

लोकप्रियसाहित्यग्रन्थमाला-47

आचार्य रामचन्द्र द्विवेदी की रचनाएँ

सम्पादक

प्रो. सूर्यप्रकाश व्यास



राष्ट्रीयसंस्कृतसंस्थानम्

मानितविश्वविद्यालयः

नवदेहली

प्रकाशकः
कुलसचिवः
राष्ट्रीयसंस्कृतसंस्थानम्
(मानितविश्वविद्यालयः)
५६-५७, इन्स्टीट्यूशनल एरिया
जनकपुरी, नवदेहली-११००५८

e-mail : rsk@nda.vsnl.net.in
website : www.sanskrit.nic.in

© राष्ट्रियसंस्कृतसंस्थानम्

ISBN : 978-93-82091-06-6

संस्करणम् २०१२ ई०

मूल्यम् 250/- ₹

मुद्रक
अमर प्रिंटिंग प्रेस, दिल्ली-९
e-mail :- amarprintingpress@gmail.com

पुरोवाक्

प्रो. रामचन्द्र द्विवेदी पारम्परिक भारतीय प्रज्ञा तथा संस्कृतपाण्डित्य के एक अप्रतिम शलाकापुरुष हैं। अधीति, बोध, आचरण व प्रचारण की चतुर्विध प्रवृत्ति से वे अपनी सारस्वतसाधना को निरन्तर गतिमयी व स्फूर्त बनाये रहे। वेद, शैवदर्शन, न्याय, अलंकारशास्त्र व संस्कृत-काव्य इन सभी विषयों पर उनका मौलिक चिन्तन व लेखन हमारी धरोहर है। प्रसन्नता का विषय है कि आचार्य द्विवेदी के सुयोग्य शिष्य प्रो. सूर्यप्रकाश व्यास ने उनके अनेक अनुपलब्ध लेखों को परिश्रम से संकलित व सम्पादित कर के यह रचनावली तैयार की है। प्रो. व्यास का यह सप्रयास अभिनन्दनीय है। आशा है, प्रस्तुत ग्रन्थ के प्रकाशन से संस्कृतविद्या के कतिपय नये वातायन उद्घाटित हो सकेंगे।

—राधावल्लभ त्रिपाठी

समर्पण

सारस्वत साधना में
सतत संलग्न श्रद्धेय गुरुवर
प्रो. मूलचन्द्र पाठक को

सम्पादकीय

आचार्य रामचन्द्र द्विवेदी (15 जून, 1935-27 सितम्बर, 1993) संस्कृत जगत् की ऐसी विभूति थे जिन्होंने अपनी सारस्वत साधना से विद्या-जगत् में भारतीय संस्कृति के मर्मज्ञ आचार्य की प्रतिष्ठा अर्जित की। उन्होंने अपनी मौलिक दृष्टि, अभिनव उद्भावना तथा अनुसन्धान-व्याख्यान-लेखन की पटु-मधुर-गम्भीर शैली से अपने पाठकों, श्रोताओं, मित्रों और शिष्यों को अपना मुरीद बना लिया था।

इन्द्रधनुषी व्यक्तित्व के धनी आचार्य द्विवेदी का साहित्यिक योगदान भी बहुआयामी है। विभिन्न शास्त्रों के अधिकारी गुरुजनों की शिक्षा, विविध महाविद्यालयों, विश्वविद्यालयों के परिवेश, विविध भाषाओं पर अधिकार तथा विलक्षण प्रतिभा ने उनके अनुसन्धान, भाषण और लेखन में भी वैविध्य व्याप्त कर दिया था।

आचार्य द्विवेदी के सम्बन्ध में, उनके निकट के कुछ लोगों में एक साधारण-सी धारणा यह रही है कि उन्होंने व्याख्यान अधिक दिये (क्योंकि अभिव्यक्ति की उनकी यह प्रिय विधा थी), व्याख्यानों की अपेक्षा पुस्तकें कम लिखीं और लेख और भी कम। किन्तु अब कहा जा सकता है कि कम से कम लेखों के बारे में यह धारणा निराधार ही है। मैं भी इस भ्रान्ति से ग्रस्त था। किन्तु आचार्य द्विवेदी के स्मृति-ग्रन्थ पीयूष-पथ के सम्पादन-प्रकाशन के बाद जब राष्ट्रिय संस्कृत संस्थान के माननीय कुलपति प्रो. राधावल्लभ त्रिपाठी के समक्ष विनयपूर्वक प्रस्ताव रखा कि आचार्यश्री के प्रकीर्ण लेखों का भी एक संग्रह प्रकाशित होना चाहिये व उनकी स्वीकृति के बाद मैंने प्रकीर्ण सामग्री को संकलित करने का सोत्साह अभियान चलाया और जो उपलब्धि हुई उससे लेखों की न्यून संख्या की भ्रान्त धारणा तो समाप्त हुई ही साथ ही यह अनुभव भी हुआ कि समग्र सामग्री को एक संग्रह में समेटना संभव नहीं है।

लेखन की प्रत्येक विधा लेखक के लिए एक अलग ही चुनौती होती है। व्याख्यान, परिवेश और श्रोतसापेक्ष होते हैं। पुस्तक की रचना, विषय-विशेष के गहन विश्लेषण में डुबकी लगाकर और चिन्तन-रत्न खोजकर लाने पर भी एक मर्यादा में रहती है। किन्तु शोध-लेखादि की विधा में लेखक के समक्ष सीमा का बन्धन होते हुए भी, गागर में सागर भरने की चुनौती होती है। पुस्तक और लेख का यह भेद उपन्यास और कहानी के भेद जैसा है। अतः मेरा विश्वास है कि इस लेख-संग्रह में पाठक आचार्य के 'गागर में सागर' के कौशल के चमत्कार का साक्षात्कार अवश्य करेंगे। यहाँ यह भी उल्लेखनीय है कि आचार्यश्री का कोई एक भी ऐसा श्रोता, पाठक या अनुरागी नहीं होगा जिसने इन समस्त लेखों का एक साथ रसास्वाद किया हो क्योंकि इनमें से कुछ अलग-अलग प्रसङ्गों में, अलग-अलग पत्र-पत्रिकाओं में प्रकाशित हुए हैं और कुछ अप्रकाशित हैं जो पाण्डुलिपि के रूप में उपलब्ध हुए हैं। अतः प्राचीन-नवीन सभी पाठकों के लिए इस संकलन में कुछ न कुछ अज्ञात और नया अवश्य है।

प्राप्त सामग्री का विषयानुसार परिच्छेदों में विभाजन तो पाठकों के सम्मुख है ही। विभाजन की एक दृष्टि प्रकाशित-अप्रकाशित और भाषा-भेद की भी है। किन्तु पाठक अपने ढंग से इन लेखों का आन्तरिक वर्गीकरण भी देख सकते हैं जैसे शास्त्रीय लेख, शोध-लेख, लेख, व्याख्यान, स्वयं की और दूसरों की पुस्तकों के आमुख, आकाशवाणी वार्ताएँ, समाचारपत्रों के लेख आदि।

इन समस्त लेखों में जैसे विषयों का उत्थापन हुआ है, विषय को व्यापक परिप्रेक्ष्य में देखते हुए जिस प्रकार उसका निर्वहन हुआ है और तर्क-प्रमाण-सन्दर्भ देते हुए जैसा समापन हुआ है, वह अपने आप में एक अपूर्व शोधविधि का परिचायक है। एक मर्मज्ञ और बहुविद् विद्याधनी आचार्य की प्रतिभा-लेखनी के स्पर्श से साधारण विषय भी कैसे विलक्षण मणि का स्वरूप धारण कर लेता है इसका दर्शन पदे-पदे यहाँ पाठक अवश्य करेंगे। ये सभी पक्ष भावी अनुसन्धाताओं और लेखकों के लिए अनुकरणीय आदर्श हैं तथा अनुसन्धेय हैं। इन आयामों के अध्ययन के बिना आचार्यश्री के योगदान का मूल्याङ्कन अपूर्ण है।

धर्म, दर्शन, संस्कृति, साहित्य, साहित्यशास्त्र, संस्कृत भाषा, व्यक्तित्व, पर्यावरण, नीति, नारी जैसे विषयों में अवगाहन करने वाली आचार्य की लेखनी संस्कृत कवियों के उपनाम जैसे लेख में शालीन मनोरञ्जन का आयाम भी प्रस्तुत करती है।

संक्षेप में, यह संग्रह एक मनोरम शास्त्रीय उपवन है जिसमें विषय, भाषा, शैली, विधा, विचार आदि के विभिन्न पारिजात अपनी-अपनी सुगन्धि का विस्तार कर रहे हैं किन्तु इसकी समष्टिगत महासुगन्धि एक ही है फिर उसे चाहे संस्कृत-संस्कृति कहें, अनेकता में एकता कहें, एकता में अनेकता कहें; लेखक की सकारात्मक सोच कहें, उसकी समन्वय दृष्टि कहें या उसके साहित्य-मन्थन का निचोड़ कहें।

कुछ सुलभ्य और कुछ दुर्लभ्य सामग्री-संकलन के इस अभियान के अन्तर्गत मेरे भिक्षापात्र में जिन्होंने सहज आत्मीयतावश सामग्री का दान किया है उनमें उल्लेखनीय हैं- आचार्य द्विवेदी के यशस्वी सुपुत्र प्रो. हर्ष द्विवेदी (निदेशक, पोद्दार प्रबन्ध संस्थान, राजस्थान विश्वविद्यालय, जयपुर), मेरे गुरुवर प्रो. मूलचन्द्र पाठक (पूर्व अध्यक्ष, संस्कृत विभाग सुखाड़िया विश्वविद्यालय, उदयपुर), प्रो. शिवसागर त्रिपाठी (पूर्व अध्यक्ष संस्कृत विभाग, राजस्थान विश्वविद्यालय, जयपुर), प्रो. आर. पी. शर्मा (दर्शन विभाग, राजस्थान विश्वविद्यालय, जयपुर) और प्रो. बीना अग्रवाल (पूर्व अध्यक्षा, संस्कृत विभाग, राजस्थान विश्वविद्यालय, जयपुर)। इन सबके सहयोग के बिना यह संग्रह इस स्वरूप को ग्रहण नहीं कर सकता था। अतः इन सबके प्रति हार्दिक आभार। आचार्य द्विवेदी के सफल और भावपूर्ण उदयपुर-प्रवासकाल में उनके उत्तम और वरिष्ठ सहयोगी रहे तथा मेरे गुरुवर प्रो. मूलचन्द्र पाठक को यह ग्रन्थ समर्पित है जो अद्यावधि सारस्वत साधना में संलग्न रहते हुए आवश्यकतानुसार शिष्यों की सहायतार्थ सदैव तत्पर रहते हैं।

आचार्य द्विवेदी के इस समस्त लेखन का अध्ययन और इस पर चिन्तन व अनुसन्धान उनके गौरव-गान के लिए नहीं अपितु भारतीय सांस्कृतिक मूल्यों की

सनातनता और प्रासङ्गिकता के प्रत्यभिज्ञान के लिए आवश्यक है। जो ज्वलन्त विषय आज समाज में चर्चित हैं, जिन पर विचारक ऊहापोह में हैं या दिग्भ्रमित हैं उन पर एक संस्कृत-संस्कृतिवेत्ता की गहन अनुभूति और समर्थ अभिव्यक्ति की दृष्टि से भी इन लेखों की उपयोगिता है।

आचार्य द्विवेदी के लेखन का स्वाध्याय करने से, बिना किसी विशेष प्रयत्न के सहज ही दो तथ्य उभर कर आते हैं। एक यह कि उनकी दृष्टि सकारात्मक थी तथा दूसरा यह कि वे इस दृष्टि का उपयोग सर्वत्र समन्वय के सूत्र ढूँढने में करते थे। स्वर्गीय पं. विद्यानिवास मिश्र को वे अग्रज-सा आदर देते थे जो अपने व्याख्यान-लेखन में सदैव अखण्डता और समग्रता की दृष्टि को प्रस्तुत करते थे। दूसरी ओर आचार्य द्विवेदी की यह समन्वय दृष्टि तार्किक और शास्त्रीय स्तर पर तो थी ही किन्तु इसका वे जीवन और जगत् के प्रत्येक व्यवहार में साक्षात्कार भी करना चाहते थे।

आचार्य द्विवेदी के शिव-सायुज्य प्राप्त करने के बाद उनकी स्मृति में अनेकत्र अनेक आयोजन हुए। वाराणसी में ढाई वर्ष तक चली तन्त्र गोष्ठियों का विस्तृत विवरण **तन्त्र-विमर्श** (आर्य भाषा संस्थान, वाराणसी, 2005) में द्रष्टव्य है। इसी प्रकार राजस्थान विश्वविद्यालय, जयपुर और सुखाड़िया विश्वविद्यालय, उदयपुर में व्याख्यान मालाओं का क्रम चला तथा वाराणसी में ही उनकी स्मृति में ग्रन्थमाला का शुभारम्भ हुआ जिसके माध्यम से अब तक 16 पुस्तकों का प्रकाशन हो चुका है। इनमें मेरे सम्पादन में तैयार तथा आर्यभाषा संस्थान, वाराणसी से प्रकाशित **पीयूष-पथ** विशेषरूप से उल्लेखनीय है जिसमें इस प्रसङ्ग की अब तक की समस्त गतिविधियों का विस्तृत विवरण है तथा जिसका लोकार्पण दिनाङ्क 27 सितम्बर, 2011 को माननीय कुलपति प्रो. राधावल्लभ त्रिपाठी ने जयपुर में किया था।

आचार्य के लेखों का यह संग्रह पाठकों के समक्ष रखते हुए स्पष्ट करना चाहता हूँ कि सामग्री-संकलन का यह अभियान अभी अपूर्ण है अथवा यह उसका

एक चरण है। अभी उनकी हस्तलिपि में बहुत-सी अव्यस्थित सामग्री मेरे समक्ष है। उनके अपूर्ण लेखों की पूर्णता की खोज, उनके व्याख्यानों के यत्र-तत्र विकीर्ण विवरण, आकाशवाणी की शेष वार्ताओं, विद्वान् मित्रों से उनके पत्राचार आदि का संग्रह अभी शेष है। इन सब के लिए न केवल समय व श्रम की अपेक्षा है बल्कि सम्बद्ध व्यक्तियों और संस्थाओं का हार्दिक सहयोग भी आवश्यक है। अतः मैं उनके प्रति अनुराग रखने वाले सभी सहदयों से इस ग्रन्थ के माध्यम से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उनके व्यक्तित्व, संस्मरण, कृतित्व और उसकी समीक्षा से सम्बन्धित जो भी सामग्री उनके पास हो उसे कृपया मुझे उपलब्ध कराएँ, उसे मेरे भिक्षापात्र में डालें ताकि उनमें से प्रकाशनाहर्ह सामग्री को प्रकाशित करके संस्कृत-संस्कृति की इस महनीय और अभूतपूर्व विभूति को भावी पीढ़ी के समक्ष व्यापक और यथासंभव पूर्ण रूप में प्रस्तुत किया जा सके।

प्राप्त सामग्री को सुव्यवस्थित रूप में प्रस्तुत करने में अनेक व्यावहारिक कठिनाइयों का आना स्वाभाविक था। हस्तलिखित लेखों में कुछ अपूर्ण मिले, जर्जर कागजों के कारण कुछ के बीच-बीच में शब्दों का लोप मिला। किन्तु विषय और विचार की महत्ता को समझते हुए उन्हें यथावत् ले लिया गया है। सावधानी के बावजूद पाठ-संशोधन में कुछ त्रुटियाँ भी अवश्य रही होंगी। अतः ऐसी सभी कमियों के लिए मैं सुधी पाठकों से खेदपूर्वक क्षमा चाहता हूँ।

साधारण कार्य भी एक व्यक्ति से सम्भव नहीं होता तब ऐसे ऐतिहासिक और महनीय कार्य के निष्पादन में अनेक समर्थ कारकों का होना तो अनिवार्य है ही। अतः कृतज्ञता-प्रकाशन के क्रम में सर्वप्रथम मैं गुरुप्रवर श्रद्धेय आचार्य द्विवेदी के समक्ष नतमस्तक हूँ क्योंकि उन्हीं के आशीर्वाद ने मुझे श्रद्धासुमन समर्पित करने के योग्य बनाया। मैं माननीय कुलपति, प्रो. राधावल्लभ त्रिपाठी, राष्ट्रिय संस्कृत संस्थान, दिल्ली के प्रति निष्ठापूर्वक कृतज्ञता ज्ञापित करता हूँ जिन्होंने लोकप्रिय ग्रन्थमाला के अन्तर्गत इस ग्रन्थ के प्रकाशन का दायित्व ही नहीं लिया बल्कि अपनी कविता से भी इस ग्रन्थ का गौरव बढ़ाया है। म.म. प्रो. दयानन्द भार्गव, डॉ. शिवदत्त शर्मा

चतुर्वेदी, प्रो. शिवसागर त्रिपाठी तथा डॉ. शिवराम शर्मा के प्रति भी हार्दिक आभार प्रकट करता हूँ जिन्होंने नूतन काव्य-पुष्पों से आचार्य द्विवेदी को श्रद्धाञ्जलि दी है।

कतिपय पाठ्यांशों की शुद्धि व पुष्टि में आचार्य रेवाप्रसाद द्विवेदी (सनातन कवि, इमेरिटस प्रोफेसर), प्रो. हृदयरञ्जन शर्मा (पूर्व अध्यक्ष, वेद विभाग) और डॉ. शिवराम शर्मा (सङ्गीतशास्त्र विभाग, सङ्गीत एवं मञ्चकला सङ्काय) काशी हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय ने सहृदयतापूर्वक सहयोग किया, एतदर्थ मैं इनके प्रति कृतज्ञता ज्ञापित करता हूँ। इसी प्रकार डॉ. अनामिका सिंह (शोध अधिकारी, बौद्ध अध्ययन केन्द्र, आर्य महिला पी.जी. कॉलेज), डॉ. सीमा मुंशी (विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग की वरिष्ठ रिसर्च फ़ेलो) व कु. श्रद्धा (वरिष्ठ छात्रा, धर्म एवं दर्शन विभाग, का.हि.वि.वि.) ने सामग्री को सुव्यवस्थित करने एवं पाठ-संशोधन में मेरा सहयोग किया, अतः ये सभी भी मेरे हार्दिक आशीर्वाद के पात्र हैं। कम्प्यूटर-कार्य के लिए श्री बृजेश बिन्द तथा श्री रोशन कुमार सिंह को धन्यवाद देना मेरा कर्तव्य है जिन्होंने विनयपूर्वक मेरे सभी निर्देशों का यथोचित पालन किया। क्लेशः फलेन हि पुनर्नवतां विधत्ते।

वसन्तपञ्चमी, २०१२

सूर्यप्रकाश व्यास

आचार्य रामचन्द्र द्विवेदी

● जीवनवृत्त

- (i) पिता श्री गङ्गाप्रसाद द्विवेदी ।
(ii) जन्म स्थान देवर (ननिहाल) ।
पितृस्थान- सकवाई ज़िला, फर्रुखाबाद, उत्तर प्रदेश ।
(iii) जन्मतिथि 15 जून, 1935
(iv) परिवार पत्नी- (स्व.) डॉ. कमला द्विवेदी ।
पुत्र- प्रो. हर्ष द्विवेदी (सम्प्रति निदेशक, पोद्दार प्रबन्ध-
संस्थान, राजस्थान विश्वविद्यालय, जयपुर) ।
पुत्री- डॉ. उदया त्रिवेदी ।
(v) प्रारम्भिक शिक्षा एकरसानन्द संस्कृत विद्यालय, मैनपुरी (उत्तर प्रदेश)।
(vi) उच्च शिक्षा सम्पूर्णानन्द संस्कृत विश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी एवं
लखनऊ विश्वविद्यालय ।
(vii) गुरु म.म. पं.नारायणशास्त्री खिस्ते, म.म. पं. बटुकनाथशास्त्री
खिस्ते, प्रो. को. अ. सुब्रह्मण्यम् अय्यर, प्रो. कान्तिचन्द्र
पाण्डेय ।
(viii) सेवा लखनऊ विश्वविद्यालय, 1957-1961 ।
दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय (सान्ध्य महाविद्यालय),
1961-1966 ।
मोहनलाल सुखाड़िया विश्वविद्यालय, उदयपुर,
1966-1978 ।
राजस्थान विश्वविद्यालय, जयपुर, 1978-1993 ।
(ix) शिव-सायुज्य 27 सितम्बर, 1993 ।

● कृतित्व

- (i) शोध-निर्देशन शोध-प्रबन्ध एवं लघु शोध-निबन्ध ४८ ।
(ii) पुस्तकें
- Selections from Brahmanas and Upanishads. (original, Translation and Bhasya (Editor), Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1965.
 - अलङ्कारमीमांसा, मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली, 1965 ।

- जातकमाला (एम.आर. भट्ट के साथ अनुवाद एवं सम्पादन), मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली, 1966।
- ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञाविमर्शिनी (भाग I - III)(सम्पादन), मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली, 1968 ।
- Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit (editor), Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1969.
- अमरभारती (डॉ. रविशङ्कर नागर के साथ सम्पादन), मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, 1963-1973 ।
- The Poetic Light, (Kāvya prakāśa -I, II), (Translation), Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1966, 1970, 1976.
- Contribution of Jainism to Indian Culture, (Editor), Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, 1975.
- जैनविद्या का सांस्कृतिक अवदान (डॉ. प्रेमसुमन जैन के साथ सम्पादन), आदर्श साहित्य संघ, चुरु, राजस्थान, 1976 ।
- अलङ्कारसर्वस्व-सञ्जीवनी (अनुवाद एवं सम्पादन), मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली, प्रथम संस्करण - 1965, द्वितीय संस्करण-1977 ।
- अलङ्कारसर्वस्वम् (अनुवाद एवं व्याख्या), मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली, 1977।
- Jain Art and Architecture (Editing), Centre for Jain Studies, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, 1980.
- Summary of Papers (Editing), Jaipur, 1982.
- Outline of History of Śaivism (General Editing), 1986.
- Doctrine of Divine Recognition Vol 1-3, (General Editing), 1986.
- तन्त्रालोक (भाग 1-8) (डॉ. नवजीवन रस्तोगी के साथ सम्पादन), मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली, 1987 ।

- काशमीर की शैव-परम्परा, नेशनल पब्लिशिंग हाउस, नई दिल्ली, 1989 ।
- नवोन्मेष (डॉ. शिवसागर त्रिपाठी के साथ सम्पादन), राजस्थान संस्कृत अकादमी, जयपुर, 1990 ।
- संवाद (प्रो. दयाकृष्ण, प्रो. एम.पी. रेगे, एवं प्रो. मुकुन्द लाट के साथ सम्पादन), भारतीय दर्शन अनुसन्धान परिषद् एवं मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली, 1991।
- भर्तृहरि का वाक्यपदीय (अनुवाद), राजस्थान हिन्दी ग्रन्थ अकादमी, जयपुर, 1982, 1992 ।
- न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिविकासः (सम्पादन), केन्द्रीय संस्कृत विद्यापीठ, जयपुर, 1992 ।
- त्रिकदर्शनम्, सम्पूर्णानन्द संस्कृत विश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी, 1992 ।
- Studies in Mimamsa (Editing), Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1992.

३. पुरस्कार एवं सम्मान

- | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|--|
| (i) | हारीत ऋषि पुरस्कार | महाराणा मेवाड़ फाउन्डेशन, उदयपुर, 1985। |
| (ii) | राष्ट्रपति-पुरस्कार | मानव-संसाधन विकासमन्त्रालय, शिक्षा विभाग, नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1988। |
| (iii) | प्रतिष्ठित लेखक-पुरस्कार | मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली, 1988 । |
| (iv) | राजस्थान संस्कृत अकादमी पुरस्कार | जयपुर, 1989 । |
| (v) | राष्ट्रीय प्राध्यापक-पुरस्कार | विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग, दिल्ली, 1989। |
| (vi) | सम्मान | श्री वैदिक संस्कृति प्रचारक संघ, जयपुर, 1987। |
| (vii) | सम्मान | काञ्ची और शृङ्गेरी के शङ्कराचार्यों द्वारा । |

अनुक्रमणिका

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| ● सम्पादकीय | v |
| ● आचार्य रामचन्द्र द्विवेदी | xi |
| -जीवनवृत्त | |
| -कृतित्व | |
| -पुरस्कार एवं सम्मान | |
| ● अनुक्रमणिका | xiv |

प्रथम परिच्छेद : वेदादि

1 - 26

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Jāra in the R̥gveda | 1 |
| 2. अमर ग्रन्थ : यजुर्वेद | 6 |
| 3. Atharvaveda (AV) and Tantricism | 8 |
| 4. पर्यावरण का पहला दस्तावेज : अथर्ववेदीय पृथिवी-सूक्त | 9 |
| 5. विचारक्रान्ति का संघर्षमय युग : उपनिषद् काल | 10 |
| 6. श्रीमद्भगवद्गीता | 13 |
| 7. पुराणों में वर्णित तत्कालीन इतिहास और समाज | 16 |
| 8. ब्रह्मपुराण : आर्य संस्कृति का विश्वकोष | 19 |
| 9. यज्ञतत्त्वविमर्शः | 22 |

द्वितीय परिच्छेद : दर्शनशास्त्र

27 - 62

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Presidential Address in the Religion and ... | 27 |
| 2. Philosophical Writings in Modern Sanskrit | 34 |
| 3. संस्कृत विद्वानों की देन- दर्शन के क्षेत्र में | 35 |
| 4. उपक्रमः | 38 |
| 5. Introduction to Mimāṃsā studies | 43 |

6. प्रस्तावना	48
7. आदिशङ्कर	59

तृतीय परिच्छेद : काश्मीर शैवदर्शन 63 - 141

1. शैवागमदर्शनेषु परतत्त्वस्य विमर्शः	63
2. काश्मीर का शिवाद्वैत एवं प्रत्यभिज्ञा	68
3. Śiva : A symbol of Self-critical and Active ...	74
4. Yoga According to the Kashmir Śaivism	79
5. Kashmir Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism	84
6. Bhartṛhari and Kashmir Śaivism	91
7. भर्तृहरि और काश्मीर शैवदर्शन	106
8. Kashmir Śaivism (KS) and the Vedānta of Śaṅkara	108
9. Genral Editor's Note in the Īśvara-pratyabhijñā ...	115
10. Editor's note	121
11. श्रीगणेश	123
12. आमुखम्	125
13. प्रस्तावना	127
14. काश्मीर की शैव प्रतिमाएँ	131
15. काश्मीर की तान्त्रिक परम्परा में लल्लेश्वरी	133
16. श्री अमृतवाग्भवाचार्य से काशी में साक्षात्कार	137
17. उपक्रम	139

चतुर्थ परिच्छेद : जैन विद्या 142 - 173

1. जैन विद्या : एक अनुशीलन	142
2. Contribution of Jainism to Indian Culture	147
3. Social Significance of Jain Ethics	150
4. Jain Definition of the Pramāṇa	160

पञ्चम परिच्छेद : बौद्ध विद्या 174 - 222

1. The Origin of Buddhism : A Tale From ...	174
2. Introduction to Jātakamālā	182
3. Buddhist Mysticism	201

षष्ठ परिच्छेद : काव्य एवं काव्यशास्त्र 223 - 388

1. संस्कृत के आदिकवि वाल्मीकि	223
2. वाल्मीकिरामायणे मानवीयचेतना	227
3. The World of Vālmīki's and Kālidāsa's Poetry	232
4. आचार्य आनन्दवर्धन	245
5. संस्कृत साहित्य में समीक्षा का मानक ग्रन्थ वक्रोक्तिजीवित	250
6. A Critique of the Anumana-theory of Mahima ...	256
7. काव्यप्रकाशकार आचार्य मम्मट का पाण्डित्य	264
8. Mammaṭa's originality as revealed in ...	274
9. प्राक्कथन	285
10. अलंकारशास्त्रस्य दर्शनसरणिः	287
11. Percept- like experience in Bhāvika	290
12. भाविके प्रत्यक्षयमाणत्वम्	297
13. The Theory of Kāvya-pāka with special reference ...	302
14. M. Hiriyanna's Views on Theories of Poetry	315
15. Sanskrit Criticism and Contemporary Literature	321
16. Philosophical Consideration and Independence ...	323
17. Concept of Obscenity (aślīlatā) in Sanskrit Poetics	327
18. Nature of obscenity in Sanskrit Drama (Bhāṇa)	349

19. Women is Classical Sanskrit Literature	352
20. कालिदास के अभिनव आयाम	360
21. कवि-प्रतिभा	366
22. साहित्य में शब्द का सन्धान	371
23. उपमा कालिदासस्य	376
24. साम्प्रतिकं संस्कृतम्	380
25. संस्कृत कवियों के उपनाम	386

सप्तम परिच्छेद : विविध विषय 389 - 463

1. भारतीय संस्कृति : चिन्तनकण	389
2. Concept of the Śāstra	397
3. Suggestions for Indo-German Co-Operation ...	416
4. Influence of Sanskrit on the Rajasthani language ...	422
5. चतुर्थ विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनम्	441
6. The life of Ramkrishna as viewed by Romain ...	447
7. M.M. Pandit P.N. Paṭṭābhirāma Śāstrī	454
8. भारत की एकता और अखण्डता के प्रतिमान पण्डित ...	456
9. भारतीय परम्परा के मूल स्वर : डॉ. गोविन्द्रचन्द्र पाण्डेय	458

अष्टम परिच्छेद : संस्कृत कविताएँ 464 - 473

1. अभिनवसूक्तिसन्दोहः	464
2. पुराणमित्येव न साधु सर्वम्	465
3. सती-प्रथा	467
4. प्रकीर्णश्लोकाः	470

परिशिष्ट

474 - 486

1. रामचन्द्रस्मृतिः	474
आचार्यराधावल्लभः त्रिपाठी	
2. राष्ट्रपतिपुरस्कृताः श्रीरामचन्द्रद्विवेदिनः	475
डॉ. जगन्नारायणपाण्डेयः	
3. वैदुष्यवन्दनम्	475
आचार्यशिवदत्तशर्मचतुर्वेदिनः	
4. प्रणामाञ्जलि	484
प्रो. शिवसागरः त्रिपाठी	
5. श्रीरामचन्द्रं हृदि भावयामि	485
डॉ. शिवरामः शर्मा	
6. दास्ताँ तेरी	486
प्रो. दयानन्द भार्गव	



प्रथम परिच्छेद : वेदादि

1. Jāra in the Ṛgveda

The word Jāra is derived from √jṛ by adding ghañ suffix in the sense of agent.¹ It means ‘becoming old’ (Ṛgveda = RV, X. 106.7), a consumer (Nirukta, V.10; Pāṇini, III. 3.20, vārttika 4), a paramour or a lover. An identical root √jṛ (= gr) stands for ‘to call out to’, ‘address’, ‘invoke’ and ‘to praise’.² This word occurs a number of times in the RV³ in the hymns addressed to Agni, Aśvins, Uṣas, Pūṣan, Mitrāvaruṇa and Soma Pavamāna. Agni and Pūṣan are directly described as jāra. The former is spoken of as jāra of (i) waters⁴ (I.46.4), (ii) maidens (I.66.4), (iii) dawns (VII. 9.1), (iv) his sister (X.3.3) who is obviously Uṣas, and finally of (v) the sacrifice (X.7.5). Agni’s association with the Waters is prominent throughout the Vedas.⁵ The legend of Agni hiding in the waters and plants and being found out by the gods occurs in some of the later hymns of RV (X. 51-3,124). More importantly than this is the conception of waters as females (II. 35.13) which is responsible for describing Agni as their paramour. His description as the lover of maidens (jāraḥ kanīnām) and the lord of married women (patir janīnām) gave rise to a marital myth, which, according to Sāyaṇa, is contained in the RV, (X.85.41.) The preceding mantra (X.85.40) very clearly states the myth:

सोमः प्रथमो विविदे गन्धर्वो विविद उत्तरः।
तृतीयो अग्निष्टे पतिस्तुरीयस्ते मनुष्यजाः।।

Soma is the first, Gandharva the second and Agni the third husband who, according to the next mantra, gives away the bride to the human husband. It is at this stage that a girl becomes wife.⁶ In this marital myth of the RV one can discern recognition of pre-marital and free love. Gandharvas represent free love in the post-Vedic Sanskrit literature and the marriage through mutual love, known as gāndharva, is sanctioned by the Smṛtis. Acceptance of love-marriage by the family elders and the society is very succinctly stated by Kālidāsa in his Abhijñānaśākuntala (III. 20). In many cases free love may not end up in

marriage and this possibility is recognised and accepted in the Ṛgvedic myth by formulating that before a girl is married to a human being she has had three divine husbands, namely, Soma, Gandharva and Agni. Descriptions in the Upaniṣads of females being possessed by Gandharvas may in certain cases suggest the effect of free love on them. Agni is produced and kindled for the sacrifice at every dawn and is, therefore, very naturally associated with the Uṣas. Both are described paradoxically as young and ancient. Uṣas causes sacrificial fire to be kindled (I. 113.9). Agni goes to meet the refulgent Uṣas as she appears in the sky, asking her for fair riches (III. 61.6). The fire being kindled at dawn is described as “waking at dawn” (uṣarbudha). The brightness of both, Uṣas and Agni is described in great detail. As a young maiden dressed in gay attire, like a dancer, Uṣas displays her bosom (I.92.4), shows her form (I.123). and unveils her charms (I.124.3-4). This makes Uṣas a perfect model of young beauty whom an equally bright and young lover, Agni, perpetually seeks for making love. Uṣas is repeatedly called the daughter of heaven (I.30.22). Agni is similarly described as the child of heaven (IV.15.6; VI.49.2) who generated fire (X.45.3). This makes him the lover of his svasṛ (X.3.3), Uṣas, both being the progeny of heaven. Uṣas is svayaṃsārīṇī. Who, like the abhisārikā of classical Sanskrit literature, moves freely to meet her lover. In a similar description of Pūṣan as the lover of svasṛ (VI.55.4-5), the same meaning is intended to be conveyed by the seer. He is, like Agni, the lover of maidens and dawns (I. 152.4), and is described as such by way of a simile (Uṣo na jāraḥ) in the RV, I. 69.1; 5; and VII. 10.1.

Besides Agni and Pūṣan⁷, Soma Pavamāna is also likened to a paramour (VII. 32.5; 76.3; IX. 38.4; 56.3; 96.23’ 101.14).

The popular notion of a jāra (lover, paramour) and his beloved (jāriṇī) can be gleaned from the Ṛgvedic references. The beloved was conceived as kanī or unmarried young girl with splendence (Sāyaṇa on I.66.4; 152.4) and the lover as daring and gallant, as is evidenced by the character of Ṛjraśva (I.117.18) who cut into pieces hundred and a one rams in order to please she-wolf. He inspired the imagination of his beloved and enkindled her spritis (I.134.3) through his message. He was

lauded, addressed (VI. 55.4) and sung (IX. 32.5; 56.3). he was the most sapient (kavitama, VII.9.1) who gleamed with refulgence (VII. 10.1). His beloved was not known, i.e. expected, to forsake him (VII. 76.3). Conquering all obstacles he approached his love who was glad to accord him welcome (IX. 56.3; 96.23; 101.14) in her home. His beloved was known as svasṛ (a sister, free in love) by perhaps an intentional play on the word because she moved freely to a rendezvous (X.3.3). The jāra delighted his parents whom he inspired for creativity (X. 11.6). The lover who took away the maidenhood (I. 66.4) was known doing his religious duty of feeding with oblations. He is associated with spread of light (I. 69.1; 69.5) and advancement without a downward fall (I. 152.4). He woke up his sleeping beauty and enkindled love in her (I. 134.3). Such was the Ṛgvedic notion of a lover and a beloved.

Jāra is always explained as upapati (paramour) by Sāyaṇa. There is hardly any reference in the RV which might suggest that a lover was looked down upon or was considered morally wrong or corrupt. Sāyaṇa also does not consider loving sinful. Mythically speaking, Agni, Pūṣan and Vāyu are the cosmic paramours. Waters and dawns are the cosmic beloveds. Various sex symbols pervade the hymns of the RV.⁸ Heaven and Earth are represented as cosmic sex partners. Agni is invoked to stir up these parents through sexual imagery (X.11.6). Besides normal sex symbols, RV also presents seemingly abnormal sex relationship. For example, Agni (II. 35.13) and Soma (X 30.5) are represented as child-seeders (śiśu-vṛṣan) who impregnate the waters described as sisters who invoke their brother-husbands (X. 65.1). Yama and Yamī represent the same seemingly abnormal sex-relationship. The Ṛgvedic concept of jāra also involves some kind of abnormal sex symbolism. This explains the occurrence of the term svasṛ in the case of a beloved, Uṣas. The sense of illicit love implied by the term svasṛ (sister) gradually gives way to the sense of abhisārikā, beloved, going to meet her lover. In the post-Vedic tradition the normal cosmic partnership is conceived variously, such as, by the union of Śiva and Śakti in Śaivism or by the union of Prajñā and Upāya in Buddhism. Even the philosophical schools were led to explain the origin of the world in terms of real or imaginary interaction of two

entities, such as Puruṣa and Prakṛti in the Sāṃkhya or Brahman and inexplicable Māyā in the Vedānta system.

However, the relationship of free love epitomised in the RV by the jāra and his beloved finds its similarity in the concept of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. Their playful love-making aesthetically leads to the delineation of madhura rasa. Kṛṣṇa, for the Gopīs, is the supreme lover, a jāra (Bhāgavata, X.1.11-12). His love for the maidens in general and for Rādhā in particular is devoutly praised in the esoteric Vaiṣṇavism. Rādhā reminds us of Uṣas and her lover resembles the descriptions of fire, sun and the wind. All esoteric schools, Śaiva, Bauddha or Vaiṣṇava, abound in clear sex symbols. Sex images seem to be indispensable to communicate the relationship of the Supreme being with the world of men. The relation of lover and the beloved between the Supreme Soul and the individual soul is often described by the mystics of all shades. In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣd (IV. 3.21), union with the self is compared with the loving and deep embrace of a beloved. Close affinity and intimate association between the emotions of love and religion is widely recognised. Havelock Ellis observes, **early religious rites were largely sexual and orgiastic because they are largely an appeal to the generative forces of nature to exhibit a beneficial productiveness**⁹.

There exists a close connection between mystic ideas and erotic ideas, and most often these two orders of conception are associated in insanity,¹⁰ says Regis. Indian tradition did not find anything immoral, insane or absurd about this empirical relation of a lover and his beloved being extended to the mystical realm.

Mystics like Mīrā, who conceived herself as the bride of Lord Kṛṣṇa, Soeur Jeanne des Anges¹¹ and Marguerite-Marie¹² express their love for God in sexual terms. The Hebrews used a common word for empirical and divine love.

Thus, the RV has a wholesome attitude towards lovers. It looks upon them respectfully and finds nothing morally degrading in the act of love-making. This healthy attitude of the Aryans is later on manifested

in giving pre-eminence to the erotic sentiment and in divinising the playful dalliance of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa with no sense of inhibition or puritanic reproach.

Notes:

1. See, Rāmāśramī comm. on the **Amarakośa**, (Varanasi, 1970).
2. See, Monier-Williams, **Sanskrit-English Dictionary**.
3. I. 46.4; 66.4; 69.1; 5; 117.18; 134.3; 152.4; VI. 55 4; 5; VII. 9.1; 10.1; 76.3; IX. 32.5; 38.4; 56.3; 96.23; 101.14; X. 3.3; 7.5; 11.6; 34.5; 42.2; 106.7; 162.5.
4. Sāyaṇa considers Sun, instead of Agni, to be lover of Waters. This is evidently wrong on account of the context of feeding with obligations and the patent description of Agni as the Lord or Guardian of the family dwelling gr̥hapati, here as elsewhere (see, VIII. 15.2; VIII. 49.19).
5. See, A.A. Macdonell, **The Vedic Mythology**, (Delhi, 1961), p. 92.
6. In his explanation of **RV I. 66.4**, Sāyaṇa states the different stages of a maiden when the three divinities including fire become her loves, and gives the reason why they are so described:
कनीनां कन्यकानां जारो जारयिता। यतो विवाहसमयेऽग्नौ लाजादिद्रव्यहोमे सति तासां कन्यात्वं निवर्तते अतो जारयितेत्युच्यते। तथा जनीनां जायानां कृतविवाहानां पतिर्भर्ता। तथा चाख्यायते- अनुपजातपुरुषसंभोगेच्छावस्थां स्त्रियं सोमो लेभे x सोम ईषदपजातभोगेच्छां तां विश्वावसवे गन्धर्वाय प्रादात्। स च गन्धर्वो विवाहसमयेऽग्नये प्रददौ। अग्निश्च मनुजाय भर्त्रे धनपुत्रैः सहितामिमां प्रायच्छदिति।
A liberal interpretation of this legend in simple English would mean that a girl, before she is given away in marriage, has three kinds of sex experience: first yearnings for love with no real sex, romance and actual love-making which takes away (consumes) her maidenhood. It is very significantly represented by Soma, Gandharva and fire.
7. Sāyaṇa has construed all references occurring by way of upamāna in favour of Sūrya of Āditya and none in favour of Pūṣan. He has done this obviously on the basis of similarity between the two and their complete identification in the post-Vedic literature. If some distinction is maintained between Pūṣan and Sūrya, then, all indirect descriptions should refer to the former.
8. For sex-symbolism in **RV**, see, S.A. Dange's paper, **Cosmo-sexualism in the Vedic Ritual**, in Charudev Shastri Felicitation Volume, Delhi, 1974.

9. **Studies in the Psychology of Sex** (Random House, New York), Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 311.
10. As quoted **ibid**, p. 314.
11. See, **ibid**, p. 322.
11. **Ibid**, pp. 324-5.

(Recent studies in Sanskrit and Indology,
Ed. Dr. D.K. Gupta, Ajanta Publications, Delhi)



2. अमर ग्रन्थ : यजुर्वेद

वेद की चार संहिताएँ या संकलन हैं जिन्हें हम ऋग्वेद, यजुर्वेद, सामवेद तथा अथर्ववेद के नाम से जानते हैं। महाभाष्यकार पतञ्जलि के अनुसार प्रत्येक वेद की अनेक शाखाएँ थीं। जैसे कि ऋग्वेद की २१, यजुर्वेद की १००, सामवेद की १००० और अथर्ववेद की ९। आज यजुर्वेद की केवल ६ शाखाएँ ही उपलब्ध हैं। यजुर्वेद के दो भेद हैं कृष्ण और शुक्ल। कृष्ण यजुर्वेद में पद्यात्मक मन्त्रों के साथ गद्य का मिश्रण है जिसमें यज्ञ की संक्षिप्त व्याख्या है या यो कहें कि ब्राह्मण भाग इसमें मिला हुआ है। अग्न्याधान और दर्शपौर्णमास की अग्नि का कृष्णपक्ष में आधान इसमें विहित है अथवा प्रतिपदायुक्त पूर्णिमा का ग्रहण करने के कारण इसे कृष्णयजुर्वेद कहा गया जिसे एक पुराकथा के अनुसार वैशम्पायन के शिष्यों ने तित्तिरपक्षी के रूप में वमन किये गये वेद को ग्रहण किया था। इस कृष्ण यजुर्वेद की तैत्तरीय, काठक, मैत्रायणी और कपिष्ठल नामक चार शाखाएँ हैं। शुक्ल यजुर्वेद में पद्य अधिक नहीं हैं तथा शुक्लपक्ष में ही अग्न्याधान और दर्शपौर्णमास का विधान है। याज्ञवल्क्य ने इसे सूर्य से प्राप्त किया था। इसकी दो शाखाएँ हैं माध्यन्दिन वाजसनेय तथा काण्व। शुक्ल यजुर्वेद को याज्ञवल्क्य वाजसनेयि संहिता भी कहा जाता है। शाखाओं का भेद मन्त्रों के विविध प्रकार से संकलन या व्यवस्थापन, स्वराङ्कन आदि के सम्प्रदाय पर आधारित था।

वैदिक यज्ञ में होता ऋचाओं का पाठ करता था, उद्गाता सामगान करता था, अध्वर्यु यज्ञीय अनुष्ठान करता था और ब्रह्मा संपूर्ण व्यवस्था का निरीक्षक और मार्गदर्शक था। अध्वर्यु की दृष्टि से मन्त्रों के यज्ञपरक विधान के लिये ऋचाओं का यजुषों के साथ संकलन यजुर्वेद है। अतः इसमें ऋचाएँ ऋग्वेद से ही ली गयी हैं। इस अर्थ में यजुर्वेद, ऋग्वेद की तरह स्वतन्त्र रचना नहीं है। अधिकांश मन्त्र ऋग्वेद से ही लिये गये हैं, यज्ञ के अनुसार उनका व्यवस्थापन किया गया है और कुछ मन्त्र बढ़ाये गये हैं जिन्हें यजुषु कहा

जाता है। वह मन्त्र जिसमें अक्षर नियत नहीं होते, यजुष् हैं- अर्थात् नियताक्षरपाद मन्त्र-**अनियताक्षरावसानो यजुः।** यजुष् यज्ञ का फार्मूला है। इस यजुष् के कारण ही यह यजुर्वेद कहलाता है।

यजुर्वेद में ४० अध्याय हैं। कृष्ण यजुर्वेद का विभाग २ काण्ड ४४ प्रपाठक या अध्याय, ६५१ अनुवाक तथा २१९८ कण्डिकाओं में किया गया है।

शुक्ल और कृष्ण यजुर्वेद की विषयवस्तु लगभग एक-सी ही है पर उनका क्रम और निरूपण भिन्न है। यजुर्वेद यज्ञों और उनकी अनुष्ठान क्रिया का विधायक है, सामवेद भी यज्ञ क्रिया के लिये उपयोगी वेद हैं। अन्तर केवल इतना है कि सामवेद प्रधानतः सोमयाग से सम्बन्धित है जबकि यजुर्वेद सम्पूर्ण यज्ञक्रियाओं का आकर ग्रन्थ है। शुक्ल यजुर्वेद के प्रथम पच्चीस अध्यायों में दर्शपौर्णमास, पिण्डपितृयज्ञ, अग्निहोत्र, राजसूय, वाजपेय यज्ञ-यज्ञवेदी के निर्माण, सौत्रामणि (अश्विन, सरस्वती तथा इन्द्र को द्विजों द्वारा किये जाने वाले यज्ञ) तथा अश्वमेध का प्रतिपादन है। अन्तिम पन्द्रह अध्याय खिल या परिशिष्ट हैं जो कृष्ण यजुर्वेद में नहीं मिलते हैं-

**वेदाहमेतं पुरुषं महान्तमादित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात्।
तमेव विदित्वाति मृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय।।**

आगे चलकर यही पुरुष ब्रह्म का वाचक हो जाता है जिसकी प्राप्ति मुक्ति कहलाती है। वही पुरुष अंशतः प्रजापति के रूप में समग्र सृष्टि के गर्भ में अज रहकर भी विविध रूपों में उत्पन्न होता रहता है। उसी में सारे भुवन अवस्थित हैं और धीरे ही उसके स्वरूप को संपूर्णतः देख पाते हैं-

**प्रजापतिश्चरति गर्भे अन्तरजायमानो बहुधा विजायते।
तस्य योनिं परिपश्यति धीरस्तस्मिन्तस्थुर्भुवनानि विश्वा।।**

वही सर्वोत्कृष्ट तेज है, सभी देवों का अग्रणी है, उन सबसे पहले उत्पन्न है। ब्रह्म से उत्पन्न उस तेज को नमस्कार है-

**यो देवेभ्य आतपति यो देवानां पुरोहितः।
पूर्वो यो देवेभ्यो जातो नमो रुचाय ब्राह्मये।।**

इसी शुक्ल यजुर्वेद के ३४ वें अध्याय में शिवसंकल्पसूक्त भी है जिसमें मन के शुभसंकल्पों से संपन्न होने की विश्वोपयोगी प्रार्थना बारम्बार की गयी है-

**यज्जाग्रतो दूरमुदैति दैवं तदु सुप्तस्य तथैवेति।
दूरंगमं ज्योतिषां ज्योतिरेकं तन्मे मनः शिवसंकल्पमस्तु।।**

जो उत्कृष्ट ज्ञान, चित्त और धैर्य है, जो प्रजाओं का आन्तर अमृत प्रकाश है, जिसके बिना कोई कर्म नहीं किया जाता, मेरा वह मन शिवसंकल्प हो-

**यत्प्रज्ञानमुत चेतो धृतिश्च यज्ज्योतिरन्तरमृतं प्रजासु।
यस्मान्न ऋते किंचन कर्म क्रियते तन्मे मनः शिवसंकल्पमस्तु।।**

जिस अमृतमन से भूत, वर्तमान, भविष्य इन सबका आकलन होता है जिसके द्वारा सात होताओं वाला याग संपादित होता है मेरा वह मन शिवसंकल्प वाला हो-

**येनेदं भूतं भुवनं भविष्यत्परिगृहीतममृतेन सर्वम्।
येन यज्ञस्तायते सप्त होता तन्मे मनः शिवसंकल्पमस्तु।।**

और भी-

**सुषारथिरश्चानिव यन्मनुष्यान्नेनीयतेऽमीशुभिर्वाजिन इव।
हृत्प्रतिष्ठं यदजिरं जविष्ठं तन्मे मनः शिवसंकल्पमस्तु।।**

(हस्तलिखित, आकाशवाणी उदयपुर, वार्ता, २.०५.१९८९)



3. Atharvaveda (AV) and Tantricism

One of the various designations of the AV is Atharvangīrasa, that is, the text containing mantras: beneficial (atharvan) and maleficent (angiras). This clearly shows predominantly tantric character of the AV which is corroborated by its popular concerns and beliefs: blessing of men and cattle, banishment of devils and diseases, love charms, marriage customs and other domestic rites. Tantra encompasses the popular primitive and tribal forms of religion and ritualistic practice. In its popular contents the AV is older than the Rgveda. Atharvan also stands for a worshiper of agni and soma which constitute the cosmos (agnīsomātṃmakam Jagat) according to later Tantric explanation. Constant union of Mitra (God of day) and Varuṇa (God of night) is reflected in the pairing of the two ultimates, importance of Purohita develops with the significance of guru in the Tantric tradition.

The AV with its ritual prescribed in the Kausikasūtra (and the Vaitanasūtra) is an inexhaustible oldest document of Tantric rites and rituals although the Abhicāraḥkalpa a work on incantation is based on the use of AV as its source, yet spells expressed in a number of mantras e.g. x. 1.i.8.18; IV 185; V. 14.31, XIV.2.65. deserves special mention.

Special attention is invited in this paper not merely to texts bearing an incantation (abhicāra), e.g. I 7; I. 16.4; III. 6, 10.6; VI. 134; II-12; V. 31; V. 14 but also to those which promote welfare (paustika-karmas) or peace (śānti) expressed in III. 17; VI. 142; VI. 50; IV. 15; VI. 59; III. 15; IV. 384 1-4; III. 21; VI. 70; VI. 46; VI. 110 so that a comprehensive contribution of the AV to the Tantric tradition of India may be underlined.

Typed copy



4. पर्यावरण का पहला दस्तावेज : अथर्ववेदीय पृथिवी-सूक्त

दिल्ली में १४ अक्टूबर, १९८९ को सम्पन्न वेदगोष्ठी में प्रस्तुत बारह निबन्धों, का अथर्ववेद के पृथिवी सूक्त के संहितापाठ एवं पदपाठ तथा सातवलेकर, अभयदेव शर्मा तथा ह्विटने के अनुवाद के साथ भावात्मक पद्यानुवाद और साथ ही सन्दर्भ-ग्रन्थों की सूची, पृथिवी सूक्त के सुभाषित एवं छन्द निर्देश के साथ सम्पादन के लिए विदुषी सम्पादिका का प्रयत्न प्रशंसनीय है। स्वयं उसके दो लेख (एक हिन्दी में और दूसरा अंग्रेजी में) इसमें सम्मिलित हैं। संहितापाठ के साथ पदपाठ देने से एवं उसके स्वरङ्कन से किसी लेख का कोई विवेचन सम्बन्धित नहीं है और न वह साधारण पाठक के लिए उपयोगी है। अभयदेव शर्मा का हिन्दी अनुवाद, **मक्षिकास्थाने मक्षिकापातः** प्रतीत होता है क्योंकि उसमें मूल मन्त्र के शब्दों को ही प्रकारान्तर से रख दिया गया है। अतः उससे अर्थबोध नगण्य है। इन लेखों पर यदि चर्चा हुई थी तो उसका उल्लेख करना भी आवश्यक था। डॉ. मनोहरलाल गुप्त, मनमोहनदयाल चतुर्वेदी तथा डॉ. सुदेश नारङ्ग ने इस वैदिक सूक्त के जिस विज्ञान की चर्चा अपने लेखों में की है, वह न केवल परस्पर भिन्न है अपितु वह (चर्चा) सम्पूर्ण सूक्त के साथ सङ्गति भी स्पष्ट नहीं करती। वेदार्थ करने की अनेक परम्पराएँ हैं। उनमें इस संकलन में स्वामी दयानन्द सरस्वती की दृष्टि की प्रधानता है।

पृथिवी सूक्त को सम्पूर्ण पृथिवी की वन्दना मानना अधिक उपयुक्त है। इसी अभिप्राय से यह वचन सार्थक है कि भूमि माँ है और मैं पृथ्वी का पूत्र हूँ - **माता भूमिः पुत्रोऽहं पृथिव्याः।** अतः इसे मात्र मातृभूमि की वन्दना में सीमित करना या राष्ट्रगीत मान लेना, जैसा कि डॉ. फतह सिंह के लेख का तथा सातवलेकर के अनुवाद का मन्तव्य है, उचित प्रतीत नहीं होता। पृथिवी को माता और पर्जन्य को पिता कहने का अभिप्राय डॉ. कृष्णलाल ने स्पष्ट किया है जो निश्चित ही विस्तारशील एवं सृजनशील प्रकृति की अवधारणा को व्यक्त करता है जिसे पृथ्वी के निर्वचनात्मक विवेचन द्वारा नरगिस वर्मा ने प्रतिपादित किया है। शरीर को पृथिवी का प्रतीक मानना एक दुरूह कल्पना है जिसका प्रतिपादन मनोहर विद्यालङ्कार ने किया है। रवीन्द्र नागर ने इस सूक्त के यज्ञीय सन्दर्भों का अधिक विश्वसनीय विवेचन किया है। ओझाजी द्वारा प्रतिपादित वैज्ञानिक रहस्य का अनुशीलन अवश्य अपेक्षित है।

वस्तुतः अथर्ववेद का पृथिवी सूक्त मनुष्य, प्रकृति और ब्रह्माण्ड, उसके पर्यावरण और परिवेश के आत्मीय अन्तःसम्बन्ध का आर्ष उद्बोधन है। त्रिलोकीनाथ धर, उर्मिला रस्तोगी और सुदेश नारङ्ग के लेख उस ओर दिशा-सङ्केत हैं। इसे विश्व का पर्यावरण-सम्बन्धी चिन्तन का पहला दस्तावेज कहा जाय तो अत्युक्ति न होगी। शान्तिपाठ के साथ और वेदों में अन्यत्र प्रकृति से सम्बन्धित अनेक सूक्तों और मन्त्रों के साथ इस अथर्ववेदीय सूक्त का गहन तुलनात्मक विवेचन अत्यन्त उपादेय होगा। यह ग्रन्थ उसका प्रथम सोपान है, अतः स्वागतयोग्य है।

(राजस्थान पत्रिका, २ मई, १९९३ में सुदेश नारंग द्वारा सम्पादित पुस्तक 'पर्यावरण का पहला दस्तावेज: अथर्ववेदीय पृथिवी सूक्त' (परिधि प्रकाशन दिल्ली) की समीक्षा)



5. विचारक्रान्ति का संघर्षमय युग : उपनिषद् काल

भारतीय विचारधारा के इतिहास में सबसे महत्त्वपूर्ण घटना ब्राह्मण-युग से उपनिषद् में संक्रमण है। वैदिक सूक्तों में विश्वकर्मा, हिरण्यगर्भ, बृहस्पति तथा पुरुष की धारणा उपनिषदों के आत्मतत्त्व तथा ब्रह्म से इस अर्थ में नितान्त भिन्न थी कि वे सभी सृष्टि से अलग रहकर उसके स्रष्टा और नियन्ता थे। उपनिषदों ने जिस आत्मा का विवेचन किया वह आन्तर तत्त्व है। समग्र सृष्टि में चराचर में ओत-प्रोत जिससे न कुछ मांगना है न जिसे कर्मकाण्ड से, अर्थलाभ या स्वार्थसिद्धि के लिये प्रार्थनाओं से प्रसन्न किया जा सकता है। वस्तुवादी दृष्टि के विपरीत यह आत्मवादी दृष्टि भारतीय चिन्तन के क्षेत्र में महान् क्रान्ति थी। इस क्रान्ति के सूत्रधार ब्राह्मण ही नहीं अपितु क्षत्रिय और महिलाएँ भी थीं जैसाकि

बालाकि, गार्ग्य एवं अजातशत्रु, श्वेतकेतु एवं अश्वपति कैकेय को कथाओं तथा गार्गी, मैत्रेयी, जबाला आदि के वैचारिक योगदान से प्रतीत होता है।

ईशावास्योपनिषद् उन ग्यारह प्रमुख उपनिषदों में शामिल है जिनकी रचना भगवान् बुद्ध के आविर्भाव से पूर्व हो चुकी थी तथा जिनपर आचार्य शङ्कर ने अपना भाष्य लिखा है। इसमें कुल १८ मन्त्र हैं। शुक्ल यजुर्वेद की काण्व शाखा का ४०वाँ अध्याय ही ईशावास्योपनिषद् है। इसका प्रारम्भ 'ईशावास्यं' से होता है उसी के आधार पर इसके दो नाम 'ईशोपनिषद्' तथा 'ईशावास्योपनिषद्' प्रचलित हैं। इस उपनिषद् का प्रथम मन्त्र सुप्रसिद्ध है। इसमें ईश्वर के संपूर्ण चराचर जाति में व्याप्त होने की चर्चा है, त्याग का उपदेश है तथा अर्थ-लोभ के परित्याग की प्रेरणा है-

**ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वं यत् किञ्च जगत्यां जगत्।
तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जीथाः मा गृधः कस्यस्विद्धनम्॥**

प्रथम मन्त्र की भाँति द्वितीय मन्त्र भी अत्यन्त प्रसिद्ध एवं उद्धरणीय है। इसमें मनुष्य के शतायु होने की स्वीकृति के साथ उसे निरन्तर कर्म में लगे रहने की प्रेरणा दी गई है तथा यह आश्वासन दिया गया है कि कर्मयोगी कभी-भी कर्म से बंधता नहीं है-

**कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः।
एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरे॥**

दो मन्त्रों में ज्ञान एवं कर्म का, प्रवृत्ति एवं निवृत्ति का किंवा संन्यास एवं गृहस्थ के धर्मों में समन्वय का सूत्र पिरोया हुआ है। भारतीय संस्कृति केवल ज्ञानमूलक या संन्यासमूलक ही नहीं है अपितु उसकी आस्था कर्म में भी समान रूप से है। इसीलिये उसने चरैवेति, चरैवेति के द्वारा निरन्तर गतिशीलता का उपदेश दिया था। जिजीविषा की सार्थकता के लिये ही यह वैदिक प्रार्थना की गई थी कि हम जीवेम शरदः शतं, शृणुयाम शरदः शतं, अदीना स्याम शरदः शतं। उपनिषदों के इस कर्मयोग को भूलने के कारण ही हम दीनता एवं दरिद्रता के शिकार हुए हैं। जिनकी जिजीविषा समाप्त हो जाती है, जो कर्म के श्रेयस्कर मार्ग से हट जाते हैं वे आत्मघाती हैं उनका इहलोक भी बिगड़ जाता है और मरने के बाद उस असुर लोक में जाना पड़ता है जो गहरे अन्धकार में डूबा हुआ है। तृतीय मन्त्र का यही तात्पर्य है।

चौथे एवं पाँचवे मन्त्र में उस तत्त्व का प्रतिपादन है जो अचल है पर मन से भी अधिक गतिमान है जो देवताओं अथवा इन्द्रियों से अप्राप्य है; वह दौड़कर सभी को लांघ जाता है और वायु उसी में जल भरता है अर्थात् वह सभी कर्मों का आश्रय है। वह

स्पन्दनशील है साथ ही स्पन्दशून्य है, वह दूर भी है और पास भी, वह सभी के भीतर है और सभी के बाहर भी। परम सत्य के निर्वचन में भाषाई असामर्थ्य के कारण विरोध दीख पड़ना अत्यन्त स्वाभाविक है। जो सर्वात्मक या विश्वमय होकर भी उससे परे है, सगुण होकर भी निर्गुण है उसके लिये विरोधी अभिव्यक्ति ही एकमात्र रास्ता है। प्रथम मन्त्र में ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वं की जो घोषणा की गई थी उसी का व्याख्यान तदन्तरस्य सर्वस्य तदु सर्वस्यास्य बाह्यतः में मिलता है।

संसार में आपसी वैर, घृणा या द्वेष का मूल कारण अपना-परायापन है। जो सभी प्राणियों को आत्मा में और आत्मा को सभी प्राणियों में देख सकता है उसे घृणा और द्वेष नहीं होगा। विराट् विश्व के विविध प्राणियों के साथ एकता और अपनेपन की भावना जिसे "आत्मैकत्वविज्ञान" कहा गया है, हो जाने पर मनुष्य को शोक अथवा मोह कदापि नहीं हो सकता। इस भावना या विज्ञान को अभिव्यक्त करने वाले ईशोपनिषद् के छठे तथा सातवें मन्त्र भी उल्लेखनीय हैं-

**यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मन्येवानुपश्यति।
सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते।।
यस्मिन्सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवाभूद् विजानतः।
तत्र को मोहः कः शोकः एकत्वमनुपश्यतः।।**

उपनिषद् का यह एकत्व-दर्शन वेदान्तदर्शन के अद्वैतवाद की आधारशिला है। आठवें मन्त्र में ईश्वर या आत्मा को कवि (क्रान्तदर्शी) मनीषी (सर्वज्ञ) परिभू (व्यापक) एवं स्वयंभू घोषित किया गया है जो सर्वत्र गतिमान्, दीप्तिमान्, अशरीर, पवित्र एवं पापों से अछूता है। वही यथार्थतः इस संसार का अनादि काल से निर्माता है:-

कविर्मनीषी परिभूः स्वयम्भूर्याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः।

आगे चलकर बड़ी रहस्यमय शैली में कहा गया है कि अविद्या की उपासना करने वाले घोर अन्धकार में पड़ते हैं तो विद्या में निरत लोग उससे भी बढ़कर अन्धकार में जा पड़ते हैं। यहाँ अविद्या का अभिप्राय कर्म या अज्ञान से है और विद्या का शास्त्रीय ज्ञान से जिसे अन्यत्र अपरा विद्या कहा गया है। जो धीर है वे सही कहते हैं कि सत्य विद्या एवं अविद्या की लौकिक कोटियों से परे हैं। पर जो इन दोनों कोटियों की शक्ति और सीमा को पहचान लेता है वह अविद्या से मृत्यु को तैर लेता है और विद्या से अमृतत्व प्राप्त कर लेता है। विवेकी व्यक्ति कांटे से कांटा निकालना और ज्ञान से विवेक की उपलब्धि करना जानता है। तीन मन्त्रों में विद्या एवं अविद्या की चर्चा के बाद आगे तीन मन्त्रों में लगभग उसी लहजे में असंभूति (अव्यक्त प्रकृति अथवा अविद्या) तथा संभूति (कार्य ब्रह्म) की

चर्चा कर निष्कर्षतः यही माना गया है कि ईश्वर संभूति और असंभूति, संभव और असंभव दोनों से परे है जैसे कि वह विद्या और अविद्या दोनों से भिन्न बताया गया था।

सत्य का साधक सत्यधर्मा व्यक्ति उस सत्य का साक्षात्कार क्यों नहीं कर पाता? क्योंकि उसका मुख सुवर्णमय पात्र से ढँका हुआ है, उसे हटाने के लिये पूषा (ब्रह्माण्डपोषक सूर्यदेवता) की प्रार्थना ऋषि करता है-

हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्यापिहितं मुखम्।
तत्त्वं पूषन्नपावृणु सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये॥

१६वें मन्त्र में ऋषि यम, सूर्य, प्रजापति के साथ तदात्मा पूषा के कल्याणतम रूप के दर्शन की घोषणा करता है, देखता है- तथा अन्त में घोषणा करता है कि सूर्यमण्डल में विद्यमान पुरुष मैं ही हूँ- योऽसावसौ पुरुष सोऽहमस्मि। सोऽहमस्मि की चेतना विराट् पुरुष के साथ मनुष्य के तादात्म्य का शंखनाद है। इसके पूर्व वैदिक सूक्तों में सूर्य, पूषन्, यम, प्रजापति की प्रार्थना की जाती थी- उन्हें अपने से भिन्न मानकर, पर उपनिषद् के ऋषि ने वैचारिक क्रान्ति के मध्य कहा- सोऽहमस्मि।

मनुष्य की लघिमा को विराट् की गरिमा प्रदान करना- ईश्वर की व्यापकता से चर्चा, शाश्वत सोऽहमस्मि में उसे समाप्त करना मानवता का जयघोष है।

ईशोपनिषद् के अन्तिम मन्त्र में ऋषि सर्व-कर्मज्ञ अग्नि से प्रार्थना करता है कि वह सुमार्ग से कल्याण धन की ओर ले जाए ताकि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि विवेकभ्रष्ट होकर मनुष्य कुमार्ग पर चला जाए और इस प्रार्थना के साथ बारम्बार नमस्कार करता है-

अग्ने नय सुपथा राये अस्मान् विश्वानि देव वयुनानि विद्वान्।
युयोध्यस्मज्जुहुराणमेनो भूयिष्ठां ते नम उक्तिं विधेम॥

(हस्तलिखित, आकाशवाणी उदयपुर, वार्ता, २२ जनवरी, १९८१)



6. श्रीमद्भगवद्गीता

क्लासिक ग्रन्थ की प्रमुख विशेषता उसकी शब्द-शक्ति है जो अपने समय और सन्दर्भ को पार कर हर युग और सन्दर्भ को संबोधित करती है। हर व्यक्ति को लगता है कि उसके प्रश्न का समाधान उस ग्रन्थ में दिया हुआ है। गीता के बारे में यह विशेषरूप से चरितार्थ है। परमाणु के विस्फोट के समय वैज्ञानिक ने गीता में इसके स्वरूप का साक्षात्कार

किया-एक विराट् अनन्त का। जब डॉग हैमरशोल्ड अत्यन्त दुस्तर कार्य के लिए शुद्ध कर्तव्यबुद्धि के कारण संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के महामंत्री के रूप में वायुयान से जा रहे थे, तो उन्हें गीता का वह अमृतवाक्य याद आया-कर्मण्येवाधिकारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन (गीता-चयनिका, ९)।

भारत ने जब स्वातन्त्र्य संघर्ष लड़ा तो तिलक, गांधी ने गीता का सहारा लिया। उसकी नयी व्याख्या प्रस्तुत की। सुभाषचन्द्र बोस और जवाहर लाल नेहरू जैसे सेनानियों को उसने अजस्र प्रेरणा दी। यही नहीं, स्वतन्त्रता पा लेने के बाद जब राष्ट्र के आर्थिक उत्थान का प्रश्न उठा तो उसका समाधान विनोबा ने गीता की व्याख्या करके दिया। मुझे जब कोई विद्यार्थी पूछता है कि अध्ययन-अनुसन्धान में मन निरन्तर कैसे लगाऊँ, तो उत्तर देता हूँ- अभ्यासेन तु कौन्तेय वैराग्येण च गृह्यते (गीता-चयनिका, ९०)। यानि कि चाहे प्रश्न मेरा हो, समाज का हो, विश्व का हो गीता में चिन्तन का कोई ऐसा सूत्र मिल जाता है जो मार्ग-दर्शक बन जाता है। पर यह कतई आवश्यक नहीं कि जो श्लोक मेरा मार्ग-दर्शक है, मेरे प्रश्न का समाधान है, वही आपका भी हो। इसलिए हर व्यक्ति को अपनी गीता चुननी होती है। जैसे कि दर्शन के सम्प्रदाय अनेक हैं पर हर व्यक्ति को अपना जीवन-दर्शन संघटित करता पड़ता है। उसी प्रकार जो गीता में अपना श्लोक और अपना अर्थ खोजेगा उसे अवश्य मिलेगा। जीवन में हर्ष-विषाद सभी को होते हैं और हर व्यक्ति को अर्जुन की भाँति समस्याओं के चौराहे पर आकुल मन से अपने-अपने प्रश्न पूछने पड़ते हैं। दूसरों का सहारा लीजिए, बाहर मित्र खोजिये और शत्रु खोजिये या बनाइये- पर यह सब आपके जीवन को चौराहे से हटा कर रास्ता प्रशस्त कर देंगे, यह कहना कठिन है। और तब मुझे गीता का श्लोक बहुत अच्छा समाधान लगता है-

उद्धरेदात्मनात्मानं नात्मानमवसादयेत्।

आत्मैव ह्यात्मनो बन्धुरात्मैव रिपुरात्मनः॥ (गीता-चयनिका, ६७)

आप अपने सबसे बड़े मित्र और सबसे बड़े दुश्मन हैं- यह जानने के बाद शेष सब अच्छे लगते हैं और मन आत्मनिरीक्षण में लग जाता है, फिर विषाद के लिए गुंजाइश ही नहीं। उद्धरेदात्मनात्मानं आज के कई रोगों की अच्छी औषधि लगती है। पर हर व्यक्ति को इसे अपना अर्थ देना होगा, स्वयं औषधि के रूप में अपनाना होगा, तभी इसकी सार्थकता पहचानी जायेगी।

डॉ. कमलचन्द सोगाणी, प्रोफेसर, दर्शन-विभाग, सुखाड़िया विश्वविद्यालय, उदयपुर, विगत कई वर्षों से क्लासिक कृतियों के नवनीत को सामान्य प्रबुद्ध व्यक्तियों के पठनार्थ प्रस्तुत कर रहे हैं। गीता-चयनिका गीता के अत्यन्त उत्कृष्ट एवं सारभूत श्लोकों का

सानुवाद एवं व्याकरणिक विश्लेषण के साथ उपस्थापन है। प्रत्येक चयन चयनकार की दृष्टि का परिणाम होता है। महाभारत के आलोचनात्मक संस्करण को आधार बनाकर गीता का जो सर्वधर्म-दर्शन ग्राह्य स्वरूप है, उसे डॉ. सोगाणी ने अपने चयन का आधार बनाया है। गीता की साम्प्रदायिक, शैव-वैष्णव मतावलम्बी व्याख्याएँ अनेक हैं, किन्तु साम्प्रदायिक परम्परा से अतीत रहकर उसका जो सर्वजनग्राह्य स्वरूप है, वह आध्यात्मिक चेतना की विश्ववन्द्य आधार-शिला है। यह आध्यात्मिक चेतना तथा उसका सामाजिक-वैयक्तिक व्यवहार में उपयोग विरोधी कोटियाँ नहीं हैं। अतः व्यावहारिक तथा आत्मचिन्तन-प्रवण साधक दोनों ही इस चयनिका से लाभ उठा सकते हैं। अनुवाद सरल, सुबोध तथा विश्वसनीय है, शास्त्रीय उलझाव अथवा साम्प्रदायिक अर्थबोध से यह आक्रान्त नहीं है। व्याकरणिक विश्लेषण उपयोगी है।

मेरी यह इच्छा है कि डॉ. सोगाणी विश्रान्ति के क्षणों में स्वयं द्वारा तैयार की हुई चयनिकाओं के लिए भारत की क्लासिकी में रुचि रखनेवालों की कक्षाएँ लगायें। मुझे विश्वास है कि इस प्रकार जो व्यक्ति किसी कारण भारत की संस्कृति-सम्पदा से बेखबर रहे हैं और आज जिनमें उसे जानने की ललक पैदा हुई है वे उनके चयनिका ग्रन्थों से बहुत लाभान्वित होंगे और यह देश भी अपनी नैतिक, आध्यात्मिक संपदा को पहिचानना प्रारम्भ कर सकेगा। इसी में व्यक्ति, समाज और राष्ट्र का अभ्युदय और निःश्रेयस सन्निहित है।

पाठक से भी मेरा एक निवेदन है। गीता के प्रत्येक श्लोक में तात्पर्य की अनन्तता निहित है। यह निस्सीमता प्रत्येक व्यक्ति अपना अर्थ खोजकर पा सकता है। गीता को नया अर्थ शास्त्रज्ञ पण्डित नहीं, अपितु सामान्य जन देता है। ऐसा अर्थ ही समाज को नया मार्ग तथा नया दिशा-बोध प्रदान करता है। डॉ. सोगाणी के हम सभी संस्कृतज्ञ ऋणी हैं जिन्होंने गीता की अमृतोपम वाणी को बुधजनहिताय, बहुजनसुखाय सुलभ बनाया है। उनका शेष जीवन समाज के लिए समर्पित इसी प्रकार की सारस्वत साधना में लगा रहे-यही हमारी प्रार्थना है।

(पुस्तक का विवरण: गीता-चयनिका, संपादक- डॉ. कमलचन्द सोगाणी, प्रोफेसर, दर्शन-विभाग, मोहनलाल सुखाड़िया विश्वविद्यालय, उदयपुर (राजस्थान), प्रकाशक-प्राकृत भारती अकादमी, जयपुर, प्रथम संस्करण-मार्च, १९८८, सम्मति-पृ. संख्या-xi, xii, xiii)



7. पुराणों में वर्णित तत्कालीन इतिहास और समाज

पुराण का अर्थ है पुराना अर्थात् प्राचीन आख्यान। इसका एक और अर्थ है पुराना और नया- पुरा च नवं। महाभारत और पुराण को पाँचवाँ वेद कहा गया है। दैनिक जीवन में पुराण का कितना महत्त्व आज भी है यह प्रत्येक धार्मिक कृत्य में श्रुति-स्मृतिपुराणोक्त के संकल्प से स्पष्ट होता है। पुराणों की रचना विभिन्न ५-६ शताब्दियों तक होती रही। प्रमुख, पुराणों में समुद्रगुप्त प्रथम के २१ दिग्विजय के निर्वैर ज्ञान से यह मानना उचित होगा कि उनमें उपलब्ध ऐतिहासिक विवरण ३३५ई. पूर्व का है।

जिन विद्वानों ने पुराणों की ऐतिहासिक, राजनीतिक व सांस्कृतिक सामग्री का अन्वेषण किया है उनमें पार्जिटर विन्सेट स्मिथ, डी आर भण्डारकर, के.पी. जायसवाल, एच.सी. राय चौधरी, वी रंगाचार्य, डी. आर. मनकड, ई.जे. रैप्सन, पी.एस.भार्गव का नाम विशेषरूप से उल्लेखनीय है। इनके विपरीत कुछ विद्वानों की धारणा है कि पौराणिक इतिहास अविश्वसनीय तथा भ्रामक है। दूसरे विश्वसनीय स्रोतों से तुलना तथा प्रामाणीकरण के बगैर पौराणिक इतिहास का उपयोग निरर्थक है। वस्तुतः पुराणों ने अपनी विशिष्ट शैली में भारत के प्राचीन इतिहास एवं संस्कृति को सुरक्षित रखा है। समझ के साथ उसकी सामग्री का अनुशीलन करने पर हम निश्चित ही प्राचीन भारतीय इतिहास के लुप्त पृष्ठों को, उसके सामाजिक एवं सांस्कृतिक स्पन्दन को पा सकते हैं। प्राचीनतम पुराणों ब्रह्म, वायु, ब्रह्माण्ड एवं मत्स्य में तथा प्राचीनतर विष्णुपुराण में वंश एवं वंशानुचरित भागवत, गरुड़, अग्नि, पद्म, लिंग, कूर्म तथा मार्कण्डेय पुराणों की अपेक्षा अधिक है पर परवर्ती नारद, ब्रह्मवैवर्त, वराह, वामन तथा स्कन्द पुराणों में इतिहास शून्यप्राय है। भारतवंशीय राजा अधिशीमकृष्ण तक के राजवंशों का वर्णन पुराणों में भूतकाल में है तथा उनके बाद के राजाओं का इतिहास भविष्य के प्रयोग द्वारा किया जो कि प्रो भार्गव के अनुसार इस बात का प्रमाण है कि प्राचीन पुराणों का कृत्रिम स्वरूप महाभारत युद्ध के पाँच वंशों के बाद निश्चित हो चुका था। इसलिये इसके बाद के राजाओं के वर्णन में भविष्यत्काल का प्रयोग हुआ है।

पुराणों के वंश-वर्णन के अनुसार विवस्वान् सूर्य के पुत्र वैवस्वत मनु के नौ पुत्रों में से चार इक्ष्वाकु, नाभानेदिष्ठ, शर्यान्त तथा नाभाग अधिक प्रतापी थे। इक्ष्वाकु, अयोध्या में राज्य करते थे, इनके दो पुत्र विकुक्षिशशाद और निमि थे जिनसे अयोध्या तथा विदेह के वंश चले। इसी ऐक्ष्वाकु सूर्य वंश में आगे चलकर दशरथ पुत्र राम हुए थे। नाभानेदिष्ठ वैशाली के राजा थे। उन्होंने वैशात्य वंश की स्थापना की। शर्याति आवर्त अर्थात् गुजरात का

राजा था जिससे शार्यात वंश चला। नाभाग के वंश में उत्पन्न रथीतर से राथीतर वंश चला। वैवस मनु के उपर्युक्त चार पुत्रों के अतिरिक्त एक पुत्री थी। कुछ पुराणों के अनुसार वह पुत्र इल था जो लड़की बन गया था। इला का विवाह सोम पुत्र बुध से हुआ, इन्हीं से पुरुरवा ऐल उत्पन्न हुआ जिससे प्रतिष्ठान (प्रयाग) के चन्द्र या ऐलवंश की स्थापना हुई। पुरुरवा के पुत्रों में से आयु प्रतिष्ठान में ही राज्य करता रहा और उसके भाई अमावसु ने कान्यकुब्ज में अपने राजवंश की प्रतिष्ठा की। आयु के नहुष क्षत्रवृद्ध या वृद्धशर्मा, रम्भ, रजि और अनेन नामक पुत्रों में से क्षत्रवृद्ध ने काशीराज्य की स्थापना की। नहुषपुत्र ययाति के पाँच पुत्रों ने अनेक राजवंशों का प्रवर्तन किया जिनमें हैहय, यादव जिसमें (कृष्ण पैदा हुए) तुर्वसु, द्रुह्यु, आनव तथा पौरव (जिसमें पाण्डव पैदा हुए) उल्लेखनीय हैं। इन विभिन्न राजवंशों का वर्णन राजाओं एवं महापुरुषों के चरित का निरूपण ही पुराणों में उपलब्ध इतिहास है जो महाभारत के युद्ध के लगभग २००० वर्ष पूर्वतक का है। महाभारत युग के बाद केवल ऐश्वकाकु, पौरव तथा मागध राजवंशों के राजाओं का ही उल्लेख है जो अधिसोमकृष्ण नामक राजा के उल्लेख तक समाप्त हो जाता है। शेष राजवंशों का अत्यन्त अपूर्ण वर्णन ही यत्र-तत्र उपलब्ध होता है।

अधिसोमकृष्ण के बाद कलियुग के जिन राजाओं का भविष्यकाल में भविष्यवाणी के रूप में वायु, ब्रह्माण्ड, विष्णु, मत्स्य तथा भागवत पुराणों में उल्लेख है उनमें शिशुनाग नन्द, मौर्य, शुंग, काण्व, आध्र एवं गुप्त वंश के इतिहास-प्रसिद्ध राज्य सम्मिलित हैं। इन राजवंशों के पूर्वजों के उल्लेख के साथ ही निम्नवर्गीय बर्बर राजवंशों जैसे कि आभीर, गर्दमिल, शक, यवन, तुसर, हूण का भी उल्लेख हमें प्राप्त होता है। राजाओं एवं राजवंशों के वर्णन के साथ-साथ पुराण उत्तर भारत में तत्कालीन सामाजिक अवस्था का भी चित्रण करते हैं। पार्जितर ने वायु, ब्रह्माण्ड, विष्णु, मत्स्य तथा भागवत पुराणों में उपलब्ध सामग्री का आलोचनात्मक अध्ययन कर उनके ऐतिहासिक महत्त्व का प्रतिपादन किया है। राजवंश के पौराणिक उल्लेखों में एक दो गलतियाँ भी हैं जिनका इतिहास से विरोध स्पष्ट है। जैसे कि कोसलराज प्रसेनजित् के पूर्ववर्ती के रूप में शाक्य, शुद्धोदन, सिद्धार्थ तथा राहुल का उल्लेख या बिम्बिसार और उसके उत्तराधिकारियों को शिशुनाग तथा काकवर्ण का वंशज बतलाना। भौगोलिक विवरण में भी यत्र-तत्र गड़बड़ी देखने को मिलती है। उदाहरण के लिये पुराणों में पुरुरवा और उनके वंशजों ययाति आदि को प्रतिष्ठान (प्रयाग) का नरेश बताया गया है जबकि महाभारत में ययाति को सरस्वती प्रदेश का घोषित किया गया है। ऋषियों का उल्लेख भी वैदिक परम्परा से भिन्न है। पुराणों में दक्ष मारीचि आदि ऋषियों को ब्राह्मण कुल का पूर्वपुरुष ही नहीं सृष्टि का प्रजापति भी माना गया है। अधिसोमकृष्ण से

पूर्ववर्ती राजवंशों का जो पौराणिक वृत्तान्त महाभारत से मेल नहीं खाता उसके सम्बन्ध में यह भी कहा जा सकता है कि पुराणों में प्राचीन भारत की स्वतन्त्र ऐतिहासिक वंशावली सुरक्षित हो।

राजाओं एवं ऋषियों के अभिलेख के साथ के कारण पुराणों का तत्कालीन इतिहास की दृष्टि से ही महत्त्व नहीं है अपितु अपने समय के समाज के प्रतिबिम्ब की दृष्टि से भी पुराण-साहित्य अत्यन्त महत्त्वपूर्ण सन्दर्भ-ग्रन्थ हैं। धर्मसूत्रों तथा धर्मशास्त्रों में चित्रित समाज ब्राह्मण वर्ग की आदर्श कल्पना से हमें अवश्य परिचित कराता है किन्तु वह समाज के सामान्य वर्ग की व्यवस्था, स्थिति या वास्तविकता का बोध नहीं दे पाता। अतएव पुराणों में उपलब्ध आनुषंगिक सामग्री प्राचीन भारत के समाज का विकास जानने के लिये बहुत महत्त्वपूर्ण है।

ईसा-जन्म के पहले और बाद की कुछ शताब्दियों के उस जीवन्त हिन्दू समाज का चित्र पुराणों में सुरक्षित है जो अपनी जीवट और पाचनशक्ति की परिस्थितियों के अनुरूप अपने स्वरूप में परिवर्तन करता रहा। परिणामतः उसने भारत के विभिन्न भागों में फैले कबीलों को और अनगिनत आक्रामक जातियों को अपने में सम्मिलित कर भारतीय समाज को सांस्कृतिक एकता प्रदान की। ज्ञान, कर्म तथा भक्ति के सिद्धान्तों में समन्वय स्थापित करने का, वैदिक तथा अवैदिक विचारधाराओं में सामंजस्य के सूत्र पिरोने का श्रेय पुराणों को ही है। नितान्त अनपढ़ साधारण भारतीय को भी धर्म, दर्शन, ज्ञान विज्ञान से सहज परिचय स्थापित कराने का भी श्रेय पुराणों को ही है। जाति-प्रथा की जकड़न से भारतीय समाज को मुक्त करने में स्त्री, शूद्र, चाण्डाल को धर्म के क्षेत्र में प्रवेश और स्वतन्त्रता दिलाने में पुराणों ने महत्त्वपूर्ण भूमिका निभाई है। वस्तुतः प्राचीन भारतीय समाज में पुराणों का इतना महत्त्व बढ़ गया था कि विज्ञानभिक्षु, रामानुज, मध्व, वल्लभ, जीवगोस्वामी जैसे प्रखर चिन्तक तथा समाजसुधारक अपने मत की पुष्टि में वेदों की अपेक्षा पुराणों का कहीं अधिक उल्लेख करते हैं। भास्कर राय जैसे आचार्य पुराण को श्रुति के समान ही प्रामाणिक मानते हैं। भक्ति की जिस पावन धारा ने भारतीय समाज को राष्ट्रीय एकता का सांस्कृतिक गीत आदि के क्षेत्रों में समृद्धि एवं मानवीय चेतना की मुक्ति प्रदान की है उसे प्रवाहित करने का श्रेय पुराणों को है। परवर्ती सन्त-धारा उन्हीं से उद्भूत है। आज का सामान्य भारतीय वैदिक तथा धर्मशास्त्रीय आदर्शों की अपेक्षा पुराणों में वर्णित धार्मिक भावना, सामाजिक संस्कार तथा सांस्कृतिक परिकल्पनाओं से अनुप्राणित है।

(हस्तलिखित, आकाशवाणी उदयपुर, वार्ता, २९.०१.१९८३)



8. ब्रह्मपुराण : आर्य संस्कृति का विश्वकोष

परम्परा के अनुसार अट्टारह महापुराण या पुराण हैं। उतने ही उपपुराण हैं। महाभारत, मत्स्य, कूर्म तथा हरिवंश आदि में प्राप्त पुराण-सूची में ब्रह्मपुराण का सर्वप्रथम उल्लेख आता है। किन्तु आज जो ब्रह्मपुराण हमें मिलता है वह अधिक प्राचीन नहीं है। विद्वानों की धारणा है कि वर्तमान ब्रह्मपुराण की रचना ९००-१२०० ई. की है। इसके अध्यायों की संघटना भी महाभारत, हरिवंश तथा विष्णु, मार्कण्डेय एवं वायुपुराणों से की गई है। इसमें उड़ीसा के पुरुषोत्तम क्षेत्र (पुरी), कोणादित्य (कोणार्क) एकाग्रक्षेत्र (मुक्तेश्वर), विरजाक्षेत्र (जाजपुर) का विशिष्ट उल्लेख है तथा ओण्ड्र या उत्कल के ब्राह्मणों की पूज्यता का प्रतिपादन है। वैष्णव, सौर, शैव तथा शाक्तों के इन पुण्य तीर्थों का समावेश परवर्ती काल का प्रक्षेप है। इसीलिये यह मान्यता है कि ब्रह्मपुराण का वर्तमान स्वरूप १२वीं शताब्दी ईसवी तक स्थिर हो गया था।

वेद, वेदाङ्ग एवं उपनिषदों का विद्वान् यदि पुराण को नहीं जानता तो विचक्षण या तत्त्वद्रष्टा नहीं माना जा सकता-

यो विद्याच्चतुरो वेदान् साङ्गोपनिषदो द्विजः।
न चेत् पुराणं संविद्यान्नैव स स्याद् विचक्षणः।।

वेद का उपबृंहण इतिहास तथा पुराण से करना चाहिए। जो व्यक्ति कम जानकार है उससे वेद को बहुत डर लगता है कि कहीं वह मुझ पर प्रहार न कर बैठे- अर्थात् अर्थ का अनर्थ न कर दे। इसीलिये पुराण को पञ्चम वेद कहा गया है। भास्कर राय ने उसके अर्थवाद वाक्यों की विधिवक्त्र की तरह प्रामाणिकता मानी है। साहित्यशास्त्री पुराण-वाक्य को मित्र की सलाह की तरह विचारणीय एवं अनुकरणीय मानते हैं।

