Patakāsthānaka is a dramatic artifice to foreshadow future events. It signifies particular spots in the body of the theme of a play where an equivocal speech or situation suggests, indicates or brings on, or helps to bring on a coming event. Sgn. describes the Patakasthanaka as,

\[
\text{Yatrānyasmiṃścintyamāne tallingo'nyaḥ prayujyate} / \\
\text{āgantukena bhūvena patakāsthānakaḥ tu tat} //
\]

The NS (GOS) reads the first 'pūda' of the verse as, "yatṛārthe cintite" nyasmin', but the reading of the NLRK, is found in a ms. By 'āgantuka-bhāva' Sgn. understands Vyabhicāribhāva. Thus, according to Sgn., that is Patakāsthānaka, where something is being thought of but some other thing having the same characteristics (tallinga) is indicated or introduced through a Vyabhicāri-bhāva. For illustration, Sgn. refers to the Daśarathāṅka and says:

\[
\text{daśaratho rāmasya rajye cintyamāne bharatasya rājyam tallinga - jātamiti} \\
\text{viśādenāgantukena vyabhicāriṃ bhūvena grhitapāṭhati rāmo'pi gacchatu} \\
\text{vamanityādi" But this interpretation of Sgn. is quite novel and is not accepted by any other theorist. There may be a change of bhāva in the acting of a character on the stage due to the indication of some future event, but that indication is not given by any other Bhāva. 'āgantuka-bhāva' here in}
\]

1. NLRK. ll. 1000-1001.
2. NS. GOS. XIX. 30, p. 18, f. n. 5
3. NLRK. ll. 1003-1005. The Daśarathāṅka is referred to once more in the NLRK. ll. 1762-1785. Nothing more is known either about the play or its author. The two citations in the NLRK, indicate that the play begins with the exile of Rāma.
this context simply means some accidental or extraneous matter which is not in hand. Ag. says: "sahākūrī-kṛtam agantukam ucyate". We know that in a play every episode is 'sahākūrī' to the 'pradāhā-ṃrtta'. In the gradual development of a plot the playwright introduces at places new turns to the course of action and gives hint to the future event by bringing in something not expected at the present moment (āgantuka-Lhāva). These spots are called Pataṅkaṭsthānakas in Sanskrit dramaturgy.

The NLRK, Sr. pra., ND., and the SD. follow the NŚ. and maintains that there are four types of Pataṅkaṭsthānakas. But the DR. accepts only two varieties of the Pataṅkaṭsthānaka, inasmuch as the similarity between the indicating matter and the matter indicated lies in respect of situation or attribute. Dhanika clarifies this and says that where the indication is given through the 'alāṅkāra' Anyokti, it is the first type (known as Tulyasaṃvīdhānaka) and in the case of the second type (named Tulyaviṣeṣāṇaka) the indication is offered by the 'alāṅkāra' Samāsokti. Śdt. seems to have expanded this theory to make it corroborate to the view of the NS. Śīṅgabhbupāla and Rūpāgoscmin also follow the suit. They maintain that the Tulyasaṃvīdhānaka variety of the Pataṅkaṭsthānaka is of three kinds conforming respectively to the first three varieties of the NŚ. and that the Tulyaviṣeṣāṇa variety is a kind by itself and corresponds to the fourth Pataṅkaṭsthānaka of the NS. But none of the theorists like Ag., Sgn., Bhoja and Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra refer to this.

5. DR. I. 14.
6. DE. Avaloka. P.4. taccā tulyetivṛttatayā tulya-viṣeṣāṇatayā ca dviprakāram, anyokti - samasokti - lhedat /
view. Neither the standpoint of the DR. in this respect, nor its elaborated form as in the Bhā. pra. etc., can be supported by the canons of the NS. The DR. maintains clearly a different view from that of the NS. regarding the Parākāsthānakas and Śdt. with a synthetic outlook tries to correlate the two. Śiṅgabhūpāla seems to have followed the Bhā. pra. in this respect.

The NLRK, Śr. pra. and the SD. and even the Bhā. pra. and the RS. also quote the definitions of the four Parākāsthānakas ad-verbum from the NS. The ND. in its usual way offers sūtra-like definitions but in the gloss states the samething as in the NS. It changes the order of the Parākāsthānakas of the NS. a bit. The fourth variety of the NS. is the third of the ND. and vice-versa. The DR. sticks to its own position and the Avaloka illustrates only two types of Parākāsthānakas.

