CHAPTER VIII

THE RELATION OF THE NATYADARPANA TO OTHER WORKS ON DRAMATURGY OR POETICS.

A. THE ND'S INDEBTEDNESS TO THE EARLIER WORKS ON DRAMATURGY.

As we have occasionally seen in the earlier chapters (Ch. III to VI) the authors of the ND have considerably borrowed from their predecessors especially Bharata, Abhinavagupta, Dhanañjaya and others. This chapter therefore presents a comparative study of the Natyadarpana and other works on dramaturgy. We start with the relation of the ND to the NS.

(i) THE NATYADARPANA AND THE NATYAŚASTRA.

The NS is reputed to be the oldest extant work on dramaturgy. Bharata who is rightly called "the father of literary criticism" deserves the credit of bringing to light the principles of dramaturgy in a systematic form which lay scattered before his times. The NS therefore is accepted as a "canonical book of Indian dramaturgy."

The later writers on dramaturgy acknowledge their indebtedness to this 'intellectual giant' and express their feelings of reverence and gratitude to him. The DR goes to the extent of saying "Who else is capable of defining Nāṭya?" and humbly expresses that whatever is embodied by him in his work is merely a summary of what the learned preceptors had already proclaimed.

Our authors too admit their indebtedness to their previous writers in their introductory verses. The NS being the most authentic work on dramaturgy the ND has accepted most of the definitions from the NS only. That our authors have mainly followed the old authorities (i.e. Bharata) is evident from the following remarks:

1. At the end of the discussion of Uparūpakas the ND states that these Rūpakas have been mentioned in the commentary only, (and not in Kārikās,) because they are less interesting and have not been mentioned by the old authorities.

2. The ND condemns those who propound that the hero of a Nāṭaka should be Dhīrodātta only, on the basis of the

1. DR I, 4.
2. ND, p. 23, verse No.2.
fact that they do not abide by the tradition established by Bharata.

3. While discussing Prakarana the ND points out that those who assert that the hero of a Prakarana should be of Dhīrasānta type having a minister in their view are not supported by the Vṛddhas (i.e. Bharata) (and therefore cannot be accepted). Here the ND quotes one line from the NS in support of his statement.

4. The ND criticises Bhavabhūti for employing Kāśi in exuberance in his Prakarana called Mālatimādhava which, the ND observes, is against the opinion of the Vṛddhas.

5. While discussing Dhruvas the ND remarks that "Prāśadikī Dhruva must be introduced after Pravesikī and Akṣepikī" as 'the old tradition' says so.

The above instances are sufficient to show that the ND takes the old authorities, viz., Bharata and others as binding upon all, and criticises those who disregard these authorities.

2. ND, p. 117.
3. ND, p. 120.
5. It may be pointed out here that even though the authors of the ND criticize those who disregard the early authorities, they themselves have not always followed those authorities as will be seen from the later discussion. At one place they have even accused Bharata of self-contradiction.
Moreover, our authors literally quote the NS of Bharata more than once:-

1. They bodily quote in series the Nāndi verses given by Bharata by mentioning his name.

2. At the end of the discussion of the sixty four Sandhyangas the ND mentions that other twenty one Sandhyantarās also are mentioned by some and they quote three verses from the NS enumerating these.

3. The ND also quotes the celebrated dictum of Bharata on Rasa, namely, Rasa is produced by the communion of Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas. Of course the name of Bharata is not mentioned along with the dictum.

1. Vide ND, p. 192, Tathā ca bharatamunih nāndīm paṭhati... etc. (NS V, 110-113).

   This is a rare phenomenon in this work. The authors of the ND hardly refer by name to any author (excepting of course when they want to criticise him). This reveals the high esteem in which the authors of the ND hold this old sage as it suggests that they do not feel humiliated in quoting from Bharata as an authority and accepting the debt by mentioning his name.

2. ND, p. 116; NS (KM) XIX, 105-107.

3. Vibhāvānubhāvāvyabhicāribhāvasmyogad rasanispattih-
   ND, p. 161; NS (KM), p. 62.
4. The ND quotes as an authority from the NS the statement
"The commander-in-chief and the minister are of Drirodatta type", (without any specific reference to Bharata).

5. The ND verbally quotes the ten Lasyangas from the NS.

The ND refers to Bharata in various ways. Sometimes the ND calls him Muni, Pūrvamuni, sometimes he is referred to as Vṛddha and at times as Pūrvācārya or Nātyācārya. The view of Bharata is also referred to as Munisamaya, Vṛddhasampradaya, or Vṛddhābhāshipraya.

A comparative study of the two texts (the ND and the NS) will clearly show that the ND has mostly depended upon Bharata while defining and explaining the various topics concerned. The NS was in fact the chief source-book for all the later writers on dramaturgy. So ND's indebtedness to the NS is obvious and evident. A full list of all the instances where the

---

1. ND, p. 178; NS (KM) XXIV, 14.
2. ND, p. 127; NS (KM) XVIII, 135-4.
3. ND, p. 120.
5. ND, p. 215.
6. ND, Pp. 155, 163. The plural used in some cases is likely to be for showing reverence.
7. ND, p. 195.
8. ND, p. 29.
10. ND, p. 120.
ND has directly or indirectly borrowed significant phrases or ideas is practically impossible as it would be too lengthy which is neither necessary nor desirable. I therefore have to content myself by giving a specimen or two of each type of borrowing.

Sometimes the ND borrows verbatim from the NS. Very often the ND picks up significant phrases from the NS and puts the idea in its own language. Authors of the ND fully know their limitation of space. They could not afford to be lengthy unnecessarily. A work like the ND which proposes to discuss

1. e.g. (a) Verses enumerating Rasas and Sthāyī Bhāvas

verbally echo NS, Cf. ND III, 111 and NS (GOS) VI, 15 and ND III, 126 and NS (GOS) VI, 17.

(b) Enumeration of Angas & Upāngas in Angika Abhinaya

Cf. ND:- अंगसंख्या:कविपरिभाषाधिकृतां भिन्नपुष्पातिकारकोपात्मानाः।

NS:- नैसर्गिकोपात्मानां साधरकालिपोष्ट्यत् भिन्नपुष्पाः।


2. (a) Definition of Mukha-

ND:- मुखः प्रधानवांशे बीलितिरसाध्य:। ----- ५-४

NS:- अन बीलिसमुक्षित: नानाध्यक्षसंभव स्ब:।-----तन्मुखः परीक्षितम् || ----- (K.M) ५०-५१.

(b) Definition of Pratimukha-

ND:- प्रतीमुखः किंयोकत्वतीयमाटसम्भवित:।----- ५-५.

NS:- बीलिसोप्राप्तवां अश्च रूपसंभव कवित:।

मुनेस्थनस्य शर्मां तद्प्रतिमुखं स्मृतम् || (K.M)

19, 40
in a few pages almost all problems which a writer of drama has to face cannot afford to be very elaborate. So the ND sometimes summarizes in a few words what Bharata has elaborately discussed in good many verses. For instance the ND summarizes in a few lines the Āṅgika Abhinaya described by Bharata in several chapters (NS(KM)Ch. VIII to XII). On the other hand at times the ND simplifies or elaborates what Bharata has stated briefly. For better elucidation the ND resorts to concrete illustrations, e.g., the topic on Sandhis and Sandhyāngsa has been treated rather briefly by the NS, while, the ND devotes considerable space to the topic making the treatment exhaustive with profuse illustrations from a large number of plays. Even the treatment of the twelve types of Rūpakas, the limbs of Vīthi, etc. as we find in the ND is rather more elaborate as compared to the treatment of the NS.

1. Of:

(a) NS:-

कामधे कविनिज्ञन रस्मिः संदभुजः

(b) ND:-

हेतु: कान्तिभाषाकान्ते: पुनर्विशेषतः

NS:-

अतः परम सङ्कुचितः सर्प्पिलाविहृत व्यथापः

कान्तिः अभावाकृतखः --

पुंरतिर्यासुस्यात् (कान्ते: नामविभिन्नता अन्याय:-) (K.M)

2. In fact the nature and scope of Bharata's NS is so vast (५, ३०-३४) that it cannot afford to elaborate and illustrate the various topics.
It is true that the authors of the ND have followed Bharata in most cases, still however they do not always follow the NS. At places they differ.

(a) While the NS recognises only ten types of Rūpaka the ND recognises twelve Rūpakas. The ND here gives the Natikā and the Prakaranikā the status of principal Rūpakas.

(b) The NS mentions eight Rasas. The ND adds Śānta and makes the number nine and adds that there can be even more Rasas than nine such as Laulya, Sneha, Duhkha, Sukha, etc.

(c) The NS considers all Rasas as pleasant, enjoyable while the ND opines that some of the Rasas are pleasant while others like Karuna, Raudra, Bibhatsa and Bhayańska, are not pleasant.

(d) The ND does not recognise Sāmānyabhīnsya as an independent form of Abhīnsya while Bharata has devoted full chapters to its discussion. The ND includes it in Vācika Abhīnsya.

1. NS (KM) VI, 16.
2. ND, p. 163.
3. Cr. Āsvādayanti manasa tasmān nātyarasāh smṛtah - NS (KM)p. 193
4. ND, p. 159.
5. ND, p. 191.
6. NS (KM) XXII and XXIV.
(e) The ND also does not recognize Cītrābhīnaya discussed by Bharata. The ND includes it in Angika Abhinaya as the former consists of the movement of limbs of body and is simply a mixture of two, three or four of the Abhinayas.

(f) Bharata has described in detail the religious Preliminaries called Purvarāṇga which ought to be performed before the actual staging of a dramatic piece. The NS discusses the nineteen limbs of Purvarāṇga. The ND opines that these are all (except Nāndī) futile and meant to deceive the faithful votaries (this is, in fact, a great hit to the Brahmanical ritualism by a Jaina writer).

(g) The ND defines as many as thirteen minor plays (which the ND calls other Rūpakas) which are not mentioned by Bharata.

(h) The NS gives five types of Prastāvanā-Kathodghata and others. The ND does not approve of any of these types. What Bharata calls 'types', the ND calls them "the modes of introducing character on the stage".

Moreover, the NS includes only two of the Vīthyaṅgas (viz. Udghātyaka and Avalagita) as the types of Prastāvanā,

1. NS (KM) XXV; Cf. ND, p. 191.
2. 'Sraddhālapratāranamātratvāt - ND, p. 155; also Cf. kesāmicīt niśphalatvāt..... ND, p. 193.
while the ND thinks that not only two but all of the thirteen Vīthyaṅgas can be introduced in a Prologue.

(i) Bharata divides each of the four Vṛttis into four types, e.g., Bhāratī has four limbs – Prarocana, Āmukha, Vīthi and Prahasana. Similarly Sāttvati, Kaisiki and Ārabhati also have four limbs each. The ND does not admit of any such types or limbs of Vṛttis even though in case of Bhāratī the ND points out that it occurs in Āmukha, Prarocana and all the Rūpakas.

(j) Bharata wants that Vedic metres, viz., Uṣṇik and Gāyatri should be used profusely in Samavakāra. The ND on the contrary holds that Gāyatri and other Vedic metres should not be used in Samavakāra. (It may be noted here that the editors of the NS give another reading in the foot-note according to which these Vṛttas should not be used in Samavakāra and it is possible that the edition of the NS which our authors possessed might have this second reading which the ND follows).

