, \textit{mahāvighna}. If the
vital parts of the body of a lady would become totally naked in public, it would be obscene. The *dolā-vilāsa* will stop instantaneously--then and there! No respectable woman, no decent lady would like to remain naked in public even for a moment. In reality the *jaghana* had become just a little bit bare, because the knot (or tie) of her *sāri* (wearing apparel) had become slightly loose, and had slipped just a little. There is no need to make the *jaghana* totally naked, completely bare. The purpose is served, and in a better way, if it is seen just a little bit bare. It is the slight glimpse of a part of the *jaghana* that brings fresh filip to the mind-born (God of Love). Misra translates "*manobhūḥ* " as "love" only!

And the question is: What is the need for a change? A change is to be considered only when the existing text does not make enough sense. For example, we don't change a particular part of an automobile if it is functioning perfectly well!

Here is a great poet, echoing the same sentiments:

\[
\text{Nāndhrīpayodhara ivātitārām prakāśaḥ}
\]
\[
\text{no Gurajarīstana ivātitārām nigūḍhaḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Artho girām apihitaḥ pihitaśca kaścit}
\]
\[
\text{saubhāgyam eti marahaṭṭavadhūkucābhāḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Quoted in Bālabodhinī comm. on Kāvyaprakāśa, v. 45.}
\]
\[
\]

Since we do not want to change *asāmyṛta* into *asāmyṛte*, we are not willing to follow the other path suggested by Misra, though, according to him, it is the best, but we regard it as the worst. The whole inherent charm of the *ucchvāsiṇa* of *manobhūḥ* is ruined. If Bilhaṇa were there to see what distortion Misra has perpetrated, the poet would merely cry in utter dispair:

\[
\text{Arasikeṣu kavītvanivedanaṁ śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha.}
\]

Here is a charming *saduki* of a great poet, which may open the *carmacakṣuḥ* of critics like Misra:

\[
\text{Anudghuṣṭaḥ śabdair atha ghaṭanataḥ ca sphaṭatarāḥ}
\]
\[
\text{padānām arthātmā sukhatayati na tūttānitaraṣaḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Yathā kiṅcitkiṅcitpavanacalācātmāmśukatayā}
\]
\[
\text{kucābhogaḥ strīṇām sukhatayi na tūḍghāṭitam uḍaḥ.}
\]

This verse has some variant readings as quoted by Vāmanācārya Jhalākīkara in his *Bālabodhinī* on *Kāvyaprakāśa*. 7th ed. 1965, p.191, fn.3.

[DHARMĀŚOKASYA. FROM SUKTIMUKTĀVALI. KAVIKĀVYAPRAŚAṂSĀ]

\[
\text{Anuddhṛṣṭaḥ śabdair atha ca racaṇātaḥ sphaṭarasaḥ}
\]
\[
\text{padāṇām arthātmā janayati kaviṇaṁ bahumudam.}
\]
\[
\text{Yathā kiṅcitkiṅcitpavanacalācālaṁkalayā}
\]
\[
\text{kucadvandaṁ kāṇṭiṁ kirati na tathodghāṭitam uḍaḥ.}
\]
anuddhṛṣ aḥ may very well be an error on the part of the scribe or printer.

We would like to know from Misra, the critic, how does he want to construe the whole verse. Is asaṁvyṛṭaḥ an uddeśya or vidheya? What is the finite verb? What is the meaning of kimapi? How does it stand in relation to Misra's "Love unfettered?"

We have designated Misra as munitrayaikyam--Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali--all three in one! He refers to Pāṇini 2.1.49 in discussing the above--"asaṁvyṛṭa srastaduk ūlabandhe." The sūtra is "Pūrvakālaikasarvājarat purāṇanavakevalāḥ samānādhikaraṇa." The example of "pūrvakāla", as given by Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita, is "pūrvam snātah p aścādanuliptah snātānuliptah." Misra has not specifically stated in Sanskrit what he wants to convey. Therefore, we cannot determine what he exactly wants to say. We can only guess. If we are right, we will need a compound like "pūrvam asaṁvyṛṭah paścād srastadukālabandhaḥ." This will require that we have another sub-compound (bahu vr̥hi), something like "srastah dukūlasya bandho yasya tat (jaghanam)", because unless s and until "srastadukūlabandha" is made an adjective of jaghana, and made coordinat e with "srasta", i.e. a samānādhikaraṇa, we cannot apply the above sūtra of Pāṇini.

If the above reasoning, as advanced by us, is accepted, then the whole compound w ould mean that the hips got first naked and then their knot of the clothing (dress) got "s rasta", i.e. slipped! This will be an absurd idea. If Misra wants to live in his own wor d, he is free to do so. But no sane lover of the poetry would accompany him into that world of fantasy created by him.

*                   *                   *

Bh's Grammatical Jugglery

The word aksūṇa in the verse 7:40 provides an opportunity for Bh to display his com mand over grammatical construction and interpretation. Bilhaṇa says:

Rāśikṛtāḥ puspapāragapuñjāḥ pade pade daksināmārutena. Mattasya Caitrādviradasya kartum aksūṇahetor iva pāṁsūtalpān. [7:40]

I did not understand the meaning of the word aksūṇa in this verse. I had no hesitatio n in confessing the limitations of my knowledge and stated with all the honesty and sin cerity at my command that aksūṇapadasyārtho nāvagamyate. Even today, after a laps e of four decades, I don't know exactly what it means!

Bh who took Candrikā to be an "ancient" commentary, consciously or unconsciouls y, remarked:

Kutracit "asya śabdasyārthāgam na jāyate" iti spaṣṭam likhitvā ūpānīkṛtā vid uṣā niraḥaṅkāram svapāndityam pariṣāyitam."
I don't know wherefrom Bh quotes Caritacandrika. The only place Nagar (i.e. Caritacandrika) used such an expression was here in 7.40, but N’s words are: ‘akṣūnapadas yārtha nāvagamyate!

However, Bh had no difficulty at all in understanding the meaning of the word. Through a rigorous jugglery of a great grammarian, Bh has tried to establish that the word akṣūna can be interpreted as gatyavarodhaḥ, i.e. viśrāmaḥ. But he overlooks the significance of the expression pade pade = at every step, everywhere. The must elephant does not need immediate or constant rest. He needs an outlet for his over-bursting energy—let him steam off, as it were. He is not suffering from, say, tuberculosis that he would need rest at every step. In reality, he would like to get engaged in sportive acts at every step. That is the meaning. So, although the dictionaries do not support us, although we are not yet sure whether the word akṣūna is genuine and correct, (i.e. whether it represents the original correct reading), we can tentatively assign it the meaning of vihāra, līlā, or krīḍā (sportive play) to relieve him of the intense pressure caused by the severe madāvasthā.

It is interesting to observe that B & G try to render the verse in English, but they avoid the interpretation of the words kartum akṣūnahetor iva. Here is what they say:

The southern breeze ![ali] piled up, at every step, pollens of flowers as if to make a bed for the intoxicated ![ali] elephant in the shape of caitra.

I don’t think the breeze can pile up. It has to be the wind.

However, they are honest enough to add in the footnote: "In this verse the word Ac hyūnahetoh [sic] is obscure." ['Achyūna' won’t make akṣūna.]

Misra's Chapter I is titled: "Specimens of Textual Difficulties." He has discussed so many "difficulties," as felt by him. To us many of them are merely his own fantastic fantasies. However, he has not discussed the word akṣūna. Probably he did not have any "difficulty" in it at all! Nevertheless, it is still a cause of great "difficulty" to me!

I believe we must go to some ancient text on GajaÅśāstra to understand this verse [7:40]. Mātanga-līlā of Nīlakanṭha describes the first stage of must, (mada, dangerous periodic excitement), prathamā madāvasthā, as follows:

Madhurucinakahadantapreksaṇo nīlamegha-
ccavir aruṇādṛgantaḥ padmakiñjalkabinduḥ.
Aparagajavirodhī pāṃsupāthovihārair
bhavati ca kaṭapūrṇaḥ sundaro vāraṇendraḥ.
[Navamaḥ pa alaḥ. Verse 12]

And here is Edgerton's translation of the above verse [pp. 82-83]:

12. With honey-coloured nails, tusks and eyes [? MLN], skin like a dark cloud, red corners of the eyes, lotus-filament spots (on the skin), quarreling with other elephants,
with sporting in dust [stress mine] and water, the handsome elephant-king becomes "temple-filled" (in the first stage of must.)

The text reads  \textit{pāṃsuptāthovihārāir}, i.e. instrumental of "bhavati." Edgerton gives a variant reading \textit{vihārī}. We believe this reading is preferable. The elephant does not become "\textit{ka apīrṇaḥ}" by means of or through "sporting in dust and water." The \textit{mada} is a natural phenomenon and the "sport" is the resultant natural behaviour. \textit{Vihārī} is in perfect consonance with \textit{virodhī}.

Well, whatever it may be, our main concern is \textit{pāṃsuvihāra}. \textit{Dhālimṛṣṭiḥ} is mentioned as part of the daily routine (\textit{dinacaryā}) by Nīlakaṇṭha [11:8]. Edgerton translates the word as "rubbing down with powder." We believe this is \textit{pāṃśukrīdā}, rather than "rubbing with powder."

\textbf{Cf. Vaprakrīḍāpariṇatagajaprekṣaṇīyaṃ dadarśa.}  
\textbf{[Meghadūte Kālidāsah]}

Now let us see what \textit{Mātvaṅgalī} says on \textit{pāṃśu} \textit{[puṣpa- parāgapuṇjāḥ]} of Bilhana:

\textit{Sarveṣāṃ madakṛḍ vasantasamayaḥ prokto, viśeṣāḥ asau nāgāṇāṃ tu, tato vasantajanitā ye te tu gandhadvipāḥ.} [1:40]

And \textit{rajoṁbupaṅkaviḥṛtī}  [1:35]

This justifies the \textit{mada} in the Spring:

\textit{Atimadhurarasāṅāṃ sevayā patrabhaṅgaiḥ kabalakubalāsāpair annapānair yathoktaḥ.  
Śrutisubhagavacobiḥ pāṃsu [stress added] pāṅkāmbudānair bhavati muditacetāḥ kāmacāreṇa nāgāḥ.} [9:1]

And \textit{pāṅkāmbupāṃsupriyah} [stress added]  [5:6]

We would like to refer to another \textit{ākara-grantha} on the subject: Pālakāpyamuni-\ vir acito \textit{Hastyāyuvedaḥ}. [Poona, Anandashrama, 1894].

\textit{Caturtthe uttarasthāne triṃśattamaḥ pāṃsudānādhyāyaḥ.} [p.691]

\textit{Athāṭaḥ pāṃsudānasya vakṣyate guṇasaṅgrahāḥ.} [15]

\textit{Atha śraddhāṃ ca kurute tathāhāraśramaṃ bhavet [tyajet?] Pāṃśur mattasya nāgasya manāḥsaukhyavivardhanaḥ.} [16]

Pāṃśur uṣṇābhitaptasya jayasaukhyavivardhanaḥ.} [17]

\textit{Pāṃśudānagnopeto rasadhātur vivardhate, etc. etc.}
I went through the entire book, I am sorry to say, hurriedly, but I did not find any clue to solve the problem of \textit{akṣaṇaḥetoḥ} in the verse being discussed.

As stated elsewhere, an attempt was made by a vaiyākaranaśiromani a distinguished friend of Bharadwaj, to give the derivation of this word [\textit{akṣaṇa}]. Bilhana did not write a poetry that could be understood only with the help of such a great learned grammarian. He composed his poem in \textit{Vaidarbhī riti} and it is endowed with \textit{prasāda guṇa}. Let us hear Bilhana himself:

Grāmo nāsau na sa janapadaḥ sāstī no rājadhānī
tannāranyam na tad upavanam sā na sārasvatī bhūḥ.
Vidvān mṛkhaḥ pariṇatavayā bālakaḥ strī pumān vā
yatronmīlapulakam akhilā nāsya kāvyam paṭhanti. [18:89]

I am sure Bilhana knew the word "\textit{viśrāma}", which could be substituted for \textit{akṣaṇa}, which this great grammarian has derived with such a great verbal jugglery. Instead of using the word "\textit{akṣaṇa}" and forcing Bh to employ the services of such a great grammarian, Bilhana could have easily sung:

Mattasya caitraviradasya kartuµ viśrāmahetor iva pāṃsutalpān. [!] 

Let us study the following verse which gives us Misra's one more "non-sensical" interpretation, to borrow his own terminology. Bilhana says:

Unnidrapaṅktisthitacampakāni cakāśire kelivanāntarāṇi.
Viyogināṁ kavalīkṛtāṇāṁ suvarṇakāñcibhir ivāṅcitāni. [7:50]

Misra translates the above verse as follows:

The interiors of the parks, whose campaka-[is a Sanskrit word] trees standing in rows, were fully bloomed (with yellow-golden flowers), appeared as if marked by the golden belts of jilted lonely girls who intended to hang themselves by their belts. (emphasis added) [p. 29]

The underlined portion is a display of "nonsensical" interpretation by our Abhinava-Bilhaṇa Misra. I don't know how he gets all this meaning. The poet says \textit{kavalīkṛtāṇāṁ viyogināṁ suvarṇakāñcibhir aṅcitāni iva = "adorned with [not merely "marked by"] golden girdles [not belts] of the devoured (swallowed) ladies who had been suffering from the pain of separation from their lovers." The \textit{viyoginis} died when the \textit{campaka} flowers attained the stage of full bloom. I don't know why Misra had to take the ladies to the \textit{campaka} trees to hang themselves? Were they the gallows? We don't know how far Misra can take himself! Misra does not give the meaning of the word \textit{kavalīkṛtā nāṁ} which means "devoured", "eaten up", or "swallowed." At least the word does not figure in his translation!
Śrīharṣa in his Naiṣadhyacarita describes the destructive force of campaka flowers. Here is one of his saduktis:

Vicinvatīḥ pāṇthapataṅgahimśanair apuṇyakarmāṇyalikajalacchalāt.
Vyalokayac campakakorakāvalīḥ sa Śambarārer balidīpikā īva.

Probably Misra did not read it. Neither Bh nor B & G are very clear here. However, they have not misunderstood the way Misra has done.

Also Bilhaṇa:

Tathā gataḥ campakadāmagaurī ṣaṛtrayaṣṭīḥ kṛṣatām kṛṣāṅgyāḥ.
Yathā galaccāpamanoratōśyāṁ maurvīlatāsthāṁ madanaḥ karoti. [9:30]

Once again we meet here the word aṇcītam, disliked so much by Misra, already discussed, in connection with the verse (in suvarṇakāṇēcitībhir īvāṇcītāṁ).

Misra commented on this word as follows:

for arcītam in MSS. and ed. pri., aṇcītam in ed. sec. (followed by ed. ter.) is done endless by the editor, obviously in silent reference to Pāṇ.6.4.30 and 7.2.53, yet Bilhaṇa has no example of aṇcīta in this sense. [p.26, fn.2]

Misra does not ask us once again here to replace aṇcītam by arcītam! Why? However, he translates the word as "marked by!"

* * *

A simple word 'kuhūṭkāri' occurring in

Pāṇīyaṁ nālikērīphalakuharakuḥūṭkāri kallolayantāḥ
Kāverītrātaladrumabharitasurāḥbhāṇḍabhāṅkāranāṇāḥ.
Unmiślaṁśālaparicayāśīrā vāntyamī Drāvidināṁ
karputrāpānḍugandasthalaluṭhitarayā vāyavo dākṣinātyāḥ.
[7:71]

agitates Misra's brain-cells. In his opinion, "the previous attempts in translating [Bilhaṇa] have been banal." [p. 19] Also "attempts in interpreting the text, in the hands of modern scholars, have been dubious." [Misra on his DUST-jacket!] So he says:

kuhūṭkāri:- the wrong orthography kuhūṭ- (all edd. and anthologies) instead of kuhū, "a sound, like the cry of the Kokila", may be due to false [?] analogy after phūṭkṛ (8.1 8; 11.23) "to make a hissing sound." Cp. below Chap. III on 7.71. [p. 15]

We don't understand what the melodious song of the Kokila has to do here. Kuhūṭkāri is just an onomatopoeic word, being an imitation of the sound of the coconuts shake
n by the winds (the nuts possessing water inside naturally make the specific sound when shaken).

Cf. Nārikelaphalakhaṇḍatāṇḍava

Misra could have suggested an improved reading based on the A MS. i.e. *lulita* for *u hita* in the fourth *pāḍa*. Cf.

Niṣiddhāra apyebhīr lulitamakardando madhukaraiḥ [*Veṇīsamhāra* 1.1]

For a similar idea see:

Ye dolākelikāraḥ kim api mṛgadṛṣṭām mānatantucchido ye sadyaḥ śrīgāradīksāvyatikaraguravo ye ca lokatraye'pi.

Te kaṇṭhe lolayantaḥ pārabhṛtavayasāṃ pañcamam rāgarājam vānti svairam samīrāḥ smaravijayamahāsākṣino dākṣīṇātyāḥ.

The above verse, composed by Rājaśekhara, is cited by Sūktimuktañvalī right after the following two verses of Bilhaṇa--*Pāṇīyam nālīkeri* and *Tanvānaśītalatvam*. All the three are very similar in wording and meaning--*śabdāvalī* and arthatattvam.

Misra also discusses *bhāṃkāri* in 7:71. He says:


Na hi sarvaḥ sarvaṃ jānāti

B changed a perfectly sensible word into utter nonsense in the following verse as recognised by Misra also. But Misra goes on to find fault with *Caritacandrikā* and Bh to o.

Māti nirvivare tasyāś citraṃ kucayugāntare.
Kṛḍākunḍalitocanḍa-kodandab kusumāyudhaḥ.

[8:41]

Misra says:

*māti*: the reading of MS. (*māti*) should be kept (with ed. sec.) and not changed into *b hāti* (edd. pri. and ter). It can, of course, not mean *āgacchati* (ed. sec.) but fits, finds place in". Cp.

Where does your " (quote) begin, Mr. Misra?
2.79 kvacin na māti sma mudā naresvarah, "the king did not find a place anywhere through joy", i.e. "cannot [could not?] contain himself for [!] joy", cp. Śiś. 1.23 etc. The verse in question... should be rendered as follows:

"God Love, whose terrible [!] bow is playfully arc hed, fits, [it is] marvelous, in the space between her breasts, which [yet] is without an opening [!] [which might give him room]." [What a terrible translation!] [p. 15]

Misra finds fault with N who has explained the word "māti" by "āgacchati." Pāṇini has Ādhāro'dhikaraṇaṁ (1.4.45) and Saptamyadhiśastra ca. (2.3.36). Bhāṭṭoji Dīkṣita defines-- upasālesiko, vaitayiko'bhivyāpakaś cetyādhārastridhā, and cites as the example of the third category sarvaminnatmāsti. I don't know what else it (māti) would mean when we put the following three words together: nirvivare kucayugāntare āgacchati.

Those who try to translate the poetry of one language into another faithfully and also want to preserve the beauties of the original alone know the problems involved. It is more difficult to translate great poets like Bilhaṇa, whose poetic muse cannot be easily rendered in other words, even in the same language. Agamyo hi mahākaviṇāṃ pant hāḥ! N follows sthālārundhatīnyāya or śākhācandrayāya when he uses the word "āgacchati." Misra has not given any other Sanskrit equivalent of his own choice. He merely translates "māti" into English by "fits, finds place in." Misra has cited a similar passage: kvacin na māti sma mudā naresvarah. Let us examine how shallow is his translation: "the king did not find a place anywhere through joy, i.e. "cannot [!] contain himself for [!] joy." It would have been much better to say: The king's joy had no bounds (limits); his joy was simply overwhelming, or, overflowing. Misra is translating literally. 'Na māti sma' is an idiomatic expression and hence it should be translated idiomatically.

Bh takes pride in copying "B" and "R" even where "N" has a better reading. The above verse is another example of this kind of unjust decision on the part of Bh. He reads "bhāti" and rejects "māti", i.e. he goes against even J, i.e. the poet himself. He explains "bhāti" as "pāññatayā samāgatya sāvakāśam virājata iti citram iti āścaryam." Incidentally it might be added that even Bh says: samāgatya. Cf. N's āgacchati.

We have already stated this and would state it once again that appreciation of poetry is an art. It is a matter of feeling. It is not a scientific phenomenon which can be verified empirically or proved by physical, concrete evidence. The true meaning of a kāvya can be comprehended only by those who are gifted by nature and have experienced the beauties of poetic muse by actually feeling them. The essence of poetry is: Kāvyārthaḥ-anāparipakvabuddhi-vibhavamātravedyam.

And

Saṅdārthaśasanajāna-mātreṇaiva na vedyate.
Vedyate sa hi kāvyārthatattvajñair eva kevalam.
[Dhvanyālokaḥ 1.14]

And here is our own poet Bilhaṇa: Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham. [1:22]
Bilhaṇa himself has warned unqualified simple folks (mugdhājanas) against trying to understand him: [1:22, etc.]

We fail to understand what is there to wonder about if Kāma is able to stay there. St rangely enough Bh forces the word "bhāti" to mean far more than its prakṛti and praty aya are capable of.

Bh tries to defend Bühler for his erroneous renderings of the text of the Vik. He says:

Prācīna kevala eka hasta-likhita pustaka ke ādhāra para jo bhī pustaka prathama b āra śīghratāse chapavāī jāegī, unamēm [!] yadi aśuddhiyāṃ ho [?] to ve kṣamya haim . Dā Jārja Byuhlara Mahodaya ko anya prati kahīm na milane se kevala usa eka Vikr amāṅkadevacarita Mahākāvyā kī hastalikhita prati ke ādhāra para hī pustaka chapav ānī pari thi. Kucha loga bhale hī Dā Jārja Byuhlara Mahodaya kī pustaka kī aśuddhi bahuta batākara [!] usakī [!]

Did Bh actually want to say...pustaka ko aśuddhi bahuta batākara... or, aśuddhī bahul a? It seems someone else (who might have had some personal grudge against N) wrote the above words. Mātsaryaṅgapahatātmānāṁ hi śkhālanti sādhuṣvapi mānasāṁi. Bh haravi. Bh merely got them published without understanding them! Dveṣyaiva k eśām api candrakhanda-vipāṇḍurā punḍrakaśārkarāpi [1:20.3-4]

nindā kareṁ kintu maiṁ to Dā Jārja Byuhlara Mahodaya ko aneka dhanyavāda detā hūm ki unhoṁne isa mahākāvyaaratna ko parakha kara īsako, aśuddhiyukta hī kyoṁ n a ho, prakāśita kara jagat ke sammukha prakaṣta kiyā. Anyathā yaha mahākāvyā bhī anya uttama tathā upayogī sāṃskṛta grantha [!] ke sādṛśa pustakālayom kī andherī ko thāriyoṁ meṁ hastalikhitā rūpa meṁ hī paṛā rahatā [What a wonderful Hindi writing! Deserves Maṅgalāprasāda pārītoṣika as well as Bhāratīya Jñānāpīṭha mahāpuraskāra!].

The above words, if freely rendered into English, would read as follows:

When a work is published for the first time in rush [!] and when it is based on only one old manuscript, there are bound to be errors and they are to be condoned.

Since Dr. Georg Bühler did not get any other manuscript of the Carita, he had to get the work published on the basis of only one manuscript that he had found. Some may very well abuse (nindā kareṁ) Dr. Georg Bühler by pointing out the errors of his edition, but I offer myriads of my sincere thanks to that great Georg Bühler who realized the value of this great epic-gem and brought it out before the learned world--may be even in erroneous form.... [Vol. III, Introd. p. 2]

It is interesting to note that Bh did not indulge in this kind of unnecessary defence of Bühler in his first two volumes. It seems his mind got inflated by his apparent success when he saw his third volume was published and he was able to put forth all
that he wanted. His mental balloon of pride got inflated with hot air and soared high up in the skies.

We do not understand why such a defense was necessary! It assumes quite a lot. Bh does not mention the name of the "abuser" who has "abused," according to him, the name of Bühler. He merely says "some" (plural) as "abusing." We wish he had named those who, in his opinion, had abused Dr. Georg Bühler. Bh has used the word "nindā." Now the word "nindā" means "guñeṣu doṣāropāḥ," i.e. to superimpose vices on virtues. But Bühler is not criticized, even if he is, in a way that could be termed as "imposing vices on virtues." To state the facts (vastu-sthiti-kathanam) is not "nindā." Our ancient nītikāras have already instructed us:

Śatror api guṇā vācyā doṣā vācyā gūror api.

If Bh has in his mind the criticism of Bühler by Nagar, he is sadly mistaken. He is misrepresenting the facts; he is distorting the truth. Here is what Nagar wrote in his "Introduction" [pp. 2-4 Prastāvanā, p. 5 Upodghāta].

Bühler was in great rush as far as the original copying is concerned. His time in Jaisalmer was extremely limited. He had seen the manuscript for the first time. He copied it within seven days. Nagar has acknowledged how significant was the task performed by Bühler. It is not the intention of Nagar to decry Bühler's virtues, but just to state the facts. However, it is not only the copying of J at Jaisalmer that created errors, but many of them were generated subsequently in the process of preparing the press copy, and in consciously editing the work for publication. If Bühler had just reproduced the Jaisalmer MS. photographically—exactly as it was—it would have been far more authentic and helpful to future generations!

Bh has no idea—none whatsoever—of the "blood, sweat and tears" to which Nagar was subjected in correcting the text. He (Bh) crossed the turbulent river easily by means of the bridge constructed by Nagar. How could he know how the bridge was constructed? He had never constructed even one bridge in his entire life. Did he ever come across the following sadukti:

Vidvān eva vijānāti vidvajjanapariśramam.
Na hi vandhyā vijānāti gurvīṃ prasavavedanāṃ.

Also we have Murāri kavi:

Abdhir langhita eva vānarabhaṭaiḥ kintvasya gambhīratāṃ
āpātālanimagnāpi varavapur jānāti manthācalāḥ.
Nagar has shown how Bühler both restored and distorted the text. Bühler's debt is a
acknowledged very well by Nagar in clear terms:

Param atra na višeadoṣabhājanaṃ Đā. Byuhlaramahodayaḥ. Tena yadapyakāri ta
d astyadhikham. Tasya vidyāvyāsaṅgagaveṣañā् saktiprabhṛtīganañāḥ praśamsākotim atīt
ya varante... Khaniprädbhūtaṃ ratnaṃ sadyo malinam eva jāyate... Đā. Byuhlaras
āmskaraṇadoṣā na khalu na soḍhavyāḥ. [p. 4, Upodghāta.]

Maybe Bh did not read this eulogy. If he read it, he certainly disregarded it while tr
ying to defend Bühler unnecessarily.

Let us resume our discussion. Āstām tāvat, prakṛtam anusaraṃmah. The original readi
ng (8:41) was "māti." Bühler changed it to "bhāti." With reference to Bühler’s knowled
gs of the Kavyamārga and the power of appreciation of the poetic muse, N had alread
y commented in his Introduction: [pp. 2-4 & 8 of Prastāvanā and p. 4 of Upodghāta].
We can reproduce here one of the most significant statements: "Itihāscāryasya Đā. B
yuhlaramahodayasya jñānārāśvaitihāsīko’msāḥ sāhityāṃśam nānām atyāśeta." [p. 6 of
Upodghāta]. Bh should not have forgotten the immortal dictum of Viśākhadatta: Na h
i sarvāḥ sarvāṃ jñātā!

Bh unnecessarily tries to defend B as if he (Bh) alone is a guṇagrāhin and has unde
rstood the value of Bühler's work, and that no one else has been able to appreciate the
great contribution B has made to the Indological studies in general. Bh argues that on
ly one ancient MS. was available to Bühler. But that does not mean that the editor sho
uld take undue liberty with it. None can justify the distortion of the original text. Even
one MS can be so accurate as to surpass ten inaccurate ones. It is well said:

Varam eko guṇī putro na ca mūrkaḥsatānyapi.
Ekaś candras tamo hanti na ca tārāgaṇo'khilāḥ.

Bühler had only one MS. So what? It is one of the best that ever existed. One can
condone the errors if they had existed in the original. But one cannot tolerate misrepr
esentation of the true text on the part of any editor, howsoever great he might be. J is
far more correct than one could ever imagine! B was not to be blamed at all if J was i
ntrinsically erroneous and its errors were reproduced by B. We are disturbed by those
passages where J is perfect, i.e. true and correct one hundred percent, but B (kaścana
pāṇḍityapradarśanapaḥ paṇḍitammanyāḥ sampādaśaśiromāniḥ) did not understand t
he meaning and tried to show his own pedantry, and distorted the original text. We w
ould have no quarrel with B at all if he and his associates had brought forth only a true
representation of J.

We do not understand what Bh means by aśuddhiyuktaḥ kṛ yōṃ na ho [V.3, Introd. p
. 2]. Does he mean "the one which was full of errors from the very beginning, that is,
which was originally (intrinsically) erroneous" or does he mean "by making one erron
eous which had no error to begin with?" If it is the former, we have no quarrel with hi
m. If it is the latter, we cannot agree. It is better not to publish a text than to publish it
by distorting the original, creating non-sense where there was a perfect sense already
reigning supreme. For example, substitution of \textit{manmathabāṇamitram} for \textit{manmathabā lamitram} [7:3] and \textit{vibhātavarga} for \textit{vibhāvavarge} [13:72].

Having written what is presented above, I felt an unresistible urge to give a fuller treatment to the topic and silence the neo-expounder, (Bh) who unnecessarily tried to defend someone who did not need any defence! Maybe Bh was just suffering from inferiority complex. He wanted to show off.

Let us consider some more vital readings and evaluate how they have been mishandled.

\begin{quote}
Ullekhālāghaṇāpaṭūnāṃ sacetasāṃ vaikaṅkopamānāṃ.
Vicāraśānopalapaṭikāsu matsūktiratnānyatithībhavantu. [1:19]
\end{quote}

The above is a true and exact reproduction of J.

In the 4th \textit{pāda}, P committed an error while copying and turned the reading into- \textit{ratnānīvibhībhavantu}. That is "ta" was read as "va," and "tha" as "bha". B exercised his power of reconstruction and restoration, and turned the whole into \textit{ratnānī nidhībhavantu}. That is, not only "bha" and "ba" were changed but also "nya-" into "ni."

Consequently the reading got far removed from the original. This is an example of \textit{sāmyena nika asthān pā hān parityajya dūrasthān ayuktān pā hān svabuddhyā'gha ayat}.

And here is another example of mishandling:

\begin{quote}
Prakoṣṭhāpṛṣṭhasphuradindranīla-ratnāvalīkaṅkaṅadambareṇa.
Bandhāya dharmaṇpratibandhakānāṃ vahan sahotthān iva nāgapāśān. [1:47]
\end{quote}

This is the reading of J, correct one hundred percent.

In the 4th \textit{pāda}, J has \textit{vahan sahotthān}.

P turned it into \textit{vahūn sahotthān}.

B made it \textit{badhnan sahotthān}.

But \textit{badhnan} where?

Obviously \textit{badhnan} is far removed from \textit{vahan} as compared to \textit{vahūn} which erroneously had crept into P.

Here is one more instance to satisfy Bh, if he could listen to reasoning.

\begin{quote}
Svaḥsaundarībandiparigrahāya datto'ñjaliḥ sampratī dānavendraiḥ.
Iti praharsād amarāṅganaṇāṇāṃ netrotpalaśrenibhir arcyamānāḥ. [1:52]
\end{quote}
In the first pāda, J has bandi. As stated on p.3 of my Prastāvanā, samaste’pi Ja pust ake ba varṇasya prayoga eva nāsti.

Naturally P could have taken it to be vandi. Even a beginner knows ba-vayor abhed abh. B could have made it bandi (=captive). However, he went far away from the reality and turned the reading into vṛnda. The total charm of the poet’s camatkārokti, madhu rokti, and vicchitti was lost in that vṛnda (multitude).

* * *

Prāptas tataḥ śrījayasimhadevaśa Cālukyasimhāsanamaṇḍanatvam. Yasya vyarājanta gajāhaveṣu muktāpalaṅīva kare yaśāṃsi. [1:79]

Here is one more camatkāra of B. Bilhaṇa composed the fourth quarter as muktāpaṅīva kare yaśāṃsi. P omitted two letters (kare) and made it muktāpalaṅīva yaśaṃsi! B fills the lacuna with mahā! Yaśas might have become mahat, but the vacanam got laghu.

As an essential decorum that deserves to be observed, B ought to have enclosed his own creation within square brackets with a question mark. The B text as it appears has no indication whatsoever that mahā is not Bilhaṇa-kavi-vacanam, but a creation of some mahāpandaṇita!

* * *

Let us study one more example of "doṣayukta hī kyoṃ na ho":

Cintāmaṇir yasya puro varākas tathāhi vārtttā janaviśruteyam Yat tatra sauvarṇatulādhirūḍhē cakre sa pāśānatulādhiroham. [1:98]

J has cakre sa.

P turned it into cakre sma.

As if this aberration was not enough, the Errata of B makes the reading as dhatte sma. We are reminded of a popular saying--marza barhatā hī gayā jyoṃ jyoṃ dava kī. The disease went on increasing as we went on treating.

* * *

Here is another failure on the part of B. This is how Bilhaṇa composed the following verse originally:

Sa sauṣkāraikadhano’pi soḍhavāms tapodhanair duṣprasaḥam pariśramam. Rarāja tīvre tapasi sthito nrpaḥ śaśīva candadyutimaṇḍalātīthiḥ. [2:45]
The fourth caraṇa in P reads śaṣṭva dyutimāndalātīthiḥ, i.e. there is an omission of two letters. B makes an attempt to fill the lacuna but fails. Success eludes him.

The king performed such a severe tapas that mahārṣayo’smād apakarṣam āyayuh [2:44]. Also the poet says: Nṛpaṁ ka horavratacaryayā kṛṣam [2:46]. Obviously the king got withered. He became weak and pale. Certainly he was not at his best as far as his dyuti was concerned. Now the moon shines (displays her glory and splendour) among the stars. The poet wants to convey the idea that the king resembled the moon when she is in direct contact with the sun, caṇḍadyutimāndalātīthi [let us pay attention to the word "caṇḍa"]. The poet wanted the "sun" but B gives us the stars! Not tārāmāndala even, but only the tārādyutimāndala. Only their shine! B ought to have remembered that the moon does not lose her lustre among the stars! What a contrast! How deeply injurious is the distortion of truth and how undesirable is the misrepresentation of facts!! Still Bh has the dhāṛṣ yam (audacity) to utter--kucha loha hī nindā kareṁ!

We cannot expect B to have the divine insight--divya cakṣuh. Every scholar has his own limitations. He may not be able to divine the actual words of the poet. But it is his academic and moral duty to see that what he imagines does not lead us the wrong way--asato mā sad gamaya!

It is better to keep quiet. But if one decides to speak, he should see that it does not turn out to be meaningless.

Cf. prabhātakalpa śaśineva śarvarī.

* * *

Kalatram urvītilakasya mekhalākalāpamāṇiṣṭamārṣacibhir dadhe.
Udeṣyataḥ sūryasamsyasa tejasah samudgataṁ bālam ivātapam puraḥ. [2:72]

The word bāla is not very clear in J. It could very well be read as pāla. N’s fn reads: "Pāla- " ityasti "bāla- " iti veti Ja. pustake spaś anī nāsti."

B reads jālamivātapam.

B fn. gives pālamivātapam. (i.e. acc. to B, P (and supposedly J too) has pālamivātapam.

However, the question is: How the word jāla would get connected with ātapam?

And befitting its own "nature," R makes it "jālamivātatam." The person who saw the last edition first and struggled and struggled cannot come in the sphere of the limited knowledge of Bh, who had Rāmāvatāra Śarmā as his guruveryāṇām. This is called an dhena niyamāṇā yathāndhāḥ! Bh cannot even dream of the terrible toil of N! Na hi va ndhyā vijānāti gurvīm prasavavedanām! Bh had unlimited power in his pen.

The restoring (or distorting ?) editor did not care whether the text made any sense at all or not.
Atra Dr̥avidaḥumipāladalanaṃkritāraṣaṇḍāmāre kodan̥ḍadhvanibhir vidhunvatā
ganadhvānānukārair jagat. Vaidehiṃraṃaṇaṃsyā Rāvanāśīraś cede Ṛyaṅaṅtakrudh
ah pratyāvṛttir akāṇḍakampataralair āśaṅkī Laṅkācaraṇīḥ. [3:77]

J has Dr̥avida. The editor in B did not understand the meaning of the proper name.
So he made it dr̥avita = made to run away! But there is no valor in
dr̥avita-dalana!

Bilhaṇa himself says elsewhere:

Aripṛṣṭhagrahaṇān nyavartin. [15:84.4]

Here in 3:77, at the end of the first caraṇa we have kṛīḍārasoṇḍāmāre. This is the r

eading of J.

P omits ddā and makes it kṛīḍārasomare.

B makes it kṛīḍārasotthe rave.

We don't know if the editor-restorer understood the meaning! We can call it only av
yāpāreśu vyāpāram.

However, B ed. gives kṛīḍārasomarave in the fn., thereby attributing this reading to
P, which is not true because P has kṛīḍārasomare!!

Thus we see that there is a divergence of form and substance between P and B fn! I

n other words, B fn. = transcription of P, or "press-copy," and not what was prepared in
Jaisalmer. This was an aside.

To return to the main theme: R makes it kṛīḍārasotthe raṇe. Seyam aparā kathā!!

Then we come to verse 4:113:

Pranayapravānaṇaivāsīt tasya śṛṭaḥ saparigrāhaḥ.
Pram naṅṅikaroṭi sma Vikramāṅkaḥ kalaṅkiniṃ. [4:113]

This verse does exist in P, still it does not exist in the B ed.!! Would this kind of omis
sion too be called by Bh as "aśuddhi bahuta [aśuddhibahula?] batākara nindā kareṃ!!
"

We can simply say mukham astīti vaktavyam.

Rājaḥaṃsam iva bāhupañjare śṛvilāsabhuvi lālayan yaṣaḥ.
Tatra tatra śatapatralocanaś citram abhyudayam āsasāda saḥ. [5:9]

The original and correct reading is *tatra tatra śatapatra*. P makes it *tatra tatrātapatra*. How close to the original! Interchange of one syllable *a* for *śa*. We would like to remind our readers once again that the letter "ś" of P resembles "rā." So *tatra tatra śata patra* of J very well might have been copied by P as *tatra tatra rātapatra* as far as the press-copy-writer is concerned.

But B goes far away and makes it *tatra tāmarasapatra*. This is not restoration, but new construction. Did Bh examine these issues? Did he have enough ability even to go in such deep waters? Could he understand all these delicate points?

* * *

Taccamārajasi dūram udgate yan na digbhramam adhatta bhāskaraḥ. Hetur atra rajasāṁ nivāraṇāṁ kuñjaradhvajapātāntavijanaḥ. [5:66]

The original reading is *taccamārajasi*. Probably P too has the same because there is no fn. for it in B.

But B makes it *tatra bhūrajasi*. *Rajas*, if not stated otherwise, comes from *bhūḥ* only. We will call this once again *avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram*.

* * *

Javasamucitadhāvanānurūpā kimiti kātā pāthulā na nātha pāthvī. Nabhasi khurapuair iti sphuradbhir vidhim iva ye sma muhūḥ pratikṣipanti. [6:49]

Here is another *camatkāra* of B.

The *śuddhipatra* of B asks us to change *javasa* to *rajama*! We don't understand what is the purpose behind it!!

J has *Javasamucitadhāvanānurūpā*---perfect and true, correct and complete.

P makes it *Javamamucitadhāvanānurūpa*---hardly any change.

It is remarkable to see how close is P to J. But what does B do? It takes the reading far far away from the original and makes it *ravamanumitadhāvanānurūpam*! A true *s ahṛadaya* alone can feel the excruciating pain! The editor alone might have been able to figure out what is meant here. *Ravamanumitadhāvanā- nūpam* did not yield any sensible reading. So the "Errata" of B makes it *Rajamanumitadhāvanānurūpam*. Here we find a perfect example of the *sadukti--Vināyakam prakurvāṇo racayāmāsa vānara m*.

Another example of distortion:
J has *Kimiti kṛtā prthulā na nātha prthvī*.

P has *Kimiti kṛta prthulā nāya prthvī*.

B makes *Kimiti kṛtā prthulā tvayā na prthvī*.

In other words, P changes *kṛtā* to *kṛta*, omits *na* and changes *nātha* to *nāya*! Still P did not go far away from the original J. But where does B lead us to? It takes us far away from the original! Although B successfully restores *kṛta* to *kṛtā*, yet he does not bringing in *na* to its **proper** place. We can understand all this. However, we don't understand how *nāya* could be turned into *tvayā?* Nātha is much closer to *nāya* than *tvayā*.

Did the Great Defender Bh pay any attention to all these distortions and destructions in restoration when he assembled the courage and said: *kucha loga bhalehī nindā kar em*.

* * *

**Atrāntare manmathabāṇamitram latāvadhūvibramasūtradhrāḥ.**

**Sthānopadeśī pikapaṇcāmasya śṛṅgārābandhur madhur āvir āśīt.** [7:3]

B reads here--*manmathabāṇamitram*. Bilhaṇa said: *manmathabālamitram*. Someone who was aksarasātru nāma vidyādhara changed bāla to bāṇa! This change is unworthy of great scholars such as Bühler, Vāmanācārya, and Bhāmacārya. This is one of the most unjustifiable attempts on the part of B. [We would like to state with all the emphasis at our command that by B we do not necessarily and always mean the person of Dr. Georg Bühler himself, but the one who fooled with Bilhaṇa's original words.] *Mādu* (Spring) is the supplier of bāṇas (arrows). He is not a mitram of manmathabāṇa!

The person who distorted the truth and misrepresented the fact had totally missed the essence. Bālamitram has a very fine equivalent in Hindi. It is called laṅgo iyā yāra! A friend from the very early childhood!! In English we have another expression--bom friend, but it does not convey a long friendship that begins in the very early age. In spite of all these aberrations, Bh had the audacity to say *nindā kareµ*!

* * *

**Līlāśukāḥ kokilakūjitānām atipraharśād vihitānukārāḥ.**

**Gṛhād adhāvyanta viyoginībhir guṇa hi kāle guṇinām guṇāya.** [7:32]

J is not clear. One could read either *dadhāvyanta* or *dadhā yanta*. P has *dadhādyanta*. The copyist read *dadhā yanta* and wrote it in such a way that it resembled *dadhādyanta*.

But B goes far away and makes it *davāhyanta*. It is not a scholarly attempt. It will be called taking undue liberty.

* * *
Manasvinīnāṃ manasō'vatīrya mānasya vegena palāyitasya.
Jīvagrāhīyeva vasantamitraṃ babhrāma vāyuḥ kakubhāṃ mukhāni. [7:43]

This is a distressing attempt on the part of B to try to improve the text and in that process destroy it. It is a negation of sahṛdayatvam!

N’s fn. no. 7 on p. 75 states: mānasya iti gānasasya iti vā Ja. pustake spas am nāsti.

B makes it gānasya.

R makes it māsasya! That is befitting R ed.

It is interesting to observe that B is wrong as far as the first letter is concerned. R is wrong as far as the second letter is concerned!

Elsewhere in this study we have discussed the concept of māna or kopa in full detail s [p. 185+] ///change page no.??!!

The poet has already told us: Srṅgārabandhur madhur āvirāstī. [7:3.4]

There was no scope for māna to be there anymore. It ran away. Vāyuḥ is vasantmitr am. So he is chasing māna. We don’t know how gāna (song, music) could run away? That is totally irrelevant.

Still Bh declared kucha loga bhalehī nindā karenī!

* * *

The poet says:

Hemamaṅjīramālābhīyāṃ bhātī janghālatādvayam.
Kṛṭālavālam vāllabhyāt kuṅkumeneva subhravaḥ.
[8:14]

P has kṛṭālavālambāllabhāyāt. This is correct and meaningful. We need not repeat th at J does not make any distinction between ba and va. If we separate kṛṭālavālam from the word following--and the next word is vāllabhyāt--we reach Bilhaṇa all the way. This is what Bilhaṇa meant.

However, B fn. says: kṛṭālavālālambāllabhāyāt. i.e. acc. to B. ed. P has one extra letter "lā" inserted in between "vā" and "la". Also it has changed "v" into "b".

This leads us to reiterate once again that the press-copyist of B is not always true to his original, i.e. he created his own errors like the omission of total verses already existing even in P. In other words, B fn. means (=stands for) the press-copy of B rather than P itself. This is a very important matter to keep in mind. Evidently there are deviations in the press-copy from the P transcript. To put it differently, B ascribes an error to
P which actually might be that of the "Press-copy" of his edition! P is still correct, while the press-copy of B is wrong. Once the press-copy was made from P, we don't know if anyone compared and collated it with the original P.

B ed. did not know what to do with *kṛālavālāmbālabhyāt*. So it distorted the text, twisted it around, and murdered the *sāhityavidyāvadhū*.

B made it *kṛālavālam lambābhyām*! So the *hemamanjīramāle* (dual) got lengthened!! A perfect sense turned into total nonsense and rubbish. In the process of legitimate reconstruction, we see total destruction. We lose *vālabhya* completely. Still the Bh had the audacity to say *Kucha loga bhalehi nindā kareṃ*.

* * *

Māti nirvivare tasyāś citraṃ kucayugāntare.
Kṛdākundalitoccanākodāntāh kusumāyudhaḥ.

[8:41]

This śloka has been discussed in full detail in its proper place. [pp. 134-137]

* * *

Bhāti dantacchadeṇāsyāḥ svacchā daśanamālikā.
Sarasvatyaḵṣamāleva pūjāpadadālaṅcitā. [8:69]

N’s fn. no. 1 on p. 88 declares: *Pra. pustake sannapyayaṃ ślokaḥ Ba pustake nāsti.*

* * *

Vidvanmūrḍhanya panditaśiromanī Vidyāvāgṭaḥ Bh still has the courage to say *Kucha loga bhalehi nindā kareṃ*. How pitiful. It is simply disgusting! *Na hi vandhyā vijānāt i gurviṃ prasavavedanāṃ*!

* * *

Aśaṅkitaḥ Saṅkaramallayuddhe yaḥ svedavārāṃ vinivāraṇāya.
Bhasmotkaraṃ vismayaghūrṇitasya kakṣāntarāt tasya samācakarṣa. [9:102]

In the second quarter, P has *svedadhārāmbunivāraṇāya*. B makes the reading *sveda dhārāmbunivāraṇāya* and removes it far away from the original! He takes undue liberty with the text, since he alters quite a bit. *dha* and *va* are very close in resemblance as far as J MS. is concerned.

The editor probably did not recall: *āpah strī bhūmī vār vāri*.

Yet Bh tries to defend B without any justification!

* * *

Yāntiṣu yadvāravilāśiṃṣu kareṇubhiḥ pūritadiktaṭābhīḥ.
Dineʿpi dikpālapurfavākṣāḥ prakṣālanaṃ candrikayā labhante. [9:127]
In the first quarter, P has *Yadvārivilāsinīṣu*. Instead of removing "i" from atop the letter "ra," Bühler breaks *vāravilāsinī* into two and makes it *Yadvārivi vilāsinīṣu* = at whose gate, the beautiful women (locative). He did not like the idea of Vāravilāsini here! He thus takes away all the charm from Bilhaṇa’s *kavivacanam*.

* * *

Āropyaṃnā dayitena kācit nītambabhāṛat svayam apragalbhā. Skandhāt taraḥ pratyuta mūlam āpa svinnena pādāmburuhadvayena. [10:43]

Bilhaṇa said: *Svinnena (=perspiring.)* This is the reading up to and including P. So meone possessing a more fertile brain made it *khinnena*. This is called poetic murder!!

Still Bh had the courage....

* * *

Āhūyamānā iva hamsanādair vikṣayamānā iva kautukena. Jagmus tataḥ klāntinivāraṇāya lilāsarastīram arālanetṛāḥ. [10:63]

Bilhaṇa’s expression is *klāntinivāraṇāya*. B has made it *klāntinirvāraṇāya*! We would like to call it *avyāpāresu vyāpāram*. The editor who changed the reading unnecessarly did not realize that his reading also generates the blemish of *chandobhaṅga*!

However, we would like to point out that there is an alternative, very close reading—close to *nirvāraṇāya*! And that is *nibarhaṇāya*, but that is *karṇaka u* and uncalled for.

* * *


J has *pā alena mahasām*. [tejasāṃ]

P has *pādaleva manasām*. [mānasānām]

B makes it *pā alena tamasām*. [andhakārāṇām]

So we have come from light to darkness! The Upanishads teach us to pray: Tamaśo mā jyotir gamaya. Here we have exactly the opposite.

It will be called a disservice to the *sahāradaya*. The editor took it beyond the grasp of an intelligent reader. May be the "Defender" of B could understand it. We cannot, simply cannot.

