

B i l h a ṅ a ' s

Vikramāṅkadevacarita

and

Its Neo-Expounders

By

Dr. Murari Lal Nagar

Sahityacharya, Kavyatirtha, Kavyasindhu

M.A., Doctor of Library Science

Second Ed. Revised

International Library Center

Columbia, MO

1999

Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita And Its Neo-Expounders

CONTENTS

ĀMUKHAM	iii
AN APPRECIATION	viii
DVITĪYAM ĀMUKHAM	x
INTRODUCTION	001
CHAPTER	
I. Specimens of Textual Difficulties	043
II. Some Lexicographical Points of Interest	255
III. Secondary Source Material Relating to <i>Vikramāṅkadevacarita</i>	271
IV. Verses Ascribed to Bilhaṇa in Anthologies	278
V. Conclusions	295
Appendix I: On <i>Caritacandrikā</i>	298
Appendix II: Cālukya Cola Empires	313
Bibliography of Misra	314
Anubandhaḥ	316
Index	318

Āmukham

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

Guṇadoṣān aśāstrajñāḥ kathaṃ vibhajate janaḥ.
Kim andhasyādhikāro'sti rūpabhedopalabधिṣu.
Kāvyaḍarśaḥ.

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

Girām pravṛttir mama nīrasā'pi mānyā bhavitrī nṛpateś caritraiḥ.
Ke vā na śuṣkāṃ mṛdam abhrasindhu-sambandhinīm mūrdhani dhārayanti.
Bilhaṇasya.

Pavitram atrātanute jagad yuge smṛtā rasakṣālanayeva yatkathā.
Kathaṃ na sā madgiram āvilām api svasevinīm eva pavitrayiṣyati.
Śrīharṣasya.

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

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

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

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

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

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

When I arrived in this country for the second time in 1965, one of my friends in India wrote to me to the effect that at that point I was in a country of plenty and abundance and thereonwards I won't feel any monetary need. I wrote him back to the effect: "Yes, it is true. Every house in America is blessed in its courtyard with a Tree of Dollars. The householder has just to get up in the morning and shake the tree. The dollars just shower until the shaking stops!"

America may seem a land of plenty for those who have never toiled and suffered here, but it is built by the bones of toilers and joined by the blood, sweat, and tears of the sufferers. America has been made what she is. It was not discovered the way she is now. The wealth of America has been drawn from the bosom of the Mother Earth. It is not fallen down onto the earth from the open skies. Neither it is an imperial creation. Well, this was an aside. Maybe some eyes get opened wide enough to realize and perceive the truth.

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

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

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

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

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

The reader will observe that a great deal of stealing has been committed by some "scholars" from my previous work on Bilhaṇa, whose plagiarism has been criticized by me. Yet I give full freedom to any Sanskrit pandit to edit this work, revise it and publish it. There is no copyright!

Viśvanātha Śāstrī Bhāradvāja, I think, is no more there to see his criticism. But Misra will certainly see. I don't think it will serve any useful purpose. He has already reached the top of the Mount Everest. He cannot go any higher. But he will certainly come down in the eyes of those who have been misled by him. So a copy will be sent to Tübingen.

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

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

Satyam eva jayate.

Columbia, MO

Murari L. Nagar

Gandhi Jayanti

Sāhityacharya (1940)

(2 October 1990)

An Appreciation

Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita and its neo-expounders

During my sojourn in the U.S.A. in 1991, I was pleased to see a scholarly work entitled *Bilhaṇa's 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 *Cari tacandrikā*. Both the critics unfairly utilized the writings of Dr. Nagar without any acknowledgement whatsoever. Bharadvaja assigned the *Candrikā* to an ancient writer of the thirteenth century though it was written by Dr. Nagar in the middle of this century and the composer is still alive and well and is working at the University of Missouri at Columbia in America. In many places both the critics ignored the explanations of *Cari tacandrikā* and gave their own which are less acceptable, or not at all acceptable.

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

**Asatpraudhyanṛtājñāna-dūṣaṇair dūnacetasah.
Kāvyopaplavaśaṅkotthaḥ kopo granthatvam āgataḥ.**

I examined the points of disagreement very carefully and gave suggestions to change wherever necessary. I agree with Dr. Nagar in so many places. While advancing his views, he has discussed them in a very vivid language, citing authoritative statements from various sastric disciplines to lead the reader along convincingly to the just goal.

He has the ability of catching the subtle meanings in the poem, which are hidden from the mind of an ordinary reader. He does not want to twist the meaning of the words or to replace them according to his own sweet will and pleasure, but tries faithfully to derive the meaning as the poet himself intended. In fact, he has in the book confessed his inability to get the meaning in some places as a true researcher ought to do, without trying to extract some sort of a meaning by hook or crook. And he does not hesitate to admit his own errors of judgment crept through his limitation of knowledge as a youth

h in his early twenties when he prepared his previous work. His patience and perseverance to bring the truth to light is highly praiseworthy. He was so anxious to bring out the correct text of Bilhaṇa's immortal poem that he took an arduous journey to Jaisalmer long ago in order to collate the readings in the light of the additional data made available since Drs. Bühler and Jacobi copied the entire manuscript in just a week in the year 1974. The wrong interpretations of Misra were felt so worthless by Dr. Nagar that he held doubts about Misra's getting the degree on the basis of the published booklet. He entered into lengthy correspondence with the authorities of the University of Tübingen wherefrom Dr. Misra claims to have received the degree. The authorities could not solve the riddle and have admitted that Misra has no legal right to call himself a DOCTOR.

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

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

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

Dvitīyam Āmukham

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

Mahākavi Śrīharṣa has sung:

Pavitram atrātanute jagad yuge

And our own poet Bilhaṇa too:

Girām pravṛttir mama nīrasāpi

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sūtradhāraḥkṛtārambhair nāṭakair bahubhūmikaiḥ.
Sapatākair yaśo lebhe Bhāso devakulair eva.

What did Bhāsa say? He assured us:

Dvīpād anyasmād api madhyād api jalanidher diśo'pyantāt.
Ānīya jhaṭīti ghaṭayati vidhir abhimatam abhimukhībhūtaḥ.

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

Dr. Satapathy went through the entire book. Though no more possessing the best hearing 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 *Bilhaṇamahākaviyaśogūṇagāna*. 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 ślokatva m 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 thankful to him.

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

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

Sarve bhavantu sukhinaḥ sarve santu nirāmayāḥ.
Sarve bhadraṇi paśyantū 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 mahākāvya of the great Kashmirian poet Bilhaṇa is one of the best (if not the best) historical poems in Sanskrit literature. It follows a new path in poetic composition and blazes a new trail scarcely witnessed in earlier poets. Bilhaṇa himself declares:

Praudhiprakaṣeṇa purāṇarīti-vyatikramaḥ ślāghyatamaḥ padānām.
Atyunnatisphoṭitakañcukāni vandyāni kāntākucamaṇḍalāni.

And also

Sahasraśaḥ santu viśāradānām vaidarbhalīlānidhayaḥ prabandhāḥ.
Tathāpi vaicityarahasyalubdhāḥ śraddhāṃ vidhāsyanti sacetaso'tra.

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

I have succeeded in seeing a portion of the famous Bhandar of the Oswal Jains of the 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 guinea-worms.

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

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

The Carita was prescribed for the Sāhitya Ācārya Examination (Pt.I) of the Government Sanskrit College, Banaras (now Sanskrit University, Varanasi) for the first time in 1940. By that time I had already studied Sanskrit for about 12 years and had read most of the works by great Sanskrit writers like Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Daṇḍin, Māgha, Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti, Śriharṣa and Subandhu, etc., some at the venerable feet of great Sanskrit gurus in Banaras and some through my self-study.

As an act of dharma and also for svāntaḥ sukhāya I used to teach Sanskrit to students junior to me every day for about seven hours. In July of 1939 I was requested to teach the Carita. However, I had no time. That was my final year in the University and I had to maintain my first position in the final examination. So I did not want to teach. Nevertheless, two of my close friends, who had to study it as part of their curriculum, prevailed upon me. I had no choice. That was my first acquaintance with this great work. My association with Bilhaṇa, which began then, is still continued even after 37 years. [This writing goes back to 1977].

The two friends were regular students of the College and were studying the work with an old professor there, who was not at all able to grasp the true meaning of many verses. For example, he interpreted the word śauṇḍīryam as 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 got it published with his own commentaries from the Banaras Hindu University. If Bilhaṇa could hear how his poetic muse was molested by this great pandit, he would have certainly cried in despair. It was truly the murder of Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū.

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

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

One of the greatest causes of the unintelligibility of the text was the corruptness of the edition we were using. Dr. Bühler's first edition of 1875 had gone long out of print. The then available edition published under the name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Pt. Rāmāvatāra Śarmā was a total disgrace to Sanskrit scholarship. With regard to it, I had declared in 1945:

Idaṃ no daurbhāgyam saubhāgyam vā, yat prācīnatamam śuddhatamam
ca Ja. pustakaṃ sarvathānte, navīnatamam aśuddhatamaṃ ca Rā. pusta
kaṃ sarvataḥ prathamam avālokyata. Anyathā mūlasaṃsodhane'smatkṛtaḥ
cirapariśramaḥ kaṣṭhānubhavaśca abhāvakoṭāveva tiṣṭhet. [Prastāvanā, p.7
]

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

Dvītyam--Kāśīsthajñānamaṇḍalādhikāribhir guruvaryyānāṃ sammatyā
asammatyā vā tannāmnā prakāśitam atīvāśuddham iti śrīguruvaryyānāṃ dṛṣṭi

patham api na gataṃ syād ityeva dyotayati. Sati ravikaranikarapraveśe k
uto'ndha- kārasya saṃbhavaḥ? [Vol. I, Kiñcit prāstāvikaṃ, p.1].

And

Kālakramād būlarasaṃskaraṇe samāptim āsādite kāsīstha-Jñānamaṇḍal

a

mudrāyantrālayān mahāmahopādhyāya-pañḍitapravara-guruvara-Śrī-Rāmā-
vatāraśarmaṇāmnā sampāditam prakṛtamahākāvyaṣya saṃskaraṇāntaram
ca prakāśabhāvam ānīyata. Param atra saṃskaraṇa'pi [?] pūrvasaṃkaraṇa-
śuddhīnām nirākasya kā kathā [?] navanavānyaśuddhyantarāṅyapi locanapthā

tithitām ¹prayānti, yataḥ saḥḍayānām cekhidiate cetaḥ. Atra śrīmatām guru
varyāṅam nāma saṃyogo manasi vicikitsām utpādayati.

[Vol. I, *Bhūmikā*, p. 3]

----- Bh makes a very funny statement here:-- locanapathātithitām prayānti. Mistakes, errors,
and blunders cannot be compared with atithis, the guests! Bh continues: yataḥ saḥḍayānām cekh
idyate 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 none of his b
usiness if his words lead to that bhāva or not! This is called Bhāradvāja-racanā-śailī. [This is a footn
ote. Not properly displayed.]

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

5. Vikramānka-deva-caritam...Rāmā-vatāra-Śarmaṇā saṃskṛtam [ed. b
y Rāmāvatāra Śarmā]. Benares: Jñānamaṇḍala Press, 1978 [i.e.=1921]. 1,4,2,
153p. This edition, which is full of inaccuracies, seems to have been associ
ated by some one with the great name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Pañḍita Rām
āvatāra Śarmā. [p. 111].

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

The learned pañḍit Sharma tells us in his short introduction of one and a half pages,
which too is full of numerous errors, that he has corrected Bühler's errors as far as prac
ticable. We took his word to be true and correct. It was a Herculean task--a Bhagīrath
a prayāsa to bring the River Gaṅgā of Bilhaṇa's Muse on to this earth once again. It w
as found to be a very difficult task indeed.

1

----- Bh makes a very funny statement here:-- locanapathātithitām prayānti. Mistakes, errors,
and blunders cannot be compared with atithis, the guests! Bh continues: yataḥ saḥḍayānām cekhidiate 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 none of his business if his words lead to that bhāva or not! This is called Bhāradvāja-racanā-śailī. [This is a
footnote. Not properly displayed.]

However, gradually we became disillusioned and realized that the text of Sharma as presented in his edition suffered from many inaccuracies. It may sound like bragging (ātmaślāghā), but sometimes we had to spend several hours--even days--in trying to reconstruct a word or a sentence. How could we even dream that Dr. Bühler's text would have been rather distorted by Śarmā!

Fortunately one of our friends chanced to see Bühler's edition with one of his classmates. He compared only two readings of Sharma's text with those of Bühler and reported them to me. It was great delight and reassurance. There was clear evidence that Bühler's edition was much 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:

Lekhanī pustikā nārī [dārāḥ] parahaste gatā gatā.
Āgatā daivayogena naṣṭā bhraṣṭā ca marditā.

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

But the same poem was prescribed for the second year of the Acarya Examination the following year. The same friends came to me once again and I had to teach them. These friends were highly intelligent and contributed a great deal toward the correct interpretation of the text. Here was a clear evidence to show how teaching is a cooperative enterprise and how intelligent students contribute enormously toward the enrichment of the teacher's knowledge. It was truly saha vīryam 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. we had to go out. I obtained a "MS" from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. When it arrived it did not look like a conventional manuscript at all! It was copied on a large size thick modern paper. Of course, it was in Bālabodha (Devanāgarī) characters but it seemed to be a *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 Jaisalmer.

Nagar's Edition:

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

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

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

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

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

It is indeed a great pleasure to find that the editor has greatly improved upon the earlier editions and has given us a more reliable text of the poem with the

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 his 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 Nagar had hardly any competence to write in English at that time!

Another reviewer commented in 1947:

S.D. Bhanot. *Indian Librarian*, 1 (March 1947): 126-27.

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 Editor Princeps of Dr. Bühler, highly useful in many ways, suffered obviously from defects resulting from the inadequate and unsatisfactory character of the materials then available. The attempt of Pandit Ramavatara Sharma that followed also failed to improve upon the text of Dr. Bühler. In fact his text is definitely more unsatisfactory as compared to that of his predecessor.

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

Besides a critical Introduction and a brief though none-the-less useful glossary explaining important and difficult words and incorporating most of the notes in the scribe's own hand on the ancient Jasmere 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 Geneological Tables of the Lohara and Calukya families. These features have considerably added to the usefulness of the edition.

Even Misra (with his tiny little knowledge and a totally insensitive mind) was able to perceive the value of N's ed. as late as 1976:

Vikramāṅkadevacaritam Mahākāvyaṃ; ed. [with an elaborate Sanskrit introduction], by Murari-[] Lal Nagar. Benares: Govt. Sanskrit College, 1945. 2,[2], 12, 40, 325. 42, [6]. [!] p., fold map, tabs., app., (The Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bahavana Texts Series, 82)

This ed., which has invariably [?] been referred to by me as editio secunda, is in fact a great improvement on the previous ed. 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 prastāvanā. An elaborated [!] introduction of forty pages, an alphabetical list of proper names, an index to the verses, an extensive gloss, a map of the Chola and Chalukya empire [!], a reproduction of the Nilgunda copper plate inscription of Vikramaditya VI, dynastical tables of the Lohara, Chola and Western Chalukyas, and a concordance of important king-names [!] make this edition still more useful. [Stress added] (Misra pp. 111-12)

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

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

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

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

I learnt that Pt. Vishwanath Shastri Bharadwaj of the Banaras Hindu University was working on the Vikramāṅkadevacarita. In order to avoid duplication, I wrote to him to the following effect:

I have been working on the Vikramāṅkadevacarita of Mahākavi Bilhaṇa for many years. Now I want to bring out a revised edition of the work. I have learnt that you are also working on the same poem. There is no point in two people working on the same poem when there are thousands of unpublished literary gems still buried among bundles of manuscripts in our old libraries.

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

His reply was anything but pleasant. He said:

Pt. Vishwanath Shastri Bharadwaj	17 Gol
Magali	
M.A., Kavyatirth, Vidyavagish	Banar
Das - 1	
Retd. Lecturer, History of Sanskrit	Dated
Literature and Philosophy	January 27
, 1960	
Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya, B.H.U.	
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 Lal[!] Ji,

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

Regarding Bilhaṇa'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 Sanskrit 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 slumbering [!] for years together.

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

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

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

Again thanking you for your edition of Vikramankdeva Charitam.

Yours sincerely

[Sd. V. N. Shastri]

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

I wrote to him immediately:

24/4 Railway Colony
Kishanganj
February 5, 1960

Dear Shri Bharadwaj:

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

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

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

Please return the book after you have gone through it!

Thanks again,

Sincerely yours,

Murari L. Nagar

Pt. Vishwanath Shastri Bharadwaj
17 Golagali
Banaras-1

Reminder sent on March 3, 1960.

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 ṭippaṇī, 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 Vikramānka and Bilhaṇa, the writing of the gloss was a quick affair and so trivial!

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

Antarbhāvitataṭṭippaṇīkā saiṣā "Candrikā" tanīyasyapi granthārtham ujvalayīṣy
atīti viśvasimaḥ.

Is it not clear from this statement that the Caritacandrikā is different from Jaisalmer's "ṭippaṇī," that the Caritacandrikā contains the "ṭippaṇī," 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 footnote:

* Ūdrśacihnadvayāntarvartinī ṭippaṇī
Jaisalmeragranthasthetyavagantavyam

and the quotations in the Caritacandrikā from Jaisalmer's ṭippaṇī are preceded and followed by (i.e. enclosed within) the sign *, e.g. * *Rādhā Viṣṇubhāryā* * (p.209), * *abhi prāyo'nyatrollikhanam* * (p.210). I have also given Hindī-paryāyāḥ. Do you think the words of Hindī which I have given here and there did exist in the 12th or 13th century?

Furthermore, at the end of the Caritacandrikā I have given the date V. 2001--. Did you see it? What does it mean?

Well, I am very much grateful to you for whatever nice things you have said about my work on the whole. If you think that the editor of the poem or the writer of the gloss Caritacandrikā has understood the poet to any extent, I can assure you that your work does not lead him even one inch further! While I was a student in Banaras and was e

engaged in editing this work, I went from door to door begging for the correct meaning of the obscure words. None was able to help me! So I wrote "Asya padasyārtho nāvag amyate". Your big commentaries are typical of what other pandits used to say in Banaras (e.g. śrotṇām itī vastuviplavakṛtaḥ prāyeṇa ṭikākṛtaḥ).

I don't know what is the purpose in explaining, for example, a word "sūtikāgrham" by another word "ariṣṭam? For such work our forefathers have been saying: "Maghavā kī ṭikā Biḍaujā!" 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 pratyaya of an obscure word like akṣūṇa, yet it does not convey the meaning desired by a saḥṛdaya. For such vaiyākaraṇakhasūci/s we have: Vadantu katiciddhathāt khaphachatheti varṇacchaṭāḥ.

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 other's works and do not even acknowledge! Probably they think that the author from whom they are stealing might have left this world long ago, or, that he would not be able to see the act of stealing even if he were still alive.

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

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

Comments on Bh's Edition

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

In countries like India, and in the communities which are not yet totally ruined by the unwholesome influences of Western traditions and in which things occur even now as they used to be in ancient days, marriages are still arranged. In societies where a long courtship precedes the actual marriage, the girl may come to know almost, say, all the aunts and uncles of the boy. However, when the girl sees the boy for the first time only after the marriage, as is the case when marriages are arranged because the families follow the same old orthodox Indian tradition, there is no possibility of the girl's getting acquainted with the family members of the boy. After the wedding ceremony is completed, the groom (husband) leads his newly-wed wife to the audience, including rel

atives, and offers his respects by bowing down to each and every one of his elders. The girl follows him and bows down to whomsoever the husband bows down. She does not know at all the person to whom she is paying her homage. It is merely a ritual--just because the husband bows down to the person, it is her duty to follow suit!

Visvanatha Sastri Bharadvaja, the great editor and commentator of Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacaritam concludes his "Kiñcit Prāstāvikam" with the following words:

Śrīmadbhyo Dā Jārja Byuhlara, Ke. Kṛṣṇammācāriyara, E. Bī. Kītha, Rāmanātha Dīkṣita, Mahāvīraprasāda Dvivedī, Kalhaṇa...Prabhṛtibhyaḥ sarve bhyo mānyebhyo lekhakebhyas teṣām pustakalekhā-valokanena bahuśa upakṛtatvāt dhanyavādān samarpayāmi.

So, among others, Bharadvaj salutes also Śrī Rāmanātha Dīkṣita and says that he was highly obliged to him (RND) in so many ways since he (Bh) studied his (of RND) work (pustaka/lekha). We are not sure which particular Ramanatha Diksita 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. At least I did not consult any of his published books. He was my fellow-scholar at the Govt. Sanskrit College, Banaras, where both of us were recipients of the Sadholal Research Fellowship and conducted our own individual research.

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

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

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

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

The same work has been cited by Bharadvaj in his "Pariśiṣṭam Gha. Vikramāṅkdevacarita-mahākāvyaśya Vikramādityasya ca Varṇanātmakā Lekhā Granthāś ca," appearing at the end of his V. 1, in the following words:

5. Cālukya Ṣaṣṭha Vikramāditya kā Jivana va Samaya--Śrī Rāmnātha Dīkṣita, Sāhitya Śiromaṇi, Sādholāla Risarca Skālara, Banārasa-- Śrī E. Vhī. Veṅkaṭaramaṇa [sic] dvārā Temila [sic] Bhāṣā meṃ Likhita the Life and Times of C

halukya Vikramaditya VI [?] kā Anuvāda. [N.B. There is no imprint and no collation either!]

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

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

Bh says that he saw Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī (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 Subhāṭā (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 VIDYĀVĀGĪSH! (See his letterhead).

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

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

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

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

No v l. is recorded except [sic] cases where the editor has come up with his own conjecture. Other features, viz. index to verses and proper names, general

ogical tabs., map, inscription etc. have been mostly reproduced, as such, from the editio secunda. (stress added)

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

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

Great poets have beautifully described such great "commentators":

Durbodhaṃ yad atīva taddhi [vi] jahati spaṣṭārtham ityuktibhiḥ
Spaṣṭārtheṣvativistrīṃ vidadhati vyarthaiḥ samāsādikaiḥ.
Asthāne'nupayogibhiśca bahubhir jalpair bhramaṃ tanvate
Śrot+rṇām iti vastuviplavakṛtaḥ prāyeṇa ṭikākṛtaḥ.
(Ascribed to Bhoja)

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

Bhaṅgas taraṅga ūrmir vā striyām vīcir athormiṣu.
Mahatsūllolakallolau... (ityamarah).

So kallolāḥ can be rendered as mahāntas taraṅgaḥ. It is ridiculous to gloss kallolāḥ 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, better known-- (*pracalita*) than *ullolāḥ*. Also, we would like to know what is the gain in explaining pṛthivyāḥ by pṛthivyāḥ. It is simply piṣṭapeṣaṇaṃ.

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

Viṣamo'pi vigāhyate nayaḥ kṛtatīrthaḥ payasām ivāśayaḥ.
Sa tu tatra viśeṣadurlabhaḥ sad upanyasyati kṛtyavartma yaḥ.
[*Kirātārjunīya*. 2:3]

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

Bilhaṇa says:

Sāhityapāthonidhimanthanottham karṇāmṛtam rakṣata he kavīndrāḥ.
Yad asya daityā iva luṅṭhanāya kāvyārthcaurāḥ praguṇībhavanti.

The poet had in his mind writer-pretenders like Bh in his mind. Bh copies from N e d. prfofusely, yet he professes to have improved N' s text. The present work will provide innumerable examples of the depth of knowledge of Bh and demonstrate how beautifully he has improved the text!

Bh admits that N has worked really hard to get the correct reading. He does have some good words for N's ed. Yet he attributes certain errors to it. He says: "*Parañcātrāp i yatra tatra sampādanarabhasād anyakāraṇād vā pā ha-bhedanirṇaye pramādo jāta i va dṛśyate.*" He cites three example to prove his point. The first example cited by Bh is *Asmarad dviradadānavāriṇā.*

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

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

Śūro'si kṛtavidyo'si darśanīyo'si putraka.
Yasmin kule tvam utpanno gajas tatra na hanyate.

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

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

Hastadvayīgāḍhagr̥hītalola-dolāguṇānām jaghane vadhūnām.
Asamvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe kimapyabhūd ucchvasito manobhūḥ. [7:29]

There is a famous *ukti*:

Nāndhrīpayodhara ivātitārām prakāśaḥ no gurjarīstana ivātitārām nigūḍhaḥ.
Artho girām apihitaḥ pihitaśca kaścit saubhāgyameti Marahaṭṭavadhūkucābhaḥ.
[quoted in *Bālabodhinī Comm. on Kāvya prakāśa.*, v.45]

Thus if the vital organs (of the bodies) of the ladies would become totally naked, it would be obscene. There would be *bībhatsa* scene and not the continuity of *śṛṅgāra*.

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

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

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

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

Jaba Sva. mānanīya Śarmā jī ke [*guruvarya* of Vol.1 has now become only Śarmājī] *saṃskaraṇa kī pustakeṃ aprāpya hone lagīṃ taba yaha āvaśyaka t hā ki isa*

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

mahākāvya kā eka śuddha [!] *saṃskaraṇa* nikale. Isa liye Ḍā. Maṅgaladeva Śāstrī Em. E. Ḍi. Phil (Ānksan) [!] *Pustakālayādhyakṣa*, Sarasvatī Bhavana Pustakālaya, Vārāṇasi ne Sādholāla Risarca Skālara [!] Śri Paṃ. Murārī [!] Lāla Nāgara Em. E. Sāhityācārya dvārā Sarasvatī Bhavana Pustakālaya, Vārāṇasī se isakā ṛtīya *saṃskaraṇa prakāśita karāyā*. Isameṃ sandeha nahīṃ ki yaha *saṃskaraṇa prakāśaka* [!] mahodaya ke athaka *parīśrama* se, *prakāśita tīna saṃskaraṇaṃ* meṃ śuddha va uttama hai.

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

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

Ī. 1940 Varṣāt Kā. Rā. Saṃ. Ma. parīkṣāyām pāṭhyatvena nirdhāritam itīdam caritaṃ lokānām viśeṣato nayanagocarātām agacchat. Tadaivāsmābhir etat-kāvyaṃ pāṭhayadbhir asya mātmyam itihāsajñānasāpekṣatvam upalabdhasaṃskaraṇasya ca doṣabāhulyam abhyupa gamya etadviśayakaviśiṣṭādhyayanāder āvaśyakatvam anvabhāvi. Kiṃ ca kāvyamūla saṃśodhanādāvapi prāvarttyata. Sarasvatībhavane Sādholālarisarca-skālararūpeṇa gaveṣaṇā vasare samupalabdhe Vikramāṅkadeva- carita viśayaka gaveṣaṇā manoratho'smābhis teṣām (Dā. Maṅgaladeva-śāstriṇām) purataḥ pratyavāst hāpyata.

Svānupamaḡaṇapreritās te tu na paraṃ tatkāryam anvamodayanta, api tu sādhu sa mpādite tasmin mudraṇāśvāsanamapyaduḥ.

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 [!] Nagar! He must have returned from a distant planet after a lapse of decades. Or, he must have 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 this Introduction of Bh. I was not even a B.A., not to talk of M.A., when I completed this research! I don't know what the writer means by "*prakāśaka mahodaya*"! Does he mean the "College"? We can only bow down our head in reverence (or in disgust) for this sagacious suggestion.

The writer (surrogate of Bh) reaches the highest peak of his vain glory when he takes the courage and declares:

Kucha sthalom para isa tṛtīya saṃskaraṇa meṃ bhī mujhe pāṭhabheda meṃ parivartana karanā paṛā hai jo vicāra vinimaya ke anantara āvaśyaka pratīta huā.

He gives three examples, already discussed.

And then he makes a general bold statement:

Isa prakāra prāyaḥ sabhī sargoṃ meṃ thoṛā bahuta pāṭhabheda karanā āvaśyaka huā hai.

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

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

Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham.

We are also reminded of another nītivacana:

Mūrkho'pi śobhate tāvat yāvat kiñcin na bhāṣate

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

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

Misra's Magnum Opus

The above background is presented here just to assure the readers that the present writer is not a beginner in this line (Sanskrit studies). I have studied Bilhaṇa probably more than any other scholar in modern times.

In 1977 I chanced to see the Studies on Bilhaṇa and his Vikramāṅkadevacarita by B. N. Misra. The learned author has featured his degrees on the title page as follows:

M.A., D.L.Sc.
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 Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita (Vcar.), which I undertook under the guidance of Professor Paul Thieme.

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

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

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

It is hoped that the treatment of certain lexicographical items [?] in Chapter I, [!] will not only help the understanding and interpretation of Bilhaṇa, 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. Subhāṣitaratnaśāstra (Srk); Saduktikaraṇāmṛta (Sk.); Sūktimuktāvalī (Smk.); Śārngadharaṇḍhātī (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 Bilhaṇa's verses are quoted in anthologies anonymously. These are marked in the table of concordance of quotations on pp. 65-68.

The most interesting result of Chapter IV, [?] is the proof that Vidyākara quotes Bilhaṇa's Karnasundari (cp. verse 39) on p. 81 whereby Kosambi's argument regarding the time of Vidyākara in so far as it is based on his not knowing Bilhaṇa (cp. Srk. Introd. p. xxxiii), is shown to be invalid. Verses not verifiable in the extant works of Bilhaṇa, but ascribed to him in the anthologies, have been taken either from oral tradition of single verses or from works of his which are altogether lost. Four of the verses ascribed to Bilhaṇa (cp. vv. 14, 64, 71 and 79) treat the subject of the Rāma-story. This may seem interesting in connection with the Vcar. 18.94 and Bühler's assumption of Bilhaṇa's having composed Rāmastuti (a proper "Rāmacarita" with Bilhaṇa as an [!] author seems rather unlikely). On several occasions the verses treated here show affinity in style or vocabulary with the extant work [?] of Bilhaṇa and these as such have been discussed critically. Not in all cases the genuineness of the ascription to Bilhaṇa is warranted by such further evidence.

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

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

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

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

B.N. Misra

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

he order adopted is, however, that of Vik. itself so that some sort of sequence is maintained.

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

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

Yadyapi na bhavati hāniḥ parakīyāṃ carati rāsabhe drākṣām.
Anucitam idam iti kṛtvā hā hā hā heti khidyate cetaḥ.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Misra himself ignites the fire. And then he shouts "fire", "fire"! He takes a bucket, puts the fire out, as it were, and declares himself to be a hero!

Many a time he destroys a load-bearing wall while attempting his "fire-fighting" enterprises and the whole building tumbles, and crumbles, and gets turned into rubble.

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

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

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

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

Gaṇayanti nāpaśabdaṃ na vṛttabhaṅgam kṣayaṃ na cārthasya.
Rasikatvenākulitāḥ veśyāpatayaḥ kukavayaś ca.

[Baladeva Upadhyaya, comp. *Sūkti-mañjarī*, Varanasi, 1967, p.25]

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

1. Kuṅṭhatvam āyāti guṇaḥ kavīnām sāhityavidyāśramavarjiteṣu.
Kuryād anārdreṣu kim aṅganānām keśeṣu kṛṣṇāgurudhūpavāsaḥ. [1:14]
2. Vyutpattir āvarjitakovidāpi na rañjanāya kramate jaḍānām.
Na mauktikacchidrakarī śalākā pragalbhate karmaṇi ṭāṅkikāyāḥ. [1:16]
3. Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti saṅkrāntavakrokti-rahasya-mudrāḥ.
Te'smatprabandhān avadhārayantu kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham. [1:22]
4. Alaukikollekhasamarpaṇena vidagdhetakāṣapaṭṭikāsu.
Parīkṣitaṃ kāvyasuvarṇam etal lokasya kaṅṭhābharaṇatvam etu. [1:24]

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

was also able to get more information about--an inner view of--this great author and critic. The dust-jacket reads:

Bilhaṇa'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 Bilhaṇa'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, we do not find these conclusions convincing at all! Rather, we believe, they are mis

leading. The reader will examine the comments of Misra and our criticism thereon. We hope that will help in the correct understanding of Bilhaṇa's poetic muse.

We are reminded of some immortal words of Kavikulaguru Kālidāsa:

Taṃ santaḥ śrotum arhanti sadasadvaktihetavaḥ.
Hemnaḥ saṃlakṣyate hyagnau viśuddhiḥ śyāmikāpi vā. 1:10

Also our own poet Bilhaṇa has expressed his sincere wish:

Ullekhalīlāghaṭanāpaṭūnām sacetasām vaikaṭīkopamānām.
Vicāraśāṅopalapaṭṭīkāsu matsūktiratnānyatithībhavantu. [1:19]

There are 6 chapters in Misra's work:

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

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

Before we begin our critical study of the great performance of this great "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 Tübingen has proved that he did not receive the degree! The correspondence is presented here as an evidence. Misra's Magnum Opus & the University of Tübingen

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

Misra begins his "Preface" with the following words: "The investigations submitted here have grown from a study of Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* (Vcar.), [Misra does not

ot 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 Bilhaṇa and his Vikramāṅkadevacarita (New Delhi, 1976).

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

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

Auf Ihre Anfrage vom 17.10.77 müssen wir Ihnen leider mitteilen, dass Herr Misra seine Dissertation noch nicht bei uns abgeliefert hat. Wir bemühen uns jedoch über einen Mitarbeiter unseres Hauses, der sich zur Zeit in Indien aufhält, Kontakt zu Herrn Misra aufzunehmen und werden Ihnen dann wieder Bescheid geben. Da wir unseren Kollegen erst Ende Dezember 1977 zurückerwarteten, werden wir Ihnen frühestens Anfang Januar 1978 Nachricht geben können. Wir bitten um etwas Geduld and verbleiben mit freundlichem Gruss im Auftrage.

Translated freely into English, the above would read:

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

I could not grasp the meaning in full. My curiosity was not satisfied at all. I was still wondering whether the full dissertation was available in Tübingen University and whether it was submitted originally in German. It was my assumption that a German University would insist on the dissertation being written in German. Later I learnt from a 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, whom I wrote, had to get the needed information from the author through a common friend visiting India! There was a lack

of understanding. I wish I knew German or the lady would write to me in English. I wrote to her once again on Nov. 18, 1977:

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

I am an Oriental scholar and have devoted all my life to the study and teaching of Sanskrit. Bilhāṇa 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, just reproduced above, I received another letter from her dated 14.11.77 along with photo-copies of the preliminary pages of the book, which by the way, I already had with me. Here is what she wrote:

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

Translated into English, the above would read somewhat as follows:

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

With kind greetings.

I wrote to her:

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

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

Thanking you so much,

Her reply came promptly:

Wir bestätigen dankend den Eingang Ihres Schreibens vom 18. November 1977. Nach Auskunft von Herrn Professor Dr. Paul Thieme handelt es sich bei dem Ihnen vorliegenden Exemplar "Misra: Studies on Bilhaṇa..." um die vollständige Dissertation. Wir haben Ihr Schreiben im Original an Herrn Professor Dr. Thieme, Spemannstr. 14, 7400 Tübingen weitergeleitet und hoffen, dass er zur Klärung dieser Angelegenheit beitragen kann.

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 Bilhaṇa... it is a question of the complete dissertation. We have forwarded your letter in original to Professor Dr. Thieme, Spemannstr. 14, 7400 Tübingen and hope that he can contribute to the clarification of this matter.

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

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

Thanking you so much,

I never received a reply!

On September 25, 1978 I visited Tübingen with my wife. I met everyone there who might (or could) throw some light on the matter and solve the riddle. All my efforts proved fruitless. It was certain that the Misra in question was not yet a DOCTOR legally!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please send your reply to my address in India.

Thank you very much,

Once again there was no response whatsoever! What does this continued silence mean? I was left wondering.

In the middle of January 1979 I received the following letter from Tübingen:

Unter der von meinem Vorgänger mir übergebenen Post fand sich auch Ihr Brief vom 27. September 1978. Auf Ihre Anfrage "whether one Mr. B.N. Misra earned his 'Ph.D.' degree" kann ich Ihnen lediglich mitteilen, dass Herr Misra laut unserer Kartei am 18.2.1972 eine Dissertation ueber "Studies in [!] Bilhaṇa and his Vikramankadevacarita" eingereicht hat und dass am 29.5.1972 die mündliche Prüfung stattgefunden hat. (Hauptfach: Indologie, Nebenfacher: Bibliotheks-wissenschaft und Vergleichende Religions-wissen-schaft-Hauptberichterstatte Herr Prof. Thieme.)

Wie Sie sicher wissen, bedeutet das, dass Herr Misra zumindest nach deutschen Gepflogenheiten dadurch das Recht zur Führung des Doktorgrades noch nicht erhalten hat. Das ist erst nach Ablieferung der vorgeschriebenen Pflichtexemplare der gedruckten Dissertation und der im Anschluss daran erfolgenden Aushandigung des Doktordiploms möglich.

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 [!] Bilhaṇa and his Vikramankadevacarita" and that on 29.5.1972 the oral examination took place (Main subjects: Indology; Subsidiaries, Library Science and Comparative Theology--Main reporter Prof. Thieme.

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

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

And this is what I wrote to Dr. Klein:

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

I only wish I knew German. My question still remains unanswered: Did Mr. Misra really qualify for the degree? From what you have written I can only gather that he wrote a dissertation and took the "oral defence" as well. The only formality that yet remained to be gone through was the submission of the prescribed copies of the printed dissertation.

The question is: The book is already printed. Why did Mr. Misra not submit the prescribed number of copies to the University? Does he not care to see that the degree is conferred on him--even in absentia--and that he has the legal right to call himself a DOCTOR?

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

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

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

Please enlighten me in full details. I will appreciate.

Thanking you,

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

Some time after having received your letter of February 14th I will try [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 certification" the 12th of June 1972 and since this time didn't anything else happen here at the Dekanat; although we wrote him (Varanasi -5) several times.

2) Why Mr. Misra did not submit the copies, even if the book is printed, is a question which can be answered perhaps by Mr. Misra, but not by us. We also cannot understand why he renounces to get the legal right to bear the title. [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 dissertation (we do not know whether this is identical with the printed book or not), was accepted by the two "reviewers", Prof. Thieme and Prof. de Simone. Whether Prof. Thieme has reason to say anything to this affair or not, also is a question not to be answered by us.

I hope that these specifications suffice for you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SPECIMENS OF TEXTUAL DIFFICULTIES

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

1.48b- *lakṣa*- "aim": a wrong [!] orthography (cp. also 12.5: 18.30) instead of *lakṣya* a "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 *ṣ*. (cp. J. Wackernagel, *Altind. Gram.*, Bd. 1 para 235. 1957; 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:

Uttarjanīkena muhuḥ kareṇa kṛtākṛtāvekṣaṇabaddhalakṣaḥ.
Ruṣā niṣedhanniva ceṣṭitāni dikpālavargasya nirargalāni. [1:48]

We do not know what, if any, "difficulty" is here. The great lexicographer Amara lays down: *lakṣam lakṣyam śaravyam 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 *ṇyat* gives us *lakṣya*. We can have *cvi* from both.

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

Prāpnotyāśu paraṃ sthānam lakṣam mukta ivāśugaḥ.

Pratyakṣavad ākāśe lakṣam baddhvā.

Utkarṣaḥ sa ca dhanvinām yad iṣavaḥ
siddhyanti lakṣe cale.

Darpeṇa kautukavatā mayi baddhalakṣyaḥ.

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

01:48b Kṛtākṛtāvekṣaṇabaddhalakṣaḥ.

12:05 Gavākṣarandhrair avalokayantī
lakṣīkṛtā kāpi manobhavana.

18:30 Kṛīḍāvātāyanakṛtapadasyaiva lakṣībhavanti
[The above two have been listed twice unnecessarily
by Misra.]

07:73 Kāmaḥ saṃprati bāṇamokṣarasiko
lakṣyeṣvalakṣyeṣu ca.

12:76 Sthalavilūṭhitabāṣpavyaktilakṣyaiḥ kaṭākṣaiḥ.

13:19 Ghanoparodhāt taralākṣi lakṣyate.

13:52 Jarāvimumkteva mṛgākṣi lakṣyate.

13:55 Svabhāvanīlāḥ katham atra lakṣyatām.

17:04 Kvacin na durbhikṣam alakṣyata kṣitau.

[We don't know why Misra has included such
verbs here!]

18:81 Durlakṣyatvam kaliyugadr̥śām prāpīte brahmadhāmnā.

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

Pañceṣuś calalakṣabhedavidhinā garvaṃ samārohati.
[7:72]

It was all

Yena kena prakāreṇa prasiddhaḥ puruṣo bhavet.

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

Bilhaṇa says:

Jigīṣavaḥ ke'pi vijitya viśvam vilāsadīkṣārasikāḥ krameṇa.
Cakruḥ padaṃ nāgarakhaṇḍacumbi-pūgadrūmāyām diśi dakṣiṇasyām.

Nirviṣeṇāpi sarpeṇa kartavyā mahatī phaṇā.
Viṣaṃ bhavatu mā vāstu sphaṭāṭopo bhayaṅkaraḥ.
[ghaṭāṭopo bhayaṅkaraḥ ityapi pāṭhaḥ.]

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

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

Characteristic seems Vcar. 1.64:

nāgarakhaṇḍa-cumbipūgadruma
 "arecanut trees touching nāgara-khaṇḍa" (15)
 Misra's footnote

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

15.6ab subhaṭaḥ pramadākarārpitaṃ [!]
 dalayan nāgarakhaṇḍavīṭikām.

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

Other occurrences of this word: Śambhukavi, *Anyoktimuktālatā* (KM.2), v.6: pakvaṃ nāgarakhaṇḍapallavam "a ripe sprout [leaf?] of the nāgarakhaṇḍa" Skm. 2081, ascribed to Rājaśekhara: paṇṇam nāgarakhaṇḍam ārdrasubhagam "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." [We 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: pānamāhi nāgarṣaṇḍa pāna "amongst Pān (Piper betel) Nāgarṣaṇḍa is the [best] Pān." Karpūravallī, Vcar. 9.60, in Hindi known as *kapurī* [sic], is another variety of betel, yellowish, hard, and full of veins, but of good taste and smell.

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

How about Tāmbūlaṃ kaṭutiktam uṣṇamadhuram?

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

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

Sammukhopaviṣṭayā kucataṭavisrastavaśanayā dayitayā dīyamāna karpūra kaśṭūrīkā- vimiśra cūrṇāvalīptapākāparipāṇḍura- nāgarakhaṇḍaparnavīṭikaḥ. [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 JMS frequently interchanges kha and ṣa? We don't know if he knows even today the birthplace of Bilhaṇa. It is not Khonamukha but Khonamuṣa. Until N appeared all, repeat ALL thought it to be Khonamukha. Do you get the point, Mr. Misra?

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

Nārikelaphalakhaṇḍatāṇḍava-kṣuṇṇatatkularavārivīcayaḥ.
Yatra yānti marutaḥ smarāstratām dhūtapakvakadalīsamṛddhayaḥ. [5:22]

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.

* * *

Regarding the word *pratiṣhā* in:

Ārakṭam arghārpaṇataparāṇām siddhāṅganānām iva kuṅkumena.
Bimbaṃ dadhe bimbaphalapraṭiṣṭhām rājīvinījīvitavallabhasya. [1:35]

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

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

The trouble with Misra is that he proceeds with a pre-conceived notion. He wants to find out in Bilhaṇa and in his own little "lexica" what his mini-mind dictates. The question is: Why to interpret *pratiṣhā* as "likeness" or "sameness" here? *Pratiṣhā* is to be

aken here in the sense of "pre-eminence, superiority, high rank or position, fame, celebrity." (Monier-Williams).

1:35cd

bimbam dadhe bimbaphalapratiṣṭhām rājīvinījīvita-vallabhasya.

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

There are some instances where *pratiṣṭhā* is used in its literal [?] sense, as a derivative of *prati-sthā* "to stand against", meaning "footing, standing": 1:57ab *kṣmābhṛtkulānām upari pratiṣṭhām avāpya* "having gained footing above the family of the kings/mountains"; 1.66cd

Viṣṇoḥ pratiṣṭheti vibhīṣaṇasya rājye paraṃ saṅkucitā babhūvuḥ

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

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

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

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

Although N's *Caritacandrikā* translates *pratiṣṭhām* as *sāmyam*, it can also mean *pada m*. Bh puts it better. He says "*pratiṣṭhām savarṇatvāt sārūpyam*", i.e. *tādātmyam*, *abhedah*.

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

Incidentally Misra has also discussed the meaning of *saṅkucita* with reference to 1:66 where it occurs with *pratiṣṭhā* in the above-quoted para (p.30).

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

Dvīpakṣamāpālaparamparāṇām dorvikramād utkhananonmukhās te.

Viṣṇoḥ pratiṣṭheti Vibhīṣaṇasya rājye paraṃ saṅkucitā babhūvuḥ. [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 founded by Lord Viṣṇu, having appeared on this earth in the form [incarnation] of Śrī Rāmacandra.

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

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

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

Base for support:

Dharmo viśvasya jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā.

Firm basis:

Apratiṣṭhe Raghujeṣṭhe kā pratiṣṭhā kulasya naḥ.

Foundation site:

Lokasya nābhir jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā.

An object of glory:

Tyaktā mayā nāma kulapraṭiṣṭhā.

Installation, inauguration, or the consecration of an idol or image:

Calācaleti dvividhā pratiṣṭhā jīvamandiram.

Also Prāṇapraṭiṣṭhā.

* * *

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

Yasyāñjanaśyāmalakhaḍgapatṭa-jātāni jāne dhavalatvam āpuḥ.
Arātinārīśarakāṇḍapāṇḍu-gaṇḍasthalīnirluṭhanād yaśāṃsi. [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 footnotes:

33. Cp. *nirlu (h) ana-* : 5.3

34. For whiteness of (ripe) sugar-cane stalks cp. e.g. Viddh. 1.32/33...[?] *parip ākapāṇḍurāṇām śarakāṇḍānam*. [Note: Misra's quoted word is *śarakāṇḍa*, yet he translates it as "sugar-cane stalks."]

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

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

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

Collyrium or black pigment used to paint the eye-lashes. Cf.

Ajñānāndhasya lokasya jñānāñjanaśalākayā.

Caḥṣurunmīlitaṃ yena tasmai Pāṇinaye namaḥ.

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

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

Here is some information for an *antevāsin* of German gurus:

Sadyaḥ karasparśam avāpya citram raṇe raṇe yasya kṛpāṇalekhā.

Tamālanīlā śaradindupāṇḍu yaśas trilokyābharaṇam prasūte.

Kāvyaṇprakāśe visamālaṅkārodāharaṇam idam.

According to the *Bālabodhinī* commentary on *Kāvyaṇprakāśa* this verse occurs as no. 62 in the first canto of *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* of Padmagupta Parimala.

Atra kāryakāraṇayoḥ yaśaḥkṛpāṇayoḥ pāṇḍuranīlākhau guṇau viruddhāviti viśamā laṅkāraḥ. Taduktam Nidarśanakāraiḥ. Kāraṇaguṇāḥ kāryaguṇān [svajātīyān iti śeṣaḥ]

ārabhante [janayanti] iti sthite'pi khaḍgalatāyāḥ kṛṣṇāyāḥ śuklasya yaśasa utpattir iti śvetakṛṣṇaguṇayor vaiṣamyam.

Incidentally we may remark here that we have not tried to study or criticize what Bh has done or undone with regard to the ascription of *alaṅkāras* to Bilhaṇa's compositions. We are not fully prepared at the moment to do it, and the subject is beyond the scope of the present study. However, our curiosity prompted us to see what *alaṅkāra-śāstra-pāṇḍityam* is demonstrated by Bh in this instance. And here is a quote from Bh:

Añjanena saha khaḍgasya śyāmalatvena sādṛśyadarśanāt gaṇḍasthalyāḥ pāṇḍutvena śarakāṇḍena sādṛśyāccopamā.

How simple! How innocent! How innocuous!

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

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

Śrīmanto Baṭukanāthaśāstri-Khistemahodayā Em. E. Sāhityācāryā Rājakīya saṃskṛtamahāvīdyālayasāhityaśāstrādhyāpakāḥ sāsīrvādaṃ dhanyavādān arhanti, yair āmūlacūlam Saṃskṛta-Hindī-vyākhyāsaḥ hitaṃ lekharūpam idam nibhālya bahuṣu sthaleṣu, viśeṣato'laṅkāraniveśe kavimātragamya-durūhavicārāṇām nirdeśam kurvadbhir atra guṇādhikyam utpāditam. [This is merely an *atiśayokti*, which is *saṃśayokti* as well].

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

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

Upamaikā śailūṣī saṃprāpya vicitrabhūmikābhedān.
Rañjayati kāvyaraṅge nṛtyantī tadvidāṃ cetaḥ.

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

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

Apparently Bh not only did not study the *Kāvya prakāśa* (an advanced text) but he did not study even the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*.

Tathā coktaṃ *Sāhityadarpaṇe*:

Guṇau kriye [vā] cet syātām viruddhe hetukāryayoḥ. 69

... ..

tad viṣamaṃ mataṃ. 70

Sadyaḥ karasparśam avāpya citraṃ...

Atra kāraṇarūpāsīlatāyāḥ 'kāraṇaguṇā hi kāryaguṇam ārabhante' iti sthiter viruddhā śuklayaśasa utpattiḥ.

[Naī Dillī: Pāṇini, 1982. p.

593]

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

Kuṇthatvam āyāti guṇaḥ kavīnām sāhitya-vidyā-śrama-varjiteṣu.

Kuryād anārdreṣu kim aṅganānām keṣeṣu kṛṣṇāgarudhūpavāsaḥ.

Although, according to Misra "in reality '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--aṅjanaśyāmalakhaḍgapa a*). So the poet had to find out a reason for its turning out white.

Misra p. 41, lines 17-18.

Mr. Misra ought to have known that this is a play and display of *viṣama alaṅkāra*, not just *utprekṣā* alone! *Viṣama* is the real *vicchitti*, 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 Mister Misra: We have learnt at this advanced age, after having studied Sanskrit for about five decades, for the first time through Misra that *śa rakāṇḍa* is sugar-cane!

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

cf. Kuśakāśaśaraiḥ parṇaiḥ supericchādītām tathā.

Śarakāṇḍapāṇḍugaṇḍasthalā.

Mukhena Sītāṃ śarapāṇḍureṇa.

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

In *Śabdakalpadruma*, we read:

Tr̥ṇaviśeṣaḥ, kāṇḍa iti Hindībhāṣā. Tatparyāyāḥ iṣuḥ, kāṇḍaḥ, bāṇaḥ. muñjaḥ, tejanaḥ, guṇḍrakaḥ, iti *Ratnamālā*.

Bhadramuñjaḥ śaro bāṇas tejanaś cakṣuveṣṭanaḥ.
Muñjo muñjātako bāṇaḥ sthūladarbhaḥ sumedhasaḥ.
Muñjadvayam tu madhuram tuvarm śiśiram tathā
Dāhatṛṣṇāvisrapāsra-mūtravastyakṣirogajit.
Doṣatrayaharaṃ vṛṣyam mekhalāsūpayujyate.

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

Explaining this very word (*śara*) N wrote in his *Caritacandrikā*: "*Śaraḥ--Gundras tej anakaḥ ityamarāḥ. Saraharī iti khyātaḥ. Kāṇḍo daṇḍaḥ*. Either Misra did not see it, or disdainfully rejected it.

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

* * *

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

Cālukyavaṃśāmālamauktikaśrīḥ Satyāśrayo'bhūd atha bhūmipālah.
Khaḍgena yasya bhṛkuṭīkrudheva dviṣāṃ kapālānyapi cūrṇitāni. [1:74]

He says:

For- *mauktikaśrīh*, "splendour of the pearl", (in all edd.) read *mauktikah śrī-* and con-
strue *śrī-* with *satyāśrayaḥ* as an honorific word, which is fully confirmed by the parallel
stanzas, e.g. 1:68 *Śrītailapaḥ*, 1:79 *Śrījayasimhadevaḥ*. For the wrong [?] orthograph
y 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 us
of a great *sadukti*:

Mṛtkumbhabālukārandhra-pidhānaracanārthinā.
Dakṣiṇāvartaśaṅkho'yaṃ hanta cūrnīkṛto mayā.

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

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

Cālukyavaṃśāmalamauktikaḥ śrīsatyāśrayo'bhūd atha bhūmipālaḥ.

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

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

Misra cites as an example "*Śrītailapaḥ*" and "*Śrījayasimhadevaḥ*". He forgets "*Hārīta*"
and "*Mānavya*" (1:58) and "*Āhavamalladeva*" and "*Trailokyamalla*" (1:87). We
don't have to have the honorific prefix "*śrī*" everywhere. And the question is: Where
do we bring it from? We cannot rob Peter to pay Paul! Moreover, *mauktika* is a *nitya*

napuṃsaka word (i.e. it can never be used in either masculine or feminine). Amarasimha's *nāmalingānuśāsanam* unequivocally dictates: *atha mauktikam*. Therefore, we can not have *Cālukyavaṃśāmalamauktikaḥ* as Misra ordains. If the reading is changed against the authority of the MS., we will be making Bilhaṇa commit a literary crime!

* * *

Misra is miserably confused here:

Prthvībhujāṅgaḥ parikampitāṅgīm yaśaḥpaṭolluṅṭhanakelikāraḥ.
Vidhr̥tya Kāñciṃ bhujayor balena yaś Colarājyaśriyam ācarṣa. [1:115]

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

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

Misra's footnotes:

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

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

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

30. The capital of the Colas.

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

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

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

His words applicable to the *aprakṛta* (*upamāna*):

Who, as the paramour of the earth [?] raped, by the strength of his arms, the Fortuna of the kingdom of the Colas [?], whose limbs had started to tremble, after he had opened her belt [?] indulging in the sport of robbing her (the Fortuna) of her [white] cloth (dress) that was her honour.

The above words can be tabulated as follows:

The Words of the Poet	Misra's Translation
	Prakṛtam or Upameyam Aprakṛtam/Upamānam
Yaḥ pṛthvībhujaṅgaḥ	Who as the paramour of the earth (= as a king)
ācakarṣa	snatched raped [!]
bhujayoḥ balena	by the strength of his arms same [!]
parikampitāṅgīm Colarājyaśriyam	the royal fortune of Fortuna of the kingdom the kingdom of the of the Colas, whose limbs Colas, whose army had had started to tremble been shaken
vidhṛ[vṛ]tya Kāñcīm	after he had opened her Kāñcī belt
yaśaḥpaṭolluṅṭhana- kelikāraḥ.	indulging in the sport of sport of robbing (ud robbing (ud with luṅṭh) with luṅṭh) it (the her (the Fortuna) of capital) of its flags her [white] cloth that was[?] its (dress) that was her [white] fame. honour.

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

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

Caritacandrikā explains:

Pṛthvībhujaṅgaḥ bhūpatiḥ kāmukaś ca. Parikampitāṅgīm bhayena premṇā ca. Yaśa iti. Yaśaś Colakīrtir eva paṭas tasyolluṅṭhanam apaharaṇam tasya keliṃ karotīti tādrś aḥ. Kāñcīm Colarājadhānīm mekhalāṃ ca. Colarājyaśriyaṃ Colanṛpatilakṣmīm aṅga nāṃ ca.

Bh comments:

Anvayaḥ:

Yaḥ yaśaḥpaṭolluṅṭhanakelikāraḥ pṛthvībhujāṅgaḥ bhujayoḥ balena Kāñcīm vidhṛt ya parikampitāṅgīm Colarājyaśriyam ācarṣa.

Vyākhyā:

Yaḥ prasiddho, yaśaś Colakīrtir eva paṭas, tasyolluṅṭhanam utkṣepaṇam apaharaṇam eva kelis tām karotīti, yaśaḥpaṭolluṅṭhanakelikāraḥ, pṛthvyāḥ pṛthivyāḥ bhujāṅgaḥ patih kāmukaś ca, bhujayor balena, Kāñcīm tannāmnīm nagarīm raśanāñca, v idhṛtya jītvā pragṛhya ca, parikampitam aṅgam [or aṅgāni?] yasyā [!] sā, bhayena a preṃṇā ca kampa- yuktām, Colarājyasya śriyam lakṣmīm lalanāñcā"carṣā"krṣṭ avān. Atra nṛparājyalakṣmī vyavahāre'prakṛtasya viṭakartṛkasya kāñcī-parigraheṇa haṭhād anyasādhāraṇanāyikā- samākarṣanarūpasyāprakṛta-vyavahārasya'bhedasam āropāt samāsoktir alaṅkāraḥ. We 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 *prati lipika*. If *Caritacandrikā* did not have it, how could he have it!

And Gajānana Śāstri Musalgāonkar explains this as follows:

Anvayaḥ:

Yaśaḥpaṭolluṅṭhanakelikāraḥ pṛthvībhujāṅgaḥ yaḥ Kāñcīm vidhṛtya parikampitāṅgīm Colarājyaśriyam bhujayor balena ācarṣa. [Prose order of Bh is much better as far as the location of *bhujayor balena* is concerned].

Vyākhyā:

Yaśa iti. Yaśa eva = Colakīrtir eva, paṭaḥ = ācchādanam, uttarīyavastram [!] iti yāvat, tasya luṅṭhanam = apaharaṇam, tasya kelih = krīḍā, tām karoti tacchīlaḥ, pṛthvībhujāṅgaḥ = kṣitīśaḥ kāmukaś ca, yaḥ Āhavamalladevaḥ, Kāñcīm Colarājadhānīm, me khalām ca, vidhṛtya = gṛhītvā, bhayena preṃṇā ca parikampitāni aṅgāni yasyāḥ sā tā m = vepamānaśarīrām, Colarājyaśriyam = Colanṛpatilakṣmīm aṅganam ca, bhujayoḥ = bāhvoḥ, balena = śaktyā, ācarṣa = ājahāra; Atra Colanṛpatirājyalakṣmīvyavahāre [!] kāmukakartṛkasya Kāñcīparigraheṇa haṭhād anyasādhāraṇanāyikāsamākarṣanarūpasya aprakṛtavyavahārasya abhedasamāropāt samāsoktir alaṅkāraḥ. [A copy of Bh]

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

Musalgaonkar is another copy-cat! He too misses the significance of *aṅga*! *Kāmad ughā hi mahākavīnām vāco bhavanti*, but *Locanābhyām vihinasya darpaṇaḥ kim kariṣyati*!

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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

According to Monier-Williams, *aṅgam* = (a) a limb or member of the body; (b) a division or department (of anything), a part or portion, as of a whole; as *saptāṅgam rājya m.*

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

Svāmyamātyasuhṛtkośa-rāṣṭradurgabalāni ca.
Rājyāṅgāni prakṛtayaḥ paurāṇām Śreṇayo'pi ca.

[Pauraśreṇībhiḥ sahāṣṭāṅgam api rājyam--Rāmāśramī]

And this is how *Kāmandakīya* enumerates them:

Svāmyamātyaś ca rāṣṭram ca durgam kośo balaṃ suhṛt.
Parasparopakārīdam saptāṅgam rājyam ucyate.

One of these seven (or 8 or 9) *aṅgas* is the army (*senā*), which has four subdivisions:

Hastyaśvarathapādātaṃ senāṅgam syāc catuṣṭayam.

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

Misra's interpretation here is unacceptable. *Parikampitāṅgīm* is a *viśeṣana* and qualifies *Colarājyaśriyam*, which is the *viśeṣya*. It is a *Bahuvrīhi* compound-- *pari kampitān i aṅgāni yasyāḥ sā tām*.

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

It is to be remembered that unless and until we have a clear and specific mention of the word *senā* (army), the mere term *aṅga* cannot stand for the *caturaṅgasenā*. This is not interpretation. It is all *sāhasikasya karma*.

We would like to know from Misra why *aṅga* here could not stand for *pañcāṅgo rāj anayaḥ*, five-part state-craft:

Sahāyāḥ sādhanopāyāḥ vibhāgo deśakālayoḥ.
Vinipātapratīkāraḥ siddhiḥ pañcāṅga iṣyate.
Śabdakalpadrumaḥ]

Or *Ṣaḍaṅgo vedaḥ*? Or *Saptāṅgam rājyam*? Why only *balam*?

Misra tries to surpass our ancient great Indian writer Bhāskarācārya:

Vayam iha padavidyāṃ tarkam ānvīkṣikīm vā
yadi pathi vipathe vā vartayāmaḥ sa anthāḥ.
Udayati diśi yasyāṃ bhānumān saiva pūrvā

na hi taraṇir udīte dikparādhīnavṛttiḥ. He reminds us of another *sadukti*:

Uṣṭrāṇām ca vivāheṣu gītam gāyanti gardabhāḥ.
Parasparam praśamsanti aho rūpam aho dhvaniḥ.

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

Sāhitye sukumāravastuni dṛḍhanyāyagrahagranthile
tarke vā mayi saṃvidhātari samaṃ līlāyate Bhāratī.
Śayyā vāstu mṛdūttaracchadavatī darbhāṅkurair āstṛtā
bhūmir vā hṛdayaṅgamo yadi patis tulyā ratir yoṣitaḥ.

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

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

Vepathur yathā

Rāgaroṣabhayādibhyaḥ kampo gātrasya vepathuḥ

bhayādibhyaḥ is a better reading as compared to *śramādibhyaḥ*!

Yathā

Mā garvam udvaha kapolatala cakāsti
kāntasvahastalikhitā mama mañjarīti.
Anyāpi kiṃ na khalu bhājanam īdrśīnām
vairī na ced bhavati vepathur antarāyaḥ.
[Refer this to *patravallim kapole*]

Rāgād yathā

Vāraṃvāraṃ tirayati dr̥ṣor udgamaṃ bāṣpapūras
tatsaṅkalpopahitajaḍimastambham abhyeti gātram.
Sadyaḥ svidyatyayam aviratokampalolāṅgulīkaḥ
pāñir lekhāvidhiṣu nitarāṃ kampate kiṃ karomi.

Evam roṣādibhir ūhyam. Iti "Ga."

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

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

Praśānte nūpurārāve śrūyate mekhalādhvaniḥ.
Kānte ratipariśrānte kāmīnī puruṣāyate.

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

Undoubtedly, *Kāmadughā hi mahākavīnām vāco bhavanti*: The sayings of the great poets are divine wish-cows; they would give any boon (meaning) we pray for. A

nd one can derive more than one meaning from a word, yet the *prakṛti* (root) and *prat*
yaya (ending) must admit--have the inherent power to denote the desired meaning. We
cannot ask a dead barren woman to deliver a child through her womb!

The poet says: "Yaḥ [bhujayoḥ balena] Kāñcīm vidhṛtya Colarājyaśriyam ācak
arṣa." 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 acq
uired the Cola kingdom by seizing the city of Kāñcī, the capital of the Colas. The fall of
the city of Kāñcī signalled the defeat of the Cola king and the victory of the Calukyas
over the Colas, their inveterate enemies.

