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Ā M U K H A M

Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti
saṅkrāntavakroktirahasyamudrāḥ.
Te'smatprabandhān avadhārayantu
kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham.

Bilhaṇasya

Guṇadosān aśāstrajñāḥ katham vibhajate janaḥ.
Kim andhasyādhikāro'sti rūpabhedopalabdhiṣu.

Kāvyādarśaḥ

Śabdārtha-sāsana-jñāna-mātreṇaiva na vedyate.
Vedyate sa hi kāvyārtha-tattvajñāireva kevalam.

Dhvanyālovakāḥ

Girām pravṛttir mama nīrasā'pi
mānyā bhavitṛī nṛpateś caritraiḥ.
Ke vā na śuṣkām mṛdam abhrasindhu-
sambandhīnya mūrdhani dhārayanti.

Bilhaṇasya

Pavitram atrātanute jagad yuge
smṛtā rasakṣālanayeva yatkathā.
Katham na sā madgiram āvilām api
svasevinīṃ eva pavitrasyati.

Śrīharṣasya.
This 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 the adhikārins are. It is the outcome of fifty years of study and research in the field of Sanskrit scholarship, but it was written in America where I did not have easy access to bibliographical resources. Many of the statements and quotations are derived from memory. Anabhyāse viṣam śāstram! Moreover, I have been completely out of touch with 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 āgatah. 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 Bilhana. 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, retyped, and sent back to an able editor in India. He was recommended by one of my closest and most trustworthy friends. He did not do anything! Maybe it was beyond his limited knowledge. Maybe it was not his field. Then I sent it to a publisher. He demanded sixty thousand rupees just for production, and all the editorial and proofreading work had to be extra.

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

Once and 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 were none there who were for dharma, artha, and kāma with equal division and preponderance.

I was born and brought up in India. I lived there continuously for thirty-three years before I came to America for advanced studies, 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 everyone in America is rolling in dollars. There is no poverty, no squalor, no want. There are no needy people. 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 I was in a country of plenty and abundance, and thereonwards I wouldn't feel any monetary need. I wrote him back, "Yes, it is true. Every house in America is blessed in its courtyard with a Tree of Dollars. The house-holder 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 did not fall down onto the earth from the open skies. Neither was it an imperial creation. Well, this was an aside. Maybe some eyes were 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 of 1990. Thirteen precious years were wasted in this mirage. As the book was originally 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 for 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. And how will they realize its value? No bookseller would like to promote its sale. It won't bring lucrative commission or the means to persuade the librarians. I 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 a place on its shelves! 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 modern computer technology--as it was available to me here in Columbia with no active studies, reading, writing, or 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 one project being pushed "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, devoted, selfless scholar who possesses all the knowledge which has been instrumental here, plus all that is still lacking, readers can stay with this publication.

Readers will observe that a great deal of stealing has been committed by some "scholars" from my previous work on Bihāna, and this plagiarism has been heavily criticized by me. Yet I give full freedom to any Sanskrit pandit to edit, revise, and publish this work. There is no copyright!
Viśvanātha Śāstrī Bhāradvāja, I think, is no longer 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. However, 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. I request an inquiry. I can not 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 the main 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

Bilhana's Vikramāṅkadevacarita and Its Neo-Expounders

During my sojourn in the U.S.A. in 1991, I was pleased to see a scholarly work entitled Bilhana’s Vikramāṅkadevacarita 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 Vikramāṅkadevacarita. Dr. Nagar had edited the poem as a youth in 1945 and composed a brief glossary naming it the "Caritacandrīkā." Both the critics unfairly utilized the writings of Dr. Nagar without any acknowledgement whatsoever. Bharadvaja assigned the "Candrīkā" 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 "Caritacandrīkā" and gave their own which are less acceptable, or not at all acceptable.

Again, Dr. Nagar finds their suggestions to replace the words of Bilhana 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 Bilhana 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 śloka tvam 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:

Asatpraudhyoṇṛçarṇa-duṣaṇair dūnacetasah.
Kāvyopaplaśaṅkotthah 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 youth 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 1874. 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.
DVITIYAM ĀMUKHAM

It is a pleasure, a very great pleasure, for me to present the second revised edition of Bilhana's Vikramāṅkadevacarīta and Its Neo-Expounders to the lovers of Sanskrit around the world. The first edition, though quite limited, went out of print so fast! It was simply amazing! But on the second thought, I 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 Bilhana too:

Girām pravṛttir mama nīrasāpi

In the first "Āmukham" I stated, "The book has a very long story and a sad one too." It was narrated in brief. In spite of my best efforts I could not find even a single scholar to collaborate with me on the work. 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 me alone? Even our great poet Kālidāsa--one of the greatest poets to have ever appeared on this earth--had this to say about himself:

Ā paritoṣād viduṣām
sādhu na manye prayogavijñānām.
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 and forth and back again.

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

I am reminded of another great Sanskrit poet, Kavītākāminīhāsa Bhāsa about whom another poet has sung,

Sūtradhārakṛtārmbhair nāṭakair bahubhūmikaiḥ.
Sapatākair yaśo lebhe Bhāso devakulair eva.

What did Bhāsa say? He assured us that

Dvīpād anyasmād api madhyād api jalaniḍher diśo'pyantāt.
Ānīya jhaṭiti ghaṭayati vidhīr abhimatam abhimukhībhūtaḥ.

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

Dr. Satapathy went through the entire book. Though no more possessing the best health 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, Bilhaṇamahākaviyaśōguṇā-gāṇa. 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 śokaḥ śloka-tvam āgataḥ. According to Dr. Satapathy, it was a case of kopo granthatvam 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 grateful to him.

I only wish that Dr. Satapathy could have 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 Śāstracudāmaṇi in Sanskrit Vidyāpīṭham in his home town of Jagannāthapurī. It will be a case of ratnam kāṇcanam anvagāt. I 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 sukhinaḥ sarve santu nirāmayāḥ.
Sarve bhadrāṇi paśyantu mā kaścid duḥkhabhāg bhavet.

Columbia, MO
1 January 1992
Happy New Year

Murari Lal Nagar
Aspiring to remain in service of
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 fresh trail scarcely witnessed in earlier poets. Bilhaṇa himself declares,

Praudhiparakṣeṇa purāṇa-viṣayikramaḥ śāghyaṭamaḥ padānāṁ.
Atyunantaśphoṭita-kāṇcukāṇi vandyāṇi kāntākucamāṇḍalāṇi.

and also

Sahasraśaḥ sau ṣvāradānāṁ vaidarbhalilāndhāyaḥ prabandhāḥ.
Tathāpi vaicīryarahasyalubdhāḥ śraddhāṁ vidhāsyantī sacetasō-tra.

Dr. Johann Georg Bühler (1837-1898, of Bombay and finally of Vienna) became the first scholar in our time 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 of 1874,

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 [IA 5 (March 1874):89].

Dr. Bühler edited the work and had it published with his learned "Introduction" in the Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series (as no. 14) in 1875. Once again he emphasized the value of the work:

As soon as I recognised the importance of the MS, I resolved to copy it out myself. My time at Jaisalmer was limited. But with the help of my companion Dr. H. Jacob of Bonn, who kindly lent me his assistance during my whole tour in Rajputana, the task was accomplished in seven days (p. 46).

The Carita was prescribed for the Sāhitya Ācārya Examination (Pt. 1) 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 twelve years and had read most of the works by great Sanskrit writers like Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Daṇḍin, Māgha, Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti, Śrīharṣa, and Subandhu, some at the venerable feet of great Sanskrit gurus in Banaras and some through my own studies.
As an act of dharma and also for svāntāḥ sukhāya, I used to teach Sanskrit to junior students 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, still continues today after thirty-seven years. (This writing goes back to 1977.)

The two friends were regular students of the College; they were studying the work with an old professor there who was not at all able to grasp the true meaning of the many verses. For example, he interpreted the word “śaundāryam as madyapāyitvam”! 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 had 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 tasted, the more we enjoyed it. 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 fewer problems because we could easily conclude that it was wrong. But when a reading only 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 "satyāyamānam asatya"! 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 long gone out of print. The edition then available under the name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Pt. Rāmavatāra Śarmā was a total disgrace to Sanskrit scholarship. With regard to it, I had declared in 1945,


And Shrī Viśvanātha Śāstrī Bhāradvāja had the same opinion with regard to that edition, which he expressed in his own version:
Dvitīyam--Kāśīsthajñānānandaśaladhiḥkāribhir guru-varyāṇāṁ sammatyā
asammatyā vā tannāṁṇa prakāśitam atīvāuddham iti śrīguruvarvāṇāṁ dṛṣṭipatham
api na gataṃ syād ityeva dyotayati. Sati raviśkarikarapraveśe kuto'ndhakāra-
sya sambhavaḥ (Kiścīt prāstāvīkam, vol. 1, p. 1)?

and

Kālakramād byūlarasamkaraṇe samāptim āśādite Kāśīsthajñānānandaśala
mudrāyantrālayān mahāmahopādhyāya-paṇḍitaprayāra-guruvara-Srī-Rāmāvatāra-
śarmanātmā na sampāditaḥ prakṛtamahā-kāvyasya samkaraṇāntaraṃ ca prakāśa-
bhāvam ānīyata. Param atra samkaraṇe pī [?] pūrvasamkaraṇaśuddhiṃāṃ nīrā-
kaṇaṃsasya kā kathā? Navanavānyaśuddhyantarāṇyapi locanapathātiḥtitāṃ

---------

Bh makes a very funny statement here: "locanapathātiḥtitāṃ prayānti." "Mistakes, errors,
and blunders cannot be compared with atithis, the guests!" Bh continues, "yataḥ sahṛdayā-
nām 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 bhāvaḥ is always what he
wants to get. It is not his concern if his words lead to that bhāva or not! This is called "bhā
radvāja-racanā-śaili."

---------

prayānti, yataḥ sahṛdayāṇaṃ cekhidyate cetaḥ. Atra śrīmatāṃ guruvaryāṇāṃ
nāmasāmyogo manasi vičikitsāṃ utpādayati (Bhūmikā, vol. 1, p. 3).

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

5. Vikramāṅka-deva-caritam . . . Rāmāvatāra-Śarmanā śaṃṣkṛtam [ed. by Rā
This edition, which is full of inaccuracies, seems to have been associated by some-
one with the great name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍita Rāmāvatāra Sarmā (p. 11
1).

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

The learned pandit Sharma tells us in his short introduction of one and a half pages,
which is also full of numerous errors, that he has corrected Bühler's errors as far as practic-
al. We took his word to be true and correct. It was a Herculean task--a Bhagīratha prayā-
sa--to bring the River Gaṅgā of Bilhana's muse on to this earth once again. It was found to
be a very difficult task indeed.

However, gradually we became disillusioned and realised that the text of Sharma
as presented in his edition suffered from many inaccuracies. It may sound like bragging
(ātmāslāghā), but sometimes we had to spend several hours--even days--in trying to recon-
struct a word or a sentence. How could we even dream that Dr. Bühler's text would have
been so distorted by Sarmā?
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 Bühler and reported them to me. It was a great delight and reassurance. There was clear evidence that Bühler's edition was superior. However, the student who owned that rare copy of Bühler's edition would not lend it even for a day! There was so much distrust:

\[\text{Lekhanī pustikā nārī [dārāh] parahaste gatā gatā.}\
\[\text{Āgatā daivayogena naṣṭā bhraṣṭā ca marditā.}\]

The owner was not willing 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 time in 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 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 sāha vīryam karavāvahai.

In January 1941 a great ambition was fulfilled. I saw the edition of Bühler 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 disgusted when we realized how irresponsible Sharma's work was. It generated a nauseating feeling.

I concluded that in spite of Bühler'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., I 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, thick, modern paper. Of course it was in Bālabodha (Devanāgarī) characters, but it seemed to be a bālakṛti (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. Bühler's text enabled me to conclude that it was the transcript prepared by Drs. Bühler and Jacobi in Jais almer.

* * *

NAGAR'S EDITION
I decided to go to Jaisalmer for a comparative study, collation, and 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, and some of the lacunae in Bühler's text were filled with the original readings because they were not lacking in the 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 the J MS., Bühler says in his "Introduction,"

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 (pp. 45-46).

--------
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 Bilhana's Vikramāṅkadevacarita which is a mahā-kāvyā 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 [sic] 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 help of a critical and judicious use of the material which was available to him. In his Sanskrit "Introduction," running over nearly 40 pages printed in small type, the editor very ably discusses many historical problems presented by the poem, and arrives at conclusions which can hardly be disputed. In the foot-notes to this "Introduction" he rightly points out many an error committed by Dr. Bühler, and others in the discussion of the historical material contained in the poem. A brief summary in English of all the important points discussed and decided by the editor in this "Introduction" would have been surely most welcome from the point of view of the general reader.

But I had hardly any competence to write in English at that time!

Another reviewer commented in 1947,

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 glos-sary explaining important and difficult words and incorporating most of the notes in the scribe's own hand on the ancient Jasemere 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 [S. D. Bhanot, Indian Librarian, 1 (March 1947): 126-27].
Even Misra (with his tiny little knowledge and totally insensitive mind) was able to perceive the value of my edition 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 MSS, 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 prastāvāna. 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 Chalu kya empire [!], a reproduction of the Nilgunda copper plate inscription of Vikrama-ditya VI, dynastical tables of the Lohara, Chola and Western Chalukyas, and a concordance of important king-names [!] make this edition still more useful (Misra, pp. 111-12, stress added).

Misra is not specific about the authorship of "Candrikā." Probably he did not mis-understand! 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 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 three hundred copies that 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. Since my early youth I had had a dream to visit the United States of America. This 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. In 1956 we came back home. I remained busy with my new job at 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 one hundred institutions of higher learning in India.

Around 1958, circumstances prompted me to think of a new and revised edition of the work. I inquired with almost all the leading manuscript libraries of the world whether any new manuscript of the Vikramāṅkadevacarita had been acquired recently; the response was negative. However, I worked on the Vikramāṅkābhuyadaya of Someśvara Bhū-
lokamalla, 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. Vikramāṅka-devacarita, 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,

Pt. Vishwanath Shastri Bharadwaj 17 Golagali M.A., Kavyatirth, Vidyavagish Banaras - 1 Retd. Lecturer, History of Sanskrit Dated
Ex-member, Board of Sanskrit Studies, U.P.
& its Examination Committee Member, Faculty of Oriental Learning &
Boards of Sahitya & Itihasa-Purana Banaras Hindu University

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 undertaken [!] 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 Vikramaṅkadevacarita 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 Vikramaṅkadevacarita 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

I wrote again on March 3, 1960, but never received a reply. This reminder was sent later that same month:

March 27, 1960

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 Bilhana, 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,

Antarbhāvitaṭtipanīkā saīṣa "Candrikā" tanīyasyapi granthārtham ujjvalayiṣyatītī 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:

* Īḍrśacihadvayāntarvartinī ṭippanī  
Jaisalmeragranthasthetyavagantavyam.

and the quotations in the "Caritacandrikā" from Jaisalmer's tippani are preceded and followed by (i.e. enclosed within) the sign *, e.g. *Rādhā Viṣṇubhāryā * (p. 209), * abhiprāyo'nyatrollikhanam * (p. 210). I have also given Hindī-paryāyāḥ. 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 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 nāvagamyate." Your big commentaries are typical of what other pandits used to say in Banaras (e.g. śroṭṭmām itī vastuviplavakṛtaḥ prāyeṇa tiṭkā--kṛtaḥ).

I don't know what is the purpose in explaining, for example, a word "sūtikā-ghram" by another word "ariṣṭām"? For such work our forefathers have been saying: "Maghavā kī tiṭkā Biḍaujāl!" 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 grammarian friend might have been able to give the prakṛti and prat yaya of an obscure word like akṣuṇa, yet it does not convey the meaning desired by a sahṛdaya. For such vaiyākaraṇakhasūci/s we have: Vadantu katicid dhaṭhāt khap hachāṛtheti varṇacchāṛāḥ.

You have given a map of 11th century India. Would you kindly tell me what sources have you 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 others’ works and do not even acknowledge it? 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., A.D. 1229). 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 were 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 ten years younger than I am. Be that as it may, I continued to work on the Vikramāṅka-devacarita as time permitted because Bharadvaj's work was nothing but a guide (or mis-guide) to the student examinees.

* * *

COMMENTS ON BHARADVAJ’S EDITION

Some preliminary remarks about the work of Bharadwaj would 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 parāma-gurave namah. Śrī parāt parāma-gurave namah. Śrī parāt parātara-parāma-gurave namah. Śrī parāt parāt para-rama-parama-gurave namah," etc. "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.

In coutries 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 mar riage, 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 leads his new wife to the audience, including relatives, 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 Bharadvaja, the great editor and commentator of Bilhaña’s Vikra
māṅkadevacaritam, concludes his "Kiñcit Prāstāvikam" with the following words:

nātha Dīkṣita, Mahāvīraprasāda Dvivedī, Kalhaṇa. . Prabhṛtibhayaḥ sarvebhyo
mānyebhyo lekhakebhyaḥ teśām pustakalekhāvalokanena bahuṣa upakṛtatvāt
dhanyavādān samarpayāmi.

So, among others, Bharadvaj salutes Śrī Rāmanātha Dīkṣita and says that he was highly
obliged to Rāmanātha Dīkṣita. I am not 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 lekha Bh is alluding to.
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 Sarvasvati Bhavan Library of the College, I found a booklet in Tamil. Since I
could not read it, and my friend Shri Ramanatha Dikṣita could, 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 (copycats) like Dvi-
vedi. It was an enchanting work.

In my "Bibliography" of the works consulted (Vikramāṅkadevacaritasaya Aitihāsika
tattva-Nirūpāne Sahāyakā Granthāḥ), I had cited the above translation as follows:

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

The same work has been cited by Bharadvaj in his Pariśīṭam Gha. Vikramāṅka
devacarita-mahākāvyasya Vikramādityasya ca Varṇanātmaṅka Lekhā Granthāś ca, appearing at the end of his vol. 1, in the following words:

5. Ĉalukya Saṅtha Vikramāditya kā Jīvana va Samaya--Śrī Rāmnātha Dīkṣita,
Sāhitya Śiromāni, Sādholālā Risarca Skālara, Banārāsa--Śrī E. Vīr. Venkaṭa
ramaṇa [sic] dvārā Temila [sic] Bhāṣā meṅ Likhita The Life and Times of
Chalukya Vikramaditya VI [?] kā Anuvāda, [N.B. There is no imprint and no col-
lation either!]
The above "Anuvāda" has been viewed so far by only two people in this wide world: Shri Dīkṣīta and me. It is still in my possession in its original form as it was written by me as early as 1940. I don't know where or how Bharadvaj saw this! And I don't know either where he got the English title! I can understand him saluting Dīkṣīta as a matter of courtesy, but I don't know why he had to say that he saw Dīkṣīta'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 Dīkṣīta and still claims that he saw it, we can conclude that he did not see any of the books listed by me, but only reproduced my list. It was not necessary for him to study those works, either. That is a fact. Anyone who goes through my elaborate "Introduction," and then 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 writers who preceded him.

Bh says that he saw Kalhana's Rājatarāṅginī (original Sanskrit) as well as Stein's Kalhana's Chronology of Kashmir (translation). Had he done so, he would not have made Kṣitirāja a sahodara bhrātā (a real brother) of Subhaṭā (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 Vidyāvāgīś! (See his letterhead.)

I learn from Bh that the city of Bombay is the home of two Royal Asiatic Societies, and that 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 by him as no. 10 and 11, respectively.

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!

I could go on and on and on like this. What I 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 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 except [sic] cases where the editor has come up with his own conjecture. Other features, viz. index to verses and proper names, genealogical tabs., map, inscription etc. have been mostly reproduced, [stress added] as such, from the editio secunda.
Bh professes to have helped the examinees (students) by writing a simple yet brief commentary. How simple his commentary is can be easily realized when we find an original word (of the poet Bilhana) like "sātikāgrha" explained by a synonym like "ariṣ am"! This is called in popular parlance "Maghavā kī ṭkā biḍaujā."

Again Bh interprets "viplava" as "dimba" [Vik. 6:9]. A beginner in Sanskrit, and even in modern Hindi, knows what "viplava" is. The question arises, how many know "dimba"?

Great poets have beautifully described such great "commentators":

Durbodhāṃ yaḍ atīva taddhi [vi] jahiśa spaṣṭārtham ityuktibhiḥ
Spaṣṭārthesvativistṛtiṃ vidadhati vyarthaiḥ samāśādikaiḥ.
Asthānēṇupayogibhiśa ca bahubhīr jalpair bhramāṃ tanvate
Śrōṭrāṃ iti vastuviplavakṛtaḥ prāyeṇa ṭikākṛtaḥ.

(ascribed to Bhoja)

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

Bhaṅgas taraṅga urmīr vā striyām vīcīr athormīṣu,
Mahatsūllolakollolau . . . (ityamaraḥ).

So "kallolāḥ" can be rendered as "mahāntas taraṅgaḥ." It is ridiculous to gloss "kal-lolāḥ" by "ullolāḥ" unless one wants to instruct the student in a more difficult synonym, or parade one's own pedantry! The former is much more common and better known (pracali ta) than "ullolāḥ." Also, I would like to know what is the gain in explaining "prthivyāḥ" by "prthivyāḥ." It is simply piṣţapesaṇaṃ.

The easy way Bh steals from me and then misinterprets Bilhana reminds me of Bhāravi's following sadukti:

Viṣamo'pi vigāhyate nayaḥ kṛṣṭārthaḥ payasāṃ ivāśayaḥ.
Sa tu tatra viśeṣadurlabhaḥ sad upanyasyati kṛtyavartma yaḥ.

(Kirāṭārjunīya, 2:3)

How much my friends and I had to struggle to bring some sense out of the apparent nonsense created by R! And Bh just takes it over without any acknowledgment what-soever. However, where I have failed, Bh had no brain to improve the text or solve the riddle.

Bilhana says,

Sāhityapāthonidhimanthanoththam karṇāṃṛtam rakṣata he kavīndrāḥ.
Yad asya dāityā iva luṇṭhanāya kāvyārthcārāḥ praguṇībhavanti.
The poet had writer-pretenders like Bh in mind when he wrote this. Bh copies from my ed. profusely, yet he professes to have improved on my text. The present work will provide in numerable examples of the depth of knowledge of Bh and demonstrate just how beautifully he has improved the text!

Bh admits that I have worked really hard to get the correct reading, and he does have some good words for my ed. Yet he attributes certain errors to it. He says, "Parañcā ṭrāpi yatra tatra sampādanaṇaḥ phāṣā anyakāraṇād vā pātha-bhedaṇiṇaye pramādo jāta iva drṣyate." He cites three example to prove his point.

The first example cited by Bh is "Asmarad dviradadānavārīṇā." The great scholar-pretender declares with all the vehemence at his command, "Ityatra teneti pāṭhāt tasyeti pā haḥ sādhutaḥ pratibhāti." I don't know what Bh means by "sādhutaḥ.""

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 or determination as to the correctness of the reading. Under the circumstances the reading "tena" is acceptable to all! I fail to understand what authority any editor, much less Bh, has to change the reading unnecessarily! It is unwanted, uncalled for, and unjust. Furthermore, how can anyone conclusively assert that "tasya" is preferable to "tena"? If so, "Rāmęṇa bāṇena hato Vālī" will be less desirable than "Rāmasya bāṇena hato Vālī." "Dviradadānavārīṇā" is only an instrument. The agent or kartā is Vikrama. He polluted the sea (water) through "dvirada- dāna vārī." It seems Bh suffers from an inferiority complex and just wants to show off. We can only remind him,

Śūro'si kṛtaṇīyo'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 he is familiar with anything substantial at all.

Bh gives the following verse as the second example where I have allegedly erred in his opinion:

Hastadvayīgarḍhagṛṅtalola-dolāgūṇaṁ jaghṇe vadūṇaṁ.
Asamvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe kimapyaḥḥūd ucchvasito manobhūḥ (7:29).

There is a famous ukti:

Nāṇdhṛpayodhara ivāṭitarāṁ prakaśaḥ no gurjāṛṣṭana āvāṭitarāṁ nigūḍhaḥ.
Artho girām apihitaḥ pihitaśa kaścit saubhāgyameti Maraḥṭavadūḥkūcāḥhaḥ.

(quoted in Bālabodhini Comm. on Kāvyapraṅkāsa, v. 45)

Thus if the vital organs (of the bodies) of the ladies would become totally naked, it would be obscene. There would be a bibhatsa scene and not the continuity of śṛṅgāra. No decent
woman would like her *jaghaṇa* to be totally naked in public. In reality, the *jaghaṇa* had be
come just a little bit bare, because the knot or tie of her *sari* (wearing apparel) had bcome
loose and it had just slipped a little! There is no need to make the *jaghaṇa* 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, when does one have the authority to change the
meaning? A change is thought of only when what exists does not make 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. Here I can only say that it would have been much better if Bh had kept quiet
!

In one place Bh accuses me of carelessness (*pramādah*) in determining the correct
reading due to haste in editing or some other reason. In another he alleges that pitfalls
(*skhalananam*) abound in the process of the reconstruction of the text on my part. His actual
words are "*skhalananam varīvartī.*" Here we have "yaṅluk," which is enjoined by "*Dhātor
ekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhiḥāre yaṅ.*** To explain, "*Paunāḥpūnayam bhrāṛthaḥ ca kriyā-
samabhiḥārab*" = "repetition of act or the intensity thereof." Therefore, "*skhalananam varī
vartī*" means "*atiśayena vartate, sutarāṃ vartate, atyartham asti, bhṛṣam asti*" ("that the mis
takes abound, occur time and again," etc.). Is this justified? How many cases can Bh cite?
Seeing all the blunders he has himself committed, I don't know which *pratyaya* should be
used in regard to him!

Nothing promotes success like a previous success. Once all three volumes of Bh
were published, he became elated. He lost his mind. In his third volume his *ātmāślāghā*
knew no bounds. On p. 3 of his *Bhūmikā* (vol. 3) he says,

Jaba Sva. mānaṇiyā Śarmā ji ke [guruva of Vol. 1 has now become only Śarmājī] saṃskaraṇa kī pustakeṁ aprāpya hone lagiṁ taba yaha āvaśyaka thā ki is

---------

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 Colleg
e, Banaras, for having prescribed such a work, the available edition of which was so poor
and intrinsically defective. They used to charge (jocularly, of course) 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 lagiṁ," not "*ho gainṁ*!"

---------

mahākāvyā kā eka śuddha [!] saṃskaraṇa nikale. Isa liye Dā. Maṅgaladeva Śāstrī
Em. E. Di. Phil (Ānksan) [!] Pustakālayādhyaṅkaṣa, Sarasvatī Bhavana Pustakālaya,
Vārāṇasi ne Śādholā Risaṅa Skālara [!] Śri Paṃ. Murārī [!] Lāla Nāgara Em. E.
Sāhityācārya dvārā Sarasvatī Bhavana Pustakālaya, Vārāṇasī se isakā tṛtiya saṃskaraṇa prakāśita karāyā.
Isameṁ sandeha naḥīṁ ki yaha saṃskaraṇa prakāśaka [!]
mahodaya ke athaka pariśrama se, prakāśita tīna sāṃskaraṇoṁ meṁ sūdha va utt ama hai.

The writer assumes quite a lot! He is inflated with a false sense of success.

Whoever the writer of the above passage is, he has demonstrated his abundance of knowledge. I don't believe it is the writing of Bh. In my "Introduction," I narrated the circumstances which led me toward the study of this immortal work. The writer of the above passage makes Mangaladeva Sastri as the karṇa! This is a misrepresentation of facts and a distortion of truth! Here are my words in "Prastāvanā":


Svānupamaguṇapreitās te tu na param tatkāryam anvamodayanta, api tu sā dhu sampādite tasmin mudrāṅśvāsanamapayaduḥ (p. 10).

Dr. Mangal Deva Shastri himself says in his "Foreword:"

The editorial duties, on his own request [stress added] 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 of the above "history" says that Dr. Mangal Deva Shastri was the Librarian of the Sarasvati Bhavan Library when he got this work done by (!) me! He must have returned from a distant planet after a lapse of decades. Or maybe he slept for decades! He must have been a Kaliyuga Kumbhakarna; he got up all of a sudden and wrote the narrative! He thought that Dr. Mangal Deva Shastri was still the Librarian. No, he was not the Librarian at that time. He was then the Principal of the Govt. Sanskrit College, Banaras. Before he occupied that distinguished chair, he was the Registrar of the Govt. Sanskrit College Examinations (U.P.) for years. And he was the Librarian even before he became the Registrar! It is very unfortunate that such irresponsible pen-holders pretend that they too can write!

There are many untruths and half-truths in Bh's "Introduction." I was not even a B. A., much less an M.A., when I completed this research! I don't know what the writer means by "prakāśaka mahodaya"! Does he mean the College? I can only bow down my head in reverence (or disgust) for this sagacious suggestion.

The writer (surrogate of Bh) reaches the highest peak of his vain glory when he declares,
Kucha sthalom para isa tṛṭiya saṃskaraṇa meṃ bhī mujhe pāṭhabheda meṃ parivartana karanā paṛā hai jo vicāra vinimaya ke anantara āvaśyaka pratiṭa huā.

He gives three examples, already discussed, and then he makes a generally bold statement:

Issa prakāra prāyāh sabhī sargoṃ meṃ thorā bahuta pāṭhabheda karanā āvaś yaka huā hai.

This is anything but honest and true scholarship, not worthy of one who claims to be a mem ber 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 the claim of Bh is! It is merely a bālacāpalam. His action reminds me of a great sadukti of our own poet Bilhana:

Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham.

I am also reminded of another nītivacana:

Mūrkho’pi sūhate tāvat yāvat kiṃcin na bhāṣate

True scholarship and simple morality demand that Bh should have indicated all the cases where he had changed my text so that the discerning critics might have seen for themselves how true his claim was! If the three cases cited by him provide any evidence, the conclusion is indisputable that it is 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 I can state that the prose order of Bh is arbitrary at many times, to say the least. No sahrdaya will accept it. It is neither khaṇḍānvaya nor daṇḍānvaya. It is probably Bhāradvājānvaya, i.e. manah pūtaṃ samācara. Or we may call it "vitaṇḍāvādānvaya"; it befits his total per sonality and accomplishments.

* * * *

MISRA’S MAGNUM OPUS

The above background is presented here just to assure the readers that I am not a be ginner in this line (of Sanskrit studies). I have studied Bilhana probably more than any other scholar in modern times.
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In 1977 I chanced to see the Studies on Bilhana 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 Bilhana’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," then the "study" must have been very small!

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., "Intro." 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)].

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

It is hoped that the treatment of certain lexicographical items [?] in Chapter II, [!] will not only help the understanding and interpretation of Bilhana, 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. Subhāṣita-ratnakośa (Srk); Saduktikaraṇāmṛta (Skm.); Sūktimuktāvalī (Śmk.); Śāṅgadharapa dhdhati (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 Bilhana’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 Bīλhaṇa'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. "Intro." p. xxxiiii), is shown to be invalid. Verses not verifiable in the extant works of Bīλhaṇa, 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 Bīλhaṇa (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 Bīλhaṇa's having composed Rāmāstuti (a proper "Rāma-carita" with Bīλhaṇa as an [!] author seems rather unlikely). On several occasions the verses treated here show affinity in style or vocabulary with the extant work [?] of Bīλhaṇa and these as such have been discussed critically. Not in all cases the genuineness of the ascription to Bīλhaṇa is warranted by such further evidence.

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

I express may [sic, i.e., 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

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

through the entire text of Vikramāṅkadevacarita with me as well as his valuable guidence 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 opport unity of warmly thanking her for her co-operation. . . .

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 those feelings. The reader may not find any coherent, orderly narration here, because it is a criticism of a work that lacks coherence and order in itself. My attempt here is only to expose the hollowness of the unworthy and misguided comments of Misra, Bharadwaj, and others, and to uphold the worthy muse of mahākāvi Bīλhaṇa. The order adopted is, however, that of the Vik, itself so that some sort of sequence is maintained.
The question arises, why should I feel 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 Bilhana. Many others had preceded him and had practiced it. Bh had done it. Musalgaonkar had done it. Then why 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. Incidentally, my criticism of Misra also brings in the performance of both Bh and Musalgaonkar. So this writing is a kind of "Śokaḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ"

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

Yadyapi na bhavati hānīḥ parakīyām carati rāsabhe drāksām.
Anucitam idam iti kṛtvā hā hā heti khidyate cetaḥ.

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

The "investigations" of Misra on the Vik. remind me of Don Quixote de la Mancha, who imagines himself to be a knight (hero) and, with an intent 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 become the subject of ridicule from 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 jalatādanam 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 also 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, 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 crumbles.

Misra's attempts at emendations reminds me of the story of a man who was walking alone in a sandy desert. The sun was burning hot overhead, and the sand below was burn-
ing 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 mankind he is not a doctor of medicine. Had he been a physician and surgeon, his method of treatment would have been as follows:

A patient comes to his clinic. The patient is only suffering from a 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 bed per manently!

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

Gaṇayanti nāpaśabdaṁ na ṛṭtabhaṅgam kṣayaṁ na cārthasya.
Rasikatvenākutilāḥ veṣyāpatayaḥ kukavayaś ca.


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


2) Vyutpatīr āvarjitakovidāpi na raṇjanāya kramate jaḍāṇām. Na mauktikacchidrakarī śalākā pragalbhate karmani ṭaṅkikāyāḥ (1:16).


In December of 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 colours. The books arrived early in January of 1978. I was fortunate to see the beautiful "jacket" designed by S. K. Berry. A book jacket is also called a "dust jacket." It protects the book from dust after the book comes off the press. In the case of Misra's book this dust jacket is doubly meaningful because it serves two purposes: it protects the book not only from the external dust in the air, but it also covers the work from its own internal or inherent dust already contained therein. It is so beautiful and functional. It also gave me more information about this great author and critic. The dust jacket reads,
Bilhaña’s Vikramāṅkadevacarita 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 Bilhaña'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 Vikramāṅkadevacarita 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, I do not find these conclusions convincing at all! Rather, I believe, they are misleading. The reader will examine the comments of Misra and my criticism thereon. I hope that will help in the correct understanding of Bilhaña's poetic muse.
I am reminded of some immortal words of Kavikulaguru Kālidāsa:

Tam santaḥ śrotum arhanti sadasadyakṣīṭehetavāḥ.  
Hemnaḥ samākṣayate hyagnau viśuddhiḥ śyāmikāpi vā (1:10).

Also our own poet Bilhaṇa has expressed his sincere wish as follows:

Ullekhāḷāḍhaṭṭānaḥpāṭūnāṁ sacetasāṁ vaiṇikopamānāṁ.  
Vicāraṣaṇopalapāṭṭikāsu matṣūktiratnāṇyātāṁbhavantu (1:19).

There are six chapters in Misra’s work:

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

My 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 I begin my critical study of the great performance of this great "investigator, " 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 Tuebin gen has proved that he did not receive the degree! The correspondence is presented here as evidence from Misra's magnum opus and the University of Tübin gen.

The "Preface" is dated 1st September 1976 and was written from G. N. Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, Allahabad. The title page shows that "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 Vikramaṇkadevacarita (Vcar.), [Misra does not 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 Bilhana and his Vikramāṅka devacarita (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 University of Tübingen and whether it was submitted originally in German. It was my assumption that a German university would insist upon the dissertation being written in German. Later I learnt from a UMC 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 to whom I had written had to get the needed information from the author through a common friend visiting India! There was a lack of understanding. I wished that I knew German or that 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 poet 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 (reproduced above) I received another letter from her dated 14.11.77 along with photocopies of the preliminary pages of the book, which I already had with me. Here is what she wrote:


Translated into English, the above would read 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 as the preface for you and from these copies you can see the bibliographic information.

With kind greetings . . .

I wrote to her in turn:

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 Bilhana . . ." 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 could (or might) 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 again 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 did this continued silence mean? I was left wondering.
In the middle of January 1979 I received the following letter from someone by the name of Dr. Klein in 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 Vikramakadevacarita" 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 [sic]
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 [stress added] 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 certifi-
cation" 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 under-
stand why he renounces to get the legal right to bear the title [stress added].

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 dis
sertation (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 Bilha
na'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 impostor.

The following may be added to the above information: While Mr. Misra was con-
ducting his "investigations" in Tübingen, 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” (a Ph. D.) from the Sanskrit University, Varanasi.
The title of his "śodhapa-bandha" is Vikramāṅkadeva-caritasya Sāhityikam Sarvekṣaṇam
- I don't know if the work is published as yet or not, but I have acquired a xerox copy. Limi-
tations of space do not permit me to present even the highlights of this work. Suffice it to
say that if I try to condemn and criticize this book, another book will emerge of the same
size as this one. I 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 even
deserve 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. Chandri-
ka Prasad Shukla, because his kṛti among others was helpful to him. I have not heard of
any work on Bilhana by CPS. Let us find out. PCS's "Bibliography" does not describe this
work.
CHAPTER I

SPECIMENS OF TEXTUAL DIFFICULTIES

Misra begins his learned discourse with the following:

1.48b
lakṣa- "aim": a wrong [!] orthography (cp. also 12.5; 18.30) instead of lakṣya "to be observed/marked", gerundive of root lakṣa "to mark, to observe", cp. 7.73; 12.76; 13.19, 52, 55; 17.4, 53; 18.8. - cp. on 12.5b; 18.30d. lakṣa- is an orthographic variant, y being dropped after ś. (cp. J. Wackernagel, Altd. Gram., Bd. 1 para 235. 19 57; P. Thieme, Heimat der indoger, Gemeinsprache (Abh. d. Ak. Wiss. u. Lit. Mainz, Geistes-und Sozialwiss. Kl. Jg. 1953, Nr. 11, S.573 ff) (p. 1).

The verse in reference is

Uttarjanikena muhuḥ kareṇa kṛttāṃkṛṭāvekṣaṇabaddhalakṣaḥ.
Rusā niśedhanniva cēstitāni dikpālavargasya nirargalāni (1:48).

I do not know what, if any, "difficulty" is here. The great lexicographer Amara states, "Lakṣaṃ lakṣyamāṃ śaravyaṃ 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). Ghaṇ gives us "lakṣa," while nyat gives us "lakṣya." We can have cvi from both.

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

Prapnotyāśu paraṇāṃ lakṣaṃ mukta ivāśugaḥ.

Pratyakṣavad ākāśe lakṣaṃ baddhvā.

Uttarὰ sa ca dhanvinām yad iṣavaḥ siddhyanti lakṣe cale.

Darpeṇa kautukavatā mayi baddhalakṣyaḥ.

There is nothing wrong. It is all ghatat opo bhayaṅkaraḥ on the part of Misra. He cites the following on "lakṣya" and "lakṣa":

01:48b Kṛttāṃkṛṭāvekṣaṇabaddhalakṣaḥ.

12:05 Gavākṣarandhrair avalokayantarā
lakṣīkṛtā kāpi manobhavena.

18:30 Kṛṣṇavatāyanakṛtapadasyaiva lakṣibhavanti

The above two have been listed twice unnecessarily by Misra.
07:73  Kāmaḥ samprati bānāmokṣarasiko laṅśyeṣvalaṅṣyeṣu ca.

12:76  Sthalaviluṭhītabāspavyaktīlakyaiḥ kāṭākṣaiḥ.

13:19  Ghanoparodhāt tarālākṣi laṅṣyaṭe.

13:52  Jarāvimukteva mṛgākṣi laṅṣyaṭe.

13:55  Svabhāvanīlāḥ katham atra laṅṣyaṭām.

17:04  Kvacin na durbhikṣam laṅṣyata kṣitau.

I don't know why Misra has included such verbs here!

18:81  Durlaṅṣyatvam kāliyugadrśām ṛṣitaḥ brahmaḥamnā.

I do not understand either why Misra had to give so many examples. Did he want to ex-
haust the universe? Of course not, because we have many more such examples:

Paṅcesuṣ calaṅṣabhedavidhinā garvaṁ saṃrōhati (7:72).

It was all

Yena kena prakāreṇa prasiddhāḥ puṣo 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.”

Bilhana says,

Jigīṣavah ke’pi vijitya viśvam vilāsādīkṣārasikāḥ kramena,
Cākruḥ padām nāgaraṅkhaṇḍacumbi-pūgadrumāyām diśi davaṇṣasyām.

Nirviṣeṇāpi sarpeṇa kartavyā mahatī phanaḥ,
Viṣam bhavatu mā vāstu sphaṭātopo bhayaṅkaraḥ.
[ghaṭātopo bhayaṅkaraḥ ityapi pāṭhaḥ.]

Here is a discussion on “nāgarkhaṇḍa” by Misra:

nāgaraṅkhanda- (1.64; 15.6). possibly written for nāgaraṅsanda- (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, nāgarkhaṇḍa-
might be taken as "piece of ginger" (cp. Stein’s remark in Eng. Trans. of Rājat. 7.19
4). 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 (p. 33).

It is common (or uncommon) to take a rope to be a snake! A close examination, however, shows that the rope is a rope and not a snake! I find it difficult to accept the type of research Mr. Misra has performed. The "Caritacandrikā" had explained this as early as 1945!

Vcar. 1.64 seems characteristic:

nāgarakhaṇḍa-cumbipūgadruma "arecanut trees touching nāgara-khaṇḍa"\(^\text{15}\)

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 . . . [Misra’s footnote].

15.6ab
subhaṭāḥ pramadākārārpitaṁ [!]
dalayan nāgarakhaṇḍavīṭikām.

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

Other occurrences of this word: Śambhumā, Anyoktimuktālatā (KM.2), v.6: pakvaṁ nāgarakhaṇḍapallavam, "a ripe sprout [''leaf'?] of the nāgarakhaṇḍa" Skm. 2081, ascribed to Rājaśekhara: paṇḍam 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 nāgarṣaṇḍa- 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 nāgarṣaṇḍa-, when [?] it means "betel creeper or leaf." [I do not agree at all!]

Probably nāgarṣaṇḍa- corresponds to what in Hindi is known as nāgaripān, cf. Hindi- Śabdasāgar, 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: pāṇamāhi nāgarṣaṇḍa pāṇa "amongst Pān (Piper betel) Nāgarṣaṇḍa is the [best] Pān." Karpūravalli, Vcar. 9.60, in Hindi known as kapuri [sic], is another variety of betel, yello wish, hard, and full of veins, but of good taste and smell.

. . . nāgaripān and kapuriṇpān are perhaps cultivated betels and liked by the eaters [!] for their particular smell, i.e. of ginger and camphor respectively.

How about Tāmbūlaṁ katutiktam uṣṇamadhumā?
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 me 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) states in his Vikramāṅkābh hyudaya,

Sammukhopaviṣṭayā kucatāvisrastavasanayā dayitayā diyamāna karpūra kastūrik ā- vimiśra cūmāvaliptākaparipāṇḍura- nāgarakhaṇḍaparṇāvītkah (p. 25).

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

In brief, "nāga" and "nāgara" are synonymous.

Is it too early for Mr. Misra to know that the JMS frequently interchanges "kha" and "ṣa"? I'm not sure if he knows even today the birthplace of Bilhaṇa. It is not Khona-mukha, but Khonamuṣa. Until I appeared, everyone, repeat EVERYONE, thought it to be Khonamukha. Do you get the point, Mr. Misra?

For Misra's enlightenment, I would like to cite one more "khaṇḍa":


"Khaṇḍa" and "ṣaṇḍa" 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.

* * *

The word "pratiṣṭhā" appears as follows:

Āraktam arghaṃpanatatparāṇāṃ siddhāṅganānāṃ iva kuṅkumena. Bimbam dadhe bimbaphalapratisthāṃ rājīvinījitavallabhasya (1:35).

Misra has the following learned discourse:

Pratiṣṭhā- "likeness, sameness" is an idiomatic use of Bilhaṇa, not recorded in lexica . . . (pp. 35-36).

The trouble with Misra is that he proceeds with a preconceived notion. He wants to find out in Bilhaṇa and in his own little "lexica" what his mini-mind dictates. The question is,
why interpret "pratiṣṭ hā" as "likeness" or "sameness" here? "Pratisthā" is to be taken here in the sense of "pre-eminence, superiority, high rank or position, fame, celebrity" (Monier-Williams). Let us now continue with Misra's misinterpretation:

1:35cd
bimbam dadhe bimbaphalapraṭiṣṭhām
rājīvīnīvīta-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 . . . ātataptram . . . kuraṅganābhūtikapraṭiṣṭ hām . . . . samārohati, "the umbrella climbs up/aquires the likeness of a tilaka of musk."

There are some instances where pratiṣṭ hā is used in its literal [?] sense, as a derivation of prati-sthā "to stand against", meaning "footing, standing": 1:57ab kṣmābhṛtykalām upari pratiṣṭ hām avāpya "having gained footing above the family of the kings-mountains"; 1:66cd. . . .

Viṣṇoḥ pratiṣṭheta vibhiṣaṇasya 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'] of Viṣṇu."

Cp. also 3.17; 16.29: parā pratiṣṭ hā "firmest stand"; 1.79: kulapraṭiṣṭ hā "firm stand of a family"; 18.59: sāstrapraṭiṣṭ hā "firm footing in the [traditional] teaching." [Misra is wrong; it is not 18.59 but 18.56. He did not even proofread properly! ] It seems that pratiṣṭ hā- in the sense of "likeness" is derived from "reflection [in a mirror]", [not necessarily] lit. "what takes its stand [in the mirror]". Compare. 6.48 ab

Pratiphalananihāt sahasrābhāsā maṇimayapalyayapanapratiṣṭhitena.

"[B]y 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 my "Caritacandrikā" translates "pratiṣṭ hām" as "sāmyam," it can also mean "padam." Bh puts it better. He says "pratiṣṭ hām savarṇatvāti sārāpyam," i.e., "tādāmyam, abhe daḥ."

I don't have to insist that it means "likeness, sameness," or that it is an idiomatic use, or that we have to bring in a "mirror" or "image" or "reflection" to prove my point.

Incidentally, Misra has also discussed the meaning of "saṅkucita" with reference to 1:66, where it occurs with "pratiṣṭ hā" in the para quoted above (p. 30). The word "saṅkucita" has many meanings. It may be taken here to mean "narrowed" or "cowering," but it can be explained better in context. Here is the full verse:
Dvīpakṣamāpālaparamparāṇāṃ dorvikramād utkhananomukhās te.
Viṣṇoḥ pratiṣṭheta Vibhīṣaṇasya rājye parama saṅkucitā 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 Vibhīṣaṇa simply because it was found
ed by Lord Viṣṇu, having appeared on this earth in the form (incarnation) of Śrī Rāmacandra.

I have used the word "spared," but it can be put in a different way: They did not dar
e touch the Island of Śrī Laṅkā. But for the fact that it was founded by the Lord Himself, th
е Cālukya kings would have certainly conquered the Island of Śrī Laṅkā as well!

We have another use of "saṅkucita" by Bilhana: "Laṅkāpateḥ saṅkucitam yaśo yat" (1:27). Here it means merely "narrowed down, not allowed to spread far and wide."

I would like to stress once again that Misra misses the essence of the word "pratiṣṭ hā," which has a very profound meaning. The following definitions may be noted:

"Base for support": Dharmo viśvasya jagataḥ pratiṣ hā.

"Firm basis": Apratiṣ he Raghujyes he kā pratiṣ hā kulasya naḥ.

"Foundation site": Lokasya nābhīr jagataḥ pratiṣ hā.

"An object of glory": Tyaktā mayā nāma kulapratīṣ hā.

"Installation, inauguration, or the consecration of an idol or image": Calācaleti dvīv
idhā pratiṣ hā jīvamandiram.

Also Prāṇapratīṣ hā.

* * * * *

The following verse provides an excellent opportunity for Misra to display his great
vitaṇḍāvāda:

Yasyānjanasyāmalakhadjapattā-jātāni jāne dhavalatvam āpuḥ.
Arāṭinārīśarakāṇḍapāṇḍu-gaṇḍasthalānālānuṭhanād yaśāmsi (1:71).

Misra says,

"... Whose fame ... became white, I fancy, because of its rolling (niḥ-lu h)\(^{33}\) on
the cheeks, white as sugarcane stalks\(^{34}\) [from grief], of the wives of the enemies.

He adds the following footnotes:
33. Cp. nirlut (ḥ) ana- : 5.3

34. For whiteness of (ripe) sugar-cane stalks cp. e.g. Viddh. 1.32/33 . . . [?] paripāk a- pāṇḍurāṇām śarakāṇḍānam. [Note: Misra’s quoted word is “śarakāṇḍa,” yet he translates it as "sugar-cane stalks.”]

Misra tries to demonstrate his prākāṇḍaṃ pāṇḍityam, which is like a śaśa-śṛṅga! This is an ut-preksā, a poetical fancy, not a description of a real event. The poet imagines the fame (actually, "the fame") of the king to roll/wallow on the cheeks in a feeling of exuberance, like 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).

I am not sure if Mr. Misra understood the poet. Even if he did, I doubt his readers will be able to understand him. Misra has omitted the following words from his quoted verse: "Aṅjanaśyāmalakhadgapattajātāni,” "the fame is generated from (or 'born out of') the (blade of) sword which is as dark as the aṅjana for the eye (Hindi kājala).” Now the "effect" Collyrium or black pigment used to paint the eye-lashes. Cf. the following verse.

Ajānāṇḍhasya lokasya jānāṇjanaśaṅkāvakā. Cakṣurunmīlitaṃ yena tasmai Pāṇinaye namaḥ.

(kārya) derives its qualities (like color) from the cause (kāraṇa). That is the law of nature. If so, how could the fame become white if it is born of a black substance? It too must turn out to be black! The poet explains and provides the reason: "arātinārīśarakāṇḍapāṇḍu-ga ṇḍasthalī- nirlut hanād.” Yes, Mr. Misra, the fame HAD TO BE TURNED WHITE, of course, in the kāvyasa-samsāra; not in your world, and not in mine either. You are truly a mugdh aṣiromani. You have not explained the word "mugdha” on p. 38 of your book. Did you ever read Amara: "Mugdhaḥ sundara-mūḍhayoh”?

And, by the way, I 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:


According to the Bālabodhini commentary on Kāvyaparakāśa, this verse occurs as no. 62 in the first canto of the Navasāhasāṅkacarīta of Padmagupta Parimala.
Incidentally I would like to remark here that I have not tried to study or criticize what Bh has done or undone with regard to the ascription of *alankāras* to Bilhana's compositions. I am not fully prepared at the moment to do it, and the subject is beyond the scope of the present study. How-ever, my curiosity prompted me to see what *alankāra-śāstra-pāṇḍityam* is demonstrated by Bh in this instance. Here is a quote from Bh:

*Añjanena saha khaḍgasya śyāmalatvena sāḍṛṣyadarśanāt gaṇḍasthalyāḥ pāṇḍutvena śarakāṇḍena sāḍṛṣyāccopamā.*

How simple! How innocent! How innocuous! Generations of students to come shall really be helped by the great services of Bh. I am once again reminded of *Kurvantu śesāḥ sukavā kya- pā ham.*

Bh tells us in his "Kiñcit Prāśāvikam":

*Srīmanto Bātukanāthaśāstri-Khistemahodayā Em. E. Sāhityācāryā Rājākīy a saṃskṛtamahāvidyālayasāhityasāśrādhyāpakāḥ sāśirvādaṃ dhanyavādān arhnti , yair āmūlacūlam Saṃskṛta-Hindi-vyākhyaśahitam lekharūpaṃ idam nibhālya bah uṣu sthaleṣu, viśeṣato’laṅkāraniveṣe kaviṃtrāgamya-duṛhavicārāṇaṃ nirdeśāṃ kurvadbhir atra guṇāḍhikyam utpāditam (p. 3). [This is merely an atiśayokti, which is saṃśayokti as well.]

Truly it is said that one sparrow does not make the summer. But then we have *Sthālipulāka nyāya* 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 guṇāḍhikyam but sahrdaya-hṛdaya-vidāraṇaṃ, vācaka-pravaṇicanaṃ, and ḥā dhiṅ kaṣṭaṃ. Bh should have known that this is much more than upamā. Upamā is base d as the root of all the *alankāras*. I wonder if our "Vidyāvāgīśa" has ever come across the following sadukti:

Upamaikā śailūṣī samprāpya vicitrabhūmikābhedān.  
Raṇjayati kāvyarāṅge nṛtyantī tadvidāṃ cetaḥ.

The word "jāne" should have opened the closed doors of his mind! All this shows that Bh is not an adhikārin at all. Apparently Bh not only did not study the Kāvyaparakāśa (an advanced text), but he did not even study the Sāhityadarpana.

Tathā coktaṃ Sāhityadarpane:  
Guṇau kriye [vā] cet syātaṃ viruddhe hetukāryayoh. 69
tad viṣamaṁ mataṁ. 70
Sadyaḥ karasparśam avāpya citraṁ . .
Atra kāraṇārūpāsilatāyāḥ 'kāraṇaṅgaṁ hi kāryaṅgaṁ
ārabhante' iti sthiter viruddhā śuklayaśasa utpattih.

(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 tot-
ally unfamiliar with the kāvyamārga. He is completely sāhitya-vidyāśrama-varjita. It is for
critics such as Misra that Bilaṁa sang long ago:

Kuṇhatvam āyāti guṇaṁ kavīnāṁ sāhitya-vidyā-śrama-varjiteṣu.
Kuryād anārdreṣu kim aṅgaṅānāṁ keṣeṣu kṛṣṇāgarudhūpavāṣaḥ.

According to Misra, "'fame' is always thought to be white by nature," yet it was expected to
turn out black--it had become black--because it was born of a black substance (kāraṇa--aṁj
anaś- syāmalakhaḍgapa a). Therefore the poet had to find a reason for its turning out whit-
e. See Misra p. 41, lines 17-18.

Mr. Misra ought to have known that this is a play and display of viṣama alaṅkāra,
not just utprekṣā alone! Viṣama is the real vicchitti, the real camatkāra. Misra's philosophy
of life is "the easiest is the best," but it is not always true.

Let us resume our study of Mr. Misra: Thanks to him I have learnt at this advanced
age, after having studied Sanskrit for five decades, that "śarakāṇḍa" means "sugar-cane"!
Apte explains "śara" as "a kind of white reed or grass." (Probably Mr. Misra uses this "sug-
ar" in his tea!)

Kuśakāśaśaraṁ pariṇaṁ suparicchāditām tathā.
Śarakāṇḍapāṇḍugandasthalā.
Mukhena Sītāṁ sarapāṇḍureṇa.

And for "śarakāṇḍa": "a reed-stalk."

In Śabdakalpadruma, we read:

Ṭrṇaviśeṣaḥ, kāṇḍa iti Hindībhāṣā. Tatparyāyāḥ iṣuḥ, kāṇḍaḥ, bāṇaḥ. muṇja
ḥ. tejanaḥ, guṇḍrakaḥ, iti Ratnamālā.

Bhadramuṇjaṁ śaro bānaṁ tejanaṁ caksuśeṣṭanaṁ.
Muṇjo muṇjāṭaka bāṇaḥ sthūladrībaḥ sumedhasaṁ.
Muṇjadvayam tu madhuraṁ tuvarma śiśiraṁ tathā
We know at least this much: sugarcane is not used to make mauñji-mekhalā. Cf. mauñji-ba ndhāt prabhṛti (Vik. 18:81).

Explaining this very word ("śara") I wrote in my "Caritacandrikā," "Śarāḥ—Gundras tejanakaḥ ityamaraḥ. Sarahariḥ iti khyātah. Kāṇḍo daṇḍah." Either Misra did not see it, or he disdainfully rejected it.

It is true that "sugar" is occasionally regarded as being white when a special kind is meant, like "punḍraka-śarkarā—Dveṣayāva keśām api candrakhanḍa[vipāṇḍurā punḍraka śar karāpi" (Vik. 1:20). I say "occasionally" because we have 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:

Cālukyavamśāmalamauktikaśrīḥ Satyāśrayo'bhūd atha bhūmipālah. Khaḍgena yasya bhṛktikrudheva dvīśāṃ kapālāṇyapi cūṇītāni (1:74).

