

## Survey of the commentary on *Mudrārākṣasa* plays

**Suvajit Samanta**

Phd Scholar in University of Calcutta Deptt : Sanskrit, India

### Abstract

In ancient India Sanskrit drama was enriched by many poets. In his talent, these priceless poems gave us gifts. Because of being rich in talent, the writers of some poems did not understand the reader. Basically, the meaningful works are not understandable in general. But how can readers understand this taken of the poets? Compose some Scholarly notes to solve this problem by the commentary. We will be able to cross the poem in this thinker boat by the not-scripter, this can be said. More specifically, the matter can be made clear; it is not easy to understand the poet's use of ornaments, rhythms, grammar etc. in his poetry. According to the description, it must understand this; you need to talk about it.

In this Sanskrit literary world, there are many poets who have acknowledged their poetry about the myths of their poetry. Like Kalidasa's next poets Bhatti tells about his own poetry —

“Dīpatulya prabandhoayaṃ śabdalaṅkāraśuṣāṃ .

Hastādarś ivāndhānāṃ bhavet vyākaraṇādṛte .<sup>1</sup>

This poem is luminous to grateful readers. But to a non-scholar person, this poem is as useless as a mirror in the eyes of the blind. If there is no knowledge of Panini grammar, the verses will look cryptic. As a result, they cannot be appreciated.

vyākhyāgamyamidaṃ kābyamutsavaḥ sudhiyāmalam.

Hatā durmedhasāścāsmiṃ vidvat priyatayā mayā.<sup>2</sup>

This poem is understood only explanation. It is a source of information to the good people, but the non-scholar people do not have access to the inside of this verse.

This poem is written for teaching grammar. So the poets have used a lot of trouble for many times. As a result, artificiality has become manifest in the language. There has been a rasa in poetry absorption due to excessive bias in grammar. Still the artificiality and difficulty of the language despite the fact that the verse of poetry that conquered for his purpose is undeniable. The way to teach through non-literate grammar and complex rhythms poetry has opened.

Through this word it is understood that all the places of this poem are rich in grammar. Not only grammar, but also there are rhythms, ornaments, and so on. It is impossible to

<sup>1</sup> *Bhaṭṭikāṃvyam* 21/33

<sup>2</sup> *Bhaṭṭikāvyam* 22/84

understand the common man without this skilled style scholar. The commentator compiled commentaries' for proper understanding of this poem. Bhamaha also said —

“Kāvyaṅyapī yadīmaani vyākhyāgamyāni śāstrvat.  
Utsavaḥ sudhiyāmeva hanta durmedhaso hatā.”<sup>1</sup>

Poet Nsrayan said in his *Subhadrāharaṇam* —

“Sudustaraṃ vyākaraṇāmburasimḥ manaścaritren vigāhya labdhaiḥ.  
Suśabdaratnaiḥ racayāmi hāraṃ kāvyam Subhadrāharaṇābhīdhānam.”<sup>2</sup>

With this, Sriharsha has said in a *Naiṣdhacaritṃ* —

“Granthagrānthirīha kvacitkvacidapī nyāsi prayatnā mayā  
Prājñāmanyamanā haṭhate paṭhitī māsminkhelatu.  
Śraddhārāddhaguruślathīkṛtatadṛgrānthiḥ samāsādāya-  
tvetatkāvyaarasormimajjanasukhavāyāsajjanamḥ sajjanah.”<sup>3</sup>

Mallinatha said in the interpretation of the Bharavi's *Kirātārjunīyaṃ*

‘ Nārikelaphalasammitṃ vacoḥ bharaveḥ.’

Through this statement it is understood that how rich Bharavi's *Kirātārjunīyaṃ* is rich in significance. Need commentaries for proper understanding of this epic.

As Kalidasa says in the writings of *Raghuvamśam*

“Athavā kṛtavāgdvāre vāseasmin pūrvasūribhiḥ.  
Maṇau vajrasamutkṛṇ sūtrsyevāsti me gatiḥ.”<sup>4</sup>

Likewise, it is necessary that we need a lot of thunderstorms to enter the poetry. Nobody is unskilled will remain unaccustomed to forever.

Now let's talk about the currency notes of our discussion. Visakhadatta compiled his poetry in approximately 400 AD.( R.S. Pandit). This play is completely different. He wrote this play full of own talent and political environment, not following the poets like Bhasa, Kalidasa, Bhavabhuti, Sudraka etc. Which is a fully different feature? After leaving the romance and heroism, there is a different feeling in the *raudrarasa*.