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

And ladies in India don't wear a "belt" over their saris. It is tied by a knot [See
bandhanāt in the verse --*nīvī svayaṃ bandhanāt*] or tucked under a petticoat. A belt i
s removed before the garment can be removed. But the *kāminī* continues to wear her
kāñcī throughout her *rati-prasaṅga*. Misra does not tell us how she is drawn by the lov
er towards him. It is also to be remembered that that part of the body which is right bel
ow the front of the girdle is extremely delicate. It sends the message directly to the mi
nd. It serves as the power-source--a means of electrification. Once the lover touches t
hat part, the beloved loses her own self! Read the following:

Nīvīm prati praṇihite tu kare priyeṇa
sakhyaḥ śapāmi yadi kiñcid api smarāmi.

And

Nīvimokṣo hi mokṣaḥ.

Also

Kānte talpam upāgate vigalitā nīvī svayaṃ bandhanāt
vāsaśca ślathamekhalāguṇadhṛtaṃ kiñcin nitambe sthitam.
Etāvāt sakhi vedmi kevalam ahaṃ tasyāṅgasaṅge punaḥ
ko'sau kāsmi rataṃ ca kiṃ katham iti svalpāpi me na smṛtiḥ.
Sūktimuktāvalī, 86:17 [Kasyāpi]

We don't know wherefrom Misra gets the "flags". We don't see any! He is *prajñāca*
kṣu in a sense of the term. [See his discussion on *carmacakṣuḥ*, pp.31-32]. Or, maybe
he is confused. He may have in his mind the following verse:

Misra might have argued: Wherever there is Kāñcī there are the flags. So there are flags even in 1:115!

Kāñcī padātibhir amuṣya viluṅṭhitābhūd
devālayadhvajapaṭāvalimātraśeṣā.
Luṅṭākaluptanikhilāmbaraḍambarāṇām.
kaupīnakārpaṇapareva purāṅganānām. [3:76]

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

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

Dieser Kūonig zog die Schutzgüottin des Colareiches an sich, als er durch die Gewalt der Arme die Stadt *Kāñcī* erstürmte, deren Glieder in zitternds Bewegung versetzt waren, weil er sich ein Speil aus dem Zerreißen ihres Ruhmesgewandes machte.

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

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

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

Taṃ vibhāvya rabhasād upāgataṃ kṣmābhujāṅgam upajātasādhvasā.
Lolavārinidhinīlakuṇḍalā drāviḍakṣitipabhūr akampata. [5:28]
(a play of *Samāsokti*).

* * *

Explaining the verse:

Avīkṣamāṇā sadṛśaṃ guṇair mama kramāgatā śrīr iyam āśrayaṃ puraḥ.
Payodhimadhyasthitapotakūpakasthitā śakuntīva muhuḥ prakampate. [2:31]

Misra says:

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

This is another attempt on the part of Misra to create an aura of his learning. We are reminded of another meaningful *sadukti*:

Asthāne'nupayogibhiṣca bahubhir jalpair bhramaṃ tanvate.

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

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

Savāsanānāṃ sabhyānāṃ rasasyāsvādanaṃ bhavet.
Nirvāsanās tu raṅgāntaḥ-kāṣṭhakudyāśmasannibhāḥ.

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

Also

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

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

If Misra wanted to know the true application of the maxim *kākākṣigolakanyāya*, he should have referred to "*adhītavedo'smi kṛtāśrutāgamaḥ*", where "*asmītyaham arthe'vyayam*" or "*uttamapuruṣaikavacanam*" of *as bhuvi* is applicable both to the left and to the right. We can interpret "*aham adhītavedo'smi*" or "*aham kṛtāśrutāgamaḥ asmi*." It is all improper to talk about *asti* sentence and *asmi* sentence, as Misra does. "*Adhītavedaḥ*" is a *Bahuvrīhi* compound and so is *kṛtāśrutāgamaḥ*.

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

We have just discussed a verse:

Vidhṛtya Kāñcīm bhujayor balena
yaś Colarājyaśriyam ācakarṣa.

This too is a very fine example of *kākākṣigolakanyāya* or *dehalīdīpakanyāya*. The words "*bhujayor balena*" could be connected either with what precedes or what succeeds.

* * *

Misra introduces another *vitaṇḍāvāda* regarding *graha* and *āgraha* in:

Alaṃ viśādena karoṣi kiṃ mukhaṃ kavoṣṇaniḥśvāsavidhūsarādharmaṃ.
Abhīṣṭavastupratibandhinām ahaṃ kṛtāgraho nīgrahaṇāya karmaṇām. [2:38]

On the above Misra says:

2.38d

āgraha-, is used in the sense of "stubborn wish, persistent [sic] resolution [resolution?]", hence *kṛtāgraha*, "he who has formed a firm resolution." Contrast Hindi *āgraha*, meaning "request".

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

Cp. *āgraha-* 5.18, 9.130, 10.87 (emend *līlavagāhagraha-* to *līlavagāhāgraha-*); *durāgraha* "bad (ill-advised) [i.e. ill-advised] resolution". 3.52; 4.115; 6.7; 7.12; 16.42. [p. 2]

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

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

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

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

* * *

On the verse

Adhītavedo'smi kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ śramo'sti bhūyān itihāsavartmasu.
Guruṣvavajñāvimukhaṃ sadā manas tad abhyupayo'tra mayā na durlabhaḥ.
[2:39]

Misra presents a discourse, which is only his *bālacāpalam*:

2.39a

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

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

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

* * *

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

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

* * *

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 *kṛtaśrutāgama-* [sic] amount to the same thing, there would be a tautology (*paunaruktya* or *piṣapeṣaṇa*).

A possible way to remove this tautology is to emend *śrutāgama-* into *smṛtāgama-*, "the *smṛti* tradition." The king would refer to his study of the Veda (*veda*), of the *Dharmasāstra* (*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

śruti or what is directly heard or revealed to the Ṛṣis). In its widest application, this use of the term *smṛti* includes 6 *Vedāṅgas*, the *sūtras* both *śrauta* and *gṛhya*, the law books of Manu, etc. [also] the *itihāsas*...*Smṛta* does not mean this body of knowledge! If *smṛti* in its widest sense includes *itihāsa* too then there will be *paunaruktyadoṣaḥ*! What is *śrutam*? Anything heard, that which has been heard (especially from the beginning) knowledge as heard by holy men and transmitted from generation to generation, or tradition or revelation. Cf. Kālidāsa:

Śrutasya yāyād ayam antam arbhakaḥ.

Another *sadukti*:

Śrotram śrutenaiva na kuṇḍalena.

Śabdakalpadrumaḥ: śrutam (śrūyate sma yad iti) śāstram.

Śrutam śāstrāvadhṛtayoḥ [iti Amaraḥ.] Vedas, including *smṛtis*:
śrutam śāstrāṇi, Vedāṅgāni, darśanāni ca, itihāsaḥ, purāṇāni ca.

Our own poet Bilhaṇa too in 18:77:

Dātā parākramadhanaḥ śrutapārādṛśvā

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

Niṣiddham apyācaraṇīyam āpadi kriyā satī nāvati yatra sarvathā.

Ghanāmbunā rājapathe hi picchile kvacid budhair apyapathena gamyate. 9:36

Also the *smṛtis* prescribe: *Āpatkāle maryādā nāsti*.

"*Kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ*" of J cannot be converted into "*kṛtaḥ śrutāgamaḥ*" or *kṛtaś śrutāgamaḥ* because the J text does not read that way! "*Kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ*" will be only a *bahu vrīhi* compound. We are not composing the poem. We are only interpreting it. To prescribe "*smṛtāgamaḥ*" will be a *svacchandācāraḥ*. "*Smṛtam*" can never mean 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 "*kr̥taśr̥utāgamah*". Only "A," which belongs to another family and is thus an external entity, an outsider, so to speak, has "*kr̥taḥ śr̥utāgamah*." Bh prefers this reading of A, but gives no reason. Here we have a foreign element. J's reading is lost forever as far as Bh is concerned, even though it [J] is better and preferable. Cf. what precedes: *adhītavedo'smi*.

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

(Ahaṃ) śrutāgamah (san) adhītavedaḥ asmi. Itihāsavartmasu bhūyān pariśramah kṛtaḥ. Manaḥ guruṣu sadā avajñāvimukham asti. Tat mayā atra abhyupāyaḥ na durlabhaḥ.

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

* * *

On the verse:

Sa somavannetracakorapāraṇām 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: upamārūpakayoḥ saṅkaraḥ*)" [p.3]

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

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

Ekasya ca grahe nyāya-doṣābhāvādaniścayaḥ.

Dvayor bahūnām vā alāṅkāraṇām ekatra samāveśe'pi virodhāt na yatra yugapad a vasthānam, na caikatarasya parigrahe sādhakam taditarasya vā parihāre bādhakam asti yenaikatara eva parigrhyeta, sa niścayābhāva- rūpo dvitīyaḥ saṅkaraḥ.

[*Kāvya prakāśa: 10th Ullāsa, 140 Vṛtti*]

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

Astrajvālāvalīḍhapratibalajaladher antaraurvāyamāṇe
 senānāthe sthite'smin mama pitari gurau sarvadhanvīśvarāṇām.
 Karṇālaṃ sambhrameṇa vraja Kṛpa samaraṃ muñca Hārdikya śankāṃ
 tāte cāpadvitīye vahati raṇadhurāṃ ko bhayasyāvakāśaḥ.

Atra Droṇasyaurveṇopamā pratibalajaladher ityatropamāyāḥ sādhike tyupamādvay
 am api sañjātaparamparam (*Citra- mīmāṃsā, Rūpakapra karaṇam*. Chowkhamba, 197
 1. [pp. 227-280])

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

Commenting on the verse:

Bhiṣagbhir āpāditasarvabheṣajaṃ vitīrṇarakṣāvidhimaṇḍalākṣatam.
 Viśāradābhiḥ prasavocite vidhau nirantaraṃ gotravadhūbhir aṅcitam. [2:80]

Misra dictates:

2.80a

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

We fail to understand how breezes could be scattered.

Cp. also 18.14 *śilā viprakīrṇāḥ* "the rocks that were scattered." 18.6--*kīrṇakarṇāmṛta* "
 by which nectar for the ears is scattered". *akṣata-* "uncrushed grain", as an object of *u*
d-kṛī, compare 2.83 *akṣatotkaraiḥ* "by the throwings up of uncrushed grain. [p. 3]

Vitīrṇarakṣāvidhimaṇḍalākṣatam:

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

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

The last word in this verse (*aṅcitam*) ignites Misra's power of argumentation (*vitāṇḍā*
vāda). He says:

On --*añcitam* (ed.sec. and ter), see below chap II n.2. [p. 3]. And the "note" expounds:

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

Let us see what these words mean:

arc = To adore, worship, salute, welcome with respect.

It also means to honour, i.e. decorate and adorn.

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

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

Some examples of the use by great poets:

Dordaṇḍāñcitamahimā;

Gateṣu līlāñcitavikrameṣu;

Kanakācala-saṅkāśa-devatāyatanāñcite;

Api khañjanam añjanāñcite.

Añcitābhyām gatābhyām.

Here are the variant readings of the word under discussion:

J reads *arccitam*,
B reads *arcitam*,
N reads *añcitam*,
Bh reads *añcitam* but interprets *pūjitam*,
A reads *arcitam*,
AP reads *acitam*.

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

indicative of authority. Maybe he means "stealthily" and uses a word to make it appear as innocent.

Ātmavat sarvabhūteṣu yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati.

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

Misra says Bilhaṇa had not used the word *añcitam* anywhere in this sense. If by the word "this" he means "*bhūṣitam*", Misra ignores the following verse:

Anena nūnam jaladheḥ samuddhṛtam vicitraratnāṅkuradanturaṃ payaḥ.
Anekavarṇāñcitam anyathā kathaṃ payomucā nirmitam indrakārmukam. [13:21]

In 2:80 Bh forces *añcitam* to mean *pūjitam*, but *Caritacandrikā* has already put *bhūṣitam*. And this word goes back to J gloss, i.e., J gloss too has *bhūṣitam*. Bh had no justification in accepting the reading of N and rejecting his meaning. We are instructed: *Vā garthāviva samprktau*. The word and its meaning go together. Bh rejects the reading [vāk] of B presented by J, but accepts his meaning (*artha*) i.e., *pūjitam*. B & G translate the word in question "*arcitam*" by "worshipped." 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 "*añcitam*." He translates it as "marked (characterized) by." I have put it as *viśiṣam* (in *Candrikā*). But it can mean *bhūṣitam* as well. MW puts "distinguished" as a meaning of *añcitam*.

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

Ityudañcitavilāsarasānām. [11:67]

and

Udañcitabhrūlatikāpatākam akāraṇād eva mukham cakāra. [9:84]
* * *

Misra tries to exhibit his erudition:

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

He says:

2.81d

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

2.89a

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

9.31ab...

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

9.73b...

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

9.93a

pradarśayām āsa tataḥ kumāryāḥ

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

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

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

9.94

yasya... maurvīravaḥ ... pātālatalasthitānām...kathayām babhūva

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

13.50ab

samarpayām āsa payāṃsi... jaladhiḥ payomucām "the ocean offered water to the clouds." [pp.3-4]

But Macdonell says:

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

mayā tasyābhayam pradattam.
kim tava rocate eṣaḥ?
mamānatikruddho muniḥ.

Misra says: "In later [?] Sanskrit the use of genitive instead of dative is found with increasing frequency..."

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

Pāṇini clearly declares:

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

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

* * *

Let us study Misra's comments on:

Cañcaccāraṇadīyamānakanakaṃ sannaddhagītadhvani
sphūrjadgāthakaluṅṭhyamānakaṛaṭi

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

- (1) sphūrjadgāthakaluṅṭhyamānakaṛaṭi, and,
- (2) prārabdhanṛtyotsavam. (or nṛtto?)

There is a *padaccheda* in between the two in J.

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

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

Pūrṇam maṅgalatūryadundubhiravair uttālavaitālika-
ślāghālaṅghitapūrvapārthivam atha kṣmābhartur āsīd gṛham.
[2:90]

He says:

For *cañcat-* (all edd.) read *carcat-*, and for *-kara i* - "elephant" in b read with Bühler *-kara am* "A kind of drum." For discussion of this *pāda* [?] cp. Chap. II on root *lu* . [pp. 45-46] [p. 4]

Bühler is wrong. Misra is doubly wrong when he rejects N's (i.e. J's) reading and follows the path of one who has no knowledge of direction! J has "kara i" clear, very clear, absolutely and unquestionably. Furthermore, J gloss puts "hāthī" as a synonym for "kara i". So there is no doubt that the meaning "elephant" antedates 1286 V. (1229/30 A.D.)!

Misra says on pp. 45-46:

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

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

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

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

Mātaṅgalīlā of Nīlakaṇṭha, 8:4, clearly states: *gānapriyam [gajam]*. Also 11:40: *vīṇādigītapriyaḥ [gajaḥ]*.

In the *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* ascribed to Bhāsa, Udayana is described as catching elephants by luring them by means of the sound of *vīṇā*.

Gajaṃ tam ahaṃ vīṇādvitīya ānayāmi. (I act)

and

Śrutisukhamadhurā svabhāvaraktā karajamukhollikhitāgraghṛṣṭatantrī.
Rṣivacanagateva mantravidyā gajaḥṛdayāni balād vaśīkaroti. [2:12]

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

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

We don't know what is the Sanskrit equivalent here [of Bilhaṇa] which Misra has translated as "alternately." *Cañcat* is the only word that could be thought of (Misra's favorite phraseology!).

So all the elephants were removed by Misra. The singers did not get them at all. They were left only with the drums to beat and make loud noise of music!

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

Janāya śuddhāntacarāya śamsate kumārajanmāmṛtasammitākṣaram.
Adeyam āsīt trayam eva bhūpateḥ śaśiprabhaṃ chatram ubhe ca cāmare.

Let us now consider Misra's remarks on *cañcat*:

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

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

Cañcaccandrakarasparśa-harṣonmīlitatārakā.
Aho rāgavatī sandhyā jahāti svaym ambaram.
[*Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa. Kiṣkindhā*, 30:45]

And

Cañcacolāñcalāni pratisaraṇarayavyastaveṇīni bāhor
vikṣepād dakṣiṇasya pracalitavalayāsphālakolāhalāni.
Śvāsatrutyadvacāmsi drutam itarakarotkṣiptalolālakāni
srastasrañji pramodam dadhati mṛgadṛśām kandukakrīḍitāni.
Subhāṣitaratnakośe anurāgavrajyā.

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

Puṣpair bhrājiṣṇubhastrākaraṇim agaṇitaiḥ śākhinaḥ ke na yātāḥ
cañcannistriṃśalekhāmayam iva bhuvanaṃ bhr̥ṅgamālābhir āste.
Trailokyākāṇḍacaṇḍapraharaṇanibiḍotsāhakaṇḍūladoṣṇaḥ
puṣpeṣor jāitraśastravyatikaravidhaye sādhu sajjo vasantaḥ.
[7:68]

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

Yasminnurvīpatigṛhatates tuṅgimā varṇyate kim
tasyāś cañcaccaturavanitābhūṣitānekabhūmeḥ.
Jāne yasyāṃ Kusumadhanuṣaḥ svargarāmāmanāṃsi
krīḍāvātāyanakṛtapadasyaiva lakṣṭbhavanti. [18:30]

And

Yenodīcyām diśi gatavatā vanditosau girīndraś
cañcacaṇḍipativṛṣakhurakṣodalekhāvataṃsaḥ. [18:54]

And here is one more *cañcat* from *Venīsaṃhāra*:

Cañcadbhujabhramitacaṇḍagadābhīghāta-
sañcūrṇitoruyugalasya Suyodhanasya.
Styānāvanaddhaghanaśoṇitaśoṇapāṇir
uttamaṣyisyati kacāṃs tava devi Bhīmaḥ.

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

Cañcac cumbati kāñcanācalamukhaṃ kaṇṭham kṣamābandināṃ
no muñcatyacalendravakṣasi ciram līlām samālabate.
Kim cālīṅgati diktaṭān vitanute krīḍām bhujāṅgaiḥ samam
kīrtir mānam apāsya paśya taruṇī dhik ceṣṭitais tāvakī.
[ceṣṭate tāvakī?]

Śobhākara adds:

Atra kīrtipriyatamātvamukhena nindayā sarvavyāpitvam iti stutir lakṣyate.

This poet too did not know as much as our Misra did!

Śobhākara has cited one more verse, which begins with the word *cañcat*. I am referring to it only to show that the attempt on the part of Misra to discard Bilhaṇa's *cañcat* is unscholarly. The verse is:

Cañcatkaṭākṣabhramarābhirāma-rāmāmukhāmbhojaparamparābhiḥ.
Itastataḥ [sic] yatra sarāṃsi śobhām gharmaprasādād dviguṇām avāpuḥ.
Cited as an example of "*samādhiḥ*."

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

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

Na hyeṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati.

And

Locanābhyām vihīnasya darpaṇaḥ kim kariṣyati.

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

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

And let us see what Apte says:

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

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

* * *

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

Aurvāgnitaptapāthodhau candanasyandavāsītāḥ.
Śītopacārasāmrājyaṃ bhejur malayanimnagāḥ. [4:6]

He says:

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

Many a time, we find it terribly distressing even to listen to the unreasonable suggestions made by Misra. He wants to replace *sāmrājyam* by *sāmarthyam*. The idea is not acceptable. We throw away *cintāmaṇi* and get a piece of pebble in return. Misra forgets that he is not the poet. An "empire" and all the glory inherent therein is million times better than just plain "capacity." *Mūrkhō'pi śobhate tāvat yāvat kiñcin na bhāṣate!* We don't understand how *sāmarthyam* has the capacity to replace *sāmrājyam* here!

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

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

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

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

* * *

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

Kakubhām bhartṛbhaktānām pṛcchantīnām nṛpasthitim.
Vidravantam ivābhāntam atyantatvaritaiḥ padaiḥ. [4:40]

Bh interprets "*kakubhām prati dhāvantaṃ iva*," running towards the directions!

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

"Sa tatkṣaṇāt parimlāna-mukhaṃ sammukhapātinam."
says Bilhaṇa: 4:37.

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

"Dadarśa rājadhānītaḥ pradhānam dūtam āgatam."
[4:37].

The directions--*diśaḥ*-- (depicted to be female, beloved of the King Āhavamalla) were anxious to get the news of Āhavamalla. The messenger did not have the courage to tell them of the death of their lord, their lover, Āhavamalla. So the messenger was running away from them and not running toward them! Bh has supplied his own *avyaya*--i indeclinable particle "*prati*." "*Kakubhāṃ diśāṃ diśo digāṅganāḥ pratītyarthaḥ*. [4:37]. From the 6th *vibhakti* he has jumped back to the 2nd and then supplied his own "*prati*." He is *kartum akartum anyathākartum samarthaḥ*. Is he not? But in reality here the genitive (or the possessive) case is used in *avajānā* or *tiraskāra* or disregard. It may be fear as well. "*Kakubhāṃ vidravantam*," running away from the directions, being afraid of them, "*diśo'nāḍṛtya gacchantam*." Bh forgets that *prati* will demand *dviṭyā* and not *ṣaḥ hi*.

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

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

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

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

Let it be repeated:

Here we have "*Ṣaḥ hī cānādare*." *Pan.* 2.3.38. This *sūtra* gets *anuvṛtti* from "*Yasya ca bhāvena bhāvalakṣaṇam*." "*Anādare gamyamāne sati yasya kriyayā kriyāntaram lakṣyat e tasmāt ṣaḥ hisaptamyau staḥ*." As an example, we have "*Rudati rudato vā prāvṛjīt. Rudantam putrādikam anāḍṛtya saṅnyastavān iti bhāvaḥ*."

Mammaṭa gives an example of similar *ṣaḥ hī*:

Gāmāruhammi gāme vasāmi ṇaaratṭhiim ṇa jāṇāmi.
Nāriāṇaṃ paiṇo haremi jā homi sā homi.
Kāvya prakāśa.

* * *

Misra presents an amusing situation in the following verse:

Kuṇṭhīkṛtāriśastrasya tasya vajropamākṛteḥ.

Bhāgyānām 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. Bhāgyānām eva me doṣād eṣa jātaḥ parikṣayaḥ.

II. Madbhāgyadoṣād evaiṣa jāne jātaḥ parikṣayaḥ..

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

Like Mr. Misra indeed!

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

The MS does not have two versions! It seems Misra did not notice the first occurrence of the expression "*pā hāntaram*," in 1:102 *Viśīrṇakarṇā* and 1:103 *Karṇe viśīrṇe*, where *Caritacandrikā* explains:

Pāṭhāntaram: Mahākavaya uktam evārthaṃ bhaṅgyantareṇa bahudhā nirūpayanti. Jainasampradāye tad eva pāṭhāntaram ityucyata iti manyāmahe. Atra pāṭhāntara- padena tad eva boddhavyam na tu pāṭhāntararūpo'rtho' bhipretaḥ. [p. 217]

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

Āryaṃ 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 5th syllable should always be a *laghu*. Hence the second reading is not any deliberate improvement on the first.

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

Bahu jagada purstāt tasya mattā kilāham.

It is really painful to see the extent of Misra's mastery of traditional Sanskrit scholarship. It is not becoming of his family if it was what he has publicized in his "dust jacket."

For Misra's enlightenment we are presenting below some "SPECIMENS" of the cases where Bilhaṇa, i.e. Purāṇa Bilhaṇa has erred in the opinion of Misra!

Nivedayantam	4:39.3
Anarthavārttā	4:41.1
Tvadaṅkapālī	4:47.3
Taraṅghastair	4:63.3
Anyonyakaṅthā	4:93.1
Tejonidhīnām	4:107.1
Āryam viparyastam	4:118.3
Kṛtālavālam	8:14.3
Manye tadūrū	8:16.1
Nitamababimbam	8:17.1
Prakoṣṭhabandhe	8:58.1
Purāṇabāṇatyāgāya	8:71.1
Saundaryapātre	8:76.1

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

Uktam evārtham bhaṅgyantareṇa pratipādayati kaviḥ:

Śisūpālavadhe tṛtīyaḥ sargaḥ:

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

Kapāṭavistīrṇamanoramoraḥsthalasthitaśrīlalanasya tasya.
Ānanditāśeṣajanā babhūva sarvāṅgasaṅginyaparaiva lakṣmīḥ. 3:13

The great commentator Mallinātha explains:

Prāyeṇaikārthamapyanekaṃ ślokaṃ ukṭiviśeṣa- lābhāl likhanti kavayaḥ. Yathāha Naiṣadhe--ādāveva 'Nipīya'--(1:1) ityādi ślokadvayam; tathā 'Svakeleśa' (1:23) ityādi ślokadvayaṃ ceti.

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

* * *

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

Iti sa manasā nīscityārthaṃ Culukyaśikhāmaṇiḥ
śravaṇasaraṇim bhindan bherīraveṇa viniryayau.
Api ca kupitaḥ kṣmābhṛtsenāgajeṣu niṣeṣubhiḥ
katiṣu vidadhe dhairyadhvaṃsaṃ na sāhasalāñchanaḥ.
[4:119]

Misra indulges in his characteristic *jalpa*:

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

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

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

c api ca kupitakṣmābhṛtsenāgajesu [sic] nijeṣubhiḥ

d katiṣu vidadhe dhairyadhvaṃsaṃ na sāhasalāñchanah||

"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 *nijeṣubhiḥ*: "by his jealous ones (his male elephants that smell the king's elephants in their stables start to trumpet, whereupon these get afraid)"(7) *Irṣu* for *īrṣyu* is a common misspelling (see Apte. *s.v.* *īrṣyā*, *īrṣya*, *īrṣyu*), Cp. also above on 1.48b (*lakṣa* for *lakṣya*).

Note that Vikramāditya, though in distress about the bad behaviour of his elder brother Somadeva, is himself not "enraged" (*kupita*) [!] neither can he be designated, as yet, as *kṣmābhṛt* (king): verses 116-117. Somadeva, of course is "enraged", 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 Tungabhadra (5.18), the southern frontier of the Cālukya kingdom.
7. As to the jealousy (*īrṣyā*, *aṣūyā*, *amaṛṣa*, *roṣa*) of the male elephants, cp. Ragh. 4.23 (*aṣūyā*); 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:

Gacchataḥ skhalanaṃ kvāpi bhavatyeva pramādataḥ.
Hasanti durjanās tatra samādadhati sajjanāḥ.

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

Once again Misra tries to display his scholarship! Even though Bühler's text reads *kupito*, his "Corrigenda and Addenda" (line 14) tells his readers, who are equipped with an unbiased mind, to "read *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. We wonder how he would be able to guide others! May God bless his disciples! It will be only a case of *andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāḥ*.

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

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

udañciromāñcatayā samantataḥ
sa śāityasamparkam iva nyavedayat.

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

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

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

Since N was not paid monetary compensation on the basis of the total number of pages, and since he did not want to display his erudition, he did not think it appropriate to waste his time in discussing such obvious grammatical or printing errors.

"*Nijerṣubhiḥ*" by itself cannot mean "*īṣyālugajaiḥ*" unless Misra makes it mean that through his super power. The poet makes a general statement. Vikrama's march signalled the defeat and destruction of the courage and fortitude of all the enemies of the Chalukya kingdom. "*Kṣmābhṛt*" here does not mean Someśvara Bhuvanaikamalla, but "*prati-nṛpatayaḥ*" in general as explained by *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. We don't say that Vikrama is enraged with his elder brother; he is enraged with all his enemies. The poet has already alluded to this idea in an earlier verse:

Mayā nipīḍyamānās te nibiḍam Draviḍādayaḥ.
Āryam viparyastam api prabhavanti na bādhitum. [4.118]

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

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

* * *

With regard to

Tām vidhāya katiciddināni sa preyasīghuṣṛṇapaṅkilāṃ nadīm.
Colasammukham agāhatāhavaprāptidurlalitaḥ āgraham. [5:18]

Misra comments:

-*āhavaprāptidurlalitaḥ*-, "whose arm was spoiled by the obtaining of fight", seems not intelligible. Read, therefore, *āhavaprāptidurlalitaḥ*-, "whose arm was spoil

ed by not obtaining fights", i.e. unruly because of not getting fights, like a child that was fondled too much or kept from exerting itself and hence gets restless. [p.9]

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

Ajñānāndhasya lokasya jñānāñjanaśalākayā
Caḥsurunmīlitaṃ yena tasmai śrigurave namaḥ.

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

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

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

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

We wonder if Misra had read the following:

Udāraśauryaikarasaḥ kṣamāpatiḥ
sa nirvinodaḥ samarotsvaṃ vinā.
Samāpitāśeṣamadāndhabhūpayor
asevakatvaṃ bhujayor amanyata. [17:8]

* * *

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

Ālupendram avadātavikramas tyaktacāpalam asāvavardhayat.
Dīpayatyavinayāgradūtikā kopam apraṇatir eva tāḍśām. [5:26]

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

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

Yasyotsaṅge kulasarid asau Nīlakaṇṭhaprasūtā [18:9]

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

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

Vyāpṛtair aviratam śīlīmukhaiḥ Keralakṣitipavāmacakṣuṣām.
Pūrvakalpitam asāvadarśayad gaṇḍapāliṣu nivāsam aśruṇaḥ. [5:27]

Śīlīmukha. Bh knows that *śīlīmukhā* means "arrow" as well as "bee". See his comments on 5:72: "*Śīlīmukhā bāṇā bhramarāś ca. Alibāṇau Śīlīmukhau ityamarāḥ.*" Nevertheless he did not apply the "bee" meaning in 5:27a. *Candrikā* says: "*Śīlīmukhaiḥ bāṇa iḥ bhramarāś ca.* Bh and Banerji-Gupta both miss the point. They take only one meaning, i.e. arrows. They probably forget that here *śīlīmukha* means both "arrow" as well as "bee". How the bees are attracted toward the face of a beautiful woman is well depicted by Kālidāsa in his immortal work *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*. (Act I):

Calāpāṅgām dṛṣṭim spr̥sasi bahuśo vepathumatīm
rahasyākhyāyīva svanasi mṛdu kaṇṭikacaraḥ.
Karam vyādhunvatyāḥ pibasi ratisarvasvam adharam
vayaṃ tattvānveṣān madhukara hatās tvam khalu kṛtī.

Our own poet Bilhaṇa too has vividly delineated this *bhramarabādhā*:

Kācit kṣipantī madhupam viśantam itas tataḥ pāṇisaroruheṇa.
Bālye kṛtam kandukatāḍaneṣu śramam mṛgākṣi bahu manyate sma.
[10:61]

Kṣipto mukhāt ṣaṭcaraṇas taruṇyā viveśa hastāmbujakośam 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 exposition of 5:27. *Vik.* 10:28 presents another enchanting example of *śīlīmukha*:

Guṇam dadhāne madhunārpyamāṇam manasvinām mānasabhedadakṣe.
Śīlīmukhaśreṇir upaiti saṅgam puṣpe ca kandarpaśarāsane ca. [10:28]

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

We have another verse depicting the same idea:

Pāṇau padmadhiyā madhūkakusumabhrāntyā tathā gaṇḍayor
nīlendīvaraśaṅkayā nayanayor bandhūkabuddhyādhare.
Līyante kabarīṣu bāndhavajanavyāmohajātaspr̥hā
durvārā madhupāḥ kiyanti sutanu sthānāni rakṣiṣyasi.
[Kasyāpi]

[In *Sūktimuktāvalī*. Kusumāpa[va?] cayādīpaddhati. 65]

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

Tvadbhiyā giriguhāśraye sthitāḥ sāhasāṅka galitratrapā nṛpāḥ.
Jyāravapratiraveṇa tān api tvaddhanuḥ samarasīmni bādhaḥ. [5:40]

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

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

Gāhate'tra dhṛtakārmuke tvayi prītidānam api bhītidānatām.
Tena tasya mahatī vilakṣatā yan na vetsi guṇapakṣapātītām. [5:58]

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

Tena kāraṇena yatra yasya Drāviḍarājasya viṣaye... guṇapakṣapātītām vetsi jānāsi dhārayasītyarthaḥ... Yasya kṛte tava guṇapakṣapātītvam vartate.

This is all unnecessary. Bh tries to interpret *yena kena prakāreṇa* which is not justified. The reading "*yatra*" is not desirable. It cannot be taken to mean "*Yaṃ Drāviḍam prati tava Vikramāṅkasya guṇapakṣapātītā*". The *dūta* does not brag about the qualities of his master, who is, or at least wants to be, humble. These *guṇas* (qualities) belong to Vikrama.

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

We are reminded of Bhāravi's one charming *sadukti*:

Vītasprhāṇām api muktibhājām bhavanti bhavyeṣu hi pakṣapātāḥ.

Āstām tāvat, Prakṛtam anusarāmaḥ.

Bh forces "*yatra*" to mean "*yasya viṣaye*" and turns "*vetsi*" to mean "*dhārayasi*"! Here it is not Vikrama, let it be repeated, who is "*guṇapakṣapātin*," but it is the Cola King who is "*guṇapakṣapātin*." The qualities belong to Vikrama and not to Colarāja! Colarāja is offering his daughter in marriage to Vikrama, because the former is influenced by the qualities of Vikrama. In fact, Vikrama has invaded the territory of the Colas. We don't know how Bh could force such an interpretation on us and create a situation wh

ich is painful. We are reminded here of a passage in Through the looking glass by Lewis Carroll:

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

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

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

London, Macmillan, 1895. p. 124.

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

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

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

* * *

Misra as an Historiographer

Misra presents a very lengthy discussion on the following verse:

Tatra dakṣiṇataṭe kṛtasthitiḥ Kuntalendur avalokya tadbalam.
Bāhum āhavasahasradīkṣitaṃ vandate sma paricumbati sma ca. [5:78]

He expounds:

kṛtasthitiḥ...In 5.56 the messenger of the Cola king proposes [?] Vikramāditya to return (*ni--vrt*) [from the Cola country he has invaded] and to take his stand in the vicinity/proximity (*upāntavartmani*)--obviously of the Cola country. This vicinity/proximity is defined as *tuṅgabhadrayā mudrite*, "sealed by the Tungabhadrā." Whether we understand and sealed (*mudrita*) in the sense of "marked" (*cihnita*) or "sealed off, closed" (cf. 11.19 *amudrita* "unsealed; unrestrained"; Kāṇṣasū. 4.5,6 *mudrita* "closed, sealed") the northern shore of the Tungabhadrā, which lies outside the Cola country, but in its immediate vicinity (*upāntavartmani*), must be meant [?!] The peacetreaty [sic] the Cola king proposes and which he wants to cement by offering his daughter to Vikramāditya as a wife

fe, can be concluded only--it seems obvious--when Vikramāditya has left the country: only on this condition the Cola king's "gift of friendship" (that is the giving of his daughter in matrimony) cannot be looked at as a "gift of fear" (verse 58). This is borne out by the following description of the Cola king's army reaching the Tungabhadrā, putting up a camp alongside its shore (verse 76) and enjoying bathing in the river (verse 77): this would be impossible if King Vikramāditya had himself with his army occupied the southern shore. Consequently the reading of all the editions in verse 78 *dakṣiṇata e kṛtasthitiḥ kuntalenduḥ ...* "the moon of the Kuntalas having taken his stand on the southern shore," cannot be correct. We have to amend *dakṣiṇata e kṛtasthiti* and construe it with *tad balam*. Thus we get:

a tatra dakṣiṇataḥ kṛtasthiti

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

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

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

This Misra is Abhinavabīḥaṇa. He has the right to create his own sṛṣṭi.

Apāre kāvyasaṃsāre kavir ekaḥ prajāpatiḥ.
Yathā'smai rocate viśvam tathaiva parivartate.

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

Vikramādityasāmṛjyasīmā: Dakṣiṇasyām ātuṅgabhadrāyā uttarasyām Narmadām yāvat tatsāmṛjyaṃ viśṛtam abhavat. Tungabhadrā-Kṛṣṇāsaṅgamād uttarato Godāva

rī-Vardhā saṅgamaṃ yāvat, tataś cāgre etām Vardhānadīm yāvat saralarekhāyām ākṛṣṭāyām Cālukya [sām] rājya-prācyasīmā nirdhāryeta.

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

Here we see Misra, playing the role of an historiographer for the first time, discussing historical facts and trying to improve upon all the editions, including Bilhaṇa 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 Vanavāsamaṇḍala for some time. He advances towards the kings [5:23] of Malaya country. Jayakeśin 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 the *Upodghāta* of Nagar.] 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 Tuṅgabhadrā itself was the dividing line between the two empires. If so, he is far removed from the reality. Vikrama had entered right into the territories of the Colas. He was asked to retreat back toward the river. Both armies met on the South Bank itself. Vikrama did not cross the river. He did not go across to the North Bank.

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

Misra may advance a counter-argument and say: The rule *vā pādante tvasau g vakrah* (= 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 *kṛtasthitiḥ* is changed into *kṛtasthiti*. But that is a rule which may be restored to if a mahākavi has already composed that way and not to cater to the whims and caprices of every Tom, Dick and Harry.

We find it difficult to leave this topic. Delivering his learned discourse on *kṛtasthitiḥ* (5:78a), as presented above, Misra has pronounced his judgment and said: "This would be impossible if king Vikramāditya had himself with his army occupied the southern shore." He puts a severe limit on the length of the shore of Tungabhadrā! It was not a pond. It was a mighty river, *Dakṣiṇāpatha-jāhnavī*. Its shore stretched for miles and miles, 400 miles to be exact.

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

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

Sindhutīranilayānurodhataḥ tat tathā balam avāpa dīrghatām.
Antarakṣapitarātribhir janaiḥ prāpyate sma nṛpamandiraṃ yathā. [5:76]

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

* * *

Another unreasonable suggestion of Misra is about:

Raṇarabhasavilāsakautukena sthitim atha bibhrad asau yaśovatamsām.
Vidhihatakadurāgrahād akāṇḍe gatam aśṛṇod Draviḍendram Indradhāmnī.
[6:7]

Misra says:

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

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

Udāraśauryaikaṛasaḥ kṣamāpatiḥ sa nirvinodaḥ samarotsavaṃ vinā.

and

Colasaṃmukhamagāhatāhava-prāptidurlalita bāhurāgraham.

Misra's interpretation [on p. 5] is:

"not exhibiting continuance in (= continuous attachment to) the glory-wreathed (= glory-rewarded) curiosity (= desire) for the sport of battle fury".

The above interpretation goes against the very grain of *vīrarasa* and cannot be even entertained as a sound suggestion.

The following may be interpolated as a special note. The author is indebted to Pt. N. 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 "*nañ*" freely used, goes only with the verb. Obviously, Misra's suggestion betrays his total ignorance of the grammatical rules of Negation (*niṣedha*). He does not know the difference between *pariyudāsa* and *prasajyapraṭiṣedha*. If the meaning suggested by Misra was desired by the poet, he would resort to *pariyudāsa*, where *samāsa* of *nañ* and *bibhrat* is compulsory:

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

Prādhānyaṃ syād vidher yatra praṭiṣedhe'pradhānatā.
Pariyudāsaḥ sa vijñeyo yatrottarapadena nañ.

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

Aprādhānyaṃ vidher yatra praṭiṣedhe pradhānatā.
Prasajyapraṭiṣedho'sau kriyayā saha yatra nañ.
[Vyaktiviveka, II Vimarśa]

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

* * *

Plagiarism can be quite subtle. For instance:

Narapatitanayaḥ kayāpi kopa-sphuritaradacchadalekhayāluloke.
Prakaṭitapaṭupañcabāṇalīlā-kalakilakiñcitam iḥṣaṇāñcalena. [6:19]

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

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

Verse 19 describes--like the preceding verses 12-17--the behavior of one particular girl at the sight of the king, while verse 18 gives a comprehensive finishing statement: *iti*.

..abhavad...vilāsaḥ... "thus was the playful behaviour [of the beautiful women of the town]..." The order of the verses 18 and 19 should, therefore, be inverted.

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

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

Misra continues:

āluloke "was looked at" in 19a is peculiar as it cannot be derived from *ālokaya-*, "to look at", of which the perf. pass. would be *ālokeyām 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.

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

* * *

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

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

Misra presents his outstanding stand:

niviṣ a - does not mean *dalita-*, "torn asunder", as it is glossed in *ed. ter*. What is expected in this context *caraṇatalaniviṣ aduṣ avargaḥ*, "by whom the crowd of the evil ones was... by the soles of his feet", would be *nipiṣ 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:

Yādṛṣam pustakaṃ dṛṣṭam tādṛṣam likhitam mayā.

Just because Bh translated "*niviṣ a*" as *dalita* it does not mean that we must discard his word and change Bilhaṇa'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 sticking, or staying in (loc. or comp.);" Monier-Williams. Misra is always ready to destroy first what is already there and then reconstruct his own. He does not want to interpret the poet's words. He wants to put his own words into the poet's mouth.

Misra recommends that *niviṣ 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. *Caraṇan ipiṣ a* would easily express the desired meaning. So "*tala*" would become redundant. "*Tala*" serves us better if we have to say 'under the feet.' Also the word "*nipiṣ a*" is not in the usage of the poets. "*Niṣpiṣ 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. Here is his discussion on:

Atha katiṣucid eva daivayogāt parigaliteṣu dineṣu Colasūnoḥ.
Śriyam aharata Rājigābhidhānaḥ prakṛtivorodhahatasya Veṅgināthaḥ. [6:26]

Misra shows his *prakṛti*:

The expression *prakṛtivorodhahata*- 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 tradition", i.e. "impious." Hence *prakṛtivorodhin*- in 6.27 would mean "who is in conflict with nature", i.e. "unnatural." This fits well as a qualification of Somadeva, who indulges in an unnatural hatred towards his brother.

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

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

[p. 12] [Misra does not know who Rājiga was. He ought to have studied pages 27-29 of my *Upodghāta*].

How about expressions like *hā hato'smi mandabhāgyaḥ* and *Vayam tattvānveṣān madhukara hatās tvam khalu kṛtī!*

It is not necessary to make "virodhi" of "virodha." As *Caritacandrikā* explains: *Praṅktivirodho naisargikavairam tena hatasya*. We can interpret it only in the sense that Rājiga was an inveterate enemy-- "yeṣāṃ ca virodhaḥ śāśvatikaḥ," "ahinakulam," or "kākolūkīyam." 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 as *galitanayasya*. [6:38]

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

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

Bühler does not identify Colasūnu, but he was Adhirājarājendra. of the people, the subjects. But the poet uses the same expression at the end of the following verse *prakṛti virodhinam asya Somadevam* (6.27). Here and earlier, in both the places, "*prakṛtivorodha*" means only the natural enmity like *ahinakulam* or *kākolūkīyam*, 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 "*prakṛtivorodhahatasya*" is set in between "*Rājigābhīdhānaḥ*" and "*Veṅgināthaḥ*." So according to *Dehālī-dīpakanyāya*, the death was caused by Rājiga, who was Veṅginātha. We do not believe that the people of the Cola kingdom first revolted, then killed Adhirājarājendra and then invited Rājiga to occupy the throne.

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

Prakṛtīnām prajānām prakṛteḥ svabhāvasya vā virodhena prātikūlyena vaireṇa vā hatasya mārītasya.

We don't believe that Adhirājarājendra was killed by his own subjects. Unless all the subjects wanted Rājendracola to be the ruler, they would not have killed their own king. In any case, the allies of Adhirājarājendra must have been very weak. He did not have enough support. However, Banerji and Gupta attempt to translate the passage thus:

Then after the lapse of a few days, as Fate would have it, the lord of Veṅgi, named Rājiga, carried away the goddess of royalty of the prince of Cola who was distressed [!] by the revolt of the subjects.

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

Also the word "*punaḥ*" may have some significance. When Vīrarājendra 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.

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

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

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

Let us hear what the poet himself says:

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

2. Rājyam uddhṛtam anarthapaṅkataḥ
kanyakāvitarāṇād 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.

Bilhaṇa says:

Kanyāpradānacchalataḥ kṣitiśāḥ sarvasvadānam bahavo'sya cakruḥ.

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

Tyāgam eva praśamsanti guror utpathagāmināḥ. [4:117]

Mayā nipīḍyamānās te nibiḍam Draviḍādayaḥ.
Āryam viparyastam api prabhavanti na bādhitum. [4:118]

The question is what would have happened to the entire Cālukya kingdom if Vikra māḍitya 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 Cālukya kingdom would have been completely wiped off then and there and forever!

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

Bubhukṣitaḥ kiṃ na karoti pāpam kṣīṇā narā nīṣkaruṇā bhavanti.
Ākhyāhi bhadre priyadarśanasya na Gaṅgadattaḥ punar eti kūpam.

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

Misra's Misdirections

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

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

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

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

c *gaganagirita ī navendranīla*-
d *drutiśatanirjharadhāriṇīva reje* //

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

While *druti*-, "melting, molten substance," here fits well as qualification of *nirjhara*-, "cascades", it should be changed into *dyuti*- [?] in 11.41a *ketakadrutinibham mahaḥ... ind*

oh, "the splendour (*mahaḥ*)-of the moon that...was like the shine (*dyuti*) of a [!] (white) *Ketaka* flower." Cp. 11.87:

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

- a *nikṣipya*.....
- b *ātmadyatiṃ dadhati pāṇḍuratām pradīpāḥ* /

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

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

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

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

*Ketakadrutinibham bhuvanāntas tanmahaḥ prakṛtiśīṭalam indoḥ.
Kasya no vapuṣi candanalepaḥ kāntitaś ca guṇataś ca babhūva. [11.41]*

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

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

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

Misra did not realize that the *dyuti* was too precious to be "thrown down.," It was entrusted to the care of *gaṇḍaphalaka!*

We hope Misra had read Kālidāsa:

Dinānte nihitam tejaḥ savitreva hutāśanaḥ.

Āstām 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 *nirjhara!* To put it differently, the lustre of *indranīla* does not constitute the cascade; it is the liquefied *indranīla* itself that is showering!

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

To change *ketakadruti* into *ketakadyuti* will 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 the soothing quality. To say *ketakadyutinibham* will be an utter nonsense. How? Why? A *bhāvuka kavi* alone can understand. One has to go and ask some real guru who knows. *Upadekṣyanti te jñānaṃ jñāninas tattva-darśinaḥ*. Saṃskṛta is divine.

Saṃskṛtam nāma daivī vāg anvākhyātā maharṣibhiḥ.

We are reminded of the following *Sadukti*:

Ajñānāndhasya lokasya jñānāñjanaśalākayā.
Cakṣur unmīlitaṃ yena tasmai [śrī gurave] namaḥ.

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

Mr. Misra may know:

Savāsanānām sabhyānām rasasyāsvādanaṃ bhavet.
Nirvāsanās tu raṅgāntaḥ kāṣṭhakuḍyāśmasannibhāḥ.

Misra is advised to read the following:

Drāvitasphaṭikaśailaviṭaṅka-sphāranirjharaparamparayeva.
Pūritā śaśirucā bhuvanaśrīr mānapaṅkam anudat pramadānām. [11:38]

and

Jalāśayā yatra hasanti santataṃ navendranīladravanirmalodarāḥ [kāḥ?]
Śaratsamutsāritameghakardamam Kalindakanyāhradamecakaṃ nabhaḥ. [2:6]

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

Misra expects us to accept his *Ketakadyutinibham mahaḥ!* Poor critic! He did not realize that it would be the total negation of *sahṛdayatvam*. *Dyuti* will cover only *kānti* and not the *guṇa* as well. Bilhaṇa 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 Bilhaṇa's *vyutpatti* and *vicchitti* will never agree. They will remind Misra once again of Bilhaṇa's own *sadukti*:

Kuṇṭhatvam āyāti guṇah kavīnām sāhityavidyāśramavarjiteṣu.

and

Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham.

And here is our favorite poet Murari:

Daivīm vācam upāsate hi bahavaḥ sāraṃ tu sārasvatam
jānīte nitarām asau gurukulakliṣ o Murāriḥ kaviḥ.
Abdhir laṅghita eva vānarabhaṭaiḥ kintvasya gambhīratām
āpātālanimagnapīvaravapur jānāti manthācalaḥ.
[stress added]

Also we have

Śīlā-Vijjā-Mārulā-Morikādyāḥ kāvyam kartuṃ santi śaktāḥ striyo'pi.
Tattvaṃ vettuṃ vādino nirvijetum viśvam vaktuṃ yaḥ pravīṇaḥ sa vandyāḥ.

Why This Book?

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

aṇa. **This has been an objective of our undertaking this study of Misra.**

* * *

Another "emendation" suggested by Misra relates to:

Bahubhir abhīhitaiḥ kim adbhutair vā
bhayajananaṃ Bhuvanaikamallasainyam.
Raṇarasacalitaṃ vilokya keṣāṃ
alabhata cetasi nāntaraṃ vikalpaḥ. [6:53]

Misra says:

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

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

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

Bh translates correctly: "*raṇasya yuddhasya rasensāhena calitam samāpatantam*."

* * *

However, Misra has taken a correct stand regarding:

Dviradapatir amuṣya śatrusenā-bhaṭamukhapadmavimardakelikālaḥ.
Jhaṭīti raṇasaraś cakāra lakṣmī-karadhṛtavibhramapuṇḍarīkaśeṣam. [6:88]

Misra states:

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

Misra's punctuation marks are baffling.

a. *dviradapatir amuṣya śatrusenā-*

b. *bha amukhapadmavimardakelikārah /*

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

Misra displays here his knowledge of the elephants!

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

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

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

- *śeṣam* 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 "MSS." or he deliberately uses the plural? We are generally concerned here only with "J", i.e. only one MS.

c*raṇasaraś cakāra lakṣmī* [-]/

d *karadhṛtavibhramapuṇḍarīkaśeṣam*//

"..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 hanakelikārah*, "indulging in the sport of robbing the dress that is (white) fame"; 16.52 *tuhinagirita īkelikārāḥ samīrāḥ*, "the winds indulging in sports on the slopes of the snow mountain."

This is the first instance (6:86) where Misra has improved the reading of N by pointing out its deviation from B, without the support of J, and then concluding that it was a slip of pen on the part of N. This improvement is owed to M. This is called *ghuṇākṣara-nyāya*.

N inherits "kālah" from R! Of course, this is an error on the part of N, but can be explained not only by the fact that the press copy for N was the R itself, but also "kālah" was much more charming and yielded alliteration. N was caught in the trap unawares!

This is a case of a lie that seemingly appears like the truth! We have named it *Satyāyamānam asatyam*. This shows how one is easily misled by a lie which does not seem to be a lie. Even though the specific reading is not genuine, one cannot suspect its being corrupt, because it makes a good sense by itself.

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

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

"Gacchataḥ skhalanaṃ kvāpi bhavatyeva prāmadataḥ."

No man is infallible. After I had written the above, I saw once again the unworthy ed. of R [for which Bh had said:... *sati ravikaranikarapraveśe kuto'ndhakārasya sambhavaḥ!* It has *kelikālah*, i.e. its own creation! It does not reproduce what B has. So N got himself caught in the trap laid by R! This is called *Svayaṃ naṣ aḥ parān nāśayati*.

Śeṣam comes from J. "*Kośam*" is the creation of Bühler's fertile brain. We don't know 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 N goes back to J. However, M is not explicit on this point. He is equivocal.

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

* * *

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

Iti bhramatsaurabhamāṃsalena nimīlītānāṃ malayānilena.
Abhūc ciraṃ bhūmigṛhasthitānāṃ pralāpamālā priyakāṅkṣiṇīnāṃ.
[7:14 *Kulakam*]

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

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

(=*vyathita*, glossed in ed. ter.). Hence read *nipīḍita- Ānipīlita- Ānipīlita*. [p. 14]

Once again we are reminded by our ancestor-gurus--*jivat kaver āśay na varṇanīyaḥ* = Don't try to interpret the poet who is still alive. We hesitate to put our words into Misra's mouth. However, we have no choice.

Probably what Misra wants us to learn here is: *nipīḍita* is derived from *nipīḷita*, which in turn is derived from *nipīlita*. If so we can bow down our head not in reverence but in shame and say: *mugdha-mataye namaḥ*. The original word of Bilhaṇa is *nimīlita*. We fail to understand how 'm' gets turned into 'p"! A reader of these lines is bound to reach one of the two conclusions: Either this writer (N) is a dumb fool or Misra is not honest and reliable.

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

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

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

Also

Praudhiprakarṣeṇa purāṇarīti-vyatikramaḥ ślāghyatamaḥ padānām.
Atyunnatisphoṭitakañcukāni vandyāni kāntākucamaṇḍalāni. [1:15]

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

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

Kāmadughā hi mahākavīnām vāco bhavanti.

Atha ca

Yā dugdhāpi na dugdheva kavidoḅdhṛbhir anvaham.

Misra has no value for the *anuprāsa*. He does not care for *mādhuryam*. There is a world of difference between *nimīlitānām* and *nipīditānam*. One has to develop the art of appreciation of poetry to become a *sahṛdaya*.

* * *

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

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

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

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-ippaṇi-kārasya 'pramādād anavadhānatām parityajyeti bhāvaḥ!' [!] ityapi cintyam.*"

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

* * *

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

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

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

If Bh had seen Monier-Williams (p. 807, col. 3) he might not have been confused. MW says:

Sometimes the relative *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 connected, even the neut. sing. being occasionally thus used in connection with words of a different gender and number, and the relative being itself almost untranslatable (e.g. *yan maraṇaṃ 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 re-search. They believe and practice *manaḥpūtam samācaret*. They don't have to prove. They just dictate.

* * *

Misra's genius soars high up when he discusses:

Hastadvayīgāḍhagr̥hītalola-dolāguṇānāṃ jaghane vadhūnām.
Asaṃvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe kim apyabhūd ucchvasito manobhūḥ. [7:29]

He remarks:

asaṃvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe: it is difficult to construe this as a compound, for the hips of the women (*jaghane vadhūnām*) are not first "uncovered" (*asaṃvṛta-*) and then "loosing their linen dress" (*-srastadukūlabandha-*) as we have to understand according to Pāṇ, 2.1.49. Better is the conjecture of ed. ter.: *asaṃvṛte srastadukūlabandhe*, "[the hips of the women] having been uncovered, their underwear [!] having gone."

Because you are a *mugdha-sīromaṇi*!

Because he is *mugdhatara-sīromaṇi*!!

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

Easiest, and therefore best, would be to interpret the tradition [?] as: *asaṃvṛta[s] srastadukūlabandha* and construe *asaṃvṛtas* 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 *Subtiñantam padam*!!

Following the footsteps of Bh, Misra recommends that we should read *asaṃvṛte srastadukūlabandhe*, or better make it *asaṃvṛtaḥ* and connect the word with *manobhūḥ*! Misra merely provides one more example of *gaḍḍalikāpravāhanyāya* when he recommends that Bh's conjecture be adopted, which is unjustifiable. It is to be noted that both the "restorers" have overlooked the word "*bandha*", i.e. knot = tie. *Asaṃvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe* is a *bahuvrīhi* compound qualifying *jaghane*. Whatever is "*asaṃvṛta*" and "*srasta*" is not *jaghana* or *dukūla*, but the *dukūlabandha*. The knot gets untied or loosened and then the garment (that part of the garment) [not their "underwear" as Misra tells us!] slips down. If the *jaghana* gets totally *asaṃvṛta* (naked) there will be *rasabhaṅga* and not the continuity of *sr̥ṅgāra*. It will be a great interruption, *mahāvighna*. If the

vital parts of the body of a lady would become totally naked in public, it would be obscene. The *dolā-vilāsa* will stop instantaneously--then and there! No respectable woman, no decent lady would like to remain naked in public even for a moment. In reality the *jaghana* had become just a little bit bare, because the knot (or tie) of her *sāri* (wearing apparel) had become slightly loose, and had slipped just a little. There is no need to make the *jaghana* totally naked, completely bare. The purpose is served, and in a better way, if it is seen just a little bit bare. It is the slight glimpse of a part of the *jaghana* that brings fresh filip to the mind-born (God of Love). Misra translates "*manobhūḥ*" as "love" only!

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

Here is a great poet, echoing the same sentiments:

Nāndhrīpayodhara ivātitarām prakāśaḥ
 no Gurajarīstana ivātitarām nigūḍhaḥ.
 Artho girām apihitaḥ pihitaśca kaścit
 saubhāgyam eti marahaṭṭavadhūkucābhaḥ.
 Quoted in *Bālabodhinī* comm. on *Kāvyaṣṭakāśa*, v. 45.
 Jhalakīkara ed. Poona, 1965. p. 191 (Context: *Guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya*).

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

Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanaṃ śīrasi mā likha mā likha mā likha.

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

Anudghuṣṭaḥ śabdair atha ghaṭanataś ca sphuṭataḥ
 padānām arthātmā sukhayati na tūttānitarasaḥ.
 Yathā kiñcitkiñcitpavanacalacīnāṃśukatayā
 kucābhogaḥ strīṇām sukhayati na tūdghāṭitam uraḥ.

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

[Dharmāśokasya. From *Suktimuktāvalī*. Kavikāvyaṣṭakāśa]

Anuddhrṣṭaḥ śabdair atha ca racanātaḥ sphuṭarasaḥ
 padānām arthātmā janayati kavīnāṃ bahumudam.
 Yathā kiñcitkiñcitpavanacalacolāñcalatayā
 kucadvandvaṃ kāntiṃ kirati na tathodghāṭitam uraḥ.

anuddhr̥ṣ aḥ may very well be an error on the part of the scribe or printer.

We would like to know from Misra, the critic, how does he want to construe the whole verse. Is *asaṃvṛtaḥ* an *uddeśya* or *vidheya*? What is the finite verb? What is the meaning of *kimapi*? How does it stand in relation to Misra's "Love unfettered?"

We have designated Misra as *munitrayaikyam*--Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali--all three in one! He refers to Pāṇini 2.1.49 in discussing the above--"*asaṃvṛta srastadukūlabandhe*." The *sūtra* is "*Pūrvakālaikasarvajarat purāṇanavakevalāḥ samānādhikaraṇena*." The example of "*pūrvakāla*", as given by Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita, is "*pūrvam snātaḥ pascādādanuliptaḥ snātānuliptaḥ*." Misra has not specifically stated in Sanskrit what he wants to convey. Therefore, we cannot determine what he exactly wants to say. We can only guess. If we are right, we will need a compound like "*pūrvam asaṃvṛtaḥ pascād srasta-dukūlabandhaḥ*." This will require that we have another sub-compound (*bahuvrīhi*), something like "*srastaḥ dukūlasya bandho yasya tat (jaghanam)*", because unless and until "*srastadukūlabandha*" is made an adjective of *jaghana*, and made coordinate with "*srasta*", i.e. a *samānādhikaraṇa*, we cannot apply the above *sūtra* of Pāṇini.

If the above reasoning, as advanced by us, is accepted, then the whole compound would mean that the hips got first naked and then their knot of the clothing (dress) got "*srasta*", i.e. slipped! This will 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 that world of fantasy created by him.

* * *

Bh's Grammatical Jugglery

The word *akṣūṇa* in the verse 7:40 provides an opportunity for Bh to display his command over grammatical construction and interpretation. Bilhaṇa says:

Rāśīkṛtāḥ puṣpapāragapuñjāḥ pade pade dakṣiṇamārutena.
Mattasya caitradviradasya kartum akṣūṇahetor iva pāṃsutaalpān. [7:40]

I did not understand the meaning of the word *akṣūṇa* in this verse. I had no hesitation in confessing the limitations of my knowledge and stated with all the honesty and sincerity at my command that *akṣūṇapadasyārtho nāvagamyate*. Even today, after a lapse of four decades, I don't know exactly what it means!

Bh who took *Candrikā* to be an "ancient" commentary, consciously or unconsciously, remarked:

Kutracit "asya śabdasyārthāgamō na jāyate" iti spaṣṭam likhitvā ṭippanīkṛtā viduṣā nirahaṅkāram svapāṇḍityam paricāyitam."

I don't know wherefrom Bh quotes *Caritacandrikā*. The only place Nagar (i.e. *Caritacandrikā*) used such an expression was here in 7:40, but N's words are: '*akṣūnapadas yārtho nāvagamyate!*

However, Bh had no difficulty at all in understanding the meaning of the word. Through a rigorous jugglery of a great grammarian, Bh has tried to establish that the word *akṣūṇa* can be interpreted as *gatyavarodhaḥ*, i.e. *viśrāmaḥ*. But he overlooks the significance of the expression *pade pade* = at every step, everywhere. The must elephant does not need immediate or constant rest. He needs an outlet for his over-bursting energy--to let his steam off, as it were. He is not suffering from, say, tuberculosis that he would need rest at every step. In reality, he would like to get engaged in sportive acts at every step. That is the meaning. So, although the dictionaries do not support us, although we are not yet sure whether the word *akṣūṇa* is genuine and correct, (i.e. whether it represents the original correct reading), we can tentatively assign it the meaning of *vihāra*, *līlā*, or *krīḍā* (sportive play) to relieve him of the intense pressure caused by the severe *madāvasthā*.

It is interesting to observe that B & G try to render the verse in English, but they avoid the interpretation of the words *kartum akṣūṇahetor 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. It has to be the wind.

However, they are honest enough to add in the footnote: "In this verse the word *Achyūna* [sic] is obscure." ["*Achyūna*" won't make *akṣūṇa*.]

Misra's Chapter I is titled: "Specimens of Textual Difficulties." He has discussed so many "difficulties," as felt by him. To us many of them are merely his own fantastic fantasies. However, he has not discussed the word *akṣūṇa*. Probably he did not have any "difficulty" in it at all! Nevertheless, it is still a cause of great "difficulty" to me!

I believe we must go to some ancient text on *Gajāśāstra* to understand this verse [7:40]. *Mātaṅga-līlā* of Nīlakaṇṭha describes the first stage of must, (*mada*, dangerous periodic excitement), *prathamā madāvasthā*, as follows:

Madhurucinakhadantaprekṣaṇo nīlamegha-
cchavir aruṇadṛgantaḥ padmakiñjalkabinduḥ.
Aparagajavirodhī pāṃsupāthovihārair
bhavati ca kaṭapūrṇaḥ sundaro vāraṇendraḥ.
[*Navamaḥ pa alah*. Verse 12]

And here is Edgerton's translation of the above verse [pp. 82-83]:

12. With honey-coloured nails, tusks and eyes [? MLN], skin like a dark cloud, red corners of the eyes, lotus-filament spots (on the skin), quarreling with other elephants,

with sporting in dust [stress mine] and water, the handsome elephant-king becomes "temple-filled" (in the first stage of must.)

The text reads *pāmsupāthovihārair*, i.e. instrumental of "*bhavati*." Edgerton gives a variant reading *vihārī*. We 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 phenomenon and the "sport" is the resultant natural behaviour. *Vihārī* is in perfect consonance with *virodhī*.