(k) The NS gives twenty one other Sandhyantaras (Sandhyantarāṃ angakalpaṃ) beginning with Sama and ordains that these

1. NS (KM) XVIII, 128.
3. NS (KM) p. 299; BN.2 (NS (GOS) Vol. II, p. 941, F.N.
4. NS, (KM) XIX, 48 F.N.
5. Ibid XXI, 49-51.
Sandhyantararas along with the sixty four Sandhyangas, Laksaras, Gunes, etc. should be employed in a Nataka. The ND quotes these 21 Sandhyantararas verbatim from the NS under the opinion of 'some' (kecit) and opines that some of these can be included in Angas, some in Vyabhicaribhavas, and some are parts of the actual plot (Itivrtta).

(1) Bharata holds that the Vidusaka of a king should be a Brahmin only while the ND allows any of the three types: ascetic, Brahmin or King's employee.

(m) Bharata refers to Stambha, Sveda, etc. as Sattvika Bhavas while the ND calls them Anubhavas.

Not only do the authors of the ND differ from Bharata on several points but they go to the extent of even criticizing Bharata for a self-contradiction he has committed in restricting Bharati Vrtti to Karuna and Bibhatsa Rasas only and at the same time ordaining Bharati for Vithi, Prahasana and Bhana none of which is characterized by Karuna or Bibhatsa as

1. Ibid XXI, 118-120.
2. ND, p. 116.
3. Vithi and Prahasana are considered to be the limbs of Bharati Vrtti by the NS (KM) XX, 26.
its dominant sentiment. 1

At times we find the ND referring to the view of the NS as
'Kecit' or 'Anye' or 'Apare'. e.g.

(a) ND - Anye tu sāmbhatānām pratipakṣānām bijāphalotpattini-
rodhakānām viślesakām bhedarūpamupāyam bhedanām manvate -(p.65).
Also Cf. NS - Samghatābhedanārtho yāḥ sa bheda iti saṣājñitāḥ
(KM) IX X, 73.

(b) The ND - Apare tu krodhādeḥ prāptasya śamanam
dyutim āmananti, (p. 108) Cf. NS - Labdhāyārthasya śamanam
dyutih etc. (KM) IX X, 97.

(c) The ND refers to the view of 'some' who do not accept
'upāsti' but recognize 'Prasāda' instead, which is defined
as 'gratification arising out of some service rendered by the
person' 2. This view can be ascribed to Bharata who reads
Prasāda instead of Upāsti and defines it in a similar way 3.

1. Vide Ye tu bhārātyām bibhatsa-karunau prapannah tait
sarvarasāvīthipradhanāsārgarāvīrabhāna-pradhānahāsyaprahaṣa-
ṇāni svayam eva bhārātyāni vṛttau nityanrītāni nāvekṣitāni
(NS, p. 153). Here it may be noted that whenever the ND
criticizes higher authorities the language used is very
polite and considerate.

2. ND, p. 117.
3. NS (GOS) XIX, 101.
(d) The ND refers to the view of some (kecit) who read Pūrvavākya instead of Pūrvabhāva. It is not possible to say categorically that here the ND refers to the NS because even though the NS reads Pūrvavākya there is another reading which reads Pūrvabhāva also.

The gist of the above discussion is that even though the authors of the ND have accepted Bharata as the final authority on dramaturgy and have followed him in most cases they have not always done so. They sometimes differ from him and at times even criticize him.

1. Vide ND, p. 113 and NS (GQS) XIX, 103.
Amongst the writers on dramaturgy, Abhinava shines as one of the brightest stars. His position among the prominent writers on Alankāraśāstra can hardly be challenged. His learned commentaries over the Nāṭyaśāstra and the Dhāvanyāloka speak volumes for his learning, erudition and critical insight into the subject of poetics including dramaturgy. His scholarship and depth tends to baffle even good scholars. It is not surprising if such a master critic leaves an indelible impression on the mind of our authors and they naturally try to make the best use of the commentaries of this great intellectual giant.

The debt that Rāmacandra and Gūrṇacandra owe to this great personality cannot be over-estimated. Just as in composing the Kārikās the authors have drawn abundantly upon the NŚ of Bharata in the same way in writing the Vṛtti or the commentary the authors have mainly followed Abhinava. At great many places we find them to have copied Abhinava. Whatever is striking or attractive in the NŚ has, in many a case, its origin in the Abhinavabhārati.

At times the authors of the NŚ have lifted lines after lines, sentences after sentences, sometimes even a paragraph. Sometimes they have picked up the significant word, words or phrases from Abhinava and the matter is put in their own language.
At many a place the ideas have been taken and put in their own language. Wherever Abhinava is obscure, the ND has tried to present him in a simple and clearer manner. In case Abhinava is too brief our authors have expanded the idea so as to make it clear and easily comprehensible. The authors of the ND skip over such passages as contain lengthy and pedantic discussions carried on by Abhinava and are not very essential to the exposition of the topics concerned. Thus they summarize what the former has elaborately treated of and put the same in a well connected systematic form.

The indebtedness of the authors of the ND to Abhinava may conveniently be considered under the following headings:

I. Borrowing verbatim:
   (a) of passages.
   (b) of sentences.
   (c) of illustrations.

II. Verbal borrowing with minor changes in construction etc.
    Here the important phrases are retained along with the idea. Some words are replaced by exact synonyms. This can be divided into two sub-headings:
    (a) borrowing of passages.
    (b) borrowing of sentences.

III. Borrowing of ideas. Here only the matter is borrowed while the language and representation are the authors' own.
(I) BORROWING VERBATIM

(a) OF PASSAGES: It is rarely that the ND copies passages after passages verbatim. In that case the ND would very legitimately be accused of gross plagiarism—an unpardonable fault. Still however, the following can be quoted as an illustration of the type:


(b) OF SENTENCES
नाट्यदर्शी

३: यहाँ को है:-
“उत्तमाधम-फयामिषुंडा पृष्ठ तिनिरिता।
रक्षापरं दिवं धर्मं च सा जीवित्रिपणुनं
जिता।” चित। ।-पृ० ५०६- ।

४: ततु कछु किस्माने वास:। अर्थार्थाने अन्तः।
चौपात्ताने विच। ।-पृ० ५०४- ।

५: यस्तु चेर्चीपरं नामुस्मरण सह धुरेयसात
वनस्य धर्मित्रोपत्यमिलाणं पृ. जिलासः
स नायकस्य ताहुःसिस्तरेः नुमितः। यतातः
“सन्धिसमयगदनं रसक्षणसमयेव व यदाः
न तु के चलातान्त्रिकीसिद्धान्तमद्वन्दवेच्या।”
चित। ।-पृ० ५०- ।

६: दीवविवुधकन्युपत्ताते पुराणकारोऽपवस्यम सम्पादित चतुर्प्रसिद्धि।
-पृ० ५२- ।

अभिनवभारती

३: तथा च को है:-
“उत्तमाधम-फयामिषुंडा पृष्ठ तिनिरिता।
रक्षापरं दिवं धर्मं च सा जीवित्रिपणुनं
जिता।” चित। ।-पृ० ५०२, पृ० ५०५- ।

४: यस्तु कछु किस्माने वास:। विकृपणाने विच।
अर्थार्थाने अन्तः।-पृ० ५०२, पृ० ५०५- ।

५: यस्तु चेर्चीपरं नामुस्मरण सह धुरेयसात
वनस्य धर्मित्रोपत्यमिलाणं पृ. जिलासः
स नायकस्य ताहुःसिस्तरेः नुमितः। यतातः
“सन्धिसमयगदनं रसक्षणसमयेव यथा
न तु के चलातान्त्रिकीसिद्धान्तमद्वन्दवेच्या।”
-पृ० ५०१- ।

६: दीवविवुधकन्युपत्ताते हि पुराण-
कारोऽपवस्यम, तद्भवोऽपिष्ठ प्रशिक्षणः
युद्धनीव: ।-पृ० ५०१, पृ० ५०२- ।

७: अयसेनान् च चितते सहस्राणान्तर-प्राणिया
नागान्ते जीमुक्तवानांस्य गृहस्य
चूलस्याबत्वकामस्य कृपिताः कालो युगलाः
यथा निर्मितः। ।-पृ० ५४५- ।

८: अयसेनान् च चितते सहस्राणान्तर-प्राणिया
यथा नागान्ते जीमुक्तवानांस्य
शृङ्गस्याबत्वकामस्य कृपिताः कालो
युगलार्कियाः।-पृ० ५०२, पृ० ५२०- ।
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Abhī</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Udghātyaka</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Avaspandita</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Nālikā</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Vyāhāra</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Prapañca</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Trigata</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Chala</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Asatpralāpa</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Vākkēlī</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Śrīgāra</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Anka</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Prakarana</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Parikera</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Parinyāsa</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Samahiti</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Udbheda</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Karana</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Vilobhāna</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Bhedana</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Prāpana</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Vilāsa</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Varnasāhṛti</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Narma</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Narmadyuti pp. 75-76 III p. 44.
27. Ākṣepa p. 89 III p. 50.
30. Sakti p. 100 III p. 53.
34. Pūrvabhāva p. 114 III p. 58.

5-6.
39. Rasas: Their inter-
   relation, i.e. p. 186. I p. 297.

II. VERBAL BORROWING WITH MINOR CHANGES

(a) OF PASSAGES.
नायिकायः

१: कलसेमुरुःगामभक्ति तेतवः बायायः।
वह डेौतुंतिथिम जबेतनन्त्यः तन्नः।
कर्मयावसयावेतनस्य विवधः।
मुरुःतीमम् अनुमुरुः तत्त्वः।
वेतनायः गिर्वाम कर्मकार्यातः।
मुरुः स्वीकारः।
स्वकारः उपकारसृजः।
मुरुः विना।
उपकारसृजः
विनायः स्वाभिनिषवान्।
परार्थसेवकः।
पातका अथः श्रुतिः।

d - पु.०५१ - ७२ -

२: तेनक्षणेऽपि स्वसुःगंगातः सघः विनायकः निनिष्टः ।
यथा
वेषीलंधारेः समभेतूःग्रंथ्रुः पुनः पुनः
उपविनीताः गीर्तिः परसाधुवीरः ।
राजनांस्यः विनायः पुपः पुनः इत्यादि।
रुःगारुः मुलास्याः। अतः
वर्मापरेः निनिष्टः वेषीलंधारेः।
तथा
विनायकः साधुः यददेहा नेचित्ताः निनिष्टः
यथा
वेषीलंधारेः समभेतूःग्रंथ्रुः पुपः
प्रदृगः गीर्तिः परसाधुवीरः ।
विनाय्यनुः तु
पृः पुपः गैरसः सवतो तथा।
तथा
विनायकः साधुः यददेहा नेचित्ताः निनिष्टः
यथा
वेषीलंधारेः समभेतूःग्रंथ्रुः पुपः
प्रदृगः गीर्तिः परसाधुवीरः ।
विनाय्यनुः तु
पृः पुपः गैरसः सवतो तथा।
तथा
विनायकः साधुः यददेहा नेचित्ताः निनिष्टः
यथा
वेषीलंधारेः समभेतूःग्रंथ्रुः पुपः
प्रदृगः गीर्तिः परसाधुवीरः ।
विनाय्यनुः तु
पृः पुपः गैरसः सवतो तथा।
तथा
विनायकः साधुः यददेहा नेचित्ताः निनिष्टः
यथा
वेषीलंधारेः समभेतूःग्रंथ्रुः पुपः
प्रदृगः गीर्तिः परसाधुवीरः ।
विनाय्यनुः तु
पृः पुपः गैरसः सवतो तथा।
तथा

