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PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The present work is a collection of papers written from 1932 to 1970, by Dr. V. Raghavan, a versatile scholar in Sanskrit and Indology, on Abhinavagupta, and his works. The matter has been revised and updated, wherever necessary for this publication.

Abhinavagupta is one of the most profound and keenest minds that India has ever known. His poetical and philosophical theories hold ground even today. Dr. Raghavan's valuable writings on the personal life, critical estimate, and exposition of Abhinavagupta and his varied works are a veritable treasure on the subject.

It is therefore with great pleasure that we bring out this collection of articles which were not easily accessible to scholars in the field for a long time. We however deeply regret to note that fate took him away from the world on 5th April 1979, when only the first article in this collection was printed off.

When Dr. V. Raghavan passed away suddenly, Dr. S. S. Janaki, his ex-student, who has been associated with his academic activities for several years, undertook the finalisation of the remaining print of the publication. We thank her sincerely for her active co-operation in bringing out this publication.
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THE GURUNĀTHAPARĀMARŚA

The Gurunāthaparāmarśa presented in the following pages is a short eulogy in 47 verses in various metres on Ācārya Abhinavagupta, the renowned writer on Kashmir Śaivism and Nāṭya-Alamkāra Śāstras. Its value lies in the fact that from it we know for the first time some important information on the works of this great author, as I have shown in my account of 'The Works of Abhinavagupta', included in this collection.

In his Īṣvarapratyabhijñā Brhati Vimarśini Abhinavagupta refers to a work of his called Kathāmukhatilaka, the subject-matter of which has not been known hitherto. Śloka 9 of this Gurunāthaparāmarśa enlightens us that it is a work relating to Vāda and expounding the sixteen Padārthas of Nyāya. It is now clear that it is this Nyāya work of his that Abhinavagupta is mentioning on page 138 of his Parātrīṃśikāvivaraṇa.

Śloka 8 informs us of an altogether new work of Abhinavagupta, the Paryantapañcāśikā, which Maheśvarānanda quotes anonymously in his Mahārthamañjariparimala, and which I have edited from a single manuscript of it which I discovered in the Kerala University Oriental Manuscripts Library.

Śloka 7 of this work records an interesting information about Abhinavagupta being a 'Yoginībhū' and a chosen repository of the entire lore of the school.

Though the teacher (Guru) occupies a fundamental place in all schools of philosophy and in all branches
of knowledge in India, Kashmir Šaivism attaches some special importance to the Guru and in that light, some special significance is to be associated with this eulogy on the great Ācārya of this school.

The text edited by me here is based on a single manuscript of it in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, contained along with other related works, in a paper transcript in Telugu script, the original codex of which is in the Sanskrit College, Tripunittura, Cochin, Kerala. The codex is particularly rich in Pratyabhijñā literature and its contents are described in the MGOM. Library Catalogue under D. Nos. 15323–15342; to the importance of some of these I have drawn attention in my account of the works of Abhinavagupta.

In the text of the Gurunātha-parāmarśa edited here from the manuscript described under D. No. 15323, the obvious scribal errors have been corrected, and certain difficult passages reconstructed; the manuscript readings are given below; explanatory notes, references, etc., are also added under some of the verses.
गुरुनाथपरामशः

स्वयंचन्दनभ्रुसुमरगडदचविधा-
वैश्यमकरतितचदामार्धः
पांचचित्परमशिवायोपदेशः
पालतस्मानभिनवगुस्नाथपदः || १ ||

वत्सारस्वतरससिद्ध एव शुद्धः
सर्वोद्भव विलसति वान्यवाचकार्मः ।

(४) काश्मीरव जयति जगद्धितावतारः
स श्रीमानभिनवगुस्नाथपदः || २ ||

तथ यदास्मयति वान्यवधावःः
भक्तां भक्तमहामार्गेचह्क्रमोत्तमः ।
हर्षः वं प्रदिवशतु सचिवस्वर्थः
स श्रीमानभिनवगुस्नकालमेवः || ३ ||

संकोचं द्वितयति हृतसरोहाणां
गोभिरस्तकलदिगतसरणिपणिः ।
आलिङ्क दिशातु द्वाशामलौकिकः नः
स श्रीमानभिनवगुस्नाथवर्यः || ४ ||

१ Ms. काश्मीरवः

(४) Cf. Abhinavagupta himself in his Mālinivijayavārttika
135, काश्मीरकोशविवाणुप्तः।
यस्तापं हरति तमांसि च स्वभासा
स्वच्छात्मा सकलकलाकलाप पूणः ॥
आनन्दं दिशतु द्यशाममन्दमन्तः
स श्रीमानिनवगुणपनाथचन्द्रः ॥ ५ ॥

एकदयात्ययुगपक्षपरश्रमान्:
(a) संख्येपविस्तारकृतैववच्छां प्रवन्धे: ॥
योस्तवैग्रहीतस युक्तमारसुखसंभविद्:
तस्मै नमोदिनवगुणगुरुमाय ॥ ६ ॥

यो मेलनेच कचन देशिकयोगिनीनाम्
अवग्रहेत्याविल एप गुरुमायः ॥
तव्येव संक्रमित हत्यपलालितोब्रजूत
(b) तस्मै नमोदिनवगुणगुरुमाय ॥ ७ ॥

* The metre of verses 1—5 is Praharṣiṇī.

(a) Cf. Abhinavagupta’s longer and shorter commentaries on the Iśvarapratyabhijña, and his extensive Tantrālōka and its abridgements Tantrasāra and Tantravāṭadhānikā.

(b) Cf. Abhinavagupta, Tantrāloka, first verse and Jayaratha’s comments thereon, pp. 14–15. See also on Abhinavagupta as a Yoginībhū, K. C. Pandey, Abhinavagupta, 2nd edn. pp. 7–8; my article, Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, XIV, p. 323. This detail that in a meeting of the teachers and Yoginis, Abhinavagupta was made the sole repository of the entire teaching is not found mentioned in this form in Pandey’s book. On the transmission of the teaching from the teacher, according to the Kashmirian school, referred to in the terms Gurumukha, Kramaugha, Kathana, Pūjana and Saṅkrama, see Mahānayaprakāśa, Kas. Texts .21, pp. 109 ff and 138 ff; Mahānayaprakāśa TSS. 130, pp. 2-5, 23.
(a) पर्यंतसंपदुपपादनकल्पवस्त्री—
पञ्चाशिकारपरस्मकारणिक्रेन येन ।
श्रोक्ता निजाद्वयनये जनतां नियोक्तु
तस्मै नमोस्मिनवणुगस्मुरुत्माय ॥ ८ ॥

(b) ग्रंथं कथामुखमहात्तिकाधिवाचः
न्यायोक्तोद्धुपदार्थानिन्द्रणामि: ।
यो वादिनां व्यरऱचयविजयाय वादे
तस्मै नमोस्मिनवणुगस्मुरुत्माय ॥ ९ ॥

(c) पद्मशालाधिकत्मते ३ भरतोक्तनाथः-
वेदं रसस्यर्चितं नवसिर्विष्णूणू ।
यो भारतामिनवां रचयाश्चाकार
tasmā namośminvasṇuguruśmāya ॥ १० ॥

---

1 Ms. निवा 2 Ms. जनता 3 Ms. सिद्धे

(a) This sloka refers to a little known work of Abhinavagupta called Poryantapaṇcāśikā, whose edition is included in this Volume.

(b) This refers to a work of Abhinavagupta, Kathāmukhatilaka, known already but only by name; this verse for the first time enlightens us on its contents. There is an unmistakable reference to this Kathāmukhatilaka in Abhinavagupta's Parātrīmśikāvivaraṇa, Kas. Texts 18, p. 138: 'न हि उपास्तनामितवकारणः
स्वरूपान्वयं: ***एवं प्रकृतविषालकमन्यत्र तदनिघासः निष्कृ(क)ध्य
निधक्तिमसामाभिधेिते नेव वितमस ।'

(c) This refers to his Abhinavabhārati on Bharata’s Nāṭya-Śāstra; it may be noted that significant mention is made in the second line of the verse of Abhinavagupta’s exposition of the nine Rasas therein; that the author has in mind particularly Abhinavagupta’s brilliant exposition of the ninth Rasa, the Śānta, is clear.

* The metre of 6-10 is Vasantatilakā.
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अभिनवगुप्तसारस्वतपरसरसाद्मोदमानानाम् ।
अध्यात्मापि द्वीपक्षरुचिकृद्वाकमारानात्मितः ॥ ११ ॥

अभिनवगुप्तसारस्वतपरिमलवहुताध्वारस्ये जगति ।
संकन्दनोकिष्पि निन्दति नन्दनहरिनन्दनमोदम् ॥ १२ ॥

अभिनवगुप्तसारस्वतचन्द्रावतपरि होऽजगति ।
कथयित तमः कथा वा तापकथा वा प्रगल्भते स्थातम् ॥ १३ ॥

अभिनवगुप्तसारस्वतरस्वदत्तहृदयात्रीणाम् ।
प्रस्तुतमुद्मोदकसौर्यमयं प्रकाशते विभ्रमम् ॥ १४ ॥

अभिनवगुप्तसारस्वतराणांदंमरीचीर्चिन्चक्षूरिणोऽभि।
हत्युपरीक्षकुहे निवसति नियमेण मोक्षलक्ष्मीः ॥ १५ ॥

अभिनवगुप्तस्वयंप्रस्तुतशिवादैंतशीवीर्यलयः ।
प्रशांततः(२)पाशव-शादाशक्ताधः सुखेन विहरामः ॥ १६ ॥

* Ṣaṇāla is gruel, Kaṇji.

१ Ms. इत्य-चातुरणम्. Between हृदया and धात्रीम there is also an unnecessary space left in the manuscript for one letter. हृदयाधात्री or हृद-धात्री, a medicinal preparation of which with mercury (Rasavedhita) is referred to here.

२ Ms. पाशवशासी

(२) शाद, in my reconstruction here, means पाङ्ग and refers to Mala. Pāsava—belonging to Paśu i.e., Jīva. अनाया, कार्म and Māyiya are the three Malas binding Paśus. See below verse 44. Also आणव-मायीय-कार्म-सदासुत्तवात् नियमः—

Pratyabhijñāह्रदया.
(a) अभिनवपरमेश्वरसादात्
स्त्र्युद्दात्सिद्धितातमदेवतानामः
| जड़धूपपतामाकाशानामः
| प्रभुतिषु न प्रतिमासु पूजनस्था || १८ ||
| अभिनवपरमेश्वरशादाओऽ
| अपगत्तीतिकनिर्ग्रहायागामः
| परधनहरणादिपांचिन्ता: ⁷
| परप्रश्नाणि वच्चाति वा कथं स्थः || १९ ||

1. Ms. चिन्ता

(a) This refers to the doctrine of the several centres of the Sādhaka’s body itself being of the form of all deities and also particularly to the hymn on this subject composed by Abhinavagupta, Dehastha-devatā-cakra-stotra, for the text of which see Pandey’s Abhinavagupta, Appendix, pp. 952–3. Cf. also ‘हर्दयुग्मेऽहततं सर्वं सर्वं परिष्वर्यः प्रणमति भित्तमितिर्विधं विवाहायामात्रिमझुम्यम्’ quoted by the editor in the Parātrīṃśikā- vivaraṇa, Kas. Texts 18, p, 47, fn. See also Trisūramata ‘सर्वदेवमयः कायः’ quoted by Kṣemarāja in his Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya, p. 31, Adyar edn.

* The metre of verses 11-17 is Āryā.

† The metre of verses 18-19 is Puspitāgrā.
(a) Siddhānta is the name of the Śaiva school of the three varieties of Dvaita, Dvaitādvaita and Advaita, represented by the Āgamas; more particularly, the former two are referred to as Siddhānta; when Abhinavagupta is said to be an Ācārya of Siddhānta, the Advaita variety is meant. Of the Advaitic Tāntrik Texts, some are grouped as Bhaiṛava tantras and some, Yāmala tantras; Bhaiṛava is the Supreme Lord; Yāmala means the twin principles of Śiva-Śakti, Prakāśa-Vimarśa. Abhinavagupta imbibed Kula doctrines from Śambhunātha as he himself says in his Tantrāloka which treats of that school also. On the meaning of the expression Kula and Kaula, see Abhinavagupta, Parātrimśikāvivaraṇa, Kas. Texts 18, pp. 33-4. Trika is the system par excellence followed by Abhinavagupta; Trika is so called because of its triad of texts as well as of principles; the name survives even now among some Kashmiri Pandit families called Tikkoos (see Introducton, p. iv. Svacchandaṭantra Kas. Texts 31). On Ekavīra meaning Bhaiṛava, which is also part of Kashmir Śaivism, see Abhinavagupta, Parātrimśikā Vyākhyā, pp. 222-3, Kas. Texts. On the relative importance of these schools, see ibid. pp. 92-163; also Pandey, Abhinavagupta, pp. 14-15, 69-112.

* The metre of verse 20 is Āryā.

† The metre of verse 21 is Kokilaka.
(a) On literary and expository gifts of such extraordinary magnitude and quality being one of the results of a person ‘becoming Śiva,’ see Abhinavagupta’s Tantrāloka and Commentary, VIII, 136 and Pandey, Abhinavagupta, pp. 16, 341.

* The metre of verse 22 is Āryā.
† The metre of verse 23 is Puṣpitāgrā.
‡ The metre of verses 24, 26 is Āryā.
○ The metre of verse 25 is Rathoddhata.
अभिनवगुप्तदेशिकमुखोर्तस्यकिसुधा- 
पृतितिनिव्याहारहरी लम्बात्रमापि ।
श्रुतिययं पतिच्ययं ययं स एव कुती 
यदि हृदयं प्रविष्टस्य किं शिव एव हि सः ॥ २७ ॥

महोर सेरेशातियकथामकरनसुधु- 
परिमलमजनचन्दनिपतितसंक्षुना ।
अभिनवगुप्ताथालीकेघुधराभरमी 
शिव शिव १े गाढ़मृदमापि मां सुखारीकुलते ॥ २८ ॥

अभिनवगुप्तकिसिपरीत्वन्यात्तत: 
उदितसमस्तसंशयतमःपत्ते हृदये ॥

(a) मुकुरे इवावभाति मुखमंडलमंडमिं 
पृथगापि भासमानमपक्षवस्वविमर्शयमयु 
॥ २९ ॥

दिशि दिशि विहिराम्यहं वीत श्वाकल्लक्षुं 
भगति परमेश्वरे विष्णुवे भक्तिमानातमान ।
सुरदेशिकमुखोर्तस्यानाम्भोजावशायिनी 
रसपरिमलमजनोन्मजनानन्दलीलापरः ॥ ३० ॥

महामाहेश्वरश्रीमदाचार्योत्मोक्तः ।
हृदये प्रतितिष्ठन्तु प्रतितिष्ठन्तः पशूकः ॥ ३१ ॥

1. Ms महेशरकाठाय 2. Ms गाढ़ मूढ 3. Ms मुकुरा
4. Ms. शाखाकुंडकितः

(a) On the mirror-simile, see note below on verse 44.
‡ The metre of verses 27-29 is Kokilaka.
* The metre of verse 30 is Nārāca.
† The metre of verse 31 is Anusṭubh.
(a) मनसैव गम्यते या परिपस्थिन एव पालकः यस्यामुः।' प्रतिपदविचारान्तिमयं पद्धतिरियममिनाना जयति॥३२॥

सदामिनयुक्तागुप्तपानगोष्ठीरसात
पराक्तसमस्तपाशविकल्पनाबिभ्रममुः।
मम त्वाय निवेशितं मयं तवापि मग्नं मनः
परस्परसापस्तदं धृवि परेश संपदाधाम्॥३३॥

इष्टोपस्यमिनि संभृतः
श्रोणं तदुभयात्मकं वरसुः।
वारि वशिष्यमधिने ददॉः
(b)देव एव वरदो महानुः मधानुः॥३४॥

चमकुवन्तु मां संवेष न्यकुवन्तवथवा वुधः।
न मदुवस्थिचि कथिधिपिषिचिथविनिधये॥३५॥

1 Ms. संभृत  2 Ms. विचर्य, वर्षम्  3 Ms. वैद्य  4 Ms. दुष्कन्

(a) Line 2 : cf. Utpaladeva, Sivastotrāvali:

दुःखाम्यपि दुःखायन्ते विषम्यम् दुःखायते।
मोचायते च संसारः यत्र मार्गस्य शाण्डरः॥

Cf. Mahārthamaṇḍjari, p. 7, the whole school is called 'Apūrva' and 'Nava', the very name 'Abhinavagupta' is in all liklihood due to this idea.

(b) देव एव = दुष्कन्त एव।

† The metre of verse 32 is Āryā.

§ The metre of verse 33 is Prthvī.

‖ The metre of verse 34 is Rathoddhatā.

† The metre of verse 35 is Anusṭubh.
(a) The Tattvas are 36 from Śiva to Pṛthvī; of these the 35 besides Śiva are all derived from the first and only basic and real tattva of Śiva.

(b) The metre of verse 36 is Āryā.

† The metre of verse 37 is Mālabhārīṇī.

‡ The metre of verse 38 is Rathoddhatā.
(a) अन्तरस्थ्रोध्रव्यज्ञानकलयात्मकमलं शैवसिद्धं
यत्स्वयोऽतिपदमुदयतो वाङ्मयं ग्रस्तकामः ।
स्वोमेगोपरिवर्तितमातुरान्तरान्तरारामसान्त्रं
पश्यन्त्यस्मिन् परमक्यः पाणिनेराध्यक्षः ||३९॥

(b) विश्वं तरीये चित्तवे वाक्षुक्ष्यात्मनि गुम्फतमू ।
इत्युपादिक्षरस्मां पाणिनि: परमे गुरुः ||४०॥

(a) & (b) In these two verses, the Pāṇini Sūtras mentioned by the author refer only to the Māheśvara Sūtras. The first Sūtra of Pāṇini mentioned in verse 39 is ब्रह्म and the fourth Sūtra mentioned in verse 40 is ऐंजौ। It is well known in Śākta and other schools that the letters of the alphabet have, all of them, mystic significance, and this is all the more so in Kashmir Śaivism. The entire matrix of alphabet, Varna-mātrkā, A to H, is held to be of the form of Devi, generally speaking; each of the letters has its own further special meaning and Mantra-value, which however would be somewhat different according to the different schools and texts; see for instance Tantrābhidhāna, etc. in Tāntrik Texts Series, containing a collection of texts on this subject, and Varṣa-bijaprakāśa compiled by Sarayu Prasad Sarma.

The first and fourth Māheśvara Sūtras are here, in an imaginative manner, taken by the poetic author to signify the basic doctrines of his school; in the first, we have अ ॐ, and उ which include the two vowel components of Prāṇava or OM; ‘A’ is Śiva, I is Vahni, and ‘U’ is Vānmaya according to this verse. On ‘A’ as signifying the highest state of Śiva, see Parātīṁśikāvivaraṇa, p. 27. In the latter part of this work, Abhinavagupta explains the various mystic interpretations of the letters of the alphabet.

(continued on p. 14.)

* The metre of verse 39 is Mandākrāntā.
† The metre of verse 40 is Anuṣṭubh.
In verse 40, ‘Turīya’ by Śīlaḍa means the fourth Māheśvara Sūtra as well as the fourth transcendental state. ‘Cit-sūtra’ is again śliṣṭa:—च त्र इत्य यति वर्धितम् सूर्ये तत् चिन्तयतम्, i.e., the fourth Sūtra in which ‘C’ is ‘It’. It also means Citvantāna or Cid-adhāra, continual substratum of consciousness. Of the vowels in this Sūtra, ऐ is well known as signifying Vāk (vāk-śaktiyatmanī); ऐ is the universe; the grouping (gumphita) of पे-औ signifies therefore the doctrine of the world being a manifestation of the gross aspect of Vāk. See also Kṣemarāja, Parapravesīka, Kas. Texts 15, p. 11; तत: परं शुद्धविचित्ररस्यश्विवतवानि जानक्रियासारां शक्तिविशेषवान्ध्रू भौकारेषमल्ल्यमस्येवस्थूलरस्ताविष-मयेयेनसधूतानि।

(a) Cf. below verse 43. ‘Pāścimam’—last. On the offering of life itself as Dakṣinā and Naivedya, compare Cakrapāṇinātha, Bhāvopahāra stotra, sloka 43, मोहलोकोमोहोपत्रे विज्ञय संस्कृताम्। निवेदयामि भगवतु माणववेशब्रह्माणाम् and Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, Stavacintāmani, sloka 11, बडि यामो भवाय ते।

(b) Cf. above verse 14.

* The metre of verse 41 is Upajāti.

† The metre of verse 42 is Vasantatilakā.
(a) Ānava, Kārma and Māyīya are three kinds of Mala or Pāśa. Cf. verse 16 above.

(b) See also above verse 29 for this mirror-simile, which the Advaita Vedāntins also use (Dakṣināmūrtistotra, विश्व द्वीपंद्रंभमानन्तरीतयं निजार्धमविषम्). See also Abhinavagupta, Bodhapancadasikā, Kas. Texts, śloka. 4 “स्वामाद्वृत समघ हि वच्छक्ष्यान्तविधियतितम्.” Ananda’s Śaṭrimśattattva-sandoha, Kas. Texts 13, p. 2: “विश्व सिहत: द्वीपंद्रंभमानन्तरीतयं निजार्धमविषम्”. Kṣemarāja’s Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya, Adyar. edn., p. 26: प्राक्त निर्मातो विश्व-द्वीपंद्रंभमानन्तरीतयं अभिमानि निर्माति उन्मीलयति।” See also Abhinavagupta’s Paramārthasāra, ślokas 9,12; and Abhinavagupta’s Vivṛti-vimarśini quoted by Kṣemarāja in his gloss on Paramārthasāra:

अन्तविमानि सकलं जगदामनीह यद्विमिरितचननी मुकुरस्वरान्।
बोध: पुनःनिर्मितचन्तिनसारायुक्तं विशं विराहश्रितं नों मुकुरस्वरान्।

Jayaratha also quotes this verse of Abhinavagupta in his gloss on Tantrāloka, 111rd Āhnika, Kas. Ser, 28, Vol. 2, p. 73.

See also Rāghavānanda, Laghustutivyākhyā TSS. 60, pp. 32–33. On Pratyabhijñā and Advaita, see Pandey’s Abhinavagupta, pp. 88–89, and my note in New Indian Antiquary, Vol. III. pp. 32–34.

† The metre of verses 43, 44 is Śārdulavikrīḍita.
देशिकनागुप्तदेशविविचयः
चेतामसूतिस्मूतिविविचयः ।
अद्यन्याश्चर्मिश्चमयसस्
ब्रह्म शिवोरसिम शिवोरसिम शिवोरसिम ॥४५॥

न वेदवेदाङ्गपरिष्ठमां मेन न तक्षशिष्या न च कार्यशिष्या ।
तथापि तानतू परिमार्दि मोहथ गुहपदेश मतिवत्तिदातिर्युषु ॥४६॥

जाणन कालु कुण्डो य जीवताण गिर (सिद्ध) बच्यमु ।
वाचा होनो विभाजेन(ण) नित्य(ण) चपुण्यो स देशे(सिद्धे) अो ॥४७॥

[ येषां केषां कुर्वेनु जीवतां शिवत्यस ।
वाचा हीनो व्याजेन नित्य्यपूण्यस्ते देशिकः ॥ ]§

---

1 Ms. प्रतिवर्ति
* The metre of verse 45 is Doshaka.
† The metre of 46 is Upendravajra.
‡ The metre of 47 is Anustubh.
§ Sloka 47 is in Prakrit. Alternate readings are २ कुणि जाणु.
३ विचिह्न्या. येषां केषां in the chāyā means स्वर्गपापः.
Dr. A. N. Upadhye and Dr. P. L. Vaidya to whom I referred this Prakrit
verse and to whose kind suggestion I am thankful, reconstruct
the third pada respectively as 'वाचाचिन्तो विचारेण' and वाचुः अस्पर्शः-
संकृष्ट वेन'. I have tentatively suggested वाचा हीनो व्याजेन from
the point of view of the meaning. What is meant here is that
even without teaching anything by word of mouth the ever-full
Teacher bestows, by some pretext, on any and every living
being, the state of Siva.
CHAPTER II

THE WORKS OF ABHINAVAGUPTA

The following works of Abhinavagupta have till now been noted:

1. Anuttarartrimśikā laghuvrṣṭti or Anuttara tattva vimarśinī laghuvrṣṭti, a brief prose commentary following Utpala’s ‘mata’, on the Anuttarartrimśikā (also trimśikā) or Parātrimśikā which is an extract from the Rudrayāmala.

Mss. MD. 15336.²

TD. 8219-20.

GD. 1107-8.

2. Anuttara trimśikā vivṛti or Parātrimśikā vṛtti following the commentary of Somānanda; another prose gloss on the same text as in no. 1.


2. MD. =Madras Govt. Ori, Mss. Library Descriptive Catalogues.

TD. =Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Library Descriptive Catalogues.

GD. =Granthappura (Palace Library) Descriptive Catalogues, Trivandrum.
3. Anuttarāṣṭikā (8 verses).
   Edn. Appendix C. pp. 404-5, Dr. Pandey’s Abhinavagupta.

4. Anubhavanivedana (ascribed to Abhinava).
   4 verses.
   Edn. Ibid., p. 414.

5. Īśvarapratyabhijñā vimarśinī (-laghu vimarśinī),
   a gloss on Utpala’s Ī. Pra.

6. Īśvarapratyabhijñā vivṛti vimarśinī (-bṛhatī vimarśinī)
   a commentary on Utpala’s own vivṛti on his Ī. Pra.

7. Kathāmukhatilaka, referred to by Abhinavagupta in his Ī. Pra. bṛhatī vimarśinī according to Dr. Pandey.

   On this, see below for more definite information.

8. Kāvyakautukavivarana, a gloss on his teacher Bhaṭṭa Tota’s Kāvyakautuka. Referred to by Abhinavagupta in his Dhvanyālokalocana. (p. 178, N. S. edn. Dhva. Ā. 1928. See also J. O. R. Madras., VI. pp. 153-62, my article on Writers Quoted in the Abhinava Bhārati; see also pp. 43-44, my Number of Rasas, Adyar Library Series 1940 ed.).


12. Tattvdhva prakasan, Pandey, p. 34.


16. Tantroccaya, Pandey, p. 64.


21. Padarthaapravesa nirnya tik referred to by him in his Paratrimshik vivarana, Kas. Texts 18, p. 162.


On this work, see S. S. S. Sastri, New Indian Antiquary, I, pp. 37 ff.


27. Prakīrṇakavivaraṇa, ref. to by Jayaratha in his com. on Tantrāloka, vii, p. 33.

28. Prabodha (or Bodha) pañcadaśikā.


32. Mahopadeśa vimśatikā, 20 verses.


On this work, see my note in the New Indian Antiquary III, pp. 32-34.


34. Laghvī prakriyā, a stotra quoted by Abhinavagupta in his Gītārthasaṁgraha under IV. 28 and XII. 11.

35. Śivadṛṣṭyālocaṇa, a com. on Somānanda’s Śivadṛṣṭi. Quoted by him in his Parātrīṃśikā vivaraṇa, Kas. Texts 18, p. 116.

36. Śivaśaṅktyavinābhāva stotra, quoted in his Gītārthasaṁgraha, pp. 628-9.

Besides these, it has been noted also that, as on the Pūrva, Abhinavagupta has commented on the other Āgamaśāstras (Parātrīṃśikā vivaraṇa, Kas. Texts 18,
p. 147) and some more Stotras. His quotations also show that he himself had composed some more stotras, as also some poems.

Further, Mr. R. A. Sastri notes in his Diary that in the library of Pandit Ramjiva kokil, Banmahal, Srinagar, there is an Amareśvara stotra by Abhinavagupta.

We also come across in the Mss. Catalogues some vague and some incorrect entries against Abhinavagupta's name.

(a) Oudh. xvi 124-Spanda. We do not understand what this means.

(b) AK. 243, Auf. III p. 6a—Devīmāhātmyaṭīkā guptavati. Abhinavagupta here is a mistake for Bhāskararāya.

(c) The New Catalogus Catalogom office of the Madras University purchased from the library of the late Dr. Jacobi a long paper scroll containing a list of book-names given by Pandit Damodar Sastri, son of Pandit Saheb Ram, who are both mentioned by Buhler in his Report (pp. 26. ff.). In this scroll is found an entry "Dhvani samketa" against the name Abhinavagupta.

(d) In the Viśvabhāratī, Santiniketan, is found an entry Devībhujaṅga by Abhinavagupta. I could not examine or verify this entry, since the Librarian is not in a position to supply extracts from this work.

(e) Buhler Kashmir Report 469, Bhandarkar's Report 1875–6 and BORI 469 of 1875–6—Bimbapratībimbavāda is only a part of the Tantrāloka, III.
Further, on p. 107 of his Tantrasāra, (Kas. Texts, XVIII), Abhinavagupta makes a mention of his Tantrāloka and adds to it a perplexing reference to a Śloka vārttika. Are we to understand a work of Abhinavagupta here, and if so, whether one of his known works or a new one?

Again, a Nāṭyalocana or Nāṭyālocana has been ascribed to Abhinavagupta. (See Skt. Intro. to N. S. edn. (1928) of the Dhvanyāloka with Locana, p. 2). No definite evidence has come up yet to confirm this ascription. But I may point out in this connection that in the Candrikā on the Prabodhacandrodaya by Nāḍiṇḍa Gopa (N. S. edn.), there are quotations in Anuṣṭubh verses on topics of Nāṭyaśāstra, ascribed to Abhinavagupta, from which we may suppose that after extensively expounding Bharata, Abhinavagupta thought of a handy resume of the Nāṭyaśāstra. The following are the quotations made by Nāḍiṇḍa Gopa:

p. 7. यथोक्तमिन्वगुप्तपादः—
यथूपक्षेपकं वस्तु नाथादो रञ्ज उच्यते।
स एव पूर्वरक्ष्य्यास्रू उपोद्धारू प्रचक्षते॥

p. 8. यथोक्तमिन्वगुप्तपादः—
नान्दी पद्मकोटिदशमित्यांगवाण्यवन्धूतः।
पद्मिनि पोद्यमिर्गापि चतुर्विस्तःभृतेऽव व व।
अश्यादशपदा नान्दी द्राविषतिपदापि व।
श्रीचक्रान्तजचन्द्रेनचक्रोपरःवत्तंसिनी।
अथा वा चतुरश्रा वा तालमार्गमुसारिणी। इति॥
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p. 9. Abhinavagupta

प्रयुजय विधिनितं हि पूर्वर्जं प्रयोगतः ॥
स्थापकः प्रविशेचत्रस्त्रधारस्य वेषभाकः ॥

p. 16. Abhinavagupta

नृत्यतालालाकारिस्याहृ गानमुदासाचालनाय ॥

p. 128. '—वण्यर्ग कथाया वर्णसंहितिः ।
इत्यभिनवगुप्तवैदुर्लक्षम् ।

p. 243. Abhinavagupta

अर्थग्रहत्यवस्थातसनन्धिधर्मविचित्रितम् ॥
अर्थोपक्रमेश्वर्यक्षं पताकास्थानकालिमि ॥
अल्लंश्वरसमायुक्तं सन्धिमिश्रोपसन्धिधिमि ॥
रसोत्सचित्तिकासैंकः ब्रजनौलीतितवविशिष्टम् ॥
धीरोदाच्छोदवस्थान्रक्तिनांतकस्तुमते ॥ इति ॥

An anonymous commentary on a drama called Vasumangalanaataka by Perusuri (Mad. Govt. Ori. Mss. Lib. D. No. 11618) quotes two verses of Abhinavagupta on Nāṭya topics, on the first page of the ms.

तद्भिनवगुप्तवैदुर्लक्षम्—

'प्रथमं पूर्वर्जस्यात् ततः प्रस्तवापनेति ।
आरम्भे सर्वनाथायामेतसामाधापनस्यिन्ये ॥'

अभिनवगुप्तपादः: प्रकारद्वेषण प्रतिपाद्यान्चक्रिरे—

'यन्त्राध्यवस्तुन: पूवं रज्जविक्षोपशान्तये ।
कुशलवा: प्रकृव्रृत्तिपूर्वर्जस्य कृतितः ॥'
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The second quotation, referring to the same topic of Purvarāṅga described in citation one in N. Gopa’s commentary on the Prabodhacandrodaya may be the statement in the same context of another view.

Mallinātha, in his commentary on the Kumārashambhava I. 8, quotes a quarter of an Anuṣṭubh on Tāna in music and ascribes it to Abhinavagupta.

‘तानस्तवश्वस्वरो मतः’ इत्यभिनवगुप्तः।

TWO NEW WORKS OF ABHINAVAGUPTA

There is a paper ms. in the Madras Government Oriental Mss. Library, in Telugu script, bearing the shelf no. I. 9. 3. Though there is no indication in this ms. itself, which is a transcript, about its original, I have been able to find out that its original is a ms. in the Samskrit College at Tripunitura. This ms. contains a set of works mostly pertaining to Pratyabhijñā, and its contents are described in MD under nos. 15328 to 15342. There is valuable information here on Abhinavagupta and his works.

The Gurunāthaparāmarśa ( MD. 15323 )

The first work in this ms. is Gurunāthaparāmarśa, an eulogy on Abhinavagupta. The latter part of this work indulges in mere poetic eulogy, but in its former part, there are some verses containing valuable information.

Śl. 7 here refers to the tradition that the teachers and Yognīs once met and made Abhinavagupta the sole Ācārya and respository of the entire teaching.
The India Office Catalogue, II, p. 123b, says that an Abhinavagupta is quoted by Haradatta in his Bodhāyana śrautasūtravyākhyā. Without knowing the citation and its context, nothing can be said about this reference.

यो मेलनें कचन देशिकोगिने नाम
अद्य प्रभृत्यखिलए एव गुरुक्रमांः ।
त्वयः संक्रमित इत्युपलालितोड्भूत
तस्मै नमोद्विनवगुप्तगुरुत्तमाय ॥

In Śl. 10, significant reference is made to the exposition of the nine Rasas in Abhinavagupta’s Abhinava Bhāratī on the Nāṭya Veda of Bharata in thirty-six Āhnikas.

