

CHAPTER FIFTEENTHE TILAKAMAÑJARĪA S APROSE - POETICWORK(GADYA-KĀVYA-PRABANDHA OR A KATHĀ)

(An estimate in view of Dhanapala's contemporary
literary standards.)

I : I N T R O D U C T O R Y R E M A R K S :-(1) H I S T O R I C A L C R I T I C I S M A N E C E S S I T Y :-

Warton has cautioned that in reading the works of an author who lived in a remote age, it is necessary that we should look back upon the customs and manners which prevailed in his age; that we should place ourselves in his situation and circumstances.¹ Taine also has suggested that in order to comprehend a work of art, an artist or a group of artists, we must clearly comprehend the general social and intellectual condition of the times to which they belong.² It is only thus, affirms John Dewey, that we can hope to understand what it was that the authors

1. IC, p.526.

2. Taine quoted in VT, p.96, ft.nt.

or the makers of art intended to express and to interpret this intention in the light of their interest and cultural background.³ It is, therefore, imperative that Dhanapāla's work should be viewed in the light of his contemporary literary standards, especially when we find that hoary tradition of both the Sanskrit literary criticism and of Sanskrit literary art was being continuously moulded and nurtured, on the one hand by veteran Sanskrit critics from Bharata to Bhoja and, on the other hand, by poets from Valmiki to Padmagupta alias Parimala, during the millenium which immediately preceded the advent of our poet, Dhanapāla, who himself had also formulated some specific standards as a result of his intimate study of the prose works of Bāṇa and others. Moreover, inspite of the tremendous developments in the field of Sanskrit literary criticism, as has been pointed out by Dr. R.S.Valimbe,⁴ none of the rhetoricians ever took up one single literary work to thoroughly apply the prevalent norms to it and bring out its literary worth in the contemporary context. The present chapter is an humble, though feeble, attempt in this direction so far as Dhanapāla's TM is concerned.

4. VT, p.4.

5. cf. SP(K), pp.58-59.

(ii) STANDARDS SET BY SANSKRIT RHETORICIANS :-

Right from Bhāmaha to Bhoja, Sanskrit critics regarded Poetry to be the coexistence of word and meaning in an organic whole, and they were all the while conscious that both word (śabda) and meaning (artha) together constitute the body of Poetry, the soul being the poetically suggested feeling or aesthetic relish (rasa).⁵ Bhoja, the veteran critic-cum-poet and a contemporary of Dhana-pāla, maintained that poetic expression is one which gives parity and equal importance to both word and meaning (ubhaya-pradhāna), as both are equally important in the poetic concretisation; but neither meaning nor sound has any intrinsic value, which is created by the poetic action (kavi-vyāpāra), as is evident from the outcome of the speculations on the excellences (guṇas) and defects (doṣas) of poetry.⁶

Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy has aptly remarked⁷ that Indian writers on Poetics presumed that there is, and turned to investigate the broad principals of, beauty in literature. Their method was one of formal definition, classification and illustration, using as few words as possible. The business of Indian theorists was to classify only in order to clarify. The first principles formulated

5.cf. SP(K), pp.58-59.

6.cf. op. cit., pp.71-73.

7.ESC, pp.22-27.

by Sanskrit theorists on the art of literature have stood the test of time. The technique of Sanskrit poets directly derived from their material on the one hand, and the standards fixed by grammar, prosody, etc., on the other. The one consideration central to Sanskrit criticism was impeccability. As on the absence of palpable defects, so does Sanskrit theory insisted on the presence of positive excellences (gunas) in all the recognisable elements of a composition. While the Gunas formed a pre-requisite condition in the equipment of a poet as well as of a trained critic, there was another equally important condition, viz., Rasa or aesthetic emotion (distinct from personal emotion) which is a part of one's innate endowment, and not an acquired sensibility. The critic's first function was to recognize this underlying unity in the work of poetry before he passed to appreciate its excellences in particular elements.

(iii) DHANAPĀLA'S OWN NORMS :-

Dhanapāla had most of these specific literary standards in view when he composed his TM in the early decades of the eleventh century A.D. His close study of the performance of his highly venerated literary predecessors had enabled him to determine a few norms of his own too. His intention was to compose a major prose-romance, a

Gadya-kāvya of the 'Kathā' type,⁸ a model of which form was, in his opinion, perfectly chiselled by Bāṇa, who, he knew, had captivated the heads and hearts of the literary elite of his days.⁹ However, our poet had some reservations regarding some of the aspects of Bāṇa's literary workmanship. Thus, in view of the taste of his audience, he was not in favour of incessant prose, nor too much of verse, nor of too much double-entendre. His chief anxiety was to avoid the situation in which the interest or emotion ~~was~~ would tend to flag. For this reason he maintained that three things were a must for a major work like a Kathā, viz., (i) a good story (sat-kathā), (ii) sustained interest or suspense (kathā-rasa), and (iii) proper delineation of various sentiments (rasa).¹⁰ And he aspired to prove his proficiency in the utilisation of word, meaning, interest in the narrative as also in the delineation of various poetic emotions, and in poetic excellences.¹¹ He was prepared to offer his work to scrutiny at the hands of poets who had the capacity to feel and judge the inner meaning of poetry and who would

8. TM(N), p.7, vs.50 d: स्फुरोद्भूतस्मा रचिता कथयम् ।

9. *ibid.*, p.4, vs.27: कादम्बरी सहोदर्या सुध्या वैबुधे हृदि । हर्षारव्यायिकया ख्यातिं वाणोऽब्धिरिव लब्धवान् ॥

10. *ibid.*, p.3, vs.18: सत्कथारसवन्धेषु निबन्धेषु नियोजिताः । नीचे-
ष्विव भवन्त्यर्थः प्रायो वैरस्य हेतवः ॥

11. *ibid.*, p.5, vs.37: ~~कव्ये कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः~~ कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः कव्येः
निःसारवान्ति धे दीर्घान् गुणांश्च गतमत्ससः ॥ केचिद्वचसि वाच्येऽन्ये
केऽप्यशून्ये कथारसे । केचिदुणे प्रसादादौ धन्याः सर्वत्र केचन ॥

discuss the excellences as well as the defects with perfect impartiality.¹² For the carping hair-splitter, however, he had thorough contempt, since like a black-faced goldsmith such a critic was but a ~~rogue~~ ^{rogue} in his opinion.¹³ His chief test of the worth of poetry was with reference to its effectiveness with the understanding listeners, who, he maintained, must be completely swayed by its sweet intoxicative delight;¹⁴ not only that, the rival poets must also feel this beauty and hang their heads in acknowledgement of its unquestionable superiority.¹⁵

We shall now proceed to evaluate Dhanapāla's performance in the light of the above discussion.

II : THE SUBJECT * MATTER (VASTU)
OF THE TM :*

(1) SAT-KATHĀ, OR GOOD STORY, AS THE PRINCIPAL SUBJECT (ĀDHIKĀRIKA-VASTU):-

The story of Harivāhana's love with Tilakamanjarī in the TM forms the Ādhikārika-vastu, since it is the principal thread of the narrative.¹⁶ This story, though

-
12. TM(N), p.2, vs.8: वन्धास्ते कवयः काव्यपरमार्थविशारदाः । विचारयन्ति
ने दोषान् गुणाश्च गतमत्सराः ॥
13. ibid., p.2, vs.14: केषाश्चनेव श्यामेन मुखेनाधीमुखेक्षितः । काव्यहेम्नो
गुणान्वक्ति कलाद इव दुर्जनः ॥
14. ibid., p.2, vs.11: स्वादुतां प्रभुना नीताः पशुनामपि मानसम् ।
मदयन्ति न यद्वचः किं तेऽपि कवये भुवि ॥
15. ibid., p.2, vs.12: काव्यं तदपि किं वाच्यमवाच्यं न करोति यत् ।
श्रुतमात्रमपि त्राणां वक्त्राणि च शिरांसि च ॥
16. DR(V), I, 11 bc: वस्तु च द्विधा । तत्राधिकारिकं मुख्यम्... ।

apparently a love-episode of the couple, is really the one of a transient paradize lost for a permanent paradize to be gained, as it depicts how the religious merit earned by the Vaimānika god Jvalanaprabha stood him in good stead in his final human birth as prince Harivāhana in that, on the one hand, it brought about the reunion with his beloved Priyaṅgusundarī in her next birth as Tilakamañjarī, and, on the other hand, it afforded him an opportunity to earn further merit calculated sufficient to attain permanent happiness in the form of emancipation.¹⁷ This central theme has been so beautifully suggested (vyañjita) – and not expressed (abhihita) in so many words – that the story leaves an unfailing impression of the transient nature of sensual pleasures both in the heaven and on the earth, and illuminates one that only good works coupled with profound devotion as expressed in the worship of the images and frequent pilgrimages to the holy temples of Lord Jina, the All-Merciful, can help one attain divine joy in the human existence and permanent happiness of Final Beatitude thereafter. This noble theme is the veritable backbone of the whole composition, as it is the principal good-story (sat-kathā) around which the whole narrative revolves.

 17. cf. TM(N), pp. 411-412; especially p. 412 (12ff.); स्वादुपाका-
 मुपाज्यं विधाधरेन्द्रसंपदा सह भवान्तरे भवशतैरपि दुरापां चरम-
 देहप्राप्तिं..... हरिवाहते नाम --- कुमारेऽभवत् ---।

In view of the standards laid down by Rudraṭa, the 'Vastu' of the TM would fall under the category of 'Utpādyā' as the whole story has been invented by the poet himself,¹⁸ and Namisādhu the commentator of the KVL(R) has mentioned the TM as an illustration of this type.¹⁹

(2) THE PRESENTATION OF THE SUBJECT-MATTER (VASTU):-

In the presentation of the plot Dhanapāla seems to have followed, on the one hand the prescription of Rudraṭa and, on the other hand, the tradition formulated by Subandhu, Bāṇa, Somadeva and Trivikramabhaṭṭa. Rudraṭa has laid down that in a 'Mahā-kathā' the poet should begin with the salutation to one's favourite deity and elders and should give a brief account of his family and of himself as the author of the work.²⁰ That is why Dhanapāla commenced his ~~work~~ TM with a salutation to his favourite deity, viz., the Omniscient Jina and Ṛṣabha the First Tīrthāṅkara and Mahāvīra the last one.

Then, in keeping with the tradition of Bāṇa, he took up the praise of good critics and censure of bad ones and in the process expounded his own literary standards. Then he paid his tributes to the poets from Vālmīki to Kardamarāja, whom he considered his elders in the field of literature. But this routine has been performed in such a skillful

[18. cf.
KVL(R),
XVI, 3.]

19. cf. Comm. on KVL(R) XVI, 3: अत्र च तिलकप्रणयि वाणकधर वा निदर्शितम् ।

20. KVL(R), XVI, 20: श्लोकैर्ब्रह्मकथयामि मध्यान्देवाङ्गुरबन्धनप्रकृत्य । संक्षेपेण निजं कुलप्रभिरदत्त्वात्स्वं च कर्तव्यम् ॥

manner, of course after Bāṇa in his Harṣacaritam, that it reveals Dhanapāla's profound insight into, and subtle understanding of, the excellences of each of the authors praised.

His deep affection for his royal patrons like Siyaka, Muñja and Bhoja, compelled him to give an elaborate account of the kings of the Paramāra line bringing out the special qualities of each one of them. This, though not prescribed by the rhetoricians, was, it seems, a sort of ~~the~~ a tribute to the elders (guru-namaskāra).

As to the commencement of the ~~the~~ story proper Rudraṭa has laid down that the description of the city should come first.²¹ Dhanapāla adhered to this dictum and has started the story proper with the description of the city of Ayodhyā in a prose marked with alliteration.

Rudraṭa has further prescribed that the acquisition of a young maiden should be the central theme and all types of the Erotic sentiment (sṛṅgāra) should be delineated in a Kathā, be it in Sanskrit prose or verse, or in any other language.²² It is in keeping with this, as also with the tradition formulated by Bāṇa and others, that Dhanapāla

21. KVL(R), XVI, 21: सागुप्रासेन ततो भूयो लघ्वक्षरेण गद्येन । रचयेत्कथा-
शरीरं पुरेव पुरवर्णिकप्रश्रुतीन् ॥

22. *ibid.*, XVI, 23: कव्यालाभद्वलां वा सभ्यद्विन्द्यस्तैरकलशृङ्गारादा
इति संस्कृतेन कुर्यात्कथाप्रगद्येन चाग्येन ॥

has given prominence to the union of Harivāhana and Tilakamanjarī in the Ādhikārika-vastu and to that of Samaraketu with Malayasundarī in the Prāsaṅgika-vastu.

(3) DIVISIONS OF SUBJECT-MATTER (VASTU):-

Dhanañjaya, the author of the Daśarūpaka, and Dhanika, the author of the Avaloka commentary thereof, were both contemporaries of Dhanapāla who has mentioned the DR specifically by name.²³ It is therefore just natural that, though Dhanapāla was composing a Kathā, he has chosen to add an element of the dramatic by keeping in view the prescription of Dhanañjaya and Bhoja about observing all the requisites of a good 'Vastu' as laid down in the first chapter of the DR and the twelfth chapter of the Srg.Pr..²⁴

(A) THE ELEMENTS OF THE PLOT (ARTHA-PRAKṚTIS):-

(i) The Germ (Bīja):-

The suggestion of Jvalanaprabha's fall from the heaven and of the future reunion with the Candrātapa necklace and, through it, with his beloved Priyaṅgusundarī, sows the seed of the Ādhikārika-vastu.²⁵

23. TM(N), p.370(18ff.) असभ्यजात दशरूपकैरिव सर्वदाडिमीकृतनीधिभिः..।

24. cf. DR(V), I, 68: इत्याद्यशेषमिह वस्तुविभेदजातं राधायणादि च विभाव्य बृहत्कथा च । आयुत्रयेन दत्तु नेत्ररसानुगुण्याच्चित्रां कथापुनित्त्यारुवेयः-
पपञ्चैः ॥ _____ ; Srg.Pr.(Y), Vol.II, p.485: नारकेतु प्रयोक्तृभिः । तदा प्रकरणेष्वेव कथास्त्रारोधाधिकोक्तु च ॥

25. ~~.....~~ TM(N), pp.44-45; In translating the terms of the DR the English Translation by George C.O.Haas is adopted in this chapter, while the contents are classified in accordance with the explanations of these terms as given by Dhanika in his Avaloka commentary.

एते तु
कथयति
संक्षेपः

(ii) The Expansion (Bindu):-

The boon conferred by the goddess Śrī on King Meghavāhana, granting him a son who would become an emperor of the Vidyādharas and whom she would herself serve with her two eight-handed forms, is the further development of the 'Seed' leading to the birth of god Jvalanaprabha as Harivāhana.²⁶

(iii) Episode (Patākā):-

The introduction of the story of Sumālī, his sensuousness, and a suggestion about his fall from the heaven is the episode (patākā) which also informs us about his friendship with Jvalanaprabha, with whom he is going to be united in their next birth. This episode sows the seed of the Prāsaṅgika-vastu which runs parallel to the Ādhikārika-vastu and ends just before the conclusion of the story.

(iv) Episodical Incident (Prakarī):-

The interludes about the Candrātapa necklace, the Vetāla, the Bālārūpa ring, the capture of Samarakety, Harivāhana's meeting with Gandharvaka, seeing the portrait of Tilakamañjarī, identity of Gandharvadattā, incident of the mad elephant that flew in the air, the naval expedition of Samaraketu, Harivāhana's transportation to the region of the Vidyadharas, his mystic penance and consequent attainment

26. TM(N), p.60(6-13).

of the emperorship of the Vidyādharas - all these interludes constitute the Prakarī leading the story towards its goal.

(v) The Denouement (Kārya):-

The revelation of the identity of Jvalanaprabha and Harivāhana, and of Priyaṅgusundarī and Tilakamañjarī, marks the denouement of the main plot.

(B) THE FIVE STAGES OF THE ACTION (AVASTHĀS):-

(i) The Beginning (Arambha):-

The birth of Jvalanaprabha as 'Harivāhana' in the family of King Meghavāhana marks the first stage of Commencement.

(ii) Effort (Prayatna):-

Harivāhana's seeing the portrait of Tilakamañjarī, his love-lorn condition and his setting out on a tour in order to allay the pangs of separation marks the second stage of Effort.

(iii) Prospect of Success (Prāptyāśā):-

The transportation of Harivāhana to the remote region of the Vidyādharas and his meeting with Tilakamañjarī marks the third stage of Hope-of-Attainment.

(iv) Certainty of Success (Niyatāpti):-

The invitation to Harivāhana by Tilakamañjarī and his attainment of the emperorship of the Vidyādharas as a result of the mystic penance marks the fourth stage of Certainty-of-Attainment.

(v) Attainment of the Result (Phalāgama):-

The betrothal and marriage of Harivāhana and Tilakamañjarī after the revelation of their trans-existential love marks the final stage of Attainment-of-Fruition.

(C) THE FIVE JUNCTURES (SANDHIS):-

The interaction of these five Artha-prakṛtis and and Avasthās brings about the five Sandhis as shown below:-

The Opening (Mukha):-

(i) The narrative commencing with the account of King Meghavāhana's lack of a son, and ending with the account of Harivāhana's childhood and education the Mukha-sandhi.

(ii) The Progression (Pratimukha):-

The narrative from the presentation of Tilakamañjarī's portrait to the disappearance of the mad elephant with Harivāhana forms the Pratimkha-sandhi.

(iii) The Development (Garbha):-

The narrative from the friendship of Harivāhana with Samaraketu to the former's transportation to the Vidyādhara region and meeting with Malayasundarī forms the Garbha-sandhi.

(iv) The Pause (Vimarsa):-

The narrative from Harivāhana's arrival at Rathanūpuracakravāla to the attainment of the emperorship of the Vidyādharas forms the Vimarsa-sandhi.

(v) Conclusion (Upasaṁhṛti):-

The narrative from Tilakamañjarī's disillusionment consequent to her regaining the memory of past birth to her marriage with Harivāhana forms the Upasaṁhṛti-sandhi.

(4) SUB-DIVISIONS OF THE JUNCTURES (SANDHIS) INTHE TM :-

Having, thus, outlined these three aspects, viz., Arthaprakṛtis, Avasthās and Sandhis of the Vastu, we may now proceed further to a detailed examination of the various sub-divisions of each of the Sandhis²⁷ as utilized by Dhanapāla in the TM.

(A) THE OPENING (MUKHA-SANDHI) AND ITS SUB-DIVISIONS (Āngas):-

(i) Suggestion (Upakṣepa): The lack of a male child to King Meghavāhana inspite of a number of queens in his harem and suggestion of the fruition of the deeds of past births only at its proper time sow the seed of Jvalanaprabha's descent from the heaven by fixing the location for the descent through the king's desire for a son.

(ii) Enlargement (Parikara): This seed of their desire is germinated in the king's wish to undertake some penance consequent to his listening to a verse of a bard to

27. cf. DR(V), I, 24-55; also cf. Con. San., JOI, Vol. V, No. 4, pp. 380-398.

the effect that the night of ill-luck was fast coming to an end and the day of good-luck was about to dawn.

(iii) Establishment (Parinyāsa): The incident of imparting of the Aparājitā-vidyā by the Vidyādhara ~~king~~ Muni to King Meghavāhana with the assurance that the goddess Śrī when properly propitiated and pleased with valorous devotion would definitely bestow the boon, describes very clearly and beyond the shadow of any doubt the fruition of the desire of the royal couple to whom the god Jvalanaprabha is going to be born as a son.

(iv) Allurement (Vilobhana): The arrival of god Jvalanaprabha at the Śakrāvātāra temple and his description introduces the original personality of the plot. The subtle attraction of the god to the temple and towards the king is significant.

(v) Resolve (Yukti): God Jvalanaprabha bestows the necklace of Priyaṅgusundarī to King Meghavāhana. This necklace precipitates the appearance of Vetāla and thence the goddess Śrī.

(vi) Success (Prāpti): King Meghavāhana's successful encounter with Vetāla and his readiness to offer his head reveals the valour of the king as well as his worthiness for the boon.

(vii) Settling (Samādhāna) : The appearance of the goddess Śrī and her grant of the boon to the king with the assurance that she will ever be at the boy's service, unfolds the seed completely.

(viii) Conflict of feelings (Vidhāna): The dream of the king and the anxiety of the inmates of the royal harem are the instances in point.

(ix) Surprise (Paribhavana): The pregnancy of Queen Madirāvati and her aversion to sense objects and extreme kindness of nature during that state rouses the curiosity about the nature of the child to be born.

(x) Disclosure (Udbheda): The birth of Prince Harivāhana marks the sprouting of the seed.

(xi) Activity (Karana): The king finds the proper lucky marks on the child's limbs foreboding his future attainment of the emperorship of the Vidyādhara, and this marks the beginning of the story proper.

(xii) Incitement (Bheda): Harivāhana's education especially in painting and lute-playing add the significant helpful elements in the direction of his acquisition of Tilakamañjarī.

(B) : THE PROGRESSION (PRATIMUKHA-SANDHI) AND ITS SUB-DIVISIONS (Aṅgas):-

(i) Amorousness (Vilāsa): The sprout of love in the

heart of Harivāhana on seeing the portrait marks this stage.

(ii) Pursuit (Parisarpa): The mention of Tilakamañjarī and of her aversion to males due to the latent impressions of the love of past birth and the prediction that a human prince is going to be her match reveals the seed again.

(iii) Unrequitedness (Vidhūta): The fact that Tilakamañjarī is a 'Puruṣa-dveṣiṇī' enhances the attraction of Harivāhana.

(iv) Torment (Tāpana): The pangs of separation and love-lorn condition of Harivāhana illustrates this stage.

(v) Joke (Narma): Harivāhana's introspective reflections on his being captivated by the portrayed beauty of Tilakamañjarī underlines the apparently incongruous state of affairs.

(vi) Amusement (Narma-dyuti): Harivāhana's reflections on the strange behaviour of his mind constitutes this element.

(vii) Response (Prāṇāna): This sub-division does not seem to be utilized.

(viii) Frustration (Nirodha): The incident of the mad elephant carrying away Prince Harivāhana marks this sub-division.

(ix) Courtesy (Paryupāsana): This sub-division has

also been not utilized for the Ādhikārika-vastu.

(x) Gallantry (Puspa): The panegyric extolling Hari-vāhana illustrates this sub-division.

(xi) Thunderbolt (Vajra): This sub-division has been omitted by the poet.

(xii) Intimation (_____): The inference about the row of foot-steps is an instance in point.

(xiii) Combination of the Castes (Varna-saṁhāra): This sub-division has also been omitted by the poet.

(C) THE DEVELOPMENT (GARBHA-SANDHI) AND ITS SUB-DIVISIONS (Aṅgas):-

(i) Misstatement (Abhūtāharana): The strange love-letter found by Mañjīraka seems to reveal the internal grief of Samaraketu and thereby introduces the Prāsaṅgika-vastu concerning Samaraketu.

(ii) Indication (Mārga): Harivāhana's interpretation of the love-letter is an illustration in the point.

(iii) Supposition (Rūpa): The effect of the love-letter on Samaraketu and Kamalagupta's speech marks this stage.

(iv) Exaggeration (Udāharana): Samaraketu's introduction of his life history indicates this stage.

(v) Progress (Krama): Samaraketu's successful naval expedition illustrates this sub-division.

(vi) Propitiation (Saṅgraha): Samaraketu's conciliatory words urging Tāraka to prepare for the pursuit of the source of the divine music.

(vii) Deduction (Anumāna): Suggestions of the possible cause of the divine music.

(viii) Quarrel (Toṭaka): The invocation to the boat is a fine illustration of this sub-division.

(ix) Outwitting (Adhibala): The mad elephant flying off with Harivāhana; also sudden disappearance of Malayasundarī.

(x) Dismay (Udvega): Samaraketu's sorrow and attempt at suicide; also Harivāhana's reflections after the elephant threw him in the lake.

(xi) Consternation (Sambhrama): Malayasundarī's doubts about the incidents of the previous night.

(xii) Revelation (Ākṣepa): Harivāhana's meeting with Tilakamañjarī in the creeper-bower.

(D) THE PAUSE (AVAMARŚA-SANDHI) AND ITS SUB-DIVISIONS

(Aṅgas):-

(i) Censure (Apavāda): The message brought by Kātyāyanikā about Malayasundarī's proposed marriage with Vajrayudha under military duress.

(ii) Altercation (Sampheta): Malayasundarī's reflections as to how to register her protest with her parents.

(iii) Tumult (Vidrava): Malayasundarī's attempt at suicide.

(iv) Contempt (Drava): Taraṅgalekhā's rebuke to Malayasundarī.

(v) Placation (Śakti): Gandharvaka's encounter with Mahodara.

(vi) Rebuke (Dyuti): Mahodara's rebuke to Gandharvaka.

(vii) Reverence (Prasaṅga): Malayasundarī's meeting with Vicitravīrya and later on with Pattralekhā.

(viii) Humiliation (Chalana): This sub-division does not seem to be utilized.

(ix) Assertion (Vyavasāya): Tilakamañjarī's arrival at the temple to meet Harivāhana.

(x) Opposition (Virodhana): Harivāhana's refusal talk to Tilakamañjarī in view of her attitude at the former meeting.

(xi) Foresight (Prarocana): Tilakamañjarī gives Tambula to Harivāhana.

(xii) Boastfulness (Vicalana): This sub-division is not utilized by the poet.

(xiii) Summary (Ādāna): Malayasundarī's rescue by Samaraketu at the garden.

(E) THE CONCLUSION (NIRVAHANA-SANDHI) AND ITS
SUB-DIVISIONS (Aṅgas):-

(i) Junction(Sandhi): Tilakamañjarī observing Harivāhana from the topmost apartment of her palace and thus revealing her love for him.

(ii) Vigilence (Vibodha): Tilakamañjarī's grief at the memory of Jvalanaprabhāṅga and her desperate attempt at snapping her relations with Harivāhana.

(iii) Hint (Grathana): Śākyabuddhi's attempt at making Harivāhana propitiate the mystic Vidyās in order to enable him to attain the emperorship of the Vidyādharas.

(iv) Narration (Nirṇaya): Harivāhana's narration of his experience during the mystic 'Sādhana'.

(v) Conversation (Paribhāṣana): Harivāhana's grief when he got the message from Tilakamañjarī after she was reminded of her past birth at the sight of the Candrātapa necklace.

(vi) Graciousness (Prasāda): Harivāhana's enquiry for the welfare of Tilakamañjarī just after his coronation.

(vii) Bliss (Ānanda): Harivāhana's meeting with Tilakamañjarī who had lost all hopes of ever meeting him again.

(viii) Deliverance (Samaya): Revelation of the past births of both Harivāhana and Tilakamañjarī.

(ix) Confirmation (Kṛti): The betrothal ceremony of Harivāhana.

(x) Expression of Satisfaction (Bhāṣā): Invitation to Harivāhana from the father of Tilakamañjarī.

(xi) Unforeseen Circumstance (Upagūhana): Harivāhana's marriage with Tilakamañjarī.

(xii) Anticipation (Pūrvabhāva): Harivāhana and others visiting the holy places and enjoying divine pleasures.

(xiii) Termination (Upasāhāra): This sub-division has not been utilized.

(xiv) Benediction (Prasasti): This sub-division has also been not utilized by the poet.

(5) THE INCIDENTAL SUBJECT (PRĀSAṄGIKA-VASTU):-

The sub-plot concerning the miserable pair of lovers, viz., Samaraketu and Malayasundarī, is more earthly and hence more dramatic. Several sub-divisions of the Junctures of this Incidental Subject can also be indicated. But since it is only a part of the Principal Subject (Ādhikārika-vastu) ~~than~~ the latter alone is analysed here.

III : NETĀ, i.e. THE HEROES AND

HEROINES :-

(A) THE HEROES (NĀYAKA) AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS :-

Dhanapāla seems to have had Dhanañjaya's views

before his mind's eye, along with the living personalities of his royal patrons like Sīyaka, Muñja, and Bhoja as also the characters of Bāṇa's Kad. and HC, when he conceived his heroes like Meghavāhana, Harivāhana and Samaraketu, and heroines like Madirāvati, Tilakamañjarī and Malayasundarī. Of these, Meghavāhana is so to say the Kathāmukha-nāyaka, Harivāhana is the Kathā-nāyaka, and Samaraketu is the Patākā-nāyaka.

It must never be forgotten, in view of Mammaṭa's famous Kārikā regarding the ends of ~~the~~ Poetry and for that matter of all literary activity, served a multifold purpose in the Indian society of the times; it was a means of mass-education (vyavahāra-vidē) inculcating proper character-building so as to enable people to avoid the pitfalls of personal and social shortcomings (śivētara-kṣataye). While, on the one hand, it provided a higher type of delight (sadyaḥ-paranirvṛtaye), along with general knowledge of essential arts and sciences presented in a most palatable manner and easily digestible form (kāntā-saṁmitayopadesayuje), on the other hand, it enabled a poet, successful in achieving all these, to earn spontaneous popularity (Yasase) and adequate financial return (arthakṛte). Sanskrit poetry was never a mere harlot catering to the whims of the populace nor a means of an indiscriminate expression of normal or

abnormal psychological aberrations of one's repercussions to complex socio-economical environment in the name of literary democracy. Poetry has been, with Sanskrit authors, rather an ideal wife expected to combine the functions of a confidante, hard worker, loving mother, expert love-maker, willing companion in pursuits spiritual and tolerant of shortcomings. Thus, literature was expected to conduce to the well-being of the society rather than abnormality and unbridled self-centered individualistic outlook.

It is in this light that we have to appreciate the Sanskrit poet's insistence for an ideal hero and the Sanskrit rhetoricians' prescriptions in the matter. It was from these standards that the poetry of the times was evaluated, especially its 'Vastu' and 'Netā' aspects. Naturally an eminent poet like Dhanapāl^a~~gana~~ would be, and has to be, very scrupulous in adhering to these literary norms. That is why the prescribed normal qualities for a 'Netā' have been embodied in his 'Nāyaka' so as to be easily recognizable both in the characters of his heroes like Meghavāhana, Harivāhana, Samaraketu and others, and in those of his heroines like Madirāvati, Tilakamañjarī and Malayasundarī.

We, therefore, pass on to the classificatory clarifications of the Nāyakas of the TM;

(1) Well-bred (Vinīta): Meghavāhana, Harivāhana and Samaraketu are, all of them, well-trained in all the arts and sciences.²⁸ Modesty (vinaya) is also a prominent trait of the nature of both Meghavāhana and Harivāhana. Thus, Meghavāhana's modesty is seen when he receives the Vidyādhara Muni with utmost humility and offers his whole kingdom along with his retinue in his service.²⁹

~~(1)~~ (2) Charming (Madhura): Meghavāhana, ~~and~~ Harivāhana and Samaraketu are all very handsome. Thus, King Meghavāhana is compared with the goddess Lakṣmī in point of charm and with nectar in point of pleasantness.³⁰ Harivāhana is also said to be very handsome right from his birth,³¹ and princesses of a number of great kings are said to be constantly looking at his extraordinary^{ily} handsome figure which was comparable to that of Nalakūbara.³² Samaraketu, though of dark complexion, is also said to have been very handsome.³³

(3) Liberal (Tyāgī): Meghavāhana offers his very head when the Vetāla requests for it.³⁴ Similarly, Harivāhana undertakes the mystic penance just to save the lives of the Vidyādhara couple and actually requests the propitiated deities to do the favour to Anaṅgarati.³⁵

28. TM(N), p.13(1); 79(12ff.); 114(17ff.).

29. *ibid.*, p.25(20ff.). (Pt. nts. 30 to 35 contd. on p.717)

(4) Competent (Dakṣa): Meghavāhana is an able ruler as is evident from the description of his regime.³⁶ Harivāhana is also an able and efficient master who rules by love rather than by powers.

(5) Affable (Priyamvada): Meghavāhana's affability in speech is evidenced in his dialogues with the Vidyādhara Muni, the Vetāla, the goddess Śrī and also with his subordinates.³⁷ Harivāhana's culture in sweet-speaking is revealed in his dialogues with his friends like Samaraketu, Gandharvaka and with Malayasundarī.³⁸

(6) Popular (Raktaloka): Meghavāhana was a very popular king with his subjects as he is called 'the Lord of the people in the literal sense'.³⁹ Prince Harivāhana was also a beloved king of his friends and subjects as he had afforded protection to every creature, had arranged for regular worship at the temples of all the religious faiths, had pleased all the good people and mendicants, and had given them relief by lessening the burden of the taxes.⁴⁰

30. TM(N), p.14(5).

31. *ibid.*, p.77(19).

32. *ibid.*, p.163(9ff.).

33. *ibid.*, p.276(18ff.).

34. *ibid.*, p.51(23).

35. *ibid.* pp.397-401.

36. *ibid.*, p.15(9ff.).

37. *ibid.*, p.26(2ff.); 32(12ff.); 49(4ff.); 50(5ff.); 51(15ff.); 55(12); 55(17ff.); 57(19ff.); 59(14ff.); 81(7ff.); 81(22ff.).

38. *ibid.*, p.109(17ff.); 111(11ff.); 113(7ff.); 241(20ff.); 257(23ff.).

/ 39. *ibid.*, p.12(22ff.):

/ 40. *ibid.*, p.427(4ff.).

(7) Upright (Śuci): Meghavāhana was a man of purity in speech and action. He readily accepts the advice of the Vidyādhara Muni,⁴¹ obliges Jvalanaprabha by accepting the necklace,⁴² and straightforwardly asks the boon of a son in Madirāvati, from the goddess Śrī.⁴³ Similarly, Harivāhana is also pure at heart in that he at once assures Tilakamañjarī about his being harmless at the very first meeting with her in the bower.⁴⁴ Samaraketu is rather inferior to both in this respect.

(8) Eloquent (Vāgmī): Meghavāhana's cleverness in speech is illustrated in his talk with the goddess Śrī,⁴⁵ while that of Harivāhana is evinced in his appreciation of the unidentified love-letter and his dialogue with Gandharvaka as regards the merits and demerits of the portrait of Tilakamañjarī.⁴⁶

(9) Of Exalted Lineage (Rūdhavaṁsa): Both Meghavāhana and Harivāhana are born in the line of illustrious kings like Bharata, Bhagīratha, Dilīpa, Daśaratha and the like.⁴⁷

(10) Resolute (Sthira): The mental firmness of Meghavāhana is seen in his regulation of life both in duty

41. TM(N), p.31(6ff.).

42. *ibid.*, p.45(5ff.).

43. *ibid.*, p.58(16ff.).

44. *ibid.*, pp.248-250.

45. *ibid.*, pp.59-60.

46. *ibid.*, pp.109-110; 166-167.

47. *ibid.*, p.27(17-20).

and enjoyment, while that of Harivāhana is seen in his equanimity both in happiness and misery.

(11) Youthful (Yuvā): Meghavāhana, Harivāhana and Samaraketu are all young men, the last to being in their late teens.⁴⁸

(12) Intelligent, Energetic, Having Good Memory, Wise, Artistic and Dignified (Buddhi-utsāha-smṛti, prajñā-kalāmāna-samanvita): Meghavāhana's intelligence is seen in his talk with the Vetāla, enthusiasm in his persistence in the propitiation and care for the people, memory in the assurance about ~~fulfilment~~ the fulfilment of the prediction of the Vidyādhara Muni when Madirāvati saw the dream, wisdom in passing his kingdom to Harivāhana when the latter came of age, art in his life in the harem, and dignity in his dealing with his subordinates. Harivāhana's intelligence is revealed in his interpretation of the unidentified love-letter, enthusiasm in his persistence in the penance for propitiating mystic Vidyās, memory in his enquiry about Tilakamañjarī just after his attainment of the emperorship of the Vidyādharas, wisdom in the administration of his kingdom, art in his appreciation of the portrait of Tilakamañjarī and the effect of his lute-playing on the mad elephant, and dignity in his relation with Samaraketu, Tilakamañjarī and others. Samaraketu is also not far behind them in these qualities.

48. TM(N), p. 276 (19).

(13) Heroic (Śūra): Meghavāhana's bravery is seen in his victory over his enemies, and in his encounter with the Vetāla. Harivāhana's bravery is seen on the occasion when the mad elephant kidnaps him away and begins to fly, Samaraketu's bravery is rather tarnished by his recourse to a night-attack.

(14) Mighty (Drdha): Meghavāhana, Harivāhana and Samaraketu are all of them men of sturdy physical build.

(15) Vigorous (Tejasvī): All the three - Meghavāhana, Harivāhana and Samaraketu are heroic by nature. But the poet has brought out the heroism of the first and the last ones more prominently than that of Harivāhana.

(16) Well-versed in the Lore (Śāstra-cakṣu): Both Meghavāhana and Harivāhana conduct themselves in accordance with the procedures laid down in various treatises on Socio-political science (Dharma-śāstra and Artha-śāstra) in matters of statecraft and follow the Erotics in matters of love. Samaraketu is rather weak so far as the statecraft is concerned.

(17) Just Observer of Religious Etiquette (Dhārmika): Meghavāhana, Harivāhana and Samaraketu are all of them regular in their daily worship of their family deities. The first two are exemplary in their devotion to Lord Jina, while the last one is rather given to physical pleasures.

From another point of view, both Meghavāhana and Harivāhana are of the DHĪRODĀTTA type, since both are highly energetic, very sagacious, forgiving, never given to self-praise, steady, dignified though humble, and unflinching in their efforts for attaining the desired end.⁴⁹ These qualities can be seen in them in the following instances:

(i) Of Great Excellence (Mahā-sattva): Meghavāhana's fortitude and energetic disposition is seen respectively in his resolve to undertake penance for obtaining a son, and in ~~in~~ the consolidation of his political hold and administration in his young age. Harivāhana is likewise unmoved ~~in~~ even though the elephant kidnapping him began to fly. His courage is seen in his single-handed attempt at taming the mad elephant.

(ii) Exceedingly Serious (Atigambhīra): Both Meghavāhana and Harivāhana are sagacious by nature. Meghavāhana did not allow himself to be boisterous ~~in~~ even though he succeeded in his deadly penance for the propitiation of the goddess Śrī. Similarly, Harivāhana ~~is~~ also ^{takes} ~~the~~ ~~emperorship~~ the emperorship of the Vidyādharas rather easily.

(iii) Forbearing (Kṣamāvān): Meghavāhana is very generous and forgiving as is seen in his attitude to Samaraketu. Similarly, Harivāhana is also generous to the extent

49. cf. DR(V), II, 4 cd & 5 ab: महासत्त्वोऽतिगम्भीरः क्षमावान्विकल्शनः ॥४॥
स्थिरो निगूढहृत्कारो धीरोदातो दृढव्रतः।

of offering his whole kingdom to Anaṅgarati, and he is very much merciful even to the wild beasts so that he does not like to kill them for sport.