* * *
Kācit padair askhali tāh sakhelāṃ yāntīṣu śuddhāntakareṇukāsu.
Rājāṅganāṇāṃ akarod avajñāṃ śroṇībhare ca stanagaurave ca. [12:32]

J has Śroṇībhare ca stanagauraveca! It makes perfect sense.

P has Śroṇībharevasthanagauraveva! It makes half sense.

B makes it Śroṇībharevasthitagauraveva! It makes no sense at all!

Still the great "commentator and translator" Vidyāvägīśa Bh has the courage to say Kucha loga bhaleht nindā karem. We find no words to describe the courage of this scholar!

The editor (B) ought to have recalled that in J MS. va and ca are indistinguishable. He ought to have tried to substitute va by ca and then tried to see if he could get the correct reading, capable of conveying the proper meaning.

* * *

Vibhāvavarge jalada tvam agrañīr na candrikāpi dyutim eti tāvakīm.
Karośi kim śubhratāyā tadāyā na sundaram candanam eṇanābhitaḥ. [13:72]

This is a classic example showing the lack of knowledge of Kāvyamārga on the part of the scholar-editor (B), whosoever he might have been.

J and P both have Vibhāvavarge. However, B makes it vibhātavarge! Vibhāta will merely mean "shining" or "bright." The person who changed the reading and besmeared the beauty of our sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū--the poetic charm of Bilhaṇa’s Muse--might not have come across the word vibhāva, one of the most pre-potent elements of the sāhī tya- saṃsāra and rasa-saṃsāra. Did he ever hear expressions like

Vibhāvānubhāva-vyabhicāri-saṃyogād rasaṇiṣṭpattih, or

Vibhāvenānubhāvena vyaktaḥ saṅcārīnā tathā.
Rasatām eti ratiyādīḥ sthāyī bhāvaḥ sacetasām.

We call this (attempt) only a bāliśatvam.

* * *

Niṣṭhuraṃ kim api kathyate mayā tatra Kuntalapate kuru kṣamām.
Yat svakāryam avadhī[dhā?]rya grññate sevayaiva paritoṣam iśvarāḥ. [14:2]

J has sevayaiva.

P has sevachaiva.
B makes svecchayaiva.

This is really svecchayā eva. It is svecchācāraḥ, truly svacchandācāraḥ. We will call it manahpūtam samāccaret! We cannot call it a scholarly attempt. Sevachaiva may not convey the desired meaning. However, orthographically it is much closer to the original. Svecchayaiva is far removed; and, yet, it does not make any sense at all? Bhakṣit epi laśune na śānto vyādhiḥ.

It is to be noted that the "restorer" changes chai into yai anyway, which makes the reading sevayaiva, thus virtually restoring the corrupt reading to its original correct form. There was no need to turn seva into sveccha!

Still Bh had the courage to say nindā kareṃ! He is sarvatantrasvatantra.

We would like to make one more point before we leave the discussion of this verse. All read svakāryam avadhārya! We believe we should read it svakāryam avadhārya = viditvā!!

* * *

One of the most striking examples is Gaurīvibhramadhūpadhūma [16:51], discussed in its proper place [p. 227].

Following the sthālī-pulāka-nyāya, we have presented above some examples of the restoration—rather distortion—work of B. It was not our intention to point out the errors of Bühler. To err is human. Our attempt was directed toward Bh who unnecessarily tried to defend Bühler as if Bh alone was guṇāika-pakṣa-pātin, as if he alone was able to appreciate the great contribution made by Bühler. If the editor of B had exercised a little more caution and care, the future scholars like us would have been spared a good deal of pain and grief. Bh got everything ready-made! How could he even dream of the struggle and strife of Nagar! This is all the purpose of writing this section of the critique.

Na hi vandhyā vijānāti gurvīṃ prasavavedanām.

Let us resume our earlier discussion.

We do not discount the errors in the original. We are merely trying to rectify the errors unjustifiably ascribed to J. All the editions of Vik. published so far are derived from J. It is the mūla adhāra i.e. the arche-type, ākara-grantha. P is supposed to be a replica of J. B is supposed to be a replica of P, unless otherwise stated. R is supposed to be a replica of B. N goes back to J. Bh copies N. Now, if there is a wrong reading in B, which can be traced back to J, B is not to be blamed at all! However, if J is right and still B rejects its reading and invents his own, would it be possible to support B? Of course, not. But this is exactly what Bh has tried to do. It is not scholarly. It is not academic. The above verse [Māti...] is an example.
Bühler gives in his fn. the rejected reading "māti." In other words, both J and natura-
lly P too had "māti." B does not agree and makes it "bhāti." N goes back to J and rest-
ores the correct reading. But Bh tries to prove his superiority of skill and asserts that B
is preferable to J, i.e. the poet Bilhaṇa himself! "Bhāti" may be correct as far as its pr
akṛti and prayāya are concerned. But the vicchitti and camatkāra play their role to a
much greater extent if the original reading is upheld, i.e. "māti" is kept as it is. Here is
Kālidāsa suggesting the same idea:

Anyonyam utpṛdayad upthalāksyāḥ standadvayam pāṇḍu tathā pravṛddham.
Madhye yathā śyāmamukhasya tasya mṛṇālasūtrāntaram apyalabhyam.
[Kumārasambhavam. 1:40]

And Śṛṭharṣa:
Paricyutas tat kucabhāramadhyāt kim śoṣamāyāśi mṛṇālahāra.
Na sūkṣmatantor api tāvakasya tatrāvakāśo bhavataḥ kimu syāt. 8:41

Also Bilhaṇa:
Mukhenducandrikāpūra-plāvyamānau punaḥ punaḥ.
Śitabhītāvivāṇonyau tasyāḥ pṛḍayataḥ kucau. [8:47]

And
Drṣṭoḥ śīmāvāḍaḥ śravaṇayugalena pratikalam
stanābhīyāṃ samṛuddhe hṛdi manasijas tiṣ hati balāt.
Nitambaḥ sākrandam kṣipati raśanādāmā paritaḥ
praveśas tanvaṅgyā vapuṣi taruṇimno vijayate. [8:85]

The following poetic gems might enlighten the mind of Bh with regard to māti vs. bh
āti.

Amān ivāṅgeṣu mudāḥ prakarṣāt prayudayayau tām janakaḥ kumāryāḥ.
Anuṣṭhitam samyag upāyavidbhir nītāḥ parispandam ivārthasārthāḥ. [9:40]
And
Trilokalakṣmyeva saśīlam ṭīksitaḥ kṛtradarvaiś candrakarair ivāplutaḥ.
Adūravāṅchālatikāphalodayaḥ kvacin na māti sma mudā nareśvarah. [2:79]

And here is another great poet:
Yan na māti tadaṅgeṣu lāvyam atisāṃbhṛtam.
Piṇḍīkṛtam urodeśe tat payodharatām gatam. [Kasyāpi]
[cited by Saṃskṛtasāktisāgara, p.135]

Bh is not totally oblivious of the true purport of the poet's heart, i.e. what the poet w
ants to convey here. There is no room--none whatsoever--between the two breasts of t
he heroine. The word nirvivare is correctly translated by Bh: Nivvivare = nir nāsti viva
ram chidram avakāśo yasmiṁs tat tasmin niravakāśe. It is not surprising that the God of
Love is seated there. What is surprising is that there was no room at all for anything to begin with. Nevertheless, not only Kāma sits there, but he is also able to accommodate his gigantic bow therein! This is the reason for surprise. This is the cause for wonder. The two words "nirvivare" and "uccaṇḍha" are quite significant. Bh has deliberately overlooked their real meaning. Every beautiful thing in this world bhāti. The wonder is māti. Bh knows that here we have adhika alaṁkāra. He refers to its definition and says atrādhārāpekṣayā"dheyasyādhiyavaranṇanād adhikālaṁkārah. Did he recall any example of adhikālaṁkāra? Probably not. If he had taken the trouble of consulting even the Kāvyaprakāśa, he might have perceived the real sense and would not have turned a sensible poetic sadukti into total nonsense. [See below] He does not accept the reading of N "[māti]". He insists on "bhāti." Smartly enough, he makes "bhāti" yield the meaning of "māti", of course, by his own force, twisting the word to mean anything he wants! This is how he performs this feat:

Bhāti pūrṇatayā samāgatya sāvakāśam virājate.

One fails to understand wherefrom did he bring the sense represented by the words "pūrṇatayā samāgatya sāvakāśam." On second thought we think he is right. He is vidy āvägliṣa. He is kartum, akartum, anyathākartum samarthāḥ? Is he not? Our limited knowledge cannot reach the unlimited height his knowledge has already reached!

Let us study some more examples of adhikālaṁkara:

Yugāntakālapratisamhṛtātmano
jagānti yasyām savikāsaṃ āsata.
Tanau mamus tatra na Kaṇṭahadviṣas
tapodhanābhyaśgamasanāśbhavā muddāḥ. Māgha. 1:23

Mammaṭa cites the following verse as an example of adhikālaṁkāraḥ.

Aho viśālam bhūpāla bhuvanatritayodaram.
Māti mātum āsakyo'pi yaśorāśir yadatra te.
[Kāvyādarāśa of Daṇḍin].

I don't know whether Bh would have changed "māti" to "bhāti" here too if he had the opportunity to edit the above text.

Vāmanāchārya Jhalkikar wrote the Bālabodhinī commentary on Mammaṭa. By 1965 it had run into 7 editions. I don't know if the same Jhalkikar had any hand in the change from "māti" to "bhāti" in Vik., B's edition. Bühler says:

As soon as I recognised the importance of the MS., I resolved to copy it out myself. My time at Jesalmīr was limited. But with the help of my companion Dr. H. Jacobi of Bonn, who kindly lent me his assistance during my whole tour in Rajputana, the task was accomplished in about seven days. He copied Sargas V. VI., XIV.-XVIII. 1-74, while the rest fell to my share. We then revised our copy together. I fear however, that some at least of the little lacunae and mistakes, which had to be filled in and corrected when the work was printing, are owing to the inaccuracy of our transcript and not to th
at of the writer of the old MS. (stress added) Every case where in printing I thought it necessary to alter the text given by the transcript, has been carefully stated in the notes. With the exception of two or three passages [e.g. II.21] about which I am still in doubt, the text of the Vikramāṅkakāvyā is readable, and I believe that, if fresh MSS. are found, it will prove to be trustworthy.

I have to thank Vāmanāchārya Jhalkīkar for several emendations, which he suggested while copying my transcript for the press and his brother Bhīmāchārya for some other corrections given in the addenda. [stress added].

According to the asima-dhiṣaṇā of B!

Bh knows the niti-upadeśa: gunino na durāgrahāḥ. We don't know why he asserts it in this case. Did he not know: Ekākinī pratiṃjñā hi pratiṃjñātam na sādhayet. Mere assertion does not prove the theory!

Here is one more poetic gem from Bilhaṇa:

Sā stanānjalibandhena manmathaṃ prathamāgatam.
Karotīvomukhaṃ bālā bāndhavaṃ yauvanaśriyah. [8:44]

The compound word "aṅjalibandha" is quite significant here. What does it mean? It means the "folded hands", i.e. two hands joined together. The two breasts are likened to the two hands joined together. There is no space in between them--none whatsoever!

Also

Vilāsadolāphalake nitamba-vistāraruddhe paritas taruṇyāḥ.
Labdhaḥ paraṃ kuṇcitakārmuṇaṣaḥ tatrāvakāṣaḥ kusumāyudhena.
[7:19]

The above idea very much resembles what is expressed by the poet in māti nirviva re... [8:41].

Banerji and Gupta translate 8:41 as follows:

It is wonderful [!] (A) that the flower-arrowed god (i.e. Cupid), with his fierce [!] (B) bow playfully [!] (C) coiled, appears [!] in the interval of her breasts, which is without opening [!] (D).

The whole translation is really wonderful! These translators should be awarded a novel literary prize. Such writers are alluded to by a poet in a desperate prayer:

Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanaṃ śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha.

And by Bilhaṇa too:
Kurvantu śeśāḥ śukavākyapāṭham!

"A" should be "amazing" or "surprising" or simply "a wonder".

"B" "uccaṇḍa" does not mean here "fierce" but "of a very large size", or "gigantic."

"C" should be "skilfully."

"D" should be "space."

Here is one more poetic gem from our own poet, Mahākavi Bilhaṇa, which may throw some further light on the matter.

Nitambabimbasya nitambavatyaḥ prakāmavistāravaśād ivāsyā.
Prthvīpater uttamanāyikāpi na kāpi lebhe ṣṛdaye'vakāṣam. [9:12]

Let it be emphasized here that Bh fares better as far as "nirvivare" and "uccaṇḍa" are concerned, but he displays his unreasonableness when he says: bhāti pāṇatayā sam āgatyā sāvakāṣam virājate.

Monier-Williams [1888 ed., p. 764, column 3] says:

Mā = to correspond in measure, find measure or room in (cl. 2 with loc.,) e.g. te yaśo -rāśir bhuvana- tritayodare māti, thy mass of fame finds room in the interior of three worlds.

Apte, [1965, 3d. ed., p. 753, Column 1]: Mā = to be in, find room or space in, be contained or comprised in.

Once again we are reminded of a great sadukti of a great poet:

Daivīm vācam upāsate hi bahavaḥ sāram tu sārasvatam jānīte nitarām asau gurukulakliṣṭo Murāriḥ Kaviḥ.
Abdhir laṅghita eva vānarabhaṭaiḥ kintvasya gambhiratām āpātālanimagnāpivaravapur jānāti manthācalah.

* * *

Bilhaṇa says:

Dolāyāṁ jaghanasthalena calatā loleśanā lajjate dhatte dīkṣu niriksanaṁ smitamukhi pārāvatānāṁ rutaiḥ.
Sparśaḥ kaṇṭakakoṭibhiḥ kuṭilayā līlāvane nesyate sajjāṁ maugdhyaśarjanāya sutanoḥ śṛngāramitram vayaḥ.
[8:86]
While trying to explain this verse [8:86] Bh misses the true meaning. We are referring to the 2nd carana: Dhatte dikṣu....Bh says:


This is all incongruous. When we read such indescribable babble of tongue we are kept wondering whether the writer was awake, dreaming, or asleep--or totally out of his mind--when he wrote such nonsense and rubbish. The cooing of pigeons resembles the sound from the throat, made by the lady as an essential function of the suratakrīḍā (sexual intercourse). In other words, she makes a special cooing sound deliberately. It is not the sound made by the friction of the sexual organs of the lover and the beloved lady (liṅga and yoni). [There is a lot of natural "grease" there, Mr. Vidyāvāgīśa!] It is surprising that Bh did know of this himself! Neither did he consult a friend. Maybe he was shy of asking such a silly question, but he could have studied the literature in his University Library and spared himself the ridicule of the future generation of the readers of his "great" translation and interpretation. We are told that many great pandits of Kāśi had examined Bh's work. How did they overlook this asaṅgati?

Probably Bh had not yet read the 18th canto when he worked on the 7th canto, for Īlhaṭṭa expresses these similar ideas in 18:26:

Śrutvā śrutvā rutam avirataṁ yatra pārāvatānāṁ
dakṣāḥ kaṇṭhadhvaniṣū śanakaīḥ paurakanyā bhavanti.

Here is another poet:

Kānte tathā katham api prathitaṁ mṛgākṣyā
cāturyam uddhatamanobhayāḥ rateṣu.
Tatkūṭijānyanuvadadbhir anekavāram
śisyāyitaṁ grhakapotaśataṁ yathāsyāḥ. [Kasyāpi]  
(Also discussed in Sāhityadarpaṇa).

Let us enjoy the beauties of another poetic gem:

Narair viphalajanmabhār giridarī na kim sevyate  
nac cae chravanagocarībhavati jātucij janmanī.  
Kapotaravamādhurīviracanānukārādaro  
ratāsahakṛśodarīvacanākkākurītīdhvaniḥ.


The compiler does not give his source, but translates the verse beautifully in Hindi as follows:
Kabutarakī guțaragūmkī miṭhāsakā anukaraṇakaranevālī, ratikā pariśrama sahane meṃ asamartha navelīke prārthanāse bhare hue vacanoṁ kī dhvaniko jisane [jinhoṁ ne] jivanameṃ kabhi nahim sunā una manusyoṃ kā to janmahī vyartha hai. Ve bhal ā parvatakī kandarāom meṃ kyoṃ nahim cale jāte?

Saduktikarnāṁrtam of Śrīdharādāsa cites the above verse, ("Naraīr viphalajanmabh ir"), under "Kan hakujiita" and ascribes it to "kasyāpi." It also gives the following verse:

Kānte vicitrasatakramabaddharāge
   saṅketa'pi mṛgasāvakalocanāyāḥ.
   Tat kūjitaṃ kim api yena tadṛjatalpaṃ
dālpaiḥ parītam anuśabditalāvakaughaiḥ.

For further enlightenment of Bh on 8:86, we may offer an extract from the Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana, tr. by S. C. Upādhyāya. Bombay, Taraporevala, 1970. p. 121, Ch. 7.

Sūtra 5.--virutāni caṣtau.

On the other hand, what results from intense passion and not pain, is "viruta" or cooing, which is of eight kinds.

Sūtra 6: Hiṅkāra-stanita-kūjita-rudita-sūtkṛta-dūtkṛta-phūtkṛtāni. [only seven! sūtkṛta also?] (5) Kūjita or cooing:


A woman may also imitate the shrieks and calls of doves, koels, pigeons...

Sūtra 15: Tatrāntarmukhena kūjitaṃ phūtkṛtāṃ ca. Tatra kūjitaṃ tat saṃvṛtena
daṅṭheṇa. Kūjatyavatiṣṭheṇa saṃvṛtena jihvāmuṇaṇa
tat phūtkṛtāṃ. Vyākhyā.

At such a time, the woman should alternately utter the cooing sound from inside her mouth and the 'fu-fu' sound. (The 'fu-fu' sound is almost the opposite of cooing sound, which is usually done with the mouth kept open).

According to Apte, Ratakūjitaṃ = lustful or lascivious murmur.

Thus it becomes evident that this kaṅ hadhvanī was acquired through a voluntary learning process and was not merely an involuntary expression of exhaustion or pain, et c.

Cf. Daṇḍin:
Kalakvañitagarbhañena kaññhenäghûñnitekșaññañ.
Pârvatañ paribhramya riramsus cumbati priyám.


While on the subject, we may also think of:

Śrîparicayâj jaññâ api bhavantyabhijñâ vidagdhacaritânâm.
Upâdiasati käminñnâm yauvanamada eva lalitâni.

Quoted in Kâvyaprakâsa.

We could go on and on. Here is another poetic gem on surata-kaññha-ruta, cited by Mammañ in his Kâvyaprakâsa as an example of smarañña alaññâra:

Nimnanâbhikuharesu yañ ambhañ plâvîtam caladrsám laharîbhiñ.
Tadbhavaiñ kuharutair natamadhyâñ smâritâñ suartakaññharutânâm.
Jalhañ 67:16.

Suranâryañ ityapi pâñho drñyate.

Here is one more example of surata-kaññha-ruta. Sumukha says to Râvana:

Yanñrmilâpatir ayam ca tavâtmajañ ca
bâñotkarân vikirato racitândhakârân.
Te'nonyakhañdanavaññd viphalîbhavanti
ratyutsave badhirayar iva kaññhanadâññ.
Bâlarâmâyana of Râjasekhara. Añka 8, verse 44.

Bh refers to Shri Râmâvatâra Śarmân as his "guruvaryaññâm." It is unfortunate that his guru did not teach him even the basic Sanskrit kâvyas. We don't know whether Bh had ever seen the following sadukti of Mahâkavi Mâgha in Śiññpâlavadham:

Ratântare yatra gâhântaresu vitardiniryûhaviññanaññâñ.
Rutâni śrñvan vayasân ganñnte-vâsîtvam ápâ spuñtâm âñganânâm. 3:55

We find it difficult to leave the prakñta-prasañña. We are reminded of one more poetic gem of our own poet Bihâna:

Smaraprañstipratinbastutâm gatâñ salîladatyûhasamûhanisvanâñ.
Bhavanti yatra kaññamâtraviññrama pradâyinañ kaññharaveñ yoñitâm. [2:15]

The MS. A has vibhrama. I too thought it to be preferable. But no, viññrama is much better.

Dâtyûha-samûha-nisvanâñ give relief, even for a very short period though, to yoñitâ m kaññ haraveñ! We have seen this in India in Harikathâ. The principal performer (si
nger) takes a breather. The melody is continued by his associate. Then the principal picks up once again. So there is continuation and also on the same tāla and laya!

Apparently Bh did not understand the poet here. For kañ haravesu he says: bhāsañ a-kāryesu gīteśu vā. I wish he could tell us the significance of the words "kṣanmātraviśr ama"! The komalāṅgi gets tired by constantly making the sound. So the birds relieve her! Bh concludes: Tatratyānām nārīnām śabdō dātyāhakājitavan madhura iti vyajyate. We get hurt by the display of knowledge on the part of Bh. Truly it is said: Arasikeś u kavitvanivedanam śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha. In Hindi too we have a beautiful saying: Bhainsa ke āge bīna bājāe bhainsa paṛī pagurāe. Play vīṇā in front of the she-buffalo; she will continue her munching!

We have cited above the verse Narair viphalahanambhir. It says: Ratāsahakrśodar t-vacanakākurītihvahi. While Vātsyāyana in his Kāmaśāstra says that the sound is generated by passion and not pain and that it is voluntary and made with special effort, Narair viphalajanambhir has a different interpretation. That idea is echoed in the following verse:

Gādhāliṅganāvanāmanīkrātakucraprodhinnaromodgāmā
sāndrasneharasātirekavigalacchṛmanitambāmbarā.
Mā mā mānada māti mām alam iti kṣāmākṣarollāpinī
suptā kim nu mṛtā nu kim manasi me līnā vilīnā nu kim.

Let us now discuss the third caraṇa of the above verse (Dolāyām jaghanasthalena). Bilhaṇa says:

Sparśāh kaṇṭakakotibhiḥ kuṭīlayā līlāvane nesyate.
[8:86.3]

Misra has really murdered the Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū here while commenting on this k avivacanam. He says:

"For iṣyate (of the MS. and edd.) "is desired", read anvesyate "is looked for": "the touch by the thorns is looked for by the tricky one", the idea being: that she enjoys the scratchings that would take place in passionate embraces. The mistake nesyate (na-iṣ yate) for 'nvesyate must, however, be old as the paraphrasing line in Sp. shows." [p. 59]

The critic had already ordered earlier [pp. 15-16]:

Instead of nesyate (na-iṣyate) "is not desired" pass. of anvesyaya read anvesyate (anu-iṣyate) "is looked for", cp. below Chap. III on 8.36 [sic., should be 8:86!]

We don't know whether this is a deliberate attempt on Misra's part to increase the bulk of his book, or an unconscious display of his lack of knowledge. Also we fail to understand how anu + iṣyate becomes anvesyate! Anu + iṣyate will turn into anvisyate and not anvesyate. Cf. Anvisyan maranopāyāṃ duḥkhāt taisainyaluṭhitaḥ. 4:16.
NRR adds: "Is Misra so ignorant that he does not know the inevitability of yan here? Or, is he just careless? Shouldn't he have said anu-esyate?"

Misra certainly crosses the limits of justice and decency when he calls "neṣyate", a mistake! He also calls it "old." The question is: How old? Misra does not give the age. It is not only the J MS., which antedates the year 1229 A.D., but also the saduktikar ṇāṃṛta (1205 A.D.) has nesyate (=is not desired, or liked, or looked for).

So, if we understand Mr. Misra correctly, the Purāṇa Bilhaṇa wrote anvesyate—that was the original, correct reading. Someone at a later date, still in olden days, committed a mistake and made it nesyate. So Mahākavi Bilhaṇa had to appear on this earth once again, after so many centuries, in the nāma and rūpa of B.N. Misra to restore the original.

Let us resume our discussion of the current topic.

The verse in reference appears in saduktikarṇāṃṛta as follows:--

Dolāyāṃ jajhanasthalena calatā lokeśanā lajjate
sajjam maugdhyavisarjanāya sutanoh śṛṅgāramitṛāṃ vayaḥ.
Sparśaḥ kaṇṭakakṣoṭībhiḥ kutīlayā līlavane nesyate
dhatte dikṣu nirıkṣaṇāṃ smitamukhī pārāvatānāṃ rutaiḥ.

Incidentally we might add here that the transposition of the padas 2 and 4 in Saduktikarṇāṃṛta cannot be justified because sajjam maugdhya- is the conclusion and it must come at the very end. Sures Chandra Banerji, the editor of Saduktikarṇāṃṛta, traces this verse in other sources and anthologies:

Spd 3278; Smv 51.14; V.C. VIII 86; and in the footnotes he provides the following in formation:

a) Sp. valatā for calatā

b) This line, with vayaḥ for vapuḥ is the fourth line in Spd., V.C. [?], Smv., Spd. read the second line thus: Sa [Sā] śaṅkaṃ tanaṃ ha [n a?] kakṣatabhīyā kṛṣṭāvane kṛṣṭāti . ["Kṣata" is a very fine word, which reminds us of nakhkṣata and dantakṣata].

c) Ed. of Śarmā līlāvanau for vane. Spd. omits this line.

d) As pointed out above, Spd. and Smv. read

b) here. S pārāvatānāṃ for -vatānāṃ

b) and d) are transposed in Ed.

Notwithstanding all the variant readings and transpositions of the lines, etc., there is not even a single convincing reason to change neṣyate to anvesyate! We simply fail to
understand what Misra means by "as the paraphrasing line in Śp. shows." We feel miserable that we are not able to comprehend what Misra wants us to do.

The so-called paraphrasing line, as cited by Misra himself reads:

Sāśaṅkaṁ tanukaṅtakakṣatabhiyā kṛiḍāvane kṛiḍati.

The poet here says that [sā] kṛiḍāvane kṛiḍati= the lady does definitely play in the pleasure garden, but sāśaṅkam! Why? Tanukan akakṣatabhiyā. She plays in the pleasure garden no doubt, but with caution and care, lest the thorns scratch her body and those very scratches are misunderstood for nakhkṣatas!

The words sāśaṅkam and bhiyā are quite significant. Misra misses the essence of all!

Let it be emphasized that Mr. Misra goes against not only all the MSS. and all the editions of the Vik. but also against those ancient anthologies which have the readings exactly what Vik. has, i.e. sparsaḥ kaṇ akako ibhīḥ ku ilayā līlāvane nēṣyate. And the other anthologies, which contain sāśaṅkam tanukaṅ akakṣatabhiyā kṛiḍāvane kṛiḍati, do not lend any support to Misra's contention either that "the reading ought to be changed to "anveṣyate" is "looked for."

Misra acts in an unreasonable manner. A reasonable man would have considered the issue once again to determine whether he should tamper with an existing reading or not. Unless and until a scholar is absolutely certain about the worthlessness of the original reading and strongly feels that there is an unavoidable need for a substitution to make some sense out of a nonsensical reading, he does not take the courage to make the substitution. Misra might have concluded irretrievably that he was absolutely right, but what about his gurus in Germany, if there were any!

We don't understand what is the gain of the nāyikā in wilfully getting scratched by thorns in the garden, unless she wants to invite trouble for herself unnecessarily! We have a beautiful saying in Hindi: Ā patthara mere paira para para. O stone, come and hit me on my feet! Misra would like to change the readings left and right, up and down, to suit the lack of his understanding. So "līlāvane nēṣyate" becomes "līlāvane'nveṣyate." No sahādaya will agree.

Of course, the lady does not look for the scratchings caused by the thorns, in spite of Mr. Misra's assertions. She wants to avoid them by all means, lest they are mistaken for the scratchings (kṣatas) received during the rati-kṛiḍā, sexual play, not "passionate embraces" as Misra asks us to believe! She may enjoy the nakhkṣata or dantakṣata from her lover, but not kaṇ aka-kṣata from the thorny bushes! And, by the way, where did Misra get the idea that "scratchings take place in passionate embraces!" Does he not know any difference amongst the various components of ratikṛiḍā like ālīṅgana, cumbana, nakhkṣata and dantakṣata, etc.? We are not sure in which science or art he has acquired proficiency.
Naturally Bh reads *krīḍāvana nesyațe*, but his cause is different. He wants us to believe that the lady did not want to be scratched by the thorny bushes because they were painful! So what? Every prick is painful. The lady did not want to be scratched, not because of the potential pain, but because they were likely to be mistaken for the *nak hakṣatas* received during the *ratiśrīdrāprasāṇa*!

We are not sure if our Neo-Expounders had come across the following *sadukti*:

Drṣṭiṁ he prativeśini kṣaṇam ihāpyasmadgrhe dāsyasi
prāyenāsyā śiśō pītā na virasāḥ kaupīr apaḥ pāsyati.
Ekākinyapi yām̄ satvaram itas srotas tamālākulaṁ
nṛfrandhrās tanum ālikhantu jaraṭhacchedā nalagarthayaḥ.

And what about the following:

Kasya vā na bhavati roṣo dṛṣṭvā priyāyāḥ savraṇaṁ adharam.
Sabhramarapadmāghrāyini vāritavāme sahasvedānīṁ.

*Cāvyaprakāśa.*

* * *

Misra, the Translator

Misra is equally adept in the art of translation. He translates the following verse beautifully:

Mukhena lajjābhinayapragalbhā līlālavanyānīcitakandhareṇa.
Pratyādiśantīva divi sphurantam anekadosopahatam mrgāṅkam. [9:53]

I wish Misra had attempted more translations of Bhilāṇa. He translates *mukhena pratyādisantī iva mṛgaṅkam* as "putting as it were the moon in its place by her face" [p. 26]. We don’t know how *pratyādiś* could mean "to put someone in its place." And even if it meant that, what purpose would it serve!!

According to Apte *pratyādiś* means to reject, discard, shun--*pratyādis avīsēṣamaṇḍa navidhīḥ*; to repulse--*pratyādeśāinam abhāṣamāṇāḥ*; to cast off, repudiate-- *kāmaṁ pratyādis āṁ smarāmi na parigrahaṁ munes tanayāṁ*; to obscure, eclipse, defeat, throw into the shade or background-- *pratyādiṣyantī iva me drṣ alaksyabhidāḥ āraḥḥ; rakṣāg rhagatā dipāḥ pratyādiś ā iva*. The term also means "conquer" or "overcome" by the same authority of Apte. However, Bh correctly translates *pratyādisantī* by *tiraskurvantī* and also cites Amara as his authority--*pratyādeśo nīrākṛtiḥ*.

And the English translators B & G, substituting word for word [*makṣikāsthāne makṣi ka*] say:

Skilled in the acting of bashfulness with her face [,] she was as if repudiating [emphasis added] the moon, disfigured with many blemishes, shining in the sky, with her neck curved playfully. B & G.
The Hindi translator of Bh renders this verse as follows:

Lajjāko prakāṭa karane mem pravīṇa (vaha Candra- lekha) vilāsa se thoṛī jhukāī huṁ gardana se yuktā mukha se [so he bypasses the problem of yasya, yena, or yasmin, etc.] ākāśameṁ camakanevaële, aneka doṣoṁ se nīndaṁ athavā aneka rātriyoṁ mem (krṣṇapakṣa mem) kāntiṁna, candramā kā tīraskāra karatā huṁ prakāṭa huī.

Howsoever poor may be the translation in Sanskrit, English, or Hindi, none has missed the meaning the way Misra has done. He has missed everything.

With regard to līlālavanyāṇcitakandhareṇa, Candrikā interpreted it as follows: līlāyā lavena nyāṇcitā vakrīkṛtā kandharā yasya tena. [I believe "yasya" is wrong. It should be yena. The face has turned the neck a little. When the face is turned, naturally the neck gets turned too.]

Misra merely raises the problem but does not try to solve it! He says: "Usually the neck is thought to belong to the head, rather than to face." [p. 26, note 3].

Let us see what Bh says:

Līlāyā vilāsasya lavena leśena nyāṇcitā vakrīkṛtā kandharā grīvā yasmin tena mukhena."

So Bh uses locative!

Misra Seems Confused

Here is a case where we find Misra quite confused. He sees what in reality does not exist. He suffers from bhrāntir mithyāmatir bhramaḥ.

Undoubtedly to err is human. Our great nītikāras have already taught us:

Gacchatas skhalanaṁ kvāpi bhavatyeva pramādataḥ.

Those who ride the horses are likely to fall sometimes. There is hardly any human being on this earth who could prove that he/she has never committed an error! As a rule, one should always be careful, lest one errs. However, one should be doubly careful when trying to find fault with the work of others. Those who live in the glass house should never throw stones at others.

Here is Misra's unusual power of perception:

Tayopadeśaḥ sa kṛtaḥ kumāryaṁ vrthāgaman nīca ivopakāraḥ. Premāṇi jannāntarasaṅcitāni pṛdurbhavanti kvacic eva eva. [9:92]

Misra expounds:
kumāryāḥ, in second and third editions, conjectured [?] for kumāryām, in the MS. and ed. pri is hardly correct. Kumāryām (loc.) is to be construed with agamat (9), like nīc e in the comparison: "the instruction went to the girl in vain, like a service [goes in vai n] to a vile one". For the thought compare: Bhāsa, Cārudatta, 1.19: Bālacarita 1.15 (=Ś ūdraka Mṛcchaka ika, 1,34):

limpātiva tamo'ṅgāni varṣatīvāṅjanam nabhāḥ/ asatpuruṣāseveva dṛṣ ṛ ir viphalatāṃ gataḥ/

Bharavi, Kirat., 13.33:

upakāra ivāsati prayuktā sthitim aprāpya mrge gataḥ pranāśam/ kṛtaśaktir adhomukho gurutvāj janitavrīḍa ivātmāpauruṣena// [p. 16]

fn. 9. Cp. Raghu. 6.66...tadītyo lebhe antaram [!] cetasi nopadeśaḥ, "her instructio n did not obtain a place in her mind."

Let us see how the verse 9:92 reads both in B and N:

Tayopadeśaḥ sa kṛtaḥ kumāryāṃ [loc.] vṛthāgaman nīca ivopakāraḥ. Premāṇi janmāntarasāṅcitāni prādurbhavanti kvacid eva. [9:92]

We read here kumāryāṃ [loc.] and not kumāryāḥ [gen.] as alleged by Misra. Then ho w did he read kumāryāḥ [gen.] in the same verse? Well, he might have read the follo wing verse no. 93, which has kumāryāḥ [gen.].


So the word kumāryāḥ [gen.] of verse 93 might have been read by Misra in verse 92! This entire discussion of Misra turns out to be jalatādanam.

The facts are as follows. The verse 9:92 does not have kumāryāḥ. It has kumāryāṃ . 9:93 does have kumāryāḥ which is correct in its own context. The variant reading "k umāryāṃ of J and B appearing at the bottom of page 100 of N, refers to 9:93, and not 9:92! The figure 2 appears as superscript on the word kumāryāḥ of 93.1. 92.1 already had kumāryāṃ. There was no reason to change kumāryāṃ into kumāryāḥ! 92.1 reads s Tayopadeśaḥ sa kṛtaḥ kumāryāṃ, and 93.1 reads Pradarāyasāsa tataḥ kumāryāḥ. All this trouble arose, maybe, because the two verses are in juxtaposition, one after th e other, and Misra was too anxious to find fault with his predecessors.

We may offer an explanation to Misra's performance. It may be a case of the play and display of the maxim of maṇḍūkapluti--jumping of the frog! Misra's eyes jumped f rom one kumāryāṃ to another kumāryāḥ. He did not distinguish the two as separate w ords! The similarity of the form deceived him. Had he seen both the verses carefully, and at the same time, he would have spared his readers a great deal of trouble as well as a lot of wastage of time and energy on the part of all concerned, including the pres
ent writer. Misra seems to be careless. We do not doubt Misra's correct reading of the verse 9:93 because on page 4 we find him discussing the same verse:

\[ pradarśayām āsa tataḥ kumāryāḥ \]

(2) "then he [who "he"? It should be she, Mr. Misra!] showed to the maiden."

* * *

We have another demonstration of Misra's domineering wisdom:

Nirudhya randhraµ madhup¦ritasya pu§pasya lobhÁd bhramaro'vatasthe.

Anyena mÁrgeÆa papus tad anye labdhårjanânám ayam eva márgah. [10:13]

Misra makes an unjust suggestion:

For labdhårjanânám. [!] "of those that have obtained acquisition", which does not make sense in the context \( (labhārjanānām [sic] ayam eva mārgah, "this is the way of those that have obtained acquisition""). ed. ter. conjectures: lubdhār janānām, which see ms better--as it is indeed a greedy bee that is spoken of in the verse--but is difficult of [!] construction: "this is the way of people with the greedy". We should expect rather a loc., than an instrumental; besides, the verse is concerned with bees, not with people. More conservative [?] and without difficulties would be to read: lubdhār janānām ayam eva mārgah, "this is the way of the acquisitions (= thus it goes with the acquisitions) of the greedy ones..." [p. 16]

N has in the text "labdhār janānām ayam eva mārgah." And so does J and B. However, J gloss says "yata upārjakapuµsaú." But Candrikā suggests: "lubdhār janānām ayam eva mārgah iti pā hāḥ sādhiyān."

Misra attributes the reading--lubdhār janānām ayam eva mārgah to ed. ter. (i.e. Bh). He knows that ed. ter. is kāvyārthacauryacaturāḥ. Bh never acknowledges any debt to N. He takes Caritacandrikā to be an ancient commentary antedating 1286 A.D.! So whatever is contained in Caritacandrikā is Bh's own property! On p. 269, lines 24-25, Nagar in HIS Caritacandrikā says: Lubdhār janānām ayam eva mārgah iti pā hāḥ sād hiyān! So it is not true to say that the above reading is a contribution of Bh. Mr. Misra is careless.

Bh probably did not know that when the N text was going through the press, Caritacandrikā was not even composed! As the printing of the text progressed, Nagar wrote HIS Caritacandrikā. Otherwise Candrikā would have appeared along with the text, at the bottom, where it actually belongs. It is a pāda- ippañṭi and ought to have gone to the pāda. It was not possible for Nagar to suggest the "conjectured" reading in the text part. N text accepts what J states as far as the reading is concerned. The conjectured reading could be put only in the footnote. Since there was no possibility of putting it on
the same page under the text as a footnote (pāda-ippaññ), it had to be put in the Carita acandrika, after the text was finished.

However, Bh adopts Candrika’s [i.e. Nagar’s] conjectured reading for his text and relegates N’s (and of J too) reading labdhrājanānāṁ āyam eva mārgaḥ to the secondary position, downgrading it to his footnote. His words are: “Labdhrājanānāṁ āyam eva mārgaḥ pā ho’yaṁ cintyāḥ.” He does not give any credit to Caritacandrika or N. He does not ascribe the improved [?] reading to its true originator. He takes all the credit to himself, to be appreciated by future scholars like Misra.

Let it be remembered that for the reasons best known to him, Bh has assumed that Candrika is an ancient commentary, composed even before 1286 A.D. I don’t think such a great ancient scholar, an imaginative creation of Bh’s fertile brain, if there were one, would say “iti pā haḥ sādhāyān.” His words would be bolder, much more assertive. Also the same gloss-writer won’t put yata upārjakapumsaḥ, which is the translation of labdhrājanānāṁ. In other words, the sense in the J gloss [yata upārjakapumsaḥ] is not the same as suggested in the conjectural reading of Candrika. We are still not clear on this issue. However, Misra, who does not have any doubt about anything ever, recommends that the reading be changed to "labdhrājanānāṁ āyam eva mārgaḥ."

It is interesting to observe that according to Misra labdhrājanānāṁ "does not make any sense in the context." To him lubdhair janānāṁ seems better, yet "it is difficult of [?] construction." So he recommends that we force Bilhaṇa to speak--lubdhair janānāṁ āyam eva mārgaḥ, because that would be "more conservative [?]! We don’t know what is meant here by the last word "conservative"! It is difficult to agree with Misra for various reasons and on various grounds. He says: "We should expect rather a loc." [p. 16, 1.30]. But his suggested reading ends in "lubdhair janānāṁ." We fail to understand how a word ending in "-nāṁ" could be called a locative! May be Misra’s loc. ends in "-nāṁ"? Probably he meant "genitive."

And then Misra argues: "Besides the verse is concerned with bees, not with people." Evidently he had seen Bh, who says that here we have (the figure of speech called) "arthāntaranyāsah." It is true that the verse is concerned with the bees, but only in the first three quarters. The fourth quarter is general (sādhāraṇa) and is appropriately concerned with the people! Whether the reading is accepted to be

a) Labdhrājanānāṁ āyam eva mārgaḥ, or

b) Lubdhair janānāṁ āyam eva mārgaḥ, or

c) Lubdhair janānāṁ āyam eva mārgaḥ,

the main theme ends with the third quarter. The fourth quarter is a generalization from the preceding special situation (case). Our ākāṅksa is satisfied with the three quarters. The fourth quarter stands by itself. Even Misra brings the term "ones." We don’t know if his ‘ones’ refers to the people as well, or only to the "bees." In any case, he has missed the kavitāntargataṁ kavitāttaryāṁ. An example of the beautiful editorial work
of Shri Nagaraja Rao. I had used the word "finished." His word is much more "satisfying"! How sincerely I wish he had finished what he had begun!

Misra may know what is "arthāntaranyāsa." Here is its definition from Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha Kaviṅgāja:

Sāmānyam vā viśeṣena viśeṣas tena vā yadi.
Kāryaṃ ca kāraṇenedaṃ kāryeṇa ca samarthyaṃ
de samarthyaṃ sarthāṃ sośṭadhā mataḥ.


It would have been much better if Misra had studied the basic, elementary texts in India itself and then proceeded to earn a Ph.D. in Germany, where his so called "advisors" and "examiners" either did not read what he wrote or did not know any better! His so-called "flawless" dissertation was written in German brand of English. Maybe his advisors had no knowledge of English at all!

As far as we are concerned, the problem still remains unresolved! There are three possible readings as shown above. We still maintain that lubdhārjanānaṃ ayam eva mārgāḥ is the most appropriate reading, yata upārjakaṃpuṃsaḥ of J gloss notwithstandin

g. Let us hear what the poet wants to say:

The flower is brimming--really brimming, overflowing with honey. But the bee is too greedy. Neither does it drink itself; nor does it allow others to enjoy the drink. It covers the opening, obstructs the path, and stays right there, totally tight.

Now the other bees could not tolerate this disgusting situation. They found another opening and drank all the honey while this greedy one kept on believing that all the honey was safely preserved. This is all prakāta, the true situation, a statement of facts.

Let us pay special attention to the repetition of the word mārga. Let us consider the style of composition [racanāsāilt] of the poet. We have lobhā in the prakāta. It will be much more pleasant and appealing to have lubdhaiḥ in the concluding sentence. Not only does mārga mean "opening", it also means "way"--a way most appropriate, a prudent way, to deal with the cunning and greedy people.

*
*
*

Once again we see here Misra's fantastic flights of imagination:

Tavāṅgavallikusumair vilāsair avaimi kāmo hriyamāṣanetraḥ.
Caitrārpitaṃ nūtānaṃ astrajātam sandhātuṃkāmo'pi na sandadhātī. [10:27]

Misra says:

vilāsa- (vi- las with ghañ), used as an adjective (ed. ter., comm.; vilāsair vilāsayukta iḥ) is hardly possible. Read perhaps for vilāsair rather vikālair:
"God Kāma, whose eyes, I think, are robbed, (forcibly taken) by the timeless (vikāla) flowers (=flowers that know no season) of the liana that is your body, does not place on his bowstring the new arsenal of arrows [i.e. flowers] offered by the season Caitra, though he is wishing to do so." [p. 17]

We don't know how "vikāla" could mean [flowers] that know no season! It is not "sarvakāla" or "sarvaṛtu."

Let us examine what Bh has to say on this point that led Mr. Misra astray, if at all it did. Misra is confused.

We do not think Bh understood what Bilhaṇa has to say here! He translates vilāsaiḥ as vilāsayuktaiḥ. Misra finds fault with him, which is justifiable. However, Misra misleads his readers by suggesting an "improved" reading. His suggestion to read vikālaḥ is as unacceptable to us as any that we have found in his entire product of "investigations."

It is obvious that Bh totally overlooks vilāsaiḥ as substantive. What he says does not make much sense to us. At the end he says: Tavāṅgavallkusumair [!] eva kāmasya śa rasandhānahetukaṃ kāryam kṛtam iti bhāvah. We don't know how Bh could grow flowers in, or produce them from the body (assemblage of limbs) of Candaladeva!

Banerji and Gupta provide only a glimmering lamp to show the proper path to our neo-expounders. However, none seems to use that lamp. B and G say:

I think, Cupid, with his eyes attracted by the dalliances [vilāsaiḥ] in the shape of [?] the flowers of your body-creeper, does not wield [aim or set] the new weapon offered by Caitra, though he is willing [?] to do so.

The Spring, whose responsibility it is to provide the arsenal of weapons (arrows of flowers) to his Master, the God of Love, has provided him (God of Love) with abundant new and fresh weapons, and he (God of Love) also does want to aim those arrows at his targets; yet when he sees the vilāsas of Candaladeva, which are equated with the flowers, blossoming forth from the creeper of [that is] the body of Candaladeva, he gets so enamoured by them that he finds no enthusiasm to use those arrows (which are traditional). The vilāsas of Candaladeva are much more attractive, bewitching, effective, and superior as compared to all the arsenal of the Spring Season.

Truly speaking it is very difficult, almost impossible, to translate impregnated words of great poets like Bilhaṇa in a language which is still foreign to the present writer. To substitute words for words following the principle of makṣikāsthāne makṣikā can be done. But to bring out the real meaning of Bilhaṇa by using English language is an extre
mely difficult task indeed for me. Every word of Bilhana is enriched with pregnant meaning: hriyamānanetraṁ nītanam astrajātam sandhātukāmaḥ api na sandadhāti! The beauties of poetry can be appreciated only through the feelings of one's heart. Kāvyārt ha-bhāvanā-paripakva-buddhi-vibhava-mātra-vedyam is the kavikarma and kavimarma!

The poet says:

I (Vikramāṅkadeva) imagine that Kāma is getting so enchanted, enamoured and overwhelmed (his eyes getting...) by your (of Candaladevi) vilāsas (amorous gestures), which are, as if, the flowers of your body creeper (limbs, which are like a creeper) that he does not want to aim at his targets the new assemblage of the arms (arrows) provided by Caitra (the Spring Season), although he would very much like to do so. The essence is: The vilāsas of Candaladevi are much more charming (and so generating Kāma) than the traditional arrows (flowers) of Kāma.

This is what the poet wants to convey. The above translation is put forth here with all the due apologies to the great poet, because it still does not convey the full meaning.

Let us see what is vilāsa. Vilāsa as defined by Viśvanātha Kavirāja in his Sāhityada rpaṇa is:

Yānasthānāsanādīnāṁ mukhanetrādikarmaṇāṁ.  
Viśeṣas tu vilāsaḥ syād iṣṭasandarśanādinā.

Here is an example:

Atrāntare kim api vāgvibhāvātvirṛtta-
vaicitryam ullasitavibhramam āyatākṣyāḥ.  
Tad bhūrisāttvikavikāram apāstadhairyaṁ 
ācāryakam vijayi mānmatham āvir āsīt.

According to Hemacandra:

Līlā vilāso vicchittir vibbokaḥ kilakiṅcitam.  507

Moṭṭāyatam kuṭṭamitaṁ lahitam viḥṛtaṁ tathā.  
Vibhramaṁ cetyalaṅkārāḥ strīṇāṁ svābhāvikā daśa.  508  
[Kāvyānuśāsana]

So Vilāsa is one of the ten natural ornaments—embellishments of the women. Vilāsa is a basic quality of vilāsinī. It is a sṛṅgārabhāvajā kriyā. Let us see what Amara says:

Strīṇāṁ vilāsavinbokā vibhramā lahitam tathā.  
Helā līletyamī hāvāḥ kriyāḥ sṛṅgārabhāvajāḥ.

Rāmaśramī comments on the above:
Sṛṅgārād ratyādeḥ bhāvān manovikārac ca jātāḥ (strīnām) kriyāś ceṣṭā alaṅkārākhy ā vilāsādikā hāva-śabdavācyāḥ.

Let it be noted that vilāsa leads the above enumeration of the sṛṅgārabhāvajā kriyā.

Here is another authoritative statement defining vilāsa as presented in Rāmāśramī:

Vilāso’ṅge viśeṣo yah priyāptāvāsanādiśu.
Vilāso hāvabhede syāl līlāyām api puṃsyayam.

Tatra priyasamīpagamane yāḥ sthānāsanagamana- vilokiteṣu vīkāro’kasmāc ca kro dhāsmitacamatkāramukha- viklavanam sa vilāsāḥ.