प्राचीन भारत के पुराणैतिहास एवं राजवंश की जानकारी के लिये, पुराणकालीन सामाजिक अवस्थाओं एवं विभिन्न-जातीय विदेशियों के सामाजीकरण की प्रक्रिया को पहिचानने के लिये किया गया। भारतीय समाज के विकास की दिशा को समझने के लिये, पौराणिक भूगोल की कल्पना से परिचय के लिये ज्योतिष, नक्षत्र-विज्ञान, शकुन, अन्धविश्वास, आयुर्वेद, सर्पविद्या, सर्पविषधारणविद्या, राजधर्म, वार्ता, युद्ध-विज्ञान, धनुर्विद्या, अस्त्रशास्त्रादिविज्ञान, छन्द, व्याकरण, कोष, नाट्य, नृत्य अलंकारशास्त्र, वास्तुशास्त्र, देवप्रतिमा-निर्माण, रत्नपरीक्षा-गो, गज, अश्व, वृक्ष, वनस्पति आदि अनेक विषयों के प्राचीन ज्ञान से परिचय के लिये पुराण विश्वकोष हैं।

पुराणों ने लोकप्रचलित मत-मतान्तरों, धार्मिक मान्यताओं, लौकिक विश्वासों-आस्थाओं एवं देवी-देवताओं को स्वीकार कर उसका प्राचीन आर्य-धर्म या वैदिक धर्म से समन्वय स्थापित किया और इस प्रकार भारतीय समाज को धार्मिक तथा सांस्कृतिक एकता

प्रदान की। भक्ति की पावन धारा में द्विज के अतिरिक्त शूद्र, चाण्डाल, स्त्री आदि सभी को स्नान करने का अधिकार प्रदान किया। कर्म, ज्ञान तथा भक्ति में समन्वय स्थापित किया। आचार्य विज्ञानभिक्षु, रामानुज, मध्व, वल्लभ, जीवगोस्वामी आदि ने उपनिषदों से कहीं अधिक पुराणों का सहारा लिया तथा इनके द्वारा उस सन्त-परम्परा का संरक्षण एवं संवर्धन हुआ जो समूचे भारतीय जीवन का आज भी सांस्कृतिक आधार है।

पुराणों ने भारतवर्ष के प्रत्येक निसर्गरमणीय एवं महनीय भूभाग, नदी, नद, अरण्य, पर्वत आदि को धार्मिक महिमा से मण्डित कर उसे तीर्थ घोषित किया। व्रत, उपवास, देवपूजन, कीर्तन आदि का विधान बना कर आर्य धर्म को महाप्राण, जीवन्त और सुगम बनाया। पुराण-प्रतिपादित धर्म वैदिक कर्मकाण्ड की तरह जटिल तथा जातीय संकोच से ग्रस्त नहीं है। वह ब्रह्म की तरह अवाङ्मनोगोचर नहीं है। वह तो भारतभूमि में प्रतिष्ठित एवं जीवन्त है। इसीलिये आज भी सेतुबन्ध रामेश्वर का आर्यजन कैलास मानसरोवर की परिक्रमा के लिये, काशी में विश्वनाथ के दर्शन के लिये, सात पवित्र नदियों में स्नान के लिये, कामाख्या की पूजा के लिये, चतुर्धाम की यात्रा के लिये लालायित रहता है। पुराण भारत के चप्पे-चप्पे से प्यार और आदर की भावना करते हैं। पौराणिक धर्म केवल हिन्दुओं में धार्मिक एकता स्थापित नहीं करता अपितु भौगोलिक अखण्डता की अनुभूति भी जगाये रखता है। इसी धर्म एवं सांस्कृतिक भावना के परिपोष के लिये पुराणों में आख्यान-उपाख्यान, तीर्थ, संगम आदि का विशाल संग्रह है। इस प्रकार पुराण वैदिक धर्म के उपबृंहित स्वरूप, विभिन्न धार्मिक सम्प्रदायों एवं मत-मतान्तरों के विश्वकोष तो हैं ही साथ ही वे विश्वकोष की तरह निर्जीव सूचना केन्द्र न होकर समन्वय एवं सहिष्णुता के सच्चे प्रेरणास्तम्भ हैं।

ब्रह्मपुराण में २४५ अध्याय हैं। सृष्टि निरूपण से प्रारम्भ कर विभिन्न वंशों का वर्णन करते हुए उपाख्यान, चरित्र, उत्पत्ति-कथाओं के साथ तीर्थों का वर्णन है। अन्त में महाप्रलय-वर्णन के योग, सांख्य, क्षराक्षर विद्या-अविद्या जैसे विषयों की चर्चा के साथ पुराण समाप्त होता है। पर्वतों, गंगा आदि नदियों जम्बू द्वीप के अन्तर्गत जनपदवासियों की महिमा बताई गई है-

देवानामपि भो विप्राः सदैवैष मनोरथः।
भारतं भवमाप्स्यामो देवत्वात्प्रच्युताः क्षितौ।।
मानुष्यं कुरुते यत्तु तन्न शक्यं सुरासुरैः।
तत्कर्म निरतैस्तैस्तु तत्कर्मक्षपणोन्मुखैः।।
न भारतसमं वर्षं पृथिव्यामस्ति भो द्विजाः।
यत्र विप्रादयो वर्णाः प्राप्नुवन्त्यभिवाञ्छितम्।।
धन्यास्ते भारते वर्षे जायन्ते ये नरोत्तमाः।
धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाणां प्राप्नुवन्ति महाफलम्।।
...कः शक्नोति गुणान्वक्तुं भारतस्याखिलान्द्विजाः।। (अध्याय-२५)

विभिन्न देवों में समन्वय के साथ तान्त्रिक अंगन्यास ध्यातव्य है- ॐ विष्णवे नमः शिरः। ॐ ज्वलनाय नमः। ॐ विष्णवे नमः कवचम्। ॐ आं ललाटे र संकर्षणां मरुतान् वह्निस्तेज आदित्य इति।

विभिन्न देवों की स्तुति में पुराण की अत्यन्त साधारण भाषा मानी जाती है। अक्रूर द्वारा अच्युत की स्तुति में साहित्य का लाभ साम्प्रदायिक सहिष्णुता का भाव, वेदान्त की कल्पनाओं का स्वारस्य एक साथ मिलता है-

प्रसीद सर्वधर्मात्मन् क्षराक्षर महेश्वर।
ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवाद्याभिः कल्पनाभिरुदीरितः।।
अनाख्येयस्वरूपात्मन्ननाख्येयप्रयोजन।
अनाख्येयामिधान त्वां नतोऽस्मि परमेश्वरं।।
न यत्र नाथ विद्यन्ते नामजात्यादिकल्पनाः।
तद् ब्रह्म परमं नित्यमविकारी भवानजः।। (८४.५१-५३)

त्वं ब्रह्मा पशुपतिर्यमा विधाता त्वं धाताः। त्रिदश-पतिः समीरणोऽग्नि तोयेशो धनपतिरन्तकस्त्वमेको भिन्नात्मा जगदपि पाति स शक्तिभेदैः-

विश्वं भवान्पुजति हन्ति गभस्तिरूपो विश्वं च ते गुणमयो ऽयमजप्रपञ्चः।
रूपं परं सदितिवाचकमक्षरं यज् ज्ञानात्मने सदसते प्रणतोऽस्मि तस्मै।। (८४.५६-५७)

भारत की सुरम्य प्रकृति के वर्णन में भी भाषा मधुर एवं रमणीय हो जाती है। कोण का वर्णन सुनिए साथ ही विभिन्न पुष्पों एवं वृक्षों की पहिचान भी कीजिए- लवणस्योदधेस्तीरे पवित्रे सुमनोहरे। सर्वत्र वालुकाकीर्णे देशे सर्वगुणान्विते। चम्पकाशोकबकुलैः करवीरैः सपाटलैः। पुत्रागैः कर्णिकारैश्च बकुलैर्नागकेसरैः।। तगरैर्धवबाणैश्च अतिमुक्तैःसकुब्जकैः। मालतीकुन्दपुष्पैश्च तथान्यैर्मल्लिकादिभिः। केतकीवनखण्डैश्च सर्वर्तुकुसुमोज्ज्वलैः। कदम्बैर्लकुचैः शालैः पनसैः देवदारुभिः।। सरलैर्मुचुकुन्दैश्च चन्दनैश्च सितेतरैः अश्वत्थैः सप्तपर्णैश्च आम्रैराम्नातकैस्तथा। तालैः पूगफलैश्चैव नारिकेलैः कपित्थकैः। अन्यैश्च विविधैर्वृक्षैः सर्वतः समलंकृतम्।। क्षेत्रं तत्र रवेर्पुण्यमास्ते जगति विश्रुतं। समन्ताद्योजनं साग्रं भुक्तिमुक्तिप्रदायकम्। आस्ते तत्र स्वयं देवः सहस्रांशुर्दिवाकरः। कोणादित्य इति ख्यातो भुक्तिमुक्तिप्रदायकः।।

प्राचीन भारत के इतिहास, संस्कृति किंवा सर्वस्व को समझने के लिए पुराण अपरिहार्य विश्वकोष हैं। उनका संपादन, अध्ययन एवं अनुसंधान नवीन भारत के निर्माण का मार्गदर्शक होगा।

(हस्तलिखित, आकाशवाणी उदयपुर, वार्ता, २१.०१.१९८२)



9. यज्ञतत्त्वविमर्शः

वैदिकी संस्कृतिर्यज्ञमूला। यज्ञो वै विष्णुः (शतपथे, ४.३.४.३) एष वै प्रत्यक्षं यज्ञो यत्प्रजापतिः, स यः स यज्ञोऽसौ स आदित्यः (शतपथे, १४.१.४.६) इत्यादिभिः शतपथवाक्यैः अग्निर्वै देवानामवमो विष्णुः परमः (ऐतरेये, १.१), यज्ञो वै देवानां महः (तत्रैव, १.७.२.१), यज्ञेन वै देवाः (तत्रैव, १.५.१) इत्यादिभिर्ब्राह्मणवाक्यैर्यज्ञस्य परमेश्वररूपत्वं साक्षादाम्नातम्।

वस्तुतो यज्ञ एव प्रकृतिः कारणं वा सर्वस्य देवात्मभावस्य दीर्घायुषो, धनस्य पापनाशस्य पुण्यप्राप्तेः अपूर्वस्य, रोग-संकटादिपरिहारस्य, अमृतत्वस्य। किं बहुना अभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससिद्धेः। तत एव सर्वं जज्ञे-तस्माद्यज्ञात् सर्वहुतः संभृतं पृषदाज्यम्। पशून् तांश्चक्रे वायव्यानारण्यान् ग्राम्याश्च ये तस्माद्यज्ञात् सर्वहुत ऋचः सामानि जज्ञिरे छन्दांसि जज्ञिरे तस्माद्यज्ञुस्तस्मादजायत तस्मादश्वा अजायन्त ये के चोभयादतः। गावो हि जज्ञिरे तस्मात् तस्माज्जाता अजावयः (ऋक्, १०.९०.७-१०) अन्यत्रापि बहुत्र (तथाहि ऋग्वेदे, ४.२५.७.१.१, ४.३.९) यज्ञमाहात्म्यं श्रुतिषु प्रकटितम्। यज्ञो हि मूलं सर्वेषां श्रौतस्मार्तकर्मणामिति प्राधान्येन तत्तत्त्वप्रकाशनार्थमेव प्रवृत्तोऽयमारम्भः। लौकिकस्य सार्वभौमाभ्युदयस्य पारलौकिकस्य च निःश्रेयसस्य सिद्धिस्थानं यज्ञ एव। स एव हि सर्वान् कामान् दोग्धि लौकिकान् पारलौकिकांश्च। दृष्टाद्दृष्टोभयविधफल-प्राप्त्यर्थं च स एवानुष्ठेयः। अत एव श्रूयते यज्ञो वै श्रेष्ठतमं कर्म (शतपथे, १.७.१.५)।

अग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात् स्वर्गकामः, दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां स्वर्गकामो यजेत, ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्गकामो यजेत इत्यादीनि श्रुतिवाक्यानि मन्त्राणां नैरुक्त्यं विनियोगं प्रयोजनं प्रतिष्ठानं विधिं च व्यवस्थापयन्ति ब्राह्मणानि (तथाहि-नैरुक्त्यं यस्य मन्त्रस्य विनियोगः प्रयोजनम्। प्रतिष्ठानं विधिश्चैव ब्राह्मणं तदिहोच्यते)। वेदा हि यज्ञार्थमभिप्रवृत्ता इति वेदाङ्गज्योतिषोक्तिः, सायणादिभाष्यपरम्परा, निरवच्छिन्ना श्रौतकर्मानुष्ठानप्रवृत्तिश्च श्रुतिमन्त्राणां श्रौतकर्मभिः सह साक्षात् सम्बन्धं निर्दिशन्ति। गीतास्मृतिरपि यज्ञस्य सर्वातिशायि महत्त्वं सावष्टम्भं प्रतिपादयति। तथाहि-

यज्ञार्थात्कर्मणोऽन्यत्र लोकोऽयं कर्मबन्धनः।
तदर्थं कर्म कौन्तेय मुक्तसङ्गः समाचर।।
सहयज्ञाः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा पुरोवाच प्रजापतिः।
अनेन प्रसविष्यध्वमेष वोऽस्त्विष्टकामधुक्।।
देवान्भावयताऽनेन ते देवा भावयन्तु वः।
परस्परं भावयन्तः श्रेयः परमवाप्स्यथ।।

इष्टान्भोगान्हि वो देवा दास्यन्ते यज्ञभाविताः।
 तैर्दत्तानप्रदायेभ्यो यो भुङ्क्ते स्तेन एव सः॥
 यज्ञशिष्टाशिनः सन्तो मुच्यन्ते सर्वकिल्बिषैः।
 भुञ्जते ते त्वघं पापा ये पचन्त्यात्मकारणात्॥
 अन्नाद्भवन्ति भूतानि पर्जन्यादन्नसम्भवः।
 यज्ञाद्भवन्ति पर्जन्यो यज्ञः कर्मसमुद्भवः ॥ (गीतासु, ३.१०-१४)

पर्यन्ते च गीयते तस्मात् सर्वगतं ब्रह्म नित्यं यज्ञे प्रतिष्ठितम् (३.१५)।
 ऋग्वेदस्थोपक्रमो यज्ञदेवस्य पुरोहितस्य प्राचीनैर्नूतनैश्च सर्वैरीड्यस्य, पितुरिवाग्नेः स्तुतिपूर्वकं
 भवति- अग्निमीडे पुरोहितं यज्ञस्य देवमृत्विजम्। होतारं रत्नधातमम्। अन्यत्र च
 सूक्तेषु (तथाहि, १.३१; १.६५; ४.१२; ५.११; ६.६; ७.९) अग्निद्वारा यज्ञमहिमा प्रकाशयते।
 तथा हि-

यज्ञायज्ञा वो अग्नये गिरागिरा च दक्षसे।
 प्र प्र वयममृतं जातवेदसं प्रियं मित्रं न शंसिषम्॥ (ऋग्वेद, ६.४८.१)

इत्यत्राग्नेः प्रियमित्रत्वाम्नातम् -

विश्वासां गृहपतिर्विशामसि त्वमग्ने मानुषीणाम्।
 शतं पूर्भिर्यविष्ठ पाह्यंहसः समेद्धारं शतं हिमाः॥
 ... स्तोतृभ्यो ये च ददति। (६.४८.८)

इत्यत्राग्नेः सर्वप्रजानां गृहपतित्वमाविष्कृतम्। तस्यैव च यज्ञानां राजत्वं धर्मस्य
 रक्षकत्वं चाम्नातम्। राजन्तमध्वराणां गोपामृतस्य दीदिवम्। वर्धमानं स्वे दमे (ऋग्वेदे,
 १.१.८)।

भारोपीय (इन्डो-यूरोपियन) - भाषापरिवारस्य ग्रीक-लेटिन कैल्टिक-ट्यूटानिक
 स्लेवानिक-लिथुआनियन- भाषाणां वैदिकसंस्कृतेन सह साम्यं तद्भाषाभाषिणां प्रत्नानामार्याणां
 धार्मिकं साम्यमपि परिचाययति। देवशब्दो द्योतनार्थं यथा संस्कृते सुप्रसिद्धस्तथैवान्यास्वपि
 भारोपीयभाषासु। तथाहि- थेओस (ग्रीक), दे उस, दे इवस दियेवस (लेटिन), दिया
 (आइरीश) तिवर (नार्स भाषासु)। एतेषां सर्वेषां शब्दानां प्रकाशनं द्योतनञ्चार्थः सर्वत्र
 प्राप्यते। संस्कृतस्य अग्निशब्दः इग्निस (लैटिन), अग्निस (लिथुआनियन), ओग्निस इति
 रूपैः (प्राचीन स्लेबभाषासु) प्राप्यते। यथा वैदिकधर्मे अग्निः पूजास्थानं तथैव रोमन-ग्रीक-
 धर्मेष्वपि। लिथुआनिया जातीया; अग्निं 'उग्निस् स्तेवेन्ता (पवित्राग्निः) इति, स्जेवेन्ता पोनिक्
 (पवित्रस्वामिनी) इति च मेनिरे। आवत्सरमस्योपासना क्रियते स्म वेद्यां च सर्वदा प्रज्वलितः

प्रतिष्ठाप्यते स्म। अस्मे लेने' इत्याख्या वेद्या अधिष्ठात्री देवी तैर्मन्यते स्म। रोमवासिनां तथैव
 वेदी-देवता 'वेस्तां' इत्याख्या तदर्थं निर्मितेषु मन्दिरेषु पूज्यते स्म। ग्रीकाणामग्निदेवता ह्वेस्तिया
 गृहवेदीस्थिता सती गृह्यधर्माणां स्वामिना कल्पिता। पारसीकानां जरथुस्तधर्मे अग्निदेवतायाः
 'अतर' इत्याख्यायाः महत्त्वमतीवप्रसिद्धम्। अग्निरेव अहुरमज्दायाः शक्तिस्तेजश्च पृथिव्यां
 प्रकाशते। तथापि वैदिकधर्मे यथाऽग्निरीड्यो न तथाऽन्यत्र। तत एव ऋग्वेदस्य एकसहस्रसूक्तेषु
 प्रायेण सूक्तानां शतद्वयी पुरोहितमग्निं पुरस्कुरुते। न केवलमग्नेर्महत्त्वमपितु सर्वेषु भारोपीयधर्मविधिषु
 यज्ञस्य महत्त्वं सुप्रतिष्ठमासीदित्यपि संस्कृतस्य यज्ञात्त्वर्थस्य ग्रीकभाषायाः अगधातौ, अवेस्तायाश्च
 यज्ञातौ प्राप्या विज्ञायते। अवेस्तायाः Fraster प्रस्तेरण सह Baresman, Barezis
 बर्हिषा सह Steretobaresman स्तीर्णबर्हिषा सह Hauma सोमेन सह Zautar होत्रा
 सह संवदति। सोमस्य पानं प्रयोगश्च भारोपीयकालादेव प्रचचाल। एतेन यज्ञसंस्थायाः
 प्राच्यपाश्चात्यदिक्षु वर्तमानानामार्याणां प्रागैतिहासिककालात्प्रचलनमासीदित्यैतिह्य-
 विद्भिर्विद्वद्भिर्बहुधा तुलनात्मकदेवशास्त्र-पर्यालोचनया व्यवस्थाप्यते।

एक एव वेदो होतु-उद्गातु-अध्वर्यु-ब्रह्मणामृत्विजां कृते चतुर्था ऋग्यजुः-
 सामाथर्वभेदैर्व्यवस्थितः। अत एवाहुः- व्यधात् यज्ञसन्तत्यै वेदमेकं चतुर्विधम्। यज्ञस्य
 विधिर्ब्राह्मणानि, स्वशाखीयानि श्रौतरूपाणि, प्रयोगनिबन्धान् पद्धतीनां समालोच्य कथञ्चिदवगतुं
 शक्यते। भारतवर्षादन्यत्र भूमौ क्वापि यज्ञविधीनां तदवान्तरकर्मणां चानन्त्यं नोपलभ्यते।
 गृह्यसूत्रेषु स्मृतिषु आगमेषु च प्रतिपादितानामनुष्ठानानामपि तथैव महान् विस्तरो दृश्यते।
 सम्प्रदायस्योच्छेदेन प्रयोगपरम्परायाश्च ह्रासेनातिविचित्र-परम्पराशालिन्या यज्ञसंस्थायाः
 स्मार्तांगमादिप्रतिपादितानामनुष्ठानानाञ्च साङ्गोपाङ्गं निरूपणमसंभवमिव संवृत्तम्।
 श्रुतिस्मृत्यागमदृष्टस्य धर्मस्य तद्विधीनां च जीर्णोद्धाराय वैदिकानां सम्मेलनं प्रवर्तकं भविष्यतीति
 प्रतीमः।

आहिताग्नेः सपत्नीकस्य परस्सहस्रेषु श्रौतकर्मस्वधिकारः। तेषु कर्मसु अग्निहोत्रं
 त्रैवर्णिकेनावश्यकर्तव्यं नित्यकर्मत्वेन स्मृतिकारैः स्मृतम्। तच्च यावज्जीवमनुष्ठेयम्।
 दर्शपूर्णमासोक्तः कालविकल्पः जराजीर्णो विरमेत विंशतिं वा वर्षाणि निरवच्छिन्नमनुष्ठाय ततः
 परित्यजेदिति नाम लब्धावकाशः। अस्याग्निहोमस्य सायमुपक्रमः प्रातश्चापवर्गः (समापितः)।
 एवं सायं प्रातश्च कालद्वयानुष्ठानेनैकं कर्म निष्पद्यते। सूर्योदयादनन्तरं यच्छाखिनोऽग्निहोमं
 विहितं स उदितहोमी। ततः पूर्वं कुर्वाण अनुदितहोमीति।

दर्शपूर्णमासौ नित्यकाम्यतया द्विविधौ। प्रतिदर्शं प्रतिपौर्णमासं च यावज्जीवं
 पुरुषेणावश्यमनुष्ठेयत्वादनुष्ठाने प्रत्यवायाच्च नित्यत्वम्। तत्तत्फलमुद्दिश्यानुष्ठान-विधानाच्च
 काम्यत्वम्। अनयोर्दर्शपूर्णमासयोः न केवलं स्वर्गकामार्थत्वमपितु अभिलषितसर्वफलप्रदातृत्वं

शास्त्रसम्मतम्। पिण्डपितृयज्ञोऽमावास्यायामनुष्ठेयः दशाङ्गमिति कात्यायनः। स्वतन्त्रमिदमवामास्याकालेऽनुष्ठेयं कर्मेति जैमिनिः (४.४.८)।

निरूढपशुबन्धआहिताग्निना प्रतिसम्बत्सरं सकृत् द्विर्वा, षड्वारं वाऽनुष्ठेयः अस्य ब्राह्मणग्रन्थेषु प्रयोगविधानं न दृश्यते। सर्वेषां पशुयागानां प्रकृतिभूतोऽग्नीषोमीयः पशुयागः। स सोमयागस्याङ्गभूतः। तथापि हविर्यज्ञत्वेन निरूढपशुबन्धः पूर्वानुष्ठेय इति कृत्वा श्रौतकर्मानुष्ठानतारोऽविशेषणमेव पशुयागं साङ्गं निरूपयन्ति। एतस्मादेव चाग्नीषोमीये धर्माऽतिदिशन्ति।

चातुर्मास्यानि अग्निहोत्रदर्शपूर्णमासवन्नित्यानि। राजसूयमनुतिष्ठता क्षत्रियैर्गैव राज्ञा राजसूयमध्ये यान्यनुष्ठेयानि तानि राजसूर्यान्तर्गतानि, अन्यानि च त्रैवर्णिकेनानुष्ठेयानि स्वतन्त्राणीति द्विविधानि। अत्र चत्वारि वैश्वदेव-वरुणप्रघास-साकमेध-शुनासीरीयाख्यानि पर्वाणि सन्ति। पर्वसु पौर्णमासीष्वनुष्ठेयत्वादिमे यागाः पर्वशब्देनोच्यन्ते। साकमेधपर्वान्तर्गतान्येव सन्ति अनीकवत्यादय इष्टयः, महाहवींषि, पितृयज्ञः त्र्यम्बकहवींषीति चत्वारि कर्माणि।

आग्रयणेष्टिः शरदृतौ वसन्तर्तौ च नवान्नोत्पत्तिकालयोरनुष्ठेया। अत एव नवान्नेष्टि-रित्यप्यस्य संज्ञा। शरदि ब्रीहिकाले ब्रीहिभिर्वसन्ते नवैर्यवैश्चानुष्ठेया, नवैः श्यामाकैरपि वर्षास्वनुष्ठेया। आग्रयणं कृत्वैव नवान्नमश्नीयान्नान्यथा।

सोमयाग ऋग्यजुस्सामवेदोक्तैस्त्रिप्रकारैरङ्गकलापैः संवलितोऽनुष्ठेयते। सर्वेषां सोमयागानां प्रकृतिभूतो यागः अग्निष्टोमाख्यः। तत्र सोमयागे द्वादश स्तोत्राणि सन्ति यत्र अग्निष्टोमाख्यमन्तिमं स्तोत्रम्। तत्स्तोत्रवशादेवास्य अग्निष्टोम इति संज्ञा। तथैव उक्थ्यः षोडश अतिरात्र, वाजपेय इत्यादयोऽपि स्तोत्रसंज्ञयैव स्वसंज्ञां लभन्ते। यद्यपि सोमयागे बहूनामिष्टिपशूनामनुष्ठानमादिष्टं तथापि सोमद्रव्यकयागस्य प्राधान्यात् सोमयाग इति संज्ञा।

सोऽयं सोमयागः प्रतिवसन्तं त्रैवर्णिकेनाहिताग्निना यथाशास्त्रेण सदारेणावश्यानुष्ठेयः। अस्य काम्यत्वमपि तत्तत्फलप्राप्तिसाधनत्वेन श्रूयते। अस्यैवाङ्गभूतः प्रवर्ग्य इति संप्रदायः। अग्निष्टोम-उक्थ्य-षोडशि-अतिरात्र-रूपाश्चतस्रः सोमसंस्थाः। एतेभ्य एव ग्रहचमस-स्तोत्राणामावापोद्वापादिता अत्यग्निष्टोम-वाजपेय-अप्तोर्यामसंस्थास्तिस्रः समुदिताः। अत्यग्निष्टोमे क्षत्रिय एवाधिकृतो न पुनर्ब्राह्मणवैश्याविति केचन। आश्वलायनास्तु त्रैवर्णिकानामनधिकारं मन्यन्ते।

केषाञ्चिदागानां पर्वानुसारेण संज्ञा यथाहि दर्शपूर्णमासाविति, अपरेषां द्रव्यवशात् तथाहि सोमयाग इति, स्तवनीयस्तोमवशाच्चान्येषां तथाहि अग्निष्टोम इति, देशविशेषे ऽनुष्ठानविधिविशेषात् केषाञ्चित् संज्ञा तथाहि कुरुवाजपेय इति, अपरेषां मध्यदेशात् संज्ञा यथाहि निरूढपशुबन्ध इति। सोमयागस्य सप्तमी संस्था अप्तोर्याम इति संज्ञिता। अस्य

व्युत्पत्तिरेवं श्रूयते- पुरा कदाचित् प्रजापतिः पशूनसृजत्। सृष्टाः सन्तस्तेऽपगताः। ताननेन क्रतुनाऽऽप्नोत्। यस्मादाप्नोत् तस्मादप्तोर्यामत्वमिति। अप्तोः प्राप्तः यामो यज्ञः आप्तोर्याम इति। गवामयनाख्य-संवत्सरसत्रविषयेऽपि श्रूयते यदयं क्रतुर्गोभिरनुष्ठित इति गवामयनमिति संज्ञा।

राजा सूयते अमिषूयते सोमो यागार्थमत्रेति व्युत्पत्त्या राजसूयो निष्पाद्यते। सोऽयं क्रतुः राज्येऽभिषिक्तेन राज्यधुरं वहता क्षत्रियेणानुष्ठेयः। सूर्यवंशीयाः सोमवंशीयाश्च प्राक्तना राजानो युधिष्ठिरादय इमं क्रतुमन्वतिष्ठन्ति जानन्त्येव पुराविदः। अयं बह्वीनामिष्टीनां द्वयोः पशुयागयोः सप्तानां दर्विहोमानां षष्णां च सोमयागानां समप्राधान्यभावेन समुदायरूपः। यो खलु सार्वभौमो राजा स्यात् स अश्वमेधाख्यस्य महायागस्याधिकारी। साधारणक्षत्रियस्य सामन्तस्य, ब्राह्मणवैश्ययोर्वा नास्ति तत्राधिकारः; केचन राजसूयवदत्रापि राजसामान्यस्याधिकारं व्यवस्थापयन्ति सूत्रकाराः। यद्यप्ययं सोमयागस्तथापि सवनीयस्याश्वस्य प्राधान्यात् तद्वशादेवास्य संज्ञा। सर्वेषु श्रौतकर्मसु प्रधानतमोऽयं महायागः सर्वफलप्रदो महापातकनाशकश्च।

सर्वस्याप्यै सर्वस्य नित्यै, सर्वमेव तेनाप्नोति सर्वं जयति इत्यस्ति श्रुतेरुद्धोषः। राष्ट्रस्य सर्वविधप्रभुत्वसंपादनैककुशलोऽयं क्रतुरिति हृदयम्। आसमुद्रक्षितीशानामिनाकरथवर्त्मनां रघूणांमिव राज्ञामभावे विलुप्तानुष्ठानो जाटिलप्रयोगोऽपरिचित-पदार्थशतसंकुलोऽतिबृहत्क्रियासमूहरूपो विलोपं गतोऽयं महायागः। अधिकारि-द्रव्य-कालादीनां नवैर्विकल्पैः संपत्स्यत न वेति न प्रतीमः। श्रौतकर्मणां मध्ये ऽश्वमेधस्य प्राधान्यं सर्वयज्ञश्रेष्ठत्वं सार्वभौमकर्तृत्वं महापुण्यप्रदत्वं च प्रतिपादयद्भिर्भस्माकमृषिभी राष्ट्रस्य राज्यस्य च सर्वशक्तिमत्त्वं संप्रभुत्वं कल्याणकारित्वं च प्रामुख्येन प्रतिष्ठापितमन्यथा राष्ट्रस्य स्वातन्त्र्यं हीयेत पारतन्त्र्यं च प्रभवेत्।

सोमयागेषु पुरुषमेधः सर्वमेधश्चापि परिगणितौ तत्र पुरुषमेधे द्रव्यं द्विशतं (१९८) पुरुषपशवस्तत्तद्देवतोद्देशेन विहिताः। तैश्च सह अजा अपि तदुद्देशेन विहिताः। तेषामेव च यूपेषु बन्धन-संज्ञपन-विशसनवपोद्धरणदयो व्यापारा अनुष्ठेया भवन्ति न तु पुरुषाणाम्। ग्राम्याणां पशूनां संज्ञापनमन्येषामुत्सर्ग इत्यस्ति विशेषः। तेषान्तु नारायणात्मना ध्यानं कृत्वा उत्सर्ग अर्थात् जीवतामेव परित्यागः कार्यः। पुरुषाणां परमपुरुषात्मना ध्यानकाले एव पुरुषसूक्तमन्त्राः पठनीयाः। तदर्थमेवेदं पुरुषसूक्तं प्रवृत्तम्। पुरुषमेधशब्दश्रवणमात्रेण पुरुषा मेध्या आसन्वैदिककाल इति भ्रान्तचित्ताः पाश्चात्यास्तदनुसारिणश्च।

(हस्तलिखितम्)



द्वितीय परिच्छेद : दर्शनशास्त्र

1. Presidential address

in the Religion and Philosophy section (ICPR)

Friends,

I am most sincerely and profoundly grateful to the Members and Authorities of the All-India Oriental Conference for electing me President of the Religion and Philosophy Section for its 33rd Session being held in Calcutta under the auspices of the Asiatic Society, an institution which pioneered the Indological studies in the past and is now launching new projects for all-round development with the active association of internationally renowned scholars. The city is sanctified not only by its long and continuing tradition of scholarship in various disciplines including the neo-logic but also by the mystique of the life of Paramahansa Ramkrishna who epitomised the unity of all religions and by his worthy disciple Swami Vivekanand who internationalised the philosophy of Vedanta making it an instrument of social service, freedom of man and universalism of spirit.

It is customary for the Section President to begin his Address by making a survey of important publications and scholarly activities in the field. I approached M/s. Motilal Banarsidass, Indological publisher of long standing, with the request to publish special issue of their MLBD Bulletin listing all the works section-wise on the occasion of the Sessions of the conference. They agreed to do this. Even otherwise, the monthly issue of the MLBD news letter, reviews of works in established journals, like the Annals of BORI, Digest of Indological Studies, Annual Reports of the Institutions, will prove a better guide of goings-on in the field of religion and philosophy than a hastily prepared and necessarily brief account of the works published during a year or two. I would, therefore, like to share with you some thoughts and questions that have agitated my mind.

Dharma, which is usually yet imperfectly translated as religion, has a very wide connotation. Nature or essence of a thing or entity, moral conduct, normative behaviour, other worldly or spiritual concern, esoteric practice, rites and rituals, organisation of individuals in society and regulating their conduct in various stages of life (Varnasrama dharma), duty and obligation all this and much more is comprehended under this term. However, it is generally identified with a set of beliefs and its practice by their votaries, Moral concern for the good of others different from one's own self who are free and autonomous individuals does not seem to be focal point instead observance of ceremonies, rites and rituals, and all-absorbing interest in prescribing particular food and dress or at best a spiritual pathway to one's own perfection and salvation have become central to the popular conception of dharma, inspite of long tradition of protest against ritualism and unwarranted distinctions of caste, creed and sex. New phenomenon of political religiosity resulting in fundamentalism and sharp divisions of social groups have further undermined the role of dharma in building an egalitarian and harmonious society. True dharma should unite the mankind in fellowship of spirit, commonwealth of brotherhood and should serve as an instrument of change and well-being of all than be an uncompromising source of obscurantism, oppressive terrorism, spiritless exploitation and mutual hatred. The conception of Karunā (love and compassion) for all beings, the doctrine of non-violence positing faith in the sanctity of life in all its manifestations. The gospel of faith in the welfare of all (Sarvabhūtarati), the definition of reality as devoid of all distinctions (apetabrahmaksatrādibheda) and the ideal of universal freedom (sarva-mukti) or the description of dharma in harmony with socio-economic good of the society, are yet to boldly assert itself in true understanding of religion. A vowedly ideal life of a perfect being, Jīvanmukta, Arhat, Sthitaprajña or Yogin may be useful for an individual or his intimate follower but does he become more sensitive even to moral issues and problems that confront his brethren and his times and environment? Is he morally active for the good of others or is he a passive and insensitive witness to the cruel ways of the evils which beset society of his times? There is no dearth of Subhasitas in vast Sanskrit literature and of tales and legends in the Puranas and other kindred literature which

emphasise ethical qualities and moral virtues yet our society remained stagnant for centuries. The large army of sadhus of various descriptions and innumerable religious institutions have done but very little to wipe out poverty, illiteracy and deprivation of spirit of even their helpless and innocent followers. I do not wish to lay all the blame at the door of religion and philosophy as I am aware of social and moral commitment of the intensely religious men, like Ramkrishna Paramhansa, Swami Vivekananda and Dayananda and movements, such as, Bhakti. However, the comprehensive notion of dharma has to accept its share of responsibility for the evils and vices which dominate Indian psyche and ethos. Dharma may be eternal but its manifestation must differ from age to age and its march should be progressive in building a more prosperous, peaceful and harmonious society than at present. Kalidasa who prefers dharma to the ideal of moksa prays in the Bharata-vakya of his famous play, the Shakuntalam, for social good which implies law & order as its precondition, cultural excellence and individual freedom from the cycle of rebirth at the end. At another place, he emphasises austerities in the midst of all-round prosperity. Thus conceived dharma is an instrument of material well-being of society and freedom of human spirit and will not be condemned as a synonym for ritualism, superstition, fatalism, hatred and violence even which it claims to be the contrary.

Indian Philosophy is generally described more as a way of life than a way of thought. It is also held that it believed in the supremacy of authority (sabda) over reason, that faith and not rationality determined its course of evolution and development. As a result, it is considered more of the nature of theology than pure philosophy. Another popular notion about Indian philosophy is that it is syncretic and that all have a common goal and differ in carving out different roads leading to it. All this is patently wrong if we minutely follow the continuous encounter between various systems of thought, orthodox or unorthodox and sharp dialectics that developed during the long course of philosophical tradition in India. The encounter of the Nyaya with the Buddhism begins in the fifth century A.D. and is continued for seven centuries when Buddhism ceased to be a strong and viable force. Śaṅkara is immediately opposed

by a galaxy of Śaiva and Vaishnava philosophers. It is also true that as a result of encounter of a system with opposite system or self-critical evolution of a thought, modification (pariskara) of original view is effected many a time. Buddhist influence on Śaṅkara's Vedanta and of the latter on the Saṅkya and the development of Navya-nyaya propounding its special categories of logic and its impact on other philosophical schools and non-philosophical disciplines are well-known examples of continuous change and development of Indian philosophical thought. Argumentative spirit and hair-splitting analysis of opposite views (purvapaksas) and the notion of independence from the well-established disciplines (sarvatantrasvatantra) underline the rational evolution of Indian philosophy and its uncompromising attitude to contrary thoughts either independent of authority or proclaimed to be dependent on the verbal testimony of the Vedas or the Āgamas. A bewildering variety of opinions held within a system, for example, in the schools of Buddhism and the Vedanta of Śaṅkara and sharp divisions amongst orthodox systems, all supposedly relying on the Sruti, confirm our faith in independence of intellectual tradition of India. This is further corroborated by the evolution of both theoretical as well as experimental Sastras (scientific treatises) many of which are secular in character. The grammatical system of Panini illustrates the scientific precision and rational capacity of Indian mind. Much of the scientific literature dealing with mathematics, astronomy, geometry, physics, chemistry, metallurgy, architecture, sexology, town-planning, arts and crafts etc. is still lying in manuscripts. Developments in science and technology in advanced countries have overtaken us but we need not import philosophy also. The philosophical tradition of India is strong and formidable but should it not ask new questions and raise fresh doubts about the validity of a thought-system? This can happen only if we engage ourselves in legitimate adventures and encounters with foreign thought. Professors of Philosophy in Indian Universities who have no communication and dialogue with traditional Indian thought and the Pandits who do not understand modern developments in philosophy should join hands in the new intellectual adventure. I am glad to report that the Indian Council of Philosophical Research and the Rashtriya

Sanskrit Sansthan have held seminars on Navya-nyaya, Mīmāṃsā and Kashmir Śaivism in order to initiate the dialogue between the Pandits and the Professors of Philosophy. Sustained effort in this direction and inter-disciplinary approach by co-operation of teachers of philosophy in the Deptts. of Sanskrit and Philosophy and traditional Sanskrit scholars in the Pathashalas are bound to open up new vistas of philosophical speculations. It might also lead to lay the foundations of universal thought-system based on analysis of ontological, epistemic and other issues and problems of hard core philosophy.

Another equally important and urgent task which will help than hinder the growth of comparative philosophy is the preservation and furtherance of such philosophical systems that are not better known or are being neglected in our traditional studies. Kashmir Śaivism or Āgamic philosophy falls in this category. The number of scholars well-versed in the schools of Mīmāṃsā and Navya-Nyaya is also declining very fast.

Besides, orthodox Vedic schools and the heterodox systems of the Cārvāka, Buddhism and Jainism we have mid-position of the schools which believed in the authority of the Śaiva and Vaisnava Āgamas and the Samhitas. The followers of Āgamic tradition are generally speaking independent of the Vedic tradition of thought. This may be explained by briefly referring to their basic points of view regarding the nature of reality, status of the world, nature of the self and his pathway to freedom as found in the monistic school of Śaivism developed in Kashmir primarily by the trio of Somananda, Utpala and the celebrated Abhinavagupta. According to this system ultimate reality, spoken of as Siva, is invariably related with the powers of consciousness, bliss, desire, cognition and action. He manifests this Universe through his supreme freedom of action. He is the supreme knower and free agent (karta). He does not merely shine like a crystal but is also self-aware unlike it. The universe is his reflection which he manifests at his will and command and is one with him. He is not dependent on any external aid for reflecting the universe which is united with him with all its manifest diversity. An individual is essentially not different from him. He enjoys the same powers, albeit in limited extent and degree. Like him, he creates the world out of his

imagination. He is free to create the world of his choice. This He does so in his dreams where the objects of bewildering variety shine forth without losing their unity with the mind of a dreaming subject. He also does it as an artist and as a thinker. As a reformer he changes the objective world by his powers of knowledge and action. The self-reflective consciousness is also identified with the highest form of speech (para vak) which is the ultimate source of spoken language through intermediate stages of the pasyanti and the Madhyama where distinctions of subject and object, word and meaning, begin to appear gradually and indistinctly leading finally to their concretisation at the last stage of the Vaikhari. Relation, direction, time, space, succession of events are manifested by the reality. The diversity expresses freedom of thought and action of the ultimate in which it is rooted and united at all times. A limited and hence imperfect individual has to recognise his forgotten perfect nature in order to discover and realise his hidden potentialities. It is not, therefore, knowledge of the unknown and the novel but it is recognition of his ever-present self covered with the accidental impurities. Pratyabhijna is the way to self realisation. Pratibha or Pratyabhijna is also the means for comprehending meaning of a sentence where individual words are recollected at the time of comprehension of a sentence.

Pratibhā means in this context shining (i.e. comprehension, bhā) into an individual responsible for recollection of momentary syllables or words. Every action, such as pacati, represents a group of complimentary and preceding actions done in the past finally leading to the expression, pacati, in the present tense. This signifies unification of several past actions through recollection with the perception of a present action which gives rise to the expression such, as Pacati. Similarly, realisation of the self is a case of Pratyabhijna i.e. of the recollection (smarana) and the perception of the true nature of the self obscured by a veil of self-created ignorance, the supreme self is remembered and then perceived in one's own self. This philosophy of unity of consciousness and action, prakāsa and vimarśa, posits its unshakable faith in the freedom of action, in the reality of self-willed manifestation of the world and shows the way of recognition for discovering the potential self. Salvation, according to

this system, lies in full display of one's hidden powers (svasaktyabhivyaktata mokṣah). Samkhya believes in the different substratum of consciousness and activity, Vedanta of Sankara regards all activity illusory in character and defines the consciousness as devoid of any action or change. Change or modification, according to him, is false and unreal. The Nyayavaisesika does not regard either knowledge (Buddhi) or action (prayatna) as the essential nature of the self. Buddhism does not believe in the principle of unifying agency of self. For the Visistadvaitavadin powers of knowledge and action do not constitute the substantive as these are dependent epithets. It would therefore, seem that the Āgamic schools represented by the thinkers of Kashmir advocated an independent thought which deserves our attention for its philosophy of freedom of thought and action. While its contribution to aesthetics is better known, its stand on moral issues, is not fully understood and appreciated. It is significant to note that the Kashmir Saivism did not sanction Sannyasa as a way to spirituality nor did it accept the eightfold yoga of Patanjali. In fact, it had its own system of Yoga which is influenced in such works as the Spandakārikā and the Vijnanabhairava. The Agamic tradition made no distinction on the basis of birth in a high caste and admitted even women of lower caste in its religious rites which were esoteric in nature but were performed more in groups of individuals than only by a single individual. The Agamic philosophy of Kashmir also developed as a result of its interaction with the Buddhists whose theory of momentariness was accepted without giving up its basic stand on the nature of reality, with the Samkhyas whose twenty-five categories were admitted with necessary modifications with the grammatical philosophy of Bhartrhari, whose thoughts on Sabda-Brahman, Svatantrya, Vak and Pratibha were quoted with approval and due criticism, with the Vedanta whose conception of Maya was included under the obscuring power of the supreme self and systematic consideration of other schools of thought. Kashmir remained a secluded sanctuary after 1339 and it strained itself to protect its mysticism and philosophy. Now this system is engaging the attention of international scholarship. The publication of the out of print works of Dr. K.C. Panday and of the Tantraloka of Abhinavagupta in eight volumes will give further impetus to comparative studies in philosophy.

I have spoken briefly about redefining our attitude to religion and philosophy so that they serve the needs of the suffering world facing the dreaded prospect of self annihilation. The best way to save the world is the path of active spirituality and profound insight into philosophy through interaction with new ideas and a continuous encounter with the issues so that the truth may be revealed.

आनो भद्राः क्रतवो यन्तु विश्वतः।

Let noble thoughts come from all directions

(Hand written)



2. Philosophical Writings in Modern Sanskrit

This paper does not attempt a comprehensive survey of Sanskrit writings in our times on philosophy nor does it claim to deal with the representative philosophical writings in Sanskrit. This is a very modest attempt to deal with some works known to me accidentally as there is dearth of proper and authentic information, lack of library facilities and easy unavailability of the material. Perhaps the Sahitya Akademy could rectify this situation by preparing bibliographies subject-wise so that a clear picture of goings on in various modern languages could emerge for the benefit of less privileged Indian scholars.

Śāstra is a key concept for understanding organisation of religious and secular ideas into Sanskrit texts which evolved in intellectual circles through predominantly oral tradition in India. A theory of knowledge which is basic to a Śāstra has certain peculiar characteristics:

(i) It believes in the validity of word revealed or otherwise as a source of knowledge. Indian cultural tradition positing faith in efficacy of word re-inforces this belief.

(ii) Any Śāstra is discovery of pre-existing knowledge. This underlines the importance of tradition of a discipline which has a long

history of ideas than its formulation or rather interpretation by an individual author. Hence the mythical origin is always invoked.

(iii) Individual authorship is not denied but impersonalised revelation of truth or its institutionalised formulation is underlined. This explains anonymity or near-anonymity of authorship of the Śāstras.

(iv) Dates, chronology and biographies of authors are uncertain and ideas, opinions and their competitive co-existence are more important.

(v) There is manifest anxiety to show rootedness or unity of knowledge than to emphasise its novelty or divergence.

(vi) Each Śāstra is related to man and his destiny-through a scheme of fair ends of human life.

(vii) The language of a Śāstra is Sanskrit-which gave it a Pan-Indian character by transcreating regional terms into a refined and polished Idiom. Sanskrit is the word or idiom for an all-India understanding of contents and ideas which may have originated in the circles which did not know or speak Sanskrit. (Incomplete).

(Hand written)



3. संस्कृत विद्वानों की देन - दर्शन के क्षेत्र में

भारत में दर्शन के क्षेत्र में जो भी लिखा गया है वह सब संस्कृत विद्वानों की देन है। यह सामान्य कथन अधिक अतिशयोक्तिपूर्ण नहीं है। पालि एवं प्राकृत की प्रारम्भिक रचनाओं, तमिल जैसे सशक्त क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं में लिखे प्रकीर्ण साहित्य तथा १९वीं शताब्दी में भारतीय भाषाओं या अंग्रेजी में लिखे फुटकर कार्य को छोड़कर यही कहना होगा कि दर्शन के क्षेत्र में संस्कृत का लगभग एकाधिकार रहा है। आज के युग में भी राजस्थान के पं. विद्याधरशास्त्री जैसे विद्वान् अथवा म.म. मधुसूदन ओझा और उनकी शिष्य-मण्डली संस्कृत में दर्शन की चर्चा करती रही है। यही बात कमोवेश दूसरे प्रदेश के संस्कृत विद्वानों को लेकर भी लागू होती है। सूत्र, भाष्य या टीका अथवा स्वतन्त्र ग्रन्थ के माध्यम से

संस्कृत का विद्वान् आज भी दर्शन के वाङ्मय की श्रीवृद्धि कर रहा है। संस्कृत में निबद्ध प्राचीन भारतीय दर्शन को अंग्रेजी, हिन्दी अथवा अन्य किसी भारतीय भाषा में उपस्थित करने का वास्तविक और आधिकारिक दायित्व भी वह निबाह रहा है। जिन विषयों, आचार्यों या ग्रन्थों को उसने अनूदित करके या व्याख्या करके दूसरी भाषा में संक्रमित नहीं किया है उसकी चर्चा संस्कृत से अनभिज्ञ आधुनिक विद्वान् नहीं कर पाते हैं। वह दर्शन उनके लिए अपरिचित बना रहता है और सच यह है कि संस्कृत के दार्शनिक ग्रन्थों का अधिकांश भाग अभी-भी पाण्डुलिपियों में है। संस्कृत विद्वान् को इस सारी ज्ञानराशि का उद्धार कर आज के युग को देना है। वही प्राचीन को वर्तमान से जोड़ने का सेतु है।

सामान्यतः भारतीय दर्शन को जिसका अभिप्राय संस्कृत में उपनिबद्ध दार्शनिक चिन्तन से है, वेदों पर श्रद्धा रखने वाले आस्तिक दर्शन तथा वेदों को न मानने वाले नास्तिक दर्शन की दो प्रमुख श्रेणियों में विभाजित किया जाता है। आस्तिक दर्शन में न्याय, वैशेषिक, सांख्य-योग, मीमांसा, वेदान्त का परिगणन होता है तथा नास्तिक दर्शन में चार्वाक या लोकायत, जैन तथा बौद्ध दर्शनों का। इनके अतिरिक्त आगम या तन्त्र-परम्परा पर आधारित अनेक शैव, वैष्णव एवं शाक्त दर्शन हैं जो निगम या वेद से स्वतन्त्र होकर उद्भूत होने पर भी श्रुति से अपना सामंजस्य स्थापित करते रहे।

प्रत्येक दर्शन का विशाल वाङ्मय है और सामान्यतः वह सूत्र या कारिका, वृत्ति, भाष्य, टीका और उपटीकाओं में विभक्त होकर विकसित हुआ है। यद्यपि आस्तिक दर्शन श्रुति पर आधारित माने जाते हैं किन्तु उनका उद्भव और विकास परस्पर विरोधी होने के कारण स्वतन्त्र उद्घोष मानना अधिक उचित होगा। श्रुति-प्रामाण्य का उद्घोष करने पर भी चिन्तन की विविधता, तर्क की प्रखरता और परिणामतः प्रत्येक दर्शन की स्वतन्त्रता सुरक्षित है। ५वीं शती से लेकर १९वीं शती तक न्याय दर्शन का बौद्ध दर्शन से अनवरत संघर्ष, नव्य न्याय का उदय तथा विकास, शंकर के अद्वैत वेदान्त में विकसित तर्कवाद और उसको दूसरे वेदान्त सम्प्रदायों के आचार्यों रामानुज, वल्लभ, निम्बार्क तथा मध्व द्वारा परवर्ती आठ शताब्दियों में खण्डन की प्रचण्ड परम्परा प्रमाणित करती है कि संस्कृत के विद्वानों ने दर्शन के क्षेत्र में चिन्तन की स्वायत्तता, स्वतन्त्रता तथा तार्किकता को बनाये रखा है। श्रद्धा के सरोवरों में तर्क को दफनाया नहीं गया है। आस्तिक दर्शनों में आपस में वाद-विवाद तो हुआ ही है उससे भी बढ़कर नास्तिक दर्शनों ने विशेषतः बौद्ध दर्शन ने हर समय आस्तिक दर्शन को चुनौती दी। एक ओर वेद को नित्य अपौरुषेय स्वतः प्रमाण कहा जा रहा था तो दूसरी ओर चार्वाक जैसा महर्षि यहाँ तक कह रहा था कि वेद के तीन कर्ता हैं- भांड, धूर्त और निशाचर। इस नास्तिक का सभी ने खण्डन किया। उसे सदा ऋषि या तत्त्वद्रष्टा माना। इसीलिये सर्वदर्शनसंग्रह जैसे ग्रन्थ का आरम्भ चार्वाक दर्शन के ऊहापोह से प्रारम्भ होता है। इस प्रकार चिन्तन का प्रजातन्त्र और वैविध्य स्थापित करना संस्कृत विद्वान् की प्रमुख देन है।

चिन्तनधाराओं की विविधताओं और अनेक पगडण्डियों के बावजूद भी पारस्परिक समन्वय की परम्परा भारतीय दर्शन में सदा से रही है। कभी एक दर्शन को दूसरे दर्शन की भूमिका या सोपान मानकर अथवा अधिकारी की योग्यता रुचि या उपेक्षा के भेद से अपनी-अपनी ढपली, अपना-अपना राग अलापने पर भी यह कहा गया कि तत्त्वसाक्षात्कार का अन्तिम लक्ष्य एक होने के कारण सभी मार्ग एक ओर जाते हैं जैसे कि सभी नदियाँ समुद्र में समाती हैं-

**रुचीनां वैचित्र्याद्भ्रजुकुटिलनानापथजुषां।
नृणामेको गम्यस्त्वमसि पयसामर्णव इव।।**

इस समन्वय भावना ने कटुतापूर्ण संघर्ष को कम किया पर साथ ही स्वतन्त्रता एवं विविधता की भी रक्षा की। इस देश की विविधता इतनी अधिक थी कि उसकी सार्थक व्याख्या करने की प्रत्येक दार्शनिक को आवश्यकता थी। सांख्यदर्शन ने प्रकृति को परस्पर विरोधी गुणों का सहयोगी संघटन बताकर नानात्व के सहअस्तित्व तथा सहकर्तृत्व का दर्शन दिया। आचार्य शंकर ने जाति, दैनन्दिन व्यवहार आदि सभी बाह्य सत्त्यों को मिथ्या घोषित कर इनसे परे तत्त्व की प्रतिष्ठा की ताकि विविधता से परे जाकर **नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन-**मानकर एक, अद्वैत, निष्प्रपञ्च ब्रह्म में भारत की ही नहीं अपितु विराट् विश्व की एकता को खोजा जा सकता। यह एकता या अद्वैत का परम सत्य चिन्मय तथा आनन्दमय है। सम्पूर्ण सृष्टि की उद्भव, स्थिति एवं परम विश्रान्ति आनन्द में है। बौद्धवादी धारणा के अनुसार दुःख से उद्भव नहीं है। **आनन्दादेव खलु इमानि भूतानि जातानि आनन्देन जातानि जीवन्ति, आनन्दं प्रयन्ति अभिविशन्ति।**

नानात्व से परे जाकर ही क्यों? इस नानात्व को ही परम शिव या शक्ति का विलास चैतन्य का प्रकार या विष्णु की आनन्दमयी लीला क्यों न मान लिया जाये। प्रत्यक्ष जगत् को मिथ्या घोषित करना सर्वज्ञ एवं सर्वशक्तिमान् को अपंग बनाना है। अस्तु, सारा विश्व, जो भी दिखता है और जो दिखने के भी परे है वह सब शिव है। भावात्मक शिव कहना यदि उचित नहीं लगता तो बौद्ध ने कहा कि सब कुछ को मात्र विज्ञप्ति या शून्य कह लो क्योंकि परमार्थ को शब्द की भावात्मक या अभावात्मक अर्थ की सीमा में बाँधना ठीक नहीं है।

ईश्वर के बिना या ईश्वर को नित्य तत्त्व के रूप में माने बिना संस्कृत के विद्वान् ने भारत में धर्म की परिकल्पना की और दर्शन का विकास किया। शैव-वैष्णव दर्शन की कतिपय अवधारणाओं को छोड़ दें तो यही कहना होगा कि मानव की नियति का नियन्ता वह स्वयं है। वह उत्पन्न हुआ है अपने कर्मों के कारण। वह जो है या होगा उस पर उसके

अपने कर्तृत्व की छाप रहेगी। यह निरन्तर रहेगी। इसी चिन्तन ने कर्म सिद्धान्त दिया है और सृष्टि का नैरन्तर्य पुनर्जन्म आदि के सिद्धान्त उसी का प्रतिफल है। दर्शन कोरा तार्किक ऊहापोह न बना रहे अपितु मानव ज्ञान से अपने अज्ञान-जनित विभिन्न बन्धन काटता रहे-विद्या से अमृतत्व की प्राप्ति हो यही मोक्ष का सिद्धान्त है। संसार और मोक्ष की एक कोटि है- **संसारस्य तु या कोटिः निर्वाणस्य च विद्यते। न तयोरन्तरं किञ्चित् सुसूक्ष्ममपि विद्यते।**

आज के भारत या विश्व का जो दुःख या वेदना है उससे मुक्ति के उपाय सुझाने में संस्कृत का विद्वान् ऋषि बनकर तत्त्वदर्शन को निरन्तर विकसित करता रहे- जैसा कि वह एक शती पूर्व तक करता रहा है तो निश्चित ही विश्व का कल्याण होगा।

(हस्तलिखित, आकाशवाणी उदयपुर, वार्ता, २२ जनवरी, १९८५)



4. उपक्रमः

विश्वविश्रुतस्य दार्शनिकशिरोमणेः वर्ट्रेन्डरसेलमहोदयस्य प्रोपोजिशन(वाक्यार्थ) - विषयकं सिद्धान्तमधिकृत्य ख्रिस्तीय १९८३ वर्षे जुलाईमासस्य एकादशदिनाङ्कात् षोडशदिनाङ्कं यावत् संस्कृतस्य प्राच्यानां प्रथितयशसां पण्डितानां पाश्चात्यदर्शनविदां विदुषां च मध्ये पुण्यपत्तने विचारगोष्ठी प्रावर्तत। यन्त्रसाहाय्येन शब्दशो निबद्धमस्या विवरणं कालेन लिपिबद्धं कृत्वा महता परिश्रमेण च संपाद्य सम्प्रति प्रस्तूयते। संवादविधिना सम्पन्नाया अस्या गोष्ठ्या वार्तालापस्वरूपं प्रायेण सुरक्षितं तत एव उच्चारणानुरूपं टंकणं बहुत्र अपाणिनीयं सदपि न सर्वत्र शुद्धिं लम्बितं, न च पण्डितैः स्वयमेव समस्तपदेषु ग्रहणसौकर्याय कृताः सन्धिच्छेदादयः शुद्धिमापादिताः, न वा संयुक्ताक्षरेषु सन्धिनियमाः सर्वत्र समादृताः। नानेन वस्तुवृत्तेन नैसर्गिकेण पण्डितजनकृतेन वागव्यवहारेण पाणिनिः पाठको वा खेदमनुभविष्यति, अयमेवास्माकं प्रत्ययः। विचाराणां क्रमेण समुन्मेषोऽपि तथैव परिरक्षितः। एतेन विद्वद्गोष्ठीविवरणस्य प्रामाणिकत्वं तत्र च पाठकानां सहभागित्वमिव सेत्स्यतः। ग्रन्थपठने चापूर्व आस्वादोऽपि भविष्यति।

आंग्लभाषया पाश्चात्यदर्शनमध्यापयतां विदुषां संस्कृतभाषया दर्शनशास्त्रार्थान् विवदतां पण्डितानां च मध्ये संवादो नैव दृश्यते। भारतस्य समृद्धा तर्ककर्मशा दार्शनिकचिन्तनपद्धतिरद्यापि जीवति। टीकोपटीकाभिः स्वतन्त्रग्रन्थनिर्माणैश्च तस्या विकासोऽपि दृश्यते। परन्तु भारतस्य सर्वासु दिक्षु विद्यमानानां पण्डितानां परस्परं संपर्को जातुचिदेव जायते। दक्षिणेषु लब्धप्रतिष्ठा

नव्यनैयायिकाः, नव्यवैयाकरणा मीमांसका वा उत्तरेषु विद्यमानान् स्वबन्धुन न परिचिन्वन्ति। अन्येषामपि दिग्गजानामियमेव कथा। पुनश्च पाश्चात्यशास्त्राभ्यासकुशलैः सह संपर्कस्तु दुर्लभ एव। तेषु नवीनपूर्वपक्षाणां परामर्शो दुर्घट इवाभाति। प्रसिद्धपूर्वपक्षपिष्टपेषणं न खलु शास्त्राणां विकासायालं भवति। आंग्लभाषया भारतीयदर्शनस्य प्राथमिकः परिचयः पाश्चात्यपाठकान् लक्ष्यीकृत्य नैके ग्रन्थकारैः कारितः। भारतीयचिन्तनं कथमिव पाश्चात्यचिन्तनस्य साम्यमुपैतीति हृदि निधाय केचन ग्रन्थकारा अद्यापि प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणविवेचने प्रवर्तमानाः प्रायेण पाश्चात्यदार्शनिकानां प्रमाणपत्रं प्राप्तुं प्रयतन्ते। पाश्चात्यदर्शनदृष्टीः पूर्वपक्षीकृत्य स्वसिद्धान्तसमर्थनशक्तिस्तु तेषु प्रायेण न परिभाव्यते। पाश्चात्यदर्शने दोषा भवेयुस्तेषु केचन पौरस्त्यदृष्ट्या समाधातुं शक्यन्त इति विचारो मनागपि नोदेति। हन्त, इदमेकच्छत्रं साम्राज्यं कथमपेयात्, स्वतन्त्रस्तर्कसरणिश्चोदीयादिति चिन्तया पर्याकुलं मनस्तिष्ठति मतिमताम्। न हि तरणिरुदिते दिक्पराधीनवृत्तिः।

प्राच्यपण्डितानां पाश्चात्यदर्शनविदां च मध्ये परस्परं परिचयाभावात् सर्वं ज्ञानमस्मच्छास्त्रे प्रतिष्ठित मिति मत्वा पण्डिताः शास्त्रब्रह्माणं गणेश इति मत्वा सर्वार्थसिद्ध्यै प्रदक्षिणीकुर्वन्ति, नान्यत्र तेषां विश्वसञ्चरे मतिर्गतिर्वा प्रवर्तते। अपरे पुनः भारतीयं दर्शनं दर्शनमेव नास्ति, यच्च तत्रास्ति तत्सर्वं तुच्छं सुविज्ञातं वे ति मत्वा पण्डितानन्त्य-जानिव परित्यजन्ति। द्विसहस्रवर्षेभ्योऽधिकं निरंतरं जीवन्त्या भारतस्य सर्वासु दिक्षु लब्धप्रतिष्ठाया भारतीयचिन्तनपरम्परायाः स्वतन्त्रेऽपि देशे दुर्दशामिमां दृष्ट्वा केषां सचेतनानां चेतांसि न दूयेरन्। अत्र च भारते अन्या अपि पश्चिमेशियादेशादिप्रसूताश्चिन्तनसरण्यो नवीनप्ररोहानवापुरिति ता अपि विचारार्हाः। राष्ट्रियसंस्कृतसंस्थानस्य, भारतीयदार्शनिकानुसन्धानपरिषदः, फोर्ड-फ्राउन्डेशनस्यान्येषां च संस्थानानामार्थिकसहयोगेन प्रो. दयाकृष्णस्य, प्रो. एम.पी. रेगे इत्याख्यस्य च नेतृत्वे नैकेषां विदुषां च सहयोगेन वर्टेन्डरसेलमहोदयस्य प्रोपीजिशन-विषयकं विचारं क्षोदक्षमं कर्तुं वादे वादे जायते तत्त्वबोधः इति न्यायेन पुण्यपत्तने प्रथमा गोष्ठी प्रावर्तत। तदनु न्यायशास्त्रमधिकृत्य उच्चतर-भोटीयाध्ययनसंस्थाने सारनाथे, वाक्यमीमांसाविषये नवदिल्ल्यां, त्रिकशासनमधिकृत्य काश्मीरस्थश्रीनगरे अन्यासु च दिक्षु तत्तद्विषयिण्यो गोष्ठयः क्रमेण प्राच्यपाश्चात्यचिन्तनपरम्पराप्रसूततत्त्वदृष्टि-निरूपणार्थं प्रकान्ताः। न केवलं तर्के दर्शनशास्त्रे वा वैज्ञानिकविषयेष्वपि तथैव पारस्परिकः संवादः सुमेधसां समजायत। एष नव्यः सारस्वतोपक्रमः पुण्यपत्तने प्रथममुपक्रान्तः, रेगेमहोदयश्च तत्र प्रयोगाधिकृतः। पारस्परिकविचारे एकत्र आंग्लभाषाविद आंग्लभाषया स्वार्थं व्याहरन्, अन्यतश्च संस्कृतगिरा पण्डितोत्तमाः स्वविचारान् प्रकटयामासुः। उभयभाषाविदश्चोभयेषामनुवादविधिना साहाय्यमाचरेः। सत्यप्येतादृशि भाषान्तरकरणसाहाय्ये विचाराणां याथार्थ्येनावगम उपक्रमे काठिन्यं वैपरीत्यमन्यथाभावं वा पस्परी। अभिनवप्रयोगे भिन्नस्रोतःसंभूतचिन्तनपरामर्शं च इयमेव साधारणी गतिः। तथापि

क्रमेण स्फुटतामुपेयिवान् विचारविमर्श इति पाठकानां प्रतिपृष्ठं पठनेन स्पष्टीभविष्यति। संवादविधिना कृतस्यास्य विमर्शस्य स्वरूपं तथावत्परिरक्षितं, पौनरुक्यं तु बहुत्रापाकृतम्। तत एव यत्र क्वचन पुनरुक्तिरन्वाख्यानं, प्रकरणान्तरं, शब्दार्थानां चर्वितचर्वणं चात्र दृश्यन्ते। तथापि तत् संवादस्य सहजसुभगं स्वरूपं प्रकटीकरोति। तेनैव प्रथमं स्वखलितपदपदार्थसंबन्धापि भारती शनैः शनैः पारस्परिकबोधसौहार्दमभ्यविन्दत। एतच्च वाद-जल्प-वितण्डाविमुखानां तत्त्वार्थग्रहणदाढ्यनिविष्टदृष्टीनां प्राच्यपाश्चात्यविदुषां संवादेनानेन स्फुटं चकास्ति। पाठकाश्चात्र परमं प्रमाणं न वयम्।

डॉ. दयाकृष्णेन स्वकीय आमुखे प्रतिपादितं यत् पुण्यपत्तने संपन्नाया नवप्रयोगात्मिकाया गोष्ठ्याः फलान्येव क्रमेण न्याय-मीमांसा-त्रिकदर्शनेषु सारनाथतिरुपतिश्रीनगरेषु सम्पन्नानि गोष्ठ्यन्तराणि सन्ति। भाषाविज्ञानक्षेत्रे नवीनप्रश्नचर्चा भुवनेश्वरे संवृता। प्राचीनपण्डितानामाधुनिकतर्कशास्त्रावबोधाय जिज्ञासा, पाश्चात्यदर्शनप्रवणानां नव्यन्यायग्रन्थार्थाधिगमे समीहा, अन्ये चैवंविधा आरम्भा अस्या एव रेगेप्रवर्तिताया गोष्ठ्याः सुफलानि सन्ति। विविधेषु सारस्वतसंवादिषु यैः साहाय्यमाचरितं, स्वत एव वा काश्चन प्रवृत्तयः प्रारब्धास्तेषु राष्ट्रियसंस्कृतसंस्थानं, भारतीयदार्शनिक-अनुसन्धानपरिषत्, फोर्ड-प्रतिष्ठानं, भारतीयभाषासंस्थानं, केन्द्रीयमांगलभाषाया वैदेशिकभाषाणां च संस्थानं, डेक्कन-महाविद्यालयः, भोटीयोच्चतराध्ययनसंस्थानं तत्रत्या अधिकारिणश्च सविशेषमुल्लेखमर्हन्ति।

भारते बौद्धिकचिन्तनपरम्परा संस्कृतमाध्यमेन द्विसहस्राब्देभ्यो निरन्तरं प्रचलिता। अद्यापि सा परम्परा प्राचीनेषु पण्डितेषु जीवति। भारतस्य सर्वासु दिक्षु पण्डिता दार्शनिकप्रश्नाननयैवामरभारत्या उत्थापयन्ति, समाधानं चान्वेषयन्ति। वस्तुत आसेतुहिमाचलमद्यापि प्राचीनबौद्धिकपरम्पराभिव्यक्तेर्भाषा संस्कृतमेव, नान्या। न तस्याः स्थानं ग्रीक-लातिन-भाषावदस्माभिः परिकल्पनीयम्। प्राचीनदर्शनपरम्परापारङ्गतेषु पण्डितेषु श्रीबदरीनाथशुक्लमहोदया मूर्धन्या आसन्। ते खलु प्राचीनेषु नवीनाः, नवीनेषु च प्राचीनाः सन्तः प्राच्यपाश्चात्यकूलयोः परमसेतुबन्ध इवाभवन्। हन्त, प्राच्यप्रतीच्यतर्काणां स्वमनीषिकया परिष्कारदिशमुन्मील्य 'संवादस्य' प्रकाशनात्पूर्वमेव ते दिवङ्गताः। अयं ग्रन्थस्तेभ्यः सादरं समर्प्यते।

प्रो. रेगेमहोदयः स्वस्यामांगलभाषायां लिखितायां भूमिकायां भारतीयदर्शनस्य विविधपक्षविचारकाणामितिहासलेखकानां च प्रवृत्तिं परामृशन् तत्प्रवृत्तेर्बहिरङ्गत्वं परिरक्षणैकप्रवणत्वं च प्रतिपादयति। आंग्लभाषया भारतीयदर्शनं विमृशन्तः पाश्चात्यदर्शनपद्धतिप्रवणा लेखकाः प्रायेण पाश्चात्यतत्त्वचिन्तनपद्धतिं, तदभिव्यक्तिप्रणालीं च प्राधान्येन स्वीकृत्य भारतीयदर्शनानि विवेचयन्ति। आंग्लभाषाविज्ञाः पाश्चात्याः (प्राच्या वा) तेषां बोद्धव्याः। अत एव ते साधनायाः, पुरुषार्थानां विधिनिषेधयोः साधारणधर्माणां

चातुर्वर्ण्यव्यवस्थादीनां च विवेचनं परिहरन्ति। समाजदर्शनं नीतिदर्शनं च पाश्चात्यपद्धत्या दीक्षितानां भारतीयदार्शनिकानां विवेच्यपथवीं नावगाहेते। इयमेव खण्डदृष्टिः। एतद्विपरीतं प्राचीनपण्डिता नैयायिकादयः संस्कृतेन स्वमतविरुद्धान् तर्कानामूलचूलं परामृश्य स्वशास्त्रानुकूलान् तर्कानुद्भाव्य स्वशास्त्रपरंपराविकासाय निरन्तरं प्रयतन्ते। अत एव तेषां दृष्टेरन्तरङ्गत्वं विकासोन्मुखत्वं स्वप्रतिभानुकूलत्वं च सिध्यन्ति। भारतीयदर्शनं पाश्चात्यदृष्ट्या प्रतिपादयतां विदुषां विमर्शास्तु पाश्चात्यतत्त्वचिन्तनं क्रोडीकृत्य तदनुयायितया प्रवर्तन्ते। तुलनात्मकदर्शनमनुसंधानानां दृष्टिरपि कान्त-शंकरमध्ये, ह्याइटहैड-वाचस्पतिमिश्रमध्ये तुलनामूलैव, यत्र हि शंकरो वाचस्पतिमिश्रः, अन्यो वा भारतीयः कश्चिद्दार्शनिकः पाश्चात्यदार्शनिकमतेन प्रमीयते, प्रमाणीक्रियते च। तत एव पाश्चात्यदार्शनिकविचारधाराणां पाश्चात्यदेशेषु तत्काले प्रामुख्यमनुसृत्य प्रथमम् अद्वैतवेदान्तस्य तदनु न्यायस्य पर्यन्ते च नव्यन्यायस्याध्ययनं प्रसिद्धिं लेभे। अस्यैवेदं दुष्फलं यद्भारतीयपरम्परा अतीतोन्मुखा विभाव्यते, या हि सम्प्रति यथाकथञ्चिन् निःश्वसन्ती म्रियमाणा परिगण्यते। अस्यैव चायं दुष्परिणामो यद्भारतीयदर्शनं विश्वदर्शनमध्ये पूर्वपक्षत्वेन सिद्धान्तरूपेण वा नोल्लिख्यते, न वा स्थाप्यते। ज्ञान-मूल्य-संस्थादिविषये स्वदेशप्रकृत्यनुसारं दार्शनिकचिन्तनपद्धतिः योरोपीयदार्शनिकानां च तत्र प्रवृत्तिः सहजे। किन्तु भारतीयानां पाश्चात्यदर्शनविकासाय पण्डितमन्यता आश्चर्यमावहति। न तत्र तेषां साकल्येन गतिर्मतिर्वा प्रभवति। अत एव भारतीयानां पाश्चात्यदर्शनक्षेत्रे वास्तविकमवदानं नैव सम्बोभवति। केचिदपरे पुनः प्राचीनभारतीयचिन्तनकोषमांगलभाषयोद्घाटयितुं प्रवृत्ताः। प्राचीना भारतीया चिन्तनप्रणाली पाश्चात्यदर्शनप्रणालीसदृशी विद्यत इति तैः साधयितुमिष्यते। एका स्वतन्त्रा वर्तते पाश्चात्यदर्शनधारा, भारतीया चास्ति द्वितीया पृथग् विद्यमाना धारा। धाराद्वयस्य शुद्धदर्शनदृष्ट्या तात्त्विकसंवादस्तु न कैश्चिदपि भारतीयदार्शनिकैरास्थितः। तेन च तदीयैः प्रयत्नैः पाश्चात्यस्य भारतीयस्य वा दर्शनस्य विकासोऽपि न समजनि।

अस्ति चैतेभ्यो भिन्ना पण्डितानां शास्त्रिणां च निरवच्छिन्ना भारतीया दार्शनिकचिन्तनपरम्परा। सा हि भारतीयचिन्तनधारायां निष्णाता सती संस्कृतेन स्वमतानि प्रकाशयन्ती प्राचीनमतपरिज्ञानार्थमन्यान् सर्वान्भृशमुपकरोति। तस्यां केचन नैयायिकाः, अपरे मीमांसकाः, अन्ये च वेदान्तादिदर्शननदीष्णाः स्वज्ञानसम्प्रदायानुसारं स्वमतानि शास्त्रार्थेषु सिद्धान्तीकृत्य परपक्षान् दूषयित्वा निरन्तरं बौद्धिकपरम्परां विकासयन्ति। शास्त्रार्थैः, गोष्ठीभिः परिषदादीनां माध्यमैश्च पूर्वं बहुकालं मौखिकपरम्परा, तदनु स्वीकृतपक्षाणां तर्काणां विचाराणां च ग्रन्थविधिना लेखनेन भारतीया बौद्धिकपरम्परा दार्शनिकसम्प्रदायेषु (स्कूल्स ऑफ थॉट) विकासं लेभे लभते च। पण्डितराजराजेश्वरशास्त्रिद्रविड-पण्डितबदरीनाथशुक्लसदृशा दार्शनिकास्तस्या एव परम्परायाः साम्प्रतिकेऽपि युगे प्रातिनिध्यं चक्रुः। हन्त, तेषु बहवो दार्शनिकशिरोमणयोऽस्माभिर्न प्रत्यभिज्ञायन्ते। तेषु च बहवो प्राचीनशास्त्रार्थानां पिष्टपेषणमेव

कुर्वन्ति। तत्तद्देशोद्भवानां विविधदार्शनिकविचारसरणिषु प्रोन्मिषितान् तर्कान् नैव ते परिचिन्वन्ति। सत्यपि भाषाभेदे भारतीयदार्शनिकपरम्परायाः पाश्चात्यदर्शनपरम्पराया सह तात्त्विकः संवाद आवश्यकः वादे वादे जायते तत्त्वबोधः।

एतत्सर्वमनुसन्धाय, रसेलमहोदयेन 'गणितसिद्धान्ताः' इत्याख्ये स्वग्रन्थे प्रतिपादितस्य प्रोपोजिशनविषयकसिद्धान्तस्य भारतीयदृष्ट्या परामर्शार्थं पुण्यपत्तने विचारगोष्ठी समायोजिता यतो ह्यस्य सिद्धान्तस्य न्यायेन मीमांसया च सह वर्तते कश्चन सम्बन्धः। अस्य सिद्धान्तस्य आंग्लभाषया संक्षेपेण विवरणं प्रस्तूय तच्च संस्कृतेनानूद्य गोष्ठ्यां भागं ग्रहीष्यमाणानां विदुषां सविधे प्रागेव प्रेषितं येन विचारावसरे किञ्चित् सौकर्यं स्यात्। संवादावसरे च आंग्लभाषायां वक्तव्यस्य संस्कृतेन, संस्कृतभाषणस्य चांग्लभाषायामनुवादस्य व्यवस्था विहिता। एष विधिस्तदनन्तरं सर्वासु गोष्ठीषु व्यवस्थापितः।

पुण्यपत्तने प्रोपोजिशनविषये संपन्नाया गोष्ठ्याः किं फलमासीदिति प्रश्नः सुसमाधातुं न शक्यते। तथापि पण्डितेषु नव्यदार्शनिकसमस्यानां विमर्शार्थमौत्सुक्यं तत्परत्वं च प्रतिपदं पुण्यपत्तनगोष्ठ्यामाविरभूत्। तच्च विमर्शं उन्मिषितानां प्रश्नानां पुनर्विचारार्थं धीधनानां धियः प्रचोदयामास, संवादासतयस्यावश्यकतां चोल्लिलेख। प्रोपोजिशनसिद्धान्तः पाश्चात्यदर्शनपरम्परायां दृढं बद्धमूलो किन्तु भारतीयदृष्ट्या तं विनैव वाक्यार्थविचारः सेत्स्यतीति प्रतिभाति। पाश्चात्यपरम्परानुसारं सद्वाक्यार्थगर्भं ज्ञानं वाक्यादेव प्रवर्तते प्रसिद्ध्यति च। सदात्मकप्रोपोजिशनमेव ज्ञानस्य विषयः, स च वाक्यादेव निष्पद्यते नान्यतः। वाक्यमेवार्थस्यैकं प्रमापकम्। भारतीयपरम्परानुसारन्तु ज्ञानं सविकल्पस्यैव पदार्थस्य भवति। एकेनापि घटपदेन च वाक्यं जायते। उभयसिद्धान्तयोः कियत्साम्यं कियच्च पार्थक्यमिति वाक्य-शब्द-अर्थ-ज्ञान-विश्वास-सदादिप्रत्ययानां तुलनात्मकविश्लेषणेन निगदं निर्वक्तुं शक्यते, नान्यथा। एतदर्थं शाब्दबोधस्य साकल्येन विवेचनमावश्यकं विद्यते। भारतीयदर्शनेषु शाब्दबोधविषयिणी चर्चा बहुत्र प्राप्यते। अधुना पाश्चात्यजगति विश्लेषणात्मकं दर्शनम् अर्थ-निर्णयविज्ञानं च बहुमानास्पदम्। पुण्यपत्तने संपन्ना गोष्ठी प्राच्य-पाश्चात्य-दर्शननदीष्णान् विदुषः शाब्दबोधविचारार्थं प्रेरयामासेति सुफलं तस्याः। सर्वमिदमन्यच्चापि विवृतं रेगेमहोदयैः स्वभूमिकायाम्। विस्तरार्थं तदेव द्रष्टव्यम्।

प्रोपोजिशनविषये व्याकरणदर्शनदृष्टिः, मीमांसादृष्टिः, न्यायदृष्टिः, शास्त्रान्तरदृष्टिश्च संवादस्य पृष्ठेष्वातेषु शनैः शनैरुन्मिषति। कथामिव सा दृष्टिः पाश्चात्यवाक्यार्थविचारैरात्मानमलङ्करोति, पाश्चात्यविचारं च परिष्कुरुत इति नाप्रत्यक्षं स्यात् प्रेक्षावतां प्रतिपित्सूनां पाठकानामिति।



5. Introduction to Mīmāṃsā studies

Massive and unique contribution of Mīmāṃsā to the philosophy of language, hermeneutics, exegesis and semiology to the philosophy of religion, epistemology and above all to the philosophy of pragmatic active life affirming continuity of cultural tradition remains important for the intellectual pursuits in the world of knowledge and culture. Its influence on other branches of learning in India is formidable. No system of thought can be properly and comprehensively understood without a reference to Mīmāṃsā.

Reserch papers by eminent pundits and scholars include in this felicitation volume in honour of my friend Dr. Mandan Mishra, who is known for his basic intellectual interest in Mīmāṃsā, are devoted mainly to analytical and critical exposition of its theories, focusing attention on its relation to other disciplines and presenting a comparative study with similar Indian and Western speculations. This is perhaps the first international intellectual adventure of its kind which is bound to generate fresh thinking and create right perspectives in the field of Mīmāṃsā. Studies in Mīmāṃsā in this volume take it out of its traditionally recognised narrow confines of ritualistic interpretation of the Vedic sentences and make it part of the global phisology of language and religion. It is difficult to put the papers under neat classification or watertight compartments yet, broadly speaking, these have been arranged under three Sections: 1. Phisology, Epistemology, Ethics; 2. Language, Meaning, Grammar; and 3. Hermeneutical Essays.

G.P. Bhatt in his article gives a brief statement of the non-ritualistic and purely philosophical ideas and doctrines found in the works of Mīmāṃsā, more particularly its leading thinkers, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara.

John A. Taber advances arguments of Kumārila against the Buddhist denial of the existence of objects outside consciousness. He emphasises Kumārila's assertion that the reality of the external world is revealed directly by our perceptions and other cognitions. This is based

on the theory intrinsic validity of knowledge (svataḥprāmāṇya) which is a unique contribution of Mīmāṃsā to the theory of knowledge.

Those interested in the philosophy of religion will find certain discussions here quite exciting. Peri Sarveswara Sharma makes close textual study of the Sambandhaparīkṣā section of Kumārila's Śloka-vārtika denying creation and dissolution of the world along with a refutation of the theories of Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya, Sāṃkhya and Vedānta.

A paper by Lars Göhler in comparative phisology examining the similarities in the philosophical concepts of Kumārila and K.R. Popper regarding verification and falsity of cognition underlines contemporary significance of Mīmāṃsā epistemology.

The injunctive nature of the Vedic sentence presents a pragmatic paradox, argues Shlomo Biderman, which makes it possible to remain innocuous by opening new possibilities of understanding the role that interpretation plays in religion. He distinguishes it from the 'Semantic Paradox' found in the monotheistic context.

Tomoyasu Takenaka explains the relation between liṅga (vyāpya or pervaded) and liṅgin (vyāpaka or pervader) and the Sāhityaniyama of the Bhāṭṭa School which establishes this relationship. In his view this notion of the Bhāṭṭa School is larger than that of Vaiśeṣika or Dharmakīrti.

Self-revealed nature of the scriptural knowledge (Vedāpauruṣyatva) which is a basic concept of the epistemology of Mīmāṃsā is critically present in the light of Buddhist objections in a paper by J.M. Verpoortan.

The philosophy of activism, as expounded by P.T. Raju in a paper reprinted here is a strong rebuttal of general notion of Indian ethics as life-denying or advocacy of inaction. The paper will prove affirmation of life in Indian thought leading to the national regeneration and international co-operation for global peace.

Hajime Nakamura demonstrates that a Western notion, such as Kantian categorical imperative, could be applied to the idea of niyoga in

the Prabhākara School. He suggests that anapekṣo vidhiḥ or anapekṣā codanā found in the philosophy of Prabhākara and the Nyāyakaṇikā, a commentary by Vācaspati Mīśra on the Vidhiviveka of Maṇḍana Mīśra, could be an Indian equivalent to the western idea of categorical imperative. The notion of Niyoga in Prabhākara may have been influenced by the spirit of maitrī and karuṇā set forth in Buddhism as a categorical imperative. This is an important contribution to the study of comparative ethics.

According to Purushottam Bilimoria, the autpattika (relation of word with the meaning from the very beginning) thesis offers semiological insights from de Saussure's work and their extension in the writings of the contemporary French philosopher Jacques Derrida.

The problem of getting at the particular meaning of a sentence, from the universal and removing incompatibility in the context, is set forth and a solution suggested by K. Kunjuni Rājā by expounding two forms of Abhidhā according to the Prabhākaras and two operations of Lakṣaṇā according to the Bhāṭṭas. He also draws attention of the scholars that the Tātparya Śakti, is nothing more than the samsargamaryādā accepted by the Navyanyāya school. The theories of abhihitānvaya held by Kumārila and anvitābhidhāna and important contributions of semantics. These are variously explored in the papers. Thus, for example, the theory of prior existence of a meaning whole is comparatively brought out by Harold G. Coward. And again how a simple word Varṇa standing for phoneme or sound has been wrongly translated as 'Letter' is exposed by Albrecht Wezler with a penetrating and in-depth study of the texts and translations.

Sri Ramchandrudu points out that according to Kumārila grammar cannot intervene to get at the real meaning of a word of a sentence. Its usefulness is restricted to knowing the correct word to be employed in the performance of sacrifice. Purposes of Vyākaraṇa enunciated by Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya are roundly refuted by Kumārila as of no help for the interpretation of the Veda. This is a significant debate to establish independence of the exegetics from grammar which is primarily concerned with the determination of correct word and its formation. It cannot govern its meaning, intention or interpretation.

The views of Prabhākara, Pārthasārathi Mīśra and Khaṇḍadeva on the meaning of the ākhyāta are expounded by a great traditional Sanskrit Pundit Peri Sūryanarayan Śāstrī in his paper in Sanskrit. He favours the opinion of Khaṇḍadeva according to which fruit and operation, phala and vyāpāra are conveyed by the verb root, and bhāvanā in the form of action conducive to the meaning of the root is conveyed by ākhyāta. Kumārila's postulation of apūrva and Bhāṭṭhari's theory of Sphoṭa are compared to discuss how the words convey the meanings in a relation which is unborn and eternal and is not man-made, conventional or even divine.

The paper in Sanskrit by renowned Mīmāṃsaka, Padma Bhushan Pt. P.N. Pattābhirāma Śāstrī, the gurū of Dr. Mandan Mishra and Chairman of the Editorial Advisory Board, who was snatched away from us by the cruel hands of death before he could see the publication of this volume, establishes that the nyāyas (maxims, principles, rulings of judgements) developed by Mīmāṃsā to determine meaning of a scriptural sentence are applied by other disciplines and can be significantly used even in the judgment of worldly transactions.

Application and extension of a specific nyāya, namely the principle of apaccheda, is pinpointed in the texts of Dvaita, Advaita and Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta by N.S. Ramānuja Tātācharya in his paper in Sanskrit.

Francis X. Clooney, S.J. present continuity and difference of Mīmāṃsā in Vedānta by articulation of properly Vedāntic mode of exegesis in the Vedānta Sūtra 3.3. The Vedāntins employ upasamhāra in their interpretative movement between a reorganisation of Upaniṣadic knowledge based on the Mīmāṃsā functional systematization of the Veda and one based in part on the fact that Brahman is the known object of that knowledge, its referent. They argue from the grammatical sense of the texts and from their reference, and to highlight upasamhāra, as one of their key Uttaramīmāṃsā principles.

Kunio Harikai after close examination of the text, Arthasamgraha, by Laugākṣibhāskara, concludes that the threefold classification of arthavāda, a statement or explanation of the meaning of a formula or prayer (mantra and vidhi, injunction, in a Brāhmaṇa text) into Guṇavāda,

Vidhiśeṣa and Niṣedhaśeṣa would not be derived from the Mīmāṃsā school but from the Vedānta school or some heterodoxical Mīmāṃsakas.

Equally interesting is another paper in Sanskrit where Batuknātha Śāstrī Khiste presents the views of an original thinker of 17th century C.E. Bhāskararaya to show that the Mīmāṃsā exegesis can be applied to the Āgama texts and the worship of Śrīvidyā can be explained in the Vedāntic mode of Brahmanvidyā. The rootedness of the Āgamas in the Vedic tradition is shown here with necessary textual connections and their fresh and novel interpretations.

Yudhisthira Mīmāṃsaka has for the first time given a metaphysical interpretation to the Aśvamedha sacrifice.

In his paper on Mādhava as a Mīmāṃsaka Haruo Kurata establishes through an intimate and close study of the relevant texts that Mādhava, the author of the Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha, Jaiminīyanyāyamālā and Pārāśara-mādhaviya is neutral to both Kumārila and Prabhākara whereas Śāyaṇa, his brother and well known commentator of the Vedas, is a follower of Kumārila. Such questions, important for the history of Mīmāṃsā, are also incidentally dealt with by other scholars while dealing with the problems and issues of hermeneutics, philosophy of religion, epistemology or inter-relationship of Mīmāṃsā with other disciplines, Vyākaraṇa, Vedānta, Sāṃkhya and so on.

Johannes Bronkhorst adduces textual proof to establish that Bhartṛhari used a text of Mīmāṃsā older than Śābara's Bhāṣya, most probably Bhavadāsa's Vṛtti which contained verses found in Bhartṛhari. In the context of ritual details Bhartṛhari draws upon practical manuals of the Maitrāyaṇīyas.

As against this, Kiyotaka Yoshimizu argues that although Prabhākara insists that the fulfilment of obligation is the real interest of Vedic injunction, he also admits like Jaimini and Śābara, and unlike Bādari whom he generally follows otherwise, from the viewpoint of human motivation that the act of sacrificing is a means to and therefore subordinated to the desired result.