(iv) Unboastful (Avikatthana): Neither Meghavāhana nor Harivāhana are given to boasting about any of their achievements.

(v) Resolute (Sthira): Meghavāhana's steadfastness in love is seen in his wish to have a son from Madirāvati. Similarly, Harivāhana's steadfastness is exemplified in his attempt at suicide when he receives from Tilakamañjarī an unexpectedly shocking letter and loses all hopes of ever obtaining her.

(vi) With Self-assertiveness Suppressed (Nigūdhāṅgā-kāra): Both Meghavāhana and Harivāhana are men of utmost dignity in their behaviour towards even the super-human agencies like the goddess ŚRĪ, and saints. Their authority is fully matched by their humbleness.

(vii) Firm of Purpose (Drdhavrata): Meghavāhana does not give up his penance even when the Vetāla demands his head. Nor does Harivāhana swerve from his resolve of successfully completing the mystic propitiation inspite of various physical threats and psychological temptations.

~~*****~~ SAMARAKETU, the Patākā-nāyaka, is a close and beloved associate of Harivāhana, in comparison to whom he

is slightly inferior. Of the above-enumerated qualities, Samaraketu lacks fortitude since he is easily shaken by the ups and downs of life, and he is rather unsteadfast in his love, right from his former existence as Sumālī who forsook his beloved Priyamvadā for the sake of enjoyments with Svayamprabhā; of course, he has improved much in this respect in his birth as Samaraketu. And his egotism gets revealed during his fight with Vajrāyudha. Moreover, he is a man of the world and his love has more of the earthly element than the ethereal one.

As Dhanapāla does not want to depict any type of rivalry in his Kathā, there is no scope for a Pratināyaka or a villain in his plot.

(B) THE HEROINES (NĀYIKĀS) AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS:-

Dhanapāla's near predecessor like Rudrata and contemporary literary critics like Dhanañjaya and Bhoja have elaborately discussed the different types of Nāyikās from the points of view of custom, qualities, age, skill, tolerance, marriage or lack of it, disposition, circumstances, and etc..⁵⁰ We shall here examine the types of Nāyikās depicted in different contexts by Dhanapāla in his TM.

Madirāvati is the Kathāmukha-nāyikā. Priyaṅgusundarī later on born as Tilakamañjarī is the Mukhyā-nāyikā of the

 50. KVL(R), XII, 16-47; DR, II, 15-29; ~~SKB(RJ)~~ SKB(RJ), V, 110-120.

Ādhikārika-vastu. Priyāhvadā later on born as Malayasundatī is the Patākā-nāyikā.

(1) (OWN WIFE) (Svakiyā): A Svakiyā Nāyikā is a married wife distinguished by her qualities like purity, good conduct, sterling character and simple forgiving nature. This type is further divided into three sub-types in view of ~~her~~ her age and experience, viz., Young (Mugdhā), Middle-aged (Madhyā) and Matured (Pragalbhā).⁵¹

(a) THE INEXPERIENCED (MUGDHĀ)⁵²: Dhanapāla has illustrated this type in a couple of fine pictures, viz., those of the queens Madirāvati and Gandharvadattā. The former is pictured in the following verse:⁵³

बाढ्यक्रौणि दरिद्रमध्यसरणि प्रस्तांसमुच्चस्तनं
नीरन्त्रालकमच्छगण्डफलकं क्लेशु मुग्धेजाणसु ।
शालीनस्मितमस्मिताञ्चितपदन्यासं बिभर्ति स्म या
स्वादिष्टोक्तिनिषोकमैकविकसत्लावण्यपुण्यं वपुः ॥

"(She was one) who possessed a body having full-grown buttocks, emaciated middle portion (i.e. waist), drooping shoulders, protruding breasts, thickly-grown curly hair, pure surface of the cheeks, attractive eyebrows, lovely eyes, bashful smile, a dignified gait of footsteps, extremely sweet flowing speech and unique flush of charming pleasantness."

51. KVL(R), XII, 17; DR(V), I, 15; SKB(RJ), V, 110 cd.

52. cf. DR(V), I, 16 ab: मुग्धा नववयःकामा रतौ वामा मृदु कुधि ।

53. TM(N), p. 23(1-4).

Another beautiful picture is that of Queen Gandharvadattā drawn in the following verse:⁵⁴

भित्त्वा संपुटमौष्ठयोर्न हसितं निःशङ्कगोष्ठीष्वपि

भ्रान्तं न त्वरितैः पदगैर्हनदीहंसानुसारैष्वपि ।

साध्वं पञ्जरसारिकाभिरपि नो भूयस्तया जल्पितं

न यस्मास्ति लकट्टमेष्वपि चिरं व्यापारिता दृष्टयः ॥

"Never did she open the closed pair of her lips to laugh even in the confidential assemblies, nor did she roam freely with quick steps even while chasing the swans of the domestic rivulet, nor did she talk much even with the caged female-parrot, nor (again) did she direct her side-glances for long towards even the Tilaka trees;(such was her bashfulness.).

A ~~series~~ series of brief pictures of this type has also been given in the course of the description of the love-sports of King Meghavāhana, which evidently refer to his early youthful days. The following phrases of the passage⁵⁵ in question bring out the pictures:

(i). कामिनीजनाभरणझात्कारः : "the jingling of the ornaments of lovely ladies;

(ii). आवेशपरवशप्रवृत्तकरप्रहारव्याहारमणिक्लयः : " the tinkling of jewelled bangles due to thumping of the palms moving unvoluntarily out of excitement" ;

54. TM(N), p.262(13ff.). / 55. ibid., pp.17-18.

(iii) अविरलोद्गतश्मस्वेदतिभ्यद्रोमाञ्चकवच - "the all-pervading horripilation moistened by the profuse perspiration resulting from exhaustion (in the process of coition)";

(iv) उत्कृष्टकर्णाप्रयोग - "manipulation of excellent postures (of coition)";

(v) जलक्रीडा - "water-sport";

(vi) मन्थुगौरवादतिलङ्घितपादपतनविभ्रम - "perturbation consequent to having disregarded, out of deep anger, the (propitiatory) falling at the feet (of the beloved by the husband)" ; and

(vii) प्रणयकुपिताः प्रेयसीः - "beloveds feigning mock anger in the course of love-making"

(b) THE PARTLY EXPERIENCED ~~कवि~~ (MADHYA)⁵⁶:-

A picture of this type of Nāyikā emerges from the negative advice of the Vidyādhara Muni to Queen Madirāvati. The following peculiarities are here referred to by the poet:⁵⁷

(i) वृत्तिः - "attachment";

(ii) स्निग्धया काय्यष्ट्या उपसर्पणम् - "approaching (the beloved) by shifting one's soft body near him" ;

(iii) वचसा संभाषणम् - "talking" ;

(iv) अनंगलेखप्रेषणम् - "sending love-letters";

(v) रतिभवने अवस्थानम् - "tarrying in the bed-chamber" ;

(vi) निजचरणानुप्रावणम् - "making (the husband) hear the

56. DR(V), II, 16 cd: मध्योद्ययौवनानङ्गा ओहान्तसुरतदीमा ।

57. TM(N), pp.31-32.

jingling of her anklets";

(vii) सुरतदूतलोकः त्वराकरणम्, -"urging (the husband) to come immediately by sending love-messengers (to him)";

(viii) कपोलतले पत्रच्छेदकारणम्, -"making (the husband) draw the cosmetic designs on the surface of her cheeks";

~~अनुभूतकृत~~ (6) THE EXPERIENCED (PRAGALBHĀ)⁵⁸:-

A faint picture of this type has been drawn in passing by the poet in the following passage :⁵⁹

कदाचित्कीडाधूतपराजितः पणितमप्रयच्छन्, क्व गच्छसि इतिबध्वा-
लीकभुकुटिभिविदग्धवनिताभिराकृष्य कृतविषमपदपातौ बलादिव
दत्तकपाटैश्च वासवेषु सपत्नीसमदामेवादिप्यत ।

"Sometimes, having been defeated in the love-gamble, he was drawn by the shrewd ladies who falsely twisted their brows saying 'where do you go without paying off the bet ?' (and) while he staggered he was thrown inside as the doors were as though forcibly closed in the face of the co-wives."

(2) (A MAIDEN OR ANOTHER'S WIFE) (PARAKIYĀ)⁶⁰:-

Parakiyā is of two types : (i) an unmarried girl; and (ii) other's wife. Both Rudrātā and Dhanañjaya do not approve of depicting another's married wife (anyodhā) as a heroine of the main aesthetic emotion (rasa) and consequently of the main plot.⁶¹

58. DR(V), II, 18: यौवनान्धा स्मरोन्मता प्रगल्भा दयिताश्रके । विलीयमाने-
वान्धा दत्तारम्भेऽप्यचेतना ॥

59. TM(N), p. 18(3-6).

60. KVL(R), II, 30: परकीया तु द्वेषा कन्योदा ये ति...।; DR(V), II, 20 c:
अन्यस्त्री कन्यकोदा यः।

61. KVL(R), XIV, 12-13: न हि कथिना परदार एष्व्या नापि (P.T.O.)

Dhanapāla, being an idealist, seems to have agreed with this opinion of his contemporary critics. That is why he has chosen to omit this type altogether and has selected ~~the~~ the first type, viz., Anūḍhā, i.e. an unmarried girl, both as the Mukhyā and the Patākā Nāyikās. Dhanika, the commentator of the DR, has made it clear that it was due to her dependance on her father that an unmarried girl (kanyakā) was classed under the category of a 'Parakīyā'.⁶²

Both Tilakamañjarī and Malayasundarī, are maidens fully dependant on their respective parents, and, thus, fall under the category of Anūḍhā or Kanyā sub-type of the Parakīyā type. In the opinion of Rudrata this type of Nāyikā is supposed to instantly fall in love just on seeing, or hearing about, the Nāyaka.⁶³ Moreover, he has prescribed that such a Nāyikā should be made to see the Nāyaka personally, or in a portrait, or in a dream, or in an illusion, or here about him, in accordance with the opportune time and place.⁶⁴ Dhanapāla has carefully followed this line. Thus, Tilakamañjarī gets love-sick on seeing Harivāhana for the first time in the Cardamom bower near the Aḍṛṣṭa-para lake.⁶⁵ Similarly, Malayasundari too falls in love

62. cf. Avaloka on DR, II, 20: कन्यका तु पित्रा धायतत्त्वात्परिणीता-
प्यन्यस्त्रीत्युच्यते ।

63. KVL(R), XII, 30 bcd: -- ते हि जायेते । गुरुप्रदानात् नयकमालोक्या-
करणं वा स्मर्यम् ॥

64. ibid., XII, 31: सादात्स्मिन्ने स्वप्ने स्याद्दर्शनमेव मिन्दुजाले वा ।
देशे काले भङ्ग्या साधु तदाकर्षणं च स्यात् ॥

65. TM(N), pp. 352-355.

with Samaraketu immediately on seeing him for the first time, as though in a dream or illusion, from the rampart of the temple at Ratnakūṭa.⁶⁶

Though Rudraṭa has not laid down any procedure for introducing the Nāyaka to the Nāyikā, Dhanapāla has naturally followed in the footsteps of his predecessors like Bāna in applying similar prescriptions in this regard in the case of his Nāyakas also. Thus, Harivāhana falls in love with Tilakamañjarī the moment he sees her portrait.⁶⁷ Similarly, Samaraketu also falls in love with Malayasundarī the very moment he happens to see her standing on the rampart of the temple at Ratnakūṭa.⁶⁸

Again, Dhanapāla has fallen in line with Rudraṭa who has laid down that a Kanyā Nāyikā never looks at the Nāyaka straight in his face, though she be overjoyed at his sight, nor does she speak directly, but only through a friend.⁶⁹ Thus, Tilakamañjarī avoids looking at, and speaking to, Harivāhana, and it is only after much hesitation that she mutely condescends to offer Tāmbūla to Harivāhana with her own hands. Not once in the novel does she speak directly to the prince; it is either through Malayasundarī or

66. TM(N), pp.276-277.

67. *ibid.*, pp.174-177.

68. *ibid.*, pp.158-163; 278-279; 281(8-21).

69. cf. KVL(R), XII, 32: द्रष्टुं न सांमुखीनां कन्या शक्नोति नायकं हृष्टा ।
वक्तुं न च श्रुवाणां वक्ति सखी तं सखी-यासौ ॥

Mrgāṅkalekhā or Gandharvaka that she communicates her responses and messages. Similarly, Malayasundarī conveys her love to Samaraketu through Vasantasenā or Bandhusundarī. The beautiful descriptions of the way in which both these Nāyikās employ various ways and means to stealthily look at their respective Nāyakaare likewise in accordance with the prescription of Rudraṭa in the matter.⁷⁰

(3) SVADHĪNA-PATIKĀ (One that has her husband in subjection):

A Nāyikā who is very happy since her husband is so much under her spell of love that he always remains near her and is never at her beck and call in all matters regarding love, is called 'Svādhīna-patikā'.⁷¹ Dhanapāla has illustrated this type in Priyadarśanā who was fortunate in getting most favourable husband in the form of Tāraka, who willingly accepted her hand and was prone to neglect even his daily chores for the sake of enjoyments with her.⁷² Similarly, Madirāvati and Gandharvadattā are also the Nāyikās of this type.⁷³

(4) VIRAHOTKANTHITĀ (One that is ~~distressed~~ distressed at her lover's absence):

This type is illustrated by the poet in his descriptions of the love-sick condition of his heroines. Thus,

70. KVL(R)., XII, 33-35.

71. DR(V), II, 23: आसन्नयत्तरमणा लृष्टा स्वाधीनभर्तृका ।

72. TM(N), p. 129(6ff.) / 73. *ibid.*, p. 23(5-7); 262(17-20).

Tilakamañjarī became love-lorn after seeing Harivāhana, as has been conveyed to Malayasundarī by Caturikā.⁷⁴ A beautiful, though brief, picture of Tilakamañjarī in this condition is drawn again by the poet when Gandharvaka reports to Harivāhana how she passed her time when the latter returned to Ayodhyā.⁷⁵ The following two verses⁷⁶ brilliantly outline a beautiful picture of this type:

तापं तन्वति वारिदात्यय इव त्वद्विप्रयोगे दृढं
दुष्कारोत्कलिकां दलेरभिनवैरम्भोजिनीनामपि ।
पदात्लासितरहसोऽभिसरसामालीं कलध्वानिनः
कादम्बा निपतन्ति मानसमुवा वेगादुपेत्याधुना ॥

"As with the end of the rainy season the heat spreads; the uninterrupted budding of the lotus-plants with fresh petals (also gathers momentum); the sweet-singing swans, born at the Mānasa lake, with their speed enhanced by spreading wings sweep down speedily to a group of lakes; (so also in the case of Tilakamañjarī) now, due to separation from you, ~~with~~ ~~at~~ the end of the rainy season, ~~even the fresh petals of lotus~~ ~~es~~ enhances love-fever, even the fresh petals of lotuses generate ^{si} irresistible longing, (and) Cupid's arrows, making sweet sound (and) gathering speed due to the feathers, converge to, and fall sharply on, her."

74. TM(N), pp.352-355.

75. *ibid.*, pp.390-391.

76. *ibid.*, p.391(15-22).

तन्वंग्यास्त्वमिति प्रसादविशदं नासीति खेदालसं

चदुद्धारिपथावतारिणि जने व्यापारयन्त्या मुहुः ।

हर्षात्प्रमवाः प्रति^{२६}क्षणमवत्स्वेदाम्बुदाहृज्वरे

बाष्पाम्भःकणिकाः पयोधरतटे पुष्यन्ति शुष्यन्ति च ॥

"As the slender one's (i.e. Tilakamañjarī's) glance repeatedly turns to the person approaching the door, (and at first) flushes with joy (thinking) that it is you, (but later on) becomes languid with pain (on knowing) that it is not you, the drops of tears, rising at every moment out of joy and pain respectively, gather and dry up on the surface of her breasts in her perspiratory high (love-)fever."

Again, the description of the condition of Tilakamañja-
77 ry as she stealthily looks at Harivāhana from her bed-chamber finely illustrates this type. Similarly, a brief picture of Malayasundarī's condition⁷⁸ after she happens to see Samaraketu for the first time is also an illustration in point.

(5) PROSITA-PRIYĀ (One whose beloved is away):-

Dhanapāla has taken the opportunity to depict this type in the twin cases of Priyaṅgusundarī and Priyaṅvadā, whose husbands desert them for one reason or another. Thus, Priyaṅgusundarī's husband Jvalanaprabha deserts her in order to earn profuse merit for emancipation and to be united

77. TM(N), pp. 368-369.

78. *ibid.*, p. 277(9ff.).

with her in the next birth; but Priyamvadā's husband Sumālī deserted her out of his infatuation for another beloved called Svayamprabhā. Both Tilakamañjarī and Malayasundarī can also be classed under this category during their separation from their respective lovers. Dhanapāla has given beautiful picture each of the later two heroines in the condition of their separation.⁷⁹

(6) OTHER TYPES:*

As there is no scope for illustrating the rest of the types, viz., Vāsakasajjā, Khaṇḍitā, Kalahāntarītā, Vipralabdhā and Abhisārikā, Dhanapāla has not touched them.

(7) GENERAL QUALITIES OF THE NĀYIKĀS :-

Rhetoricians have meticulously listed twenty qualities⁸⁰ and jestures of young women as they add to their beauty and enhance their charm. Some of these qualities have been duly illustrated by our poet in the TM in various contexts as can be seen below:

(i) Bhāva or ~~Emo~~ Feeling: Malayasundarī's feelings on her having seen Samaraketu for the first time are depicted in the following passage:⁸¹

प्रससार सवाङ्गिणु रागः ।.... स्वैदजलजनितजाड्यौद्रेकेव बध्दप्रबलकम्पा
कमपि रोमाञ्चजालकमुच्चममुच्चत्कुचस्थली ।

~~8181~~

82

79. TM(N), pp.390-391; 344-345.

80. ~~8181~~, DR(V), II, 30 ab: यौवने सत्वजाः स्त्रीणामलंकास्तु विशतिः।

81. TM(N), p.277(5ff.).

"The passion spread in all the limbs The region of the breasts, trembling heavily as though subjected to the increased cold resulting from perspiration, somehow created horripilation all over."

(ii) Hāva (Emotion): It is depicted in the course of the description of Tilakamanjari as she is confronted all of a sudden for the first time in the Cardamom bower, as in the following passage:⁸²

स्थित्वा च स्थिरा द्वारनिकटे मुहूर्त्तमीषद्वलितकन्धरा
 त्रपातरलितसितैतरतारकामरनिम्नगातरंगतरलायितापांगनिर्गच्छदच्छ-
 प्रमावच्छादितदिगन्तरां सुधारसच्छटामिव सकालकूटामदिपन्मै चक्षुषि
 मुहुर्मुहुर्मेहाह्लादकारिणीं कंटादादृष्टिम् ।

"Having stood still for a while near the door, (and) having turned her/~~her~~^{neck} a little, she repeatedly showered on my eyes a gush of side-glances originating from the corners of her eyes the dark pupils whereof were bashfully tremulous and which quivered like the wavelets of the celestial stream; (the shower of the side-glances) which encompassed all the directions by the power of their purity, and as though consisting of a splash of nector mixed with (a tinge of) the Kālakūṭa poison, it repeatedly generated infatuation and joy (in me).

(iii) Helā (Passion): It is beautifully represented

by means of a series of poetic fancies descriptive of the coquetish gestures suggesting the passion experienced by Malayasundarī, thus:⁸³

तस्यैव विभ्रमक्रमनिमालने निलीनचिता, दूरस्थिताप्यसाधारणाप्रेमदर्शनो-
त्पन्नकारुण्येन केनाप्युत्तिदाप्य तत्समीपं गमितेव, तद्मुश्लेषस्य भाजनी-
कृतेव, तत्संभोगसांस्थमनुभावितेव, निष्पन्दसकलाक्यवा, स्यन्दमानानन्दजलवि-
प्लुषा - - - - - तत्कालमहमपि न जानामि कीदृश्या दृशा तमद्वाचाम् ।

"Having become completely absorbed in observing the series of his charming gestures, although (I was) standing at a distance, but as if made to go near him after having been carried (to him) by somebody who took pity on seeing the extraordinary love (of mine); as if subjected to an embrace at his hands; as though made to experience the joy of union with him; with all my limbs motionless, with tears of joy flowing (from my eyes) at that time, I too do not know with what sort of a glance did I see him."

(iv) Sobhā (Beauty): This quality is well brought out in the description of Madirāvati when the poet draws her word-picture, thus:⁸⁴

तस्य च राज्ञः ----- नाभिवक्रादपि गम्भीरेण कुचमण्डलादङ्गि-
प्युन्नतेन जघनस्थलादपि विशालेन भुजलतायुगलादपि सरलेन कपोललावण्यादपि

83. TM(N), p.277(17ff.).

84. *ibid.*, pp.21-22.

स्वच्छेन, मदनविलासकलहसमानसेनैव महतामाहितप्रमोदा मानसेन -----
 शीलसहचारिणा रूपेण, विनयक्ता योवनेन, सांभोग्यसंगिना लावण्येन
 ----- समस्तान्तःपुरशिरोरत्नभूता मदिरावती नाम देव्यमवत् ।

"And that king had a queen named Madirāvati who was the veritable crest-jewel of his whole harem in view of her heart that was deeper than her navel, loftier than her round breasts, broader than her hips, more straight than her creeper-like arms, purer than the loveliness of her cheeks; which generated joy in the minds of noble persons by her graceful gestures, in the same way as the Mānasa lake makes the swans overjoyous; her beauty being accompanied by character, her youthfulness being accompanied by modesty, her physical lustre being accompanied by good-luck (or husband's favour)."

(v) Kānti (Loveliness): This quality is depicted in the case of Malayasundarī who tells about her condition when Samaraketu was looking at her with passionate eyes, thus: ⁸⁵

प्रयत्नानीतर्ष्योऽपि मुहुर्मम ----- पर्यस्तसान्द्रदशनदीघिता-
 वघरदन्तवाससि, मुहुर्वस्त्रकेशहस्तोन्नमनाय साचिसंचारितवामकरतलायाः
 प्रकटपरिणाहे बाहुमूले ----- विन्यस्तबाहुस्वस्तिके स्तनयुगोत्संगे ----
 नगरसीमनीव सरौमालिनि मध्ये, ----- सहासविधृतसंमानोच्चये कांचि-

धामनि ----- प्रतिवेलविघटमानवेलाचलदर्दशिक्षितुतावूरदेशे, वृष्टिमा-
पतन्तीं न वारयितुमशक्त, ।

"Although he tried hard to compose himself, he could not prevent his glances from falling repeatedly : on my lips glistening with the liquid lustre of the teeth; on the root of my arms the breadth whereof was ~~revealed~~ as the left hand was moved bending it sideways to fix my repeatedly loosening braid; on the pair of (my) protruding breasts on which the hands were placed crosswise; on (my) waist which was lined with hair-lines, in the same manner as a city boundary is marked with a series of lakes; on (my) abdomen, the knot of the slipping lower garment whereof was laughingly being caught hold of (by me); (and) on the region of my thighs the lustre whereof was visible from a distance as the skirt of the lower garment was being dishevelled every moment."

(vi) Prāgalbhya (Courage): It is illustrated in the case of Priyadarśanā, thus: ⁸⁶

सा तु तत्कारग्रहणसमकालमेवोत्थितेन सरमसाकृष्टधनुषा कुसुमसायकेन
कृतसाहाय्यकेनेव दूरमपसारितसाध्वसा सविभ्रमोल्लासितकभ्रुवा गुरुणोव
नवानुरागेण कारितप्रागल्भ्यकलालापपरिचया ----- निसर्गमुग्धपि
प्राँढवनितेव किञ्चिद्विहस्य क्वचनमिदमुदीरितवती - कुमार त्वया गृहीतथा-
पिः कथमहं ----- गेहादितो गृहान्तरं गच्छामि । सांप्रतमिदमेव मे

त्वदीयं सदनमाश्रयः संवृतः इत्युक्त्वा त्रपावनतवदना --- वामचरणां-
गुष्ठलेखया मन्दमन्दमलिखत्कुट्टिमम् ।

"As though being made to completely set aside bashfulness by Cupid who ⁱ instantly arose with quickly drawn bow and came to her succour, the moment he (i.e. Tāraka) caught her hand; as if introduced in the art of maturity in speech by the deep new-born love, in the ~~same~~ manner of an instructor (who instructs) with one of the eyebrows beautifully raised; she, on her part, although naturally inexperienced, smiled a little like a mature woman, and spoke these words - 'Young man ! when (once) you have caught my hand, how can I go from this house to another one ? Now, this abode of yours has become a resort for me.' Having said so, she lowered her face out of bashfulness and began slowly to scetch the paved floor with the tip of the thumb of her left foot."

(vii) Vicchitti (Tastefulness): This quality has been illustrated in the case of Tilakamañjarī who is described thus: ⁸⁷

उद्भावितरतिप्रीतिदर्पणाप्रमेण स्वच्छकान्तिना कपोलयुगलेन स्निग्ध-
नीलालकलता इव ह्यायागताः कुरंगमदपत्रांगुलीरुद्धहन्तीम्, -----
(बालिकामपश्यम्, 1)

"(I saw a young girl) who was bearing, on both of her pure lustrous cheeks, Pattrāṅguli designs (drawn) with musk; (the designs looked) as though they were the curls of her black hair reflected in (her cheeks which created) an illusion of a mirror due to the advent of passion and love."

(viii) Kuṭṭamita (Pretended Anger): This has been faintly depicted in the course of the delineation of Meghavāhana's dalliance with his queens, thus:⁸⁸

स्रमसदशनाग्रदशदलितदन्तच्छुदमदयकचग्रहोत्सद्वृकुटिभूषितललाटदेश-
मावेशपरवशप्रवृत्तकरप्रहारव्याहरन्मणिवलयम् -----
(रतसमरमाततान् ।)

a love-

"(He carried on a battle in the form of coition) in which the (lower) lip was vehemently scratched by the bite with the tips of the teeth; in which the region of the forehead was adorned with the raised eyebrows as the hair were mercilessly caught hold of; in which the jewelled bracelet jingled due to thumping of the palm moving unvoluntarily out of excitement."

(ix) Lalita (Tenderness): This quality is illustrated in the descriptions of Tilakamañjarī and Malayasundarī.⁸⁹

(x) Vihṛta (Bashfulness): A fine illustration of this quality is found in the case of Madirāvati when she bashfully keeps mum as the Vidyādhara Muni asks for her consent,

88. TM(N), p.17(9-10).

89. *ibid.*, pp.246-247.

90. *ibid.*, p.32(7-11).

on behalf of King Meghavāhana, to stay aloof till the completion of the propitiation of the Goddess Śrī by the king. The queen is described thus:⁹⁰

तां च तथावस्थितां निर्व्वचनामघःसस्ताभिरलकवत्सरीभिर्व्विलदा-
स्मितमिवाच्छादयितुमाच्छादितकपोलदर्पणां करनखशुक्तिभिरलग्न-
मपि विलेपनाकं चरणाभिकारत्नशकलेषु पुनः पुनरुल्लिखन्तीम्, ----
अवलोक्य ---- (नरपतिः ---- आबभाषे --।)

"And seeing her standing thus, speechless, covering her mirror-like cheeks under the dropping curly locks as though to hide her perplexed smile; repeatedly scratching, with her oyster-shell-like finger nails, the dots of unguent though not at all stuck, on the pieces of jewels (studded) in the rings (worn in the fingers) of the feet."

It seems, the poet did not illustrate the rest of the feminine modes such as ~~सुखमय~~ Mādurya (Sweetness), Dīpti (Radiance), Audārya (Dignity), Dhairya (Self-control), Līlā (Spottiveness), Vilāsa (Delight), Vibhrama (Confusion), Kilakiñcita (Histerical Mood), Moṭṭāyita (Manifestation of Affection) and Bibboka (Affected Indifference) in detail due to the want of proper occasion for their depiction in the TM, though these modes have not been totally neglected by the poet, since they are occasionally referred to in passing in the descriptions of the Nāyikās in various contexts.

90. TM(N), p.32(7-11).

IV : THE NARRATIVE INTEREST :
(KATHĀ-RASA) AND DHANAPĀLA'S
NARRATIVE SKILL :

A successful writer of a narrative must create an illusion of reality in the mind of his listeners; and a sure means to this end is to hold the audience in suspense so that it is too much interested to have any time to reason and so spoil its own enjoyment; any deviation from the legitimate unfolding of the plot is fatal as it breaks the continuity of the suspense, which is inherent in any unsolved Problem, and the solution of the Problem, with its attendant removal of the suspense is the end of the story.⁹¹ Dhanapāla, being a skillful narrator and a highly conscious one at that, seems to have been pretty aware of these requirements. He, therefore, fully employed his skill in weaving his plot in such a way as to maintain constant interest of the audience in his narrative.⁹²

The story of the TM, as we have seen in a preceding chapter, begins with the description of the city of Ayodhyā, King Meghavāhana, his queen, his lack of a male ~~shishu~~ issue, and his wish to undertake the propitiation of some deity

91. cf. Gui.Fic.Wr., pp.43-45.

92. cf. TM(N), p.3, vs.18: सत्कथास्स वन्धेषु निवर्त्यु नियोजिताः ।
 नीचेष्टिव भवन्त्यक्षिः प्रायो वैरस्य हेतवः ॥ ; also, p.7, vs.50cd:

-- सुशुश्रुतस्सा रचिता कथेषु ।-३

to ensure male progeny. So far, the interest is generally sustained by the novelty of descriptions.

The introduction of the flying Vidyādhara Muni⁹³ who predicts the birth of a son, and imparts to that end the Aparājitā Vidyā, marks the beginning of the suspense, and we do not expect that we shall meet with this same Vidyādhara Muni again, till his identity is very skillfully revealed by the poet, towards the end of the story, by informing us that it was this same Mahārṣi who had imparted the Vidyā to King Meghavāhana.⁹⁴

The advent of the Vaimānika god named Jvalanaprabha⁹⁵ is also very purposefully skillful, since it heralds his impending descent to the human world by his gift of the Candrātapa necklace to the king. The poet has here quietly introduced the necklace which is intended to be a reminder to Priyaṅgusundarī, when she is later on born as Tilakamañjarī, of her love with Jvalanaprabha.⁹⁶ Thus the future role of the necklace has been faintly indicated by the poet well in advance in a skillfully casual way at the very outset of the story.

93. TM(N), pp.23-33.

94. *ibid.*, p.412(14ff.)-- मयैव पूर्वकालमुपदिष्टविद्याराधनस्य तस्यैव साकेत-
नरपतेर्मेघवाहनस्य ----।

95. *ibid.*, pp.34-45.

96. *ibid.*, p.44(15ff.): दूरीभूत एवैव मे स्वर्गच्युतस्य । गृहीतस्तु कदापि-
मनुष्यलोके * लब्धजन्मनः पुनरानन्दयति दृष्टिमिष्टतमदर्शनं यैजम् । ----
अमरलोक-युता कालक्रमेण देव्यपि मे प्रियञ्जुसुन्दरी कदापिदालोकयति ।
दर्शनाभ्यासजनितपूर्वजातिस्मृतिश्च स्मरति --- etc ..

But the suspense really gathers strength with the sudden appearance of the Vetāla who introduces himself as an attendant of the Goddess Śrī.⁹⁷ Who could ever expect that this same Mahodara would turn up again in the narrative to rescue Samaraketu and Malayasundarī and actually inform us about it quite unexpectedly when he happens to exchange words with the erring Gandharvakaṃ?⁹⁸

The words of ~~the~~ Goddess Śrī that the Candrātapa necklace, and indirectly the Bālārūṇa ring too, was to be presented to Prince Harivāhana when he comes of age and that it should always be kept with him during the battles and calamitous situations,⁹⁹ sound very innocent and natural till we come to know quite unexpectedly that this ring enabled the commander Vajrāyudha to win the losing battle¹⁰⁰ and to capture Samaraketu, the hero of the by-plot, to unite him with Prince Harivāhana, the hero of the main plot. The ring and the necklace later on remind Malayasundarī and Tilakamañjarī respectively of their past births.¹⁰¹

The sudden night-attack on Vajrāyudha's forces by Samaraketu¹⁰² further enhances the suspense which is resolved only when we know that Vajrāyudha had asked, as a price

97. cf. TM(N), p.49(9ff.): ... इयमस्मत्स्वामिनी श्रीः ... ।

98. *ibid.*, pp.381-383.

99. *ibid.*, p.60(17-23); 61(15ff.).

100. *ibid.*, pp.81-95.

101. *ibid.*, pp.404-405.

102. *ibid.*, pp.83-93.

of military peace, for the hand of Malayasundarī who had mentally offered herself in marriage to Samaraketu, and the later had no other go but to help her father and win her over from him honourably.¹⁰³ The poet has skillfully dropped an advance hint about it in the course of his description of the battle,¹⁰⁴ and it is only much later in the narrative¹⁰⁵ that we come to know about the connection of his deputation on military mission to Kāncī with his love of Malayasundarī and the consequent night-attack.

The enigmatic verse¹⁰⁶ in the anonymous love-letter, found by Mañjīraka in the Mattakokila garden, testifies to the conscious art of the poet who specifically reveals its significance through Harivāhana's words that perhaps Samaraketu was reminded of his past experiences, thus rousing the curiosity of the audience as to the tragic love affair of Samaraketu and Malayasundarī.¹⁰⁷

The interlude about Tāraka, the sailor youth, and his marriage with Priyadarśanā,¹⁰⁸ gives an unexpected turn to the smoothly sailing narrative of Samaraketu's naval expedition and provides him a companion who is meant to enable him cross over the ocean¹⁰⁹ but in fact he becomes instrumental in almost drowning him and consequently his beloved,¹¹⁰

103. TM(N), p.326(6-20).

104. *ibid.*, p.95(7ff.).

105. *ibid.*, p.321(15-23).

106. (contd. on p.746.)

by taking him, though at his request, to the island where the prince falls in love with the unknown girl - Malayasundarī -, and comes to grief. These fatal consequences are not at all clear till the poet unfolds the events at their proper places.

The suspense about the sudden alluring music from the unfrequented island in the turbulent ocean conjures up an atmosphere of a fairy tale with its nymphs and spirits, but unexpectedly turns out to be the music of the Holy-Bath Ceremony at the temple of Lord Mahāvīra,¹¹² a most unimaginable place for worldly affairs like youthful passion; but it is the holiness of this place which comes to the succour of the damned lovers :¹¹³

The poet's mastery at creating suspense is very much evident when he brings the account of Samaraketu upto a point at which the latter sees the unknown girl (Malayasundarī), and he abruptly drops the account by introducing the portrait of Tilakamañjarī. The consciousness of the literary artist

(Ft. nts. 106 to 111 continued from p.745:-)

106. TM(N),p.109(13-14): गुरुभरदत्तं वोढुं वाञ्छन्मामकृपान्त्वमन्निरेण ।
स्वीतासि पत्रपादपङ्कजे तत्रान्तिकस्थानिनः ॥
107. *ibid.*,p.113(14ff.):... कञ्चिन्न मयि जल्पति जातमुपतापदायिनः स्ववृत्ता-
न्तस्य कस्यचिदाकस्मिकं स्मरणम् । ; 114(3ff.): --निजयैव प्रशया निवेदितस्ते
शकलोऽपि सामान्येन मद्युःस्ववृत्तान्तः ।
108. *ibid.*,pp.126-130. / 109. *ibid.*,p.130(14ff.).
110. *ibid.*,p.292(1ff.). / 111. *ibid.*,p.141(12-21).
112. *ibid.*,pp.268-269. / 113. *ibid.*,p.319(18ff.);382(6ff.).

in Dhanapāla becomes quite transparent here as he slyly alludes to the response of the audience whose interest in the frame of the narrative has so far been well-sustained.¹¹⁴

The presentation of the protrait of a young girl, and through it the entry of Gandharvaka, has been skillfully utilized to introduce Tilakamañjarī as a 'male-hater' (puruṣa-dveṣiṇī), and inweave the episode regarding Gandharvadattā. The poet confounds the audience by throwing in a number of faint suggestions about the probable causes of Tilakamañjarī's aversion to males,¹¹⁵ the reason being revealed at a very late stage in the story.¹¹⁶ The suggestion that a human prince was the destined match for her¹¹⁷ faintly betrays the possibility of Harivāhana's chance. The unspecified task¹¹⁸ for which Gandharvaka was directed to go to Vicitravīrya at the Suvela mountain has been disclosed later on when the aeroplane of Gandharvaka is thrown away into the Aṅṛṣṭapāra lake by enraged Mahodara.¹¹⁹ The insertion of the confirmation of the identity of Gandharvadattā¹²⁰ rouses the curiosity which is but partially satisfied only when Malayasundarī is interrogated by Vicitravīrya¹²¹ and the determination of this identity is

114. TM(N), p.161(15ff.): इति कथंस्ताक्षिप्तचेतसि स्ववृत्तान्तमावेदयति शत्रु-
केतौ निश्चलपक्षमलेखे लिखित इव पश्यति तदीयं मुख्यमभिमुखप्रहितदृशि
सभेभ्योके, स्तब्धीकृतान्तरकथेष्वाकर्णयत्यु सकुतुहलमन्तरान्तरा विस्तारित हर्ष-
कोलाहलेषु --- प्रधानराजपुत्रेषु --- प्रचलित शिरसि संप्रपन्नमाकर्णयति सरसता
कथंस्तथा कथं पञ्जरस्य --- बन्दीवृन्दे ---!

115. cf. *ibid.*, p.169(11ff.). / 116. *ibid.*, p.410(19ff.).

117. *ibid.*, p.169(20ff.). / 118. *ibid.*, p.170(16ff.).

