

CHAPTER II

2.1 The Art of Commentary

2.2 Introduction of Commentator's

- i. Commentaries on *Mahāvīracaritam*'
- ii. Commentaries on *Mālatī mādava*
- iii. Commentaries on *Uttararāmacarita*

2.3 Available Published Sanskrit Commentaries on *Uttararāmacarita*.

2.4 Unpublished Sanskrit commentaries

2.5 About the commentators

- i. Śāradārañjana Roy
- ii. Ghanaśyāma Paṇḍita
- iii. Vīrarāghava
- iv. Ramadhara Sharma
- v. Tarakumara chakravarti
- vi. Ānanda Svarupa

2.6 Conclusion

2.7 Table of the Commentaries and commentators details.

Chapter II ABOUT THE COMMENTARY & THE COMMENTATORS:

2.1 The Art of Commentary:

Poetry of the spontaneous variety is beyond comprehension to the layman. Bhartṛhari, the author of *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, in one of the concluding verses has observed that his poem is comprehensible only with help of a commentary. To the highly intelligent, the poem may become a festivity once the commentator gives an adequate explanation.

व्याख्यागम्यमिदं काव्यमुत्सवः सुधियामलम् ।

हता दुर्मेधसश्चास्मिन् विद्वत् प्रियतया मया ॥¹

It is admitted by the learned that poem is something which is eternal especially that coming from the pen of the master poets. They note down their poem on the well of the world with colourful ink using their tongue as pen.

जयन्ति ते सत्कविकुञ्जरा ये लिखन्ति जिह्वामयतूलिकाभिः ।

पृथग्विधप्रातिभरागिणीभिश्चित्तं जगद्भित्तितलेषु काव्यम् ॥²

According to one view, poetry has a complex nature which marks it impossible to have a full comprehension at one go. Purāṇasarasvatī one of the greatest commentators of all time has observed that none could claim complete success in explaining the poem of Kālidāsa word by word since it is simply to be enjoyed and relished by oneself. As the omnipotent form of Viṣṇu is beyond the comprehension of ordinary devotees, the words of Kālidāsa too become incomprehensible in their entirety to one and all.

प्रतिपदमखिलार्थव्याकृतौ कः कृती स्यात्

सुमतिभिरनुभाव्ये कालिदासस्य काव्ये ।

प्रभवति परिमातुं को विशेषानशेषान्

¹ Unni, N. P. of *Highways and Byways in Sanskrit Literature* vol2, New Bhatiya Publisher, Delhi, 2012, p.687.

² Ibid, p.687

वपुषि सुकृतिदृश्ये विश्वरूपस्य विष्णोः ॥³

There is a view that the poet is the best commentator since he alone understands his mind. The nuance of his words and ideas can be brought out only if chooses to compose an auto commentary. There is a popular saying to this effect:

कविरेव विजानाति कवेः परिमलं गिराम् ॥

Mallinātha in his prefatory stanzas to his commentary on *Kumārasambhavam* has observed as follows.

कालिदासगिरां सारं कालिदासस्सरस्वती ।

चतुर्मुखोऽथवा साक्षाद् विदुर्नान्ये तु मादृशाः ॥

तथापि दक्षिणावर्तनाथायैः क्षुण्णवत्मसु ।

वयश्च कालिदासोक्तिष्ववकाशं लभेमहि ॥⁴

Here the famous south Indian commentator Pradīpa Daksinavartanātha has noted that the words of Kālidāsa are fully understood by Kālidāsa, goddess of Speech and the creator. Still he has attempted to comment on it through the opening provided by Dal Sinavartanātha. According to another school of thought only the commentator could have a comprehensive view which enables him to appreciate the poet through his poetic sensibility. There is a famous dictum which states व्याख्याता वेत्ति नो कविः. Only the commentator knows well, not the poet. This is especially true when the poem is abounding in suggestive meanings.

Composing a commentary is a daunting task by all means. If there is a previous commentary the later commentator will certainly make use of it. He finds justification in composing a new gloss since he feels he has something to add by way of explanations.

आलोच्य पूर्वटीकाश्च लक्षणानि च धीमताम् ।

विनिर्मिता मया सेयं सोपयोगा भविष्यति ॥

न चेह पूर्वटीकाभिः कैमर्थक्यं प्रतीयताम् ।

³ Unni, N.P. of *Meghasandēśa with the commentaries Pradīpa*, Vidyullata and Sumanoramani, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi, 1987, p.2.

⁴ M. R. Kale, *Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa*, Motilal Benarsidass, Delhi; 1981, Introduction, p. XXXii.

यतो विद्वन्मता सर्वो न सर्वं पश्यतीति वाक् ॥⁵

‘This above observation is made by Aruṇagirinātha also known as Aruṇacalanātha, one of the early Commentators of Kerala who composed glosses on the *Raghuvamśam* and *Kumārasambhavam* of Kālidāsa. According to him each commentator believes that he has something to add to what has already been explained by his predecessors. It is this attitude that resulted in the composition of sixty four or more commentaries on the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa.⁶

It cannot be said that all explanations are to the point. There is the possibility of wrong or vicious explanation. Such views are termed as poison. Mallinātha has pointed out such instances where commentators are found misrepresenting the facts. On commenting the thirty fourth stanza of the *Uttarasandeśa* beginning with “*Tamayusmān mama ca Vacanta*” Mallinātha refers to his predecessor as follows: तथा च क्वचिद् द्वितीयादर्शनाद् सर्वत्र न तथा इति नाथवचनमनाथवचनमेव । this great commentator has referred to earlier commentators with observations like “*ityanye*”, “*apare*” etc. The same commentator had a feeling that the poetry of Kālidāsa has been wrongly explained on various occasions. He felt that some kind of rejuvenation was needed to save the stanzas from bad interpretations. Hence he has named his commentaries on *Raghuvamśam*, *Kumārsambhava* and *Meghasandeśa* with the significant term “*Saṅjīvanī*” the elixir that brings to life the dead ones. According to him the poem of Kālidāsa were contaminated by the poison of misinterpretation at the hands of incompetent earlier commentators. He had in his mind commentators like Vallabhadeva of *Kāśmīra*, Niruktakāra and Dakṣiṇavartanātha – In all his Commentaries he has included a prefatory stanza which runs as follows.

