

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis Group in *Journal of South Asian Studies*, available online:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/02666030.2014.962335>

‘We do not fully understand the learned poet’s intention in not composing a twentieth canto’:
Addiction as a Structuring Theme in the *Raghuvamśa*

CSABA DEZSŐ

Introduction

Kālidāsa devoted the last (nineteenth) *sarga* of his *Raghuvamśa* to depicting the dissolute life of King Agnivarṇa, who neglects his royal obligations and spends most of his time making love to his wives and concubines. As a result, he becomes the victim of a wasting disease and is cremated in secret by his ministers, who then place his pregnant queen on the throne.

Such an anticlimactic ending of an epic that praises the exemplary virtues of the heroic and just kings of the *Sūryavamśa* has been considered suspicious by many for centuries. According to Lienhard,

it is improbable that Kālidāsa intended the Raghu poem to finish on such an unseemly note. [...] Everything seems to indicate either that Kālidāsa did not finish the poem or that a short concluding section in which the succeeding rulers are mentioned has been lost. It is also possible that he continued the chronicle up to his own day and connected the Raghu dynasty with his own patron, who may have been the Gupta King Samudragupta. [...] About a hundred years ago it was still generally thought in Indian circles that the poet’s descendants in Ujjayinī (modern Ujjain) or Dhārā were in possession of six or seven further cantos which were the conclusion of the poem.¹

Unfortunately these descendants have not yet made public the ‘lost cantos’, and it is noteworthy, as Lienhard also points out, that none of the commentaries on the *Raghuvamśa* discusses more than nineteen *sargas*. The earliest known commentator of the epic, Vallabhadeva, makes the following remark after the final verse of the nineteenth canto:²

atra ca saty api vaṃśaśeṣe kavivedhasā viṃśaḥ sargaḥ kimiti na vihita ity abhiprāyaṃ samyañ na vidmaḥ. tathā hy Agnivarṇasya putraḥ Śīghragaḥ, tadanantaram Maru-Prasusruta-Susandhy-Amarśahasvat-Viśruta-Bṛhadbalādyā babhūvuh.

And we do not fully understand the learned poet’s intention in not composing a twentieth canto here, even though the dynasty has not been completed yet. For Agnivarṇa’s son was Śīghraga, after him came Maru, Prasusruta, Susandhi, Amarśahasvat, Viśruta, Bṛhadbala, and others.³

It seems certain that Vallabhadeva, writing in tenth-century Kashmir, did not know more than nineteen cantos, and this fact clearly bothered him. Shankar Paṇḍit expressed similar views in the Preface of his edition in 1874,⁴ and following him Jacobi also speculated that perhaps one canto was missing and the last king treated by Kālidāsa might have been Maru, about whom the

Purāṇas say that he is still alive, thanks to the power of his yoga, in the village of Kalāpa, and he is going to revive the dynasty sometime in the future.⁵

In this paper I am going to examine if the thematic structure of the *Raghuvamśa* makes its seemingly inappropriate ending more plausible. Recounting the deeds of several kings of a royal lineage, Kālidāsa's epic does not describe a single hero's rise to success (*abhyudaya*), a subject that could easily give the impression of unity. Yet it is not just an unstructured series of episodes. According to Warder it is the concept of the four human goals (*puruṣārthas*) that holds the stories together: Dilīpa places piety (*dharmā*) above all, Raghu, the conqueror attains power and wealth (*artha*), Aja and Agnivarṇa lead a life subject to passion (*kāma*), while Atithi preserves the balance of the three goals.⁶ As for the fourth *puruṣārtha*, deliverance from the circle of rebirths (*mokṣa*), we see that several kings of the dynasty strive to achieve this aim as forest hermits in their old age.⁷

Tieken also embraces the view that the *Raghuvamśa* is a 'coherently structured, unified narration'.⁸ He singles out the continuation of the line of succession as the Leitmotif 'that arranges the otherwise diverse and disconnected material into some sort of overall organic whole, giving the text a very definite beginning and end'.⁹ Dilīpa, the king of the first cantos, has to propitiate a wish-fulfilling cow to secure the birth of an heir to the throne, and the epic ends with a portrait of Agnivarṇa's widow ruling over her husband's kingdom, carrying in her womb his posthumous son. More recently Anna Bonisoli Alquati argued in her doctoral dissertation that

some episodes [of the *Raghuvamśa*] acquire a deep meaning when they are seen one in the light of the other, and that all of them appear strictly linked. The tightest boundary between them is the recurrence of certain motifs: in particular, I have tried to pull out of the texts some themes that keep emerging on the surface of the whole poem. They represent to my mind the *filles rouges* that create a net of correspondences, which grant the poem coherency and charm.¹⁰

Particularly instructive is her comparative analysis of the stories of Aja and Kuśa, built around the theme of love and the role that alliance through marriage plays in strengthening the dynasty.¹¹

Bonisoli Alquati's approach of reading the episodes of the *Raghuvamśa* not in isolation but in the light of each other seems to me a fruitful one.¹² In this paper I am going to collate three stories taken from key parts of the epic: Dilīpa's from the beginning, Daśaratha's from the middle, and Agnivarṇa's from the end. The texts against the background of which I am going to examine these stories are passages from treatises on statecraft (*artha*) and *dharmā* that deal with 'human vices' or 'addictions', *puruṣavyasanas*. I am certainly not the first to point out textual parallels between Kālidāsa's works and the *Arthaśāstra*: the pioneering studies of H. A. Shah,¹³ K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar,¹⁴ and V. Raghavan¹⁵ have paved the way for my research, and I will rely upon their scholarship, even though I do not agree with all the conclusions they drew from the material they had gathered.¹⁶

Book Eight of the *Arthaśāstra* is about *vyasanas*, 'calamities', including the set of 'human vices' or 'addictions' (*puruṣavyasanas*) to which a king may fall victim. Some of these vices arise from anger (*kopaja*): verbal abuse, injury to property, and physical assault belong to this subcategory.¹⁷ The other group consists of hunting, gambling, women, and drinking: these are the vices born from passion (*kāmaja*).¹⁸ It is primarily this latter group that becomes important in the *Raghuvamśa*.

Unless indicated otherwise, the verses of the *Raghuvamśa* are going to be quoted from the Kashmirian text commented upon by Vallabhadeva,¹⁹ the earliest known commentator of the

epic.²⁰ His version often appears to be closer to what Kālidāsa might have written than the text known to later commentators,²¹ though not necessarily in every case. I am going to touch upon some of the major differences regarding the passages to be examined. Among the southern commentators I have found Aruṇagirinātha (c. 1400, Kerala) to be the most insightful;²² he quotes the *Arthaśāstra* several times. Occasionally, I will also refer to the commentaries of Mallinātha²³ and Hemādri.²⁴

Agnivarna's revels

Agnivarna, the last king of the *Raghuvaṃśa* (though, as we have seen, not the last king in Raghu's lineage), is clearly a victim of *strīvyasana*, a vice that is irredeemable (*niṣpratyādeya*) according to Kauṭilya (8.3.53). The *Arthaśāstra* lists the results of this addiction (8.3.54), some of which are nicely illustrated by Kālidāsa's verses, e.g. *kāryanirveda*, 'aversion to work':

*so 'dhikāram adhipaḥ kulocitaṃ kās cana svayam avartayat samāḥ
samnivesya saciveṣv ataḥ paraṃ strīvidheyanaṣvayauvano 'bhavat. (19.4)*

That king performed the duties proper to his family for some years himself. Then he entrusted them to his ministers and devoted his youth to women.

Adarśana, 'keeping out of sight':²⁵

*antar eva viharan divānīsaṃ na vyapaikṣata samutsukāḥ prajāḥ. (19.6cd)
gauravād yad api jātu mantrinām darśanam prakṛtikāṅkṣitam dadau
tad gavākṣavivarāvalambinā kevalena caraṇena kalpitam. (19.7)*

Day and night he enjoyed himself inside [the palace] and did not care about his anxious subjects. Even when sometimes, out of respect for his ministers, he made an appearance that had been much awaited by his subjects, it was arranged just with his foot dangling through the hole of a 'cow's eye' window.