119. *ibid.*, p.341(15ff.); 378(13-14). #

120. *ibid.*, p.170(20ff.). / 121. *ibid.*, pp.271-274.

very essential in bringing about the union of Samaraketu with Malayasundarī, as it attracts the assistance of the superhuman agency in the form of Pattralekhā and Vicitravīrya.¹²²

In the simple casual promise of Gandharvaka to Harivāhana that he will return to Ayodhyā and do a portrait of the prince, unless he is not held up on his way to Trikūṭa mountain, the poet shrewdly implants the seed of the incident of Mahodara's curse to Gandharvaka.¹²³ The element of suspense begins to sprout when Gandharvaka does not return to Ayodhyā.¹²⁴ Likewise, the casual polite promise containing the adjectives 'Sakalārthidrumasya' and 'Iṣṭaphaladāyakam' by which Gandharvaka qualifies Harivāhana and his feet respectively,¹²⁵ is very pregnant with dramatic irony suggestive of the panegyric verse about Harivāhana sung by Gandharvaka,¹²⁶ who is later on rid of the cursed state of a parrot at the hands of the prince.¹²⁷ The expression of the natural aspiration of Gandharvaka to draw a portrait of Harivāhana so as to allay Tilakamañjarī's aversion to males¹²⁸ is an advance suggestion about Harivāhana's being her destined lover. Likewise, the usual customary remarks of Harivāhana to departing Gandharvaka that the latter should not

122. cf. TM(N), p. 342(9ff.); 423(9-20). / 123. *ibid.*, pp. 381-383.

124. *ibid.*, p. 179(2): अकृतगतौ च तत्र ---।

125. *ibid.*, p. 171(15ff.): पुनरपि इष्टव्यमिष्टफलदायकं सकलार्थिकल्पदुमस्य

126. *ibid.*, p. 222(17ff.): / ते चरणप्रवालसुजालम्।

127. *ibid.*, p. 376(17ff.). / 128. *ibid.*, p. 171(17ff.).

forget the brief acquaintance¹²⁹ is related to the task of carrying messages by the parrot.¹³⁰

The hidden purpose of the letter of Samaraketu addressed to Malayasundarī and handed over by Harivāhana to Gandharvaka¹³¹ is disclosed when Malayasundarī suddenly finds it tied to her garment, and consequently gives up the idea of committing suicide again.¹³²

Dhanapāla betrays his consciousness as an artist when he seeks to enhance the suspense by drawing our attention to the inherent difficulties in the path of love of Harivāhanap~~hanap~~ hana for Tilakamañjarī, and almost challenges us to exercise our imagination as to the manner in which Harivāhana can be made to reach the remote region of the Vidyādhara.¹³³

By introducing the incident of the mad elephant to be pacified by the musical powers of Harivāhana, and the elephant suddenly flying and kidnapping the prince away,¹³⁴ the poet catches us by surprise, and leaving us bewildered and

129. TM(N), p.173(1-2). / 130. *ibid.*, p.384(9-10).

131. *ibid.*, p.173(4-8).

132. *ibid.*, pp.338-339.

133. *ibid.*, p.176(20ff): कस्य क्रमिष्यते तदेशगमनोपायेषु बुद्धिः । कस्य साहायकेन सेत्स्यति तथा सह समगमप्राप्तिः ।

134. *ibid.*, pp.184-187.

gasping as to what will now happen to the prince, he quietly passes on to Samaraketu's search operation.¹³⁵ The suspense intensifies when the poet slyly drops in the news that the elephant was, of course, recovered but the whereabouts of the prince were untracable.¹³⁶ This small detail skillfully introduced here is taken up later on to lay bare how Citramāya took the form of the prince's elephant,¹³⁷ at the instance of Gandharvaka,¹³⁸ who had promised to meet the prince again.¹³⁹

The sudden arrival of Paritoṣa with a message from Kamalagupta adds to the effect of suspense especially when the former reports about the mysterious arrival of the message and equally surprising incident of carrying away the reply of the message by a parrot.¹⁴⁰ It is noteworthy that the poet gives out the contents of the letter only after giving the full background, thus amplifying the effect of the suspense by the delaying tactics.¹⁴¹ This mystery is ^{re-}solved only when

135. TM(N), p. 187(5ff.).

136. *ibid.*, p. 189(16ff.): न केवलं गमनमार्गः सोऽपि दुष्टात्मा पाप-
कर्माभिर्दृष्टोऽस्माभिः। केवलं स नास्ति सकलमेदिनीचक्रचन्द्रमाः कुमारः।

137. *ibid.*, p. 387(4ff.): कुमार, दुर्घटमिदम्। न हि भूमिजोत्तरकरेषु-
शन्तरिक्षेण संहरति। न च पञ्चत्वगतस्तेनैव वपुष्वा पुनः स्वस्थानमा-
याति। तन्न सोऽयम्। अन्यः कोऽपि।

138. *ibid.*, p. 380(21ff.): अविलम्बो दैवयोगात्संजातस्ततः क्षिप्रमेव
भवता परित्यक्तपुरुषरूपेण देशान्तरप्रापणक्षममलक्षितं प्रतिपद्य किमपि
प्राणिरूपं रक्षतात्मानमादरेण रथनूपुरचक्रनालं कुमारे नेतव्यः। तत्र हि
गतेनानेन महती कार्यशिक्षि रस्माकम् १५. 249 (5-7) -----
392(9-11) प्रवैव गन्धर्वकप्राथितेन --- आत्तद्विरदरूपेण लौहित्य-
तरपर्वताद्याः कृतापहारं कुमारहरिनाह्वयम् ---।

139. *ibid.*, p. 171(14-17). / 140. *ibid.*, pp. 191-195.

141. *ibid.*, p. 193(1-18).



Gandharvaka relates as to how he was transformed into a parrot and how he carried the messages.¹⁴² The self-consciousness of the poet is evident in the remarks which indirectly draw our attention to the effect of the incident (of mysterious taking away of the message by a parrot) on the audience and, at the same time, the solution of the riddle is suggested in the last alternative of the remarks.¹⁴³ And the poet again drives at his ingenuity as displayed in this wonderful parrot-episode.¹⁴⁴

To heighten the suspense about the neighing of horses heard by Samaraketu, Dhanapāla utilizes the former's curiosity and poses a number of alternative possibilities of gathering so many horses in a place nearby. The poet's conscious art unfolds itself as he gives the last alternative.¹⁴⁵

The conscious artist in the poet again peeps in when Samaraketu happens to see the Prasasti engraved in the Jain temple at Mount Ekasrnga, and recapitulating the strange experience that he underwent and strange places that he reached, proclaims the uniqueness of the situations so far, thus

142. TM(N), p.384(9-13).

143. *ibid.*, p.195(2-7): सैन्यपतिरपि जातविस्मयः सहान्तिकस्थेन पार्थिव-सम्राजेन 'कोऽयं शुकः' किमर्थमर्थानन्तरमेव तरुशिरवरादितः क्षिताववतीर्णः, किं निमित्तं य लेखोऽयममुना गृहीतः, किं वा विलम्बितगतिरुदीचिमेव दिश-माश्रित्य प्रस्थितः, किं परमार्थतः शुक एवायमुत शुकव्याजेन कश्चिद्विद्यः 'इति कृतानेकविकल्पः ---।

144. *ibid.*, p.195(13): सत्त्वजन विस्मय करं शुकव्यतिकरम् ---।

145. *ibid.*, p.208(12-18): आहोस्विदम्बरास्त्वयमेवावतीर्णः स्नातुं सप्त-सप्तिरथगन्धर्व सुरविद्या धराणा प्रन्यतमः कतमोऽपि कमनीयो देशदर्शन कुतूहली विहरति ।

indirectly directing our attention to their excellence in the story of the TM;¹⁴⁶ not only that he is also conscious about the plausibility of the delineation of various incidents.¹⁴⁷

Dhanapāla's conscious effort at enhancing the curiosity of the audience is most transparent when he poses a series of questions relating to the plot and its progress.¹⁴⁸ And, when, through the reply of Gandharvaka, he comments on the parrot-episode, one can easily gather that most probably these comments are aimed at the implausibility of the parrot-episode in Bāṇa's Kādambarī in contrast to the one Dhanapāla has himself utilized.¹⁴⁹ The series of solutions¹⁵⁰ and their points of implausibility are skillfully employed to augment the effect of suspense. The real cause is revealed when Gandharvaka relates about his having incurred the curse from Mahodara.¹⁵¹ And the conscious plan in the plot is suggested when the poet indirectly ~~now~~ consoles us that

146. TM(N), p.220(6ff.): संप्रति हि दीयते दर्शनीय कथानां मुद्रा । क्रियते तेजस्वि वान्तां निवृत्तिः, वितीर्यते आश्चर्यदर्शनस्योदकाञ्जलिः ---- ।

147. *ibid.*, p.220(8ff.): कथं नु नामास्य प्राणिन इव कात्स्न्येन कम्पपरिणति विशेषाः शायन्ते, शायमाना अपि केन प्रकारेण वण्ण्यन्ते वण्ण्यमाना अपि कया युक्त्या परस्य प्रतीति विषय प्रारोप्यन्ते ।

148. *ibid.*, p.223(22ff.).

149. *ibid.*, p.224(20ff.): अनुपजातप्रतिज्ञां निवर्हिण युक्तियुक्त मप्यु-
च्यमानं कीदृशं, किं पुनरसंभाव्यमानतया शिशुजनस्यापि हास्यवृद्धिहेतु-
रीदृशं यच्च विशदप्रतिभासमतिदीर्घकालमनुभूतमात्मनापि न शक्यते
श्रद्धातुम् । तद्विपरचतुरबुद्धेः कथ्यमानं महाभागस्य कथपिव प्रतीतिपथम-
वतरिष्यति ।

150. *cf. ibid.*, p.225(1ff.): दिव्यैरप्यशक्यप्रतीकारं च्यवनमापन्नोऽस्मीति प्रत्यक्षविरुद्धम् । एत.

151. *ibid.*, pp.378-384.

the rest of the incidents beginning with the departure of Gandharvaka to his meeting with Samaraketu at Mount Ekasrnga will be narrated in due course !¹⁵²

The hint about the attempted suicide by the princess, now relaxing by the side of Harivāhana creates curiosity which is doubled by the verse of the panegyric who allegorically reminds the prince about the delay being caused in entering the city of Rathanūpuracakravāla.¹⁵³ The lengthy description of the Vaitādhyā mountain only serves to heighten the effect of already roused curiosity till the poet himself at last feels it is sufficiently aroused,¹⁵⁴ and proceeds to pick up the thread of the narrative from the point at which Harivāhana was kidnapped by the flying elephant, and indicates the missing links in the story so far. The leisurely unfolding of the story is in the manner of dangling a carrot in front of a donkey impelling it to go on and on ! Likewise, the poet promises that the story to be unfolded henceforward is also full of pleasant surprises and expresses confidence as to his own capacity to hold the interest of the audience by his narrative skill.¹⁵⁵

152. TM(N), p.225(15ff.): ...पश्चादखिललोकोत्पादिताश्चर्यमस्मद्वृत्तान्तप्रम-
ख्योऽथा निर्गमात्प्रभृति मन्वृष्टि यत्पृष्टं तदपि सर्व्वं क्रमेण गातासि ।

153. *ibid.*, p.232(4ff.).

154. *ibid.*, p.241(7-21): तदास्तां तावदस्य शिखरिणे दर्शनव्यावर्णनानि ।
तमेवावेदयं यथावृत्तमादितः प्रभृति सर्व्वमात्मीयं वृत्तान्तम् । etc.

155. *ibid.*, p.241(20ff.): युवराज , कथयामि यदि ते कौतुकम् । अवहितो
भव । प्रभूतमिदमाख्येयम् । अधवा वृथा ममाख्यथनेयम् । अयमेव भूम्ना
निरन्तराश्चरिसो मदीयेवृत्तान्तः , करिष्यत्यवधानवन्तम् ।

A faint indication of the solution of the mystery of the flying elephant is given in the reflections of Harivāhana,¹⁵⁶ and the element of destiny is put forth to rationalize the accident of the flying elephant carrying the prince particularly to the region of the Vaitādhya mountain.¹⁵⁷

The suspense based on the unexpectedness of the situation is fully exploited by the poet for propounding the typically Jainistic ideas about the nature of the world and worldly happiness, and this in its turn also serves to heighten our curiosity.¹⁵⁸

The poet again betrays his consciousness as a narrator when he discloses the connection of the portrait of Tilaka-mañjarī with his arrival at the Vaitādhya region which is recognized to be identical with the one seen by him in the portrait.¹⁵⁹

The induction of the long narrative prelude¹⁶⁰ related by Malayasundarī with the comment that it ~~is~~ comprises a series of tragic incidents¹⁶¹ is a common device aimed at fanning the curiosity of the audience and preparing them for a change as the poet seeks to give a turn to the narrative mood.

156. TM(N), p.243(3ff.).

157. *ibid.*, p.259(1-4).

158. *ibid.*, p.244(3-23).

159. *ibid.*, p.250(19ff.).

160. *ibid.*, pp.259-345.

161. *ibid.*, p.259(11ff.): किं तु सर्वदा सुखोचितस्य तेन किञ्चिदनेक-
दुःखपरम्परा विरसेन श्रुतेनावेन फलम् । अथ कुतूहलं ततः श्रुत्वा ।

The prediction by Vasurāta about the marriage of Malayasundarī¹⁶² creates the interest since it is not known as yet that she is to be the beloved of Samaraketu and is going to fulfil the conditions. The narrative purpose of the prediction is partly given out in the course of the dialogue between Vicitravīrya and Malayasundarī where it is connected with the identity of Gandharvadattā.¹⁶³

Dhanapāla has dexterously utilized the popular belief about the Vidyādharas that they kidnap human girls, and it is a potent means of creating the suspense in as much as the poet has made full use of the technique of surprise by making Malayasundarī, who was sleeping in her palace bed-chamber at Kāncī, wake up quite unexpectedly, as though in a dream, in totally unexpected surroundings of a group of princesses gathered in a Jain temple situated on the remote island in the midst of the southern ocean.¹⁶⁴ This incident of Kidnapping of Malayasundarī to Ratnakūṭa by the Vidyādharas has been cleverly made instrumental in bringing her there where she was to meet her lover,¹⁶⁵ as was predicted by Jayantaswāmī in her former birth as Priyamvadā.¹⁶⁶ This whole incident keeps us guessing as to whether it is an illusion or a dream.¹⁶⁷ It is partly resolved when Tapanavega is

162. TM(N), p.263(5-10). / 163. *ibid.*, p.273(3-10).

164. *ibid.*, pp.264-265. / 165. *ibid.*, p.276-292.

166. *ibid.*, p.407(22ff.).

167. cf. *ibid.*, p.265(13ff.): 'कन्मिन्मया स्वप्नोऽयमनुभूयते, विभ्रमो वायमिन्द्रियाणामिन्दजालं वा केनाप्युपदर्शितमेतत् 'इति पुनः पुनश्चिन्तयन्ती...'

ordered by Vicitravīrya to take Malayasundarī back in cogni-
to to her palace,¹⁶⁸ though not fully until we are assured
by the poet later on that all this was neither an illusion,
nor a dream, but a concrete reality.¹⁶⁹

The poet's mastery in holding the credulity of the au-
dience to his finger-tips is witnessed in the dexterity with
which he keeps up the element of suspense in the dialogue *
between Malayasundarī and Vicitravīrya,¹⁷⁰ wherein the pro-
blem of the identity of Gandharvadattā is kept hanging¹⁷¹
and the audience almost forgets that the poet has already
dropped the hint about its solution well in advance in the
talk between Harivāhana and Gandharvaka !¹⁷² In this dialogue,
again, the poet has sown the seeds of further suspense when
Malayasundarī declares that her maternal grandfather was a
'hermit' (tāpasa),¹⁷³ thus giving an advance suggestion about
the incident of Gandharvadattā's^s transportation to the
Prasāntavaira hermitage of Kulapati Śantātapa;¹⁷⁴ it has been
hinted at also in the words of Gandharvadattā herself.¹⁷⁵

The poet's skill lies in the fact that in spite of all these

168. TM(N), p.274(20ff.): अरे तपनवेगं प्रापयैनां प्रच्छन्नरूपामेव निजसदनम् ।

169. *ibid.*, p.292(19ff.): अपरुतस्वप्नदर्शनशक्ता च तदेवलोकनेन
सकलमपि सत्रिवृत्तान्तमवितर्षं मन्यमानाः

170. *ibid.*, pp.270-273.

171. *ibid.*, p.cf.*ibid.*, p.273(22ff.): आर्यं किं कशेमि । एतदपि
श्रुत्वा न मे निरसर्जदुर्विदग्धं श्रद्धाति दग्धहृदयम् ।

172. *ibid.*, p.170(20ff.): ----->(p.t.o.)

advance hints, he could sustain the suspense successfully to the ultimate delight of, and consequent applause from, the audience.

And see the poet's versatile art in slyly inserting the prediction by Muni Mahāyāśas about the union of Gandharvadattā with her kith and kin,¹⁷⁶ which in turn proves to be the vital key to unlock the otherwise closed fate of the so far impossible union of Samaraketu and Malayasundarī¹⁷⁷ The poet is conscious enough to point out to some of the minor missing links in the story disclosed so far and to the solutions thereof,¹⁷⁸ and this in turn is meant to further enkindle the curiosity of the audience ! And hardly would the audience remember that the result of the mission entrusted by Vicitravīrya to Citralekhā to verify the identity of Gandharvadattā,¹⁷⁹ has already been disclosed to them long back !¹⁸⁰

The faint memories of Malayasundarī slightly stirred at the sight of the temple of Mahāvīra at Ratnakūṭa¹⁸¹ serve

-
176. TM(N), p.273, (1ff.):-- तत्रसीद पुनरादिश कदा भविष्यति मे
समगमो बन्धुभिः --। महाभगे यदा तवेयमायुष्मती दुहिता - इत्यादि किमप्यवादीत्।
177. ibid., p.274(5ff.): यदि सा सत्यमेव वत्सा गन्धर्वदत्ता ततः ---
अस्या एव मलयसुन्दर्या विजाहस्तमयोः प्रथमेव प्रकृतः स्तर्धयिता।
178. ibid., p.273(15-19).
179. ibid., p.274(3ff.).
180. see supra ft. nt. 172.
181. ibid., p.275(5ff.):-- दृष्टमिव पुरा, सेवितमिव भवान्तरे,
कारितमिवात्मना, परिमलितमिव सत्त्विकाले प्रदलोक्ष्य - प्रीतहृदसा, प्रासादम् --।

as a sort of dramatic irony, referring as it does to the fact that this temple was actually built by her in her previous birth as Priyāṃvadā.¹⁸² Similarly, the sight of the image of Mahāvīra arouses her longings regarding some beloved seen in past¹⁸³ and it serves as an advance suggestion about her being the beloved of Sumālī during her former birth as Priyāṃvadā.¹⁸⁴

The poet's consciousness as a narrator again comes to the surface when he assures us, through the words of Tāraka, that he has some plan ready up his sleeves to bring about the union of Samaraketu with Malayasundarī.¹⁸⁵

The poet is very much conscious, again, about the ingenious device of double-entendre based on meaning (arthasleṣa) employed in the invocation apparently addressed to the boat but actually meant for Malayasundarī,¹⁸⁶ that ~~she~~ he draws our attention to it four times,¹⁸⁷ and as if not satisfied with this much Dhanapāla cleverly brings out the various good qualities that went into, and the motives served by, the composition of the invocation.¹⁸⁸

182. TM(N), p.408(9-12).

183. *ibid.*, p.275(17ff.): आरूढगाढोत्कण्ठा स्मरन्तीव पूर्वसंस्मृतस्य कस्यचिदभीष्टजनस्य निर्निमित्तोदीर्घमन्युवेगकथितकुचयुगा ----।

184. *ibid.*, p.407(13-15).

185. *ibid.*, p.281(20ff.): यथा सामर्थ्यवस्तरेऽस्य यत्नमहमेव चिन्तयिष्यामि ----।

186. *ibid.*, pp.283-286.

187. *ibid.*, 286(18ff.): येनमभ्यर्ण आस्ते नौशतिस्स धारिण्यवनिपाल-नन्दनी स त्वदर्धे मयैत्थमभ्यर्षिता । ---- ; 287(11) नौप्रसादननिभेन प्रवर्तिता बहुलम् । ; 296(2ff.). नौस्तय छद्मना विधावतां (p.t.o.)

The dramatic irony is again utilized when Malayasundarī somewhat sharply tells the boy of the temple-priest that she would take to the principal jewel (also her beloved hero Samaraketu) when the latter happens to come to Kāñcī.¹⁸⁹ These same words have been repeated when Samaraketu relates his past experiences to Malayasundarī.¹⁹⁰

When Malayasundarī swoons on finding that the princesses accompanying her on the rampart of the temple at Ratnakūṭa have suddenly disappeared,¹⁹¹ the poet skillfully subordinates the incident of this disappearance to the effect of it on Malayasundarī whose subconscious yearnings are thereby revealed. The audience does not know for certain whether Malayasundarī was first made invisible to Samaraketu for a while,¹⁹² though even after that she was present there to witness the suicidal attempt of the love-lorn prince to drown himself, and she also followed ~~his~~ suit there and then soon after.¹⁹³ The poet seems to have deliberately kept certain facts uncleared in order to ~~have~~^{le-} have the audience guessing as is clear from the remarks of Malayasundarī.¹⁹⁴

189. TM(N), p.288(20-23).

190. *ibid.*, p.320(20-23).

191. *ibid.*, p.290(1-3).

192. *ibid.*, p.289(17ff.): - सहेव परिजनेन शु तव प्रणयिनी स्वशक्त्या
तिरोधाय पश्यत एव मे नीता कैश्चिदपि मायादिभिः ।

193. *ibid.*, pp.290-292.

194. *ibid.*, p.294(11ff.): अहं तु जातविस्मया --- etc.

Future incidents are indicated by means of dramatic irony suggesting the future marriage of Malayasundarī with Samaraketu,¹⁹⁵ and this serves to enhance our curiosity as to how the poet is going to manage this when he made both of these lovers drown themselves into the ocean.¹⁹⁶ The poet consciously indicates his future plan by assuring us, through the words of Bandhusundarī, that though drowned Samaraketu will be saved and he would set out in search of Malayasundarī.¹⁹⁷

The rationality of the poet is remarkably noteworthy when he brings the ~~hopeless~~ hopelessly desperate lovers, viz., Samaraketu and Malayasundarī, ^{very} ~~is~~ near to each other without their knowledge when the former has been passing his night alone in the temple of Cupid in the Kusumākara garden at Kāñcī,¹⁹⁸ while the latter reaches the door of the temple ^{and bows down to} and ~~gambles~~ the deity from outside lest somebody might notice her as she is out to commit suicide.¹⁹⁹

The poet is highly conscious of his plot-construction ~~is~~ in so far as he tries to carry his audience with him by recapitulating the past events as the narrative progresses from ⁱⁿ point to point. That is why ^{he} takes such an opportunity

 195. TM(N), p.295(8ff.): अवितादेशो अवितादेशो हि तत्रैवातार्यवसुशतः।
 न तत्रैवातार्यवसुशतः कदासिद्धि संवदति । etc.
 196. ibid., p.292(2-6). / 197. ibid., p.296(5ff.).
 198. ibid., p.324(13-14). / 199. ibid., p.305(16-17).

of summing up the incidents beginning with Malayasundarī's transportation to the temple at Ratnakūṭa and ending with the end of her unconsciousness consequent to the strangling during her attempt at suicide by hanging herself.²⁰⁰ Again, Dhanapāla draws our attention to certain missing links through the reflections of Malayasundarī²⁰¹ to enhance the suspense and indicate the course of future events yet to be narrated. Similarly, the recapitulation by the poet about the events after Malayasundarī's attempt at hanging herself²⁰² supplies the missing links in the narrative much in the manner of a veritable Viṣkaṁbhaka in a Sanskrit drama.

The use of identical situations in which the companion forcibly makes one of the lovers bow down to the other, as in the cases of Samaraketu and Malayasundarī²⁰³ would naturally tickle the audience. So would a ~~short~~ sort of a telepathic instinct of both the lovers to commit suicide²⁰⁵ create tragic interest in them. The recounting of past events through the answers of Samaraketu to the question of Malayasundarī, has also been used by the poet to bring ~~about~~ the narrative uptodate though he further keeps up the interest by leaving the problem of Samaraketu's rescue from the ocean unsolved.

200. TM(N), p.310(4-17). / 201. ibid., p.312(11-17).

202. ibid., p.314(8-12).

203. ibid., p.286(6ff.): इत्युदीर्य कन्धरा निहितपाणिस्तं मे नृपकुमारं
चरणयो रपातयत् ।

204. ibid., p.314(16ff.): इत्युदीर्य कन्धरा पृष्ठलुहि तपाणिः प्रथमदर्शनं
प्रथमदर्शनं त्रपाविकुञ्चित स्मितार्द्रं नयनतारकां लब्धं मां प्रणामप्रकारयत् ।

205. ibid., p.324(10-14).

The dramatic irony in the doubt expressed by Samaraketu as to his future union with Malayasundarī is meant to keep the audience guessing about the future hurdles that might be coming in the ^{path} ~~way~~ of their happy union, such as the transportation of Malayasundarī to the hermitage of Kulapati Śāntātapa and the night-attack by Samaraketu who is thereby captured alive by the forces of Vajrāyudha. The link in the path of their marriage is provided when Kusumasekhara comes to know how Samaraketu rescued hanging Malayasundarī in the garden.²⁰⁶

Dhanapāla may not be taxing our credulity a little too much when, in his anxiety to summarize the past events and point out a doubt,²⁰⁷ he expects us to believe that the crew sailing down below could listen to the remarks of Malayasundarī apparently addressed to the temple-priest boy. The poet certainly intends here to exploit the remarks fully for the purpose of drawing our attention to his ingenuity as to the clue provided well in advance to Samaraketu for tracing the whereabouts of the unknown beloved, viz., Malayasundarī. The purposefulness of this recapitulation is highly transparent in the remark with reference to the letter from the father of Samaraketu,²⁰⁸ the contents whereof are

206. TM(ND), p.318(21-22): -- पाशच्छेदविहितास्मत्प्राणरक्षे सिंहकेन्द्रे सुनौ
मसं वन्द्यबुद्धिभावजात् ।

207. *ibid.*, p.321(1-5). / 208. *ibid.*, p.321(19ff.).

connected with the incident of the siege of Kāñcī by Vajrā-yudha.²⁰⁹ It is now only that we gather the purpose of Vajrā-dha's episode, viz., to bring out the ~~manish~~ martial nature of Samaraketu and his love for Malayasundarī for whose sake he mounted the night-attack.²¹⁰ The incident is recollected again in the form of the news brought by a Brahmin at the Prasāntavairāśrama.²¹¹

The poet's minute care for gathering the threads of the narrative is evident when we notice how Gandharvadattā is made to know about her father Vicitravīrya, the Vidyādharma emperor, through Bandhusundarī when the latter reports to her how her daughter Malayasundarī tried to commit suicide.²¹²

Dhanapāla's skill is again evident when he cuts short the narrative on linking the threads of it and also echoes the curiosity of the audience about the part of the narrative now left untold.²¹³

The element of suspense is again introduced when Malayasundarī, who swooned on the sea-shore near Prasāntavairāśrama, suddenly found herself in a wooden aeroplane floating in the waters of the Adrṣṭapāra lake situated thousands of

209. TM(N), p.82ff.

210. *ibid.*, pp.325-326; also p.339(5-8): श्रुत्वात्यद्भुतमस्मदाजिललितं
वैतालिकेभ्यः प्रगे, प्रीतात्काश्चिनराधिपात्तव सखीं प्राप्यादरप्रार्थिताम् । कोठास्मीति

211. *ibid.*, p.331(15-20). / मनोरथः ... etc.

212. *ibid.*, p.327(1-3).

213. cf. *ibid.*, p.332(1-2): किमिति 'किमतः परं श्रोतव्यम्' इति चिन्ता-
यित्वा वधीरिततदारब्धवार्ता परिसमाप्तिः - - - ।

miles away from the hermitage.²¹⁴ The suspense is resolved when we know how Mahodara had angrily thrown the aeroplane there when he cursed Gandharvaka.²¹⁵ The event is intelligently exploited to recapitulate past events under the pretext of the reflections of Malayasundarī.²¹⁶

Scarcely do we remember that the letter, which Malayasundarī accidentally found tied to the skirt of her garment,²¹⁷ was the one that was handed over to Gandharvaka by Prince Harivāhana.²¹⁸ The mystery as to how it came to be tied to the skirt of Malayasundarī's garment is unveiled only when Gandharvaka relates about his curse.²¹⁹

The suspense as to why Gandharvaka could not return²²⁰ is resolved only when he discloses how while returning from the Suvēla mountain he happened to see unconscious Malayasundarī and how in a bid to search some medicinal herb to counter the effect of poison, he incurred the curse of Mahodara, and the aeroplane, with Malayasundarī lying unconscious in it, was thrown in the Aḍṛṣṭapāra lake.²²¹ The poet reminds the audience about this episode of Gandharvaka when Malayasundarī happens to meet Pattralekḥā.²²²

214. TM(N), pp.336-337.

215. *ibid.*, p.383(6ff.): -- इत्युदीर्य दत्तहुंकारः स्थानस्थ एव तद्विमानं कथंचित्तुक्षिप्य दूरमदृष्टपारे सरसि चक्षिपत् ।

216. *ibid.*, p.337(19ff)-338(3). / 217. *ibid.*, pp.338-339.

218. *ibid.*, p.173(4-8). / 219. *ibid.*, p.384(1-3).

220. *ibid.*, p.170(15ff.); 179(2). / 221. *ibid.*, pp.378-383.

222. *ibid.*, p.341(21ff.): -- केवलमिदं न जाने स गणधर्वको वसकः कामवस्थां प्राप्तः ।

The relation of Gandharvadattā with Citralekhā and also with Pattralekhā is disclosed²²³ when Citralekhā introduces Malayasundarī and summarizes the incident about the latter's transportation by the Vidyadharas.²²⁴ And the poet wants us to note that the account of Malayasundarī is ceaselessly tragic²²⁵ and is meant to illustrate the inexorability of the Law of Karma.²²⁶ The moral of the episode of the love-affair between Malayasundarī and Samaraketu has been skillfully put forth in so many words in the form of philosophical reflections of Harivāhana.²²⁷ While the poet has indicated that the process of reaping the consequences of evil deeds by Malayasundarī is now almost over,²²⁸ as a result of her worship at Siddhātayana and etc., we are still deliberately left in the dark as to what was that evil deed for which she was subjected to so much misery. It is later on disclosed in the form of Priāṅgusundarī's anxiety for Priyamvadā²²⁹ when the former entrusts the care of her temple to the Goddess Śrī.²³⁰

223. TM(N), p.342(9ff.): -- प्रियंवदायाः यथा सहोदरी ... गवधवदन्ता नाम मे स्वसा यवीयस्यासीत् --- etc.

224. *ibid.*, p.343(19ff.).

225. *ibid.*, p.345(21): -- अनवसानोद्वेगकारिणा चरितेन तस्याः ---।

226. *ibid.*, p.345(22ff.): अहो निरवधिप्रचारो विधिः । नास्त्यजोचरः ।

पुण्यकृतकर्मणाम् । अशक्यप्रतीकारा कृतान्तशक्तिः । अन्वयता गतिः । सर्वत्र भवितव्यतायाः ।

227. *ibid.*, p.346(1-18): इह हि संसारखङ्गनि --- etc.

228. *ibid.*, p.346(19-20): अन्तमुपगतः संप्रति प्रतिकूलचारी विषमयः स ते विषमदशविपाकः । सिद्धा शून्यासेदायत्नसेवा --- etc.

229. *ibid.*, p.410(11ff.): प्रियशुसुन्दरीत्वजातपतिरस्रगमाप्यनुत्पन्नविद्वेषा सखीविद्वेषसि किञ्चिदुत्पन्नोरतिररतिआग्निनी भविष्यति भवान्तरे पराकी स्तोत्रकालमिति मुहुर्मुहुः प्रियंवदां शोभयन्ती ---।

230. *ibid.*, pp.409-410.

The poet's conscious art is ~~again~~ again to be witnessed when, while summarizing the events about Samaraketu,²³¹ he attempts at enhancing the suspense by pointing out the incompatibility of the situation in view of the missing links.²³² It is more evident when Dhanapāla resumes the account of Harivāhana by changing the focus from one scene to another in order to bring the account upto date.²³³

A fresh element of suspense, with a seed of its solution, is introduced when Malayasundarī regrets that not even a bird is at her disposal to carry a message,²³⁴ and in response to that a parrot, speaking in human tongue, suddenly comes down from a nearby tree and carries the message away.²³⁵ The typically Jainistic rationality of Dhanapāla is seen when he slyly makes his parrot say "Pakṣī-rūpī nabhaścara'ham"²³⁶ in which the word 'nabhaścara' is a double-meaning one as an adjective meaning 'the one soaring in the sky', and a substantive meaning 'a Vidyādhara'. The categorical remark of Harivāhana as to the parrot's being somebody else than a mere bird,²³⁷ is also meant to rouse our curiosity which is allayed later on in the account of Gandharvaka.²³⁸

231. TM(N), p.346(23ff.).

232. *ibid.*, p.347(7-9): 'केवलम् 'अनासन्नदेशस्थेन कथमिहस्थितायास्तेन समागमो भवी भवत्याः' इत्येतदेवाविदितमास्ते ।

233/ cf. *ibid.*, p.348(4-10): केवलमिदं क्षिणोति चेतः... etc.

234. *ibid.*, p.348(15ff.): किं तु विधिवशादवसरेऽत्र पक्षिमानोऽपि निकटे नास्ति कश्चिन्नभक्षरो यस्तत्त्वदीयवृत्तान्तमावेदयेत् ।

235. *ibid.*, pp.348-349.

/ 236. *ibid.*, p.348(3).

237. *ibid.*, p.348(6ff.): नैष पक्षिमात्रः, विशिष्टजातिः कश्चिदयम् ।

238. *ibid.*, pp.383-385.

The casual alliterative ~~manasakāṅkṣā~~ remark, viz., "Kamala-guptasya guptena bhūtvā satvaramayaṃ prāpaṇīyo lekhaḥ"²³⁹ is meant to justify the incidents previously narrated as to how Kamalagupta had found the letter of Harivāhana almost from nowhere.²⁴⁰

The reason why Prince Harivāhana first saw fresh foot-prints and not the ladies,²⁴¹ is revealed when he describes how they ran away as the flying elephant crashed into the waters of the Adṛṣṭapāra lake.²⁴² The incident of Harivāhana's first meeting with Tilakamañjarī in the creeper-bower is repeated briefly from her point of view,²⁴³ the former detailed narration²⁴⁴ of it being from the prince's view point. The news about, and the narration of the cause of, love-sick condition of Tilakamañjarī²⁴⁵ arouses our curiosity especially in view of her aversion for males.²⁴⁶

The poet seizes an opportunity to summarize the events about Harivāhana in the form of his reflections in response to the tragic tale of Malayasundarī.²⁴⁷ Similarly, the consciousness of Dhanapāla as an artist is fully revealed when he recounts,²⁴⁸ of course in a quite different context, how Tilakamañjarī did not show even the common courtesy of

239. TM(N), p.349(15ff.). / 240. *ibid.*, p.194(4-6).
 241. *ibid.*, p.245(4-9).. / 242. *ibid.*, p.354(1-3).
 243. *ibid.*, p.354(10-22). / 244. *ibid.*, p.250ff.
 245. *ibid.*, p.352-355. / 246. *ibid.*, p.169(8-16).
 247. *ibid.*, p.346(8-16). / 248. *ibid.*, p.364(3-7).

speaking to him when he first happened to meet her in the creeper-bower.

A simple casual question from Mṛgāṅkalekhā as to whether Harivāhana could see the beauty of the city of Rathanūpuracakravāla, and his equally natural reply that it cannot be called 'seen' till he has the opportunity to see it leisurely and unobserved by anybody,²⁴⁹ is really meant to introduce the magic mantle later on, which inducts further element of suspense as Gandharvaka is relieved of the curse of becoming a parrot and resumes his own Vidyādhara form;²⁵⁰ it is resolved in Gandharvaka's narration about his having incurred the curse of Mahodara. Here, the return of Gandharvaka in the form a parrot²⁵¹ is introduced at a point when Harivāhana has only just arrived at Rathanūpuracakravāla. The message brought by Gandharvaka induces Harivāhana to return to Ayodhyā²⁵² and precipitates the rest of the events in the TM in a quick succession.

The importance of the magic mantle is consciously stressed by the poet in that it is said to be invisible and to be felt by touch only; and other divine qualities of the mantle, such as its power to make one invisible, etc., are

249. *ibid.*, p.366(19ff.): -- मृगाङ्गलेखा 'कुमार, वृष्टं नगरम्' इति
प्रद्युम्नमप्राप्तित्वा -- इति.

250. *ibid.*, p.376.

/ 251. *ibid.*, p.374(18ff.).

252. *ibid.*, p.385(12ff.).

also listed, the last one, viz., to rid one off a curse, being skillfully put at the end of the list.²⁵³ We are rather amused when the poet expresses through Harivāhana his satisfaction at the narrative purpose served by the magic mantle in the narrative,²⁵⁴ and skillfully utilizes it to introduce the tragic account of Gandharvaka²⁵⁵ as he now gathers the threads of the ~~the~~ narrative.

Dhanapāla is very particular about minor details. Thus, he informs us that Gandharvaka had ~~xxix~~ tied the message^s to the skirt of his upper garment²⁵⁶ before he set out for the Suvela mountain after meeting Harivāhana at Ayodhyā. The ~~xxx~~ strategic importance of this detail is realized when we are told by Gandharvaka how he spread his upper garment over the unconscious body of Malayasundarī,²⁵⁷ since it is now only that we know how Malayasundarī accidentally found the message tied to the skirt of her garment, and that the seeming accident was after all no accident at all !

The lamentation of Tarāṅgalekhā when Malayasundarī ate the poisonous fruit and swooned,²⁵⁸ is skillfully utilized

253. TM(N), p.376(2-17).

254. *ibid.*, p.377(17ff.): -- त्वत्प्रसादीकृतेन दिव्यपरस्त्वेन पुनरसंभावित-
स्त्रिं कुतोऽप्यानीय रक्षयता परमबन्धुकल्पनेन गणधर्वकमभिप्रेतार्थतोऽधिकं
सहित्येव मे संपादितप्रभिलक्षितम् -- ।

255. *ibid.*, pp.378-384.

256. *ibid.*, p.378(15): -- उत्तरीयाञ्चलनिबद्धनिष्कलसंमरकेतुलेखश्च ---- etc.