He says,

For- mauktikaśrīḥ, "splendour of the pearl", (in all edd.) read mauktikah śrī- and construe śrī- with satyāśrayah as an honorific word, which is fully confirmed by the parallel stanzas, e.g. 1:68 Śrītailapah, 1:79 Śrījayasimhadevaḥ. For the wrong [?] ortho- graphy 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 pūrvācāryas. He reminds me of a great sadukti:

Mṛtkumbhabālukārandhra-pidhānaranacārthinā. Dakṣināvartaśaṅkho'yaṁ hanta cūṁkṛto mayā.

In trying to mend a hole in an earthen pot (caused by a sand pebble), alas, I shattered a conch shell with a daksina āvarta (a shape which spirals to the right from the left, a very valuable object). The great tragedy here is that the mṛtkumbha (earthen pot) did not even have a ny hole to begin with! Misra punched a hole just so that he could fix it!

If we connect "śrīh" with "Satyāśraya," the text would read,

Cālukyavamśāmalamauktikaḥ śṛṣṭyāśrayo'bhūd atha bhūmipālah.
The metre *upajāti*, a union of *Indra*vajrā and *Upendra* vajrā, demands that there must be eleven *aksaras* (i.e., *varṇas*, or "syllables"), including conjunct consonants) in each quarter. If we represent the two quarters as given above, the first will have only ten, while the second will have twelve! If we forcibly take "*śriḥ*" to the first one, we will take away all the splendour from the *kavi-ukti*, and we will do a great injustice to the poetic genius of *Bilhana*. 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. *"Vaṃśa"* means a dynasty as well as "bamboo," which produces the pearl. So the compound should be resolved as "mauktikasya śṛīr iva śṛīr yasya saḥ." The entire beauty, splendour, and meaning of the verse is lost if we force the word "*śriḥ*" to be merely an honorific word just to satisfy the genius of Misra! *"Śṛisatyaśrayah"* won't get any more *śriḥ*. It is unfortunate that so me *mugdha* pen holders who are totally *sāhitya-vidyā-śrama-varjitāḥ* try to interpret great poets like *Bilhana* and in the process misinterpret them and misrepresent the truth. And it is more painful when they claim to be not only research scholars themselves but also research guides!

Misra cites as examples "*Śṛitailapaḥ*" and "*Śṛījayanimhadevaḥ.*" He forgets "*Hārīta*" and "*Mānavya*" (1:58), and "*Āhavamalladeva*" and "*Trailokya-malla*" (1:87). We don't have to have the honorific prefix "*śṛī*" everywhere. The question is, where do we bring it from? We cannot rob Peter to pay Paul! Moreover, "*mauktika*" is a *nityanapaṃsaka* word (i.e., it can never be masculine or feminine). *Amarasiṃha's nāmalingānuśāsana* unequivalently dictates "*atha mauktikam.*" Therefore, we cannot have "*Cālukya-vamśāmalamauktikah*," as Misra ordains. If the reading is changed against the authority of the MS., we will be making *Bilhana* commit a literary crime!

* * *

Misra is miserably confused here:

Prthvībhujāṅgaha parikampitāṅgīṁ yaśaḥpatolluṇṭhanakelikāraḥ.
Vidhṛtya Kaścīṁ bhujayor balena yaś Colarājyaśriyam ācakarṣa (1:115).

He expounds the verse as follows:

"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\(^{29}\) Kāñci\(^{30}\) her belt, indulging in the sport of robbing (with ụd ṛuṇ ḥ) it (the capital)/her (the Fortuna) of its flags/of her [white] cloth (dress) that was its/her [white] fame/honour (pp. 39-40).

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 ["kampitaya"] and p.p. of the root "kamp" when applied to the body of Fortuna. [Is this grammatically possible? I am not competent enough to judge. Even if it is, why is it necessary at all?]

29. Read vivṛtya instead of vidhṛtya [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 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 Kāṇci (city) indulging in the sport of robbing (ud with lun 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 (the Fortuna) of her (white) cloth (dress) that was her honour.

The above words can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORDS OF THE POET</th>
<th>MISRA'S TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yaḥ prthvībhująṅgaḥ</td>
<td>Who as the paramour of the earth (= as a king)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ācakarṣa</td>
<td>snatched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhujayoh balena</td>
<td>by the strength of his arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parikampitāṅgīṁ</td>
<td>the royal fortune of the kingdom of the Colas, whose army had been shaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colarājya śriyam</td>
<td>Fortuna of the kingdom of the Colas, whose limbs had started to tremble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vidhr[vṛ]tya Kāṅcīm</td>
<td>after he had opened Kāṇci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaśaḥpātolluṇṭhana-kelikāraḥ</td>
<td>indulging in the sport of robbing (ud with Ĺu)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I hope that I have represented the interpretation of Misra correctly. If so, Misra has done a great disservice to the poetic genius of Bilhana.

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

The "Caritacandrika" explains,


Bh comments,

Anvayāḥ:

Yaḥ yaśaḥpaṭolluṭṭhanakelikāraḥ prthvībhujaṅgaḥ bhujayōḥ balena Kāncīṃ vidhṛtya parikampitāṅgīṃ Colarājaśriyāṁ ācakarṣa.

Vyākhyā:

Yaḥ prasiddho, yaśaś Colakīrtir eva paṭas, tasyolluṭṭhanam utkṣepaṇam āpa hara-ṇam eva kelis tām karotīti, yaśaḥpaṭolluṭṭhanakelikāraḥ, prthvivāḥ prthivyāḥ bhujanaṁ patiḥ kāmukaś ca, bhujayer balena, Kāncīṃ tannāṃnīṃ nagarīṃ raśanaṅca, vidhṛtya jītvā pragṛhyā ca, parikampitam aṅgam [or "aṅgāni"?] yasyā ![!] sā, bh ayena premṇā ca kampa- yuktāṃ, Colarājayasya śriyam lakṣmīṃ lalanāṅca "cakarṣ ā" kṛṣṭavān. Atra nrparājyalakṣmī vyavahāreprakṛtasya viṭṭakarṭkasya kāncī-parīg rahena haṭṭhād anyasādhāraṇanāyikā- samākarṣanarūpasyāprakṛta vyavahārasyāḥ bh edasmāropāt samāsoktir alaṅkāraḥ. [I don't know why Bh has "aprakṛta" twice and "prakṛta" 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 pratilipika. If the "Carita candrikā" did not have it, how could he have it?

Gajānana Śāstri Musalgāonkar confronts this as follows:

Anvayāḥ:
Yaśaḥpaṭolluṇṭhanakelikāraḥ prthvibhujaṅgaḥ yaḥ Kāṇcīṃ vidhṛtya parika mpitā- ngīṃ Colarājyaśriyam bhujayor balena ācakarṣa. [The prose order of Bh is much better as far as the location of bhujayor balena is concerned.]

Vyākyā:

Yaśa iti. Yaśa eva = Colakīrtir eva, paṭaḥ = ācchādanam, uttarīyavastram [!] iti yāvat, tasya luṇṭhanam = apaharaṇam, tasya keliḥ = krīḍā, tām karoti tacchīlā ḍ, prthvī- bhujangāḥ = kṣitiśaḥ kāmukaś ca, yaḥ Āhavamalladevaḥ, Kāṇcīṃ Colara jadhāṇīṃ, mekhalāṃ ca, vidhṛtya = grhiṭvā, bhayena premṇā ca parikampitāni anī yasyāḥ sā tām = vepamānaśarfrām, Colarājyaśriyam = Colanṛpatilakṣmīṃ anīgā nāṃ ca, bhujayoh = bāhvoḥ, balena = śaktyā, ācakarṣa = ājahāra; Atra Colanṛpatirā jyalakṣmīvyavahāre [!] kāmukakartṛkasya Kāṇcīparigraheṇa haṭhaḥ anyasādhāraṇ anāyikāsāmākarṣaṇarūpasya aprakṛtavyavahārasya abhedasamāropātī samāsoktir a laṃkāraḥ. [This is a copy of Bh.]

In Hindi, too, Musalgaonkar uses uttarīyavastra ("orhanī"). I don't understand why he is afraid of removing the adhovastra, i.e., the lower garment (or the sari)!

Musalgaonkar is another copycat! He also misses the significance of "aṅgā"! "Kā ma- duḥḥā hi mahākāvīnāṃ vāco bhavanti," but "locanābhīyām vihīnasya darpaṇaḥ kim kariṣ yati"!

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 as follows:

Āhavamalla, who was the paramour of the (feminine) earth [i.e., who was the king] and 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 armed forces) were all shaken to the bone, after he had seized (plundered or stormed) the city of Kāṇḍī, the capital. This is prakṛta, the reality.

We get aprakṛta by śabda-ṣakti and liṅganirdesa. The "Caritacandrikā," Bh, and Mk all have explained the verse pretty well, but Misra interprets the verse in a way that is not acceptable to me at all.

I believe that 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 = 1) "to draw towards, attract," or 2) "to deprive, take away by force, snatch." So "ācakarṣa" in the prakṛta takes the latter meaning, while in aprakṛta it takes the former meaning. I am afraid that Misra, a great disciple of a great German scholar, has missed the boat! He is still standing on the shore! I am not sure whether Misra knows that this is a play and display of a figure of speech called "samāsokti," that is, the action of a lover is superimposed on the king. The words "bh
ujaṅga," "aṅga," "pa olluṇ hanakeli," and "Kāṇci" (in the sense of raśanā or mekalā), the feminine gender of "śri," the root "vi-dṛḥ," and finally the root "ākṛṣṭ" 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 "bhujaṅga."

I 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 abhorrent. I fail to understand how one could "rape" with the strength of one's arms!

I don't see any "anyāṅganā" (sādhāraṇanāyikā) here to represent the beloved lady in the aprakṛta or upamāna side who has been "raped" by Misra! On one side (prakṛta or upameya) Misra has "royal fortune" (both words beginning with small or lowercase 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 of the "fortunes" belong to the kingdom of the Colas. There is no human person who could be "raped."

Abhinavabilihaṇa Misra (that is how I have named Misra), in his profound scholarly way, tells us that when Āharavalla "opened" (!) the city of Kāṇcī (the capital of the Colas), the army of the kingdom of the Colas was shaken. And in his equally superior style, he gives a footnote: "An army consists of four aṅgas, thus aṅga stands here for caturaṅga army."

According to Monier-Williams, "aṅgam" = 1) "a limb or member of the body," or 2) "a division or department (of anything), a part or portion, as of a whole; as 'saptāṅgam rājya am.'" And according to the same authority, "rājyāṅga" = "limb of royalty," a requisite of legal administration (variously enumerated as seven, eight, or nine; 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,

Svāmyamātyasuhṛtkaśa-rāṣṭradurgabalāṇī ca.
Rājyaṅgāni prakṛtayaḥ paurāṇāṁ Śreṇayo’pi ca.
[Pauraśreṇībhīḥ sahāṣṭāṅgam api rājyaṁ--Rāmāśramī]

And this is how Kāmankīya enumerates them:

Svāmyamātyaś ca rāṣṭram ca durgam kośo balaṁ suḥṛt.
Parasparopakārīdam saptāṅgam rājyaṁ ucayate.

One of these seven (or eight or nine) aṅgas is the army (senā), which has four subdivisions:

Hastyaśvarathapādātaṁ senāṅgaṁ syāc catuṣṭhayam.
That is, there are four divisions of senā: hasti (elephants), āśva (cavalry), ratha (chariot), and padāti (infantry).

Misra's interpretation here is unacceptable. "Parikampitāṅgīm" is a višeṣana and qualifies "Colarājiyaśriyam," which is the višeṣya. It is a Bahuśrīni compound--pari kampitānī aṅgāni yasyāḥ sā tāṃ.

Now here "yasyāḥ" (pronoun) connects with "Colarājiyaśriḥ" (substantive, i.e., the divinity (feminine) of the Cola kingdom (the Fortuna of Misra). So the limbs are hers and not those of the army. The question is, when Ahavamalla seized Kāncī, was the army alone shaken, or were all the other parts of the kingdom shaken as well? I would like to know from Misra whether or not the king was shaken, and whether the ministers too were shaken, and the allies, and the treasury, and the fortifications, and the people, and the entire territory of the Colas! 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 rājiyaśri. 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 rājiyānga.

We must remember that until and unless we have a clear and specific mention of the word "senā" (army), the mere term "aṅga" cannot stand for the "caturaṅgasenā." This is not interpret- ation. It is all sāhasikasya karma. I would like to know from Misra why "aṅga" here could not stand for "paṅcāṅgo rājanayaḥ," "five-part statecraft":

Sahāyāḥ sādhanopāyāḥ vibhāgo deśakālayoḥ.
Vinīpātapatṛkāraḥ siddhiḥ paṅcāṅga iṣyate.

[Śabdakalpadrumah]

Or "Ṣaḍaṅgo vedah"? Or "Saptāṅgam rājiyam"? Why only "balam"?

Misra tries to surpass our great Indian writer Bhāskarācārya:

Vayam iha padavidyāṁ tarkam ānvīkṣikīṁ vā
yadi pathi vipatve vā vartayāmaḥ sa antāḥ.
Udayatī diśi yasyāṁ bhānumāṁ saiva pūrvā
na hi taraṇir udite dikparādhīnavṛttīḥ.

He reminds me of another sadukti:

Uṣṭrāṇāṁ ca vivāheṣu gītam gāyanti gardabhāḥ.
Parasparam praśaṁsanti aho rūpam aho dhvaniḥ.

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

Sāhitye sukumārvastunī dṛḍhanyāyagrahagranthile
tarke vā mayi saṃvidhātari samaṁ ilaẏate Bhāratī.
Sayyā vāstu mṛdūttaracchadavātī darbhāṅkurair āṣṭṛtā
bhūmir vā hṛdayaṅgamo yadi patis tulyā ratir yoṣitaḥ.

Misra claims to be proficient in grammar as well as literature! He says that Āhava malla raped (!) the Fortuna "by the strength of his arms." We need not tell Misra that the beloved lady likes her lover to draw her towards himself by holding her girdle (kānci) after having been depriv-ed of her sārī or adhovastra, the lower garment. She enjoys this keli (game, play, or sportive act) on the part of her lover. Her limbs are trembling not because of a ny fear or danger, but because of the emergence of her passionate desire to engage in sexual intercourse accompanied with or pre- ceded by kissing, embracing, etc. This is a sāttvika bhāva. She is not raped.

Here is some information on "kampa" for the enlightenment of our mugdhaśiromani Misra Maharaja, the great neo-expounder, from Sāhiyadarpāne Tritiyaḥ Parichchedaḥ: "R āgadveṣa-śramādibhyah kampo gātrasya vepathuḥ" (1982 reprint of 1922 ed. of Nirmaya Sagar Press, p. 145). Fn gives another reading of "Ga" MS.: 

Vepathur yathā 
Rāgarośabhāyādibhyāḥ kampo gātrasya vepathuḥ

Bhayādibhyah is a better reading as compared to śramādibhyah!

Yathā 
Mā garvam udvaha kapolatale cakāsti 
kāntasvahastalikhita mama mañjarīti.
Anyāpi kim na khalu bhājanam īdṛśinām 
vairī na ced bhavati vepathur antarāyaḥ.

Compare this to patravallim kapole.

Rāgād yathā 
Vāramvāram tirayati dṛsor udgamaṁ bāṣpapūras 
tatsaṅkalpopahitajādīmsgabhtham abhyeti g ātram.
Sadyaḥ śvidyatayayam aviratokampalolāṅgulīkaḥ 
pānir lekhāvidhiṣu nitarāṁ kampate kim karomī.

Evam roṣādibhir āhyam. Iti "Ga."

Misra is not satisfied with "vidhyṛya"! 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 photocopy of J. I have just now comp
ared the text once again. "Dhy" is clearly visible here. It is as clear as crystal. It cannot b

e mistaken or misunderstood for "vr" under any circumstances, none whatsoever. We have

no right to change the reading unnecessarily and arbitrarily and thus make meaningful wor
ds lose their sense. It is a great disservice to the poet. It is an abject negation of honest an

d true scholarship.

Misra translates his chosen word as "after he had opened." I fail to understand how

the city could be opened! The act of opening is not compatible even with the girdle (kāṇcī
t), which is always open, i.e., visible. The lover does not have to "open" the girdle to procee
d further in the course of rati prasaṅga, i.e., sexual intercourse. I would like to know from

Misra if he has ever heard the following sadukti and if he knows what it means:

Praśānte nūpurārāve śrūyate mekalādhvaniḥ.
Kānte ratipariśrānte kāminī puruṣāyatē.

If Misra does not know what "mekhalā" is, he can look it up in one of his lexica! He will le
arn that it is synonymous with "kāṇcī." Yes, the girdle is an ornament worn over the sārī (l
ower garment). Here it is used by the lover to draw his beloved lady towards himself, to br
ing her close to his own self. The original word, the word of the poet, is "vidhrtya," and it h
as several meanings equally or even more relevant when applied toward the city: "having

laid siege on; having seized, stormed, conquered, plundered, taken possession of, or occupi
ed. I don't know how "vivṛtya" could provide even one of all these meanings!

Undoubtedly, "kāmadughā hi mahākavīnām vāco bhavanti," "the sayings of the grea
t poets are divine wish-cows"; they would give any boon (meaning) we pray for. One can d
erive more than one meaning from a word, yet the prakṛti (root) and pratyaya (ending) mus
t have the inherent power to denote the desired meaning. We cannot ask a barren woman t
o deliver a child through her womb!

The poet says, "Yah [bhujayoh balena] Kāncīm vidhrtya Colarājyaśriyam ācakraśa." 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 Āhavamalla acquired the Cola ki
ngdom by seizing the city of Kāṇcī, the capital of the Colas. The fall of the city of Kāṇcī si
gnalled the defeat of the Cola king and the victory of the Calukyas over the Colas, their inv
eterate enemies.

How did the lover bring his beloved lady towards him? By holding her in her kāṇcī (girdle). The girdle became the physical means or instrument in the action of drawing her t
owards him. She had to be brought close! How? By pulling her. Through what? Through the girdle! This is the meaning. Misra should know that a girdle is not a "belt."

Ladies in India don't wear a "belt" over their saris. It is tied by a knot (see "bandha
nā" in the verse "nivī svavyāṃ bandhanā" ) or tucked under a petticoat. A belt is removed b
efore the garment can be removed. But the kāminī continues to wear her kāṇcī throughout h
er rati-prasaṅga. Misra does not tell us how she is drawn by the lover towards him. It is al
so important to remember that the part of the body that is right below the front of the girdle
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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:

Nīvīṃ prati pranāhīte tu kare priyena sakhyāḥ śāpāmi yadi kiṃcid api smarāmi.

and

Nīvimokṣo hi mokṣaḥ.

and also

Kānte talpam upāgata vigaliti nīvī svayaṃ bandhanāt
vāsaśca ślathamekhalāgudhṛtam kiṃcinn nitambe sthitam.
Etāvat sakhi vedmi kevalam aham tasyāṅgasāṅge punah
ko’ sau kāsmi rataṃ ca kiṃ katham iti svalpāpi me na smṛtiḥ.

Sūktimuktāvalī, 86:17 (Kasyāpi)

I don't know where Misra gets the "flags" from; I don't see any! He is praṇācakṣu (see his disussion on "carmacakṣuḥ," pp. 31-32), or maybe he is confused. He may have the following verse in mind:

Kāncī padātibhir amuṣya viluṇṭhitabhūd
devālayadhva japaṭāvalimātraśeṣā.
Luoṭākaluptanikhilāṁbarādūmbarāṇāṁ.
kaupīṅakārpanapaṃeva purāṅganāṇām (3:76).

Misra might have argued that wherever there is Kāncī there are the flags. So there are flags even in 1:115!

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

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

Although Mr. Misra was breathing German air, he did not consult the German translations. He was aware of them, but he did not procure them. Retranslated 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 Kāncī, 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 the translation to English from German is, the original of which is Sanskrit. Assuming that the English rendering is the correct representation of the German, I 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. another poetic gem of Bilhaṇa, a play of "Samāsokti" quite similar to the above verse (1:115):

Tam vibhāvya rabhasād upāgataṁ kṣmābhujāṅgam upajātāsādhvasā. 
Lolavārinidhinīlakunḍalā drāvīḍakṣitipabhūr akampata (5:28).

* * *

Misra examines the verse

Avīkṣamāṇā sadṛśaṁ guṇair mama kramāgatā śṛṅ iyam āśrayaṁ puraḥ. 
Payodhimadhyasthitapotakūpakashṭi śaṅkūtīva muhuḥ prakampate (2:31).

and explains it as follows:

[M]ama may either be construed with sadṛśaṁ or guṇaiḥ. This kind of construction is styled in Sanskrit kākāśigolakanyāya-, 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. I am reminded of another meaningful sadukti:

Asthāne'ṇupayogibhiśca bahubhir jalpair bhramaṁ tanvate.

Misra refers to "kākāśigolakanyāya." I don't know how this "maxim" could be defined as a "term" or 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 sandwiched in between the two words "sadṛśaṁ" 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 "sadṛśaṁ guṇaiḥ m ama." I don't know how Misra wants to construe these three words, "mama guṇaiḥ sadṛśaṁ " or "guṇaiḥ mama sadṛśaṁ"? 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 sadṛśaṁ," then the question arises, "sadṛśaṁ" of whom? Does Misra want to repeat "mama," i.e., "mama guṇaiḥ mama sadṛśaṁ." 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-vibhavamaṭra-vedya. Misra may be aware of the following ukti:
Savāsanānāṃ sabhyānāṃ rasasyāsvādanaṃ bhavet.
Nirvāsanās tu raṅgāntaḥ-kāṣṭhakudāyaśmasannibhāḥ.

This is from Dhammadatta, as cited by Viśvanātha Kavirāja in his Sāhityadarpaṇa (Nirmaya Sagar ed., 1922, p. 84).

Perhaps he knows this one as well:

Kaviḥ karoti kāvyāni rasaṃ jānanti paṇḍitāḥ.
Kanyāsuratacāturyaṃ jāmāṭā vetti no pitā.

I 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 "dehalidipakanyāya," "a lamp placed on the threshold lig hts both the sides."

If Misra wanted to know the true application of the maxim "kākāśigolakanyāya," he should have referred to "adhitavedo'smi kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ," where "asmiyaham arthevyayam" or "uttamapurusaikavacanam" of "as bhuvi" is applicable both to the left and to the right. We can interpret "aham adhitavedo'smi" or "aham kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ asmi." It is improper to talk about "asti" sentence and "asmi" sentence, as Misra does. "Adhitavedah" is a Bahuv rihi compound, and so is "kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ." As far as "śrāmo'sti bhūyān itihiśavartmasu" is concerned, we have to bring "mama" by "adhyāhāra" and the same "adhyāhāra" will bring "mama" for "guruśvajñāvimukham sadā maṇḍaḥ."

We have just discussed this verse:

Vidhrtyā Kāṇčīm bhujayor balena
yaś Colarājyaśriyam acakarṣa.

This too is a very fine example of "kākāśigolakanyāya" or "dehalidipakanyāya." The word "bhujayor balena" could be connected with either what precedes or what succeeds.

* * *

Misra introduces another vītaṇḍāvāda regarding "graha" and "āgraha":

Alaṁ viṣādena karoṣi kim mukham kavoṣnaniḥvāsavidhūsarādharam.
Abhiṣṭavastupratibandhinām ahaṃ kṛtāgraхо nigrahaṇāya kramaṇām (2:38).

On the above Misra says,

2.38d
āgraha-, is used in the sense of "stubborn wish, persistant [sic] resolusion ["resoluti on"]", hence kṛtāgraho, "he who has formed a firm resolution." Contrast Hindi āgra hā, meaning "request".

64
I don't know what authority Misra has to say that Hindi "ägraha" means "request"!

Cp. ägraha- 5.18, 9.130, 10.87 (emend lilāvagāhagraha- to lilāvagāhagraha- ); dur ägraha "bad (ill-advised) [i.e., 'ill-advised'] resolution". 3.52; 4.115; 6.7; 7.12; 16.42 (p. 2).

But I do not agree at all. Misra refers to many passages where Bilhaña has used the word "ägraha"; so he wants the word "graha," which makes even a better sense in "graha utsa sarja," etc., to be discarded. Once again Misra misses the essence. Cf. "graha-kalitam ivä grajam" (6.55). "Graha" = "seizing, holding, any state which proceeds from magical influences and takes pos- session of the whole man"! "Graham" makes better sense here. It is in the above sense alone that the second half acquires a better meaning in "Nisargaramye'pi vices ite yad atiprasaṅgo rasabhaṅgahetuḥ" (10.87).

Although Misra indulges in jugglery over "graha" and "ägraha" and wants us to discard one in favor of the other, I would like to submit the following verse that contains both words in one place:

Na śāśāka nirākartum agrajasya durāgraham.
Rājyagrahamaghītānāṃ ko mantraḥ kiṃ ca bheṣajam (4:115).

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

* * *

On the verse

Adhītavedo'smi kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ śramo'sti bhūyān itihāsavartmasu.
Guruṣvavajñāvimukhaṃ sadā manas tad abhyupayo'tra mayā na durlabhah (2:39).

Misra presents the following discourse that is only his bālacāpalam:

2.39a
kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ of the MS. may be interpreted (cp. p. 1 on 1.74a) as standing for kṛt āś śrutā gamah [why?]. If this interpretation is accepted [why?] as it is by the 3rd ed. the construc- tion would be. . . .

The third ed. is not brahma-vākyā! That it is not an absolute authority is proved here time without number. Bh is merely a copycat. Also, I fail to understand how Misra thinks this is the third ed.; it is the fourth!

"I am [the] one who has studied the Veda, who has heard (from an authoritative tea- cher) 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 *kṛtah* before *śrutā ga- mah,* because *kṛtah* belongs in the *asti* sentence, while *śrutāgamaḥ* belongs to the *asmī* 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 me. No, he takes with one hand what he gives with another! See below!J

*adhītavedo'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 *śrutī*) 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 *adhītaveda-* and *kṛia- śrutāgama-* [sic] amount to the same thing, there would be a tautology (*paunar uktya* or *piś apeesāṇa*).

A possible way to remove this tautology is to emend *śrutāgama-* into *smṛtāg ama-*, "the *śrūti* tradition." The king would refer to his study of the *Veda* (*veda*), of the Dharmā- śāstra (*smṛtāgama*) and the Epics (*itihāsa*) (p. 2).

This is all *mattapralāpa.* According to Monier-Williams, "*smṛti*" means "the whole body of sacred tradition or what is remembered by human teachers" (in contradistinction to "*śrūti,"" or "what is directly heard or revealed to the Rśis"). In its widest application, this use of the term "*smṛti*" includes six *Vedāngas,* the *śūtras* both *śrutā* and *grhyā,* the law books of Manu, etc. Also, "*itihāsas . . . Smṛta*" does not mean *this* body of knowledge! If "*smṛti*" in its widest sense includes "*itihāsā*" too, then there will be *paunaruktyadoṣah!* What is "*śruta m*"? 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.

and another *sadukti*:

Śrotam śrutenaiva na kuṇḍalena.

*Śabdakalpadrumaḥ: śrutam (śrūyate sma yad iti) śastram. Śrutam śāstrāvaḍhtayoḥ [iti Am arah]. Vedas, including *smṛtis: śrutam śāstrāṇi, Vedāṅgāni, darśanāni ca, itihāsah, purāṇā ni ca.* And our own poet Bilhaṇa says,

Dātā parākramadhanah śrutapāradṛśvā (18:77)

Elsewhere I 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-paramparā*) altogether. Although
Although it gives many acceptable alternative readings—sometimes much more desirable than those of J—we cannot accept them if we want to preserve the purity (asānkaryam) of our mūla-ranṭahā (archetype) because, as the Lord Himself has instructed us in the Bhagavad-gītā, "sāṅkara narakāyaiva." "Kṛtaḥ śrutāgamaḥ" is the reading of A. Bh has no scruples. I cannot say whether he knows what the Principles of Textual Criticism are. He accepts the reading of A so lightheartedly. Of course, I 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 Naṣadhiyacarita), has benevolently instructed us.

Nṛṣiddham apyācaraṇīyam āpadi kriyā satī nāvati yatra sarvathā. Ghanāmbūnā rājapathe hi picchile kvacid budhair apyapathena gamyate (9:36).

Also the smṛtis prescribe, "Āpatkāle maryādā nāsti."

"Kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ" of J cannot be converted to "kṛtaḥ śrutāgamaḥ" or "kṛta śrutaga maḥ" because the J text does not read that way! "Kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ" will only be a bahuvrīhi compound. We are not composing the poem; we are only interpreting it. To prescribe "smṛtāgamaḥ" will be a svacchanda-cāraḥ. "Smṛtam" can never have the tradition of "smṛtis"! 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 p recedes: "adhītavedo’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, taken "kṛtaḥ" from the first quarter to the second, taken "a sti" from the second to the third, and has made "pariśramah" out of "śramah." I fail to understand what is the use of this drāviḍa-prāṇāyāma, this roundabout way.

* * *

On the verse

Sa somavannetracakorāṇām cakāra gotrasya yad ujjvalānanaḥ. Yathocitaṃ 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: upamā- rūpakayoḥ saṅkaraḥ)" (p. 3).

I believe that neither Bh nor Misra is correct. 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 saṅkaraḥ, and its approval by Misra, are both wrong. Such saṅkara of two alāṅkāras occurs only when there is neither a supporter (sādhaka) nor a detractor (bādhaka) for either of them occuring in one and the same context. Mammaṭa makes this point very clear:

Ekasya ca grahe nyāya-doṣābhāvādaniścayaḥ.

Dvayor bahunām vā alāṅkāraṁ ekatra samāveśe'pi virodhāt na yatra yug apad avasthānam, na caikatarasya parigrhe sādhakaṁ tadātarasva vā parihāre bād hakaṁ asti yenaikatara eva parigṛhyeta, sa niścayābhāva- rūpo dvitīyaḥ saṅkaraḥ.

(Kāvyaprabhāśa: 10th Ullāsa, 140 Vṛtti)

In the present case (netracakora), we do have a sādhaka, viz. "somavat." Since "so mavat" is definitely an upamā, we have to accept upamā in "netracakora" also because the two are inter-related. Appayayādīksita has dealt with a pertinent case in his Citramiṃśaḥ and has arrived at the same conclusion:

Astraṛvālāvaliḍhapratibalajaladher antaraurvāyamāne senānāthe sthite'smin mama pitari gurau sarvadhanvīśvarānām.
Kaṃṭalāṃ sambhramaṇa vṛaja Kṛpa samaraṁ muṇca Hārdikya śaṅkāṁ tāte cāpadvītiye vahati rāṇadhurāṁ ko bhayasyāvakaśāḥ.


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

Bhiṣagbhīr āpāditasarvabheṣajaṁ vītṛṇaraksāvīdhimaṇḍalākṣatam.
Viśāradābhīḥ prasavocite vidhau nirantarām gotravadhūbhīr aṅcitam (2:80).
Misra dictates,

2.80a
For _vitrña_-, "bestowed", (all ed.) substitute _vikirṇa_-. "thrown about, scattered", which seems to be more suitable. _vikirṇa_ also in 6.10--_vikirṇa . . . samirā_- "the breezes scattered by".

I fail to understand how breezes could be scattered.

Cp. also 18.14 śilā _viprakirṇāḥ_ "the rocks that were scattered." 18.6--_kārṇakarṇāmṛta_ "by which nectar for the ears is scattered". _aksāta_- "uncrushed grain", as an object of _ud-kṛ̥_, compare 2.83 _aksatokaraiḥ_ "by the throwings up of uncrushed grain" (p. 3).

Once again, Misra does not appreciate an accepted reading:

_Vitrñarāksāvidhimaṇḍalākṣatam_

_Vitrña_ is accepted by all--from J to Bh. Misra recommends "_vikirṇa_" for it. "Caritacandrika_ā_" explains, "[_Vitrñāṇi rakṣāvidhaye maṇḍalānyakṣatāḥ ca,]_" the latter two words going back to J gloss. _Vitrña_ = _datta_. Cf. _śāradvitṛṇāsuhāgya_ (16:3). I have already conferred upon Misra the title of "Abhinavabilihaṇa" because he does not explain or try to improve; he straightaway composes. Certainly rice can be scattered (_vikirṇa_); but I don't know how "maṇḍalā" ("circular form-ations") could be scattered!

I do not want to go against the J gloss unless it is absolutely unavoidable. However, "maṇḍalākṣata" could be suggested as an alternative reading to be considered for "maṇḍal ākṣata."

The last word in this verse ("aṅcitam") ignites Misra's power of argumentation (_vita ṇḍāvāda_). He says,

On --_aṅcitam (ed. sec. and ter), see below chap II n. 2. (p. 3).

The "note" expounds,

Cp. 2.80d for _arciṭam_ 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. 6.4.3 0 and 7.2.53, yet Bilhaṇa has no example of _aṅciṭa_ in this sense (p. 26).

Let us see what these words mean:

"_arc_" = "to adore, worship, salute, welcome with respect"; "to honour; i.e., decorate and adorn"

"_aṅc_" = "worship, honour, reverence, adorn, grace"
"aṅcita" = "honoured, adorned, graced, graceful, handsome"

Some examples of their use by great poets:

Dordaṇḍāṅcitamahimā
Gateṣu līlāṅcitavikrameṣu
Kanakācala-saṅkāśa-devatāyatanāṅcīte
Api khaṇjanam aṅjanāṅcīte
Aṅcitābhyyāṃ gatābhyyāṃ

Here are the variant readings of this word:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>&quot;arccitam&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&quot;arcitam&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>&quot;aṅcitam&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bh</td>
<td>&quot;aṅcitam,&quot; but interprets &quot;pūjitam&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&quot;arcitam&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>&quot;acitam&quot;</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 I adopted it. Linguistically, both mean the same. However, the primary meaning of "arcitam" would be "pūjitam," or "worshipped," while that of "aṅcitam" would be "bhūṣitam," ("adorned"). I 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 words "silent" and "silently." He expected me to announce every change by beating a 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, "[Y]et Bilhana has no example of aṅcita in this sense." I don't know what he means by the word "this"! He professes to know everything; yet he forgets that "na hi sarvaḥ sarvaṃ jānāti," "everyone does not know everything"! His statements are always indicative of authority. Maybe he means "stealthily" and uses a word to make it appear innocent.

Ātmavat sarvabhūtesu yāḥ paśyati sa paśyati.

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

Misra says Bilhana had not used the word "aṅcitaṁ" anywhere in this sense. If by "this" Misra means "bhūṣitam," then he has ignored the following verse:

Anena nūnāṃ jaladheḥ samuddhṛtam
In 2:80 Bh forces "aṅcitam" to mean "pūjitam," but "Caritacandrikā" has already put "bhāṣī tam." This word goes back to J gloss, i.e., J gloss too has "bhāṣītam." Bh had no justificatio n in accepting my reading and rejecting his meaning. We are instructed, "Vāgarthāvīva sa mpṛktau." 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," as "worship- ed"; 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 "aṅcitam.” He translates it as "marked (characterized) by.” I hav e put it as "viśīṣ am” (in "Candrikā"), but it can mean "bhāṣītam” as well. MW puts “distingu ished” as a meaning of "aṅcitam.”

I am not sure if Misra had seen the following saduktis of our own poet, Bilhaṇa:

Ityudāṅcitavilāsarasānām (11:67).

and

Udaṅcitabhrulatikāpatākam
akāraṇād eva mukham cakāra (9:84).

* * *

Misra tries to exhibit his erudition:

Viveśa subhrāth atha sūtkāṛgṛham pradhānadaivaśjñanivedite dine.
Samullasaṃbhī śakunāḥ sahasraśaḥ samarpayantī npater mahotsavam (2:81).

He says,

2.81d
samarpayantī npater 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 w hich the genitive has taken over the function of the dative.

Here are further examples from our text:
2.89a
*akathayad avanīndor nandanotpattivārttām* "told the king the news of the birth of the son"

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

9.73b . . .
*sakhirāṃ kim api bruvāṇā . . ." saying something to [her] girl friends"

9.93a
*pradarśayāṃ āsā tatāḥ kumāryāḥ*

Misra’s *carmacakṣusī* are functioning here in a normal way. He says (in a footnote) "*[K]u māryāḥ* is a conjecture cf [i.e., 'of'] *ed. sec;* Bühler has in accordance with the MS. *kumāryāṃ* which is not construable.” But on p. 16 he discusses the same reading. This time even his *carmacakṣusī* fail him.

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

9.94
*yasya . . . maurvīravah . . . pātālatalasthitānāṃ . . . kathayāṃ babhūva* "whose bowstring twang told those who dwell on the bottom of the *Pātāla*. . . .";

13.50ab
*samarpayāṃ āsa payāṃsi . . jaladhīḥ payomucāṃ* "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 tasyābhāyam pradattam.
kim tava rocate eṣaḥ?
mamānatikruddho muniḥ.

Misra says, "In later [?] Sanskrit the use of genetive instead of dative is found with increasing frequency. . . ." I 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 (ṣaṭṭhī syāt) (2.3.62).
([In the sense of] caturthī in the Vedas.)

So we have "ṣaṣ hi" 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 the following:

Caṅcaccāraṇadīyamāṇakanakam sannaddhagītadhvanī
spūrjadgāthakalunṭhyamāṇakaraṭi

The correct reading for the second caranca is "kara i [and] prārabdra," because there are two com-pound words here:

1.) spūrjadgāthakalunṭhyamāṇakaraṭi

2.) prārabdhāṅtyotsavam (or "nṛttō")

There is a padaccheda in between the two in J.

The elephants are not dancing. They are just being stolen (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 ghunākaśaranyāya! Misra could have very well seen it if he did not have the primary intention of displaying his erudition everywhere.

Pūṃṣam maṅgalatūryadundubhiravair uttālavaitālīka-
ślāghālaṅghitapūrvapārthivam atha kṣmābhurtur āśiḥd 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 my (i.e., J's) reading and follows the path of one who has no sense of direction! J clearly has "kara i," absolutely and unquestionably. Furthermore, J gloss puts "hāṭhi" as a synonym for "kara i"; so there is no doubt that the meaning "elephant" antedates 1286 V. (A.D. 1229-30)!

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.) *ḥṛ*. A *mano* (acc.) *lun ḥ* in the sense of "to fascinate" would, of course, be unexceptionable" [!]. [I don't know what Misra means by "unexceptionable"!]  

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

Mātaṅgālīḷā of Nīlakaṇṭha clearly says "gāṇapriyam [gajam]" (8:4) and "vīṇādīgīta priyāḥ [gajah]" (11:40). In the *Pratijñāyaugandharāyana* ascribed to Bhäusera, Udayana is described as catching elephants by luring them by means of the sound of vīṇā.

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

Gajaṁ tam ahaṁ vīṇādvitīya ānayāmi (I act).

and

Śrutisukhamadhurā svabhāvaraktā karajamukhollikhitāgrahṛṣṭatantrī.  
Rṣivacanagataveva mantravidyā gajahṛdayāni balād vaśkaroti (2:12).

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).

I don't know what the Sanskrit equivalent is here (of Bilhaṇa) that Misra has translated as "alternately." "Caṅcat" 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 noises of music! I am not sure if Mr. Misra had ever seen the following immortal composition from the pen of *Kavikulaguru* Kālidāsa:

Janāya śuddhāntacarāya śaṃsate kumārajanmāṁtatasammitākṣaram.  
Adeyam āsīt trayam eva bhūpateḥ śaśiprabhaṃ chatram ubhe ca cāmare.
Let us now consider Misra's remarks on "cañaṭa." He recommends "carcaṭ" for "cañaṭa." It is merely avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram. There are innumerable verses in Sanskrit literature beginning with "cañaṭa"; one just has to go through the indices of the anthologies. Let us remember that here we are talking in terms of the word "cañaṭa" in the beginning only. It may take a lot of time, money, and energy to find the word in the middle or end, until and unless 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.

I fail to understand why Misra wants to discard "cañaṭa" in favour of "carcaṭ," which is terribly harsh and karṇaka u and cannot equal the original in beauty. There are many verses which show that Misra's suggestion does not carry any weight. For example,

Cañçaccandrakarasparṣa-harṣonmīlitatārakā.
Aho rāgavatī sandhyā jahāti svaym ambaram.

(ヴァルミキ ラマヤーナ。 Kiskindhā, 30:45)

and

Cañcaccolāṅcalāni pratisaraṇarayavyastaveṇāṇī bāhor
vikṣepād dakaṁnasya pralītəvalaṁśaṁ phālakolāhalāṇi.
Śvāsāvatyaadvacāṃsi drutam itarākarotkṣiptalolālakāṇi
srastasraṇī pramodam dadhātī mrgrārśaṁ kandukakṛṣṭāṇi.

(Subḥāṣitaratnakośe Anurāgavrajaḥ)

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

Puṣpair bhrājiṣuḥbhastrākaraṇim aganītaṁ śākhinaḥ ke na yātāḥ
cācaṁnistiṁśalekhaṁmayam iva bhuvaṁ bhrūgamālāḥbhīr āste.
Trailokyakāṇḍacāṇḍaprahaṇanibidotsāhakaṇḍūladoṣnaḥ
puspeṣor jātraśastravyatikaravidhayē sādhu sajjo vasantāḥ (7:68).

Misra ought to have seen two more occurrences of "cañaṭa" in Vik. itself:

Yasminnyṛvīpatigṛhatates tuṅgimā varṇyate kim
tasyāḥ cañcaccaturavanitābhūṣitānekebhumē.
Jāne yasyāṁ Kusumadhanusāḥ svargarāmāmanāṃsi
krīḍāvāṭāyanakṛtāpadasyaiva lakṣībhavanī (18:30).

and

Yenodīcyāṁ diśi gatavatā vandīsautā girīndraś
cañcaccāṇḍipatiṁśakurakṣodakehāvataṁśaḥ (18:54).
And here is one more "cañcat" from Venīśamhāra:

Cañcadbhujabhramitacañḍagadābhīgam
sacchānumokham kāṇṭham kṣamābändiṇāṁ
no muñcatyacakendravakṣasi cīram līlām samālambate.

The following verse is cited by Śobhākara as an example of vyājastutiḥ:

Cañcāc cumbati kāṇcañcalamukham kaṇṭham kṣamābindinām
no muñcatyacakendravakṣasi cīram līlām samālambate.

Kim cāllingati diktaṭāṁ vitanute kriḍāṁ bhujāṅgaiḥ samam
kūrtir mānam apāsyā paśya taraṇī dhik ceṣṭītais tāvākī ["ceṣṭate tāvākī"]?

Śobhākara adds,

Atra kūrtipriyatamātvamukhena nindayā sarvavyāpitvam iti stutir lakṣyate.

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

Cañcatkaṭākṣabhramaraṁbhīrāma-
rāmāmukhāmbhojaparamparābhīḥ.
Itastataḥ [sic] yatra sarāmsi śobhām
gharmaprasādād dviguṇām avāpuḥ.
[cited as an example of samādhiḥ]

Let us consult one more authority. Monier-Williams says that "Bhūḍi cañcati" = "to leap, jump, move, dangle, be unsteady, shake, Bhāṛṭ.; Venīṣ.; Rūṭ.; Gīt.; Kathās, etc." [note "et c."] The word is extensively used by so many great poets and dramatists. Therefore, the c ontention of Misra that it is seldom used does not hold. We can only say,

Na hyeṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati.

and

Locanābhyaṁ vihīnasya darpaṇaṁ kim kariṣyati.

And I 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? I have not come across any! Sri Misra might have read certain kāvyas not known to me so far where it occurs, but I 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 the for
ms and meanings of "carccayati" are given, which are not relevant here. Which of these meanings does Misra want here for "carcat"?

And let us see what Apte says:

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

I don't know which of these meanings Mr. Misra wants 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."

Aurvāgnitaptāpāthodhau candanasyandavāsītāḥ.
Śītopacārasāmrājyaṃ bhejur malayaminnagāḥ (4:6).

He says,

sāmrājya-, "rulership, empire" . . śītopacārasāmrājyaṃ bhejur malayanimna gāḥ "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 sāmarthyam, "capacity": [they acquired capacity] for the cooling treatment. Cp. 4.120d sāmarthya-, "capacity" (p. 6).

Many a time, I find it terribly distressing even to listen to the unreasonable suggestions made by Misra. He wants to replace "sāmrājya" with "sāmarthyam." The idea is not acceptable. He wants us to throw away cintāmanī and get a piece of a pebble in return. Misra for gets that he is not the poet. An "empire" and all the glory inherent therein is a million times better than just plain "capacity." Mārkho'pi śobhate tāvat yāvat kiñcina bhāṣate! I don't understand how "sāmarthyami" has the capacity to replace "sāmrājya" here!

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

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

Ananyasāmānyagunatvam eva bhavatyantarāhāya mahākāvinām.
Jñātum yad eśāṃ sulabhāḥ sabhāsu na jālpam alpapratibhāḥ kṣamante (1:23).
Once again I would like to remind Misra, "Arasikesu kavitvanivedanam!" No one has the right to destroy a beautiful poem if he is unable to understand the exquisite words of great poets like Bilhana.

* * *

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

Kakubham bhartbhaktanam prchchantinam nrpastritam.
Vidravantam vibhantam atyantatvaritaih padaiih (4:40).

Bh interprets this as "kakubham prati dhavantam iva," "running towards the directions"! The messenger was coming towards Vikrama, i.e., the bank of Krishna.

Sa tatkanat parimalana-mukham sammukhapatinam (Bilhana: 4:37).

The dīta was running away from the direction of Kalyana, the Chalukya capital. He was not running toward the direction (dik). He was running away from the north and going toward the south:

Dadarśa rājadhāntaṁ pradhānam dūtam āgatam (4:37).

The directions, diśāḥ, (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 and lover, Āhavamalla. So the messenger was running away from them and not running toward them! Bh has supplied his own avaya—the indeclinable particle "prati": "Kakubham diśāṁ diśo diganganāḥ pratīyarthāḥ" (4:37). From the sixth vibhakti he has jumped back to the second and then supplied his own prati. He is kartum akartum anyathākartum samarthaḥ, is he Jot? But in reality here the genitive (or the possessive) case is used in avajñā or tiraskāra or disregard. It may be fear as well. "Kakubham vidravantam"; running away from the directions, being afraid of them, "diśo'nādyta gaṛchhantam." Bh forgets that "prati" will demand "dvitīyā" and not "śaś hiti."

W. D. Whitney, in his Sanskrit Grammar, says,

297 (d): A genitive, instead of an ablative, is sometimes found used with a verb of . . . fearing (Cambridge, Mass, 1923, p. 100).

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 "sammukhapatinam." The distance between the directions (diśāḥ) and the messenger is increasing. He is not going toward the directions! Let it be repeated: Here we have Śaś hiti cânadare (Pan. 2.3.38). This sūtra gets anuvṛtti from "Yasya ca bhāve
na bhāvalaṃkāṇam." "Anā- dare ganyamāne sati yasya kriyāvā kriyāntaram laksyate tasmāt 
śaś hisaptamyau staḥ." As an example, we have "Rudati rudato vā prāvrājī. Rudantam pu 
trādikam anādṛtya saṁnyastavān iti bhāvah."

Mammaa gives an example of similar śaś hi:

Gāmāruhammi gāme vasāmi ṇaaraṭṭhiim na jāṇāmi.
Nāariṇāṃ paina haremi jā homi (Kāvyapraṅaśa).

* * *

Misra presents an amusing situation in the following verse:

Kuṇṭhikṛṭāriśastrasya tasya vajropamākrteh.
Bhāgyāṇām eva me doṣād eṣa jātaḥ parikṣayaḥ.

Pāṭhāntaram--

Madbhāgyadoṣād evaiṣa jāne jātaḥ parikṣayaḥ (4.83).

Discussing the above, Misra says,

The MS. has two versions:

I. Bhāgyāṇām eva me doṣād eṣa jātaḥ parikṣayaḥ.

II. Madbhāgyadoṣād evaiṣa jāne jātaḥ parikṣayaḥ.

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

Like Mr. Misra indeed! Yes, Misra knows quite well how to blow his own śankha. The M 
S. does not have two versions! It seems Misra did not notice the first occurrence of the exp 
ression "pā hā- ntaram," in 1:102 Viśīṛnakarṇa and 1:103 Kaṁe viśīrne, where "Caritacan 
ārikā" explains,

Pāṭhāntaram: Mahākavya uktam evārthaṁ bhaṅgyantareṇa bahudhā nirūpayanti. 
Jaina sampadāye tad eva pāṭhāntaram ityucyata iti manyāmahe. Atra pāṭhāntara- 
padena tad eva boddhavyam na tu pāṭhāntarārūpo'rtho' bhipretaḥ (p. 217).

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

Āryaṁ viparyastam api prabhavanti na bādhitum.
In the *anus up* chapter of the *Vṛttaratnākara*, one can see numerous varieties where exceptions are found to the general rule that the fifth syllable should always be a *laghu*. Hence the second read-ing is not any deliberate improvement on the first.

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 Bilhaṇa had committed an error, his revised version should succeed and not precede! In other words, the correct version follows and does not precede the first. Truly speaking, many of Misra’s statements remind me of the following *saduki*: 

Bahu jagada purstāt tasya mattā kilāham.

It is really painful to see the extent of Misra’s mastery of traditional Sanskrit scholarship. It is not becoming of his family if what he has published on his "dust jacket" is true.

For Misra’s enlightenment I am presenting below some "SPECIMENS" of the cases where Bilhaṇa (i.e., Purāṇa Bilhaṇa) has erred in the opinion of Misra!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nivedayantam</th>
<th>4:39.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anarthavārttā</td>
<td>4:41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tvadaṅkapālī</td>
<td>4:47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāraṅgahastair</td>
<td>4:63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyonyakaṇṭhā</td>
<td>4:93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejonidhīnām</td>
<td>4:107.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āryam viparyastam</td>
<td>4:118.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛtālavālam</td>
<td>8:14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manye tadūrū</td>
<td>8:16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitamababimbam</td>
<td>8:17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakoṣṭhabandhe</td>
<td>8:58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purāṇabānatiyāgāya</td>
<td>8:71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saundaryapātre</td>
<td>8:76.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is a bright light which might help Misra to see things in their proper perspective.

Uktam evārtham bhaṅgyantareṇa pratipādayati kaviṅ

Śiśupālavadhā trṭīyaḥ sargaḥ

Prasādhitasyāsya Madhudviṣo'bhūd anyaiva lakṣmīr iti yuktam etat. Vapusyaśeṣe'khilalokakāntā sā'nanyakāntā hyurasītarā tu (3:12).

Kapāṭavistṛāmamoranorāṭhaṣṭhalasthitasrīlalanasya tasya. Ānanditāśeṣajanā babhūva sarvāṅgasāṅginyaparaiva lakṣmīḥ (3:13).

The great commentator Mallinātha explains,
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 niścityārthaṃ Culkyaśikhāmaniḥ
śravaṇasaraṇaṃ bhīdand bherīraveṇa viniryayau.
Api ca kuptaḥ kṣmābhṛṣtenāgajesu nijęśubhiḥ
katiṣu vidadhhe dhairoyadhvaṃṣam 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!] E d. sec., fol lowed by ed. ter., silently changes to kupitāḥ.

I don't know why Misra always gives kartrtvam to Bh, who is merely a copycat!

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

c api ca kutpaksmābhṛṣttenāgajesu [sic] nijesubhiḥ

d katiṣu vidadhhe dhairoyadhvaṃṣam na sāhasalāṇchanaḥ//

"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, certainly did not take place; cp. 5.5 and 6 (6). Perhaps we should amend nijesubhiḥ: "by his jealous ones (his male elephants that smell the king's elephants in their stables start to trumpet, whereupon these get afraid)"(7) Iṛṣu for īṛṣyu is a common misspelling (see Apte. s.v. īṛṣyā, īṛṣya. īṛṣyu), 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 designed, as yet, as kṣmābhṛt (king): verses 116-117. Somadeva, of course is "enraged", because his younger brother leaves the town spontaneously--and obviously, without giving due notice--with an army: 5.3-5 (cp. in particular kvathammanāḥ in 5.5, said of Somadeva).

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 (īṛṣyā, asūyā, amarṣa, roṣa) of the male elephants, cp. Ragh. 4.23 (asūyā); Śiś. 5.32-36, 42 etc. (p. 8).

It is anything but an honest and true scholarship to criticize an editor (or writer) on the 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 that

Gacchataḥ skhalanaṁ 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 critical or 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 kupitaḥ for kupito"!

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

Here is one more piece of 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 the following:

udaṇciromāṅcatayā 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 "samam tataḥ," giving credit to Bhīmāchārya for this correction! I would call it a distortion of truth and misrepresentation of facts! I 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, " I would still have read "kupitah" for "kupito," because the succeeding letter, "kṣ" of "kṣmā" (a conjunct consonant), won't allow it to be read as "kupito." Misra sees something unusual about this change. According to Misra, I 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 that are miniscule by their very nature and are incompatible with common sense. I was not paid on a "per page" basis. The total remuneration (monetary compensation) that I received from the Government Sanskrit College (Banaras) for the entire work, lasting more than five years, was only Rs. 200/- I had to spend more than that amount in just taking a trip to Jaisalmer, staying there for eighteen days, and hiring an assistant. My real gain was honor, prestige, and recognition. I was the first student whose work was published in such a prestigious series as the Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavan Texts. Since I was not paid monetary compensation on the basis of the total number of pages, and since I did not want to display my erudition, I did not think it appropriate to waste my time in discussing such obvious grammatical or printing errors.

"Nijersubhiḥ" by itself cannot mean "īrṣyālugajaiḥ" unless Misra makes it mean *that* through his superpower. 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. "Kṣmābhṛt" here does not mean "Someśvara Bhuvanaikamalla," but "prati-nṛpat ayah" in general, as explained in the "Caritacandrikā" (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. I 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 nipṛdyamānās te nibidam Draviḍādayah.
Āryam viparyastam api prabhavanti na bādhītum (4.118).

It is not proper even to imagine that as soon as Vikrama's elephants departed from Kalyāṇa, Someśvara's elephants became terrified! These two groups of elephants did not dwell 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 that "a little know ledge is a dangerous thing"!

I don't know who has designated Vikrama here as kṣmābhṛt (king)! Vikrama decided to leave Kalyāṇa, and left it. Even up to the end of Canto IV there is no actual fight betw
een 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, Bilhaṇa says that Vikrama took Simhadeva (the younger brother) along with him. It is in the fifth stanza of this canto 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 the following verse,

Tām vidhāya katiciddināi sa preyasīghuṣṭaṇaṇkīlām nadīm.
Colasammukham agāhatāhavaprāptidurlalitaḥ bhūr āgraham (5:18).

Misra comments,

āhavaprāptidurlalitabāhu, "whose arm was spoiled by the obtaining of fight", seems not intelligible. Read, therefore, āhavāprāptidurlalitabāhu-, "whose arm was spoiled 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).

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

Añānāndhasya lokasya jñānājanaśalākayā
cakṣurunmīlitaṃ yena tasmai śṛigurave namaḥ.

I 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 can suggest an emendation?

Specifically, Misra goes here by the literal meaning of the word "spoiled" (= "durlalita"); 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 battles to such an extent and with such frequency that they were restless when they were not engaged in 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 the
m, so was the case with Vikrama. He wanted to remain fighting always--remain engaged in battles forever--constantly, with no respite at all.

I wonder if Misra has read the following:

Udāraśauryaikarasaḥ kṣamāpatiḥ
sa nirvinodaḥ samarotsvam vinā.
Samāpitāśesamadāndhabhūpayor
asevakatvaṁ bhujyor amanyata (17:8).

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

Ālupendram avadātavikramas tyaktacāpalam asāvavardhayat.
Dīpayatyavinayāgradūtikā kopam apraṇatīr eva tādrśām (5:26).

Wherever and whenever I have presented an historical fact and authenticated it by documentary evidence, Bh has conveniently copied and incorporated it beautifully into his writing without any acknowledgment to me whatsoever. Where, due to insufficiency of data or lack of evidence, I have 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 extraordinary fashion, "Ālupa sya deśaviśayendram rājānam!" I 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).