*The Kathāmukhatilaka*

On p. 33 of his book on Abhinavagupta, Dr. K. C. Pandey says that a work of Abhinavagupta, Kathāmukhatilaka by name, is referred to by Abhinavagupta in his I. Pra. Brhati vimarśini and that “nothing at present can be said about its contents”. From this ms. work Gurunāṭhaparāmarśa, we are able to know that the Kathāmukhatilaka of Abhinavagupta related to vāda especially and gave an exposition of the sixteen Padārthas of the Nyāya śāstra. Śl. 9 of the Gurunāṭhapaṇṭarāmarśa runs

ग्रन्थः कथामुखमहतिलितकामिश्चानो
न्यायोक्षेपसपतान्निर्हनणांभिः ।
यो वादिनां न्यरमयां विश्वाय वादे
तस्मै नमोद्विनवगुप्तगुरुत्तमाय ॥
ABHINAVAGUPTA AND HIS WORKS

(1) The Paryantapañcāśikā
A new work of Abhinavagupta

It is however Śl. 8 of this eulogy on Abhinavagupta that is most important, for it gives us the name of a new work of Abhinavagupta, the Paryanta Pañcāśikā—

पर्यन्तसम्पूर्णपादनकल्पवल्ली-पञ्चाशिका परमकारणिकेन येन।
श्रेष्ठा निजाध्ययने जनताः नियोक्तुः
तस्मै नमोभिनवगुरुप्रतिश्रुतमय।

Out of the expression ‘पर्यन्तसम्पूर्णपादनकल्पवल्लीपञ्चाशिका’, I take ‘Paryanta Pañcāśikā’ as the title of the work, because Mahēśvarānanda quotes in his Mahārthamañjari a work of the name ‘Paryanta Pancāśikā’ and I think it likely that Mahēśvarānanda is quoting this work of Abhinavagupta mentioned in the Gurūnāthparāmarśa. The Mahārthamañjari (TSS. 66) has four quotations from the Paryanta Pañcāśikā, which appears to be a work in Anuṣṭubh verses:

1. pp. 44-5: श्रृद्धोऽविद्विन्दतार्थोऽत्साहन्तायां निमीतज्ञम्।

2. p. 49: अनन्तात्तोऽवदाकारस्वीकारेऽस्यकुलक्षणाम्।
तां स्वसन्तंविद्मायाविद्य विकल्पान्त् विकल्पयेत्।

3. p. 70: चिस्त्वाभावाभावदसौ देवः स्वात्मना विमुशाना ग्रहः।
अनाशितादिभूमया भूमिका: प्रतिपद्धते।

4. pp. 72-3: तत् वाचकवाच्यात्मस्यन्दयोर्हेकं: प्रभोः।
स्थूलत्वस्मापिभासकन्योः प्रद्विधाध्वता।
(2) The *Rahasyapañcadaśikā*

*Another new work of Abhinavagupta*

The fourth work in this ms. is the *Rahasyapañcadaśikā* of Abhinavagupta, this again a work of Abhinavagupta not known till now. The last verse says that the work is Abhinavagupta’s and contains fifteen verses.

श्रेष्ठभिनवगुप्तेन श्लोकाः पञ्चदशोदिताः।

See MD. 15326.

But as a matter of fact, the work contains 37 verses and is mostly a hymn to Devī in a variety of metres. I do not know if another minor work (the Devībhujaṅga in the Viśyabhāratī?) has got mixed up here.

*The Other Works and Authors known from this Ms.*

The interest of this ms. does not stop with the new facts about Abhinavagupta’s works noticed above. It reveals to us some more authors and their works pertaining to Pratyabhijñā.

*The Śāstra parāmarśa*

This is the second work in the ms. and mentions some of the chief works of Pratyabhijñā: Śivadrśti, the commentaries on it by Utpala and Abhinavagupta, Pratyabhijñā sūtra, Vṛtti and Vivṛti, both on the I. Pra. Sūtra, and the two Vimarśinis thereon by Abhinavagupta,—all these seeming to form a unit of five works described as ‘Prakaraṇa vivaraṇa pañcaka’.¹ Then

---

¹. As Dr. Pandey points out, this verse mentioning these five as the chief Pratyabhijñā texts is quoted in the Sarvadarśana-saṁgraha (Ānandāśrama edn. p, 100).
follow two verses praising Abhinavagupta’s Ī. Pra. Laghu Vimarśini, the next two, 7th and 8th, praise Utpala’s Śivastotrāvali and the last two verses are on Pratyabhijñā in general.

The last verse sums up the difference and distinction of the Pratyabhijñādvaita philosophy, as compared with Buddhism and Advaita Vedānta. Buddhism abolishes Ātman and Īśvara in its Vījñānādvaita, and Advaitavedānta, in its Brahmādvaita, has to resort to Anirvacanīyakhyāti and Avidyopādhi; but Pratyabhijñā (which is the heart of all Āgamas as contrasted with the Advaita Vedānta which is established on the basis of the Vedas) is suggested as overcoming the shortcomings of both Buddhism and Advaita Vedānta by its Īśvarādvaita. See MD. 15324.

Swātmaprāsaṁsā

The next work in the ms. is called Svātmaprāsaṁsā, a poem in 42 verses, by a Śaiva Siddha on himself and on his own supreme Siddha state. MD. 15325. The subject-author describes himself in the first as well as third person. The second verse appears to state that the subject-author was born under the constellation having Indra-Agni as deity, i.e., Viśākhā, on a Suklatrayodaśī, Monday. It is likely that the Śivayogin mentioned in this and the next verse is his father. In verse 3, he calls himself ‘Viśākhaḥ’, after the star. In the subsequent verses he sings of himself as a Siddha, Avadhūta, Yogirāja, Vīra, Bhikṣu and Jīvanmukta. In Śl. 5, he mentions that even at his 74th year, he retained all the lore that he learnt from his father during boyhood; in this verse, the name of Abhinavagupta is
worked in through Śleṣa. In ś. 6 he refers to his retaining the power of sweet exposition even at his 78th year; the next verse mentions his 80th year and in this verse occurs the name Siddha Viśākha, rather in a manner difficult of understanding. Viśākha does not occur beyond this.

The name with which the author frequently describes himself is Madhurāja or Mādhura. Śl. 6, which specifies his 78th year first introduces this name मधुरोऽश्वम्. In the subsequent verses, the name Madhurāja or Mādhura occurs regularly. Śl. 13 is noteworthy as praising the works of Madhurāja kavi. Śl. 29. describing himself in the first person, refers to the hereditary scholarship of his family in Yajurveda, its Lakṣaṇa and Sūtra, Pañcamakha, Mantra and Tantra and Paramādvaita.

It is not easy to determine whether Mādhura is only a variant for Madhurāja; for, one of the verses here, śl. 38, describes him as roaming in his Siddha-hood in the town of the Pāṇḍya king, i.e., Madhura or Madura in the South.

न यामी कस्यापि ग्रहं प्रतीच्छन्
नयामि सौऽख्येन तथापि कालम् ।
पुरीद्वि पाण्डेश्वरपालितायां
निरीहचूडाणिरिरस्मि तस्मात् ॥

It may be that he is called Mādhura after his place Madurā.

The complication of the name of the subject-author is not over here; for śl. 12 says:
Who is this Bhaṭṭa Kṛṣṇa? If we take the whole poem as being on one person, as it appears we should, his personal name may be Bhaṭṭakṛṣṇa, star-name Viśākha, place-name Mādhura and another name Madhurāja. I do not know if this explanation is alright. On pp. 160-161 of his thesis on Abhinavagupta, Dr. K. C. Pandey speaks of a late writer on Pratyabhijñā whom he describes as “Varadarāja alias Kṛṣṇadāsa”, “youngest son of Madhurāja” and author of a Śivasūtra vārttika. The extract given by Dr. Pandey to bear out this information about the author, his name and parentage, is however not clear in construction or import.

It is not unlikely that the subject-author of this Svātma-praśāṁsā is also the author of the eulogy on Abhinavagupta, the Gurunāthaparāmarṣa, previously noticed.

The same codex contains some well-known works also: no. 5. Anuttaratrīṃśikā Text; no. 10. Śīva sūtras; no. 15. Abhinavagupta’s Laghuṛtti on the Anuttaratrīṃśikā of which other ms. have been noted above; no. 16. Anuttaratrīṃśikā-Text again; no. 17. Prabodhapāṇcadaśikā with Avadhūta’s com; nos. 18 and 19. Avadhūta’s Pratipadikārtha vimarṣa and com. on it; and no. 20. Somānanda’s Śivadṛṣṭi.

The other works here seem to be rare: No. 7 is Svarūpa-praveśikā of Bhaṭṭa Nāga or Nāgānanda; this work has a gloss by Śivānanda and both text and gloss are represented by another ms. in the same library. See
THE WORKS OF ABHINAVAGUPTA

MT. 2159.¹ Nāgānanda appears also as a commentator on the I. Pra. Sūtra; a ms. of his com. on the I. Pra. Sū, is available in the Adyar Library (Cat. II. p. 174a; 28. B. 24).

The 8th work in the ms. is an anonymous Śaṭṭrimśat-tattvacarca.

No. 9 is Anuttaraśrīgurupaṅktiparāmarśa, a list of Pratyabhijñā teachers, taken from Somānanda's Śivadrṣṭi and supplemented. After Somānanda, the list has Utpala, Lakṣmaṇagupta, Abhinavagupta, Kṣema-rāja and Śūra. Śūra is mentioned as a pupil of Kṣem-rāja. The author of this list is one Deva Bhaṭṭa who describes himself as a pupil of Śūra himself:

तस्वापि शूरनामाभूतः... ... ... ... ...
... ... ... ... ...
वहुवेतथं शिवज्ञानमेवतस्मादेव देशिकात् ||
अधीत्य देवभ्रद्देन प्रोक्ता सन्तानसंकथा ||

See MD. 15330.

No. 11 is Gurupaṅktistotra, MD. 15332. After praying to gods Gaṇeśa and Kumāra, the hymn praises Durtvasas, Vasugupta, Somānanda, Utpala, Abhinavagupta and Kṣemarāja. The hymn closes with verses on Abhinavagupta.

No. 12. is Daśāloki² of Śrī Vidyācakravarttin who has commented upon Virūpākṣapaṅcāsikā also (TSS).

¹ M.T. = Triennial Catalogues of the Madras Govt. Ori. Mss Library.
² Ed. by Dr. V. Raghavan in Malayamārura I. pp. 22-4, Kendriya Vidyapitha, Tirapati, 1966.
No. 14 is a new metrical commentary on the Anuttara-trimśikā; it is anonymous, though the Madras Catalogue wrongly ascribes to Abhinavagupta, MD. 15335. It follows the views of Utpala and the commentaries of Abhinavagupta. The author may be a southerner since reference is made to Śiva at Cidambaram (Vyāghrapura). The work cites the Yogavāsiṣṭha:

तदेतद्व राधमायोकं वसिष्ठेन महात्मना । p. 55.

The last work in the ms., no. 28, is Bhiṣag Devarāja's Śivasūtravārttika.
CHAPTER III
THE PARYANTAPAÑCĀŚIKĀ
OF ABHINAVAGUPTA

The Paryantapañcāśikā which is presented here for the first time is a hitherto unknown minor work of the renowned Kashmirian Śaiva philosopher, Ācārya Abhinavagupta.

Information about Abhinavagupta having written such a work was first given by me in a paper on the works of Abhinavagupta in the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, XIV, iv, pp. 318–328, now included in this volume. Therein, after noting all the known works of Abhinavagupta, I collected the citations from Abhinavagupta available in other works with a view to find out what other works he had written. In that connection I drew attention to a codex in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (No. 1.9.3), which is rich in Pratyabhijñā-literature. A notice of the contents of this codex is to be found in the Descriptive Catalogues of the above Library, under Nos. 15323 to 15342, and the manuscript, itself a transcript, comes from an original in the Sanskrit College, Trippunittura, Kerala.

Among the many interesting works in this codex, the one that is relevant to our present purpose is the *Gurunātha-parāmarśa* found at the very beginning (D. No. 15323). A hymn of praise on the great Ācārya of the school, this work in verses throws light on Abhinavagupta and his contribution; it brings to light
some works of his not known before and conveys precise information on the nature of the contents of some other works known previously only by title. I first presented an edition of this Gurunāthaparāmarśa, with a brief introductory note and elucidatory foot-notes in the Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, Vol. II, No. 1; it is now included in this volume (pp. 1–16).

In one of the verses (8th), this eulogy on Abhinavagupta says that he wrote a short work on this school called the Paryantapañcāśikā.

पर्यन्तसम्रेप्तपादनकल्पवल्ली-  
पञ्चाशिका परस्कारणकेन येन ।
श्रोक्ता निजजाययनये जनतां नियोक्तं  
तस्मै नमोऽभिनवयुष्णुर्वतसमे॥

Further evidence on the existence of such a work and its exact title being Paryantapañcāśikā is, as pointed out by me in the paper on the works of Abhinavagupta, furnished by five citations which Maheśvarānanda makes from it in his Mahārthamañjarī with Parimala, T. S. S., 66, pp. 12, 44-5, 49, 70, 72-3.

In 1948 I was fortunate to discover a manuscript of this new work of Abhinavagupta in the collection in the Travancore University Manuscripts Library, mixed up in a codex with Abhinavagupta’s redaction of the Paramārthasāra. The codex, which is in Malayalam script and bears the Library No. 1881 B, is described under No. 1127 B of the Curator’s Office Descriptive Catalogue, Trivandrum. Thanks to the courtesy of the then Hony. Director of the Library, Prof. V. A.
Ramaswami Sastri, I secured a transcript of the *Paryantapañcáśikā*. The identity of the work was established not only by explicit internal evidence, but by the existence in the work of the four and a half anuṣṭubhs quoted by Maheśvarānanda.

On the basis of this manuscript, I presented a short paper on the *Paryantapañcáśikā* of Abhinavagupta to the Religion and Philosophy Section of the XIVth Session of the All-India Oriental Conference, Darbhanga. I prepared also an edition of the text of the *Paryantapañcáśikā*, which I first published in the *Annals of Oriental Research*, University of Madras, Vol. VIII, 1950-51. The manuscript is not free from mistakes or gaps but I have endeavoured to present the text here with suitable corrections and reconstructions on the basis of the many Pratyabhijñā texts available in print, including works of Abhinavagupta himself.

The work is a brief resume of the Anuttara Śaiva philosophy of Kashmir, which is also referred to by the names Trika and Pratyabhijñā, two of its basic concepts. It is a monistic system which arose on the background of the manifold religious and philosophical practices and schools of thought prevailing in Kashmir, some of which it definitely rejects, and others it criticises in the form in which they are upheld by their respective exponents and adapts into its own framework with slight modifications. Thus this school is Śaivite but it rejects the Siddhānta or dualistic Śaiva prevalent in Kashmir; it is monistic and takes its stand on Consciousness, but refutes Buddhistic Vijñānavāda, as also the Śabdādvaita of the grammarians; later exponents of the
school regularly point out how and where their position departs from Vedānta, i.e., Advaita based on the Upaniṣads; as against the Advaita of Nirguṇa Brahmaṅ, this school holds the Supreme Reality, no doubt of the form of pure Cit, to be a Personality, Śiva; and as against other theories of causation, Utpatti, Pariṇāma or Vivarta, this school holds the Appearance-theory, Ābhāsa-vāda. Though what is absolutely real is only the One Supreme Śiva, this Para-tattva has two phases Parāpara and Apara, comprehending the transitional (subject-object) and manifest (object) stages, this threefold aspect of Reality being one of the explanations of the name Trika given to this school, a kind of reconciliated stand comprehending Abheda, Bhedābheda and Bheda in the one Anuttara reality. Adopting the Bimba-pratibimba-vāda, the school holds the universe also as a reflection of the Lord. We find here thus an eclectic school attempting synthesis of Personal-Impersonal, Idealistic-Realistic trends of thought. In actual practice the synthesis of Kashmir Śaivism which takes within its sweep Āgama and Tantra, Śaivism and Śāktism, devotion and aesthetic activity, goes indeed so far enough that this school, in which not much work has yet been done, becomes not only an attractive subject but one offering a wide range of material for investigation.

Ideas and expressions of these other systems have been incorporated into the system, even Śunya, Pudgala, etc. In Somānanda’s Śivadṛṣṭi we find the whole of the second chapter devoted to a refutation of Bhartṛhari’s Sabdabrahman or Sabdādvaita; but as being equivalent to the Jñānaśakti of the Lord, the grammarians’
Paśyantī, it is said, may be accepted. In a short time a complete coordination of this school and that of the grammarians took place; the aspects of the one reality in the process of manifestation came to be mentioned in terms of the four aspects of Speech, Parā, Paśyantī, Madhyamā and Vaikhārī. The whole Sanskrit Alphabet comprising fifty letters A to Kṣa was taken as the embodiment of the ultimate essence of the Lord, Hṛdaya, and the minor work of Abhinavagupta presented here summarises the prakriyā of the Anuttara school with an emphasis on this synthetic aspect; in fact, starting and ending with obeisance to this Supreme Vāk, setting forth in the course of the resume the manifestation in terms of Vāk and giving for this work of fifty verses, the title Pañcāśikā, Abhinavagupta would appear to have emphasised this strand in the synthetic philosophy of Kashmir Saivism.

In the footnotes under the verses, I have drawn attention to many of the details pertaining to the tenets of this school. Here it is enough if I refer briefly to the major headings of the subject-matter of these fifty verses. After obeisance to the transcendental Vāk constituting the heart of the Supreme Being in the first verse, the work describes the supreme and transcendental state of the Lord Bhairava, an Existence, Knowledge and Reality into which all non-existence, ignorance and false opinion have vanished. In this impartite unity of Bhairava of the form of Consciousness and Bliss (Cidānanda-mātratman), says verse 5, lie dormant the potentialities of Icchā, Jñāna and Kriyā. In this state the Lord, who is of the form of Cit, is said to
be in His aspect called Prakāśa, his other aspect is, verse 6 tells us, Vimarśa, self-brooding, which results in the ultimate Reality assuming the role of all the categories from Anāśrita, the first stage of the Lord in which He has manifested the Icchā-sakti and has split Himself into a Cogniser, Cogniser not yet of distinct objective evolutes, but only of His own pure consciousness (Śūnya). Now, in the correlation of the prakriyās of this philosophy and that of Vāk, Prakāśa is Vācy, Vimarśa is Vācaka; from them proceed the six Adhvans. Mantra, Pada, Varṇa, Bhuvana, Tattva and Kalā, each of which has the three states, gross, subtle and transcendent. Verse 8 says that sequence, Krama, which is the essence and root of difference, is caused by the dispersion of the unitary consciousness and leads to the manifold appearances. The former state in which Self is immersed in itself is Śuddhi or Śuddha-vidyā; the Asūddhi is the contamination of the consciousness in the latter stage by the objective manifestations (9).

Creation is twofold, Sādhāraṇa of the Lord who manifests everything, including limited cognisers, called Aṇus, the individual souls; and Asādhāraṇa which is the further objective ramifications of the latter, the Aṇu (11). In the former creation of the Lord, He being the sole Reality, He is Himself the material, agent, etc., of the creation (12). The process by which the unlimited Bhairava becomes a limited Jīva is indicated in verses 13-15; there are five delimiting potencies, Āvaraṇa-saktīs,—Sheaths, Kāncukas—which cause this limitation into a finite being with sense-organs; they are Kalā, Avidyā, Rāga, Kāla and Niyati, limited doing, limited knowing, attachment, sequence, distinction and
ownership. This evolution is further explained in 16 with the mention of the names of the stages and their presiding deities. 18 and 19 emphasise the monism again and say that all this manifestation is only of the one Being besides whom all else is unreal. 20-22 show that the greatest means of realising this monistic Truth is to seek the Self and its own Consciousness itself, without resorting to any other gross or external aid; hence is this path called Ātmopāya, Ananyopāya, or Anupāya; plunging oneself into that state of Self-consciousness, one should transcend the plurality that has been thrown up. 23-25 point out three ways of achieving this end, which are explained in the footnotes in the body of the text. 26-29 are again on the absolute and self-dependent Bhairava-state, which, out of its own abundance of power, throws out and withdraws. 30-35 trace again the stages of the evolution of the five elements, the Tanmātras, senses, limited cogniser (Puruṣa), Mind, Ahaṅkāra, Mahat, and Prakṛti. 37 mentions the Śaktis or Dhāraṇas that hold together these and the Supreme Being at the two ends.

In verses 41 to 50 the description of this manifestation is given in terms of Vāk, and Its four forms Parā, Paśyantī, Madhyamā and Vaikharī. 50 refers again to the seeking of the Consciousness of Self itself; previously mention was made of it as Ātmopāya; here as the means of all means it is called Sarvopāya. 51 again pays obeisance to Vāk and 52 glorifies the Guru.

It has been repeatedly stated above that Abhinavagupta presents an eclectic system of thought in this work. Dr. K. C. Pandey, who included a section on
our work in the second revised edition of his thesis on 'Abhinavagupta, An Historical and Philosophical Study' (Chowkhamba, 1963) analyses the system propounded in our text and points out that it is Kula system; the Kaula too is one of the schools that Abhinavagupta has amalgamated here.

As already pointed out, this is a system of philosophy not very familiar among the general body of scholars. In the footnotes, I have, to elucidate the brief statement of the ideas in these verses, given explanations and extracts from the whole field of Pratyabhijñā-literature now available in print. The Paryantapañcāṣikā, which is actually quoted and mentioned only by Maheśvarānanda, was evidently kept in mind by Abhinavagupta's pupil Kṣemarāja as can be seen from a perusal of the latter's Pratyabhijñā-hṛdaya and other works. In Abhinavagupta's own works like the Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa and the Tantrāloka, there occur many passages, words and expressions found in the present text, citsvābhāvyā, anuttaravisargātman, ucitocita and so on, which I have used for verifying the correctness of this text, but to which I have not given cross references.

In one of the verses in the Gurunātha-parāmarśa referred to at the beginning (6th), reference is made to the fact that Abhinavagupta wrote short and long works, wrote long works first and then delighted in writing short resumes of the same. One such short work, I have offered here.
अभिनवगुप्तविरचिता
पर्यंतपश्चातिका
'आधन्तान्तरगतान्तरतत्त्वत्क्षितिविभानितिनिर्भराम्
अनुचार्यामहं वाचमधीये हुद्यं विभो। १ ॥(a)
स एवं भृंगवो देवस्मधे देवाध्य यन्मयः।
सेवासौ भृंगवी सत्या असत्यापि च यन्मयः। २ ॥(b)

1 Ms. has श्रीगणपति नमः।

(a) Sl. 1. The Anuccāryā Vāk or Parā Vāk, the first of the four phases of Vāk is held by this school to be identical with the Vimarśa, reflective, dynamic or creative, aspect of the Supreme Being or Reality; this same first principle, from which all creation proceeds, is variously called in the Kashmirian school Cit, Parā Vāk, Spanda, Hṛdaya etc. See Kṣemarāja's Parāpraveśikā, Kashmir Texts 15, p. 2: एवं एवं च विश्वः, चित, चोत्तमाम, स्वस्वरूपिता परावाक, स्वातत्त्वम, परमात्मानी मुखमेध्यर्थम, कस्तुत्तम, स्फोटतासारः, हुद्यम, स्पन्द इत्यादि-
शब्दचाराचेषु उद्दोष्यते। Cf. Abhinavagupta himself, Īśvara-pratyabhijñāvimartini । I. 203—परा वाक
स्वरूपिता। 'चित: प्रत्यवेशितमा परा वाकू स्वरूपिता' quoted in the Mahārthamaṅjari-parimala, p. 73,
Also Virūpākṣapañcāśikā, TSS. 9. verse—
प्रत्यवेशितमा सी चिति: स्वरसवाहिनी परा वाकू या।
आदन्तात्मसाहृतवर्णगणः सत्यहल्ला सा॥

(b) Sl. 2. As this is an Advaitic system, and as according to it, this Supreme Being referred to as Bhairava
This line is quoted by Maheśvarānanda in his *Mahārtha-maṇḍari*, TSS. p 12. 2 Ms. एकध्वमः  3 Ms. विद्वातात्ममः  4 Ms. भूपम्.

is the only Truth and all else is only its manifestation, everything, including Asat and Ajñāna, is only its projection.

(c) Śl. 4. The six Adhvans are Bhuvana, Tattva, Kalā; Mantra, Pada and Varna.

(d) Śl. 5. Cit, Ānanda, Icchā, Jñāna and Kriyā are the five Śaktis of the Supreme Being.

(e) Śl. 6. This verse is quoted on p. 70 of the *Mahārtha-maṇḍari*. Anāśritādi-bhūmyantāḥ bhūmikāḥ = Of the six Adhvans mentioned above, Tattva and Bhuvana are each 36 and 224; the 36 Tattvas start with Bhūmi; from Kālāgni-rudra to Anāśrita, the Bhuvanas are 224; as Śiva is the only Truth, He is Himself of the form of both Prakāśa and Vimarśa, and it is He who, through the latter
aspect of Vimarśa, assumes the states from Anāśrita to Bhūmi. As Śiva is the only self-dependent Principle, and the Icchā-śakti with which He creates is not different from Him, and all the rest is dependent on Him (Āśrita), He is called Anāśrita, in the stage when the Icchā-Śakti has come into being. See Svacchandatántra XI. 23, svabhāvānābhābānांभित स्वयमानथिति. T. A. VI. 43. Kas. Texts, 36, pp. 39-40. অনাধিতি: সুবল্যমাতা, ib. 44. See Vīrūpākṣa-pancāsikā, verse 2-বিমিতিপদীষ্ঠর্মে মম চৈতন্যাত্মন: শ্রারিষিদ্ধম্। শুন্যপদদীলাবচি হৃষ্যত্বাতু পীঠবতু সিদ্ধম্।\(a\) Vidyācakravarttin on above: অনাধিতাদি স্তুম্যং নির্বিশিষ্ট মম শরীরম্।

\(a\) Śi 7. The verse is quoted on p. 73 of the Mahārtha-\(mātjāri\). Śiva, who is of the twin form (Yāmala) of both Vimarśa and Prakāśa, has two Spandas, the Vimarśa-spanda and the Prakāśa-spanda; Vimarśa is Vācaka, Abhidhāna or Śabda; Prakāśa.
is Vācyā, Abhidheya or Artha; Śiva is thus Śabdārtha-svarūpa. These two aspects become the pair of triads which make the six Ādhyāvans mentioned already: thus Mantra, Pada and Varnā,—these three Ādhyāvans are Vācaka; Bhuvana, Tattva and Kalā,—these three Ādhyāvans are Vācyā; each of these is again threefold according as it is gross subtle or transcendent, Sthūla, Śūkṣma and Parā. See p. 72, Mahārthamañjāri; also, ib. p. 73, quotation from Virūpākṣapaṇcāśikā.

(a) Śl. 8. Krama or sequence is the factor causing difference both by space and time; by the dispersion of the unitary consciousness which gives rise to the variegated appearances of the world, this Krama is brought about; compare Abhinavagupta, Īśvara-pra.vimarśini, III. 2: स्वरूप-वैचित्र्यमेव देशकालक्रम:। As against the Pariṇāma of the Sāṅkhyaś, and the Vivarta of the Advaitins, Ābhāsa is the theory of this school by which it explains the manifestations of the one ultimate reality (विचित्रामासताक्रम:।).

(b) Śl. 9. The second line is quoted on pp. 44-5 of the Mahārthamañjāri.
Vidyā is Śuddhā and Aśuddhā; it is Śuddhā when Ātman is in a state of unified and undifferentiated consciousness (Cit), in which the external objects of consciousness (Idam) get merged in Self (Aham); Aśuddhi is the external dispersion of Cit; Śuddhi is the immersion of the dispersed consciousness back in Itself (Ahaftā). See Mahārthamañjarī pp. 44-5, where the following Anuṣṭubh is also quoted from Abhinavagupta’s Tantrāloka:

चिदात्मकेषवेतेषु या बुद्धिव्यतिरेकिणी।
सैवाशुद्धः परा प्रोक्ता, शुद्भिस्त्रीविमर्दनम्।। (IV. 118-9).

See also Abhinavagupta’s Iśvara-prat. vim. III. 2. शुद्भिरवपरीतता; his Parātrimśikā-vivarana, Kas. Texts, 18, p. 55 and his quotation there (from Utpaladeva’s Ajaḍapramāṭṣiddhi, 22) प्रकाश-स्वात्मविधात्रितरुंभायो हि कौटितः। as also the quotation on p. 58, ibid.

इदमित्यय बिविषपिष्मिश्य क्रियायता।
या स्वस्वह्वपिण्यवात्सिविमार्थः सोक्षमित्ययम्।।

(Ajaḍapramāṭṣiddhi, 15).

Compare also Saṭṭrimśat-tattva-sandoha, Kas. Texts, 13, śl. 4; सा महति शुद्भिविचा वेदन्ताह्न्तयोर-भेदसितः। Anuttara-prakāśa-paṇcāsiśīka of Adyanaṭha, Kas. Texts, 14, śls. 21 and 51: इदन्ताह्न्तयोरेवात्मसिति विचा निगच्छते। and अहमिम प्रलयं कुर्ब्भिदम्: प्रतियोगिनः। परापर्मारो मुद्दते स्वभावविवाप्पम्।। and Parāpravešikā of Kṣemarāja, Kas. Texts, 15, p. 7: अहंतद्वित्तयोरेवात्मायतिपलि: शुद्भिविचा। cf. Mahārthamañjarī, śl. 16, p. 44 on Śuddha (Nistuṣā) Vidyā as
the Subject-Object unification; and the quotation there (from Iśvāraprātyabhijñā of Utpaladeva, III.3). Samanāvibhikaraṇaḥ ca siddhiḥ abhinirmāṇe: ।

(a) Śū. 10. ‘Hṛdaya-viśrama’ refers to the stage of Suddhi in the previous line, the immersion and the resting of the Being in Itself. The absence of it is Aṣuddhi, when owing to Kāla, Avidyā, Rāga, Kāla and Niyati, the Self becomes a Paśu wrapped in ignorance.

Between the states of Śuddhi and Aṣuddhi, Viśrānti and Aviśrānti, knowledge and ignorance, there are numerous states, which are of varying degrees of approximation to the former; cf. Prātyabhijñā-hṛdaya of Abhinavagupta’s pupil Kṣemarāja, sūtra 8–ṭadbhūmikā: śvāntarānātmyatva: and the commentary thereon; these numerous intermediate stages are explained by Kṣemarāja in two ways,—one as the various forms of knowledge of the supposed ultimate. Truth according to the different schools of philosophy which, in fact, stop short of the really ultimate Śiva-tattva, contenting themselves with some intermediate Tattva like Buddhi (Buddhists), the Guṇas (Jains), Puruṣa (Vedāntins), Prakṛti (Pāṇcarātrins) and so on. See Prātyabhijñā-hṛdaya, Adyar edn. pp. 40–5: एवमेकस्यः चिदात्मनो मण्डल: स्वातत्त्वाब्यासिताः सर्वा इत्याभ्युमिकाः स्वातत्त्व-प्रच्छादनमीलिन्तारतस्मेवेदितः। Sthitī is also inter-
preted by Kṣemarāja in a different manner as referring to the gradual process of re-absorption in the spirit, in a greater or less degree, of the outwardly dispersed experience, i.e. the Viśrānti that is gained in sense-enjoyments when, with the mind slowly detached from the immediate stimulant-object, one forgets himself in the resultant bliss which, inwardly expanding, makes the being repose in its essential nature of Consciousness and Bliss. अपि च सर्वां दर्शनानां समस्तानां नीलसुखादिज्ञानानां या: स्थितयः अत्तनुसरणप्राप्तिस्वात्मान्तः तात्तद्युगस्मिनः चिददात्तायनावत्तेयस्वात्मान्तययाय: | तथा हि यत्र यदा वहिदुर्भिरेण स्वरुपे विभ्रमयति तदा तदा बाष्ट्रस्वसंहारः अत्त: विशारदप्रथमस्थितिः तत्तद्वेष्यतस्विवतःसंहत्त्वात्सार्युवानमिति etc. Kṣemarāja, Pra. Ṣr. p. 46.

(a) Sl. 11. This verse refers to the twofold creation, that of the Lord, i.e. the entire creation which is Meya, Object, for him who is the sole Mātr, Subject; this creation of the Lord is called Avikalpa and Sādhāraṇa; Anyathābhāva means Asādhāraṇa; and refers to the second type of creation in which the Subject or Mātr is the individual soul ( Pratyag-ātman, itself the Meya of the Lord ), and its objects are its own psychological concepts and experiences, ( true, subjective, or illusory, e.g. Idam hṛdyam, Dvicandrādhiḥ, but all of which, are, so far as the Ultimate
Divine Consciousness is concerned, really untrue, though based thereon and derived only there-from); this is called the Vikalpa-sṛṣṭi; but gradually, on the spiritual evolution of an individual, and his becoming a Jīvanmukta, the distinction of the objective world into Śādharmaṇa and Asādharmaṇa, and Mātr and Meya undergoes change and revision. See Iṣvarapratyabhijñā IV. 8–13, and Abhinavagupta's Vimarṣiṇī thereon.

(a) Śl. 12. The former, the Lord's own Sṛṣṭi, referred to previously as the Avikalpa-sṛṣṭi, is in this Advaitic system, only the Lord's appearance, Ābhāsa, and of this apparent creation, the material agent etc. are all Śiva or the Supreme Self, Himself.

(b) Śl. 13. The Supreme Being has five phases, Ānanda, Cit, Icchā, Jñāna, and Kriyā. There are also-five delimiting potencies, Āvaraṇa Saktis, Kalā,
Avidyā, Rāga, Kāla, and Niyati, which together are referred to as Kañcuka, the sheath, and which cause the different manifestations and their differences; through them the Infinite Being limits Itself into one of limited knowing, limited doing and so on; Kalā is responsible for limited doing (किंचित्वर्त्तव्यहेतु:); Avidyā causes limited knowing (किंचित्स्वर्त्तव्यहेतु:); Rāga produces attachment to objects, Viśayābhiṣāṅga; Kāla gives rise to sequence, Krama, and Niyati to the sense of distinction into mine, not mine and so on. (ममेदं न ममेद-मित्यादिनियमहेतु:.) See Parāpravesikā, Kas. Texts, 15, pp. 8–9; Mahārthamañjarī, p. 50, Pratyabhijñā-hṛdaya, pp. 48–9.