Well, whatever it may be, our main concern is *pāmsuvihāra*. *Dhūlimṛṣ iḥ* is mentioned as part of the daily routine (*dinacaryā*) by Nīlakaṇṭha [11:8]. Edgerton translates the word as "rubbing down with powder." We believe this is *pāmsūkrīḍā*, rather than "rubbing with powder."

Cf. Vapra^{krīḍā}pariṇatagajaprekṣaṇīyaṃ dadarśa.
[*Meghadūte* Kālidāsaḥ]

Now let us see what *Mātāṅgalīlā* says on *pāmsū* [*puṣpa- parāgapuñjāḥ* of Bilhaṇa]:

Sarveṣāṃ mada^{krīḍ} vasantasamayaḥ prokto, viśeṣād asau
nāgānāṃ tu, tato vasantajanitā ye te tu gandhadvipāḥ. [1:40]

And *rajo'mbupaṅkavīhṛtī* [1:35]

This justifies the *mada* in the Spring:

Atimadhurarasānām sevayā patrabhaṅgaiḥ
kabalakubalaśaṣpair annapānair yathoktaiḥ.
Śrutisubhagavacobhiḥ pāmsu [stress added] paṅkāmbudānair
bhavati muditacetāḥ kāmacāreṇa nāgaḥ. [9:1]

And paṅkāmbupāmsupriyaḥ [stress added] [5:6]

We would like to refer to another *ākara-grantha* on the subject: Pālakāpyamuni- viracito *Hastyāyurvedaḥ*. [Poona, Anandashrama, 1894].

Caturthe uttarasthāne triṃśattamaḥ pāmsudānādhyāyaḥ. [p.691]

Athātaḥ pāmsudānasya vakṣyate guṇasaṅgrahaḥ. [15]

Atha śraddhām ca kurute tathāhāraśramaṃ bhavet [tyajet?]
Pāmsūr mattasya nāgasya manaḥsaukhyavivardhanaḥ. [16]

Pāmsūr balasya janano [kathitaś ca] vivardhanaḥ.
Pāmsūr uṣṇābhitaptasya jayasaukhyavivardhanaḥ. [17]

Pāmsudānaguṇopeto rasadhātur vivardhate, etc. etc.

I went through the entire book, I am sorry to say, hurriedly, but I did not find any clue to solve the problem of *akṣūṇahetoḥ* in the verse being discussed.

As stated elsewhere, an attempt was made by a *vaiyākaraṇaśiromaṇi* a distinguished friend of Bharadwaj, to give the derivation of this word [*akṣūṇa*]. Bilhaṇa did not write a poetry that could be understood only with the help of such a great learned grammarian. He composed his poem in *Vaidarbhī rīti* and it is endowed with *prasāda guṇa*. Let us hear Bilhaṇa himself:

Grāmo nāsau na sa janapadaḥ sāsti no rājadhānī
tannāraṇyam na tad upavanam sā na sārasvatī bhūḥ.
Vidvān mūrkhah pariṇatavayā bālakaḥ strī pumān vā
yatronmīlatpulakam akhilā nāsya kāvyam paṭhanti. [18:89]

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

Mattasya caitradviradasya kartuṃ viśrāmahetor iva pāmsutalpān. [!]

* * *

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

Unnidrapaṅktisthitacampakāni cakāśire kelivanāntarāṇi.
Viyogināṇaṃ kavalīkṛtānāṃ suvarṇakāñcībhir ivāñcitāni. [7:50]

Misra translates the above verse as follows:

The interiors of the parks, whose campaka-[is a Sanskrit word] trees standing in rows, were fully bloomed (with yellow-golden flowers), appeared as if marked by the golden belts of jilted lonely girls who intended to hang themselves by their belts. (emphasis added) [p. 29]

The underlined portion is a display of "nonsensical" interpretation by our Abhinava-Bilhaṇa Misra. I don't know how he gets all this meaning. The poet says *kavalīkṛtānaṃ viyogināṇaṃ suvarṇakāñcībhir añcitāni 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 *viyoginīs* 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? We don't know how far Misra can take himself! Misra does not give the meaning of the word *kavalīkṛtānāṃ* which means "devoured", "eaten up", or "swallowed." At least the word does not figure in his translation!

Śrīharṣa in his *Naiṣadhīyacarita* describes the destructive force of *campaka* flowers. Here is one of his *saduktis*:

Vicinvatīḥ pānthapataṅgahiṃsanair apuṇyakarmāṇyalikajjalacchalāt.
Vyalokayac campakakorakāvalīḥ sa Śambarārer balidīpikā iva.
[Śrīharṣapaṇḍitasya. Jalhaṇa. Sarvapadārthasaṃstutipaddhatiḥ, 109:27]

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

Also Bilhaṇa:

Tathā gatā campakadāmagaurī śarīrayaṣṭiḥ kṛṣatām kṛśāṅgyāḥ.
Yathā galaccāpamanorathosyām maurvīlatāsthāṃ madanaḥ karoti. [9:30]

Once again we meet here the word *añcitam*, disliked so much by Misra, already discussed, in connection with the verse (in *suvarṇakāñcībhīr ivāñcitāni*).

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 Pāṇ.6.4.30 and 7.2.53, yet Bilhaṇa has no example of *añcita* in this sense. [p.26, fn.2]

Misra does not ask us once again here to replace *añcitam* by *arcitam*! Why? However, he translates the word as "marked by!"

* * *

A simple word '*kuhūtkāri*' occurring in

Pānīyaṃ nālikerīphalakuharakuhūtkāri kallolayantaḥ
Kāverītīratāladrumbharitasurābhāṇḍabhāṅkāraçaṇḍāḥ.
Unmīlannīlamocāparicayaśīśirā vāntyamī Drāviḍīnāṃ
karpūrāpāṇḍugaṇḍasthalaluṭhitarayā vāyavo dākṣiṇātyāḥ.
[7:71]

agitates Misra's brain-cells. In his opinion, "the previous attempts in translating [Bilhaṇa] have been banal." [p. 19] Also "attempts in interpreting the text, in the hands of modern scholars, have been dubious." [Misra on his DUST-jacket!] So he says:

kuhūtkāri:- the wrong orthography *kuhūt*- (all edd. and anthologies) instead of *kuhū*, "a sound, like the cry of the Kokila", may be due to false [?] analogy after *phūtkṛ* (8.1 8; 11.23) "to make a hissing sound." Cp. below Chap. III on 7.71. [p. 15]

We don't understand what the melodious song of the Kokila has to do here. *Kuhūtkāri* is just an onomatopoeic word, being an imitation of the sound of the coconuts shake

n by the winds (the nuts possessing water inside naturally make the specific sound when shaken).

Cf. Nārikelaphalakhaṇḍatāṇḍava

Misra could have suggested an improved reading based on the A MS. i.e. *lulita* for *luhita* in the fourth *pāda*. Cf.

Niṣiddhair apyebhir lulitamakarando madhukaraiḥ [Veṇīsaṃhāra 1.1]

For a similar idea see:

Ye dolākelikārāḥ kim api mṛgadṛśāṃ mānatantucchido ye
sadyaḥ śṛṅgārādikṣāvyatikaraguravo ye ca lokatraye'pi.
Te kaṇṭhe lolayantaḥ parabhr̥tavayasām pañcamaṃ rāgarājaṃ
vānti svairam samīrāḥ smaravijayamahāsākṣiṇo dākṣiṇātyāḥ.

The above verse, composed by Rājaśekhara, is cited by *Sūktimuktāvalī* right after the following two verses of Bilhaṇa--*Pāñyam nālikerī* and *Tanvānaśītalatvam*. All the three are very similar in wording and meaning--*śabdāvalī* and *arthatattvam*.

Misra also discusses *bhāṃkāri* in 7:71. He says:

bhāṃkāri-f. "a certain (rambling) sound" in b (onomotopoetic) [sic] also attested in 9:22, to be connected with *bhāṃkāri* f. "gad-fly", or just wrong for *jhāṃkāra*- (cp. *jhāṃkṛta* 9.148). [p. 15]

* * *

Na hi sarvaḥ sarvaṃ jānāti

B changed a perfectly sensible word into utter nonsense in the following verse as recognised by Misra also. But Misra goes on to find fault with *Caritacandrikā* and Bh to o.

Māti nirvivare tasyāś citraṃ kucayugāntare.
Kṛīḍākuṇḍalitoccaṇḍa-kodaṇḍaḥ 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 *kvacin na māti sma mudā nareśvaraḥ*, "the king did not find a place anywhere through joy", i.e. "cannot [could not?] contain himself for [!] joy", cp. *Śiś.* 1.23 etc. The verse in question... should be rendered as follows:

"God Love, whose terrible [!] [uccaṇḍa = gigantic, not terrible] bow is playfully arched, fits, [it is] marvelous, in the space between her breasts, which [yet] is without an opening [!] [which might give him room]." [What a terrible translation!] [p. 15]

Misra finds fault with N who has explained the word "*māti*" by "*āgacchati*." Pāṇini has as *Ādhāro'dhikaraṇam* (1.4.45) and *Saptamyadhiaraṇe ca.* (2.3.36). Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita defines-- *aupaśleṣiko, vaiṣayiko'bhivyāpakaś cetyādhārastridhā*, and cites as the example of the third category *sarvasmīnāmāsti*. I don't know what else it (*māti*) would mean when we put the following three words together: *nirvivare kucayugāntare āgacchati*.

Those who try to translate the poetry of one language into another faithfully and also want to preserve the beauties of the original alone know the problems involved. It is more difficult to translate great poets like Bilhaṇa, whose poetic muse cannot be easily rendered in other words, even in the same language. *Agamyo hi mahākavīnām pant hāḥ!* N follows *sthūlarundhatīnyāya* or *śākhācandranāyāya* when he uses the word "*āgacchati*." Misra has not given any other Sanskrit equivalent of his own choice. He merely translates "*māti*" into English by "fits, finds place in." Misra has cited a similar passage: *kvacin na māti sma mudā nareśvaraḥ*. Let us examine how shallow is his translation: "the king did not find a place anywhere through joy, i.e. "cannot [?] contain himself for [!] joy." It would have been much better to say: The king's joy had no bounds (limits); his joy was simply overwhelming, or, overflowing. Misra is translating literally. '*Na māti sma*' is an idiomatic expression and hence it should be translated idiomatically.

Bh takes pride in copying "B" and "R" even where "N" has a better reading. The above verse is another example of this kind of unjust decision on the part of Bh. He reads "*bhāti*" and rejects "*māti*", i.e. he goes against even J, i.e. the poet himself. He explains "*bhāti*" as "*pūrṇatayā samāgatya sāvakāśam virājata iti citram iti āścaryam*." Incidentally it might be added that even Bh says: *samāgatya*. Cf. N's *āgacchati*.

We have already stated this and would state it once again that appreciation of poetry is an art. It is a matter of feeling. It is not a scientific phenomenon which can be verified empirically or proved by physical, concrete evidence. The true meaning of a *kāvya* can be comprehended only by those who are gifted by nature and have experienced the beauties of poetic muse by actually feeling them. The essence of poetry is: *Kāvya arthabhāvanāparipakvabuddhi- vibhavamātravedyam*.

And

Śabdārthaśāsanajñāna-mātreṇaiva na vedyate.
Vedyate sa hi kāvyārthatattvajñair eva kevalam.
[*Dhvanyālokaḥ* 1.14]

And here is our own poet Bilhaṇa: *Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham.* [1:22]

Bilhaṇa himself has warned unqualified simple folks (*mugdhajanas*) against trying to understand him: [1:22, etc.]

We fail to understand what is there to wonder about if Kāma is able to stay there. Strangely enough Bh forces the word "*bhāti*" to mean far more than its *prakṛti* and *pratyaya* are capable of.

Bh tries to defend Bühler for his erroneous renderings of the text of the *Vik*. He says:

Prācīna kevala eka hasta-likhita pustaka ke ādhāra para jo bhī pustaka prathama bhāra śīghratāse chapavāī jāegī, unamem [!] yadi aśuddhiyāṃ ho [?] to ve kṣamya haiṃ . Dā Jārja Byuhlara Mahodaya ko anya prati kahīṃ na milane se kevala usa eka Vikramāṅkadevacarita Mahākāvya kī hastalikhita prati ke ādhāra para hī pustaka chapavānī paṛī thī. Kucha loga bhale hī Dā Jārja Byuhlara Mahodaya kī pustaka kī aśuddhī bahuta batākara [!] usakī [!]

Did Bh actually want to say...*pustaka ko aśuddhi bahuta batākara...* or, *aśuddhī bahula*? It seems someone else (who might have had some personal grudge against N) wrote the above words. *Mātsaryarāgopahatātmanāṃ hi skhalanti sādhuṣvapi mānasāni. Bharavi.* Bh merely got them published even without understanding them! *Dveṣyaiva k eṣāṃ api candrakhaṇḍa-vipāṇḍurā puṇḍrakaśarkarāpi* [1:20.3-4]

nindā kareṃ kintu maiṃ to Dā Jārja Byuhlara Mahodaya ko aneka dhanyavāda detā hūṃ ki unhoṃne isa mahākāvvyaratna ko parakha kara isako, aśuddhiyukta hī kyom na ho, prakāśita kara jagat ke sammukha prakaṭa kiyā. Anyathā yaha mahākāvya bhī anya uttama tathā upayogī saṃskṛta grantha [!] ke sadṛśa pustakālayom kī andherī ko ṭhariyom mem hastalikhita rūpa mem hī paṛā rahatā [What a wonderful Hindi writing! Deserves Maṅgalāprasāda pāritoṣika as well as Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha mahāpuraskāra!].

The above words, if freely rendered into English, would read as follows:

When a work is published for the first time in a rush [!] and when it is based on only one old manuscript, there are bound to be errors and they are to be condoned.

Since Dr. Georg Bühler did not get any other manuscript of the *Carita*, he had to get the work published on the basis of only one manuscript that he had found. Some may very well abuse (*nindā kareṃ*) Dr. Georg Bühler by pointing out the errors of his edition, but I offer myriads of my sincere thanks to that great Georg Bühler who realized the value of this great epic-gem and brought it out before the learned world--may be even in erroneous form.... [Vol. III, Introd. p. 2]

It is interesting to note that Bh did not indulge in this kind of unnecessary defence of Bühler in his first two volumes. It seems his mind got inflated by his apparent success when he saw that even his third volume was published and he was able to put forth all

that he wanted. His mental balloon of pride got inflated with hot air and soared high up in the skies.

We do not understand why such a defense was necessary! It assumes quite a lot. Bh does not mention the name of the "abuser" who has "abused," according to him, the name of Bühler. He merely says "some" (plural) as "abusing." We wish he had named those who, in his opinion, had abused Dr. Georg Bühler. Bh has used the word "*nindā*." Now the word "*nindā*" means "*guṇeṣu doṣāropah.*" i.e. to superimpose vices on virtues. But Bühler is not criticized, even if he is, in a way that could be termed as "imposing vices on virtues." To state the facts (*vastu-sthiti-kathanam*) is not "*nindā*." Our ancient *nītikāras* have already instructed us:

Śatoror api guṇā vācyā doṣā vācyā guror api.

If Bh has in his mind the criticism of Bühler by Nagar, he is sadly mistaken. He is misrepresenting the facts; he is distorting the truth. Here is what Nagar wrote in his "Introduction" [pp. 2-4 *Prastāvanā*, p. 5 *Upodghāta*].

Durgamodvase Jaisalmeranagare kṛtatatpustaka- prathamaparicayais tvarāturaiḥ Ḍā. Byuhlaramahodayaiḥ praguṇaguṇabhūyiṣṭhasyāpi Ja. pustakasya kṛteyaṃ prati lipis tadīyaliper atiprāktanatvena bahuvīdhahetvantaraiś ca prabhūtāsuddhi bahulā 'bhūt.

Bühler was in great rush as far as the original copying is concerned. His time in Jaisalmer was extremely limited. He had seen the manuscript for the first time. He copied it within seven days. Nagar has acknowledged how significant was the task performed by Bühler. It is not the intention of Nagar to decry Bühler's virtues, but just to state the facts. However, it is not only the copying of J at Jaisalmer that created errors, but great many of them were generated subsequently in the process of preparing the press copy, and in consciously editing the work for publication. If Bühler had just reproduced the Jaisalmer MS. photographically--exactly as it was--it would have been far more authentic and helpful to future generations!

Bh has no idea--none whatsoever--of the "blood, sweat and tears" to which Nagar was subjected in correcting the text. He (Bh) crossed the turbulent river easily by means of the bridge constructed by Nagar. How could he know how the bridge was constructed? He had never constructed even one bridge in his entire life. Did he ever come across the following *sadukti*:

Vidvān eva vijānāti vidvajjanapariśramam.
Na hi vandhyā vijānāti gurvīm prasavavedanām.

Also we have Murāri kavi:

Abdhir laṅghita eva vānarabhaṭaiḥ kintvasya gambhīratām
āpātālanimagnapīvaravapur jānāti manthācalaḥ.

Nagar has shown how Bühler both restored and distorted the text. Bühler's debt is acknowledged very well by Nagar in clear terms:

Param atra na viśeṣadoṣabhājanam Dā. Byuhlaramahodayaḥ. Tena yadapyakāri tad astyadhikam. Tasya vidyāvyaśaṅgagaveṣaṇā"saktiprabhṛtiguṇāḥ praśamsākoṭim atīt ya vartante... Khaniprādurbhūtam ratnam sadyo malinam eva jāyate... Dā. Byuhlaras aṃskaraṇadoṣa na khalu na soḍhavyāḥ. [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 anusarāmaḥ*. The original reading (8:41) was "*māti*." Bühler changed it to "*bhāti*." With reference to Bühler's knowledge of the *Kāvya-mārga* and the power of appreciation of the poetic muse, N had already commented in his Introduction: [pp. 2-4 & 8 of *Prastāvanā* and p. 4 of *Upodghāta*]. We can reproduce here one of the most significant statements: "*Itihāsācāryasya Dā. Byuhlaramahodayasya jñānarāśāvaitihāsiko'mśaḥ sāhityāṃśam nūnam atyaśeta*." [p. 6 of *Upodghāta*]. Bh should not have forgotten the immortal dictum of Viśākhadatta: *Na hi sarvaḥ sarvaṃ jānāti!*

Bh unnecessarily tries to defend B as if he (Bh) alone is a *guṇagrāhin* and has understood the value of Bühler's work, and that no one else has been able to appreciate the great contribution B has made to the Indological studies in general. Bh argues that only one ancient MS. was available to Bühler. But that does not mean that the editor should take undue liberty with it. None can justify the distortion of the original text. Even one MS can be so accurate as to surpass ten inaccurate ones. It is well said:

Varam eko guṇī putro na ca mūrkhāśatānyapi.
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. We are disturbed by those passages where J is perfect, i.e. true and correct one hundred percent, but B (*kaścana paṇḍityapradarśanapa uḥ paṇḍitammanyāḥ sampādakaśiromaṇiḥ*) did not understand the meaning and tried to show his own pedantry, and distorted the original text. We would have no quarrel with B at all if he and his associates had brought forth only a true representation of J.

We do not understand what Bh means by *aśuddhiyukta hī kyom na ho* [V.3, Introd. p. 2]. Does he mean "the one which was full of errors from the very beginning, that is, which was originally (intrinsically) erroneous" or does he mean "by making one erroneous which had no error to begin with?" If it is the former, we have no quarrel with him. If it is the latter, we cannot agree. It is better not to publish a text than to publish it by distorting the original, creating non-sense where there was a perfect sense already

reigning supreme. For example, substitution of *manmathabāṇamitram* for *manmathabā lamitram* [7:3] and *vibhātavarge* 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 inferiority complex. He wanted to show off.

Let us consider some more vital readings and evaluate how they have been mishandled.

Ullekhalīlāghaṭanāpaṭūnām sacetasām vaikaṭīkopamānām.
Vicārasāṇopalapaṭṭikāsu matsūktiratnānyatithībhavantu. [1:19]

The above is a true and exact reproduction of J.

In the 4th *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, and turned the whole into *ratnāni nidhībhavantu*. That is, not only "bha" and "ba" were changed but also "nya-" into "ni."

Consequently the reading got far removed from the original. This is an example of *sāmyena nika asthān pā hān parityajya dūrasthān ayuktān pā hān svabuddhyā'gha ayat*.

And here is another example of mishandling:

Prakoṣṭhapṛṣṭhasphuradindranīla-ratnāvalīkaṅkaṇaḍambareṇa.
Bandhāya dharmapratibandhakānām vahan sahotthān iva nāgapāśāṇ. [1:47]

This is the reading of J, correct one hundred percent.

In the 4th *pāda*, J has *vahan sahotthān*.

P turned it into *vahūn sahotthān*.

B made it *badhnan sahotthān*.

But *badhnan* where?

Obviously *badhnan* is far removed from *vahan* as compared to *vahūn* which erroneously had crept into P.

Here is one more instance to satisfy Bh, if he could listen to reasoning.

Svaḥsundarībandiparigrahāya datto'ñjaliḥ samprati dānavendraiḥ.
Iti parahrṣād amarāṅganānām netropalaśreṇibhir arcyamānaḥ. [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-vayor abhed aḥ*. B could have made it *bandi* (=captive). However, he went far away from the reality and turned the reading into *vṛnda*. The total charm of the poet's *camatkārokti*, *madhu rokti*, and *vicchitti* was lost in that *vṛnda* (multitude).

* * *

Prāptas tataḥ śrījayasiṃhadevaś Cālukyasiṃhāsanamaṇḍanatvam.
Yasya vyarājanta gajāhaveṣu muktāphalānīva kare yaśāṃsi. [1:79]

Here is one more *camatkāra* of B. Bilhaṇa composed the fourth quarter as *muktāphalānīva kare yaśāṃsi*. P omitted two letters (*kare*) and made it *muktāphalānīva yaśāṃsi*! B fills the lacuna with *mahā*! *Yaśas* might have become *mahat*, but the *vacanam* got *laghu*.

As an essential decorum that deserves to be observed, B ought to have enclosed his own creation within square brackets with a question mark. The B text as it appears has no indication whatsoever that *mahā* is not *Bilhaṇa-kavi-vacanam*, but a creation of some *mahāpaṇḍita*!

* * *

Let us study one more example of "*doṣayukta hī kyom 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 as *dhatte sma*. We are reminded of a popular saying--*marza barhatā hī gayā jyom jyom davā kī*. The disease went on increasing as we went on treating.

* * *

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

Sa saukumāryaikadhano'pi soḍhavāṃs
tapodhanair duṣprasahaṃ pariśramam.
Rarāja tīvre tapasi sthito nṛpaḥ
śāśīva caṇḍadyutimaṇḍalātithiḥ. [2:45]

The fourth *caraṇa* in P reads *śaśīva dyutimaṇḍalātithiḥ*, i.e. there is an omission of two letters. B makes an attempt to fill the lacuna but fails. Success eludes him.

The king performed such a severe *tapas* that *maharṣayo'smād apakarṣam āyayuh* [2:44]. Also the poet says: *Nṛpaṇ ka horavratācaryayā kṛśam* [2:46]. Obviously the king got withered. He became weak and pale. Certainly he was not at his best as far as his *dyuti* was concerned. Now the moon shines (displays her glory and splendour) among the stars. The poet wants to convey the idea that the king resembled the moon when she is in direct contact with the sun, *caṇḍadyutimaṇḍalātithi* [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 *tārādyutimaṇḍala*. 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 *dhārṣyam* (audacity) to utter--*kucha loga bhale hī nindā kareṇ!*

We cannot expect B to have the divine insight--*divyaṇ cakṣuḥ*. Every scholar has his own limitations. He may not be able to divine the actual words of the poet. But it is his academic and moral duty to see that what he imagines does not lead us the wrong way--*asato mā sad gamaya!*

It is better to keep quiet. But if one decides to speak, he should see that it does not turn out to be meaningless.

Cf. prabhātakalpā śaśīneva śarvarī.

* * *

Kalatram urvītilakasya mekhalākālāpamāṇikyamarīcibhir dadhe.

Udeṣyataḥ sūryasamasya tejasah samudgataṃ bālam ivātapam puraḥ. [2:72]

The word *bāla* is not very clear in J. It could very well be read as *pāla*. N's fn reads: "*Pāla-* " *ityasti* "*bāla-* " *iti veti Ja. pustake spaṣ am nāsti.*"

B reads *jālamivātapam*.

B fn. gives *pālamivātapam*. (i.e. acc. to B, P (and supposedly J too) has *pālamivātapam*.)

However, the question is: How the word *jāla* would get connected with *ātapam*?

And befitting its own "nature," R makes it "*jālamivātatam*." The person who saw the last edition first and struggled and struggled cannot come in the sphere of the limited knowledge of Bh, who had Rāmāvatāra Śarmā as his *guruvaryāṇām*. This is called *andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāḥ!* Bh cannot even dream of the terrible toil of N! *Na hi vāndhyā vijānāti gurvīm prasavavedanām!* Bh had unlimited power in his pen.

The restoring (or distorting ?) editor did not care whether the text made any sense at all or not.

* * *

Atra Drāviḍabhūmipāladalanakrīḍārasoḍḍāmare kodaṇḍadhvanibhir vidhunva
ti ghanadhvānānukārair jagat. Vaidehīramaṇasya Rāvaṇaśiraś chede 'pyaśāntakrudh
aḥ pratyāvṛttir akāṇḍakampataralair 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*! Bi
lhaṇa himself says elsewhere:

Aripr̥sthagrahaṇān nyavarttata. [15:84.4]

Here in 3:77, at the end of the first *caraṇa* we have *krīḍārasoḍḍāmare*. This is the r
eading of J.

P omits *ḍḍā* and makes it *krīḍārasomare*.

B makes it *krīḍārasothe rave*.

We don't know if the editor-restorer understood the meaning! We can call it only *av
yāpāreśu vyāpāram*.

However, B ed. gives *krīḍārasomarave* in the fn., thereby attributing this reading to
P, which is not true because P has *krīḍārasomare*!!

Thus we see that there is a divergence of form and substance between P and B fn! I
n other words, B fn. = transcription of P, or "press-copy," and not what was prepared i
n Jaisalmer. This was an aside.

To return to the main theme: R makes it *krīḍārasothe raṇe*. *Seyam aparā kathā*!!

* * *

Then we come to verse 4:113:

Praṇayapraṇaivāsīt tasya śrīḥ saparigrahā.
Param nāṅḡkaroti sma Vikramāṅkaḥ kalaṅkinīm. [4:113]

This verse does exist in P, still it does not exist in the B ed.! Would this kind of omis
sion too be called by Bh as "*aśuddhi bahuta [aśuddhibahula?] batākara nindā kareṃ!*
"?

We can simply say *mukham astīti vaktavyam*.

* * *

Rājahaṃsam iva bāhupañjare śrīvilāsabhuvī lālayan yaśaḥ.

Tatra tatra śatapatralocanaś citram abhyudayam āsasāda saḥ. [5:9]

The original and correct reading is *tatra tatra śatapatra*. P makes it *tatra tatrātapatr a*. How close to the original! Interchange of one syllable *a* for *śa*. We would like to remind our readers once again that the letter "ś" of P resembles "rā." So *tatra tatra śatapatra* of J very well might have been copied by P as *tatra tatra rātapatra* as far as the press-copy-writer is concerned.

But B goes far away and makes it *tatra tāmaraśapatra*. 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 rajasām nivāraṇam kuñjaradhvajapaṭāntavījanaiḥ. [5:66]

The original reading is *taccamūrajasi*. Probably P too has the same because there is no fn. for it in B.

But B makes it *tatra bhūrajasi*. *Rajas*, if not stated otherwise, comes from *bhūḥ* only. We will call this once again *avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram*.

* * *

Javasamucitadhāvanānurūpā kimiti kṛtā pṛthulā na nātha pṛthvī.
Nabhasi khurapuṭair iti sphuradbhir vidhim iva ye sma muhuḥ pratikṣipanti.
[6:49]

Here is another *camatkāra* of B.

The *śuddhipatra* of B asks us to change *javasa* to *rajama*! We don't understand what is the purpose behind it!!

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

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

It is remarkable to see how close is P to J. But what does B do? It takes the reading far far away from the original and makes it *ravamanumitadhāvanānurūpam*! A true *śaḥṛadaya* 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 prakurvāṇo racayāmāsa vānaram*.

Another example of distortion:

J has *Kimiti kṛtā pṛthulā na nātha pṛthvī*.

P has *Kimiti kṛta pṛthulā nāya pṛthvī*.

B makes *Kimiti kṛtā pṛthulā tvayā na pṛthvī*.

In other words, P changes *kṛtā* to *kṛta*, omits *na* and changes *nātha* to *nāya*! Still P did not go far away from the original J. But where does B lead us to? It takes us far away from the original! Although B successfully restores *kṛta* to *kṛtā*, yet he does not bring in *na* to its proper place. We can understand all this. However, we don't understand how *nāya* could be turned into *tvayā*? *Nātha* is much closer to *nāya* than *tvayā*.

Did the Great Defender Bh pay any attention to all these distortions and destructions in restoration when he assembled the courage and said: *kucha loga bhalehī nindā kareṃ*.

* * *

Atrāntare manmathabāṇamitraṃ latāvadhūvibhramasūtradhāraḥ.
Sthānopadeśī pikapañcamasya śṛṅgārabandhur madhur āvir āsīt. [7:3]

B reads here--*manmathabāṇamitram*. Bilhaṇa said: *manmathabālamitram*. Someone who was *akṣaraśatru nāma vidyādhara* changed *bāla* to *bāṇa*! This change is unworthy of great scholars such as Bühler, Vāmanācārya, and Bhīmācārya. This is one of the most unjustifiable attempts on the part of B. [We would like to state with all the emphasis at our command that by B we do not necessarily and always mean the person of Dr. Georg Bühler himself, but the one who fooled with Bilhaṇa's original words.] *Madhu* (Spring) is the supplier of *bāṇas* (arrows). He is not a *mitram* of *manmathabāṇa*!

The person who distorted the truth and misrepresented the fact had totally missed the essence. *Bālamitram* has a very fine equivalent in Hindi. It is called *laṅgo iyā yāra*! A friend from the very early childhood!! In English we have another expression-- 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 kareṃ*!

* * *

Līlāśukāḥ kokilakūjitānām atipraharṣād vihitānukārāḥ.
Gṛhād adhavyanta viyoginībhīr guṇo hi kāle guṇinām guṇāya. [7:32]

J is not clear. One could read either *dadhāvyanta* or *dadhā yanta*. P has *dadhādyanta*. The copyist read *dadhā yanta* and wrote it in such a way that it resembled *dadhādyanta*.

But B goes far away and makes it *davāhyanta*. It is not a scholarly attempt. It will be called taking undue liberty.

* * *

Manasvinīnāṃ manaso'vatīrya mānasya vegena palāyitasya.
Jivagrahāyeva vasantamitraṃ babhrāma vāyuh kakubhāṃ mukhāni. [7:43]

This is a distressing attempt on the part of B to try to improve the text and in that process destroy it. It is a negation of *sahṛdayatvam*!

N's fn. no. 7 on p. 75 states: *mānasya iti gānasya iti vā Ja. pustake spaṣ am nāsti*.

B makes it *gānasya*.

R makes it *māsasya*! That is befitting R ed.

It is interesting to observe that B is wrong as far as the first letter is concerned. R is wrong as far as the second letter is concerned!

Elsewhere in this study we have discussed the concept of *māna* or *kopa* in full details [p. 185+] //change page no.???

The poet has already told us: *Śrṅgārabandhur madhur āvirāsīt*. [7:3.4]

There was no scope for *māna* to be there anymore. It ran away. *Vāyuh* is *vasantmitram*. So he is chasing *māna*. We don't know how *gāna* (song, music) could run away? That is totally irrelevant.

Still Bh declared *kucha loga bhalehī nindā kareṃ*!

* * *

The poet says:

Hemamañjīramālābhyām bhāti janghālatādvayam.
Kṛtālavālam vāllabhyāt kuṅkumeneva subhruvaḥ.
[8:14]

P has *kṛtālavālamvāllabhyāt*. This is correct and meaningful. We need not repeat that J does not make any distinction between *ba* and *va*. If we separate *kṛtālavālam* from the word following--and the next word is *vāllabhyāt*--we reach Bilhaṇa all the way. This is what Bilhaṇa meant.

However, B fn. says: *kṛtālavālavāllabhyāt*. i.e. acc. to B. ed. P has one extra letter "*lā*" inserted in between "*vā*" and "*la*". Also it has changed "*v*" into "*b*".

This leads us to reiterate once again that the press-copyist of B is not always true to his original, i.e. he created his own errors like the omission of total verses already existing even in P. In other words, B fn. means (=stands for) the press-copy of B rather than P itself. This is a very important matter to keep in mind. Evidently there are deviations in the press-copy from the P transcript. To put it differently, B ascribes an error to

P which actually might be that of the "Press-copy" of his edition! P is still correct, while the press-copy of B is wrong. Once the press-copy was made from P, we don't know if anyone compared and collated it with the original P.

B ed. did not know what to do with *kṛtālavāḷambālabhyāt*. So it distorted the text, twisted it around, and murdered the *sāhityavidyāvadhū*.

B made it *kṛtālavāḷam lambābhyām*! So the *hemamañjīramāle* (dual) got lengthened !! A perfect sense turned into total nonsense and rubbish. In the process of legitimate reconstruction, we see total destruction. We lose *vāḷlabhya* completely. Still the Bh had the audacity to say *Kucha loga bhalehī nindā kareṃ*.

* * *

Māti nirvivare tasyāś citraṃ kucayugāntare.
Kṛīḍākuṇḍalitoccaṇḍakodaṇḍaḥ kusumāyudhaḥ.
[8:41]

This śloka has been discussed in full detail in its proper place. [pp. 134-137]

* * *

Bhāti dantacchadenāsyāḥ svacchā daśanamālikā.
Sarasvatyakṣamāleḥ pūjāpadmadalāñcitā. [8:69]

N's fn. no. 1 on p. 88 declares: *Pra. pustake sannapyayaṃ ślokaḥ Ba pustake nāsti*.

Vidvanmūrdhanya paṇḍitaśiromaṇi Vidyāvāgīśa Bh still has the courage to say *Kucha loga bhalehī nindā kareṃ*. How pitiful. It is simply disgusting! *Na hi vandhyā vijānāt i gurvīm prasavavedanām!*

* * *

Aśānkitaḥ Śāṅkaramallayuddhe yaḥ svedavārāṃ vinivāraṇāya.
Bhasmotkaraṃ vismayaghūrṇitasya kakṣāntarāt tasya samācakaṣa. [9:102]

In the second quarter, P has *svedadhārāṃvinivāraṇāya*. B makes the reading *sveda dhārāmbunivāraṇāya* and removes it far away from the original! He takes undue liberty with the text, since he alters quite a bit. *dha* and *va* are very close in resemblance as far as JMS. is concerned.

The editor probably did not recall: *āpaḥ strī bhūmni vār vāri*.

Yet Bh tries to defend B without any justification!

* * *

Yāntīṣu yadvāravilāsinīṣu kareṇubhiḥ pūritadiktaṭābhiḥ.
Dine'pi dikpālapurīgavākṣāḥ prakṣālanam candrikayā labhante. [9:127]

In the first quarter, P has *Yadvārivilāsiniṣu*. Instead of removing "i" from atop the letter "ra," Bühler breaks *vāravilāsini* into two and makes it *Yaddvāri vilāsiniṣu* = at whose gate, the beautiful women (locative). He did not like the idea of *Vāravilāsini* here! He thus takes away all the charm from Bilhaṇa's *kavivacanam*.

* * *

Āropyamāṇā dayitena kācit nitambabhārāt svayam apragalbhā.
Skandhāt taroḥ pratyuta mūlam āpa svinnena pādāmburuhadvayena. [10:43]

Bilhaṇa said: *Svinnena* (=perspiring.) This is the reading up to and including P. So someone possessing a more fertile brain made it *khinnena*. This is called poetic murder!! Still Bh had the courage....

* * *

Āhūyamāṇā iva haṃsanādair vikṣyamāṇā iva kautukena.
Jagmus tataḥ klāntinivāraṇāya līlāsarastīram arālanetrāḥ. [10:63]

Bilhaṇa's expression is *klāntinivāraṇāya*. B has made it *klāntinirvāhaṇāya*! We 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 *chandobhaṅga*!

However, we would like to point out that there is an alternative, very close reading-close to *nirvāhaṇāya*! And that is *nibarhaṇāya*, but that is *karṇaka u* and uncalled for.

* * *

Pāṭalena mahasām paṭalena
prācyasāilabhuvī bālamṛgāṅkaḥ.
Dhātuśṛṅgapṛthulasthaladhūlī-
kelidhūsaraśarīra ivāsīt. [11:29]

J has *pā alena mahasām*. [*tejasām*]

P has *pādaleva manasām*. [*mānasānām*]

B makes it *pā alena tamasām*. [*andhakārāṇām*]

So we have come from light to darkness! The Upanishads teach us to pray: *Tamaso mā jyotir gamaya*. Here we have exactly the opposite.

It will be called a disservice to the *sahṛadaya*. The editor took it beyond the grasp of an intelligent reader. Maybe the "Defender" of B could understand it. We cannot, simply cannot.

* * *

Kācit padair askhalitaiḥ sakhelaṃ yāntīṣu śuddhāntakareṇukāsu.
Rājāṅganānām akarod avajñāṃ śronībhare ca stanagaurave ca. [12:32]

J has *Śronībhare ca stanagauraveca!* It makes perfect sense.

P has *Śronībharevasthanagauraveva!* It makes half sense.

B makes it *Śronībharevasthitagauraveva!* It makes no sense at all!

Still the great "commentator and translator" *Vidyāvāgīśa* Bh has the courage to say *Kucha loga bhalehī nindā kareṃ*. We find no words to describe the courage of this scholar!

The editor (B) ought to have recalled that in J MS. *va* and *ca* are indistinguishable. He ought to have tried to substitute *va* by *ca* and then tried to see if he could get the correct reading, capable of conveying the proper meaning.

* * *

Vibhāvavarge jalada tvam agrāṇīr na candrikāpi dyutim eti tāvakīm.
Karoṣi kiṃ śubhratayā tadīyayā na sundaraṃ candanam eṇanābhitaḥ. [13:72]

This is a classic example showing the lack of knowledge of *Kāvya-mārga* on the part of the scholar-editor (B), whosoever he might have been.

J and P both have *Vibhāvavarge*. However, B makes it *vibhātavarge!* *Vibhāta* will merely mean "shining" or "bright." The person who changed the reading and besmeared the beauty of our *sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū*--the poetic charm of Bilhaṇa's Muse--might not have come across the word *vibhāva*, one of the most pre-potent elements of the *sāhitya-saṃsāra* and *rasa-saṃsāra*. Did he ever hear expressions like

Vibhāvānubhāva-vyabhicāri-saṃyogād rasanīṣpattiḥ, or

Vibhāvenānubhāvena vyaktaḥ sañcāriṇā tathā.
Rasatām eti ratyādiḥ sthāyī bhāvaḥ sacetasām.

We call this (attempt) only a *bālīśatvam*.

* * *

Niṣṭhuraṃ kim api kathyate mayā tatra Kuntalapate kuru kṣamām.
Yat svakāryam avadhī[dhā?]rya grhṇate sevayaiva paritoṣam īśvarāḥ. [14:2]

J has *sevayaiva*.

P has *sevachaiva*.

B makes *svecchayaiva*.

This is really *svecchayā eva*. It is *svecchācāraḥ*, truly *svacchandācāraḥ*. We will call it *manaḥpūtaṃ samācaret!* We cannot call it a scholarly attempt. *Sevachaiva* may not convey the desired meaning. However, orthographically it is much closer to the original. *Svecchayaiva* is far removed; and, yet, it does not make any sense at all? *Bhakṣite'pi laśune na śānto vyādhiḥ*.

It is to be noted that the "restorer" changes *chai* into *yai* anyway, which makes the reading *sevayaiva*, thus virtually restoring the corrupt reading to its original correct form. There was no need to turn *seva* into *sveccha!*

Still Bh had the courage to say *nindā kareṇ!* He is *sarvatantrasvatantra*.

We would like to make one more point before we leave the discussion of this verse. All read *svakāryam avadhīrya!* We believe we should read it *svakāryam avadhārya = viditvā!!*

* * *

One of the most striking examples is *Gaurīvibhramadhūpadhūma* [16:51], discussed in its proper place [p. 227].

Following the *sthāli-pulāka-nyāya*, we have presented above some examples of the restoration--rather distortion--work of B. It was not our intention to point out the errors of Bühler. To err is human. Our attempt was directed toward Bh who unnecessarily tried to defend Bühler as if Bh alone was *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 and care, the future scholars like us would have been spared a good deal of pain and grief. Bh got everything ready-made! How could he even dream of the struggle and strife of Nagar! This is all the purpose of writing this section of the critique.

Na hi vandhyā vijānāti gurvīm prasavavedanām.

Let us resume our earlier discussion.

We do not discount the errors in the original. We are merely trying to rectify the errors unjustifiably ascribed to J. All the editions of *Vik.* published so far are derived from J. It is the *mūla ādhāra* i.e. the arche-type, *ākara-grantha*. P is supposed to be a replica of J. B is supposed to be a replica of P, unless otherwise stated. R is supposed to be a replica of B. N goes back to J. Bh copies N. Now, if there is a wrong reading in B, which can be traced back to J, B is not to be blamed at all! However, if J is right and still B rejects its reading and invents his own, would it be possible to support B? Of course, not. But this is exactly what Bh has tried to do. It is not scholarly. It is not academic. The above verse [Māti...] is an example.

Bühler gives in his fn. the rejected reading "*māti*." In other words, both J and 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. the poet Bilhaṇa himself! "*Bhāti*" may be correct as far as its *prakṛti* and *pratyaya* 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 utpalākṣyāḥ stanadvayam pāṇḍu tathā pravṛddham.
Madhye yathā śyāmamukhasya tasya mṛṇālasūtrāntaram apyalabhyam.
[Kumārasambhavam. 1:40]

And Śrīharṣa:

Paricyutas tat kucabhāramadhyāt kiṃ śoṣamāyāsi mṛṇālahāra.
Na sūkṣmatantor api tāvakasya tatrāvakāśo bhavataḥ kimu syāt. 8:41

Also Bilhaṇa:

Mukhenducandrikāpūra-plāvyamānau punaḥ punaḥ.
Śitabhītāvivānyonyau tasyāḥ pīḍayataḥ kucāu. [8:47]

And

Dṛśoḥ sīmāvādaḥ śravaṇayugalena pratikalam
stanābhyāṃ saṃruddhe hṛdi manasijas tiṣṭhati balāt.
Nitambaḥ sākrandaṃ kṣipati raśanādāma paritaḥ
praveśas tanvaṅgyā vapuṣi taruṇimno vijayate. [8:85]

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

Amān ivāṅgeṣu mudaḥ prakarṣāt pratyudyayau taṃ janakaḥ kumāryāḥ.
Anuṣṭhitam samyag upāyavidbhir nītaḥ parispandanam ivārthasārthaḥ. [9:40]

And

Trilokalakṣmyeva salīlam īkṣitaḥ kṛtadravaiś candrakarair ivāplutaḥ.
Adūravāñchālatikāphalodayaḥ kvacin na *māti* sma mudā nareśvarah. [2:79]

And here is another great poet:

Yan na *māti* tadaṅgeṣu lāvaṇyam atisaṃbhṛtam.
Piṇḍīkṛtam urodeśe tat payodharatām gatam. [*Kasyāpi*]
[cited by *Saṃskṛtasūktisāgara*, 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 vivaram chidram avakāśo yasmiṃs tat tasmīn niravakāśe*. It is not surprising that the God of

Love is seated there. What is surprising is that there was no room at all for anything to begin with. Nevertheless, not only Kāma sits there, but he is also able to accommodate his gigantic bow therein! This is the reason for surprise. This is the cause for wonder. The two words "*nirvivare*" and "*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 *atrādhārāpekṣayā"dheyasyādhikyavarṇanād adhikālaṅkāraḥ*. Did he recall any example of *adhikālaṅkāra*? Probably not. If he had taken the trouble of consulting even the *Kāvya prakāśa*, he might have perceived the real sense and would not have turned a sensible poetic *sadukti* into total nonsense. [See below] He does not accept the reading of N "[*māti*]". He insists on "*bhāti*." Smartly enough, he makes "*bhāti*" yield the meaning of "*māti*", of course, by his own force, twisting the word to mean anything he wants! This is how he performs this feat:

Bhāti pūrṇatayā samāgatya sāvakāśaṃ virājate.

One fails to understand wherefrom did he bring the sense represented by the words "*pūrṇatayā samāgatya sāvakāśam*." On second thought we think he is right. He is *vidyāvāgīśa*. He is *kartum, akartum, anyathākartum samarthaḥ*? Is he not? Our limited knowledge cannot reach the unlimited height his knowledge has already reached!

Let us study some more examples of *adhikālaṅkāra*:

Yugāntakālapratīsaṃhṛtātmano
jaganti yasyām savikāśam āsata.
Tanau mamus tatra na Kaiṭabhadviṣas
tapodhanābhyāgamasambhavā mudaḥ. *Māgha*. 1:23

Mammaṭa cites the following verse as an example of *adhikālaṅkāraḥ*.

Aho viśālaṃ bhūpāla bhuvanatritayodaram.
Māti mātum aśakyo'pi yaśorāśir yadatra te.
[*Kāvya darśa* of Daṇḍin].

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

Vāmanāchārya Jhalkikar wrote the *Bālabodhinī* commentary on Mammaṭa. By 1965 it had run into 7 editions. I don't know if the same Jhalkikar had any hand in the change from "*māti*" to "*bhāti*" in *Vik.*, B's edition. Bühler says:

As soon as I recognised the importance of the MS., I resolved to copy it out myself. My time at Jesalmir was limited. But with the help of my companion Dr. H. Jacobi of Bonn, who kindly lent me his assistance during my whole tour in Rajputana, the task was accomplished in about seven days. He copied Sargas V. VI., XIV.-XVIII. 1-74, while the rest fell to my share. We then revised our copy together. I fear however, that some at least of the little lacunae and mistakes, which had to be filled in and corrected when the work was printing, are owing to the inaccuracy of our transcript and not to the

at of the writer of the old MS. (stress added) Every case where in printing I thought it necessary to alter the text given by the transcript, has been carefully stated in the notes. With the exception of two or three passages [e.g. II.21] about which I am still in doubt, the text of the Vikramāṅkākāvya is readable, and I believe that, if fresh MSS. are found, it will prove to be trustworthy.

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

According to the *asīma-dhiṣaṇā* of B!

Bh knows the *nīti-upadeśa*: *guṇino na durāgrahāḥ*. We don't know why he asserts in this case. Did he not know: *Ekākinī pratijñā hi pratijñātam na sādhayet*: Mere assertion does not prove the theory!

Here is one more poetic gem from Bilhaṇa:

Sā stanāñjalibandhena manmathaṃ prathamāgatam.
Karotīvonmukhaṃ bālā bāndhavaṃ yauvanaśriyah. [8:44]

The compound word "*añjalibandha*" is quite significant here. What does it mean? It means the "folded hands", i.e. two hands joined together. The two breasts are likened to the two hands joined together. There is no space in between them--none whatsoever!

Also

Vilāsadolāphalake nitamba-vistāraruddhe paritas taruṇyāḥ.
Labdhaḥ paraṃ kuñcitakārmukeṇa tatrāvakaśaḥ kusumāyudhena.
[7:19]

The above idea very much resembles what is expressed by the poet in *māti nirvivar* e... [8:41].

Banerji and Gupta translate 8:41 as follows:

It is wonderful [!] (A) that the flower-arrowed god (i.e. Cupid), with his fierce [!] (B) bow playfully [!] (C) coiled, appears [!] in the interval of her breasts, which is without opening [!] (D).

The whole translation is really wonderful! These translators should be awarded a novel literary prize. Such writers are alluded to by a poet in a desperate prayer:

Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanaṃ śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha.

And by Bilhaṇa too:

Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham!

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

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

"C" should be "skilfully."

"D" should be "space."

Here is one more poetic gem from our own poet, Mahākavi Bilhaṇa, which may throw some further light on the matter.

Nitambabimbasya nitambavatyāḥ prakāmvistāravaśād ivāsyā.
Pṛthvīpater uttamanāyikāpi na kāpi lebhe ḥṛdaye'vakāśam. [9:12]

Let it be emphasized here that Bh fares better as far as "*nirvivare*" and "*uccaṇḍa*" are concerned, but he displays his unreasonableness when he says: *bhāti pūrṇatayā samāgatya sāvakāśam virājate*.

Monier-Williams [1888 ed., p. 764, column 3] says:

Mā = to correspond in measure, find measure or room in (cl. 2 with loc.,) e.g. *te yaśo-rāśīr bhuvana-tritayodare māti*, thy mass of fame finds room in the interior of three worlds.

Apte, [1965, 3d. ed., p. 753, Column 1]: *Mā* = to be in, find room or space in, be contained or comprised in.

Once again we are reminded of a great *sadukti* of a great poet:

Daivīm vācam upāsate hi bahavaḥ sāram tu sārasvatam
jānīte nitarām asau gurukulakliṣṭo Murāriḥ Kaviḥ.
Abdhir laṅghita eva vānarabhaṭaiḥ kintvasya gambhīratām
āpātālanimagnapīvaravapur jānāti manthācalaḥ.

* * *

Bilhaṇa says:

Dolāyām jaghanasthalena calatā lolekṣanā lajjate
dhatte dikṣu nirīkṣaṇam smitamukhī pārāvatānām rutaiḥ.
Sparśaḥ kaṇṭakakoṭībhiḥ kuṭīlayā līlāvane neṣyate
sajjam maugdhyavisarjanāya sutanoḥ śṛṅgāramitraḥ vayaḥ.

[8:86]

While trying to explain this verse [8:86] Bh misses the true meaning. We are referring to the 2nd *carana*: *Dhatte dikṣu....*Bh says:

Kapotarutena suratasamaye liṅgayoniḥarṣaṇa- rutasmarāṇenotkaṅṭhayā itastataḥ
nirīkṣate kuto'yaṃ vicitraḥ śabdaḥ samāyāti. Kapotāḥ khalu svabhāvata eva bahaviṣ
ayalampaṭā bhavanti. Teṣāṃ śabdena teṣāṃ kāmakrīḍāṃ draṣṭum itastato'valokayati
ti bhāvaḥ.

This is all incongruous. When we read such indescribable babble of tongue we are kept wondering whether the writer was awake, dreaming, or asleep--or totally out of his mind--when he wrote such nonsense and rubbish. The cooing of pigeons resembles the sound from the throat, made by the lady as an essential function of the *suratakrīḍā* (sexual intercourse). In other words, she makes a special cooing sound deliberately. It is not the sound made by the friction of the sexual organs of the lover and the beloved lady (*liṅga* and *yoni*). [There is a lot of natural "grease" there, Mr. Vidyāvāgīśa!] It is surprising that Bh did know of this himself! Neither did he consult a friend. Maybe he was shy of asking such a silly question, but he could have studied the literature in his University Library and spared himself the ridicule of the future generation of the readers of his "great" translation and interpretation. We are told that many great pandits of Kāśī had examined Bh's work. How did they overlook this *asaṅgati*?

Probably Bh had not yet read the 18th canto when he worked on the 7th canto, for Bilhaṇa expresses there similar ideas in 18:26:

Śrutvā śrutvā rutam avirataṃ yatra pārāvatānām
dakṣaḥ kaṅṭhadhvaniṣu śanakaiḥ paurakanyā bhavanti.

Here is another poet:

Kānte tathā katham api prathitaṃ mṛgākṣyā
cāturyam uddhatamanobhavayā rateṣu.
Tatkūjitānyanuvadadbhir anekavāraṃ
śiṣyāyitaṃ gṛhakaṭapaśatair yathāsyāḥ. [Kasyāpi]
Saduktikarṇāmrta of Śrīdharadāsa. Calcutta, 1965. pp. 299-300.
(Also discussed in *Sāhityadarpaṇa*).

Let us enjoy the beauties of another poetic gem:

Narair viphalajanmabhir giridarī na kiṃ sevyate
na cec chravaṇagocarībhavati jātucij janmani.
Kapotaravamādhurīviracanānukārādaro
ratāśahakṛśodarīvacanakākurītidhvaniḥ.

Samskr̥tasūktisāgarah. Kasi, Akhila Bhāratīya Vikrama Pariṣad, Saṃvat 2014 V. *Saṅkalanakartā tathā anuvādaka* (compiler and translator): Śrī Nārāyaṇa Svāmī.

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

Kabūtarakī guṭaragūṃkī miṭhāsakā anukaraṇakaranevālī, ratikā pariśrama sahanē meṃ asamartha navelīke prārthanāse bhare hue vacanoṃ kī dhvaniko jisane [jinhoṃ ne] jīvanameṃ kabhī nahīṃ sunā una manuṣyoṃ kā to janmahī vyartha hai. Ve bhal ā parvatakī kandarāoṃ meṃ kyōṃ nahīṃ cale jāte?

Saduktikarnāṃṛtam of Śrīdharadāsa cites the above verse, ("*Narair viphalajanmabh ir*"), under "*Kaṇ hakūjitam*" and ascribes it to "*kasyāpi*." It also gives the following verse:

Kānte vicitrasuratakramabaddharāge
saṅketake'pi mṛgaśāvakalocanāyāḥ.
Tat kūjitam kim api yena tadīyatalpaṃ
nālpaiḥ parītam anuśabditalāvakaughaiḥ.

For further enlightenment of Bh on 8:86, we may offer an extract from the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, tr. by S. C. Upādhyāya. Bombay, Taraporevala, 1970. p. 121, Ch. 7.

Sūtra 5.--virutāni cāṣṭau.

On the other hand, what results from intense passion and not pain, is "*viruta*" or cooing, which is of eight kinds.

Sūtra 6: Hīnkāra-stanita-kūjita-rudita-sūtkṛta-dūtkṛta-phūtkṛtāni. [only seven! *sūtkṛta* also?] (5) Kūjita or cooing:

Sūtra 8: Pārāvata-parabhṛta-hārīta-śuka-madhukara-dātyūha- haṃsa-kāraṇḍava-
-virutāni sītkṛta-bhūyiṣṭhāni vikalpaśaḥ prayuñjīta.

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

Sūtra 15: Tatrāntarmukhena kūjitam phūtkṛtam ca. Tatra kūjitam tat saṃvṛtena
kaṇṭhena. Kūjatya- nenāvvyaktam śabditam. Yadi vivṛtena jihvāmūlena
ca tat phūtkṛtam. *Vyākhyā*.

At such a time, the woman should alternately utter the cooing sound from inside her mouth and the 'fu-fu' sound. (The 'fu-fu' sound is almost the opposite of cooing sound, which is usually done with the mouth kept open).

According to Apte, *Ratakūjitam* = lustful or lascivious murmur.

Thus it becomes evident that this *kaṇ hadhvani* was acquired through a voluntary learning process and was not merely an involuntary expression of exhaustion or pain, etc.

Cf. Daṇḍin:

Kalakvaṇitagarbheṇa kaṇṭhenāghūrṇitekṣaṇaḥ.
Pārāvataḥ paribhramya riramsuś cumbati priyām.

Kāvyaḍarśa, ed. by Dharmendrakumāra Gupta. Delhi, Mehar Chand Lacchmand
as, 1973. p. 85.

While on the subject, we may also think of:

Śrīparicayāj jaḍā api bhavantyabhijñā vidagdhacaritānām.
Upadiśati kāmīnām yauvanamada eva lalitāni.
Quoted in *Kāvyaḍrakāśa*.

We could go on and on. Here is another poetic gem on *surata-kaṇ ha-ruta*, cited by
Mammaṭa in his *Kāvyaḍrakāśa* as an example of *smaraṇa alaṅkāra*:

Nimnanābhikuhareṣu yad ambhaḥ plāvitaṃ caladṛśāṃ laharībhiḥ.
Tadbhavaiḥ kuharutair natamadyāḥ smāritāḥ suratakaṇṭharutānām.
Jalhaṇa 67:16.

Suranāryaḥ ityapi pāṭho dṛśyate.

Here is one more example of *surata-kaṇ ha-ruta*. Sumukha says to Rāvaṇa:

Yānūrmilāpatir ayam ca tavātmajaś ca
bāṇotkarān vikirato racitāndhakārān.
Te'nyonyakhaṇḍanavaśād viphalībhavanti
ratyutsave badhirayor iva kaṇṭhanādāḥ.
Bālarāmāyana of Rājaśekhara. Aṅka 8, verse 44.

Bh refers to Shri Rāmāvatāra Śarmā as his "*guruvaryāṇām*." It is unfortunate that hi
s guru did not teach him even the basic Sanskrit *kāvya*s. We don't know whether Bh h
ad ever seen the following *sadukti* of Mahākavi Māgha in *Śiśupālavadham*:

Ratāntare yatra grhāntareṣu vitardiniyūhaviṭaṅkanīḍaḥ.
Rutāni śṛṇvan vayasāṃ gaṇo'nte-vāsītvam āpa sphuṭam aṅganānām. 3:55

We find it difficult to leave the *prakṛta-prasaṅga*. We are reminded of one more po
etic gem of our own poet Bilhaṇa:

Smaraprasastiprativastutāṃ gatāḥ salīladātyūhasamūhanisvanāḥ.
Bhavanti yatra kṣaṇamātraviśrama pradāyīnaḥ kaṇṭharaveṣu yoṣitām. [2:15]

The MS. A has *vibhrama*. I too thought it to be preferable. But no, *viśrama* is much be
tter.

Dātyūha-samūha-nisvanāḥ give relief, even for a very short period though, to *yoṣitā
m kaṇ haraveṣu!* We have seen this in India in *Harikathā*. The principal performer (si

nger) takes a breather. The melody is continued by his associate. Then the principal picks up once again. So there is continuation and also on the same *tāla* and *laya*!

Apparently Bh did not understand the poet here. For *kaṇ haraveṣu* he says: *bhāṣaṇ a-kāryeṣu gīteṣu vā*. I wish he could tell us the significance of the words "*kṣaṇmātraviśr ama*"! The *komalāṅgī* gets tired by constantly making the sound. So the birds relieve her! Bh concludes: *Tatratyānām nārīṇām śabdo dātyūhakūjitavan madhura iti vyajyate*. We get hurt by the display of knowledge on the part of Bh. Truly it is said: *Arasikeṣ u kavītanivedanam śīrasi mā likha mā likha mā likha*. In Hindi too we have a beautiful saying: *Bhainsa ke āge bīna bajāe bhainsa paṛī pagurāe*. Play *vīṇā* in front of the she-buffalo; she will continue her munching!

We have cited above the verse *Narair viphalahanmabhir*. It says: *Ratāsahakṛśodar ī-vacanakākurītidhvaniḥ*. While Vātsyāyana in his *Kāmasāstra* says that the sound is generated by passion and not pain and that it is voluntary and made with special effort, *Narair viphalajanmabhir* has a different interpretation. That idea is echoed in the following verse:

Gāḍhāliṅganavāmanīkṛtakucaprodhbhinnaromodgamā
sāndrasneharasātirekavigalacchrīmannitambāambarā.
Mā mā mānada māti mām alam iti kṣāmākṣarollāpinī
suptā kiṃ nu mṛtā nu kiṃ manasi me līnā vilīnā nu kiṃ.

Let us now discuss the third *carāṇa* of the above verse (*Dolāyām jaghanasthalena*). Bilhaṇa says:

Sparśaḥ kaṇṭakakoṭibhiḥ kuṭīlayā līlāvane neṣyate.
[8:86.3]

Misra has really murdered the *Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū* here while commenting on this *k avivacanam*. He says:

"For *iṣyate* (of the MS. and edd.) "is desired", read *anveṣyate* "is looked for": "the touch by the thorns is looked for by the tricky one", the idea being: that she enjoys the scratches that would take place in passionate embracings. The mistake *neṣyate* (*na-iṣyate*) for '*nveṣyate* must, however, be old as the paraphrasing line in Sp. shows." [p. 59]

The critic had already ordered earlier [pp. 15-16]:

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

We don't know whether this is a deliberate attempt on Misra's part to increase the bulk of his book, or an unconscious display of his lack of knowledge. Also we fail to understand how *anu + iṣyate* becomes *anveṣyate*! *Anu + iṣyate* will turn into *anviṣyate* and not *anveṣyate*. Cf. *Anviṣyan maraṇopāyaṃ duḥkhāt tatsainyaluṅṭhitaḥ*. 4:16.

NRR adds: "Is Misra so ignorant that he does not know the inevitability of *yaṇ* here? Or, is he just careless? Shouldn't he have said *anu-eṣyate*?"

Misra certainly crosses the limits of justice and decency when he calls "*neṣyate*", a mistake! He also calls it "old." The question is: How old? Misra does not give the age. It is not only the JMS., which antedates the year 1229 A.D., but also the *saduktikarṇāmṛta* (1205 A.D.) has *neṣyate* (=is not desired, or liked, or looked for).

So, if we understand Mr. Misra correctly, the Purāṇa Bilhaṇa wrote *anveṣyate*--that was the original, correct reading. Someone at a later date, still in olden days, committed a mistake and made it *neṣyate*. 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 *saduktikarṇāmṛta* as follows:--

Dolāyāṃ jaghanasthalena calatā lolekṣaṇā lajjate
sajjam maugdhyavisarjanāya sutanoḥ śṛṅgāramitraṃ vayaḥ.
Sparśaḥ kaṅṭakakoṭibhiḥ kuṭilayā līlāvane neṣyate
dhatte dikṣu nirīkṣaṇaṃ smitamukhī pārāvatānāṃ rutaiḥ.

Incidentally we might add here that the transposition of the *padas* 2 and 4 in *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* cannot be justified because *sajjam maugdhyā-* is the conclusion and it must come at the very end. Sures Chandra Banerji, the editor of *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, traces this verse in other sources and anthologies:

Spd 3278; *Smv* 51.14; *V.C.* VIII 86; and in the footnotes he provides the following 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] śaṅkaṃ tanukaṇ ha [ṇ a?] kakṣatabhiyā krīḍāvane krīḍati*. ["*Kṣata*" is a very fine word, which reminds us 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. S pārāvatānām for -vatānām

b) and d) are transposed in Ed.

Notwithstanding all the variant readings and transpositions of the lines, etc., there is not even a single convincing reason to change *neṣyate* to *anveṣyate*! We simply fail to

understand what Misra means by "as the paraphrasing line in Śp. shows." We feel miserable that we are not able to comprehend what Misra wants us to do.