अभिनवसरसी

१: यन्त्रः परसः तथाः प्रकृतः उपायः।
कलसेतः।
तै जबेतस्या विवधः
कर्मः ।
अज्ञातः विनिष्टः बायायः।

d - पु.०५२ - ६१ -

२: तेनक्षणेऽपि स्वसुःगंगातः सघः विनायकः निनिष्टः ।
यथा
वेषीलंधारेः समभेतूःग्रंथ्रुः पुपः पुनः
उपविनीताः गीर्तिः परसाधुवीरः ।
राजनांस्यः विनायः पुपः पुनः इत्यादि।
विनाय्यनुः तु
पृः पुपः गैरसः सवतो तथा।
तथा
विनायकः साधुः यददेहा नेचित्ताः निनिष्टः
यथा
वेषीलंधारेः समभेतूःग्रंथ्रुः पुपः
प्रदृगः गीर्तिः परसाधुवीरः ।
विनाय्यनुः तु
पृः पुपः गैरसः सवतो तथा।
तथा
विनायकः साधुः यददेहा नेचित्ताः निनिष्टः
यथा
वेषीलंधारेः समभेतूःग्रंथ्रुः पुपः
प्रदृगः गीर्तिः परसाधुवीरः ।
विनाय्यनुः तु
पृः पुपः गैरसः सवतो तथा।
तथा
विनायकः साधुः यददेहा नेचित्ताः निनिष्टः
यथा
वेषीलंधारेः समभेतूःग्रंथ्रुः पुपः
प्रदृगः गीर्तिः परसाधुवीरः ।
विनाय्यनुः तु
पृः पुपः गैरसः सवतो तथा।
तथा

- नी १- पु.०६२-६१ -

१: काव्योऽपि यथोऽपि स्वपूर्वः ताप्स्यः स्वाभिनिषवः
अश्वेषः।
तेनक्षणेऽपि स्वसुःगंगातः अश्वेषः।

d - पु.०५६ - -

२: काव्योऽपि यथोऽपि स्वपूर्वः ताप्स्यः स्वाभिनिषवः
अश्वेषः।
तेनक्षणेऽपि स्वसुःगंगातः अश्वेषः।

d - पु.०६२-६४ -
(b) OF SENTENCES: (Below are quoted the sentences where
the ND has almost verbally lifted from the Abhi. with
very insignificant changes).

1. दच्छ भवालव धिखा नामन स्थिस्व निविजन
देशन च। -पृ २० -

2. नायिका तु जिम्मापं नवति यदर्षीति।
-पृ २० -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>नाट्यवर्धि</th>
<th>अभिव्यक्तती</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१०: सर्वप्रचंचनाय जले तेलक्षुबिर- किन्तु :</td>
<td>१०: तेलक्षुबिर सर्वप्रचंचनाय बिनु :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०४६-</td>
<td>- पु.०४६-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>११: केवल चीजें मुखस्थापित पुनरुत्थति निकलये भिनन्तु तदनन्तरयति</td>
<td>११: चीजें मुखस्थापित पवनधर्मादियति किनुसदनन्तरयति विशेषे नयो :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०५७-</td>
<td>- पु.०५७-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१२: चीजें समस्तीतिवृत्त्यापकल्याश्च</td>
<td>१२: हेतु जग तु समस्तीतिवृत्त्यापी।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०५६-</td>
<td>- पु.०५६-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१३: नेतृपुष्पास्थि प्रीति ब्रजसुपपायण्यु पयोत्तरवशः . . . . . कायमंदेवनसं व्यापराः</td>
<td>१३: साये ब्रजपरिसरसस्यो यो ब्रजनस्त- मूलतत्त्व य अवश्य: . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०५७-</td>
<td>- पु.०५७-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१५: प्रारंभकलायंक्वादात्त , मुनिमेव मुंगमु . . . . .</td>
<td>१५: प्राग्रासनमुक्तवाम्मुलस्वित्त मुक्तम्ब . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०५६-</td>
<td>- पु.०५६-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१६: प्रारंभेयो गीयायानिरारागं : पूलंनुपुख्य विचित्रसंस्थिते शमानं पुि- संप्रदायिन्तिरी हितादिक्षयक्स्थिन्ति</td>
<td>१६: प्रारंभेयो गीयायानिरारागं : पूलंनुपुख्य विचित्रसंस्थिते अर्पितित: ताक्षमु- संप्रदायिन्तिरी हितादिक्षयक्स्थिन्ति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०५४-</td>
<td>- पु.०५४-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१७: अमाययेन सागरिका चेतितारूं चोर्नु मुक्तायमृ व्यति संस्कारस्य जामेसद- रुपार्जोनिति हितादिक्षयक्स्थिन्ति</td>
<td>१७: अमाययेन सागरिका चेतितारूं चोर्नु मुक्तायमृ व्यति संस्कारस्य जामेसद- रुपार्जोनिति हितादिक्षयक्स्थिन्ति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०५४-</td>
<td>- पु.०५४-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१८: अनुमोदी शृणु चक्रवर्ती बिवृट्यते विनित्स्यर्जे- नौभो तथा बांधे शस्त्रेन्तव्यान्ते- हिपुतित:</td>
<td>१८: अनुमोदी शृणु चक्रवर्ती बिवृट्यते विनित्स्यर्जे- नौभो तथा बांधे शस्त्रेन्तव्याल्ल- हिपुतित:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०५६-</td>
<td>- पु.०५६-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२०: तेवनेन स्वयं द्वारितुं विद्रोहकारको- नौभो तथा बांधे शस्त्रेन्तव्यान्ते- हिपुतित:</td>
<td>२०: तेवनेन स्वयं द्वारितुं विद्रोहकारको- नौभो तथा बांधे शस्त्रेन्तव्याल्ल- हिपुतित:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०५६-</td>
<td>- पु.०५६-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२२: लक्ष्य वल्ला कटितितरुः तु- वानमु</td>
<td>२२: लक्ष्य वल्ला कटितितरुः तु- वानमु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- पु.०५८-</td>
<td>- पु.०५८-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18: निचलपूज-क्ष्यालेव चोटूरुक्षया
पुस्तेफियते। पृ० ८५

19: अनुमक्न निचलपूज-क्ष्यालेव, उपा-
यायुक्ते रंयुतावत्। -पृ० ८५ प्र.

20: परस्परचन्यः प्रभुतयो यशु कुंभि-
सङ्कायार्थायास्यके तथायो
समर्थ तदु कर्मः... अधिवलयः।
पृ० ८६ चौ?

21: निनातित हुँदयमिति तोऽद्वायः।
पृ० ८७ प्र?

22: यथौपि अमोहे गवितकिवरो भयनी-
सङ्कायारश्यके तथापि... सङ्कायाय
पृ० ८४ प्र.

23: खुलास्य प्रसारः... नुमित्विधा-
दिविशितकार्येन सा शारि:।
पृ० १०० प्र.

24: कथे तथय स्मानेजु गुरुते पाठनः।
पृ० १०२ प्र.

25: केवचित्तमतमग्नस्तेशः स्वायतः
मेतैंत संभिक्षयः।
पृ० १०१ प्र.

26: योग्यताः च रल्लिष्ट्येकस्मिनसिद्धिः
पुरस्तकक्षयो निवारितं न पुनः
.... मुक्तस्वप्नः।
पृ० ११५ प्र.

27: व्रतिवृत्तस्याविशेषाय रसपुवयस्येषु
विषेषेद्विहि सङ्कायादेतुमित्वतात
कुतस्यो रसायवः।
पृ० ११५ प्र.

28: परस्परचन्यः प्रभुतयो यशु कुंभि-
सङ्कायार्थायास्यके तथायो
समर्थ तदु कर्मः... अधिवलयः।
पृ० ८५ प्र.

29: निनातित यतो खुळय तत्तसोऽद्वायः।
पृ० ८५ प्र.

32: यथौपि अमोहे गवितकिवरो भयनी-
सङ्कायारश्यके तथापि... सङ्कायाय
पृ० १०१ प्र.

31: कुपितस्य प्रथमः: प्रसारः शारि:।
नुमित्विधायविशितकार्येववः।
पृ० १०१ प्र.

34: युनितिरस्येऽऽरमें व्यक्तारतिः।
पृ० १०६ प्र.

35: केवचित्तमतमग्नस्तेशः श्वायतः
मेतैंत संभिक्षयः।
पृ० १०६ प्र.

36: योग्यताः च रल्लिष्ट्येकस्मिनसिद्धिः
च मुक्तस्वप्नः। किंतु प्रकृत्यः
यो जनासमयः।
पृ० १०६ प्र.

38: व्रतिवृत्तस्याविशेषाय रसपुवयस्येषु
विषेषेद्विहि सङ्कायादेतुमित्वतात
कुतस्यो रसायवः।
पृ० १०६ प्र.
28: याकायरित-वाच्यावलि समस्या। पृ ४२२
28: याकायरिताविषयक-काव्यावलि संपूर्ण। गोविन्दी, पृ ४४४

30: खम्बे-खम्बे-तित-तित यथायथ विमान। पृ ३५०
30: खम्बे-खम्बे-तित-तित यथायथ विमान। गोविन्दी, पृ ४४५

31: ज्ञानकृत्रिम-शुचिशब्याग्या यथायथ ता ज्ञानकृत्रिम-शुचिशब्याग्या। खम्बे-खम्बे। पृ ३५०
31: ज्ञानकृत्रिम-शुचिशब्याग्या यथायथ ता ज्ञानकृत्रिम-शुचिशब्याग्या। खम्बे-खम्बे। गोविन्दी, पृ ४४४

32: दृष्टि खम्बे-शुचिशब्याग्यांश्रृंहायां तीर्थमुग्धे। पृ ३४९
32: दृष्टि खम्बे-शुचिशब्याग्यांश्रृंहायां तीर्थमुग्धे। गोविन्दी, पृ ४४४

33: प्रेम-ज्ञानतर्क-यदृच्छिक यथायथ अन्मयायां यथायथज्ञात्वादेत्तत् ्तत् ञानमत्। पृ ४४२
33: प्रेम-ज्ञानतर्क-यदृच्छिक यथायथ अन्मयायां यथायथज्ञात्वादेत्तत् ्तत् ञानमत्। गोविन्दी, पृ ४४४

34: उत्तर: यथायथ परि-ज्ञानपूर्वैवात्-नास-पूर्वे यथायथ अन्मयायां यथायथज्ञात्वादेत्तत् ्तत् ञानमत्। पृ ४४२
34: उत्तर: यथायथ परि-ज्ञानपूर्वैवात्-नास-पूर्वे यथायथ अन्मयायां यथायथज्ञात्वादेत्तत् ्तत् ञानमत्। गोविन्दी, पृ ४४४

35: परिक्षितावकारिय पद्धती-याचन-मित्रत... सणात त त्तलि व्याख्यान-द्वृत्त व्याख्या। पृ ४४६
35: परिक्षितावकारिय पद्धती-याचन-मित्रत... सणात त त्तलि व्याख्यान-द्वृत्त व्याख्या। गोविन्दी, पृ ४४६

36: निलिपी-पीये अन्धकारी! नायक! व्याख्यात! पृ ४४६
36: निलिपी-पीये अन्धकारी! नायक! व्याख्यात! गोविन्दी, पृ ४४६

37: गुप्तां दृष्ट्य संक्षणां च गुप्तां दृष्ट्य संक्षणां च। गुप्तां दृष्ट्य संक्षणां च। (सहित मुख्यम्)। पृ ४५०
37: गुप्तां दृष्ट्य संक्षणां च गुप्तां दृष्ट्य संक्षणां च। गुप्तां दृष्ट्य संक्षणां च। (सहित मुख्यम्)। गोविन्दी, पृ ४५०
III. BORROWING OF IDEAS.