Drinking, another vice that arises from passion (*kāmaja*), is a natural part of the king's revelries:²⁶

*ghrāṇakāntamadagandhakarṣiṇīḥ pānabhūmiracanāḥ priyāsakhaḥ
abhyapadyata sa vāsītāsakhaḥ puspitāḥ kamalinīr iva dvīpaḥ. (19.11)
sātirekamadagandhinam rahas tena dattam abhileṣur aṅganāḥ
tābhir apy upahr̥tam mukhāsavaṃ so 'pibad bakulatulyadohadaḥ (19.12)*

Together with his beloveds he visited the drinking sites that had been set up, attractive due to the fragrance of wine pleasant to the smell, as an elephant visits the blooming lotus ponds together with its cows. His women craved for the nectar of his mouth, excessively fragrant from wine, that he gave them in private, and he too, whose desire was like that of a *bakuka*-tree, drank the nectar of their mouth when they offered it to him.

The *Manusmṛti* also lists the *vyasanas*, but its *kāmaja* group is tenfold:

*mṛgayākṣo divāsvapnaḥ parivādaḥ striyo madah
tauryatrikam vṛthātyā ca kāmajo daśako gaṇaḥ. (7.47)²⁷*

Hunting, gambling, sleeping during the day, disparaging others, women, liquor, music, song, dance, and useless travel – this is the set of ten stemming from pleasure.²⁸

Since Agnivarṇa does not leave the inner apartments of his palace, he could hardly be accused of ‘useless travel’. But he certainly has a passion for music and dancing:

*aṅkam aṅkapaṛivartanocite tasya ninyatur aśūnyatām ubhe
vallakī ca hṛdayaṅgamasvanā mañjuvāg api ca vāmalocanā.* (19.13)

*sa svayaṃ prahatapuṣkaraḥ kṛtī lolamālyavalayo haran manah
nartakīr abhinayātīlaṅghinīḥ pārśvavartīṣu guruṣv alajjayat.* (19.14)

Two things, both suited to moving about in his lap, never left his lap empty: on the one hand, the lute whose sound touched the heart, and a fair-eyed woman with a sweet voice on the other. Skilfully beating the drum himself while his garlands and bracelets were swinging, he captivated the minds of the dancing girls, and so, as they erred in their dance-gestures, he embarrassed them in front of their teachers standing by the side.

He also tends to rest from his night-time labours during the day:

*yoṣitām uḍupater ivārciṣām sparśanirvṛtim asāv anāpnuvan
āruroha kumudākaropamām rātrijāgaraparo divāsayaḥ.* (19.34)

Insatiate with the touch of women, he became similar to a lily-pond insatiate with the touch of moonbeams: awake at night, sleeping by day.

Kauṭilya holds that kings subject to their passions perish:

kāmavaśāḥ kṣayavyayanimitam arivyādhibhiḥ (scil. *hatāḥ*). (8.3.7)

Those subject to passions have been killed by enemies and diseases as a result of wasting away and squandering.²⁹

Agnivarṇa has preserved the regal power of his predecessors so his fall is not caused by his enemies, but by consumption:³⁰

*taṃ pramattam api na prabhāvataḥ śekur ākramitum anyapārthivāḥ
āmayas tu ratirāgasambhavo Dakṣasāpa iva Candram akṣiṇot.* (19.48)

Even though he was careless, other kings were unable to attack him because of his power, but the disease that stems from passion for sex wasted him away, as Dakṣa’s curse does the moon.

The way the ministers act during the king’s illness reminded the commentator Aruṇagirinātha of the *Arthaśāstra*’s instructions:³¹

*prāg eva maraṇābādhabhayād rājñāḥ priyahitopagrahanena māsadvimāsāntaram darśanam
sthāpayed 'deśapīdāpaham amitṛāpaham āyusyaṃ putriyaṃ vā karma rājā sādhayati' ity
apadeśena. (Arthasāstra 5.6.2)*

Well before he fears that the king is in danger of dying, by winning over people dear to and intimate with the king, he should arrange for him to be seen publicly at intervals of one or two months, under the pretext: 'The king is carrying out a rite for removing the tribulations of the country – or for removing an enemy, or for promoting long life, or for securing a son'.³²

*'gūḍham eṣu divaseṣu pārthivaḥ karma sādhayati putrajanmane'
ity adarśitarujo 'sya mantrinaḥ śaśvad ūcur aghaśankinīḥ prajāḥ. (Raghuvamśa 19.52)*

His ministers, concealing his illness, always said to the people who suspected the worst: 'These days the king is performing a ritual so that a son is born to him'.

And when Agnivarṇa dies, since there is no crown prince to inherit the throne, the ministers confer royal authority on his pregnant queen, again in accordance with the instructions of the *Arthasāstra*:³³

amātyaḥ kumāraṃ rājakanyaṃ garbhiniṃ devīm vādhikurvīta. (Arthasāstra 5.6.36)

The minister should appoint the prince, the princess, or the pregnant queen.³⁴

*taiḥ kṛtaprakṛtimukhyasaṅgrahair āśu tasya sahadharmacāriṇī
sādhudr̥ṣṭaśubhagarbhalakṣaṇā pratyapadyata narādhipaśriyam. (Raghuvamśa 19.55)*

After convening a meeting of the leaders among the subjects, they [i.e. the ministers] invested with royal power his lawful wife, whose auspicious pregnancy was clearly indicated by favourable signs.

Though Agnivarṇa was not a model king, he was not evil or ungifted. He showed considerable talent in pursuing that human goal which was his obsession, namely *kāma*. In fact, he brought to perfection the gratification of his senses. Aruṇagirinātha considers him a typical *dhīralīta nāyaka*, a 'brave and light-hearted' character we often encounter in *nāṭikās*, 'whose achievements depend on his friends (or counsellors) and who is inclined to pleasures'.³⁵ As a lover, Agnivarṇa certainly did not fail: the ladies in his seraglio were anxious to enjoy his company, they held him back when he was trying to slip away, never letting him get his breath back.³⁶ His pregnant widow shed hot tears 'grieving the demise of such a king'.³⁷ On the other hand, he had never lost the love of his people either: they were eager to have his *darshan* (though they had to content themselves with his foot dangling from the window, 19.7–8) and they were concerned and had an evil presentiment when they could not see the invalid king, hidden by his ministers (19.52).

Kālidāsa clearly states that Agnivarṇa's illness, which was a result of his lifestyle,³⁸ jeopardized the future of the dynasty:

*vyoma paścimakalāsthithendu vā pañkaśeṣam iva gharmapalvalam
rājñi tatkulam abhūt kṣayāture vāmanārcir iva dīpabhājanam. (19.51)*

When the king was suffering from consumption, his family was like the sky with the moon in its last digit, or like a pond reduced to mud in the summer, or like a lamp with a tiny flame.

Agnivarṇa was far from the ideal of the Raghu kings, who were ‘householders for the sake of progeny’ (*prajāyai grhamedhinām*, 1.7), and he died ‘without seeing his redeeming offspring, though he had many wives’ (*sa tv anekavanitāsakho ’pi san pāvanīm anavalokya santatim*, 19.53). The dynasty, however, survived: although the ‘ritual for the sake of obtaining a son’ was probably just an excuse for the king not appearing in public during his illness, one of his queens did conceive. In Kauṭilya’s opinion, addiction to sexual pleasures has an advantage over other vices (e.g. drinking): *strīvyasane bhavaty apatyotpattiḥ*, ‘in the case of the vice of women, there is the production of offspring’ (*Arthaśāstra* 8.3.58).³⁹

The pious Dilīpa

Kālidāsa begins his epic with the story of Dilīpa, an exemplary member of the dynasty. In harmony with the values cherished by his family and quite unlike his dissolute descendent, Agnivarṇa, Dilīpa ‘married for the sake of progeny’ (*parinetuḥ prasūtaye*, 1.25). He pursued the three human goals suitable for a householder in an impeccable fashion:

... *bheje dharmam anāturaḥ*
agrdhnuḥ ādāde so ’rthān asaktaḥ sukham anvabhūt. (1.21)

He cultivated *dharmā* [even] without being ill, collected wealth without being greedy, enjoyed pleasure without being attached.

Dilīpa was not averse to the joys of life, but he was not attached to them. As Vallabhadeva glosses *asaktaḥ*, the king was *avyasanī*, ‘not addicted’ to sensual pleasures.⁴⁰ He did, however, have a passion for something else: Kālidāsa calls him *dharmarati*, ‘one who loves (or delights in) *dharmā*’ (1.23), glossed by Vallabhadeva as *dharmāsakta*, ‘attached (or clinging) to *dharmā*’. In fact, the other two goals of life coalesced into *dharmā* for Dilīpa:

sthityai dandayato dandyaṅ parinetuḥ prasūtaye
apy arthakāmau tasyāstāṃ dharmā eva maṅṣiṇaḥ. (1.25)

He punished those who deserved it to maintain order, married to father offspring: even power and pleasure were just *dharmā* for that wise man.