We are reminded of a subhāṣita where kavi kulaguru Kālidāsa has been equated with kavī-tā-kāmīnt-vilāsa:

Yasyāś Corasāc cikuranikaraḥ kāraṇpūro Mayūro
Bhāso hāsaḥ kavi kulaguruḥ Kālidāso vilāsāḥ.
Harṣo harṣo hṛdayavasatiḥ pañcabānas tu Bānāḥ
desāṃ naiṣā kathaya kavi tā-kāmīnt kautukāya.

One more example may be cited for vilāsa:

Dvāropāntanirantare mayī tayā saundaryasāraśriyā
proḷāśyoryugamaṃ parasparasamāsaktam samāsāditam.
Anītaṃ purataḥ śiromaṇam adhaḥ kṣipte cale locane
vācas tatra nivāritam prasaraṇam saṅkocite dorlate.

Bilhaṇa uses this word (Vilāsā) quite frequently:

Vilāsadolāphalake 7:19 Vilāsadolāyita 2:4
Vilāsavidyādhara 9:129 Vilāsayuddhena 10:73
Vilāsinām 7:47 Vilāsinīṇāṃ kusumo 10:60

All the above verses begin with the word "vilāsa." So they are in a way pratīkā-ślok as. There would be scores of verses where Bilhaṇa has used the word vilāsa, of course, not in the beginning. For example:

Vijṛmbhamāṇeṣvatha pañcabāṇa-kodāṅdasiṇāḥghanagarjiteṣu.
Vilāsinī mānasam āviveṣa sā rājahamsīva nareṣvaraṣya. [9:1]

Also Vilāsacāpaḥ
And Vilásadhanà dhanur ácakarâ. [9:5]

And Teṣām prasanno hi vilásabâñah. [10:24]

And Śobhante sma vilásakuntalalatâḥ. [10:91]

And

Iyâm vilásadrumadohaśārīr
    iyâm sudhâ yauvanadugdhasindhoḥ.
Lâvânyâmâniyårucicchâtreyam
    iyâm maṇâkârmaṇâcaṇûnâmuṣñâḥ. [9:69]

Bilhana exemplifies many vilásas beautifully in padyas 11-18 of sarga 6 and padyas 2-33 of sarga 12. Also see 9:73 and 9:74:

Iyâm mayi nyasyâti netramâlâm
    muhuḥ sakhiṇâm kimâpi bruvaṇâ.
Satyaiva sâ’bhûdanurâgavârttâ
    cîrât prasanno bhagavân anaṅgâḥ. [9:73]

Jaghâna pâdena sakhiṁ sakhelam
    âkṛṣya hâraṁ muhur âmumoca.
Sâ darâne Kuntalâpârthivasya
    na kâritâ kim mahâradhvajena. [9:74]

We don’t know whether Bh understood the compound word "vilásabâñah" in 10:24. He merely translates Vilásabâñah as kâmaḥ. We are not sure if he knows the analysis, vígraha--how Vilásabâñah is Kâmaḥ--strînâm vilâsâ eva bâñâḥ yasya--saḥ.

Misra asks us to discard vilâsaù and accept his vikâlaù! This is one of the most undesirable attempts on the part of Misra. Discussing the performance of Bühler, the present writer wrote: "Itihâsâcaryasya Dà Bûhllara [Bühler] mahodayasya jñânaráśau aiti hâsiko’msâḥ sâhityâmsâṁ nûnam atyâśeta." We are unable to decide whether Misra’s performance deserves any comment.

Misra goes to Bh and finds fault with him. Then he suddenly asks us to accept his unacceptable emendation. He wants us to replace vilâsaiù by vikâlaù--to throw away c intâmanî (wish-gem) and pick up myâloś a (sod of dirt)! "Vilâsaiù is the prakṛta, i.e. up ameya. Kusumaiù is the aprakrta, or upamâna. Vilâsaiù is the heart (true hârda) of this kavîndrokî. To throw it away will mean total destruction. There will be nothing left. It will be a dead body without the soul!

Misra knows that vilâsaù means "playful behaviour of the beautiful women" [see his comments on 6:19, p. 11], and that this word could be a substantive (noun) too--here k artâ of abhavat. Yet on p. 17 in rejecting Bh’s interpretation he reacts as if it can be only a viśeṣâna, i.e. adjective. As argued by Mister Misra, it may be “impossible” to interpret vilâsaiù here as an adjective, but we don’t understand why it could not have been a “thought of” [Misra’s favorite expression] as a noun!
Bh has equally failed. He has totally missed the essence and spirit of the poet’s *uktī. Vilāsaiḥ is not vilāsayuktaīḥ. It is not a *višeṣāṇa (adjective). It is a *višeṣya (substantive, noun). Bh reminds us of an age-old saying: Svayam naṣ aḥ parān nāsayati. He himself did not understand the true meaning and he misled Misra, if at all he did. Of course, Misra’s capacity to understand is limited anyway, especially when he does not want. Flowers don’t grow in the body (āṅgavallī) of the beloved lady. Her body is the abode of vilāsāḥ. Here vilāsāḥ are identified with *kusumāṇī. It is unfortunate that neither of these two neo-expounders cared to see Caritacandrikā, which says: āṅgāneyeva va līt tasyāḥ kusumaiḥ vilāsaiḥ--abhedaḥ.

So far we have come across only three *vṛttis (or the power of a word to express the meaning). They are: *abhidhā, lakṣaṇā and vyaṇjanā--tisrah śabdasya vṛttayah (or śa ktauḥ). Now we are learning for the first time of a new vṛtti, a new śakti, the fourth one. It is called "Miśra- śakti," the power of Misra to force a word yield any meaning he dictates. He asks us to believe that vikālaḥ can mean timeless. He did not give the prakṛti-pratyaya-vibhāga or vyutpatti (derivation) of the word. Dictionaries (Misra’s lexica) tell us that vikālaḥ (viruddha kālaḥ) stands for "evening, evening twilight, the close of day; improper (emphasis added) time, unseasonable hour."

Probably Misra wants to make this word (vikālaḥ) a compound word (may be a bahu vṛthī) and have the vigraha something like vigataḥ kālo yeṣāṃ tāṇi. Our pūrvacāryas have instructed us: Jīvatkaver āśayo na varṇaniyah. We hesitate to put our own words (interpretation) into Mr. Misra’s mouth. We only wish he had explained the word fully and systematically to avoid any unintentional misinterpretation. The specific word Misra wants to stand for "timeless" can also mean worn-out, withered, or [in the case of flowers] whose season is now over!

Unfortunately both Bh and Misra had seemingly forgotten verses 11 to 18 of canto 6 by the time they reached 10:27. Bilhana dwells on vilāsā in as many as eight verses. The description begins with Samajani kalamekhalākalāpa (6:11) and is carried upto ab havad anaṅgavilohbhano vilāsāḥ (6:18). Also verses 2-33 of canto 12 beginning with:

Asmin kṣaṇe Kuntalapārthivasya praveśam ākārya purāṇaṃ. Āśan vilāsavratadikṣitānām smaropadaśānāṃ viceṣṭīnā. [12:2]

and going upto:

Drṣām bhṛṣam kāmavaśikṛtānām kasyāścid ālokanakautikinyāḥ. Karṇāvataṃse ca nijāṇcāla ca gatāgatam yojanamātram āṣīt. [12:33]

tell us what the *vilāsas are, provided we keep our eyes open and the mind receptive.

In response to the performance of Bh we can only say: To err is human. But when we see a "Doctor" behave in this way, we don’t know what to say--the words fail us! Te ke na jānīmahe. Also

Saraso viparītaḥ cet sarasatvam na muñcātī.
Sākṣarā viparītās cet ......

We do not understand why Bh had to substitute vilāsaiḥ (substantive) by vilāsayukta
iḥ (adjective). And the question is: Does he have any grammatical authority to do so?
This is apart from the fact that in a varayātrā, (marriage procession of the bridegroom)
he cuts off the head of the bridegroom himself!

* * *

Misra's Bālacāpalam

Bilhaṇa says:

Sūtritābhisaranāḥ praṇayinyāḥ kāntasaṅgamam avighnam avāpuḥ.
Phūktetaḥ pathi nivāritadīpāś cāpalaṃ jayati paṅcaśarasya. [11:23]

Commenting on the above verse Misra says:

nivāritadīpāḥ: here nivārita-; [!] "kept off" does not yeild [sic] the sense praśānta,
"extinguished" (ed. ter., comm.). I would suggest, in the light of the context, reading nīr
vāpīta-,*"extinguished", and thus render: "lamps were extinguished [by the women...]".
For cāpalaṃ (all edd.) in d read cāturam, which suits well, since god Kama's action of
procuring a love meeting without obstacles is one of "cleverness" (cātura) and not of
"fickleness" (cāpala). [p.17]

Let us discuss Misra's cāpalam first: What Misra displays here is not a true scholarsh
ip. No doubt "cāpalam" means "fickleness", but it also means mobility and swiftness
(besides "fickleness"). In fact Monier-Williams lists the meanings in the above order, i.e.
"mobility" and "swiftness" precede "fickleness." If one were to consult MW, one will
see mobility and swiftness first before reaching "fickleness".

Apte too enumerates the meanings of "cāpalam" in the following order: 1. Quick m
otion, swiftness; 2) fickleness...We don't know how Misra concluded that the action inv
olved here was born out of "cleverness"! Even Misra's own word "clever" will mean "s
howing skill or resourcefulness often with physical dexterity."

The Hindi commentary of Bh has done a good job here. It says:

Kāmadeva mahārāja [?] kī sphūrti kī [?] balihārī hai arthāt kāmābhīhbūta hone par
a striyom me jo svābhāvika śīghratāpūrvaka apanā kārya sampādana karanekī buddh
i utpanna ho jātī hai vahā praśamsanīlya hai.

Once again Misra shows his lack of appreciation of the beauties of the poetic muse
by recommending the substitution of cāpalam by cāturam. The matter of the fact is tha
t cāturam is not grammatically correct at all because catura is not included in yuvādi.
The rule which gives us forms like cāpala is Hāyanāntayuvādibhyo’ñ (Pān. 5-1-130). S
ince this is not applicable to cātura, Misra's suggestion will be an attempt to make Bilh
aṇa violate Sanskrit grammar, which we cannot endorse. "Cāturayam" is the right form,
e.g. "vicāracāturyam apākaroti tātasya bhūyān mayi pakṣapātaḥ." [3.35] and "cātury am acāmāti Mandarādreh" [9.119]. Once again we may point out that this is the usual kind of cāpalam of Misra. He cites a meaning given by Bh, which may be wrong, but then jumps to a conclusion and asks us to amend the reading.

Many times we have wondered whether it is even appropriate for us to comment on the unsound suggestions of Misra. In order to get his wrong suggestions implemented, he will have to write his own Science of Prosody (Chandaḥśastram). Misra would like to read "nirvāpita." We believe Misra knows that the present verse is composed in svā gata metre, the definition of which is "Svāgata ranabhagair guruṇa ca." Here is the setting:

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
guru laghu guru laghu laghu guru laghu guru
S 1 S 1 1 S 1 1 S S
phū tkṛ taiḥ pa thi ni vā ri ta dṛ pāḥ
```

We also believe that Misra knows that a laghu akṣara, preceding a saṁyukta-akṣara (conjunct consonant) becomes dirgha (i.e. long) by the rule "saṁyuktādyaṁ dirgham."

So "ṛvā" will make "ni" as dirgha, which will destroy the life of the metre! Besides "nivārita" can easily mean eliminated, put off, stopped, withheld, suppressed, removed. So we don't have to change it into "nirvāpita." The question is: What is the authority to declare that "keeping off" is the only meaning of "nivārita"?

We have seen Misra's way of emending where the metre itself dictates the composition in a specific way in terms of a letter being laghu or guru. We don't know to what extent the Vikramäṅkadevacarita would have been changed by Misra if there were no restrictions imposed by the chandaḥśāstra and there were no dangers of chandobhaṅga doṣa in following Miśramārga; in other words, if Vikramäṅkadevacarita would have been a gadya-kāvya and not a padya-kāvya! We don't know why Misra forgets here his own high sounding statement on metri causa! [See his remarks regarding 9.41d, on p. 16].

Bh Shows the Limits of His Limited Knowledge

We are obliged to say something quite frank though not very pleasant relative to Bh's comment on the following verse:

```
Bāṇāḥ śvetamayūkhaśāṇakaśaṇakṣaṇṇaḥ kṣaṇāt kṣaṇatāṁ
yātās tyaktayāsū yāsu nihitāḥ paṅcāpi paṅceṣuṇā.
Uttaṁspalapallave'pi paṭīte daivāt pūraḥ pādayoḥ
kaṇṭhaḥśeṣakāṣṭhorakautukarasāṁ tiṣṭhanti tāḥ kāminām.
[11:90]
```

This is one more case that demonstrates how little Bh understood as far as the central idea of Bilhaṇa is concerned. Bh proves the correctness of the age-old saying: "Littl
e knowledge is a dangerous thing." As is usual with him, he has totally missed the true meaning!

N in his Caritacandrikā has clearly shown how this verse is to be interpreted: "Palla vapatanam atra saś ha upāyo rasāntaram vā." But our great "Vidyāvāgīśa" Bh does not pay any attention to what Caritacandrikā says. He provides his own independent interpretation. Well, he too has his own power of imagination and the right to exercise it. Bh translates the related passage as follows:

Tāh māninyāh daivād dūrdaivād abhāgyād ityarthāḥ.

This is all undesirable. No sensible sahṛdaya will ever accept it. "Daivād" does not mean here "bad luck;" it means "by chance," or even luckily--exactly the opposite of what Bh intends to say. It also means "accidentally." Perhaps Bh did not recall the following enumeration of Amara: "Daivāṁ diś am bhāgadheyaṁ bhāgyam strī ni yatir vid hiḥ." Bh comments: "Pādayoḥ carāṇayoḥ puro'gre uttamśarūpa abhūsaṅarpūpa kāmin ā dhāritāḥ ityarthāḥ." This is not true. The leaf of the blue lotus was worn as an ornament by the beloved lady and not by the lover (man). We are not sure whether we are reproducing the idea of Bh correctly. Sincerely, we are not able to understand what Bh wants to say here.

Here are his words:

Utpalapallavaḥ kamalapatraṃ tasmin patiteḥ[!] praṇatisamaye karnādīsthānāt pat iteḥ[!],
[we don't know why our "vidyāvāgīśa" has to repeat the same word!] kāmināṃ kāma -pīditānāṃ patīnāṃ kāntāhāleśe kāntāhālinge kaṭhoro mānadhārāne [!] drīdhaḥ kaut ukasya kutūhalasya rasaḥ āsvādo yāsu tāh satyāḥ tiṣṭhanti. Na keṇāpi prakāreṇa mān aṃ utsṛjya kāmijanapriyaṃ

The facts here are as follows: The first five weapons have already failed. Perhaps this is the significance of the phrase "paṇcāpi paṇcēśunā." The "sāma", "bheda", "dāna", and "nati" all have been tried, but all have failed. They all went in vain. The lover also had been practicing "upekṣā", i.e. indifference. The whole night has passed. Still the beloved lady is not pleased. She is not yet reconciled. We are reminded here of another sadukti of a great poet:

Gataprāyā rātrīḥ krśataṇu śaśṭ śīryata iva
praṇḍīpo'yaṃ nirāravaśam upagato ghūrṇata iva.
Praṇāmānto mānas tyaṣaji na tathāpi krudham aho
kucapratyāsattyāḥ hṛdayam apī te caṇḍi kāṭhinam.

In this verse "praṇāmānto mānaḥ" is quite significant. In our verse too, the dawn has almost dawned. Now it is very close to the morning. All the expedients, all the efforts, all the instruments have been tried but failed. There is no question of the lover bowing down any more. He had already fallen down at her feet. But she did not give up her māṇa. We would like to declare with all the vehemence at our command, even at
the risk of being repetitive, that the lover has tried every possible means, including, of course, "praṇati."

Bh translates "ka horo = mānadhāraṇe drṛṭhaḥ." We don't know how this can be connected with "kautukarasa." "Ka hora" here does not mean "stiff" or "hard", but "full-grown", or "mature", or "well-developed." For example, "ka horagarbhāṃ Jānakīṃ." Do we translate this as having a "stiff" embryo?

Bh concludes: "Na kenā prakāreṇa mānam utsṛṛjya kāmijanapriyaṃ kurvanti iti bhā vaḥ." If we accept this view, then the question arises: How do we interpret the first two quarters of the verse? What is the significance of "yātās tyaktanayāsu?" And also the ultimate end will be "viprayoga" and not "sāmyoga."

Many a time Bh takes undue liberty and reduces a perfectly sensible sadukti into an abject nonsense. In the verse under discussion, the poet says: "uttāṃsoptpalapallave a pi patite." He turns the ukti around and makes it uttāṃsoptpalapallave patite api. Thus he shows once again that he misses the meaning intended by the poet. He believes in manahpūtam samācaret.

The poet says: daivāt. He means "luckily." Bh turns it around and makes it durdaivāt abhāgyād ityarthah. Certainly it was a durdaiva of Bīlaṇa that a commentator [!] like Bh used his pen (worse than a poisoned sword) on him and tormented all of us time and again!

Let us seek the support of some higher authority in SāhityaÅŚāstra, in this case, Daśarūpa of Dhanañjaya who says:


Sāmādau tu parikṣiṇe syād upeksā'vadhīraṇam.
Rabhhasatrasaharsādeḥ kopabhṛmaṃśo rasāntaram.

Of these [expedients], Conciliation [is the use of] endearing words; Dissension, the winning over of her friends; Gift-giving, (regarding [regaining?] her favour) under pretext of [giving her] ornaments and the like; Humility, falling at her feet. When Conciliation and the other [expedients] have been exhausted, [then] Indifference--[that is], disregard [of her]--may be [employed]. Diversion is the interruption of anger through impetuosity, fear, joy, or the like. [4.67] p.59, 50; H. 54 b.c, 55). Strīṇāṃ ṛṣyākṛto mānaḥ kopo'nyāsaṅgini priye.

Srute vā'numite dṛṣṭe...

The Resentment arising in [a state of] jealousy is anger on the part of women when their lover is heard, inferred, or seen [to be devoted to another]. 68 (p. 61; H. 56).

Yathottaram guruḥ saḍbhir upāyais tam upācare.
Sāmnā bhedena dānena nātyupekṣārasāntaraīḥ.
The loved one (guru) [?] may remedy this [resentment] [or estrangement?] by six expedients [employed] in proper succession: Conciliation (sāman), Dissension (bheda), Gift-giving (dāna), Humility (nati), Indifference (upekṣā), and Diversion (rasāntara).

"guruḥ" is not to be interpreted here as "the loved one (guru)." "Guruḥ" does not refer to the lover. One cannot have rati with the guru. Guruḥ is not the kartā of upācaret. It refers to "kopaḥ" (anger). The anger grows in intensity and volume gradually. Yathottaram kramāsah, guruḥ gahanah (mānah), high in degree, vehement, violent. However, yathottaram can also be interpreted as "in succession." Cf. Tadbhaṅgāya patiḥ kury āt saḍupāyān iti kramāt. We would like to call such foreign writers as "kośapanaḍitas--dictionary scholars!

Notes: The term rasāntara signifies [substitution of] another emotion and consequently indicates the diversion from resentment effected by such substitution. 69 (p. 62-64a; H. 57,58).

Tatra priyavacaḥ sāma bhedas tatsakhyupārjanam. Dānam vyājena bhūṣadeḥ pādyoh patanaṃ natiḥ.

Similar ideas have been expressed by Sāradātanaya in his Bhāvaprakāśa (IV Adhik arāṇa).

Let us resume our discussion. Prakṛtam anusarāmaḥ. Yāsu nihitāḥ pāṇcāpi pānçeṣu ṇā [11:90]. If all those severe weapons have already failed, then what is surprising if the very tender leaf of lotus fails? Bilhaṇa has already expressed similar ideas elsewhere:

Ye kuṇḍhikṛtavallabhapraṇatayaḥ śastraịr anaṅgasya ye na prāptāḥ ca niśṭhīnpatikaraiḥ śaithilyavīthīm api. Te niśāṅkavitāṅkatālitumalaprotaputtaḥvitaś-chinnāḥ kukkuṭakūjitair mṛgaḍrśāṃ mānagrahagranthayaḥ. [11:83]

This verse brings forth ideas similar to what are expressed in 11:90. Here an ordinary, simple instrument, of course, seemingly, worked where great, fierce weapons had failed! Why? Because it is the dawn. If the beloved (lady) does not still get reconciled, she will have to suffer for the entire day? And who knows if the lover will visit her again the following evening!

Bilhaṇa has sung the same melodious song once again though in a different way. This is what he says:

This *kavindrokti* too is misunderstood and consequently misinterpreted by Bh. He says:

Kukkuṭānām kaṇṭhānāde kaṇṭām gate śrotram prāpte sati [absolute locative, or sati saptamī] manyuvaśataḥ krodhavaśataḥ jhaṭīti śighram utṭhāya śayyāṁ parityajya calitum pravrṭtā udvuktā nāryāḥ kiñcīt kṣuṭādinibhamātram udṛya prāneśakeliśay aneṣu punaḥ patanti.

This is a murder of *Śāhitya-vidyā-vadhū*. Bh expects us to believe that the women first heard the "kukku ṛkaṇ hanāda, then they were angered because they had to leave, then they started leaving, then they pretended sneezing, etc., and finally they came back to the bed of the lover! This is all unacceptable. The poet says:

Utṭhāya manyuvaśataḥ calitum pravrṭtāḥ
kaṇṭām gate jhaṭīti kukkuṭakaṇṭhanāde.

Bh affects transposition of the first two caraṇas—he changes their respective order. Bh makes Bilhaṇa say:

Karṇāṁ gate jhaṭīti kukkuṭakaṇṭhanāde
utṭhāya manyuvaśataḥ calitum pravrṭtāḥ. [!]

We would like Bhāradvāja Mahāśaya to know that the ladies were angry not because they were forced to leave on account of the morning—the day had dawned—they were angry, their *manuḥ* (*kopa*) was generated out of *praṇaya-kalahā* or *Īṣyā*. The facts are: The ladies get up; they begin to leave. Their going was caused by *maṇa*. But they hear the *kukku ṛkaṇ hanāda*. They had no idea what the time was when they had started to leave! But it dawned on them that the day had already dawned; it was already the day-break!! So it was not proper for them to leave. There was no more time left to while away. If they wanted to enjoy the remaining hours, rather minutes, they must go back to their lovers. Otherwise they would have to suffer for the whole day. So they had to come back! But if they came back out of their own accord, i.e. voluntarily, i.e. without any *anunaya* on the part of the lover, they would degrade themselves in the eyes of their lovers, who would very well say: "Well, you left with such arrogance! Why did you come back? I did not implore you to come back." Thus their pride would get further injured. It would be *kṣate kṣāram*, insult added to injury. So they wanted to show some pretext. And consequently they sneezed, or pretended that someone else had sneezed. So it was an *apaśakuna*, an ill omen. They could not go away at such an inauspicious moment. So they had to come back.

Bh may not remember that when a married woman, say, a member of a joint Hindu family system, is forced to leave the *raṇga-mahal*, because of her duty, she does not have any excuse, she cannot make any excuse, and she would not come back to her husband's bed even if someone sneezes. Here the poet clearly states: *Kiñcīt kṣuṭādinibha mātram!* Mark the word "*nibhamātram.*"

Bh confirms his lack of appreciation through the Hindi translation:
The Hindi translator too misses the true hárda of the poet. We repeat because dvir baddham subaddham bhavati. Women did not get up and start going after they had heard the crowing of the cocks. They started first. They would have waited for their lovers to come and persuade them to come back to the bed. Then alone they would have gone to the prāñeṣakeliśayana. But as it happened, the cocks crowed! It was already the dawn. There was no time left for any more pranaya-kalahā or rati-kopa. They were not angry, let it be emphasized, because they had to leave. They were angry because of some fault on the part of their lovers, like gotraskhalana. The translation as rendered by Bh and quoted above would suggest the word "duúkha" rather than "manyu."

If the women were forced to leave the beds of their husbands because it was the dawn, they would be unhappy rather than angry!

It seems that by the time Bh came to verse 11:93 he had forgotten 11:83 and its words—chinnāh kukku akūjitair mṛgadṛśām mānagrahaigranthayāḥ.

It is unfortunate that commentators like Bh do not understand the kavivacanam, pregnant with super ideas, and mislead all the future generations of their readers. Bilhaṇa had already anticipated such wrong-doings by irresponsible neo-expounders like Bh when he had said: Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapā ham. [1:22]

Bh had certainly not seen verse 16:6 when he tried his skill on 11:93, because the former could have shown him the way. Here it is:

Rati kopa prasāde ca dadhānāḥ paripūrṇatām.
Āyāmavatyo yāminyaḥ kāmīnīnām mude‘bhavan. [16:6]

Let us study some relevant passages from the Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha Kavirāja: What is ratikopa? What is prasāda? What is the significance of the word "āyāmavatyāyaḥ"?

Atra Sāhityadarpaṇe ṭṛṭīyaḥ Paricchedaḥ.

Atha mānaḥ:

Mānaḥ kopaḥ sa tu dvedhā pranayasyāsamudbhavaḥ.
Dvayoḥ pranayamānaḥ syāt pramode sumahatyapi. 198

Premṇaḥ kuṭilagāmitvāt kopo yaḥ kāraṇam vinā.

Dvayor iti nāyakasya nāyikāyāś ca ubhayaḥ ca pranayamāno varṇanīyaḥ. Udāh aranām. Tatra nāyakasya yathā:

Alīkaprasupta nimīlitākṣa dehi subhaga mama avakāśaṃ.
Gaṇḍaparicumbanapulakitāṅga na punaḥ cirayiṣyāmi
(Chāyā).

Nāyikāyā yathā Kumārasambhave sandhyāvarṇanāvasare.

Ubhayor yathā:

[Chāyā]

Anunayaparyantāsahatve tvasya na vipralambhabhedaḥ, kintu sambhogasaṅcāryākhyabhāvatvam. Yathā

Bhrūbhaṅge racite'pi drṣṭir adhikam sotkaṇṭham udvīkṣate ruddhāyam api vāci sasmitam idam dagdhānanaṁ jāyate.
Kārkaśyām gamite'pi cetasi tanuḥ romāṇcam ālambate drṣṭe nirvāhanaṁ bhaviṣyati katham māṇasya tasmīn jāne.

Yathā vā

Ekasmin śayane parāṁmukhatayā vīttottaram tāmyator anyonyasya ṛṛdi sthite'pyanunaye saṃrakṣator gauravam.
Dampatyoh śanakair apāṅgavalanān miśrībhavaccakṣuṣor bhagno mānakaliḥ saḥāsarabhasavyāsaktakaṇṭhagrahaḥ.

Patyur anyapriyāsaṅge drṣṭe'thānumite śrute. 199

Īryāmānọ bhavet strīṇām tatra tvanumitās tridhā. Utsvapnāyitabhogāṅka-gotraskhalanasambhavā. 200

Tatra drṣṭe yathā

Vinayati sudṛṣo drṣoh parāgaṁ pranayini kausumam ānanānilena. Tadahitayuvater abhīkṣṇam aṅkoṁ dvayam api roṣarajobhirāpupure.

Sambhogacihnenānumite yathā

Navanakhapadam aṅgam gopayasyaṁśukena sthagayasi punar oṣṭham pāṇinā dantadaṣṭam. Pratidiśam aparastṛṣaṅgaṁśīr visarpan navaparimalagandhaḥ kena Śākyo varītum.

Evam anyatra

Śāma bhedo'tha dānaṁ ca natyupēkeṣa rasāntaram. Tadbhaṅgāya patiḥ kuryāt śadupāyān iti kramāt. 201
Tatra priyavacaḥ sāma bhedaḥ tatsakhyaupārjanam.
Dānam vyājena bhūśadeḥ pādyoḥ patanaṃ natiḥ.  202

Sāmādau tu pariṣṭiṣṇe syād upeksāvadhīrānam.
Rabhasastraḥsahāraśādeḥ kopabhramaṃśo rasāntaram.  203

Yathā

No caṭuṣṭraṇām kṛtam ityādi.
Atra sāmādayaḥ pañca sūcitāḥ. Rasāntaram īhyam.

Cāṭukāram api prāṇa-nātham roṣād apāsyā Ya.
Paścāttapam avāpnoti kalahāntaritā tu sā.

[82. Source same]

Yathā mama tātapādānāṃ:

No caṭuṣṭraṇām kṛtam [sāma] na ca drśā āhro'ntike vīkṣitaḥ [dānaṃ]
kāntasya priyahetavā nijasakhīvāco pi dūrīkṛtāḥ [bhedāḥ].
Pādānte vinipatyā [natiḥ] tatkaṇām asau gacchan [upekṣā] mayā mūḍhayā
pāṇibhyām avarudhya hanta sahasā kaṇṭhe kathaṃ nārpitaḥ.

Here (in this last verse) we have examples of all the first five expedients. There wa
s no rasāntaram. So there was no reconciliation. The lover left absolutely. He would
not return! Now the beloved lady has merely to repent. So the sambhoga śrīgāra
was not continued. She is now "kalahāntaritā." There is the "vipralambha", or "viyoga."

Also the following sadukti will be relevant:

Caraṇapatanapratyākhyanāt prasādaparāṁmukhe
nibhārтitavācāretyuktvā ruṣā paruṣiśkṛte.
Vrajaṭi ramaṇe niḥśvasyoccaḥ stanasthitahastayā
nayanasalilacchannā drṣṭīb sakhīṣu niveṣitā.


Viśvanātha Kavirāja did not give the example of rasāntaram. Bilhaṇa has given. K
ukku akūjitāni and uttamśotpalapallavapatanam are rasāntaram. The "ancient" writer
of Caritacandrikā says very clearly [p.281, line 15]: "Pallavapatanam atra śaṣ ha upā
yo rasāntaraṃ vā. We don't think Bh saw this. Even if he had seen this, he would hav
e rejected it. His determination to interpret certain uktis in a certain way was firm. Mā
ti nirvivare and Yaśya bhrātā are some examples.

Here is one more vivid example of rasāntaram:

Kṛtvā vigraham aśrupātakaluṣam śayyāsanād utthita
krodhācāpi vihāya garbhabhavanadvāraṃ ruṣā prasthitā.
Drṣṭvā candramasaṃ prabhāvirahitaṃ prayuṣaṇātāhata
hā rātris tvaritā gateti patitā kāntā priyasyorasi.

Another example:

Tasyāḥ sāndravilepanastanayugapraśleṣamudrāṅkitam
kim vakṣaś caraṇānativyatikaravyājena gopāyyate.

Ityukte kva tad ityudīrya sahasā tatsamprāṃśotpum mayā
samśīṣṭā rabhasena tatsukhavaśāt tanvyāpi tad vismrṭam.

[Amaroḥ]

Bilhaṇa himself makes a reference to māna in the following verse:

Jñātum adbhutavilāsanidhāne premṇi sāmyam iva jātagarimni.
Kelidhāmani tayoḥ satavārṇaṃ kṣiptavān manasi māṇam anaṅgah. [11:72]

A great deal of information on māna (love in separation) can be obtained from Kan
gra paintings on love (M.S. Randhawa, Comp., New Delhi, National Museum, 1962.
Chap. 7. pp. 89-97) where Randhawa discusses the theme on the basis of the Rasikapri
yā of Keśavadāsa.

* * *

Here is one more example of the unworthy attempts made by Bh to interpret our gre
at poet Bilhaṇa. Such commentators were envisioned by Bilhaṇa and were alluded in t
he very beginning of his immortal work:

Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti saṅkrāṃtavakroktirahasyamudrāḥ.
Te'smatprabandhān avadhārayantu kurvantu śesāḥ śukavākyapāṭham. [1:22]

The poet says:

Nirādaraṃ vīkṣya nṛṇaṃ mṛgākṣyā līlānāmatkandarayā kāyāpi.
Hṛdi sthiṭāḥ kārmukakarṣaṇārtham ayaścyateva prasabhāṃ manobhūḥ. [12:10]

What is the prasaṅga (context) here? The prasaṅga is:

Asmin kṣane Kuntalapārthivasya praveṣam ākārya purāṅganānām.
Āsan vilāsavrataṅkṣiṭānām smaropadiśṭāni viceśṭiṭāni. [12:2]

The lady expected the king to see her, but the king did not pay any attention! He dis
regarded her completely!! So she became dejected, disheartened, depressed, and dow
cast. Her face fell down. This is all prakṛtta, the reality. Now the poet imagines. Th
e God of Love was already present in her heart (as well as on the chest, i.e. the boso
m). So she asked him all of a sudden (or with all the earnestness, or with all the force)
to aim his bow at the king so that he gets attracted toward her. That is the central idea
of the poet.
We see here Bh misrepresenting the facts. The commentary Ramā of Bh expects us to accept something which we find difficult to accept. Bh gives kāmavaṣṭvāt as the cause of līlānamatkandharayā! This is not correct. The lowering of the neck (grīvā) was not caused by passionate feelings, but due to the insult, generated by the fact that the king did not pay any attention to her! Nirādaraṃ vikṣya nrpaṃ!

Probably Bh was led astray by the word līlā! We have stated time and again that Bh turns the poet's words around--changes the order of the words completely--and generates disorder. The result is chaos. The poet begins with Nirādaraṃ vikṣya nrpaṃ mrgā kṣyā. Then he says: līlānamtkandharayā. The first statement (occurrence, i.e. vyāpāra) is the cause. The second statement (occurrence) is the effect. Bh transposes the caraṇas. This can be characterized only as avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram. We are distressed not only by the fact that Bh murders sāhitya-vidyā-vadhā, we are also--and much more distressed by the feeling that none of those "great pandits" claimed by Bh as having collaborated with him in this great performance were able to show him the correct path! We cannot believe that such great scholars would have allowed such incongruities to be perpetuated. To quote Bh himself: Sati ravi kanikarapraveśe kuto'ndhakārasya sambha vaḥ.

Misra's Misdirected Emendation:

Jṛmbhāśamāsphoṭakarāṇgulikām akharvadorṇeṇikāyā kayācit.
Nirikṣya rājānam ajātarāgam atarjyatevātiruṣā manobhūḥ. [12:20]

Misra dictates on the above:

12:20b

For dorvenikāyā, "with the braid that was her arm" read dorvenukāyā...atarjyata, "he was threatened" [by some girl [how young?] with the bamboo (= Hindi lā hi) that was her arm. We don't know how "bamboo" could mean lā hi! Misra might not have realized that "akharvadorṇeṇikāyā" is a bahuvrīhi compound, qualifying kayāpi.

Misra shows here his lack of understanding of even the most rudimentary concepts of Sāhityavidyā. The face is identified with, for example, moon because of its beauty. There is a common quality, sādharmya, which is the means, whereby two different objects are identified and regarded as one. The Upapameya and upamāna should have certain common characteristics--guṇasādhāranyam!

Misra identifies arms (mark the plural, of course, dual number in Sanskrit) with the bamboo [stick]! We don't know what identical quality he found in both of them. Length? May be. However, the colour is certainly not identical. Also notable is the fact that the arms are two in number and Misra's lā hi is only one! If the arm (one only) was extended in the form of a stick (Misra's lā hi), what is the significance of Jṛmbhāśamāspho akarāṇgulikam! The process of karāṇgulisamāspho a (cracking the knuckles) cannot be performed without joining the two hands and all the fingers!!

Let us consider the word veṇu. It is masculine. So how could it be veṇukā? And what is the significance of Jṛmbhāśamāspho akarāṇgulikam, if we have only one arm? H
ere are some more relevant passages: *Uttarjanikena mühuh kareṇa*. [1:48]. In the process of *tarjana* we need the *tarjanta* (the threatening finger, the forefinger, the pointing finger) and only one arm, preferably right. Bilhaṇa has another sūkti: *Jṛmbhāvaśott ambhitahastayugma-saṅgha allāśphu adhaṅgulikaḥ*. (9:85). This is a very fine comparative study. Here we have "uttambhita" as well as "hastayugma."

Today (Oct. 28, 1977) while considering the unreasonable suggestion of Misra to change *dorvenikayā* to *dorvenukayā* (Vīk. 12:20b), I gave more thought to the words of the poet. The nāyikā is yawning. She is stretching herself. Her fingers are twisted. They produce a specific sound (cracking of the bones!). This process of *karāṅgulīsamāsp ho a* cannot be performed unless and until both the arms are stretched upward, or forward, and all the fingers are united and twisted together.

Here "*veṇī*" does not mean "braid" and the arm cannot be turned into it. There can be no *abhedasaḍhana*—identification of doḥ (arm) with veṇī (braid). No purpose is served in converting the braid into the arm or vice versa. They are both *prakṛtas*. They are both real and existing. Both of them are parts of the nāyikā. Nagar was wrong when he glossed *dorvenyau* as bāhulate. He did not visualize that the two arms have to be united at their ends before there could be the *karāṅgulī-samāspho a*. He was very young at the time, in his early twenties!

Bh is wrong too when he takes veṇī to be the veṇī (Hindi co ṭ). There is no connection between the arms and the braid. Their mention at one place does not have any special significance. Here Bh copies Candrikā literally, syllable by syllable. "Jṛmbhayā s amāspho o yāsu, tadrśyaḥ karāṅgulyo yasmin karmaṇī tad yathā syāt tathā." Bh says: *d orvenyau bāhulate venī ca*. At least he does not make them identical; he does not treat them as one and the same. What is *jṛmbhād*? Here is another poet:

*Cakrīkṛtabhujalatikāṁ vakrīkṛtvaktram unnamadgrīvam.*
No harati kasya hṛdayaṁ hariṇadrśo jṛmbhaṇārambhāḥ.

*Veṇī (hrasva) =* the confluence or meeting of two or more [rivers or streams] in a common point of union. *Veṇī =* dam, bridge. So it can mean saṅgama or union, meeting to gether at a point!

We believe Misra comes from Allahabad! He might be aware of "Triveṇīsaṅgama!" And Bharadvaja claims a Hindu traditional heritage. Did he ever take a holy bath in Prayāga? *Cakrīkṛtabhujalatikam* expresses the idea in its totality. The two arms are extended, stretched, rounded and joined at the fingers. This is a true description of the specific condition, when a lady under the influence of the God of Love acts in a certain manner (a vilāsa). And here is anoter poet:

Āsyendoḥ pariveśavad ratipateś cāmpeyakodaṇḍavad
dhammadumumucāḥ kṣaṇadyutivadāsajau kṣipantīḥ bhujau.
Viśṭiṣyadvalī lakṣyanābhiṣigalānīvyunnamanmadhyamam
kiṃcitkiṃcidudāntakaṇḍam aho kumbhastani jṛmbhate.

So, Misra’s understanding of the poem cannot be commended and his emendation is to be condemned.

Misra’s Pitiable Misrepresentation

Neither Bh nor Misra has understood the following:

Asmākam ālokanavighnahetos taraṅgitāṅgī purataḥ sthitāsi.
Kiṃ tuṅgavātāyanasaṅgatānām karōṣi mātsaryaparā parāsām. [12:27]

A free rendering would be:

In order to create obstruction in our viewing, 0 taraṅgitāṅgī (having leaping limbs) woman, you have come and stood right in front of us. You are so selfish and jealous! What can you do to those women who are situated (standing) on the balconies high up? You cannot obstruct their views! Asmākam... purataḥ sthitāsi. Tuṅga vātāyana -saṅg atānām parāsām (anyāsām) kiṃ karōṣi?

But Misra says:

12:27d
Instead of parāsām (gen. pl. f. para-, "the other one") read parāsam (acc. sing. of parāsa-m. "driving away) in order to get an object for karōṣi as "which" kiṃ is not suitabl e.

cd kiṃ tuṅgavātāyanasaṅgatānām karōṣi mātsaryaparā parāsām//[sic].

Misra asks us to emend, but himself keeps the original reading!]

"why do you, being keen on jealousy, cause driving away (parāsa) [of the girls] that have come together on the high roof platform."

Misra tries to interpret "kim" as "why" rather than "what"! We fail to understand him. As a rule, he takes only one meaning which he desires. And then he proceeds with his emending suggestions. He overlooks other meanings. We would like to know from Misra how would he interpret statements like the following:

kiṃ karōṣi nijayāthāvā bhuvā [5:38]

kiṃ karōṣi vayasādhikena me [5:83]

We are still kept wondering how the particular jealous woman, coming and standing on the ground level in front of the other women, could "cause driving away (parāsa) [of the girls] that have come together on the high roof platform?" How could she scare those ladies away?
Let it be stressed here that Misra is not totally unaware of the existence of high balconies. He observes: "Young women, crowding each other, stand on these balconies in excitement, looking at scenes below." [p. 49. fn. 51].

Let us now see Bh's performance. Bh displays once again his habit of twisting the arms of the sentence, as it were--taking the words up and down without any rhyme or reason. We don't know why he has taken mātsaryaparā at the very end. Truly speaking mātsarya is the root cause of the specific action on the part of the obstructionist woman--to stand in front of others so as to obstruct their vision. [cf. Bhāravi: Mātsaryarāgop ahatatmanāṃ hi skhalanti sādhuṣyapi mānasāni.]

However, Bh gives a meaning which is clear enough, ruling out any possibility for Misra to misinterpret the poet. Bh says:

Taraṅgitāngī tvam ālokane asmatkarmaka [!] darāsane vighnahetor vighno- tpādan ārtham asmākam purtaḥ sāhitāsi. Tūṅgavātāyana-samupaviśṭānāṁ parāsām anyāsām nāyikānāṁ mātsaye para parāyaṇa kim karoṣi.

There is a lot of undesirable element dumped by Bh in his translation. "Darāsanam" need not necessarily be "asmatkarmaka." It could very well be "asmatkarṭka" too. The ladies did not want merely "to be seen." They also wanted to see. Mātsaryaparā need not be taken at the very end. Saṅgatānāṁ does not necessarily mean samupaviṣ ānāṁ. They could be very well standing!

We would call all this avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram. Evidently the Hindi translation is much more appropriate. The Hindi translator knows much more than Bh. It becomes more and more evident to me that these two were not one and the same person. They were two different persons. Hindi says:

He caṅcalasārīravāli kāminī! Hama logomke [dvārā?] rājāko dekhanemem vighna utpanna karane ke āge kharī ho gaī hai. Parantu mātsar yubuddhi se vyāpta tū umče jharokhom mem baithī huī anya nāriyom kā kyā bigāra s aṅkaṭī hain [emphasis added].

We believe the reader is able to distinguish the difference between the two interpretations given above. The Sanskrit commentator unnecessarily brings the idea of "to be seen" by the king--asmatkarmakadarśana--which is not expressed by asmākam ālokān avighnahetoḥ. Hindi has correctly put it "hama logom ke rājā ko dekhanemem." We have added "dvārā."

And finally here is the English translation, which does not express fully the sense of the poem! It is māṣikāsthāne māṣikā, and yet it gives enough meaning to enlighten the minds of critics such as Misra and Bh. The English translation says:

You, with your body having folds [!], are staying in front for the obstruction of our sight. Being jealous, what will you do to other ladies who are at the elevated windows?
Mātsaryaparā must come at the very beginning, because her coming and standing in front of others was also born out of jealousy. She was motivated by jealousy to begin with—from the very start. This is what Caritacandrīkā says: Ālokanavighnahetor ava lokanāvarodhāya. Vātāyanaṃ gavākṣaḥ. Parāsāṃ anyāṅganānāṃ.

So we see that Caritacandrīkā had no problem. Bh had no problem. The English translators too had no problem. But the author of "Specimens of Textual Difficulties" (that is how Misra has titled his first chapter), had great "difficulties" in understanding the verse with "parāsāṃ." So he asks us to accept his suggestion of "parāsam", which we find difficult to accept.

Here is a verbal image. People were standing on the ground level. One woman was jealous. She was inconsiderate. In order to have a full and unhindered view of King Vikrama, she virtually jumped and stood in front of others, who were standing on the ground, thus obstructing their view—their range of vision. So, one of the women, whose view was thus obstructed says: Asmākam ālokanavighnaheto...

We have shown what our earlier authorities (pavrācāryas) have already said. Either Misra did not have access to their works, or following the gajanimylvāya did not see them.

Taraṅgitāṅgli here does not mean "with your body having folds" as the English translators would want us to believe. It means caṅcalāṅgli, moving restlessly to and fro. Probably the translators jumped and ran away with the very first meaning they got in the dictionary, i.e. "having folds as waves."

The deeper we go, the greater depth we find. That is the beauty of the immortal words of great poets. Kāmadughā hi mahākāvīnām vāco bhavanti! How appropriate is the word taraṅgitāṅgli! The subject (woman) was standing behind the other women. All of a sudden she pushed others aside and came in front of them, thus obstructing their view. This was with a malicious design—ālokanavighnaheto: To obstruct their view.

Misra also notices [p. 22, comments on 14:44 and 17:29d] how Bh plays with the words. First he would give the śabdārtha and then give any meaning desired by him as the bhāva whether it can be derived from the stated words or not. The "bhāva" of Bh is really what suits Bhāradvāja.

* * * *

Misra once again puts us in a difficult situation. He comments on the following verse:

Vapus tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya vyarājadālepanacandanena. Viśvapraṃśārkaṁayükhatāpa-śāntyartham āśiṣṭam ivendubhāsā. [12:45]

Misra proclaims:

12:45a
It is preposterous [!] to compare the king's body with the height [sic] of the Himālaya: 

\[ vapus \text{ tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya... "his body, high as the Himālaya." For tuṅga, "high", read raṅga "colour". ab-vapus tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya vyarājad ālepanacandanena/}\n
His body appeared of the colour (raṅga) of the snow mountain by the sandal that was his coating (with which he had smeared his body). [p.18-19] We don't understand how Misra's mind works. His quoted text reads "-tuṅgam," while HIS translation reads "colour (raṅga)."

Misra crosses the limits of decency, when he denounces the poet for having composed his poetry according to the kavimārga, the path of the poets.

\[ \text{Apāre kāvyasamsāre kavirekaḥ prajāpatih.} \]
\[ \text{Yathāsmai rocate viśvam tathaiva parivartate.} \]

The poet creates his own world. If we don't like it, we don't go near it. Bilhaṇa had already anticipated such unjust critics when he had said:

\[ \text{Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapātham.} \]

Also Mammaṭa:

\[ \text{Niyatikṛtaniyamaraḥhitāṁ hlādaikamayīṁ ananyaparatantarāṁ.} \]
\[ \text{Navarasarucirāṁ nirmimātādhatī Bhāratī kaver jayati.} \]

We don't know if Misra saw the following sūkти of Bilhaṇa which would be branded by him as "preposterous."

\[ \text{Śrīkaṇḍacakāparipāṇḍuro'yaṁ Paṇḍyaḥ prakāmonnatacāruдеhaḥ.} \]
\[ \text{Kṣīrodadhikṣīraparipūtasya cāturāṁ acāmaṁ Mandarādeḥ. [9:119]} \]

Here the body of the king of Paṇḍya country is compared with the Mandara mountain! So Bilhaṇa is guilty of using "preposterous" words not only once but at least twice! Not only Bilhaṇa, even kavikulaguru Kālidāsa should be charged with the same guilt of saying "preposterous" things as determined by Misra:

\[ \text{Paṇḍyo'yaṁ aṁśārpitalambahāraḥ klrptāṅgarāgo haricandanena.} \]
\[ \text{Ābhāti bāḷātaparaktaśānuḥ sanirjharodgāra ivādrīrajah.} \]
\[ \text{[Raghuvaṁśa, 6:60]} \]

Since, according to Misra, Bilhaṇa (a Purāṇa Kavi) had no right to say that the body of King Vikrāma was as high as the Mountain Himālaya, he suggests that the reading be changed to "tuṣārācalarāṅgam." Misra probably would have the following vigraha in his mind: "Tuṣārācalasya raṅga iva raṅgo yasya tam."

We see expressions like:

\[ \text{Kailāśaśubhraṁ bhavanāṅgaṇaṁ tat. [9:46]} \]
Kailasagaura vrṣam ārurukṣoḥ. [Raghuvaṃśa]

Kundendutuṣārahāradhavalā, etc.

Misra very much would have liked Bilhaṇa say: \textit{Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya!} It is interesting to observe that while preparing a draft for the present publication, Shri Nagaraja Rao of Mysore wrote \textit{Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya}, of course, correcting it subsequently, and not ...\textit{tuṅgam asya}. This phenomenon also shows how variant readings are created.

We also don’t know why the Himalayas had to be brought in at all if the unusual height was not intended to be conveyed. There are thousands of other white objects in the universe of poets, their kāvyasaṃsāra.

A Merciless Murder of the Poetic Muse

With regard to

\begin{quote}
Cakāra kāntākucapatrabhaṅga-kastūrikāpaṅkakalaṅkitāni.
Varṣājalabhrāntivilolahāṃsa-hāsāni līlāsarasāpayāṃsi. [12:69]
\end{quote}

Misra displays his critical acumen:

The agent of \textit{cakāra} is "he" the king. In the preceding verse, however, "some girl" (kācana) is the agent of the verb (vilaṅghayāṁ āsa). As the change to a new subject (the king) would necessitate this to be named, verse 69 should be read before 68 and after 67, where \textit{devaḥ} "the king" is explicitly given as the subject. [p.19]

The more we read the "suggestions" made by Misra, the more we feel sad. He recommends that "verse 69 should be read before 68 and after 67." This is called \textit{ekāṃ san dhistato'paraṃ prácyavate}.

Verse 67 and 68 are so intimately interwoven that to insert a wedge in between the two would be a great disservice to the Poetic Muse of Bilhaṇa. We will merely betray our own lack of appreciation of poetic art.

Verse 67 reads:

\begin{quote}
Devāh karāmbhoruḥhayantaradhrām kṣipan kapole vipuleksanāyāḥ.
Kumudvatīkāmini raṃśiḍāṇḍam praveśayannarka iva vyārājat. [12:67]
\end{quote}

And the next verse 68 reads:

\begin{quote}
Ānamyā līḷāparivartanena vilaṅghayāmāsa narendramuktām.
Kaṭṭhonmukhīṁ kācana kambukaṇṭhi smarāśidhārām iva vāridhārām. [12:68]
\end{quote}
The first verse is the offence. The second is the defence. To put another verse (and all the ideas expressed therein) in between the two would not be appropriate. Since these two verses are like vāgartha--one following the other--devaḥ (of 69) will get anuvṛtti (from 67) and get connected with cakāra (of 69). We should not worry at all!

Nagar’s Youth & His Atiśayokti

The youth in Nagar in his early twenties was so powerful and hence rash that he declared: Ja. pustakāc chuddhataram pustakam āvirbhavati ced ito’pyadhikam śodhanam nāsambhavi. Prastāvanā, p.7. It was an immaturity on his part to think that he had totally exhausted the collation of J and subsequent improvement of the text. There is enough scope even today for a discerning scholar to make some improvements. But Mūsa has missed all such opportunities. Maybe he did not have enough resources. For example, I have in my possession even today a true copy of J.

Here is an interesting example to prove the above point:

Vyadhita tadānu devyāḥ patravallīṃ kapole
vipulapulakalekhādanturaḥ kuntalenduḥ.
Pratiyuvatibhir ardhe tāditaḥ pāṇḍu-gaṇḍa-
sthalaviluṭhitabāṣpavyaktīlakṣyaīḥ katākṣaiḥ. [12:76]

I do not believe Misra had any original source to improve upon the readings of the text. Certainly, he did not see any of the MSS. Yet he writes beautifully: "Our MSS." etc. Nor did he see even Bühler’s edition! Even if he saw it, Misra did not make any original contribution.

Misra did not promise to correct the entire text of the poem. He just wanted to present "Some Specimens of Textual Difficulties." Since his knowledge of Sanskrit was limited, he had more "difficulties" in understanding the text than even a beginner would have had! Here is a reading which needs correction! The correct reading is not "danturaḥ kuntalenduḥ" but "danture kuntalenduḥ, 'danture' being an adjective of "kapole!" J actually has danture! We could not expect such a miracle from Bh.

Nagar had missed it. His text is deficient even today! Many of the readings in N are assumptions, i.e. accepted as correct. Wherever there was a doubt, N has examined the MS and other sources with deep insight. I believe if one, not familiar with the poem the way I was, goes through J once again and compares it with N, he might be able to make some improvements. Once a text is almost kāñ hastha, even a wrong reading appears right. This is a psychological phenomenon.

There was no apparent reason to doubt danturaḥ kuntalenduḥ. Thus it remained wrong. But once I was going through a similar passage in Vikramāṇkābhyudaya. It has danture kapole! (or something like that). Ekasambandhi jñānam aparasambandhismara kam. I was reminded of the passage in Vik. I saw J. It showed danture when carefully looked at.
P has *danturakuntalenduḥ*—neither *mātrā* of *e*, nor *visarga*! No *padaccheda* either! Undoubtedly the *mātrā* on the left was ignored by copyist P. B made it *danturah kunta lenduḥ*. N copied B via R. Bh copied N! So that is the story!

*Lekhayā luloke* [6:19] is one more example. *Nrpaśya vallabhaḥ* [14:44] is another example where the text of N remained defective.

* * *

Here is one more display of the unusual power of Misra in recommending emendation. Bilhaṇa sang:

Prabuddhakārṣyāḥ paritāpasaṅkucaḥ sapaṅkapaṅkarhinīdaṃkitaḥ.
Daśām alabdhābdhisamāgamāś ciraṃ viyogayogām abhajanta nimnagāḥ. [13:8]

Misra goes his own usual way. He says:

13.8
Emend *prabuddha*-to *pravṛddha*--; cp. ed. ter., comm. where *prabuddha*- is explained by *pravṛddha-* under the requirement of the text: *pravṛddhakārṣyāḥ...nimnagāḥ,* "the rivers whose leanness had grown big..." *prabuddha*- in 13.11d should also be emended to *pravṛddha* by which it is again glossed in ed. ter., commentary. [p. 19]

Misra does not like the word *prabuddha*. We don't know what Misra means by "under the requirement of the text." Once again I have checked J today (Oct.31, 1977). Both the passages [here and in 13:11] still have *prabuddha* very clearly visible. To change from *prabuddha* to *pravṛddha* would be merely an *avyāpāreśu vyāpāram*. *Prabuddha* conveys the meaning intended by the poet! One has to develop the power of appreciation. Listen to what Murārikavi says:

Jāntē nitarām asau gurukulakliṣṭo Murāriḥ kaviḥ.

The most appropriate meaning of *prabuddha* here (according to Apte) would be—beginning to work, or take effect.

* * *

Misra presents a long discourse on the following:

Nirantarāghaṭitapātalādharāḥ kramān nidāghasya ghanoṃmastaṅginaḥ.
Vyaramśiṣuḥ śvāsasamāraṇā iva prabuddhadāṅalabandhavo'nlāḥ. [13:11]

Cp. *Vanāni dahato vahneḥ sakhā bhavati mārūtaḥ*.

He says:
Previous attempts in translating the verse have been banal, since the poet's use of punning (śleṣa) in it could not find expression in them. The pun, how it should be understood and explained is as follows:

nirantarā gha itapā alādharāḥ kramān nidāghasya ghanoṃsaṅgīnāḥ/
vyārāṃsiṣuḥ śvāsasamīraṇāḥ iva prabuddha(IO)dāvānalabandhavo'nilaḥ//

"The incessant (nirantarāḥ) winds that are the friends of the grown/big forest fires (i.e. that are accompanied by forest fires, [or increasing the fury of the fires?] that rubbed (violently shook) the pāala trees (lit. "the bearer of the pāala - blossoms"), that were in connection with (were accompanied by) violent heat- [that were] like the incessant breathings (śvāsa- samīraṇāḥ) of the hot season [in the act of violent love-making], that are like grown forest fires (i.e. that are hot like forest fires)(11) that hurt (lit. violently rub) (his) red lips, that are accompanied by sibilants/hissings (in the effort to cool the m) in due course (krāmat) [sic] came to a stop." [pp.19-20]

Misra's footnotes:
10. Read pravṛddha, see above on 13.8a

11. In this case the compound ending in--bandhavaḥ is to be taken as bahuvrīhi "who se frinds [sic] (i.e. equals) are...

It is difficult even to try to comment on what Misra talks here.

Vṛkṣo mahāruhāḥ śākhi viṭapī pādāpas tāruḥ.
Anokahaḥ kuṭaḥ śālaḥ palāśi drudrāgamāḥ.
[Amarāh. 13 vṛkṣasya.]

We have no absolute, unrestricted authority to coin our own word like pāala-dhara, pāala=flower, dhara = bearer, i.e. bearer of pāala flowers, therefore tree! We have heard words like jaladhara and mahīdhara,, but we have never heard of puspa-dhara as tree!

Misra is kartum akartum anyathākartum samarthah. By the time I came to page 19 of Misra, I had become so unhappy that I almost decided to give it up! His work has b een a very unpleasant reading. Misra appears to be an all-powerful personality. I have been studying Sanskrit classics for the last 45 years or so, but I have never seen such an irresponsible work of any writer, Indian or foreigner. Commenting on Vik. 13:11, Misra says: "Previous attempts.... a stop." My pen stops right here. I would not want to discuss this further. This writing goes back to 1977.

Kathāpi khalu pāpānāṃ alam aśreyase yataḥ.

The above feelings were my immediate reaction. Subsequently I decided to comment just to show the hollowness of what Misra had said. Here Misra has tried to coin his own term. He is wrong. While coining a new term one has to observe certain principles.
I have been living in the United States of America continuously for the last 18 years. Many Indian boys and girls have approached me through letters to help them cross the seven seas in order to study in the USA, the "Land of Opportunities." Many parents have entreated me to get their sons and daughters step on the soil of the Land of Learning. I have always discouraged them. I have tried to make them understand that it is foolish, rather absurd to learn the ABC of any Science or Art in the USA. One should at least become a master in a field of knowledge. Then alone he should go abroad.

I hold the same opinion about Misra. He ought to have learnt the first lessons of poetic criticism in India before he tried to demonstrate his knowledge in a country which is the cradle of modern western studies in Sanskrit.

*Kāvyakalpalatā-kaviśkāvyṛtī* of Amaracandra Yati is very clear on the above point—how to coin a new term—and how not to coin it. In his *Śabdasiddhi-pratāna*, Amaracandra lays down:

Rūḍhayaugikamiśrākhyāś tridhā śabdāḥ prakṛttītāḥ. 
Yogo guṇena kriyāyā sambandhena kṛto-ngayaḥ. 
Sambandhaḥ svavāmitvādiḥ.

Here are some examples:

Bhūnetā bhūpatir bhūbhuk bhūpālo bhūdhanas tathā. 
Bhūmāṁś ceti kave rūḍhyā jñeyodāharanaṇāvalī.

Iti śabdaḥ prakārārthaḥ, tena bhūpādayo’pi.

Kavīnām rūḍhiḥ paramparāyātā prasiddhis tayā, na tu kavirūḍhyatikramena. 
Yathā kapālityādau satyapi svavāmi- bhāvasambandhe kapālī matvarthīya eva bh avāti, na tu kapālapālāḥ, kapāladhanāḥ, kapālabhuk, kapālanetā, kapālapatīr, ityādi. Furthermore Amaracandra instructs the would-be poetic critics like Misra:

Dhāryāt dhvajāstrapāṇyaṅka-maulibhrnmaṇḍanasamānāḥ. 
Dharabhārtṛmaṇimatvartha-śāliṣekharasāḍaṅkaś ca.

After enumerating certain permissible and acceptable words, Amaracandra rules out any possibility of a display of erudition by half-baked scholars like Misra, which will merely prove that "little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Once again Amaracandra ordains:

Kavirūḍhyeteyeva. Tena satyapi dhāryadhārakabhāva- sambandhe na sarveb hyo dhāryebhyo dhvajādyarthāḥ śabdāḥ prayoijāḥ---Na hi bhavati Gaṅgā- dhara v at Candra dharaḥ.

According to Misra *nijerṣubhiḥ* (p.8 comments on 4:119c) can mean elephants of Viṅkrama! *Caturaṅga* can mean a moving army (p.21 on 13:36c). He can make *nilam* st
and for kamalam and śuklāḥ for pa ah. A qualifying adjective alone can be made to st and for the qualified substantive.

Anyone who has ever read any of my previous Sanskrit works would readily agree that I have at least some ability to understand even subtle interpretations of Sanskrit classics. However, I fail to understand in many places what Misra wants to convey to his reader. The above (Vik. 13:11, Misra p.19) is a classic example.

Even if we accept for the sake of argument that "the bearers of the pāla blossoms" are the pāla trees, we fail to understand how 'pā aladharā' could come into being! If we have the vigraha like "pā alāni dharantīti", the resulting compound word would be pā aladharāḥ. Only Misra's extraordinary calibre can bring in the dīrgha and make it pā alādharāḥ. Even if we say dharantīti dharāḥ, we would get only pā aladharāḥ. Therefore, Misra's suggestion is absurd, to say the least.

Misra's other statements with reference to this verse are beyond the grasp of the limited knowledge of this writer. So I express my inability to comment on them. They can be understood and discussed only by a man of Misra's capabilities!

* * *

Words of great poets may contain some ideas so deep that they are not easily comprehended by the uninitiated. Critics like Misra not only miss them, but misunderstand them and misinterpret them. For example:

Ṭṛṇāni bhūhrkaṇṭakeṣu niksipan na kaiḥ sphuraddhīramḍaṅganisvanaḥ. Taḍītpradhārāḥ caladāṅkalīlayā nidāgham anvisyati vāridāgamaḥ. [13:36]

This is the reading in all, including J. Misra comments on the above:

13.36c
calad aṅkālīlayā is understood [!] by ed. ter. as "moving with the beauty of a seal", which is impossible because calat n. cannot be construed with vāridāgamaḥ m... "With the beauty of the moving curved line" (Eng. rend.) is grammatically possible, but gives very poor sense. The text seems to be not correct. I propose: caturaṅgalīlayā: [beca use you are a mugdha, Mr. Misra]

ṭṛṇāni bhūhrkaṇṭakeṣu niksipan na kaiḥ sphuraddhīramḍaṅganisvanaḥ/
taḍītpradhārāḥ caladāṅkalīlayā nidāgham anvisyati vāridāgamaḥ/

It is noteworthy that Misra's reformed and quoted version still reads--caladāṅkalīlayā dh!

"By which lamps, which are [its] lightnings, does not the rainy season search for the hot season, with the beauty (showing the splendour) of a [moving] army (caturaṅga), the sound of deep drums bursting forth from it, throwing down grass on the mountain s lopes (or: the camps of the kings) (1) [pp 20-21].

176
Misra's footnote:
1. "Throwing grass on" [the camps] is used in the sense of: making them left [abandoned?] by the vanquished armies, cp. 9.113.

This is one more futile attempt on the part of Misra to compose his own poetry rather than to try to understand what the poet had in his mind and interpret it honestly and sincerely.

Misra would force the word caturaṅga into the mouth of Bilhana whether the poet likes it or not. According to the great critic and philologist Mr. Misra, Caturaṅga (an adjective only) could mean bālam--sainyam. So śuklaḥ can mean paḥ and nilam can mean kamalam. Caladanaka becomes caturaṅga. We find ourselves running out of adjectives to offer our criticism to Misra's suggestions. We can once again borrow from Misra his own word "preposterous" to characterize his attempt here to reconstruct. He did not know, he could not know, that what we read here as caladanaka (i.e. the existing reading) is correct one hundred percent--absolutely, positively, undeniably--at least in its second component, āṅka.

The facts of the matter are as follows: Bilhana is describing the rainy season and imagining that it acted like a ...[?]. The text as it stands even up to Bh is not totally correct!

The available text reads as quoted above. Caritacandrika attempts to explain certain words but shows its inability to comprehend fully the ultimate sense (bhāvah) and states at the end: "tātparyam?" Caritacandrikākāra--that ancient commentator of Śrī Bhāradvāja accepts his limitations. But Bh possesses unlimited knowledge and so he does not want to accept any limitations to it and tries to explain the verse by every possible means. Bh prescribes the following anvaya (prose order):

Sphuraddhīramṛdaṅganisvānaḥ āṅkaḷīlayā calat vārīdagaḥ bhūbhṛtaḥkāteṣu tṛṇā ni nīksipan kaiḥ taḍitpradīpaḥ nīdāgahāṃ na anviṣyati.

Then he comments on the verse as follows: (vyākhyā):

Sphuranto dhīrsya gambhīrasya mṛdaṅgasya nīsvanāḥ śabdā iva nīsvanaḥ yaṣya sa , āṅkaṭat cihnayatātmena ankaḥ "muharachāpā" iti Hindībhāṣāyāṃ, tasya lilā tayā calat gacchat, vārīdagaḥ vaṃsākālaḥ, bhūbhṛtaḥkāteṣu parvatānaṃ bēṣu nṛpasen āsu vā tṛṇāni ghāsāṃ nīksipan samutpaḍayyan, kaiḥ kīḍṛṣaiḥ taḍid eva vidyud eva pra dīpo [?] dīpas taḥ, nīdāgamam grīṣmakālam nāniṣyati asthāt sarvaṃprakārēṇa tam anviṣyartah. Adyāpi kim kutṛāpi nīdāgho varṭate iti jījñāsaḥ taḍitpradīpaḥ tasyāneva śaṅam karotī bhāvaḥ.

Bh has easily drawn the conclusion 'iti bhāvaḥ', but we fail to understand how did he arrive at the specific "bhāvaḥ." The treatment of "na kaiḥ" by Bh is asaṅgata. Bh shows that he has understood very well. That he did not understand will be fully demonstrated after our present discussion is finished. One reason of the lack of full and immediate intelligibility of this verse lies in "na kaiḥ" which appear as if they are two different words! But in reality they are not!! Also the word "āṅka" has a special significance.
which lies beyond the power of such critics who are not gurukulakīṣa a and who do not persevere to dig deep into the mine of jewels. They go after quick fame. They get only artificial gem and parade their wares and cheat their customers. Caritacandrikā explains all the difficult words except "aṅka". Bh invents his own derivation by skillful manoeuvring and says: "aṅkayati cihayati ityāneca aṅkaḥ 'moharachāpa' iti Hindībhāṣā yām." He explains in Hindi: "apane āneki moharachāpa lagānevalā." (stamp or seal?) This is all meaningless. We fail to understand what meaning and purpose are attached by Bh to the word "nrpasenāsū," which he steals outright once again without any acknowledgment, from Caritacandrikā. He connects "kaiḥ" with "taditpradīpaiḥ" and puts the whole sentence into an interrogative form! He explains "kaiḥ" by the word "kīḍṛśaikāiḥ". The word "calat" is the first component of the karmadhāraya compound, "Calāṃ ścāsauc aṅkāścā caładaṅkaḥ tasya līlayā". But Bh treats it as a separate word and connects it with vāridāgamāḥ. Was he unaware of the fact that "calat" becomes "calan" when it is separated and is made to qualify a noun in masculine gender (vāridāgamaḥ in this case)? After the sandhi, we would have calamaṅkalīlayā, which will totally ruin the metre. We wonder, however, if Bh is aware of his shortcoming? Probably not Is he really satisfied with his performance? But Misra is aware of Bh's blunder! He was not convinced.