(a) Kriyā is the activity of the Jñānaśakti itself in terms of Kāla-krama, and is not really distinct from it; see Īṣvaraprat. and Vimarśini, III 1: चित्तूरूप एव...कालकमाक्षिपणु क्रियाभिधीयते, तस्य प्रमातुरेत् ज्ञानशक्तिरपुष्पो धर्मः; ‘तत्’ इति तस्मादविद्वृत्तं ज्ञातं क्रिया च। ज्ञातं विमार्षनुष्ठानितं; विमार्षं एव च क्रियेति। न च ज्ञानशक्तिविविधीतयां क्रियायोगं। The Text runs as मातुरेत् तदन्योऽविद्वृत्ते ज्ञातकर्मणी।

(b) कर्मचुदचक्षताम् = कर्मंद्रिय-चुदीन्द्रियताम्। इच्छया स्वेच्छया। परिमीयते = परिमितः पशुरुपेण संकुचितो भवति।
(c) This is a self-contained line. तम् = भैरवम्।

(d) When the unlimited Being has the first joint emanation of the Jñānaśakti and the Kārmaśakti, the creation yet being only potential, He is in the stage of Śiva-tattva; when He has the first protrusion of the Jñānaśakti in Him, and the creation to be is in the stage of an image within Himself, He is the Sadāśiva-tattva; this Sadāśiva has nothing to do with the deity-form referred to by that name; it is derived from the word Sat, as now the creation just ‘is’; from Sat, the stage derives the name Sadākhya; the third stage is Vidyeśa when the externalisation of the creation, the dualism of ‘this’ (Idam) apart from 'I' (Aham), has shown itself. See Īkṣvaraprat. and Vimarsini III. 1-3: मातुरेव तदायोन्यात्मचित्ते ज्ञान-कर्मणि॥ किन्तुवातत् रक्षोद्रेकादायां तत्कमादिदत्र॥ बहिर्भिरपरवे तु परतः पारमेश्वरम॥ ईश्वरी बहिर्ह्वमेति निनेिौन्तः सदाशिवः॥ सामानाभिकरणं च सदिधार्मिकिंद्र-धियो॥ Abhinavagupta: तत्देवल्विवृक्तत्ज्ञानक्रियाकर्मं क्रियाक्षेत्रं सकलवात्त्वराशिलात्रिसंहार्षारप्रतिविभ्रन-सहिष्णु यत् यत्…शिवतत्त्वम्। …आन्तर्ग ज्ञानरुपः या द्रश्यत् तस्य उद्रेकामासनेः सादाश्च सदाश्चायां भवं, यत्:प्रभृति सावित्र प्रलया; सदाश्चायाः सदाश्चविश्वास्त्रहस्तम् इत्यं वाच्यं तत्त्वम्। सूक्तकमोपेश्वरोऽभिमुचितं तस्तादायं तत्त्वम्। बहिर्भिर्वश्च क्रियाक्षेत्रिकमथस्य परते उद्रेकामासे सति पारमेश्वरं परमेश्वरश्वाययमीधवरत्वं नाम। …अनन्तयो
These give rise to body, breath, intellect and the void; void, Śūnya, is the state in deep sleep or complete stupor, a state like ether, yet part of the realm of knowledge, a state in which the subject knows itself just as 'I'. In all these states from gross body cognised as 'I am lean' to Śūnya, it is only the subject (Aham) that shines through. I. Prat. III. 8. and Vimarsīṇī: शून्ये बुद्धो शरीरे वा मायाशक्तिविजूिम्। सुषुप्ते प्रलये 'न' इत्यभासमयाभिः च तावच्छन्न्यानामाकल्पतत्वप्रेष वेष्मानौतितसु 'अहम्' इत्यात्मलवेश वीक्षयते। अहमुच्छन्न्यातिधिनिति इति प्राण: ... स्वच्छोदकाययुतया वेष्मानोतिताविबद्धनवति बुधिरसिद्धातिबिविश्यते।... शरीरसेव पृथिवीप्राणः कुशोहोत्स्मित्याविद्याद्वमसु अहमिवायतत्या महत्ति। Also ibid. II. 3. 2: Vimarsīṇī: तेन शून्य-वी-प्राणवेहांद्रुपयथाध्रयत्वीकारात्मकसंकोचपरिश्रुतहृदितात् मायाप्रमातु: etc. See also Ādyanātha's Anuttaraprakāśapañcāśīka, Kas. Texts 14, p. 3 verses 15 ff, where however, the editor remarks, there is difference in some cases between the accepted views and those held by Ādyanātha.

On the exact meaning attached to Śūnya in this system, see Tantrāloka, VI 9-10, Kas. Texts 36, (Vol. IV.) pp. 8–9 and Jayaratha's gloss thereon. The Śūnya is the Samvid, pure and void of all objective taint, shining like the sky as it were; it is not complete void. संबिन्द्रात्र हि यत्चुदुः प्रकाश-परमार्थमू। तत्मयात्मात्म: प्रोज्यत विविकात भासते नभ:।। तदेव शून्यहृदयं संविदः परिगोयते। नेति नेति विमृशः योगिनिः सा परा दशा।। Com: शून्यतं व्रजस्य सर्वस्य...
(a) Śū. 17. See above verses 11, 12 and notes thereon. In verse 17, the creation of the universe is taken a stage further; Asādhāraṇi-ṣṛṣṭi or Vikalpa-ṣṛṣṭi has already been explained; Śaiva-sarga is the Śāmbhavi-ṣṛṣṭi referred to in verses 11-12, and is called Śādharana; this forms the basis of the Asādhāraṇa-ṣṛṣṭi. तत्स्य refers to the delimited soul, Parimita Bhairava, i.e., the Paśu. Compare Īṣvara. Prat. IV. 9: तत्स्यासादारणी सृष्टिरीश्वरसृष्टिः च जीविनी। सृष्टिप्रज्ञातया सत्येवाज्ञातया तद्वात्रात्। which is closely followed in our text here. Also Abhinavagupta on Ī. Pra. IV. 9: असादारणी प्रतिप्रमाणतः

(b) Śū. 18. Though the Self renders itself manifold in this manner, it is essentially rooted in its own unitary nature of the form of consciousness.

(c) Śū. 19. As Consciousness is impartite and the universe is really only its appearance, everything except it is really non-existent.
(a) Śīl. 20. On Ananyopāya and Anupāya as names of this path of realisation, see *Mahānayaprapakoṣa-TSS.* p. 2, śls. 9, 13; p. 4, śl. 31. In the *Tantrāloka,* Abhinavagupta himself explains the various Upāyas or means of realisation; the binding universe being a manifestation of the One Supreme Being or Soul, through his Śaktis, the process of liberation is of the form of transcending one Śakti after the other till the seeker is at the stage of the Ātman Itself; Kriyā-upāya or Ānāvopāya is the grossest form of seeking, in which the aspirant uses Mantras etc. Jñāna or Śākta Upāya is the next higher in which non-dual knowledge is sought and contemplated upon as means; Icchā or Sāṃbhava Upāya is the still more refined path in which by mere Icchā or by a flash, one at once attains to the Ātman. In the highest form of Sādhana, the seeker seeks only the Consciousness or Self Itself and has now no need for external aids of worship or contemplation; hence this is called Ātmopāya or Anupāya; it is also called Ānandopāya. See *Tantrāloka,* Āh. 1, 2, 3 and 5; the Śivasūtras, as explained by Kṣemarāja in his *Vimarśini,* Kas. Texts, deals in its three chapters with the three Upāyas Sāṃbhava, Śākta, and Ānava; the fourth Anupāya transcends these three Upāyas, which alone the earlier phase

(a) This verse is quoted on p. 49 of the Maharthamañjari. The one undifferentiated consciousness of Self takes manifold forms and permeates all these different and infinite forms thrown up by Itself; when the Yogin concentrates on the one essential substratum of consciousness, he does not see the differences. See Maharthamañjari, p. 49.

(b) ŚIt. 23. Vāha is a technical concept of the school; there are five Vāhas or currents or levels of the flow of consciousness,—‘वाहा: परमेश्वरस्य स्फुरणधारा’: as Maheśvarananda puts it (p. 89); they are Vyoma-vāmeśvari, Khecarī, Dikcarī, Gocarī and Bhūcarī; Vyomeśvari or Vyoma-vāmeśvari is the Transcendental Cit-Sakti of the Lord; Khecarī relates to Buddhī or knowledge in a cogniser; Dik-carī to Antahkaraṇa; Go-carī to the senses; Bhūcarī to objects cognised through these. See
Mahārthamañjarī, pp. 89–92; Pratyabhijñāhyaḍaya, pp. 60–62. The Yogin is to transcend the four lower Vāhas or currents and plunge into the first or primary Vāha, the consciousness of Self, Ātma-Citi, and thus get over or destroy the Jaḍa, i.e., the physical universe.

The word ‘Broḍayet’ here in the ms. may appear to be corrupt but it is correct. Abhinavagupta uses the form ‘Brūḍita’ in his I. Pra. Vimarśinī, Vol. I, Kas. Texts 22, pp. 107–8: अतः स्वरूपान्तः ब्रूढितम्. अर्थारिष्टम् अपरमति मिथ्राकारामात्मति परिग्रह कविकेदवार्थ स्वरूपान्तः मामासासयति इत्यार्थम्, संपा ज्ञातशवितः। Brūḍita mean ‘Nimagna’, imbedded or immersed or sunk into; Broḍayet in verse 23 above therefore means that the Jaḍa or inanimate external creation should be made to submerge itself in the consciousness of Self, Ātma-Citi, in which the Sādhaka should plunge. That the meaning ‘immerse’ or ‘sink down’ is correct is proved by the following verse in Abhinavagupta’s Tantraloka where he uses the verbal form ‘Brūḍati’ in the senses of ‘sinking downwards’; to illustrate the point that as the Bimba rises higher and higher, its Pratibimba or image sinks lower and lower, he says: यथा यथा हि गणनमुखतेतकलहस्तः। जले विम्ब्र ब्रूढत्वस्य तथेत्यकार्याय विचितः। XV. 431, Kas. Texts 59, p. 219. For another usage of this rare root, see Praśnaśatakā of Jinavallabha, šl. 3, अर्थू ब्रुढ़न्तकार्याय विचितः। C. Bendall’s Catalogue of Skt. Mss. in the British Museum, p. 176a. See also another Jain work Anandalekha of Vinayavijaya, III.
114, p. 106, Praśasti Samgraha, Ahmedabad. Kalhaṇa uses ‘Bruṇīta’ in the sense of ‘immersed in water’ (Rājatarāhgingī, VIII. 1068). The root ‘Bruṇ’ is only a variant of ‘Vruṇ’ in the same sense ‘Majjana’ found in the Dhātupāthha, though usage of it seems to be much more scarce in the latter form.

(a) Śl. 24. Srṣṭi, Sthiti, Saṃbhāra, Tirodhāna and Anugrāha are the five acts of Śiva; even in the state of His delimitation into a Paśu, He continues to exhibit these five activities in a limited sphere and form; to that extent, the individual’s essential Śiva-vehicle persists and it should help him to believe in his essential Śiva-vehicle. See Pratyabhijñāḥṛdaya, Sūtra 10: तथा पद्मो तदृढः पञ्चकृत्यानि करोति and the Vṛtti thereon pp. 51-3: देवाराजादिपदमाविषयः चिदृपो महेश्वरो बहिमुखीभावावरे नीलादिकर्मी नियतदेशकालादित्यः यदव आपासयति तत्त नियतदेशकालाश्रामासांशी अस्य सह्यता। अन्यदेशकालाश्रामासांशेऽस्य सह्यता। नीलाधामासांशे स्थापकता। नेदेनामासांशे विलयकरिता।, प्रकाशकेषन प्रकाशने अनुसरितः।...एव-धिरं पञ्चविष्कृतकालित्वातिनं सदा हृदप्रतिपत्ता परिशील्यमाने महेश्वरामुनीयत्यत्वे भविष्यताम्। See Bṛha Prat. 1. 59. and Abhinavagupta’s Vimarsihini thereon: तेन तेन प्रमाणसह ऐक्यं सुज्ज्वते, अत्रेय ग्रामान ऐक्यं सिद्धते, घटादिमाथ्रपूर्वपन्नमिनमानून तिरोभावाध्ययते, तत्वतिआभिसं प्रकाशाभासनपूर्ण-
क्षेपज्ञानप्रसंख्यान(न)र्गे)शिनादक्षमेन वा।
गुहवक्रेण तात्वात्मन्याकलपय क्रूर्ति संवेदत्॥ २५ II(a)

1 Ms gap.

त्वबितरणाद्य अनुश्रु: क्रियते, तेन ... भगवत: पञ्चकृत्ययोगो
यावत् सततमेव व्यवहारेऽपि। Also Tantravaṭadhanikā,
Kas. Texts, 24, I, 28-30; and Mahārthamañjarī,
p. 53.

(a) Śl. 25. Kṣepa etc. are all aspects of the process of
emergence of the universe from the Supreme
Being and its absorption back into the same
source, all of which are included in the compre-
hensive concept of Kāla. Kṣepa is the first
throwing out or dispersion of the Ātman; Jñāna
is the contemplation of the dispersed object as
still included in the subject; Prasaṁkhyāna is the
distinction of the cogniser and the cognised and
identification of the constituents in the dispersed
object; Gati is the cognition or the taking by the
consciousness of the form of particular objects
which are all the same its images; Nāda is the
extinction of all the stages from Jñāna onwards,
and the flashing of the whole as a mere piece of
consciousness forming a part of the Ātman. See
Abhinavagupta, Tantrāloka IV. 173-5 and
Kṣemarāja’s gloss thereon:

क्षेपो ज्ञानं च संख्यानं गतिनादै इति क्रमात्॥ १७३॥
स्वात्मनो मेदनं क्षेपो मेदितस्याविकल्पनम्।
ज्ञानं, विकल: संख्यानमन्यतो व्यतिमेदनात्॥ १७४॥
गति: स्वर्णपारोहित्वं प्रतिविम्बवेदन यत्।
नादः स्वात्मपरमशेषेष्टता तद्विलोपनार्। ॥ १७५ ॥

‘कल किल बिल क्षेपे’ ‘कल गति’ ‘कल संख्याने’ ‘कल शब्दे’ इति वातुचतुरंतयस्य ्पद्धारायमायेन यद्गतिजाति प्राप्तो च वर्तित इति। एतदेव क्रमेण व्याचर्य क्रमाविद्यालयम्। भेदनिमिति वहिल्लासनम्। अविकल्पनिमिति स्वात्ममोदेन परामर्शं।
भेदितयोऽव भ्रातृप्रमोदेष्यतर्यस्य परस्परारोहिणाः ‘इदमिदं
नानिदम’ इति प्रतिनियततनावस्थापनातु संख्यानं विकलपः।
गतिः गतिः गतिः परस्परसर्जनाः प्राप्तः। तेन भेदितोऽर्थः संचलकस्त्रां स्वर्णपरारोहितू भ्रातृतीति स्वर्णपरारोही, तस्य भावः; तत्त्वम; न चैततु कट इति हेक्केददतर्येक्के विषये, इति प्रतिबिम्बविदितः; प्रतिबिम्बस्य
हि तद्विलोपितत्वेकंपि तद्विलोपितत्वेकंपञ्चविभासो भवेदिति भावः। स्वात्मपरमशेषेष्टेति नदनामारूपत्वावतु। तद्विलोपनार्थः तेषांविभिक्तज्ञानादीनां विलोपनाः अपहस्तानारत्तिर्ययोऽव; एतदेव भिन्नस्य भवेदिति भावः। ॥ pp. 203-205, Kas. Texts 30.

The deity symbolising this Kāla responsible for this fivefold ‘Kalana’ is Kāli or Kālakarṣiṇī; *Tantrāloka*, IV. 176: इति पद्धारायमायेन कलानं कूद्वानं परा। देवी काली तथा कालकण्ठी चेति कथ्यते। See below verse 42 on Kālakarṣiṇī.

On Kṣepa, see also *Mahānayaprakāśa*, TSS. p. 51, verses 50-51: क्षेपे बहिर्मुकेभ्यातम ... प्रवृत्तेत्तारात्म्याविदेशकालमयः स्वरूपत:।

On Nāda in particular see again *Tantrāloka* IV. 189-190: तत्सदेव बह्रीरूप प्राप्तोधाराग्रिलिपतम। अन्तर्द्वरामशेषेष्टेति नतालयं इदंतापरमशेषेष्टिरत्सरेशनोपलस्य योज्यावहृततमशष्टि स्वस्वरूपपरिहारेण तदेकत्मतामापनमपि etc. p. 221.
विकल्पयित्वा विश्वात्मा भैरवोद्धमये ममेत ताः।
विश्वभवण्यसः यथा वहृजळितामुखः प्रभा रवे॥
एकोद्ध मातृविज्ञानानमेवप्रकारवान्।
श्रद्धोधिवानप्रेमणं केचरांदिष्टुद्धर्॥४॥
ध्रुवामेद्ग्रामकरणं वन्धमोक्षं विमावयन।
भैरवोद्देसीतु विश्वभवु स्वाच्छन्तं परमं ग्रजेन॥२६-२८॥
अत्न्तःकार्विशिष्टकारावकालकमात्मनः।
अपराधीनमाथस्ते यथे त्रामवनिर्मेय॥२९॥५॥
अनुचारविसर्गार् विश्वमोदयाञ्चालम्।
सहृदिक्षवशक्त्योस्तदन्तरसार्याःसार्यः॥३०॥६॥

१ Ms. भैरवोद्देसीतु २ Ms. क्षामात्मनः ३ Ms. यथवः।
४ Ms. बिमावयनः।

(a) केचरांदिष्टुद्धर्: = केचःप्रमुखद्वाचचतुष्टयः। For the four states or Vāhas Khecarī, Dik-carī, Go-carī and Bhūcarī, see above notes under verse 23.

(b) Śl. 29. The Lord being the sole self-dependent entity, He, out of his own innate power, Himself being not subject to either time or sequence, throws out the universe and withdraws it again into Himself. See also below verse 36. Antaḥ-kāra and Bahiṣ-kāra mean Nimeśa and Unmeśa; for the use of the expressions Antaḥ-kāra and Bahiṣṭkāra in this sense, see Abhinavagupta himself Parātrimśikāvivaraṇa, Kas. Texts 18, p. 9, line 2.

(c) Śl. 30. See Abhinavagupta’s comments on Parātrimśikā, verses 5–9. All the various manifestations are held to be the result of various Śaktis.
See Mahārthamaṇḍārjari, p. 38 श्रवणस्यास्त्रसमूहायां: Tantrāsara, Āhn. iv. श्रवणस्यास्त्रसमूहायां मांगलसास्त्रायां and Tantrālokā, IV. 40. and III. 68: तत्वोर्येऽपि दर्शनम् रूप संवाध्यायेऽस्त्रसमूहाय, आन्द्रविद्युत: समभवता यथो विशेष विशेष्यवेदः।

(a) Śl. 31. उनाता refers to the Saṅkoca or limitation of the Lord's Śaktis; तयोः refers to Īsana and Icchā; विदाह = Samvidāh; refers to consciousness of which the Lord is the embodiment.

(b) Śl. 32. On these three verses, compare Ādyanātha's Anuttaraprakāśapañcāśākā, Kas. Texts, 14, pp. 5-6, Śls. 32-36: अनुत्तरं भिन्नं भिन्नं आन्द्रविद्युतं तथा इति। इत्येकरणत्राकुष्ठस्तुतिजगन्मयोऽस्त्रसमूहाय। ... ... ... उवति विशेष्यतिसंपर्वति विशुौंदृश्वतस्य निपुंसस्थरमुः। and Abhinavagupta himself on Parātrimśikā, 5-9, pp. 167 ff: एव पक्षेऽपि स्वदिष्टक्षमति इत्यादिकिताः स्वस्वयन्त्रञ्जिताः ज्ञातानि शरणं भविष्यमात्रानुभवविकासाः। भेदविशेष्यकोविशेष्यस्तत्वादं तात्त्ववेदं पुनः: प्रसंस्ति आन्द्रविद्युतम्। इत्यादिक भाविष्यन्ति कस्यात्मकस्वात्मन्येण जिववेदताः ईश्वरहया इति विनिमयेऽन्तः। उन्मिष्टताः तु ज्ञातानि स्वविशेष्यमात्रानुभवविकासाः। भेदविशेष्य... अनन्तकरणवेदेशीयाः।

...अनुतरपद एव संक्षमातु वृहत्त एव भिन्नाम्यति एकार्शसंविदु किल स्वरूपत एव देशकालकलनोपादानांदेवपदयेव प्रामुखतत्वाचार्यनेन सम्बन्धिता विसंगभूमी चावर्त्ति, विसंगभूमिस्तेष
Again Abhinavagupta, *Mālinīvijayavārttika*, Kas. Texts 31, p. 81, śls. 884 ff.: अनुत्तरा स्थिति: पूर्वमानन्देछेश-नान्यतः । उदयश्रोतनावेश इति पद्म व्यवस्थतम् ॥ etc.

(a) Śls. 33–35 show the unfolding of principles of the Universe from the Vimarśa-śakti or Vedyollāsa of the Lord,—the five elements Earth etc., the five Tanmātras of Gandha etc., the ten Senses, Intelligence so far as the individual is concerned; sequence or time; mind, Ahaṅkāra, Mahat and Prakṛti; and Puruṣa is the delimited soul ( यदा तु परमेश्वरः पारमेश्वर्यां मायाशक्त्या स्वरूपं गृहितत्वा संकुचित-ग्राहकातमशुते तदा पुरुषस्वः—Parāpravesikā, pp. 7–8).
(a) Śl. 36. Goes with the three previous verses. Dvīrūpa and Udbhayātman = Śiva-Śakti; Prakāśa-Vimarśa. Icchā is the primary manifestation of the Lord’s desire to create; the two successive stages are Jñāna and Kriyā; in the Jñāna-stage the Lord is called Sadāsiva and is of the subjective form of Ahantā; in the Kriyā-stage, He is Iśvara, representing the objective Idantā, the manifest Universe; Unmeṣa—unfolding of the Lord’s activity; Nimesa—His withdrawal of the same: ईस्वरो बहुर्न्वेषो निमेशोन्तरस्वादाशिवः। See Mahārthaṁaṁjari, pp. 40–43.

अन्यथा in this verse, fourth foot, means निमेशात्; अनुतरायुतात् = अनुतरसंविचारात्।

(b) Śl. 37. The four Śaktis are the Āvaraṇa-Śaktis or Kaṅcukas, omitting probably Niyati. See Mahārthaṁaṁjari p. 50: तत्र च रागो मायाविवेक कला काल इति क्रमं पुरुषस्योद्वारं विन्दुप्रवेशपरिहारातु त्रिशिष्टकुवल्म मध्यस्याकाव्यस्य प्रति पुरुषविवेकजोवात्माकाराशुपत्यात्य तासामुप्योगः। एतैन धारणांविवेकेऽव्याख्यातम्। They occupy an intermediate position between the gross evolutes and Supreme Being and form a sustaining medium so to say. According to Abhinavagupta himself on Parātritāṁśikā, these
four Śaktis which are called Dhāraṇas are Rāga, Vidyā, Kalā and Māyā; p. 113. राग-विद्या-कला-मायाव्याख्यानि तत्त्वानि धारणि यथार्थसूत्रात्या अभिमानयतीति धारणानि। . . p. 116. रागादय एव आच्छाद्यमाणादृ भावः उक्तत्त्वायेन धारणमत्त्वाय श्रति प्रयोजकतां गच्छति। अतिस्तवेत पुनःव्यवपदेशकारणाभृता हितोऽणिच्च उत्पन्ने धारणशब्दवाच्याः . . . That it is the Tattvas or Śaktis called Kaṇcuka which are called Dhāraṇas is made clear in a further passage there: pp.116-7: तदेव धारणशब्दवेदनापर शास्त्रेषु कब्ज्जु-कनामवेद्यप्रसिद्धायेव तत्त्वानीहूँ निरूपितानि। These Kaṇcuka-śaktis are 5; Abhinavagupta mentions 4 Śaktis here as Dhāraṇas; I indicated above, on the basis of the Mahārthamaṇjarī, that Niyati is probably left out; in the passage I have quoted above from Parātrīṃśikāvivarana, p. 113, Abhinavagupta mentions the four as Rāga, Vidyā, Kalā and Māyā; on p. 119, Abhinavagupta returns to this question and says that, according to some texts Māyā is included in Vidyā (see Mahesvarānanda jointly mentioning them as Māyā-vidyā); in other texts, Rāga is said to be part of Puruṣa and not separately mentioned; in Trika texts Niyati and Kāla are not separately dealt with. केपुचित्ता शास्त्रेषु सा महामाया मेद-मलाभावो-पचारातू विद्यात्त्वसेवत्येव निरूपिते . . केपुचित्ता शास्त्रेषु 'रागतत्त्व पुनःव्यवस्थानम्' हि त्त पृथक्कः परामृष्टम् . . इत्यव श्रीत्रिकांगमेषु नियतिकाली न पृथक्कः निरूपितो।
(a) Visarga is creation through manifestation out of Himself.

स्वात्मन: स्वात्मनि स्वात्मक्षेपो वैसपिकी दिखात:।

Tantraloka, III. 141.

अनुतंत्रं परं धामं तदेवाकुलमुच्छये।

विसर्गस्तत्स्य नायस्य कौलिकी शक्तिस्वच्छये।

विसर्गता च सैवस्या यदानन्दवेदयक्तात।

स्वन्तिभूतिक्षाक्षिक्ष्ठिपर्यंता प्रोच्छलस्थित्यं। ib. 143-4.

(b) Śl. 40, इयत्सवं रत्न refers to all this created universe

इयलाबिद्वरा = Through the three Šaktis of Icchā, Jñāna and Kriyā; अनुतंत्र तथा, तत् एव = the basis and material cause of the creation are all the same Supreme Being Himself.

(c) On the Šakti or Vimarśa aspect and its further manifestations set forth in this and the further verses, see Abhinavagupta’s Parātrimsikā-vivaraṇa,
Kas. Texts 18, pp. 3–12. मन्नाथी वाक्क is परावाक्क which is one continuous flow without distinction of time, एक-वार-बहा; in other words, it is always of the present, मन्नमेव वर्तमानस्य as Abhinava-gupta says in the Parātrimśikā-vivaraṇa, p. 4.

(a) Śl. 42. Having later a triple flow (Trivaham), it, the Parā Vāk, brings in the sense of Time (kāla), both in the objective world and in its subjective cogniser; hence the Mantrī Vāk or Parā is called Kāla-karśinī. It is called Parā when it is purely in its subjective aspect as pure illumination; when it is this as well as object, like one seeing his image in a mirror, it is Parāparā; it is Aparā when the object aspect is distinct and is seen as such. When all these aspects are together comprehended by the Parā Śakti, it is called Kāla-karśinī. See the editorial footnote on p. 24 of the Parātrimśikāvivaraṇa: यथा इति शिवविदिधरण्यन्तम अविकल्पसंविद्वात्तया विभवति च पञ्चवति च भासयति च परमेश्वरः सा अस्य परा शक्ति:। यथा दर्पणहृद्यादिविद्वो मेदमेदद्वयं सा परापरा। यथा परस्परविक्षण-तया मेदेन सा अपरा। एतत् त्रितयं यथा आत्मनि कौशी-कारिण अनुसन्धानात्मना ग्रस्ते सापि परेव कालकर्षणी श्रव्दात्तरनिद्धित्ता हिति।

See above note on verse 25 and quotation on Kāla-karśinī from Tantrāloka (IV. 176).
(a) Śl. 43. The significance of line one and how Parāparā is so called has been explained above under Śl. 42, Line 2: When Kriyā-śakti is manifest, the Lord at that stage is called Iśa or Iśvara; in the Jñāna-stage, He is Sadāśiva; see above under Śl. 36.

(b) Śl. 44. Refers to the further stage of the Parā Vāk, viz. Madhyamā. As Parā is transcendent, and Paśyanti is subtle (Sūkśmā), Madhyamā, in whose stage temporal sequence is clear, is called gross, Sthūla. On Antaḥ-karaṇa, Samkalpa-Vikalpa and Prāṇa being the realm of this Madhyamā, see Utpaladeva on Śivaśāsti, II. 37: Madhyamaśya vā ca vāhaṇaṃ苗eśeṣaṃ victvamānaṃ bhava abhivad-vāhaṃ ghaṇaḥ. Tasya eva sākṣiptatmano ārthasāvatikāvya bukhya samvartakaṃ: Karoṇa prāṇapānaṃ tasya evākasvānañātu, n tu paścita, tva. See also Śitikanṭha's Mahānaya-prakāśa, Kas. Texts, 21 p. 53: viśca kaloliti-vātma maṇāsāyaṇaṃ jagnu kalavatvā cha jñānīti jagnvālamaṅgo madhyamāḥḥ.

(c) Śl. 45. Māya = mānāvayāpya or the illusion of objects as different and distinct entities. It is the deli-
mitigation of the Subject or Self. मातुमित्त्वम् क्रमः = Sequence or temporal and spatial distinctions. अपूर्बः = the delimited soul. 'अपूर्बः आत्मा देहमुख्यकादि'—Abhinavagupta, Parātrimśikā-vivaraṇa, p. 25 : 'अपूर्वपरमाया पुरुषसंज्व्वा'—p. 5, Śattrimśat-tattvasandoha, Kas. Texts 13. All these appear in the Paśyantī and Madhyamā stages (दशयोः पूर्वयोः); i.e. the three Malas, Māyiya, Ānava (of the Aṇu) and Kārmaṇa (of Karman) arise in these two stages. 'अपूर्वमित्वम् पुरुषस्यावपरामर्शस्वत्त्वत् संकुचितमन्यो जीवः, तत्स्य भावः आपूर्वम्'। See Mahārtha-mañjarī, pp. 31–32.

(a) Śi. 47. Sthāna, Karanā etc. refer to the vocal apparatus through which Vāk attains linguistic form; in this stage, it is called Vaikhari; all that we hear with our ear pertains to this realm.

On these four aspects of Vāk, see also Mahārtha-mañjarī verses 49, 50.

(b) Śi. 49. Vyāpti in line one may simply mean the unfoldment of Vāk in the form mentioned in the
foregoing verses. Vyāpti is also a technical concept of this Śāstra meaning the submerging of the lower stage (symbolised by its presiding Śakti), in the next higher stage (symbolised by its presiding Śakti). See Śitikanṭha’s Mahānaya-prakāśa, pp. 58–59. Generally it is used in this Śāstra to mean the progressive evolution of the aspirant to the higher state. See Tantrāloka, V. 99, 107. Vargādhidevatās refer to the eight deities presiding over the eight siddhis; see Mahārthamaṇjarī, pp. 130–131, also Mālinīvijayottara quoted on p. 67 of Spandanirṇaya, Kas. Texts, 42—वग्ग्रंधकामि ज्ञेयमघोरास्वमनुचक्कात् || तदेव शक्तिमेदेनि. माहेश्वरादि चाहतकम् || They overpower and bind with activity (सुझैऽ) only those who wallow in the senses; but those who have realised the above-given truth of the Supreme Vāk and Its many manifestations, are Jīvan-muktas, even though they may be in the midst of the world and its normal life; hence these Śaktis do not meddle with their realised state of Paramesvaratva. See quotation in Spandanirṇaya, p. 67: विषयेऽव संलिनानाथोऽर्थप: पात- यन्त्यगृहूऽऽ। ibid. pp. 68–69: भोजयताः तु कथमसी शक्तिरस्य गत: इत्यतितदेवोत्तरस्म। कलामिः अकारार्दिवर्गाचिन्धायाकामिनिर्मायमिः तद्वर्भवं त्ताविश्वाऔष्ट्यविस्थानाविश्वाश्रियमलिनी-विजयनिभावताःपाभिः × × विलुप्तविभव: संकुचितोद्रिः, अपूर्णोद्रिः, कर्माणि किंवदूः, इतमुपादेवे, इदं जहामि इत्याविचित्र ताँत × × हर्षोकारिदृष्टाः नेनौयनमाः इव क्षणमाप्स्वस्वस्थ्याविश्वात्स्व। उत्तरः-सावकलंहप: शक्तिवर्गेण भूज्यमान्: पशुःहः।
उपाये नाग्रहः कार्य उपेया मैरवसिथितः।
यासौ स्वसांवितः तामेव सवोषाप्यां समाविशेषत्। ॥ ५० ॥ (a)
आधुन्तान्तर्गतान्तर्वाच्यवाच्यकनिमर्गः।
रहस्यं मन्त्रयुक्तः अपदेशनुचरं महः। ॥ ५१ ॥ (b)
शम्भोरिविवहुद्धयं जयन्ति गुरवं पुरा।
नित्येऽत्यासामाधानात्मयत्सम्पदः। ॥ ५२ ॥ (c)
॥ परियुप्रण्ड कृतिरिम्य श्रीमदाचार्योभिवत्तुनासनाथस्य
पर्यन्तपश्चाशिका नाम ॥ ॥

---

1 Ms. स्वसांविताः। 2 Ms. संविद्रम। पदम। 3 Ms. After this we have नमरिषवाय।

(a) Śū. 50. See above notes under verse 20, where, in view of the thorough monism of the school, the path is called Ananyopāya or Ātmopāya; here Sva-Samvit (one’s own inner consciousness) which is the Supreme Being, is itself to be resorted to as the means of all means for attaining realisation.

(b) Śū. 51. See above verses 1 and 7.

(c) oSampadaḥ is correct; see verse 8 quoted in the Introduction from the Gurunātha-parāmarśa: पर्यन्तसम्पदपादन etc.
CHAPTER IV

ABHINAVAGUPTA'S MAHOPADEŠA-VIMŚATIKA AND ŚAŃKARA'S NIRGUṆA-MĀNASA-PŪJA: PRATYABHIJÑĀ AND ADVAITA

After a critical examination of the Paramārtha-sāra-saṅgraha of Abhinavagupta in its relation to the Āryūs of Śeṣa in the New Indian Antiquary, l.i. pp. 37-72, Prof. S.S. Suryanarayana Śāstri observes: "The conclusion reached here has a significance not confined to the Paramārtha-sāra. It is possible that more than one Pratyabhijñā work has derived from Advaita sources."¹ One more Pratyabhijñā work of this nature, deriving, though in part, from an Advaitic minor work, is the minor poem of Abhinavagupta called the Mahopadeśa Vimsatika edited by Dr. K. C. Pandey at the end of his book on Abhinavagupta (pp. 407-408, Chowk. Series, Studies I). Of these twenty verses of Abhinavagupta, the verses 13 to 18 forming the latter part of the poem are more or less completely taken from a minor poem ascribed to Śaṅkara called variously Nirguṇa-mānasa-pūjā, Ātma-pūjā, Parā-pūjā and so on.

This minor work of Śaṅkara is printed as Nirguṇa-mānasa-pūjā in volume 18 of the Complete Works of

¹ In JOR. Madras, VI (1932) pp. 121-129, in an article on the Dakṣiṇāmūrtī hymn in ten verses ascribed to Śaṅkara, Amarnath Ray contended that this hymn of the Kashmirian Śaiva Pratyabhijñā School, has been adapted and adopted by the Śaṅkara Advaita school.
Śaṅkara of the Vani Vilas Press, Śrirangam, but in this text there are a few omissions. The two Stotra Collections of the Gujarati News Press of Bombay give this work as Nirguṇa-mānasā-pūjā and the texts here are full. (Bṛhat-stotra-ratna-hāra, part 2, pp. 801-3 and Bṛhat-stotra-muktāhāra, part 2, pp. 424-427). The text comprises two parts, the first being the pupil’s questions as to how one could do the ritual of worship in the case of the one, attributeless and all-comprehending Ātman, and the second part being the teacher’s answers setting forth a scheme of ‘ideal’ worship. Abhinavagupta takes the former question-part and incorporates it in his work with an introduction, a few elaborations and a brief finish of his own. When we examine the mss. of this work of Śaṅkara we find that it is available in a shorter version also containing the former question-part only, but with a verse or two at the end containing a brief reply or explanation. We also see that the name of the work varies with each ms. almost.

In the Tanjore Descriptive Catalogue, No. 7400 is the same work, but called Svātma-pūjā and containing only the answer portion. This is the Burnell Ms. noted by Aufrechter on p. 751 b. of his Catalogus Catalogorum Vol. I. In the Descriptive Catalogues of the Madras Government Oriental Library, No. 8610 gives, like the Tanjore ms., only the latter answer-part but calls the work Ātma-mānasika-pūjā; No. 8611 in the same Catalogue represents a ms. of the whole work with both the question-part and the answer-part, but the work is here named Ātma-lingārcana; the next number, 8612, in the same Catalogue, contains
only the former part of question and is described in the
colophon as Dakṣiṇāmūrti-mānasa-pūjā(vidhi), and this
last is the same ms. as noted by Aufrecht in C.C., III. p.
52b, Sg. I. 112. In the Triennial Catalogues of the same
Madras Library there are two more mss., Nos. R. 1419
(n) and 1419 (o). These two texts contain only the
answer-part with a few lines at the end by way of
answer. The former of these two mss. is called Ātmā-
pūjā and the latter Nirguṇa-staka-pūjā. The readings of
these two mss. agree with those known to Abhinava-
gupta and the concluding verse of the latter, R 1419(o),
seems to be the germ out of which the first 12 verses of
Abhinavagupta’s Mahopadeśa-vimśatika have grown. We
have the same work of Śaṅkara in the Ātmā-līnga-pūjā-
paddhati in Hall, p. 132.