भारती कालिदासस्य दुर्व्याख्याविषमूर्च्छिता ।

एषा संजीवनीव्याख्या तामद्योज्जीवयिष्यति ॥

⁵ *Raghuvamśa with Prakāṣika*, Ravivarma Sanskrit Series No.3, Trippunithura, Cochin, 1964. P.69

⁶ For an account of the commentaries on *Meghadūta* see, S. K. De’s edition, Sahitya Academy, New Delhi, 1957.

This idea of the misrepresentation by predecessors is shared by Dakṣiṇavartanātha also, who has stated as follows in his commentary on *Raghuvamśam* named *Dīpikā*:

दुर्व्याख्यातृवचोयुक्त्या नष्टप्रायप्रभामिमाम् ।
भारतीं कालिदासस्य समुद्रर्तुं त्वरामहे ॥

Commentators are subjected to correction and criticism by the later writers. Hence it is not easy to launch a new commentary. Even a great commentator like Pūraṇasarasvatī the author of the *Vidyullatā* commentary on *Meghadūta* congratulates himself for his boldness in the venture.

निधौ रसानां निलये गुणानालंकृतीनामुदधावदोषे ।
काव्ये कवीन्द्रस्य नवार्थतीर्थे या व्याचिकिर्षा मम तां नतोऽस्मि ॥
मेधस्य विष्वग्रसवर्षुकस्य व्याख्या ममेयं विशदप्रकाशा ।
विध्योतयन्ती स्फुटमर्थजातं विधुल्लेवास्तु विभूषणाय ॥

In the second stanza he names his commentary as, *Vidyullatā*, lightening, a title appropriate to the work relating to *Megha*, literally a cloud with which lightning is associated. The word “*Viṣādaprakāśa*” is also significant since it refers to effulgence as well as clarity. Here he salutes his audacity in composing a commentary on Kālidāsa. This Kerala commentator has sounded a warning note that unless the critic is conversant with the principals of poetics, he is apt to commit mistakes. Even in the selection of reading of the text he has to be careful in ancient works which has a wide circulation all over the land, it is possible that numerous readings will occur. There is the possibility of *Prakṣiptas* i.e. interpolations both in the form of stanzas in full or parts. To distinguish the original readings and to fix the text traditional a scholarship is a must. Those ‘without this are referred to as *Gurukulavimukhas* – people averse to the tradition maintained by preceptors. It is observed by Pūraṇasarasvatī in the concluding stanzas of *Vidyullatā* as follows:

सुकविवचसि पाठानन्यथाकृत्य मोहाद्
रसगतिमवधूय प्रौढमर्थं विहाय ।

वि बुधवरसमाजे व्याक्रियाकामुकाणां
गुरुकुलविमुखानां धृषुतायै नमोऽस्तु ॥

He bows to the audacity of such writers who are bold enough to give wrong interpretations in the assembly of the learned. He has in fact composed detailed discussions rather than brief commentaries. Further he has justified the volume of his glosses in the following words in the preface of his *Rasamañjarī* commentary on *Mālatimādhava*.⁷

वक्तुं शक्योऽर्थविस्तारो न विना विस्तरं गिराम् ।
अतः प्रथनदोऽस्मिन् सद्यः सहदयैः स्वयम् ॥

Discussions regarding the fixing of the text forms one of the duties of a commentator. Dakṣiṇavartanātha in his *Dīpikā* commentary on *Raghuvamśam* has alluded to this aspect as follows:⁸

वैदेशिकेषु कोशेषु पाठभेदान् निरीक्षितान् ।
साधूनिहार्पयन्त्यास्त्यज्यन् व्याख्यातुमारभे ॥

It follows that Dakṣiṇavartanātha has procured the text from different regions in order to have a critical study of the readings. This is textual criticism of the highest kind: An instance may be cited from the *Raghuvamśam* (IV 55).

मुरचीमारुतोद्धतमगमत्कैतकं रजः ।
तद्योधवारवाणानामयत्नपटवासताम् ॥

Dakṣiṇavartanātha has for the first time given the reading *Muracī* to denote the name of the river and has commented on it as follows:

मुरची केरलदेशजा नदी ।

Following him Narāyaṇa Paṇḍita in his Padārtha *Dīpikā* commentary observes⁹

मुरची नाम केरलदेशेषु दक्षिणस्यां दिशि काचिन्नदी ।

The present writer has identified the river *Muracī* with the river *Curin* alias Periyar or Always River flowing to the west and having a length of 142 miles and

⁷ Trivandrum Sanskrit Series NO. 173, Trivandrum, 1953.

⁸ op. cit. p.70

⁹ Ibid. p.690

one of the longest rivers of Kerala. “In the above instance Mallinātha in his *Saṅjīvanī* Commentary has preferred the reading *Muralā* and gives the alternative form *Murali*.

मुरला नाम केरलदेशेषु काचिन्नदी ।

मुरलीति केचित् पठन्ति ।

V Rajarajavartna Raja, a historian of Kerala Sanskrit literature has offered the following remarks in dealing with the commentaries in Sanskrit.