The "Candrika" stops with Śivaḥ only with regard to Nīlakaṇṭ ha. While "nabhaḥ-saṅgi-gaṇ gā" was Nīlakaṇṭ ha = Śiva-prasūtā, Vitastā (river) was not! Yet Bh says so. In reality "Vitastā" originated from a mountain called "Nīlakaṇṭ ha" (and not "Śiva")!

I am not sure if Bh's literary interpretation is always acceptable. Let us see:

Vyāpṛtair avirataṁ śilimukhaṁ Keralakṣitipavāmacakṣuṣām.
Pūrvakalpitam asāvadarśayād gaṇḍapāliṣu nivāsām aśruṇaḥ (5:27).

Śilimukha. Bh knows that "śilimukhā" means "arrow" as well as "bee." (See his comments on 5:72: "Śilimukha bāṇā bhramarāś ca. Alībāṇau Śilimukhau ityamaraḥ." ) Nevertheless
he did not apply the "bee" meaning in 5:27a. "Candrikā" says, "Śīlīmukhaḥ bānaḥ bhram araś ca." Bh and Banerji-Gupta both miss the point. They take only one meaning, i.e., "ar rows." They probably forget that here "śīlīmukha" means both "arrow" as well as "bee." However the bees are attracted toward the face of a beautiful woman is well-depicted by Kālidāsā in his immortal work Abhijñānaśākuntalam (Act I):

Calāpāṅgām ḍṛṣṭīṃ sprāsī bahuṣo vepathumatīṃ rahasyākhyāyīva svanasi mṛdu karaṃṇāṅkacaraḥ.
Karaṃ vyādhunvatyaḥ pibasi ratisarvasvam adharam vayaṃ tattvānveśān madhukara hatās tvam khalu kṛṭi.

Our own poet Bilhaṇa has also vividly delineated this bhramarabādhā:

Kācit kṣiptatī madhupam viśantam itas tataḥ pānisaroruṇaḥa.
Bālye kṛtām kandukatāṇḍaneṣu śramaṃ mṛgākṣi bahu manyate sma (10:61).

Kṣipto mukhāt saṭcaranaṃ tarunyā viveṣa hastāmbujakoṣam asyāḥ.
Tasmād vidhūto mukham ājagāma lajjā kutaḥ svārthaparāyaṇānām (10:62).

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

Guṇaṃ dadhāne madhunārpyamāṇam manasvinām mānasabhedadakṣe.
Śīlīmukhaśreṇir upaiti saṅgam puṣpe ca kandarpāṣarāsane ca (10:28).

To come back to the main point, arrows don't stay. They fly past or pierce through. The bl ack color of the bees becomes the means for the imagination of the tears on the cheeks.

We have another verse depicting the same idea:

Pāṇau padmadhiyā madhūkakusumabhṛāntyā tathā gaṇḍayor nīlendivaraśaṅkayā nayanayor bandhūkabuddhyādhare.
Līyante kabariṣu bāṇḍhavajānīmohajātaspṛhā durvāra madhupāḥ kiṃyanti sutanu sthānāni rakṣiṣyasi.

(Kasyāpi, Sūktimuktāvalī, Kusumāpā ["va"?] cayādipaddhati. 65)

Here is one more verse where Bh presents an interpretation that I find unacceptable:

Tvadbhīyā girīghhāṣraye sḥitāḥ sāhasāṅka galitatratāḥ nṛpāḥ.
Jyāravaprātiraveṇa tān api tvaddhanuḥ samarasīṃmi bādhate (5:40).

Bh points out that "girīghhāṣu ye" is a variant reading. No doubt, but if you remove the wo rd "āśraya," i.e., "refuge," half the charm of the poem is lost! Bilhaṇa's poetic muse does n ot permit me to adopt it.
Bh believes that he can interpret any word the way he wants. He is a "Vidyāvāgīśa"
! He comments on the following verse:

Gāhate'tra dhṛtakārmuke tvayi prītīdānam api bhītīdānatām.
Tenā tasya mahatī vilākṣatā yan na vetsi guṇapakṣapātītām (5:58).

B had made "yatrot" of "yanna," which was copied by R. I have "yanna" because J has it.
How- ever, 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 comment s,

Tenā kāraṇena yatra yasya Drāviḍarājasya viṣaye . . . guṇapakṣapātītām vetsi jānā
si dhārayāsītyarthaḥ. . . . Yasya kṛte tava guṇapakṣapātītvam vartate.

This is all unnecessary. Bh tries to interpret "yena kena prakāreṇa," which is not justified.
The reading "yatrot" is not desirable. It cannot be taken to mean "Yaṃ Drāviḍam prati tava
Vikramā-ṅkasya guṇapakṣapātītā." The dūta does not brag about the qualities of his maste r, who is, or who 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 mess enger tries to tell Vikrama is this: "If you (Vikrama) do not realize that he (Drāviḍanpati)
is fond of your qualities, and therefore wants to give his daughter to you in marriage, then he
will feel embar- rassed (mentally disturbed or disappointed). He would feel that he was
misunderstood; i.e., his offer was not taken in the spirit in which it was given." I am remin ded of Bhāravi's charming sadukti:

Vītasprhaṇām api muktibhājām bhavanti bhavyesu hi pakṣapātāḥ.

Āstām távat, Prakṛtam anusarāmaḥ.

Bh forces "yatrot" to mean "yasya viṣaye" and turns "vetsi" into "dhārayasi"! Here it
is not Vikrama, let it be repeated, who is "guṇapakṣapātīn," but it is the Cola King who is
guṇapakṣa- pātin. The qualities belong to Vikrama and not to Colarāja! Colarāja is offerin g
his daughter in marriage to Vikrama because the former is influenced by the qualities of t he latter. In fact, Vikrama has invaded the territory of the Colas. I don't know how Bh cou ld force such an interpretation on us and create a situation which is painful. I am 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 mea ns just what I choose it to mean--neither more nor less."

". . . The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so m any 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 was found correct and true to B (i.e., J, P, and B), I adopted it because it is the reading intended by the poet himself. Now R has distorted it in many places because he did not know any better. The first word in line 4 is "yanna." R unnecessarily makes it "yatra." I don't even know whether it was 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--"makšikā sthāne makšikā." They agree to "yanna," and explain it in the same way. Bh goes in his own way, but I am 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 to the capital of the Colas.

* * *

MISRA AS AN HISTORIOGRAPHER

Misra presents a very lengthy discussion on the following verse:

Tatra dakṣiṇata-te kṛtaṣṭhitih Kuntalendur avalokya tadbalam.  
Bāhum āhavasahasradīkṣitaṁ vandate sma paricumbati sma ca (5:78).

He expounds,

kṛtaṣṭhitih. . . . In 5.56 the messenger of the Cola king proposes [?] Vikramāditya to return (ni--vṛt) [from the Cola country he has invaded] and to take his stand in the vicinity/proximity (upāntavartman)---obviously of the Cola country. This vicinity/proximity is defined as tuṅgabhadrāya mudrite, "sealed by the Tungabhadrā." Whether we understand sealed (mudrita) in the sense of "marked" (cihnita) or "sealed off, closed" (cf. 11.19 amudrita "unsealed; unrestrained"; Karṇasū. 4.5,6 mudrita "closed, sealed") the northern shore of the Tungabhadrā, which lies outside the Cola country, but in its immediate vicinity (upānta vartman), must be meant [?]! The peacetime /sic/ the Cola king proposes and which he wants to cement by offering his daughter to Vikramāditya as a wife, 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 Vikramā
ditya had himself with his army occupied the southern shore. Consequently the reading of all the editions in verse 78 daksīṇata e kṛṭasthitih kuntalenduh . . . "the moon of the Kunta las having taken his stand on the southern shore," cannot be correct. We have to amend daksīṇata e kṛṭasthitih and construe it with tad balam. Thus we get:

a  tatra daksīṇataṭe kṛṭasthitī
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 "kṛṭasthitih" be turned into a napu mśaka word and 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 as an ything but a mascu- line-ending compound. Also, in the phrase "tatra daksīṇata e kṛṭasthitih ," the word "kṛṭasthitih" is so sandwiched in between that it is impossible to take it out. The southern shore was not a part of the Chola empire. Misra has not advanced even one con vincing argument to support his theory.

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 mes- sengers only. Does he mean to say that both parties were stationed on two different shores while the entire marriage ceremony was performed? I cannot believe so!

This Misra is Abhinavabilhaṇa. He has the right to create his own sṝṣ i.

Apāre kāvyasamsāre kavir ekhaḥ praṭāpatiḥ.  
Yathāśmai rocaye viśvam tathaiva parivartate.

Misra can also be creative, especially when he has reached such a high position. Let me show what I said on p. 39 of my Upodgāta:


Translated into English, this passage reads as follows:
His empire extended from the Narbuddā southwards to the Tungabhadrā, 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 Vanavasāmaṇḍala for some time. He advances towards the kings (5:23) of Malaya country. Jayakesin surrenders. Ālupa king is augmented (5:26). Kerala is attacked (5:27). The land of the Draviḍa 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 my Upodghāta.] N also 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 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 European languages. However, he forgets his own rules and regulations. He makes improper suggestions, even overlooking the demands of Sanskrit prosody. I don’t know what havoc he would have wrought on the Vikramāditya-ṇkadevacarita had it been a prose work! He asks us to remove the visarga of “kṛtaśthitiḥ” (5:78.1), make it a neutral (napumsaka) 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. However, Misra is not totally unaware of the needs of the specific metrical composition; see his comments on 16.9, p. 61, at the bottom, and also p. 62.

Misra may advance a counter argument and say, "The rule 'vā pādante tvasu g vak rah' = 'a syllable is counted as guru at the end of a pāda despite its laghutva for metrical purposes.' Therefore, no harm is done to the metre even when 'kṛtaśthitiḥ' is changed to 'kṛtaṣthiti.'" 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.

I 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
impos-sible if king Vikramāditya had himself, with his army, occupied the southern shore." He puts a severe limit on the length of the shore of Tugabhadrā! It was not a pond; it was a mighty river, Dakṣiṇāpatha-jāhnavī. Its shore stretched for miles and miles (four hundred 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. "Dakṣiṇa ta ta" does not necessarily mean "South bank." It can mean only the right bank as opposed to the left bank, determined on the basis of which way the river flows!

Sindhuṭīranilayānurodhatas tat tathā balam avāpa dīrghatām.
Antarakṣapitarātribhj janaiḥ prāpyate saṃṇpamandiraṃ yathā (5:76).

Everyone wanted to camp quite close to the river bank. Consequently, the stretch of the army became 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 the following verse:

Raṇarabhasavīlasakautukena sthitim atha bijbhad asau yaśovatāmsaṃ.
Vidhihatakadurāgrahād akānde gatam aśīṇod Draviḍendram Indradhāmi (6:7).

Misra says,

Interpret raṇarabhasavīlasakautukena 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 battles.

I have already discussed "Uḍāraśauryaikarasanaḥ kṣamāpatih sa nirvinodah samarots avam vinā," and "Colasaṃmuḥkhamagāhataḥhava-prāptidurlalitabāhurāgraḥam." 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." This 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. I am indebted to Pt. Nagaraja 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 "naḥ" freely
used, goes only with the verb. Obviously, Misra's suggestion betrays his total ignorance of the grammatical rules of Negation (niśedha). He does not know the difference between paryudāsa and prasajyapratiśedha. If the meaning suggested by Misra was desired by the poet, he would resort to paryudāsa, where samāsa of nañ and b ibhrat is compulsory. . . .

I am indebted to Shri Nagaraja Rao of Mysore for this next grammatical discussion: resumee

Prādhānyam syād vidher yatra pratiśedhe'pradhānatā.
Paryudāsaḥ sa vijñeyo yatottarapadena nañ.

Since such samāsa has not been used, if we allow Misra to have his way and split k autuke na, then it would be a case of prasajya pratiśedha where the free nañ gets in
variably con- nected with the finite verb:

Aprādhānyam vidher yatra pratiśedhe pradhānatā.
Prasajyapratiśedho'sau kriyayā saha yatra nañ (Vyaktiveka, II Vimarśa).

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

* * *

Plagiarism can be quite subtle. Regard the following verse:

Narapatitanayaḥ kayāpi kopa-sphuritaradacchadalekhayāluloke, 
Prakaśitapaṭupañcabāṇalīlā-kalakilakiñcitam īkṣaṇāñcalena (6:19).

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

Misra appropriates the above idea from Bh as his own without any acknowledgement. This is called "anyāyapūrṇam ātmasātkaṇaṇam." Here are Misra's words:

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 . . . vilāṣaḥ . . . " thus was the playful behaviour [of the beautiful women of the town]. . . ." The order of the verses 18 and 19 should, therefore, be inverted (p. 11).

Misra knows that "vilāsa" can be used as a substantive (noun) and that it means "playful behavior." Still he forgets this fact while discussing "Tavāṅgavallīkusumair" and turns "vilās
aiḥ" into "vikālaḥ" (an adjective)—one more illogical attempt just like so many others on the part of Misra!

Honesty, sincerity, and truthfulness demand that 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 Bh where he has improved the study of the text! This is not a characteristic of an "investigator," but that of an alligator. Misra had his own reasons. If he had ascribed this improvement to Bh, then he would not have been able to dupe the university and get his 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 "thought"] to belong to ā - lok (Dhātup. 1.76 lokṛ darśane): ālokate, not met with outside grammatical works and possibly a grammatical fiction.

I have no padaccheda between "yā" and "lu." However, "Candrikā" says "luloke drś aḥ," which is wrong according to Rao. It should be "āluloke." J has a clear sign ("ss," i.e., "avagṛaha"), visible even today, directing us to read "āluloke." Although Bh does not have in the text the sign of dīrgha, i.e., "avagṛaha" "ss," yet in the commentary he puts "āluloke sāmdṛś aḥ." He does not criticize me for "luloke"! What a way to criticize such a great ancient scholar antedating A.D. 1286! Misra also has overlooked my error. 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 the next example:


Misra presents his outstanding version:

niviś a - does not mean dalīta-, "torn asunder", as it is glossed in ed. ter. What is expected in this context caranātalaniviṣ aduṣ avargaḥ, "by whom the crowd of the evil ones was... by the soles of his feet", would be nipiś 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

Yādṛśam pustakam dṛṣṭam tādṛśam likhitam mayā.
Just because Bh translated "ṇiviṣ a" as "dalita" it does not mean that we must discard this 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 śrotāraḥ, and not racayitāraḥ. "Niviṣ a" means "lying, or resting, or stick-ing, or staying in (loc. or comp.)" (Monier-Williams). Misra is always ready to first destroy what is already there and then reconstruct his own meaning. 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 "ṇiviṣ a" be changed to "nipiṣ a" = "crushed"! If we merely want to say "crushed by the feet," we don't have to bring in "tala, "sole or bottom." "Cara ṃanipiṣ a" would easily express the desired meaning; so "tala" would become redundant. "Tala" serves us better if we want to say "under the feet." Also, the word "nipiṣ a" is not in the usage of the poets. "Nipiṣ a" is the current (pracalita) and hence the correct form. On this ground too Misra's recommendation is to be rejected.

* * *

Once again Misra tries to be an historiographer. Regarding the verse

Atha katiṣuc eva daivayogat parigaliteṣu dineṣu Colasūnoḥ.
Śriyaṃ aharata Rājigābhīdhanaḥ prakṛtivirodhahatasya Veṅgināthaḥ (6:26).

Misra shows his prakṛti:

The expression prakṛtivirodhahata- 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: yaśovirodhin- in 6.62 means "what is in conflict with a good name", i.e. "disgraceful", dharmavirodhin- in 6.65 means "what is in conflict with sacred tradi-tion", i.e. "impious." Hence prakṛtivirodhin- 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.

I don't know how Somadeva's hatred toward Vikrama could be called "unnatural." My response to Misra would be "mukham astiti vaktavyam." Does Misra want to tell us that Adhirāj arājendra was killed by Somadeva? Even I cannot dream that Misra would turn out to be so senseless! I simply fail to understand him.

In 6.26 we should have to understand: "slain by conflict with nature", which does not seem to make sense. [What a beautiful English! It is pardonable to borrow Misra's phraseology since he was breathing German air.] I propose to read instead of prakṛti- virodha-hatasya rather: prakṛtivirodhahatasya "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 po
int 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" (p. 12).

Misra does not know who Rājiga was. He ought to have studied pages 27-29 of my Upodg hāta!

How about expressions like "hā hato’smi mandabhāgyaḥ" and "Vayam tattvānveśaṇ madhukara hatās tvam khalu kṛtī"?

It is not necessary to make "virodhi" of "virodha." As Caritacandrikā explains, "P rakṛti virodho naisargikavairam tena hatasya." We can interpret it only in the sense that Rājiga was an inveterate enemy, "yesāṁ ca virodhaḥ śāśvatiḥāḥ," "ahinakulam," or "kākolākī yam." 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.

Rājiga suspected, rather apprehended, interference once again by Vikrama; so he aroused his brother Someśvara. The poet calls Rājiga "galitanayasya" (6:38).

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

"Prakṛti virodhahatasya": Bühler thinks that this means that the brother-in-law (Colasūnu) of Vikra ma was killed by the rebellion.

Bühler does not identify Colasūnu, but he was Adhirājarājendra of the people, the s subjects. But the poet uses the same expression at the end of the next verse: "prakṛti virodh inam asya Somadevam" (6.27). Here and earlier, in both the places, "prakṛti virodha" means only "natural enmity" like "ahinakulam" or "kākolākīyam," 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: Rājiga killed Adhirājarājendra on account of his natural or inborn enmity. Here the expression "prakṛti virodhahatasya" is set between "Rājigābhidhānah" and "Veṅgi- nāthāḥ." So, according to Dehali-dipakanyāya, the death was caused by Rājiga, who was Veṅginātha. I do not believe that the people of the Cola king dom first revolted, then killed Adhirājarājendra, and then invited Rājiga to occupy the throne.

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

Prakṛṭiṇāṃ prajāṇāṃ prakṛteḥ svabhāvasya vā virodhena prātikūlyena vaireṇa vā h atasya māritasya.

I don't believe that Adhirājarājendra was killed by his own subjects. Unless all the subjects want- ed 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 Veñgi, named Rājiga, carried away the goddess of royalty of the prince of Cola who was distressed by the revolt of the subjects.

I am left wondering if the translators really understood the poet!

The word “punah” may also have some significance. When Vīrārājendra died, Rājiga had a chance to capture the throne. Vikrama intervened and placed his brother-in-law Adhirājarājendra on the throne. On the departure of Vikrama, Rājiga killed Adhirājarājendra and usurped the throne. He was afraid Vikrama might thwart his plans once again; so he entered into alliance with Somadeva.

Bilhana says, "Anucitam amunā. . . " (6:38). Criticizing the poet, Bühler remarks, "Bilhana, in uttering this statement, forgets that his hero had formed a matrimonial alliance with the same Chola race."

I 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. Sandhīr nā vígraḥo yānam . . . Sandhi; alliance is the first of the six guṇas of diplomacy or statecraft (śādguṇyo mantrāḥ). Bühler himself forgets that it is one thing to accept the daughter of an enemy (kiṅg) 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 Vīrārājendra had virtually surrendered.

Let us hear what the poet himself says:

1.) Sandhibandham avalokyam niścalam. . . (5:62).

2.) Rājyam uddhīrtam anarthapaṅkataḥ
kanyakāvītaraṇād amanyata (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.

Bilhana says,

Kanyāpradānacchalaṭā kṣitīśāḥ sarvasvadānam bahavo'sya cakrūḥ.

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 prāṣaṁsanti guror utpathagāmīnāḥ (4:117).
Mayā nipṛṇamānas te nibiḍam Draviḍādayaḥ.  
Āryam viparyastam api prabhavanti na bādhitum (4:118).

The question is, what would have happened to the entire Cālokya kingdom if Vikramāditya 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 Rājiga had come out absolutely victorious from this war, the Cālokya kingdom would have been completely wiped out then and there and forever!

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

Bubhukṣitaḥ kim na karoti pāpam kṣīṇā nārā nīśkarṇā bhavanti.  
Ākhyāhi bhadre priyadarśanasya na Gaṅgadattaḥ punar eti kūpam.

Let it be stressed once again that Vikrama entered into an alliance with his enemy for peace, while Someśvara entered into an alliance with his enemy for war, and that 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 sarvāḥ sarvāḥ jānāti.

* * *

MISRA’S MISDIRECTION

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

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

This is a very strange type of construction. Why is so much prominence given to Bühler? I don't know. The MS. comes first; all other editions come afterwards. Bühler is in-between. I wonder if Misra knows the difference between "MS." and "MSS." Here we have only one MS.

c gaganagirita i navendranīla-
d drutisataniṣṭharadharinīva reje//

"... the top of the mountain of the sky (lit. which is the sky) shone like bearing a hundred cascades of fresh meltlings of (blue) sapphires (= of just molten sapphires)". 
While *druti-*,”melting, molten substance,” here qualifies of *nirjhora-*,”cascades”, it should be changed into *dyuti-*[?] in 11.41a *ketakadrutinibham mahah . . . indoh,*”the splendour (mahah)-of the moon that . . . was like the shine (dyuti) of a [!] (white) K *etaka* flower.”  Cp. 11.87 . . .

It seems that Misra has only one flower! We cannot make a paste for the entire world with one flower! Time and again I find it difficult to understand Misra.

a  *nïśipyä . . .

b  *ātmadyatīṁ dadhatī pāṇḍuratāṁ 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 my 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 me. I 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 prakṛṭiśātalam indoh.*
Kasya no vauṣi candanalepaḥ kāṇṭitaś ca guṇataś ca babhūva (11.41).

This change is dictated on page 17. The above text (in the quoted para: ”. . . ketakadrutini bham . . . ”) 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 did he change it in the course of translating? The question of questions still remains, why?

Misra asks us to compare this verse to 11:87. It contains "dyuti." I fail to understand how this "dyuti" in 11:87 will help him to change "druti" into "dyuti" in "navendrantladrut i" (6.51) and "ketakadrutii" (11.41). The whole discussion is not clear to me at all. In my opinion this citation (of "Nïśipyä") is irrelevant because we need the word "dyuti" there since it means the "rays" there, rather than "lustre" only. The fact is that "indranīla" and "ketaka a" themselves are turned into "dravā" or "druti." They are to be liquefied! The lamps are not! It is a *kavïndrokti*, and only a *sahṛdaya* can understand it.

And, by the way, Misra translates the word "nïśipyä" 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 "nïśip": "to throw or cast down, put or place down; to ent
rust, 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!

I hope Misra has read Kālidāsa:

Dinānte nihitam tejah savitrea hutāšanaḥ.

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

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

To change "ketakadruti" into "ketakadyuti" would be a murder of the poetic genius of Bilhaṇa. 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 everyone by virtue of their lustre as well as their soothing quality. To say "ketakadyutinibham" would be utter non-sense. How? Why? A bhāvuka kavi alone can understand. One has to go and ask some real guru who knows. Upadeśyanti te jñānam jñāninas tatvya-darśīnāḥ. Saṁs kṛta is divine.

Saṁskṛtam nāma daivī vāg anvākhyaētā maharṣibhiḥ.

I am reminded of the following sadukti:

Ajñānāndhasya lokasya jñānānjanaśalākayā. 
Cakṣur ummilitaṁ yena tasmai [śrī gurave] namaḥ.

An infant takes every woman to be its mama. Misra would remove all the "druti" from Vikṣ. I don't know what he did with "kṛtadravaiś candrakarair ivāplutah" (2:79) and "drāvitasp ĥa ikaśaila" (11:38).

Mr. Misra may know this verse:

Savāsanānāṁ sabhyānām rasasyāśvādanāṁ bhavet. 
Nirvāsanās tu raṅgāntaḥ kāṣṭhakudyāśmasannibhāḥ.
I advise him to read

Drāvitasphaṭikaśailavitānika-sphāranirjaraparamparayeva.
Pūrīṭa śaśirucā bhuvanaśrīr mānapaṇkam anudat pramadānām (11:38).

and

Jalāśayā yatra hasanti santataṃ navendranīladravanirmalodarāḥ [kāḥ?]
Śaratsamutsāritameghakardamam Kalindakanyakāhāradamekakam nabhaḥ (2:6).

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

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

Kuṇṭhatvam āyāti guṇaḥ kavīṇām sāhityavidyā śramavarjiteṣu.

and

Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham.

And here is our favorite poet Murari:

Daivīṃ vācaṃ upāsate hi bahavaḥ sāraṃ tu sārasvatam
Abdhir langhita eva vānarabhaṭaḥ kiṃvasya gambhīratām
āpātālani mākapīvara vāpur jānāti manthācalaḥ.

Also we have

Śīlā-Vījjā-Mārulā-Morikādyāḥ kāvyam kartum santi śaktāḥ striyo'pi.
Tattvam vettum vādino nirvijetum viśvam vaktum yaḥ pravīṇaḥ sa vandyaḥ.

* * *

WHY THIS BOOK?

Misra needs a real guru who can open his eyes and show him the correct path. Oth
erwise there will be constant chaos. The "dust jacket" of his book tells us, "The author, wh
o has taken only specimens of these problems and discussed them in the present work, is ke
eping himself busy in giving wide treatment to these in his critical edition of the Vikramāṇa
devacarita in [the] near future." If the whole work is going to be like the "specimens" I s
see here, I simply shudder at the thought of the amount of unworthy writing that would be se
attered all over the Sanskrit world in India and abroad. It will be a disaster as far as Sansk
rit scholarship is concerned. It will be a dis- service to the cause of Sanskrit studies in gene
ral and to Mahākavi Bilhaṇa in particular. Let us save the world from this calamity. Let u
s persuade Misra to acquire the basic knowledge of lite- rary criticism before he wields his
pen on a great poet like Bilhaṇa. This has been the objective of my undertaking this study
of Misra.

Another "emendation" suggested by Misra relates to this verse:

Bahubhir abhihitaiḥ kim adbhitair vā
bhāyajanananāṃ Bhuvanaikamallasainyam.
Ranarasacalitam vilokya keśāṃ
alabhata cetasi nāntaraṃ vikalpah (6:53).

Misra says,

For ranarasacalitam, "moved towards [why not 'by' or 'for'?] the taste of battl
e", substitute ranarasavalitam, "addicted to the taste of battle" [!] valita- from the ro
ot 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).

He talks as though he has seen the J MS.!

Misra recommends that we discard "calitam" and adopt "valitam." I cannot agree.
The trouble with Misra is that he interprets Bilhaṇa's words arbitrarily and unreasonably--t
he way he wants. He breaks the whole glass, as it were, and then like a child he wants to p
ut it back together. He translates "ranarasacalitam" as "moved towards the taste of battle."
The question is, why con- stue it that way? "Raṇe yah rasaḥ utsāhah (see 'Candrikā') ten
a tasmād vā hetoh 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."

Surprisingly, Misra has taken a correct stand here:

Dviradapatir amuṣya śatrusenā-bhaṭamukhapadmavimardakelikālaḥ.

Misra states,
Bühler (ed.pr.) reads in b kelikāraḥ (against kelikālaḥ of second and third editions, which do not mention his reading), and -puṇḍarikakośam in d- against puṇḍar ikāśesam (second and third edd., which in this case mention Bühler's reading) [!] kel ikāraḥ in b is certainly preferable.

Misra's punctuation marks are baffling.

a. dviradapatir amuṣya śatrusenā-

b. bha amukhapadnavimardakelikāraḥ/

"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 elephants! What about his statement asserting that "elephants are not known to enjoy music" (discussed earlier)? Here is a famous example: Megh. 1.2 "vapraprīḍa- parinatagaja-," more suitable than "[h]is . . . elephant, the god of death in (for) the play/game of crushing . . . ."

Seeing that Bühler's reading is not even mentioned^8, I may even consider the "-kālaḥ" of the second ed., taken over by the third ed., to be due to a slip of pen.

. . . -śesam in d (against Bühler's kośam) 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 "MS S.," or does he deliberately uses the plural? Here I am generally concerned only with "J," i.e., only one MS.

c. . . raṇasarāṣ caṅkāra lakṣmī [-]/

d. karadhyatavibhammera puṇḍarīkaśesam//

". . . 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)."

. . . puṇḍarīkakośam. "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 olluṇ hanakelikāraḥ, "indulging in the sport of robbing the dress that is (white) fame"; 16.52 tuhinagirīta ikeleīkāraḥ samīrāḥ, "the winds in duling in sports on the slopes of the snow mountain".

This is the first instance (6:86) where Misra has improved my own reading by pointing its d eviation from B, without the support of J, and then concluding that it was a slip of the pen o n the my part. This improvement is owed to Misra. This is called "ghuṇākṣara-nyāya."

I inherited "kālaḥ" from R! Of course, this is an error on my part, which can be expl ained not only by the fact that my press copy was the R itself, but also because "kālaḥ" was much more charming and yielded alliteration. I was caught in the trap unawares! This is a case of a lie that seemed like the truth! I have named it "Satyāyamānam asatyaṃ." This shows how easily one is misled by a lie which does not seem to be a lie. Even though the s pecific reading is not genuine, one cannot suspect its being corrupt because it makes good s ense by itself.

I would like to know from Misra where the third edition mentions the reading of B? "Keli- kālaḥ" is certainly my error, realized today on Oct. 25, 1977! J has "kelikāraḥ," and so naturally, or as is expected, B should have the same. It does.

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 the old saying, "to err is human," or,

Gacchata skhalanam 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, "... [S]ati ravikaranikarapraveśe kuto'ndhakārasya sambhavah." It has "keli- kālaḥ," i.e., its own creation! It does not reproduce what B has. So I got myself f caught in the trap laid by R! This is called "Śvayām naś aḥ parān nāśyati."

"Śeṣam" comes from J. "Kośam" is the creation of Bühler's fertile brain. I don't kno w how Misra got the evidence that "śeṣam" seems to have the support of the MSS. (p. 14). He did not consult any MS of Vik. His "seems" denotes his supposition, because I went ba ck to J. However, Misra is not explicit on this point; he is equivocal. It is useless to talk ab out Bh because he is only a copycat--a cheater and a liar.

* * *

Here we have yet another recommendation from a controversial critic for emendati on:

Iti bhramatsaurabhamāṃsalena nimīlitānāṃ malayānilena.
Abhūc ciraṃ bhūmigṛhistitānāṃ pralāpamālā priyakāṅkṣīnāṃ (7:14 Kulakam).

And now another display of Misra's profound knowledge:
nimilīta-, "having been closed", does not make sense here. What is required, [!1] is a participle meaning "tormented. . . ."

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

Once again we are reminded by our ancestor-gurus: "Jivat kaver āśay na varṇanīyah." = "Don't try to interpret the poet who is still alive." I hesitate to put my words into Misra's mouth. However, I have no choice.

Probably what Misra wants us to learn here is that "nipidita" is derived from "nipīlit a," which in turn is derived from "nipīlīta." If so we can bow down our heads, not in reverence, but in shame and say, "Mugdha-mataye namaḥ." The original word of Bilhana is "nimīlīta." I fail to understand how the "m" gets turned into a "p"! A reader of these lines is bound to reach one of two conclusions: either this writer (refering to me!) is a fool, or Misra is not honest or reliable.

Misra shows here his superb knowledge of "philological linguistics." I fail to understand the connection between "nimilīta" (the starting point) and "nipidita" (Misra's end product)!

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

\[
\text{Sahasraśaḥ santu viśāradānām vaidarbhalīlānidhayaḥ prabandhāḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Tathāpi vaicitryarahasyalubdhāḥ śraddhāṃ vidhāsyanti sacetaso' tra (1:13).}
\]

and

\[
\text{Praudhiprakarṣeṇa purāṇarīti-vyatikramaḥ ślāghyatamaḥ padānām.}
\]
\[
\text{Atyunnatisphoṭītakañcukāni vandyāni kāntākucamaṇḍalāni (1:15).}
\]

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

I translated "nimilitānām" as "paripiditānam." Bh copied it and said "vyathitānām"! Monier-Williams gives some better meanings. For example, "having closed the eyes." A pte gives other meanings as well, like "benumbed" and "stupefied." "Nimilitānām" really denotes intense pain causing the sufferer to close the eyes. "Nimilīta" does not exclusively
mean "having been closed," as Misra puts it; it has many meanings. And we should never f
orget the great dictum:

Kāmadughā hi mahākāvināṁ vāco bhavanti.

Atha ca

Yā dugdhāpi na dugdheva kavidogdhrbhir anvaham.

Misra has no value for the anuprāsa. He does not care for mādhuryam. There is a world of
diference between "nimīlitānām" and "nipīditānam." One has to develop the art of appr
eciation of poetry to become a sahryaya.

* * *

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 varṇayitum manobhūh (7:20).

My reading 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 "Sarasvatyanugrahāt." He critic
izes "Carita- candrikā," which has tried to explain "pramādāt anavadhānatām parityayeti b
hāvah." Bh argues that "pramādāt" is an error of the scribe and relates a certain Puranic st
ory to support his argument, which still remains unacceptable to me. I still don’t know how
"prasādāt" could specifically mean "Sarasvatyanugrahāt"! However, Śabhākara has "pras
ādāt."

Probably this is the only instance where Bh has gone against "Caritacandrikā" (that
great ancient glossary!) and is bold enough to disagree openly. He says, "Caritacandrikā- i
ppani-kārasya pramādād anavadhānatām parityayeti bhāvah! [!] ityapi cintyam."

Misra presents a lengthy discussion on the reading. He unnecessarily goes to Pāṇin
i. I had no intention of getting Pāṇini involved here for the final decision. Let it be stresse
d 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 co
ment- ators take liberties with the poet:

Dolāsu yad dolanam aṅganānāṁ yan mallikā yac ca lavaṅgavāyuḥ.
Sā viśvasammoḥanadīkṣitasya 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 it, but refrained from doing so on account of the unavailability of another reading, as if wherever he has changed a reading and ruined the text he had some support! But he forgets that "yat" here is "Ṣāmāne na paṁsakaṁ." In order to match with "śā" (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 yad, with or without its demonstrative, appears to be used redundantly to eke out the metre, or perhaps to give force to the noun with which it is con- nected, 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. yan maraṇaṁ so'syā viśrāmaḥ).

But Bh belongs to a class of arm-chair "researchers" whose primary instrument is assertion and not vācoyukti. They don't want to search; they just want to research. They believe and practice manahpūtam samācāret. They don't have to prove; they just dictate.

* * *

Misra's genius soars high up when he discusses this verse:

Hastadvayīgādhagrhītalola-dolāguṇānāṁ jaghane vadhūnāṁ.
Asaṁvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe kim apyabhūd ucchvasito manobhūḥ (7:29).

He remarks,

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

He is mugdhatara-śiromaṇi! Misra talks about their underwear. I am not sure if they wore under- wear!

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

Notice how Misra's padam ends without any vibhakti! He brings Pāṇini again and again. But here Misra overlooks Subtiṅantam padam!
Following the footsteps of Bh, Misra recommends that we should read "asamvyrte sr asta- dukālabandhe," or better make it "asamvṛtyaḥ" and connect the word with "manobhūḥ"! Misra merely provides one more example of "gadālikāpravahānaya" when he recommends that Bh's conjecture be adopted, which is unjustifiable. It is to be noted that both "rest orers" have over-looked the word "bandha," i.e., "knot" or "tie." "Asamvṛtasrastadukālabandhe" is a bahuvrīhi compound qualifying "jaghaṇe." Whatever is asamvṛta and srasta is not jaghana or dukāla, but dukālabandha. 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 jaghana gets totally asamvṛta (naked), there will be rasabhaṅga and not the continuity of śrṅgāra. It will be a great interruption, mahā-vighna. 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 instaneously--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 (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 as 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 translat es "manobhūḥ" as "love" only!

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. 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:

Nāndhrīpayodhara ivātitarām prakāśaḥ
no Gurajarīstana ivātitarām nigūḍhaḥ.
Artho girām apihitaḥ pihitaśca kaścit
saubhāgyam eti marahaṭṭavadhūkucūbhaḥ.


Since I do not want to change "asamvṛta" into "asamvyrte," I am not willing to follow the other path suggested by Misra. According to him, it is the best, but I regard it as the worst. The whole inherent charm of the ucchvasita of "manobhūḥ" is ruined. If Bilhaṇa were here to see what distortion Misra has perpetrated, the poet would cry in despair.

Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanāṁ śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha.

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

Anudghuṣṭaḥ śabdair atha ghaṭanataś ca sphuṭataraḥ
padānāṁ arthātmā sukhayati na tūtānitaraśaḥ.
Yathā kiṅcitkiṅcitpavanacalacāṁśukatayā
kucābhogah strīnām sukhayati na tudghātītam uraḥ.

This verse has some variant readings as quoted by Vāmanācārya Jhalakīkara in his Bālabo dhinī on Kāvyapракāśa:

[Dharmāsokasya, from Suktimuktāvalī, Kavikāvyapraśaṃsā]

Anuddhṛṣṭah śabdair atha ca rancanātah sphaṭarasah
padānām arthātmā janayati kavīnām bahumudam.
Yathā kiṃcitikiṃcitpavanacalacolāṅcalataya

kucadvandvaṃ kāntīṃ kirati na tathodghātītam uraḥ (7th ed. 1965, p.191, fn. 3).

"Anuddhṛṣ ah" may very well be an error on the part of the scribe or printer.

I would like to know from Misra, the critic, how he wants to construe the whole verse. Is "asam- vṛtah" an udeśyā or vidheya? What is the finite verb? What is the meaning of "kim api"? How does it stand in relation to Misra’s "love unfettered"?

I have designated Misra as munitrayaikyam--Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali--all three in one! He refers to Pāṇini 2.1.49 in discussing the above, "asaṃvṛta srastadukālaban dēhe." The sūtra is "Pūrvakālaiṣkapavarjaraḥ purāṇanavakevalaḥ samānādhiyakaranaḥ." The example of "pūrva-kāla," as given by Bhaṭṭoṣī Dīksita, is "pūrvam svatāḥ paścādunilīpīḥ s nātānulīpīḥ." Misra has not specifically stated in Sanskrit what he wants to convey. Therefore, I cannot determine exactly what he wants to say; I can only guess. If I am right, we will need a compound like "pūrvam asaṃvṛtaḥ paścād srasta-dukālabandhaḥ." This will require another subcompound (bahu- vṛtiḥ), something like "srastaḥ dukūlasya bandho yasya tat (jaghanam)," because until and unless "srastadukālabandha" is made an adjective of "jaṅghana," and made to coordinate with "srasta" (i.e., a "samānādhiyakaraṇa"), we cannot apply the above sūtra of Pāṇini.

If the above reasoning, as advanced by me, is accepted, then the whole compound would mean that the hips first became naked, and then their knot of the clothing (dress) became "srasta," i.e., it slipped! This would be an absurd idea. If Misra wants to live in his own world, he is free to do so. But no sane lover of the poetry would accompany him into his world of fantasy.

* * *

BHARADVAJ’S GRAMMATICAL JUGGLERY

The word "aṅśāṇa" in verse 7:40 provides an opportunity for Bh to display his command over grammatical construction and interpretation. Bhiṣanā says:

Rāśikṛtāḥ puṣpaṁpaṛagapuṇjāḥ pade pade daksīṇamārutena.
Mattasya caitradvīradsya kartum aksūnahetor iva pāṁsūtalpān (7:40).

I did not understand the meaning of the word "aksūna" in this verse. I had no hesitation in con-fessing the limitations of my knowledge and stated with all the honesty and sincerity a t my com-mand that aksūnapadasyārtho nāvagamyate. Even today, after a lapse of four de cades, I still don't know exactly what it means!

Bh who took "Candrikā" to be an "ancient" commentary, consciously or unconsciously, re-marked,

Kutracit "asya śabdasyārthāgamo na jāyate" iti spasītam likhitvā tippaniśkrta
viduṣā nirahaṅkāram svapāṇḍityam paricāyatam."

I don't know where Bh quotes "Caritacandrikā" from. The only place I (in my "Caritacandrikā") used such an expression was here in 7:40, but my words were "aksūnapadasyārtho nāvagamyate"!

However, Bh had no difficulty at all in understanding the meaning of the word. Throug h a rigorous jugglery of a great grammarian, Bh has tried to establish that the word "aksūna" can be interpreted as "gatyavarodahā," i.e., "viśrāmaḥ." But he overlooks the signifi ance of the expres-sion "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--to let his steam off, as it were. He is not suffering from, say, tuberculosis, so that he would need rest at every step. In reality, he would like to be engaged in sportive acts at every ste p; that is the meaning. So, although the dictionaries do not support me, although I am not y et sure whether the word "aṣūna" is genuine and correct (i.e., whether it represents the ori ginal and correct reading), I can tentatively assign it the meaning of "vihāra, līlā, or krīḍā" (sportive play) to relieve him of the intense pressure caused by the severe madavasthā.

It is interesting to observe that B & G try to render the verse in English, but they avoid the interpretation of the words "kartum aksūnahetor iva." Here is what they say:

The southern breeze [!] piled up, at every step, pollens of flowers as if to make a bed ["beds"?] of dust for the intoxicated [!] elephant in the shape of caitra.

I don't think the "breeze" can pile up pollen. It has to be the wind. However, they are hone st enough to add in the footnote, "In this verse the word Achyūnahetoh [sic] is obscure." ["Achyūna" won't make "aṣūna."]

Misra's Chapter I is titled "Specimens of Textual Difficulties." He has discussed so many "difficulties," as felt by him. To me many of them are merely his own fantastic fanta sies. How- ever, he has not discussed the word "aṣūna." Probably he did not have any "di fficulty" in it at all! Nevertheless, it is still a cause of great difficulty to me!
I believe that we must go to some ancient text on Gajaśāstra to understand this verse (7:40). Mātaṅga-līla of Nīlakaṇṭha describes the first stage of "must," ("mada," "dangerous excitement"), prathama madāvasthā, as follows:

Madhurucinakhadantapreṣaṇa nīlamegha-cchavir aruṇadṛgantaḥ padmakiñjalkabinduḥ.
Aparagajavirodhi pāṃsupāthovihārair bhavati ca kaṭapūrṇaḥ sundaro vāraṇendraḥ.

(Navamā paṭalāḥ, 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-kin g becomes "temple-filled" (in the first stage of must.)

The text reads "pāṃsupāthovihāra," i.e., instrumental of "bhavati." Edgerton gives the va riant reading "vihārī." I believe this reading is preferable. The elephant does not become "ka apūrṇaḥ" by means of or through "sporting in dust and water."

The mada is a natural p henomenon, and the "sport" is the resultant natural behaviour. "Vihārī" is in perfect conson ance with "virodhī."

My main concern is "pāṃsuvihāra." "Dhūlimṛṣ iḥ" is mentioned as part of the daily routine (dinacaryā) by Nīlakaṇṭha (11:8). Edgerton translates the word as "rubbing down with powder." I believe this is "pāṃsuṭrīdā," rather than "rubbing with powder."

Cf. Vapakṛṭāpārinatagajapreṣaṇīyaṃ dadaśā (Meghadūte, Kālidāsaḥ).

Now let us see what Mātaṅgalīlā says on "pāṃśu" ("puspa-parāgapuṇjāḥ" of Bilhaṇa):

Sarveśāṃ madakṛḍ vasantaśamayā prokto, viśeśād asau nāgānāṃ tu, tato vasantaśanītā ye te tu gandhadvipāḥ (1:40).

And "rajośmbupaṃkavihṛtī" (1:35).

This justifies the mada in the Spring:

Atimadhurarasānāṃ sevayaḥ patrabhaṅgaiḥ
kabalkubalaśaṃpaśr annapaṇāin yathoktaih.
Śrutisubhagavacbhīḥ pāṃśu [stress added] paṅkāmbudānair
bhavati muditacetāḥ kāmacāreṇa nāgaḥ (9:1).

And paṅkāmbupāṃsupriyāḥ [stress added] (5:6)
I would like to refer to another ākara-grantha on the subject, Pālakāpyamuni-viracito Hastāyur-vedāḥ (Poona, Anandashrama, 1894):

Caturthe uttarasthāne trimśattamaḥ pāṃсудānādhyāyaḥ (p. 691)

Athātaḥ pāṃсудānasya vakṣyate guṇasaṅgrahaḥ (15).

Atha śraddhāṃ ca kurute tathāhāraśramaṃ bhavet ["tyajet"]?
Pāṃṣūr mattasya nāgasya manaḥsaṅkhyavivardhanaḥ (16).

Pāṃṣūr balasya janano [kathitaś ca] vivardhanaḥ.
Pāṃṣūr uṣṇābhītapastasya jayaśaṅkhyavivardhanaḥ (17).

Pāṃсудānagnuṇopeto rasadhātur vivardhate, 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 "aksūṇahetoh" in the verse being discussed.

As stated elsewhere, an attempt was made by a vaiyākarānaśiromani, a distinguished friend of Bharadwaj, to give the derivation of this word ("aksūṇa"). Bilhaṇa did not write poetry that could be understood only with the help of such a great learned grammarian. He composed his poem in Vaidarbhi rūti and it is endowed with prasāda guna. Let us hear Bilhaṇa himself:

Grāmo nāsau na sa jana padah sāsti no rājadhānī
tattāranyam na tad upavanam sā na sārasvatī bhūḥ.
Vidvān mūrkaḥ pariṇatavāyā bālakaḥ stṛī pumān vā
yatromīlatpulakam akhilā nāsya kāvyam paṭhanti (18:89).

I am sure Bilhaṇa knew the word "viśrāma," which could be substituted for "aksūṇa," and which this great grammarian has derived with such great verbal jugglery. Instead of using the word "aksūṇa" and forcing Bh to employ the services of such a great grammarian, Bilhaṇa could easily have sung,

Mattasya caitradviradasya kartuṃ viśrāmahetor iva pāṃsutalpān [!].

* * * *

Let us study the following verse, which gives us one more "non-sensical" interpretation from Misra, to borrow his own terminology. Bilhaṇa says,

Unnidrapaṅktisthitacampakāni cakāśire kelivanāntarāṇi,
Viyoginīnāṃ kavālikṛtānāṃ suvarṇakāṇḍībhir ivāṅcitānī (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 (p. 29).

The stressed portion is a display of "non-sensical" interpretation by our Abhinava-Bilhana Misra. I don't know how he gets this meaning. The poet says "kavalikrtam viyoginjnam s uvarnakancibhir ancitani 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 viyoginis died when the campaka flowers attained the stage of full bloom. I don't know why Misra had to take the ladies to the campaka trees to hang themselves! Were they the gallows? I don't know how far Misra can take himself! Misra does not give the meaning of the word "kavalikrtanam," which means "devoured, eaten up, or swallowed." At least the word does not figure in his translation!

Srîharṣa in his Naiṣadhiyacarita describes the destructive force of campaka flowers. Here is one of his saduktis:

Vicinvatih pānthapataṅgahimsanair aprīyakarmāṇyaliṇkajjālačchālāt. Vyalokayac campakakorakāvalīḥ sa Śambārārer baliddīpikā iva.


Probably Misra did not read it. Neither Bh nor B & G are very clear here. However, they have not misunderstood it the way Misra has.

The problem occurs again in another verse by Bilhana:

Tathā gataḥ campakadāmagaurī śarīrayaṣṭiḥ kṛṣatām kṛśāṅgyāḥ. Yathā galaccāpanamoratho’syāṃ mauryālātāsthāṃ madanaḥ karoti (9:30).

Once again we meet here the word "añcitam," which is disliked so much by Misra (already discussed in "suvarṇakancibhir ivāñcitīni"). Misra commented on this word as follows:

... for arcitam in MSS. and ed. pri., añcitam in ed. sec. (followed by ed. ter.) is done needlessly by the editor, obviously in silent reference to Pān.6.4.30 and 7.2.53, yet Bilhana has no example of añcita in this sense (p. 26, fn. 2).

Misra does not ask us once again here to replace "añcita" by "arcitam"! Why? He does, however, translate the word as "marked by"!

* * * *

A simple word, "kuṅṭkāri," occurring in the verse
Pāṇīyāṃ nālikēphalakuharakuhūtkāri kallolayantaḥ
Kāverīrīratāladrumaharitasurābhāṇḍabhāṅkāraṇḍāḥ.
Unmīlannīlomacāparicayāṣiśirā vāntyamī Drāvidīṇāṃ
karpūrāpāṇḍuganḍasthalalūṭhitaravā vāyavo dākṣīṇātyāḥ (7:71).

agitates Misra's brain cells. In his opinion, "the previous attempts in translating [Bilhana] 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,

\textit{kuhūtkāri-}: the wrong orthography \textit{kuhūt}- (all edd. and anthologies) instead of \textit{kuhū}, "a sound, like the cry of the Kokila", may be due to false [?] analogy after \textit{phūtkṛ} (8.18; 11.23) "to make a hissing sound." Cp. below Chap. III on 7.71 (p. 15).

I don't understand what the melodious song of the \textit{Kokila} has to do with the rest. "\textit{Kuhūtkāri} i" is just an onomatopoeic word, an imitation of the sound of coconuts shaken by the winds (the nuts possessing liquid inside naturally make the specific sound when shaken).

Cf. Nārikelaphalakaṅḍataṇḍava.

Misra could have suggested an improved reading based on the A MS., i.e., "\textit{lulita}" for "\textit{lt hita}" in the fourth pāda. Cf.

Niṣiddhair apyebhīr lulitamakarando madhukaraih (\textit{Venīsamhāra} 1.1)

For a similar idea, see

Ye dolākelikārāh kim api mrgadrśāṁ mānatantucchido ye
sadyāḥ śṛṅgāradīkṣāvyatikaraguravā ye ca lokatraye’pi.
Te kaṇṭhe lolayantaḥ parabhṛtavayasāṁ pañcamaṁ rāgarājaṁ
vānti svairam samīrāḥ smaraviyamahāsākṣino dākṣīṇātyāḥ.

The above verse, composed by Rājaśekhara, is cited by \textit{Sūktimuktāvalī} right after the following two verses of Bilhana, "Pāṇīyāṃ nālikēri" and "Taṁvāṇaśītalatvam." All the three are very similar in wording and meaning--\textit{sabdāvalī} and \textit{arthatattvam}.

Misra also discusses "\textit{bhāmkāri}" in 7:71. He says,

\textit{bhāmkāri-} f. "a certain (rambling) sound" in b (onomatopoetic) \textit{sic} also attested in 9:22, to be connected with \textit{bhāmkāri} f. "gad-fly", or just wrong for \textit{jhāṅkāra-} (cp. \textit{jhāṅkṛta} 9.148) (p. 15).

* * *

Na hi sarvaḥ sarvaṁ 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 citram kucayugāntare.
Krīḍākundalitoccaṇḍa-kodanḍaḥ kusumāyudhaḥ (8:41).

Misra says,

*māti*: the reading of MS. (māti) should be kept (with ed. sec.) and not changed into bhāti (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  kvacīn 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. Śīś. 1.23 etc. The verse in question . . . should be rendered as follows:

"God Love, whose terrible [!] [uccaṇḍa = 'gigantic;' not 'terrible'] bow is play fully arched, fits, [it is] marvelous, [in the space between her breasts, which [yet] is without an opening [! 'which might give him room']" (p. 15).

What a terrible translation! Misra finds fault with me when I have explained the word "māti" by "āgacchati." Pāṇini has "Ādhāro'dhikaraṇam" (1.4.45) and "Saptamyaḍhīrāṇe ca." (2.3.36). Bhattatōji Dīksita writes "aupaśleṣiko, vaiṣayikoḥbhivyāpakaś cetyādḥāras tridhā," and cites as the example of the third category "svarasmīnaṃmaṭi." I don't know what else it ("māti") would mean when we put the following three words together: "nirvivare kucayu gāntare 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 even 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 mahākāvīnīm pantiḥ! I followed sthūlārundhatīnyāya or śākhācandranyāya when I used 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: "kvacīn na māti sma mudā naresvarah." Let us examine how shallow his translation is: "'[T]he 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 should be translated idiomatically.

Bh takes pride in copying "B" and "R" even when my reading was better. 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, the poet himself. He explains "bhāti" as
"pūrṇatayā samāgatyā sāvakāśam virājata iti citram iti āścaryam." Incidentally, it might be added that even Bh says "samāgatyā." Cf. N's āgacchati.

I have already stated this and would state 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 kāvyā can be comprehended only by those who are gifted by nature and have experienced the beauties of poetical muse by actually feeling them. The essence of poetry is

Kāvyārthabhāvanāparipakvabuddhi-vibhavamātravedyam.

and

Śabdārthaśasanajñāna-mātrenāiva na vedyate.
Vedyate sa hi kāvyārthatattvajñāir eva kevalam (Dhvanyālokaḥ 1.14).

And once again here is our own poet Bilhana:

Kurvantu śeśāḥ śukavākyapāṭham (1:22).

Bilhana himself has warned unqualified simple folks (mudhajanās) against trying to understand him (1:22). I fail to understand what there is to wonder about if Kāma is able to stay there. Strangely enough Bh forces the word "bhāti" to mean far more than its prakṛti and prayāya 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 prat hama bāra śīḍhratāse chapavāī jāegī, unāmeś [!] yadi āsuddhiyām ho [?] to ve kṣa mya haiṁ. Dā Jāṛja Byuhlara Mahodaya ko anya pratī kāhīṁ na milane se kevala usa eka Vikramāṅkadevacarita Mahākāvyā kī hastalikhita prati ke ādhāra para hī p ustaka chapavāī pari thi. Kucha loga bhale hī Dā Jāṛja Byuhlara Mahodaya kī pu staka kī āsuddhi bahuta batākara [!] usakī [!]

--------

Did Bh actually want to say "pustaka ko āsuddhi bahuta batākara" or "āsuddhi bahula"? It seems someone else (who might have had some personal grudge against me) wrote the above words. Mātsyarāgopahatatmanāṁ hi skhalanti sādhusvapi mānasāṁi. Bharavi. Bh me rely got them published without even understanding them! "Dvesyaiva keśām api candrakh aṇḍa-vipāṇḍurā puṇḍraśaṅkarāpi" (1:20.3-4).

--------

nindā kareṁ kintu maiṁ to Dā Jāṛja Byuhlara Mahodaya ko aneka dhanyavāda det ā hūṁ ki unhomne isa mahākāvyaratnā ko parakha kara isako, āsuddhiyukta hī kyo m na ho, prakāśita kara jagat ke sammukha prakāṭa kiyā. Anyathā yaha mahā kāv
ya bhī anya uttama tathā upayogī samāskṛta grantha [!] ke sadṛśa pustakālayoṃ kī a ndheṛī koṭiḥariyoṃ meṃ hastaṅkhitā rūpa meṃ hī paṛā rahatā. [What wonder ful H indi writing! It deserves Maṅgalaprasāda pāritosika as well as Bhāratīya Jñānapī h a 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 o n only one old manuscript, there are bound to be errors and they are to be condoned.

Since Dr. Georg Bührer 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 kareṃ) Dr. Georg Bührer by pointing out the err ors of his edition, but I offer myriads of my sincere thanks to that great Georg Bühr e r 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, "Introduct." p. 2)

It is interesting to note that Bh did not indulge in this kind of unnecessary defence of Bührle r in his first two volumes. It seems his mind was inflated by his apparent success when he s aw that even his third volume was published and he was able to put forth all that he wanted . His mental baloon of pride was inflated with hot air and soared high up in the skies.

I do not understand why such a defense was necessary! It assumes quite a lot. Bh d oes not mention the name of the "abuser" who has "abused," according to him, the name of Bührer. He merely says that "some" (plural) have been "abusing." I wish he had named t hose who, in his opinion, had abused Dr. Georg Bührer. Bh has used the word "nindā." No w the word "nindā" means "guṇeṣu doṣāropah," i.e., "to superimpose vices on virtues." But even if he is guilty of this, Bührer has not been criticized in a way that could be termed as "imposing vices on virtues." To state the facts (vastu-sthiti-kathanaṃ) is not "nindā." Our a ncient nītikāras have already instructed us:

Śatror api guṇā vācyā doṣā vācyā guror api.

If Bh has in his mind the criticism of Bührer from me, he is sadly mistaken. He is misrepre-senting the facts; he is distorting the truth. Here is what I wrote in my "Introduction":

Durgamodvase Jaisalmeranagare kṛtatatpustaka-prathamaparīcayais tvarāt uraiḥ Dā. Byuhlaramahodayaiḥ praguṣṇa-guṇabhūyissṭhasyāpi Ja. pustakasya kṛteya m prati lipis tadīyaliper atiprāktanatvena bahuvidhahevatvānaiḥ ca prabhūtā sūdhi bahulā 'bhūt (pp. 2-4 Prastāvanā, p. 5 Upodghāta).