The 7th verse in the text in ms. R. 1419 (n) de-
cribes this worship as ‘Parā pūjā’, and this expression
is retained by Abhinavagupta in the last verse. In the
Bṛhat-stotra-ratnākara of the N. S. Press and in the first
part of one of the Stotra Collections of the Gujarati
Press, this shorter version is printed with the title Parā-
pūjā. Aufrecht notes also a ms. of this work with the
name Parā-pūjā. (B. iv. 68. C. C. I, 327a ). The
Yogavāsiṣṭha knows this work and the name Parā pūjā.
See VI a 38, 21 and the words here योजनेन परा स्मृता ।

I give below the correspondences between the latter
part of Abhinavagupta’s Mahopadeśa-vimśatikā and the
former part of the Nirguṇa-mānasa-pūjā of Śaṅkara,
showing also the differences which are only slight.

1 See my article on the Date of the Yogavāsiṣṭha in JOR.
Madras, XIII. p. 119.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahopadeśa-vimśatikā</th>
<th>Nirguaṇa-mānasa-pūjā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अन्नाज्ञान तृतीयोऽयानं 12c</td>
<td>Additions of Abhinava.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्गुणास्य च नाम किम् 12d</td>
<td>same 2a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पूर्णस्वातांहरुं कुत्र 13a.</td>
<td>same 2b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सवाज्ञानस्य चासनम् 13b.</td>
<td>same 2c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्वच्छास्य पादवर्धनं च 13c.</td>
<td>same 2d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गृहस्वातांहरुं कुत्र 13d.</td>
<td>same 3a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्मलस्य कुदस्तनामम् 14a.</td>
<td>वासो विश्वदर्श्य 3b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वस्त्रं विश्वोदर्श्य च 14b.</td>
<td>same 4a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्लोचन स्य गुनः 14c.</td>
<td>same 4b in Madras ms. R. 1419 (o); same in R. 1419(n) but 3d here. In the printed texts we read as 4c-d: निर्विशेषस्य का सूचा कोजाकारो निराकृते।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रम्यस्याभमर्ण कुत्र 14d.</td>
<td>same 4c in R. 1419(o) and same 3c in R. 1419 (n). But in the printed text we have 3c-d: अगोचरस्य त्वर्णस्य कुदस्तस्योपवेदितकम्।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्लोचनस्यौपवेदि: 15a.</td>
<td>same 4d in R. 1419(o); 4b in R. 1419(n). 4b in printed texts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुष्पं निर्विशेषस्य च 15b.</td>
<td>अन्नाज्ञान स्योऽयान: 15c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अग्राण्यस्य कुतो धूपः</td>
<td>5a in R. 1419 (o).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्गुणास्य कुतो धूपः</td>
<td>4c in R. 1419 (n).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्न्न्यवेदिः कि धूपः</td>
<td>5a in printed texts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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चशुहोत्नत्स्थ दीपक: 15d.

चशुहोत्नत्स्थ दीपकम्
5b in R. 1419 (o).
स्वप्रकाशस्य दीपकम्
4d in R. 1419 (n).
दीपाविः सर्बसाक्षिणः
5b in printed texts.

नित्यपुष्पस्य नैवेद्यम्
ताम्भूलं च कुतो विभोः: 16 a-b.

नित्यपुष्पस्य नैवेद्य निष्क्रमस्य
फलं कुतः। ताम्भूलं च विभोः
कुन्त्र 5a-b-c in R. 1419 (n).
निजान्तदैवतकुस्तत्स्य नैवेद्यं किं
भवेदिह्।
विश्वायन्दैवतकुस्तत्स्य किं ताम्भूलं
प्रकल्पते ॥
5c-d and 6a-b in printed texts.

प्रदक्षिणममन्त्स्य 16c.

स्वयं प्रकाशमानस्य
कुतो नौरजनं विभ: 17a-b.

स्वयं प्रकाशमानस्य
कुतो नौरजनं विभोः
same 7a in R. 1419 (o).
same 6c in R. 1419 (n).
same 7c in printed texts.

अविद्यवस्तत्स्य नैरति: 16d.

अविद्यवस्तत्स्य कानैरति:
6d in R. 1419 (n).
same 7d in D. 8612.

प्रमाणोद्वयवस्तुनः:
7d in printed texts.

स्वयं प्रकाशमानस्य
कुतो नौरजनं विभोः
same 6c-d in R. 1419 (o)
but with भवेत for विभोः:
same 6a-b in R. 1419 (n)
but with नौरजनविभिः at the end
स्वयंप्रकाशचित्राय:
योृस्तवकन्दिभासकः।
गीतेत्र श्रुतिभिस्ततस्य
नौरजनविभिः कुतः ॥
6c-d. 7a-b in printed texts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahopadeśa-vimśatika</th>
<th>Nirguṇa-mānasā-pūjā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>वेदवाचामवेदस्य</td>
<td>same in printed texts; 8a-b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कुतस्ततोत्र विधीयते । 17c-d.</td>
<td>same in R. 1419n; 7a-b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अन्तबैहिः पूर्णस्य कथमुद्वासनं</td>
<td>same except for विधो in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भवेत् । 18a-b.</td>
<td>place of भवेत् in D. 8612.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>अन्तबैहः संस्थितस्य चोद्वासन-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>विधि: कृतः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8c-d in printed texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भेदहीनस्य विषवत्र कथं च हवनं</td>
<td>an addition of Abhinava.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भवेत् । 18c-d.</td>
<td>लक्ष्मीनाथस्य दक्षिणा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पूर्णस्य दक्षिणा कृत्र 19a.</td>
<td>6b in R. 1419 (o).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>नित्यानाथस्य दक्षिणा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5d in R. 1419 (n).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नित्यवृप्तस्य तर्पणम्</td>
<td>additions of Abhinava.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नित्यजर्जन्य व्यापकस्य</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अप्रपयक्ष्य क्षमापणम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b-c-d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PARMĀRTHA-DVĀDAŠIKA

(otherwise called Advayadvādaśikā)

In Appendix C of his Abhinavagupta, An Historical and Philosophical Study (Chowkhamba Skt. Series Studies, Vol. I), Dr. K. C. Pandey has printed the texts of eight minor works under the title "Philosophical Stotras of Abhinava". The second of these is one in thirteen verses in various metres called the "Paramārthavādaśikā" ascribed to Abhinavagupta.

On p. 63 of his work, while dealing with the works of Abhinavagupta, Dr. Pandey notes that this short work is also known as Advayadvādaśikā and that its second verse 'Yadyatattva' etc. is quoted as from the Advayadvādaśikā by Ramyadeva in his commentary on Cakrapārinātha's Bhāvopahārastotra, under verse 45, (Kashmir Texts, 14, p. 45).

In fact Ramyadeva makes two citations at this place, 'तदुर्ल मया क्षत्तात्तात्तात्तिशान्तितस्तवे' and 'अद्वयद्वदशिकायाकायात
मयि' and we do not know if we are to suppose the word 'मयि' as understood (anuvṛtta) in the second instance also, and take the Advayadvādaśikā also as a work of Ramyadeva. Far from being contradicted, such an assumption will be found to be strengthened by the work itself, in whose last verse Ramyadeva is expressly mentioned as the author:

.
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भवोत्थमययमक्ष्यं गद्रश्त्रुगालविद्रावणं
प्रवोधधुरी धीमतामपि सक्ष्य यदुःपनम्।
सुधाम-गहनातवी-विहरणातितुष्ततुष्टुष्टमादि
अभेदकरिबृंहितं व्यधितरम्यदेवो हुरिः॥१

1. L. Silburn who has included this in her Volume of Hymnes de Abhinavagupta, (Publications de l' Institute De Civilisation Indienne, Paris, 1970) appears to have not seen this note of mine on the real author of this work being Ramyadeva, which had appeared originally in IHQ. Calcutta.
CHAPTER VI

ABHINAVAGUPTA AND THE BHĀSYA
ON THE YOGASŪTRAS

In his commentary on the Nāṭyaśāstra, Ch. 6, while explaining the Sthāyibhāvas first on p. 284 (Gaek. edn., Vol. I. 1926), and the Śāntarasa then on p. 335 (ibid.), Abhinavagupta quotes two passages from the Bhāsyā on Patañjali’s Yogasūtras ascribed to Vyāsa and mentions Patañjali himself as their author.

1. यथाह परम्पराः ‘न हि चैव एकस्यां रक्त इत्यन्यासु विरंक’

   p. 284.

2. ‘ताहं तु वैराग्यम ज्ञानस्येव परा कारणः’ इति मुज्ज्वविभुमुनैव

   p. 335.¹

While editing the text of Abhinavagupta’s commentary on the Nāṭya-śāstra, on the basis of the printed and manuscript materials, for purposes of quotation in my contributions on Rasa, I simply pointed out that these passages occur in Vyāsa’s Bhāsyā and not among the Sūtras of Patañjali, and left them there.²

---

1. Hemacandra who reproduces the commentary of Abhinavagupta extensively in his own Kavyānuśasana and the commentary thereon, reproduces the first passage with Patañjali’s name on p. 84 and drops the reference to Bhujaṅgavibhū while reproducing the second passage on p. 81.

Prof. P. V. Kane, in his contribution “Gleanings from the Abhinavabhārati”, in the *Pāthak Com. Vol.*, pp. 392-3, marks the two above-noted passages and he reverts to them in the *Annals of the B. O. R. I.*, Vol. XIX, p. 163. He notes that the passages cited by Abhinavagupta and ascribed to Patañjali by him, occur with slight difference in Vyāsa’s *Bhāṣya*, but says that consequently Patañjali is the author of the *Bhāṣya* also. He, no doubt, notes that the tradition of the *Bhāṣya* being a work of Vyāsa is handed down from Vācaspatimiśra downwards, but is disposed to view that, in this matter, Abhinavagupta is more reliable than Vācaspatimiśra! Prof. Kane notes also that under *Yogasūtras*, III. 44, the *Bhāṣya* cites Patañjali and that this must be a case of the author quoting himself!

Let me pursue the problem. In his commentary on the *Gītā* the *Gītarthasaṁgraha* (N. S. edn.), Abhinavagupta makes two quotations relevant to this discussion. On p. 232, he is giving his own peculiar interpretation of *Gītā*, IV. 34, ‘Tad viddhi pranipātena’, etc. He explains Pranipāta as Bhakti, Paripraśna as self-deliberation and Sevā as practice. The words ‘jñāninaḥ’ and ‘Tattva-darsīnaḥ’ are made by him adjectives to ‘Indriya-viśeṣāḥ’—one’s own senses, which have become enlightened.

“उपदेश्यति उप समीपे प्रापविष्यति । तथा हि तत्स्वमेव
darśyanītīt tatśvadāśin:। उत्तो हि ‘योग एव योगस्य उपाध्यायः
अहंमरा तत्र प्रज्ञा’ इति”

Here, the latter part, ‘Ṛtambhāra tatra prajñā’ is *Yogasūtra*, I. 48, but the former part ‘Yoga eva yogasya
upālīḥyāyah is an anuvīlī, not a quotation, of a passage in the Bhāṣya on III. 6: "भूमेरस्य इवमन्ततरा भूमिरित्यत्र योग एव उपाध्याय:।" Abhinavagupta mixes up the Sūtra and the Bhāṣya here. The second quotation is on p. 328 which shows that Abhinavagupta knew the Bhāsyakṛtī, though not as Vyāsa. Abhinavagupta says: उत्तरं च तत्त्रभवता भाष्यक्रता—'उभयाधीनस्मिन्तत्रवृत्तिनिरोध' इति। This passage occurs in Vyāsabhāṣya, I. 12, p. 17, Ānandaśrama edn. Does it mean that, as in the case of the Kārikās and the Vyrtti of the Dhvanyāloka, this dualism of the Mūlakāra and the Vyrttikāra is only to distinguish the two parts of a work, and not to mean that the two parts are by two different authors?

It may be suggested that since Yoga is primarily attributed to Hiranyagarbha, Abhinavagupta thought that the Yogasūtras were revealed by Hiranyagarbha, and the Bhāṣya was written by Patañjali. In the Śānta-rasa-discussion in the Abhinavabhāratī, the Yogasūtras are cited thrice, pp.335,338 and 340 (1926 ed.), and it is only in the case of the first of these quotations that Abhinavagupta says anything regarding the author. This first quotation on p. 335 forms the sentence previous to the quotation which Abhinavagupta explicitly ascribes to Bhūjaṅgavibhū; while he is so explicit in mentioning the author of the Bhāṣya-passage as Bhūjaṅgavibhū, he says regarding the quotation of a Sūtra of Patañjali himself: "तत्रभविर्द्दर्पुत्रकम्य—'तत्वपरंपुष्ण्यते: गुणवैतुष्ण्यम' इति।" But if we examine the following sentence and understand the full force of 'Eva' in 'Bhūjaṅgavibhūnaiva', we can see that Abhinavagupta means by his preceding 'Tatra-bhavān' only Bhūjaṅgavibhū. In his Mālinīvijaya-
vārttika, p. 19, (Kashmir Series of Text and Studies) Abhinavagupta quotes Patañjali as author of the Yoga-sūtra, III. 33. On pp. 190 and 240 of the Parātrimśikā (Kashmir Series), there are two references to one and the same Yoga-sūtra, namely III. 17, on p. 190 as said by Šeṣamuni and on p. 240 as Yoga-sūtra. In his Tantrāloka (Vol. VIII., p. 95), in ch. 13, Śl. 146, Abhinavagupta cites Yoga-sūtra III. 33 and mentions the author as Šeṣa mahāmuni: 'यत्रात्मित्वात्रा सर्व चेत्तूँचे शेषमहामुनि:' All these prove that Abhinavagupta took both the Sūtrakāra and the Bhāṣyakāra of Yoga as Patañjali.

There is yet one more quotation by Abhinavagupta bearing on this question. In his Iśvarapratyabhijnāvīmarśini (Kashmir Series, XII, pp. 200-201), Abhinavagupta quotes "चितिशक्तिरविपरिषामिनी" and ends the observation with the words 'द्विति गृह्य अनन्तेन'. This passage 'Citiśaktiḥ aparināmini' ascribed to Guru Ananta again reinforces the view that Abhinavagupta considered the Bhāṣya also as the work of Patañjali, for this passage occurs in the Bhāṣya on I. 2. (p. 6, Ānandāśrama edn.).

In his gloss on the Vijñānabhairava (Kashmir Series, VIII, p. 112), Śivopādhyāya cites the second quotation from the Yogabhāṣya appearing in Abhinavagupta's Gitārthasamgraha (उभमवधीननित्विविज्ञानिरोच:) and says on it: 'इति पत्रज्ञनित्वात्'. On pp. 55 and 66, Śivopādhyāya quotes from Patañjali, but in both cases here from the Sūtras (Sūtras III, 26–27 and II, 49–50).

In Jain literary tradition too, this confusion is seen. Guñaratna in his Tarkarahasya-dīpikā and Malliṣeṇa in his Śyādvāda-maṅjarī cite a passage found actually in
the Vyāsa Bhāṣya but which both of them ascribe to Patañjali. See Anekānta-jayapatākā, GOS. CV. Vol. II. (1947), Kapadia’s Introduction, p. XLIII.

At one stage of my investigation, I thought that, as in the case of the Gītā, so also in the case of the Yoga-sūtras and the Bhāṣya thereon, there must be some Kashmirian peculiarity. But an examination of practically all the Pratyabhijñā texts published in the Kashmir Series and elsewhere (TSS. for instance), has shown that no such peculiarity is there like Patañjali’s common authorship of both the Sūtras and the Bhāṣya. If we examine the works of Kṣemarāja, Abhinavagupta’s own pupil and a prolific writer of the system, we see that in Vol. VI of his commentary, the Uddyota, on the Svacchandatantra (Kashmir Series, 56), p. 51, Kṣemarāja quotes the Yogasūtra I-3 and I-24 and in his comments on the latter Sūtra says: ‘इत्येतत्त्वंतः स्वाभाविक भगवतेऽवासमूलिताः’ etc. If Abhinavagupta represented any tradition contradicting Vyāsa’s authorship of the Bhāṣya and holding Patañjali, the Sūtrakāra himself as the Bhāṣyakāra also, it is not possible that Abhinavagupta’s own pupil, Kṣemarāja, knew nothing of this tradition.

But how to explain Abhinavagupta’s ascription of Bhāṣya-passages, again and again, to Patañjali? This can be answered only by another question. In his Locana on the Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta has three remarks which contradict our knowledge.

1. On p. 63, N. S. edn., Ānandavardhana quotes from Vālmiki the verse ‘रविब्यक्ति तत्सौदं भाषयः’ etc. as an example of Atyanta-tiraskṛta-vācyā dhvani, resting on
the expression, ‘niśvāsāndhāḥ’. In the South Indian recension, this verse occurs in the Rāmāyaṇa in the Āraṇyakaṇḍa, Canto 16. It occurs in a description of Hemanta season by Lakṣmaṇa. But what does Abhinava-gupta say on this verse? He says that this is a verse spoken by Rāma: हेमन्तवर्णनि पञ्चवर्षाण्य रामस्य उक्ति-वियम्। In the edition of Gaspare Gorresio, this verse occurs in Āraṇya, 22, as śloka 13, with slightly different readings, but here again Lakṣmaṇa is the speaker, and not Rāma. In the North-Western recension edited by Messrs. Bhagavaddatta and Viśvabandhu Śāstrī, this verse occurs in Āraṇya, 22, as sl. 13, and here again as spoken by Lakṣmaṇa.

2. On p. 142, N. S. edn., Abhinava-gupta ascribes the Kādambarī-kathāsāra, which we know as a work of Abhinanda, to Abhinanda’s father, Bhaṭṭa Jayanta.

3. On p. 151, Abhinava-gupta gives an analysis of the Tāpasavatsaraṇa, the play of Anaṅgaharṣa Māyurāja, drawing attention to the poet’s skill in keeping up the thread of Vāsavadattā-vipralambha continuously through every one of the six acts. Here Abhinava-gupta names each act and cites a verse from each and in these citations, the verse cited as one from act IV actually occurs in act V, thus making two citations from act V, and none from act IV.

Regarding the second of the above three mistakes, Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar explained that when Abhinava-gupta spoke of the Kādambarīkathāsāra as a work of Bhaṭṭa Jayantaka, we had to take that the diminutive ‘ka’ in the end signifies Jayanta’s son. But
we have to take that the first and third instances in his *Locana* are slight mistakes natural in an encyclopaedic writer like Abhinavagupta. Abhinavagupta’s citation of *Vyāsabhāṣya* as *Patanjal*’s has to be placed on a par with the above instances from his *Dhvanyālokalocana*. For, with due deference to Prof. Kane, it is evident that none can attach greater weight on this question to the testimony of Abhinavagupta than to that of Vācaspatimiśra.


"तदुक्तं पतञ्जलिना—‘अपरिणामिति हि भोक्तशक्ति: अप्रति-सङ्क्रम्य च’* परिणामित्यवं प्रतिसंक्रान्तेव तद्वृत्तिमुनुपति —।"

This passage cited by Viṣṇubhaṭṭa occurs in the *Bhāṣya* as a quotation, with the introductory words "Tathā coktam" and Vācaspati identifies this as a quotation from Pañcaśikha, whom, according to Vācaspati, the *Bhāṣya* quotes rather often. This mistake is again like Abhinavagupta’s and must be ignored.

In the *Patanjal* section of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, the author simply reproduces this quotation as made by Viṣṇubhaṭṭa, with *Patanjal*’s name on p. 125 (Ānandāśrama edn.)², though the author knows on p. 127, *ibid.*, that the *Bhāṣya* was written by Vyāsa: ‘तद-भाषि व्यासभाष्ये योगसूत्रविवरणपरे, अत्यत्यमधिकारायं.’

---

1 The edition reads चापरिणामित्येष which is wrong.
2 Again on p. 130, the same reference is repeated.
Abhinavagupta, Śeṣa or Patañjali and Nānyadeva

In the reference extracted by us from the gloss of Abhinavagupta on the Īśvarapratyabhijñā of Utpala, we saw Abhinavagupta refer to the Yoga-author Patañjali, the Great Serpent, Śeṣa or Ananta, as ‘Guru’. What does this mean? This refers to the Śeṣa Āryās, the work which Abhinavagupta made into his Paramārthasaṁgroha. Abhinavagupta refers to Śeṣa’s Āryās as Ādhārakārikās and quotes from them in his Gitārtha- saṁgroha and Tantrāloka. Śeṣa is considered as Śeṣa Bhaṭṭāraka, a Guru of Abhinavagupta’s Pratyabhijñā school. Hence the reference to him as Guru.

It is said by Dr. K. C. Pandey, in his book on Abhinavagupta, that Abhinavagupta quotes in his Gitārthasaṁgroha from Śeṣa’s Āryās “as from a Śruti”, pp. 58-59. This is wrong, for the word ‘Śruti’ in the phrase प्रमाणभूतवृत्तिविरोधकः refers to Vedic passages like ‘ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मवेद हि तीर्थ’; and with “अस्ति हि तीर्थ” etc.”, we have the next sentence giving additional authority.1 Equally to be ignored is Dr. Pandey’s paragraph on p. 9 of his thesis on Abhinavagupta as an incarnation of Śeṣa, which he says is the tradition in dance-circles in South

1. In an attempt to reply to me on this point, Dr. Pandey explained in an article in the JOR. Madras, XIII. pp. 167-175 ‘The meaning of “Śruti” in the Philosophical Literature of Kashmir’ that Śruti as used by Abhinavagupta does not necessarily mean Veda, but refers primarily to the authoritative texts of the school of Kāśmir Śaivism. See especially pp. 170-4 of the above paper.
India. Neither our being natives of South India nor our touch for long with dance-circles bear out this tradition, which distance vouchsafed to Dr. Pandey. This is a bit of research on a par with another of Dr. Pandey on pp. 121-125, where he imagines Nānyadeva to have been quoted by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on the Nāṭyasāstra, on p. 255, Vol. I, Gaeck. edn. If Dr. Pandey had carefully seen p. 253, it must have been plain to him that the text on pp. 253 to 261 form not Abhinavagupta's commentary, but the commentary written and supplied by Mr. M. R. Kavi to fill a gap in the Mss. of the Abhinavabhratī. This the editor Mr. Kavi says in a footnote on p. 253; further, Abhinavagupta's colophon appears on p. 253. In the portion in which Dr. Pandey takes Abhinavagupta to have cited Nānyadeva, Abhinavagupta cites King Raghunātha of Tanjore of the 17th century! (See p. 255 itself). On p. 124 of his thesis, Dr. Pandey says: "For, we have ascertained from Mr. Rāmakṛṣṇa Kavi that the passage quoted by Abhinavagupta from Nānyadeva's commentary, given above, is actually found in the seventh chapter, called Rāgādhyāya, of the Ms. of Nānya's commentary". This is impossible; Mr. Kavi must have said that the passage cited occurred in the Rāgādhyāya and not also that the passage was quoted by Abhinavagupta. So Dr. Pandey need not have taken any trouble to reconsider Nānyadeva's date.

However, Dr. Pandey had continued to be under the illusion of Abhinavagupta quoting Nānyadeva, as he
repeats this error in the second revised edition of his thesis. Long ago, in my account of early music writers,¹ I had pointed out that Nānyadeva quotes Abhinavagupta, in his Bharata-bhāṣya preserved in a part of that work in a ms. in the BORI., Poona. This citation of Abhinavagupta by Nānyadeva occurs on p. 75, of the first part of the Bharatabhāṣya edited from the Indrakalā Music University, Khairagadh, M. P. (1961).

CHAPTER VII

A QUOTATION IN THE LOCANA OF ABHINAVAGUPTA

(i)

In his Locana on Uddyota One of the Dhvanyāloka, p. 48, N. S. Press edn., p. 245, KSRI. edn., Abhinavagupta makes the quotation ‘गामशख पुख्व पशुम’. While preparing the Index to the KSRI. edn. of the Dhvanyāloka with Locana etc., (Uddyota One), I gave for this the reference ‘Atharvaveda 8. 7. 11’, where such a line occurs. The identification caused some difficulty and I was not quite satisfied with the reference to Ath. V. 8. 7. 11 which alone I could give then.

I have now been able to find the source wherefrom Abhinavagupta must have quoted it. It is in the course of his commentary on the expression ‘वाच्यवाचक-संमिश्र: शब्दात्मा काव्यम’ in Ānandavardhana’s text that Abhinavagupta quotes this passage. Abhinavagupta’s characteristic ‘mano-dharma’ comes into play here, and he interprets the original as meaning that all the four are called Dhvani—the Vācyas, Vācaka, their Sammiśra or the Vyañgya that results from the union of Vibhāva, Anubhāva etc., and lastly Šabda or Šabdana, i.e. the Vyañjanā vyāpāra.
"वाच्यवाचकसहितः समिश्र इति मध्यमपदलोपी समासः।
‘गामश्व पुरुषं पशुम’ इतिविवृत्त समुच्योद्वरं चकर्येण विनापि।
तेन वाच्योषिते ध्वनिः, वाचकं शब्दोषिते ध्वनिः।
……संमिश्रः (or समिश्रते) विभावायुभावसंवलनं यथिध्वनिः……शब्दं शब्दं शब्दव्यापारः……
……सोशिते ध्वननादृप पवनिः।……

For such an interpretation, the word 'ca' would appear to be necessary to join the expressions वाच्यवाचकसमिश्र शब्दात्मा च। But Abhinavagupta says that there are expressions giving a cumulative sense even without the use of 'ca' and it is to illustrate this that he cites the expression 'गामश्व पुरुषं पशुम' with the explanation इतिविवृत्समुच्योद्वरं चकर्येण विनापि।

In view of the point involved in this illustration I think it is from the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali and a verse quoted therein that Abhinavagupta is making his citation. In Pāṇini 2. 2. 29 चारें द्वन्द्वः and the Vārttika thereon चारें द्वन्दवचनेनसमासेषमि चारसंम्ब्रत्यादनुक्षेमिष्ट हसः, Patañjali says :=

चारें द्वन्दवचनेनसमासेषमि चारसंम्ब्रत्यादनुक्षेमिष्ट हसः
अहरस्मयमानो गामश्व पुरुषं पशुमঃ।
वैव्यः तृप्ति सुराय द्वारे दुर्मती।


(ii)

On reading my above note identifying the source of the above-mentioned quotation in Abhinavagupta’s

*This line is quoted anonymously in Kṣīrasvāmin’s Nipatavayopasargavṛtti (Madras MS) also.
Dhvanyālokālocana. गामश्वं पुरुषं पशुम् Mm. P. V. Kane wrote: "I read...... your brief but interesting note on 'गामश्वं पुरुषं पशुम्' ......which you rightly trace to the Mahābhāṣya. May I draw your attention to the same arrangement (but in the nominative case) in such an old work as the Atharva Veda VIII. 2.25 where we read

सर्वो वै तत्र जीवति गौर्जन: पुरुषं पशुं ।

यत्रेतं ब्रह्म क्रियते परिधिर्जीवनाय कम् ॥

I hope this will interest you."

As noted in the Index compiled by me for the K.S.R.I. edn. of the Dhvanyāloka, Uddyota One, and as mentioned by me above, 'गामश्वं पुरुषं पशुम्' in the same form as quoted by Abhinavagupta, occurs in the Atharva Veda VIII. 7. 11. But the quotation made by Abhinavagupta, is to be traced to the citation in the Mahābhāṣya.

Śrī S. Ramaswami Śāstrī, a Life Member of the K.S.R.I., wrote to me with reference to this, that the verse cited by Patañjali, with some differences, occurs in the Taittirīya Aranyaka, Prapāthaka VI. Anuvāka 5.

आहरहन्यमानो गामश्वं पुरुषं जगत ।

वैवस्त्तो न तुप्पति पशुभिमार्जनेयं: ॥

The Anuvāka deals with Yamayajña and this verse is the fourth of a set of seven verses on Yama in the latter part of the Anuvāka.

( iii )

In Uddyota I'. 17/18 of the Dhvanyāloka, when dealing with the introduction of Alāṅkāras in such a way as not to hinder the Rasa, but to promote it
Ānandavardhana says that there are, however, poets in whom Alaṅkāras seem to gush forth, without their having to take any special effort to work the figures in and gives the brilliant example of Bāṇa in Kādambarī and Pravarasena in Setubandha (p. 87, 1928 Ns. ed.) In such cases, Ānandavardhana would concede to Alaṅkara an integral relation to Rasa (antaraṅgatva). But to such Alaṅkāras of Šabda as are by nature difficult of execution, like Yamaka, and to the extremes of Citra like the Bandhas, referred to properly as Duṣkaraṇas, Ānandavardhana would not concede this antaraṅgatva even though there may be cases of Yamakas which in a way, have Rasa. These are, according to him, cases of Rasa being subordinate (aṅga) and the Yamaka (aṅgin).

यत्तु रसवन्ति कानिचिद्यमकादीदिन हृदयन्ते, तत्र रसादनामक्षतर यमकाददेनां त्वज्ञतेव।

Commenting on the words: रसवन्ति कानिचिद्यमकादीदिन, Abhinavagupta says in the Locana: कानिचिददिति, कालिदासादिदि कालिदासादिदि कालिदासादि।

Now, to which work or portion of a work of Kīlāpāsa is Abhinavagupta referring here? For a long time, since my first study of the Dhvanyāloka and Locana, I had been taking this as a reference to Kālidāsa’s display of Yamaka in Raghuvamśa, Canto IX. The restraint, limited range, ease and grace of this Yamaka indeed make it probable that it is this that is referred to as the Rasavad-Yamaka of Kālidāsa by Abhinavagupta.

But later, it appeared that Abhinavagupta was most probably referring here to the short lyric in Yamaka, the Ghaṭakarparā, on which Abhinavagupta himself
wrote a gloss which was published in the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. In his gloss on śloka 20 here, Abhinavagupta offers some textual criticism, pointing out that this verse is not found in some versions and that, being defective as composition and inappropiate, it was not probably the verse with which the poet could have concluded his work. While saying so, Abhinavagupta observes: “We have heard that it was Kālidāsa who wrote this poem; and even an iota of such defect could not be imagined in his poetry; therefore the work should have ended with the verse previous to this.”

“किश्चां कर्ता महाकविः कालिदास इति अनुश्रुति मस्माभि:। न चास्य काव्य तुषारमाधिपि कल्पितयुक्तब्रजो मनोयेवयुक्तेष्योषि सहृदया:। तस्मात् प्राकृतं एव परिसमाप्तिश्लोक:।”

From this it could be legitimately held that it is the Ghaṭakarpāra that the Locana-passage quoted above refers to. That this is the real identity of the reference to Kālidāsa-Yamaka in the Locana is confirmed by the further general observations made by Abhinavagupta on the question of employing Yamaka in Vipralambharaṣa, his defence that here it is aprṭhag-yatnaniṛvartya rasaposaka and his quotation of two verses of Ānandavardhana rasākṣitātva and bhava-bhūtātva śrūṣṭi from the same context in the Dhvanyāloka which we have been considering.

अन्तः च यमकानों विप्रलम्बश्रुतः रसाकृतिशब्दबिध्यशब्दीत्यादि तथा अप्रत्ययत्ननिबंबर्त्यत्या निबन्ध: कृतः; येन प्रत्युत रसपरिपोषक-विशेषत्वशास्त्रविश्वासाश्रितापिदपरम्परालाभो यमकासम्पन्नः। तदुक्तम्—
रसाकृतिशब्द तथा यमकानों विप्रलम्बस्रुतः तस्य बलं: भास्यक्रियो भवेतु।
अप्रत्ययत्ननिबंबर्त्यं: सोश्च व्रजारो ध्वनी मतः।।
It may be seen that Abhinavagupta, in this place adopts a somewhat different standpoint, whereas in the *Locana*, he strictly follows Ānandavardhana. According to the latter and the *Locana*, Yamaka cannot be Rasāṅga, but ḥere Abhinavagupta argues that the Yamaka really offers such word-resources as could be, by interpretations, made to augment the Rasa.

1. The reading in the Dhvanyāloka is "निन्द्यन्तम्" II, p. 16.
CHAPTER VIII

ABHINAVAGUPTA'S POLYMATHY

In a note on 'The Nāṭya Śāstra and the Abhinavabhārati in the IHQ., X. 1, March, 34, Mr. Monomohan Ghosh proposes to discuss the 'principles connected with the interpretation' of the Nāṭya Śāstra (N.Ś.) and the chief object of the note seems to be to prove Abhinavagupta's nescience. The note has to be understood with reference to its etiology and it appears close upon a discussion on the architecture of the theatre described by Bharata in Chapter II of his N. Ś. in the previous numbers of the IHQ., in which Mr. Mankad, Mr. M. Ghosh, and myself took part. It is with reference to that discussion that Mr. Ghosh says in a footnote on p. 161 of this note that Mr. Mankad and Mr. Raghavan have given undue weight to the Abhinavabhārati (Abhi. Bhā.). A perusal of the studies of mine on some subjects of the N. Ś. and the Abhi. Bhā. published in the J. O. R. Madras will show how I have not been a blind Bhakta of Abhinavagupta, how I have often gone to the very text of the N. Ś. and not only that, how I have pointed out that Bharata's text itself has often to be quietly laid aside. Regarding the particular subject of Theatre-architecture, I have said only this much, that Abhinavagupta cannot be totally neglected, that at least to one who wants to consult Abhinavagupta it is plain that Raṅga-śīrṣa and Raṅga-pīṭha are two different places and the measurements of the various parts of the play-house in our interpretation differ from those of Mr. Ghosh. It cannot be said that our interpretation is not borne out by the text of the
N. S. itself and with our interpretation which satisfies us, we find that Abhinavagupta agrees.

In the Note under discussion, Mr. M. Ghosh has expanded the issue to one of a general challenging of Abhinavagupta's polymathy or of 'Abhinavagupta's omniscience' as he says. He quotes a passage from the Abhi. Bhā. where on the subject of Prākṛt grammar, Abhinavagupta refers us for further knowledge to such Prākṛt grammar works as Prākṛtadipikā, the Vṛtti on the Prākṛtasūtras by Utpala and the work called Paddhati. Basing himself on this passage, Mr. Ghosh says that Abhinavagupta "was not very well informed about Prākṛt Grammars and Grammarians". The reason given for this conclusion is that Abhinavagupta has not mentioned the known authorities, Vararuci, Bhāmaha and Caṇḍa, but has mentioned 'unknown' writers. This, after all, is negative evidence and it is too much to jump from this to the conclusion that "any faith in Abhinava's omniscience will have to be given up."