Here we have a figure of speech called utprekṣā. It is defined as: Sambhāvanam at hotprekṣā prakṛṭasya parenā yat. There has to be a set of prakṛtās (upameyas), the realities, and another set of aprakṛtās (upamānas) or imaginary objects, the creations of the poet's own mind. The latter are superimposed by imagination on the former. Let us analyze the objects or constituents expressed in this verse and assign them to the specific category they belong to.

The poet describes the rainy season. There are the clouds, the table-land of mountains, newly-growing grass, thunder, and lightning. Taking these realities, the poet creates his own poetic world and says that, as though, the rainy season is searching the "nīdāgha" or the Summer. He creates the other attributes of the aprakṛta world by his own imagination.

Jalhaṃa in his Sūktimuktāvalī quotes a verse, ascribed to Pāṇini, which expresses somewhat similar ideas. The verse reads as follows:

Kṣapāḥ kṣāṁkṛtya prasabham apahṛtyāmbu saritām
pratāpyorvāṃ kṛṣṇāṁ tarugahanam ucchosya sakalam.
Kva sampratyuṣāmśur gata iti tadālokanaparās
taḍiddīpālokā diśi diśi caraṇṭha jaladāḥ.
Jalhaṃa, 61:18.

Bh repeats the words of Caritacandrikā (śukavākyapā ham) and gives two meanings of "bhūtāhṛtya akeṣu—that is, parvatanitamāṣeṣu nrpasenāsā vā." But he does not ask himself what is the significance of the second meaning, nrpasenāsā, the aprakṛta or up amāṇa."

There is the thunder. It is expressed by the poet specifically and separately, yet it is hidden in a misreading which N could not detect in the early 1940's, when he was a y
young beginner, but which he was able to do later after studying other texts. Then he was able to recommend a new reading. In order to supply the word signifying thunder, Bh has resorted to a strange compound and says "sphuranto dhīrasya gambhīrasya mṛ daṅgasya nisvanāḥ śabdā iva nisvanā yasya." The word "nikśipan" is interpreted by Bh to mean "samutpādayan" which again is only the prakṛta and not aprakṛta.

Let us present these two sets of thoughts in parallel columns and find out what is missing in this puzzle and then try if we can supply it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRAKRĪTA (UPAMEYA)</th>
<th>APRAKRĪTA (UPAMĀNA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tṛṇa (green grass)</td>
<td>tṛṇa (hay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhūbhṛṭkaṭaka, i.e.</td>
<td>bhūbhṛṭkaṭaka, i.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parvatanitamba</td>
<td>nrpasainya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vīramṛdaṅganisvana</td>
<td>It has to be vīra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taḍit</td>
<td>pradīpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāridāgama</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question now before us is how to bring in what is missing!

Banerji and Gupta translate the verse thus:

The rainy season, with the rising grave [!] sound of a mṛdaṅga while throwing grasses on the slopes of mountains, is searching with the lightning lamps for summer alone with the beauty of a moving curved line. [stress added]

What a disgusting display of makṣikāsthāne makṣikā! The translators have totally neglected the set of aprakṛtas. We don't know what they mean by "alone with the beauty of a moving curved line."

The true purport of this verse remained obscure until this author read a relevant passage in the Mānasollāsa worded as follows:

Ekam uddiśya sarvān vā birudāṁ pāṭhayet tu yaḥ. 34

Gāyayed vādayed vā'pi kāhalāṁ vā madoddhataḥ. Āruhya mahiṣam darpād divā dīpam pradīpayet. 35

Ṭmāṇī vikiran vīthāṁ birudāṅko nigadyate.
[Adhyāya 4, Viṃśati 4, verses 34--36. GOS. 84, pt. 2]

The challenger, who is at the height of his glory and pride, almost blinded by his own utter superiority, causes his eulogy to be read aloud or sung in public. The eulogy is aimed at one (the most powerful) or all---anyone who is ready to meet the challenge! A large drum is beaten to announce his challenge. He rides a buffalo in self-arrogance and lights lamps even during the day. He strews grass in the path. Such a challenger, hero, is called birudāṅka.
Mānasollāsa defines the "aṅka" as follows:

Yena vā yuddhyate sārdham ekaḥ khalakadhāmani.  28

Samenaṅstrenā yaḥ tajnair aṅkaḥ sa parikṛtitaḥ. [Adhyāya 4, Viṃśati 4, verse 28 second half and 29 first half. GOS 84, pt. 2, p. 225] Vikramāṅkāḥbhuyudaya als o has a similar passage:

Kadācit kareṅkūrdhān puro vādyāmānāvīramṛdaṅgān... cf. prakāṭa itavīramṛdaṅg adhirāṇādaḥ. Vik. 6:68.2. udbhāṣadarpavipaniṃgavikīrtatṛṣṇān... aṅkapha[kha?]lā ke yodhayāmāsa. [p. 26, 1. 13--2]

Thus it is seen that what Bh has tried to derive out of aṅka is a totally irrelevant meaning. "Aṅkayati cihnayati ityanena ankaḥ, 'moharachāpa' iti Hindībhāṣāyām" is an attempt to extract a meaning which does not exist at all! And what we get is totally useless. Once again we are reminded of Bilhāṇa's words: Rasadhvāner adhvani ye caranti. Aṅka is the hero, the challenger, aprakāṭa of "vāridāgama." Now the question is how to explain the two words "na" and "kaiḥ" [as they appear] and how to obtain the prakṛta of mṛdāṅga-nisvāna. The B text reads "nikṣipāna kaiḥ." N has separated the last two words and reads "nikṣipan na kaiḥ." That is dumb! This is copied by Bh. J too has "-nnakaiḥ". The J, as is usual with most of the MSS., does not separate the words. The letters "ka" and "va" resemble each other so closely (in J) that they are liable to be confused and interchanged. "Nṛa" and "nna" when written in the specific Devanagari script of J are almost identical in appearance. If these statements of facts are accepted as valid bases for interpretation, we easily get the word "ravaiḥ" which becomes the prakṛta, the thunder of the clouds! Also it is better to read "spūradhvāramṛdaṅga" instead of "spūradhvāramṛdaṅga", because what is beaten to announce the call for challenge (āhvāna, lalakāranā in Hindi) is the drum of bravery and not merely a deep [grave!] sound of a drum. Even in the passage from the Vikramāṅkāḥbhuyudaya quoted above, we have vīramṛdaṅga and not dhīramṛdaṅga. "Vīra" is the original reading. Now we have the full complement of the aprakṛta with all its attributes--the challenger, the army of the king, victory-drum, and the lamp.

Although the above reading incorporating the word "ravaiḥ" is a pure conjecture on the part of Nagar, not yet substantiated by any MS. or other evidence, yet the verse cannot be explained unless and until we make this kind of a bold suggestion. Some other worthier scholar (I mean truly) might be able to offer another interpretation which might be more acceptable. Until then we can stay with this reading.


Here is the full text:
Rājaśekharaprāṇītaṁ Bālarāmāyaṇaṁ nāma nāṭakam. Tatra Vīrāvīsa nāmāṣṭam oṅkaḥ.

Laṅkēśvareṇa... Dāśarathim abhidhātum abhihitam...

Sa niśācaracakravarṭī tvām āha yaduta kim akhila-vānara-rākṣasa-kṣayakareṇa sa mṛgāmeṇa, tad ekam tulā-dyūtaṁ pravartayāvaḥ. Tatra ca

Tvātkaṅkākārāvijaye tava Rāma Laṅkā
   Sītā ca te punar iyaṁ bhavato'stu dārāḥ.
Matkāṅkākārāvijaye tu mamādhipatyam
tasyām ca te purī kalatrajane ca tatra.

* * *

And

gauragunāṁ ahaṅkṛṭibhṛtāṁ jaitrāṅkakāre... [Naiṣadhīyacaritam, 12:84]

The fame of his arms having gone afar like a champion warrior, conquering all objects proud of their own whiteness, the timid night lotus sleeps not at night; the wreath of mallika blossoms on the braid of thy hair crouches in fear; the terrified moon perspires, shedding its nectar. [Context: svayaṁvara] Tr. by Krishna Kanta Handiqi. Poona, 1965. pp.189-90.

And here is one more relevant passage from Vikramaṅkābhudyodaya:

Tasyāṁtmaḥbahaḥ prakāmaviṣamasaṅgrāmalabdha-vijayo Vijaya-dityaś cakravarṭī b abhūva, yaś caikākī niksipyāmāteṣu rājyabhāram ekāṅgavīro nigūhitanjākāraḥ Sing haladvīpe, [sic] Kāṅcīpure, Veṅgyām, Gaṅgapāṭikāyām ca darpāt prakaṣītāṣidhenuvi dyo niravadyaparā- kramanihatapratyaṅkakāro niravadyam nāma lebhe.

In our earlier passage just quoted above, we noted ekāṅgavīraḥ. We have also seen pratyaṅkakāraḥ. Here (in the following verse) we have ekāṅgabhaḥ aḥ.

Karoti caitraḥ saha candanānilaḥ kim indunā kokilapañcamena ca.
   Na vidyate jetur anaṅgabhūpateḥ kim anyad ekāṅgabhaṭas tvayā samaḥ. [13:73]

Thus it is proved that Misra’s suggestion to read caturaṅga in place of caladaṅka is unsound.

Reference has already been to Misra’s fn.: "throwing down grass on...the camps of the kings." (13)

fn.13. "Throwing grass on" [the camps] is used in the sense of: making them left by the vanquished armies. cp.9.113."
Once again Misra shows his lack of knowledge. The challenger throws \( (ni + kṣip = \text{scatters, strews, casts}) \) grass on the ground as part of the process of challenging: \( tṛṇāni \) \( \text{vikiran vīthyām or vipaṇimārgavikīrṇatṛṇān.} \)

Misra asks us to compare the following verse:

\[
\text{Yasya pratāpo'gnir aprṛva eva}
\]
\[
\text{jāgarti bhūbhṛtkaṭaṅkasthaliṣu.}
\]
\[
\text{Yatra praviṣte ripupārthivānām}
\]
\[
\text{tṛṇāni rohanti grhāṅgaṇēṣu. [9:113]}
\]

This allusion is irrelevant. In \( tṛṇāni bhūbhṛtkaṭaṅkasya, \) the \( \text{prakṛta is "growing (causing to grow) (green) grass on the mountain slopes," and the aprakṛta is "strewing, scattering, casting down, dry grass (hay) in the camps of kings." So to bring in the idea of causing the grass (rather weeds) to grow because of desertion (udvasannagarī) (9:113) is ridiculous. There the cause is totally different.} \)

Therefore, we may conclude that neither Misra nor Bh has really understood Bilhaṇa, but both have only attempted to emend or interpret according to their own whims and caprices. It is all \( \text{gha ā opo bhayaṅkarah.} \) Shri Nagaraj Rao of Mysore tells me that even today, \( aṅka \) means a challenge fight (like that of cocks) in Kannada.

Before we leave this topic, I would like to point out that I am not yet fully satisfied with \( \text{caladaṅkā! "Calat" does not serve any special purpose here, especially when compounded. It would be more helpful if we could separate it and connect it with vārīḍā gamāḥ. But then we will have the problem of its turning into "calan." Could caladaṅkā be birudāṅka, or some such word? It cannot be aṅkakāra, but we need a "challenge r", and not just a "challenge" or sham fight, or a "citravyuddha."} \)

The art of reconstruction is a very delicate and skilful task. We have to change, if at all absolutely essential, as little as possible. I have been thinking over this problem now-a-days (March 1990). I think we need a \( \text{prakṛta to be in sāmānādhikaraṇya with aṅkakāra or challenger. The dark moving rain cloud is what is missing and needed! The present text reads caladaṅka. If we change only one letter, just one letter, we may get what is missing!! Let us read jaladaṅka!!! We leave this problem for the next generation to think upon and resolve.} \)

This is how the verse would read after all the above discussion and decision:

\[
\text{Tṛṇāni bhūbhṛtkaṭaṅkasya nikṣipan ravaṅaḥ sphurḍvīramṛdaṅgaṇīsvaraḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Taḍītpradṛṣṭājalaḥ añkalīlayā nīdāgham anviṣyati vārīdāgamāḥ.}
\]

Bh creates a bitter controversy over:

\[
\text{Namatyaḥśyāmalaśaṣṭpamaṇḍala-sthitendragopapracaṁya vārīdāḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Giristhalīṣu cyutaśakramukā- bhraṁād ivodbhṛntataḍīdvilocanāḥ. [13:37]}
\]
This is one of those examples cited by Bh where he has gone against the reading of N! In his opinion he has improved. We don't know if M read the conclusions of both N and Bh with regard to the worthlessness of R ed. The attempt on the part of Bh to assert the supremacy of "namatyayam" over "namatyayaḥ" reminds us of the following sa dukti:

Ghaṭaṁ bhindyāt paṭaṁ chindyāt kuryād vā rāśabhadhvanim.
Yena kena prakāreṇa prasiddhaḥ puruṣo bhavet.

It is to be remembered that

J has "namatyayam-",
B has "namatyayam-",
N has "namatyayam-.

Even the R text has "namatyayam-"

Then how did "namatyayam" creep in? Well, the R ed. has a long errata listing a total of 79 corrections. Strangely enough, or appropriately enough, even this "Errata" needs another errata!

N had commented upon R's ed. as early as 1945 in the following words:


An examiner examining a group of answer books is easily able to detect who steals from whom! Bh is truly a nakalchī bandar! In my Prastāvanā on p. 5, I have erroneously given 1927 (A.D.) as the date of publication of R ed. It is wrong. In reality it is 1921/22, because its date (as given in the book) is 1978 Vikrama era. Bh copied the wrong date on page 1 of his "Kiṁcit Prāstāvikam"! With reference to the editor R, he calls him his guruvaryātm. Did Bh really see the book even once in his life time from a critical point of view? He just copies N in its evaluation except that he insists that in some cases he has changed N's readings. The changes are for "worse", rather than for "better." Misra, by the way, correctly gives the date on p. 111 of his Bibliography.

Nagar continues:

Khaniprādurbhūtaṁ rataṁ sadyo malinam eva jāyate. Paraṁ yāthārthyaṇa kalānī śnāto janās tat kaśaṇādinā manojñīkṛtya lokasamakṣam upasthāpayati. Dā. Bhyulara-
Nevertheless Bh insists on R’s reading, which is the product of some fertile brain of a thoughtless and senseless person who was asked to go through the text and offer some corrections. Whether the person was a mārkhaśiromaṇi (crest-jewel of the fools), or Bṛhaspati himself, it is evident that he did not understand the meaning of the compound word ayāhśyāmalaśpamāṇḍalasthitendragoparacayā.

To support "namatyayam" over "namatyayaḥ" is totalitarian dictatorship or simply a fool’s obstinacy. But that is exactly what Bh does. He asserts: "namatyayam iti pā hāt n amatyayam iti pā ha eva samiçnāh." [Mark eva!] He does not advance any argument. He does not give any cogent reason. He merely dictates. Cf. his statement on "yasyā b hrātā", 18:47. Bh overlooks the dictum: Ekākīnī pratijñāḥ na pratiññātāṁ na sādhayet--Mere assertion does not validate a theory.

Once again we would like to remind pseudo-critics like Bh that appreciation of poetry is not an exact, verifiable science. It is a subtle art—a feeling—which can be experienced only through the cultivated senses. We have: a) śuṣkō ṛṛkṣas tiṣṭ hatyagre. We may also have b) nīrasatarur iha vilasati purataḥ. How can we prove by any scientific evidence or methodology that (b) is much more charming than (a)?

We can only conclude that someone did not know what "namatyayahśyāmala" meant. And so he made it "namatyayam śyāmala!" Such critics have existed all along since the creation of this universe. It is with reference to such simpletons that a great poet sang long, long ago:

Bindudvantaraṅgitarājarśasaratāṁ kartā śīrobindukam
karmeti kramaśiṣṭātiṇyayakalā ye ke'pi tebhya'ñjaliḥ. (or tebhya namaḥ)

A true sahrdaya reader may recall:

Kimapi kimapi mandaṁ mandam āsattiyogād
aviralitakopalam jalpator akramaṇa.
Aśithilaparīraṁbhavyāprtaikaikadoṣnor
aviditagatayāmā rātrir eva vyaramśīt.
(Uattarāmacarita)

Once upon a time there was a heartless, senseless, thoughtless, careless fellow who tried to improve this kavindrokti and recommended that the penultimate word be changed to evam! No further comments are necessary.
Let us see what the poet wants to say: It is the rainy season. It is raining dogs and cats. The plateaus (the mountain tops, the table-lands) are dark green, very green indeed. There are millions of tiny red insects. All of a sudden there is a terrible flash of lightning. This is all prakṛta, the reality; a statement of facts. Now the poet creates his own world of fancy and fiction. The cloud gets scared: "Did the bow of Indra (rainbow) fall down? Did I pour so heavily? Did I fell it?" The ground strewn with red insects is imagined to be the rainbow, fallen down on the ground, as if it were, from the sky, by the force of the torrential rain! The flash of lightning is imagined to be the scared eyes of the cloud. Such a ground is mistaken for the rainbow.

Now a discerning reader, a true sahṛdaya can place his hand on his heart and answer the following question: There are two possible meanings: (1) This cloud or (2) the ground is dark green, like ayas (steel). Which of the two would make a better sense? A person with a cultivated (saṃskṛta) mind, capable of appreciating the beauties of a poetic genius like Bilhaṇa will immediately say that a dark green background will show the beauties of the red insects far far better than if it is otherwise, i.e. green only, or light green. Now in spite of all this, if someone insists on namatayam śyāmala- we can only fold our hands in reverence and say--ye ke'pi tebhya'o'ñalih. We may also remind the pretender, who does not have a heart, tender like a lotus, but has a machine as hard as a cinder:

Śūro'si kṛtavidyo'si darśanīyo'si putraka.
Yasmin kule tvam utpanno gajas tatra na hanyate.

Although the translation of B and G is like a plastic rose (flower) devoid of any fragrance or soft touch, as compared to the real one, yet it is clear enough not to allow any sensible person go on insisting on an absurd interpretation. B and G say:

The cloud, with its lightning-eye perplexed, is bending low on the mountains on which there is a multitude of fireflies in the grass black as iron, as if owing to an illusion of the rainbow that has dropped down. [stress added]

We have shown throughout this study--here, there, and everywhere--how miserably B and G fail to represent the poet's hārda in a true and faithful manner. One more example is presented here: They have translated "indragopa" as fire-flies. It is not true. We simply fail to understand why they did not consult the Caritacandrikā which had explained this verse in early forties when its writer was only in his early twenties. This is what Candrikā stated:

Ayo lauham tadvat śyāmaleṣu śaspamanaḍaleṣu bālaṭṇasamūheṣu sthitā indragopān āṁ śonavāṅkīṭaviśeṣaṇāṁ (Hi. bṛabhahūṭi) pracayā yāsu tāsu....

In spite of this B & G say--"fire-flies"! The Sanskrit equivalent for "fire-flies" is kha dyotah! It is glow-worm. Yet it does not constantly glow. It does not continuously shine. Its shining is intermittent.

Also to be noted is the word "sthita" used by Bilhaṇa. A fly does not remain "sthiita". It FLIES. It is caṅcala! Indragopas are red insects confined to the ground. They are
called (in English) *cochineal* insects. They are used to produce a dye. How sincerely we wish these translators had been more thoughtful.

As we stated earlier, Bh does not advance any argument. However, Misra does. Here is what he says:

13.37a

For *ayaḥ* "iron" (in earlier edd.). _ed. ter._ reads *ayam* "this" (taken from the ed. of Pt. Rāmāvatāra Śarmā). *ayaḥśyāmala-* "black as iron", in itself would make good sense. Yet, since the description concerns here a single detail--one particular cloud--of the rainy season *ayaḥ...vāridāḥ*, "this (particular)... cloud", seems called for. Cp. next verse: *amī payomucaḥ*, "those (particular) clouds." [p.21]

We need not tell Mister Misra that if the poet wanted to have "one" cloud, his purpose would have been easily served by the singular number--*vāridāḥ namati*! Misra is not unaware of the fact that R, which is full of innumerable inaccuracies, seems to have been associated by someone with the great name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍita Rāmāvatāra Śarmā. The question is how much faith we could place in that someone?

If what we are writing now in the following paragraphs is true, Misra will prove to be a very careless writer.

Misra alludes to the next verse--*amī payomucaḥ*. He translates *amī* as "those", i.e. _prathamābahuvacanam--asau_, *amū, amī_. He brings *payomucaḥ* in _sāmānādhi karanya_ with *amī_. He translates the word *payomucaḥ* as the clouds, i.e. _prathamābahuvacanam_. We cannot believe that a person who claims to have earned a Ph.D. on this writing, can write all this. Let us read the full verse once again:

_Amī viyannālasarojamaṇḍala- pralambanālapratimallādambaraḥ._
_Anāṅganārācaparamparānībhāḥ patanti dhārānicayāḥ payomucaḥ._

Misra's gurus ought to have told him that *amī* is not connected with "*payomucaḥ*", but it is connected with "*dhārānicayāḥ*." "*Payomucaḥ* is not _prathamābahuvacanam_ but it is _ṣaś hyekavacanam_. The meaning is not "these clouds" but the torrential rain--*dhārā nicayāḥ* of this cloud! _Ke patanti? Dhārānicayāḥ patanti!_ Whose? Of the cloud--one cloud--not many. Misra's gurus must not have even seen what he wrote and presented as his doctoral dissertation!

Before we leave this topic we may cite for our sensible readers a _sadukti_ expressing similar sentiments:

_Nirūkṣya vidyunnayanaiḥ payodo mukham niśāyām abhisārikāyāḥ._
_Dhārānipātaiaḥ saha kim nu vāntaś candro'yam ityārtataram rarāsa._
_Smk. 71:7 Abhisārikāpaddhatiḥ._
_Hariharasya? Rather anonymous._

Bh as translator
I have not yet gone through the translation work of Bh in its entirety. But whatever I have seen is enough to hurt a sahṛdaya. We are not sure if Bh really understands the poet's heart and soul.

Let us take the verse 13:54:

Payodavāndaµ gaganasthalollasat-taḍillatādohadakardamadyuti.
Cakāsti saṅkrāntakalaṅkam ambhasām nabhaṣcyutānām iva gālanāṁśukam. [1 3:54]

Bh translates the quarter ...taḍillatādohadakardamadyuti as follows:

"yā taḍidrūpinī latā tasyā dohadarūpo" (ipsito) yo [sic] kardamaḥ" ("dohadasyārthaḥ 'khāda' iti "Hindyām") [!] "paṃkhaḥ paṅko'ṣtrī sādakardamau" ityamarahḥ"; "tasya" "dyu tiriva dyutiḥ kāntir" yasya tat.

We are learning for the first time in our life that the word dohada in Hindi means khāda, i.e. manure or fertilizer! Bh might have thought that since there is latā (creper) we must have the manure as well! That may be his logic. No Hindi dictionary gives the meaning as claimed by Bh. Of course, the Śabdakalpadruma of Rājā Rādha Kānta Deva (Vārāṇasī, 1967) says: Dohadaḥ puṃ. kl. (doham ākarṣaṃ dadātti. doha+da+kaḥ) garbhiniyabhilāṣāḥ. Sāda iti bhaṣaṣa." It does not say khāda. It says sāda. Also it does not say Hindi bhaṣā, but only bhaṣā. Now this lexicographer hailed from Bengal. His bhaṣā would naturally be Bengali. Well, in Bengali sāda does mean icchā, abhīlāṣa, garbhiniḥra spṛhiḥ and dohada. Also, it is to be noted that sāda is derived from sādha = icchā.

However, MW lists one of the meanings of dohada as a kind of fragrant substance used as manure, Naish. 1:82.

*                      *                       *

Misra exemplifies Ghuṇākṣāranyāya:

Here is an exceptional case. In understanding and interpreting the following verse N committed an error. Misra corrects it. We can call it only a ghuṇākṣāranyāya:

Sarvadaiva hṛdayam malīmasam na kṣaṇam spṛšati te prasannatām.
Tat khalatvam akhilopāpinaḥ puṣpakārmukanṛpasya vallabha. [14:44]

Misra says:

14.44c

Instead of khalatvam", "roguishness", which cannot be construed unless one makes an arbitrary addition like "tava niścitam eva" (ed. ter., comm.) and changes the nominative vallabhaḥ into the vocative vallabha, read tat khala tvam...vallabhaḥ, therefore, thou rogue, art the friend of... [p. 22]
This is one of those rare instances where Misra makes some sense and improves the reading of N. N went against all [as far as vallabhaḥ is concerned] and suggested the reading [he] vallabha for vallabhaḥ because he took khalatvam (bhāve) as one word meaning duṣ ṛtvam. He did not notice the padacceda (break of the words) between khalal and tvam in J! Bühler does not have the padacceda! Neither does R. N here has proved the truth of the age-old saying: Ekaµ sandhitsato'param prájñavate. In trying to keep khalatvam as one word, he erroneously changed vallabhaḥ to vallabha. Bh follows N blindly. He has no thinking of his own! However, Misra brings out to light the real purport of the poet.

Today [Oct. 31, 1977] I saw J once again after I read Misra. There IS a sign of pad acceda between "khala" and "tvam". Also on the top there is a gloss "he" for "khala"! [sambodhanam!]

* * *

Bilhaṇa composed:

Subḥaṭḥ pramadākarārpitām dalayan nāgarakhaṇḍavītikām.
Ripudantīghaṭāsu khaṇḍanam ṭṛṇam uṣāhavaśād amanyata. [15:6]

Misra reads:

Subḥaṭḥ pramadākarārpitam dalayan nāgarakhaṇḍavītikām. [p. 33]

Misra takes a stand here which cannot be justified. He copies B. N reads--tām, which is correct. It qualifies a feminine compound--nāgarakhaṇḍavītīkām.

Also, could we have one word--ripudantigha ṣukhaṇḍanam and have ghā ānām i n the vigraha? J however has a padaccheda between ghā āsu and khaṇḍanam.

* * *

Here is an interesting point. In Sūktimuktāvalī, Hemantapaddhatiū 63:8 and 63:9 (16:14 and 16:15 of Vikramāṅkadevacarita) appear as follows:

A Samakṣam api sūryasya paryabhūyata padmini.
   Tejasvino'pi kurvanti kim kāla vaśām āgatāḥ. 8

B Madvairiṇaḥ kaṭhorāṃśor iyaṃ praṇayabhūṛ iti.
   Roṣād iva tuṣāreṇa paryabhūyata padmini. 9

Bilhaṇa’s order is:

16:14 B [.4 niradahyata padmini. Niradahyata is much better in the context. 16:15 A
Misra notices only 16:14. He does not notice 16:15. Does it not add further weight to the inference that he did not consult the original source, i.e. "Smk"’s edn. (GOS)!

Of course, repeating the same paryabhūtyata is no good composition. So Bilhana’s or original is preferable.

* * *

Wrong Construction Leads to Destruction

We can see how wrong construction of readings of B creates a destruction of the meaning in the following verse:

Gaurvibhramadhūpadhūmapaṭalaśyāmāyamānodarāḥ
kaṇṭhakṣodabhyān na ye kavāliṭāḥ Śrīkaṇṭhaśaṅkhoragaiḥ.
Sphārōnmlītaśāradāgrhabṛhaddvārāgraghaṇṭāravās
te ślāghām alabhanta Kuntalapateḥ Kailāsaśailānilāḥ.

[16:51]

The third and fourth lines in B read as follows:

Sphārōnmlītaśāradāgrhabṛhaddvārān mudā nirgatās
te ślāghām alabhanta Kuntalapateḥ Kailāsaraudrānilāḥ.
(underlined Byuhlarakavi-vacanan)

The destruction created by the wrong reconstruction in the text may be presented and explained as follows:

16:51.1 śyāmāyamodarāḥ P. (omission and wrong copying by P. J is correct).

16:51.2 All have kṣoda. My conjecture is kṣobha.

16:51.3 -grhabṛddvāravāste --P. (omission). J has gṛhavṛddvārāgraghaṃ āravās te. Letters h a d-rā gra gha m ā not copied by P. In other words, although J does contain these five specific letters, they have been inadvertently omitted by P!

16:51.3 -grhabṛhaddvārān mudā nirgatās. B attempts to emend. There is no achievement! It proves to be a fruitless effort.

16:51.4 Kailāsaraudrānilāḥ P. Certainly it is a doubtful case in original, i.e. "śai" of J mistaken for "rau" by the press-copyist. It would have been like "śai" in P. Cf 6:46.3 reading of P viśikharāka, where śa has been mistaken for rā. Two occurrences of one type of error.
Kailāsaraudrānilāḥ | B. Raudra (=fierce) winds are not applauded. They

won't get ślāghā of Kuntalapati. Absence of any sense created where perfect sense was reigning supreme.

Together J has:
Sphāro nmīli ta śā ra dā gr ha bṛ ha ddvā rā gra ghana ṭā ra vās

P has:
Sphāro nmīli ta śā ra dā gr ha bṛ 0 ddvā 0 0 0 ra vās

B has:
Sphāro nmīli ta śā ra dā gr ha bṛ ha ddvā rā nmu dā nir ga tās

So P omitted second ha. Bühler restored it correctly.

P omitted rā after ddvā. Bühler restored it correctly.

P also omitted three more letters: [a] gra ghaÆÊÁ. Bühler, however, could not fill the lacuna correctly. In an attempt to secure the true and correct reading, B threw away the last two letters ra vā (=sound) of P, i.e. last two letters of the caraṇa. And he created through his own imagination six letters (including one halanta) rān mudā nirgatās as the substitutes. Let it be reiterated that his first letter is a correct restoration. However, nmudā nirgatās is merely a wild guess. It does not convey the meaning intended by the poet. The editor had a right to create through his own imagination any number of letters to bring some plausible meaning. However, we wonder if he had any right to throw away the two most significant letters ra vā meaning the sound already existing in J, copied by him, and existing also in P.

We may try to provide an explanation as to why this mistake originally occurred. Probably while copying, the eyes of P jumped from first ra to second ra in consonance with the maṇḍukaplustinyāya (maxim of the jumping of the frog) or what we have termed netrocchalanam. Originally this is how [...] he might have read [We cannot reproduce the diagram here through letters. It will have to be drawn graphically.] śāradāghrab rddaṇā....raṇās. Thus the letters represented by ellipses were totally omitted.

In brief, B really missed only "a graghaṇ ā." Since he did not have the ghaṇ ā, i.e t he bells, he had to discard also their sound rava.

August A. Haack's German translation (1899) of the original Sanskrit was based on Bühler's text. Naturally he translates the words sphāronmīlitā-śāradā-grha-brhaddevār ān mudā nirgatās as "coming out of the huge gates of Durga's [!] house, the gates that were thrown open with great force, etc. [How Śāradā could be translated as Durgā unless we treat Mahākāli, Mahālakṣmi and Mahāssarasvatī as one here! But that is not the issue here.] The above quotation is a re-translation in English of his German words. The original German in full reads: Indische Stimmungsbilder, Sieben Episoden des "

It is to be noted that strong gusts of wind may blow in--throw the doors open--and dash into the house [temple] but they cannot come out of the house by throwing the doors open, because they do not originate inside the house! Here they come out of the Kailäsa mountain!! From the open space!!!

All this trouble arose because while copying J, the transcriber P omitted some letters (5 in number)--rÄgraghaÆÊÁ and the editor B subsequently activated and energised his own poetic muse and invented certain substitute letters, thus making the whole reading as nmudÁ nirgatÁs. Thus the most significant element, the ghaÆÊÁrava "chime of the bells" was lost and the winds had to come out of the temple! They are in DevanÄgar¥. Some being conjunct consonants. "rä "gra" "ghä" "nä".

We maintain that Bühler took undue liberty with the poet. He ought to have left the lacuna as it was found in P. The best or utmost he could have done is to enclose his conjectural reading within [ ] square brackets. His performance was unscholarly at least in this instance. It was not a reconstruction, but utter destruction.

Banerji and Gupta do not acknowledge N's text as their source, yet they had the word ghaÆÊÁrava and so they could speak of the "chime of bells." Their translation reads:

[The] winds from the mount Kailäsa, which wafted [?] the chime of bells in front of the huge doors of the temple of SÄradÄ that were wide open, which were not gorged by the serpents round the neck of Äiva out of the fear of their throats being bruised [?] (and) which were blackened by the mass of the smoke of incense at the amorous sports [?] of GaurÄ, received eulogy from the king of Kuntala.

The translators have taken the word unmÄlita to mean "wide open" doors! It is not clear how they could have derived the expression "waffted" when there is no other word (verb, kriyÄpada) to express the action. "Wafft" is all right in connection with the sound of the bells, but this specific action is not represented in the original. There is no word like vÄdana or cÄlana" or vÄyuprerita, etc. "Wafft" means "to cause to move, or go lightly by, or as if by the impulse of wind or waves." According to Monier-Williams, "wafft" (of English) could be translated in Sanskrit, as Äanaiú Äanair vÄyau vah, or Äani, vayu nÄ prÄr or prÄnud or upanud."

The reason why the serpents of Äiva did not swallow the Kailäsa winds lies in the fact that they contained the smoke of GaurÄ's vibhramadhÄpa incense. As compared to kÄsoda the term kÄsobha is preferable. Air filled with smoke is likely to be less palatable (desired for). The first line of the verse narrates the cause and the second its effect. T
he translators have missed the significance of this phenomenon. The adjective *spháro nmílita* does not qualify the doors of the Śāradā temple, but the *ghan ārava*, the sound of the bells, which was highly magnified by the strong gusts of winds. cf. *Jālodgīrṇair upacitavapuh keśasamskāradhūpaḥ*. Meghadūta. Also Bihāra himself: *Kuryād anār dreṣū kim aṅganānāṁ keśeṣu kṛṣṇāgurudhūpavāṣāḥ*.

N has correctly explained the passage in his Candrikā:

*Sphāram atyartham unmīlito vistāraṁ nītaḥ Śāradāgṛhasya Kaśmīra-Sarasvatī-mandaṁ dirasya bṛhadvārāgreṣu sthitānāṁ ghanṭānāṁ ravo yais te.*

These words of N have been copied by Bh, syllable by syllable--*akṣaraśah*--of course, as is usual with him without any acknowledgment, none whatsoever! Let it be emphasized that N has indicated the direct quotations from J gloss by enclosing its words within two asterisks.

**Misra Tries to Show Off**

Misra just wanted to show off. One of his chapters is headed "Secondary Source Material Relating to Vikramādeśacarita.

So Misra decided to tell the world that the text of the *Vikramādeśacarita* here has been corrected by N with the help of some secondary source material. It is not true. N is not a *kāvyārthaçaura* that he would not disclose his source! Had he taken any help from any of the so called "secondary" sources of Misra, he would have certainly acknowledged it in his *Prastāvanā*. We are not sure if Misra even read N's *Prastāvanā*. N's text is based on J. Whatever is there [in N] is found in J even today, unless otherwise specified.

Misra confuses between J and P, maybe deliberately. On p. 63 under 16:51(c) he says:

In: Vcar. MS. the syllables *ha* in *bhāt* and *rāgraghaṇ ā* are left out. Bühler (*ed. pri*.) tried to fill the gap by his wording, *ed. sec.* changed silently following secondary tradition. (*Smk* 63:22).

This is an unjust assumption on the part of Misra. It seems he thinks himself to be omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent. Misra is mistaken if he believed that his (of Misra) Vcar MS. here is J! The footnote no. 6 on p. 175 of N reads: *grhabṛddvārāvāste ślā gḥā- P*. Now "P" does not mean "J". Misra ought to have read pages one to three of N's *Prastāvanā*. This omission of J by P and subsequent attempt on the part of Bühler to restore the text were so significant that they were specifically noted by N as illustrations of Bühler's futile attempts to restore the text.

On page 3 N clearly says:

Misra alleges that N changed "silently". [Does he mean "stealthily"?"

The same kind of phenomenon we witness with regard to *Caritacandrikā*. Bh took it to be an ancient work and continued to believe so in spite of my protest! I wrote to him immediately after his first volume was published that it was my work, yet he did not change his stand. Kālidāsa did not give his name even when he composed such immortal poems like *Kumārasambhava*, *Meghadūta* and *Raghuvaṃśa*. But for the strict rule and tradition of nāyaÅśāstra he might have omitted his name even from the *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*. N did not want to claim *Caritacandrikā* to be acclaimed as an outstanding, epoch-making work that deserved an outstanding prize in literature. To him the restoration of the text was much more significant. To N his *Upodghāta* was much more valuable. Probably Bh knew the truth. But since he wanted to continue to incorporate Candrika into his work without any acknowledgment, he did not ascribe it to its proper author.

Truly speaking Nagar’s historical research, as embodied in his *Upodghāta*, and his reconstruction of the text took much more of his time, energy, and attention than what was needed to write *Caritacandrikā*. In fact his contribution to Bilhaṇa, if there is any, lies in the first two components and not in the last one.

The editor of *Sāktimuktāvalī* notes on p. 58 a variant reading for 16:51 (end):

Santatam amī Kailāsaśailānilāḥ ityatra Kuntalapateḥ Kailāsaraudrānilāḥ iti pāṭhabhedah.

So Bühler’s mis-construction has been taken to be a legitimate, variant reading! Excellent!

* * *

We see Misra once again indulging in some unwanted emendation in:

Nirantarāṃ Brahmapurībhīr āvṛtam cakāra tatraiva puraṃ sa pārthivah. Vīriṇcilokāt suralokataḥ ca yad vibhūṣya bhāgāviva kautukāt kṛtam. [17:29]

Misra expounds:

17.29d Vibhūṣya "having decorated", does not suit the context here. Read vimūṣya [!]. "having stolen" (Dhātup. 1.707 mūṣa [!] steye): [Is this muṣ or muśa?]

b-d cakāra tatraiva puraṃ sa pārthivah/
         vīriṇcilokāt suralokate ca yad
              vibhūṣya bhāgāv iva... kṛtam//
"The king built just there [!] a city, which was made [by him] as if he had stolen/robbed (vimūṣya) two pieces [pieces or parts?] [one] from the world of Brahmān [!] and [the other] from the world of the gods."

Note that ed. ter. explains vibhūṣya by alamkṛtya but gives in the end as the sense (bhāva):... bhāgau grhītvā racitam. bha and ma are easily confounded in the MS. [p. 22]

Still there remains an unsolved problem. J definitely and clearly has vibhūṣya. My conjecture is vikṛṣya. Or, could it be vicitya? However, Misra suggests vimūṣya. He says that bha and ma are easily confounded in the MS., but not here [in J], and the idea of stealing also does not sound very commendable. In my paper entitled "Bilhana's Nārāyaṇapura: Temple, Tank, and Town," I had changed the reading to vikṛṣya.

On August 22, 1990 we thought of another word--vijitya. But it is far removed from the original reading--vibhūṣya. It seems we will have to stay with vibhūṣya unless and until we find a better substitute.

*                   *                   *

The following verse poses a problem in textual reconstruction:

Saharṣam ityapsarasām ajāyata prajāgaram pañcaśarasya tanvatā. Pravṛkṣaṇḥagraharāntakautuka-pradhāvitānām śravaṇāṃrtaṃ kathā. [17:64]

Let us compare the various readings:

17:64.3 graharāntā [?] -grahaṇā[?]mta [?] - J. The Jaina Devāgarī nā of J could be easily mistaken by a foreigner for rā. -grahaśānta - B. Cf. viśikhaśakala vs. viśikha rāka. B lists the variant readings in the fn. A discerning reader has a chance to consider, weigh, and evaluate if the rejected reading is not better. R does not list any alternative readings at all. Hence naturally the reader is likely to conclude that it is a mistake of the scribe. He has no clue to think of a better rendering. In other words Bühler is scholarly, while R is not.

17:64 B does not contain Etadanantaram kulakam. [B omits all such literary essentials]. It does not appear even in the fn of B.

Here is our Misra:

There is no such word as rānta- (edd. sec. and ter.; Bühler therefore conjectures śānta- which, however, does not yield good sense, since pravṛkṣaṇ hagrahaśāntakautuka-, would mean: "the desire that had ceased from [or for?] embracing the great hero [heroes, Mr. Misra!]."

Read sāndra, "intense, strong" (cp. 17.18; 18.52): -sāndrakautuka-, "intense desire", [!] cp. Kum. 7.62 tāsām...sāndrakutāhalānām, "of those women whose desire/curiosity was intense." [p. 22] Misra says: "There is no such word as rānta." What about those scholars in Varanasi (the ancient seat of Sanskrit learning) who worked with Bh in bringing out his worthy ed.?
It is not proper to say here--"Bührer therefore conjectures..." Bührer had no other reading except what he has given, i.e. śānta. Where does an opportunity occur for him to conjecture? Where was the need? Why would he conjecture at all? The way Misra writes, it would seem that Bührer conjectured in 1874, after he had read N's ed. (1945) and Bh ed. in 1964, and found that their readings were not acceptable!

The two letters creating the problem very much look like "nānta" (old Devanāgarī style, where the letter "na" resembles "rā". This is in contradistinction to Marāṭhī (bālab odha) "na." The difference can be better seen when given in original Devanāgarī script and not transliterated into Roman script. For approximate visualization we can cite the letter 'U' + a bar. This makes Marathi na.

Once again I would like to reiterate here, even at the risk of being repetitive, that Drs. Bührer and Jacobi saw the Carita and the manuscript J for the first time in their life in Jaisalmer. They copied the entire (voluminous) work just in seven days! Sanskrit was not their mother tongue and they did not begin their primary education in an environment of, say, a Hindu Brāhmaṇa born and brought up in Varanasi. No matter what we think or say, Devanāgarī was still a foreign script to them. They were not raised with it. So we can easily imagine what kind of "copy" they would have made.

On the other hand, before I went to Jaisalmer I had already earned the degree of Sahityacharya from the Government Sanskrit College, Banaras (probably the most exacting and demanding Sanskrit degree in India), having studied Sanskrit for at least 14 years. I had already lived in Sanskrit and Hindi environment for more than 22 years. I had taught Sanskrit for many years. Sanskrit was almost my mother tongue. I had just earned then the first prize in an All-Banaras Sanskrit Elocution Contest. I had studied and taught the Vikramādīkadevacarita for several years. I had also seen the B ed. I had also seen P—the transcript of J-- made by Bührer and Jacobi. I had consulted some other manuscripts too. So there was nothing surprising if I could do a more representative job than those foreigners who had seen that Ms. for the first time in their life in that "country of sand, bad water, and guineaworms." (Bührer, Introd.)

Also, I might add here that through the courtesy of Munivara Sri Puṇyavijayaji Mahārāja, the same precious MS. J was brought to Ahmedabad in 1960. I took it to Bombay where I got it photocopied in my direct supervision. That very photocopy is still with me! And I have been using it all along since then.

Let us resume our study of the enlightening performance of Mr. Misra, who had practically no "tools" yet went on constructing and reconstructing the Vikramādīkadevacarita in a foreign land.

I have once again checked (today on Nov. 2, 1977) the J MS., (of course, its photocopy). I don't know at this moment how these two letters were represented in P. However, we cannot accept śānta as an appropriate representation, because, if the anxiety is śānta = quenched--śānta-kautuka, then there is no justification for pradhāvana. One does not run if one's anxiety is satisfied.
Bühler created šānta out of his brain. It is always necessary to keep in mind that when we mention the name of Dr. Georg Bühler in these contexts, it is only an upalaksana.

The press copy for the printing of the Carita was prepared by someone else, here Shri Vamanacarya Jhalkikar, who could have taught students like Misra Sanskrit for one hundred years, if both could have lived that long. Certain changes were also recommended by Bhimacarya, a brother of Vamanacarya. Without considering the consequences, "Śānta" is certainly not acceptable. Since śānta and rānta are very close in appearance (i.e. orthographically in Devanāgarī, the way P was prepared) N conjectured rānta. One who has thoroughly studied and examined both J and P alone knows how J was converted into a "copy" by Bühler and Jacobi, as explained above. And on the basis of our personal knowledge we can declare even today, with all the emphasis at our command, that that was the best Nagar could do at that time.

If we want to reconstruct the text with the least possible change, which is the most scholarly and desirable method, we could lengthen the vowel in śānta [which seems to be the reading in J] and make it nānta. Then we can interpret: pravrakaṇ ḥagrāṇaṁ antaḥ or ante yasya tādṛṣṭaṁ yaṁ kautukam tena pradhāvitānāṁ. Urged by the anxiety, the ultimate objective of which was to embrace the great warriors, they ran... Because anta also means (according to Apte) "end, conclusion, termination, of. In comp. in this sense and meaning "ending in or with", "ceasing to exist with", "reaching to the end"...phalodayāntāya tapaḥsamādhaye. [Kumārasaṃbhava 5.6] "ending with (lasting till) the attainment of fruit."

Restoration does not necessarily mean total replacement. We have to restore with the same type of material and the restored object must look like the original one. Sāndra is too far removed from śānta. Misra violates all the Principles of Textual Criticism when he takes liberty with the poet and puts his "nonsensical" (to borrow Misra's own phraseology used by him with reference to the great poet Bilhaṇa) words into the poet's mouth. This is his usual pattern. Also to be noted is a small sign, looking like a hook, which cannot be reproduced here because of the limitations of the characters available on this computer, but which looks very much like the repha in, say, Śarva, and which is always used by J to lengthen the vowel written incorrectly as short. For example, kṛtāspadāḥ svar- (17:10). Here the word "kṛtāspadāḥ" was read by P as "kṛtāspardāḥ"! [An uninformed person like Misra, who has never seen J has no right to talk about it!] So the original reading could very well be ṣgrahaṇānta. What about pravrakaṇ ḥag rahaṇāttakautuka, where ātta will mean grhīta?

* * *

We have one more play of prank, a bālacāpalam, by Misra Maharaja:

Yasmin kiñcin na tad upavanam yatra no kelivāpi
naiśa vāpi na viṣamadhanuskārmanam yatra rāmāḥ.
Nāsau rāmāṇ manasijakathāghatābhagā yuvānāḥ
kāmaṃ yasyā na nibiṣatarapremabandhe patanti. [18:20]

The brilliant scholar-pretender shows his brilliant scholarship:
18:20c  manasijakathāghātabhagñā yuvānāh (in the MS. and subsequent edd.), "young men broken by the beatings of the love-stories" does not give good sense. More appropriate would be manasijakasaṭāghātabhagnā - (cp. also 7.52; 12.26, "tormented by whip strokes by Kāma." Tha and śa in Devanāgarī are often confused. [p. 23] [We don't know how bhagñā could mean "tormented"] By whom? Where? When? What is the evidence? How many MSS. have you seen Mr. Misra? Which Devanāgarī are you talking? It must be of some German make!

Once again Misra betrays his total lack of knowledge of kavimārga when he makes such an absurd suggestion. Manasija-kathā does not necessarily mean "love-stories" as Misra tries to restrict the meaning of the word kathā. It also means [rather that is the primary meaning, given first by Monier-Williams] conversation, speech, talking together. We can translate it by premālāpa, premasāṁbhāṣaṇa, prema-vārtā, prema-kathā.

Moreover, Manasija, as he is known to us, is not reputed to use the harsh whip as his weapon. He uses very soft arrows of flower. Maybe the German make of "Manasija" uses a kaṭā as his weapon! Here is an example from Sūktimuktāvalī:

Sudirghā rāgaśālīnyo bahuparvamanoharāḥ.
Taśyā virejur āṅgulyah kāmināṁ saṁkathā iva.
[Śrīnām aṅgavarṇanapaddhatīḥ. 53.45]

The following two verses are alluded to by Misra in discussing the above verse 18:20, and in suggesting substitution of kathā by kaṭā!

Udañcayan kimśukapuṣpasūciḥ salīlam ādhūtalatākaśāgraḥ.
Viyogināṁ nigrahaṇāya sajjaḥ Kāmājñāyā daksinamārutobhūt. [7:52]

Asaṃśayaṁ nīlasaroruḥākṣi samāruroha tvai pañcabāṇāḥ.
Drutair vinirīyāśi padair yad esā kaśāhêtevottarālā turaṅgī. [12:26]

None of the two verses contain even a single set of words that could be made to mean an "tormented by whip strokes by Kāma." Miśraśakti alone can make them mean what Misra wants them to mean. This is not proper. Kaṭā may be appropriate in the two verses just given above. It is irrelevant to allude to kaṭā occurring in these two verses while discussing yasmin kiṣcin. We have a saying in Hindi: jītane kāle utane bāpa ke sāle! Misra's effort is "preposterous" to borrow his own terminology, once again.

May we suggest vrāta for ghāta and magnā for bhagnā?

*  *  *

Kartuṁ kṛtyā tilakam Alakāgopūrāṇām gatena
Krauṇcasyāgre Bhṛgupatiśaracchidram adreṇ vilokya.
Yena kṛīḍālaśabālīṭḥ pīvare bāhudaṇḍe
cāṇḍādhvāne dhanuṣi ca ruṣā sūtrīṭa dhṛṣṭipāṭāḥ.
[18:35]
Misra expounds:

18:35c For krīḍā read vṛīḍā:-vṛīḍālavaśabalitāḥ dṛṣṭ ipātāḥ "glances that are variegated/disfigured [!] by a little bit of shame." [!] For an analogous idea compare 18.57 savṛīḍobhūṭ, "he felt ashamed." The idea seems [!] that shame gives the eye a particular colour.

Bilhana apprehended kāvyārthacaryaṃ. He warned the kaviṇḍras against it. Here and there Misra criticizes N by specification, nāmagrāham, e.g., ed. sec. is wrong, etc. But he does not give credit to N for any suggestion he made even before 1945!

On 18:35 Caritacandrikā (p.316, lines 3-4) says: Api nāma `vṛīḍālava-śabalitāḥ' iti pā ho'nuvitaḥ syāt? In the year 1976, Misra claims to have conducted his "investigation s" under a great German scholar Paul Thieme [!] and proclaims the above conjectured reading as if he thought it for the first time! It was a Misropajñām jñānam! This is called PLAGIARISM, a literary theft, anything but an honest and true scholarship. Not that Misra did not read p. 316 of N, i.e. this page in Caritacandrikā, because he refers to it in his discussion of the following verse [18:38] which provides ample food for thought.

* * *

The following verse presents a riddle not yet solved:

Campāśīṃni Kṣitipatikādādhāmmi Dārvābhisāre
Traigartīṣu kṣiṣṭu bhavane Bhattulakṣoṇibhartuḥ.
Krīḍāśailikṛtahimagirer hāsabhīteva yasya
bhrāmyatījñā sukṛṭavasater bhūḥ pratāpodayānām.

[18:38]

18:38.3 All have - girer hāsabhīteva. My conjecture, himagireḥ śītabhīteva.

18:38.4 -vasater bhūpṛatā- B
-vasaterbhrapṛatā- R

Let us see what Misra says:

śītabhītā-proposed in ed. sec. (p. 316) for hāsabhītā- (in other edd.) seems not to be [!] required. hāsabhītā- "afraid of the laughter", gives good sense; cp. 7.4 śīturībhitīyā, "out of fear of the winter season." [p. 23]

In the very beginning we would like to say that Misra raises irrelevant matters. We are not arguing over bhītī itself; we are arguing over its cause--hāsa or śīta. Therefore, to refer to śīturībhitīyā is not proper. Misra does not advance any argument, or provide any explanation. According to him hāsabhītā "makes good sense!" But the question is: Afraid of whom? Why? Misra does not provide any details. And finally he says: cp. 7.4 Śīturībhityā, "out of fear of the winter season." We don't know what is the use of alluding to this statement! Does it make any sense here at all? Thus we see time
and again Misra raising irrelevant matters. He merely raises a smoke-screen and blurs the vision of his spectators! He does not answer. He creates more problem for us.