K.T. Pandurangi illustrates the logic and methodology of Mīmāṃsā followed by Śāṅkara in the field of dharma-jñāna at the stage of avidyā and application of its principles, even in the case of Brahmajñāna. What is true of Vedānta is also equally true of Tantra, Alankāra, Dharmasāstra and other disciplines.

There is no branch of learning and no movement of thought and action which did not interact with Mīmāṃsā. Much work still remains to be done in this area of research. Contemporary philosophers of language and theorists of knowledge may discover fresh insights in this system of thought which has remained largely unexplored for its hard-core philosophy. This volume, one should hope, will mark a shift from pure ritualism to speculative, epistemological, hermeneutical concern and interdisciplinary significance of Mīmāṃsā which would become part of universal thought systems.

(Introduction, STUDIES IN MĪMĀMSĀ Dr. Mandan Mishra Felicitation Volume, MLBD, Delhi, 1993)



6. प्रस्तावना

प्रायः एकसहस्रवर्षपर्यन्तं नैयायिकानां बौद्धैः सह सारस्वतकलहो न्यायशास्त्रविकासस्य मूलमभवत्। ख्रिस्तीयतृतीयचतुर्थशताब्द्यां वात्स्यायनेन प्रणीतस्य न्यायसूत्रभाष्यस्य खण्डनं दिङ्नागेन (५०० ई.) प्रमाणसमुच्चयग्रन्थेऽकारि। यदुत्तरमुद्योतकरेण (६३५ ई.) न्यायभाष्यवार्तिके तदनु च वाचस्पतिमिश्रेण (८४० ई.) न्यायवार्तिकतात्पर्यटीकायामुदयनाचार्येण (९८४ ई.) च न्यायवार्तिकतात्पर्यपरिशुद्धावकार्षीत्। इयञ्च परम्परा वर्द्धमानेन (१२२५ ई.) न्यायनिबन्धप्रकाशे, पद्मनाभमिश्रेण वर्द्धमानेन्दौ, शङ्करमिश्रेण (१४२५ ई.) न्यायतात्पर्यमण्डनादिटीकोपटीकासु परिरक्षिता।

बौद्धानामनात्मवादोऽनीश्वरवादश्च सुप्रथितौ। वेदप्रामाण्यमनङ्गीकुर्वन्तश्चार्वाका आर्हताश्चापि नेश्वरं मन्यन्ते। वेदप्रामाण्यं स्वीकुर्वन्तोऽपि मीमांसकाः सांख्याश्च नेश्वरं श्रद्धते। न्यायसूत्रेष्वीश्वरस्य सूत्रत्रये (४।१।१९,२०,२१) उल्लेखः प्राप्यते, यस्योपबृंहणं टीकोपटीकासु

यत् किञ्चिदुपलभ्यते। अभिनवगुप्तपादानां गुरुवः श्रीमदुत्पलाचार्याः (नवमशताब्द्याः मध्यभागे) काश्मीरेषु ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञाकारिकां सिद्धिद्वयैश्च (अजडप्रमातृसिद्धिं, ईश्वरसिद्धिं सम्बन्धसिद्धिं च) निर्मायेश्वरस्य चेतनात्मतत्त्वस्य च प्रतिष्ठामकार्षुः। उदयनाचार्यस्य आत्मतत्त्वविवेकः (यस्य चतुर्थपरिच्छेदस्य पञ्चमं प्रकरणम् ईश्वरसिद्धिरिति नाम्ना संज्ञितम्) बौद्धनैयायिकस्य श्रीकल्याणरक्षितस्य ईश्वरभङ्गकारिकां खण्डयितुं प्रणीतः, कुसुमाञ्जलिश्चानात्मवादमनीश्वरवादञ्च निराकृत्येश्वरसिद्धिं वितनुते। एवमेव श्रीधरस्य न्यायकन्दली, रघुनाथशिरोमणेः ईश्वरानुमानञ्च न्यायवैशेषिकसम्मतमीश्वरसिद्धिसाधकं तर्कताण्डवं प्रस्तौति। उदयनाचार्यस्य न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिः केवलं कुसुमाञ्जलिरित्यपि बहु व्यपदिश्यते।

श्रीवत्सशिष्यः श्रीमदुदयनाचार्यो दशमशताब्द्याश्चतुर्थे भागे ९०६ शकाब्दे ९८४ ख्रिस्ताब्दे वा स्वकृतिं लक्षणावलीं प्राणैषीदिति तत एवावधार्यते। तथा हि-

तर्काम्बराङ्कप्रमितेस्वतीतेषु शकान्ततः।
वर्षेषूदयनश्चक्रे सुबोधां लक्षणावलीम्।।

स स्वजन्मना मिथिलाभूमिमलञ्चकार। एष आचार्यो वैशेषिकदर्शनस्य न्यायदर्शनस्य च समन्वयदिशं सूत्रयामास। जयन्तभट्टवाचस्पतिमिश्रप्रभृतिरिव सोऽपि परमशैव आसीत्। तेन प्रणीता टीकाग्रन्थाः सन्ति-

१. न्यायपरिशिष्टम् (न्यायसूत्रटीका)।
२. किरणावली (प्रशस्तपादकृतपदार्थधर्मसंग्रहटीका)।
३. न्यायवार्तिकतात्पर्यटीकापरिशुद्धिः (न्यायनिबन्धो वा)।
(वाचस्पतिमिश्रकृतन्यायतात्पर्यटीकाव्याख्या)

तेन प्रणीताः स्वतन्त्रग्रन्था अधोनिर्दिष्टाः सन्ति-

१. आत्मतत्त्वविवेकः (बौद्धाधिकारो बौद्धधिवकारो वा)।
२. न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिः (कुसुमाञ्जलिर्वा)।
३. लक्षणावली (वैशेषिकदर्शनग्रन्थः)।
४. प्रबोधसिद्धिः (न्यायविषयको ग्रन्थो वरदराजेन तार्किकरक्षायां सूचितः)।

एतेषु ग्रन्थेषु न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिरितरग्रन्थापेक्षया विद्वत्सु विशिष्टं प्रचारं प्राप। कुसुमाञ्जलिग्रन्थे प्रदर्शिता युक्तयस्तर्काश्च तदनुवर्तिभिर्नैयायिकैरङ्गीकृताः। उदयनाचार्यस्य युक्त्या प्रभावितो मीमांसकोऽपि सन् खण्डदेवः (१७०० ई.) मीमांसासूत्राणि शाबरभाष्याद्यनुसारं व्याचक्षाणोऽपि “मम त्वेवं वदतोऽपि जिह्वा दूषयतीति हरिस्मरणमेवात्र शरण” मिति मीमांसकसम्मतमनीश्वरवादं भीतः सन् परिजिहीर्षति। भक्तिमाहात्म्यमित्याख्ये ग्रन्थे

श्रीमदुदयनाचार्यस्य संस्तव एवं कृतः-

भगवानपि तत्रैव मिथिलायां जनार्दनः।
श्रीमदुदयनाचार्यरूपेणावततार ह।।
बौद्धसिद्धान्तमुग्धान्तः सुखाय हितकारिणीम्।
व्यातेने विदुषां प्रीत्यै विमलां किरणावलीम्।।
अद्यापि मिथिलायान्तु तदन्वयभवा द्विजाः।
विद्वांसः शास्त्रसम्पन्नाः पाठयन्ति गृहे गृहे।।

एवमेव भादुडीवंशावल्यां तत्संस्तवः प्राप्यते-

बृहस्पतिसुतः श्रीमान् भुवि विख्यातमङ्गलः।
धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय बौद्धविध्वंसहेतवे।।
ख्यात उदयनाचार्यो बभूव शङ्करो यथा।
ब्रह्मतत्त्वप्रकाशाय चकार कुसुमाञ्जलिम्।।

भविष्यपुराणस्य त्रिंशत्तमे परिशिष्टाध्याये एतदाचार्यस्य माहात्म्यं बौद्धाचार्येण सह शास्त्रार्थे विजयेन संदृब्धम्। तच्च तत एवावधारणीयम्। जगन्नाथपुर्यां (बदरीनाथपुर्यां वा) यदाऽयमाचार्यो मन्दिरस्य कपाटान् आवृतान् ददर्श, तदा स जगदीश्वरं सम्बोधयन् सदर्पमुद्धोषयामास-

ऐश्वर्यमदमत्तोऽसि, मामवज्ञाय वर्तसे।
उपस्थितेषु बौद्धेषु, मदधीना तव स्थितिः।।

इयं प्रौढोक्तिः सत्या मिथ्या वा स्यात्, परमनयैतत्स्पष्टमायाति यद् बौद्धानामनीश्वरवादखण्डने ईश्वरास्तित्वसाधने चायमाचार्यो लोकेषु शास्त्रेषु च परमां प्रतिष्ठां प्राप्नोत्। तत एव श्रीहर्षः खण्डनखण्डखाद्ये ग्रन्थे “शङ्का चेदनुमास्त्येव” इत्यस्याः कुसुमाञ्जलिकारिकायाः (३.७) वेदान्तदृशा खण्डनमुत्पेक्षयामास। तथा हि-

व्याघातो यदि शङ्कास्ति न चेच्छङ्का ततस्तराम्।
व्याघातावधिराशङ्का तर्कः शङ्कावधिः कुतः।।

अन्यत्रापि शारदाटीकानुसारं न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिमतमेव खण्डनार्थं यदाह-
बाधेनोपाधिरुन्नीयतामन्येन वेति न कश्चिद् विशेषः इत्यादौ संदृब्धम्। एवमेव जैनाचार्यो गुणरत्नः (१५०० ई.) तर्करहस्यदीपिकाख्ये ग्रन्थे ईश्वरवादमुपक्षेप्तमुदयनाचार्यमेव पूर्वपक्षत्वेन जग्राह। नास्तिकेषु पूर्वपक्षीभूयास्तिकेषु च सिद्धान्तीभूय एष आचार्य ईश्वरवादस्य प्रतिनिध्यं चक्रे।

न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिटीकानां बृहती परम्परा मूलग्रन्थस्यानितरसाधारणवैशिष्ट्यं व्यनक्ति। काश्मीरस्तार्किकरक्षाकर्ता वरदराजः (११०० ई.) प्रथमः कुसुमाञ्जलिटीकाकार आसीत्। यद्यपि टीकायामस्यामन्येषाम्मतान्यप्यावश्यकानि प्रदर्शितानि, तथाप्येकादशशताब्द्याः पूर्वं कस्याश्चिदन्यस्याष्टीकाया नाम नोपलभ्यते। गङ्गेशोपाध्यायात्प्राग्भवो दिवाकरोपाध्यायः (१२७० ई.) परिमलाख्यां टीकाञ्चकार। याद्य नाममात्रावशेषा पाटनानगरे जैनपुस्कालयेऽमुद्रिता सूच्यते। उदयनाचार्यस्य आत्मपरिशुद्धेः, आत्मतत्त्वविवेकस्य च टीकेऽपि नोपलभ्यते। एवमेव प्रभाकरोपाध्यायेन (१२५० ई.) उदयनस्य न्यायकुसुमाञ्जल्यादिषु ग्रन्थेषु कृता अपि टीका नोपलभ्यन्ते। इयमेव गतिर्गङ्गेशोपाध्यायपूर्ववर्तिनो जगद्गुरोः टीकायाः। गङ्गेशोपाध्यायपुत्रः वर्धमानोपाध्यायः (१३५० ई.) प्रकाशनाम्नीं टीकां प्राणैषीत्। प्रतिपदव्याख्यानापेक्षयास्यां भाष्यकल्यायां टीकायां विशिष्टविषयाणां विवेचनं दृश्यते। अस्याः प्रकाशनं काशीसंस्कृतग्रन्थमालायां बिब्लोथियाग्रन्थमालायाञ्चाभवत्। अस्याः प्रकाशव्याख्यायाः मकरन्दनाम्नी रुचिदत्तमिश्रेण (१५५६ ई.) कृता टीका, भगीरथठक्कुरेण च कृता जलदापरनाम्नी प्रकाशिता टीकोपलभ्येते। तत्त्वचिन्तामणिव्याख्याता त्वन्तोपाध्यायः (१३७५ ई.) मकरन्दाख्यां टीकाञ्चकारेति शङ्करमिश्रकृतेन संदर्भेण ज्ञायते। तत्त्वचिन्तामणिदीधित्यादिकर्ता रघुनाथशिरोमणिः (१४७५ ई.) न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्यां दीधितिनाम्नीं प्राणैषीत्। याद्यापि काशीस्थसरस्वतीभवनपुस्तकालये पाण्डुलिपिरूपेण परिरक्षिता। उपस्कारादिकर्ता शंकरमिश्रः (१५०० ई.) आमोदाख्यटीकाप्रणयनेन प्रमोदं वितेने। गुणानन्दविद्यावागीशः (१५५० ई.) विवेकनाम्नीं टीकाञ्चकार। व्युत्पत्तिवादिकर्ता गदाधरभट्टाचार्यः (१६५० ई.) कुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्यां चक्रे इति पाण्डुलिपिसूचिभिर्ज्ञायते। गोकुलनाथोपाध्यायेन (१६५० ई.) कृता टिप्पणी दरभङ्गापुस्तकालयेऽमुद्रिता विद्यते। अस्मिन्नैव काले गोस्वामिभट्टपुत्रो गोपीनाथमौनीदं प्रथमतयात्रास्मभिः प्रकाशितां टीकां व्यधात्। गुणानन्दविद्यावागीशस्तात्पर्यविवेकं विरचयामास। इयं टीकाशुतोषग्रन्थमालायाम्मुद्रिता। त्रिलोचनन्यायपञ्चाननेन (१७०० ई.) कृता काचन व्याख्यासीदिति बंगीयन्यायचर्चातो ज्ञायते। नारायणतीर्थेन कृता व्याख्या वुरुक्षेत्रविश्वविद्यालयग्रन्थमालायाम्मुद्रिता। रुद्रन्यायवाचस्पतिभट्टाचार्येण (१६०० ई.) कृता काचन व्याख्यासीदिति पाण्डुलिपिसूचीतो ज्ञायते। त्रिलोचनदेवस्य (१८०० ई.) टीकाऽमुद्रिता वाराणसीपुस्तकालय उपलभ्यते।

गंगाधरकविरत्नकविराजः (१७९८ ई.) शोधनाख्यां व्याख्याञ्चकार, या कालिकातास्थायां गंगाधरमनीषाग्रन्थमालायां मुद्रिता। तथैव चन्द्रकान्ततर्कालंकारेण (१९०० ई.) कृता टीकापि तत एव मुद्रिता। चन्द्रनारायणभट्टाचार्येण (१८००-१९ ई.) कुसुमाञ्जलिक्रोडपत्रं विरचितम्। यद्धि चौखम्बाग्रन्थमालायाम्मुद्रितम्। धर्मदत्तबच्चामिश्रमणां (१८६० ई.) टिप्पणी काशीस्थसंस्कृतग्रन्थमालायाम्मुद्रिता।

विंशतिशताब्द्याधुनिके काले साम्प्रतिकैर्विद्वद्भिः कुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्या-निर्माणपरम्परा सबहुमानं परिपाल्यते। एतत्प्रमाणभूताः सन्ति कोल्लूरसोमशेखरशास्त्रिणा, उत्तमूरवीराराधवाचार्येण, नावलपाकंदेवनाथाचार्येण, शिवचन्द्रपण्डितेन, राधामोहनस्वामिना, कामाख्यानाथतर्कवागीशेन, अम्बाप्रसादशास्त्रिणा, महामहोपाध्यायहरिहरकृपालुद्विवेदिना च कृता व्याख्याः।

कुसुमाञ्जलिकारिकाभागस्य व्याख्यासु माधवसरस्वत्याः (१५०० ई.) टीका, हरिदासन्यायालंकारस्य (१६०० ई.) न्यायालंकारापरभिधा व्याख्या, हरिदासीयवृत्तेश्च नारायणमिश्रेण (१९६९ ई.) कृता व्याख्या, वैद्यनाथभट्टेन च कृता सौरभाख्या हरिदासीयवृत्तिव्याख्या, गोस्वामिभट्टाचार्यकृता च व्याख्या उपलभ्यन्ते। एवमेव रामभद्रसार्वभौमेन (१६००-१७०० ई.) भृगुदेवन्यायालंकारेण (१६५० ई.) जयरामन्यायपञ्चाननेन (१६५७ ई.) कृताः कारिकाव्याख्या अपि मुद्रिता अमुद्रिता वा तिष्ठन्ति।

न केवलं वृत्ति-व्याख्या-टीकादिरूपेण न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिः विद्वद्भिः सत्कृतः स्वतन्त्रग्रन्थनिर्माणेनापि तत्र अत्यादरः प्रकटीकृतः। तथा हि प्रमाणप्रमोदनामको ग्रन्थः “कार्यायोजनधृत्यादे” रित्यादिकारिकया निर्दिष्टान् ईश्वरसाधकहेतून् नव्यन्यायशैल्या परिष्कुरुते। ‘बबुआ’ उपनामकेन दुःखमोचनज्ञानामकेन विदुषा विरचिता प्रमाणप्रमोदव्याख्या तामेव न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्योपव्याख्यापरम्परां स्वातन्त्र्येण पुष्पाति।

क्रमेण हासमुपगच्छति संस्कृतबोधे, प्रादेशिकभाषाणाञ्चोपचयं चुम्बति महिम्नि, आधुनिकभाषास्वपि न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्यापरम्परा नवावतारं लभते। अस्य प्रमाणमस्ति श्रीदुर्गाधरज्ञासम्पादितो भाषानुवादेन सह व्याख्यातश्च न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिः। यस्य प्रकाशनं १९७३ तमे ख्रिस्ताब्दे वाराणसेयसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयतः प्रकाशितायां गंगानाथज्ञा-ग्रन्थमालायां समभवत्। आचार्यविश्वेश्वरसिद्धान्तशिरोमणिना कृता परिमलाख्या हिन्दीटीका चौखम्बाविद्याभवनवाराणसीतः प्रकाशिता परीक्षार्थेषु छात्रेषु कृतादरा तिष्ठति। इ.बी. कावेल कृतो हरिदासीयव्याख्यया सह कुसुमाञ्जलेराङ्गलभाषानुवाद एकोनविंशतिशताब्द्यां प्रकाशं लम्बितः। महामहोपाध्यायगोपीनाथकविराजेन प्रथमस्तबकस्यांशानुवादोऽपि आङ्गलभाषया १९२३ तमे वर्षे पत्रिकायां प्रकाशितः। बङ्गीयभाषायां रामकृष्णतर्कतीर्थकृतो भाषानुवादो ढाकातः १९२४ तमे ख्रिस्ताब्दे प्रकाशितः। रवितोर्थकृतः प्रथमद्वितीयस्तबकानुवादः १९४६ ख्रिस्ताब्दे पुनर्मुद्रितः। अस्य ग्रन्थस्य मुद्रिताऽमुद्रितानां टीकाग्रन्थानां कृते द्रष्टव्या आर. तंगस्वामिशर्मणा कृता मद्रपुरीविश्वविद्यालयतो १९८५ ख्रिस्ताब्दे प्रकाशिता दर्शनमञ्जरी (प्रथमभागालिका)। ग्रन्थस्य मुद्रितटीकानां विविधसंस्करणानां विवरणार्थं समीक्षाग्रन्थानाञ्च कृते द्रष्टव्या कार्ल. एच. पौटर-सम्पादिता “इन्साब्रलोपीडिया आफ इण्डियन फिलासफी” (पृ. २११-२१३)।

न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिग्रन्थस्येश्वरसाधनिकायां प्रधानं तात्पर्यम्। श्रुतस्येश्वरस्य मण्डनार्थं प्रवृत्तोऽयं ग्रन्थः-

स्वर्गापवर्गयोर्द्वारमामनन्ति मनीषिणः।
 यदुपास्तिमसावत्र परमात्मा निरूप्यते।।
 न्यायचर्चयमीशस्य मननव्यपदेशभाक्।
 उपासनैव क्रियते श्रवणानन्तरागता।। (अत्रैव, १.२-३)

अद्वैतवादिनां द्वैतवादिनाञ्चेश्वरविषयविवादे मध्यसेतुभूतास्तत्रभवन्त उदयनाचार्याः स्वकीयया अलौकिक्या नैयायिकपरिभाषया ईश्वरतत्त्वमनुमानद्वारा उमयाविरुद्धं साधयन्ति, तदुपयोगिपञ्चावयववाक्यप्रयोगस्यैव संपूर्णेऽस्मिन्ग्रन्थे उपलभ्यमानत्वात्। अन्तरा अनुद्यमाने जीवेश्वरभेदादौ तु अनुद्यमानत्वमेव न विधेयत्वम्, तदुपयोगिपञ्चावयववाक्यप्रयोगस्यात्र ग्रन्थे क्वचिदप्यदर्शनात्।। इत्येवं स्वप्रस्तावनायां परामृशन्तः पण्डितराजश्रीराजेश्वरशास्त्रिद्रविडमहोदया (न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिः, काशी संस्कृतग्रन्थमाला १९५९ पृ. ५)। आत्मा वाऽरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः अनेन श्रुतिवाक्येन सह ग्रन्थस्य संबन्धं कटाक्षयन्त औपनिषदादिसकलवादिविहितत्वमाम्नाषिषुः। पञ्चावयववाक्यप्रयोगे न्यायचर्चाया वैशिष्ट्यं न तिरोहितं विदुषामथापि कार्यकारणभावमवलम्ब्य वेदकर्तृत्वेन चेश्वरसिद्धिः जन्माद्यस्य यतः, शास्त्रयोनित्वात् इति वेदान्तसूत्रेऽप्यन्तर्भावयति। तत्रापि ब्रह्मणः (ईश्वरस्य) जगत्कर्तृत्वं वेदकर्तृत्वं च सूत्रितम्। अतो वेदवेदान्तसिद्ध एवेश्वरो न्यायोपार्शितदिशात्र निभाल्यते। तत एवाहुराचार्या आत्मतत्त्वविवेके-

न ग्राह्यभेदमवधूय धियोऽस्ति वृत्तिस्तद्वाधने बलिनि वेदनये जयश्रीः।
 नो चेदनिन्द्यमिदमीदृशमेव विश्वं तथ्यं तथागतमतस्य तु कोऽवकाशः।।

आसंसारं प्रसिद्धानुभावे भगवति भवे सन्देह एव कुतः। किं निरूपणीय-
 मिति कुसुमाञ्जलिवृत्तिस्थो भागः प्रथमसूत्रस्थं शङ्करभाष्यं स्मारयति। तच्चेदम् सर्वो
 ह्यात्मास्तित्वं प्रत्येति न नाहमस्मीति। यदि हि नात्मास्तित्वप्रसिद्धिः स्यात् सर्वो
 लोको नाहमस्मीति प्रतीयात्। आत्मा च ब्रह्म। यदि तर्हि लोके ब्रह्मात्मत्वेन प्रसिद्धमस्ति
 ततो ज्ञातमेवेत्यजिज्ञास्यत्वं पुनरापन्नम्।

अत्र ग्रन्थे प्रथमे स्तबके चार्वाकानां, द्वितीये मीमांसकानां, तृतीये बौद्धानां, चतुर्थे
 जैनानां, पञ्चमे च सांख्यानां मतानि प्राधान्येन खण्डितानि प्रसङ्गाच्च न्यायानुसारं कार्यकारणभावः,
 अदृष्टं, प्रामाण्यं, शब्दानित्यत्वं, वेदानां पौरुषेयत्वम्, पदानां विशिष्टे शक्तिः, प्रमाणानां विवेचनम्,
 प्रमालक्षणम्, ईश्वरस्य प्रमाणत्वम्, अशरीरस्येश्वरस्य जगत्कर्तृत्वम्, आप्ताभिप्रायस्य
 विध्यर्थत्वमित्यादयो विषया निरूपिताः प्रतिवादिवादाश्च खण्डिताः।

ग्रन्थकारानुसारमीश्वरसिद्धिबाधिका या पञ्चतयी विप्रतिपत्तिस्तस्या एव पञ्चस्तवकेषु
 क्रमेण निरासः। सा चेयं संक्षेपतः पञ्चतयी विप्रतिपत्तिः- अलौकिकस्य

परलोकसाधनस्याभावात्, अन्यथापि परलोकसाधनानुष्ठानसंभवात्,
 तदभावावेदकप्रमाणसद्भावात्, सत्त्वेऽपि तस्याप्रमाणत्वात्, तत्साधके प्रमाणाभावाच्च।
 पञ्चविप्रतिपत्तिनिरसनानन्तरमनीश्वरसाधकाष्टविधानुमानप्रदर्शनार्थं प्रसिद्धोऽयं ग्रन्थः। तथा हि-

कार्यायोजनधृत्यादेः पदात्प्रत्ययतः श्रुतेः।
 वाक्यात् सङ्ख्याविशेषाच्च साध्यो विश्वविदव्ययः।।

क्षित्यंकुरादिकं कर्तृपूर्वकं कार्यत्वादिति हेतुना जगतः कर्तुरीश्वरस्य सिद्धिरिति प्रथमो
 हेतुः। क्षित्यंकुरादिकं सकर्तृकमायोजनात्। आयोजनं नाम प्रेरणम्। परमाण्वाद्यश्चेतनेन प्रेरिताः
 सन्तः प्रवर्तन्तेऽचेतनत्वाद् वास्यादिवत्। एवमायोजनं नाम कार्यारम्भसंयोगजनकं कर्म तच्च
 चेतनप्रयत्नपूर्वकं कर्मत्वाद्दस्मदादि-शरीरक्रियावदित्यायोजनेन हेतुना जगतः कर्तृत्वेनेश्वरसिद्धिः।

क्षित्यादि सकर्तृकं कर्तृप्रयत्नाधिष्ठितं धृतेः पतनाभावात्। धृतिश्च गुरुत्ववतां पतनाभावः।
 धृत्यादेरित्यत्रादिपदात्संहरणं गृह्यते। एवञ्च क्षित्यादि जगत् प्रयत्नवद्विनाशयं विनाशयत्वात्
 पाठ्यमानपटवदिति हेत्वन्तरेणापि जगत् संहर्तुरीश्वरस्य सिद्धिः।

पद्यते गम्यते व्यवहाराङ्गमर्थ इति वृद्धव्यवहारः पदाभिधेयः। एवं कुविन्दादीनां
 पटादिनिर्माणनैपुण्यं यत्तत्, बालानां लिपितत्क्रमव्यवहारः यः सः स्वतन्त्रपुरुषविश्रान्तः व्यवहारत्वात्,
 आधुनिकलिप्यादिव्यवहारवदिति वा पदत्वेन हेतुना व्यवहार-प्रयोजकस्येश्वरस्य सिद्धिः।

प्रत्ययतः समाश्वासात् प्रमात्वविषयकज्ञानाद् वा। ततश्च आगमादिसम्प्रदायोऽयं
 कारणगुणपूर्वकः प्रमाणत्वात् प्रत्यक्षादिवत्, वेदजन्यं ज्ञानं कारणगुणजन्यं प्रमात्वात् प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमावत्
 इत्यनुमानेन प्रत्ययतः ईश्वरसिद्धिः।

श्रुतेर्वेदात्। तथा च वेदाः सर्वज्ञप्रणीताः वेदत्वात् यत्रैवं तत्रैवं यथा इतरवाक्यमिति
 व्यतिरेक्यनुमानेनेश्वरसिद्धिः। एवं वेदः पौरुषेयः वेदत्वादायुर्वेदवत् इत्यनुमानेन च
 वेदकर्तृत्वेनेश्वरसिद्धिः।

वाक्यादित्यस्यान्वयत इत्यर्थः। वेदवाक्यानि पौरुषेयाणि वाक्यत्वात्
 अस्मदादिवाक्यवदित्यनुमानेन, वेदः पौरुषेयः वाक्यत्वात् भारतादिवदित्यनुमानेन च
 तादृशपुरुषस्येश्वरस्य सिद्धिः।

संख्याविशेषः परमाणुगतद्वित्वम्। द्वयणुकारम्भकपरमाणुगतद्वित्वसंख्याविशेषात्, एवं
 त्र्यणुकारम्भकद्वयणुकगतत्रित्वसंख्याविशेषादित्यर्थः। एवञ्च द्वयणुकत्र्यणुके परिमाणवती द्रव्यत्वात्,
 तच्च परिमाणं कार्यं कार्यगुणत्वात्, तच्च कार्यं सकर्तृकं स च कर्ता ईश्वर इत्यनुमानेनेश्वरसिद्धिः।
 विश्वविदव्यय इत्यनेन ईश्वरे नित्यसर्वविषयकज्ञानसिद्धिः।

तत्र चार्वाकाः मन्यन्ते देह एव आत्मा, तस्यैव च चैतन्यम्। देहातिरिक्तः कश्चिदात्मा नास्ति, यस्य परलोके स्वर्गादिभोगः स्यात्। तदनुसारं परलोकः स्वर्गादिकं वा नास्ति। अलौकिकस्य परलोकसाधनस्याभावा दिति कर्मसम्पादनानन्तरं परक्षणे एव फलं भवति। अतः धर्माधर्मयोरधिष्ठातृत्वेन कर्मफलदातृत्वेन वा कश्चिद् नास्ति इति नेश्वरसिद्धिः। यदि धर्माधर्मात्मकम् अदृष्टं नाम किञ्चिद् स्यात्, तदा तदधिष्ठातृत्वा ईश्वरः कल्पेतापि। अदृष्टमेव नास्ति, तत्र प्रमाणाभावात्। इन्द्रियाविषयत्वात् न तावददृष्टं प्रत्यक्षविषयम्। नानुमानादपि अदृष्टसिद्धिर्भवितुमर्हति, अनुमानस्याप्रमाणत्वात् सर्वत्र व्यभिचारसंशयेना- व्यभिचारितसम्बन्धज्ञानाधीनमनुमानं न स्वीकर्तुं शक्यते, अनुमानस्य चाप्रामाण्ये तदधीनसंकेतग्रहाधीनबोधजनकस्य शब्दस्यापि नास्ति प्रामाण्यम्। यदि कार्यकारणभावः प्रामाणिकः स्यात् तदा क्षित्यादिकर्तृत्वेन ईश्वरसिद्धिः सुशका। पृथिव्यादिदर्शनेऽपि न तत्र कार्यत्वं सिद्ध्यति। अतः क्षित्यादिकर्तृत्वेनापि नेश्वरसिद्धिः कार्यकारणभावस्याप्रामाणिकत्वात्। इदं चार्वाकमतं निराकुर्वन्त उदयानाचार्याः जगतः सर्वगोचरं सर्वानुभूतं वैचित्र्यं प्रतिपादयन्ति। इदं च वैचित्र्यं कारणमन्तरेण न निरूपयितुं शक्यम्, वैचित्र्यस्य कार्यतया कारणजन्यत्वनियमात्। तत्र दृष्टकारणाभावेऽदृष्टमेव कारणमाश्रयणीयम्। यदि अदृष्टं न स्यात् तर्हि न कोऽपि धर्माचरणे प्रवर्तते। प्रवर्तन्ते च बहुशः बहुव्ययायाससाध्ये यागादिककर्मणि शिष्टाः। अनुमानं प्रमाणमेव। व्यभिचारसंशयेन हि अनुमानस्याप्रामाण्यं चार्वाकाः स्थापयन्ति, सोऽयं व्यभिचारसंशयः अनुमानमन्तरेण दुर्वारख्येयः। कालान्तरे देशान्तरे च स्थितयोः वह्निधूमयोः ज्ञानन्तु न प्रत्यक्षेण संभवति। तस्मात् प्रत्यक्षातिरिक्तमनुमानमनिच्छतापि अंगीकरणीयमेव। व्यभिचारसंशयेन हेतोर्न साधनत्वमित्यपि अनुमानेऽसति दुर्वचम्। बाल्येऽनुभूतस्य वार्धके स्मरणं, बाल्यवार्धकशरीरभेदेऽपि स्वीक्रियते एव। न खलु अन्येन दृष्टम् अन्यः कश्चित् स्मरति इति कश्चिदनुसंधाता देहव्यतिरिक्तः स्वीकर्तव्य एव।

मीमांसकादयः पृथिव्याः अकार्यत्वमास्थुः। यदि पृथिव्यां कार्यत्वं प्रत्यक्षं स्यात्तदा तत्कर्तृत्वस्य अस्मदादिषु असंभवात् सर्वज्ञः सर्वशक्तिः परमात्मा सिद्ध्येत्। मीमांसकानुसारं वेदो नित्योऽपौरुषेयश्च, न केनापि पुरुषेण वेदः कृतः इति वेदकर्तृत्वेन ईश्वरसिद्धिर्न भवितुमर्हति। ईश्वरस्य सद्भावं विनाऽपि परलोकसाधनानुष्ठानं संभवतीति न तदनुरोधेन ईश्वरसत्ता अपेक्ष्यते।

मीमांसकमतं निराकुर्वन्त आचार्याः वेदवाक्यानां जन्यत्वं पौरुषेयत्वञ्च साधयन्ति। तदनुसारम् इतरवाक्यानीव जन्यान्वेव न तु नित्यानि। तानि च भ्रमादिशून्यपरमाप्तेन पुरुषेण (ईश्वरेण) प्रणीतत्वात् महाजनपरिगृहीतत्वाच्च प्रमाणम्।

अनात्मवादिनामनीश्वरवादिनाञ्च बौद्धानाम्मते यस्य वस्तुनः प्रत्यक्षतः उपलब्धिर्नास्ति तादृशं किमपि वस्तु नास्ति। न केनाऽपि कदापि कुत्रापि वा सर्वज्ञः पुरुषो दृष्टः, तद्दर्शनसंभावनापि

नास्ति। अतः सर्वज्ञः पुरुषः खपुष्पायितः। न खलु प्रत्यक्षानुपलम्भबाधिते विषयेऽनुमानं प्रवर्तते। अतः प्रत्यक्षानुपलम्भबाधितत्वात् नानुमानेन ईश्वरसिद्धिः। पुनश्च लोके दृश्यते यो हि कर्ता भवति स शरीरी भवति, ईश्वरस्तु अशरीरी। अतोऽशरीरत्वात् नेश्वरसिद्धिः। “प्रयोजनमनादाय न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्तते” इति प्रसिद्धं लोके। ईश्वर आप्तकाम इति स्वीक्रियते। आप्तकामस्य न किमपि प्रयोजनं भवति, अतः क्षित्यादिकर्तृत्वेनापि नेश्वरसिद्धिः भवितुमर्हति।

बौद्धमतनिराकरणप्रकारस्त्वेवं-उपलम्भयोगस्यानुपलम्भेन अभावनिश्रयो भवति न तु अनुपलम्भमात्रेण। तथा सति अतीन्द्रियाणामाकाशादीनामप्यभावः प्रसज्येत। अतः प्रत्यक्षानुपलम्भात् ईश्वराभाव इति कथनमयुक्तम्, ईश्वरस्य प्रत्यक्षोपलम्भयोग्यत्वाच्च। शरीराभावात् प्रयोजनाभावाच्च ईश्वरे कर्तृत्वाभावानुमाने आश्रयस्यांगीकारप्रसंगः। तदनङ्गीकारे कुत्र कर्तृत्वाभावानुमानम्। यो हि कर्ता भवति तेन अवश्यं शरीरिणा भाव्यमिति नास्ति नियमः, न चास्ति तत्र प्रमाणं विपक्षे बाधकाभावात्। ईश्वरस्याप्तकामत्वेऽपि भूतानुग्रहः प्रयोजनमस्त्येवेति ईश्वरः सिद्ध्यति।

आर्हताः नैयायिकस्वीकृतेश्वरसद्भावेऽपि तत्र प्रमाणं न स्वीकुर्वन्ति। यतः ईश्वरस्य सर्वविषयकं ज्ञानं प्रमाज्ञानलक्षणसमन्वितं नास्ति। ईश्वरज्ञानं नित्यं सर्वविषयञ्चेति नैयायिकाः अभिप्रयन्ति। न खलु नित्यस्य वस्तुनः करणं कर्ता वा भवितुमर्हति। अतश्च ईश्वरः स्वज्ञानस्यापि करणं कर्ता वा नास्ति। अतः ईश्वरो न प्रमाणम्। ईश्वर-ज्ञानञ्च न प्रमा। अज्ञातविषयकं ज्ञानं प्रमा भवति। सर्वज्ञस्य ईश्वरस्य न किञ्चिदस्ति अज्ञातम्। यस्य ज्ञानं जायते तस्य प्रमा भवेत्, ईश्वरस्य ज्ञानं नित्यत्वान्नोत्पद्यते तस्मात् ईश्वरज्ञानं न प्रमा, नापि ईश्वरः प्रमाणम्।

आर्हतमतं निराकुर्वन्तः कुसुमाञ्जलिकाराः एवमाहुः-ईश्वरज्ञानस्य नित्यत्वेऽपि तदाश्रयः ईश्वरः स्वीकर्तव्य एव क्रियाश्रयस्य कर्तृत्वात्। अतः ईश्वरः प्रमाणम्। अज्ञातविषयकं ज्ञानं प्रमा नेदमास्थातुं शक्यम्। एकविषयकधारावाहिकबुद्धीनाम् अप्रमात्वप्रसंगात्। शुक्तिकायाम् इदं रजतमिति भ्रमज्ञानस्यापि प्रमात्वप्रसंगाच्च। अतः यथार्थानुभव एव प्रमा। ईश्वरज्ञानञ्च यथार्थोऽनुभवः इति प्रमा भवत्येव।

सांख्यास्तु प्रकृतेरेव जगत्कर्तृत्वं स्वीकुर्वन्ति। अतः जगत्कर्तृत्वेन ईश्वरसद्भावे प्रमाणं नैवाङ्गीकुर्वन्ति। उपासनाविधिपरत्वेन वेदस्य स्वार्थे तात्पर्याभावात् वेदोऽपि ईश्वरसद्भावे न प्रमाणम्।

अचेतनायाः प्रकृतेः कर्तृत्वं न संभवति कर्तृत्वस्य चैतन्यनियमात्। अतः क्षित्यादिकर्तृत्वेन चेतनः ईश्वरः सिद्ध्यति। द्वयणुकारम्भकपरमाणुद्वयसंयोगजनकं कर्मापि ईश्वरप्रयत्नादेव जायते। कर्मणश्चेतनप्रयत्नजन्यत्वनियमात्। ईश्वरमुपासीत इत्यादिदेववाक्यान्पि तत्सद्भावे प्रमाणम्।

उदयनाचार्यस्य कुसुमाञ्जलिटीकाप्रटीकासु अप्रकाशितचरा अत्र इदं प्रथमतया प्रकाशिता टीका न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिविकासाख्या श्रीमता गोपीनाथमौनिना कृता। अस्याष्टीकायाः 'कुसुमाञ्जलिविकास' इति संज्ञा पुष्पिकातो ज्ञायते। 'कुसुमाञ्जलेः विकास' (प्रथमपृष्ठे) 'आचार्यवाचामकरोद् विकासम्' (१७५ पृष्ठे पञ्चमे पद्ये) इत्युल्लेखेनापि टीकायाः संज्ञा विकास आसीदिति निगमयितुं शक्यते। मूलग्रन्थस्य नाम टीकाकर्त्रा कुसुमाञ्जलिरिति पुष्पिकायां निर्दिष्टं तथापि "न्यायप्रसूनाञ्जलिनामधेयं निर्माणमाचार्यकृतं प्रकाश्य" (पृष्ठे १७६) इत्येतेन न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिरिति संज्ञापि समर्थ्यते।

बडोदरास्थप्राच्यविद्यासंस्थानात् यो हस्तलेखः प्राप्तस्तत्र अस्य ग्रन्थस्य नाम "कुसुमाञ्जलिकारिकाविकास" इति संज्ञितम्। प्रारम्भे पुष्पिकायां च वृत्तिभागं विहाय कारिकाणां व्याख्यानात् इयं संज्ञाऽपि स्पष्टार्था। जयपुरस्थहस्तलेखस्य स्तबकान्तपुष्पिकासु प्रथमे स्तबकान्ते कुसुमाञ्जलिकारिका विकास इति, द्वितीयस्तबकान्ते कुसुमाञ्जलिविकास इति, तृतीयस्तबकान्ते न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिविकास इति चतुर्थपञ्चमस्तबकयोरन्ते च कुसुमाञ्जलिविकास इत्युपलभ्यते।

मद्रासविश्वविद्यालयतः १९८५ तमे ख्रिस्ताब्दे प्रकाशितायाः दर्शनञ्जर्याः प्रथमे भागे २४३ पृष्ठे अस्याष्टीकायाः विलास इति नाम निर्दिष्टम्। तच्च नेतैः प्रमाणैः समर्थ्यते।

श्रीगोस्वामिभट्टस्य पुत्रः श्रीगोपीनाथमौनी राज्ञः मिर्जाराजा श्रीजयसिंहस्य (१६२१-१६६७ ई.) राजधान्याम् आम्बेरिगिरौ (आमेर इति प्रख्याते) कुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्यामकरोदिति टीकाकृतपद्याभ्यां निश्चप्रचं भवति-

गोस्वामिभट्टपुत्रस्य गोपीनाथस्य मौनिनः ।
कृतिः करोतु कृतिनां कौतुकं हृत्तमोपहम् ।। (पृ. १)
राज्ञः श्रीजयसिंहस्य गिरावांबेरिसंज्ञके ।
आचार्यकारिकाव्याख्यां गोपीनाथोऽकरोदिमाम् ।। (पृ. १७६)

एतेषां न्यायशास्त्रे गुरवः श्रीन्यायवाचस्पतिनामधेया रुद्राख्या आसन्निति तद्वचोभिर्ज्ञायते-

श्रीन्यायवाचस्पतिनामधेयं जगद्गुरुं रुद्रमिह प्रणम्य ।
विनिर्मितं शर्म तनोतु तेषां दुरूहतर्के मतिरस्ति येषाम् ।। (पृ. १२९)

कुसुमाञ्जलिविकासकर्ता श्रीगोपीनाथमौनी मिर्जाराजा जयसिंहस्य (१६२१-१६६७ ई.) काले आमेरराज्ये ग्रन्थमिमं प्रणिनाय तद्गुरवश्च भावसिंहस्य (१५७६-१६२१ ई.) प्रीतिपात्राण्यभवन्। एतैः प्रमाणैरिदं सुस्पष्टं भवति यत् सप्तदशशताब्द्यां श्रीगोपीनाथमौनी आमेरराज्ये वसन् सारस्वतमुत्कर्ष चक्रे। कुसुमाञ्जलिग्रन्थस्य प्रणयनकालः (१६४०-५० ई.) मध्ये अनुमातुं शक्यते।

श्रीरुद्रन्यायवाचस्पतिर्विश्वनाथसिद्धान्तपञ्चाननस्य ज्येष्ठभ्राता आसीत्। अनेन भावविलासः, भ्रमरदूतः, वृन्दावनविनोद इति काव्यत्रयं, कुसुमाञ्जलिकारिकाणां, तत्त्वचिन्तामणेः, लीलावतीदीधितेः, बौद्धाधिकारदीधितेः, किरणावलीप्रकाशविवृतेः पदार्थतत्त्वनिरूपणस्य चित्ररूपवादार्थस्य, वादपदार्थस्य, आख्यातवादस्य नजवादस्य च टीका विरचिता अभूवन्निति 'काशी की सारस्वत साधना' (बिहार राष्ट्रभाषा परिषद् पृ. २७-२८) ग्रन्थलेखेन ज्ञायते। आमेरराज्ञो मिर्जाराजा जयसिंहस्य पूर्वशासकः भावसिंहः (१५७६-१६२१ ई.) जयपुरराज्यं शशास यस्य प्रीत्यै भावविलासस्य निर्माणमभूत्-

अन्यापदेशविनिवेशविदग्धबुद्धिश्रीभावसिंहनरसिंहनियोगयोगात् ।
सम्पादितो विविधभावविकासभाजां प्रीत्यै भृशं भवतु भावविलास एष ।।

(काव्यमाला, श्लोक १३४)

अनेन टीकाकर्त्रा स्ववंशस्य परिचयः टीकान्ते निवेशितः। तदनुसारम् अस्य पूर्वजः 'कुलकल्पवृक्षः' श्रीमौनिभट्टः महाराष्ट्रकुले आसीत्, यन्नामवर्णैरंकिता वंशजाः राज्ञां पूज्याः बभूवुः। एतेनेदमवसीयते यदस्य वंशजाः सर्वदा राज्याश्रयमविन्दन्। श्रीमौनिभट्टस्यात्मजो रघुनाथभट्टः मौनिकुलं स्वधर्माचरणैः पवित्रीचकार। तस्यैवानुजो दामोरदरभट्टः साक्षात् सरस्वतीमिव मल्लारिनामानं सुतं प्रपेदे। इदं "प्रह्लादितामान्तरलब्धशक्तिं" इति पाठस्य स्थाने "मल्लारिनामापरलब्धशक्तिं" मिति पाठभेदेन ज्ञायते। रघुनाथभट्टस्य पुत्रः गोस्वामीनामा आसीत् यो वाचस्पतिरिव बुधानां गुरुत्वं दधार। तस्यैव गोस्वामिभट्टस्यात्मजः श्रीगोपीनाथमौनी इमां टीकां चक्रे। अस्मिन्नेव महाराष्ट्रीये मौनिकुले समुत्पन्नः मौनिश्रीकृष्णभट्टनामा वृत्तिदीपिकानामकं ग्रन्थं चकार। (यस्य प्रकाशनं राजस्थानपुरातनग्रन्थमालायां श्रीपुरुषोत्तमशर्मचतुर्वेदिना सम्पाद्य कृतम्।) मौनी इति नाम्ना विख्याते वंशे समुत्पन्नः श्रीकृष्णभट्टः रघुनाथभट्टस्य सुतः श्रीगोवर्धनभट्टस्य पौत्र आसीदिति वृत्तिदीपिकास्थैः मंगलपद्यैः सूच्यते। श्रीगोपीनाथमौनिनः पितृव्यचरणा अपि नव्यनैयायिका आसन्निति सप्तदशपृष्ठेऽत्र तन्मतोल्लेखेन निष्कृष्टं भवति। तथा हि- "एवञ्च वह्नित्वपृथ्वीत्वादेः कार्यतावच्छेदकस्य परमाणुवृत्तित्वेऽपि न क्षतिरिति पितृव्यचरणाः" ग्रन्थकार इव टीकाकारोऽपि शिवभक्त आसीदिति प्रथमतृतीयमंगलपद्याभ्यां चतुर्थस्तबकान्तपद्येन च स्पष्टं भवति। अतिगभीराणामाचार्यवाचां विकासार्थं कृतेयं व्याख्या मूलग्रन्थार्थबोधाय प्रवृत्ता। या हि सदसद्विवेकचतुराणां कृतिनां मनो विनोदयति हृत्तमश्चाप्यहन्ति। मात्सर्यं परिहृत्य टीकामिमां दृष्ट्वा अन्यटीकाभ्यः विशिष्टमुत्कर्षं बुधाः ज्ञास्यन्तीति प्रत्ययः टीकाकृता प्रकटितः (पृ. ५७)।

गोपीनाथमौनिना पदार्थविवेकस्य टीका, शब्दालोकरहस्यं, अन्ये च केचन ग्रन्था निर्मिता अभूवन्नित्यपि उल्लेखः प्राप्यते।

वेदवेदाङ्गस्मृतिपुराणकाव्यनाटकादीनां प्रतिपदमुद्धरणैः अस्य सर्वशास्त्रवैशारद्यं स्फुटीभवति। कुसुमाञ्जलिटीकाकृतां व्याख्यानानां बहुशः खण्डनेन अस्याष्टीकाया वैशिष्ट्यं न्यायशास्त्रस्य विकासं कुरुते। तत एव टीकाकृतः सूक्तिरियं सुतरां समञ्जते-

महाशयानां हृदयं प्रविष्टा मुखाकृतिर्दर्पणसंगतेव।

महत्त्वमादाय निजाश्रयस्थं प्रसिद्धिमायास्यति निर्मितिर्मे। (पृ. १७६)

.....

(न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिविकासः, केन्द्रीय-संस्कृत-विद्यापीठम्, जयपुरम्, १९९२)



7. आदिशङ्कर

पिछली बारह शताब्दियों से जिस आचार्य के चिन्तन ने इस देश के दर्शन को सर्वाधिक प्रभावित किया है तथा जिनकी आचार्य-परम्परा आज भी निरन्तर विकासशील है, उनका जन्म केरल के मालाबार क्षेत्र के कालडि नामक ग्राम में नम्बूदरी ब्राह्मण के घर हुआ था (जन्म ७८८ ई. तथा निर्वाण ८२० ई. में माना जाता है)। उनका नाम है- शङ्कराचार्य। उन्होंने शैशव के प्रथम आठ वर्ष में चारों वेदों का अध्ययन कर लिया था, बारह वर्ष में सभी शास्त्रों का ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया था और सोलहवें वर्ष में ब्रह्मसूत्र पर अपनी विश्वप्रसिद्ध शारीरकमीमांसा या भाष्य की रचना कर दी थी और बत्तीसवें वर्ष में ब्रह्मलीन हो गये थे।

इतनी कम अवस्था में विश्व को अपना महान् योगदान देने वाला कोई दूसरा मनीषी दिखाई या सुनाई नहीं देता। इन्होंने न केवल वेदान्त के ग्रन्थों का प्रणयन किया अपितु अद्वैत सिद्धान्त के प्रचार के लिए देश के विभिन्न भूभागों का परिभ्रमण किया। दूसरे मतों को मानने वालों के साथ निरन्तर शास्त्रार्थ करके सम्पूर्ण देश में अद्वैत की विजय-पताका फहरा दी। आज उनका अद्वैत सिद्धान्त भारतीय दर्शन का चूड़ामणि माना जाता है। स्वामी विवेकानन्द एवं अन्य आचार्यों के माध्यम से शङ्कराचार्य का अद्वैत वेदान्त सार्वभौम हो गया। दर्शन के क्षेत्र में ही नहीं अपितु स्तोत्रों के माध्यम से साहित्य के क्षेत्र में भी आदिशङ्कर का योगदान अपूर्व और अविस्मरणीय है।

कहा जाता है कि पाँच वर्ष की अवस्था में यह बालक जब नदी में स्नान कर रहा था तो एक ग्राह ने उसे पकड़ लिया और तब तक नहीं छोड़ा जब तक उसकी वृद्धा माता ने संन्यास-ग्रहण करने की अनुमति नहीं दी। पर अनुमति के साथ एक शर्त थी कि वृद्धा माता

का जब भी देहावसान होगा तो संन्यासी होने पर भी आचार्य शङ्कर अपनी माँ की अन्त्येष्टि करने स्वयं आयेंगे। इसे शिशु शङ्कर ने स्वीकार कर उस नियम का अपवाद बनाया जिसके अनुसार संन्यासी अग्नि नहीं छू सकता।

इसी प्रकार के कई मार्मिक मानवीय प्रसङ्ग उनकी जीवनगाथा में जुड़े हुए हैं। विद्वानों में यह प्रसिद्धि है कि शङ्कर पहले शाक्त थे और बाद में वैष्णव हुए तथा अन्त में संन्यासी होकर अद्वैत वेदान्त के प्रतिपादक बने। यह भी एक तथ्य है कि दक्षिण भारत के होने पर भी शङ्कराचार्य की किसी भी रचना में दक्षिण के भौगोलिक विवरण, खान-पान या क्षेत्रीय परम्परा का सन्दर्भ नहीं मिलता। यह सम्भव है कि उन्होंने अपना मुख्य जीवन उत्तर भारत में बिताया हो। उनके गुरु भी उत्तर के ही थे। उनके पितामह का नाम विधाधिराज था। कालडि नामक ग्राम के बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि स्वयं शङ्कर भगवान् कैलास से चलकर आये थे इसलिए काल+अडि के आधार पर तमिल में इस गाँव का नाम कालडि पड़ा। शङ्कर के पिता का नाम शिवगुरु था। उन्होंने शिव की आराधना द्वारा साक्षात् शङ्कर को अपने पुत्र के रूप में प्राप्त किया था। उनके शिष्य सुरेश्वराचार्य के अनुसार इनके कुल का गोत्र आत्रेय था। शङ्कराचार्य के गुरु माण्डूक्यकारिका के विश्रुत लेखक गौडपाद के शिष्य गोविन्दभगवत्पाद थे।

शङ्कर के शिष्यों में पद्मपाद, हस्तामलक तथा सुरेश्वर उल्लेखनीय हैं। शङ्कर की जीवन-गाथा को लेकर अनेक ग्रन्थों का प्रणयन हुआ है जिनमें शङ्कर- दिग्विजय तथा केरलोत्पत्ति विशेषरूप से उल्लेखनीय हैं।

शङ्कराचार्य के नाम से सौ से अधिक रचनाएँ प्रसिद्ध हैं पर इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि उनमें अनेक कृतियाँ आदि शङ्कर के द्वारा प्रणीत नहीं हैं। भारतीय साहित्य की यह परम्परा रही है कि अपनी कृति के प्रचार के लिए लेखक या कवि स्वयं का नाम न देकर किसी प्रसिद्ध कवि या आचार्य के नाम से अपनी रचना को समर्पित कर देता था। यही कारण है कि कालिदास के नाम से अनेक रचनाएँ प्रसिद्ध हो गईं। व्यास के नाम से अनेक पुराण-उपपुराणों की रचना हो गई; रामायण-महाभारत में प्रक्षिप्त अंश से अनेक रचनाकारों की रचनाएँ निरन्तर साहित्य-समुद्र में नदियों की भाँति अपना वैयक्तिक नाम खोती रहीं और रचना को जीवित बनाये रहीं। अपने नाम के मोह में न पड़कर सृजन को जीवित रखने का यह अपूर्व भारतीय प्रयोग है। जिन कृतियों को आदिशङ्कर द्वारा प्रणीत माना जाता है, उनमें ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्य, गीताभाष्य, दश उपनिषदों के भाष्य, माण्डूक्यकारिकाभाष्य, विष्णुसहस्रनामभाष्य, विवेकचूड़ामणि, उपदेशसाहस्री, दक्षिणामूर्तिस्तोत्र, गायत्रीभाष्य तथा सम्भवतः सौन्दर्यलहरी

विशेषरूप से उल्लेखनीय हैं। चर्पटमञ्जरी या भजगोविन्दम् आदि छोटे-छोटे स्तोत्र भी आदि शङ्कर के नाम से अधिक प्रसिद्ध हैं। उपनिषद्, ब्रह्मसूत्र तथा गीता को मिलाकर प्रस्थानत्रयी कहा जाता है। ये भारतीय संस्कृति और चिन्तन के आधारभूत ग्रन्थ हैं। इन तीनों ग्रन्थों पर टीका अथवा भाष्य लिखकर अपने मत की स्थापना द्वारा ही किसी मनीषी को आचार्य माने जाने की परम्परा का सूत्रपात स्वयं शङ्कर ने ही किया था। इनके बाद जो भी आचार्य आये, जैसे कि रामानुज, वल्लभ, निम्बार्क, मध्व उनके लिए यह आवश्यक हो गया कि प्रस्थानत्रयी पर भाष्य लिखें अथवा उनके साथ अपने मत की सङ्गति प्रमाणित करें। इस प्रकार आचार्य शङ्कर ने इन ग्रन्थों को चिन्तन का मेरुदण्ड बना दिया ताकि नवीन चिन्तन अपनी जड़ तक जाकर अपनी प्रामाणिकता प्रतिपादित कर सके तथा परम्परा और परिवर्तन-संस्कृति के प्रवाह में मिल सके।

आठवीं शताब्दी का भारत विभिन्न सम्प्रदायों में विभक्त था, वेद-विरोधी नास्तिकता प्रबल थी तथा आचार एवं मर्यादा निरन्तर शिथिल होती जा रही थी, कर्मकाण्ड जोर पकड़े हुए था, धर्म का वास्तविक स्वरूप गुफा में छिप गया था, लौकिक अभ्युदय के लिए धर्म का हिंसा-प्रधान तान्त्रिक रूप का भी ताण्डव-नर्तन हो रहा था; इस परिस्थिति में शङ्कराचार्य का प्रादुर्भाव हुआ था। उन्होंने निर्गुण ब्रह्म को परमतत्त्व के रूप में प्रतिपादित किया। उस परमतत्त्व की न कोई जाति है, न देश है, न अवस्था है, न वर्ण है, न लिङ्ग है। इसका सीधा-सा अभिप्राय यह हुआ कि सारे सम्प्रदाय, पूजा-पद्धतियाँ, आचार-सविचार, वेष-भूषा, सब कुछ नामरूप हैं, उपाधिरूप हैं, प्रपञ्चरूप हैं, माया हैं। इसमें से व्यक्ति किसी भी माध्यम को अपनी इच्छा के अनुसार अपना सकता है पर उसका कोई पारमार्थिक महत्त्व नहीं है। अनेक प्रकार की विविधताओं से भरे हुए इस विश्व में विविधता को, द्वैत को, प्रपञ्च घोषित करना और परमार्थ को इन सबसे परे बताना चिन्तन के क्षेत्र में ऐतिहासिक उपलब्धि है। विविध का निराकरण कर समग्र ब्रह्माण्ड की एकता का उद्घोष आचार्य शङ्कर ने किया है- सर्व खल्विदं ब्रह्म। नानात्व स्वयं में सत्य नहीं है, वह माया है जिसे न सत् कहा जा सकता है और न असत्। इसी अर्थ में संसार मिथ्या, माया या अविद्या है।

ब्रह्मसूत्र पर आचार्य शङ्कर ने जो भाष्य लिखा है उसका नाम है- शारीरकभाष्य। शरीर में रहने वाला शारीरक अर्थात् जीव। इस भाष्य की यह संज्ञा इस बात को सूचित करती है कि ब्रह्मसूत्र के रचयिता बादरायण ने अखिल ब्रह्माण्ड की एकता का प्रतिपादन करने के लिए ब्रह्मतत्त्व का निरूपण किया था, तो आदिशङ्कर ने उस ब्रह्म के साथ आत्मा या देही की एकता का प्रतिपादन करने के लिए अपने भाष्य का नाम शारीरक रखा तथा यह

घोषित किया कि आत्मा ही ब्रह्म है- आत्मा च ब्रह्म। तत्त्वमसि का भी यही रहस्य है। इसी को ब्रह्म और आत्मा का एकत्व विज्ञान आचार्य शङ्कर ने घोषित किया है। घृणा, द्वेष और हिंसा मनुष्य को मनुष्य से काटती है; अहिंसा, करुणा और मैत्री के भाव एक को दूसरे से जोड़ते हैं, प्रेम में एकता की अनुभूति, प्रेमीयुगल का सुख-दुःख में अद्वैत का अनुभव-अद्वैत सुखदुःखयोः मात्र कल्पना नहीं, अपितु मानवीय अनुभूति का यथार्थ है। यही अद्वैत की भावभूमि है। शङ्कर का यह अद्वैत सिद्धान्त समग्र ब्रह्माण्ड की एकता और समग्र प्राणियों के तादात्म्य का, ब्रह्मरूपता का दार्शनिक जयघोष है।

बौद्ध आत्मा के अस्तित्व को स्वीकार नहीं करते। वे अनात्मवादी हैं। आचार्य शङ्कर के अनुसार आत्मा स्वयंसिद्ध है क्योंकि प्रत्येक व्यक्ति को अपने होने का अनुभव होता है। अपने न होने का अनुभव उसे नहीं होता। यह आत्मा सच्चिदानन्द है। आनन्द इसका स्वरूप है; दुःख इसकी नियति नहीं है। इस प्रकार शङ्कर का अद्वैतवाद बौद्धों के अनात्मवाद तथा दुःखवाद का प्रत्यक्ष विरोध करता है और यह घोषणा करता है कि सृष्टि की उत्पत्ति, स्थिति और लय आनन्द में विश्रान्त है। यह चिन्तन अरब-ग्रीक के चिन्तन से भिन्न है। यही कारण है कि भारतीय दर्शन ने मानवीय त्रासदी को अन्तिम सत्य नहीं माना।

आदिशङ्कर का अद्वैत सिद्धान्त विश्व में वेदान्त के नाम से प्रसिद्ध है। वेद के अन्त, अन्तिम भाग तथा उद्देश्य को प्रमाण मानकर प्रवर्तित होने के कारण इसे वेदान्त कहते हैं। इस प्रकार शङ्कर का दर्शन विश्व के प्राचीनतम चिन्तन तथा ग्रन्थ, वेद या श्रुति से सीधा जुड़ा हुआ है। इसके साथ ही अनुभव पर आधारित होने के कारण यह निरन्तर नवीन और सृजनशील भी है। भारत के विभिन्न कोनों, कांची, शृंगेरी, पुरी, द्वारका, श्रीनगर तथा बदरीनाथ में स्थापित मठों में शङ्कर की परम्परा आज भी जीवित है। शङ्कराचार्य प्राचीन ऐतिहासिक व्यक्ति ही नहीं, अपितु आज भी प्राणवान् संस्था है। उनका वेदान्त दर्शन इस वैज्ञानिक युग में भी सार्थक है। कर्म के ऊपर ज्ञान की, धर्म के ऊपर दर्शन की जो प्रतिष्ठा आदिशङ्कर ने स्थापित की है वही भारत के नव-निर्माण का, विश्व में शान्ति की स्थापना और प्राणिमात्र के बन्धन से छुटकारा पाने का एकमात्र मार्ग है- ऋते ज्ञानान्न न मुक्तिः।

(राजस्थान पत्रिका, जयपुर)



तृतीय परिच्छेद : काश्मीर शैव दर्शन

1. शैवागमदर्शनेषु परतत्त्वविमर्शः

कालमुख-कापालिक-कारुणिकप्रभृतीनि बहूनि शैवदर्शनानि यत्र तत्र नामतः स्मर्यन्ते। नहि तेषां साहित्यं साम्प्रतं प्राप्यते, येन सप्रमाणं साङ्गोपाङ्गं च पूर्वोक्तदर्शनविमर्शः क्षोदक्षमतामवगाहेत। अथ दश शैवदर्शनान्यैतिह्यप्रमाणं तत्साहित्यं चोपजीव्य शैवागमपारङ्गतैः सावष्टम्भमनुसन्धीयन्ते। एतानि तानि १. द्वैतपाशुपतदर्शनम् २. द्वैतशैवसिद्धान्तदर्शनम् ३. द्वैताद्वैतलकुलीशपाशुपतदर्शनम् ४. विशिष्टद्वैतशैवदर्शनम् ५. वीरशैवमतं शैवविशेषाद्वयदर्शनं वा ६. नन्दिकेश्वरीयं शिवाद्वैतदर्शनम् ७. रसेश्वरदर्शनम् ८. क्रमदर्शनम् ९. कुलदर्शनम् १०. प्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शनं च। पर्यन्तसंख्यातानि क्रमकुलप्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शनान्येकान्तेन काश्मीरदेशोद्धवत्वात् काश्मीरिक्वैश्वाचार्यै-स्तदितरविस्मारकेन प्राधान्येन परिपोषितत्वादिदानीन्तनैस्तत्त्वज्ञैः काश्मीरशैवदर्शनानीत्यभिधीयन्ते। शैवागमान् परमं प्रमाणीकृत्य प्रवृत्तेष्वेषु दर्शनेष्वनेकभूमिकं वैचित्र्यं प्रेक्षावतामापाततः प्रेङ्खत्प्रेक्षामारोहतितामाम्। वेदान्तवाक्यकुसुमग्रथनार्थानि बादरायणसूत्राणि प्रमाणकोटिमाटीकयद्विरसंख्या-तैरिवाचार्यैर्यावन्तो यादृशाश्च पक्षाः प्रतिष्ठापिताः, सिद्धान्ताः समाप्ताः, दृष्टयश्च समुन्मेषिताः, प्रायस्तावन्तस्तादृशाश्चात्रापि दिग्भेदेन पन्थानः प्रवर्तिताः प्रसृताः परिमार्गिताश्च परिलक्ष्यन्ते। पुनश्च दृष्टीनामानन्त्यात् रुचीनां वैचित्र्यादृजुकुटिलनानापथजुषां नृणां सकलप्रयोजनमौलिभूतं परमपुरुषार्थं प्रतिपादयितुं निगूढरमणीया नव्याश्चार्था आलोकनीयतामानीताः। श्रुतिस्मृतिमूलेष्वाम्बुधारेषु तद्बाह्यानामनधिकारात्तन्मूलेषु दर्शनेष्वपि सावर्णिका एव सहजालापं विघ्नभ्रं च भेजिरे। आगमाश्रितेष्वाम्बुधारेषु सर्वेषामधिकारादाचारविचारचर्चादीनां देशकालादिषु शतशो भिद्यमानत्वाद् भिन्नरुचेर्लोकस्य प्रस्थानभेदप्रवर्तकत्वाद् आगममूलानां दर्शनानां सहजं वैलक्षण्यं सर्वावदातं विभाति। तत एव मन्ये कुलदर्शनचर्यायां शाक्तसम्प्रदाय इव मद्यमांसमैथुनरूपमकारत्रयस्योपयोगः स्वीकृतः, भोगमोक्षयोश्च परस्पराविरोधेन समन्वयः समाप्ताः। यथा हि जगत्प्रकृतिरतीतकल्पपरम्पराविभूतविचित्रवस्तुप्रपञ्चा सती पुनरिदानीं परिक्षीणा परपदार्थनिर्माणशक्तिरिति न शक्यतेऽभिधातुम्, तद्वदेव जगत्प्रकृतिं सूक्ष्मेक्षकया परामृशदर्शनमपि नवनवाभिर्दृष्टिभिरभिवर्धतेतमाम्। किं वा बहुविस्तरेण, प्रकृतमेव पर्यायेण परामृशामः।

१. द्वैतपाशुपतमते परतत्त्वस्वरूपम्

श्रीबादरायणेन पत्युरसामञ्जस्यात् इति सूत्रेण संदृब्धं श्रीशङ्कराचार्येण तद्भाष्ये माहेश्वरास्तु इति नाम्नाऽनूद्य विप्रतिपाद्यमानं पाशुपतमतं प्रधानपतिरूपयोः कारणयोः परत्वप्रतिपादनाद् द्वैतदर्शनमवसीयते। तदिदं कारणकार्ययोगविधिदुःखान्तानि पञ्च तत्त्वानि

तनोति। एते पदार्थाः पशुपतिनेश्वरेण पशुपाशविमोक्षणयोपदिष्टाः। कारणं पतिरिति कार्यं पशुरिति। पतिस्तत्र सांख्ययोगवैशेषिकादीनां मतेनेवात्रापि निमित्तकारणं स्वीकृतः। प्रकृतिरुपादानकारणम्। तदेवं कारणं द्विविधम्-उपादानं निमित्तं च। पशुस्तावद् देहेन्द्रियादिव्यतिरिक्तो नित्यश्चिदात्मकोऽनेको विभुरनादिमलावृतोऽस्वतन्त्रः कर्ता च। पशुपाशविमोक्ष एव दुःखान्तः। स एव चात्र मोक्षः। अतः पशूनां कर्मानुसारेण प्रकृत्युपादानतया जगदुत्पत्तिस्थितिलयहेतुः पतिरिति पाशुपतमतेन पतिस्वरूपम्। नास्य हीनमध्यमोत्तमविभागेन प्राणिनां सृष्टे रागद्वेषादिप्रसक्तिराशङ्कनीया, प्राणिकर्मणामेव तद्विभागोपपादकत्वात्। न च कर्मेश्वरयोः प्रवर्त्यप्रवर्तयित्वे इतरेतराश्रयप्रसङ्गः स्यात्, कर्मणामचेतनत्वात् कदा कथं कीदृशी च प्रवृत्तिरिति चेतनधर्मानवगाहित्वात् कर्मानुसारं प्रकृत्युपादानकं चेच्छाज्ञानादीनां पर्यन्ते पत्युरधीनत्वेनैवोपपत्तेश्च। पशुपाशविमोक्षणार्थं प्रवृत्तेश्च लौकिकस्वार्थपरार्थप्रवृत्तिदोषगुणानाविलत्वादनीश्वरत्वप्रसङ्गोऽपि दूरे आस्तामिति।

२. द्वैतशैवसिद्धान्तदर्शनम्

सर्वदर्शनसंग्रहे शैवदर्शननाम्ना संगृहीतं दशशिवागमानामष्टादशरुद्रागमानां च प्रामाण्यं सिद्धान्तयत् सद्योज्योतिषा प्रवर्तितं सिद्धान्तशैवदर्शनं पतिपशुपाशरूपं पदार्थत्रयं विवृणोति। तत्र पतिस्वरूपनिरूपणमेवात्र प्राथम्येन प्रासङ्गिकम्। ऐंस्लम (Anselm)- एक्वीनस (Aquinas)- देकार्त (Descartes)- लाइबनिट्ज़ (Leibnitz)- उल्फ (Wolf) प्रभृतिभिर्दार्शनिकैर्यथाविधमधीश्वरस्य कर्तृत्वं निमित्तकारणत्वं वा प्रतिपाद्यते, अरस्तूमहोदयेन च स मुख्यः प्रवर्तयिता (Prime mover) इति मन्यते, तथैवात्रापि पतिः स्वीक्रियते। एको विभुर्नित्योऽनादिनन्तश्चिदघ्नो नित्यमुक्तो रागद्वेषादिमलैरनाविद्धः स्वतन्त्रो निरतिशयकरुणः शुद्धः कर्ता पतिरित्युच्यते। स हि स्वशक्त्याऽनन्यभूतयो रविरिव कमलानि प्रधानोपादानेन जगन्ति विकचीकुरुते। इच्छाज्ञानक्रियारूपास्तस्य तिस्रः शक्तयः। तद्व्यापारभेदेन च सृष्टिस्थितिसंहारनिरोधानुग्रहा अप्यस्यैव शक्तय इत्युच्यन्ते। अत एवास्य पञ्चवक्त्रत्वम् ईशतत्पुरुषसद्योजातवामदेवाधोरूपं तैत्तिरीयारण्यके श्रूयते। अत्र पतिपशुपाशरूपं पदार्थत्रयं शिवपुरुषमहामाया नामभिरपि निर्दिश्यते। अस्मिन्नेव पदार्थत्रये प्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शनादिषु निरूपितानि षट्त्रिंशत्तत्त्वान्यन्तर्भवन्ति। काश्मीरप्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शने शुद्धाशुद्धाख्यो द्विविधस्तावदध्वा। तत्र शिवशक्तिसदाशिवेश्वर-सद्विद्याख्यं तत्त्वपञ्चकं शुद्धम्। एतच्च पत्यावन्तर्भाव्यते सिद्धान्तशैवैः। अशुद्धाध्वनि परिगृहीतानां माया-शक्तिपञ्चक (कलाविद्याकालरागनियतिरूपम्)-प्रकृति-तदप्रकृतिविकृतिभूतचतुर्विंशतितत्त्वानां पुरुषवर्जितानां पशावन्तर्भावः पुरुषस्य च पत्यौ स्वीकृतः। एवमियमन्तर्भावकथा प्रचलति सिद्धान्तशैवदर्शने। शैवागमदर्शनपारङ्गतैरस्माकं गुरुवर्यैः डॉ. कान्तिचन्द्रपाण्डेयमहोदयैराधुनिकविद्वत्समाजे जाग्रतीं भ्रान्तिं निराकुर्वद्भिरिदं निर्णीयते यत्- “नास्य तामिलशैवसिद्धान्तात् कश्चन भेदः। तामिलशैवसिद्धान्तेऽपि पशुपतिपाशाख्यानि त्रीणि प्रधानतत्त्वानि, षट्त्रिंशदवान्तरतत्त्वानि, मलमायाकर्माख्यास्त्रयो मलाः, शुद्धाशुद्धरूपा

द्विविधा सृष्टिः, परापश्यन्तीमध्यमावैखरीरूपा चतुर्विधा वाक्, अष्टाविंशत्यागमानाञ्च प्रामाण्यमूरीक्रियत इति भाषाभावकृतो भेदः। तथ्यं त्विदं यद् मेखण्डदेवो यस्तामिलशैवसिद्धान्तप्रमाणग्रन्थं शिवज्ञानबोधाख्यं व्यलिखत् स त्रयोदशशताब्द्यामभवत्, यतः पूर्वं सद्योज्योतिदेवबलभोजाघोरशिवादिभिर्बहवो द्वैतशैवसिद्धान्तप्रतिपादनपरा ग्रन्था लिखिताः” इति।^३ तदनेनैतिह्यानुरोधेनेदं निष्प्रपञ्चं चकास्ते यद्दक्षिणेषु बन्धप्रसराणां शैवसिद्धान्तानां मूलं शैवागमा एव, न पुनस्तामिलादिभाषोपनिबद्धाः केचन प्राचीनग्रन्थाः।

अचेतनानां नित्यत्वमसम्भवीति परमाणूनां नित्यत्वानभ्युपगमात्, जीवस्य ज्ञानरूपत्वं न पुनः ज्ञानाश्रयत्वम्, सृष्टौ च सत्कार्यवादस्वीकारात् वैशेषिकेभ्यः, पुरुषस्य (पशोः) अनादिमलावृतत्वेन पुष्करपलाशवनिर्लेपत्वानङ्गीकारात् सांख्यसिद्धान्तेभ्यः, पशूनां न पतिरूपत्वं किन्तु तदाश्रितत्वमुपादाननिमित्तकारणयोर्भिन्नत्वं न पुनरेकत्वमिति व्यवस्थाया वेदान्तेभ्यः, सिद्धान्तशैवदर्शनस्य जगत्स्वरूपनिरूपणे परतत्त्वविमर्शं चास्ते सर्वावदातं वैलक्षण्यम्।

३. द्वैताद्वैतलकुलीशपाशुपतदर्शनम्

ख्रिस्तीयद्वितीयशतके श्रीमता लकुलीशेन प्रवर्तितं तन्नाम्नैव प्राप्तोपाख्यं द्वैताद्वैतलकुलीशपाशुपतदर्शनं कारणकार्ययोगविधिदुःखान्तान्तं पाशुपतदर्शनपरिगृहीतं तत्त्वपञ्चकं स्वीकुर्वद् कारणं पतिरिति, कार्यं विद्याकलापशुरूपं त्रिविधमिति, योगः शिवसायुज्यमिति, सर्वदुःखोपशमरूपोऽनात्मकः, शिवसायुज्यरूपः सात्मकश्चेति द्विविधो दुःखान्त इति स्वदृशा तत्त्वग्राममापादयति। कार्यत्वेऽपि नित्यस्य पशोः पञ्चमलपरिहाणानन्तरं शिवसायुज्येन (न पुनर्वेदान्तनय इव जीवस्य ब्रह्मत्वेन) मुक्तौ सत्त्वाद् द्वैताद्वैतत्वम्। पुनश्च कारणमेकः पतिः तस्मादेव त्रिविधं विद्याकलापशुरूपं कार्यत्रयमुद्भवति। तच्च पुनः शक्तावतिष्ठते। शक्तिश्च शिवादिभिन्ना। अतः स्वाभिन्नशक्तौ सर्वाभ्यन्तरं कारिणः शिवस्यावयविन इवैकत्वाङ्गीकारात् तद्वाह्यस्य स्वतन्त्रस्य कस्यचिदपि तत्त्वास्यास्वीकाराद् द्वैताद्वैतत्वं विशदं भवति। पाशुपतसूत्रेषु पतिः कारणं ब्रह्म वेति शब्दान्तरं न त्वर्थान्तरम्। तच्च सद् असद्भिन्नत्वात् आद्यमाद्यन्ताभावात्। सांख्ययोगाभिमतस्य पुरुषस्येव च नास्ति तस्य जन्मजराप्रणाशापत्तिः। तत एव पतिं सद्योजातमाहुरिति कौण्डिन्यः। स एव प्रधानं निमित्तं च कारणं। तस्मादेव कार्यत्रयस्य भवस्य चोद्भवः^४। सृष्टिस्थितिसंहारान् दृक् क्रियाशक्तिमान् स एव चिक्रीडिषया कुरुते। ज्ञानं क्रिया च वहेदाहकत्वाभिव तस्य शक्तौ। परतत्त्वस्वरूपविमर्शं पाशुपतसूत्रकारो लकुलीशस्तैत्तिरीयारण्यकमन्त्रानुससारेति न विचिकित्स्यमेतद्भवद्विर्वक्ष्यमाणान् मन्त्रान् सूत्राणि चानुध्यायद्भिः- भवोद्भवाय नमः। वामदेवाय नमो। ज्येष्ठाय नमः। श्रेष्ठाय नमो। रुद्राय नमः (तैत्तिरीयारण्यके)। तथा- भवोद्भवः..... रुद्रस्य (पाशुपतसूत्राणि, ५५-५७)। ज्ञानशक्तिसामर्थ्येन सः पशून् व्याप्य स्थितः। पशोः पशुत्वापादकं च तस्यैव सामर्थ्यं शक्तिर्वा। वस्तुतस्तैत्तिरीयारण्यके चत्वारिंशदनुवाकादारभ्य सप्तचत्वारिंशानुवाकपर्यन्तं यत्

परशिवस्वरूपमाम्नायते तदेव मूलमस्य दर्शनस्य। तत्र पञ्चमन्त्राः- सद्योजातं प्रपद्यामि, वामदेवाय नमः, अघोरेभ्योऽथ घोरेभ्यः, तत्पुरुषाय विद्महे, ईशानः सर्वविद्यानाम्। एत एव मन्त्रा लकुलीशेन मनाक् परिवर्तनेन सूत्रिताः^५ दर्शनदृष्ट्या च स्फारिताः।

● कारणकार्यसम्बन्धः

कारणं पतिः कार्यं च विद्याकलापशुत्रयमिति प्रागवोचाम। तत्र नैयायिका वैशेषिकाश्चेश्वरस्य कारणत्वं स्वीकुर्वाणा अपि परमाण्वाद्युपादानादिसहकारिकारण-परतन्त्रतयाऽस्य निमित्तकारणत्वमेवाभ्युपगच्छन्ति। वेदान्तिनां नये ब्रह्म उपादानं निमित्तञ्च। अत्र लकुलीशपाशुपतदर्शने पतिरेवोद्भावयति कार्यत्रयम्। अत एव स भवोद्भव इति श्रूयते। कार्यत्रयस्य च नित्यत्वेन तस्मिन् स्थितिः। सृष्टिश्च वृत्तिलाभः।^६ स एवासनमाश्रयो वा त्रिविधस्य कार्यस्य। कार्यत्रयं शक्तिस्थम्। शक्तिश्च सामर्थ्यमैश्वर्यम्, स्वगुणसद्भावः “सतत्त्वं सत्त्वधर्मः” (पाशुपतसूत्रम्-५८) इत्येवं शक्तिः शिवादिभिन्नैव। यथा तारकशतखचितं व्योम आकाशतत्त्वे विश्रान्तम्, तथैव चित्रविचित्रपरम्परविभूतं जगदिदं कारणे शिवे। नीरक्षोरयोरिव नास्ति कारणकार्ययोः वृत्तिसङ्करः।^७ अनयोस्तु पुनरादित्यदीपप्रभयोरिव भेदस्तद्देव च सापेक्षे व्यापकत्वाव्यापकत्वे। कारणं पतिर्विभुर्व्यापकः सर्वानैवार्थान् व्याप्नोति। पशुत्वेन स्वीकृतः सांख्याभिमतः पुरुषश्चतुर्विंशतितत्त्वानि प्रधानस्थानीया च कला स्वकार्यवर्गं व्याप्नुतः। व्याप्यं व्यापकञ्चैकत्र स्थितेऽपि हरिद्रारञ्जितजलमिवान्योन्यभेदं न परित्यजतः। तदेवमुभयोरेकत्र स्थितिर्न च वृत्तिसङ्करः। कारणस्य च पत्युर्निरतिशयव्यापकत्वम्। स्वतन्त्रश्च सः। कार्यं निजानर्थान् व्याप्य परतन्त्रं च। उभयोर्नित्यत्वं तु प्रागेव प्रतिपादितमिति दिक्।

४. विशिष्टाद्वैतशैवदर्शनम्

ख्रिस्तीयनवमशताब्द्यां भास्करो भेदाभेदवादमभ्युपजगाम, रामानुज-गुरुर्यादवप्रकाशश्च वैष्णवविशिष्टाद्वैतं प्रकाशयामास। उभावप्याचार्यावुपजीव्य निगमागमयोरविरोधित्वं शिवागमत्वं च मन्वानः श्रीमान् श्रीकण्ठः स्वीये ब्रह्ममीमांसाभाष्ये शैवविशिष्टाद्वैतमेकादशशतके प्रतिष्ठापयामास। अस्यैव निगमागमविरोधस्थापकानि बहूनि प्रमाणानि स्वीकुर्वन् श्रीमान् रामानुजाचार्यः समकालं तदनु च वैष्णवविशिष्टाद्वैतं प्रसारयामासेति विदितमस्तु प्रेक्षावताम्। अथ प्रकृतं विशिष्य ब्रूमः। ब्रह्मादिनानानामभेदैराम्नातः शिव एव परः। शक्तिस्तस्य विशेषणम्। नहि तां विना कोऽपि शिवं प्रतीयतात्। औष्ण्यप्रकाशादिकमजानानो वह्निं न प्रत्येति। अथ कीदृशोऽयं विशेषणविशेष्यभावसम्बन्ध इति चेत्, ययोर्द्वयोर्मध्ये एकस्य ज्ञानमपरस्य ज्ञानमन्तरा न प्रभवति, ययोश्चैकमपरस्वातन्त्र्येण न भवति, तयोर्हि विशेषणविशेष्यभाव इति प्रतिजानीमः। शिवेन सहाविनाभाविनी शक्तिरेव जगदुद्भावयति, तत्रैव च जगद् बीजात्मना संहतं भवतीति जगदुत्पत्तिस्थितिसंहारकारिणी शक्तिरेव, परं तस्याः शिवाविनाभावित्वाद् जगतस्तद्भेदेऽप्यभेदोऽवसीयत इति शैवानां विशिष्टाद्वैतम्।

५. शैवविशेषाद्वयवादो वीरशैवमतं वा

दक्षिणेषु लब्धप्रसरं वसवनाम्ना आचार्येण ख्रिस्तीयदशमशतके वीरतापूर्वकं शिवलिङ्गादिधारणरक्षणदिना लोके वीरशैवमिति प्रख्यातमेतन्मतं दर्शनदृष्ट्या विशेषाद्वैतशुद्धद्वैताद्वैतसेश्वराद्वैत-शिवाद्वैतप्रभृतिभिर्भिन्नाभिरभिख्याभिः परिचीयते। अस्मिन् दर्शने स्वान्तःकृतानन्तविश्वरूपः शिव एव परं तत्त्वम्। स एव स्वातन्त्र्येण विश्वमुद्भावयति, उद्भूतं चैतत्तस्मिन्नेवान्तरवतिष्ठते, अयमेवास्य शिवाद्वैतवादः। तथा चोक्तं सिद्धान्तशिखामणौ^{१०}-

विशब्देनोच्यते शक्तिः शिवजीवैक्यबोधिका।
तस्यां रमन्ते ये शैवा वीरशैवास्तु ते मताः।।

क्रियासारे च^{१०}-

विशब्दो वा विकल्पार्थो रशब्दो रहितार्थकः।
विकल्परहितं शैवं वीरशैवं प्रचक्षते।।

परश्च शिवः सर्वशक्तिमान्। शक्तिश्च वहेर्दाहकत्वमिव तदभिन्ना। तदभिन्नायामेव च शक्तौ विषयविषयिविभागेन विभक्तं सर्वं जगदिदमवस्थितं यत एव चोद्भवति। अतो नायं शिवः बौद्धानामिव शून्यमनिर्वचनीयं वेति सेश्वराद्वैतवादः। न वायं शाङ्करवेदान्तताभिमतं निर्गुणं निरस्तसमस्तकल्याणगुणगणाद्यतिशयं जडाविशिष्टं ब्रह्म, अस्य सगुणत्वात्। अयमेव वीरशैवमतस्य शाङ्करनिर्विशेषाद्वैतप्रतियोगी विशेषाद्वैतवादः। तथा हि श्रीपतिपण्डितः श्रीकरभाष्ये-
विश्व शेषश्च विशेषौ, तयोरद्वैतं विशेषाद्वैतम् अद्वैतपदेन भ्रमरकीटवज्जीवस्य स्वाभाविकभेदनिवृत्तिरुपाद्यते” इति। (अपूर्णः)।

सन्दर्भ

१. रत्नत्रये, पृ. ४२।
२. तत्रैव, पृ. १०४।
३. आगमदर्शनपरिषदि प्रदत्तमध्यक्षीयं भाषणम्, मार्च १९६१।
४. मिथ्याज्ञानाधर्मासक्तिहेतुच्युतरूपाणि पञ्च।
५. पाशुपतसूत्रम्, ५४-५५।
६. द्रष्टव्यानि पाशुपतसूत्राणि, ७२-७६, ८९-९१, १०७-१०८, १४४-१४६।
७. तत्रैव, ६०।
८. तत्रैव, ५९।
९. सिद्धान्तशिरोमणिः, ३०।
१०. क्रियासारः, ३।

(सारस्वती सुषमा)



2. काश्मीर का शिवाद्वैत एवं प्रत्यभिज्ञा

शैव-दार्शनिकों को लगता है कि शङ्कर का ब्रह्म माया के द्वैत में फँसा हुआ है, सूर्य बदली से ढक गया और वेदान्त का ईश्वर या सांख्य का पुरुष कर्तृत्व, सामर्थ्य और स्वातन्त्र्य के बिना लंगड़ा (पङ्क) दिखाई देता है। इस तरह शङ्कर का अद्वैतवाद सम्पूर्णता ग्रहण नहीं करता, क्योंकि एक का निषेध किए बिना वह अद्वैत स्थापित नहीं कर पाता। पर यह निषेध त्रिकदर्शन की दृष्टि से पूर्ण को अपूर्ण बनाना है। अतः उन्हें यह ग्राह्य नहीं है। ब्रह्म, शिव, परमशिव, अनुत्तर, भैरव, काली किसी भी नाम से कहें (संज्ञासु केवलमयं विदुषां विवादः)। पारमार्थिक अद्वैतवाद के लिए उसके स्वातन्त्र्य को स्वीकार करना आवश्यक है। इसके बिना न तो उस तत्त्व का परमत्व स्थापित होगा और न सृष्टि के उन्मेष-निमेष, प्रलयोदय की व्याख्या होगी और न उससे सम्बन्ध ही तात्त्विक हो पाएगा। त्रिकदर्शन के अनुसार परमतत्त्व शक्ति त्रिशूल से निरन्तर परिगत है। वह त्रिशूली है। इच्छा, ज्ञान एवं क्रिया उसके त्रिशूल हैं। शैवदर्शन का ईश्वराद्वयवाद पराद्वैत है जो शून्यवाद-सदृश शङ्कर के निर्गुण ब्रह्माद्वैत से सर्वथा भिन्न है। इसमें द्वैत, द्वैताद्वैत दोनों सम होकर अद्वय बनते हैं। इस पराद्वैत में न तो भेद को स्वीकार करना पड़ता है और न छोड़ना पड़ता है। तत्त्वतः द्वैत न होने पर भेदावभासन का स्वातन्त्र्य इस पराद्वैत की व्याख्या है। किसी प्रकार भेद का प्रकाश, आनन्द और सुन्दर शिवाद्वैत का प्रभेदन नहीं कर सकता। अद्वय की इस भूमि में सुख-दुःख, बन्ध-मोक्ष, जड़-चेतन, घट-कुम्भ की तरह अर्थतः पर्याय बन जाते हैं- शब्द और संज्ञाएँ भले ही भिन्न हों- क्योंकि इन सभी परस्पर विरोधी संज्ञाओं का महेश्वर के स्वरूप से अभेद है।

त्रिकदर्शन में माया शिव की शक्ति है, बन्धन नहीं, उसके स्वातन्त्र्य, क्रीडाभाव या लीला का स्फुरण है, प्रतीपभाव की प्रतीति नहीं है। यह शिवाद्वयवाद, ब्रह्माद्वैतवाद तथा बौद्धों के शून्यवाद, विज्ञानवाद से विलक्षण है और ईश्वर या शिव की सर्वात्मकता तथा शिव-भक्ति के सामरस्य का प्रतिपादक सिद्धान्त है।