Bührer was in a 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 with in seven days. I have acknowledged how significant the task performed by Bührer was. It i s not my intention to decry Bührer's virtues, but to state the facts. However, it is not only th e copying of J MS. at Jaisalmer that created errors. A great many of them were generated
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subsequently in the process of preparing the press copy, and in consciously edit-ing the wo-

rk for publication. If Bühler had just reproduced the Jaisalmer MS, photogra- phically--exa-
crly 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 I was su-
bjected in correcting the text. He (Bh) crossed the turbulent river easily by means of the br-
idge I constructed. How could he know how the bridge was constructed? He had never con-
structed even one bridge in his entire life. Did he ever come across the following sad- ukti

\[
\text{Vidvān eva vijñāṇī vidvajjanaparīśramam.}
\]
\[
\text{Na hi vandhyā vijñāṇī gurvīṃ prasavavedānāṃ.}
\]

We also have Murāri kavi:

\[
\text{Abdhir langhita eva vānarábhaṭaiḥ kintvasya gambhīratām}
\]
\[
\text{āpātālanimaganāpīvaravapur jānāti manthācalaḥ.}
\]

I have shown how Bühler both restored and distorted the text. My debt to Bühler is ack-
owedged in very clear terms:

\[
\text{Param atra na viśeśadoṣabhaḥjanaṃ Da. Byuhlaramahodayaḥ. Tena yad apy}
\]
\[
\text{akāri tad astyadhikam. Tasya vidyāvyaṣaṅgagaveśanā'aktiprabhṛtigunāḥ praṇaṃś}
\]
\[
\text{ākoṭim atītya vartante . . . Khanipradurbhātam ratnam sadyo malinam eva jāyate.}
\]
\[
\text{. . . Da. Byuhlaraṃskaranaḍoṣā na khalu na sōdhavyāḥ (p. 4, Upodghāta).}
\]

Maybe Bh did not read this eulogy. If he read it, he certainly disregarded it while trying to
defend Bühler unnecessarily.

Let us resume our discussion. Āstām tāvat, prakṛtam anusarāmāḥ. The original rea-
ding (8:41) was "māti." Bühler changed it to "bhāti." With reference to Bühler's knowled-
g of the Kāvyāmārga and the power of appreciating the poetic muse, I had already comme-
ted in my "Introduction" (pp. 2-4, 8 of Prastāvāṇa and p. 4 of Upodghāta). I would like to
reproduce here one of the most significant statements: "Itihāsācāryasya Da. Byuhlaramaho
dayasya jñānaraśāvaitihāsikōṁśaḥ sāhityāṃśam nānām atyaśeta" (p. 6 of Upodghāta). Bh
should not have forgotten the immortal dictum of Viśākhadatta: "Na hi sarvaḥ sarvāṃ jānā
ti!"

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 grea-
t contribution B has made to the Indological studies in general. Bh argues that only one an-
cient MS. was available to Bühler. But that does not mean that the editor should take undu-
eliberty with it. Nothing can justify the distortion of the original text. Even one MS. can b-
e so accurate as to surpass ten inaccurate ones. It is well said that

\[
\text{Varam ēko guṇī putro na ca mūrkaśatānyāpi.}
\]
Ekaś candras tamo hanti na ca tārāgaṇo'khilaḥ.

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 misrepresentation 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 intrinsically erroneous and its errors were reproduced by B. I am disturbed by those passages where J is perfect, true, and correct one hundred percent. But B (kaścana pāṇḍityapradarśanapatuh panđitanm anyāḥ sampādakaśiromāniḥ) did not understand the meaning and tried to show his own pedantry by distorting the original text. I would have no quarrel with B at all if he and his associates had brought forth only a true representation of J.

I do not understand what Bh means by "aśuddhiyukta hī kyoṃ na ho" (vol. 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 erroneous which had no error to begin with"? If it is the former, I have no quarrel with him. If it is the latter, I cannot agree. It is better not to publish a text than to publish it by distorting the original, creating nonsense where there was perfect sense already reigning supreme. For example, substitution of "manmathabāṇamitrānāṃ" for "manmathabālamitrānāṃ" (7:3) and "vibhāt avarge" for "vibhāvavarge" (13:72).

Having written what is presented above, I felt an irresistible 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 an inferiority complex and wanted to show off. Let us consider some more vital readings and evaluate how they have been mishandled:

Ullekalīghaṭanāpaṭṭunāṃ sacetasāṃ vaiktikopamānām.
Vīcāraṣaṇopalapaṭṭikāsā matsūktiratnānyatithībhavantu (1:19).

The above is a true and exact reproduction of J.

In the fourth pāda, P committed an error while copying and turned the reading into "ratnānyavibhībhavantu." That is, "ta" was read as "va," and "tha" as "bha." B exercised his power of reconstruction and restoration by turning the whole into "ratnāni nīdībhavantu." Not only "bha" and "ba" were changed, but also "nya-" was turned to "ni." Consequently the reading became far removed from the original. This is an example of sāmyena nika ast hān pā hān parityajya dūrasthān ayuktān pā hān svabuddhā'gha ayat.

Here is another example of mishandling:

Prakōṣṭhapṛṣṭhasphuradindranīla-ratnāvalīkaṇaṇaḍambareṇa.
Bandhāya dharmapratibandhakāṇāṃ vahan sahotthān iva nāgappāśāṇ (1:47).

This is the reading of J; one hundred percent correct.
In the fourth pāda, J has "vahan sahotthān." P turned it into "vahūn sahotthān." B made it "badhnaḥ sahotthān." But "badhnā" where? Obviously "badhna" is far removed from "vahan" as compared to "vahūn," which had erroneously crept into P.

Here is one more instance to satisfy Bh, if he can listen to reasoning:

Svaḥsundarībandiparigrāhāya dattoṅjalih samprati dānavendraiḥ. Iti praharṣād amarāṅganāṇāṃ netropalāśreṇibhir arcyamāṇaḥ (1:52).

In the first pāda, J has "bandi." As stated on p. 3 of my Prastāvanā, "samaste'pi Ja pustake ba varṇasya prayoga eva nāsti."

Naturally P could have taken it to be "vandi." Even a beginner knows "ba-vyor ab hedah." B could have made it "bandi" (= "captive"). However, he went far away from the reality and turned the reading into "vrnda." The total charm of the poet's camatkāroktī, ma dhuroktī, and vicchitti was lost in that vrnda (multitude).

* * *

Prāptas tataḥ śrījayasimhadevaś Cālukyasiṃhāsanamanḍanatvam. Yasya vyājanta gajāhaveṣu muktāphalāṇīva kare yaśāmsi (1:79).

Here is one more camatkāra from B. Bilhaṇa composed the fourth quarter as “muktā- phal āṇīva kare yaśāmsi.” P omitted two letters ("kare") and made it "muktāphalāṇīva yaśāmsi"! B fills the lacuna with mahā! "Yaśas" might have become mahat, but the vacanām got lag hu.

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 mahā paṇḍita!

* * *

Let us study one more example of "doṣayuktā hi kyoṁ na ho":

Cintāmaṇir yasya puro varākas tathāhi vārttā janaviśruteyam Yat tatra sauvarṇatulādhirūḍhe cakre sa pāṣāṇatulādhiroham (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 "dhatte s ma." I am reminded of a popular saying: "marza baḥhatā hī gayā jyōṁ jyōṁ davā kī." The disease went on increasing as I went on treating.

* * *
Here is another failure on the part of B. This is how Bilhana originally composed the following verse:

Sa saukumāryaikadhano’pi sōdhavāṃs
tapodhanair duśprasahāṃ pariśramam.
Rarāja tīvre tapasi sthito nṛpaḥ
śaśīva caṇḍadyutimaṇḍalatithiḥ (2:45).

The fourth caraṇa in P reads "śaśīva dyutimaṇḍalatithiḥ"; 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 "mahārṣaya’smād apakārṣam āyayuh" (2:44). Also the poet says, "Nṛpaṁ ka horavratacaryayā kṛśam" (2:46). Obviously the king withered. He became weak and pale. Certainly he was not at his best as far as his dyutī w as concerned. Now the moon shines (displays her glory and splendour) among the stars. The poet wanted to convey the idea that the king resembled the moon when she was in direct contact with the sun, caṇḍadyutimaṇḍalatithi (let us pay attention to the word "caṇḍa"). The poet wanted the sun, but B gives us the stars! Not tārāmaṇḍala even, but only the tārād yutimaṇḍala; 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 loga bhale hī nindā kareṇu"!

We cannot expect B to have divine insight, divyaṁ 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 ma sad gamaya! It is better to keep quiet, but if one decides to speak, one should see that it does not turn out to be meaningless. Cf. prabhātakalpa śaśīneva śarvarī.

* * *

Kalatram urvītilakasya mekhalākalāpamāṇikyamaricibhir dadhe.
Udeśyataḥ sūryasamasya tejasāḥ samudgataṃ bālam ivātapaṃ puraḥ (2:72).

The word "bāla" is not very clear in J; it could very well be read as "pāla."
My fn reads, "Pāla-’ ityasti bāla- ’ iti veti Ja. pustake spaś anātī." B reads "jālamivātapatam." B's fn gives "pālamivātapatam" (i.e., acc. to B, P, and supposedly J too, have "pālamivā- tapam .") However, the question is, how did the word "jāla" get connected with "ātapatam"?

Befitting its own "nature," R makes it "jālamivātataṃ." The person who saw the last edition first and struggled and struggled cannot come into the sphere of the limited knowledge of Bh, who had Rāmāvatāra Śarmā as his guruvaryāṇām. This is called "andhena nīy amāṇā yathāndhāḥ!" Bh cannot even dream of the terrible toil I endured! Na hi vandhyā vi
jānāti gurvīm prasavavedāṁ! Bh had unlimited power in his pen. The restoring (or distorting?) editor did not care whether or not the text made any sense at all.

* * *

Atra Drāviḍabhinipāladalankanṛdaśasodāmare kodanaḍadhvanibhir vidhun vati ghanadhvānunukārair jagat. Vaidēhīramaṇasya Rāvaṇaśīraś chede pyaśāntak rudhaḥ pratyāvṛttir akāṅkakampataralair āśaṅki Laṅkācaraiḥ (3:77).

J has “Drāviḍa.” The editor in B did not understand the meaning of the proper name; so he made it ”drāvita” = ”made to run away”! But there is no valor in ”drāvita-dalana”! Bilhaṇa himself says elsewhere:

Aripīṭhagrahaṇān nyavarttata (15:84.4).

Here in 3:77, at the end of the first caraṇa, we have ”kṛdaṇaśasodāmare.” This is the reading of J. P omits ”ddā” and makes it ”kṛdaṇaśasomare”; B makes it ”kṛdaṇaśasotthe rave.” I don’t know if the editor-restorer understood the meaning! I can call it only ”avyāpāreśu vyāpāram.”

However, B ed. gives ”kṛdaṇaśasotthe rave” in the fn., thereby attributing this reading to P, which is not true because P has ”kṛdaṇaśasomare”! Thus we see that there is a divergence of form and substance between P and B fn! In 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 ”kṛdaṇaśasotthe raṇe.” S eyam aparā kathā!

* * *

Now we come to verse 4:113:

Praṇāyaśravanaśvāṣṭ tasya śrīḥ saparigrāhā.
Paraṇ naṅgīkaroti sma Vikramāṅkaḥ kalaṅkinīm (4:113).

This verse does exist in P, but still it does not exist in the B ed! Would this kind of omission be called by Bh ”aśuddhi bahuta ["aśuddhibahula"] batākara nindā kareṁ”? I can simply say, “Mukham astiti vaktavyam.”

* * *

Rājahamsam iva bāhupaṇijare śrīvilāsabhuvi lālayan yaṣaḥ.
Tatra tatra śatapatralocanaś citram abhyudayam āsasāda saḥ (5:9).

The original and correct reading is ”tatra tatra śatapatra.” P makes it ”tatra tatrā- tapatra.” How close to the original, the interchange of only one syllable ”a” for ”śa”! I wou
ld like to remind my readers once again that the letter "ś" of P resembles "rā." There fore "tatra tatra śatapatra" of J might very well have been copied by P as "tatra tatra rātapatra" as far as the press copy writer was concerned.

But B goes far away and makes it "tatra tāmarasaputra." 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?

* * * *

Taccamūrajasi dūram udgate yan na digbhramam adhatta bhāskaraḥ.
Hetur atra rajasāṁ nivāraṇaṁ kuñjaradhvajapatāntavājanaṁ (5:66).

The original reading is "taccamūrajasi." Probably P 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 b hāḥ only. I will once again call this "avyāpāresu vyāpāram."

* * * *

Javasamucitadhāvanānurūpā kimiti kṛtā prthulā na nātha prthvī.
Nabhasi khurapuṭair iti sphuradbhir vidhim iva ye sma muhuḥ pratikṣipanti (6:49).

Here is another camatkāra of B. The śuddhīpatra of B asks us to change "javasa" to "rajama"! I don't understand what the purpose behind it is!

J has "Javasamucitadhāvanānurūpā"--perfect and true, correct, and complete.

P makes it "Javamamucitadhāvanānurūpa"--hardly any change.

It is remarkable to see how close P is to J, but what does B do? It takes the reading far, far away from the original and makes it "ravamanumitadhāvanānurūpam"! A true saḥṛ adaya alone can feel the excruciating pain! The editor alone might have been able to figure out what is meant here. "Ravamanumitadhāvanā-nurūpam" did not yield any sensible reading; so the "Errata" of B makes it "Rajamanumitadhāvanānurūpam." Here we find a perfect example of the sadukti, "Vināyakam prakurvaṇo racayāṃśa vānaram."

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 from the original J. But where does B lead us to? It takes us far away fro
m the original! Although B successfully restores "kṛta" to "kṛtā," he does not bring "na" to its proper place. I can understand all this. However, I don't understand how "nāya" could be turned into "tvayā"! "Nātha" is much closer to "nāya" than "tvayā." Did the Great Defen- der Bh pay any attention to all these distortions and destructions in restoration when he as- sembled his courage and said, "[K]ucha loga bhalehī nindā kareṇī"?

* * *

Astrāntare manmathabāṇamitrāṇa latāvadhūvibhramasūtraadhāraḥ.
Śṭānopadeśī pikapaṇcamasyā śṛṅgārabandhur madhur āvir āśīt (7:3).

Here B reads "manmathabāṇamitrāṇa." Bilhaṇa said "manmathabālamitrāṇa." Someone who was aśkaraśatrul nāma vidyādhara changed "bāla" to "bāṇa"! This change is unworthy of great scholars like Bühler, Vāmanācārya, and Bhūmācārya. This is one of the most unjustifiable attempts on the part of B. (I would like to state with all the emphasis at my comma nd that by "B" I do not necessarily and always mean the person of Dr. Georg Bühler himself, but the one who fooled with Bilhaṇa's original words.) Madhu (Spring) is the supplier of bāṇas (arrows). He is not a "mitram" of "manmathabāṇa"!

The person who distorted the truth and misrepresented the facts has totally missed the essence. "Bālamitrāṇa" has a very fine equivalent in Hindi. It is called "laṅgo iyā- yāra, " a friend from very early childhood"! In English we have another expression, "bosom 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 kareṇī"!

* * *

Līlāśukāḥ kokilākūjītānām atiprahārṣād vihitānukāraḥ.
Grhād adhāvyānta viyoginībhir guṇo hi kāle guṇinām guṇāya (7:32).

J is not clear. One could read either "dadāhyanta" or "dadāha yanta." P has "dadā-hyanta ." The copyist read "dadāha yanta" and wrote it in such a way that it resembled dadāha -dyanta a." But B goes far away and makes it "davāhyanta." It is not a scholarly attempt. It will be called "taking undue liberty."

* * *

Manasvinīnāṁ manaso'vatīrya māṇasya vegena palāyitasya.
Jīvagrahāyeva vasantamitrāṇa babhrāma vāyuḥ kakubhāṁ mukhāṇi (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 saḥṛdayatvam!

My fn. no. 7 on p. 75 states, "[M]ānasya iti gānasya iti vā Ja. pustake spāṣ am nāsti." B makes it "gānasya." R makes it "māsasya"! That is befitting R ed. It is interesting to o
b-serve that B is wrong as far as the first letter is concerned, while 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. The poet has already told us, "Srṅgārabandhur madhur āvirāsit" (7:3.4). There was no scope for "māna" to be there anymore. It ran away. "Vāyuḥ" is "vasantmitram"; so he is chasing "māna." I don't know how gāṇa (song or music) could run away. That is totally irrelevant. Still Bh declared, "[K]ucha loga bhalehī nindā kareṃ!"

* * *

The poet says,

Hemamaṇṭiramālābhyām bhāti janghālatādvayam.
Kṛtālavālam vāllabhyaī kuṅkumeneva subhruvaḥ (8:14).

P has "kṛtālavālāmbāllabhyaī." This is correct and meaningful. I need not repeat that J does not make any distinction between "ba" and "va." If we separate "kṛtālavālam" from the following word--and the next word is "vāllabhyāt"--we reach Bilhaṇa anyway. This is what Bilhaṇa meant. However, B fn. says "kṛtālavālālāmbāllabhyaī," i.e., acc. to B. ed. P has one extra letter "lā" inserted in between "vā" and "lā." Also it has changed "v" into "b ."

This leads me 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, P 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, I don't know if anyone compared and collated it with the original P.

B ed. did not know what to do with "kṛtālavālālāmbāllabhyaī"; so it distorted the text, twisted it around, and murdered the sāḥityavidyāvadhā. B made it "kṛtālavālam lāmbābh yām"! So the hemamanṭiraṇāle (duel) was lengthened! Perfect sense turned into total nonsense and rubbish. In the process of legitimate reconstruction, we see total destruction. We lose vāllabhya completely. Still Bh had the audacity to say, "Kucha loga bhalehī nindā ka reṃ."

* * *

Māti nirvivare tasyāś citraṃ kucayugāntare.
Kṛīḍākundaṅditoccaṇḍakodandaḥ kusumāyudhaḥ (8:41).

This śloka has been discussed in full detail in its proper place.

124
Bhāti dantacchadenaśyāḥ svacchā daśanamālikā.
Sarasvatyakṣamāleva pūjāpadmadalāñcitā (8:69).

My fn. no. 1 on p. 88 declares, "Pra. pustake sannapayaṁ ślokaḥ Ba pustake nāsti." Vidva
nmūrdhanya pāṇḍitaśiromāṇa Vidvāvāgīśa Bh still has the arrogance to say, "Kucha loga bh
alehī nindā kareṁ." How pitiful; it is simply disgusting! Na hi vandhyā vijānāti gurvīṁ pra
savavedanāṁ!

Aśaṅkitaḥ Śaṅkaramallayuddhe yaḥ svedavārāṁ vinivāraṇāya.
Bhasmotkaraṁ vismayaghūṁtasya kakṣāntarāt tasya samācakarṣa (9:102).

In the second quarter, P has "svedadhārāṁvinivāraṇāya." B makes the reading "svedadhār-
āṃbunivāraṇāya" and removes it far away from the original! He takes undue liberty with t
he text and 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 bhūmni vār vāri." Yet Bh tries to defend
B without any justification!

Yāntīṣu yadvāravilāsinīṣu kareṇubhiḥ pūritadiktaṭābhīḥ.
Dine'pi dikpālapurfāvāksāḥ praksālanam candrikayā labhante (9:127).

In the first quarter, P has "yadvārivilāsinīṣu." Instead of removing the accent mark from at
op the letter "ra," Bühler breaks "vāravilāsinī" into two and makes it "yadvārī vilāsintu"
= "at whose gate, the beautiful women (locative)." He did not like the idea of vāravilāsinī
here! He thus takes away all the charm from Bilhaṇa's kaviyacanam.

Āropyasāṅ dayitena kācit nitambabhārāt svayam apragalbhā.
Skandhāt taroh pratyuta mūlam āpa svinnena pādāṃburhadvayena (10:43).

Bilhaṇa said "svinnena" (= "perspiring"). This is the reading up to and including P. Some-
one possessing a more fertile brain made it "khinnena." This is poetic murder! Still Bh had
the audacity.

Āhūyamāṇā iva hamsanādair vikṛṣyamāṇā iva kautukena.
Jagmūs tataḥ klāntinivāraṇāya līlāsaraṇīram arālanetrāh (10:63).
Bilhana's expression is "klāntinivaraṇāya." B has made it "klāntinirvānaṇāya!" I would like to call it "avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram." The editor who changed the reading unnecessarily did not realize that his reading also generates the blemish of chandobhanaṅga! However, I would like to point out that there is an alternative, a very close reading--close to "nirvānaṇāya." That is "nibharaṇāya," but that is karṇaka u and uncalled for.

* * *

Pātalena mahasāṃ paṭalena
prācyasailabhuvi bālamṛgāṅkaḥ.
Dhātuṣṭapṛthulasthaladhūli-
kelidhūṣaraśarīra ivāsīt (11:29).

J has "pā alena mahasāṃ" (tejasām).

P has "pādaleva manasāṃ" (mānasānām).

B makes it "pā alena tamasāṃ" (andhakārāṇām).

So we have come from light to darkness! The Upanisads teach us to pray, "Tamaso mā jy otir gamaya." Here we have exactly the opposite. It will be called a disservice to the saḥṛ adaya. The editor took it beyond the grasp of an intelligent reader. May be the "defender" of B could understand it. I cannot; I simply cannot.

* * *

Kācit padair askhalaṁ sakheḷaṁ yātuṣu śuddhāntakārenukāsu.
Rājaṅganāṇām akarod avajñāṁ śroṇibhare ca stanaṣaurave ca (12:32).

J has "Śroṇibhare ca stanaṣauraveca"! It makes perfect sense.

P has "Śroṇibharevasthanaganauraveva"! It makes half sense.

B makes it "Śroṇibharevasthitaganauraveva"! It makes no sense at all!

Still the great "commentator and translator" Vidyāvāḍa Bh has the courage to say, "Kuch aloga bhalehi nindā kareṇi." I find no words to describe the arrogance 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.

* * *

Vibhāvavarga jalaṁ tvam agrāṅṛ na candrikāpi dyutim eti tāvākim.
Karoṣi kiṃ śubhratayā tadiyayā 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 bes-meared 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 sāhitya-saṃsāra and rasa-saṃsāra. Did he ever hear expressions like the following?

Vibhāvānubhāva-vyabhicāri-saṃyogād rasaṇīpattipīh

or

Vibhāvenānubhāvena vyaktaḥ saṅcārinā tathā.
Rasatām eti ratvādīḥ sthāyī bhāvaḥ sacetasām.

I call this (attempt) only a "baliśatvam."

* * *

Niṣṭhuraṃ kim api kathya mayā tatra Kunalapate kuru kṣamām.
Yat svakāryaṃ avadhī["dhā"?]rya grhnate sevayaiva paritoṣam īśvarāḥ (14:2).

J has "sevayaiva."

P has "sevachaiva."

B makes "svecchyaiva."

This is really "svecchya eva." It is "sveccchācāraḥ," truly "svacchandācāraḥ." I will call it "manahpūtam samacareti!" I cannot call it "a scholarly attempt." "Sevachaiva" may not convey the desired meaning. However, orthographically, it is much closer to the original. "Śve cchayaiva" is far removed; yet it does not make any sense at all. Bhakṣite’pi laśune na śānt o 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 audacity to say "nind ā kareṃ!" He is sarvatantrasvatantra.

I would like to make one more point before we leave the discussion of this verse. A ll read "svakāryam avadhīrya"! I believe we should read it as "svakāryam avadhārya" = "vi ditvā"!
One of the most striking examples is "Gaurīvibrahmadhūpadhāma" (16:51), discussed later in its proper place.

Following the sthālī-pulāka-nyāya, I have presented above some examples of the restoration--rather, distortion--of the work of B. It was not my intention to point out the errors of Bühler; to err is human. My attempt was directed toward Bh, who unnecessarily tried to defend Bühler as if Bh alone was guṇaika-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 on and care, future scholars like me 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 I would later endure! This was all the purpose of writing that section of the critique.

Na hi vandhyā vijnānti gurvīṁ prasavavedanāṁ.

Let us resume our earlier discussion. I have not discounted the errors in the original. I am 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 ādhāra; i.e., the arche-type, ākara-grānt ha. 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 (my edition) goes back to J. Bh copies N. No w, 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.

In his fn. Bühler gives the rejected reading "māti." In other words, both J and naturally P too had "māti." B does not agree and makes it "bhāti." N goes back to J and restores the correct reading, but Bh tries to prove his superiority of skill and asserts that B is preferable to J, i.e., to the poet Bilhaṇa himself! "Bhāti" may be correct as far as its prakṛti and p ratyaya 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 utpīḍayad utpalāksyāḥ stanadvayam pāṇḍu tathā pravṛddham. Madhye yathā śyāmamukhasya tasya mṛṇālasūtrāntaram apyālabhyam.

(Kumārasambhavam 1:40)

And Śrīharṣa:

Paricyutas tat kucabhāramadhyāt kim śoṣamāyasya mṛṇālahāra. Na sūkṣmatantar api tāvakasya tatrāvakaśo bhavataḥ kimu syāt (8:41).

And also Bilhaṇa:
Mukhenducandrikāpūra-plāvyamānaḥ punaḥ punaḥ.
Śītabhītāvivānyonyauḥ tasyāḥ pīḍayataḥ kucau (8:47).

and

Dṛśoḥ sīmāvādaḥ śravaṇayugalena pratikalam
ṣtanābhīyāṁ saṃṛuddhe hyḍi manasijas tiṣ haṭi balāt.
Nitambahā sākrandaṁ kṣipati raśanādāma pariṁaḥ
praveśas tanvaṅgṛāḥ vapuṣi taraṇimno vijayate (8:85).

The following poetic gems might enlighten the mind of Bh with regard to "māti" vs. "bhāti."

Amān ivāngeṣu mudaḥ prakarṣāt pratyudyaṇau tam janakaḥ kumāryāḥ.
Anuṣṭhitam samyag upāyavidbhir nīṭaḥ parispandam ivāṛthasārthaḥ (9:40).

and

Trilokalakṣmyeva salīlam īkṣitaḥ kṛtadravaśī candrakarair ivāplutaḥ.
Adūravaṇācchālatikāphalodayah kvacin na māti sma mudā nareśvarah (2:79).

Here is another great poet:

Yan na māti tadaṇgeṣu lāvanyam atiṁbhṛtaṁ.
Piṇḍīkṛtaṁ urodeśe tat payodharatāṁ gatam (Kasyāpī)

(cited by Saṁskṛtasūktisāgara p. 135)

Bh is not totally oblivious of the true purport of the poet's heart, i.e., what the poet wants to convey here. There is no room, none whatsoever, between the two breasts of the heroine. The word "nirvivare" is correctly translated by Bh: "nirvivare" = "nir nāsti vivara m chidram avakāśo yasmins tat tasmin niravakāše." 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 cow therein! This is the reason for surprise. This is the cause for wonder. The two words "nirvivare" and "uccaṇḍa" 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 alaṅkāra." He refers to its definition and says "atraḍhāraṇekṣayād heṣyadhiyaavaraṇanād adhikālaṁkāraṁ." Did he recall any example of "adhikālaṁkāra"? Probably not. If he had taken the trouble of consulting even the Kāvyapraṅgaḥ, 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 my reading ("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! That is how he performs this feat:

Bhāti pūrṇatayā samāgatyā sāvakāśaṁ virājate.
One fails to understand where he acquired the sense represented by the words “pūrṇatayā s
amāgatyā sāvakāśam.” On second thought, I think he is right. He is vidyāvāgiśa. He is kart
um, akartum, anyathā-kartum samarthaḥ, is he not? My limited knowledge cannot reach the
unlimited height his knowledge has already reached!

Let us study some more examples of "adhikālaṅkara":

Yugāntakālapratisamḥṛtātmanto
jaganti yasyām savikāsam āsata.
Tanau mamus tatra na Kaitabhādviṣas
tapodhanābhyyāgamasamībhavā mudaḥ (Māgha, 1:23).

Mammaṭa cites the following verse as an example of "adhikālaṅkāraḥ":

Aho viśālaṁ bhūpāla bhuvanatritayodaram.
Māti mātum asākyo’pi yaśorāśir yadatra te (Kāvyādarśa of Daṇḍin).

I don't know whether Bh would have changed "māti" to "bhāti" here, too, if he had the oppo
rtunity to edit the above text.

Vāmanāchārya Jhalikar wrote the Bālabodhinī commentary on Mammaṭa. By 196
5 it had run into 7 editions. I don't know if the same Jhalikar had any hand in the change f
rom "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 Rajputa
na, 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 f
ear however, that some at least of the little lacunae and mistakes, which had to be f
illed in and corrected when the work was printing, are owing to the inaccuracy of ou
r transcript and not to that of the writer of the old MS [stress added]. Every case wh
ere in printing I thought it necessary to alter the text given by the transcript, has bee
n 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 Vikramāṅkakāvya is readable, an
d I believe that, if fresh MSS. are found, it will prove to be trustworthy.

I have to thank Vāmanāchārya Jhalākar for several emendations, which he suggest
ed while copying my transcript for the press and his brother Bhīmāchārya for some
other corrections given in the addenda [stress added].

According to the asīma-dhiṣaṇā of B!
Bh knows the "nīti-upadeśa: guṇino na durāgrahāḥ." I don't know why he asserts this here. Did he not know that "ekākinī pratiṣṭhā hi pratiṣṭhātam na sādhayet," "mere assertion does not prove the theory"?

Here is one more poetic gem from Bilhaṇa:

Sā stanaṇjalibandhana manmathaṁ prathamāgamatam.
Karotiṇomukhaṁ bāḷā bāṇḍhavaṁ yauvanaśriyah (8:44).

The compound word "aṇjalibandha" is quite significant here. What does it mean? It means "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!

Vilāsadolāphalake nitamba-vistāraruddhe parītas tarunyāḥ.
Labdhāḥ paraṁ kuṇcitakārmukṇaṁ tatrāvaśaḥ kusumāyudhena (7:19).

The above idea very much resembles what is expressed by the poet in "māti nirvivare . . ." (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 literary prize. Such writers are alluded to by a poet in a desperate prayer:

Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanaṁ śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha.

And by Bilhaṇa too:

Kurvantu sēṣāḥ śukavākyapātham!

A) This should be "amazing" or "surprising" or simply "a wonder."

B) Vuccaṇḍa does not mean "fierce" here, but "of a very large size" or "gigantic."

C) This should be "skilfully."

D) This 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 nitambavatyāḥ prakāmavistāravaśād ivāsyā.
Prthvīpater uttamanāyikāpi na kāpi lebbe hṛdaye'vakāśam (9:12).

Let it be emphasized here that Bh fares better as far as "nirvivre" and "uccaṇḍa" are concerned, but he displays his unreasonableness when he says "bhātī pūrṇatayā samāgatyā sāv akāśam virājate."

Monier-Williams says,

\[ Mā = \text{to correspond in measure, find measure or room in (cl. 2 with loc..) e.g. te yaśo} \]
\[ \text{-rāśir bhuvana- tritayodare māti, thy mass of fame finds room in the interior of three worlds (1888 ed., p. 764, column 3).} \]

Apte:

\[ Mā = \text{to be in, find room or space in, be contained or comprised in (1965, 3d. ed., p. 753, Column 1).} \]

Once again I am reminded of a great sadukti of a great poet:

Daivīṁ vācam upāsate hi bahavaḥ sāram tu sārasvatam jānīte nitarām asau gurukulakliśto Murāriḥ Kaviḥ.

Abdhir langhita eva vānarabhaṭaḥiṁ kintvasya gambhīratāṁ āpāṭālanimagnapīvaravapur jānāti manthācalah.

* * *

Bilhaṇa says,

Dolāyāṁ jaghanasthalena calatā lokekṣanā lajjate
dhatte dīkṣu nirīkṣaṇaṁ smitamukhi pārāvatānāṁ rutaiḥ.

Sparśaḥ kāntakaṅṭibhiḥ kuṭilaya līlāvane nesyaṭe
saṁjnaṁ maugdhyavisarjanāya sutasoḥ śṛṅgāramitraṁ vayaḥ (8:86).

While trying to explain this verse (8:86), Bh misses the true meaning. I am referring to the second carana: "Dhatte dīkṣu. . . ." Bh says,


This is all incongruous. When I read such indescribable babble I keep 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 suratakṛīḍā (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 future generations of readers of his "great" translation and interpretation. I am 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 eighteenth canto when he was working on the seventeenth canto, for there Bilhana expresses similar ideas in 18:26:

Śrutvā śrutvā rutam avirataṁ yatra pārāvatānām
dakṣāḥ kaṇṭhadhvanisu śanakaḥ paurakanyā bhavanti.

Here is another poet:

Kānte tathā katham api prathitaṁ mṛgāksyā
catūryam uddhatamanobhavyā rateṣu.
Tatkūjītānuyadadhbir anekavāraṁ
śiṣyāyitaṁ grhakopātatair yathāṣyāḥ.

(Kasyāpi, *Saduktikarnāmṛta* of Śrīdharadāsa, Calcutta, 1965, pp. 299-300. Also dis cussed in *Sāhityadarpana.*

Let us enjoy the beauties of another poetic gem:

Narair viphalajānmbhir giridarī na kiṃ sevye	na cec chrvanāgocarībhavati jātucīj janmai.
Kapotoravamādhurīviraçanānukārādaro
ratāsahakṛśodarīvacanakākurītīdhvaniḥ.

(Samskṛtaśāktaśāgarāh, Kasi, Akhila Bhāratīya Vikrama Pariṣad, Saṃvat 2014 V.
Saṅkalanaṅka tathā anuvādaka, compiled and translated by Śrī Nārāyaṇa Svāmī.)

The compiler does not give his source, but translates the verse beautifully in Hindi as follows:

Kabūtarakī guṭaragūṃkī miṭṭhāsakā anukaraṇakaranevālī, ratikā pariśrama sahane
meṃ asamaṅtha navelike prārthanāse bhare hue vacanoṃ kī dhvaniko jisane [jinho ṃne] jīvanoṃ mṛbhih naṃmī sunā una manusyoṃ kā to janmāṅ vyarthā hai. Ve bhālā parvataṅkī kandarāoṃ meṃ kyoṃ naṃmī cale jāte?

Saduktikarnāmṛtam of Śrīdharadāsa cites the above verse, "Narair viphalajānmbhir," und er "Kaṅ hakūjitam" and ascribes it to "kasyāpi." It also gives the following verse:

Kānte vicitraṣuratākramabaddharāge
saṅketake'pi mṛgaśāvakalocanāyāh.

133
Tat kūjitam kim api yena tadīyatalpaṁ
nālpaiḥ parītam anusābditalāvakaughaiḥ.

For further enlightenment of Bh on 8:86, I would like to offer an extract from the Kāma- sūtra of Vātsyāyana, tr. by S. C. Upādhyāya (Bombay, Taraporevala, 1970, p. 121, Ch. 7):

Sūtra 5.--virutāni cāṣṭau.

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-phūtkṛtaṇī. [Only seven! Sūkṛta also?] (5) Kūjita or cooing. . .


A woman may also imitate the shrieks and calls of doves, koels, pigeons. . .


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 the cooing sound, which is usually done with the mouth kept open).

According to Apte, "Ratakūjitam" = "lustful or lascivious murmur." Thus it becomes evident that this kaṇṭha hadhvāni was acquired through a voluntary learning process and was not merely an involuntary expression of exhaustion or pain, etc.

Cf. Daṇḍin:

Kalakvaṇitagarbhena kaṇṭhenāghührṇitekṣaṇaḥ.
Pārāvataḥ paribhramya irimsuś cumbati priyām.

(Kāvyādarśa, ed. by Dharmendrakumāra Gupta, Delhi, Mehar Chand Lacchmandas, 1973, p. 85.)

This subject also brings the following verse to mind:

Śrīparicayāj jaḍā api bhavantyabhijñā vidagdhacaritānām.
Upadiśati kāminīnām yauvanamadā eva lailitāni.

(quoted in Kāvyaprakāśa)
I could go on and on. Here is another poetic gem on surata-kañ ha-ruta, cited by Mammaṭa in his Kāvyapratkāśa as an example of smarana alaṅkāra:

Nimnanābhikuharesu yad ambhaḥ plāvitaṃ caladṛśaṃ laharībhīḥ.
Tadbhavaiḥ kuharutair natamadhyaḥ smāritisī suratakaṅṭharutānāṃ (Jalhaṇa 67:16).

Suranāryaḥ ityapi paṭho ṅṛṣyate.

Here is one more example of surata-kañ ha-ruta. Sumukha says to Rāvaṇa,

Yānūmilāpatir ayam ca tavātmajāś ca
bāṇotkarān vikirato racitāndhakārān.
Te'nyonyakhaṇḍanaśaś viphalībhavanti
ratyutsave badhirayor iva kaṅṭhanādaḥ.

(Bālarāmāyana of Rājaśekhara, Anka 8, verse 44)

Bh refers to Shri Rāmāvatāra Sarmā as his "guruvaryānām." It is unfortunate that his guru did not teach him even the basic Sanskrit kāvyas. I don't know whether Bh has ever seen the following sadukti of Mahākavi Māgha in Śiśupālavadham:

Ratāntare yatra grāhṭaresu vitardiniryūHAVIṬAṆKANĪDAḤ.
Rutāni sṛṇvan vayasāṁ gaṇo'nte-vāśitvam āpa sphuṭam aṅganānām (3:55).

I find it difficult to leave the prakṛta-prasaṅga. I am reminded of one more poetic gem of our own poet Bilhaṇa:

Smarapraśastiprativastutāṁ gataḥ saṁlātyuhasamūhanisvanāḥ.
Bhavanti yatra kṣaṇamātraviśrama pradāyinaḥ kaṅṭharaveṣu yoṣitām (2:15).

The A MS. has "vibhrama." I too thought it to be preferable. But no, "viṣrama" is much better.

Dātyūha-samūha-nisvanāḥ give relief, even for a very short period, to yoṣitām kañ h araveṣu! We have seen this in India in Harikathā. The principal performer (singer) takes a breather. The melody is continued by his associate. Then the lead singer picks up once again; so there is continuation on the same tāla and laya!

Apparently Bh did not understand the poet here. For "kañ haraveṣu" he says "bhāṣa ṇa-kāryeṣu gīteṣu vā." I wish he could tell us the significance of the word "kṣaṇa- mātraviśr ama!" The komalāṅgi gets tired by constantly making the sound; so the birds relieve her! Bh concludes, "Tatratyānām nārīṇām śābdō dātyūhakājītañ mahūra iti vyajyate." I get hurt by the display of knowledge on the part of Bh. Truly it is said that arasīkeṣu kavitvanive danam śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha. In Hindi too we have a beautiful saying: "Bhains
a ke āge bīna bajāe bhainsa parī pagurāe,” “play vīnā in front of the she-buffalo; she will continue her munching”!

I have cited above the verse, “Narair viphalahannabhir. . . ” It says, “Ratāsaha- kṛṣodari-vacanakākūrtiḍhvaniḥ.” 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, “N arair viphalajannabhir” has a different interpretation. That idea is echoed in the following verse:

Gāḍhāliṅganavāmanīkṛtakucaprodbhinnaromodgāma
sāndrasneharasātirekavigalacchṛmannitambāmbarā.
Mā mā mānada māti mām alam iti kṣāmkṣarollāpinī
suptā kiṃ nu mṛta nu kiṃ manasi me līnā vilinā nu kiṃ.

Let us now discuss the third caraṇa of the above verse (Dolāyām jaghanaṃsthalena). Bilhaṇa says,

Sparśaḥ kaṇṭakakoṭibhiḥ kuṭilayā līlāvane nesyaṭe (8:86.3).

Misra has really murdered the Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū here while commenting on this kavi-va canam. He says,

For iṣyate (of the MS. and edd.) “is desired”, read anvesyaṭe "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 nesyaṭe (na-iṣyate) for ‘nvesyaṭe must, however, be old as the paraphrasing line in Sp. shows " (p. 59).

The critic had already ordered earlier on pp. 15-16,

Instead of nesyaṭe (na-iṣyate) "is not desired" pass. of anvesyaṭa read anvesyaṭe (anu-iṣyate) "is looked for", cp. below Chap. III on 8.36 [sic., should be 8:86!]

I 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. I also fail to understand how “anu” + “iṣyate” becomes “anvesyaṭe”? “Anu” + “iṣyate” will turn into “anvisyaṭe” and not “anvesyaṭe.” Cf. Anvisyaṇ maraṇopāyaṁ duḥkhaḥ tatasānyalūṇ hitaḥ, 4:16. NRR adds, "Is Misra so ignorant that he does not know the inevitability of yan here? Or, is he just care- less? S hadn't he have said anu-esyaṭe’’?

Misra certainly crosses the limits of justice and decency when he calls “nesyaṭe” 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 A.D. 1229, but also the Saduktikarnāmṛta (A.D. 1205) has "nesyaṭe" (= "is not desired, liked, or looked for").
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So, if I understand Mr. Misra correctly, the Purāṇa Bilhaṇa wrote "anvesyate"—that was the original and 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 Saduktikārṇāmṛta as follows:

Dolāyāṃ jaghanasthalaṇa calatā lolekṣaṇā lajjate
sajjāṃ maugdhavyarjanāya sutanoḥ śrīgāramitraṃ vayaḥ.
Sparśaḥ kaṇṭakakotibhiḥ kuṭilayā līlāvane nesyate
dhatte dikṣu nirīkṣaṇam smitamukhī pārvatānāṃ rūtaḥ.

Incidentally I might add here that the transposition of padaś 2 and 4 in Saduktikārṇāmṛta cannot be justified because "sajjāṃ maugdhya-" is the conclusion, and it must come at the very end. Sures Chandra Banerji, the editor of Saduktikārṇāmṛta, traces this verse in other sources and anthologies (Spd 3278; Smv 51.14; V.C. VIII 86). In the footnotes he provides the following information:

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] śaṅकaṃ tanukaṇṭ ha ["n a"] kakṣatabhīyā krīḍāvane krīḍati. ["Kṣata is a very fine word, which reminds me of "nakhakṣata" and "dantakṣata"].

c) Ed. of Śarmā līlāvanau for vane. Spd. omits this line.

d) As pointed out above, Spd. and Smv. read (b) here. Spāravatīnāṃ 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 "nesyate" to "'anvesyate"! I simply fail to understand and what Misra means by "as the paraphrasing line in Sp. shows." I feel miserable that I am not able to comprehend what Misra wants me to do.

The so-called paraphrasing line, as cited by Misra himself, reads,

Sāśaṅkaṃ tanukaṇṭakakṣatabhīyā krīḍāvane krīḍati.

The poet here says that "[sā] krīḍāvane krīḍati" = "the lady does definitely play in the pleasure garden," but sāśaṅkaṃ! Why? Tanukaṇṭ akakṣatabhīyā. She plays in the pleasure garden, no doubt, but with caution and care, lest the thorns scratch her body. Those very scraches are misunderstood for nakhakṣatas!
The words "śaśaṅkam" 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 exactly the same readings that Vik has; i.e., sparsah kaṇ akako ibhīḥ ku īlayā lilāvane nesyat. And the other anthologies, which contain "śaśaṅkam tanukaṇ akāṣatabhīyā kṛḍāvane kṛṣṭati," do not lend any support to Misra's contention that "the reading ought to be changed to 'anvesyate'" is "looked for" either!

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. Until and unless 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 have the right to make the substitut-ion. Misra might have concluded irretrievably that he was absolutely right, but what about his gurus in Germany, if there were any?

I 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: "A patthara mere pairā 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 "lilāvane nesyate" becomes "lilāvane'nesyate." No saḥṛdaya 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-krīḍa, sexual play, not "passionate embraces" as Misra asks us to believe! She may enjoy the nakhakṣata or dantakṣata from her lover, but not kaṇ aka-kuṣata from 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 rati-krīḍā like ālingana, cumbana, nakhakṣata, and da ntakṣata, etc.? I am not sure whether he acquired proficiency in science or art.

Naturally Bh reads "kṛḍāvane nesyate," 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 nakha-kṣatas received during the rati-krīḍāprasānga!

I do not know if our neo-expounders have come across the following sadukti:

Dṛṣṭīṃ he prativeśīni kṣanam ihāpyasmadgrhe dāṣyasi
prāyēṇāsya śīśoh pītā na virasāḥ kaupīr apaḥ pāsyati.
Ekākinyapi yāmi sataram itas srotas tāmalākalam
nīrandhrās tanum ālīkhantu jāraṭhaḥchedā nalamgranthayaḥ.

And what about the following?
Kasya vā na bhavati roṣo drṣṭvā priyāyāḥ savraṇam adharam. 
Sabhramarapadmāghrāyiṇi vāritavāme sahasvedānīm (Kāvyaprabhāsa).

*   *   *

MISRA THE TRANSLATOR

Misra is equally adept in the art of translation. He translates the following verse be autifully:

Mukhena lajjābhinayapragalbhā līlālavanyāñcitakandharena.
Pratyādiśantīva divi sphurantam anekadoṣopahataṃ mṛgāṅkam (9:53).

I wish Misra had attempted more translations of Bihāra. He translates "mukhena pratyādiśantī iva mṛgāṅkam" as "putting as it were the moon in its place by her face" (p. 26). I 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"; pratyā- diś aviśesam anḍanavidhiḥ," "to repulse"; "pratyādiśeśainam abhāṣamāṇā," "to cast off, repudiate"; "kā maṃ pratyādiś āṁ smarāmi na parigrhaṁ munes tanayāṁ," "to obscure, eclipse, defeat, throw into the shade or background"; "pratyādiśyanta iva me drṣ alaksyabhidaḥ śarāh, raksāg rhaγata dīpāḥ pratyādis ā iva." The term also means "conquer" or "overcome" by the same authority of Apte. However, Bh correctly translates "pratyādiśantī" as "tiraskurvanti" and also cites Amara as his authority--pratyādeśo nirākṛtih. And the English translators B & G, substituting word for word (māṅṣikāsthāne māṅṣikā), 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 prakaṭa karane mēṃ pravīṇa (vaha Candra- lekhā) vilāsā se thoṛī jhukāī hu ī gardana se yukta mukha se [so he bypasses the problem of “yasya,” “yena,” or “ya smin,” etc.] ākāśameṃ camakanevāle, aneka doṣem se nindya athavā aneka rātriyo m meṃ (kṛṇapakṣa meṃ) kāntihāna, candramā kā tiraskāra karati huī prakaṭa huī.

Howsoever poor the translation in Sanskrit, English, or Hindi may be, no one has missed the meaning the way Misra has. He has missed everything.

"Candrikā" interpreted "līlālavanyāñcitakandharena" as follows: "līlāyā lavena nyān -citā 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 turns too.]
Misra merely raises the question and 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 nyañcita vārīkṛtā kandharā grīvā yasmin tena muk hena.

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 nītiṇāras have already taught us,

Gacchatas skhalanaṃ kvāpi bhavatyeva pramādataḥ.

Those who ride horses are likely to fall sometimes. There is hardly any human being on th is earth who could prove that he/she has never committed an error! As a rule, one should a lways 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 glass houses should never throw stones at others.

Here is Misra's unusual power of perception:

Tayopadeśāḥ sa kṛṭah kumāryāṃ yṛthāgaman niṣca ivopakāraḥ.
Premāṇi jampāntarasaṇcītāni prādurbhāvantī kvacid evam eva (9:92).

Misra expounds:

kumāryāḥ, in second and third editions, conjectured [?] for kumāryāṃ, in the MS. and ed. pri is hardly correct. Kumāryāṃ (loc.) is to be construed with agamat ∧9, like n ice in the comparison: "the instruction went to the girl in vain, like a service [goes i n vain] to a vile one". For the thought compare: Bhāsa, Čārudatta, 1.19: Bālacakīt a 1.15 (= Śūdraka Mrçchakatīka, 1, 34):

\[ \text{limpatīva tamo'ṅgāni varṣatīvānjanaṃ nabhaḥ} \]
\[ \text{asatpurūṣaseveva drṣ ir viphalatāṃ gatā} \]

Bharavi, Kirat., 13.33:

\[ \text{upakāra ivāsati prayuktah sthitim aprāpya mrge gataḥ pranāśam} \]
\[ \text{kṛthaśaktir adhomukho gurutvāj janitavrīḍa ivātmapauruṣena} \] (p. 16).
9. Cp. Raghu. 6.66 . . . tadiyo lebhe antaram [!] cetasi nopadeśah, "her instruction did not obtain a place in her mind" [Misra's footnote].

Let us see how the verse 9:92 reads both in B and N:

Tayopadeśah sa kṛtaḥ kumāryāṁ [loc.] vrthaṃgan niça ivopakāraḥ.
Premāṇi janmāntarasāñcitāni prādurbhavanti kvacīd evam eva (9:92).

We read here "kumāryāṁ" (loc.) and not "kumāryāḥ" (gen.) as alleged by Misra. Then how did he read "kumāryāḥ" (gen.) in the same verse? Well, he might have read the following verse, which has "kumāryāḥ" (gen.):

Pradarśayāṁśa tataḥ kumāryāḥ kṣitīṣam anyam pratihārarakṣī.
Cūtānubande madhupāṅganāyāḥ mugdhā madhuśṛfiva karṇikāram (9:93).

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 jālatāḍanam.

The facts are as follows: The verse 9:92 does not have "kumāryāḥ." It has "kumār-yaṃ." Verse 9:93 does have "kumāryāḥ," which is correct in its own context. The variant reading "kumāryāṁ" 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 "kumāryāṁ." There was no reason to change "kumāryāṁ" into "kumāryāṁ"! Note that 92.1 reads "Tayopadesah sa kṛtaḥ kumāryāṁ," and 93.1 reads "Pradarśayāṁśa tataḥ kumāryāḥ." All this trouble arose, perhaps, because the two verses are in juxtaposition, one after the other, and Misra was too anxious to find fault with his predecessors.

I can offer an explanation for Misra's performance. It may be a case of the play and display of the maxim of "maṇḍikapāṛti," "jumping of the frog"! Misra's eyes jumped from one "kumāryāṁ" to another "kumāryāḥ." He did not distinguish the two as separate words! 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 time and energy, including me. Misra seems to be careless. I do not doubt Misra's correct reading of the verse 9:93 because on page 4 we find him discussing the same verse:

pradarśayāṁ āsa tataḥ kumāryāḥ^2 "then he [Who "he"? It should be "she," Mr. Misra!] showed to the maiden."

Regarding the footnote, "kumāryāḥ" is, Mr. Misra, a conjecture of ed. sec. In accordance with the MS., Bühler has "kumāryāṁ," which is not construable.

* * *

Here we have another demonstration of Misra's domineering wisdom:

Nirudhya randhraṃ madhupūrītasya puspasya lobhād bharamarōvataste.
Anyena mārgena papus tad anye labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārgah (10:13).

Misra makes an unjust suggestion:

For labdhārjanānām. [!] "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: lubdhaīr janānā m, which seems 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: labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārgah, "this is the way of the acquisitions (= thus it goes with the acquisitions) of the greedy ones . . ." (p. 16).

My text reads "labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārgah," and so does J and B. However, J gloss says "yata upārjakaṇuṇṇaḥ." But "Candrikā" suggests "lubdhaīr janānām ayam eva mārgah iti pā hah sādhiyān."

Misra attributes the reading, "lubdhaīr janānām ayam eva mārgah," to *ed. ter.* (i.e., Bh). He knows that *ed. ter.* is "kāvyārthacauśvacaturāḥ." Bh never acknowledges any debt to me. He takes "Caritacandrikā" to be an ancient commentary antedating A.D. 1286; so whatever is contained in "Caritacandrikā" is Bh's own property! On p. 269, lines 24-25, I said in MY "Caritacandrikā," "Lubdhaīr janānām ayam eva mārgah iti pā hah sādhiyān!" 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, "Carita candrikā" was not even composed! As the printing of the text progressed, I wrote MY "Caritacandrikā." Otherwise "Candrikā" would have appeared along with the text, at the bottom, where it actually belongs. It is a pāda- ippani and ought to have gone to the pāda. It was not possible for me to suggest the "conjectured" reading in the text part. My 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- ippaṇi), it had to be put in the "Caritacandrikā," after the text was finished.

However, Bh adopts the conjectured reading of "Candrikā" (i.e., my reading) for his text and relegates N's (and that of J too) reading "labdhaīrjanānām ayam eva mārgah" to the secondary position, downgrading it to his footnote. His words are "Labdhaīrjanānām aya m eva mārgah pā ho'yaṁ cintyaḥ." He does not give any credit to "Caritacandrikā" or to me. 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 reasons best known to him, Bh has assumed that "Can drikā" is an ancient commentary, composed even before A.D. 1286. I don't think such a great ancient scholar, an imaginative creation of Bh's fertile brain, if he has one, would say "iti pā hah sādhīyān." His words would be bolder, much more assertive. Also the same glos
s-writer won't have "yata upārjakapumsah," which is the translation of "labdhārjanānām." In other words, the sense in the J gloss ("yata upārjakapumsah") is not the same as suggested in the conjectural reading of "Candrikā." I am still not clear on this issue. However, Misra, who does not have any doubt about anything, ever, recommends that the reading be changed to "labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārgaḥ."

It is interesting to observe that according to Misra, "labdhārjanānām" "does not make any sense in the context." To him "labdhair janānām" seems better, yet "it is difficult of [?] construction." So he recommends that we force Bilhana to speak the words "labdhārjan ānām ayam eva mārgaḥ" because that would be "more conservative"! I 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 "labdhārjanānām." I fail to understand how a word ending in "-nām" could be called a locative! May be Misra's loc. ends in "-nām"! Probably he meant "genitive."

And then Misra argues that "[b]esides the verse is concerned with bees, not with people." Evidently he had seen Bb, who says that here we have (the figure of speech called) "arthāntaranyāsah." It is true that the verse is concerned with bees, but only in the first three quarters. The fourth quarter is general (sādhāraṇa) and is appropriately concerned with people! Whether the reading is accepted to be

a) labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārgaḥ

b) labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārgaḥ

c) labdhair janānām ayam eva mārgaḥ

the main theme ends with the third quarter. The fourth quarter is a generalization from the preceding special situation (case). Our akāṅka is satisfied with the three quarters. The fourth quarter stands by itself. Even Misra uses the term "ones." I don't know if his "ones" refers to the people as well, or only to the "bees." In any case, he has missed the kavītāntarg atam kavītāntarparyam. 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 "arthāntaranyāsa" is. Here is its definition from Sāhitya-darpana by Viśvanātha Kavirāja:

Sāmānyaṁ vā viśeṣena viśeṣas tena vā yadi.
Kāryaṁ ca kāraṇenedaṁ kārṣeṇa ca samarthyaṁ.
Sādharmyeṇetareṇarthaṁ arthaṁ yāsoṣṭadhā maṁ.

(Naī Dillī: Pāṇini, 1982. p. 579)
It would have been much better if Misra had studied the basic, elementary texts in India its elf and then proceeded to earn a Ph.D. in Germany, where his so called "advisors" and "ex aminers" either did not read what he wrote or did not know any better! His so-called "flaw less" dissertation was written in a German brand of English. Maybe his advisors had no kn owledge of English at all!

As far as I am concerned, the problem still remains unresolved! There are three po ssible readings as shown above. I still maintain that "lubdhair janânâm ayam eva margaḥ" is the most appropriate reading, "yata upârjakapuṁsaḥ" of J gloss notwithstanding. 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 d rink. 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 a nother opening and drank all the honey while this greedy one kept on believing that all the honey was safely preserved. This is all prakṛta, the true situation, a stateme nt of facts.

Let us pay special attention to the repetition of the word "mārga," and also consider the style of composition (racanāsailī) of the poet. We have "lobhā" in the prakṛta. 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 and prudent way to deal with cunning and greedy people.