“Commentators in Sanskrit are often classified in to five groups depending on their attainments:

1. Scholar,
2. Connoisseurs,
3. Scholars with aesthetic sensibility,
4. Ordinary critics and
5. Those who could not claim any originality or outstanding qualities.

People of the first variety have erudition in *Śāstras* and they manage well especially when they have to quote from such treatises. Their comments will be scientifically based and well arranged. Those belonging to the second group mainly lack in scientific wisdom. But they will be able to bring out the suggestions employed by the poet and would present the poem from the perspective of the poet. Their treatises are enjoyable for the readers in spite of the fact that they lack in depth. The third group belonging to the ideal class combine the qualities of the first two classes. The fourth and fifth classes of commentators somehow manage to give an idea of the work on which they comment, the fourth group comparing somewhat better to the last group. But those who belong to the third type are best suited to explain the works belonging to the fourth group comparing somewhat better to the last group. But those who belong to third type are best suited to explain the works belonging to the fields of *Mahakāvyas*, *Nāṭakas* and message poems. Scholarship and aesthetic sensibility are a must to bring out the full worth of such works. In other words, they must be endowed

with a great measure of poetic qualities. Only a poet could understand the mind of another poet. The commentator brimming with poetic ability could do better than any other type of critics.”

The same historian while dealing with the *Vidyullatā* commentary of Pūraṇasarasvatī on *Meghadūta* has enumerated the following features of the gloss which may be considered as guidelines to commentators.¹⁰

1. Purpose of the particular text.
2. The suggestive import conceived by the poet.
3. Exposition of hitherto unknown aspect of the ideas or purport.
4. Explanation of points alluded to by earlier commentators in a terse manner or comprehension of the views insufficiently expressed.
5. Citing of authority to substantiate the explanation from lexicons, scientific texts, authoritative writers etc.
6. Prefatory introduction to each of the stanzas so as to invite the attention of the reader to the point of debate.
7. Discussion regarding the appropriateness of the particular word or expression.
8. Literary beauty of the sentences under discussion by pointing out figures and meters employed.
9. Interconnection of the earlier stanza to the succeeding ones and
10. Selection of the best recession of the text or reading.

Here it may be noted that R. V Kriṣṇamācāri has pointed out the features of the *Vidyullatā* commentary in his prefatory note to the edition of the commentary as follows.¹¹

अस्यां खलु व्याख्यां मौलानां सर्वेषामपि पदानां सुप्रसिद्धानि प्रतिपदानि विवरणतया प्रकटितानि । पदार्थप्रदर्शनपूर्वकं वाक्यार्थः साधु निरूपितः । तत्र तत्र शङ्कासमाधाने च सयुक्तिप्रमाणां प्रदर्शिते । रसगमनिका च रम्यतरं विचारिता । कोशव्याकरणदिकं निपुणं निरूपितम् । अलङ्कारश्च सातिशयं विवेचितः । व्यङ्ग्यार्थश्च विशेषेण विशदिकृतः, यः किल मल्लिनाथेन मनसापि न

¹⁰ Ibid, p.690

¹¹ R. V Krishnamachariar, Srirangam, 1926, Introduction, p.10.

कलितः । समादितश्च समीचीनतरः पाठ, यो बहुत्र मल्लिनाथीयेन पाठेन विसंवदति, संवदति च पाशार्वाभ्युदयस्थितेन तेन तेन पाठेन । इदं पुनरन्याद्यशमस्य व्याख्यानस्य सौभाग्यसर्वस्वम्, यदयमेतत् काव्यश्रवणपठनजन्यं प्रयोजनमत्र विचारयति ।

Another feature of a good commentary is the discussion regarding the purpose of the poem. Here again Pūraṇasarasvatī has proved himself as the best example enumerating the aim of the poem in so many words. He anticipates the question from an ordinary inquisitive reader as to what purpose does the study of the poem serve. He himself answers that there are many advantages to be gained by the study of the work. One will have a better knowledge of the sound and sense in poetry; familiarity with customs and manners of various regions; attainment of merit having known about various shrines and holy Ghats; eternal flame; fortune gained by being dear to the kings and nobles; expertise in erotic text like the *Kāmasūtra* and knowledge about various fine arts like music and dance; dexterity in dealing with emotions of love in union and separation; knowledge about the habits and behavior of chaste women; recognition as a literary connoisseur in the assembly of the elite; aesthetic relish of the sublime variety and so on. Pūraṇasarasvatī states as follows:

अत्राह कश्चित् —

यक्षो रामगिरौ न्यवसिदित्युक्तम्, उपरि तु तत्सन्देशप्रकारः प्रपञ्चयिष्यते; अतोऽस्माकं पठतां शृण्वतां च किमायातम् इति । उच्यते — अत्र तावन्मुदुलसरल चेतसां व्युत्पाद्यानामक्लेशेनैव विशिषुशब्दार्थव्युत्पत्तिः तत्तद्देशविशेषव्यवहारवेदनं पुण्यतीर्थदेवावायतनादिसंकीर्तनेन दुरितक्षयः, कीर्तिरलधीयसी, राजादिवल्लभतया द्राविणसमप्तिः कामसूत्रादिविधासु गीतादिकलासु च कौशलम्, सम्भोगविप्रलम्भरूपशृङ्गारसागरकर्णधारत्वं पतिव्रताधर्म-परिज्ञानम्, सह्य इति सदसि सत्कृतिः मन्दीकृतपरब्रह्मानन्दसन्दोहश्च रसास्वाद इत्यादीनि परः शतं प्रयोजनानि ।

It may be noted that Gauridāsa (15th century) has followed Pūraṇasarasvatī in enumeration the purpose of similar poem. In his *Cintātilaka* commentary on *Śukasandeśa* of Lakṣmidāsa he has stated as follows:

प्रयोजनमपि विद्यते, प्रथमं तावद् विशिषुशब्दार्थव्युत्पत्तिः पुण्यतीर्थक्षेत्रादिकीर्तनेन दुरितक्षयः शसिकलाविशदा च कीर्तिः इत्यमी तावत् तिष्ठन्तु । मन्दीकृतमाक्षिकरसः परब्रह्मतिशायी रसास्वाद एव परमं प्रयोजनम् ।

The commentary remains unpublished thought manuscripts are available in the Kerala University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum.