The first Parākāsthānaka according to the NLRK. consists in the immediate fulfilment of the desired end (tatkṣaṇa-deva samihitasāryathasya niśpattiḥ) through the attainment of the object longed for (abhivañchana-siddhi-niśpādanataḥ). The illustration is given from the Nāgā, where Jimūtavāhana wishes to sacrifice himself but Śāṅkhaerūda refuses to give him the 'vadhya-cihna', the purpose of which is served by a pair of red cloth, sent by the mother of Miṭrāvasu through the Kaṃcukin, who hands it over to the hero. Ag. also offers the same illustration along with another from the L.V.

8. ND. pp. 40-41.
9. NLRK. 11, 1008-1009. This is Sgn.'s gloss on the definition taken from the NS (GOS. XIX. 31), 1.1007. Sgn. reads 'niśpatti' in place of 'sam-patti' in the NS.
The second Patakāsthānaka is a statement having double meanings (śliṣṭam vacanam) and incorporating many purposes (bahvartha-samādhānam) forming the basis of the composition (prastutasya kāvyasyāśrayam). The verse "nirvāṇa-vairadahanā" etc., recited by the Sūtradāra in the Prastāvāna of the V.sam. has been chosen to be the illustration. The verse through Śleṣa refers to the annihilation of the Kauravas and the victory of the Pāṇḍavas, though apparently it expresses the welfare of both the parties. This verse of the V.sam. undoubtedly forms the basis of the play as it arouses the wrath of Bhīma and also contains the central theme in a nutshell.

The third Patakāsthānaka, as Sgn. describes it, consists in the intimation of the object (arthaprakāśam) with courtesy and in a subtle way through exchanges of equivocal words. Sgn. illustrates this Patakāsthānaka by citing a verse, evidently not from any play, of an unknown poet. The verse contains equivocal dialogues between a 'khanditū-nāyikā' and the 'nāyaka'. The more common illustration, however, is the dialogue of Cāṇakya and Siddhārthaka in Maṇḍā (Act.I):-

Cāṇakya - api nāma durātmā rākṣaso gṛhyeta
Siddhārthaka - (Praviśya) aśam gaṅhido.

11. NLRK. 11. 1015-1017. NS. GOS. XIX. 32. The SD(VI. 47) reads "nānā-bandhasamāśrayam" in place of "kāvyabandhasamāśrayam" of the N. and the NLL.


13. NLRK. 11.1021-1024; NS. GOS. XIX. 33. 'savinayanam' in the definition has been taken by Sgn. to mean 'auddhatyam apāśya', but Ag. interpretes it as 'visēsa-niscayaprāptya sahitam.' Visvanātha (SD. below VI. 48) follows Ag.


RB. quotes the same definition as in the NS. of the third Patākās-16
thānaka twice with a minor variation but ascribes it to Mg. It shows that
Mg. in his work on dramaturgy took some verses from the NS. ad-verbīm.

The fourth Patākāsthānaka, according to Sgn. consists in a well-
knit and ambiguous arrangement of words giving reasons (upapattimān) and
capable of linking the motive of the composition (kāvyā-yojana-kṣama).
For illustration a verse, addressed to Sītā by Rāma, has been quoted from
18 the Jānaki-rāghava. The verse carries two meanings:— (1) this Asoka garden
will charm thee with its blossoms; (2) perhaps Rāvana having the Puṣpaka
chariot will carry thee off in the pleasure garden. Thus it suggests the
motive of the action, i.e., the abduction of Sītā.

The verse 'uddāmotkalikām' etc., in the Act II of the Ratnāvalī
has been cited as an illustration of the fourth Patākāsthānaka in the Śr.
pra., Bha. pra., RS, and SD. All these works appear to be influenced by the
19

16. Abhi-sāku. p.151. tallakṣaṇam uktaṃ mātrguptācāryaih — arthopk-
-ṣeṇaṃ yattu gudham savinayam bhave / śīśita-pratyuttaropetam trtīyam
tanmatam tathā / RB. quotes the same verse and here also ascribes it to
Mg. in another place of his commentary on the Abhi-sāku (p.123) but here the
reading is a bit corrupt.

17. NLRK. II. 1033-1035, NS. GOS. XIX 34. The NS. reads the third foot
as 'upanyāsa-sujuktaśca' instead of 'upapatyā samprayuktah' of the NLRK. A
ms. of the NS (GOS. Vol. III. p.21. na) reads 'upapatyā yutam yacca'. The
reading in the SD. (VI. 49) is 'Pradhānārthāntarākṣepi'.

