

Agreement and disagreement of CP with Vidyādhara,
Mallinātha and Nārāyaṇa.

In this chapter, an attempt is made to compare certain points of agreement and disagreement of CP with other three important commentators, and to bring out the excellence of CP.

Under I.134, the word sacitra-vailakṣya - Kṛpam is explained almost similarly by all the four with a few changes. V. explains citra as हेसस्तथा वदतीत्याश्चर्यम् । : CP. मनुष्य-वाक्त्वाच्चित्रम् । M. पक्षिकथनाच्चित्रम् ।* and N. explains पक्षिणो मनुष्य-वाक्त्वाद् हेमपक्षित्याद्वा चित्रमाश्चर्यम् । All of them have justified the word by saying that because it is the speech of a bird in a human manner, the king is astonished. Only N. gives optional meaning which has a fault called dūrānvaya of the word hemapakṣa i.e. golden wings from I.130 (मनीष्य पक्षिणमप हेमजन्मनः).

Many a times, wherever there is an opportunity, CP. clearly explains the intention of the poet by giving a syllogism. While others offer simple explanation. Thus the word trinayanatva (IV.77) is explained by CP with the syllogism as under:-

अत्रानुमानं प्रमाणमाह - लोकस्त्रिनेत्रो भवेत् ।
कामस्याङ्किगतत्वात् ।
यस्य यस्य कामोऽङ्किगतः स स त्रिनेत्रः ।
यथा महादेवः ।
तथा चायं कामोऽङ्किगतः ।

CP. prefixes the honorific word Śrī to the names of the gods etc. while others give only synonym. Thus under III.32 the word mrd (V.M. Bhava, N. Hara) is explained by CP mrdasya = as Śrīmahādevasya. while Vāṇ^m say Bhāṇasya and N. Harasya.

Under XI.75, the word sikhī is not given due justice by V.M. and N. even with the proper and exact synonym. Only CP explains it in details as one of the five brothers viz.

Vaiśvānara, Gṛhapati, Yaviṣṭha, Pāvaka and Sauvika. The word sikhī refers to the last one i.e. Sauvika. To corroborate this meaning, CP quotes Rgvedaṇukramāṇi and Brahaddēvtā, with the full mythology of the disappearance of Sauvika fire. This is not irrelevant, because the poet refers to it with the words विधिस्तु वैदिकः and CP seems to do better justice to the poet.

The siglum ānanda of the poet is brought out, first of all by CP. V. is silent over this. M. Corroborates the word with the dictum of Mahābhāṣyakāra महात्मादीनि महात्मध्यानि etc. N, clearly points out that सर्वसर्गसमाप्तिप्रसङ्गे आनन्द-पदप्रयोगात् आनन्दाश्चमिदं काव्यम्! Thus N, reiterates the statement of CP.

The exactness^{ls} also an outstanding feature of CP. The words like cikitsā (V.85), anikṣā (VI.43)^{etc} are explained by him with exact connotation. Cikitsā is the medical treatment (ausadhopacārah) V. explains it as only treatment (upacārah) M. does not say anything. N on the contrary explains it as remedy (Pratikāyā)

Similarly the word anikṣā is explained by CP as as non-observance (anikṣanam) as well as non-seeing (anavalokanam). V. gives both the words viz. anikṣanam and anavalokanam but not as its meaning. He only uses them in different places as synonyms. M. calls it as anirikṣā. While N. explains it as anavalokanam.

In case of neuter forms whenever there is a possibility of confusion regarding the subject and the object the singular forms of nominative and the accusative (as being similar)¹ CP adds the word कर्तृ, कर्म etc. Thus under I. 19, अपुस्तथा लिङादथा - स्य यौवनम् | -- is explained as अथ अस्य यौवनं कर्तृ अपु. कर्म तथा etc. V. and M. are silent on this. But N. explains it in a similar way N. takes the above explanation as the second one, while the first one is शरीरं कर्तृ यौवनं कर्मभूतं etc. Vide II.27.

The word bandha (III.124) is explained by (as the particular love postures (karana) such as pañkajāsana, venudārīta etc. as described by Vātsyāyana etc. in their works on erotics. V. explains it like CP but without any reference to Vātsyāyana. N. omits the word venudārīta and calls it suratabandhas. Only M. differs here and explains it as love-postures like uttāna (or uttānaka).

Some peculiar grammatical forms of words are not explained properly by V.M. and N. e.g. the word ganeya² (III.50) is ~~extra~~ explained fully by CP by giving detailed grammatical steps of its formation. V. is silent, because he does not want to make his commentary an arena of scholarship. M. and N. simply explain it with the ऊोणादिकप्रत्ययः viz. उयः²
1. vide chap. 3, sect. vyākaraṇa.