Dharmagupta, the author of the *Varavarṇinī* commentary on *Śukasandēśa*¹² has made some observations on his ability when compared to the arduous task of commenting on the message poem.

लक्ष्मीदासकवेः क्व लज्जितवियदगङ्गातरङ्गागिरः

किलष्टोन्मेषतयानुदीर्णाविषया दृष्टिः क्वचास्माद्रुशाम् ।

तासामेव तथापि वीक्ष्य विकटोल्लासप्रसादं गुणं

व्याख्याने प्रयतामहे सहदयास्तत्र प्रसीदन्तु नः ॥

In another stanza he has referred to previous commentaries pointing out their limitations.

भाङ्कारमात्रे कतिचित् प्रवृत्ताः पयोदानेन परे कुतार्थाः ।

संवादवाचैव विवृन्वतेऽन्ये व्याख्याकृतः किंन्वियता फलं नः ॥

Some are flamboyant, some derive satisfaction by offering synonyms for words under Explanation. Some others just point out similarity between the incidents or expressions by quoting from literature. But such explanations do not serve the purpose for the common reader.

The name Varavarṇinī is given to the commentary by the author deliberately to bring out the likeness of a lady. This he has alluded to in the following verse;

कृतपदविच्छित्तिरियं सुविग्रहा हृद्यतरपदार्थोक्तिः ।

प्रथितान्वया प्रकाशितभावा विवृतिर्विभातु युवतिरिव ।

दत्ताद् युवतिसाधर्म्याद् वर्णनाद् वरवस्तूनः ।

भविष्यत्याख्या लोके व्याख्यैषा वरवर्णिनी ॥

Gauridāsa the author of the *Cintātilaka* commentary on the same message poem conveys his intention in commenting on the work as follows:

पदच्छेदः स्फुटप्रायः पदार्थपदविग्रहौ ।

¹² Unni, N.P., *Śukasandēśa of Laksmidasa*, with Vilāsini commentary of Manaveda, Nag Publishers, Delhi, 1985, p.54.

अभिप्रायौ प्रदर्शयैते पदभङ्गोऽपि कुत्रचित् ॥

These are the minimum requirements expected from a commentary by the readers. An anonymous author of the *Padārtha Dīpikā* commentary on *Śukasandēśa* compares the poem to a deep ocean abounding in incomprehensible expression and the gloss to stick which enables one to cross it.¹³

मन्देतेतरधियामवलम्बनार्थं

सन्देशकाव्यकठिनार्थमहाहदेषु ।

व्याख्यामयीं सुललितामवलम्ब्य यष्टिं

निर्मातुमारभ इहास्तु गुरुप्रसादः ॥

But Manaveda the author of the *Vilāsini* commentary compares the poem to a mountain which is insurmountable by the obstacle posted by difficult words. Hence he resorts to a stick which is none other than the blessing of his preceptor. Like an old man he proposes to climb the mount by depending on the support of the stick.¹⁴

लक्ष्मीदासकवीश्वरेण भणितस्सन्देशकाव्याचलो

गूढार्थोच्छ्रयदुर्गमोऽद्य धिषणाशक्त्या मयाऽऽरुह्यते ।

श्रान्तश्चेत् पतितोऽन्तरा गुरुकृपायष्टिं गरिष्टां तदा

विषुभ्याधिककृच्छ्रतः स्थविरवद् गन्तास्मि चाधित्यकाम् ॥

He is conscious of the critics who are biased against him. They may not receive the work and may ignore it. Let there be blind men or people with diseases of the eye. But that is no reason why a lamp should not be lit, for the light is for the benefit of the world at large.

ईर्ष्याक्रषायितधियामथवा बुधानां

किं स्यादनादभरैर्विफला कृतिर्मे ।

अन्धेषु वा नयनरोगिषु सत्सु दीपो

नोज्ज्वल्यते किमिति नोपकरोति लोकम् ॥

¹³ Ibid, Introduction, p.61.

¹⁴ Ibid, p.2.

From the above observation it may be seen that composing a good commentary is not an easy task. It is a venture best suited to a few scholars of the stature of Dakṣiṇavaratanātha, Mallinātha, Aruṇagirinātha, Purāṇasarasvatī and Ṛṣiputra Parameswara and others. However great they are in their achievement they are made the target of sharp criticism by the writers of the caliber of Bhoja and Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita. The following stanza of Bhoja contains a classic observation on the role of the commentator sounding a warning to those who are not well accomplished.

दुर्बोधं यदतीव तद् विजहति स्पष्टार्थमित्युक्तिभिः
स्पष्टार्थेष्वतिविस्तृतिं विदधति व्यर्थे :समासादिकै :।
अस्थानेऽनुपयोगिभिश्च बहुभि :जल्पै :भ्रमं तन्वते
श्रोतृणामिति वस्तुविप्लवकृतः सर्वेऽपि टीकाकृतः ॥

What, is extremely difficult to comprehend is left out from the purview of comment with a simple and convenient observation that the meaning is clear or obvious. Where the meaning is obvious posing no problem for understanding the commentator embarks into a digression with the classification of various compound formation of words in the stanza. Further they point out many features which are totally irrelevant to the situation such as the recapitulation of the stories connected with the character etc. This is just to show off the erudition of the commentator rather than to serve the context. In short most of the commentators are flamboyant when it comes to the explanation of the purport of the text. The famous south Indian poet, critic, philosopher and satirist have come down heavily on bad critics”.