1: न तत्र के शिष्यि. न लहु.... कामरूपः गुरुभर: किन्तु मितास्थिरः।
   प्र० २६.

2: वर्तमाने क ने तारा.... रसायनः स्वातः।
   प्र० २०.

1: यत्र यत्तापुक्तः स्तित्तुः ता सा के शिष्यायः।
   ग्रंथोऽ०, पृ० २६१

2: तेन वर्तिवराजचारित्य चार्यमिश्रये।
   ...।
   ग्रंथोऽ०, पृ० २६७२
4: देवतानं द्रुपदश्चात्यस्मिन् श्रीमान्ध्रयश्चक्षुः कृतिरतिः न मर्यादा-श्रेयस्याम्।

5: जनानुभूत्येव गोपः स्वातः... जना-सिमकम्... तबिवरीत्यप्वापरितम्।

6: गोपुर्वम् च केशः कैचिद स्तोत्रभावम्। कैचिद भवत्वा-प्रिम् यथे प्रस्तुततमुखः।

7: महाभाष्यम्... यथा पुनराभिवर्तितः।

8: यह तत्काल्यकालयो सप्तमित्रवा प्रतिलिखितः।

9: मुनियमणि प्रति बृहद्मूलाः पायथुः प्रति-सतु-रक्षणः। प्रायः तत्तात्त्यवापि मय-ब्रजनं वर्णार्थः।

10: प्रेसापूर्वकाः प्रयत्नमरमः।

11: भ्रं मुनियमणिद्विधाविवधायनथसर्वन्यायाध्यायमेव वास्तवविधता विद्या हस्ताक्षराद्विशालादिकम्।

12: प्रायः मुनियमणि प्रक्ष्यः... जबीतुप्रयात्-समस्तत्व यथौत्सुक्ष्यवति तबिवरीत्याः।

13: प्रेयुषमणि।

14: बधु ज्ञानविकारः। अस्त्राश्मार्गः।
42: मुख्यश्रेणी पक्षपातियों स्तरा नेत्रो-पायेन विध पर्यन्त नवतीति निकाय
- पायेन परमेष्टरूपः प्रयासः।
पृ ५० ५०

43: मानुषधेन पक्षपातयोः प्रतिकथा-

44: प्रतिकथाभेन सबसचालितमत्या

45: गरोधश्रेणियाः प्रयाणलक्षणवाना-

46: वक्ष्य विलारः पारिकः।
पृ ६० ६०

47: यु कोः नियताराजः जय भेदः।
पृ ८१ ८१

48: केवल तु मुख्यः सम्भोक्तयज्ञवाच

49: यत: गुद्धलीन्तिज्ञातः सम्भवेऽ

50: तत्योऽ प्रक्ष्यसिद्धिभिः चतुः-

"Gomukhosästra", पृ ५० ५०
24: कामकाज के चरम के ... जूगर: प्रतिवर्तते।

21: नाम ... को देख का आनंद नहीं लेना चाहिए।

24: न नाम को देख का आनंद नहीं लेना चाहिए।

25: व्यापारिक नियमों का नियम है।

26: तथा हि कुमारियों द्वारा बाध्य नहीं किया गया।

27: क्रृष्ण संग में विवाद नहीं होता।
It is not always that the authors of the ND follow Abhinava. Sometimes the view of Abhinava is referred to as the view of some (Kedut), e.g., Abhinava holds that Praveshaka should not occur at the beginning of the first act\(^1\). The ND refers to this view as the view of some\(^2\). Another instance of the same type is:

The ND refers to the view of Abhinava about Dyuti, viz., Krodhadeh arthasya praptasya yati prasamanam sa dyutim (III, p. 58) has been referred to by the ND as the view of some. Cf. Apare tā krodhadeh praptasya śamanam dyutim āmananti - (ND, p. 108).

This detailed comparison will prove beyond any shadow of doubt that the authors of the ND have considerably drawn from Abhinava. It is rather strange that the authors of the ND should not acknowledge their debt. They do not refer to Abhinava at all. What is more extraordinary and astounding is the fact that our authors criticize Abhinava on a minor point on one occasion mentioning him by name. The occasion is the etymology of Natakā from the root Nat (to dance)\(^3\). The ND opines that it should be derived from 'Nat' and not 'Nat' as Abhinava does.

---

2. ND, p. 39.
The above criticism of the ND is not properly justified. Apart from the theoretical justification of the criticism it (which too lacks sound reasoning and propriety) lacks in the healthy spirit of sportsmanship in the sense that they refer to Abhinava only to criticize. We feel as if the authors of the ND have picked up this unique opportunity to find fault with this great writer whose learning, judgment, and erudition, are beyond question.

At the same time it is obvious that the authors of the ND have sufficient respect for Abhinava. Even when they want to criticize, the criticism is so mild. Look at the above criticism also which is put in a very mild tone.

We should also note a few points to the credit of the ND. Inspite of the fact that the authors of the ND have abundantly drawn upon the Abhi so much so that one may be led to look upon this work as an abridged edition of the Abhi, there is no blind imitation anywhere. The above-mentioned instance where the authors of the ND have criticized Abhinava shows their free thinking. Authors of the ND have often tried to simplify the Abhi. The Abhi is at times obscure and lacks perspicuity. The ND here substitutes simple words for

1. Vide - Ghatādīvad bhūvabhāvas ointyah - ND, p. 28.
the difficult ones. The ND adds some words to make the sense clearer where the Abhi. has been too brief. On certain occasions the ND expands the idea expressed so briefly or concisely by the Abhi. Where the Abhi. enters into scholastic and lengthy discussions the ND summarizes the passage and puts the gist in a simple language. At times what Abhinava means to say is put in a better polished language by the ND. For instance, the time duration suggested by each of the five Arthopaksepakas is very briefly but adequately and aptly stated by the ND refraining from the scholastic and lengthy discussions in which the Abhi. enters. At times the ND adds

1. Cf. Abhi.:- Yathā ratnāvalyām...amātyasya vīro, vatsaraṣajasya śrīngāraṇadbhutān tataḥ śrīngāra iti. (Vol. III, p. 24) has been better elucidated by the ND thus:-

Yathā ratnāvalyām...amātya-yaugandharāyanaśya prthvi-sāmrājyavijigisor virah; vatsa-rājasya vasantavibhēvah śrīngarāh, paurāpramodāvalokanād adbhubhā, tata udyanāgamanād arabhya punah śrīngarāh.... ND, p. 54.

Abhinava has not explained how Yaugandharāyana has vīra and Vatsarāja has Śrīṅgāra and Adbhuta.

a number of illustrations to make the point clearer, e.g., the discussion of the ND on the five Avasthas is much similar to that of the Abhi with the only difference that the ND abundantly supplies illustrations to elucidate each while Abhi does not.

The ND can be useful to us from another point of view also. Since the ND often follows the Abhi word for word the ND can help us in settling the text of the Abhinavabharatī at some places where it is corrupt. We know that the text of the Abhi is not so genuine and requires correction at places. The ND can help us here. The following instances will be enough to illustrate the point:

(i) The Abhi on Adhībala reads as follows -

"Parasparavacanaspravṛttayor yasyaivādhikāṃ..." etc.
(III, p. 51) Here the ND reads the same as
Parasparavānacanaspravṛttayor yasya..." etc. (p. 39).
Here the ND reads 'vānaca' instead of 'vacana' which appears to be a better and correct reading.

(ii) "Ankasaṃptāyām api vā avasthāyāṃ yadā bijasya samharaṇām bhavati tadāpyāṅkacchedah". Abhi. II, 416.
This is rightly emended by the ND as -
Asamāptāyām api avasthāyāṃ kāryavaśena yo vā cochedah, somākich - ND, p. 34.
(iii) "Vasantasena muddha muddha uktih" - Abhi. II, p. 433
is rightly corrected by the ND as -
"Madhava muddha candra muggata uktih - ND p. 118.

(iv) Similarly "yatha mayasironiksepe ramabhyudaye citram nepathyam, yathha vasvatthamnah (Venya) (Abhi. III, p. 164) may be rightly amended in the light of the
ND p. 158 as -
"Yatha mayasironiksepe ramabhyudaye citram nepathyam
yathha vasvatthamnah..." etc.

(v) The Abhi. defines Viskambhaka as "Visakambhayati
Upastambhayati Viskambhakah". The root here is
obviously 'skambh' with 'vi', which belongs to 1st, 5th, and 9th conjugation. It is not possible to
understand why Abhinava puts its causal form when that
sense is not needed. The ND therefore reads
"Visakambhayati vittam upastambhayati Viskambhakah."

(vi) "Durstarthagarbhatvad, ganda iva gandah". Abhi. II, p. 458
may easily be corrected in the light of the ND -
"Durstarthagarbhatvad dusta sonitagarbhaganda iva gandah" -
p. 138.

1. It may also be noted here that by using the adjective
"dusta - sonitagarbha" to 'ganda' the ND has nicely
clarified the analogy, so briefly stated by Abhinava.
(iii) THE NĀTYAÇARPAṆA AND THE DĀṢĀRUPAKA

It becomes highly interesting to study the mutual relation between the ND and the DR (along with 'Avaloka' of Dhanika) especially when we do not find the mention of the name of the DR or its author even once throughout the work. Nevertheless a deeper comparative study of the two texts makes it abundantly clear that the authors of the ND do have the DR in mind while writing the work. The DR by its brevity and by the compact, precise and systematic treatment of the subject had won such tremendous popularity, that no later writer on dramaturgy could afford to ignore it. Dhanājñāya had a place next only to Bharata. So it is not possible to imagine that the authors of the ND did not take note of this important treatise. On the contrary, it appears that the DR has remained continuously before the mental eye of our authors in the course of writing this work. In fact the authors of the ND have modelled their work on the DR (They chose to discuss mostly those topics which had been treated of by the DR).

At the outset the very form of the ND seems to have been modelled upon the DR. The DR is divided into four chapters called Prakāśa, the ND also is divided into four chapters called Vivekās. In both, Kārikās are composed in Anuṣṭubh

1. Vide Trans. of DR by Hall (Intro).
metre (in an aphoristic style). The Authors of the ND then add a lucid commentary to these Kārikās in order to elucidate what they had so briefly stated in Kārikās. Thus the form resembles the DR together with its commentary called Avaloka. Of course, the only difference here is that in the DR Kārikās and Vṛtti are by two different hands, while in the ND the authorship of both, the Kārika and the Vṛtti, is the same.

In the beginning, they offer salutation to the Jaina vāk having twelve forms. The idea might have been suggested by the salutation offered by the DR to Viṣṇu having ten forms or incarnations. This reference to ten incarnations of Viṣṇu made by the DR must have led the Jainas to think out another number which should be connected with their religion, and this number was twelve, the number of their principal Aṅga texts which constitute their Āgama (or canon).

While explaining the technical terms the DR often offers an etymological explanation thinking that knowledge of the root and its component parts would give a better idea of the meaning of the term. The ND too follows this method in many cases.

1. Cf. ND I, 1 and DR I, 2.
On a comparison of the two works it is evident that there is similarity between the two works which ranges from the verbal identity to the similarity of ideas, etc. The treatment of this comparative study, therefore, may be divided into the following headings:

(A) Similarity of treatment or order.
(B) Similarity of sentences.
(C) Similarity of phrases.
(D) Similarity of illustrations.
(E) Similarity of ideas.

(A) SIMILARITY OF TREATMENT.