While Agnivarṇa was not satisfied with his wives and concubines and had affairs with dancing girls and maidservants, his ancestor Dilīpa had taken marriage more seriously:

kalatravantam ātmānam avarodhe mahaty api
tayā mene manasvinyā Lakṣmyā ca vasudhādhīpaḥ. (1.32)

Though he had a large harem, it was that wise woman [i.e. Sudakṣiṇā] and Lakṣmī on account of whom the ruler of the earth regarded himself as having a wife.

Marriage for Dilīpa was part of his responsibilities: as a king he was the husband of Royal Power, *Rājyaśrī*, of the Realm, *Bhūdevī*,⁴¹ and of Sudakṣiṇā, his dearly beloved wife and prospective mother of the heir to the throne. And yet the eagerly awaited birth of a son and heir was delayed. So Dilīpa entrusted the kingdom to his ministers, as Bhagīratha had done once, both with the purpose of finding a means to purify their ancestors: a son in Dilīpa's case and the Gaṅgā in Bhagīratha's,⁴² and not just to get rid of the burden of royal obligations to enjoy life in an unfettered way, as Agnivarṇa would. King and queen travelled with a small entourage to the *ashram* of Vasiṣṭha, the royal chaplain (*purohita*) and guru of the dynasty, to ask for his advice. After the king and the Brahman had paid their mutual compliments, Vasiṣṭha used his yogic powers to discover 'the cause of obstruction in the lineage' (*santatistambhakāraṇam*, 1.73). His words addressed to Dilīpa are handed down in essentially two different versions. Vallabha comments on the following verses (1.74–80):

*purā Śakram upasthāya tavorvīm pratiyāsyataḥ
āsīt kalpatarucchāyāsevīnī Surabhīḥ pathi. (74)*

*imāṃ devīm ṛtusnātāṃ smṛtvā sapadi satvarah
pradakṣiṇakriyātītas tasyāḥ kopam ajījanah. (75)*

*'avajānāsi mām yasmād atas te na bhaviṣyati
matprasūtīm anārādhya prajeti' tvā śasāpa sā. (76)*

*sa śāpo na tvayā rājan na ca sārathinā śrutah
nadaty ākāśa-Gaṅgāyāḥ srotasy uddāmadiggaje. (77)*

*avaimi tadapadhyānād yatnāpekṣam manoratham,
pratibadhnāti hi śreyah pūjyapūjāvvyatikramah. (78)*

*haviṣe dīrghasattrasya sā cedānīm Pracetasah
bhujāṅgapihitadvāraṃ Pātālam adhiṣṭhati. (79)*

*sa tvam ekāntarām tasyā madīyām vatsamātaram
ārādhaya sapatnīkaḥ, sā vām kāmam pradāsyati. (80)*

Once, when you were returning to the earth after attending Indra, Surabhi (the wish-yielding cow) was there on your way, resting in the shade of the tree of plenty. Remembering that this queen of yours had just bathed after her period, you failed to circumambulate [the cow] and thus made her angry. 'Since you have treated me with disrespect, you shall not have a child unless you worship my offspring', she cursed you. That curse was not heard either by you or by your charioteer because an unfettered elephant of the quarter was trumpeting in the stream of the heavenly Ganges. I reckon that the fulfilment of your desire requires some effort because of her ill will, for neglecting the worship of those who should be worshipped puts an obstacle in the way of good fortune. She [i.e. Surabhi] is staying in the netherworld now, the gate of which is blocked by serpents, to provide oblation for Pracetas, who is engaged in a long sacrificial session. You and your wife should worship her grandchild who belongs to me and who is the mother of a calf. She will grant your wish.

The conscientious Dilīpa recalled his duty as a householder, laid down in the *Manusmṛti* as follows (3.45): ‘Devoted to his wife, he should always have sex with her during her fertile period’.⁴³ The southern commentators Aruṇagirinātha and Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita read a different verse here:

*dharmalopabhayād rājñīm imāṃ saṃcintya satvaraḥ
pradakṣiṇakriyārḥyāṃ tasyāṃ tvam sādhu nācaraḥ.*

Afraid of the transgression of your duty, thinking of this queen, in a hurry, you did not behave properly towards her [i.e. Surabhi], who is worthy of ritual circumambulation.

As Goodall and Isaacson point out, ‘[t]he southern commentators’ reading of this verse could be a version rewritten by pedants who wished it to be made explicit that Dilīpa’s reason for rushing back was *dharmalopabhaya*’.⁴⁴ This might be the case, but even if it is not made explicit, this *was* in fact the king’s reason, or put differently, it was his ‘love for *dharma*’, *dharmarati* (not denying, of course, that he also loved his wife). But his preoccupation with his duty as a husband made him make a mistake: he failed to notice and greet the holy cow. Surabhi cursed him, at least in Vallabhadeva’s (and Mallinātha’s) version.⁴⁵ The Keralan commentators (and some manuscripts of Mallinātha’s commentary) do not have the curse, they simply read:⁴⁶

*īpsitaṃ tadavadhyānād viddhi sārgalam ātmanah,
pratibadhnāti hi śreyah pūjyapūjāvyatikramah.*

Know that your desire is impeded because of her disrespect, for neglecting the worship of those who should be worshipped puts an obstacle in the way of good fortune.

Thus, in their version Dilīpa’s disrespect (*avadhyāna*) towards the cow is in itself the cause for his being childless, while in the other version the cause is Surabhi’s curse, her ‘ill will’, *apadhyāna*, or, as Vallabhadeva glosses it, her ‘tarnished judgment’, *kaluṣadarśana*. In the text commented upon by the southern commentators, since Surabhi was not available at the moment, Vasiṣṭha suggested that the king propitiate her daughter instead,⁴⁷ a logical solution. The version with the curse appears to be less logical: as Goodall and Isaacson observe, ‘the specifying in the curse (in 1:76c) that Surabhi’s offspring are to be worshipped rather than herself does not accord well with Vasiṣṭha’s explanation in 1:79 that Surabhi is unavailable to be worshipped’.⁴⁸ On the other hand, Surabhi is away at a sacrifice ‘to provide substances to be offered’ (*hotavyaṃ dātum*), as Vallabhadeva remarks, which probably means she is giving milk. But that implies that her calf is also with her,⁴⁹ so that particular offspring cannot be worshipped: this might be the reason why Vasiṣṭha says in Vallabhadeva’s version: ‘worship her grandchild, who belongs to me’ (*ekāntarāṃ tasyā madīyāṃ ... ārādhaya*), so the line of thought becomes coherent.⁵⁰

Now, various scenarios could be put forward to explain these two (or three, including Mallinātha’s hybrid) versions. As Goodall and Isaacson suggest, ‘the episode of the curse might secondarily have been removed by some transmitters of the poem in the South who wished to avoid having so inauspicious an event in the first *sarga* of the poem’.⁵¹ Or the curse might have been added to at least partly exonerate Dilīpa from the responsibility of his childlessness: in Vallabhadeva’s reading, Surabhi’s anger is also an important factor. But in either of these versions, Dilīpa’s story concerns some of the key issues of Kālidāsa’s poetry: it is a story about remembering and forgetting, attention and inattentiveness, and the difficulty of creating and maintaining a harmony of duties, interests, and desires, be they ours or others’.

Śakuntalā, whose thoughts are filled with her love for Duṣyanta, brings upon herself the curse of the irascible sage whom she forgets to greet. But it is not just the sage she fails to notice: she is unaware of even having been cursed. Likewise, Dilīpa is so engrossed in the fulfilment of his kingly duties that he commits a mistake of inattentiveness, and he remains unaware of this mistake until the sage enlightens him. Agnivarṇa's addiction to *kāma* makes him neglect his responsibilities as a king and endangers the future of the dynasty. Dilīpa's single-minded pursuit of *dharma* also has its dangers: although his passion has a loftier object than Agnivarṇa's, it turns his attention away from things that prove to be important. Fortunately, Vasiṣṭha and the ministers are always there to help fix what went wrong.

Dilīpa becomes Nandini's guardian and accompanies her on her rambles in the forest, ready to protect her from danger. When a lion, which claims to be Śiva's servant, attacks the cow, the king offers his own body in exchange. Fortunately, the lion proves to be Nandini's magical projection, and the holy cow is so satisfied with Dilīpa's selfless heroism that she grants him the blessing of a son.