257. *ibid.*, p.380(13ff.): -- मिथ्या च प्रथीयता निजप्रावारेण सर्वाक्षोषु -- ।

258. *ibid.*, pp.334-337.

to attract the attention of Gandharvaka who was returning in an aeroplane from the Suvela mountain.²⁵⁹

Mahodara is again referred to as having assumed the form of a Vetāla²⁶⁰ in order to remind the audience about the identity of Mahodara, the Yakṣa attendant of the Goddess Śrī, and the Vetāla who tested the devotion of King Meghāvāhana. The missing links as to the rescue of Samaraketu (along with Tāraka) and Malayasundarī after they tried to drown themselves into the ocean, are supplied here by revealing that it was Mahodara who saved these desperate lovers and reached them to their respective places safely.²⁶¹ However, the little doubt lurks in our mind as to why Mahodara should have taken this trouble. This doubt is also removed when, in reponse to the request by Priyaṅgusundarī, the Goddess Śrī entrusts the task of guarding both the Jain temples, viz., the one built by Priyaṅgusundarī at Mount Ekaśṛṅga and the other by Priyaṃvadā at Ratnakūṭa island, to the care of Mahodara,²⁶² who therefore was naturally interested in averting the mishap in order to prevent the defilement of the ~~the~~ holy premises.

259. TM(N), p.378(16ff.).

260. *ibid.*, p.382(4): --- आविष्कृतवेतारुपरुः... ।

261. *ibid.*, p.382(11-17).

262. *ibid.*, p.410(9-11): भद्र, तस्य प्रियंवदाकारितस्यास्य च प्रियञ्जु-
सुन्दरीप्रासादस्य प्रतनुरव्यपास्ततद्देण अवता रक्षणीयः दुद्रलोकोपद्रवः... ।

The end of the curse of Mahodara to Gandharvaka is stipulated to be only by the grace - or gift ⁶ of the Goddess Śrī.²⁶³ It is noteworthy that the element of accident is not wholly irrational and is justified by Dhanapāla as in the case of Gandharvaka, who, remembering that he was a Vidyādhara,²⁶⁴ came down from the tree when Malayasundarī invoked the help of a bird or a Vidyādhara to carry a message of Harivāhana, who had asked him not to forget his acquaintance in times of need.²⁶⁵ It is here that the mystery of the parrot who carried the messages of Harivāhana and of Kamalagupta is revealed.²⁶⁶ The speech of Gandharvaka is skillfully utilized by the poet to recapitulate past events and show their interrelationship.²⁶⁷ A couple of missing links are also indicated in order to maintain the interest;²⁶⁸ though the solutions to these have been indirectly revealed long back.

The skill of the poet is again witnessed when we find that the contents of the letter sent by Kamalagupta as a reply²⁶⁹ are revealed only after Gandharvaka is rid of Mahodara's curse, and the message is further utilized for providing a reason for sending Harivāhana back to Ayodhyā in

263. TM(N), p.383(5ff.): न चिरदपि प्राक्तनी प्रकृतिमासादयिष्यसि
विनास्मत्स्वामिनी प्रसादम् -----

264. cf. ibid., p.385(22): पूर्वजैति स्मृतिस्तु तिर्यक्त्वेऽपि मे ^{कथयता} 9-12).

265. ibid., p.173(1-2); 384(9-10). / 266. ibid., p.384(2-16).

267. ibid., pp.384(2-16).

268. ibid., p.384(14ff.): केवलम् 'श्वं भर्तृदारिका मलयसुन्दरी पतितमात्रैव
तत्रादृष्टपारसरसि कथमेतद्विषयिकारा सञ्जाता, कथं च निर्निमित्तमेवाहं
प्राक्तनं पुरुषरूपभाषणः' इति न जानामि ।

269. ibid., pp.194-195.

search of Samaraketu.²⁷⁰ Malayasundarī's doubt about the identity of Samaraketu²⁷¹ is meant to rouse our curiosity to be allayed later on when the identity of him with Sumālī in his former birth²⁷² is disclosed.

The casual reference to the impending arrival of Hari-vāhana and his mastery of the Vidyās²⁷³ is intended to suggest the incidents to be narrated shortly, viz., the propitiation of the mystic Vidyās by him.²⁷⁴ The incident of the portrait of Tilakamañjarī,²⁷⁵ which was referred to in connection with the account of Gandharvaka,²⁷⁶ is again adduced to with reference to the love-lorn condition of Tilakamañjarī.²⁷⁷

The Candrātapa necklace and the Bālārūṇa ring are re-introduced in the narrative at the proper juncture towards the close of the narrative in the most natural manner²⁷⁸ already suggested long back.²⁷⁹ The recounting here of the events of the presentation of the necklace by Jvalanaprabha serves to remind the audience about the original thread of the narrative and prepares them for final revelation of the identities of the pairs of the lovers of past birth. The

270. TM(N), p.384(20ff.) - 385(20).

271. *ibid.*, p.385(6-9).

272. *ibid.*, pp.412-413.

273. *ibid.*, p.390(22):-- स्वप्नत्युपेयुषो निरवशेषविधापास्तदशिनः कुमारहस्तिवाहनस्य--।

274. *ibid.*, pp.398-401. / 275. *ibid.*, pp.161-173.

276. *ibid.*, pp.378(1-3):-- त्वमपि दुष्टा निर्विघ्ननिहितेक्षणेन दीर्घकालमस्य परमोपकारिणः प्रसन्नेन इत्युदीर्य पूर्ववृत्तं चित्रपरवृत्तान्तमावेदयम्।

277. *ibid.*, p.391(10-13). / 278. *ibid.*, p.395(8-10).

279. *ibid.*, p.60(13-23).

presentation of the necklace and the ring to Tilakamañjarī and Malayasundarī respectively by Harivāhana is also justified by the poet in a very convincing manner.²⁸⁰

The element of suspense is again introduced in the message from Tilakamañjarī after she is reminded of Jvalanaprabha at the sight of the necklace,²⁸¹ and generates desperation in Harivāhana,²⁸² thereby preparing him for propitiation of the Vidyās by rousing his sense of pity for Anaṅgarati by referring to how the latter was rendered homeless by his cousins who usurped his kingdom.²⁸³ The process of unfolding is skillfully utilized to further add to it by boxing the account of Vikramabāhu.²⁸⁴ Our curiosity is heightened by referring to some confirmation received by Vīrasena from the Munis on the Aṣṭāpada.²⁸⁵ The illusory aspect of the episode of Anaṅgarati is also revealed in so many words.²⁸⁶

The sad news about Tilakamañjarī and Malayasundarī brought by Gandharvaka²⁸⁷ is but an attempt by the poet to wind up the story by supplying the remaining links of the story, while at the same time sustaining the interest right upto the end. It is but a projection of past events²⁸⁸ utilized for

280. TM(N), p.395(21)-396(4). / 281. cf. *ibid.*, p.396(19ff.).
 282. *ibid.*, p.397(1-14). / 283. *ibid.*, p.398(4-5).
 284. *ibid.*, pp.401-402. / 285. *ibid.*, p.402(1-3).
 286. *ibid.*, p.402(7): - प्रयुक्तविधा प्रदर्शितं परस्परानुरक्तं देवतीकरण-वेष्टितम्...।
 287. *ibid.*, pp.404-418. / 288. *ibid.*, p.404(19ff.).

bringing the narrative uptodate by shifting the focus by means of boxing technique.

The suspense is completely resolved by the revelation of the riddle of past births by Maharṣi,²⁸⁹ whose identity with the Vidyādhara Muni introduced in the beginning of the prose-romance²⁹⁰ is but slightly and carefully indicated.²⁹¹

The poet's skill at sustaining the interest in the narrative right upto the last page of his novel is seen as we notice how he keeps the audience oscillating between hope and despair when just after the appearance ~~and~~ of some bad omens,²⁹² Sandīpana brings the sad news about the attempted suicide by Harivāhana and Tilakamañjarī's desperate resolve to follow suit.²⁹³ The element of accident in the timely arrival of Prakarṣa with a message from Cakrasena urging Tilakamañjarī to postpone her resolve of committing suicide for six months²⁹⁴ serves to enhance our curiosity, though the relevant events have already been described in detail only recently.²⁹⁵

The conscious art of Dhanapāla is again seen when he reminds the audience about the events right from the moment

289. TM(N), pp.406-413.

/ 290. *ibid.*, pp.23-25.

291. see *supra* ft. nt. 94.

/ 292. *ibid.*, p.413(19ff.).

293. *ibid.*, pp.415-416.

/ 294. *ibid.*, p.417.

295. *ibid.*, pp.398-402.

Tilakamanjarī saw the necklace to the last day of six monthly postponement of her resolve to commit suicide, and brings the suspense to a final end by using it as a means to rouse the memories of Harivāhana about his past birth.²⁹⁶ The poet again points out to the past events beginning with the question put by Samaraketu to Harivāhana and ending with his meeting the latter sitting with Tilakamanjarī, just before his ceremonial entrance into the Vidyādhara city called Gaganavallabha.²⁹⁷

Samaraketu's sorrow on listening to Harivāhana's account²⁹⁸ still leaves the audience curious. The curiosity is heightened when Malayasundarī is introduced to Samaraketu as a beloved of two births (janma-dvaya-praṇayinī)²⁹⁹ and Samaraketu refers to some injustice done by him³⁰⁰ to her without specifying what it was, also leaves us rather guessing, till we remember how, as Sumālī, he had fled to Nandīśvara-dvīpa to flirt with Svayamprabhā,³⁰¹ leaving Priyamvadā in the lurch.³⁰²

And lastly, the poet is quite a conscious artist when he poses the question about the possibility of Samaraketu

296. TM(N), p.418(18ff.): -- इति निवेदयति हार्यदर्शनात्प्रभृति पूर्ववृत्तं तिलक-
मञ्जरीवृत्तान्तमग्रातो विनयसर्वे गम्धर्वके स्तहस्रैव पूर्वजन्मानुभूतं सर्वमपि
गीर्वाणसदनावाससुसमस्मरम् ।

297. *ibid.*, p.420(8-10): -- इति निवेद्य विद्याधरगिरौ कुतूहलकृतप्रश्नस्य
समरकेतोर्वारणापहरतः प्रभृति पूर्ववृत्तमात्मीयवृत्तान्तम्: -- ।

298. *ibid.*, p.420(10-15). / 299. *ibid.*, p.421(15ff.).

300. *ibid.*, p.421(21ff.): अहं तु कृतविप्रियः प्रियंवदभावतः प्रभृति
तस्याश्चपत्या न शक्नोमि वीक्षितुं वदनम्: -- ।

301. *ibid.*, pp.40-41.

302. *ibid.*, p.407(14ff.): पूर्वमेव द्वीपान्तरविहारनिर्जतेन प्रेयसा विप्र-
सुक्या भर्तृसुहृदः सुमालिनाम्नो हृदयभूतया प्रियंवदभिधानया प्रधानदेव्या... ।

being known to Vicitravīrya and the former's being selected as a worthy match for Malayasundarī inspite of the objections of the relatives,³⁰³ and immediately proceeds to give the solution, with reference to the predictions by Vasurāta and Muni Mahayaśas.³⁰⁴

V : DELINEATION OF VARIOUS
SENTIMENTS (RASA) :-

In the opinion of Bhoja, says Krishna Caitanya,³⁰⁵ the whole composition considered as an organism demands that it should have one Rasa as its dominant mood. But this does not entail exclusiveness or monotony; for in the development of that one dominant sentiment throughout the composition, all the rich variety of human sentiments can be portrayed in a subtle orchestration which strengthens the focal sentiment in its supreme status,³⁰⁶ The sentiment may be of a very complex kind and can assimilate a conflict in a ~~dialectical~~ dialectical synthesis. And we should not take the ~~term~~ term Rasa only in its popular sense signifying the principal nine sentiments enumerated by the rhetoricians, but should also understand it in its etymological sense of poetic or aesthetic relish.

303. TM(N), pp.14-20. / 304. ibid.,p.263(2-10);273(3-19).

305. SP(K), p.189.

306. Srg.Pr.(Y),p.471: रसभावनिरन्तरत्वमित्यनेन रसग्रहणेनापि तत्कारण-
भूतानां भावानां परिग्रहे पृथग्भावग्रहणेन रसभावानां परस्परं कार्यकारण-
भावमभिदधद्रसैश्चो आना अवेर्था रसाः रसेश्चैव रसा इति नैरन्तरस्य
रसभावबहुत्वस्थान्यत्वेन भोजनस्यैवैकस्य प्रबन्धस्यापि वैरस्यभवाकरोति।

What, then, is the focal sentiment of Dhanapāla's prose-ronance ? There is no doubt that the poet himself seems to subscribe to the above-noted view of Bhoja as regards the dominant sentiment of the whole composition (prabandha-rasa), as is evident from his censure of poetic compositions devoid of a good story and a good sentiment.³⁰⁷ He has also alluded once to the sentiment of the 'frame of the story' (sarasatām kathā-panjarasya).³⁰⁸ In the introductory verses, Dhanapāla has specifically mentioned that the story is intended to have 'distinctly manifested Marvellous sentiment'.³⁰⁹ However, towards the end of the TM, he has indirectly referred to the total effect of excitement or poignancy (sam-vega).³¹⁰

The rhetoricians like Rudraṭa and Bhoja have insisted on having Srngara as the principal sentiment of full-fledged compositions like a Nāṭaka, an Ākhyāyikā and etc.³¹¹ On the other hand veteran Jain authors like Haribhadrasūri, Udyotanasūri and others, who regard Dharma-kathā as the only literary type worthy to be attempted by a devout Jain poet, also allowed, though as a second choice, a mixed type called Sankīrṇa-kathā, which deals with the acquisition of the three-fold Puruṣārthas on the part of the hero, and delineating

307. cf. TM(N), p.3, vs.18: सत्कथास्यवन्ध्येषु निबन्धेषु नियोजितः ।

नी-वेच्चिव भवन्त्यर्थः प्रथमो वैरस्यहेतवः ॥

308. ibid., p.161(19). / 309. ibid., p.7 vs.50d: -- स्फुराद्भुतस्या

310. (p.t.o.)

/ रञ्जिता कथेयम् ॥

Śānta-rasa. Dhanapāla, as a devout Jain, wanted to strike a middle path calculated, on the one hand, to conform to the demands of his faith and, on the other hand, to comply with the prescription of the rhetoricians and fall in line with the tradition of Bāṇa's Kadambarī. Thus, we find that though there is an undercurrent, throughout the story, of the tragic delineated in connection with the by-plot concerning Samaraketu and Malayasundarī, the dominant sentiment of the main plot of Harivāhana's love with Tilakamañjarī is Śṛṅgāra.

We shall now examine how Dhanapāla has succeeded in delineating this and other sentiments (rasas) in the course of his narrative.

(1) ŚṚṄĀRĀ-RASA or EROTIC SENTIMENT :

The Erotic sentiment enjoys predominance with Dhanapāla in the TM, in both its aspects of union of lovers (saṁyoga) and their separation (vipralambha). In accordance with the Sanskrit poetic and critical tradition, he depicts, as fundamental determinants (ālabana-vibhāva), the charm of female forms in the portrayals of Tilakamañjarī, Malayasundarī and others. The excitant determinants (uddīpana-vibhāva) which foster the Erotic sentiment are described in the bodily postures and gestures of his heroines. The consequents or external manifestations of feelings (anu-bhāva)

and the transitory or evanescent feelings (sancāri-bhāva) have been skillfully depicted in various amorous reactions of the lovers on appropriate occasions. To borrow the words of Dr. Dharmendra Kumar Gupta,³¹² the delineation develops the dominant emotion (sthāyi-bhāva) into the state of the erotic sentiment (Śṛṅgāra-rasa) with the help of the description of beautiful damsels as fundamental determinants, of physical and natural beauty as exciting phenomena, of their consequents and of feelings like desire, joy, anxiety, distraction and despair as accompanying emotions (bhāva).

It is noteworthy that Dhanapāla never condescends to indecency of situation or indelicacy of expression and his love-pictures are generally unearthly, and rarely sensuous. With Dhanapāla it is the mental plane of love which is more prominent than the physical one which, in his opinion, culminates in misery only. He depicts mainly 'Love at first sight' and works out its fulfilment with the help of divine agencies. The poet is very careful in eschewing obscenity, even a slightest tinge of it.

(a) SAMYOGA ŚRĪGĀRA :-

The love in union is graphically depicted in the course of the delineation of the love-sports of King Meghavāhana with his queens.³¹³ In this series of brief word-pictures the queens are the fundamental determinants (alambana-vibhāva).

312. CSDAHW, p.333.

/ 313. TM(N), pp.17-18.

The excitants (uddīpana-vibhāva) utilized by the poet are:

- (i) The jingling of ornaments of lovable damsels (kāminī-janābharāṇa-jhātkāra);
- (ii) vehement biting (of the lower lip (of the beloved) by one's fore-teeth (sarabhasa-daśaṅgra-daṁṣa);
- (iii) tightly catching hold of the hair of the braid (adaya-kaca-graha);
- (iv) dragging (ākarṣaṇa);
- (v) water-sport (jala-kriḍā);
- (vi) walking along the sport-hillock (kriḍā-girau bhāṣaṇam);
- (vii) (drawing) cosmetic designs on the surface of pitcher-like breasts of the beloveds (kāminī-kuca-kumbha-bhittiṣu pattraṅguli-kalpana);
- (viii) amorous gambling (kriḍā-dyūta);
- (ix) drinking of wine (kāpiśāyana-pāna);
- (x) creating mirth by imitating the make up and etc., of face (vadana-maṇḍanādibhiḥ viḍambana-prakāraiḥ hāṣaṇam);
- (xi) observing the beauty (depicted) in the portraits (citrapaṭa-rūpa-darśana); and
- (xii) catching hold of the under-garment (of queens) (jaghanāṁsuka-grahaṇa).

The consequents (anu-bhāva) depicted here are : perspiration (sveda), horripilation (romānca) and curling of eyebrows (bhrūbhaṅga). The dominant emotion (sthāyi-bhāva), viz., affection (rati) is indicated through various references to excellent postures of coition (utkr̥ṣṭa-karaṇa-prayoga), sprinkling of water by the queens, reconciliation of the beloveds and competition with the queens in fulfilling the yearnings (dohada) of plants in the harem gardens. The evanescent feelings (samcāri-bhāva) referred to are: excitement (āveśa), indignation (manyu), anguish (santāpa), jealousy (īrṣyā), affected anger in love-making (praṇaya-kopa) and perplexed smile (vailakṣyaśhāsa).

While describing how, on completion of his penance for propitiation of the Goddess Śrī, King Meghavāhana went to the harem, adorned Queen Madirāvati with his own hands, embraced her and passed his night with her, the poet exhibits his sense of decorum when he describes the incident very briefly thus ³¹⁴

दृष्ट्वा च विरतनिमेषया दृष्ट्या सुचिरमतिचारुणा तेन वेष-
ग्रहणेन तैश्च तत्कालमाविर्भूतैः प्रियप्रेमातिशयजन्मभिः स्मरविकारैर्द्विगुण-
तररम्यदर्शनां सुदृढमाश्लिष्य शयनीयमनयत् । तत्रैव च तया सह सुष्वाप ।

With the description of the physical features of Tilakamañjarī³¹⁵ whom Harivāhana happened to meet with for a while in the bower of Cardamom-creepers, Dhanapāla commences the depiction of Sañyoga-śṛṅgāra. The following poetic allusions serve as the fundamental determinants (ālambana-vibhāva):

(i) The ruddy nails of her feet were like the blades of Cupid's arrow dipped in the blood of a lover's heart;

(ii) her plump buttocks were like a couple of quivers full of Cupid's arrows;

(iii) her slender waist was like the shore of the ocean of amorous feelings in the form of her abdominal region;

(iv) her round full-grown breasts were like a pair of dice testifying to the victory of Cupid.

The consequent like the feeling of wonder (vismaya) is expressed beautifully in the following two verses:³¹⁶

ग्रहकवलनाद्, प्रष्टा लक्ष्मीः किमुदापतेरियं
 मथनवकितापक्रान्ता व्यैरुतामृतदेवता ।
 गिरिशनयनोदर्विदग्धान्मनोभवपादपा-
 द्विदितमथवा जाता सुभूरियं नवकन्दली ॥
 जानीथः श्रुतिशालिनो खलु युवामावां प्रकृत्यर्जुनी
 त्रैलोक्ये वपुरीदृगन्धयुवतैः संभाव्यते किं क्वचित् ।
 एतत्प्रष्टुमपास्तनीलनलिनश्रेणीविकासश्रिणी
 शक्येऽस्याः समुपागते मृगदृशः कण्ठान्तिक्तं लोचने ॥

315. TM(N), pp.246-247.

316. ibid., p.248(3-10).

Another instance of Saṁyoga-sr̥ṅgāra is provided by Dhanapāla when he describes³¹⁷ the effect of love at first sight in the case of both Samaraketu and Malayasundarī.

In the description of Samaraketu sailing in a boat, the following poetic allusions³¹⁸ to him commence the delineation of the Erotic sentiment:

- (i) अध्यासितमकरमिव यादसां नाथम् ;
- (ii) ईशाननयनानलादुपद्रुतमयुग्मेषुम् ;
- (iii) स्वरूपमिव रूपस्य ;
- (iv) लयनमिव लावण्यस्य ;

The feeling of amazement as expressed in her reflections, grows in the mind of Malayasundarī whose whole body is permeated with the passion as she observes Samaraketu. Various evanescent feelings (saṁcāri-bhāvas), such as bashfulness, shivering sensation, burning effect, heaviness of body, anger, loss of consciousness, and etc., are depicted by the poet in the following words:³¹⁹

ततोऽहं लज्जयानुरागेण च युगपदास्कन्दिता 'शीतलौ जलनिधिवैलानिलः' इति विमुक्तसीत्कारा मुहुः सहवरीमन्तरे कृत्वा, 'कर्कशो बालातपस्पर्शः' इति मुहुर्गच्छरीयाशुकैन्नननं स्थायित्वा, 'श्रान्तातिदीर्घसोपानपथलंघनेन' इत्यंगमारं शालशृंगोत्संगसंगिनं कृत्वा, कृतोपसर्पणं कृतसंलापं कृताकारिनिरीक्षणं कृतपरिहासं न केवलमात्मनस्तस्यापि तं निजसखीजनं प्रियमपि सरौजमीदामाणा ----- ।

317. TM(N), pp.276-279.

/ 318. ibid., p.276(6-18).

319. ibid., p.277(9-14).

The fundamental determinant, viz., love (rati) can be witnessed transforming itself into vividly acute longings in the form of mental union as described in the following passage:³²⁰

केवलं तस्यैव रूपावलोकने तस्यैवाक्यवपूष्णीतानिर्वर्णने तस्यैव यावनो-
द्भेदभव्यताभावे तस्यैव विक्रमक्रमनिभालने निलीनचिन्ता, दूरस्थिताप्य-
साधारणाप्रेमदर्शनोत्पन्नकारुण्येन केनाप्युत्तिदाप्य तत्समीपं गमितैव, तद-
मुजाश्लेषस्य भाजनीकृतेव, तत्संभोगसौख्यमनुभावितैव निष्पन्दसकलाक्यवा
स्यन्दमानानन्दजलविषृणा ----- ।

Similarly, the concurrent effect of passion on Samara-
ketu is graphically portrayed by means of various consequents
like trembling, yawning, choking of throat, etc., and the
excitant determinants, such as casting side glances, embra-
cing, kissing the face, biting the lower lip, bruising the
limbs with finger nails, beating limbs and etc., in the
following passage:³²¹

दर्शनादेव चासां ---- इतस्ततस्तरलकुटिलानदिपत्कटादान्, -----
उद्गतपुलकपद्भित्तिरुम्पत ----- सांगमंगमजृम्पत ---- सगद्गदस्वरः स्व-
कर्मसु कर्णधारानतत्त्वरत् । दर्शयितुमिव मे मुजाश्लेषलीलाम्, -----
चामर्ग्राहिणीं सहासमाश्लिषात् । प्रकाशयितुमिव वदनचुम्बनप्रपंचमीषदा-
मीलितदले लीलाम्बुजन्मनि प्रवालपाटलमधरपल्लवमजीघटत् । ॥ निवेदयितु-
मिव दन्तच्छेदच्छेदमनिमित्तमेवादाय नागवल्गिलशकलमग्रदशनसंदर्शने शनकौखण्डयत् ।

320. TM(N), p.277(16-21).

321. ibid., p.278(5-17).

कथयितुमिव नखच्छेदवेदग्ध्यमायतागुष्ठकरुहाग्रेण तरुणाकेतकगर्भपत्रम-
नतिदीर्घलैखालांक्षितोदरमकार्णीत् । प्रपंचयितुमिव ताडनक्रममकाण्ड-
दर्शिताश्लीलवेष्टां समासन्नसंवाहिकां सहासः कर्तलाग्रेण स्कन्धदेशे
पुनः पुनरवधीत् ।

Having described various gestures of Samaraketu calcu-
lated to conceal the effect of passion,³²² the poet proceeds
to portray a bewitching picture of Malayasundarī,³²³ as she
is being observed by her lover who could not check his glances
from falling on these limbs, thus :

प्रयत्नानीतधैर्योऽपि मुहुर्मम ----- पर्यस्तसान्द्रदशनदीधितावधरदन्त-
वाससि, मुहुरवप्रस्तकेशहस्तोन्मनाय साचिसंचारितवामकर्तलायाः प्रकट-
परिणाहे बाहुभूले, मुहुर्मुक्तसीत्कारायाः शिशिरनीरधिमरुन्निरोधाय
हागिति विन्ध्यस्तबाहुस्वस्तिके स्तनयुगोत्संगे, मुहुश्चटुलनेत्रकंचुकाग्रपल्लव-
प्रकाशितनाभिदेशायाः ----- सरोमालिनि मध्ये, मुहुस्तन्मुखापितदृशः
कृत्वान्तरे सहवरीं सयत्नमाबध्दपरिधानकदायाः सहासविघृतप्रसमानो-
च्चये कांचिधामनि, मुहुः सत्वरमितस्ततः प्रचलितायाः प्रतिवैलविघट-
मानवैलांचलदरदर्शितुतावूरुदेशे, दृष्टिमांपतन्तीं न वारयितुमशक्तम् ।

The mental union, effected when Malayasundarī throws
the garland into the neck of Samaraketu, is vividly descri-
bed

322. TM(N), p.278(19ff.).

323. *ibid.*, p.279(2-10).

thus : 324

अहमपि स्वहस्त्रचित्तविशेषका ----- आदाय वदनावलोकनव्याजेन
मणिदर्पणमन्तरितपार्श्वपरिजनदृष्टिपाता तिर्यकप्रवर्तितेन चक्षुणा
तस्य तत्काणोपजातद्विगुणसौभाग्यमंगलैखालावण्यमखिलमप्यपास्तशंका पुनः
पुनरपिबम् । अथ प्रीतिपुलकिततनुः स पृथ्वीपालतनयः स्तनकण्ठावलिम्बना
मत्करार्पितेन पुष्पदाम्ना तत्र दाणौ सादादवाप्तपाणिग्रहणमात्मानं
मन्यमानः ----- ३

The Saṃyoga-srṅgāra is, again, delineated artistically when Dhanapāla describes the feeling of joy as experienced by Malayasundarī³²⁵ as she lay in the lap of Samaraketu after he rescued her from her attempt at suicide. These are the words in which the poet depicts the pleasant effects of touch with a lover's body:

अवजितारविन्दगर्भैस्सर्साकुमार्येण मज्जगतमपि मुष्णता विरहदाहोष्मा-
णम्, आनयतेव सन्निपातनिद्रामिन्द्रियाणां, रचयतेव चन्दनद्रवेण चर्चा-
माचरणमन्तःकरणस्य, क्षिपतेव क्षीरसागरोदरे निरवशेषनक्यवान्,
परिणामयतेव शारदाज्योत्स्नारूपेण शरीरम्, स्कीकुर्व्वतेव प्रतिप्राणि-
स्थितानि सकलान्यपि त्रैलोक्यसुखानि निदर्शनैरनावेधहृद्यतास्वरूपेण, सार-
मिव सुधारसस्य सत्त्वमिव शंकरशिरःशशिकलायाशैत्यस्य सकलमादाय विधि-
नोत्पादितेन ----- परां स्वादुतामानीतेन ----- तस्य
सकलगात्रस्पर्शेन ----- सहसैव विह्वलतामगच्छम् ।

An interesting account of bashful Tilakamañjarī's play-fully

324. TM(N), p.289(5-11).

325. ibid., pp.312-313.

amorous gestures³²⁶ at the temple when she came to meet Hari-
vāhana depicts how the inner urge of a love-lorn girl finds
expression when bashfulness ties her tongue up. Thus, Dhana-
pāla describes how Tilakamañjarī, when she was sarcastically
reminded by Harivāhana of her rather discourteous lack of
response to him, went to the topmost storey of the nunnery
and tarried there for a long time embracing the ruby-pillars,
loudly reading erotic Subhāṣitas, drawing outlines of pairs
of Vidyādharas and birds engrossed in love-sports, encoura-
ging the peacock to dance to the rhythm of her claps, mock-
ing at Caturikā as she reported that the bed was ready, pe-
tting pearls at Viṣas engaged in glibly pacifying ~~ng~~ angered
beloved, taking off garlands from the necks of maid-servants
and putting them on into the necks of female bracket-figures,
curving with her finger her companion's forehead-marks stra-
ightened as they were dragged by their lovers, applied sandal
paste to her maid-servants' lower lips bitten by their lovers,
kissing her relatives' children with loud labial noise as
her cheeks touched their's, raised her hand in unnecessarily
adjusting her unloosened braid and exhibited her full-grown
breast in the process.

(b) VIPRALAMBHA ŚRĠGĀRA:-

Love in separation is generally depicted in two

situations by the poets, viz., (i) when the fresh lovers get love-sick due to their intense longing for meeting each other, in which case it is termed 'Pūrva-rāga' wherein 'separation' really means 'lack of an opportunity to get united' (ayoga); and (ii) when the lover goes abroad or deserts the beloved out of affection for another beloved, in which case it is the separation in its true sense, separation normally presupposes union. Dhanapāla has depicted the Vipralambha or Ayoga type of Śṛṅgāra in the course of the description of the effect of love-sickness of his heroes and heroines.

The 'Nīlirāga' sub-type of 'Purva-raga' type of Vipralambha-śṛṅgāra is delineated by the poet when Harivāhana happens to see the portrait of Tilakamañjarī. The poet here gradually describes the effect of the portrait on Harivāhana. Thus in the first stage the prince passes the whole day in observing the portrait alone in his bed-chamber; the portrayed beauty strikes him as spotless (anavadya) and extraordinary (rūpātisaya); he stops looking at it only when the advent of evening darkness prevents him from continuing the observation.³²⁷

This is an instance of 'love at first sight'. The portrait of Tilakamañjarī here serves as the fundamental determinant to create an attraction for her in the prince's heart

327. TM(N), p.173(16ff.).

by means of her physical beauty.³²⁸ The information that Tilakamañjarī had an innate aversion for males and that a human prince was destined to marry her,³²⁹ gradually enkindles his desire to acquire her in marriage.³³⁰ This is the stage called 'desire' (abhilāṣa).

The reflections of Harivāhana³³¹ on the state of his mind which takes himself to be the sure object of Tilakamañjarī's love and his being chosen as a match by her, depict his gradually intensifying longings as are revealed also in his inability to prevent his glances from repeatedly falling on her various limbs like feet, thighs, navel, full-grown breasts, lower lip, eyes and eyebrows, in order to allay his love fever. The love has taken deep roots when the 'prince confirms that none of the other beauties seen so far could attract his heart as could the portrayed beauty of Tilakamañjarī.³³²

The stage of 'anxiety' (cintā) is depicted when Harivāhana expresses it in so many words as to whether Gandharvaka would return,~~and~~ take his portrait to Tilakamañjarī, introduce him to her, and whether she too would fall in love and convey it through Gandharvaka.³³³

328. TM(N), p.174(22ff.).

/ 329. *ibid.*, p.169(8-22).

330. *ibid.*, p.175(6ff.).

/ 331. *ibid.*, p.176(7ff.).

332. *ibid.*, p.176(16ff.).

/ 333. *ibid.*, p.176(21ff.).

The uneasiness of Harivāhana is graphically described by the poet thus:³³⁴

इत्यनेकसंकल्पपर्याकुलचेतसः प्रबन्धवर्धमानाऽर्तेरनवर्तमुक्तायतोष्वा-
निःश्वासस्य मुहुर्मुहुः पर्यङ्कपरिवर्तेनैस्तरंगितोक्च्छुदपटस्य प्रभातागमन-
पर्युत्सुकताया प्रदोषेऽपि नष्टनिद्रस्य ----- शतयामेव कथमपि दापा-
विराममभजत ।

The advent of the rainy season serves as an excitant determinant (uddīpana-vibhāva) for intensifying the longings of the prince. The poet has, in this connection mentioned a few of the consequents like recollection (smarana), love-torment (raṇaraṇaka), burning sensation (dāha), anguish (ārtti) and incessant tears (asru-visaram ajasram).³³⁵

A description of the rainy season occasions the depiction of various treatments³³⁶ that could not be given to the prince in order to counter the pangs consequent to non-consummation of love. It enhances the effect of prince's love-lorn condition.

With the arrival of the Śarad season a number of evanescent feelings (saṁcāri-bhāvas), like the constant memory of the beloved (smṛti) extremely powerful mental excitement (atidārunāvega) and agitation (udvega) surge in the mind of the prince.³³⁷

334. TM(N), p.177(5-8). / 335. ibid., pp.179-180.

336. ibid., pp.180-181.

337. ibid., p.181(7ff.): .. तिलकमञ्जरी खंततरुअरणजन्मना विकलवीकृतो
गाढप्रतिदारुणा वेगेनो द्वेगेन ---।

The effect of love on Tilakamañjarī after she first went away from the creeper-bower on seeing Harivāhana is depicted by the poet in a few flourishes of her masterly pen, such as:³³⁸

~~सख्यं~~ असमञ्जसन्धस्तचर्णा तरुतलेष्वेकाकिनी ----- परिभ्रमति
----- किमपि काम्यं ----- अन्वेषयति ----- सर्वदा शयनतल्लगता
----- मन्दमध्यमभिनन्दितदिव्यरसपानभोजना ----- ।

Similarly, in a brief account of how Tilakamañjarī passed her days of separation after Harivāhana returned to Ayodhyā,³³⁹ Dhanapāla gives a vivid picture of love in separation.

(2) VĪRA RASA or THE HEROIC SENTIMENT :-

Dhanapāla delineates the Heroic sentiment in all its four varieties, viz., Yuddha-vīra, Dāna-vīra, Dayā-vīra, Dharma-vīra.

(a) The Heroic sentiment as expressed in the warrior-like qualities of the hero (Yuddha-vīra) has been delineated by Dhanapāla in the course of Vijayavega's report about the night-attack by Samaraketu on the forces of Vajrāyudha who had besieged Kāncī. Both Vajrāyudha and Samaraketu, the commanders of the rival armies, are the fundamental determinants of the Heroic sentiment here, Having indirectly given

338. TM(N), p.355(1-17).

339. ihid., p.391(1-8).

out the reason why Vajrāyudha marched against King Kusuma-
śekhara of Kāñcī,⁴⁰⁰ the poet draws a picture of the precau-
tionary measures undertaken by the latter who shut himself
securely in his fort and began to solicit reinforcements
from the neighbouring princes.⁴⁰¹ This description expands
the fundamental determinant, and serves as the background
of the night-attack, by describing how the besieging forces
daily clashed with the rival forces protecting, and fighting
from inside, the fort.⁴⁰² This background is beautifully su-
mmed up by the poet in the following words:⁴⁰³

भयानकानि च कुतूहलकराणि च क्रोधजनकानि च हासावहानि च
विनोदभूतानि च ~~दिव्यदृश्यानि~~ निर्वेददायीनि च प्रतिदिनमायोधना-
न्यमवन् । एवं च कांचीग्रहणार्दणविधावधिरूढगाढाभिनिवेश्योर्भिनवे
ददम्पतिकर्पल्लव्योरिव तयोः क्वियानप्यतिपपात कालः ।

A brief picture of the normal routines in the camp, such as the change of guarding duties, gaiety of the festival of Cupid and the relaxing commander listening to the songs of women,⁴⁰⁴ during the midnight hours skillfully provides an atmosphere of carefreeness and peace calculated to enhance by contrast the effect of surprise and suddenness of the night-attack by Samaraketu.

400. TM(N), p.82(7ff.): ... चरणतलमृदित भुजकला वलिप्त भूपालशिरःशेखरं
कुसुमशेखरनामान मवनिपाल मुन्मूलयितु काप्रः ... काञ्चि मण्डलाभिमुख मन्वत् ।

401. *ibid.*, p.82(12-23).

/ 402. *ibid.*, p.83(3-18).

403. *ibid.*, p.83(16-20).

/ 404. *ibid.*, pp.83(20)-84(9).

The sudden hullabaloo created by the war-music, and the shouts of military officers ordering the soldiers to quickly get ready for the fight, the arrival of Kacaraka and Kāndarāta with the intelligence report about the exit of an attacking contingent from the fort of Kāncī and Vajrāyudha's preparations to meet the attacking forces half-way⁴⁰⁵ serve as the excitant determinants. So do the following details in the description of the physical clash of the rival forces.⁴⁰⁶ The following phrases⁴⁰⁷ in the description impart graphic tinges and develop the picture of a battle:

--- युगपदेकीभूतोदारवारिराशिरञ्जलविसर्वाणिघनपदातिघोरौ, मुदित-
योगिनीमृग्यमाणलोकपालकपालवणकः --- निपीतनर्वशाविस्वरविसारि-
शिवाफेत्कारडामरः --- सोत्कापात इव निशितप्रासवृष्टिभिः, सनिघातपात-
इव गदाप्रहारैः, --- सोत्पातरविमण्डल इव क्रीलालितकरालनाराचमुक्तिभिः,
सवेधुतस्फूर्ज इव जवापतज्ज्वलितशक्तिभिः ~~सर्व~~ महाप्रलयसन्निभः --- अजायत / समरसघट्टः ।
408

The references to the following details enhance the atmosphere further:

--- इभपत्नीनां बृंहितेन --- वाजिनां ह्रीषितेन --- स्यन्दनानां चित्कृ-
तेन --- चाप्यष्टीनां टंकृतेन --- रथकेतनानां कटुत्कारेण --- नाराचानां
सूत्कारेण --- रुधिरापगानां घूत्कारेण --- समरभेरिणां मांकारेण ---
साक्रन्दमिव, साट्टहासमिव, सास्फोटनैवमिव ब्रह्माण्डमभवत् ।

A few evanescent feelings like anger, cruelty, enmity,

405. TM(N), pp.84-86.

/ 406. *ibid.*, pp.86-87.

407. *ibid.*, p.87(3-12).