None has blindly taken Abhinavagupta as 'Sarvajña' but it would seem that Mr. Ghosh asks us to take Abhinavagupta as an 'Ajña' and not to worry ourselves over the text of his commentary, and waste time in reading it. For, he says that, to add to the inherent unreliability of the Abhi. Bhā. its text is in a wretched condition and that a critical edition of the Abhi. Bhā. is well nigh an impossibility, for a long time. This remark applies equally to the "wretched conditions of materials" regarding the text of the N. Ś. itself which alone Mr. Ghosh proposes to rely upon and study. At best Mr. Ghosh has argued only for the need for strenuous, careful, devoted and patient research in Nāṭya Literature.
To return to Abhinavagupta's alleged lack of information on Prākṛt Grammars, the evidence cited by Mr. Ghosh may be compared to Bāna's omission to praise Vālmīki and his epic in the introductory stanzas of his Harṣacarita. That Vararuci, Bhāmaha and Caṇḍa are the only universal authorities who exhaust the field, that a work called Prākṛtadīpikā, a Prākṛta Grammarian named Utpala and his Sūtra Vṛtti, and another Prākṛt Grammar called Paddhati are insignificant works and that Abhinavagupta's omission to refer to the former set of writers and his reference to the latter, argues his ignorance of Prākṛt Grammar Literature is to say too much. To Abhinavagupta are due our thanks for enriching our information on Prākṛt Grammar Literature. On the subject of Prosody, Abhinavagupta has quoted Jayadeva and Kātyāyana and not Piṅgala. Jayadeva at least is referred to twice by Namisādhū and his work is available and has more usually been printed. The quotation from a Kātyāyana's treatise on Prosody is a pure gain to our knowledge of Prosody Literature.

In the first paragraph of his Note, Mr. Ghosh has been least anxious to examine the Ms. of the Abhi. Bhā. before he passes his judgment that Abhinavagupta's commentary is an "one-sided version". Mr. Ghosh says: "This commentator (Abhinava), as was very natural for a scholar in those days, followed the recension of the work that was available to him and probably did not know that there might be other recensions of the same. As a result of this, Abhinavagupta's commentary loses much of its value". (P. 161).

Now, there is concrete evidence to prove that Abhinavagupta knew the two chief recensions of the
In his *Abhi. Bhā.* itself, there are three places where Abhinavagupta himself says that another recension exists. This has already been pointed out by me more than once, in my exposition of the concept of Lakṣaṇa¹ and 'Writers quoted in the *Abhi. Bhā.*' published in the *J.O.R.*, Madras. It is well known that on Lakṣaṇas, the *N.Ś.* has two recensions, the Anuṣṭūbh and the Upajāti recensions as I have called them in my exposition of Lakṣaṇa. Abhinavagupta here notices the existence of two 'Pāṭhakramas', of other Mss. containing a different set of Lakṣaṇas, and says that he chooses for the main exposition the recension handed down to him by his teacher and that then and there he notes the Lakṣaṇas of the other Pustakas also and explains them. He says:

“तथा च मतान्तरेण भरतभुविलेक्षण अन्यथापुहेश्वरेन
लक्षणेन च नामान्तरेक्षण लक्षणान्तरेक्षण च ह्यवहारं करोति।
तत्त्व एव पुस्तकेषु भेदो द्वयते, तत्त्व च दश्यिण्याम्।
एतरितान् (प्रथमो) इहेशक्रस्तु असमदुपाध्यायवपर्य्यागतः।”


Similarly at the beginning of the chapter on metres (chap. XV), Abhinavagupta speaks of the prevalence of two recensions. He says:

“तत्रेहायेन भरतभुविलेक्षणान्तरादिदिः (?) कैलितृ
कितिक्षणां स्वीकृतम् इति दिविषयं पुस्तकैरमैव द्वयते।
मथ्येच च चिन्तनाय (चिन्तन 1) पुस्तकैव उभयमापि पञ्चैति,
एतेभद्रा एतःसंस्रवा आत्मशास्त्रि (ख) शास्त्रीयत्यथः।”


---

¹ See Ch. I. in my ‘Some Concepts of Alaṅkāra Śāstra’, Adyar Library.
Again, Abhinavagupta notes while commenting on the Guṇas and the Doṣas that in certain Mss. the Doṣa-section precedes and in certain others, the Guṇa-section but that the majority of Mss. read the Doṣa-section first.

“केशुचित्तु पुस्तकेषु च एष ग्रन्थः पञ्चादृ हस्यते। वाहुत्येन प्रथम हस्यत हि तथैव व्याचक्षक्षमे॥”

When dealing with Śānta Rasa, on which there was controversy, Abhinavagupta advocates not only the possibility of Śānta as a Rasa but also its being the leading Rasa and the Rasa at the basis of all other Rasas. To reinforce the latter idea, Abhinavagupta says that it is because of its basic character that Bharata deals with it at the very beginning of his treatment of Rasas and that in some old mss. of the N. Ś.¹ the Śānta Rasa section is found first, i.e. before that on Śṛṅgāra Rasa which is found first in many mss.

अथ सर्वप्रकृतितत्वाभिमानाय पूर्वमभिमानम् ।
तथा च चिरंतनपुस्तकेषु ‘स्थायिभावान् रससत्यमपनेष्याम्’
इत्यन्तरं ‘शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभावात्मकः’ इत्यादिशान्तः-
रक्षण पञ्चयते ।


¹. See also my ‘The Number of Rasas’, Adyar Library, IIIrd edn., 1975, p. 198.
CHAPTER IX

ABHINAVABHĀRATĪ—IS THERE A SECOND WORK OF THAT NAME?

By Abhinavabharatī, we have always understood the commentary of Abhinavagupta on the Nāṭya Śāstra. But recently I came across a couple of quotations under this name made by Abhinavagupta himself in a work of his, which can only mean that there is a second work of Abhinavagupta of this name which, on the showing of the two verses quoted, appears to be a Kāvya written by him.

In his Iśvarapratyabhijñāvivrtimarsini (Kashmir Series Texts and Studies, LXII and LXV), Abhinavagupta has these two interesting quotations:

(1) LXII. p. 48:

यद्योक्तमभिनवभारत्यापम—

उपचारचार च सा कृतिमानिति

मुनिमन्यलभोगसमर्थेः।

परितुतोष च सोपिद्विरागिनां

न हि सुखं करणाधिर्यं सुखम्॥

(2) LXV. p. 138:

यदभिनवभारती—

प्रभुपरिचयाधर्मचैव धियं च पराक्रमं

परिजनन्तो ध्वंते नास्य स्वकं स्फुरितं कवचित्।

रजनिशार्याः शोच्यर्वं ये तथोभिरशिवयः

वहरभिमृत्तः पश्यंते च क भवन्ति मुहूर्त्तः॥ इति॥
The latter verse could be a detached Subhāśita; indeed several Subhāśitas of Abhinavagupta are known from his citation in his Locana; and on this basis, the second Abhinavabhāratī may be taken as a collection of Abhinavagupta's stray verses. But the former verse suggests a poem with a specific theme, with a sage and a lady gratifying the former.

Nor could this name Abhinavabhāratī apply to a poem of an author different from Abhinavagupta, although, unlike what he does usually, he does not, in both the above-mentioned instances, introduce his quotations with the words 'मयः' or 'ममः'.

CHAPTER X

WRITERS QUOTED IN THE ABHINAVA-
BHĀRATĪ*

I

The Abhinavabhārati of Abhinavagupta, the only available commentary on the Nātya Śāstra opens our eyes to a vast vista of the Nātya literature that existed before Abhinavagupta, independent treatises on drama, dance and music, as also regular commentaries on the Nātya Śāstra of Bharata. Its importance to the student of the history of Nātya and Saṅgīta cannot be overemphasised. Though we know of the antiquity of Nātya and Saṅgīta, it seems that their study had a renaissance in Kashmir in the time of Jayāpiḍa. Earlier works as of Māṭṛgupta existed but it was a period of more vigorous study that began in the time of king Jayāpiḍa. Kalhaṇa says in his Rājataraṅgini (IV 420-484) that while wandering incognito with the name Kallaṭa, in the kingdom of Paunḍhra-
vardhana ruled by prince Jayanta, Jayāpiḍa saw in

* Mention of many of the writers quoted in the Abhinava-
bhārati is already made by Dr. Sankaran, in his book, Theories of Rasa and Dhvani* chap. VIII, pp. 92–96. A few names have also been noticed by Mr. R. Ramamurti (vide J. O. R. previous numbers). This paper of mine brings to light more writers on Dramaturgy who have not been noticed previously and further collects the fragments of some of the writers quoted, explains the quotations wherever possible and discusses related issues also.
a temple the presentation of Nāṭya by court ezans according to the science of Bharata which he knew well. Jayāpiṇḍa lived sometime with one of those court ezans, Kamalā by name and brought her with himself to Kashmir as a queen. Naturally Jayāpiṇḍa evinced great enthusiasm for Nāṭya and asked his court-poet Udbhata to write a commentary on the Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata. Udbhata’s commentary is the first and it inaugurated an era of vigorous study of the Nāṭya Śāstra. This period produced innumerable works and it closed with the time of Abhinavagupta, after which the Śāstra began to flourish in Central and South India.

Abhinavagupta’s life was a full and rich one. He was a great Śaivite Ācārya who had written numerous works on Śaivism. His family itself was full of scholars. After he became a Śaivācārya (Śivasmrṭi-kṛtārtha) as he himself says, he took to Poetics and Dramaturgy. Rather it was drama that he studied at first. His first guru was Bhaṭṭa Tota or Tauta, whose work, the Kānyakautaka, as we shall see presently, generally spoke of poet and poetry, specially contributed a theory of Rasa-realisation and dealt with Dramaturgy at length. On this Abhinava commented, as he himself says in his commentary on the Dhvanyālōka, III, p. 178. Abhinava was studying the Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata under Tauta, the good Brahmin, Sadvipra-Tota as he describes his teacher in the introductory verse at the beginning of the Abhinavabhāraṭi, but meantime he had sought Bhaṭṭendurāja, a poet, and had studied the Dhvanyālōka under him, the result of which study is the commentary on the
Dhvanyāloka by him, called the Locana, which by its excellence displaced the older commentary called Candrikā, written by one of Abhinava's own ancestors (pp. 123 and 185 Locana). It is after writing the Locana that Abhinava took up the stupendous task of a commentary on the Nāṭya Veda. The talents required to undertake that task must be of a many-sided nature, possessing mastery over Alaṅkāra Śāstra, the Daśarūpaka, Dance and Music. The problems of the Nāṭya Śāstra are many. Unless the bulk of early literature such as Kohala's work etc. is unearthed, these problems cannot be solved. Most of the ancient works were available to Abhinavagupta. Even then we can see that explanations in many places are imaginary or merely grammatical. This is true of many things in the text of the Bhāratīya Nāṭya Śāstra itself. But Abhinava's was the best commentary and it became a famous authority read widely. Śāradātanaya says that he wrote his Bhāvatprakāśa basing it on the work of Abhinavagupta, though as a matter of fact, this is only a courteous remark, Śāradātanaya being no follower of Abhinava. But in his time and afterwards the Abhinavabhārati became the one standard work on Nāṭya. As far as needed in the Alaṅkāra Śāstra, Hemacandra freely reproduced its passages. Rāmacandra's Nāṭyadarpana, in its Vṛtti, completely reproduces many a passage of the Abhinavabhārati. So also Catura Kallinātha's commentary, Kalānidhi, on Śāṅgagadeva's Saṅgītaratnākara. The Saṅgītaratnākara itself bases its last chapter, the Nārtanādhyāya on the Abhinavabhārati. As for instance, see the section on Nāṭya-dharmī and Lokadharmī.
As a great scholar, master of many Śāstras, Abhinava has occasion to quote authorities of many branches of study in his voluminous commentary on the Nāṭya Śāstra. Thus while commenting on the word ‘Sampravartate’ chap. X, p. 317, Vol. II, Mad. Ms. (GOS. II. p. 95) he quotes Bharṭmitrācārya, a scholar of Mīmāṃsā and Vyākaraṇa. Bharṭmitrācārya was one of those who made the Mīmāṃsā, Lokāyata. Vide Śloka Vārttika, p. 4 Chowk, edn. Pārthasārathi comments on Śl. 10 thus—

मीमांसा हि भर्त्मित्रादिदिमः अलोकायतैव सति लोकायतीश्चत।

As a grammarian, he is quoted in Mukula’s Abhidhāvrttimātya p. 17 Nir. S. edn. He is given there as the author of the well-known Kārikā on the 5 kinds of Lakṣaṇā, Abhidheyena Sambandhāt etc. which is quoted by all writers. Abhinava quotes him to show how sometimes the origin of a new significance to a root as a result of the added Upasarga is not a rule. After briefly speaking of this Anityatva of the Upasarga-arthayoga on the authority of Bharṭmitrācārya Abhinava says that he stops this grammatical discussion since it will tire the prakṛtādhikārins i.e. students of Nāṭya. This reference is to show the nature of the sort of references occurring in the Abhinavabhārati. I shall mention one by one the authors and works thus quoted, giving less attention to writers of extraneous subjects and more to writers on Nāṭya and Saṅgīta. I do not deal with any of the poets whose verses are quoted. The poets quoted must be the subject of a separate paper. There are
many valuable names, one such being Ḍāsa, who is
twice quoted. I shall make one exception and mention
one poet, belonging to the family of Abhinavagupta.

At the end of the Parātrimsikā, written for the sake
of one Karṇa, and Abhinava’s own brother named
Manoratha, Abhinava gives his geneology thus: The
Kūṭastha is Atrigupta; Abhinava’s father is Chukhala
and grandfather Varāhagupta. This father Cukhala
or Chukhalaka is given in the Mad. Ms. of the
Abhinavabhārati as Duṭkhala.

इत्यं दशमस्थ्यायं व्याच्छे च समासतः १
शिवस्मृतिकताथौऽचि च परार्थः दुःखलामजः ॥

—Vol. II, p. 325

This Duṭkhala is evidently a mistake for Cukhala
which seems to be the correct name since it is so given
many times in the Parātrimsikā and the Mālinītantra-
vārttika.

1. P. 251 Gaek. edn. The editor suggests in the brackets
that Ḍāsa may be Bhāsa. The name Ḍāsa and one Anuṣṭubh
Verse of his on Śakāra are again found on p. 433. Vol. II?
Mad. Ms. अथ च (तथा च) हासस्य श्लोकः—‘प्राकृतेद्वश शकास्य
विमृतिनां मसिद्धये। तद्विभूतिरप्रभवे तात्त्वत्वेव प्रकाशिता॥’ Ḍāsa may be
a mistake for Bhāsa or Hāla or for anything. But why should
not there be a poet and dramatist called Ḍāsa?

(The references to the Abhinavabhārati are to page numbers
of the edition of the Nātya Sāstra with the Abhinavabhārati
in the Gaek. series and to the ms. in the Govt. Oriental
Mss. Library, Madras ).
The Abhinavabhāratī, at the end of chapters 20 and 27 mentions another guru of Abhinava besides Tota and Bhāṭṭendurāja. He is called Nṛsimhagupta alias Mukhala and is given as the teacher of Abhinava-gupta in the lore of music.

Originally from the gupta in the Samskṛta name and from the vernacular name Mukhala, which resembles Cukhala, the name of Abhinava’s father, I thought that this music-teacher of Abhinava might be one of Abhinava’s family. Recently I came across a Ms. called Ḩiṣvarapratyabhijñāvimārśini-Vyākhyā, an anonymous commentary on the commentary of Abhinava on the Ḩiṣvarapratyabhijñā of Abhinava’s Paramaguru Śrīmad Utpaladeva. It is described under R. No. 4353, p. 6399 in the Triennial Catalogue of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, 1922–23 to 1924–25. From the opening sentence of that work we are able to identify that this Nṛsimhagupta is none else than Abhinava’s own father. The Ḩiṣvarapratyabhijñāvimārśini-Vyākhyā says—
Thus the father of Abhinava whose vernacular name alone as Cukhala, we knew till now, had the Samskṛta name as Nṛsimhagupta or Narasimhagupta. Abhinava learnt the Geyavidyā under his own father. The name ‘Mukhala’ as given in the Ms. may be a mistake for Cukhala. We also come to know now that Abhinava’s mother was named Vimalā.

From the Abhinavabhāratī we know of two more members of Abhinava’s family. One is Abhinava’s paternal uncle, Vāmanagupta, a poet, one of whose verses, Abhinava quotes to illustrate Hāsyābhāsa.


The other name is Yaśorāga. Abhinava says that Yaśorāga is his own father’s maternal grandfather. Such a distant relative to be specially referred to in a manner which shows that Abhinava seems to be proud of his connection with him, should have been a great man. But of him we know little except what is said in this reference. Abhinava ends his commentary on the sixteenth chapter thus—
Coming to Abhinava’s Vidyākula we already know that Bhaṭṭa Tauta is his guru in Nāṭya śāstra. It is really Tauta that is a prominent figure of landmark in the history of the Nāṭya śāstra and it is a pity that his Kāvyakautuka is lost. The few available glimpses, speaking so amply of the greatness of that work, only heighten our sorrow. Tota’s definition of Pratibhā very soon became classic and Kṣemendra quotes it in his Aucityavicāracarca, mentioning Bhaṭṭa Tauta by name while many others quote it anonymously.

—Aucityavicāracarca. K.M. Gucchaka I, p. 155

Tota’s definition of Kavi and Kāvya are equally famous and are quoted by many anonymously, as for instance by Hemacandra. Kāvyānuśāsana p. 3, K. M. edn. Māṇikyacandra quotes it, mentioning the source by name. Mammaṭa adopts Tota’s definition and briefly says of poetry that it is Lokottaravarṇanāṇipuṇa-kavikarma. Commenting on this, Māṇikyacandra says:

—p. 7, Mysore Ed. Kāvyaprakāśa
With reference to these definitions of Tota's of Pratibhā, Kavi and Kāvyā, we have to consider a similar quotation by Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikshita in his Kāvyadarpaṇa (16th century).

स्मृतिव्यर्थतविषया मतिरागामिगोचरा ।
बुद्धिस्तात्तकालिको शोका प्रज्ञा बैकालिकी मता ॥
प्रज्ञा नवनवोन्मेवशालिनी प्रतिभा चिन्दुः ।
दे वर्णनी गिराते देव्या: शास्त्रं च कविकर्मे च ॥
प्रज्ञोप्यं तयोरायं प्रतिसोजुवत्मन्तिमयः ।


Tauta's definition of Pratibhā occurs here with a slight change. This quotation is anonymous. It will be surprising if it is a fact that at such a distant time in the South, Rājacūḍāmaṇi had access to Tota's Kāvyakautuka; in case we grant that, these verses may occur in some other place in the Kāvyakautuka. Perhaps some later writer adopted Tota's definition into his.

Tota's definition of Kāvyā quoted by Hemacandra and Māṇikyacandra is quoted in the commentary on the Vyaktiviveka printed in the Triv. series.

1. cf. तिष्ठा च सा (बुद्धि:) स्मृतिः मति: प्रज्ञेति । अतिक्रान्तस्य अर्थस्य सम्बन्धाय स्मृतिः । वर्तमानस्य मन्त्रीर मति: । अनावतस्य प्रज्ञात्री प्रज्ञेति । सा तिष्ठकारापि कविनामुपकर्ता ।


2. cf. हि वाङ्कमयस्मयस्य, शास्त्रं काक्ष्यं ।—Ibid., I. 2, p. 2.

3. Earlier than Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikshita, Vidyāeakravarttin (early 14th century) from the South gives the same verses anonymously in his com. Sampradāya-prakūśini on Kāvyaprakūśa (T.S.S. Part I, p. 13)—S.S. Janaki
There is another quotation in Hemacandra from Tota, in which Tota speaks of the greatness of the poet, whom he calls as Sage and Seer. Hemacandra quotes the verses of Tota while speaking of the etymology of the word Kavi. The Kavi has Darśana and Varṇanā. Without the latter the Sage and Seer does not become a poet. Mere thought is not poetry but only thought in poetic cast called Varṇanā.

Tota is the first teacher of Abhinava in Alāṅkāra and Abhinava's commentary on Tota's Kāvyakautuka is Abhinava's first work in Alāṅkāra. Abhinava refers to this commentary of his in his Locana, III Ud. Kāvyakautukāvivaraṇa seems to be its name. The context where Abhinava refers to it in his Locana is Śānta Rasa. There seems to be a brilliant exposition of Śānta as the greatest Rasa in the Kāvyakautuka.
Tota is not often referred to in the *Locana*, which often quotes the views and verses of Abhinava’s other guru, Bhaṭṭendurāja who taught him the *Dhvanyāloka*. There are however two more references to Tota in the *Locana*. The first of these two is on p. 29.

Further it is Tota who demolished the theories of Lollaṭa and Saṅkuka on the subject of Rasa-realisation and probably expounded also a little in his *Kāvyakautuka* the theory which Abhinava laterly expounded. Abhinava after stating the view of Śrī Saṅkuka says at the beginning of its refutation:

—p. 275, Gaek. Edn.

Tota has criticised Saṅkuka’s ideas of Naṭa’s Anukaraṇa in his work. In this same context,
Hemacandra and Māṇikyacandra have in the place of the above sentence of Abhinava, the following:

नैतर्द्वैतिके भद्धतौः।

Thus the order of the Rasa-theorists is Lollaṭa, Saṅkuka, Tota, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and Abhinvagupta. The theory propounded by Abhinava is a slight change of that of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and might have been taught by Tota himself. There is no evidence of Tota having refuted Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka also. It is not unlikely that the Ṣṛdayadarpaṇa, which in style and execution is a work that can be compared to the Kāvyakautuka, came after Tota wrote his work.

References to Bhaṭṭa Tota in the Abhinavabharati are innumerable. References to him as the teacher of Abhinava in Nāṭya are two, one in the beginning of the commentary and the other at the end of the commentary on chapter XIX,

संश्वतत्वदनोदितनागतत्वचेद—
तत्त्वार्थमथिंजनवाहिनिभिंचितसिद्धिहेतुः।
महेश्वराभिनवगुप्तपद्मग्राहिष्ठः
संश्वतत्वचितविभिना विश्वदीकरोति॥

—in p. 1. Gaek. Edn. Śl. 4

दिजवतोतिनिहितपि सन्ध्यध्यायार्थत्वचगटनेयम्।
अभिनवगुप्तेन कृता शिवचरणभ्रोजमधुपेन॥

—Last verse, Chap. XIX. p. 543, Mad.Ms.; GOS. III, p.82

There are many references to the interpretations of difficult texts suggested by Tota. These are not given here; but only fragments of his Kāvyakautuka,
quoted by Abhinava, so that scholars may have an idea of the further nature of that work. *Anuvādas* or references to the views of Tota in his *Kāvyakautuka* occurring in *Abhinavabhāratī* are also given.

1. Commenting on the text of Bharata वैलोक्यस्यास्य सबस्य नाटच भावानुकीर्तनम् Abhinava at great length, explains the significance of the word ‘Anukīrtana’, differentiates it from ‘Anukaraṇa’ or Imitation, criticises Anukaraṇa and says that the text of the *Kāvyakautuka* also on this subject must be taken to mean this.

तस्मादनियतानुकारो नाटयासिति न अभिमित्वयम्। अस्म- दुपाध्यायक्रकायकोकौतुकेदप्तेवेत्र अभिमायो मन्तवः न त्व- नियतानुकारोपिण।


Abhinava’s point is this. Drama is not exactly Imitation-Anukaraṇa. That is, the idea of Anukaraṇa must be modified. Imitation which is Drama is not the imitation which is the basis of laughter, of the Hāsyarasa.

पर्चेष्टानुकरणात् हासः समुपजायत।

—N. S. VII 116

Some others seem to have modified Anukaraṇa into aniyatānukāra. Abhinava refutes this and says that the proper word for it is what Bharata has given, Anukīrtanam, which he explains as Anuvyavasāya.

तदिदमनुकीर्तिनमनुव्यवसायविशेषो नाट्यापपपप्यो नानु- कार इति अभिमित्वयम्।
तेन अनुभवसायविषयिकायं नाट्यम्।
तस्मात् अनुभवसायतमकं कीर्तिनं रूपितविकल्पसंबद्धनम् नाट्यम्।


2. In his commentary on the fourth chapter, Abhinava quotes Tota on the dances in the pūrvaraṅga.

यथोर्त्ते भवति महत्ता तेन्—“पर्योगक्षेत्रास्य प्रयोगः” हृति


3. In chapter six, on Rasas, Abhinava quotes Tota. Tota opines that Rasas are primarily in Nāṭya only, for it is necessary for Rasa-realisation that a thing must be made pratyakṣa by acting. This Rasa-realisation can also be in Drṣṭya-kāvyya if the descriptions are powerful enough to make the story appear so vivid as drama enacted before our mind’s eye.

न नाथय एव च रसः काव्येषदिन नाट्यायमान एव रसः।
काव्यार्थविषये हि प्रत्यक्षकल्पसंबद्धनोदये रसोदय हृत्यापाध्यायः
यदाहुः काव्यकौतुके—

प्रयोगक्षेत्रानापि काल्ये नास्वादसम्मवे।
वर्णनोत्तक्तिकामोगप्रौढोक्त्या सम्प्रगपिता।

उदाहनकान्ताचन्द्राधा भावः प्रत्यक्षवस्तुक्तः ॥ हृति


There is no possibility of delection unless the poem attains the state of dramatic presentation, Prayog-gatvam anāpanne. Therefore, Rasa is realised perfectly only in drama-Nāṭyāya māna eva rasaḥ. Such Rasa-realisation can be from a Kāvya also if the description is brilliant, if it is as powerful and living as
if enacted before our eyes. The master-poet's Praudhokti has that power to make things like garden, heroine, moon etc. appear as if they are seen with the eyes-pratyakṣavat sphuṭaḥ. Others however hold a different view of Rasa-realisation in Kāvyā but Abhinava follows his teacher and says that Kāvyā is in essence dramatic, and hence can evoke Rasa. But he adds that greater than the narrative and descriptive Mahā-Kāvyā, it is drama that is Kāvyā par excellence. He quotes Vāmana here:

सन्दृश्यं दशरूपकं श्रेयं। अन्ये तु काव्येश्वपि गुणाल्पकारः
सौन्दर्यालिक्ष्यकं रसचर्चणामहुः। वर्यं तु ृतुं काव्यं
तात्त्वजन्यतो दशरूपकमेव। . . . तत्व एवोच्चते "सन्दृश्यं
दशरूपकमिति। . . . काव्यं च नाटकमेव . . . .

4. The fourth quotation from the Kāvyakautuka is on the 10 Avasthās of Śrīgāra.

यदा तु विश्राममाध्यता न भवति, तदा स्वातन्त्र्यम्। तदुक्तम्-
अस्मदुपाध्यायब्रह्मलोके-नेन—
स्वातन्त्र्येण प्रबृहो तु सर्व्राणिषु सम्मवः' हृदि ।

Bharata discusses the question, how in Śrīgāra, which is rati-prabhava developed from the Sthāyin called Rati, there appear Bhāvas of the Karuṇa Rasa? The reply is that these Bhāvas appear in the second aspect of Śrīgāra called Vipralambha, which is of ten stages or states as shown in the Vaiśīka Śāstras. It is only as Vipralambhāṅga that these ten states appear in the Nāyaka or Nāyikā. There are other places where
independently or in the absence of Śṛṅgāra, these states appear. These can appear in all beings and have nothing to do with Vipralambha, when they are thus ‘Śvatantra’. Abhinava gives the illustration of the states in Rāvaṇa, where also they are Śvatantra, since in Rāvaṇa, it is a case of Rasābhāsa.

5. In the commentary on chap. XIII Tota. is quoted on Nātyadhamī and Lokadharmī.

यथोक्तमस्मदुपाध्यायः:—

यद्वासिति न तत्रास्य कवेत्त्रेणनमहति ।

यष्ठासम्भवि तत्र यात्सम्भव्यत्र तु धर्मतः ॥


6. The next reference is in chap. XIV.

यतु उपाध्यायः: कव्यकौँकुके रसोहेश्परश्चोऽसे 'त्यादि

निरूपितं तदृष्टान्यायतयः व न युगैतवयम् ।


7. The seventh quotation from the Kāvyakautuka is in the fifteenth chapter.

“यथापि नात्कादिःएकविरचनकाले परिपक्वश्रस्य

न क्रमशतिमाःः तथाप्योद्वारार्थिया कर्त्यतत्” इत्यादि:।

बन्धस्य यो युक्तोद्वस्य: तत्रिस्पति: प्रवचनश्वायः:।

तत्सम्पतिःमित्रायाशिरनिर्विचिन तदमिथायारोपणामिति । स एव

क्रम इत्युपाध्यायः। यदादि:—

“महाकविनां पद्वेशदाचामाराहुक्षतामू।

नासंस्त्रृष्य पद्मस्पर्शौ सम्पत्तोपायनपद्वति: ॥

8. In chapter 16, in the commentary on the section on the 36 Kāvyā Lakṣaṇas, which has two recensions in the text of the N. Ś. Abhinava says that he follows mainly the Upajāti recension which has been handed down to him from his teacher.

उदेश्यक्रमस्तु अस्मद्यपाठध्यायपरम्परागतः।

There is evidence to show that the Kāvyakautuka dealt with the 36 Lakṣaṇas. Vide my paper on Lakṣaṇa in J.O.R. VI. 1932, pp. 54–82. Abhinava, on p. 404, in the same chapter, refers also to the view of Tota that Alaṅkāras multiply by mixing with the Lakṣaṇas. In a quotation from Tota found in a further context, there is mention of Lakṣaṇa along with Alaṅkāra, Guṇa etc.

9. In chapter XIX, on the Sandhis of a drama, Abhinava quotes Tota who says that all actions have the five stages, Prārambha etc. The text is bad and this much can be reproduced here.

उपाध्यायास्तवाहुः। "सर्वमेतिईर्वं पक्षसत्त्वेव। न हि क्षिप्रिद्विश्वपत्रोऽऽऽऽ"
—Vol. II, p. 495; G.O.S. III, p. 10

10. The fragment No. 5 given above is again quoted along with its following verse. The text is better in this second quotation but still much of what it means is not easily made out. The quotation is in chap. XIX.

रसोपयोगी तथाविधः कालविशेषो गुरुत्वम्। तथा च रत्नावलयां भूयस्याचन्द्रोदयो वर्णितः। "समप्रत्येक सरोर्दः"
11. The biggest quotation from the *Kāvyakautuka*, containing four verses, is the following. It describes Vācyābhinaya or Vācikābhinaya, the text of a drama.

12. In chapter XXII, while speaking of the ten Avasthās of Kāma, upon which Abhinava quoted Tota in an earlier instance also, given above as no. 4—Abhinava again quotes Tota.
"तथा च भझीरोत्तेऽनोकक्तम—
'कामवस्था न भृस्ञारः कचिदासं तदज्ज्वता ।'

13. In the Tālādhyaṇa, (Chap. XXXI) there is a reference to an opinion of Tota expressed in his Kāvyakautuka and there is also a small quotation from it. The point in discussion and the reference to Tota appeared earlier also. Vide p. 173, Gaek. edn. Vol. I. The text is very bad and its import cannot be made out.

"तथा च दौम्भिकाषु स एवार्थः प्रधानभूतः इति चूडामणि
स्पष्टमेव उक्तम्। 'चोरि अमिटुण्मवः महसा कुक्कुले मितु' इति।
तथा च विरसननोद्वर्यः प्रवादः पदमचूडामणिया हि।
तदेतदउ भज्जोतेन कान्यकौङ्कु वितत्व दशितं च 'सारेस्तु
नये तुष्प्ते' इति। लोके शाख्यान्त्रे चैवं प्रधानाज्ञानप्रधानाना-
लुयायिनिम् अन्योन्यमतुनयसम्मतमेवेति यावत्।
—G.O.S. IV, p. 271

The earlier reference to the same point mentioned above is in the discussion on the difference between Naṭya and Nṛtya.

"अत एव चूडामणिदौम्भिकायं प्रतिज्ञातस्—"बिन्दुषुर्ण चमि
सहि इहोदिवचो अमिदुणिग। महसारक गेते उ [?]।" अत एव
सहद्या: स्मारनिः 'वध(स)चूडामणि आ।' तस्मान्तः च
nायादिभिः तदक्ष्योपेत्तवाट।

The Ąḍambikā is an Uparūpaka, a Nṛtyaprabanḍha. The Cudāmani Ąḍambikā which Abhinava refers to more than once is an example of it. It can be inferred from
another reference that one Rāṇaka was the author of Čudāmani Dombikā.


14. On p. 184, Vol. III there is a discussion on the language to be used in the Lāsyāṅga called Śirṣaka. This Āṅga of Lāsyā called Śirṣaka is considered as the greatest, since it is described as Uttamottama and naturally we find a variety of views on the subject of the language to be used in it. Some say it is Sanskrit; others, Prākṛt. Bhaṭṭa Tota is quoted here as holding the view that since the context is one speaking of the Saindhavī Prākṛt, the Śirṣaka must be in the Saindhavī Prākṛt.


15. In the Sāmānyābhinaya chapter, Bharata has given Vākyā (i.e.) Vācikābhinaya as one of the six varieties of Sarīrābhinaya. Surely speech is physical, Sarīra, but in that case even Bhāvas would have to be called similarly. In connection with this difficulty, Abhinava quotes a peculiar definition of Vācikābhiniyā itself offered by his teacher Tota. The text here is bad, though a reference to Tota can be clearly seen. The text can be thus given.
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तत् एव—

यथैपाध्यायेनायमेकीयोधिस्रायो दर्शितः ।

This then, Abhinava explains and thus concludes—

—Vol. IV, p 40

Bhaṭṭendurāja

All the ‘Upādhyāyas’ occurring in the Abhinava-

bhāratī refer only to Bhaṭṭa Tota. Bhaṭṭendurāja is

quoted as a poet, his verses occurring as illustrations

for the Lakṣaṇas etc. As in the Locana, here also he is

extravagantly praised by Abhinava and in one place

he is classed along with Vyāsa and Kālidāsa for


Vol. III, there is one noteworthy reference to him.

The context is the Alāṅkāras of the Nāyikās, viz.,

Śobhā, Vilāsa etc., coming under Sāmānyābhinaya.

While illustrating Vibhrama comes the verse from

Kumārasambhava......गदेशु लोकान्वितविंश्रभेषु. An emenda-

tion of this by some one who is described as Tantrajñā

is given by Abhinava, viz., गदेशु लोकान्वितसन्तरेषु. Abhinava

refutes this emendation, proudly referring to

himself as Bhaṭṭendurāja Śīṣya—नेति भट्टेन्दुराज-विश्वः.

The Tantrajñā here referred to may be Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka

for Abhinava often pricks the Mīmāṃsaka in him.

Utpaladeva

Having treated here of the teachers Abhinava, we

can speak here also of Abhinava’s Paramaguru in
Saivism, Śrīmad Utpaladevapāda, whose life seems to have been as rich as Abhinava’s. The Abhinava-
bhāratī reveals to us that this Śaivācārya and grand-
preceptor of Abhinava is also a Saṅgītācārya, and 
wrote a work on music. Abhinava quotes him in the 
Geyādhikāra four times.

1. अन्ये त्वाहूः स्वरा इत्यल्लह्वैरकैदेशा: प्रयोजयायां [?] 
तु ज्ञाता: ऋषिमदुपलदेवपादस्तथा मन्यन्ते।

—Chap. 29, Jātyadhyāya, Vol. IV, 21, Mad. Ms. 
G.O.S. IV, pp. 86-7

2. परमगुरुश्रीमदुपलदेवपादानां मते वर्णोऽपि पद-
निचन्याते तदाल्पितात्त्वाँग गीततयोगरहितकेवलस्वरालाप-
मात्रावाणिज्याति।

—p. 22; G.O.S. IV, p. 87

3. In this third instance, Abhinava differs from 
his Paramaguru.

उत्पलदेवपादातु अस्तत्वरमगुरवो व्याचक्षते: ... निरुण्य-
मानमत्तीति। वर्यं तु मन्यामेव वीलसायामपिथ: ... ...

