

THE PROLOGUE AND EPILOGUE VERSES OF VĀCASPATI-MĪŚRA-I*

Ashok Aklujkar, University of British Columbia

§1.1 Recently, I had an occasion to write about Vācaspati-mīśra's Tattva-samīkṣā commentary to Maṇḍana-mīśra's Brahma-siddhi. As one part of my article, I pointed out that two verses found at the end of the Yukti-dīpikā manuscripts¹ and probably referred to by the remark *kṛtir iyaṁ śrī-vācaspati-mīśrāṇām* in one ms could have come from the Tattva-samīkṣā.² To judge the viability of the connection which had occurred to me, I made a study of the verses found at the beginning and end of Vācaspati's works. As a few verses composed by him are found also in the middle of two of his works, I included them too to get a better sense of his verse style. The purpose of the present article is to report my discoveries in the hope that they will either throw new light on Vācaspati's life or help in bringing precision and certainty to the conjectures that have already been made about his life. I also hope that, when critical editions

* I was able to complete this article because of the help I received from Professors Albrecht Wezler, Lambert Schmithausen (University of Hamburg) and Karin Preisendanz (University of Vienna) and from Dr. Elliot M. Stern (Philadelphia), all of whom read the earlier drafts carefully and made me aware of the need for improvement in minor as well as major respects. Professor Srinivas Ayya Srinivasan (University of Hamburg) kindly discussed with me the questions I put to him regarding manuscript variations. My thanks go also to the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung of the Federal Republic of Germany for its fellowship which enabled me to concentrate on research during 1998-99.

I have italicized only those non-English words which are mentioned as distinct from used, except when such words occur as parts of whole phrases or passages.

¹ I will employ the following abbreviations, except in quotations and some sentences in which their use would look odd: "ms" for "manuscript," "ed" for "editor," "edn" for "edition," "comm" for "commentary," and "vol" for "volume."

² The relevant details can be had from Aklujkar 1998. The verses concerned are: *tattvaspṛśaḥ khaṇḍita-bheda-vādinō dhvāntacchidaḥ paṇḍita-ṣaṇḍa-maṇḍanāḥ / viniḥsṛtā maṇḍana-vaktra-paṅkajāj jayanti vācaḥ śruti-nīti-maṇḍanāḥ* // (found at the end of the mss of Maṇḍana-mīśra's Brahma-siddhi) *sphuṭābhidheyā madhurāpi bhārati māṇṣiṇo nopakhalaṁ virājate / kṛṣānu-garbhāpy abhito himāgamaṁ kaduṣṇatām yāti divākara-dyutiḥ* // *nayanti santas ca yataḥ sva-śaktito guṇaṁ pareṣām tanum apy udāratām / iti prayātv eṣa mama śramaḥ satām vicāraṇānugraha-mātra-pātratām* // (found at the end of the mss of the Yukti-dīpikā). My preference for the readings given here is justified in the article to which I have just referred.

of those of his works which have so far not been critically edited are prepared, the editors will seek answers to some of the questions I raise, explicitly and implicitly.

§1.2 For the sake of convenience in later discussion, I will take up Vācaspati's verses in the sequence in which Vācaspati is thought to have completed or undertaken his works. First, I will offer observations, mainly text-critical in nature, on specific verses. These will be followed by general observations regarding Vācaspati's life as a scholar.

§2.1a Nyāya-kaṇikā beginning:

*parāmrṣṭaḥ kleśaiḥ katham api na yo jātu bhagavān
na dharmādharmābhyām, tribhir api vipākair na ca tayoh /
paraṁ vācām tattvaṁ yam adhigamayaty om iti padaṁ
namasyāmo viṣṇuṁ tam amara-gurūṇām api gurum //1//
bhuvana-bhavana-sthema-dhvaṁsa-prabandha-vidhāyine
bhava-bhayabhide tubhyaṁ bhettre purām tisṛṇām api /
kṣiti-hutavaha-kṣetrajñāmbhaḥ-prabhañjana-candramas-
tapana-viyad ity aṣṭau mūrtir namo bhava bibhrate //2//
ajñāna-timira-śamanīm para-damanīm nyāya-mañjarīm rucirām /
prasavitre prabhavitre vidyā-tarave namo gurave //3//
ācārya-kṛti-niveśanam apy avadhūtaṁ vaco 'smadādīnām /
rathyodakam iva gaṅgā-pravāha-pātaḥ pavitrayati //4//³*

§2.1b The first verse is unlike most of Vācaspati's other verses in that it praises Viṣṇu, principally and exclusively. Given the liberal attitude toward various deities expressed in Tattva-bindu verse 1 and Bhāmatī verse 4, it is not impossible that Vācaspati wrote the verse. However, it seems improbable from the pattern seen in his other verses collected here that he would write such a verse without any reference to Śiva or that he would place it ahead of a verse praising Śiva.

³ For the recurrence of verse 4 in the prologue of the Bhāmatī, see §3.3-4 below. For the absence of an epilogue in the Nyāya-kaṇikā, see note 19 of Aklujkar 1998.

Secondly, in almost every commentary prologue,⁴ Vācaspati has tried to match the content of the maṅgala verse with the content of the work or darśana to follow (cf. §2.4a, §2.5a, §2.6a, §2.7a, four out of five cases). The present verse, if at all it is authored by him, would then be appropriate for the beginning of his commentary on the Yoga-bhāṣya. Its details are reminiscent of the Yoga-sūtras 1.24-27: *kleśa-karma-vipākāśayair aparāmrṣṭaḥ puruṣa-viśeṣa īśvaraḥ, tatra niratiśayam sarvajña-bījam, sa pūrveṣām api guruḥ ... and tasya vācakaḥ praṇavaḥ*. It has a partial similarity of content with the maṅgala verse at present found at the beginning of the Tattva-vaiśaradī (§2.6a below) and also with the maṅgala verses and the first epilogue verse of the Pātanjala-yoga-sāstra-

⁴ (a) I qualify with “commentary” here because I wish to leave out the prologues of two noncommentarial works: the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha and the Tattva-bindu. The relationship through thought elements or theme of an opening verse with the main text to follow, if perceived, can lead us to examine if such relationships exist in the case of the other works of the same author. If they are found to exist, we may speak of a pattern. But the detected pattern can become a better piece of evidence in deciding authorship if we can establish inclination. It is possible to do so if the nature of the text to follow is already set for the prologue author -- if he has no freedom with respect to the text which follows. Then we have a stricter ascertainment of the pattern and a good reason to consider it probable that the author likes to meet certain challenges or to aim at achieving subtler results.

I leave out the prologue of the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha also for the reasons indicated in §3.1-2 .

(b) I further confine myself to maṅgala verses, because the content of the other type of prologue verses in any Sanskrit commentary will be determined by considerations such as who the author of the commentandum is, what the commentator’s sources of knowledge or inspiration are, and so on. These non-maṅgala verses, therefore, will not give us a specific enough pattern suitable for use in authorship issues.

(c) The preceding clarifications leave only verse 2 of the Nyāya-kaṇikā as a possible oddity. While that verse may not contain any clear indications of affinity with the Mīmāṃsā, it probably comes as close as a theist author can come in writing a maṅgala for a text discussing issues in an atheist system. Vācaspati’s verse is not unlike Kumārila’s at the beginning of the Śloka-vārttika (*viśuddha-jñāna-dehāya tri-vedī-divya-cakṣuṣe / śreyaḥ-prāpti-nimittāya namaḥ somārdha-dhāriṇe //*) in that it too speaks of objects associated with the ritualistic side of Vedic life. Its tenor is also like that of the nāndī verse of the Abhijñāna-sākuntala, the work of an author to whom the Brahmanical way of life, including its rituals, was very dear.

(d) Rṣi-putra Parameśvara-I wrote two commentaries, Juṣadhvaṁ-karaṇī (brief and earlier) and Svaditaṁ-karaṇī (longer and later), to the Nyāya-kaṇikā. Dr. Stern, who has edited the two commentaries very competently but is yet to publish them, obliged me by providing the following information: In Svaditaṁ-karaṇī, Parameśvara-I first interprets the second verse as connected to Yoga-sāstra, then adds an alternative explanation according to Nyāya-sāstra. Finally, he says that the first and second verses praise the two deities in accord with Śruti, Smṛti, Itihāsa and Purāṇa

vivaraṇa ascribed to Śaṅkara (note words in boldface type):⁵

*yasmin na staḥ karma-**vipākau** yata āstām*
kleśā *yasmai nālam alaṅghyā nikhilānām /*
nāvacchinnaḥ kāla-dṛśā yaḥ kalayantyā
*lokeśas taṁ kaitābha-śatruṁ [= **Viṣṇuṁ**] praṇamāmi //*
yaḥ sarvavit sarva-vibhūti-śaktir
vihīna-doṣopahita-kriyā-phalaḥ [→ °ṣo vihita-kriyā-phalaḥ?]
viśvodbhavānta-sthiti-hetur īśo
*namo 'stu tasmai **gurave guror api** // ...*
omkāro yasya vaktā *samacarata phalaiḥ karma yasmād aśeṣam*
*niṣkarma-**kleśa-pāko** ghaṭayati sakalam yaḥ phalena kriyāṇām /*
īśānām īśvaro yaḥ sthiti-bhava-nidhana-prakriyāṇām vidhātā
dhyāyan naḥ śuklimānam vyapanudatutarām kṛṣṇimānam sa kṛṣṇaḥ [=
Viṣṇuḥ *] //*

The verse *parāmr̥ṣṭaḥ* ... may be inauthentic or might have come to its present place from an original location in some other work of Vācaspati as the above observations suggest. However, before any conclusion is reached in this regard, due recognition should be shown of the fact that the verse has been in its present location for at least 600 years. Dr. Stern kindly informs me that “only one of the manuscripts, D, is intact for the beginning of the Nyāya-kaṇikā, but both of Parameśvara-I’s commentaries [see note 4d] comment on this verse — a brief explanation in Juṣadhvaṁ-karaṇī and a long explanation ending on folio 3a in Svaditaṁ-karaṇī.” Parameśvara-I lived in the middle of the fourteenth century A.D.