According to him bad critics deserve to be ignored. The criticism of a bad poet in regard to poetry is not at all a disqualification. A pond made turbulent by the fleeting fish becomes crystal clear in a short time. One should not begin to criticize even before reading and appreciating a poem. Such critics find fault with poets who blaze a trail of their own as unorthodox. If a poet follows the path

trodden by a worthy predecessor, he is derided as blind follower without any originality on his part. Biased critics are described as foul – mouthed. It seems that the creator has filled up the mouth of biased critics with garlic and then drenched it with the sour juice of *Nīma*. But for this how could they emanate such foul smell and taste. It is better to be condemned by the sweet and suggestive words of a good poet rather than being praised by the sour – mouthed and tasteless poetasters.

According to Nīlakaṇṭha critics belong to three kinds such as ignorant ones, those possessed of improper knowledge and those who are really learned. While the first two types are to be ignored the views of the learned are to be appreciated and recognized. The stanza, the poem, the intelligence and the fame are lost if one ignores the fault pointed out on these by the learned critic. One may legitimately conclude that *Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita* had strong view regarding the various aspects of literature.¹⁵

The dictum of Patañjali, the greatest ever commentator whose work is appropriately called the

Mahābhāṣya – the great commentary is worthy of our attention.

The nuances of the text can be known only through traditional commentaries which help to resolve apparent contradictions. This exactly is the purpose of the study of hermeneutics.¹⁶

2.2 Introduction of Commentator's

While reading Sanskrit Dramas, Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacaritam* touched me. Bhavabhūti's diction, simple language, beautiful verses attracted me. A lot has been already discussed about the story, characters, Rasa, Nature, poetry of *Uttararāmacaritam*. Almost all the scholars of Sanskrit have taken note of this

¹⁵ Unni N. P. *Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita*, Makers of Indian Literature, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1995, p.61.

¹⁶ Unni N.P. *Highways and Byways in Sanskrit Literature*, and New Bharatiya book Corporation, 2012, P.687 to 696.

drama. Dr. V. V. Mirashi has discussed about Bhavabhūti right from his birth place till the smallest element of Drama.

G. K. Bhatt in his book “Sanskrit drama and dramatists” has discussed upon Bhavabhūti’s three dramas, their story, plot, changes made in there, in psychological delineation, etc.

The plays composed by Bhavabhūti are Mahaviracarita, Malatimadhava, Uttararamacarita, the commentaries and critics on these passages three plays are as follows:

i. Commentaries on Mahaviracaritam

1. Manuscripts. Com.; by Atmarama by Viraraghava.
2. Anundoram Borooah with Sanskrit commentaries London 1877
3. Commentator Viraraghava edited by T.R. Ratnam Aiyar, Bomabay 1892
4. Commentaries of Lakshmana Suri, Madras, 1904
5. Commentary by ‘Prakash’ Acharya Ramachandra Mishra, 1970

ii. Commentaries on Malatimadhava

1. Commentary by Jagaddhara, R.G.Bhandarkar, Bomabay 1876
2. Commentary of Prakrit, Calcutta, 1830
3. Commentary by J. Vidyasagara, Calcutta 1876
4. Commentary of Tripurarisuri called Bhavapradipika in Telugu, Madras 1883
5. Commentary of Jagaddhara, edited by Bhuvanacandra Vasaka, Calcutta, 1886
6. Commentaries of Tripurari and Jagaddhara, edited by M. R. Telang, Bombay, 1892
7. Commentary by Harihara, Pondichery, 1999
8. Commentary by ‘Ganga’ Dr. Gangasagar ray, Chaukhamba 2014

iii. Commentaries on Uttararamacaritam

There are many commentaries available on *Uttararāmacaritam*, in which the commentaries of Ghanshyama, Viraraghava, Narayana and Ramachandra Budhendra are famous. Several Indian editions of it have been published. The more popular of these is the Nirnaysagara edition, the first edition of which was published from Mumbai in 1899. There have been many other edits to it. The famous versions of these are: C.H. Published with English translation by tony (Calcutta, 1871), with French translation by Feline (Qd “III” VIII) from Brussels and Paris published in 1880, edited in the Harvard oriental Series as an English translation only and foreword by Dr. Belwalkar (1915 AD).

I have collected the data about Sanskrit commentaries available on *Uttararāmacaritam*. Some of them are published and some are not, following is the list of the commentators who have written commentaries on *Uttararāmacaritam*.

There are several commentaries written on *Uttararāmacaritam* which attracted my attention, which are listed below:

2.3 AVAILABLE PUBLISHED SANSKRIT COMMENTARIES ON *UTTARARĀMACARITAM*

1. *Mitabhāṣiṇī* by Saradārañjana Roy
2. Talashparshini of Virarāghava.
3. Untitled Tīkā by Ānandasvarūpa.
4. Commentary by Rāmadhara Śarmā.
5. Sañjivanī of Ghanaśyāma Paṇḍita.
6. Untitled Tīkā of Tārākumar Cakravartī.
7. Bhavbhutarthbodhikay of Pandit Bhatji Shastri
8. Bhavarthdipika of Narayan
9. ‘Chandrika’ of Dr. Rakesh Shastri.
10. ‘UMA’ Dr. Omawati Sharma
11. ‘Rama’ Dr. Ramakant Tripathi