* * *

Once again we see here Misra's fantastic flights of imagination:

Tavāṅgavallikusumair vilāsair avaimi kāmo hriyamāṇanetraḥ.
Caitrārpitam nūtanam astaticām sandhātukāmo'pi na sandadhāti (10:27).

Misra says:

vilāsa- (vi- las with ghañ), used as an adjective (ed. ter., comm.; vilāsair vilāsayuktai ḥ) is hardly possible. Read perhaps for vilāsair rather vikālair:

tavāṅgavallikusumair vilāsair [!] avaimi kāmo hriyamāṇanetraḥ
caitrārpitam nūtanam astaticām samdhātukāmo'pi na samadhāti

"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).
I don't know how "vikāla" could mean "[flowers] that know no season"! It is not sarvakāla or sarvartu.

Let us examine what Bh has to say on this point that led Mr. Misra astray, if it did at all. Misra is confused.

Tava Candralekhāyāḥ vilāsaḥ vilāsayuktaiḥ [,] aṅgānyeva vallyo latāḥ tāsā m kusumāni puspāṇi taḥi [,] athavā latāsthānapannā śarīrayaṣṭiḥ kusumasthaneṅgā ni.

I do not think Bh understood what Bilhana wanted 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 un acceptable to me as any that I 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 me. At the end he says, "Tavāṅgavallikusumair [!] eva kāmasya śar asandhānāhetukaṃ kāryam krtam iti bhāvaḥ." I don't know how Bh could grow flowers in or produce them from the body (assemblage of limbs) of Candaladevi!

Banerji and Gupta provide only a glimmering lamp to show the proper path to our neo-expounders. However, no one seems to use that lamp. B and G say,

I think, Cupid, with his eyes attracted by the dalliances [vilāsaḥ] 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 these arrows at his targets; yet when he sees the vilāsas of Candaladevi, which are equated with the flowers, blossoming forth from the creeper of [that is] the body of Candaladevi, he gets so enamoured by them that he finds no enthusiasm to use those arrows (which are traditional). The vilāsas of Candaladevi are much more attractive, bewitching, effective, and superior as compared to all the arsenal of the Spring Son.

Truly speaking it is very difficult, almost impossible, to translate impregnated words of great poets like Bilhana in a language which is still foreign to me. To substitute words for words following the principle of māskikāsthāne māskikā can be done, but to bring out the real meaning of Bilhana using the English language is an extremely difficult task indeed for me. Every word of Bilhana is enriched with pregnant meaning: hariyamānanetraḥ nītanam astra jātam sandhātukāmāḥ api na sandadhāti! The beauties of poetry can be appreciated only through the feelings of one's heart. Kāvyārtha-bhāvanā-paripakva-buddhi-vibhava-mātra-ved yam 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 (Candaladevī’s) vilāsas (amorous gestures), which are as if the flowers of your body creeper (limbs, which are like creepers) 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 Candaladevī 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 due apologies to the great poet, because it still does not convey the full meaning.

Let us see what "vilāsa" is. "Vilāsa" as defined by Viśvanātha Kavirāja in his Sāhit yadarpaṇa is

Yānasthānāsanādīnāṃ mukhanetrādikarmaṇāṃ.
Viśeṣas tu vilāsaḥ syād iṣṭasandarṣānādinā.

Here is an example:

Atrāntare kim api vāgvibhavātivṛṭta-
vācītryām uḷḷasitavibhramam āyatākṣyāḥ.
Tad bhūrisāttvīkavikārām apāstadhairyam
ācāryakam vijayi mānmatham āvir āsīt.

According to Hemacandra,

Līlā vilāso vicchittir vibbokaḥ kilakiṅcitam.  507

Moṭṭāyitam kuṭṭamitaṁ lalitam vīṛṭaṁ tathā.
Vibhramaś cetyalāṅkārāḥ 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 vilāsavigbokā vibhramā lalitaṁ tathā.
Helā llīleyamī hāvaḥ kriyāḥ sṛṅgārabhāvajāḥ.

Rāmāśrāmī comments on the above:

Sṛṅgārād ratyādeḥ bhāvān manovikārāc ca jāṭāḥ (strīṇāḥ) kriyāś ceṣṭā alaṅkārā- kh yā vilāsādikā hāva-śabdavācyāḥ.
Let it be noted that "vilāsa" leads the above enumeration of the srṅgārabhāvajā kriyā. Here is another authoritative statement defining "vilāsa" as presented in Rāmārūmī:

Vilāso'ńge višeṣo yah priyāptāvasanādiṣu.  
Vilāso hāvabhede syāl līlāyām api puṃṣyayam.

Tatra priyasamāpamane yah sthānāsanagamanama- vilokiteśu vikāro'kasmāc ca kro dhasmitacamatkāramukha- viklavanāṃ sa vilāsah.

I am reminded of a subhāṣīta where kavikulaguru Kālidāsa has been equated with kavitā-kāminī-vilāsa:

Yasyāś Coraś cikuranikaraḥ kaṃapūro Mayūro  
Bhāso hāsaḥ kavikulaguruḥ Kālidāso vilāsah.  
Harṣo harṣo ṃṛdayavasatiḥ paṇcābānas tu Bāṇaḥ  
keśāṃ naiṣā kathaya kavitākāminī kautukāya.

One more example may be cited for "vilāsa":

Dvāropāntanirantare mayī tāya saundaryasārāśriyā  
prolloṣyoryuyagām parasarasmāsaktam samāsādītām.  
Ānītam purataḥ śiromaṃkam adhāḥ kṣipte cale locane  
vācasa tātra nīvāritam prasaraṇaṃ saṅkocite dorlate.

(Subhāṣītaraṇaṃbhāngāra, Bombay, 1952, p. 304)

Bilhāṇa uses this word ("vilāsa") quite frequently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vilāsadolāpha laka</th>
<th>Vilāsadolāyita</th>
<th>Vilāsavidyādhara</th>
<th>Vilāsayuddhena</th>
<th>Vilāsinām</th>
<th>Vilāsinīnāṃ kusumo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All the above verses begin with the word "vilāsa"; so they are in a way pratiṣṭhāṣlokas. The re would be scores of verses where Bilhāṇa has used the word "vilāsa," but, of course, not i n the beginning. For example:

Vijṛṃbhamāṇeṣvatha paṇcābāṇa-kodaṇḍasiṃjāghanagarjiteṣu.  
Vilāsinī mānasam ā viveśa sā rājaḥaṃsīva nareśvarasya (9:1).

and also

Vilāsacāpaḥ  
Vilāsadhanvā dhanur ācakarṣa (9:5).
Tešāṁ prasanno hi vilāsabāṇah (10:24).
Śobhante sma vilāsakuntalalatāḥ (10:91).

Iyaṁ vilāsadrumadohadaśrí
iyaṁ sudhā yauvanadudghasindhoḥ.
Lāvanyamarāṇikyarucicchaṭeyām
iyaṁ maṇahkāraṇacūṇamuṣṭih (9:69).

Bilhaṇa exemplifies the word "vilāsa" beautifully many times in padyas 11-18 of sarga 6 and padyas 2-33 of sarga 12. Also see 9:73 and 9:74:

Iyaṁ mayi nyasyati netramālāṁ
muhūṛt sakhīṁ kimapi bruvāṇā.
Satyaiva sā'bhūdanurāgavārttā
cirāt prasanno bhagavān anaṅgaḥ (9:73).

Jaghaṇa pādena sakhīṁ sakhelam
ākṛṣya hāraṁ muhur ānumoca.
Sā darśane Kuntalapārthivasya
na kāritā kiṁ makaradhvajena (9:74).

I don't know whether Bh understood the compound word "vilāsabāṇah" in 10:24. He merely translates "vilāsabāṇah" as "kāmaḥ." I am not sure if he knows the analysis, "vigraha"--how "vilāsabāṇah" is "kāmaḥ"--strīnāṁ vilāśa eva bāṇāḥ yasya--sah.

Misra asks us to discard "vilāsaiḥ" and accept his "vikālaiḥ"! This is one of the most undesirable attempts on the part of Misra. Discussing the performance of Bühler, I previously wrote, "Itihāsācaryasya Daṃ Byuḥlar [Bühler] mahodayasya jñānarāṣau aitihāsikōṇiśāh sāhītyāṃsaṁ niśām atayāṣeta." I am 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 "vilāsaiḥ" with "vikālaiḥ," to throw away cintāmani (wish-gem) and pick up mṛloṣa (sod of dirt)! "Vilāsaiḥ" is the prakṛta, i.e., upamaya. "Kusumaiḥ" is the aprakṛta, or upamāna. "Vilāsaiḥ" is the heart (true hārdā) of this kavindrokti. To throw it away will mean total destruction. There will be nothing left; it will be a dead body without a soul!

Misra knows that "vilāsaiḥ" 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 karta of abhavat. Yet on p. 17 in rejecting Bh's interpretation he reacts as if it can be only a vi śesāṇa, i.e., adjective. As argued by Mister Misra, it may be "impossible" to interpret "vilāsaiḥ" here as an adjective, but I don't understand why it could not have been "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 ukti. "Vilāsaih" is not "vilāsayuktaih." It is not a višeṣaṇa (adjective). It is a višeṣya (substantive noun). Bh reminds me of an age-old saying: "Śvayam nas ah parān nāsayati." He himself did not understand the true meaning and he misled Misra, if he did at all. Of course, Misra's capacity to understand is limited anyway, especially when he does not want to understand. Flowers don't grow in the body (angavali) of the beloved lady. Her body is the abode of vilāsaih. Here vilāsaih are identified with kusumāni. It is unfortunate that neither of these two neo-expounders cared to see "Caritacandrikā," which says, "[A]ṅgānyeva vallī tasyāh kusumāni vilāsaih--abhedaih".

So far we have come across only three vyṛtis (or the power of a word to express the meaning). They are abhidhā, lakṣaṇā, and vyaṇjanā--tisraḥ śabdasya vyṛtayāḥ (or śakta-yaḥ). Now we are learning for the first time of a new vyṛti, a new śakti, the fourth one. It is called "Miśra-śakti," the power of Misra to force a word to yield any meaning he dictates. He asks us to believe that "vikālaḥ" can mean "timeless." He did not give the prakṛti-prat yaya-vibhāga or vyutpatti (derivation) of the word. Dictionaries (Misra's lexica) tell us that "vikālaḥ" (virudhāḥ kālaḥ) stands for "evening, evening twilight, the close of day; improper time [emphasis added] time, unseasonable hour."

Probably Misra wants to make this word ("vikālaḥ") a compound word (maybe a ba huvṛīhi) and have the vigraha something like vigataḥ kālo yesām tāni. Our pūrvācāryas have instructed us, "Jīvatkaverā dāsayo na varānātyāh." I hesitate to put my own words (interpretations) into Mr. Misra's mouth. I 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 "Samajāni kalamekhalākalāpa" (6:11) and is carried up to "abhav ad anāṅgavilobhano vilāsaih" (6:18). Also, verses 2-33 of canto 12 beginning with

Asmin kṣaṇe Kuntalapārthivasya praveśaṃ ākārṇya purāṇgaṇānām.
Āsan vilāsavratadikṣitānāṃ smaropadiṣṭāni viceṣṭītāni (12:2).

and going up to

Drśām bhṛṣām kāmaśākṣātānāṃ kasyāścid ālokanaśaktikīnyāḥ.
Karnaśvataṃse ca nijāñcāle ca gatāgatam yojanamāttram āsīt (12:33).

tell us what the "vilāsas" are, provided we keep our eyes open and our minds receptive.

In response to the performance of Bh I can only say, "To err is human." But when I see a "doctor" behave in this way, I don't know what to say; the words fail me! Te ke na jā nīmahe. Also
Saraso viparītaś cet sarasatvatvaṁ na muñcati.
Sākṣarā viparītāś cet. . . .

I do not understand why Bh had to substitute "vilāsaiḥ" (substantive) with "vilāsayuktaiḥ" (a djective). And the question is, does he have any grammatical authority to do so? This is a part 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,

Sūtrībhisaranaṇāḥ praṇayinayaḥ kāntasaṅgamam avighnam avāpuḥ.
Phūṭkṛtaḥ pathi nivāritādiṇāḥ cāpalam jayati paṇcaśārasya (11:23).

Commenting on the above verse Misra says,

*nivāritādiṇāḥ* here nivārita-: [!] "kept off" does not yeild [sic] the sense pr asānta, "extinguished" (ed. ter., comm.). I would suggest, in the light of the context, reading nirvāpiṭa-, "extinguished", and thus render: "lamps were extin- guished [b y the women . . . ]". For cāpalam (all edd.) in d read cāturam, which suits well, sinc e god Kama's action of procuring a love meeting without obstacles is one of "clever ness" (cātura) and not of "fickleness" (cāpala) (p. 17).

Let us discuss Misra's "cāpalam" first: What Misra displays here is not true scholarship. No doubt "cāpalam" means "fickleness," but it also means "mobility" and "swiftness" (beside s "fickleness"). In fact Monier-Williams lists the meanings in this order, i.e., "mobility" an d "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 motion, swiftness," 2) "fickleness. . . . " I don't know how Misra concluded that the action involved here was born out of "cleverness"! Even Misra's own word, "clever," can 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 śphūrti kī [?] balīhārī hai arthāt kāmābhibhūta h one para striyom me jo svābhāvika śīghrātāpūrvvaka apanā kārya sampādana karan ekti buddhi utpanna ho jātī hai vaha praśamsanīya hai.

Once again Misra shows his lack of appreciation of the beauties of the poetic muse by reco mmending the substitution of "cāpalam" for "cāturam." The matter of the fact is that "cātur
am" is not grammatically correct at all because "catura" is not included in "yuvâdi." The rule that gives us forms like "çâpala" is "Hâyanântayuvâdibhyo'n" (Pân. 5-1-130). Since this is not applicable to "câtura," Misra's suggestion will be an attempt to make Bilhaña violate Sanskrit grammar, which I cannot endorse. "Çâturyam" is the right form, e.g., "vicâracâtur yam apâkaroti tâtasya bhûyân mayi pâksapâtaḥ" (3.35) and "çâturyam âcâmati Mandarâdrei h" (9.119). Once again I would like to point out that this is the usual kind of çâpalam of Misra. He cites a meaning given by Bh, which may be wrong, but then jumps to conclusions and asks us to amend the reading.

Many times I have wondered whether it is even appropriate for me 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 (Chandahśastram). Misra would like to read "n irvâpita." I believe Misra knows that the present verse is composed in svâgata metre, the definition of which is "svâgata ranabhogâir gurûnâ ca." Here is the setting:

```
guru laghu guru laghu laghu guru laghu laghu guru guru
```

I also believe that Misra knows that a laghu aksara, preceding a saṃyukta-aksara (conjunct consonant) becomes dîrgha (i.e., long) by the rule "saṃyuktâdyaṁ dîrgham." So "rvâ" will make "ni" as dîrgha, which will destroy the life of the metre! Besides "nivârita" can easily mean "eliminated, put off, stopped, withheld, suppressed, removed"; so we don't have to change it into "nirvâpita." The question is, does Misra have the authority to declare that "keeping off" is the only meaning of "nivârita"?

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. I don't know to what extent the Vikramâṅkadevacarita would have been changed by Misra if there had been no restrictions imposed by the chandahśstra and no dangers of chandobhaṅgadosa in following Mi śramārga; in other words, if Vikramâṅkadevacarita had been a gâdyâ-kâvyâ and not a pady a-kâvyâ! I don't know why Misra forgets here his own high-sounding statement on metri ca usa! (See his remarks regarding 9.41d on p. 16.)

```
* * * * *
```

BHARADVĀJ SHOWS THE LIMITS OF HIS LIMITED KNOWLEDGE

I am obliged to say something quite frank--though not very pleasant--relative to Bh's comment on the following verse:

```
Bâñâḥ śvetamayûkhaśaṅkaśaṅkaśaṅkṣunñāḥ kṣanâtt kuṇṭhatâṁ
yâtâs tyaktanâyâsâ sâsû nihîtâh paâcâpī paâcâśunñâ.
Uttâsotpalapallavâ'pi patite daivât purâh pâdayâḥ
```
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kanṭhāśleṣakaṭhorakautukarasās tiṣṭhanti tāḥ kāminām (11:90).

This is one more case that demonstrates how little Bh understood Bilhaṇa's central ideas. He proves the truth of the saying "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." As is usual with him, he has totally missed the true meaning!

In my "Caritacandrikā," I have clearly shown how this verse is to be interpreted: "P allavapatanam atra śaś 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:

Tāḥ māṇīnayaḥ daivād durdaivād abhāgyād ityarthāḥ.

This is all undesirable. No sensible sahrdaya 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: "Daivaṁ diś am bhāgadheyam bhāgyam stṛī niyatir vidhīḥ." Bh comment s, "Pādayoh caraṇayoh puro'gre uttamsarāpa abhāṣaṇarūpah kāminā dhāritah ityarthah." 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). I am not sure whether I am reproducing the idea of Bh correctly. Sincerely, I am not able to understand what Bh wants to say here. Here are his words:

Utpalapallavāḥ kamalapartram tasmin paṭite'pi [!] pranāthisamaye karmādi- st hānāṭ paṭite'pi, [I don't know why our "vidyāvāgīśa" has to repeat the same word!] kāmināṃ kāma -pīḍitānāṃ paṭānāṃ kanṭhāśleṣe kanṭhāślīṅgane kaṭhoro māṇadhāraṇe [!] drḍhah kautukasya kutūhalasya rasaḥ āsvādā yāsu tāḥ satyāḥ tiṣṭhanti. Na ke nāpi prakāreṇa mānaṃ utṣṛjya kāmiṇapriyaṃ ?

The facts here are as follows: The first five weapons have already failed. Perhaps this is the significance of the phrase "paṇcāpi paṇiceṣaṇa." The śāma, bheda, dāna, and nati all have been tried, but all have failed. They all went in vain. The lover also had been practicing ānekṣā, i.e., indifference. The whole night has passed, and still the beloved lady is not pleased. She is not yet reconciled. I am reminded here of another sadukti of a great poet:

Gataprāyā rātriḥ kṛṣatanu śaśi śīryata iva
pradīpo'yaṃ nirdāvaśaṃ upagato ghūṃata iva.
Praṇāṁste mānas tyajasi na tathāpi krudham aho
kucapratyaśatyāḥ ārdhayam api te caṇḍi kaṭhinam.

In this verse "praṇāṁste mānas" is quite significant. In our verse, too, the dawn has almost broken. 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 māna. I would like to declare with all the vehemence at my command, even at the risk of being repetitive, that the lover has tried every possible means, including, of course, "praṇati."
Bh translates "ka horo as mānadhāraṇe drīḍhaḥ." I don't know how this can be connected with "kautukarasa." "Kathora" here does not mean "stiff" or "hard," but "full-grown, " "mature," or "well-developed." For example, "kathoragarbhām Jānakīm." Do we translate this as having a "stiff" embryo?

Bh concludes, "Na kenāpi prakāreṇa mānam utsṛjya 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 "saṃyoga."

Many a time Bh takes undue liberty and reduces a perfectly sensible sadukti into abject nonsense. In the verse under discussion, the poet says "uttamsotpalapallave api patite. " Bh turns the ukti around and makes it "uttamsotpalapallave patite api." Thus he shows once again that he misses the meaning intended by the poet. He believes in manahpūtam sam ācāret.

The poet says "daivāt." He means "luckily." Bh turns it around and makes it "dur-dāivāt abhāgyād ityarthāh." Certainly it was a durdaiva of Bilhana that a commentator [!] [tormetor?] 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 Sāhityaśāstra; Daśarūpa of Dhananjaya says,

Sāmādau tu parikṣiṇe syād upekṣā’vadhīraṇam.
Rabhasatrasaharśādeḥ kopabhraṃśo 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 hat is], disregard [of her]--may be [employed]. Diversion is the interruption of anger through impetuosity, fear, joy, or the like (4.67, p.59, 60; H. 54 b.c, 55). Strīnāṁ īr ṣyākṛto mānaḥ kopa’nyāsaṅgīni priye.

Śrute vā’numite ďṛṣṭe . . .

The Resentment arising in [a state of] jealousy is anger on the part of woman when their lover is heard, inferred, or seen [to be devoted to another] (68, p. 61: H. 56).

Yathottaram guruḥ śaḍbhir upāyais tam upācaret.
Sāmnā bhedena dānena natyupēkṣārasāntaraśiḥ.
The loved one (guru) [?] may remedy this [resentment or estrangement?] by six expedients [employed] in proper succession: Conciliation (sāman), Dissension (bhedā), Gift-giving (dāna), Humility (nati), Indifference (upekṣā), and Diversion (rāsāntara).

"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 upācāret. It refers to "kopaḥ" (anger). The anger grows in intensity and volume gradually. Yathottaram kra maśah, guruḥ gahanah (mānah), high in degree, vehement, violent. However, "yathottaram" can also be interpreted as "in succession." Cf. Tadbhaṅgāya patih kuryāt śadupāyān iti krāmāt. I would like to call such foreign writers "kośapaṇḍita"—dictionary scholars!

Notes: The term rāsāntara signifies [substitution of] another emotion and consequently indicates the diversion from resentment effected by such substitution—ion 9. (p. 62-64a; H. 57,58).

Tatra priyavacaḥ sāma bhedas tatsakhypārjanam. Dānam vyājena bhūṣādeḥ pādyoh patanaṁ natiḥ.

Similar ideas have been expressed by Śāradātanaya in his Bhāvaprakāśa (IV Adhikaraṇa).

(tr. by George C. O. Haas, New York, 1965, pp. 136-37)

Let us resume our discussion. "Prakṛtam anusarāmaḥ. Yāsu nihitāḥ pañcāpi pañcesuna" (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 kṛṣṭhikṛtavallabhapraṇaṭatah śastraṁ anāṅgasya ye na prāptāḥ ca niśṭhīṁpatikaraḥ śaithilyavīṁ tiḥ api. Te niḥśāṅka-viṣaṅka-tātulumalaprotaplapulāvitaś-chinnāḥ kukkuṭakūjitaṁ mṛgādṛśaṁ māṇagrahagranthayaḥ (11:83).

This verse brings forth ideas similar to those expressed in 11:90. Here, a simple, ordinary 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 sings the same melodious song once again, though in a different way. This is what he says:
Uthāya manyuvaśatāś calitum pravrṭtaḥ
karnaṃ gate jhaṭiti kukkuṭakaṇṭhanāde.
Kiṅcit kṣutādinibhamātram udīrya nāryāḥ.
prāṇeśakeliśayaneṣu punaḥ patanti (11:93).

This kavīndrokti is also misunderstood and consequently misinterpreted by Bh. He says,

Kukkuṭānāṃ kaṇṭhanāde karnaṃ gate śrotam prāpte sati [absolute locative, or sati saptamī] manyuvaśatāḥ krodhavaśatāḥ jhaṭiti śighrama utthāya śayyāṁ parityajya c alitum gantom pravrṭṭā udvyuktā nāryāḥ kiṅcit kṣutādinibhamātram udīrya prāṇeśa-keliśayaneṣu punaḥ patanti.

This is a murder of Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū. Bh expects us to believe that the women first hea rd the kukku aṇaḥ hanāda, then they were angered because they had to leave, then they sta rted to leave, then they pretended to sneeze, etc., and finally they came back to the bed of t he lover! This is all unacceptable. The poet says,

Uthāya manyuvaśatāś calitum pravrṭtaḥ
karnaṃ gate jhaṭiti kukkuṭakaṇṭhanāde.

Bh affects the transposition of the first two caraṇas; he changes their respective order. Bh makes Bilhaṇa say,

Karṇaṃ gate jhaṭiti kukkuṭakaṇṭhanāde
utthāya manyuvaśatāś calitum pravrṭtaḥ [!].

I would like Bhāradvāja Mahāśaya to know that the ladies were angry, not because they w ere forced to leave on account of the morning (the day had dawned), but because their man yu (kopa) was generated out of pranaya-kalaḥa or Ḥryā. The facts are as follows: The lad ies get up; they begin to leave. Their going was caused by māna. But they hear the kukku aṇaḥ hanāda. They had no idea what the time was when they had started to leave! But the n they realized that the day had already dawned; it was already daybreak! So it was not pr oper for them to leave. There was no more time left to while away. If they wanted to enjo y the remaining hours, rather minutes, they must go back to their lovers. Otherwise they w ould 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 and without any anumaya 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." Th us their pride would be 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 s omeone 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 raṅga-mahal because of her duty, she does not have a
ny 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 "Kīṁcit kṣutādīnibhamātram"! Mark the word "nibhamātram."

Bh confirms his lack of appreciation through the Hindi translation:

Murge ke (prātaḥ kālīna) śabda ke sunāī paṛane para (patise alaga honā paḍ a rahā hai) isa krodha se, jaldī uṭhakara jāti huṅ kāmīnīyāṃ kucha chīṅka ādi apaś akuna sūcaka bāta kā bahānā karake arthāt kisī apāṣakuna mātra kā nāmo- lēkha karake patikī kṛīḍāsāyyāṃ para phira se leṭa jāṭī haiṁ.

The Hindi translator, too, misses the true hārda of the poet. I repeat because dvir baddham subaddham bhavati. The women did not get up and start to go after they had heard the crow wing 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 prāṇeṣak eliśayana. But as it happened, the cocks crowed! It was already the dawn. There was no time left for any more pranaya-kalaha 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 "dūkhya" 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--"chinnāḥ kūkutakūjitair mṛgadṛṣṭām mānagrahagranthayaḥ."

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 said, "Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāham" (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:

Ratikope prasāde ca dadhānāḥ pariṇāmatām.
Āyāmavatyo yāminyāḥ kāminīnāṁ mudebhavan (16:6).

Let us study some relevant passages from the Sāhityadarpana of Viśvanātha Kavirāja: What is ratikopa? What is prasāda? What is the significance of the word "āyāmavatyaḥ"?

Atra Sāhityadarpaṇe tṛīyaḥ Paricchedaḥ.

Atha mānāḥ:

Mānāḥ kopaḥ sa tu dvedhā pranayershīṣamudbhavaḥ.
Dvayoh pranayamānāḥ syāt pramode sumahatyapi. 198
Premṇaḥ kuṭilagāmitvāt kopo yaḥ kāraṇam vinā.

Dvayor iti nāyakasya nāyikāyaś ca ubhayoś ca praṇayamāṇo varṇanīyaḥ. U dāharaṇam. Tatra nāyakasya yathā:

Alīkaprasupta nimīlitākṣa dehi subhaga mama avakāśam. Gaṇḍaparicumbanapulakitāṅga na punah ciraiṣyāmi (Chāyā).

Nāyikāya yathā Kumārasambhave sandhyāvarṇanāvasare.

Ubhayor yathā:

Praṇayakupitayor dvayor api alīkaprasuptayor māṇinoḥ. Niścalaniruddhanīḥsvāsa-dattakarnayoḥ ko mallāḥ (Chāyā).

Anunayaparyantāsahatve tvasya na vipralambhabhedatā, kintu sambhogasa ū-cāryākhyabhāvatvam. Yathā

Bhrūbhaṅge racite’pi drṣṭīr adhikam sotkaṇṭham udvīkṣate ruddhāyām api vāci sasmitam idam dagdhānanaṃ jāyate.
Kārkaśyām gamite’pi cetasi tanū romāṇcam ālambate drṣṭe nirvahaṇam bhaviṣyati katham māṇasya tasmān jane.

Yathā vā

Ekasmin śayane parāṇmukhatayā vītottaram tāmyator anyonyasya hṛdi sthite’pyanunaye saṃprakṣator gauravam.
Dampatyoḥ śanakair apāṅgavalanāṁ miśrībhavaccaksuror bhagno mānakaliḥ sahāsaraḥhasavyāsaṃktakaṇṭhaḥgraḥaḥ.

Patyur anyapriyāsaṅge drṣṭe’thānumite śruṭe. 199

Īrṣyāmāno bhavet strīṇām tatra tvanumitis tridhā.
Utsvānāyitabhogāṅka-gotraskhalanasambhavā. 200

Tatra drṣṭe yathā

Vinayati sudṛśo drṣtho parāgam praṇayini kaṣumam ānanānilena. Tadahitayuvater abhīkṣṇam aksṇor dvayam api roṣarajobhirāpupūre.

Sambhogacihnenānumite yathā

Navanakhapadam aṅgam gopayasyaṁśukena sthaṅgayaśi puraṅ oṣṭham pāṇīṁa dantadaṭṭam.
Pratidiśaṁ aparasṛsāṅgaṁśi visarpaṁ navaparimalagandhaḥ kena śakyo varītum.
Evam anyatrasaṁbhaṅgvitṛṣṇyāṁ patiḥ kuryāt ṣaḍupāyāṁ iti kramāt. 201

Tatra priyavacahāḥ saṁma bhedas tatsakhyupārjanam. 202
Dānum vyājena bhūsādeḥ pādyoh patanaṁ natiḥ.

Saṁmādau tu parikṣīṇe syād upekṣāvadhīraṇam.
Rabhasatrāsaharṣādeḥ kopabhraṁso rasāntaram. 203

Yathā

No caṭuśravaṇam kṛtam ityādi.
Atra saṁmādayaḥ pañca sūcitāḥ. Rasāntaram ūhyam.

Caṭukāram api prāṇa-nātham roṣād apāsya yā.
Paścāttāpam avāpnoti kalahāntaritā tu sā (82, source same).

Yathā mama tātapādānāṁ:

No caṭuśravaṇam kṛtam [sāma] na ca dṛśāh hāro'ntike vīkṣitaḥ [dānām] kāntasya priyahetavo nijasakhīvāco'pi dūrīkṛtāḥ [bhedāh].

Here (in this last verse) we have examples of all the first five expedients. There was no ra sāntaram; so there was no reconciliation. The lover left absolutely. He would not return! Now the beloved lady has merely to repent; so the sambhoga śṛṅgāra was not continued. She is now kalahāntaritā. There is the vipralambha or viyoga.

The following sadukti will also be relevant:

Caranāpataṇapratyākhyānāṁ prasādaparāṁmukhe nibhṛtakitavācāreyuktvā ruṣā paruṣīkṛte.
Vrajaṁ ramaṇe niḥśvasyoccaḥ stanasthitahastayā nayanatilacchannā dṛṣṭīḥ sakhibhu niveśitā.

(Atra Viṣādasyodayaḥ. Na mānabhaṅgai. Amaruśatake.)

Viśvanātha Kavirāja did not give the example of rasāntaram Bilhaṇa has given. "Kukkutakūjitāni" and "uttamṣotpalapallavapatanam" are rasāntaram. The "ancient" writer of "Carit acandrākā" says very clearly, "Pallavapatanam atra ṣaṣ ha upāyo rasāntaram vā" (p. 281, line 15). I don't think Bh saw this. Even if he had seen this, he would have rejected it. His d
etermination to interpret certain *uktis* in a certain way was firm. *"Māti nirvivare"* and *"Yaś ya bhrātā"* are examples.

Here are more vivid examples of *rasāntaram*:

Kr̥tvā vigraham āsṛpātakaluṣam śaṇyāsanād utthiṭā
krodhāccāpi vihāya garbhahavanadvāraṁ ruṣā prasthitā.
Dr̥ṣṭvā candramasaṁ prabhāvirahitaṁ pratyūsavāṭāhatā
hā rātris tvaritā gateti patitā kāntā priyasyorasi.

Another example:

Tasyāḥ sāndravilepanastanayugapraśleṣamudrāṅkitaṁ
kim vakaṣa caranānativyatikaravyājena gopāyyate.
Ityukte kva tad ityudṛya sahasā tatsampramāṛṣṭum mayā
saṃśliṣṭā rabhasena tatsuḥvāśāt tanvyāpi tad vismṛtam (Amaroh).

Bilhaṇa himself makes a reference to *māna* in the following verse:

Jaṇatum adbhumilāsanidhāne premī sāmyam iva jātagarimṇi.
Kelidhāmani tayoḥ śatavāraṁ kṣiptavān manasi mānānaṅgāḥ (11:72).

A great deal of information on *māna* (love in separation) can be obtained from Kangra Pai
89-97) where Randhawa discusses the theme on the basis of the Rasikapriyā of Keśava dā
sa.

* * *

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 alluded to in the ver
y beginning of his immortal work:

Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti saṅkrāntavakrtirahasyamudrāḥ.
Te'smatprabandhān avadhārayantu kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham (1:22).

The poet says:

Nirādaraṁ vīṣya nṛpaṁ mṛgākṣyā līlānamatkandharayā kayāpi.
Hṛḍī sthitā kārmukakarṣanārtham ayācyateva prasabhaṁ manobhūḥ (12:10)

What is the prasaṅga (context) here? The prasaṅga is

Asmin kṣane Kuntalapārthivasya praveśam ākārṇya purāṅganānām.
Āsan vilāsavratadikṣitānāṁ smaropadiṣṭāṁ viceṣṭitāni (12:2).
The lady expected the king to see her, but the king did not pay any attention! He disregarded her completely; so she became dejected, disheartened, depressed, and downcast. Her face fell down. This is all prakta, the reality. Now the poet imagines that the God of Love was already present in her heart (as well as on her chest, i.e., her bosom). 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 will be 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 that I find difficult to accept. Bh gives kāmavaśatvāt as the cause of "līlānamatkandharaya!" This is not correct. The lowering of the neck (grīvā) was not caused by passionate feelings, but due to insult generated by the fact that the king did not pay any attention to her! Nirādaram vikṣya nrpaṁ!

Probably Bh was led astray by the word "līlā"! I 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 "Nirādaram vikṣya nrpaṁ mṛgākṣyā." Then he says "līlānamatkandharaya." The first statement (occurrence, i.e., vyāpāra) is the cause. The second statement (occurrence) is the effect. Bh transposes the cāraṇjas. This can be characterized only as "avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram." I am distressed not only by the fact that Bh murders sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū, but 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! I cannot believe that such great scholars would have allowed such incongruities to be perpetuated. To quote Bh himself, "Sāti ravikaranikarapraveṣe kuto'ndhakārasya sambhavaḥ."

* * *

MISRA'S MISDIRECTED EMENDATION


Misra dictates on the above as follows:

12:20b
For dorveṇikayā, "with the braid that was her arm" read dorveṇukayā . . . atarjyata, "he was threatened" [by some girl--how young?] with the bamboo (= Hindi lāthī) that was her arm.

I don't know how "bamboo" could mean "lāthī"! Misra might not have realized that "akhar vadorveṇikayā" 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, the moon because of its beauty. There is a common quality, sādharmya, which is the means whereby two different objects a
re identified and regarded as one. The *Upapameya* and *upamāna* should have certain common characteristics—*gunaśādhāraṇyam*!

Misra identifies arms (mark the plural, of course, dual number in Sanskrit) with the bamboo (stick)! I don’t know what identical quality he found in both of them. Length? Maybe. However, the colour is certainly not identical. Also notable is the fact that the arms are two in number and Misra’s *lāthī* is only one! If the arm (one only) was extended in the form of a stick (Misra’s *lāthī*), what is the significance of "*Jṛmbhāsamāśphotakarā-ṇgulikam*"? The process of *karāṅgulīsamāśphota* (cracking the knuckles) cannot be per-formed with out 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 "*jṛmbhāsamāśpho akarāṅgulikam*" if we have only one arm? Here are some more relevant passages: "*Uttarajanikena muhuḥ kareṇa*" (1:48). In the process of *tarjana* we need the *tarjanī* (the threatening finger, the forefinger, the pointing finger) and only one arm, preferably the right. Bihana has another sūkti: "*Jṛmbhāvaśottambhitā hastayugma-sanītha alīlāsphu adaṅgulikāḥ*" (9:85). This is a very fine comparative study. Here we have *uttambhitā* as well as *hastayugma*.

Today (Oct. 28, 1977), while considering the unreasonable suggestion of Misra to change "*dorveṇikāya*" to "*dorveṇukāya*" (Vik. 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 *karāṅgulīsamāśphoa* 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 *abhedaśādhana*—identification of *doḥi* (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*. I was wrong when I glossed "*dor-veṇyau*" as "bāhulate." I did not visualize that the two arms have to be united at their ends before there could be the *karāṅguli-samaśpho a*. I was very young at the time, in my early twenties!

Bṛ is wrong too when he takes "*veṇī" to be the "*veṇī" (Hindi "co i"). 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 sa māśpho o yāsu, tadyāśah karāṅgulyo yasmin karmanī tad yathā syāt tathā." Bh says "*dor-veṇyau bāhulate veṇī ca." At least he does not make them identical; he does not treat them as one and the same. What is *jṛmbhā?* Here is another poet:

*Cakṛkṛtabhujalatikaṃ vakraṅkṛtavaktram unnamadgriyam.
No harati kasya ṣṛdayaṃ hariṇadṛśo jṛmbhaṅārambhaḥ.*
"Veni" (hrasva) = "the confluence or meeting of two or more [rivers or streams] in a common point of union." "Veni" = "dam, bridge." So it can mean "saṅgama" or "union, meeting together at a point"!

I believe Misra comes from Allahabad. He might be aware of "Trivenīsaṅgama"! And Bharadvaja claims a Hindu traditional heritage. Did he ever take a holy bath in Prayāga? "Cakrīṭabhujalatikam" 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 another poet:

Āsyendoḥ pariveṣavad ratipateṣ cāmpeyakodāṇḍavad
dhammālambumucat kṣaṇadyutivadāsajau kṣipatō bhujau.
Viśiṣṭadvalī lakṣyanābhivigalanīvyyunnāmanmadhyamam
kiñcitkiñcidudāṇcānakalam aho kumbhastānī ṇrbhate.

(Subhāśitaratnabhāṇḍāgarah, 8th ed., Bombay, 1952, pp. 269-70)

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:

Aṃkam ālokānapāhahetos varaṅtāṅgi purataḥ sthitāsi.
Kīṁ tuṅgavātāyana saṅgatāṅm karoṣī mātsaryaparā parāsām (12:27).

A free rendering would be as follows:

In order to create obstruction in our viewing, O varaṅtāṅgi (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 balcoyies high up? You cannot obstruct their views! Aṃkam... purataḥ sthitāsi. Tuṅg a vātāyana-saṅgatāṅm parāsām (anyāsām) kīṁ karoṣī?

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 karoṣī as "which" kīṁ is not suī table.

cd kīṁ tuṅgavātāyana saṅgatāṅm karoṣī mātsaryaparā parāsām! [sic].
Misra asks us to emend the reading, but keeps the original!

... [W]hy 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"! I fail to understand him. As a r ule, he takes only the one meaning that he desires, and then he proceeds with his emend- ing suggestions. He overlooks other meanings. I would like to know from Misra how he wo uld interpret statements like the following:

kim karoṣi nijayāthavā bhuvā (5:38)

kim karoṣi vayasādhikena me (5:83)

I am still kept wondering how the particular jealous woman, coming and standing on the gr ound level in front of the other women, could "cause driving away (parāsa) [of the girls] th at 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 balco nies. He observes, "Young women, crowding each other, stand on these balconies in excit ement, looking at scenes below" (p. 49, fn. 51).

Let us now see Bh's performance. Bh displays once again his habit of twisting the a rms of the sentence, as it were; taking the words up and down without any rhyme or reason. I 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. Bhravī: "Mātsaryarāgopahatmanām hi skhalanti sādhusvapi mānasāni.")

However, Bh gives a meaning which is clear enough, ruling out any possibility for Misra to misinterpret the poet. Bh says,

Taraṅgītāngī tvam ālokane asmatkarmaka [!]—darśane vighnahetor vighno-tpādanārtham asmākam purtaḥ sthitāi. Tuṅgavātīyana-samupaviṣṭāni parāsām anyāsām nāyikānām mātsarye parā parāyaṇā kim karoṣi.

There are a lot of undesirable elements dumped by Bh in his translation. "Darśanam" need not necessarily be "asmatkarmaka." It could very well be "asmatkartyka" too. The ladies did not want merely "to be seen." They also wanted to see. "Mātsaryaparā" need not be t aken at the very end. "Saṅgatānām" does not necessarily mean "samupaviṣ ānām." They c ould be very well standing!

I would call all this "avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram." Evidently the Hindi translation is muc h 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 people. Hindi says,

He cañcalasārīravālī kāminī! Hama logomke [dvārā?] rājāko dekhanemem vighna utpanna karanekke udēsa se tū hama logoṃ ke āge khaṛī ho gaī hai. Paran-tu mātsaryabuddhi se vyāpta tū ūmcē jharokhoṃ mem baiṭhi huī anya nāriyoṃ kā, kyā bigāra sacati hai [emphasis added].

I 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--"asmākam ālokanavighna- hetoḥ." Hindi has correctly put it as "hama logoṃ ke rājā ko dekhanemem." I have added "dvārā."

And finally here is the English translation, which does not express fully the sense of the poem! It is māśikāsthāne māśikā, 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 wind-o ws?

"Mātsaryapara" 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—f rom the very start. This is what "Caritacandrikā" says: "Ālokanavighnahetor avalokanā- var odhāya. Vātāyananī gavākṣaḥ. Parāsām anyāṅganānām."

So we see that "Caritacandrikā" had no problem. Bh had no problem. The English translators had no problem either. But the author of "Specimens of Textual Difficulties" (that is how Misra has entitled his first chapter), had great "difficulties" in understanding the verse with "parāsām"; so he asks us to accept his suggestion of "parāsam," which I find difficult to accept.

Here is a verbal image: People were standing on the ground level. One woman was jealous and 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 ālokanavighnahetoḥ. . . ."

I have shown what our earlier authorities (pūrvācāryas) have already said. Either Misra did not have access to their works, or following the gajanimilikānyāya did not see the m.

"Taraṅgitāṅgī" here does not mean "with your body having folds," as the English translators would want us to believe. It means "cancalāṅgī," "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 mahākavīnām vāco bhavanti! How appropriate is the word "taraṅgitāṅgi"! The subject (woman) was standing behind the other women. All of a sudden she pushed the others aside and came in front of them, thus obstructing their view. This was with a malicious design—ālokanavighnahetoh: 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 bh āvārtha, 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.
Viśvapraṇāśvaṃayukhatāpa-sāntyartham āśliṣṭam ivenduhbhasā (12:45).

Misra proclaims,

12:45a
It is preposterous [!] to compare the king's body with the height [sic] of the Himālaya: vapus tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya . . . "his body, high as the Himālaya." For tuṅga, "high", read raṅga "colour". ab-vapus tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya vyarājad ālepanacand anena//

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). I 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.

Apāre kāvyasamsāre kavirekaḥ prajāpatiḥ.
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,

Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham.

Also Mammaṭa:

Niyatikṛtaniyamarihitaṁ hlādaikamayīṁ ananyaparatantrāṁ.
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Navarasarucirām nirmitim ādadhatī Bhāratī kaver jayati.

I don't know if Misra saw the following sūkti of Bilhaṇa, which would be branded by him as "preposteronus":

Śrīkhaṇḍacakāparipāṇḍuro'yaṃ Paṇḍyaḥ prakāmonnatacārudehaḥ.
Kṣīrodadhiṣṭaparipūlasya cāturyam ācāmati Mandarādṛēḥ (9:119).

Here the body of the king of Paṇḍya country is compared with the Mandara mountain! So Bilhaṇa is guilty of using "preposteronus" words not only once but at least twice! Not only B ilhaṇa, even kavikulaguru Kālidāsa should be charged with the same guilt of saying "prepos- terous" things as determined by Misra:

Paṇḍyo'yaṃ aṁśāpitalambahāraḥ klrptāṅgarāgo haricandanena.
Ābhāti bālātaparaktasānuḥ sanirjharodgāra ivādīrājaḥ (Raghuvaṃśa, 6:60)

Since, according to Misra, Bilhaṇa (a Purāṇa Kavi) had no right to say that the body of Kin g Vikrama was as high as the Mountain Himālaya, he suggests that the reading be changed to "tuṣārācaḷaṇaṅgam." Misra probably would have the following vigraha in his mind: "T uṣārācalasya raṅga iva raṅga yasya tam."

We see expressions like

Kailāsaśubhraṁ bhavanāṅgaṇaṁ tat (9:46)
Kailāsagaurāṃ vṛṣam ārurukṣoḥ (Raghuvaṃśa)

Kundendutuṣārahāradhavalā

Misra very much would have liked Bilhaṇa to say, "Vapus tuṣārācaḷaṇaḥaḥ asya!“ It is in teresting to observe that while preparing a draft for the present publication, Shri Naga-raja Rao of Mysore wrote, "Vapus tuṣārācaḷaṇaḥaḥ asya,“ of course correcting it sub- sequentl y, and not "... tuṅgaḥ asya." This phenomenon also shows how variant readings are creat ed.

I 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 univer sre of poets, their kāvyasamsāra.

*    *    *

A MERCILESS MURDER OF THE POETIC MUSE

With regard to

Cakāra kāntākuaptrabhaṅga-kastūrikāpaṅkakalāṅkitāni.
Varṣajalabhṛṇtivilolahaṃsa-hāsāni līḷārasāpayāṃsi (12:69).

Misra displays his critical acumen:

The agent of cakāra is "he" the king. In the preceding verse, however, "some girl" (kācana) is the agent of the verb (vilaṅghayām 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 devah "the king" is explicitly given as the subject (p. 19).

The more I read the "suggestions" made by Misra, the sadder I feel. He recommends that "verse 69 should be read before 68 and after 67." This is called "ekāṃ sandhītsato'param pracyavate."

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 would merely betray our own lack of appreciation for poetic art. Verse 67 reads,

Devaḥ karāmbhoruhayantradhārām kṣipan kapole vipulekṣanāyāh.
Kumudvatīkāmini raśmidaṇḍam pravesayannarka iva vyarājat (12:67).

And the next verse, 68, reads,

Ānāmya līḷāparivartanena vilaṅghayāmāsa narendramuktām.
Kaṇṭhonmukhīm kācana kambukaṇṭhi smarāsidhārām iva vārīdhārām (12:68).

The first verse is the offence. The second is the defence. To put another verse (and all the ideas expressed therein) between the two would not be appropriate. Since these two verses are like vāgarthā—one following the other—devah (of 69) will get anuvṛtti (from 67) and will be connected with cakāra (of 69). We should not worry at all!

* * *

NAGAR'S YOUTH AND ATĪśAYOKTI

When I was young, in my early twenties, I rashly declared, "Ja. pustakāc chuddha-taram pustakam āvirbhavati ced ito'pyadhikam śodhanam nāsambhavi" (Prastāvanā, p. 7). It was an immaturity on my part to think that I 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 Misra has missed all such opportunities. Maybe he did not have enough resources. For example, I have in my possession even today a true photocopy of J.

Here is an interesting example to prove the above point:

Vyadhita tadānu devyāḥ pattravallīṃ kapole
vipulapulakalekhādanturaḥ kuntalenduḥ.
Pratiyuvatibhir ardhe tāḍitaḥ pāṇḍugandha-
sthalaviluṭhitabāṣpavyaktilakṣyaiḥ kaṭākṣaiḥ (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 "danturāḥ kuntale nduḥ" but "danture kuntalenduḥ," "danture" being an adjective of "kapole"! J actually "danture"! We could not expect such miracles from Bh.

I had missed it. My text is deficient even today! Many of the readings in N are assumptions, i.e., accepted as correct. Wherever there was a doubt, I have examined the MS. and other sources with deep insight. I believe if one unfamiliar with the poem, the way I was, were to go through J once again and compares it with N, he might be able to make some improvements. Once a text is almost kaṇ haṣṭa, even an incorrect reading appears right. This is a psychological phenomenon.

There was no apparent reason to doubt "danturāḥ kuntalenduḥ." Thus it remained wrong. But once I was going through a similar passage in Vikramāṅkābhuyadaya. It has "d anture kapole" (or something like that). Ekasambandhi jñānam aparasambandhi- smarakam. I was reminded of the passage in Vik. I saw J. It showed "danture" when carefully observed.

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 "danturāḥ kunt alenduḥ." N copied B by way of R. Bh copied N! So that is the story!

"Lekhayā luloke" (6:19) is one more example, and "Nṛpasya vallabhāḥ" (14:44) is a nother example where the text of N remained defective.

* * *

Here is one more display of the unusual power of Misra in recommending emendation. Bilhaṇa sang,

Prabuddhakārśyāḥ paritāpasāṅkucaḥ sapaṅkapaṅkeruhiṇḍalāṅkitāḥ. Daśām alabdhiḥdhisamāgamāś ciraṅ viyogayogāṁ 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: pravṛddhakāṛṣyāḥ . . . nimmagāḥ, "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." I 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 avyāpāresu vyāpāram. "Prabuddha" conveys the meaning intended by the poet! One has to develop the power of appreciation. Listen to what Murārikavi says:

Jānīte nitarām asau guruñalakliṣṭo 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 ghanōṣmasaṅginaḥ. Vyaramsiṣuḥ śvāsasamīraṇā iva prabuddhadāvānalabdhaṇo'nilāḥ (13:11).

[Cp. Vanāni dahato vahneḥ sakā bhavati mārataḥ.]

He says,

Previous attempts in translating the verse have been banal, since the poet's use of punning (ṣleṣa) 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 ghanōṣmasaṅginah/
vyaṛamsiṣuḥ śvāsasamīraṇā iva prabuddha^10 dāvānalabdhaṇo'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 pā ala trees (lit. "the bearer of the pā ala - 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 them) in due course (krāmāt) [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* "whose frinds [sic] (i.e., equals) are. . . ."

It is difficult even to try to comment on what Misra says here.

Vṛkṣo mahīruhaḥ śākhi viṭapī pādapas tareḥ.  
Anokahaḥ kutāḥ śalaḥ palāśī drudrumāgamāḥ (Amarāṇa. 13 vṛkṣasya).

We have no absolute, unrestricted authority to coin our own words like "pā ala-dhara," "pāt ala" = "flower," "dhara" = "bearer," i.e., "bearer of pā ala flowers"; therefore, "tree"! I have heard words like "jaladhara" and "mahīdhara," but I 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 been a very unpleasant reading. Misra appears to be an all-powerful personality. I have been studying Sanskrit classics for the last 45 years, but I have never seen such an irresponsible work of any writer, Indian or foreigner. Commenting on Vik. 13:11, Misra says, "Previous at tempts . . . a stop." My pen stops right here. I would not want to discuss this further. This writing goes back to 1977.

Kathāpi khalu pāpānām 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 eight-en 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 help 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 ABCs of any science or art in the USA. One should at least become a master in a field of knowledge. Then alone should one 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-kaviśikṣāvṛtti of Amaracandra Yati is very clear on the above point --how to coin a new term, and how not to coin it. In his Šabdasiddhi-pratāna, Amaracandra dictates,

Rūdhayaugikamiśrākhyās tridhā śabdāḥ prakīrtitāḥ.
Yogo guṇena kriyāya sambandhena kṛto'nvayaḥ.
Sambandhah svasvāmitvādiḥ.

Here are some examples:

Bhūnetā būpapati bhūbhuk bhūpālo bhūdhanas tathā.
Bhūmāṃś ceti kave rūḍhyā jñeyodāharanāvalī.

Iti śabdāḥ prakārārthaḥ, tena bhūpādayo'pi.

Kavinām rūḍhiḥ paramparāyātā prasiddhis tayā, na tu kavirūḍhyatikrameṇa.
Yathā kapālīyādau satyapi svasvāmi-bhāvasambandhe kapālī matvarthiṣya eva b havati, na tu kapālapālāḥ, kapāladhanaḥ, kapālabhuk, kapālanetā, kapālapatir, ityā di.

Furthermore, Amarakandra instructs the would-be poetic critics like Misra,

Dhāryāt dhvajāstrapānyaṅka-maulibhūmmanḍanasamānāḥ.
Dharabhārtṛ-mālimatvarthā-sāliśekharasadṛkṣāṣ ca.

After enumerating certain permissible and acceptable words, Amarakandra rules out any possibility of a display of erudition by half-baked scholars like Misra that will merely prove that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Once again Amarakandra ordains,

Kavirūḍhyeteyeva. Tena satyapi dhāryadhārakabhāva-sambandhe na sarveb hyo dhāryebyo dhvajādyarthāḥ śabdāḥ prayojyāḥ--Na hi bhavati Gaṅgā- dharavat Candradharaḥ.

According to Misra, "nijerṣubhiḥ" (p. 8 comments on 4:119c) can mean "the elephants of V ikrama"! "Caturāṅga" can mean "a moving army" (p. 21 on 13:36c). He can make "nīlam" stand for "kamalam" and "śuklah" for "pa ah." A qualifying adjective alone can be made to stand 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 I could accept for the sake of argument that "the bearers of the pātala blossoms" are the pā ala trees, I fail to understand how "pā aladhara" could come into being! If we have the vigraha like "pā alāṇī dharantīti," the resulting compound word would be "pātāl aladharaḥ." Only Misra's extraordinary calibre can bring in the dīrgha and make it "pā alā dharah." Even if we say "dharantīti dharaḥ," we would get only "pā aladharaḥ." Therefore, Misra's suggestion is absurd, to say the least.
Misra's other statements with reference to this verse are beyond the grasp of my limited knowledge; 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 the m and misinterpret them. Take, for example,

Ṭṛṇāni bhūbhṛtkaṭaśu nikiśipan na kaiḥ sphuraddhiḥraṃdaṅganisvanah.
Taḍītpr địaśa caladaṅkalīlayā nidāgham anviṣyaṭi vārīdgaṃaḥ (13:36).

This is the reading in all of the texts, including J. Misra comments on the above,

13.36c
[C]alad aṅkalīlayā is understood [!] by ed. ter. as "moving with the beauty of a seal ", which is impossible because calat n. cannot be construed with vārīdagamah 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: caturaṅgalī
layā . . . [because you are a mugdha, Mr. Misra].

ṭṛṇāni bhūbhṛtka akeṣu nikiśipan na kaiḥ sphuraddhiḥraṃdaṅganisvanah/
taḍītpr iṣaḥ caladaṅkalīlayā nidāgham anviṣyaṭi vārīdagamah]

It is noteworthy that Misra's reformed and quoted version still reads "caladaṅkalīlayā"!

"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 (catauraṅga), the sound of deep drums bursting forth from it, throwing down grass on the mountain slopes (or: the camps of the kings)\(^1\) (pp 20-21).

Misra's footnote:

1. "Throwing grass on" [the camps] is used in the sense of: making them left ["aba nDoned"?] 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 Bilaṅga, whether the poet likes it or not. According to the great critic and philologist Mr. Misra, "caturaṅga" (an adjective only) could mean "balaṃ--sainyam." So "ṣuklaḥ" can mean "pa aḥ" and "nīlam" can mean "ka malam." "Caladaṅka" becomes "caturaṅga." I find myself running out of adjectives to offer my criticism to Misra's suggestions. I will once again borrow from Misra his own word, "p reposterous," to characterize his attempt here to reconstruct. He did not know, he could not know, that what we read here as "caladaṅka" (i.e., the existing reading) is correct one hun
dread percent; absolutely, positively, undeniably—at least in its second component, "äṅka." The facts of the matter are as follows: Billuṇa 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. "Caritacandrīkā" attempts to explain certain words but shows its inability to comprehend fully the ultimate sense (bhāvah) and states "ātparyam?” at the end. Caritacandrīkākāra, 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):

Sphuraddhīramḍaṅgānivānāḥ aṅkalīlayāḥ calat vāridāgamaḥ bhūbhṛṭkaṭaṃ keṣu tṛṇāni nṛṣipan kaiḥ tāḍitpradīpāṇiḥ niḍāḥmaḥ na anviṣyatī.

Then he comments on the verse as follows (vyākhya):

Sphuranto dhīrasya gambhīrasya mṛđaṅgasya nisvanāḥ śabdā iva nisvanā y asya sa, aṅkayati cihnyatītyanena aṅkah "muharachāpā" iti Hindibhāṣāyam, tasaya līlā tayā calat gacchat, vāridāgamaḥ varṣākālaḥ, bhūbhṛṭkaṭaṃ keṣu parvata- nitamb esu nṛpasenāsū vā tṛṇāni ghāsān nṛṣipan samutpādayan, kaiḥ kīḍṛśaiḥ tāḍid eva vi dyud eva pradīpō [?] dipas tāiḥ, niḍāḥmaṁ grīṃsmakālam naṇiṣyatī arthāḥ sarvapraṅāṇaḥ tam anviṣyatītyarthāḥ. Adyāpī kim kūtraṇī niḍāgho vartate iti jijñāsayā tāḍit pradīpāṇi tāśyāṃśeṣaṃ karotīti bhāvah.