§2.1c The construction *kṣiti-hutavaha-kṣetraññāmbhaḥ-prabhañjana-candramas-tapana-viyad ity aṣṭau mūrtīr namo bhava bibhrate* in verse 2 is somewhat unusual, although not inauthentic, ungrammatical or obscure. Its

⁵ (a) Some readings in the verses which follow are problematic. I do not pretend to understand the citations fully. I hope that a critical edition being prepared by Mr. Kengo Harimoto will give us intelligible readings.

(b) Dr. Stern has brought another parallel to my attention, the first maṅgala verse of the Mitākṣarā commentary to Yājñavalkya-dharma-sāstra: *dharmādharmau tad-vipākās trayo 'pi kleśāḥ pañca prāṇinām āyatante / yasmīn, etair no parāmr̥ṣṭa īśo yas taṁ vande viṣṇum omkāra-vācyam //*

form seems to have been determined by the exigencies of metre, which is understandable. Normally, we come across constructions such as *kṣīti-...viyad-ākhyāḥ*⁶ *aṣṭau mūrṭīḥ bibhrate*. The author obviously expects us to take *kṣīti-...viyad* as a samāhāra-dvandva, so that the employment of the singular number will be grammatical.

§2.1d The identity of the text Nyāya-mañjarī mentioned in verse 3 has implications for the relative chronology of Vācaspati. I have at present nothing new to contribute to the issue that has been discussed by several scholars, except to point out the following: (a) One early perceptive discussion is available in Srinivasan 1967:54-61. (b) The discussion by Janaki Vallabha Bhattacharyya (1978:xxiv-xxx) is methodologically faulty, although his conclusion may not be wrong. Bhattacharyya builds one conclusion on top of another without noticing that the latter may be nothing but someone's testimony and/or conjecture (sometimes amounting to nothing more than an imputed motive).

§2.1e As for the author Tri-locana of the Nyāya-mañjarī mentioned by Vācaspati, I will offer a new conjecture in §3.5(a). At this point, let me include only a clarification and an interesting piece of information. Tri-locana is not mentioned in the verse in which Vācaspati speaks of a guru who authored the Nyāya-mañjarī.⁷ I learn from Dr. Stern that "Parameśvara-I, the commentator of the Nyāya-kaṇikā, does not name Vācaspati's guru and does not supply any information that would help in determining the authorship of the Nyāya-mañjarī." However, neither Dr. Stern nor I think that such absence of explication implies that Tri-locana was not Vācaspati's guru or that Tri-locana did not write a Nyāya-mañjarī (a text different from Jayanta's carrying the same title). The evidence establishing a teacher-disciple relationship between Tri-

⁶ Synonyms of *ākhyā* such as *saṃjñā*, and, if the enumeration is not complete, *ādi*, *ādya* etc. may also be attested in such contexts.

⁷ This absence of direct, explicit naming may be due to a cultural convention; cf. *yat tu "ātma-nāma guror nāma nāmātikṛpaṇasya ca / āyus-kāmo na gṛhṇīyāj jyeṣṭhāpatya-kalatrayoḥ //*" *iti tat kāmyam, āyus-kāma iti śravaṇāt*. Nanda-panḍita, Keśava-vaijayantī commentary on Viṣṇu-smṛti, p. 433. Further, the convention might have been thought of as something to be observed only as long as the guru was alive.

locana and Vācaspati is quite strong. In the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā 1.1.4 (Thakur edn p. 107) we read: *tad etad atisphuṭatvāt śiṣyair gamyata eveti bhāṣya-vārttikakārābhyām avyākhyātam api asmābhiḥ [verse:] tri-locana-gurūnnīta-mārgānugamanonmukhaiḥ / yathā-nyāyaṁ yathā-vastu vyākhyātam idam idṛśam //*. Here, Vācaspati himself refers to Tri-locana as his guru.⁸ Udayana's references to Tri-locana (Thakur edn p. 3, p. 471), although not quite as explicit, also suggest a direct relationship between Tri-locana and Vācaspati in which the former is assumed to be a source of the darśana knowledge of the latter. We further learn from Thakur (1948:37) that Vardhamāna, while commenting on Udayana's first reference, informs us with the words *tri-locanaḥ ṭīkākrto vidyā-guruḥ* 'Tri-locana is the senior who taught the author of the (Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-)ṭīkā.' Similarly, a direct relationship between Tri-locana and the Nyāya-mañjarī is established by Jñāna-śrī-mitra's (p. 236) reference *mañjaryāṁ tri-locanaḥ punar āha*, immediately followed by a reference to Vācaspati, indicating that the Tri-locana meant is the one associated with Vācaspati. The same pattern is seen in most references to Tri-locana.

Dr. Stern has kindly communicated to me that Parameśvara-I, in his Svaditam-karaṇī, offers an interesting explanation of the word *prabhavitre* employed in the verse under consideration. Parameśvara-I interprets *prabhavitre* also as 'father': *na kevalam eṣa gurur asmākaṁ vidyā-guruḥ, kiṁtu janma-gurur apīty āha **prabhavitra** iti. janitr-janayitror abheda-vivakṣayā **prabhavitra** ity uktam asmadātmanā janitre 'smākaṁ janayitre pitra iti yāvat "ātmā hi jajña ātmanaḥ" [Aitareya-brāhmaṇa 33.1] iti śrutis cābhedopacāre bījam. prabhūtāya ca prabhava ca sarvasyeti sidhyati ...*

Commentators can sometimes read too much into a text, especially when a word can easily be taken in more than one sense and when the commentator has so much respect for the commentandum author that he is anxious to present that author as a skillful composer. However, we should also note that there is nothing impossible or improbable in the identification to which Parameśvara-I has given expression. The name "Tri-locana," as a synonym of Śiva, fits the preference for invoking Śiva seen in Vācaspati's maṅgala verses. A Śaiva

⁸ The name "Tri-vikrama" read in this passage by Ramaswami Sastri (1936:Introduction p. 53) seems to be an oversight.

family is likely to have a member named by using an epithet of Śiva. The only possible conflict with the other available pieces of information about Tri-locana that I can think of is this: According to Matilal (1977:92) and Solomon (1986:560), Durveka-miśra (Dharmottara-pradīpa, pp. 173-174) makes fun of Tri-locana with the word *kārpaṭika-karṇāṭa*.⁹ Both Matilal and Solomon take this as indicating that Tri-locana belonged to the Karṇāṭaka region. Vācaspati is generally thought to have hailed from the Bihar region, in particular Mithilā (Matilal 1977:95).¹⁰

However, Durveka's reference too is not necessarily an obstacle in relating Vācaspati to Tri-locana as a son. After quoting a seven-line passage from Tri-locana's Nyāya-bhāṣya-ṭīkā as a pūrva-pakṣa, Durveka begins his response with *tad etat kārpaṭika-karṇāṭa-raṭitam aśraddheyam dhimatām*. Here, *karṇāṭa* does mean 'associated with Karṇāṭa(ka), belonging to Karṇāṭa(ka),'¹¹ but the reference need not be only to a person. It could equally well be to the Karṇāṭa language,¹² used at least in central India as an upalakṣaṇa for speech that does

⁹ The meanings of *kārpaṭika* given by the dictionaries can be arranged as follows according to their probable historical sequence: 'a man in rags, in Lumpen gehüllter,' 'beggar, Bettler,' 'a pilgrim, Pilger,' 'a ragged ascetic,' 'a cheater, rascal, Schelm.' In addition, we get the following interesting information from Rangaswami Aiyangar (1942:xxvii): "The recommendation for a pilgrim to assume the garb of a *kārpaṭika* which is defined by Mitra-miśra as wearing red caste marks, (tāmra-mudrā), a copper wristlet, (tāmra-kaṅkaṇa) and a red robe (kāṣāya-vastra) was probably designed to help in the identification of pilgrims ... Footnote 2 at this point has: "*kārpaṭī-veṣaḥ, tāmra-mudrā-tāmra-kaṅkaṇa-kāṣāya-vastra-dhāraṇam* (Tīrtha-prakāśa p. 29)."

¹⁰ (a) I do not know how old or strong the evidence really is for associating Vācaspati with eastern India. A thorough investigation of what has been commonly held seems necessary. However, in view of the fact that many authors carrying *miśra* after their personal name or pen-name are recorded to have come from eastern Uttar Pradesh, Bihar etc., the tradition about Vācaspati's geographical affiliation that has developed among the students of Indian philosophy has a good chance of being correct.

(b) If *miśra* was entirely an honorific in Vācaspati's time or region, it is possible that he received it while his father did not.

¹¹ The dictionaries record enough occurrences establishing that both *karṇāṭa* and *kārṇāṭa* can express the sense 'associated with Karṇāṭa.' The word need not have a long vowel in its first syllable to express a taddhita meaning.

¹² Whether this language would be related specifically or exclusively to the language we at present refer to with the word "Kannāḍa" need not be considered here.

not make sense (of course, to a non-Karṇāṭa speaker, mostly a northerner).¹³ The compound expression Durveka uses can be dissolved as kārpaṭika-karṇāṭasya raṭitam (as Matilal and Solomon have apparently done) or as kārpaṭikasya karṇāṭa-raṭitam ‘the unintelligible¹⁴ talk of a kārpaṭika or beggar,’¹⁵ but, in view of what I have pointed out in notes 9 and 13-15 and the fact that contextually no purpose would be served by a specification of Tri-locana’s place of birth or residence, the latter dissolution seems better. A pilgrim coming from south India and speaking a language that the people living in a northern place of pilgrimage could not understand must have been a rather common experience.¹⁶ It could have given rise to an expression that was not to be taken literally but as meaning ‘speech that does not convey any meaning, senseless talk, ranting.’ Malvania (Introduction p. XXXIII-XXXIV), the editor of Durveka’s work, has already observed: “Durveka’s use of Sanskrit idioms and illustrative arguments has made the dry philosophical treatise quite an interesting one.”

However, even if *karṇāṭa* is taken to mean ‘a person hailing from Karnāṭa(ka),’ there is no real difficulty in accepting Tri-locana as Vācaspati’s father. The family the two belonged to could have originally come from Karṇāṭa(ka). Alternatively, Tri-locana could have gone to live in Karṇāṭa(ka). Learned Brahmins in early medieval India seem to have moved rather freely to

¹³ (a) Usages based on *kānaḍīta bolāṇe* and *kānaḍīta sāṅgaṇe* are frequently heard in Marathi even today; e.g. *mī kāya kānaḍīta bolato āhe kā* ‘Am I talking in Kannaḍa,’ meaning ‘Am I saying something that does not make sense to you.’