Gacchataḥ skhalanam of N.

To err is human. I regret that my interpretation of bhūḥ pratāpodayānām (18.38.4) was wrong, as pointed out by Shri Nagaraja Rao of Mysore, who had agreed to collabo rate with me and make this work ready for publication. Unfortunately, however, he could not complete it.

This was an aside. Bh does not raise any objection to N's (of Caritacandrikā) interpretation [p. 316]: Bhūr utpattisthānānāṁ karma. Was he afraid of an ancient [!] commentator, as he took Caritacandrikākāra to be? He silently puts his own interpretation. Not that he did not see the passage, because he takes into consideration, rather discusses, N's conjecture of śītabhūṭā, which appears only here [on p. 316] and not in the original text. I took bhūḥ to be acc. pl., dvitīyā bahuvacanam rather than nom. sing. prathama ikavacanam! Acc. Rao, the pl. of bhūḥ would be bhuvāḥ and not bhūḥ. I am indebted to Shri Nagaraja Rao for this correction.

Bhūḥ is declined like pāḥ and bhrūḥ and not as vadhūḥ or camāḥ, where acc. pl. resembles nom. sing. Nevertheless Bh (who takes bhūḥ to be nom. sing.) does not explain the real purport at all. Why krīḍāśailīkṛtaḥimagiri is Śaṅkara? What connection does he have here? What is the purport of the "heat" -- the second meaning of pratāpa which Bh too knows. He says: prakṛṣṇa atāpaśca.

All the regions mentioned in the verse (Campā, Dārvābhisāra, Trigarta and Bhartul akṣoṇibhartuḥ bhavane) are in the Himalaya mountain. These regions (territories) are cold. They need heat, they need warmth. Unless and until we bring the "heating power" into play, the second meaning of pratāpa remains inoperative!

What is krīḍāśaila? It is an artificial hill serving as a pleasure spot; a pleasure mountain. Here is Kaḷīdāsa in his Meghadūta:

Tasyāṁ tīre racitaśikharāḥ peśalair indranīlaiḥ
Krīḍāśailaḥ kanakakadālīveṣṭanapreksanītyaḥ. 74.

Also Harṣacarita: 1:6

And our own poet Bilhaṇa:

Krīḍāśailībhavanti pratikalamalinām kausumāḥ pāṁsukūtāḥ. [7:67]

Let it be stressed that J and B both have hāsabhītā. So N too has the same. However, in his Caritacandrikā N says:

Nūnam śītabhīteva ityucitāḥ pāḥah. [p. 316]
Bh leaves the issue undecided. He translates the words, following the maxim of makṣī kāsthāne makṣikā without reaching any conclusion and without getting the true essence of the poet's ārdam. He does not arrive at any decision. The first two lines are clear to all. These are the territories located in the Hīmālayas, which owed their allegiance to King Ananta of Kashmir. He was their overlord. His supremacy was recognized by all the vassal kings ruling those mountain regions. Ananta's command (ājñā) was honored (accepted) by all as the supreme authority. This is the prakṛta, or the statement of facts.

Now comes the aprakṛta, the fanciful world created by the poet--

Yasya ājñā bhrāmyati. Yasya Anantasya. Kathambhūtasya Anantasya?

These questions too can be easily answered. Now the big question comes: Why the command (f.) (= ājñā) bhrāmyati, and where?

Two possible answers have been provided so far: (1) hāsabhīteva or śītabhīteva. Bh makes us uneasy when he translates krīḍāśailīkṛtahimagireḥ as krīḍāśailīkṛtah krīḍāp arvattkṛtah himagirih Kailāsah yena tasya Śivasya. This is called manahpātīsamācā ret. Kailāsā is only a peak of the Hīmālayas. Śiva has never been described as having made either Kailāsa or even the Great Hīmālaya as his krīḍāśaila.

Bh has missed the true essence of the word krīḍāśaila. Śiva is Devāhdeva, Mahādeva, the Supreme God of all the gods. He can make the entire Hīmālayas, nay even the entire universe as his abode. There is nothing surprising about it. To limit Śiva's all-pervasiveness to Kailāsa only is to show the limitations of one's own little knowledge, which is always dangerous. The fact of the matter is: Krīḍāśailīkṛtahimagireḥ is the qualifying adjective of "Anantasya"--Anant who has made the entire Hīmālaya as his krīḍāśaila (play-hill). There lies the beauty. There lies the kavitvam. That is called viicc hittiḥ.

Another question is why Śiva should laugh at Anantasya ājñā or Anantasya ājñā should be Śivasya hāsād bhūtā? Why she should be Kailāsasya śītabhūtā? Is the Greatest of the Great Gods Śiva here prasaṅga-saṅgata at all? Of course, not. Bh leaves every thing for the reader to decide. He does not want to risk any decision lest he is exposed, if he is proven wrong.

Śiva is depicted white: rajatagirinibham. Fame is depicted white. Śiva may be imagined to laugh at the white fame. We bring this here just for the sake of argument. But ājñā is not depicted white. So she should not be afraid of being laughed at. There is no sādharmya. There is no sharing of one and the same quality or characteristic.

Bh has missed the significance of the word pratāpa although he translates it correctly, of course copying from N. What is pratāpa? Pratāpa is: Sa pratāpaḥ prabhāvaś ca yat tejah kośadaṇḍajam.
Bh performs the act of śukavākyapā ham. He quotes Amara and also copies Caritac andrikā-"koṣadaṇḍajaṁ tejāḥ prakṛṣ atāpaś ca." We would like to know why Bh brings the meaning prakṛṣ atāpaś ca? He does not apply it anywhere! Then why does he bring it in?

Pratāpa is compared to fire. We have numerous examples in literature:

Yasya pratāpo'gnir apūrva eva jāgarti bhūbhṛtakaṭakasthalīṣu. [9:113].

Pratāpam āropya parām samunnatim yaśāḥ pradarśyeva ca dāvabhasmabhiḥ. Bhajan nidāghaḥ kṛtakṛtyatām iva svapauruṣāviṣkaraṇān nyavarttata. [13:1]

B has jagannidāghah here. We don't know why Bh did not insist on that reading here! Here is our Nīlaguṇḍatāmraśāsanam:

Tataḥ pratāpajvalanaprabhāva-nirmūlanirdagdhavirodhivaṃśaḥ. Tasyātmajaḥ pālayita dharāyāḥ Śrīmān abhūd Ēhavamalladevaḥ. [N ed. p. 39, Section 8]

Once again we may remind our neo-expounders that the fame is described as white:

Yasyākhilavyāpi yaśo'vādatām akāṇḍadugdhāmbhūdadhiśankām. Karoti mugdhāmarasundarīṇām abhūt sa bhūyo Jagadekamallaḥ.

And the laughter as well as fame both are described white;

Hanūmadādyair yaśasā mayā punar dviśām hasair dūtapatathāḥ sitīkṛtaḥ. [Śrīharṣasya]

Since ājñā is not white, it cannot be brought into the picture at all as far as Śivahāsa or any white object is concerned. Ājñā is not afraid of the great Himālayas either, if we take into consideration only its colour--whiteness.

Why do we have here the word pratāpa with a second meaning prakṛṣ abh tāpaḥ (terrible heat, or burning fire, etc.)? Why does a person wander hither and thither in search of hot regions unless and until he/she wants warmth? When do we want warmth? Of course, when we feel cold, or when we are afraid of cold. Thus comes my conjectured meaning-- śīta-bḥītā. We have a similar expression in:

Mukhenducandrikāpūra-plāvyamānau puraḥ puraḥ. Śītabhītāvivānyonyam tasyāḥ piḍayataḥ stanau. [8:47]

Here is an actual concrete example of how variant readings are created, especially when the copyist allows his memory to play its part. Vik. has stanau and not kucau. I wrote kucau by relying upon my memory. This phenomenon explains one of the reasons of generating variants in anthologies. This may also explain some of the variations between P and the press-copy for B, which was prepared by a great scholar, real scholar, P t. Shri Vamanacharya Jhalkikar. When a true scholar copies some work, his memory becomes an obstacle to the true and faithful copying, which is harmful!
We took (or rather mistook) \textit{bhūr utpattisthānāni karma} (acc. fem. plural) and wanted to make it an object of \textit{bhrāmyati}. Konta \textit{bhrāmyati}? \textit{Pratāpodayānām bhūḥ}: The regions where there is abundant growth and prevalence of \textit{pratāpa} in both the senses of the term.

We have thought it time and again that Misra had no need to conduct any “investigations” to arrive at his conclusions. He has enough internal power to assert. He has the freedom to pronounce \textit{ex cathedra} judgement: “\textit{Śītabhītā} ![1] proposed in ed. sec. (p. 3 16) for \textit{hāsabhītā} ![1] (in other edd.) seems not to be required.” First of all N proposed \textit{Śītabhītā}. Secondly, even his ed., i.e. N, has \textit{hāsabhītā}.

On Oct. 12, 1977 we conjectured another reading: \textit{vāsabhītā}. She (ājñā) does not like to live in the colder regions but prefers to wander in the hotter regions. In any case, the true meaning of this verse is not yet clear to me!

The real purport (\textit{vastu-tattvam}) here is that King Anant had made such a large number of extensive territories in the Himalayas a play-hill, \textit{kṛḍāśaila}!

\textbf{Bh, the Great Historiographer}

The following verse provides an excellent opportunity for Bh to demonstrate that he too can be an historiographer. (See the long list of books consulted ![1] by him).

\begin{quote}
\textit{Yasya bhrātā Kṣitipatir iti kṣātratejonidhānam}
\textit{Bhojakśambhūtsadṛṣṭamahimā Loharakhaṇḍalo'bhūt.}
\textit{Śaṅke lakṣmyāḥ śirasi caraṇaṃ nyasya vakṣaṛṣṭhitāyaḥ prāptā lilātilakatulanāṃ yanmukhe sūktidevī. 18:47}\end{quote}

N’s fn says: All have \textit{yasyā bhrātā}. Yet N makes it \textit{yasya bhrātā}!

\textbf{Bh got inspired by a sudden impulse to demonstrate his knowledge of historiography.} All the editions including J read \textit{yasyā bhrātā}. So, he argued, what right does N have to make the reading \textit{yasya bhrātā}? Consequently he asserts that \textit{yasya bhāteti pāḥ āt yasyā bhrāteti pāḥ hāḥ samucitab!} He does not cite any authority. He does not advance any argument. He overlooks the great principle of \textit{vāda--Ekākinī pratijñā hi pratijñātāṃ na sādhyet}: Mere assertion does not prove a theory. All read \textit{yasyā!} So we must follow the crowd. It is not the question of majority only; it is the question of unanimity--all against one!! Bh alludes to two verses--18:38 and 18:67 where the name of Kṣitipati occurs, but that is irrelevant.

\textbf{N did not base his change on mere assertion.} It did not emanate from obstinacy. He advanced cogent arguments. This is what he said in his \textit{Upodghātā} (p. 9):

\begin{quote}
\textit{Loharadurgādhipatī Kṣitipatir Anantadevasya bhrātā babhūva. Dā. Byuhlara (Bühler) mahodayo 'Yasyā bhrātā Kṣitipatir iti kṣātratejonidhānam' iti pāṭham abhyupagam ya 'Kṣitipatiḥ Subhaḥbhrātāśrī' iti vyācakhyaū. Dvivediprabhṛtayo vidvāṃsa ṛṣīśāne kasthaleṣu nirvicāram Dā. Byuhlaramahodayam anucakruḥ. Vastustau 'Yasya bhrātā

Putro Vigrahārājasya Kṣitirājābhidhas tataḥ.
Rājñāḥ pitr vyajayo bhrātā kadācit pārśvam āyayau.
(Rajño'nantadevasya.)

Stein translates the above verse as follows:

Some-time, thereafter, the King [Ananta] was visited by his cousin [brother] called Kṣitirāja, the son of Vigrahārāja.

We learn from the Rājataraṅgini that Diddā, daughter of Simharāja, Lord of Loharā, married Kṣemagupta, king of Kashmir. She adopted her nephew, Saṃgrāmarāja, son of her brother Udayarāja, as the son (and successor), to the throne of Kashmir. He ruled over Kashmir from 1003 to 1028 A.D. Naturally to Ananta, who was the son (and successor) of Saṃgrāmarāja, Kṣitirāja was a cousin, being the son of his uncle, Vigrahārāja. The kingdom of Lohara got assimilated into that of Kashmir, when Kṣitirāja gave it to Utkarṣa. Let it be stressed here that N's fn. no. 9 adds: Paśyata Pariśiṣ am Ka. This Pariśiṣ a (Appendix) appears on p. 247, immediately after the Nilagunḍatāmraśāsanam in N's ed. Here it is being reproduced for ready reference.

Scions of the Lohara Dynasty
(As the rulers over Kashmir)

* Simharāja (Lord of Lohara)

--------------------------------------------
| Diddā | *Udayarāja |
| 980/1-1003 A.D. | |
| (m. Kṣemagupta) | |
| (950-958 A.D.) | |
| of Kashmir | |

--------------------------------------------
| Saṃgrāmarāja | *Vigrahārāja |
| ( Adopted by Diddā as her successor to the Kashmir throne (1003-1028 A.D.) | *Kṣitirāja |
| | |
| | |
| | *Bhuvanarāja |

--------------------------------------------
| Harirāja | Ananta |
| (1028 A.D.) | (1028-1063 A.D.) |
| | (1063-1080 A.D.) |
We believe Bh saw the above writing. Nevertheless, to assert that the correct reading for 18:47.1 is Yasyā bhrātā and to maintain that Kṣitipati or Kṣitirāja was the brother, nay the sahodara of Subhaṭā, the queen of Ananta, is to negate the facts of history. The tragic situation is that this point is well discussed and clarified by N in his edition on p. 9 of his Upodghāta. Yet Bh does not accept the truth. He wants to assert the superiority of his wisdom. We are reminded of an excellent sadukti:

Sampūnākumbho na karoti śabdam ārdho ghaṭo ghoṣam upaiti nūnam.
Vidvān kulīno na karoti garvam guṇair vihīnā bahu jalpayanti.

Here is one more interesting point worth noticing. Bh, while commenting upon Devī tasyā praṣurayaśasasā candrikevendujātā
yātā khyātim jagati Subhaṭetādibhāryā babhūva. [18:40]
says: Jālandhareṇhipāṇendurāndrubhājītāḥ samutpannāḥ...Subhaṭādeviśītānāmāḥ... And in his fn. he adds: Śūryamātīyaṇaparāṇāmadheyā. Bh copies, as usual, from Candrika where we read: Induś candraḥ Jālandharaḥdhipāṇ Inducandraḥ ca. Subhaṭeti Śūrya mataḥ -tyaparāṇāmadheyā.

N’s Caritacandrikaḥ derives its information from Rājarṣaṅgiṇi, which says:

Jālandhareṇhipāṇaḥcandraḥsudhām suttām.
Upayeme manojñatvāj jyeṣṭhām Āsamatīṃ svayam. [7:150]

Tasyāḥ kiṃcavidvanyūnām svasāram yo yavāyasīṃ.
Atha Śūryamatīṃ Devīṃ bhūbhuce pariṇītavām. [7:152]

Here "bhūbhuce" means "Anantadevāya."

We still don’t know if Bh saw the Genealogical Table of the Lohara dynasty (Pariśi śam "Ka" of N), and if so he understood it, and if so he compared it with his own statement on p. 209 of his Vol. 3.

Bh admits that Subhaṭā (alias Śūryamatī) was a daughter of king Inducandra, the Lord of Jālandhara. And yet he maintains that Kṣitipati (alias Kṣitirāja) was her brother,
not only a distant brother but real brother (**sahodaro bhrātā**). If Kṣitirāja was a real brother of Subhaṭā, (Kṣitirāja, who was a son of Vigrahārāja, the Lord of Lohara--*[Putro Vigrahārājasya Kṣitirājābhidhas tataḥ. Rāj.]*, then she must have herself hailed from the Lohara Dynasty (the same dynasty that gave birth to Anantadeva and Kṣitirāja)!

Did she? If Subhaṭā and Kṣitirāja were real sister and brother then the name of her father would be Vigrahārāja and not Inducandra!

Also we have to consider one more fact. Inducandra, the father of Subhaṭā was the Lord of Jālandhara, while the father of Kṣitirāja (Subhaṭā’s real brother, (even) in the opinion of Bh) was the Lord of Lohara! Would it be correct to conclude, then, that there was no difference between Lohara and Jālandhara as far as Bh is concerned?

It is just possible that what is published in the name of Bhāradvāja is the creation of more than one person! His discussion on **yasyā bhrātā** (18:47) has a footnote: *Atraitas yaiva sargasya 38 tathā 67 saṅkhākau ślokā{va}valokanīyau*. Bh alludes to Kṣitipati.

The verse 18:67 reads:

Durgāṁ prāpya Kṣitipatiyaśodhāma yasyānuyo’sau  
kasyākārṣṇā na khalu pulakotkaṛṣṇam Utkarsadevaḥ.  
Yenāropyā svabhūjaśikhare nīrmitā dūrām urvī  
mlecchakṣonīpatiharikhurstamudrādaridrā. [18:67]

In Sanskrit *(Ramā of Bh)* we read...**Loharadurgāṁ prāpya...** The word prāpya is not commented upon. However, the Hindi vyākhyākāra knows much more than all of us combined. He says:

Harṣadeva ke chōte bhā ṭ Utkarsadeva ne vipakṣī [!] rājā Kṣitirāja ke kirtisthāna [!] Loharadurgā nāmake kile ko jītakara [!!!]

This is flagrant violation of history. Kṣitirāja was not a vipakṣī rājā. And Utkarṣa did not conquer the fort named Loharadurga! Would it be possible to agree that Hindi and Sanskrit commentaries came out of the same pen? Of course, not!

Bh claims having studied *Rājataraṅgini*, Sanskrit as well as English. He ought to have known that according to the *Rājataraṅgini*, Utkarṣa was still a stanandhaya (baby sucking mother's breast) when Kṣitirāja gave him the kingdom of Lohara!

Dattvā stanandhayāyāpi tadotkarṣābhidhāya saḥ.

The poet could have easily said: **jitvā**, if the fort had to be conquered. Why did Bilhana say prāpya? It is difficult to describe in words what a great injury Bh has inflicted on Bilhana. Coming generations will remain ajñāna-andhakāra-ācchanna.

Here is the relevant passage in full from the *Rājataraṅgini*:

Kalhana says:
Putro Vigrahārājasya Kṣitirājābhidhas tataḥ.  
Rājñāḥ pitṛvyayo bhrātā kadācit pārśvam āyayau. 7:251

Tasmai nyavedayat khedam sa cittasyopatāpakam.  
Putre Bhuvanarājākhaye rājyalubdhete'iviolute.  7:252

* * * *

Kṣitirājāḥ svavadhvām ca viruddhāyām viśuddhadhīh.  
Manastāpāpē cakre sarvātyāgāṁte sprām.  7:255

Rājyām Kalaśaputrāya jyeṣṭhāanantarajanmane.  
Rāmalekhabhādānāyāṁ rājīyāṁ jātāya satvaram.  7:256

Dattvā stanandhāyāyāpi tadotkarśābhiddhāya saḥ.  
Rājarṣir vibhūdhaiḥ sārdham vidadhe tīrthasevanam. 7:257

Bhuktvā śamasukham bhūrīn varṣān paramavaipāṇavaḥ.  
Sa cakrāyudhasāyujyaṃ yayau Cakradhāre sudhīh.  7:258

Summing up we may say that although Kṣitirāja had a son named Bhuvanarāja, he was wicked and vicious and hence unfit for the throne in the eyes of Kṣitirāja, his father. So he gave away his kingdom to Kalaśa's son INFANT Utkarṣa. In this way he partially repaid the debt of Diddā.

There is nothing surprising if Bühler adopted the reading as "yasyā bhrātā Kṣitipatir iti," because that is the reading of J. In the absence of any contradictory immediate evidence, there was no reason for him to doubt the text. Although he studied Rājataraṅgini later and corroborated many of Bilhaṇa's statements by citing it as the authority, probably he did not examine this specific issue. Scholars like Dvivedi just followed Bühler by gaḍḍulikāpravāhānūya and gaṭāṇugatikānyaḥ.

Nevertheless, Bh should know better since all the data that was accumulated since Bühler wrote was available to him. He had the N ed. and all the information contained in it. Yet he asserts that Kṣitirāja was a brother of Subhaṇā; not only a distant brother but a sahodara bhrātā of Subhaṇā, let it be repeated.

Before we leave this topic we may present another case of a similar nature, but showing dissimilar action on the part of Bh.

Dātā parākramadhanāḥ śrutapārāḍrśvā  
nāmnāya Rājakalaśas tanayo babhūva.  
Prāleyabhūdharaguhās timiracchālena  
yasyādhunāpi makhadhūmam ivodvahanti. [18:77]

All end with udvamanti. Nagar made it udvahanti. Bh copies N in a casual manner. We don't know why in this case he did not raise the flag of revolt! Why did he submit to N? 
Misra's determination to destroy everything remains undaunted:

Yasya prāptādbhutaparinātēḥ karkaśe tarkamārge
tyāgaḥ kāsām vicarati girāṃ gocare kāntakērīḥ.
Yena nyastā dalitavipādam kovidānām gṛheṣu
Śrīr nādyāpi svapiti lalanābhuṣanānām nīnādaiḥ. [18:48]

It is a pity that more often than not whenever Misra opens his mouth to talk we fail to understand him. Misra's propositions are "preposterous," to borrow his own terminology [p. 18, note on 12:45a]. Of course, there are exceptions too; but they merely prove the rule.

With regard to the verse 18:48 he says:

For vicarati read na carati: tyāgaḥ kāsām na carati girāṃ gocare kāntakērīḥ "in the domain of which poetry does not move his liberality, which is of lovely glory?" [p. 23]

We are simply puzzled. First of all, the question is why we should read na carati for vicarati when the latter makes perfect sense already? Secondly, we would like to know what Misra wants to convey. We don't know it. Does he want to say that Kṣitirāja gave donations to the poets? We are instructed by our gurus: jñatākaver āsaya na varṇaṁ anīyāḥ: "Do not try to interpret the poet who is still living." However, if our conjecture is right, then Misra will prove unjust. Girām here certainly does not mean poetry per se. We believe Misra must have heard expressions like vācām agocaram, or girām attya vartate. What Bilhaṇa wants to say here is: The generosity of Kṣitipati was indescribable. Kāsāṁ girām gocare vicarati? Na kāsām api iti bhāvaḥ.

We are not sure whether Misra considered what his pūrvacāryas had already said--how they had explained this ukti of Bilhaṇa. Candrikā says: Girām gocare vāgvisaye. Bh translates: Yasya Loharādhīpasaya...tyāgaḥ dānam...kāsām girām vācām gocare vīṣaye vicarati vartate, vāgagocaram dānam iti bhāvaḥ.

We believe Misra had seen the following sadukti while he was still in his senses:

Kavitvavaktṛtvaphalā cucumba Sarasvatī tasya mukhāravindam. [3:19]

In this connection Misra ought to have known that the art of poetry (kavitva) is distinct from the art of speech, oratory (vākytva). One does not have to be a poet to display the art of gīr (vāṇī). Here (i.e. in tyāgaḥ kāsāṁ) the poet Bilhaṇa refers to the art of speech, narration, i.e. oral presentation, rather than poetic composition.

We have one more suggestion from Misra--one of the most undesirable ones--in the following verse:
Kālaḥ Kālaṇjaragiripater yaḥ prayāṇe dharitrīṁ
tukkhārāṁāṁ khuraputāravāiḥ kṣmāpaśūnyāṁ cakāra.
Śrīdāhālakṣiti-parivṛṛhaḥ so'pi yaṁ prāpya vr̥ttam
Karnaḥ karnāṃtrarasabharāsvādam antas tatāna. [18:93]

Misra makes us terribly disturbed. He says:

18.93c yam (acc. m.) cannot be construed with vr̥ttam n., as in ed. ter., comm. It clearly must refer to Bilhaṇa, as the relative pronouns in the previous verses (18.90d, 91d, 92c) do. vr̥ttam must be analyzed as accusative of a masculine noun. Perhaps for vr̥ttam read bhṛtyam:

c ...so'pi yaṁ prāpya bhṛtyam [bhṛtyam or bhṛtyam, Mr. Misra?]

d karnaḥ ...āsvādam antas tatānai/

"Even this king Karna enjoyed in his heart (Bilhaṇa’s poetry) after having him got [!] as his servant (court poet)". [p. 24]

Misra makes Mahākavi Bilhaṇa a bhṛtya (slave) of Karna! And that too in an autobiographical narration by Bilhaṇa himself!! Words fail us when we try to describe how thoughtless a person can be. Bilhaṇa was one of the most self-respecting poets in the world. It is Bilhaṇa who said:

Sarvasvam grhavarti Kuntalapatiṛ* grhṇātu tan me punar
bhāṇḍāgāram akhaṇḍam eva hṛdaye jāgarti sārasvatam.
Re kṣudrās tyajata pramodam acirād eṣyanti manmandiram
helāndolitakarnatālakaraṇaḥskandhādhirūḍhā śriyāḥ.
*[Gurjarapatirityapi pāṭhaḥ]

And

Nilacchatronmadagajaghatāpāṭram uttrastacolāt
Cālukyendrād abhāṣita kṛṣṭi yo’tra vidyāpatīvam.
Asminnāṣāt tadānu nibṛdaśleśahevākalīlā
vellābāhuṇkvaṇitaivalayā santatāṁ rājyalakṣmīṁ.

[18:101]

To make such a great poet a servant (slave) even of a king like Karna is an act which can be "thought of" (a favorite expression of Misra) only by a scholar of Misra’s calibre.

He was still breathing the air of Herr Hitler.

On p. 100 Misra himself describes the honour, glory, and splendour attained by Bilhaṇa, by quoting the following eulogy:

Vapur yāṁ āvāṣaḥ [yāṁāvāṣaḥ?] kucaparivṛṛtaḥ Cedinṛpatiḥ
paribhṛntā ratnākaraparidhir eṣa vasumatī.
Na muktvā rāmāṇāṁ padam iha śiro'nyasya [śiro yasya?] namitam
kavīndrai rājendrair lalitam iyātī Bilhaṇakathā.
[? puryāṁ āvāsaḥ, a suggested reading]

This verse raises many questions. It is not clear to us at all. But everything is clear to Misra. Nothing is obscure to him.

And on p. 24 Misra asks us to make Bilhaṇa a bhṛtya (slave) of Karṇa! We don't know if these two Misras are one and the same. The lion may die of hunger, but he won't eat grass! We may not be able to ascertain the original, true reading to take the place of vṛttam (or nūnam?) here, but to suggest bhṛtyam and that too for a self-respecting poet like Bilhaṇa is in the domain of only great critics like Misra! It cannot be described in words: Kathāpi khalu pāpānāṁ alam aśreyase yataḥ.

Misra's first chapter ends here. However, we have already discussed many of his suggestions made in subsequent chapters (of his book) as and when the topics (in Bilhaṇa's order) demanded. So, avoiding repetition, we will try to discuss in the following chapters his other "investigations."
CHAPTER II

Some Lexicographical Points of Interest

In Chapter II, entitled "Some Lexicographical Points of Interests," Misra lists the following words (for discussion?):

1. aṅkura- m.  12. pratiṣṭhā
2. aṅc, aṅcaya [!]  13. bhaṅgi/ bhaṅgī
3. ārya  14. muktā
4. kuc (+ sam)  15. mugdha
5. kṛtakṣaṇa  16. luṇṭh, luṭ (h), luṭh
6. keyūra  17. vah (+ ud)
7. carmacakṣus-  18. vātāyana
8. citraśālā-  19. vyākhya
9. cīnapiṣṭa  20. velā
10. nāgarakhaṇḍa  21. saṃsthita
11. pāthonidhi

We don't know how velā can follow vyākhya! However, we point this out with terrible trepidation because Misra claims to have mastered Library Science as well. He is a D. L. Sc. too.

9. cīnapiṣṭa  20. velā
10. nāgarakhaṇḍa  21. saṃsthita
11. pāthonidhi

We fail to understand the full significance of these long, elaborate discussions. We don't know either what Misra's central objective is. In his enthusiasm to locate the occurrence of one word more than once, he has picked up certain other word which is irrelevant for the purpose in view.

We fail to understand the full significance of these long, elaborate discussions. We don't know either what Misra's central objective is. In his enthusiasm to locate the occurrence of one word more than once, he has picked up certain other word which is irrelevant for the purpose in view.

For example, on p. 30, he discusses the word kṛtakṣaṇa. He locates the following occurrences:

1. 7:36 kramāl lipijñānakṛtakṣaṇasya
2. 9:13 pracchādanārthaṁ vihitakṣaṇo'pi
3. 13:41 kṛtakṣaṇaṁ kṣudranadīsamāgame
4. 14:35  kṣetrabhūmiṣu kṛtekṣaṇotsavāḥ ![]

5. 16:4  divasa-grasta-vistāra-karṣaṇāya kṛtakṣaṇāḥ.

While it may be legitimate to include number 2 in the present discussion (because vi hita is synonymous with kṛta), we don't know how number 4-- kṛta- ikṣaṇa- utsava could be made to belong to this category! Here we have kṛtekṣaṇa and not kṛtakṣaṇa.

Let us discuss Misra's comments on certain words. It is all nothing but vitaṇḍāvādaḥ.

Misra says:

(1) aṅkura- m.

aṅkura- "a sprout, shoot", in the end of a compound:

a) ratnāṅkura- "a sproutlike jewel" (ratnam aṅkura iva) = " a new/young jewel" = "a small jewel" (M.W. only from the Mṛchch.: 1.18; 12.3; 15.77; vyāghranakẖāṅkura- "a sprout like a [!] tiger nail" = "a small tiger nail, tied around the neck of children, even now-a-days, as an amulet, to ward off the bad effect of an evil spirit, cp. Hindi baghānāl/bagahanahā/baghanakhā. (1) 3.13.

Misra's footnote:

1. vyāghranakẖāṅkura- a kind of "medicinal herb" (Eng. rend.) to be tied around the neck of children, [!] is probably a substitute for the real tiger nail, which for a king was more easier [! What a beautiful English! In the company of his German Gurus, Misra forgot his own English!] to obtain than for a common man.

b) radāṅkura-/dantāṅkura- "sprout of the tooth/tusk" (radasya/dantasyāṅkuraḥ)- "tip of the tooth/tusk" (PW. and MW. only from Abhidhānaci. of Hemacandra, 297): 17.50 a radāṅkuraprotam arātīdentinā "pierced with the tip of its tooth/tusk by the enemy elephant"; 17.56 ...radāṅkurāh...tān muku eṣv atādayan "the tips of the teeth/tusks...struck at the diadems (helmets) [of the soldiers]." More: literal "struck them (the soldiers) at their diadems helmets)."

1.65cd  karīndradantāṅkuralekhānībhīr alekhi....vijaya-praśastiḥ// "a victory inscription was written by the pens, which were the tips of the tusks of the elephants." [pp. 25 -26]

Aṅkura literally may mean anything, but here it is used in the sense of "beautiful", "newly-appeared", "fresh-cut." Students of Sanskrit literature know it very well that poets use many words, especially in the end of compounds, which merely add to the beauty of the preceding word. For example, bāhulatā or bāhuvallī. There are many other words like karikalabha or puṣpamālā or kṛpānalekhā. It is very difficult to translate su
ch words into English. "Sprout-like-jewel" may be grammatically and lexicographically harmless, but it is not needed. \textit{Rātnāṅkura} means beautiful jewel. That is all.

This word (\textit{aṅkura}) is very much like \textit{latā or latikā}, e.g. \textit{Puṇḍrakeśulatikāś cakaśīrē}. Here \textit{Latikā} means "beauty in general" more than anything else.

* * *

Misra expounds:

4. Root \textit{kuc (+sam)}

\textit{sam-kuc} means, in contradistinction to \textit{vi-kuc}, "to open (like flower)"- "to close, to shrink, to shrink back." Thus in 1.66...\textit{te viṣṇoḥ pratiṣḥeti vibhīṣaṇasya rájye param(9) sa�kucitā babhuvuḥ} "they (the kings of the Chaulukya [!] family) shrank, however, with respect to the kingdom of Vibhīṣaṇa (Ceylon) (i.e. they shrank back from entering it) [thinking] it is the standing point/domain of Visnu." [fn. 10] Cp. also 1.27; 9.115; 12.53; 16.1; 18.53, etc.

We are not sure if this is true! May be Misra has his own dictionaries!! We did not find.

Misra's footnote:

9. \textit{param} obviously not used in the sense of \textit{kevalam (ed. ter., comm.)} here. Cp. also 1.85; 2.30; 4.30; 7.19; 7.65; 15.72; \textit{yadi param} [Ref.? Does Misra mean 18:99?] "if at all" (PW "wenn überhaupt", [So Misra knows German too!]

10. \textit{Bilhaṇa's statement seems to be historically correct [!], since no king of the Chaulukya [!] dynasty undertook military expeditions to Ceylon. In any case Bühler's understanding of 1.66 ("narrow was the realm of Vibhīṣaṇa": Introd., p. 26) cannot be accepted. [p. 30]

We don't know what Misra means by "Ceylon"--Simhala or Laṅkā! If he means Simhala, then he has not seen the following:

\textit{Tadbhayāt Simhaladvīpa-bhūpatiḥ śaraṇāgataḥ.}
\textit{Viśārāṃśāramapade Lopāmudrāpater muneḥ.} [4:20]

Also to be noted is:

\textit{Āpāṇḍupāṇḍyam ālola-colaṃ ākrāntasimhalam.} [4:45]

Simhala and Laṅkā are not accepted as being positively identical. (Simhalalṅketya ṣtopa-dvīpadīpīte---we recite in saṅkalpa daily)

Misra overrules Bh as far as the meaning of "\textit{param}" is concerned. He says that the word cannot mean "\textit{kevalam}". However, he does not give any synonym in Sanskrit.
He translates it in English only and substitutes *yadi param* (ref.?) by "if at all." As if English was not sufficient to inform his readers, he adds some German words: "wenn übe rhaupt."

5. *kritakṣaṇa-*

*kṛtakṣaṇa-*lit. "having made the leisure" is used in the sense of "having taken the time to learn" [nonsense]: (ll) 7.36 *kramaṁ lipijñānakṛtakṣaṇasya*, "of him who had taken time to learn, in due course, the knowledge of writing." Cp. also 9.13; 13.41; 14.35; 16.4. *kṛtakṣaṇa-* is synonymous to *vihitakṣaṇa* - 9.13; *pracchādanārthāṁ vihitakṣaṇah*, "he who had taken the time to learn, to conceal (his feelings)", Cp. MW, s.v. [Candrikā says: *nirvyāpārasthitiḥ*. J gloss vakaver says: *niyamaḥ*].

Misra's footnote:


The Latin word *schola* may mean "leisure" and "school," but *kṣaṇa* of Sanskrit by itself has nothing to do with "learning"!

Lipijñānakṛtakṣaṇasya may mean "one who has devoted time to learn the writing," but "lipikṛtakṣaṇasya" by itslef will hardly mean "learning."

*Kṣaṇa* means, according to Amara: *nirvyāpārasthitau kālavīśeṣotsavayoh kṣaṇah*. Has Misra seen this?

In *kṛtakṣaṇaṁ kṣudraṇadīsamāgame*, there is no learning process at all! Here *kṣaṇa = utsava*, festivity, enjoyment, etc. The same is true of *Vihitakṣaṇa*. It may very well mean "who has given an opportunity or chance to conceal, who has made an effort, etc."

17. Root *vah* (+ *ud*)

Misra presents a long discourse. He creates a mountain of a mole-hill. He assumes certain things without any basis and then tries to offer solutions and comments. He criticizes his predecessors without understanding them. He misunderstands the poet and tells us that the use of the word is rare, etc. Misra says:

*ud-vah* is on several occasions used in the sense "to exhibit, to show, to make manifest", which seems rather a rare use (not properly recorded in lexica). Thus in

1.4 *ekas stanaḥ* (48)........................

... ... ...

yasyāḥ priyārdhaḥsthitim udvahantyāḥ
sā pātu vah parvataraṇājaputrī//
"May that daughter of the king of the mountains (i.e. the Himālaya) protect you, the one breast of whom [whose?] who exhibits standing [!] in the half part of her beloved one, has gone..."

In this sense ud - vah occurs also in 1.51; 3.39; 5.10, 20; 9.11, 32; 10.23, 36; 12.50; 14.47 etc.

Interpreting this word literally (on 1.14 [i.e. 1.4] edd. sec. and ter., comm.) commentators seem to have missed this sense [to exhibit?]. Their comment on udvahantyāḥ as equivalent to dhārayantyāḥ "carrying" allegedly [sic] showing Bilhaṇa to be a śākta has no cogency. 49 Bilhaṇa has used ud-vah in the non-figurative sense of "carrying" in 12:48...asyodvahatāḥ karābje...ambhoruhinipalāśam "of him, who was carrying in his hand the leaf of a lotus"; cp. also 15.64; 18.77. The figurative use of udvah by Bilhaṇa may be compared to that of roots bhṛ and bhaj: in 1.91 bibhrat and 11.37 bhāji are replaceable [sic, should be replaceable] by the corresponding forms of ud-vah. [47-48]

Misra's footnotes:

48. ekastanaḥ (ed. ter.) is a bad (?) orthography

This is not any systematic, consciously executed orthography. It is a simple case of misunderstanding. If N had resorted to report such irregularities of B and R, his ed. would have inflated ten times! It is silly even to discuss such matters.

for ekaḥ stanaḥ (edd. pri and sec.). Cp. p. 1. 1.74a.

49: Śiva and Pārvatī are sometimes united in the form of a single androgy nous deity. The right hand (?) side of the divinity represents Śiva and the left Pārvatī. It is Śiva, ardhanārī 'half women [!]' and half iṣa 'lord'. The male half has ja āmuku a on the head and the single breast of the female side is prominent, the waist pinched in, the hair done up in a knot (dhāmmilla). Cp. e.g. the figure of Ardhanārīśvara of Mahabali puram, belonging to 7th cent. A.D. (T.A. Gopinath Rao, Elements of Hindu Iconography, vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 328). Cp. also the verse on Ardhanārīśvara in Śmk. 1.11, ascribed to Bilhaṇa. [pp. 47-48]

Lexicographers follow the literature. The literature or the poets do not follow them. Otherwise, we would not have the sayings like: niraṅkuṣāḥ kavayaḥ. Even the grammar does not precede the literature.

According to MW, ud-vah means also: to bear up, lift up, elevate, wear, (clothes, et c.); have, possess, to show. Misra cites the following uses of ud-vah by Bilhaṇa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Expression</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>samudvahannunatam aṃsakūṭam</td>
<td>1:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padāṭivrataṃ udvahāmi</td>
<td>3:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manyupanākakaluṣaṃ samudvahan bhrāṭṛduṣcaritacintanān manaḥ</td>
<td>5:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is just possible that \textit{ud-vah} might have been used on several occasions in the sense "to exhibit, to show, to make manifest", but that does not mean that it is a "rare" use and that if a particular use is not properly recorded in lexica then it becomes a rare use. Here is the full text of the verse under discussion:

\begin{verse}
Ekah stanasa tuñgatarah parasya vārtām iva prāṣum āgaṁ mukhāgram. 
Yasyāḥ priyārdhasthitum udvahantyāḥ sā pātu vaḥ parvatarājaputrī. [1:4]
\end{verse}

Note: Misra's text reads…\textit{priyārdhaḥsthitim}

Misra translates the words "priyārdhasthitim udvahantyāḥ" as one "who exhibits standing [noun?] in the half part of her beloved one." "To Exhibit" is one of the meanings of \textit{udvah}. That is all. Apte gives "standing" as the first meaning of the word "\textit{sthiti}", and Misra runs away with it. He does not go beyond the first meaning. This word has many meanings, more profound than "standing." It means "continuance in one state," "steady application or devotion," "stability", "permanence", "perpetuation," "continuance," "high station or rank," "preservation," etc. etc.

If a person "wears" an object, if a person "possesses" an object, he is bound to "exhibit" it, provided it can come into direct contact with the eyes of a perceiver. The people "wear" the perfume too. Even that is felt, if not by \textit{cakṣurindriya}, by \textit{ghrāṇendriya}. So "exhibit" is the effect rather than the cause. The cause is to "wear" or "possess."

It is unfortunate that Misra does not understand N's \textit{Caritacandrikā} and blames it unjustifiably. He misleads his readers without quoting the \textit{Caritacandrikā} in original. \textit{Caritacandrikā} does not explain the word \textit{udvahantyāḥ} at all. It merely explains the compound word \textit{priyārdhasthitim} in the following way: "Priyasya ardhanārīśvarasya Śivas ya ardhe svīye daksināṅge sthitis tām." [p. 209]. To attribute more to an earlier writer and to distort his statement is a misrepresentation of facts and certainly not a sign of true scholarship. Kathāpi khalu pāpānām alam aśreyase yataḥ. We can only say that
before Misra makes such "preposterous" statements (to borrow his own terminology) he should sit with some learned Sanskrit scholar, a pandit, a true guru, become his antevāsin, and acquire a basic knowledge of Sanskrit as well as the principles of literary criticism. Then alone he should try to interpret great poets like Bilhaṇa.

If Misra thinks that the interpretation of N means that "Pārvatī is carrying Śiva in her half" he is sadly mistaken. Misra does not know the true meaning of N's words at all. We are reminded of the famous prayer once again:

Ajñānāndhasya lokasya....

Let us see what Bh says:

Priyasya Śivasyārdhasthitimardhe svadakṣināṅge sthitimudvahantyāḥ dhāra yantyāḥ.

Now Bh puts his own interpretation into the mouth of Bilhaṇa and concludes:

"Tantraśastradṛṣṭyā Pārvatvāy ādyāśaktitvena grahaṇam kavisammatataṁ pratibhāti."

He cites a beautiful stuti from Ānandasāgarastava of Śrīṅlakaṇṭhadikṣita:

Ardhaṁ striyas tribhuvane sacarācare'smin
ardhaṁ pumāmsa iti darśayitum bhavatyā.
Strī [!] pūṃsalakṣanam idam vapur āḍṛṭam yat
tenāsi devi viditā trijagaccharīrā.

Whether Bilhaṇa was a śākta or not, but certainly Bh shows his bias. Well, there is nothing wrong in that. That is his interpretation. Śiva gives his half to Pārvatī, or Pārvatī takes half of Śiva is a question no one can decide in an absolute manner. However, that Bilhaṇa wanted to pay his homage to the female deity is evident from his words in the prayer: "Sā pātum vah Parvatārājaputṛt." To begin with, he offers his prayers to Lord Viṣṇu, manifest in the form Kaṃsariṇu, i.e. Śrīṅkaṇṭha. Then he offers his homage to Lord Śeṣāyin. Once again he prays to Lord Viṣṇu. And then he pays his respect to Pārvatī. Next he shows his obeisance to Lord Viṣṇu as the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa. Then comes Śiva in an indirect manner. After this we find his invocation to Sarasvatī, the goddess of learning. And finally comes Ganeśa, whom one would expect in the very beginning. But Bilhaṇa had his own special way. He was following a new path of his own.

It is interesting to observe that in most of these cases, Bilhaṇa does not offer his praṇāma directly to the deity. In the first verse, he prays that the sword of Kaṃsariṇu may protect the readers. Then he prays that Bhagavān Mukunda may bring prosperity to the readers. And then comes vakṣahsthalt of Garuḍadhvaja. In the fourth verse we find Bilhaṇa making a direct reference to Parvatārājaputṛt and praying that may she protect the readers. Nandaka (the sword) is directly mentioned thereafter and the poet wishes that let it give deep pleasure to his readers. In the sixth verse is worshiped Śiva not directly but through his pranāmaḥ, which are said to be above all, sarvotkarsaṇa vartante. Next comes Sarasvatī. Bilhaṇa prays that she be pleased with the readers.
ven Ganeśa is worshiped not directly, but through his karaškarānām vikṣepaliñā, the playful scattering (sprinkling) of the drops of water through the trunk. So Bilhaṇa demnstrates his own praudhi, his own special vicchitti and vyutpatti. By saluting one deity in a particular manner, he does not become a śākta, śaiva, or vaiśnava. He did not as k our Abhinava-Bilhaṇa Misra to protect him from being branded as śākta. If at all, he was more inclined toward Saivism, which flourished so pervasively in Kashmir, the home of Bilhaṇa. Let us finish this discussion with the concluding words of Bilhaṇa:

Yasya svēcchāsabaracaritālokanatrastayevasa
nyastaś cūḍāsasikalikāyā kāpī dūre kuraṅgaḥ.  
Sa vyutpattim sukavivacanesvādikartā śrutāṅm  
devāḥ preyān acaladuhitūr niścalām vah karotu.  

[stress added]

Our prayer is: May God bless such ignorant writers with the light of learning.

It is noteworthy that the poet finishes his great work by invoking the blessings of "A caladuhitūḥ preyān," the lover of the daughter of the Himalayas, i.e. Śaṅkarā! Śaṅkar a does not come directly but through "acaladuhitā." Let us pay special attention to the two words "acala" in "acaladuhitā," and niścalām as an adjective of "vyutpattim." We may recall the very early reference to this word in:

Vyutpattir āvarjtakovidāpi na raṅjanāya kramate jaḍānām.  
Na mauktikacchidrakārī śalākā pragalbhate karmāṇi ṭaṅkikāyāḥ.  

What is vyutpattih? Vyutpattih is development, perfection, growth (esp. in knowledge, proficiency, esp. in literature or science), comprehensive learning or scholarship, etc. It also means "derivation" (in grammar), the power to analyze a word into its prakṛti and pratyaya. We have the expressions like "avyutpannaprātipadika."

So, unless and until one has been blessed with "sukavivacanesu vyutpattim" he sho uld not indulge in commenting upon great works such as the Vikramāṇkadevacarita of Mahākavi Bilhaṇa. He should first acquire this "sukavivacanesu vyupattim" by becomin g an antevasin of a worthy guru and acquire the quality of vinaya and jījñāsā.

We are not sure if Misra has seen the Kāvyaprakāśa, the immortal work of Mammaṭa. Mammaṭa gives hetuḥ (kāraṇam) of kāvyam:

Śaktir nipunatā loka-śāstrākavyādyavekṣaṇāt.  
Kāvyajñāśikṣayābhyāsa iti hetu tadadbhave.  

This nipunatā is identical with vyutpattih. Mammaṭa says:

"Lokasya sthāvarajaṅgamātmakavṛttāsya. Śāstrāṇām chandovyākaraṇābhidhānak oṣa -kalācaturvargagajaturangahaḍgāḍilakṣaṇaṅgarthānām. Kāvyāṇām ca mahākav isam bandhinām. Ādigrahaṇād itihāsāṅgām ca vimarṣanād vyutpattih."
Avekṣāṇād = vimarṣanād = muhur muhun tattatpadārtharasādīgocarād anusandhānā
t. Nipuṇatā = vyupattih = tattadartharasādīgocaro dṛḍhatarasamśkāraḥ = sakalapadār

* * *

Let us turn our attention to another demonstration of scholarship by Misra. He acts like a dictator as far as the interpretation of literature is concerned. He says:

18. vātāyana-

vātāyana- is invariably glossed in ed. sec. and reproduced [mark the word] in ed. ter. by gavākṣa- "a round window" at the instance of Amarak. 2.3.9. Literally vātāyana may be explained as vātasyāyanam yena "by which the wind goes [and comes] = window" or vātasyāyanam yatra "where there is the going [and coming] of the "wind". Thus it comes to be used not only in the sense of gavākṣa- but as a designation of "the flat roof of an Indian house (50) roof terrace, balcony (51) portico", etc.

From the context it appears that "balcony" or "flat roof" is the sense in which vātāyana is used in 9.91...vilāsavātāyanasevanena "by enjoying the pleasure balcony."52

9.129cd vātāyanaḥ kelivimānakalpaṁ tavāstu kāṇcī nayanotsavāya.

"May Kāṇcī be to the feast of your eyes by its balconies which are like pleasure vim ānas."

Cp. also: 12.21, 27; 17.10, 30, 32, 60; 18.4, 9, 25. 30; Karnāṣu. 1.22. [pp. 48-49]

Misra’s footnotes:

50. Kathās. 95.18 svagṛhottuṅgavātāyanagataḥ 'staying on the lofty roof of the house'; ibid. 103.16 harmyavātāyanārṇādhah "having climbed on the roof of the palace" [like a monkey, isn’t it Mr....er....Doctor Misra?] (cp. also Hcar. 4 para. 7. ... sa rājā... har m [y?] asya pṛṣṭhe susvāpa "that king slept on the roof of the palace"). Tawney’s explanation of vātāyana by ‘window’ for these passages in Kathās., is shown [by whom?] to be wrong by the context. [Misra translates vātāyana by "roof" in all these passages. To us it seems merely a durāgraha of one who is grahakalita].

51. Bcar. 3.19-21; Ragh. 7.6-8; Rudrakavi, Rāṣṭraudha., 20.57. Balconies (= vātāyana) framed by small railings, are found in sculptures at Bāḥruṭ[Bharhut?], Sāṇc, Mat hura etc. Young women, crowding each other [or one another?], stand on these balconies in excitement, looking at scenes below. Cp. A. Coomaraswamy, Early Indian Architecture (Palaces) pp. 181-217 (Eastern Art, 3).

52. For a similar description cp. particular passage in Bāṃbh[a?]ṭṭa’s Hcar., in which queen Yaśovatī is described to enjoy moonlight on a balcony by putting on her upper garment. [pp.48-49]
In response to Misra’s explanations and interpretations as presented above, we would like to submit as follows:

"Vātāyana is invariably glossed in ed. sec. and reproduced [!] in ed. ter. by gavākṣa " because Amarasiṃha has ordained that way in his Nāmaliṅgānusāsanam: Vātāyana m gavākṣaḥ. But there is nothing wrong in it. "Vātāyanaḥ" is "gavākṣaḥ" and "gavākṣaḥ" is "vātāyanaṃ." They are interchangeable words. They are paryāya (synonymous) padas. The question is: How can Misra assert categorically and convincingly that gavākṣa is a round window? What authority does he have to prove that "gavākṣa" means a ROUND WINDOW only and not a square or an oblong window? And what about hexagonal, octagonal, etc.?

Misra gives the vyutpatti of vātāyanaṃ by the words—vātasya ayanam yena, or yatrā but he does not explain the word gavākṣa by the same methodology.

Let us see how Rāmāśramī explains gavākṣa: "Gavām aksīva... gāvo jalāni kirāṇā v ā aksānti vyāpnuvanti enam anena vā." i.e. the one which the water or rays can PERV ADE, or permeate, or penetrate, i.e. an open space, or an opening through which the water or rays can pass. This can mean window. It can also mean an open terrace. The point we want to make is this: Both the words have exactly the same meaning; a space open, as opposed to a room, which is closed by four walls through which neither air nor water could enter in, or penetrate. In brief, Misra has not given any documentary evidence to prove that gavākṣa is a ROUND WINDOW. That is all.

* * *

Misra once again plays plagiarism.

19 vyākhyā-

vyākhyā- "interpretation" is obvious in 18.4b and 78b. In 18.79c Mahābhāṣyavyākhyā-, is taken as "commentary on the Mahābhāṣya" by Bühler, followed by others, which seems doubtful:

Misra does not clearly state what he means by "followed by others" (his p. 49, l. 21). Does he mean Nagar too? If yes, then he is not speaking the whole truth.

18.79cd

mahābhāṣyavyākhyām akhilajanavandyām vidadhatāḥ sadā yasya cchātrais tilakitam abhūt prāṇaṇaṃ api/

"[Jyeṣṭhakalāśa] even [!] whose courtyard was always adorned by pupils when he gave his explanation of the Mahābhāṣya, praiseworthy to all people (respected by everybody)."

The idea is that when he gave his instruction, there were so many pupils, that they had to stand [?] partly outside the room in the courtyard [nonsense of the greatest magnitude!]
Therefore, *vyākhyā*- "interpretation [given to his pupils] [!] like former occurrences, [!] is more likely in above stanza. Moreover, no commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* by *Jyeṣṭhakalasa* is known or mentioned elsewhere. [pp. 49-50]

Here is what Nagar had stated 35 years ago (1943):


I don't know if it is virtuous for Misra to appropriate the above idea to his own self? If writers had not indulged in this kind of dirty deeds, Bilhaṇa would not have said:

*Sāhityapāthonidhamthanottham karṇāṃrtaṃ rakṣata he kaviṇidrāḥ.*

Yadasya daitya īva luṃṭhanāya kāvyārtha caurāḥ pragunībhavanti. [1:11]

Before we leave this topic we would like to point out that Misra's attempt to interpret "-api" to mean the "smallness" of the room (causing the overflow of students) is uncal led for. It is not necessary to imagine that the "room" in which Jyeṣṭhakalasaḥ taught Mahābhāṣya was so small that the students had to stand in the courtyard! We don't believe either that there were so many students--the crowd was so large—that they overflowed the room. We believe that "prāṅganaṃ" here stands in contradistinction to the vyākhyāsthānāni, which were more or less "public" places, while the house of Jyeṣṭhaka laṣa was his own home, a private residence. Misra's "vyākhyā" is far-fetched.

*          *          *

Misra continues his learned exposition:

20 velā:

velā- is explained by ta a "shore" edd. ter. and sec. [why the order is changed here? ] on verse 9.7, which is hardly correct;

śṛṅgāraraṇākaśakreva tayā praveṣe vihite tarunyā/  
navānurāgena manas tadiyam ratnotkareṇeva sanātham āsīt//

"When the entrance was effected by that young girl, [why not say: when that young girl entered!] who was like the flood wave of the ocean of love [!], his mind was join ed [!] with new affection (colouring) as if with a scattering of jewels."
The idea is that she causes his mind to be full of affection like the flood wave of the ocean (ratnākara- "jewel mine") scatters jewels (makes the shore full of jewels). Cp. 12.40cd:

samucchalanṭā praṇayīkṛtāni lāvanyaratnākaravelayeva//

"as if embraced by the gushing up flood wave of the ocean of loveliness."

In 7.75 velācala- "coastal mountain" is used for "shore."

velā- originally means "tide, flow", whence developed some secondary senses, viz. "wave" (originally: "of which the tide consists"), "shore" (originally: "on which the tide is observed"), "boundary/limit" (originally: "of the tide"). Cp. Amarak. 3.3.98 abdhy-am buvikṛtau velā kālāmayādayor api.

velā- prefixed with ud (= udvela-) in 8.52 and 10.70 is used in the sense of "limitless." [pp. 50-51]

Misra declares emphatically that velā originally means "tide, flow." We don't know what he means by "originally." [Does he mean before Vālmīki and Vyāsa?] Even if it is admitted that the original meaning of velā is "tide" or "flow," it does mean samudra-tā too. Here is Apte: Velā [=] Time, Season, Opportunity, Interval of repose, Leisure, Tide, Flow, Current, Sea-coast, Sea-shore, (ex. Velānilāya prasṛtā bhujāṅgāḥ; Sa vel āvapravalayām (urvīm), Limit, Boundary, etc. etc.

It is to be remembered that "tide" or "flow", i.e. the huge mass of water itself is not red (rāga-yukta). It is the jewels that are red. Where do they get collected? On the shore! They are washed ashore. We have similar expression: Samudravelā ratratnasa mpadām [Vik. 2:21]. The "tide" or "flow, unless it reaches the shore and washes the red gems on it, cannot be coloured and can not colour any other object.

In other words, the jewels are strewn, or are found scattered on the shore after the tide has ebbed, i.e. receded. After the jewels are washed ashore and are collected on the shore, the tide does not have to stay there. The jewels are seen on the shore after the water gets receded. So we are more concerned here with the shore, rather than the tide! Compare also:


Thus we have shown following the maxim of sthālpulāka the fact that Misra's arguments and statements leave much to be desired. Now we will pass on to his third chapter to show him further in his true color.
CHAPTER III