Daśaratha's weakness: hunting

The very first verse of the ninth canto introduces Daśaratha, not only as a great warrior (*mahāratha*), but also as one 'who had subdued his senses by concentration' (*samādhijitendriyaḥ*) and 'who stood at the head of those who control themselves and those who protect' (*yamavatām avatām ca dhuri sthitaḥ*). And if we still have doubts concerning the king's relations with 'human vices', Kālidāsa spells it out for us:

*na mṛgadāvaratir na durodaram na ca śaśipratimābharaṇam madhu
tam udayāya na vā navayauvanāḥ priyatamā yatamānam apāharan. (9.7)*

Neither the love of deer-parks, nor gambling, nor wine decorated with the reflection of the moon, nor his beloveds in the bloom of youth distracted him when he was striving for a rise in prosperity.

The commentators certainly recognise the four addictions that arise from passion (*kāmaja vyasanas*).⁵² Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita and Mallinātha quote *Manusmṛti* 7.50, which identifies drinking, gambling, women, and hunting as the most dangerous addictions among the ten vices listed in 7.47 (see above). In Hemādri's view, the following verses show that Daśaratha was also immune to the three vices born from anger (*krodhaja*).⁵³ 'Verbal abuse' (*vākpārūṣya*) is referred to in verse 8:

*na kṛpaṇā prabhavaty api Vāsave na vitathā parihāsakathāsv api
api sapatnajane na ca tena vāg aparūṣā paruṣākṣaram īritā.*

He did not utter feeble words even when Indra wielded his power, or false words even while telling jokes, nor did he, who was free from anger, speak abusive words even to his adversaries.

Verse 9 alludes to 'injury to property' (*arthadūṣaṇa*) and 'physical assault' (*daṇḍapārūṣya*):

*udayam astamayam ca Raghūdvahād ubhayam ānāsire vasudhādhipāḥ,
sa hi nideśam alaṅghayatām abhūt suhṛd ayohṛdayaḥ pratigarjatām.*

The vassal kings experienced both rise and fall thanks to the chief of the Raghu clan, for he was friendly to those who did not transgress his orders, [but] he showed an iron heart towards those who grumbled.

Thus Kālidāsa portrays Daśaratha as a king who was unaffected by the temptations of human vices, who was as detached from passions (*avyasanī, asakta*) as his great-grandfather had been. But while Dilīpa had loved *dharma* (*dharmarati*) above all, Daśaratha delighted in peace or rest (*śamarati*, verse 4). Aruṇagirinātha quotes the *Arthasāstra*'s definition of *śama* at this point:

karmaphalopabhogānām kṣemārādhanah śamaḥ (6.2.3)⁵⁴

Rest consists of the security that one furnishes to the enjoyment of the fruits of one's activities.⁵⁵

One day, when Daśaratha had conquered the earth and decorated the riverbanks with golden sacrificial posts, spring arrived with fresh flowers, as if to wait upon that 'single ruler of the people' (*ekanaarādhipa*).⁵⁶ But spring came for more than just to pay its respects:

*abhinayān paricetum ivodyatā malayamārutakampitapallavā
amadayat sahakāralatā manaḥ sakalikā kalikāmajitām api.*⁵⁷

The mango sapling, full of buds, looking as if trying to practise the dance gestures as its shoots were shaken by the southern wind, intoxicated the minds of even those who had defeated both enmity and lust.

The blossoms and shoots of mango have similar effects on Agnivarṇa's women (19.43): they shed their quarrels and pacify the king themselves (*anvanaiṣur avakīrṇavighrahās tam*). In the ninth canto, however, we can recognise the king himself behind the attribute *kalikāmajit*, since, as we have seen above, Daśaratha had successfully distanced himself from both kinds of human vices, be they *kāmaja* or *krodhaja*. This verse forebodes a dangerous change of mental state.

When Dilīpa entered the forest as the holy cow's guardian, his aura created a royal atmosphere around him:⁵⁸ roadside trees heralded his approach with the cries of birds;⁵⁹ young vines tossed in the wind and showered flowers on him, as girls scatter parched rice over a king who enters the city;⁶⁰ forest deities loudly sang his praises to the accompaniment of whistling wind-filled bamboos serving as flutes.⁶¹ Dilīpa, though alone, without attendants or any insignia, transformed the forest around him into a capital city greeting its victorious king.

Daśaratha entered a forest where spring, and with it love, had brought nature under its sway. Kālidāsa marshals the topoi of *śṛṅgāra* poetry, many of which we also find in the last canto in a courtly context, while here they are located in the forest.⁶²

*daśanacandrikayā vyavabhāsitaṃ hasitaṃ āsavagandhi madhor iva
bakulapuṣpam asevyata śatpadaih śuci rasam cirasamcitam ipsubhiḥ.*⁶³

The bees, wishing to obtain its pure nectar that had accumulated for a long time, were visiting the *bakula* flower, which looked like the smile of spring made bright by shining teeth, fragrant like/with wine.

*surabhisaṅgamajam vanamālayā navapalāśam adhāryata bhaṅguram
ramaṇadattam ivārdranakhakṣataṃ pramadayā madayāpitalajjayā.*⁶⁴

The row of trees bore new, fragile *palāśa* flowers born from its union with spring, as a passionate woman, her sense of shame banished by intoxication, wears the fresh nail marks given by her lover.

*prathamam anyabhṛtābhīr udiritāḥ praviralā iva mugdhavadhūkathāḥ
surabhighandhiṣu śūsruvire girāḥ kusumitāsu mitā vanarājiṣu.*⁶⁵

First the scanty sounds uttered by cuckoos were heard among the sweet-smelling, blossoming rows of trees, resembling the reticent talk of artless brides.

*tilakamastakaharmyakṛtāspadaiḥ kusumamadhvanuṣaṅgasugandhibhiḥ
kalam agīyata bhṛṅgavilāsinām smarayutair ayutair abalāsakhaiḥ.*⁶⁶

Thousands of enamoured bee-lovers were singing softly together with their females, having settled on the rooftops that were the tops of *tilaka* trees, and sweet-smelling on account of their contact with the nectar of flowers.

Cunning girls let go of the ropes of the swing so that they can embrace their lovers,⁶⁷ a familiar scene from Agnivarṇa's revels (19.44), where their pretext is fear, while here they feign clumsiness. In Agnivarṇa's court, each rich festival is succeeded by another, even richer one.⁶⁸ In the ninth canto, a spring festival brimming with *śṛṅgāra* forms around Daśaratha, and it takes hold of him:⁶⁹

*atha yathāsukham ārtavam utsavam samanubhūya vilāsavatīśakhaḥ
narapatiś cakame mṛgayāratim sa Madhuman-Madhu-Manmathasannibhaḥ.*

Then, having enjoyed the spring festival at ease in the company of playful women, the king, who was similar to Madhumat, Madhu, and Manmatha, longed for the pleasures of hunting.

The commentators interpret the similes in different ways. Mallinātha and Aruṇagirinātha identify Madhumat with Viṣṇu, Madhu with spring, and Manmatha with Kāma. Vallabhadeva offers roughly the same glosses (he takes *madhu* to mean *caitra*, the first spring month), but he also has an alternative for Madhumat, namely *mādhava* or *vaiśākha*, the second month of spring. Notwithstanding these differences, both Vallabhadeva and Aruṇagirinātha hold that the similes foreground the king's relation to *śṛṅgāra*.⁷⁰

In an atmosphere full of love and yearning, hunting becomes Daśaratha's passion. But, as Vallabhadeva points it out: 'Surely, the pursuit of hunting has been forbidden, because it is a vice [*vyasana*], so how could he pursue it?'⁷¹ Aruṇagirinātha asks the same question: 'Hunting was prohibited before as a vice in [the verse beginning] "Neither delight in hunting..."', so why is it introduced here?'⁷² He provides the following answer:

One who has accomplished his goal is entitled to pleasures (*kāma*), so it is enjoined now because he has accomplished his goal, while previously it was forbidden because he had not done so yet. This is why it was said there: 'striving for success'.⁷³

According to Vallabhadeva, Hemādri, and Mallinātha, the next verse aims at dispelling our doubts about Daśaratha's new hobby.⁷⁴ Aruṇagirinātha goes a bit further when he introduces the verse as follows: 'Now [Kālidāsa] shows that, when [hunting] is performed in its own time, it is not only not a vice, but even a virtue'.⁷⁵

*paricayaṃ calalakṣyaṇipātane bhayaruṣoś ca tadingitavedanam
śramajayāt praguṇām ca karoty asau tanum ato 'numataḥ sacivair yayau. (9.55)*

It [i.e. hunting] makes one skilled in bringing down moving targets and familiar with the signs they make in fear or anger, and it also makes the body fit due to the overcoming of fatigue: for these reasons he was given permission by his ministers and set off.