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

Sāśaṅkaṃ tanukaṅṭakakṣatabhiyā krīḍāvane krīḍati.

The poet here says that [*sā*] *krīḍāvane krīḍati*= the lady does definitely play in the pleasure garden, but *sāśaṅkaṃ!* Why? *Tanukaṅṭakakṣatabhiyā*. She plays in the pleasure garden no doubt, but with caution and care, lest the thorns scratch her body and those very scratches are misunderstood for *nakhakṣatas!*

The words *sāśaṅkaṃ* and *bhiyā* are quite significant. Misra misses the essence of all !

Let it be emphasized that Mr. Misra goes against not only all the MSS. and all the editions of the *Vik.* but also against those ancient anthologies which have the readings exactly what *Vik.* has, i.e. *sparsaḥ kaṅ akako ibhiḥ ku ilayā līlavane neṣyate*. And the other anthologies, which contain *sāśaṅkaṃ tanukaṅṭakakṣatabhiyā krīḍāvane krīḍati*, do not lend any support to Misra's contention either that "the reading ought to be changed to "*anveṣyate*" is "looked for."

Misra acts in an unreasonable manner. A reasonable man would have considered the issue once again to determine whether he should tamper with an existing reading or not. Unless and until a scholar is absolutely certain about the worthlessness of the original reading and strongly feels that there is an unavoidable need for a substitution to make some sense out of a nonsensical reading, he does not take the courage to make the substitution. Misra might have concluded irretrievably that he was absolutely right, but what about his gurus in Germany, if there were any!

We don't understand what is the gain of the *nāyikā* in wilfully getting scratched by thorns in the garden, unless she wants to invite trouble for herself unnecessarily! We have a beautiful saying in Hindi: *Ā patthara mere paira para para*. O stone, come and hit me on my feet! Misra would like to change the readings left and right, up and down, to suit the lack of his understanding. So "*līlavane neṣyate*" becomes "*līlavane'nveṣyate*." 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 embracings" as Misra asks us to believe! She may enjoy the *nakhakṣata* or *dantakṣata* from her lover, but not *kaṅ aka-kṣata* from the thorny bushes! And, by the way, where did Misra get the idea that "scratchings take place in passionate embracings!" Does he not know any difference amongst the various components of *ratikrīḍā* like *ālīṅgana*, *cumbana*, *nakhakṣata* and *dantakṣata*, etc.? We are not sure in which science or art he has acquired proficiency.

Naturally Bh reads *krīḍāvane neṣyate*, but his cause is different. He wants us to believe that the lady did not want to be scratched by the thorny bushes because they were painful! So what? Every prick is painful. The lady did not want to be scratched, not because of the potential pain, but because they were likely to be mistaken for the *nak hakṣatas* received during the *ratikrīḍāprasāṅga*!

We are not sure if our Neo-Expounders had come across the following *sadukti*:

Dr̥ṣṭim he prativeśini kṣaṇam ihāpyasmadgr̥he dāsyasi
prāyeṇāsya śiṣoḥ pitā na virasāḥ kaupīr apaḥ pāsyati.
Ekākinyapi yāmi satvaram itas srotas tamālākulam
nīrandhrās tanum ālikhantu jaraṭhacchedā nalagranthayaḥ.

And what about the following:

Kasya vā na bhavati roṣo dr̥ṣṭvā priyāyāḥ savraṇam adharam.
Sabhramarapadmāghrāyīṇi vāritavāme sahasvedānīm.
Kāvya prakāśa.

* * *

Misra, the Translator

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

Mukhena lajjābhinayapragalbhā līlālavanyāñcitakandhareṇa.
Pratyādiśantīva divi spurantam anekadoṣopahataṃ mṛgāṅkam. [9:53]

I wish Misra had attempted more translations of Bilhaṇa. He translates *mukhena pratyādiśantī iva mṛgāṅkam* as "putting as it were the moon in its place by her face" [p. 26]. We don't know how *pratyādiś* could mean "to put someone in its place." And even if it meant that, what purpose would it serve!!

According to Apte *pratyādiś* means to reject, discard, shun--*pratyādiṣ aviśeṣamaṇḍa navidhiḥ*; to repulse--*pratyādideśainam abhāṣamāṇā*; to cast off, repudiate-- *kāmaṃ pratyādiṣ ām smarāmi na parigrahaṃ munes tanayām*; to obscure, eclipse, defeat, throw into the shade or background-- *pratyādiśyanta iva me dṛṣ alakṣyabhidaḥ śarāḥ*; *rakṣāg rhagatā dīpāḥ pratyādiṣ ā iva*. The term also means "conquer" or "overcome" by the same authority of Apte. However, Bh correctly translates *pratyādiśantī* by *tiraskurvantī* and also cites Amara as his authority--*pratyādeśo nirākṛtiḥ*.

And the English translators B & G, substituting word for word [*makṣikāsthāne makṣikā*] 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 prakāṣa karane meṃ pravīṇa (vaha Candra- lekhā) vilāsa se thoṛī jhukāī h
uī gardana se yukta mukha se [so he bypasses the problem of *yasya*, *yena*, or *yasmin*,
etc.] ākāśameṃ camakanevāle, aneka doṣoṃ se nindya athavā aneka rātriyom meṃ (
kṛṣṇapakṣa meṃ) kāntihīna, candramā kā tiraskāra karatī huī prakāṣa huī.

Howsoever poor may be the translation in Sanskrit, English, or Hindi, none has miss
ed the meaning the way Misra has done. He has missed everything.

With regard to *līlālavanyañcitakandhareṇa*, *Candrikā* interpreted it as follows: *līlāyā
lavena nyañcitā vakrīkṛtā kandharā yasya tena*. [I believe "*yasya*" is wrong. It should
be *yena*. The face has turned the neck a little. When the face is turned, naturally the
neck gets turned too.]

Misra merely raises the problem but does not try to solve it! He says: "Usually the
neck is thought to belong to the head, rather than to face." [p. 26, note 3].

Let us see what Bh says:

Līlāyā vilāsasya lavena leśena nyañcitā vakrīkṛtā kandharā grīvā yasmin tena
mukhena."

So Bh uses locative!

Misra Seems Confused

Here is a case where we find Misra quite confused. He sees what in reality does no
t exist. He suffers from *bhrāntir mithyāmatir bhramaḥ*.

Undoubtedly to err is human. Our great *nītikāras* have already taught us:

Gacchataḥ skhalanaṃ kvāpi bhavatyeva pramādataḥ.

Those who ride the horses are likely to fall sometimes. There is hardly any human
being on this earth who could prove that he/she has never committed an error! As a ru
le, one should always be careful, lest one errs. However, one should be doubly caref
ul when trying to find fault with the work of others. Those who live in the glass house s
hould never throw stone at others.

Here is Misra's unusual power of perception:

Tayopadeśaḥ sa kṛtaḥ kumāryāṃ vṛthāgaman nīca ivopakāraḥ.
Premāṇi janmāntarasañcitāni prādurbhavanti kvacid evam eva. [9:92]

Misra expounds:

kumāryāḥ, in second and third editions, conjectured [?] for *kumāryām*, in the MS. and ed. pri is hardly correct. *Kumāryām* (loc.) is to be construed with *agamat* (9), like *nīc* in the comparison: "the instruction went to the girl in vain, like a service [goes in vain] to a vile one". For the thought compare: Bhāsa, Cārudatta, 1.19: Bālacarita 1.15 (=Ś *ūdraka Mr̥cchaka ika*, 1,34):

*limpatīva tamo'ṅgāni varṣatīvāñjanam nabhaḥ/
asatpuruṣaseveva dr̥ṣ ir viphalatām gatā//*

Bharavi, Kirat., 13.33:

*upakāra ivāsati prayuktaḥ sthitim aprāpya mṛge gataḥ praṇāśam/
kṛtaśaktir adhomukho gurutvāj janitavr̥ḍa ivātmapauruṣeṇa// [p. 16]*

fn. 9. Cp. Raghu. 6.66...*tadīyo lebhe antaram [!] cetasi nopadeśaḥ*, "her instruction did not obtain a place in her mind."

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

Tayopadeśaḥ sa kṛtaḥ kumāryām [loc.] vṛthāgaman nīca ivopakāraḥ.
Premāni janmāntarasañcitāni prādurbhavanti kvacid evam eva. [9:92]

We read here *kumāryām* [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 no. 93, which has *kumāryāḥ* [gen.].

Pradarśayāmāsa tataḥ kumāryāḥ kṣitīśam anyam pratihārarakṣī.
Cūtānubandhe madhupāṅganāyāḥ mugdhā madhuśrīr iva 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 *jalatāḍanam*.

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

We may offer an explanation to Misra's performance. It may be a case of the play and display of the maxim of *maṅḍūkapluti*--jumping of the frog! Misra's eyes jumped from one *kumāryām* 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 a lot of wastage of time and energy on the part of all concerned, including the pres

ent writer. Misra seems to be careless. We do not doubt Misra's correct reading of the verse 9:93 because on page 4 we find him discussing the same verse:

pradarśayām āsa tataḥ kumāryāḥ (2) "then he [who "he"? It should be she, Mr. Misra!] showed to the maiden."

fn.2. *Kumāryāḥ*" is, Mr. Misra, a conjecture [!] of ed. sec.; Bühler has in accordance with the MS. *kumāryāṃ* which is not construable."

* * *

We have another demonstration of Misra's domineering wisdom:

Nirudhya randhraṃ madhupūritasya puṣpasya lobhād bhramaro'vatasthe.
Anyena mārgeṇa papus tad anye labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārgaḥ. [10:13]

Misra makes an unjust suggestion:

For *labdhārjanānām*. [!] "of those that have obtained acquisition", which does not make sense in the context (*labdhārjanānām* [sic] *ayam eva mārgaḥ*, "this is the way of those that have obtained acquisition"). ed. ter. conjectures: *lubdhair janānām*, 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: *lubdhārjanānām ayam eva mārgaḥ*, "this is the way of the acquisitions (= thus it goes with the acquisitions) of the greedy ones..." [p. 16]

N has in the text "*labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārgaḥ*." And so does J and B. However, J gloss says "*yata upārjakapuṃsaḥ*." But *Candrikā* suggests: "*lubdhair janānām ayam eva mārgaḥ iti pā haḥ sādhyān*."

Misra attributes the reading--*lubdhair janānām ayam eva mārgaḥ* to ed. ter. (i.e. Bh). He knows that ed. ter. is *kāvyārthacauryacaturāḥ*. Bh never acknowledges any debt to N. He takes *Caritacandrikā* to be an ancient commentary antedating 1286 A.D.! So whatever is contained in *Caritacandrikā* is Bh's own property! On p. 269, lines 24-25, Nagar in *HIS Caritacandrikā* says: *Lubdhair janānām ayam eva mārgaḥ iti pā haḥ sādhyān*! So it is not true to say that the above reading is a contribution of Bh. Mr. Misra is careless.

Bh probably did not know that when the N text was going through the press, *Caritacandrikā* was not even composed! As the printing of the text progressed, Nagar wrote *HIS Caritacandrikā*. Otherwise *Candrikā* would have appeared along with the text, at the bottom, where it actually belongs. It is a *pāda-ippaṇī* and ought to have gone to the *pāda*. It was not possible for Nagar to suggest the "conjectured" reading in the text part. N text accepts what J states as far as the reading is concerned. The conjectured reading could be put only in the footnote. Since there was no possibility of putting it on

the same page under the text as a footnote (*pāda- ippanī*), it had to be put in the *Caritacandrikā*, after the text was finished.

However, Bh adopts *Candrikā's* [i.e. Nagar's] conjectured reading for his text and relegates N's (and of J too) reading *labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārگاḥ* to the secondary position, downgrading it to his footnote. His words are: "*Labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārگاḥ pā ho'yaḥ cintyaḥ.*" He does not give any credit to *Caritacandrikā* or N. He does not ascribe the improved [?] reading to its true originator. He takes all the credit to himself, to be appreciated by future scholars like Misra.

Let it be remembered that for the reasons best known to him, Bh has assumed that *Candrikā* is an ancient commentary, composed even before 1286 A.D. I don't think such a great ancient scholar, an imaginative creation of Bh's fertile brain, if there were one, would say "*iti pā haḥ sādhyān.*" His words would be bolder, much more assertive. Also the same gloss-writer won't put *yata upārjakapumsaḥ*, which is the translation of *labdhārjanānām*. In other words, the sense in the J gloss [*yata upārjakapumsaḥ*] is not the same as suggested in the conjectural reading of *Candrikā*. We are still not clear on this issue. However, Misra, who does not have any doubt about anything ever, recommends that the reading be changed to "*lubdhārjanānām ayam eva mārگاḥ.*"

It is interesting to observe that according to Misra *labdhārjanānām* "does not make any sense in the context." To him *lubdhair janānām* seems better, yet "it is difficult of [?] construction." So he recommends that we force Bilhaṇa to speak--*lubdhārjanānām ayam eva mārگاḥ*, because that would be "more conservative [?! We don't know what is meant here by the last word "conservative"! It is difficult to agree with Misra for various reasons and on various grounds. He says: "We should expect rather a loc." [p. 16, 1.30]. But his suggested reading ends in "*lubdhārjanānām.*" We 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: "Besides the verse is concerned with bees, not with people."

Evidently he had seen Bh, who says that here we have (the figure of speech called) "*arthāntaranyāsaḥ.*" It is true that the verse is concerned with the bees, but only in the first three quarters. The fourth quarter is general (*sādhāraṇa*) and is appropriately concerned with the people! Whether the reading is accepted to be

a) *Labdhārjanānām ayam eva mārگاḥ*, or

b) *Lubdhārjanānām ayam eva mārگاḥ*, or

c) *Lubdhair janānām ayam eva mārگاḥ*,

the main theme ends with the third quarter. The fourth quarter is a generalization from the preceding special situation (case). Our *ākāṅkṣā* is satisfied with the three quarters.

The fourth quarter stands by itself. Even Misra brings the term "ones." We don't know if his 'ones' refers to the people as well, or only to the "bees." In any case, he has missed the *kavitāntarगतam kavitātātparyam*. An example of the beautiful editorial work

of Shri Nagaraja Rao. I had used the word "finished." His word is much more "satisfying"! How sincerely I wish he had finished what he had begun!

Misra may know what is "*arthāntaranyāsa*." Here is its definition from *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of Viśvanātha Kavirāja:

Sāmānyam vā viśeṣeṇa viśeṣas tena vā yadi.
Kāryam ca kāraṇenedam kāryeṇa ca samarthyate.
Sādharmyeṇetareṇārthāntaranyāso'ṣṭadhā mataḥ.
[Nāī Dillī: Pāṇini, 1982. p. 579]

It would have been much better if Misra had studied the basic, elementary texts in India itself and then proceeded to earn a Ph.D. in Germany, where his so called "advisors" and "examiners" either did not read what he wrote or did not know any better! His so-called "flawless" dissertation was written in German brand of English. Maybe his advisors had no knowledge of English at all!

As far as we are concerned, the problem still remains unresolved! There are three possible readings as shown above. We still maintain that *lubdhair janānām ayam eva mārgaḥ* is the most appropriate reading, *yata upāṛjakapuṃsaḥ* 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 drink. It covers the opening, obstructs the path, and stays right there, totally tight.

Now the other bees could not tolerate this disgusting situation. They found another opening and drank all the honey while this greedy one kept on believing that all the honey was safely preserved. This is all *prakṛta*, the true situation, a statement of facts.

Let us pay special attention to the repetition of the word *mārga*. Let us consider the style of composition [*racanāśailī*] of the poet. We have *lobhāt* in the *prakṛta*. It will be much more pleasant and appealing to have *lubdhair* in the concluding sentence. Not only does *mārga* mean "opening", it also means "way"--a way most appropriate, a prudent way, to deal with the cunning and greedy people.

* * *

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

Tavāṅgavallīkusumair vilāsair avaimi kāmo hriyamāṇanetraḥ.
Cairārpitaṃ nūtanam astrajātam sandhātukāmo'pi na sandadhāti. [10:27]

Misra says:

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

*tavāṅgavallīkusumair vilāsair [!] avaimi kāmo hriyamāṅanetraḥ/
caitrārpiṭaṃ nūtanam astrajātaṃ saṃdhātukāmo'pi na saṃdadhātī//*

"God Kāma, whose eyes, I think, are robbed, (forcibly taken) by the timeless (*vikāla*) flowers (=flowers that know no season) of the liana that is your body, does not place on his bowstring the new arsenal of arrows [i.e. flowers] offered by the season Caitra, though he is wishing to do so." [p. 17]

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

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

Tava Candralekhāyāḥ vilāsaiḥ vilāsayuktaiḥ [,] aṅgānyeva vallyo latāḥ tāsāṃ kusumāni puṣpāni taiḥ [,] athavā latāsthānāpannā śarīrayaṣṭiḥ kusumasthane'ṅgāni.

We do not think Bh understood what Bilhaṇa has to say here! He translates *vilāsaiḥ* as *vilāsayuktaiḥ*. Misra finds fault with him, which is justifiable. However, Misra misleads his readers by suggesting an "improved" reading. His suggestion to read *vikālaiḥ* is as unacceptable to us as any that we have found in his entire product of "investigations."

It is obvious that Bh totally overlooks *vilāsāḥ* as substantive. What he says does not make much sense to us. At the end he says: *Tavāṅgavallīkusumair [!] eva kāmasya śarasandhānahetukaṃ kāryam kṛtam iti bhāvaḥ*. We don't know how Bh could grow flowers in, or produce them from the body (assemblage of limbs) of Candaladevī!

Banerji and Gupta provide only a glimmering lamp to show the proper path to our neo-exponents. However, none seems to use that lamp. B and G say:

I think, Cupid, with his eyes attracted by the dalliances [*vilāsaiḥ*] in the shape of [?] the flowers of your body-creeper, does not wield [aim or set] the new weapon offered by Caitra, though he is willing [?] to do so.

The Spring, whose responsibility it is to provide the arsenal of weapons (arrows of flowers) to his Master, the God of Love, has provided him (God of Love) with abundant new and fresh weapons, and he (God of Love) also does want to aim those arrows at his targets; yet when he sees the *vilāsas* of Candaladevī, which are equated with the flowers, blossoming forth from the creeper of [that is] the body of Candaladevī, he gets so enamoured by them that he finds no enthusiasm to use those arrows (which are traditional). The *vilāsas* of Candaladevī are much more attractive, bewitching, effective, and superior as compared to all the arsenal of the Spring Season.

Truly speaking it is very difficult, almost impossible, to translate impregnated words of great poets like Bilhaṇa in a language which is still foreign to the present writer. To substitute words for words following the principle of *maksikāsthāne maksikā* can be done. But to bring out the real meaning of Bilhaṇa by using English language is an extreme

mely difficult task indeed for me. Every word of Bilhaṇa is enriched with pregnant meaning: *hriyamānnetraḥ nūtanam astrajātam sandhātukāmaḥ api na sandadhāti!* The beauties of poetry can be appreciated only through the feelings of one's heart. *Kāvyaṛtha-bhāvanā-paripakva-buddhi-vibhava-mātra-vedyam* is the *kavikarma* and *kavimarma* !

The poet says:

I (Vikramāṅkadeva) imagine that Kāma is getting so enchanted, enamoured and overwhelmed (his eyes getting...) by your (of Candaladevī) *vilāsas* (amorous gestures), which are, as if, the flowers of your body-creeper (limbs, which are like a creeper) that he does not want to aim at his targets the new assemblage of the arms (arrows) provided by Caitra (the Spring Season), although he would very much like to do so. The essence is: The *vilāsas* of 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 the due apologies to the great poet, because it still does not convey the full meaning.

Let us see what is *vilāsa*. *Vilāsa* as defined by Viśvanātha Kavirāja in his *Sāhityadarpaṇa* is:

Yānasthānāsanādīnāṃ mukhanetrādikarmaṇām.
Viśeṣas tu vilāsaḥ syād iṣṭasandarśanādīnā.

Here is an example:

Atrāntare kim api vāgvibhavātivr̥tta-
vaicitryam ullasitavibhramam āyatākṣyāḥ.
Tad bhūrisattvikavikāram apāstadhairyam
ācāryakam vijayi mānmatham āvir āsīt.

According to Hemacandra:

Līlā vilāso vicchittir vibbokaḥ kilakiñcitam. 507

Moṭṭāyitam kuṭṭamitam lalitam vihr̥tam tathā.
Vibhramaś cetyalankārāḥ strīṇāṃ svābhāvikā daśa. 508
[*Kāvyaṅuśāsana*]

So *Vilāsa* is one of the ten natural ornaments-- embellishments of the women. *Vilāsa* is a basic quality of *vilāsinī*. It is a *ṣṛṅgārabhāvajā kriyā*. Let us see what Amara says:

Strīṇāṃ vilāsavibbokā vibhramā lalitam tathā.
Helā līletyamī hāvāḥ kriyāḥ ṣṛṅgārabhāvajāḥ.

Rāmāśramī comments on the above:

Sṛṅgārād ratyādeḥ bhāvān manovikārac ca jātāḥ (strīṅām) kriyās ceṣṭā alaṅkārahya
ā vilāsādikā hāva-śabdavācyāḥ.

Let it be noted that *vilāsa* leads the above enumeration of the *sṛṅgārabhāvajā kriyā*.

Here is another authoritative statement defining *vilāsa* as presented in Rāmāśramī:

Vilāso'ṅge viśeṣo yaḥ priyāptāvāsanādiṣu.
Vilāso hāvabhede syāl līlāyām api puṁsyayam.

Tatra priyasamīpagamane yaḥ sthānāsanagamana- vilokiteṣu vikāro'kasmāc ca kro
dhasmitacamatkāramukha- viklavanaṃ sa vilāsaḥ.

We are reminded of a *subhāṣita* where *kavikulaguru* Kālidāsa has been equated with
kavitā-kāminī-vilāsa:

Yasyās Coraś cikuranikaraḥ karṇapūro Mayūro
Bhāso hāsaḥ kavikulaguruḥ Kālidāso vilāsaḥ.
Harṣo harṣo hṛdayavasatiḥ pañcabāṇas tu Bāṇaḥ
keṣām naiṣā kathaya kavitākāminī kautukāya.

One more example may be cited for *vilāsa*:

Dvāropāntanirantare mayi tayā saundaryasāraśriyā
prollāsyoruyugaṃ parasparasamāsaktam samāsāditam.
Ānītaṃ purataḥ śiromaśukam adhaḥ ksipte cale locane
vācas tatra nivāritam prasaraṇaṃ saṅkocite dorlate.
Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra. Bombay, 1952. p. 304.

Bilhaṇa uses this word (*Vilāsa*) quite frequently:

Vilāsadolāphalake 7:19 Vilāsadolāyita 2:4

Vilāsavidyādhara 9:129 Vilāsayuddhena 10:73

Vilāsinām 7:47 Vilāsinīṅām kusumo 10:60

All the above verses begin with the word "*vilāsa*." So they are in a way *pratīka-śloka*
as. There would be scores of verses where Bilhaṇa has used the word *vilāsa*, of course,
not in the beginning. For example:

Vijṛmbhamāṇeṣvatha pañcabāṇa-kodaṇḍasiṅjāghanagarjiteṣu.
Vilāsinī mānasam āviveśa sā rājahaṃsīva nareśvarasya. [9:1]

Also *Vilāsacāpaḥ*

And Vilāsadhanvā dhanur ācakarṣa. [9:5]

And Teṣāṃ prasanno hi vilāsabāṇaḥ. [10:24]

And Śobhante sma vilāsakuntalalatāḥ. [10:91]

And

Iyaṃ vilāsadrumadohadaśrīr
iyaṃ sudhā yauvanadugdhasindhoh.
Lāvaṇyamāṇikyaruicicchateyam
iyaṃ manaḥkārmaṇacūrṇamuṣṭiḥ. [9:69]

Bilhaṇa exemplifies many *vilāsas* beautifully in *padyas* 11-18 of *sarga* 6 and *padyas* 2-33 of *sarga* 12. Also see 9:73 and 9:74:

Iyaṃ mayi nyasyati netramālāṃ
muhuḥ sakhīnāṃ kimapi bruvāṇā.
Satyaiva sā'bhūdanurāgavārttā
cirāt prasanno bhagavān anaṅgaḥ. [9:73]

Jaghāna pādena sakhīṃ sakhelam
ākṛṣya hāraṃ muhur āmumoca.
Sā darśane Kuntalapārthivasya
na kāritā kiṃ makaradhvajena. [9:74]

We don't know whether Bh understood the compound word "*vilāsabāṇaḥ*" in 10:24. He merely translates *Vilāsabāṇaḥ* as *kāmaḥ*. We are not sure if he knows the analysis, *viḡraha*--how *Vilāsabāṇaḥ* is *Kāmaḥ*--*strīṇāṃ vilāsā eva bāṇāḥ yasya*--*saḥ*.

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, the present writer wrote: "*Itihāsācaryasya Ḍā Byuhlara [Bühler] mahodayasya jñānarāśau aiti hāsiko'ṃśaḥ sāhityāṃśaṃ nūnam atyaśeta.*" We are unable to decide whether Misra's performance deserves any comment.

Misra goes to Bh and finds fault with him. Then he suddenly asks us to accept his unacceptable emendation. He wants us to replace *vilāsaiḥ* by *vikālaiḥ*--to throw away *intāmaṇi* (wish-gem) and pick up *mṛlloṣa* (sod of dirt)! "*Vilāsaiḥ* is the *prakṛta*, i.e. *upameya*. *Kusumaiḥ* is the *aparakṛta*, or *upamāna*. *Vilāsaiḥ* is the heart (true *hārda*) of this *kavīndrokti*. To throw it away will mean total destruction. There will be nothing left. It will be a dead body without the soul!

Misra knows that *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 *kartā* of *abhavat*. Yet on p. 17 in rejecting Bh's interpretation he reacts as if it can be only a *viśeṣaṇa*, i.e. adjective. As argued by Mister Misra, it may be "impossible" to interpret *vilāsaiḥ* here as an adjective, but we 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*. *Vilāsaiḥ* is not *vilāsayuktaiḥ*. It is not a *viśeṣaṇa* (adjective). It is a *viśeṣya* (substantive, noun). Bh reminds us of an age-old saying: *Svayaṃ naṣ aḥ parān nāśayati*. He himself did not understand the true meaning and he misled Misra, if at all he did. Of course, Misra's capacity to understand is limited anyway, especially when he does not want. Flowers don't grow in the body (*aṅgavallī*) of the beloved lady. Her body is the abode of *vilāsāḥ*. Here *vilāsāḥ* are identified with *kusumāni*. It is unfortunate that neither of these two neo-expounders cared to see *Caritacandrikā*, which says: *aṅgānyeva vallī tasyāḥ kusumaiḥ vilāsaiḥ--abhedat*.

So far we have come across only three *vṛttis* (or the power of a word to express the meaning). They are: *abhidhā*, *lakṣaṇā* and *vyañjanā--tisraḥ śabdasya vṛttayaḥ* (or *śaktayaḥ*). Now we are learning for the first time of a new *vṛtti*, a new *śakti*, the fourth one. It is called "Mīśra-*śakti*," the power of Misra to force a word yield any meaning he dictates. He asks us to believe that *vikālaḥ* can mean timeless. He did not give the *prakṛti-pratyaya-vibhāga* or *vyutpatti* (derivation) of the word. Dictionaries (Misra's *Lexica*) tell us that *vikālaḥ* (*viruddhaḥ kālaḥ*) stands for "evening, evening twilight, the close of day; improper (emphasis added) time, unseasonable hour."

Probably Misra wants to make this word (*vikālaḥ*) a compound word (may be a *bahuvrīhi*) and have the *vigraha* something like *vigataḥ kālo yeṣām tāni*. Our *pūrvācāryas* have instructed us: *Jivatkaver āśayo na varṇanīyaḥ*. We hesitate to put our own words (interpretation) into Mr. Misra's mouth. We only wish he had explained the word fully and systematically to avoid any unintentional misinterpretation. The specific word Misra wants to stand for "timeless" can also mean *worn-out*, *withered*, or [in the case of flowers] whose season is now over!

Unfortunately both Bh and Misra had seemingly forgotten verses 11 to 18 of canto 6 by the time they reached 10:27. Bilhaṇa dwells on *vilāsa* in as many as eight verses. The description begins with *Samajani kalamekhalākālāpa* (6:11) and is carried upto *abhavad anaṅgavilobhano vilāsaḥ* (6:18). Also verses 2-33 of canto 12 beginning with:

Asmin kṣaṇe Kuntalapārthivasya praveśam ākarṇya purāṅganānām.
Āsan vilāsavratadīkṣitānām smaropadiṣṭāni viceṣṭitāni. [12:2]

and going upto:

Dṛśām bhṛśam kāmavaśīkṛtānām kasyāścid ālokanakautikinyāḥ.
Karṇāvatamṣe ca nijāñcale ca gatāgatam yojanamātram āsīt. [12:33]

tell us what the *vilāsas* are, provided we keep our eyes open and the mind receptive.

In response to the performance of Bh we can only say: To err is human. But when we see a "Doctor" behave in this way, we don't know what to say--the words fail us! *Te ke na jānīmahe*. Also

Saraso viparītaś cet sarasatvam na muñcati.

Sākṣarā viparītās cet

We do not understand why Bh had to substitute *vilāsaiḥ* (substantive) by *vilāsayukta iḥ* (adjective). And the question is: Does he have any grammatical authority to do so? This is apart from the fact that in a *varayātrā*, (marriage procession of the bridegroom) he cuts off the head of the bridegroom himself!

* * *

Misra's Bālacāpalam

Bilhaṇa says:

Sūtritābhisaraṇāḥ praṇayinyaḥ kāntasaṅgamam avighnam avāpuḥ.
Phūtkṛtaiḥ pathi nivāritadīpās cāpalam jayati pañcaśarasya. [11:23]

Commenting on the above verse Misra says:

nivāritadīpāḥ: here *nivārita-*; [!] "kept off" does not yeild [sic] the sense *praśānta*, "extinguished" (ed. ter., comm.). I would suggest, in the light of the context, reading *nirvāpita-*, "extinguished", and thus render: "lamps were extinguished [by the women...]". For *cāpalam* (all edd.) in d read *cāturam*, which suits well, since god Kama's action of procuring a love meeting without obstacles is one of "cleverness" (*cātura*) and not of "fickleness" (*cāpala*). [p.17]

Let us discuss Misra's *cāpalam* first: What Misra displays here is not a true scholarsh ip. No doubt "*cāpalam*" means "fickleness", but it also means mobility and swiftness (besides "fickleness"). In fact Monier-Williams lists the meanings in the above order, i.e . "mobility" and "swiftness" precede "fickleness." If one were to consult MW, one will see mobility and swiftness first before reaching "fickleness".

Apte too enumerates the meanings of "*cāpalam*" in the following order: 1. Quick motion, swiftness; 2) fickleness...We don't know how Misra concluded that the action involved here was born out of "cleverness"! Even Misra's own word "clever" will mean "showing skill or resourcefulness often with physical dexterity."

The Hindi commentary of Bh has done a good job here. It says:

Kāmadeva mahārāja [?] kī sphūrti kī [?] balihārī hai arthāt kāmābhībhūta hone par a striyoṃ me jo svābhāvika śighratāpūrvaka apanā kārya sampādana karane kī buddhi utpanna ho jāti hai vaha praśamsanīya hai.

Once again Misra shows his lack of appreciation of the beauties of the poetic muse by recommending the substitution of *cāpalam* by *cāturam*. The matter of the fact is that *cāturam* is not grammatically correct at all because *catura* is not included in *yuvādi*. The rule which gives us forms like *cāpala* is *Hāyanāntayuvādibhyo'ṅ* (*Pān.* 5-1-130). Since this is not applicable to *cātura*, Misra's suggestion will be an attempt to make Bilhaṇa violate Sanskrit grammar, which we cannot endorse. "*Cāturyam*" is the right form,

e.g. "*vicāracāturyam apākaroti tātasya bhūyān mayi pakṣapātaḥ.*" [3.35] and "*cāturyam ācāmati Mandarādreh*" [9.119]. Once again we may point out that this is the usual kind of *cāpalam* of Misra. He cites a meaning given by Bh, which may be wrong, but then jumps to a conclusion and asks us to amend the reading.

Many times we have wondered whether it is even appropriate for us to comment on the unsound suggestions of Misra. In order to get his wrong suggestions implemented, he will have to write his own Science of Prosody (*Chandaḥśāstram*). Misra would like to read "*nirvāpita.*" We believe Misra knows that the present verse is composed in *svāgatā* metre, the definition of which is "*Svāgatā ranabhagair guruṇā ca.*" Here is the setting:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
guru laghu guru laghu laghu laghu guru laghu laghu guru guru

S 1 S 1 1 1 S 1 1 S S

phū tkṛ taiḥ pa thi ni vā ri ta dī pāḥ

We also believe that Misra knows that a laghu *akṣara*, preceding a *saṃyukta-akṣara* (conjunct consonant) becomes *dīrgha* (i.e. long) by the rule "*saṃyuktādyaṃ dīrgham.*" So "*rvā*" will make "*ni*" as *dīrgha*, which will destroy the life of the metre! Besides "*nivārita*" can easily mean eliminated, put off, stopped, withheld, suppressed, removed. So we don't have to change it into "*nirvāpita.*" The question is: What is the authority to declare that "keeping off" is the only meaning of "*nivārita*"?

We have seen Misra's way of emending where the metre itself dictates the composition in a specific way in terms of a letter being *laghu* or *guru*. We don't know to what extent the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* would have been changed by Misra if there were no restrictions imposed by the *chandaḥśāstra* and there were no dangers of *chandobhaṅga doṣa* in following *Miśramārga*; in other words, if *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* would have been a *gadya-kāvya* and not a *padya-kāvya*! We don't know why Misra forgets here his own high sounding statement on *metri causa*! [See his remarks regarding 9.41d, on p. 16].

Bh Shows the Limits of His Limited Knowledge

We are obliged to say something quite frank though not very pleasant relative to Bh's comment on the following verse:

Bāṇāḥ śvetamayūkhaśāṅkakaṣaṅkaṣuṅṅāḥ kṣaṅāt kuṅṭhatām
yātās tyaktanayāsu yāsu nihitāḥ pañcāpi pañceṣuṅā.
Uttamsotpalalave'pi patite daivāt puraḥ pādayoḥ
kaṅṭhāśleṣakaṭhorakautukarasās tiṣṭhanti tāḥ kāmīnām.

[11:90]

This is one more case that demonstrates how little Bh understood as far as the central idea of Bilhaṇa is concerned. Bh proves the correctness of the age-old saying: "Little

e knowledge is a dangerous thing." As is usual with him, he has totally missed the true meaning!

N in his *Caritacandrikā* has clearly shown how this verse is to be interpreted: "*Palla vapatanam atra śaṣ ha upāyo rasāntaraṃ 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 māninyaḥ daivād durdaivād abhāgyād ityarthaḥ.

This is all undesirable. No sensible *sahṛdaya* will ever accept it. "*Daivād*" does not mean here "bad luck;" it means "by chance," or even luckily--exactly the opposite of what Bh intends to say. It also means "accidentally." Perhaps Bh did not recall the following enumeration of Amara: "*Daivam diṣ am bhāgadheyam bhāgyam strī niyatir vidhiḥ.*" Bh comments: "*Pādayoḥ caraṇayoḥ puro'gre uttamsarūpa ābhūṣaṇarūpaḥ kāmīnā dhāritāḥ ityarthaḥ.*" This is not true. The leaf of the blue lotus was worn as an ornament by the beloved lady and not by the lover (man). We are not sure whether we are reproducing the idea of Bh correctly. Sincerely, we are not able to understand what Bh wants to say here.

Here are his words:

Utpalapallavaḥ kamalapatraṃ tasmin patite'pi [!] praṇatisamayē karṇādīsthānāt patite'pi,
[we don't know why our "*vidyāvāgīśa*" has to repeat the same word!] kāmīnāṃ kāmāpīḍitānāṃ patīnāṃ kaṅṭhāśleṣe kaṅṭhālīṅgane kaṭhoro mānadhāraṇe [!] dṛḍhaḥ kautukasya kutūhalasya rasaḥ āsvādo yāsu tāḥ satyaḥ tiṣṭhanti. Na kenāpi prakāreṇa mānaṃ utsrjya kāmijanapriyaṃ

The facts here are as follows: The first five weapons have already failed. Perhaps this is the significance of the phrase "*pañcāpi pañceṣuṇā.*" The "*sāma*", "*bheda*", "*dāna*", and "*nati*" all have been tried, but all have failed. They all went in vain. The lover also had been practicing "*upekṣā*", i.e. indifference. The whole night has passed. Still the beloved lady is not pleased. She is not yet reconciled. We are reminded here of another *sadukti* of a great poet:

Gataprāyā rātriḥ kṛṣatanu śaśī śīryata iva
pradīpo'yaṃ nidrāvaśam upagato ghūrṇata iva.
Praṇāmānto mānas tyajasi na tathāpi krudham aho
kucapratyāsattyā hṛdayam api te caṇḍi kaṭhinam.

In this verse "*praṇāmānto mānaḥ*" is quite significant. In our verse too, the dawn has almost dawned. Now it is very close to the morning. All the expedients, all the efforts, all the instruments have been tried but failed. There is no question of the lover bowing down any more. He had already fallen down at her feet. But she did not give up her *māna*. We would like to declare with all the vehemence at our command, even at

the risk of being repetitive, that the lover has tried every possible means, including, of course, "*praṇāti*."

Bh translates "*ka horo = mānadhāraṇe dṛḍhaḥ*." We don't know how this can be connected with "*kautukarasa*." "*Ka hora*" here does not mean "stiff" or "hard", but "full-grown", or "mature", or "well-developed." For example, "*ka horagarbhām Jānakīm*." Do we translate this as having a "stiff" embryo?

Bh concludes: "*Na kenāpi prakāreṇa mānam utsṛjya kāmijanapriyaṃ kurvanti iti bhāvaḥ*." 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 an abject nonsense. In the verse under discussion, the poet says: "*uttamṣotpalapallave a pi patite*." He turns the *ukti* around and makes it *uttamṣotpalapallave patite api*. Thus he shows once again that he misses the meaning intended by the poet. He believes in *manahpūtam samācaret*.

The poet says: *daivāt*. He means "luckily." Bh turns it around and makes it *durdaivāt abhāgyād ityarthaḥ*. Certainly it was a *durdaiva* of Bilhaṇa that a commentator [!] like Bh used his pen (worse than a poisoned sword) on him and tormented all of us time and again!

Let us seek the support of some higher authority in Sāhityaśāstra, in this case, *Daśarūpa* of Dhanañjaya who says:

Tr. by George C.O. Haas. New York, 1965. pp. 136-37.

Sāmādaṁ tu parikṣiṇe syād upekṣā'vadhīraṇam.
Rabhasatrāsaharṣādeḥ 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 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). Strīṇām īrṣyākṛto m ānaḥ kopo'nyāsaṅgini priye.

Śrute vā'numite dṛṣṭe...

The Resentment arising in [a state of] jealousy is anger on the part of women when their lover is heard, inferred, or seen [to be devoted to another]. 68 (p. 61; H. 56).

Yathottaram guruḥ ṣaḍbhir upāyais tam upācaret.
Sāmnā bhedena dānena natyupekṣārasāntaraiḥ.

The loved one (guru) [?] may remedy this [resentment] [or estrangement?] by six expedients [employed] in proper succession: Conciliation (*sāman*), Dissension (*bheda*), Gift-giving (*dāna*), Humility (*nati*), Indifference (*upekṣā*), and Diversion (*rasāntara*).

"*guruḥ*" is not to be interpreted here as "the loved one (guru)." "*Guruḥ*" does not refer to the lover. One cannot have *rati* with the guru. *Guruḥ* is not the *kartā* of *upācaret*. It refers to "*kopaḥ*" (anger). The anger grows in intensity and volume gradually. *Yathottaram kramaśaḥ, guruḥ gahanaḥ (mānaḥ), high in degree, vehement, violent*. However, *yathottaram* can also be interpreted as "in succession." Cf. *Tadbhaṅgāya patiḥ kuryāt śaḍupāyān iti kramāt*. We would like to call such foreign writers as "*kośapaṇḍitas*--dictionary scholars!

Notes: The term *rasāntara* signifies [substitution of] another emotion and consequently indicates the diversion from resentment effected by such substitution. 69 (p. 62-64a; H. 57,58).

Tatra priyavacaḥ sāma bhedas tatsakhyupārjanam.
Dānam vyājena bhūṣādeḥ pādyoḥ patanaṃ natiḥ.

Similar ideas have been expressed by Śāradātanaya in his *Bhāvaprakāśa* (IV Adhikaraṇa).

Let us resume our discussion. *Prakṛtam anusarāmaḥ. Yāsu nihitāḥ pañcāpi pañceṣu nā* [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 kuṅṭhīkṛtavallabhapraṇatayaḥ śastrair anaṅgasya ye
na prāptāś ca niśīthinīpatikaraiḥ śaithilyavīthīm api.
Te niḥśaṅkaviṭaṅkatālutumulaprotaplutaplāvitaś-
chinnāḥ kukkuṭakūjitair mṛgaḍṛśāṃ mānagrahagranthayaḥ.
[11:83]

This verse brings forth ideas similar to what are expressed in 11:90. Here an ordinary, simple instrument, of course, seemingly, worked where great, fierce weapons had failed! Why? Because it is the dawn. If the beloved (lady) does not still get reconciled, she will have to suffer for the entire day? And who knows if the lover will visit her again the following evening!

Bilhaṇa has sung the same melodious song once again though in a different way. This is what he says:

Uthhāya manyuvaśataś calitum pravṛttāḥ
karṇaṃ gate jhaṭiti kukkuṭakaṅṭhanāde.
Kiñcit kṣutādinibhamātram udīrya nāryāḥ.
prāṇeśakeliśayaneṣu punaḥ patanti. [11:93]

This *kavīndrokti* too is misunderstood and consequently misinterpreted by Bh. He says:

Kukkuṭānām kaṅṭhanāde kaṛṇaṃ gate śrotram prāpte sati [absolute locative, or sati saptamī] manyuvaśataḥ krodhavaśataḥ jhaṭiti śighraṃ utthāya śayyāṃ parityajya calitum gantum pravṛttā udyuktā nāryaḥ kiñcit kṣutādinibhamātram udīrya prāneśakeliśayaneṣu punaḥ patanti.

This is a murder of *Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū*. Bh expects us to believe that the women first heard the "*kukku akaṅ hanāda*, then they were angered because they had to leave, then they started leaving, then they pretended sneezing, etc., and finally they came back to the bed of the lover! This is all unacceptable. The poet says:

Utthāya manyuvaśataś calitum pravṛttaḥ
kaṛṇaṃ gate jhaṭiti kukkuṭakaṅṭhanāde.

Bh affects transposition of the first two *carāṇas*--he changes their respective order. Bh makes Bilhaṇa say:

Kaṛṇaṃ gate jhaṭiti kukkuṭakaṅṭhanāde
utthāya manyuvaśataś calitum pravṛttāḥ. [!]

We would like Bhāradvāja Mahāśaya to know that the ladies were angry not because they were forced to leave on account of the morning--the day had dawned--they were angry, their *manyu* (*kopa*) was generated out of *praṇaya-kalaha* or *īrṣyā*. The facts are: The ladies get up; they begin to leave. Their going was caused by *māna*. But they hear the *kukku akaṅ hanāda*. They had no idea what the time was when they had started to leave! But it dawned on them that the day had already dawned; it was already the day-break!! So it was not proper for them to leave. There was no more time left to while away. If they wanted to enjoy the remaining hours, rather minutes, they must go back to their lovers. Otherwise they would have to suffer for the whole day. So they had to come back! But if they came back out of their own accord, i.e. voluntarily, i.e. without any *anunaya* on the part of the lover, they would degrade themselves in the eyes of their lovers, who would very well say: "Well, you left with such arrogance! Why did you come back? I did not implore you to come back." Thus their pride would get further injured. It would be *kṣate kṣāram*, insult added to injury. So they wanted to show some pretext. And consequently they sneezed, or pretended that someone else had sneezed. So it was an *apaśakuna*, an ill omen. They could not go away at such an inauspicious moment. So they had to come back.

Bh may not remember that when a married woman, say, a member of a joint Hindu family system, is forced to leave the *raṅga-mahal*, because of her duty, she does not have any excuse, she cannot make any excuse, and she would not come back to her husband's bed even if someone sneezes. Here the poet clearly states: *Kiñcit kṣutādinibhamātram!* 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 paḍa rah ā hai) isa krodha se, jaldī uṭhakra jāti huī kāmīniyāṃ kucha chīṃka ādi apaśakuna s ūcaka bāta kā bahānā karake arthāt kisī apaśakuna mātra kā nāmollekha karake pati kī krīḍāśayyāoṃ para phira se leṭa jāti haiṃ.

The Hindi translator too misses the true *hārda* of the poet. We repeat because *dvir baddham subaddham bhavati*. Women did not get up and start going after they had heard the crowing of the cocks. They started first. They would have waited for their lovers to come and persuade them to come back to the bed. Then alone they would have gone to the *prāneśakeliśayana*. But as it happened, the cocks crowed! It was already the dawn. There was no time left for any more *praṇaya-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 "*duḥkha*" 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 kukku akūjitair mṛgadṛśām 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 had said: *Kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapā ham*. [1:22]

Bh had certainly not seen verse 16:6 when he tried his skill on 11:93, because the former could have shown him the way. Here it is:

Ratikope prasāde ca dadhānāḥ paripūrṇatām.
Āyāmatyo yāminyāḥ kāmīnīnām mude'bhavan. [16:6]

Let us study some relevant passages from the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of Viśvanātha Kavirāja: What is *raticopa*? What is *prasāda*? What is the significance of the word "*āyāmatyāḥ*"?

Atra Sāhityadarpaṇe tṛtīyaḥ Paricchedaḥ.

Atha mānaḥ:

Mānaḥ kopaḥ sa tu dvedhā praṇayerśyāsamudbhavaḥ.
Dvayoḥ praṇayamānaḥ syāt pramode sumahatyapi. 198

Premṇaḥ kuṭilagāmitvāt kopo yaḥ kāraṇam vinā.

Dvayor iti nāyakasya nāyikāyāś ca ubhayoś ca praṇayamāno varṇanīyaḥ. Udāharaṇam. Tatra nāyakasya yathā:

Alīkaprasupta nimīlitākṣa dehi subhaga mama avakāśam.

Gaṇḍaparcumbanapulakitāṅga na punaḥ cirayiṣyāmi
(Chāyā).

Nāyikāyā yathā Kumārasambhave sandhyāvarṇanāvasare.

Ubhayor yathā:

Praṇayakupitayor dvayor api alīkaprasuptayor māninoḥ.
Niścalaniruddhaniḥśvāsa-dattakarṇayoḥ ko mallaḥ.
[Chāyā]

Anunayaparyantāsahatve tvasya na vipralambhabhedatā, kintu sambhogasañ-c
āryākhyabhāvatvam. Yathā

Bhrūbhaṅge racite'pi dṛṣṭir adhikam sotkaṅṭham udvīkṣate
ruddhāyām api vāci sasmitam idam dagdhānanam jāyate.
Kārkaśyam gamite'pi cetasi tanū romāñcam ālambate
dṛṣṭe nirvaḥanam bhaviṣyati katham mānasya tasmiñ jane.

Yathā vā

Ekasmin śayane parānmukhatayā vītottaram tāmīyator
anyonyasya hṛdi sthite'pyanunaye samrakṣator gauravam.
Dampatyoḥ śanakair apāṅgavalanān miśrībhavaccakṣuṣor
bhagno mānakaliḥ sahāsarabhasavyāsaktakaṅṭhagrahaḥ.

Patyur anyapriyāsaṅge dṛṣṭe'thānumite śrute. 199

Īrsyāmāno bhavet strīṅām tatra tvanumitis tridhā.
Utsvapnāyitabhogāṅka-gotraskhalanasambhavā. 200

Tatra dṛṣṭe yathā

Vinayati sudṛśo dṛśoḥ parāgam praṇayini kausumam ānanānilena.
Tadahitayuvater abhīkṣnam akṣṇor dvayam api roṣarajobhirāpupūre.

Sambhogacihnenānumite yathā

Navanakhapadam aṅgam gopayasyaṁśukena
sthaḡayasi punar oṣṭham pāṇinā dantadaṣṭam.
Pratidiśam aparastrīsaṅgaśaṁśī visarpan
navaparimalagandhaḥ kena śakyo varītum.

Evam anyatra

Sāma bhedo'tha dānam ca natyupekṣe rasāntaram.
Tadbhaṅgāya patiḥ kuryāt ṣaḍupāyān iti kramāt. 201

Tatra priyavacaḥ sāma bhedas tatsakhyupārjanam.
Dānam vyājena bhūṣādeḥ pādyoḥ patanaṃ natiḥ. 202

Sāmādu tu parikṣīṇe syād upekṣāvadhīraṇam.
Rabhasatrāsaharṣādeḥ kopabhraṃśo rasāntaram. 203

Yathā

No cāṭuśravaṇam kṛtam ityādi.
Atra sāmādayaḥ pañca sūcitāḥ. Rasāntaram ūhyam.

Cāṭukāram api prāṇa-nātham roṣād apāsya yā.
Paścāttāpam avāpnoti kalahāntarītā tu sā.
[82. Source same]

Yathā mama tātapādānām:

No cāṭuśravaṇam kṛtam [sāma] na ca dṛśā hāro'ntike vīkṣitaḥ [dānaṃ]
kāntasya priyahetavo nijasakhīvāco'pi dūrīkṛtāḥ [bhedaḥ].
Pādānte vinipatya [natiḥ] tatkṣaṇam asau gacchan [upekṣā] mayā mūḍhayā
pāṇibhyām avarudhya hanta sahasā kaṅṭhe kathaṃ nārpitaḥ.

Here (in this last verse) we have examples of all the first five expedients. There was no *rasāntaram*. So there was no reconciliation. The lover left absolutely. He would not return! Now the beloved lady has merely to repent. So the *sambhoga śṛṅgāra* was not continued. She is now "*kalahāntarītā*." There is the "*vipralambha*", or "*viyoga*."

Also the following *sadukti* will be relevant:

Caraṇapatanapratyākhyānāt prasādaparāṇmukhe
nibhṛtakitavācāretyuktā ruṣā paruṣīkṛte.
Vrajati ramaṇe niḥśvasyoccaiḥ stanasthitahastayā
nayanasalilacchannā dṛṣṭiḥ sakhīṣu niveśitā.

Atra Viśādasyodayaḥ. Na mānabhaṅgaḥ. *Amaruśatake*.

Viśvanātha Kavirāja did not give the example of *rasāntaram*. Bilhaṇa has given. *Kukku akūjitāni* and *uttamṣotpalapallavapatanam* are *rasāntaram*. The "ancient" writer of *Caritacandrikā* says very clearly [p.281, line 15]: "*Pallavapatanam atra ṣaṣ ha upāyo rasāntaram vā*. We don't think Bh saw this. Even if he had seen this, he would have rejected it. His determination to interpret certain *uktis* in a certain way was firm. *Māti nirvivare* and *Yaśya bhrātā* are some examples.

Here is one more vivid example of *rasāntaram*:

Kṛtvā vighraṃ aśrupātakaluṣam śayyāsanād utthitā
krodhāccāpi vihāya garbhabhavanadvāraṃ ruṣā prasthitā.
Dṛṣtvā candramasaṃ prabhāviraḥitaṃ pratyūṣavātāhatā

hā rātris tvaritā gateti patitā kāntā priyasyorasi.

Another example:

Tasyāḥ sāndravilepanastanayugaprasāṣamudrāṅkitam
kiṃ vakṣas̄ caraṇānativyatikaravyājena gopāyyate.
Ityukte kva tad ityudīrya sahasā tatsampramārṣṭum mayā
saṃśliṣṭā rabhasena tatsukhavaśāt tanvyāpi tad vismṛtam.
[Amaroḥ]

Bilhaṇa himself makes a reference to *māna* in the following verse:

Jñātum adbhutavilāsanidhāne premṇi sāmīyam iva jātagarimṇi.
Kelidhāmani tayoh̄ śatavāraṃ kṣiptavān manasi mānam anaṅgaḥ. [11:72]

A great deal of information on *māna* (love in separation) can be obtained from *Kan gra paintings on love* (M.S. Randhawa, *Comp.*, New Delhi, National Museum, 1962. Chap. 7. pp. 89-97) where Randhawa discusses the theme on the basis of the *Rasikapri yā* of Keśavadāsa.

* * *

Here is one more example of the unworthy attempts made by Bh to interpret our great poet Bilhaṇa. Such commentators were envisioned by Bilhaṇa and were alluded in the very beginning of his immortal work:

Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti saṅkrāntavakroktirahasyamudrāḥ.
Te'smatprabandhān avadhārayantu kurvantu śeṣāḥ śukavākyapāṭham. [1:22]

The poet says:

Nirādaraṃ vīkṣya nṛpaṃ mṛgākṣyā līlānamatkandharayā kayāpi.
Hṛdi sthitaḥ kārmukakarṣaṇārtham ayācyateva prasabhaṃ manobhūḥ. [12:10]

What is the *prasaṅga* (context) here? The *prasaṅga* is:

Asmin kṣaṇe Kuntalapārthivasya praveśam ākarṇya purāṅganānām.
Āsan vilāsavratadīkṣitānām smaropadiṣṭāni 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 *prakṛta*, the reality. Now the poet imagines. The God of Love was already present in her heart (as well as on the chest, i.e. the 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 gets attracted toward her. That is the central idea of the poet.

We see here Bh misrepresenting the facts. The commentary *Ramā* of Bh expects us to accept something which we find difficult to accept. Bh gives *kāmavaśatvāt* as the cause of *līlānamatkandharayā!* This is not correct. The lowering of the neck (*grīvā*) was not caused by passionate feelings, but due to the insult, generated by the fact that the king did not pay any attention to her! *Nirādaraṃ vīkṣya nṛpaṃ!*

Probably Bh was led astray by the word *līlā!* We have stated time and again that Bh turns the poet's words around--changes the order of the words completely--and generates disorder. The result is chaos. The poet begins with *Nirādaraṃ vīkṣya nṛpaṃ mṛgā kṣyā.* Then he says: *līlānamtkandharayā.* The first statement (occurrence, i.e. *vyāpāra*) is the cause. The second statement (occurrence) is the effect. Bh transposes the *caranās.* This can be characterized only as *avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram.* We are distressed not only by the fact that Bh murders *sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū,* we are also--and much more distressed by the feeling that none of those "great pandits" claimed by Bh as having collaborated with him in this great performance were able to show him the correct path! We cannot believe that such great scholars would have allowed such incongruities to be perpetuated. To quote Bh himself: *Sati ravikaranikarapraveśe kuto'ndhakārasya sambhavaḥ.*

Misra's Misdirected Emendation:

Jṛmbhāsamāspḥoṭakarāṅgulīkam akharvadorveṇīkayā kayācit.
Nirīkṣya rājānam ajātarāgam atarjyatevātīruṣā manobhūḥ. [12:20]

Misra dictates on the above:

12:20b

For *dorveṇīkayā,* "with the braid that was her arm" read *dorveṇukayā...atarjayata,* "he was threatened" [by some girl [how young?]] with the bamboo (= Hindi *lā hī*) that was her arm. We don't know how "bamboo" could mean *lā hī!* Misra might not have realized that "*akharvadorveṇīkayā*" is a *bahuvrīhi* compound, qualifying *kayāpi.*

Misra shows here his lack of understanding of even the most rudimentary concepts of *Sāhityavidyā.* The face is identified with, for example, moon because of its beauty. There is a common quality, *sādharmya,* which is the means, whereby two different objects are identified and regarded as one. The *Upapameya* and *upamāna* should have certain common characteristics--*guṇasādhāraṇyam!*

Misra identifies arms (mark the plural, of course, dual number in Sanskrit) with the bamboo [stick]! We don't know what identical quality he found in both of them. Length? May be. However, the colour is certainly not identical. Also notable is the fact that the arms are two in number and Misra's *lā hī* is only one! If the arm (one only) was extended in the form of a stick (Misra's *lā hī*), what is the significance of *Jṛmbhāsamāspḥoṭakarāṅgulīkam!* The process of *karāṅgulīsamāspḥoṭa* (cracking the knuckles) cannot be performed without joining the two hands and all the fingers!!

Let us consider the word *veṇu.* It is masculine. So how could it be *veṇukā?* And what is the significance of *jṛmbhāsamāspḥoṭakarāṅgulīkam,* if we have only one arm? H

ere are some more relevant passages: *Uttarjanīkena 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 right. Bilhaṇa has another *sūkti*: *Jṛmbhāvaśott ambhitahastayugma-saṅgha alīlāspḥu adaṅgulīkaḥ*. (9:85). This is a very fine comparative study. Here we have "*uttambhita*" as well as "*hastayugma*."

Today (Oct. 28, 1977) while considering the unreasonable suggestion of Misra to change *dorveṇikayā* to *dorveṇukayā* (*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 *karāṅgulīsamāspḥo a* cannot be performed unless and until both the arms are stretched upward, or forward, and all the fingers are united and twisted together.

Here "*veṇī*" does not mean "braid" and the arm cannot be turned into it. There can be no *abhedasādhana*--identification of *doḥ* (arm) with *veṇī* (braid). No purpose is served in converting the braid into the arm or vice versa. They are both *prakṛtas*. They are both real and existing. Both of them are parts of the *nāyikā*. Nagar was wrong when he glossed *dorveṇyau* as *bāhulate*. He did not visualize that the two arms have to be united at their ends before there could be the *karāṅgulī-samāspḥo a*. He was very young at the time, in his early twenties!

Bh is wrong too when he takes *veṇī* to be the *veṇī* (Hindi *co ī*). 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 samāspḥo o yāsu, tadṛśyaḥ karāṅgulyo yasmin karmaṇi tad yathā syāt tathā*." Bh says: *dorveṇyau 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:

Cakrīkṛtabhujalatiḥ vakrīkṛtavaktram unnamadgrīvam.
No harati kasya hṛdayaṃ hariṇadr̥ṣo jṛmbhāṇārambhāḥ.

Veṇī (*hrasva*) = the confluence or meeting of two or more [rivers or streams] in a common point of union. *Veṇī* = dam, bridge. So it can mean *saṅgama* or union, meeting together at a point!

We believe Misra comes from Allahabad! He might be aware of "Triveṇīsaṅgama!" And Bharadvaja claims a Hindu traditional heritage. Did he ever take a holy bath in Prayāga? *Cakrīkṛtabhujalatiḥ* 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 ratipateś cāmpeyakodaṇḍavad
dhammillāmbumucaḥ kṣaṇadyutivadāsajjau kṣipantī bhujau.
Viśliṣyadvali lakṣyaṇābhivigalannīvyunnamanmadhyamam
kiñcitkiñcidudañcadañcalam aho kumbhastanī jṛmbhate.
[*Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāraḥ*. 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 Pitiabale Misrepresentation

Neither Bh nor Misra has understood the following:

Asmākam ālokanavighnahetos taraṅgitāṅgī purataḥ sthitāsi.
Kiṃ tuṅgavātāyanasaṅgatānām karoṣi mātsaryaparā parāsām. [12:27]

A free rendering would be:

In order to create obstruction in our viewing, O *taraṅgitāṅgī* (having leaping limbs) woman, you have come and stood right in front of us. You are so selfish and jealous! What can you do to those women who are situated (standing) on the balconies high up? You cannot obstruct their views! *Asmākam... purataḥ sthitāsi. Tuṅga vātāyana -saṅgatānām parāsām (anyāsām) kiṃ karoṣi?*

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 *karoṣi* as "which" *kim* is not suitable.

cd *kiṃ tuṅgavātāyanasaṅgatānām karoṣi mātsaryaparā parāsām*//[sic].

Misra asks us to emend, but himself keeps the original reading!]

"why do you, being keen on jealousy, cause driving away (*parāsa*) [of the girls] that have come together on the high roof platform."

Misra tries to interpret "*kim*" as "why" rather than "what"! We fail to understand him. As a rule, he takes only one meaning which he desires. And then he proceeds with his emending suggestions. He overlooks other meanings. We would like to know from Misra how would he interpret statements like the following:

kiṃ karoṣi nijayāthavā bhuvā [5:38]

kiṃ karoṣi vayasādhikena me [5:83]

We are still kept wondering how the particular jealous woman, coming and standing on the ground level in front of the other women, could "cause driving away (*parāsa*) [of the girls] that have come together on the high roof platform?" How could she scare those ladies away?

Let it be stressed here that Misra is not totally unaware of the existence of high balconies. He observes: "Young women, crowding each other, stand on these balconies in excitement, looking at scenes below." [p. 49. fn. 51].

Let us now see Bh's performance. Bh displays once again his habit of twisting the arms of the sentence, as it were--taking the words up and down without any rhyme or reason. We don't know why he has taken *mātsaryaparā* at the very end. Truly speaking *mātsarya* is the root cause of the specific action on the part of the obstructionist woman--to stand in front of others so as to obstruct their vision. [cf. Bhāravi: *Mātsaryarāgopahatatmanām hi skhalanti sādhuṣyapi mānasāni.*]

However, Bh gives a meaning which is clear enough, ruling out any possibility for Misra to misinterpret the poet. Bh says:

Taraṅgitāṅgī tvam ālokane asmatkarmaka [!]- darśane vighnahetor vighno- tpādan artham asmākam purtaḥ sthitāsi. Tuṅgavātāyana-samupaviṣṭānām parāsām anyāsām nāyikānām mātsarye parā parāyaṇā kiṃ karoṣi.

There is a lot of undesirable element dumped by Bh in his translation. "*Darśanam*" need not necessarily be "*asmatkarmaka*." It could very well be "*asmatkartṛka*" too. The ladies did not want merely "to be seen." They also wanted to see. *Mātsaryaparā* need not be taken at the very end. *Sanḡatānām* does not necessarily mean *samupaviṣṭānām*. They could be very well standing!

We would call all this *avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram*. Evidently the Hindi translation is much more appropriate. The Hindi translator knows much more than Bh. It becomes more and more evident to me that these two were not one and the same person. They were two different persons. Hindi says:

He cañcalaśarīravālī kāmīnī! Hama logom̄ke [dvārā?] rājāko dekhanemem̄ vighna utpanna karaneke uddeśa se tū hama logom̄ ke āge kharī ho gāī hai. Parantu mātsarayabuddhi se vyāpta tū ūm̄ce jharokhom̄ mem̄ baiṭhī huī anya nāriyom̄ kā kyā bigāra s akatī hai [emphasis added].