12. Commentary by Shivbalak dvivedi
13. ‘Chandrakala – Vidhyotini’ Shri SheshrajSharma
14. Commentary by Tarinish Jha

2.4 Unpublished Sanskrit Commentaries:

1. *Uttararāmacaritam* with a commentary on Prākṛta passage.
2. ‘*Bhavabodhini*’ of Rama Candra Budhendra.
3. Commentary by K. B. Mande.
4. Commentary by Paṇḍit B. S. Ghate.
5. ‘*Kumbhakonam*’ of Laksman suri
6. ‘*Bhavartha Dīpikā*’ of Narayana Bhatta.
7. Commentary by Isvara Candra Vidyāsāgara.
8. ‘*Ṭikā*’ by Abhirāmabhaṭṭa (Son of Rudra)
9. Commentary by Premācandra Tarkavāgiśa.
10. ‘*Kalla*’ by Addangikumāra Tātācārya
11. *Apekṣitavyākhyā* by Bhaṭṭa Naṛayaṇa (Son of Raṅganātha Dīkṣita)
12. Bhavatalasparśiniī by AnnavappayyangarCommentary by Ananda Śarmā.
13. Commentary called *Laghuvyākhyā*.
14. Commentary by Rāghavacārya.
15. Commentary by Venubhupa etc...

To work upon all the commentaries and their commentator’s is too big or elaborate. Moreover not all these commentaries are available so I will work upon six published Sanskrit commentaries in my thesis, viz. *Mitabhāṣiṇī*, *Saṅjīvanī*, *Talsaprshin*, *Rāma Tika*

2.5ABOUT THE COMMENTATORS:-

Information about commentators is rare to find. I have tried to collect information about the commentators as much as possible.

i. Śāradārañjana Roy:

Particular characteristic of Śāradārañjana Roy is that he does not give the commentary of the passage. He gives the commentary of verses. He firstly gives the main *Śloka* and after doing its translation into English. He gives ‘*Mitabhāṣiṇī anvaya*’ and ‘*vyākhyā*’. Thus he gives his Commentary as well as notes at the end.¹⁷

ii. Ghanaśyāma Paṇḍita:

Ghanaśyāma Paṇḍita firstly presents eulogy and gives commentary on both verses and Passages. He gives a detailed commentary of each word. He explains the meaning of words along with the grammar. There seems clarity in his commentary writing. He presents first “*Idam...* and at the end of *Śloka* no.1 and at the end of the Act writes ‘*Uttararāmacarite Sañjīvanī vyākhyā*’. This is not seen in other commentators. Ghanaśyāma gives notes at the end after the seventh act. At the end he writes, ‘*Sañjīvanīvyākhyāyaḥ prathamō ’nkaḥ samaptah*’. Thus, he gives this at the end.

The only commentaries available on this side of India were that of Vīrarāghava issued by the Nirṇayasāgara press and the one included in Vidyāsāgara’s edition, says that he has been fortunate enough to secure a transcript of the commentary of Ghanaśyāma through the Kindness of Mr. Varadacari, Librarian of the Government Oriental Mss. Library at Madras. He was informed by M. M. Gaṇapati Śāstrī of Trivandrum that there is another commentary at Trivandrum by a pupil of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa.

A few remarks about Ghanaśyāma must be made here. He furnishes us with a good deal of information about himself in the introductory verses to his commentary and the colophons at the end of the first and seventh acts. He seems to have been a Maharashtra (Deśastha) Brāhmaṇa his surname was Caundo Caunde? He belonged to the Manu – *Bhārgava gotra*. His grandfather’s name

¹⁷ Roy Saradaranjan, Uttararamacaritam of Bhavabhuti, with the commentary, Bharatiya kala Prakashan, Delhi 2008.p.(vi)

was Bālājī his mother and father were respectively called *Kāśī* and *Mahādeva*. His Maternal Grand – father was Timmaji Bālājī of the *Kauṇḍinya gotra*. He was the younger brother of Śākambharī and Cidambara, the latter of whom is styled *Paramāhaṃsa*. *Ghanasyama* had two wives Sundarī and Kamalā in the introduction the author furnishes us with the details of his horoscope (the *Lagnakuṇḍalī* and also the *Navamāṃśakuṇḍalī*) Ghanaśyāma seems to have been prolific writer. He tells us that he composed 64 works but of these he mentions his commentaries on the *Śākuntalam*, *Vidvaśālabhañjikā*, *Bhojacampū* and *Bhāratacampū*. He seems to have written several works dealing with metrics and poetics one of which was called *Pracaṇḍarāhudayadīpikā*.) Introductory verse 16) He seems to have been a staunch *Śaiva*. He mentions about thirty Marathi words and a few south Indian words. He was a minister of king Tukkājī Mahārājā of Chola. This we identify with Tukkājī king of Tanjore who ruled from 1728 to 1735 A. D.

Ghanaśyāma was a man of great erudition. His commentary is replete with quotations from numbers works. He generally comments upon every verse in the text. His explanations, however, are not full. He very often notes various reading and discusses them. He refer to previous commentators, though not by name and his criticisms never spare his opponents and sometimes verge upon the indecent. He never allows an opportunity to pass of finding fault with Bhavabhūti himself. Some of his strictures passed on the author of the drama are however, quite beside the point. His explanation are often far – fetched and sometimes positively wrong. Excluding lexicons and lexicographers, Ghanaśyāma mentions the following authors and work by name. *Āgamatatra Īśvarakṛṣṇamiśra*, *Uttararāmāyaṇa*, *Kāvyaacintāmaṇi*, *Kāvyaedīpikā* composed by Daṇḍī. *Kavyalakṣaṇa* composed by Śīnātha, Kāmāndaka, Kālidāsa, Kuṇḍamkumakavi *Kumārasambhava* kṣotriya Govardhana, Gaudapādācārya, *Cāturvarga chāndogyopaniṣada* Jayadeva Diṇḍīma Daṇḍī Dīkṣita (Appaya?) Nāṭyapadvati Nīlakaṇṭha) a poet) *Nyāyaśāstra Purāṇa purāṇapadvati*, Puṣpadantastava, Prabhākaramiśra) a poet),