(b) The words *drāmīla*, *drāmiḍa*, *drāviḍa* etc. may also have such an idiomatic connotation for northern speakers and authors in certain contexts; cf. Asaṅga, *Bodhi-sattva-bhūmi* p. 48 (Dutt edn = p. 69 of Wogihara edn): *avyaktāḥ śabdāḥ. yeṣāṃ artho na vijñāyate. tad yathā drāmiḍānām mantrāṇām vāyu-vanaspati-śuka-śārikā-kokila- jīvaṃjīvakādīnām*. I am grateful to Dr. Mudagamuwe Maithrimurthi for this reference.

(c) If my guess about the idiomatic usage is correct then Durveka-miśra has preserved for us a valuable piece of evidence regarding the age of a linguistic prejudice arising out of ignorance.

¹⁴ Contextually, this would have the further sense ‘senseless, illogical.’

¹⁵ Here, the notion ‘beggar’ could have the specific connotation ‘one who has come from a long distance, in rags, with no money to speak of left with him.’

¹⁶ Note *miśra* in Durveka-miśra’s name, suggesting a possible association with the eastern part of northern India such as eastern Uttar Pradesh or Bihar.

distant regions. Keeping such a ‘migration’ possibility open may perhaps tie in well with what I note in §3.5b and allow us to widen our search for the ruler Nṛga or Śrīman-nṛga whom Vācaspati praises as a contemporary (see §2.7e below). Furthermore, if Vācaspati spent at least a part of his life in the Karṇāṭa(ka) region, his reference implying knowledge of Śaṅkarācārya’s personal life (§3.4) and Parameśvara-I’s reference to Tri-locana as Vācaspati’s father come across to us as more probable outcomes.¹⁷

§2.2a Tattva-bindu beginning:

*ahaye budhnyāya namo, bradhnāya namo, namo ’stu gaṇa-pataye /
āryāyai bhāratyai namo, namo viṣṭara-śravase //*

Tattva-bindu conclusion:

*tattva-bindu-parāmarśa-puṣṭānām buddhi-vīrudhaḥ /
vākyārtha-dhī-sumanasah puruṣārtha-phalapradaḥ //1//
vākyārtha-mitaye puṁsām bhrama-saṁtamasacchidā /
indunevāmunā mārgo darśitas tattva-bindunā //2//*

§2.2b The first verse indicates the extent to which Vācaspati could naturally go in his choice of deities to worship (cf. verse 4 of the Bhāmatī prologue). Although his greater inclination is toward Śiva and Śiva’s family, probably along with the Sun, he is, as observed in §2.1b, a religious liberal, in keeping with his acceptance of Advaita.

§2.2c The presence of two verses at the end indirectly praising the author’s achievement is somewhat unexpected, but it can be said to have a parallel in verses 1 and 2 of the Bhāmatī epilogue.

The extended creeper or vine metaphor in the first agrees with Vācaspati’s

¹⁷ It is not the case that these references are implausible on the background of what we at present assume about Vācaspati’s personal life. Vācaspati could have heard about Śaṅkara even in the distant Mithilā if Śaṅkara had already attained fame as a saint, and Parameśvara-I could have known Vācaspati’s personal history at the distant village of Porkulam if his family had specialized in darśana study for generations and if Vācaspati’s father had been a philosopher with original works to his credit. But Vācaspati’s being nearer to Kerala, the region to which Śaṅkara and Parameśvara-I belonged, makes the occurrence of the references seem all the more natural.

use of it elsewhere (§2.4a epilogue verse 3) and with the similarly developed ‘tree’ metaphor in §2.1a verse 3.

A variant reading of the first two quarters in the same verse is recorded in Biardeau’s edn as coming from a ms written in Banaras and preserved at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune. This reading is: *tattva-bindu-parāmrṣṭāḥ puṣṭā vāg-buddhi-vīrudhaḥ*. Since we do not have Parameśvara-II’s commentary on the last parts of the Tattva-bindu available,¹⁸ we cannot determine how he read and interpreted the verse. However, I learn from Dr. Stern that Parameśvara-I cites the verse as follows while commenting on the opening part of the Nyāya-kaṇikā in his Svaditaṁ-karaṇī: *veda-taror hi nyāya-sāstraṁ puṣpaṁ, mīmāṁsā phalam. padārtha-jñā[na-rūpe] [6b]¹⁹ vedārtha-jñāne hi nyāya-vistaropayogaḥ. vākyārtha-jñāna-rūpe puruṣārtha-jñāne mīmāṁsopayogaḥ. yathoktam. tattva-bindu-parāmarśa-puṣṭā vāg-buddhi-vīrudhaḥ / padārtha-dhī-sumanasah puruṣārtha-phalapradaḥ //*. Although this reading of Parameśvara-I is not identical with the variant noted in Biardeau’s edn it does lend indirect support to that reading. Thus, *tattva-bindu-parāmarśa-puṣṭā vāg-buddhi-vīrudhaḥ* may be preferred as a reading supported fully by a fourteenth-century commentator from the south and partly by a northern ms. Its joint reference to vāc and buddhi is paralleled by such expressions as Udayana’s *vāk-cetasoḥ* in the prologue of his Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā-parisuddhi.

Although Parameśvara-I does not mention Vācaspati as the author of the verse, he is unlikely to have anyone else in mind. In reading the thought *padārtha-jñā[na-rūpe] vedārtha-jñāne hi nyāya-vistaropayogaḥ. vākyārtha-jñāna-rūpe puruṣārtha-jñāne mīmāṁsopayogaḥ* in Vācaspati’s Nyāya-kaṇikā verse, one would expect him to appeal primarily to what he viewed as Vācaspati’s statement elsewhere. Secondly, the citation presupposes knowledge of Tattva-bindu as a proper name standing for a specific text.

§2.2d The second epilogue verse of the Tattva-bindu has affinity of imagery

¹⁸ The editor V.A. Ramaswami Sastri could not get any ms containing the explanation of these parts.

¹⁹ The notation “6b” marks the beginning of the second side of folio 6. The three syllables preceding it are a conjecture of Dr. Stern.

with the verse found at the end of some Tattva-kaumudī mss, about the authenticity of which I will express some doubt in §2.5b. However, as the metaphor of moon or moonlight naturally suggests itself in the case of the Tattva-kaumudī ('Moonlight of/on reality') and as the metaphor is very common (in fact, overused), the affinity does not have much value as a piece of evidence for higher textual criticism. Unfortunately, as mentioned above, Parameśvara-II's commentary on the last few sections of the Tattva-bindu does not seem to have been preserved. If we had access to a commentary, we would have been in a better position to judge the genuineness of the verse.

§2.3a Nyāya-sūci-nibandha beginning:

*namāmi dharmā-vijñāna-vairāgyaiśvarya-śāline /
nidhaye vāg-viśuddhīnām akṣa-pādāya tāyine //1//
akṣa-pāda-praṇītānām sūtrāṇām sāra-bodhikā /
śrī-vācaspati-miśreṇa mayā sūci vidhāsyate //2//*

Nyāya-sūci-nibandha conclusion:

*yad alambhi kim-api puṇyam dustara-kunibandha-panka-magnānām /
śrī-gautama-sugavīnām atijaratīnām samuddharaṇāt //1//
saṁsāra-jaladhi-setau vṛṣa-ketau sakala-duḥkha-śama-hetau /
etasya²⁰ phalam akhilam arpitam. etena prīyatām īśaḥ //2//
nyāya-sūci-nibandho 'sāv akāri sudhiyām mude /
śrī-vācaspati-miśreṇa vasvaṅka-vasu-vatsare //3//*

See §3.1-2 below.

§2.4a Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭikā beginning:

*viśva-vyāpī viśva-saktiḥ pinākī
viśveśāno viśvakṛd viśva-mūrtiḥ /
viśva-jñātā viśva-saṁhāra-kārī
viśvārādhyo rādhayatv īhitam naḥ //1//*

[Verse 2 same as §2.3a, Nyāya-sūci-nibandha beginning, verse 1]

grantha-vyākhyā-cchalenaiva nirastākhila-dūṣaṇā /

²⁰ Some edns of the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭikā, where also this verse occurs, print the metrically faulty and contextually incongruent *tasya* in lieu of *etasya* (note *etena* which follows).

nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkāsmābhir vidhāsyate //3//

icchāmi kim-api puṇyam ... [the rest as in §2.3a, Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha conclusion, verse 1‘ab’] /

uddiyotakara-gavīnām ... [the rest as in §2.3a Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha conclusion verse 1‘cd’] //4//

Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā conclusion:

[Verse 1‘ab’ same as §2.3a, Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha conclusion verse, 1‘ab’] /

uddiyotakara-gavīnām ... [the rest as in §2.3a, Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha conclusion, verse 1‘cd’] //1//

[Verse 2 same as §2.3a, Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha conclusion, verse 2]

tattva-jñāna-prasava-surabhir gūḍha-bahvartha-jātā

seyam mokṣāmṛtamaya-phalā sūkti-mañju-pravālā /

pratyakṣāptāgamamaya-mahā-nyāya-mūlā manojñā

ṭīkā-vīrud bhavatu kṛtinām nandinī ṣaṭ-padānām //3//

krūrāḥ, kṛto ’ñjalir ayam, balir eṣa dattaḥ

kāyo mayā. praharatātra yathābhilāṣam /

abhyarthaye, vitatha-vānmaya-pāmsu-varṣair

mā māvilī-kuruta kīrti-nadiḥ pareṣām //4//

See §3.1-2 below.