—Chap. XXXI, p. 84, Vol. IV; G.O.S. IV, p. 164

The word Vyācakṣate does not mean so much as 
Utpaladeva actually commented on Bharata but mean 
only that he interpreted a particular text of Bharata in a 
certain way in his independent work on music. This 
particular text is—

त्रयो भेदा हि तालस्य दिगुणाः दिगुणाः: स्वतः।

—Tālādhyāya— Śl. 26, p. 344, N.Ś. Kav. Edn.

4. तस्मादुक्तर्मोऽपि वनात्राधिक सरसगुरुतिपि युक्तम्।

यथोत्तर ऋषिमदुपलदेवपादाः—
The *Abhinavabhāratī* is the only source of information as regards Utpaladeva having written a work on music. Śrṅgadeva's list and the lists in other music works, cataloguing the Saṅgītācāryas do not mention him. There seems to be however one reference, perhaps to this work of Utpaladeva on music in the *Śivatattvvaratnākara* of Basavarāja, in its Saṅgīta Chapter. This work is a thesaurus like Someśvara's *Abhilaśitārtha-cintāmaṇi* otherwise called *Mānasollāsa*, to which the *Śivatattvvaratnākara* is much indebted. Chapter six of this work of Basava treats of the fine arts. The concluding verses of this chapter give the authorities of the Śastra. The following refer to the Saṅgīta section.

Most likely the text of the last line is somewhat corrupt. Anyhow we have a mention here, among authorities on Sangīta, of a name, Utpala.

**KOHALA, DATTILA**

Early Nāṭya literature is also early Saṅgīta literature. Saṅgīta itself was not music, vocal or instrumental, but both kinds of music and also dance.
Therefore the works of the early period dealt completely with these three, though they were called works on Nāṭya. Works, as of Kohala's, dealt at length with both Nāṭya and music; certain others were primarily works on Nāṭya but contained a section on music. Certain others dealt primarily with music and to this class belongs the work of Dattila. Many of the old authorities quoted by Abhinava are writers on both Nāṭya and music. The most important among these is Kohala. His work must have been very big, treating elaborately and completely of drama, dance and music. Kohala is attributed by all writers on dramaturgy with the introduction of the Uparūpakas. His personality is clouded in mythology and it appears in the Nāṭya Śāstra itself. Many a work with his name is seen in the Mss. libraries. One work at least, we surely know as written by Kohala and as being called Saṅgīta Meru. It must be a stupendous treatise on the Nāṭya Śāstra. It is set in the style of dialogue between Kohala and Sage Śārdūla and large extracts from this on the Karavatandas of dance are given by Kallinātha, in his commentary on the last chapter of the Saṅgīta Ratnākara. There are many references to Kohala in the Abhinavabhārati, in the Nāṭyādhikāra as well as in the Geyādhikāra. Of Kohala and writers like Dattila we cannot speak much.\(^1\) Dattila is also quoted often by Abhinava, but only in the section on music. As a

---

work on Naṭya Śāstra it must be big and the very small music work called Dattilam published in the Triv. series is perhaps only a very much abridged copy of the Music section of the original Dattilam. But Mr. Ramakrsnakavi says¹ that since all quotations found in the name of Dattila are traceable in the Triv. Dattilam, it is genuine and that the original work of Dattila is only small and that this small Dattilam had a commentary called Prayogastabaka.

Another such writer, a Saṅgītācārya who is often quoted by Abhinava is Viśākhilācārya. Nārada is however quoted only twice. The first reference to him is on his Nirvacana of the word Gāndharva as Pritivardhana. Mataṅga, another sage, author of the Brhaddeśi, published in the Triv. series, is twice quoted by Abhinava. Kāśyapa is another sage and writer on music whom Abhinava quotes. He is quoted by other writers on music also. In Vol. IV, pp. 6–13, Abhinava gives eight pages of Anuṭubhs on the tunes to be used according to each Rasa and Bhāva. These verses are either quotation or a compilation made by Abhinava from Kāśyapa’s work. For he says at the beginning—

तत्र रुक्ष्यप्रवर्त्तकात्मकोपयोगिकश्यामरुद्रिण्य चिन्तियोगजातं कहर्षते ।

—P. 5, Vol. IV; G.O.S. IV, pp. 72-3

And the Anuṭubhs close thus—

1. Reference to the views of Mr. R. Kavi in this paper are to those expressed by him to me in a personal discussion I had with him on the writers quoted in the Abhinavabhārati.
This Kaśyapa is very prominent name in Saṅgīta and is quoted by other writers also. Our interest in him is all the more, since he appears to be one of the early writers on Alaṅkāra also. We have the authority of a commentator on the Kāvyādarsa for taking Kaśyapa as an early writer on Alaṅkāra. The Hṛdayaṅgamā mentions a Kaśyapa along with Vararuci as an ancient writer on Alaṅkāra.

If this Kaśyapa is the Kaśyapa of Saṅgīta, we can take that the work of Kaśyapa is a big one dealing completely with Nātya Śāstra, a portion of which is Vācikābhinayā, in whose treatment Alaṅkāra Śāstra comes. This Kaśyapa seems to have written two works. Nānyadeva, in his Bharata Bhāṣya or the Sarvasvatīhṛdayālaṅkāra, besides quoting Kaśyapa often, quotes a Bṛhatkas'yapa also. More about the names in early Saṅgīta literature cannot be said since most of the books are lost and we have only fragmentary quotations to help us. The names are involved in mythology and many of them are Sages and Gods.

1. Chap. VIII, pp. 111–b and 114-a. Ms. of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute. This Ms. was kindly borrowed for my use by my Professor, Mm. Kuppuswami Sastriar from the Bhandarkar Institute. The work is incomplete and this Ms. contains only the Saṅgīta portion of the Vācikāmśa, which is a fourth of the whole (Since printed in two parts).
UDBHAṬA

Another set of authors which we shall briefly mention here is of those who wrote regular commentaries on the Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata. As we have said above, the earliest known commentator is Udbhata. He is mentioned as one of the commentators on Bharata by śāṅgadeva. There is now no doubt of his having written a commentary on Bharata, for the Abhinavabhāratī confirms śāṅgadeva. There are four references to Udbhata at distant intervals in the Abhinavabhāratī. The first occurs while Abhinava comments on Śl. 10, Chap. VI, p. 266. Geak. edn. This verse of Bharata gives the Saṅgraha or brief enumeration of the topics of the Nāṭya Śāstra, numbering eleven.

रसा भावा ह्यमिनया धर्मन्द्रविन्यस्वरचयः ।
सिद्धिः स्वरास्तथातोथं मानं रञ्जगश्च सड्युः ॥

On this Udbhata is said to have commented thus: this verse gives eleven Āṅgas while according to Bharata’s Mata, the Āṅgas are only five, three Abhinayās and music of two kinds, vocal and instrumental. This verse with eleven Āṅgas is according to Kohala’s Mata, which only restates as eleven the five Āṅgas of Bharata. Further Bharata, in dealing with these Āṅgas one by one, does not follow this order.

अभिनयत्रयं गीतातोथं चेति पञ्चाङ्गं नाटास्यः ।
अनेन तु श्लोकेन कोहलमते एकादशाङ्गवस्यायते, न तु मरते,
तत्सहीतस्वपि पुनरन्त्रोदेशात्, क्रमव्यत्यासनादित्यीज्ञाता: ॥

Lollaṭa has criticised this view as can be seen from the next sentence in the Abhinavabhāratī here.
2. The second reference to Udbhaṭa is in the chapter on Hastābinaya. Bhaṭṭa Udbhaṭa is quoted on the Nṛtta Hasta called Svastika-patāka. The text of Bharata on this Hasta is this—उत्तानी वामपाल्वस्त्री स्वस्तिकः परिक्रितः।

The reference to Udbhaṭa in the Abhinavabhārati on this verse is this—

‘उत्तानोऽधस्ततः ज्योत्रोग्रस्तो मुख एव च। पश्च प्रचारस्त्रेष्येति भ्रोल्लुतः पठति।


3. The third reference is in the Daśarūpādhyāya, in the Lakṣaṇa of Samavakāra.

उषिणिको सम्भवं गायत्री भद्भभिः।।।वनद्रतिलानि विषमार्थसमानि। तान्यत्र समवकारे सम्यक् योज्यानितै। नेव प्रयोज्यानीत्युल्लुतः। पठति। सम्ब्रह्मादीत्येव प्रयोज्यानि नाल्याक्षराणि स व्याच्छेदे।


In describing the Samavakāra, Bharata says—

उषिणिगायत्री वा तानि तथान्यानि वनद्रतिलानि।
वृत्तानि समवकारे कविभिन्नेऽपि प्रयोज्यानि॥

—XX 80, Kasi, Edn.

The Kasi edn. notes another reading for the last foot in the foot note, viz., तानि। This reading is followed by Abhinava, G.O.S. II, p. 441, who holds that in a Samavakāra, the metres of small number syllables and crooked metres must be introduced. Udbhaṭa adopts the reading and says that those metres must not be introduced and only Srāgdhārā etc. which are long and smooth must be used.
4. The fourth reference to Udbhaṭa is in the Daśarūpādhyāya. This is a valuable reference and here we have the Anuvāda of a very original view of Udbhaṭa as regards the Vṛttis, Kaiśiki etc. Bharata gives four Vṛttis: Kaiśiki, Ārabhaṭi, Sāttvati and Bhārati; Udbhaṭa first raises a point that these four Vṛttis are not enough since there are places where there is none of these four. The case of Death (maraṇa) is one such. Death is the result or fruit one gets for some action. The Vṛtti of this state, and of similar states, is Phalavṛtti or Phalasaṁvitti. This new Vṛtti, Udbhaṭa first establishes. Then he attacks the four Vṛttis of Bharata and says that they must be cast away. He creates two new Vṛttis in their place. These two plus the first established phalavṛtti make three and Udbhaṭa, we can clearly see, holds only these three Vṛttis. The Daśarūpaka and the Bhāvaprakāśa have missed the exact view of Udbhaṭa. The authors of these two works did not note the two Vṛttis Udbhaṭa set in the place of the four of Bharata but were all aware that Udbhaṭa created an additional Vṛtti called Phalavṛtti. This they called by the name Arthavṛtti, the word Artha being used as a synonym of Phala. It is absolutely wrong to attribute five Vṛttis to Udbhaṭa. Surely Bhoja recognises five Vṛttis in his Śrīgūrāṇaprakāśa but what is his fifth Vṛtti? As is usual with him, he mixes all the four of Bharata and creates the fifth, called Miśra Vṛtti. This is no new Vṛtti and has nothing to do with the Arthavṛtti or Phala-Vṛtti of Udbhaṭa, calling which as the fifth is itself wrong. Miśra can never mean Phala and Phala Vṛtti is ex-
plained at length by Abhinava as Vṛtti of Maraṇa etc. according to its author, Udbhata. Bhoja’s Miśra-vṛtti is the name of the Vṛtti of the Kāvyas as a whole, particular portions of it being in any one of the four Vṛttis. Thus the remarks on Udbhata and Vṛttis made by Mr. Ramasvami Sastriyar in his Sanskrit Introduction (p. 15) to his recently published edition of the Kāvyālāṅkārasarasamgraha of Udbhata with Tilaka’s commentary, (Gaek. series, LV.) are all wrong. More elaborate treatment of this subject, the correct interpretation of Daśaratīpaka etc. have been given by me in a paper of mine on the Vṛttis. The text of the Abhinavabhārata, giving the view of Udbhata is long and I have given the quotation in the paper above referred to.

There is further a long discussion and refutation of the Śvaśabda-vācyatva of Rasa in the beginning of the commentary on chap. XIV, which is the beginning of Vācikābhinaya. Though Udbhata is not mentioned here by name, this section is evidently directed against Udbhata, pp. 361–364, Vol. II, Abhi. Bhā. (G.O.S. II, pp. 221-4)

Further evidence of Udbhata having commented on the Nāṭya Śāstra comes from Kuntaka who refers to him as an expert in Bharata, while criticising Udbhata’s Īrjasvī Alanākāra.

नन्तु भरतनयानिपणमानसाना परमार्थचिदां तत्रभवतः वयं 
विवदामहे।  
—Vakroktijīvīta III

LOLLAṬA AND ŚAṆKUKA

The next commentator on the Nāṭya Śāstra is Lollaṭa. He is always seen in the Abhinavabhārati just after Udbhāṭa, whose views Lollaṭa is given as refuting at every step. Thus Lollaṭa is referred to as refuting Udbhāṭa's views on the eleven topics of Nāṭya and on the Vṛttis. This also proves that Lollaṭa's commentary came after Udbhāṭa's. Besides these, there are many references to Lollaṭa although the Abhi. Bhā. There can be no doubt of his having written a regular commentary on the Nāṭya Śāstra.

ŚaṆkuka is also often quoted in the Abhi. Bhā, and he must also have written a regular commentary on the Nāṭya Śāstra. His commentary comes next to Lollaṭa's. Rājaśekhara quotes two Āryā verses in his Kāvyamāṁśā (p. 45) under the name of one Āparājīti.

अस्तु नाम निस्सीमा अर्थसार्थं। किन्तु रसचत एव निवर्णे युक्तं, न नीरसस्य इति आपराजिति।

यदाहः
मञ्जनुष्पावचयनसन्ध्याचन्द्रोदयादिवाक्रमिह।
सरसमपि नातिबहुः प्रकटसानन्वितं रचयेतु॥
यस्तु सरिद्रिद्रिसागरपुरुरगरथादिविशणे यत्नः।
कविशक्तिक्षयातिफलो विततविधियां नो मतं स इह॥

The second verse in the above quotation along with its following verse is, as pointed out by the editor in the notes (Gaek. edn.) quoted by Hemacandra under the name Lollaṭa (Kāvyānuśāsana Parikh's ed. Vol. I. 1938 p. 307).
The second verse in this quotation is quoted by Namisādhu anonymously (Kavyālaṅkāra p. 35). Whether these verses are from an independent work is not known. They may be Saṅgraha Ślokas in Lollaṭa's commentary on the Nāṭya Śāstra itself.

These verses point out some principles of Rasaurcitya in Varṇanas and condemn the long descriptions in the Mahākāvyas that have nothing to do with the Rasa. Thus Āparājitī, son of Aparājita, found in Rājaśekhara is none else than Lollaṭa. A poet called Bhaṭṭa Aparājita is found in the Subhāṣitāvalī (Śī. 1024—an Anyāpadeśa on a dog). He is probably the father of Lollaṭa. Therefore, Lollaṭa falls between Udbhata and Rājaśekhara and is earlier to Saṅkuka, a poet described by Kalhaṇa as the author of a poem called Bhuvanabhhyudaya and as having lived in the time of Ajitāpiḍa (c. 814–851.) Thus Saṅkuka is earlier to Ānandavardhana. With Lollaṭa began the theories of Rasa. Udbhata's interpretation of the Rasa Śūtra does not seem to have been noteworthy. On Rasas, we have two views of Udbhata quoted in Pratīhāreṇdu-rāja's Laghuṣṭṭi on the Kavyālaṅkārasārasaṅgraha. Those two are—पञ्चह्यं रसा: and चतुर्थ्यं भावः:—pp. 48, 49, N.S. Press, Edn.
The latter refers to the four Bhāvas, विभाव, अनुभाव, व्यभिचारिभाव and स्थायिभाव. The former contains a point for which Udbhaṭa has been severely criticised. The former says that Rasa is developed from or is in five forms which he thus gives in K.A.S.S. स्वशब्द-स्थायि-स्थाचारिविभाव-अभिनय-आस्पदम्. Of these the स्व-शब्दास्पदतः of Rasa of Udbhaṭa has been refuted by all writers, Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta and others. This स्वशब्दाचार्यतः of Rasa is considered as a positive flaw of Rasa. Besides these no peculiar Rasa-doctrine of Udbhaṭa is found anywhere. It is Lollaṭa who began to analyse the experience of the spectator of a drama.

(ii)

KĪRTIDHARA

Another writer given as a commentator on Bharata by Śāṅgadeva is Kīrtidhara. There are at least four references to him in the Abhinavabhārati.

1. The first reference to Kīrtidhara is on the difference between Nāṭya and Nrūta, occurring on p. 208, Gaek. edn., at the end of Chap. IV. There is nothing in this reference to show that Kīrtidhara commented on Bharata.

The other three references are in the Geyādhikāra, Vol. IV, Mad. Ms.

2. एतदुक्षम्—
प्राह्मेककलं साम दिकतं वद्विजं तथा।
चान्द्रे तु विकतं शुष्कं पूर्वयोः सार्थकं पदम्।

इति कीर्तिधराचार्यः।

—p. 42; G.O.S. IV, p. 111
3. नन्दु चत्वारि यथा कीर्तिधरोर्लभ्यात् हि ति।  
—p. 50

4. The fourth reference is a valuable one. The context is the Mārgāsārita dances of the Pūrvaraṅga.

यचन्ते कीर्तिधरेण नन्दिकेशरमतागमित्वेन दशितं तदस्मामिः  
साक्षाः न द्यम्, तत्प्रत्ययान्ति लिखिते।  
—p. 50; G.O.S. IV, p. 120

Abhinava proposes to give the dances from Kīrtidhara, who himself gives them from Nandikeśvara. Abhinava says that he himself did not have access to Nandikeśvara’s work and that he writes these on the authority of Kīrtidhara. Accordingly on pp. 51–54, Abhinava gives a large prose extract on the Mārgāsārita dances of the Pūrvaraṅga. So it is that we find Nandikeśvara, the most prominent in the pantheon of Saṅgīta and Nāṭya, not quoted anywhere by Abhinava. But Mr. R. Kavi says that the passage above quoted reads differently in his Ms. and hence means differently; and that Abhinava does quote largely from Nandikeśvara in the commentary on Chap. XXVIII. The Ms. of the Madras Government Oriental Mss. Library unfortunately does not contain the major portion of the commentary on this Chap. Mr. R. Kavi says that his Ms. contains it completely. Though the work of Nandikeśvara was not available to Abhinava, a work called Nandimatam was available to Abhinava. It is quoted on p. 141, Gaek. edn., on the movement called Recitam.
From the above references we can say that there is no evidence to take Kirtidhara as having written a commentary on Bharata.

**Tīkākāra**

There is a commentary on the Nātya Śāstra called the Tīkā which Abhinava quotes often. Except four references, all the other references to it are in the Geyādhikāra. The following are the concerned quotations in Abhi. Bhā. (Mad. Ms. and printed text).

1. While commenting on Śl. 2, Chap. IXX, on the two parts of the plot, Ādhikārika and Prāsaṅgika Abhinava refers to and refutes the Tīkākāra, who divided the Prāsaṅgika into many kinds.

   तेन शक्त्यन्तरयोगायोगाभ्यां च यत्रप्रासङ्गिकस्य अनेक- 
   विचारवियो तीकाकिक्तिरस्याथिया न तदुपाध्ययः सन्मत्यन्ते

   —G.O.S. III, p. 3

   Abhinava follows his teacher, does not accept many kinds of Prāsaṅgika but gives it as of one kind only.

2. The next reference in the Nātyādhikāra is in the Chapter on Sāmānyabhinaya. Bharata gives a list of twelve ‘Mārgas’ of Abhinaya-Ālāpa, Pralāpa etc. Śls. 49–57, p. 273, KāŚ edn. The twelfth is Atideśa and while commenting upon it, Abhinava remarks that the Tīkākāra has introduced irrelevant things here.

   अत्र उपदेशातिदेशयों उपमानस्य च साहित्यविषये ताकिक- 
   मीमांसकविषये विशेषग्रन्थिपादनं यत् टीकाकारः क्रुंद, तत्सुकुमार-
3. गानमुप्रकाकः सत् नाट्यं व्यवस्थापयदेव उपर्वय-तीति युक्तएव एव कमः हिंति टीकाकारः, तदेतथा विदामः।
—Vol. III, p. 98; G.O.S. IV, p. 5

4. यथा तत्त्वीगतः प्रौद्योग हिंति। विपश्चीवीणादिभेदादि आतोधतेति टीकाकारः तदुप्रकमः।

5. तदेव निर्वेचनं तात्पयेण श्लोक इति टीकाकारः। अत्र तु नकारस्तु व्याख्यात एव तस्मादुपाध्यायेऽपरिद्वैषयः।
—Vol. III, p. 100; G.O.S. IV, p. 6

6. टीकाकारः गानं प्रधानं तदुपकारकी वीणाविशालिति। गुणप्रधानतानिर्णयोऽसंधनं गायनीमत्र गायनतीत्वेत्‌-समर्थने तु यो महान्संरमः।
—G.O.S. IV, p. 7

7. The next reference is on the tunes to be used for the various Bhāvas and Rasas. The Tikākāra says that what Kaśyapa has given on this subject does not agree with Bharata. Abhinava removes this difficulty. He says that it is Kaśyapa, Kohala and others who added and developed Bharata and instead of saying that these three differ, later writers must follow all the three, for the views of Kaśyapa and Kohala¹ in this particular respect have become widespread in the world.

अत्र टीकाकारः श्लोकः योऽवत् जात्वं शक्तिकान्ताः शिविनयोऽ उक्तः स कस्तप्रथमनिमतादिभिविरुद्धते। तथा हि तथूकम्।

भृत्युतः कोहलस्त्रद्विध्यते। हिंति वर्षमुखज्ञातमेव मुनिना।

¹ Kohala on this subject of tunes according to Rasas is quoted by Mallinātha on Śl. 91, canto. VII, Ku. Sam.
8. टीकाकारस्त्र्वाहूँ, आश्र्यः स्वतः स्वस्वेषः जातिनां गाने उपयोगः न तु रक्षिसम्पादकत्वेन। एतत्र पूर्वेऽव विचारितमित्यास्ताः।

—Vol. IV, p. 14

9. टीकाकारस्त्र्वाहूँ श्लोकार्थस्पस्य प्रतिकर्षणमुद्वस्य
ध्यान्यात् पुनर्स्वत्साहायमित्यास्तां तावत्।

—Vol. IV, p. 22; G.O.S. IV, p. 87

10. ये स्वयं ते आनीत्रयोगविषयः तान्मिन्योधतेदिति
वणित्रितत्वात् वणी इति टीकाकृतः।

—Vol. IV, p. 22; G.O.S. Ibid.

This is refuted by Abhinava by quoting his Paramaguru, Utpaladeva.

11. The next reference is valuable since it mentions the Sadāśiva Bharata or the work on Nātya attributed to Sadāśiva, and since it mentions also the Guru of the Tīkākāra.

—Vol. IV, p. 25; G.O.S. IV, p. 91

From the above-given passage, we may take one Śrīpāda as the teacher of the Tīkākāra. Whether that
is the real full name of the teacher or only the honorific suffix to his name cannot be said. From the temper of Abhinava’s criticisms and from the fact that all the references to the Īṭīkākāra are cases of complete refutation, one can infer that perhaps the Īṭīkākāra was a contemporary of Abhinava, that he blundered much in the Geyādhikāra especially and that his Īṭīkā was undeservedly popular. But there is no clear evidence for such conclusions.

12. यत्र टीकाक्तता स्थगतपरगतत्त्वेन धर्मस्यातितिदेशस्य बिकल्पक्षणामभिधात्तलाभोभोगितमं अतिदेशस्य अभ्यधापि।
   तदेवमेव सर्वेऽश्राब्धक्षेत्रा दृश्य इत्यादावपि अतिदेशस्वरूप-निर्विवें नेम पूर्वेतथा मन्तव्यम्।
   —Vol. IV, p. 59; G.O.S. IV, p. 140

13. विकल्पक्षणां वा श्रृतिसद्वद्यो मवेन स्वरः।
   अनीरणातु श्रेष्ठाः स्वाराणामपि सम्मेव।
   अस्यायं टीकाकारस्तचावदाह—×××
   एष चार्यं: फल्गु-प्रायः। न हीयता वीणायां श्रृतिचर्चा कार्यिद्वितं भवति।
   —Vol. IV, p. 63; G.O.S. IV, pp. 143-4

14. यष्टीकाकारेः गौंनेव तत्पुर्वस्तववात् सर्पिण्यादापिः सम्यांतं
   भवतीत्युत्., तत् यासमास्थं।
   —Vol. IV, p. 89; G.O.S. IV, p. 168

15. टीकाकृतस्तू (°कृता तु) सन्निपातत्वद्वपुत्रा श्रम्यादि-
   व्यास्ल्याः अवान्ततितलसमासौ नायं विशेषविविशिरिति . . . .
   शिष्टवलोकमागः व्यर्थ इत्यलमने।
   —Vol. IV, p. 137; G.O.S. IV, p. 223
16. पद्म अस्य स्थानमाह अस्य चाँगलये विनित हि
टेकामा रस्तावत् न्यायं कुसिति

—p. 151; G.O.S. IV, pp. 240-1

17. टेकामा रस्तु • • • उपोहनतं यदुक्तं तत्कथारमि
न विचः, मुनिना उक्तवात् ( अनुक्तवात् ) दच्चादिरिलेव • • •

—p. 162; G.O.S. IV, p. 255

Abhinava here says that the Tikākāra does not know what the Upohana given by Bharata means. It is not explained by Bharata but is explained only by Dattila and other writers. Abhinava ridicules the Tikākāra for not having read even Dattila’s work.

18. अत्र टेकामारेण आक्षिष्मु। वज्रं च शीर्षं चैति यो
विनियोगः प्रापुक्तः, तत्र वज्रादिपु वर्णान्तरख्यानं तालाध्याये
बहुशाखः पूर्वपरिरोध हि। तदेवदस्मदगमव्याख्यायां
निश्चितां नामेव। अन्यदेव हि • • • तथा हि तेनोक्कुमु • • •

Then Abhinava gives a long Anuvāda of the view of the Tikākāra, gives a criticism of it by other writers with whom he and his teacher agree. The passage ends thus:

इदमेव युक्तमित्रुपाध्यायाः।

—Vol. IV, p. 192; G.O.S. IV, pp. 297-8

19. टेकामारस्तु परक्रमणं। त्रिकोणचतुष्कोणर्जुपेक्षया
व्यक्तचतुर्वितालविभमाहुः। तस्मात् ( तद् ) अस्मद्गुणम्यो
न रूपितमु।

—Vol. IV, p. 192; G.O.S. Ibid.

These are the references to the Tikākāra available in the Abhinavabhāratī. Two references
to him are available in the portion printed in the Gaek. Series, Vol. I, pp. 318 and 328. These two are in the sections on Karuṇa and Bhayānaka Rasas respectively (Ch. VI) and here also the Tīkā-kāra is criticised. The name of the author of this Tīkā on Bharata is not known. His Guru can be taken to be one Śrīpāda. An Ālaṅkārika of this same name, Śrīpāda, is quoted by Keśava in his Ālaṅkāra-śekhara. Śrīpāda is a Buddhist or Jaina name.

**BHAṬṬAYANTRA**

A writer named Bhaṭṭayantra is quoted and that only once by Abhinavagupta. The context is the discussion on the difference between Nāṭya and Nṛta. Bhaṭṭayantra’s definition of Nṛta is given.

‘शिक्षास्वेच्छान्यनृत्कतिपयनादिक्षृतम् नृत्मृ अन्यास-फलम्’ इति मद्ययन्तः।

—Gaek. edn., Vol. I, p. 208

There is no evidence to suppose that Bhaṭṭayantra wrote a commentary on the Nāṭya Śāstra.

**ŚRĪHARṢA’S NĀṬYA VĀRTOS**

Next to the consideration of the commentaries on the Nāṭya Śāstra, comes that of the Vārttika on the Nāṭya Śāstra. The Nāṭya Śāstra, like other Śāstras, has its Sūtras, Vārttika and Bhāṣya. We must distinguish from these the still later Alāṅkāra Sūtras, Alāṅkāra Vārttika and Alāṅkāra Bhāṣya. Besides the Kāvyālaṅkāra Sūtras of Vāmana, the Kārikās of
Mammapa have been considered as Sūtras and a persistent tradition was current in some parts of the country that the Kārikās of the Kavyaprakāśa were the Sūtras of Bharata, the product of which view is the Sāhityakaumudi of Vidyābhūṣaṇa (K. M. 63). Besides these two instances, there seems to be some other Sūtrakāra for Aaṅkāra, a Buddhist monk. We know him from quotations of his Sūtras in Keśava’s Aaṅkāra Śekhara (pp. 2 and 20. K. M. edn.). He is referred to as Aaṅkāravidyā-sūtrakāra, Bhagavān Saudhodani. An Aaṅkāra Vārttika is referred to by Jayaratha in his Vimarśini on the Aaṅkāra-sarvasva.¹ Three verses from a Vārttika on the different meanings of the word Dhvani are quoted in Bhaṭṭa Gopa’s commentary on the Kavyaprakāśa.² These verses put in metre what Abhinava has said in his Locana: that Dhvani by different Vyūtpattis mean Dhvanivyāpāra, Dhvanyamāṇārtha, Dhvani-kāvyā etc. Thus this Vārttika quoted by Bhaṭṭa Gopa is later than Abhinava. This Vārttika may or may not be the Aaṅkāra-vārttika referred to by Jayaratha. Again these must not be confused with the Harṣacaritavārttika of Ruuyaka or Maṅkhuka, which, I think, is a commentary on the Harṣacarita of Bāṇa, pointing out with definitions the Aaṅkāras which abound in that work. An Aaṅkāra Bhāṣya is thrice quoted by Jayaratha³ and the first two of these references are repeated by Jagannātha in his Rasagangādhara. These Sūtras, Vārttikas and Bhāṣya of Aaṅkāra must not be confused with those of

---

¹ P. 71. Nir. S. Edn.
² Triv. edn., p. 234.
³ Pp. 35, 83 and 138.
the Nātya Śāstra. The Sūtras of the Nātya Śāstra are the brief prose bits available in the Nātya Śāstra of Bharata, such as the Rasa Sūtra, as also the Nātya Sūtras referred to by Pāṇini. The whole Nātya Śāstra itself is also Sūtra, for Abhinava takes it so.

पद्मकं भरतद्वारस्यं विब्रुवन्।
वन्दे शिवं श्रुतिद्वारविवेकि धाम॥

—Gaek. edn., p. 1

The Vārttika on it was written by one Śrī Harṣa to whom we will return presently. The Bhāṣya is by Nānyadeva alias Rāja Nārāyaṇa, king of Mithilā. He is later than Abhinava and is earlier than Śāṅgadeva. His work, though generally called as Bharata Bhāṣya, has in two of the colophons the name Bharata Vārttika. The work is also called Sarasvatihṛdaya Alanākāra. A section of one fourth of that work is now available to us and the Ms. of it is in the library of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, Poona.¹ The work is stupendous in its plan. It is divided into four Amśas, each amśa dealing with one of the four Abhinayas. The first seems to be the Vācikāmśa and comprises of Saṅgīta, Alanākāra and Daśarūpa. Of this first Amśa, the portion dealing with music alone is now available. Two of the colophons have this suggestive word—वाचिकांसे.

The Harṣavārttika on the Nātya Śāstra is nowhere else referred to except in the Abhinavabhārati. Here also it is

¹ Two parts of this work based on the ms. at Poona have been brought out, by the Indra Kala Parishad, Khairagarh, 1961, 1976. Ed. by Sri C. P. Desai, with com. in Sanskrit, Hindi and English.

A Transcript copy of this work is now available in the Mad. Ms. Library.
quoted only in the first six chapters. Not even a single reference to it is available in the remaining bulk of the *Abhinavabharati*. Perhaps to Abhinava himself, only a fragment of the *Harśavārttika* was available. Who this Harṣa or Śrī Harṣa is cannot be decided.

1. The first quotation from the Vārttika is in the commentary on chapter two on Theatre. The verses quoted speak of the number and position of the pillars.

वाचिकंकृतः

अन्ते नेपथ्यश्रेण सम्मै दौ पीठकाश चतवारः।

... न्ये चतवारः दशेषवङ्कर भवन्त्येते।

भिचे स्तम्भानां च स्थादन्तरमण्डलमेवान्तः।॥” हृति।

—Vol. I, p. 67, Gaek. 1st edn., N. S.

2. The second reference occurs in the same chapter and describes the gallery-like seating arrangement of the theatre.

द्वोभवाताथः सोडशा नानामेवदुः।[?]

चतवारः पीठगता: पश्चाद्य्रे च याविह दौ दौ॥

पद तान्तरास्त्रायान्ये कार्ये हृति शास्त्रः...।

... पीठगता: पश्चाद्य्रे च याविह दौ दौ॥

तेषामश्वाङ्केर्पुर द्विवेष्या य उदिता।।

तैविक्षरेषीर तत्त स्थादातोक समस्तरंः॥

सोपानाधृति पीठकमत्र विषेध्य समन्तो रहे।

येनातोक... क्युपरिकायातु॥


3. In the discussion on the difference between Nṛtta and Nātya, Śrī Harṣa boldly says that they are not different, both of them having the same features.

नास्त्यसै भिन्नस्वभाव ही यावत्। यदायिंकम्। एवम्। अवान्तरवाच्यरूपदेशो रागदर्शनीयेषु। सिङ्हादिवर्णकैवर्म कचिद् अपयथान्तरन्यासात्॥

5. The next reference is also on the same subject:

रसभावदिरक्षिदिशाथि यथां पूर्ण वा अपूर्ण वा कुत एव नाटजनूजयोभेदः तत्त्वायुकार्तवे हि हर्षवाचिकम्।

—p. 207, Ibid.

Nāṭya primarily means all stage performances. It is divided into two kinds, Drama and Dance. The former is Rūpaka, the 10 kinds in the scheme of Daśarūpaka and some of the major varieties of the Uparūpakas also, such as Nāṭikā and Troṭaka. The minor varieties of the Uparūpakas are Nṛtya-prabandhas. These represent the second, viz. Dance. Sometimes the former (i.e.) Dramas alone are referred to as Nāṭya and the rest as Nṛtya or Nṛtta, two kinds of dance. These two are clearly different since Drama is enacted by many while the Nṛtya or Nṛtta is Ekahārya, a complete theme rendered in Abhinaya by one. But underneath this difference, there are common features which Harṣa emphasises. They are both of them Anukāra and the mode of interpretation in both of
them is Abhinaya and Āṅgahāra. It is on this point that Abhinava quotes a number of writers at the end of chapter four; Bhatṭayantra, Kṛtīdhara, Lollāṭa etc.

6. The sixth reference to the Vārttika is to its interpretation of the word Pūrva-raṅga. This is the first reference which refers to the Vārttikakāra as Śrīharṣa.

Śrīharṣaṃ rāṣṭraṅgaṃ tāṁśyānām brahma nāṭyaśāstraśyaṃ yogyasya tattvānī pūrvarāṅgataṁ mantrasāṁ pūrvāśaśi rāṣṭrayati samāsamaṇṣṭ

यदाह—

dṛṣṭa yedavasthāsyaṃ (vastraṃ) nāṭyasya rāṣṭraya pādabhāga: śyu: || pūrve t eva yasminu śruṣṭa: śyu: pūrwaroṣṭa: ||

—p. 211, Ibid.