/ 408. *ibid.*, p.87(13-21).

deceitfulness and violence are skillfully mentioned by the poet thus: ⁴⁰⁹

--- अमर्षमय इव क्रौर्यमय इव वैरमय इव व्याजमय इव हिसामय इव
विमाव्यमाने जगति ----- ।

The ~~innate~~ atmosphere of excitement reaches the climax when the rival commanders come ~~in~~ face to face with each other. The innate primary feeling (sthāyi-bhāva) of enthusiasm (utsāha) is exhibited in the energetic challenges exchanged by Vajrāyudha and Samaraketu. ⁴¹⁰

The mention of the consequents like horripilation (romāñca), anger (kopa) and throbbing of the eye-brows ⁴¹¹ bring out the vivid picture of Vajrāyudha in this connection.

A brief picturesque reference to the Goddess-of-Victory uneasily shifting her seat from Vajrāyudha's shoulder to his bow, to the edge of his sword, to the parasol and Cāmaras, intensifies the feeling of uncertainty of his victory as he is gradually being overpowered by the irresistible onslaught of Samaraketu. ⁴¹²

(b) The Heroic sentiment as expressed in the generosity (Dāna-vīra) is illustrated in the generously heroic determination with which Harivāhana undertook the mystic penance on behalf of the Vidyādhara youth named Anaṅgarati in

409. TM(N), p.88(12-13).

411. *ibid.*, p.89(5-9).

/ 410. *ibid.*, pp.88-89.

/ 412. *ibid.*, p.91(1-4).

order to rehabilitate the latter in his ancestral kingdom.⁴¹³

(c) The Heroic sentiment as expressed in the merciful nature (Dayā-vīra) is depicted in connection with Harivāhana's mercy on wild beasts of prey during his stay in the Prāgyotisa region where he participated in the hunting expeditions but instead of killing the beasts he amused himself by only teasing them in various ways.⁴¹⁴

(d) The Heroic sentiment as expressed in the religious fervour (Dharma-vīra) is exemplified in the enthusiasm of god Jvalanaprabha who enlightened his friend Sumāli as to the Right Path and accumulated profuse merit for himself.⁴¹⁵

(3) KARUṆA-RASA or THE PATHETIC SENTIMENT :-

Dhanapāla's skill in delineation of the pathetic sentiment is witnessed in the effective development of the tragic atmosphere in various contexts in the TM, such as, the sack of the celestial city of Rativīsālā, sorrow of Samaraketu and his companions consequent to the disappearance of the mad elephant with Prince Harivāhana, Bandhusundarī's lament as Malayasundarī tried to commit suicide by hanging herself, and such other situations.

A graphic picture of the sack of the celestial city of Rativīsālā⁴¹⁶ portending the fall of god Sumālī from the

413. TM(N), pp.397-402.

/ 414. *ibid.*, pp.183(2-16).

415. *ibid.*, pp.411-412.

/ 416. *ibid.*, pp.40-41.

heaven, serves to highlight the transitory nature of worldly pleasures. The following references⁴¹⁷ make the outlines of the picture stand out as in a relief:

--- चिन्ताक्सिंस्थुलगृहस्थगीर्वाणपरिहृतनिजनिजव्यापारा गलितगर्व-
गन्धर्वशिथिलितगीतगोष्ठीस्वरविचारा --- पानकैलिनिरपेदायदाशून्यीकृतो-
पवनतरु षण्डलतामण्डपा, नष्टहर्षकिंपुरु षनिर्मत्स्यमानपरिरम्भणायात-
वत्समतरुणगिणा --- तत्क्षणास्तानकल्पपादपा --- प्रतिमन्दिरमाकर्ष्य-
मानश्रवणदुष्टहाकष्टशब्दा ---- (नगरी) ।

The sorrowful condition of Samaraketu⁴¹⁸ as his forces fail to trace the whereabouts of Prince Harivāhana after the latter was kidnapped by the mad elephant,⁴¹⁹ is heightened in gradual stages leading to Samaraketu's resolve to make an end of his life by entering fire. The poet begins with a description of anxious Samaraketu, thus:⁴²⁰

वृत्तिमात्रमल्पीभूतभूपात्मजपुनर्दर्शनाशश्च प्रेर्यमाणोऽपि वारंवारमनि-
पतिभिराग्रहेण नाहारमग्राहीत् । गृहीतगाढचिन्तामानश्च दृढसमाधिस्थ
इव लक्ष्यमाणः प्रतिदाणादिप्लतप्तायतश्वासपिशुनितसमाधिर्देवतास्मरण-
वन्ध्यां सन्ध्यामत्यवाह्यत् । तरुतलप्रसारिते च तुरगपृष्ठास्तरणचूर्मणि
निषण्णो विषण्णेनान्तरात्मना चिन्तयन्कुमारमुदीक्ष्य तानि तानिष्टानि
कथंचिदपि तामनेककल्पायतैकैक्यामां त्रियामामनयत् । --- अस्तपर्यस्तमण्डले
च कमलबन्धो ~~वदनिर्वेदः~~ बद्धनिर्वेदः कथंचिदागत्य वसतिस्थानमधिकमस्वस्थ-
चेताश्चिन्तामयीमिव प्रबलदत्ताहवेदनावेगदुःसहां सहासन्नवनदीर्घिकाचक्रवाल-
मिथुनैर्निशीथिनीमनयत् ।

417. TM(N), p.41(1-8).

/ 418. *ibid.*, pp.188-191.

419. *ibid.*, pp.186-187.

/ 420. *ibid.*, pp.188(2-17).

As the dejected pursuers returned with the messages of unfulfilled mission, the gloom darkened, thus:⁴²¹

इत्यभिधाय बाष्पजललवानघोमुखाः ससृजुः । युवराजस्तु तदकाण्डकुलिश-
पाशपातप्रस्थमाकर्ण्य तेषां वचनमक्रमापचितेन पूरितः परमशोकैः - 'भद्राः,
किमद्यापि कथयिष्यथ । श्रुतं श्रोतव्यम् । उपसंहरत वार्ताम् ॥ अतः परमशक्तः
श्रोतुमस्मि ' इत्युदीर्यीवच्छाद्य च त्वरितमुत्तरीयवाससा सोचमांगमंगं - 'हा
सर्वगुणानिधे, हा बुधजनैकवत्सल, हा प्रजाबन्धो, हा समस्तकलाकुशल, कोसले-
न्द्रकुलवृद्ध, हरिवाहन, कदा द्रष्टव्योऽसि ' इति विलपन्नेव मीलितेदाणः
दाणोनेव निकटोपविष्टस्य सहस्राहिणो जगाम पर्यस्तविग्रहस्तिर्यगुत्संगम् ।
अत्रान्तरे निरन्तरोदितरुदितरक्सभेदमेदुरो दारयन्निव दयालुहृदयानि
रादोरन्ध्रमाचस्कन्द दारुणो राजवृन्दस्याक्रन्दः ।

The climax is reached when Samaraketu decides to commit suicide and, bidding farewell to his companions, proceeds to enter the funeral pyre, thus:⁴²²

'मुञ्चत च सर्वात्मना मय्यपेक्षाम् । अहं हि प्रथमदर्शनं स्व देवेन मृत्युतां
कुमारस्य नीतः । न तद्विरहेन मया दाणामपीह स्थातव्यम् । न च प्रवर्षितेन
प्रदेशादितः पदमपि प्रतीपं गन्तव्यम् । तदनुजानीत मां जीवितपरित्यागाय
यावदद्यापि न शृणोमि कुमारस्य चरमवार्ताम् । यावच्चैष चिरदर्शनोत्कण्ठि-
तो न मे मार्गमवलोकयति तावत्त्वरितं स्व लोकान्तरगतं तमनुगच्छामि ' इत्यु-
दीर्य चिन्तितचिताप्रवेशश्चरणोत्पदोपसमकालमुत्थितेन व्योमविवरव्यापिना
शिविरलोकाक्रन्दकलकलेन सूचितक्रमः शैलनिम्नगापुलिनमुद्दिश्योदचलत् ।

The tragic effect is more touching and pronounced when Malayasundarī resolves to hang herself to death after her maid-servant Kātyāyanikā informed her that she was to be given away in marriage to Vajrāyudha as a price of military piece.⁴²³

The touching atmosphere gathers as Malayasundarī goes to meet her parents presumably for the ~~last~~ last time, as described in the following words:⁴²⁴

अभ्यर्च्य परमया भक्त्या भगवन्तं प्रद्युम्नं ---- जनकं द्रष्टुमत्रजम् । स्थित्वा
च तत्पादमूले मुहूर्तमुत्थिता पुनरलभ्यदर्शनमस्य वदनं पुनः पुनरवलोक्यन्ती प्रयत्न-
स्तम्भिताश्रुम्बाभवनमगमम् । तत्र च --- वारंवारमाकारिता जनन्या भुक्त्वा
तया सा ध्वमैकभाजने भाविततद्गिरहदुःखदाबमानमानसा ~~विषमया~~ विषमया निव
कतिचिदन्मकवलान्कृतोपस्पर्शना च स्वसंवर्धितानेकबालवृद्धाकाकुलं गृहोद्यानमगच्छम् ।

The tragic in the situation gets dense as Malayasundarī bids farewell to her dear Asoka tree, lotus-pond and birds:⁴²⁵

'तात रक्ताशोक, लोकान्तरगतपि स्मरंश्यास्मि । कमलदीर्घिके, दीर्घकालं
क्लेशमनुभावितासि निर्घृणया निदाघमज्जनेषु । सखे शिखण्डिन्, अस्तं गता
ते हस्ततालताण्डवक्रीडा । वत्स कलहंस, निरुत्सवस्तै गमिष्यति मानसागमन-
दिवसः । मा कृथाः कोकमिथुनक, मद्भियोगे शोकम् । जात शुकपोत, मा तानि
विस्मरिष्यसि मत्सुभाषितानि' इति भाषमाणा --- स्वनिवासमागमम् ।

A vivid picture of Malayasundarī suspecting the arrival of somebody in her pursuit, as she rushed to the harem

423. TM(N), pp.298-299.

424. *ibid.*, p.301(4-14).

425. *ibid.*, p.301(~~4-14~~20ff.).

garden in a bid to hang herself enhances the effect.⁴²⁶ So does the description of Malayasundarī tightening her clothes and braid, preparatory to hanging herself, so that people may not be ashamed to find her in an unseemly condition, and praying to Cupid with a craving to be united with Samaraketu in the next birth.⁴²⁷

The realistic depiction of the experience of Malayasundarī hanging in the noose before life ebbed out of her⁴²⁸ serves the purpose of an excellent excitant determinant. The lamentation of Bandhusundarī⁴²⁹ who helplessly sees the noose gradually tightening~~ing~~ around Malayasundarī's neck and her limbs gradually succumbing to the ebbing consciousness is a masterpiece.

The tragic effect touches a high water-mark when Malayasundarī prevents Bandhusundarī, with a gesture, from trying to rescue her;⁴³⁰ the poet here draws an intensely touching picture of weeping Bandhusundarī in the following words:

दृष्ट्वा च तां तथाविधावस्थामुपस्थिता --- अखिलैरपि त्रैलोक्यवसिभिर-
सौख्यैः शतमुखीभूतदुःखवेगां विगलितोष्णाबाष्पपटलविप्लावितमुखीं कृतप्रयत्ना-
पि दृढमतिगाढपाशग्रन्थिपीडितगलत्वादपारयन्ती वक्तुमुत्तिष्ठत्य किञ्चित्प्रव-
लितेन पाणिना दक्षिणोत्तरेण रुदतीं तां न्यवारयम् । सा तु तेन प्रचलता
मत्कर्तलेन तालवृन्तेनेव प्रबलसंदीपितशोकपावका 'मर्तृदारिके, विरम । किं

426. TM(N), p. 303(6-16).

/ 427. *ibid.*, p.306(1-15).

428. *ibid.*, pp.306-307.

/ 429. *ibid.*, p.308.

430. *ibid.*, p.309(1-11).

वारयसि दैवैनेव वारिता । विरताहमथ प्रभृति रोदनात् । अनाकुला
 प्रसाध्य स्वाभिप्रेतमर्थम् । अस्मद्विधे बाह्यपरिजनेऽथापि कः प्रतिबन्धः
 इति रोषदिवोदीर्यं द्विगुणमापूर्यमाणबाष्परुध्दगलनिर्यदागदगदादार-
 मुन्मुक्तगुरुतराक्रन्दा दूरमुत्तिद्यात्प्योत्तिद्याथ पातितेन निर्दयाघातविघटितं
 गुलीकिसलयगलद्विधिरशीकरेण करयुगलेन युगपदुत्तमांगमुरस्तटं च ताडनत्रुटितहार-
 मुक्तमुक्ताफलासारसंवर्द्धिताशुबिन्दुविसरमनवर्तमाजध्मे ।

The lamentation of Malayasundarī⁴³¹ when she heard the news about the tragic defeat of Samaraketu and his being captured alive by the inimical forces, is not so touching when compared to a similar lamentation of Tilakamañjarī, who, having heard the unbearable news about Harivāhana's possible suicide, addressed a devoutly pathetic prayer to Lord Jina Rṣabha, bade farewell to her friends for good and proceeded to drown herself into the waters of the Adrṣṭapāra lake. The tragic touch is thus given by the poet:⁴³²

∴ अनणुवक्रपाषाणपरुषहृदयस्य दुर्विदग्धबुधैरनेकदुःसहदुःखसंभारभाजनस्य
 भगवन्, भव जनस्यास्य जन्मान्तरे शरणम्, इत्यभिधाय बाष्पायमाणानयन-
 युगला प्रत्येकमापृच्छ्य परिवारलोकमच्छिन्नरोदनोच्छ्वन्नघट्टुणा परिहृतसुहृदबन्धु-
 शिशुजनेन शोकविद्राणामलिनमुखरुचा मलयसुन्दरीप्रमुखेन सहिता प्रियसखीसार्थेन
 प्रतिपन्नमरणाप्रसाधनेन च प्रणयिना पण्यनारीगणोनान्धेन च प्रगुणमनसा गुणा-
 नुरक्तेन बाह्यपरिजनेनानुगम्यमाना गुरुतराक्रन्दनिष्यन्दमनुपदमग्रतोमूय कृतवारणा
 नुबन्धमवधूय सर्व्वतो गृहीतवाक्यं राजलोकमायतनमण्डपान्निरक्रामत् ॥ १ ॥

The tragic touches are, moreover, found in a few other situations, such as, Vicitravīrya's dialogue with Malayasundarī⁴³⁴ and the sorrow of King Kusumasekhara as he came to know about the attempt at suicide by his only daughter Malayasundarī.⁴³⁵ An admixture of the Pathetic sentiment with the Heroic, the Tranquil and the Miraculous one has been successfully depicted in the incidents beginning with Gan-
~~dhara's report about the effect of the~~ dharvaka's report about the effect of the necklace on Tilakamañjarī, and Harivāhana's arrival at the temple where she was undergoing treatment for love-sickness.⁴³⁶

(4) HĀSYA RASA or THE HUMOUR :-

As compared to most other classical Sanskrit poets like Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Śudraka, Daṇḍin and Bāṇa, Dhanapāla has a serious bent of mind though not too serious like Bhāravi or Bhavabhūti. From the very idealistic nature of the theme of the TM, and there being no scope for the traditional role of a clown (vidūṣaka) or a king's son-in-law (rāṣṭrīya) in prose romances, the Comic sentiment is but sparsely delineated. Even then, as in Bāṇa, the Comic developed by Dhanapāla is subtle, refined and conscious, and at times it is blended with a tinge of the Erotic and even the Tragic too. His humour is sometimes based on wit, sometimes on mild

434. TM(N), p.271(20ff.)-272(6). ॐ

435. ibid., p.328(15)-329(3).

436. ibid., pp.396-419.

satire and sometimes on incongruity.

Humour in wit and jest is found when King Meghavāhana deliberately teases Queen Madirāvati as he assures the Vidyādhara Muni that he need not ask the queen to observe abstinence since he would send her away to a forest so that there would not be any scope for interference from her nor would his worship schedule be interrupted !⁴³⁷

Dhanapāla's sense of subtle humour with a tinge of irony or mild satire is beautifully represented in the reply of King Meghavāhana to the Vetāla who claimed first preference in the matter of being offered obeisance by the king, who in his turn directs with dignity a few ~~sallys~~ sallys as follows:⁴³⁸

सर्वमुपपन्नमभिहितम्, । उपदिष्टमखिलष्टया युक्त्या । प्रबोधिता
क्यम्, । यथा निदर्शितः सूक्ष्मदर्शिना तथैवैष सेवामार्गः । परिग्रहजने संनिधौ
सति कोऽधिकारः प्रमूणामग्रपूजायाम्, । महती मूढता । गाढमविवेकविलसि-
तम्, । अप्रतिविधेया वैधतेयम्, । यदस्माभिः सर्वसैव्यगुणसंपदुपेतं भवन्तमप-
हाय प्रमादादिदोषोपहतचित्तवृत्तिभिरियमग्रत स्व देवता सेवितुमुपक्रान्ता ।
कृतश्च पूजाविघ्नकारणो न कियानप्यबहुमानः ।

Humour in jest and jocular verbosity is illustrated when Kamalagupta tries to humour Samaraketu⁴³⁹ who unexpectedly collapses into despondency as Harivahana reveals the significance of the unidentified love-letter found by Mañjiraka in

437. TM(N); p.32(20-23).

438. ibid., p.50(5-11).

439. ibid., pp.111-113.

the Mattakokila garden. The comic intention of Kamalagupta is evident when the poet consciously reveals it thus:⁴⁴⁰

--- प्रकृतिप्रगल्भवाक्किमपि कौविदः परिहासकैलिषु कमलगुप्तनामा
कलिगदेशाधीशसूनुः शनैर्विहस्यावोचत् ।

Dhanapāla has also tried his hand at humour based on incongruity of psychological situation. We have a fine example of this type in Harivāhana's reflections consequent to his having seen the portrait of Tilakamañjarī. He wonders how his mind is repeatedly attracted to different limbs of Tilakamañjarī while it should have been concentrated on the path of emancipation ! The psychological paradox is well brought out by the poet in the following passage ⁴⁴¹

असौ पुनरपरा विहम्बना यदयमात्मा मदनदाहोपशमाय प्रशममार्ग-
मवतारितोऽप्यधोगतिं रागिणस्तदप्रियुगलस्यालोचयति, न प्राणिजात-
स्य । कदलीस्तम्भतुल्यतां तदूरुपरिणाहस्य विमृशति न देहनिःसारतायाः ।
हृदयवासिभिः संगो ~~दुःखहेतुरित्यल~~ ~~व्यविवरं~~ तत्पयोधरद्वन्द्वमवधारयति
न कलत्रपुत्रादिवर्गम् । मध्यस्थां तन्नाभिमुद्रामभिनन्दति न भावनाम् ।
मधुरं मुखे तदधरप्रवालं ध्यायति न भोगसौख्यम् । युगान्तविलुलितदरि-
सागरसमं तदधिनिविस्तारमुत्प्रेजाते न संसारम् । आरोपितानंगवापभंगुरं
तद्भूलताललितमथ्येति न विधेर्विलसितम् ।

Dhanapāla's consciousness about the quality of humour is evinced when he specifically refers to the coarse humour generated by ordinary unrefined people who take pleasure in

440. TM(N), p. ~~111~~ 111(9-11). / 441. *ibid.*, p. 176(7-15).

teasing animals in various ways.⁴⁴² But that type of comic entertainment indulged in by Prince Harivāhana in preference to killing wild animals in hunting, and in order to forget the pangs of separation from his beloved.

Another instance of humour based on incongruity is met with in the description of the villagers lining up the path of Samaraketu's expeditionary procession bound for the naval port from which the naval expedition was to be launched. This incongruity is, of course, from the point of view only of the city-dwellers like Dhanapāla and the elite of Bhoja's court. The humorous touches enliven the picture by bringing out the peculiarities of village life, thus ⁴⁴³

अथाग्रेसराश्ववारदर्शनदुमितैः 'कटकमागच्छति' इति जनर्वादुपलभ्योपलभ्य
सर्वतः प्रधावितैः --- अवकारकूटकैष्वधिरूढैः --- पादपस्कन्धेषु बध्दासनैः ---
सर्वत्र सकुतूहलैरपि सविशेषं करिषु क्रमैलकेषु च प्रहितदृष्टिभिः, प्रमाणरूपबलो-
पवयशालिनां प्रत्येकमद्बुहां मूल्यमुद्धृत्यभिः --- करणुकाधिरूढं दुद्रगणिका-
गणमप्यन्तःपुरमिति, घृतोष्णावारणं चारणमपि महाराजपुत्र इति --- दुर्दा-
न्तवाजिवृषभोत्प्लवनेषु व्यालदन्तिकेगोपसर्पिणेषु च स्खलतः पततः पलायमाना-
नवलोक्यावलोक्य समकालकृतकलकलैः सतालशब्दमुच्चैस्तरां हसद्भिः ~~हसद्भिः~~ ग्रामेयकैः ---

Humour with a tinge of erotic is touched in passing in the remarks like the following ⁴⁴⁴

442. *ibid.*, p.183(14ff.):...

443. *ibid.*, p.183(8-16). / *ibid.*, pp.118-120.

लावण्यवति, पृष्ठतो निबिडलग्ना पीडयसि मामन्तर्बहिश्चातिनिष्पुरेण
 वलता पुरस्तनपीठेन । तरंगिके, दूरमपसर, विधिता गतिस्तव जघनभित्त्या
 सर्वतो निरुध्दमार्गस्यास्य सैनिकवर्गस्य । लवंगिके, परिकरबन्धदर्शनेऽपि परि-
 चारकः स्वन्नसकलगात्रयष्टिर्यथैष कम्पते तथावश्यमवतरन्त्यास्तरीतस्तव घनजघन-
 मारेण पीडितो व्रीडयिष्यति प्रेक्षाकजनम् । व्याघ्रदत्त, घाव शीघ्रम्, रणा
 विपद्यते निपतिता पोतात्पितामही मकरिकायास्तव श्वश्रुः ।

And a tinge of ^{the} Tragic is blended with the Comic in
 the episode of Anangarati and his beloved both of whom are
 shown as competing with each other for dying first. The po-
 et's consciousness as to the tragic nature of the humour ~~is~~
 is manifested in the following remarks : 445

'मुञ्चती च जीवितमिमां द्रष्टुमसहः पुरस्तादेव गत्वा मोक्तुमहमिच्छामि
 वैहम् । अस्तौ तु जीवत्येव मयि मर्तुमुत्सुका मनक्ति मे गमनमेभिः प्रकारैः' इति
 निवेदिते तेन करुणया विस्मृतात्मदुःखः ----- ।

(5) RAUDRA-RASA or THE FURIOUS SENTIMENT :-

On one occasion has the poet taken opportunity to
 depict the Furious sentiment, of which anger (krodha) is the
 fundamental mood. When Gandharvaka was speeding in his aero-
 plane to the Suvela mountain in order to fetch some medici-
 nal herb for countering the effect of poisonous fruit on
 Malayasundarī, he unwittingly crossed over the pinnacle of
 the Jain temple of Lord Mahāvira at Ratnakūṭa and incurred
 the wrath of the guardian Yakṣa named Mahodara, who assumed

the form of a Vetāla, cursed Gandharvaka and threw the aerial car into a distant lake with a roar of defiance (hūmkāra). The following descriptive touches serve to generate the effect. Thus, the picture of indignant Mahodara is drawn in the following words : 446

--- अग्निमिषपद्मणां परुषतारकेण सरुषेव किञ्चिच्चदुष्ठा कृतावेदाणां
दक्षिणाकरगृहीतामग्रभागविधृतकतिपयकोमलच्छुद्धामायामिनी न्यग्रोधवीरुधम-
भीक्ष्णमुत्तिदापन्तमेकमत्युग्रतेजसं पुरुषमद्रादाम् ।

The anger of Mahodara is exhibited in the following abusive phrases : 447

स स्वमुक्तमात्र एव मया रोषरक्तेदाणां ललाटतटविघटितमंगुरप्रकुटिरा-
विःकृतवैतालरूपः 'रे रे दुरात्मन्, अनात्मज्ञ, विज्ञानरहितं, परिहृतविशि-
ष्टजनसमाचार, विगतपारसंसारपत्वलपंकशूकर, महापापकारिन्, --- ।

The cause of Mahodara's indignation is revealed in the following hot words : 448

तदरे दुराचार, क्रूरहृदयोऽहम् । न त्वमसि, यो तिविस्तीर्णमनिवार्य-
मभ्यर्णवर्तिनं च विहाय व्योममार्गमनेकसुरसिध्वसाध्यविधाघरवृन्दवन्दनीयस्य
भुवनत्रयप्रथितयशसो विशिष्टदेवताविहितनिष्पतेरादिदेवतायतनमण्डपस्य शिखराग्र-
भागेन लीलया निबध्दलोलध्वजपताकमुत्तमं यानमास्थितो यातुमभिलषसि । मां च
करुणया पुरोभूय कृतनिषेधम्, 'अपसर' इति वारंवारमविशंकितस्तर्जयसि । गतोऽ-
स्यघस्तादनेन दुश्चेष्टितेन । क्व यासि दृष्टः । पतितोऽथ दृष्टिगोचरे महो-
दरस्य । हृता हताश, ते विधाघरकृता विहायसि चिरंतनी सा यदृच्छाचारिता,
यदि परमिदानीं पदाविदोषेण देवतायतनानि लंघयसि --- ।

446. TM(N), p.381(11-14). / 447. ibid., p.382(3-6).

448. ibid., p.382(18)-383(3).

The incident being very brief, the depiction of this sentiment is also naturally cursory.

(6) BHAYĀNAKA-RASA or THE TERRIBLE SENTIMENT :-

The sentiment of the Terrible with its attendant permanent mood of Fear is touched in passing on two occasions, viz., (i) when the Vetāla suddenly appears in front of King Meghavāhana; and (ii) when Tilakamañjarī and her companions are perturbed and afraid as they see a big flying elephant fall headlong into the waters of the Adr̥stapāra lake.

The sudden appearance of the Vetāla with his unimaginably huge terrible form and his roar of fearful laughter generate the effect of the Terrible. The dreadful nature of the burst of laughter is brought out by the poet thus: ⁴⁴⁹

अत्रान्तरे नितान्तभीषणो विशेषजनितस्फातिरास्फालिताशातटैः
प्रतिफलद्भिरतिपरिस्फुटैः प्रतिशब्दैः शब्दमयमिवादधानस्त्रिभुवनमुद्भ्रान्त-
नयनतारकाकान्तिसारीकृतदिग्भिराकणितः समयमुमयकर्णदिवहस्ताभिरायतन-
देवताभिः कुलिशताडितकुलाचलशिखरसमकालनिपतद्गण्डशैलनिवहनादोधुरो
हासध्वनिरुदलसत् ।

The Terrible is here meant to subserve the Heroic by enhancing by contrast the heroic nature of King Meghavāhana who is not in the least ruffled by the unexpected appearance of the ghastly Vetāla nor by his frightful laughter. ⁴⁵⁰

Similarly, the sense of fear aroused in the companions of Tilakamañjarī at the dreadful roar of frightfully falling elephant is described in the following words :⁴⁵¹

तस्य चोच्छ्रितसलिलच्छटास्नपिततटविटपिना जनितसकलाटवीसत्वसत्रा-
सेन विगतहेतुना वेगपतनेन तरलितो भयविहस्तः सकलोऽपि मर्षदारिका-
पार्श्ववती युवतिलोकः प्रपलायकश्चित्रतलेषु कश्चिद्गततिलयेषु कश्चिद्-
गिरिगुहान्तरालेषु त्रसा न्यलीयत ।

But, as this fear was to last only for a moment, the delineation of the mood is also very brief and fleeting.

(7) BĪBHATSA-RASA or THE DISGUSTFUL SENTIMENT :-

The effect of the Loathsome generated when the poet arouses our sense of aversion (jugupsā) as he draws a lengthy and fully detailed word-picture of the towering terrific form of the Vetāla.⁴⁵² The poet has fully employed most of its fundamental and excitant determinants and evanescent feelings in the process of delineation. Though the whole description is a masterpiece probably unrivalled in the whole of Sanskrit literature, ^{some of its} ~~a few~~ pieces are noteworthy as specimens of Dhanapāla's skill of depicting the sentiment:

The shanks of the Vetāla are pictured in the following words :⁴⁵³

451. TM(N), p.353(23ff.).

452. ibid., pp.46-49.

453. ibid., p.46(21ff.).

--- अद्गुद्रसरलशिरादण्डनिचितेन निश्चेतुमुच्छ्वायमूर्ध्वलोकस्य संगृहीतानेक-
रज्जुनेवोपलक्ष्यमाणेन गगनसीमोल्लंघिना जघाद्वितयेन निरन्तरारूढवितत-
व्रततिजालयमलतालशिखरनिषण्णामिव दृश्यमानम्, ---- ।

The depth of his belly-pit and the ugliness of his che-
st are brought out in the following phrases :⁴⁵⁴

--- अक्षुब्धप्रवाहपाटल्या वैतरणीसरित्सलिलवेणिकयेव पृथुलदीर्घया सीमन्ति-
तकरालकुञ्जिकुहरपातालम्, आर्द्रपंकपटलश्याममतिकृशतया कायस्य दूरदर्शितो-
न्नतीनां पर्शुकानामन्तरालद्रोणिषु निद्रायमाणाशिशुसरीसृपं सीरगतिमार्ग-
निर्गताविरलविषकन्दलं सादादिवाधर्मदोत्रमुरःप्रदेशं दर्शयन्तम्, -----
----- ।

The picture becomes terribly realistic when the poet
describes in the following words how the Vetāla was holding
a living Vetāla-worshipper by his neck in his left arm-pit,
was cutting pieces out of his body with scissors in his right
hand, and was devouring his flesh with his sharp teeth and
enjoying it with his grinding jaws :⁴⁵⁵

----- दक्षिणेन च प्रतिपाणव्यापारितनिशितकर्षिकेन वामकदान्तर-
दिप्लकन्धरस्य दृढनिरुध्दनिःश्वासनिर्गमत्वाद~~क~~ध्वरपशोरिव तव-
दतिकरणमन्तःक्रन्दतो दक्षिणःफलकृपाणघातस्य वैतालसाधकस्य साधित-
मूर्ध्वमुत्सर्पता परिकराशीविषवदनविषपाककेन गात्रपिशितमुत्कृत्योत्कृत्य
कीकशोपदशमश्नन्तं क्वलितपिशितवर्ष्णायासव चलैन कपिलतासंविभाग-
दानाय त्रिभुवनोदरचारिणीनामचिररोचिषामारब्धसंज्ञासमाह्वानैनेव

दोयानलवर्चसा कुर्चककलापेन क्वचितमखिलरौमरन्ध्रनिर्गलद्दुधिरगण्डूषमिव
प्रलम्बपृथुलं चिबुकमुद्धहन्तम् ।

The creeping snakes worn as ear-rings and the wagging
tongue of the Vetāla are picturesquely exhibited thus :⁴⁵⁶

----- शिखिकणारुणया तिर्यग्विसर्पिण्या फणमणिकिणमालया
जटालीकृतसरलभोगनालाभ्यामलघुना निष्पतन्तमोघेन घोणापुटश्वासमुम-
यतः पालुमवतीर्णाभ्यां कर्णाभिरणविषघराभ्यां द्विधाप्यघःकृतोष्ठ-
पृष्ठलोमलेखं मुहुरुदचता मुहुर्न्यचता मुहुः प्राचता तिर्यगजगरदेहदीर्घ-
पृथुलेन जिह्वालताग्रेण ललाटचिबुकसृक्कप्रान्तगतमाद्राद्रिमंगारागमेदःकर्म-
मास्वादयन्तम्, ----- ।

The frightful nature of this loathsome description is
summed up in the following few masterly touches :⁴⁵⁷

अस्थिनूपुरैरपि पदप्रयोगमुखैर्भयप्रस्तुतसतुतिभिरिव सततसेवितचरणम्,
आमरणभुजगैरपि ज्वलदुन्मयूखफणमणिभिरात्तप्रदीपैरिवाग्वाह्यमान-
कज्जलकालकायप्रमान्धतमसं मासेनापि स्वादनभीतेनेव सास्त्रेण परि-
त्यक्तसर्ववियवम्, अवयवानप्यस्थिसारानतिविकृतरूपदर्शनभयात्पलायितुकामा-
निव स्नायुग्रन्थिगाढनध्दान्धधानम्, आजानुलम्बमानशवशिरौमालमैकं
वेतालमद्रोक्षति ।

The Disgustful sentiment is also touched in passing ■ to
enhance the heroic sentiment in the course of the descrip-
tion of the night-attack of Samaraketu and the consequent
clash of rival forces. The poet gives the relevant touches
thus :

456. TM(N), p.48(2ff.).
458. ibid., p.87(2ff.).

/ 457. ibid., p.48(20ff.).
/ 459. ibid., p.88(4ff.).

परस्परवधनिबन्धकदायोश्च तयोस्तत्पाणामाकुलितसकलजीवलोको
 युगपदैकीभूतोदारवारिराशिरस्रजलविस्मरवर्षिघनपदातिघोरो मुदित-
 योगिनीमृग्यमाणलोकपालकपालचणकः --- निपीतनर्वशाविस्वर-
 विसारिशिवाफेत्कारहामरः --- (समरसंघट्टः) ⁴⁵⁸ --- प्रभूतपिशिता-
 म्भवह्वारजनिततीव्रोदन्येन कर्दमप्रायमपीयत दातजापगाम्बु कौणपगणेन ⁴⁵⁹ ।

Thus, Dhanapāla seems to have taken great care in presenting the picture and in intensifying the Terrible sentiment as it afforded him full opportunity to show in one place his workmanship in many ways.

(8) ADBHUTA-RASA or THE MARVELLOUS SENTIMENT :

Dhanapāla is a pastmaster in the depiction of the sentiment of the Marvellous which permeates the very structure of the whole story of the TM. IT has been used most effectively^e to generate a sense of surprise and thereby sustain the element of suspense throughout the narrative. And the poet is quite conscious about this aspect as is evident from ^a ~~the~~ number of remarks scattered all over in the TM.⁴⁶⁰

The principal points and incidents where the Marvellous has been prominently utilized in the narrative apart from the wonderful nature of the descriptions and imageries, are listed below as specimens :

(i) The unexpected arrival of the Vidyādhara Muni; ⁴⁶¹

460. TM(N), Intro.vs.50 d:-- स्फुराद्भुतरसा रञ्जिता कथेयम् । ; 99(16ff)
 एतां च दिव्याङ्गुलीयकप्रभावावेदेन प्रसङ्गागतामवनिपतिराकर्ण्य.... परं विस्मय-
 मगच्छत् ।; 161(20) ध्रुवराजवात्तदिधृतश्रवणेन पीतप्रतिचिरं कर्णाभूतम् ।;
 195(13) .. सर्वजनविस्मयकरं शुकव्यतिकरम्... ।; 216(11) तच्च तदा-
 विधमपरत्र कुत्रचिददृष्टं पूर्वमपूर्वाकारविशेषमशेषाश्चैवपत्यन्त- (p.t.o.)

458. & 459. (See p.810 for these ft.nts.)

(ii) The sudden appearance of the Vaimanika god Jvalanaprabha in front of King Meghavāhana at the Śakrāvātāra temple;⁴⁶²

(iii) The instantaneous apparition of the Vetāla and King Meghavāhana's prolonged attempt at severing his own head and the sudden appearance of the Goddess Śrī;⁴⁶³

(iv) The night-attack by Samaraketu and the magic effect of the Bālārūṇa ring;⁴⁶⁴

(v) The friendship of Samaraketu and Harivāhana;⁴⁶⁵

(vi) The episode of the unidentified ~~name~~ love-letter and its effect on Samaraketu;⁴⁶⁶

(vii) The love-episode of Priyadarsanā and Tāraka;⁴⁶⁷

(viii) The mysterious divine music from the island, the group of flying Vidyādharas, the divine temple and the beautiful girl on the rampart;⁴⁶⁸

(ix) The introduction of the portrait of Tilakamañjarī and her aversion for males;⁴⁶⁹

(x) The episode of pacifying the mad elephant and the latter kidnapping the prince;⁴⁷⁰

(xi) The wonderful episode of the appearance of Harivāhana's message and of ~~the~~ a parrot carrying the reply back to him;⁴⁷¹

~~462~~ 462. TM(N), pp.35-39. / 463. ibid., pp.46-55.
 464. ibid., pp.83-93. / 465. ibid., pp.102-103.
 466. ibid., pp.108-111. / 467. ibid., pp.127-129.
 468. ibid., p.147;152-153;155;161. / 469. ibid., pp.163-164;
 470. ibid., pp.184-185. / 471. ibid., pp. ~~192-195~~ / 168-169.

(xii) The Jain temple and Gandharvaka's prayer in honour of Harivāhana;⁴⁷²

(xiii) Samaraketu meeting with Harivāhana who is about to be crowned as the emperor of the Vidyādharas;⁴⁷³

(xiv) The flying elephant falling into the lake and disappearing altogether;⁴⁷⁴

(xv) Malayasundarī kidnapped by the Vidyādharas for making her dance on the occasion of the Holy-Bath Ceremony of Lord Mahavira's image;⁴⁷⁵

(xvi) The unsolved problem of the identity of Gandharvaddattā;⁴⁷⁶

(xvii) The apparent invocation to the boat, really addressed to Malayasundarī;⁴⁷⁷

(xviii) Malayasundarī conveying her love to Samaraketu in the boat through a garland thrown in his neck by her from the rampart of the temple;⁴⁷⁸

(xix) The sudden disappearance of Malayasundarī to the sight of Samaraketu and Tāraka;⁴⁷⁹

(xx) Malayasundarī mysteriously brought back into her bed-chamber of the harem in her palace at Kāñcī;⁴⁸⁰

472. TM(N), pp.214-219. /473. / ibid., pp.229-237.

474. ibid., pp.241-243. / 475. ibid., pp.264-270.

476. ibid., pp.270-274. / 477. ibid., pp.283-286.

478. ibid., pp.288-289. / 479. ibid., pp.289-290.

480. ibid., p.292.