We believe the reader is able to distinguish the difference between the two interpretations given above. The Sanskrit commentator unnecessarily brings the idea of "to be seen" by the king--*asmatkarmakadarśana*--which is not expressed by *asmākam ālokanaviḡhanahetoḡ*. Hindi has correctly put it "*hama logom̄ ke rājā ko dekhanemem̄*." We have added "*dvārā*."

And finally here is the English translation, which does not express fully the sense of the poem! It is *makṣikāsthāne makṣikā*, and yet it gives enough meaning to enlighten the minds of critics such as Misra and Bh. The English translation says:

You, with your body having folds [!], are staying in front for the obstruction of our sight. Being jealous what will you do to other ladies who are at the elevated windows?

Mātsaryaparā must come at the very beginning, because her coming and standing in front of others was also born out of jealousy. She was motivated by jealousy to begin with--from the very start. This is what *Caritacandrikā* says: *Ālokanaviḥnāhetor avalokanāvarodhāya. Vātāyanaṃ gavākṣaḥ. Parāsām anyāṅganānām.*

So we see that *Caritacandrikā* had no problem. Bh had no problem. The English translators too had no problem. But the author of "Specimens of Textual Difficulties" (that is how Misra has titled his first chapter), had great "difficulties" in understanding the verse with "*parāsām*." So he asks us to accept his suggestion of "*parāsam*", which we find difficult to accept

Here is a verbal image. People were standing on the ground level. One woman was jealous. She was inconsiderate. In order to have a full and unhindered view of King Vikrama, she virtually jumped and stood in front of others, who were standing on the ground, thus obstructing their view--their range of vision. So, one of the women, whose view was thus obstructed says: *Asmākam ālokanaviḥnāhetoḥ...*

We have shown what our earlier authorities (*pūrvācāryas*) have already said. Either Misra did not have access to their works, or following the *gajanimīlikānyāya* did not see them.

Taraṅgitāṅgī here does not mean "with your body having folds" as the English translators would want us to believe. It means *cañcalāṅgī*, moving restlessly 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 *taraṅgitāṅgī!* The subject (woman) was standing behind the other women. All of a sudden she pushed others aside and came in front of them, thus obstructing their view. This was with a malicious design--*ālokanaviḥnāhetoḥ*: 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 *bhāvārtha* 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 vyarājādālepanacandanena.
Viśvapraviṣṭārkamayūkhatāpa-sāntyartham āśliṣṭam ivendubhāsā. [12:45]

Misra proclaims:

12:45a

It is preposterous [!] to compare the king's body with the high [sic] of the Himālaya: *vapus tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya...* "his body, high as the Himālaya." For *tuṅga*, "high", read *raṅga* "colour". *ab-vapus tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya vyarājad ālepanacandanena//*

His body appeared of the colour (*raṅga*) of the snow mountain by the sandal that was his coating (with which he had smeared his body). [p.18-19] We don't understand how Misra's mind works. His quoted text reads "*-tuṅgam*," while HIS translation reads "colour (*raṅga*)."

Misra crosses the limits of decency, when he denounces the poet for having composed his poetry according to the *kavimārga*, the path of the poets.

Apāre kāvyasaṃsāre kavirekaḥ prajāpatiḥ.
Yathāsmāi 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:

Niyatikṛtaniyamarahitām hlādaikamayīm ananyaparatantrām.
Navarasarucirām nirmitim ādadhatī Bhāratī kaver jayati.

We don't know if Misra saw the following *sūkti* of Bilhaṇa which would be branded by him as "preposterous."

Śrīkhaṇḍacarcāparipāṇḍuro'yam Pāṇḍyaḥ prakāmonnatacārudehaḥ.
Kṣīrodadhikṣīrapariplutasya cāturyam ācāmati Mandarādreḥ. [9:119]

Here the body of the king of Pāṇḍya country is compared with the Mandara mountain! So Bilhaṇa is guilty of using "preposterous" words not only once but at least twice! Not only Bilhaṇa, even *kavikulaguru* Kālidāsa should be charged with the same guilt of saying "preposterous" things as determined by Misra:

Pāṇḍyo'yam aṃsārpitalambahāraḥ klṛptāṅgarāgo haricandanena.
Ābhāti bālātaparaktasānuḥ sanirjharodgāra ivādrirājaḥ.
[*Raghuvamśa*, 6:60]

Since, according to Misra, Bilhaṇa (a Purāṇa Kavi) had no right to say that the body of King Vikrama was as high as the Mountain Himālaya, he suggests that the reading be changed to "*tuṣārācalaraṅgam*." Misra probably would have the following *vigraha* in his mind: "*Tuṣārācalasya raṅga iva raṅgo yasya tam*."

We see expressions like:

Kailāsaśubhraṃ bhavanāṅgaṇaṃ tat. [9:46]

Kailāsagauram vṛṣam ārurukṣoḥ. [Raghuvamśa]

Kundendutuṣārahāradhavalā, etc.

Misra very much would have liked Bilhaṇa say: *Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya!* It is interesting to observe that while preparing a draft for the present publication, Shri Nagaraja Rao of Mysore wrote *Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya*, of course, correcting it subsequently, and not ...*tuṅgam asya*. This phenomenon also shows how variant readings are created.

We also don't know why the Himalayas had to be brought in at all if the unusual height was not intended to be conveyed. There are thousands of other white objects in the universe of poets, their *kāvyaśamsāra*.

A Merciless Murder of the Poetic Muse

With regard to

Cakāra kāntākucapatrabhaṅga-kastūrikāpaṅkakalaṅkitāni.
Varṣājalahrāntivilolahamśa-hāsāni līlāsarasīpayāṃsi. [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 (*vilāṅghayām 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 *devaḥ* "the king" is explicitly given as the subject. [p.19]

The more we read the "suggestions" made by Misra, the more we feel sad. He recommends that "verse 69 should be read before 68 and after 67." This is called *ekaṃ sandhitasato'paraṃ 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 will merely betray our own lack of appreciation of poetic art.

Verse 67 reads:

Devaḥ karāmbhoruhayantradhārām kṣīpan kapole vipulekṣanāyāh.
Kumudvatīkāmīni raṣmidaṇḍam praveśayannarka iva vyarājat. [12:67]

And the next verse 68 reads:

Ānamya līlāparivartanena vilāṅghayāmāsa narendramuktām.
Kaṅṭhonmukhīm kācana kambukaṅṭhī smarāsīdhārām iva vāridhārām. [12:68]

The first verse is the offence. The second is the defence. To put another verse (and all the ideas expressed therein) in between the two would not be appropriate. Since these two verses are like *vāgartha*--one following the other--*devaḥ* (of 69) will get *anuvṛtti* (from 67) and get connected with *cakāra* (of 69). We should not worry at all!

Nagar's Youth & His Atiśayokti

The youth in Nagar in his early twenties was so powerful and hence rash that he declared: *Ja. pustakāc chuddhataram pustakam āvirbhavati ced ito'pyadhikam śodhanam nāsambhavi. Prastāvanā, p.7.* It was an immaturity on his part to think that he had totally exhausted the collation of J and subsequent improvement of the text. There is enough scope even today for a discerning scholar to make some improvements. But Misra has missed all such opportunities. Maybe he did not have enough resources. For example, I have in my possession even today a *true* copy of J.

Here is an interesting example to prove the above point:

Vyadhita tadanu devyāḥ patravallīm kapole
vipulapulakalekhādanturaḥ kuntalenduḥ.
Pratiyuvatibhir ardhe tāḍitaḥ pāṇḍugaṇḍa-
sthalavilūṭhitabāṣpavyaktilakṣyaīḥ 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 "*danturaḥ kuntalenduḥ*" but "*danture kuntalenduḥ*, '*danture*' being an adjective of "*kapole*!" J actually has *danture*! We could not expect such miracle from Bh.

Nagar had missed it. His text is deficient even today! Many of the readings in N are assumptions, i.e. accepted as correct. Wherever there was a doubt, N has examined the MS and other sources with deep insight. I believe if one, not familiar with the poem the way I was, goes through J once again and compares it with N, he might be able to make some improvements. Once a text is almost *kaṇḥastha*, even a wrong reading appears right. This is a psychological phenomenon.

There was no apparent reason to doubt *danturaḥ kuntalenduḥ*. Thus it remained wrong. But once I was going through a similar passage in *Vikramāṅkābhayudaya*. It has *danture kapole*! (or something like that). *Ekasambandhi jñānam aparasambandhismarakam*. I was reminded of the passage in *Vik*. I saw J. It showed *danture* when carefully looked at.

P has *danturakuntalenduḥ*--neither *mātrā* of e, nor *visarga*! No *padaccheda* either! Undoubtedly the *mātrā* on the left was ignored by copyist P. B made it *danturaḥ kunta lenduḥ*. N copied B *via* R. Bh copied N! So that is the story!

Lekhayā luloke [6:19] is one more example.
Nṛpasya vallabhah [14:44] is another example where the text of N remained defective

* * *

Here is one more display of the unusual power of Misra in recommending emendation. Bilhaṇa sang:

Prabuddhakārśyāḥ paritāpasankucat sapaṅkapaṅkeruḥiṇīdalāṅkitāḥ.
Daśām alabdḥābdhisamāgamāś ciraṃ viyogayogyām 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: *pravṛddhakārśyāḥ...nimnagāḥ*, "the rivers whose leanness had grown big..." *prabuddha*- in 13.11d should also be emended to *pravṛddha* by which it is again glossed in ed. ter., commentary. [p. 19]

Misra does not like the word *prabuddha*. We don't know what Misra means by "under the requirement of the text." Once again I have checked J today (Oct.31, 1977). Both the passages [here and in 13:11] still have *prabuddha* very clearly visible. To change from *prabuddha* to *pravṛddha* would be merely an *avyāpāreṣu 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 gurukulakliṣṭo Murāriḥ kaviḥ.

The most appropriate meaning of *prabuddha* here (according to Apte) would be--beginning to work, or take effect.

* * *

Misra presents a long discourse on the following:

Nirantarāghaṭṭitapāṭalādharāḥ kramān nidāghasya ghanoṣmasaṅgināḥ.
Vyaramsiṣuḥ śvāsasamīraṇā iva prabuddhadāvānalabandhavo'nilāḥ.
[13:11]

Cp. *Vanāni dahato vahneḥ sakhā bhavati mārutaḥ*.

He says:

Previous attempts in translating the verse have been banal, since the poet's use of punning (*śleṣa*) in it could not find expression in them. The pun, how it should be understood and explained is as follows:

*nirantarā gha itapā alādharāḥ kramān nidāghasya ghaṇoṣmasaṅginaḥ/
vyaraṃsiṣuḥ śvāsasamīraṇā iva prabuddha(10)dāvānalabandhavo'nilaḥ//*

"The incessant (*nirantarāḥ*) winds that are the friends of the grown/big forest fires (i.e. that are accompanied by forest fires, [or increasing the fury of the fires?] that rubbed (violently shook) the *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 the m) 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 friends [sic] (i.e. equals) are..."

It is difficult even to try to comment on what Misra talks here.

वृक्षो महिरुहाḥ śākhī viṭapī pādapas taruḥ.
Anokahaḥ kuṭaḥ śālah palāśī drudrumāgamāḥ.
[Amarah. 13 *vṛkṣasya*.]

We have no absolute, unrestricted authority to coin our own word like *pā ala-dhara*, *pā ala*=flower, *dhara* = bearer, i.e. bearer of *pā ala* flowers, therefore tree! We have heard words like *jaladhara* and *mahīdhara*., but we have never heard of *puṣpa-dhara* as tree!

Misra is *kartum akartum anyathākartum samarthaḥ*. 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 or so, but I have never seen such an irresponsible work of any writer, Indian or foreigner. Commenting on *Vik.* 13:11, Misra says: "Previous attempts.... a stop." My pen stops right here. I would not want to discuss this further. This writing goes back to 1977.

Kathāpi khalu 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 18 years . Many Indian boys and girls have approached me through letters to help them cross the seven seas in order to study in the USA, the "Land of Opportunities." Many parents have entreated me to get their sons and daughters step on the soil of the Land of Learning. I have always discouraged them. I have tried to make them understand that it is foolish, rather absurd to learn the ABC of any Science or Art in the USA. One should at least become a master in a field of knowledge. Then alone he should go abroad.

I hold the same opinion about Misra. He ought to have learnt the first lessons of poetic criticism in India before he tried to demonstrate his knowledge in a country which is the cradle of modern western studies in Sanskrit.

Kāvyaikalpalatā-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 *Śabdāsiddhi-pratāna*, Amaracandra lays down:

Rūḍhayaugikamiśrākhyās tridhā śabdāḥ prakīrtitāḥ.
Yogo guṇena kriyayā sambandhena kṛto'nvayaḥ.
Sambandhaḥ svasvāmitvādiḥ.

Here are some examples:

Bhūnetā bhūpatir bhūbhuk bhūpālo bhūdhanas tathā.
Bhūmāṁś ceti kave rūḍhyā jñeyodāharaṇāvalī.

Iti śabdaḥ prakārārthaḥ, tena bhūpādayo'pi.

Kavīnām rūḍhiḥ paramparāyātā prasiddhis tayā, na tu kavirūḍhyatikrameṇa. Yathā kapālītyādau satyapi svasvāmi- bhāvasambandhe kapālī matvarthīya eva bhavati, na tu kapālapālaḥ, kapāladhanaḥ, kapālabhuk, kapālanetā, kapālapatir, ityādi. Furthermore Amaracandra instructs the would-be poetic critics like Misra:

Dhāryāt dhvajāstrapāṇyaṅka-maulibhṛnmaṇḍanasamānāḥ.
Dharabhartṛmālimatvartha-śāliśekharasadṛkṣāś ca.

After enumerating certain permissible and acceptable words, Amaracandra rules out any possibility of a display of erudition by half-baked scholars like Misra, which will merely prove that "little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Once again Amaracandra ordains:

Kavirūḍhyetyeva. Tena satyapi dhāryadhārahākabhāva- sambandhe na sarvebhyo dhāryebhyo dhvajādyarthāḥ śabdāḥ prayojyāḥ---Na hi bhavati Gaṅgā- dhara v at Candra dharāḥ.

According to Misra *nijerṣubhiḥ* (p.8 comments on 4:119c) can mean elephants of Vikrama! *Caturaṅga* can mean a moving army (p.21 on 13:36c). He can make *nīlam* st

and for *kamalam* and *śuklaḥ* for *pa aḥ*. 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 we accept for the sake of argument that "the bearers of the *pā ala* blossoms" are the *pā ala* trees, we fail to understand how '*pā aladhara*' could come into being! If we have the *vigraha* like "*pā alāni dharantīti*", the resulting compound word would be *pā aladharāḥ*. Only Misra's extraordinary calibre can bring in the *dīrgha* and make it *pā alādharāḥ*. Even if we say *dharantīti dharāḥ*, we would get only *pā aladharāḥ*. Therefore, Misra's suggestion is absurd, to say the least.

Misra's other statements with reference to this verse are beyond the grasp of the limited knowledge of this writer. So I express my inability to comment on them. They can be understood and discussed only by a man of Misra's capabilities!

* * *

Words of great poets may contain some ideas so deep that they are not easily comprehended by the uninitiated. Critics like Misra not only miss them, but misunderstand them and misinterpret them. For example:

Trṇāni bhūbhṛtkātakeṣu niṣṭipan na kaiḥ sphuraddhīramṛdaṅganisvanaḥ.
Taḍitpradīpaiś caladaṅkalīlayā nidāgham anviṣyati vāridāgamaḥ. [13:36]

This is the reading in all, including J. Misra comments on the above:

13.36c

calad aṅkalīlayā is understood [!] by ed. ter. as "moving with the beauty of a seal", which is impossible because *calat* n. cannot be construed with *vāridāgamaḥ m...* "With the beauty of the moving curved line" (Eng. rend.) is grammatically possible, but gives a very poor sense. The text seems to be not correct. I propose: *caturaṅgalīlayā*: [because you are a *mugdha*, Mr. Misra]

*trṇāni bhūbhṛtka akeṣu niṣṭipan na kaiḥ sphuraddhīramṛdaṅganisvanaḥ/
taḍitpradīpaiḥ caladaṅkalīlayā nidāgham anviṣyati vāridāgamaḥ//*

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 (*caturaṅga*), 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 [abandoned?] by the vanquished armies, cp. 9.113.

This is one more futile attempt on the part of Misra to compose his own poetry rather than to try to understand what the poet had in his mind and interpret it honestly and sincerely.

Misra would force the word *caturaṅga* into the mouth of Bilhaṇa whether the poet likes it or not. According to the great critic and philologist Mr. Misra, *Caturaṅga* (an adjective only) could mean *balam--sainyam*. So *śuklaḥ* can mean *pa aḥ* and *nīlam* can mean *kamalam*. *Caladaṅka* becomes *caturaṅga*. We find ourselves running out of adjectives to offer our criticism to Misra's suggestions. We can once again borrow from Misra his own word "preposterous" to characterize his attempt here to reconstruct. He did not know, he could not know, that what we read here as *caladaṅka* (i.e. the existing reading) is correct one hundred percent--absolutely, positively, undeniably--at least in its second component, *aṅka*.

The facts of the matter are as follows: Bilhaṇa 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. *Caritacandrikā* attempts to explain certain words but shows its inability to comprehend fully the ultimate sense (*bhāvaḥ*) and states at the end: "*tātparyam?*" *Caritacandrikākāra*--that ancient commentator of Śrī Bhāradvāja accepts his limitations. But Bh possesses unlimited knowledge and so he does not want to accept any limitations to it and tries to explain the verse by every possible means. Bh prescribes the following *anvaya* (prose order):

Sphuraddhīramṛdaṅganisvanaḥ aṅkalīlayā calat vāridāgamaḥ bhūbhṛtkaṭakeṣu ṛṇāni nikṣipan kaiḥ taḍitpradīpaiḥ nidāghaṃ na anvīṣyati.

Then he comments on the verse as follows: (*vyākhyā*):

Sphuranto dhīrasya gambhīrasya mṛdaṅgasya nisvanāḥ śabdā iva nisvanā yasya sa, aṅkayati cihnayatītyanena aṅkaḥ "muharachāpa" iti Hindībhāṣāyām, tasya līlā tayā calat gacchat, vāridāgamaḥ varṣākālaḥ, bhūbhṛtkaṭakeṣu parvatanitambeṣu nṛpasenāsu vā ṛṇāni ghāsān nikṣipan samutpādayan, kaiḥ kīḍṛśaiḥ taḍid eva vidyud eva pradīpo [?] dīpas taiḥ, nidāgham grīṣmakālam nānvīṣyati arthāt sarvaprakāreṇa tam anvīṣyatītyarthaḥ. Adyāpi kim kutrāpi nidāgho vartate iti jijñāsayā taḍitpradīpais tasyānveṣaṇam karotīti bhāvaḥ.

Bh has easily drawn the conclusion '*iti bhāvaḥ*', but we fail to understand how did he arrive at the specific "*bhāvaḥ*." The treatment of "*na kaiḥ*" by Bh is *asaṅgata*. Bh shows that he has understood very well. That he did not understand will be fully demonstrated after our present discussion is finished. One reason of the lack of full and immediate intelligibility of this verse lies in "*na kaiḥ*" which appear as if they are two different words! But in reality they are not!! Also the word "*aṅka*" has a special significance

which lies beyond the power of such critics who are not *gurukulakliṣa* and who do not persevere to dig deep into the mine of jewels. They go after quick fame. They get only artificial gem and parade their wares and cheat their customers. *Caritacandrikā* explains all the difficult words except "aṅka". Bh invents his own derivation by skillful manouvering and says: "aṅkayati cihṇayati ityanena aṅkaḥ 'moharachāpa' iti Hindībhāṣā yām." He explains in Hindi: "apane ānekī moharachāpa lagānevālā." (stamp or seal?) . This is all meaningless. We fail to understand what meaning and purpose are attached by Bh to the word "nṛpasenāsu," which he steals outright once again without any acknowledgment, from *Caritacandrikā*. He connects "kaiḥ" with "taḍitpradīpaiḥ" and puts the whole sentence into an interrogative form! He explains "kaiḥ" by the word "kīdrś aiḥ". The word "calat" is the first component of the *karmadhāraya* compound, "Calam ścāsau aṅkaśca caladaṅkaḥ tasya līlayā". But Bh treats it as a separate word and connects it with *vāridāgamah*." Was he unaware of the fact that "calat" becomes "calan" when it is separated and is made to qualify a noun in masculine gender (*vāridāgamaḥ* in this case)? After the *sandhi*, we would have *calannaṅkalīlayā*, which will totally ruin the metre. We wonder, however, if Bh is aware of his shortcoming? Probably not. Is he really satisfied with his performance? But Misra is aware of Bh's blunder! He was not convinced.

Here we have a figure of speech called *utprekṣā*. It is defined as: *Sambhāvanam at hotprekṣā 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, as though, the rainy season is searching the "nid āgha" or the Summer. He creates the other attributes of the *aprakṛta* world by his own imagination.

Jalhaṇa in his *Sūktimuktāvalī* quotes a verse, ascribed to Pāṇini, which expresses somewhat similar ideas. The verse reads as follows:

Kṣapāḥ kṣāmīkṛtya prasabham apahr̥tyāmbu saritām
 pratāpyorvīm̐ kṛtsnāḥ tarugahanam ucchoṣya sakalam.
 Kva sampratyuṣṇām̐sur gata iti tadālokanaparās
 taḍiddīpālokā dīśi dīśi carantīha jaladāḥ.
 Jalhaṇa, 61:18.

Bh repeats the words of *Caritacandrikā* (*śukavākyapā ham*) and gives two meanings of "bhūbhṛtka akeṣu--that is, *parvatanitambeṣu nṛpasenāsu vā*." But he does not ask himself what is the significance of the second meaning, *nṛpasenāsu*, the *aprakṛta* or *upamāna*."

There is the thunder. It is expressed by the poet specifically and separately, yet it is hidden in a misreading which N could not detect in the early 1940's, when he was a y

young beginner, but which he was able to do later after studying other texts. Then he was able to recommend a new reading. In order to supply the word signifying thunder, Bh has resorted to a strange compound and says "*sphuranto dhīrasya gambhīrasya mṛdaṅgasya nisvanāḥ śabdā iva nisvanā yasya.*" The word "*nikṣīpan*" is interpreted by Bh to mean "*samutpādayan*" which again is only the *prakṛta* and not *aparakṛta*.

Let us present these two sets of thoughts in parallel columns and find out what is missing in this puzzle and then try if we can supply it:

PRAKṚTA (UPAMEYA)	APRAKṚTA (UPAMĀNA)
tṛṇa (green grass)	tṛṇa (hay)
bhūbhṛtkaṭaka, i.e.	bhūbhṛtkaṭaka, i.e.
parvatanitamba	nṛpasainya
????	vīramṛdaṅganisvana [dhīra is wrong. It has to be vīra]
taḍit	pradīpa
vāridāgama	????

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 *aparakṛtas*. We don't know what they mean by "alone with the beauty of a moving curved line."

The true purport of this verse remained obscure until this author read a relevant passage in the *Mānasollāsa* worded as follows:

Ekam uddīśya sarvān vā birudaṃ pāṭhayet tu yaḥ. 34

Gāyayed vādayed vā'pi kāhalāṃ vā madoddhataḥ.
Āruhya mahiṣam darpād divā dīpam pradīpayet. 35

Tṛṇāni vikīran vīthyāṃ birudāṅko nigadyate.
[Adhyāya 4, Viṃśati 4, verses 34--36. GOS. 84, pt. 2]

The challenger, who is at the height of his glory and pride, almost blinded by his own utter superiority, causes his eulogy to be read aloud or sung in public. The eulogy is aimed at one (the most powerful) or all---anyone who is ready to meet the challenge! A large drum is beaten to announce his challenge. He rides a buffalo in self-arrogance and lights lamps even during the day. He strews grass in the path. Such a challenger, hero, is called *birudāṅka*.

Mānasollāsa defines the "aṅka" as follows:

Yena vā yuddhyate sārddham ekaḥ khalakadhāmani. 28

Samenāstreṇa yaḥ tajjnair aṅkaḥ sa parikīrtitaḥ. [Adhyāya 4, Viṃśati 4, verse 28 second half and 29 first half. GOS 84, pt. 2, p. 225] *Vikramāṅkābhyudaya* also has a similar passage:

Kadācit kareṇukārūḍhān puro vādyamānavīramṛdaṅgān... cf. *praka itavīramṛdaṅg adhīranādaḥ*. *Vik.* 6:68.2. udbhaṭadarpavipaṇimārgavikīrṇatṛṇān... aṅkapha[kha?]la ke yodhayāmāsa. [p. 26, 1. 13--2]

Thus it is seen that what Bh has tried to derive out of *aṅka* is a totally irrelevant meaning. "*Aṅkayati cihnayati ityanena ankaḥ, 'moharachāpa' iti Hindībhāṣāyām*" is an attempt to extract a meaning which does not exist at all! And what we get is totally useless. Once again we are reminded of Bilhaṇa's words: *Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti*. *Aṅka* is the hero, the 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 "*nikṣipanna kaiḥ*." N has separated the last two words and reads "*nikṣipan na kaiḥ*." That is dumb! This is copied by Bh. J too has "*-nnakaiḥ*". The J, as is usual with most of the MSS., does not separate the words. The letters "*ka*" and "*va*" resemble each other so closely (in J) that they are liable to be confused and interchanged. "*Nra*" and "*nna*" when written in the specific Devanagari script of J are almost identical in appearance. If these statements of facts are accepted as valid bases for interpretation, we easily get the word "*ravaiḥ*" which becomes the *prakṛta*, the thunder of the clouds! Also it is better to read "*sphuradvīramṛdaṅga*" instead of "*sphuraddhīramṛdaṅga*", because what is beaten to announce the call for challenge (*āhvāna*, *lalakāranā* in Hindi) is the drum of bravery and not merely a deep [grave!] sound of a drum. Even in the passage from the *Vikramāṅkābhyudaya* quoted above, we have *vīramṛdaṅga* and not *dhīramṛdaṅga*. "*Vīra*" is the original reading. Now we have the full complement of the *aprakṛta* with all its attributes-- the challenger, the army of the king, victory-drum, and the lamp.

Although the above reading incorporating the word "*ravaiḥ*" is a pure conjecture on the part of Nagar, not yet substantiated by any MS. or other evidence, yet the verse cannot be explained unless and until we make this kind of a bold suggestion. Some other worthier scholar (I mean truly) might be able to offer another interpretation which might be more acceptable. Until then we can stay with this reading.

Monier-Williams explains: *aṅkaḥ* = a military show or sham-fight, and *aṅkakāraḥ* = a champion chosen by each side to decide a battle. We have many examples of the use of this word as given below. Apte says: *aṅkakāraḥ* = a champion warrior, *tvatkāṅk akāravijaye tava Rāma Laṅkā. Bālarāmāyaṇa*, Act. 8. *Practical Sanskrit English dictionary*. Rev. & enl. ed. (3rd). 1965. Appendix, p. 1.

Here is the full text:

Rājaśekharaṇṭam Bālarāmāyaṇam nāma nāṭakam. Tatra Vīravilāso nāmāṣṭam o'ṅkaḥ.

Lañkeśvareṇa... Dāśarathim abhidhātum abhihitam...

Sa niśācaracakravartī tvām āha yaduta kim akhila-vānara-rākṣasa-kṣayakareṇa sa ṃgrāmeṇa, tad ekam tulā-dyūtam pravartayāvaḥ. Tatra ca

Tvatkāṅkakāravijaye tava Rāma Lañkā
Sītā ca te punar iyaṃ bhavato'stu dārāḥ.
Matkāṅkakāravijaye tu mamādhipatyam
tasyāṃ ca te puri kalatrajane ca tatra.

* * *

And

gauraguṇair ahañkṛtibhṛtām jaitrāṅkakāre... [Naiṣadhīyacaritam, 12:84]

The fame of his arms having gone afar like a champion warrior, conquering all objects proud of their own whiteness, the timid night lotus sleeps not at night; the wreath of mallika blossoms on the braid of thy hair crouches in fear; the terrified moon perspires, shedding its nectar. [Context: *svayaṃvara*] Tr. by Krishna Kanta Handiqi. Poona, 1965. pp.189-90.

And here is one more relevant passage from *Vikramāṅkābhyudaya*:

Tasyātmabhavaḥ prakāmaṣamasamgrāmalabdhavijayo Vijayādityaś cakravartī b abhūva, yaś caikākī niṣṭipyāmātyeṣu rājyabhāram ekāṅgavīro nigūhitaniṅkārāḥ Sing haladvīpe, [sic] Kāñcīpure, Veṅgyām, Gaṅgapāṭikāyām ca darpāt prakāṭitāsīdhenuvi dyo niravadyaparā- kramanihatapratyaṅkakāro niravadyam nāma lebhe.

In our earlier passage just quoted above, we noted *ekāṅgavīraḥ*. We have also seen *pratyāṅkakārāḥ*. Here (in the following verse) we have *ekāṅgabha aḥ*.

Karoti caitraḥ saha candanānilaiḥ kim indunā kokilapañcamena ca.
Na vidyate jetur anaṅgabhūpateḥ kim anyad ekāṅgabhaṭas tvayā samaḥ. [13:73]

Thus it is proved that Misra's suggestion to read *caturaṅga* in place of *caladaṅka* is unsound.

Reference has already been to Misra's fn.: "throwing down grass on...the camps of the kings." (13)

fn.13. "Throwing grass on" [the camps] is used in the sense of: making them left by the vanquished armies. cp.9.113."

Once again Misra shows his lack of knowledge. The challenger throws (*ni + kṣip* = scatters, strews, casts) grass on the ground as part of the process of challenging: *trṇāni vikīran vīthyām* or *vīpaṇīmārgavikīrṇatrṇān*.

Misra asks us to compare the following verse:

Yasya pratāpo'gnir apūrva eva
jāgarti bhūbhṛtkāṭakasthalīṣu.
Yatra praviṣṭe ripupārthivānām
trṇāni rohanti gṛhāṅgaṇeṣu. [9:113]

This allusion is irrelevant. In *trṇāni bhūbhṛtaka akeṣu*, the *prakṛta* is "growing (causing to grow) (green) grass on the mountain slopes," and the *aparakṛta* is "strewing, scattering, casting down, dry grass (hay) in the camps of kings." So to bring in the idea of causing the grass (rather weeds) to grow because of desertion (*udvasannagarī*) (9:113) is ridiculous. There the cause is totally different.

Therefore, we may conclude that neither Misra nor Bh has really understood Bilhana, but both have only attempted to emend or interpret according to their own whims and caprices. It is all *gha ā opo bhayaṅkaraḥ*. Shri Nagaraj Rao of Mysore tells me that even today, *aṅka* means a challenge fight (like that of cocks) in Kannada.

Before we leave this topic, I would like to point out that I am not yet fully satisfied with *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 gamaḥ*. But then we will have the problem of its turning into "*calan*." Could *caladaṅka* be *birudāṅka*, or some such word? It cannot be *aṅkakāra*, but we need a "challenger", and not just a "challenge" or sham fight, or a "*citrayuddha*."

The art of reconstruction is a very delicate and skilful task. We have to change, if at all absolutely essential, as little as possible. I have been thinking over this problem now-a-days (March 1990). I think we need a *prakṛta* to be in *sāmānādhikarāṇya* 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*!!! We leave this problem for the next generation to think upon and resolve.

This is how the verse would read after all the above discussion and decision:

Trṇāni bhūbhṛtkāṭakeṣu nikṣīpan ravaiḥ sphurdvīramṛdaṅganisvanaḥ.
Taḍitpradīpair jaladāṅkalīlayā nidāgham anviṣyati vāridāgamaḥ.

* * *

Bh creates a bitter controversy over:

Namatyayaḥśyāmalaśaṣpamaṅḍala-sthitendragopapracayāsu vāridaḥ.
Giristhalīṣu cyutaśakrakārmuka- bhramād ivodbhrāntataḍidvilocanaḥ. [13:37]

This is one of those examples cited by Bh where he has gone against the reading of N! In his opinion he has improved. We don't know if M read the conclusions of both N and Bh with regard to the worthlessness of R ed. The attempt on the part of Bh to assert the supremacy of "namatyayam" over "namatyayah" reminds us of the following *sadukti*:

Ghaṭaṃ bhindyāt paṭaṃ chindyāt kuryād vā rāsabhadhvanim.
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!

N had commented upon R's ed. as early as 1945 in the following words:

Sva. Ma. Ma. Śrī Paṃ. Rāmāvatāraśarmaṇāṃ nāmnā saṃskṛtam 1927 I. varṣe [sic. in reality published in 1978 Vikramābda, i.e. 1921/22 A.D.] Kāśikajñānamaṇḍalāt prakāśitaṃ saṃskaraṇam idam doṣeṣu prathamam satyamevātīsete. Atra prathamasaṃskaraṇasthā- śuddhiṣu kvacidamaṣataḥ śodhitāsvapi [note] naikatra nūtanāśuddhiparamparāśrīṣṭir eva dṛṣṭipathaṃ prayāti. Etatsaṃskartrā prathamasaṃskaraṇasthāśuddhyaśud dhipatram api na vyalokīti citram. Etanmudraṇādikaṃ tathā viśṛṅkhalam asti yathā tad avalokya ciraṃ cekhidyate cetaḥ. [*Prastāvanā*, p. 5]

An examiner examining a group of answer books is easily able to detect who steals from whom! Bh is truly a *nakalchī bandar*! In my *Prastāvanā* on p. 5, I have erroneously given 1927 (A.D.) as the date of publication of R ed. It is wrong. In reality it is 1921/22, because its date (as given in the book) is 1978 Vikrama era. Bh copied the wrong date on page 1 of his "*Kiñcit Prastāvika*"! With reference to the editor R, he calls him his *guruvaryāṇām*. Did Bh really see the book even once in his life time from a critical point of view? He just copies N in its evaluation except that he insists that in some cases he has changed N's readings. The changes are for "worse", rather than for "better." Misra, by the way, correctly gives the date on p. 111 of his *Bibliography*.

Nagar continues:

Khaniprādurbhūtaṃ ratnaṃ sadyo malinam eva jāyate. Paraṃ yāthārthyena kalāni ṣṇāto janas tat kaṣaṇādinā manojñīkṛtya lokasamakṣam upasthāpayati. Ḍā. Byuhlara-

saṃskaraṇadoṣā na khalu na soḍhavyāḥ. Sa tvāsīt prāthamikaḥ prayāsaḥ. Paraṃ dod
ūyate'ntaḥkaraṇaṃ yadrāmāvatāraśarmaṇaṃ saṃskaraṇe tad ratnaṃ paṅkakaḷāṅkita
m eva dṛṣṭi-gocaram āyāti, kutas tāvat punar ujjvalīkṛtiḥ. Tatra khalu Dā. Byuhlarasa
ṃskaraṇāśuddhayaḥ tu nāmnaiva saṃsodhitāḥ, [note again] paraṃ tato'pyadhikāḥ sṛ
ṣṭā nūtanāśuddhayaḥ. Prathamasaṃskaraṇasthāśuddhi- saṅkhyā dvitīye dviguṇībhūy
a 400 aṅkaṃ bhajate. [*Upodghāta*. p.

4]

Nevertheless Bh insists on R's reading, which is the product of some fertile brain of
a thoughtless and senseless person who was asked to go through the text and offer so
me corrections. Whether the person was a *mūrkhāśiromaṇi* (crest-jewel of the fools), o
r Bṛhaspati himself, it is evident that he did not understand the meaning of the compou
nd word *ayaḥśyāmalaśaṣpamaṇḍalasthitendragopapracayāsu*.

To support "*namatyayam*" over "*namatyayaḥ*" is totalitarian dictatorship or simply a f
ool's obstinacy. But that is exactly what Bh does. He asserts: "*namatyayaḥ iti pā hāt n
amatyayam iti pā ha eva samīcīnaḥ*." [Mark *eva!*] He does not advance any argument.
He does not give any cogent reason. He merely dictates. Cf. his statement on "*yasyā b
hrātā*", 18:47. Bh overlooks the dictum: *Ekākinī pratijñā hi pratijñātaṃ na sādhayet*--M
ere assertion does not validate a theory.

Once again we would like to remind pseudo-critics like Bh that appreciation of poet
y is not an exact, verifiable science. It is a subtle art--a feeling--which can be experie
nced only through the cultivated senses. We have: a) *śuṣko vṛkṣas tiṣṭhatyagre*. We m
ay also have b) *nīrasatarur iha vilasati purataḥ*. How can we prove by any scientific e
vidence or methodology that (b) is much more charming than (a)?

We can only conclude that someone did not know what "*namatyayaḥśyāmala*" mean
t. And so he made it "*namatyayaṃ śyāmala!*" Such critics have existed all along since
the creation of this universe. It is with reference to such simpletons that a great poet s
ang long, long ago:

Bindudvandvataṅgitāgrasaraṇiḥ kartā śirobindukam
karmeti kramaśikṣitānvayakalā ye ke'pi tebhyo'ñjaliḥ. (or tebhyo namaḥ)

A true *sahṛdaya* reader may recall:

Kimapi kimapi mandaṃ mandam āsattiyogād
aviralitakapolam jalpator akramaṇa.
Aśīthilaparirambhavyāpṛtaikaikadoṣnor
aviditagatayāmā rātrir eva vyaramṣīt.
(*Uattarrāmacarita*)

Once upon a time there was a heartless, senseless, thoughtless, careless fellow who
tried to improve this *kavīndrokti* and recommended that the penultimate word be cha
nged to *evam!* No further comments are necessary.

Let us see what the poet wants to say: It is the rainy season. It is raining dogs and cats. The plateaus (the mountain tops, the table-lands) are dark green, very green indeed. There are millions of tiny red insects. All of a sudden there is a terrible flash of lightning. This is all *prakṛta*, the reality; a statement of facts. Now the poet creates his own world of fancy and fiction. The cloud gets scared: "Did the bow of Indra (rainbow) fall down? Did I pour so heavily? Did I fell it?" The ground strewn with red insects is imagined to be the rainbow, fallen down on the ground, as it were, from the sky, by the force of the torrential rain! The flash of lightning is imagined to be the scared eyes of the cloud. Such a ground is mistaken for the rainbow.

Now a discerning reader, a true *sahṛdaya* can place his hand on his heart and answer the following question: There are two possible meanings: (1) This cloud or (2) the ground is dark green, like *ayas* (steel). Which of the two would make a better sense? A person with a cultivated (saṃskṛta) mind, capable of appreciating the beauties of a poetic genius like Bilhaṇa will immediately say that a dark green background will show the beauties of the red insects far far better than if it is otherwise, i.e. green only, or light green. Now in spite of all this, if someone insists on *namatyayaṃ śyāmala-* we can only fold our hands in reverence and say--*ye ke'pi tebhyo'ñjaliḥ*. We may also remind the pretender, who does not have a heart, tender like a lotus, but has a machine as hard as a cinder:

Śūro'si kṛtavidyo'si darśanīyo'si putraka.
Yasmin kule tvam utpanno gajas tatra na hanyate.

Although the translation of B and G is like a plastic rose (flower) devoid of any fragrance or soft touch, as compared to the real one, yet it is clear enough not to allow any sensible person go on insisting on an absurd interpretation. B and G say:

The cloud, with its lightning-eye perplexed, is bending low on the mountains on which there is a multitude of fireflies in the grass black as iron, as if owing to an illusion of the rainbow that has dropped down. [stress added]

We have shown throughout this study--here, there, and everywhere-- how miserably B and G fail to represent the poet's *hārda* in a true and faithful manner. One more example is presented here: They have translated "indragopa" as fire-flies. It is not true. We simply fail to understand why they did not consult the *Caritacandrikā* which had explained this verse in early forties when its writer was only in his early twenties. This is what *Candrikā* stated:

Ayo lauham tadvat śyāmaleṣu śaṣpamaṇḍaleṣu bālatṛṇasamūheṣu sthitā indragopān
āṃ śonavarnakīṭavīṣeṣāṇāṃ (Hi. bīrabahūṭī) pracayā yāsu tāsu....

In spite of this B & G say--"fire-flies"! The Sanskrit equivalent for "fire-flies" is *khadyataḥ!* It is glow-worm. Yet it does not constantly glow. It does not continuously shine. Its shining is intermittent.

Also to be noted is the word "*sthita*" used by Bilhaṇa. A fly does not remain "*sthita*". It FLIES. It is *cañcala!* *Indragopas* are red insects confined to the ground. They are

called (in English) *cochineal* insects. They are used to produce a dye. How sincerely we wish these translators had been more thoughtful.

As we stated earlier, Bh does not advance any argument. However, Misra does. Here is what he says:

13.37a

For *ayaḥ* "iron" (in earlier edd.). ed. ter. reads *ayam* "this" (taken from the ed. of Pt. Rāmāvatāra Śarmā). *ayaḥśyāmala-*, "black as iron", in itself would make good sense. Yet, since the description concerns here a single detail--one particular cloud--of the rainy season *ayaṃ...vāridaḥ*, "this (particular)... cloud", seems called for. Cp. next verse ; *amī payomucaḥ*, "those (particular) clouds." [p.21]

We need not tell Mister Misra that if the poet wanted to have "one" cloud, his purpose would have been easily served by the singular number--*vāridaḥ namati!* Misra is not unaware of the fact that R, which is full of innumerable inaccuracies, seems to have been associated by someone with the great name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍita Rāmāvatāra Śarmā. The question is how much faith we could place in that someone?

If what we are writing now in the following paragraphs is true, Misra will prove to be a very careless writer.

Misra alludes to the next verse--*amī payomucaḥ*. He translates *amī* as "those", i.e. *prathamābahuvacanam--asau, amū, amī*. He brings *payomucaḥ* in *sāmānādhikaranya* with *amī*. He translates the word *payomucaḥ* as the clouds, i.e. *prathamābahuvacanam*. We cannot believe that a person who claims to have earned a Ph.D. on this writing, can write all this. Let us read the full verse once again:

Amī viyannīlasarojamaṇḍala- pralambanālapratimallaḍambarāḥ.
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 *śaṣṭhyekavacanam*. The meaning is not "these clouds" but the torrential rain--*dhārānicayāḥ* of this cloud! *Ke patanti? Dhārānicayāḥ patanti!* Whose? Of the cloud--one cloud--not many. Misra's gurus must not have even seen what he wrote and presented as his doctoral dissertation!

Before we leave this topic we may cite for our sensible readers a *sadukti* expressing similar sentiments:

Nirīkṣya vidyunnayanaiḥ payodo mukhaṃ niśāyām abhisārikāyāḥ.
Dhārānipātaiḥ saha kiṃ nu vāntaś candro'yam ityārtataraṃ rarāsa.
Smk. 71:7 *Abhisārikāpaddhatiḥ*.
Hariharasya? Rather anonymous.

Bh as translator

I have not yet gone through the translation work of Bh in its entirety. But whatever I have seen is enough to hurt a *sahṛdaya*. We are not sure if Bh really understands the poet's heart and soul.

Let us take the verse 13:54:

Payodavṛndaṃ gaganasthalollasat-taḍillatādohadakardamadyuti.
Cakāsti saṅkrāntakalaṅkam ambhasām nabhaścyutānām iva gālanāmśukam. [13:54]

Bh translates the quarter ...*taḍillatādohadakardamadyuti* as follows:

"yā taḍidrūpiṇī latā tasyā dohadarūpo" (īpsito) yo [sic] kardamaḥ" ("dohadasyārthaḥ 'khāda' iti "Hindyām") [!] "paṃkaḥ pañko'strī sādakardamau" ityamarāḥ"; "tasya" "dyu tiriva dyutiḥ kāntir" yasya tat.

We are learning for the first time in our life that the word *dohada* in Hindi means *khāda*, i.e. manure or fertilizer! Bh might have thought that since there is *latā* (creeper) we must have the manure as well! That may be his logic. No Hindi dictionary gives the meaning as claimed by Bh. Of course, the *Śabdakalpadruma* of Rājā Rādha Kānta Deva (Vārāṇasī, 1967) says: *Dohadaḥ puṃ. kl. (doham ākarṣaṃ dadātīti. doha+da+kaḥ) garbhīnyabhilāṣaḥ. Sāda iti bhāṣa.*" It does not say *khāda*. It says *sāda*. Also it does not say Hindi *bhāṣā*, but only *bhāṣā*. Now this lexicographer hailed from Bengal. His *bhāṣā* would naturally be Bengali. Well, in Bengali *sāda* does mean *icchā, abhīlāṣa, garbhīṇira sprīhā and dohada*. Also, it is to be noted that *sāda* is derived from *sādha = icchā*.

However, MW lists one of the meanings of *dohada* as a kind of fragrant substance used as manure, *Naish.* 1:82.

* * *

Misra exemplifies *Ghuṇākṣaranyāya*:

Here is an exceptional case. In understanding and interpreting the following verse N committed an error. Misra corrects it. We can call it only a *ghuṇākṣaranyāya*:

Sarvadaiva hṛdayaṃ malīmasam na kṣaṇam sprīṣati te prasannatām.
Tat khalatvam akhilopatāpinaḥ puṣpakārmukanṛpasya vallabha. [14:44]

Misra says:

14.44c

Instead of *khalatvam*", "rogishness", which cannot be construed unless one makes an arbitrary addition like "*tava niścitam eva*" (ed. ter., comm.) and changes the nominative *vallabhaḥ* into the vocative *vallabha*, read *tat khala tvam...vallabhaḥ*, therefore, thou rogue, art the friend of... [p. 22]

This is one of those rare instances where Misra makes some sense and improves the reading of N. N went against all [as far as *vallabhaḥ* is concerned] and suggested the reading [he] *vallabha* for *vallabhaḥ* because he took *khalatvam* (*bhāve*) as one word meaning *duṣ atvam*. He did not notice the *padaccheda* (break of the words) between *khala* and *tvam* in J! Bühler does not have the *padaccheda*! Neither does R. N here has proved the truth of the age-old saying: *Ekam sandhitsu'param pracyavate*. In trying to keep *khalatvam* as one word, he erroneously changed *vallabhaḥ* to *vallabha*. Bh follows N blindly. He has no thinking of his own! However, Misra brings out to light the real purport of the poet.

Today [Oct. 31, 1977] I saw J once again after I read Misra. There IS a sign of *padaccheda* between "khala" and "tvam". Also on the top there is a gloss "he" for "khala" ! [*sambodhanam*!]

* * *

Bilhaṇa composed:

Subhaṭaḥ pramadākarārpitām dalayan nāgarakhaṇḍvīṭikām.
Ripudantighaṭāsu khaṇḍanam ṭṛṇam utsāhavaśād amanyata. [15:6]

Misra reads:

Subhaṭaḥ pramadākarārpitam dalayan nāgarakhaṇḍavīṭikām. [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-- *nāgarakhaṇḍavī ikām*.

Also, could we have one word--*ripudantigha āsukhaṇḍanam* and have *gha ānām* in the *vigraha* ? J however has a *padaccheda* between *gha āsu* and *khaṇḍanam*.

* * *

Here is an interesting point. In *Sūktimuktāvalī*, *Hemantapaddhatiḥ* 63:8 and 63:9 (16:14 and 16:15 of *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*) appear as follows:

A Samakṣam api sūryasya paryabhūyata padminī.
Tejasvino'pi kurvanti kiṃ kāla vaśam āgatāḥ. 8

B Madvairiṇaḥ kaṭhorāṃśor iyaṃ praṇayabhūr iti.
Roṣād iva tuṣāreṇa paryabhūyata padminī. 9

Bilhaṇa's order is:

16:14 B [.4 *niradahyata padminī*. *Niradahyata* is much better in the context.
16:15 A

Misra notices only 16:14. He does not notice 16:15. Does it not add further weight to the inference that he did not consult the original source, i. e. "Smk"'s edn. (GOS)!

Of course, repeating the same *paryabhūyata* is no good composition. So Bilhaṇa's original is preferable.

* * *

Wrong Construction Leads to Destruction

We can see how wrong construction of readings of B creates a destruction of the meaning in the following verse:

Gaurīvibhramadhūpadhūmapaṭalaśyāmāyamānodarāḥ
kaṅṭhakoṣodabhayān na ye kavalitāḥ Śrīkaṅṭhakaṅṭhoragaiḥ.
Sphāronmīlitaśāradāgrhabṛhaddvārāgraghaṅṭāravās
te ślāghām alabhanta Kuntalapateḥ Kailāsaśailānilāḥ.
[16:51]

The third and fourth lines in B read as follows:

Sphāronmīlitaśāradāgrhabṛhaddvārān mudā nirgatās
te ślāghām alabhanta Kuntalapateḥ Kailāsaraudrānilāḥ.
(underlined *Byuhlarakavi-vacanam*)

The destruction created by the wrong reconstruction in the text may be presented and explained as follows:

16:51.1 *śyāmāyamodarāḥ* P. (omission and wrong copying by P. J is correct).

16:51.2 All have *kṣoda*. My conjecture is *kṣobha*.

16:51.3 *-grhabṛddvāravāste* --P. (omission). J has *grhavṛhaddvārāgraghaṅṭāravās*
te. Letters *h a d-rā gra gha ṅ ā* not copied by P. In other words, although J
does contain these five specific letters, they have been inadvertently omitted by P!

16:51.3 *-grhabṛhaddvārān mudā nirgatās*. B attempts to emend. There is no
achievement! It proves to be a fruitless effort.

16:51.4 *Kailāsaraulānilāḥ* 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
n
P. Cf 6:46.3 reading of P *viśikharāka*, where *śa* has been mistaken for *rā*.
Two occurrences of one type of error.

16:51.4 *Kailāsarauḍrānilāḥ* B. *Raudra* (=fierce) winds are not applauded. They

won't get *ślāghā* of Kuntalapati. Absence of any sense created where perfect sense was reigning supreme.

Together J has:

Sphā ro nmī li ta śā ra dā gṛ ha bṛ ha ddvā rā gra ghaṇ ṭā ra vās

P has:

Sphā ro nmī li ta śā ra dā gṛ ha bṛ 0 ddvā 0 0 0 0 ra vās

B has:

Sphā ro nmī li ta śā ra dā gṛ ha bṛ ha ddvā rā nmu dā nir ga tās

So P omitted second *ha*. Bühler restored it correctly.

P omitted *rā* after *ddvā*. Bühler restored it correctly.

P also omitted three more letters: *[a] gra ghaṇ 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 vā* (= sound) of P, i.e. last two letters of the *carāṇa*. And he created through his own imagination six letters (including one *halanta*) *rān mudā nirgatās* as the substitutes. Let it be reiterated that his first letter is a correct restoration. However, *nmudā nirgatās* is merely a wild guess. It does not convey the meaning intended by the poet. The editor had a right to create through his own imagination any number of letters to bring some plausible meaning. However, we wonder if he had any right to throw away the two most significant letters *ra vā* meaning the sound already existing in J, copied by him, and existing also in P.

We may try to provide an explanation as to why this mistake originally occurred. Probably while copying, the eyes of P jumped from first *ra* to second *ra* in consonance with the *maṇḍūkaphlutinyāya* (maxim of the jumping of the frog) or what we have termed *netrocchalanam*. Originally this is how [...] he might have read [We cannot reproduce the diagram here through letters. It will have to be drawn graphically.] *śāradāgṛhab rddvā....ravās*. Thus the letters represented by ellipses were totally omitted.

In brief, B really missed only "*a gra ghaṇ ā*." Since he did not have the *ghaṇ ā*, 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 *sphāronmīlita-śāradā-gṛha-bṛhaddvār ān mudā nirgatās* as "coming out of the huge gates of Durga's [!] house, the gates that were thrown open with great force, etc. [How Śāradā could be translated as Durgā unless we treat Mahākālī, Mahālakṣmī and Mahāssarasvatī as one here! But that is not the issue here.] The above quotation is a re-translation in English of his German words. The original German in full reads: Indische Stimmungsbilder, Sieben Episoden des "

Vikramanka-deva caritam aus dem Sanskrit uebersetzt und erklart, von August Haack . Sudoll bei Ratibor, 1899. p. 84.

51. Die durch das grosse, mit einem Prall geoffnete Thor des Hauses der Durga her ausgekommenen Kailasa Winde, welche von den Schlangen, der Perlenschnur Civa s's, aus Furcht vor dem Zermalmern des Halses nicht verschluckt worden sind - dunkelbraun sind ihre Hohlungen durch die -Rauchmassen des aūcherwerks bei den Buhlkunsten Gauri's -empfangen mit Freuden den Lobpreis des Kuntalakonigs.

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 (5 in number)--*rāgraghaṇ ā* and the editor B subsequently activated and energised his own poetic muse and invented certain substitute letters, thus making the whole reading as *nmudā nirgatās*. Thus the most significant element, the *ghaṇ 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*" "*ṇ ā*".

We maintain that Bühler took undue liberty with the poet. He ought to have left the lacuna as it was found in P. The best or utmost he could have done is to enclose his conjectural reading within [] square brackets. His performance was unscholarly at least in this instance. It was not a reconstruction, but utter destruction.

Banerji and Gupta do not acknowledge N's text as their source, yet they had the word *ghaṇ ārava* and so they could speak of the "chime of bells." Their translation reads:

[The] winds from the mount Kailāsa, which wafted [?] the chime of bells in front of the huge doors of the temple of Śāradā 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 amorous sports [?] of Gaurī, received eulogy from the king of Kuntala.

The translators have taken the word *unmīlita* 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* or *cālana*" or *vāyuprerita*, etc. "Waft" means "to cause to move, or go lightly by, or as if by the impulse of wind or waves." According to Monier-Williams, "waft" (of English) could be translated in Sanskrit, as *śanaiḥ śanair vāyau vah, or āni, vayanā prer or praṇud or upanud.*"

The reason why the serpents of Śiva did not swallow the Kailāsa winds lies in the fact that they contained the smoke of Gauri's *vibhramadhūpa* incense. As compared to *śoda* the term *kṣobha* is preferable. Air filled with smoke is likely to be less palatable (desired for). The first line of the verse narrates the cause and the second its effect. T

he translators have missed the significance of this phenomenon. The adjective *sphāro nmīlita* does not qualify the doors of the Śāradā temple, but the *ghaṇ ārava*, the sound of the bells, which was highly magnified by the strong gusts of winds. cf. *Jālodgīrṇair upacitavapuḥ keśasaṃskāradhūpaiḥ. Meghadūta*. Also Bilhaṇa himself: *Kuryād anār dreṣu kim aṅganānām keśeṣu kṛṣṇāgurudhūpavāsah*.

N has correctly explained the passage in his Candrikā:

Sphāram atyartham unmīlito vistāraṃ nītaḥ Śāradāgrhasya Kāśmīra-Sarasvatī-ma ndirasya bhāddvārāgreṣu sthitānām ghaṇṭānām ravo yais te.

These words of N have been copied by Bh, syllable by syllable--*akṣaraśah*--of course, as is usual with him without any acknowledgment, none whatsoever! Let it be emphasized that N has indicated the direct quotations from J gloss by enclosing its words within two asterisks.

Misra Tries to Show Off

Misra just wanted to show off. One of his chapters is headed "Secondary Source Material Relating to Vikramāṅkadevacarita.

So Misra decided to tell the world that the text of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* here has been corrected by N with the help of some secondary source material. It is not true. N is not a *kāvyārthacaura* that he would not disclose his source! Had he taken any help from any of the so called "secondary" sources of Misra, he would have certainly acknowledged it in his *Prastāvanā*. We are not sure if Misra even read N's *Prastāvanā*. N's text is based on J. Whatever is there [in N] is found in J even today, unless otherwise specified.

Misra confuses between J and P, maybe deliberately. On p. 63 under 16:51(c) he says:

In: Vcar. MS. the syllables *ha* in *bṛhat* and *rāgraghaṇ ā* are left out. Bühler (ed. pri.) tried to fill the gap by his wording, ed. sec. changed silently following secondary tradition. (Smk 63:22).

This is an unjust assumption on the part of Misra. It seems he thinks himself to be omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent. Misra is mistaken if he believed that his (of Misra) Vcar MS. here is J! The footnote no. 6 on p. 175 of N reads: *grhabṛddvāravāste ślā ghā*- P. Now "P" does not mean "J". Misra ought to have read pages one to three of N's *Prastāvanā*. This omission of J by P and subsequent attempt on the part of Bühler to restore the text were so significant that they were specifically noted by N as illustrations of Bühler's futile attempts to restore the text.

On page 3 N clearly says:

Param ito'dhikaṃ vismayāvahāni bahūni viparīta-sthalānyapi pura upatiṣṭhanti. Tat hāhi pra. pustake *br̥ddvāravāste* (ṣoḍa. 51) ityaśuddhaḥ pāṭho'sti. Ja. pusake tvadyāpi *br̥haddvārāgrahaṇ āravāste* iti spaṣṭam evāste.

Misra alleges that N changed "silently". [Does he mean "stealthily?" He expected N to announce it with a grand beating of drums as he himself does time and again! The same kind of phenomenon we witness with regard to *Caritacandrikā*. Bh took it to be an ancient work and continued to believe so in spite of my protest! I wrote to him immediately after his first volume was published that it was my work, yet he did not change his stand. Kālidāsa did not give his name even when he composed such immortal poems like *Kumārasambhava*, *Meghadūta* and *Raghuvamśa*. But for the strict rule and tradition of *nā yaśāstra* he might have omitted his name even from the *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*. N did not want to claim *Caritacandrikā* to be acclaimed as an outstanding, epoch-making work that deserved an outstanding prize in literature. To him the restoration of the text was much more significant. To N his *Upodghāta* was much more valuable. Probably Bh knew the truth. But since he wanted to continue to incorporate *Candrikā* into his work without any acknowledgment, he did not ascribe it to its proper author.

Truly speaking Nagar's historical research, as embodied in his *Upodghāta*, and his reconstruction of the text took much more of his time, energy, and attention than what was needed to write *Caritacandrikā*. In fact his contribution to Bilhaṇa, if there is any, lies in the first two components and not in the last one.

The editor of *Sūktimuktāvalī* notes on p. 58 a variant reading for 16:51 (end):

Santatam amī Kailāsaśailānilāḥ ityatra Kuntalapateḥ
Kailāsaraudrānilāḥ iti pāṭhabhedah.

So Bühler's mis-construction has been taken to be a legitimate, variant reading!
Excellent!

* * *

We see Misra once again indulging in some unwanted emendation in:

Nirantaram Brahmapurībhir āvṛtam cakāra tatraiva puraṃ sa pārthivaḥ.
Viriñcilokāt suralokataś 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 pārthivaḥ*
virīñcilokāt suralokataś ca yad
vibhūṣya bhāgāv iva... kṛtam!

"The king built just there [!] a city, which was made [by him] as if he had stolen/robbed (*vimūṣya*) two pieces [pieces or parts?] [one] from the world of Brahmān [!] and [the other] from the world of the gods."

Note that ed. ter. explains *vibhūṣya* by *alamkrtya* but gives in the end as the sense (*bhāva*):... *bhāgau grhītvā racitam. bha* and *ma* are easily confounded in the MS. [p. 22]

Still there remains an unsolved problem. J definitely and clearly has *vibhūṣya*. My conjecture is *vikṛṣya*. Or, could it be *vicitya*? However, Misra suggests *vimūṣya*. He says that *bha* and *ma* are easily confounded in the MS., but not here [in J], and the idea of stealing also does not sound very commendable. In my paper entitled "Bilhaṇa's Nārāyaṇapura: Temple, Tank, and Town," I had changed the reading to *vikṛṣya*.

On August 22, 1990 we thought of another word--*vijitya*. But it is far removed from the original reading--*vibhūṣya*. It seems we will have to stay with *vibhūṣya* unless and until we find a better substitute.

* * *

The following verse poses a problem in textual reconstruction:

Sahaṣam ityapsarasām ajāyata prajāgaram pañcaśarasya tanvatī.
Pravīraṇṭhagraharāntakautuka-pradhāvitānām śravaṇāmṛtaṁ kathā. [17:64]

Let us compare the various readings:

17:64.3 *graharāntā* [?] -*grahaṇā*[?]mta [?]- J. The Jaina Devanāgarī *ṇā* of J could be easily mistaken by a foreigner for *rā*. -*grahaśānta* - B. Cf. *viśikhaśakala* vs. *viśikharāka*. B lists the variant readings in the fns. A discerning reader has a chance to consider, weigh, and evaluate if the rejected reading is not better. R does not list any alternative readings at all. Hence naturally the reader is likely to conclude that it is a mistake of the scribe. He has no clue to think of a better rendering. In other words Bühler is scholarly, while R is not.

17:64 B does not contain *Etadanantaram kulakam*. [B omits all such literary essentials]. It does not appear even in the fn of B.

Here is our Misra:

There is no such word as *rānta*- (edd. sec. and ter.; Bühler therefore conjectures *śānta*- which, however, does not yield good sense, since *pravīraṇṭhagrahaśāntakautuka*- , would mean: "the desire that had ceased from [or for?] embracing the great heroes [heroes, Mr. Misra!]." Read *sāndra*, "intense, strong" (cp. 17.18; 18.52): -*sāndrakautuka*-, "intense desire", [!] cp. Kum. 7.62 *tāsām...sāndrakutūhalānām*, "of those women whose desire/curiosity was intense." [p. 22] Misra says: "There is no such word as *rānta*." What about those scholars in Varanasi (the ancient seat of Sanskrit learning) who worked with Bh in bringing out his worthy ed.?

It is not proper to say here--"Bühler therefore conjectures..." Bühler had no other reading except what he has given, i.e. *śānta*. Where does an opportunity occur for him to conjecture? Where was the need? Why would he conjecture at all? The way Misra writes, it would seem that Bühler conjectured in 1874, after he had read N's ed. (1945) and Bh ed. in 1964, and found that their readings were not acceptable!

The two letters creating the problem very much look like "*ṇānta*" (old Devanāgarī style, where the letter "*ṇa*" resembles "*rā*"). This is in contradistinction to Marāṭhī (*bāḷabodha*) "*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 life in Jaisalmer. They copied the entire (voluminous) work just in seven days! Sanskrit was not their mother tongue and they did not begin their primary education in an environment of, say, a Hindu Brāhmaṇa born and brought up in Varanasi. No matter what we think or say, Devanāgarī was still a foreign script to them. They were not raised with it. So we can easily imagine what kind of "copy" they would have made.

On the other hand, before I went to Jaisalmer I had already earned the degree of Sahityacharya from the Government Sanskrit College, Banaras (probably the most exacting and demanding Sanskrit degree in India), having studied Sanskrit for at least 14 years. I had already lived in Sanskrit and Hindi environment for more than 22 years. I had taught Sanskrit for many years. Sanskrit was almost my mother tongue. I had just earned then the first prize in an All-Banaras Sanskrit Elocution Contest. I had studied and taught the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* for several years. I had also seen the B ed. I had also seen P--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 life in that "country of sand, bad water, and guineaworms." (Bühler, Introd.)