Bh has easily drawn the conclusion "iti bhāvah," but I fail to understand how he arrived at the specific "bhāvah." 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 my 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 gurukulaklis a and who do not persevere to dig deep into the mine of jewels. They go after quick fame. They get only artificial gems and parade their wares and cheat their customers. "Caritacandrīkā" explains all the difficult words except "āṅka." Bh invents his own derivation by skillful maneuvering and says, "[A]ṅkayati cihnyatī ityagena aṅkah ‘mohara chāpā’ iti Hindibhāṣāyām." He explains in Hindi, "[A]pane ānekī moharachāpā laṅānevālā " (stamp or seal?). This is all meaningless. I fail to understand what meaning and purpose are attached by Bh to the word "nṛpasenāsū," which he steals outright once again without a ny acknowledgment to "Caritacandrīkā." He connects "kaiḥ" with "tāḍit- pradīpāṇi" and puts the whole sentence into an interrogative form! He explains "kaiḥ" by the word "kīḍṛśai h." The word "calat" is the first component of the karmadhāraya com- pound, "Calamścāsa u aṅkaśca caladāṅkah tasya līlāyā." But Bh treats it as a separate word and connects it with "vāridāgamaḥ." Was he unaware of the fact that "calat" becomes "calan" when it is separated and is made to qualify a noun in masculine gender ("vāridā- gamāḥ" in this case)? After the "sandhi," we would have "calanāṅkaḷīlāyā," which will totally ruin the metre. I wo
nder, 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 ahotprekṣā prakṛtasya pareṇa yat." There has to be a set of prakṛtas (upameyas), the realities, and another set of aprakṛtas (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 it is as though the rainy season is searching the nidāgha or "the Summer." He creates the other attributes of the aprakṛta world by his own imagination.

In his Sūktimukta-valī, Jalhaṇa quotes a verse ascribed to Pāṇini that expresses somewhat similar ideas. The verse reads as follows:

Kṣapāḥ kṣamikṛtya prasabham apahṛtyāmbu saritāṃ
pratāpyorvīm kṛṣṇām tarugahanam ucchasya sakalam.
Kva sampratyuṣnāṃsur gata iti tadālokana-prārās
tadiddīpālokā diśi diśi carantīha jaladāḥ (Jalhaṇa, 61:18).

Bh repeats the words of "Caritacandrikā" ("śukavākyapā ham") and gives two meanings of "bhūbhr̥ta akeṣu"--that is, "parvatanitambeṣu nrpasenāsu vā." But he does not ask himself about the significance of the second meaning, "nrpasenāsu," the aprakṛta or upamāna.

There is the thunder. It is expressed by the poet specifically and separately, yet it is hidden in a misreading that I could not detect in the early 1940s, when I was a young beginner. Later, after studying other texts, I was able to locate it and recommend a new reading.

In order to supply the word signifying "thunder," Bh resorts to a strange com-pound and says "sphuranto dhirasya gambhīrasya mṛdaṅgasya nisvanāḥ śabdā iva nisvanā yasya." The word "nikiṣpān" 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, then try to 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., parvatanitamba?</td>
<td>bhūbhṛṭkaṭaka, i.e., nrpasainya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taḍīt</td>
<td>prādiśa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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. I 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 I read a relevant passage in the Mānasollāsa, worded as follows:

Ekam uddiśya sarvān vā birudam pāṭhayet tu yaḥ. 34
Gāyayed vādayed vā'pi kāhalāṃ vā madaddhataḥ. Āruhya mahiśam darpād divā dīpam pradīpayet. 35
Trṇāni virū查获 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, a hero, is called "birudāṅka."

Mānasollāsa defines the ""aṅka" as follows:

Yena vā yuddhyate sārdham ekaḥ khalakadhamani. 28
Samenastraṇa yaḥ tajnair aṅkāḥ sa parikīrtitaḥ.
(Adhyāya 4, Viṃśati 4, verse 28, second half; and 29, first half. GOS 84, pt. 2, p. 225.)

Vikramāṅkābhuyudaya also has a similar passage:

Kadācit kareṇukāruḍhāṇ puro vādyamānāvīramṛdaṅgān ... cf. prakāti-vīr amṛdaṅgadhīḥaranaδah. Vīk. 6:68.2. udbaṭadarpavīpaṇīmārgavikīrṇatṛṇān ... aṅk apha[kha?]lake yodhayāmāsa (p. 26, 1. 13-20).
Thus it is seen that what Bh has tried to derive out of "aṅka" is a totally irrelevant mean-
g. "Ankayati cinhayati ityanena ankaḥ, 'moharachāpa' iti Hindbhāṣāyām" is an attempt to e-
extract a meaning which does not exist at all! What we get is totally useless. Once again I
am reminded of Bilhana's words: "Rasadhaner adhivani ye carantī." "Aṅka" is the hero, th
e challenger, aprakṛta 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 "mṛdaṅga-nisvana." The
B text reads "nikśipanna kaiḥ." N has separated the last two words and reads "nikśipan na
kaiḥ." That is dumb! This is copied by Bh. J too has "-nnakaiḥ." The J, as is usual with m
ost of the MSS., does not separate the words. The letters "ka" and "va" resemble each othe
r so closely (only that they are liable to be confused and interchanged. "Nra" and "nna" wh
en written in the specific Devanagari script of J are almost identical in appearance. If th
es 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 "sp
huradvīramṛdaṅga" instead of "sphuraddhīramṛdaṅga" because what is beaten to announce
the call for challenge ("āhvāna," "lalakāranā" in Hindi) is the drum of bravery and not mer
ely a deep (grave!) sound of a drum. Even in the passage from the Vikramāṅkābhyudaya q
otted above, we have "vīramṛdaṅga" and not "dhīramṛdaṅga." "Vīra" is the original readi
ng. Now we have the full complement of the aprakṛta with all its attributes--the challenger
, the army of the king, the victory-drums, and the lamp.

Although the above reading incorporating the word "ravaiḥ" is a pure conjecture on
my part, not yet substantiated by any MS. or other evidence, the verse still cannot be ex-
plained until and unless we make this kind of a bold suggestion. Some other worthier scholar
(I mean that truly) might be able to offer another interpretation that might be more accepta-
ble. Until then we can stay with this reading.

Monier-Williams explains that "aṅkaḥ" = "a military show or sham-fight" and "aṅka
kāraḥ" = "a champion chosen by each side to decide a battle." We have many examples o
f the use of this word as given below. Apte says that "aṅkakāraḥ" = "a champion warrior, t
vatkāṅkakāravajye tava Rāma Laṅkā" (Bālarāmāyana, Act. 8. Practical Sanskrit English D
ictionary. Rev. & enl. 3rd ed. 1965. Appendix, p. 1). Here is the full text:

Rājaśekharapraṇāṭtam Bālarāmāyanaṁ nāma nāṭakam. Tatra Vīralāso nāmā- śta
mońkaḥ.

Laṅkēśvareṇa . . . Dāśarathim abhidhātum abhīhitam . . .

Sa niśācaraacakravr̥t tvām āha -- yaduta kim akhila-vānara-rākṣasa-kṣayakareṇa s
aṃgrāmeṇa, tad ekam tulā-dyūtaṁ pravartayāvaḥ. Tatra ca

Tvāṭkāṅkakāravajye tava Rāma Laṅkā
Sītā ca te punar iyaṁ bhavato'stu dārāḥ.
Matkāṅkakāravajye tu mamādhipatyam
tasyāṁ ca te puri kalatrajane ca tatra.

Here is another example:
gauraguṇair ahaṅkṛṭibhṛtām 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 per spires, shedding its nectar. (Context: svayamvara) (Tr. by Krishna Kanta Handiqui. Poona, 1965. pp. 189-90).

And here is one more relevant passage from Vikramāṅkābhuyadaya:


In the earlier passage just quoted above, we noted "ekāṅgavīraḥ." We have also seen "pratyāṅkakāraḥ." Here, in the following verse, we have "ekāṅgabha aḥ":

Karoti caitrāḥ saha candanānīlaiḥ kim indunā kokilapaṇčamena ca.
Na vidyate jetur anāṅgabhūpateḥ kim anyad ekāṅgabhaṭas tvayā samaḥ (13:73).

Thus it is proved that Misra's suggestion to read "caturaṅga" in place of "caladaṅka" is absurd.

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" = "scatters, strews, casts") grass on the ground as part of the process of challenging: "tṛṇāṇi viki ran viṭḥyāṁ" or "vipaṇāmāravikīṭḥatṛṇān."

Misra asks us to compare the following verse:

Yasya pratāpo'gnir apūrva eva
jāgarti bhūbhṛtakaṭakasthaliṣu.
Yatra praviṣṭe ripupārthivānām
tṛṇāṇi rohanti grhaṅgaṇeṣu (9:113).

This allusion is irrelevant. In "tṛṇāṇi bhūbhṛtaka akeṣu," the 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 gr
ass (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 Bilhana, but both have only attempted to emend or interpret according to their own whims and caprices. It is all gha a opo bhayaṅkaraḥ. Shri Nagaraj Rao of Mysore tells me that even today that "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 "caladaṅka." "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 "vāridā- gamah," but then we would have the problem of turning it into "calan." Could "caladaṅka" be "birudāṅka," or some such word? It cannot be "aṅkakāra," but we need a "challenger" and not just a "challenge," a sham fight, or a "citrayuddha."

The art of reconstruction is a very delicate and skillful task. We have to change as little as possible, and even then only when it is absolutely essential. I have been thinking over this problem now-a-days (March 1990). I think we need a prakṛta to be in sāmānā dhik aranya 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 "jaladāṅka"! I will 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 decisions have been applied:

Trnāni bhūbhṛtkaṭakeṣu nikṣiptaṁ ravaḥ spuṛdvīrīmṛdaṅgaṁivisvatraḥ.
Taditpradīpain jaladāṅkalaṁvayā nidāghama anvisyati vāridāgamah.

*     *     *

Bh creates a bitter controversy over

Namatrayayahśyāmalalāśaṣpamanḍala-sthitendraparacayāsa vāridaḥ.
Giristhalīṣu cyutaśakrakārmuka- bhramād ivodbhṛntataṭidvilocanah (13:37).

This is one of those examples cited by Bh where he has gone against my reading! In his opinion he has improved it; I don't know if M read both my conclusions and those of Bh with regard to the worthlessness of the R ed. The attempt on the part of Bh to assert the supremacy of "namatrayam" over "namatrayaḥ" reminds me of the following sadukti:

Ghaṭaṁ bhindyāt paṭaṁ chindyāt kuryād vā rāṣabhadhvanim.
Yena kena prakāreṇa prasiddhaḥ puruṣo bhavet.

It is to be remembered that
J has "namatyayah-"

B has "namatyayah-"

N has "namatyayah-"

Even the R text has "namatyayah-"! 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!

I had commented upon R's ed. as early as 1945 in the following words:


An examiner checking a group of answer books is easily able to detect who steals fr om whom! Bh is truly a nakalchī banḍar! In my "Prastāvanā" on p. 5, I had erroneously gi ven A.D. 1927 as the date of publication of R ed. It is wrong. In reality it is 1921-22 beca use its date (as given in the book) is 1978 Vikrama era. Bh copied the wrong date on page 1 of his "Khācit Prāstāvakam"! He calls the editor of R his guruvyarāyāṃ. Did Bh really see the book even once in his lifetime from a critical point of view? He just copies my text in its evaluation except that in some cases he has changed the N text's readings. The changes are for the "worse" rather than for the "better." Misra, by the way, gives the correct date on p. 111 of his "Bibliography."

My text continues,


Nevertheless Bh insists on R's reading, which is the product of some fertile brain of a thoug htless and senseless person who was asked to go through the text and offer some correction s. Whether the person was a mūrkhasiromani (crest-jewel of the fools), or Brhaspati himsel f, it is evident that he did not understand the meaning of the compound word "ayahśyāmala śaspamāṇḍalasthitendragopapracyāsū."
To support "namatyayam" over "namatyayah" is totalitarian dictatorship or simply a fool's obstinacy, but that is exactly what Bh does. He asserts, "[N]amatyayah iti pā hāt nam atyayam iti pā ha eva samicīnah" (mark "eva")! He does not advance any argument. He does not give any cogent reason. He merely dictates. Cf. his statement on "yasyā bhrātā," 18:47. Bh overlooks the dictum "Ekānī pratiṣṭā hi pratiṣṭātām na saḍhayet," "mere assertion on does not validate a theory."

Once again I would like to remind pseudo-critics like Bh that the 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 1) śuṣko vrksas tiṣ hatyagre. We may also have 2) niṣatasat ira vaḷasati purataḥ. How can we prove by any scientific evidence or methodology that the latter is much more charming than the former?

I can only conclude that someone did not know what "nāmatyayahśyāmala" meant, and so he made it "nāmatyayam śyāmala"! Such critics have existed all along since the creation of the poetic tradition. It is with reference to such simperons that a great poet sang long, long ago,

Bindudvandvataranīghatārasaraṇī kartā śirobindukam
darmi kramaśiṣṭiṣṇavayakalā ye ke’pi tebhyo’ņjaliḥ [or "tebhyo namaḥ.”].

A true saḥṛdaya reader may recall,

Kimapi kimapi mandam mandam āsatiyogād
aviralitakopalam jalator akrameṇa.
Asithilaparāmbhavāyāprātaikaikadoṣṇor
aviditagatayāmā rātrir eva vyāraṃsīt (Uttarrāmacarita).

Once upon a time there was a heartless, senseless, thoughtless, careless fellow who tried to improve this kavindroktī 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 cats and dogs. 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 word of fancy and fiction. The cloud becomes frightened: "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 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, and the ground is mistaken for the rainbow.

Now a discerning reader, a true saḥṛdaya, 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 better sense? A person with
a cultivated (śāṃskṛta) mind, capable of appreciating the beauties of a poetic genius like Bilhana, 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"--I can only fold my hands in reverence and say, "Ye ke'pi tebhya'ñjalih." I would also like to remind the pretender, who does not have a heart that is tender like a lotus, but a machine as hard as a cinder,

Śūro'si kṛtavidyō'si darśanīyo'si putraka.
Yasmin kule tvam uppanno 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 a real one, it is still 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].

I have shown throughout this study--here, there, and everywhere--how miserably B and G fail to represent the poet's ārda in a true and faithful manner. One more example is presented here: They have translated "indragopa" as "fire-flies." It is not true. I simply fail to understand why they did not consult the "Caritacandrikā," which had explained this verse in the early 1940s when I was only in my early twenties. This is what "Candrikā" stated:

Ayo lauham tadvat śyāmaleṣu śaśpamanḍaleṣu bālaṭṭhasamāheṣu sthitā indragopāṇām śonaṅkāṭiṣṭāvīṣeṣāṇāṃ (Hi. bīrabahūti) pracāyā yāsu tāsu . . .

In spite of this B & G say "fire-flies"! The Sanskrit equivalent for "fire-flies" is "khadyo-tah"! 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 Bilhana. A fly does not remain "sthita." It FLIES. It is caṅcalā! Indragopas are red insects confined to the ground. They are called (in English) "cochineal" insects. They are used to produce a dye. How sincerely I wish these translators had been more thoughtful.

As I stated earlier, Bh does not advance any argument. However, Misra does. Here is what he says:

13.37a
For ayah "iron" (in earlier edd.). ed. ter. reads ayam "this" (taken from the ed. of Pt. Rāmāvatāra Śarmā). ayahśyāmala-, "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 ayam . . . vāridat, "this (particular) . . . cloud", seems called for. C p. next verse; amī payomucaḥ, "those (particular) clouds" (p. 21).
I 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 "vāridaḥ namatī"! 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 should we place in that someone?

If what I am writing now in the following paragraphs is true, Misra will prove to be a very careless writer--anything but a worthy scholar.

Misra alludes to the next verse, "amī payomucah." He translates "amī" as "those," i.e., "prathamābahuvacanam"--asau, amā, amī. He brings "payomucah" in "sāmānādhi-karanya" with "amī." He translates the word "payomucah" as "the clouds," i.e., "prathamā bahuvacanam." I 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- pralambanālāpratimallaḏambarāḥ. Anaṅganārācaparamparānibhāḥ 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 saṣḥ yekavacanam. 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 I leave this topic I would like to cite for my sensible readers a sādukti expressing similar sentiments:

Nirīkṣya vidyunnayanaiḥ payodo mukhaṁ niśāyāṁ abhisārikāyāḥ. Dhārānipātaiḥ saha kimu vántaś candro'yan ityārtataraṁ rārāsa.

(Smk. 71:7 Abhisārikāpaddhatiḥ. Author unknown; possibly Hariharasya.)

* * *

BHARADVAJ AS TRANSLATOR

I have not yet gone through the translation work of Bh in its entirety, but what I have seen is enough to hurt a sahṛdaya. I am not sure if Bh really understands the poet's heart and soul. Let us take the verse 13:54:

Payodavrndaṁ gaganasthalollasat-taḍillatādohadakardamadyuti. Cakāsti saṅkrāntakalaṅkam ambhasām nabhaścyutānām iva gālānāṁsukam (13:54)

Bh translates the quarter "... taḍillatādohadakardamadyuti" as follows:
"yā taḍidṛūpiṇī latā tasyā dohadrūpo" (îpsito) yo [sic] kardamaḥ" ("dohasyā- rth aḥ 'khāḍa' iti "Hindyām") [!] "pañkaḥ pañka'strī sādkardamaú" ityamaraḥ"; "tasya " dyutiriva dyutiḥ kāntīr" yasya tat.

I am learning for the first time in my life that the word "dohada" in Hindi means "khāḍa," i. e., "manure" or "fertilizer"! Bh might have thought that since there is latā ( creeper) there must be manure as well! That may be his logic. No Hindi dictionary gives the meaning as claimed by Bh. Of course, the Šabdakalpadruma of Rājā Rādha Kānta Deva (Vārāṇasī, 19 67) says, "Dohadaḥ puṃ. kl. (doham ākārṇaḥ dadāti. doha+da+kaḥ) garbhīnyabhi- lāṣaḥ. Sāḍa iti bhāṣa." It does not say "khāḍa." It says "sāḍa." Also it does not say Hindi "bhā śā," but only "bhāṣā." Now this lexicographer hailed from Bengal. His "bhāṣā" would naturally be Bengali. Well, in Bengali "sāḍa" does mean "icchā, abhilāṣa, garbhiniḥra sparśā, a nd dohada." Also, it is to be noted that "sāḍa" is derived from "sāḍha" = "icchā."

However, MW lists one of the meanings of "dohada" as "a kind of fragrant sub- stance used as manure," (Naish 1:82).

* * *

Here is an exceptional case. In understanding and interpreting the following verse, I committed an error. Misra corrects it. I can call it only a "ghuṇākṣaranyāya":

Sarvadaiva hṛdayaṁ mālīmasam na kṣaṇam sparśati te prasannatām.
Tat khalatvam akhilopatāpinaḥ puspakārmukanpasya vallabha (14:44).

Misra exemplifies "ghuṇākṣaranyāya." He 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 nomi native vallabhāḥ into the vocative vallabha, read tat khala tvam . . vallabhaḥ, there fore, thou rogue, art the friend of . . . (p. 22).

This is one of those rare instances where Misra makes some sense and improves on my rea ding. I went against all the others (as far as "vallabhāḥ" is concerned) and suggested the re ading "[he] vallabha" for "vallabhāḥ" because I took "khalatvam" (bhāve) as one word mea ning "duṣ atvam." I did not notice the padaccheda (break of the words) between "khala" a nd "tvam" in J! Bühler does not have the padaccheda! Neither does R. Here I have proved the truth of the age-old saying, "Ekam sandhitato param pracyavate." In trying to keep " khalatvam" as one word, I erroneously changed "vallabhaḥ" to "vallabha." Bh followed my example 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 accheda between "khala" and "tvam." Also, on the top, there is the gloss "he" for "khala" (s ambodhanam)!
Bilhana composed,

Subhataḥ pramadākārārpirām dalayan nāgaraṅkaṇḍavīṭikām.
Ripudantighatāsū khaṇḍanam tṛṇaṃ utsāhavaśād amanyata (15:6).

Misra reads,

Subhataḥ pramadākārārpitam dalayan nāgaraṅkaṇḍavīṭikām (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, "nāgarakahāṇḍavī ikām." Also, could we have one word, "ripudantigha āsukhaṅḍanam," and have gha ānām in the vigraha? J, however, has a padaccheda between "gha āsu" and "khaṇḍanam."

* * *

Here is an interesting point. In Śūktimuktāvalī, Hemantapaddhatīḥ 63:8 and 63:9 (16:14 and 16:15 of Vīkramāṅkadevacarīta) appear as follows:

A) Samakṣam api sūryasya paryabhūyata padmīni.
Tejasvinō'pi kurvanti kim kāla vaśam āgatāḥ. 8

B) Madvairiṇaḥ kaṭhorāṁśor iyaṁ praṇayabhūr iti.
Rośād īva tūṣāreṇa paryabhūyata padmīni. 9

Bilhana’s order is

16:14  B [.4 niradhyata padmīni. Niradhyata 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" ed. (GOS)? Of course, repeating the same paryabhūyata is no good composition; so Bilhana’s original is preferable.

* * *

INCORRECT CONSTRUCTION LEADS TO DESTRUCTION

We can see how the incorrect construction of the readings of B creates a destruction of meaning in the following verse:

Gaurīvibhramadhūpadhūmapaṭalaśyāmāyamāṇodarāḥ
kaṇṭhakṣodorabhayāna ye kavalitāḥ Śrīkaṇṭhaśaṅhoragaṁ.
Sphāronmīlitaśradāgrhabhradhavārāgraghaṇṭāravās
te ślāghām alabhanta Kuntalapateḥ Kailāśaśailānilāḥ (16:51).

The third and fourth lines in B read as follows:

Sphāronmīlitaśradāgrhabhradhavārāghan mudā nirgatās
te ślāghām alabhanta Kuntalapateḥ Kailāsaraudrānilāḥ.

[underlined Byuhlarakavi-vacanam]

The destruction created by the wrong reconstruction in the text may be presented and ex- p lained as follows:

16:51.1: "śyāmāyamodaraḥ" P. (Omission and incorrect copying by P; J is correct.)

16:51.2: All have "kṣoda." (My conjecture is "kṣobha."

16:51.3: "-grhabṛddvāravāste" P. (omission). J has "grha-vṛddavārāgrhaṁ āravā ste." Letters "ha," "d-rā," "gra," "gha," and "mā" were 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: "-grhabṛddvārān mudā nirgatās." B attempts to emend. There is no ach iement! 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. C f. 6:46.3 reading of P višikharāka, where śa has been mistaken for rā. Two occurence of one type of error.

16:51.4: "Kailāsaraudrānilāḥ" B. "Raudra" (= fierce) winds are not applauded. They won't get "ślāghā" of Kuntalapati. This creates an absence of all sense creat-ed where perfect sense was reigning supreme.

All together,

J has sphā, ro, nmī, li, ta, śā, ra, dā, gr, ha, bṛ, ha, ddvā, rā, gra, ghan, ā, ra, and vās

P has sphā, ro, nmī, li, ta, śā, ra, dā, gr, ha, bṛ, ddvā, ra, and vās

B has sphā, ro, nmī, li, ta, śā, ra, dā, gr, ha, bṛ, ha, ddvā, rā, nmu, dā, nir, ga, and tās

So P omitted the second ha; Bühler restored it correctly. P omitted "rā" after "ddvā"; Bühler restored it correctly. P also omitted three more letters: "[a] gra," "gham," and " ā."
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" and "vā" (= sound) of P, i.e., the last two letters of the *carana*. 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, I wonder if he had any right to throw away the two most significant letters, "ra" and "vā," meaning the sound already existing in J, copied by him, and existing also in P.

I will try to provide an explanation as to why this mistake originally occurred. While copying, the eyes of P probably jumped from first "ra" to the second "ra" in consonance with the *maṇḍalakaputiniyāya* (maxim of the jumping of the frog) or what I have termed "netr occhalam." Originally this is how he might have read--I cannot reproduce the diagram here through letters.; it will have to be drawn graphically--"śāradāgrhābṛddvā . . . ravās." Thus the letters represented by ellipsis dots were totally omitted.

In brief, B really missed only "a graghā ᾃ." Since he did not have the "ghan ᾃ," i.e., "the 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 "spārānma.līta-śāradā-grha-ṛhadārān mudā nirgatās" as "coming out of the huge gates of Durgā's [[!] house, the gates that were thrown open with great force, etc. (How could Sāradā be translated as Durgā unless we tre at Mahākāli, Mahālakṣmi, and Mahāsarasvatī as one here? But that is not the issue.) The above quotation is a re-translation in English of his German words. The original German in full reads, Indische Stimmungsbilder, Sieben Episoden des "Vikramanka-deva caritam a us dem Sanskrit übersetzt und erklärt, von August Haack. Sudoll bei Ratibor, 1899. p. 84.


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 Kailāsa mountain, from the open space!

All this trouble arose because while copying J. The transcriber P omitted some letters (five in number); rāgraghā ᾃ and the editor B subsequently activated and energised his own poetic muse and invented certain substitute letters, thus making the whole reading as n mudā nirgatās. Thus the most significant element, the "ghan ārava," "chime of the bells," was lost and the winds had to come out of the temple! They are in *Devanāgarī*, some being conjunct consonants ("rā," "gra," "gha," and "n ā").
I 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 in this instance, at the very least. It was not a reconstruction, but utter destruction.

Banerji and Gupta do not acknowledge my text as their source; yet they had the word "ghañ árava" so they could speak of the "chime of bells." Their translation reads,

[The] winds from the mount Kailása, which wafted [?] the chime of bells in front of the huge doors of the temple of Sáradá that were wide open, which were not gorged by the serpents round the neck of Śiva out of the fear of their throats being bruised [?] (and) which were blackened by the mass of the smoke of incense at the a morous sports [?] of Gaurí, received eulogy from the king of Kuntala.

The translators have taken the word "umīlita" to mean "wide open' doors"! It is not clear how they could have derived the expression "wafted" when there is no other word (verb, "kriyāpada") to express the action. "Waft" 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 "vādana, "cālana," or "vāyuprēita." "Waft" means "to cause to move; go lightly by, as if by the impulse of wind or waves." According to Monier-Williams, "waft" (English) could be translated to Sanskrit as "sañaiḥ śanair vāyau vah," "āni," "vayunā prer," "prānud," or "upanud."

The reason why the serpents of Śiva did not swallow the Kailása winds lies in the fact that they contained the smoke of Gaurí’s vibhramadāpa incense. As compared to "kṣodā," the term "kṣobha" is preferable. Air filled with smoke is likely to be less palatable (desired). The first line of the verse narrates the cause, and the second its effect. The translators have missed the significance of this phenomenon. The adjective "phāronmī- lita" does not qualify the doors of the Śāradā temple, but the ghañ ārava, the sound of the bells, which was highly magnified by the strong gusts of winds. Cf. "Jālodgīrṇair upacita-vapul keśa sanskāradāpaḥ. Meghadūta." Also Bilhaṇa himself: "Kuryād anārdreṣu kim anangānām keśeṣu kṛṣṇāgurudāpavāsah."

I correctly explained the passage in "Candrikā":

Sphāram atyartham ummīlita vistāraṁ nītaḥ Śāradāgṛhasya Kāśmīra-Sarasvatī-man dirasya brhaddvārāgreṣu sthitānāṁ ghaṇṭānāṁ ravo yais te.

These words of mine have been copied by Bh, syllable by syllable--"akṣaraśaḥ"--of course, as is usual with him, without any acknowledgment to me; none whatsoever! Let it be emphasized that I have indicated the direct quotations from the J gloss by enclosing its words within two asterisks.

* * * * *

MISRA TRIES TO SHOW OFF

187
Misra just wanted to show off. One of his chapters is headed "Secondary Source Material Relating to Vikramāṅkadevacarita."

Misra decided to tell the world that the text of the Vikramāṅkadevacarita here had been corrected by me with the help of some secondary source material. It is not true. I am not a kāvyārthacauyacatura that I would not disclose his source! Had I taken any help from any of the so-called "secondary" sources of Misra, I would certainly have acknowledged it in my "Prastāvanā." I am not sure if Misra even read my "Prastāvanā." My text is based on J. Whatever is there in N is found in J even today, unless otherwise specified.

Misra confuses J and P, maybe deliberately. On p. 63, under 16:51(c), he says,

In: Vcar. MS. the syllables ha in brhat and rāgrahantā 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 Vcar. MS. here is J! The footnote no. 6 on p. 175 of N reads "gṛhṛyoddvārvāste śāghā- P." Now "P" does not mean "J." Misra ought to have read pages one to three of my "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 me as illustrations of Bühler's futile attempts to restore the text.

On page 3 of my text I clearly say,

Param ito'dhiṣṭa vismayāvahāni bahūni viparīta-sthalānyapi pura upa-tiṣṭhi anti. Tathāhi pra. pustake byddvārvāste (ṣoḍa. 51) ityaśuddhaḥ pāṭho'sti. Ja. pustak e tvadyāpi byhaddvārāgrahantārvāste iti spaṣṭam evāste.

Misra alleges that I changed "silently." (Does he mean "stealthily"?) He expected me to announce it with a grand beating of drums as he himself does time and again! The same kind of phenomenon occurs with regard to "Caritacandrikā." Bh took it to be an ancient work, and continues 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. Kāli-dāsa did not give his name even when he composed such immortal poems like Kumāra-sambhava, Meghadūta, and Raghuvaṃśa. But for the strict rule and tradition of nātyā- sāstra he might have omitted his name even from the Abhijñānaśākuntalam. I did not want "Caritacandrikā" to be acclaimed as an outstanding, epoch-making work whose author deserved an outstanding prize in literature. To me the restoration of the text was much more significant. To me, my Upodghāta was much more valuable. Probably Bh knew the truth, but since he wanted to continue to incorporate "Candrikā" into his work without any acknowledgment, he did not ascribe it to its proper author.
Truly speaking, my historical research as embodied in Upodghāta and the recon-struction of the text took much more of time, energy, and attention than what was needed to write "Caritacandrikā." In fact my contribution to Bilhaṇa, if there is any, lies in the first two components and not in the last one.

The editor of Sūktimuktāvalī notes on p. 58 a variant reading for 16:51 (end):

Santatam amī Kailāśaśailānilāḥ ityatra Kuntalapateḥ Kailāsaraudrānilāḥ iti pāṭhab hedaḥ.

So Bühler's misconstruction has been taken to be a legitimate, variant reading!
Excellent!

* * *

Here we see Misra once again indulging in some unwanted emendation:

Nirantaramaḥ Brahmaṇapūrbhīḥ āvṛtamaḥ cakāra tatraiva puraṃ sa pārthivahā. Viriṇcilokāt 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 muṣa?]

b-d  cakāra tatraiva puraṃ sa pārthivahā/
viriṇcilokāt suralokataḥ ca yad
vibhūṣya bhāgāviva 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 alaṃkṛtya but gives in the end as the sense (b hāva): . . . 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 "vicītya"? 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 "Bilhaṇa's Nārāyaṇapura: Temple, Tank, and Town," I had changed the reading to "vikṛṣya."
On August 22, 1990, I thought of another word: "vijitya." But it is far removed from the original reading ("vibhāsya"). It seems we will have to stay with "vibhāsya" until and unless we find a better substitute.

*   *   *

The following verse poses a problem in textual reconstruction:

Saharṣam ityapsarasām ajāyata prajāgaraṇa pañcaśarasaya tanvatī.
Pravīrakaṇṭhagraharaṇtakautuka-pradhāvatīnāṁ śravaṇāṃṛtaṁ kathā (17:64).

Let us compare the various readings:

17:64.3 graharāntā [?] -grahaṇā[?]/nta [?]- J. The Jaina Devanāgarīṇā of J could be easily mistaken by a foreigner for rá-. -grahaśānta - B. Cf. viśikhaśakala vs. viśik harāka. 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 Etadanantaraṇa kulakam. [B omits all such literary essenti als]. 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 sānta- which, however, does not yield good sense, since pravīrakaṇṭhagraha- sāntakautuka-, would mean: "the desire that had ceased from [or "for"] embracing the great heros [heroes, Mr. Misra]."

Read sāndra, "intense, strong" (cp. 17.18; 18.52): -sāndrakautuka-, "intense desire", (!) cp. Kum. 7.62 tāsām . . . sāndrakutū- halā nām, "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 ancien seat of Sanskrit learning) who worked with Bh in bringing out his worthy ed.? It is not proper to say here, "Bühler therefore conjectures. . . ." Bühler had no other reading except what he has given, i.e., "śānta." Where does an opportunity occur for him to con-jecture? Where was the need? Why would he conjecture at all? The way Misra writes, it would seem that Bühler conjectured in 1874, after he had read my ed. (1945) and Bh ed. in 1964, and found that their readings were not acceptable!

The two letters creating the problem look very much like "ṇānta" (old Devanāgarī style, where the letter "ṇa" resembles "rā." This is in contradistinction to Marāṭhī (bāla- bodha) "ṇa." 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 "ṇa."
Once again I would like to reiterate here, even at the risk of being repetitive, that Drs. Bühler and Jacobi saw the "Carita" and the manuscript J for the first time in their lives in Jaisalmer. They copied the entire (voluminous) work in just seven days! Sanskrit was not their mother tongue, and they did not begin their primary education in the environment of a Hindu Brāhmaṇa born and brought up in Varanasi. No matter what they think or say, De vanāgarī 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 fourteen years. I had already lived in a Sanskrit and Hindi environment for more than 22 years. I had taught Sanskrit for quite some time. Sanskrit was almost my mother tongue. I had just earned the first prize in an All-Banaras Sanskrit Elocution Contest. I had studied and taught the Vikramāṇkadevacarita for several years. I had also seen the B ed. as well as the P ed.--the transcript of J--made by Bühler 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 lives in that "country of sand, bad water, and guineaworms" (Bühler, "Introduct.").

Also, I might add here that through the courtesy of Munivara Sri Punyavijaya Mahārāja, the same precious MS. J was brought to Ahmedabad in 1960, where it was photocopied under 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 Vikramāṇkadeva-carita 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, I 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 "śānta" out of his brain. It is always necessary to keep in mind that when I 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 Jhalikkar, 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), I 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 my personal knowledge I can
declare even today, with all the emphasis at my command, that that was the best I 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 "nanta" (which seems to be the reading in J) and make it "nānta." Then we can interpret "pravirakaṇ ḫagṛahāṇam anta ḫ" or "ante yasya tādṛṣaṁ yat kautukaṁ tena pradhāvītānāṁ." "Urged by the anxiety, the ultimate objective of which was to embrace the great warriors, they ran. . . ." "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" . . . phalo dayāntāya tapaḥsāmādhyaye" (Kumārasaṁbhava 5.6) "ending with (lasting till) the attain- ment 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. "Śāndra" is too far removed from "nanta." 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 Bihāṇa) 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 svīya-" (17:10). He re 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!) The original reading could very wel be "grahaṇānta." What about "pravirakaṇ ḫagṛahāṇāṭkautuka," where "āṭta" will mean "grhiṇa?"

* * *

We have one more prank, a bālacāpalam, by Misra Maharaja:

Yasmin kiṅcīn na tad upavanam yatra no kelivāpī	naṁśa vāpī na viṣamadhanuskrāṇam yatra rāmāḥ.
Nāsau rāmā manasijakaṭāghāṭabhaṅgā yuvānaḥ
kāmaṁ yasyā na nibidatarapremabandhe patanti (18:20).

The brilliant scholar-pretender shows his ingenious skill:

18:20c
manasijakathāghāṭabhagnā yuvānaḥ (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 manasijakaśāghāṭabhagnā- (cp. also 7.52; 12.26, "tormented by whip strokes by Kāma." Tha and ṣa in Devanāgarī are often confused (p. 23).
I don't know how "bhagnā" could mean "tormented"! By whom? Where? When? What is the evidence? How many MSS. have you seen, Mr. Misra? Which Devāṅgarī are you talking about? 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"; Misra tries to restrict the meaning of the word "kathā." It also means--actually, its primary meaning, as the definition given first by Monier-Williams, is "conversation, speech, talking together." It can be translated as "premālāpa, premasāṁbhāṣāṇa, prema-vārtā, prema-kathā."

Moreover, Manasija, as he is best known, is not reputed to use the harsh whip as his weapon. He uses very soft arrows of flowers. Maybe the German make of "Manasija" uses a kaśā as his weapon! Here is an example from Sūkṣimuktāvalī:

Sudīrghā rāgaśālinyo bahuparvamanohanarāh. Tasyā virejur āṅgulyaḥ kāmīṇaṁ saṁkathā iva.

(Stṛṇām aṅgavarṇanapaddhatiḥ, 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 "kaśā"!

Udaṇcayan kimśukapuspūcīḥ salīlam ādhūtalatākaśāgraḥ. Viyogināṁ nigranaṁya sajjhaḥ Kāmājñayā dakṣiṇamāruto'bhūt (7:52).

Asamśayaṁ niḷasaroruḥākṣi saṁmaruḥa tvayi paṇcabāṇaḥ. Drutair vinirvāṣi padair yad eṣā kaśāhatevottaralā turaṅgī (12:26).

None of the two verses contain even a single set of words that could be made to mean "tormented by whip strokes by Kāma." Misrāṅkati alone can make them mean what Misra wants them to mean. This is not proper. "Kaśā" may be appropriate in the two verses just given above. It is irrelevant to allude to "kaśā" occurring in these two verses while dis-cussing "yasmin kiṅcin." We have a saying in Hindi: "Jitane kāle utene bāpa ke sāle!" Misra's effort is "preposterous," to borrow his own terminology, once again.

May I suggest "vrāṭa" for "ghāṭa" and "magnā" for "bhagnā"?

*     *     *

Kartūṁ kṛtyā tilakam Alakāgopurāṇāṁ gatena Krauṅcasyāyā Bhṛgupatiśaracchidram adrer vilokya. Yena kṛḍālavaśābalitāḥ pīvare bāhudaṇe caṇḍadhvāne dhanuśi ca ruṣā sūṭritā drṣṭipātāḥ (18:35).

Misra expounds,
18:35c
For krīḍā read vrīḍā: -vrīḍālavaśabalitāḥ drṣ ipātāḥ "glances that are varie-gated/di
sfigured [!] by a little bit of shame." [!] For an analogous idea compare 18.57 savrī
doḥūṭ, "he felt ashamed." The idea seems [!] that shame gives the eye a particular
[which one?] colour.

Bilhana apprehended kāvyārthacauoram. He warned the kavīndras against it. Here and th
ere Misra criticizes me by specification, "nāmagrāham," e.g., ed. sec. is wrong, etc. But he
does not give credit to me for any suggestion he made even before 1945!

On 18:35 "Caritacandrikā" says, "Api nāma 'vrīḍālava-śabalitāḥ' iti pā ho'nucitaḥ sy
āt?" (p. 316, lines 3-4). In the year 1976, Misra claims to have conducted his "investi-
gations" under the great German scholar Paul Thieme [!] and proclaims the above con-
jectured reading as if he thought it for the first time! It was a Miśrāpaṇāṃ jāṇam! This is called
PLAGIARISM, a literary theft, anything but honest and true scholarship. Not that Misra di
d not read p. 316 of N (i.e., this page in "Caritacandrikā") because he refers to it in his disc-
ussion of the following verse (18:38) which provides ample food for thought.

* * * * *

The following verse presents a riddle not yet solved:

Campāśīmiṃ Kṣitipatikathādhami Dārvābhisāre
Traigartīsu kṣitīsu bhavane Bhartulakṣonībhartuh.
Krīḍāśailīkṛtahimagirer hāsabhīteva yasya
bhṛmyatājñā sukṛtavasater bhūḥ pratāpodayānāṃ (18:38).

18:38.3 All have "-girer hāsabhīteva." My conjecture: "himagireḥ śīṭabhīteva."

18:38.4 "-vasater bhūpratā" (B)
"-vasaterbhraprüfata" (R)

Let us see what Misra says:

śīṭabhītā- 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 śīṭartu-bh
ītyā, "out of fear of the winter season" (p. 23).

In the very beginning I would like to say that Misra raises irrelevant matters. We are not a
rguing over "bhūtī" itself; we are arguing over its cause, "hāṣa" or "śīṭa." Therefore, to refe
r to "śīṭartubhītyā" is not proper. Misra does not advance any argument or provide any exp
lanation. 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 Śīṭartubhī
tyā, 'out of fear of the winter season.'" I don't know what the use is of alluding to this state-
ment! Does it make any sense here at all? Thus we see time and again Misra raising irrel
event matters. He merely raises a smoke-screen and blurs the vision of his spectators! He
does not answer any questions; he creates more problems for us.

* * *

GACCHATAṆ SKHALANAM OF NAGAR

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 collaborat
ce with me and make this work ready for publication. Unfortunately, he could not complete
it.

This was an aside. Bh does not raise any objection to my interpretation (in "Carita-c
andrikā"): "Bhūr utpattisthānāni karma" (p. 316). Was he afraid of an ancient [!] com-men
tor, as he took "Caritacandrikākāra" to be? He silently inserts his own interpretation. No
t that he did not see the passage, because he takes into consideration (rather, "dis-cusses")
my conjecture of "śītabhītā," which appears only here (on p. 316) and not in the original tex
t. I took "bhūḥ" to be acc. pl., "dvitiya bahuvacanam," rather than nom. sing. "prathaṁaṁa
vacanam"! Acc. Rao, the pl. of "bhūḥ" would be "bhuvah" and not "bhūḥ." I am indebted to
Shri Nagaraja Rao for this correction.

"Bhūḥ" is declined like "pūḥ" and "bhrūḥ" and not as "vadhūḥ" or "camūḥ," where a
cc. pl. resembles nom. sing. Nevertheless Bh (who takes "bhūḥ" to be nom. sing.) does not
explain the real purport at all. Why is "kriḍāśailikṛtahimagī" Śaṅkara? What con-nection
does he have here? What is the purport of the "heat" (the second meaning of "pratāpa," w
hich Bh knows too)? He says "prakṛṣ atāpaṁaṁa."

All the regions mentioned in the verse (Campā, Dārvābhisāra, Trigarta, and Bhartu
lakṣonibhartuḥ bhavane) are in the Himālaya Mountains. These regions (territories) are co
ld. They need heat, they need warmth. Until and unless we bring the "heating power" into
play, the second meaning of "pratāpa" remains inoperative!

What is "kriḍāśaila"? It is an artificial hill serving as a pleasure spot, a pleasure mo
untain. Here is Kālidāsa in his Meghadūta:

Tasyāḥ tīre racitaśikharah peśalair indranīlaiḥ
Kriḍāśailaḥ kanakakadalīveṣṭanaprekaṭaṇīyaḥ. 74

(Tasyāḥ vāpyāḥ)

Consider also Harṣacarita 1:6 and our own poet Bilhaṇa:

Kriḍāśailibhavanti pratikalamalāṁ kausumāḥ pāṁsukūṭāḥ (7:67).

Let it be stressed that J and B both have "hāsabhītā"; so "Caritacandrikā" has the same. H
owever, I said in my text, "Nūnam śītabhītēva ityucitaḥ pāḥah" (p. 316). Bh leaves the issu
e undecided. He translates the words following the maxim of "māṣikāsthāne māṣikā" without reaching any conclusion and without getting the true essence of the poet's hārdam. He does not arrive at any decision. The first two lines are clear to all. These are the territories located in the Himalayas that 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 bhrāmyayi. 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 "ḥīta-bhīteva. " Bh makes me uneasy when he translates "krīḍāśailikṛtahimagireḥ" as "krīḍā-sailikṛtah krīḍāparvātikṛtah himagiriḥ Kailāśaḥ yena tasya Śivasya." This is called "manahpūtanī samāc aret." Kailāsa is only a peak of the Himalayas. Śiva has never been described as having made either Kailāsa or even the Great Himalaya as his krīḍāśaila.

Bh has missed the true essence of the word "krīḍāśaila."

 Śiva is Devādhiva, Mahādeva, the Supreme God of all the gods. He can make the entire Himalayas—even the entire universe—as his abode. There is nothing surprising about it. To limit Śiva's all-pervasive ness to Kailāsa only is to show the limitations of one's own little knowledge, which is always dangerous. The fact of the matter is, "Krīḍāśailikṛtahimagireḥ" is the qualifying adjective of "Anantasya"—Anant who has made the entire Himalaya as his krīḍāśaila (play-hill). There lies the beauty. There lies the kavītvam. That is called "vicchittiḥ."

Another question is why Śiva should laugh at Anantasya ājñā, or why Anantasya ājñā should be Śivasya hāsād bhītā? Why should she be "Kailāsasya śitabhītā"? Is the Great est of the Great Gods, Śiva, prasaṅga-saṅgata at all here? Of course not. Bh leaves everyth ing for the reader to decide. He does not want to risk any decision lest he be exposed and proven wrong.

Śiva is depicted as being white, rajatagirinibham. Fame is depicted as white also. Śiva may be imagined to laugh at the white fame. I bring this up here just for the sake of a argument. But ājñā is not depicted as 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 character- istic.

Bh has missed the significance of the word "pratāp," although he translates it correctly, (of course copying from my text). What is "pratāp?" "Pratēpa" is "Sa pratēpāḥ pra bhāvaś ca yat tejaḥ kośadandaṇḍajam."
Bh performs the act of śukavākyapātham. He quotes Amara and also copies "Carita candrikā": "kośadāṇḍajamā tejah prakṛṣ atāpaś ca." I would like to know why Bh mentions the meaning "prakṛṣ atāpaś ca." He does not apply it anywhere; so why does he bring up at all?

"Pratāpa" is compared to fire. We have numerous examples in literature:

Yasya pratāpo'gni apūrva eva jāgarti bhūbhṛtakātakasthalīṣu (9:113).

Pratāpam āropya parām samunnatim yaśaḥ pradarśyeva ca dāvabhasmabhiḥ. Bhajan nidāghaḥ kṛtakṛtyatām iva svapauruṣāviśkaraṇān nyavarttata (13:1).

B has "jagannidāghaḥ" here. I don't know why Bh did not insist on that reading here!

Here is our "Nilaguvṛdatāmraśāsanam":

Tataḥ pratāpajvalanaprabhāva-nirmulanirdagdhavrodhivamśaḥ.
Tasyātmajāḥ pālayitā dharāyāḥ Śrīmān abhūd Āhavamalladevaḥ

(N ed., p. 39, Section 8).

Once again I would like to remind the neo-expounders that the fame is described as white:

Yasyākhilavāpi yaśo'vadātam akāṅḍadugdhambhudhvrdhīśaṅkām.
Karoti mugdhamarasundarānām abhūt sa bhūyo Jagadekamalāḥ.

And laughter as well as fame are both described as white:

Hanūmadādyair yaśasā mayā punar dviśām hasair dūtapathaḥ sitkṛtaḥ (Śrīharṣasy a).

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 Hīmālayas either, if we take into consideration only its colour, white.

Why do we have here the word "pratāpa" with a second meaning "prakṛṣ āḥ tāpah" ("terrible heat," "burning fire," etc.)? Why would a person wander hither and thither in search of hot regions unless and until he or 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-bhītā." Here is a similar expression:

Mukhenducandrikāpūra-plāvyamānau punaḥ punaḥ.
Śītabhītāvivānyonyam tasyāḥ pīḍayataḥ stanau (8:47).

Here is a concrete example of how variant readings are created, especially when the copyist allows his memory to play its part. Vik has "stanau" and not "kuca." I wrote "kuca" b
y 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—a real scholar, Pt. Shri Vamanachary a Jhalkikar. When a true scholar copies some work, his memory becomes an obstacle to the true and faithful copying, which is harmful!

I took (or rather mistook) "bhūr utpattisthānāmi karma" (acc. fem. plural) and wanted to make it an object of "bhrāmyati." Kutra bhrāmyati? Pratāpodayānāṁ bhūḥ: The regions where there is abundant growth and prevalence of pratāpa in both the senses of the term.

I have thought time and again that Misra had no need to conduct any "investigat-ions" to arrive at his conclusions. He has enough internal power to assert. He has the freedom to pronounce ex cathedra judgement: "Śīabhīta [!] proposed in ed. sec. (p. 316) for hāsa bhīta [!] (in other edd.) seems not to be required." First of all, I proposed "Śīta-bhīṭā." Secondly, even his ed. (i.e. N) has "hāshabhīṭā."

On Oct. 12, 1977, I conjectured another reading: "vāsabhīṭā." 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 (vastu-tattvam) here is that King Anant had made a large number of extensive territories in the Himālayas a play-hill, krīḍāsaila!

*B * *

BHARADVAJ, THE GREAT HISTORIOGRAPHER

The following verse provides an excellent opportunity for Bh to demonstrate that he too can be a historiographer. (See the long list of books consulted [!] by him).

Yasya bhṛṭā Kṣitipatrī iti kṣātratejonidhānam
Bhojakṣmābhṛṭṣadṛśamahimā Loharakhanḍalobhūṭ.
Śaṅke lakṣmyāḥ śirasi caraṇaṁ nyasya vakṣaḥsthitāyāḥ
prāptā līlātilakatulanāṁ yanmukhe sūktidevī (18:47).

N's fn. says, "All have yasyā bhrāṭā." Yet N makes it "yasya bhrāṭā"!

Bh had a sudden impulse to demonstrate his knowledge of historiography. All the editions, including J, read "yasyā bhrāṭā." So, he argued, what right does N have to make the reading "yasya bhrāṭā"? Consequently he asserts that yasya bhāteti pāḥ yasyā bhrāteti pāṭhaḥ samucitaḥ! He does not cite any authority. He does not advance any argument. He overlooks the great principle of vāda: "Ekākīna pratijñā hi pratijñātaṁ na sādhayet." "Mer e assertion does not prove a theory." All read "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.
I did not base my change on mere assertion. It did not emanate from obstinacy; I advanced cogent arguments. This is what I said in my "Upodghāta" (p. 9):

Ka):

Putro Vigraharājasya Kṣitirājābhidhas tataḥ.
Rājñāḥ pitṛvyajo 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 Vigrarāja.

We learn from the Rājatarāṅgīnī that Diddā, daughter of Simharāja, Lord of Lohara, married Kṣemagupta, king of Kashmir. She adopted her nephew, Samgrāmarāja, 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 Samgrāmarāja, Kṣitirāja was a cousin, being the son of his uncle, Vigrarāja. The king-dom of Lohara was assimilated into that of Kashmir when Kṣitirāja gave it to Utkarṣa. Let it be stressed here that N's fn. no. 9 adds "Paśyata Pariśṭam am Ka." This "Pariśīṭa" (Appendix) appears on p. 247, immediately after the "Nilagunḍatāṃpraśasanam" in N's ed. Here it is reproduced on the next page 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]

-----------------------------------------
↓ ↓
Samgrāmarāja   *Vigrahāra (Lord of Lohara)  
[ 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.)  ↓
Kalaśa  ↓
(1063-1080 A.D.)  (1080-1089 A.D.)

-----------------------------------------
↓ ↓ ↓
Harṣa   Utkarṣa   *Vijayamalla  
(1089-1101 A.D.)  (1089 A.D.)

Note: * = did not rule over Kashmir.  
I believe that 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 Subhaṭṭa, the queen of Ananta, is to negate the facts of history. The tragic situation is that this point is well discussed and clarified in my edition on p. 9 of "Upanīdhyāta." Yet Bh does not accept the truth. He wants to assert the superiority of his wisdom. I am reminded of an excellent sadukti:

Sampūrṇakumbho na karoti śabdam ardho ghaṭo ghaṣam upaiti nūnam.
Vidvān kuñño na karoti garvam guṇair vihīnā bahu jalpayanti.

Here is one more interesting point worth noticing. Bh, while commenting upon the verse

Devī tasya pracurayaśasāś candrikevendujātā
yātā khyātim jagati Subhaṭṭeyādbhāryā babhūva (18:40).

says, "Jālandharādhipādinducandrājjjātā samuppannā... Subha ādevītināmnā..." And in his fn. he adds, "Sūryamatītyaparanāmadheyā." Bh copies, as usual, from "Candrīkā" where we read, "Induś candraḥ Jālandharādhipaḥ Inducandraś ca. Subha eti Sūryamatī -tyapara nāmadheyā."

My "Caritacandrīkā" derives its information from Rājata-raṅgini, which says,

Jālandharādhipasyendu-candrasyendumukhīṃ sutām.
Upayeme manojñatvāj jyeṣṭhām Āsamatīṃ svayam (7:150).

Tasyāḥ kiṃcidvayonyūnāṃ svasāram yo yavīyasīm.
Atha Sūryamatīṃ Devīṃ bhūbhuje pariṇītavān (7:152).

Here "bhūbhuje" means "Anantadevāya."

I still don't know if Bh saw the Genealogical Table of the Lohara Dynasty (Pari-śiṣṭ am "Ka" of N), or if he understood it, or if he compared it with his own statement on p. 209 of his Vol. 3.

Bh admits that Subhaṭṭa (alias Sūryamaṭī) was a daughter of King Inducandra, the Lord of Jālandhara. Yet he maintains that Kṣitipati (alias Kṣitirāja) was her brother, not only a distant brother but real brother (sahodari bhrātā). If Kṣitirāja was a real brother of Subhaṭṭa, (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 (that same dynasty that gave birth to Anantadeva and Kṣitirāja)! Did she? If Subhaṭṭa and Kṣitirāja were real sister and brother, then the name of her father would be Vigrahārāja and not Inducandra!

We also have to consider one more fact. Inducandra, the father of Subhaṭṭa, was the Lord of Jālandhara, while the father of Kṣitirāja [Subhaṭṭa's real brother, (even) in the opi-
nion of Bh] was the Lord of Lohara! Would it be correct to conclude, then, that there was no difference between Lohara and Jálandhara as far as Bh is concerned?

It is just possible that what is published in the name of Bhäradvāja is the creation of more than one person! His discussion on "yasyā bhrātā" (18:47) has a footnote: "Atrai- ta syaiva sargasya 38 tathā 67 saṅkhyaśau ślokā[va]valokaniyau." Bh alludes to Kṣitipati.

The verse 18:67 reads,

Durgam prāpya Kṣitipatiyaśodhāma yasyānūjo'sau kasyākārśīn na khalu pulakotkarṣam Utkarṣadevaḥ.
Yenāropyā svabhujāshikhare nirmitā dūram urvī mlecchakṣoṇīpatiharihurakhumudrādaridrā (18:67).

In Sanskrit (Ramā of Bh) we read "... Loharadurgam prāpya ..." The word "prāya" is not commented upon. However, the Hindi vyākhya kāra knows much more than all of us combined. He says,

Harṣadeva ke choṭe bhāī Utkarṣadeva ne vipakṣī [!] rājā Kṣitirāja ke kirti-st hāna [!] Loharadurga nāmake kile ko jīṭakara [!]

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 to have studied Rājatarāṅginī in Sanskrit as well as English. He ought to have known that according to the Rājatarāṅginī, Utkarṣa was still a stanandhaya (baby suckling its mother's breast) when Kṣitirāja gave him the kingdom of Lohara!

Dattvā stanandhayāyāpi tadotkarṣābhhidhāya saḥ.

The poet could have easily said "jītvā" 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 Rājatarāṅginī. Kalhana says,

Putro Vigrahārājasya Kṣitirājābhidhas tataḥ.
Rājñāḥ pitṛvyayo bhrātā kadācit pāṛśvam āyayau. 7:251

Tasmai nyavedayat khedam sa cittasyopaṭāpakam.
Putre Bhuvanarājākhye rājyalubhde'tiviplute. 7:252

Kṣitirājaḥ svavadhvāṃ ca viruddhāyāṃ viśuddhadhiḥ.
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Manastāpāphe cakre sarvatayāgāmṛte sprhām. 7:255

Rājyaṁ Kalaśaputrāya jyeṣṭhāanantarajanmane.
Rāmalekhābhidhānāyāṁ rājīyāṁ jātāya satvaram. 7:256

Dattvā stanandhayāyāpi tadotkarṣābhidhāya saḥ.
Rājarsir vibhudhaṁ sārdhaṁ vidadhe fīrthatavanam. 7:257

Bhuktvā śamasukham bhūṛīṁ varśān paramavaiṣṇavaḥ.
Sa cakrāyudhasāyujaṁ yayau Cakradhare sudhīḥ. 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, the INFANT Utkaṛṣa. In this way he partially repaid the debt of Diddā.