§2.5a Tattva-kaumudī beginning:

ajām ekām lohita-sukla-kṛṣṇām

bahviḥ prajāḥ sṛjamānām²¹ namāmaḥ /

ajā, ye tām juṣamāṇām bhajante

jahaty enām bhukta-bhogām, numas tām //1//

kapilāya mahā-munaye, munaye śiṣyāya tasya cāsuraye /

pañca-sikhāya tathēśvara-kṛṣṇāyaite namasyāmaḥ //2//

Tattva-kaumudī conclusion:

²¹ Srinivasan (1967:68) reads *sṛjamānāḥ*, which is a (very rare) misprint or oversight in his (meticulously executed) edn. I say this for three reasons: (a) The visarga is not dropped as it should be in view of the following voiced consonant. (b) Every other edn I have been able to consult reads *°mānām*, while Srinivasan does not record that reading even as a variant. (c) The meaning would be contextually quite inappropriate. There is no reason I can think of why Vācaspati would say here that he is creating much *prajā*.

manāmsi kumudānīva²² bodhayantī satām sadā /
śrī-vācaspati-miśrānām kṛtiḥ stāt tattva-kaumudī //

§2.5b The Tattva-kaumudī’s current epilogue verse is not, on the criteria of textual criticism, in as strong a position as Vācaspati’s other epilogue verses. We learn from Srinivasan (1967:9-17, 179), that it is missing in the usually reliable Grantha manuscript. However, since a considerable portion of the text is lost before the verse in the Grantha manuscript, the absence of the verse cannot be taken as evidence to the effect that the verse was always missing in the Grantha line of Tattva-kaumudī transmission. But note that the verse is found written after the colophon sentence, *iti śrī-vācaspati-miśra-viracitā sām̐khyā-saptati-ṭīkā samāptā*, in the generally superior Malayalam manuscript²³ and before a section colophon in a Śāradā ms not utilized by Srinivasan.²⁴ This indicates uncertainty as to the exact location of the verse and a strong probability of its originally having been an addition appearing after the colophon *iti śrī-*

²² The reading *kumudānīva cetāmsi* is also attested in some mss and edns.

²³ (a) Srinivasan (1967:22) observes that the Grantha ms and Malayalam ms he used represent largely independent lines of text transmission. This gives them a value comparable to that of versions or recensions in reflecting the history of the text (I use the word “comparable” because Srinivasan thinks that the method of constructing a stemma codicum is inapplicable to his mss.) Further, on p. 23, we learn from Srinivasan that the Grantha ms and the Malayalam ms give him distinctive primary or original readings which justifies their inclusion in the reconstruction of the Tattva-kaumudī text. I take this as evidence of the greater reliability, on the whole, of the Grantha and Malayalam transmissions of the Tattva-kaumudī.

(b) Incidentally, the text of Srinivasan’s note **20** [boldface type in the original] on p. 179 which reads “S. Noten 2, 16” should read “S. Noten 72, 16” or “S. §2.72.16”.

²⁴ This ms is Mu I 71 of the Universitäts Bibliothek at Göttingen. It is described under no. 1399 on p. 192 of *Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band II,4* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1975). In it, we see the following sequence: (a) *manāmsi ...* (b) *iti vācaspati-viracitāyām tattva-kaumudyām saptamam āhnikam*. (c) *iti śrī-vācaspati-miśra-viracitāyām* [sic] *tattva-kaumudī samāptā*. (d) [a verse the first half of which I do not entirely understand:] *anivṛtti-mālāḥ [- °tti-mālāḥ?] samyag vihitam vṛtti-cintaye / avimukta-jvarāḥ pathyam te tyajanty ātma-ghātinah //* Carrying the text of Vācaspati’s commentary divided into āhnikas, this ms agrees in general with the Śāradā ms from Baroda used by Srinivasan. Its evidence suggests the possibility that even in the Baroda ms the sequence I have shown here with (a)-(c) exists, although Srinivasan has not so reported. The Baroda ms too has some text matter related to a (Tattva-samāsa-)vṛtti after the final colophon, but not (d), it seems (cf. Srinivasan 1967:12).

vācaspati-miśra-viracitā²⁵

The verse is also different in its content from the other verses collected here. It speaks in a third person voice and employs the honorific plural *miśrāṇām* in speaking of Vācaspati. The other prologue and epilogue verses of Vācaspati have something personal about them, including first person expression. Only the Tattva-bindu verses in §2.2a constitute an exception to this statement, but they too are not written in a third person voice. They simply express a wish about Vācaspati's work.

Moreover, as indicated in §2.2c-d, some doubt may justifiably be entertained about the authenticity of at least the second laudatory verse at the end of the Tattva-bindu, which is similar in tone to the verse under study. In view of all these considerations and the information recorded in note 28a, I consider it highly probable that the real author of *manāmsi ...* is a student of Vācaspati's.

§2.6a Tattva-vaiśārādī (see note 27c) beginning:

*namāmi jagad-utpatti-hetave vṛṣa-ketave /
kleśa-karma-vipākādi-rahitāya hitāya ca //1//
natvā patañjalim ṛṣim veda-vyāsenā bhāṣite /
saṅkṣipta-spaṣṭa-bahvarthā bhāṣye vyākhyā vidhāsyate //2//*

Tattva-vaiśārādī conclusion:

*nidānaṁ tāpānāṁ uditam. atha tāpās ca kathitāḥ.
sahāṅgair aṣṭābhir vihitam iha yoga-dvayam api /
kṛto mukter adhvā guṇa-puruṣa-bhedaḥ sphuṭataro
viviktaṁ kaivalyaṁ, parigalita-tāpā citir asau //*

§2.6b For the first verse of the Tattva-vaiśārādī prologue, see §2.1a, verses 1-2, and §2.1b above.

In a so-far unpublished lecture text that I hope to be able to publish before long, I have suggested that *veda-vyāsenā* of verse 2 is probably a corruption of

²⁵ Many more mss of the Tattva-kaumudī than the ones used by Srinivasan are mentioned in ms catalogues (Srinivasan's purpose was limited; it was not exactly to prepare a full-scale critical edn). However, relatively few catalogues give the beginnings and conclusions of mss. Here I have to confine myself, first, to the catalogues that are immediately accessible and, secondly, to such among accessible catalogues as reproduce the ms beginnings and conclusions.

vindhya-vāseṇa.

Regarding the last verse, one could say that it is really not a typical epilogue verse, because it does not express an auspicious thought or tell us anything about when or where the work was completed. It has the appearance of a saṅgraha-kārikā summarizing the entire (Yoga-sūtra and) Yoga-bhāṣya.²⁶ However, one could also hold that the verse is indeed an epilogue verse, despite the feature identified, because its intent is auspicious in that it gives varied expression to, that is, highlights, the state of being free from worldly afflictions.

§2.7a Bhāmatī beginning:

*anirvācyāvidyā-dvitaya-sacivasya prabhavato
vivartā yasyaite viyad-anila-tejob-avanayaḥ /
yataś cābhūd viśvaṁ caram acaram uccāvacam idam
namāmas tad brahmāparimita-sukha-jñānam amṛtam //1//
niḥśvasitam asya vedā, vīkṣitam etasya pañca bhūtāni /
smitam etasya carācaram, asya ca suptaṁ mahā-pralayaḥ //2//
ṣaḍbhir aṅgair upetāya vividhair avyayair api /
śāśvatāya namas-kurmo vedāya ca bhavāya ca //3//
mārtaṇḍa-tilaka-svāmi-mahā-gaṇa-patīn vayam /
viśva-vandyān namasyāmaḥ sarva-siddhi-vidhāyinaḥ //4//
brahma-sūtra-kṛte tasmai veda-vyāsāya vedhase /
jñāna-śakty-avatārāya namo bhagavato hareḥ //5//
natvā viśuddha-vijñānaṁ śaṁkaraṁ karuṇā-nidhim /
bhāṣyaṁ prasanna-gambhīraṁ tat-praṇītaṁ vibhajyate //6//*

[Verse 7 same as §2.1a, Nyāya-kaṇikā beginning, verse 4. See §3.3-4]

Bhāmatī conclusion:

*bhaṅktvā vādy-asurendra-vṛndam akhilāvidyopadhānātigaṁ
yenāmnāya-payo-nidher naya-mathā brahmāmṛtaṁ prāpyate /
so 'yaṁ śāṁkara-bhāṣya-jāta-viṣayo vācaspateḥ sādaraṁ*

²⁶ In the Tattva-vaiśaradī, Vācaspati has adopted the practice of writing a saṅgraha-śloka at the end of each pāda. There is such a śloka for the fourth and the last pāda immediately before the verse we are discussing. Therefore, the verse can be a saṅgraha-kārikā only with respect to all the four pādas taken together. Its content also indicates the same.

saṁdarbhaḥ paribhāvyatām, sumatayaḥ, svārtheṣu ko matsaraḥ //1//
ajñāna-sāgarām tīrtvā brahma-tattvam abhīpsatām /
nīti-nau-karṇadhāreṇa mayāpūri manorathaḥ //2//
yan nyāya-kaṇikā-tattva-samīkṣā-tattva-bindubhiḥ /
yan nyāya-sāmkhya-yogānām vedāntānām nibandhanaiḥ²⁷ //3//
samacaiṣaṁ mahat puṇyam tat-phalaṁ puṣkalaṁ mayā /
samarpitam. athaitena priyatām parameśvaraḥ //4//
nṛpāntarāṇām manasāpy agamyām bhrū-kṣepa-mātreṇa cakāra kīrtim /
kārtasvarāsāra-supūrītārthi-sārthaḥ svayam śāstra-vicakṣaṇas ca //5//
naresvarā yac-caritānukāram icchanti kartum, na ca pārayanti /

²⁷ (a) Occasionally, the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha is mentioned as the referent of the nibandhana in Nyāya that Vācaspati mentions here. However, the discussion in §3.2 should establish that the composition intended by Vācaspati must be the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā, because of which he has secured a place of prominence in the Nyāya as well as other traditions of Indian philosophy. Cf. Amalānanda p. 1021: *nyāyasya nibandho nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā*.