Aruṇagirinātha, and in modern times Shah,⁷⁶ and more recently Rajendran⁷⁷ and Wojtilla,⁷⁸ have already pointed out the parallel passage in the *Arthaśāstra*, which reflects Kauṭilya's view:

*mṛgayāyām tu vyāyāmaḥ śleṣmapittamedahsvedanāśas cale sthite ca kāye lakṣaparicayaḥ
kopabhayasthāneṣu ca mṛgānām cittajñānam anityayānam ceti. (8.3.46)⁷⁹*

In the case of hunting, on the other hand, we have exercise; the elimination of phlegm, bile, fat, and perspiration; practice in hitting moving and still bodies; and discerning the minds of animals when they are angry, afraid, and at ease; as well as travel that is not constant.⁸⁰

Backed by the authority of Kauṭilya's guidance, his counsellors do not advise Daśaratha against hunting, so he throws himself into his favourite sport. But he does not just massacre all creatures that cross his path. As Rajendran notes,⁸¹ the king has mercy on certain animals, especially those that remind him of his beloved women. Thus the peacock is saved, because its feathers put him in mind of the hair of his beloved that has come undone during lovemaking.⁸² When Daśaratha sees that a doe tries to protect her mate with her own body he is overcome by compassion because he recognises the couple as fellow beings, lovers just like him (*kāmitayā*).⁸³ He is unable to shoot other antelopes whose eyes, trembling with fear, have brought the flirty glances of his bold beloveds to his mind,⁸⁴ a scene that is reminiscent of the beautiful verse in the first canto in which Dilīpa and Sudakṣiṇā 'see the similarity to each other's eyes in the antelope couples'.⁸⁵ The hunting scene of Daśaratha is permeated by *śṛṅgāra*.

But he is not so merciful to all the beasts in the forest: attacking wild boars, bison, and tigers die by his hand. His great-grandfather offered his own body to the lion that had attacked the holy cow entrusted to his care. Daśaratha provokes the lions himself:

*nirghātograiḥ kuñjalīnāñ jighāmsur jyānirghoṣaiḥ kṣobhayām āsa simhān,
nūnam teṣām abhyasūyāparo 'sau vīryodagre rājasābde mṛgānām.⁸⁶*

Eager to kill the lions hiding in the shrubbery, he annoyed them with the sound of his bowstring, frightful as thunderstorm. No doubt he was jealous of the royal title of these beasts – a title that is made exalted by valour.

Daśaratha was portrayed as ‘free from anger’, *aparauṣ*, and thus free from the vices arising from anger at the beginning of the canto (9.8). Now he is jealous, and his jealous anger makes him want to kill. The passion of hunting gets the upper hand over him:

*iti vismṛtānyakaraṇīyam ātmanah sacivāvalambitadhuraṃ narādhipam
parivṛddharāgam anubandhasevayā mṛgayā jahāra catureva kāmīnī.*⁸⁷

The king, who had forgotten about his other duties and had entrusted the yoke [of government] to his ministers, his passion increased due to the continuous pursuit [of this sport], was enthralled by hunting, as if by a skilful mistress.

Dilīpa also placed his kingdom in the custody of his ministers, but not to cultivate some sport: he wanted to secure the continuation of his dynasty. Daśaratha’s descendant, Agnivarna, will also ‘entrust his office to his counsellors’ (*so ’dhikāram ... samniveśya saciveṣu*, 19.4) so that he can immerse himself in his revels, ‘turning away from his other duties’ (*anyakāryavimukhaḥ*, 19.47). Daśaratha himself, initially a self-disciplined man, is now engulfed by passion and seduced by his pastime. Aruṇagirinātha remarks that expressions such as ‘continuous pursuit’ (*anubandhasevā*) suggest that the king spent many days engaged in hunting.⁸⁸ The same commentator quotes the *Kāmasūtra* (2.1.40) here, which says, *prītiḥ sābhyaśikī jñeyā mṛgayādiṣu karmasu*, ‘love is to be known as linked with repeated practice with regard to such activities as hunting’.⁸⁹ He also reads *dharāpatim*⁹⁰ instead of *narādhipam*, and adds an insightful comment: ‘the similarity of the earth (*dharā*) to a former mistress is implied’.⁹¹ But even without this reading, the verse suggests that Daśaratha has become unfaithful to Royal Majesty (*rājalakṣmī*) and the Earth, his spouses by right of kingship.

His single-minded attachment to his new love makes him oblivious even to the rules of the game: he wants to kill an elephant just in sport, an act his father, Aja, refrained from even when he was attacked by the animal, because he knew that killing a forest elephant was taboo for kings.⁹² Daśaratha is just as educated (*śrutavat*) as his father was, but he is too preoccupied, ‘blinded by passion’, to remember his learning:

*nṛpateḥ pratiśiddham eva tat kṛtavān Paṅktiratho ’viśāṅkya yat.
apathe padam arpayanti hi śrutavanto ’pi rajonimilitāḥ.*⁹³

What Daśaratha did without misgivings is definitely forbidden for a king. Even the learned put their feet on the wrong path when blinded by passion.

The mistake Daśaratha made was, according to Aruṇagirinātha, that he released his arrow in the belief that the noise he had heard was an elephant bathing in the river.⁹⁴ He would have committed an offense even if he had killed an elephant, but his arrow tragically caused the death of a young ascetic who was filling his pitcher in the river, and who was the only support of his old, blind parents.⁹⁵ The king took the wounded boy to his parents and told them what he had done ‘unknowingly’ (*ajñānataḥ*).⁹⁶ Daśaratha is certainly right in saying that he did not mean to kill the boy, but the chain of events that led to the murder was initiated by his passionate engrossment in one of the ‘human vices’, which made him inattentive, and therefore made him commit another vice: physical assault. *Danḍapāruṣya*, according to the *Arthaśāstra*, causes the offender to suffer the same blow from others.⁹⁷ The boy dies and his father curses the king: ‘You shall die like me, in old age, due to your grief for your son.’⁹⁸ It is a terrible curse, but mixed with

blessing, as Daśaratha tells the old ascetic in the next verse, for he can be sure now that he *will* have a son.

Conclusions

Sudarśana, having defeated his enemies, had left a rich and secure kingdom to Agnivarṇa, to be enjoyed without any disturbance (19.3). Agnivarṇa certainly did this; in fact, his whole reign was about enjoyment. When Daśaratha inherited the throne, he did not allow himself to be distracted by human vices and strove for conquest (9.7). Once he had secured his position as *cakravartin*, he followed his natural disposition to relish the pleasures of a peaceful life. Both kings assigned the responsibility for governing to their ministers in a time of peace and security, and both of them neglected their kingly duties, but while Agnivarṇa had never (or at least not for long) intended to take these duties seriously, Daśaratha had begun to reign in an exemplary fashion, and only later let himself be seduced by the passion of hunting.

Their illustrious ancestor, Dilīpa, never considered the disregard of royal duties as an option. He was *kṣātra dharma* incarnate (1.13). Even when he entrusted his ministers with the burden of his kingdom, he did so because his responsibility toward the dynasty required him to concentrate on securing an heir. Agnimitra occupies the opposite end of the scale of conscience: he uses duty only as a pretext to have a break between two rendezvous (19.31). For Dilīpa, *dharma* takes priority over any other matter and determines his relationships with women. He is wedded *ex officio* to Royal Majesty, *Rājaśrī*, and to the Realm, *Bhūdevī*, and among his many mortal wives it is Sudakṣiṇā, the future mother of the crown prince, whom he considers his true spouse. Daśaratha is more of the romantic kind, and is easily seduced by the temptations of spring and hunting. The lustful Agnivarṇa is after sex, regardless of whether he gets it from his concubines or from servant girls. Since Śrīdevī and Bhūdevī cannot satisfy his carnal desires, he is not really interested in them.