Secondary Source Material Relating To

Vikramāṅkadevacarita

In this "Chapter III: Secondary Source Material Relating to Vikramāṅkadevacarita," Misra discusses variant readings found in anthologies. With regard to 16:49 he states:

(b) In our [!] MS. the first three syllables are missing. They have to be supplied from Smk-, which reads talpeṣu (accordingly edd. sec. and ter. against Bühler's vistṛṇa-.

[p.62]

This is a misrepresentation of facts and distortion of truth. A cruel criminal takes others too to be criminals. It is lokapraṇaṇcanam, and not ślokavivecanam. It is all cheating and lying. N did not use any secondary source to fill the lacunae caused by Bühler's errors in transcribing J. N went straight to J and found the correct and complete, true and exact readings still preserved there. See N's comments on Gaurīvibhramdhūpadh ūma--(Vik. 16:51)

It seems Misra did not read "the sigla and abbreviation" [expression borrowed from Misra, p. 126] used by N in his Prastāvanā on p. 2. (Kāvyamūlasaṃśodhanopayoginā m pustakāṇāṃ sāṅketikacihnavivaranaṣahitaḥ paricayaḥ).

At the bottom of page 175, fn no. 4 (four) of N reads: dareṣu tūla- Pra." Now this "Pra" (= Pra. Pustakam) has been described on p. 2 of the "Prastāvanā" thus:


Maybe Misra did not read this. In case he read it and also understood it, the conclusion is irresistible that he is not honest. We don't know what Misra means by "Our" MS. The omission was generated by "P" and not by J! Now P is not J! So Drs. Bühler and Jacobi are responsible for this lacuna. J has even today the three letters "talpeṣu" right in their proper place. They are not "to be supplied from Misra's Smk." They were supplied by J to Nagar as early as 1941 or so when Nagar toiled in Jaisalmer and compared his "copy" with the original J MS. To bring in "ed. ter." is uncalled for, because Bh is merely a copier.

Let us see, once again, Misra's power of perception. Gaṇḍe maṇḍanam āṭmanaiva kurute (8:82) is cited by Saduktikarnāṃpta (Calcutta, 1965, p. 137) as no. 506 under section 7 Pragalbhā, but the compiler Śrīdharaṅdaṇḍa puts it as anonymous kasyacit [!]
The very next verse in Saduktikaṇṭāma is Dolāyām jaghanasthalena, which is Vik. 8:86. This is correctly ascribed to Bilhaṅga by the statement "Bilhaṅasya." Thus it can be concluded that the compiler did not consult the original Vik. He depended upon an earlier compilation, or loka prasiddhi (popular tradition). That Misra does not notice this omission (of 8:82) is aparā kathā! Or, was he concerned only with those verses which were ascribed to Bilhaṅga nāmagrāham (by name)?

Let us study another instance:


Niśāsu yatra pratibimbavartmanāḥ samāgataś cārudṛṣāṁ niśākarah.
Vilāsadolāyitakunḍalāhataḥ kapolalāvanyajale nimajjati.
Bilhaṅasya [Vik.17:34]

The above verse is not listed by the editor of Smk as one of the compositions of Bilhaṅga [!] although the text on p. 378 clearly states "Bilhaṅasyaitau". The dual number refers to the earlier verse "Sthītā [stu]" or "Sthitāsu" which is Smk. 107:8 and Vik. 17:33. Therefore, this omission seems very strange, because after the second verse there is a clear statement "Bilhaṅasyaitau." Although Misra does list this 17:34 verse in his "Concordance" on page 67, yet he does not include it in his discussion in the Chapter entitled "Secondary Source Material Relating to Vikramāṅkadevacarita."

It may be reasonable to infer from the successive enumeration (or listing) of the two verses in the order of the original that the compiler of Smk. had the original text of Vik. with him!

According to Misra the following verses of the Vikramāṅkadevacarita are cited in anthologies:

01:07 Vacāṃsi Vācaspatimatsareṇa
01:14 Kuṇṭhatvam āyāti guṇaḥ kavīnām
01:18 Jaḍeṣu jātapratibhābhimānāḥ
01:26 Prthvīpateḥ santi na yasya pārśve
01:27 Laṅkāpateḥ saṅkucitaṁ yaśo yad
01:29 Karṇāṁrtaṁ sūktirasam vimucya

There is a big gap between canto 1 and canto 7, i.e. no verse is quoted in anthologies from cantos 2 through 6, inclusive. Bilhaṅga is remembered as a poet and not as a biographer of Vikramādiya although he composed Vikramādiya's Carita. This is in response to those critics who blame him for having composed a carita mahākāvyā and for having followed the kavimārga.
07:05  ಕೃತಪ್ರಕೋಪಾಂ ಪವನಾಶಾನಾನಂ
07:20  ಸಂಡೂರ್ಯಂ ಇಂದುವರಾಲೋಕಾನಾನಂ
07:22  ಪ್ರಸಾರಾ ಪಾದುವಿಹಿತಶೇಷಾಂ
07:23  ಉನ್ನಮ್ಯಂ ದುರಾಮುಹುರ್ ಅಣಂಮಾಣಂತಾಗಂ
07:63  ಮಾಣಾಗ್ರಾಂಠಕದರಥಾಯಂ‌ ಕಥಿತಾಗಂ
07:64  ಲ್ಲೈಸ್ನಾನ್ವಿದ್ದ್ಲಿಕ್ಷಸಾಂ ಮದ್ದುಲ್ಲಿಹಂ
07:70  ಮಲಯಾಗೀರಿಸಾಂರಾ ಸಿಂಹಾಲದ್ವಿಪ
data
07:71  ಪಾನಿಯಂ ನಲಿಕೇರಿಪಿಲಾಲಕುಹರ
data
07:76  ಯಾ೦ ಕುತ್ನಾಕಂದಾಲಿಕಾವಳನತ
data
08:06  ತಸ್ಯಾಂ ಪಾದನಕಾಸ್ರೆನಿಂಂ
08:08  ಅಮುಳಯಾಸಯ ಮಮ ಸವ್ರಾಂ
08:10  ಜಾಗಾಟ ಕಮಾಲಳ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಮ
08:14  ಹೆಮಮಾಂಜಿಂ ರಾಮಲಾಭ್ಯಯಂ
08:16  ಮಂಯೆ ತದುರ್ ಸಂಭಾವ್ಯ
08:21  ತಾನನ್ತಾಬಯ ನೀಂದನತ
data
08:25  ಬಹಾಂ ರಮಯಾಲಿ ತಸ್ಯಾಂ
08:30  ಮಂಯೆ ಸಮಾಂತಲಾವಣಂ
08:37  ದಾರಿದ್ರಮು ದೃಷ್ಟವಾ
08:47  ಮುಕ್ಷಂಡಾಂಧಿಕಾಪೂರ
data
08:48  ತತ್ಕಾದ್ವ ಕಾರದ ಕಿಂದಿನ
data
08:51  ಅಯಂ ತ್ರಯಾಂಂ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂಣಂ
08:60  ಅಂಗುಲಿಖಿ ಕೃಂಙಾಖ್ಯಾಂ
08:62  ಹಾಸೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಬಳಾಯಂ
08:64  ಸರಳೆ ಎವ ದೋರ್ಳಕ್ಷ
08:65  Bāhū tasyāḥ kucābhoga
08:69  Bhāti dantacchadenaśyāḥ
08:71  Purāṇabāṇatyāgāya
08:73  Mrgīsambandhinī drṣṭir
08:76  Saundaryapātre vaktrendau
08:79  Kiñcit savibhramodaṇci
08:82  Gaṇḍe maṇḍanam ātmanaiva
08:85  Drṣoḥ sīmāvādaḥ śravana
08:86  Dolāyām jaghanasthalena
08:87  Lāsyābhyāsamiṣeṇa citram
08:88  Vaktram nirmalam unnatā
10:39  Asaṅkhyaṇuṣpo'pi manobhavasya
10:42  Atādayat pallavaṇṇīnaikāṃ
10:46  Svedāṃbhasā puṣparajobharaiś ca
10:71  Dattaṃ sarobhyaḥ phalam
10:75  Kimapyaṇaṇātasaroruhebhyaḥ
11:09  Bhānumān aparadigvanitāyāḥ
11:77  Yaḥ sainye smarapārthivasya
11:83  Ye kuṇḍhīkṛtavallabhapraṇatayaḥ
13:05  Raveḥ samastakṣitimadhyagam
13:09  Drśam prapāpālikāyā prakāśite
13:25  Adabhram abhropolapaṭṭakeṣu ye
13:80  Nayasva pāram pulinadvayānugām
13:88  Vidyutpaṅkajakhaṇḍapaṅkapaṭaḥ
14:32 Nīlantaradanicolakojhite
14:37 Kuṇṇamauktikaparāgaperāṇḍuraḥ
16:02 Saratkālātapaklānta
16:08 Alabhanta nabahkṣetre
16:09 Sasaṅkeneva Kandarpa
16:10 Abhūvannadbhoṣmānaḥ
16:14 Madvairināḥ kaṭhorāṃśor
16:15 Samakṣam api sūryasya
16:44 Svecchāvihārarasikasya
16:49 Aṅgārāhāsiṣu vilāsagṛhodareṣu
16:51 Gaurīvibhramadhūpadhūma
16:52 Prṣṭāḥ stokam Vitastāta
17:11 Ahaṃ sadā prāṇasamam
17:12 Narendracāmīkacaracārubhūṣaṇa
17:33 Sthitāstu yatoparibhūmi
17:34 Niśāsu yatra pratibimba
18:06 Svecchābhāṅgurabhāgyamegha
18:107 He rājānas tyajata sukavi

Here is a summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canto</th>
<th>Total no. of verses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

226
Cantoes disregarded by anthologists: 2-6, 9, 12, 15 = 8.

It is to be noted that Misra overlooks the Alankāratnatākara by Śobhākaramitra which cites many verses from Bilhana. All the above dambara on the part of Misra is more of a padding rather than real kāmini-kucakalāśau!
CHAPTER IV

Verses Ascribed to Bilhana in Anthologies

In Chapter IV Misra discusses "Verses Ascribed to Bilhana in Anthologies." He begins with:

\[
\text{atrākaṇṭham viluṭha salile nirjalā bhūḥ purastāj} \\
\text{jahyāḥ sōṣaṃ vadanavi[ni?]ḥitenāmalakyaḥ phalena/} \\
\text{sthāne sthāne tad iti pathikastrījana[h] klāntagātrīṃ} \\
\text{paśyan sītām kim u na krpāḥ vardhito roditaṣ ca} //
\]

Smk. 90.19: Karuṇapaddhatiḥ; Bilhanasya.

Misra's comments are:

(d) \text{vardhito roditas ca} "gladdened (comforted) and made to weep": the wives of the travellers are comforted by their compassion (krpā) because they realize that there is a woman even more unhappy than themselves [nonsense]. \text{vardhaya} - "to gladden (comfort)"; Vcar. 5.26: Karnasu. 21/2; 25/6 [!]. [p. 69]

Like so many of Misra's "interpretations", this too does not make any sense to us! All the pathika-strījanas were not unlucky, destitute, or distressed. And who says Sītā was unhappy? Read what she says in Vālmīki-- [Ayodhyākāṇḍa, sargas 27-30.

It is a horrible insult to that Divine Lady Jaganmātā Sītā

---------

\text{Udbhavasthitisaµhāra-kĀrinniḥ klesahāriṇiḥ.} \\
\text{Sarvaśreyaskarinniḥ Sītām nato'haṃ Rāmavallabhāṃ.} \\
Ādyā, Jaganmātā, Jagachchaktiḥ Devayajanasaṃbhavā....

\text{Viśvambharā bhagavatī bhavatīṃ asūta} \\
\text{Rājā prajāpastismo Janakah pīṭā te.} \\
\text{Teśāṃ vadhūṣ tvam asi nandini pārthivānām} \\
\text{yeṣā kule ca savitā ca gurur vayam ca.} \\
(Drawn from memory. To be checked).

---------

to say that she was so unhappy that the passersby women would take pity on her and regard themselves more lucky! Furthermore, we don't know how Misra gets the meaning "gladdened (comforted)" by the word \text{vardhito}!! My interpretation is that the passersby women were gladdened = happy, because they were able to have the divine \text{darśa na} of Devī Sītā, and also satisfied that they were able to give some good, helpful advice to their "queen," which would help her cross the terrain where there was no water for a long stretch of land.

* * *
Misra’s Power of Perception (or deception)

32
dehapraviṣṭādrisutāmukhendu-
dvitīyakhaṇḍārdham ivāgato yaḥ/
avāptukāmaḥ paripūrṇabhāvam
sa pātu vaḥ Śambhujaṭārḍhacandraḥ//

Smk. 2.52: āśīrvādāpadhattiḥ: Bilhaṇasya-.

Misra ordains:

(a) Read *indum* for *indu*. "The half moon in Śiva's hair... that has approached the face moon of Pārvatī...as if it were its second half... [pp. 78-79]

Once again Misra displays his ignorance. And urged by his arrogance suggests an emendation which does not solve the problem at all! Rather it creates a situation which can well be described as "confusion-worse-confounded." It would have been much better if he had observed silence and merely stated, like in the previous verse (his no. 31), this "seems obscure."

Misra says: "The half-moon in Śiva’s hair--that has approached the face moon of Pārvatī--as if it were the second half--"

In order to comprehend the *kavitābhivyañjitaṁ kavitātparyam*, it may be helpful to refer to another verse by the same poet, we mean our great poet Mahākavi Bilhaṇa.

Ekaḥ stanas tuṅgataraḥ parasya vārttām iva praṣṭum agāṁ mukhāgam.
Yasyāḥ priyārdhasthitim udvahantyāḥ saḥ pātu vaḥ parvatarājaputrī. [1:4]

In *Dehapriviṣ ādrisutā*...the poet describes the moment of the immortal union of Śiva with Pārvatī and the emergence of the Lord Ardhārīśvara. [See Misra’s fn. no. 49 on p. 48]. Śiva gives half of his body to Pārvatī, or the half of Pārvatī’s body gets merged into that of Śiva. One half is *nara*; the other half is *nārī*. Pārvatī’s face was a FULL MOON before this unification. All of a sudden one half of it disappears and gets merged into that [the face] of Śiva. These are the facts. Now the poet displays his *kavitā-c amatkāra-cāturī*. He says that the half-moon (crescent), seen in Śiva’s jaṭā (formation of hair) has come to secure the half moon of Pārvatī’s face (which has now merged into Śiva’s face) in order that it, i.e. Śiva’s half moon could become a full moon! This is the meaning.

Yaḥ Śambhujaṭārḍhacandraḥ, paripūrṇabhāvam avāptukāmaḥ iva, dehapraviṣṭādri-
sutāmukhendu- dvitīyakhaṇḍārdham āgataḥ saḥ vaḥ pātu.

The verse is not very clear as it stands. We have purposely kept it as it appears in the doctoral dissertation of Mr. Misra. The problem is created by the two words *khaṇḍa* and *ardha* which are (almost) synonymous. *Ja ārdhacandraḥ āgataḥ* is clear. But wh
ere? Why? So Misra suggests that we read mukhendum instead of mukhendu, thus making dehâprâvis adrisutâmukhendu (acc.) and dvityaâkhaâdârdham-- samânâdhihikarañ a--as one and the same object. The question is: Whose deha? Whose body? Where did the full-moon of Adrisutâ go? Wherein did it disappear? Whereinto did it get merged? Where did the ja ärđhacandra go? To whom did it go? To Adrisutâ? Well, she does not have the full moon anymore! Half of her moon (face) has already gone into that (the face) of Śiva and has disappeared. She has already lost half of her face-moon.

Misra wants us to accept his suggestion that ja ärđhacandra [of Śiva] goes to Pârvatâ’s half moon to get it? If Pârvatâ gives all that is left with her now, what will she have? Can she give the remaining half too? Is the ja ärđhacandra justified in expecting Pârvatâ to give up even the half, which is the only remnant of her former full-moon face?

Misra’s suggestion is totally meaningless. It is clear that he did not understand the poet at all! He has given one more proof here that he is not yet an adhikârin. We believe instead of changing mukhendu into mukhendum, and creating a situation confirming the age-old saying, Bhakṣite’pi laÅune na ÅÁnto vâdhiú, or Vinâyakam prakurvâno racayâmâsa vânaram, we should change ardham (half) into artham (prayojanâya) i.e. in order to obtain, or for the purpose of obtaining, the second half of the full-face moon of Adrisutâ (the half of which) has merged into the body of Śiva! The ja ärđhacandra comes to Śiva and not to Pârvatâ! This is the fact.

According to Apte, arthaḥ = object, purpose, end and aim, wish, desire; often used in this sense as the last member of compounds and translated by "for" 'for the sake of... It mostly occurs in this sense as artham as the last member of compounds and has an adverbial force --kimartham for what purpose? Why? For whom, or for which?

Here are some examples:

Taddarâsanâd abhuc chambhor bhûyân dârârtham âdaraḥ.  
Kumârasambhave.

And here is our own poet:

Pratyâgacchati langhanârtham asakrîd vyomângañâma candramâḥ.  [8:83.2]

[I had conjectured artham in early fifties, while still in India. I was copying all the verses of Bilhañâ occuring in the Sûktimuktâvalî. I had thought even at that time that the reading ought to be artham and not ardhham.]

Limits of Misra’s Little Knowledge

33
dehârdham kuru pârvatî sthirapadâm [haste] dhanur dhâraya  
vâdârdham yadi mrjyatâm karatalam bhâsmângarâgeâna me/  
evañ jaîpata eva bânañîkhiñi proôdiya śîñjâpâni-  
śvâsaiñ prajvalite pureśu jayati smerañ purârer mukham//
Smk. 1.11: Namaskārapaddatiḥ [sic]; Bilhaṇasya. c) śiṅjā- as "bow string" (rare use) also Vcar. 8.88 [i.e. 8:89!] 9.1, 32 [p. 79]

The editor of Sūktimuktāvalī notes a variant "deham" for "haste" which is enclosed in square brackets!

With regard to śiṅjā- as "bow string" Misra says that it is a "rare use." We don't agree.

Amarakośa Rāmāśramī says on Śiṅjinī: maurvī jyā śiṅjinī guṇah. 2:8.85. Śinte, śiī a vyakte śabde (a.ā. se.) Āvāyake ṇiniḥ (3.3. 170). Misra himself has given three examples:

1) śiṅjācālaṇacālacaśrutīgallāttādaṅkapatraḥ smaraḥ. 8:89
2) paṅcabāṅkodaṅdaśiṅjāḥghanagarjiteṣu. 9:1, and
3) śiṅjāpi jātā na manobhavasya. 9.32.

Nevertheless he calls the use "rare." We don't know what he means.

If the above verse is a poetic composition of Bilhaṇa we may conclude that he was very fond of the God Ardhanārīśvara.

Misra Notices Kāvyārthacaurya

34
drāghīyasā dhārṣtyagunenā yuktāh
kaiḥ kair aprūvaiḥ parakāvyakhaṇḍaiḥ/
āḍāmbaram ye vacasāṃ vahanti
te ke'pi kanthākavyo jayanti//

Śp. 193: Kukavinindā; Bilhaṇasya. Smk. 5.1: idem; Kṣemendrasya (not attested).

Verses denouncing plagiarists (kāvyacaurya) in Vcar. 1.11, 18 [p. 79]

The edn of Smk. has kair apyapūrvaiḥ. [What about aprūṇaiḥ?]

We don't know wherefrom Misra gets his reading. Probably from Śp.

Once again Misra betrays his lack of knowledge:

35
dhatte drṣṭīm adhit[a?]vibhramalavāṃ sā puspalāvījane
caitrasya kṣana[ya?]m ādareṇa mahatā mauhūrtikān pṛcchati/
śyenā[r?] tuṣyatī kokilādhvaniruṣā saṃtyāyā? līlāśukān
niḥśokā tvayī durlābhe kim ā[?]pārām śā[?]kyam varākyā tayā//
We have re-presented the text here on the basis of what Misra has presented. There are many errors. If Misra himself press-copied what is printed here, then it is safe to conclude that he did not understand the poet at all!

Smk. 44.15: nāyakasyāgre dūtyuktih; Bilhaṇasya.

Misra comments:

c) tuṣyati here with the abl. of starting point[?]

d) For niḥśoka [!]--read niḥśūka- "0 merciless one!"[?] [Remember his text has "niḥśo kā" because of her wrath with [on?] the kokilas "she is contented on account of [!] the falcon"; varāka-/fem. varākt- in the sense of miserable, to be pitied"; Vcar. 1.18, 98; 8.46; 11.9 (-ī), 65 (-ī); vārākt- in the sense of "miserable, wretched, of vile behaviour": Vcar. 6.35; Karnasu. 1.11 [p. 79]

We don’t believe Misra has understood the meaning of this verse. It seems he is totally tired. There are many errors in his text. There are many points where there is chandobhāṅga. For adhīta do we read adhīra? Saṃtyājyā (second long) is wrong. There is chandobhāṅga too, when the last letter (which will be 15th) of the word (saṃty ājyā) is read as long. The reading can be saṃtyājya. [Later on I found (in the original, Smk) that it is santyajya]. Even that is not appropriate as far as the meaning is concerned. I remember having read santarjya, meaning having chased them away. Or, is it my kalpanā only? Probably lilāśukas were copying the melodious tunes of the kokilas. So she drove them away, and now she is pleased with the falcon, because it does not imitate the kokilas. Misra has śyenā[t]tuṣyati. Smk has śyenā[t]tuṣyati. So the paṁcamī vibhakti is not the original, but only conjectural. Misra explains: "(c) tuṣyati here with the abl. of starting point." Dhruvam apāye'pādānam. We don’t find any "starting point" (dhruva) here! There is nothing like aśvāt patati or grāmād āyāti. Misra himself translates the phrase as "on account of" (line 3 in (d. We believe this is hetvarthe paṁcamī.

Here is a relevant sadukti from our own poet:

Lilāśukāḥ kokilakūjitānām atipraharṣād vihitānukārāḥ.
Grhād adhāvyanta viyoginībhīr guṇo hi kāle guṇinām guṇāya. [7:32]

Guṇo hi doṣāya bhavat kadācit. [Alternative reading of MS. A]

Niḥśoka seems to be wrong. Niḥśoka = free from (devoid of) sorrow or care. Niḥśoka, an address to the nāyaka will be quite appropriate, i.e. he does not care what happens to his [beloved] lady who is pining so intensely for him!

We have never heard of niḥśūka! Of course, the dictionary gives the meaning as copied by Misra, but why to change when niḥśoka makes a perfect sense, even a better one!
In the fourth pāda, Misra has committed two errors, forgetting his own metri causa--
1) durlābhe (durlabhe is the form) and 2) āpārām (aparam is the right form here) and
not āpārām! It is śakyam, and not śākyam (what Misra has).

Kṣaṇam does not make any sense here! Of course, Misra does not care--He is niḥśo ka!
He does not understand the poet anyway! Kṣayam will be more appropriate--When
will the month of Caitra (destructive season) end? Mark who are asked: Mauhūrtikā
n prcchati! It is to be remembered here that we have a dvikarmaka dhātu here. Mauhūrt
ikān kṣayāṁ prcchati. Unfortunately, Smk too has kṣaṇam.

* * *

Misra has little regard for the science of prosody. Let us see what he says on the fol-
lowing verse:

36
dhik tvāṁ re kalikāla yāhi vilayam [!] viparyastatā
hā kaṣṭham śrutiśālinām vyavaḥṭir mlecchocitā dṛṣyate/
ekā vāṁmayadevatā bhagavatī vikretum āṅiyate
niḥśaṅkārī aparaiḥ pariksāṇavidhau sarvāṅgam udghāṭyate//

xiii) the verse is ascribed to Bilhaṅa.

In anthologies there is often confusion in ascribing verses to Bilhaṅa or to Ralhaṅa[!] T
hus Śp. 913; 988, are ascribed to Ralhaṅa by most, but to Bilhaṅa by some MSS, (5) an-
d by Brhačchāṅgadharapaddhati.(6) [p. 80]

5: ZDMG 27, 1876, p.56

1960, pt. 3, p. 157 f. [p. 80]

The above verse is an aṅśaravyttam, called Śārdūlavikṛditam, where each quarter
has to contain 19 aṅśaras. Its definition is: sūryāśvair masajastatāḥ saguravaḥ Śārdūl
avikṛditam. In Misra's text as quoted above, in the first quarter two aṅśaras are missin-
g. Misra couldn't care less! He is niḥśāka, anyway. The missing letters maybe "keya-
m", between "vilayam" and "viparyastatā." This omission did not strike Misra at all! N
ot that Misra does not know that a metre can be spoiled. On p. 61, with reference to v
erse 13:84 Mayā kumāryāpi na suptam ekayā, he points out that Śp 3762 "omits me, w
hich spoils the metre."

I had conjectured "keyam" the moment I read the above verse for the first time and
noticed Misra's omission. Today (Jan 12, '78) I saw Sāktimuktāvalī. It does have keya-
m in its proper place! So Misra's performance is of a very low order.

We might add as a footnote: Smk has e[kaih] and gives ekā as a variant reading in t
he footnote!
Misra's Āḍambara:

39
nīrāgā mṛgalañcchane mukham api svaṁ nekṣate darpaṇe
trastā kokilakūjitād api giram nonmudrayatā atmānaḥ/ 
citram duḥsahadāyini[!] dhṛtaḍvesā'pi puṣpāyudhe 
mugdhā sā subhaga tvayi pratipadam premāḥikam puṣyati//

Smk. 44.16: nāyakasāygre dūtyuktiḥ; Bilhanasya. Srk. 536: dūtvacanavrajyā; Śrṅgārasya. Skm. 647: Śrṅgārapravāhā/Śrṅgārasya. Sp.3488: nāyakasāygre dūtyuktiḥ; kasyā pi.

While trying to understand Misra many a time we have felt so frustrated that our feelings turn into vācām agocaram.

Let us take, for example, the verse occuring as no. 39 on p. 81. We don’t know what is the source of Misra. Every editor (or critic) while noting the variant readings has a source as his ākara, while he notes the variations from it (his main source). Here we find variant readings noted from Smk, Srk, Skm, and Śp. Then the question arises where in the world does the verse occur exactly as it appears in Misra’s text? That is, what is Misra’s primary source?

Saduktikarnāṁṛtam has been divided into five sections, which the compiler has named as pravāha. Each pravāha in its turn has been divided into subsections named vīc ayah. On p. 70, under verse no. 5. Misra has noted a variant reading: Skm. 2367: uccāvacapravāhe samasya; kasyacit. So here we have uccāvaca as pravāha and samasya as vīci. On p. 91, lines 1-2: Skm 607: śrṅgārapravāhe virahiṁvivacanam; Silhanasya [1]

Following the same principle we would expect in verse 39 (p. 81) śrṅgārapravāhe udvegakathanam, the latter being the vīci or subsection. But Misra’s relevant statement stops with śrṅgārapravāhaḥ!

Let us resume our discussion. Misra gives:

Variants:
a) For nīrāgā: Srk.; Skm. sodvegā.

b) For citraṃ duḥ⁻: Smk. itthaṃ duḥ. 

c) For mugdhā sā subhagā [!] tvayi: Srk. bālā sā...; Śp.

sābālā subhagaṃ prati; for pratipadam premāḥ: Skm. pratimuḥuḥ premāḥ. 
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That the ascription to Bilhaṇa is correct, [] is proved by the verse occurring in Karṇaṣu. 2.29. Here we read:

b) khinnā kokilakūjitād api; (d) mugdhākṣṭ.

khinnā...-kūjitāt seems to be emended into trastā...-kūjitāt "afraid of". But "tormented on account of the crying..." is unobjectionable, [] cp. above verse 35c...śyenā[t] tu śyati."

The verse was overlooked by D.D. Kosambi (7) when discussing the age of Vidyākara (the compiler of Srk.), Introd. p. xxxiii. It shows his conclusions to be wrong. Also the statement, concerning the verses of Karṇaṣu., given by B.S. Miller, Caurap. p. 4 n 7 does not stand. [pp. 81-82]

7: Which is pardonable as the verse starts differently in Srk. (sodvegā mṛga-) and Karṇaṣu. (nīrāgā mṛga-).

Mark the word "pardonable." Otherwise Kosambi would have been hanged.

Note the omission of two letters in the third quarter! Skm. edn.(GOS) clearly has the word dāha after duhsaha and before dāyini. So, it is evident that Misra does not even consult the original. We don't know what is his source.

The above verse has been cited by Śobhākara as an example of pratyanākam. It is not traced by Devadhara (editor) to any poet. Identity of the nāyaka with smara is shown. Sūktimuktāvall clearly and specifically ascribes it to Bilhaṇa.

* * *

Let us examine one more incongruity of Misra:

purah sthitvā kimcid valitamukham ālokaya sakhe sakhdāḥ sthāsyanti dhruvam idam adṛṣṭāṁ tava dṛśah/ itas caṇicatkāñcīraṇitamukharāṁ saudhaśikharāṁ arākāyāṁ keyaṁ kavacayati candrena mahasā/

While reading it, I got the feeling that adṛṣ āś tava dṛśah does not make much sense! I thought we should change the reading to adṛṣ vā tava dṛśah! And lo, Misra has noted a variant reading. Śp. makes it adṛṣ vā! But, Misra, swayed by his own super-knowledge, rejects it on the ground that it is "hardly possible." But he does not tell us what sense does "his possible" make!

Furthermore, we believe the penultimate word in the 4th pāda should be cāndreṇa (of the moon) and not candreṇa. It is an adjective and qualifies mahasā.

We could go on and on. But we don't want to become too boring to our own readers.
Incidentally, this verse contains the word *cañcat*, unworthy in the eyes of Misra! We don't know why he did not recommend that it be discarded right away?

Here is one more poetic gem which might make Misra re-think as far as *cañcat* is concerned:

\[
\text{Mallimatalluşu vanántaresu vallyantare vallabhamāhvayantī.} \\
\text{Cañcadvipañcīkalanādabhaṅgī-sangītam aṅgīkurute sam bhṛṅgī.} \\
\text{(*Sāhityadarpaṇa*)}
\]

**Misra Writes for Himself**

At least he did not write for me, because I find it beyond my power of understanding. I am simply dazzled by the effulgence (*divyajyoti*) of his terrific writing. I feel lost.

Misra quotes:

\[
mukharamurajam paurastrībhir na lāsyam upāsyate \\
sarasamadhurstām nātyāgāre na kūjati vallakī/ \\
ahaha pahita[!]dvāram kasmād idaṃ paritaḥ puraṃ \\
[viratasurata] vyāpāratvāt prasuptam ivākhilam.
\]

Smk. 107-18 [sic]: *nagarīvarṇanapaddhatiḥ: Bilhaṇasya.*

d) For *viratasurata* - of the edition: *sukharatarata*- reading of the MSS.[?] is to be retained: "When the occupation is busy (*rata*) with the enjoyment (*rata* n.) of happiness" [?] [p. 86]

So according to Misra

\[
\text{vyāpāra} = \text{occupation} \\
rata = \text{busy [adj.?]} \\
rata = \text{enjoyment (n.)} \\
sukha = \text{happiness}
\]

We are reminded of a well-known *upadeśavacanam* once again: *jīvatkaver āśayo n a varṇantīyāḥ*. God alone knows-- of course Mr. Misra does not know--and he does not care either--what he wants to tell us here.

Ayam aparō'sya viśeṣaḥ (or, sakhi me, caturo bhartā) 
svayam api likhitam svayam na vācayati.

We don't know what Misra wants to mean by "occupation." How could "occupation" be busy with the "enjoyment of happiness!" Most of the time Misra speaks, we feel lost. We scratch our head and exert our brain to understand Mr. Misra. We fail miserably. We have to acquire his type of knowledge to understand him.

We know that this is *nagarī-varṇanapaḍḍhatiḥ*. We imagine this *nagarī* is śokākulā , distressed by grief; may be she is deserted. Otherwise, what is the significance of the exclamatory word *ahaha*? Why the gates are closed? Misra reads *pahitadvāram*. It
must be *pihitadvāram*. The whole may very well be a description of a city which is besieged, beleaguered. [Later on I found that Smk. has *pihita*. So Misra is wrong in this case too].

The above criticism was written some time ago. Today (Jan. 13, 1978) I saw the Smk. edn. Of course, the general heading under which this verse is cited is *Nagarivarṇ ana- paddhatiḥ*, but there is a sub-heading-- *udvasannagaram* under which this verse is cited. So my guess was right. My conjecture is *viratasakala*. But it is not any closer (orthographically or morphologically) to the reading of the MSS. *sukharatarata*. I suggested *sakala* as a substitute for *surata*; but that is the conjectured reading of the editor and not of the MSS.

Let it be stressed here that the *ākaragrantha* (archetype MS.) of the editor had an omission of six letters. Editor supplies substitutes from his own imagination. Four MSS. give the reading as *sukharatarata*. The editor rejects all the four! However, Misra knows better!

* * *

Here is another display of Misra's perfect performance:

54

yaḥ śrotāmṛtānirjharākavasatiṁ nirvyājam ārūḍhavān
yaḥ saṁjīvānamanāntitām [!] trinayanapluṣṭasya cetobhuvah/
vināvam masṛṇo dhvaniṣ catasṛṇām pātraṁ śrutāṁ abhūt
so'yāṁ kokilakāṇṭhaṇeuṇuvivaravyāpāritaḥ pañcamah/

Smk. 59.17: *Vasantavarṇanapaddhatiḥ: Bilhaṇasya.*

a) For -*vasatiṁ* read -*vasatir*?

b) For *mantritām* read *mantratām* ("lifegiving spell"). [p. 87]

Misra suggests "For *vasatiṁ* read *vasatir*". It is not acceptable. If śrotāmṛta...vasatiḥ and pañcamah dhvaniḥ are made coordinately with each other (i.e. if they are made *samāṇādhiḥkaraṇa*) then what will be the object (*karma*) of ārūḍhavān? We are afraid our readers would have become bitterly bored by our repeated demonstration of the bālacāpalam, bālacāpale, bālacāpalāni of Mahāpañḍita Mister Misramaharaja, a Ph.D. from Tuebingen, Germany.

* * *

Anthologies also differ on the authorship. Let us see the following:


Smerās santu sabhāsadaḥ karicamūdarpaṇaṃ pāṁḍreṇa ṣaṁaṃ ṣa jambukayuva yuddhāya baddhādaraḥ. Tatrāpi prathayanti tulyabalatām eke tayor uccakair
anye saṃśayaśaṃsinas tad apare bāḍhaṃ viparyāsinaḥ.

[Bhīmapaṇḍitasya]

The above verse has been attributed to Bhīmapaṇḍita by the compiler of Sūktimuktā valī. However, Bhand. Rep. ascribes it to Bilhaṇa. Misra has cited many verses which are ascribed anonymously to a poet, or to some poet other than Bilhaṇa by the compiler of an anthology. However, in such cases Misra cites Bhand. Rep. as the authority and ascribes it to Bilhaṇa. But he has overlooked this verse. Therefore, we cannot determine whether he studied the anthologies in original or copied the information from a secondary source!

It is to be noted in this connection that the next verse--"Yenānargala", 22:8, Misra's no. 58--is ascribed to Bherībhāṅkāra by Jalhaṇa. Yet on the basis of Bhand. Rep. it is ascribed by Misra to Bilhaṇa. And the subsequent verse--Grāmāṇām upaśalyasīmanī, 22:9, Misra's no. 23--is ascribed to Ralhaṇa by Jalhaṇa. But the editor ascribes it to Bilhaṇa on the basis of another MS.

Let it be noted here that all the three verses cited in succession are ascribed by the compiler to a poet other than Bilhaṇa, but by another source to Bilhaṇa.

* * * *

Misra's One More "Nonsensical" Reading:

59
re mātaṇga madāmbuḍambaratayā rolambarolam vahan
vanyānām avalambanaṁ vanam idaṁ bhaṅkum yad utkaṇṭhase/
dṛṣṭaḥ [!] tat kim aho mahonnatadharādhaureyadhātrīdhara-
prasthaprasthitameghayūthamathanotkaṇṭhi na kaṇṭhīravahḥ/

--Śp. 915: simhānyoktayah; Bilhaṇasya.

Misra commands:

a) Instead of nonsensical [!] rolambarolam : read rolambakholam "[carrying] a helmet" (the closed "helmet" prevents the elephant [sic] from looking properly).
   ro for kho is a simple mistake. [pp. 88-89]

   We don't know if Misra ever read the great poet Bhāravi, who taught us centuries ago:

   Sahasā vidadhīta na kriyām avivekaḥ param āpadām padam.

   Misra is very hasty. He jumps immediately and condemns the poet. He does not want to consult any ākaraṅgrantha. He is quick in suggesting an emendation. He pronounces the judgement right away. We don't know what he means by "simple mistake." We have never heard of a closed helmet worn by an elephant that prevents him from looking properly! He calls rolam "nonsensical". We think Misra should have been more
e careful. It is not proper to condemn Bilhana in this manner. The word conveys a perfect meaning. Misra suggests kholam which is typical of his numerous incongruities.

Misra recommends that we discard rolambarolam vahan and read rolambakholam vahan, i.e. throw away a priceless real ruby and pick up a piece of red glass! [Misra has plenty of "glass." See p. 88, line 25]. It is with reference to such thoughtless critics that a great poet sang long ago:

Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanam śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha!

Maybe Misra has never come across the figure of speech called yamaka, a beautiful example of which is presented by Candrāloka of Jayadeva:

Āvṛttavaṇṇastabakam stavakandāṅkuraṃ kaveḥ.
Yamakaṃ prathamā dhurya-mādhuryavacacasso viduḥ.

Here is one more example from the Vikramāṅkadevacarita itself:

Vipakṣavīrāḍhubatakaḥīḥārī Hārīta ityādipumān sa yatra.
Mānnavanāmā ca babhūva mānī mānnavayaṃ yaḥ kṛtvān ariṇām. [1:58]

"Rolambakholam" will ruin the yamaka alakāra. It would have been much better if Misra had contained his erudition itself in a khola (slip cover).

The above discussion does not answer the main question: After all what does the word "rola" mean? Well, Abhidhānarājendra (Prākṛta-Māgadhī-Saṃskṛta-sabdakośa) of Vijayarājendrasūrīvara (Ratlam, 1923). v. 6, p. 580, states: rola pu. śabde kalahe rave ca. Let it be noted that the next word rolamba is designated as deśī. So we don't have to throw away rolam and ruin the poetic beauty.

We might add here that Misra was not unaware of the Abhidhānarājendra. See his p. 31, n. 12. Our readers may recollect the following saduktis:

Locanābhyāṃ vihīnasya darpaṇaḥ kim kariṣyati, and
Na hi kastūrikāmodaḥ śapathena vibhāvyate, and
Na hyeṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati.

Misra's One More Attempt to Annoy His Readers:

vrthā gāthāḥ[ḥ]ślokair alam alam alakāṃ mama rujaṃ
ekadācid dhūṛto'yaṃ kavivacanam ityākalayati/
idaṃ pārśve tasya praḥiṇu sakhi lagnājanalavasravadbāṣpṭiḍaṛgathitalipi tāṭankayugalam//

Smk. 41.6: dūtīpraṇapaddhatiḥ; Bilhanasya.
Skm. 607: śṛṅgārapravāhe virahiniḥvacanam; Silhanasy[a].

Variants:

a) Editions write gāthāślokaṁ, which is hardly correct. cp. p. 1 on 1.74a.

b) For ayam: Skm. asau.

d) For tā añka- : tādañka-, which is the orthography of Bühler's Vcar. MS.: 1.102; 8.88 . [pp. 90-91]

Misra's above text reads alākam. [We don't know what it means] Sūktimuktāvalī and Saduktikarnāṁrta both have alīkāṁ, which is correct by itself since it means mithyā, but we don't know how will it fit in the present context.

Once again Misra proves the validity of the following saying:

............... kuryād vā rāsabhadvanīm.
Yena kena prakāreṇa prasiddhāḥ puruṣo bhavet.

Misra probably does not know what he is talking about! He says: "Editions write gāt hāślokaṁ which is hardly correct. Cp. p. 1 on 1:74a." So Misra has inserted a visarga (:) in between gāthā and ślokaṁ, thus, probably converting gāthā into a nominative plural (noun), prathamā bahuvacanam--kartāpadam. We don't know. However, gāthāśloka is a compound word meaning a verse in gāthā. For example:

sangrathya kaścit katicid padāni gāthākavitvaµ kathayāmbabhūva. [Vik. 9:86]

Gāthā means a song. It also means a Prākṛta dialect. Furthermore, it stands for the name of the Āryā metre.

The poet says that the virahini nāyikā does not want to compose a love lament in poetic form and in Prākṛta dialect lest it is mistaken, by the cunning nāyaka, for kavivaca nam-- exaggerated poetic flights of imagination! So she wants to send her ear-rings which have plentiful writings made by her aṇjana mixed with flowing warm tears! There is enough message of sufferings carved on those ear-rings of the beloved lady.

We feel mentally tormented when Misra says "which is hardly correct." Has he read Abhijñānaśākuntalam or any other poetic composition where this kind of viraha-sande śa-lekhana-presaṇa is described? Probably not.
CHAPTER V

Conclusions

The preceding presentation represents our honest and sincere criticism of Misra's work as presented in his Studies on Bilhana and his Vikramāṅkadevacarita. Incidentally it also deals with certain half-baked and fully naked scholars who preceded Misra and offered him a ground to play his pranks! Our delineation of Misra follows the maxim of Sthālipulāka—offers merely specimens. Our criticism was not intended to be exhaustive by any means. It would have merely increased the bulk of the present study unnecessarily. It would have caused continuous pain and suffering for longer periods to our readers.

We don't know what Misra's central focus—primary objective—was in writing what we read in his book. In our view he emerges as a mixture of pseudo-linguist and a misguided critic, a true saṅkara—neither this nor that. He is a mixed breed. Even his name corroborates this fact! He is miśra, i.e. mixed, not pure, a saṅkara. And the Bhagavadgītā has sung: Saṅkarō narakāyaiva. Since we don't profess to be the former (linguist), we have tried to cover only the literary aspect of his work. The other aspect is left for some other linguist-grammarian to discuss.

Sri Nagaraja Rao of Mysore had agreed to collaborate with me in this work. His knowledge of Sanskrit grammar was excellent. He has given some comments here and there. But he could not complete his assignment. I only wish some other scholar in future takes up this challenge and silences Mr. Misra as far as the grammar is concerned.

Misra's performance reminds us:

Guror giraḥ pañca dinānyadhītya vedantaśāstrāṇi dinatrayaṁ ca. 
Amī samāghrāya ca tarkavādān samāgatāḥ kukkuṭa-MIŚRA-pādāḥ.

In his first chapter Misra presents "Specimens of Textual Difficulties." It is by no means an exhaustive study. He merely presents some specimens, by his own confession. The reader finishes the chapter with the impression that the poem (Vik.) is full of difficulties. This is a great injustice to the poet. We have already observed time and again: Na hyeṣa sthānor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati. Also, Locanāḥbhāṃ vihitīn asya darpaṇāḥ kim kariṣyati. Misra's "difficulties" are mostly the creation of his own mind. They simply betray his own inherent lack of knowledge.

In chapter 2, Misra points out "Some Lexicographical Points of Interest." They do not seem to be of any "interest" to us at all! They merely constitute Misra's childish attempts to parade his pedantry. They don't lead us toward any better appreciation of the poetic muse of Bilhana. They don't add any glory to Bilhana's vyutpatti or vicchitti.

Rest of Misra's work consists of a kind of compilation. There is hardly any originality of ideas. There is hardly any camatkāra. All along we have been wondering what i
s, after all, Misra’s primary focus. In Hindi we have a beautiful saying: Isaktí ḫm a usak ā roṛā; Bhánumatí ne kunabá joṛā. Misra has titled his work as Studies on Bilhaṇa and his Vikramāṇkadevacarita. If we assume that the study concerns primarily with one specific work of Bilhaṇa, then Chapter 4, "Verses Ascribed to Bilhaṇa in Anthologies" is far removed from the central theme of the study. Of course, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the contents of this chapter, but then the title of the study would be more appropriately something like "Studies on Bilhaṇa and his Works".

Here is a comparative statement showing the relative size of all of Misra’s chapters in terms of the total number of pages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Total No. of Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of references</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus it is seen that Chap. 4 (Verses Ascribed to Bilhaṇa in Anthologies) is the bulkiest. Let us reiterate: there is nothing basically wrong, but then it is not directly related to the specific work—Vikramāṇkadevacarita. Consequently, the title of the work turns out to be misleading! A student of Vikramāṇkadevacarita will not find much of interest in this work. Yes, of Bilhaṇa, he will have something. A greater part of this "Studies" is more or less a reproduction of the standard published anthologies. Misra makes hardly any contribution of his own. This is not a work of research.

What is research? Research is the extension of the boundary of the field of knowledge. It represents discovery of unknown facts or a new interpretation of existing known facts. Research is not mere compilation. A florist cannot be equated with a floriculturist.

I would like to record here for further discussion one more idea as the Postscript to the work. Every time I read the expressions of Misra like ed. ter. or ed. sec. [the "sigla" of Misra!] I wondered why he totally disregarded the ed. of Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍitapravara Rāmāvatāra Śarmā. Not that he does not accept its existence. He does accept it and its readings as well. It is an edition definitely and must be reckoned as such. Truly speaking it is the second edition; while Nagar’s is the third and that of Bharadwaj is the fourth! On p. 111 Misra says:

This edition [mark Misra’s designation], which is full of inaccuracies, seems to have been associated by someone[?] with the great name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍita Rāmāvatāra Šarmā.

Misra does not comprehend the sarcasm contained in my statement to the effect that Šarmā did not edit the work. Šarmā did and blundered.

So Misra accepts the existence of R. Appropriately enough, Misra numbers R as 5 and puts it between the two editions of Bühler and Nagar, which are numbered 4 and 6 respectively. Nevertheless to call Bühler’s ed. as No. 1 and that of Nagar as No. 2 is merely gajanimilikā or sato’pyapāpaḥ.
APPENDIX I

On Caritacandrikā

Dr. H.D. Velankar, the first reviewer of N, had this to say with regard to Caritacandrikā as early as 1945:

At the end of the text of the poem, the editor has given a brief explanation of difficult words in the poem, giving it the name Carita-candrikā. This Candrikā, we are told, includes the very brief gloss written in the margin of the old Jesalmir manuscript.

Another reviewer noted the true nature of Caritacandrikā in 1947. He said:

Besides a critical Introduction and a brief though nonetheless useful glossary explaining important and difficult words and incorporating most of the notes in the scribes' own hand on the ancient Jaselmere manuscript...

These reviewers had no difficulty at all. Yet Bh, for the reasons best known to him, assumes that the Caritacandrikā is an "ancient" commentary! He says:

Srī Nāgaramahodayair Jaisalmerarābhajñāna-kośabhāṇḍārasthad hastalikhitāt pust akāt mahatā śramaṇa tippanīsamgrahām kṛtvā Caritacandrikānāmnā [!] sā pariśiṣṭarū peṇa svapustake samghītā, kenāpī kavirahasyakusālēnaiva dhīmataiśā gumphitetat ra nāsti sandeheśāvasarah. Īsvāyā 1286 varṣato'pi prācīne'smin hastalikhite pustak e tippanyeśā svaprācīnātvām prakatayatyeva. Kutrācit "asya śabdāyārthāgam [!] na jāyate" iti spaṣṭam likhitvā tippanīktē vidūṣā [!] nirahaṅkāraṁ svapāṇḍityaṁ paricā yītam. Guṇino nā durāgraḥaṁ iti svagunītvam [!] api prakāṣitam. Tiṅkāyā abhāve'rthāva bodhaviṣaye tippaniyeśā baḥuśu sthaleśu pāṭhakānāṁ atīvopakārinīti niścapracam. (V. 1, Kīṅcit Prāstāvikam, p. 2)

There are 208 pages in the text of the Vikramāṅkadevacarita in Nagar's edition. According to the colophon of J, the pūrṇagranthasaṅkhya (or ślokasaṅkhya) of the Carita as presented in J is 2545. This number multiplied by 8 x 4 will be 81,440 aṅkāras. This is the volume, or size, or extent of the Carita text. Now the Caritacandrikā as presented in N extends to 117 pages. It is printed in much smaller type as compared to the text. Whereas the text has much wider margins and lots of space in between the lines, the composition and printing lay-out of the Candrikā is very solid. There are 27 lines in a full page of Candrikā, each line containing approximately 30 characters. Thus the total granthasaṅkhya of the Caritacandrikā would be approximately 2962, i.e. 417 ślokaś more than the text! All these facts are clearly visible to the person who is not wearing blinding folds of pride and prejudice.

We are not sure if Bh knows what is meant by marginal gloss-- whether he has ever seen even a single manuscript, in his entire life, with marginal notes! Bühler has described the J MS. in his Introduction (Section IV, pp. 44-45). Maybe Bh did not read it. Even if he read it, maybe, he did not understand the meaning of the word "annotated.
"However, N has described the MS. and its gloss once again in his Prastāvanā, pp. 1-2. N says:

16x2" अकारत्मकृत्य 15ै तालापत्रेशत्यूज्वलमासिलिक्ष्के स्म पुस्तके पत्रसाक्ष्या अन्नकृष्टिन्यासः स्वार्णमाय्या मस्यां लिखिता ओसाद...." "=" इद्र्शचन्दनवायनांतरावस्ति हैपितार सांक्षीप्तभय सांगतास्वर्थभय पत्रानाम प्राण्तचाचुत्ये'पि सुष्क्माक्षारार्थ लिखिता ही (stress added).

Now Bh ought to have realized that what is written on the margins cannot be bigger, larger or longer than the main text! Yet he took the entire Caritacandrikā to be an ancient commentary, contemporary with the writing of the MS. I am not sure if he read my Prastutasaṃskara-vaśayam...viṣṇumasthalārthāvabhodhikā in Caritacandrikā (pp. 7-8) wherein having referred to the J gloss, I have described the nature and content of the Caritacandrikā in the clearest possible terms. Here are my words:

...antarbhāvita-taṭṭippanākā saisā 'Candrikā' tanīyasyapi granthārtham ujjvalayiṣyatī ti viśvasimāh.

We are not sure if Bh understood the meaning of the compound word-- "antarbhāvit a-taṭṭippanākā," since his knowledge of Sanskrit is extremely limited when it comes to a point which he does not want to understand! If he did not, why did he not consult one of the myriads of specialists who are alleged to have assisted and helped him in this entire work?

Be that as it may. Let us assume that it was an honest [?] error of judgment on the part of Bh. But as soon as I saw his Vol. 1 (published in 1958 ) I protested to him. I wrote to him in the clearest possible language that it was MY work. Probably he did not get my letter, or threw it away in the waste-paper basket even without reading. He did not like my writing to begin with anyway! In any case, he did not correct himself.

All the circumstances stated above were external grounds. Now let us give the subject an internal examination. Bh ought to have considered the following facts if he were a scholar in the least sense of the term-- if he possessed even an iota of true scholar ship in him.

The Caritacandrikā begins on page 209. The top of the page displays in bold, large, ornamental letters the following words: Atha Caritacandrikā. We don't believe a āṭṭippanāī written on patrāṇāṃ prāntacatus'ye'pi will have a beginning like this! But Bh was his own master. Why should he pay any attention to such trifling matters! Once he had decided that two plus two make five, no power on earth could change his mind.

Line 9 of the very first page says: (Hi. Kasauñ). At the bottom of that very first page there is a footnote, related to the above word, which reads: Hi.= Hindībhāṣāyām, i.e. any artha preceded by a letter Hi, is a Hindi word. Then, according to this great research scholar (Bh) Hindi was so well-developed even before 1286 A.D., the date on which the J MS. was mūlyaḥ punargṛhitā, i.e. re-acquired by paying the price! So this word antedates 1286 A.D. Note Hindi linguists!
Line 14 reads: *Rādhā Viṣṇubhāryā*. The footnote tells us:

\[ idṛśacihnadvayāntarvartinī ippaṇī Jaisalmeraganthasthetyavagantavyam. \]

Maybe Bh did not read this too. Or would it be correct to conclude that even if he read it, his knowledge of Sanskrit was so limited indeed that he did not comprehend the true meaning! Let it be stressed here that there are 19 lines in the first page (a large portion at the top having been taken by the heading) each line containing approximately 30 letters. However, in the entire page only 6 letters have been enclosed within ‘*‘.

On the next page (210) we read: 'Kukkuravadra’ iti Vyākhyaśudhā (Bhānujīdīkṣitakṛtāmaraīkā). So Bhānujīdīkṣita must have flourished even before 1286 A.D.! Note the historiographers of Sanskrit literature, especially those who want to study or discuss Amarakośa!

On page 214 we read: Saraharī iti khyātah. So this word too proves quite old.

On page 219 we read: * "Kalyāṇaka akāṃ nagaram iti pra* (pra. = prasiddham?).” So the ancient writer of the gloss himself wrote pra and since he himself was not sure about its meaning, he raised a question too (pra = prasiddham!)! It must be stated once again here that there are two stars which precede and succeed the specific phrase. We can simply admire the depth and breadth of the knowledge-ocean (jñānāmahāsāgara) of Bh our "Vidyāvāgīśa"! He did not even think about these baffling points. To him they were not baffling at all.

On page 220 we read: Kāṣucana pratiṣu 'yadvaśmasu' iti pramādān mudritaṃ śodha nīyam. So there was a printing press in India even before 1286 A.D.! The Vikramāṇka devacaritam was printed and published even before that date! This is an important matter to be noted by the historiographers of printing in India!

On page 222 there is a Hindi word chānanā! Naturally this word too is older than 1286 A.D.

The bottom line of page 223 reads: upāṃṣu śanaiḥ *ekānte*. Did Bh think of the relationship of these two expressions appearing in juxtaposition?

On page 224 we have two more words of Hindi--āratī and turahī. Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā of Vārāṇasī should note these facts.

On page 237 we read: *cauryakeliḥ parapuruṣaparanārikriyā*. But then the Carita candrikā raises a question "(-krīḍā?).” Would it be correct to conclude then that the same writer wrote kriyā and then asked himself whether it should read krīḍā?

There are Hindi words on almost every page, sometimes one page containing more than one.
On page 247 Caritacandrikā says: Dolāsu dolāsu iti Jalhaṇa-Śāṅgadhara-saṃgrhit aḥ pā hāḥ. Historiographers of Sanskrit literature note this fact which makes Jalhaṇa and Śāṅgadhara posterior to the date 1286 A.D.

On page 248 we read:

Akuṣaṇahetoḥ aṅgīkṛtasāmrājyabhārasya madhor anucaratvān mārutasya. 'Akuṣaṇa' padasyārtho nāvagamyaṭe. 'Akuṣobha' iti pāṭhe pratipanne-- akuṣobho gajābandhanastā mbo gajābandhanabhūmir vetyarthāḥ saṅgataḥ svaṭī. 11 sarge 82 śloko'pi draṣṭavya ḫ.

What this "ancient" commentator could not understand was easily understood and explained by Bh in a split second! How? Because he had the help of a great grammarian which this poor Caritacandrikākāra lacked.

It is interesting to watch how the term "akuṣaṇa" has been interpreted by Bh, of course, with the help of a great grammarian, whose debt he acknowledges in the following words:

P.S.: On Jan. 8, 1983, while making the fair copy of the above, a thought comes to my mind that to the writer of J gloss, the word 'akuṣaṇa' (or whatever it might be) was so ga tārtha that he did not think it needed any explanation! Today the second part of my conjecture stated above seems ridiculous!

Śrī Paṇ. Rājanārāyaṇa Śarmāṇo Hindūviśvavidyālayīya- Śaṃskṛtamahāvidyā layavyākaraṇavihāradhāyakṣā dhanyavādaḥ abhinandyante, yais sahārṣaṁ sarva daiva kaṭhinā prayuktaśabdasiddhau svānupamaśabdaśāstra- jñānena śabdasidd him saṃśādhyā mahān upakāraḥ kṛtah. (Kīṅcit Prāstāvikam. v.1, p.3)

Bilhaṇa used neither ka hina nor aprayukta śabdas! It is insult added to injury to blame e Bilhaṇa for such imaginary sins! His rīti is Vaidarbhī and his guṇa is prasāda. Na hy eṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na pāṣyati.

It is amusing to see how this "ka hina" and "apprayukta" śabda (akuṣaṇa) has been blessed with śabdasiddhi (derivation and explanation) by the great grammarian-friend of Bh:

ākuṣaṇaṃ viśrāmaḥ satataparāśrameṇa
samāgataklāntirūpañyūnatāyā
dūrīkaraṇārtham viśrāntīr ityarthaḥ.

The above explanation appears in the commentary Ramā. The footnote reads:

Saṃjñāsu dhāturūpañ pratyayāś ca tataḥ pare.
Kāryād vidyād anu[!]bandham etac chāstraṃ uṇādiṣu.

Ṭuṅku gatau - ādādikāddhātor bhāve naḥ pratyaye bāhulakād dirghe naṁsaṁśe 'akuṣaṇa' śabdo niśpannāḥ. Na kṣaṇaṃ aṃ kṣaṇaṃ gatyavarodho viśrāma ityarthaḥ.