(b) What Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha (p. 949) says while explaining the present verse half is unlikely to be historically accurate, but it should be noted because it does not seem to have been noted in the secondary literature on Vācaspati and because it may help in determining Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha's regional affiliation: *sāmkhya-nibandhanam kāli-dāsa-kṛtāryā-saptati-vyākhyā. tasyās tattva-kaumudīti nāma. pātañjala-bhāṣya-ṭīketi pātañjalasya yoga-śāstrasya yad bhāṣyam veda-vyāsa-kṛtam tasya ṭīkā tattva-sāradī nāmety arthaḥ*. Here, the Āryā-saptati, obviously the same work as the Sāmkhya-kārikās, is attributed to Kāli-dāsa, but the attribution of the Sāmkhya-kārikās to Īsvara-kṛṣṇa is also attested, in fact, better attested. One way to get out of the difficulty then would be to conclude that Īsvara-kṛṣṇa and Kāli-dāsa were two names of the same person. Mainkar (1962, 1972: Introduction pp. 30-31) has, in fact, argued for such an identification, albeit not on the basis of Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha's remark but of a few other commentators in other branches of Sanskrit literature. His thesis does not appear plausible, but the available evidence may help us in determining the regional affiliations of the commentators concerned. The view expressed by Kane (1962: Introduction pp. 42-43) about the place of residence of one such commentator, Ghana-śyāma, is based on direct and clear evidence, while the view expressed by Subrahmanya Sastri (1955:xxxix) about Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha's province amounts to nothing more than a good guess. The region in which the belief that Kāli-dāsa wrote the Sāmkhya-kārikās was current in some circles seems to be that part of south India which stretches diagonally from a place like Paiṭhaṅ to Tanjore.

(c) The title *Tattva-sāradī* attested in Amalānanda's and Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha's glosses should be noted. It seems more appropriate than *Tattva-vaiśāradī* and fits the pentamoraic pattern seen in the second parts of *Tattva-samīkṣā* and *Tattva-kaumudī* (and perhaps *Bhāmatī*; as the title of a prakaraṇa, *Tattva-bindu* could be an exception). However, a decision regarding whether *sāradī* should be preferred to *vaiśāradī* can be made only after a critical consultation of manuscripts.

tasmin mahīpe mahaniya-kīrtau śrīman-nṛge 'kāri mayā nibandhaḥ
//6//²⁸

§2.7b In the first verse of the epilogue here, a wrong reading (originally probably a misprint), *naya-pathā*, has been printed in the Bhāmatī edns for a long time. It has been a case of one editor blindly following another. Amalānanda's Kalpa-taru presupposes the reading adopted here and clarifies it:

²⁸ (a) In addition, we have the following verses at the beginning of the Bhāmatī on the fourth adhyāya:

nābhyarthyā iha santaḥ svayaṁ pravṛttā, na cetare śakyāḥ /
matsara-pitta-nibandhanam acikitsyaṁ arocakaṁ yeṣāṁ //1//
śaṅke samprati nirviśaṅkam adhunā svārājya-saukhyam vahan
nendraḥ sāndra-tapaḥ-sthiteṣu katham apy udvegam abhyesyati /
yad vācaspati-miśra-nirmīta-mīta-vyākhyāna-mātra-sphuṭad-
vedāntārtha-viveka-vañcita-bhavāḥ svarge 'py amī niḥsprhāḥ //2//

Of these, the second verse is known for a long time as the composition of Sanātana added to the Bhāmatī text. Sanātana is said to be a disciple of Vācaspati; cf. Amalānanda: *ācāryasya śiṣyaḥ sanātana-nāmā tat-kṛtām stutiṁ tat-prītyarthaṁ prabandham āropayati*.

Appaya-dīkṣita, the earlier commentator of Amalānanda, does not indicate awareness of either verse. Lakṣmī-nṛ-siṁha, author of the later Ābhoga, indicates awareness only of the first verse. These facts, however, cannot be taken as indications of inauthenticity. Appaya-dīkṣita does not comment on incidental verses and simple parts of the Bhāmatī. Lakṣmī-nṛ-siṁha too might not have seen any need to add to Amalānanda's words. It could also have been his policy to restrict himself to writings that had a direct or indirect bearing on Vācaspati's own words.

However, one problem in interpreting Amalānanda's statement does not so far seem to have been noticed. If he had written *sva-kṛtām stutiṁ*, we would have unambiguously understood Sanātana to be the author of the eulogy verse. As it is, the sentence can mean that Vācaspati wrote a boastful verse (but decided not to include it in his work himself) and Sanātana, to please him, inserted it into the text. This would present Vācaspati either as a man of low moral standards (he did not mind if someone else did the dishonorable thing for him) or as a man too easy to please. It is unlikely that Amalānanda would want his readers to understand things this way, especially after he has referred to Vācaspati as *ācārya* and when his respect for Vācaspati is evident. The likely intention of his remark, therefore, seems to be this: Sanātana wrote a verse in praise of his teacher. He put it in the Bhāmatī ms to please his teacher (maybe, while he was making the final draft, the press copy of those days). The teacher, not to hurt the student's feelings, decided to let it stand.

(b) The employment of both *samprati* and *adhunā* in Sanātana's verse can be accounted for by taking *samprati* with *sāndra-tapaḥ-sthiteṣu* (as Amalānanda does) or *śaṅke* and *adhunā* with *vahan*, but it would have been better if he had employed only one of the two words meaning 'now'.

(c) See §3.5b, d-e below for possible implications of the two verses.

śruti-liṅgādi-nyāya-rūpa-manthā[ḥ]. tena. Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha's Ābhoga introduces this clarification with *naya-rūpaṁ manthānam eva darśayati*. Reference to a churning rod, *mathin*, is what we expect in the context of the extended metaphor based on the samudra-mathana or 'churning of the ocean' myth utilized in the verse.

§2.7c Another wrong reading, which has behind it the respectability that time bestows, is current in the case of verse 5. It is °*tārtha-sā*°. Having come across the alliterative expression *arthi-sārtha* in some Sanskrit verse which I cannot recall now, I read °*tārtha-sā*° as °*tārthi-sā*° and translated *arthi-sārtha* as 'hosts of supplicants' instinctively. Subsequently, I encountered the following comment of Amalānanda (13th century) and had second thoughts about my understanding: ***kārtasvaram*** *suvarṇam. tasyāsāro* 'navarata-varṣaṇam. *tena supūrito* 'rthaḥ *kāṅkṣito* [any qualificand? read *kāṅkṣito* 'rthaḥ or *kāṅkṣitam* as a noun?] *yasya sārthasya jana-samūhasya* [?] *sa tathety eko bahu-vrīhiḥ. tathā-vidhaḥ sārtho* *yasya prakṛtatvena* [?] ²⁹ *vartate sa nrgas tathety aparaha*. A careful consideration of Amalānanda's comment, however, convinced me that what he was doing was to give the best possible explanation he could, on the strength of the context, of a bad reading. He was following the 'sthitasya gatiś cintanīyā' principle ³⁰ of Sanskrit commentators. He takes *kārtasvarāsāra-*

²⁹ I wonder if the original reading here was °*kṛtīve*°, with *prakṛti* referring to a ruler's subjects or to his kośa prakṛti, the treasury that figures in the Artha-sāstra enumeration of seven prakṛtis. Sankaranarayanan's (1985:35) translation of Vācaspati's expression *kārtasvarāsāra-* ... seems to presuppose such an emendation in Amalānanda's commentary. It runs thus: "the desires of whose subjects are fulfilled by the incessant rain of gold."

³⁰ (a) This, I think, is a very sensible principle to follow when an interpreter cannot collect manuscripts belonging to different regions and representing various versions or recensions. We should be grateful to Sanskrit commentators that they generally did not take liberties with the inherited readings in problematic situations and thus obliterate the historical evidence. To avail oneself of such liberties would not only have been a display of overconfidence in one's knowledge and abilities, it would have been ultimately less beneficial to the generations to come. The commentators' strategy of interpreting 'around' the reading on the strength of the context was modest and safer and, in many cases, it offered the same results as methodologically sound emendations of texts would have. It had scope for giving the contextually expected meaning, based on the thinking of an informed and expert reader, without causing damage to the lines of text transmission. All that the commentator had to do was

supūrītārthaḥ as a *bahu-vrīhi* embedded in a larger *bahu-vrīhi* ending in °*tārtha-sārthaḥ*. This is possible as far as the word forms go, but it forces him to assign to *sārtha* ‘host, caravan’ the unattested general meaning *jana-samūha* ‘subjects, citizenry’ and to connect the action of filling conveyed by *supūrīta* with *artha* understood in an abstract sense, rather than with the physical entity that *sārtha* signifies. On the other hand, *kārtasvarāsāreṇa supūrītaḥ arthi-sārthaḥ yena* gives us a contextually appropriate meaning (‘by whom the multitude of supplicants is well-filled with a shower / showers of gold’) in a straightforward way. This reaction of mine was unexpectedly supported by the information I later read in Sankaranarayanan 1985:48: “Lakṣmī-ṅ-simha refers to the existence of the alternative reading *kārtasvarāsāra-supūrītārthi-sārthaḥ* meaning ‘He, the desires of the multitude of whose petitioners are fulfilled by the showers of gold.’”³¹ The expression *artha-sārtha* can be looked upon as a *lectio difficilior* and deserves to be considered seriously, but experience teaches us that we cannot always accept a reading simply because it is a *lectio difficilior*. In a case in which we have reason to believe that an alternative form has been used elsewhere (and I am sure that *arthi-sārtha* has been used more than once), has probably become an idiom because of its striking nature (due to alliteration etc.), is likely to have developed association with a particular context (in this case, supplicants going to a rich person) and does not appear to have been someone’s emendation, we cannot set aside the alternative form just because it gives a contextually appropriate sense in a straightforward manner. Its claim for acceptance is then at least as strong as that of a *lectio difficilior*.

§2.7d In the same verse 5, Sankaranarayanan (1985:34 fn 1) emends °*kṣaṇas*

to add a few words of his own and provide a bridge linking the actual words of the commentandum to the contextually anticipated meaning.

(b) I owe the expression *sthitasya gatiś cintaniyā* to my pandit teachers. I do not know if it occurs exactly in that form in any commentary. Alternative expressions like *sthitē tv etat* (or *sthitēsv etat*) *samarthanam* are possible. They refer to problematic situations created by readings as well as ideas.