Under X.34, the word anyonyabhāṣā, is explained by V. and CP, as the pkṭ, language of the different states such as गौड - द्रविड - मल्लयज - महाराष्ट्र - गुर्जर - मातृवादिलोकानां परस्परप्राकृत etc. (V. omits Gūjara). while M. and N. do not mention the name of any state.

The mythology of Sarasvatī XI 64³ being a consort of Lord Viṣṇu is given in the āgama. V and N are silent and do not comment on it. But CP⁴ and M⁵ make the point clear.

2. Vide. Chap. 3, sect. vyākaraṇa etc.

3. देवी पवित्रितचतुर्भुजवामभागा etc.

4. आगमे हि २. ... श्रीकृष्णस्य शक्तिरूपतया पत्नीत्वेन श्रूयते।

5. लक्ष्मीसरस्वत्यौ हि देवस्य दक्षिणवामपार्श्ववर्तिन्यौ इत्यागमः।

lxiii...

lix...

Thus CP is more precise in giving appropriate meanings and ^{there}by does better justice to the poem.

In the beginning of each canto the introductory remark given by CP. relate the preceding canto with the canto at ^{on} hand. V and M. are silent on this ^{point} style, while N. gives only a single sentence to introduce the canto ^{on} at hand. CP. gives longer ^{length} introductory remarks to introduce the canto on hand properly.

The word naisthika XVII.113 is explained by CP in a ^{traditional} way with the etymological meaning ^{as} निष्ठा - मुक्तान्तिकालं ^{अप्यतीति} (one who leads his entire life; i.e. till his death, with the teacher) and quotes याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृति (II.49) नैष्ठिको ब्रह्मचारी तु etc. to support his explanation. Here M. explains it as थापज्जीयं ब्रह्मचर्येण अवतिष्ठ ^{भावति} ~~and N.~~

N. explains it as गुरुकुलनिवासिना ^{and} quotes the same verse.

In case of the readings, CP does not accept any reading which is not grammatically correct ^{or} ^{correct} regarding the context. He remarks that ^a particular reading is not correct or requires ^{the} thought.

The reading bhajata ⁵ under XI.24 and ksura^Ksunnāsu ⁶ under XII.66 are not correct ones. Even though V. accepts bhajata (and not ~~tyajata~~). N. accepts both. Under XI. 24, though N, mentions ^{the} reading tyajata for bhajata. Both these readings are accepted by M.

Thus V. and CP. ~~accept~~ accept the reading vmoti X.18 and not bhajeta which is accepted by M. and N.

5. भजतेति पुस्तकान्तरपाठोऽशुद्धः ।

6. कसुरकुण्डासु ... अयमेव पाठः श्रेयान् । तथापि सुधीभिर्विचार्यः ।

1724... 1x...

The verse X. 33 has alternative stanza which is given by CP as ^{अवि पाडांतर-लोका} ~~अवि पाडांतर-लोका~~ .V. is silent. M. comments this verse viz. ^{अस्वेदगात्रा} ~~अस्वेदगात्रा~~ etc. N. again accepts this second reading as the another reading.

The reading of navaloka (XII.62) is accepted by CP. and M. while N. accepts varaloka. At the same time, under XVI.75, CP's reading is nyadhustamam, and he gives another reading vyadhustamam, which is accepted by V. and M.

As far as the discussions on various topics and explanations in ~~a~~ ^{various} ~~ways~~ are concerned, CP is unique, because ~~xxx~~ V. gives important ^{co} to the literary aspect in his commentary. M. thinks himself satisfied by quoting various ^e ~~lexicons~~ ⁸. While N. makes the poem an arena of hairsplitting and far ^{ch} ~~fetched~~ explanations // CP. Handiqui K.K: Nc. "The commentary of Mallinatha is particularly rich in lexicographical quotations" Intro. P.XXXV.//

test
note
8.

Wherever CP. records variant readings, N. accepts CP's variant reading as the main reading. Many of his explanations are borrowed verbatim by him from the commentary of CP.

I end this chapter with the remark of Handiqui -
"Cāndū-pandita seems to have realised that Naisadha was essentially a learned poem, and must be approached with the full equipment of the traditional learning."⁹

7. अस्वेदगात्राश्चलन्चामरोद्यै -
रमीलनेत्राः प्रतिवस्तुचित्रैः ।
अमृतामाला विपुलातपत्रै -
देवा नृदेवाश्च भिदां न भेजुः ॥

8. Intro. p. xxxviii.

ixi...