

## **Chapter: V**

### **Conclusion.**

It was a pleasure to work on commentaries of *Uttararāmacarita* and to note the variants or different opinions of six commentators on the text *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti. Each commentator is unique in its own way.

**5.1 Commentator: SR** He does not give the commentary of a passage he gives the commentary of a verse by defining it and he firstly gives the main shloka and after doing its translation in to English he gives मितभाषिण/अन्वयः and व्याख्याः thus he presents his commentary and he also gives notes at the end.

**5.2 Commentator: GP** He firstly presents a eulogy and gives commentary in both shloka and passage and he prefers to give a detailed commentary of each word. He explains the meaning of a word along with the grammar. There seems clarify first इदं...and at the end shloka no: 1 and at the end of the act presents – उत्तररामचरितसंजीवनीख्यातटीप्पके | it does not seem in other commentators' such as the commentator -1 and घनश्याम gives notes at the back. After act – 7 and he gives end to the act in this way – संजीवनाख्याटीप्पणे प्रथमोङ्क समाप्तः || thus every chapter ends.

GP has given a Sanskrit 'Tika' with verse and paragraphs. No translation or notes is found. And he has explained every important semantics. The *Rāmāyaṇa* & *Māhābhārata* is also mentioned in his commentary. He has given a lot of metaphors etc. He has knowledge of grammar also which he explains in each verse. Lesser differences are found in his verses.

**5.3 Commentator: VR** वीरराघव who explains the meaning of a word of each paragraph or shloka by giving detailed writing. Having presented the original shloka, he explains at length catching every word. Translation of shloka is not done. He writes the first letter of a shloka and at the end gives number to the shloka so that we get to know that the commentary of the shloka gets over here. He presents the dialogues and the word's meaning and grammar of every shloka or passage, he presents the mood of it such as he presents संभोगशृङ्गार रस | and the compounds used in the shloka – 27 of act: 1 and सुभाषित from *Uttararāmacaritam*; for instance a sentence from act – 1 – page no: 83 “कर्तव्यानि खलु दुः खित दुः ख विपर्णानि | and act: 2 shloka – page no – 37 अद्वैतं सुखदुःखयोरनुगुणं सर्वास्ववस्थासु...इत्यादि |

And the meters used in the shloka like अनुष्टुप् Act: 1, 2, 3, 4...and he gives colophon after the act: 7. at the end of the act.

दाशरथिवंशजनुषो भूसारजवीरराघवाचार्यस्य |

उत्तररामचरितव्याख्याङ्केष्वादिमः प्रायात् ||

इति श्री वाधूलवीरराघवविरचिणायां भवभूतिभावतलस्पर्शिनी समाख्यायामुत्तररामचरितव्याख्यां प्रथमोऽङ्कः |

This is how he ends the act of the play.

**5.4 Commentator: AS** first he gives the literal meaning of each word by presenting the original shloka and he translates the gives notes and specially presents his own views. He presents his view at the end of the first shloka of the Act: 1 this is how he presents each shloka and passage of the act and informs where he has adopted the पाठ from. He verses presents the name of each act before the act starts and informs about which meter is used in the shloka such as in आकिञ्चित्तदपि अङ्क ३. ५. श्लोक is in अनुष्टुप् meter. He does not write all the comments together like other commentators, but he presents his comment taking each word, taking different page for each shloka and

passage whereas a difference is found among other commentators. He ends every act by giving name to every act. This commentator seems to follow the commentator – 4 Ānanda Svarupa because there is found a lot of similarity between them although they differ to some extent.

Commentator AS has presented special information about *Dhātu*, *Samāsa*, in his commentary. And in his sentences there is a feature of *Samāsa Alamkāra*.

**5.5 Commentator: RS** This commentator seems to follow the commentator – 4 i.e. Ānanda Svarupa because there is found a lot of similarity to some extents such as this presents अन्वयः after presenting the original shloka. Then he presents the literal meaning and Hindi – meaning; there after he presents his comment. While doing as “संस्कृतव्याख्या” he gives grammar, then presents comment and his opinion about it too. He has given the Characterization, summary, main Stanzas in relation to the introductory etc. There has been given अन्वय, शब्दार्थ, अर्थ, टीका, टिप्पणी and व्युत्पत्ति etc. In the beginning of the book. P.no.47 he has also given सूक्ति – व्याख्या – हिन्दी | He also has given index with each act and characterization of the characters, act-wise summary in Sanskrit and Hindi.