Also, I might add here that through the courtesy of Munivara Sri Puṇyavijayajī Mahārāja, the same precious MS. J was brought to Ahmedabad in 1960. I took it to Bombay where I got it photocopied in my direct supervision. That very photocopy is still with me! And I have been using it all along since then.

Let us resume our study of the enlightening performance of Mr. Misra, who had practically no "tools" yet went on constructing and reconstructing the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* in a foreign land.

I have once again checked (today on Nov. 2, 1977) the J MS., (of course, its photocopy). I don't know at this moment how these two letters were represented in P. However, we cannot accept *śānta* as an appropriate representation, because, if the anxiety is *śānta* = quenched--*śānta-kautuka*, then there is no justification for *pradhāvana*. One does not run if one's anxiety is satisfied.

Bühler created *śānta* out of his brain. It is always necessary to keep in mind that when we mention the name of Dr. Georg Bühler in these contexts, it is only an *upalakṣaṇa*.

The press copy for the printing of the *Carita* was prepared by someone else, here Shri Vamanacarya Jhalkikar, who could have taught students like Misra Sanskrit for one hundred years, if both could have lived that long. Certain changes were also recommended by Bhimacarya, a brother of Vamanacarya. without considering the consequences. "*Śānta*" is certainly not acceptable. Since *śānta* and *rānta* are very close in appearance (i.e. orthographically in Devanāgarī, the way P was prepared) N conjectured *rānta*. One who has thoroughly studied and examined both J and P alone knows how J was converted into a "copy" by Bühler and Jacobi, as explained above. And on the basis of our personal knowledge we can declare even today, with all the emphasis at our command, that that was the best Nagar could do at that time.

If we want to reconstruct the text with the least possible change, which is the most scholarly and desirable method, we could lengthen the vowel in *ṇanta* [which seems to be the reading in J] and make it *ṇānta*. Then we can interpret: *pravīraṇaḥ hagrahaṇa m antaḥ* or *ante yasya tādrśaṃ yat kautukaṃ tena pradhāvitānām*. Urged by the anxiety, the ultimate objective of which was to embrace the great warriors, they ran... Because *anta* also means (according to Apte) "end, conclusion, termination, of. In comp. in this sense and meaning "ending in or with", "ceasing to exist with", "reaching to the end"...*phalodayāntāya tapaḥsamādhaye*. [Kumārasambhava 5.6] "ending with (lasting till) the attainment of fruit."

Restoration does not necessarily mean total replacement. We have to restore with the same type of material and the restored object must look like the original one. *Sāndra* is too far removed from *ṇanta*. Misra violates all the Principles of Textual Criticism when he takes liberty with the poet and puts his "nonsensical" (to borrow Misra's own phraseology used by him with reference to the great poet Bilhaṇa) words into the poet's mouth. This is his usual pattern. Also to be noted is a small sign, looking like a hook, which cannot be reproduced here because of the limitations of the characters available on this computer, but which looks very much like the *repha* in, say, *Śarva*, and which is always used by J to lengthen the vowel written incorrectly as short. For example, *ḥṛtāspadāḥ svīya-* (17:10). Here the word "ḥṛtāspadāḥ" was read by P as "*ḥṛtāspardaḥ*"! [An uninformed person like Misra, who has never seen J has no right to talk about it!] So the original reading could very well be *grahaṇānta*. What about *pravīraṇaḥ hagrahaṇāntakautuka*, where *ānta* will mean *grhīta*?

* * *

We have one more play of prank, a *bālacāpalam*, by Misra Maharaja:

Yasmin kiñcin na tad upavanam yatra no kelivāpī
naiṣā vāpī na viṣamadhanuṣkārmaṇam yatra rāmāḥ.
Nāsau rāmā manasijakathāghātabhagnā yuvānaḥ
kāmaṃ yasyā na nibiḍatarapremabandhe patanti. [18:20]

The brilliant scholar-pretender shows his brilliant scholarship:

18:20c *manasijakathāghātabhagnā 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 *manasijakaśāghātabhagnā-* (cp. also 7.52; 12.26, "tormented by whip strokes by Kāma." *Tha* and *śa* in Devanāgarī are often confused. [p. 23] [We don't know how *bhagnā* could mean "tormented"!]) By whom? Where? When? What is the evidence? How many MSS. have you seen Mr. Misra? Which Devanāgarī are you talking? It must be of some German make!

Once again Misra betrays his total lack of knowledge of *kavimārga* when he makes such an absurd suggestion. *Manasija-kathā* does not necessarily mean "love-stories" as Misra tries to restrict the meaning of the word *kathā*. It also means [rather that is the primary meaning, given first by Monier-Williams]. conversation, speech, talking together. We can translate it by *premālāpa*, *premasaṃbhāṣaṇa*, *prema-vārtā*, *prema-kathā*.

Moreover, Manasija, as he is known to us, is not reputed to use the harsh whip as his weapon. He uses very soft arrows of flower. Maybe the German make of "Manasija" uses a *kaśā* as his weapon! Here is an example from *Sūktimuktāvalī*:

Sudīrghā rāgaśālinyo bahuparvamanoharāḥ.
Tasyā virejur aṅgulyaḥ kāmināṃ saṃkathā iva.
[Strīṇām 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*!

Udañcayan kiṃśukapuṣpasūcīḥ salīlam ādhūtalatākaśāgrāḥ.
Viyogināṃ nigrahaṇāya sajjāḥ Kāmājñayā dakṣiṇamāruto'bhūt. [7:52]

Asaṃśayaṃ nīlasaroruhākṣi samāruroha tvayi pañcabāṇaḥ.
Drutair viniryāsi 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 an "tormented by whip strokes by Kāma." *Miśraśakti* 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 discussing *yasmin kiñcin*. We have a saying in Hindi: *jitane kāle utane bāpa ke sāle!* Misra's effort is "preposterous" to borrow his own terminology, once again.

May we suggest *vrāta* for *ghāta* and *magnā* for *bhagnā*?

* * *

Kartuṃ kīrtyā tilakam Alakāgopurāṇāṃ gatena
Krauñcasyāgre Bhṛgupatīśaracchidram adrer vilokya.
Yena krīḍālavaśabalitāḥ pīvare bāhudaṇḍe
caṇḍadhvāne dhanuṣi ca ruṣā sūtritā dṛṣṭipātāḥ.
[18:35]

Misra expounds:

18:35c For *krīḍā* read *vrīḍā*:-*vrīḍālavasābalitāḥ dṛṣ ipātāḥ* "glances that are variegated/disfigured [!] by a little bit of shame." [!] For an analogous idea compare 18.57 *savrīḍobhūt*, "he felt ashamed." The idea seems [!] that shame gives the eye a particular [which one?] colour.

Bilhaṇa apprehended *kāvyārthacauryam*. He warned the *kavīndras* against it. Here and there Misra criticizes N by specification, *nāmagrāham*, e.g., ed. sec. is wrong, etc. But he does not give credit to N for any suggestion he made even before 1945!

On 18:35 *Caritacandrikā* (p.316, lines 3-4) says: *Api nāma 'vrīḍālava-sābalitāḥ' iti pā ho'nucitāḥ syāt?* In the year 1976, Misra claims to have conducted his "investigation s" under a great German scholar Paul Thieme [!] and proclaims the above conjectured reading as if he thought it for the first time! It was a *Misropajñam jñānam*! This is called PLAGIARISM, a literary theft, anything but an honest and true scholarship. Not that Misra did not read p. 316 of N, i.e. this page in *Caritacandrikā*, because he refers to it in his discussion of the following verse [18:38] which provides ample food for thought.

* * *

The following verse presents a riddle not yet solved:

Campāsīmni Kṣītipatikathādhāmnī Dārvābhisāre
Traigartīṣu kṣītiṣu bhavane Bhartulakṣoṇibhartuḥ.
Kṛīḍāsailīkṛtahimagirer hāsabhīteva yasya
bhrāmyatyājñā sukṛtavasater bhūḥ pratāpodayānām.
[18:38]

18:38.3 All have - *girer hāsabhīteva*. My conjecture, *himagireḥ śītabhīteva*.

18:38.4 -*vasater bhūpratā*- B
-*vasaterbhrapratā*- R

Let us see what Misra says:

śītabhītā-proposed in ed. sec. (p. 316) for *hāsabhītā*- (in other edd.) seems not to be [!] required. *hāsabhītā*- "afraid of the laughter", gives good sense; cp. 7.4 *śītartubhītyā*, "out of fear of the winter season." [p. 23]

In the very beginning we would like to say that Misra raises irrelevant matters. We are not arguing over *bhīti* itself; we are arguing over its cause--*hāsa* or *śīta*. Therefore, to refer to *śītartubhītyā* is not proper. Misra does not advance any argument, or provide any explanation. According to him *hāsabhītā* "makes good sense!" But the question is: Afraid of whom? Why? Misra does not provide any details. And finally he says: cp. 7.4 *Śītartubhītyā*, "out of fear of the winter season." We don't know what is the use of alluding to this statement! Does it make any sense here at all? Thus we see time

and again Misra raising irrelevant matters. He merely raises a smoke-screen and blurs the vision of his spectators! He does not answer. He creates more problem for us.

Gacchataḥ skhalanam of N.

To err is human. I regret that my interpretation of *bhūḥ pratāpodayānām* (18.38.4) was wrong, as pointed out by Shri Nagaraja Rao of Mysore, who had agreed to collaborate with me and make this work ready for publication. Unfortunately, however, he could not complete it.

This was an aside. Bh does not raise any objection to N's (of *Caritacandrikā*) interpretation [p. 316]: *Bhūr utpattisthānāni karma*. Was he afraid of an ancient (!) commentator, as he took *Caritacandrikākāra* to be? He silently puts his own interpretation. Not that he did not see the passage, because he takes into consideration, rather discusses, N's conjecture of *śītabhītā*, which appears only here [on p. 316] and not in the original text. I took *bhūḥ* to be acc. pl., *dvitīyā bahuvacanam* rather than nom. sing. *prathamā ikavacanam*! Acc. Rao, the pl. of *bhū* would be *bhuvāḥ* 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 acc. pl. resembles nom. sing. Nevertheless Bh (who takes *bhūḥ* to be nom. sing.) does not explain the real purport at all. Why *krīḍāśailīkṛtahimagiri* is Śaṅkara? What connection does he have here? What is the purport of the "heat"-- the second meaning of *pratāpa* which Bh too knows. He says: *prakṛṣ atāpaśca*.

All the regions mentioned in the verse (Campā, Dārvābhisāra, Trigarta and Bhartulakṣaṇibhartuḥ bhavane) are in the Himālaya mountain. These regions (territories) are cold. They need heat, they need warmth. Unless and until we bring the "heating power" into play, the second meaning of *pratāpa* remains inoperative!

What is *krīḍāśaila*? It is an artificial hill serving as a pleasure spot; a pleasure mountain. Here is Kālidāsa in his *Meghadūta*:

Tasyās tīre racitaśikharāḥ peśalair indranīlaiḥ
Krīḍāśailaḥ kanakakadalīveṣṭanaprekṣaṇīyaḥ. 74.
[*Tasyāḥ vāpyāḥ*]

Also *Harṣacarita*: 1:6

And our own poet Bilhaṇa:

Krīḍāśailībhavanti pratikalāmalinām kausumāḥ pāmsukūṭāḥ. [7:67]

Let it be stressed that J and B both have *hāsabhītā*. So N too has the same. However, in his *Caritacandrikā* N says:

Nūnam śītabhīteva ityucitaḥ pā haḥ. [p. 316]

Bh leaves the issue undecided. He translates the words, following the maxim of *makṣi kāsthāne makṣikā* 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 Himālayas, which owed their allegiance to King Ananta of Kashmir. He was their overlord. His supremacy was recognized by all the vassal kings ruling those mountain regions. Ananta's command (*ājñā*) was honored (accepted) by all as the supreme authority. This is the *prakṛta*, or the statement of facts.

Now comes the *aparakṛta*, the fanciful world created by the poet--

Yasya ājñā bhrāmyati. Yasya Anantasya. Kathambhūtasya Anantasya?
Sukṛtavasateḥ. Punaḥ kathambhūtasya? Krīḍāśailīkṛtahimagireḥ.

These questions too can be easily answered. Now the big question comes: Why the command (f.) (= *ājñā*) *bhrāmyati*, and where?

Two possible answers have been provided so far: (1) *hāsabhīteva* or *śītabhīteva*. Bh makes us uneasy when he translates *krīḍāśailīkṛtahimagireḥ* as *krīḍāśailīkṛtaḥ krīḍāp arvatīkṛtaḥ himagiriḥ Kailāsaḥ yena tasya Śivasya*. This is called *manahpūtaṃ samāca ret*. Kailāsa is only a peak of the Himālayas. Śiva has never been described as having made either Kailāsa or even the Great Himālaya as his *krīḍāśaila*.

Bh has missed the true essence of the word *krīḍāśaila*. Śiva is Devādhīteva, Mahā deva, the Supreme God of all the gods. He can make the entire Himālayas, nay even the entire universe as his abode. There is nothing surprising about it. To limit Śiva's all-pervasiveness to Kailāsa only is to show the limitations of one's own little knowledge, which is always dangerous. The fact of the matter is: *Krīḍāśailīkṛtahimagireḥ* is the qualifying adjective of "Anantasya"--Anant who has made the entire Himālaya as his *krīḍāśaila* (play-hill). There lies the beauty. There lies the *kavitvam*. That is called *vicc hittiḥ*.

Another question is why Śiva should laugh at *Anantasya ājñā* or *Anantasya ājñā* should be *Śivasya hāsād bhītā*? Why she should be *Kailāsasya śītabhītā*? Is the Greatest of the Great Gods Śiva here *prasaṅga-saṅgata* at all? Of course, not. Bh leaves everything for the reader to decide. He does not want to risk any decision lest he is exposed, if he is proven wrong.

Śiva is depicted white: *rajatagirinibham*. Fame is depicted white. Śiva may be imagined to laugh at the white fame. We bring this here just for the sake of argument. But *ājñā* is not depicted white. So she should not be afraid of being laughed at. There is no *sādharmya*. There is no sharing of one and the same quality or characteristic.

Bh has missed the significance of the word *pratāpa* although he translates it correctly, of course copying from N. What is *pratāpa*? *Pratāpa* is: *Sa pratāpaḥ prabhāvaś ca yat tejah kośadaṇḍajam*.

Bh performs the act of *śukavākyapā ham*. He quotes Amara and also copies *Caritacandrikā*--"koṣadaṇḍajam tejah prakṛṣ atāpaś ca." We would like to know why Bh brings the meaning *prakṛṣ atāpaś ca*? He does not apply it anywhere! Then why does he bring it in?

Pratāpa is compared to fire. We have numerous examples in literature:

Yasya pratāpo'gnir apūrva eva jāgarti bhūbhṛtakaṭakasthalīṣu. [9:113].

Pratāpam āropya parām samunnatim yaśaḥ pradarśyeva ca dāvabhasmabhiḥ.
Bhajan nidāghaḥ kṛtakṛtyatām iva svapauruṣāviṣkaraṇān nyavarttata. [13:1]

B has *jagannidāghaḥ* here. We don't know why Bh did not insist on that reading here! Here is our *Nīlaguṇḍatāmraśāsanam*:

Tataḥ pratāpajvalanaprabhāva-nirmūlanirdagdhavirodhivaṃśaḥ.
Tasyātmajaḥ pālayitā dharāyāḥ Śrīmān abhūd Āhavamalladevaḥ.
[N ed. p. 39, Section 8]

Once again we may remind our neo-expounders that the fame is described as white:

Yasyākhillavyāpi yaśo'vadātam akāṇḍadugdhāmbudhivṛddhiśaṅkām.
Karoti mugdhāmarasundarīṇām abhūt sa bhūyo Jagadekamallaḥ.

And the laughter as well as fame both are described white;

Hanūmadādyair yaśasā mayā punar dviṣāṃ hasair dūtapathaḥ sitkṛtaḥ.
[Śrīharṣasya]

Since *ājñā* is not white, it cannot be brought into the picture at all as far as *Śivahāsa* or any white object is concerned. *Ājñā* is not afraid of the great Himālayas either, if we take into consideration only its colour--whiteness.

Why do we have here the word *pratāpa* with a second meaning *prakṛṣ aḥ tāpaḥ* (terrible heat, or burning fire, etc.)? Why does a person wander hither and thither in search of hot regions unless and until he/she wants warmth? When do we want warmth? Of course, when we feel cold, or when we are afraid of cold. Thus comes my conjectured meaning-- *śīta-bhītā*. We have a similar expression in:

Mukhenducandrikāpūra-plāvyamānau punaḥ punaḥ.
Śītabhītāvivānyonyam tasyāḥ pīḍayataḥ stanau. [8:47]

Here is an actual concrete example of how variant readings are created, especially when the copyist allows his memory to play its part. *Vik.* has *stanau* and not *kucau*. I wrote *kucau* by relying upon my memory. This phenomenon explains one of the reasons of generating variants in anthologies. This may also explain some of the variations between P and the press-copy for B, which was prepared by a great scholar, real scholar, P. t. Shri Vamanacharya Jhalkikar. When a true scholar copies some work, his memory becomes an obstacle to the true and faithful copying, which is harmful!

We took (or rather mistook) *bhūr utpattisthānāni karma* (acc. fem. plural) and wanted to make it an object of *bhrāmyati*. *Kutra bhrāmyati? Pratāpodayānām bhūḥ*: The regions where there is abundant growth and prevalence of *pratāpa* in both the senses of the term.

We have thought it time and again that Misra had no need to conduct any "investigations" to arrive at his conclusions. He has enough internal power to assert. He has the freedom to pronounce *ex cathedra* judgement: "*Śītabhīta* [!] proposed in *ed. sec.* (p. 316) for *hāsabhīta* [!] (in other edd.) seems not to be required." First of all N proposed *Śītabhīta*. Secondly, even his ed., i.e. N, has *hāsabhīta*.

On Oct. 12, 1977 we conjectured another reading: *vāsabhīta*. 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 such a large number of extensive territories in the Himālayas a play-hill, *krīḍāśaila*!

Bh, the Great Historiographer

The following verse provides an excellent opportunity for Bh to demonstrate that he too can be an historiographer. (See the long list of books consulted [!] by him).

Yasya bhrātā Kṣitipatir iti kṣātratejonidhānam
Bhojakṣmābhṛtsadṛśamahimā Loharākhaṇḍalo'bhūt.
Śaṅke lakṣmyāḥ śirasi caraṇaṃ nyasya vakṣaḥsthitāyāḥ
prāptā lilātilakatulanāṃ yanmukhe sūktidevī. 18:47]

N's fn says: All have *yasyā bhrātā*. Yet N makes it *yasya bhrātā*!

Bh got inspired by a sudden impulse to demonstrate his knowledge of historiography. All the editions including J read *yasyā bhrātā*. So, he argued, what right does N have to make the reading *yasya bhrātā*? Consequently he asserts that *yasya bhātetī pā hāt yasyā bhrātetī pā haḥ samucitaḥ*! He does not cite any authority. He does not advance any argument. He overlooks the great principle of *vāda--Ekākinī pratiḥṇā hi pratijñātaṃ na sādhyet*: Mere 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.

N did not base his change on mere assertion. It did not emanate from obstinacy. He advanced cogent arguments. This is what he said in his *Upodghāta* (p. 9):

Loharadurgādhipatiḥ Kṣitipatir Anantadevasya bhrātā babhūva. Ḍā. Byuhlara (Bühler) mahodayo 'Yasyā bhrātā Kṣitipatir iti kṣātratejonidhānam' iti pāṭham abhyupagam ya 'Kṣitipatiḥ Subhaṭābhrātāsīd' iti vyācakhyau. Dvivediprabhṛtayo vidvāṃsa īdṛśāne kashaleṣu nirvicāram Ḍā. Byuhlaramahodayam anucakruḥ. Vastutastu 'Yasya bhrātā

Kṣītipatir' iti pāṭhaḥ saṅgataḥ. Kṣītipatir Anantadevasya pitṛvyajo bhrātā"sīt. Tathā c a nirdiṣṭam eva *Rājatarāṅgiṇyām* (vii:251. *Paśyata Parisiṣ am Ka*):

Putro Vighararājasya Kṣītirājābhidhas 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 Kṣītirāja, the son of Vighararāja.

We learn from the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* that Diddā, daughter of Siṃharāja, Lord of Lohara, married Kṣemagupta, king of Kashmir. She adopted her nephew, Saṃgrāmarāja, son of her brother Udayarāja, as the son (and successor), to the throne of Kashmir. He ruled over Kashmir from 1003 to 1028 A.D. Naturally to Ananta, who was the son (and successor) of Saṃgrāmarāja, Kṣītirāja was a cousin, being the son of his uncle, Vighararāja. The kingdom of Lohara got assimilated into that of Kashmir, when Kṣītirāja gave it to Utkarṣa. Let it be stressed here that N's fn. no. 9 adds: *Paśyata Parisiṣ am Ka*. This *Parisiṣ a* (Appendix) appears on p. 247, immediately after the *Nīlaguṇḍatāmraś āsanam* in N's ed. Here it is being reproduced for ready reference.

Scions of the Lohara Dynasty
(As the rulers over Kashmir)

* Siṃharāja (Lord of Lohara)

!

!	!
Diddā	*Udayarāja
980/1-1003 A.D.	
(m. Kṣemagupta	!
(950-958 A.D.)	!
of Kashmir	!

!	!
Saṃgrāmarāja	*Vighararāja
(Adopted by Diddā as her	(Lord of Lohara
successor to the Kashmir	!
throne (1003-1028 A.D.)	*Kṣītirāja
!	!
!	*Bhuvanarāja

!	!
Harirāja	Ananta
(1028 A.D.)	(1028-1063 A.D.
	(1063-1080 A.D.)
	!

Kalaśa
(1063-1080 A.D.)
(1080-1089 A.D.)

!	!	!
Harṣa (1089-1101 A.D.)	Utkarṣa (1089 A.D.)	*Vijayamalla

Note: * = Did not rule over Kashmir.

Source: Stein. *Kalhana's Chronology of Kashmir*. I, 108;
II, 294; Genealogical Tables, p. 145. Raj. vii, 251-259.

We believe Bh saw the above writing. Nevertheless, to assert that the correct reading for 18:47.1 is *Yasyā bhrātā* and to maintain that Kṣitipati or Kṣitirāja was the brother, nay the *sahodara* of Subhāṭā, the queen of Ananta, is to negate the facts of history. The tragic situation is that this point is well discussed and clarified by N in his edition on p. 9 of his *Upodghāta*. Yet Bh does not accept the truth. He wants to assert the superiority of his wisdom. We are reminded of an excellent *sadukti*:

Sampūrṇakumbho na karoti śabdārdho ghaṭo ghoṣam upaiti nūnam.
Vidvān kulīno na karoti garvam guṇair vihinā bahu jalpayanti.

Here is one more interesting point worth noticing. Bh, while commenting upon

Devī tasya pracurayaśasaś candrikevendujātā
yātā khyātim jagati Subhāṭetyādibhāryā babhūva. [18:40]

says: Jālandharādhipādinducandrājjātā samutpannā...Subhāṭādevītināmnā....

And in his fn. he adds: *Sūryamatītyaparanāmadheyā*. Bh copies, as usual, from Candrikā where we read: Induś candraḥ Jālandharādhipaḥ Inducandraś ca. Subhāṭeti Sūryamatī -tyaparanāmadheyā.

N's Caritacandrikā derives its information from *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, which says:

Jālandharādhipasyendu-candrasyendumukhīm sutām.
Upayeme manojñatvāj jyeṣṭhām Āsamatīm svayam. [7:150]

Tasyāḥ kiñcidvayonyūnām svasāram yo yavīyasīm.
Atha Sūryamatīm Devīm bhūbhujē pariṇītavān. [7:152]

Here "bhūbhujē" means "Anantadevāya."

We still don't know if Bh saw the Genealogical Table of the Lohara dynasty (*Parīśiṣam "Ka"* of N), and if so he understood it, and if so he compared it with his own statement on p. 209 of his Vol. 3.

Bh admits that Subhāṭā (alias Sūryamatī) was a daughter of king Inducandra, the Lord of Jālandhara. And yet he maintains that Kṣitipati (alias Kṣitirāja) was her brother,

not only a distant brother but real brother (*sahodaro bhrātā*). If Kṣītirāja was a real brother of Subhātā, (Kṣītirāja, who was a son of Vīgraharāja, the Lord of Lohara--[Putro Vīgraharājasya Kṣītirājabhidhas tataḥ. *Rāj.*], then she must have herself hailed from the Lohara Dynasty (the same dynasty that gave birth to Anantadeva and Kṣītirāja)! Did she? If Subhātā and Kṣītirāja were real sister and brother then the name of her father would be Vīgraharāja and not Inducandra!

Also we have to consider one more fact. Inducandra, the father of Subhātā was the Lord of Jālandhara, while the father of Kṣītirāja (Subhātā's real brother, (even) in the opinion of Bh) was the Lord of Lohara! Would it be correct to conclude, then, that there was no difference between Lohara and Jālandhara as far as Bh is concerned?

It is just possible that what is published in the name of Bhāradvāja is the creation of more than one person! His discussion on *yasyā bhrātā* (18:47) has a footnote: *Atraitas yaiva sargasya 38 tathā 67 saṅkhyākau ślokā[va]valokanīyau*. Bh alludes to Kṣītipati.

The verse 18:67 reads:

Durgam prāpya Kṣītipatiyaśodhāma yasyānujo'sau
kasyākārṣīn na khalu pulakotkarṣam Utkarṣadevaḥ.
Yenāropya svabhujāśikhare nirmitā dūram urvī
mlecchakṣoṇīpatiharikhurakṣodamudrādaridrā. [18:67]

In Sanskrit (*Ramā* of Bh) we read...*Loharadurgam prāpya*... The word *prāpya* is not commented upon. However, the Hindi *vyākhyākāra* knows much more than all of us combined. He says:

Harṣadeva ke choṭe bhāi Utkarṣadeva ne vipakṣī [!] rājā Kṣītirāja ke kirtisthāna [!] Loharadurga nāmake kile ko jītakara [!!!]

This is flagrant violation of history. Kṣītirāja was not a *vipakṣī rājā*. And Utkarṣa did not conquer the fort named Loharadurga! Would it be possible to agree that Hindi and Sanskrit commentaries came out of the same pen? Of course, not!

Bh claims having studied *Rājataranṅiṇī*, Sanskrit as well as English. He ought to have known that according to the *Rājataranṅiṇī*, Utkarṣa was still a *stanandhaya* (baby sucking mother's breast) when Kṣītirāja gave him the kingdom of Lohara!

Dattvā stanandhayāyāpi tadotkarṣābhidhāya saḥ.

The poet could have easily said: *jītvā*, if the fort had to be conquered. Why did Bilhaṇa say *prāpya*? It is difficult to describe in words what a great injury Bh has inflicted on Bilhaṇa. Coming generations will remain *ajñāna-andhakāra-ācchanna*.

Here is the relevant passage in full from the *Rājataranṅiṇī*:

Kalhaṇa says:

Putro Vigharājasya Kṣītirājābhīdhas tataḥ.
Rājñāḥ pitṛvyajo bhrātā kadācit pārśvam āyayau. 7:251

Tasmai nyavedayat khedam sa cittasyopatāpakam.
Putre Bhuvanarājākhye rājyalubdhe'tiviplute. 7:252

* * * *

Kṣītirājaḥ svavadhvām ca viruddhāyām viśuddhadhīḥ.
Manastāpāphe cakre sarvatyāgāmṛte sprhām. 7:255

Rājyaṃ Kalaśaputrāya jyeṣṭhānantarajanmane.
Rāmalekhābhīdhānāyām rājñyām jātāya satvaram. 7:256

Dattvā stanandhayāyāpi tadotkarṣābhīdhāya saḥ.
Rājarṣir vibhudhaiḥ sārddhaṃ vidadhe tīrthasevanam. 7:257

Bhuktvā śamasukhaṃ bhūrīn varṣān paramavaiṣṇavaḥ.
Sa cakrāyudhasāyujyaṃ yayau Cakradhare sudhīḥ. 7:258

Summing up we may say that although Kṣītirāja had a son named Bhuvanarāja, he was wicked and vicious and hence unfit for the throne in the eyes of Kṣītirāja, his father. So he gave away his kingdom to Kalaśa's son INFANT Utkarṣa. In this way he partially repaid the debt of Diddā.

There is nothing surprising if Bühler adopted the reading as "*yasyā bhrātā Kṣītipatir iti*," because that is the reading of J. In the absence of any contradictory immediate evidence, there was no reason for him to doubt the text. Although he studied *Rājatarāṅgī* later and corroborated many of Bilhaṇa's statements by citing it as the authority, probably he did not examine this specific issue. Scholars like Dvivedi just followed Bühler by gaḍḍulikāpravāhanyāya and gatānugatikanyāya.

Nevertheless, Bh should know better since all the data that was accumulated since Bühler wrote was available to him. He had the N ed. and all the information contained in it. Yet he asserts that Kṣītirāja was a brother of Subhātā; not only a distant brother but a *sahodara bhrātā* of Subhātā, let it be repeated.

Before we leave this topic we may present another case of a similar nature, but showing dissimilar action on the part of Bh.

Dātā parākramadhanaḥ śrutapārādṛśvā
nāmnāsya Rājakalaśas tanayo babhūva.
Prāleyabhūdaraguhās timiracchalena
yasyādhunāpi makhadhūmam ivodvahanti. [18:77]

All end with *udvamanti*. Nagar made it *udvahanti*. Bh copies N in a casual manner. We don't know why in this case he did not raise the flag of revolt! Why did he submit to N?

* * *

Misra's determination to destroy everything remains undaunted:

Yasya prāptādbhutaparīṇateḥ karkaṣe tarkamārgē
tyāgaḥ kāsām vicarati girām gocare kāntakīrtiḥ.
Yena nyastā dalitavipadām kovidānām gr̥heṣu
Śrīr nādyāpi svapiti lalanābhūṣaṇānām ninādaiḥ. [18:48]

It is a pity that more often than not whenever Misra opens his mouth to talk we fail to understand him. Misra's propositions are "preposterous," to borrow his own terminology [p. 18, note on 12:45a]. Of course, there are exceptions too; but they merely prove the rule.

With regard to the verse 18:48 he says:

For *vicarati* read *na carati*: *tyāgaḥ kāsām na carati girām gocare kāntakīrtiḥ* "in the domain of which poetry does not move his liberality, which is of lovely glory?" [p. 23]

We are simply puzzled. First of all, the question is why we should read *na carati* for *vicarati* when the latter makes perfect sense already? Secondly, we would like to know what Misra wants to convey. We don't know it. Does he want to say that Kṣitirāja gave donations to the poets? We are instructed by our *gurus*: *jīvatkaver āśayo na varṇanīyaḥ*: "Do not try to interpret the poet who is still living." However, if our conjecture is right, then Misra will prove unjust. *Girām* here certainly does not mean poetry per se. We believe Misra must have heard expressions like *vācām agocaram*, or *girām atītya vartate*. What Bilhaṇa wants to say here is: The generosity of Kṣitipati was indescribable. *Kāsām girām gocare vicarati? Na kāsām api iti bhāvaḥ*.

We are not sure whether Misra considered what his *pūrvācāryas* had already said--how they had explained this *ukti* of Bilhaṇa. Candrikā says: *Girām gocare vāgviṣaye*. Bh translates: *Yasya Loharādhipasya...tyāgaḥ dānam...kāsām girām vācām gocare viṣaye vicarati vartate, vāgagocaram dānam iti bhāvaḥ*.

We believe Misra had seen the following *sadukti* while he was still in his senses:

Kavitvavaktṛtvaphalā cucumba Sarasvatī tasya mukhāravindam. [3:19]

In this connection Misra ought to have known that the art of poetry (*kavitva*) is distinct from the art of speech, oratory (*vaktva*). One does not have to be a poet to display the art of *gīr* (*vāṇī*). Here (i.e. in *tyāgaḥ kāsām*) 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 yaḥ prayāṇe dharitrīm
tukkārāṇām khuraṇaravaiḥ kṣmāpaśūnyām cakāra.
Śrīdāhālakṣitiparivṛdhaḥ so'pi yaḥ prāpya vṛttam
Kārṇaḥ kārṇāmṛtarasabharāsvādam antas tatāna. [18:93]

Misra makes us 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 Bilhaṇa, 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 *bhṛtyam*:

c ...so'pi yaḥ prāpya bhṛtyam [*bhṛityam* or *bhṛtyam*, Mr. Misra?]

d *kārṇaḥ ...āsvādam antas tatāna*//

"Even this king Kārṇa enjoyed in his heart (Bilhaṇa's poetry) after having him got [!] as his servant (court poet)". [p. 24]

Misra makes Mahākavi Bilhaṇa a *bhṛtya* (slave) of Kārṇa! And that too in an autobiographical narration by Bilhaṇa himself!! Words fail us when we try to describe How thoughtless a person can be. Bilhaṇa was one of the most self-respecting poets in the world. It is Bilhaṇa who said:

Sarvasvaḥ ḡhavarti Kuntalapatir* ḡḡṇātu tan me punar
bhāṇḍāḡaram akhaṇḍam eva ḡḡdaye jāḡarti sārasvatam.
Re kṣudrās tyajata pramodam acirād eṣyanti manmandiram
helāndolitakarṇatālakaraṭiskandhādhirūḡhā śriyaḡ.
*[Gurjarapatirityapi pāṭhaḡ]

And

Nīlacchatronmadaḡajaghaṭāpātram uttrastacolāt
Cālukyendrād alabhata kṛtī yo'tra vidyāpatitvam.
Asmīnāsīt tadanu nibiḡḡśleṣahevākalīlā
velladbāhukvaṇitavalayā santataḡ rājyalakṣmīḡ.
[18:101]

To make such a great poet a servant (slave) even of a king like Kārṇa is an act which can be "thought of" (a favorite expression of Misra) only by a scholar of Misra's calibre.

He was still breathing the air of Herr Hitler.

On p. 100 Misra himself describes the honour, glory, and splendour attained by Bilhaṇa, by quoting the following eulogy:

Vapur yām āvāsaḡ [*yāmāvāsaḡ?*] kucaparivṛtaś Cedīrṇpatiḡ
paribhrāntā ratnākaraparidhir eṣā vasumatī.

Na muktvā rāmāṇāṃ padam iha śiro'nyasya [śiro yasya?] namitam
kavīndrai rājendrait lalitam iyatī Bilhaṇakathā.
[? puryām āvāsaḥ, a suggested reading]

This verse raises many questions. It is not clear to us at all. But everything is clear to Misra. Nothing is obscure to him.

And on p. 24 Misra asks us to make Bilhaṇa a *bhṛtya* (slave) of Karṇa! We don't know if these two Misras are one and the same. The lion may die of hunger, but he won't eat grass! We may not be able to ascertain the original, true reading to take the place of *vṛttam* (or *nūnam*?) here, but to suggest *bhṛtyam* and that too for a self-respecting poet like Bilhaṇa is in the domain of only great critics like Misra! It cannot be described in words: *Kathāpi khalu pāpānām alam aśreyase yataḥ*.

Misra's first chapter ends here. However, we have already discussed many of his suggestions made in subsequent chapters (of his book) as and when the topics (in Bilhaṇa's order) demanded. So, avoiding repetition, we will try to discuss in the following chapters his other "investigations."

CHAPTER II

Some Lexicographical Points of Interest

In Chapter II, entitled "Some Lexicographical Points of Interests," Misra lists the following words (for discussion?):

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. añkura- m. | 12. pratiṣṭhā |
| 2. añc, añcaya [!] | 13. bhaṅgi/ bhaṅgī |
| 3. ārya | 14. muktā |
| 4. kuc (+ sam) | 15. mugdha |
| 5. kṛtakṣaṇa | 16. luṅṭh, luṭ (h), luṭh |
| 6. keyūra | 17. vah (+ ud) |
| 7. carmacakṣus- | 18. vātāyana |
| 8. citraśālā- | 19. vyākhyā |

We don't know how *velā* can follow *vyākhyā*! However, we point this out with terrible trepidation because Misra claims to have mastered Library Science as well. He is a D. L. Sc. too.

- | | |
|------------------|---------------|
| 9. cīnapiṣṭa | 20. velā |
| 10. nāgarakhaṇḍa | 21. saṃsthita |
| 11. pāthonidhi | |

We fail to understand the full significance of these long, elaborate discussions. We don't know either what Misra's central objective is. In his enthusiasm to locate the occurrence of one word more than once, he has picked up certain other word which is irrelevant for the purpose in view.

For example, on p. 30, he discusses the word *kṛtakṣaṇa*. He locates the following occurrences:

- 7:36 kramāl lipijñānakṛtakṣaṇasya
- 9:13 pracchādanārthaṃ vihitakṣaṇo'pi
- 13:41 kṛtakṣaṇaṃ kṣudranadīsamāgame

4. 14:35 kṣetrabhūmiṣu kṛtekṣaṇotsavāḥ [!]
 5. 16:4 divasa-grasta-vistāra-karṣaṇāya kṛtakṣaṇāḥ.

While it may be legitimate to include number 2 in the present discussion (because *vi hita* is synonymous with *kṛta*), we don't know how number 4-- *kṛta- 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 all nothing but *vitaṇḍāvādah*.

Misra says:

(1) *aṅkura- m*.

aṅkura-, "a sprout, shoot", in the end of a compound:

a) *ratnāṅkura-*, "a sproutlike jewel" (*ratnam aṅkura iva*) = "a new/young jewel" = "a small jewel" (M.W. only from the *Mṛcch.*): 1.18; 12.3; 15.77; *vyāghranakhāṅkura-* "a sprout like a [!] tiger nail" = "a small tiger nail, tied around the neck of children, even now-a-days, as an amulet, to ward off the bad effect of an evil spirit, cp. Hindi *bagha nā/baghanahā/baghanakhā*.(1) 3.13.

Misra's footnote:

1. *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 a beautiful English! In the company of his German Gurus, Misra forgot his own English!] to obtain than for a common man.

b) *radāṅkura-/dantāṅkura-* "sprout of the tooth/tusk" (*radasya/dantasyāṅkuraḥ*)- "tip of the tooth/tusk" (PW. and MW. only from *Abhidhānaci. of Hemacandra*, 297): 17.50 a *radāṅkuraprotam arātidantinā* "pierced with the tip of its tooth/tusk by the enemy elephant"; 17.56 ...*radāṅkurāḥ...tān muku eṣv atāḍayan* "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 *karīndradantāṅkuralekhanībhir alekhi....vijaya-praśastiḥ*// "a victory inscription was written by the pens, which were the tips of the tusks of the elephants." [pp. 25-26]

Aṅkura literally may mean anything, but here it is used in the sense of "beautiful", "newly-appeared", "fresh-cut." Students of Sanskrit literature know it very well that poets use many words, especially in the end of compounds, which merely add to the beauty of the preceding word. For example, *bāhulatā* or *bāhuvallī*. There are many other words like *karikalabha* or *puṣpamālā* or *kṛpānalekhā*. It is very difficult to translate su

ch words into English. "Sprout-like-jewel" may be grammatically and lexicographically harmless, but it is not needed. *Rātnāṅkura* means beautiful jewel. That is all.

This word (*aṅkura*) is very much like *latā* or *latikā*, e.g. *Puṇḍrakeṣulatikās cakaśir* e. Here *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 viṣṇoḥ pratiṣ hetī vibhīṣaṇasya rājye param(9) sa ṁkucitā babhuvuḥ* "they (the kings of the Chaulukya [!] family) shrank, however, with respect to the kingdom of Vibhīṣaṇa (Ceylon) (i.e. they shrank back from entering it) [thinking] it is the standing point/domain of Visnu." [fn. 10] Cp. also ? 1.27; 9.115; 12.53; 16.1; 18.53, etc.

We are not sure if this is true! May be Misra has his own dictionaries!! We did not find.

Misra's footnote:

9. *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"i., [So Misra knows German too!])

10. Bilhaṇa's statement seems to be historically correct [!], since no king of the Chaulukya [!] dynasty undertook military expeditions to Ceylon. In any case Bühler's understanding of 1.66 ("narrow was the realm of Vibhīṣaṇa": Introd., p. 26) cannot be accepted. [p. 30]

We don't know what Misra means by "Ceylon"--Siṃhala or Laṅkā!
If he means Siṃhala, then he has not seen the following:

Tadbhayāt Siṃhaladvīpa-bhūpatiḥ śaraṇāgataḥ.
Viśaśrāmāśramapade Lopāmudrāpater muneh. [4:20]

Also to be noted is:

Āpāṇḍupāṇḍyam ālola-colam ākrāntasiṃhalam. [4:45]

Siṃhala and Laṅkā are not accepted as being positively identical. (Siṃhalalāketya ṣtopa-dvīpadīpīte---we recite in saṅkalpa 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 was 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 *kramāl 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 vihitakṣaṇaḥ*, "he who had taken the time to learn, to conceal (his feelings)", Cp. MW. s.v. [Candrikā says: *nirvyāpārasthitih*. J gloss vatkaver says: *niyamah*].

Misra's footnote:

11. Cp. Lat. schola "leisure" and "school." [p. 30]

The Latin word schola may mean "leisure" and "school," but *kṣaṇa* of Sanskrit by itself has nothing to do with "learning"!

Lipijñānakṛtakṣaṇasya may mean "one who has devoted time to learn the writing," but "lipikṛtakṣaṇasya" by itself will hardly mean "learning."

Kṣaṇa means, according to Amara: *nirvyāpārasthitau kālavīśeṣotsavayoḥ kṣaṇaḥ*. Has Misra seen this?

In *kṛtakṣaṇaṃ kṣudranadīsamāgame*, there is no learning process at all! Here *kṣaṇa* = *utsava*, festivity, enjoyment, etc. The same is true of *Vihitakṣaṇa*. It may very well mean "who has given an opportunity or chance to conceal, who has made an effort, etc."

17. Root *vah* (+ *ud*)

Misra presents a long discourse. He creates a mountain of a mole-hill. He assumes certain things without any basis and then tries to offer solutions and comments. He criticizes his predecessors without understanding them. He misunderstands the poet and tells us that the use of the word is rare, etc. Misra says:

ud-vah is on several occasions used in the sense "to exhibit, to show to make manifest", which seems rather a rare use (not properly recorded in lexica). Thus in

1.4 *ekas stanaḥ* (48).....

... ..
yasyāḥ priyārdhaḥsthitim udvahantyāḥ
sā pātu 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 *udvahantyāḥ* as equivalent to *dhārayantyāḥ* "carrying" allegedly [sic] showing Bilhaṇa to be a śākta has no cogency. 49 Bilhaṇa has used *ud-vah* in the non-figurative sense of "carrying" in 12:48...*asyodvahataḥ karābje...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 1.91 *bibhrat* and 11.37 *bhāji* are replaceable [sic, should be replaceable] by the corresponding forms of *ud-vah*. [47-48]

Misra's footnotes:

48. *ekastanaḥ* (ed. ter.) is a bad [?] orthography

This is not any systematic, consciously executed orthography. It is a simple case of misunderstanding. If N had resorted to report such irregularities of B and R, his ed. would have inflated ten times! It is silly even to discuss such matters.

for *ekah stanaḥ* (edd. pri and sec.). Cp. p. 1. 1.74a.

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. 1.11, ascribed to Bilhaṇa. [pp. 47-48]

Lexicographers follow the literature. The literature or the poets do not follow them. Otherwise, we would not have the sayings like: *niraṅkuśāḥ kavayaḥ*. Even the grammar does not precede the literature.

According to MW, *ud-vah* means also: to bear up, lift up, elevate, wear, (clothes, etc.); have, possess, to show. Misra cites the following uses of *ud-vah* by Bilhaṇa:

samudvahannunnatam aṃsakūṭam.	1:51
padātivratam udvahāmi.	3:39
manyupaṅkakaḷuṣaṃ samudvahan bhrātṛduṣcaritacintanān manaḥ.	5:10

yatra tiṣṭhati virodham udvahan dāhataḥ prabhṛti tejasā saha.	5:20
urvīpateḥ pārvaṇacandravaktrā samudvahantī hṛdaye nivāsam.	9:11
tantukṛśām vahantyāḥ.	9:32
puṣpāñjalikṣepam ivodvahanti.	10:23
samudvahantyoḥ tad athāyatākṣī- dolāvilolānanamārgasakhyam.	10:36
himaṃ 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 "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 stanas tuṅgataḥ paraṣya vārtām iva praṣṭum agān mukhāgram.
Yasyāḥ priyārdhasthitim udvahantyāḥ sā pātu vaḥ parvatarājaputrī. [1:4]

Note: Misra's text reads...*priyārdhasthitim*

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 "*sthiti*", and Misra runs away with it. He does not go beyond the first meaning. This word has many meanings, more profound than "standing." It means "continuance in one state," "steady application or devotion," "stability", "permanence", "perpetuation," "continuance," "high station or rank," "preservation," etc. etc.

If a person "wears" an object, if a person "possesses" an object, he is bound to "exhibit" it, provided it can come into direct contact with the eyes of a perceiver. The people "wear" the perfume too. Even that is felt, if not by *cakṣurindriya*, by *ghrāṇendriya*. So "exhibit" is the effect rather than the cause. The cause is to "wear" or "possess."

It is unfortunate that Misra does not understand N's *Caritacandrikā* and blames it unjustifiably. He misleads his readers without quoting the *Caritacandrikā* in original. *Caritacandrikā* does not explain the word *udvahantyāḥ* at all. It merely explains the compound word *priyārdhasthitim* in the following way: "Priyasya ardhanārīśvarasya Śivasya ardhe svīye dakṣiṇāṅge sthitis tām." [p. 209]. To attribute more to an earlier writer and to distort his statement is a misrepresentation of facts and certainly not a sign of true scholarship. Kathāpi khalu pāpānām alam aśreyase yataḥ. We can only say that

before Misra makes such "preposterous" statements (to borrow his own terminology) he should sit with some learned Sanskrit scholar, a pandit, a true guru, become his *antev āsin*, and acquire a basic knowledge of Sanskrit as well as the principles of literary criticism. Then alone he should try to interpret great poets like Bilhaṇa.

If Misra thinks that the interpretation of N means that "Pārvatī is carrying Śiva in her half" he is sadly mistaken. Misra does not know the true meaning of N's words at all. We are reminded of the famous prayer once again:

Ajñānāndhasya lokasya....

Let us see what Bh says:

Priyasya Śivasyārdhasthitimardhe svadakṣiṇāṅge sthitimudvahantyāḥ dhāra yantyāḥ.

Now Bh puts his own interpretation into the mouth of Bilhaṇa and concludes:

"Tantraśāstradrṣṭyā Pārvatya ādyaśaktitvena grahaṇam kavissammataṃ pratibhāti." He cites a beautiful *stuti* from Ānandasāgarastava of Śrīnīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita:

Ardhaṃ striyas tribhuvane sacarācare'smin
ardhaṃ pumāṃsa iti darśayitum bhavatyā.
Stri [!] puṃsalakṣaṇam idam vapur ādṛtam yat
tenāsi devi viditā trijagaccharīrā.

Whether Bilhaṇa was a śākta or not, but certainly Bh shows his bias. Well, there is nothing wrong in that. That is his interpretation. Śiva gives his half to Pārvatī, or Pārvatī takes half of Śiva is a question no one can decide in an absolute manner. However, that Bilhaṇa wanted to pay his homage to the female deity is evident from his words in the prayer: "*Sā pātu vaḥ Parvatarājaputrī.*" To begin with, he offers his prayers to Lord Viṣṇu, manifest in the form Kaṃsaripu, i.e. Śrīkṛṣṇa. Then he offers his homage to Lord Śeṣaśāyin. 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 Kaṃsaripu may protect the readers. Then he prays that Bhagavān Mukunda may bring prosperity to the readers. And then comes *vakṣaḥsthalī* of Garuḍadhvaja. In the fourth verse we find Bilhaṇa making a direct reference to Parvatarājaputrī and praying that may she protect the readers. Nandaka (the sword) is directly mentioned thereafter and the poet wishes that let it give deep pleasure to his readers. In the sixth verse is worshiped Śiva, not directly but through his *praṇāmāḥ*, which are said to be above all, sarvotkarṣeṇa vartante. Next comes Sarasvatī. Bilhaṇa prays that she be pleased with the readers. E

ven Gaṇeśa is worshiped not directly, but through his *karaśīkarāṇām vikṣepalīlā*, the playful scattering (sprinkling) of the drops of water through the trunk. So Bilhaṇa demonstrates his own *prauḍhi*, his own special *vicchitti* and *vyutpatti*. 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 in Kashmir, the home of Bilhaṇa. Let us finish this discussion with the concluding words of Bilhaṇa:

Yasya svecchāśabaracaritālokanatrastayeva
 nyastaś cūḍāśasikalikayā kvāpi dūre kuraṅgaḥ.
 Sa vyutpattim sukavivacaneṣvādikartā śrutīnām
 devaḥ preyān acaladuhitur niścalām vaḥ karotu.
 [stress added]

Our prayer is: May God bless such ignorant writers with the light of learning.

It is noteworthy that the poet finishes his great work by invoking the blessings of "Acaladuhituh preyān." the lover of the daughter of the Himalayas, i.e. Śaṅkara! Śaṅkara does not come directly but through "acaladuhitā." Let us pay special attention to the two words "acala" in "acaladuhitā," and *niścalām* as an adjective of "vyutpattim." We may recall the very early reference to this word in:

Vyutpattir āvarjitakovidāpi na raṅjanāya kramate jaḍānām.
 Na mauktikacchidrakarī śalākā pragalbhate karmaṇi ṭaṅkikāyāḥ.

What is *vyutpattiḥ*? *Vyutpattiḥ* is development, perfection, growth (esp. in knowledge, proficiency, esp. in literature or science), comprehensive learning or scholarship, etc. It also means "derivation" (in grammar), the power to analyze a word into its prakṛti and pratyaya. We have the expressions like "*avyutpannaprātipadika*."

So, unless and until one has been blessed with "sukavivacaneṣu vyutpattim" he should not indulge in commenting upon great works such as the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* of Mahākavi Bilhaṇa. He should first acquire this "*sukavivacaneṣu vyutpattim*" by becoming an antevasin of a worthy guru and acquire the quality of *vinaya* and *jijñāsā*.

We are not sure if Misra has seen the *Kāvyaṅkārāśā*, the immortal work of Mammaṭa. Mammaṭa gives hetuḥ (kāraṇam) of kāvyam:

Śaktir nipuṇatā loka-śāstrakāvyaḍyavekṣaṇāt.
 Kāvyaḍjñāśikṣayābhyāsa iti hetus tadudbhave.

This *nipuṇatā* is identical with *vyutpattiḥ*. Mammaṭa says:

"Lokasya sthāvarajaṅgamātmakavṛttasya. Śāstrāṅām chandovyākaraṅābhidhānak ośa -kalācaturvargaḍajaturāṅgakaḍḍādilakṣaṅagrānthānām. Kāvyaṅām ca mahākav isam bandhinām. Ādigrahaṅād itihāsādīnām ca vimarśanād vyutpattiḥ."

Avekṣaṇād = vimarśanād = muhur muhus tattatpadārtharasādīgocarād anusandhānāt. Nipuṇatā = vyutpattiḥ = tattadartharasādīgocarō dṛḍhatarasamskāraḥ = sakalapadārtha paurvāparyālocanakaūśalam. Bālabodhinī of Vamanacarya Jhalkikar, pp. 12-13.

* * *

Let us turn our attention to another demonstration of scholarship by Misra. He acts like a dictator as far as the interpretation of literature is concerned. He says:

18. *vātāyana-*

vātāyana- is invariably glossed in ed. sec. and reproduced [mark the word] in ed. ter. by *gavākṣa-* "a round window" at the instance of Amarak. 2.3.9. Literally *vātāyana* - may be explained as *vātasyāyanam yena* "by which the wind goes [and comes] = window" or *vātasyāyanam yatra* "where there is the going [and coming] of the "wind". Thus it comes to be used not only in the sense of *gavākṣa-* but as a designation of "the flat roof of an Indian house (50) roof terrace, balcony (51) portico", etc.

From the context it appears that "balcony" or "flat roof" is the sense in which *vātāyana* is used in 9.91...*vilāsavātāyanasevanena* "by enjoying the pleasure balcony."52

9.129cd *vātāyanaiḥ kelivimānakalpais tavāstu kāñcī nayanotsavāya.*

"May Kāñcī be to the feast of your eyes by its balconies which are like pleasure *vimānas.*"

Cp. also: 12.21, 27; 17.10, 30, 32, 60; 18.4,9,25. 30; Karnaṣu. 1.22. [pp. 48-49]

Misra's footnotes:

50. Kathās. 95.18 *svagrhotuṅgavātāyanagataḥ* 'staying on the lofty roof of the house'; *ibid.* 103.16 *harmyavātāyanārūḍhaḥ* "having climbed on the roof of the palace" [like a monkey, isn't it Mr....er....Doctor Misra?] (cp. also Hcar. 4 para. 7. ... *sa rājā... harm [y?] asya prṣṭhe suṣvāpa* "that king slept on the roof of the palace"). Tawney's explanation of *vātāyana* by 'window' for these passages in Kathās., is shown [by whom?] to be wrong by the context. [Misra translates *vātāyana* by "roof" in all these passages. To us it seems merely a *durāgraha* of one who is *grahakalita*].

51. Bcar. 3.19-21; Ragh. 7.6-8; Rudrakavi, Rāṣṭraudha., 20.57. Balconies (= *vātāyana*) framed by small railings, are found in sculptures at Bārhuṭ [Bharhut?], Sāñcī, Mathura etc. Young women, crowding each other [or one another?], stand on these balconies in excitement, looking at scenes below. Cp. A. Coomaraswamy, Early Indian Architecture (Palaces) pp. 181-217 (Eastern Art, 3).

52. For a similar description cp. particular passage in Bāṇabh[ā?]ṭṭa's Hcar., in which queen Yaśovatī is described to enjoy moonlight on a balcony by putting on her upper garment. [pp.48-49]

In response to Misra's explanations and interpretations as presented above, we would like to submit as follows:

"*Vātāyana* is invariably glossed in *ed. sec.* and reproduced [!] in *ed. ter.* by *gavākṣa* " because *Amarasiṃha* has ordained that way in his *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam*: *Vātāyana* ṃ *gavākṣaḥ*. But there is nothing wrong in it. "*Vātāyanam*" is "*gavākṣaḥ*" and "*gavākṣaḥ*" is "*vātāyanam*." They are interchangeable words. They are *paryāya* (synonymous) *padas*. The question is: How can Misra assert categorically and convincingly that *gavākṣa* is a round window? What authority does he have to prove that "*gavākṣa*" means a ROUND WINDOW only and not a square or an oblong window? And what about hexagonal, octagonal, etc.?

Misra gives the *vyutpatti* of *vātāyanam* by the words-- *vātasya ayanam yena*, or *yatr a* but he does not explain the word *gavākṣa* by the same methodology.

Let us see how *Rāmāśramī* explains *gavākṣa*: "*Gavām akṣīva... gāvo jalāni kiraṇā vā akṣanti vyāpnuvanti enam anena vā.*" i.e. the one which the water or rays can PERVADE, or permeate, or penetrate, i.e. an open space, or an opening through which the water or rays can pass. This can mean window. It can also mean an open terrace. The point we want to make is this: Both the words have exactly the same meaning; a space open, as opposed to a room, which is closed by four walls through which neither air nor water could enter in, or penetrate. In brief, Misra has not given any documentary evidence to prove that *gavākṣa* is a ROUND WINDOW. That is all.

* * *

Misra once again plays plagiarism.

19 *vyākhyā-*

vyākhyā- "interpretation" is obvious in 18.4b and 78b. In 18.79c *Mahābhāṣyavyākhyā-*, is taken as "commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*" by Bühler, followed by others, which seems doubtful:

Misra does not clearly state what he means by "followed by others" (his p. 49, l. 21). Does he mean Nagar too? If yes, then he is not speaking the whole truth.

18.79cd

*mahābhāṣyavyākhyām akhilajanavandyām vidadhataḥ sadā
yasya cchātrais tilakitam abhūt prāṅgaṇam 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 former occurrences, [!] is more likely in above stanza. Moreover, no commentary on the Mahābhāṣya by Jyeṣṭhakalaśa is known or mentioned elsewhere. [pp. 49-50]

Here is what Nagar had stated 35 years ago (1943):

Mahābhāṣyavyākhyām....prāṅganam api', iti kaver uktim 'Jyeṣṭhakalaśo mahābhāṣyaṭīkāṃ kāñcana praṇināya' iti vyākhyātavān Ḍā. Byuhlaramahodayaḥ. Iyaṃ ṭīkā kvacanāpi nopalabhyate nāpi ca nirdiśyata iti tena pratyapādi. Sarvam etad asaṅgatam. Jyeṣṭhakalaśaḥ kām api ṭīkāṃ na praṇītavān iti vastusthiṭiḥ. Sa hi mahābhāṣyasya vyākhyāyām (vyākhyāne'dhyāpane vā) kuśalo'bhavad ityeva kaver āśayaḥ. Kāśmīreṣvanekāni vyākhyāsthānānyāsan Kāśmīrikā vidvāṃsaś ca vyākhyākuśalā āsanniti kavina'nyatrāpi sthānadvaye (aṣṭā. 4; aṣṭā. 78) pratyapādi. Kaveḥ prāguktoktau ṭīkānirmānaparakatayā pratipannāyām chātrāṅgāṃ nirdeśo na saṅgacchate. Kiñca 'kṛtavataḥ' i ti padenaiva tātparyāvabodhe sukare vartamānakālaprayogo mudhaiva syāt. [Upodg hāta. 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 deeds, Bilhaṇa would not have said:

Sāhityapāthonidhimanthanottham karṇāmṛtaṃ rakṣata he kavīndrāḥ.
Yadasya daityā iva luṅṭhanāya kāvyārthacaurāḥ praguṇībhavanti. [1:11]

Before we leave this topic we would like to point out that Misra's attempt to interpret "*api*" to mean the "smallness" of the room (causing the overflow of students) is uncalled for. It is not necessary to imagine that the "room" in which Jyeṣṭhakalaśa taught Mahābhāṣya was so small that the students had to stand in the courtyard! We don't believe either that there were so many students--the crowd was so large--that they overflowed the room. We believe that "*prāṅganam*" here stands in contradistinction to the *vyākhyāsthānāni*, which were more or less "public" places, while the house of Jyeṣṭhakalaśa was his own home, a private residence. Misra's "*vyākhyā*" is far-fetched.

* * *

Misra continues his learned exposition:

20 *velā*

velā- is explained by *ta a* "shore" edd. ter. and sec. [why the order is changed here?] on verse 9.7, which is hardly correct;

śṛṅgāraratnākaravelayeva tayā praveśe vihite taruṇyā/
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:

samucchalyantī prāṇayīkṛtāni lāvānyaratnākaravelāyeva//

"as if embraced by the gushing up flood wave of the ocean of loveliness."

In 7.75 *velācala*- "coastal mountain" is used for "shore."

velā- originally means "tide, flow", whence developed some secondary senses, viz. "wave" (originally: "of which the tide consists"), "shore" (originally: "on which the tide is observed"), "boundary/limit" (originally: "of the tide"). Cp. Amarak. 3.3.98 *abdhy-am buvikṛtau velā kālamaryādayor api*.

velā- prefixed with *ud* (= *udvela*-) in 8.52 and 10.70 is used in the sense of "limitless." [pp. 50-51]

Misra declares emphatically that *velā* originally means "tide, flow." We don't know what he means by "originally." [Does he mean before Vālmīki and Vyāsa?] Even if it is admitted that the original meaning of *velā* is "tide" or "flow," it does mean *samudra-ta* too. Here is Apte: *Velā* [=] Time, Season, Opportunity, Interval of repose, Leisure, Tide, Flow, Current, Sea-coast, Sea-shore, (ex. *Velānilāya prasṛtā bhujāṅgāḥ; Sa velāvapralayām (urvīm)*), Limit, Boundary, etc. etc.

It is to be remembered that "tide" or "flow", i.e. the huge mass of water itself is not red (*rāga-yukta*). It is the jewels that are red. Where do they get collected? On the shore! They are washed ashore. We have similar expression: *Samudravelā ratiratnasaṃpadām* [Vik. 2:21]. The "tide" or "flow, unless it reaches the shore and washes the red gems on it, cannot be coloured and can not colour any other object.

In other words, the jewels are strewn, or are found scattered on the shore after the tide has ebbed, i.e. receded. After the jewels are washed ashore and are collected on the shore, the tide does not have to stay there. The jewels are seen on the shore after the water gets receded. So we are more concerned here with the shore, rather than the tide! Compare also:

Yaṃ vīkṣya pāthodhir adhiyacāpam śoṇāśmabhiḥ śoṇitaśoṇadehaiḥ.

Kṣobhād abhīkṣṇam raghurājabāṇa-jīrṇavraṇasphoṭam ivācacakṣe. [1:109]

Thus we have shown following the maxim of *sthālīpulāka* the fact that Misra's arguments and statements leave much to be desired. Now we will pass on to his third chapter to show him further in his true color.

CHAPTER III

Secondary Source Material Relating To

Vikramāṅkadevacarita

In this "Chapter III: Secondary Source Material Relating to *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*," Misra discusses variant readings found in anthologies. With regard to 16:49 he states:

(b) In our [!] MS. the first three syllables are missing. They have to be supplied from Smk-, which reads *talpeṣu* (accordingly *edd. sec. and ter.* against Bühler's *vistīrṇa-*. [p.62]

This is a misrepresentation of facts and distortion of truth. A cruel criminal takes others too to be criminals. It is *lokapravañcanam*, and not *śloka vivecanam*. It is all cheating and lying. N did not use any secondary source to fill the lacunae caused by Bühler's errors in transcribing J. N went straight to J and found the correct and complete, true and exact readings still preserved there. See N's comments on *Gaurī vibhramdhūpadhūma--(Vik. 16:51)*

It seems Misra did not read "the sigla and abbreviation" [expression borrowed from Misra, p. 126] used by N in his *Prastāvanā* on p. 2. (*Kāvya mūlasaṁśodhanopayoginā m pustakānām sāṅketikacihnavivaraṇasahitaḥ paricayaḥ*).

At the bottom of page 175, fn no. 4 (four) of N reads: *dareṣu tūla- Pra.*" Now this "P" (= *Pra. Pustakam*) has been described on p. 2 of the "*Prastāvanā*" thus:

Puṇyapattanasthabhāṇḍāra karaprācyagaveṣaṇāsaṁsthāyāḥ (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona) adhigataṁ pustakam idam Ḍā. Byuhlara-Yākobī (Drs. Bühler and Jacobi) Mahodayābhyām 1874 I. vatsare svahastalikhitā Ja. pustakapratilipiḥ.