The three kings all bring curses upon their heads which suit their mistakes or vices. Dilīpa is obliged to attend assiduously to the comfort of the offspring of the holy cow he offended; Daśaratha will have to share the tragic fate of the father of the ascetic boy he killed; and the symptoms of Agnivarṇa's illness match those of *viraha*, separation from one's lover (19.50). But, curiously, the mistakes and vices of these kings also play a role in the continuation of their lineage. When the selfless and valiant Dilīpa is granted a boon by the cow, he gets a chance to ask for 'a son to be born from Sudakṣiṇā, who will be the founder of a dynasty and whose fame will be never-ending'.⁹⁹ The ascetic's curse also entails that Daśaratha will have a son, even though the loss of this son will be the cause of his demise. And finally, Agnivarṇa's addiction to sex makes the begetting of a child more likely than a passion for drinking or gambling would.

Dilīpa regards his pregnant wife as the earth that hides treasures,¹⁰⁰ and good omens predict that the birth of Raghu will bring about prosperity for the people.¹⁰¹ Agnivarṇa's unnamed queen is placed on the throne when the signs clearly indicate an auspicious pregnancy.¹⁰² She carries the child in her womb as the earth carries the seeds for the prosperity of the people.¹⁰³ There is the promise of the birth of a good king, perhaps even of a second Raghu, in the last verse of the epic, so a continuation is not difficult to imagine.

But if we consider the themes of duty versus pleasure and preoccupation versus forgetting, *sarga* XIX appears to be a possible and logical conclusion. At the beginning of the epic, *dharma* reigns supreme, and even mistakes caused by the single-minded fulfilment of one's duty are corrected by perseverance with dharmic behaviour. The king of the ninth canto (roughly in the middle of the epic) still lives up to the standards of the dynasty: he is self-disciplined, righteous, and a great conqueror, but what he prizes most is the enjoyment of the fruits of his

endeavours. He flings himself wholeheartedly into his leisure pursuits, which seduce him like a new mistress and make him oblivious to what he must or must not do. In the last canto, kingly duties are a pressing burden, to be dumped as soon as possible, or just used as a pretext; passions prevail.

The end of the epic is not the end of the dynasty, but the first king whose story Kālidāsa narrates in detail is not Manu Vaivasvata either. The concluding verse may be read as auguring a great king and Raghu-like conqueror, and as long as the dynasty is not extinct, there is always a chance that the next king will resemble an illustrious predecessor. Certain kingly characteristics, predilections, and accomplishments keep recurring in Raghu's *vamśa* as it appears in the *Raghuvamśa*, though not always exactly in the same way. The first king of the epic was immune to the temptations of the passions, his great-grandchild could not resist them when he was given some idle days, and, finally, Agnivarṇa had no intention at all of resisting the temptations of the flesh. His portrayal is a possible (and perhaps somewhat pessimistic) conclusion of a study of the royalty's attitude toward *dharma* and *kāma*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by a Bolyai János Research Scholarship, awarded by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

NOTES

¹ S. Lienhard, *A History of Classical Poetry, Sanskrit – Pali – Prakrit* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984), p. 177.

² Vallabhadeva's commentary is quoted from D. Goodall and H. Isaacson, *The Raghupañcikā of Vallabhadeva, Being the Earliest Commentary on the Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa, Vol. I.* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2003) for the first six *sargas*, and from an unpublished draft edition prepared by D. Goodall, H. Isaacson, and myself for *sargas* 7–19.

³ Cf. W. Kirfel, *Das Purāna Pañcalakṣaṇa, Versuch einer Textgeschichte* (Bonn: Kurt Schroeder Verlag, 1927), p. 337. Amaraṣa and Sahasvat may be two kings as in *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 4.4.111. See Khemraj Krishnadas, *Śrīviṣṇumahāpurāṇam / The Viṣṇumahāpurāṇa* (Bombay: Venkateshwar Steam Press, 1910; repr. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1995).

⁴ *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa with the Commentary of Mallinātha, Part III, Cantos XIV–XIX*, ed. by S. P. Paṇḍit (Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt, 1874), p. 18: 'The line of kings therefore mentioned by our poem not being complete the conclusion is inevitable either that our poet did not finish his work or if he did it has not descended to us in its entirety'.

⁵ H. Jacobi, 'Die Epen Kālidāsa's', in *Verhandlungen des 5. Internationalen Orientalistenkongress*, 2 vols (Berlin: [n. pub.], 1882), II.2, 149; cf. Kirfel, p. 337; *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 4.4.109–10.

⁶ A. K. Warder, *Indian Kāvya Literature, Volume Three: The Early Medieval Period (Śūdraka to Viśākhadatta)* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977), pp. 131–136.

⁷ On this subject see R. Tsuchida, 'Die Weltentsagung der Ikṣvāku-Könige', *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture*, 133 (1997), 105–61.

⁸ H. Tieken, 'The Structure of Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa', *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, 15 (1989), 151–58 (p. 152).

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

¹⁰ A. Bonisoli Alquati, 'Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa: An Analysis. Dottorato di Ricerca in Studi Indologici e Tibetologici Ciclo XXI' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Università degli Studi di Torino, 2008), p. 106.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 72–104.

¹² Ibid., p. 8.

¹³ H. A. Shah, ‘Kauṭilya and Kālidāsa I’, *The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*, 10 (1919–20), 303–17; H. A. Shah, ‘Kauṭilya and Kālidāsa II’, *The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*, 11 (1920–21), 42–61; H. A. Shah, ‘Kauṭilya and Kālidāsa III’, *The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*, 11 (1920–21), 138–45; H. A. Shah, ‘Kauṭilya and Kālidāsa IV’, *The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*, 11 (1920–21), 238–48.

¹⁴ K. B. Ayyar, ‘A Study of Kālidāsa in Relation to Political Science’, in *Proceedings of the Third All-India Oriental Conference, Madras, 1924* (Madras: [n.pub.], 1925), pp. 1–16.

¹⁵ V. Raghavan, ‘Kālidāsa and Kauṭilya’, in *Proceedings of the Thirteenth All-India Oriental Conference, Nagpur, 1946* (Nagpur: [n. pub.], 1951), pp. 102–08.

¹⁶ For example, dating Kālidāsa to a time before Aśoka, as Shah did.

¹⁷ *Arthaśāstra* 8.3.23: *vākpārusyam arthadūṣaṇam dandapārusyam iti*; 8.3.37: *iti kopajas trivargah*. Quoted from *The Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra, Part I: A Critical Edition With a Glossary*, ed. and trans. by R. P. Kangle, 2nd edn (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1969; repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988). I have adopted Olivelle’s translation of these terms, see P. Olivelle, *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India. Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

¹⁸ *Arthaśāstra* 8.3.38: *kāmajas tu mṛgayā dyūtaṁ striyaḥ pānam iti caturvargah*. Quoted as in note 17.

¹⁹ From Goodall and Isaacson, *The Raghupañcikā*, in the case of the first six cantos, and from an unpublished draft edition prepared by Goodall, Isaacson, and myself in the case of the later cantos. Verse numbering also follows these editions, unless indicated otherwise.

²⁰ He is dated to the early tenth century – see Goodall and Isaacson, *The Raghupañcikā*, p. xvi. We know from his introductory verses that he decided to write a commentary on the *Raghuvamśa* because he had been urged by many good people troubled by the lack of a commentary (*tikāviraḥakhedārtasādhusārthapravartitaiḥ*, p. 1).

²¹ See Goodall and Isaacson, *The Raghupañcikā*, pp. xxxi–xl; D. Goodall, “‘Bhūte ‘āha’ iti pramādāt”: Firm Evidence for the Direction of Change Where Certain Verses of the *Raghuvamśa* are Various Transmitted’, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft*, 151 (2001), 103–24; D. Goodall, ‘Retracer la transmission des textes littéraires à l’aide des textes “théoriques” de l’Alaṅkāraśāstra ancien: quelques exemples tirés du *Raghuvamśa*’, in *Écrire et transmettre en Inde classique*, ed. by G. Colas and G. Gerschheimer (Paris: École française d’Extrême-Orient, 2009), pp. 63–77.

²² See Goodall and Isaacson, *The Raghupañcikā*, pp. lxxviii–lxxix. I used the following edition: *Raghuvamśa by Mahakavi Kalidasa with Prakasika Commentary of Arunagirinatha & Padarthadeepika Commentary of Narayana Panditha[.] Cantos 1 to 6*, ed. by K. A. Poduval and C. K. Raman Nambiar (Tripunithura: Sanskrit College Committee, 1964); *Raghuvamśa by Mahakavi Kalidasa with Prakasika Commentary of Sri Arunagirinatha & Padarthadeepika Commentary of Sri Narayana Panditha[.] Cantos 7 to 12*, ed. by K. A. Poduval and C. K. Raman Nambiar (Tripunithura: Sanskrit College Committee, [n.d.]); *Raghuvamśa by Mahakavi Kalidasa with Prakasika Commentary of Arunagirinatha & Padarthadeepika Commentary of Narayana Panditha[.] Cantos XIII to XIX*, ed. by K. A. Poduval and C. K. Raman Nambiar (Tripunithura: Sanskrit College Committee, 1959).