³¹ Toward the completion of this article I had access to the edn of Lakṣmī-ṅ-simha’s work and I could confirm Sankaranarayanan’s helpful reference. The Ābhoga on Amalānanda’s *Kalpa-taru* reads on p. 949: *tatrāarthi-sārtheti pātham kārtasvarāsāreṇa supūrītaḥ arthinām sārtho yasyetyevam spaṣṭatvād upekṣya, sva-dṛṣtam artha-sārtheti pātham vyācaṣṭe kārtasvaram-ityādinā* (→ °*svaretyā*°).

ca to °kṣaṇo yaḥ. For proper syntactic relating of the words, forms of the relative pronoun are needed. I too, at first, found their non-employment in the verse strange. However, since they are absent in the case of all the three propositions regarding Nṛga contained in the verse,³² any emendation made to satisfy our expectation will need three forms, will disrupt the metre and will be quite drastic. Therefore, we should accept the verse as it is. Vācaspati could have thought that the context was sufficiently clear for the readers to be able to supply *yaḥ* in the three propositions.

§2.7e Sankaranarayanan (1985:45-61; 1997:136 note 1) suggests that, in verse 6, we should read *nṛpe* in the place of *nṛge* and take *mahīpa* as standing for the proper name Mahī Pāla, so that a determination of Vācaspati's date that conforms to the statements made by and about Vācaspati can be obtained. In my view, such an emendation should not be introduced. The reading *nṛge* is attested in more than one place in the Bhāmatī and also in the mss of commentaries that are 6-7 centuries old, as noted by Sankaranarayanan himself.³³ According to the canons of textual criticism, it should not be replaced unless it is evidently incongruent with many other reliable indications in the evidence. Such is not the case. Therefore, we should retain *nṛge* as the reading and continue our efforts to identify the ruler Nṛga meant by Vācaspati. That the deciphered epigraphs do

³² These propositions are: 'Nṛga obtained such fame with the mere movement of his brow as other kings were not able to reach even in their imagination,' 'hosts of supplicants have been fully satisfied by Nṛga through showers of gold,' and 'Nṛga is himself a judge of śāstras.'

³³ (a) In addition to the epilogue, Vācaspati mentions Nṛga while commenting on the Bhāṣya of 2.1.33: *na cādyāpi na dṛśyante līlā-mātra-vinirmītāni mahā-prāsāda-pramada-vanāni śrīman-nṛga-narendrāṇām* [- *nṛgādi-na*? honorific plural?] *anyeṣāṃ manasāpi duṣkarāṇi nareśvarāṇām*. At the same place, Amalānanda informs us that Nṛga is the king who honoured Vācaspati (*ācāryaṃ yo mahīpatir mahayām-cakāra tasya nāma nṛga iti*). The editors of neither Vācaspati's text nor Amalānanda's indicate any uncertainty about the *nṛga* constituent of the sentence. Besides, *nṛga* is in prose here. Vācaspati cannot be said to have modified the name for the sake of the metre or to have given us a synonymous expression for a proper name (as Sanskrit poets and versifiers sometimes do).

(b) While commenting on Amalānanda's sentence quoted in (a), Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha reads *mahī-* in the place of *mahayām-*. He explains that reading as follows: **mahaḥ** *pūjā. sātīsayenāsyeti vīgrahe, arśa-āder ākṛti-gaṇatvād ac-pratyaye, tataś cvi-pratyayaḥ. anena mahī-patinācārya-vācaspati-viṣaye yāvati kṛtā pūjā tāvatī pūjā pūrvaṃ kenāpi na kṛtety abhūta-tad-bhāva iti bhāvaḥ.*

not mention Nṛga as a king or ruler is not sufficient justification for abandoning the reading. The epigraphs (or any documents for that matter) do not constitute the complete record of history — even of political or dynastic history. The very unusualness of the name Nṛga holds the promise of enabling us one day to determine Vācaspati's time and domicile (at least for a part of his life) with certainty. Furthermore, the large number of ad-hoc assumptions (including the identity of Vācaspati-II with the Vācaspati-I of our present study; see Aklujkar 1998) and arbitrary textual changes Sankaranarayanan (1985:53-59) must introduce in order to make his emendation conform to the available evidence tells us that his emendation is not the solution to the problem that has confronted him as it did the earlier students of Vācaspati's works.

§3.1 It will be evident from §2.3a, §2.4a and §2.7a above that Vācaspati could have 'recycled' some of his verses. To do so is no dishonour, at least in the second half of first millenium A.D. to which Vācaspati belonged. The poet Bhava-bhūti (ca. 7th century A.D.) is seen re-using his verses in plays, occasionally by adopting the device of ūha or partial substitution. If this could be done in poetic literature, in which novelty of expression is prized and is explicitly expected by theoreticians, it could certainly be done in śāstra without bringing disrepute onto oneself. The śāstrakāras in practically all areas seem to have seen nothing wrong even in adapting the verses of others (e.g., 'Bhāmaha : Daṇḍin' in poetics, 'Kumārila : Śānta-rakṣita' in philosophy, several Smṛti authors in Dharma-śāstra). Doing so was not a matter of inability but purely of convenience (and occasionally of being able to score points in debate through sarcasm). Vācaspati, after all, was only using his own products again.

However, if one looks at the situation more carefully, one notices that recurrence is not a common phenomenon in Vācaspati's prologue and epilogue verses. More importantly, there are other explanations, at least as plausible as the 'ethos' explanation given just now, for the recurrence.

§3.2 The Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha is hardly a work for which Vācaspati would have claimed authorship in the usual sense of the term. In presenting it, he was simply rendering service to the field, essentially not different from the service we render through editing of mss or publication of bibliographies. Although

scholars (e.g. Sankaranarayanan 1997:116-118, following several other students of Vācaspati's works) have placed the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha before the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā in the chronological order of his works, it is more likely that the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha was a by-product of the study Vācaspati undertook to prepare himself for writing the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā and of the notes he must have made while he was writing the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā.³⁴ Hence, his adaptation of essentially the same prologue and epilogue and his addition of two simple anuṣṭubh verses giving only the practical information about the composition of the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha make eminent sense.

To determine that Vācaspati presented the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha to the scholarly world after completing or essentially completing the final text of the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā, we do not have to go by common sense alone. The verses *icchāmi ...* and *yad alambhi ...* contain indications to that effect. When they occur in the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā, the word *uddiyotakara* fits the metre naturally. When one of them occurs in the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha, the padding prefix *su* is needed.³⁵

Thus, one gain of our study of Vācaspati's introductory and concluding verses is that we can adjust our chronology of Vācaspati's works to reflect the more plausible 'Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā → Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha' order.

³⁴ (a) Srinivasan (1967:61-63) comes close to stating the points I state here but with the intention of doubting Vācaspati's authorship of the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha. I think the work can be and should be ascribed to Vācaspati even if a difference of readings was discovered between its sūtra-pāṭha and the sūtras cited in the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā. In writing the latter, Vācaspati could have abided by the 'sthitasya gatis cintaniyā' convention I discuss in note 30. He could have followed the readings found in Uddyotakara's work or tradition.

(b) That Amalānanda, while glossing Bhāmatī epilogue verse 3, identifies Vācaspati's nibandhana in Nyāya with the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā, not with the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha, could be due to his awareness that the latter is not Vācaspati's work in the usual sense of the term. His gloss need not imply that Vācaspati did not work for the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha.

³⁵ The verses contain a metaphor made possible by paranomasia. Unless *go* is taken both as 'cow' and 'speech, statement, discourse,' *pañka* and *samuddharaṇa* do not deliver their full meanings. It is unlikely to be the case that the intention was to suggest that only good cows (*sugavī*) sinking in mud or marchland should be rescued.

The completion of the former took place before or very close to vatsara³⁶ 898 in which the Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha is said to have been finished.

§3.3 The other case of redeployment is found in §2.1a and §2.7a. Verse 4 of the Nyāya-kaṇikā prologue is identical with the last verse in the prologue of the Bhāmatī: *ācārya-kṛti-niveśanam apy avadhūtam vaco 'smadādīnām / rathyodakam iva gaṅgā-pravāha-pātaḥ pavitrayati //*. One way of looking at the recurrence would be that Vācaspati, for some reason, wanted the prologue of his last work to end like the prologue of his first work. However, given the absence of a similar parallelism in the epilogue (the Nyāya-kaṇikā does not seem to have had one; the Bhāmatī has a quite long and specific one), I do not see much benefit in pursuing this possibility.

The alternative of imagining that *ācārya-kṛti-* ... is a later addition to the Nyāya-kaṇikā prologue is not open to us, even though there is room to raise suspicion about the authenticity and necessity of the first verse of that prologue (§2.1b). Vācaspati has implicitly or explicitly expressed respect for the authors of the commentanda whenever he has appeared in the role of a commentator. Not having a verse in praise of Maṇḍana before he begins to comment on the Vidhi-viveka would be very odd. The commentator Parameśvara-I, too, comments on the verse and attests to the fact that the verse has been in the Nyāya-kaṇikā mss for at least 600 years.

Is it, then, possible that *ācārya-kṛti-* ... is an interpolation in the Bhāmatī? It is not as badly needed in the Bhāmatī as it is in the Nyāya-kaṇikā. There is a verse before it (*natvā viśuddha-vijñānam śaṅkaram karuṇā-nidhim / bhāṣyam prasanna-gambhīram tat-praṇītam vibhajyate //*) which adequately meets the expectation created by Vācaspati's (and others') practice of expressing respect for the author of the commentandum. Secondly, Amalānanda does not gloss *ācārya-kṛti-* ... (and *natvā*; Akhaṇḍānanda glosses both).

These considerations are relevant and valid. However, it would be hasty to assign a 'visitor' status to the verse in question on their basis. We should not conclude on the basis of absences alone (absence of the need for a second

³⁶ I will stay away here from the debate regarding whether *vatsara* refers to the Śaṅvat era or the Śaka era.

homage and absence of explicit recognition by Amalānanda). The verse does not conflict with any other detail in the prologues or epilogues or with any other statement made by or about Vācaspati. We should wait until we find out if there is truly objective support for declaring it an interpolation. Only a critical edition of the Bhāmatī (which, to my knowledge, has so far not been published) or availability of some other old commentaries will help us in settling the issue, it seems.