<sup>1</sup> *Kāvyaḷamḥkārah* 2/20

<sup>2</sup> *Subhadrāharaṇam* 1<sup>st</sup> chapter.

<sup>3</sup> *Naiṣdhacaritṃ* 1<sup>st</sup> chapter.

<sup>4</sup> *Raghuvamśam* 1/4

Its appreciation for being free from traditional influences is also different. As a result, the appreciation of this play is felt in the politics context. So the natyārāsa reader is not easily absorbed in general. In order to pass this drama properly, the ancient commentators gave us a gift commentaries.

Before discussing this drama, one thing can be said specifically that the number of commentary is not too much for different characteristics. The reasons are —

1. Sanskrit plays are often not completely politicized. Although the background of Bhasa's *ūrubhangam*, *Swapnavāsavadattam*, *Pratiñāyaugandharāyaṇam* of politics is found in the drama, yet it is not completely political. Again the Shudraka's *Mṛcchakaṭikam* drama is written in the political environment, but here sringara-rasa<sup>1</sup> is the main. Here the politics is secondary, essentially love has gained prominence. However, the entire subject of the *Mudrākṣasam* play is fully political. It is Said that the commentators did not express their interest in writing this drama.
2. There are heroines in play wrights like Bhasa, Kalidasa, Bhavabhuti etc. Love has gained prominence for being a heroine. But there is not a heroine in this play<sup>2</sup>, except for the wife of Chandanadasa, there is no mention of any female characters, so love is fully absent. There is only the direct access to the craft, the bandwidth plan so the commentaries of this drama are shore.
3. According to the rules Alamkarasatra's in most plays, the hero of Dhīrodatta<sup>3</sup> has been noticed. Vishakhadatta has composed his plays in such a way that the hero is difficult to determine. According to someone, Chandragupta<sup>4</sup> is the main hero of the play, according to someone Chanakya<sup>5</sup>, and many others also confessed to the Rakshasa<sup>6</sup>. Because of this complexity, wise Commentators are not willing to write annotations.

<sup>1</sup> According to *Sāhityadarpaṇam* 6<sup>th</sup> volume —“Eka eva bhavedamṅī śṛṅgāro vīra eva vā.  
Aṅgamanye rasāḥ sarve ----- ”

<sup>2</sup> . M.R.Kale said, The usual companions of the hero, Viz. The pūṭhamarda, Vidūṣaka and Viṭa as well Nāyikā or the heroine, are not introduced in the *Mudrākṣas*. So the actions about them have been dropped. ( M.R.p.xv.).

<sup>3</sup> Prakhyāavamśo rājarshidhīrodāttaḥ pratāpavān.  
Divyoatha divyādivyo vā guṇavān nāyako mataḥ. ( Visvanatha *Sāhityadarpaṇam* 6th chapter.).

avikatthanaḥ kṣamāvānatigambhīro mahāsattvaḥ.  
nigūḍhamāno dhīrodātta dṛḍhabrataḥ kathitaḥ. ( Viswanatha *Sāhityadarpaṇam* 3rd chapter.).

<sup>4</sup> Haridasa Siddhantavagisha said Chandragupta as a hero decisive collections ---- Dhīrodāttagūṇī sa nāyaka iha śrīchandragupto nṛpaḥ. ( *Cāṇakyaśāstrī* īkā ).

M.R.Kale Said, Chandragupta, the hero of this play. ( M.R.p.xvi.).

<sup>5</sup> . Kaviraja Vishwanatha, the fourteenth century poet, wrote in his *Sāhityadarpaṇam*. Chanakya as the hero in the third volume of his literary orthography -----

Tyāgī kṛtī kulīnaḥ suśriko rūpayauvanotsāhī.  
Dakṣoanuraktalokastejo vaidaghyāśīlavān netā.

<sup>6</sup> Dr.G.V.deva-sthali said that Rakshasa is tragic hero ----- ‘ Our sympathies are naturally roused in his favor and we automatically acknowledge him as the hero, of course, a tragic hero. ( ref. from. *Mudrākṣasa*. Ed. UdayachandraBandyopadhaya, p.40.).