7. The next is on the Aṅgas of the Pūrvarāṅga, viz. Pratyāhāra, Avatāraṇa etc.

उत्क्रं च वाचिकं 'बुद्धयावष्टक्यर्दिद[?] राजङ्गेद', न तु प्रत्यायाराज्ञवतरणेः आदेः, राजङ्गाराज्ञीनि पाश्चात्यानि पादभागाद्राघानि हि इति।

—p. 212, Ibid.

8. The eighth and the last reference available is on the Sthāpaka Sūtradhāra of the Pūrvarāṅga. Śrī Harṣa here mentions a poet called Hāsa and a drama of his, probably with story of Nala as its plot.

यदाह Śrīharṣaṃ 'अत एव हासो नाम (कविः) कर्मिनिव-भाटके 'दिर्वं यात्थितज्ञवेदयोगोकलित एवाभिचारते। अशक्‌यस्य पुरोहितस्थास्यम्' ह्यत्यादि।

—p. 251. Ibid.
From these references, we see also that Śrī Harṣa’s Vārttika on the Nāṭya Śāstra was mainly in Āryā verses with occasional prose. It must be this Vārttikakāra Harṣa whom Śāradātanaya mentions in his Bhāvaprakāśa, on the definition of the Uparūpaka called Toṭaka.

दिश्यमातुपस्योगो यत्राद्वैरविद्वृष्टकः।
तदेवं तोटको भेदो नाटकस्येति हर्षावाकः॥


This definition, especially the feature—‘यत्राड्वैरविद्वृष्टकः’ is not in agreement with Vikramorvasiṇya which is a Toṭaka and hence Śāradātanaya remarks upon Harṣa’s definition—

तदन्यापकमित्यन्ये नाट्रित्यन्ते विनिविषितः।

Prabhākara’s Rasapradīpa (G. Kaviraj, Sarasvati Bhavan Studies) gives a prose extract from one Śrīharṣa Miśra on the subject of Doṣa. The passage seems to be that of a late-writer and this Śrī Harṣa is not identical with the Vārttikakāra.

Keśava Miśra, in his Alaṅkāraśekhara (K. M. edn. p. 47), in the chapter on Kavi Śikṣā, while giving a list of Upamās for the various parts of the body says that the nose is compared to the sesameum flower—तिलप्रसूनः. He illustrates this with a verse and adds:

‘कामतृणीकृत्य नासा वण्येत्’ इति श्रीहर्षः।’

1. This may refer to poet Śrī Harṣa, who in his Naṣadha Canto VII, Sl. 36, describes Damayanti’s nose as Cupid’s, quiver—Kāmatuṇa.
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This Śrī Harṣa whose identity also is not known has greater likeness only to the Śrī Harṣa Miśra mentioned by Prabhākara or may be the author of Naiṣadhacarita.

RĀHULA

Rāhula is mentioned as an authority on Nāṭya Śāstra in Śāṅgadeva’s list, क्षेत्राजश्र राहलः. His name is given by Śāṅgadeva as Rahala. He is quoted in the Abhinavabhairati four times. Mr. R. Kavi, in the introduction to his edition of the Nāṭya Śāstra Vol. I, in the Gaek. series says that Rāhula is a Vārttikakāra. He has not given any evidence for that statement and we also do not find any evidence to take Rāhula as a Vārttikakāra. One quotation from Rāhula is in the commentary on chapter four. It is on one of kind of Nāṭyadharma or Nāṭyadharmī.

-पाराधार्यायतवं अस्तित्वितेसपि स प्रियतमप्रहुतो तद्-
विषयोक्तिप्रत्यत्वष्ठादिप्रयोगोऽऽन्त्येऽप्याकाशभाषितादी भाषण-
रूपके च विचारते च। यथाह राहुलः—

परोक्षेपि हि वक्तव्यो नार्यं प्रत्यक्षवत् प्रियः।
सब्रीं च नाट्यवर्मोद्यं भरतेनोदितं द्रव्यम्॥

—p. 172, Gaek. edn.


-तेन मौघ्यमदभाविकत्वपरितपनादिनामपि गत्याचार्यं-
राहुलादिभिमिराभिधानं विरुद्धमित्यलं वहुना।

—p. 38
Here the word Gatyācārya is evidently a mistake for Śākyācārya\(^1\), Rāhula, as can be seen from his name, is a Baudhāya. Further this passage with a slight change is reproduced by Hemacandra in his \textit{Kāvyānūsasana}, where we have the correct word Śākyācārya.

\[\text{शाख्याचार्यराहुलादर्यस्तु मौग्यमदभाविकतव परितपना-}\]
\[\text{दीनपल्लद्धारानाचक्ष्ते।} \text{तेष्माथि:} \text{मरतमतातुसारिम्बिरमिश्रितं।} \]

—p. 316, K.M. edn.

Bharata gives a list of Alaṅkāras of damsels, Bhāva, Hāva etc., three Aṅgajas, ten Svabhāvatās and seven Ayatnajas, on the whole twenty. Chap. XXIX. Bharata. Hemacandra, pp. 308–316. Besides these twenty, मौग्य, मद, भाबिकतव, परितपन etc. are also considered as Alaṅkāras of women by Rāhula and others of his school. The Buddhist monks contributed much to Alaṅkāra also. There is a work on Pornography by another Buddhist monk called Padma Śrī. The work is called \textit{Nāgarasarvasva}. In these works, they have a slightly different Sampradāya on some subjects of which one is the Alaṅkāras of women. Hemacandra follows Bharata and gives only 20 Alaṅkāras. In Padma Śrī’s \textit{Nāgarasarvasva}, we have these sixteen Alaṅkāras.

\[\text{हेलाविनिस्थितिर्निम्नोक्षकिल्कितिष्ठित्विभ्रमः।} \]
\[\text{लीला विलासो हावश विक्षेपो विक्रित मदः।} \]
\[\text{मोदायितं कुटितं मौग्यं च तपनं तथा।} \]
\[\text{ललितं चेतयमी हावः चेष्टा।} \]

—Chap. VII, pp. 28–40

\(^1\) G.O.S. III. p. 164 reads Śākyācārya–S.S.J.
Of these, those not given by Bharata and consequently not found in standard works are four, विक्षेपः, मदः, मौग्यः and तपनस्। The last three are attributed to राहुला by Abhinavagupta. Vikşepa is not mentioned by Abhinava and the Bhāvikatva mentioned by him as held by राहुला is missing in the above list. The editor of the Nāgarasarvasva, Mr. Tanusukha Rama Sarma has pointed out this peculiarity in this Tippani on the text, has suggested that Padma Śrī might have followed Rāhula and other Buddhist Ālaṅkārikas and that certain readings noted in the Sāhityadarpana, Nīrnaya Sagar edition, quote and follow Padma Śrī, who is mentioned there as Śākya-bhikṣu. The Sāhityadarpana does not also give Bhāvikatva and while following Bharata, follows also Padma Śrī and other Buddhist writers who give other Ālaṅkāras in addition. The Sāhityadarpana on the whole gives 28 Ālaṅkāras, those in addition to the 20 of Bharata being, मदः, तपनस्, मौग्यः, विक्षेपः, कुदूह्लः, हसितः, चकितः and केलि। The last four of these are not found in Padma Śrī. Vīrītām in Padma Śrī is given as Vihṛtām. The last four of Viśvanātha are from Bhoja who gives these new Ālaṅkāras in his Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa and the Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa; vide S.K.A. pp. 478, 533, 534 and 537. While Śāradātanaya like Viśvanātha follows Bhoja, Śiṅga Bhūpāla refutes Bhoja for holding these. (p. 10, Bhā. Pr.; p. 57, R.A.S. Triv. edn.)

Besides Rāhula and Padma Śrī, we come to know from Padma Śrī's definition of Vikşepa that there is another writer on Ālaṅkāra of their school, Sage Kapila.
Of Rāhula we do not know much. We see a poet called Rāhulaka in the anthology, *Subhāṣitāvalī*. Śl. 2900. Rāhulaka’s work on Nāṭya Śāstra is in an independent treatise. Mr. R. Kavi mentions another Buddhistic writer on Nāṭya named Śini of whom he himself does not say more. Introduction to his edn. of *N.S.*, Gaek. series. Vol. I, p. 6 (1st ed.)

**MĀṬRGUPTA**

Māṭrgupta is a poet and writer on Nāṭya and Saṅgīta. He is mentioned as an authority in music works. Mr. T. R. Chiutamani has collected fragments of this writer and spoken of his date etc. in an article published in the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Vol. II. Māṭrgupta’s work is in Anuṣṭubhs surveying the fields of Kāvyā, Rūpaka and Saṅgīta. There are four references to him in the *Abhinavabhārati*. In the Tatādhyaṇya, on the Puṣpa, a technical name in the playing of Vīṇā-Abhinava quotes from Māṭrgupta.

—Vol. IV, p. 32; G.O.S. IV, p. 99

Śāradātanaya quotes Māṭrgupta’s view on the nature of the plot of a Nāṭaka that it should have some Utpādyāmśa though it is Pūrvavṛttāṅśraya.


1. The other references to Māṭrgupta occur in the same 29th chapter, on Śruti and Svara (G.O.S. IV, pp. 12, 21) and on auspiciousness of Madhyama Svara (G.O.S. *Ibid*, p. 43)—S.S.J.
BHAṬṬANĀYAKA

Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka is referred to in other places besides the discussion on Rasa-realisation. Though now and then Abhinava tries to laugh at him, more especially, the Mīmāṃsaka in him, Abhinava quotes him often. Surely Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's Hṛdayadarpana is a very great book approaching in nature the Kāvyakautuka of Tota. It is Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka who introduced the concept of Sādhāraṇikarana to explain the psychology of Rasa-realisation. In the very first chapter of the Abhinavabhaṭṭaratī, there is a long Anuvāda of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka’s beautiful eulogy on Nātya, in the image of which God made this world. Abhinava quotes here, in the end, the Maṅgalasloka of the Hṛdayadarpana also.

1. The available fragments of Bhaṭṭanāyaka have been collected by Mr. T.R. Chintamani in the J.O.R. Madras. Vol. I, pp. 267 ff.
Just as Tota is quoted by all for his definition of pratibhā, Kavi and kāvyā, so also is Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka for his differentiation of kāvyā from Śāstra and Ākhyāna. The one and a half verses of his on this subject say that Śāstra is Šabdapradhāna, Ākhyāna is Arthapradhāna and Kāvyā is Vyāpārapradhāna or Abhidhāpradhāna. 1 Abhinava agrees with this and quotes while explaining the concept of Lakṣaṇa, where he also speaks of Kāvyā as Abhidhāpradhāna, and of Lakṣaṇa as equivalent to the complete Abhidhā of the poet. p. 383, Vol. II, Mad. MS. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka considered Kāvyā as distinguished from Śāstra and Ākhyāna, by that characteristic of the poet's expression called Bhāvakatva Vyāpāra achieved by Gunas and Alāṅkāras. Slightly changing this Vyāpāra into one of Dhvani or Suggestion and Rasāsvāda through it, Abhinava can accept it when he is an exponent of Dhvani in his Locana, vide p. 27 Dhvanyāloka. A corollary of this view is the other dictum of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka that one enjoys a Kāvyā while from Purāṇa and Veda or Śāstra, he takes instruction and injunction respectively.

1. Abhidhā is here used not in its restricted sense of Śakti, but in its larger and more general meaning viz., the poet's expression as a whole. Vide p. 64, Vol. VI, part I. J.O.R. My article on Lakṣaṇa.
Mr. Rāmakṛṣṇa kavi proposes a problem that Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka wrote a commentary on Bhāmaha’s Kāvyālāṅkāra. He even seems to think that the Hṛdayadarpaṇa itself is a commentary on Bhāmaha. He relies on the following verse on Bhāmaha, written by Bhaṭṭa Gopāla in his introductory verses on the Ālaṅkārikas, in his commentary on the Kāvyaprakāśa.

The verse definitely mentions Nāyaka (i.e.) Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka along with Udbhāṭa, whom we know, from reliable sources of information, as a commentator on Bhāmaha. Such evidences as are available in the case of Udbhāṭa are not available in the case of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka. Firstly we do not hear of any other work of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka except his Hṛdayadarpaṇa. And the evidence of Mahima Bhaṭṭa who says ‘अद्वयंदर्पणममक्रो’ and of his commentator who says ‘द्वयंदर्पणाछयो ध्वनिचिन्तस्मातिद्वयो’ surely point to the fact that Hṛdayadarpaṇa is an independent treatise on poetics, primarily intended to demolish the doctrine of Dhvani. If it is a commentary on Bhāmaha, there could not have been this utter lack of references to that fact in the writings of Abhinava who has often to refute Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka. Further Bhaṭṭa Gopāla’s evi-
dence itself is not completely trustworthy. His ascriptions of quotations to certain writers are wrong. As for instance, on p. 277, Triv. edn. Bhaṭṭa Gopāla makes Udbhata refute the Anumāna theory of Rasa-pratīti.

वस्माहिष्ठ प्रतीतिरिति न युक्तं वक्तमुः। यदाहं उद्भयतः
न च अनुमितमात्रत्वः स्थितो भावः काव्यस्य जीवितमुः।
अपि तु साधारण्येन प्रतिपन्नः रसनाय्यापारगोचरः। एवं
रसेश्चेष्यवचनत्वमुः। तत एव व्यञ्जनव रसभावतदाभासतत्वाशमा:
काव्यत्वचविचित्रितिबिधीयते।

This was a very perplexing reference, until I found out the fact that Bhaṭṭa Gopāla here attributed part of Tilaka’s commentary on Udbhata’s K.A.S.S. to Udbhata himself. (Vide p. 41, Mad. MS. of Tilaka’s commentary on the K.A.S.S. Vide p. 33. Geak. edn. of this work). The above given lines are seen in Tilaka’s commentary, in Varga IV, under Preyośāṅkāra. Even earlier, Bhaṭṭa Gopāla makes a similar confusion between Udbhata and his commentators and attributes to Udbhata the enumeration of the Vyabhicārins and Sthāyins which is really given not by Udbhata but only by Pratihārendurāja and Tilaka and which are from Bharata.

But, without going so far as Mr. Kavi does, the verse of Bhaṭṭa Gopāla on Bhāmaha, Udbhata and Nāyaka can very well be explained. The verse certainly refers to Udbhata and we know him as the author of the Bhāmahavivarana from other sources. It certainly refers to Nāyaka, but does it mean Nāyaka as a commentator like Udbhata? No. It
refers to Nāyaka as one who adopted and developed Bhāmaha. This is quite logical view. We know that the ancients beginning from Bhāmaha held even the content of poetry as finally shedding beauty over the form only. This is the proper interpretation of the old Rasavadadalāṅkāra. Nāyaka accepted, as Abhinava says, ( p. 12 ), that Rasa is the Ātman of poetry. But in distinguishing poetry from ordinary, Śāstraic, or Purānic utterances, he formulated the doctrine of Abhidhā-prādhānāya or vyāpāraprādhānāya. This means an emphasis on the form of poetry as its differentia. Bhāmaha gave Vakrokti as the differentia of poetry. The Abhidhā of a poet is his characteristic expression as a whole, his Vakrokti. Abhinava equates Nāyaka’s Vyāpāra, ( i.e. ) expression having it and Bhāmaha’s Vakrokti in his commentary on the section on Lakṣaṇas, Abhi. Bhā. ( G.O.S. II. p. 298 ). Abhinava says in his Locana that the Bhāvaktvavvāpāra, which is one of the three Amśas of Kāvya Śabda as distinguished from other Śabdas, is the embellished utterance having Guṇas and Alāṅkāras, pp. 68–70,

भावक्तमापि समुचितगुणाल्लभारप्रथिणांहस्माभिरेव वितत्य
वश्यते ।

—p. 70

Thus it is most likely that Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, in defining poetry and its difference from other utterances, and in expounding his idea of Abhidhā-prādhānāya or Vyāpāraprādhānāya, drew upon, adopted, exploited and re-interpreted Bhāmaha’s idea of poetry as being characterised by Vakrokti. This is perhaps th
‘Upalālana’ which Bhaṭṭa Gopāla says, Nāyaka gave to Bhāmalīa.

GHANṬAKA

We know a poet Ghanṭaka from the anthologies. This poet is revealed by Abhinava as a writer on Dramaturgy. He is quoted in the Daśarūpakādhyāya, on the point of the nature of the Nāyaka and Nāyikā in the drama called Nāṭikā, which type is not fully described by Bharata but is said to be derived from Nāṭaka. In making ūha from Nāṭaka to arrive at the characteristics of a Nāṭikā, there are differences in the views of writers on the Nāyaka and the Nāyikā. Lolāṭa and Śankuka are quoted here after whom Ghanṭaka is also quoted.


How much is Nāṭikā derived from Nāṭaka? How many features of Nāṭaka are also to be adopted for Nāṭikā? On this Ghanṭaka expresses the opinion that only in so far as a king is the hero, does a Nāṭikā base itself on a Nāṭaka. The qualities necessary for the hero of a Nāṭaka is unnecessary in the King-hero of Nāṭikā. Other writers opine that the varieties of heroes and heroines possible in a Nāṭikā are eight or sixteen. It cannot be decided whether Ghanṭaka wrote on Nāṭya completely or on Daśarūpa only.
SAKALĪGARBAHĀ

From the Abhinavabhārata on the Daśarūpakādhyāya, an up till now unknown writer on Dramaturgy is unearthed. His name is Sakalīgarbha. He is quoted along with Uḍbhāta, on the subject of Vṛttis. Both of them held new and peculiar Vṛttis. Sakalīgarbha casts away Uḍbhāta's Phalavṛtti and in its place creates a Vṛtti called Ātmasaṁvṛtti. He realises the need for such a Vṛtti which Uḍbhāta pointed out. But in cases like Maraṇa, Mūrcha etc., instead of Uḍbhāta's Phalavṛtti or Phalasaṁvṛtti Sakalīgarbha would call the Vṛtti as Ātmasaṁvṛtti. Another difference between Uḍbhāta and Sakalīgarbha is that while Uḍbhāta discards the four Vṛttis of Bharata and postulates two of his own, in their place, Sakalīgarbha accepts the four of Bharata, adds one more for cases like Maraṇa and thus holds five Vṛttis. Of this also I have dealt with at length in my paper on Vṛttis referred to before.

From this reference to Lolāta's refutation of Sakalīgarbha's view, we can make out that Sakalīgarbha came between Uḍbhāta and Lolāta. It is to this Sakalīgarbha's view that Śāradātanayya refers to when he says that some others recognise a fifth
Vṛtti called Viśrānti, ‘विश्रांति (प्रति) पश्चात करे’ p. 12, Gaek. edn. The word Viśrānti in the printed text of the Bhāvaprakāśa must be Viśrānti and it means Ātmasamvṛtti,

PRIYĀTITHI

Another writer on Dramaturgy like Sakalīgarbha is revealed to us on p. 537. His name is Priyātithi. Of him also we do not hear anything elsewhere. He is quoted while discussing the nature of ‘Saindhava’, which is one of the ten Lasyāṅgas.

priyātithibhūtiḥ (तिभि) सुनिमतोपेक्षेऽव उक्षण(ण) उदाहरणं च कृतम्, न चोकं युक्त्या तेन किष्ठित, हित्यसदेह।
---Vol. II, p. 537; G.O.S. III, p. 73

The definition of Saindhava given by Priyātithi does not agree with Bharata’s view and hence Abhinava says that he must not be accepted.

BHAṬṬA SUMANAS

A writer on music called Bhaṭṭa Sumanas is quoted in the Geyādhikāra.

अतस्तेषां व्यवहाराय विशेषसंज्ञािः प्रयोजनमिति भद्रयुमनसा तु श्लोकव्यस्यायं वाक्येकवाक्यतया महता प्रबन्धनेनाथों व्याख्यातः।
---Vol. IV, p. 80; G.O.S. IV, p. 161

Bhaṭṭa Sumanas perhaps commented on the Geyādhikāra or had occasion in an independent work of his to quote the three verses of Bharata under dis-
cussion in the above reference, and comment very elaborately on the theme.

BHĀṬṬA VṛDDHI

A similar writer called Bhaṭṭa Vṛddhi is also quoted in the Geyādhikāra, in the Tālādhyāya.

केचित्त्र अपपरिहारायः भोजनप्रायाः खतत्तायायेन अद्ध्य-
सिद्धर्थं च सम्पातालौ भ्रातातलो आद्या यावतसम्भवं
योज्यो। तथा च महत्यादितद्वा(?)दी पाणितलयभ्यं-
पुस्तकेऽ सर्वं शतं इति प्रस्तारो दशयते।

—Vol. IV, p. 203; G.O.S. IV, p. 307

This Bhaṭṭa Vṛddhi is a poet and a large number of his verses are found in the Subhāṣītāvalī. One verse attributed to him there viz., Śaśīdivasadhūsaṇaḥ etc., is found in the Nītiṣātaka of Bhartṛhari.

RUDRAṬA

Rudraṭa, the well-known Ālaṅkārika, is a Saṅgītā-
cārya also. Śaṅgīvadeva numbers him in his list.

रूढ्रटो नान्यभूषणालो भोजभूषणभस्त्रथा।

He is twice mentioned in Kallinātha’s commentary on the Saṅgītaratnākara, p. 82, Ānandāśrama edn, Abhinavā refers once in the Geyādhikāra to one Rudraka which evidently is a scribal error for Rudraṭa.

रूढ्रका(टा)दिभिस्तु एतस्थर्थ व्र (अद्वृत्यमानेन:) उत्कानां(?)
हलोकपाठविश्रुतौः सर्वत्रेव अद्भक्तस्योक्तः प्रस्तारस्य इत्य-
स्यादौ प्रथमभूतः उद्दृढः... ... हत्यपेश्यमेव।

—Vol. IV, p. 332; G.O.S. IV, p. 252
BHAṬṬA GOPĀLA

A writer named Bhaṭṭa Gopāla is twice mentioned in the Abhinavabhāratī and he is the author of a work on Tāla, entitled Tāladipikā.

This reference is in Gatyadhīya. As promised here, he again comes to the same point in Dhruvādhiya¹.

2. अन्ये तु यथोचितो मार्गः यथामार्गः इति विग्रहेण सुकुमारत्वात् भ्रवक एवानौं (!) हत्याहुः। यथा हि भट्टगोपालः स्वामिश्रयेण भ्रवके विविधिति (!)।

This Bhaṭṭa Gopāla who is a predecessor of Abhinava and perhaps near to Lollaṭa’s time, is thus different from Śaradātanaya’s father and also from the author of the commentary, Sāhityacūḍāmaṇi on the Kāvyapraṅkaṭa.

AṢṬĀGAMAS

On p. 227, Vol. IV, there is this Paṇkti in the Abhinavabhāratī.

अन्ये तु श्रीमपरमवं (?!) व्याच्चक्ते। तब अष्टागमपञ्च-विरूद्धसिद्धपरेष्यमेव।

¹ A second reference to Bhaṭṭagopāla is in Dhruvādhiya (G.O.S. IV, p. 386: महानिपल-महलोकप्रस्थूतिमिस्तु तथाविवर्ण विनियोगशेषेः च इत्यतः।) —S.S.J.
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From this we can guess that in Abhinava’s time eight works on Nāṭya were considered as basic and finally authoritative works of that Śāstra. What separate works constitute this ‘authoritative eight’ is not known. It is likely that the words Aṣṭāgama are a corruption for Asmadāgama.

Besides the above noticed writers and works clearly discernible in the text, there are some names in the Abhinavabhārati which are lost in the broken text. Thus we have two writers:

1. A Bhaṭṭa is lost in a corrupt line on p. 188, Vol. IV (ms.) (G.O.S. IV, p. 291). He is quoted just after the quotation of Abhinava’s Parama Guru Utpaladeva. The available text gives only this much—

   भट्टसनापि ।

2. Similarly we miss a Datta in a line on p. 203, Vol. IV (ms.) (G.O.S. IV, p. 307), where he is quoted along with Bhaṭṭa Vṛddhi. See above under Bhaṭṭa Vṛddhi.

   “तथा च भट्टसनापित-द्वादि etc.”

On the four kinds of Vādya, there is this passage in one place:

    चातुर्विंश्यं स्थरौथ्मेत्व स्मारयति । तद(त) तन्त्रीगतं
    ( Bh. XXVIII, 2 ) हेत्यादि ।

    ( Vol. III, p. 95 )

There is no improbability in Sūrya being one in the pantheon of Saṅgītācāryas. But, I think in the above passage, there is no mention of any writer. Sūryoktam is evidently a corruption for pūrvoktam.²

1. It is probable that the correct reading here is महोत्सनापि—S. S. Janaki

2. The printed ed. (G.O.S. IV, p. 2) reads ‘पूर्वोक्तम’—S.S.J.
In Vol. III, on p. 20 (G.O.S. III, p. 137), Abhinava refers to Viśvakarman’s work while speaking of the nature of the Mahendradhvaja or Jarjara.

On the next page also (G.O.S. III, p. 141), the word Mahātmanā in Bharata is interpreted by Abhinava as Viśvakarmanā. These references occur in the chapter on Āhāryābhinhaya and other stage equipments like Jarjara. The first reference at least seems to refer to some definite Silpa work attributed to the name of Viśvakarman and which work spoke also of the making of the stage and of the other stage sundries.

These are the writers on Āalāṅkāra, Daśarūpaka, Nāṭya and Saṅgīta who are quoted by Abhinava in his Abhinavabhāratī. Before we go to writers on other subjects quoted by him, we must discuss Abhinava with reference to Kuntaka and the concept of Vakrokti.

Dr. S. K. De says in his introduction to the Vakrokti-jivita that “Kuntaka was thus probably a younger contemporary of Abhinava, or a contemporary who might have been unknown or not yet sufficiently recognised in the schools.” Dr. Sankaran discusses the question of Kuntaka’s date on p. 119 of his Theories of Rasa and Dhwani, and points out there that there is a passage in the Abhinavabhāratī—which seems to refer to Kuntaka only or to those whose ideas found an exponent in Kuntaka. The said passage occurs in the commentary on the fourteenth chapter, wherefrom begins Vācika-
abhinaya. The *Abhinavabhāratī* on this chapter devotes the first section to criticise the theory of *Svaśabdavācyatva* of Rasa. The next section is what we are concerned here with. The text here is very bad and it is a pity we are not able to reproduce large extracts from it. From this section we can have an idea of what Abhinava thought of the concept of Vakrokti. In the *Locana*, in the first Uddyota commenting on Manoratha’s verse, Abhinava interprets Vakrokti as utkṛṣṭa saṅghaṭanā. In the third Uddyota he takes Vakrokti as the general name of all Alaṅkāras. In the *Abhinavabhāratī*, while dealing with the concept of Lakṣaṇa, Abhinava considers Vakrokti as equal to Lakṣaṇa, Gumpha, Bhaṇitī and Kavivyāpāra, as has been explained in my paper on Lakṣaṇa published in Vol. VI, Part I of J.O.R. Madras. In the *Abhinavabhāratī* on Chapter 14, he says that poetry is pervaded by ten kinds of Vaicitrya, resting on the ten kinds of Śabda. Śabdās are given as of ten kinds by Bharata.

नामाख्यातोपसर्षिततद्वितिनिपातसमायः।
सत्त्विविभक्तिनियुक्तो विजेणो वाचिकाशिनियः॥
—G.O.S. XIV, 4

These ten kinds of words forming the Vaćika, Abhinava opines, must be Vicitra if they are to be poetic. Thus poetry has ten kinds of Vaicitrya. The number ten, to accord with which the text of Bharata was reconstructed, is proved by the following line in the *Abhinavabhāratī*.

इन्येन दशसिद्दिः कवितावचिकशब्दनियो्यचकारः।
The two bits ending with Samāśaḥ and Niyuktah govern Vācikābhīnayaḥ, the last word and the Samāsa is given by Abhinava as मत्वर्ष्यः अच्. At the end of the commentary on the first line he says—मत्वर्ष्यः च ( मत्वर्ष्यः अच् ) p. 366 ( G.O.S. II, p. 227 ). At the end of his commentary on the second bit he says पूर्वबद्धापि ह्रन्दान्मत्वर्ष्यः : ( अच् ) p. 367 ( G.O.S. II. p. 229 ).

Then Abhinava takes the ten kinds of words one by one and explains and illustrates the Vaicitrya of each. As much as can be here quoted are given.¹ The first is Nāmavaicitrya—

नाम तथा मदनरिपरिति भगवत्पर्यायः एतदीयमुक्तः वर्णनेन प्रयोज्यम्।

—p. 365; G.O.S. II, p. 226

2. The next, Ākhyāta, is taken by Abhinava to refer only to Vartamanakāla etc., to the Lakāras on the Dhātus.

आत्मतमपि यद्रेचिच्छ्यां—[किं] स्मरसि स्मर मेखलागुणेः: ( Kumāra. IV, 8 ) ( p. 365 ) ( G.O.S. II. p. 226 )

इति वर्तमानप्रत्येक्तत सत्साक्षात्कारेय उपालम्बविषयता त्वमेवातः

• • • • • The Pratyudāharana also is given by him—

अन्यथा स्मृतवाचिनिति मेखलागुणेः: इति स्यात्।

—p. 365; G.O.S. Ibid.

¹. The verse as printed in the Kasi edn. p. 169, Chap. XV. Sl. 4 gives only nine kinds of words. The verse given above by me was reconstructed according to the Abhinavabhāratī by my Professor Mr. Prof. S. Kuppusvami Sastriyar.
3. The Upasarga is divided by Abhinava into two classes, Prakṛtārthayōgi and Arthena adhika-dyotaka. For the former he gives ‘nirmita’ as illustration.

उपसर्गोऽदि प्रकृतार्थयोगिनो यथा, निर्मिति इत्यथेन न मिति।
अधित(क)द्योतको(को) यथा ‘मुहुर्यपचित्तिैदिधिराद्यपते (Megha,
Uttara. v. 44 ) हति।

—p. 365; G.O.S. Ibid.

In Upasargas he includes the कर्मप्रवचनीय also such as Prati.

उपसर्गः कर्मप्रवचनीया अपि रुक्ष्यन्ते, ‘कि स्यादृ
अजुनः प्रति’ हति च।

—p. 365; G.O.S. Ibid.

4. The fourth word is Hita. It is taken as indicative of those other than the Taddhita-pratyayayas.

विचित्रत्मिति ( हितत्मिति ) तद्वित ( अन्तद्वित )प्रत्ययोप
रक्षणम्।

The example for the Vaicitrya of Hita is thus given.

मीमांसेः हुद्यमात्मन एव वाचला
नामापि मानकलनां सह्ये न जातु।

Here Mīmāṃsāte is an example of नामवाचलैवचित्यः.
The Pratyudāharana is also given: न तु ‘चिन्त्र चिन्त्रयति
ना ( सा )त्मन एव’ हति।

वें सुच्चात्प्रत्ययपरं न तत्क्रृतस ( पदान्तरेषु तक्रंसु )
वाच्यः, गौरवमयातु नोदाहतम्।

—p. 365; G.O.S. Ibid.
Within Hita, Abhinava includes the Tiṅ upon a nāmadehātu, kṛt and the Strīpratyaya. He illustrates the Vaicitrya caused by the use of a word in the feminine gender.

श्रीप्रत्ययो यथा, ‘अच्छासीनः स वैद्यधी’ , . . . . . . न तु वैद्यधी(भ्य)मिति। श्रीप्रत्ययेन सौभाग्यातिशयप्रतिति,(ते )।

—p. 366; G.O.S. Ibid.

5. The fifth is Taddhita and the Vaicitrya resulting from Taddhitaprayogas is thus illustrated:

तद्विदो यथा शांतव च पुरुषः’ (Raghu. IV. 42)
हति। न तु श्रूणाः चेति।

—p. 366; G.O.S. Ibid.

6. निपतो यथा ‘हहा हा देवि धीरा मव।’ ‘आः
किमः किराती।’

—p. 866; G.O.S. Ibid.

7. समासो यथा ‘मध्येग्रामयुनमयुना’ हति। नन्तु
(न तु ) ‘मध्ये ग्रामचिततनयनयो’ (रवितनयो:) हति।
एवं समासान्त्रेण वाच्यः।

—p. 366; G.O.S. II, p. 227

8. सन्निः दिःषा, नैरन्तरं रूप ( or उप )श्लेष्यः।

The example given for the former is ‘असिलता तत्रानि
सिरा’ and for the latter ‘सूच्र ब्राह्मण’ etc. In the case of
the latter he takes it as identical with the शब्दागुणा
called Śleṣa in Vāmana. He interprets this as एक-
पदविक्शम and illustrates the same verse as given
by Vāmana, सूच्र ब्राह्मणुस्थले etc.
9. The vibhakti is taken by Abhinava to include सुपुर, तिङ, वचन, कारकशस्त्र and उपग्रह (i.e.) आत्मन्ये and Parasmai Padas.

विभक्ति: सुपुर्दवचनानि, तैः कारकशस्त्रयोगिः सर्नति(१) उपग्रहाशोपलक्ष्यन्ति। यथा पाण्डितश्च मर्य वपुः।

—p. 366; G.O.S. Ibid.

नदु (न तु) 'पाण्डवभावं वपुः।' एवं कारकान्तरेषु वाच्यम्।

—p. 366; G.O.S. II, p. 229

वचनं यथा ‘पाण्डव यस्य दासा:’ ... तथा वैचिन्येण तवं हि रामस्य दासा:।

कि (तिङ) यथा ‘कीर्तिस्तव श्वेता (श्वेतते)। नदु (न तु) ‘श्वेतं यस्वतवः (तावकम्)। उपग्रह–कर्मणो (कर्मन्ति) श्रुतशालिनो (तां)। नदु (न तु) कर्मेः श्रुत–

शालित्वम्।

—pp. 366 and 367; G.O.S. Ibid.

10. The last is Niyukta which means Dhātu. It is thus interpreted by Abhinava.

नियुक्ते क्रियायामिति युक्तो (नियुक्तो) धातुः। धातु–

वैचिन्यं (यथा) ‘प्रस्तं (प्रस्तं) कुञ्जान्ते जगतः। नदु (न तु) ‘श्रुक्मस्।’

—p. 367; G.O.S. Ibid.

Every kind of word is thus to be used so that it may impart special beauty and significance. The Vaicitrya of poetry is thus of ten kinds. Closing this section Abhinava reconciles Ānandavardhana’s Dhvani to such a view.
Anandavardhana pointed out from the point of view of Dhvani that in a verse the Vibhakti, Vacana etc. may have Dhvani. It is only another way of saying it when it is said that there is Vaicitrya in Sup, Tiṅ etc. Abhinava has used here the word Vaicitrya to mean striking beauty. It is the same as the Vakrokti which is Kuntaka’s thesis. Abhinava shows here an acquaintance with a school of critics who explained everything as a kind of Vakrokti. He has not only shown some items of Vakrokti found in Kuntaka but has shown others also such as Sandhivaicitrya. Abhinava here does not follow or adopt any school but shows generally how in poetry every word has to be Vicitra, how the same thing was said under a different name by Anandavardhana and indirectly also suggests that those who developed Vakrokti discovered nothing new but only adopted a different phraseology. This he means when he says ‘अन्येऽरिपि सुवादिविक्रितेति’. Here the ‘anya’ is either a clear reference to Kuntaka who had written his book by the time of the writing of the Abhinavabhāratī or a reference to those whose ideas of Vakrokti were formulated into a theory by Kuntaka. The concept of Vakrokti had a great destiny and was ruling long in Kashmirian Kāvyagoṭhis. Many were acquainted with Vakrokti-
prakāras in a Kāvyā and it is likely that what Kuntaka did in addition was to apply that same concept fruitfully to Prakaraṇa and Prabandha.