There is nothing surprising if Bühler adopted the reading as "yasyā bhrātā Kṣitipatīr ītī," 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 Rājatarāṅgini later and corroborated many of Bilhana's statements by citing it as the authority, probably he did not examine this specific issue. Scholars like Dvivedi just followed Bühler by gaḍḍulikāp ravāhanyāya and gaṭānugatīkanyāya.

Nevertheless, Bh should know better since all the data that was accumulated since Bühler wrote was available to him. He had my ed. and all the information contained in it. Yet he asserts that Kṣitirāja was a brother of Subhaṭā, not only a distant brother but a saho dara bhrātā of Subhaṭā.

Before we leave this topic I would like to present another case of a similar nature, but showing different action on the part of Bh:

Dātā parākramadhanaḥ śrutaṇāḍābīśvā
nāmnāsyā Rājakalaśas tanayo babhūva.
Prāleyabhūḍharaghūṣas timiracchālena
yasyādhunāpi makhadhūmam ivodvahanti (18:77).

All end with "udvamanāti." I made it "udvahanti." Bh copied me in a casual manner. I don't know why in this case he did not raise the flag of revolt! Why did he submit to my reading?

* * *

Misra's determination to destroy everything remains undaunted:

Yasya prāptādhbhutaparināteḥ karkaśe tarkamārge
tyāgaḥ kāsāṁ vicarati girīṁ gocare kāntakīṛtīḥ.
Yena nyastā dalitavipadām kovidānām grheṣu
Śrīr nādyāpi svapiti lalanaḥbhūṣaṇānāṁ ninādaiḥ (18:48).

It is a pity that, whenever Misra opens his mouth to talk, I fail to understand him more often than not. 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 accentuate the rule.

With regard to the verse 18:48 he says,

For vicarati read na carati: tyāgaḥ kāsām na carati girām gocare kāntakīrtiḥ "in the domain of which poetry does not move his liberality, which is of lovely glory?" (p. 23).

I am simply puzzled. First of all, the question is, why should we read "na carati" for "vicarati" when the latter makes perfect sense already? Secondly, I would like to know what Misra wants to convey; I don't know it. Does he want to say that Kṣitirāja gave donations to the poets? We are instructed by our gurus, "Jīvatkaver āśayo na varṇanīyaḥ." "Do not try to interpret the poet who is still living." However, if my conjecture is right, then Misra will prove unjust. "Girām" here certainly does not mean "poetry," per se. I believe Misra must have heard expressions like "vācāṁ agocaram," or "girn atitya vartate." What Bilhaṇa wants to say here is, "The generosity of Kṣitipati was indescribable." Kāsāṁ girām gocare vic arati? Na kāsāṁ api iti bhāvaḥ.

I am not sure whether Misra considered what his pūrvacāryas had already said, how they had explained this ukti of Bilhaṇa. "Candrikā" says "Girām gocare vāgviṣaye." Bh translates, "Yasya Loharadhipasya . . . tyāgaḥ dānam . . . kāsāṁ girām vācāṁ gocare viṣaye vi carati vartate, vāgagocaram dānam iti bhāvaḥ."

I believe Misra had seen the following sadukti while he was still in his senses:

Kavitvavaktṛtvaphalā cumcuba 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 (vākṛtvā). 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 Kālañjaragiripater yāḥ prayāṇe dharitrīṁ
tukkhāraṇāṁ khurapaṭaravaiḥ kṣmāpaśūnyāṁ caṅkāra.
Śrīḍāhālakṣitiparivṛdhah so’pi yaṁ prāpya vṛttam
Karṇaḥ karṇāmṛtarasabharāśvādam antas tatāna (18:93).

Misra makes me terribly disturbed. He says,
18.93c
*yam* (acc. m.) cannot be construed with *vṛttam* n., as in *ed. ter.*, comm. It clearly must refer to Bhīṣma, as the relative pronouns in the previous verses (18.90d, 91d, 92c) do. *vṛttam* must be analyzed as accusative of a masculine noun. Perhaps for *vṛttam* read *bhrtyam*:

**c** . . . *so’pi yaṃ prāpya bhrityam* ["bhrityam" or "bhrtyam," Mr. Misra?]

**d** *kaṇṭhaḥ . . . āsvādām antas tatānaḥ*

"Even this king Kaṇṭha enjoyed in his heart (Bhīṣma’s poetry) after having him got [!] as his servant (court poet)" (p. 24).

Misra makes Mahākavi Bhīṣma a *bhrtya* (slave) of Kaṇṭha! And that too in an autobiographical narration by Bhīṣma himself! Words fail me when I try to describe how thoughtless a person can be. Bhīṣma was one of the most self-respecting poets in the world. It is Bhīṣma who said,

*Sarvasvam grhavarti Kuntalapatir* grhṇātu tan me punar
bhāṇḍāgaram akhaṇḍam eva hṛdaye jāgarti sārasvatam.
Re kṣudrās tyajata pramodam acirād esyanti manmandiram
helāndolitakarṇatālakarāṭiṣkandhādhirūḍhā śriyāḥ.

*Gurjarapatirityapi pāṭhaḥ*

And

*Nīlachatronmadagajaghaṭāpātram utrastacolāt
Cālukyendraḥ alabhata kṛtī yo’tra vidyāpatitvam.
Asminnāśīt tadānu nibṛdhasēṣahevaśakalī
vellabāḥuṅkaṇitaṭvalayaḥ santataṁ rājyalakṣmīḥ (18:101)*

To make such a great poet a servant (slave), even of a king like Kaṇṭha, 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 Bhīṣma by quoting the following eulogy:

*Vapur yām āvāsah ["yāmāvāsah"?] kucaparivṛtaś Cedinṛpatih
paribhrāntaḥ ratnākaraparidhir esā vasmātī.
Na muktvā rāmāṇāṁ padam iha śīroḥ nyasya ["śīroḥ nyasya"?] namitam
ekavīndrai rājendraṁ lalitam iyaṭī Bhīṣmaṅkathā.
[? *puryām āvāsah*, a suggested reading]
This verse raises many questions. It is not clear to me at all, but everything is clear to Misra. Nothing is obscure to him.

On p. 24 Misra asks us to make Bilhana a bhṛtya (slave) of Karna! I 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 "vyattam" (or "nūnam"?) here, but to suggest "bhṛtyam"--and that too for a self-respecting poet like Bilhana--is in the domain of only great critics like Misra! It cannot be described in words: Kathāpi khalu pāpānām alam ašreyase 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 Bilhana's order) demanded. So, to avoid repetition, we will try to discuss in the following section 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. añkura- m. 8. citraśālā- 15. mugdha
2. añc, añcaya [!] 9. cīnapiṣṭa 16. luṇṭh, luṭ(h), luṭh
3. ārya 10. nāgarakhaṇḍa 17. vah (+ ud)
4. kuc (+ sam) 11. pāthonidhi 18. vātāyana
5. kṛtakṣaṇa 12. pratiṣṭhā 19. vyākhya
6. keyūra 13. bhaṅgi/bhaṅgī 20. velā
7. carmacakṣus- 14. muktā 21. saṃsthita

I don't know how "velā" can follow "vyākhya!" However, I point this out with terrible trepidation because Misra claims to have mastered Library Science as well. He is a Doctor of Lib. Sci. too.

I fail to understand the full significance of these long, elaborate discussions. I 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 other certain words which are 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 kṣudranādīsamāgame
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 "vihita" is synonymous with "kṛta"), I don't know how number 4, kṛtā-īkṣaṇa- 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 nothing but \textit{vitaṇḍāvādaḥ}.

He says,

(1) \textit{aṅkura-} \textit{m.}

\textit{aṅkura-}, "a sprout, shoot", in the end of a compound:

a) \textit{ratnāṅkura-}, "a sproutlike jewel" (\textit{ratnam aṅkura iva}) = "a new/young jewel" = "a small jewel" (M.W. only from the Mṛcch.: 1.18; 12.3; 15.77; \textit{vyāghranakhā-} ṅkur \textit{a}-"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. H indi baghanāi/baghanahāi/baghanakhāī) (3.13).

Misra's footnote:

1. \textit{vyāghranakhāṅkura-} 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 beautiful English! In the company of his German gurus, Misra forgot his own English!] to obtain than for a common man.

b) \textit{radāṅkura-} \textit{dantāṅkura-} "sprout of the tooth/tusk" (\textit{radasya/dantasyāṅkuraḥ})- "tip of the tooth/tusk" (PW. and MW. only from Abhidhānaci. of Hemacandra, 297): 17. 50a \textit{radāṅkura} \textit{protam arātīdantinā} "pierced with the tip of its tooth/tusk by the enemy elephant"; 17.56 ... \textit{radāṅkurāḥ} ... tān muku esv 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 \textit{karīndradantāṅkuralkelekanībhīr alekhi ... vijaya-prāstātīḥ// "a victory inscription was written by the pens, which were the tips of the tusks of the elephants" (pp. 25-26).

"\textit{Aṅkura}" has many meanings, but here it is used in the sense of "beautiful, newly-appa red, fresh-cut." Students of Sanskrit literature know very well that poets use many words, es pecially in the end of compounds, which merely add to the beauty of the pre-ceding word. For example, "bāhulatā" or "bāhuvallī." There are many other words like "karikalabha" or "puṣpamālā" or "krpānalekhā." It is very difficult to translate such words into English. "Spr out-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 "\textit{latikā}," e.g., \textit{Pundrakeśulatikāś ca akaśire}. Here "\textit{latikā}" means "beauty in general" more than anything else.

* * *

Misra expounds:
4. Root kuc (+ sam)

*sam-kuc* means, in contradistinction to *vi-kuc*, "to open (like flower)" - "to close, to shrink, to shrink back." Thus in 1.66 . . . *te viṣṇuh pratiṣ heti vibhīṣaṇasya rāye paraṁ samkucitā 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.

I am not even sure if this is true! Maybe Misra has his own dictionaries; I did not find this word! Misra’s footnotes:

9. *param* obviously not used in the sense of *kevalam* (ed. ter., comm.) here. Cp. also
1.85; 2.30; 4.30; 7.19; 7.65; 15.72; *yadi param* [Ref.? Does Misra mean 18:99?] "if at all" (PW "wenn überhaupt"), [So Misra knows German too!]

10. Bilhana’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": "Introdt.," p. 26) cannot be accepted (p. 30).

I don’t know what Misra means by "Ceylon"; Siṃhala or Laṅkā? If he means Siṃhala, the

Tadbhayāt Siṃhaladvīpa-bhūpatiḥ śaraṇāgataḥ.
Viśaśrāmāśramapade Lopaṃudrāpater muneh (4:20).

Note the following as well:

Āpāṇḍupāṇḍyam ālola-colam ākṛantasiṃhalam (4:45).

Siṃhala and Laṅkā are not accepted as being positively identical. (*Siṃhalalṅketyaṣṭopa-dv Ṣpadipite--we recite in Sankalpa daily*)

Misra overrules Bh as far as the meaning of "*param*" is concerned. He says that the

word cannot mean "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 were not sufficient to inform his readers, he adds some German words: "*wenn überhaupt."

5. *kṛtakṣaṇa-*

*kṛtakṣaṇa-* lit. "having made the leisure" is used in the sense of "having taken the time to learn" [nonsense]: (II) 7.36 kramaḥ 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; *pracchādanārthaṃ vihitak
śaṇaḥ, "he who had taken the time to learn, to conceal (his feelings)", Cp. MW. s.v. ["Candrikā" says "nirvāyapārasthitī." J gloss vatkaver 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!"

"Lipiṃṇānakṛtakṣaṇasya" may mean "one who has devoted time to learn the riting," but "lipikṛtakṣaṇasya" by itself can hardly mean "learning."

"Kṣaṇa" means, according to Amara, "nirvāyapārasthitau kālaviśeṣotsavayoh kṣaṇaḥ. " Has Misra seen this?

In "kṛtakṣaṇam kṣudranadīṣamāgame," there is no learning process at all! Here "kṣaṇa" = utsava, festivity, enjoyment, etc. The same is true of "vihitsaṇa." 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 makes a mountain out of a mole-hill. He assumes certa in 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 mani-f est", which seems rather a rare use (not properly recorded in lexica). Thus in

1.4 ekas stanaḥ\(^{48}\). .

. . . . . . . . . .

yasyaḥ priyārthaḥstitim udvahantyāḥ
sā pātu vaḥ parvatarājaputrī/

"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 *udv ahantyāḥ* as equivalent to *dhārayantyāḥ* "carrying" allegeddly [sic] showing Bilhana to be a śākta has no cogency\(^{49}\). Bilhana has used *ud-vah* in the non-figurative s
sense of "carrying" in 12:48 . . . asyodvahataḥ karāhbe . . . ambhoruhiṇīpalāśam "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 1.9 I bibhrat and 11.37 bhāji are replaceable [sic, should be "replaceable"] by the corresponding forms of ud-vah (47-48).

Misra’s footnotes:


This is not any systematic, consciously executed orthography. It is a simple case of mis-understanding. If I had resorted to report such irregularities of B and R, my ed. would have been inflated ten times! It is silly even to discuss such matters.

49. Śiva and Pārvatī are sometimes united in the form of a single androgynous deity. The right hand [?] side of the divinity represents Śiva and the left Pārvatī. It is Śiva, ardhanārī "half women" [!] and half īśa '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 (dhammilla). Cp. e.g. the figure of Ardhanārīśvara of Mahabalipuram, 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 Smk. 1.1 1, ascribed to Bilhaṇa (pp. 47-48).

Lexicographers follow the literature, not the other way around. Otherwise, we would not have the sayings like "nirāṅkuśāḥ kavyaḥ." Even the grammar does not precede the literature.

According to MW, "ud-vah" also means "to bear up, lift up, elevate, wear (clothes, etc.); to have, possess, show." Misra cites the following uses of "ud-vah" by Bilhaṇa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Phrase</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>samudvahannunmatam aṃsakūṭam</td>
<td>1:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padātivratam udvahāmi</td>
<td>3:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manyupāṅkakaluṣaṃ samudvahan bhrāṛduścaritacintanān manaḥ</td>
<td>5:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yatra tiṣṭhati virodham udvahan dāhataḥ prabṛhti tejāsā saha</td>
<td>5:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urvīpatēḥ pārvanacandravaktrā samudvahantī ṛḍaye nivāsam.</td>
<td>9:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tantukṛṣām vahantyāḥ</td>
<td>9:32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
puṣpānjalikṣepam ivodvahanti 10:23
samudvahantyos tad athāyatākṣi-
dolāvilolānamārgasakhyam 10:36
himaṇ śīlībhūtam ivodvahanti 12:50
mānase kaluṣatām samudvahan 14:47

It is just possible that "ud-vah" might have been used on several occasions in the sense of "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:

Ekaḥ stanasa tuṅgatarāḥ parasya vārtām iva praśṭum agān mukhāgram.
Yasyaḥ priyārdhasthitim udvahantyaḥ sā pātu vaḥ parvatarājaputṛ (1:4).

Note: Misra's text reads "priyārdhahsthitim."

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 "udvah." That is all. Apte gives "standing" as the first meaning of the word "sthitī," and Misra runs away with it. He does not go beyond the first meaning. This word has many meanings that are more profound than "standing." It means "continuance in one state," "steady application or devotion," "stability," "permanence," "perpetuation," "continuance," "high station or rank," "preservation," etc.

If a person "wears" or "possesses" an object, he is bound to "exhibit" it, provided it can come into direct contact with the eyes of a perceiver. People "wear" perfume too. Even that is felt, if not by caksurindriya, then by grhaṇendriya. Therefore, "exhibit" is the effect rather than the cause. The cause is to "wear" or "possess."

It is unfortunate that Misra does not understand "Caritacandrikā" and blames it un-justifiably. He misleads his readers without quoting the "Caritacandrikā" in its original for mat. My text does not explain the word "udvahantyāḥ" at all. It merely explains the compound word "priyārdhasthitim" in the following way: "Priyasya ardhanārtīśvarasya Śivasya ardhe śvīye daksinānge 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 scholarshi p. Kathāpi khalu pāpānām alam aśreyase yataḥ. I 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 the N text means that "Pārvatī is carrying Śiva in her half," he is sadly mistaken. Misra does not know the true meaning of my words at all. I am reminded of his famous prayer once again: Ajñānāndhasya lokasya.

Let us see what Bh says:

Priyasya Śivasyārdhasthitimardhe svadakṣināṅge sthitimudvantyāḥ dhārayantyāḥ.

Now Bh puts his own interpretation into the mouth of Bilhaṇa and concludes,

Tantraśastradrṣṭyā Pārvatīyā ādyāśaktitvena grahaṇam kavisammtatāṃ pratibhāti.

He cites a beautiful stuti from Ānandasāgarastava of Śrīnīlakaṇṭhadīksīta:

Ardhaṃ striyas tribhuvane sacarācare'smin
ardhaṃ puṃāmsa iti dārāyitum bhavatī.  
Strī [!] puṃsalakṣaṇam idam vapur āḍṛtam yat
tenāsi devi viditā trijagaccharīrā.

Whether Bilhaṇa was a śākta or not, Bh certainly shows his bias. Well, there is nothing wrong in that. That is his interpretation. Whether 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, "Ś ā pāṭu vaḥ Parvatarājaputrī." To begin with, he offers his prayers to Lord Viṣṇu, manifest in the form Kamsaripu, i.e., Śrīkṛṣṇa. Then he offers his homage to Lord Śeṣaśāyīn. 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 Gaṇeśa, 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 Kamsaripu may protect the readers. Then he prays that Bhagavān Mukunda may bring prosperity to the readers. And then comes vakaṣṭhālī of Garuḍadhvaja. In the fourth verse we find Bilhaṇa making a direct reference to Parvatarājaputrī and praying that she will protect the readers. Nandaka (the sword) is directly mentioned thereafter, and the poet wishes it to give deep pleasure to his readers. In the sixth verse Śiva is worshiped; not directly, but through his praṇā māḥ, which are said to be above all, sarvotkārṣenā varante. Next comes Sarasvatī. Bilhaṇa prays that she be pleased with the readers. Even Gaṇeśa is worshiped indirectly, but through his karaśṭikarāṇāṃ vikṣepalīlā, the playful scattering (sprinkling) of the drops of water through the trunk. So Bilhaṇa demonstrates his own praṇāḍhi, his own special vicchitti and vyuttattī. By saluting one deity in a particular manner, he does not become a śākta, śaiva, or vaiṣṇava. He did not ask our Abhinava-Bilhaṇa Misra to protect him from being branded as śākta. If at all, he was more inclined toward Śaivism, which flourished so pervasively
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in Kashmir, the home of Bilhana. Let us finish this discussion with the concluding words of Bilhana:

Yasya svacchāsabaracaritālokanatrasrayeva
nyastaç caudāsikālkāyā kvāpi dure kuraṅgaḥ.
Sa vyutpattim sukavivacanesvādikartā śrutiṃäm
devaḥ preyaṃ acaladuhitir niścalam vah karotu [stress added].

I pray that God will 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 caladuhitih preyaṃ," the lover of the daughter of the Himalayas; i.e., Saṅkara! Saṅkara does not come directly but through "acaladuhitī." Let us pay special attention to the words "acala" in "acaladuhitī," and "niścalām" as an adjective of "vyutpattim." Recall the very early reference to this word in the verse

Vyutpattir āvarjitakovidāpi na raṅjanāya kramate jaḍāṇām.
Na mauktikacchidrakarī śalaṅkā praghabhate karmanī taṅkikāyāḥ.

What is "vyutpattīḥ"? "Vyutpattīḥ" is "development, perfection, growth (esp. in knowledge or proficiency 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 pratya-y a. We have the expressions like "avyutpamaprātipadika."

So, until and unless one has been blessed with "sukavivacanesu vyutpattim," one should not indulge in commenting upon great works such as the Vikramāṅkadevacarita of Mahā-kavi Bilhana. One should first acquire this "sukavivacanesu vyutpattim" by becoming an antevasin of a worthy guru and acquire the qualities of vinayā and jijnāsā.

I am not sure if Mśra has seen the Kāvyaprapāsa, the immortal work of Mammaṭa. Mammaṭa gives hetuḥ (kāraṇam) of kāvyam:

Śaktir nipuṇata loka-śastrakāvyādyavekṣaṇāt.
Kāvyajñāsikṣayābhyaśa iti hetus tadubbhave.

This "nipuṇata" is identical with "vyutpattī." Mammaṭa says:

Lokasya sthāvarajaṅgamātmakavṛttasya. Śastraṅgam chandovyākaraṇābhidhāna- k oṣa-kalācaturvargagaṭuraṅgahdgadākṣaṇagranthānām. Kāvyāṅgām ca mahā-k avisam bandhinām. Ādigrahanād itihāsādīnām ca vimarṣānād vyutpattī.

Let us turn our attention to another demonstration of scholarship by Misra. He acts like a dictator of the interpretation of literature. 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 is to be used not only in the sense of gavākṣa- but as a design-nation 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
vātāyanaiḥ kelivimānakalpaś tavāstu kāñcī nayanotsavāya.

"May Kāñcī be to the feast of your eyes by its balconies which are like pleasure vi mānas."

Cp. also: 12.21, 27; 17.10, 30, 32, 60; 18.4,9,25. 30; Karnaśu. 1.22 (pp. 48-49).

Misra's footnotes:

50. Kathās. 95.18 svagrhottuṁgavātāyanagataḥ 'staying on the lofty roof of the house'; ibid. 103.16 harmyavātāyanārdhāḥ "having climbed on the roof of the palace" [like a monkey, isn't it Mister . . . er . . . Doctor Misra?] (cp. also Hcar. 4 para. 7 . . sa rājā . . . harm[y?]asya prṣṭhe susvāpā "that king slept on the roof of the palace"). Tawney's explanation of vātāyana by 'window' for these passages in Kathās., is shown n [by whom?] to be wrong by the context. [Misra translates vātāyana as "roof" in all these passages. To me 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 Bārhut ["Bharhut"?], Sāñcī, Mathura etc. Young women, crowing 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 Bānabh[a?]ṭṭa's Hcar., in which queen Yaśovarī 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, I would like to submit the following: "Vātāyana is invariably glossed in ed. sec. and reproduced [!] in ed. ter. by gavākṣa" because Amarasimha has ordained that way in his Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam, "Vātāyanaṃ gavākṣah." But there is nothing wrong in it. "Vātāyanaṃ" is "gavākṣah" and "g avākṣah" is "vātāyanaṃ." They are interchangeable words. They are paryāya (synonymus) 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 a hexagonal, octagonal, etc. window?

Misra gives the vyutpatti of "vātāyanaṃ" by the words "vātasya ayanam yena" or "ya tra," but he does not explain the word "gavākṣa" by the same methodology.

Let us see how Rāmāśramī explains "gavākṣa": "Gavām aksīva . . . gāvo jalāni kiraṇa vā aksanti vyāpnuvantī 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 I want to make is this: Both words have exactly the same meaning—an open space (as opposed to a room), which is closed by four walls through which neither air nor water could enter in or penetrate. Misra has not given any documentary evidence to prove that "gavākṣa" is a ROUND WINDOW. That is all.

* * *

Misra is once again a plagiarist here:

19. vyākhyā-

vyākhyā- "interpretation" is obvious in 18.4b and 78b. In 18.79c Mahābhāṣya-vyākhya yā-, 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 me too? If so, then he is not speaking the whole truth.

18.79cd
mahābhāṣyavāyākhyām akhilajananavandyaṃ vidadhataḥ
sadā yasya cchātrais tilakitam abhūt prāṇaṇam api//

"[Jyeṣṭhakalaśa] 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 for
mer occurrences, [!] is more likely in above stanza. Moreover, no commentary on the Mahābhāṣya by Jyeṣṭhakalāśa is known or mentioned elsewhere (pp. 49-50).

Here is what I had stated 35 years ago (1943):

Mahābhāṣyavyākhyām. . . . prāṅgam api, iti kaver uktim 'Jyeṣṭhakalaśo mahābhāṣyaṭīkām kāñcana praṇīnāya' iti vyākhyātavān Dā. Byuhlaramahodayaḥ. Iyam tīkā kvacanāpi nopalabhyate nāpi ca nirdiśyata iti tena pratapādi. Sarvam et ad asaṅgatam. Jyeṣṭhakalāśaḥ kām api tīkām na praṇītavān iti vastushītiḥ. Sa hi mahābhāṣyasya vyākhyāyām (vyākhyāne'dhyāpane vā) kuśalo'bhavad ityeva kaver āsayaḥ. Kāśmīreśvanēkāni vyākhyāsthānānyāsan Kāśmīrikā vidvāmsaś ca vyākh yākuśalā āśaniti kavinā'nyatrāpi sthānadvaye (aśṭā. 4; aśṭā. 78) pratapādi. Kave ḥ prāguktoktau tīkānimānaparakatayā pratipannāyām chātraṇām nirdeśo na saṅga cchate. Kīnca 'kṛtavataḥ' iti padenaiva tātparyāvabodhe sukare varta-mānakālapra yogo mudhaiva syāt (Upodghāta, p. 11).

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 deed, Bilhana would not have said,

Sāhityapāthonidhimanthanottham karṇāṁṛtam rakṣata he kavīndrāḥ. Yadasya daityā iva luṇṭhanāya kāvyārthacaurāḥ praguṇīḥbhavanti (1:11).

Before I leave this topic I would like to point out that Misra's attempt to interpret "a pi" to mean the "smallness" of the room (causing the overflow of students) is uncalled for. It is not necessary to imagine that the "room" in which Jyeṣṭhakalāśa taught Mahā-bhāṣya was so small that the students had to stand in the courtyard! I don't believe either that there were so many students--that the crowd was so large--that they overflowed the room. I believe that "prāṅgam" here stands in contradistinction to the vyākhyāsthānāni, which were more or less "public" places, while the house of Jyeṣṭhakalāśa was his own home, a private residence. Misra's "vyākhya" is far-fetched.

* * *

Misra continues his learned exposition:

20. velā

velā- is explained by ta a "shore" edd. ter. and sec. [why is the order changed here?] on verse 9.7, which is hardly correct;

śrīgāraraṅgārakaravelaya eva tayā praveśe vihite taraṇyā/ navānurāgeṇa manas tadīyam 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 joined [!] 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:

samucchalantā 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 abdhya-ambuṃkritau velā kālamaryādayor api.

velā- prefixed with ud (= udvēla-) in 8.52 and 10.70 is used in the sense of "limit-less s" (pp. 50-51).

Misra declares emphatically that "velā originally means 'tide, flow.'" I 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-ta a" too. Here is Apte: "Velā [=] Time, Season, Opportunity, Interval of repose, Leisure, Tide, Flow, Current, Sea-coast, Sea-shore, [ex. Velānilāya prasṛtā bhujāṅgāḥ; Sa velā- vapravala yāṁ (urvīm)], Limit, Boundary, 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 a similar expression: "Samudravelā rati-ratnasampan dāṁ" (Vik. 2:21). The "tide" or "flow, unless it reaches the shore and washes the red gems on it, cannot be coloured and cannot colour any other object.

In other words, the jewels are strewn or found scattered along the shore after the tide has ebbed, i.e., receded. After the jewels are washed ashore and collected, the tide does not have to stay there. The jewels are seen on the shore after the water recedes; so we are more concerned here with the shore, rather than the tide! Compare also

Yāṁ vīkṣya pāthodhir adhijyacāpam śoṇāśmabhīḥ śoṇītaśoṇadehāih.
Kṣobhād abhīksṇam raṅgurājābāna-jīrṇavraṅṣaśpōtam ivācacakṣē (1:109).

Thus, through the maxim of "sthālipulāka," I have shown that Misra's arguments and statements leave much to be desired. Now I will pass on to his third chapter to further show his true color.
CHAPTER III
SECONDARY SOURCE MATERIAL
RELATING TO VIKRAMĀṆKĀDEVACARITA

In this "Chapter III: Secondary Source Material Relating to Vikramāṇkadeva carita 
" 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 fro 
m Smk-, which reads talpeṣu (accordingly edd. sec. and ter. against Bühler's vistirṇa 
-) (p. 62).

This is a misrepresentation of facts and distortion of truth. A cruel criminal takes others too 
to be criminals. It is lokapravaṇcanam, and not ślokavivecanam. It is all cheating and lyin 
g. I did not use any secondary source to fill the lacunae caused by Bühler's errors in transcr 
cribing J. I went straight to J and found the correct and complete, true and exact readings still 
preserved there. See my comments on "Gaurīvibrhamadhpadhāna" (Vik. 16:51).

It seems Misra did not read "the sigla and abbreviation" (expression borrowed from 
Misra, p. 126) that I used in my "Prastāvanā" on p. 2. (Kāvyamūlasaṃśodhanopayoginām p 
ustakānām "sāṅketaikacihnaivivaranaṣasahitah paricayah").

The bottom of page 175, fn no. 4 of N, reads "dareṣu tūla- Pra." Now this "Pra" (= 
Pra. Pustakam) has been described on p. 2 of the "Prastāvanā" thus:

Punyapattanasthabhāṇḍarākapraṇađaņaśaṇaśaṃsthāyah (Bhandarkar Oriental R 
search Institute, Poona) adhigataṃ pustakam idam Ā. Byuhlara-Yākobi (Drs. Bū 
hler and Jacobi) Mahodayābhyaṃ 1874 I. vatsare svahastalikhitā Ja. pustaka-pratil 
ipiḥ.

Maybe Misra did not read this, but if he read and understood it, the conclusion is irresistible 
that he is not honest. I don't know what Misra means by "our" MS. The omission was gene 
rated by "P" and not by J! Now P is not J! So Drs. Bühler and Jacobi are responsible for th 
is 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 to me by J as early as 1941 wh 
en I toiled in Jaisalmer and compared his "copy" with the original J MS. To bring in "ed. te 
r." is uncalled for, because Bh is merely a copier.

Let us see, once again, Misra's power of perception. "Gaṇḍe maṇḍanaṁ ātmanaiva 
kurute" (8:82) is cited by Saduktikarnāṁra (Calcutta, 1965, p. 137) as no. 506 under sectio 
7 Pragalbhā, but the compiler Śrīdhāradāsa puts it as anonymous kasyacit!

The very next verse in Saduktikarnāṁra is "Dolāyām jaghanasthalena," which is V 
ik, 8:86. This is correctly ascribed to Bilhana by the statement "Bilhaṇasya." Thus it can b
e 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 _Bilhaṇa nāmagrāham_ (by name)?

Let us study another instance:


Niśāsu yatra pratibimbavartmanā samāgataś cārūḍrāś niśākaraḥ. Vilāsadalāyitakunḍalāhataḥ kāpolalāvāṇyajale nimajjati.

_Bilhaṇasya (Vik.17:34)_

The above verse is not listed by the editor of _Śmk_ as one of the compositions of Bilhaṇa !] although the text on p. 378 clearly says "_Bilhaṇasyaitau_." The dual number refers to the earlier verse "_Sthitā [stu]_" or "_Sthitāsū_" which is _Śmk_. 107:8 and _Vik_. 17:33. Therefore, this omission seems very strange because after the second verse there is the clear statement "_Bilhaṇasyaitau_." Although Misra does list this 17:34 verse in his "Concordance" on page 67, he does not include it in his discussion in the chapter entitled "Secondary Source Materials 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 _Śmk_ 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 kavīnāṃ
01:18 Jaḍeṣu jātapratibhābhīmāṇāḥ
01:26 Pṛthvīpateḥ santi na yasya pārśve
01:27 Laṅkāpateḥ saṅkucitaṃ yaśo yad
01:29 Karṇāṁrtaṃ süktirasam 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). Bilhaṇa is remembered as a poet and not as a biographer of Vikramāditya although he composed _Vikramāditya's Carita_. This is in response to those critics who blame him for having composed a _carita mahākāvyya_ and for his having followed the _kavimārga_.
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07:05  Kṛtaprakopāḥ pavanāśanānām
07:20  Saundaryam indīvaralocanānām
07:22  Prasārya pāda u vihitasthitīnām
07:23  Unnamya dūram muhur ānāmantyaḥ
07:63  Mānagrathikadarthanāya kathitāḥ
07:64  Līlāsnānavidhikṣamaṇ madhulīhām
07:70  Malayagirisamīrāḥ Śiṃhaladvīpa
07:71  Pānīyam nālikēphalakuhaṇa
07:76  Yaś cūtāṅkurakandalīkavalanāt
08:06  Tasyāḥ pādanakhaśreṇīḥ
08:08  Amūlyasya mama svarṇa
08:10  Jāgrataḥ kamalaḷ lakṣmīm
08:14  Hemamaṇjiṛamālābhyaṁ
08:16  Manye tadūrū samēbhāvya
08:21  Tannitambasya nindanti
08:25  Bhāti romāvalī tasyāḥ
08:30  Manye samēptalēvanyā
08:37  Daridram udaram drśtvā
08:47  Mukhenducandrikāpūra
08:48  Tatkucau carataḥ kiṃcinc
08:51  Ayām trayāṇām grāmāṇām
08:60  Āṅgulībhīḥ kuraṅgākṣyāḥ
08:62  Haste cakāti bālāyāḥ
Sarale eva dorlekhe

Bāhū tasyāḥ kucābhoga

Bhāti dantacchadenāsyāḥ

Purāṇabāṇatyāgāya

Mrgīsambandhinī dṛṣṭir

Saundaryapātre vaktrendau

Kiṅcit savibhramodaṅci

Gaṅde maṅdanam ātmanaiva

Dṛśoḥ sīmāvādaḥ śravaṇa

Dolāyām jagnhasṭhalena

Lāsyābhīsamiśeṇa citram

Vaktram nirmalam uṇnatā

Asaṅkhyapuspo'pi manobhavasya

Atādayat pallaśapāṅinaikām

Svedāṁbhasā puṣparajbharaiś ca

Dattaṁ sarbhyaḥ phalam

Kimapyaṇjañātasarorubebhyaḥ

Bhānumān aparadyvanītyāḥ

Yāḥ sainye smarārthivasya

Ye kuṇṭhīkṛtavallabhapraṇatayaḥ

Raveḥ samastakṣitimadhyagam

Drśam prapāpālikayā prakāśite

Adabhram abhropalapaṭṭakesu ye
13:80  Nayasva pāraṃ pulinadvayānugām
13:88  Vidyutpaṅkajakhaṇḍapanaṅkapaṭalī
c
14:32  Nīlanṛadanicolakojhitē
c
14:37  Kṣunṇamauktikaparāgappāṇḍuraḥ
c
16:02  Śaratkālātapaklānta
c
16:08  Alabhanta nabhaṅkṣetre
c
16:09  Saśaṅkeneva Kandarpa
c
16:10  Abhūvannadbhutośmānaḥ
c
16:14  Madvairīṇah kaṭhorāṃśor
c
16:15  Samakṣam api sūryasya
c
16:44  Svecchāvihārarasikasya
c
16:49  Aṅgārahāsiṣu vilāṣagrhodareṣu
c
16:51  Gaurīvibhramadhpadhūma
c
16:52  Sprṣṭāḥ stokam Vitastātaṭa
c
17:11  Ahaṃ sadā prāṇasamam
c
17:12  Narendraṃkārakaṃrubhṣaṇa
c
17:33  Sthitāstu yatroparibhūmi
c
17:34  Niśāsu yatra pratibimba
c
18:06  Svecchābhāṅgurabhāgyamegha
c
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>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 07 | 09 |
| 08 | 26 |
| 10 | 05 |
| 11 | 03 |
| 13 | 06 |
| 14 | 02 |
| 16 | 10 |
| 17 | 04 |
| 18 | 02 |

Cantoes disregarded by anthologists: 2-6, 9, 12, 15 = 8.

It is to be noted that Misra overlooks the Alaṅkāraratnākara by Śobhākaramitra, which cites many verses from Bilhaṇa. All the above dambāra on the part of Misra is more of a padding rather than real kāmini-kucakalaśau!
CHAPTER IV

VERSES ASCRIBED TO BILHAṆA IN ANTHOLOGIES

In Chapter IV Misra discusses "Verses Ascribed to BilhaṆa in Anthologies." He begins with this verse:

atrākaṇṭham viluṭha salile nirjalā bhūḥ purastāj
jahyāḥ śoṣaṃ vadanav[ni?]hitenāmalayāḥ phalena/
sthāne sthāne tad iti pathikastrījana[h] klāntagātrīṁ
paśyan sītām kim u na kṛpayā vardhito roditaś ca/

Smk. 90.19: Karuṇapaddhatiḥ: BilhaṆasya.

Misra's comments:

(d) vardhito roditas ca "gladdened (comforted) and made to weep": the wives of the travellers are comforted by their compassion (kṛpā) because they realize that there is a woman even more unhappy than themselves [nonsense]. 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 me! All the pathika-strījanas were not unlucky, destitute, or distressed. And who says Sītā was unhappy? Read what she says in Vālmīki (Ayodhyākanda, sargas 27-30):

Udbhavasthitisamhāra-kāriṇīṁ kleśahāriṇīṁ.
Sarvaśreyaskarīṁ Sītāṁ nato'haṁ Rāmavallabhām.
Ādyā, Jaganmātā, Jagachchaktiḥ Devayajanāsambhavā. . . .

Viśvambharā bhagavatī bhavatīṁ asūta
Rājā prajāpastiṣam Janakaḥ pītā te.
Teṣām vadhūs tvam asi nandini pārthivānāṁ
yeśā kule ca savitā ca gurur vayam ca.

It is a horrible insult to that Divine Lady Jaganmātā Sītā to say that she was so unhappy that the women passing by would take pity on her and regard themselves more lucky! Further more, I don't know how Misra gets the meaning "gladdened (comforted)" by the word vardhito! My interpretation is that the other women were gladdened (= happy) because they were able to have the divine darśana 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 long stretch of terrain where there was no water.

* * *
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MISRA'S POWER OF PERCEPTION (OR DECEPTION)

Regarding the verse

32
dhapraśītaḏrīṣṭamukhendu-
dvīṭyakhaṇḍārdham ivāgato yah/
avāptukāmahaḥ pariṇabhāvam
sa pātu vah Śambhujacarṇḍhacandraḥ///

Smk. 2.52: āśīrvedapaddhatih: 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. Urged by his arrogance, he suggests an emendation on 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), that 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 *kaviṭābhīvyajītaṁ kaviṭā paryam*, it may be helpful to refer to another verse by the same poet, our great poet Maḥākavi Bilhaṇa.

Ekaḥ stanas tuṅgataraḥ parasya vāṛttām iva praṣṭum agān mukhāgram.
Yasyāḥ priyārdhashthim udvahantyāḥ sā pātu vah parvataraṇaḥputrī (1:4).

In "Dehapriviṣ adrisutā..." the poet describes the moment of the immortal union of Śiva with Pārvatī and the emergence of the Lord Ardhanaṁśvara. (See Misra's fn. no. 49 on p. 48.) Śiva gives half of his body to Pārvatī, or half of Pārvatī's body merges with 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 merges with that (face) of Śiva. These are the facts. Now the poet displays his *kaviṭā-camatkāra-cāturī* . He says that the half moon (crescent), seen in Śiva's *ja ā* (formation of hair) has come to secure the half moon of Pārvatī's face (which has now merged with Śiva's face) in order that it (i.e., Śiva's half moon) could become a full moon! This is the meaning.

Yaḥ Śambhuja ārdhacandraḥ, pariṇabhāvam avāptukāmahaḥ iva, dehapraviṣ ādri- s utāmukhendu- dvīṭyakhaṇḍārdham āgataḥ saḥ vah pātu.

The verse is not very clear as it stands. I have purposely kept it as it appears in the doctoral dissertation of Mr. Misra. The problem is created by the two words "khaṇḍa" and "ard
"ha" which are (almost) synonymous. "Ja ārdhacandraḥ āgataḥ" is clear. But where? Why? So Misra suggests that we read "mukhendum" instead of "mukhendu," thus making "deha praviṣ ādrisutāmukhendum" (acc.) and "dvitiyakhaṇḍārdham"-samānādhikaraṇa-as one and the same object. The question is, whose deha? Whose body? Where did the full-moon of Adrisutā go? Wherein did it disappear? Whereinto did it become merged? Where did the ja ārdhacandra go? To whom did it go? To Adrisutā? 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 ārdhacandra (of Śiva) goes to Pārvatī's half moon to get it. If Pārvatī gives all that is left with her now, what will she have? Can she give the remaining half too? Is the ja ārdhacandra justified in expecting Pārvatī to give up even the second 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 proved one more time here that he is not yet an adhikārin. I believe that changing "mukhendu" into "mukhendum" will only confirm the age-old saying, "Bhakṣeṇaś’ti laśune na śaṁto vyādhil, or "Vināyakaḥ prakurvāṇa racayāmaśa vānaram." Instead, we should change "ardham" (half) into "arthaḥ" (prayajanāya) in order to obtain—or for the purpose of obtaining—the second half of the full-face moon of Adrisutā, the half which has merged into the body of Śiva! The ja ārdhacandra comes to Śiva and not to Pārvatī! 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' or 'for the sake of'. . . . It mostly occurs in this sense as 'arthaḥ' as the last member of compounds and has an ad verbal force--kimartham. . . ." For what purpose? Why? For whom, or for what?

Here are some examples:

Taddarśanād abhūc chambhor bhūyān dārārtham ādaraḥ.

(Kumārasambhaave)

And here is our own poet:

Pratyaśagacchati langhanārtham asakṛd vyomāṅgaṇaḥ candramāḥ (8:83.2).

I had conjectured "arthaḥ" in early fifties, while still in India. I was copying all the verses of Bhāṣaṇa occurring in the Sūktaṁkāvalī. I had thought even at that time that the reading ought to be "arthaḥ" and not "ardham."

* * *

LIMITS OF MISRA'S LITTLE KNOWLEDGE
33
dehārdham kuru pārvati sthirapadāṃ [haste] dhanur dhāraya
svedārdram yadi mṛjyatām karatalaṃ bhasmāṅgarāgeṇa me/
evaṃ jalpata eva bānaśikhini proḍīya śīnjāpani-
vāśaiḥ prajvalite pureṣu jayati smeraṃ purārer mukham//

Smk. 1.11: Namākṛapaddaṭhi [sic]; Bilhaṇasya. c) śīnjā- as "bow string" (rare use)
e 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 "śīnjā-" as "bow string" Misra says that it is a "rare use." I don't agree.

Amarakośa Rāmāśramī says on "śīnjini," "maurvi jyā śīnjini guṇah" (2:8.85). Śīnte,
śijī avyakte śabde (a.ä. se.) Āvaśyake ṇiniḥ (3.3. 170). Misra himself has given three examples:

1) śīnjācālanācaṇcaśrutigalattādaṅkapatraḥ smaraḥ (8:89)
2) pañcabāpanakdoṇḍaśīnjāghanagarjiteṣu (9:1)
3) śīnjāpi jātā na manobhavasya (9.32)

Nevertheless, he calls the use "rare." I 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 Ardhanāṛiśvara.

*      *      *

MISRA NOTICES KĀVYĀRTHACAURYA

34
drāghīyasā dhārṣṭyagunena yuktāḥ
kaiḥ kair apūrvaiḥ parakāvyakhaṇḍaiḥ/
ādambaraṃ ye vasasāṃ vahanti
te ke'pi kanthākavayo jayanti”//

Śp. 193: Kukavinindā; Bilhaṇasya. Smk. 5.1: idem; Kṣemendrasya (not attested).

Verses denouncing plagiarists (kāvyacaura) in Vcar. 1.11, 18 (p. 79).

The edn. of Smk. has "kair apyapūrvaih." What about apūṛṇaiḥ? I don't know wher
efrom Misra gets his reading. Probably from Śp.
Once again Misra betrays his lack of knowledge:

35

dhate drśtim adhīta[ra?]vibhramalavām sā puspalāvijāne
caitrasya kṣaṇa[ya?]m ādareṇa mahatā mauhūrtikān pṛcchati/
śyenā[?] tuṣyati kokiladhvaniraṇā saṃtyājya (?) līlāśukān
niḥśokā tvayi durlābhe kim ā[?]?pārām śā[?]kym varākyā tayā//

I have refitted the text here based on 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: nāyakasyaṅgre dātyuktih; Bilhaṇasya!)

Misra comments,

c) tuṣyati here with the abl. of starting point[?]

d) For niḥśoka [!]--read niḥśuka-- "O merciless one!" [? Remember his text has "ni ḍokā."/ because of her wrath with [on?] the kokilas "she is contented on account of [!] the falcon"; varāka/- fem. varāki- in the sense of miserable, to be pitied"; Vcar. 1
.18, 98; 8.46: 11.9 (-Ī), 65 (-Ī); vārāki- in the sense of "miserable, wretched, of vile b ehaviour": Vcar. 6.35; Karnasu. 1.11 (p. 79).

I don't believe Misra has understood the meaning of this verse. It seems he is now totally ti red. There are many errors in his text. There are many points where there is chandobhaṅg a. Do we read "adhīra" for "adhīta"? "Saṃtyājya" (second long) is wrong. There is chando bhaṅga too, when the last letter (which will be the 15th) of the word ("saṃtyājya") is read a s long. The reading can be "saṃtyajya." (Later on I found --in the original Smk.--that it is "saṃtyajya"). Even that is not appropriate as far as the meaning is concerned. I remember having read "sanṭarjiya," meaning "having chased them away." Or is it my kalpanā only? Probably līlāśukas were copying the melodic tunes of the kokilas. So she drove them aw ay, and now she is pleased with the falcon because it does not imitate the kokilas. Misra h as "śyenā[t]tuṣyati." Smk. has "śyenā[t]tuṣyati", so the pañcamī vibhakti is not the original, but only conjectural. Misra explains, "(c) tuṣyati here with the abl. of starting point." Dhr uvaṁ apāye'pādānam. I can't find any "starting point" (dhruvā) here! There is nothing like aśvāt paṭati or grāmād āyāti. Misra himself translates the phrase as "on account of" [line 3 in (d)]. I believe this is hetvarthe pañcamī.

Here is a relevant saduktī from our own poet:

Līlāśukāḥ kokilakūjītāṁ atipraharsād vihitānukārah.
Grāhād adhāvyanta viyoginībhir guṇo hi kāle guninām guṇāya (7:32).

Guṇo hi doṣāya bhavet kadācit [alternative reading of MS. A].
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"Nihšokā" seems to be wrong. "Nihšoka" = "free from (devoid of) sorrow or care." "Nihšoka," an address to the nāyaka, would be quite appropriate; i.e., he does not care what happens to his (beloved) lady, who is pining so intensely for him!

I have never heard of "niḥsūka"! Of course, the dictionary gives the meaning as copied by Misra, but why change anything when "niḥsoka" makes perfect sense, or even better sense?

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) instead of "āpārām"! It is "śakyam," and not "śākyam" (which is what Misra has).

"Kṣaṇam" does not make any sense here! Of course, Misra does not care; he is niḥsoka! He does not understand the poet anyway! "Kṣayam" would be more appropriate. When will the month of Caitra (the destructive season) end? Mark those who are asked: Mauhūrtikān precchati! It is to be remembered that we have a dvikarmaka dhātu here. Mauhūrtikān kṣayam precchati. Unfortunately, Smk. too has "kṣaṇam."

* * *

Misra has little regard for the science of prosody. Let us see what he says on the following verse:

36
dhik tvām re kalikāla yāhi vilayam [!] viparyastatā
hā kaṣṭam śrutiśalinām vyavahṛtīr mlecchocitā dṛṣyate/
ekair vāṁmayadevatā bhagavatī vikretum ānīyate
niḥśaṅkair aparaiḥ parīkṣaṇavidhau sarvāṅgam udghātyate//

Śp. 194. kukavinindā: Bilhanaṣya. Smk. 5.2: idem. Ralhaṇasya. In Bhand. rep. (p. xxxiii) the verse is ascribed to Bilhaṇa.

In anthologies there is often confusion in ascribing verses to Bilhaṇa or to Ralhaṇa [!]. Thus Śp. 913; 988, are ascribed to Ralhaṇa by most, but to Bilhaṇa by some MS S,^5 and by Br̥hacchārṇgadharapaddhati^6 (p. 80).

The footnotes are given as follows:

5. ZDMG 27, 1876, p.56


The above verse is an aṅkaravṛttaṃ, called Śārdūlavikṛditam, where each quarter has to contain nineteen aṅkaras. Its definition is "sūryāśvair masajastatāḥ saguravah Śārdūla- vikṛṭ itam." In Misra’s text as quoted above, two aṅkaras are missing in the first quarter. Misra c
oulnd't care less! He is nihśūka, anyway. The missing letters may be "keyam," between "vi layam" and "viparyastatā." This omission did not strike Misra at all! Not that Misra does not know that a metre can be spoiled. On p. 61, with reference to verse 13:84 "Mayā kumā ryāpi na saptam ekaya," he points out that Šp. 3762 "omits me, which 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 Śūktimuktāvalī. It does have "keyam" in its proper place; so Misra's performance is of a very low order!

I would also like to point out that Smk has "e[kaih]" and gives "ekā" as a variant reading in the footnote!

* * *

Misra's Ādhambara:

39

nīrāgā mṛgalāṅchane mukham api svam nekṣate darpaṇe
trastā kokilakūjitād api giram nonnudrayaty ātmanah/
citram duhsahadāyin[!] dhṛtađveṣā’pi puspațudhe
mugdhā sā subhaga tvayi pratipadam premādhikam puṣyatū//

Smk. 44.16: nāyakasyāgre dūtyuktiḥ; Bilhanasya. Srk. 536: dūtīvacanavajyā; Śrīng ārasya. Skm. 647: Śrīngārapravāhah/Śrīngārasya. Šp. 3488: nāyakasyāgre dūtyuktih; kasyāpi.

While trying to understand Misra, many a time I have felt so frustrated that my feelings turn into vācām agocaram. Let us take, for example, the verse occurring as no. 39 on p. 81. I don't know what Misra's source is. While noting the variant readings, every editor (or critic) 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 Šp. 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?

Saduktikarnāmrtam has been divided into five sections, which the compiler has named as "pravāha." Each pravāha in its turn has been divided into subsections named "vīca yah." On p. 70, under verse no. 5., Misra has noted a variant reading: Skm. 2367: “uccāva capravāhe samasyā; kasyacit.” So here we have uccāvaca as pravāha and samasyā as vīci. On p. 91, lines 1-2: Skm. 607: śrīṅgārapravāhe virahiniṇvacanam; Silhanasy!

Following the same principle we would expect in verse 39 (p. 81) śrīṅgārapravāhe u dvegakathanam, the latter being the vīci or subsection. But Misra’s relevant statement stops with śrīṅgārapravāhab!

Let us resume our discussion. Misra gives the following variants:
a) For nīrāgā: Srk.; Skm. sodvegā.

c) For citraṇa duḥ-: Smk. itthaṃ duḥ.

d) For mugdhā sā subhagā [!] tvayi: Srk. bālā sā . . ; Sp. sābālā subhagam prati; for pratipadaṃ premā: Skm. pratimuhuḥ premā-.

That the ascription to Bilhaṇa is correct, [!] is proved by the verse occurring in Karna su. 2.29. Here we read:

b) khinnā kokilakājitād api; (d) mugdhākṣī.

khinnā . . . -kājitāt seems to be emended into trastā . . . -kājitāt "afraid of". But "tormented on account of the crying . . . " is unobjectionable, [?] cp. above verse 35c . . . śyenā[t]tuṣyati."

The verse was overlooked by D. D. Kosambi when discussing the age of Vidyākara (the compiler of Srk.). "Intro." p. xxxii. It shows his conclusions to be wrong. Also the statement, concerning the verses of Karnaśu., given by B. S. Miller, Caurap. p. 4 n7 does not stand (pp. 81-82).

Misra's footnote:

7. Which is pardonable as the verse starts differently in Srk. (sodvegā mṛga-) and Karnaśu. (nīrāgā mṛga-).

Mark the word "pardonable." Otherwise Kosambi would have been hanged. Also note the omission of two letters in the third quarter! Skm, edn. (GOS) clearly has the word "dāha" after "duḥṣaha" and before "dāyini"; so it is evident that Misra did not even consult the original. I don't know what his source was.

The above verse has been cited by Śobhākara as an example of pratyanikam. It is not traced by Devadharī (editor) to any poet. The identity of the nāyaka with śmara is shown. Śūktimuktavali certainly and specifically ascribes it to Bilhaṇa.

* * *

Let us examine one more incongruity of Misra:

purāḥ sthitvā kimcid valitamukham ālokaya sakhe
sakhedāḥ sthāsyanti dhruvam idam adṛṣṭās tava drśaḥ/
itas caṅcatkāncīranitamukharān saudhasikharān
arākāyāṃ keyaṃ kavacayati candrēṇa mahasā//

While reading it, I got the feeling that "adṛṣ ṛṣaḥ tava drśaḥ" does not make much sense. I thought we should change the reading to "adṛṣ ṛṣaḥ vā tava drśaḥ." And lo, Misra has noted a var
iant reading. Ṣp. makes it "adrś vā"! But Misra, swayed by his own superior knowledge, rejects it on the ground that it is "hardly possible." But he does not tell us what sense "his possible" makes!

Furthermore, I believe the penultimate word in the fourth pāda should be "cāndreṇa" (of the moon) and not "candreṇa." It is an adjective and qualifies "mahasā."

I could go on and on. But I don't want to become too boring to my own readers.

Incidentally, this verse contains the word "cañcat," which is unworthy in the eyes of Misra! I don't know why he did not recommend that it be discarded right away. Here is one more poetic gem which might make Misra reconsider the word "cañcat."

Mallimatallīṣu vanāntareṣu vallyantare vallabhamāhvaṁaṇṭi. Cañcadvipaṇcīkalanādabhaṅgaṁ-sangītam aṅgīkurute sam bhṛṅgī.

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 praurastrībhir na lāsyam upāsyate
sarasmadhuram nātyāgare na kūjati vallakt/ ahaha pahita[!]dvāram kasmād idaṃ paritaḥ puraṃ
[viratasurata] vyāpāratvāt prasuptam ivākhilam.

Smk. 107-18 [sic]: nagarīvarṇanapaddhatiḥ: Bilhanaṣya.

d) For viratasurata- of the edition: sukharaṭarata- 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,

"vyāpāra" = "occupation"
"rata" = "busy" (adj.?)
"rata" = "enjoyment" (n. )
"sukha" = "happiness"
I am reminded of a well-known upadeśavacanam once again: "Jīvatkaver āśayo na varṇanī yaḥ." 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, caturu bhartā) svayam api likhitam svayam na vācayati.

I 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, I feel lost. I scratch my head and exhaust my brain trying to understand Mr. Misra, but I fail miserably. I have to acquire his type of knowledge to understand him.

I know that this is nagarī-varṇana-paddhatiḥ. I imagine this nagarī is śokākulā, distressed by grief; maybe she has been deserted. Otherwise, what is the significance of the exclamatory word "ahaha"? Why are the gates 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 "Nagarī varṇana - 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 "saka la" 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 ākaragranthas (archetype MS.) of the editor had an omission of six letters. The editor supplied substitutes from his own imagination. Four MSS give the reading as "sukharatarata." The editor rejects all four! However, Misra knows better!

* * *

Here is another display of Misra's perfect performance:

54
yaḥ śrotramṛtanjharaiikavasātīṁ nirvāyājam āruḍhavān yaḥ saṅjīvanamantritāṁ ![] trinayanaṇaḥṣaṣṭya cetobhuvah/viṇāvan maṣṭṇo dhvaniṣy catarṣṇāṁ pātraṁ śrutināṁ abhūt so'yaṁ kokilakaṇṭhaṇeṇuvivaravyāpāritaḥ paṇcamah//

Smk. 59.17: Vasantavarṇanapaddhatiḥ: Bihāṇasya.

a) For -vasatīṁ read -vasatīr [?]

b) For manritāṁ read manratāṁ ("lifegiving spell") (p. 87)
Misra suggests, "For vasatiṣṭa read vasatir." It is not acceptable. If "śrotrāṃṣṭa . . . vasatiṣṭā" and "pañcamah dhvaniḥ" are made to coordinate with each other (i.e., if they are made sa māṇādhikarana), then what will be the object (karma) of "ārūdhavanā"? I am afraid my rea
ders will become bitterly bored by my repeated demonstration of the bālacāpalam, bāla cā pale, bālacāpalāni of Mahāpāṇḍita Mister Misramaharaja, a Ph.D. from Tübingen, Germa
ty.