²³ *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa With the Commentary of Mallinātha Edited with A Literal English Translation, Copious Notes in English Intermixed with Full Extracts, Elucidating the Text, from the Commentaries of Bhaṭṭa Hemādri, Cāritravardhana, Vallabha, Dinakaramiśra, Sumativijaya,*

Vijayagaṇi, Vijayānandasūri's Varacaraṇasevaka and Dharmameru, with Various Readings etc. etc., ed. by G. R. Nandargikar, 5th edn (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982).

²⁴ *Raghuvamśadarpana: Raghuvamśa Commentary by Hemādri, Vol. 1.*, ed. by R. P. Dwivedi (Patna: Kashiprasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1973).

²⁵ See Shah, 'Kauṭilya and Kālidāsa II', p. 246.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ P. Olivelle, *Manu's Code of Law. A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

²⁸ As per Olivelle's translation – see note 27.

²⁹ The sentence has variant readings, this is the one commented upon by the *Nayacandrikā* –see *The Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra*, ed. and trans. by Kangle, p. 209. It is also followed by Raghavan, p. 108, who understands a chiasmic construction: *kṣaya* goes with *vyādhi* and *vyaya* with *ari*. Olivelle adopts the reading *kṣayanimitam* and translates: '[T]hose under the sway of pleasure have been killed by enemies and diseases as a result of their decline'. Olivelle, *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra*, p. 336.

³⁰ See Raghavan, p. 108.

³¹ See Aruṇagirinātha's commentary *ad loc.*, also Shah, 'Kauṭilya and Kālidāsa I', p. 315; Raghavan, p. 108; Ayyar, p. 12.

³² As per Olivelle's translation – see note 17.

³³ See Aruṇagirinātha's commentary *ad loc.*, also Shah, 'Kauṭilya and Kālidāsa I', p. 315.

³⁴ As per Olivelle's translation – see note 17.

³⁵ *sacivāyattasiddhir bhogapravaṇas ca* (Aruṇagirinātha's commentary on 19.4).

³⁶ See *Raghuvamśa* 19.29–33.

³⁷ *tathāvidhanarendravipattisokād*, 19.56. Vallabhadeva glosses *tathāvidha* with *rāgin*, 'passionate', Mallinātha, on the other hand, takes it as an attribute of *vipatti*.

³⁸ *ratirāgasambhavo*, 'caused by his passion for sex' (19.48).

³⁹ Of course Kauṭilya adds certain reservations: *strīvyasana* has certain positive aspects when it involves one's wives in one's home. The result of this vice is 'the devastation of everything in the case of women with whom sex is forbidden' (*Arthaśāstra* 8.3.59: *agamyeṣu sarvocchittiḥ*, as per Olivelle's translation – see note 17).

⁴⁰ Vallabhadeva *ad loc.*: *avyasanī sukham anubabhūva*.

⁴¹ Cf. Vallabhadeva *ad loc.*: *vasudhādhipa ity anena bhūvo 'pi kalatratvam uktam*.

⁴² This is according to verse 1.34, as known to Vallabhadeva: *Gaṅgām Bhagīratheneva pūrveṣām pāvanakṣamām / īpsatā santatim nyastā tena mantriṣu Kosalā //* The southern commentators read instead: *santānārthāya vidhaye svabhujād avatāritā / tena dhūr jagato gurvī saciveṣu nicikṣipe //* Goodall and Isaacson think that '[i]t is possible that the verse known to the southern commentators is a secondary replacement for the verse known to Vallabhadeva, since it obviates the possible criticism that Dilīpa hands over control only of Kosalā rather than of the entire earth, which he rules'. Goodall and Isaacson, *The Raghupañcikā*, p. 274. The southern version is closer to 2.74 (Dilīpa resumes power): *bhūje bhujāṅgendrasamānasāre bhūyaḥ sa bhūmer dhuram āsasañja*.

⁴³ *ṛtukālābhigāmī syāt svadāranirataḥ sadā*, quoted by Mallinātha *ad loc.* Vallabhadeva quotes a *śruti* passage: *ṛtāv upeyād iti śruteḥ* (found actually in *Gautamadharmasūtra* 1.5.1).

⁴⁴ Goodall and Isaacson, *The Raghupañcikā*, p. 285. Mallinātha comments on a hybrid version: *dharmalopabhayād rājñim ṛtusnātām imām smaran / pradakṣiṇakriyārbhāyām tasyām tvaṃ sādhu nācarah //*

⁴⁵ Śaraṇadeva's *Durghataṅṛtti* (1172 CE, Bengal) quotes 1.76 (*matprasūtim...*) in his commentary on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.4.21, which means that he also knew a version with the curse. See *La*

Durghatavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva. Traité grammatical en sanskrit du XIII^e siècle, Volume II, Fascicule I: Adhyāya III–V, édité et traduit par Louis Renou (Paris: Société d'Édition « Les Belles Lettres », 1945), p. 72.

⁴⁶ Verse 76 in Aruṇagirinātha and Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita, verse 79 in the editions of Mallinātha (which also include the curse).

⁴⁷ *sutām madīyām Surabheḥ kṛtvā pratidinidhiṃ śuciḥ / ārādhaya sapatnīkaḥ prītā kāmādughā hi sā //* (verse 78 in Aruṇagirinātha and Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita, verse 81 in Mallinātha, who reads *tadīyām*).

⁴⁸ Goodall and Isaacson, *The Raghupañcikā*, p. 286.

⁴⁹ Cf. 2.66, where Dilīpa asks for the milk of Nandinī that remains after her calf has had its fill and after the amount required for the sacrifice has been milked out.

⁵⁰ Mallinātha seems to comment upon a mixed version: it includes the curse, but verse 81 reads *sutām tadīyām Surabheḥ kṛtvā pratidinidhiṃ śuciḥ*, though some of its manuscripts seem to read *sa gām madīyām Surabheḥ kṛtvā pratidinidhiṃ śuciḥ*.

⁵¹ Goodall and Isaacson, *The Raghupañcikā*, p. 286.

⁵² Vallabhadeva: *mṛgayādyūtapanāstrīvyasanāni kāmajātāni tam na jahrrur ity arthaḥ*; Aruṇagirinātha: *anena puruṣavyasanavarge catvāri kāmajāni tasya nāsann ity uktam*; Hemādri: *catvāri kāmajāny etāni vyasanāni*.

⁵³ Cf. *Arthasāstra* 8.3.23, 37: *vākpārusyam arthadūṣaṇam daṇḍapārusyam iti... iti kopajas trivargah*, ‘Verbal abuse, injury to property, and physical assault... these constitute the set of three stemming from wrath’ (as per Olivelle’s translation – see note 17). Hemādri refers to Kāmandaka and Manu, not to the *Arthasāstra*. The *Manusmṛti* teaches eight *krodhaja* vices (7.48) out of which those mentioned in the *Arthasāstra* are considered to be the three most serious ones (7.51).

⁵⁴ This is the reading according to Kangle’s (as in note 17) and Venkatanathacharya’s (*Arthasāstra of Kauṭilya with Chandrika*, crit. ed. N. S. Venkatanathacharya (Mysore: Oriental Research Institute, 1986)) editions (they report no variants). *Ārādhana* is glossed as *sādhana*, ‘accomplishing’, by Venkatanathacharya’s *Candrikā* commentary. The text of Aruṇagirinātha’s commentary actually reads *karmaphalopayogāt*, which might be just a corruption, or we could interpret the sentence as follows: ‘Peace is the accomplishment of security, because one can enjoy the fruits of one’s works’.

⁵⁵ As per Olivelle’s translation – see note 17.

⁵⁶ Verse 25 in Vallabhadeva and Hemādri, 24 in Mallinātha, 22 in Aruṇagirinātha (with variants).

⁵⁷ Verse 30 in Vallabhadeva, 29 in Mallinātha, 31 in Hemādri, 26 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁵⁸ 2.7: *sa nyastacihnām api rājalakṣmīm tejoviśeṣānumitām dadhānaḥ*, ‘bearing royal fortune which, although its insignia have been put aside, was inferred from his superior majesty’.