18. NLRK. II. 1036-1037.

19. Śr. pra (Vol. II.) p.504., Bha. pra. P.203. 11. 5-6, RS. p.213.
SD. below VI. 49.
Avaloka where the said verse has been quoted as an illustration of the Tulyavīṣeṣaṇa variety of Patañjāli, which is taken to be the same as the fourth one of the NS., as pointed out before. But Ag. clearly states that this verse cannot be taken as an illustration of the fourth Patañjāli, on the other hand it is an example of Vyāhāra an 'ānya' of the Vīthi.

Dr. S.N. Shastri says that the subsidiary portion of the plot is of three kinds; the Patañjāli, Prakāra and the Patañjāli. This is the view of Sāradātanayā alone and is not maintained by any other authority including the NS. The Patañjāli in no way can be considered as constituting a sub-division of the Prāsaṅgika - vṛtta. They are really decorations adding charm to the composition, as stated by dgn. The NS. itself states, - "catuspatañjā-ṇāramāṇ nātaka kāryam iṣyate". Ag. also maintains that they add beauty to the composition but refers to a view that takes them as 'dūṣāṇas'. The ND too emphasises this decorative aspect of the Patañjāli and enjoins that there should not be any play devoid of it, and also maintains that all the Patañjāli are equally essential.

20. DR. Avaloka. p. 4.
22. LPSD. p. 72.
23. Bha. pra. P. 201. 11, 11-12. The Bha. pra., however, (p. 202. 1-9) rightly says that the Patañjāli are 'sūcanopāyas'.
24. MLRK. 1,997. Kāvyasyālaṁkārabhūtāni/ 1,998 Patañjālīni śobhāhetūni/
25. NS. GOS. XIX. 36.
27. ND. pp. 39, 41.
Dr. S.N. Shastri further maintains that Sgn. recommends the use of the four Patākāsthānakas "in succession in the first four junctures commencing with the Protasis in a drama". It is a fact that Sgn. restricts their use in first four Sandhis only and clearly states that the last Sandhi should not have any Patākāsthānaka. At the conclusion of the discussion on the topic Sgn. states: "asya prayogo mukhādi-sandhi-catuṣṭaye kvaṇi vidhātavyaḥ". Here the pronoun 'asya' may refer to the Patākāsthānaka in general or only the fourth one. In the first case the statement simply means that a Patākāsthānaka may be used anywhere in the first four Sandhis; if the second alternative is accepted then it means that the fourth Patākāsthānaka may be used in the first four Sandhis. In any case, the NLRK. does not appear to have recommended the use of the four Patākāsthānakas in succession. On the other hand Sgn. seems to maintain that they may be used without any restriction in the first four Sandhis. That there was a confusion regarding the use of the Patākāsthānakas in a play, is evident from the statement of Ag. The great commentator refers to and rejects the view as untenable that restricts the use of these four in first four Sandhis in succession and takes the words 'prathama' dvitiya' etc., before them as indicating their occurrence in the kūkha Sandhi, Pratinukha-sandhi etc., respectively. Viśvanātha also refers to the view as

28. LPSD. p. 80, f.n. 4.
29. NLRK. 1.998. nirvāhaṇasandhi-varjanā kāriṇi.
30. NLRK. 1. 1038.
31. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p.20. anye tu catuṣpatakā-paramam iti bhāvi-sandhi-catuṣṭayābhi-prāyena manyamāṇā h prathamādvitiyādi-sabdān mukhādi-sandhi-visaya-prayogābhi-prāyenā vyācakṣate/atra ca yuktir na lakṣyate, na vā camatkāram bhajatītyasadeva /
maintained by some, but he himself advocates the free and frequent use of
the Patākāsthānakas in all the Sandhis without any restriction, as they
are very much admirable, evidently due to their power of enhancing the
beauty of the composition.

There is another view referred to in the Abhi-bhā. that establishes
a relation between the Patākā-nāyaka and the Patākā-sthānaka. This view up-
holds that in the first four Sandhis there should be as many as four Patākā-
nāyakas and each should be indicated successively by the four Patākāsthānakas.