(xxi) Marriage proposal by Vajrāyudha and Malayasundarī's consequent attempt at suicide and her rescue at the hands of Samaraketu;⁴⁸¹

(xxii) Malayasundarī's mysterious transportation to the Adrṣṭapāra lake;⁴⁸²

(xxiii) Malayasundarī suddenly finds a letter and gives up her resolve to commit suicide;⁴⁸³

(xxiv) The mysterious incident of a parrot responding to the call and carrying the message of Harivāḥana;⁴⁸⁴

(xxv) The incident of the magic mantle and the sudden reappearance of Gandharvaka from the lap of Harivāḥana;⁴⁸⁵

(xxvi) Mahodara's curse to Gandharvaka;⁴⁸⁶

(xxvii) The unexpected message from Tilakamañjarī, Harivāḥana's resolve of suicide, his meeting Anaṅgarati and undertaking mystic penance on the latter's behalf;⁴⁸⁷

(xxviii) The revelation of the past births by Maharṣi;⁴⁸⁸

(xxix) Tilakamañjarī's attempt at suicide;⁴⁸⁹

(xxx) Vicitravīrya's message through Kalyāṇaka and transportation of Samaraketu to the Suvēla mountain.⁴⁹⁰

The Marvellous is generated generally by giving an unexpected or undreamt of turn to the events or by resorting to the superhuman element in the story; both these aspects

481. TM(N), pp. 298-310. / 482. *ibid.*, pp. 336-338.
 483. *ibid.*, pp. 338-339. / 484. *ibid.*, pp. 348-349.
 485. *ibid.*, pp. 376-377. / 486. *ibid.*, pp. 381-383.
 487. *ibid.*, pp. 396-403. / 488. *ibid.*, pp. 406-413.
 489. *ibid.*, pp. 416-417. / 490. *ibid.*, pp. 422-422.

are very important in the narrative technique of Dhanapāla.

(9) SANTA-RASA or THE QUIETISTIC SENTIMENT :-

The Quietistic sustained by its permanent mood of complete indifference to worldly objects (nirveda) is delineated on four occasions, viz., (i) when Samaraketu addresses a prayer to the image of Lord Ṛṣabha; (ii) when Harivāhana swims out of the Aṛṣṭapara lake and reflects on the events; (iii) when Harivāhana consoles Malayasundari; and (iv) in the religious discourse of Maharsi who reveals the past births of the heroes and the heroines of the TM.

When Samaraketu reaches the temple of Lord Ṛṣabha on Mount Ekaśṛṅga after his hazardous journey through the Vin-dhya forest and happens to see the huge thought-gem image installed therein, he is overcome with a sense of devotion and addresses a prayer in a voice choked with tears of joy. The poet pictures the event thus: ⁴⁹¹

अनन्तरं च निरन्तरोदचदुच्चरोमांकुरकदम्बकेन कदम्बकेसरोपहारमिव
किरता विग्रहेणादग्रपदमाग्रलग्नोज्ज्वलाशुजलविपुष्पा महार्घमुक्ताफलार्ध-
मिवोत्पिपाता वदुद्भयेन ----- शिरसि विरचिताञ्जलिमुकुलकरालमाल-
पट्टस्तटघटितैकशुक्तिसंपुट इव जलराशितुलया भक्त्या प्रणम्य -----
त्रिभुवनभवनदीपमभवनदीपं संसारजीष्णारिण्यैकपारिजातमपारिजातं सकल-
मथ्यलोकनयनाभिनन्दनं नाभिनन्दनमानन्दगद्गदया नवोदमारालसरसत्पयो-
दनादमेदुरया ----- ~~अतिगम्भीरया~~ अतिगम्भीरया भारत्या स्मरयन्निव

समवसरणादुन्दुभिध्वनेरिति कर्तुं स्तुतिं प्रस्तुतवान् -

शुष्कशिखरिणि कल्पशाखीव

निधिरधनग्राम इव कमलणण्ड इव मार्वेऽध्वनि ।

भवमीमारण्य इह वीदितातोऽसि

मुनिनाथ कथमपि ॥

दृष्टे भवति नयनसृष्ट्या सममद्य जन्म जिन सफलमभून्मम ।

अकृतपुण्यमपि सुकृतिजनं प्रति लघुमात्मानमवैमि न संप्रति ॥

The poet here reminds us that this prayer is meant to enhance the sense of aversion (sañvega). He has utilized the the fundamental determinants like hopelessly transient nature of worldly existence, the excitant determinants like the divine temple and the awe-inspiring huge image of Lord R̥ṣabha, the consequent determinants like horripilation, tears of joy, choked voice, and evanescent feelings like joy, and yearning for emancipation.

The Quietistic sentiment is again touched on another occasion ■ ■ when the mad elephant, that was pacified by Harivāhana's music of the lute, carried him away to the mountainous region of Vataḍhya, and, as the prince flourished his dagger, the elephant falls into the lake; Harivāhana swims out of the water and begins to reflect on the unexpected turn of events culminating into his transportation to the remote region where he is left all alone to fend for his way.

He sits on a slab. His wet body has to be dried by the midday breeze. His throat and mouth are drying up. He is overpowered by a sense of wonder at the strange sequence of events that have suddenly cut him off from his kith and kin. The poet depicts his reflections in the following words :⁴⁹²

अहो विरसता संसारस्थितेः, अहो विचित्रता कर्मपरिणतीनाम्, अहो
यदृच्छाकारितायाममिनिवेशो विधेः, अहो भृगुस्वभावता विभवानाम् ।
अथैव तादृशि तृष्णीकृतत्रिदशपतिमिानसौन्दर्यसंपदि निजे सद्मनि सुहृत्समेतो
वीणावादनादिजनितमानन्दमनुभवन्नवस्थितोऽहमथैव दुर्गगिरिकान्तारमध्यव-
र्ती परिवृतो वनश्वापदशतैरन्यवैदेशिकपथिकसामान्यमवस्थाविशेषम् । --
---- सर्व्व स्वायमेवंप्रकारः संसारः ।

This sentiment is again brought in when, on another occasion, Harivāhana consoles Malayasundarī as she completes the narration of the tragic events of her life. Harivāhana himself is overcome with a sense of dejection and reflects about the inevitability of the consequences of past misdeeds, thus:⁴⁹³

अहो निरवधिप्रचारो विधिः । नास्त्यगोचरः पुराकृतकर्मणां ।
अशक्यप्रतीकारा कृतान्तशक्तिः । अव्याहता गतिः सर्व्वत्र भवितव्यतायाः ।

He then proceeds to console Malayasundarī with the following words:⁴⁹⁴

मा विषीद । मा खेदमुद्धह । मा कृतान्तमाक्रोश । मा कर्मणां देहि दोषम् ।

492. TM(N), p.244.

493. ibid., pp.345-346.

494. ibid., p.346(7ff.).

इह हि संसारसद्मनि समासादितावतारः स्वभावविमलोऽपि जन्तुरेकत्रैव
जन्मनि दशावशेन दीपाङ्कुर इवानेकानि रूपान्तराण्यनुभवति । -----
तदैतदमृतविषभूतं वस्तुरूपमधिगम्य कस्माद्विषादिनी भवसि । कथय
दिव्येषु वा मानुषेषु वा यस्यैक्यैवावस्थया व्यतीतः कालः । यश्चाति
पुण्यवानपि प्रागनुभूय सौस्थानि पश्चान्न दुःखं प्राप्तः । सर्वथा धैर्यमाधेहि ।
--- अन्तिमुपगतः संप्रति प्रतिकूलचारी विषमयः स ते विषमदशाविपाकः ।
सिद्धा शून्यसिद्धायतनसेवा । -- तिष्ठति स ते दीर्घायुर्घटितक्लेशो जीवि-
तेशः । Dhanapāla has specifically mentioned that the stories
of both Samaraketu and Malayasundarī are tragic and meant
to arouse the feeling of aversion to transient worldly plea-
sures. 495

And lastly, this sentiment of the Quietistic id again
pressed into service when Tilakamañjarī happens to come across
the Maharṣi and listens to his religious discourse which
harps on the supremacy of the Law of Karma, thus: 496

इह हि जीवः शुभाशुभनिमित्तनिर्वृत्तितेन स्वकर्मणा नित्यमनुसृतः परि-
वर्तमानो महति संसारचक्रे कुशलकुलालपरिगृहीत इव मृत्पिण्डः स्थाल-
कोशकलशादीनि स्पृशति विविधान्यवस्थान्तराणि ।

On being questioned by the Vidyādhara King Vīrasena, he re-
veals the mystery about the past births of Tilakamañjarī
and Harivāhana and later on of Malayasundarī and Samaraketu
beginning with the events of their life as Priyaṅgusundarī
and Jvalanāprabha and as Priyamvadā and Sumālī respectively.

495. TM(N), p.114(4): सकलोऽपि सामान्येन मद्युभवृत्तान्तः । ;345(21) तेना-
नवसानोद्वेगकारिणा चरितेन तस्यास्तुषारविलेनेव नालिकाकरः परां मन्मनिमगमम् ।
496. ibid., p.406(b).

The miserable nature of their human life with its alternating series of pleasures and pains is thus highlighted in a contrast to their comparatively long stretch of happy divine life in the heaven, though the latter too has to end as the merits are exhausted; the only permanent happiness is said to result only through utmost devotion to Lord Jina and accumulation of profuse merit through pious deeds. Dhanapāla has specified the purpose of the Mahārṣi's narration, viz., to create a sense of aversion to transient worldly and heavenly pleasures.⁴⁹⁷

VI : G U N A S , R Ī T I S , V R T T I S ,
A L A Ņ K Ā R A S A N D T H E I R
A U C I T Y A o r P R O P R I E T Y :-

(A) G U N A S , R Ī T I S , A N D V R T T I S :-

In his definition of 'KĀVYA', Dhanapāla's royal patron and contemporary poet-critic Paramāra Bhojadeva, the author of the SKB, has assigned an equal place to Guna and Alāṅkāra along with Rasa.⁴⁹⁸ And while dealing with the Doṣas of which he requires Kāvya to be kept clear, he has enumerated a special set of them called Arītimat. In the opinion of Dr. P.C.Lahiri,⁴⁹⁹ these Arītimat Doṣas or poetic

497. TM(N), p.413(4ff.)-- शंजातसंवेगः समग्रोऽपि परिषज्जनः प्रशान्तेन मनसा विचारयन् विरसतां संसारस्थितेः स्थास्नुषु क्लेशायासबहुलेषु दीर्घदुःखो-
 द्वेजदायिषु बृहत्स्वपि स्वर्गभोगेष्वपि लाजमश्लेषयत् ।

498. SKB(RJ), I, 2: निर्देष्टुं गुणवत्काल्यमलंकारैरलंस्कृतम् । रसान्वितं कविः कुर्वन् शीतिं प्रीतिं च विन्दति ॥

499. cf. CRGSP, pp.148-176.

defects, as the very name indicates, serve to make Rīti defective by the prominence given to the opposites (viparyayas) of some standard excellences in a composition. The Guṇas, which in Bhoja's treatment, appear to be common to all the Rītis are: Śleṣa (compactness), Samatā (evenness), Saukumārya (softness), Prasāda (lucidity), Artha-vyakti (explicitness of sense), Kānti (dignity or agreeability), Ojas (abundance of compound words), Mādhurya (sweetness) and Audārya (elevation).

Bhoja gives a derivative definition of the term Rīti and takes it to be synonymous with Mārga which he describes as the way or manner of composition which the people of Vaidarbha and other lands follow.⁵⁰⁰ Bhoja enumerates six Rītis, viz., Vaidarbhī, Pāñcālī, Gauḍīyā, Latīyā, Āvantikā and Māgadhī, and these are determined both by the presence or absence of certain standard excellences as in the treatment of the Rīti theorists and of compound words as in Rudraṭa.

In the interest of brevity and in order to absolve ourselves from the charge of 'Durjanatā' levelled by Dhanapāla himself against the critics who give too much importance to the Guṇas,⁵⁰¹ we shall keep away from being entangled, and

500. SKB(RJ), II, 27: वैदर्भादिकृतः पन्था काव्ये मर्ज इति स्मृतः ।

सिद्धगतादिति धातोः सा व्युत्पत्त्या सीतिरुच्यते ॥

501. TM(N), Intro. vs. 14: कशाशनेन श्यामेन मुखेनाधोमुखेक्षणः ।

काव्येणो गुणान्वक्ति कलाद इव दुर्जनः ॥

perhaps hopelessly lost, in the jungle of twenty-four ~~दश~~ Sabda-guṇas, twenty-four Artha-guṇas, and twenty-four Vaiśeṣika-guṇas, ~~एते दशदशदशदश~~ which in turn are further classified in three categories called Pada-guṇas, Vākya-guṇas and Vākya-rtha-guṇas. Our interest here is to see how Dhanapāla has utilized the general poetic excellences (guṇas) in relation to various manners of composition (rītis) and the part they play towards the realisation of Rasa.

(1) Vaidarbhī : The Vaidarbhī Rīti is marked by a few compound words and presence of all the Guṇas. Dhanapāla has very rarely employed this manner of composition since he was not prepared to sacrifice Ojas (superabundance of compound words) which is ^{the} very essence of forceful Sanskrit prose style. It is utilized generally during the delineation of sentiments like Karuṇa, Hāsya, Śānta, and at times, of Raudra also, only to relieve the monotony of other Rītis. And it is a ~~सामान्य~~ good medium for general narration of the story proper. The poetic qualities like Śleṣa (compactness), Samatā (evenness), Prasāda (lucidity), Artha-vyakti (explicitness of sense), Kānti (agreeability) and Audārya (elevation) are to be seen in varying proportions in the following instances:

(i) In Karuṇa, e.g.,⁵⁰²

आश्लिष्य कण्ठमुना मुक्ताहारेण हृदि निविष्टेन ।

सरणैव वारितो मे त्वदुःपरिरम्भणारम्भः ॥

(ii) In Hāsya, e.g.,⁵⁰³

भूयोऽप्यसौ सहासमवदत् - नरेन्द्र न वयं पद्मिणी न पशवो न
मनुष्याः । कथं फलानि मूलान्यन्मं वाहरामः । ज्ञापाचराः खलु वयम् ।
--- किमनेन द्विजस्यैव मदिरास्वादसौन्दर्यकथनेन मध्येतरवस्तुतत्त्वप्रकाशनेन ।

(iii) In Śānta, e.g.,⁵⁰⁴

दुष्पणोऽपि रोहति तरुः क्षीणोऽप्युपवीयते पुनश्चन्द्रः ।
इति विमृशन्तः सन्तः संतप्यन्ते न विधुरेषु ॥

(iv) In Raudra also, e.g.,⁵⁰⁵

दुर्विनीते, क्वागता त्वमिह । किं तवागमनकार्यमत्रोपजातम् । कस्त-
वास्मिन्नास्ते । केन ते दुर्मतिरियं दत्ता । ह्रीतापि न तपस्वलोकस्य ।

(2) Pāñcālī : The Pāñcālī Rīti may contain compounds of not more than five or six words. The Guṇas Mādhurya (sweetness) and Saukumārya (softness) should predominate therein, but in any case Ojas (emphatic assertion) and Kānti (dignity or conspicuous presence of Rasas) must not be present ~~in~~ in it. This manner is very common with Dhanapāla and is normally utilized in the course of delineation of sentiments like Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, Karuṇa and Adbhuta, as in the following instances :

(i) In Śṛṅgāra, e.g.,⁵⁰⁶

तद्विरहदाहविच्छेदामेण पत्रणण्डाडम्बरेण विहितपत्रपाणीव
वर्णासिलिलपूरितासु विलाससरसीषु निममज्जुरम्भोजिनीवनानि । घनधारा-
भिवृष्टमूर्त्यस्तदारिर्दर्शनदुःखिता इव दूरविनतेः पल्लवैदाणारम्बुकणिकाशु-
विसरमज्जमसृजन्नुपवनद्रुमाः ।

503. TM(N), p.50(23ff.). / 504. ibid.,p.402(17-18).
505. ibid.,p.335(13-16). / 506. ibid.,p.179(20ff.).

(ii) In Vīra, e.g.,⁵⁰⁷

वारवारमन्योन्यकृततर्जनयोश्च तयोराकर्णान्तिकृष्टमुक्तास्तत्काल-
मास्वादितगलामिषविसारिणो लंघितदिशो दूराध्वगा राजकार्योपयो-
गिनस्तीक्ष्णाः परितोषितसुरांगनाः सुपर्वाणो महाजवा वाजिनश्चाप-
त्यतोषिताः क्षितिपालदारकाः ----- क्वचिद्राजाध्यक्षा इवाकृष्टसुमट-
ग्रामकंकटाः ----- सायकाः प्रससुः ।

(iii) In Karuna, e.g.,⁵⁰⁸

मुक्तदेहायाश्च मे गात्रभारेण दूरमाकृष्टादृष्टमत्साहसोत्पन्न-
साध्वसेव सव्वतः समकम्पतासावशोकपादपशाखा । कम्पतरलितकुलाय-
कोटरोड्डीनानि विस्तारिणा पदापातविरुतेन हाहारवमिव कुवाणानि
पर्यन्तेषु बभ्रमुः ससंभ्रमाणीव विह्वलमकुलानि ।

(iv) In Adbhuta, e.g.,⁵⁰⁹

दृश्यं भूमिमृतोऽस्य देव किमिह स्कन्धस्थविधाधर-

श्रेणीयस्य वहन्ति यस्य समतामन्येऽपि गोत्राचलाः ।

द्रष्टव्यस्त्वमनन्यतुल्यमहिमा मध्ये धरित्रीभृतां

येनाधःकृतखेवरेन्द्रततिना बध्दास्य मूर्ध्नि स्थितिः ॥

(3) Gaudīyā : The Gaudīyā Rīti should contain long compounds and the Guṇas Ojas (superabundance of compounds and emphatic assertion) and Kānti (dignity and conspicuousness of Rasa) should prominently shine in it. This manner has been usually employed by Dhanapāla in the delineation of sentiments like Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, and in the descriptions of

507. TM(N), p. 89 (9ff.).

508. *ibid.*, p. 306 (16ff.).

509. *ibid.*, p. 240 (20-23).

a forest and etc.,

(i) In Śṛṅgāra, e.g., 510

कदाचित्सकुतूहलदेवतादरावलोकितः कामिनीजनाभरणशात्कारतूर्य-
रवसंवर्धितैस्तारतरविलपिनां वैतालिकानामिव केलीशकुन्तानां ध्वनिभि-
राधीयमानरभसः सरभसदशनाग्रदंशदलितदन्तच्छुद्धमवयकचग्रहोत्सदद्भुकुटि-
भूषितललाटदेशमावेशप्रवृत्तकरप्रहारव्याहरन्मणिवलयमविरलोद्गत-
श्रमस्वेदतिम्यद्रोमांचकवचमनवर्तमुक्तकौसुमशरासारव्यपञ्चिदेशादुपजाततुष्टि-
नेव मानसमुवा देवेन पात्यमानपुष्पवृष्टिः उत्कृष्टकर्णप्रयोगरमणीयम-
त्यद्भुतं रतसमरमाततान ।

Here the Gaudīyā Rīti almost slips into the Pāñcālī.

(ii) In Vīra, e.g., 511

इत्यनवर्तकृतकोलाहलानि बध्दवेगद्विरदपृष्ठसारिदोलायमानसायासप्रा-
सपूलानि चलितरथचीत्कारचकितशाकिनीचक्रवालाध्दवलोकितान्युद्गूर्ण-
कृपाणपादातपदपातकम्पितधराद्विषयमवन्त सर्व्वतो स्मत्सैन्यराजन्य-
कानि ।

(iii) In the description of a temple, ~~as in~~ as in 512

(तस्य च मध्यभागे) --- अञ्जमणिकुट्टिमोञ्जलत्प्रभापटलनिर्मग्न-
मूलतया प्लवमानमिव, सुघटितस्फटिकोपलपट्टकल्पितानल्पपीठबन्धान्य-
ञ्जतयान्तरिदास्थितमिव विभाव्यमानं ----- ववचित्सितमुजंग-
शंकिमयूरौपरुध्यमानबिम्बागतचलञ्चीनाशुकपताकं -----
(बायतनं ददर्श) ।

(iv) In the description of a forest, as in : 513

510. TM(N), p. 840 (800-801) 17(6ff.).

511. ibid., p. 93(6ff.) / 512. ibid., p. 214(9ff.).

513. ibid., p. 199(18ff.).

----- दुरवतारतुंगतटाभिरुक्तेटिपाषाणपटलस्खलनबहुमुख-
 प्रवृत्तमुखरप्रोतोजलाभिरनतिनिबिडनिर्गुण्डीलतागुल्मगुपिलीकृतोपल-
 वालुकाबहुलविच्छिन्नान्तरालपुलिनाभिरुच्छलत्कूलनलवननिलीननाहल-
 निवहकाहलकोलाहलाभिः शैलनिम्नगाभिर्निम्नीकृतान्तरालया ----
 (विन्ध्याटवीभुवा) --- ।

(4) Āvantikā : It is an intermediate type between Vaidarbhī and Pāncālī and admits of compounds of three or four words and there is perhaps no hard and fast rule regarding the presence of the Guṇas. Dhanapāla has utilized this manner very often in the delineation of most of the Rasas and in general narration, as for instance in :

(i) अहो चंचलस्वभावता चित्तपरिणतेः । अहो विकारबहुलता तारु-
 प्यगतेः । अहो दुःखदायकत्वं सुखाभिलाषाणाम् । अहो व्यसनदान-
 वैदग्ध्यमनधीनतायाः । अहो कार्श्यपरिणातिविवारविद्वेषो दृष्टोद्वेक-
 विलसितानाम् । अहो मतिविपर्ययप्रदानतात्पर्यं दैवप्रातिकूल्य-⁵¹⁴
 स्य---।

or in (ii) अथासौ मुनिकन्यका समाप्तजपविधिरुत्थाय कृतदेवताप्रणामा-
 गृहीतपुष्पपटलिक्या पृष्ठतः परिवारिक्यानुगम्यमाना हसितमदमत्सहसं-
 गतिभिर्निगत्य मन्थरैः पदन्यासैरायतनपर्यन्तवर्तिषु प्रासादकेषु प्रति-
 ष्ठिता जिनप्रतिमाः क्रमेणापूपुजत् । 515

(5) Lāṭiyā : The Lāṭiyā Rīti is a peculiar admixture of all the Rītis. It is perhaps meant that a particular few or all the Guṇas may be present in it, and may be marked by compounds of all variable lengths. This had been very convenient
 514. TM(N), p.149(5ff.). / 515. ibid., p.256(7ff.).

to Dhanapāla in the delineation of almost all the Rasas and in the descriptions of cities, heroes and the heroines, as it affords full freedom in varying the syntactical style and length of the compounds in keeping with the form and content of the poetic imageries and serves to relieve the monotony natural in sustained series of a single manner. The typical instances of this manner of composition may be found in the descriptions of Ayodhyā,⁵¹⁶ King Meghavāhana,⁵¹⁷ Tilakamanjarī,⁵¹⁸ and so on.

(6) Māgadhī : The Māgadhī Rīti is a defective mode of speech where uniformity is lacking throughout the composition, i.e., where the composition begins with a particular Rīti but breaks in the interval, making place for some other Rīti. This type is generally illustrated when Dhanapāla depicts the agitated state of mind as in the case of Taraṅga⁵¹⁹lekṣhā or Mahodara.⁵²⁰

Thus, it seems that though Dhanapāla has tried his hand at all the six styles mentioned by Bhoja, he has kept in view the prescription of Rudraṭa about the use of particular Rīti for delineation of particular Rasa.⁵²¹ And, with Dhanapāla, the Gunas Slesa and Samatā arise from his consciousness

516. TM(N), pp.7-12. / 517. ibid., pp.12-16. / 518. ibid., pp.245-519. / 519. ibid., pp.335-336. / 520. ibid., pp.382-383. / 247.

521. KVL(R), XV, 20: वैदिकीपाञ्चाल्यौ प्रयसि करुणे भयानकाद्भुतयोः ।
लाशियागौडिये मैत्रे कुयाद्यथौचित्यम् ॥

of poetic skill; Saukumārya, Mādhurya, Prasāda and Arthavyakti sprout from his sense of music, natural alliterative tendency and preference for ~~प्रसन्न~~ familiar words; Ojas, Kānti and Audārya ensue from his concentration and skillful choice of fitting vocabulary and depth of sentiment.

As to the concept of Vṛttis, Bharata meant by it the use of words as will promote the realisation of Rasa, while Bāna and Rudraṭa meant by it the varieties of compounded collocation. Bharata has mentioned four Vṛttis, viz., Bhārati, Ārabhaṭī, Sāttvatī and Kaisikī. Dhanapāla mentions Kaisikī as the best of the Vṛttis.⁵²² Bāna mentions the Pada-vṛtti in which the Padas are un-compounded.⁵²³ As has been pointed out by Dr. V. Raghavan,⁵²⁴ Bhoja maintains that mainly three kinds of Vṛtti, distinguished by three Guṇas, viz., Saukumārya, Praudhī and Madhyamatva. Bhoja does not call these by the old names Upanāgarikā etc.; he applies those names to varieties of Śrutyanuprāsa. Though fortunately these Vṛttis disappear in later literature,⁵²⁵ they had a firm grip on the minds of poets like Dhanapāla and others of the age.

According to Rudraṭa, collocation of words is of two kinds, compounded and un-compounded. The latter is of only

522. TM(N), p.159(16): -- कैशिकीदिवे शब्दयुतीनाम् --- ।

523. Kad(BS), p.285 : -- असदस्तपदवृत्तिमिवाङ्क्यात् --- ।

524. SCOAS, p.189.

/ 525. *ibid.*, p.190.

one kind and is called the Vaidarbhi Rīti; the collocation with compounds is of three kinds, and are related with Gaudīyā, Pāncālī and Lāṭiyā if the compounds are too long, of two or three words, and of five or seven words respectively. Long before Bhoja, Rudraṭa knew the Vṛttis which were Anuprāsa Jātis. And Dhanapāla too mentions Jāti as one of the best figures of speech (alaṅkāṛti).⁵²⁶ Thus, though in poetics we have many concepts having the name Vṛtti, such as (i) varieties of alliteration (anuprāsa-jāti); (ii) varieties of compounded collocation (samāsa-jāti); (iii) the significatory capacities of words; and (iv) the old Vṛttis like Kaisikī etc., Of these the first will be taken up when we consider the Alaṅkāras. The second and the third, being more or less identical with the Rītis, do not need further discussion. As to the fourth, the whole field of Sravya Kāvya, in the opinion of Dr. V. Raghavan,⁵²⁷ is Bhāratī Vṛtti. Descriptions of love, evening, moonlight, seasons etc., must be Kaisikī and of war etc., Ārabhaṭī. Sāttvatī, if we accept it as the name of action, is as absent from Kāvya as is Bhāratī is present. Bhāratī or the text of the whole Kāvya will, opines Dr. V. Raghavan,⁵²⁸ be modified according to the situation, by Kaisikī and Ārabhaṭī, producing

527-526. SCOAS, p. 182.

528. *ibid.*

526. TM(N), p. 159 (16 H): ...जातिदिवालसकृतीनाम्...

two main varieties of Bhāratī going by the names of Vaidarbhī Rīti and Gaudīyā Rīti. The two and the only two Gunas necessary here for classification are Mādhurya and Ojas, characterising the two extremes of Śṛṅgāra and Raudra. This simple and strictly logical position of Vṛtti in Kāvya thus precludes further discussion here.

(B) ALĀNKĀRAS AND THEIR AUCITYA or PROPRIETY :-

As has been aptly pointed out by Dr. V. Raghavan,⁵²⁹ all poetic expression involves some kind of expressional deviation of beauty, some out-of-the-way-ness involving striking disposition of words and ideas, resulting in a beautiful form and a greater effect. This striking disposition of words, this deviation from the plain and ordinary mode of speaking, is called Alāṅkāra or figure of speech. There is such a thing as Aucitya, i.e., appropriateness, harmony and proportion, which is the ultimate beauty in the poetry; and the final ground for this Aucitya is the Rasa.⁵³⁰ When used with appropriateness, Alāṅkāras go to enrich the ideas of the poet and add to the diction.⁵³¹

Dhanapāla had before him the literary models of Bāṇa and Trivikramabhaṭṭa when he composed his TM, and he knew the importance of the sound-effect in view of its popular

529. SCOAS, p.50.
531. ibid., p.66.

/ 530. ibid., p.54.

appeal in those days.⁵³² The very concepts of Rīti and Vṛtti in poetics owe their formulation to the study of these sound-effects; the first effect a verse on its mere reading or hearing produces, holds the mind to the end; for the Rasa to be suggested, even the jingle in the sounds or the clash of words is welcome and appropriate means.⁵³³

It is rarely that ^{our} poet uses a single figure of speech in exclusion to the other ones. He rather prefers to exhibit his skill by beautifully mixing both the Śabdālaṅkāras and the Arthālaṅkāras in a complex mixture resulting in an attractive sound-texture. Naturally, in quoting the illustrations one has to keep one's eye on the prominent one in the piece cited.

(1) ANUPRĀSA (ALLITERATION) :-

Though, unlike Bāṇa, ~~the~~ Dhanapāla was against an endless series of compounds, he was very fond of jingle of sounds as is evident in numerous instances on every page throughout the text of the TM wherein alliteration (anuprāsa) has been employed skillfully as it creates the melodious effect. In fact Dhanapāla seems to have been captivated by the charm of this favourite figure of speech.⁵³⁴ He has utilized all the five types of Anuprāsa-jātis, viz., Madhurā, Prauḍhā, Paraṣā, Lalitā and Bhadrā, enumerated by Rudratā.⁵³⁵

532. TM(N), p.3, Intro.vs.16 ab: वणशुक्तिं दधानापि स्निग्धजनप्रतेहसम्।

533. SCOAS, p.86. / 534. TM(N), p.159(16ff.)...जाति -

535. KVL(R), II, 20, 24, 26 and 29. / निवृत्तशुक्तिनाम् -

Thus, we find :

(a) Madhurā, as in

-- पतितशीर्ष्णतिरुपष्णानिकरावकीर्ष्णानि कान्तार- (199,4ff.);
वर्त्मना ---।

(b) Praudhā, as in

-- गद्गदिकागृहमाणगलनिर्गलदपर्याप्तादारम्, --- (93,13);

(c) Paruṣā, as in

--- आसक्तसान्द्रसमारेणुधूसराभिरामवपुष्णम्, ----- (93,16);

(d) Lalitā, as in

--- आन्दोलितालिनीललीलालकभंगमाभंगुरम्, ----- (76,18ff.);

and (e) Bhadrā, as in

--- गात्रसंधट्टरणिगततारक्वाणमणिघण्टेश्चण्डडिण्डिमार्कडमरितविपदा-
वारणः-- (367,3ff.).

Anuprāsa ~~is~~ flows with natural felicity from the pen of Dhanapāla, can be seen in the following specimens of the remaining three types of alliteration, viz., Chekānuprāsa, Lāṭānuprāsa and Śrutyanuprāsa, ~~namān~~ :

(f) Chekānuprāsa, as in

-- निव्याजिमावर्जितमनाः --- (93,10ff.), ॐ --- नाद्रादीत्तदा-

स्य चामरग्राहिणीमप्रादीत् --- (94,8ff.), -- सर्वागिणामाकल्पमल्प-

पदातिबलपरिवृतः -- (177,10), ----- सस्मार सस्मरेण चेतसा

----- (179,6), ----- नानाशकुनिकुलसौहित्येषु लौहित्यापकण्ठकानने-

षु -- (182,22), -- कुमार, दारुणां वारणः (185,21), -- सशो-

केन राजलोकेनावलोक्यमानो ---- (187,3), ----- कार्म्पनिर्मित-

ताष्णमिन्दिरास्तीष्णाम्, -- (196,3);

(g) Lāṭānuprāsa, as in

--- मकरन्दपोनपरवशालिनीशालिनि --- (206,9ff.), -- निरनु-
 क्रोशमाक्रोशन्तीम्, --- (306,3), --- स्लालकंगनागपुन्नागसंकटम्, ---
 --- (210,22);

(h) Śrutyanuprāsa, as in

--- दालयं दारैणं ^{सामुद्रिणं} वारिणा वारवारमास्यम्, ----- (146,
 13ff.) -- वेलां गते विरलतां विलीनतापे तपनतेजसि तरलिता
 --- (178,9ff.), --- मरुत्तहरितहारिपत्रनिवहनिवारितदिनेशदीधिति-
 प्रवेशः-- (228,12ff.), -- अमन्दमानन्दमनुभवन्ती ----- (319,6),
 --- नीतश्च वीतगमनाभिलाषोऽपि निवासम्, ---- (320,8ff.),
 ----- तरलितैस्तापिच्छकपिच्छमसि च्छदच्छायातमसि -----
 --- (353,15ff.), --- अंगं मुक्त्वा व्यासंगमेकक एव गच्छ शृंगिण-
 मेककृंगम्, ----- (401,19ff.).

The poet is adept at utilizing alliteration in creating various types of sound-effects. Thus, the effect of :

(i) war-music is sought to be created in

---- कुपितयमहुंकारानुकारिभांकारभैरवमतिगम्भीरमारसन्ती-
 नां समरद्वक्कानां ध्वनितेन ----- (86,9ff.);

(ii) treading on dry leaves in

--- पतितशीर्णतिरुपणानिकरावकीर्णौन कान्तारवर्त्मना
 (199,4ff.);

(iii) flowing water of streams in

--- दुरवतारतुंगतटाभिरुत्कोटिपाषाणपटलस्खलनबहुमुख-
 प्रवृत्तोत्तोजलाभिः --- (199,18ff.).

(2) YAMAKA (RHYME or CHIME) :-

Another figure of speech based on Rhyme and used with equally pleasing effect is Yamaka, which is illustrated in its varieties like Saṁyatāvṛtti, Asaṁyatāvṛtti in both Madhya-yamaka and Antya-yamaka types, and they are usually accompanied by alliteration. Though generally Yamaka would need special effort and drag the poet away from his concentration on Rasa, Dhanapāla is a happy exception in that it comes with him easily and on proper occasions only so that it never distracts the audience nor does it hinder the Rasa. The following specimens illustrate the varieties employed by our poet:

(a) Saṁyatāvṛtti Madhya-yamaka ; as in

--- अविनिश्चितासमदोमस्य समदोमस्य सामन्तलोकस्य ---- (90, 11ff.),

--- शोकलम्बालकं बालकमादाय -- (137, 4), --- अत्र हि पदे पदे

--- श्रीडास्थानानि, स्थाने स्थाने सर्वर्तुकानि वनानि, वने वने कल्पतरु-
षण्डानि, षण्डे षण्डे काचनलतादोलाय (148, 1ff.) where the

Yamaka is interpenetrated with another figure of speech called Ekāvalī, कर्णकोटराध्वनि ध्वनिविशेषानव-
धारयन्तम्, ----- (183, 22);

(b) Saṁyatāvṛtti Antya-yamaka, as in

--- लघितो सर्वद्वीपसायात्रिकाणाममार्गो मार्गः । समाक्रान्ता --
भूमिगोचराणामभूमिर्भूमिः । आसादितमिदं सर्वसुन्दरपदार्थानामधि-
ष्ठानं स्थानम् । अहो अवलोकितं --- कौतुकाना- / (158, 18ff.);

मायतनमायतनम् ।

(c) Asam̐yatāvṛtti Madhya-yamaka, as in

--- शिखरिभिरधिष्ठितपृष्ठभागो मठ इव सपारापतः संवरति
कमठो ----- (145, 14ff.), --- उपस्थिते च प्रदोषे प्रतीष्य
कृतसपर्याणां द्विजन्मनामाशिष्यमार्गस्य च सपर्याणां याम- (173, 19ff.),
and in ^{प्रक-}प्रकृतिमन्दापि तस्या गतिरमन्दायत ^{करिणी}----- (75, 1ff.)

where it is skillfully intertwined with another figure of speech called Virodhābhāsa arising from the apparent contradiction in 'Mandāyata' and 'Aman-dayāta'!

(3) ŚLEṢA (PARONOMASIA) :-

The third figure of speech used by Dhanapāla is Śleṣa or Paronomasia in both its varieties, viz., the one based on verbal sound (Śabdālaṅkāra) and the other one based on meaning (Arthālaṅkāra). Dhanapāla knew that his audience readily responded to paronomasia if it was not ceaselessly overdone, as for instance, was done by Tivikramabhaṭṭa in his Nalacampū. Dhanapāla's Śleṣa is happily rare and very subtle, but it never tends to be obscure. It is employed in both its sub-varieties called Abhaṅga (i.e. the one in which the constituent syllables do not have to be split up) and Sabhaṅga (i.e., the one in which the syllables have to be necessarily broken up and construed differently with relevant substantives. Thus, we have :

(1) Abhaṅga-śleṣa, as in

--- विघृतविकोशपुष्करेण न तथा निजकरे यथा सुमटनिकरे
दृष्टिमनयत्, ----- (75, 15ff.)

where the words 'Puṣkara' means (a) a lotus, when construed with 'Kara', and (b) a sword, when construed with 'Subhata';

or in

--- सर्वदा शर्वरीषु विहितप्रचारेण नकचर्चकर्विना लकेश्वरेणापि
सततमभिशंकितोत्साहस्य सिंहलद्वीपमर्तुर्महानरेन्द्रस्य चन्द्रकेतो -----

(95,2ff.) where the word 'Mahānarendra' means both
(a) a magician, and (b) a great king;

or in

--- निसर्गैर्णैव पदापातिना प्रसन्नमुखरागधुतेर्विनयवतश्च भवतः ---

(349,10ff.) where the word 'Pakṣapātinah' means
(a) of one who flies with wings, and (b) of one who
is partial (to me).

Similarly, we have :

(ii) Sabhaṅga-slesa, as in

--- कृष्णातारोचितामपि क्षीरध्वलामधर दृष्टिम्, ----- (74,22ff.)

where the compound 'Kṛṣṇatārocitām' needs to be broken up as Kṛṣṇa - tāra - ucitām and Kṛṣṇatā - rocitām ;

or in

-- प्रदोषचन्द्रकलामिव विनिद्रकोकनदविनिवेशितकराम्, --- (55,6ff.)

where the compound 'Vinidrakokanadavinivesitakarām' has to be broken up as Vinidra-kokanada-vinivesitakarām and Vinidra-koka-nada-vinivesita-karām.

In -- सुग्रीवसेनामिव स्फुरत्तारनीलागदाम्, ----- where the word 'Sugrīva' means (a) one who has a beautiful neck, and (b) Sugrīva, and the word 'Nīlāṅgada' means (a) blue bracelet, and (b) Nīla and Aṅgada, the poet has skillfully alluded to the characters of the Rāmāyana story.

In the following instances the poet has presupposed the provisional verbal identity of 'La' and 'Ba' and of 'Ra' and 'Va' and 'Ba' and of 'La' respectively:

(i) तं च पुरोलिखितरुचिरलेखस्वस्तिकमावासगृहमिव मुहुर्निरीक्ष्य -----

(192,19ff.). (Here the pronoun 'tam' refers to the message (lekha) mentioned in the preceding line No. 15.). The word 'lekha' has to be construed as 'rekha' with the message (lekha) and as 'lekha' with the house (āvāsa-gṛha); and

(ii) -- वलितरंगितमध्यसरणिं क्रीडारामं विषमबाणस्य --(264,11ff.)

where the compound 'Bali....' has to be broken up as 'Bali....' with 'Kṛīḍārāmaṃ' and 'Bali....' with 'Navayauvanāvātāraṃ'.