§3.4 If Vācaspati has indeed redeployed the verse, the redeployment could be indicative of a significant feature of his life as a philosopher or of an important development in it. The reflection of reverence in *ācārya-kṛti* ... is unlike any other expression of reverence we find for temporally distant authors in Vācaspati's prologues. It has a tone of humility and submission which is found only in the verse *ajñāna-timira-śamanīm* etc. that he has written in reference to his guru (and most probably father; cf. §2.1e).³⁷ Thus, it is very likely that Maṇḍana and Śaṅkara touched him in some personal way in addition to the intellectual way in which they engaged his mind. While it does not seem plausible that he knew them through a direct personal encounter, he very much seems to have felt personally close to them, definitely in terms of the views they put forward and probably in terms of the kind of lives they led. It is likely (a) that he had information that they both led extraordinarily dedicated scholarly or spiritual lives and (b) that he trusted that information. While this cannot be convincingly proved, especially in the case of Maṇḍana, Vācaspati's references to Śaṅkara with the adjectives *viśuddha-vijñāna* and *karuṇā-nidhi*, particularly the latter, would be hard to account for unless it is presumed that a very positive image of Śaṅkara's life had registered itself on Vācaspati's mind. Thus, when Vācaspati transfers to Śaṅkara's bhāṣya the tribute he had written for Maṇḍana's Vidhi-viveka, he is very probably telling his readers that they should view him as having the same respect for both Maṇḍana and Śaṅkara — as one who, in Advaita, will reconcile the views of both without finding fault with

³⁷ Note particularly the expression *prabhavitre*.

either.³⁸ Another possibility which I consider less likely, given Vācaspati's total personality as a writer, is that his re-application of the tribute to Śaṅkara is to be viewed as a signal to his readers to the effect that a change has taken place in his attitude toward Maṇḍana.

§3.5 Other interesting features of Vācaspati's scholarly life that a cumulative consideration of his prologue and epilogue verses reveals are these:

(a) Expression of homage to the guru is absent in the post-Nyāya-kaṇikā works. Vācaspati's guru was Tri-locana (§2.1e). References collected by scholars establish that this guru was primarily known for his contribution to Nyāya (cf. Thakur 1948, Solomon 1986). Vācaspati was obviously so close and so much indebted to him that he has paid him homage even in the context of a Mīmāṃsā work, namely the Nyāya-kaṇikā. Yet, Vācaspati is silent about him in the prologues of later works, including that of the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭikā, a work in the Nyāya system, although he remembers him once in the body of the work directly and probably many times implicitly as the association of Tri-locana with several significant views in Nyāya by Udayana, Jñāna-śrī-mitra, Ratna-kīrti etc. indicates. This situation suggests that Tri-locana was no longer there to receive Vācaspati's expression of gratitude when Vācaspati's later works such as the Tattva-bindu were composed. The death of Tri-locana must have occurred not long after the Nyāya-kaṇikā was composed.

(b) The references to attempts to spoil Vācaspati's good name appear in a proportionately large number of verses: (i) Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭikā: *krūrāḥ, kṛto 'ñjalir ayam, balir eṣa dattaḥ kāyo mayā. praharatātra yathābhilāṣam / abhyarthaye, vitatha-vānmayā-pāṁśu-varṣair mā māvilī-*

³⁸ In the Advaita Vedānta tradition, one overall impression of Vācaspati's position is conveyed by the remark *vācaspatī tu maṇḍana-prṣṭha-sevī* (Anubhūti-sva-rūpācārya, Prakāṣārtha-vivaraṇa on Śaṅkara's Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya 3.4.47, according to Subrahmanya Sastri 1955:xxx, Upodghāta p. 14). However, Vācaspati does not seem to be an uncritical follower of Maṇḍana (as he probably was not of any other thinker on whom he has commented). For instance, he parts company with Maṇḍana in the Tattva-bindu, probably written not long after he wrote on the Vidhi-viveka and the Brahma-siddhi, rejects sphoṭa-vāda and accepts abhihitānvaya-vāda. Note also the discussion in Subrahmanya Sastri 1955:xxviii-xxx, Upodghāta pp. 13-14 pertaining to differences of views between Śaṅkara and Vācaspati.

kuruta kīrti-nadīḥ pareṣām // (ii) Bhāmatī: ... *svārtheṣu ko matsaraḥ* . In addition, we have the following verse, bearing the stamp of Vācaspati's style, at the beginning of the Bhāmatī on the fourth adhyāya: *nābhyarthyā iha santaḥ svayaṁ pravṛttā, na cetare śakyāḥ / matsara-pitta-nibandhanam acikitsyaṁ arocakam yeṣām* // Possibly to be added to these passages is the verse *sphuṭābhidheyā* ... in note 2, if it indeed comes from the Tattva-samīkṣā as I have conjectured. The number of these statements, as well as the strong tone of two of them, gives the impression that a personal hurt is being expressed and that the author has faced hostile reactions, entirely undeserved in his view, for a considerable period.³⁹

(c) Corresponding to the dismissive gesture contained in the last but one 'jealousy' verse *nābhyarthyā...* is the expression by Vācaspati of increasing confidence in the soundness and depth of his own scholarship. This is clearly felt if one reads the first epilogue verse of the Tattva-bindu, then the third epilogue verse of the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā and then the first two epilogue verses of the Bhāmatī.⁴⁰

(d) Sankaranarayanan (1985:44-45 fn. 2) informs us that according to Lakṣmī-nṛ-siṁha, author of the Ābhoga subcommentary on the Bhāmatī, the latter work was completed in 40 days. The precise sense of this statement would depend on which activities Lakṣmī-nṛ-siṁha included in the meaning of the term *vyākhyāna* that he employs. However, even if he meant that the whole text of the Bhāmatī was composed and finalized in 40 days, I do not see that as an adequate reason to declare his statement as untrustworthy. To write a work like the Bhāmatī in 40 days is not easy, but it is not impossible either if one has the prior preparation as a scholar and thinker that Vācaspati had and if one has studied Śaṅkara's commentary on the Śārīraka-mīmāṃsā or Brahma-sūtras for many years as a personal favourite as Vācaspati probably had. Thus, Lakṣmī-nṛ-siṁha's statement may be thought of as giving us a piece of historical

³⁹ In Lakṣmī-nṛ-siṁha's remark quoted in note 33b, a suggestion of belated appreciation of Vācaspati's scholarship may be implicit, but I do not think one can prove that the suggestion is indeed there.

⁴⁰ As discussed above, the other potentially relevant verses either come from works that are not truly independent, or are not epilogue verses in the real sense of the term, or were probably not written by Vācaspati.

knowledge that was handed down in the Advaita tradition without any significant distortion. Also, the fact that “40” is not a sacred, conventional or ‘fabled’ number increases the probability of the statement’s being in accord with historical reality.⁴¹

(e) As in (d), the piece of traditional information contained in note 28a need not be rejected. However, while not ruling out the possibility expressed in Amalānanda’s statement, namely that Vācaspati allowed an (extravagant) praise of himself to be included in the Bhāmatī just to humour his student Sanātana, I wish to suggest another possibility. Sanātana might have prepared the final copy of the Bhāmatī on the fourth adhyāya after Vācaspati’s death or incapacitation. It is conceivable that Vācaspati finished the final version up to the end of the third adhyāya and finished the semi-final draft (or a draft very close to that stage), including the epilogue verses, of the fourth adhyāya but the responsibility of putting the text of the fourth adhyāya together for public availability fell upon Sanātana. While carrying out that responsibility, he placed a verse of Vācaspati followed by his own verse at the beginning of the fourth adhyāya as a kind of mark. Vācaspati’s verse stated that he (Vācaspati) could not

⁴¹ Lakṣmī-ṅ-simha’s perspective in giving the information he has given us is not that of a historian. The context in which he makes his remark is created, on the one hand, by his summary of some Śaṅkara-vijaya account mentioning a number of miraculous events in Śaṅkara’s life and, on the other, by an expression of similar awe with respect to Vācaspati. However, this need not mean that all the details in the remark are to be distrusted.

The details are: *vācaspter api dig-vijayaḥ, catvāriṃśatā divasaiḥ śrīmacchārīraka-mīmāṃsā-bhāṣye vyākhyānam, acumbita-prakriyā-parikalpanena līlā-mātreṇaiva nānā-sāstreṣu granthakaraṇam, svācchandyena para-loka-gamanam, ityevamādīni manuṣya-mātreṇa satā manasāpy ālocayitum aśakyāni caritrāṇi* Here, I do not know what the acumbita-prakriyā is and how it is provided -- how its parikalpana occurs. The last detail svācchandyena para-loka-gamana ‘going to another world according to one’s own wish’ could refer to a miraculous capability to move to a higher world. But it probably refers to Vācaspati’s concluding that what he wanted to accomplish in his life had been accomplished and the time to leave for another world had come — to Vācaspati’s willing his own death. The application of this will could have come about through samādhi or prāyopaveśana. See §3.5e. Sometimes, however, a person’s being able to predict beforehand the time of his death may also be mistaken for svācchandyena maraṇa or para-loka-gamana. Stories are occasionally heard about individuals who could ascertain when the course of their life would run out. They are supposed to be able to ascertain thus because their power of mental concentration enables them to notice subtle changes in the behaviour of their pulse etc.

hope to attract to his work those who suffered from an incurable case of arocaka (a disease in which one does not relish what one eats or drinks) caused by jealousy. Sanātana's verse was a eulogy of the teacher. Introduction of a marker of the kind I have suggested very probably exists at the end of the Vākyapadīya or the second kāṇḍa of the Trikāṇḍī (Aklujkar 1978). Its existence between the two halves of Bāṇa's Kādambarī is well-known and beyond doubt. A reconstruction based on its acceptance would also be in agreement with the information in (d), namely that the Bhāmatī was completed in a very short time and the memory of its having been completed in a race with time was preserved (see note 41).

§4.1 Summary of results with some further speculation:

Biographical: (a) Vācaspati was a liberal Śaiva. The philosopher Tri-locana was not only his teacher but, very probably, also father. While Vācaspati's belonging to Mithilā or Bihar has not been disproved, one needs to keep an open mind regarding where he was born and lived. He might have spent some time in Karṇāta(ka), possibly as a scholar highly honoured by Śrīman-nṛga or Nṛga. He completed the Nyāya-sūci-nibandha in vatsara 898 *after* completing the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā. He writes about Maṇḍana and Śaṅkara with warmth and knowledge about their personal lives. He seems to have encountered much jealousy. The fourth adhyāya Bhāmatī is likely to have been given final shape by Sanātana, a student of his, as he completed the whole comm a few days before his death. (b) Tri-locana probably died within a few years after Vācaspati's Nyāya-kaṇikā was completed. (c) Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha, author of Ābhoga subcommentary on Śaṅkara's Śārīraka-mīmāṃsā-bhāṣya, seems to have come from an area spreading diagonally from Paiṭhaṇ to Tanjore.