Ag. rightly criticises this view as 'asat'. Another theory, referred to and
rejected by Ag. as 'upahūsapātrikṛtaḥ Pakaḥ', makes the number of the Patā-

kāsthānakas as five. All these confusing views seem to have had their ori-
gin to the attempt of bringing the plot of a play into a mechanical framework
of divisions. The Sandhis are five in number, so also are the Avasthās, Arthapra-
kṛtis and Arthropakṣepakas. This fact might have tempted some later theo-
rists to raise the number of the Patākāsthānakas to five. We have also seen
that some authors endeavoured to correlate the Sandhis, Avasthās and Arthapra-
kṛtis. A similar attempt was also made to tag the Patākāsthānakas with the
Sandhis. All these views are decidedly later, but they were formed long before

32. SD. p. 344. etāni...sarvasandhiṣu bhavanti / kāvyā-karturicchāvasād
bhūyo bhūyo'pi bhavanti /

33. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 22. caturṣu sandhiṣu catvāraḥ patākā-nāyakāḥ,
tēṣām yathākramaṃ sūcakāni patākūsthānāni, Prathamaṃ mukhasandhau yāvaccaturtham
avamarsa-sandhāviti, taccāsat /

34. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 20.
Ag., and also the number of their adherents was not too negligible to be overlooked by the great commentator.

We have shown that according to Sgn., there should be no Patākāsthānaka in the Nīrvahāṇa-sandhi, they are to be used in the first four Sandhis only. It may be argued that even at the beginning of the Nīrvahāṇa-sandhi the final object comes very near to be accomplished and there remains practically no future event to be indicated by a Patākāsthānaka. From a study of the Sandhis, as has already been done, it appears that after the Vimarśa-sandhi the final result comes to be almost a determined fact and as such, there is but a very little scope of a Patākāsthānaka in the Nīrvahāṇa-sandhi.

Sgn., however, is not the propounder of the above theory. It is Mg., if Rāghavabhaṭṭa is to be believed, who recommended that the four Patākāsthānakas should be used in the first four Sandhis, but whether in succession or not is not clear from the quotation found in the Arthadyotanikā. Rb. says: "eśāṃ sthānam apyuktam mātryguptacāryaiḥ - mukhe pratimukhe guruce ca caturśvapi / bhedaḥ sandhiṣu kartavyāḥ patākāsthānaksya tu" // The verse seems to mean that different Patākāsthānakas are to be used in the first four Sandhis. Among the authors of extant works on dramaturgy, Sgn. is the most ardent follower of Mg. and his standpoint, as discussed above, also supports this view. From the statement "patākāsthānaksya bhedaḥ sandhiṣu kartavyāḥ," it does not definitely follow that the Patākāsthānakas are to be used in succession. But this theory of the use of Patākāsthānakas in succession in the first four Sandhis, also seems to be very old. A definition of the first Patākāsthānaka, ascribed to Ādi-bharata by Rb. gives a hint to this theory. Rb. states, "tallakṣaṇaṃ ādi-bharate - sahasai-vārthā-sampattir-nāyakasyo-pakārī-kaḥ/ patākā-sthānakaṃ sandhau prathame (?) tanmatam" // Here it is said that

35. Abhi.-āku. p.110. / 36. Abhi.-āku. pp.40-41. The definition is very similar to that of the Mg.
this is the description of the Pataṅkāsthānaka which is to be used in the first Sandhi, i.e., the first Pataṅkāsthānaka is restricted to the first Sandhi. It can reasonably be surmised that the adherents of this view advocated the use of other three also in succession in the three following Sandhis. Again the NS. enjoins that Patākā, the 'vyāpi-prāsaṅgika-vṛtta', is to be closed at least in the Vimarśa-sandhi, after which there is no scope of a Pataṅkāsthānaka according to the above two views ascribed to Ng. and Ādi-bharata respectively. From this perhaps the tendency to establish a relation between the Patākā and Pataṅkāsthānaka had developed and ultimately gave rise to the view that established a correlation among the four Sandhis, four Pataṅkāsthānakas and four Patākānūyakas. The theory has rightly been exploded by Ag., as shown before. The view of Ādi-bharata that the Pataṅkāsthānaka forms a subdivision of the Prāsaṅgika-vṛtta is also based on the same tendency as above. The above theory ascribed to Ādi-bharata was further elaborated and the number of the Pataṅkāsthānakas was raised to five to fit in with the five Sandhis and a theory of mechanical correlation was thus established. It is interesting to note that all these theories developed as early as to be refuted by Ag. It also shows to what extent the authors of Indian dramaturgy have shown their extraordinary genius for correlation and classification.