Bāṇa, Bilhaṇa, Bhagavānbodhāyana) author of a Ramayana composed in various meters and of Mahanataka), seem to be Śaṅkarācārya, Bhaṭṭācārya, Bhaṭṭi, Bhartṛhari, Bhārata, Bhāravi, Bhojacarita Maṇḍanamiśra Mallinātha, Māgha Mudrārākṣasa Murārī Ramāyaṇa rupādarśa) on dramaturgy) Līlādhara) a poet) Lilāśuka (a poet) Lolamba Varasanta (an author of *Śrī Kalahastīśvaraśtaka* (Vararuci (author of the *Prākṛta Vyākaraṇa*) Vālmīki, *Vikramacarita* *Vikramārkkacarita* *Veṇīsaṁhāra* *Śaśīśekhara* *Śtvagītā* *Śṛṅgāramañjarī*) on potions) Śrī Nātha) author of *Kāvyaalakṣaṇa* *Sāhitya* *Maṇḍla* and *Vikramārkkacarita*(Śrisukabhāṣya Śrī Harṣa Saptasatī samaya padvati sārvaabhauma hanumannāṭka Haradatta Hāsamiśra) a poet)

There are many quotations from *Śrutis* and *Smṛtis* there are some quotations which we have not been able to identify. Ghanaśyāma. calls himself *Kośāvalīvallabha* (Introductory verses 5) which epithet he richly deserves besides the *Amarakośa* on which he says there were numerous *Ṭīkās* in his day, he refers by name to the following lexicographers and lexicons: Agastya, Amaramālā, Amaraśeṣa, Abhayarūpa, Ekākṣara, Kopila, Kedāra, Keśava, Cākṣurupa, Jaya Trikāṇḍī) different from *Amarakośa* (Trikāṇḍaśeṣa Trirupa

Danañjaya Dhanvantari (dealing with trees and plants) Dharani Dhvanimañjarī Nandī Nandārjuna (a commentator it seems on some lexicon)

Nānārthamañjarī, Nāmanidhāna nāmamālā nāmārṇava padārthamālā, Padmalālā mukuṭa Māṭhara) a lexicon dealing with verbs), Medinī Yādava Ratnākar, Ratnakośa Śabdamañjarī Śabdamālā Śabdārṇava Sārasvata Halāyudha Harāvalī Hemacandra Haima.

It seems that at least in the opinion of Ghanaśyāma, Kālidāsa was also called Bhartṛmidha and Isvarakṛṣṇa Ghanaśyāma cites verse from the *Kumārasambhavam*, *Raghuvaṁśam* and *Śākuntalam* as if they were composed by Bhartṛmidha or Isvarakṛṣṇa. If Ghanaśyāma is right then this would open up the question whether Īśvarakṛṣṇamiśra Kālidāsa is the same as the author of the *Sākhyaikārikāra*? The commentary of Vīrarāghava is fuller than that of

Ghanaśyāma and is more helpful to the student. He calls himself in the colophons at the end of the acts a descendant of the family of Rama himself and come from a town called Bhūsāra of Bhūmisāra his family name was *Vādhula*. He is later than Ghanaśyāma and often citizen him though without, naming him he seems to be the same Vīrarāghava that commented on the *Mahāvīracaritam* where his name is also given as Annappanharya. There is a third commentary by Rāma Candrabudhendra, who seems to have been an inhabitant of Benares. This was printed in *Telugu* and *Grantha* Characters Vidyāsāgara in his Bengali introduction to the *Uttararāmacarita* says that he derived help from a commentary on the Drama composed by Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa in *Samvat* 1686 and embodied it in his Sanskrit notes whether Rāmacandrabudhendra and Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa are identical is very doubtful. But to Judge from Vidyāsāgara's Sanskrit notes embodying Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa commentary was almost word to word same as that of Rāmacandrabudhendra.¹⁸

iii. **Vīrarāghava:**

He explains the meaning of words of each paragraph and verses by writing in detail on them. Having presented the original *śloka*, he explains at length catching every word. He did not translate the verses. He writes the first letter of a *śloka* and at the end gives number to the *śloka* so that we get to know that the commentary of the *śloka* gets over here. For example he presents the words, meaning and grammar of every *śloka* or passages. He presents the mood of it also along with the compounds.¹⁹

iv. **Ramadhara Sharma:**

¹⁸ P. V. Kane, Bhavabhuti of the *Uttararāmacarita*, With Commentary of, Ghansyama Pandita, Bombay-1929.

¹⁹ Kale, M. R., Uttararamacaritam of Bhavabhuti, with the commentary of Viraraghava, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1982

This commentator seems to follow the commentator Ānandasvarupa because there is a lot of similarity found between them, although they differ to some extent. For e.g. Commentator Rāmadhara Śarmā presents ‘*anvaya*’ after presenting the original *śloka*. Then he presents the literal meaning and Hindi meaning; there after he presents his comment. Giving ‘*Saṃskṛta vyākhyā*’,²⁰ he gives grammar, then presents comments and even he presents his opinion about it too.

He has discussed even the characters, summary, main stanzas in relation to the introductory *bhūmikā*. He has given *anvaya*, *śabdārthaḥ*, *arthaḥ*, *ṭīkā*, *ṭippaṇī* and *vyutpatti* etc.

He also has given index with each act and characterization of the characters, act-wise summary in Sanskrit and Hindi.