4. This play is not the śṛṅgār, but the virarasa wars do not exist here by arms. Instead, the battle of warfare and conquest of the archery is not noticed. On the other hand, the stability of politic-war between Chanakya and Rakshasa. Therefore, due to the main rasa, the places of war vira-rasa<sup>1</sup> have been accepted in this play. Still, the role of raudra-rasa in this play is evident. Perhaps for this exception, the reformist commentators were not willing to write the commentary.
5. There is also debate on the birthplace of Vishakhadatta. According to Someone vihar<sup>2</sup>: according to Someone, the Bengale<sup>3</sup> of this birthplace. In addition, it is considered as one of the best places of land for Smṛti and Nāya. So literature matters are not seen as much. This play of Vishakhadatta is not well-respected due to the exception. Naturally, the commentary of this drama was not composed much.
6. Its lack of clarity of love has not spread to the audience more reality. Erotic plays *Swapnavasavadattam*, *Abhijñanaśakuntalam*, *Uttararāmacaritam* etc. capture everyone's mind. So the number of notes is more. On the other hand, this drama is a little appreciated.
7. According to the rules of alaṅkāraśātram, generality dramas are famous fictional, and śṛṅgar-rasa erotic. But this play is an exceptional. Like them it's not reputable incident, not erotic. Moreover, it is a note-worthy history. So the number of notes is less.
8. Viswanatha said in his *Sahityadarpanam* 6<sup>th</sup> volume 'Nāṭakam khyātavṛttam syāt' etc. and 'itihāsodbhavam vṛttamnyadvā sajjanāśrayam' etc. Through this commentary he will be collected from the story of the drama, from the legendary story in history or the people.  
The playwright has collected a historical story from Vishakhadatta Purana or folklore and gave him a new look in his talent. However, he changed the change. One thing to remember is that it was not the work of the playwright to present the facts in reality; rather it was his main task to present that incident logically. Here is the level of difference between history and poetry. History is a background of this play, but it is not history. In this context, Western scholar Aristotle's remarks are memorable ---- 'It is not function of the poet to relate what has happened, but what may happened according to the Law of probability and necessity'. (Aristotle and poetics.)
9. Sanskrit drama is rich by many playwrights. The plays of these playwrights have often been adopted of the same direction. But the drama needed some dramatist to do different things to do so. But their fullness was formed in the match between hero and heroine. The opposite of this play hero is not specific, not a heroine and other female characters, there is no love.
10. Political environment is its main element. The strange characteristic is also seen in the character's play. The role of the opponent in other plays is not the same.

<sup>1</sup> M.R.kale said Vira is the chief rasa of the *Mudrā* ( M.R.p.xvi.).

<sup>2</sup> After watching this application of Kusumapura in the play, Telang, etc., thinks Pandit of Bihar Pradesh.

<sup>3</sup> "Cīyate vāliśasyāpi satkṣetrpatitā kṛṣiḥ.

Na śāleḥ stambakāritā vapturḡuṇamapekṣte.."( *Mudrārākṣasa* 1/3)

'Api ca vahati jalamiyam pinaṣṭi gandhān' ( *Mudrārākṣasa* ¼) These statements made him known as the playwright of Bengal.

According to the incident they apply. The main is the match between hero and heroine. This romantic attracts everyone. It is missing here.

11. The presence of two opponents in the entire drama for political reasons is noticeable. On the other hand, the Chanakya on the other side, the Raksasa. Among these, there was ashock of political wars. The reader cannot easily understand what the final outcome of this play is. And the events are different from other dramas and strange. As a result, it was not appreciated at that time. So its notes were not composed much.

Later, its impact on the political environment was noticed. Vishakhadatta's plays have been willing to write an annotation. But it is less in number. According to commentary list from the many libraries in the note annotations. Some of the findings have been published, and many are still unpublished. The description is given below.

The published notes are:

Commentators	Commentaries	Times
Jivananda Vidyasagar	Vivṛtiḥ	1881
Aswinikumar	Arthodyotaniḥ	1117
Kanakalal Thakur	Bhavabodhinī	1920-21
Taranath Tarkavachaspati	Vṛttiḥ	1869
Vidhubhushana Goswami	Vyākhyā	1901
Shrishachandra Bhattacharya	Bodhanaḥ	1908
Haridasa Siddhantavagisha	Cāṇakyaçāturī	1983
Dhundhiraja	Mudrārākṣasavyākhyā	1813

The Unpublished notes are:

Commentators	Commentaries
Bhaskara	Padaparakāśaḥ
Maheshwara	Mudrādīpikā
Ratinatha Chakravartti	Mudrānirgarvavistāraḥ
Lakshmanasudhi	Vyākhyā
Graheshwara	Mudrādīpikā/ Mudrārākṣasavyākhyā

Information collected sources :

A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscript, Tanjore , Vol.xvi.

A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscript, Madras, Vol. xxi.

A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscript, RASB, Vol. xvi.

Catalogues of Sanskrit Manuscript, Nagpur, Vol. xvi.

Descriptive Catalogue. BORI. Vol. xxi.

New catalogues Catalogorum, Vol. xxi.