* * *

Anthologies also differ on the authorship. Let us see the following:

Smerās santu sahāsadaḥ karicamūdarpaṇaṁ sūryānā
pāṇindraṇa saṁsa ha sa jambukapuruṣa yuddhāya baddhādaraḥ.
Tatrāpi prathayanti tulyabalaṁ eke tayor uccakair
anye saṁśayaśāmsinas tad apare bāḍhaṃ viparyāśinaḥ.

Bhīmapāṇḍitasya

Sūktimuktāvalī, Bhūcarāh, Simhapaddhatiḥ, Simhāṇyoktiḥ 22.7.

The above verse has been attributed to Bhīmapāṇḍita by the compiler of Sūktimuktāvalī. However, Bhand. Rep. ascribes it to Bhilāna. Misra has cited many verses which are ascri
ed anonymously to a poet (or to some poet other than Bhilāna) by the compiler of an anth
ology. However, in such cases, Misra cites Bhand. Rep. as the authority and ascribes it to Bhilāna. But he has overlooked this verse. Therefore, I cannot determine whether he studi
ed 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 Bheritbhāṅkara by Jalhaṇa. Yet on the basis of Bhand. Rep. it is ascri
ed by Misra to Bhilāna. And the subsequent verse ("Grāmānāṃ upāśalyāśīmāni," 22:9, M isra's no. 23) is ascribed to Ralhaṇa by Jalhaṇa, but the editor ascribes it to Bhilāna 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 Bhilāna, but by another source to Bhilāna.

* * *

ONE MORE "NONSENSICAL" READING FROM MISRA

59
re mātaṇaṇa mahāmbuḍaṁbarataṇaṇa rolambarolam vahan
vanyānāṁ avalambanaṁ vanam idaṁ bhaṅktum yad utkaṇṭhase/ drṣṭaḥ[!] tat kim aho mahonnatadharādhaureyadhātrīdhara-
prasthaprashtitameghyūthamathanotkaṃṭhī na kaṇṭhīravah/  

Śp. 915: simhānyoktayāḥ; Bilhaṇasya.

Misra commands,

a) Instead of nonsensical [!] rolambarolam: read rolambahkolam "[carrying] a helmet [!] of bees" (the closed "helmet" prevents the elephant [sic] from looking properly). ro for kho is a simple mistake (pp. 88-89).

I 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 to conclusions and condemns the poet. He does not want to consult any ākaraṇgranthā. He is quick in suggesting an emendation. He pronounces the judgement right away. I don't know what he means by "simple mistake." I have never heard of a closed helmet worn by an elephant that prevents him from looking properly! He calls "rolam" "nonsensical." I think Misra should have been more careful. It is not proper to condemn Bilhaṇa 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 "rolamba- khol am vahan," He wants us to 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 thought less critics that a great poet sang long ago,

Arasiṣeṣu 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:

Āvṛttavarṇastabakam stavakandāṅkuraṃ kaveḥ.  
Yamakaṃ prathamā dhurya-mādhuryavacaso viduḥ.

Here is one more example from the Vikramāṅkadevacarita itself:

Vipakṣavīrādbhutakīrtihārī Hārīta ityādipumān sa yatra.  
Mānavaṇāma ca baṅhūva mānī mānavaṇayaṃ yah kṛtvān ariṇām (1:58)

"Rolambakholam" will ruin the yamaka alaṅkāra. 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, Abhidhānarájendrā (Prākṛta-Māgadhī-Śamskṛta-śabdakośa) of Vijayājendraśūrīṣvara (Ratlam, 1923). v. 6, p. 580, says that "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.

I would like to add here that Misra was not unaware of the Abhidhānārājendra. See his p. 31, n. 12. Readers may recollect the following saduktis:

Locanābhyaṃ vīhānasya darpaṇaḥ kim kariṣyati.
Na hi kastūrikāmodaḥ śapathena vibhāvyate.
Na hyeṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati.

*   *   *

MISRA ONCE MORE ATTEMPTS TO ANNOY HIS READERS

vrthā gāthā[h]ślokaih alam abam alākām mama rujaṃ
dadcid dhūrto'yaṃ kavivacanam ityākalayati/
idam pārśve tasya prahīnu sakhi lagnāṇjanalava-
sravadbāspotīdagrathtalipi tāṭankayugalal//

Smk. 41.6: dūtipreṣaṇapaddhatiḥ; Bilhaṇasya.

Skm. 607: śṛṇgārapravāhe virahinīvacanam; Silhaṇasy[a].

Variants:

a) Editions write gāthāślokaih, which is hardly correct. Cp. p. 1 on 1.74a.

b) For ayam: Skm. asau.

d) For tā aṅka- : tādaṅka- , which is the orthography of Bühler's Vcar. MS.: 1.102; 8.88 (pp. 90-91).

Misra's above text reads "alakam." I don't know what this means. Sūktimuktāvalī and Sad uktikarnāmṛta both have "alikām," which is correct by itself since it means "mithyā," but I don't know how it fits into the this context.

Once again Misra proves the validity of the saying,

... kuryād vā rāṣabhadhvanim.
Yena kena prakāreṇa prasiddhaḥ pururṣo bhavet.

Misra probably does not know what he is talking about! He says, "Editions write gāthā- ślo kaiḥ which is hardly correct. Cp. p. 1 on 1:74a." So Misra has inserted a visarga (:) in between "gāthā" and "ślokaiḥ," thus converting "gāthā" into a nominative plural (noun), prath
amā bahuvacanam–kartripadam. I don't know. However, gāthāsloka is a compound word meaning "a verse in 'gāthā.'" For example,

sangrathyā kaścit katicid padāni gāthākavitvam 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 virahinī nāyikā does not want to compose a love lament in poetic form and in the Prākṛta dialect lest it be mistaken, by the cunning nāyaka, for kavivaca nam--exaggerated poetic flights of imagination! So she wants to send her ear-ornaments, which have plentiful writings made by her aṅjana, mixed with warm, flowing tears! There is a strong enough message of suffering carved on those earrings of the beloved lady.

I feel mentally tormented when Misra says "which is hardly correct." Has he read Abhijñānaśākuntalam or any other poetic composition where this kind of viraha-sandeśa-le khana-preśaṇa is described? Probably not.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis represents my 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 on which to play his pranks! My delineation of Misra follows the maxim of Sthālī-pulāka, merely offering specimens. My criticism was not intended to be exhaustive by any means; doing so would have merely increased the bulk of the present study unnecessarily. It would have caused continuous pain and suffering to my readers for longer periods.

I don't know what Misra's central focus (primary objective) was in writing what I have read in his book. In my view he emerges as a mixture of pseudo-linguist and 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, "Saṅkaro narakāyaiva." Since I don't profess to be a linguist, I have tried to cover only the literary aspect of his work. The other aspect is left for some other linguist-grammarians to discuss.

Sri Nagaraja Rao of Mysore had agreed to collaborate with me in this work. His knowledge of Sanskrit grammar was excellent, and he gave some comments here and there. However, he could not complete his assignment. I only wish some other scholar in the future takes up this challenge and silences Mr. Misra as far as the grammar is concerned.

Misra's performance reminds me that

Gūrō gīrāḥ paṁca dinānyadhītya vedantaśāstrāṇi dinatrayaṁ ca.
Aṃ śamāghṛāya ca tarkavādāṁ samāgataḥ 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 sṭhāṇor a parādho yad enam andho na paśyati." Also, "Locanābhyyām vihīnasya darpaṇaḥ kim kariṣya ti." Misra's "difficulties" are mostly the creation of his own mind. They simply betray his own lack of knowledge.

In Chapter 2, Misra points out "some lexicographical points of interest." They do not seem to be of any "interest" to me 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 use of Bilhana. They don't add any glory to Bilhana's vyutpatti or vicchitti.
The rest of Misra’s work consists of a kind of compilation. There is hardly any 
camatkāra. All along I have been wondering what 
Misra’s primary focus is, after all. In Hindi we have a beautiful saying: “Isakī īm a usakā 
rorā; Bhānumatī ne kunabā jorā.” Misra has titled his work as Studies on Bilhaṇa and his 
Vikramāṇkadevacarita. If we assume that the study is primarily concerned 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 more appropriately be 
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>References</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---------
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Thus it is seen that Chapter 4 ("Verses Ascribed to Bilhaṇa in Anthologies") is the bulkiest. 
Let us reiterate: there is nothing intrinsically wrong with this chapter, except that 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 to 
his interest in this work. Yes, of Bilhaṇa, he will have something. A greater part of this "st 
udy" 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 a field of know-led 
ge. It represents a discovery of unknown facts or a new interpretation of existing facts. Re 
search is not a mere compilation. A florist cannot be equated with a floriculturist.

For further discussion, I would like to record here 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 Paṇḍita-p 
rayara Rāmavatāra Śarmā. Not that he does not accept its existence. He does accept it an 
d its readings as well. It is definitely an edition and must be reckoned as such. Truly speak 
ing it is the second edition, while mine 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 Mahāmahopādhyā-y a Paṇḍita Rāmāvaṭāra Śarmā.

Misra does not comprehend the sarcasm contained in my statement to the effect that Śarmā did not edit the work. Śarmā 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 (my own ed.), which are number ed 4 and 6, respectively. Nevertheless to name Bühler's ed. as no. 1 and mine as no. 2 is merely gajanimilikā or satō’pyapālpah.
APPENDIX I

ON "CARITACANDRIKĀ"

Dr. H. D. Velankar, the first reviewer of my text, 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 Jasemere manuscript.

These reviewers had no difficulty at all. Yet Bh, for reasons known only to him, assumes that the "Caritacandrikā" is an "ancient" commentary! He says:


There are 208 pages in the text of the Vikramāṅkadevacariṇa in my edition. According to the colophon of J, the pūrṇa-granthasaṅkhya (or ślokasaṅkhya) of the "Carita" as presented in J is 2545. This number multiplied by 8 x 4 will be 81,440 akṣaras. 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 grantha saṅkhya of the "Carita-candrikā" would be approximately 2962; i.e., 417 ślokas more than the text! All these facts are clearly visible to the person who is not wearing a blindfold of pride and bigotry.

I am not sure if Bh knows what is meant by marginal gloss—whether he has ever seen a single manuscript in his entire life with marginal notes! Bühler has described the J M
S. in his "Introduction" (Section IV, pp. 44-45). Maybe Bh did not read it. Even if he read it, perhaps he did not understand the meaning of the word "annotated." However, I described the MS. and its gloss once again in my "Prastāvanā" on pages 1 and 2:

16x2" ākārātmakesu 158 tālapatreyāvyuttamālasīlkhītē'smin putake patrasaṅkh yāṅkāṣṭippanyaśca svārṇamayyā masyā likhitā āsan. . . " "-" īdrśacihnadvayāntar avasthāpīтāh saṅkṣiptāh saṅgatāscārthāh patrāṇāṁ prāntacatuśtaye'pi sūkṣmākṣaraír likhitāh (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 "Prastuta saṃskaraṇavaiśityam . . . viśamasthalārthāvabodhikā tippani-Caritacandrikā" (pp. 7-8) wherein having referred to the J gloss, I have described the nature and content of the "Caritac andrikā" in the clearest possible terms. Here are my words:

. . . antarbhāvita-taṭṭippaniñkā saīśa 'Candrikā' tanṛyasayapi granthārtham ujjvalayiśu atīti viśvasimaḥ.

I am not sure if Bh understood the meaning of the compound word "antarbhāvita-tattippa-ṇiṅkā," since his knowledge of Sanskrit is extremely limited when it comes to a point when 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 wastepaper basket without even reading it. 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 the follow- ing words in large, bold, ornamental letters: "Atha Caritacandrikā." I don't believe that a śānappāni written on patrāṇāṁ prāntacatuśtaye'pi would 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. Kasauti." At the bottom of that very first page there is a footnote, related to the above word, which reads "Hi. = Hindīḥāṣāyām," i.e., a ny artha preceded by a letter Hi is a Hindi word. Then, according to this great research scholar (Bh), Hindi was well-developed even before A.D. 1286, the date on which the J MS. w
as mūlyena punargrhītā (i.e., reacquired by paying the price)! So this word antedates A.D. 1286. Note Hindi linguists!

Line 14 reads, "*Rādhā Viṣṇubhāryā.*" The footnote tells us,

_idṛśacihnadvayāntavartinī tippanī Jaisalmeragranthasthetyavagantavyam._

Maybe Bh did not read this either. Or would it be correct to conclude that even if he did 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 nineteen lines in the first page (a large portion at the top having been taken by the heading), each line containing approximately thirty letters. However, only six letters have been enclosed within asterisks (*) on the entire page.

On the next page (210), we read, "Kukkuravadā’ iti Vyākhyāsudhā (Bhānujīdikṣīta-kṛtāmaratīkā)." So Bhānujīdikṣīta must have flourished even before A.D. 1286! Historiographers of Sanskrit literature should note this, especially those who want to study or dis-cuss Amarakośa!

On page 214 we read, "Sarahrī iti khyātaḥ." So this word too proves to be 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 (jñānamahāsāgara) 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, "Kāsucana pratiṣu 'yadvaśmasu' iti pramādān mudritaṃ śodh anīyam." So there was a printing press in India even before A.D. 1286! The Vikramā-ṅka 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 the Hindi word "chānanā." Naturally this word too is older than A.D. 1286.

The bottom line of page 223 reads "upāṃśu 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: "āratt" and "turahī." Nāgarī Pra-c ārini Sahhā of Vārānasī should note these facts.
On page 237 we read, "*cauryakeliḥ parapurūṣaparanārīkriyā.*" But then the "Car itacandrikā" 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 more than one. On page 247 "Caritacandrikā" says, "Dolāsu dolāsu iti Jalhaṇa-Śāṅgadhara-saṃgrhitah pā hāḥ." Hi storiographers of Sanskrit literature note this fact which makes Jalhaṇa and Śāṅgadhara postdate A.D. 1286.

On page 248 we read,

Aksūṇahetoḥ aṅgīkṛtasāmrājyabhārasya madhor anucaratvān mārutasya. 'Aksūṇa' padasyārtha nāvagamāyate. 'Aksobha' iti pāṭhe pratipanne--aksobho gajabandhana-stambho gajabandhanabhūmir vetyarthaḥ saṅgataḥ syāt. 11 sarge 82 ślokopī draṣṭa vyāḥ.

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 "aksūṇa" has been interpreted by Bh—with the help of a great grammarian, of course, whose debt he acknowledges in the following words:

Śrī Paṃ. Rājanārāyaṇa Śarmaṇo Hindūviśavidyālayīya- Saṃskṛtamahā-vidyālayavyākaraṇavibhāgāhyakṣa dhanyavādair abhinandvantye, yais saharsam s arvadaiva kaṭhīnā prayuktasabdasiddhau svānapamaśabdaśāstra- jñaṇena śabda- si ddhim saṃśādhyā mahān upakāraḥ kṛtaḥ (Kiṃcit Prāstävikam, v.1, p. 3).

Bilhaṇa used neither kathina nor aprayukta śabdas! It is insult added to injury to blame Bilhaṇa for such imaginary sins! His rīti is Vaidarbhi and his guṇa is prasāda. Na hyeṣa sthāṇ or aprādho yad enam andho na paśyati.

(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 "aksūṇa" (or whatever it might be) was so gatārtha that he did not think it needed any explanation! Today the second part of my conjecture stated above seems ridiculous!)

It is amusing to see how this "ka hina" and "aprayukta" śabda ("aksūṇa") has been blessed with śabdasiddhi (derivation and explanation) by the great grammarian-friend of Bh:

aṅgaṁ viśrāmaḥ satapatariśramaṇaḥ samāgataklāntirūpanyunatāyā dūrīkaraṇārthaḥ viśrāntīr ityarthah.

The above explanation appears in the commentary Ramā. The footnote reads,
Saṃjñāsu dhāturūpāṇi prayāyāś ca tataḥ pare.
Kāryād vidyād anu[!]bandham etac chāstram uṇādiṣu.

Ṭuṣu gatau - ādādikādhātor bhāve naṁ prayayaye bāhulakād dīrghe naṁsamāse 'ak śūṇa' śabdō nispannāḥ. Na kṣūṇam aksūṇam gatyavarodho viśrāma ityarthaḥ.

Both this great Vaiyākaraṇa-śiromāni (Rājanaśraya) and Sāhitya- dhurandhara "Vidyā-v āgīśa" Bh have overlooked one of the most significant words: "mattasya"! Bilhana did not say "śrāntasya." Caitradingrada was not hauling such huge logs of wood that he would be h orribly exhausted and needed viśrāma so often. See below the discussion of the im- mortal words "pade pade." I had annotated the above passage (in Bh's ed.) with the fol-low ing words:

 Ko'pi vaiyākaraṇakesarī svapratibhāṃ prādarsayat!
Tāvan mauna evāvalambanīyam yāvan na yathārthapāṭhaprāptiḥ.

The late Muni Śrī Puṇywajayaḥ Mahārāja had given me an appropriate meaning, but I do n't recall it now! According to him the word was correct. Could this word mean "madanivā raṇa, " "to bring back to sobriety"?

This topic has been discussed earlier. Āstāṁ tāvat, prakṛtam anusarāmaḥ.

A saduktī is cited on page 248 of "Caritacandrikā":

Mallikāmukule canḍī! Bhāti guṇjan madhuvrataḥ.
Prayāṇe paṇcabāṇasya śaṅkham āpūrayanniva.

So the author of the above must have flourished earlier than A.D. 1286. Let us find out who the author is. In any case, the assumed tippanikāra or tippanilekhaka was almost a mag ian. He could write all these long verses in the margins! I 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 on p. 439 of his vol. 1. According to Bh this Caritacandrikākāra must have been a kavi rahas ya kuṣala dhīmāṇ (p. 2 of his Kīncit Prāstāvīkam, vol. 1). This Caritacandrikākāra cited the above verse on p. 248 with reference to "Lagnadvirephadhyānīpūryaṃṇam . . . " 7:41. Bh renders a great service to the world of scholarship by citing it, but he introduces it with the words "Uktam Sāhityadarpana." I don't know how would it help! I still don't know the nam e of the poet who composed this beautiful couplet.

On page 265 we read, "Gopācalāḥ *guyałaeru* (sāmpratam Gvāliyara ityucyate)." Did Bh stop to think what function this word, "*guyałaeru,*" (enclosed within two asterisks ) was performing here? What did it represent, and what is the significance of the word "sā mpratam"? When? Before A.D. 1286?
We have three words: "gopācalaḥ," "guyālaeru," and "gvāliyara." Is there any historical, chronological, or linguistic progression? Do they belong to the same age, the same language, the same stratum? Bh, why did you pretend to know everything when you actually did not know? Your "great" Caritacandrikākāra accepted his limitations, a fact which you have noted yourself. Why did you not? Didn't you know that "na hi sarvāḥ sarvaṁ jānāti"?

It is fantastically funny to read Bh's commentary here. He says, "Gopānāṁ dhenu-pālakānāṁ acalaḥ parvato Govardhanākhyāḥ!" So "Govardhana mountain" was a king-dom, and the king described in verse 9:109 of the "Carita" was its lord!

On page 301, in the last line, we read, "Etadupādhiṅenena chalena (etaddhetujanye-nādhiraṇena)?" Did Bh understand what is cited above? The īppanikāra explains certain words. Yet he is not sure; so he asks a question. I believe Bh can easily answer! What is "adhiraṇena"? Pt. Bharadvajai! This is a printing mistake for "avadhiraṇena" (detected only on Dec. 24, 1982!)

The writing of Bh is atyanta-hāsyāspada in many a place, to say the least. Bilhana says,

Tat paryantashhitagunānikanāmandapam yatra dhatte
dhāma vyomāṅgaṇatilakatām Kṣemagaurīśvarasya.

"Caritacandrikā" explains, "Kṣemagaurīśvarasya dhāma Kāśmīra-nṛpati-Kṣemaguptanir-māpitaṁ Śivamandiram" (p. 314). These words of mine, of NAGAR, in "Candrikā" are followed by "°Khemesaradeu."° Let it be stressed here with all the force at my command that his expression, "khemesaradeu," appears within two asterisks; so these words were directly borrowed from the J gloss.

But Bh wanted to display his brilliant scholarship; so he adds to the knowledge (?) of his readers, "Khemesaradeu iti Kāśmīrabhāṣāyāṁ prasiddhe!" Scholars of the Kashmiri language should note this! Here is a great pandit from Kashi giving you a new word! What a great pity!

I really wonder whether Bh possessed enough brain power to discern the numerous incongruities I have been pointing out time and again. Any sensible person would have stopped to wonder if he were following a false belief that "Caritacandrikā" was an ANCIENT commentary! Or would it be correct to assume that he knew the truth in his heart of hearts, yet he continued to deceive himself so that he could steal from the "Candrikā" until the very end? This is exactly what he did. The relevant portion from the "Candrikā" follows:

Rāmo Rāmacandraḥ* Nāṭyaprayoge nāṭakābhinnayakriyāyām, višeṣyam. Yoga-sthā nām yogyāndrañām. Āśūtrayanti janayanti.

And here is an exact reproduction of the same passage from the great commentary called Ramā of Panditamanya Viśvanātha Śāstrī Bhāradvāja (what a deceitful act of stealing!):


No further comments are necessary. Stealing is an art! It is not a sin until and unless it is detected.

The greatest service that Bh has rendered here relates to "Khemesaradeu." This is his most outstanding contribution. Bilhaṇa 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 Panditamāṅī Bhāradvāja? To think that only some of his astonishing qualifications are displayed on the title page of his immortal work and at the head of the letter he wrote to me!

I am not sure if Bh had seen the descriptions of J gloss anywhere. If so, did he remember it? Let it be recalled that the J MS. was seen by Bühler (and by me too) in aislmer. It belongs to the Brhajjiṅñakosha Bhandāra of the Oswal Jains, preserved under the great temple of Pārisnāth (Pārvanātha) in the fort of Jaisalmer.

With regard to this J gloss Bühler says, "The glosses are in a mixture of ancient Gujarati and Marwadi, such as is used by the Yatis down to the present day." Bühler also tells us that the letters of the MS. (including the gloss) are ancient Jain Devanagari ("Inrod." p. 45).

Here is what I said about the language and other aspects of the J gloss:

Kiṅca gīrvāṇaṅchnibaddhāpi sā prācīnātippaṇi kvacit GurjararMarudeśa- bh āṣāt miketyanadhidgatasakalārthār aptyasmābhibhī sā tathaivopasthāpitā. Neyam mūl avatsuvācetyā bahutrāṃdbhār naivāvagantum aḻāri, kutas tāvat pratilipi- viṣayīkart um. Tathāpi seyam atiprācīneti tadbhāṣāgaveṣaṇāyām sādhanam syād ityavadhāry ate.

Maybe Bh did not have access to the B ed.
The above was written long ago. Today (March 10, 1990) while reformatting my own writing for computers, I recalled that I had seen Bühler's edition in the same Banaras Hindu University Library, which was the Karmabhūmi of this scholar-thief. He could have seen it if he wanted. But why should he have cared? He knew everything. He was sarvajña cakravarti.

But he has extensively used my ed. He has profusely copied from my "Carita-candrikā." 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>J gloss</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gāmḍuyauṃ</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>choṭi churī</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choru</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>thahiyāniu</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavāda</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>thalī</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goliyā 'dhaṇuhi' abhyāsu</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>guyālaeru</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>davādi</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>daru</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jetalu višeṣu</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>ghātu*</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padhathā</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>pālaṭau</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darau</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>pātau</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kisaum achaī</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>vikhariyaum</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āṃvaliyau</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>khāṃpanu</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kasaumākeku</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>garaḍhauṃ</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*followed by avayava śuddhiḥ

I believe Bh would like us to believe that all these words belong to the Kasmiri language! Bh has also stated elsewhere that tad-bhāṣṭāyām. What an innocent statement! He is cunningly equivocal. Naro vā kuñjaro vā. He wanted to save his own skin too. Bh copied so extensively from "Caritacandrikā," yet I don't think he paid any attention to the words cited above.

* * *

A NOTE ON THE STARRING IN THE "CARITACANDRIKĀ"

I had stated, "Antarbhāvitata ippanīkā saśā 'Candrikā.' . . . "

"Caritacandrikā" contains many explanatory words which are direct borrowings from J gloss; the featuring of certain J gloss words within two asterisks was intended to indicate this. Certain meanings occurring in J gloss had to be emphasized, like "Rādhā Viṣṇabhāryā" (1:5) and "Rādhā Kṛṣṇabhāryā" (18:87). Many words occurring in J gloss were not intelligible to me 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 m
any words (meanings or interpretations) which are part of J gloss. They are not starred; so this may be regarded as a flaw. Yet it is not. I did not think that words that are found so easily in the dictionaries and presented no conflict had to be starred simply because they occurred in J gloss! The criterion that warranted starring was how uncommon or significant a word of J gloss was.

Here is a passage that clearly demonstrates—as if one more demonstration were needed—how ill-equipped Bh was to interpret a divine poem like Bilhana’s Vikramāṇka-devacarita. On p. 314, "Caritacandrikā" says,

Kāśṭhīladvijavasatayah 'Kāśṭhīla' iti nāmadheyā Brāhmaṇañāṁ nīvāsabhūmayah.
Kāśṭhīleti—*jātivīśeṣāḥ.* Vastutastu Vitastāvāma-taṭasthaḥ pradeśa-viśeṣaḥ.

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: there are two writers involved. First we see that the expression "Kāṣṭhīladvijavasatayah" is explained in a certain way. Then the compound word "jātivīśeṣāḥ" is given. It is preceded and followed as well by an asterisk (*). Then we find the following words: "Vastutastu. . . ." In other words, "Kāśṭhīla" 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 it would have to be accepted that the same person contradicted 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 . . .” he maintains,

Tāh Kāśṭhīladvijānāṁ Kāśṭhīla iti nāmadheyabrāhmaṇañāṁ vasatayah nīvāsa-bhū mayah.

This is called "durāgrahāḥ." What Bilhana means is "Kāṣṭhīla-dvijavasatayah" and not "Kāṣṭhīladvija-vasatayah"! Bh seems to have forgotten his own dictum: "Guṇino na durā-grahaḥ."

Let us resume our main theme. In 18:44.1 there is a samastapada—adhiṣṭ hāna-madhye. "Caritacandrikā" explains, "Vitastāpulalavartini pradeśaviśeṣe," and then adds within two asterisks, "*ahī hānamāḥ.*" The great commentator Pt. Bharadvaja displays his extra ordinary erudition and says"adhiṣṭ hānamadhye Vitastāpulalavartini pradeśaviśeṣe [exact copy of "Caritacandrikā"] (‘Ahī hānamāhi’ iti tadbhāṣāyām).’ I don't understand what he means by "tad!" Maybe he thinks that there is a language called "tadbhāṣā!" Cf. my words: "Tadbhāṣāgaveśanāyām sādhanamā syādīti manvāmahe." But the interesting point is that he encloses all the six letters (ahī hānamāhi) in quotation marks (”). He does not stop to think that "ahī hāna" is "adhiṣṭ 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 t
he wisest. He excels everyone else in this art of interpretation. He goes beyond! He trans
lates, "Ahī hāṇamāḥī nāmaka sthāna men." The short "i" of Sanskrit comm. in "māḥī" beco
mes long in Hindi comm.! Is it possible for us to accept the contention that Hindi and Sans
krit are from one and the same pen? It will be foolish even to think this. Kahātā 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 a
nd made him aware of the reality that there are certain words which might have come from
another pen in "Caritacandrikā." On page 321 we read,

Chāyāyā *dhūmena citraṃ vicchāyaṃ jāyata iti bhāvaḥ.* Vastutastu svapada- bhr
aṃśabhayaṭ Śakrasya vaivarṇyam.

Certain words here are preceded and followed by asterisks! They make a statement. The
subsequent words reject it. I don't know if Bh knows what the significance of a statement i
s if it is introduced with an expression like "vastutastu." See also: "Vastutastu Vītāstā- vām
ata astaḥ pradeśaviśeṣaḥ" (discussed earlier).

Bh blindly copies both statements. His exact words are, "Dhūmena citraṃ vicchā-ya
m jāyate. Vastutastu svapada-bhrāmśa-bhayād Indrasya vaivarṇyamiti bhāvaḥ." The quest
ion is, why does he give the first statement if he has to contradict it by the subsequent state
ment? I don't know what he took the two asterisks to mean!

I am not sure if he had ever read the Amara: "tvantāthādi na pūrvabhāk." "Vastu ta
stu" contradicts the previous statement. It means "but in reality." I fail to understand why
such scholar-pretenders follow the path of darkness and do not open their eyes even when t
here 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 e
dition of a "Vidyāvāridhi"?

In 18:18.3 Bilhana uses an expression, "drṣ ādrṣ a." I was not sure about the mean-
ing. I was merely a youth in my early twenties; so I put it as "aihikāmuṃśikohaya- vidhān
ām?" Bh copied my words straightaway. However, he removed the question mark. He ha
s no doubt, nowhere, never!

Let us recall what Bh says about this "Caritacandrikā" and its author:

Śrīnāgaramahodayair Jaisalmerabrhaṇhajjñānaṁkṣa-bhāṇḍarasthādhaṭṭalikhi-
tāt pustakāt mahatā śramaṇa tippaniśaṃgrahaṁ kṛtvā Caritacandrikānāmnā sā pari
śīṣṭa rūpeṇa svapustake samgrhītā, kenaḥ kaviḥ aṣṭaḥ saṃghaṇaḥ aṣṭaḥ bhōmaṇaḥ [str
ess added] gumphityatraśaṁ śatā santheśāvāsaraḥ. Uśāvīya 1286 varṣaḥōpi prāc
īne'smin hastalikhite pustake tiṃpaniyeśā svaprācīnatvam prakaṭayateva (Kiṃcit Pr
āstāvikam, vol. 1, p. 2).
A thief takes everyone else to be a thief in this world. Bh tells his readers that I collected all the "notes" from J MS. and reproduced them in my book as an appendix, naming it the "C aritacandrikā." I have never seen a greater fool on this earth! First of all, I won't steal. I possessed enough brain power to compose my own "annotations." And I was not a habitual thief either. Even if I had stolen, I would not have had 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-tippanī," or something like that. A smart thief also knows how to cover up his theft. Bh himself is a thief and accuses me falsely of imaginary theft. It is much larger, longer, and extensive than even the original! It cannot be an appendix.

Again in his Bhūmikā the learned scholar-pretender presents his distorted view:

Tatkāvyānte Caritacandrikānāmnā Jaisalamera-bṛhatjñānakośabhāṇḍāra sth a pustakātippanīsamgraho Nāgaramahodayasya saṃskaraṇaṃ suvarṇaṃ sugandhi yuktam iv'karot. Tippanīkaraḥ ka iti yadyapi na jñātaṃ tathāpi tasya paṇḍityapra karṇo vidyotata eva (vol. 1, p. 4).

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 Caritacandrikātippanīkāraḥ ya ke'pi te bhavantu [!] mama hārdikān dhanyavādān arhanti. Eteṣām tippanīti kālekhane mahaṭī sahāyatā jātetya-māya m nirūpya [!] virāmāmyatīvaratāt (p. 4).

Whatever you may say, you are a great māyāvin Mr. Bh!

So, even such an ancient learned "composer" of "Caritacandrikā" was not sure about the meaning of "drṣ drṣ 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 sarvajñacakra'vatī.

I concluded my "Caritacandrikā" with the following words:


So this "marginal gloss" had a colophon too! And what about the date; i.e., Samvat 2001, i.e., A.D. 1944/45? Bh was not concerned at all with all this contradictory evidence. 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 Narendra Dev, 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!
MISRA'S BIBLIOGRAPHY

This work has primarily been a candid criticism of Misra's Studies on Bilhana and H is Vikramānkevadacarita, and it was as unpleasant for me to write as Misra's book was to r ead. Throughout this book--here, there and everywhere--I have offered a justification of w hy I felt such an irresistible urge to express myself the way I did. It was truly a case of Śok aḥ ślokavānam āgataḥ. How beautifully it is said about our mahākavi Bhavabhūti,

Api grāvā rodityapi dalati vajrasya hrdayam.

Bhavabhūti himself has sung,

Pūrotpīde taḍāgasya parīvāhaḥ pratikriyā.
Śokasaṃvighahṛdayam pralāpāir eva dhāryante.

I have followed the great ethical principle of Špaṣ avaktā sukḥī bhavet. Also

Sulabhāḥ puruṣā rājan satatam priyavādinaḥ.
Aprīyasya ca pathyasya vaktā śrotā ca durlabhahaḥ.

Readers would have found many passages which might have led them to one of two concl uisions: either Misra was out of his mind when he wrote his book, or I was out of his mind w hen I criticised it!

My correspondence with the University of Tübingen, reproduced here in the very be ginning, contains convincing evidence that there is something unusual about this "disser- ta tion" of Misra, which he claims has earned a doctorate for him! I don't believe it.

Misra also claims to be a specialist in Library Science. He has appended an extensi ve bibliography to his magnum opus. For the reasons already stated, I did not think it nec es sary to present another bibliography of my own. But since I wanted the reader to have the benefit of Misra’s exceptional bibliography, befitting his exceptional "dissertation," I almost decided to reproduce it mechanically and enclose it as an appendix to this work. This wo uld not have been an infringement of any copyright, nor would it have been branded as plagi arism--kāvyārthacaurya. I did not want to commit this sin, the same sin for which I have condemned Mr. Misra time and again. This bibliography would have also demonstrated t o readers how a proper one should be prepared and presented for a doctoral dissertation to a German university. However, for various reasons, I abandoned the idea.

Once again I offer my sincere apologies to my readers for having presented this bitt ersweet writing in this vein. Truth is at many times unpalatable. It takes two to grasp it: o ne who can speak and another who can listen. However, I would like to assure my readers with all the emphasis at my command that what is presented in this book in its final form is much more mild than it was when it originally emerged. The most spicy juices have been
edited and removed. After the whole book was completed, it was ruthlessly purged! A large amount of true yet frank criticism was eliminated. I have tried my best to be as reticent as possible, and I give credit to my better half for this sweetening and softening. The final judgement rests with the critical readers.
ANUBANDHĀH

I have previously discussed the reading "Vapur yām āvāsah . . . " which was re-presented exactly the way it appears in Misra's magnum opus (p. 100). At that time I had suggested "yāmāvāsah" as an alternative reading. Subsequently I thought of "puryām āvāsah." My footnote provides a brief discussion there.

Since then I have consulted the Śūktimuktāvalī. It gives all three components toget her—Vapuryāmāvāsah. Because I am not as learned as Misra, I put a "(? )" (question mark) after the first pāda. I could not understand it. But Misra is a sarvajñacakravarti. He knows everything 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 (vapuryāmāvāsah) into three! This is a despicable attempt. "Vapur" makes some sense independently. "Āvāsah" too would make some sense. But I don't know what sense Doctor Misra (a Snātaka of Tübingen) would like us to derive from yām. This is avyāpāreṣu vyāpārah—monkey business.

I think that "Vā" is an error. It should be read as "Tri! " I advise the reader to write "tra" in Devanāgarī and then join the two protruding lines. "Tra" will become "Vā" very easily. "Triputryām" will bring a new life into the kavīndrokti. The word "kuca" is still a puzzle to me. Could it be budhā?

I believe that "śiro'nyasya" (in the third pāda) is wrong. It should be read as "śiro y asya." Misra could not care less.

In spite of all these changes and suggestions for improvement, the true and final pur port of the verse is still an enigma to me.

As already stated in the "Dvītīyam Āmukham," 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 "Kāvyasāstravinodena kālo gacchati dhīmatām" was a possible new interpretation of "bhūḥ pratapodayānām" in "Campāśīnmi" (Vik. 18:38), discussed earlier in this book.

I have submitted my apologies for an incorrect interpretation made earlier. It was a n error in grammar. Now I have a new interpretation. I believe "bhūḥ" can stay as it is—not as "dvitiyābahuvarcanam"—karma—but as "kartṛpadam prathamāikavacanāntam," meaning "pratapodayānām bhūḥ utpattisthānam ajañā bhrāmyati!" She is śītahitā, not for herself but for her master, Anantanrpati. In order that her master might feel warm and comfortable in those colder regions, she roams around hither and thither to make them warm! She has the power to generate pratāpa, meaning also utkṛṣṭāḥ tāpāḥ. This new suggested interpretation is offered to the rasika-jana-manḍall for consideration.
There are many more suggestions, but I will have to wait until the next edition comes out.
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Ekākiṁ pratiṁśa hi pratiṁśātaṁ, 110, 154, 172
Ekam sandhītsato 'param pracyavate, 143
Ekam uddiśya sarvān vā, 150
Elephants (and music), 58
English translators (māṣikāsthāne māṣikā), 140

263
Gacchataḥ skhalanam kvāpi, 66, 85, 118, 168
Gaḍḍalikāpravāhanyāya
   wrt Misra, 88
   wrt scholars like Dvivedi, 176
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Gaganagīritaḥ navendranīla, 79
Gāhate'ra dhṛtakārmuke tvayi, 70
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on rānta, 164
makes kaśā of kathā, 166
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notices kāvyārthacaurya, 198
and his book (full of errors), 198ff.
and science of prosody, 198ff.
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on Mahābhāṣyavyākhyā, 188
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Nāgarāja Rāo--Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya, 142
Nāgarīvarṇanapaddhatiḥ, 202
Nāgavallī, 33
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Nirantarāghaṭītapāṭalādharāḥ, 145
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Niśiddhair apyebhīr lulitamakarando, 94
Niśiddham apyācaraṇīyam āpadi, 52
Nivārīta vs. nirvāpīta, 127
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Pāmsudāna, 91
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Pāṇḍyo’yam amsārpītalambahāraḥ, 144
Pāṇīyam nālikēphilakuhara, 94
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Para pratiśṭhā, 34
Parāsam, 138
Parāsām vs. parāsām, 139
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Paripākapāṇḍurāṇāṃ śarakāṇḍānām, 36
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Payodavṛṇadāṃ gagana, 157
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Prabuddha vs. pravṛddha, 144
Prabuddhakārśyāḥ paritāpa, 144
Pradarśayāṁśa tataḥ kumārīyāḥ, 56, 119ff.
Prādhānayam syād vidher yatra, 74
Prakṛtivirodhahata, 78
Pramādat vs. prasādāt, 87
Prāṇāṁśto māṇaḥ, 130
Prāṇapratīṣṭhā, 36
Prāpnotyāśu paraṁ sthānam, 31
Prasāda, 64
Prasādāt vs. pramādāt, 86f.
Prasajyapratiśedha, 74
Praśānte nūpurārāve, 46
Pratādiśyanta iva me, 117
Pratāpa, 175, 177
Pratāpam āropya paraṁ samunnetim, 177
Pratijñāyaugandharāyana, 58
Pratiphalananibhad, 35
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Pratyādeśainam abhāṣamāṇā, 117
Pratyādiś, 117
Pratyādiśaviśeṣamanḍanavidhīḥ, 117
Pratyāgacchati laṅghanārtham, 197
Praudhiparakarṣaṇa purāṇarīti, 1
wrt Misra, 21, 86
Pravṛddha, 144
Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavan Texts Series, 66
Priyatama Chandra Shastri, 30
Prthvībhujāṅgaḥ parikampitāṅgīṛm, 40ff.
Puṇḍraka-sarkāra, 39
Puraḥ sthitvā kiṃcid valita, 202
Purāṇa-Bilhana wrt Misra, 58
Pūrvakālaikasarvajarat, 89
Puṣpair bhrājīṣṇubhastrā, 59
Puṣpāṇjalikṣepam ivodvahanti, 183

Rājaśekhara, 94
Rājatarāṅginī, 172
Rājīga, 76
Rajombupāṅkaviḥṛtī, 91
Rājyam uddhṛtam anarthapaṅkataḥ, 78
Rāmanātha Dīkṣita (wrt Bh), 12
Rāmāśramī
   on rājyāṅgam, 44
   on vilāsa, 124
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Rāmāvatāra Šarmā (guruvaryāṇām of Bh), 114
Raṇarabhasavilāsakautukaṇa, 74
Raṇarasacalitam, 83
Randhawa, M. S., 136
Rānta vs. śānta, 164
Rasadhvaner adhvaṇi ye caranti, iii
   wrt Misra, 22
   wrt Bh, 136
Rasāntaram, 130
Rasikapriyā of Keśavadāsa, 136  
Rāśikṛtāḥ puṣpaparāgapuṇjāḥ, 90  
Ratāntare yatra grāhāntaresu, 114  
Ratikopa, 133  
Ratikope prasāde ca, 133  
Ravaiḥ, 151  
Re mātānga madāmbuḍambaratayā, 204  
Research (defined), 209  
Restoration (of text), 166  
Rolambarolam vs. rolambakholam, 205  
Rūdhayaugikamiśrākhyaś, 146

Sa somavannetracakorapāraṇām, 52  
Sā stanāñjalibandhena, 110  
Sa tatkṣaṇāt parimlāna, 62ff.  
Śabdakalpadruma, 39  
Śabdārthaśasanañāna, iii, 95  
Śabdasya śaktayāḥ, 126  
Śad upāyāḥ, 131  
Śādgunyō mantraḥ, 78  
Śādharmya, 137, 170  
Śaduktikamāṃṛta (wrt Dolāyām jaghana), 115  
Sadyaḥ karasparśam avāpya citram, 37  
Saharṣaṁ ityapsarasāṁ ajāyatam, 164  
Sahasā vidadhīta na kriyāṁ, 205  
Sahasraśaḥ santu viśāradānām, 1  
   wrt Misra, 22, 87  
Sāhityadarpāṇa, 133  
   on kampa (vepathu), 45  
   on arthāntaranyāsa, 121  
   on vilāsa, 124  
   on māna, 133ff.  
Sāhityapāthonidhimanthanottham, 15, 188  
Sāhitye sukumāravaastunī (wrt Misra), 45  
Sahṛdaya (hurt by Bh), 157  
Śākhācandranyāya, 95  
Sakhīṇām kim api bruvānā, 56  
Śaktir nipuṇatā lokaśāstra, 185  
Sāmāḍaṇu tu parikṣiṇe, 130  
Samakṣam api sūryasya, 159  
Sāmānye napuṃsakam, 87  
Samarpayāmāśa payāmsi, 57  
Śāmarthyaṁ, 64ff.  
Samāsokti, 42  
Śambhukavi, 33
Sampūrnakumbho na karoti śābdam, 174
Sāmrājayam, 61ff.
Saṃskṛtam nāma daivī vāk, 81
Samucchālayā praṇayīkṛtāni, 189
Samudvahannunatam āṃsakūtam, 183
Samudvahantyos tad athāyatāksī, 183
Saṃyuktādyam dīrgham, 128
Śānta, 32ff.
Sandhībandham avalokya niścalam, 78
Sangrathya kaścit katicit padāni gāthākavitvam, 206
Saṅkucita, 35ff.
Śānta-kautaka, 164ff.
Saptamādyikaraṇe ca, 95
Śāradā, 160
Śārakāṇḍa, 38

 as Misra’s sugarcane, 36
Śarakāṇḍapāṇḍugaṇḍasthala, 38
Sarasa vipārītaḥ cet (wrt Bh), 127
Śārdūlavikṛditam, 200
Śarvadaiva hṛdayaṁ malīmasam, 158
Śarvasvam grhavartī Kuntalapatir, 178
Śarvēśāṁ madakṛd vasantasamayaḥ, 91
Śaṣṭhāḥ upāyaḥ, 129
Śaṣṭhī cānādare, 62
Śāstrapratiṣṭhā, 35
Satrō api guṇā vācyā (wrt Bühler), 97
Satyāyamānam asatyaḥ, 84
Saundaryam indīvaracanānāṁ, 86
Śavāsaṅnāṁ sabhyānāṁ, 49
Śavrīḍo’bhūt, 167
Shola (Latin), 181
Śīlā-Vijjā-Mārulā, 82
Śīlāna, 206
Śīlimukha, 69ff.
Śindhutīraniyānurodhatas, 73
Śīnjā, 197
Śīnjinī, 198
Śīrasā mā likha mā likha mā likha (wrt Misra), 205
Śīṭabhītā, 168, 171
Śmarāḥ asyāḥ kathayāmbabhūva, 56
Śmarapraśastiprativastutāṁ gatāḥ, 114
Śmeras santu sabhāsadaḥ, 204
Śmṛti, 51
Śobhākara, 60, 202
Śobhante sma vilāsakuntalalatāḥ, 125
Somadeva, 77
Someśvara Bhūlokamalla, 7, 33
Sparśaḥ kaṇṭakakọṭibhiḥ kuṭilayā, 115
Śrīharṣa, 45, 52, 93, 108
Śrīkhandacarcāparīparīduro'yaṁ, 142
Śrīnīlakaṇṭhaḍikṣita, 184
Śrīparicayāj jaḍā api, 113
Śrīgāraṇatānākaravelayeva, 188
Śrotam śrutenaiva na kundalena, 51
Śrutasya yāyād ayam antar arbhakaḥ, 51
Śruti, 51
Śrūtvā śrūtvā rutam aviratam, 112
Stein translates Putro Vigrahārājasya, 172
Sthālīpulākanyāya, 208
Śhiti, 183
Sthūlārundhatīnāya, 95
Strīṇāṃ vilāśa-vibbokā, 122
Subhaṭā, 174
Subhaṭaḥ pramadākarārpitām (wrt Misra), 33, 158
Sudīrghā rāgaśālīnyo, 167
Śukavākyapāṭham (wrt Bh), 170
Śukharatarata, 203
Śuklaḥ/paṭaḥ, 148
Sūktimuktāvalī, 152, 158
Surata-krīḍā, 111f.
Śuro'si kṛtavidyo'si, 155
wrt Bh, 15
Śūryamati, 174
Suṣko vrkṣas tiṣṭhatyagre, 155
Śvāgata metre, 128
Śvagrhotuntavatīyāyanagataḥ, 186
Śvāmyamātyasuhṛtkośa, 44
Śvayaṃ nastaḥ parān nāsayati
wrt R, 85
wrt Bh, 126

Tadbhayāt Simhaladvīpabhūpatiḥ, 181
Taddarśānād abhūc chambhor, 197
Tadīyo lebhennaram cetasi nopaḍeśaḥ, 119
Talpeṣu, 190
Tāṃ santeḥ śrotum arhanti (wrt Misra), 23
Tāṃ vibhāvya rabhasād upāgatam, 48
Tāṃ vidhāya katicid dināni, 67
Tāṃbulaṃ kaṭutiktim uṣṇamadhuram, 33
Tantukṛśaṃ vahantyāḥ, 183
Taraṅgitāṅgī, 138
Tarjana, 137
Tasyāḥ sāndravilepanastana, 135
Tataḥ prātāpajvalanaprabāva, 170
Tathā gatā campakadāmagaurī, 93
Tatra daksinataṭe kṛtaśthitiḥ, 71
Tavāṅgavallīkumarī vilāsaiḥ, 122
Tayopadeśaḥ sa kṛtāḥ kumārīyām, 118
Te ke na jānīmahe wrt Misra, 127
Teśām prasanno hi vilāsabāṇaḥ, 125
Thieme, Paul, 24ff.
Through the Looking Glass, 70
Translation (problems of), 95, 123
Trilokalakṣmyeva salīlam īkṣitaḥ, 108
Tṛṇāni bhūbhṛtkaṭaṇeṣu, 147
Tübingen (correspondence with) 24ff.
Tuṅgabhadrā, 71
Tvadbhiyā giriguḥāśraye sthitāḥ, 70
Tyāgam eva praśamsanti, 79
Tyaktā mayā nāma kulapratīṣṭhā, 36

Udañcayan kimśukapuṇpasucīḥ, 167
Udañciromaṇcatayā samantataḥ, 66
Udāraśauryaikarasaḥ kṣamāpatiḥ, 68, 74
Udvasannagaram, 203
Ullekhaliṅgahaṭanāpaṭūnām (wrt Misra), 23
Union List of Learned American Serials in Indian Libraries, 11
Unnidrapaṅktiṣṭhitacampakāni, 92
Upakāra ivāsati prayuktaḥ, 119
Upamā-rūpaka-saṅkara, 52
Urvīpateḥ pārvanacandravaktrā, 183
Uṣṭrāṇām ca vivāheṣu (wrt Misra), 45
Utprekaṣā, 149
Uttarjanikena muhuḥ kareṇa, 31, 137
Utthāya manyuvasaṭaḥ, 132

Vācāṃ agocaram, 177
Vāgarthāviva sampṛktau, 55
Vah (+ ud), 182
Vakṛtvam, 177
Vallabhaḥ vs. vallabha, 158
Vālmīki, 195
Vāmanācārya Jhalākīkar, 180
Vaprakriḍāpaṇītagaṇa, 84
Vapur yāmāvāśaḥ kucaparivṛtaś, 178
Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya (Nāgarāja Rāo), 142
Vapus tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya, 141
Varam eko guṇī putraḥ, 98
Vāraṃvāraṃ tirayati dṛṣor udgamam, 46
Vardhito roditaś ca, 195
Variant readings, 171
Vāsabhītā, 171
Vātāyana, 186
Vātāyanaiḥ kelivimānakalpaiḥ, 186
Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra, 113
Vayam iha padavidyām (wrt Misra), 45
Velā, 188
Velācala, 189
Velankar, H. D., 5
Venāṅnātha, 76
Veṇī, 138ff.
Veṇīsamhāra, 94
Venukā, 137ff.
Verses (cited in anthologies), 191ff.
Vibhūṣya vs. vimūṣya, 163
Vicāracāturyam apākaroṭi, 128
Vicarati vs. na carati, 176
Vicinvatīḥ pāṇthapataṅgahimsanair, 93
Viddhaśālabhaṇjikā, 36
Vidhṛtya Kāncīṃ bhujyor balena, 49
Vidhṛtya vs. vivṛtya, 46
Vidvān eva vijāṇāti (wrt Bh), 97
Vidyākara (age of), 201
Vijṛmbhamāṇesvatha, 125
Vikālaiḥ of Misra, 122
Vikīrṇa, 54ff.
Vikrama (and diplomacy), 78
Vikramāḍitya-sāṃrājya-sīmā, 72
Vikramāṅkābhyudaya, 7, 33, 144
  on anākakāra 151
Vilāsa, 122ff.
Vilāsabāṇaḥ, 126
Vilāsacāpaḥ, 125
Vilāsadhanvā dhanur ācakarṣa, 125
Vilāsadolāphalake niṭamba, 110
Vilāsavātāyanasevanena, 186
Vilāsoṅge viśeṣo yaḥ, 124
Vināyakam prakurvāno, 197
Vipakṣavārābhatkārīṛtiḥṛī, 205
Viraha-sandeśa-lekhana-preśana, 207
Vīramṛdaṅga, 151
Viratasurata, 202
Virutāni cāṣtau, 113
Viṣamo’pi vigāhyate nayaḥ, 15
Viśikhaśakala, 164
Viṣṇoh pratiṣṭheti Vibhīṣaṇasya, 35
Viṭaspṛhāṇām api muktiḥājām, 70
Viśṭha vs. vikīrṇa, 54ff.
Viveśa subhrūr atha sūtikāgrham, 56
Vivṛtya (Misra), 46
Vṛḍālavaśabalitaḥ, 167
Vṛthā gāthāślokair alam alam, 206
Vṛttam vs. bhṛtyam, 177
Vṛttaratnākara, 63
Vyadhita tadānu devyāḥ patravallīm kapole, 143
Vyāprtair aviratam śilīmukhaiḥ, 69
Vyutpattiḥ, 185ff.
Vyutpattir āvarjitakovidāpi (wrt Misra), 22, 185

Whitney, W. D., 62
Why This Book?, 82
Word formation, 146

Yā dugdhāpi na dugdheva, 86
Yadātapatram mama netrapadma, 34
Yāḍṛśaṁ pustakam dṛṣṭam, 76
Yadyapi na bhavati hāṇīḥ . . . rāsabhe, 21
Yāḥ śrotāṃrtaṇirjharaihavasatim, 203
Yām vīksya pāthodhir adhijyacāpam, 189
Yamaka-alaṅkāra, 205
Yānasthānaśanādīnām, 124
Yānūrmiḻatpir āyaṁ ca tavātmajaś ca, 114
Yasmin kīcīcin na tad upavanam, 166
Yasminnurvīpati . . . caṅcāc-catura, 60
Yasya bhrātā Kṣitipatir iti, 171
Yasya prāptādbhutaparinātēḥ karkāse, 176
Yasya prātāpo’gnir āpūrva eva, 152, 170
Yasya svecchāśabara-caritālokanā, 185
Yasya . . . mārvīravaḥ . . . pātālatala, 57
Yasyākhilavāyāpi yaso’vadātām, 170
Yasyāṅjanaśyāmalaradgapaṭṭa, 36
Yasyāś Coraś cikuranikuraḥ, 124
Yasyotsaṅge kulasarid asau Nīlakaṇṭha, 69
Yatra tiṣṭhati virodham udvahan, 183
Yatra vs. yanna, 70
Ye dolākelikārāḥ kim api mrgadrśām, 94
Ye kepi tebhyo'ñjalīḥ, 155
Ye kuṇṭhīkṛtavallabha, 131, 193
Yena kena prakāreṇa (wrt Misra), 206
Yenānargala, 204
Yenodīcyām divī gatavatā . . . cañcaca-Caṇḍīpati, 60
Yeśām ca virodhaḥ śāsvatikaḥ, 77
Youth (of Nagar), 143
Andhana niyamana yathändhāḥ.

One scholar named Priyatamacandra Śāstrī earned the degree of Vidyāvāridhi (= P h.D.) from the Vāraṇaseya Śaṅskṛta Viśvavidyālaya on a śodhaprabandha titled Vikramāṅkadevacaritasya Sāhitvikam Sarveksanam under the guidance of a fantastic scholar named Pattabhirama Sastrī, famous as a mūmāmsaka. I don't know how much of Sāhitaya he knew, but he had earned a great deal of fame and notoriety. He seems to have given a true ex ample of two well-known and very ancient nyāyas: "Na hi sarvaḥ sarvam jānāti" and "And hena niyamāna yathändhāḥ." This will be proved by the time this note is finished.

This scholar Priyatamacandra says that he received great help from Batuk Nath Shastri Khisht. This too seems to be a mānāntaraviruddhaarthavāda. This Batuk Nath and I used to play pranks together. We were almost classmates; he was just one or two years ahead.

I 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-pratibimbha-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 "Caritacandrikā," this pathabhrānta andhena niyamananda andha sc holar-pretender Vidyāvāridhi says,


Then he copies some of my words from my Upodghāta without understanding the meaning.

What a worthless interpretation, and what a horribly misleading statement! Such sc holar-pretenders are awarded Vidyā vāridhi degrees on such worthless and misleading writings! To me all this looks as an unmattapralāpa. I was born and brought up in Banaras. I know where and how much bhānga is used there. This fantastic scholar must have been m adhuramadārārasapaṇamadonnattaḥ when he wrote his śodhaprabandha. How else we can explain such writing? If we apply the sthātipulākanyāya to this statement, we can well gu ess what kind the whole work would be.
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Vikramāṅkadevacarita is one of the best historical poems in Sanskrit literature, if not the best. Bilhaṇa ranks as one of the greatest poets the world has enjoyed. He was exceptionally romantic, almost a legend himself. A court poet of Cālukya Vikramāditya VI, a great emperor of 11th century India, Bilhaṇa composed the poem as a panegyric for his patron.

Dr. Nagar’s work corrects some wayward modern 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 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 succeeding critics. The book is quite extensive, yet very inexpensive. It has an elaborate index and a map of contemporary India. Studied with charming gems of Sanskrit poetic citations, it’s a lovely reading that will bring enjoyment.
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