सोमानन्द ने शिवदृष्टि में कहा है कि नानाभेद चित् की अभिव्यक्ति है। घट और यज्ञदत्त शिवात्मक हैं और शिव घटात्मक और यज्ञदत्तात्मक है। शिव विभिन्न भावों में सदा अपना परामर्श करता है, इसी प्रकार विभिन्न भाव-पदार्थ भी। सारा जगत् शिवमय है और शिव जगन्मय। एक पदार्थ का दूसरे सभी पदार्थों से भेद नहीं है- सर्वे सर्वात्मकाः भावाः सर्वसर्वस्वरूपतः। यही शिव की सर्वात्मकता और सर्व की शिवात्मकता है।

त्रिकदर्शन ३६ तत्त्व स्वीकार करता है- शिव, शक्ति सदाशिव, ईश्वर और सद्विद्या, ये प्रथम पाँच तत्त्व शुद्ध हैं क्योंकि इनमें माया या इदन्ता का स्पर्श नहीं है। माया और पाँच कञ्चुक - कला, विद्या, काल, राग, नियति-शिव के कञ्चुक आवरण या पाश हैं।

इन्हीं से आवेष्टित होकर शिव पुरुष तत्त्व है, जिसे पशु भी कहते हैं। इन तत्त्वों के साथ प्रकृति और उसके सांख्यसम्मत २३ परिणामों को मिलाकर कुल ३६ तत्त्व त्रिकदर्शन को मान्य हैं। शिव के अतिरिक्त परमशिव, अनुत्तर, भैरव, काली आदि की ३७ वें तत्त्व के रूप में कल्पना की गई है। शैव जिस प्रकार शिव को परमतत्त्व मानते हैं, उसी प्रकार शाक्त शक्तितत्त्व को परम या प्रधान मानते हैं।

चित्, चैतन्य, संवित् या प्रकाश का स्वभाव है विमर्श, स्पन्द या क्रिया। यह क्रिया स्वभाव होने के नाते सहज, लीलारूप, अनायास और आनन्दात्मक है, शिव का हृदय और सार है। यह क्रिया न तो प्रयत्नसाध्य है और न यान्त्रिक। प्रकाश विमर्शात्मक है और विमर्श प्रकाशात्मक। प्रकाश की यह विमर्शरूपता, चैतन्य की यह स्पन्दशीलता या गत्यात्मकता उसकी स्वतन्त्रता को अभिव्यक्ति करती है। यही स्वतन्त्र चित् विश्वसिद्धि का हेतु- चित्तिः स्वतंत्रा विश्वसिद्धिहेतुः- यही शिव-शक्ति का तादात्म्य अथवा अविनाभाव है।

न शिवः शक्तिरहितो न शक्तिर्व्यतिरेकिणी।

शिवः शक्तस्तथा भावानिच्छया कर्तुमीदृशान्॥ (शिवदृष्टि, ३.२-३)

इसी को शिवशक्ति का तादात्म्य कहा जाता है। तादात्म्यमनयोर्नित्यं वह्निदाहिकयोरिव। शिव शब्द में इकार शक्ति का प्रतीक है अन्यथा वह मात्र शव है अर्थात् निर्विमर्शात्मक ब्रह्म की तरह है, जो जड़ से भिन्न नहीं किया जा सकता। प्रत्यवमर्शात्मक चित्ति को आगम-दर्शन में परावाक् कहा गया है। परमतत्त्व को वागुरूप में कहना और उसके चतुर्विध-विभाग द्वारा सृष्टि की व्याख्या करना आगम-दर्शन की विशिष्ट कल्पना है। इसमें वाक् के चार रूप माने गये हैं- परा, पश्यन्ती, मध्यमा तथा वैखरी। सोमानन्द की घोषणा है कि आत्मा ही शिव है, किन्तु आगमोक्त शिव समस्त भावों में स्फुरित है, वह पूर्ण चैतन्य तथा व्यापक है, उसकी इच्छा का प्रसार अव्याहत है तथा ज्ञान एवं क्रिया का वह निरन्तर विस्तार करता है-

आत्मैव सर्वभावेषु स्फुरन्निर्वृतचिद्विभुः।

अनिरुद्धेच्छाप्रसरः प्रसरदृक्क्रियः शिवः॥ (वही, १.२)

सृष्टि, स्थिति, संहार, निग्रह और अनुग्रह शिव के सनातन एवं शाश्वत कृत्य हैं। चित्, आनन्द, इच्छा, ज्ञान और क्रिया, उसकी प्रमुख शक्तियाँ हैं। वस्तुतः अनन्त शक्तियों से परिपूर्ण होने पर भी शिव की कर्तृत्व शक्ति ही प्रधान है। उसी के द्वारा अन्य सभी शक्तियों का आक्षेप हो जाता है। शिव ऐसा कलाकार है जो बिना किसी उपादान और भित्ति के जगच्चित्र का निर्माण करता है-

निरुपादानसम्भारमभित्तावेव तन्वते।

जगच्चित्रं नमस्तस्मै कलाशलाघाय शूलिने॥

स्वातन्त्र्य का निकष है अन्यापेक्षा का अभाव। चैतन्य, ऐश्वर्य और कर्तृत्व, अतिदुर्घटकारिता अथवा कर्तुमकर्तुमन्यथाकर्तुम् का सामर्थ्य स्वतन्त्रता है जो कि स्वयं की बोधरूपता से भिन्न नहीं है।

शक्ति का अन्तःस्फुरण, सत्ता का अनुभव, सदाशिव तत्त्व है और बाह्य-स्फुरण ईश्वर तत्त्व। वस्तुतः इस स्थिति में आन्तर और बाह्य है नहीं किन्तु स्फुरत्ता- रूप शक्ति या स्पन्द की यह छलकन (उच्छलन) है, जो कुछ प्याले में और कुछ प्याले के बाहर की ओर लगती है। यह आन्तर व बाह्य औन्मुख्य मात्र है। आँख की मुद्रित और अमुद्रित अवस्था में जैसे कुछ आन्तर व बाह्य नहीं है, उसी प्रकार इस उन्मेष व निमेष में भी। यह उन्मेष-निमेष आगे चलकर प्रलयोदय का प्रतीक बन जाता है। शिव, शक्ति, सदाशिव, ईश्वर के इन स्वरूपों की इसमें विद्यमान अहन्ता-इदन्ता, अहमिदं की शुद्ध प्रतीति सद्विद्या है- सामानाधिकरण्यं च सद्विद्याहमिदंधियोः। एक तराजू के दो समान पलड़ों की तरह अहं और इदं का जहाँ अनुभव हो, वह सद्विद्या का द्योतक है। इस प्रकार अहमिदं का शुद्ध परामर्श ही सद्विद्या है। शुद्ध विद्या को परापर दशा कहा गया है। भावों का अनात्मरूप में भासन अपरत्व (अपूर्णत्व) है, उनका अहन्ता में आच्छादित रहना परत्व है। सद्विद्या में अनात्मरूप से भासित पदार्थ अहन्ता से आच्छादित रहते हैं। अतः इसे परापर दशा कहा गया है।

भेदों का आभासन करने की स्वतन्त्रता को प्रकट करने वाली माया, वह मोहिनी शक्ति है, जो एक रस में विकल्पों के शिल्प बुन देती है। पूर्ण जब अपने को माया के द्वारा अपूर्ण रूप में अभिव्यक्त करता है तो वह अपने को पाँच पाश या कञ्चुक से आवृत्त कर लेता है। वे हैं- कला, विद्या, राग, काल और नियति। कला किञ्चित्कर्तृत्व का और विद्या किञ्चिज्ज्ञातृत्व का कारण है। राग विषयों में अभिष्वङ्ग है। काल, भाव और अभाव का क्रम है नियति। यह मेरा है, यह मेरा नहीं है- इस प्रकार के नियमन का हेतु है। (द्र. ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञाविमर्शिनी, ३.१.७.-९, तन्त्रालोक ६.१५७) अभिनव के अनुसार कला, परिमित कर्तृत्व कारण है, शेष चार कञ्चुक कार्य हैं - विद्या रागोऽथ नियतिः कालश्चैतच्चतुष्टयं कलाकार्यम् (वही, ६.१६१)।

जिस प्रकार स्वप्न, स्मरण, मनोराज्य, सङ्कल्प तथा योगी की इच्छा को बाह्य उपादान की अपेक्षा नहीं है, उसी प्रकार शिव या परा संवित् अपनी स्वतन्त्र इच्छा से अन्तःस्थ भाव का बाह्य विषय के रूप में आभासन करती है। सब कुछ उस स्वतन्त्र शिव के अधीन अवश्य है पर वह पराधीन नहीं है, उसका कोई आवरक, अवच्छेदक, उपाधि

आदि भी उससे स्वतन्त्र नहीं है। उसकी भी वही सृष्टि करता है- यह उसकी लीला या क्रीड़ा है, पराधीनता नहीं है। माया से लेकर पृथ्वी पर्यन्त तत्त्व, उसी चैतन्य का विलास है, उसी के स्वातन्त्र्य का उन्मेष और उन्मीलन है। वही सर्ग और विसर्ग, सृष्टि, स्थिति, संहार, निग्रह और अनुग्रह की अभिव्यक्ति से अपनी स्वतन्त्रता का उद्घोष करता है।

त्रिकदर्शन के अनुसार नानात्व का आभास शक्तिमान् शिव की स्वतन्त्र इच्छा का नानात्व के रूप में आभास या प्रकाशन है। एकरूप रहने पर स्वतन्त्रता का भान नहीं होता। अतः उच्चावच, समविषम भूमिकाओं में आत्मस्वरूप का गोपन कर अवतीर्ण होना गत्यात्मिका संवित् का स्वभाव है। शिव स्वात्मप्रच्छादन-क्रीडापण्डित है। अतः यह जगत् शिव का आभास है या उन्मीलन है और उन्हीं की तरह सत्य है।

आगम-दर्शन शिव की विश्वमयता को बहुत महत्त्व देता है- अहं की सर्वात्मकता की अनुभूति जिसमें सब कुछ अपना हो जाए अर्थात् भूमा का महाभाव पूर्ण अहन्ता है। मन, बुद्धि, अहंकार से आवेष्टित, शरीर इन्द्रिय के बन्धन से परिग्रहीत, स्व-पर, विषय-विषयी, शुद्ध-अशुद्ध और विधि-निषेध के द्वैत से आक्रान्त अहम् अभिमान के नामान्तर हैं। अनहम् या अनात्म की जब तक प्रतीति होती है, वास्तविकता अहम् का भाव ही नहीं हो सकता। वेदान्त में आत्मरूप अहं की प्रतीति इदं के विरोधी प्रत्यय के रूप में है, त्रिकदर्शन में यह प्रतीति इदं को आत्मरूपतया देखने-अनुभव करने में है। एक का आधार नेति नेति है तो दूसरे का जित देखो तित लाल।

शैव दर्शन के अनुसार चैतन्य के निर्मल दर्पण में वस्तु का नानात्व प्रतिबिम्बित होता है अर्थात् चैतन्य की भूमिका में ही नानात्व की प्रतीति होती है। प्रतिबिम्ब अनेक होते हैं। अर्थात् दर्पण में प्रतिबिम्बित विभिन्न प्रतिबिम्ब दर्पण से भी भिन्न हैं और एक दूसरे से भी। यह नानात्व की प्रतीति है, किन्तु इन सभी प्रतिबिम्बों का दर्पण से अलग अस्तित्व नहीं है। दर्पण जड़ है पर चित्-दर्पण में नानात्व प्रतिबिम्बित है, वह जड़ नहीं है, साधारण दर्पण को न तो प्रतिबिम्बियों का भान है और न अपना और न इन सभी से अद्वय का। स्वच्छ, स्फटिक मणि में प्रतिबिम्बित नाना रूप जैसे मणि की निर्मलता में कोई विकार या दोष पैदा नहीं करते हैं अपितु उसकी निर्मलता का द्योतक हैं। इसी प्रतिबिम्बन के कारण विश्वोत्तीर्ण शिव विश्वमय कहलाता है। दर्पण में प्रतिबिम्बित वस्तु अर्थक्रियाकारी नहीं होती, इस अर्थ में वह भ्रान्ति मानी जा सकती है, किन्तु चित् में प्रतिबिम्बित विश्व अर्थक्रियाकारी होता है।

प्रतिबिम्ब अर्थक्रियाकारी ही नहीं, अपितु आनन्दात्मक भी होता है। कामिनी दर्पण में अपने कान्त के प्रतिबिम्बित मुख को देखकर प्रसन्न होती है (द्र. तन्त्रालोक, ३.६.२९)। इसी प्रकार साहित्य तथा कला के क्षेत्र में भी सहृदय प्रमाताओं के चित्तों का सामुदायिक

रूप में प्रतिबिम्बन आनन्द की सृष्टि करता है (द्र. वही, ३.२०९)। जिसकी संवित् में विश्ववैचित्र्य का प्रतिबिम्बन होता है, उसी को विश्वेश्वर कहते हैं।

विश्व वस्तुतः शिव का आभास है और उसी में प्रतिबिम्बरूप में प्रतिष्ठित है। अर्थात् सृष्टि की दृष्टि से आभासवाद है और स्थिति की दृष्टि से प्रतिबिम्बवाद और संहार की दृष्टि से समावेश। निस्तरंग समुद्र का तरङ्गण आभास है, उसका कल्लोलित रहना स्थिति है और अन्त में पुनः निस्तरङ्ग (शान्त) हो जाना संहार है। इन सभी का मूल है शिव का स्वातन्त्र्य।

शैव दार्शनिक वस्तु के सत्त्व को अर्थक्रियाकारिता से समवेत मानते हैं अथवा यह भी कहा जा सकता है कि वस्तु का सत्त्व अर्थक्रियाकारिता के कारण है। पर यह अर्थक्रियाकारिता शिव की इच्छाशक्ति का फल है, वस्तु का स्वतन्त्र स्वभाव नहीं है। उनके अनुसार जो अर्थक्रियाकारी है, वह सत् है और वह सब शिव है अर्थात् संवित् या चैतन्य से एकात्म है। जो शक्त है, वही अर्थक्रियाकारी हो सकता है। इस प्रकार सत्ता या अर्थक्रियाकारिता का अविनाभाव (अव्यभिचार) है। इसी को प्रख्या (सत्त्व) तथा उपाख्या (अर्थक्रियाकारिता) कहते हैं। यही नहीं, त्रिकदर्शन की यह भी मान्यता है कि जो वस्तु बाह्य रूप में प्रकाशित होकर प्रत्यक्ष या अनुमान का विषय बनती है उसे तो व्यवहार की दृष्टि से वस्तु माना ही जाता है किन्तु जो बाह्य आकार ग्रहण नहीं करती और व्यवहारतः अवस्तु कहलाती है, यदि वह संवित् में प्रतिभासित होती है, चाहे वह आकाश पुष्प, शृंग या और कुछ हो, वह भी अवस्तु नहीं है। चिद्रूपता के अनुभव के साथ ही वस्तुता, सत्त्व तथा अर्थक्रियाकारिता समवेत है। यही वस्तु-अवस्तु की शिवात्मकता है। इसी आधार पर शैवदर्शन व्यावहारिक, बौद्धिक, कल्पनात्मक या तदुत्तीर्ण प्रत्यय की सत्यता प्रतिष्ठित करता है और मिथ्यावाद का खण्डन करता है। वस्तु की सत्ता संवित् के प्रकाश को और अर्थक्रियाकारिता उसके स्वातन्त्र्य को व्यक्त करती है।

वसुगुप्त इसी स्वातन्त्र्य को चैतन्य, स्फुरता या स्पन्द कहते हैं- यही महासत्ता है और इसी को परावाक् कहा गया है। यही मुख्य ऐश्वर्य और आत्मपरामर्श है-इसी से निजत्व का बोध होता है। यही वह विशेषता या धर्म है, जो सभी धर्मों और शक्तियों को अन्तर्भूत कर लेता है। इसीलिए पाणिनि ने कर्ता को स्वतन्त्र (स्वतन्त्रः कर्ता १.४.५४) कहा था। आज के शब्दों में स्वातन्त्र्य, चेतना, रचनाशीलता, निजत्व आइडेन्टिटी, क्रियाशीलता, कर्तृत्व तथा आनन्द का पर्याय है। यह समष्टि तथा व्यष्टि दोनों है, अपरिमित और परिमित दोनों का स्वभाव है। प्रथम पाँच तत्त्व-शिव, शक्ति, सदाशिव, ईश्वर और सद्द्विधा क्रमशः संवित् के चित्, आनन्द, इच्छा, ज्ञान, क्रिया के प्रतीक हैं तो कला, विद्या, काल, राग और नियति उसकी अपूर्णता के। यह अपूर्णता माया का कार्य है।

स्वरूप का आवरण कञ्चुक है। पूर्ण का अनेक रूपों में आभासन अपूर्ण बनकर ही हो सकता है। अपूर्णता की अभिव्यक्ति की स्थिति में वास्तविक पूर्णता का प्रत्यभिज्ञान हो जाए तो अपूर्णता का मल हटकर पुनः निर्मल पूर्णता की पहचान स्थापित हो जाती है। जब तक इस पूर्णता या ईश्वरत्व की प्रत्यभिज्ञा नहीं होती और अपूर्णता या परिमिति को यथार्थ मान लिया जाता है तो यही अज्ञान है।

अज्ञान या भ्रम खण्ड-दृष्टि है, अपूर्ण दृष्टि है, समग्रता या पूर्णता का ज्ञान नहीं है। अपूर्णता का ज्ञान अज्ञान है। शिवसूत्र (१.२ तथा ३.२) में इसी अपूर्णता के ज्ञान को बन्धन कहा है- ज्ञानं बन्धः। मूलरूप में अज्ञान तीन प्रकार का है- आणव, मायीय तथा कार्म। अणुभाव का अर्थ है, संकुचित होना। स्वतन्त्रता का संकोच और बोध का संकोच- इस प्रकार आणव मल दो प्रकार का है। स्वातन्त्र्य का बोध से अलग होना और बोध का स्वातन्त्र्य से अलग होना, दूसरे शब्दों में विमर्श का अप्रकाशरूप होना या प्रकाश का विमर्शरूप न होना, शक्ति की शिवात्मकता और शिव की शक्तिरूपता की हानि है। यह स्वरूप की हानि है, यही आणव मल है। स्वरूप का निमीलन ही संकोच या हानि है। स्वरूप-संकोच होने पर भेद का प्रथम रूप मायीय मल है, इससे देहादि में भेदबोध होने पर धर्माधर्म कार्म मल हैं, इसी से जन्म, आयु और भोग का फल सुखदुःखादि भोगना पड़ता है। वस्तुतः ये तीनों मल अज्ञानरूप होने के कारण माया के कार्य हैं।

शैवदर्शन में ज्ञान अथवा प्रत्यभिज्ञा अथवा क्रियात्मक ज्ञान पूर्णता का प्रकाशक है। 'यह वही देवदत्त है', जिसे पहले कभी देखा था, उसके सामने पड़ने पर ज्ञात का ज्ञान प्रत्यभिज्ञा है। यह स्मृति और प्रत्यक्ष का मिला हुआ ज्ञान है। यह प्रत्यभिज्ञा का प्रचलित अर्थ है। त्रिकदर्शन की प्रत्यभिज्ञा का स्वरूप इससे भिन्न है। वह ज्ञान (लोचन) का ही अनुसन्धान या विशिष्ट निरूपण है- ज्ञातस्यापि विशेषतो निरूपणम्, अनुसंधानात्मकम्। जो सदा अपने साथ है, जो पहले से प्रकाशित है और अभी भी प्रकाशमान है, उसका अभिमुख ज्ञान प्रत्यभिज्ञा है। प्रत्यभिज्ञा में प्रति उपसर्ग प्रतीप का, अभि उपसर्ग अभिमुख्य का और ज्ञान अनुसंधान का वाचक है। आत्मा प्रकाशित होने पर भी बौद्धिक विकल्पों से विच्छिन्न हो जाता है, उसी का सर्वतोभावेन साक्षात् ज्ञान प्रत्यभिज्ञा है।

यही प्रत्यभिज्ञा प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान और शब्द प्रमाणों का मूल है। जैसे कोई कामिनी पहले से प्रार्थित प्रियतम को पास पाकर भी उसे अपरिचित होने के कारण जनसाधारण समझकर प्यार नहीं कर पाती, उसी प्रकार हम अपनी आत्मा के ऐश्वर्य से अपरिचित रहकर पूर्णता का भान नहीं कर पाते। कोई गुरु या शास्त्र हमें बता दे, जैसे कि कामिनी को दूती, या फिर हमें खुद अपनी ज्ञानक्रियारूप शक्ति का अभिज्ञान हो जाए तो हमें पूर्णता या जीवन्मुक्ति

मिलेगी, साथ ही उस पूर्णता में समा जाने का रस भी आयेगा। शङ्कर को पाने के लिए तपस्या में निरत पार्वती ब्रह्मचारी के वेश में आए हुए शिव को पहचान नहीं पाती। शङ्कर की निन्दा करने वाले इस ब्रह्मचारी को वह अपनी सखी से आश्रम से बाहर निकालने को भी कह देती है (निवार्यतामालि किमप्ययं बटुः पुनर्विवक्षुः स्फुरितोत्तराधरः -कुमारसंभव, पञ्चम सर्ग)। पर ज्यों ही शिव स्वयं को प्रकट करते हैं, पार्वती की अंगयष्टि रोमांच और रस से भर जाती है (तं वीक्ष्य वैपथ्यमतिः सरसांगयष्टिः -वही)। कालिदास ने इस प्रसङ्ग से प्रत्यभिज्ञा और उसमें होने वाली चमत्कारमयी रसानुभूति का सङ्केत किया है। प्रत्यभिज्ञा का अभिज्ञान बाह्य नहीं है, बल्कि आन्तर प्रतीति है।

(राजस्थान पत्रिका, रविवारीय परिशिष्ट, ११ जुलाई, १९९३)



3. Śiva: A symbol of Self-critical and Active consciousness

Indian schools of philosophy can be basically and broadly divided into three points of view regarding the nature of consciousness Samkhya, Vedanta, Jainism, Yoga and Śaivism propound the view that consciousness is essentially a contentless entity. According to second point of view of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika which is a modification of the first view, the consciousness is quality of the substance called soul. These points of view are opposed totally by the Buddhists. The Buddhists of all philosophical sects and creeds hold that consciousness is not an entity in any recognised sense of the term. This Buddhist view of consciousness is primarily rooted in and derived from his fundamental doctrine of anāntman. According to this view there is no soul and no consciousness. Rejection of an abiding entity, namely soul implies that consciousness is neither identical with nor a property of the soul. Buddhists deny primary derivative existence of consciousness. They explain the nature of consciousness or conscious self from functional point of view. If to be is to change, consciousness positing any abiding subject or object would not yield real nature of things. Similarly Consciousness without any contact with the object will lack the essential character of being conscious.

Hence true nature of consciousness should not only reveal ever changing character of things but also of its aim. Changing consciousness of changing objects will never posit any coherence and unity and will be devoid of abiding and permanent self.

According to Kashmir Śaivism the ultimate reality is spoken of as Maheśvara, Anuttara, Param Bhairava etc. It is cit, Caitanya or consciousness. It is cetana or conscious as it is invariably related to or inseparable from the power or action of consciousness that is Citikriya. Consciousness has two important characteristics, namely self-luminosity (Svaprakāśata) and self consciousness (Vimarśa). While prakāśa or luminosity is a transcendental and static aspect of the self, the self-critical consciousness (Vimarśa) implies universal and dynamic aspect of the self. A stir or spanda in the consciousness like ripple in the still-water represents śakti aspect of śiva. The self-luminous consciousness manifests itself first as śakti where everything is one complete whole without any distinction or manifestation of subject and object. Through its second manifestation the consciousness reveals complete unity of the objective universe with the subjects, the self. At this stage, which is known as Vidyā thisness is identical with the "I-ness". At the third stage of Māyā the subject and object the whole universe, appear as mutually distinct and separate elements. Brahman of Vedānta is self-luminous but is not self-conscious.

It is therefore spoken of as Śānta i.e., without any activity. The manifestation of the universe is in spite of him. The consciousness or Brahman under goes no change. The ultimate metaphysical principle of Kashmir Śaivism, Maheśvara, manifests Himself through three important stages of śakti, Vidyā and Māyā out of his own free will (svātantrya). He is a free agent eternally associated with manifold powers to imagine the world in his own image through his critical consciousness or Vimarśa śakti. Utpala offers two analogies to explain the nature of consciousness according his system. The reality is like a mirror with one important difference. The ordinary mirror can and does receive reflections of external objects without in any way being affected by the objects which are reflected in it.

The consciousness first creates or imagines the universe of subjects and objects through its power of imagination. These objects so manifested remain one with the consciousness as the objects reflected in the mirror, The universe is thus a reflection on universal mirror. What is reflected in the mirror of consciousness is its own creation and imagination externally manifested. The consciousness can also be spoken of as universal mind just as an individual mind is capable in its creativity, is imagining or dreaming the subject-object universe and just as this universe is in no way different from the individual mind, and it is in fact identical with it, similarly the whole universe is identical with the nature of consciousness. The distinctions of subject and object the duality of body and mind, the difference of internal and external proceed from the free activity of self-luminous consciousness. It is not fettered by any external affections. There is in fact nothing extrinsic or external to it. The consciousness can be spoken of complete I-ness, Pūrṇa-Ahaṁta, or pure subjectivity free to manifest the universe of limited subjects and objects. But nothing is really different from the universal mind the consciousness. The individual mind has certain limitations, the universal mind has none. It is free and does not depend on any external thing either to bring the whole universe into being or maintain it separately as it were or to merge it in its own identity. The universe is like the thought or idea of the universal mind which is neither exhausted or affected by its manifestation. This self-luminous, self-critical and free consciousness is presupposition of all thoughts and actions. This view of consciousness establishes and omniscient and omnipotent permanent self.

The Kashmir Śaivism is aware of the Buddhist view of the soul. According of this view the conception of an abiding entity called soul, self or God is an illegitimate obstruction. It does not believe in the existence of soul which is nothing but a stream of ideas. The self is nothing but a flux of cognitions which belongs to no permanent subject. Such a subject is not a fact of experience. The Śaiva considers this view untenable. He asserts like Kant that synthesis of various cognitions and experiences can't be adequately explained without assuming a priori entity

of permanent self. As the synthesis of experience is not possible on the basis of momentariness of the self Utpala asserts in his *Īśvara-prabhijñā-Vimarsinī*.

Thus, all human transactions originating from unification of various kinds of cognitions which mutually differ and can't become one another's object will come to an end.

If there be not one Maheśvara, who is essentially self-luminous, holds within all the innumerable forms of the universe and possesses the powers of cognition, remembrance and differentiation. The Kashmir Śaivism does not admit any difference between mind and matter, thought and thing, subject and object. It asserts the similarity between the individual and the universal minds. Knowledge, recollection and differentiation are the distinctive functions of both the individual mind and the universal mind is the consciousness. The explanations offered by the dualists and the pluralists are unsatisfactory as they fail to bridge the gulf between the self and the not-self. The approach of the subjectivist like the *Vijñānavadin* fails to explain the world of common experience. The pure idealism of Śaṅkara and others negates the reality of the world by declaring it illusory or inexplicable. The phenomenon of knowledge can't be explained without assuming their essential unity in self-luminous consciousness. Utpala therefore declares that the all inclusive universal mind is the epistemic necessity to account for the phenomenon of knowledge.

Kashmir Śaivism admits five states of consciousness namely waking, sleep and deep sleep relating to the individual self and the fourth *turiya* and *turiyātīta*, beyond the fourth, states relating to the universal self. It propounds seven kinds of individual selves limited in their consciousness. These are technically called **Śiva, Śakti Mantra-Maheśa, Mantreśa, Mantra** or **Vidyeshvara, Pralayākala** and **Sakala**. Analysis of the the five states of consciousness and seven kinds of *pramātr*s or knowers will reveal the detailed investigation into the nature of consciousness by Śaiva thinkers. However, I would prefer to conclude this paper by quoting utpala directly on his conception of consciousness as explained above-

चिदात्मैव हि देवोन्तःस्थितमिच्छावशाद् बहिः।
योगीव निरुपादानमर्थजातं प्रकाशयेत्॥

(भास्करी, Vol. I. 1.5.7)

स्वभावमवभासस्य विमर्शं विदुरन्यथा।
प्रकाशोऽर्थोपरक्तोऽपि स्फटिकादिजडोपमः॥
आत्मात एव चैतन्यं चित्क्रियाचितिकर्तृता-
तात्पर्येणोदितस्तेन जडात्स हि विलक्षणः॥

(Ibid. 11-12)

चित्तिः प्रत्यवमर्शात्मा परावाक् स्वरसोदिता।
स्वातन्त्र्यमेतन्मुख्यं तदैश्वर्यं परमात्मनः॥
सा स्फुरत्ता महासत्ता देशकालविशेषिणी।
सैषा सारतया प्रोक्ता हृदयं परमेष्ठिनः॥

(Ibid. 13-14)

या चैषा प्रतिभा तत्तत्पदार्थक्रमरूषिता।
अक्रमानन्तचिद्रूपः प्रमाता स महेश्वरः॥

(Ibid. I. 7-1)

Finally, the very first *Kārikā* of *Īśvara-pratyabhijñā* deserves to be quoted for its basic thesis that a prior entity called Maheśvara is both omniscient and omnipotent through its powers of activity and cognition eternally associated with Him. Such a nature of ultimate metaphysical epistemic and mystic principle can neither be refuted nor asserted by any knowing subject.

कर्तरि ज्ञातरि स्वात्मन्यादिसिद्धे महेश्वरे।
अजडात्मा निषेधं वा सिद्धिं वा विदधीत कः॥

(Ibid. 1.1.)

(Hand written)



4. Yoga According to the Kashmir Śaivism

Karma and Spanda systems of KŚ (Kashmir Śaivism) specially deal with the yoga. Advocates of close relationship between the KŚ and the Indus Valley Civilisation find that the image of Lord Paśupati found at Mohanjodaro resembles the yogic posture, śāmbhava-mudrā, described by Abhinavagupta in his Anubhava-Nivedana-Stotra and affirm its popularity in Present-day Kashmir. The second and third chapters of the Spanda kārikā (abbreviated as SP) named respectively as the sahaja-vidyodaya (rise of innate knowledge) and vibhūti-spanda (bloom of yogic powers) remind me of the terms current in the yoga system. Abhinavagupta who is believed to be yoginibhū, born of parents copulating as Śakti and Śiva, deals with the yoga in the context of Śākta way of self-realisation in chapter IV of the Tantrāloka (TA in short). As is well known KŚ recognises four ways of realisation: Anupāya, Śāmbhava, Śākta and Āṇava. These are practised through the exercise of power of bliss, will, knowledge and action and are, therefore, known as ānandopāya, icchopāya, jñānopāya and kriyopāya. It is not my purpose here to describe all these four ways in all the possible details as these are authoritatively dealt with in the opening chapters of the TA. My main aim is to contradistinguish the Śaiva yoga from the classical yoga of Patañjali which as an export culture has degenerated into interesting physical exercises, psycho-analytical substitute and at worst a cosy way for permissive sexuality. The Characteristics of yogin described in Gitā and in Śaiva works on yoga are such that they emphasise oneness of the cosmic creation, universality of man, kindness and compassion and are against any kind of violence, apartheid and distinctions on the basis of caste, creed, nationality, or religious sectarianism.

Amongst the four means of realisation the first two have hardly any use of the common forms of yoga. Anupāya is hardly a means. As the very term indicates, it represents emerging stage of final Śivahood. The Śāmbhava yoga marked by dominance of will-power represents non-differentiated state of subject and object and is a state of no-thinking and can be spoken of as a state of pure being admitting no conception or

expression. The identification with the vowel sound (from a to visarga), visualisation of the letters from ka to ha as representing the divine powers of the Lord and the practice of the mātṛkā (garland of letters constituted by regular arrangement from a to ha) and the mālinī (the same garland arranged in irregular order and beginning from na and ending with pha) are also considered part of the Śāmbhava yoga. In fact it is firmly believed in the system that the bondage or the freedom is essentially the creation of the will of God. While His obscuring power is responsible for bondage His grace delivers the man from the bondage. Man can attain his freedom when Śiva so desires. The divine grace of the latter is spoken of as Śaktipāta. This is responsible for taking the aspirant to a real guru who is finally no other than Śiva Himself. With his grace, all the four means of knowledge, including meditation, are of no use and consequence. The śākta way consists in the purification of the determinate forms of cognition (vikalpa) and consequent merger into or union with Śiva. The impure forms of cognition create imperfection in knowledge which binds the aspirant. As this path is an exercise in knowledge, hence it is also termed as jñānopāya. It consists in the constant reflection (bhāvanā) on the nature of reality. This includes a number of means including recitation of sacred formulae, sacrifice, vrata and yoga and is, therefore, also known as the collocation of means (upāyamaṇḍala). The fourth means of realisation, i.e., āṇava is mainly dependent on the activity of mind meditating on vital airs (uccāra), on body with one nervous system (karaṇa), on time and space (deśakālādhva) with its various subdivisions. It is spoken of as extrinsic because the object of meditation is external. One important question raised in the context of four means of realisation is whether they are related as one step to the other or whether they are equally valid and are independent of each other. The answer given to this problem is that none of these means can be held either superior or inferior and that none of these create any difference in its result and that a particular means can be employed by the aspirant according to his genius and taste. It is so because self-knowledge is the only way to self-realisation. All the means finally lead to the one and the same means which is the self-awareness. A look at the three (excluding the anupāya) means of spiritual realisation, mentioned above, brings forth its resemblance with the jñānayoga, karmayoga and bhaktiyoga of the Bhagavadgītā respectively.

The ānandopāya which is really different from the other means of realisation can hardly be regarded as the way because it represents the blissful state of consciousness with which it is one.

Tarka or reasoning is accepted as a helpful means for self-realisation in many systems of Indian philosophy. KŚ gives the most important place to the tarka which is identified with the pure knowledge (sadvidyā). Reasoning that obscures the real nature of the self and which aims at the defeat of the opponent is no good reasoning but the tarka which reveals the real nature of the self and which arises in the mind purified by sadvidyā and which is able to recognise the nature of the self that alone is good reasoning or sattarka. Such a reasoning is also spoken of as bhāvanā which makes it possible to identify even distant object with the self.

According to the KŚ there are only six parts of yoga. It does not accept the eight parts admitted in the classical yoga system. It excludes yama, niyama, and āsana and includes good reasoning and propounds it as the best part of the yoga. The good reasoning may arise either with the help of the guide or scriptures but the one which arises innately in one's own mind is considered the best. The rejection of yama, niyama and āsana as parts of the yoga, is based on the argument that they are not direct means of what is to be achieved. Even prāṇāyāma and pratyāhāra are considered as an extrinsic part whereas dhyāna, dhāraṇā and samādhi are considered as intrinsic parts of the yoga. In fact all these have significance because they are helpful in creating the good reasoning (TA. IV. 105) as the yama etc. can produce their effect on vital airs, body and mind. This in any case is no direct awareness of reality. Yogic forms are therefore, only indirect way of self-realisation through the intervening process of purification of the body, mind and life-force. The good reasoning, which can be regarded as self-reflection, is of some value in the yoga system of the KŚ and so far as other parts of the classical yoga are concerned, purely physical exercises are completely rejected and others like dhyāna, dhāraṇā and samādhi are accommodated as an aid to self-reflection which constitutes the real pathway of the recognition of self. This position of KŚ on Yoga is different from the classical yoga of Patañjali.

The yoga as handed down in the tradition of the KŚ, through Āgama literature like Mālinivijayottara, Svachchandantra, Śivasūkta Vijñānabhairava and as expounded by Bhaṭṭa Kallata in his SP and by Abhinavagupta in his encyclopedic work, the Tantrāloka, and its digest the Tantrasāra, is different from Patañjali's yoga in another aspect. The latter emphasises eight parts of yoga without relating it to the five vital airs, prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, udāna and samāna, with the nervous system of the body, Iḍā, Piṅgalā, and suṣumnā the nerve plexuses mūlādhāra and other similar objects following the system of six circles. The yoga is KŚ maintains this relationship and also describes the spiritual ascent through five states of consciousness, namely waking, sleeping, deep sleep, the fourth state (turiya) and the state beyond the fourth (turyātīta). Thus interdependence of vital air with the mind, with the various psychic parts of the body and the empirical and the transcendental states of consciousness is well pronounced in the Śaiva Yoga. Gītā also speaks of balancing of prāṇa and apāna and the fixation of the prāṇa at the tip of nose (v. 27) or the eye-brows (VIII-10) and head (VIII-12). Gītā (see IV. 29-30) also speaks of oblation of prāṇa to apāna and of apāna to prāṇa and describes the performers of this sacrifice not as yoginaḥ but as yajñavidaḥ (knowers of sacrifice). The mystic sacrifice of vital airs is also referred to in the Maitrī Upaniṣad (See VI. 9 and 18). This kind of sacrifice is unknown to the system of Patañjali who regarded breath-control as indispensable for the yoga. The KŚ accepts the mysticism of this sacrifice.

The SP (I. 23-25.) speaks of the entrance of yogin into the path of Suṣumnā which is represented as great ākāśa where the sun and the moon are set. The sun and the moon represent, according to the various interpretations, object and the means of the cognition, prāṇa and apāna and the power of Śiva and Jīva. In another place SP (III. 33-35) distinguishes between the two kinds of yogins, one who is alert in the states of waking and sleep and the other who is slack in the yoga. While the former, through his freedom of will, is able to see and dream, according to his desire, the latter is no different from the ordinary human being. Here also the author speaks of the rise of the sun and the moon in the yogin which is responsible for his quick concentration and freedom of

will in perceiving the objects both in the states of awakening and dreaming. The SP also speaks of unmeṣa, a sudden flash of thought, even in an ordinary human being when he is engrossed in a thought and is suddenly transported to another thought. While this unmeṣa or sudden flash of thought is not voluntary in the ordinary human being it is completely natural to the yogin. In fact, the SP (III . 41) illustrates many such extraneous situations which occasionally and contingently reveal the nature of self to the ordinary human being as opposed to its voluntary revelation in the yogin (see, SP I-22). In the same vein the Śivasūtra had pronounced the awareness of the fourth state of consciousness even in the ordinary states of walking, sleep and deep sleep (I.7) and spoke of a sense of wonder as a ground for yoga (I. 12). The good reasoning (sattarka) stated earlier can be compared with the vitarka (self-reflection) of the Śivasūtra (I. 28) Description of the cognitive senses as the spectators (III. II) of the dance of the supreme self (ātman III. 9) on the stage of the introspective inner self (III. 10) leading finally to the Sāttvika purification through the medium of intellect (III. 12) briefly outlines Śaiva Yoga in the Śivasūtras. The Vijñānabhairava (see 71, 101, 118), and the Śivadṛṣṭi (I. 9-10) of Somānanda pinpoint situations of intense emotional stresses and strain and of joy which may be used for the realisation of the self through stillness of intellect (Vijñānabhairava, 101), its concentration, absorption and merger (Ibid, 71) in order to feel the nearness to Brahman (Ibid, 118). One hundred and twelve dhāraṇās given in this book of Śaiva Yoga, i.e., the Vijñānabhairava, not merely comprehend the various ways of sādhanā included under the śākta and the āṇava means of self-realisation but carve out a very practical way of turning empirical experiences into the natural and spontaneous experience of the highest self, Bhairava. Each form of empirical cognition and action can be turned into spiritual experience (Ibid; 137) and in this Vijñānabhairava (verse 140) echoes the sense of Gitā (V. 10) when it declares: Even while living such a man is free from bondage and is not defiled by the action which he continuously performs.

It is pertinent to note here in passing that the Śivasūtra, Śivadṛṣṭi, Spandakārikā and Vijñānabhairava concern almost exclusively with the Śaiva way of spiritual sādhanā or Śaiva yoga and its philosophical insight. The KŚ is also associated and identified more conveniently with the

esoteric religious practices. The TA of Abhinavagupta is a brilliant example of this. Nevertheless, although the original insight is never lost sight of yet it can be suspected that over-elaboration of the rites and rituals of tantra on the basis of Agamic texts might have blurred the vision of an ordinary follower who may be lacking in seriousness of purposes and pursuit, profundity of thought and clarity of goal, There can be little doubt that an unbroken tradition of the Śaiva Yoga and philosophical vision always co-existed with an elaborate system of rites and rituals and yet some authors decidedly ignored any description of the Tantric practices in their treatises. Utpala is a brilliant example of this point. He wrote beautiful Śivastorāvali to express Śaiva bhaktiyoga when the movement of devotion spread throughout the length and breadth of this country as the best medium of cultural unity of the nation.

(Annals of the B.O.R.I., Poona, Vol. LXIII, 1987)



5. Kashmir Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism

From very early times till the systematic formulation of the philosophical doctrines of Śaivism in 8th century A.D. and after, Kashmir continued to be the meeting place of different schools of Indian Philosophy. Traditions preserved in Nīlamatapūrāṇa, Mūlasarvāstivāda and Vinayapīṭaka testify to the spread of Buddhism to Kashmir from the third century B.C. **Some of the Sanskrit versions of Vinaya represent 'Gautam' as visiting Muttra, northwest India and Kashmir.**¹ Asoka (268-9 B.C.), who was a worshipper of Śiva in his early life, had helped the cause of introducing Buddhism in Kashmir. His son Jalauka and queen Isānadevī were opposed to it and had revived the Śaiva cults. What is, however, most pertinent is the glorious role that Kashmir played in the development of the Mahāyāna or Great Vehicle, reposing its faith in a Superintending God interesting himself in man's welfare. The aim of the Hīnayānists to attain arhathood and absolute extinction for one-

self was replaced by the idea of Bodhisattva-hood of the Mahāyānists. Every being of the world is a potential Buddha; he has within him all the potentialities of becoming a samyak-sambuddha or perfectly enlightend one. Thus Bodhisattva, a liberated being or Jīvanmukta of Śaivism, works for the welfare of all. He helps them in their spiritual uplift. Like a gurū he initiates the spiritual aspirant into the mystical lore of unity with Absolute, Śūnya or Śiva.

The Mahāyāna was a new religion which had the indelible impress of Śaivism. That this school of Buddhism was born in Kashmir and developed by Kashmiri scholars who brought the impress of Kashmir Śaivism to bear upon it, is an established fact.² Kashmir was the Senai wherefrom the gospel of karuṇā or compassion was propagated and carried to the cultural extensions of Greater India. Tantric Buddhism was only an outcome of and growth within this new religion developed under the influence of ritualistic, religious and philosophical tradition of Kashmir. The philosophical doctrines, theology, mystic practices, rites and rituals of the one informed and influenced the other in the long history of development. The definite dates of origin of mystic schools and comparative antecedence of even important details or points of view will always be difficult to determine, because the Indian mystics of all the shades believed in keeping their teachings secret and oral. Hence the unanimous anxiety of all the later writers to trace the origin of Tantric traditions from Śiva or Buddha (sometimes called Maitreya) is understandable. The geographical co-existence of Śaiva traditions and Mahāyāna Buddhism in the mystic settings of the valley of Gods is more than a possibility. The striking similarities of the ideals and some of the important details are not mere matters of opinion but can stand the close scrutiny of fact-finding and objective analysis.

Kashmir Śaivism has three schools namely, Kula, Krama and Pratyabhijñā. It recognises three paths of liberation i.e. ānandopāya, icchopāya and śaktopāya. Immediate liberation through special grace of the Lord is the first path. It is also called anupāya, because here śakti herself is working through the teacher to liberate the jīva who does not require any active process on his part. God himself makes the first

advances. And indeed without His grace the final beatitude is impossible.³ **'I thought that I loved him,'** Abu Yazid of Bistam is reported as saying, **'but when I (looked again I saw that) his love preceded mine' or again 'for thirty years I looked for God but when I paused to think, He was the seeker and I the sought.'** So too Qushayri tells us how Rabia, when asked by a man who had committed many grievous sins, whether God would accept his repentance, replied **'nay, rather you will repent if he turns to you in forgiveness (first)' for 'you cannot delight in God before God delights in you'**.⁴ This is then rightly called anupāya. An Advaitavedāntin or Sāṃkhyayogin attains liberation entirely by his own efforts, since in their nirguṇa monism, there is no place for the compassion of God. Orthodox advaita Vedānta or earlier Sāṃkhya do not recognise a compassionate God. A Śaiva does. He believes that anugraha or grace is one of the five fundamental acts that God eternally does.⁵

Destruction of the vikāpas leading to definite knowledge is the second path of liberation. Strong urge to know and unite with the Absolute characterises this path. It is called icchopāya. Control of the senses, inflation of psyche and intuitional awareness is technically the way of Śakti or śaktopāya. As these three ways of liberation adopt the recognitive and not cognitive or analytical process they may be rightly called pratyabhijñānas. The realisation consists not in the actualisation of the potential, nor in the attainment of something new; nor in knowing what was unknown before; but in penetrating through the veil, that makes the Maheśvara appear as the individual, of which every one is immediately aware, and in recognizing Maheśvara in the individual.⁶ Realistic idealism is the metaphysical theory of Kashmir school of Śaivism. It believes in the reality of all that is. The object is not a vivarta of Brahman or a product of creative illusion called Māyā, nor a transformation of collective unconscious or Prakṛiti of the Sāṃkhya, nor a conglomeration of atoms with only efficient causality of God, the Prime Mover. The world of subject and objects is the manifestation of Śiva or ultimate Principle. All is Śiva. All is real. This is different from the Vedānta view where all is one but the all is not real: sarvam khalvidam Brahma. neha nānāsti kiñcana.

Distinctions of subject and object, the plurality of selves and the variety of forms are not the inexplicable illusions, or the evolutionary results or a disturbed equipoise of the three mutually opposed but co-functionary guṇas of Prakṛti, reflecting within the light of puruṣa. Nor are they the 'new' bundles of eternal reals conjoined by internal or external relations. Śiva is prakāśa (light) and vimarśa (awareness). His powers are not different from himself. Through his power of action or kriyāśakti, he manifests the phenomena, which are the basis of the order of time and space. Through his second power, i.e. jñānaśakti he manifests the phenomenon of knowledge, the trio of the subject, object and the cognition. Śiva is infinite and the infinite is inherently capable of infinite forms. There is no contradiction. The Infinite cannot become finite by dividing itself in infinite forms:

pūrṇasya pūrṇamādāya pūrṇamevāvaśiṣyate.

To manifest Himself is His nature and will. All religions are obliged to accept plurality inherent in one, for God could neither create nor imagine anything other than Himself, had he not the potentiality of plurality or absolute freedom of forms in Himself.

Śāṅkhya teaches the separation of the individual puruṣa from Prakṛti or isolation of the self from all that is not-self. The aim and purpose of meditation and concentration is to isolate the self from the contents of unconscious, the not-self. This state of isolation or emptying oneself of all content is the individual soul's liberation in Śāṅkhya. It is kaivalya or isolation. According to Śankara's school of Vedānta, Brahman is one and absolute-one without second; ekamevādhitīyam Brahma. Human soul is Brahman: Ātmā ca Brahma. To know the Brahman is to know ātman or vice versa and negatively that not-self does not exist. Thus self-realisation is the isolation of ātman (self) from the anātman (not-self). There is some theoretical difference between Śāṅkhya and Vedānta about the nature of the not-self or anātman. The former holds it real and a pariṇāma of prakṛti but the latter views it as vivarta or appearance of the Real. Its position as real or unreal is treated as a matter of opinion in Vedānta schools and their interpretations. However, what interests us is their unanimous anxiety to isolate the self, puruṣa or ātman from the not-

self, prakṛti or practical reality of the world (Vyāvahārika sattā). Thus it is clear, (and it is so easy to understand if we just inter-change the words ātman for puruṣa and anātman for prakṛti) that the Vedānta in practice does not go beyond the Śāṅkhya theory of self-isolation from the whole psycho-physical complex as the goal of mystical self-identity. The Nyāyavaiśeṣikas regard soul as the substratum of consciousness-a quality arising in it under certain conditions. Its liberation is its descent into the state of unconscious. From a brief statement of the mystical doctrines of the Śāṅkhya, Vedānta and the Nyāyavaiśeṣika what we get is a principle of self-isolation. Hence the experience of the mystics of these schools is not of union, communion or unity with the Absolute but self-identification through the Yogic process of separation of the puruṣa from the prakṛti in Śāṅkhya, cessation of the illusion or practical real in Vedānta and the disjunction of consciousness in Nyāya-vaiśeṣika. This natural rest and the possession of their own souls cannot be taken as the intimate communion of the human soul with its Maker. There can be no union when there is only one.

Keeping in view their mystical goal the practices of these schools can rightly be described as aiming at suppression of psyche and not a positive inflation or sublimation. Coming to Śaiva mysticism we find a difference in fundamentals and consequently in the purpose of mystic techniques, rites and rituals. Harmony of Śiva and Śakti and a transcendental unitive self-repose through the recognitive process is the goal of Śaiva mysticism. Śakti or the principle of energy is the power of the absolute i.e. Śiva the auspicious. It is not a creative illusion as the māyā of the Vedānta, nor a collective unconscious as the Prakṛti of the Śāṅkhya, nor a quality inhering in a substance as the Nyāyavaiśeṣika could interpret it. Śakti is the creative dynamism, the 'eternal feminine' seated in the heart of the divine Lord.

Na śivaḥ śaktirahito na śaktiḥ śiva- varjitā, tādātmyamanayor nityam vahnidāhakayoriva. The harmonious integration of the two and not isolation, negation or distinction characterises the Śaiva mysticism.

According to Jung⁷, the human psyche is androgynous. Every male has within his own psyche a female principle, the animo, and

conversely every female has a male principle within herself, the animus. The achievement of integration is the union and reconciliation of the two principles. This conjunction oppositorum is found in many schools of mysticism, for example in the union of Chinese Yang and Yin and in the mystical marriage of soul with Christ. The unio mystica of Śiva and Śakti, inseparable like moon and her rays or word and idea, finds its echo in the mysticism of Tantric Buddhism as the union of Buddha and Prajñāpāramitā or conversely prajñā and Upāya.

The Buddhist Tantrism has two main schools, Pāramitānaya and the Mantranaya. The latter is subdivided into three schools of Kālacakrayāna, Vajrayāna and Sahajayāna. The Pāramitānaya is based, by and large, on the philosophy of inferential existence of the objects expounded by the Sautrāntikas and the Mantrayāna on the Vijñānavāda of the Yogācāra school and the Mādhyamikaś theory of absolute nothingness or śūnyatā. What, however, interests the Buddhist mystics is not the philosophy as a way of thought but as a way of life. The metaphysical doctrines are only of secondary importance, the mystic methods for the realisation of reality, the unio mystica, is their abiding interest. Buddhist Tantrism thus pre-eminently deals with the esoteric Yoga, occult practices, rites and rituals rather than with any pure philosophical speculations. The religion of philosophy and not particular points of view appeal to the mystics. This is as it should be if the goal of mysticism is not to be identified with or confused with a mere formulation of metaphysical principles. Belief in the human body as the seat and best medium of truth, a theological principle of duality in non-duality, the static and the dynamic nature of Reality are some of the important fundamentals of Tantrism. The ultimate goal of Śaivism and Buddhist tantrism is the perfect state of union-union between the two aspects of the reality and the realisation of the non-dual nature of the self and the not-self.⁸ This union of Śiva and Śakti is represented by prajñā and upāya or Śūnyatā and karuṇā. It is held in Śaivism that the metaphysical principles of Śiva-Śakti are manifested in the form of male and female. Tantric Buddhism also holds that Prajñā and upāya, the corresponding principles to Śiva and Śakti, manifest themselves in the form of female and male. The comparative study of the principle of the prajñāpāramitā with Mahāśakti; of mudrās with the actualisations of Śakti; of the sixfold

yoga with the eight-fold yoga; of the ten spiritual planes of Pramuditā and others to produce Bodhi-mind with śuddha adhavan or Pure way; of sahajavajra or śūnya-body with the śākta-body and of the two forms of nirvāṇa-conditional and unconditional (sopadhi and nirupadhi), will be a fruitful acquisition.

Religious mysticism is not the anti-thesis of philosophy. It is rather its perfection and synthesis. Tantric theology, the chanting of mantras, mystical diagrams, the postures and circles, meditations and salutations of various types, sexo-yogic practices, the five 'makāras', may seem to a superficial observer profane insanity, unphilosophical, unsocial and immoral, but to a serious student of mystic culture, they reveal their true nature. There are marked similarities and striking differences between the two schools on many points of sādhanā and its objective but a careful analysis of the contentions of these two schools of mysticism is still a desideratum. Comparative mysticism-as a new branch of study, is still in its infancy. It is necessary that we evaluate the all-important contribution of Śaivism and Buddhist Tantrism to the mystic culture of this country. Mādhyamika's assertion that all is śūnya and Śaiva's declaration that all is Śiva seem to be extreme positions. But to a discerning mind and a spiritual aspirant or a follower of the mystic path the discretion and the wisdom of interpreting these expressions of absolutism as signifying negative and positive forms (where neither is possible) is not denied.

References:

1. Sir Charles Eliot, **Hinduism and Buddhism**, P. 263.
2. Vide. B. Bhattacharya, **Introduction to Sādhnamālā**, Vol. II and **An Introduction to Tantric Buddhism**.
3. **Bhāskari**, Vol. I, P. 25-26.
4. Quoted in **Mysticism, Sacred and Profane**, pp. 146-7.
5. Vide, **Tantrāloka and Śivaḍṛṣṭi**.
6. Pandey, K.C.: **Introduction to Bhāskari**, Vol. II.
7. Jung, C.G., **Psychology of the Unconscious**.
8. Dasgupta, S.B., **An Intro. Tantric Buddhism**, p. 3-4.

(Printed)



6. Bhartṛhari and Kashmir Śaivism

Bhartṛhari (Bh.), the famous author of Vākya-padīya¹ (VP), is now safely assigned to the fifth century A.D. (between 450-500 A.D.) on the basis of the two verses, namely, **yathā viśuddham ākāśam** and **tathedam amṛtaṁ brahma** of the VP occurring in the Traikālyaparīkṣā (verse 31 and 32) of Dinnāga (480-540 A.D.), and also on the basis of phrases like so' **yam ity abhisambandhāt and caitanyaṁ puruṣasya svarūpam** found in the Vyāsabhāṣya² on the Yogasūtras 3.17 and 1.9 respectively echoing kindred expressions in the VP 2.40 and 1.124. The Vṛtti on the VP is according to the tradition from the pen of Bh. himself. There is no conclusive evidence to prove different authorship of the Vṛtti. In any case the Kashmirian tradition regards both the Kārikās and the Vṛtti by the same author.

Somānanda (880 A.D.) systematised the Trika system based on the Āgamas in his pioneer work of Kashmir Śaivism, namely, Śivadrṣṭi or Vision of Śiva. Utpala (910 A.D.) wrote his Vṛtti on it and wrote his famous work, the Īśvarapratyabhijñānākārikā. Rāmakaṇṭha (950 A.D.) wrote Vivṛti on the Spandakārikā revealed to Vasugupta. Abhinavagupta (980-1020 A.D.), the encyclopedic writer and thinker who is known for his two commentaries on the Īśvarapratyabhijñānākārikā, namely Vimarśinī and Vivṛtivismarśinī and for his Tantrāloka, the encyclopaedia of Tantric rites, rituals and philosophy, is like Śaṅkara of Kashmir śaivism. Jayaratha (1170 A.D.) wrote a commentary Viveka on the Tantrāloka. One of the commentators of the VP is Helārāja (950 A.D.) whose commentary, Prakāśa, is still extant on the third Kāṇḍa. He is regarded as the teacher of Abhinavagupta. His commentary which reads like an independent work, betrays clear-cut affinity with the philosophical presuppositions of the Trika system. Abhinavagupta himself had perhaps written a commentary on the third chapter of the VP, namely Prakīrṇakavivaraṇa and may be an independent work also bearing on the philosophy of grammar. This can be speculated on the basis of the expression anyatra occurring in the Tantrāloka and its explanation as prakīrṇaka-vivaraṇādaḥ offered by

Jayaratha in his Viveka thereon.³ Bh. and his VP along with the Vṛtti are extensively quoted, alluded or referred to both explicitly and implicitly.⁴ This is usually done with approval and a high sense of veneration as is evident from expressions, such as, **tatrabhavān, tatrabhavād-Bhartṛharipaṭhitam āgamam.**

The manner in which the very first Kārikā of the VP is treated by Somānanda in his Śivadrṣṭi and by Utpala in his comment thereon and by Rāmakaṇṭha in his Vivṛti on the Spandakārikā and later on by Abhinavagupta will be found very interesting. Somānanda is critical of the theory of Śabda-Brahman of Bh. particularly for identifying Śabda-Brahman with the Paśyantī form of Vāc. According to him one must accept four divisions of the Vāc-Parā, Paśyantī, Madhyamā and Vaikharī, and in his view Śabda-Brahman could be identified with the Parā form of Vāc only. This is clear from the reading of Śivadrṣṭi 2.2, 2.8 cd; 2.9-10, 2.21cd; 2.22ab, 2.81-82 and Utpaladeva's comment on the same.⁵

Abhinavagupta gives quotations from the Vṛtti on VP 1.1 and explains that the form and action cannot be defined and the same are result of avidyā. He also explains the nature of vivarta in this context.⁶ It is, in fact, Rāmakaṇṭha who in his Vivṛti on the Spandakārikā, 4.18, brings out Śaivite interpretation of the VP 1.1. According to him the expansion of śaktis, śaktiprasara, is spoken of as vivarta by the grammarian. The word-principle for which Brahman is another synonym is not different from the highest Lord. It is the highest form of śakti which brings about the full and final success. He explains the four forms of the Śakti, and identification of Vaikharī with kriyāśakti, power of action, of Madhyamā with the power of will and of Paśyantī with the power of knowledge. These powers are dependent on the divine form which is identical with the alphabets and the words. The sentence which is one of the many ways in which śakti expands itself is eternal in the form of mantra and the śāstra and is non-eternal in the form of ordinary worldly communication. Recognition of the wealth of letters as the śakti of Lord leads to the attainment of the highest goal but the same being related to numerous individuals becomes the cause of bondage:

शब्दाद्वयवादे सामान्येन शब्दार्थोभयरूपोऽपर्यन्तावान्तरभेदो योऽयमीश्वरस्य शक्तिप्रसरस्तं विवर्तवाचोयुक्त्या वयवहरति स्म। यदाह-अनादिनिधनं ब्रह्म..... विवर्ततेऽर्थभावेनयतः। इति। अत्र ब्रह्मपर्यायशब्दतत्त्वतया पारमैश्वरमेव रूपं निर्दिष्टम्। तदियं परा शक्तिरेव स्वमार्गस्था ज्ञाता तथा सम्यक्प्रतिपन्नस्वभावा सती संपूर्णा सिद्धिमुपपादयति इत्युक्तम्। सोऽयमेव वैखारीरूपमापन्ना पुरुषप्राणाधीनाभिव्यक्तिकत्वात् स्थूला क्रियाशक्तिः इत्यपि क्वचिदुक्ता, तत्पूर्वा च मध्यमा वाक् इच्छाशक्तिः; तत्पूर्वा च पश्यन्ती ज्ञानशक्तिरिति। तदेवं शक्तित्वे सति शक्तिमन्तमियमपेक्षते इति अभिन्नमातृकः शब्दराशिरूपक्रियाप्रधान ऐश्वरो विग्रहोऽस्याः समाश्रयः यत्रेयं वर्गादिभिः वाक्यपर्यन्तैः स्वप्रसरभेदैः विजृम्भते। योऽपि वाक्यरूपः प्रसरोऽस्याः स नित्यानित्यभेदेन द्विविधः। तत्र मन्त्रात्मकः शास्त्रात्मकश्च नित्यः। लौकिकव्यवहारविषयलौकिकवाक्यात्मकस्तु अनित्यः। एवं परमेश्वरशक्तित्वेन प्रत्यभिज्ञायमाना एषा वामङ्गी विभूतिः परसिद्धिप्रदा। नानापशुसम्बन्धितया तु अविच्छिद्यमाना बन्धहेतुर्भवति।

In spite of sharp criticism of Bh.'s view of Śabda-Brahman as contained in the VP 1.1, Somānanda incorporates ideas contained in the Kārikās of the VP in his Śivadṛṣṭi. Thus 1.32 and 1.42 of the VP are reflected in 2.33 and 5.62 of the Śivadṛṣṭi, 1.115 in 2.6, 1.123 in 2.11, 1.143 in 2.7-8, and 3.8.4 in 1.19. Utpala, Rāmakaṇṭha and Abhinavagupta are definitely more indebted to Bh. for working out their system in the light of ideas contained in the VP.

Importance of the Āgama as the source of knowledge, recognition of manifold śaktis in non-dualistic reality, identification of the absolute with the word-principle, vāc and its four forms, importance of pratibhā are some of the basic things which made deep impact on the works of Kashmir Śaivism.

The term Āgama in the VP stands for tradition, for rule of conduct and the scriptural work or Śāstra codifying the unbroken tradition. It also stands for śabda as pramāṇa, as authority against reasoning. The VP unequivocally declares that reasoning cannot determine dharma which cannot be known without āgama and that even the knowledge of the sages is derived from the āgamas.⁷ He points out limitations of reasoning which can always be displaced by better reasoning by more intelligent men. In

view of differing potentialities of objects due to variation in state, place and time it is always difficult to grasp the objects correctly.⁸ The knowledge of enlightened sages of undisturbed mind is akin to direct perception.⁹ Those who have not seen the truth their perception and description of it are unreliable and inconsistent.¹⁰ Āgama is like continuous consciousness which cannot be obliterated by inferential arguments.¹¹ These ideas emphasising impersonal authority of the śāstra, importance of the enlightened souls and stating the limits of reasoning are widely used by the religious tradition of India, these are interwoven in Śivadṛṣṭi 2.33 and 5.62, in the IPVV Vol. III, pp. 94-95 in the XXXV and XXXVII chapters and other portions of the Tantrāloka dealing with the significance of the śāstra.

The ultimate reality, spoken of as Maheśvara, Anuttara, Parama Śiva, Bhairava etc. is cit, caitanya or consciousness. It is cetana or conscious as it is invariably related to or is inseparable from the power or action of consciousness i.e., citikriyā. Consciousness has two important characteristics, namely self-luminosity (svaprakāśatś) and self-consciousness (vimarśa). While prakāśa or luminosity is a transcendental and static aspect of the self, the self-critical consciousness (vimarśa), which constitutes its very freedom (svāntarya) and kartṛva, implies universal and dynamic aspect of the self. A stir or spanda in the consciousness like ripple in the still water represents śakti aspect of Śiva. The self-luminous consciousness manifests itself first as śakti where everything is one complete whole without any distinction or manifestation of subject and object. Through its second manifestation the consciousness reveals complete unity of the objective universe with the subject, the Self. At this stage, which is known as vidyā, 'this ness' is identical with the 'I-ness'. At the third stage of Māyā, the subject and object, the whole universe, appear as mutually distinct and separate elements. Advaita Vedānta denied the reality of matter in order to preserve the transcendental integrity of Brahman. Change and activity belong to the sphere of nature which may be practically real but are finally unreal. There can be no real relationship between the transcendental being and the nature. Brahman and Māyā, Puruṣa and Prakṛti are not really and actually related. The self

is one and it is none other than the Brahman. It is beyond all change, transformation, mutability and specifications and hence nothing can distinguish one self from the other. This implies that the one reality can be known only by negation and that any change or modification is apparent and not real. Any identification of the absolute with the universe or of the universe with the absolute is false superimposition. This is brought about by inexplicable nature of ignorance, māyā and/or avidyā at macrocosmic and microcosmic levels. Kashmir Śaivism (KŚ) and Vedānta agree that the absoluteness is not qualified or predicated by any thing standing outside or external to it. The absolute is pure in both the systems. According to the Vedānta it is only in the secondary sense that the Brahman can be defined, otherwise it is beyond all descriptions and characterisations. It cannot be grasped by speech or mind. Anuttara of Śaivism is of the same nature. The autonomy of consciousness or independence of eternal reality from the body and mind is accepted both by Vedānta and Śaivism. However, the Brahman of Vedānta is self-luminous but is not self-conscious. It is, therefore, spoken of as śānta, that is, without any activity. The manifestation of the universe is in spite of him. The consciousness or Bhraman undergoes no change. The ultimate metaphysical principle of KŚ, Maheśvara, manifests Himself through three important stages of Śakti, Vidyā and Māyā out of his own free will (svātantrya). He is a free agent eternally associated with manifold powers to imagine the world in His own image through His critical consciousness or vimarśa śakti. The VP very distinctly recognises śakti and its variety and treats it as inseparable from imperishable word-principle which is Brahman without beginning and end. The Vṛtti on the VP 1.1 makes it clear that the Śabda-Brahman is possessed of all śaktis which bring out great diversity: **sarvavikalpātītaṁ tattvaṁ bhedasamsargasamatikrameṇa samāviṣṭaṁ sarvābhiḥ śaktibhiḥ.**

The verses found in the Vṛtti on 1.1 more particularly:

**tathedam amṛtaṁ brahma nirvikāram avidyayā/
kaluṣatvam ivāpannaṁ bhedarūpaṁ vivartate//**

explains the role of avidyā in forming the modification. The Kārikās 1.2-4 expound the diversity through the idea of śakti, which is manifold and

inseparable, and constitutes the svātantrya in the form of kālaśakti. It is through the śakti that the one is divided into experiencer (subject), experienced (object) and the experience.¹² The power of words constitutes the universe.¹³ Thus śakti has been recognised in various forms in the system of Bh.¹⁴ Recognition of śakti as freedom remaining inseparable from Śabda-Brahman and manifesting diversity of the world is pre-eminently suited to the philosophy of KŚ.

Śabda-Brahman of the VP is recognised as parā vāc¹⁵ in the Trika system which is identified as parā pratibhā.¹⁶ It was Somānanda, who, on the basis of the philosophy of Śabda-Brahman and, in fact, in criticism of it, postulated that paśyantī cannot be regarded as the highest form of speech. As a result, the KŚ recognised four forms of vāc. But in doing so they have adopted the descriptions of Paśyantī, Madhyamā and Vaikharī from the VP and its Vṛtti. A number of verses occurring in the Vṛtti under 1.143 vaikharyā madhyamāyāś ca etc. have been quoted in various works of KŚ¹⁷. It is possible that some verses from the āgamic sources were interpolated in the Vṛtti.

Bhartṛhari's basic ideas regarding supreme importance of vāc or śabda that all knowledge is permeated by word, that all knowledge is vāc, which is pratyavamarśinī or self-aware and is the source of all branches of knowledge and arts, that vāc is responsible for all human activity¹⁸, are very fondly quoted by a host of Śaiva writers.¹⁹ Taking cue or support from Bh. Tāntric philosophers considered mātṛkā, the alphabets from a to kṣa as base of knowledge.²⁰ Thus, the basic concept of mantra as the highest form of vāc or ultimate reality and of the letters as the base of knowledge, which is very fundamental to all shades of Tantricism, can be traced to the ideas contained in

**na so'sti pratayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamād ṛte/
anuviddham iva jñānaṁ sarvaṁ śabdena bhāsate//**

and

**vāgrūpatā ced utkrāmed avabodhasya śāśvati/
na prakāśaḥ prakāśeta sā hi pratyavamarśinī//**

of VP. Abhinavagupta explains vāgrūpatā etc. according to his own system where pratyavamarśa is expounded as consciousness in the form of aham which is defined as self-repose without and dependence.²¹ The inseparability of word and knowledge, śabda and pratyaya, was rendered in terms of prakāśa and vimarśa, Śiva and Śakti following the Āgamic tradition of nondualistic Śaivism.

Bh. considered pratibhā as common to all beings, birds and beasts, it was regarded as a flash of intelligence and also as constituting the meaning of a sentence.²² Its importance or significance is unique in the system of Bh.

In the Vṛtti of the VP, pratibhā is identified with vāc which is spoken of as the parāpara or the ultimate cause. It is only through pratibhā which is identical with Being that spiritual attainment is finally possible:

- (i) सोऽव्यतिक्रीर्णा वागवस्थामधिगम्य वाग्विकाराणां प्रकृतिं प्रतिभामनुपरैति
- (ii) विकारापगमे सत्यं सुवर्णं कुण्डले यथा।
विकारापगमे सत्यां तथाहुः; प्रकृतिं पराम्।।
- (iii) भेदोद्ग्राहिविवर्तेन लब्धाकारपरिग्रहा।
आम्नाता सर्वविद्यासु वागेव प्रकृतिः परा।।
- (iv) तदध्यासाच्च शब्दपूर्वकयोगमधिगम्य प्रतिभां तत्त्वप्रभवां भावविकारप्रकृतिं
सत्तां साध्यसाधनशक्तियुक्तां सम्यगवबुध्य नियता क्षेमप्राप्तिः

(Quoted in Bhartṛhari, K.A.S. Iyer, Poona, 1969, p. 452.)

Abhinavagupta identified the parā vāc with parā pratibhā (Tantrāloka II. 79) which was not different from the self-consciousness, svasaṁvid,²³ responsible for all kinds of communication.²⁴

As a result of continuous interaction of the Trika system with the philosophy of language as propounded by Bh. The grammarian-philosophers like Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa accepted four forms of Vāc. He held that Vedic expressions like: **Catvāri śṛṅgās trayo sya pādāḥ** (IV. 25.83), **catvāri vāk parimitā padāni** supported his view. In this Uddyota on the

Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali he holds that ca is **catvāri padajātāni nāmākhyātopasarganipātās ca** indicates these four forms of Vāc : **bhāṣye padajātāni parā-pāśyanti-madhyamā-vaikharirūpāṇi/ ata evāgre nipātās ceti cakāraḥ saṅgacchate/** In his Paramalaghumañjūṣā, 11, he describes the four forms of Vāc thus:

**parā vāk mūlacakrasthā paśyanti nābhisaṁsthitā/
hṛdisthā madhyamā jñeyā vaikharī kaṅṭhadeśagā//**

Similar descriptions are found in the Tantric texts. Sanctity of word, its eternality and authority are commonly shared by the traditions of Veda (nigama) and āgama (Tantra).

Authority and significance of the scriptures, of mantras, anuvāra, visarga, dot and seeded letters (bījākṣaras), of discourses of great souls like Buddha and Mahāvīra flow from the word only. The word is the very basis of religious and cultural traditions of a race or a country. The words and their order in the Vedas remains so sacred to the Vedists that it can admit of no change. It is impersonal and self-valid. Similarly the mantras in various traditions of religion must be uttered and repeated in the same form and order in which they have been handed down by tradition. No translation of a mantra, howsoever, perfect, will produce the desired and promised merit. It is not so much the meaning which can perhaps be preserved in good translation but the sanctified form or order of religious language that is significant. śabda is Brahman, really and absolutely real; artha is vivarta, apparent and changing. Kautsa may have had some such idea also when he declared that the mantras are without meanings which may be superimposed on a word which has all potentialities inherent in it. All words convey all kinds of meanings (sarve sarvārthavācakāḥ). Specificity and particularity of meaning is limitation and conditioning of word. Tantric mantras like aim, hrīm, klīm do not have conventional meanings of common usage. But these in themselves are significant and efficacious. These letters are, in fact, the very form of deity, of consciousness, and they represent parā vāc and its self-critical awareness, pratyavamarśa. The philosophy of word developed by Bhartṛhari had its roots in the Vedic, āgamic and even non-Vedic tradition of India which

adored the Word. It was on account of supremacy of word over changing meanings that the unity and continuity on the one hand and change and modification on the other, were admitted in Indian tradition. The importance of Sanskrit, Prākṛita and Pāli in various religious traditions also emphasised the role of word in the cultural heritage of India. The plethora of commentaries and sub-commentaries and varying interpretations of the sacred texts show that the words handed down by the tradition were considered inviolable. Independent or original treatises were also soaked in extracts and quotations of the tradition, āgama or the śāstra. Bh. perfected the philosophy of word which had a great impact, direct or indirect, implicit or explicit on the tradition and culture of India. Kashmir Śaivism was no exception. It incorporated his basic ideas and interwove them into the non-dualistic system of philosophy.

According to KŚ the consciousness and its contents are identical and equally real. This is absolute idealism because according to this nothing exists independently of Śiva. The external objective world is the manifestation of what is really internal and remains reflected within the integral unity of the consciousness. Śiva is both a witnessing self and a perceived object. The KŚ understands the world as a symbol of the absolute which is always in the state of becoming, appearing in diverse forms through its power of freedom. Creation is conceived here in diverse forms through its power of spontaneous play of the Lord. It is both real and delightful. Rippling of the ocean, externalization by Yogin of essentially internal thought, art-object of an artist and images reflected in the mirror, are generally cited as examples to illustrate the externalization of inward reality eternally manifesting itself in diverse forms and still maintaining its integral unity. In this view the world is nothing but externalization of the consciousness and is not in any way different from it and it is so because it is real creation of consciousness. The world is not a snake in the rope or the second moon or the silver in the conch-shell. It is free expression of his personality or a thought-construct of a philosopher. In brief, Vedānta and KŚ are opposed to the realism posting independence of the subject and object but both present different models of the nature of consciousness. According to the Vedāntins change, predication, mutability will defile purity of consciousness, but according to the KŚ

consciousness is all, full and comprehensive, hence duality and diversity also do not exist beyond it. Consciousness is without contents. In fact, the consciousness and its contents are identical both in manifested and unmanifested forms. The consciousness is dynamic and not quiet. It is self-resplendent like a gem and, unlike it, it is also self-reflective which is the very characteristic of the consciousness.

The two models of non-dualism presented by Vedānta and Kashmir Śaivism owe much to the idealistic thought system of Bhartṛhari. His philosophy of word and meaning inspired great thinkers of Kerala and Kashmir in their special constructions of non-dualism His contribution to grammar, linguistics, poetry, philosophy and aesthetics is unique in the history of intellectual tradition of India.

References :

1. See, (i) Introduction, pp. xii-xiii, **Vākyapadiya** of Bhartṛhari, University of Poona, Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, Vol. II, ed. K.V. Abhyankar and V.P. Limaye, Poona 1965,
(ii) **Bhartṛhari**, K.A., Subramania Iyer, Poona 1969, p. 2.
2. Vyāsa who is placed in the fifth century (400-500 A.D.) by P.V. Kane, **comments on the Yogasūtra**, 3.17 as follows: **सोऽयमित्यभिसंबन्धात् एकाकार एव प्रत्ययः संकेत इति।**

This, according to K.V. Abhyankar and V.P. Limaye is echoing the following:

सोऽयमित्यभिसंबन्धो ब्रह्मा प्रकम्यते यदा।
वाक्यार्थस्य तदैकोऽपि वर्णः प्रत्यायकः क्वचित्।। (VP, 2.40)

Similarly, **Vyāsa** on the **Yogasūtra** 1.9:

.....वस्तुशून्यत्वेऽपि शब्दज्ञानमाहात्म्यनिबन्धनो व्यवहारो दृश्यते। तद्यथा चैतन्यं पुरुषस्य स्वरूपमिति echoes the **Vṛtti** on VP 1.124यथा प्रकाशकत्वमग्नेः स्वरूपं चैतन्यं वाऽन्तर्यामिणः तथा ज्ञानमपि सर्वं वाग्रूपमात्रानुगतम्।

3. Thus we find references of allusions to **VP** 1. 1; 1.3; 1.32; 1.34-35; 1.40-42; 1.50; 1.55; 1.84; 1.112; 1.120-126; 1.128; 1.143; 2.19; 2.22; 2.38; 2.128; 2.312; 2.315-16; 3.1.9; 3.1. 11; 3.1.14; 3.1.32; 3.1.51; 3.1.104; 3.1.105; 3.2.1; 3.2.11.3.2.17; 3.3. 4-5; 3. 3.9-11; 3 3.51; 3.7. 39-41; 3.7. 110; 3.7.163, 3.8. 1-4; 3.8.6; 3.8. 9-11; 3.8..14 in the works of Utpala, Rāmakaṇṭha, Abhinavagupta and others.

4. इत्थं जडेन संबन्धे न मुख्या व्यर्थसंगतिः।
आस्तामन्यत्र विततमेतद्विस्तरतो मया।। TA X., 41
अन्यत्रेति प्रकीर्णकविवरणादौ Viveka thereon.
5. The text and comment as found in Appendix III of Poona ed. is given in full with necessary formal changes:
इत्याहुस्तं परं ब्रह्म यदनादि तथाक्षयम्।
तदक्षरं शब्दरूपं सा पश्यन्ती परा हि वाक्।।

Utpala comments this:

तथा च त एवमाहुः यदनादि अनन्तं च परं ब्रह्म चिद्रूपं तदक्षरं निर्विकारं शब्दरूपम्। सा एव च पश्यन्तीसंज्ञा परा वाक्। वाग्रूपतां विना परब्रह्माख्यः चित्रकाशोऽपि न प्रकाशेत। सा हि प्रत्यवमर्शिनी। प्रत्यवमर्शनमेव च प्रकाशनमुच्यते इत्याहुस्ते।

He evidently refers to VP 1.124;

वाग्रूपता चेदुत्कामेत् अवबोधस्य शाश्वती।
न प्रकाशः प्रकाशेत सा हि प्रत्यवमर्शिनी।।

Somānanda actually quotes this and other Kārikās in his Śivadṛṣṭi (2. 9-10) for refutation as a Pūrvapakṣa thus : यस्मात्तैरुच्यते सद्भिरेवं वस्तुप्रवृत्तये (ibid, 2.8 cd).

Utpala says: यस्मात् तैः वैयाकरणैः सद्भिः साधुभिर्मुग्धैः एवमुक्तरूपं प्रतिपादितं पश्यन्तीरूपं शब्दतत्त्वं अक्षरं अनाद्यन्तं ब्रह्म विश्वार्थभावेन विवर्तते तदसत्यरूपमात्मन्युपगच्छति। असत्यविभक्तान्यरूपोपग्राहिता विवर्तः। तस्यास्तद्विवर्तते यतो विवर्तनात् प्रक्रिया भावभूतभुवनादिविन्वासवैचित्र्यमिति।

Here Utpala actually quotes from the Vṛtti of Bh. on VP 1.1 thus:

विवर्ततेऽर्थभावेन। एकस्य तत्त्वादप्रच्युतस्य भेदानुकारेण असत्यविभक्तान्यरूपोपग्राहिता विवर्तः। स्वप्नविषयप्रतिभासवत्। उक्तं च- मूर्तिक्रियाविवर्तौ अविद्याशक्तिप्रवृत्तिमात्रम्। तौ विद्यात्मनि तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनाख्येयौ। एतद्धि अविद्याया अविद्यात्वम्। इति।

Utpala on Śivadṛṣṭi 2.21 cd and 2.22 ab which says:

यद्याभासान् बहिर्भूतांस्तत्सतोऽप्यसतोऽपि वा।
सत्यत्वे दर्शनभ्रंशो ह्यसत्ये सत्यता कथम्।।

observes and quotes from the Vṛtti of Bh. his standard definition of vivarta thus:

यद्याभासान् घटपटादिरूपान् इदन्त्या पश्यति तत् तेषां सत्यासत्यताविचारे सत्यता तावत् असत्याविभक्तान्यरूपोपग्राहितात्मकं विवर्तं इच्छद्भिः दर्शनभ्रंशभयात्त वाच्या असत्ये पुनर्दृश्ये नासत्यार्थदर्शित्वे पश्यन्त्याः सत्यतायोगः।

Somānanda further refutes the grammarian's view regarding Śabda in Śivadṛṣṭi 2.80 and 2. 81:

शब्दस्य विषयाख्यस्य मिश्रत्वेनेन्द्रियस्य तु।
सर्वदर्शनविज्ञानशून्यता पदवेदिनाम्।।
यस्मादनादिनिधनं शब्दतत्त्वं परा हि वाक्।
पश्यन्त्या वपर्यमानत्वे हस्ते ग्राह्यकता पतेत्।।

Utpala explains:

विषयरूपत्वेन कर्मतया यस्य आख्या प्रतीतिः शब्दस्य तस्य इन्द्रियस्य च करणतया प्रसिद्धस्य वाग्रूपस्य मिश्रत्वेन एकीकारेण यस्मात् तैरुक्तं अनादिनिधनं इत्यादिकं अभेदाभिधायि तयोः यस्मात् तेन मिश्रीकारेण सर्वदर्शनाज्ञानता पदवेदिनां वैयाकरणानां प्राप्ता। न हि क्वचिदपि सांख्यादिदर्शनेषु व्यावहारिकयोः इन्द्रियविषययोः अभेदः दृष्टः। एवं च वा शब्दस्य पदत्वेन अनादिनिधनत्वेन अद्वयवादादैक्येन वपर्यमानत्वे हस्तेऽपि कर्मेन्द्रिये तद्ग्राह्येण एकता प्रसज्येत।

6. क्रियारहितमिति। न अत्र देशकर्मक्रिया उपयुक्ता सा अस्तु मा वा भूत्। वेद्यस्वरूपं तु यत् तदेव मूर्तिदेशभेदक्रमोपकाराय आलम्ब्यते इत्यर्थः। अनेकस्य इति पदेन अनेन मूर्तिविवृता वेद्यवस्तुरूपत्वेन। लक्षणे इति इत्थंभूतलक्षणे तृतीया ज्ञापकस्य वा लक्षणया हेतुत्वविवक्षायां हेतौ। न च इयं स्वमनीषिका इत्याह तत्रभवत इति। इच्छन् इति अन्यैरपि 'मूर्तिक्रियाविवर्तौ अविद्याशक्तिप्रवृत्तिमात्रम्' इत्यादिभिः श्रुत्यन्तवाक्यैः व्यवहृतं अभ्युपगच्छन् इत्यर्थः। उक्तं च - मूर्तिक्रियाविवर्तौ अविद्याशक्तिप्रवृत्तिमात्रम्। तौ विद्यात्मनि तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनाख्येयौ। एतद्धि अविद्याया अविद्यात्वम्। IPVV, Vol. III, p. 14.

He further refers to the Vṛtti on the VP 1. 1 and explains: एवं परिणामवृत्तान्तं प्रदर्श्य विवर्तवृत्तान्तं परोपगतमाह- 'ब्रह्मणस्तु' इति। 'एकस्य' इति। 'तत्त्वादप्रच्युतस्य' इत्यपि एकत्वेनैवाक्षिप्तं इति पृथङ् नातिरिक्तम्। 'भेदानुकारेण' इति तु सत्यविभक्तताभिधानेनैव स्वीकृतम्।

7. न चागमादृते धर्मस्तरकेण व्यवतिष्ठते।
ऋषीणामपि यज्ज्ञानं तदप्यागमपूर्वकम्।। VP, 1.30
8. अवस्थादेशकालानां भेदाद् भिन्नासु शक्तिषु।
भावानामनुमानेन प्रसिद्धिरतिदुर्लभा। Ibid, I. 32
9. आविर्भूतप्रकाशानामनुपप्लुतचेतसाम्।
अतीतानागतज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षान्न विशिष्यते।। Ibid, I. 37
10. तस्माददृष्टतत्त्वानां सापराधं बहुच्छलम्।
दर्शनं वचनं चापि नित्यमेवानवस्थितम्।। Ibid, II. 138

11. चैतन्यमिव यश्चायमविच्छेदेन वर्तते।
आगमस्तमुपासीनो हेतुवादैर्न बाध्यते।। Ibid, I. 141
12. (i) एकमेव यदाप्नातं भिन्नशक्तिव्यपाश्रयात्।
अपृथक्त्वेऽपि शक्तिभ्यः पृथक्त्वेनेव वर्तते।। Ibid, I. 2
- (ii) अध्याहितकलां यस्य कालशक्तिमुपाश्रिताः। Ibid, I. 3 ab
- (iii) एकस्य सर्वबीजस्य यस्य चयमनेकधा।
भोक्तृभोक्तव्यरूपेण भोगरूपेण च स्थितिः।। Ibid, I. 4
13. शब्देष्वेवाश्रिता शक्तिर्विश्वस्यास्य निबन्धिनी।
यन्नेत्रः प्रतिमात्मायं भेदरूपः प्रतीयते।। Ibid, I. 118
14. ग्राह्यत्वं ग्राह्यकत्वं च द्वे शक्ती तेजसो यथा I.55; संकीर्णा इव शक्तयः I.88;
अणवः सर्वशक्तित्वाद् भेदसंसर्गवृत्तयः I. 110; स्वशक्तौ व्यज्यमानायां I.111;
तस्य प्राणे च या शक्तिः I.117; अविभक्तेऽपि वाक्यार्थे शक्तिभेदादपोद्भृते 2.88;
See, also 3.7.2, 3.7.28-31, 34, 35.
15. चितिः प्रत्यवमर्शात्मा परा वाक् स्वरसोदिता।
स्वातन्त्र्यमेतन्मुख्यं तदैश्वर्यं परमात्मनः।। IP Kārikā, 1, 5.13.
16. तां परां प्रतिभां देवीं संविदत्ते ह्यनुत्तराम्।। TA. II. 79.
17. Abhinavagupta says:
- (i) स पदवाक्यात्मा अभिजल्पः सूत्रस्थानीयेन वपुषा सूक्ष्म इति यावत्। यथा
हि तत्रभवान् प्रतिसंहतक्रमा तु, सत्यपि भेदे समाविष्टक्रमशक्तिः पश्यन्ती।
IPVV. Vol. II, p. 189.
- (ii) उत्तरोत्तरप्रसरापेक्षया पूर्वपूर्वनिष्ठं सौक्ष्म्यं यतः। तदाह तत्रभवान् भर्तृहरिः
“प्रतिसंहतक्रमान्तः सत्यप्यभेदे समाविष्टक्रमशक्तिः पश्यन्ती सा अचला च चला
प्रतिलब्धासमाधाना च संविन्निष्ठज्ञेयाकारा प्रतिबीजकारा चिराकारा च
परिच्छिन्नार्थप्रत्यवभासा संसृष्टार्थप्रत्यवभासा च सर्वार्थप्रत्यवभासा
प्रशान्तप्रत्यवभासा च” इति। अनेन हि अपरिमाणभेदत्वेन
अहंतेदंतयोर्विचित्रतेप्सा। Ibid. p. 226
- (iii) Rāmakaṇṭha, in his Vivṛti on Spandakārikā 4.18, quotes: अविभागा तु
पश्यन्ती, केवलं बुद्ध्युपादाना, स्थानेष्वभिहिते वाणौ,
सेयमाकीर्षमाणायपि
- (iv) Somānanda refers to Vaikharī in his Śivadṛṣṭi 2.7-8 thus:

संप्राप्ता वक्त्रकुहरं कण्ठादिस्थानभागशः।
वैखरी कथ्यते सैव बहिर्नासिकया क्रमात् ।।

घटादिरूपैर्व्यावृत्ता गृह्यते चक्षुरादिना।...

Utpala quotes स्थानेषु विवृत्ते वायौ in his comment thereon.