⁵⁹ 2.9: *pārśvadrumāḥ ... udīrayām āsur ivonmadānām ālokaśabdaṃ vayasām virāvaiḥ*.

⁶⁰ 2.10: *marutpayuktās ca ... tam ... avākiran bālalatāḥ prasūnair ācāralājair iva paurakanyāḥ*.

⁶¹ 2.12: *sa kīcakair mārutapūrṇarandhraiḥ kūjadbhīr āpādītavaṃśakṛtyam / śusrāva kuñjeṣu yaśaḥ svam uccair udgīyamānam vanadevatābhiḥ //*

⁶² The description of spring has been transmitted with many variants. Certain verses are not commented upon by all commentators, and the order of verses also varies greatly. The four verses I have selected were known to Vallabhadeva and Hemādri, but some of them are omitted by the southern commentators.

⁶³ Verse 34 in Vallabhadeva and Hemādri, found between 30 (*nayaguṇopacitām...*) and 31 (*kusumam eva...*) in certain manuscripts of Mallinātha (as reported by Nandargikar), omitted in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁶⁴ Verse 35 in Vallabhadeva, 37 in Hemādri, found between 26 (*kusumajanma...*) and 27 (*upahitam...*) in certain manuscripts of Mallinātha (as reported by Nandargikar), omitted in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁶⁵ Verse 38 in Vallabhadeva, 39 in Hemādri, 34 in Mallinātha, 32 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁶⁶ Verse 39 in Vallabhadeva, 49 in Hemādri, omitted in Mallinātha and Aruṇagirinātha.

⁶⁷ Verse 41 in Vallabhadeva, 57 in Hemādri, 46 in Mallinātha, 44 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁶⁸ 19.5: *ṛddhimantam adhikaraddhir uttarah pūrvam utsavam apohad utsavaḥ*.

⁶⁹ Verse 54 in Vallabhadeva, 59 in Hemādri, 48 in Mallinātha, 46 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁷⁰ Vallabhadeva: *śṛṅgāritvāc caitāny upamānāni*; Aruṇagirinātha: *upamayā tadānīm nāyakasya śṛṅgāropakaranasāmagrī svato manoharatvaṃ ca dhvanyate*. Hemādri thinks the comparison is more complex: *śaurye Viṣṇunā, saurabhe vasantena, saundarye 'naṅgena sama ity arthaḥ*.

⁷¹ Vallabhadeva *ad loc.*: *nanu mṛgayāsevanam vyasanatvān niṣiddham, tat katham asāv asevatā?*

⁷² Verse 7 (Aruṇagirinātha reads *mṛgayābhiratiḥ* instead of *mṛgadāvaratiḥ*).

⁷³ Aruṇagirinātha *ad loc.*: *nanu na mṛgayābhiratir iti vyasanatvena prāñniṣiddhā mṛgayā, sā katham atra prastūyate. ucyate, kṛtakṛtyasya kāme 'dhikāra iti kṛtakṛtyatvād idānīm tadvidhiḥ. pūrvam tu tadabhāvān niṣedhaḥ. tata eva tatroktam udayāya yatamānam iti*.

⁷⁴ Vallabhadeva *ad loc.* (verse 55 in his version): *nanu mṛgayāsevanam vyasanatvān niṣiddham tat katham asāv asevatetyāha*; Hemādri *ad loc.* (verse 60 in his version): *vyasanatvena niṣiddham mṛgayām katham asau cakama ity āha*; Mallinātha *ad loc.* (verse 49 in his version): *vyasanāsaṅgadoṣam pariharann āha*.

⁷⁵ Aruṇagirinātha *ad loc.* (verse 47 in his version): *atha svāvasare 'nuṣṭhīyamānāyā *na kevalam na* (conj.: *na kevalam* ed.) *vyasanatvam asyāḥ kim tu guṇatvam apīti darśayati*.

⁷⁶ Shah, 'Kauṭilya and Kālidāsa I', pp. 303–09.

⁷⁷ C. Rajendran, 'Encountering the Forest: Kālidāsa's Perception on Hunting', in *Pandanus '06: Nature in Literature and Ritual*, ed. by J. Vacek (Prague: Signeta, 2006), pp. 131–42 (p. 134).

⁷⁸ G. Wojtilla, 'The King Is Hunting: Is It Good Or Bad?', in *Kings and Ascetics in Indian Classical Literature: International Seminar 21–22 September 2007, Proceedings*, ed. by P. M. Rossi and C. Pieruccini (Milan: Cisalpino; Istituto Editoriale Universitario, 2009), pp. 199–212 (pp. 200, 206).

⁷⁹ Cf. the words of the general in *The Recognition of Shakūntala by Kalidasa*, ed. and transl. Somadeva Vasudeva (New York: NYU Press & JJC Foundation, 2006), 2.36 (p. 106).

⁸⁰ As per Olivelle's translation – see note 17.

⁸¹ Rajendran, pp. 135–36.

⁸² 9.73 in Vallabhadeva, 67 in Mallinātha, 65 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁸³ 9.63 in Vallabhadeva, 57 in Mallinātha, 55 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁸⁴ 9.64 in Vallabhadeva, 58 in Mallinātha, 56 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁸⁵ *parasparākṣisādṛśyam... mṛgadvandveṣu paśyantau*, 1.43 in Vallabhadeva, 40 in Mallinātha, 41 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁸⁶ 9.70 in Vallabhadeva, 64 in Mallinātha, 62 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁸⁷ 9.75 in Vallabhadeva, 69 in Mallinātha, 67 in Aruṇagirinātha, 80 in Hemādri.

⁸⁸ Aruṇagirinātha *ad loc.*: *atra anubaddhasevayādibhiḥ śabdair mṛgayāsaktasya bahudivasātivāhanam gamyate*.

⁸⁹ Cf. Hemādri *ad loc.*: *vyasaneṣu hi sevayā rāga upajāyate*, 'passion for vices is produced by indulgence'. Agnivarṇa's addiction also increases as he throws himself into richer and richer pleasures (9.10: *aṅganās tam adhikam vyalobhayan*; 16: *kāmyavastusu naveṣu saṅginah*; 27: *vighnīteccam api tasya sarvato manmathendhanam abhūt vadhūratam*).

⁹⁰ Some manuscripts of Mallinātha read *dharādhipam*, as reported by Nandargikar, p. 288. He adopts *narādhipam* though.

⁹¹ Aruṇagirinātha *ad loc.*: *dharāyās ca pūrvanāyikāsāmyam pratīyate.*

⁹² 5.50: *tam āpatantam nṛpater avadhyo vanyaḥ karīti śrutavān kumāraḥ / nivartayisyān viśikhena kumbhe jaghāna nātyāyatakṛṣṭaśāringaḥ //*

⁹³ 9.80 in Vallabhadeva, 74 in Mallinātha, 72 in Aruṇagirinātha, 85 in Hemādri.

⁹⁴ Aruṇagirinātha *ad loc.*: *yat kṛtavān tat pratiśiddham evety anvayaḥ. kṛtam ca dviradabuddhyā śaravisarjanam.*

⁹⁵ One factor could have made things worse: if Daśaratha had murdered a Brahman, but the ascetic family was *dvijetara* (verse 82).

⁹⁶ 9.83 in Vallabhadeva, 77 in Mallinātha, 75 in Aruṇagirinātha.

⁹⁷ *Arthaśāstra* 8.3.36: *dandapāruṣyāc ca tam eva doṣam anyebhyaḥ prāpnoti.*

⁹⁸ *diṣṭāntam āpsyati bhavān api putraśokād ante vayasya aham iveti* (9.85 in Vallabhadeva, 79 in Mallinātha, 77 in Aruṇagirinātha).

⁹⁹ 2.64: *vaṁśasya kartāram anantakīrtiṃ Sudakṣiṇāyāṃ tanayaṃ yayāce.*

¹⁰⁰ 3.9: *nidhānagarbhām iva sāgarāmbarāṃ ... nṛpaḥ saagarbhāṃ mahiṣīm amanyata.*

¹⁰¹ 3.14: *bhavo hi lokābhyudayāya tādrśām.*

¹⁰² 19.55: *sādhudṛṣṭaśubhagarbhalakṣaṇā.*

¹⁰³ 19.57: *bhāvāya... prajānām antargūḍham kṣitir iva babhau bījamuṣṭiṃ dadhānā.*