Coming to the writers on other subjects quoted in the Abhinavabhārati—on Prosody which forms a chapter in Bharata, Abhinava quotes three old writers—Jayadeva, Kātyāyana and Bhaṭṭa Śaṅkara. Jayadeva is quoted on p. 370, Vol. II. (G.O.S. II, p. 244)

सर्वेऽः वृत्तानामित्यादौ अर्थसमासेन जयदेवविवधात्।

Who this Jayadeva is, is not known. He is twice mentioned as a writer on Prosody by Namisādhu in his Šīkā on Rudraṭa. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa in his commentary on the Vṛttaratnākara quotes Jayadeva and his definition of the Upacitra metre. Jayadeva is twice quoted in Rāmacandra Budhendra’s commentary, Paṅcika, on the Vṛttaratnākara.

11. Kātyāyana is the second writer on Prosody quoted by Abhinava. He is quoted on the metres for the various emotional situations and on the metres favoured in various countries.

यथोत्तः कात्यायनेन—

वीरस्य बुद्धिप्रदानां वणनेन सम्बरा भवेत्।
नायिकावर्णानां कार्यं वसन्ततिलकादिक्मू।
श्रावत्तिका प्राच्येषु मन्दाकान्तां च दक्षिणे।

—Vol. II, p. 370; G.O.S. II, p. 246

12. The third writer on Prosody is quoted at the end of the work in some connection.
This Bhaṭṭa Śaṅkara seems to be a Śaivācārya like Abhinava. A Śaiva called Śaṅkarakanṭha is known to us as the father of Ratnākaraṇṭha, the author of Stutikusumānjali tikā. Aufrecht mentions two more Śaṅkaras, one, son of Ratnākara and commentator on Mahimnas Stotra and another, a writer on prosody called Śaṅkaraśarman, who wrote a work on metrics called Vṛttamuktāvalī. Mr. R. Kavi is of opinion that the Bhaṭṭa Śaṅkara quoted by Abhinava is a commentator on Chandoviciti.

In the chapter on the Prākṛt, Abhinava mentions three works on Prākṛt grammar, Prākṛtadipikā, Sūtravṛtti, and Paddhati and one writer on Prākṛt grammar called Utpala.

The author of the Prākṛtadipikā is not given and Utpala, whose identity is not known, is given as the author of the two works on Prākṛt grammar, Sūtravṛtti and Paddhati. A grammarian Utpala is said to be quoted in the Nyāsa on Hemacandra's Brhad Vṛtti. ( p. 316 a. New Catalogus Catalogorum II.)
CHAPTER XI

(i)

SOME CORRECTIONS AND EMENDATIONS TO THE TEXT OF THE ABHINAVA-BHĀRATĪ

The manuscript position regarding the Abhinavabhārati, commentary on the Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata, not showing signs of improvement, it seems legitimate, as indeed necessary, to use other aids to purify its text which has appeared in the Gaekwad’s Oriental Series with numerous corruptions and unintelligible lines. Two such aids are the intensive scrutiny of the text, sometimes from purely grammatical and literary points of view, and the external testimonium of other treatises on Nāṭya Śāstra which clearly and closely borrow from Abhinavagupta. Collation with these can yield very fruitful results. The dance chapter (VII) of the Saṅgītaratnākara follows Abhinavagupta so closely that in many places it forms merely a metrical recast of the Abhinavabhārati. In a more pronounced manner than even the Saṅgītaratnākara, the Nyttaratnāvalī of Jáya- senāpati follows the Abhinavabhārati. In portions relating to Rasa and matters which are usually included in treatises on poetics and dramaturgy, it is well-known how the extensive borrowings and verbatim reproductions in the Kāvyānusāsana—and its com-
mentary by Hemacandra—and in the *Nātyadarpana* of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra help in the reconstruction of the text of the *Abhinavabhāratī*.

While working on portions of the *Abhinavabhāratī* I had made a number of corrections and emendations in the above-mentioned manner. These are offered here for the help of fellow-workers on these extremely difficult and little-studied texts.

1. On Karaṇas as composing Aṅgahāras (*Abhinavabhāratī*² I. p. 93, lines 10, 11):

```
करणद्वययोगोन्य च विनिहृत्ताभिमानो नास्ति ततः परं तु नृत्यतीत्यभिमानात् करणद्वयं नृत्यात्तक्षेत्रुक्तम्।
एवं ग्रहणान्द-न्यूनताधिकसंग्रहः।
```

The bold faced portions in the above are corrupt. The text of Bharata here says that two Karaṇas, which form the minimum, constitute the *Māṭyākā* or basic unit for an Aṅgahāra; and Aṅgahāras may be composed of two, three or four such Karaṇa-units. Here Abhinavagupta says that the reason why two Karaṇa-combinations are mentioned as the minimum unit is that, so long as one remains in one Karaṇa alone, there is no

---


2. References are to the edition in the Gaekwad’s Oriental Series, and to the ms. at Madras Govt. Ori. Mss. Library.
feeling that one is dancing; it is when one passes from one Karaṇa to another that the sense of dancing is realised. Accordingly the first of the two sentences above should read as:

करणामयायोगेण च विना नृत्ताममानो नाति।

Abhinavagupta’s further remark refers to Bharata’s text.

इत्यां त्रिभिष्टुस्तिरवर्णिप्रशंसहरस्तु मादवः॥

Therefore, in the Abhinavabhārati, एवग्रहणावत्, which wrongly puts the reader’s mind on the ‘eva’ of the previous line, is wrong. Abhinavagupta has passed that line and the word whose significance he has to point out now is ‘vā’ in the second line of verse 31. So the reading is वाग्रहणावत्; and ‘vā’ means permission or further possibility, the exact opposite of ‘eva’ which means specification (avadhāraṇa). अन्नृत्तामासंग्रह: should be just the opposite नृत्तामासंग्रह:. By वा in चातुर्खर्व, Bharata means that an Aṅgahāra may comprise less or more than four Karaṇas; as a matter of fact he calls a pentad of Karaṇas Saṅghātaka and adds Aṅgahāras of six, seven, eight or nine Karaṇas (NS IV, 32, 33).

To corroborate such a correction, we may cite also the Nyātāratnāvali (p. 137, Govt. Ori. Mss. Lib. edn.) in which we read:

नृत्यतीति परिष्नानं तद्विदयेन यतो भवेत्॥
करणामयायोगस्ततः स्यान्त्रृत्तमातुका॥
तद्वै तिस्मितल्लो वेत्यव्य हारः प्रकीर्तित॥
हस्तः प्रायंकमाल्यांतः कुतुक्ती व्यधिचारत॥
वाश्वशैवन्विकवाना न्यूनतान्विकतेः सुनिः॥

The GOS edn. gives here a Prākrit passage which is an illustration of the use of Uttāna Patākā-hastas, viz., the abhinaya of asūya, in the second Karanā, the Vartita. Abhūtvāyāyaśāhinīya yo vottanā pataka. Yasya “tucch kād sambh rāmar uta marapaṁ paññāvāśāvinmūt n atha” tathā eva pataka etc. Here the Prākrit illustration, whatever it means, is to stop at gugum. The text should then read abhūt-vartanāvyāvahārinīya pataka etc. By a different action, the same Patākā-hastas portray a different feeling, indignation (Roṣa), and this action is ‘āviddha-vartana’ etc. Jáya (Ibid. p. 113) who gives here a complete description based on Abhinavagupta has:

आविद्वर्तनाध्यावपवर्तनलिनिपतित्व

एतो यदा तदा रोषवाक्यायितिस्य ममतम्

3. Ardha-Nikuṭṭaka Karanā (ibid. I, p. 104), lines 7-9:

The ‘Aṅcita’ in Bharata, which refers to the hands, forms the meaning of the word ‘Nikuṭṭita’ in the names of this and the previous Karanā; but Abhinavagupta says that his predecessor Śaṅkuka interpreted the Aṅcita of the hands differently. This reference to Śaṅkuka and his view is found thus in the GOS edn.:

शशुकादिविश्वसनं देहाभिमुख्युपेन प्रह्यायानेन मनागार्क्षण-मिति व्याख्यायितं नाम्ना न सञ्चापत्न्यास्तास्

‘Manāg ālakṣaṇam’ has no meaning; ‘vyākhyā-yitam’ is an absurd expression. ‘Ālakṣaṇam’ should
read 'Ākaraṇaṃ'. Jáya (Ibid. p. 136. verses 238-9) who keeps very close to Abhinavagupta reads here:

स्वदेहानिरोहितं प्रचुभागेनारक्षणं मत्तम्।
श्रकुशप्रमुखः प्रोक्तपश्चितं तच संगतम्॥

व्याक्याययत् नास्ति न सज्जतम् in the GOS edn. should be rectified into व्याख्यायि which is the verb going with श्रयुक्तादिभि; and the rest should read तत्त्तमः न सज्जतम् meaning: 'That does not agree with the name', i.e., Nikūṭṭana or even Aṅcita.

Regarding the usage of the Ardha-nikuṭṭita, the GOS edn. reads here:

अस्य च प्रयोगः स्वातंसंभावनाविभय एव प्रहस्ते वाक्यार्थः॥

Here प्रहस्ते should read अप्रहस्ते, i.e., एवाप्रहस्ते वाक्यार्थः. Contexts involving pronounced self-glorification (pra-rūḍha-ātmasambhāvanā) are to be portrayed by Nikūṭṭita Karaṇa; see GOS edn. under that Karaṇa, p. 104: अस्य च पुनः पुनरात्मसंभावनाप्रयोगम् वाक्यविभित्तत्वे प्रयोगः। Ardhanikūṭṭita which is a partial modification of the same Karaṇa is to be used, not exactly in the same context, but for the same feeling in a less pronounced form. That is the import of the use of 'eva' also; the text means, 'in the case of the same (eva-) self-estimation; but not in a pronounced (apra-rūḍha) manner.' Jáya (Ibid. p. 136. v. 239) reproduces correctly:

अप्रहस्ताथः तद्भवते॥

4. Dikṣyastika Karaṇa (Ibid. I. p. 107, line 12):

चतुदिन्द्रमुखेशु सुनिधिकृष्ण ख्रियमेव एवाप्रहस्तः हितः॥
"Now, why an āṅguśṭha-specification here and why and how a broken thumb?"

The correct word here is अनुरूपिताङ्कन meaning 'without a break in the movement'. This is based on the expression शिल्प in Bharata. The readings recorded here are शिल्पगत:, शिल्पकृत:, शिल्पकर:, शिल्पकर:, but the Abhinavabhārati's अन एवामुक्त शिल्प इति suggests that the text of Bharata contains the word 'Āṅga' in this pāda.

The Nṛttaratnāvali (Ibid. p. 129. v. 189) reads here:

कुण्यदुरूपिताङ्कन दिएत्येशु चतुष्पांपि।

In the Ānandāśrama edition of the Saṅgītaratnākara, four MSS. are recorded as supporting this reading, though an inferior reading is adopted in the text. On p. 91 of the Abhinavabhārati again, वृद्धिताङ्कण्य, in line two, should read श्रृः.

5. Vikṣiptākiṣpta Karaṇa (Ibid. I. p. 109, lines 7 and 6 from below):

‘द्वितीयस्य विक्षेपणमननागमने। प्रधाने वाक्यार्थेः चास्य: प्रयोगः।’

This should read, ‘—द्वितीयस्य विक्षेप: गमननागमनप्रधाने वाक्यार्थेः चास्य: प्रयोगः:।’ In line 17 there should be a semi-colon after वा.

अथे तु कदाचिद्वितीयस्य मोदरकणाः यथायोगं एतc. in line eighteen is absurd. It should read वा विच्छेदरकणे. For corroboration, see Abhinavabhārati itself, I. p. 96, line 3—अभिनवान्तरालविच्छेदप्रण्यादनादी।

The question dealt with here under Vikṣiptākiṣpta by Abhinavagupta is the application and use of
Karaṇas like Vikṣiptākṣipta. First he states that it is to be used for abhinaya of expressions involving 'gamanāgamana', 'going to and fro'. Then he cites a Prākṛt illustration and records a different usage suggested by some others. With reference to this difference in prayoga according to different authorities, he siezes the opportunity to clarify the general question of prayoga of the respective Karaṇas on the basis of the indications given by his own teacher Bhaṭṭa Tota. This clarification is: Wherever Abhinaya-hastas are shown as forming part of the Karaṇa-definition, the indication is that they have an abhinaya-application; where only Nṛttta-hastas figure in Karaṇa-definitions, the Karaṇas are meant for pure Nṛttta. Abhinavagupta then informs us that other commentators merely enumerate the different applications to which Karaṇas can be put, viz., to cover up a gap that has occurred, at the end of a passage of gesticulation, in gait and coming round, in swinging over to a different rhythm, in the presentation through stylised movements of fights, or in movement in general; Bharata himself mentions some of these in IV. 56 at the enumeration Karaṇas, and the Abhinavabhāratī clarifies this point in its comments on IV. 56 also. See also Sāṅgītaratnākara VII. 623-5. Jāya, though he gives the whole thing as a prayoga of Vikṣepākṣiptaka, writes here:

एतराविज्ञविष्केत् प्रयोज्यं सनिधिगुस्ये।
तालानामागुस्ते गतीनां वा परिक्रमे।
चारीणां वा निन्ध्रावही सन्न्वचरेऽप यथोचित्व।

7. Vidyudbhānta (ibid. I. I. 125, lines 3 and 2 from bottom):

संवेदीमण्डलगत्या आश्या आविंद्र्या एवम्। आँखें अन्यथा।

The word needed is a feminine instrumental aiming at the elucidation of ‘सर्वातम्ब्रातालागत्या’ in the instrumental and meaning ‘with an all-round movement’; therefore ‘आँखें’ may be a corruption for आँखें.

In the next line प्रक्रिया संवेदीमण्डलगत्या आविंद्र्या एवम्. should be प्रक्रिया सर्वातम्ब्रातालागत्या। After विचित्र: should be the word इत्यादि which is missing.

8. Hariṇapluta (ibid. I. p. 131, last line):

After Abhinavagupta’s remark तस्यास्तु करणप्रवेषः प्रागेवोक्तः, we have in brackets ‘भुजज्ञातसितकरणव्याख्यानावसरे’। This information within brackets is evidently the editor’s and has been inserted by mistake; for Abhinavagupta does not speak of the Hariṇapluta-cāri under Bhujāṅgatrāśīta Karanā which it does not occur; on the other hand, Abhinavagupta’s reference is likely to be to Sannata Karanā (No. 75) not far removed from the present one, of which Hariṇapluta-cāri is a part. See Abhi. Bhā. I. p. 129.

9. Ākṣipta, Aṅgahāra (Ibid. I. p. 145, line 3):

यव यथा बुद्धश्वेतहृ तत्र तस्य केतिः प्रवर्तितमाः। The text should read द्वियोगमाः.


परिवर्तितस्य सुंदर्कण्ठाम्।

12. The three varieties of Raudra Rasa, (Ibid. p. 332, ch. VI, line 3):

After वाक्यस्व, there is to be a full stop.

13. The three varieties of Karuṇa Rasa, (Ibid. I. p. 332, ch. VI, line 4):

शोकशब्दन्त स्वज्ञानादिनासौ चैवे नयो विभावः। should read as शोकशब्दन्त स्वज्ञानादिनास्त्वः; एते नयो विभावः।

14. The three varieties of Bibhatsa Rasa, (Ibid. I. p. 332, ch. VI, line 3 from below):

यदाहूः ‘शोकास्वाह्न्यू न्युपस्त’ इति। This may be read as यदाहूः ‘शोकास्वाह्न्युपुप्सा’ इति, there being here a quotation from Yoga Sūtras II. 40. The editor has identified the very next citation which is Yoga Sūtra II. 33.

15. Samapādā, cāṛ (Ibid. II. p. 97, line 2):

तदा चरणाध्वारी भवत्येव, read : चरणाध्वारी.

16. Ibid. II. p. 137, lines 2-3:

उत्तं च विराजविद्वराजगुप्तमिति ? evidently carries a quotation from Gītā IX. 2, राजविद्वा राजगुप्तम्.

17. (Ibid. II. p. 141, lines 3, 2 from below):

युद्धवीरार्द्र हि प्रधानानुसन्धानमेवोचितम्। Here, the word should be प्रधान। In the next line आचार्य मातुलान्त्र भार्तृ व इत्यादिपते: contains an anuvāda of Gītā I. 26.

18. (Ibid. II. p. 148, lines 6-7):

‘Viraprasāntaḥ’ should be ‘Dhīraprasāntaḥ’.

19. (Ibid. II. p. 150, lines 9-10):

In the anuṣṭubh verse on the ‘Gati’ for Śaṅta Rasa, which Abhinavagupta rejects as interpolation, आन्तगतिम् should be शान्तगतिम्.
20. Abhinaya for riding a vehicle etc. (Ibid. II. p. 154, line 4):

रथगमनादभिनयनं न युक्तम्। The last words should read नायुक्तम् meaning just the opposite.

21. (Ibid. II. p. 246):

After the three Anuśṭubh lines cited from Kātyāyana, the five prose lines of the commentary are very badly presented. In the last two lines the ides is that while some of the metres like Dohaka and Toṭaka shine better when sung, metres like Anuśṭubh and Sraddhāra should rather be simply recited. The text may therefore read thus: कैषाम् श्वेत्तौक्तकृदत्तकादस्ति शीतमानत्यते शोभतयो भवति; श्लोकमश्वरादीनां तु पाठेन.

From this gloss of Abhinavagupta one is led to suggest that the text of Bharata relating to this, विद्वद्विकृतत्ववं is read by Abhinavagupta as विद्वद्विकृतत्ववं. Consequently the corrupt Pratikā in the Abhi. Bhā. introducing the above gloss भवते कृत इति is to be read probably as विद्वद्विकृतत्व इति.

22. (Ibid. II. p. 247, line 1):

स्तोत्रशाल्प्रेषु should be स्तोत्रशास्त्रेषु.

23. (Ibid. II. p. 287, lines 1-2):

गीतं पाठ्यमानल्याभावान्तु न वृत्ताता अभ्यतापेक्षते। Here if we have गीतं, the end should read न वृत्तात्ता अभ्यताम- पेक्षते; of if we retain वृत्ताता अभ्यता in the nominative, we should read गीते and अपेक्षते.
24. (Ibid. II. p. 294, lines 3-4):

This is to be read as तत्र गुणाल् कावश्रेति.

25. (Ibid. II. p. 295, lines 6-7):

Obviously, by the sense, we should have here न instead of च, i.e., न लक्ष्यति.

There is to be a full stop after अलूक्ष्यः and the further portion should really read यत्वं अजुक्ष्यं ततलक्षणम् etc. Lakṣaṇa, on the view propounded here, differs from Alaṅkāra in being अजुक्ष्यं. See also ch. I on Lakṣaṇa in my Concepts of Alaṅkāra Śāstra, Adyar Library Series.

26. (Ibid. II. p. 296, line 8):

This should obviously read पद्ध इति.

27. (Ibid. II. p. 298, line 6 from below):

तावणिटि वारणपरं etc. Read this as तावणिटि वारणपरं etc.

28. (Ibid. II. p. 299, line 10):

In the quotation from the Pādatāditaka, ‘Kusūlagninā’ should be ‘Kukūlagninā’.

29. (Ibid. II. p. 305):

Lines 3-5 are corrupt: but the illustration for Nirukta printed absurdly can easily be restored: यथा सत्यं सराजगतिसु रणजनाविदिति (?) Read this as यथा सत्यं स राजा; प्रकृतिरूपजनाविदिति.

30. (Ibid. II. p. 305, lines 6-5 from below):
ननु गौरव्याकृत प्रकाश्योगेश्यपि किः न कार्यं कोषपरिवर्णन

31. (Ibid. II. p. 387, line 8 from below):
भविष्यत्मनुबद्धव तद् दृढ्याविव्वरानुसारेण। Here
what is separately and wrongly found as तद् और दृढ-
स्थायिः should read together, as तद्भगतस्थायिः.

32. (Ibid. II. pp. 396-97):
The first para on p. 397 ends with the words
इति संग्रहकारः from which it is legitimate to look in the
preceding lines for a quotation from that writer. When
we scan, with this idea in mind, we see quite an
interesting thing. Three and a half lines of the text,
beginning at the middle of the last line on p. 396,
form a citation from the Saṅgrahakāra and the lines
printed as running prose, are really in Āryā verses:

आदौ मध्यः स्तव्याई मध्यान्ते चार्पां वाक्ये।
पूर्वः भूयान्तमध्ये दृढ्य विपरीतको यसं विसर्गः॥
बहुधु हृतिदृशय मध्यो मनागु हृतोद्तत्त्वं दृढः स्यात्।
त्रिस्वाने हृतमध्यविलिमितयुगु दीपयं सदारोध।
विपरीतं (तः) प्रश्रयं (नः) स्यात् उत्त्रन्यं चैकस्थानिवैहात्॥
इति संग्रहकारः.

33. (Ibid. II. p. 397, line 8 from bottom):
‘इति हि श्लोकप्रथमसङ्क्षेपं मध्यमलयो भूयोष्पिः दृढः वाक्ये।
सैत्यादियुः’.

(There is an editorial footnote concerning सैत्यादियु-
“सा बाला वयस्म्यगल्लभमनस्” इत्यादिश्लोकः.)
The correct construction is that the first sentence mentioning Madhyama-laya for the former parts of the first line of the verse क्वाकार्य etc., should stop at मध्य-लयः. The stop after मूयोपि दृष्यते should be removed; and दृष्यते should read दृष्येत with सेत्यादियु tacked on to it. The quotation is मूयोपि दृष्येत सा which forms the latter parts ( पासेवायक्षण्ड ) of the first line of the same well-known verse क्वाकार्य, शशवक्षण: क्ष च कुलं, मूयोपि दृष्येत सा.

सेत्यादियु is not, as has been explained absurdly in the footnote, a reference to the verse सा बाला etc., from the Amaruka.

34. ( Ibid. II. p. 412, lines 12-11 from below ):
रणजनाया etatmasāntvāt should read रणजनाया etatmahāntvāt.

देवानामवियाधानम् in the second line above this, is corrupt.

35. ( Ibid. II. p. 418, lines 9-10 ):
तत् एवेतरं न निस्वुखः स्वात् इति। Here न निस्वुखः स्वात् is a quotation from Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra, I. 7.

36. ( Ibid. II. p. 421, lines 7-8 ):
Line 7 is to be properly punctuated thus: नायक-शब्देन तत्त्वीतिसम्बोधी; तो सम्बंधितव प्रत्यक्षी यत्र। So far it is the Vigraha and the gloss on the expression सम्बंधित-नायकः. The next sentence is wrongly printed; the essential word न is missing; the meaning is ‘even in a One-Act Play, the Act is not to be made void of the direct presence of the hero and his activity’; therefore,
the line should read: एङ्का एति उपस्थिति नायकचरितप्रस्तुतकार-स्थानीय न कार्यः। किंपुनरस्ये नामणि प्रस्तुतये नाटके वेत्तुक्मः। 37. (Ibid. II. p. 427, line 3. from below.)

In the quotation here बश्या हि जीवत: पुनरावृत्ति: which is absurd, should read वृष्टा हि. This is in explanation of 'Apasaraṇa' in Bharata's text. The idea is that the hero is not to be killed during the course of the plot; but the adverse turn of events for him should be managed only by making him 'retreat' or go into hiding for the time being, by his captivity or even by a truce. It is in connection with Apasaraṇa or 'retreat' that Abhinavagupta makes the quotation that in an impossible situation, one should give up everything and make a tactical escape, for, if a man manages to live, we know by experience that he comes back (वृष्टा हि जीवत: पुनरावृत्ति: ) and regains power. This is a quotation from Kauṭilya, (IIInd Edition, Mysore, p. 360, lines 1-3).

In The Adyar Library Bulletin, vol. 18, 3-4 (December 1954), pp. 196-209, attention was drawn to the textual difficulties in the Abhinavabhārati, in MS. or print, and point of view of the meaning of the passages, helped on the one hand by the tradition of the art and on the other by the correlated study of allied texts and texts patently deriving their material from Abhinavagupta; also, pursuing this process of purification, a series of thirty-seven corrections and emendations were proposed in the text as printed in the first two volumes in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series. During my further study
of the *Abhinavabhārati*, I have come across several other passages where similar improvements are possible, and these I propose to offer in the present paper, taking into notice also the revised second edition of the first volume of the *Abhinavabhārati* in the GOS, which appeared in 1956.


ककिचिदश्रेष्ठप्राघानं रूपकम् यथा नाटकम्। प्रकरणं वा क्रिया-प्राघानम्। तथा प्रसिद्धानं यथा भाणः।

Here: the punctuation given in the first edition which is correct may be restored.


प्रलसिष्ठो करारिति लताहस्तो मन्त्रयोऽ न तु. दोलाहस्तो।

तयोरेकविषययोर्त्र वर्तनायाशातुरश्चमभेज्जेहतुवात्।

As it is, the words *tayor ekaviṣayah* do not make any sense. The question is whether in Samanakha, the hands which are non-technically given as *pralambitaḥ* are technically Latā-hasta-s or Dola-hasta-s. Abhinavagupta says they are Latā, and not Dola and the reason is to be seen from the application of Dola, Bharata IX. 149 (GOS, II), on the basis of which we can reconstruct this passage as: *tayoh sokaiva vā*, *sokaiva vā* or *tayoh sokaiva*. Dola-hasta-s convey dejection. This is corroborated by Jayā who has here (*Nṛttaratnāvali*, IV. 39) *sokaiva viṣayāvetau*. 
40. IV. 126, Vidyudbhṛānta, I, p. 125 ( p. 123 ), penultimate line :

तत्पादस्य निभुत उद्भ्रमणात्—।

Here the word iva is necessary: vidyuta iva udṛhramanāt—

41. IV. 250, the Aṅgahāra-s, being thirty-two in number. I, p. 165 ( p. 163 ).

Here lines 1-2 of the Abhī. Bhā. give one kind of accounting for the number thirty-two on the basis of the musical items of the Pūrvarāṅga. In line 1, there is an addition made in the revised edition; and in the first edition the number nine ( nava ) is added in brackets after vardhamānakaraṇāṁ and this is reproduced in the revised edition also. Now, how even after this addition the number thirty-two is arrived at is not clear; for the number thus mentioned is only seventeen ( 3+(9)+4+1 ). If the nine in brackets is not inserted—and there seems to be no justification for its insertion—the expression vardhamānakaraṇāṁ which should really be vardhamānakaṇaṇāṁ will probably go with catvāri āsāritāṁ. Some clarification of this passage in the Abhī. Bhā. may be gained from Jāya who reproduces it in his verses IV. 359-60 :

विश्लेषितगतकाञ्जनि चतुर्मिर्धिकानि च।
आसारितानि चत्वारि वर्ध्मानकहेतुः (?)।।
वस्तू त्रिविद्यधुः, एकैव वाणिकैति परे विद्यः।।

From this, it could be seen that the missing number is really in respect of the first item, Gitakāṅga-s, which
is 24 according to Jāya whose list adds correctly to 32.

42. IV. 21 ff, I, p. 165 (p. 163), l. 7 from below:

पृथक्कृष्णस्थायिक्यापनाथं चैव अरणाज्ञानान्तरभूविनामधु-पादानाम्।

Here the portion in thick type should read पर्थक
adṛṣṭārthakhyaṇāpanārtham. Recaka-s are part and parcel of the Karaṇa-s and Aṅghāra-s, but Abhinavagupta explains that their separate treatment is due to the fact that there is special non-worldly (adṛṣṭa) merit attached to them, as to other constituents of Tāṇḍava. Cf. Jāya, IV. 376, p. 157:

प्रयुक्ता: पुण्यसम्पन्नवत्सो रेचका हमे।

43. In the same context, a couple of lines below, Abhinavagupta quotes an Anuṣṭubh line from Tumburu which is printed in the earlier and the revised GOS eds. (I, p. 165; 163) thus:

अष्णहाराभिधानातू करणे रेचकानू विदुः।

The reference here is to Recaka-s which are naturally involved in the execution of the Karaṇa-s which occur at the beginning, middle and the end of Aṅghāra-s: aṅghārādīmadhyāntakaraṇai recakān viduḥ (Jāya, IV. 374, p. 156). This should be the correct reading of the line from Tumburu.

There are three more corruptions in this paragraph and the revised edition suggests emendations to two of these in the last two lines on the page.

44. IV. 295, I, p. 193 (p. 191), ll. 1-2:
The revised edition effects one improvement, pिन्दिक- 
bandhadvayaprakāraḥ. The correct reading here is:
pिन्दिक- 
bandhaḥ dviprakāraḥ, sajātyo vā ...... vijātyo vā ...... 
The Pīndibandha is of two kinds, Sajātiya and Vijātiya.

45. I, p. 216 (p. 214), ll. 4 and 7:
(a) एवं तावदन्तयेवनिकाज्ञानः दश्तार्थे एव प्रयोगः।
(b) एवं दश्तार्थे प्रयोगे पूर्व कुर्ते, पवाद्व दश्तार्थःत्तनुसारे एव 
bhārīnta bhāviḥ; etc.

Here the expression drṣṭārtha in (a) and in the 
begging of (b) should be adṛṣṭārtha. The whole 
treatment of Pūrvarāṅga has one burden, namely, that 
it is of special religious merit, adṛṣṭārtha and devatā-
prityartha.

46. VI. 16, I, p. 269 (p. 267), l. 7:
Abhinavagupta explains here the significance of 
Bharata mentioning Rasa in the singular number in 
the Śūtra, na hi rasād pte kaścid arthaḥ prapartate and 
shows on the analogy of the theories of Sphoṭa and 
that of sentence and meaning, how if Rasa is one, the 
plurality of the eight Rasa-s, Śṛṅgāra, etc., could be 
understood: If the analogy of Sphoṭa is accepted, the 
one nameless absolute Rasa alone is real, and its mani-
fold forms are asatya; on the analogy of the Anvita-
bhidhāna-vāda relating to the nature and status of 
words in a sentence, the other named Rasa-s will be 
satya and while conveying their own meanings, they 
will convey also the one Rasa as such; that is, the
constituent Rasa-s play a dual role (ubhayātmaka). On the analogy of the Abhīhitānvaya theory of words and sentence, the many named Rasa-s will be parts of a whole. In the light of this explanation we may read the text as printed in the first edition or the revised one with the emendations shown within brackets.

तत्तः मुख्यभूतात् महारसात्सकुटाद्वाचात्यानि वा, अन्विताभिधानद्वीपेय उपायात्मकानि (उभयात्मकानि) सत्यानि वा, अभिधितान्वद्वीपेय तत्समुद्राय(च)रप्पणि वा सचन्तरणिभागाभिनिवेशहृद्गंजानि हृद्यन्ते (भागाभिनिवेशहृद्गंजा निहृद्यन्ते).

Cf. also ibid., p. 273, line 3 from bottom: tasyāvā punar bhāgaḍṛśa vibhāga. See also p. 76 of my Number of Rasas (Adyar Library).

47. Vol. II, p. 54, Tāmracūḍa-hasta, l. 2 from below:

चूळासुत्कब्बूढरकारत्वादः ताम्रचूडः।

is the text as printed. It should read cūḍāyukta-kukkūṭa, etc.

48. Ibid., p. 55, l. 4:

एस्य एवानुसंधुतेष्यः।

Here the nu is to be removed; the word is asamyutēbhyah. The reference is to the Asamyutahasta-s.

49. Ibid., p. 64, l. 2:

विभावदायः।

This should be vibhāvādāyah.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 82, II. 2-4, the possibility of numberless Vartanā-ś or Karaṇa-ś of the hands:

एतेषु करणेष्व चतुष्कु हतमस्यविलम्बितादिविचित्रित्येन बाहु-पयायेन च समस्तानि योजनयाच यदा निषुज्यन्ते तथा धात-वर्तनादिश्यतसहस्त्राणि अत्रवचान्तभृत्तानि—।

The conditions which are responsible for multiplying the varieties of hand-movements called Hasta-karaṇa-ś or Hasta-vartanā-ś are tempo (Druta, Madhyā and Vilambita), the employment of the hands one after the other, and employing them together or singly. In the light of this, we should read the word *samasta* ās *samastavyasta* and it should go with the next word as follows: *samastavyastayojanayā* which is the third variegating condition. Cf. Jáya’s *Nṛttaratnavali*, II. 227:

हतमस्यादिविचित्रित्यात् समस्तव्यास्तयोजनात्।
पयायायोऽधिपि बाहूनां करणेष्व चतुष्क्रिये प।
वर्तनांः क्रियमाणास्तु संभवन्तु परश्रयत्सु॥

which keeps very close to Abhinavagupta; see also *Sangitaratnākara*, VII. 348-9, which too follows Abhinavagupta:

बाहूनां करणेनाथ समस्तव्यास्तयोजनात्।
कमादृ हतादिविचित्रित्यायायतेनस्य सहस्त्रः।
वर्तनाश्चदृष्टान्तः × ×॥

Śāṅgadeva, it may be noted, adds a fourth factor of variegation, the order or sequence of movements, *krama*.
In the Abhi. Bhā. text, in the word ghātavartanādi, there is no mistake; it is correct, being the name of one of such possible Karavartanā-varieties. It is an alternate name of Alapallava-vartana (see Kallinātha’s commentary on Saṃg. Rat., vol. IV, p. 109, Adyar ed., Vartanā 20).

51. Ibid., p. 101, Cāri Mattalli, 1. 5 from below:

अगाधमदविषया मत्तश्रीः

This should be gāḍhamadaviṣayā. The previous feet-movement, Samotsarita-mattalli is for moderate intoxication but Mattalli is for high intoxication; hence gāḍha is the correct word. Cf. Nyttaratnāvalī, III. 38: tāruṇe made.

52. X. 49, ibid., p. 107, II. 4-6. Abhi. Bhā. as printed reads—

एवकारोप्यसंभावनां निरस्यते | हस्त ह्यति | अर्थवचनः
नूत्ति नात्थे, नूचे तु पक्षप्रदोतोऽपक्षविश्वितावपि—

Here, the first portion in thick type should read anyasaṁbhāvanāṁ nirasyati. The next word in thick type should be nṛtye and after Paksavāṇcītāv api, there should be a full stop. Cf. Nyttaratnāvalī III. 66.

53. XVII. 106, Kāku, ibid., p. 389. 1. 4:

लौल्यं च साकांक्षे यथा स्वरवैचित्र्यं लक्ष्ये ईशयतो

etc.

This should read: laulyaṁ ca sākāṁkṣatā; iyatā svaravaicitryaṁ lakṣyate iṣadyato, etc. From iṣadyataḥ
another etymological explanation of Kāku begins. Cf. the author's Locana on this topic of Kāku under Dhvanyāloka, III. 39.

Corrections and emendations to the third volume of the Abhiṣṭa Bhā: text, GOS, will be offered on another occasion.