- (v) Jayaratha, in his viveka on the TA (11.63-65), says: इह खलु अविभागा
तु पश्यन्ती इत्यादिरीत्या क्रमस्यानुन्मीलनात् परस्परं अनासादितविभागवर्णोघाः
भगवतां तावतोऽर्थान् अभेदेन अमृतशान्तः सृष्टाः समुल्लासिताः इत्यर्थः।
18. Reference is made to VP, 1.123-27 न सोऽस्ति प्रत्ययो लोके, वाग्रूपता
चेदुत्कामेत्, सा सर्वविद्या शिल्पानां, सैषा संसारिणां संज्ञा, अर्थक्रियासु वाक्
सर्वान्
19. Thus (i) न सोऽस्ति प्रत्ययो is quoted by Rāmakaṇṭha in his Vivṛti on the
Spandakārikā 4.17, by Abhinava in his commentary on the
Nāṭyaśāstra 20.26 and also in IPVV vol. II, p. 237, by Somānanda in
Śivadṛṣṭi 2.9 and explained by Utpala. संविभागा तु पश्यन्ती occurs in
Śivadṛṣṭi 2.11 and In Śivasūtravṛtti on Śivasūtra, 1.4.
- (ii) वाग्रूपता.... quoted by Rāmakaṇṭha in his Vivṛti on: Spandakārikā
4.18; by Abhinavagupta in IPVV, Vol. II, pp. 81-83.
- (iii) Abhinavagupta in his explanation of सा स्फुरत्ता महासत्ता
(Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā 1.5.14) in the Vimarśini, speaks of
parā vāc as constituting the freedom which is identified with
mantra, Vimarśa, parā vāc, sphurattā, mahāsattā, svātantrya and
mantra are treated as synonyms. He says:
- सर्वस्य हि मन्त्र एव हृदयम्। मन्त्रश्च विमर्शनात्मा। विमर्शनं च परावाक्शक्तिमयम्।
तत एवोक्तं- ‘न तैर्विना भवेच्छब्दो नार्थो नापि चित्तेर्गतिः’। इत्यागमेषु
तत्रभवद्भर्तृहरिणाऽपि ‘न सोऽस्ति....’ ‘वाग्रूपता चेत्’ इति ‘सैषा संसारिणां
.....’ ‘यदुत्कान्तौ....’ इत्यादि च।
20. (i) ज्ञानाधिष्ठानं मातृका। Śivasūtra, 1.4.
- (ii) कवर्गादिषु माहेश्वर्याद्याः पशुमातरः। Ibid, 3.19 Śivasūtravṛtti quotes न
सोऽस्ति प्रत्ययः.... वाग्रूपता चेत् in support of the explanation.
21. एतत् संवादयति तथा चेति भर्तृहरिरित्यवोचत इति संबन्धः। केन वाक्येन। आह-
‘वाग्रूपता’ इत्यादिना ‘प्रत्यवमर्शिनी’ इत्यन्तेन। किमवोचत। आह- प्रकाशस्य
जडवैलक्षण्यं संरम्भः कर्तृत्वरूपो यः स एव आत्मविश्रान्तिलक्षणो निरपेक्षत्वेन
विमर्शोऽहमिति कथ्यते। ननु केन शब्देन असौ संरम्भः कारिकायामुक्तः। आह-
प्रकाशेत् इति। लिङ् अत्र संभावनाधिक्यमात्रमाह। आख्यातरूपता तु
कर्तृव्यापारप्राधान्यविश्रान्तिसतत्त्वेति आशयः। तदयं तिङन्तार्थ एव स्वातन्त्र्यात्मा

विमर्शः प्रकाशस्य प्रहेयं वपुर्बोधस्य या वाग्रूपता शब्दनशब्दयित्तरूपता शाश्वती संकेतादिवत्। अत एव निरपेक्षा अहमिति चमत्कारस्वभावता यदि उत्क्रामेत भावप्रकाशमुल्लंघ्य क्रामेत इदंभावग्राह्यं भावनं स्वीकुर्यात्तदा प्रकाशभावोऽयमर्थो निर्विकल्पे वा द्योत्यते। वक्तीति वचनं चेति वाक् प्रकाश एतयर्थमुखेन उपक्रमो मन्तव्यः। एतदर्थमेव अवबोधस्य इत्युपक्रम्य नासौ प्रकाशते इत्युक्तम्। 'अवबोधस्य' इति च षष्ठ्या अयमेवाशयः। अन्यथा चैतत्। प्रकाशः प्रकाशते इति बोधस्य यदि अपरः प्रकारो न भवेत्। भवति च। *IPVV*, Vol. II, pp. 81-83.

22. See, *VP* II, 117, 143, 148, 152.

23. See, *TA* XI. 65-67 and 78. Jayaratha quotes अविभागा तु पश्यन्ती and व्यवहाराः प्रतायन्ते तिथ्यामपि यद्गशात् in this connection.

24. In this connection the following may be quoted:

(i) वाचा विरूप नित्यया, *Rgveda*, VIII., 75.6

(ii) वाग्घि ब्रह्म, *Aitareya Br.*, 2.15

(iii) वाग् वै ब्रह्म, *Bṛhad. Up.*, 4.12

(iv) नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि, *Chāndogya Up.*, 6.3.7

(v) अनादिनिधना नित्या वागुत्सृष्टा स्वयम्भुवा।
आदौ वेदमयी दिव्या यतः सर्वाः प्रवृत्तयः।।

Mahābhārata, Śāntiparva, 253

(vi) ते मृत्युमतिवर्तन्ते ये वै वाचमुपासते। quoted in the *Śāṅkarabhāṣya*, 1.3.28

(vii) सूक्ष्मार्थेनाविभक्ततत्त्वामेकां वाचमनभिष्यन्दमानाम्। उतान्ये विदुरन्यामिव च पूतां नानारूपामात्मनि सन्निविष्टाम्।। *Auto-commentary on VP*, 1.1

(viii) इदमन्धं तमः कृत्स्नं जायेत भुवनत्रयम्।

यदि शब्दाह्वयं ज्योतिरासंसारान्न दीप्यते।। *Daṇḍin, Kāvyaḍarśa*

(ix) अनादिनिधनाय च नमः *Maitrāyaṇi Up*, 3.5

(x) St. John's Gospel:

In the beginning there was the word

And the Word was with God

And the Word was God

(xi) *Harisvāmin* (638 A.D.) commenting on the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.3.2.16 (*vāg vā anuṣṭubhaḥ*) says:

वाचो वा इदं सर्वं प्रभवति। तस्माच्च शब्दात्मिकाया अनुष्ठुभः इदं सर्वं विकारजातं प्रभवते जायते च। जातं च विवर्तत इत्यर्थः।

Abbreviations used

Bh. = **Bhatṛhari**

IPVV = **Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśini**

IPV = **Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśini**

KŚ = **Kashmir Śaivism**

TA = **Tantrāloka**

VP = **Vākyapadiya**

(*The Annals (B.O.R.I.) Amṛatamahotsava,*

Vol. LXXII and LXXIII 1991-1993)



7. भर्तृहरि और काश्मीर शैवदर्शन

वाक्यपदीय के सुप्रसिद्ध कृतिकार भर्तृहरि स्वयं यह स्वीकार करते हैं कि उनकी रचना उनके गुरु वसुरात के आगमसंग्रह पर ही नहीं अपितु पतञ्जलि के महाभाष्य तथा व्यादि के संग्रह पर आधारित है। व्यादि तथा वसुरात के ग्रन्थ न जाने कब से उपलब्ध नहीं हैं। पतञ्जलि के महाभाष्य में जो दार्शनिक अंश बिखरे पड़े हैं उनका प्रभाव भर्तृहरि पर अवश्य पाया जा सकता है। व्याकरण-दर्शन की परम्परा पर्याप्त प्राचीन है, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है। महेश्वर सूत्र की नन्दिकेश्वर द्वारा दार्शनिक व्याख्या भी इसी परम्परा की एक कड़ी है। भर्तृहरि ने और उनके टीकाकार नागेशभट्ट ने व्याकरणदर्शन की परम्परा को वैदिक वाक्यों से सम्बद्ध कर उसकी प्राचीनता स्थापित की है। दिङ्नाग के प्रमाण-समुच्चय तथा त्रैकाल्यपरीक्षा (जो जब संस्कृत में उपलब्ध नहीं है) के तिब्बती अनुवाद के आधार पर एच.आर. आर्यंगार तथा फ्राउवालनर ने यह निर्णय लिया है कि चूँकि दिङ्नाग ने वाक्यपदीय के द्वितीय तथा तृतीय काण्डों की कारिकाओं का उपयोग किया है अतः भर्तृहरि का समय ४५०-५१० ई. होना चाहिये। प्रो. अय्यर ने इसी प्रमाण को निर्णायक माना है।

यद्यपि बौद्ध नैयायिक दिङ्नाग और इनके अतिरिक्त भव्य, कमलशील, शान्तरक्षित आदि अन्य दार्शनिकों ने भर्तृहरि को दार्शनिक मानने में आपत्ति नहीं की थी किन्तु नवम शताब्दी ई. के काश्मीर शैव दार्शनिक सोमानन्द ने अपनी शिवदृष्टि में उन्हें दार्शनिक मानने में आपत्ति की है। सोमानन्द शैवदर्शन के प्रथम ग्रन्थकार हैं। उनका भर्तृहरि से परिचय विरोध

से प्रारम्भ होता है। वे भर्तृहरि द्वारा प्रतिपादित पश्यन्ती को वाक्त्व का परम स्वरूप न स्वीकार कर वाक् के परा नामक चतुर्थ भेद की कल्पना का बीजारोपण करते हैं। उन्हीं के शिष्य आचार्य उत्पल अपने गुरु सोमानन्द के विरोध की व्याख्या करते हैं पर साथ ही परावाक् की उद्भावना ही नहीं करते अपितु उसका प्रत्यवमर्शरूपिणी चिति से तादात्म्य स्थापित करते हैं। साथ ही भर्तृहरि के सिद्धान्त कि प्रत्येक ज्ञान शब्द से अनुविद्ध है उसका उद्धारण ही नहीं देते, अपितु कालशक्ति के सन्दर्भ में भर्तृहरि ने जिस स्वातन्त्र्यशक्ति की चर्चा की है उससे प्रभाव ग्रहण कर चिति, संविद् या महेश्वर नामक परतत्त्व के स्वातन्त्र्य का प्रबल उद्घोष करते हैं। उनके प्रशिष्य आचार्य अभिनवगुप्त उत्पल की ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञा पर अपनी बृहतीविमर्शिनी नामक टीका में भर्तृहरि के वाक्यपदीय से विभिन्न सन्दर्भों में अनेक उद्धारण प्रस्तुत करते हैं। वाक्यपदीय के ये सभी उद्धारण समर्थन के रूप में प्रायः दिये गये हैं। उनकी विमर्शिनी टीका में भी वाक्यपदीय के कुछ उद्धारण हैं। जयरथ की तन्त्रालोकटीका विवेक के अनुसार तन्त्रालोक के अनेक विचारों में, मेरी दृष्टि से कारिकाओं में भी वाक्यपदीय के सिद्धान्त अनुस्यूत हैं। तन्त्रालोक की एक कारिका में आए अन्यत्र पद की व्याख्या-अन्यत्रेति प्रकीर्णकविवरणादौ की है, इससे प्रतीत होता है कि अभिनवगुप्त ने व्याकरणदर्शन पर ग्रन्थ लिखा था जो संभवतः भर्तृहरि के वाक्यपदीय के अन्तिम तृतीय काण्ड, प्रकीर्णकाण्ड की संक्षिप्त टीका (विवरण) हो सकती है। विवरणादौ के आदि पद से दो संभावनाएँ हो सकती हैं एक तो यह कि अभिनवगुप्त ने प्रकीर्णविवरण के अतिरिक्त स्वतन्त्र व्याकरण दर्शन-विषयक ग्रन्थ लिखा हो या फिर वाक्यपदीय के प्रथम दो काण्डों पर भी विवरण लिखा हो। कारिका इस प्रकार है-

इत्थं जडेन सम्बन्धे न मुख्यार्थसङ्गतिः।

आस्तामन्यत्र विततमेतद्विस्तरतो भयात्।। (तन्त्रालोक, VII. ३३)

अभिनवगुप्त के एक गुरु भूतिराजतनय हेलाराज थे। उन्होंने वाक्यपदीय पर टीका लिखी है। वे काश्मीर शैवदर्शन के भी ज्ञाता थे। स्वभावतः उसके स्वातन्त्र्य सिद्धान्त तथा परावाक् की स्वीकृति उनकी टीका में है।

पाणिनि का एक सूत्र स्वतन्त्रः कर्ता एक ओर कर्ता कारक के मुख्य स्वातन्त्र्य को तो दूसरी ओर चिति या परम प्रमाता के अप्रतिहत स्वातन्त्र्य को दार्शनिक आधार प्रदान करता है। यद्यपि काशैद (काश्मीर शैव दर्शन) का भर्तृहरि से सम्बन्ध विरोध से प्रारम्भ होता है किन्तु उत्पल, अभिनव आदि के प्रयत्नों से वह समर्थन में परिणति पाता है। यह मैत्री सम्बन्ध एक तरफा नहीं है क्योंकि इसे सोमानन्द के शिष्य-प्रशिष्य ही स्थापित नहीं करते अपितु व्याकरण-दर्शन के अर्वाचीन प्रतिनिधि नागोजी (या नागेश) भट्ट भी परावाक् को

अपने दर्शन में मान्यता प्रदान कर मैत्री सम्बन्ध को पारस्परिक तथा प्रगाढ़ बनाते हैं। नागेश भट्ट के अनुसार चत्वारि शृङ्गास्त्रियोऽस्यपादाः तथा चत्वारि वाक्परिमितापदानि में वाक् के चार रूप संदर्भित हैं। महाभाष्यकार ने इसकी व्याख्या चत्वारि पदजातानि नामख्यातोपसर्गनिपाताश्च के द्वारा की थी पर महाभाष्य की उद्योत नामक टीका में नागेशभट्ट ने महाभाष्य में आए च के द्वारा परा, पश्यन्ती, मध्यमा तथा वैखरी को स्वीकार किया है: भाष्ये पदजातानि परा पश्यन्ती मध्यमा वैखरीरूपाणि अत एवाग्रे निपातश्चेति चकारः संगच्छते।

वाक् के चार भेदों की ही नहीं अपितु नागेश भट्ट ने उनके स्थान की भी परमलघुमञ्जूषा में चर्चा की है-

परा वाक् मूलचक्रस्था पश्यन्ती नाभिसंस्थिता।

हृदिस्था मध्यमा ज्ञेया वैखरी कण्ठदेशजा।।

भर्तृहरि और काशैद के पारस्परिक विरोध और समर्थन के सूत्रण के बाद वाक् तत्त्व की विस्तार से चर्चा आवश्यक है ताकि व्याकरण दर्शन के शब्द ब्रह्मवाद तथा प्रत्यवमर्शात्मिका चिति के सिद्धान्तों की तुलना की जा सके और विश्व के साथ उस परम तत्त्व के सम्बन्ध की व्याख्या की जा सके। इसी सन्दर्भ में इन दोनों दर्शनों के प्रारम्भिक विरोध तथा पार्यन्तिक मैत्री का सन्दर्भ भी समाविष्ट होगा।(अपूर्ण)।

(हस्तलिखित)



8. Kashmir Śaivism (KS) and the Vedānta of Śaṅkara

There is no direct reference to the Brahmasūtra or the works of Ādi Śaṅkara in the literature that constitutes backbone of Kashmir Śaivism¹. Somānanda (end of the 9th century A.D.), Utpala (beginning of the 10th century A.D.), and Abhinavagupta (middle of the 10th century A.D. to beginning of the 11th century A.D.) who followed Śaṅkara (820 A.D.) chronologically and who may be considered trinity of Śaiva monism make numerous references to the Vedas, Upaniṣads, Gītā and the Vedānta²

but none to the Brahmasūtra or its celebrated Bhāṣya by Śaṅkara. In fact Bhagavadgīta is classed as an Āgama³ and is continuously commented upon by Śaiva thinkers including Vasugupta, Abhinavagupta and Rāma-kaṇṭha and is extensively quoted in commentaries on the Īśvara-pratyabhijñānākārikā by Abhinavagupta. Upaniṣadic sentences have been quoted with approval⁵ and in support of the basic doctrines of KS. Somānanda who systematised the monistic school of Śaivism refers to many views of Vedānta in his vision of Śiva (ch. VI. 2-15). Amongst them are those who held that Brahman assumed diverse forms (Chitrabrahmavāda), others believed in the plurality of the self (nanātmavāda), another Vedantic opinion considered Brahman as the material cause (Upādāna) of the universe, the ātmavādins amongst them held the individual soul to be the absolute, the netivādins denied any positive sense of self or Brahman, others held that the selves are like sparks of the fire like Brahman (sphuliṅgātmavādins), the pratibimbavādins regarded the self as a reflection of Brahman, another opinion believed in the plurality of selves in different bodies with inherent duality of the world, still others held that the individual souls are mutually different but they are essentially one with the Brahman, just like various streams and the sun. Some Vedāntins maintained that the knowledge, freedom and bondage are within the sphere of avidyā itself. References and allusions to Vedānta and its various philosophical opinions recur in the works of Utpala and Abhinavagupta as well.

Yet it is a moot question whether these ācāryas had any direct knowledge of the Vedānta of Śaṅkara or they were simply referring to the tradition of Vedānta as found in the Upaniṣad and the Gītā and also Gaudapada. Modern writers on KŚ have assumed without any clear and conclusive evidence that (i) the Śivasutrās were inspired by Śaṅkara that he visited Kashmir in the beginning of the 9th century A.D. as per the doubtful description in the Śaṅkaradigvijaya, that the works like the Dakṣiṇāmurtī Stotra, the Saundaryalahari and Prapancaśāra are from the pen of Śaṅkara whose, Tantric or Śākta monism is reflected in KŚ that the life of Śaṅkara as Śākta-Śaiva and his thought should not be divided in interpreting his philosophy. This has led many scholars like Buhler, Chatterji, Dasgupta, K.C. Pandey, B.N. Pandit and others to think that

KS or the Śaiva monism of Kashmir is an application of Śaṅkaras, principles to the Śaiva philosophy. This is not true or complementary to either of these two systems of thought. These do share many common ideas, forms and arguments naturally and also with idealist thought more particularly with the school of Buddhism. A correct view could be that Śaṅkara and KŚ proposed two alternative models of nature of reality in reaction to the rise of subjective idealism of the Yogācāra and the Śūnyavāda of the Mādhyamikas in keeping with their tradition (Sampradāya) of interpreting the authority of the Śruti (mainly Upaniṣads) on the one hand and the Āgamas on the other.

The Vākyapadīya of Bhartrihari, the Bhagavadgītā and the Upaniṣads including the Māndūkyakārikā were common sources for the growth of idealism in orthodox non-Buddhist circles although to begin with Somānanda does not agree with any of these sources and the Śaiva thinkers do not show any respect for the Brahmasūtra and make no direct reference to Śaṅkara. Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Buddhism and Jainism do not claim to present interpretative study of the Scriptures or the revealed texts. Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta and Śaivism (both northern and southern) claim to be rooted in their traditional scriptures. The first amongst these is diametrically opposed to the Vedānta of any sort. The Upaniṣads are variously interpreted by a great line of philosophers foremost amongst whom is Śaṅkara. Both KŚ and Śaṅkara give importance to spiritual experience (anubhava) and svasamvedana and accept the significance of reasoning tarka or sattarka as an aid to the understanding of the Vedānta and the Śaivāgamas. Just like the Upaniṣads, the Āgamas presented diverse traditions of dualistic, dualistic-cum-non-dualistic and non-dualistic thought and spiritual path ways, rites and rituals.

Abhinavagupta was the Śaṅkara of Kashmir who strengthened Śaiva monism and integrated and syncretised diverse ritualistic traditions with the theology of oneness with Śiva, known as Śivādvaita or Śivādvaya. Contemporary writers describe KS as realistic idealism, idealistic monism (K C Pandey), monistic idealism (J. Rudrapa), concrete monism (R.K. Kaw), theistic monism (B.N. Pandit) and so on. Mālinivijayavārtika which is regarded as a basic Āgama of KS described it as parādvaita and

advaya (a Buddhist term) where dualism and non-dualism (realism and idealism by implecation) are on equal terms (I. 262), where distinctions are neither accepted nor rejected (**Idam hi tat parādavaitam bhedyatya grahaṇa na yat**) (Ibid. no. I. 261). no division can split the advaya native of reality apparent opposites like pleasure and pain, freedom and bondage, sentiency and insentiency are synonyms like pot and jar and these cannot touch the integral native of reality declares Abhinavagupta in his Tantrāloka (II. 19) : **अस्यां भूमौ सुखं दुःखं बन्धो मोक्षश्चित्तिर्जडः घटकुम्भवदेकार्थाः शब्दास्तेष्वेकमेव च।**

By anything standing outside or external to it. The absolute is pure in both the systems. According to the Vedānta it is only in the secondary sense that the Brahman can be defined otherwise it is beyond all descriptions and characterisations. It can't be grasped by speech or mind. Anuttara of Śaivism is of the same native. The autonomy of consciousness or independence of eternal reality from the body and mind is accepted by both Vedānta and Śankara.

According to Kashmir Śaivism the ultimate reality, spoken of as Maheśvara, Anuttara, Parama Śiva, Bhairava, etc., is invariably related to or is inseparable from the power or action of consciousness that is citikriya. Consciousness has two important characteristics, namely, self-luminosity (Svaprakāśatā) and self-consciousness (Vimarśa). While prakāśa or luminosity is a transcendental and static aspect of the self. The self-critical consciousness (Vimarśa) implies universal and dynamic aspect of the self. A stir or spanda in the consciousness like ripple in the still water represents śakti aspect of Śaiva. The self-luminous consciousness manifests itself first as Sakti where everything is one complete whole without any distinction or manifestation of subject and object. Through its second manifestation the consciousness reveals complete unity of the objective universe with the subject, the self. At this stage, which is known as vidya, thisness is identical with the 'I-ness'. At the third stage of **Maya** the subject and object, the whole universe, appear as mutually distinct and separate elements. Advaita Vedānta denied the reality of matter in order to preserve the transcendental integrity of

Brahman. Change and activity belong to the sphere of native which may be practically real but is finally unreal. There can be no real relationship between the transcendental being and the native.

The self is one only and it is none other than the Brahman: *Atmā ca Brahm*. It is beyond all change, transformation, mutability and specifications and hence nothing can distinguish one self from the other. This implies that the one reality can be known only by negation and that any change or modification is apparent and not real. Any identification of the absolute with the *Aiśvarya* or of the universe with the absolute is false, super imposition. This is brought about by inexplicable native of ignorance (*Māyā* and *Avidyā*) both at macrocosmic and microcosmic levels. Ks and Vedānta agree that the absoluteness is not qualified or predicated.

However Brahman of Vedānta is self-luminous but it is not self-conscious. It is, therefore, spoken of as *Śānta* i.e. without any activity, The manifestation of the universe is in spite of him. The consciousness or Brahman undergoes no change. The ultimate metaphysical principle of Kashmir Śaivism, Mahesvara, manifests Himself through three important stages of *Śaktī*, *Vidyā* and *Māyā* out of his own free will (*Svātantrya*). He is a free agent eternally associated with manifold powers to imagine the world in his own image through his critical consciousness or *Vimarsa Sakti*. Utpala offers two analogies to explain the nature of consciousness according to his system. The reality is like a mirror with one important difference. The ordinary mirror can and does receive reflections of external objects without in any way being affected by the objects which are reflected in it. It does not, however, create them. It lacks free will for creativity.

The consciousness first creates or imagines the universe of subjects and objects through its power of imagination. These objects so manifested remain one with the consciousness as the objects reflected in the mirror. The universe is, thus, a reflection on universal mirror. What is reflected in the mirror of consciousness is its own creation and imagination externally manifested. The consciousness can also be spoken of as universal mind. Just as an individual mind is capable, in its creativity,

in imagining or dreaming the subject-object universe and just as this universe is in no way different from the individual mind, and it is in fact identical with it similarly the whole universe is identical with the nature of consciousness. The distinctions of subject and object, the duality of body and mind, the difference of internal and external proceed from the free activity of self-luminous consciousness. It is not fattered by any external affections. There is in fact nothing extrinsic or external to it. The consciousness can be spoken of as complete I-ness, Pūrṇa-Ahamta, or pure subjectivity free to manifest the universe of limited subjects and objects. But nothing is really different from the universal mind, the consciousness or samvid. The individual mind has certain limitations, the universal mind has none. It is free and does not depend on any external thing either to bring the whole universe into being or to maintain it separately as it were or to merge it in its own identity. The universe is like the thought or idea of the universal mind which is neither exhausted or affected by its manifestation. The self-luminous, self-critical and free consciousness is the source of all thoughts and actions. This view of consciousness establishes an omniscient and omnipotent permanent reality which is both transcendental and and is able to create sustain and merge the universe and also obscure and reveal itself as will.

The Kashmir Saivism and the Vedāntā were aware of the Buddhist view of the soul. According to this view the conception of an abiding entity called soul, self or God is an illegitimate abstraction. It does not believe in the existence of soul which is nothing but a stream of ideas. The self is nothing but a flux of cognitions which belongs to no permanent subject. Such a subject is not a fact of experience. The Śaiva and Vedāntā consider this view untenable. They assert that synthesis of various cognitions as experiences cannot be adequately explained without assuming a priori entity of permanent self. As the synthesis of experience is not possible on the basis of momentariness of the self Utpala asserts in his *Isvara-pratyabhijna vimarshini*.

Thus, all human transactions originating from unification of various kinds of cognitions which mutually differ and cannot become one another's object, will come to an end.

If there be not one Mahesvara, who is essentially self-luminous, who holds within all the innumerable forms of the universe and possesses the powers of cognition, remembrance and differentiation. The Kashmir Saivism does not admit any difference between mind and matter, thought and thing, subject and object. It asserts the similarity between the individual and the universal mind. Knowledge, recollection and differentiation are the distinctive functions of both the individual mind and the universal mind, that is, the consciousness. The explanations offered by the dualists and the pluralists are unsatisfactory as they fail to bridge the gulf between the self and the not-self. The approach of the subjectivist like the *Vijñānavādin* fails to explain the world of common experience. The pure idealism of Sāṅkara and others negates the reality of the world by declaring it illusory or inexplicable. The phenomenon of knowledge cannot be explained without assuming their essential unity in self-luminous consciousness. But this consciousness according to Ks is not a passive witness. The consciousness is dynamic. This dynamism is spoken of as *spanda*, vibration, *Svatantrya*, freedom and *aiśvarya* or fullness. The reality which is devoid of this freedom of action and knowledge is active like the Brahman of Vedānta. The omniscience and omnipotence of Brahman are really due to the contingency of neiscience (*Śāṅkarabhāṣya*). Brahman is not a creator God (*Īsvara*) for creation is unreal according to the Vedānta. In KS Śiva is real ground of all things, their very essence and substance.

Brahman of the vedānta is the basis (*adhithāna*) of an unreal world. According to Ks the consciousness and its contents are identical and equally real. This is absolute idealism because above to this nothing exists independent of Śiva. The external objective world is the manifestation of what is really internal and remains reflected within the integral unity of the consciousness. Śiva is both a witnessing self and a perceived object. The KS understands the world as a symbol of the absolute which is always in the state of becoming, appearing in diverse forms through its power of freedom. Creation is conceived here in terms of aesthetic yogic and spontaneous play. It is both real and delightful. Ri..... of the occur externalization by Yogic of essentially internal thought, art-object of an artist and images reflected in the mirror are generally

cited as examples to illustrate the externalisation of reality eternally manifesting itself in different forms andmaintaining its integral unity.

In this view the world is nothing but externalisation of the consciousness and is not in any way different from it and it so because it is real, a creation of consciousness.

In brief, Vedānta and KS are opposed to the realism positing independence of the subject and object but both present two different models of the nature of consciousness. According to the Vedāntin the change predication mutability will..... the purity of consciousness but according to the KS consciousness is all. Hence duality and diversity also do not exist beyond if consciousness is not contentless. In fact the consciousness and its contents are identical both in manifest and unmanifested forms. The consciousness is dynamic and not quite of itself respondent like gem and unlike is it also self reflective which is the very characteristic consciousness. In other words, Vedānta is the criticism of the Sāṃkhya by way of denying status to the Prakṛti and rendering it as an inexplicable illusory experience. The KS in the critique of the Vedānta by way of establishing the integral unity and dynamism of the consciousness both succeeded in challenging the Buddhist view that changing consciousness of changing objects will never post any coherence and unity and will be devoid of an abiding and permanent self. Vedānta and KS thus represent sister thoughts and two facets of idealism to meet the Buddhist challenge in India of 8th to 10th centuries AD.

(उन्मीलनम्)



9. Genral Editor's Note in the Īśvara-pratyabhijñā-Vimarśinī

Īśvara-pratyabhijñā-Vimarśinī, IPV in short, (Critique of the Doctrine of Divine Recognition) is the most important work of the Pratyabhijñā school of Kashmir Śaivism. This is a commentary by the great Abhinavagupta on the Īśvara-pratyabhijñā-Sūtra (or-Kārikā) of

Utpala, expounded by a commentary Bhāskarī of Bhāskarakaṇṭha. The original text with Vimarśinī and the Bhāskarī thereon was edited and published by my teachers, Dr. K.C. Pandey and Professor K.A. Subramania Iyer, along with English translation of IPV by Dr. Pandey, in three volumes under the title, Bhāskarī, as the Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavan Texts Nos. 70, 83 and 84 in the years 1938, 1950 and 1954 respectively. These works were out of print for long and are now being re-issued under the general title of Īśvara-pratyabhijñā-Vimarśinī of Abhinavagupta, in the three volumes. An Outline of History of Śaiva Philosophy given by Dr. Pandey in Vol. III of the Bhāskarī will be issued separately for the sake of general readers and the scholars interested in the history of religions. Reprint of the rare and fundamental works of Kashmir Śaivism will be welcomed by the scholars concerned with the idealistic systems of Indian Philosophy.

It was in the mid-9th century A.D., when the whole of India was fired with the Advaita Vedānta of Ācārya Śaṅkara that the beautiful land of Goddess Śāradā, the Kashmir valley, produced a great ācārya, who systematized the philosophical postulates of the Śaiva non-dualism on the basis of the monistic Śaiva scriptures. His name is Somadeva, better known as Somānanda. He was an older contemporary of another great Śaiva ācārya, Bhaṭṭa Kallaṭa who wrote his Vṛtti on the Spanda Sūtras revealed to Vasugupta. The spanda system hardly differs in its philosophical thought from Somānanda. Their real difference lies in prescribing different means of realizing the philosophical goal. Śivadr̥ṣṭi or Vision from Śiva by Somānanda is the first systematic formulation of the philosophy of what is later on conveniently described as the Pratybhijñā school of Kashmir Śaivism, following the term occurring in the Īśvara-pratyabhijñā of Utpala. Somānanda in his foundational work, the Śivadr̥ṣṭi, consisting of seven chapters of 700 verses, declared (I. 2) that Lord Śiva is the essence and identity of all the beings. He shines in all the beings. He is bliss and consciousness whose free will nothing can impede and who manifests himself through his powers of knowledge and action. This concept of the highest reality is basically different from the Buddhistic idea of momentary vijñāna, from the nirguṇa (hence passive) Brahman

of Śaṅkara, from the dualistic conception of Puruṣa and Prakṛti of the Sāṅkhya and from the later schools of Vaiṣṇava Vedānta. Somānanda not merely propounded his theory of the ultimate reality, he refuted the grammarians' theory of Śabda Brahman, the views of the Śāktas, the dualistic Śaivas, and the followers of the Yoga and demonstrated the lack of logic and consistency in their view of reality. Utpaladeva, Utpalācārya, or simply Utpala, built the great edifice of the Pratyabhijñā on the foundations laid by his teacher Somānanda. He wrote his famous Īśvara-pratyabhijñā Sūtra of Kārikā by working out at great length the germinal ideas of the founder of the system (Utpala treats his Kārikā as the reflection of the Śivadṛṣṭi) and by providing a suitable fencing against the onslaughts of the counter systems of Indian philosophy.

Utpala advocates the permanence and universality of the self and criticises the Vijñānavādin's theory of momentariness and individuality. He asserts that freedom of will, thought and action is basic essence of being. Being must have innate power to become at will. He vehemently opposes the passive Brahman of Vedānta and lack of integrality between Puruṣa and Prakṛti of the Sāṅkhya. Vasugupta had recognized three ways of final freedom of human beings: Śāmbhava, Śākta and Āṇava. These ways required an ascetic life of complete detachment and austere practice of Yoga. Somānanda and Utpala show a new way to freedom and beatitude. The realization in the Pratyabhijñā system, to quote from the Introduction of Vol. II (pp. v-vi) by Dr. K.C. Pandey, "consists, not in the actualisation of the potential, nor in the attainment of something new, but in penetrating through the veil that makes the Maheśvara appear as the individual of which everyone is immediately aware and in recognising the Maheśvara in the individual." The followers of this system daily recite the following verse which sums up the attitude of a Śaiva:

शिवो दाता शिवो भोक्ता, शिवः सर्वमिदं जगत्।
शिवो यजति यज्ञश्च, यः शिवः सोऽहमेव हि।।

The following prayer for universal peace and happiness occurring at the end of the manuscript B of the Vivṛtivismarśinī of Abhinavagupta quoted by its editor in his Preface to Volume I explains the Śaiva's feelings for the world around him and for his fellow human beings:

शुभमस्तु सर्वजगतां परहितनिरता भवन्तु भूतगणाः।
दोषाः प्रयान्तु शान्तिं सर्वत्र सुखीभवन्तु लोकाः।।

Utpala holds that the human being is essentially free; freedom is the very nature of the individual. However, the veil of ignorance covers this freedom of man and thus keeps him away from the God within him. Man must remove this ignorance; he must penetrate through the veil to recognize his real self, eternally free, omniscient and omnipotent. Recognition is the way to regain the lost freedom. Incidentally, it is significant to note that the philosophy of Utpala has intimate parallels in the Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra of Ācārya Śaṅkara, as interpreted by his great disciple, Sureśvara (See Abhinavagupta, pp. 151-52) and the lyrics of the Saundaryalaharī.

According to the tradition, Utpala lived near Vicharnaga to the north of Srinagar and belonged to the end of the 9th and first half of the 10th century A.D. Many of his works are lost, those surviving include Ajaḍapramāṭṛsiddhi, Īśvarasiddhi, Sambandhasiddhi and the commentaries on the latter two works. His commentary on the Śivadṛṣṭi is available only in part. His devotional lyrics are collected under the title Śivastotrāvalī and quotations from his unknown works are found in the IPV. But he is justly famous for his Īśvarapratyabhijñā Sūtra or Kārikā. This reveals sharpness of his intellect, original thinking and masterly exposition, intimate knowledge of the monistic tradition of the Śaiva Āgamas and the recognitive Sādhanā to realize the Lord Maheśvara.

He wrote two auto-commentaries on his Kārikā: Vṛtti and Vivṛti or Ṭikā. No complete MS of either of these two commentaries by Utpala has so far been discovered. The available portion of the Vṛtti upto the 20th Kārikā of the third adhikāra was published in the Kashmir Sanskrit Series and the fragment of the Vivṛti is in the personal collection of Dr. K.C. Pandey, which remains unpublished. The fragment of the Vivṛti begins with the 6th Kārikā of the jñānādhikāra, Āhnika 3 and ends abruptly with the 3rd Kārikā of the fifth Āhnika. Utpala imparted his new doctrine to Lakṣmaṇagupta who transmitted it to his worthiest disciple, Abhinavagupta, an encyclopaedic writer on Indian aesthetics and Kashmir

Śaivism. Abhinava wrote a commentary on the Vivṛti of Utpala, known as the Vivṛtivismarśinī. This was published in the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, Nos. LX (1938 A.D.), LXII (1941 A.D.) and LXV (1943 A.D.) in three volumes. Abhinava's direct commentary on the text of Utpala's Kārikā is also known as Vimarśinī and described as Laghu Vimarśinī, being shorter in length than the Vivṛti-Vimarśinī, which is described as the Bṛhatīvimarśinī. They are also known as Catuṣṣāhasrī and Aṣṭādaśasāhasrī respectively in accordance with the old method of calculation. The Sūtras or Kārikās of Utpala remain unintelligible without a commentary, like the Sūtras of Pāṇini or Bādarāyaṇa. Utpala's own commentaries are more in the nature of independent exposition of the Pratyabhijñā system than actual explanation of the text. Abhinavagupta's Vimarśinī offers explanation of the Kārikā and also reads like an independent work. It is available in full and it represents the system comprehensively and correctly. Abhinavagupta's Vimarśinī is thus the most authentic commentary of the Pratyabhijñā system, which enjoys the reputation of an original work. However, in spite of its clarity and lucidity and comprehensive treatment of the system, it does require a guide to understand the full implications of the words and the ideas of the Vimarśinī. The commentary does not solve the problem fully particularly when the oral tradition of teaching the śāstras is lost and when we know that the original thinker like Abhinava will naturally make fresh points in promoting the tradition and in defending it against newly formulated counter-points in the philosophical circles of India in the 10th century A.D.

It was to obviate this difficulty that Dr. K.C. Pandey set on the search for a commentary on Abhinava's Vimarśinī. He struck gold in 1931 when he discovered a commentary Bhāskari by Bhāskarakaṇṭha. He belonged to the later half of the 18th century A.D. According to the Bhāskari he was of the Dhaumyāyona Gotra and the names of his grandfather and father were Vaidūryakaṇṭha and Avatārikaṇṭha respectively. It was to teach his son Jagannātha (svavasutādibodhanārtham) that Bhāskara wrote his learned commentary giving traditional interpretation of the Vimarśinī or the Pratyabhijñā school of Kashmir Śaivism for that matter, which was handed down to him through unbroken chain of ācāryas. Besides

this commentary, he translated the mystic sayings of Lalleśvarī, Lallā vāk, into Sanskrit, wrote a commentary, available in fragment, on the Yogavāsiṣṭha and composed a poem, named Harṣeśvarastava, in singing the glory of Lord on the occasion of his visit to the temple in Kashmir.

Another anonymous commentary on the Vimarśinī, Īśvara-pratyabhijñā-Vimarśinī-Vyākhyā procured by the late Dr. K.C.

Pandey from the Government Manuscript Library, Madras and edited by him before his sad demise is under print and will be published before long by Messrs Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

According to Mādhava (15th century A.D.), the author of the Sarvadarśana-Saṃgraha, (i) Sūtra i.e. Īśvara-pratyabhijñākārikā of Utpala and his two commentaries thereon, (ii) Vṛtti and (iii) Vivṛti and short and long commentaries of Abhinavagupta, namely, (iv) Vimarśinī and Vivṛtivismarśinī constitute the Īśvara-pratyabhijñāśāstra which in essence is the exposition of the Śivadrṣṭi (spoken of as a prakaraṇa of the Śaivaśāstra) of Somānanda-

सूत्रं वृत्तिर्विवृतिर्लघ्वी बृहतीत्युभे विमर्शिन्यौ ।
प्रकरणविवरणपञ्चकमिति शास्त्रं प्रत्यभिज्ञायाः ॥

(This verse also occurs in the Śāstraparāmarśa of Madhuraja where the last word reads as 'pratyabhijñākhyam'.)

The Īśvara-pratyabhijñāśāstra of Utpalācārya has four Adhikāras: Jñāna-, Kriyā-, Āgama- and the Tattvasaṅgraha. The first volume contains the Jñānādhikāra which has eight Āhnikas or chapters along with the Vimarśinī of Abhinavagupta and the Bhāskari of Bhāskarakaṇṭha. The second volume completes the text and the commentaries in the remaining three Adhikāras. This also carries an Introduction giving in brief the History and Literature and Philosophy of the Pratyabhijñā system along with various appendixes for Vol. I and Vol. II. Vol. III gives English translation of the Īśvara-pratyabhijñā and the Vimarśinī. As these volumes are essentially photo-prints; the original edition has not been disturbed except in the formal matters where the change of title, publisher etc. is involved. In some cases it might create apparent difficulties. For example,

the volumes, although now differently titled will still be found under the old title fo the Bhāskarī in the contents, introduction etc. of Dr. K.C. Pandey. In our desire to place these volumes in the hands of readers at the earliest, we did not think it proper to make changes warranted by new circumstances of the publication. I crave the indulgence of the scholars in this matter and hope the reprint of the classic texts of the Īśvara-pratyabhijñā system of Kashmir, for which real credit should go to Shri J.P. Jain, the publisher, will help in further promoting the growing interest of Indologists in this branch of Indian Phisology.

(Vol. II, Reprint, 1986)



10. Editor's note

Īśvara-pratyabhijñā-Vimarśinī

The scholars interested in the study of Kashmir Śaivism will be happy to know that the works of the late Dr. K.C. Pandey who made pioneering contribution to research in Kashmir Śaivism are being issued in five volumes. The first volume will be the Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī of Abhinavagupta with a commentary Bhāskarī by Bhāskarakantha. This volume contains two parts completing the text and the commentaries.

The present volume in the series of doctrine of divine recognition is an English translation of the IPV of Abhinavagupta. This was first published under Bhāskari Volume III in the year 1954. This note is based on the preface to the above volume by Dr. Pandey. The II volume will complete the text and the commentary, Bhāskarī. Before the tragic end of Dr. K.C. Pandey, he had edited a commentary by an unknwon author on the IPV which is named as Vyākhyā. This will be issued in two volumes IV and V. Thus commentaries on the IPV of Abhinavagupta will be published in four volumes. Dr. Pandey had made a promise in his Abhinavagupta: An historical and philosophical study to publish this

translation of IPV in 1931 when he discovered the manuscript of the Bhāskarī. The present volume is an English translation of:

- (I) The Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Kārikā of Utpalācārya
- (II) The Vimarśinī, a commentary on the above by Abhinavagupta in the light of Bhāskarī.

These two are well recognised authoritative texts, out of the six, referred to by Madhva in his Sarva Darśana Saṅgraha in the section of the Pratyabhijñā system, the recognitive school of Kashmir.

The original work on the system is the Śiva Drṣṭi of Somānanda (800 A.D.). The Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Kārikā of Utpalācārya, according to his own statement, is only a reflection (Pratibimba) of the system of Somānanda. On his Kārikā he himself wrote two commentaries: (I) The Vṛiti: no complete Ms of this work has so far been discovered: the available portion has been published in the Kashmir Sanskrit series: and (II) the Vivṛti: only a fragment of this work has recently been traced in Kashmir, after a long and continuous search for it for about twenty-five years by Dr. Pandey. Abhinavagupta wrote (I) The Vivṛti Vimarśinī, a commentary on the Vivṛti, which also has been published in the K.S.S. without the original, and (II) the Vimarśinī a Commentary on the Karikā. Historically, the Vimarśinī is the last of the available works of Abhinavagupta and, according to his own statement, summarily presents his views on the system. Thus, besides the Siva Drsti of Somānanda, Utpalācārya's Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Kārikā and Abhinavagupta's Vimarśinī on it, an English Translation of which is given in the following pages, are the only two complete texts on the system available so far.

The Kārikā, without the commentary, the Vimarśinī, is extremely difficult to understand. But the commentary also is from the pen of Abhinavagupta, whose style is notoriously difficult. Therefore, to facilitate the understanding of these, the publication of the Bhāskarī was undertaken. A new commentary by an enonymous author was further found by Dr. Pandey. This is also being printed under Vol. III and IV of the Doctrine of Divine Recognition.

Abhinavagupta is primarily a commentator. A reader familiar with the commentaries on the philosophical works on the western philosophy, will be struck with the difference in the method of the commentator. He will find that a point, though of very great importance from the philosophical point of view and, therefore, is seriously taken up for a comment, is yet given up after just a few words: and another point is taken in hand, which does not seem to be closely related to the point just discussed. Such a reader has to remember that Sanskrit authors comment, not on isolated points of a system but on every word of the original. They do not attempt to criticise and to present an advance on the ideas contained in the original text. Even when they do so, they always attempt to show that all that they say, is implied by a word, construction, affix, case or personal termination.

Therefore, while approaching the commentary, the Vimarśinī, the reader has to jot down the philosophical points as they occur, eliminating the grammatical and other discussions, and arrange them systematically, in order to get the connected argument on a philosophical point.

(Typed)



11. श्रीगणेश

इलाजी का और वत्सलनिधि के न्यासधारियों का मैं हृदय से अनुग्रहीत हूँ। उन्होंने अपनी आत्मीयता को मेरी पात्रता मान लिया पर मुझे खुशी है कि इस व्याज से मुझे स्व. हीरानन्द शास्त्रीजी की पुण्यस्मृति को अपनी श्रद्धा के व्याख्यान अर्पित करने का अवसर मिल सका। इस श्राद्ध के मुख्य यजमान हमारे बीच नहीं हैं पर उन्होंने भारतीय साहित्य और संस्कृति को जो नयी दृष्टि और आयाम दिये हैं, वे हमारा पथ निरन्तर आलोकित करते रहेंगे। श्रद्धेय अज्ञेयजी को हमारी शत-शत श्रद्धाञ्जलि समर्पित है। व्याख्यानों का आयोजन 'काश्मीर शैवदर्शन: साहित्य, दर्शन, साधना' के नाम से हुआ था। प्रकाशन के समय मुख्य शीर्षक में शाब्दिक परिवर्तन कर दिया है। काश्मीर त्रिकदर्शन की आगम-

परम्परा, वाङ्मय, दर्शन और साधना के सम्बन्ध में यह आलेख प्राथमिक परिचय भर है। इस सामान्य परिचय को प्रस्तुत करने में मुझे पूर्व सूरियों से सहायता न मिलती तो गुप्त गंगा तक पहुँचना मुश्किल था। टिप्पणियों में संस्कृत के उद्धरण और सन्दर्भ बहुत दिये हैं ताकि पाठक मूल तक पहुँचकर अपना निर्णय ले सकें और गहरे भी पैठ सकें।

आगम निगम से भिन्न परम्परा है। योग और भक्ति इसी आगम-परम्परा के अमूल्य उपहार हैं। प्रागैतिहासिक काल से इस परम्परा के प्रमाण मिलते हैं। वेद (विशेषतः अथर्ववेद), उपनिषद्, रामायण, महाभारत, गीता, ब्रह्मसूत्र, पुराण आदि में तान्त्रिक साधना एवं दर्शन के अनेक सूत्र गुंथे हुए हैं। त्रिकदर्शन के अनेक आचार्यों ने इन ग्रन्थों से अपने मन्तव्य की संगति स्पष्ट की है और आचार्य शंकर के निर्गुण ब्रह्मवाद को मुख्य धारा से विलग माना है। मध्यकालीन साधनापद्धतियों, शैव-वैष्णव सम्प्रदाय, सन्त-साहित्य, सिद्धपरम्परा तथा उनके चिन्तन का ज्ञान निश्चित ही आगम और उससे प्रसूत तत्त्वचिन्तन तथा साधना के अध्ययन से ही सम्भव है। भारतीय संस्कृति की सम्पूर्ण अवधारणा इसके बिना सम्भव नहीं है। इस परम्परा का प्रवाह कभी-कभी क्षीण अवश्य हुआ है पर रुका या सूखा नहीं है।

काश्मीर का अद्वयवादी त्रिकदर्शन तान्त्रिक विचारधारा और साधना का व्यवस्थित दार्शनिक विश्लेषण प्रस्तुत करता है। वस्तुतः यही आगमों तथा तन्त्रों का प्रतिनिधि दर्शन है। सोमानन्द, उत्पल और अभिनवगुप्त इस दर्शन के मुनित्रयी हैं। आलोचना तथा नाट्यशास्त्र के क्षेत्र में सुप्रसिद्ध अभिनवगुप्त के 'लोचन' तथा 'अभिनवभारती' का आधार त्रिकदर्शन है, तन्त्रालोक उसका विश्वकोष है। इसी की एक शाखा प्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शन है जो जयशंकरप्रसाद की कामायनी का मूलाधार है। इसके पूर्व तुलसी ने स्वयं अपने रामचरितमानस की रचना का आधार नाना पुराण, निगम और आगम को माना था। उत्पल और अभिनव ने, और इनसे पूर्व और बाद में काश्मीर के अनेक कवियों ने दार्शनिक और आध्यात्मिक अनुभवों को काव्यात्मक वाणी दी है। ललदेद (लल्लेश्वरी) के वरव (वचन) काश्मीरी भाषा के अति प्राचीन रूप हैं जो आज भी श्रीनगर में पण्डितों और मौलवियों की समान आस्था के केन्द्र हैं। त्रिपुरा सम्प्रदाय का दर्शन काश्मीर की तान्त्रिक विचारधारा से ओत-प्रोत है। अभिनवगुप्त की शिष्यपरम्परा उन्हीं के समय में केरल तक पहुँच गयी थी। वस्तुतः उनके तान्त्रिक दर्शन का और उसी के आधार पर प्रतिष्ठापित रसध्वनिदर्शन का अभी तक समर्थ खण्डन नहीं हो पाया है। बल्कि हुआ यह है कि आचार्य शङ्कर को भी तान्त्रिक माना जाने लगा। दक्षिणामूर्तिस्तोत्र, सौन्दर्यलहरी, प्रपञ्चसार आदि उनकी रचनाएँ न भी हों तब भी शङ्कर की अद्वैत परम्परा में तान्त्रिक साधना एवं दर्शन के वे प्रमाण अवश्य हैं। इसी प्रकार महायान के

उदय में और बौद्ध तान्त्रिक सम्प्रदायों के विकास में काश्मीर का अवदान स्वीकार किया जा रहा है। तन्त्र वस्तुतः बौद्ध, जैन, शैव, शाक्त तथा वैष्णव मान्यताओं तथा साधनाओं का संगम-स्थल है। इधर तान्त्रिक विचारधारा को जादू-टोना भर न मानकर मानव और विश्व के सम्बन्ध में उसके चिन्तन को जानने-पहचानने की रुचि बढ़ी है। काश्मीर की तान्त्रिक परम्परा का, उसके साहित्य, दर्शन और साधना का यह परिचय उसमें सहायक होगा।

साहित्य अकादमी, रवीन्द्रभवन, नयी दिल्ली में २३ से २५ दिसम्बर तक इलाजी की प्रेरणा से स्व. श्री हीरानन्द शास्त्री की स्मृति में आयोजित तीन व्याख्यानों को जिन प्रबुद्ध श्रोताओं ने शान्ति, धैर्य और सद्भाव से सुना था तथा विमर्श-सत्र में उन पर चर्चा की थी उनमें से प्रत्येक का मैं कृतज्ञ हूँ अन्ततः श्रीविद्या-त्वदीयाभिर्वाग्भिस्तव जननि वाचां स्तुतिमियम्।

(काश्मीर की शैव परम्परा, नेशनल पब्लिशिंग हाउस,
नई दिल्ली, १९९०)



12. आमुखम्

काश्मीरशैवदर्शनत्वेन सम्प्रति प्रत्यभिज्ञायमानं त्रिकदर्शनं बौद्धवेदान्तादि-दर्शनान्तरविलक्षणस्य परमाद्वयस्य प्रतिपादकं प्रत्नमपि नातिप्रसिद्धं प्रस्थानम्। एतदेव दर्शनं तान्त्रिकसाधनाया विचारपद्धतेश्च प्रतिनिध्यं कुरुते, आगममूलां संस्कृतिं साक्षात्कुरुते, कालिदास-जयप्रसादप्रभृतीनां केषाञ्चन कवीनां रहस्यमुन्मीलयति, मध्यकालिकसन्त-साहित्य-सम्प्रदायानामाधारपीठं निर्मिमीते, रससिद्धान्तस्य दार्शनिकीमुपपत्तिं निबध्नाति। किं बहुना, सर्वस्यापि चैतन्यं स्वातन्त्र्यं माहेश्वर्यञ्चोद्घोषयति। ज्ञानेच्छाक्रियाशक्तित्रितयत्रिशूली सर्वः शिव एव। ज्ञानक्रिययोः प्रकाशविमर्शात्मकयोर्नास्ति वैयधिकरण्यम्। स्वातन्त्र्यं चैतन्यस्य स्वभावः। प्रमा-प्रमाण-प्रमेय-त्रिपुटी प्रमातरि विश्रान्ता। प्रमाता च स्वात्मा स्वसंवेदनसिद्धः आगमप्रसिद्धः कर्ता ज्ञाता चादिसिद्धः। न तस्य निषेधः सिद्धिर्वा।

दर्शनं शुद्धविज्ञानाद्व्यतिरिच्यते। विज्ञानमपि संस्कृतिनिरपेक्षं न भवति; तद्भवेदपि दर्शनन्तु संस्कृतिसापेक्षमेव। तत्त्वतो दर्शनं सांस्कृतिकी निष्पत्तिर्न पुनः परीक्षणसहः इन्द्रियगोचरश्च वैज्ञानिकः प्रयोगः। विज्ञानमपि चिन्तनस्य परां भूमिमधिष्ठाय दर्शनस्वरूपं गृह्णाति। संस्कृतिर्हि विषयतया सह विषयिभावम्, इदन्तया सह अहन्तां, प्रमेयेन सह प्रमातारं, तर्केण सह

भावनामनुपादाय न प्रवर्तते। तर्क एक श्रवणमनननिदिद्ध्यासनैः पुनः पुनरनुसंधानेन भावना भवति। तयोरविरोधं, सम्पृक्तिं सौभ्रात्रं साहित्यञ्च संस्कृतिर्वितनोति। दर्शनस्य संस्कृतिमूलत्वात्

संस्कृतेश्चाभिव्यक्तीनां दिक्कालाद्यवच्छिन्नत्वात्प्रतिप्रमातृनिष्ठत्वाच्च दार्शनिकप्रतिपत्तयः सांस्कृतिकप्रत्ययपरम्परामनुधावन्ति। तत एवैकस्मिन्नपि विषये भिन्नाः प्रतिपत्तयः स्वसम्प्रदायानुसारं तुल्यं प्रामाण्यं भजन्ते। नैकापि तासु सम्प्रदायसिद्धत्वात् स्वानुभवसिद्धत्वाच्च बाधिता भवति, न वा अप्रामाणिकीति प्रदर्शयितुं शक्यते। तत एव सर्वेषां दार्शनिकविकल्पनां समानं प्रामाण्यं स्वीकार्यम्। नैकस्यापरेणात्यन्तिक ऐकान्तिको वा बाधः। सर्वेषां सहावस्थानं भूमिकाभेदेनाधिकारिभेदेन प्रकल्पनीयम्। तत एवाहूः-तद्भूमिका एव सर्वदर्शनस्थितयः।

व्याख्यानत्रयमत्र त्रिकदर्शनस्य प्रथमं वाङ्मयं प्रमाणमीमांसां तत्त्वमीमांसां च प्राधान्येन पुरस्कुरुते, तदनु स्वातन्त्र्येण सिद्धान्तं शिवाभासवादं प्रस्तौति, पर्यन्ते च शिवाद्वयवादेनोपसंहरति। नात्र साधना न्यरूपि। तदर्थमाकरग्रन्थाः साहित्यं दर्शनं साधनाञ्च विषयीकृत व्याख्यानत्रिकसङ्ग्रहरूपा मदीया 'काश्मीर की शैव परम्परा' द्रष्टव्या।

भारतस्य स्वातन्त्र्योदयादारभ्य पञ्चवर्षपर्यन्तमन्तेवासिना मया काशिकराजकीयसंस्कृतमहाविद्यालये बाल्येऽधीतम्। तस्य वाराणसेयसम्पूर्णानन्दसंस्कृत-विश्वविद्यालयत्वेन परिणतौ सत्यामप्यस्त्येव मे निरवच्छिन्नः कश्चन सम्बन्धः। स चाधुना बन्धुवर्याणां प्राच्यप्रतीच्यविविधविद्यास्थानानां सुगृहीतनामधेयानामाचार्य-श्रीविद्यानिवासमिश्र-महोदयानां व्याख्यानार्थमनुरोधेन नवतां विधत्ते। एतद् व्याख्यानत्रयं तदनुग्रहस्य प्रेरणायाश्च फलम्। तानहं सप्रश्रयं प्रणमामि। यदत्र सौष्ठवं किञ्चित्तद्गुरोरेव नैव मे इति धिया प्रणतेन मया ग्रन्थोऽयं श्रीगुरुचरणकमलेषु समर्प्यते त्वदीयं वस्तु गोविन्द तुभ्यमेव समर्पये।

यैर्मनीषिर्मूर्धन्यैरियं व्याख्यानत्रयी दिवसत्रयं धैर्येण श्रुता स्नेहातिशयाच्च प्रशंसिता ते प्रणतिततिभिः पूज्यन्ते।.....

कुलपतीनां प्रेरणया प्रातः स्मरणीयानामाचार्यश्रीबदरीनाथशुक्लमहोदयानां स्मृतौ समायोजितासु व्याख्यानमालासु भारतीयदर्शनानां नवनवोन्मेषैः क्रियमाणं प्राज्ञं श्राद्धमिदं सारस्वतं जगदनृणं विधातुं सुकृतः पन्थाः तस्मै श्रीगुरवे नमः।

(त्रिकदर्शनम्, सम्पूर्णानन्द संस्कृत विश्वविद्यालय,
वाराणसी, १९९२)



13. प्रस्तावना

सोमानन्द, उत्पल और अभिनवगुप्त काश्मीर शैवदर्शन का त्रिक या मुनित्रय है। सोमानन्द के शिष्य उत्पल का समय नवीं शताब्दी का पूर्वार्द्ध माना जाता है। ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञा उनकी सुविख्यात कृति है जिसने काश्मीर शैव दर्शन को तार्किक उपपत्ति प्रदान की। बौद्ध, सांख्य एवं न्याय दर्शन, दार्शनिक क्षेत्र में प्रमुख मल्ल थे जिनसे निपटे बिना किसी नये सिद्धान्त की उद्भावना व प्रतिष्ठा असम्भव थी। आचार्य उत्पल ने इन्हीं प्रतिपक्षों का निराकरण कर अपने सिद्धान्त की स्थापना, गहन तार्किक विश्लेषण के साथ, ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञा में की है। किन्तु उन्हें यह आवश्यक प्रतीत हुआ होगा कि चेतन प्रमाता के साथ समग्र चेतनाचेतन विश्व की विश्रान्ति, बुद्धिमान् कर्ता के रूप में विश्व के स्रष्टा ईश्वर की सिद्धि तथा अनेकता में एकता के अनुसन्धानरूप सम्बन्ध के विषय में संक्षेप में लिखा जाए। इन विषयों का विस्तृत प्रतिपादन ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञा में किया जा चुका है- इस उल्लेख के साथ उन्होंने अजडप्रमाता, ईश्वर तथा सम्बन्ध की सिद्धि के लिये जो कुछ संक्षेप में लिखा था वह सिद्धित्रयी के नाम से १९२१ में काश्मीर ग्रन्थावली में प्रकाशित हुआ था। उस समय तक मूल ग्रन्थ की जो स्थिति थी वह दुर्भाग्य से आज भी बनी हुई है। अजडप्रमातृसिद्धि की उत्पलकृत वृत्ति का अभी भी पता नहीं चल पाया है तथा ईश्वरसिद्धि में जो अंश त्रुटित थे उन्हें पूर्ण करने के लिये कोई नई पाण्डुलिपि भी उपलब्ध नहीं हो पाई है। इसलिये उत्पल की यह सिद्धित्रयी पाठकों के लिये दुर्लभ हो गई। नवीन पाण्डुलिपि की सामग्री के अभाव में, अपनी कल्पना से पाठ की उद्भावना करना न केवल दुष्कर कार्य है अपितु वह कठोर अध्यवसाय के बाजवूद भी विश्वसनीय व प्रामाणिक नहीं हो पाता। इस स्थिति में एकमात्र विकल्प यही सम्भव था कि आचार्य उत्पल द्वारा निर्दिष्ट मतों के मूल का अनुसन्धान कर शब्दार्थ की व्याख्या के साथ उनके तात्पर्य को स्पष्ट किया जाए। यह कार्य भी अत्यन्त कठिन है किन्तु इसे अपने हाथ में लेने का साहस मेरे प्रिय शिष्य डॉ. सूर्यप्रकाश व्यास ने जुटाया है। उत्पल की सिद्धित्रयी की विस्तृत भूमिका, हिन्दी अनुवाद तथा विविध परिशिष्टों के सहित प्रकाशन उसी के साहस का सुखद परिणाम है। डॉ. व्यास अपनी कृति 'बौद्ध, वेदान्त एवं काश्मीर शैव दर्शन' के कारण सुपरिचित हैं। प्रस्तुत ग्रन्थ उनकी काश्मीर शैव दर्शन-विषयक साधना का सुफल है।

आचार्य उत्पल के अनुसार विज्ञानवादी बौद्ध जड़ अथवा अजड वस्तुओं का भेद प्रख्यातपाख्या अथवा अर्थक्रियाकारिता के आधार पर स्थापित नहीं कर सकता। बौद्ध मत का यह निराकरण अजडप्रमातृसिद्धि की पहली से आठवीं कारिका तक है। इसके अनन्तर उत्पल ने चेतन प्रमाता के स्वातन्त्र्य की प्रतिष्ठा पर निर्गुण ब्रह्मवादियों के शान्तब्रह्मवाद का निराकरण ९ से ११ कारिकाओं में किया है। १५वीं कारिका में उन्होंने अपनी धारणा को

स्पष्ट करते हुए कहा है कि इदम् या विषय के रूप में जो जाना जाता है उस जड़ की विश्रान्ति संवित् में है। उस संवित् का अहरूप में अनुभव ही विमर्श या प्रत्यवमर्श है जो सभी जड़ वस्तुओं की प्रमाता के साथ एकता स्थापित कर उन्हें पार्यन्तिक चैतन्य प्रदान करता है-

इदमित्यस्य विच्छिन्नविमर्शस्य कृतार्थता।

या स्वस्वरूपे विश्रान्तिर्विमर्श सोऽहमित्ययम्॥

(अजडप्रमातृसिद्धि, १५)

हरभट्ट शास्त्री की इसकी वृत्ति उल्लेखनीय है- इदमिति विच्छिन्नतया विमृश्यस्यास्य जडस्य या संवित्स्वरूपविश्रान्तिलक्षणकृतार्थता सोऽहमेव तत्तद्भववैचित्र्यात्मना प्रकाश इति चैतन्यप्रकाशतादात्म्यादहं-प्रत्यवमर्शात्मा जीवितस्थानीयो, यदाश्रयाज्जडमपि वस्तु विप्रष्टस्वभावप्रमात्रैक्यादहंभावा- इत्यद्वैतोऽजडप्रमातृभाव एव सर्वतः पारिपूर्ण्येन विजृम्भते- इति तात्पर्यम्॥

अस्तु। चेतन प्रमाता के साथ उसकी पूर्णाहन्ताप्रतीति में सभी विषयों का तादात्म्य और चैतन्य अवस्थित है। यह शैव दृष्टि बौद्ध और शाङ्कर वेदान्त की दृष्टि से सर्वथा भिन्न है। बौद्ध की दृष्टि से वस्तु के सदसत्त्व का व्यवस्थापक प्रख्योपाख्य- भाव अथवा अर्थक्रियाकारिता है। उसका ज्ञाता में प्रतिष्ठित होना या विश्रान्त होना या तदात्म होना आवश्यक नहीं है। वेदान्त की दृष्टि में विषय का विषयी के साथ, अन्धकार व प्रकाश की तरह, विरोध है। इदन्ता, अहन्ता के साथ कथमपि समरस नहीं हो सकती। विषयता का भान भ्रान्ति है जो मिथ्या प्रत्यय से जन्म लेती है, मनुष्य के बन्धन का कारण बनती है और वह नैसर्गिक व अनादि है। शैव दृष्टि, इसके ठीक विपरीत, विषय को संवित् का उल्लास स्वीकार करती है। विषयता की सत्ता अहंप्रत्यवमर्श से उद्भूत होती है और उसी में विलीन होती है। अतः इदन्ता व अहन्ता का सामरस्य पूर्णाहन्ता के विमर्श में है। 'मैं ही विश्व के वैचित्र्य में प्रकाशित हूँ' अथवा सर्व शिवमयं जगत् यह शैवदृष्टि है। सभी प्रकार के अनुभवों की पार्यन्तिक विश्रामभूमि एकमात्र चेतन प्रमातृभाव है- न तो 'विज्ञप्तिमात्रता' है और न निर्विमर्शात्मक ब्रह्मरूपता। प्रकाशविमर्शमय पूर्णाहन्ता अपने को जब अणु- (संकुचित या परिमित) रूप में प्रकट करती है तो वही उसका जीवात्मभाव है। अमित परमात्मा क्रीड़ा के लिये स्वयं अपने को मित बना लेता है। पूर्णता द्वारा अपूर्ण के रूप में यह अवभासन उसकी स्वतन्त्रता है, उसका विकार नहीं और इस प्रक्रिया में पूर्णभाव खण्डित नहीं होता, परमात्मा अखण्ड रहता है-

द्विधा स एष एवात्मा मितोऽपरिमितस्तथा।

प्राणादिना निरुद्धोऽण परमात्मात्वखण्डितः॥ (वही १६)

और वही पौवापर्य का मित व अमित दोनों रूपों में अनुसन्धान है।

नैयायिक आत्मा में ज्ञानादि गुणों का समवाय मानता है। आत्मा ज्ञानादि समवायी हैं। न्याय की आत्मसम्बन्धी इस दृष्टि का खण्डन आचार्य उत्पल ने अजडप्रमातृसिद्धि की १९-२० कारिकाओं में किया है। उनके अनुसार न्याय का आत्मा निर्विमर्श होने से जड़ होगा। वह पारमार्थिक प्रमाता नहीं हो सकता। वस्तुतः अपरिच्छिन्न और पूर्ण अहंभाव का प्रथम न होना ही जीवभाव या बन्ध है। परन्तु इन सभी स्थितियों में अहंभाव का पूर्ण निरोध कभी नहीं होता। हाँ, अपूर्णता का अवभासन अवश्य रहता है। अजडप्रमातृसिद्धि की २२ से २४ कारिकाओं में आचार्य उत्पल ने अहंभाव की व्याख्या 'प्रकाश की आत्मविश्रान्ति', 'सर्वापेक्षानिरोध' द्वारा स्व में विश्रान्ति (जिसे ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञाविमर्शिनी में अनन्याप्रेक्षिता या अनन्यमुखप्रेक्षित्व कहा गया है) स्वातन्त्र्य, मुख्य कर्तृत्व तथा ईश्वरभाव के रूप में की है। माया शिव की स्वयं से अभिन्न स्वरूपगोपनमयी क्रीड़ा है जिसके द्वारा पूर्णभाव की ख्याति नहीं हो पाती। पूर्णता की यह अख्याति ही जगत् है। यह उत्पल का अख्यातिवाद है जो दूसरे दार्शनिकों के ख्यातिवादों से भिन्न है। अजडप्रमाता की सिद्धि में उनका व्यापक तर्क यही है कि सभी प्रकार के ज्ञान, अनुभव आदि के पौर्वापर्य का अनुसन्धान करने वाला स्वतन्त्र, स्वसंवेदनसिद्ध, एक, अनादि प्रमातृत्व है। उसी में भाव या अर्थ की प्रतिष्ठा है, उसी के द्वारा वस्तु के सदसत्त्व की तन्निष्ठ और तद्विश्रान्तिरूप में ही व्याख्या की जा सकती है। संवित् के अनुसन्धानात्मक चैतन्य में ही अन्तः स्थित भावजात, ज्ञान शक्ति से भेदात्मक भासित होता है। विषय और विषयी के सम्बन्ध में, ज्ञाता, ज्ञान व ज्ञेय के सम्बन्ध में आचार्य उत्पल की यह मीमांसा 'तदद्वयमयं जगत्' के सिद्धान्त का प्रतिपादन है। यह व्यवहार और परमार्थ की दो भिन्न कोटियों को स्वीकार नहीं करता जैसा कि बौद्ध और वेदान्ती मानते हैं। यह अद्वयवाद, व्यवहार का परमार्थता के साथ तादात्म्य तथा परमार्थ द्वारा व्यवहार (नानात्व) को अभिव्यक्त करने की स्वतन्त्रता का उद्घोष करता है।

बौद्धों ने ईश्वर के अस्तित्व पर प्रश्नचिह्न लगा दिया था, सांख्य स्वभाववाद द्वारा ईश्वर की अपेक्षा से मुक्त हो गया था और नैयायिकों का ईश्वर अनीश्वर हो गया था। इन तीनों दृष्टियों का, विशेषतः सांख्य सिद्धान्त का खण्डन करते हुए आचार्य उत्पल ने यह स्थापित किया है कि सन्निवेश-विशेष या कोई भी व्यवस्थित रचना बुद्धिमान् कर्तृत्व को माने बिना सम्भव नहीं है। मिट्टी घड़े का उपादान कारण हो सकती है, किन्तु हर मिट्टी घड़े की विशिष्ट रचना का स्वयं कारण बन सकती है- यह कथमपि माना नहीं जा सकता। घट का निर्माण, तर्क व्यवस्था या कलात्मक संरचना, मात्र उपादान कारण या सहकारी कारण से सम्भव नहीं। सृष्टि, गुणाक्षर न्याय नहीं है, यह कुशल चित्तरे का चित्र है जिसमें उसका अन्तर्भाव सन्निविष्ट है। वस्तुतः कोई भी चित्र एक सजग चित्रकार के अन्तःस्थित भाव का संयोजन-वियोजन, स्वतन्त्र पद्धति से अपूर्व निर्माण है, वह सन्निवेश विशेष है। उसका दूसरे के साथ

सम्बन्ध भी है। वह उपकार्योपकारक भाव में एक-दूसरे से सम्बद्ध होकर व्यवस्थित है और इसीलिये समग्र विश्व ईश्वर द्वारा ही निर्मित है। 'अजडप्रमातृसिद्धि' के प्रसङ्ग में ईश्वर के व्याख्यान का उपक्रम उपलब्ध है। उसका सृष्टि-प्रक्रिया के सन्दर्भ में, विश्व की निर्मितिके प्रसङ्ग में सांख्य-बौद्ध-न्याय-सम्मत दृष्टियों के उपपत्तिपूर्वक खण्डन के साथ विष्कलन 'ईश्वरसिद्धि' में प्राप्त होता है। आचार्य शङ्कर की भाँति उत्पल की प्रखर तार्किकता का साक्षात्कार 'ईश्वरसिद्धि' की कारिकाओं और विशेषरूप से वृत्ति में किया जा सकता है। ईश्वर की सिद्धि में उनका एकमात्र प्रधान तर्क है, जिसका उन्होंने प्रारम्भ में उल्लेख और अन्त में निगमन किया है। पहली कारिका जो इस प्रकार है- तत्त्वादि बुद्धिमद्भेदतु संनिवेशविशेषवत्। तथा अन्तिम कारिका है-

तस्मात्प्रसिद्धं तत्त्वादि बुद्धिमत्कर्तृपूर्वकम् ॥५२॥

संस्थानभेदादित्येतन्निरवद्यं प्रसाधनम् ॥५३॥

उनका यह हेतु या तर्क किसी प्रकार के हेतु-दोषों से परिभूत नहीं होता तथापि उनका कथन है कि कितने भी अपराजेय और निर्दुष्ट तर्क दिये जाएँ, मूढ़ के हाथ में रखी हुई महादेवमणि उसे प्रकाश नहीं दे पाती। भले ही वह ईश्वर कर्ता, ज्ञाता के रूप में सभी प्राणियों के अन्तस् में स्थित है और शेष है केवल उसे पहिचानना। उसे पहिचानना या अपने को पहिचान लेना, ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञा या स्वात्मप्रत्यभिज्ञा, भारतीय परम्परा में एक ही बात है- आत्मानं विद्धि, आत्मा च ब्रह्म। ईश्वर के सम्बन्ध में यह दृष्टि कि आत्मभाव व परमात्मभाव एक है, ख्रिस्तीय, अरबिक आदि दूसरे धर्म-दर्शनों से नितान्त भिन्न है। यहाँ मनुष्य ही परमात्मा है। वही अपनी नियति का कर्ता और ज्ञाता है। वही अपने पूर्ण भाव में सृष्टि के मूल, मध्य व अन्त में स्थित है।

'सम्बन्धसिद्धि' में, सम्बन्ध के विषय में आचार्य उत्पल ने जिस सिद्धान्त का प्रतिपादन किया है वह सूत्ररूप में इस प्रकार है-संशब्देन सहार्थवृत्तिना समानार्थवृत्तिना वा बन्धिना च देशान्तरपरिहार-पूर्वकैकदेशावस्थानार्थन विस्पष्टमुक्तैव सा ह्यनेकस्यैकता।

इसी को आधार बनाकर उन्होंने विभिन्न कारकों द्वारा, जिन सम्बन्धों की अभिव्यक्ति होती है उनकी और तार्किक सम्बन्ध का जो स्वरूप माना गया है, उसकी व्याख्या की है। दुर्भाग्य से उत्पल के विचार अभी तक 'सम्बन्धसिद्धान्त' के विवेचन में विचारे नहीं जा सके हैं। इस प्रकाशन के साथ उनके इस अपेक्षाकृत अपरिचित व अज्ञात सिद्धान्त का गहन तार्किक विश्लेषण हो सकेगा ताकि काश्मीर शैव दर्शन ने विश्व के दर्शन को अपना जो अवदान दिया है, वह जाना जा सके।

काश्मीर शैव दर्शन अभी भी भारत में तथा अन्यत्र अपरिचित है। इसकी दार्शनिक उपपत्तियाँ नवीन हैं। उनमें शुद्ध तार्किकता है तथा वे प्रचलित भारतीय दर्शनों से भिन्न व विलक्षण हैं। अतः निश्चित रूप से उपादेय हैं। किन्तु काश्मीर शैव दर्शन के ग्रन्थों के दुर्लभ हो जाने से, नवीन मातृका सामग्री के उपलब्ध न होने से और हिन्दी, अंग्रेजी आदि में व्याख्यान न होने से यह चिन्तामणि चिन्तकों के हाथ नहीं लग पाई। डॉ. व्यास ने एक महत्त्वपूर्ण ग्रन्थ के सानुवाद प्रकाशन द्वारा इस दिशा में एक प्रशंसनीय प्रयास किया है। वे अपनी निरन्तर सारस्वत साधना से काश्मीर शैव दर्शन की विच्छिन्न एवं विकीर्ण सम्प्रदाय-परम्परा का पुनरुद्धार करें, यही मेरी हार्दिक मङ्गल-कामना है। आचार्य उत्पल की संक्षिप्त किन्तु महनीय कृति 'सिद्धित्रयी' की व्याख्या एवं भूमिका के साथ प्रकाशन, शैव सम्प्रदाय की प्राणप्रतिष्ठा के लिए किया गया यह उपक्रम स्तुत्य है। आशा है कि त्रिकदर्शन की जो विशाल ग्रन्थ-राशि अव्याख्यात पड़ी है उसके क्रमशः सम्पादन और व्याख्यान का गुरुतर दायित्व डॉ. व्यास आजीवन निभाते रहेंगे। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ इस प्रकाशन की त्रुटियों के विवेचन के लिए और उत्पल के मत की तुलनात्मक समीक्षा के लिये मैं दार्शनिकों को आमन्त्रित करता हूँ।

(सिद्धित्रयी, संपा. - सूर्यप्रकाश व्यास, चौखम्भा संस्कृत संस्थान,
वाराणसी, १९८९)



14. काश्मीर की शैव प्रतिमाएँ

डॉ. उमा पाण्डेय ने काश्मीर के सौन्दर्य, संघर्ष और समन्वय को सूत्र बनाकर उसका प्राचीन इतिहास धार्मिक, सांस्कृतिक परिवेश में प्रस्तुत किया है।

यद्यपि पुस्तक के शीर्षक से ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि इसमें काश्मीर में प्राप्त शैव-प्रतिमाओं का साङ्गोपाङ्ग विवेचन होगा पर वस्तुतः इसमें उसके भूगोल, समाज, संस्कृति, धर्म की पृष्ठभूमि में काश्मीर शैव दर्शन के ८वीं शती में उदय का ऐतिहासिक परिचय प्रस्तुत किया गया है। अन्तिम अध्याय में पुरातात्विक अवशेषों के सन्दर्भ में शैव प्रतिमाओं का विस्तृत उल्लेख है और उसी के साथ काश्मीर के शैव मन्दिरों और शिव की मूर्तियों से सम्बन्धित बारह पट्टिकाएँ श्वेतश्याम रंग में दी हुई हैं। सम्पूर्ण ग्रन्थ आगम-पुराण तथा इतिहास के सन्दर्भों से अनुस्यूत है पर उससे एक सशक्त और प्राणवान् परम्परा का चित्र उभर नहीं पाया है। डॉ. के.डी. बाजपेयी की संक्षिप्त किन्तु अत्यन्त प्रामाणिक प्रस्तावना

सारगर्भित है। तन्त्र की साधना के विभिन्न रूप आज भी श्रीनगर की मिट्टी में घुले-मिले हैं, उसकी ऋषि-परम्परा आज भी धर्मों के संघर्ष और समन्वय की कहानी कहती है और आज भी १४ वीं शती की योगीश्वरी लकदर सूफी और शैव दोनों की आस्था का केन्द्रबिन्दु है। उसे इस ग्रन्थ में अधिक उभारा नहीं गया है। स्वातन्त्र्योत्तर भारत में सत्ताप्रधान राजनीति ने समन्वय के सारे सांस्कृतिक सूत्र पीछे धकेल दिए हैं। इन सबसे उबरने का एक मार्ग यही है कि भारत के प्रत्येक क्षेत्र के उस चित्र को फिर से सजाएँ-संवारे जो अन्तर्द्वन्द्वों के मध्य से समन्वय का मार्ग प्रशस्त करता आया है।

काश्मीर ने भारत में साहित्य, दर्शन, तन्त्र-साधना तथा साहित्य-समीक्षा के क्षेत्र में अनुपम योगदान दिया है। उसने विभिन्न धार्मिक समुदायों के मध्य सहिष्णुता स्थापित करने का, पारस्परिक आदान-प्रदान को अङ्गीकार करने का शताब्दियों तक पूरे भारत के समक्ष प्रतिमान प्रस्तुत किया है। विदुषी लेखिका के विभिन्न अध्यायों में प्रस्तुत धार्मिक, सांस्कृतिक, दार्शनिक विश्लेषण से यह स्पष्ट होता है। इसी चेतना को प्रदीप्त करने में यह ऐतिहासिक परिचय सहायक हो सकता है। संक्षेप में विभिन्न आयामों को प्रस्तुत करने के लिए यह ग्रन्थ उपयोगी है। पर साथ ही यह भी उल्लेख आवश्यक है कि शैव मूर्तियों का विवरण अधिक विस्तार के साथ होना चाहिए था। यह भी खेद के साथ लिखना पड़ता है कि ग्रन्थ के प्रत्येक पृष्ठ में वाक्य-रचना या वर्तनी की अशुद्धियाँ हैं। शिव, काश्मीर, श्रीनगर, अमरनाथ, नीलमत-पुराण, राजतरंगिणी, वज्रयान, ध्वनि आदि शब्दों तक में अशुद्धियाँ बहुत खलती हैं। कुछ विषय विवादास्पद रहेंगे जैसे कि आदिशङ्कर की काश्मीर-यात्रा, उनके द्वारा सौन्दर्यलहरी का प्रणयन, आदि बुद्ध का निर्गुण ब्रह्म अथवा परमशिव की कल्पना से उदय, शक्ति और प्रज्ञापारमिता की एकता, अवलोकितेश्वर, तारा, मञ्जुश्री आदि की पौराणिक देवताओं के आधार पर अवधारणा। किसी भी धर्म या दर्शन के प्रकर्ष तथा अपकर्ष दोनों का कारण काश्मीर प्रदेश के एकान्त को बताना और उसकी दुर्गमता को श्रेय देना भी कुछ लचीला तर्क लगता है जिसका बार-बार सहारा लिया गया है। किसी दैनिक अखबार में प्रकाशित लेख को प्रमाण मानकर (पृ. २३) सिन्धु घाटी की सभ्यता को आर्य घोषित कर देना साहस मात्र है। वसुगुप्त को शिवसूत्र का स्वप्न आदि शङ्कर ने दिया होगा, यह भी सोचना या कल्पना कर लेना ठीक नहीं है। वस्तुतः काश्मीर शैव दर्शन का उदय और विकास आगम-परम्परा का सुफल है। जिस प्रकार शङ्कर के अद्वैत वेदान्त के विकास में या किसी भी दर्शन के निर्माण और उत्कर्ष में द्वय दार्शनिक तर्कों का भी आदान-प्रदान होता है, उसी प्रकार बौद्ध, सांख्य औपनिषद आदि दार्शनिक धाराओं ने भी काश्मीर के त्रिकदर्शन के निर्माण में योगदान दिया था। पर निश्चित ही वह आदि शङ्कर की अत्यन्त सन्देहास्पद वस्तुतः ऐतिहासिक दृष्टि से अमान्य काश्मीर यात्रा का फल नहीं है। स्वयं शङ्कर का दर्शन उपनिषद्, गीता, ब्रह्मसूत्र, गौडपादकारिका तथा बौद्धदर्शन की चिन्तन-परम्परा से प्रसूत है। अद्वैत के

विभिन्न रूप व विकल्प आगम-निगम परम्परा में मौजूद थे, उनमें से ग्रहणमूलक अद्वैत को काश्मीर के आचार्यों ने और निषेधमूलक अद्वैत को केरल के परमाचार्य ने अपनी वाणी दी। काश्मीर शैव दर्शन के सम्बन्ध में यह दृष्टि अधिक समंजस प्रतीत होती है।

आजकल प्रकाशक कुछ चित्र देकर, बड़ा टाइप देकर, मोटा कागज लगाकर पुस्तक के शीर्षक को तदनु रूप आकर्षक बनाकर अधिक मूल्यवान् बना देते हैं। यही प्रयत्न इसमें भी दिखाई देता है। अच्छा होता यदि शोधग्रन्थ के अनुरूप इसका मुद्रण और प्रकाशन होता और मूल्य रखने में अनावश्यक वृद्धि न की जाती। कम मूल्य में इसे प्रस्तुत किया जा सकता था और तब यह और अधिक उपादेय व ग्राह्य होता।

(उमा पाण्डेय-सम्पादित *Saivait Sculptures of Kashmir : A historical Approach*, पब्लिकेशन स्कीम, जयपुर, १९९२, पुस्तक की समीक्षा, राजस्थान पत्रिका, १३ जून, १९९३)



15. कश्मीर की तान्त्रिक परम्परा में लल्लेश्वरी

कश्मीर की भूमि में चिन्तन और कवन सहोदर हैं। साहित्य, दर्शन और साहित्यशास्त्र का वह शारदापीठ है। कविता और केसर उसमें एक साथ उगते हैं। कश्मीर के त्रिकदर्शन को परमाद्वैत, महाद्वैत अथवा ईश्वराद्वयवाद के नाम से जाना जाता है। तन्त्रों का प्रतिनिधि दर्शन इस देश को कश्मीर ने ही दिया है।

जैन, वैष्णव और बौद्ध परम्परा की भाँति शैवदर्शन की भी एक विकसित और समृद्ध आगमपरम्परा है। यह दर्शन मूलतः निगममूलक न होकर आगममूलक है। मध्यकालीन साधना-पद्धति, सन्त-साहित्य, सिद्धों की बानी समझने के लिये तन्त्र अथवा आगम के मूल तक जाना आवश्यक है। कश्मीर का अद्वयवादी शैव दर्शन तान्त्रिक या आगममूलक विचारधारा और साधना का व्यवस्थित दार्शनिक विश्लेषण प्रस्तुत करता है।

तान्त्रिक साधना- दर्शन ने जिन मूल्यों की स्थापना की है, उनमें सभी वर्णों का समान अधिकार व्यष्टि और समष्टि की एकात्मता, शक्ति की महत्ता, साधना में स्त्री तथा नीच जाति के व्यक्तियों का द्विज की अपेक्षा विशेष स्थान, ज्ञान की विभिन्न धाराओं का अधिकारी के अनुसार सम्मान, योग और ध्यान की प्रमुखता, समता की दृष्टि, संसार की सत्यता तथा शिवमयता, करुणा तथा अनुग्रह (शक्तिपात) के साथ सत्तर्क का महत्त्व तथा ज्ञान और क्रिया का विरोध या समुच्चय नहीं अपितु सामरस्य प्रमुख हैं।

शैव पदार्थों का व्युत्पादक शास्त्र तन्त्र है जो कि धारणार्थक तन्त्रि धातु से निष्पन्न है। इस प्रकार तन्त्र शब्द विस्तारार्थक तनु धातु से अथवा धारणार्थक अथवा व्याख्यार्थक तन्त्रि अथवा तन्त्रि धातु से निष्पन्न माना जाता है। तन्त्र शब्द शास्त्र का भी सामान्य वाचक है। सांख्यकारिका की टीका युक्तिदीपिका में जो तन्त्र के गुण बताए गए हैं या अन्यत्र (चरकसंहिता, अर्थशास्त्र आदि में) जिन तन्त्रयुक्तियों का उल्लेख है, वे वस्तुतः शास्त्रसामान्य के लिए ही हैं। मैदिनीकोष के अनुसार इसके और भी अर्थ हैं। आगम के लिए तन्त्र शब्द का प्रयोग पारिभाषिक है। आगम के एक भेद के अनुसार आगम पच्चीस विषयों का निरूपण करते हैं तो तन्त्र सात का और यामल उन्हीं में से पाँच का (द्र.टी.ए. गोपीनाथराव, एलीमेन्ट्स ऑव हिन्दू आइकोनाग्राफी, भाग १, पृ. २१ (ट.)(तान्त्रिक वाङ्मय के एक भाग के लिए यामल शब्द का भी प्रयोग होता है जिसके आठ लक्षण बतलाए गए हैं (महातन्त्र और संहिता, स्वच्छन्दोद्योत, १.७ के अनुसार)।

तन्त्रों का शैव, शाक्त वैष्णव आदि सम्प्रदायों के विकास में वही महत्त्व और स्थान है जैसा कि उपनिषदों का आस्तिक दर्शनों के विकास में। आगम निगम (श्रुति), स्मृति, पुराण से भिन्न वाङ्मय के प्रतिनिधि हैं - आगतं शिववक्त्रेभ्यो गतं च गिरिजामुखे, मतं च वासुदेवस्य तस्मादागम-उच्यते (सर्वोल्लासतन्त्र, १.१५)। आगमों की संवादात्मिका शैली बोध्य के रूप में अवतीर्ण होती है और स्वयं सदाशिव गुरु-शिष्य-भाव में स्थित होकर प्रश्नोत्तरात्मिका शैली में आगम- तन्त्र का अवतरण करते हैं। अभ्युदय और निःश्रेयस् दोनों की एक साथ प्राप्ति के उपाय के रूप में भी आगम की व्याख्या की गई है-आगच्छन्ति बुद्धिमारोहन्ति यस्माद् अभ्युदयनिःश्रेयसोपायाः स आगमः (तत्त्ववैशारदी, १.७)।

तान्त्रिक दर्शन एवं साधना के अनेक बीज वेदों में विशेषतः अथर्ववेद में उपलब्ध हैं। अथर्ववेद के वे अंश जिनमें जादू-टोना अभिचारादि का अंकन है उन्हें कुछ विद्वान् प्रागैतिहासिक युग की देन और ऋग्वेद की यज्ञपरक ऋचाओं की अपेक्षा अधिक प्राचीन मानते हैं। उनके अनुसार भेषज्यपरक एवं पौष्टिक अथवा वे स्थल जिनमें राक्षस, गन्धर्व, अप्सराओं का वर्णन मिलता है, उनकी रचना इन्डो-यूरोपियन काल की देन है। उनके वर्णन के सन्दर्भ में आए प्रजापति, ईशान, महादेव, नीललोहित आदि के प्रयोग से यह स्पष्ट है कि ब्राह्म्य आर्यों की ही एक उपजाति थी, जो ऋग्वेद की क्लिष्ट धार्मिक परम्परा से हटकर भिन्न आचार का पालन करती थी और इनका रुद्र से विशेष सम्बन्ध था। ब्राह्म्यों के अतिरिक्त वैष्णव तथा श्रमण धर्म के बीज भी अथर्ववेद में प्राप्त होते हैं। अथर्ववेद का दूसरा नाम अथवांगिरस भी प्रचलित है। अंगिरस शब्द को जादू-टोना, कृत्या, अभिचारादि का सूचक माना जाता है। मधुसूदन सरस्वती ने अथर्वन् शब्द को "पौषाभिचारिक" की संज्ञा दी है। अतः यह मानना उचित होगा कि ऋग्वेद से प्राचीन प्रागैतिहासिक धर्म के बीज अथर्ववेद की श्रुति में सुरक्षित हैं। वैदिक यज्ञ में पशुबलि, चरु आदि का विधान (ऐतरेय

आरण्यक ३.२.१.२) तन्त्र की भाँति आचमन से पूजा के प्रारम्भ से व बीजमन्त्र से बताया गया है। स्वच्छन्दतन्त्र में ज्ञानरूप आगम को प्रष्टा तथा वक्ता (भैरवी-भैरव) का पारस्परिक अनुग्राह्य-अनुग्राहक भाव माना है जो टीकाकार क्षेमराज के अनुसार योगप्रत्यक्ष के समान है। अभिनव ने इसी को शब्दान्तर से पुरातन समस्त व्यवहार की अविगीत प्रसिद्धि कहा है और यह प्रतिपादित किया है कि समग्र व्यवहार प्रत्यक्ष अथवा अनुमान पर नहीं अपितु शब्दात्मिका प्रसिद्धि या आगम पर आश्रित है।

पुराणों में लोकप्रिय सामान्य धर्म का, व्रत, उपवास, पर्व का विभिन्न आख्यानों के साथ वर्णन है, उसमें प्रतिपादित साधना गुह्य नहीं है, तन्त्र-आगम में प्रतिपादित साधनाएँ, बौद्ध, जैन, शैव शाक्तादि सभी सम्प्रदायों में गुह्य हैं और यह निरन्तर सुनने को मिलता है कि यह मन्त्र या उपासना-विशेष या क्रिया गुह्यातिगुह्य है। इसका एक कारण साधना का लोकव्यवहार से विरुद्ध होना है।

शिवसूत्र वसुगुप्त (९वीं शती ई. प्रारम्भ) को स्वप्न में मिले थे अथवा महादेवक नामक पर्वत की शिला पर उत्कीर्ण रूप में प्राप्त हुए थे। अतः शिवसूत्र को आगमकल्प माना जा सकता है। सोमानन्द (नवम शती ई. का अन्तिम भाग) की शिवदृष्टि अद्वैत शैवदर्शन का साङ्गोपाङ्ग विवचन करने वाला प्रथम ग्रन्थ है। इसका सम्बन्ध त्र्यम्बक मठिका से था। वह सात आह्निकों में ७२४ श्लोकों में निबद्ध है।

सोमानन्द के प्रमुख शिष्य (उदयाकर एवं वागीश्वरी के पुत्र मूलतः लाटदेशीय) उपत्पलदेव का स्थितिकाल नवम शताब्दी का अन्तिम भाग है। इनकी प्रसिद्ध कृति ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञा है। शिवदृष्टि तथा ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञा में नाम, शैली एवं आकार का भेद अवश्य है किन्तु उनका प्रतिपाद्य एक ही है। उत्पल ने स्वयं कहा है कि शिवदृष्टि में उनके महागुरु ने जो कुछ भी बताया है कि उसी नवीन मार्ग का अनुकरण उन्होंने किया है। उत्पल के साक्षात् शिष्य का पता नहीं है जिन्होंने ग्रन्थ का निर्माण किया हो। किन्तु लक्ष्मणगुप्त ऐसे आचार्य हैं जिन्होंने साधनाप्रधान एवं तर्क प्रधान दोनों धाराओं का समन्वय किया था और वे अभिनवगुप्त के गुरु थे। इस तरह अभिनवगुप्त उत्पलदेव के प्रशिष्य हैं।

अभिनवगुप्त (१०वीं शती ई.) ने लगभग चालीस ग्रन्थों की रचना की थी। ध्वन्यालोक पर उनकी लोचनटीका एवं नाट्यशास्त्र पर अभिनवभारती आगमेतर विद्वानों में भी प्रसिद्ध है। अभिनवगुप्त की दार्शनिक कृतियों में तन्त्रालोक सबसे अधिक महत्त्वपूर्ण एवं विशालकाय है। यह शैवदर्शन, आचार, साधना, योग एवं तान्त्रिक कर्मकाण्ड का विश्वकोष है। तन्त्रालोक के प्रमुख विषयों का सार अत्यन्त संक्षेप में तन्त्रसार में प्रस्तुत किया गया है।

प्रारम्भ से ही दार्शनिक ग्रन्थों के साथ-साथ काव्यमयी वाणी में स्तोत्र के रूप में अपने भाव, साधना तथा दर्शन को अभिव्यक्त करने के लिए स्तोत्र लिखने की परम्परा रही

है। भट्टनारायण की स्तवचिन्तामणि व उत्पल की शिवस्तोत्रावली इसके रमणीय उदाहरण हैं। इसी परम्परा में अभिनवगुप्त के क्रमस्तोत्र, भैरवस्तम्ब, अनुत्तराष्टिका, अनुभवनिवेदनस्तोत्र, देहस्थ-देवताचक्रस्तोत्र आदि उल्लेखनीय स्तोत्र ग्रन्थ हैं। अभिनवगुप्त के टीका-ग्रन्थों में ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञा पर विमर्शिनी तथा विवृत्तिविमर्शिनी टीकाएँ, परात्रीशिका पर विवरण नामक, शिवदृष्टि पर अवलोचन (अप्राप्य) भगवद्गीतार्थसंग्रह उल्लेखनीय हैं।

कश्मीर शैवशास्त्र का विभाग क्रम, कुल, प्रत्यभिज्ञा में किया जाता है। प्रत्येक शाखा में साधना-भेद, दृष्टि-भेद तथा ग्रन्थ-भेद अवश्य होता है, किन्तु कश्मीर-शैवदर्शन की विकास-यात्रा में तीनों मिलकर चले हैं और इसका सबसे महत्त्वपूर्ण प्रमाण है अभिनवगुप्त का तन्त्रालोक।

१४वीं शती ई. की प्रसिद्ध योगीश्वरी लल्लेश्वरी, लल या ललदेव आज भी कश्मीर के हिन्दू-मुसलमानों की आस्था का केन्द्र है। उनकी वाणी, लल्लवख (लल्लवाक्यानि) का संस्कृत में अनुवाद १६वीं शती में ही भास्करकण्ठ ने किया था। वे कहती हैं-

सहजस शम तु दम नो गच्छे यच्छि नो प्रावख मुक्ती द्वार।
सलिलस लवण जन मीलित्य गच्छे तोति छुव अर्लन सहज व्यचार ।।

(शम-दम से सहज गम्य नहीं है चाहने भर से मुक्ति का द्वार नहीं खुल जाता, पानी में नमक की तरह उसमें घुल जाने के बाद भी सहज तत्त्व का विचार दुर्लभ बना रहा)।

गगनचय बूतल चय चय चुख घन पवन त राथ।
अर्ग चन्दुन पोश पोज चुय चय छख सोरुय त लागिजिय क्याह ।।

(तुम गगन हो, तुम भूतल हो, तुम दिन, पवन और रात हो, अगरू, चन्दन, पुष्प और जल हो, तुम, तुम सब कुछ हो तो क्या अर्पण करूँ?)