The most brilliant and unique feat of Pronomasia based on meaning (Artha-sleṣa) is illustrated in the apparent invocation to the boat.⁵³⁶ The whole monologue, of more than three pages in length, has been composed with such a superb ingenuity that it can be fully construed with reference to a boat

536. TM(N), pp.283-286.

(nau) as well as to Malayasundarī. In some parts, of course, it is based on verbal Śleṣa on words like Dhīvara, Bhujāṅga, Nāgaraka, Sandhi-ghaṭanā, Vamśa, Tatparatā, Guṇavatī, Gambhīrā, Sakarnā, Bahukṣamā, Sthirā, Mahārthā, Mahāpruṣodvahana-yogyā, Pātra, and etc., but in the sentences like मा निपत सागरात्प्रविशि ---, -मा प्रविश रसातले -----, - मा समाश्रय दिगन्तान्-- the Śleṣa solely depends on the double-meaning with reference to the boat as well as to Malayasundarī. Perhaps Dhanapāla is the first poet to have attempted at such a device in a Sanskrit prose-romance, though it was explored on in the field of Sanskrit Epic poems.

Dhanapāla is highly conscious about this brilliant piece which is full of fine suggestive sense (vyaṅgyārtha) and testifies to Dhanapāla's high strature as a first-rate poet.

(4) UPAMĀ (SIMILE) :

As in Daṇḍin and Bāṇa so in Dhanapāla also, Upamā or Simile enjoys a very prominent place along with Utpreksā or Poetic fancy, both being the tour de force of most of the Sanskrit ~~poets~~ poets who have ever been tapping their resourcefulness in turning out fresh and subtle similes from their observation of the world of their varied experience.

Dhanapāla has based his similes on a variety of subjects such as poetic conventions, religion, mythology, astrology, sociology, archery and etc., and they are mostly interpenetrated

by other figures of speech such as Śleṣa, Utprekṣā, Rūpaka, and others. The following specimens would testify to the poet's sense of propriety, freshness and effectiveness.

The terrible laughter of the ~~mountain~~ Vetāla is compared, by implication, to the simultaneously rolling rocks of a peak of a great mountain hit by the thunderbolt, as in

--- कुलिशताडितकुलाचलशिखरसमकालनिपतद्गण्डशैलनिवहनोधुरो हास-
ध्वनिरदलसत्, ----- (46,8ff.). The strange simile, as

in -- रासमप्रोथघूसरं नखप्रमाक्सरम्, ----- (46,19), appropriately brings out the effect of oddity in the description of the terrific Vetāla. The series of similes (mālopamā), as in

--- चन्द्रमण्डलमिव शिशिरात्ययेन, मानससरस्तोयमिवागस्त्योदयेन, सुकवि-
वाचमिव सज्जनपरिग्रहेण, गगनतलमिव शरत्कालागमेन, सप्रसादमपि मे
प्रसादितं हृदयम्, ----- (56,18ff.), most effectively

depicts the intensity of joy and satisfaction experienced by the Goddess Śrī on seeing the unparalleled valour of King Meghavāhana; the series of similes is here enhanced by the touches of alliteration and apparent contradiction in the

tail piece. A fine simile, as in --- प्रथमजलधरस्तनितेनेव वि-
न्ध्यः सद्य एवोदमिन्नसरसरोमाचकन्दलः ----- (89,5ff.) pictu-

resquely represents the favourable effect of Samaraketu's challenging roar on brave Vajrāyudha at the start of a fierce dual in the course of a battle that ensued during the night-attack. The redness of the sky at the time of sunset

after the battle is aptly compared to a stream of blood flowing from the heart of the Sun pierced by the warriors proceeding to emancipation, as in --- अपवर्गचलितवीरवर्गभिन्नसूर्य-

मण्डलरुधिरप्रवाह इव पूर्वदिग्भागमरुणीचकार संध्यारागः -----

(96,8ff.); and the underlying simile enhances the effect of another more prominent figures of speech here, viz., Tadgunā (transfer of qualities) and Utpreksā (poetic fancy). The grief of sighing Samaraketu is graphically brought in a series of similes, such as, -- वारिबद्ध इव वनकरी, लव्यमिध्याशाप इव साधुरकस्मात्प्रणाष्टसकलगृहस्वापतेय इव गृहपतिरायतोष्णान्मुहुर्मुहुः सृजसि निःस्वासान् ----- (111,18ff.). The jocular trend

of Kamalagupta's monologue is appropriately exhibited, as in,

--- शौच्यः पुनरसौ पापकर्मा कर्मवाण्डाला प्रकृतिदुष्टात्मा विशिष्टाभासः

सकलवारग्रामणिरग्रालनामा मंजीरो येन माजरिणेव मूषिकामिषमुपसृत्य

निमृतमत्र विनिहितमुपलदयता ----- उपहृत्य लेखपत्रकम्, -----

----- (112,9ff.), where he mockingly admonishes Manjiraka

for having picked up an anonymous love-letter in the manner

of a cat picking up the stealthily stored flesh of a rat;

the simile is here beautifully strengthened by another figure

of speech called Parikara which consists of a series of

most appropriately purposeful adjectives. The helplessness

of Samaraketu is evident when he compares himself to a help-

less bird that has, having strayed on a vast ocean, traversed

a long distance but is at a loss to find the shore, as in,

--- कथं चास्थिरस्वभावतया सरभसप्रधावितेनेव भूमिमियतीमागत्य भग्नमनसा तीरा-

दर्शिशकुनिनेव पश्चान्निवर्तितव्यम् -- (149,17ff.). The inscribed line of letters in an inscription at the Jain temple on Mounts Ekasr̥ṅga are suggestively compared to the pearl necklace worn by the Goddess Sarasvatī in her neck, as in, --- सर-
स्वतीमणिकण्ठानुकुरिणीभिर्वर्णपङ्क्तिभिरुद्भासितां प्रशस्तिं (219,16ff.). The pure water of the divine Adṛṣṭapāra lake dripping from between the fingers is likened to the white moon-rays passing through them, as in, --- करागुलीविवरविगलदिन्दुदीधितिघवल-
घारं सुधारसस्वादु -- सलिलम् -- (252,9ff.). In the changed situation when his beloved has suddenly disappeared leaving him love-lorn and desperate for committing suicide, the garland lovingly thrown into Samaraketu's neck by enamoured Malayasundarī is appropriately compared by the former to a wreath worn by a culprit condemned to capital punishment in a full-fledged simile, as in, -- तत्करद्वयीनिबिडसदानितया करेणुरिव कण्ठरज्ज्वा
स्वयं वर्णमालया न शक्नोमि वयस्रजमिवोद्धहन्निमां कन्धराबद्धां बन्धुलोकं द्रष्टुम्,
(291,8ff.) wherein Samaraketu also likens himself to an elephant; the simile is here supported by purposeful adjective, viz., Tatcara.... etc., forming the figure of speech called Parikara. The graphic picture of hanging Malayasundarī arises when the poet most aptly compares her to a cursed goddess about to descend to, but has not yet touched, the earth, as in, --- तत्काणाप्राप्तमर्त्यलोकावतारशापेव त्रिदशलनासमासन्नभूतलस्पर्शा
निरालम्बमम्बरे कृतस्थितिः ----- (306,23ff.). The setting Sun

is suggestively compared to a round cross-section of a pillar of red sandal, as in --- ककवकृवा तिवृत्तचन्दनस्तम्भच्छेद-
 च्छविनां दिनकरबिम्बेन ----- (350,9). While consoling Tilakanañ-
 jarī who is dejected at the impending departure of Harivāha-
 na for Ayodhyā, Malayasundarī compares him to the Moon had
 her to the waves of the ocean, as in --- पुनरुत्तमिष्यत्येव वाध-
 प्रमृति दूरेऽप्यवस्थितः सुधाशुरिव सिन्धुवेलायाः समासन्नि ^{स्व} कल्याणभागिन्याः (385,17ff.).
 And the sensual infatuation of god Sumālī is well brought
 out when he is compared to a mighty elephant of a principal
 direction, as in --- स्निग्धविततसिध्दायतनवनखण्डे पृथुनितम्बकुच-
 कुम्भमण्डलाभिः सुरकौण्डिभिरिवाशागजस्य प्रधानाप्सरौभिः परिवृतस्य
 विवर्तते विजृम्भितामन्दरतिरसानन्दस्य स्वच्छन्दचारिभिरिन्द्रियैर्दूरमप-
 हृतस्य ----- सुमालिनाम्नो वैमानिकस्य ----- (411,15ff.).

Some of the striking similes are based principally on
 paronomasia, while repping in a few other figures of speech
 also. Thus, Samaraketu hopes to find out Harivāhana with the
 help of the latter's fame of good qualities in the same a
 manner as the clouded Moon can be located with the help of
 the accompanying halo, as in --- लब्धनिर्गमा निसर्गविमलाम्बुः
 कलाम्बुः प्रमेव मृगलाङ्गुलं हृन्मपि तमाविःकरिष्यति विजृम्भमाणा दिग्मुखे-
 षु सद्गुणस्थातिः ----- (197,6ff.),

where the word 'Kalā' signifies both the 'fine arts' and the
 'digits of the Moon'. The drops of tears rolling in success-
 ion from the eyes of Malayasundarī at the question from Ha-
 rivāhana, are graphically compared to a number of shooting

stars, as in --- तत्त्वाणानिबन्धरागोयाश्च लोचनापागंसरितः पूर्वहरितं
 इव तरुणाज्यनेतिराहतायास्तारकासमूहः पपाताजस्रमशुकणवि-^{स्तारः} (258,20ff.);
 here the full-fledged simile is beautifully blended with alliteration and metaphor. The flags fluttering on the temple of Cupid are compared to the waves of the ocean in the form of attachment, as in रागजलनिधेवीचिमिरिव सनिहितमकराभिरालोहिता-
 शुकपताकाभिः पल्लवितशिक्षरेण --- केतस्तम्भेन प्रकाशयमानम्, -----
 (303,18ff.), where the word 'Sannihita' has to be understood in the sense of 'having in the vicinity' with 'Vici' and that of 'put', i.e. painted, with 'Patākā'. The buds of the Aśoka tree are beautifully compared to the bleeding hearts of travellers who have been separated from their young wives, as in ---- तरुणागृहिणीवियोगविघटिता ध्वन्यहृदयैरिवोदामराग-
 रशोकपादपप्रवालैः --(304,16ff.), where the word 'Rāga' has to be construed in the sense of 'passion' with 'Adhvanya' and in that of 'redness' with 'Pravāla'.

The following notable similes are based on some of the positive sciences and such other subjects. Thus, the Vidyādhara Muni declines to accept the kingdom humbly offered in service by King Meghavāhana and compares himself to a doctor who is unable to cure the dying patient, as in -- विपत्प्रतीकारासमर्थः क्षीणायुषोऽस्य मिषागिव कथमुक्थमाहरामि । (44,8ff.). Another classical instance of a simile from Āyurveda is found when the restive feudatories sought to be brought to

book by Samaraketu are aptly compared to festering wounds necessitating a variety of clinical treatments, as in स्थान-स्थानेषु लब्धोदयानहितोपचारैः परममुपचयं प्राप्तान्सर्वतः समासादितप्रसरानाविः कृतानेकविकाराननवरतकृतरुजो जनस्य दुष्टव्रणानिव नृपान्कांश्चत्त्रशक्त्या कां-श्चन्मन्त्रशक्त्या --- उज्जितातोष्पणाश्च प्रकटितप्रसन्नमुखरागान्निगलितोन्नतीन-भिषोकविधिनापटुबन्धेनान्यैश्च निर्वृत्तिकरैराज्यदानादिभिर्मधुरोपचारैः पुनस्तामेव प्राक्तनीं प्रकृति-^{मानयधु} (133, 7ff.), where the words 'Tantra', 'Mantra', 'Śastra-vyāpāra', 'Kṣāra', 'Rakta', 'Kṣuraprabheda', 'Eka- deśa-dahana', Maṇḍalopamarda', 'Mukha-rāga', 'Unnati', 'Abhi- seka', 'Paṭṭa-bandha' and etc., are to be construed as technical terms of the science of medicine and as those of the science of statecraft; the basic full-fledged simile is here intertwined with two other figures of speech, viz., Śleṣa, and Dīpaṅka. Another full-fledged simile is drawn from navigation when the poet seeks to describe the darkness gradually creeping after the sunset, as in --- ऊर्ध्वकिरणार्ज्जुस्तम्बलम्बमान-शशिबिम्बनागरादपरदिग्भागयानपात्रादवततार सायात्रिक इव कृताम्बरजलधि-यात्रः शनैः शनैरन्धकारः ----- (150, 13ff.), where the simile is fully dependent on the basic metaphorical identity of (Kirāṇa' with 'Rajju', of 'Śasi-bimba' with 'Nāgara', of 'Apara-digbhāga' with 'Yāna-pātra' and of 'Andhakāra' with 'Sāmyātrika'. While describing the neck of Malayasundarī the poet draws his simile from mythology, picturing Viṣṇu with his discus and conch, as in --- सुदर्शनीपेतेन वैकुण्ठेनेव कण्ठ-

नालेन तुलितशंखाम्, ----- (160,20ff.), where the words 'Sudarsana', 'Vaikuṅṭha' and 'Śaṅkha' are all double-meaning. Similarly, the poet draws upon the Rāmāyana story when he compares the ocean to the life-story of Lakṣmaṇa, as in

---- सौमित्रिवरितमिव विस्तारितोम्बिलास्यशोभम्, ----- (204,18ff.), where the latter compound has to be broken up as 'Vistārita-urmmi-lāsyā-sobham' with 'Ambhonidhi', and as 'Vistārita-urmmilā-āsyā-sobham' with 'Saumitri-caritam'. When the good omens are compared to the Śaivas, the simile is based on religion, as in --- प्रतिपन्नदक्षिणवाममाग्गामैः परं शिवं शंसदभिरमि-प्रेतसाधकैः शैवैरिव प्रधानशकुनेः ~~पदे~~ पदे दत्तनिर्वृतिः -----(198,23ff.).

Similarly the instruction in Jainism is compared to the nymphs, as in ---- स्वभावमधुराभिर्यथात्प्रथितशुश्रूषारसावेशामिः प्रकाशित-प्रगुणसंसारनिर्वाणसरणिभिरर्थसाराभिरप्सरामिरिव जिनमतानुसारिणीभि-र्वाग्भिरावेद्य जीवादितत्त्वप्रमेदम्, ----- (411,20ff.).

While praising the valour of King Meghavāhana, the poet compares the total destruction of the king's enemies to the negation of all external things of the world with reference to the philosophical tenets of Buddhist Logic, as in

यस्य दोषिणा स्फुरध्वैता प्रतीये विबुधैर्बुधैः ।

बौध्दतर्कं ह्यवार्थानां नाशो राज्ञां निरन्वयः ॥ (16,6ff.).

The science of Erotics is tapped when the forest land is compared to a beloved who has been guilty of committing some fault, as in -- सापराधवध्वैव प्रियालपनसफलीभूतपादमातनि-^{ष्ठया} (200,20ff.),

where the latter compound has to be broken up as 'Priya-
-ālapana-saphalībhūta-pāda-pāta-niṣṭhayā' with 'Vadhvā',
and as 'Priyāla-panasa-phalībhūta-pādapa-ataniṣṭhayā' with
'Atavī-bhuvā'. And when the poet compares the same forest π
with a quiver of arrows, as in --- वीरपुराणतूप्यैव गरखराच्छमल्ल-
शरभरोचितया (200,21ff.), he again resorts to Sabhaṅga-sleṣa
necessitating the latter compound to be broken up as 'Gaura-
-khara-accha-bhalla-śara-bhara-ucitayā' with 'Tunyā' and as
'Gaurakhara-acchabhalla-śarabha-rocitayā' with 'Atavī-bhuvā',
the science of Archery is referred to. It is more effective-
ly drawn upon in the following case, viz., --- संधानमानीतो
विशिक्ष इव विघटते विपदाः । विलक्षिभूतश्च महतीमप्रतिष्ठामुपकण्ठवर्तिषु
नृपेषु प्रस्थापयति (327,17ff.), where the words 'Sandhāna',
'Viśikha', 'Vipakṣa' and 'Vilakṣībhūta' are to be construed
both from the points of view of Archery and of ~~Statecraft~~
statecraft. It is Sociology and Lexicography that are allu-
ded to when the neck of a parrot is compared to the word
'Dvijāti', as in -- त्रिवर्णीराजिना द्विजातिशब्देनेवोद्भासितैः कण्ठभागेन
(348,19ff.). In another simile the white garment of Harivā-
hana is compared with the science of Arithmetic, as in
-- संख्यानशास्त्रेणोव नवदशालंकृतेन श्वेतचीनवस्त्रद्वयेन संवीतम्, -----
(229,9). When roaming Harivāhana is compared to a group of
constellations, as in --- आशागृहीतो ग्रहग्राम इव लवमप्यकृतविश्रामः
परिभ्रम्य मूयांसि मण्डलानि तदेव शून्यं वनमविदात्, ----- (392,15ff.),

the Astrology, and particularly the horoscopic aspect thereof, is alluded to. And lastly, the poet refers to Gambling when Harivāhana compares the heavenly life-span of Sumālī with an eight-housed gambling board, as in ----- परमप्रमाद-
वसतेरवारितादाप्रवारहारितस्वार्थसंपदोऽष्टापदधूतस्यैव स्मरसि तस्य
त्रिविष्टपवासस्य ----- (420,20ff.).

(5) UTPREKṢĀ (POETIC FANCY) :-

Writers of Sanskrit prose-romances seem to have been very much fond of poetic conceits (utprekṣās) as they afforded greater freedom to their soaring imagination than was available when they resorted to simile. In spinning out poetic fancies their genius literally travelled from earth to heaven and from heaven back to the earth and practically covered all important fields of human endeavour, be they fine arts, positive sciences and social disciplines, everyday life, mythology, religion, philosophy, and what not. Ingenuity and eccentricity ~~and~~ often formed the endowments of many a poet who strained the conceits too much on the verge of farfetchedness and irrelevancy. In fact this figure of speech is a very powerful poetic medium demanding great care, since it specially needs to be used in close harmony with the main theme and Rasa. The poet's taste, scholarship and literary calibre are revealed by the manner in which he uses or abuses this figure of speech.

Dhanapāla has proved an adept at using his poetic fancy (utprekṣā) to ~~the~~ aesthetic benefit and in total sympathy with the prevalent poetic relish or sentiment at ~~the~~ a given point in the narration. It can easily be noticed that he has exhibited his skill and propriety in harnessing all types of poetic conceits, viz., Svarūpotprekṣā, Hetūtprekṣā and Phalotprekṣā. And his Ūtprekṣās are at times interwoven with many other figures of speech such as Anuprāsa, Yamaka, Upamā, Rūpaka, Samāsokti and others.

The following specimens of poetic fancies (utprekṣās) would amply testify to the poetic genius of Dhanapāla as they are marked by contextual harmony and sympathetic depiction. Thus, the lustre, the impending fall from the heaven and the consequent dejection are suggestively foreboded in the course of the long description of the Vaimānika god Jvalanaprabha by means of apt poetic conceits, as in

--- क्षारदेशे झगिति दत्तदर्शनम्, ----- समुपजातद्वादशारुणोदयमिव
 ब्रह्मस्तम्बमस्तशिखरपर्यस्तसूर्यमिव दिक्सम्, ----- इन्दुमण्डलाभिमुखी-
 मूतसँहिकेयमिव पावृष्णचन्द्रिकापटलम्, ----- त्रिदशलोबश्रियो वियोगा-
 श्रुमिरिव सकज्जलैः कल्माषितेन कल्पतरुपल्लवचारुण्णा चरुण्ण्येन
 चोत्तमानम्, --- प्रियापयोधरपरिरम्भशंसिमिः पृथुलपरिमण्डलैर्दिव्य-
 चन्दनरसस्तबकैः स्वर्गच्यवनसुलभो हृदयदवधुरितरसुरमिवैनमपि मा पीडये-
 दिति बुद्ध्या समागतैरखिलपाँष्णिमासीशशिमण्डलैरिवाधिष्ठितवदा-
 स्थलामोगम्, ----- वूडारत्नेन भाक्सुरलक्ष्मीविनाशसूचनाय
 कृतसानिध्यैनोत्पातसूर्यमण्डलेनेव सकीलेन कलितोत्तमांगम्, -----

मर्त्यलाकणट्वरणहठवुम्बनशंकयेव निबिडसंकौचितमुखीभिर्मन्दारकलिकाभि-
रन्तरान्तरा दन्तुरितेन किञ्चिदारूढम्लानिना पारिजातकुसुमशेखरेण विराज-
मानम्, ----- एकं वैमानिकमपश्यम्, | ~~-----~~ (pp.35-38).

The Candrātapa necklace is beautifully fancied to be the essence of nectar exuding from the broken heart of god Jvalanaprabha, as in ---- उपस्थितनिरक्सानसुरलोकविरहव्यथाविदीर्ण-
हृदयोद्गीर्णगिर्णामृतच्छटासारमिव हारमुपनिन्द्ये ----- (45,4ff.).

The reverberating shouts of joy accompanied by the festive music consequent to the birth of a male child to Queen Madirāvati is graphically and most effectively depicted in the following poetic conceits :

अनुसृतः पटीयसा झ्नात्कृतेन वादित्राणामाह्वयन्निव नर्तनाय व्योम्नि
वैमानिकवधूवृन्दम्, आकारयन्निव महोत्सवावलोकनाय दिदु लोकपाल-
परिषदम्, आदिशन्निव रंगावलीयोग्यरत्नानयनाय ~~पृथ्वी~~ पृथ्वीतलो-
पान्तेषु पाथोनिधीन्, बभ्राम -- जगति नान्दीघोषः (76,9ff.).

Vajrāyudha's fondness for fighting and his consequent martial movements are appropriately brought out in the following poetic fancies :

नायकस्तत्काललव्धावसरेण मृत्यैनेव रणरसेन विकटरोमांचकवचेन
प्रेयमाणा विजृम्भितातिमीषणाभ्रुकुटिसंकटायमानललाटभित्तिः ----
---- रभसदूरपातिभिरभिमुखप्रकटितासियष्टिमात्मव्हायाममिहन्तु-
मिव पुरःप्रवर्तितैः पादैराकम्पितचित्तिः ----- (84, 21ff.).

The following series of suggestive poetic conceits bring

out the fierce nature of the battle during the night-attack by Samaraketu :

--- सतारकावर्णं इव वेतालदृष्टिभिः, सौत्कापातरविमण्डल इव कीलालित-
करालचक्रमुक्तिभिः, सर्वधुतस्फुर्ज इव जवापतज्ज्वलितशक्तिभिः, सखण्डपरशु-
ताण्डव इव प्रवण्डानिलघूतध्वजसहस्रैः, सकालाग्निधूम इव प्रकुपितसुघटप्रकुटीतमिश्रै-
रजायत महाप्रलयसंनिभः समरसंघट्टः । ----- (87,7ff.).

A highly graphic word-picture of a hand of an archer in action emerges in the following fancies :

----- अतिवेगव्यापृतोऽस्य तत्र दाणो प्रोत इव तूणीमुखेषु, लिखित इव
मौर्व्याम्, उत्कीर्णं इव पुक्षुषु, अवतंसति इव श्रवणान्तै तुल्यकालमलक्ष्यत
वामेतरः पाणिः । (90,21ff.).

A picture of swooned Samaraketu is sought to be brought out by means of the following fancies :

अद्रादीच्च ----- आसादितविजयरिपुदर्शनपरिजिही षयैव निमिषिते-
दाणारविन्दम्, --- उत्सृष्टवापयष्टिना वामेन ददाणो न च स्फुरितदीर्घ-
नखकिरणेन तत्दाणाप्रष्टकरवालान्वेषिणो न पाणिना विराजमानम्, ---
प्रसुप्तसरःकुमुदमध्यवर्तिनमिव प्रतिमादिनकरम्, -----कुमारम्, (93,15ff.).

The details in the description of the day-break following the night-attack are skillfully harmonized with the situation of the cease-fire in the following fancies :

--- अमरीभूतसुभटनिर्दयाश्लिष्टसुरवधूहारमुक्तमौर्विककविसरमिव तुहिन-
जलबिन्दुनिकरं ववर्णं गगनतलम् । अरुणालोकरलितानि वेतालवृन्दा-
नीव तिरौबभूवुस्तिमिराणि । रणभूमिशोषितावलोकनमत्त इव पाश्चा-
त्यशैलशिखरे स्खलद्विकलपादः पपात तारापतिः । -----

--- अपवर्णचलितवीरवर्गभिन्नसूर्यमण्डलरुधिरप्रवाह इव पूर्वदिग्भागमरुणी-
चकार संध्यारागः । (96,1ff.).

A fittingly sympathetic poetic conceit is employed in describing the single-stringed necklace worn by Samabaketu on the occasion of the auspicious rites performed before he set out for the naval expedition, as in :

--- स्थूलस्वच्छमुक्ताफलप्रथितां तत्दाणंप्रमुदिताया वदाःस्थलभाजो
राजलक्ष्या लोचनद्वयानन्दाश्रुपध्दतिमिव द्विधाप्रवृतां नाभिचक्रुम्बिनी-
मेकावलीं दधानः ----- (115,3ff.).

The intense love and interest of Kamalagupta for Harivāhana is effectively suggested, with reference to the latter's message to the former, in a series of three fancies, viz.,

--- गृहीत्वा गृहीतार्थमपि पूर्वमपूर्वमिव सयत्नमुद्देश्य विस्तार्य च
पुरस्तात्प्रीतिविस्फारितेन चक्षुषा पिबन्निवोपगूहन्निवान्तः प्रवेशय-
न्निव पुनःपुनरवाचयत् । (196,7ff.).

A series of fanciful flights of poetic imaginations in the description of Adrṣṭapāra lake exhibits the poet's ingenuity, as in :

--- अण्णपूर्णमालवालमिव त्रिलोकीलतायाः कान्तिसंततितिरोहितान्तरालं
नाभिमण्डलमिव भूतघात्रिया विलासराप्यदर्पणमिव दिशां प्रतिबिम्बमिवा-
म्बरतलस्य लीलादुकूलवितानमिव फणीन्द्रस्याट्टहासमिव पातालत्रयस्य,
निःसर्णवर्त्मैव बलिकीर्तिकलापस्य रसातलप्रवेशद्वारमिव मन्दाकिनीप्रवाहस्य
शेषाहिफणाचक्रवालधुतिजालमिवोच्छलितं विधुन्तुदग्रासमयादिन्दुचन्द्रिका-
पटलमिव गलितम्, ----- (203,3ff.).

The fancies heralding the welfare bade to Samaraketu by Nature when he started for ~~Har~~ Vaitādhya in search of Harivāhana, are beautifully appropriate, as in :

--- अनवर्तकपर्णातालास्फालितकपोलमितिभिः सरभसमाहन्यमानप्रस्थान-
मंगलतूर्य इव कनकरात्रिभिः, अनिलवलितशाखाग्रालितसितकलिकैः शिरसि विदि-
प्यमाणादातकणा इव वनस्पतिभिः, अंगसंगवेल्लितलताखण्डोद्भूतैरुत्तरोरुवध-
मण्डलं ध्वनिन्दिरारभ्यमाण ब्रह्मघोष इव मधुकरैः, मानुषदर्शननिसर्गकारै-
त्वरितपदमग्नतः पलायमानैरुपदिश्यमानमार्गं इव मल्लिकादास्तत्त्वाणानिपी-
ताण्णाभिर्नृचीणैः सरोवराद्विरलतृणास्तम्बकवलनार्थमनुवेलमवनमितमूर्धभिः
पदे पदे सप्रदक्षिणां प्रणम्यमान इव प्राङ्मुखस्थितैर्वनहरिणैः (209,16ff.).

The golden lotuses offered to the image of Lord Jina are fancied to be the faces of the water deities, as in :

--- तत्त्वाणाप्रतिबुद्धानामुधानदीर्घिकाजलदेवतानामीदाणप्रवृत्तजृम्भिकाशुकणि-
कैर्मुखप्रतिबिम्बैरिव सधोजलादुद्धृतैः कनकारविन्दैः ----- (255,6ff.).

The rays of the Moon falling on the body of the love-lorn Samaraketu are aptly and picturesquely fancied to be the blades of spears, as in :

--- जालान्तरनिपातिभिरशुनिकरैः प्रासविसरैरिव हिमाशुना हन्यमानः --
(324,7ff.).

The advent of the night is fancied in the following manners:

--- दृष्टिविरहितेव सृष्टिरिन्द्रियाणांमुदभाव्यत । रसातलोदरगता इवाज्ञा-
यन्त ककुभः । समुद्रजलम~~स्त्रि~~नेव समदृश्यत मही । (351,12ff.).

The sudden joy and the pleasant touch at the unexpected appearance of Gandharvaka from the lap of Harivāhana at the

touch of the magic mantle is depicted by means of the following poetic conceits :

--- कथं शिरीषकेशररेणुपरमाणुभिरिवारब्धेन शरदरविन्दकोशमध्यादिव
लब्धजन्मना सुधारसकुण्डकुदोरिवाकृष्टेन मलयद्विहरिवन्दनच्छाययेव कुरितेन
मूच्छामिव जनयता निद्रामिवानयता क्षीरसागर इव स्नपयता निर्व्वर्णा-
सौख्यसंस्थामिवाचक्षाणेन प्रह्लादिना तदीयसंस्पर्शेन परवशीकृतं विभ्रतो ममांग-
मुत्संगदेशादलक्षितोद्गमः सहस्रैव --- पुमानग्रतो भवत् । (376, 17ff.).

The grief of Priyaṅgusundarī at the sad message from Priyaṅ-
vadā and the news about her having lost faith in the predi-
ction of Jayantaswāmī, is aptly brought out in the fancy abo-
ut her tears, as in :

--- इति निशम्य चोद्वेगंभीमं प्रियसखीचरमसदेशक्वचनमुद्विग्नमानसा प्रियंगुसुन्दरी
प्रेमपरतया जीवन्त्या एव संस्था निवापसलिलाभ्रजलिमिव प्रदातुं प्रसृतिदीर्घा-
भ्यामदिपात्राभ्यामुत्ससर्जाद्दुविसरम् । ----- (409, 20ff.).

A number of poetic conceits called Hetūtprekṣās enhance the beauty of the situation or description by projecting a fanciful cause or motive in it. Thus, the fact that Hari-
vāhana and Samaraketu were well established in the hearts of citizens is fancifully represented as :

दुष्टजनपददृष्टिदोषसंज्ञाणार्थमिव पारैलोकेन स्वान्तेषु सततधार्यमाणयोः ---
(104, 6ff.);
and their happy days are depicted by means of the following

qualitative conceits (gunōtprekṣās) : ---- सुखमया इव घृतिमया
इवामृतमया इव प्रीतिमया इवातिचक्रमुः ---- दिवसाः । (104, 18ff.).

The cause is quite harmoniously rational when the poet fan-

fancies the body of Samaraketu smeared with unguents to the rather besmeared with moon-light, as in :

--- शरच्चन्द्रातपेनेव कौमुदीमहोत्सवप्रमणालग्नेन स्पृशाह्लादिना वन्दनाग-
रागेण सर्वांगिणा शोभमानः ----- (115,2ff.).

A beautifully sympathetic picture of Nature emerges from the following Hetūtprekṣās describing the love-lorn condition of Harivāhana at the advent of the rainy season, as in :

दृष्ट्वा च तमकाण्डवैरिणा मन्मथेन घस्मिर्तुना च युगपदुत्ताप्यमानमुत्पन्ना-
नुकम्पो निर्वर्षयितुमिव चक्रे जगत्यामवतारमखिलविश्वोपकारी वारिदा-
गमः । प्रवर्षितप्रबलधारापंकतयो भक्तुमिव तस्य धारागृहस्पृहां दिाप्रमेवा-
न्तरिदामाच्छादयाचक्रुरञ्जिनीपलाशप्रकर्णीलाः पयोमुवः । सततयामिनी-
जागरणजडतारकां प्रसादयितुमिव तद्दृष्टिमविरलोदभिन्नमरक्तश्यामशाब्जला
बभूव भूतघात्री ----- (179,12ff.).

The villages of the forest tribes are fittingly fancied to be the personified unrighteous cities evacuated to the forests due to the fear of the Age of Merit, as in

--- अघर्म्मनगरीभिरिव कृतयुगमयाद्गृहीतवनवासांभिः शबरपत्नीभिरध्यासित-
विषमपर्वतोद्देश्या --- अटवीमुवा---- (200,11ff.).

In the description of the temple of Cupid the surrounding trees are fancied to be the soldiers paraded for inspection by the Spring season, the companion of Cupid, as in :

--- त्रीणिमुवनान्यमिषेणायितुमुत्तस्य विषमबाणस्य बलदर्शनाय मधुना
स्वसैन्ययोधैरिवाहृतैस्तिलकवम्पकाशोकपुन्नागकेसरप्रमृतिभिः प्रधानपादपैः
समन्तादुपगूढं ----- कामदेवायतनम्, ----- (303,23ff.).

When Malayasundarī hung herself into the noose tied to the branch of an Aśoka tree in a bid to commit suicide, the sympathetic graphical effect of distress in Nature is depicted by the following fancies :

मुक्तदेहायाश्च मे गात्रमारेण दूरमाकृष्टा दृष्टमत्साहसोत्पन्नसाध्वसेव
सर्व्वतः समकम्पतासावशोकपादपशाखा । कम्पतरलितकुलायकोटरोड्डीनानि
विस्तारिणा पदापातविरुतेन हाहारवमिव कुक्वाणानि पर्यन्तेषु बभ्रमुः
ससंप्रमाणि विह्वलै- ^{कुलानि ।} (306, 16ff.).

Similarly, the anxious affection of Malayasundarī's father is beautifully represented in a single Hetūtprekṣā, viz.,

मूयोमर्णासमावनया हृदय इव निदोप्तुकामस्तत्कालमधिकमुल्लासितेन बलवता-
पत्यस्नेहेन मोहितो मुहुर्मुहुर्गाढमस्वजत । ----- (329, 1ff.).

It is only rarely that Dhanapāla employs Ūtprekṣā in exclusion; generally it is interwoven with one or more other figures of speech. The following specimens, as also a few of the ones given above, would suffice to illustrate how Dhanapāla skillfully amalgamates them to advantage. Thus, in the fancies about the garden surrounding the Jain temple, viz.,

--- एकमन्दिरमिव सकलवनदेवतानां नन्दनमिव नन्दनस्य तिलकमिव त्रिलाक्याः
रतिगृहमिव रतेरायुधागारमिव कुसुमायुधस्य -(212, 6ff.),

both Anuprāsa and Yamaka are intertwined with Ūtprekṣā. In the poetic conceit about the rising Sun, as in :

अथ समन्ततः प्रदीपितकाष्ठमवगताशयेनेव प्रभातनेहसा प्रकाशितमुदचद्विचक्र-
वालं चिताचक्रमिव चण्डाशुमण्डलमवलोक्य ----- (191, 1ff.);

The Utprekṣā^{is} based on Upamā, which in its turn is based on Śleṣa on the compounded word 'Kāṣṭhā' which doubly means (i) fire-wood, and (ii) direction, (the advantage of grammatical shortening of the last syllable in this word being fully utilized in the case of former meaning !).

In a beautiful fancy about Malayasundarī as seen for the first time by Samaraketu, viz.,

--- प्रत्युषसापि गगनमरकतस्थालनिहितदिनकरप्रदीपेन प्रस्तुतारात्रिकेण
कृतोपस्थानाम्, ---कन्यकाम्, ---(161,7ff.),

the Utprekṣā is based on underlying Rūpaka and Samāsokti.

The Utprekṣās concerning the happy youthful days passed by Harivāhana and Samaraketu, as in :

--- सुखमया इव घृतिमया इवामृतमया इव प्रीतिमया इवातिवक्रमुः कति-
प्येऽपि दिक्साः । (104,18ff.),

are supported by Kāraka-dīpaka. The Utprekṣā about the sea-breeze, as in :

--- मुहुः स्पृष्टशैवलप्रताने मुहुरामृष्टचन्द्रिकामणिदृषदि मुहुमृदितफेनपटले
मुहुराश्लिष्टसलिलवीचिसंचये संचरति वडवामुखानलसंपर्कजातकृती त्रसन्ताप इव
मन्दमन्दमौदन्वते मरुति ----(151,5ff.),

is grounded on Cetanokti, i.e. personification.

The apt Hetūtprekṣā about the setting Sun, as in :

अथावबुध्दतदभिप्रायः प्रयाणशुद्धिमिव प्रष्टुमुपसर्ष परिणतज्योतिषम-
तुषारदीधितिमस्तमयरागः । (197,15ff.),

the figure of speech is based on Abhaṅga-śleṣa since the

compound \ddagger 'Parinata-jyotiṣām' doubly means 'to one who is a past-master in Astrology', and 'to one whose lustre has faded'. A fine Utpreksā about the water-pitchers in the Jalamandapa, viz.,

-- जलकलशैरपि निबिडकपर्पटावगुण्ठितकण्णोरुत्पन्नशिरोवेदनैरिवाधिष्ठितम्, --
(106,18),

is based on Samāsokti from which emerges a life-like picture of a man suffering from headache. The Utpreksā about the Suvela mountain, as in :

--- दर्शितमुग्धमोकि कोत्लासहासया प्रारब्धपरिहासयैव लवणजलनिधिवेलया
वीचिहस्तापवज्जितैः पयोभिरनवर्तमाहन्यमानं सुवेलनामानमचलराजमव्रजम्, \ddagger
----- (134,19ff.),

is beautifully blended with Samāsokti, arousing the memory of the water-sport of an affectionate youthful couple, which in its turn is founded on Rūpaka in the compounds 'Mauktikollāsa-hāsa' and 'Vīci-hasta'. In the verse depicting the unrivalled beauty of Malayasundarī, viz.,

वस्या नेत्रयुगेन नीरजदलप्रगदामदध्यद्ब्रुहा
चञ्चत्पावर्णचन्द्रमण्डलरुचा वक्त्रारविन्देन च ।
स्वामालोक्य दृशं रुचं च विजितां तुल्यं त्रपाबाधितै-
बद्धा निर्जनसंचरेषु कमलैर्मन्ये वनेषु स्थितिः ॥

- (256,3-6),

the basic Utpreksā is supported by a number of figures of \ddagger speech like Vyatireka, Vyaṅgyopamā and Pratyanīka.