Treatment is more or less similar. As has already been pointed out the form of the ND is clearly modelled on that of the DR. The first chapter (Viveka) of the ND very much resembles the first chapter of the DR both treating of similar topics such as the types of dramas, division of plot, Avasthā, Arthaprakārti, Samās, Samadhyaṅgas, Arthopakṣeṇapākas, Nātyoktis etc. The second chapter of the ND can be well compared with the third one of the DR, both treating of the types of dramas, their definitions, and the Viṭhyāṅgas. Of course, the treatment of Vṛttis which is found here in the
DR is given by the ND in the beginning of the next chapter. Moreover, the treatment of Nātaka and Aṅka found here in the DR is given by the ND in the previous chapter. The third chapter of the ND and the fourth of the DR mainly deal with Rasa and Bhāva. The ND includes two more topics Vṛtti and Abhinaya, the latter of which is untouched by the DR. The fourth chapter of the ND which is a miscellany has much in common with the second chapter of the DR, which treats of the types of characters, qualities of a hero, types of heroines, qualities of heroines, friends (or helpmates) of heroines, language or dialect to be spoken by different characters and modes of address. The ND treats of Nāndī and Dhruvā which are not dealt with by the DR.

This will make it clear that the ND has mostly chosen for discussion those topics which have been treated of by the DR (barring the three topics, viz., Nāndī, Dhruvā and Abhinaya).

The Karikās are brief and rather more lucid and simple.

These Karikās are accompanied by an explanation in the commentary (in the DR the task is accomplished by Dhanika) which also contains illustrations.
### (3) SIMILARITY OF SENTENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>नाटयवाचि</th>
<th>दशरथपक</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१. पराभुत्य रक्षालयाम् यमेन तद-पवारितम्।</td>
<td>१, ४२</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२. अंसायमित्रपापेक्ष विन्ध्याग्रुपस्यो जनम्।</td>
<td>१, २६</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३. किजस्वेनितरयोगे।</td>
<td>१, ४३</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४. क्ष्यन पूर्विनितां एव प्रविष्टेन सुमन्त-पापेक्ष शतान्नद्य-जनक-कथाये-जिथे अतिश्रेणु मुख्य पञ्च</td>
<td>४, ६२</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>५. क्षण्य वहार्जवर्णरूपः वाग्येः-चेतामश्च परिवर्तते नर्म।</td>
<td>४, ५०</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>६. उदयनवर्ते किंशिपर्याट प्रयोग:।</td>
<td>४, ५८</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (५) SIMILARITY OF PHRASES:

| धीरो रक्षालयाम् यमेन चामः विक्रयः। | १, ८ |
| २. महास्त्र सिरोपार्यो श्यामो सत्यी सम्म रिद्धः। | २, ८ |
| ३. दलुन: पूर्ण शुद्ध जाते ने निम्नय-सिरितः। | १, २६ |
| ४. अतिश्रेणिस्यायेःशृंगारसिय: श्वरचान। | १, ६२ |
| ५. क्षण्य वहार्जवर्णरूपः वाग्येः- | ४, ५० |
| ६. धीरो रक्षालयाम् यमेन चामः विक्रयः। | १, ८ |
| ४. महास्त्र सिरोपार्यो श्यामो सत्यी सम्म रिद्धः। | २, ८ |
| ३. दलुन: पूर्ण शुद्ध जाते ने निम्नय-सिरितः। | १, २६ |
| ५. क्षण्य वहार्जवर्णरूपः वाग्येः- | ४, ५० |
| ६. धीरो रक्षालयाम् यमेन चामः विक्रयः। | १, ८ |
(D) SIMILARITY OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

The illustrations cited to illustrate the following are common to the ND and the DR -

(i) Ankēśya
   ND p. 39   DR pp. 32-33.

(ii) Anṅkāvatāra.
    ND p. 40   DR p. 33.

(iii) Bīja
     ND p. 42   DR p. 5.

(iv) Prayatna
     ND pp. 50-51   DR pp. 5-6.

(v) Pratimukha
    ND p. 55   DR p. 11.

(vi) Upakāṣpa
     ND p. 60   DR p. 7.

(vii) Karana
     ND p. 63   DR p. 10.

(viii) Prāpāṇa or Prāpti.
(ix) Vidhāna
   ND p· 67 DR p· 9·

(x) Sāmpheta
   ND p· 93-94 DR p· 22·

(xi) Prarocana
   ND p· 102; DR pp· 25-26·

(xii) Sandhi
   ND p· 104 DR p· 27·

(xiii) Grathana
   ND p· 105 DR p· 28·

(xiv) Kṛti
   ND p· 107 DR p· 30·

(xv) Purvabhāva
   ND p· 112 DR p· 30·

(xvi) Kāvyasaṁhāra
   ND p· 113 DR p· 31·

(xvii) Vyāhāra
   ND p· 133-4 DR p· 69·

(xviii) Gāndha
   ND p· 138 DR p· 67·

(xix) Mrdava
   ND p· 149 DR p· 69·
These illustrations along with the illustrations quoted by the ND while mentioning the view of the DR number about fifty. This large number indicates to what extent the authors
of the ND have borrowed from the Daśarūpakāvaloka of Dhanika.

At times a particular illustration is given by the DR to illustrate one particular point while the same is quoted by the ND in an altogether different context to illustrate just some other point, e.g.,

(i) The RTN I, 23 etc. (ND, p. 45) is given by the ND as an illustration of the third type of Patakāsthānaka while the DR gives it as an illustration of Bindu (DR, p. 5).

(ii) The Vṛttī I, 26 which is quoted by the ND (p. 61) as an illustration of Parīnāyasa is given by the DR as an illustration of Samādhāna (DR p. 8).

(iii) The Vṛttī I, 24 which is quoted by the DR (p. 61) as an illustration of Udbheda is quoted by the ND as that of Samāhitī (ND, p. 62).

At times the DR gives a particular piece from a work to illustrate one point while the ND quotes just a different piece from the same work to illustrate the same, e.g.,

1. This should not lead us to think that the following instances show any inherent contradiction between the two. It is possible that one and the same verse can serve the purpose of both. It depends upon how one looks at it.
Marcia la illustrated by both the works from the RTN only but the quotations are different.¹

(ii) Quite similar is the case with Narmadyuti also².

(iii) The illustration of Sāmgraha of the ND and the DR although both from the RTN are different³.

(iv) The illustrations of Udāhṛti given by the ND and the DR although both from the RTN are different⁴.

(v) The illustration of Udvega given by the ND from the Ven†, is much similar to that of the DR from the same work but not the same⁵. Illustration from the RTN given by both also are slightly different⁶.

(E) SIMILARITY OF IDEAS

As regards the similarity of ideas there can be innumerable instances of this kind. The reason is that both the ND and the DR draw amply upon the NS of Bharata. Naturally therefore there will be a remarkable similarity between the two works so far as ideas are concerned.

1. ND, p. 74; DR, p. 13.
   But this is also quite possible as Narma and others can be used more than once in a play.
2. ND, pp. 75-76; DR, p. 13.
3. ND, p. 82; DR, p. 18.
4. ND, p. 85; DR, p. 17.
5. ND, p. 87; DR, p. 20.
6. ND, p. 87; DR, p. 20.
It is evident that the authors of the ND have not always accepted the DR. At times they do differ; but, whenever and wherever they differ they do mention the view of the DR under 'Kecit', 'Anye' or "Eke". If they find the DR's view incorrect or faulty they do not fail to criticize it offering their own arguments. Below are quoted some of the instances where the ND differs from the DR and criticizes it.

1. While discussing the hero of a Nataka, the ND refers to the view of those who propound that the hero of a Nataka should be of Dhīrodātta type only and remarks that they do not follow the tradition of the poets who have employed Dhīrālalita and other types of the hero in a Nataka. The view criticized clearly refers to the DR.

2. While discussing the hero of Prakarana the ND remarks-

"He who holds that the hero of a Prakarana should be of Dhīraśānta type thinking that a minister, a Brahmin and a merchant are of Dhīraśānta nature is violating the ancient tradition." The ND here quotes from the NS itself to the effect that an army-commander and a minister are of Dhīrodātta type.

1. ND, p. 29.
2. DR, III, 22.
3. ND, p. 117. Here the reference to the view in singular number is unusual and significant as it clearly refers to Dhanañjaya (Vide DR, III, 39-40).
4. NS (KM) XXIV, 4.
It is noteworthy here that in the points of difference, the ND generally refers to the old tradition which is highly honoured by our authors, even though they do not always follow it.

At good many a place the authors of the ND differ from the view of the DR. On such occasions they simply state the view of the DR under 'Kecit', 'Anye', 'Apare' without making any comments on such views. The following are the instances:

(i) Definition of Udbheda
   ND pp. 62-63, DR I 296.

(ii) Definition of Bhedana.
   ND p. 64-65, DR I 29a.

(iii) Definition of Varṇasamhāra.
   ND p. 73, DR I 35cd.

(iv) Definition of Marmadyuti.
   ND p. 76, DR I 33d pp. 13-14.

(v) Definition of Rūpa.
   ND p. 83, DR I 39a.

(vi) Non-recognition of Prārthanā as a Sandhyaṅga.
   ND p. 85.

(vii) Definition of Krama.
   ND p. 86, DR I 39c.

(viii) Non-acceptance of Chadana and mentioning Chalana instead.
   DR p. 95, DR I, 46d. (p. 24)
(ix) Definition of Dyuti.

ND p. 96. DR I 46b.

(x) Non-recognition of Kheda and Virodha and reading Vidrava and Vicalana instead.

ND p. 98. DR I, 45c, 46a.

(xi) Definition of Śakti.

ND p. 100. DR I 46a.

(xii) Definition of Vyavāśya.

ND p. 105. DR I 47a.

(xiii) Definition of Paribhāṣā.

ND p. 106. DR I 52a.

(xiv) Definition of Adhibala.

ND p. 137. DR III 18ab.

(xv) Definition of Prapañca.


(xvi) Definition of Vākkeli.

ND p. 146. DR III 17cd.

(xvii) Definition of Asatpralāpā.

ND p. 145. DR III 20ab.

(xviii) Definition of Nālika.

ND p. 146. DR III 19cd.

(xix) Definition of Avalagita.

ND p. 150. DR III 15ab.

(xx) Non-recognition of Śānta in drama.

ND p. 170. DR IV 35 and Avaloka on it.
(xxi) Considering the MRC as a mixed type of Prakāraṇa.

ND p. 119. DR p. 72.

The above list will show how the ND has not missed any opportunity to quote the view of the DR wherever the ND's explanation has differed from the DR. The ND has retained the same wording as found in the DR. The definitions are also followed by the same illustrations as are given by Dhanika in the Avaloka. It is only in the definition of Nālikā that strangely enough the ND has quoted an illustration different from the one in the DR.

When we compare these two works we naturally find that the ND carries away the palm of superiority especially for the following reasons:

(1) In the DR Dhananjaya has written the Kārikās only, while the authors of the ND have supplied us with a very clearly written and informative Vṛtti also.

(2) The DR is often too brief. This brevity has been achieved at times at the cost of clarity of expression. But for the invaluable commentary of Dhanika the DR would have been almost incomprehensible. Divested of Dhanika's commentary the DR would be looked upon rather as insignificant
treatise. Even the commentary of Dhanika is not of so much help. In spite of the commentary the text remains unintelligible at some places. At times obscure words or phrases are not elucidated. The commentator sometimes disposes of the topic with only one word 'Spastam'. Kārikās in the ND too are brief quite in keeping with the aphoristic style, but at the same time perfectly clear.