अजपा गायत्री हंस हंस जपिथ अहम् त्राविथ सुय अद रट ।
यम्य त्रौव अहं सुय रुद पानय बो ह न आसुन छय व्वपदीश ।।

(अजपा गायत्री मंत्र “हंसः” हर सांस में जपो, अहं छोड़ दो और उसमें खो जाओ, जिसने अहं को छोड़ा वह उसे पा गया, उससे अलग होने को मिटा दो, यही सीख है)।

अस पृन्दे ज्वसे जाखे न्यथ्य स्नानकरि तीर्थन ।
वहर्ह्य वाहरस नो नुय आसे निशि छय त प्रजानतन ।।

(वह हंसता है, छींकता है, जंभाई लेता है, तीर्थों में नित्य स्नान करता है, वह सारे साल नंगा रहता है, वह तुम्हारे पास है, उसे पहचानो)।

लल बो ह लूसस छाडान त गारान हाल म्य को रमस रसनिश तिय।
बुछुन हयो तमस तार्य डीठिमस बरन म्यति कल गनेयन जि जोगमस ततिय।।

(लल खोजती और बाँट जोहती थक गई, मैंने उसका पीछा किया धीरे-धीरे, मैंने कोशिश की कि उसकी एक झलक मिल जाय, पर देखा कि दरवाजे बन्द हैं, मेरी चाह और गहरी हो गई और उसकी बात में मैं अपने भीतर बैठ गई)।

योगीश्वरी के इन वचनों में काश्मीर की तान्त्रिक विचारधारा और भक्तिभावना मुखरित हुई है।

(राजस्थान पत्रिका की छायाप्रति, दिनाङ्क - अज्ञात)



16. श्री अमृतवाग्भवाचार्य से काशी में साक्षात्कार

सम्भवतः सन् १९६५ की बात है। मैं तन्त्र-सम्मेलन में सम्मिलित होने काशी गया हुआ था। इसी अवसर पर (हो सकता है इसी के आस-पास का कोई दूसरा अवसर हो क्योंकि सन् १९६५ में, मैं अपनी पुस्तक के प्रकाशनार्थ भी आता जाता रहता था) आदरणीय पं. बटुकनाथ शास्त्री खिस्ते ने मुझसे कहा कि एक सिद्ध महापुरुष महाराष्ट्रीय पण्डित के यहाँ ठहरे हुए हैं। खिस्तेजी स्वयं तन्त्र, आगम एवं साहित्य के निष्णात हैं, उनके पिता स्वर्गीय म.म. नारायण शास्त्री खिस्तेजी भी तान्त्रिक-साधना एवं साहित्य में वैदुष्य के लिए विख्यात थे। स्वभावतः मेरे मन में उत्सुकता थी। कैसा होता है सिद्ध महापुरुष ! इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे आस्था से अधिक उत्सुकता थी। खैर, खिस्तेजी के साथ रात में लगभग ९ बजे, मैं श्री अमृतवाग्भवाचार्यजी के दर्शन के लिए पहुँचा। वहाँ पहले तो तन्त्र सम्मेलन को लेकर चर्चा हुई। फिर आचार्यजी ने अपनी साधना के कतिपय प्रसङ्ग सुनाए। आज वे सारे प्रसङ्ग (सम्भवतः तीन प्रसङ्ग उन्होंने सुनाए थे) मेरे मन में गड्डु-मड्डु हो गये हैं। कोई भी प्रसङ्ग स्पष्ट और विशद नहीं रह गया है। पर सबसे पहले मैं प्रभावित हुआ था, उनके सरल सादे व्यक्तित्व से। छरहरा बदन, न ज्यादा लम्बी और न छोटी दाढ़ी, सफेद धोती जो उस समय उत्तरीय भी था पहने तख्त पर आधा लेटा, आधा बैठा व्यक्ति मुझे भारतीय पण्डित-परम्परा का प्रतीक लगा। साधना एवं अनुभव के संस्मरण सुनाते-सुनाते वे स्वरचित स्तुतियों का भी पाठ करते जाते थे। इन स्तुतियों में देवी के स्वरूप का स्मरण उल्लेखनीय हैं। संस्कृत में संक्षिप्त स्तोत्र लिखने और उसे शुद्ध यति-विराम के साथ सुनने से ही संस्कृतज्ञ के नाते मेरी आस्था अंकुरित हो गई थी। उनके द्वारा रचित स्तोत्र किसी विद्वान् कवि की

कल्पना नहीं थे अपितु साक्षात्कार के अनुभव की शब्द-मूर्ति थे। इसलिए वह विशिष्ट उपलब्धि है। मुझे स्मरण आता है कि काश्मीर में शारदा के किशोरी रूप में दर्शन को उन्होंने कितनी सरल और भोली भावात्मकता के साथ सुनाया था। उनकी वाणी की निश्चलता से लगता था कि यह सब सत्य होगा। कम से कम उसे असत्य सिद्ध करने का मेरे पास न कोई अनुभव था और न प्रमाण। दूसरे के साक्षात्कार और प्रयत्न को हम केवल अनुमान के आधार पर या बौद्धिक तर्क-वितर्क से अपने लिए भले झुठला लें पर जिसने सारा जीवन उसी स्वसंवेदन सिद्ध आत्मानुभव में जिया हो उसके यथार्थ को हम मिटा नहीं सकते। अधिक से अधिक हम तो यही कह पायेंगे- अविगत गति कछु कहि न जाये। भेंट समाप्त होते होते, रात गहराने लगी थी। प्रत्येक संस्मरण नया आध्यात्मिक प्रकाश विकीर्ण कर रहा था और इसी स्थिति में यह प्रथम दर्शन का अन्तिम क्षण आ गया। उन्होंने अपनी एक कृति मुझे भी दी। उसे लेकर मैं वापस लौट आया। इसके बाद लम्बे अन्तराल तक उनकी चर्चा लगभग नहीं के बराबर सुनने को मिली। सन् १९६६ में, मैं दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय छोड़कर उदयपुर विश्वविद्यालय चला आया। कुछ वर्षों बाद डॉ. रामगोपाल शर्मा दिनेश, हिन्दी विभाग, उदयपुर विश्वविद्यालय, से यह सुनने को मिला कि वे अपने शैव महाकाव्य-सम्बन्धी शोधग्रन्थ में सहायता लेने भरतपुर जाते रहते हैं जहाँ उन्हें श्री अमृतवाग्भवाचार्यजी से अपेक्षित सहायता मिल जाती है। पुनः कुछ वर्षों बाद डॉ. भंवरलाल जोशी की पुस्तक 'काश्मीर शैव दर्शन और कामायनी' देखने को मिली। उसमें उनका उल्लेख था। साथ ही जोशीजी से जब भेंट हुई तो उन्होंने भी सादर आचार्यश्री का स्मरण किया। इन सभी अवसरों पर मेरी काशी की स्मृति ताजी हो जाती थी और एक बार फिर उनकी मूर्ति का मानस-प्रत्यक्ष हो जाता था। मुझे अब लगा कि राजस्थान में शैवदर्शन के प्रचार-प्रसार के आचार्यश्री श्रद्धेय स्रोत हैं। मेरी भी इच्छा होती थी कि अवसर सहज रूप में मिले तो मैं भी उनसे शास्त्र-चर्चा का लाभ उठाऊँ।

यह सब धीरे-धीरे प्रसुप्त होने लगा था। कोई दुर्गादत्तजी शर्मा जयपुर में मिले। उनके माध्यम से मुझे आचार्यश्री का सम्पूर्ण साहित्य मिला। उनके पुण्यस्मरण का एक सभा में अवसर प्राप्त हुआ और यह जानकर मेरी प्रसन्नता और बढ़ गई कि वे आचार्यश्री के जीवन, साधना और वैदुष्य का निरन्तर संरक्षण करने में एक संस्था के माध्यम से सदा प्रयत्नशील रहेंगे। यह सर्वोत्तम श्रद्धाञ्जलि है जो उन्हें हमारे बीच सदा अमर रखेगी।

(स्मृति ग्रन्थ, श्रीमदमृतवाग्भवाचार्य-सांस्कृतिक शिक्षा एवं
शोध संस्थान, जयपुर, संवत् २०४२)



17. उपक्रम

यह हमारे लिए गौरव और प्रसन्नता की बात है कि संस्कृत के लब्धप्रतिष्ठ लेखक डॉ. शिवसागर त्रिपाठी (तत्कालीन अध्यक्ष, संस्कृत विभाग राजस्थान विश्वविद्यालय) जयपुर, ने साधना-सिद्धि और वैदुषी के लिए सुप्रसिद्ध श्री अमृतवाग्भवाचार्य की एक महनीय कृति 'राष्ट्रालोक' को, आचार्य-प्रणीत 'श्रीराष्ट्रसंजीवनभाष्य' के साथ सम्पादित कर उसे बहुजनहिताय एवं बहुजनसुखाय बनाने हेतु प्राञ्जल हिन्दी में 'राष्ट्रालोक' एवं उसके भाष्य का सार प्रस्तुत किया है। यह कार्य अनेक दृष्टियों से महत्त्वपूर्ण है। आज अपना देश राष्ट्र के रूप में अस्तित्व एवं अस्मिता की सुरक्षा के लिए संघर्ष और आतंक में फँसा हुआ है। सामान्यतः प्रतीत होता है कि भारतीय राष्ट्र आर्थिक और राजनीतिक दुश्क्र में फँसा है, पर शायद अधिक सच यह है कि उसका सांस्कृतिक संकट अधिक गहरा गया है। स्वतन्त्रता के सूर्योदय के कई वर्ष पूर्व श्रीमद्अमृतवाग्भवाचार्य की क्रान्त दृष्टि ने सन् १९३४ में राष्ट्र-स्वरूप के सम्बन्ध में अपने चिन्तन को संस्कृत में अभिव्यक्त किया था जिसका पद्यात्मक प्रकाशन ही हुआ था। इसी चिन्तन का विस्तार सन् १९४८ में स्वतन्त्रता के सूर्योदय के पश्चात् भी हुआ था। तब से लेकर आज तक भारतीय राष्ट्र के रूप में सन्त का चिन्तन-मनन प्रसुप्त एव मूर्च्छित-सा था, क्योंकि सामान्य जनता का इससे सीधा सरोकार नहीं हो पाया था। डॉ. त्रिपाठी का यह नवीन प्रकाशन उस समस्या की पूर्ति है। इसलिए निश्चय ही यह कार्य श्लाघ्य भी है और सामयिक भी है। वस्तुतः १०८ पद्यों के भाष्य के साथ भाषान्तर में प्रस्तुति का यह प्रथम खण्ड मात्र है। इसके प्रकाशन के साथ ही पाठक को ३६ पद्यों के आगे शेष पद्यों के उसी रूप में सम्पादन एवं रूपान्तरण की उत्सुकतापूर्वक प्रतीक्षा रहेगी।

श्री अमृतवाग्भवाचार्य काश्मीर के शैव दर्शन, जिसे त्रिक दर्शन एवं प्रत्यभिज्ञा दर्शन के रूप में भी जाना जाता है, के सिद्ध आचार्य थे। उन्हें न केवल इस दर्शन का अपितु अन्य साधना-प्रधान दर्शनों का भी सहज विज्ञान था। वे साक्षात्कृतधर्मा ऋषि थे जिन्होंने अपने अनेक ग्रन्थों में 'शिवदृष्टि' की आधारभूमि बनाकर चिन्तन के क्षेत्र में नए क्षितिजों का उन्मेष किया था। 'राष्ट्रालोक' भी उसी प्रकार की एक महती कृति है। शैव दर्शन का प्रमुख सिद्धान्त है, 'स्वातन्त्र्य'। यह कर्तृत्व का पर्याय है। अनेक भारतीय दर्शनों में कर्तृत्व को विकार माना जाता है, उसे ईश्वर अथवा आत्मा की ईशिता, सामर्थ्य, पूर्णता अथवा परता का पर्याय नहीं माना जाता। इसलिए वेदान्त का ब्रह्म और सांख्य का पुरुष दोनों निर्विकार हैं। वे कुछ कर नहीं सकते। सारा कर्तृत्व माया अथवा प्रकृति का है, ब्रह्म या ईश्वर विकार से और इसलिए कर्तृत्व से अकलुषित है। शैवदर्शन की दृष्टि से स्वातन्त्र्य या कर्तृत्व का यह

अभाव चैतन्य को जड़ बना देता है। निष्क्रिय चेतना जडमणि की तरह है। कर्ता स्वतन्त्र होता है-'स्वतन्त्रः कर्ता'। जो स्वतन्त्र नहीं, वह कर्ता नहीं माना जा सकता। इसलिए वेदान्त, सांख्य और न्याय के ईश्वर को इस जगत् का कर्ता अथवा संहर्ता कैसे स्वीकार किया जा सकता है! इसके विपरीत त्रिक दर्शन के स्वातन्त्र्यवाद के अनुसार न केवल परम प्रमाता शिव, अपितु प्रत्येक परिमित प्रमाता (जीव) चेतन एवं स्वतन्त्र है। वह प्रकाश भी है और विमर्श भी। स्वतन्त्रता एव चेतना उसका स्वभाव है, आगन्तुक धर्म, गुण, अवच्छेदक या उपाधि नहीं। इस मान्यता के आलोक में 'राष्ट्रालोक' परतन्त्र भारत में स्वतन्त्रता का चिन्तनमूलक सांस्कृतिक शंखनाद था। यह दुर्भाग्य की ही बात है कि देश की समस्याओं को लेकर जो स्वातन्त्र्यमूलक चिन्तन प्रस्तुत किया गया था, उसकी ओर संस्कृत से अपरिचित लोगों का ध्यान नहीं जा सका। डॉ. त्रिपाठी द्वारा यह प्रकाशन उस कमी को पूरा करने का प्राथमिक सोपान है।

संस्कृत में लेखन की एक सुव्यवस्थित पारम्परिक पद्धति है। पहले सूत्र या कारिका में चिन्तन का बीज वपन किया जाता है और फिर वृत्ति, विवरण, टीका या भाष्य के द्वारा कारिका में निबद्ध बीजाक्षरों का अंकुरण, पल्लवन एवं पुष्पायन किया जाता है। इसी पद्धति को आचार्यश्री ने 'राष्ट्रालोक' में अपनाया है। ग्रन्थ का प्रारम्भ शैवी चित्कला की वन्दना से होता है जो राष्ट्ररूपी वृषकेतु की चेतना शक्ति है। राष्ट्र को शिव के रूप में और उसी की चेतना की शक्तिरूप में कल्पना लेखक की दृष्टि को प्राचीन भारतीय सांस्कृतिक परम्परा से जोड़ता है। इस प्रकार यह ग्रन्थ पुराण एव नवीन के बीच में सेतुबन्ध का कार्य करता है। इसमें जिन विषयों पर नवीन राष्ट्रदृष्टि का उन्मीलन किया गया है, उनमें से कुछ विशेषरूप से उल्लेखनीय हैं- राष्ट्र, राष्ट्रियता, स्वराष्ट्रशिक्षा, सहशिक्षा, सैनिक शिक्षा, राष्ट्रभाषा, धर्मभाषा, ग्रामीण क्षेत्रोत्थान, प्रतिग्राम में पाठशाला और प्रतिमण्डल में महाविद्यालय की स्थापना, आदर्श शिक्षकों की व्यवस्था, अराष्ट्रियों, राष्ट्रघातियों और आततायियों से सतर्कता और सुदृढ़ गुप्तचर व्यवस्था आदि। आचार्य की दृष्टि में राष्ट्र की अभिधारणा मुख्यतः सांस्कृतिक है। अतः इस सम्बन्ध में उनका यह पद्य उद्दरणीय है-

समानसंस्कृतिमतां यावती पितृपुण्यभूः।

तावतीं भुवमावृत्य राष्ट्रमेकं निगद्यते।। रा. ३।।

परतन्त्रता को अभिशाप मानकर उनका यह कथन भी अत्यन्त सामयिक और प्रेरणास्पद है-

पारतन्त्र्यस्य निगडं दृढीकुर्वन्ति ते नराः।

ये राष्ट्रार्थं न जानन्ति मर्तुमात्मविरोधिनः।। रा. १२।।

राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा और राष्ट्रभाषा के अतिरिक्त राष्ट्र की शिशु-सम्पत्ति और युवा-सम्पत्ति कैसी हो, इस सम्बन्ध में उनका समस्त चिन्तन पद्य संख्या १५ से ३६ तक विशेषरूप से उल्लेखनीय है।

अत्यन्त सरल और प्राञ्जल संस्कृत में राष्ट्र-सम्बन्धी चिन्तन के लिए उपनिबद्ध पद्य वस्तुतः प्रत्येक भारतवासी के लिए पठनीय हैं। इन सरल पद्यों का भाष्य निश्चित ही अत्यन्त गम्भीर है और यह विद्वानों के लिए अधिक उपयोगी सिद्ध होगा। मूल और भाष्य के मर्म को प्रामाणिक किन्तु साथ ही सरल एवं सुबोध भाषा में प्रस्तुत करने के लिए डॉ. त्रिपाठी हम सभी के बधाई के पात्र हैं।

मुझे विश्वास है कि डॉ. त्रिपाठी की निरन्तर गतिशील सारस्वत साधना ज्ञान-विज्ञान के नए आयामों को उन्मीलित करती रहेगी।

(श्री अमृतवाग्भवाचार्य-प्रणीत श्री राष्ट्रसंजीवनभाष्य पर डॉ. शिवसागर त्रिपाठी द्वारा लिखित राष्ट्रालोक पुस्तक से) प्रकाशक - जयपुर)



चतुर्थ परिच्छेद : जैन विद्या

1. जैन विद्या : एक अनुशीलन

१. उदयपुर सङ्गोष्ठी : भगवान् महावीर के प्रति सामायिक

राजस्थान के किसी भी विश्वविद्यालय में प्राकृत अथवा जैन विद्या के अध्ययन और अनुसन्धान की व्यवस्था नहीं थी, यद्यपि राजस्थान प्राकृत का अक्षय भण्डार और जैन संस्कृति का युगों से मुख्य केन्द्र रहा है। उदयपुर विश्वविद्यालय में १९७०-७१ में प्राकृत के अध्ययन की व्यवस्था के बाद यह आवश्यक था कि इस विषय के अध्ययन को सही दिशा प्रदान करने के लिए एक अखिल भारतीय सङ्गोष्ठी आयोजित की जाए। यह हमारे विभाग की अर्हता अथवा पात्रता थी जिसके आधार पर अखिल भारतीय सङ्गोष्ठी के आयोजन का विचार अंकुरित हुआ। किन्तु इसके दो सामयिक कारण भी थे। एक तो यह कि प्राकृत भाषा पर चार-पाँच सङ्गोष्ठियाँ भारत के विभिन्न विश्वविद्यालयों में हो चुकी थीं किन्तु जैन विद्या के अवदान पर कोई चर्चा साक्षात् और तुलनात्मक रूप में किसी भी विश्वविद्यालय में अखिल भारतीय स्तर पर नहीं हुई थी। इस विषय को अपनाने में विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग को भी प्राथमिक सङ्कोच था किन्तु मेरा यह सौभाग्य था कि जैन विद्या पर अखिल भारतीय सङ्गोष्ठी आयोजित कर सकने का विचार सफल हुआ। दूसरा सामयिक कारण था, भगवान् महावीर का २५००वें निर्वाण महोत्सव का १९७४ में होना। कहीं यह महोत्सव केवल सामाजिक उत्सव बनकर न रह जाए इसकी आशंका मेरे मन में थी। इस अवसर को उचित रूप से शैक्षणिक और बौद्धिक बनाने के लिए तथा इस महोत्सव की स्थायिता के लिए यह आवश्यक था कि कुछ वर्ष पूर्व ही इसकी तैयारी के लिए विद्वानों को एकत्र कर उनके विचारों को यथासमय प्रकाशित किया जा सके। यह एक प्रकार से संस्कृत विभाग का सामायिक था।

जैसा कि अभी-अभी कहा है प्राकृत भाषाओं में पाँच सङ्गोष्ठियों देश के विभिन्न विश्वविद्यालयों में आयोजित हुई हैं और उनका स्पष्ट निष्कर्ष है कि किसी भी भारतीय भाषा को, चाहे वह भारोपीय परिवार की हो या द्रविड़ परिवार की या अन्य किसी परिवार की, हम न उसकी उत्पत्ति को और न उसके विकास को पहचान पायेंगे जब तक कि प्राकृत-अपभ्रंश के उत्स तक न पहुँच जाएँ। इस दृष्टि से प्राकृत के अध्ययन का एक विशेष महत्त्व है। जहाँ संस्कृत भाषा का अध्ययन भारोपीय परिवार की भाषाओं के तत्सम और तद्भव रूपों को समझने में हमारी सहायता करता है वहाँ प्राकृत-अपभ्रंश का अध्ययन भारोपीय परिवार की भाषाओं के देशज शब्दों को समझने में (जिनकी व्याख्या संस्कृत नहीं कर पाती) और इसके

अतिरिक्त अन्य अनेक भाषा-परिवारों के शब्दों की उत्पत्ति और विकास को जानने में वह बहुत हद तक एकमात्र माध्यम है। इस प्रकार एक ओर तो भारोपीय भाषाओं के सन्दर्भ में प्राकृत का संस्कृत के समानान्तर महत्त्व है और दूसरी ओर देशज शब्दों की पहिचान में उनके एकाधिकार का भी महत्त्व है।

२. जैन साहित्य : लोकधर्म का सन्देशवाहक

भारतीय साहित्य विभिन्न धाराओं में विभक्त संस्कृतियों का सन्देशवाहक रहा है। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि भारतीय साहित्य में लौकिकता (सेक्यूलरिज्म) से संपृक्त वाङ्मय विशाल है। किन्तु बहुत कुछ साहित्य धर्म, संस्कृति तथा दर्शन के सूत्रों की व्याख्या के लिए ही प्रणीत हुआ है। इसीलिए बौद्ध साहित्य निर्वाण, क्षणिकता, अनात्मा और शान्ति के सन्देश को मुखरित करता है और ब्राह्मण साहित्य ब्रह्म अथवा ईश्वर तथा आत्मा की अमरता को वाणी प्रदान करता है। श्रमण संस्कृति का साहित्य जीवन की नैतिक साधना के लिये पुद्गल के आस्रव का संवर और निर्जरा के माध्यम से उसके मोक्ष की निरन्तर साधना करता है। सारे कथ्य, कथाबन्ध, शिल्प किंवा साहित्य के समग्र उपादान भी उसी साध्य को अभिव्यक्त करने के साधन हैं। समग्र दृष्टि से देखें तो ऐसा प्रतीत होगा कि जैन, बौद्ध, ब्राह्मण साहित्य ने कला कला के लिए इस पाश्चात्य आदर्श वाक्य को कभी नहीं स्वीकारा। अतः जैन संस्कृति पर आश्रित साहित्य का केन्द्र बिन्दु सदा निश्चित और सुदृढ़ रहा है। केन्द्रीय बिन्दु की इस एकाग्रता के साथ ही जैन साहित्यकार में शिल्प, विद्या या कला की दृष्टि से ऐसा कुछ भी नहीं है जिसे उसने न अपनाया हो। इस अर्थ में वह भारतीय साहित्यकार का सच्चा सहकर्मी रहा है। सहधर्मी होकर भी उसने साहित्य के अनेक शिखर स्थापित किये हैं। अतः कालिदास का प्रसाद, पुराणों की मिथक संपदा, महाभारत की सर्वांगीणता एवं विशालता, माघ-भारवि-श्रीहर्ष, जैसे कवियों की शिल्प-प्रियता, दण्डी, बाणभट्ट का गद्य सौन्दर्य, पंचतन्त्र, हितोपदेश, जातक आदि का कथा-वैभव तथा रूपक के लिए विभिन्न रूप जैन-वाङ्मय में समानान्तर रूप में उपलब्ध हैं। शिल्प किंवा कला की समानान्तरता का सहभागी होने के साथ लोकभाषा को अपनाने से इस साहित्य में लोकधर्मिता के जो तत्त्व सहज रूप में आये हैं वे श्रेणिक भाषा में, जो कि देवताओं की भाषा थी, मनुष्यों की नहीं, उपलब्ध नहीं थे।

३. जैन धर्म-दर्शन : मनुष्य-केन्द्रित साधना द्वारा पूर्णता (मोक्ष) की प्राप्ति

भारतीय धर्म और दर्शन के तीन निश्चित प्रस्थान हैं। एक तो शाश्वत आत्मवाद, जो आत्मा को शाश्वत, अजर, अमर, निर्विकार स्वीकार करता है। दूसरा है बौद्धों का नैरात्म्यवाद जो कि आत्मा, परमात्मा आदि के अस्तित्व को ही नहीं स्वीकारता। ये दोनों एकान्त दृष्टियाँ हैं, एक-दूसरे से विपरीत। इन दो एकान्त दृष्टियों का खण्डन करते हुए जैन दर्शन की मान्यता

है कि न तो आत्मा (जीव) को अस्वीकार किया जा सकता है और न उसे सभी स्थितियों में पूर्ण और निर्विकार माना जा सकता है। क्षणभङ्गुर मानने में समग्र नैतिक एवं धार्मिक साधना और अपूर्णता से पूर्णता की ओर मनुष्य की दृष्टि तत्त्वतः अर्थहीन हो जायेगी। उसे पूर्ण और निर्विकार स्वीकार करने पर साधना या अनुष्ठान की आवश्यकता ही नहीं रहेगी और न पुण्य-पाप की, सुख-दुःख की व्याख्या की जा सकेगी। अतः शाश्वत एवं निर्विकार आत्मवाद तथा नैरात्म्यवाद के विपरीत जैन दर्शन उस जीव को प्रतिष्ठित करता है, जो अपनी मोक्ष-साधना में निरन्तर लगकर अपूर्ण से पूर्ण बनता है। पूर्णता की यह साधना किसी ईश्वरीय अनुग्रह का परिणाम न होकर जीवन की अपनी तपस्या और साधना की अन्तिम परिणति है। इस प्रकार जैन धर्म और दर्शन मनुष्य-केन्द्रित साधना का धर्म और दर्शन है। यही कारण है कि इसमें आचार की जो प्रतिष्ठा और सूक्ष्म व्याख्या है, वह अन्यत्र उपलब्ध नहीं होती।

स्पष्टतः कहा गया है कि सम्यक् दर्शन (श्रद्धा), ज्ञान और चरित्र तीनों मिलकर मोक्ष का मार्ग है। हिन्दू तथा बौद्ध के अनुसार दर्शन, ज्ञान या भक्ति के माध्यम से मोक्ष या निर्वाण का पा सकना सम्भव है। किन्तु जैन दृष्टि के अनुसार चरित्र (आचार) की सिद्धि के बिना मोक्ष पाना सम्भव नहीं है। मनुष्य को मोक्ष-साधना का केन्द्र मानने से यह अत्यन्त स्वाभाविक हो गया कि आध्यत्मिक, मानसिक, भौतिक अथवा अन्य किसी स्तर पर हिंसा को स्वीकार ही न किया जा सके। हिन्दू धर्म में वैदिक हिंसा को स्वीकार कर लिया गया था और बौद्ध दर्शन में स्वयं तथागत ने कुछ अपवाद प्रतिष्ठित कर दिये थे। किन्तु जैन धर्म की दृष्टि यह कभी नहीं स्वीकार कर सकती कि एक प्राणी दूसरे प्राणी के प्रति मनसा-वाचा-कर्मणा या अन्य किसी प्रकार से हिंसक होकर भी पूर्णता (मोक्ष) की साधना कर सकता है।

४. वर्तमान सन्दर्भ : अहिंसा की साधना

आज के समाज की व्यथा की यदि किसी एक शब्द से व्याख्या हो सकती है तो वह है हिंसा। आणविक अस्त्रों का संत्रास, परिवेश (इनवार्नमेंट) के मिट जाने का भय, शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र एवं समाज द्वारा शोषण की पीड़ा, दरिद्रता, मानसिक-शारीरिक निर्बलता- ये सब हिंसा को व्यक्त करती हैं। और सृष्टि के इतिहास में पहली बार यह भय खड़ा हो गया है कि कहीं मनुष्य का अस्तित्व ही निकट भविष्य में न समाप्त हो जाए। इस विभीषिका का एक ही समाधान है और वह है- अहिंसा का सिद्धान्त। मुझे तो ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि शायद छोटे-छोटे गणों में विभक्त महावीर-काल के परस्पर संघर्षशील समाज के समक्ष इस अहिंसा की उतनी आवश्यकता नहीं थी क्योंकि महावीर के सन्देश को सर्वात्मना स्वीकार न करके भी विश्व का समाज अपनी आयु के २५०० वर्ष तो बिता ही चुका है लेकिन आगे भी इतने वर्ष बिता पायेगा इसमें वैज्ञानिकों को पूरा सन्देह है। आचार-धर्म का मूल अहिंसा है। समग्र आचार-धर्म उसी सिद्धान्त के पल्लवन हैं। किसी विशिष्ट आचार व रीति का उतना महत्त्व नहीं है जितना कि मूल का। एकाध पत्ता भले टूट जाए, देश और काल के निमित्त से

प्रवर्तित कोई आचार हमसे भले छूट जाए, लेकिन मूल नहीं सूखना चाहिए। अहिंसा मूल है, आचार विशेष पल्लव।

५. जैन कला : सौन्दर्य एवं अध्यात्म की स्वतन्त्र अभिव्यक्ति

जैसा कि भारतीय साहित्य के सन्दर्भ में कहा गया, बहुत कुछ वही कलाकृतियों के सन्दर्भ में चरितार्थ है। दोनों ही कवि-मन के बाह्य रूप हैं। उपकरण भिन्न हैं। सृजन-धर्म का मूल एक है। कला की विविधा जो बौद्ध और हिन्दू कलाकृतियों में प्राप्त होती है उस सब को अपनाकर भी अपनी चिन्तन-दृष्टि के भेद के कारण जैन कलाकृतियाँ समान होकर भी विशिष्ट हैं। समानता में यह भिन्नता उसकी स्वतन्त्रता का प्रमाण है। यह स्वतन्त्रता ही साहित्य अथवा कलाकृति का वास्तविक उत्कर्ष बिन्दु होता है। जैन कला ने सौन्दर्य और अध्यात्म दोनों की अभिव्यक्ति में अपनी मौलिकता को बनाये रखा है।

६. जैन विद्या का प्रचार-प्रसार : दृष्टि का खुलापन

जैन विद्या के प्रचार-प्रसार के लिए सबसे पहले तो जैन समाज को अपनी दृष्टि बदलनी होगी, उसके बाद शेष समाज को। विद्या की साधना को केवल कुछ क्षण के लिए धार्मिक अनुष्ठान का अङ्ग न मानकर इसे खुली हवा में ले जाने के लिए जैन समाज को मन से और कर्म से तैयार होना होगा। इसका अर्थ है कि पाण्डुलिपियों के रूप में जो अपार सम्पदा मन्दिरों में मात्र पूजा के लिए सुरक्षित है और जिसकी वर्ष में एकाध यात्रा बाहरी दुनिया के सामने हो जाती है उसे राष्ट्र के प्रत्येक व्यक्ति द्वारा अध्ययन और मनन के लिए सुलभ बनाया जाए। पाण्डुलिपियों के मन्दिर के पट खोलने के लिए युग-युग के पुजारी को तैयार हो जाना चाहिए। पर जैन समाज की यह तैयारी काफी नहीं है। ग्रन्थ के विनाश के जिस भय और आतंक के कारण उसे इस ग्रन्थ संपदा को सुरक्षित रखने को बाध्य होना पड़ा उसका कारण न केवल उनको विनष्ट करना था बल्कि जैनेतर समाज की वह मनोवृत्ति भी थी जिसने कहा था- न गच्छेत् जैनमन्दिरम्। अतः दोनों को ही नयी समझ के लिए अपने को तैयार करना होगा। विश्वविद्यालय और विद्या के दूसरे प्रतिष्ठानों को भी यह सोचना होगा कि साम्प्रदायिक होना एक बात है और सम्प्रदायविशेष का सम्पूर्ण अध्यवसाय और निष्ठा के साथ अध्ययन करना दूसरी बात है। यह दुर्भाग्य है कि यूरोपीय, अमेरिकी या रूसी भाषा, साहित्य और समाज को जानने के लिए भारतीय विश्वविद्यालयों के पाठ्यक्रम में व्यवस्था आसान है, लेकिन भारतीय भाषा, साहित्य व संस्कृति को विश्वविद्यालय स्तर तक प्रवेश दिलाना दुष्कर कार्य है। इस कार्य में साम्प्रदायिकता को प्रश्रय देने का आक्षेप पहले किया जाता है। अतः समाज और शैक्षणिक जगत् में समन्वय अनिवार्य है। मनोवृत्तियों के इस भरत-मिलाप के बाद जिन कार्यों से जैन विद्या का प्रचार और प्रसार सचमुच सफल हो सकेगा, उनमें से कतिपय निम्नाङ्कित हैं :

- (i) श्रेणिक भाषा (क्लासिकल लैंग्वेज) और साहित्य के साथ प्राकृत भाषा और साहित्य का अध्ययन पाठ्यक्रम का अनिवार्य अङ्ग बने।
- (ii) आधुनिक भारतीय भाषाओं के प्राचीन रूप के पाठ्यक्रम के साथ अपभ्रंश आदि सम्बद्ध भाषा का अध्ययन अनिवार्यतः निर्धारित किया जाना चाहिए।
- (iii) छात्रवृत्तियों का अधिकाधिक समायोजन किया जाना चाहिए जिन्हें निश्चित रूप से जैन और जैनेतर में भेद न करके पढ़ने वाले छात्रों को योग्यतानुसार दिया जाना चाहिए।
- (iv) प्राकृत के अध्ययन एवं अनुसन्धान को मानक स्तर प्रदान करने के लिए प्रत्येक प्रदेश के कम-से-कम एक विश्वविद्यालय में जैन विद्या के अध्ययन के लिए आसन स्थापित किया जाना चाहिए जो पूर्वतः स्थापित संस्कृत अथवा आधुनिक भारतीय भाषाओं के साथ सम्बद्ध होकर कार्य करे।
- (v) प्रारम्भ में स्तर की एकरूपता स्थापित करने के लिए अखिल भारतीय स्तर पर सङ्गोष्ठी के माध्यम से विभिन्न श्रेणियों के लिए समान पाठ्यक्रम का विधान करना चाहिए। इसी विधान के अनुरूप पाठ्यक्रम में निर्धारित पुस्तकों के अनुवाद एवं टिप्पणियों के साथ समालोचनात्मक संस्करण प्रकाशित किये जाएँ जो मूल्य की दृष्टि से भी छात्रोपयोगी हों। प्राकृत पढ़ने वालों की संख्या प्रारम्भ में कम होगी इसलिए यह कार्य और भी आवश्यक है।
- (vi) अनुसन्धान को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए सभी पाण्डुलिपियों की विस्तृत एवं पूर्ण संशोधित ग्रन्थ-सूची प्रकाशित हो। उनमें से आवश्यक ग्रन्थों का चयन एवं सम्पादन कर उन्हें प्रकाशित करना चाहिए। ग्रन्थों के आलोचनात्मक सम्पादन में तुलनात्मक दृष्टि नितान्त अपेक्षित है ताकि एक ओर उसे संस्कृत की धारा से और दूसरी ओर आधुनिक भारतीय भाषाओं की धारा से जोड़ा जा सके।
- (vii) चूँकि जैन विद्या के महत्त्व की जानकारी अभी भारतीय समाज को नहीं है इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि इसके विभिन्न पक्षों पर देश के कोने-कोने में निरन्तर सङ्गोष्ठियाँ की जाएँ जिनमें वहाँ के समाज को भी अपने साथ में सम्मिलित किया जाए ताकि जैन विद्या के गौरव के सम्बन्ध में भारतीय जनचेतना जागृत हो सके। यह जागृति ही जैन विद्या के प्रसार-प्रचार का सर्वोत्तम उपाय है, जो अन्य उपाय स्वतः खोज लेगा।

(जैन विद्या का सांस्कृतिक अवदान, आदर्श साहित्य संघ चुरु, राजस्थान, १९७६)



2. Contribution of Jainism to Indian Culture

A Seminar on **Contribution of Jainism To Indian Culture with special reference to the Doctrine of Non-Violence** was held from 2nd to 6th October, 1973 under the auspices of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Udaipur. About sixty papers were contributed to the Seminar which was attended by a large number of scholars of Jainism and allied disciplines from different parts of the country. This was the second Seminar organised by the Department of Sanskrit; the first one was held in December, 1968, on the **Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit**. The present publication comprises some of the papers contributed to the Seminar on Jainism. I am extremely grateful to Lala Shri Sunder Lal Jain whose encouragement is my best inspiration for work. Prof. Jagdish Lal Shastri never fails to appreciate what I do, this accounts for accepting these seminar papers for publication which has been speeded up by Shri Jainendra Prakash Jain, Dr. A. Bhattacharya and Shri N.K. Jain. Seminar papers in Hindi are being published by the Adarsh Sahitya Sangh, Churu, Rajasthan.

The Seminar was inaugurated on the morning of 2nd October, 1973, the date rendered auspicious by the birth of Mahatma Gandhi, the apostle of peace and non-violence. Dr. A. N. Upadhye, the doyen of Jainological Studies in India, very kindly accepted its General Presidentship. He was ably and competently assisted by the chairmen : Dr. M.L. Mehta, Dr. T.G. Kalghatgi, Professor Satyavrat, Professor H.C. Bhayani, Pt. Dalsukh Malvania, Professor G.N. Sharma, G.C. Choudhary and the Secretaries: Professor M.G. Dhadphate, Dr. V.P. Jain, Dr. N.H. Samtani, Dr. K.C. Jain and Dr. V.D. Johrapurkar for different sessions of the Seminar. Besides the General President of the Seminar, Dr. K.D. Bajpai also delivered special lecture on **Jain Art and Architecture** which was illustrated with representative slides by Dr. G.C. Jain. As Director of the Seminar, I owe a deep debt of gratitude to these scholars in particular and to all others who made the Seminar a great success by their enlightened guidance and participation and now by their permission for publication.

Colleagues of my Department don't need a special and recorded mention of my gratitude which is writ large in the sanctum of my heart. Many friends from other Departments, notably Dr. K.C. Sogani, Associate Professor in the Department of Philosophy and Shri O.D. Upadhyya, Assistant Professor in the Department of Drawing and Painting, helped me in the organisation of the Seminar. Digamber Jain Agrawal Samaj, Jain Mumukshu Mandal, Shvetambara Terapanth Samaj, Vardhamana Sthanakvasi Samaj, Shvetambara Murti Pujak Samaj, Bharat Jain Mahamandal and Mahavir Nirvan Mahotsava Samit of Udaipur town and Himmat Singh Saruparia gave receptions in honour of the participating scholars. Active participation by local Jain community was a special feature of this Seminar. Town and gown met profitably. Thus the ideal of the University to meet the social needs the aspiration was realised.

It was on the initial recommendation of the then Vice-Chancellor of Udaipur University, Dr. G.S. Mahajani now the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Poona that the University Grants Commission, New Delhi, accepted my proposal to sponsor this Seminar. I am most sincerely thankful to him and to the authorities of the Commission. I must mention here without fail the names of my esteemed friends: Dr. D.K. Mishra, Director of Extension and Shri A.C. Sharma, Comptroller, University of Udaipur, who are always unfailing in their help in any good work that I do. This Seminar is the best thing that could be done by any University because here it was for the first time that Jainism was discussed in all its bearings, comparatively, analytically and critically. I really regret that lively and enlightened discussion that followed the presentation of papers is not included here as was done earlier in the publication of the Seminar on **Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit**. This is mainly due to the imperfect and incomplete recording of the discussion on the papers which deal with a wide variety of subjects related to language and literature, religion, philosophy and ethics, fine arts and sciences and finally to the history and culture of Jainism. Indexes of authors, works and terms, prepared by my pupil-colleague Dr. V.P. Bhatt, will be found useful by the readers and researchers.

Dissent co-existed in the intellectual and religious democracy of India from the times of the Vedas. In the royal family of Kṣatriyas, a great hero, Mahāvīra was born in the old Republic of Vaiśālī. He was born more than 2500 years ago, probably 20 years before the birth of another great leader of India, the Buddha. He proclaimed: **Enemies are within and not without, real conquest is the conquest of petty self, all absolutism is false, relativity is the truth, violence and lust will solve no problem. Ahimsā and Aparigraha are the real answers to the problems of man and his world,** war against internal impurities must be won with the weapon of renunciation and asceticism; with this was born a new faith, a new religion that has given a new sense and direction to our struggle. The world has won many a battle through violence and conquest of nature but is now losing the war. We face extinction through thermo-nuclear weapons due to personal and organised violence. Recapitulation of Lord Mahāvīra's message can still save us from final death, from universal suicide.

Lord Mahāvīra attained Nirvāṇa on the dark night of Amāvāsyā in the month of Kārttika (corresponding to 13 November this year). The nation will be celebrating the Nirvāṇa for the full one year ending on 14 November 1975, when the next Kārttika Amāvāsyā falls. Empirical night of darkness marks the final day of his awakening. Language and literature, religion and philosophy, fine arts and sciences, history and culture of India have benefited from the contribution that Jainism has made through its long course of development. Buddhism has disappeared from the land of its birth. Jainism is firmly rooted in the soil of India.

Universities in India can no longer ignore the study of its rich cultural heritage. If gown does not know the town, all education will be irrelevant. Rajasthan has a large number of Jains, living followers of old faith now organized into different sects. A rich treasure of manuscripts and variety of monuments exist. But no attempt was made to introduce the study of the Jaina language, literature and culture in Rajasthan. The Department of Sanskrit, University of Udaipur, pioneered the introduction of Prakrit as a special study at M.A. in Sanskrit and at Certificate level for the beginners from the year 1971.

2500 years of the Lord Mahāvīras Nirvāṇa are being celebrated in all the parts of the country this year. There is hardly nay organisation or individual who is not contributing his best in spreading his message throughout the length and breadth of this country and in other corners of the world. This Seminar was contemplated well in advance so that the papers may be published during the year of Nirvāṇa. This may be considered our most humble offering (a Sāmāyika) to the Lord Mahāvīra. (Editorial, Contribution of Jainism to Indian Culture, MLBD, Delhi, 1975)



3. Social Significance of Jaina Ethics

Essence of Jaina ethics provides the best rasion d'etre for Mahāvīra's relevance in our times. Melvin Radar in his book Ethics and the Human community holds in opposition to the relativist, subjective, intuitional and a priori theories that ethics should be based upon human nature and its potentialities.¹ He finds expression of man's deliberate attempt to make himself at home in the universe through religious sense of community which enables, him to escape from his loneliness and self-alienation in the ancient Egyptian religion, in the Confucian doctrine of human-heartedness and universal kindness; the Taoist sense of mystic unity with nature; the Buddhist emancipation from self hood, the Hindu vision of all-encompassing, all-penetrating spirit; the Moslem idea of One God and One Humanity; the Hebraic devotion to a God of love and justice; and the Christian fellowship of all men in God².

Moral aphorism of all religions, including Jainism confirm their community-mindedness. Religion that ignores society has no chance of survival.³ Ethical ideals of universal love and brotherhood, Ahimsā, charity, simplicity, chastity, truthfulness and non-attachment to worldly interests and gains are extolled in all religions. There may be some difference of emphasis on these ideals in one or the other religion but none preaches hatred, malice, pride, prejudice, passion exploitation of fellow human

beings or disrespect of life in all its varied and various forms. And if religion is not to be mistaken for dogma or ritual which sometimes sanctioned intolerance and disrespect for life, it can be affirmed without fear of contradiction that religion is no antithesis to humanism, social development, universal understanding and democratic spirit. True Dharma founded on the cardinal ethical virtues is Sanātana, eternal and universal.

Belief in God of any description or permanence of the soul or elaborate metaphysics and ontology can wait for their turn or may even be discarded but concern for the alleviation of suffering of fellow human being and his ultimate and absolute freedom or beatitude is to engage immediate and ever-lasting attention of all religions and ethical quests. In order to realise the Summum Bonum a seemingly negative, purely individualistic and ascetic ethical discipline, in contrast to a more loving, burning and joyous ethical discipline, may be prescribed. But there is no radical difference between what is said to be the negative and the positive ethical attitudes. If nothing else then history of the followers negates the prejudice of superiority of Western over the Eastern ethical ideal. It is with this basic understanding of religion or ethics that I approach to examine the social and contemporary significance of Jain ethical teachings.

As its very name signifies Jainism stands for extreme severity of ethical discipline both for the ascetic and the house holder. This emphasis distinguishes it from Buddhism which stood for the golden mean in ethical teachings and from Hinduism which in its original spirit is less ascetic and severe in prescribing the ethical extremities. Healthy interest in worldly gains, conception of svarga as the Summum Bonum, elaborate rites and rituals as the means of attaining it mark the period of the Saṁhitās and the Brāhmanas. It is not, therefore, without significance that Indra the War-God is the hero of this period and Varuṇa, the God of moral virtues is less prominent. It was the souldering dissent of contemporary free thinkers who were denounced by vedic seers as brahmadviṣaḥ 'haters of the Veda', devanid 'maligners of Gods', apavratas 'men of no principles' as also reaction against artificial over-elaborate and complex ritualism, arising due to self-critical consciousness of vedic

believers which led to the Upaniṣadic, ethical attitude preferring śreyas 'spiritual freedom' to preyas 'material prosperity' and parā vidyā 'spiritual knowledge' to aparā vidyā 'mundane knowledge' and extolling tyāga 'renunciation', tapas 'penance' and vairāgya 'detachment' over worldly or other worldly pursuits. It is still a question of preference and superiority. Asceticism is not recognized as an exclusive and absolute virtue. After all, entire earlier tradition could not be cast off like a robe, it could at best be critically examined and a new choice or preference was to be underlined in the light of self-critical consciousness, and perhaps more so, because continuing free thinking began gradually to organise itself into well-defined movements of Jainism and Buddhism. Upaniṣads, therefore, speak in the language of preference. That the Brahmanical tradition stands not only for preference, but actually for a synthesis between vedic ideal of svarga and Upaniṣadic ideal of liberation is seen in the definition of Dharma which is described as realisation of both the abhyudaya and niḥśreyas. Connection of Brahman as sat 'absolute reality', cit 'absolute consciousness' and ānanda 'absolute bliss' in the Vedānta, of which the source and authority are the Upaniṣads, is not a break-off from the conception of svarga which is an abode of positive bliss but its perfection and absolute excellence. In fact the arguments generally deduced to prove the nature of reality are based on comparison leading finally to absoluteness of existence, knowledge and bliss in the Ultimate. Late Hindu tradition, as manifested through the Mīmāṃsaka's notion of Mokṣa 'liberation', integral harmony of two principles 'sāmarasya,' viśiṣṭādvita etc.' propounded by Kashmir Śaivism and some schools of Vaiṣṇavism, militancy of some sects like Vīra Śaiva, Śākta and Lingāyatās, Tantric eroticism and pervading sensuality of classical Sanskrit literature also underlined that Hinduism is not preeminently ascetic in its spirit or development. It did imbibe the asceticism and renunciation in its course of development right from the age of the Upaniṣads but did never give up its faith in the life of pleasures here and beyond. It is, therefore, no mistake to declare Buddhism and Jainism as revolt against Vedism. Denial of God and the authority of the Vedas, revolt against ritualism and class distinctions are points of agreement between dissenting religious of

Buddhism and Jainism. They prescribe ethical discipline and subscribe to the belief in the transmigration and the law of Karman. Sin in their view is no offence against God or against the injunctions of the Vedas which assigned different duties according to the distinction of caste, age and sex. Man is solely responsible for his actions. He is his own refuge. The whole course of moral discipline is his sole responsibility. There is no divine intervention to obstruct this progress in ethical discipline. Nor is there any succour to him if he falters. Interference is from within either psychologically or physically or even spiritually. Man is endowed with freedom and responsibility to embark upon the course of his ultimate perfection. This is the original attitude of Jainism and Buddhism which may have been compromised or modified in the course of long history of perpetual encounter with Hinduism, but was never totally rejected or replaced in theory.

Between Jainism and Buddhism there have been claims of superiority of ethical teachings of one over the other. Thus for example, Nahar and Ghosh speaking of Buddhism say that its philosophy of momentariness has undermined its ethics because **such a philosophical speculation, by the perfect frankness with which it eulogies the life of momentary experience and undermined importance of calculating wisdom so essential in life, takes away from man what is of worth and dignity to him and thus bears its own condemnation.** Contrasting Jainism with Buddhism they conclude that **the Summum bonum of life is here in Jainism not the gratuitous enjoyment of the present in utter disregard of the future as Buddhists hold** ⁴. This is complete misunderstanding of the Buddhist philosophy as it renders the latter to hedonism. Buddha propounded a comprehensive ethical code which was summed up in Eightfold Path: right belief, right aspiration, right speech, right conduct, right livelihood, right effort, right thought and right concentration. Refutation of permanent self has an ethical motive. Existence of suffering is the fundamental fact of human existence. Its recognition is the first Noble Truth, the second Noble Truth is that is caused by desire or craving which is based on intellectual and moral error of self-centredness. The very notion of the self, as abiding, permanent and eternal

is an illusion. There is no self, one's life is just an unbroken stream of successive states that are casually connected and behind this stream there is no permanent ego, no self-contained entity independent of change and independent of one's fellows.⁵ To consider his self supreme, to be selfish about it is the root moral error of life. The third Noble Truth teaches emancipation from the sense of self; Nirvāṇa is the result of this emancipation from self. So long as individuality, ego or selfishness persists there is no freedom, no Nirvāṇa. The Fourth Noble Truth tells the way, the eightfold path to remove the suffering through extinction of self-centredness. Thus the theory of anatta 'no self' in Buddhism has a very profound meaning and is not to be confused with the **claim of the present even of the momentary present imperious and supreme beyond all others** as Nahar and Ghosh do.⁶ However, what distinguishes Jain ethics from that of Buddhism is its strict asceticism and non-absolutistic relativism reconciling opposites between Hinduism and Buddhism. Buddha practiced ascetic life for six years and then declared that **the truth cannot be attained by one who has lost his strength.** There are two extremes which he who has gone forth ought not to follow habitual devotion, on the one hand, to the passions, to the pleasure of sensual things and habitual devotion, on the other hand, self-mortification which is painful, ignoble and unprofitable. There is a middle path discovered by the Tathāgata⁷.

Jainism prescribes strict and, in fact, extremely severe ethical discipline for the house-holder and the ascetic, the śrāvaka and the śramaṇa. It lays equal emphasis on faith, knowledge and conduct which together constitute way to individual freedom.⁸ The Jain philosophy divides the world primarily into the duality of Jīva 'self' and ajīva 'not self' with their inherent pluralism. The self is infinite, alike eternal and of various forms implying different stages of development. Its intrinsic nature of perfection, infinite intelligence, infinite peace, infinite faith and infinite power is obscured by its union with matter. Its ethical aim is to cast off this malignant influence of the not-self and realise its real nature which is perfect enlightenment. Perfect knowledge is never inactive. Knowledge does not exist without right action and right conduct. Enlightened self

leads active life for the good of others, as he can do no more of good to himself. The seven tattvas postulated by Jainism, namely Jīva, Ajīva, Āśrava, Bandha, Saṁvara, Nirjarā and Mokṣa underline all-absorbing concentration of Jainism on the ethical perfection of the self as the real objective of metaphysical or philosophical enquiry. This is in bold contrast to other systems of Indian philosophy where ethics does not occupy such an important place in the scheme of philosophical categories. It is, therefore, no surprise that Jainism has propounded in great details the path of ethical discipline both for the clergy and the laity.

Jainism lays down five vows for the ascetic and the same are prescribed for the house-holder with some modification. They are ahimsā 'non-injury', Satya 'truth', asteya 'Chastity' and aparigraha 'renunciation'. While an ascetic has to fulfill these vows fully and completely, the same can be achieved only partially or in small degree by the house-holder. Thus the mahāvratas 'great vows' in the case of the house-holder become anuvratas. These vows have significance only in relation to the community. Without social reference the vows lose their virtue. Amongst these Ahimsā occupies the foremost place. And in a way, all others are a means to achieve the perfection of Ahimsā which, though apparently a negative term signifying non-injury to life, is in essence positive as it will include respect for all forms of life through love of not only human beings but also of all the creatures and plants and in fact, any form of creation vibrating with life. The one word that sums up the whole of Jaina ethics is ahimsā which inspires a Jaina for active social service and makes him to pray for the good of the all: **Let there be rain in every proper season. Let diseases die and famine and theft be nowhere. Let the law of jaina give all happiness to all the living beings of the world.**

The vow of truth enjoins upon the ascetic that he will not resort to falsity either for his own sake or for the sake of others through fear or frown. Even the truth that hurts others is no truth.⁹

The Asteya is an ethical discipline of neither accepting even the most insignificant thing without the permission of the owner nor approving such an act of stealing the articles which belong to others.

The ethical vow of Brahmacharya is the cultivation of good moral character, of celibate life renouncing all forms of sensuous pleasures and company of prostitutes or concubines. **Wine, Meat, gambling, erotic music with song and dance, personal decoration, intoxication, libertines and aimless wanderings, these ten are the concomitants of sexual passion**¹⁰.

Parigraha is characterised by attachment to worldly gains. Problems of modern Indian society, nay, of all the nations are rooted in the spirit of acquisition. The world today is divided into two classes of exploiters and the exploited. There will be no final redemption from this evil unless the vow of aparigraha is observed both in letter and spirit. Creed for amassing wealth, hoarding of goods of social need, cornering the material and intellectual wealth of the world for the good of one against others mark our age. Parigraha 'acquisition' has resulted in the depletion of natural resources and pollution of atmosphere. The mankind faces in near future the problem of its extinction. Scientists are worried over the environmental catastrophe. What has brought about this sorry state of affairs in the planet which has been ruled since long by scientific slogan of conquest of nature which has been achieved through fierce spirit of competition and unprincipled greed and suicidal violence?

As a result of Himsā 'violence', asatya 'falsity' of various ideologies based on some or the other kind of violence, Steyas, 'enslavement of nations', brahmacharya 'permissiveness of sex and a life of luxury and indulgence' and parigraha 'amassing of physical and intellectual wealth by a nation or a group of nations, the world is now sitting over volcano of its own making facing its extinction through its own instruments of death and destruction. What can save us from this mad pursuit?

Lord Mahāvīra preached the ethical discipline of five Vows not merely for the salvation of some individuals but for the survival and development of the whole world through the cardinal doctrine of ahimsā and its other correlaries. The social good in its ultimate analysis depends upon the perfection achieved by an individual. There is no opposition

between the good of the community and that of the individual, the two are inextricably inter-linked.

Those who followed Mahāvīra during the 2500 years of his Nirvāṇa perfected the details of essential ethical discipline only in relation to the spriti of his message. Many of these details are also significant as they underline the social and objective content of the virtues to be cultivated by a true Jaina. Thus it was to perfect the cardinal principle of Ahimsā that the concepts of (i) Mūlaguṇas 'Primary moral virtues', (ii) the seven Śīlavratas 'Vows of conduct educating the individual for the life of renunciation' (iii) the eleven Pratimas and of the (iv) Sallekhanā 'spiritual preparation for individual extinction' were developed for the house-holder by a galaxy of Jaina thinkers. For ascetics, the ethical discipline is more rigorous as is evident for the description of (i) five great Vows, (ii) the five Samitis 'carefulness', (iii) the six āvaśyaka Karmas 'essential acts' consisting of Sāmāyika Stuti, Vandanā, Prati-karmaṇa Pratyākhyāna and Kāyotsaraga,¹¹ conquest of twenty-two pariśahas¹² obstacles of various kinds caused by others', (v) and six kind of both the internal and external austerities, (vi) enjoining of various types of meditation, and finally (vii) espousing the spritual death by a Muni.

While Jainism prescribes individual and spiritual values which seem to have an indirect relation with society it does not in any case ignore the social values which have been listed by Dr. K.C. Sogani in his book entitled "Ethical Doctrines in Jainism" (p. 266). These are Bhūta Anukampa and Maitri, 'universal compassion and friendship', Dāna 'Charity', Nirvicikitsā 'Non-hatred towards the diseased', Pramoda 'Commendation of the meritorious' and Karuṇā 'Active compassion for the distressed or helping those who are miserable, thirsty and hungry', Madhyasata 'Indifference towards the arrogant', Aparigraha 'Non-acquisition', Ahimsā 'Non-injury', Kṣamā 'Forgiveness' and Prabhāvana 'propagation of moral and spritual values through adqueate means'.

The concept of Puṇya 'Merit' and Pāpa 'Demerit' again bears a social objective. There are nine ways of earning puṇya: through service of anna 'food to the needy', Pāna 'water to the thirsty', Vastra 'clothes to

the poor', Layana 'shelter to the needy and the monk', Śayana 'providing beds', and social service through manas 'mind' śārīra 'body', vacana 'speech' and namaskāra 'a sense of hunility'.

Himsā or infliction of any kind of suffering has been considered the greatest sin. The other seventeen sins are untruthfulness, dishonesty, unchastity, covetousness, anger, conceit, deceit and cheating, avarice, attachment, hatred or envy, quarrelsomeness, slander, false stories to discredit others, finding fault with others, lack of self-control, hypocrisy and false faith. The cultivation of the puṇyas and abstinence from the sins, enumerated above, do not only lead to the spiritual fulfilment but goes to make world perfect and worth living. This then underlines the relevance of Mahāvīra's teachings and social significance of his ethical discipline.

Dr. Schweitzer distinguishes Indian, more particularly Hindu, thought from Western thought mainly on the basis of antagonism between what he describes 'world and life-negation', and 'world and Life-affirmation'.¹³ According to him Indian religion is other-wordly and life-denying, while the Western religion affirms life. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan has adequately met his criticism by pointing out the central features of Hindu thought such as the four stages of life, the doctrines of Karma and rebirth which imply action in a real world, and by under-lining the essential unity of all religions in denying the reality of the world¹⁴ and by contrasting religion and humanism. Criticism by Dr. Schweitzer will be apparently more pertinently applicable to the Jainism and Buddhism on account of their more pronounced emphasis on asceticism which is the essence of life-negation. A similar criticism is voiced by Henri Bergson in **The two Sources of Morality and Religion** (See pp. 216 and 227) wherein he terms Indian mysticism negative as against the positive mysticism of Christians. As pointed out earlier in introductory passage of this paper there is no radical difference between what is described as positive and negative mysticism because in their essence these are rooted in the basic unity of all and are ultimately concerned with the good of the individual and the community. Moreover positive mysticism is not necessarily

Christian. It may have different forms. Mahāyāna Buddhism has no less concern, love and compassion for the mankind than the Christianity. The five Vows, the conception of puṇya and pāpa and active social service by Tīrthaṅkaras make the Jainism equally positive, Hinduism as understood and practised by servants of our age such as Ramkrishna, Vivekananda and Gandhi underlines that what seems to Western critics as inferior religion is nothing more than their cultural prejudice. Accidents of an age or defilement by the professed votaries of a religion don't mark its essence. Otherwise the life-affirming, positive religion of Christians would appear more exploitative as its avowed followers enslaved one nation after the other, shed more blood than the water in the Ganga, even though Christianity preaches love and service. Essence of all religions is social good and individual freedom. Jainism shows an important way of achieving it through rigorous discipline of body and mind.

The noted American physiologist, Prof. M.B. Visscher declared in his plenary lecture (reported briefly in the Times of India, Delhi, dated 24th October, 1974), at the 26th International Congress of physiological Scientists meeting at Delhi that one of the most pressing problem for human society today is **the kind of organised violence we call war. Personal violence, too, is not an insignificant problem as the increase in the incidence of kidnapping, skyjacking, murder, robbery and rape all over the world indicate.** He said that a world in which thermonuclear weapons existed in such a quantity as to be capable of destroying all life on our planet, it behoved society to learn more about violence and how to control it. Information gained from behaviour science that violence has biological roots is not sufficient. It is true that human animal has tendency towards violence and lust for power and money. Himsā and Parigraha, to use the words of Jainism, are biologically rooted in man; should we hence give into despair because of the tendency of human animal to use his intelligence in the large number of scientists that the future prospect was hopeless? Mahāvīra would say No. His indispensable ethical teachings of ahimsā and aparigraha to name only two out of the five cardinal Vows are the way for the freedom, peace and prosperity of the world troubled by excessive violence and over-powering spirit of exploitation and acquisition.

Notes

1. Published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, inc., 1964, see, preface p. v.
 2. **Ibid.**, p. 417.
 3. See, Pratt, **The Religions Consciousness**, pp. 7-12.
 4. See, Nahar and Ghosh, **An epitome of Jainism**, p. 468.
 5. Malvin Reader, **Ethics and the Human Community**, New York, p. 915.
 6. Op. cit.
 7. First sermon on Setting in Motion the Wheel of the Law. See, Radhakrishnan, **Indian Philosophy**, Vol. I, Macmillan Company, London, 1956, p. 420.
 8. Umāsvāti, **Tattvārthādhigamasūtra**, I. 1.
 9. See, **Daśavaikālika**, VI. 11.
 10. **Yaśaṣṭilaka and Indian Culture**, p. 267.
 11. See, for details Dr. K.C. Sogani, **Ethical Doctrines of Jainism**, pp. 88-89, 138-141.
 12. **Indian Thought and its Development**, 1936.
 13. **Eastern Religions and Western Thought**, Oxford University Press, 1940, pp. 64-114.
- (**Indian Philosophical quarterly, University of Poona Vol. III, No. I, October, 1975**)



4. Jain Definitions of the Pramāṇa

Definitions of the Pramāṇa proposed by the Jain logicians may be broadly divided into six types, the first two of which are simply derivative, such as:

- (i) प्रमिणोति प्रमीयतेऽनेन प्रतितिमात्रं वा प्रमाणम्
(Pūjyapāda Sarvārthasiddhi, 1.12)
- (ii) प्रकर्षेण संशयादिव्यवच्छेदेन मीयते परिच्छिद्यते वस्तुतत्त्वं येन तत् प्रमाणां, प्रमायां साधकतमम्।
(Hemacandra, Pramāṇamīmāṃsā)

These follow the Nyāya tradition first recorded by Vātsyāyana¹ and continued through the ages² down to the times when popular handbooks, like Tarkabhāṣā³ ruled the day.

1. Defining the Pramāṇa derivatively, that it is the unique and active cause (karaṇa)⁴ of valid cognition, serves the purpose of excluding such general conditions of all knowledge as subject (pramātā), object (prameya), time, space etc., within the scope of the means of knowledge. Pramāṇa being the source, means instrument or organ of valid cognition its supreme value in ascertaining and comprehending the truth can hardly be exaggerated.⁵

Philosophers of every shade agree that Pramāṇa is the only source of valid cognition, knowledge or truth. This initial agreement is followed by sharp disagreement on major issues involved, namely, the nature of instrument (karaṇa) and of the knowledge (pramā).

2. Vidyānanda, who follows Āgamic tradition or more precisely Ḡṛddhāpiccha (Tattvārtha-Sūtra 1.9-10) defines pramāṇa as right or valid cognition.⁶

In order to assert the Jain view even the term pramāṇa is taken in the sense of abstract state (i.e. pramiti or valid cognition⁷); knowing, according to Jainism, is a conscious act, the means of knowledge, therefore, can be knowledge itself which is of the nature of cessation of ignorance. According to the Nyāya, the means of perceptual knowledge is threefold, namely, sense, sense-object-contact and cognition. In indeterminate knowledge, sense-object-contact is the means and it is only in generating the attitudes of rejection, acceptance or indifference, as the case may be, that indeterminate cognition is the means.⁸

As both cognition and non-cognition are admitted to be instrument of knowledge in the Nyāya system, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa accepts collocation of the two as the nature (Svarūpa) of pramāṇa.⁹ According to the Nyāya, an object is not known without its contact with the sense. If object unconnected with the senses were to be cognised then all the objects will be known, but no object, which is beyond our ken is ever known.¹⁰

Moreover the instrument is always different from the subject and object. "I see the jar with the eyes." In this example the eye is the instrument which is different from both the agent, 'I', and the act of seeing. Therefore, knowing itself cannot be the instrument.¹¹ To this the Jainas reply that even when the eye is in contact with the ether, along with a jar, there is no knowledge of the former. So far as the difference of means and result is concerned, it can be maintained otherwise. It is only the sentient cognition, which can, like light, illuminate the object and not the insentient sense-contact. Similarly, collocation of different causes including cognition, admitted by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa as the means of knowledge, cannot be so regarded. Collocation of causes, like sense-contact, is insentient. Only a sentient cause can produce sentient knowledge. Moreover, the collocation will not be a direct cause because it will first produce cognition and then only will lead to knowledge. An indirect cause is not a karaṇa.¹²

The Vaiśeṣikas also define pramāṇa as the flawless knowledge.¹³ However, the author of the Vyomavatī, following the line of the Naiyāyikas, regards contact and cognition as the pramāṇa.¹⁴

Sāṅkhya¹⁵ and Yoga¹⁶ consider pramāṇa to be the modification of intellect, which assumes the form of object. This is also not acceptable to the Jainas, firstly because no blind modification of unconscious principle of intellect can create sentient knowledge, and secondly, it is against our experience to say that intellect or sense can assume the form of an object.

According to the Prābhākaras the function of knower (jñātṛvyāpāra) producing knowledge is considered to be pramāṇa.¹⁷ This is refuted by the Jainas on the ground that the entity named as the function of the knower cannot be established by any of the pramāṇas.¹⁸

Like Jainas, Buddhists also define pramāṇa in terms of valid cognition and do not regard sense, contact or modification of blind intellect or activity of the cogniser as the means of knowledge. However, the Buddhist contention that cognition of the unique particular (svalakṣaṇa), being devoid of all construction, is indeterminate (nirvikalpaka) and there

is no determinate perception, is unacceptable to the Jainas on the ground that *pramāṇa* must be definite and competent to decide good and bad so as to be empirically useful.¹⁹ Moreover idealistic Buddhists regard identity between cognition and its content as the organ of knowledge²⁰, i.e. object and its cognition are not different. This is clearly unacceptable to the Jainas who consider object external and independent of cognition. Cognition reveals itself and the content, but does not assume the form of the object because the abstract cognition cannot become concrete. Also, in the case of an illusion, the cognition, even if it were to assume the objective form, does not become knowledge. Hence, Buddhist view of identity between cognition and its object or assuming the form of the object²¹ is clearly untenable.

A question may be asked that if valid cognition is the means of knowledge, then what will be the result, i.e., how can the difference between the means and end be maintained? The Jain reply is that cessation of ignorance or creation of attitudes of rejection, acceptance or indifference on knowing the objects can rightly be taken to be the end of knowledge.²²

Thus, the second type of definition underlines the instrumentality of cognition which is sentient, determinate and different from the object and refutes contact etc, as the *pramāṇa*.²³

3. Samantabhadra is the first Jain logician to define the *pramāṇa* as the knowledge which illumines itself and the object.²⁴ This definition was modified by Siddhasena by adding a new term 'without obstruction'.²⁵

Although this definition bears the impact of Buddhists inasmuch as they had characterised knowledge as self-illuminating²⁶ and of the Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsakas who had used 'without obstruction' in their definition.²⁷ Yet it sets aside their views as also those of others. While Jainas consider knowledge as illuminating²⁸ both the self and the object, the realistic Buddhist, the Naiyāyika²⁹ and the Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsakas hold that it illumines the external object alone, as it cannot illuminate itself. The Jainas assert that if knowledge cannot illumine itself, it cannot cognise the external object either. It should therefore be admitted that knowledge,

like a lamp, illumines itself as well as the external object. The very nature of cognition is self-manifesting. It is the manifestation of the object, however, which determines a particular cognition to be valid or invalid.³⁰ The Jain view of *Prāmāṇa* also sets aside the Yogācāra view which maintains that knowledge illumines itself alone because there is no object independent of it. The Upaniṣdic view of Reality being consciousness³¹ and all else appearance stands similarly refuted according to Jainism which maintains the reality of the external world.

In order to differentiate knowledge from false cognition illustrated in the cases of false images, wrong beliefs etc., the term 'without any obstruction' has been used. A valid cognition is never erroneous that will be a contradiction in terms.³²

This third type of definition thus emphasises the character of knowledge as determinant of both the self and the object and asserts the reality of external phenomena.³³

4. Akalaṅka maintained true cognition to be manifesting both the self and the object.³⁴ Further, he proposed another definition of *pramāṇa*³⁵ by incorporating the term *avisamvādi*³⁶ of the Buddhists and 'anadhigata' (unknown) or 'apūrva' (novel) of the Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsakas.³⁷ According to the Buddhists, knowledge, being practically useful should lead to the realisation of some end, be harmonious with experience and favour successful volition. The Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsakas consider it necessary that the content of knowledge should be unknown, or previously unacquired and hence novel. Māṇikyanandin combined the opinions of Samantabhadra and Akalaṅka by including 'sva' and 'apūrva' in his single definition. Use of the term 'vyavasāya'³⁸ (determination) by him bears further the influence of Nyāya where this term occurs in the definition of perception.³⁹

If the object of cognition must be novel as admitted by Akalaṅka, following the Mīmāṃsakas and the Buddhists,⁴⁰ how can continuous cognition (Dhārāvāhika jñāna) of an object be regarded as *pramāṇa*? The Naiyāyikas have not to bother themselves on this question because

cognition of even previously known object can be *pramāṇa* in their opinion.⁴¹ The *Mīmāṃsakas* also admit the validity of continuous cognition. According to the *Prābhākaras* the *pramāṇa* is experience⁴² and therefore there is no problem in admitting a case of continuous cognition under the *pramāṇa*. The followers of *Kumārila* who insist on the novelty (*anadhigatatva* or *apūrvatva*) of the object, however, say that subtle difference in time makes the object novel. *Śālikanātha*, a follower of the *Prābhākara* School, has a better explanation to offer. He says, each individual cognition in the series of continuous cognition is independent of the other. None of them can be distinguished either in its awareness or creation. Hence, each one of these cognitions is valid.⁴³

Digambara logicians admit continuous cognition to be valid only if it cognises the moments also, otherwise it is held to be invalid. This view corresponds with the one held by the Buddhist *Arcaṭa*⁴⁴ who conceded *Yogic* continuous cognition to be valid as it can cognise the difference wrought by time and regarded an ordinary man's continuous cognition as invalid. In the *Jaina* system, 'memory' is also included under valid knowledge and hence the element of novelty in the definition of *pramāṇa*, accepted by *Akalaṅka* and *Māṇikyanandin*, stands in a different sense of 'novel in some aspect' and not that of 'totally novel'.⁴⁵

5. *Vidyānanda* discards the element of novelty in his definition of *pramāṇa*⁴⁶ which follows largely the views of *Samantabhadra* and *Siddhasena*, accepting the term 'vyavasāya' introduced by *Māṇikyanandin*. *Abhayadeva*, the commentator on the *Sanmati*, follows *Vidyānanda* with the only difference that he substitutes 'vyavasāya' by a synonym *Nirṇīti*.⁴⁷ *Vādi Devasūri*, however, accepts *Vidyānanda*'s definition as it is.⁴⁸ All the *Śvetāmbara* logicians accept continuous cognition and recollection as *pramāṇa*. They see, therefore, no need to keep *anadhigat* or 'apūrva' in their definitions of knowledge.

6. *Hemacandra* defines *Pramāṇa* as authentic definitive cognition of an object.⁴⁹ His definition follows *Umāsvāti*,⁵⁰ *Dharmakīrti*,⁵¹ and *Bhāsarvajña*⁵² in using the term 'Samyag', and *Abhayadeva* in using the

term *nirṇaya*, which stands for cognition devoid of the characteristic of doubt, indecision and indeterminate cognition, and negates the status of *pramāṇa* to the sense-object contact (admitted by the *Nyāya*) and to doubt etc., though they are included under the category of cognition of the *Jainas*.⁵³ The prefix 'pra' in the term *pramāṇa* signifies the same.⁵⁴ *Hemacandra*'s definition is important for excluding the term for self-illuminating character of knowledge in the definition of *pramāṇa*. It is true that knowledge is self-manifesting as is revealed in introspection which illuminates cognition alongwith its subject and object. Cognition cannot be held to be revealed either by second cognition or by presumption or be made dependent on the cognition of the object, because that will involve either an infinite regress or a logical see-saw. Therefore, the cognition must be accepted to be self-illuminating, says *Hemacandra*.⁵⁵ However, he objects to the inclusion of this well-established self-illuminating character of the cognition in the definition of *Pramāṇa* because this overlaps cases of erroneous cognition,⁵⁶ such as doubt which are equally self-revealing as there is not a single case of cognition which is not ipso facto self-manifesting. The old masters included this character of cognition for clear understanding of the learners.⁵⁷

Hemacandra's definition is also significant on account of exclusion of the term *apūrva* (novel) or *anadhigata* (unknown) admitted by the Buddhist, the *Bhāṭṭa* *Mīmāṃsaka* and the *Digambara* school of *Jaina* logicians. According to him cognition of an object cognised before, as in the case of continuous cognition, determinate perception and its judgement, as also recollection, may legitimately be considered valid cognition. The term *anadhigata* will serve no purpose either with reference to the substance which does not vary, being self-same unity and eternal in either state, *qua* cognised before or to be cognised hereafter.

Nor has this term any significance with reference to modes which are temporary. Because, then, even the case of continuous cognition cannot be regarded as cognising the precognised object.⁵⁸ The qualifying proviso of *anadhigata* is, therefore, unnecessary with reference to both the eternal selfsame substance and the changing modes.

In recollection which is admitted to be *pramāṇa*, there is cognition of the pre-cognised. Even those, who regard recollection to be invalid, do so on the basis that it is not directly derived from an object and not on the basis that it cognises the pre-cognised object.⁵⁹

An exposition of the six varieties of definitions given here gives the Jain view of *pramā* (knowledge), *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) and *Jñāna* (cognition). Salient features of this view may be summed up as follows:-

1. Cognition illumines itself and the object. This is a synthesis of the idealistic view of the Buddhist, the *Prābhākara* and the *Vedāntist* (also the *Kashmir Śaivaite*), which regards knowledge to be self-evident and of the realistic view of the *Sautrāntika*, *Nyāyavaiśeṣika*, *Sāṃkhya-Yogin* and the *Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsaka*, which asserts that the knowledge illuminates the object alone.
2. According to Jaina, authentic cognition alone is the instrument of knowledge. Sense, sense-object-contact (*Nyāyavaiśeṣika*), modification of intellect (*Sāṃkhya*), or identity (*Sārūpya*, idealistic Buddhist) cannot be the source of knowledge.
3. Source and end of knowledge are different. While authentic cognition is the source of knowledge, it is the cessation of ignorance by removing the *Kārmic Veil* enveloping the individual soul which is the ultimate end. In empirical state, however, forming the attitude of rejection, acceptance or indifference; as the case may be, is the result of *pramāṇa*.
4. *Pramāṇa* is comprehensive as it reveals the object fully.⁶⁰ Even when one perceives the colour of an object one knows the full object and is thus aware, for example, that this is the jar, whereas *Naya* reveals only a particular aspect of an object. This jar is possessed of colour. This example illustrates that *Naya* focusses its attention only on the colour, but when through cognisance of different aspects, the object jar is known fully it becomes the case of *pramāṇa*.
5. The Jaina view of *pramāṇa* accepts all shades of definitions without compromising its independence. In its philosophical dialogue with

the non-Jaina thinkers, it maintained its idealistic realism by defining *pramāṇa* as knowledge illuminating itself and the object but did not hesitate to benefit from the wisdom of others. This explains the impact of the Buddhist, the *Nyāyavaiśeṣika* and the *Mīmāṃsaka* definitions, both in form and idea, over the Jains whose contribution to epistemological problems is massive and significant for properly constructing the history of Indian wisdom in all its details.

References

1. उपलब्धिसाधनानि प्रमाणानीति समाख्यानिर्वचनसामर्थ्याद् बोद्धव्यं प्रमीयतेऽनेनेति करणार्थाभिधानो हि प्रमाणशब्दः। *Nyāyabhāṣya*, I 1.3
2. (i) प्रमासाधनं हि प्रमाणम् सामान्यलक्षणं तु प्रमाणपदादेव समाख्या-निर्वचनसामर्थ्यसंहितादवगम्यते। *Nyāyavārtikatāparyāṭikā*, p. 21.
(ii) प्रमीयते येन तत्प्रमाणमिति करणार्थाभिधायिनः प्रमाणशब्दात् प्रमाकरणं प्रमाणमवगम्यते। *Nyāyamañjarī*, p. 25.
3. प्रमाकरणं प्रमाणम्। *Tarkabhāṣā*.
4. व्यापारवदसाधारणं कारणं करणम्। or साधकतमं करणम्। The term *Pramāṇa* is formed by suffixing *lyuṭ* (ṇa) to *√mā* (to measure) prefixed by *pra*.
5. (i) प्रमाणादर्थसंसिद्धिस्तदाभासाद्विपर्ययः।
Māṇikyanandin, Parikṣāmukha, verse 1.
(ii) प्रमाणादिष्टसंसिद्धिरन्यथातिप्रसंगतः। *Vidyānanda, Pramāṇa-parikṣā*, p. 63.
(iii) सम्यग्ज्ञानपूर्विका सर्वपुरुषार्थसिद्धिरिति तद्व्युत्पाद्यते। *Dharmakīrti, Nyāyabindu*, I. 1.
(iv) मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिः। *Nyāya maxim*.
(v) प्रमेयसिद्धिः प्रमाणाद्धिः। *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 4.
6. सम्यग्ज्ञानं प्रमाणम्। This simple definition partly echoes the Buddhist definition:
(i) प्रमाणामविसंवादि ज्ञानम्। *Dharmakīrti, Pramāṇavārtika*, 2.4
This definition has been adopted verbatim in the *Nyāyāvatāra*, p. 3.

7. Besides Pūjyapāda's derivation, the following may also be noted:
प्रमितिः प्रमाणमिति भावव्युत्पत्त्या सम्यग्ज्ञानमेव प्रमाणम्।
Bhāvasena, *Pramāprameya*, pp. 1-2.
8. (i) कदा पुनरिन्द्रियं करणम् ? यदा निर्विकल्पकरूपा प्रमा फलम्।... यदा निर्विकल्पकानन्तरं सविकल्पकं... ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते, तदेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षः करणम्। ... यदा उक्तसविकल्पकानन्तरं हानोपादानोपेक्षाबुद्ध्यो जायन्ते तदा निर्विकल्पकं ज्ञानं करणम्। *Tarkabhāṣā*, pp. 48-49.
- Earlier also, in the context of definition of *pramāṇa* it is stated that sense-contact etc. is the instrument and not the subject or the object. सत्यपि प्रमातरि प्रमेये च प्रमानुत्पत्तेरिन्द्रियसंयोगादौ सति अविलम्बेन प्रमोत्पत्तेरत इन्द्रिसंयोगादिरेव करणम्। *ibid.*, p. 45.
- (ii) यदा सन्निकर्षस्तदा ज्ञानं प्रमितिः, यदा ज्ञानं तदा हानोपादानोपेक्षाबुद्ध्यः फलम्। *Nyāyabhāṣya*, I. 1.3
9. अव्यभिचारिणीमसंदिग्धमर्थोपलब्धिं विदधती बोधाबोधस्वभावा सामग्री प्रमाणम्, बोधाबोधस्वभावो हि तस्य स्वरूपम्। *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 12.
10. ननु सन्निकर्षविगमे किं व्यवहितानुपलब्धिरिति ब्रूमः। यदि ह्यसन्निकर्षमपि चक्षुरादीन्द्रियमर्थं गृह्णीयात् व्यवहितोऽपि ततोऽर्थ उपलभ्येत, न चोपलभ्येत, तस्मादस्ति सन्निकर्षः। *ibid.*, p. 69.
11. Vide, *ibid.*, pp. 66-67.
12. For detailed criticism of the Nyāya view of *pramāṇa*, see, *Nyāyakumudacandra*, pp. 40-41 and *Prameyakamalamārtaṇḍa*. P. 19.
13. अदुष्टं विद्या। *Kaṇāda Sūtra*, 9.2.12.
14. Vide, *Vyomavati on the Praśastapādabhāṣya*, p. 553.
15. (i) सांख्यस्तु बुद्धिवृत्तिः प्रमाणमिति प्रतिपन्नः विषयाकारपरिणतेन्द्रियादिवृत्त्यनुपातिनी बुद्धिवृत्तिरेव पुरुषमुपरञ्जयन्ती प्रमाणम्। *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 24.
- (ii) इन्द्रियप्रणालिकयार्थसन्निकर्षेण लिङ्गज्ञानादिना वा बुद्धेरर्थाकारा वृत्तिर्जायते। *Sāmkhyapracāsanabhāṣya*, I. 87.
16. प्रमाणं वृत्तिरेव च। *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, p. 16.
17. ज्ञानं हि नाम क्रियात्मकं, क्रिया च फलानुमेया, ज्ञातृव्यापारेण फलनिष्पत्तेः। *Nyāyamañjari*, p. 16

- Later on Jayanta concludes Mīmāṃsaka's view: तदेष फलानुमेयो ज्ञानव्यापारो ज्ञानादिशब्दाबाध; प्रमाणम्। *ibid*
18. See, *Nyāyakumudacandra*, pp. 42-45 and *Prameyakamalamārtaṇḍa*, pp. 20-25.
19. हिताहितप्राप्तिपरिहारसमर्थं हि प्रमाणं ततो ज्ञानमेव तत्। *Parikṣāmukha*, I. 2.
20. (i) विषयाधिगतिश्चात्र प्रमाणफलमिष्यते। स्ववित्तिर्वा प्रमाणं तु सारूप्यं योग्यतापि वा। *Śāntarākṣita, Tattvasaṁgrahakārikā*, 1344.
- (ii) करणसाधनेन मानशब्देन सारूप्यलक्षणं प्रमाणमभिधीयते। *Dharmottara, Nyāyabinduṭika on Sūtra*, 3.
21. स्वसंवित्तिः फलं चात्र ताद्रूप्यादर्थनिश्चयः। विषयाकार एवास्य प्रमाणं तेन मीयते।। *Diñnāga, Pramāṇasamuccaya*, I. 10.
22. (i) ननु चोक्तं ज्ञाने प्रमाणे सति फलाभाव इति। नैष दोषः, अर्थाधिगमे प्रीतिदर्शनात्। सा फलमित्युच्यते, उपेक्षाऽज्ञाननाशो वा फलम्। *Pūjyapāda, Sarvārthasiddhi*, I. 10.
- (ii) अज्ञाननिवृत्तिर्हानोपादानोपेक्षाश्च फलम्। *Mānikyanandin, Parikṣāmukha*, V.1.
23. सन्निकर्षादेरज्ञानस्य प्रामाण्यमनुपपन्नमर्थान्तरवत्। I. 3.
24. स्वपरावभासकं यथा प्रमाणं भुवि बुद्धिलक्षणम्। *Svayambhūstotra*, 63.
25. प्रमाणं स्वपराभासि ज्ञानं बाधविवर्जितम्। *Nyāyavatāra*, 1.
26. 'स्वरूपस्य स्वतो गतेः। Also स्वरूपाधिगतेः परम्। *Dharmakīrti, Pramāṇavārtika*, II. 4.
27. तत्रापूर्वार्थविज्ञानं निश्चितं बाधवर्जितम्। अदुष्टकारणारब्धं प्रमाणं लोकसम्मतम्।।
Ascribed to Kumārila but not found in the extant *Ślokavārtika*. Quoted and criticized by Vidyānanda in the *Tattvārtha-Ślokavārtika*. I. 10. 71.
28. (i) अज्ञातार्थज्ञापकं प्रमाणम्।
(ii) अज्ञातार्थप्रकाशो वा। *Diñnāga, Pramāṇavārttika*, II. 5.
29. (i) अर्थप्रकाशो बुद्धिः। *Tarkakaumudī*, NS. Ed. p. 6.
(ii) विज्ञानमनात्मसंवेदनम्। *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, p. 4.