At times the poet bases his Utpreksās on allusions

to tales from Epic histories and Purānas, religious beliefs or philosophical tenets, architectural details, military science, Ayurveda, Metallurgy and so on. Thus, the following poetic conceits are based on allusions to stories from the Epic histories and Purānas :

- (i) अनवर्तमुन्मिषता निसर्गस्निग्धेन कण्ठपूरमौक्तिकस्तवकेन कृत्तिका-
पुजेनेव कुमारशब्दविप्रलब्धेन कृतमुखालोकम् --- समरकेतुम् --- (100,19ff.);
- (ii) -रतिसुखपराङ्मुखेन धूर्जटिललाटलोचननिर्भवेव हृदयेनानंगीकृतकन्द-
र्ष्याः ---- (104,7ff.);
- (iii) अन्धकारातिकन्धराकान्तिकालीभिः पातालतिमिरेभ्य इव जृम्भिता-
भिः --- अन्तःप्रसुप्ताच्युतशरीरधुतेव दत्तसंस्काराभिः --- अन्तःकर्णवासि-
वैवस्वतानुजदेहलाकण्येन लिप्ताभिः --- निम्नगाभिसारिकाभिर्गाढमुपगूढं
---अम्भोनिधिम्, ----- (120,14ff.);
- (iv) ससंभ्रममुत्थाय निरुप्यमाण इव पुनर्मृतमथनारम्भभीतेनाम्भोधिना
--- सैन्यावासभेरीध्वनिः ----- (138,17ff.);
- (v) दाणेन च कठोरतरतां कलयता कलिकालेनेव क्लुषात्मना तमस्तोमेन
कवलितं सकलमपि भुवनमेकवर्णमिववत् । --- मुरारिजठरावासित इव
व्यभाव्यत सकलोऽपि भूतग्रामः । ----- (351,11ff.);
- (vi) ससीमा सग्रामा सनगरसरिदङ्गीपवल्या
तमिस्त्रादुन्मज्जत्युदधिजलमथ्यादिव मही ॥ (359,1ff.);
- (vii) अप्सरोभिरिव सुरापहरणाशंक्या क्षीरोदादपसृताभिः मुनितपोभीत-
श्रुतमखाज्ञया स्वर्गतोऽवतीर्णाभिः, अमृतजलदेवताभिरिव सुरापहरणाशंक्या
क्षीरोदादप
सृताभिः (371,1ff.);
- (viii) सौरिजठराभ्योज इव बध्दपदमासनो दक्षिणाग्रहस्तविन्धस्तादा-
सूत्रः क्रमेण कर्तुं मन्त्रसाधनमुपक्रान्तवान् । (399,5ff.).

The Utpreksā, as in :

--- विपाकदारुणातया विषयसौस्थ्यमिव मूर्त्तिमत्तया परिणतम्, ---
(335, 1ff.), ~~विपाकदारुणातया विषयसौस्थ्यमिव मूर्त्तिमत्तया परिणतम्~~

is based on the philosophical, rather ethical, Law of Karma.

The poetic conceit, as in :

--- सततसंनिधिप्रीतदेवतावितीर्णचैतन्याभिः स्वविमानशालभञ्जिकाभि-
रिव पुञ्जीभूताभिः --- (371, 3ff.),

is based on religious rites and Architecture.

The poetic fancy, as in :

--- संनिहितोरुनाभिभिः श्रोणिचक्रैः रथवरूथिनीमिव यौवनयुवराज-
स्य योजयन्तीभिः --- (371, 5ff.),

is grounded on military science.

The Utpreksā, as in :

--- कसंश्लिष्टयष्टिदीपिकाकिरणपटलपल्लवितदेहलावण्याभिः शैल-
कटकौण्ठिभिरिव धन्वन्तरिप्रहिताभिः --- (55, 3),

is founded on Āyurveda.

The implied Utpreksā, as in :

--- प्रततवडवाग्नितापिते पतितुमपराण्णविस्नेहकटाहे निरूप्य तपनतपनीय-
माषकं -- जगाम श्यामता प्रदाणः --- (351, 4ff.),

is based on Metallurgy.

The poetic fancy, as in :

--- चूडार्त्नेन भाक्सुरलक्ष्मीविनाशसूचनाय कृतसानिध्येनोत्पातमण्डलेनेव
सकीलेन कलितोत्तमांगम् -- वैमानिकम् -- (37, 19ff.),

is based on Astrology.

Similarly, the poetic conceit, as in :

--- प्रमुख एव प्रवृत्तमेषस्य ततश्चलितरोहिणीकवृषस्य क्वापि क्वापि
विभाव्यमानतुलाधनुषः प्रभात एव प्रस्थितस्य तारकासार्थस्य चरणो-
त्थापितो रेणुविशर इव घूसरारुणो नमःसरणिमरुणादरुणालोकः ।
(150,17ff.),

is based on farmer's life and Astronomy.

And lastly, the Utpreksā, as in :

--- निर्दयचरणाप्रणाददलितदलपुटैरपहायापहाय कमलगर्मशयनानि घाव्दमि-
रुधानदीर्घिकामधुकरकुलैः समन्ततस्तिमिरशिविरैरिव शरिरप्रभारोषितैः
कृततुमुलकोलाहलम्, --- (37,23ff.),

is based on life in a military camp.

(6) RŪPAKA (METAPHOR) :-

The Metaphor is a form of expression more concentrated than simile, and is used when the degree of excitation is great. It represents many thoughts in a few words. These Metaphors play an important part in the economy of language. Authors of Sanskrit prose-romances, like Bāna and Daṇḍin have employed them but sparingly. Dhanapāla is no exception to this trend. Even then we find that he has employed this figure of speech effectively to enhance the beauty of the situation. A few specimens are given here.

Thus, in the course of the description of the titanic figure of the Vetāla, his ~~sāngam~~ fingers and nails are depicted most appropriately by means of the following Metaphors:

--- अतिकठिनसर्वपवाभिर्गुलीवैणुदण्डिकाभिः कुटिलतीक्ष्णायताग्रकोटिभिः
करैरुदकुदालैः --- कृतोद्यमम्, -----(47,21ff.).

The feet of King Meghavāhana are aptly represented as 'Carana-pallava' (69,3) and the nails of his feet and the rays emitting from the crest-jewels of his feudatories are beautifully described, as in :

--- अर्चयन्ति देवस्य चरणसखचिन्तामणिपरम्परां पुरःप्रकीर्णचूडामणि-
किर्णाचक्रवालबालपत्तवैर्मूर्धभिर्मूर्धाभिर्षिकतापार्थिवकुलोद्भवा -----
सपरिजना राजानः । (81,14ff.).

A beautiful full-fledged Metaphor is found in the verse :

इयं व्योमाम्भोधेस्तटमिव जवात्प्राप्य तपनं
निशानां विविश्लष्यध्वनघटितकाष्ठा विघटते ।

असावप्यामूलवृटितकरसतानतनिकः

प्रयात्यस्तं स्रस्तः सितपट इव श्वेतकिर्णः ॥ (358, 174-)

where the imagery is taken from navigation, there being identity between 'Nisā' and 'Nau', between 'Kaṣṭhā' (=direction) and 'Kaṣṭha' (= wooden planks), and between 'Kaṣṭha-santāna' and 'Tanika'.

(7) VYATIREKA (DISSIMILITUDE) :-

This figure of speech occurs when the thing compared (upameya) is said to be more than a match for the standard of comparison (upamāna). A few instances of this manner of expression are found in Dhanapāla too. Thus, it is most effectively utilized in the description of Queen Madirāvati, as in:

--- पर्यन्तज्वलितरत्नदीपमहाहृतल्पशायिन्या निशितमसिपट्टमधिशयाना न
लेशेनापि सदृशविमवा बभूव राजलक्ष्मीः । (22,18ff.),

where the figure of speech is based on Śleṣa necessitating
syllables
the/compounds in 'Nisitamasi paṭṭam adhisayānā' has^{ve} to be bro-
ken up as 'Nisi tamasi paṭṭam adhisayānā' with Madirāvati
and 'Nisitam asi-paṭṭam adhisayānā' with 'Rājalakṣmī'. Ano-
ther excellent instance of this figure of speech is found
in a verse in the course of the description of ^{Tilakamañjarī} Madhūkañjarī /
by Harivāhana, viz.,

दचे पत्रं कुवलयततेरायतं चक्षुरस्याः

कुम्भावेमां कुवपरिकरः पूर्वपदतिकरोति ।

दन्तच्छेदच्छविमनुवदत्यच्छता गण्डमिते-

श्वान्द्रं विम्बं युतिविलसितैर्दूषयत्यास्यलक्ष्मीः ||(255,23ff.),

where her eyes, breasts, cheeks and face are said to have
far surpassed the blue lotus, the temple of an elephant, the
whiteness of an elephant-tusk and the lustre of the Moon res-
pectively in point of beauty. A series of Vyatirekas is
utilized to depict the intensity of pain, as in :

--- प्रियवियोगादपि दुःसहेन, गृहागतार्थिजननिराकरणादपि कष्टतरेण,
विपदापदापसर्पणादपि संतापकेन, निशितनिस्त्रिशदारणादपि दारुणेन
-- वेदनावेगेन व्याकुलीकृता-(307,4ff.).

(8) BHRĀNTIMĀN (ILLUSION) :-

A fine instance of poetic illusion is found in
the following instance, viz.,

--- प्रत्यग्रपलशकलपाटलेरु पान्तरु पल्लवप्रतिबिम्बेर्विप्रलभ्यमानमुग्ध-
मीनम्, --- अदृष्टपाराभिधानं सरः ----- (203,18ff.),

where the fish in the Adṛṣṭapāra lake are poetically said to have been deceived by the reflections of fresh red buds of trees on the bank; they take them to be red pieces of fresh flesh !

(9) SANDEHA (DOUBT) :-

A most outstanding classic example of this figure of speech in the TM is found in the description of Tilakamañjarī, as in :

ग्रहकवलनाद्भ्रष्टा लक्ष्मीः किमृक्षापतेरियं

मथनचकितापद्मान्ताब्धेरुतामृतदेवता ।

गिरिशनयनोदच्चिदेग्धान्मनोभवपादपा-

द्विदितमथवा जाता सुभूरियं नवकन्दली ॥ (248,3ff.),

where the poetic doubt is of the Niscayānta type.

(10) ATISAYOKTI (HYPERBOLE) :-

A fine instance of Atisayokti is found in the description of King Meghavāhana, as in :

--- निर्यत्नघृतसमस्तभुवनमारतया च तं द्वितीयं शेषं तृतीयमादिवराहदंष्ट्रां-
कुरमष्टमं कुलाचलं नवममाशागजममन्यन्त जनाः । ----- (15,19ff.).

The denseness of the night during the night-attack is represented in the following pieces of exaggerations :

--- अतिसंहततया च तेषामन्तरितचक्रुडुरिन्द्रियाः पुरोवर्तिनामपि वीराणां
रणमतीन्द्रियेण चक्रुषाद्राक्रुडुरमरपंकयः । समीपेऽपि त्रिदशतां भटजनमुपा-
गतं न स्वयानमारोपयितुमपारयन्त्सः । ----- (89,20ff.).

Again, the intensity of Malayasundari's pain is described in :

--- एकपद स्वास्पदीकृतामखिलैरपि त्रैलोक्यवर्तिभिरसौख्यैः शतमुखी-
कृतदुःखवेगाम् ----- (309, 1ff.).

(11) SAHOKTI (SIMULTANEITY) :*

Dhanapāla is quite fond of this figure of speech though he utilizes it only occasionally, but in a very appropriate manner. The following instances would suffice to illustrate this point :

- (i) मुक्त्वा च सफलकं प्रभृताभिमानेन सार्धं कृपाणाम् --- (38, 20ff.);
- (ii) यास्यति द्रागेव निद्रा सहैजाणाभ्यां दायकम्, ---- (146, 14);
- (iii) चिन्तामणिमयीव प्रबलदत्ताहवेदनावेगदुःसहां सहासन्निभवन-
दीर्घिकाचक्रवाकमिथुनेर्निशीथिनीमनयत् । ----- (188, 15ff.);
- (iv) प्रवृत्ता सखीभिरिव साकं प्रेदाकमनोवृत्तिभिः प्रनर्तितुम्, -----
(269, 23ff.);
- (v) समं मार्तण्डमण्डलामोगेन विच्छायतामगुह्यम् । (323, 18ff.);
- (vi) ईषन्मुकुलिताशामुखेऽहनि सहायापेदीव पुराणाप्ररुणेण सप्त-
स्थिति-
सप्तिना सार्धमस्तदातिघरं हिह्यमगमम्, (387, 9ff.);
- (vii) त्वामनुगन्तुं घावता किरातवर्षाधरकुम्भिप्रायलोकेन रिक्तीकृतनिशान्तं
सार्धमन्तःकरणेन देव्याः सर्वमपि शून्यमन्तःपुरमजायत । -----
(389, 20ff.).

(12) TULYA*YOGITĀ (EQUAL PARING):-

A beautiful instance of a series of this figure of speech is found in the description of the city of Kāncī, as
in :

--- यत्र नागवल्लीलालसा धनिन उधानपालाश्च; परमतज्ञाः पौराः

प्रामाणिकाश्च, सफलजातयः शोत्रिया गृहारामाश्च, हरिद्रासान्द्र-
रुचकयोः रागिणः सुवर्णाचम्पकस्तम्बकनिचयाश्च, प्रगुणाविशिखा गृह-
निवेशाः सुभटबाणधयश्च, आबहुमालिकाः प्रासादाः प्रकृतयश्च, संकुचि-
तालकाः प्रधानापणाः प्रमदाललाटलेखाश्च, सुराभिरामाभिरुचित-
कारिण्यः पण्यवनिताः पौरयुक्तयश्च । ----- (206,6-11),

where the whole series is based on Sabhaṅga-sleṣa necessia-
ting the adjectives to be broken up as 'Nāgavat-lilā-alasāḥ'
with 'Dhaninah' and 'Nāgavallī-lālasāḥ' with
'Udyānapālāḥ', and so on.

(13) DĪPAKA (COMMON PAIRING) :-

A few instances of a variety of the figure of
speech called Dīpaka are noteworthy. Thus, the advice of
King Meghavāhana to Prince Harivāhana about Samaraketu is
given in this mode of expression, as in :

--- अन्वहं चायमापत्स्वपरिहारेण, संपत्स्वादरातिशयेन, समानगुणेषु
गौरवोत्कर्षेण, विवादेशु पदाग्रहणेन, नूतनार्थलाभेषु संविमजनेन नर्म-
स्वममोद्घाटनेन -- सर्वत्र चातिविश्वासदर्शनेन --सख्यमानेयः (102,19ff.).

In the depiction of the uneasiness of love-lorn Harivāhana,
as in :

--- चक्रवाकस्यैवैकाकिनः सरस्तीरे निषण्णस्य कुमुदणण्डस्यैव क्वणाद्भिरलि-
कुलैराकुलीकृतस्य हन्दुना शमितनिद्रस्य मम -- दायमगाद्रजनिः (253,8ff.),

where the Dīpaka is interpenetrated by simile.

(14) ARTHĀNTARANYĀSA (CORROBORATION) :-

When the Vidyādhara Muni advises King Meghavāhana

to strictly stick to the instruction imparted by him with reference to the Aparājitā Vidyā, the poet concludes the advice with an Arthāntaranyāsa, thus :

--- केवलं कर्तव्येषु दृढमप्रमादिना भवितव्यम् । आलोचितव्यं च सम्य-
क्प्रज्ञया प्रस्तावोचितमनुष्ठानम् । प्रज्ञायमावर्णामन्थाविव हविर्भुजः
पितरौ कार्यसिद्धेः ---- (30,22).

(15) VYĀJASTUTI (IRONY) :-

When King Meghavāhana replies to the Vetāla who insists upon first preference in worship, as in :

--- तस्य वचनमनुवर्त्तमानो मेदिनीपतिर्विहस्य किञ्चित्सोपहासमवदत् -
सर्वमुपपन्नमभिहितम् । उपदिष्टमक्लिष्टया युक्त्या । प्रबोधिता व्यम् ।
यथा निदर्शितः सूक्ष्मदर्शिना तथैवैष सेवामार्गः । परिग्रहजने संनिधौ
सति कोऽधिकारः प्रभूणामग्रपूजायाम् । महती मूढता । गाढमविवेक-
विलसितम् । -----(49,5ff.),

where the king actually means the contrary of what he says.

(16) SAMĀSOKTI (SUGGESTIVE BREVITY) :-

A few specimens of Samāsokti, or suggestive speech of brevity, are notable for their beauty. Thus, in the description of the early morning the receding rays of the Moon are depicted in the following words :

उद्यज्जाड्य इव प्रोतनमरुत्संसर्गतिश्चन्द्रमाः

पादानेण दिगन्ततल्पतलतः सकोचयत्यायतान् (238,5ff.),

where the predominant Samāsokti suggests the picture of a person contracting his limbs out of cold in the early morning;

the figure of speech is supported by Rūpaka and Śleṣa. The Vaitādhya mountain is described as :

--- विशालकटकावष्टब्धभूतलं प्रतिपदाभिव हिमवतः ----- (239,11),
where another picture of an enemy king ready with his army emerges from the pun on the words 'Kaṭaka' (= ridge; army). Similarly, a picture of an old man emerges from the description of the setting Sun, as in :

--- सुसमानसरलरविकरशिरासंततिः स्वस्थानवलितद्विजसमूहो विवर्णसिंकुचित-
च्छविः प्राप्य परिणतिप्रकर्षमस्तोन्मुखो बभूव दिवसः । ----- (350,13ff).

(17) PARYĀYOKTA (CIRCUMLOCUTION) :-

Samaraketu is ~~अस्मान्मा~~ indirectly praised by King Meghavāhana who apparently extolls his father, as in :

--- लोकमुपजनयता भवन्तमस्तोकसंचितसुकृतसंभारेण धारितो धुरि समस्तानां
पुत्रिणामात्मा महात्मना सिंहलेश्वरेण । ----- (101,19ff.),
where the Paryāyokta is intertwined with Anuprāsa. The fact of the rising Sun being reflected in the ocean is beautifully depicted, as in :

--- 'किं वृथा नदसि, मथने यदि मया रत्नानि ते कदाकृतानि तदुपैक्षत'
इत्यवतार्य शिरसः पुरो मन्दरदिातिमृतादिपुत्तमुत्तरीयदामभिव पिण्डीकृत-
मिन्दुमण्डलमाकुलाकुलप्रसारितोर्मिहस्तो जग्राह जलधिः । (150,15ff.),
where the basic Paryāyokta is highly supported by a graphic Samāsokti based on common life, and by Hetūtprekṣā and Rūpaka. When, in the course of the description of Tilakamañjarī, Harivāhana refers to the extraordinary length of her eyes

in the following verse :

जानीथः श्रुतिशालिनौ खलु युवामावां प्रकृत्यर्जुनी

त्रैलोक्ये वपुरीदृगन्ययुवतेः संभाव्यते किं क्वचित् ।

स्तत्प्रष्टुमपास्तनीलनलिनैर्गणिविकाशश्रिणी

शक्ये स्याः समुपागते मृगदृशः कण्ठान्तिकं लोचने ॥ (248,7-10),

where the basic Paryāyokta is interwoven with Pratīpa, Kāvya-
liṅga and Utpreṣā. In the misery of the rival kings of Ha-
rivāhana graphically depicted, as in :

गेहे देव्या सुषिरनिपतन्मारुतोत्तानवेणो

घृत्त्वा कोणं विरचितलयो वादयन्दन्तवीणाम् ।

रात्रौ द्वित्रैः सह सहचरैः सेवते त्वद्विपदाः

किं संगीतं न हि न हि महीनाथ हेमन्तशीतम् ॥ (358,13ff.),

the Paryāyokta is based on Rūpaka the imagery whereof is ~~drawn~~
drawn from music.

(18) VIRODHĀBHĀSA (APPARENT CONTRADICTION) :-

Dhanapāla's skill in the use of the figure of
speech called Virodhābhāsa or apparent contradiction can be
seen in the following noteworthy specimens. The temple of
Lord Mahāvīra is ~~described~~ described in a series of three
phrases, viz.,

--- अनेकमणिमालालंकृतमपि रत्नचतुष्कराजितं, ध्वजाधिष्ठितमपि सिंहा-

क्रान्तम्, अङ्गीकृतविमानाकारमपि सर्वतोभद्रम् ----- (215,23ff.),

where, in the first compound the words 'Mālā' and 'Catuska'
are double-meaning, while in the latter two the knowledge of
architectural details serve to resolve the contradiction. In

depicting the condition of Queen Madirāvati after she conceived, the poet resorts to Śleṣa in order to bring in the Virodhābhāsa, as in :

--- निवृत्तरजःसंगापि पाण्डुतामगच्छत् । चलितुमसहापि खेलात्सपदन्यासमकरो-
त् । दधत्यपि तनुतामुपचिता बभूव गात्रयष्ट्या । कृष्णतारौचितामपि
दीर्घवलतामघत्त दृष्टिम् । तथा च प्रकृतिमन्दापि तस्या गतिर्मन्दायत ।
पीनापि जघनमण्डली पीनताममजत । ----- (74,20ff.).

At times the poet combines Yamaka with Virodhābhāsa, as in :

--- अक्तीर्णश्च तस्मिंस्तापमतापमातपमनातपं तपनमतपनं दिक्समदिवसं
ग्रीष्ममग्रीष्मं कालमकालं तुषारपातमनुषारपातं त्रिभुवनमत्रिभुवनं सर्ग-
क्रमममस्त । ----- (212,15ff.),

where ~~the poet~~ he describes the extraordinary peaceful atmosphere in the garden surrounding the temple of Lord Ṛṣabha at Mount Ekaśrīṅga. The amalgamation of the two figures of speech with Virodhābhāsa is rather ingenious when the poet resorts to it in the description of the Vaitāḍhya mountain, as in :

----- मेरुकल्पपादपालीपरिगतमपि नमेरुकल्पपादपालीपरिगतं, वनगजाली-
संकुलमपि नवनगजालीसंकुलं तमवलोकितवान् । ----- (240,14ff.).

It should be noted here that the contradiction is felt in the above case only when the phrases are heard with emphasis on 'Na' , rather than they are read ! This testifies to the essential nature of the work being one to be listened to (śravya) rather than read (vācya)! And the Śleṣa involved here is a Sabhaṅga one necessitating the compounds to be broken up as a 'Meru-kalpa-pāda-pālī-parigatam nameru-

kalpapādapa-āli-parigatam, vana-gaja-āli-saṅkulam nava-nagajā-āli-saṅkulam.

(19) KĀVYALIṄGA (POETIC REASON) :-

With reference to the origin of the Ratnakūta island, the poet mixes poetry with Parānic allusion, as in :
 --- एष किल हृदयस्खलनमैथिली विरहशोकशंकोत्सकापुरिमभिप्रस्थितस्य दाश-
 रथैराज्ञया पर्वतानाहरद्मिः प्लवगयूथाधिपैरुत्पाट्य हाटकगिरेः सानुरानीतः।
 उपनीतश्च भुजबलावलेपादनादरप्रसारितैककर्तलस्य सेनापतेर्नलस्य तेनापि रम-
 णीयतातिदर्शनप्रीतिमनसा सुचिरमवलोक्य नायमुद्रागस्तुंगपिशंगधुतिपिशंगिता-
 शामुखो वज्रमणिरिव कृत्रिमैर्मणिभिः पाषाणमृन्मयैरमीभिरचलैः सहैकत्र
~~समवायमर्हतीति~~ समवायमर्हतीति विमृश्य सेतोः पृथग्पाथोनिघौ निहितः पयो-
 निधिनापि पुत्रबहुमानादात्मनः क्रीडागिरित्वेनोपकल्पितः।(137,13ff.),
 where, in accordance with the typically Jainistic attitude, new mythological points are poetically added to popular Rāmāyana story, while utilizing the Kāvyaṅga.

(20) TADGUNA (TRANSFER OF QUALITY):-

We find this figure of speech utilized in a couple of instances, such as :

संध्यारागरजितरजनीतमः ----- (74,5) and कान्तिमुभयथापि
 हरितां प्रापुरब्धिन्यः । (350,17ff.).

(21) SAMUCCAYA (CONCATENATION) :-

A fine specimen of this figure of speech is coined when the poet describes the gradually descending darkness of the night, as in :

किं च नक्तं चरकुलानां प्रवारः, खगिनामूर्ध्वचरणावस्थितिः, उलूकानां चटु-

रालोकः चक्रनाम्नामपनिद्रत्वमद्रो-~~॥~~ (351, 16ff.).

(22) KĀRAṆAMĀLĀ (CHAIN OF CAUSES) :-

A classical specimen of this figure of speech is found in the depiction of the disinterested life of ascetics in the course of a dialogue between King Meghavāhana and the Vidyādhara Muni, as in :

--- आहारमपि शरीरवृत्त्यै गृह्णन्ति, शरीरमपि धर्मसाधनमिति धारयन्ति, धर्ममपि मुक्तिकारणमिति बहुमन्यन्ते मुक्तिमपि निरत्सुकेन चेतसामिवाङ्गन्ति । ----- (26, 19ff.).

(23) PARISAṆKHYĀ (EXCLUSION) :-

~~A figure~~ This figure of speech is utilized mostly in the course of the description of a king or a city. Thus, the absence of breach of law, of the extensive travelling, of confiscation of wealth of citizens by the king, ^{subjecting} of/~~subjecting~~ the guilty to fire ordeal, of jealousy, and of too much attachment for worldly wealth among the citizens of Ayodhyā during the regime of King Meghavāhana has been skillfully alluded to in the following passage :

यस्यां च वीथिगृहाणां राजपथातिक्रमः, दोलाक्रीडासु दिगन्तरयात्रा, कुमुदलण्डानां सर्वस्वापहरणम्, अनगमार्गणानां मर्मघट्टनव्यसनं, वैष्णवानां कृष्णावर्त्मनि प्रवेशः, सूर्योपलानां मित्रोदयेन ज्वलनं, वैशेषिकमते द्रव्यस्य कूटस्थनित्यता । ----- (12, 12ff.),

where the negation (vyapoha) is beautifully suggested (pratiyamāna). In the description of the citizens of Kāñcī, however, the poet chooses to express the exclusion in so many

words, as in :

यत्र मुग्धता रूपेषु न सुरतेषु, हरिद्रारागो वै देहेषु न स्नेहेषु, बहु-
वचनप्रयोगः पूज्यनामसु न परप्रयोजनांगीकरणेषु, विभ्रमो रतेषु न
चित्तेषु । ----- (260,14ff.),

where the Parisaṅkhyā is based on Śleṣa on the words 'Mugdha-
tā' (= wonder; innocence), 'Haridrā-rāga' (= colour of tumeric;
unsteady attachment), and 'Vibhrama' (= 'Bahu-vacana-prayoga'
(= use of plural; talkativeness) and 'Vibhrama' (= charm;
illusion). In the depiction of the noble qualities of King
Meghavāhana, the poet resorts to Parisaṅkhyā based on Sabha-
ṅga-śleṣa, as in :

-- उच्चापशब्दः शत्रुसंहारे न वस्तुविचारे, -- अविनितापहारी पालनेन न
लालनेन ----- (13,14ff.),

where the words 'Uccāpaśabdah' has to be broken up as 'Ut-
cāpa-śabdah' and 'Ucca-apaśabdah', and the compound 'Avani-
tāpahārī' as 'Avani-tāpa-hārī' and 'A-vanitā-apahārī'.

(24) EKĀVALĪ (SINGLE-STRINGED NECKLACE) :-

The beauty of the figure of speech called Ekāvalī
is seen in the TM in a few instances. Thus, the poet descri-
bes the Ratnakūṭa island in the following manner :

अत्र हि पदेपदे सुन्दरतया सुरलोकस्यापि जनितक्रीडानि स्थानानि, स्थाने
स्थाने स्र्वर्तुकानि वनानि, वने वने विकचरत्नकुसुमस्तबकतारकानि कल्पतरु-
षण्डानि, षण्डे षण्डे बहुप्रपंचाः कांचनलतादौलाः, प्रतिदोलमान्दोलनक्रीडा-
नन्दितानि दृश्यन्ते सततमनवैषेणाणि विधाघ्रद्वन्द्वानि । -----
(148,2ff.).

(27) CETANOKTI (PERSONIFICATION) :-

Though Sanskrit rhetoricians have not noticed a figure of speech like this, we do find instances of this mode of expression, as in :

किंचास्कन्दति शैलकन्दरमुवो मित्तं करैररुणै-

रैतद्वर्षकरालकोलकपिलश्यामं त्रियामातमः । (238, 11ff.),

where the personification is effected on the strength of Upamā and faint Samāsokti. In another place the martial victory is personified in the course of critical moments of a battle wherein the victory fluctuates between two equally skillful and brave warriors, as in :

अविरलशरासारत्रासिता हसीव मेघागमे पत्वलमनवलोकिताश्रयविसंस्थुला
सैन्यपतिवदाःस्थलममुचद्राजलदमीः । उद्धान्तहृदया च दाणां बाहुशिरसि दाणां
धनुषि, दाणां कृपाणाघाराभसि, दाणामातपत्रे, दाणां पालिकेष्वजेषु,
दाणां चामरेष्वकृतस्थितिम् । (90, 23ff.);

here also the personification is based on Upamā.

(28) ULLEKHA (INTUITIVE DESCRIPTION) :-

Although no such figure of speech has been recognized by rhetoricians like Rudraṭa, Bhoja and others, until the author of the Alankāra-sarvasva awarded it the special separate status, the poets have been utilizing this mode of expression. Naturally Dhanapāla could not be expected to be an exception. Thus, the advent of youth is described in the following manner :

क्रमेण निर्व्वर्षकमविप्रयुक्तं ~~कुर्यात्~~ रागिमिधुनानां, सतापकं दरिद्रकामिहृदयानां

प्रसाधकं कुरूपाणामध्यापकमशेषविप्रमकलानां --- अंगीकृतवती नवयोक्ता-
वतारमगैः । (264,8ff.).

It is to be noted here that we have confined ourselves to the narrative part proper of the TM in illustrating the use of various figures of speech by Dhanapāla, and have not touched those in the ~~amsh~~ introductory verses to the text.

VII : KĀVYA-DOSAS or POETIC

BLEMISHES :-

Sanskrit rhetoricians have emphasized upon the intellectual equipment (vyutpatti) of poets, by which they expected in them a thorough knowledge of the ways of the world, of men, sciences, arts and what not. The poet was expected to be alert in the choice of words, and observance of the rules of grammar, logic and poetic conventions. Critics have not been sparing in picking up inexcusable flaws from the works of top-ranking poets like Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Māgha, Śrīharṣa, and others. It may never be feasible for a poet to totally eschew all possible faults. But, as a setter of literary norms and ideals, the critic has to be a scholar competent in appreciating good points (gunajna) and in exposing the defects (doṣajna), as is evident from the definitions of Poetry (Kāvya) postulated by rhetoricians from Bharata to Bhoja and many others, all of whom have generally accorded co-equal status to diction (sabda) and

meaning (artha) and insisted on the presence of excellences (guṇa) which practically consist of the negation of faults (doṣa).

Dhanapāla's contemporary critic Bhoja has taken particular delight in elaborately classifying poetic blemishes under separate heads of (a) defects of word (pada-doṣa), (b) defects of sentences (vākya-doṣa), and (c) defects of the meaning of sentences (vākya-rtha-doṣa) in the very first ~~xxxxx~~ chapter of his SKB. As has been observed by Dr. Bechan Jha, most of the poetic defects enumerated by Bhoja are mentioned by his predecessors like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana and Rudrata, all of whom he has followed and taken almost all the Doṣas from them.⁵³⁶

We shall here give a few specimens of glaring poetic blemishes that are found in Dhanapāla's TM.

(A) PADA-DOSAS :-

The following Pada-doṣas are worth noticing :

(i) Asādhu, i.e., grammatically incorrect, as in :

आरब्धवेत्ता च्चर्वावस्थित्वा विरमावासगमनाय मां पुनः पुनर-
त्वरत् ।----- (344, 9ff.) where 'Avasthitvā' is

grammatically incorrect; the correct form should be 'Avasthāya'.

(ii) Aprayukta, i.e., not usually used by good poets,

as in :

तेन च प्रचुरदाहवेदनावहेन चित्ताहुतवहेनेव द्विगुणमुपताप्यमानः

(324,6ff.), where the word 'Citā-hutavaha' is awkward since it combines the inauspicious 'citā' with auspicious 'Hutavaha' !

(iii) Anyartha, i.e., having unconventional meaning:

as in,

वन्दे वाल्मीकिकानीनां --(3,12), where the word 'Kānīna' is used to signify 'Vyāsa', the author of the Mahābhārata !

(iv) Apuṣṭa or useless addition of qualifying words:

as in,

---विचित्रवीनाशुकक्रजान्ध्वजान्, ----- (263,13), where the word 'Vrajān' is quite redundant as it does not add to the meaning of the compound in any way and is unnecessarily used for the sake of bringing in alliteration.

(v) Asamartha, i.e., incapable of giving the sense in which it is used : as in,

अनादप्रप्यसुन्दरस्वादुफलमूलकन्दं ----- धम्मार्णयम्,

(182,2ff.), where the word 'Anādara' is meant to indicate the sense of 'Aprayatna' or 'Anāyāsa', but it cannot give this sense without farfetchedly stretching it; here also it is the poet's fondness for alliteration that is responsible for the defect.

(vi) Gūḍha, i.e., use of a word in a less known sense:

as in,

देहनष्टराहुदंष्ट्राशकल इव निशाकरः (२७,७).

with the word 'priyatveha' creates the wrong impression of Samaraketu being the beloved of Tilakamanjarī ! The cause of this confusion is the intervening position of the word 'Priyatveha' between 'Tilakamanjaryāh' and 'Kathitena', wherein the genitive in the former word is Śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī serving the purpose of the dative. The poet really seems to have meant ~~that~~ : देवेनैव प्रियत्वेन प्रथमदर्शने तिलकमंजरीः कथितं यथा-
श्रुतं कुमारसमरकेतुम्, ----- etc..

(C) VĀKYĀRTHA DOṢAS :-

Of the sixteen Vākyaārtha-doṣas, the following are found in Dhanapāla's prose-romance :

(i), Vyārtha, i.e., purposeless : as in,

यः कश्चिदत्र यात्रादर्शिनार्थमागतः स्मरायतनमध्ये वाकृत्रिम-
सरितीरमण्डनेषु माधवीमण्डपेषु वा कृताभिनवसंस्कारासु क्रीडागिरि-
गुहासु वा गन्धसलिलच्छटाघाततटशिलातलेषु कमलकुमुददीर्घिकापुलिनेषु
वा गृहीतव्रतः श्रान्तः पानगोष्ठीप्रसक्तः प्रियाविरहवेदनाचो वा
तिष्ठति स तूर्णमुचिष्ठतूचिष्ठतु ----- (324, 19ff.),

where, looking to the context, viz., that Bandhusundarī is reported to have appealed for succour from someone in order to rescue hanging Malayasundarī, the underlined adjectival compounds are superficial and do not fit in with the situation.

(ii) Hinopama, i.e., deficiency : as in,

--- असितपदाचतुर्दशीमिव सर्वभूतानन्दकारिणीमचिर-
परिणतामंगलदमी दधानम्, ----- (24, 7),

where the poet has inadvertently compared the holy body of the Vidyādhara Muni with the unholy 'Asita-pakṣa-caturdaśī' in a flair for playing on the word 'Bhūta' !

(iii) Adhikopama, i.e., redundancy in Upamana, as in

-- अजगरदेहदीर्घपृथुलेन जिह्वालताग्रेण --(48,6),

where either the former compound or the latter one becomes redundant as the contradiction between 'Pṛthula' and 'Latāgra' mars the effect.

(iv) Asadr̥ṣopama, i.e., dissimilarity; as in,

-- नायनरश्मि निवहमिव मन्दाकिनी प्रति प्रधावितमन्तिक-
महिषस्य -- (23,20),

where the Vidyādhara Muni is fancied to be the glance of the buffalo of the God-of-death !

(v) Aprasiddhopama, i.e., strangeness of the standard of comparision : as in,

-- ईदाममहानदीप्रवाहयोः --- (160,23),

where the glance is metaphorically identified with a pair of big rivers : Similarly, in the verse,

जाता दाडिमबीजपाक्षुहृदः संधयोदये तारका

यान्ति प्लुष्टजरत्पलालतुलनां तान्तास्तमस्तन्तवः ।

ज्योत्स्नापायविपाण्डु मण्डलमपि प्रत्यङ्गमोभिचिमा-

क्षूर्णोन्दोर्ज्जदूष्णानाभिनिलयप्रागल्भ्यमभ्यस्य-^{ति ॥} (238, 1ff.),

'Tārakāh', 'Tamas-tantavah' and 'Pūrṇendoh maṇḍalam' are compared to 'Dāḍima-bīja-pākā', 'Pluṣṭa-jarat-palāla' and 'Jarad-ūrṇanābhi-nilaya' respectively !

(vi) Aślīla, i.e., indecorous : as in,

--- गर्भपातमिव सर्वर्षकाभ्रविधुताम्, ----- (154,5ff.),

where, in this strange Utprekṣā, the divine temple of Lord Rṣabha is sought to be described !

(vii) Viruddha, i.e., contradictory : as in,

--- अवश्यायजलबिन्दुजालमिव नदात्रनिवहमजप्रमुञ्जती वाशालतासु
--(74,2ff.),

where the vast directions are identified with tiny 'Latā' in a Metaphor !

(D) MISCELLANEOUS DEFECTS :-

Over and above these poetic defects, there are a few blemishes comprising strange comparisons or imageries in figures of speech like Upamā, Utprekṣā, Rūpaka and others. Moreover, there are a few more faults which can be classified as Prabandha-doṣas or defects of the composition as a whole, as for instance :

(i) The improper and unnecessary details, as in,

-- समाश्लिष्य देवीमिव सदुःखमवदम्, ---- (29,4), especially when the words are addressed to the Vidyādhara Muni.

(ii) Loose ends of the story mentioned in Chapter VIII.

(iii) The unimaginative description of the red foot-prints of the courtezans on the floor of the temple on the Ratnakūta island (157,19ff.),

as they could not possibly be seen by Samaraketu who was sailing below in a ship in the ocean!

* * * \$ \$ * * * \$ \$ * * *