(3) At times the DR is obscure. The obscurity is due to clumsy expression, or construction or the use of a word in a peculiar sense different from its general sense. On the other hand, the ND has maintained commendable simplicity throughout the work.

(4) The DR usually mentions only one view—the view which Dhanañjaya holds. Very rarely the DR mentions or criticizes the views of others of its predecessors. The ND, on the other hand, mentions the views of the earlier writers and even comments upon them wherever the authors feel it necessary. Thus we are in a better and complete picture of the topic at hand.

(5) The ND supplies the reader with a number of illustrations. Where the DR is satisfied by giving only one illustration, the ND sometimes gives two and at times even three; for instance, in case of Narma, the ND gives as many as six illustrations while the DR gives only two. Similarly, four illustrations are
cited to explain Vajra. And we all know the importance of illustrations in clarifying the abstract ideas.

(6) Some of the minor topics concerning dramatics like Māndā, Dhruvaś, the names of the different characters find a treatment in the ND though not in the DR. The DR has totally left out Abhinaya which forms a very important element of Drama.

(7) In the ND the treatment of all the topics is highly systematic while at times the DR may be accused of unsystematic treatment, e.g., in the treatment of Arthapraṇātis the DR seems to be quite unsystematic. In the beginning the DR divides the plot into two-principal and subordinate, the latter is subdivided into Patakā and Prakari. Then the DR gives another division of plot into well-known, imaginary and mixed and defines each. Then it takes up Karya, for definition which is followed by the explanation of Bija and Bindu and finally enumerates the five Arthapraṇātis. The right procedure should have been to enumerate first and then to define each in order of enumeration.

This comparison will be sufficient to prove that the ND, from the point of view of treatment of the subject, lucidity of style, clarity of expression, etc., is highly superior to the DR1. The ND is exhaustive and informative even though it

1. This view has been supported also by M. Ghosh. Vide NS (Intro.) p. 69.
does not enter into unnecessary details that would confuse the
reader and abstains as far as possible from divisions and sub-
divisions which are often unnecessary and confusing.

It is likely that one of the purposes of the authors of
the ND in writing this work was to excel the DR which must
have won immense popularity in the days of Rāmacandra and
Gūnācandra. From the comparative study of both the works it
is evident that the authors have constantly kept the DR and
the Avaloka commentary by Dhanika before them not only because
it was an important work on dramaturgy but also, because they
aimed at surpassing it. The comparison undertaken above shows
that they have been fairly successful in their task.

(iv) THE NĀTYADARPANA AND THE KĀVYĀNUSĀSANA.

Our authors-Rāmacandra and Gūnācandra-are known to be
the pupils of Hemacandra, the author of the KS. That they show
their regard towards their preceptor will be clear from
what follows.

In the concluding verses of the work the authors of the
ND express their feeling of reverence. Here they speak of
their great "Guru" as an authority on different sciences.

1. Sabda-pramāṇa-sāhitya- chandolakṣmavidhāyināṁ;
śrīhemacandrāpādānāṁ prasādāya nama namaḥ. ND, p. 215.
In fact they are proud that they are the pupils of such a great Guru. Rāmacandra refers to himself as the pupil of Hemacandra-cārya in several of his plays.

Moreover the ND has once quoted an aphorism from Hemacandra's grammar while explaining the grammatical formation of the word 'Vācika'.

Following Hemacandra, our authors pay homage to the Jainī vāk in the introductory verse of benediction. We also find the ND echoing the KS when the former names the chapters as Vivekas after the KS.

The authors of the ND do not seem to have much depended upon the KS so far as the treatment of dramas is concerned as Hemacandra has very briefly treated of that topic and there too he has almost literally borrowed from the earlier authorities viz., Bharata and Abhinava. In the following instances we find some similarity of ideas between the ND and the KS; still however it is not possible to state categorically that the ND has borrowed them from the KS only as the KS itself has borrowed from the earlier sources.

2. Jyostnaditvād ani - Hajma, o 6,4, 117, ND, p. 188.
नादयवर्धि

1: तथापि रामकथारतित्वम् न रावणव-पिति...। पृ ५४
2: थमस्व च मोचबे तुतुत्तय मोचे पि अराम्यरेश हि। पृ ५५
3: अथ खिन्नकारप्रतिलकर्ता...समु-जितेष्यति किवाद्यू नमकार-श्लोऽने परारुपः। पृ ५६
4: स्थायिग्यो रसः। पृ ५६
5: परस्परार्जोकुङ्जमनकोज्यायिदने विवेचयो कुन्यकः। पृ ५७
6: स्विधाकाभे पुराणां। यथा तेषी लखारे...तुयोति नेपुमुस-मकारोपयकारिः पुरुषते समरसरमने ब्रजगरवर्खिनी। पृ ५८
7: स्विधाकाभे जिविन्ने यथा बीरपारते राजविविवायोयो विभुद्वे बीरसे। पृ ५९
8: अग्रने...रसाय निवङ्गस्थानस्तत्तिष्ठ अनुसङ्ख्याः सर्वेऽण रसों सत्य सुभाषणे। यथा रात्रिकां चतुर्यो ब्राह्मणमननात सागराकामयमृतितिः। पृ ६०

काम्यनुशासन

1: रामदिवदुर विनितित्वम् न रावणाधि-बिजय्यपविहत्वी। पृ ५८
2: क्रयाघनुषो गानमणि पारम्येष लिः पेषस-पुरो जनावात। पृ ६२
3: शितसमयपरित् नवार्थ शान्तारः समुचिते-म्वदेवताँ पुवितते। पृ ६३
4: साच परस्परावर्जोकुङ्जमनकाध्यात्ममेव। पृ ६४
5: अस्स दुयोधिनाय...तथागृहतामभुमुसम्भावीर-क्षणकतिरिः समरसरमने पुरुषोते। पृ ६८
6: अस्स दुयोधिनाय...विभुद्वे बीरसे। पृ ६९
7: अस्स दुयोधिनाय...विभुद्वे बीरसे। पृ ७०
नाद्यवधि

कृपया नुस्खा

पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः.
पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः.
पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः
पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः.

पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः
पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः
पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः
पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः

पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः
पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः
पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः
पुनः नन्नएकस्वरूपः कुमारसम्बन्धः रतिः
The definitions of Sattaka and Gosthi that we find in the ND and the KS are identical. The definitions of Hallisaka and Srīgadita also are similar in both. But these definitions are borrowed by the ND from the SP of Bhoja (and not from the KS).

Some illustrations are found to be common between the ND & the KS.

(i) Illustration of Śṛngāra

(ii) Illustration of Śṛngāra
ND p. 164  KS p. 113.

(iii) Illustration of Doses

(iv) Dantakṣatāṇi karajais ca etc.

(v) Kalpto hastāvalagnah...etc.
ND p. 172-3; KS p. 164.

There is one verse quoted from the Venī by both but in altogether different contexts. The KS (p. 116) quotes it to illustrate Raūdra Rasa while the ND quotes it as an illustration of a Sandhyānga called Parinyāsa.

1. The ND criticises this example having quoted it.
At another place also the KS (p. 123) quotes a verse (Kvākāryam 'sas'ālakṣmaṇo etc) to illustrate the mixture of Vyabhicāri bhāvas. The ND quotes it to illustrate the case of contradictory Rasas.

At one place the KS (p. 167) has quoted only a quarter of the verse 'Ayan 'sā rasanotkarse... etc. While the ND (p. 172) gives it in full.

The authors of the ND have not blindly imitated the KS. At many places they have tried to improve upon the KS. The benedictory verse of the ND though praising the Jainī vāk appears more artistic and meaningful than that of the KS.

The ND accepts the number of Rūpakas as twelve in accordance with the KS; but it does not accept Saṭṭaka as the twelfth. The ND substitutes it by Prakāraṇīka (probably because Saṭṭaka was purely a prakrit play). Here the authors of the ND seem to be improving upon their teacher's view which reveals their free thinking.

The ND like the KS, does not divide the dramatic literature into Rūpaka and Uparūpaka. But while the KS divides the drama into Pāthyā and Geya and calls the Uparūpaka as Geya

1. The reasons for substituting prakāraṇīka in the place of Saṭṭaka are already discussed earlier in chapter III of the Thesis.
Rūpaka, the ND divides the drama into Pradhānarasa Rūpaka and Apradhānarasa Rūpaka.

The most important deviation of the ND from the KS is found in the ND's peculiar theory of the dual nature of Rasas. Hemacandra has followed the Abhi. and the KP in his discussion of Rasa. But Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra have boldly discarded the view of their preceptor and the great authorities like Bhārata and others.

Moreover the ND admits of Rasas like Laulya, Sneha etc. over and above the principal nine even though the KS refuses to accept them as independent Rasas and includes them under nine. The ND refers to this view of the KS under "Kecit".

Similarly we come across a few instances where the ND goes to the extent of criticizing the KS under the "Kecit". It is true that all the three of the below mentioned views originally belong to the KP and that they are borrowed by Hemacandra from the same and so the criticism that follows is equally applicable to both, the KP and the KS, more

2. Ete nava eva .. rasāḥ. Tena .. sneho rasāḥ ity asat... etc.
   KS p. 106.
3. Sambhāvantypareṇa .. kecid esām pūrvesvantarbhāvam ahuh.. ND, p. 163.
rightly to the KP\(^1\). Still however it cannot be gainsaid that the authors of the ND disagree with the views of their preceptor even though their criticism may directly be aimed at others.

Following the KP, the KS, has given the description of Hayagrīva\(^2\) in Hayagrīvavadha as the illustration of a Rasadosa, viz., over-elaboration of a subordinate object\(^3\).

The ND boldly points out that this is not the above-said fault. It is the fault of the story or plot, there being less description of the hero of the plot.

The ND mentions and criticizes the view of some who hold that Vyabhicārina, Sthāyins and Rasas should (always be suggested and) never be expressed. This view is found in the KS where it considers the above matter as a Rasadosa although

1. The tone here is slightly aggressive. Had the criticism been directed against their preceptor only the tone should have been very mild as is seen when the ND criticizes Bharata or Abhinava (Vide ND, pp. 28, 153). So the real victim appears to be Māmaṭa who is also criticized for considering Nirveda as Sthāyī of Sānta.


3. It should be noted here that this illustration and the views that follow are borrowed by the KS from the KP.

4. Rasasthāyīvyabhicāriṇīṁ svasabdēna vādātvāṁ doṣāḥ.

KS, p. 159.
It is stated that at times Vyabhicārikathana may not be a Dosa. But the ND holds that this is quite wrong. On the contrary, the actual mention of Vyabhicārin and others may go to develop the particular Vibhāva or situation.

The ND refers to another view, viz., mentioning of Vibhāvas or Anubhāvas which are common to two sentiments with the result that the particular Vibhāva is not clearly understandable. The ND gives the illustration where a similar situation arises. This view together with the illustration is found as the first among eight Rasadoṣas mentioned by the KS. The ND states that this is no Rasadoṣa at all. It is simply Vākyadoṣa-fault of expression-as it lacks perpicuity and causes doubt regarding the Bhāva or the sentiment which is to be conveyed.

The above instances render it absolutely clear that the authors of the ND are men of independent thinking and hold views different from those of their teacher. They have courage.

1. Kecit tu vyabhicāri rasasthāyināṁ svāśabdena vācyatvam rasaḍoṣam āhus tad ayuktad, vyabhicāryādīnāṁ svāśacakapada-prayoge'pi vibhāvapuṣṭau. ND, p. 175.