30. भावप्रमेयोपेक्षायां प्रमाणाभासनिह्ववः,
वह्निः प्रमेयापेक्षायां प्रमाणं तन्निभं च ते। Āptamimānsā, Verse 83.
31. (i) सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्मा। Taittiriya, II 1.1.
(ii) विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म। Bṛhadāraṇyaka, III. 28.
32. (i) न प्रत्यक्षमपि भ्रान्तं प्रमाणत्वविनिश्चयात्।
भ्रान्तं प्रमाणमित्येतद् विरुद्धवचनं यतः।। Nyāyavatāra, 6.
(ii) अनुमानं तदभ्रान्तं प्रमाणत्वात् समक्षवत् । ibid, 5.
33. सकलप्रतिभासस्य भ्रान्तत्वासिद्धितः स्फुटम्।
प्रमाणं स्वात्मनश्चापि द्वयसिद्धौ प्रसिद्ध्यति। ibid,7.
34. सिद्धौ यत्र परापेक्ष्यं सिद्धौ स्वपररूपयोः।
तत् प्रमाणं ततो नान्यदविकल्पमचेतनम्।। Siddhivinīścaya, p. 175.
35. प्रमाणमविसंवादि ज्ञानमनधिगतार्थाधिगमलक्षणत्वात्। Aṣṭaśati.
36. (i) ततोऽर्थक्रियासमर्थवस्तुप्रकाशकं सम्यग्ज्ञानम्।
(ii) यतश्चार्थसिद्धिस्तत् सम्यग्ज्ञानम्।।
(iii) अविंसंवादकं ज्ञानं सम्यग्ज्ञानम्। लोके च पूर्वमुपदर्शितमर्थं प्रापयन्संवादक
उच्यते। तद्विज्ञानमपि स्वयं प्रदर्शितमर्थं प्रापयत् संवादकमुच्यते। प्रदर्शिते चार्थे
प्रवर्तकत्वमेव प्रापकत्वं नाम। Nyāyabindutikā on Sūtra, I.
37. (i) तत्रापुर्वार्थविज्ञानं quoted above.
(ii) यथार्थमगृहीतग्राहि ज्ञानं प्रमाणम्। Śāstradīpikā, 45.
(iii) औत्पत्तिकगिरा दोषः कारणस्य निवार्यते। अबोधो व्यतिरेकेण स्वतस्तेन प्रमाणता।।
सर्वस्यानुपलब्धेऽर्थे प्रामाण्यं स्मृतिरन्वयथा। Ślokavārtika, 10-11.
(iv) एतच्च विशेषणमुपादानेन सूत्रकारेण कारणदोषबाधकज्ञानरहितमगृहीतग्राहि
ज्ञानं प्रमाणमिति प्रमाणलक्षणं सूचितम्। Śāstradīpikā, p. 123.
(v) अनधिगतार्थगन्तु प्रमाणमिति भाट्टमीमांसका आहुः।Siddhacandrodaya,
20.
38. स्वापूर्वार्थव्यवसायात्मकं ज्ञानं प्रमाणम्। Parikṣāmukha., I. 1.
39. इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षोत्पन्नं ज्ञानमव्यपदेश्यमव्यभिचारि व्यवसायात्मकं प्रत्यक्षम्।
Nyāyasūtra, I. 1.4.

40. (i) अज्ञातार्थज्ञापकं प्रमाणमिति प्रमाणसामान्यलक्षणम्। Dīnāga,
Pramāṇasamuccaya.
(ii) अत एवानधिगतविषयमप्रमाणम्। येनैव हि ज्ञानेन प्रथममधिगतोऽर्थस्तेनैव
प्रवर्तितः पुरुषः प्राप्तिश्चार्थः तत्रैवार्थे किमन्येन ज्ञानेनाधिकं कार्यम्,
ततोऽधिगतविषयमप्रमाणम्।
Dharmottara concludes this in his explanation of the term
'avisamvādaka' in his Ṭikā on the Nyāyabindu, p. 3. while the
term Anadhigata excludes both vikalpa and Smṛti in Buddhism, in
Mīmāṃsā it excludes only the cases of recollection and not
'Vikalpa'.
41. अनधिगतार्थगन्तुत्वं च धारावाहिकविज्ञानानामधिगतार्थगोचराणां लोकसिद्ध-
प्रमाणभावानां प्रामाण्यं विहन्तीति नाद्रियामहे। Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā,
p. 20 See, also Kandali, p. 61. Nyāyamañjarī, p. 22 and
Nyāyakusumāñjali, 4.1.
42. (i) अनुभूतिश्च नः प्रमाणम्। Prabhākara, Bṛhatī, I.I. 5.
(ii) प्रमाणमनुभूतिः सा स्मृतेरन्या। Prakaraṇapañcikā, p. 42.
43. अन्योन्यनिरपेक्षा धारावाहिकबुद्धयः व्याप्रियमाणे हि पूर्वोक्तज्ञानकारणकलाप
उत्तरेषामप्युत्पत्तिरिति न प्रतीतितः उत्पत्तितो वा धारावाहिकविज्ञानानि
परस्परस्यातिशेरत इति युक्ता सर्वेषामपि प्रमाणता। Prakaraṇapañcikā, p.
42. See, Bṛhatī also p. 103.
44. Vide, his Ṭikā on the Hetubindu, p. 39.
45. (i) गृहीतमगृहीतं वा स्वार्थं यदि व्यवस्यति।
तत्र लोके न शास्त्रेषु विज्ञाति प्रमाणताम्। Tattvārthaśloka, I. 10.78.
(ii) प्रामान्तरागृहीतार्थप्रकाशित्वं प्रपञ्चतः। प्रामाण्यं च गृहीतार्थग्राहित्वेऽपि कथंचन।
Ibid.
46. तत्त्वार्थव्यवसायात्मज्ञानं मानमितीयता।
लक्षणेन गतार्थत्वात् व्यर्थमन्यद्विशेषणम्।।
Tattvārthaśloka, I, 10.77. See, also Pramāṇaparikṣā, 53.
47. प्रमाणं स्वार्थनिर्णीतस्वभावं ज्ञानम्। Sanmatīṭikā, p. 518.
48. स्वपरव्यवसायि ज्ञानं प्रमाणम्। Pramāṇanirṇaya.

पञ्चम परिच्छेद : बौद्ध विद्या

1. The Origin of Buddhism : A Tale From The Haracaritacintāmaṇi (HCC)

Jayadratha or Jayaratha of Kashmir (1200 A.D.) wrote a poem called Haracaritacintāmaṇi (HCC) to glorify the deeds of lord Śiva. The poet's descriptions of the glorious acts of Śiva are based on the Śāstras¹ or on the mythological accounts is found in extensive religious literature in Sanskrit centring round the personality and the cult of Śiva. The poet had written a scholarly short commentary namely Viveka, on the Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta (1160 A.D.) the encyclopaedic philosophical work on Kasmir Śaivism. Jayadratha is thus a celebrated and devoted scholar of Trika philosophy. The Haracaritacintāmaṇi bears out the impress of the philosopher-poet. The extant poem, as published in the Kāvya-māla (No. 61), abruptly ends with the 45th verse in the 32nd flash (Prakāśa or canto). The editor of the K.M. text is uncertain about the extent of the poem.² His uncertainty is quite reasonable in the face of the abrupt end of the poem. Owing to the fact that this poem lacks the unity of theme and is avowedly a collection of the deeds of Śiva gathered from the different śāstras for making the devotion of the wise steadfast³, it is understandably difficult to pronounce any decision on the number of Flashes that this poem originally contained. However, the introduction or upodghāta, summing up in order the contents of the whole work, does not leave us in much doubt about the extent of the poem. From the 46th verse of the upodghāta, it is clear that the story of Śiva-rātri (the night of Śiva), found in the 31st flash of the poem, formed the last story that Jayadratha had planned to narrate. The 32nd flash seems to conclude the poet's work with the mention of the merits (Māhātmya) of Śiva-worship. It briefly refers to the stories already told in the former flashers. It should therefore be clear that the poem was originally written in 32 flashes. But, the loss of quite a few verses of the 32nd flash is beyond any doubt, because one can not think of this poem ending without any mention of the poet or without any concluding note on the poem.

49. सम्यगर्थनिर्णयः प्रमाणम्। Pramāṇamimāṃsā, 2.
50. सम्यग्दर्शनज्ञानचारित्राणि मोक्षमार्गः। Tattvārthasūtra, I. 1.
51. सम्यग्ज्ञानपूर्विका सर्वपुरुषार्थसिद्धिः। Nyāyabindu, I. 1.
52. सम्यगनुभवसाधनं प्रमाणम्। Nyāyasāra. P. 1.
53. तत्र निर्णयः संशयानवध्यवसायाविकल्पकत्ववरहितं ज्ञानम्। ततो निर्णयपदेनाज्ञानरूपस्येन्द्रियसन्निकर्षादेः ज्ञानरूपस्यापि संशयादेः प्रमाणत्वनिषेधः। Pramāṇamimāṃsā, p. 3.
54. प्रकर्षेण संशयादिव्यवच्छेदेन मीयते परिच्छिद्यते वस्तुतत्त्वं येन तत् प्रमाणम्। *ibid*, p. 2.
55. तस्मादर्थोन्मुखतयेव स्वोन्मुखतयापि ज्ञानस्य प्रतिभासता स्वनिर्णयात्मकत्वमप्यस्ति-संवित् स्वप्रकाशा अर्थप्रतीतित्वात्, यः स्वप्रकाशो न भवति नासावर्थप्रतीतिः, यथा घटः। *ibid*, pp. 3-4.
56. स्वनिर्णयः सन्नप्यलक्षणम्, अप्रमाणेऽपि भावात्। *ibid*, p. 4.
57. स्वनिर्णयस्तु अप्रमाणेऽपि संशयादौ वर्तते, न हि काचित् ज्ञानमात्रा सास्ति या न स्वसंविदिता नाम ततो न स्वनिर्णयो लक्षणमुक्तमस्माभिः, वृद्धैस्तु परीक्षार्थमुपक्षिप्तः। *ibid*, p. 4.
58. ग्रहीष्यमाणग्राहिण इव गृहीतग्राहिणोऽपि नाप्रामाण्यम्। Pramāṇamimāṃsā, 4. See, also the Vṛtti.
59. See, Pramāṇamimāṃsā, p. 5., which quotes the following at the end of the discussion on this point:
न स्मृतेरप्रमाणत्वं गृहीतग्राहिताकृतम्,
अपि त्वनर्थजन्यत्वं तदप्रामाण्यकारणम्।। Nyāyamañjari, P. 23.
60. तथा चोक्तं सकलादेशः प्रमाणाधीनः। Sarvārthasiddhi, I. 6.
(Amritdhara, Prof. R.N. Dandekar Felicitation Vol., New Delhi, 1984)



The poet Jayadratha, who is conscious of his philosophical scholarship and great proficiency in learning or vutpatti skillfully avoids the display of his knowledge. He directs the learned highbrow readers to study his other works⁴ to satisfy their desire for higher learning. Intoxicated with devotion, the poet of HCC prefers to be simple and direct in his description. He employs simple language and deliberately avoids the ornate style. He says that he would prefer laxity in style and diction to a display of his proficiency.

इयं साधारणी वाणी शम्भुशक्तिमतः प्रति।
समस्तलोकसुभगा शैथिल्येनैव शोभते॥

(Introductory, verse no. 8)

This poem is, nevertheless, a forceful exposition of the philosophical doctrines of Kashmir Śaivism, particularly the Kula system of philosophy. The introductory verse found at the beginning of each Flash gives a philosophical explanation of the contents or the stories in a particular Flash. There is hardly any rival system of life or thought, philosophical speculation or religious discipline which does not find, directly or indirectly, a forceful refutation in this poem. The poet-philosopher, in his zeal to establish the supremacy of the religion and the philosophy of Śaivism, has invented ingenious ways to bring all other gods under the suzerainty of Śiva, in making all the important religions of this country pay their homage to Śiva and in describing all the gods paying their homage to the God of gods, Mahādeva. This ideal of the poet has rendered the Haracaritacintāmaṇi a mythico-philosophical poem of Puraṇic character.

In the 13th Flash of this poem, Jayadratha recounts the stories of three invincible devils, namely Vidyumālin, Tāraka and Kamala who had acquired the boon from Brahmā to become the masters of all the worlds. They had also got in boon three wonderful cities of three worlds combined in one and known as Tripura. The perforation and cohesion of this Tripura by a single arrow and the existence of two Śaṅkaras were almost impossible conditions which warranted the death of these demons. Armed with these boons from the creator, all the three began to propitiate

lord Śiva on the advice of their guide and philosopher, Śukra. They all resolved in association with Maya that Śiva alone will be their sole refuge whose free will is followed by Brahmā and all other gods.

अद्य प्रभृति सर्वेषां गतिरस्माकमीश्वरः।

यदिच्छामनुवर्तन्ते ब्रह्मविष्णवादयः सुराः॥ (HCC, 13.29)

The demons made up their mind to be devoted to Śiva and never to swerve from the path of that devotion or show any indifference to the worship of Śivaliṅga and they remained deeply absorbed in His worship in mind, action and speech.⁵

The mighty demons, powerful and invincible, were ready to attack the world of gods. The gods were pale with fear and they approached Śiva to seek his protection from the three terrible demons. But, Śaṅkara refused to help the gods against his own devotees.

Who, where, when and how can be conquered these demons, whose daily rite is the worship of my Liṅga alone? asks Śiva-

दानवास्ते विजीयन्ते केन कुत्र कदा कथम्।

मल्लिङ्गार्चनमेवास्ति येषां कर्म दिने दिने ॥ (Ibid, 13.43)

Finding it impossible to destroy the devotees of Śiva, Brahmā requested him to attend to his prayer when these demons began to abuse the faith and turn into heretics. 'Amen', said Śiva. Brahmā and the other gods returned to their homes with a sad heart. The heaven had lost all its prime majesty because it remained under the constant threat of attack from the most powerful demons. Visualizing his kingdom of heaven shorn of all glory, Indra sought in private the counsels of his teacher, Bṛhaspati. He analysed the chief cause of the invincibility of the demons to be their steadfast devotion. Any plan to enfeeble their faith, to shake their beliefs, to swerve them from the path of devotion to Lord Śiva would meet with no success in the presence of Śukara who could penetrate the heart of things with his keen perception. He would understand, Bṛhaspati was sure, the secret plans with the help of his penetrating intellect and would frustrate them easily. However, Bṛhaspati unfolded his plan to Indra.

Generally, all and sundry aspire for easy success in life. Ambition fires the imagination of all. A desire for acquiring more and more power and a position of superiority corrupts all souls. This leads to the worship of the high and mighty. Everybody is interested to know about the superior and the powerful and is always delighted to listen to the deity of power. But none else other than Lord Śiva is supreme. He alone is at the head of all. **However, I shall contrive to propound a superior god, says Bṛhaspati, and will write imaginary Sāstras and the ways of meditation wherein Maheśvara will be reduced to a secondary position.⁶ This novel scheme will slacken the un-swerving faith of the demons and, consequently, lead to their death and destruction.** Thus Bṛhaspati planned with Indra. The new hereticism was given the name of Buddhist philosophy as it is rooted in and originates from the intellect or 'Buddhi'.

बुद्धेरागतमित्येतद्दर्शनं बौद्धमुच्यते। (Ibid, 13.74.)

Buddha is the god of this religious philosophy. And, Viṣṇu himself appears in the form of Buddha in all the yugas. It is to put the world in distress, to destroy the institutions of the sacrifice and life, to spread the horror of the age of strife, Kali, that Viṣṇu appears as the Buddha.

लोकानुपप्लावयितुं हन्तुं यज्ञादिकाः क्रियाः।
घोरं कलिं प्रथयितुं बुद्धत्वं याति केशवः।। (Ibid, 13.91.)

If Viṣṇu does not assume the form of the Buddha, how then can there be terrific disorder in the age of strain and strife?. The Buddha of this new heretic order is the same as Viṣṇu; the other gods who will bring about the lack of faith in the demons⁷ are imaginary and fictitious. Buddha's supremacy over all other gods is maintained on the strength of intellectual convictions and the power of argumentation. The Śaivite gods, Gaṇapati and others are declared to belong to the Buddhist pantheon.⁸ The dhyānas or meditations of these new gods, falsely imagined, will lead the demons into the delusion of regarding these gods as superior to Śiva. Once the worship of these gods is made popular and celebrated, Bṛhaspati plans to render the Śaiva Tantras and Mantras into Buddhism. From the different parts of Śaiva scriptures, rites and rituals will be

taken out to be grafted on this novel discipline meant for slackening the faith in Śaivism.⁹ The intellectual delight and a sense of possessing a keener intellect will satisfy the new converts. The intellect will rule over the faith and would finally destroy it. In this newly propounded Buddhist literature, the worship of Śiva's symbol will be declared to constitute bondage. The zero-ness (Śūnyatā) which strips off all the obligations of religious life would be regarded as liberation.

लिङ्गार्चनादिकस्तत्र बन्धस्तावन्निगद्यते।
मुक्तिस्तु शून्यतैव स्यादितिकर्तव्यहारिणी।। (Ibid, 13.81.)

The institution of sacrifice is to be given up. The belief in the existence of the self and the supreme self (Prameśvara) is to be abused and controverted. Such a fictitious and imaginary treatise propounding the new faith, which will be the denial of the old faith, is designated Māyātāntra by Bṛhaspati.¹⁰ He believes that the practical demonstration of new ideals will certainly delude the demons. It will indeed be impossible even for Śukra to prevent the effect so created in the minds of the demons. To preserve faith is difficult, to fall into doubt is easy. It requires much effort to go up but none to go down. How hard is it to climb the mountain but how (easily) may one fall down from it?

ऊर्ध्वारोहे महान् यत्नो नाद्यःपाते पुनः क्वचित्।
कथमारुहते शैलः कथं वास्मान्निपत्यते।। (Ibid, 13.86.)

Having prepared his plan in all the details Bṛhaspati waited for an opportunity to execute the same by propagating Buddhism amongst the demons and Maya. Incidentally, Śukara left for performing a sacrifice to be completed in a year's time. This was a golden chance for Bṛhaspati to win over the demons and to make them give up the worship of Śiva and to draw them into the fold of Buddhism. He approached them in the disguise of their teacher Śukra, who had left earlier. The demons were surprised to find the disguised Śukra. They anxiously asked the cause of their teacher's return. To this, Bṛhaspati, disguised as Śukra, replied that the interest of his disciples was always uppermost in his mind. It was to tell them a secret that he had come back immediately. He says, "This is

a more powerful god, namely Buddha, whose standard and umbrella are carried by Śiva. He alone can fulfill all the desires.” Śukara advised them to propitiate the Buddha and give up the worship of Śivalinga. At first, Tāraka resisted the new teachings of his master. He was greatly disturbed by and rather annoyed at his teacher propounding a new god. It agitated his mind to hear something against his old belief and way of worship. But, Bṛahaspati converted him to Buddhism with his powerful words and clever arguments. He expounded the Buddhist philosophy to Vidyumālin and Kamala, the other two associates of Tāraka and succeeded in weaning them away from their old path, their old religion and philosophy.

Now, the demons, having left the worship of Śiva, did not tolerate even the mention of Him. They became the most zealous opponents of Śiva. They began to oppress the world and grabbed all that fascinated their imagination. These adventures of the new converts greatly agitated the gods who went to Śiva to seek His protection from the oppression of the demons. Now that the demons had turned away from His devotion, Śiva promised the assembled gods to burn the trio of Cities, Tripura. A chariot was prepared for Śiva to proceed for the battle against Tāraka and the others. The earth was the chariot, the Vedas were the horses, Meru held the standard and the Sun and the Moon acted as the wheels of the chariot. The mountain Mandara was the lofty bow with Vāsuki as its string. Bṛhamā was the charioteer, Viṣṇu was the arrow with Māruta as its feathered part and fire as its point. Under the leadership of Śiva, all the gods united to fight the common menace. Śukra had returned by now after performing the sacrifice that had lasted a year. He understood the situation and realized what a great delusion had been created by Bṛahaspati in his absence. He tried to mitigate the vicious effect of Bṛahaspati’s plan. But, it was too late. His counsels fell on deaf ears. The disciples of Śukra were no longer in a mood to hear the voice of their master. He was abused and humiliated and none was ready to listen to his wise counsel. The master was disappointed and frustrated in his efforts to bring them back to the old fold. The demons in their fury had destroyed all the symbols of Śiva. They were going to kill Maya whom they held in

bondage. Śukra helplessly tried to prevent them from following the course of self-destruction. But, none of the demons paid any heed to his words. The three cities were reduced to ashes by Śiva. Maya was freed from bondage by Nandin, who is in reality another form of Śiva. The demons were consumed by the blazing fire of Tripura.

This, in brief, is the story of the burning down of Tripura. Jayadratha has philosophically explained this. According to him the triple forms of the knower, the known and the knowledge, are the evil creations of Māyā. Māyā in Śaivism is the power of Śiva. It constitutes the limitations of the ultimate. It veils the real powers of the Absolute and manifests the objective-ness of Idantā. It makes the perfect to appear as imperfect. The creations of Māyā or a sense of Idantā implying distinctions of the subject, object and the means of cognition or the cognition itself can be destroyed or consumed by the fire of perfect monism. Tripura is the triple form of the objective (or Māyā) consciousness. Its burning leads to the revelation of the Absolute.¹¹ And it is the fire of real knowledge that burns down the distinctions of the subject etc.

The tale of the origin of Buddhism intertwined with the story of the conflagration of the collection of the three cities has a few important points to make. Firstly, the poet considers Buddhism or its religion and philosophy a rival system opposed to the ultimate of Śaivism. It also points out that the Buddhism, its literature, mythology, its religious practices etc., are the outcome of a spirit of revolt against Hinduism or, more particularly, Śaivism. Nevertheless, Buddhism greatly resembles the Śaiva traditions. The statement of Bṛahaspati that the Buddhist scriptures will be created out of the different parts of Śaiva scriptures is significant from this point of view. It makes out a case for a comparative study of the Śaiva and Buddhist literatures, their religion and philosophy, particularly their schools of mysticism. Bṛahaspati’s plan to make the Śaiva deities like Gaṇapati belong to the Buddhist pantheon has been successful in a large measure because some scholars of Buddhist theology and mythology sincerely believe that many gods and goddesses of Hinduism like Gaṇapati and Kālī, are originally Buddhist divinities, I do

not want to dispute their contention here. But, it can be safely said that the Mahāhāna school of Buddhism was born in Kashmir to which our past belongs and the scholars of Kashmir brought Śaivism to bear upon this new religion of Buddhism with its ideal of Bodhisattva-hood working for the welfare of all. Kashmir was the senai where the gospel of karuṇā or compassion was preached. Tāntric Buddhism was an outcome of and growth within this new religion, the Great Vehicle. The philosophical doctrines, theology, mystic practices, rites and rituals of the one informed and influenced the other in the long history of these two important religions of India grown in the cradle of Kashmir. There has been large-scale borrowings of ideas and ideals, symbols and images and esoteric practices. There was indeed a Bṛahaspati (who he was we shall never be able to know) or many more who cleverly intermixed the two disciplines of life and thought. And his mission of fusing the two streams of Indian culture has been largely successful.

References

1. चरित्राणि त्रिनेत्रस्य शास्त्रदृष्टानि गुम्फये, Introductory verse, No. 5 b.
2. Vide, editor's footnote, HCC, NS. ed ., p. 281.
3. उचित्य तस्य चरितान्यधुना तानि शास्त्रतः।
मथैकत्र निवेश्यन्ते भक्तिदाढ्याय धीमताम्॥
4. Vide, introductory verse, No. 7.
5. *Ibid*, 13.30-37.
6. H.C.C., 13. 68-69.
7. *Ibid*, 13.93.
8. *Ibid*, 13.75-76.
9. H.C.C., 13.79.
10. H.C.C., 13.85.
11. एतद्वेदकवेद्यवेदनमयं दग्ध्वा पुराणां त्रयम्,
पूर्णाद्वैतहुताशनेन शमयन्मायामयोपद्रवम्॥ HCC, 13. Ia.

(Printed Matter)



2. Introduction to Jātakamālā

The Jātakmālā of Āryaśūra or Āryasūra is also called Bodhisattvāvadānamālā which title explains the nature of this work being a collection (garland) of the great and glorious acts (avadānas) of Bodhisattva.

1. Inspiring ideal of the Jātakas

It was the Bodhisattava-doctrine of the Buddhists that inspired the creation of extensive Jātaka literature. The ideal of Bodhisattva developed under the impact of Mahāyāna (or Great Vehicle). In earlier Buddhism or Hīnayāna the Bodhisattva was conceived simply as a previous incarnation of Buddha. According to this concept the Buddha, in a long series of transmigrations as a Bodhisattva, did many deeds of kindness before achieving his perfection or the Buddhahood. The early Jātaka tales illustrate that Bodhisattva can be incarnated as men or animals, but the more advanced Bodhisattavas were to be adored and prayed to for achieving one's nirvāṇa.

The concern of the Hīnayānists was for individual's perfection and his own arhathood or final extinction. He followed the example of Bodhisattva, the previous incarnation of the Buddha, to win his nirvāṇa. as quickly as possible. This concern for his own nirvāṇa and perfection was replaced by a new ideal of Bodhisattva. In Mahāyāna the Bodhisattva was conceived not as a being who was anxiously working and awaiting for becoming Buddha, but as one who would wait until even the smallest creature had won the highest Sumum bonum of his life and would work for the welfare of all for the same ideal.

The is ideal of Bodhisattva working for the freedom and good of all, and not merely striving to win his own freedom made the old ideal of arhant, who achieved nirvāṇa for his own self and would be born no more, appear as rather selfish.

Men should aim at becoming Boddhistvas, beings who have attained their own perfection and are still striving for the freedom of all, and not arhants. This was the new message of Mahāyāna.

The following declaration of Lord Kṛṣṇa. in the Bhagīvadgītā manifests the same ideal :

न मे पार्थास्ति कर्तव्यं त्रिषु लोकेषु किञ्चन।
नानवाप्तमवाप्तव्यं वर्त एव च कर्मणि॥ (Gita, III. 22.)

He inspired Ārjuna for effective participation in war for the good of others, for the lokasaṅgraha, the welfare of the world, even if Ārjuna had nothing to gain or nothing at stake.

In Tantric culture also the only duty of a guru or spiritual guide, who has attained perfect purity and realized his perfect identity with the Ultimate, is considered to be the welfare of all the worldly beings.¹

However, the ideal of Bhagvān of Gītā or of a gurū of Tantric tradition is different in one important respect from the ideal of Bodhisattva. In Brāhmanical (popularly but wrongly called Hindu) tradition, as distinguished from the Buddhistic, Bhāgavan or gurū, who is not considered different from the ultimate Śiva or Śakti, is a Perfect Being. He is the personification of the Absolute. He admits of no evolution. But the Buddhist tradition cannot, on theoretical considerations, regard Bodhisattva as perfect incarnation of the perfect absolute. The state of perfection is to evolve gradually within him. Perfection is not his inherent or constant state. But it is the very nature of the Bhagavān of Bhāgavatism. Bodhisattva strives to ascend the ideal of perfection, and once he has achieved it he works for the welfare of all others. A Bhagavān, on the other hand, descends down in the form of Kṛṣṇa or even as an animal, a boar, fish or the lion, and may choose to continue doing good to others, mainly his followers. But a Bodhisattva slowly and steadily cultivates the good nature, setting his example for others and in the process of his perfection is shown to be born as animal, bird, ordinary subject or a king. He attains the state of perfection through the anterior births which are of far lower nature. However, the concern for the freedom of all is common ideal espoused by the Mahāyāna, Bhāgavatism, Tantrism and the later Vedānta.²

The Bodhisattva is thought of in the Mahāyāna not only as a spirit of Kindness and compassion but also of suffering. We often meet the resolve of the Bodhisattva ready to take upon himself the deeds of all beings even of those in the hells, in other worlds or in the realms of punishment.

This concept of Bodhisattva as a Suffering Saviour, which closely resembles the Christian God who gives his life as a ransom for many, reminds us of the famous Sankrit Sloka:

न त्वहं कामये राज्यं न स्वर्गं ना पुनर्भवम्।
कामये दुःखतप्तानां प्राणिनामार्तिनाशनम्॥

Śibi, when strongly advised by his Minister against giving away his eye to the mendicant, repeats the same resolve of saving the suffering world and fulfil the desire of Śakra, the begger of his eyes:

नायं यत्नः सार्वभौमत्वमाप्तुं नैव स्वर्गं नापवर्गं न कीर्तिम्।
त्रातुं लोकानित्ययं त्वादरो मे याञ्चाक्लेशो मा च भूदस्य मोघः॥³

“This is no effort for attaining emperorship, nor fame, nor Heaven, nor liberation; but I am interest only in saving the people. Moreover, let not this person’s trouble of preferring the request be frustrated.”

Immeasurable charity and compassion, purity of mind and indifference to the pleasures of one’s own self are the sine quo non of such a Saviour.⁴ In his thought, word and deed he is ever inspired by friendliness, good will and benevolence.⁵ The generous hospitality of a Bodhisattva knows no limits. He would gladly offer even his body when he has nothing else to offer. Thus Bodhisattva, born as a hare, resolves:

समधिगतमिदं मयातिथेयं हृदयविमुञ्च यतो विषाददैन्यम्।
समुपनतमनेन सत्करिष्याम्यहमतिथिप्रणयं शरीरकेन॥

"I possess this means of entertaining guests. Hence, O heart, give up your wretchedness of grief. I shall satisfy the request that is made, with this little body."

The same resolve to sacrifice his body for the good of others is repeated in the Hastijātaka. Bodhisattva, born as an elephant, offers his body to the travellers, who had lost their way in the jungle, so that they may cross the ocean of misery:

करोमि तदिदं देहं बहुरोगशतालयम्।
एषां दुःखपरीतानामापदुत्तरणप्लवम्।।

Here also Bodhisattva-elephant makes it clear that he is striving for the welfare of others and that he does not care either for liberation or for the emperorship of the world or for the attainment of the bliss of heaven, etc.

नायं प्रयत्नः सुगतिं ममाप्तुं नैकातपत्रां मनुजेन्द्रलक्ष्मीं।
सुखप्रकर्षैकरसां न च द्यां ब्राह्मीं श्रियं नैव न मोक्षसौख्यम्१॥

(Hastijātaka, verse no. 21)

Thus we find that Jātakas are narrated to glorify the ideal of Bodhisattva, a being of immeasurable charity and compassion who is unconcerned with his self and is ever striving to save the world from the toils of transmigration and the sufferings of the world. It was to nourish this new ideal of Mahāyānism that the works like Jātakamālā, describing the glorious and benevolent acts of Bodhisattva, came into existence.

2. The Source Literature

The source of the Jātakamālā in Sanskrit is the extensive kindred literature in Pāli. The Pāli canon consists of three sections called piṭakas (baskets). These three are known as the Vinaya, Sutta (Sanskrit, Sūtra) and Abhidhamma. The largest and most important of the Tripiṭakas is the Sutta piṭaka. It is divided into five Nikāyas (Groups):

- (i) Dīgha (Dīrgha, i.e. Long) Nikāya, a collection of long sermons.
- (ii) Majjhima (Madhyama, i.e. Medium) Nikāya, shorter sermons.
- (iii) Saṃyutta (Saṃyukta, connected) Nikāya, brief pronouncements.
- (iv) Aṅguttara (Graduated) Nikāya.

- (v) Khuddaka (Minor) Nikāya, miscellaneous works in prose and verse. It contains fifteen works⁸ including the Dhammapada, the Theragāthā and the Therīgāthā. The Jātakas occupy the tenth place among these works.

This grouping of the Khuddaka Nikāya into fifteen works was done at a later date. Originally the Jātakas formed one of the nine types of composition of the Āgam piṭaka⁹ which was the only compilation of the First Buddhist Council. **The tales are told in full in a prose commentary attributed to Buddhaghōṣa which is invariably published with the verses. Most of the tales are secular and they do not convey a very exalted message, but they have all been given an odour of sanctity by being ascribed to Buddha, who is said to have told them as recollections of his previous birth as a Bodhisattva, a being destined to become a Buddha. These easy and vivid stories are great as literature**¹⁰ Written in simple Pāli language, which was understood by the ordinary man, the Pāli Jātakas were simple in style, as different from the ornate character of classical Sanskrit. They contained many fine passages but were largely prosaic and repetitive. This character of simplicity in style and prosaic repetition of stock phrases and descriptions is found in the Sanskrit of Jātakamālā also. Many ideas, morals and descriptions are repeated without any care for the offence to style. Thus for example, the charity and compassion are glorified, usually in the same tone and tenor, on the slightest pretext. The gift for eulogising the ethical and moral virtues, like charity, hospitality, friendliness and compassion, exists in rather uncomfortable abundance¹¹. The tale recedes to the background and gives way to the repetitive descriptions in verses. The succession of events and interest therein are sacrificed for the versification of ideas and events.

The Pāli Jātakas are 547 in number. The number does not correspond to exactly 547 tales, because some of these are repetitions in a different setting or in variant version.

The Jātakamālā consists of 34 stories. Many of these are traceable to the Pāli Jātakas and the works like Cariyapiṭaka and Apadāna.

The author of Jātakamālā may have also drawn upon the Sanskrit versions of the Vinayapiṭaka. Given below is the list of 34 Jātakas of the Jātakamālā with notes on identification of their source¹²:

1. Vyāghrijātaka. This Jātaka is not yet traced to any Pāli source. In this story a Bodhisattva is described to have given his body as food to save the life of newly born young ones of a tigress. The first trace of this Jātaka is found in Mūlāsarvāstivāda Vinaya from which Avadāna No. 32 on Divyāvādāna seems to have been taken. Kṣemendra in Avadāna-kalpalatā refers to this Jātaka in Avadāna No. 51 and also again in Avadāna No. 95. He also bodily takes two stanzas which to Prof. Vaidya appear to be from the pen of Āryaśūra. The case of the few other Jātakas, about 6 in number which are not yet traced to Pāli sources, may be similarly explained that they were the speciality of the period of transition from Hīnayāna to Mahāyāna and of Āryaśūra.
2. Śibijātaka. The story of Śibi is well-known to the Purāṇas. It is found in Pāli Jātaka no. 499 and in Cariyāpiṭka 8. Avadānakalpalatā by Kṣemendra also, in Avadāna no. 91, refers to king Śibi in a slightly different way.
3. Kulmāṣaṇḍijātaka. This corresponds to Pāli Jātaka no. 415.
4. Śreṣṭhijātaka. This corresponds to Pāli Jātaka no. 40 which appears there under the title of Kḥadiraṅgāra Jātaka.
5. Aviṣahyaśreṣṭhijātaka. This corresponds to Pāli Jātaka no. 340 where it appears under a slightly different title of Viṣahya-seṭṭhijātaka.
6. Śaśajātaka. This corresponds to Pāli Jātakas no. 316 and Cariyāpiṭaka no. 10 where its title is Sasapandita.
7. Agastyajātaka. This corresponds to Pāli Jātaka no. 480 and Cariyāpiṭak no. 1. Where it is called Akitti or Akatti.
8. Maitrībalajātaka. The Pāli source is not traced as yet.

9. Viśvantarajātaka. This is one of the most popular tales of Buddhist literature. It corresponds to Jātaka no. 547 and Cariyāpiṭaka no. 9. It also figures in Mādhyamaka Vṛtti 30.88 called Prasannapadā of Candrakṛiti and in Avadānakalpalatā no. 29. The story has been sculptured in the Relic chamber of the Mahā Thūpa in Ceylon and elsewhere.
10. Yajñajātaka. Pāli source not traced. The censure of animal sacrifice is so vehemently done in this story that much of it seems to be of late origin and speaks of the encounter between Buddhism and Brāhmaṇism.
11. Śakrajātaka. This corresponds to Pālijātaka no. 31 where its title is Kulavakajātaka.
12. Brāhmaṇajātaka. Not yet traced to Pāli sources.
13. Unmādayantījātaka. This corresponds to Pāli Jātaka no. 527.
14. Supāragajātaka. Corresponds to Jātaka no. 463.
15. Matsyajātaka. Corresponds to Jātaka no. 75 in Pāli and Cariyāpiṭaka, no. 30.
16. Vartakāpotakajātaka. Corresponds to Jātaka, no. 35 and Cariyāpiṭaka, no. 29.
17. Kumbhajātaka. Corresponds to Jātaka, no. 512 in Pāli.
18. Aputrajātaka is not yet traced to Pāli sources.
19. Bisajātaka. Corresponds to Pāli Jātaka no. 488 and Cariyāpiṭaka, no. 24. At the end of this Jātaka there is a remark that this Jātaka was composed by Bhagavan, followed by the stanzas¹³ giving the past and future identifications of the characters of the story. Such a description is invariably found in all the Pāli Jātakas but Āryaśūra does not include such a description in his Jātakas. Hence Kern has rightly regarded as spurious the portion at the end of this single Jātaka.
20. Śreṣṭhijātaka. Corresponds to Kalyāṇadhammajātaka in Pāli, no. 171.

21. Cuḍḍabodhijātaka corresponds to Pāli Jātaka, no. 443 and Cariyāpiṭaka, no. 14.
22. Hamsajātaka corresponds to Pāli Jātaka, no. 502.
23. Mahābodhijātaka corresponds to Pāli Jātaka, no. 528.
24. Mahākapijātaka corresponds to Jātaka, no. 407 in Pāli. This story is sculptured in the Bharhut Stūp.
25. Śarabhajātaka corresponds to Pāli Jātaka, no. 483.
26. Rurujātaka corresponds to Pāli Jātaka, no. 482.
27. Mahākapijātaka corresponds to Jātaka, no. 407 and Cariyāpiṭaka, no. 27 where it is called Kāpirāja.
28. Kṣāntijātaka corresponds to Pāli Khantivādi-jātaka, no. 313. The story is sculptured in Ajanta Caves wherein stanzas 4, 15, and 19 from the Jātakamālā are engraved.
29. Brahmajātaka is not yet traced to Pāli sources.
30. Hastijātaka is not yet traced to Pāli sources. This may be the original creation of the author of Jātakamālā himself.
31. Sutasomajātaka corresponds to Jātaka, no. 537 and Cariyāpiṭaka, no. 32. The story is well-known in the Purāṇas under Kalmāṣapāda and also in works like Avadānakalpalatā, 53 and 91.
32. Ayogṛhajātaka corresponds to Pāli Jātaka no. 510 and Cariyāpiṭaka, no. 23. where it is called Ayoghara.
33. Mahiṣajātaka corresponds to Pāli Jātaka no. 278 and Cariyāpiṭaka, no. 15.
34. Śatapatrajātaka. Corresponds to Pāli Jātaka, no. 308 where it is called Javasakuṇajātaka.

At the end of the 34 Jātakas, Kern has appended the Kacchapa-jātaka which he found in one of the manuscripts (P) after XVI. His opinion about this Jātakas is quoted here:

The spuriousness of this, is clear at first sight, since it is written in a totally different kind of language, something like the so-called Gāthā-dialect. The official number of the Jātakas is thirty-four according to Northern Buddhists. Buddha is known by the epithet Catuṣṭriṃśajjātakajña.¹⁴

We have indicated the relationship of the thirty-four stories of the Jātakamālā to its source literature in Pāli. Very few of the tales of Āryaśūra have their parallels in non-Buddhist Sanskrit literature, The Vartakājātaka is related to the Śāraṅgopākhyāna in Mahābhārata I. 229 (Bombay ed.), the story of Unmādayantī is repeated thrice in the Kathāsaritsāgara where the principal female character is called Unmādinī.¹⁵ The tale of Tārāvaloka in the same work¹⁶ corresponds to the Viśvantarajātaka. In Taraṅga 28 we find the outlines of the Kṣānti-jātaka.

We have discussed above the source of the Jātakamālā in Buddhist Pāli literature, mainly the Jātakas, and have also indicated in brief their relation to non-Buddhist works and their impact in far lands. The impulse for creating tales is a feature of general human nature and therefore to suggest, as Benfey did, that the existing folktales of Europe and Asia originated in India in Buddhist circles or that many of the non-Buddhistic Indian tales in the works like Pañcatantra and Hitopadeśa bear traces of Buddhistic influence, will be too naive. Dr. Hertel who has edited and translated a much earlier version of Pañcatantra, than the one available to Benfey which version had been prepared by Buddhist or Jain editors, has competently proved the Brāhmiṇical origin of the Pañcatantra.

This suggests that the tales, Buddhistic and non-Buddhistic had their independent origin and the parallelism¹⁷ do not qualify for a valid theory of dependent origin. Although Buddhism was a great source of tales, the bulk of those occurring in the Jātakas are pre-Buddhistic and merely adaptations of Indian tales. The rich Indian folklore is the real and ultimate source of the Jātaka and other Fable literature of India. And so far as the stories of the Jātakamālā are concerned it has been shown that they are traced to Pāli sources. Though the stories are old, the treatment given to them by Āryaśūra varies with the subject-matter.

The relationship of the Buddhist Jātaka tales with the non-Buddhist literature was made complicated to settle by the observations of Benfey who had concluded that the origin of the Pañcatantra, the Hitopadeśa and Vetālapañcavimśatikā was Buddhist. Franke in his article “Jātaka Mahābhārata Parallelen” in German has shown by a critical and detailed examination of a number of parallel tales and verses that neither work directly borrows from the other and both draw upon a common source. This is equally valid in reference to Pañcatantra also, three of the frame stories of which occur in the Jātaka as well as a variant of the fourth.¹⁸ A detailed comparison proves that these tales had a common source of inheritance and that neither borrowed from the other. The bulk of stories occurring in the Jātakas are pre-Buddhist in their origin, and merely adaptations of the ancient Indian tales. They sprang from the common folklore of the fabulous (punningly) India, the home of fables.

Some stories in Aesop¹⁹ (i.e. the Greek fables of various dates collected under that name) and Arabian Nights have close parallels to the Jātaka tales.²⁰ We also find definite influence of Jātaka stories in medieval and modern European literature, such as that of the robbers and the treasure in Chaucer’s Pardoner’s Tale (Pāli Jātaka, no. 48), or of the ploughshares eaten by mice (Pāli Jātaka, no. 218), and the tortoise and geese (Pāli Jātaka, no. 215) among La Fontaine’s fables To sum up the Jātakas of Āryaśūra, 28 of which are traced to Pāli sources, were largely the adaptation of Pāli Jātakas. The latter had a common source of their origin, along with works like Pañcatantra, Hitopadeśa and Vetālapañcavimśatikā in India’s fabulous folklore. The Jātaka tales have close parallels in non-Buddhist works like Mahābhārata and Kathāsaritāsāgara and in Aesop, Arabian Nights and in medieval and modern literature.

3. Characteristics of a Jātaka

A typical Jātaka, according to Prof. Rhys Davids, is one which has (1) an introductory episode, (2) the story of the past being the Jātaka proper in prose (3) the verse giving the moral in archaic language and many times appearing redundant for presenting the same facts of the

story (4) an explanation of the verse or verses and (5) identification of the actors of the past story with the present one among whom Buddha is the principal character.²¹ Prof. Davidis has further advocated that the verse or a group of verses by itself cannot be a Jātaka. Prof. Winternitz also holds the same view. **Not one, but several literary types are represented in the Jātaka collection. There are some Jātakas** he observes, **which were prose stories with one or two or a few verses containing either the moral or the gist of the tale. In these cases it is likely enough that the commentary has preserved more or less of the old prose stories. Another type of Jātakas is that of Campū, in which the story itself is related alternately in prose and verse, in which case the commentary is often an expansion of the original prose text. But there are other Jātakas which originally consisted of Gāthās only : Some of them ballads in dialogue form, others ballads in a mixture of dialogue-verses and narrative stanzas, others again epics or fragments and some even mere strings of moral maxims on some topic. In all these cases the entire prose belongs to the commentary.**²²

Among the literary types mentioned by Prof. Winternitz it will be found that the Jātakamālā follows the Campū style in which the story is introduced in prose, and verses repeat and support the description of the ideas and events contained in the prose. An analysis of the five stories included in the present selection will give an idea of other important features of the stories of Jātakamālā.

In the very beginning of each Jātaka, Āryaśūra eulogizes the moral virtue which he intends to bring home through the story. Thus, for example, the Noble Dharma in Śibhijātaka, the habit of charity in Śaśa-Jātaka, purity of intention in the Yajñajātaka, infallible character of the noble even though plunged in calamity in Harṁsajātaka and accepting suffering for the good of others in Hastijātaka, are eulogized. The beginning of a story is then introduced with stock phrase: तद्यथानुश्रूयते or **That is as it is heard traditionally.** The moral virtue eulogized in the very first line of a Jātaka, is brought home again in more words at the end of a story. Kern thought that the epilogues or concluding statements

(vide his Introduction, p. x) are spurious or later additions. This view is controverted by others who believe rightly that epilogues are intrinsically part of the story. Then follows the introductory episode that describes the birth of Bodhisattva as a king, Hare, Swan or Elephant. This introduction is immediately followed by the description of the qualities of Bodhisattva in verses. In each Jātaka, here and there we find great sayings of universal validity (vide Inde to Subhāṣitas). Another important characteristic of these Jātakas is the felicitations offered to Bodhisattva at his moral victory by siddhas, devas, nāgas. These descriptions etc. follow one uniform pattern reminding us of the similar descriptions in the Purāṇas. The heavenly deities gather all of a sudden to offer Bodhisattva their hearty felicitations and the story is close to its end. For a comparison of such verses please see the following.

- Śibijātaka, verses no. 38-43.
- Śaśajātaka, verses no. 18-21.
- Hastijātaka, verses no. 23-30.

In Haṃsajātaka the glorification and eulogy of Bodhisattva by gods, etc. is summed up in such phrases:-

गुणातिशयप्रभावविस्मितमनसः सिद्धर्षिविद्याधरदैवतगणास्तयोः
कीर्त्याश्रयाभिः कथाभिस्तत्र तत्राभिरेमिरे ²³।p. 47

Another important feature of the Jātakamālā is that in many stories it is Śakra, the Lord of gods, who appears in disguised form to test, as it were, the moral virtues of Bodhisattva. This feature is introduced to suggest the supremacy of Buddhism over Brāhmaṇism or it may be the common pattern which was followed by the Purāṇas also. In Purāṇic literature we know Śakra or Indra is not a very respected character. The hero of Ṛgveda was no longer held in the same honour by the time of Purāṇas. He is no doubt the Lord of all gods but is usually shown associated with mean display of lust, jealousy, deception and other bad traits.

The sketch of his character is not much different in Buddhist or non-Buddhist literature. It is difficult, therefore, to say that Jātaka had a deliberate scheme of looking down upon the deities of Brāhmaṇism. The

censure of animal sacrifice in the Yajñajātaka also does not prove conclusively that it was Buddhism which spearheaded the criticism of Vedic religion and philosophy. In fact, revolt against sacrificial form of religion is heard even in the Upanisads²⁴, the principal ones amongst which are decidedly pre-Buddhistic in origin and these had given up regarding karman (symbolised by sacrifice) as a means of spiritual freedom. Knowledge became means of liberations.²⁵

Another striking feature of the Jātakas is their belief in the ethical and moral supremacy of the animal world over men. Man may deceive, and he does, but animal or bird will never. In animals are shown the qualities which are difficult to find even in men. The description of the Hare in glowing words bears it out:

जातिः क्वेयं तद्विरोधि क्व चेदं त्यागौदार्यं चेतसः पाटवं च।
विस्पष्टोऽयं पुण्यमन्दादराणां प्रत्यादेशो देवतानां नृणां च॥

(Śaśajātaka, 35.)

Haṃsajātaka makes the supremacy of the animals very explicit: कृतकमधुरोपचारवचनप्रच्छन्नतीक्ष्णदौरात्म्यानि च प्रायेण पेलवघृणानि शठानि मानुषहृदयानि। पश्यतु स्वामी।

वाशितार्थस्वहृदयाः प्रायेण मृगपक्षिणा।
मनुष्याः पुनरेकीयास्तद्विपर्ययनैपुणाः॥
उच्यते नाम मधुरं स्वनुबन्धि निरत्ययम् ।
वणिजोऽपि हि कुर्वन्ति लाभसिद्ध्याशया फलम्॥ (Verses 19-20)

In Haṃsajātaka again the king of Vārāṇasī, Brahmadata by name is shown to have deceived the aquatic birds by creating an artificial lake and by getting the Bodhisattva-swan and his companion caught. Thereupon the Swan says:

विस्मृतात्यशङ्कानां सूक्ष्मैर्विश्वासनक्रमैः।
विकरोत्येव विस्रम्भः प्रमादापनयाकरः॥

In the story the companion of Bodhisattva-swan, Sumukha by name, is shown to have never left his Lord in distress. And even a hunts-

man is won over by unfailing sincerity, integrity and faithfulness of Sumukha. The huntsman praises him thus:

मानुषेष्वप्ययं धर्म आश्चर्यो दैवतेषु वा ।
स्वाम्यर्थं त्यजता प्राणान् यस्त्वयात्र प्रदर्शितः ॥

and shows how the conduct of birds far excels that of men. Thus in animal stories there is little or no evil, but when the stories deal with human beings we see cruelty, deception and evil in abundance.²⁶

Jātakas are important for reconstructing the history of India's culture and civilization. We learn much about the social, religious, economic and political situation of the age when Jātakas were written. However what interests us here is the long versifications of the theories or principles of polity. Duties of a king are, for example, listed in so many verses in the Jātakamāla. We would request the reader to refer to verses 67-70 and 97-98 of the Hamsajātaka and verses 22-24 of the Yajñajātaka to form his own idea. Given below is a verse describing the festive and happy folk in colourful costumes when a king had succeeded in his resolve to eradicate poverty from his land:

अथ विहाय जनः स दरिद्रतां सममवाप्तवसुर्वसुधाधिपात् ।
विविधचित्रपरिच्छदभूषणः प्रविततोत्सवशोभ इवाभवत् ॥

(Yajñajātaka, verse 25.)

Another tells the duties of a king in simple and effective words:

प्रजाहितं कृत्यतमं महीपतेस्तदस्य पन्था ह्युभयत्र भूतये ।
भवेच्च तद्राजनि धर्मवत्सले नृपस्य वृत्तं हि जनोऽनुवर्तते ॥

(Hamsajātaka, verse 98.)

4. Life, date and works of Āryaśūra

We know very little about the life of Āryaśūra. According to Taranath, the famous Buddhist historian, Āryaśūra readily resolved to sacrifice his life and give his body as food to save the tigress and her newly born young ones. This may perhaps account for the inspiration of Āryaśūra and his Jātakamāla. Benedictory verses here state the nature

and purpose of this work and speak of his devotion to the Buddha (Sarvajña) Dharma, and Order (Saṅgha).

श्रीमन्ति सद्गुणपरिग्रहमङ्गलानि कीर्त्यास्पदान्यनवगीतमनोहराणि ।
पूर्वप्रजन्मसु मुनेश्चरिताद्भुतानि भक्त्या स्वकाव्यकुसुमाञ्जलिनाच्यिष्ये ॥१॥

श्लाघ्यैरमीभिरभिलक्षितचिह्नभूतैरादेशितो भवति यत्सुगतत्वमार्गः ।
स्यादेवरूक्षमनसामपि च प्रसादो धर्म्याः कथाश्च रमणीयतरत्वमीयुः ॥२॥

लोकार्थमित्यभिसमीक्ष्य करिष्यतेऽयं श्रुत्यार्षयुक्त्यविगुणेन पथा प्रयत्नः ।
लोकोत्तमस्य चरितातिशयप्रदेशैःस्वं प्रातिभं गमयितुं श्रुतिवल्लभत्वम् ॥३॥

स्वार्थोद्यैतरपि परार्थचरस्य यस्य नैवान्वगम्यत गुणप्रतिपत्तिशोभा ।
सर्वज्ञ इत्यवितथाक्षरदीप्तकीर्तिं मूर्ध्ना नमे तमसमं सहधर्मसंघम् ॥४॥

The poesy of Āryaśūra is the precursor of classical, chaste and ornate Sanskrit. The poet is indebted to Aśvaghōṣ and Kumāralāta (author of Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā). Some of his verses and phrases²⁷ seem echoed in Kālidāsa. The image of moving cluster of lotuses can be compared with moving dīpaśikhā or better with moving creeper (Sañcārīṇī pallaviṇī lateva). Description of the king of Yajñajātaka as a seer²⁸ (muni) reminds us of cognate description of Duṣyanta. Fondness for the uses of Upamā, the alankāras based on similitude, and Arthāntaranyāsa (vide Subhāṣitas) is common to both the poets. What strikes us most is the very poetic description of nature in the Jātakamāla Āryaśūra. The description of the lake in Hamsajātaka (verses 2-3, 8-16) is particularly striking for its beauty of imagery. The descriptions in prose (pp. 51-52) are equally elegant and indicate the future of Sanskrit prose. Āryaśūra is justly famous for his chaste Sanskrit. Abhinanda says:

सुबन्धौ भक्तिर्नः क इह रघुकारे न रमते धृतिर्दाक्षीपुत्रे हरति हरिचन्द्रोऽपि हृदयम् ।
विशुद्धोक्तौ शूरः प्रकृतिसुभगा भारविगिरि; तथाप्यन्तर्मोदं कमपि भवभूतिर्वितनुते ॥

(Subhāṣataratnakoṣa, 1968; Saduktikarṇāmṛta, V, 26.5)

The Jātakamāla had two commentaries; one by a Dharmakirti and the other by an unknown author. Its Chinese translation, containing 14 stories only, was done some time during 960-1127. A.D. The influence

of Kumārlāta on the Jātakamālā makes it evident that the latter cannot be much older than the beginning of the 4th century A.D. and as one of the works of Āryaśūra was translated into Chinese in 434 A.D. he cannot be placed later than 400 A.D. Prof. P.L. Vaidya assigns the author of Jātakamālā to 350-400 A.D. It has already been mentioned that some of the stories and verses from Jātakamālā were sculptured in Ajantā caves, which fact testifies to its popularity by the 6th century A.D.

Āryaśūra is credited to have written the following works:

1. Pāramitāsamāsa tr. by A. Ferrari, published in Annali Lateranese, Vol. X., Citta Lal Vaticano, 1946. It consists of six Samāsas or chapters, namely Dānapāramitā, Śīlapāramitā, Kṣāntipāramitā, Vīryapāramitā, Dhyānapāramitā and Prajñāpāramitā and has 364 verses. It advocates the same ideal of ethical and spiritual perfection which is the aim of Jātakamālā.
2. Prātimokṣasūtrapaddhati. It is available only in Tibetan translation. Vide Tohoku Catalogue, no. 4103.
3. Bodhisattvajātakadharmagaṇḍī. This work also is available only in Tibetan translation. Vide Tohoku Catalogue, no. 4157.
4. Supaṭhanirdeśaparīkathā. This again is known from Tibetan translation. Vide Ibid, no. 4175.
5. Subhāṣitaratanakaraṇḍaka-kathā is published for the first time in Appendix IV of Buddhist Sanskrit Texts- no. 21, and edited by Dr. A.C. Banerjee. His opinion on the problem of authorship of this work is quoted below:

Considering the elegance of style of the Jātakamālā, the question naturally arises in one's mind whether the author of the present text is identical with that of the Jātakamālā. We know that there were two distinguished Nāgarjunas. One was the promulgator of the Mādhyamika system of thought and the other was a great Tāntric teacher. The two Nāgarjunas lived about four hundred years apart but they have been carelessly mingled together in Tibetan

traditions. Similar may be the case with our poet Āryaśūra. There were very likely two individuals of the name of Āryaśūra. One was the author of Jātakamālā and the other was that of Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍaka-Kathā. In Tibetan accounts the two have probably been mistaken as one person.²⁹

It would thus seem that the fame of Āryaśūra as poet rests mainly on the Jātakamālā which, in fact, qualifies to be the immortal monument of his glory.

References

1. स्वं कर्तव्यं किमपि कलयल्लोक एष प्रयत्नात्त्रो पारक्यं प्रतिघटयते काञ्चन स्वात्मवृत्तिम्। यस्तु ध्वस्तारिवलभवमलो भैरवीभावपूर्णः कृत्यं तस्य स्फुरतरमिदं लोककर्तव्यमात्रम्।।
2. Some of the later Vedāntists, like Appayya Dikṣita, say that liberation is truly possible only when all are liberated.
3. Śībijātaka, verse no. 28.
4. Cf. अहो बतौदार्यमहो कृपालुता विशुद्धता पश्य यथास्य चेतसः। अहो स्वसौख्येषु निरुत्सुका मतिः नमोस्तु तेऽभ्युद्गतधैर्यविक्रमः।।
Ibid, verse no. 42.
5. Cf. तस्य मैत्र्यवदातेन मनोवाक्कायकर्मणा। Śāśajātaka, verse no. 3.
6. Ibid, verse no. 17.
7. Cf. Śībijātaka, verse no. 28.
8. These are: 1. Khuddakapāṭha, 2. Dhammapada, 3. Udāna, 4. Itivuttaka, 5. Suttanipāta, 6. Vimānavatthu, 7. Petavatthu, 8. Theragāthā, 9. Therīgāthā 10. Jātaka, 11. Niddesa, 12. Paṭisambhidā, 13. Apadāna 14. Buddavaṃsa, 15. Cariyāpiṭaka.
9. The division of the Pāli canon into the three piṭakas was done in the Third Buddhist Council. Prior to that it was divided, in the Second Buddhist Council, into Sutta and Vinaya only. The First Council constituted the Pāli canon in the shape of Āgampīṭaka only. The nine types of the composition of this original Āgampīṭaka were: 1.Sutta, 2.Geyya, 3.Veyyākaraṇa, 4.Gāthā, 5.Udāna, 6.Itivuttaka, 7. Jātaka, 8. Abbhuta and 9. Vedalla.
10. A.L. Basham. The Wonder that was India, p. 267.

11. Vide Index to Subhāṣitas.
12. This note is largely based on P.L. Vaidya's Critical Notes in his edition of the *Jātakamālā*.
13. अहं शारद्वतीपुत्रो मौद्गल्यायनकाश्यपौ।
पूर्णातिरुद्धावानन्द इत्यासुभ्रातरस्तदा।।
भगिन्युत्पलावर्णासीद्दासी कुब्जोत्तराभवत्।
चित्रो गृहपतिर्दासो यक्षः सातागिरिस्तदा।।
पारिलेयोऽभवन्नागो मधुदातैव वानरः।
कालोदायी च शक्रोऽभूद्भार्यतामिति जातकम्।।
14. Hemacandra in his *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* uses the above epithet for the Buddha and explains the same as follows: चतुस्त्रिंशतं जातकं व्याघ्रीप्रभृतीनि जानाति चतुस्त्रिंशज्जातकज्ञः।
15. S. Taraṅga, 15.
16. Taraṅga, 113, 17-95.
17. Bhadanta Ānanda Kausalyāyana, in his Introduction (p. 24) to the Hindi translation of the Pāli Jātakas (Vol. I), has noted the following parallels of the verses of the Jātakas and the Rāmāyaṇ of Vālmiki:
- (i) फलानं इव पक्कानं निच्चं पपतना भयम्।
एवं जातानं मच्चारं निच्चं मरणतो भयम्।। *Dasaratha Jātaka*, 5
- Cf. यथा फलानां पक्वानां नान्यत्र पतनाद्भयम्।
एवं नराणां जातानां नान्यत्र मरणाद्भयम्।। *Rāmāyaṇ*
- (ii) एको व मच्चो अच्चेति, एको व जायते कुले। *Dasaratha Jātaka*, 10
- Cf. यदेको जायते जन्तुरेक एव विनश्यति। *Rāmāyaṇ*
- (iii) दसवस्स सहस्सानि सट्ठि वस्स सतानि च।
कम्बुग्रीवो महाबाहु रामो रज्जं अकारयि।। *Dasaratha Jātaka*, 13
- Cf. दशवर्षसहस्राणि दश वर्षशतानि च।
वीतशोकभयक्रोधो रामो राज्यमकारयत्।। *Rāmāyaṇ*
- In the absence of a critical edition of the Rāmāyaṇa it is difficult to pronounce any opinion on such parallels. The following verse where Buddha's name occurs in the Rāmāyaṇ has been shown to be spurious interpolation:

यथा हि चोरः स तथा हि बुद्धस्तथागतं नास्तिकमत्र विद्धि।
तस्माद्भि यः शङ्क्यतमः प्रजानां न नास्तिकेनाभिमुखो बुधः स्यात्।।

Ayodhyākāṇḍa, II, 19.34.

And the case of the former three verses, quoted here, may not be different.

18. Vide, *Pāli Jātaka* nos. 141, 206, 208, 349.
19. Mr. Jacobs quotes *Jātakas* 30, 32, 34 (with 45), 136, 143, 146, 189, 215, 295, 308, 375, 383, 426 for parallelisms with such fables as The Ass in the Lion's Skin, The Wolf and the Lamb and the Fox and the Crow.
20. Indebtedness of Aesop to the Jātakas or to Indian fables is open to question. Benfey believed in the Greek origin of Indian fables. Rawlinson, who holds the view of Indian origin of Aesop, points out "that the migration of fables was originally from East to West and not vice versa, is shown by the fact that the animals and birds who play the leading parts, the lion, the jackal, the elephant and the peacock are mostly Indian ones. In the European versions the jackal becomes the fox: the relation between the lion and the jackal is a natural one, whereas that between the lion and the fox is not". - quoted in *The Wisdom of India*, p. 361.
21. It will be noticed that the above-mentioned characteristics of Pāli Jātaka are equally valid in the case of Jātakas by Āryaśūra. We do not, however, find the last part so elaborately (it is some times even absent) as it was found in the Pāli.
22. M. Winternitz, *Jātaka Gāthās and Jātaka Commentary*, *Indian Historical quarterly*, Vol. IV. No. 1. 1928.
23. Cf. p. 46 तत्प्रत्यक्षिणां देवनागयक्षविद्याधरतपस्विनां परं विस्मयमुपजहत्तुः।
24. (i) प्लवा ह्येते अदृढा यज्ञरूपा अष्टादशोक्तमवरं येषु कर्म।
एतच्छ्रेयो येऽभिनन्दन्ति मूढा जरामृत्युं पुनरेवापियन्ति।।
Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, I. 2.7.
- (ii) इष्टापूर्तं मन्यमाना वरिष्ठं नान्यच्छ्रेयो वेदयन्ते प्रमूढाः।
नाकस्य पृष्ठे ते सुकृतेऽनुभूत्वेमं लोकं हीनतरं विशन्ति।। *Ibid*, I.2.10.
- (iii) एतद्भस्म वै तद्विद्वांस आहुर्ऋषयः कावषेयाः किमर्था वयमध्येष्यामहे किमर्था वयं यक्ष्यामहे? *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*.
- (iv) तद्यथेह कर्मजितो लोकः क्षीयत एवमेवामुत्र पुण्यजितो लोकः क्षीयते।
Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VIII.1.6.

- The **Bhagavadgītā** also declared: एवं त्रयीधर्ममनुप्रपन्ना गतागतं कामकामा लभन्ते। IX.21.
25. (i) य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति। **Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad**, IV. 4.23.
(ii) तरति शोकमात्मवित्। **Chāndogya Upaniṣad**, . VII. 1.3
(iii) निचाय्य तन्मृत्युमुखात्प्रमुच्यते। **Kāthopaniṣad**, I.3.15.
(iv) स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति। **Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad**, III.2.9.
(v) तत्र को मोहः कः शोकः एकत्वमनुश्रयतः। **Īśā**, 7.
(vi) विद्ययामृतमश्नुते। **Ibid**,11.
26. Accusation of Śakuntalā by Duṣyanta, in words with double entendre implying the animal world also, is noted here along with censure of the king by Śakuntalā.
- (i) प्रागन्तरिक्षगमनात्स्वमपत्यजातमन्वैर्द्विजैः परभृताः खलु पोषयन्ति॥
Menakā, before leaving for heaven had left the care of Śakuntalā to another dvija i.e. Kaṇva.
- (ii) आजन्मनः शाठ्यमशिक्षितो यः तस्याप्रमाणं वचनं जनस्य।
परातिसन्धानमधीयते यैर्विद्येति ते सन्तु किलाप्तवाचः॥
27. कलनूपुरनादेन हंसयूथेन तेन तत्।
पुण्डरीकवनेनेव रेजे सञ्चारिणा सरः॥
28. नाथः पुथिव्याः स जितेन्द्रियारिर्भुक्तावगीतेषु फलेष्वसक्तः।
प्रजाहितेष्वहितसर्वभावो धर्मेककार्यो मुनिवद्बभूव॥ **Yajñajātaka**, verse 1.
29. A.C. Banerjee's Preface to his ed. p. 278.

(The **Jātakamālā** of **Āryaśūra** : A Selection, Introduction, MLBD,
Delhi, 1966)



3. Buddhist Mysticism

There are conflicting opinions about the nature of Buddhist mysticism. This is mainly due to the possibility of different interpretations of metaphysical postulates involved in the doctrines of anattā and sūnyatā. Buddhism itself is not a single system. It admits of all facets of philosophical thought : Realism, Idealism and Absolutism. Then there is

a pathetic anxiety to give metaphysical labels to an experience which defies all such labels and all the categories of intellection. The inherent imperfection of our linguistic tool does not permit us to go beyond the terms of 'no' and 'yes'. No wonder, therefore, the nirvāṇic experience is spoken of and interpreted as annihilation or as bliss. Our notions about religion that it cannot be conceived without a God and Soul and some natural relationship between them add to our problem of understanding the nature of Buddhist mysticism. India's characteristic and much talked about spirituality based on the recognition of supremacy of spirit over matter seems to be offended when the permanence of and privileged place to spirit is denied. Thus the difficulties created by the established concepts of religion and philosophy, and imperfections of language are great hurdles. Buddha kept silence on many of the issues with which philosophy and religion had traditionally concerned themselves. I would also prefer silence. This choice may be allowed so that I may not be tempted to add to the confused noise. An exercise of such a choice here means restricting oneself, so far as possible, to a practical (as distinguished from speculative) analysis of experience that the Buddha had and his conservative (Hīnayānist)¹ compassionate and catholic (Mahāyānist) and erotic and asoteric following (Tāntrika) preached and practiced; that means taking experience as forming a concrete way of life and not as leading to a way of thought. If this be granted i.e. if mysticism be understood as living and leading others to live a life of new experience (nirvāṇa in the case of Buddhism) that gives freedom from suffering, then ineffability would be considered the mark of expression but not a characteristic experience, leading to a lasting experience and passively will have to choose a different meaning for itself when serene contemplation is object of denotation. The so-called characteristics of mystical experience, namely, ineffability, transiency and passivity are not valid characteristics for nirvāṇic experience. Once a Gautama becomes the Buddha, the Enlightened, he is Buddha for ever leading others thereafter to the same goal. Buddha is to know and to wake up. Buddhahood is thus knowledge and awakening. It is enlightenment, experience. And that is nirvāṇa. Dhammapada describes this experience of Buddha in the following hymn of victory which echoes the immediate reaction of Buddha to his experience :

**Looking for the maker of this tabernacle
I ran to no avail.
Through a round of many births;
And wearisome is birth again and again.
But now, maker of the tabernacle, thou hast been seen;
Thou shalt not rear this tabernacle again.
All thy rafters are broken;
Thy ridge-pole is shattered;
The mind approaching the Eternal,²
Has attained to the extinction of all desires.³**

This symbolised expression of experience underlines (i) weariness of existence through the symbol of repeated births (ii) seeing of the gahakāraka, i.e. the 'ego' that binds us to a life of suffering, and (iii) freedom or sense of release symbolised by a mind free from all conditions or impressions or compounds. (Pot has been emptied of all its compounds, contents). This is then suchness (tathatā), egolessness (anattā) and sūnyatā. But all this sounds merely negative. A positive and more dynamic expression of experience is recorded in the Vinaya and the Majjhima Nikāya which runs as follows:⁴

**I have conquered and I know all,
I am enlightened quite by himself and have none as teacher.
There is no one that is the same as I in the whole world
Where there are many deities.
I am the one who is really worth,
I am the most supreme teacher.
I am the only one who is fully enlightened.
I am tranquilized.
I am now in Nirvāṇa.⁵**

This records the conquest of all knowledge whereby the conquerer⁶ becomes enlightened, an absolute 'I', worthy, and tranquil. He is now Eckhart's man of freedom, who clings to nothing and to whom nothing clings.⁷

For this conquest of enlightenment Buddha revealed the four Noble Truths and prescribed the Eightfold path as a part of last Truth; all in a meaningful order of succession. These truths are on the (i) existence of suffering, (ii) cause of suffering, (iii) ending of suffering, and (iv) the path leading to the end. Majjhima Nikāya, 141 describes these as follows:

1. What then is the Noble Truth of ill? Birth is ill, decay is ill, Sickness is ill. Death is ill. To be conjoined with what one dislikes means suffering. To be disjoined from what one likes means suffering. Not to get what one wants also that means suffering. In short, all grasping at (any of) the five skandha-s (involves) suffering.
2. What then is the Noble Truth of the origination of ill? It is that craving (taṇhā) which leads to rebirth, accompanied by delight, now here, now there, i.e. craving for sensuous experience, craving to perpetuate oneself, craving for extinction.
3. What then is the Noble Truth of the stopping of ill? It is the complete stopping of that craving, the withdrawal from it, the renouncing of it, throwing it back, liberation from it, non-attachment to it.
4. What then is the Noble Truth of the Steps which lead to the stopping of ill? It is this Noble Eightfold Path which consists of (i) right seeing (Sammādasana) (ii) right knowing (sammāsankappa) (iii) right speech, (iv) right conduct, (v) right life, (vi) right action, (vii) right thought, (viii) right concentration.

Buddhist mysticism starts with the recognition of suffering, it finds taṇhā (tṛṣṇā in Sanskrit) as the cause of origination of suffering, it holds the hope of rooting out the cause of suffering and finally prescribes the ways of overcoming it. Dhammapada declares :⁸

He who overcomes this contemptible thirst, sufferings fall off from him like water drops from a lotus-leaf.

It would be pertinent here to remark that the first item of the Noble Eight-fold Path is Sammādasana, right seeing. The right knowledge follows it, which in its turn, controls speech, conduct, life,

actions and thought. This control leads to concentration. The basis of Buddhist mysticism is 'seeing' or 'experiencing' things as they really are. This was later on explained as anattā (egolessness), (tathatā) suchness and sūnyatā (vacuity, zeroness). From this proceeded the notion of a world of particulars. All this would debar any description of Buddhist mysticism either as Soul-mysticism,⁹ or as pantheistic kind of God-mysticism. Buddhism admits no soul, no God. Realisation of self or return to God is not its ideal. Hence it would be inapt to give Buddhist mysticism labels such as mentioned above. But as proposed at the outset I would not like to go in my analysis beyond the periphery of purely religious or philosophical speculations. It is safer to remain at the coast when so many others are busy measuring the metaphysical depth of the Buddhism. At the end of enunciation of Four Noble truths Tathāgata warns the followers of his path to avoid two extremes. He says:

There are two extremes, brothers, which must be avoided by one who is striving towards liberation. The one, the desire to gratify passions and the desire for the joys of the senses which is low, vile, degrading and pernicious and is the path of the children of the world; the other that of violent mortification which is sad, painful, and useless. The intermediary path alone, which the Buddha found, avoids these two extremes, opens the eyes, enlightens the mind and leads to peace, wisdom, light, nirvāṇa¹⁰

However, Buddhism, as it is generally understood to have emerged in the first phase of the Hīnayāna and the last phase of the Tāntricism, seems not to have scrupulously adhered to the golden rule of avoiding the two extremes. The Hīnayānist appears to have taken to the rigorous asceticism for his own perfection and the Tāntrika seems to adore the path of gratification of passions and the enjoyment of senses. Both are the Buddhists and yet standing apparently on the two extremes which the Buddha had enjoined upon all to avoid. A simple and somewhat naive way to get out of this difficulty is to explain away Hīnayānism as a somewhat unfaithful representative of Buddha's teachings¹¹ and to discredit Tāntricism with stock belief that it is corrupt form and

degeneration of pure Buddhism. A similar difficulty (in the area of metaphysics) of undertaking Buddhist mysticism without firm belief in a permanent Soul and God leads to the transformation of views in a modern exponent like Mrs. Rhys Davids¹² who changed her earlier interpretation so as to admit the possibility of Soul and God and the positive state of bliss in nirvāṇa. Some others, such as Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, find it safer to use from the very beginning the magical wand of Upaniṣdic ideas and thus pave the way for others to confound the Buddhist mysticism with Vedantism.¹³ However, there are some scholars, like Prof. T.R.V. Murti, who have boldly asserted the central doctrine of Buddhism being fundamentally different from the Brāhmanical (Hinduism as a common denominator has led to many confusions about the different point of views which Indianism has upheld) doctrine of soul. But presently we are more concerned with the mystical experience than with its various metaphysical labels. It is necessary to restrict the scope of mysticism to a trans-philosophical and trans-psychological as also trans-moral analysis of experience. Metaphysical interpretations vary from school to school and also within the same school, psychology has not so far reached a stage beyond the ego,¹⁴ and morality is bound with shifting stands of social whims. The salvation is aimed at by all sorts of system, such as, by pluralistic realism of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, dualistic idealism of the Sāṃkhya-yoga, monistic absolutism of Śāṅkara, qualified monism of Rāmānuja, and by the 'inconceivable difference-non-difference' (acintyabhedābheda) of the Chaitanya School, and so on. Śaivism and Buddhism, through their different schools, admit of realism, absolutism, monism, dualism and pluralism. The Kaivalya-experience of the Sāṃkhya, Apavarga experience of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika, Mokṣa-experience of the Śāṅkara Vedānta, Sālokya, Sāyujya, Sāmīpya and Sārūpya varieties of the Vaiṣṇavism and nirvāṇic experience of Buddhism do not give warranty for any one particular type of philosophical description. This becomes evident when we realise the contradiction contained in the concept of salvation and the philosophical notion of a system. Take for example Sāṃkhya and the Nyāya Vaiśeṣika systems. According to well-known philosophical position of the Sāṃkhya, there are two ultimate principles,

Puruṣa and Prakṛitī, but the mystical experience of kaivalya is final separation of Puruṣa from Prakṛitī.¹⁵ In experience the second ultimate should not figure. The Prakṛitī must disappear immediately when she is seen. Philosophically the ultimates are two and this is supported by the Vivekakhyāti (Discrimination), but the salvation is an experience of being only one. The Nyāya-vaiśeṣika philosophy admits seven ultimate categories, namely, Dravya (substance), Guṇa (quality), karman (Action), Sāmānya (Universal), Viśeṣa (Final differentia), Samavāya (Inherence) and Abhāva (Non-existence). Ātman (Soul), according to this system, is a dravya, a substratum of consciousness- a quality arising in it under certain conditions. Realisation of the self, which is its goal of mystical experience, is a state when soul is in its true nature. The soul is a substance and the true nature of it can be being without quality (or a number of qualities). The Philosophical foundation of pluralistic realism must vanish in the mystical experience of the apavarga or Salvation. Apavarga-experience, thus does not found or sustain the philosophical system of either dualism of Sāṃkhya or realism of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Mysticism does not establish any particular school of philosophy. Mystical experience is the common goal of all the philosophical systems of India. It is the common (or rather universal) aim, not because it gives credence to a particular shade of philosophical opinion but because it may admit all schools and transcend them all. It would be unwise, therefore, to insist on holding one particular philosophical explanation of mysticism in general and more particularly Buddhist and Śaiva mysticism which have, in fact, admitted a variety of followers, realist, idealist, absolutist, in their fold. Philosophical interpretations of Four Noble Truths being a doubtful guide or at best being of equally good value let me prefer the scope of this article to methods of attaining the Enlightenment-experience by the ideal men of the Hīnayāna, Mahāyāna and Tāntrism.

The Noble Eightfold Path explained earlier forms the part and parcel of the last among the Four Noble Truths, indicating thereby the inseparability of Truth and the Path leading to it. If this inseparability is not adhered to, we will be cruelly defeated in our defence of mysticism against induced or artificial experiences and the variegated forms of

psychism, such as clairvoyance, psychometry and the like. The concept of ideal men of Hindu mysticism, such as Arhant in Hīnayāna, Bodhisattva in Mahāyāna, Arhat in Jainism, Sthitaprajña in the Bhagavadgītā, gurū (spiritual teacher) in Śaivism, esoteric Buddhism and Śāktism, Bhagavān in the Bhāgavat cult, and the doctrine of Jivanmukti (liberation while alive) will have no value and universal validity if mysticism be understood as a way of thought as opposed to a life of 'new' experience. Mysticism be understood as a way of thought as opposed to a life of 'new' experience. Mysticism ought to concern itself with a way of thought. This will establish its independence from philosophy as also from artificial life created by drinks of various sorts.¹⁶ Difference of philosophical opinion or its interpretation is not material for mysticism. A mystic may hold any opinion or none. The crucial point will be whether he has pursued relentlessly the spiritual path and attained a life of awakening, of larger awareness, of cosmic consciousness. The 'new' life is then the natural life of the mystic. Artificial life created by the hypnotic devices or by any kind of psychism can never produce a Buddha or a Mahāvīra.

The Fourth Truth which is actually the Truth of the Way is generally summed up and elaborated in terms of the triad, Śīla (Moral and ethical Discipline), Samādhi (contemplation) and Prajñā (wisdom). This moral discipline is commonly accepted by all the schools of Buddhism of all countries. The Śīla has ten items and is spoken of Daśa-Śīla. These forbid, (1) killing of any being (pānātipāta); (2) taking what is not given (adinnadānā); (3) indulgence in sexual desires, (4) misconduct, (5) telling lies (musāvāda), (6) Slander (pisunavācā); (7) frivolous and senseless talk (samphappalāpa); (8) covetousness (abhiḥjhā), (9) malevolence (byāpāda) and (10) wrong views (micchādiṭṭhi). The first four of these ten Śīla-s, together with the abstinence from any state of indolence arising from the use of intoxicants (surā-meraya-majjapaṃā-daṭṭhānā-vermaṇi), constitute what is known as 'pañcaśīla' which is the minimal moral requirements¹⁷ of Buddhism. Moreover, all Buddhists take the three Refuges in the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṅgha. The monastic rules were minutely elaborated. The Theravāda prescribed 227 rules and the

Mahāyāna 250 rules.¹⁸ The first path of Śīla is the fundamental basis to enter the second path of meditation. That the moral discipline is indispensable for the practice of meditation can be referred to from what are known as the four kinds of Paṛisuddhi-śīla (morality of purification), namely, the Pātimokkha saṃvara-śīla (restraint with regard to the the monastic obligations), Indriya-saṃvara-śīla (restraint of the senses), ājiva-paṛisuddhi-śīla (purity of mean of livelihood) and paccayasannissita-śīla (morality in respect of the four monastic requisites). The rules of Vinaya are with slight difference in detail, common to all the schools and emphasise the ethical perfection as the invariable pre-requisite for embarking upon the spiritual journey to the path of meditation or Samādhi. The traditional definition of Samādhi is 'cita's ekāggatā or one-pointedness of the mind.

Literally it means 'firm fixation' and can admit of a wide and diffuse connotation and is generally used in the sense of concentration of mind on a single object. Buddha has described it as follows in its sense of mindfulness and self-possession:

"And how, O king is a monk endowed with mindfulness and self-possession? In this case a monk is self-possessed in advancing, in with-drawing, in looking forward or looking around, in bendeing, or stretching his limbs, in wearing his inner and outer robes and bowl, in eating, drinking, masticating and tasting; in answering the calls of nature, in walking, standing, sitting, sleeping, waking, speaking, keeping silence. Thus, O king, is a monk endowed with mindfulness and self-possession."¹⁹

Buddhaghōṣa, in the II Ch. of his work, Visuddhimagga, has given a very lucid and extensive information about the practice of meditation. He has collated from the Pāli texts forty supports or divisions of meditation, under the term kammatthāna which comprises the ten devices (kasina), the ten Recollections (anusatti), the four sublimate abodes (brahma-vihāra-s), the four formless spheres (arupāyatana), perception of the loathsomeness of food and analysis of the four elements. The time and space at my disposal will not permit me to give any description of these. These, however, are essentially the elaborations of the four dhyānas described by the Buddha.²⁰ The first dhyāna emphasises reasoning,

investigation, joy and concentration. In this the mystic "suffuses, pervades, fills and permeates his body with the pleasure (sukha) and joy (pīti) arising from seclusion, and there is nothing in all his body untouched by the pleasure and joy arising from seclusion." In the second dhyāna there are "joy and pleasure arising from concentration and freedom from reasoning and investigation." In the third the mystic experiences the pleasure that the noble ones call "dwelling with equanimity, mindful and happy." The fourth dhyāna is "without pain and pleasure and with the purity of equanimity, mindfulness." Some other texts by reckoning the cessation of reason and cessation of investigation give a scheme of five dhyāna-s instead of four. The Jhāna in Prakrit is dhyāna is Sanskrit, Dzyan in Tibet, Ch'an in Chinese and Zen in Japan. It corresponds to the 'Via Mystics' of Christianity. It begins with the discipline of mind, body and senses and can be paralleled with 'Via purgativa'. The fourth dhyāna, in which, as J. Evola has remarked,²¹ the body is not only pervaded but also covered by the new force, leads to states of development of liberating insight or the wisdom begins and the transcendental path (lokottara-magga) begins to bloom. It is thus 'Via Illuminativa' of Christianity.

Beyond the paths of ethical perfection (śīla) and meditation (samādhi) there is the Path of Prajñā or Wisdom. It is through this wisdom that a Buddhist mystic realises the impermanence of all composite things (Saṅkhāra), that all composite things are sorrowful and that all things are egoless. And it is this realisation which leads to the disconcert from suffering.²² It is through Wisdom as D.T. Suzuki has explained, that the doctrine of non-ego, impermanence of things and a spirit of detachment are obtained.²³ The wonder that Prajñā performs lies beyond the domain of psychology. It catches the ego, "not from outside but from within"; catches the actor in the midst of his action, he is not made to stop acting in order to be seen as actor. The actor is the acting, and the acting is the actor and of this unification or identification Prajñā is awakened (p. 40), Prajñā institution is the same as Eichart's love "with which he (God) loves himself." In it opens the Prajñā-eye which can see the world beyond the reach of psychology.

1. Hīnayān Mystic and the Ideal of Arhant

Śīla, Samādhi and Prajñā are thus the Pathways to Nirvāṇa. The last has been held as the path par excellence. The Hīnayāna mystic passes through four stages. These are:

- (i) The stage of the Satāpanna or one who has entered the stream.
- (ii) The stage of the Sakṛdāgāmin or of one who will return only once to this world.
- (iii) The stage of Anāgāmin or of one who will not be reborn in the world.
- (iv) The stage of the Arhant who is completely free from error, free from delusion and ignorance.

The Buddhists texts speak of the stage of Asekha i.e. a stage which lies beyond teaching and may perhaps be regarded a stage beyond that of the Arhant, but the transition from the later to the former is natural. After the mahāparinirvāṇa of the Buddha a number of Buddhist communities came into existence, which differed in their understanding and interpretation of Buddha's teachings. Different versions of scriptures followed. Sāriputrā's version of Law, which was followed by the Theravādins and Sarvāstivādins was one of them. It held Prajñā to be the highest of the five cardinal virtues, which are Faith, Vigour, Mindfulness, Meditation and Wisdom. According to this school of Sāriputra, which was later called Hīnayāna, Wisdom can assure final salvation. Wisdom is used here in a special sense. It is a "kind of methodical contemplation based on the rules of the Abhidharma" (D'onza). It was to pursue this path of Prajñā that the old school of Buddhism dedicated itself. The final goal was to attain Arhanthood which is thus described in the Dhammapada.²⁴

"To him who has finished the path and passed beyond sorrow, who has freed himself on all sides, and thrown away every fetter, there is no more fever of grief". "For such there are no more births. Tranquil is the mind, tranquil the words and deeds of him who is thus tranquilised and made free by wisdom." They, having obtained 'the fruit of the fourth path' and immersed themselves, have received without price and are in the enjoyment of Nirvāṇa."

The above description of Arhant brings out two important characteristics of Nirvāṇa-experience: (1) The cessation of suffering through freedom from fetters and (2) The tranquility of mind. Nirvāṇa is extinction only in so far as it relates to the extinction of hoarded desires, extinction of the law of Karman, and the extinction of phenomenal existence.

Negative moment generates the freedom and leads to experience of perfect peace, bliss and perfect knowledge. The idea of Jīvanmukti and Videhamukti is also to be found in the distinction between nibbāna and parinibbāna.

"When a Buddhist has become an Arhant, when he reached nirvāṇa, the fruit of the fourth path, he has extinguished upādāna and kleśa (error) but he is still alive." It is the same as the state of Jīvanmukta.

When upādi, the skandha-s, the body with all its power passes away, "There will then be nothing left to bring about the rise of a new set of Skandha-s of a new individual and the Arhant will be no longer alive or existent in any sense at all, he will have reached parinibbāna, complete extinction or nirupādiśeṣa nibbānadhātu extinction not only of Taṇhā and of the fires of passion but also of the Upādi and the five skandha-s."²⁵

The Avadāna Śataka²⁶ brings out the freedom from suffering through struggle and strain and attainment of super-knowledge and powers of an Arhant in a fuller description of an Arhant:

"He exerted himself, he strove and struggled and thus he realised that this circle of 'Birth and death, with its five constituents (Skandha-s) is in constant flux. He rejected all the conditions of existence which are brought about by a compound of conditions since it is their nature to decay and crumble away, to change and to be destroyed. He abandoned all the defilement and won Arhantship. On becoming an Arhant he lost all this attachment with the 'Tripleworld' (i.e. the world of sense, desire, the world of form, the formless world). Gold and clod of earth were to his mind the same. He remained cool (in danger) like the fragrant sandalwood to the axe which cuts it down. By his Gnosis he had torn the

‘eggshell’ of ignorance. He had obtained Gnosis the super knowledge and the ‘powers of analytical Insight’. He became averse to worldly gains and he became worthy of being honoured, saluted and revered by the Devas, including Indra, Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa.”

2. Mahāyāna Mystic and the Ideal Bodhisattva

The two words which occur almost on each page of the Mahāyāna literature are the words Bodhisattva and Śūnyatā. Literally Bodhisattva means an enlightenment-being. Early Buddhists, particularly the Sarvāstivādins, also conceived the idea of Bodhisattva. Abhidharmakośa²⁷ has given a fine description of him. He was conceived to be a previous incarnation of the Buddha who took good of others as his own. However, it is only in Mahāyāna (also known as Bodhisattavayāna) that the conception of Bodhisattva becomes valid ideal of the Buddhists. The concern of the Hīnayānists was for individual’s perfection and his own Arhanthood. He followed the example of Bodhisattva, the previous incarnation of the Buddha, to win his own nirvāṇa as quickly as possible. The concern for the individual’s nirvāṇa was replaced by a new ideal of Bodhisattva, conceived not as a being anxiously working and awaiting for becoming Buddha, but as one who would wait until even the smallest creature had won the Summum bonnum of his life and would work for the welfare of all for the same ideal.