Dr. Rāmadhara Śarmā has given Bhavabhūti’s introduction in Hindi as well as Sanskrit.

v. **Tarakumara Chakravarti:**

To explain the ‘*paṭha*’ or word’s meaning at length. He only presents the given meaning or ‘*paṭha*’ which is correct and completely apt where in there is no difference of opinion, incorrectness and there is no great change in it and there has been given enough justice to every *śloka* and paragraph of Bhavabhūti. There has not been demonstrated any kind of objection.²¹

²¹ Majumdara, Babu Bardaprasad, Uttararamacaritam of Bhavabhūti with the commentary of Tara Kumar Chakravarti.

vi. **Ānanda Svarupa:**

There is hardly any information found about the life, date & time of Ananada Svarup. In his *Uttararāmacarita* commentary, he has given the meaning of every word. He has also presented metaphorical verses etc. in Hindi and has translated the verses and explained the words of Importance. He has also mentioned other commentators.

2.6 Conclusion:

To understand plays in Sanskrit literature, it is very necessary to read critiques and commentators from this criticism, the reader can easily understand the play. From the critics of *Uttararāmacarita* it becomes easier for us to understand this play of Bhavabhūti.

The commentators have tried to explain or elaborate a concept given by Bhavabhūti as per their understanding of the drama and its characters. At times they even deviate from what seems to be the most problem meaning in first reading. They do so giving reasoning about such a thought. Many commentators follow the line of thought of Bhavabhūti and refrain from commenting at places

where the imports clear. All this will be discussed in the next chapter at appropriate places. It is not mentioned here in order to avoid repetition.

Uttararamacaritam has played an important role in pointing out interpretation of several verses & passages, heightening the meaning or giving perspective of the situation. The study of commentary in this light is very important.

2.7 Table of the Commentaries and commentators details

Sr.no.	Editor	Name of Commentary	Name of commentator	Publication	Years	Language
1.	M.R.Kale	Talasparsīni	Virarāghava	Motilal banarasidas	1982	Sanskrit
2	Saradārañjana Roy	Mitbhashini	Saradārañjana Roy	Bhartiyakala Praksan Delhi.	2008	Sanskrit And English
3	P.V.Kane	Sañjivanī	Ghanaśyāma Paṇḍita	Bombay		Sanskrit
4	B.P.Majumdāra	Untitled	Tārākumar Cakravartī	K.C.Chucker L.Butty at, B.P.M.S. Jammu.	1870	Sanskrit Devanāgarī lipi
5	Rāmadhar Śarmā	Rāma	Rāmadhar Śarmā	Bhartiya Vidhya prakashan, Delhi	2005	Sanskrit and Hindi
6	Śri Janārdan Śāstri Pandye	Ṭīkā	Anand Svarūpa	Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi	1963	Sanskrit and Hindi
7	E. B. Cowell	Tarkabagisa	Premacandra	Calcutta	1862	Sanskrit

8	Isvaracandra Vidyasagara	Untitled	Isverchandra	Culcutta	1876	Sanskrit
9	-	Bhavabodhi	Ramacandra Budhendra	Madras	1881	Sanskrit
10	K.B. Mande	Untitled	K.B.Mande	Poona	1881	Sanskrit and English
11	S.G. Bhanap	Untitled	S.G.Bhanap	Bombay	1888	Sanskrit and English
12	V.S.Patvardhan	Bhavbhuttarth bodhikam	B.S.Ghate	Nagpur	1895	Sanskrit
13	T.R.Ratnam	Talapsapshini	Viraraghava	Bombay	1899	Sanskrit
14	-	Kumbhakonam	Lakṣmana Suri	Bombay	1900	Sanskrit
15	-	-	Ānandaśarmā	Mysore	-	-
16	-	Laghuvyakhyā	-	Mysore	-	-
17	-	Ṭikā	Abhirāma Bhaṭṭ, Son of Rudra	B.C.Lib of India office by A.C. Burnel - 1	1941	Sanskrit
18	-	Kalā	Addanjai Kumara Tātārya	Madaras	1906	Pālī
19	-	-	Nārāyaṇa	Banaras	1901	-
20	-	-	Nārāyaṇa	Madaras	1880	Sanskrit

21	-	Apekṣita Vyakyāna	Bhatta Nārāyaṇa (Son of R aṅganātha Dīkṣita)	Nasik	-	-
22	-	Bhavabodhini	Ramachandra Budhendra	Madaras	1882	Telugu Grantha Script
23	-	-	Vemabhupa (Very brief)	Go. Oriental Lib. Maysore	1922	Sanskrit
24	-	Kumbhakonam	Lakshman suri	-	1900	Sanskrit
25	-	Bhavbhuttarth bodhikam	Pandit Bhattji	Nagapur	1909	Sanskrit
26	Sankara Rama Shastri	Bhavarathadipika	Nayaran	Madaras	1932	Sanskrit
27	Dr, R. Shastri	Chandrika	Dr. Rakesh shastri	Chaukhambha Oriental	2022	Sanskrit and Hindi
28	Uma Sharma	UMA	Dr. Omawati Sharma	Chaukhambha Oriental Delhi.	1997	Sanskrit and Hindi
29	Dr Ramakanta Tripathi	Rama	Dr. Ramakanta Tripathi	Chaukhambha Surbharti, Varansi	2020	Sanskrit and Hindi
30	Dr.Prtyuvtsala	Surbhivibhushitam	Dr.Shiv Balak drivedi	Kanpur		Sanskrit and Hindi

31	Jaykrushnadas Haridas Gupt	Chandrakala- Vidhyotini	Shri Sheshraj Sharma Shastri	Banaras	1949	Sanskrit
32	Ramnarayana Veniprasada	-	Tarinish Jha	Ilahabad	1963	Sanskrit and Hindi