Text-critical: (a) The first maṅgala verse, *parāmrṣtaḥ kleśaiḥ ...*, of the Nyāya-kaṇikā is unlikely to have been authored by Vācaspati. It could have come from an ancestor of Parameśvara-I, who lived at Porkulam, Kerala, in the fourteenth century A.D. and to a member of whose family the authorship of the Yoga-sāstra-vivarāṇa is probably to be attributed; cf. M. Ramakrishna Kavi, 1927, "Literary Gleanings," Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society 2.2:130-145. (b) The first concluding verse of the Tattva-bindu should read °*puṣṭā vāg-buddhi*°. (c) While moderate scepticism may be maintained about the authenticity of the second concluding verse of the Tattva-bindu, the Tattva-kaumudī's concluding verse *manāṃsi kumudānīva ...* is almost certainly not composed by Vācaspati. (d) The possibility that the older name of Vācaspati's commentary on the Yoga-sūtra-bhāṣya is Tattva-sāradī, not Tattva-vaśā°, deserves to be explored. (e) In the first epilogue verse of the Bhāmatī, *naya-pathā* should be corrected to *naya-mathā* and, in the fifth verse, °*tārtha-sā*° to °*tārthi-sā*°. (f) The compound *kārpaṭika-karṇāṭa-raṭita* in effect, means 'statements that do not make sense'.

Bibliography

Akhaṇḍānanda. *R̥ju-prakāśikā*: see Śaṅkara.

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1978. "The concluding verses of Bharṭṛ-hari's Vākya-kāṇḍa." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 58-59 (Diamond Jubilee Volume): 9-26.

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1998. "Vācaspati-miśra's Tattva-samīkṣā and the last two verses in Yukti-dīpikā manuscripts." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 62:125-165.

Amalānanda. *Kalpa-taru*: (a) see Śaṅkara. (b) Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha. Ābhogaḥ. *Kalpa-taru-vyākhyā*. (eds) Rama Sastri, Polagam; Subrahmanya Sastri, S. Madras: Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library. 1955. Madras Government Oriental Series no. 78.

Asaṅga. *Bodhi-sattva-bhūmi*. (Ed) Dutt, Nalinaksha. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute. 1966. An earlier edn: (Ed) Wogihara, Unrai. Tokyo. 1930.

Bhattacharyya, Janaki Ballabha (tr). 1978. *Jayanta-bhaṭṭa's Nyāya-mañjarī. The Compendium of Indian Speculative Logic*. Vol. 1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. No subsequent vol seems to have been ever published.

Bhava-bhūti. *Uttara-rāma-carita* with the Commentary of Ghana-śyāma. (Ed, annot) Kane, P.V. (tr) Joshi, C.N. Fourth revised edn. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Biardeau, Madeleine: see Vācaspati-miśra. *Tattva-bindu*.

Durveka-miśra. *Dharmottara-pradīpa*. (Ed) Malvania, Dalsukhbhai. Patna: Kashiprasad Jayaswal Research Institute. 1955. Revised second edn 1971. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series no. 2.

Īśvara-kṛṣṇa. *Sāṅkhya-kārikā* with the Commentary of Gauḍa-pāda. (Ed, tr of both the kārikā and comm). Mainkar, T.G. Poona: Oriental Book Agency. 1964. Second revised and enlarged edn: same publisher, 1972.

Jñāna-śrī-mitra. *Jñāna-śrī-mitra-nibandhāvalī*. (Ed) Thakur, Anantalal. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute. 1959. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series vol. 5.

Kane, P.V.: see Bhava-bhūti.

Lakṣmīdhara. *Kṛtya-kalpa-taru*. Vols 14. (Ed) Rangaswami Aiyangar, K.V. Gaekwad's Oriental Series no. 48. Vol 8, to which I refer, was published in 1942.

Lakṣmī-nṛ-simha: see Amalānanda.

Mainkar, T.G. 1962. *Kālidāsa, His Art and Thought*. Poona/Pune: Deshmukh Prakashan.

Mainkar, T.G. 1972: see Īśvara-kṛṣṇa.

Maṇḍana-miśra. *Vidhi-viveka with Vācaspati-miśra's Nyāya-kaṇikā*. (Ed) Gosvāmī, Mahā-prabhu-lala [= Goswami, Mahaprabhu Lal]. Varanasi: Tara Publications. 1978.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna. 1977. *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*. (General ed) Gonda, Jan. A History of Indian Literature, vol. 6, fasc. 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Nanda-panḍita. *Viṣṇu-smṛti with the Commentary Keśava-vaijayanti* of Nanda-panḍita. (Ed) Krishnamacharya, V. Vols 2. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre. 1964. The Adyar Library Series no. 93.

Patañjali. (a) *Yoga-sūtras with Vyāsa's Bhāṣya and Vācaspati Miśra's Tattva-vaiśārādī*. (Eds) Pandits at Ānandāśrama. Poona: Ānandāśrama. Ānandāśrama-saṁskṛta-granthāvalī 47. Reprint 4, 1984. (b) *Pātañjala-yoga-sūtra-bhāṣya-vivaraṇam* [- °ga-śāstra-vi° of Śaṁkara ⁴²]. (Eds) Rama Sastri, Polakam; Krishnamurthi Sastri, S.R. Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library. 1952. Madras Government Oriental Series no. 44.

Ramaswami Sastri, V.A.: see Vācaspati-miśra. *Tattva-bindu*.

Rangaswami Aiyangar: see Lakṣmīdhara.

Ratna-kīrti. *Ratna-kīrti-nibandhāvalī*. (Ed) Thakur, Anantalal. Patna: Kasiprasad Jayaswal Research Institute. 1957. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series no. 3.

Śaṁkara: see Patañjali. *Yoga-sūtra*.

Śaṁkara. *Brahma-sūtra-śāṁkara-bhāṣyam* *Bhāmatyādi-vyākhyopavyākhyā-navakopetam*. [English title carries no diacritics:] *Brahma-sutra-sankara-bhashyam with Nine Commentaries*. Parts [= vols] 2. (Ed) Sastri, Ananta Krishna. Calcutta: Metropolitan Printing and Publishing House. 1933. Calcutta Sanskrit Series no. 1.

Śaṁkara. *Brahma-sūtra-śāṁkara-bhāṣya with commentaries, Bhāmatī by Vācaspati Miśra, Vedānta-kalpa-taru by Amalānanda Sarasvatī and Kalpa-taru-parimala by Appaya Dīkṣita*. (Ed) Sastri, Ananta Krishna. Bombay: Nirnaya

⁴² This Śaṁkara may not be identical with Ādi-śaṁkara or the author who is commonly referred to as Śaṁkarācārya and is credited with the authorship of the Śārīraka-mīmāṁsā- or Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya.

Sagar Press. 1917. See Amalānanda.

Sankaranarayanan, S. 1985. "The colophon in the Bhāmatī: a new study." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 49:34-61.

Sankaranarayanan, S. 1997. "Tattva-samīkṣā of Vācaspati Mīśra: a fresh view." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 61:115-138.

Solomon, E.A. 1986. "Tri-locana - A Forgotten Naiyāyika." In *Sanskrit and World Culture. Proceedings of the 4th World Sanskrit Conference ... Weimar ... 1979*, pp. 560-566.

Srinivasan, Srinivasa Ayya: see Vācaspati, *Tattva-kaumudī*.

Subrahmanya Sastri 1955: see Amalānanda.

Thakur, Anantalal. 1948. "The Naiyāyika Tri-locana as teacher of Vācaspati." *Indian Culture* 14:36-40.

Thakur, Anantalal. 1955. "Nyāya-mañjarī of guru Tri-locana." *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 4:507-511. I have given this reference according to Solomon 1986, as I was not been able to consult the article itself. Karl H. Potter's *Bibliography* gives the reference as *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 41: 507-511.

Udayana. *Nyāya-vārttika-tātparyā-parīśuddhi*. (Ed) Thakur, Anantalal. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research. 1996.

Vācaspati-mīśra. *Bhāmatī*: see Śaṅkara.

Vācaspati-mīśra. *Nyāya-kaṇikā*: see Maṇḍana, *Vidhi-viveka*.

Vācaspati-mīśra. *Nyāya-vārttika-tātparyā-ṭīkā*. (Ed) Thakur, Anantalal. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research. 1996.

Vācaspati-mīśra. *Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha*. Printed as appendix in: Uddyotakara. *Nyāya-vārttika*. (Ed) Dvivedin, Vindhyaśvarī Prasād. Calcutta. 1887-1914. Bibliotheca Indica no. 133. Reprint: Delhi. 1986.

Vācaspati-mīśra. *Tattva-kaumudī*. (Ed) Srinivasan, Srinivasa Ayya. *Vācaspati-mīśra's Tattva-kaumudī. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung*. Hamburg: Gram, de Gruyter & Co. 1967. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien no. 12.

Vācaspati-mīśra. (a) *Tattva-bindu. With Tattva-vibhāvanā commentary of Ṛṣi-putra Parameśvara*. (Ed) Ramaswami Sastri, V.A. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University. 1936. Annamalai University Sanskrit Series 3. (b) Biardeau, Madeleine (ed, tr). 1956. *Le Tattva-bindu de Vācaspati-mīśra*.

Pondichery: Institut Français d'Indologie. Publications de l'Institut
Français d'Indologie. No. 3. Reprint or second edn: 1979.

Vācaspati-mīśra. *Tattva-vaiśārādī*. See Patañjali.

Add:

For arthi-sārtha in a different context: Helā 3.2.2 (get the accurate text later):

उपाधीनां चागमापायवश-विधुरित-निज-स्व-रूपाणाम् अर्थि-
सार्थ-समाशा-पूरण-प्रतिहत-शक्तित्वान् न तावत्य् एव पर्यवसानम्
इत्य् उपलक्षित-रूप-पृष्ठ-पातिनः शब्दा व्यवस्थाप्यन्ते ।