2. Tatra vibhāvānubhāvayoh klesavyaktir yathā - Pariharati ratim matim lunīte skhalatitarām ... etc. KS, p. 169.

enough to state them boldly and criticize the views which are contrary to their own, even if they be the views of the reputed authority like Abhinava or the most revered person their own teacher.

A question may also arise in the mind of a reader as to why did Ramaendra and Gunacandra undertake to write on dramaturgy when their preceptor had already treated of the subject in his KS. The pupils were most probably not impelled by a desire to surpass their preceptor. It is reasonable to believe that in view of the brief treatment of dramaturgy in the KS, they undertook composing the ND. If we have a look at the nature and scope of the KS we find that the work has a very wide field to cover. It deals with Kāvya i.e. literature in all its forms and aspects. The field of poetics is too vast to allow an exhaustive treatment of dramaturgy in one and the same work. That is exactly why most of the Sanskrit poets like Bhāma, Dandin; Mammaṭa and others have not touched the subject of dramaturgy in their work on poetics and we find separate works such as the NS, the DR, the NIR, the ND and others on the subject of dramaturgy alone. The KS does treat of dramaturgy but its treatment is too brief and unsatisfactory. The subject is dealt with in the last chapter and is disposed off in a few pages. Most of the
Rūpakas are disposed off in three to four verses. Even Nāṭaka is not devoted more verses than two. Here too the KS has simply copied out verbatim from the NS of Bharata and the Abhi. Thus the treatment does not betray any originality and hardly deserves much credit. The pupils (Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra) must have thought therefore of giving a fuller, detailed and systematic treatment to this very important and well developed form of Sanskrit literature. The authors of the ND even though they must have been influenced by the KS have treated the subject in an independent manner and have fully succeeded in giving a clear and lucid exposition to this very important aspect of literary criticism.

One point needs to be stressed here again. The above comparison of the two works where we have been able to perceive considerable similarity and sometimes verbal identity need not lead us to conclude that the ND has extensively borrowed from the KS. The fact is that even though the KS and the ND are similar at places, the views that the KS has expressed are also to be found in earlier works like the Abhi, the Dhv., the KP, etc. from whom the KS has amply borrowed. So the ND might have borrowed directly from the KS or from the earlier original sources from which the KS has borrowed, e.g., some of the views (of the KS) which are criticized by the ND are originally the views of Mammata.
Still it is quite natural to presume that Hemacandra being
the preceptor of our authors, they must have well studied his
KS and other works. They actually quote from Hemacandra's
Sabdānuśasana. The KS, therefore, must have some influence
at least on their writing, which is clearly seen in their
beneficary verse and other places which we have already
discussed, despite the fact that our authors accept only
those of Hemacandra's views which could satisfy their own
reason.

(V) THE NATYADARPANA AND THE ŚRĪGĀRAPRAKĀŚA

The SP of Bhoja is a voluminous work dealing with poetics
including dramaturgy. A comparative study of the two works,
viz., the SP and the ND indicates that the ND has considerably
drawn upon the SP.

Firstly, the authors of the ND have accepted the same
types of Uparūpakas as have been mentioned by the SP having
added Sattaka to the list of the SP. The ND verbally borrows
the definition of Sattaka and the other Uparūpakas from the SP.
Even the same order is also resorted to with very minor changes.

The Durmallikā of the SP is called the Durmilitā by
the ND.

The ND has at times referred to the view of Bhoja under
the usual "Kecit" or "Anye". The following may be quoted as
the instances:

In most of the above instances the illustrations quoted by both are the same. In the following cases also the same illustrations are found in the ND and the SP as well, e.g.,
(I) The illustration of Patakaśthānaka from the Rāmābhīṣyadaya
(Act III-SP, Act II-ND) where Sugrīva sends a message to Sītā—'Why to talk more? 0 respectable one! Rāma will bring you back in no time even if you be on the other side of the ocean'.

ND, p. 45; SB, p. 201.

(II) The illustration of Patakaśthānaka from the MDR where Gāṇakya speaks to himself "0, if that wretched Rāksasa were caught", and immediately Siddharthaka enters with the words, "Sir,......has been caught." ND, p. 46; SP, pp. 201-2.

(iii) The illustration of Upākṣepa from the RTN, viz.,
"Propitious fate brings at once the desired object, even from a different isle......" etc..(I,6). ND, p. 60; SP, p. 204.

(iv) The illustration of Nārma from the RTN, consisting of a humorous dialogue between the king and the Vidūṣaṇa.

ND, p. 74; SP, p. 211-12.

(v) The illustration of Parīnyāsa from the Vṛṣṇi-I, 21 where Bhīma takes an oath to braid Draupadī's hair having killed Duryodhana. ND, p. 61; SP, p. 204.

(vi) The illustration of Ārmanda from the RTN, viz., King—Who would not honour the favour by the queen?

ND, p. 109; SP, p. 230.
(vii) The illustration of Vākkelī. The witty dialogue between Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa where Rādhā asks who it was at the door. Kṛṣṇa replies that it was Hari ((i) Kṛṣṇa (ii) Monkey) whereupon Rādhā wittily inquires what business the monkey had there, etc.

ND, p. 145; SP, p. 189.

(viii) The illustration of Trigata from the Indulekha Vithī.

"Is it the cooing of the royal swans? or is it the humming of the bees?...etc.

ND, p. 145; SP, p. 188.

Thus it is very clear that the authors of the ND are considerably indebted to Bhoja and that they have often mentioned his views under 'Anyē', 'Kecit', 'Yadāhuh', etc.
The SP is mainly a work on poetics; still however the subject of dramaturgy does find a place in it and our authors have made considerable use of it.

The ND can be very useful in another way. The text of the SP as found in the manuscript is highly corrupt and incomplete as it drops many lines or words in between. The ND, because it draws upon the work (SP), can help in settling the text, e.g., the text regarding the definition of Prāpanca (SP p.191) is highly corrupt. But the illustration quoted by the ND from

1. This point has been discussed in the comparative study between the ND and the Abh.
the Prayogabhuyûdasya to illustrate the view of 'some' is identical with that given by the SP. Hence it is not unreasonable to suppose that the view of some here refers to the view of Bhoja especially when we have seen that his view is so often referred to and his definitions verbally cited by the ND. Thus in the light of the ND we can supply some of the missing portion of the text.

(VI) THE NĀTYADARPANA AND THE NĀTAKALAKSAMARATNAKOSA.

The NLR of Sāgaranandin is a work treating of dramaturgy. As the work is believed to have preceded the ND and as the authors of the ND claim to have studied the previous works on the subject it is quite natural that they should have consulted Sāgaranandin also on certain occasions.

The following are the instances where the view of the NLR is mentioned by the authors of the ND -

1. This comparative study has been undertaken on a consideration that the NLR precedes the ND on the basis of the dates given by Prof. Gode and M.R. Kavi who have been followed by P.V. Kane and M. Ghosh respectively. Dr. V. Raghavan puts the work after Bhoja and Abhinava and before Saradātarmya and in no case later than the thirteenth century. He, however, does not specify whether it preceded the ND or not.
8. Definition of Kṛti.

The ND refers to a view of some who do not recognize Kṛti and accept Dyuti instead which is defined as 'pacification of unfavourable things' (p. 167). The NIR too mentions Dyuti instead of Kṛti, which it defines as 'pacification of jealousy and misery' (p. 37).
9. While discussing Purvabhāva, a limb of Nirvāhāna Samidhi, the ND points to a view of some who accept Purvavākya instead and define it as a sentence similar to that in Mūkha sandhi. The NLR reads Purvavākya instead of Purvabhāva and defines it as "exposition of the seed" (which is sown in Mūkha Samidhi) which agrees in sense with the definition given above by the ND (ND, p. 111).

By an examination of the above cases we can infer that even though the NLR did not have any notable influence on the writers of the ND, the latter did consult the work occasionally. Usually the authors of the ND, when they refer to the views of others, state them keeping the same wording as is evident from the numerous quotations which the ND has cited from the DR. The difference in wording here may be explained in three ways:—

1. The readings of the text often differ in different manuscripts so the text of the NLR which was before the ND might have slightly different readings.

2. The authors of the ND might not have the actual text of the NLR by their side when they wrote the work (as they had the Abhi; the DR and the NS with them) but they must have studied or gone through the text of the NLR before hand and they are quoting from memory.

1. NLR, p. 38.
3. The citations originally refer to some other work on dramaturgy which was fairly utilized by the NIR. This alternative explanation gets corroborated by the fact that the illustrations which are quoted by the ND to illustrate the views do not tally with those in the NIR (so far as the above-mentioned instances are concerned).

Dr. V. Raghavan rightly opines that the NIR has mainly drawn upon Bhoja and Abhinavagupta. A comparative study of the ND and the SP suggests that most of the above-mentioned views which are referred to by the ND are also traceable to the SP of Bhoja. So it is quite likely and more probable that the ND is referring to Bhoja, the original authority, upon whom both draw.

So far as illustrations from the dramatic works are concerned the ND and the NIR have about a dozen of illustrations common to both. But here too, excepting two or three illustrations quoted by the ND are in a context quite different from the NIR, e.g.,

(a) "Ātāmratām apanayāmi..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 89) to illustrate Adhibala while by the NIR (p. 68) to illustrate a Laksana called Aminaya.

(b) "Añonyāśphālabhinna..." etc. is given as an illustration of Bhūdana by the ND (p. 64) while the NIR quotes it to illustrate Samādhaṇa (p. 26).
(c) The ND (p. 102) quotes, "Pūryantāṁ..." etc. to illustrate Prarocana while the NLR (p. 4) to illustrate Avamārṣa.

(d) "Bhartā tavāhām..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 102) to illustrate Yukti while by the NLR (p. 127) to illustrate Tarka.

(e) "Bhūyaḥ paribhavaksānti..." etc. is cited by the ND (p. 62) to illustrate Udbheda, by the NLR (p. 26) to illustrate Vidhāna.

(f) "Manah prakṛtyaiva cālam..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 85) to illustrate Udārṇī, by the NLR (p. 31) to illustrate Rūpa.

(g) "Satpāksā madhuragirah..." etc. quoted by the ND (p. 150) to illustrate Avaspandita, by the NLR (p. 7) to illustrate Biṣa (Śleṣa variety).

(h) "Svargastri yadi..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 68) to illustrate Paribhāvanā while the NLR (p. 64) takes it as an illustration of Sāṃśaya.

(i) "Tavāsmai gītarāgena..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 154) to illustrate one of the modes of the entry of a character by Āhvaṇa (i.e. calling), the NLR (p. 51) cites it as an instance of Avalagita type of Prastāvāna.

(j) "Tīrṇe bhīṣamamahodadhau..." etc. is cited by the ND (p. 58) to illustrate a variety of Avamārṣa in which impediment is based on fury. The NLR (p. 34) illustrates by the same
verse another variety of Avamara where the obstruction is of the nature of a calamity (Vyasana).

The instances given above clearly go to suggest that the commonness of the verses which is found in the two works is simply accidental and does not show the influence of one over the other.

The illustrations which find a place in both the ND and the NLR - in the same context are as under:

1. "Cancadbhubhramita..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p.61) and NLR (p. 25) both as an illustration of Parinyasa but this need not lead us to suppose that the ND has borrowed from the NLR since the Abhi.(III, p.38) also quotes the above verse to illustrate Parinyasa.

2. "Mathnami kauravasatam..." etc. is quoted by the ND and NLR (p. 66) and the NLR (p. 26) as illustration of Prapti or Prapane. This verse is cited also by the DR to illustrate Prapti (and does not show the influence of the NLR).