Maybe Misra did not read this. In case he read it and also understood it, the conclusion is irresistible that he is not honest. We don't know what Misra means by "Our" MS. The omission was generated by "P" and not by J! Now P is not J! So Drs. Bühler and Jacobi are responsible for this lacuna. J has even today the three letters "*talpeṣu*" right in their proper place. They are not "to be supplied from Misra's Smk." They were supplied by J to Nagar as early as 1941 or so when Nagar toiled in Jaisalmer and compared his "copy" with the original J MS. To bring in "*ed. ter.*" is uncalled for, because Bh is merely a copier.

Let us see, once again, Misra's power of perception. Gaṇḍe maṇḍanam ātmanaiva kurute (8:82) is cited by *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (Calcutta, 1965, p. 137) as no. 506 under section 7 *Pragalbhā*, but the compiler Śrīdharadāsa puts it as anonymous *kasyacit* [!]

The very next verse in Saduktikarṇāmṛta is Dolāyām jaghanasthalena, which is Vik. 8:86. This is correctly ascribed to Bilhaṇa by the statement "Bilhaṇasya." Thus it can be concluded that the compiler did not consult the original Vik. He depended upon an earlier compilation, or *loka prasiddhi* (popular tradition). That Misra does not notice this omission (of 8:82) is *aparā kathā*! Or, was he concerned only with those verses which were ascribed to *Bilhaṇa nāmagrāham* (by name)?

Let us study another instance:

Sūktimuktāvalī Nagarīvarṇanapaddhatiḥ 107:9.

Niśāsu yatra pratibimbavartmanā samāgataś cārudṛsām niśākaraḥ.
Vilāsadolāyitakuṇḍalāhataḥ kapolalāvanyaajale nimajjati.
Bilhaṇasya [Vik.17:34]

The above verse is not listed by the editor of Smk as one of the compositions of Bilhaṇa [!] although the text on p. 378 clearly states "*Bilhaṇasyaitau*". The dual number refers to the earlier verse "*Sthitā [stu]*" or "*Sthitāsu*" which is Smk. 107:8 and Vik. 17:33. Therefore, this omission seems very strange, because after the second verse there is a clear statement "*Bilhaṇasyaitau*." Although Misra does list this 17:34 verse in his "Concordance" on page 67, yet he does not include it in his discussion in the Chapter entitled "Secondary Source Material Relating to *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*."

It may be reasonable to infer from the successive enumeration (or listing) of the two verses in the order of the original that the compiler of Smk. had the original text of Vik. with him!

According to Misra the following verses of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* are cited in anthologies:

01:07 Vacāṃsi Vācaspatimatsareṇa

01:14 Kuṇṭhatvam āyāti guṇaḥ kavīnām

01:18 Jaḍeṣu jātapratibhābhimānāḥ

01:26 Pṛthvīpateḥ santi na yasya pārśve

01:27 Laṅkāpateḥ saṅkucitaṃ yaśo yad

01:29 Karṇāmṛtaṃ sūktirasam vimucya

There is a big gap between canto 1 and canto 7, i.e. no verse is quoted in anthologies from cantos 2 through 6, inclusive. 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 mahākāvya* and for his having followed the *kavimārga*.

- 07:05 Kṛtaprakopāḥ pavanāśanānām
07:20 Saundaryam indīvaralocanānām
07:22 Prasārya pādaḥ vihitasthitīnām
07:23 Unnamya dūram muhur ānamantyaḥ
07:63 Mānagranthikadarthanāya kathitāḥ
07:64 Līlāsānavidhikṣamaḥ madhulihām
07:70 Malayagirisamīrāḥ Siṃhaladvīpa
07:71 Pānīyam nālikerīphalakuvara
07:76 Yaś cūtāṅkurakandalīkavalanāt
08:06 Tasyāḥ pādanakhaśreṇiḥ
08:08 Amūlyasya mama svarṇa
08:10 Jāgrataḥ kamalāl lakṣmīm
08:14 Hemamañjīramālābhyām
08:16 Manye tadūrū saṃbhāvya
08:21 Tannitambasya nindanti
08:25 Bhāti romāvalī tasyāḥ
08:30 Manye samāptalāvanya
08:37 Daridram udaram dṛṣṭvā
08:47 Mukhenducandrikāpūra
08:48 Tatkucau carataḥ kiñcin
08:51 Ayaḥ trayāṇām grāmāṇām
08:60 Aṅgulībhiḥ kuraṅgākṣyāḥ
08:62 Haste cakāsti bālāyāḥ
08:64 Sarale eva dorlekhe

- 08:65 Bāhū tasyāḥ kucābhoga
- 08:69 Bhāti dantacchadenāsyāḥ
- 08:71 Purāṇabāṇatyāgāya
- 08:73 Mṛgīsambandhinī dṛṣṭir
- 08:76 Saundaryapātre vaktrendau
- 08:79 Kiñcit savibhramodañci
- 08:82 Gaṇḍe maṇḍanam ātmanaiva
- 08:85 Dṛśoḥ sīmāvādaḥ śravaṇa
- 08:86 Dolāyām jaghanasthalena
- 08:87 Lāsyābhyāsamiṣeṇa citram
- 08:88 Vaktram nirmalam unnatā
- 10:39 Asaṅkhyapuṣpo'pi manobhavasya
- 10:42 Atāḍayat pallavapāṇinaikām
- 10:46 Svedāmbhasā puṣparajobharaiś ca
- 10:71 Dattaṃ sarobhyaḥ phalam
- 10:75 Kimapyavajñātasaroruhebhyaḥ
- 11:09 Bhānumān aparadigvanitāyāḥ
- 11:77 Yaḥ sainye smarapārthivasya
- 11:83 Ye kuṅṭhīkṛtavallabhapraṇatayaḥ
- 13:05 Raveḥ samastakṣitimadhyagam
- 13:09 Dṛśam prapāpālikayā prakāśite
- 13:25 Adabhram abhropalapaṭṭakeṣu ye
- 13:80 Nayasva pāraṃ pulinadvayānugām
- 13:88 Vidyutpaṅkajakhaṇḍapaṅkapaṭālī

- 14:32 Nīlanīradanicolakojjhite
 14:37 Kṣuṇṇamauktikaparāgapāṇḍuraḥ
 16:02 Śaratkāḷātapaklānta
 16:08 Alabhanta nabhaḥkṣetre
 16:09 Saśaṅkeneva Kandarpa
 16:10 Abhūvannadbhutoṣmānaḥ
 16:14 Madvairiṇaḥ kaṭhorāṃśor
 16:15 Samakṣam api sūryasya
 16:44 Svecchāvihārarasikasya
 16:49 Aṅgārahāṣiṣu vilāsagrhodareṣu
 16:51 Gaurīvibhramadhūpadhūma
 16:52 Sprṣṭāḥ stokam Vitastātaḥ
 17:11 Ahaṃ sadā prāṇasamam
 17:12 Narendracāmīkaracārubhūṣaṇa
 17:33 Sthitāstu yatroparibhūmi
 17:34 Nisāsu yatra pratibimba
 18:06 Svecchābhaṅgurabhāgyamegha
 18:107 He rājānas tyajata sukavi

Here is a summary:

<u>Canto</u>	<u>Total no. of verses</u>
01	06
07	09
08	26
10	05
11	03
13	06
14	02
16	10

17	04
18	02
-----	-----
10	73

Cantoes disregarded by anthologists: 2-6, 9, 12, 15 = 8.

It is to be noted that Misra overlooks the *Alaṅkāratnākara* by Śobhākaramitra which cites many verses from Bilhaṇa. All the above *ḍambara* on the part of Misra is more of a padding rather than real *kāminī-kucakalāśau!*

CHAPTER IV

Verses Ascribed to Bilhaṇa in Anthologies

In Chapter IV Misra discusses "Verses Ascribed to Bilhaṇa in Anthologies." He begins with:

atrākaṅṭham viluṭha salile nirjalā bhūḥ purastāj
jahyāḥ śoṣaṃ vadanavi[ni?]hitenāmalakyāḥ phalena/
sthāne sthāne tad iti pathikastrījana[h] klāntagātrīm
paśyan sītām kim u na kṛpayā vardhito roditaṣ ca//

Smk. 90.19: *Karuṇapaddhatiḥ; Bilhaṇasya.*

Misra's comments are:

(d) *vardhito roditaṣ 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 us! All the *pathika-strījanas* were not unlucky, destitute, or distressed. And who says Sītā was unhappy? Read what she says in Vālmīki-- [*Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, sargas 27-30.

It is a horrible insult to that Divine Lady Jagamātā Sītā

Udbhavasthitisamhāra-kāriṇīm kleśahāriṇīm.
Sarvasreyaskarīm Sītām nato'haṃ Rāmavallabhām.
Ādyā, Jagamātā, Jagacchaktiḥ Devayajanasambhavā....

Viśvambharā bhagavatī bhavatīm asūta

Rājā prajāpastisamo Janakaḥ pitā te.
Teṣāṃ vadhūs tvam asi nandini pārthivānām
yeṣā kule ca savitā ca gurur vayam ca.
(Drawn from memory. To be checked).

to say that she was so unhappy that the passersby women would take pity on her and regard themselves more lucky! Furthermore, we don't know how Misra gets the meaning "gladdened (comforted)" by the word *vardhito*!! My interpretation is that the passersby 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 terrain where there was no water for a long stretch of land.

* * *

Misra's Power of Perception (or deception)

32

dehapraviṣṭādrisutāmukhendu-
dvitīyakhaṇḍārdham ivāgato yaḥ/
avāptukāmaḥ paripūrṇabhāvam
sa pātu vaḥ Śambhujaṭārdhacandraḥ//

Smk. 2.52: *āśīrvādapaddhatiḥ*: Bilhaṇasya-.

Misra ordains:

(a) Read *indum* for *indu-*. "The half moon in Śiva's hair... that has approached the face moon of Pārvatī...as if it were its second half... [pp. 78-79]

Once again Misra displays his ignorance. And urged by his arrogance suggests an emendation which does not solve the problem at all! Rather it creates a situation which can well be described as "confusion-worse-confounded." It would have been much better if he had observed silence and merely stated, like in the previous verse (his no. 31), this "seems obscure."

Misra says: "The half-moon in Śiva's hair--that has approached the face moon of Pārvatī--as if it were the second half--"

In order to comprehend the *kavitābhivyañjitaṃ kavitātparyam*, it may be helpful to refer to another verse by the same poet, we mean our great poet Mahākavi Bilhaṇa.

Ekaḥ stanaḥ tuṅgataḥ paraṣya vārttām iva praṣṭum agān mukhāgram.
Yasyaḥ priyārdhasthitim udvahantyaḥ sā pātu vaḥ parvatarājaputrī. [1:4]

In *Dehapraviṣṭādrisutā*...the poet describes the moment of the immortal union of Śiva with Pārvatī and the emergence of the Lord Ardhanārīśvara. [See Misra's fn. no. 49 on p. 48]. Śiva gives half of his body to Pārvatī, or the half of Pārvatī's body gets merged into that of Śiva. One half is *nara*; the other half is *nārī*. Pārvatī's face was a FULL MOON before this unification. All of a sudden one half of it disappears and gets merged into that [the face] of Śiva. These are the facts. Now the poet displays his *kavitā-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 into Śiva's face) in order that it, i.e. Śiva's half moon could become a full moon! This is the meaning.

Yaḥ Śambhujaṭārdhacandraḥ, paripūrṇabhāvam avāptukāmaḥ iva, dehapraviṣṭādrisutāmukhendu- dvitīyakhaṇḍārdham āgataḥ saḥ vaḥ pātu.

The verse is not very clear as it stands. We have purposely kept it as it appears in the doctoral dissertation of Mr. Misra. The problem is created by the two words *khaṇḍa* and *ardha* which are (almost) synonymous. *Ja ārdhacandraḥ āgataḥ* is clear. But wh

ere? Why? So Misra suggests that we read *mukhendum* instead of *mukhendu*, thus making *dehapraviṣ ādriśutāmukhendum* (acc.) and *dvitīyakhaṇḍārdham-- samānādhikaraṇa* as one and the same object. The question is: Whose *deha*? Whose body? Where did the full-moon of Adriśutā go? Wherein did it disappear? Whereinto did it get merged? Where did the *ja ārdhacandra* go? To whom did it go? To Adriśutā? 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 half, which is the only remnant of her former full-moon face?

Misra's suggestion is totally meaningless. It is clear that he did not understand the poet at all! He has given one more proof here that he is not yet an *adhikārin*. We believe instead of changing *mukhendu* into *mukhendum*, and creating a situation confirming the age-old saying, *Bhakṣite'pi laśune na śānto vyādhiḥ*, or *Vināyakaṃ prakurvāṇo racayāmāsa vānaram*, we should change *ardham* (half) into *artham* (*prayojanāya*) i. e. in order to obtain, or for the purpose of obtaining, the second half of the full-face moon of Adriśutā (the half of 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, *arthah* = object, purpose, end and aim, wish, desire; often used in this sense as the last member of compounds and translated by "for" 'for the sake of'... It mostly occurs in this sense as *artham* as the last member of compounds and has an adverbial force --*kimartham* for what purpose? Why? For whom, or for which?

Here are some examples:

Taddarśanād abhūc chambhor bhūyān dārārdham ādaraḥ.
Kumārasambhave.

And here is our own poet:

Pratyāgacchati langhanārdham asakṛd vyomāṅgaṇaṃ candramāḥ. [8:83.2]

[I had conjectured *artham* in early fifties, while still in India. I was copying all the verses of Bilhaṇa occurring in the *Sūktimuktāvalī*. I had thought even at that time that the reading ought to be *artham* and not *ardham*.

Limits of Misra's Little Knowledge

33

dehārdham kuru pārvati sthirapadam [haste] dhanur dhāraya
svedārdham yadi mṛjyatām karatalaṃ bhasmāṅgarāgeṇa me/
evaṃ jalpata eva bāṇaśikhini proḍḍīya śinjāphaṇi-
śvāsaiḥ prajvalite pureṣu jayati smerāṃ purārer mukham//

Smk. 1.11: Namaskārapaddatīḥ [sic]; Bilhaṇasya. c) *śiñjā-* as "bow string" (rare use) also Vcar. 8.88 [i.e. 8:89!] 9.1, 32 [p. 79]

The editor of *Sūktimuktāvalī* notes a variant "*deham*" for "*haste*" which is enclosed in square brackets!

With regard to *śiñjā-* as "bow string" Misra says that it is a "rare use." We don't agree.

Amarakośa Rāmāśramī says on *Śiñjinī: maurvī jyā siñjinī guṇaḥ. 2:8.85. Śinte, śiji a vyakte śabde (a.ā. se.) Āvaśyake ṇiniḥ (3.3. 170)*. Misra himself has given three examples:

1) *śiñjācālanacañcalaśrutigalattāḍaṅkapatraḥ smaraḥ. 8:89*

2) *pañcabāṇakodaṇḍaśiñjāghanagarjiteṣu. 9:1, and*

3) *śiñjāpi jātā na manobhavasya. 9.32 .*

Nevertheless he calls the use "rare." We don't know what he means.

If the above verse is a poetic composition of Bilhaṇa we may conclude that he was very fond of the God Ardhanārīśvara.

Misra Notices Kāvyaṛthacaurya

34
drāghīyasā dhārṣṭyaguṇena yuktāḥ
kaiḥ kair apūrvaiḥ parakāvyaḥkhaṇḍaiḥ/
āḍambaram ye vacasāṃ vahanti
te ke'pi kanthākavayo jayanti//

Śp. 193: *Kukavinindā; Bilhaṇasya. Smk. 5.1: idem; Kṣemendrasya* (not attested).

Verses denouncing plagiarists (*kāvyaḥcaura*) in Vcar. 1.11, 18 [p. 79]

The edn of Smk. has *kair apyapūrvaiḥ*. [What about *apūrṇaiḥ*?]

We don't know wherefrom Misra gets his reading. Probably from Śp.

Once again Misra betrays his lack of knowledge:

35
dhatte dṛṣṭim adhīta[ra?]vibhramalavām sā puṣpalāvījane
caitrasya kṣaṇa[ya?]m ādareṇa mahatā mauhūrtikān pṛcchati/
śyenā[t?] tuṣyati kokiladhvanirūṣā samtyājyā [?] līlāsukān
niḥśokā tvayi durlābhe kiṃ ā[?]pārām śā[?]kyam varākyā tayā//

We have re-presented the text here on the basis of what Misra has presented. There are many errors. If Misra himself press-copied what is printed here, then it is safe to conclude that he did not understand the poet at all!

Smk. 44.15: *nāyakasyāgre dūtyuktiḥ; Bilhaṇasya.*

Misra comments:

c) *tuṣyati* here with the abl. of starting point[?]

d) For *niḥśoka* [!]-read *niḥśūka*- "O merciless one!"[?] [Remember his text has "*niḥśoka*"] because of her wrath with [on?] the *kokilas* "she is contented on account of [!] the falcon"; *varāka*-/ fem. *varākī*- in the sense of "miserable, to be pitied"; Vcar. 1.18, 98; 8.46; 11.9 (-ī), 65 (-ī); *vārākī*- in the sense of "miserable, wretched, of vile behaviour": Vcar. 6.35; Karnasu. 1.11 [p. 79]

We don't believe Misra has understood the meaning of this verse. It seems he is now totally tired. There are many errors in his text. There are many points where there is *chandobhaṅga*. For *adhīta* do we read *adhīra*? *Samtyājyā* (second long) is wrong. There here is *chandobhaṅga* too, when the last letter (which will be 15th) of the word (*saṃtyājyā*) is read as long. The reading can be *saṃtyajya*. [Later on I found (in the original, Smk) that it is *santyajya*]. Even that is not appropriate as far as the meaning is concerned. I remember having read *santarjya*, meaning having chased them away. Or, is it my *kalpanā* only? Probably *līlāsukas* were copying the melodious tunes of the *kokilas*.

So she drove them away, and now she is pleased with the falcon, because it does not imitate the *kokilas*. Misra has *śyenā[t]tuṣyati*. Smk has *śyenā[t]tuṣyati*. So the *pañcamī vibhakti* is not the original, but only conjectural. Misra explains: "(c) *tuṣyati* here with the abl. of starting point." *Dhruvam apāye'pādānam*. We don't find any "starting point" (*dhruva*) here! There is nothing like *āsvāt patati* or *grāmād āyāti*. Misra himself translates the phrase as "on account of" (line 3 in (d). We believe this is *hetvarthe pañcamī*.

Here is a relevant *sadukti* from our own poet:

Līlāsukāḥ kokilakūjitānām atipraharṣād vihitānukārāḥ.

Gṛhād adhāvyaṅta viyoginībhīr guṇo hi kāle guṇinām guṇāya. [7:32]

Guṇo hi doṣāya bhavet kadācit. [Alternative reading of MS. A]

Niḥśokā seems to be wrong. *Niḥśoka* = free from (devoid of) sorrow or care. *Niḥśoka*, an address to the *nāyaka* will be quite appropriate, i.e. he does not care what happens to his [beloved] lady who is pining so intensely for him!

We have never heard of *niḥśūka*! Of course, the dictionary gives the meaning as copied by Misra, but why to change when *niḥśoka* makes a perfect sense, even a better one!

In the fourth *pāda*, Misra has committed two errors, forgetting his own metri causa-- 1) *durlābhe* (*durlabhe* is the form) and 2) *āpārām* (*aparam* is the right form here) and not *āpārām*! It is *śakyam*, and not *śākyam* (what Misra has).

Kṣaṇam does not make any sense here! Of course, Misra does not care--He is *niḥśoka*! He does not understand the poet anyway! *Kṣayam* will be more appropriate--When will the month of Caitra (destructive season) end? Mark who are asked: *Mauhūrtikā n pṛcchati*! It is to be remembered here that we have a *dvikarmaka dhātu* here. *Mauhūrtikān kṣayam pṛcchati*. 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 śrutiśālinām vyavahṛtir mlecchocitā dṛśyate/
ekair vānmayadevatā bhagavatī vikretum ānīyate
niḥśānkair aparaiḥ parīkṣaṇavidhau sarvāṅgam udghāṭyate//

Śp. 194. *kukavinindā: Bilhaṇasya*. Smk. 5.2: idem. *Ralhaṇasya*. In Bhand. rep. (p. xx xiii) 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 MSS, (5) and by Bṛhacchārṅgadharapaddhati.(6) [p. 80]

5: ZDMG 27, 1876, p.56

6: A.D. Pusalkar, P.K. Gode Commemoration Vol. Poona, 1960, pt. 3, p. 157 f. [p. 80]

The above verse is an *akṣaravṛttam*, called *Śārdūlavikrīḍitam*, where each quarter has to contain 19 *akṣaras*. Its definition is: *sūryāśvair masajastatāḥ saguravaḥ Śārdūlavikrīḍitam*. In Misra's text as quoted above, in the first quarter two *akṣaras* are missing. Misra couldn't care less! He is *niḥśūka*, anyway. The missing letters maybe "*keyam*", between "*vilayam*" 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 kumāryāpi na suptam ekayā*, he points out that Śp 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 *Sūktimuktāvalī*. It does have *keyam* in its proper place! So Misra's performance is of a very low order.

We might add as a footnote: Smk has *e[kaiḥ]* and gives *ekā* as a variant reading in the footnote!

* * *

Misra's Āḍambara:

39

nīrāgā mṛgalāñchane mukham api svaṃ nekṣate darpaṇe
trastā kokilakūjitād api giram nonmudrayaty ātmanaḥ/
citram duḥsahadāyini[!] dhṛtadveṣā'pi puṣpāyudhe
mugdhā sā subhaga tvayi pratipadam premādhikam puṣyati//

Smk. 44.16: *nāyakasyāgre dūtyuktiḥ*; *Bilhaṇasya*. Srk. 536: *dūtīvacanavrajyā*; *Śṛṅgāra*
sya. Skm. 647: *Śṛṅgārapravāhaḥ/Śṛṅgārasya*. Śp.3488: *nāyakasyāgre dūtyuktiḥ*; *kasyā*
pi.

While trying to understand Misra many a time we have felt so frustrated that our feelings turn into *vācām agocaram*.

Let us take, for example, the verse occurring as no. 39 on p. 81. We don't know what is the source of Misra. Every editor (or critic) while noting the variant readings has a source as his *ākara*, while he notes the variations from it (his main source). Here we find variant readings noted from Smk, Srk, Skm, and Śp. Then the question arises where in the world does the verse occur exactly as it appears in Misra's text? That is, what is Misra's primary source?

Saduktikarṇāmṛtam has been divided into five sections, which the compiler has named as *pravāha*. Each *pravāha* in its turn has been divided into subsections named *vīc ayaḥ*. On p. 70, under verse no. 5. Misra has noted a variant reading: Skm. 2367: *ucc āvacapravāhe samasyā*; *kasyacit*. So here we have *uccāvaca* as *pravāha* and *samasyā* as *vīci*. On p. 91, lines 1-2: Skm 607: *śṛṅgārapravāhe virahiṇīvacanam*; *Silhanasy* [!]

Following the same principle we would expect in verse 39 (p. 81) *śṛṅgārapravāhe udvegakathanam*, the latter being the *vīci* or subsection. But Misra's relevant statement stops with *śṛṅgārapravāhaḥ!*

Let us resume our discussion. Misra gives:

Variants:

- a) For *nīrāgā*: Srk.; Skm. *sodvegā*.
- c) For *citram duḥ-*: Smk. *ittham duḥ*.
- d) For *mugdhā sā subhagā* [!]: Srk.
bālā sā...; Śp.

sābālā subhagaṃ prati; for *pratipadam premā*: Skm. *pratimuhuh premā-*.

That the ascription to Bilhaṇa is correct, [!] is proved by the verse occurring in Karṇasu. 2.29. Here we read:

b) *khinnā kokilakūjitād api; (d) mugdhākṣī.*

khinnā...-kūjitāt seems to be emended into *trastā...-kūjitāt* "afraid of". But "tormented on account of the crying..." is unobjectionable, [?] cp. above verse 35c...*śyenā[t] tu śyati.*"

The verse was overlooked by D.D. Kosambi (7) when discussing the age of Vidyākara (the compiler of Srk.), Introd. p. xxxiii. It shows his conclusions to be wrong. Also the statement, concerning the verses of Karṇasu., given by B.S. Miller, Caurap. p. 4 n 7 does not stand. [pp. 81-82]

7: Which is pardonable as the verse starts differently in Srk. (*sodvegā mṛga-*) and Karṇasu. (*nīrāgā mṛga-*).

Mark the word "pardonable." Otherwise Kosambi would have been hanged.

Note the omission of two letters in the third quarter! Skm. edn.(GOS) clearly has the word *dāha* after *duḥsaha* and before *dāyini*. So, it is evident that Misra does not even consult the original. We don't know what is his source.

The above verse has been cited by Śobhākara as an example of *pratyānikam*. It is not traced by Devadhara (editor) to any poet. Identity of the *nāyaka* with *smara* is shown. *Sūktimuktāvalī* clearly and specifically ascribes it to Bilhaṇa.

* * *

Let us examine one more incongruity of Misra:

puraḥ sthitvā kiṃcid valitamukham ālokaya sakhe
sakhedāḥ sthāsyanti dhruvam idam adṛṣṭās tava dṛśaḥ/
itas cañcatkāñcīraṇitamukharān saudhaśikharān
arākāyāṃ keyaṃ kavacayati candreṇa mahasā//

While reading it, I got the feeling that *adṛṣ ās tava dṛśaḥ* does not make much sense! I thought we should change the reading to *adṛṣ vā tava dṛśaḥ!* And lo, Misra has noted a variant reading. Śp. makes it *adṛṣ vā!* But, Misra, swayed by his own super-knowledge, rejects it on the ground that it is "hardly possible." But he does not tell us what sense does "his possible" make!

Furthermore, we believe the penultimate word in the 4th *pāda* should be *cāndreṇa* (of the moon) and not *candreṇa*. It is an adjective and qualifies *mahasā*.

We could go on and on. But we don't want to become too boring to our own readers.

Incidentally, this verse contains the word *cañcat*, unworthy in the eyes of Misra! We don't know why he did not recommend that it be discarded right away?

Here is one more poetic gem which might make Misra re-think as far as *cañcat* is concerned:

Mallīmatallīṣu vanāntareṣu vallyantare vallabhamāhvayantī.
Cañcadvipañcīkalanādabhaṅgī-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 paurastrībhir na lāsyam upāsyate
sarasamadhuraṃ nāṭyāgāre na kūjati vallakī/
ahaha pahita[!]dvāraṃ kasmād idaṃ paritaḥ puraṃ
[viratasurata] vyāpāratvāt prasuptam ivākhilam.

Smk. 107-18 [sic]: *nagarīvarṇanapaddhatiḥ: Bilhaṇasya.*

d) For *viratasurata*- of the edition: *sukharatarata*- reading of the MSS.[?] is to be retained: "When the occupation is busy (*rata*) with the enjoyment (*rata n.*) of happiness" [?] [p. 86]

So according to Misra

vyāpāra = occupation
rata = busy [adj.?
rata = enjoyment (n.)
sukha = happiness

We are reminded of a well-known *upadeśavacanam* once again: *jīvatkaver āśayo na a varṇanīyaḥ*. God alone knows-- of course Mr. Misra does not know--and he does not care either--what he wants to tell us here.

Ayam aparosya viśeṣaḥ (or, sakhi me, caturo bhartā)
svayam api likhitam svayam na vācayati.

We don't know what Misra wants to mean by "occupation." How could "occupation" be busy with the "enjoyment of happiness!" Most of the time Misra speaks, we feel lost. We scratch our head and exert our brain to understand Mr. Misra. We fail miserably. We have to acquire his type of knowledge to understand him.

We know that this is *nagarī-varṇana-paddhatiḥ*. We imagine this *nagarī* is *śokākulā*, distressed by grief; may be she is deserted. Otherwise, what is the significance of the exclamatory word *ahaha*? Why the gates are closed? Misra reads *pahitadvāram*. It

must be *pihitadvāram*. The whole may very well be a description of a city which is besieged, beleaguered. [Later on I found that Smk. has *pihita*. So Misra is wrong in this case too].

The above criticism was written some time ago. Today (Jan. 13, 1978) I saw the Smk. edn. Of course, the general heading under which this verse is cited is *Nagarīvarṇana-paddhatiḥ*, but there is a sub-heading-- *udvasannagaram* under which this verse is cited. So my guess was right. My conjecture is *viratasakala*. But it is not any closer (orthographically or morphologically) to the reading of the MSS. *sukharatarata*. I suggested *sakala* as a substitute for *surata*; but that is the conjectured reading of the editor and not of the MSS.

Let it be stressed here that the *ākaragrantha* (archetype MS.) of the editor had an omission of six letters. Editor supplies substitutes from his own imagination. Four MSS. give the reading as *sukharatarata*. The editor rejects all the four! However, Misra knows better!

* * *

Here is another display of Misra's perfect performance:

54
yaḥ śrotrāmṛtanirjharaiḥkavasatiṃ nirvyājam ārūḍhavān
yaḥ sañjīvanamantritāṃ [!] trinayanapluṣṭasya cetobhavaḥ/
vīṇāvan masṣṇo dhvaniś catasṣṇām pātraṃ śrutīnām abhūt
so'yaṃ kokilakaṇṭhaveṇuvivaravyāpārītaḥ pañcamaḥ//

Smk. 59.17: *Vasantavarṇanapaddhatiḥ: Bilhaṇasya*.

a) For *-vasatiṃ* read *-vasatir*?

b) For *mantritāṃ* read *mantratāṃ* ("lifegiving spell"). [p. 87]

Misra suggests "For *vasatiṃ* read *vasatir*".

It is not acceptable. If *śrotrāmṛta...vasatiḥ* and *pañcamaḥ dhvaniḥ* are made coordinate with each other (i.e. if they are made *samānādhikaraṇa*) then what will be the object (*karma*) of *ārūḍhavān*? We are afraid our readers would have become bitterly bored by our repeated demonstration of the *bālacāpalam*, *bālacāpale*, *bālacāpalāni* of Mahāpañḍita Mister Misramaharaja, a Ph.D. from Tuebingen, Germany.

* * *

Anthologies also differ on the authorship. Let us see the following:

Sūktimuktāvalī. Bhūcarāḥ. Siṃhapaddhatiḥ. Siṃhānyoktiḥ.22.7

Smerās santu sabhāsadaḥ karicamūdarapajvarotsāriṇā
pārīndreṇa samaṃ sa jambukayuvā yuddhāya baddhādarāḥ.
Tatrāpi prathayanti tulyabalatām eke tayor uccakair

anye saṃśayaśaṃsinas tad apare bādhaṃ viparyāsinaḥ.
[Bhīmapaṇḍitasya]

The above verse has been attributed to Bhīmapaṇḍita by the compiler of *Sūktimuktāvalī*. However, Bhand. Rep. ascribes it to Bilhaṇa. Misra has cited many verses which are ascribed anonymously to a poet, or to some poet other than Bilhaṇa by the compiler of an anthology. However, in such cases Misra cites Bhand. Rep. as the authority and ascribes it to Bilhaṇa. But he has overlooked this verse. Therefore, we cannot determine whether he studied the anthologies in original or copied the information from a secondary source!

It is to be noted in this connection that the next verse-- "*Yenānargala*", 22:8, Misra's no. 58--is ascribed to Bherībhaṅkāra by Jalhaṇa. Yet on the basis of Bhand. Rep. it is ascribed by Misra to Bilhaṇa. And the subsequent verse-- *Grāmāṇām upasālyasīmani*, 22:9, Misra's no. 23--is ascribed to Ralhaṇa by Jalhaṇa. But the editor ascribes it to Bilhaṇa on the basis of another MS.

Let it be noted here that all the three verses cited in succession are ascribed by the compiler to a poet other than Bilhaṇa, but by another source to Bilhaṇa.

* * * *

Misra's One More "Nonsensical" Reading:

59

re mātaṅga madāmbuḍambaratayā rolambarolaṃ vahan
vanyānām avalambanaṃ vanam idaṃ bhaṅktum yad utkaṅṭhase/
dr̥ṣṭaḥ [!] tat kim aho mahonnatadharādhaureyadhātrīdhara-
prasthaprasthitameghayūthamathanotkaṅṭhī na kaṅṭhīravaḥ//

--Śp. 915: *siṃhānyoktayaḥ; Bilhaṇasya*.

Misra commands:

a) Instead of nonsensical [!] *rolambarolaṃ* : read *rolambakholam* "[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]

We don't know if Misra ever read the great poet Bhāravi, who taught us centuries ago:

Sahasā vidadhīta na kriyām avivekaḥ param āpadām padam.

Misra is very hasty. He jumps immediately and condemns the poet. He does not want to consult any *ākaragrantha*. He is quick in suggesting an emendation. He pronounces the judgement right away. We don't know what he means by "simple mistake." We have never heard of a closed helmet worn by an elephant that prevents him from looking properly! He calls *rolam* "nonsensical". We think Misra should have been mor

e 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 *rolambakholam vahan*, i.e. throw away a priceless real ruby and pick up a piece of red glass! [Misra has plenty of "glass." See p. 88, line 25]. It is with reference to such thoughtless critics that a great poet sang long ago:

Arasikeṣu kavivānivedanam 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 stavakandānkuraṃ kaveḥ.
Yamakaṃ prathamā dhurya-mādhuryavacaso viduḥ.

Here is one more example from the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* itself:

Vipakṣavīrādbhuta-kīrtihārī Hārīta ityādipumān sa yatra.
Mānavyanāmā ca babhūva mānī mānavyayaṃ yaḥ kṛtavān ariṇām. [1:58]

"*Rolambakholam*" will ruin the *yamaka alaṅkāra*. It would have been much better if Misra had contained his erudition itself in a *kholā* (slip cover).

The above discussion does not answer the main question: After all what does the word "rola" mean? Well, *Abhidhānarājendra (Prākṛta-Māgadhī-Saṃskṛta-śabdakośa)* of Vijayarājendrasūrīśvara (Ratlam, 1923). v. 6, p. 580, states: *rola pu. śabde kalahe rava ca*. Let it be noted that the next word *rolamba* is designated as *deśī*. So we don't have to throw away *rolam* and ruin the poetic beauty.

We might add here that Misra was not unaware of the *Abhidhānarājendra*. See his p. 31, n. 12. Our readers may recollect the following *saduktis*:

Locanābhyāṃ vihīnasya darpaṇaḥ kiṃ kariṣyati, and

Na hi kastūrikāmodaḥ śapathena vibhāvyaṭe, and

Na hyeṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati.

Misra's One More Attempt to Annoy His Readers:

vṛthā gāthā[ḥ]ślokair alam alam alākāṃ mama rujaṃ
kadācid dhūrto'yaṃ kavivacanam ityākalayati/
idaṃ pārśve tasya prahiṇu sakhi lagnāñjanalava-
sraavadbāspotpīḍagrathitalipi tāṅkayugalam//

Smk. 41.6: *dūtīpreṣaṇapaddhatiḥ; Bilhaṇasya*.

Skm. 607: *śṛṅgārapravāhe virahiṇīvacanam; Silhaṇasy[a]*.

Variants:

a) Editions write *gāthāślokaīḥ*, which is hardly correct. cp. p. 1 on 1.74a.

b) For *ayam*: Skm. *asau*.

d) For *tā aṅka-* : *tāḍaṅka-* , which is the orthography of Bühler's Vcar. MS.: 1.102; 8.88 . [pp. 90-91]

Misra's above text reads *alākam*. [We don't know what it means] *Sūktimuktāvalī* and *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* both have *alīkām*, which is correct by itself since it means *mīthyā*, but we don't know how will it fit in the present context.

Once again Misra proves the validity of the following saying:

..... kuryād vā rāsabhadhvanim.
Yena kena prakāreṇa prasiddhaḥ puruṣo bhavet.

Misra probably does not know what he is talking about! He says: "Editions write *gāthāślokaīḥ* which is hardly correct. Cp. p. 1 on 1:74a." So Misra has inserted a *visarga* (:) in between *gāthā* and *ślokaīḥ*, thus, probably converting *gāthā* into a nominative plural (noun), *prathamā bahuvacanam--kartṛpadam*. We don't know. However, *gāthāśloka* is a compound word meaning a verse in *gāthā*. For example:

sangrathya kaścit katicid padāni gāthākavitvaṃ 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 *virahiṇī nāyikā* does not want to compose a love lament in poetic form and in *Prākṛta* dialect lest it is mistaken, by the cunning *nāyaka*, for *kavivacanam--* exaggerated poetic flights of imagination! So she wants to send her ear-ornaments which have plentiful writings made by her *añjana* mixed with flowing warm tears! There is enough message of sufferings carved on those ear-rings of the beloved lady.

We feel mentally tormented when Misra says "which is hardly correct." Has he read *Abhijñānaśākuntalam* or any other poetic composition where this kind of *viraha-sandeha-lekhana-preṣaṇa* is described? Probably not.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions

The preceding presentation represents our honest and sincere criticism of Misra's work as presented in his *Studies on Bilhaṇa and his Vikramāṅkadevacarita*. Incidentally it also deals with certain half-baked and fully naked scholars who preceded Misra and offered him a ground to play his pranks! Our delineation of Misra follows the maxim of *Sthālīpulāka*--offers merely specimens. Our criticism was not intended to be exhaustive by any means. It would have merely increased the bulk of the present study unnecessarily. It would have caused continuous pain and suffering for longer periods to our readers.

We don't know what Misra's central focus--primary objective-- was in writing what we read in his book. In our view he emerges as a mixture of pseudo-linguist and a misguided critic, a true *saṅkara*--neither this nor that. He is a mixed breed. Even his name corroborates this fact! He is *miśra*, i.e. mixed, not pure, a *saṅkara*. And the *Bhagavadgītā* has sung: *Saṅkaro narakāyaiva*. Since we don't profess to be the former (linguist), we have tried to cover only the literary aspect of his work. The other aspect is left for some other linguist-grammarians to discuss.

Sri Nagaraja Rao of Mysore had agreed to collaborate with me in this work. His knowledge of Sanskrit grammar was excellent. He has given some comments here and there. But he could not complete his assignment. I only wish some other scholar in future takes up this challenge and silences Mr. Misra as far as the grammar is concerned.

Misra's performance reminds us:

Guror giraḥ pañca dinānyadhītya vedantaśāstrāṇi dinatrayaṃ ca.
Amī samāghrāya ca tarkavādān samāgatāḥ kukkuṭa-MIŚRA-pādāḥ.

In his first chapter Misra presents "Specimens of Textual Difficulties." It is by no means an exhaustive study. He merely presents some specimens, by his own confession. The reader finishes the chapter with the impression that the poem (Vik.) is full of difficulties. This is a great injustice to the poet. We have already observed time and again: *Na hyeṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati*. Also, *Locanābhyām vihīnasya darpaṇaḥ kiṃ kariṣyati*. Misra's "difficulties" are mostly the creation of his own mind. They simply betray his own inherent lack of knowledge.

In chapter 2, Misra points out "Some Lexicographical Points of Interest." They do not seem to be of any "interest" to us at all! They merely constitute Misra's childish attempts to parade his pedantry. They don't lead us toward any better appreciation of the poetic muse of Bilhaṇa. They don't add any glory to Bilhaṇa's *vyutpatti or vicchitti*.

Rest of Misra's work consists of a kind of compilation. There is hardly any originality of ideas. There is hardly any *camatkāra*. All along we have been wondering what i

s, after all, Misra's primary focus. In Hindi we have a beautiful saying: *Isakī īṃ a usak ā roṛā; Bhānumatī ne kunabā joṛā*. Misra has titled his work as *Studies on Bilhaṇa and his Vikramāṅkadevacarita*. If we assume that the study concerns primarily with one specific work of Bilhaṇa, then Chapter 4, "Verses Ascribed to Bilhaṇa in Anthologies" is far removed from the central theme of the study. Of course, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the contents of this chapter, but then the title of the study would be more appropriately something like "Studies on Bilhaṇa and his Works".

Here is a comparative statement showing the relative size of all of Misra's chapters in terms of the total number of pages:

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Total No. of Pages</u>
1	24
2	27
3	17
4	38
5	3
6	16
Works of references	8
Index	2

	135

Thus it is seen that Chap. 4 (Verses Ascribed to Bilhaṇa in Anthologies) is the bulkiest. Let us reiterate: there is nothing basically wrong, but then it is not directly related to the specific work--*Vikramāṅkadevacarita*. Consequently, the title of the work turns out to be misleading! A student of *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* will not find much to his interest in this work. Yes, of Bilhaṇa, he will have something. A greater part of this "Studies" is more or less a reproduction of the standard published anthologies. Misra makes hardly any contribution of his own. This is not a work of research.

What is research? Research is the extension of the boundary of the field of knowledge. It represents discovery of unknown facts or a new interpretation of existing known facts. Research is not mere compilation. A florist cannot be equated with a floriculturist.

I would like to record here for further discussion one more idea as the Postscript to the work. Every time I read the expressions of Misra like ed. ter. or ed. sec. [the "sigla" of Misra!] I wondered why he totally disregarded the ed. of Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍitapravara Rāmāvatāra Śarmā. Not that he does not accept its existence. He does accept it and its readings as well. It is an edition definitely and must be reckoned as such. Truly speaking it is the second edition; while Nagar's is the third and that of Bharadwaj is the fourth! On p. 111 Misra says:

5. Vikramāṅka-deva-caritam...Rāmāvatāra-Śaramaṇā saṃskṛtaṃ [ed. by Rāmāvatāra Śarmā] Benares: Jñāna- maṇḍala Press, 1978 [= 1921]. 1, 4, 2, 153 p.

This edition [mark Misra's designation], which is full of inaccuracies, seems to have been associated by someone[?] with the great name of Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍita Rāmāvatāra 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, which are numbered 4 and 6 respectively. Nevertheless to call Bühler's ed. as No. 1 and that of Nagar as No. 2 is merely *gajanimīlikā or sato'pyaplāpaḥ*.

APPENDIX I

On Caritacandrikā

Dr. H.D. Velankar, the first reviewer of N, had this to say with regard to *Caritacandrikā* as early as 1945:

At the end of the text of the poem, the editor has given a brief explanation of difficult words in the poem, giving it the name Carita-candrikā. This Candrikā, we are told, includes the very brief gloss written in the margin of the old Jesalmir manuscript.

Another reviewer noted the true nature of *Caritacandrikā* in 1947. He said:

Besides a critical Introduction and a brief though nonetheless useful glossary explaining important and difficult words and incorporating most of the notes in the scribes' own hand on the ancient Jaelmere manuscript...

These reviewers had no difficulty at all. Yet Bh, for the reasons best known to him, assumes that the *Caritacandrikā* is an "ancient" commentary! He says:

Śrī Nāgaramahodayair Jaisalamerabṛhājñāna-koṣabhāṇḍārasthād hastalikhitāt pustakāt mahatā śrameṇa ṭippanīsaṃgrahaṃ kṛtvā *Caritacandrikānāmnā* [!] sā pariśiṣṭarūpeṇa svapustake saṃgrhītā, kenāpi kavirahasyakuśalenaiva dhīmataiṣā gumphitetyatra nāsti sandehaleśāvasaraḥ. Ūsavīya 1286 varṣato'pi prācīne'smin hastalikhite pustake ṭippanyeṣā svaprācīnatvaṃ prakāṣayatyeva. Kutracit "asya śabdasyārthāgamo [!] na jāyate" iti spaṣṭaṃ likhitvā ṭippanīkṛtā viduṣā [!] nirahaṅkāraṃ svapāṇḍityaṃ paricāyitam. Guṇino na durāgrahā iti svaguṇitvam [!] api prakāṣitam. Ṭikāyā abhāve'rthāva bodhaviṣaye ṭippanyeṣā bahuṣu sthaleṣu pāṭhakānām atīvopakāriṇīti niścrapracam. (V. 1, Kiñcit Prāstāvikam, p. 2)

There are 208 pages in the text of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* in Nagar's edition. According to the colophon of J, the pūrṇagranthasaṅkhyā (or ślokasaṅkhyā) 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 *granthasaṅkhyā* of the *Caritacandrikā* would be approximately 2962, i.e. 417 *śloka*s more than the text! All these facts are clearly visible to the person who is not wearing blinding folds of pride and prejudice.

We are not sure if Bh knows what is meant by marginal gloss-- whether he has ever seen even a single manuscript, in his entire life, with marginal notes! Bühler has described the J MS. in his Introduction (Section IV, pp. 44-45). Maybe Bh did not read it. Even if he read it, maybe, he did not understand the meaning of the word "annotated."

" However, N has described the MS. and its gloss once again in his *Prastāvanā*, pp. 1-2 . N says:

16x2" ākārātmakeṣu 158 tālapatreṣvatyujjvalamasīlikhite'smin pustake patrasaṅkhyāṅkāṣṭippanyaśca svarṇamayyā masyā likhitā āsan...." "=" īdrśacihnadvayāntaravasthāpitāḥ saṅkṣiptāḥ saṅgatāścārthāḥ patrāṇāṃ prāntacatuṣṭaye'pi sūkṣmākṣarair likhitāḥ (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 *Prastutasamskaraṇavaiśiṣyam...viśamasthalārthāvabodhikā ippanī--Caritacandrikā* (pp. 7-8) wherein having referred to the J gloss, I have described the nature and content of the *Caritacandrikā* in the clearest possible terms. Here are my words:

...antarbhāvita-taṭṭippanīkā saiṣā 'Candrikā' tanīyasyapi granthārtham ujjvalayīṣyatīti viśvasimaḥ.

We are not sure if Bh understood the meaning of the compound word-- "*antarbhāvit a-ta ippanīkā*," since his knowledge of Sanskrit is extremely limited when it comes to a point which he does not want to understand! If he did not, why did he not consult one of the myriads of specialists who are alleged to have assisted and helped him in this entire work?

Be that as it may. Let us assume that it was an honest [?] error of judgment on the part of Bh. But as soon as I saw his Vol. 1 (published in 1958) I protested to him. I wrote to him in the clearest possible language that it was MY work. Probably he did not get my letter, or threw it away in the waste-paper basket even without reading. He did not like my writing to begin with anyway! In any case, he did not correct himself.

All the circumstances stated above were external grounds. Now let us give the subject an internal examination. Bh ought to have considered the following facts if he were a scholar in the least sense of the term-- if he possessed even an iota of true scholarship in him.

The *Caritacandrikā* begins on page 209. The top of the page displays in bold, large, ornamental letters the following words: *Atha Caritacandrikā*. We don't believe a *ippanī* written on *patrāṇāṃ prāntacatuṣṭaye'pi* will have a beginning like this! But Bh was his own master. Why should he pay any attention to such trifling matters! Once he had decided that two plus two make five, no power on earth could change his mind.

Line 9 of the very first page says: (*Hi. Kasau ī*). At the bottom of that very first page there is a footnote, related to the above word, which reads: *Hi.= Hindībhāṣāyām*, i.e. any *artha* preceded by a letter *Hi*, is a Hindi word. Then, according to this great research scholar (Bh) Hindi was so well-developed even before 1286 A.D., the date on which the J MS. was *mūlyena punargrhitā*, i.e. re-acquired by paying the price! So this word antedates 1286 A.D. Note Hindi linguists!

Line 14 reads: *Rādhā Viṣṇubhāryā*. The footnote tells us:

idṛśacihnadvayāntarvartinī ippanī Jaisalameragranthasthetyavagantavyam.

Maybe Bh did not read this too. Or would it be correct to conclude that even if he read it, his knowledge of Sanskrit was so limited indeed that he did not comprehend the true meaning! Let it be stressed here that there are 19 lines in the first page (a large portion at the top having been taken by the heading) each line containing approximately 30 letters. However, in the entire page only 6 letters have been enclosed within '*'.

On the next page (210) we read: '*Kukkuravadrā' iti Vyākhyāśudhā (Bhānujīdīkṣitaḥ tāmara īkā)*. So Bhānujīdīkṣita must have flourished even before 1286 A.D.! Note the historiographers of Sanskrit literature, especially those who want to study or discuss *Amarakośa!*

On page 214 we read : *Saraharī iti khyātaḥ*. So this word too proves quite old.

On page 219 we read: * "*Kalyāṇaka akam 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 mudritam śodhanīyam*. So there was a printing press in India even before 1286 A.D.! The *Vikramāṅka devacaritam* was printed and published even before that date! This is an important matter to be noted by the historiographers of printing in India!

On page 222 there is a Hindi word *chānanā!* Naturally this word too is older than 1286 A.D.

The bottom line of page 223 reads: *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--*āratī* and *turahī*. Nāgarī Pracāriṇī S abhā of Vārāṇasī should note these facts.

On page 237 we read: **cauryakeliḥ parapuruṣaparanārīkriyā**. But then the *Carita candrikā* raises a question "*(-krīḍā ?)*." Would it be correct to conclude then that the same writer wrote *kriyā* and then asked himself whether it should read *krīḍā?*

There are Hindi words on almost every page, sometimes one page containing more than one.

On page 247 *Caritacandrikā* says: *Dolāsu dolāsu iti Jalhaṇa-Śārṅgadharma-saṃgrhītaḥ pā haḥ*. Historiographers of Sanskrit literature note this fact which makes Jalhaṇa and Śārṅgadharma posterior to the date 1286 A.D.

On page 248 we read:

Akṣūṇahetoḥ aṅgīkṛtasāmrajyabhārasya madhor anucaratvān mārutasya. 'Akṣūṇa' padasyārtho nāvagamyate. 'Akṣobha' iti pāṭhe pratipanne-- akṣobho gajabandhanastambho gajabandhanabhūmir vetyarthaḥ saṅgataḥ syāt. 11 sarge 82 śloko'pi draṣṭavyaḥ.

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 in which this poor *Caritacandrikākāra* lacked.

It is interesting to watch how the term "*akṣūṇa*" has been interpreted by Bh, of course, with the help of a great grammarian, whose debt he acknowledges in the following words:

P.S.: On Jan. 8, 1983, while making the fair copy of the above, a thought comes to my mind that to the writer of J gloss, the word '*akṣūṇa*' (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!

Śrī Paṃ. Rājanārāyaṇa Śarmāṇo Hindūviśvavidyālayīya- Saṃskṛtamahāvidyālayavyākaraṇavibhāgādhyakṣā dhanyavādair abhinandyante, yais saharṣam sarva daiva kaṭhinā prayuktaśabdāsiddhau svānupamaśabdaśāstra- jñānena śabdāsiddhim saṃsādhyā mahān upakāraḥ kṛtaḥ. (*Kiñcit Prāstāvikam*. v.1, p.3)

Bilhaṇa used neither *ka hina* nor *aprayukta śabdā*! It is insult added to injury to blame Bilhaṇa for such imaginary sins! His *rīti* is *Vaidarbhī* and his *guṇa* is *prasāda*. *Na hy eṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati*.

It is amusing to see how this "*ka hina*" and "*aprayukta*" *śabda* (*akṣūṇa*) has been blessed with *śabdāsiddhi* (derivation and explanation) by the great grammarian-friend of Bh:

akṣūṇaṃ viśrāmaḥ satatapariśrameṇa
samāgataklāntirūpanyūnatāyā
dūrīkaraṇārthaṃ viśrāntir ityarthaḥ.

The above explanation appears in the commentary *Ramā*. The footnote reads:

Saṃjñāsu dhāturūpāṇi pratyayās ca tataḥ pare.
Kāryād vidyād anu[!]bandham etac chāstram uṇādiṣu.

Ṭukṣu gatau - ādādikāddhātor bhāve naṅ pratyaye bāhulakād dīrghe naṅsamāse 'akṣūṇa' śabdo niṣpannaḥ. Na kṣūṇaṃ akṣūṇaṃ gatyavarodho viśrāma ityarthaḥ.

Both this great Vaiyākaraṇa-śiromaṇi (Rājanārāyaṇa) and Sāhitya-dhurandhara " Vidyāvāgīśa" Bh have overlooked one of the most significant words-- *mattasya!* Bilhaṇa did not say "*śrāntasya*". Caitradvirada was not hauling huge logs of wood that he would have been horribly exhausted and needed *viśrāma* and quite so often. See below the discussion of the immortal words "*pade pade*". I had annotated the above passage (in Bh's ed.) with the following words:

Ko'pi vaiyākaraṇakesarī svapratibhāṃ prādarśayat!
Tāvan maunam evāvalambanīyam yāvan na yathārthapāṭhaprāptiḥ.

The late Muni Śrī Puṇyavijayaḥ Mahārāja had given me an appropriate meaning. But I don't recall it now! According to him the word was correct. Could this word mean *madanivāraṇa*, to bring back to sobriety?

This topic has been discussed earlier.

Āstām tāvat, prakṛtam anusarāmaḥ.

On page 248 (of *Caritacandrikā*) a *sadukti* is cited by N:

Mallikāmukule caṇḍi! bhāti guñjan madhuvrataḥ.
Prayāṇe pañcabāṇasya śaṅkham āpūrayanniva.

So the author of the above must have flourished earlier than 1286 A.D. Let us find out who the author is. In any case, the assumed *ippanīkāra* or *ippanīlekhaka* was almost a magician. He could write all these long verses on the margins! We wonder again and again if Bh has ever seen even one "marginal gloss." (See his letter to me where he brags about having seen many priceless MSS.)

And, by the way, the great commentator Bh copied the above verse as a footnote on p. 439 of his vol. 1. According to Bh. this *Caritacandrikākāra* must have been a *kavi rahasyakuśala dhīmān* (p. 2 of his *Kiñcit Prāstāvīkam*. Vol. 1). This *Caritacandrikākār* cited the above verse on p. 248 with reference to *Lagnadvirephadhvanipūryamāṇam*. .. 7:41. Bh renders a great service to the world of scholarship by citing it, but he introduces it with the following words: "*Uktam Sāhityadarpaṇe*." We don't know how would it help! Still we don't know the name of the poet who composed this beautiful couplet.

On page 265 we read:-- *Gopācalaḥ *guyālaeru** (sāmpratam Gvāliyara ityucyate). Did Bh stop to think what function this word **guyālaeru**, enclosed within two asterisks, was performing here! What did it represent!! And what is the significance of the word "*sāmpratam*"? When? Before 1286 A.D.?

We have three words-- *gopācalaḥ*, *guyālaeru*, and *gvāliyara!* Is there any historical, chronological, or linguistic progression? Do they belong to the same age, same language, 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 y

ou have noted yourself. Why did you not? Didn't you know that *Na hi sarvaḥ sarvaṃ j ānāti!*?

It is fantastically funny to read Bh's commentary here. He says: Gopānām dhenupā lakānām acalaḥ parvato Govardhanākhyah! So "Govardhana mountain" was a kingd om and the king described in verse 9:109 of the Carita was its lord!

On page 301, last line, we read: *Etadupādhinā'nena chalena (etaddhetujanyenādhīraṇena?)* Did Bh understand what is cited above? The ṭippanīkāra explains certain words. Yet he is not sure. So he asks a question. I believe Bh. can easily answer! What is *adhīraṇena?* Pt. Bharadvajaji! This is a printing mistake, for *avadhīraṇena!* (Detected only on Dec. 24, 1982)!

The writing of Bh is in many a place *atyanta-hāsyāspada*, to say the least. Bilhaṇa says:

Tat paryantasthitaguṇanikāmaṇḍapaṃ yatra dhatte
dhāma vyomāṅgaṇatilakatām Kṣemagaurīśvarasya.

Caritacandrikā explains [p. 314]: *Kṣemagaurīśvarasya dhāma Kāśmīra-nṛpati-Kṣem agupta-nirmāpitaṃ Śivamandiram.* These words of NAGAR, repeat NAGAR, in *Candrikā* are followed by **Khemesaradeu**. Let it be stressed here with all the force at our command that this expression '*khemesaradeu*' appears within two asterisks. So these words are 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 Kāśmīrabhāṣāyāṃ prasiddhe!* Note the scholars of Kashmiri language!! Here is a great Pandit from Kashi who is giving you a new word! What a great pity!

We really wonder whether Bh possessed enough brain power to discern the numerous incongruities we have been pointing out time and again. Any sensible person would have stopped to think if he was following a correct path in sticking to a false belief that *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* upto the very end? This is exactly what he did. The relevant portion from the *Candrikā* follows:

Tat prasiddham. Paryanteti--paryante prāntabhāge sthito guṇanikāyā nṛtyasya maṇḍapo yatra tat. Yatra pure. Vyomāṅgaṇatilakatām ākāśabhūṣaṇatvam. Kṣemagaurīśvarasya dhāma Kāśmīra- nṛpati-Kṣemaguptanirmāpitam Śivamandiram. **Khemesaradeu** Rāmāḥ kāmīnyah. Rāmānukaraṇavidhau ramyābhīnayaavyāpāre **Rāmo Rāmacandraḥ** Nāṭyaprayoge nāṭakābhīnaya-kriyāyām, viśeṣyam. Yogasthānām yogīndrāṇām. Āsūtrayanti janayanti.

And here is an exact reproduction of the same passage from the great commentary called *Ramā* of Panditammanya Viśvanātha Śāstrī Bhāradvāja [what a deceitful act of stealing]:

Yatra Pravaraपुरे पार्यन्ते प्रान्ताभङ्गे स्थितो गुणनिकयान् नृत्यस्या मण्डपो यत्र
 a tat Kṣemagaurīśvarasya tat prasiddham dhāma gṛham Kāśmīranṛpati-Kṣemagupta-
 nirmāpitam Śivamandiram vyomāṅgaṅasyā"kaśasya tilakatām bhūṣaṅatvaṃ dhatte.
 Yatra Śivamandire (Khemasaradeu iti Kāśmīrabhāṣāyām prasiddhe) rāmāḥ aṅganāḥ
 nāṭyaprayoge nāṭakābhinaya-kriyāyām rāmānukaraṇavidhau ramaṇīyābhinayavyāp-
 āre rāmacandrābhinayavyāpāre[!] vā yogasthānām api yoginām siddhānām api gātra
 ṃ vapuḥ "gātraṃ vapuḥ saṃhananaṃ śarīraṃ varṣma vighrahaḥ" ityamarāḥ. Sapulaka
 ṃ saromaṅcam āsūtrayanti janayanti.

No further comments are necessary. Stealing is an art! It is not at all a sin unless a
 nd until detected.

The greatest service that Bh has rendered here relates to *Khemasaradeu*. 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 Panditamānī Bharadvaja, only some
 of whose astonishing qualifications are displayed on the title page of his immortal wor-
 k and at the head of the letter he wrote to me.

We are not sure if Bh had seen the descriptions of J gloss anywhere and, if so, if he
 remembered it! Let it be recalled that the J MS. was seen by Bühler (and by Nagar to
 o) in Jaisalmer. It belongs to the Bṛhajjñānakosha Bhaṇḍāra of the Oswal Jains, prese-
 rved under the great temple of Pārisnāth (Pārsvanātha) in the fort of Jaisalmer.

With regard to this J gloss Bühler says: "The glosses are in a mixture of ancient Guj-
 arati and Marvadi, such as is used by the Yatis down to the present day." Bühler also t-
 ells us that the letters of the MS. (including the gloss are ancient Jain Devanagari. [I
 nrod. p. 45]

And here is what Nagar said about the language and other aspects of the J gloss:

Kiñca gīrvāṇavāṇīnibaddhāpi sā prācīnaṭippanī kvacit Gurjara-Marudeśabhāṣātmik
 etyanadhigatasakalārthair apyasmābhiḥ sā tathairopasthāpitā. Neyam mūlavatsuvācy
 eti bahutrāsmābhir naivāvagantum apāri, kutas tāvat pratilipiṣayīkartum. Tathāpi se
 yam atiprācīneti tadbhāṣāgaveṣaṅāyām sādhanam syād ityavadhāryate.

May be Bh did not have access to B ed.

The above was written long long ago. Today (10 March 1990) while computerizing my
 own writing, I recalled that I had seen the Bühler's edition in the same Banaras Hindu
 University (Library) which was the Karmabhūmi of this scholar-thief. He could have s-
 een it if he wanted. But why should he have wanted? He knew everything. He was s-
 arvajñacakravartī.

But he has extensively used N ed. He has profusely copied from N's *Caritacandrikā*.
 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.

gāṃḍuyaṃ	p. 223
choru	248
pavāḍā	250
goliyā 'dhaṇuhī' abhyāsu	250
davāḍi	250
jetalu viśeṣu	253
paḍihatha	255
darau	257
kisaṃ acaī	263
āṃvaliyau	263
kasauṃeku	263
choṭi churī	264
thahiyāinu	264
thalī	264
guyālaeru	265
darau	272
ghāṭu (followed by avayava śuddhiḥ)	274
pālaṭaṃ	275
pāṭau	275
vikhariyaṃ	276
khāṃpaṇu	278
garaḍhaṃ	280
sejāhala	280
dehurāsarū	284
yogeśvarū	284
teravaṃ	289
koilā	289
khola	294
caukapuriyā	297
khemesaradeu	314
ahīṭhānamāhi	317
praharahāthi	317
ḍāhaliyau karṇṇu	323

I believe Bh would like us to believe that all these words belong to the Kasmiri language! Bh has also stated elsewhere *tad- bhāṣāyām*. What an innocent statement! He is cunningly equivocal. *Naro vā kuñjaro vā*. He wanted to save his own skin too. Bh copied so extensively from *Caritacandrikā*, yet we don't know if he paid any attention to the words cited above.

A Note on the Starring in the *Caritacandrikā*

N has stated: "*Antarbhāvitata ippanīkā saiṣā Candrikā...*"

Caritacandrikā contains many explanatory words which are direct borrowings from J gloss. So the featuring of certain J gloss words within two asterisks was intended to indicate their being definitely borrowed. Certain meanings occurring in J gloss had to be emphasized like "*Rādhā Viṣṇubhāryā*(1:5)" and "*Rādhā Kṛṣṇabhāryā* (18:87)". Many words occurring in J gloss were not intelligible to me also because they were illegible. So there was a specific motive in starring. It was to show that they were definitely not my words. I have found subsequently that there are many words (meanings or interpretations) which are part of J gloss. Yet they are not starred. So this may be regarded as a flaw. Yet it is not. I did not think that the words which are found so easily in the dictionaries and presented no conflict had to be starred simply because they occurred in J gloss! The criterion was how uncommon or significant was a word of J gloss that warranted starring.

Here is a passage that clearly demonstrates--if one more demonstration were needed--how ill-equipped Bh was to interpret a divine poem like Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacharita*. On p. 314 *Caritacandrikā* says:

Kāṣṭhīladvijavasatayaḥ 'Kāṣṭhīla' iti nāmadheyā Brāhmaṇānām nivāsabhūmayāḥ. Kāṣṭhīleti--*jātivīśeṣaḥ*. Vastutastu Vitastāvāma- taṭasthaḥ pradeśa-vīśeṣaḥ.