Dr. Ramadhar Sharma has also given (Introduction about Bhavabhūti) in Hindi and Sanskrit in his book.

Commentator RS explained the meaning of each word in Sanskrit & he gives verses in Hindi. He introduce *Veda*, *Mīmāṃsā* *Vedānta*, etc.

**5.6 Commentator: TC** (Tara Kumar Chakravarty) He starts his book with the lord ‘! नमो गणेशाय’ and he does not give his introduction. He has presented the poem with the prayer of गणेशाय and he has mentioned that his comments logic etc. about it would

help the student for their knowledge. He informs I have researched over this  
करुवन्तनाटकः |

This commentator does not give number etc. to shloka. He only used sign – marks such as ‘\*’ and ‘+’ using such kind of signs he presents his comment and he has written *Sītā*’s sentences in to ordinary (प्राकृत) language and under it he explains it in Sanskrit that what is the Sanskrit sentence of an ordinary and presents his comment translating the ancient words in to Sanskrit and he avoids to explain the पाठ or words meaning at length, he only presents the given meaning or पाठ which is correct and completely apt where in there is no difference opinion. Incorrectness and there is no great change in it and there has been given enough justice to every shloka and paragraph of *Bhavabhūti*. There has not been demonstrated any kind of objection. There is a use of prakrit language for lower characters in this play the use of Vedic language is also found at the end of the *Uttararāmacaritam* which is the peculiarity of this play.

Commentator TC has presented his commentary entirely in Sanskrit.

The language of writing this is very difficult and the sentences are long. He did not offer any kind of translation, note or feature. Only the verse paragraph of *Uttararāmacarita* has given its direct definition. The text of the letter is also complex for the reader, yet it is understandable.

Among all the critics, ‘पाठ’ is found in verses and paragraphs, whereas TC is found in verses and Paragraph’s.

Commentator TC commentary suggests that he must have a deep knowledge of rhetoric, drama, and Grammar. Thus, even though the syntax of TC is complex, it is understandable to the reader.

Thus all commentators have the distinctive feature of presenting their own commentaries. In this, commentators GP and TC have presented the commentary in their own distinctive style. They did not follow any of the commentators.

There is no monotony in the voice of Bhavabhūti. His style can easily take on a meaningful form. In a line like त्वं जीवितं त्वमसि मे हृदयं द्वितीयं | so this same poet can also express the Ojas Guna in आगर्जद्भिरिकुञ्जरघटानिस्तीर्णज्वरं etc. by describing the horrible and glorious scenes of the war. Thus *Vaidarbhī rīti* & Gaudi with compounds are equally accomplished by the poet. Sometimes in the first half of the verse, *Vaidarbhī rīti* and in the second half, *Gauḍī rīti* is found. The poet uses both styles at the same time. Whether it is a description of *Uttarāmacarita*'s गोदावरीवारयः or a description of Bhallukas, the language of the poet is complete.

The variety of verses of Bhavabhūti is noticeable. His deer and peacock are much appreciated. In *Mālatīmādhava* he has successfully used many unpopular meters. In this way, he has also experimented with Aparavaktra, Rathoddhatā, Mañjubhāṣiṇī, Praharṣiṇī, Nardtak, Upagiti and Sagramadamdakvritta with 54 letters in each Pada. 19 verses are used with Anuṣṭup and Śikharīṇī meter. He Used has metaphors 38 times but there is Predominance of Upamā, Utprekṣā, & Kāvyaṭiṅga.

### **Conclusion:**

Seeing the excellent poetry of Bhavabhūti and the dominance of his speech, the shortcomings noted above of Bhavabhūti are nowhere to be found in its merits and the idol of Bhavabhūti, which fascinates and impresses the connoisseurs of all the three periods, remains with an elevated head.

To understand plays in Sanskrit literature, it is very necessary to read critiques and commentaries. From these criticism and different opinions the reader can easily

understand the play. From the commentators of *Uttararāmacarita* it becomes easier for us to understand this play of Bhavabhūti. The various commentators of *Uttararāmacarita* has played an important role in pointing out interpretation of several verses & passages, heightening the meaning or giving a perspective of the situation. The study of commentary in this light is very important.

\*\*\*\*\*