3. The ND (p. 86) gives a view of "Some" who define Krama as "the understanding of the future event", and illustrates from the Veni.

Kṛpa - "O king Duryodhana! The son of Drona has decided to bear the heavy burden of war... etc.

The same illustration along with the view is found in the NLR (p. 32).
The instances given above go to suggest that the authors of the ND do not seem to have reckoned the NIR as an authority. Some of the illustrations of the ND which show similarly with those of the NIR (and whose number is far less than the number of those which are dissimilar) seems to be accidental rather than intentional. Nevertheless it is quite probable that on certain occasions the authors of the ND did refer to the view of the NIR.

(B) TRACES OF THE INFLUENCE OF OTHER WORKS.

The ND reveals slight traces of influence of a few works on poetics, viz., the Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana, the Kāvyaprakāśa of Māmata, the Kāvyālāṅkāra of Bhāmaha and the Kāvyādāra of Dandin.

In fact the writers on poetics, with only a few exceptions, have usually ignored the subject of dramaturgy for the fear of their work being lengthy. Still however it is possible to find some similarity between the ND and the above-mentioned works, especially the Dhv. and the KP on matters concerning both the poetics as well as the dramaturgy such as sentiment (Rasa) flaws of sentiments contradictory sentiments, states (Bhāva) etc.

(a) **THE NĀTYADĀRPAṆA AND THE DHVANYĀLOKA**

In the history of Sanskrit poetics the Dhv. is considered to be an epoch-making work. Rāmacandra and Gūmacandra seem to have been indebted to Ānandavardhana in giving an exposition of Rasadosas which a poet as well as a dramatist should scrupulously avoid. Ānandavardhana gives such a very lucid and critical exposition of this topic that the later writers like Māmata and Hemacandra have amply drawn on the Dhv. Thus there is a similarity of treatment among all these three works so far as this topic is concerned and so it is difficult to say which of the works the ND has actually drawn upon.

The types of Dosas discussed by the ND are in keeping with the Dhv. The following parallelism is clearly perceptible. The following Dosas should be avoided.

1. **Introduction of unfavourable Vībhāvas**
   

2. **A sudden statement not relevant to the subject in hand.**
   
   ND, p. 174 Dhv, p. 289.

3. **Depiction of Characters in a contrary way (not in keeping with their nature).**
   
   ND, p. 174 Dhv, p. 293.

4. **Over-elaboration of a subordinate element.**
   
   ND, p. 174 Dhv, p. 291.
(5) Unnecessary Elaboration of a sentiment that is fully developed (e.g. the sentiment of pathos in the lamentations of Ratí in the Kūmrārasambhava).


The influence of the Dhv. is also seen in the ND’s views on Aucitya. In the history of Aucitya Āṇandavardhana has a very important place. He reckons Aucitya as the very secret of Rasa. The greatest flaw in Rasa is lack of propriety. The ND too, following the Dhv., recognizes Aucitya as the first and the foremost among the flaws of Rasa and all the rest as included in it. The ND like Āṇandavardhana takes the idea of Aucitya as pervading the entire field of literature. The ND has also quoted a verse from the Dhv. to the effect that Sandhis and Sandyāṅgas are to be employed with a view to developing Rasa and not merely to fulfill the conditions of Śāstra.

The problem of contradictory Rasas discussed by the ND also seems to be based on the Dhv.

1. Ānaucityād pte rānyad rasabhāṅgasya kāraṇāḥ; Prasiddaucityabandhastu rasasyopaniṣat para Dhv. p. 259.
2. Āṅgaugṛyādaṁ ca doṣā paramārthato 'naucityāntah- pātināḥ = ND, p. 175.
3. For details vide appendix D.
4. ND, p. 70; Dhv. III, 12.
नारद्यद्विः

11: क्षणमनाथ्यो चर्याविविषयाय रसयोविविषयात् न तु मिलेन।

पुरो १०२

21: तथा स्त्रीविद्या वसन्तु: रसयो-विविषयात् न तु... मुल्यविविषयात्।

. . . . . मुल्यविविषयात् यथा - कितवो हस्तावल्लः... (वस्त्राविद्)।

पुरो १०३

31: तत्ष्वकार्यार्थस्य तु रसयोविविषयार्थस्य न तु शीर्षाकार्यः।

यथा युद्धवा:

प्रः -

स्वाकार्यः शाल्मलः... (वस्त्राविद्)।

पुरो १०४

41: तत्ष्वकार्यार्थस्य स्त्रीविद्याःकृतिः - रसयोविविषयार्थस्य न स्वाकार्यः

रसायनेन रसायनेन रसायनेन।

यथा नागान्द्रे...।

पुरो १०५

51: अर्थं स रश्नोर्तकः...। अर्थं

पुरांनुसा: समस्ययान्यतितायतां -

वचनं तत्त्ववाच्यं गुरुः: समस्यः

करः -प्रश्नयति।

पुरो १०६
Thus in spite of the apparently different natures of the two works, the authors of the ND seem to have well studied this masterly composition of Anandavardhana and depended upon him so far as the treatment of the above aspects of Rasa is concerned.

(b) \textit{THE NATYADARPANA AND THE KAVYAPRAK\'A\'S}

Mammat\'a is one of the most popular Sanskrit rhetoricians. His KP is reckoned to be one of the most authentic works on Sanskrit poetics and has won very wide popularity. The authors of the ND too seem to have well studied his work as an acquaintance with it is casually noticeable in their own work\(^1\).

There is a remarkable similarity between the KP and the ND in the treatment of flaws of Rasa and how to reconcile the use of contradictory Rasas simultaneously\(^2\). The original source for both the works is evidently the Dhvany\'aloka.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Natyadarpana} & \textit{Kavyaparak\'a}\'s. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Natyadarpana}, pp. 103-160.
\item \textit{Kavyaparak\'a\'s}, pp. 171-176.
\end{enumerate}
Still however it is clear that the NH has fully consulted the
KP on the subject as can very well be inferred from the
criticism of the views of the KP wherever our authors have
differed as well as the specific reference to Mañmatā by
name while discussing the topics mentioned above (concerning
Rasa).

Some illustrations too appear to be common to both:

1. Anyatra vratatīti.....etc.
   NH p. 165. KP p. 103.

2. Ekasmin sayāne ........etc.
   NH p. 164. KP p. 125.

3. Dantaksatāni .........etc.
   NH p. 172. KP p. 1453.

4. Ayam sa rāsanotkarāī.....etc.
   NH p. 172. KP p. 1453.

5. Kṛṣipto hastāvalagnah.....etc.
   NH p. 172. KP p. 1457.

6. Kvaṅkāryām .............etc.
   NH p. 173. KP p. 1457.

At one place our authors plainly and specifically

1. Even Hemacandra, the learned preceptor of our authors,
   has profusely drawn upon the KP.
criticize Māṃmatha for calling Nirvēda as the Sthāyī of Santa. Rāmacandra and Gunacandra point out that Māṃmatha has committed a fault of self-contradiction when he considers Nirvēda at one place as Sthāyī while at another as a Vyabhicārī.

The ND often disagrees with the views of the KP and criticizes them, e.g.,

(1) The ND does not consider the description of Hayagrīva which Māṃmatha takes as a Rasadosa, viz., over-elaboration of a minor thing, as a fault of Rasa but a fault of story.

(2) The ND does not agree with Māṃmatha when he says that Vyabhicārīs etc. should not be mentioned by name.

(3) The KP refers to a Rasadosa where Vibhāvas and Ambhāvas common to two sentiments are referred. The ND opines that it is a Vākyadosa and not a Rasadosa. The ND quotes the same verse viz., 'Pariharati ratim, matim lunite' etc. (which Māṃmatha quotes as a Rasadosa where the Vibhāva)

---

1. This view has been discussed in Ch. V of the present Thesis (Pp. 385-385).
is not clearly grasped on account of the ambiguity of the Anubhāvas)\(^1\) and remarks that it is a Vākyadosa\(^2\).

It can be very conveniently inferred from the above data that Rāmacandra and Gunaṇacandra were fully conversant with the KP of Mammata and occasionally consulted it especially with regard to certain problems connected with Rasa.

\[\text{(C)}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nāḍyārāṇī</th>
<th>Kāmśālākār</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1: प्रशः कष्टव विघनानां सावभिम्भो पोषिताम।
| स्थवर्ये वातस्यायो शतयम। |

| ततो निर्युक्ततदुःखः || पृ 21 |

2: नासिकान्ते न्याय शीर्षः इवयोौक्त्र रक्षायोः।
| कुच्चवास: कुरंगाहस: काम्याभागीं स्वप्रस्करित: || पृ 24 |

| 2: रक्षिता सन्निधिवेन क्रोधौ यथविवस्तवता। |

| पृ 2 |

1: कविकर्म परस्परावर्
| कशूक: राजशालिनाम। |

| कथ्यायेः कन्तव तु कलकस्यादि शृङ्खलाः। || पृ 24 |

| 1: (न)कविकर्मपराय
| भयाये लक्षण्य च। |

| कुर्क्षितः पुन: सावभु मुष्टिगहुमर्मिज्जच। || पृ 2 |

---

1. KP, p. 438.
2. ND, p. 176.
(d) THE INFLUENCE OF THE ND ON LATER WORKS

In spite of the obvious merits of the ND as an independent work on dramaturgy it appears that the ND could not exercise any notable influence on the later writers on dramaturgy. In fact, the work was totally neglected by the later theorists. We do not come across the name of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra or any mention of their work in the later works on dramaturgy. Their peculiar views on certain topics such as Rasa, Pūrvaranga, etc. do not seem to have been taken note of by the later Brahmanical critics like
Visvanātha, Jagannātha and others. This is probably due to
the fact that the authors were Jainas. The history of ancient
India shows that the Jainas and the Bāuddhas were, as a rule,
looked upon as hostiles by the Brāhmaṇas. Their religion was
known as heterodox religion. There was a natural antipathy
against this non-vedic religion in the hearts of Brāhmaṇas
and we find that they were ridiculed in the ancient works on
Hindu religion and philosophy; of course, the Jainas also in
their turn did not leave any opportunity to condemn the
Brāhmaṇas and their rituals. This antagonistic attitude of
one towards the other resulted in the fact that even in the
literary field the Jaina writers were mostly neglected and
disregarded by the Brāhmaṇa pandits.

In the definitions of the Uparūpakas we find a number
of verses in the ND to be common with those of the BP. But
here both seem to have drawn from a common source which is
most probably the SP of Bhoja.

1. In their Nātyadarpana even Rāmacandra and Gunacandra
condemn the lengthy ceremony of the Purvarṣaṅga as futile
and meant to deceive the innocent votaries (ND, p. 155).
2. It has been already pointed out that the ND has literally
borrowed the definitions of all the Uparūpakas from Bhoja
and the BP also must have done the same so far as some
of the definitions are concerned.
The only later work in which we may find some traces of the influence of the ND is the Kāvyaprakāśakhandana of Siddhicandragani. The KPK refers to some views which are ascribed to moderns and which, though not identical with those of the ND are very similar to them, e.g., the moderners partly agree with the ND's view of the dual nature of Rasa in so far as they also believe that Karuna and others do not produce joy. They, on the other hand, are not prepared to reckon them as Rasas at all.

The moderners also agree with the ND in differing from Mammata on the point that the verbal mentioning of the Vyabhicāribhāvas etc., is a fault. They, on the other hand, believe that the verbal mentioning is a positive merit and not a demerit.

1. KPK p. 59.