Both this great Vaiyākaraṇa-śiromaṇi (Rājanārāyaṇa) and Sāhitya- dhurandhara "Vidyāvägīśa" Bh have overlooked one of the most significant words-- *mattasya*! Bilhana did not say "śrāntasya". Craitadvirada was not hauling huge logs of wood that he w ould have been horribly exhausted and needed viśrāma and quite so often. See below the discussion of the immortal words "pade pade". I had annotated the above passage (in Bh's ed.) with the following words:

Ko'pi vaiyākaraṇakesarvā svapratibhāṃ prādarāyaṃ!
Tāvan maunam evāvalambanīyam yāvan na yathārthapāṭhaprāptiḥ.

The late Muni Śrī Puṇyavijayajī Mahārāja had given me an appropriate meaning. But I don't recall it now! According to him the word was correct. Could this word mean *m adanivāraṇa*, to bring back to sobriety?

This topic has been discussed earlier.

Āstāṃ tāvat, prakṛtam anusarāmaḥ.

On page 248 (of Caritacandrikā) a sadukti is cited by N:

Mallikāmukule caṇḍī! bhāti guñjan madhuvrataḥ.
Prayāṇe pañcatabāṇasya śaṅkham āpūrayannīva.

So the author of the above must have flourished earlier than 1286 A.D. Let us find o ut who the author is. In any case, the assumed *ippañikāra* or *ippañilekhaka* was almo st a magician. He could write all these long verses on the margins! We wonder again and again if Bh has ever seen even one "marginal gloss." (See his letter to me where he brags about having seen many priceless MSS.)

And, by the way, the great commentator Bh copied the above verse as a footnote o n p. 439 of his vol. 1. According to Bh. this Caritacandrikākāra must have been a *kavi rahasyakusala dhīmāṇ* (p. 2 of his Kiñcit Prāstāvikam. Vol. 1). This Caritacandrikākāra cited the above verse on p. 248 with reference to Lagnadvirephadhvanipūryamāṇam. .. 7:41. Bh renders a great service to the world of scholarship by citing it, but he introd uces it with the following words: "Uktam Sāhityadarpaṇa." We don't know how would it help! Still we don't know the name of the poet who composed this beautiful couplet.

On page 265 we read:-- Gopācalaḥ *guyālaeru* (sāmpratam Gvāliyara ityucyate). Did Bh stop to think what function this word *guyālaeru*, enclosed within two asterisk s, was performing here! What did it represent!! And what is the significance of the wo rd "sāmpratam"? When? Before 1286 A.D.?

We have three words-- gopācalah, guyālaeru, and gvāliyara! Is there any historical, chronological, or linguistic progression? Do they belong to the same age, same langu age, same stratum? Bh, why did you pretend to know everything when you actually d id not know? Your "great" Caritacandrikākāra accepted his limitations, a fact which y
ou have noted yourself. Why did you not? Didn’t you know that \( Na \ hi \ sarvāḥ \ sarvam \ j \ ānāti!? \)

It is fantastically funny to read Bh’s commentary here. He says: Gopānām dhenuṅā lakānām acalāḥ parvato Govardhanākhyāḥ! So "Govardhana mountain" was a kingd om and the king described in verse 9:109 of the Carita was its lord!

On page 301, last line, we read: \( Etadupādhinā’nena chalena (etaddhetujanyenādhir anena?) \) Did Bh understand what is cited above? The ṭiṃpiṅkāra explains certain words. Yet he is not sure. So he asks a question. I believe Bh. can easily answer! What is \( s \ adhirāṇena \)? Pt. Bharadvajaji! This is a printing mistake, for \( avadhīrāṇena! \) (Detecte d only on Dec. 24, 1982)!

The writing of Bh is in many a place \( atyanta-hāsyāspada, \) to say the least. Bilhaṇa says:

\[
\text{Tat paryantasthitagunanikāmaṇḍapam yatra dhatte dhāma vyomāṅgaṇatilakatām Kṣemagaurīśvarasya.}
\]

\( \text{Caritacandrikā explains [p. 314]: Kṣemagaurīśvarasya dhāma Kāśmīra-nṛpati-Kṣem agupta-nirmāpitaṃ Śivamandiram. These words of NAGAR, repeat NAGAR, in Candr ikā are followed by *Khemesaradeu*. Let it be stressed here with all the force at our c ommand that this expression 'khemesaradeu' appears within two asterisks. So these wo rds are directly borrowed from the J gloss.} \)

But Bh wanted to display his brilliant scholarship. So he adds to the knowledge [?] of his readers: \( \text{Khemesaradeu iti Kāśmīrabhāṣāyāṃ prasiddhe!} \) Note the scholars of Ka shmiri language!! Here is a great Pandit from Kashi who is giving you a new word! What a great pity!

We really wonder whether Bh possessed enough brain power to discern the numero us incongruities we have been pointing out time and again. Any sensible person would have stopped to think if he was following a correct path in sticking to a false belief that \( \text{Caritacandrikā was an ANCIENT commentary!} \) Or, would it be correct to assume th at he knew the truth in his heart of hearts, yet he continued to deceive himself so that he could steal from the Candrikā upto the very end? This is exactly what he did. The re levent portion from the Candrikā follows:

\[
\]

And here is an exact reproduction of the same passage from the great commentary called Ramā of Panditammanya Viśvanātha Sāstrī Bhāradvāja [what a deceitful act of stealing]:
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Yatra Pravarapure paryante prãntabhãge sthitu guãnikãyã nãtyasya maãḍapo yatra tat Kãśemagaurãsvarama tat prasiddham dhãma grãham Kãśmîriprãnti-Kãsemagupta-nirmpãtim Sivamandiram vyomãnganaãyã"kãsasya tilakatãm bhûsaãnttvãm dhatte. Yatra Sivamandire (Khemesaradeu iti Kãśmîrabhãsãyãm prasiddhe) rãmãh aãganãh nãtyaprãyo gne nãtakabhãnaya-kriyãyãm rãmãnukarãnavãdhdhau ramaãnãbhnayavãyp äre rãmacandrabhãnayavãypãre[!] vã yogasthãnãm api yoginãm siddhãnãm api gãtra ñ vapuã "gãtram vapuã saãmanãnãm sãrîram varãsma vigrahãhu" ityamaraã. Sapulaka ñ saãromaãçcam ãsãtrayantã janayantã.

No further comments are necessary. Stealing is an art! It is not at all a sin unless a nd until detected.

The greatest service that Bh has rendered here relates to Khemesaradeu. This is his most outstanding contribution. Bilhaãña hailed from Kashmir. So the specific word must be an integral part of the Kashmiri language! Can anybody doubt this fact, especially when it is uttered by such a learned authority as Panditamãnã Bharadvaja, only some of whose astonishing qualifications are displayed on the title page of his immortal wor k and at the head of the letter he wrote to me.

We are not sure if Bh had seen the descriptions of J gloss anywhere and, if so, if he remembered it! Let it be recalled that the J MS. was seen by Bãhler (and by Nagar to o) in Jaisalmer. It belongs to the Bãhajjãnakoshã Bhaãndãra of the Oswal Jains, prese rved under the great temple of Pãrãsnã ã (Pãrãsvanãtha) in the fort of Jaisalmer.

With regard to this J gloss Bãhler says: "The glosses are in a mixture of ancient Guj arati and Marvadi, such as is used by the Yatis down to the present day." Bãhler also t ells us that the letters of the MS. (including the gloss are ancient Jain Devanagari. [I nrod. p. 45]

And here is what Nagar said about the language and other aspects of the J gloss:


May be Bh did not have access to B ed.

The above was written long long ago. Today (10 March 1990) while computerizing my own writing, I recalled that I had seen the Bãhler's edition in the same Banaras Hindu University (Library) which was the Karmabhûmi of this scholar-thief. He could have s een it if he wanted. But why should he have wanted? He knew everything. He was s arvajñacakraavartã.

But he has extensively used N ed. He has profusely copied from N's Caritacandrikã. He should have seen many such words. What did he think of those?
It will be quite appropriate to cite certain words here from this J gloss that may throw further light on the matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gāmduyaum</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choru</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavādā</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golīyā 'dhaṇuḥi' abhyāsu</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>davādī</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jētālu viśeṣu</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paḍihatha</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darau</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kīsaum achaḥ</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ānvaliyau</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kasaumeku</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choṭi churi</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thahiyāinu</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thalī</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guyālaeru</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darau</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghāṭu (followed by avayava)</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pālataum</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pāṭau</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vikhariyaum</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khāmpaṇu</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garaḍhaum</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sejāhala</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dehurāsaru</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yogēśvaru</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teravaum</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koḷā</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khola</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caukapuriyā</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khemesaradeu</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahīṭhānāmāhi</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praharahāthi</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāhaliyau karnaṭu</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe Bh would like us to believe that all these words belong to the Kasmiri language! Bh has also stated elsewhere _tad- bhāṣāyām_. What an innocent statement! He is cunningly equivocal. _Naro vā kuṇjaro vā_. He wanted to save his own skin too. Bh copied so extensively from _Caritacandrikā_, yet we don't know if he paid any attention to the words cited above.

A Note on the Starring in the _Caritacandrikā_

N has stated: "_Antarbhāvitata ippantkā saīṣā Candrikā..._"
Caritacandrikā contains many explanatory words which are direct borrowings from J gloss. So the featuring of certain J gloss words within two asterisks was intended to indicate their being definitely borrowed. Certain meanings occurring in J gloss had to be emphasized like "Rādhā Viṣṇubhāryā (1:5)" and "Rādhā Kṛṣṇabhāryā (18:87)". Many words occurring in J gloss were not intelligible to me also because they were illegible. So there was a specific motive in starring. It was to show that they were definitely not my words. I have found subsequently that there are many words (meanings or interpretations) which are part of J gloss. Yet they are not starred. So this may be regarded as a flaw. Yet it is not. I did not think that the words which are found so easily in the dictionaries and presented no conflict had to be starred simply because they occurred in J gloss! The criterion was how uncommon or significant was a word of J gloss that warranted starring.

Here is a passage that clearly demonstrates—if one more demonstration were needed—how ill-equipped Bh was to interpret a divine poem like Bilhaṇa’s Vikramāṇkadevaca rita. On p. 314 Caritacandrikā says:


Even the above passage did not remove the darkness pervading the mind of Bh. A man possessing a sound mind in a sound body would have realized that there is something strange in the above passage: that there are two writers involved. First we see that the expression "Kāṣṭhīladvijavasatayā" is explained in a certain way. Then the compound word "jātiviśeṣaḥ" is given. It is preceded and followed as well by a *. Then we find the following words: Vastutastu... In other words, "Kāṣṭhīla" is not the name of a specific jāti [of the Brāhmaṇas] but it is the name of a locality (a residential area, a sub-division, what we may call in Hindi "Mohallā.") If we assume that the entire Caritacandrikā was composed by one and the same person, who flourished in ancient India, then the same person would have to be accepted as contradicting himself!

The conclusion is irresistible that Bh did not have enough brain power (or did not use whatever he possessed) to grasp what is presented above. In spite of vastutas tu... etc., he maintains:

Tāḥ Kāṣṭhīladvijānām Kāṣṭhīla iti nāmadheyabrāhmaṇānāṁ vasatayāḥ nivāsabhū mayaḥ.

This is called durāgrahaḥ. What Bilhaṇa means and what the fact is--Kāṣṭhīlā-dvijav asatayāḥ, and not Kāṣṭhīladvijav-vasatayāḥ! Bh seems to have forgotten his own dictum: Guṇino na durāgrahaḥ.

Let us resume our main theme. In 18:44.1 there is a samastapada--adhīṣṭhāna-madh ye. Caritacandrikā explains: Vitastāpulinavarṭini pradeśaviśeṣe, and then adds within two asterisks: *aḥi hānamāḥi*. The great commentator Pt. Bharadvaja displays his extraordinary erudition and says: "adhīṣ hānamadhye Vitastāpulinavarṭini pradeśaviśeṣ e [exact copy of Caritacandrikā!] ("Aḥi hānamāḥi" iti tadbhāṣāyāṁ)." We don't understand what he means by "tad"! [Maybe he thinks that there is a language called "tadb
hāṣa!" Cf. Nagar's words: *Tadbhāṣāgaṇeṣaṇāyām sādhanam syāditi manyāmahe.* But the interesting point is that he encloses all the six letters *(ahī hānamāhi)* in " " quotation marks, i.e. inverted double commas! He does not stop to think that "ahī hāna" is *adhi ś hāna* and māhi (old Gujarati) is *in* i.e. madhye!

The Hindi commentator is still a greater authority. He is wise. He is wiser. He is the wisest. He excels everyone else in this art of interpretation. He goes beyond! He translates: Ahīḥhānaṃāhī nāmaka sthānaṃ mem. The short "i" of Sanskrit comm. in "māh i" becomes long in Hindi comm.! Is it possible for us to accept the contention that Hindi and Sanskrit are from one and the same pen? It will be foolish even to think. Kahatā bhī dīvānā, sunatā bhī dīvānā (Insane speaking and insane listening.)

There was one more lamp which might have lighted the dark corner of Bh’s mind and made him aware of the reality that there are certain words which might have come from another pen in *Caritacandrika*. On page 321 we read:

Chāyayā *dhūmena citrāṃ vicchāy am jāyata iti bhāvah,*Vastutastu svapada- bhraṃśabhayāt Śakrasya vaivānasyam.

Certain words here are preceded and followed by asterisks! They make a statement. The subsequent words reject it. We don't know if Bh knows what is the significance of a statement if it is introduced with an expression like "vastutastu". See also: Vastutastu Vitastāvāmataṭasthaḥ pradeśaviśeṣaḥ-- discussed earlier.

Bh blindly copies both the statements. His exact words are: Dhūmena citrāṃ vicchāy am jāyate. Vastutastu svapada-bhraṃśa-bhayād Indrasya vaivānasyamiti bhāvah.

The question is: Why does he give the first statement if he has to contradict the same by the subsequent statement? We don't know what he took the two asterisks for!

We are not sure if he had ever read the Amara: tvantāthādi na pūrvaḥbhāk. *Vastutastu* contradicts the previous statement. It means "but in reality." We fail to understand why such scholar-pretenders follow the path of darkness and do not open their eyes even when there is enough light all around?

It is interesting to note that Śakra of Bilhana and *Caritacandrikā* becomes Indra of Ramā! Bh has to show some originality! How else he could add to the bulk of his grand edition of a "Vidyāvāridhi?"

In 18:18.3 Bilhana uses an expression-- *dṛṣ aḍṛṣ a*. Nagar was not sure about the meaning. He was merely a youth in his early twenties! So he put it: *aihikāmuṣnikohhay avidhānām?* Bh copies the words of "Nagar" straightaway. However, he removes the question mark. He has no doubt, nowhere, never!

Let us recall what Bh says about this *Caritacandrikā* and its author:

Śrīnāgaramahodayair Jaisalameraḥbhajjānakoṣa- bhāṇḍarāsthaḥ hastalikhitā t pustakāt mahatā śramaṇa tiṃpaṇīṃgraḥāṃ kṛtvā Caritacandrikānāmnā sā pari
A thief takes everyone else to be a thief in this world. Bh tells his readers that Nagar collected all the "notes" from J MS. and reproduced it in his book as an appendix, naming it the "Caritacandrika." I have never seen a greater fool on this earth!! First of all Nagar won't steal. He possessed enough brain power to compose his own "annotations," (which he really did). And he was not a habitual thief either. Even if he had stolen, he would not have the courage to "name" it. A straight man does not name the baby of someone else as his own. An honest and truthful scholar (if he had taken someone else's work) would have called it "Jaisalmera-pustaka-ippanṭ," or something like that. A smart thief also knows how to cover up his theft. Bh himself is a thief and accuses Nagar falsely of imaginary theft.

It is much larger, longer, and extensive than even the original! It cannot be an Appendix.

Again in his Bhūmikā (V. 1, p.4) the learned scholar-pretender presents his distorted view:

Tatkāvyānte Caritacandrikānāmnā Jaisalamera-brhajñānakośabhāṇḍāra stha pustakāṭ tiṭpañisasamgraho Nāgaramahodayasya saṃskaraṇaṃ suvarṇaṃ sugandhi yuktam ivā'karot. Tiṭpañkārāḥ ka iti yadyapi na jātaṃ tathāpi tasya pāṇḍityapr akarṣo vidyotata eva.

Mr. Bharadwaj, you are either a fool, or a cheat, or a liar, or all combined into one!

Bh concludes his Prāstāvikam with the following words:

Ante ca Caritacandrikaṭtiṭpañkārā ye ke'pi te bhavantu [!] mama hārdikān dhanya vādān arhanti. Eteṣām tiṭpañyā tiṭalezaḥane mahatī sahāyatā jātetyamāyaṃ nirūpya [!] viramāṇyatavistarāt. [p.4]

Whatever you may say, but you are a great māyāvin Mr. Bh!

So, even such an ancient learned "composer" of Caritacandrika was not sure about the meaning of drṣ ādṛṣ a. Yet Bh had no problem. He copied it beautifully, but removed the question mark! He never had any problem--any question--about his knowledge, because it was unlimited--he knew everything and correctly too. He was sarvajāacakā ravartī.

Nagar concludes his Caritacandrika with the following words:


So this "marginal gloss" had a colophon too! And what about the date, i.e. Samvat 2001, i.e. 1944/45 A.D.? Bh was not concerned at all with all these contradictory evidences.
nces. Once he had decided that it was "ancient" no external or internal evidence could influence him to change his mind! Was he not appointed a member of the Sanskrit Sahitya Research Committee of the Banaras Hindu University in 1953 by Acharya Narendradeva, the then Vice-Chancellor? That should have been enough proof to demonstrate that he knew everything!

This fact is well featured by Bh on the title page!
Bibliography of Misra's Studies on Bilhaṇa and His Vikramāṇkadevacarita

The preceding pages have presented a candid criticism primarily of Misra's Studies on Bilhaṇa and His Vikramāṇkadevacarita. It has been a very unpleasant reading and writing. And so is this criticism. Throughout this book--here, there and everywhere--we have offered a justification of why we felt such an irresistible urge to express ourselves the way we did. It was truly a case of Śokāḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ. How beautifully it is said about our mahākavi Bhavabhūti:

Api grāvā rodityapi dalati vajrasya hṛdayam.

Same Bhavabhūti has sung:

Pūrotpiḍe taḍāgasya parīvāhah pratikriyā,
Śokasamvignahṛdayam pralāpair eva dhāryate.

We have followed the great ethical principle of Spaṣ avaktā sukhi bhavet. Also

Sulabhāḥ puruṣā rājan satatam priyavādinaḥ.
Apriyasya ca pathyasya vaktā śrotā ca durlabhaḥ.

The reader would have found many passages which might have led him to one of the two conclusions--either Misra was out of his mind when he wrote, or this critic was out of his mind when he wrote what he wrote!

Our correspondence with the University of Tübingen, reproduced here in the very beginning, contains convincing evidence that there is something unusual about this "dissertation" of Misra, which he claims has earned a doctorate for him! We don't believe it.

Misra also claims to be a specialist in Library Science. He has appended an extensive bibliography to his Magnum opus. For the reasons stated above, we did not think it necessary to present another bibliography of our own. But since we wanted the reader to have the benefit of Misra's exceptional bibliography, befitting his exceptional "dissertation", we had decided to reproduce it mechanically and enclose it as an appendix to our work. This would not have been any infringement of copyright either. Neither it would have been branded as plagiarism--kāvyārthacaurya. We did not want to commit this sin, the same sin for which we have condemned Mr. Misra time and again. This would have also demonstrated to the reader how a bibliography should be prepared and presented for a doctoral dissertation to a German university. However, for various reasons, we abandoned the idea.

Once again we offer our sincere apologies to our readers for having presented this bittersweet writing in this vein. Truth is many a time unpalatable. It takes two to utter it: One who can speak and another who can listen. However, we would like to assure our readers with all the emphasis at our command that what is presented in this book in its final form is much more milder than how it had emerged originally. A great deal
of spicy juices have been taken out. After the whole book was completed, it was ruthlessly purged! A large amount of true yet frank criticism was eliminated. We have tried our best to be as reticent as possible and we give credit to our better half for this sweetening and softening. The final judgement rests with the critical readers.
On p. 254 we have discussed Vapur yām āvāśaḥ...the reading having been presented exactly the way it appears in Misra’s *magnum opus* (p. 100).

Earlier we had suggested [yāmāvāśaḥ] as an alternative reading. Subsequently we thought of [puryām āvāśaḥ]. Our footnote provides a brief discussion there.

Since then we consulted the *Sūktimuktāvalī*. It gives all the three components together—Vapuryāmāvāśaḥ. The editor, who is not as learned as Misra, has put a "?" after the first pāda. He could not understand it. But Misra is a sarvañācakravartī. He knows everything and in a proper manner. He has no doubt on any subject anywhere of any kind—none whatsoever.

So he has broken the cluster of letters (vapuryāmāvāśaḥ) into three! This is a despicable attempt. Vapur makes some sense independently. Āvāśaḥ too would make some sense. But we don’t know what sense Doctor Misra (a *Snātaka* of Tübingen) would like us to derive from yām. This is avyāpāreṣu vyāpāraḥ—a monkey business.

We think "Va" is an error. It should be read as "Tri!" We advice the reader to write "tra" in Devanāgarī and then join the two protruding lines. "Tra" will become "Va" very easily. "Tripuryām" will bring a new life into the *kavīndrokti*. The word "kuca" is still a puzzle to us. Could it be *budha*?

We believe in the third pāda "śiro’nyasya" is wrong. It should be read as śiro yasya. Misra could not care less.

In spite of all these changes and suggestions for improvement, the true and final purport of the verse is still an enigma to us.

As already stated in our *Dvityyam Ānukham* the sojourn of Dr. L. Satapathy in Columbia during the winter of 1991 was highly beneficial. My contact with Sanskrit studies was revived. It was a renaissance. Vāde vāde jāyate tattvabodhaḥ. One significant outcome of our *Kāvyāśāstravinodena kālo gacchati dhiimatām* was a possible new interpretation of bhūḥ pratāpodayānām in *Campāśīmni* (Vik. 18:38), discussed on page 240 of this book.

I had submitted my apologies for a wrong interpretation made earlier. It was an error or in grammar. Now we have a new interpretation. We believe bhūḥ can stay as it is—not as dvitīyābahuvacanam—karma—but as kartāpadam prathamaikavacanāntam, meaning *pratāpodayānām bhūḥ utpattisthānam āpjā bhṛāmyati!* She is śītabhītā, not for herself but for her master, Anantanāpī. In order that her master might feel warm and comfortable in those colder regions, she roams around hither and thither to make them w
arm! She has the power to generate *pratāpa*, meaning also *utkṛṣṭah tāpah*. This new suggested interpretation is offered to the *rasika-jana-mañḍalī* for consideration.

There are many more suggestions. But we will wait until the next edition comes out.

MLN

INDEX

A lion won't eat grass, even if dying 254
Ā patthara mere paira para para 167
Abdhir lanqhita eva vānarabhaṭaiḥ wrt Bh 138
Abhedā-sādhana 197
Abhidhā, lakṣānā, vyaṇjanā 181
Abhidhānarājendrā 292
Abhijānaśākuntalam 98, 294
Abhinavabhiṇaṇa Misra 62, etc.
Acaladuhituh preyān 264
Ādhāro'dhikaraṇam 135
Adhika alaṅkāra 156
Adhirājarājendrā 111
Adhitavedo'smi kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ 71+
Āgraṇa 71
Āhavapṛaptidurlalitābhāhu 96+
Ahinakulam 110
Aho viśālamaḥ bhūpāla 156
Ajñāṇāndhasya lokasya 116, 262
Akathayad avanīndor nandanotpattiśāh Ram 80
Aksūna 129
Alākām 293
Alam viśādena karoṣi 70
Alaukikkolahhasamarpaṇena 30
Āluloke 107, 206
Ālupendram avadātavikramas 97
Amāṅ ivāngeṣu mudaḥ prakarśad 155
Amaracandra Yati 209
Amarasimha 266
Amī viyannīlasaroja 224
Ānanya līlāparivartanena 204
Ānandasāgarastava 263
Ananta, King of Kashmir 242, 246
Ananyasāmāṇyayuṣṇatvam eva 87
Aṅc 77+
Ancient India 103
Aṅcitatābhyaṃ gatābhyām 77
Aṅcitam 133
Aṅcitam, Misra’s vitanḍāvāda on 77+
Andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāh wrt Misra as a "guide" 94
Anena nūnam jaladheḥ 78
Aṅjalibandha 158
Aṅka 212
Aṅka in Mānasollāsa 215
Aṅkura 256
Anta 237
Anuddhṛṣṭaḥ śabdair 127
Anudghṛṣṭaḥ śabdair 126
Anveṣyate 164+
Anyāyapūrṇam ātmasātkaraṇam 107
Anyoktimuktālatā 46
Anyonyam utpīḍayad utpalākṣyāḥ 154
Apāre kāvyasāmsāre 103, 202
Āpatkāle maryāḍā nāsti 74
Api khaṇjanam aṅjanāṅcite 77
Appayadīkṣita--Citramāṁṣā 75
Aprādhānyam vidher yatra 106
Apratīṣṭhe Raghujīyeṣṭhe 50
Apte on aṅkakāraḥ 216
Āraktam arghārpaṇatatparāṇām 47-48
Arasikeśu kavitva nivedanam 87
Arasikeśu kavitvanivedanam wrt B & G 158
Arasikeśu kavitvanivedanam wrt Bh 163
Arasikeśu kavitvanivedanam wrt Misra 126, 292
Arc 77
Arccitam 77
Ardham striyas tribhuvane sacarācare’smin 263
Ardham vs artham 280
Ardhanārīśvara 260+, 279
Arthāntaranyāsa 174
Asaṅṣayaṃ nīlasaroruhāksi 238
Asaṃvrtastrasastadukūlabandhe 125+
Asmākam ālokanavignahetos 198
Asmin kṣaṇe Kuntntalapārthivasya 182
Asthāne'nupayogibhiḥca bahubhir 69
Astrajvālāvalīdhapratibala 75
Āsyendoḥ parīvesavad 197
Atha katiṣucid eva daivayogāt 109
Athāṭaḥ pāmsudānasya 130
Atimadhumarasānām sevayā 130
Atrāṅkāṭha viluṭha salile 278
Atrāṅtare kim api vāgvibhavātivṛtta 178
Aurvāgnitaptapāṭhodhau 86
Authenticity of J 6
Āvṛttavarṇastabakam 292
Avīśamāṇā sadṛśam guṇair mama 68
Avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram wrt Bh 99+, 199fn
Avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram wrt Misra 84

B & G on Gaurīvibhrama 230
B & G on Tavāṅgavallī 176
B & G on Trāṇī bhūbhṛtkaṭakesu 214
B & G, translation of, a plastic rose 222
B omits collectivity of verses 234
B on J 6
B's mis-construction taken as variant reading 233
Bahu jagada purastāt wrt Misra 90
Bahubhir abhihitaiḥ kim adbhitair vā 118
Bālabodhinī comm. on Kāvyaprapāsa 21, 52
Bālarāmāya on aṅkakāra 216
Bāṇāḥ śvetamayukhaśāṇa 184
Bh and literary interpretation 98+
Bh and textual criticism 20
Bh as a commentator 19+
Bh as a translator 19+, 224
Bh as an alaṅkārasāstrapaṇḍita 52
Bh as an editor and researcher 17+
Bh as an historiographer 97+
Bh betrays ignorance of loka-vyavahāra 184+
Bh commits cold-blooded murder of Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū 184+
Bh confirms ignorance through Hindi 190
Bh errs on vilāsa 176+
Bh explains yena kena prakāreṇa 212+
Bh goes against N 219
Bh has never done any research 135+
Bh ignorant of ratikopa 189
Bh interprets bhāti 156
Bh is equivocal 243
Bh is kāvyārthacauryacatureḥ 172fn, etc.
Bh misunderstands kavīndrokti 184+
Bh murders history 249
Bh murders Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū once again 242
Bh on Asmākam ālokana vighnahetos 199
Bh on Caritacandrikā 173
Bh on Caritacandrikākāra 128
Bh on N ed. 22+
Bh on N’s readings 20+
Bh on pratiṣṭhā 49
Bh on R 3-4
Bh reaches the pinnacle of absurdity 248
Bh uselessly tries to defend Bühler 136
Bh wrt *Caritacandrikā* 16
Bh, N’s correspondence with 9-15
Bh, Prose order 25
Bh, some preliminary remarks on Bh ed. 16+
Bh, the great historiographer 245+
Bh, the Great Pretender 245+
Bh’s action—totalitarian dictatorship 221
Bh’s avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram 199fn, etc.
Bh’s interpretation of Priyārđhasthitim 262+
Bh’s treatment of...is asaṅgata 212+
Bhainsa ke āge bīna bājāe 163
Bhakṣite’pi laśune na śānto vyādhiḥ wrt Misra 280
Bhāmkāri 134
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 271
Bhanot, S. D. 7
Bhāravi 100, 122
Bhāsa 83
Bhāskarācārya 64
Bhāti vs māti 134+
Bhaṭṭoḷī Dīkṣita 135
Bhīmācārya corrects B ed. 94
Bhīmapanaḍita 290
Bhīṣagbhīr āpāditasarvabheṣajam 76
Bhṛāntir mithyāmatir bhramaḥ wrt Misra 169
Bhūḥṛṇṭaṭaṇesu 210
Bhūḥ pratāpodayāṇām 240+
Bhūr 241
Bhuvanarāja 250
Bhilāṇa as śākta, says Misra 260
Bhilāṇa demonstrates his own prauḍhi 263
Bhilāṇa demonstrates his own vicchitti 263
Bhilāṇa demonstrates his own vyutpatti 263
Bhilāṇa exemplifies many vilāsas 180
Bhilāṇa, pioneer 122
Bhilāṇa’s use of vilāsa 181+
Bhilāṇa’s way of praṇāmāḥ 263
Bimbam dadhe bimbaphalapraṭiṣṭhām 48
Bindudvantaraṇaṅgītāgrasaraṇīḥ kartā 221
Birudāṅka 215
Bubhukṣitaḥ kim na karoti pāpam 113
Bühler and Jacobi--Transcription of J 271
Bühler and N, a contrast, wrt J MS 235+
Bühler on J 157
Bühler on Vikrama’s alliance with the Cola King 111
Bühler takes undue liberty 140+, 230
Bühler—historiographer vs literary critic 139
Bühler, failure on the part of 140+
Bühler, Georg 1
Bühler, Georg on Vik. 1
Bühler’s contribution 138
Bühler’s mishandling of Vik. text 140+

Calacaleti dvividhayā 50
Calāpāṅgāṃ drṣṭīṃ sprṣasi 98
Cālukya-Cola-Empires, boundary between 103
Cālukyavamśāmalamauktikaśrīḥ 55
Camatkāra-paramparā of Bühler 140+
Campāśīmni Kṣitipatikathādhāmni 240
Campaka flowers 132
Caṅcacakrakarasparśa 84
Caṅcacakāraṇadīyamāna 81
Caṅcacakolāṅcalāni 84
Caṅcacakumbatī kāṇcanācalamukham 85
Caṅcad-bhujabhramita 85
Caṅcat 82+
Caṅcat-katākṣabhramarābhīrāma 85
Candrikā on jṛmbhāsamāsphoṭa 197
Cāpalam 187
Carcat 82+
Caritacandrikā, nature of 172+
Caritacandrikā on pratiṣṭhā 49
Caritacandrikā on Tṛṇāṇi bhūbhṛtkatākeṣu 212
Carmacakṣṣuṣi 80fn
Carroll, Lewis 100
Cāturam 183
Caturaṅga 211
Caturaṅgalīlayā 211
Caturthyarthre bahulam chandasi 81
Cāturyam ācāmati Mandarāḍreḥ 183
Ceylon irt Chalukyas 258
Chandaḥśastram wrt Mīśra 184
Chandobhaṅga 285
Citra-yuddha 218
Colasammukham agāhātāhava 105

Daivam diṣṭam bhāgadhheyam 185
Daivāt 185, 186
Daivīṃ vācam upāsate 117
Daivīṃ vācam wrt Māti nirivare 159
Dakṣināpatha-Jāhnavī 104
Daṇḍin 162
Danturaḥ Kumtałenduh 205
Danture kapole 205
Daśarāpa of Dhanañjaya 187
Devaḥ karāṃbhoryayantraddhārāṃ 204
Devī tasya pracurayaśasas 248
Dhanañjaya 187
Dharmo viśvasya jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā 50
Dhatte drṣṭim adhīravibhramalavām 282
Dhik tvām re kalikāla yāhi vilayam 284
Dhīramḍaṅga 216
Dhūlimṛṣthih 130
Dohada 225
Dolāvilāsa 125+
Dolāyām jaghanasthalena 159, 165, 274
Dordanḍāñcitamahimā 77
Dorveṇikayā 196
Drāghīyasā dhārṣtyaṅgūṇena yuktāḥ 282
Drṣām bhrām kāmavaśīkṛtāṇām 182
Drṣoḥ sāmāvādāḥ 155
Drṣṭim he prātiveśīni kṣaṇaṃ 167
Druti vs dyuti 113+
Durgā 229
Durlalita 96
Dvāropātanirantar mayi tayā 179
Dvīpakṣamāpālaparamparānām 49
Dvīrapatir amūṣya satrusena 118
Dyuti vs druti 113+

Edgerton, Franklin, tr. of Maṭaṅga-līlā 129
Ekaḥ stanas tuṅgataḥ parasya 261, 279
Ekākinī pratiṣṭhā hi pratiṣṭhātaṃ 157, 221, 246
Ekaṃ sandhīsato'param prayavate 204
Ekaṃ uddiśya sarvān vā 215
Elephants wrt love of music 82
English translators--makṣikāsthāne makṣikā 200

Gacchataḥ skhalanam kvāpi 93, 120, 169, 240
Gaḍḍalikāpravāhanyāya wrt Misra 125
Gaḍḍalikāpravāhanyāya wrt scholars like Dvivedi 250
Gaḍḍhālinganavāmanikṛtakucaprodhīnna 164
"Indo-American library Cooperation" 15
Inducandra 248
Indum for indu 279
Isakī ḍīṁṭa usakā roṛā 296
Iṣyate 164
Iti bhramatsaurabhamāṃsalena 121
Iti sa manasā niścityārtham 92
Iyaṃ mayi nyasyati netramālām 180

Jacobi, H. 1
Jagannidāghaḥ--B 243
Jaghāna pādena sakhīm sakhelam 180
Jala-tāḍanam wrt Misra 175
Jalāṇa 213
Jānīte nitarāṃ asau gurukula 206
Jaṭārdhacandra 279+
Jīgīṣavaḥ ke’pi vijitya 45
Jīvatkaver āśayo na varṇanīyaḥ wrt Misra 181, 252, 288
Jñātum adbhuṭavilāsanidhāne 194
Jṛmbhāsamāsphoṭakarāṅgulīkam 195
Jṛmbhāvaśottambhita 196
Jyeṣṭhakalasa 267

Kācit kṣipantī madhupam 98
Kailāsagauram vṛṣam ārurukṣoh 203
Kailāśaśailānilāh 227+
Kailāśaśubhram bhavanāṅgaṇaṃ tat 203
Kākāśigolakanyāya 69
Kakubhām bhartṛbhaktām 88+
Kālaḥ Kālaṅjaragiripater yah prayāṇe 252
Kalakvaṇitagarbheṇa 162
Kalhaṇa as historian, wrt Bh 245+
Kālidāsa 83, 98, 122, 203
Kālidāsa omits his name from his works 232
Kāmadeughā hi mahākavīnāṃ vāco bhavanti 66, 123, 201
Kāmaṃ pratyādiṣṭāṃ smarāmi 168
Kāmandakṣya on rājyāṅga 62
Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana 161
Kanakācalasaṅkāśa-devatāyatanāncite 77
Kāṇḍī 67
Kāṇḍī padātibhir amuṣya 67
Kangra paintings on love 194
Kānte talpam upāgate 67
Kānte tathā kathā api prathitam 160
Kānte vicirasuratakramabaddharāge 161
Kanyāpradānacakalataḥ kṣītiśāḥ 112
Kāraṇagunāḥ kāryagunāḥ ārabhante 52
Karāṅguli-samāsphoṭa 197
Karaṭi 82+
Karna, King of Kālañjara 252
Karpūravalli 46
Kartuṃ kīrtyā tilakam alakāgopurāṇām 239
Kasya vā na bhavati roṣo 168
Kathāpi khalu pāpānām 208
Katicid api dināni tatra nītvā 108
Kaviḥ karoti kāvyāni 69
Kavimārga 202
Kavitvam 252
Kavitvavakṛtrvaphalā cucumba 252
Kavitābhivyaṅjītam kavitātparyam 279
Kāvyakalpalatā-kaviśiṣṭāvṛtiḥ 209
Kāvyamārga 209
Kāvyaprakāśa 89
Kāvyaprakāśe viṣamālāṅkāroḍāharaṇām 52
Kāvyārthabhāvanāpaipakvabuddhi 136
Kāvyārthacauryam wrt Misra 239
Keliṅkālaḥ 118
Keliṅkāraḥ 119
Keśavadāsa 194
Ketakadrutinibham mahaḥ 114
Khaṇḍa 45+
Khiste, Bāṭukanātha Sāstrī 53
Kīṁ karoṣi nijayāthvā bhuvaḥ 198
Kīṁ karoṣi vayaśādhiḥkena me 299
Kīṁ tava rocate eṣaḥ 81
Kosambi, D. D. 287
Kṛḍāḥ vs vrīḍā 239
Kṛḍālavaśābālīḥ 239
Kṛḍāśailaḥ 241+
Kṛḍāśailaḥ kanakakadaliḥ 241
Kṛḍāśailībhavanti pratikalam alinām 241
Kṛḍāśailīkṛtāhimagireḥ 241
Kṛtṛṣṭ śrutāgamah 72+
Kṛtakṣaṇa 255, 258
Kṛtasthitiḥ 101
Kṛtvā vigraham aśrupāta 193
Kṣaṇamātraviśrama 163
Kṣapāḥ kṣāmikṛtyā 213
Kṣate kṣāram wrt Misra 87
Kṣipto mukhāt ṣaṭcaraṇaḥ 98
Kṣitipati or Kṣitirāja 245+, 249
Kṣmābhṛtkulānām upari pratiṣṭhām 48
Kuc (+sam) 257
Kuhūktāri 133
Kulapratīṣṭhā 48
Kumārasambhavam 154
Kumāryāḥ vs kumāryām 80, 170, 172
Kundendutuṣārahāradhavāla 203
Kuṇṭhatvam āyāti guṇaḥ kavīnām wrt Misra 30, 117
Kuṇṭhikṛtaṭriśastraśya 89
Kupitaḥ kṣmābhṛt 92+
Kurvantu śeṣaḥ śukavākyapāṭhaḥ wrt B & G 158
Kurvantu śeṣaḥ śukavākyapāṭhaḥ wrt Bh 136, 190
Kurvantu śeṣaḥ śukavākyapāṭhaḥ wrt Misra 117, 202
Kuryād anārdreṣu kīm aṅganānām 231fn

Labdhārjanānām 172
Lakṣa 43+
Lakṣya 43+
Lekhaṇī pustikā nārī 5
Lekhayā luloke 107, 206
Lexicographers vs poets 260
Līlā vilāso vicchittir 178
Līlālavanya-aṅcitakandhareṇa 168+
Līlāsukāḥ kokilakūjitānām 283
Limits of Misra’s unlimited knowledge 281
Limpāṭīva tamo’ṅgāni 170
Little knowledge dangerous wrt Bh 185, 242
Little knowledge dangerous wrt Misra 96
Locanābhīyām vīhīnasya wrt Misra 86, 292, 308?
Lohara 246
Lohara Dynasty, scions of 247
Lokasya nābhīr jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā 50
Lubdhair janānām 172
Lubdhrjanānām 172
Lulita vs luṭhīta 133
Luloke 107, 206

Mā (root) 159
Mā garvam udvaha kapolatale cakāsti 65
Madvairāṇāḥ kāṭhorāṃśor 227
Māgha 122, 163
Mahābhāṣyavyākhyā 267
Makṣikāsthāne makṣikā wrt B & G 101, 168, 214
Makṣikāsthāne makṣikā wrt Bh 163, 242
Mamānatikruddho muniḥ 81
Mammaṭa, example of saṣṭhī 89
Mammaṭa on kāvyā-hetu 264
Mammaṭa on saṅkara 75
Māna 185+
Manasija wrt kaśā 238
Manasijakathāghāṭabhagnāḥ 238
Mānasollāsa 214
Maṇḍukaprutinyāya 171, 229
Maṅgalākṣata 76
Manyupaṅkakaluṣam samudvahan 261
Māṅgalalilā 83, 129
Māti vs bhāti 134+
Māti nirvivare tasyāś 134+
Mātsarya 199
MauktikaÅrṇī 55
Mauñjī- mekhalā 55
Mayā nipīydamānās te 95, 112
Mayā tasyābhayaṃ pradattam 81
Meghadūte Kālidāsaū 130
Misra & science of prosody 283+
Misra as an historiographer 101+
Misra as translator 57
Misra betrays ignorance 262+, 279, 282
Misra commits literary crime 262+
Misra condemns Bilhaṇa’s ukti as preposterous 201
Misra confuses nature of Vca r MS 232
Misra corrects N, a play of ghuṇākṣaranyāya 226
Misra crosses the limits of justice 165
Misra determined to destroy everything 251
Misra discounts R 297
Misra goes against all authorities 166
Misra indulges in unwanted emendation 241
Misra is confused 169
Misra makes kaśā of kathā 238
Misra murders poetic muse of Bilhaṇa 118, 208
Misra murders Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū 164
Misra notices kāvyārthacaurya by others 282
Misra on genitive for dative 79+
Misra on N 8
Misra on payomucaḥ 224
Misra on R 4
Misra on rānta 234
Misra once again plays plagiarism 267
Misra parades his pedantry 231, 259+
Misra reaches the highest peak of absurdity 251
Misra really needs some real guru 117
Misra shows slavish mentality 252
Misra stoops to the lowest level 251
Misra writes for himself 288
Misra wrt literary criticism 209
Miśra-śakti 181
Misra--pratibhābhāsa 122
Misra, a pretender 234
Misra, a saṅkara 295
Misra, a scholar-pretender 238, 265
Misra, a totalitarian dictator 265
Misra, kartum akartum anyathākartuṁ samarthah 208
Misra, munitrayaikyam 127
Misra’s absurdities 251, 287, 292
Misra’s āḍambara 285
Misra's arrogance cum ignorance 89+, 93, 279, 292
Misra’s asūmajaḥatā 164
Misra’s avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram 206
Misra’s balaçāpalam 182, 198
Misra’s book full of errors 282+
Misra’s chapters in terms of no. of pages 296
Misra’s childish blabberings 184
Misra’s eulogy and prospectus on dust-jacket 31+
Misra’s ex cathedra judgment 245
Misra’s one more attempt to annoy his readers 292
Misra’s gajanimṛlikā 201, 297
Misra’s great power of emendation 96
Misra’s jalpa 92
Misra’s knowledge of Gajaśāstra 121
Misra’s knowledge of Sanskrit 212, 271
Misra’s Magnum opus 25+
Misra’s manahpūtam samācaret 184
Misra’s metri-causa 184
Misra’s misdeeds 207+
Misra's misdirected emendation 195
Misra’s misdirection 113
Misra’s "nature" 52
Misra’s one more nonsensical reading 291
Misra’s performance (cintāmañi vs mṛlloṣṭa) 180
Misra’s pitiable misrepresentation 198
Misra’s plagiarism 107, 239
Misra’s play of prank 237
Misra’s preposterous propositions 251, 262
Misra’s sato’pyapalāpaḥ 297
Misra’s suggestions absurd 211
Misra’s unreasobleness 103, 173, 203
Misra’s utprekṣā 51+
Misra's vitanḍāvāda   50, 70
Misra's work more padding than real kucakalaśau   277
Misra's work--why to criticize?   28+
Misra's work, most irresponsible   208
Misra's work, nature of   295+
Miśropajñāṇam jāñānam   239
Mrktumbhabālukārandhra   56
MS. A   74+
Mukham astti vaktavyam wrt Misra   109fn
Mukharamurajaṃ paurastrībhir na lāsyam   288
Mukhena lajjābhīnaya-pragalbhā   168
Mukhena Śītāṃ śarapāṇḍureṇa   54
Mukhenducandrikāpūra   155, 244
Murārikavi   206
Mūrkho'pi śobhate tāvat wrt Misra   87
Musalgaonkar   15

N interprets Yasya bhrātā   246
N on B ed.   4-5, 232, etc.
N on Mahābhāṣya-vyākhyā   268
N on N ed.   23+
N on P   7
N on R   3, 219+
N teaches Vik.   2+
N visits Jaisalmer   6, 94, 235
N's "Sigla and abbreviations" wrt Misra   271
N's contribution to Vik.   233
N's ed. reviewed   6-8
Na hi kastūrikāmodaḥ wrt Misra   292
Na hi sarvāḥ sarvam jānāti   134
Na hi vandhyā vijānāti wrt Bh   154
Na hyeṣa sthānōr aparādho wrt Misra   86, 292, 295
Na māti sma   134+
Na śaśāka nirākartum   71
Nagar on the correctness [!] of his ed.   204
Nagar's ed.   5
Nagar's text still deficient   205
Nāgara   47
Nāgarāja Rāo--Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya   203fn
Nagarivarṇanapaddhatiḥ   288
Nāgavalli   47
Naiṣadhiyacaritam   73, 132
Nakalchī bandar wrt Bh   220
Nāmalingānuṣāsanam   266
Namatyayaḥṣyāmalaśaśpamaṇḍala   219
Nāndhrīpayodhara ivātitarām 21, 126
Narair viphalajanmabhīr giridarī 160
Narapatitanayāḥ kayāpi kopa 107
Nārāyaṇa Svāmī 161
Navasāhasāṅkacarīta 52
Navendranīlā 113
Neo-expounders like M and Bh 244
Niḥśoka vs niḥṣūka 283
Nijerśubhīḥ 92, 95, 209
Nilacchatronmadagajaghaṭāpātram 253
Nilagundatāmraśāsanam 243
Nilakaṇṭha, author of Mātanga-līlā 83, 129
Nilakantha mountain 98
Nilam/kamalam 211
Nimīlita 121
Nimnanābhihūreṣu yad ambhaḥ 162
Nipīṣṭa 108
Nīrāgā mṛgalāṇchane mukham api 285
Niraṅkuśāḥ kavyaḥ 261
Nirantarāghaṭītapātalādharāḥ 207
Nirantaram Brahmapurībhīr āvṛtam 233
Nīrasatarur iha vilasati purataḥ 221
Nīrīkṣya vidyunnayanaiḥ payodo 224
Nirudhya randhram madhupūritasya 172
Nirvāpita 183
Nirviṣeṇāpi sarpeṇa 45
Nirvīvare 156
Niśāsu yatra pratibimbavartmanā 276
Niṣiddhair apyebhir lulisamakarando 133
Niṣiddham apyācaranāyam āpadi 73
Nivārita vs nirvāpita 183
Nivāritidāpāḥ 183
Nīvīm prati prānihiṭe tu kare priyena 67
Nīvimokṣo hi mokṣaḥ 67
Niviṣṭa 108
Niyatikṛtaniyamarahitām 202
Novel prize in literature 158
Nṛpasya vallabha 206, 225

On Caritacandrikā, a note on identification 298-312

Padātivrataṃ udvahāmi 261
Padmagupta 52
Pālakāpyamuni-viracito *Hastāyurvedaḥ* 130
Pāṃṣudāna 130
Pāṇau padmadhiyā madhūka 99
Pañcāṅgo rājanayāḥ 64
Pāṇyo'yam āṃśārpitalambahāraḥ 206
Pānīyam nālīkerīphalakuhara 133
Paṅkāmbupāṃsupriyaḥ 130
Parā pratiṣṭhā 48
Parāsam 198
Parāsāṁ vs parāsam 198
Pārāvatānāṃ putaiḥ 159
Parīcyutas tatucabhāramadhyāt 155
Parīpākapaṇḍurāṇāṃ ārakāṇḍānām 51
Paryudāsa 106
Pāṭala-dhara 207
Pāṭhāntaram 90
Pavitrām atrātanute jagad yuge iii
Payodāṛṇandam gaganā 225
Poetry, appreciation of, a subtle art 136, 221
Poetry, essence of 136
Pra. MS. 271
Prabuddha vs pravṛddha 206
Prabuddha-kārṣyāḥ paritāpa 206
Pradarāṣṭramāṇa tataḥ kumāryāḥ 80, 170+
Prādhānyam syād vidher yatra 106
Prākṛtivirodhahata 111
Prāmādat vs prasādāt 123
Prāṇāmānto mānaḥ 186
Prāṇapratiṣṭhā 50
Prāṇaparyāśu param sthānam 43
Prasāda 191
Prasādāt vs pramādāt 123
Prasajyapratiṣedha 106
Prāśānte nūpurārāve 66
Pratāpa 250, 252
Pratāpam āropya parām samunnatim 252
Pratījñāyaugandharāyaṇa 83
Pratiphalanabhiḥ 49
Pratiṣṭhā 47+
Pratīḍideśainam abhaṣamāṇā 168
Pratīḍiśi 168
Pratīḍiṣṭaviśeṣamanḍanavidiḥ 168
Pratīḍiśyanta iva me 168
Pratīyagacchati laṅghanārtham 281
Pravṛdhāpakṛṣena purāṇarīti 1
Pravṛdhāpakṛṣena purāṇarīti wrt Misra 30, 122
Pravṛddha 206
Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavan Texts Series  94
Priyatama Chandra Shastri  42
Prthvībhujaṅgaḥ parikampīṅgīm  57+
Puṇḍraka-śākarā  55
Purāṅa sthitvā kiṅcid valita  287
Purāṅa-Bilhana wrt Misra  83, etc.
Pūrvakālaikasavajarat  127
Puspair bhrājīṣṭubhastrā  84
Puspāñjalikṣepam ivodvahanti  261

Rājaśekhara  134
Rājataraṅgini  246
Rājīga  109
Rajombupāṅkavihṛti  130
Rājyam uddhārtam anarthapāṅkataḥ  112
Rāmanātha Dīkṣita wrt Bh  17
Rāmaśramī on gavākṣa  267
Rāmaśramī on rājyāṅgam  63
Rāmaśramī on vilāsa  178
Rāmāvatāra Śarma, guruvaryāṇām of Bh  163
Rānarabhasavilāsakautukena  105
Rānarasacalitam  118
Randhawa, M. S.  194
Rānta vs śānta  234
Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti  iii
Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti wrt Bh  194
Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti wrt Misra  30
Rasāntaram  187
Rasikapriyā of Keśavādaśa  194
Rāśikṛtāḥ puspaparāgapaṇjāḥ  128
Ratāntare yatra grhāntareshu  163
Ratikopa  191
Ratikoṣa prasāde ca  191
Ravaiḥ  215
Re māṭaṅga madāṃbuḍhambaratayā  291
Research defined  297
Restoration of text  237
Rolambarolam vs rolobhakholam  291
Rūḍhayaugikamiśrākhyās  209

Sa somavannetracakoraparaṇām  74
Sā stanāñjalibandhena  157
Sa tatkaṇāt parimāna  88+
Sabdakalpadruma  55
Śabdārthaśasanajñāna  iii, 136
Śabdasya śaktayaḥ  181
Ṣaḍ upāyāḥ  187
Ṣaḍgunyo mantraḥ  112
Śādharmya  196, 243
Saduktikarāmaṇta wrt Dolāyām jaghana  165
Sadyāḥ karasparśam avāpya citram  52
Saharṣam ityapsarasām ajāyata  234
Sahasā vidaḥhitā na kriyām  291
Sahasraśaḥ santu viśāradānām  1
Sahasraśaḥ santu viśāradānām wrt Misra  30, 124
Śāhityadarpaṇa  191
Śāhityadarpaṇa on arthāntaranyāsa  174
Śāhityadarpaṇa on kampa (vepathu)  65
Śāhityadarpaṇa on māna  191+
Śāhityadarpaṇa on vilāsa  177
Śāhityapāthonidhimanthanottam  20
Śāhityapāthonidhimanthanottam  268
Śāhitye sukumāravastuni wrt Misra  64
Sahrdaya hurt by Bh  224
Śākhācandanyāya  135
Sakhīnām kim api bruvāṇa  80
Śaktir nipuṇatā lokaśāstra  265
Sāmādau tu parikṣiṣé  187
Samakṣam api sūryasya  227
Sāmānye napumṣakam  124
Samarpayāmaṇa payāṃsi  80
Śāmarthyam  87+
Śāmasoki  59
Śambhukavi  46
Sampūṇaṇakumbho na karoti śabdam  248
Śāmrājyaam  87+
Śamskrām nāma daiवī vāk  116
Samucchalantyā praṇayīkṛtāni  269
Samudvahannunatam asambāt  261
Samudvahantyos tad athāyatākṣi  261
Śamyuktādyam dīrgham  184
Ṣaṇḍa  45+
Sandhibandham avalokaṇa niścalam  112
Sangrathya kaścit katicit padāni gāthākavitvam  293
Sañkucita  49+
Śānta-kautaka  235+
Saptamadyāhikaraṇe ca  135
Śāradā  229
Śarakāṇḍa  54
Śarakāṇḍa = sugarcane of Misra  51
Śarakāṇḍapāṇḍugaṇḍasthala  54
Saraso viparītaś cet wrt Bh  182
Šukavākyapāṭham wrt Bh 243
Sukharatarata 288
Šuklaḥ/paṭaḥ 211
Sūktimuktāvali 218, 227
Surata-krīḍā 159+
Šuṭro’si kṛtavido’si 222
Sūro’si kṛtavido’si wrt Bh 21
Sūryamatī 248
Susko vrksas tiṣṭhatyagre 221
Śvāgatā metre 184
Śvagrhottuṅgavātāyanagataḥ 266
Śvāmyamātyasuḥṛtkoṣa 62
Śvayaṃ naṣṭaḥ parān nāśayati wrt Bh 181
Śvayaṃ naṣṭaḥ parān nāśayati wrt R 121

Tadbhayāt Simhaladvīpabhūpatiḥ 258
Taddarśanād abhūc chambhor 281
Tadīyo lebhe’ntaram cetasi nopadeśaḥ 170
Talpeṣu 271
Tam santaḥ śrotum arhanti wrt Misra 32
Tam vibhāvyā rabhasād upāgatam 68
Tām vidhāya katicid dināni 96
Tāmbūlaṃ kaṭutiktam uṣṇamadhuram 46
Tantukṛśaṃ vahantyaḥ 261
Taranāṅgiṃ 198
Tarjana 196
Tasyāḥ sāndravilepanastana 194
Tataḥ pratāpajvalanaprabhāva 244
Tathā gatā cāmpakadāmagaurī 132
Tatra daksinātaṇe kṛtasthitīḥ 101
Tavāṅgavallīkusumair vilāsaiḥ 175
Tayopadeśaḥ sa kṛtah kumāryām 170
Te ke na jānimahe wrt Misra 182
Teṣāṃ prasanno hi vilāsabāṇaḥ 179
Thieme, Paul 34+
Through the Looking Glass 100
Translation, problems of 135, 177
Trilokalakṣmyeva saḷāḷam ikṣitaḥ 155
Trṇāṇi bhūbhṛtkaṭakeṣu 210
Tlbingen, correspondence with 34+
Tuṅgabhadra 101
Tvadbhiyā girighuḥśraye sthitāḥ 99
Tyāgam eva praśaṁṣanti 112
Tyaktā mayā nāma kulapraṭiṣṭhā 50
Vācām agocaram 252
Vāgarthāviva sampṛktau 78
Vah(+ ud) 259
Vaktṛtvam 252
Vallabhaḥ vs vallabha 226
Vālmīki on Sātā’s resolve to accompany Rāma 278
Vāmanācārya Jhalakīkar 157
Vaprakṛtāparinātagaja 119
Vapur yāmāvāsaḥ kucparivrṭaḥ 254
Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya--Nāgarāja Rāo 203fn
Vapus tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya 201
Varam eko guṇī putraḥ 139
Vāraṃvāraṃ tirayati drṣor udgamam 65
Vardhito roditaḥ ca 278
Variant readings, how created 244fn
Vāsabhītā 245
Vātāyana 265
Vātāyanaḥ kelinvinānakpaiḥ 265
Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra 161
Vayam iha padavidyām wrt Misra 64
Velā 269
Velācala 269
Velankar, H. D. 6
Veṅginātha 109
Veṇī 195+
Venīsamhāra 133
Veṅukā 195+
Vibhūṣya vs vimūṣya 233
Vicāracāturyam apākaroti 183
Vicarati vs na carati 252
Vicinvatīḥ pānthapataṅgahimsanair 132
Viddhaśālalabhaṅjikā 51
Vidhṛtya Kāncīṃ bhujayor balena 70
Vidhṛtya vs vivṛtya 65
Vidvān eva vijānāti wrt Bh 138
Vidyākara, age of 287
Vijṛmbhamāṇesvatha 179
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**Andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāh.**

One scholar named Priyatamacandra Śastrī earned the degree of Vidyāvāridhi (=Ph.D.) from the Vārāṇaseya Saṃskātra Viśvavidyālaya on a *śodhaprabandha* titled *Vikramāṅkadevacaritasā sāhityikam sarvekṣaṇam* under the guidance of a fantastic scholar named Pattabhirama Sastrī, famous as a mīmāṃsaka. We don’t know how much of Sāhitya he knew. However, he had earned a great deal of name and fame. But he seems to have given a true example of two well known very ancient nyāyas *Na hi sarvāḥ sarvam jānāti* and *Andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāh*. This will be proved by the time this note is finished.

This scholar Priyatamacandra says that he received great help from Batuk Nath Shastri Khiste. This too seems to be a *mānāntara viruddha arthavāda*. This Batuk Nath and the writer of these lines used to play pranks together. We were almost classmates. He was just one or two years ahead.

We don’t know if this thesis is published as yet or not. If not, good, because it lies. It is not reliable. The scholar has just wasted his time, money and energy in bringing out the *bimba-pratibimba-bhāva* in the immortal work of Bilhana and some earlier poets. He was not able to see the special *vicchitti* and *camatkara* in Bilhana.

With regard to the *Caritacandrika* this pathabhrānta andhena nīyamana and ha scholar-pretender Vidyāvāridhi says:

> Vikramāṅkadevacaritasā prathamapustake [=J MS] arthāvagama saukaryā rt ham viṣamasthalārthāvabodhiṇī Caritacandrikānāmnī ṭippani vartate. Ģā.

Byulhara[!] maho-dayena svakīye Vikramāṅkadevacarite (dvītyaṭṭīyaapustake)


Then he copies some of my words from my Upodghāta without understanding the meaning.

What a worthless show of scholarship and what a horrible misleading statement! Such scholar-pretenders are awarded Vidyā vāridhi degrees on such trash of misleading writings. To us all this looks as an umattapralāpa. I was born and brought up in Banaras. I know where and how much bhāṅga is used there. This scholar - fantastic must have been Gaṅgātaraṅgavilasannaudolālulitamānasabhaṅg.
amadhuramadirārasapānamadonmataḥ when he wrote his śodhaprabandaḥ. How else we can explain such nonsensical writing. If we apply the sthālīpulākanyāya to this statement, we can well guess what kind of the whole writing would be.
Bilhana's Vikraman̄kadevacarita and Its Neo-Expounders

Vikraman̄kadevacarita is one of the best historical poems in Sanskrit literature, if not the best. Bilhana ranks as one of the greatest poets the world has enjoyed. He was exceptionally romantic, almost a legend himself. A court poet of Cālukya Vikramaditya VI, a great emperor of the 11th century India, Bilhana composed the poem as a panegyric for his patron.

Dr. Nagar's work corrects some modern wayward writers who have done great injustice to the poet by misrepresenting the facts and distorting the truth. Their ignorance can be matched only by their arrogance. Here is a demonstration of their pompous play and display of naked plagiarism, still generating great rewards of riches and reputation. This book is a kind of remedial writing, which restores the truth and upholds the justice. It is an outcome of fifty years of learning, reading, writing and research in the field of Sanskrit studies. Dr. Nagar's exposition and application of certain fundamental principles of literary and textual criticism may serve as a guide to the succeeding critics. The book is quite extensive, yet very inexpensive. Has an elaborate index and a map of contemporary India. Studded with charming gems of Sanskrit poetic citations. A lovely reading that assures bliss.
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