Even the above passage did not remove the darkness pervading the mind of Bh. A man possessing a sound mind in a sound body would have realized that there is something strange in the above passage: that there are two writers involved. First we see that the expression "*Kāṣṭhīladvijavasatayaḥ*" is explained in a certain way. Then the compound word "*jātivīśeṣaḥ*" is given. It is preceded and followed as well by a *. Then we find the following words: Vastutastu... In other words, "Kāṣṭhīla" is not the name of a specific *jāti* [of the Brāhmaṇas] but it is the name of a locality (a residential area, a sub-division, what we may call in Hindi "Mohallā.") If we assume that the entire *Caritacandrikā* was composed by one and the same person, who flourished in ancient India, then the same person would have to be accepted as contradicting himself!

The conclusion is irresistible that Bh did not have enough brain power (or did not use whatever he possessed) to grasp what is presented above. In spite of *vastutas tu....* etc., he maintains:

Tāḥ Kāṣṭhīladvijānām Kāṣṭhīla iti nāmadheyabrāhmaṇānām vasatayaḥ nivāsabhūmayāḥ.

This is called *durāgrahaḥ*. What Bilhaṇa means and what the fact is--*Kāṣṭhīladvijavasatayaḥ*, and not *Kāṣṭhīladvijavasatayaḥ*! Bh seems to have forgotten his own dictum: *Guṇino na durāgrahaḥ*.

Let us resume our main theme. In 18:44.1 there is a samastapada--adhiṣṭhāna-madhya. *Caritacandrikā* explains: Vitastāpulinavartini pradeśavīśeṣe, and then adds within two asterisks: **ahī hānamāhi**. The great commentator Pt. Bharadvaja displays his extraordinary erudition and says: "*adhiṣṭhānamadhye Vitastāpulinavartini pradeśavīśeṣe* [exact copy of *Caritacandrikā*!] ("*Ahī hānamāhi*" iti *tadbhāṣyām*). We don't understand what he means by "*tad*"! [Maybe he thinks that there is a language called "*tadbhāṣyām*"]

hāṣā!" Cf. Nagar's words: *Tadbhāṣāgaveṣaṇāyām sādhanam syāditi manyāmahe.*" But the interesting point is that he encloses all the six letters (*ahī hānamāhi*) in " " quotation marks, i.e. inverted double commas! He does not stop to think that "*ahī hāna*" is "*adhi ṣ hāna*" and *māhi* (old Gujarati) is "in" i.e. *madhye*!

The Hindi commentator is still a greater authority. He is wise. He is wiser. He is the wisest. He excels everyone else in this art of interpretation. He goes beyond! He translates: *Ahīṭhānamāhī nāmaka sthāna meṃ.* The short "i" of Sanskrit comm. in "*māhi*" becomes long in Hindi comm.! Is it possible for us to accept the contention that Hindi and Sanskrit are from one and the same pen? It will be foolish even to think. *Kahatā bhī dīvānā, sunatā bhī dīvānā* (Insane speaking and insane listening.)

There was one more lamp which might have lighted the dark corner of Bh's mind and made him aware of the reality that there are certain words which might have come from another pen in "*Caritacandrikā*" On page 321 we read:

Chāyayā *dhūmena citram vicchāyam jāyata iti bhāvaḥ.*Vastutastu svapada- bhraṃśabhayāt Śakrasya vaivarṇyam.

Certain words here are preceded and followed by asterisks! They make a statement. The subsequent words reject it. We don't know if Bh knows what is the significance of a statement if it is introduced with an expression like "*vastutastu*". See also: *Vastutastu Vitastāvāmatatasthaḥ pradeśaviśeṣaḥ--* discussed earlier.

Bh blindly copies both the statements. His exact words are: *Dhūmena citram vicchāyam jāyate. Vastutastu svapada-bhraṃśa-bhayād Indrasya vaivarṇyamiti bhāvaḥ.*

The question is: Why does he give the first statement if he has to contradict the same by the subsequent statement? We don't know what he took the two asterisks for!

We are not sure if he had ever read the Amara: *tvantāthādi na pūrvabhāk. Vastutastu* contradicts the previous statement. It means "but in reality." We fail to understand why such scholar-pretenders follow the path of darkness and do not open their eyes even when there is enough light all around?

It is interesting to note that Śakra of Bilhaṇa and *Caritacandrikā* becomes Indra of Ramā! Bh has to show some originality! How else he could add to the bulk of his grand edition of a "Vidyāvāridhi?"

In 18:18.3 Bilhaṇa uses an expression-- *dr̥ṣ ādr̥ṣ a.* Nagar was not sure about the meaning. He was merely a youth in his early twenties! So he put it: *aihi kāmūṣmikobhay avidhānām?* Bh copies the words of "Nagar" straightaway. However, he removes the question mark. He has no doubt, nowhere, never!

Let us recall what Bh says about this *Caritacandrikā* and its author:

Śrīnāgaramahodayair Jaisalamerabṛhājñānakośa- bhāṇḍārasthād hastalikhitā
t pustakāt mahatā śrameṇa ṭippanīsaṃgrahaṃ kṛtvā Caritacandrikānāmnā sā pari

śiṣṭa rūpeṇa svapustake saṃgrhītā, kenāpi kavirahasyakuśalenaiva dhīmataiṣā (st
ress added) gumphitetyatra nāsti sandehaleśāvasaraḥ. Ūśavīya 1286 varṣato'pi prācīn
e'smin hastalikhite pustake ṭippanyeṣā svaprācīnatvaṃ prakāṭayatyeva. [Kiñcit Prā
stāvīkam. V. 1, p. 2] A thief takes everyone else to be a thief in this world. Bh tells his
readers that Nagar collected all the "notes" from J MS. and reproduced it in his book a
s an appendix, naming it the "*Caritacandrikā*." I have never seen a greater fool on this
earth!! First of all Nagar won't steal. He possessed enough brain power to compose hi
s own "annotations," (which he really did). And he was not a habitual thief either. Ev
en if he had stolen, he would not have the courage to "name" it. A straight man does
not name the baby of someone else as his own. An honest and truthful scholar (if he h
ad taken someone else's work) would have called it "*Jaisalmera-pustaka- ippanī*," or s
omething like that. A smart thief also knows how to cover up his theft. Bh himself is a
thief and accuses Nagar falsely of imaginary theft.

It is much larger, longer, and extensive than even the original! It cannot be an Appen
dix.

Again in his Bhūmikā (V. 1, p.4) the learned scholar-pretender presents his distorted
view:

Tatkāvyānte *Caritacandrikā*nāmnā Jaisalamera- brhajjñānakośabhāṇḍāra stha
pustakāṭ ṭippanisaṃgraho Nāgaramahodayasya saṃskaraṇaṃ suvarṇaṃ sugandhi
yuktam ivā'karot. Ṭippanīkāraḥ ka iti yadyapi na jñātaṃ tathāpi tasya pāṇḍityapr
akarṣo vidyotata eva.

Mr. Bharadwaj, you are either a fool, or a cheat, or a liar, or all combined into one!

Bh concludes his *Prāstāvīkam* with the following words:

Ante ca *Caritacandrikā*ṭippanīkāra ye ke'pi te bhavantu [!] mama hārdikān dhanya
vādān arhanti. Eteṣāṃ ṭippanyā ṭīkālekane mahatī sahāyatā jātetyamāyam nirūpya
[!] viramāmyativistarāt. [p.4]

Whatever you may say, but you are a great *māyāvin* Mr. Bh!

So, even such an ancient learned "composer" of *Caritacandrikā* was not sure about t
he meaning of *dr̥ṣ ādr̥ṣ a*. Yet Bh had no problem. He copied it beautifully, but remov
ed the question mark! He never had any problem--any question-- about his knowledge
, because it was unlimited-- he knew everything and corrcly too. He was *sarvajñacak
ravartī*.

Nagar concludes his *Caritacandrikā* with the following words:

Iti śam. Śrīr astu. Kalyāṇam astu. Samāpteyaṃ Caritacandrikābhīdhānā Vikra
māṅka devacarita mahākāvyaṭippanī. Śrīḥ Śrīḥ Śrīḥ. Vijayādaśamī Saṃ 2001.

So this "marginal gloss" had a colophon too! And what about the date, i.e. Samvat 2
001, i.e. 1944/45 A.D.! Bh was not concerned at all with all these contradictory evide

nces. Once he had decided that it was "ancient" no external or internal evidence could influence him to change his mind! Was he not appointed a member of the Sanskrit Sahitya Research Committee of the Banaras Hindu University in 1953 by Acharya Narendra Deva, the then Vice-Chancellor? That should have been enough proof to demonstrate that he knew everything!

This fact is well featured by Bh on the title page!

Bibliography of Misra's Studies on Bilhaṇa and His Vikramāṅkadevacarita

The preceding pages have presented a candid criticism primarily of Misra's *Studies on Bilhaṇa and His Vikramāṅkadevacarita*. It has been a very unpleasant reading and writing. And so is this criticism. Throughout this book--here, there and everywhere--we have offered a justification of why we felt such an irresistible urge to express ourselves the way we did. It was truly a case of *Śokaḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ*. How beautifully it is said about our *mahākavi* Bhavabhūti:

Api grāvā rodityapi dalati vajrasya hṛdayam.

Same Bhavabhūti has sung:

Pūrotpīḍe taḍāgasya parīvāhaḥ pratikriyā.
Śokasamvignahṛdayam pralāpair eva dhāryate.

We have followed the great ethical principle of *Spaṣ avaktā sukhī bhavet*. Also

Sulabhāḥ puruṣā rājan satatam priyavādināḥ.
Apriyasya ca pathyasya vaktā śrotā ca durlabhaḥ.

The reader would have found many passages which might have led him to one of the two conclusions--either Misra was out of his mind when he wrote, or this critic was out of his mind when he wrote what he wrote!

Our correspondence with the University of Tübingen, reproduced here in the very beginning, contains convincing evidence that there is something unusual about this "dissertation" of Misra, which he claims has earned a doctorate for him! We don't believe it.

Misra also claims to be a specialist in Library Science. He has appended an extensive bibliography to his *Magnum opus*. For the reasons stated above, we did not think it necessary to present another bibliography of our own. But since we wanted the reader to have the benefit of Misra's exceptional bibliography, befitting his exceptional "dissertation", we had decided to reproduce it mechanically and enclose it as an appendix to our work. This would not have been any infringement of copyright either. Neither it would have been branded as plagiarism--*kāvyārthacaurya*. We did not want to commit this sin, the same sin for which we have condemned Mr. Misra time and again. This would have also demonstrated to the reader how a bibliography should be prepared and presented for a doctoral dissertation to a German university. However, for various reasons, we abandoned the idea.

Once again we offer our sincere apologies to our readers for having presented this bitter-sweet writing in this vein. Truth is many a time unpalatable. It takes two to utter it : One who can speak and another who can listen. However, we would like to assure our readers with all the emphasis at our command that what is presented in this book in its final form is much more milder than how it had emerged originally. A great deal

of spicy juices have been taken out. After the whole book was completed, it was ruthlessly purged! A large amount of true yet frank criticism was eliminated. We have tried our best to be as reticent as possible and we give credit to our better half for this sweetening and softening. The final judgement rests with the critical readers.

Anubandhaḥ

Vapur yām āvāṣḥ

On p. 254 we have discussed *Vapur yām āvāṣaḥ*...the reading having been presented exactly the way it appears in Misra's *magnum opus* (p. 100).

Earlier we had suggested [yāmāvāṣaḥ] as an alternative reading. Subsequently we thought of [puryām āvāṣaḥ]. Our footnote provides a brief discussion there.

Since then we consulted the *Sūktimuktāvalī*. It gives all the three components together--*Vapuryāmāvāṣaḥ*. The editor, who is not as learned as Misra, has put a "?" after the first *pāda*. He could not understand it. But Misra is a *sarvajñacakravartī*. He knows everything and in a proper manner. He has no doubt on any subject anywhere of any kind--none whatsoever.

So he has broken the cluster of letters (*vapuryāmāvāṣaḥ*) into three! This is a despicable attempt. *Vapur* makes some sense independently. *Āvāṣaḥ* too would make some sense. But we don't know what sense Doctor Misra (a *Snātaka* of Tübingen) would like us to derive from *yām*. This is *avyāpāreṣu vyāpāraḥ*--a monkey business.

We think "Va" is an error. It should be read as "Tri!" We advise the reader to write "tra" in Devanāgarī and then join the two protruding lines. "Tra" will become "Va" very easily. "Tripuryām" will bring a new life into the *kavīndrokti*. The word "*kuca*" is still a puzzle to us. Could it be *budha*?

We believe in the third *pāda* "*śiro'nyasya*" is wrong. It should be read as *śiro yasya*. Misra could not care less.

In spite of all these changes and suggestions for improvement, the true and final purport of the verse is still an enigma to us.

Vāde vāde jāyate tattvabodhaḥ

As already stated in our "*Dvītyam 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 "*Kāvyaśāstravinodena kālo gacchati dhīmatām*" was a possible new interpretation of *bhūḥ pratāpodayānām* in *Campāsīmni* (Vik. 18:38), discussed on page 240 of this book.

I had submitted my apologies for a wrong interpretation made earlier. It was an error in grammar. Now we have a new interpretation. We believe *bhūḥ* can stay as it is--not as *dvītyābahuvacanam--karma--*but as *kartṛpadam prathamāikavacanāntam*, meaning *pratāpodayānām bhūḥ utpattisthānam ājñā bhrāmyati!* She is *śītabhitā*, not for herself but for her master, Anantaṅṇpati. In order that her master might feel warm and comfortable in those colder regions, she roams around hither and thither to make them w

arm! She has the power to generate *pratāpa*, meaning also *utkr̥ṣṭaḥ tāpaḥ*. This new suggested interpretation is offered to the *rasika-jana-maṇḍalī* for consideration.

There are many more suggestions. But we will wait until the next edition comes out

MLN

INDEX

- A lion won't eat grass, even if dying 254
Ā patthara mere paira para paṛa 167
Abdhir laṅghita eva vānarabhaṭaiḥ wrt Bh 138
Abheda-sādhana 197
Abhidhā, lakṣaṇā, vyañjanā 181
Abhidhānarājendra 292
Abhijñānaśākuntalam 98, 294
Abhinavabilhaṇa Misra 62, etc.
Acaladuhituḥ preyān 264
Ādhāro'dhikaraṇam 135
Adhika alaṅkāra 156
Adhirājarājendra 111
Adhītaṅvedo'smi kṛtaśrutāgamaḥ 71+
Āgraha 71
Āhavaprāptidurlalitabāhu 96+
Ahinakulam 110
Aho viśālaṃ bhūpāla 156
Ajñānāndhasya lokasya 116, 262
Akathayad avanīndor nandanotpattivārttām 80
Akṣūṇa 129
Alākām 293
Alam viśādena karoṣi 70
Alaukikollekhasamarpaṇena 30
Āluloke 107, 206
Ālupendram avadātavikramas 97
Amān ivāṅgeṣu mudāḥ prakarṣād 155
Amaracandra Yati 209
Amarasiṃha 266
Amī viyannīlasaroja 224
Ānamya līlāparivartanena 204
Ānandasāgarastava 263
Ananta, King of Kashmir 242, 246
Ananyasāmānyaguṇatvam eva 87
Añc 77+
Ancient India 103
Añcitābhyām gatābhyām 77

Añcitam 133
 Añcitam, Misra's vitaṇḍāvāda on 77+
 Andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāḥ wrt Misra as a "guide" 94
 Anena nūnam jaladheḥ 78
 Añjalibandha 158
 Añka 212
 Añka in *Mānasollāsa* 215
 Añkura 256
 Anta 237
 Anuddhṛṣṭaḥ śabdair 127
 Anudghuṣṭaḥ śabdair 126
 Anveṣyate 164+
 Anyāyapūrṇam ātmasātkaraṇam 107
Anyoktimuktālatā 46
 Anyonyam utpīḍayad utpalākṣyāḥ 154
 Apāre kāvyasaṃsāre 103, 202
 Āpatkāle maryādā nāsti 74
 Api khañjanam añjanāñcite 77
 Appayyadīkṣita--*Citramīmāṃsā* 75
 Aprādhānyam vidher yatra 106
 Apratiṣṭhe Raghujyeṣṭhe 50
 Apte on añkakāraḥ 216
 Āraktam arghārpaṇatatarāṇām 47-48
 Arasikeṣu kavitva nivedanam 87
 Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanam wrt B & G 158
 Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanam wrt Bh 163
 Arasikeṣu kavitvanivedanam wrt Misra 126, 292
 Arc 77
 Arcitam 77
 Ardham striyas tribhuvane sacarācare'smin 263
 Ardham vs artham 280
 Ardhanārīśvara 260+, 279
 Arthāntaranyāsa 174
 Asaṃśayaṃ nīlasaroruhākṣi 238
 Asaṃvṛtasrastadukūlabandhe 125+
 Asmākam ālokanaviḡnahetos 198
 Asmin kṣaṇe Kuntntalapārthivasya 182
 Asthāne'nupayogibhiśca bahubhir 69
 Astrajvālāvalīḍhapratibala 75
 Āsyendoḥ pariveṣavad 197
 Atha katiṣucid eva daivayogāt 109
 Athātaḥ pāṃsudānasya 130
 Atimadhurarasānām sevayā 130
 Atrākaṇṭham viluṭha salile 278
 Atrāntare kim api vāgvibhavātivr̥tta 178
 Aurvāgnitaptapāthodhau 86
 Authenticity of J 6
 Āvṛttavarṇastabakam 292

Avīkṣamāṇā sadṛśam guṇair mama 68
Avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram wrt Bh 99+, 199fn
Avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram wrt Misra 84

B & G on Gaurīvibhrama 230
B & G on Tavāṅgavallī 176
B & G on Tṛṇāni bhūbhṛtkaṭakeṣu 214
B & G, translation of, a plastic rose 222
B omits collectivity of verses 234
B on J 6
B's mis-construction taken as variant reading 233
Bahu jagada purastāt wrt Misra 90
Bahubhir abhihitaiḥ kim adbhutair vā 118
Bālabodhinī comm. on *Kāvyaṣaṅkṣā* 21, 52
Bālarāmāyaṇa on aṅkakāra 216
Bāṇaḥ śvetamayūkhaśāṇa 184
Bh and literary interpretation 98+
Bh and textual criticism 20
Bh as a commentator 19+
Bh as a translator 19+, 224
Bh as an alaṅkāraśāstraṇḍita 52
Bh as an editor and researcher 17+
Bh as an historiographer 97+
Bh betrays ignorance of loka-vyavahāra 184+
Bh commits cold-blooded murder of Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū 184+
Bh confirms ignorance through Hindi 190
Bh errs on vilāsa 176+
Bh explains yena kena prakāreṇa 212+
Bh goes against N 219
Bh has never done any research 135+
Bh ignorant of ratikopa 189
Bh interprets bhāti 156
Bh is equivocal 243
Bh is kāvyārthacauryacaturaḥ 172fn, etc.
Bh misunderstands kavīndrokti 184+
Bh murders history 249
Bh murders Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū once again 242
Bh on Asmākam ālokanaviḅṅhahetos 199
Bh on *Caritacandrikā* 173
Bh on *Caritacandrikākāra* 128
Bh on N ed. 22+
Bh on N's readings 20+
Bh on pratiṣṭhā 49
Bh on R 3-4
Bh reaches the pinnacle of absurdity 248
Bh uselessly tries to defend Bühler 136

Bh wrt *Caritacandrikā* 16
 Bh, N's correspondence with 9-15
 Bh, Prose order 25
 Bh, some preliminary remarks on Bh ed. 16+
 Bh, the great historiographer 245+
 Bh, the Great Pretender 245+
 Bh's action--totalitarian dictatorship 221
 Bh's avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram 199fn, etc.
 Bh's interpretation of Priyārdhasthitim 262+
 Bh's treatment of...is asaṅgata 212+
 Bhainsa ke āge bīna bajāe 163
 Bhakṣite'pi laśune na śānto vyādhiḥ wrt Misra 280
 Bhāṃkāri 134
 Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 271
 Bhanot, S. D. 7
 Bhāravi 100, 122
 Bhāsa 83
 Bhāskarācārya 64
 Bhāti vs māti 134+
 Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita 135
 Bhīmācārya corrects B ed. 94
 Bhīmapaṇḍita 290
 Bhiṣagbhir āpāditasarvabheṣajam 76
 Bhrāntir mithyāmatir bhramaḥ wrt Misra 169
 Bhūbhṛtkātakeṣu 210
 Bhūḥ pratāpodayānām 240+
 Bhūr 241
 Bhuvanarāja 250
 Bilhaṇa as śākta, says Misra 260
 Bilhaṇa demonstrates his own prauḍhi 263
 Bilhaṇa demonstrates his own vicchitti 263
 Bilhaṇa demonstrates his own vyutpatti 263
 Bilhaṇa exemplifies many vilāsas 180
 Bilhaṇa, pioneer 122
 Bilhaṇa's use of vilāsa 181+
 Bilhaṇa's way of praṇāmāḥ 263
 Bimbaḃ dadhe bimbaphalapraṭiṣṭhām 48
 Bindudvandvatarāṅgitāgrasaraṅiḥ kartā 221
 Birudāṅka 215
 Bubhukṣitaḥ kiṃ na karoti pāpam 113
 Bühler and Jacobi--Transcription of J 271
 Bühler and N, a contrast, wrt J MS 235+
 Bühler on J 157
 Bühler on Vikrama's alliance with the Cola King 111
 Bühler takes undue liberty 140+, 230
 Bühler--historiographer vs literary critic 139
 Bühler, failure on the part of 140+
 Bühler, Georg 1

Bühler, Georg on Vik. 1
Bühler's contribution 138
Bühler's mishandling of Vik. text 140+

Cakāra kāntākucapatrabhaṅga 203
Cakrīkṛtabhujalatikam 197
Calācaleti dvividhā 50
Calad aṅkalīlayā 210+
Calāpāṅgāṃ drṣṭiṃ spr̥śasi 98
Cālukya-Cola-Empires, boundary between 103
Cālukyavaṃśāmālamauktikaśrīḥ 55
Camatkāra-paramparā of Bühler 140+
Campāsīmi Kṣītipatikathādhāmi 240
Campaka flowers 132
Cañcac-candrakarasparśa 84
Cañcac-cāraṇadīyamāna 81
Cañcac-colāñcalāni 84
Cañcac-cumbati kāñcanācalamukham 85
Cañcad-bhujabhramita 85
Cañcat 82+
Cañcat-kaṭākṣabhramarābhirāma 85
Candrikā on jīmbhāsamāsphoṭa 197
Cāpalam 187
Carcat 82+
Caritacandrikā, nature of 172+
Caritacandrikā on pratiṣṭhā 49
Caritacandrikā on Tṛṇāni bhūbhṛtkātakeṣu 212
Carmacakṣuṣī 80fn
Carroll, Lewis 100
Cāturam 183
Caturaṅga 211
Caturaṅgalīlayā 211
Caturtharthe bahulaṃ chandasi 81
Cāturyam ācāmati Mandarādreḥ 183
Ceylon irt Chalukyas 258
Chandaḥśāstram wrt Misra 184
Chandobhaṅga 285
Citra-yuddha 218
Colasammukham agāhatāhava 105

Daivam diṣṭam bhāgadheyam 185
Daivāt 185, 186
Daivīm vācam upāsate 117
Daivīm vācam wrt Māti nirvivare 159

Dakṣiṇāpatha-Jāhnavī 104
 Daṇḍin 162
 Danturaḥ Kuntalenduḥ 205
 Danture kapole 205
Daśarūpa of Dhanañjaya 187
 Devaḥ karāmbhoruhayantradhārām 204
 Devī tasya pracurayaśasaś 248
 Dhanañjaya 187
 Dharmo viśvasya jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā 50
 Dhatte dr̥ṣṭim adhīravibhramalavām 282
 Dhik tvām re kalikāla yāhi vilayam 284
 Dhīramṛdaṅga 216
 Dhūlimṛṣṭiḥ 130
 Dohada 225
 Dolāvilāsa 125+
 Dolāyāṃ jaghanasthalena 159, 165, 274
 Dordaṇḍāñcitamahimā 77
 Dorveṇikayā 196
 Drāghīyasā dhārṣṭyaguṇena yuktāḥ 282
 Dṛśām bhṛśam kāmavaśīkṛtānām 182
 Dṛśoḥ sīmāvādaḥ 155
 Dṛṣṭim he prativeśini kṣaṇam 167
 Druti vs dyuti 113+
 Durgā 229
 Durlalita 96
 Dvāropāntanirantare mayi tayā 179
 Dvīpakṣamāpālaparamparāṇām 49
 Dviradapatir amuṣya śatrusenā 118
 Dyuti vs druti 113+

Edgerton, Franklin, tr. of *Mātaṅga-līlā* 129
 Ekaḥ stanas tuṅgataḥ parasya 261, 279
 Ekākinī pratijñā hi pratijñātaṃ 157, 221, 246
 Ekaṃ sandhitsu'param pracyavate 204
 Ekam uddiśya sarvān vā 215
 Elephants wrt love of music 82
 English translators--makṣikāsthāne makṣikā 200

Gacchataḥ skhalanam kvāpi 93, 120, 169, 240
 Gaḍḍalikāpravāhanyāya wrt Misra 125
 Gaḍḍalikāpravāhanyāya wrt scholars like Dvivedi 250
 Gādhāliṅganavāmanīkṛtakucaprodhinnā 164

Gaganagiritatī navendranīla 113
 Gāhate'tra dhṛtakārmuke tvayi 99
 Gaja-śāstra 129
 Gajam tam aham vīṇādvitīyaḥ 83
 Gāmāruhammi gāme vasāmi 89
 Gaṇayanti nāpaśabdāṃ wrt Misra 30
 Gaṇḍe maṇḍanam ātmanaiva kurute 274
 Gaṅgadatta story 113
 Gatānugatikanyāya wrt scholars like Dvivedi 250
 Gataprāyā rātriḥ kṛśatanu 186
 Gateṣu līlāñcitavikrameṣu 77
 Gāthāśloka 293
 Gauraguṇair ahañkṛtibhṛtām jaitrāñkakāre 217
 Gaurīvibhramadhūpadhūma 227
 Gavākṣa 265+
 Ghaṭam bhindyāt paṭam chindyāt wrt Bh & Misra 44, 219
 Ghaṭātopo bhayañkaraḥ on the part of Bh and Misra 218
 Ghaṭātopo bhayañkaraḥ on the part of Misra 44
 Ghuṇākṣaranyāya wrt Bh 82fn
 Ghuṇākṣaranyāya wrt Misra 122
 Gīram atītya vartate 252
 Gīrām pravṛttir mama nīrasāpi iii
 Graha 71
 Grahaṇānta 234+
 Grahaśānta 234+
 Gramāṇāmupaśalyasīmani 290
 Grāmo nāsau na sa janapadaḥ 131
 Grass, throwing on the ground (Misra on) 211
 Guṇadoṣān aśāstrajñāḥ iii
 Guṇam dadhāne madhunārpyamāṇam 99
 Guṇino na durāgrahāḥ 157
 Guror giraḥ pañca dinānyadhītya 295

Haack, August A. German translation 67, 229
 Hanūmadādyair yaśasā mayā punar 244
 Hāsabhītā vs śītabhītā 240+
 Hastadvayīgāḍhagrītalola 125
 Hastadvayīgāḍhagrītalola wrt Bh 21
Hastyāyurvedaḥ 130
 Hāyanantayuvādibhyo'ṇ 183
 Hemacandra on vilāsa 178
 Himaṇ śīlībhūtam ivodvahanti 261
Hindī Sabdasāgara 46
 Hindu marriage, customs & traditions 16-17
 "History of the Baroda Library Movement" 15
 Humpty Dumpty 100

"Indo-American library Cooperation" 15
Inducandra 248
Indum for indu 279
Isakī iṃṭa usakā roṛā 296
Iṣyate 164
Iti bhramatsaurabhamāṃsalena 121
Iti sa manasā niścīyārtham 92
Iyaṃ mayi nyasyati netramālām 180

Jacobi, H. 1
Jagannidāghaḥ--B 243
Jaghāna pādena sakhīm sakhelam 180
Jala-tāḍanam wrt Misra 175
Jalhaṇa 213
Jānīte nitarām asau gurukula 206
Jaṭārdhacandra 279+
Jigīṣavaḥ ke'pi vijītya 45
Jīvatkaver āśayo na varṇanīyaḥ wrt Misra 181, 252, 288
Jñātum adbhutavilāsanidhāne 194
Jṛmbhāsamāspṛṣṭakarāṅgulīkam 195
Jṛmbhāvaśottambhita 196
Jyeṣṭhakalaśa 267

Kācit kṣīpantī madhupam 98
Kailāsagauram vṛṣam āruruḥṣoḥ 203
Kailāsaśailānilāḥ 227+
Kailāsaśubhram bhavanāṅgaṇaṃ tat 203
Kākākṣigolakanyāya 69
Kakubhām bhartṛbhaktānām 88+
Kālaḥ Kālañjaragiripater yaḥ prayāṇe 252
Kalakvaṇitagarbheṇa 162
Kalhaṇa as historian, wrt Bh 245+
Kālidāsa 83, 98, 122, 203
Kālidāsa omits his name from his works 232
Kāmadughā hi mahākavīnām vāco bhavanti 66, 123, 201
Kāmaṃ pratyādiṣṭāṃ smarāmi 168
Kāmandakīya on rājyāṅga 62
Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana 161
Kanakācalasaṅkāśa-devatāyatanāñcite 77
Kāñcī 67
Kāñcī padātibhir amuṣya 67
Kangra paintings on love 194

Kānte talpam upāgate 67
 Kānte tathā katham api prathitam 160
 Kānte vicitrasuratakramabaddharāge 161
 Kanyāpradānacchalataḥ kṣitīśāḥ 112
 Kāraṇaguṇāḥ kāryaguṇān ārabhante 52
 Karāṅgulī-samāsphoṭa 197
 Karaṭi 82+
 Karṇa, King of Kālāñjara 252
Karpūravallī 46
 Kartum kīrtiyā tilakam alakāgopurāṇām 239
 Kasya vā na bhavati roṣo 168
 Kathāpi khalu pāpānām 208
 Katicid api dināni tatra nītvā 108
 Kaviḥ karoti kāvyāni 69
 Kavimārga 202
 Kavītvam 252
 Kavītvavaktṛtvaphalā cucumba 252
 Kavītvabhivyañjitam kavītvātparyam 279
Kāvyaikalpalatā-kavīśikṣāvṛttiḥ 209
 Kāvya-mārga 209
Kāvya-prakāśa 89
Kāvya-prakāśe viṣamālaṅkārodāharaṇam 52
 Kāvya-rthabhāvanāparipakvabuddhi 136
 Kāvya-rthacauryam wrt Misra 239
 Kelikālaḥ 118
 Kelikāraḥ 119
 Keśavadāsa 194
 Ketakadrutinibhaṃ mahaḥ 114
 Khaṇḍa 45+
 Khiste, Baṭukanātha Śāstrī 53
 Kiṃ karoṣi nijayāthavā bhuvā 198
 Kiṃ karoṣi vayasādhikena me 299
 Kiṃ tava rocate eṣaḥ 81
 Kosambi, D. D. 287
 Krīḍā vs vrīḍā 239
 Krīḍā-lavaśabalitāḥ 239
 Krīḍāśaila 241+
 Krīḍāśailaḥ kanakakadalī 241
 Krīḍāśailībhavanti pratikalām alinām 241
 Krīḍāśailīkṛtahimagireḥ 241
 Kṛtaḥ śrutāgamaḥ 72+
 Kṛtakṣaṇa 255, 258
 Kṛtasthitiḥ 101
 Kṛtvā vīgraham aśrupāta 193
 Kṣaṇamātraviśrama 163
 Kṣapāḥ kṣāmīkṛtya 213
 Kṣate kṣāram wrt Misra 87
 Kṣipto mukhāt ṣaṭcaraṇaḥ 98

Kṣitipati or Kṣitirāja 245+, 249
Kṣmābhṛtkulānām upari pratiṣṭhām 48
Kuc (+sam) 257
Kuhūtkāri 133
Kulapraṭiṣṭhā 48
Kumārasambhavam 154
Kumāryāḥ vs kumāryām 80, 170, 172
Kundendutuṣārahāradhavalā 203
Kuṇṭhatvam āyāti guṇaḥ kavīnām wrt Misra 30, 117
Kuṇṭhīkṛtāriśastrasya 89
Kupitaḥ kṣmābhṛt 92+
Kurvantu śeṣaḥ śukavākyapāṭham wrt B & G 158
Kurvantu śeṣaḥ śukavākyapāṭham wrt Bh 136, 190
Kurvantu śeṣaḥ śukavākyapāṭham wrt Misra 117, 202
Kuryād anārdreṣu kim aṅganānām 231fn

Labdhārjanānām 172
Lakṣa 43+
Lakṣya 43+
Lekhanī pustikā nārī 5
Lekhayā luloke 107, 206
Lexicographers vs poets 260
Līlā vilāso vicchittir 178
Līlālavanyañcitakandhareṇa 168+
Līlāśukāḥ kokilakūjitānām 283
Limits of Misra's unlimited knowledge 281
Limpatīva tamo'ṅgāni 170
Little knowledge dangerous wrt Bh 185, 242
Little knowldege dangerous wrt Misra 96
Locanābhyām vihīnasya wrt Misra 86, 292, 308?
Lohara 246
Lohara Dynasty, scions of 247
Lokasya nābhir jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā 50
Lubdhair janānām 172
Lubdhārjanānām 172
Lulita vs luṭhita 133
Luloke 107, 206

Mā (root) 159
Mā garvam udvaha kapolatāle cakāsti 65
Madvairiṇaḥ kaṭhorāṃsor 227
Māgha 122, 163

Mahābhāṣyavyākhyā 267
 Makṣikāsthāne makṣikā wrt B & G 101, 168, 214
 Makṣikāsthāne makṣikā wrt Bh 163, 242
 Mamānatikruddho muniḥ 81
 Mammaṭa, example of ṣaṣṭhī 89
 Mammaṭa on kāvya-hetu 264
 Mammaṭa on saṅkara 75
 Māna 185+
 Manasija wrt kaśā 238
 Manasijakathāghātabhagnāḥ 238
Mānasollāsa 214
 Maṇḍūkaplutinyāya 171, 229
 Maṅgalākṣata 76
 Manyupaṅkakaḷuṣam samudvahan 261
Mātaṅgalīlā 83, 129
 Māti vs bhāti 134+
 Māti nirvivare tasyāś 134+
 Mātsarya 199
 Mauktikaśrīḥ 55
 Mauñjī-mekhalā 55
 Mayā nipīḍyamānās te 95, 112
 Mayā tasyābhayaṃ pradattam 81
Meghadūte Kālidāsaḥ 130
 Misra & science of prosody 283+
 Misra as an historiographer 101+
 Misra as translator 57
 Misra betrays ignorance 262+, 279, 282
 Misra commits literary crime 262+
 Misra condemns Bilhaṇa's ukti as preposterous 201
 Misra confuses nature of *Vcar* MS 232
 Misra corrects N, a play of ghuṇākṣaranyāya 226
 Misra crosses the limits of justice 165
 Misra determined to destroy everything 251
 Misra discounts R 297
 Misra goes against all authorities 166
 Misra indulges in unwanted emendation 241
 Misra is confused 169
 Misra makes kaśā of kathā 238
 Misra murders poetic muse of Bilhaṇa 118, 208
 Misra murders Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū 164
 Misra notices kāvyārthacaurya by others 282
 Misra on genitive for dative 79+
 Misra on N 8
 Misra on payomucaḥ 224
 Misra on R 4
 Misra on rānta 234
 Misra once again plays plagiarism 267
 Misra parades his pedantry 231, 259+

Misra reaches the highest peak of absurdity 251
 Misra really needs some real guru 117
 Misra shows slavish mentality 252
 Misra stoops to the lowest level 251
 Misra writes for himself 288
 Misra wrt literary criticism 209
 Miśra-śakti 181
 Misra--pratibhābhāsa 122
 Misra, a pretender 234
 Misra, a saṅkara 295
 Misra, a scholar-pretender 238, 265
 Misra, a totalitarian dictator 265
 Misra, kartum akartum anyathākartum samarthaḥ 208
 Misra, munitrayaikyam 127
 Misra's absurdities 251, 287, 292
 Misra's āḍambara 285
 Misra's arrogance cum ignorance 89+, 93, 279, 292
 Misra's asīmajadātā 164
 Misra's avyāpāreṣu vyāpāram 206
 Misra's bālacāpalam 182, 198
 Misra's book full of errors 282+
 Misra's chapters in terms of no. of pages 296
 Misra's childish blabberings 184
 Misra's eulogy and prospectus on dust-jacket 31+
 Misra's *ex cathedra* judgment 245
 Misra's one more attempt to annoy his readers 292
 Misra's gajanimīlikā 201, 297
 Misra's great power of emendation 96
 Misra's jalpa 92
 Misra's knowledge of Gajāśāstra 121
 Misra's knowledge of Sanskrit 212, 271
 Misra's *Magnum opus* 25+
 Misra's manaḥpūtam samācāret 184
 Misra's metri-causa 184
 Misra's misdeeds 207+
 Misra's misdirected emendation 195
 Misra's misdirection 113
 Misra's "nature" 52
 Misra's one more nonsensical reading 291
 Misra's performance (cintāmaṇi vs mṛlloṣṭa) 180
 Misra's pitiable misrepresentation 198
 Misra's plagiarism 107, 239
 Misra's play of prank 237
 Misra's preposterous propositions 251, 262
 Misra's sato'pyapalāpaḥ 297
 Misra's suggestions absurd 211
 Misra's unreasonableness 103, 173, 203
 Misra's utprekṣā 51+

Misra's vitaṇḍāvāda 50, 70
 Misra's work more padding than real *kucakalaśau* 277
 Misra's work--why to criticize? 28+
 Misra's work, most irresponsible 208
 Misra's work, nature of 295+
 Miśropajñam jñānam 239
 Mṛtkumbhabālukārandhra 56
 MS. A 74+
 Mukham astīti vaktavyam wrt Misra 109fn
 Mukharamuraṇam paurastrībhir na lāsyam 288
 Mukhena lajjābhīnayapragalbhā 168
 Mukhena Sītāṇ śarapāṇḍureṇa 54
 Mukhenducandrikāpūra 155, 244
 Murārikavi 206
 Mūrkhopi śobhate tāvat wrt Misra 87
 Musalgaonkar 15

N interprets Yasya bhrātā 246
 N on B ed. 4-5, 232, etc.
 N on Mahābhāṣyavyākhyā 268
 N on N ed. 23+
 N on P 7
 N on R 3, 219+
 N teaches Vik. 2+
 N visits Jaisalmer 6, 94, 235
 N's "Sigla and abbreviations" wrt Misra 271
 N's contribution to *Vik.* 233
 N's ed. reviewed 6-8
 Na hi kastūrikāmodaḥ wrt Misra 292
 Na hi sarvaḥ sarvaṇ jānāti 134
 Na hi vandhyā vijānāti wrt Bh 154
 Na hyeṣa sthāṇor aparādho wrt Misra 86, 292, 295
 Na māti sma 134+
 Na śaśāka nirākartum 71
 Nagar on the correctness [!] of his ed. 204
 Nagar's ed. 5
 Nagar's text still deficient 205
 Nāgara 47
 Nāgarāja Rāo--Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya 203fn
 Nagarīvarṇanapaddhatiḥ 288
 Nāgavallī 47
Naiṣadhīyacaritam 73, 132
 Nakalchī bandar wrt Bh 220
Nāmalīṅgānuśāsanam 266
 Namatyayaḥśyāmalaśaṣpamaṇḍala 219

Nāndhrīpayodhara ivāṭitarām 21, 126
 Narair viphalajanmabhir giridarī 160
 Narapatitanayaḥ kayāpi kopa 107
 Nārāyaṇa Svāmī 161
Navasāhasāṅkacarita 52
 Navendranīlā 113
 Neo-expounders like M and Bh 244
 Niḥśoka vs niḥśūka 283
 Nijerṣubhiḥ 92, 95, 209
 Nīlacchatronmadagajaghaṭāpātram 253
 Nīlaguṇḍatāmraśāsanam 243
 Nīlakaṇṭha, author of *Mātaṅga-līlā* 83, 129
 Nīlakaṇṭha mountain 98
 Nīlam/kamalam 211
 Nīmīlita 121
 Nimnanābhikuhareṣu yad ambhaḥ 162
 Nīpiṣṭa 108
 Nīrāgā mṛgalāñchane mukham api 285
 Nirañkuśāḥ kavayaḥ 261
 Nirantarāghaṭṭitapāṭalādharāḥ 207
 Nirantaram Brahmapurībhir āvṛtam 233
 Nīrasatarur iha vilasati purataḥ 221
 Nirīkṣya vidyunnayanaiḥ payodo 224
 Nirudhya randhraṃ madhupūritasya 172
 Nirvāpita 183
 Nirviṣeṇāpi sarpeṇa 45
 Nirvivare 156
 Nīśāsu yatra pratibimbavartmanā 276
 Niṣiddhair apyebhir lulitamakarando 133
 Niṣiddham apyācaraṇīyam āpadi 73
 Nivārita vs nirvāpita 183
 Nivāritadīpāḥ 183
 Nīvīm prati praṇihite tu kare priyeṇa 67
 Nīvimokṣo hi mokṣaḥ 67
 Niviṣṭa 108
 Niyatikṛtaniyamarahitām 202
 Novel prize in literature 158
 Nṛpasya vallabha 206, 225

On *Caritacandrikā*, a note on identification 298-312

Padātivratam udvahāmi 261

Padmagupta 52
 Pālakāpyamuni-viracito *Hastyāyurvedaḥ* 130
 Pāṃsudāna 130
 Pāṇau padmadhiyā madhūka 99
 Pañcāṅgo rājanayaḥ 64
 Pāṇḍyo'yam aṃsārpitalambahāraḥ 206
 Pāñiyam nālikerīphalakuhara 133
 Pañkāmbupāṃsupriyaḥ 130
 Parā pratiṣṭhā 48
 Parāsam 198
 Parāsām vs parāsam 198
 Pārāvatānām rutaiḥ 159
 Paricyutas tatkucabhāramadhyāt 155
 Paripākapāṇḍurāṇām śarakāṇḍānām 51
 Paryudāsa 106
 Pāṭala-dhara 207
 Pāṭhāntaram 90
 Pavitram atrātanute jagad yuge iii
 Payodavṛndaṃ gagana 225
 Poetry, appreciation of, a subtle art 136, 221
 Poetry, essence of 136
 Pra. MS. 271
 Prabuddha vs pravṛddha 206
 Prabuddhakārśyāḥ paritāpa 206
 Pradarśayāmāsa tataḥ kumāryāḥ 80, 170+
 Prādhānyam syād vidher yatra 106
 Prakṛtivyirodhahata 111
 Pramādat vs prasādāt 123
 Praṇāmānto mānaḥ 186
 Prāṇapraṭiṣṭhā 50
 Prāpnotyāśu paraṃ sthānam 43
 Prasāda 191
 Prasādāt vs pramādāt 123
 Prasajyapraṭiṣedha 106
 Praśānte nūpurārāve 66
 Pratāpa 250, 252
 Pratāpam āropya parām samunnatim 252
Pratiññāyugaṇḍharāyaṇa 83
 Pratiṭhalananibhāt 49
 Pratiṣṭhā 47+
 Pratyādideśainam abhāṣamāṇā 168
 Pratyādiś 168
 Pratyādiṣṭaviśeṣamaṇḍanavidhiḥ 168
 Pratādiśyanta iva me 168
 Pratyāgacchati laṅghanārtham 281
 Prauḍhiprakarṣeṇa purāṇarīti 1
 Prauḍhiprakarṣeṇa purāṇarīti wrt Misra 30, 122
 Pravṛddha 206

Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavan Texts Series 94

Priyatama Chandra Shastri 42
Pṛthvībhujāṅgaḥ parikampitāṅgīm 57+
Puṇḍraka-śarkarā 55
Puraḥ sthitvā kiñcid valita 287
Purāṇa-Bilhaṇa wrt Misra 83, etc.
Pūrvakālaikasarvajarat 127
Puṣpair bhrājīṣṇubhastrā 84
Puṣpāñjalikṣepam ivodvahanti 261

Rājaśekhara 134
Rājatarāṅgiṇī 246
Rājiga 109
Rajombupāṅkavīhṛti 130
Rājyam uddhṛtam anarthapaṅkataḥ 112
Rāmanātha Dīkṣita wrt Bh 17
Rāmāśramī on gavākṣa 267
Rāmāśramī on rājyāṅgam 63
Rāmāśramī on vilāsa 178
Rāmāvatāra Śarmā, guruvaryāṅām of Bh 163
Raṇarabhasavilāsakautukena 105
Raṇarasacalitam 118
Randhawa, M. S. 194
Rānta vs śānta 234
Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti iii
Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti wrt Bh 194
Rasadhvaner adhvani ye caranti wrt Misra 30
Rasāntaram 187
Rasikapriyā of Keśavadāsa 194
Rāśīkṛtāḥ puṣpaparāgapuñjāḥ 128
Ratāntare yatra gṛhāntareṣu 163
Ratikopa 191
Ratikope prasāde ca 191
Ravaiḥ 215
Re mātaṅga madāmbuḍambaratayā 291
Research defined 297
Restoration of text 237
Rolambarolam vs rolambakholam 291
Rūḍhayaugikamīśrākhyās 209

Sa somavannetracakorapāraṇām 74
Sā stanāñjalibandhena 157
Sa tatkṣaṇāt parimlāna 88+
Sabdakalpadruma 55

Śabdārthaśāsanajñāna iii, 136
 Śabdasya śaktayaḥ 181
 Ṣaḍ upāyāḥ 187
 Ṣaḍguṇyo mantraḥ 112
 Sādharmya 196, 243
Saduktikarṇāmṛta wrt Dolāyām jaghana 165
 Sadyaḥ karasparśam avāpya citram 52
 Saharṣam ityapsarasām ajāyata 234
 Sahasā vidadhīta na kriyām 291
 Sahasraśaḥ santu viśāradānām 1
 Sahasraśaḥ santu viśāradānām wrt Misra 30, 124
Sāhityadarpaṇa 191
Sāhityadarpaṇa on arthāntaranyāsa 174
Sāhityadarpaṇa on kampa (vepathu) 65
Sāhityadarpaṇa on māna 191+
Sāhityadarpaṇa on vilāsa 177
 Sāhityapāthonidhimanthanottham 20
 Sāhityapāthonidhimanthanottham 268
 Sāhitye sukumāravastuni wrt Misra 64
 Sahṛdaya hurt by Bh 224
 Śākhācandranyāya 135
 Sakhīnām kim api bruvāṇā 80
 Śaktir nipuṇatā lokaśāstra 265
 Sāmādaḥ tu parikṣiṇe 187
 Samakṣam api sūryasya 227
 Sāmānye napuṃsakam 124
 Samarpayāmāsa payāṃsi 80
 Sāmarthyam 87+
 Samāsokti 59
 Śambhukavi 46
 Sampūrṇakumbho na karoti śabdām 248
 Sāmrajyam 87+
 Saṃskṛtam nāma daivī vāk 116
 Samucchalyantā prāyāṅkṛtāni 269
 Samudvahannunnatam aṃsakūṭam 261
 Samudvahantyoḥ tad athāyatākṣī 261
 Saṃyuktādyam dīrgham 184
 Ṣaṇḍa 45+
 Sandhibandham avalokya niścalam 112
 Saṅgrathya kaścit katicit padāni gāthākavitvam 293
 Sañkucita 49+
 Śānta-kautaka 235+
 Saptamyadhikaraṇe ca 135
 Śāradā 229
 Śarakāṇḍa 54
 Śarakāṇḍa = sugarcane of Misra 51
 Śarakāṇḍapāṇḍugaṇḍasthala 54
 Saraso viparītaś cet wrt Bh 182

Śārdūlavikrīḍitam 285
 Sarvadaiva hṛdayaṃ malīmasam 225
 Sarvasvam gṛhavarti Kuntalapatir 253
 Sarveṣāṃ madakṛd vasantasamayaḥ 130
 Śaṣṭhaḥ upāyaḥ 185
 Śaṣṭhī cānādare 89
 Śāstrapratiṣṭhā 48
 Satror api guṇā vācyā wrt Bühler 138
 Satyāyamānam asatyam 120
 Saundaryam indīvaralocanānām 123
 Savāsanānām sabhyānām 69
 Savrīḍo'bhūt 239
Shola (Latin) 259
 Sīlā-Vijjā-Mārulā 117
 Silhaṇa 293
 Śilīmukha 98+
 Sindhutīranilayānurodhataḥ 105
 Siñjā 281
 Siñjinī 281
 Śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha wrt Misra 292
 Śītabhītā 240, 245
 Smaraḥ asyāḥ kathayāmbabhūva 80
 Smaraprasastiprativastutāṃ gatāḥ 163
 Smerās santu sabhāsadaḥ 290
 Smk. compiler had the original text of *Vik.* 272
 Smṛti 73
 Śobhākara 85, 287
 Śobhante sma vilāsakuntalalatāḥ 179
 Somadeva 111
 Someśvara Bhūlokamalla 9, 47
 Sparśaḥ kaṇṭakakoṭibhiḥ kuṭilayā 164
 Śrīharṣa 64, 73, 132, 155
 Śrīkhaṇḍacarcāparipāṇḍuro'yam 202
 Śrīnīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita 263
 Śrīparicayāj jaḍā api 162
 Śṛṅgāraratnākaravelayeva 269
 Śrotraṃ śrutenaiva na kuṇḍalena 74
 Śrutasya yāyād ayam antam arbhakaḥ 74
 Śruti 73
 Śrutvā śrutvā rutam aviratam 160
 Stein translates Putro Vighararājasya 246
 Sthālīpulākanyāya 295
 Sthiti 262
 Sthūlārundhatīnyāya 135
 Strīṇāṃ vilāsa-vibbokā 178
 Subhaṭā 248
 Subhaṭaḥ pramadākarārpitām wrt Misra 46, 226
 Sudīrghā rāgaśālinyo 238

Śukavākyapāṭham wrt Bh 243
 Sukharatarata 288
 Śuklah/paṭaḥ 211
Sūktimuktāvalī 218, 227
 Surata-krīḍā 159+
 Śuro'si kṛtavidyo'si 222
 Śūro'si kṛtavidyo'si wrt Bh 21
 Sūryamatī 248
 Suṣko vṛkṣas tiṣṭhatyagre 221
 Svāgatā metre 184
 Svagr̥hottuṅgavātāyanagataḥ 266
 Svāmyamātyasuhṛtkośa 62
 Svayaṃ naṣṭaḥ parān nāśayati wrt Bh 181
 Svayaṃ naṣṭaḥ parān nāśayati wrt R 121

Tadbhayāt Siṃhaladvīpabhūpatiḥ 258
 Taddarśanād abhūc chambhor 281
 Tadīyo lebhe'ntaram cetasi nopadeśaḥ 170
 Talpeṣu 271
 Taṃ santaḥ śrotum arhanti wrt Misra 32
 Taṃ vibhāvya rabhasād upāgatam 68
 Tāṃ vidhāya katicid dināni 96
 Tāmbūlaṃ kaṭutiktam uṣṇamadhuram 46
 Tantukṛśāṃ vahantyāḥ 261
 Taraṅgitāṅgī 198
 Tarjana 196
 Tasyāḥ sāndravilepanastana 194
 Tataḥ pratāpajvalanaprabhāva 244
 Tathā gatā campakadāmagaurī 132
 Tatra dakṣiṇataṭe kṛtasthitiḥ 101
 Tavāṅgavallīkusumair vilāsaiḥ 175
 Tayopadeśaḥ sa kṛtaḥ kumāryām 170
 Te ke na jānīmahe wrt Misra 182
 Teṣāṃ prasanno hi vilāsabāṇaḥ 179
 Thieme, Paul 34+
Through the Looking Glass 100
 Translation, problems of 135, 177
 Trilokalakṣmyeva salīlam ikṣitaḥ 155
 Tṛṇāni bhūbhṛtkātakeṣu 210
 Tlbingen, correspondence with 34+
 Tuṅgabhadrā 101
 Tvadbhiyā giriguhāśraye sthitaḥ 99
 Tyāgam eva praśamsanti 112
 Tyaktā mayā nāma kulapraṭiṣṭhā 50

Udañcayan kiṃśukapuṣpasūcīḥ 238
Udañciromañcatayā samantataḥ 94
Udāraśauryaikarasaḥ kṣamāpatiḥ 97, 105
Udvasannagaram 289
Ullekhaliḷāghaṭanāpaṭūnām wrt Misra 32
Unnidrapaṅktisthitacampakāni 131
Upakāra ivāsati prayuktaḥ 170
Upamā-rūpaka-saṅkara 75
Urvīpateḥ pārvaṇacandravaktrā 261
Uṣṭrāṇām ca vivāheṣu wrt Misra 64
Utprekṣā 213
Uttarjanīkena muhuḥ kareṇa 43, 196
Utthāya manyuvaśataḥ 188
ULLAS 15

Vācām agocaram 252
Vāgarthāviva samprktau 78
Vah(+ ud) 259
Vakṛtvam 252
Vallabhaḥ vs vallabha 226
Vālmīki on Sātā's resolve to accompany Rāma 278
Vāmanācārya Jhaḷakīkar 157
Vaprakrīḍāpariṇatagaja 119
Vapur yāmāvāsaḥ kucaparivṛtaś 254
Vapus tuṣārācalagauram asya--Nāgarāja Rāo 203fn
Vapus tuṣārācalatuṅgam asya 201
Varam eko guṇī putraḥ 139
Vāraṃvāraṃ tirayati dṛṣor udgamam 65
Vardhito roditaś ca 278
Variant readings, how created 244fn
Vāsabhītā 245
Vātāyana 265
Vātāyanaiḥ kelivimānakalpaiḥ 265
Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* 161
Vayam iha padavidyām wrt Misra 64
Velā 269
Velācala 269
Velankar, H. D. 6
Veṅginātha 109
Veṇī 195+
Veṇīsamhāra 133
Veṇukā 195+

Vibhūṣya vs vimūṣya 233
 Vicāracāturiam apākaroti 183
 Vicarati vs na carati 252
 Vicinvatīḥ pānthapataṅgahiṃsanair 132
Viddhaśālabhañjikā 51
 Vidhṛtya Kāñcīṃ bhujayor balena 70
 Vidhṛtya vs vivṛtya 65
 Vidvān eva vijānāti wrt Bh 138
 Vidyākara, age of 287
 Vijṛmbhamāṇesvatha 179
Vik. verses cited in anthologies 273+
 Vikālaiḥ of Misra 175
 Vikīrṇa 77+
 Vikrama's wise stroke of diplomacy 112
 Vikramāditya-sāmrajya-sīmā 103
Vikramāñkābhūdaya 9, 47, 205
Vikramāñkābhūdaya on añkakāra 217
 Vilāsa 175+
 Vilāsabāṇaḥ 180
 Vilāsacāpaḥ 179
 Vilāsadhanvā dhanur ācakaṛṣa 179
 Vilāsadolāphalake nitamba 158
 Vilāsavātāyanasevanena 265
 Vilāso'ṅge viśeṣo yaḥ 178
 Vināyakam prakurvāṇo 280
 Vipakṣavīrādbhutakīrtihārī 292
 Viraha-sandēśa-lekhana-preṣana 294
 Vīramṛdaṅga 216
 Viratasurata 288
 Virutāni caṣṭau 161
 Viṣamo'pi vigāhyate nayaḥ 20
 Viśikhaśakala 234
 Viṣṇoḥ pratiṣṭheti Vibhīṣaṇasya 48
 Vītasprhāṇām api muktibhājām 100
 Vitīrṇa vs. vikīrṇa 77+
 Viveśa subhrūr atha sūtikāgrham 80
 Vivṛtya (Misra) 65
 Vrīḍālavaśabalitaḥ 239
 Vṛthā gāthāślokaḥ alam alam 293
 Vṛttam vs bhṛtyam 253
Vṛttaratnākara 90
 Vyadhita tadanu devyāḥ patravallīm kapole 205
 Vyāpṛtair aviratam śilīmukhaiḥ 98
 Vyutpattiḥ 264+
 Vyutpattir āvarjitakovidāpi wrt Misra 30, 264

Whitney, W. D. 88
Why this book? 117
Word-formation 209
Wrong construction leads to destruction 227

Yā dugdhāpi na dugdheva 123
Yadāpatram mama netrapadma 48
Yādṛṣaṃ pustakaṃ dr̥ṣṭam 108
Yadyapi na bhavati hāniḥ...rāsabhe 28
Yaḥ śrotṛāmṛtanirjharaiḥkavasatim 289
Yaṃ vīkṣya pāthodhir adhiyacāpam 270
Yamaka-alaṅkāra 292
Yānasthānāsanādīnām 177
Yānūmilāpatir ayaṃ ca tavātmajaś ca 163
Yasmin kiñcin na tad upavanam 237
Yasminnurvīpati...cañcac-catura 84
Yasya bhrātā Kṣitipatir iti 245
Yasya prāptādbhutaparinateḥ karkaśe 251
Yasya pratāpo'gnir apūrva eva 218, 243
Yasya svecchāśabaracaritālokana 264
Yasya...maurvīravaḥ...pātālatala 80
Yasyākhilavyāpi yaso'vadātam 244
Yasyāñjanaśyāmalakhaḍgapaṭṭa 50
Yasyāś Coraś cikuranikuraḥ 179
Yasyotsaṅge kulasarid asau Nīlakaṇṭha 97
Yatra tiṣṭhati virodham udvahan 261
Yatra ṡ yanna 99
Ye dolākelikārāḥ kim api mṛgadṛśām 134
Ye kepi tebhyo'ñjaliḥ 221
Ye kuṇṭhīkṛtavallabha 188, 275
Yena kena prakāreṇa wrt Misra 293
Yenānargala 290
Yenodīcyām diśi gatavatā...cañcac-Canḍīpati 85
Yeṣām ca virodhaḥ śāsvatikaḥ 110
Youth in Nagar 204

P.S.

Andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāḥ.

One scholar named Priyatamacandra Śāstrī earned the degree of Vidyāvāridhi (=Ph.D.) from the Vārāṇaseya Saṃskṛta Viśvavidyālaya on a **śodhaprabandha** titled *Vikramāṅkadevacaritasya sāhityikam sarvekṣaṇam* under the guidance of a fantastic scholar named Patabhirama Sastri, famous as a **mimāmsaka**. We don't know how much of Sāhitaya he knew. However he had earned a great deal of name and fame. But he seems to have given a true example of two well known very ancient nyāyas **Na hi sarvaḥ sarvam jānāti** and **Andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāḥ**. This will be proved by the time this note is finished.

This scholar Priyatamacandra says that he received great help from Batuk Nath Shastri Khiste. This too seems to be a **mānāntaraviruddha arthavāda**. This Batuk Nath and the writer of these lines used to play pranks together. We were almost classmates. He was just one or two years ahead.

We don't know if this thesis is published as yet or not. If not, good, because it lies. It is not reliable. The scholar has just wasted his time, money and energy in bringing out the **bimba-pratibimba-bhāva** in the immortal work of Bilhana and some earlier poets. He was not able to see the special **vicchitti** and **camatkara** in Bilhana.

With regard to the *Caritacandrikā* this **pathabhrānta andhena nīyamana andha** scholar-pretender Vidyāvāridhi says:

Vikramāṅkadevacaritasya prathamapustake [=J MS] arthāvagama saukaryā rtham viṣamasthalārthāvabodhinī Caritacandrikānāmnī ṭippanī vartate. Dā.

Byulhara[!] maho-dayena svakīye Vikramāṅkadevacarite (dviṭīyaṭṭīyapustake)

[P and B] iyam ṭippanī noddhṛtā. Śrīmadbhiḥ Murārīlālaśarmabhiḥ Jaialamera - Bṛhājñānakośabhāṇḍāra sthād hasta likhitāt pustakāt mahatā parisśrameṇa saṅgrhīteyam ṭippanī Caritacandrikānāmnī Vikramāṅkadevacaritasya Sarasvatībhavanasamskaraṇe prakāśitā. ASYĀ ṬIPPANĪYA LEKHAKASYA NĀMA DAURBHĀGYEṆA KĀLAKALITAMEVĀSTI. [nonsense and rubbish!] 1286 Ī. varṣataḥ prācīne'smin pustake vidyamānāya asyāḥ prācīnatā nāsti sandigdā. Śrīmurārīlālanāgaramahodayairanadhigatasakalārthā tathaivo pasthāpitā. Asyā lekhakaḥ asya śabdārtho nopagamyaite ityādi likhitvā svīyagarvaśūnyapāṇḍityasya paricayam dattavān.

Then he copies some of my words from my **Upodghāta** without understanding the meaning.

What a worthless show of scholarship and what a horrible misleading statement! Such scholar-pretenders are awarded Vidyā vā ridhi degrees on such trash of misleading writings. To us 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 scholar - fantastic must have been **Gaṅgātaraṅgavilasannaudolālulitamānasabhaṅg**

amadhuramadirārasapānamadonmattaḥ when he wrote his **śodhapra-bandha**. How else we can explain such nonsensical writing. If we apply the **sthālīpulākanyāya** to this statement, we can well guess what kind of the whole writing would be.

Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita and Its Neo-Expounders

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 the 11th century India, Bilhaṇa composed the poem as a panegyric for his patron.

Dr. Nagar's work corrects some modern wayward writers who have done great injustice to the poet by misrepresenting the facts and distorting the truth. Their ignorance can be matched only by their arrogance. Here is a demonstration of their pompous play and display of naked plagiarism, still generating great rewards of riches and reputation. This book is a kind of remedial writing, which restores the truth and upholds the justice. It is an outcome of fifty years of learning, reading, writing and research in the field of Sanskrit studies. Dr. Nagar's exposition and application of certain fundamental principles of literary and textual criticism may serve as a guide to the succeeding critics. The book is quite extensive, yet very inexpensive. Has an elaborate index and a map of contemporary India. Studied with charming gems of Sanskrit poetic citations. A lovely reading that assures bliss.

1991 339pp. ₹45.00 ISBN 0-943913-18-7

We will be very happy to send you a copy on approval without any obligation on your part. You need not even return it! Just keep it as a gift from us.

International Library Center, 1405 St. Christopher Street
Columbia, MO 65203-2356. (314) 449-5871

ILC is a non-profit, charitable research institution promoting international fellowship of libraries and librarianship. A list of some of its recent publications appears separately. These have come out through the generous help of the University of Missouri, Columbia.