The ideal of Bodhisattva working for the freedom and good of all, and not merely striving to gain his own freedom, made the old ideal of Arhant, who achieved nirvāṇa for his own self and would be born no more, appear as rather selfish. A passage from the Prajñāpāramitā brings out this difference in the two ideals:

“How do the person belonging to the Vehicle of the Disciples and Pratyekabuddha train themselves ? They think, one single self we will tame, one single self we fill pacify, one single self we will land into nirvāṇa. Then they undertake exercises which bring about wholesome roots for the sake of taming themselves, pacifying themselves, nirvāṇising themselves; certainly, the Bodhisattva should not train himself like that. He should undertake exercises for bringing

about roots wholesome with idea; Myself I will place in suchness and for the sake of helping all the world I will also place all beings in suchness; the immeasurable world of beings I will lead to nirvāṇa”.²⁸

In Tibetan, Bodhisattva is translated as a Being with heroic mind. The hero does not abandon the fellows caught in suffering.²⁹ The Hīnayāna mysticism aimed at arhanthood as the state of highest perfection and knowledge by an individual. It was individualistic quietism. Wisdom was taught here as the highest virtue, compassion was relegated to background or regarded as a subsidiary virtue. The ideal of Bodhisattva in Mahāyāna mysticism integrated the ideals of compassion and wisdom. This Bodhisattva had no concern for kingship of world, for heaven, salvation or glory, his simple concern is the suffering people. He suffered many hardships and remained ever prepared to sacrifice his life for the good of others. He undergoes all privations, hardships and troubles for the sake of others and declares:

“This effort of mine is not for attaining better existence nor for monarch’s unrivalled imperial status, nor for unalloyed exalted, pleasures nor for spiritual glory or the happiness of liberation.”³⁰

The Bodhisattva does not only set himself free, he devises to make all others free. As Prajñāpāramitā puts it:

“Doers of what is hard are the Bodhisattva-s, the great beings who have set out to win supreme enlightenment. They don’t wish to attain their own private nirvāṇa. On the contrary, they have surveyed, the highly painful world of being and yet desirous to win supreme enlightenment, they don’t trouble at birth and death. They have set out for the benefit of the world, for the ease of the world, out of pity for the world. They have resolved: We will become a place of rest, the final relief of the world, a refuge for the world, the world’s place of rest, islands of the world, lights of the world, leaders of the world, the world meaning of salvation.”³¹

As contrasted with ethico-religious rigourism and quietistic and individualistic mysticism of Hīnayāna which Aśaṅga characterises narrow

in its aim of self-liberation, narrow teachings to realise that aim, narrow method applied for this realisation, insufficiency of equipment and the shortness of time which final liberation is guaranteed³² the Bodhisattvayāna preferred attainment of perfect knowledge as associated with Karuṇā. Bodhisattvahood means the attainment of the Bodhimind which is defined as unified state of śūnyatā and universal compassion.³³ Integral function of the philosophical truth or wisdom (śūnyatā or Prajñā) and universal welfare is what we must understand from the Boddhicitta.

Thus Bodhisattva is a heroic being full of knowledge and compassion. For him then Saṃsāra and nirvāṇa cannot be different. It is the doctrine of Karuṇā which is a key to the understanding of the classic statement of Nāgārjuna that there is not even the slightest difference between saṃsāra and nirvāṇa. The quietist Hīnyāna mysticism now enters the phase of activist in its second phase of Mahāyāna. The mysticism of knowledge and understanding is combined with the mysticism of love for the fellow human beings of the world which then cannot be conceived different from the nirvāṇa, the mystic ideal.

Another noteworthy feature of Mahāyāna is its conception of the three bodies of the Buddha. The Buddha is, according to this concept, not a particular historical personage, he is but the ultimate principle as the totality of thought and beings in an unconditioned state of all-existence. This principle has three aspects or bodies. Viz., Dharmakāya (primordial body or thatness of all existence), the Sambhogakāya or the body of bliss and Nirmāṇakāya (i.e. the body of transformation).

With universal freedom as their ideal the Mahāyānists made their religion catholic enough to make it acceptable to even ordinary person. It was in this stage of Buddhism the popular religious beliefs and practices began to be incorporated that a new school developed which introduced Mantra-elements, like the Dhāriṇī-s, into the province of this religion. The Tattvaratnāvalī, in fact, divided Mahāyāna into two schools, viz., Pāramitānaya, or the discipline of Supreme Virtue and Mantra-naya which introduced all sorts of esoteric principles and practices in Buddhism. The Mantranaya was the precursor of Tāntric Buddhism which was mainly

divided into three vehicles, viz., Vajrayāna, Kālacakrayāna and Sahajayāna. Belief in the efficacy of the mantra, etc. had existed even in the times of Buddha himself,³⁴ and Tāntric ideas of sexo-yogic practice leadings to blissful union were present in the sūtrālaṅkāra itself. Belief in mysterious power of Mantra, worship of the Stūpa, reverence for the mystic Bodhimaṇḍala, or the Circle round the holy tree beneath which Buddha had attained his bodhi, were handed down from earlier traditions.³⁵ They paved the way for the vigorous propagation of the Mantra, Mudrā (posture and gestures) and Maṇḍala (Mystic diagram) by Tāntric Buddhism. Once the portals of Buddhism were flung open to esoteric elements the beliefs in gods, demigods, demons and ghosts, magic, charm and sorcery followed. To these again were added elements of yoga-Haṭhayoga, Layayoga, Mantra-yoga and Rājayoga. In the earlier phase of Tāntrism the emphasis was laid on Mantra, Mudrā, Maṇḍala and Abhiṣeka but later on the sexo-yogic practice was held as the most important for the attainment of supreme bliss. It was through the enjoyment of the five objects of desire (Pañca-kāma-guṇa) and of the five accessories beginning with the syllable 'm' (Pañcamakāra-s), namely madya, māṃsa, matsya, mudrā and maithuna that the perfection is said to be achieved.

This erotic mysticism is known as Vajrayāna or the Adamantine way. It is generally divided into four classes. The first two namely kriyāntara and caryāntara are considered lower as they are concerned with rites and ceremonial worship of Gods, etc. and the last two, viz., Yoga-tantra and Anuttaratantra are considered higher inasmuch as they describe Yogic processes for the consideration and realisation of the ultimate truth.³⁶

Another school of Tantra, which is not considered independent from Vajrayāna by Dr. S.N. Dasgupta is known as Kālacakrayān. It lays emphasis on the control of vital winds and results attained thereby. According to this school the universe with all its objects and localities is situated in the body and time in all its divisions is within the body in the processes of vital wind. The stress on body-centred yoga seems to be a special feature of Kālacakrayāna. Abhinavagupta in his Tantrāloka³⁷ has

similarly explained the functioning of time within the body with reference to vital winds and the process of controlling time through the control of vital wind through yogic practices.

Buddhist Tantrism appears to have transformed the philosophical concepts of Mahāyāna. Thus Śūnyatā is spoken of as Vajra-firm, substantial, indivisible, impenetrable, incapable of being burnt and imperishable. The transformation of Śūnyatā into Vajra explained how all the Gods, articles for worship, yogic practices, rites and rituals were regarded of Vajra nature. The supreme deity of this Yāna is Vajrasattva which resembles the pure consciousness of the Vijñānavādin and the Brahman of Vedānta.³⁸ The Mahāyānic idea of Bodhicitta as attainment of perfect wisdom combined with universal compassion was identified in Vajrayāna, more particularly in Sahajayāna with Prajñā and Upāya conceived as female and male respectively. Bodhicitta is thus a state produced through the union of passive female principle of Prjāñā with active male principle of Upāya. The doctrine of Śūnyatā through its equation with Prajñā (feminine gender) was rendered female and the doctrine of Karuṇā, which was a dynamic principle for iniversal salvation, was transformed into male through its equation wity Upāya (mas gender).

Thus the union of Śūnyatā and Karuṇā or Prajñā and Upāya translated into the mystic union of female and male through sexo-yogic practice.

This union known as Yuganaddha or non-duallism (advaya) is described in terms of population of conjugal union in Buddhist, Śaiva and Śakta Tantras. It results in great bliss (Mahāsukha). There have always been two opinions on the nature of Nirvāṇa being a negative or positive state. Some passages in Pāli texts do describe it as a state of inifinte bliss.³⁹ Vijñānavādin also described it as “the Immutable element which is beyond the reach of all good, permanent, perfect bliss-it is liberation, the substance itself.”⁴⁰ However, Buddhist Trantrism is very positive about the positively blissful state of nirvāṇa which it calls Mahāsukha. It is described as satata-Sukhamaya or eternally blissful, the place of both enjoyment and liberation, changesless, supreme bliss, the seed of all supreme bliss, the seed of all substance (Vastu).⁴¹

To conclude Buddhist mysticism aims at nirvāṇa, the Enlightenment-experience through ethico-moral discipline of mind, body and senses (as understood by the way of śīla), through elaborate process of meditation (Samādhi) and finally through the insight into the nature of Reality (Prajñā). A Hīnayāna mystic attains the individul nirvāṇa and a Mahāyānist is busy working out the salvation of others. The good of the world is his own summum bonum. The world and nirvāṇa are not different.

The Hīnayānist is only a step behind the Mahāyāna mystic. While the former stops when he has realised his own nirvāṇa, the Mahāyānist goes a step further to lead the world to the highest goal of human life-freedom from suffering and peace of mind.⁴²

Individual's freedom and peace is the goal of Hīnayāna mysticism, the goal of Mahāyāna is universal freedom and universal peace. The path leading to this is common-

The threefold path of Śīla, Samādhi and Prajñā.

References

1. The consensus among the scholars prefers the use of Early Buddhism for the Hīnayāna but I have retained in this article the word of common parlance.
2. The original is **Visankhāragatam cittam**. Henry Warren translates it This mind Jhas demolition reached. Suzuki has pointed out how both the translators read their own meaning; one pointing to positive and the other to nihilistic or negativism.
3. The **Dhammapada**, V, pp. 153-4. tr. by Irving Babbit (Oxford University Press, 1936)and quoted by Suzuki in **Mysticism**, p. 44.) (Harpr and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1957), (hereafter **mysticism**).
4. **The Vinaya**, I., p. 8., **The Majjhima Nikāya**, tr. by Lord Chalmers (Oxford University Press), 26, p. 12.
5. There is similar Gāthā in the **Dhammapad**, V. 353, which echoes the dynamism of experience. It runs as follows: I have conquered all, I know all, in all conditions of life I am free from taint. I have left all, and through the destruction of thirst I am free. Having by myself attained specific knowledge, to whom can I point as my teachers- quoted by Suzuki in **Mysticism**, p. 68.

6. The conqueror is thus described in the **Dhammapada**, p. 179,
He whose conquest nobody can conquer again,
Into whose conquest nobody in this world can enter-
By what trace can you trace him,
The awakened, of infinite range, trackless?
7. Maister Eckhart, tr. by C.da B. Evans (Hohn M. Watkins, London, 1924),
Vol. I, p. 146.
8. **The Dhammapada**, tr. by Radhakrishnan, Verse 336.
9. F.C. Happold in his book **Mysticism: A study and an Anthology**,
Penguin Books, 1963, divides mystical experience into two types;
namely, the mysticism of knowledge and understanding and the
mysticism of love and union (vide pp. 40-42). Approaching these
varieties from a different angle he considers mysticism in its three
aspects of nature-mysticism, Soul-mysticism and God-mysticism.
Nature-mysticism is characterised by a sense of the immanence of God
or Soul in nature. At its heart lies what Zaehner. **Mysticism: Sacred
and Profane**, calls the panentheic experience, that is the experience
of the All in the one and of the one in the all. It may also be called 'pan-
theistic'. In the soul-mysticism the idea of the existence of God is, in
any expressible form, absent. The chief object of man is the quest of his
own self and of right knowledge about it. In God-mysticism the basic
idea is that of the return of the spirit to its immortal and infinite ground,
which is God. The mystical schools of Śāṅkara and Meister Eckhart
combine, according to him, the Soul-mysticism with God-mysticism.
Happold labels Buddhist mysticism as analytical Soul-mysticism. The
qualification to the nomenclature is added because he found it difficult
to ignore the analytical and scientific foundations of Buddhism.
10. Sūtra of the foundation of Reign of law **Dhammacakkapavattana Sutta**
as quoted by Jacques De Marquette in **Introduction to Comparative
Mysticism**, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1965, p. 58.
11. To quote Janques De Merquette, It has become evident that Hīnayānism,
far from being the most faithful representative of the early teachings as
it claims to be, is on the contrary an entirely new version and quite a
perverted travesty of the tenets of Gautam. **Ibid**, p. 83.
12. Disgusted with the Buddhism where God plays no part and man is
denied any personal reality, Mrs. Rhys David approves its description

- as "barely hanging on the fringes of the world religions and being
sacred more than a system of ethics". Quoted in **the Original Gospel
of Buddha**, p. 13.
13. The interpretation of Śūnyatā as an attributeless Reality escaping the
grant of intellectual comprehension and verbal exposition, the
description of dharma-s (things) as unspeakable, unchanging, all-void
quiescent and pure by Nāgārjuna, admission of the Tathatā-nature of
things to be something substantial, permanent and unchanging,
Yogācāras conception of the ultimate reality as the Abhūta-parikalpa
or as pure consciousness (Vijñāptimātrā) "drive us very near to the
Vedāntic conception of the ultimate Reality as the Nirguṇa
(attributeless) Brahman who transcends all knowledge, knower and
the known". Similarly the conception of Dharmakāya or cosmic unity
or the organised totality of things "seem to be just the same as that of
the idea of the nirguṇa Brahman of the Upaniṣds". Summed up from
Ch. I. pp. 29-32 of **An Introduction to Tantric Buddhism** by S. N.
Dasgupta (University of Calcutta, 1958).
 14. D.T. Suzuki has said it aptly: The psychological analysis that cannot go
further or deeper than the egolessness of the psychological ego fails to
see into the egolessness of all things..... **Mysticism**, p. 42.
 15. Vivekahyāti or discriminating knowledge which distinguishes the two
ultimates and is conscious of the two, must ultimately lead to the
mystical experience of the kaivalya.
 16. In fact may mystics openly abuse the philosophical speculations.
Sahajayānists among the Buddhists are known for such a revolt against
all passion for philosophy. Chaitanya is credited to have said that it
would be better to throw off the Śāstras. When Upaniṣads declared
(Vide Īṣa up) that Vidyā (Philosophical knowledge included) leads to
greater darkness than the Avidyā (Ignorance) they did realise the utter
meaninglessness of the philosophical opinions. Śāṅkara also makes a
similar sense when he says (though in his own framework of
metaphysical commitment) that all epistemological knowledge leads
to ignorance: **avidyāvadiṣayāni tāvad pratyakṣādini (Śāṅkara's
Bhāṣya on Bādarāyaṇa Sūtra)**.
 17. Members of the Saṅgha are further enjoined to follow a discipline
implying vows of chastity, humility and poverty which correspond to
the vows of Christian monks.

18. Buddhism does not only prescribe negations for moral discipline but also lays down the six Pāramitā-s (perfections or virtues). These are perfections of (1) giving (Dānapāramitā), (2) Morality (Śīla), (3) Patience (kṣānti), (4) Vigour (Vīrya), (5) Meditation (Dhyāna) and (6) Wisdom (Prajñā).

Each of the six perfections has been dealt with at enormous length in extensive Mahāyāna literature. The extent of Prajñāpāramitā texts available in Mahāyāna seems to give a paramount emphasis to Prajñā. The Laṅkāvatārasūtra speaks of three degrees in each perfection, viz., ordinary, extra-ordinary and superlative; when practised by ordinary people for the sake of worldly gains a perfection is said to be ordinary, when cultivated by the Hīnayānists for the attainment of individual nirvāṇa, it is extra-ordinary but when developed by the Bodhisattvas not for their own nirvāṇa alone but for the sake of all it is superlative. Closely paralleling this is the distinction of mundane practice of a perfection and the Transcendental given in the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā.

19. **Dīghanikāya**, I, 47. (tr. by Thomas in **Early Buddhist Scriptures**).
20. Vide, **ibid**, pp. 63-64.
21. **The Doctrine of Awakening**, p. 196.
22. All composite things (saṅkhāra) are impermanent. When a man by wisdom realises (this), he need not (this world) of sorrow, this is the path of purity. All composite things are sorrowful. When a man by wisdom realises (this) he needs not (this world of) Sorrow; this is the path to purity.
All things (dhamma) are egoless. When a man by wisdom realises (this) he needs not (this world of) sorrow: this is the path to purity.
The Dhammapada, tr. S. Radhakrishnan (Oxford University Press, 1951) verses 277-9, pp. 146-7
23. **Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist**. Pages within bracket in this paragraph refer to this book.
24. **Dhammapada**, verses 90 and 98.
25. Quoted from **Fundamentals of Religion** by Dr. N. Brahma, University of Calcutta, 1960
26. **Avadānaśataka**, II. 348.
27. **Abhidharmakośa**, III. 94; II. 191-2.

28. **Aṣṭasāhasrikā** XI, 234-35. Quoted by Conze.
29. The heroic nature of the Bodhisattva is finely woven into the texture of **Jātaka**-tales.
30. **Hastijātaka**, verse 21
31. Quoted in **Buddhism** by Conze, p. 128.
32. **Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra**, Chap. I. verse 10.
33. **Śūnyatākaruṇābhinnam bodhicittamiti smṛtam. Śrīguhyasamājantra** (G.D.S. I., p. 153).
34. **Tattvaratnāvali in Ādyavajrasaṅgraha**. P. 21.
See, also **An Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism** by Dr. B. Bhattacharya, p. 48 and **Introduction to Sādhanamālā** (Vol. II), Dr. Bhattacharya, pp. xvi-xvii.
35. For occasional references to Tāntric practices including the sex-element see **Dīghanikāya**, **Brahmajālasutta**; **Kathāvatthu**, xvii. 6,7,8,9,10, XXIII.2. Majjhīmanikāya., Pali Text Society's ed. I. p. 305.
36. Cf. division of Vaiṣṇavatantra into **jñānapāda**, **yogapāda**, **Kriyāpāda**, and **caryāpāda** (found in the padmatantra).
37. **Tantrāloka**, Chap. III.
38. Vide **Obscure Religious Cults** by S.N. Dasgupta (Pirmal K.L. Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta, 1962) pp. 24-28.
39. **Milinda-panha** ed. Trenckner, pp. 315-26. See also **A Dictionary of Pāli Language** under the word **nibbāna**. Other references (i) **Suttanipāta** 1933, (ii) **Aṅguttara**. IV, 239, (iii) **Vimānavatthu**, 51 (iv) **Therīgāthā**, 350 (v) **Dhammapada**, 285.
40. Vasubandhu's **Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi**, **Triṃśikā**, verse, 30.
41. **Guhyasiddhi** of Padma-Vajra quoted by Dr. Bagchi, p. 33.
42. **Bodhisattvabhūmi** (edited by Dr. Nalinaksha Datta) describes the Sixteen **Bhūmi**-s or grounds. Out of these fifteen are common for all Buddhists, only the **Bodhisattvabhūmi** expounding the ideal of universal freedom through compassion is exclusive to a Bodhisattva.
- (Akhil Bharatiya Skt. Parishad, RATM, Shri Gopal Chandra Sinha Commemoration Volume, Lucknow, Vol. xvi-xviii, 1984-86)



षष्ठ परिच्छेद : काव्य एवं काव्यशास्त्र

1. संस्कृत के आदिकवि वाल्मीकि

वाल्मीकि के पहले भी संस्कृत में कविता होती होगी। वैदिक काव्य ने अपने को उषः सूक्त, अरण्यानी सूक्त तथा और भी कई प्रकार के सूक्तों में अभिव्यक्त किया था। फिर वाल्मीकि को संस्कृत का आदिकवि क्यों कहा जाता है? शायद इसलिये कि वे पहले कवि थे जो क्रौञ्चमिथुन की विरह-व्यथा से शोकाकुल हुए थे और उनका शोक श्लोक बना था और उन्होंने पहली बार यह प्रश्न पूछा-

आज की इस दुनिया में कौन है गुणवान् और पराक्रमी जिसके क्रोध से भयभीत होकर देवता भी रण में काँपने लगे-

कोन्वस्मिन्साम्प्रतं लोके गुणवान् कश्च वीर्यवान्।

कस्य बिभ्यति देवाश्च जातरोषस्य संयुगे।। (१.१.२)

इससे पहले भी कविता का मुख्य सम्बन्ध परलोक और देवी देवता से था जिनसे मानव का रिश्ता दूर का था, अपनेपन का नहीं था। वाल्मीकि को वैदिक काल के अतिरिक्त आख्यान, कथा, नाटक, गाथा, हास्य आदि की मौखिक काव्यपरम्परा थाती में मिली थी।

वाल्मीकि आस्था, निष्ठा और विश्वास के कवि हैं। निर्वेद, वैराग्य या जीवन से पलायन उनके काव्य का स्वर नहीं है। तभी तो उन्होंने कहा है-

अनिर्वेदः श्रियो मूलमनिर्वेदः परं सुखम्।

अनिर्वेदो हि सततं सर्वार्थेषु प्रवर्तकः।। (५.१०.१०)

सीता को न खोज पाने की स्थिति में प्राणों का त्याग करने का वितर्क कहने वाले हनुमान की यह उक्ति कि जीवन बना रहे तभी भद्र और ध्रुव संगम हो सकता है, उसी आशावाद की पुष्टि है-

विनाशे बहवो दोषा जीवनं प्राप्नोति भद्रकम्।

तस्मात् प्राणान् धरिष्यामि ध्रुवो जीवति संगमः।। (५.१३.४७)

वाल्मीकि की निष्ठा जीवन और उसके आनन्द में है भले ही संघर्ष की कितनी भी तपिश सैकड़ों साल झेलनी पड़े-

कल्याणी बत गाथेयं लौकिकी प्रतिभाति मे।

एति जीवन्तमानन्दो नरं वर्षशतादपि।। (५.३४.६)

वाल्मीकि ने अपनी रामायण में तीन नगरियों का प्रधान रूप से चित्रण किया है- अयोध्या, किष्किन्धा और लंका। अयोध्यापति दशरथ कैकेयी के प्रति अपने काम से राम को वनवास भेजने के लिये विवश हैं। इसलिये वन में भी राम कौशल्या और सुमित्रा को कैकेयी द्वारा दी जाने वाली पीड़ा से व्यथित होते रहते हैं-

इदं व्यसनमालोक्य राज्ञश्च मतिविभ्रमम्।

काम एवार्थधर्माभ्यां गरीयानिति मे मतिः।। (२.५३.९)

अपीदानीं तु कैकेयी सौभाग्यमदमोहिता।

कौसल्यां च सुमित्रां च सा प्रबाधोत मत्कृते।। (२.५३.१५)

उसी प्रकार किष्किन्धा में दो भाइयों बाली और सुग्रीव में लड़ाई की जड़ काम-भावना है। लंकेश्वर रावण का परकीया सीता के प्रति कामभाव राम-रावण युद्ध का और बाद में सीता के निर्वासन का प्रधान हेतु है। एक ओर वाल्मीकि ने काम का वासना और व्यसन के रूप में चित्रण किया है तो दूसरी ओर दाम्पत्य प्रेम का आदर्श सीता और राम के चरित्र द्वारा प्रस्तुत किया है। सीता के वियोग में राम के मनोभावों का अन्यत्र सूक्ष्म और मर्मस्पर्शी चित्रण वाल्मीकि ने किया है- समय के साथ शोक कम हो जाता है पर राम का तो बढ़ता ही रहता है-

शोकश्च किल कालेन गच्छता ह्यपगच्छति।

मम चापश्यतः कान्तामहन्यहनि वर्धते।। (६.५.४)

वायु! तुम वहाँ जाकर बहो जहाँ सीता है, उसे छूकर मुझे भी छू लेना-

वाहि वात यतः कान्ता तां स्पृष्ट्वा मामपि स्पृश।

त्वयि मे गात्रसंस्पर्शश्चन्द्रे दृष्टिसमागमः।। (६.५.६)

राम अपने मन को यह ढाढस देते हैं कि आखिरकार हम दोनों एक धरती पर तो हैं ही। जैसे एक सूखी हुई क्यारी साथ की सींची हुई क्यारी के सहारे जी लेती है वैसे ही सीता के जीने के समाचार से मैं जी लूँगा-

बह्वेतत् कामयमानस्य शक्यमेतेन जीवितुम्।

यदहं सा च वामोरुरेकां धरणिमाश्रितौ।।

केदारस्येव केदारः सोदकस्य निरूदकः।

उपस्नेहेन जीवामि जीवन्तीं यच्छृणोमि ताम्।। (६.५.१०-११)

हनुमानजी की सीता-राम के सम्बन्ध में तभी यह दृष्टि बनी थी- अस्या देव्या मनस्तस्मिन् तस्य चास्यां प्रतिष्ठितम्। प्रकृति के चितरे के रूप में उसमें व्याप्त विराट्

सादृश्य को उपमा, उत्प्रेक्षा, रूपक की माला में पिरोने में वाल्मीकि अद्वितीय हैं। वे उन अनेक विशेषणों और पदावलियों के प्रजापति हैं जो महाकाव्य की परवर्ती परम्परा में आदर्श उपमान बन गये- समुद्र की गम्भीरता, हिमालय की उच्चता और धीरता के वे शाश्वत प्रवर्तक हैं। रमणीय चित्रकूट को देखकर सारे कष्ट भूल जाना, कल्याण की भावना में चित्त का समाहित हो जाना और पाप के लिये मन न करना-प्रकृति के प्रति अत्यन्त अपूर्व श्रद्धाभाव की अभिव्यक्ति है-

न राज्यभ्रंशनं भद्रे न सुहृद्भिर्विना भवः।
मनो मे बाधते दृष्ट्वा रमणीयमिमं गिरिम्॥ (६.१४.३)
यावता चित्रकूटस्य नर शृङ्गाण्यवेक्षते।
कल्याणानि समाधत्ते न पापे कुरुते मनः॥ (२.५४.३०)

गङ्गा के वर्णन में उनकी लेखनी एक साथ प्रकृति की मन्जुलता तथा भीषणता किंवा विविधता और विशालता को मानवी मूर्ति दे देती है-

जलाघाताद्गहासोग्रां फेननिर्मलहासिनीम्।
क्वचिद्वेणीकृतजलां क्वचिदावर्तशोभिताम्॥
क्वचित्स्तिमितगम्भीरां क्वचिद् वेगसमाकुलाम्।
क्वचिद्गम्भीरनिर्घोषां क्वचिद्भैरवनिःस्वनाम्॥
देवसंधाप्लुतजलां निर्मलोत्पलसंकुलाम्।
क्वचिदाभोगपुलिनां क्वचिन्निर्मलबालुकाम्॥ (२.५०:१६-१८)

वर्षा के समय पर्वतों की छटा निराली है-पूरे पण्डित लगते हैं-

मेघकृष्णाजिनधरा धारायज्ञोपवीतिनः।
मारुतापूरितगुहाः प्राधीता इव पर्वताः॥ (४.२८.१०)

और कर्णिकार जैसे-

सुपुष्पितांस्तु पश्यैतान् कर्णिकारान् समन्ततः।
हाटकप्रतिसंछन्नान् नरान् पीताम्बरानिव॥ (४.१.११)

सीता की तरह गरमी भी धरती लगती है और नीलमेघ का सहारा लिये हुए बिजली रावण के अंक में पड़ी हुई सीता-सी लगती है-

एषा धर्मपरिक्लिष्टा नववारिपरिप्लुता।
सीतेव शोकसन्तप्ता सती वाष्पं विमुञ्चति॥ (४.२८.७)

नीलमेघाश्रिता विद्युत्स्फुरन्ती प्रतिभाति मे।
स्फुरन्ती रावणस्यांके वैदेहीव तपस्विनी॥ (४.२८.१२)

यहाँ प्रकृति उपमान नहीं अपितु उपमेय है और मानुषी सृष्टि उपमान है।

वाल्मीकि के कुछ समासोक्तिमय चित्रण परवर्ती कवियों के लिये आदर्श हो गये हैं। जैसे कि-

चञ्चलचन्द्रकरस्पर्शहर्षोन्मीलिततारका।
अहो रागवती सन्ध्या जहाति स्वयमम्बरम्॥ (४.३०.४५)

आनन्दवर्धन ने ध्वनि काव्य के उदाहरण में वाल्मीकि को ही सर्वप्रथम उद्धृत किया है-

रविसंक्रान्तसौभाग्यस्तुषारावृतमण्डलः।
निःश्वसिताया इवादर्शश्चन्द्रमा न प्रकाशते॥ (३.१६.१३)

वाल्मीकि की कुछ सूक्तियाँ आज भी आर्षवाक्य की तरह संस्कृत-जगत् में प्रचलित हैं-

१. न स संकुचितः पन्था येन बाली हतोहतः।
२. रामो द्विर्नाभिभाषते।
३. आम्रं छित्वा कुठारेण निम्बं परिचरेत्तु कः।
४. नहि निम्बात् स्रवेत क्षौद्रं लोके निगदितं वचः।
५. न परेणापहतं मक्ष्यं व्याघ्रः खादितुमिच्छति।
६. सुलभाः पुरुषा राजन् सततं प्रियवादिनः।
अप्रियस्य च पथ्यस्य वक्ता श्रोता च दुर्लभः॥
७. पतिव्रतानां नाश्रूणि वृथा पतन्ति भूतले।
८. आत्मा हि दारा सर्वेषां दारसं गृहवर्तिनाम्।
९. वयस्यः परमा गतिः।
१०. मृदुर्हि परिभूयते।

(हस्तलिखित, आकाशवाणी उदयपुर, वार्ता, १७ अक्टूबर, १९८९)



2. वाल्मीकिरामायणे मानवीयचेतना

वैदिकं काव्यं दिव्यमलौकिकं देवतास्वरूपमार्षेण चक्षुषा साक्षाच्चकार।
इन्द्राग्निवरुणमरुद्रुद्रादयो देवाः पाश्चात्यसमीक्षकदृशा प्राकृतशक्तीनां प्रातिनिध्यं कुर्वन्तोऽपि
प्राधान्येनाप्राकृतां पारलौकिकीं द्वन्द्वतीताञ्च भावभूमिमेवाविष्कुर्वन्ति। न ते दुःखेषूद्विजन्ते, न
वा सुखेषु पर्यत्सुकीभवन्ति। लाभ एव तान् लभते न हानिः। जय एव तेषां जायते न पराजयः।
न तेषु मनुष्यसुलभा रत्यादयो नव स्थायिभावाः चिरस्थितिं भजन्ते। न खल्वभावास्तैरनुभूयन्ते
न च तेषु सञ्चारिणो जातुचिदपि सञ्चरन्ति? षडरयोवा व्यभिचरन्ति। स्वयमाप्तकामाः सन्तस्तेऽन्येषां
कामान् कृतार्थयन्ति। प्रार्थनासुलभास्ते न स्वयं स्वार्थं प्रार्थयन्ते। मन्त्रात्मकासु च देवतासु
त्रैवर्णिकानामेवाधिकारः। न खलु सर्ववर्णसुलभा वेदचतुष्टयी।

वाल्मीकिरामायणन्तु नूतनशृङ्खलसामवतारः। तदिदमाद्यं काव्यं सार्ववर्णिकम्।
मनुष्यसुलभोऽत्र शोकः श्लोकात्तामपन्नः। बालकाण्डस्य द्वितीयसर्गे कथं रामायणं करुणवेदिनः
शोकार्तस्य मुनेरनुव्याहरणप्रवृत्तः श्लोक इति स्वयमेवाविष्कृतं कविना-

तथाविधं द्विजं दृष्ट्वा निषादेन निपातितम्।
ऋषेर्धर्मात्मनस्तस्य कारुण्यं समपद्यत।।
ततः करुणवेदित्वादधर्मोऽयमिति द्विजः।
निशाम्य रुदतीं क्रौञ्चीमिदं वचनमब्रवीत्।।
मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठां त्वमगमः शाश्वतीः समाः।
यत्क्रौञ्चमिथुनादेकमवधीः काममोहितम्।।
तस्येत्थं बुब्रतश्चिन्ता बभूव हृदि वीक्षतः।
शोकार्तेनास्य शकुनेः किमिदं व्याहृतं मया।।
चिन्तयन्स महाप्राज्ञश्चकार मतिमान्मतिम्।
शिष्यं चैवाब्रवीद् वाक्यमिदं स मुनिपुङ्गवः।।
पादं बद्धोऽक्षरसमस्तन्मीलयसमन्वितः।
शोकार्तस्य प्रवृत्तो मे श्लोको भवतु नान्यथा।।

(बालकाण्डे, द्वितीयसर्गे, श्लोक संख्या १३-१८)

आदिकवेरमुमेवार्थमनुभावयति महाकविः कालिदासः। तथा हि-

तामभ्यगच्छद्दरुदितानुसारी कविः कुशेध्याहरणाय यातः।
निषादविद्धाण्डजदर्शनोत्थः श्लोकत्वमापद्यत यस्य शोकः।।

(रघुवंशे, १४.७०)

ध्वनिप्रस्थानप्रतिष्ठापकः साहित्यसमीक्षाविचक्षणो ध्वन्यालोकप्रणेता
आनन्दवर्धनाचार्योऽपि तदेव हृदयं रामयणस्येति स्पष्टं स्फोटयति। तथा हि-

काव्यस्यात्मा स एवार्थस्तथा चादिकवेःपुरा।

क्रौञ्चद्वन्द्ववियोगोत्थः शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः।। (ध्वन्यालोके, १.५)

उत्खातलोकत्रयकण्टकोऽपि सत्यप्रतिज्ञोऽपि, अविकत्थनोऽपि रामो मिथ्यापवादक्षुभितः
सन्नकस्मादेव कलुषप्रवृत्त्या सीतां स्वप्रणिधानतो विसृजति-इत्यस्ति मानुषसुलभो दोषः। अत्र
चोचित एवादिकवेर्मन्युर्भरताग्रजे-

उत्खातलोकत्रयकण्टकेऽपि सत्यप्रतिज्ञेऽप्यविकत्थनेऽपि।

त्वां प्रत्यकस्मात् कलुषप्रवृत्तावस्त्येव मन्युर्भरताग्रजेऽपि।।

(रघुवंशे, १४.७३)

सोऽयमादिकवेः शोकः कथं काव्यात्मतया परिणमत इत्येतदभिनवगुप्तपादाचार्यैः
'काव्यस्यात्मे' ति ध्वन्यालोककारिकां रसध्वनिपरतया व्याचिख्यासद्भिः सविस्तरं
लोचनटीकायामुपबृंहितम्। तच्च तत एवावधेयम्।

निषादसन्निभेन रावणेन सीतामभ्यवपन्नो महाबलो गृध्रराजो जटायुः खड्गेन पक्षच्छेदं
कृत्वा निपातितः। तं परिष्वज्य प्राकृतजन इव-

निपपातावशो भूमौ रुरोद सहलक्ष्मणः।

द्विगुणीकृततापार्तो रामो धीरतरोऽपि सन्।। (अरण्यकाण्डे, ६७.२२)

तमुद्वीक्ष्य सधर्मात्माऽनाथवद् विललाप सुबहुभिर्दुःखैर्दीनतां चान्वभवद्रामः।
अब्रवीच्च-

पश्य लक्ष्मण गृध्रोऽयमुपकारी हतश्च मे।

सीतामभ्यवपन्नो हि रावणेन बलीयसा।।

गृध्रराज्यं परित्यज्य पितृपैतामहं महत्।

मम हेतोरयं प्राणान् मुमोच पतगेश्वरः।।

सर्वत्र खलु दृश्यन्ते साधवो धर्मचारिणः।

शूराः शरण्याः सौमित्रे तिर्यग्योनिगतेष्वपि।। (तत्रैव, ६८. २२-२४)

सीताहरणजादपि दुःखाद् गृध्रस्य विनाशमधिकतरमनुभवन् पतगेश्वरं दशरथसमं
पूजनीयं मान्यं मेने तं च दीप्तां चितामारोप्य ददाह रामो धर्मात्मा स्वबन्धुमिव दुःखितः
(तत्रैव, ३१)। जटायुषो वधप्रसङ्गेन शोक-दुःखकारुण्यादीनां भावानां स्वयमेव क्रौञ्चवधेन
साक्षात्कृतानामात्माऽऽविष्कृतः कविना।

इदानीन्तने पुंप्रधानेऽस्मत्समाजे स्वप्रियाया भार्याया वियोगेन विनाशेन वा विलपन्तः पुरुषा विरलविरला स्युः, सन्तश्च ते नान्यैः पुरुषधौरैर्विलपन्तोऽभिनन्दन्ते सीताया वियोगे रामस्य विलापः प्राकृतजननिर्विशेषतया वाल्मीकिना निर्वर्णितः^१। तथा हि-

हा ममार्ये क्व यातासि हा साध्वि वरवर्णिनि।
हा सकामाद्य कैकेयी देवि मेऽद्य भविष्यति।।
सीतया सह निर्यातो विना सीतामुपागतः।
कथं नाम प्रवेक्ष्यामि शून्यमन्तः पुरं मम।।
अथवा न गमिष्यामि पुरीं भरतपालिताम्।
स्वर्गोऽपि हि तया हीनः शून्य एव मतो मम।।
तन्मामुत्सृज्य हि वने गच्छायोध्यापुरीं शुभाम्।
न त्वहं तां विना सीतां जीवेयं हि कथञ्चन।।

(३.६२ श्लोकाः, ९-१०, १४-१५)

उन्मत्त इव वने भ्रान्तो रामः शोकपङ्कणवप्लुतः सन् वृक्षाद् वृक्षं नदीनदं गिरींश्चापि प्रधावन् विलपन् बभ्राम। तथा हि-

अस्ति कच्चित्त्वया दृष्टा सा कदम्बप्रिया प्रिया।
कदम्ब यदि जानीषे शंस सीतां शुभाननाम्।।
अथवाऽर्जुन शंस त्वं प्रियां तामर्जुनप्रियाम्।
जनकस्य सुता तन्वी यदि जीवति वा न वा।।

(तत्रैव, ६० श्लोकाः, १२-१४)

अपृच्छच्च मृग-गज-शार्दूलान्-

अथवा मृगशावाक्षीं मृग जानासि मैथिलीम्।
मृगविप्रेक्षणी कान्ता मृगीभिः सहिता भवेत्।।
गज सा गजनासोरुर्द्यदि दृष्टा त्वया भवेत्।
तां मन्ये विदितां तुभ्यमाख्याहि वरवारण।।
शार्दूल यदि सा दृष्टा प्रिया चन्द्रनिभानना।
मैथिली मम विस्रब्धः कथयस्व न ते भयम्।।

(तत्रैव, श्लोकाः २३-२५)

प्रमत्त इवान्वभवच्च-

किं धावसि प्रिये नूनं दृष्टासि कमलेक्षणे।
वृक्षैराच्छाद्य चात्मानं किं मां न प्रतिभाषसे।।
तिष्ठ तिष्ठ वरारोहे न तेऽस्ति करुणा मयि।
नात्यर्थं हास्यशीलासि किमर्थं मामुपेक्षसे।।

(वही, श्लोकाः, २६-२७)

वाल्मीकिना वर्णितस्य रामभद्रस्य सीतावियोगजन्यं मानुषसुलभं भावमनुभवता कविकुलगुरुणा कालिदासेन विक्रमोर्वशीयस्य चतुर्थेऽङ्के प्रमत्त इव पुरुरवा उर्वशीमन्वेष-यन्वर्णितः। रामस्य विलापश्चेन्दुमतीवियोगेऽजस्य विलापे प्रतिबिम्बितः परिदृश्यते। कान्ताविरहव्याकुलो यक्षोऽपि रामगिरिमध्यास्य श्यामास्वङ्गं चकितहरिणीप्रेक्षणे दृष्टिपातं वक्त्रच्छायां शशिनि, शिखिनां बर्हभारेषु केशान्, प्रतनुषु नदीवीचिषु भूविलासान् चातकास्थितायाः स्वप्रियाया उत्पश्यन्नपि राम इव नैकत्र सम्पूर्णं सादृश्यमवधारयति। रामवियुक्तायाः सीतायाः शोकानुभवस्तु नितरां गिरामगोचरः।

वस्तुस्तु सर्वाऽपि रामकथा मानवीयचैतन्यमेव प्रतिपदमभिव्यनक्ति। रामस्य मातृपितृगुरुविधेयता, स्वबन्धुषु सौभ्रात्रं, प्रियायाः प्राणप्रियत्वं, प्रजाजनंप्रेमा, शत्रुञ्जयत्वमप्रतिहतामोघधनुर्धरत्वं, कुब्जादिषु क्षमाशीलता, निषादराजगुहेन सुग्रीवेण च सह सौहृदं तत्परवशतया च बालिवधसाहाय्यं, वनवासिनामाश्रमवासिनां च रक्षाव्रतं, जरायुषि शबर्यां चादरभावः हनूमति स्नेहः, रिपूणामपि गुणेषु गौरवं, शरणागतानामार्तानाञ्च परित्राणं, सुग्रीवस्य विभीषणस्य च स्वराज्ययोरभिषेकः- सर्वमेतत् रामस्य, रामकथायाश्च मानवीयचैतन्याभिव्यञ्जकमेव स्वरूपमाविष्कुरुते। रामः पुरुषः सन्नेव पुरुषोत्तमो भवति। मानुषो राघवो राजन् इति हनूमदुक्तिरत्र विशिष्य शरणीकरणीया।

तत्त्वतः कामाभिभूतानामवशानां दशरथ-बालि-रावणसदृशानां राज्ञां तत्प्रकर्षं परिभाव्य तत्परिपालितानाञ्च राजधानीनामयोध्या-किष्किन्धा-लङ्कानां दुरन्तं, तत्कृतं राष्ट्रियं दुर्दैवं च विभाव्य गुणवन्तं वीर्यवन्तं नरमेवान्वेष्टुं प्रवृत्तं पुराणमुनेरादिकाव्यम्। तत एवायमुपक्रम एव तपस्विनो वाल्मीकेः प्रश्नः-

को न्वस्मिन् साम्प्रतं लोके गुणवान् कश्च वीर्यवान्।
धर्मज्ञश्च कृतज्ञश्च सत्यवाक्यो दृढव्रतः।।

चारित्र्येण च को युक्तः सर्वभूतेषु को हितः।
विद्वान् कः कः समर्थश्च कश्चैकप्रियदर्शनः।।
आत्मवान् को जितक्रोधो द्युतिमान् कोऽनसूयकः।
कस्य बिभ्यति देवाश्च जातरोषस्य संयुगे।।

(१.१.२-४)

प्रश्नान्ते च नारदं सम्बोधयन्नादिकविराह- महर्षे त्वं समर्थोऽसि ज्ञातुमेवंविधं नरम्।

अस्मिंल्लोके, एतस्मिन्नेव समस्याशतसङ्कुले समाजे राष्ट्रे वा न हि परत्र परस्मिंल्लोके वेदादिगम्ये स्वर्गादौ। साम्प्रतं, न तु पुरा भविष्यति वा यस्मिन् कस्मिंश्चित् स्वर्णयुगत्वेन परिभाव्यमाने काले। एवंविधो वर्णितगुणसम्पन्नः कश्चिन्नरो वेदितव्यो न तु परलोकस्थः कश्चन देवः। अत एव नरवैशिष्ट्यमुपनिबध्नन्नाह-

यस्य बिभ्यति देवाश्च जातरोषस्यसंयुगे। एवंविधो नरो यदि कुपितः स्यात्तर्हि देवा अपि भयं विदधुः किं पुनर्मानुषमशकाः प्रसादितदेवताका राक्षसा वा। प्रश्नोत्तरं व्याहरन्नारदोऽपि रामस्य मानुषोचितानुणान्सविशेषमुल्लिलेख। तेषु 'प्रजानां च हिते रतः', 'रक्षिता जीवलोकस्य', 'सर्वलोकप्रियः', 'अदीनात्मा', 'सर्वसमः', कालाग्निसदृशः क्रोधे क्षमया पृथिवीसमः, धनदेन समस्त्यागे सत्ये धर्म इवापरः सविशेषमुल्लिलेखमर्हन्ति। साम्प्रतमप्येवंविध एवं पुरुषोत्तमो राष्ट्रसंरक्षणार्थमभ्यर्थ्यते।

सन्दर्भाः

- लोचनस्य कश्चिदंशः सौविध्यार्थमत्राप्युद्ध्रियते- क्रौञ्चस्य द्वन्द्ववियोगेन सहचरीहनतोद्भूतेन साहचर्यध्वंसनेनोत्थितो यः शोकः स्थायिभावो निरपेक्षभावत्वाद्द्विप्रलम्भ शृङ्गारोचितरतिस्थायिभावादन्वय एव। स एव तथाभूतविभावतदुत्थाक्रन्दाद्यनुभावचर्वणया हृदयसंवादतन्मयी- भवनक्रमादास्वाद्यमानतां प्रतिपन्नः करुणरसरूपतां लौकिकशोकव्यतिरिक्तां स्वाचित्तद्गुतिसमास्वाद्यासारां प्रतिपन्नो रसपरिपूर्णवृन्मभोच्चलनवाच्चित्त-वृत्तिनिःष्यन्दस्वभाववाग्बिलापादिवच्च समयानपेक्षत्वेऽपि चित्तवृत्ति-व्यञ्जकत्वादिति नयेनाकृतकतयैवावशात् समुचितशब्दच्छन्दोवृत्तादिनियन्त्रितश्लोकरूपतां प्राप्तः।
- अरण्यकाण्डस्य षष्ठितमसर्गादारभ्य त्रिषष्टितमसर्गपर्यन्तं सीतान्वेषणव्याकुलस्य रामस्य विलापः सविशेषमुपनिबद्धः। स एव चान्यत्रापि प्रसङ्गानुसारं पुनरुक्तः।

(हस्तलिखितम्)



3. The World of Vālmiki's and Kālidāsa's Poetry

Vālmiki is a seer and a poet. His poem the Rāmāyaṇa, is the first Kāvya integrating insight with art, perception with presentation of tattvadarśan (philosophical vision) with Varṇanā (aesthetic description).¹ Literary criticism in Sanskrit, both formal and informal, derived its principles from the readings of the Rāmāyaṇa. This is particularly true of the theory of dhvani propounded by Ānandavardhana (9th century A.D.).² The nature and definition of the Kāvya, more prominently of the Mahākāvya, took shape in the light of the works of Vālmiki and Kālidāsa.³ The pathos felt by the first poet at wanton killing of a bird in union by a hunter turned it into śloka.⁴ This leads the poet to search for a perfect human being, an ideal man, a paragon of virtues who could make this very world better and worth living, the characteristics of such a man are given in the opening verses of the Rāmāyaṇa. The very first line of these verses is worth quoting in original:

कोन्वस्मिन् साम्प्रतं लोके गुणवान् कश्चवीर्यवान्

(who in this very world and now is virtuous and valiant?) Other verses are also with quoting.⁵

This shows real concern of the poet with the problems and issues of his times and with the world around him. The Vedic poetry was basically focussed on eternal world of Gods. It was religious in nature and lacked the sorrow, suffering and frailties of human characters. Man on earth was afraid of Gods and prayed for their benevolence and gifts. The ideal man of Vālmiki is not afraid of Gods, instead Gods are afraid of him if he is angered in a battle:

यस्य बिभ्यति देवाश्च जातरोषस्य संयुगे।

Emotions of man rule the poetry of Vālmiki, the first poet of classical Sanskrit, who is distinctly different from the Vedic poets singing the glory of the Gods. Human emotion of pathos as abiding feeling manifests itself as Karuṇa rasa in the Rāmāyaṇa. That is the dominant sentiment here; other eight rasas are its parts which nourish organic unity of the poem as a whole.⁶

The greatest gift of Vālmīki to the world is the character of Rāma. He is characterised as embodiment of dharma, devotion to one's duty and to the ethical virtues of truth, self-control, firm resolution, sense of gratitude, beneficence for all being and so on.⁷ Yet he has weakness of a man in flesh and blood. He weeps like a child embracing every tree and creeper when Sītā is abducted by Rāvaṇa, he loses his control when Lakṣmaṇa is unconscious after he was knocked down by Indrajit. His weakness for public opinion is demonstrated when he gave credence to the gossip of a drunken fisherman even after the chastity and fidelity of Sītā had been tested in fire and her purity had been accepted by Rāma. The killing of Vālin out of friendship for Sugrīva and killing of Śambūka, the Śūdra engrossed in austerities, have raised questions which have received no satisfactory answers.⁸

Rāma considers himself as a mere man, a son of Daśaratha even when sages, celestials and others extol him as divine being.⁹ His learning, intelligence, invincibility in war, simplicity, goodness, consideration for others, many virtues and philosophic wisdom are all essentially humane. His relationship with his parents, wife, brothers, friends, sages and even with those hostile to him or public at large are unique set-off against the prevailing norms of relations in Ayodhyā, Kiṣkindhā and Laṅkā. This entitled him to receive boundless affection of his parents, devoted love of his wife, devotion and service of brothers, Bharata and Lakṣmaṇa, friendly help from Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa, dedication of Hanūmat and active help from sages like Viśvāmitra and Agastya who gave Rāma weapon and the mantra to overcome evil of his times. His life was not a bed of roses but a continuous struggle spread throughout his life. This was accentuated and made intensely internal as well by the loss of his beloved in the forest, her fire ordeal and her repudiation just to maintain dharma of a king who must be above all suspicion. It is the uniqueness of his character which has inspired generations of poets, artists and dramatists of India and far-eastern countries to recreate and enact Rāmāyaṇa in their languages, and cultural settings and made Rāma a household word and his life and character as a model for solving even current problems of life. Hence the dictum in Sanskrit criticism: Ramavad Vartitavyam.

Ayodhyā, Kiṣkindhā and Laṅkā were the three pre-eminent capital cities, ruled over by Daśaratha, Vālin and Rāvaṇa respectively. All these cities were rich, prosperous, mighty and powerful kingdoms. The rulers of these cities were learned, invincible in wars and belonged to the celebrated line. Yet, all of them were infatuated by passion and in the case of Vālin and Rāvaṇa uncontrolled pride and prejudice against wholesome advice of their near and dear ones led to the fall of their mighty empires. Daśaratha, overcome by passion (Kāmātman) and under the control of Kaikeyī¹² had to banish Rāma even at the cost of his life, Vālin was not prepared to accept his brother Sugrīva as heir-apparent even though Tārā pleaded his case strongly and he had taken his brother's wife Rumā, and Rāvaṇa drove out Vibhīṣaṇa for his dissent against immoral action of his brother in keeping another's wife under his captivity. Each ruler suffered for being over-powered by passion, lust or strong pride and prejudice. Kāma was sought to be replaced by Dharma.

In the eyes of Vālmīki, the kings of the three capitals worked against the dharma, the basic norm prescribed for them. Rāma inflicted the punishment of death on Vālin and Rāvaṇa in order to establish dharma on earth. Daśratha died out of grief for his son, the embodiment of dharma, who was exiled to give way to Bharata to rule and finally to establish rule of Rāma on earth, which could be a model for others. Although Rāma killed Vālin and Rāvaṇa for their immoral actions, he installed their brothers as their successors to the throne as he had no intention of putting Kiṣkindhā or Laṅkā under the rule of Ayodhyā. It was clear from the time he befriended Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa. In fact it was to secure their rights that Rāma helped them. Rāma's victory over Kiṣkindhā and Laṅkā can not even be spoken of as cultural conquest or imposition of a superior culture on the inferior cultures of the Vānaras and the Rākṣasas. There is no empirical design, no sense of racial superiority or conquest, no practice of division of cultures into main culture and sub-cultures. What is defended is svadharma and what is punished is deviation from the basic norm of a given society.

A theme recurrent in the Rāmāyaṇa is the defence of the sages and hermits and their institution of sacrifice. Rākṣasas are described as

destroyers of sacrifice (Yajñaghna). The godly persons helpless before the mighty power of the Rākṣasas, pray to Rāma for their life and for the defence of their centres of learning and culture. Rāma renders help to all of them. The Rākṣasas also resorted to tapas and sacrifices. They used the rites and rituals for gaining magical powers. This was abuse of dharma. All Rākṣasas got some boon or the other for their invincibility. Yet the magical or tāmasa use of dharma did not help them and they were finally vanquished. Good intentions and beneficial use of dhārmic or ethical power is necessary. Otherwise it becomes selfdestructive.

The Rāmayaṇ is a mix of ākhyāna¹³ myths and legends, itihāsa¹⁴ and Kāvya¹⁵ or purely Puranic legends, repetitive descriptions of battles and battle-scenes, motif of boons and curses, descriptions of the hermitages, etymological legends explaining significance of epic characters, geneological lists, exaggerations in describing physical forms of the Vānaras, rākṣasas, daityas, introduction of supernatural elements, incorporation of didactic material, ethics, philosophy and polity, elaboration of descriptions of seasons, mountains and rivers have enlarged the world of Vālmīki and made it more comprehensive. Description of the cities, capitals and courts, forests, hermitages, mountains, rivers, ponds, tīrthas and the sea; men, devas and demons, birds, beasts and animals, of dawn and moon light, of seasons and varying moods of nature, of human feelings of love and hatred in mellifluous metre and in similes heaped on similes make even original text of the Ramāyana unrivalled. Daśaratha keeping his word Rāma obeying his father, his exclusive love in a polygamous society for Sītā, Sītā a symbol of purity of womahood and suffering in love, Lakṣmana as embodiment of unfailing service, Bharata's renunciation of empire, devoted service of Hanumat, Rāvaṇa's ego, conceit pride and learning are unique creations of the poet. Exalting dialogues and maxims, seraglio of Rāvaṇa, the coronation crisis in Ayodhyā, the meeting of Rāma and Bharata, Daśratha's grief and death at his son's exile, Rāma's love for the humblest of the humble, his unfailing archery, repudiation of his mother Kaikeyī by Bharata, Sītā's forgiveness for the demonesses, the unity of purpose among the gods, sages, birds, beasts and monkeys in helping Rāma and finally the conception of Rāmarājya or kingdom of God on earth have made this epic immortal.

Vālmīki is still unsurpassed in the treatment of the theme of triumph of good over the forces of evil. His metre, figure and diction, in fact, the whole art of poetry, has inspired generations of poets including Kālidāsa. References to Rāma's story in the beginning and the end of the Meghadūta¹⁶ leave no doubt that this lyrical poem was inspired by the incident of delivering the message of Rāma to Sītā by Hanumat. Kālidāsa recalls Vālmīki as pūrvasūri in Raghuvamśa (I.4) at the very beginning and also in the 14th canto (verse No. 70) to indicate his indebtedness to the poet, Vālmīki, the muni whose pathos became Śloka. His vision of Laṅkā in the Sundarkāṇḍa must have inspired Kālidāsa in his description on Ayodhyā in human form. His elaborate descriptions of the rains, autumn and winter must have generated the idea of composing the Ṛtusamhāra, the cycle of six seasons peculiar to the climate of India. This is just illustrative. In fact, the form, content and even message of the Rāmāyana served as a model to succeeding generations of poets. Poetry of simile elegance (Vaidarbhī kavītā) was born with Vālmīki and got wedded to Kālidāsa- out of own choice.

Vālmīki began his poem with a search for an ideal individual; Kālidāsa set out to illustrate a number of virtues in the family of Raghu.¹⁷ An individual, howsoever, great, may not be an answer to the problems of society and a nation so he placed his faith in the institution of family, represented by the line of Raghu. His anxiety for a worthy heir-apparent is clearly expressed in Raghuvamśa, and Śakuntalam and is also implicit in the other two drams, namely Mālavikāgnimitra and the Vikramorvaśīya. While respect for the sages and the hermitages is shown in all his works, the problem of destruction of evil, Tāraka, in his view, required the union of divine Śiva and Pārvatī through tapas for the birth of Kumāra.

Kālidāsa viewed literature as integrating of word and meaning comparable to the harmonious union of Śiva and his consort and its dramatic form as a peaceful visual sacrifice. His faith and philosophy were anchored in the Vedas, Smṛtis and the Purāṇas. He advocated an orderly progress in the four stages of human life divided into hierarchical system of the four varnas. He found the old scheme of trivarga (dharma,

artha and kāma) with the superemacy of dharma sufficient to meet the challenges of life. This is in bold contrast to Aśvaghosa. For him poetry is only a cover, a device to facilitate understanding of the significance and essence of liberation preached by a supremely great and enlightened soul, the Buddha. Aśvaghōṣa believed in the excellence of a great individual leading to the path of life-denying asceticism: Kālidāsa, on the other hand, made the great ascetic Śiva to unite with Pārvatī in a wedlock so that a brave warrior-god could be born to save the world from the attacks of the great demon. Even a Buddhist nun, Kauśikī is made to help in the union of the lovers. Kāma is not conceived by Kālidāsa as Māra, death or destruction as in Aśvaghōṣa but as a desire whose sensuality is burnt for gaining spirituality of love. All women characters in Kālidāsa are partners of their husbands in achieving the goal of dharam in harmony with artha, material prosperity and kāma, desire fore love.

Kālidāsa is a master poet of Śṛṅgāra. His cycle of seasons is soaked in earthly universal love between men and women set in the natural environment. Nature, man and the divine are one whole in his view. The lamentations of Rati at the death of her husband, kāma, pronounce in the Kumārasambhava (IV.33) the inseperable companionship in nature-

**After the Lord of Night the moonlight goes,
Alongwith the cloud the lightening is dissolved:
Wives even follow in their husbands' path;
Even things bereft of sense obey this law.¹⁹**

Nature is the central concern of the poet in all his works. It is conceived both in divine and human terms. The real hero of Meghadūta is the wandering cloud, rivers are his spouses waiting in separation and suffering in his absence. Śankuntalā is described as daughter of nature. More than the union of lovers, their separation heightens the intensity of mutually felt love. In Vālmīki, Sītā was a symbol of suffering in separation. In the works of Kālidāsa there are a host of others, besides Sītā, who represent her symbol. Śakuntalā repudiated by Duṣyanta, Pārvatī failing initially to gain the love of Śiva, Rati left behind by her love reduced to ashes, the death of Indumatī at the touch of a floral wreath,

Mālavikā reduced to the position of a maid-servant, the widowed queen of Agnivarṇa, the voluptuous last king in the line of Raghu, Yakṣiṇī in Alakā represent suffering in love. Constant companionship of Dilīpa and Sudakṣiṇā is a rare example which again is bedevilled by moments of anxiety for obtaining the heir-apparent for the kindom.

The fourth, sixth and 13th cantos of Raghūvaṃśa, the first part of Meghasandeśa and the first can to of Kumārasambhava describing the Himalayan region reveal Kālidāsa's knowledge of several parts of India, its country side, cities, capitals, people of different ranks, confluences of rivers and its presentation in elegant and polished form are unique creations of beauty. Through the descriptions of romance in nature, human and semi-divine worlds he has created poetic beauty, par-excellence.

Although he has portrayed ideal kings in his treatment of Dilīpa, Raghu, Aja and Rāma in Raghuvamśa, his criticism of the court and the kings is hardly hidden from the discerning eyes of a critic. Rāma is followed by nearly 25 non-descript kings and the curtain is drawn on the dynasty of Raghu with the portrayal of the licentious life of the king Agnivarṇa who was consumed by the fire of his lustful passion and died leaving behind his widowed queen in the family way suggesting some hope for the future. Ayodhyā, once the prosperous and mighty capital of the Ikṣvākus appears wailing in a dream. Ayodhyā had a glorious hoary past but its immediate past and future are no good. This is veiled criticism of the illustrious family which had already been indicated by Sītā when she was forsaken in the forest by Lakṣmaṇa at the command of Lord Rāma.²⁰

The fifth Act of Śkuntalam opens with a rebuke of the king Duṣyanta by Hamsapadikā. The two bards bestow full-throated praise on the king,²¹ a service for which they were employed. Śāraṅgarava and Śāradvata, two brother-like companions of the heroine, Śakuntalā, have no good opinion of the Court²² or the chamber where the king is seated alongwith the priest. Their sharp censure of the conduct of the king in his very presence and finally wrathful rebuke by Śankuntalā by describing him as a wicked rogue putting on the garb of virtue and resembling a

well covered with grass, is unmitigated criticism of the institution of kings and their treacherous ways. The hero of Vālmīki is Rāma who renounced the kingdom offered by Bharata, the hero of Aśvaghoṣa is Buddha who had renounced the world. The hero of the Kumārasāmbhava is the great ascetic Lord Śiva. Although kings are the heroes of three plays of Kālidāsa and an epic poem he has also voiced his criticism of the kings and the courts. Many later Sanskrit poets received no patronage from the kings. They preferred mythical beings or epic characters like Arjuna and Rāma as the heroes of their poems, yet they introduced cantos on polity so that the degenerate kings of their times might imbibe certain instructions. This is inspired by presentation of ideal kings and their polity in Vālmīki and Kālidāsa and not by their desire to seek the patronage of the kings of their days. The writers of historical or carita-kāvya or praśastikāvya, as distinct from mahākāvya, may have been a different class. I therefore, fail to appreciate description of the mahākāvya as court-poetry. No concrete evidence of royal patronage to mahākavis has been furnished so far.

The ideals which inspired the artistic creation of Kālidāsa are briefly and succinctly stated in the benedictory verses of his three plays particularly Vikramorvaśīya and Śākuntalam. In the former, union of wealth and learning for the prosperity of good people, and the welfare of all are prayed for; in the latter play maintenance of law and order, social welfare of subjects; by the kings, cultural progress of society and finally personal freedom of the individual and the poet, are advocated. The poetry of Vālmīki and Kālidāsa was born in different ages. Yet their purpose was the same as is enshrined in the famous verse of the Bhagvadgītā, IV.8:

परित्राणाय साधूनां विनाशाय च दुष्कृताम्।
धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय संभावामि युगे युगे॥

(For the protection of the good, for the destruction of the wicked and for the establishment of virtue I am born age after age). This Kālidāsa does by seeking the beautiful through the romance of nature and of human and divine beings.

The monistic school of Kashmir Śaivism developed by Somānanda, Utpala and Abhinavagupta propounded harmonious

integrality of Śiva and Śakti, as of word and meaning, or moon and her light. The distinction of one being real and consciousness (chetana) and the other being unreal matter was not accepted. The duality of bhoga (sensuality) and mokṣa (spirituality) was denied, the good and the beautiful were not opposed in this view. The higher self is active consciousness and not a passive witness devoid of all attributes. Freedom is the very essence of the spirit. Recognition of ever-present self, covered by a veil out of spontaneous desire for sporting, is the goal of human life. Umā (a. u, m or Praṇava arranged in irregular order of syllables and representing Śakti or dynamics within) could not recognise Śiva who was disguised in the form of Brahmācārīn. Her recognition and union with him represent realisation of the highest by the dynamic power of the self. In Śākuntalam Śākuntalā was not recognised by Duṣhyanta representing Īśa, Śiva. Finally he recognised her in the hermitage of Mārīca with the help of their son Bhrata. This represents realisation of Śakti by Śiva.²³

The allegorical significance and suggestiveness of Rama's story is indicated by Śaṅkara in his Ātmabodha. According to him the soul (Rāma) after crossing moha in the form of the sea and killing attachment and hatred (raga and dveṣa) represented by the rākṣaṣas, shines resplendently united with quietitude (Śānti in the form of Sitā).²⁴ The Vedānta of Rāmānuja looked upon the Rāmāyaṇa as a gospel of Śaraṇāgati (absolute surrender to God).²⁵ Such a tradition of interpretation is diametrically opposed to the modern view of considering it as a precursor of court-poetry.

The spirit of renunciation and tapas in the midst of material well-being and prosperity, a kind of harmony of trivarga (group of three ends of human life) and the fusion of abhyudaya (worldly progress) and (niḥśreyas) (Summum bonnum of life) are clearly brought out by Duṣhyanta when he observes the penance-groves of the venerable sages in the Śākuntalam (VII. 12):

प्राणानामनिलेन वृत्तिरुचिता सत्कल्पवृक्षे वने
तोये काञ्चनपद्मरेणुकपिशे धर्माभिषेकक्रिया ।
ध्यानं रत्नशिलातलेषु विवुधस्त्रीसन्निधौ संयमो
यत्कांक्षन्ति तपोभिरन्यमुनयस्तस्मिंस्तपस्यन्तमी ।।

(The necessary (or habitual) maintenance of life on the wind in a grove abounding in the desire-yielding trees, the performance of ablution for religious purposes in waters fragrant with the pollen of golden lotuses; mediation practised on jewel slabs, (thus) these (sages) are practising penance in the midst of objects which other sages desire (to attain) by austerities- tr. M.R. Kale).

The first poet found the truth through the search and success of the good, the mahākavi who followed him closely realised it by beholding the beautiful. Poetry of simple elegance born with Vālmīki was wedded to Kālidāsa out of her own free will on attaining her youth.

वाल्मीकेरजनि प्रकाशितगुणा व्यासेन लीलावती।
वैदर्भी कविता स्वयं वृतवती श्रीकालिदासं वरम्।।

Notes & References

1. Bhaṭṭa Tauta, the teacher of Abhinavagupta (10th century A.D.), as quoted by Hemaendra in his **Kāvyañuśāsana** (ed. Parikh, Vol. I, p. 433) maintains that the first poet, the seer, had a clear and uninterrupted vision of things but it was born as poetry only through its artistic presentation:

तथाहि दर्शने स्वच्छे नित्येऽप्यादिकवेमुनेः।
नोदिता कविता लोके यावज्जाता न वर्णना।।

Bhavabhūti spoke of this vision as irresistible light (avyāhata Jyotiḥ) and described Vālmīki as the first poet (see, **Uttararāmācarita**, II.5 and **Mālatīmadhava**, I.7). Indian tradition unanimously holds him as the first poet. Daṇḍin in **Avantisundarikathā** (opening verses), Soddhala in **Udaya-sundarī** (opening verses), Dhanapāla in **Tilakamañjarī**, Kṣemendra in the **Rāmāyaṇamañjarī** (ओंकार इव वर्णानां कवीनां प्रथमो मुनिः) and a host of others hold him as the first poet and a seer.

2. The following extracts from **Dhvanyāloka** of Ānandavaradhana clearly spell out the indebtedness of the dhvani theory to the **Rāmāyaṇa**:

- (i)रामायणमहाभारतप्रभृतिनि लक्ष्ये सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धव्यवहारं लक्ष्यतां सहृदयानामानन्दो मनसि लभतां प्रतिष्ठाम् ।। Ch. I
- (ii) काव्यस्यात्मा स एवार्थस्तथा चादिकवेः पुरा।
क्रौञ्चद्वन्द्ववियोगोत्थः शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः।। 1.4
- (iii) वाल्मीकिव्यतिरिक्तस्य यद्येकस्यापि कस्यचित्।
इष्यते प्रतिभार्थेषु तत्तदानन्त्यमक्षयम्।। Ch. Iv
- (iv) वाल्मीकिव्यासमुख्याश्च ये प्रख्याताः कवीश्वराः।
तदभिप्रायबाह्योऽयं नास्माभिर्दर्शितो नयः।। CH. 3

3. It would appear from the reading of **Dhvanyāloka** (see, Vṛtti on 1.6, 2.19, 3.14) that Ānandavaradhana considered Vālmīki and Vyāsa followed by Kālidāsa as the only Mahākavis, great poets, and their works as mahākāvya, deserving his highest respect. This is also borne out by his remark:

द्वित्राः पंचषो वा कवयः कालिदासाद्याः। CH. IV.

Description of the cities of a worthy hero intent on harmony of the three ends of life, description of the seasons, mountains, rivers, woods, groves, lakes, deserts, oceans, continents, even worlds, setting of the sun, rising of the moon, excitement of women, and such other features which constitute a mahākāvya are present in the **Rāmāyaṇa** and the mahākāvya of Kālidāsa.

4. Śoka, grief, pathos, pity or sorrow is not without an intense sense of karuṇā, compassion. Rāma's unceasing śoka at the separation from his love is described by Vālmīki:

शोकश्च किल कालेन गच्छता ह्यपगच्छति।
मेम चापश्यतः कान्तामहन्यहनि वर्धते।।

VI. 5.5 and see, also 6.9-11.

Kālidāsa in his **Raghuvamśa**, Ānandavaradhana in **Dhvanyāloka** (IV ch.), Rājaśekhara in **Kāvyañimāmsā** (Ch. III, Baroda Ed. p.7) hold that the śoka of the poet turned into śloka. Anuṣṭubha metre, though Vedic in origin, was perfected and made classic by the poet. Śloka also stands for glory or fame of the poet, Hence the primary and basic purpose of poetry is Kīrti (**karoti Kīrtim, Bhāmaha; kāvyam yaśase (Mammaṭa)**).

5. The opening verses of the **Rāmāyaṇa** even if treated as interpolations are the nearest and closest creative interpretation of the poet's intention in composing his poem. These may be quoted in full as these underline Vālmīki's concept of the ideal man (nara) :

कोन्वस्मिन्साम्प्रतं लोके गुणवान् कश्च वीर्यवान्।
धर्मज्ञश्च वृत्तज्ञश्च सत्यवाक्यो दृढव्रतः॥
चारित्र्येण च को युक्तः सर्वभूतेषु को हितः।
विद्वान् कः कः समर्थश्च कश्चैकप्रियदर्शनः॥
आत्मवान् को जितक्रोधो द्युतिमान् कोऽनुसूयकः।
कस्य बिभ्यति देवाश्च जातरोगस्य संयुगे॥ I. 1-29

These verses emphasise virtue, valour, knowledge of law, sense of gratitude, truthfulness, firm resolve, impeccable character, beneficence for all beings, wisdom, efficacy, charming appearance, self-control, lustre in anger, being a terror for Gods in a battle. Various episodes of the **Rāmāyaṇa** amply illustrate the presence of these qualities in the character of Rāma.

6. हास्यशृंगारकारुण्यरौद्रवीरभयानकैः।

बीभत्सादिरसैर्युक्तं काव्यमेतदगायताम्॥ *ibid*, 1.48

Ānandavardhana holds that karuṇa is the dominant rasa in the **Rāmāyaṇa**. This is hinted at by the first poet himself. The poem ends with the final separation from Sītā and the Karuṇa has been consummated in the epic: रामायणे हि करुणो रसः स्वयमादिकविना सूचितः शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः इत्येवंवादिना। *Dhavanyāloka*, Ch. IV; also निर्व्यूढश्च स एव सीतात्यन्तवियोगपर्यन्तमेव स्वप्रबन्धमुपरचयता। *Ibid*, Kuntaka also held the same view (*Vakroktijivita*, Krishnamoorthy, ed. P. 276). The śoka of Daśaratha and of the inhabitants of Ayodhyā at the exile of Rāma to the forest for fourteen years, that of Rāma and Sītā in their separation (once when Sītā was kidnapped by Rāvaṇa and again when she was abandoned by Rāma himself on account of the scandal) make it abiding in the **Rāmāyaṇa** from the beginning to the end.

7. He is usually described as dharmātman, anchored in dharma, dharmajña, knower of dhrama. Daśaratha considered him 'wise elder' in the practice of dharma; Kauśalyā testified to Rāma's impregnable faith in dharma which will protect her son even in the wild forest; Mārica clearly perceived him as the embodiment of dharma (**Ramo vighrahavān dharmah**), Viśvāmitra found him to be the refuge of the entire world (**sarvalokaśaranya**), so did Tārā (see, **Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa**, 15.19), Vālin thought dharmajña can not sin against him (*Ibid*, 16.5). Mandodarī was full of praise for Rāma and like Tārā advised her husband not to pick a quarrel with him.

8. Vālin asked Rāma: "I have committed no offence against your city or the people nor have I humiliated you then why have you killed me who has committed no sin" (*ibid*, 16.20)

The repudiation of Sītā by Rāma after killing Rāvaṇa is very harsh and inhuman:

(i) रावणाङ्कपरिभ्रष्टा दृष्टा दुष्टेन चक्षुषा।

कथं त्वां पुनरादद्यां कुलं व्यपदिशन्महत्॥ *Yuddhakāṇḍa*, 38.20.

(ii) लक्ष्मणे भरते वा त्वं कुरु बुद्धिं यथासुखम्।

सुग्रीवे वानरेन्द्रे वा राक्षसेन्द्रे विभीषणे॥ *Ibid*, 22.3

He is chastised by Kālidās for abandoning a fully pregnant queen in the deep forest without any help and security. Bhavabhūti also implies his disapproval when he says: रामस्य बाहुरसि निर्भरगर्भखिन्नसीताविवासनपटोः करुणा कुतस्ते। *Uttararāmcarita*.

9. **Rāmāyaṇa**, 16.117, 6.11.

10. (i) आनुशंस्यमनुक्रोशः श्रुतं शीलं दमः शमः।

राघवं शोभयन्त्येते षड्गुणाः पुरुषर्षभ॥ *Ibid*, 2.33,12

(ii) मूलं ह्येषः मनुष्याणां धर्मसारो महाद्युतिः।

पुष्यं फलं च पत्रं च शाखाश्चास्येतरे जनाः॥ *Ibid*, 15

11. *Ibid*, 4.15, 17-22 and 10th, 35th, 63rd and 111th sargas of **Yuddhakāṇḍa**.

12. अनाथश्च हि वृद्धश्च मया चैव विनाकृतः।

किं करिष्यति कामात्मा कैकेयीवशमागतः॥

इदं व्यसनमालोक्य राजश्च मतिविभ्रमम्।

काम एवार्थधर्माभ्यां गरीयानिति मे मतिः॥ *Ibid*, 2.47.6.13-14

In his reply to dying Vālin, Rāma made it clear that indulgence in lust by taking the brother's wife is the real reason for awarding the punishment of death.

13. *Ibid*, 1.4-11.

14. *Ibid*, 6.131-114.

15. *Ibid*, 1.4.6

16. जनकतनयास्नापुण्योदकेषु I.1 ;

वन्द्यैः पुंसां रघुपतिपदैरङ्कितं मेखलासु I.12 ;

इत्याख्याते पवनतनये मैथिलीवोन्मुखी सा II. 37

17. **Raghuvamśa**, I. 5-9.
18. **Ibid**, I. 25; xiv. 21.
19. **Ibid**, Iv. 33, tr. By A.A. Macdonell, **A History of Sanskrit Literature**, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1962, p. 277.
20. **Raghuvamśa**, xiv. 61.
21. **Śākuntala**, V. 7-8.
22. **Ibid**, 10-11; 25.
23. For detailed treatment see R.C. Dwivedi, **Kashmir Kī Śaiva Paramparā**, National Publishing House, New Delhi, 1990.
24. तीर्त्वा मोहार्णवं हित्वा रागद्वेषादिराक्षसान्।
शान्तिसीतासमायुक्त आत्मारामो विराजते।।
25. The wife of Vālin had declared Rāma as:
निवासवृक्षः साधूनामापन्नानां परागतिः।
आर्तानां संश्रयश्चैव यशसश्चैकभाजनम्।। **Kiṣkindhākānda**, 15.19.

(Typed)



4. आचार्य आनन्दवर्धन

संस्कृत के साहित्य-समीक्षकों में राजानक आनन्दवर्धन का नाम सबसे अधिक महनीय है। काश्मीर के इस अलंकारशास्त्री का आज भी वही आदर है जो इसे अवन्तिवर्मा तथा उनके पुत्र शंकर वर्मा के साम्राज्य में प्राप्त था। इन्हीं राजाओं के राज्यकाल के अनुसार इनका स्थितिकाल नवमशतक का मध्यार्ध तथा उत्तरार्ध है। यह युग अनेक दृष्टियों से महत्त्वपूर्ण है। इस समय भारत की सौन्दर्यभूमि काश्मीर इस देश का शारदापीठ था। दार्शनिक चिन्तन, काव्यसृष्टि तथा काव्यसमीक्षा की वह क्रीड़ाभूमि थी। यों तो आनन्दवर्धन का महत्त्व सहृदय साहित्यसमीक्षक के रूप में है किन्तु उनके व्यक्तित्व और कृतित्व में दार्शनिक तथा कवि के व्यक्तित्व का अपूर्व मिश्रण है। इनकी रचनाएँ इस मान्यता के लिये पर्याप्त आधार हैं। दैवीशतक, विषमवाणलीला तथा अर्जुनचरित में हमें उनके कवि-व्यक्तित्व का दर्शन होता है तो उनकी दार्शनिक कृतियाँ तत्त्वालोक तथा प्रयासविनिश्चयटीकाविवृति उनके चिन्तनप्रवण व्यक्तित्व का पर्याप्त परिचय देती हैं। इस प्रकार आनन्दवर्धन सहृदय हैं, कवि हैं, दार्शनिक हैं और इन सबसे परे ध्वनिकार हैं-साहित्यसमीक्षा के एक युगान्तरकारी

ध्वनि-सिद्धान्त के प्रवर्तक। संस्कृत के अन्य अनेक आचार्यों की भाँति इस महान् समीक्षक के जीवन और देश के सम्बन्ध में दैवीशतक के आधार पर और काव्यानुशासन के लेखक हेमचन्द्र द्वारा पुनरुल्लेख के अनुसार केवल इतना ही मालूम है कि इनके पिता का नाम 'नीरू' था जिसका अशुद्ध रूप एक पाण्डुलिपि में 'जोन' के रूप में मिलता है। इनका वास्तविक परिचय तो इनकी कमनीय और मौलिक कृति ध्वन्यालोक के विचारों से अवगत होने में है जिसे सर्वप्रथम प्रकाश में लाने का श्रेय डॉ. व्यूल्हर को प्राप्त है। इस ग्रन्थ को 'सहृदयालोक' संज्ञा भी दी जाती है। इसके प्रमुखतया तीन अंग हैं कारिका, वृत्ति तथा उदाहरण। उदाहरणों का वृत्ति की परिभाषा के अनुसार उसी का अंग मान लें तो ग्रन्थ का विभाजन दो भागों में मानना अनुचित न होगा। इनके अतिरिक्त कतिपय संग्रहश्लोक या संक्षेपश्लोक तथा परिकरश्लोक भी हैं, जिनमें वृत्ति-प्रतिपादित विषय का संक्षेप या उपबृंहण है। ध्वन्यालोक की यह शैली नवीन नहीं है। इस देश का विशाल साहित्य, सूत्र या कारिका की संक्षिप्त शैली में सन्निबद्ध है। अलंकारशास्त्र का प्रारूप यदि भरत के नाट्यशास्त्र से मान लें तो सूत्र अथवा कारिका के रूप में इस शास्त्र का अन्य अनेक शास्त्रों की भाँति प्रारम्भ माना जायेगा। इसके बाद भामह, दण्डी, उद्भट तथा रुद्रट ने पदों में इस शास्त्र का विकास किया। वामन ने काव्यालंकार सूत्र वृत्ति लिखकर एक नवीन शैली को, जिसका प्रयोग उस समय दूसरे शास्त्रों की रचना में प्रचलित था, मान्यता दी। ग्रन्थकार स्वयं सूत्र या कारिका का निर्माण करता है, उन पर अपनी वृत्ति लिखकर अपने अथवा दूसरे कवियों के काव्य से उदाहरण प्रस्तुत करता है। वामन के ग्रन्थ की इसी रूपशैली में आनन्दवर्धन का ध्वन्यालोक लिया गया है और उसके बाद कुन्तक ने वक्रोक्तिजीवित, मम्मट ने काव्यप्रकाश तथा रुय्यक ने अलंकारसर्वस्व, इसी रूपविद्या में लिखा है।

आनन्दवर्धन के समय काश्मीर में इस शैली का प्रचार न केवल अलंकारशास्त्रियों अपितु दार्शनिकों में भी था। स्वभावतः ध्वन्यालोककार ने अपने समय की शैली को अपनाया है किन्तु डॉ. व्यूल्हर के समय से यह विवाद आज तक जीवित है कि कारिकाकार कौन है और वृत्तिकार कौन है? अभिनवगुप्त ने कारिकाकार का अस्मन्मूल ग्रन्थकार के रूप में तथा वृत्ति के लेखक का वृत्तिकार तथा ग्रन्थकार का ग्रन्थकृत के रूप में उल्लेख किया है। अनेकत्र उन्होंने कारिका और वृत्ति के मतों में विरोध की उद्घावना भी की है। इन्हीं के आधार पर डॉ. व्यूल्हर, प्रो. याकोबी, डॉ. कीथ आदि प्राचीन और डॉ. वे, डॉ. काणे, प्रो. शिव प्रसाद आदि अधुनातन विद्वान् ध्वनिकार तथा वृत्तिकार को भिन्न मानते हैं। ध्वन्यालोक के सहृदयमनःप्रीतये और उसकी वृत्ति सहृदयानामानन्दो मनसि लभतां सुप्रतिष्ठाम् तथा मुकुलभट्ट के तथाहि तत्र विवक्षितान्यपरता सहृदयैः काव्यवतर्त्मनि निरूपिता आदि में आए 'सहृदय' शब्द के आधार पर। जो सर्वदा बहुवचनान्त है। डॉ.काणे ने

ध्वनिकार अथवा कारिकाकार का नाम 'सहृदय' तथा वृत्तिकार का नाम आनन्द सिद्ध करने की चेष्टा की है। यह विवाद वस्तुतः आज के खोजपूर्ण दिमाग की उपज है जो बहुत कुछ तर्क के केशाकर्षण पर आधारित है। अभिनव द्वारा भिन्न रूप में उल्लेख प्रकल्पित है—विषय को स्पष्ट करने के लिए। अभिनव स्वयं अभिनवभारती के अनेक स्थलों में कारिकाभाग तथा वृत्तिभाग के प्रतिपाद्य को अभिन्न मान कर चले हैं। अभिनवोत्तर प्रायः सभी आचार्य कारिका और वृत्ति के विषय में किसी प्रकार का लेखक-भेद पर आधृत वैषम्य नहीं मानते हैं। आनन्दवर्धन स्वयं अथवा अभिनव या दूसरे परवर्ती आचार्य ने मूलध्वनिकार के नाम तक की स्पष्ट चर्चा नहीं की है। और फिर आनन्दवर्धन के समकालीन जयन्तभट्ट से लेकर काश्मीर के कुन्तक, मम्मट, महिम, रुय्यक आदि तथा अन्य आलंकारिकों द्वारा ध्वन्यालोक को एक ग्रन्थ और उसका लेखक आनन्दवर्धन को मानने की संस्कृत साहित्य की अक्षुण्ण परम्परा किसी भी तरह टाली नहीं जा सकती। आनन्द के ही शब्दों में कृतित्व के सम्बन्ध में उत्तर इस प्रकार होगा -

इति काव्यार्थविवेको योऽयं चेतश्चमत्कृतिविधायी।
सूरिभिरनुसृतसारैरस्मदुपज्ञो न विस्मार्थः॥

काव्यालोचन का यह ध्वनिसिद्धान्त 'अस्मदुपज्ञ' है अर्थात् आनन्दवर्धन द्वारा प्रतिष्ठापित है।

ध्वनिकार के रूप में आनन्दवर्धन की चर्चा के पूर्व उनकी कविता को परख लेना आवश्यक है, नहीं तो मुझे डर है कि ध्वनिसिद्धान्त वह काव्यसमीक्षा समझी जायेगी जो केवल बुद्धिप्रेरित है अतः शास्त्रीय है किन्तु कवित्वपूर्ण या भावात्मक नहीं। काव्यलोक निःसीम है, उसका एकमात्र प्रजापति है कवि। विधाता के विश्व को वह अपनी रुचि के अनुसार रंग देता रहता है -

अपारे काव्यसंसारे कविरैकः प्रजापतिः।
यथास्मै रोचते विश्वं तथेदं परिवर्तते॥ (ध्वन्यालोक, ३)

शृंगारी कवि, काव्यलोक को रस से भर देता है। कुसुमसायक की 'विषम बाणलीला' देखिये असुरों में न राग है, न अनुराग, उनका हृदय कौस्तुभमणि जैसे रत्न को पाने में लगा है, प्रेयसी के बिम्बाघर में उसे ला बैठाना तो विषमबाण की ही लीला है।

तत्तेषां श्रीसहोदरत्नाहरणे हृदयमेकरसम्।
बिम्बाधरे प्रियाणां निवेशितं कुसुमवाणेन।।

(संस्कृतच्छाया, ध्वन्यालोक, २)

श्लोक सुन्दर है, पर आप तारीफ करें तो क्योंकि कवि का कहना है, गुण तभी गुण हैं जब सहृदय उसकी प्रशंसा करें। सूर्य की किरणों का अनुग्रह पाकर ही कमल सचमुच कमल है-

तदा जायन्ते गुणा यदा ते सहृदयैर्गृह्यन्ते।
रविकिरणानुग्रहीतानि भवन्ति कमलानि कमलानि।।

ध्वनि काव्य की आत्मा है, काव्य का जीवातु है, वह उपस्कार्य है, अलङ्कार्य है, गुण और अलंकारों की भाँति उपस्कारक नहीं। गुण आदि तो उसी के साम्राज्य में चारुता का आधान करते हैंयस्य गुणालंकारकृतचारुत्वपरिग्रहसाम्राज्यम्। वेदान्ती का ब्रह्म अनिर्वचनीय है, माया उसे बता नहीं सकती, उसका संकेत भर कर सकती है। काव्यात्मा ध्वनि भी, एक दृष्टि से, अनिर्वचनीय है, अभिधा से वह अभिधेय नहीं है, लक्षण से उसे लक्षित करना सम्भव नहीं है। उसका केवल सूचन, ध्वनन या द्योतन हो सकता है, वर्णन या अभिधान नहीं। अभिधा अथवा तात्पर्या के माध्यम से उसकी संवृत्ति सम्भव नहीं है। इस सभी से परे व्यञ्जना की स्वीकृति आवश्यक है। वही द्वार है, माध्यम या व्यापार है जो ध्वनितत्व की अनुभूति में हमारी सहायता कर सकता है। यह है ध्वनि सिद्धान्त। काव्यालोचन की यह स्थापना नवम शती की है। इसके पूर्व भी काव्य थे, सहृदय थे, काव्यास्वाद होता था और उसका शास्त्रीय विवेचन भी। कालिदास की कविता सुनकर आनन्दवर्धन को जितना आनन्द मिला होगा उससे कम भामह या वामन को नहीं। और यही क्यों, कालिदास भी तो वाल्मीकि की रामायण से द्रवित होकर कह उठे थे शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः। पर कविता सुन्दरी के सौन्दर्य की, शास्त्रीय शब्दों में आनन्दवर्धन तक, समग्ररूप में व्याख्या कोई न कर सका था। ध्वनिसिद्धान्त की निर्भ्रान्त स्थापना तथा काव्यसमीक्षा के अन्य तत्त्वों के साथ उसका सम्बन्ध और समन्वय आनन्द की ही देन है। इनके पूर्व भी साहित्यालोचन के इतिहास में समय-समय पर उद्भावित काव्यतत्त्व की व्यापक परिधि में पूर्ववर्ती समीक्षातत्त्वों के समन्वय और समाहार की अपूर्व चेष्टा सदा वर्तमान थी। भामह ने अतिशयोक्ति की व्यापकता में समग्र अलंकारों का बीज माना था। दण्डी और विशेषतः वामन ने गुण और अलंकार को काव्य के क्रमशः अन्तरंग और बहिरंग धर्म मानकर इन्हें काव्यसौन्दर्य का पर्याय माना। समन्वय की यह चेष्टा सदा जागरूक थी यद्यपि इसमें न पूर्णता थी और न वैज्ञानिकता। संभवतः पूर्ववर्ती आचार्यों ने समझौता किया था, समन्वय नहीं। ध्वनिवाद के दूसरे सिद्धान्तों के साथ समझौता नहीं अपितु समन्वय हुआ। समझौता कदाचित् निर्बलता का प्रतीक है। पर समन्वय व्यापकता तथा उदारता का। रसध्वनि को श्रेष्ठ

मानकर ही आनन्दवर्धन ने दूसरे काव्यतत्त्वों को उचित स्थान दिया और सभी को स्वीकार करना पड़ा कि ध्वनिकार ने आलंकारिक सरणि को व्यवस्था प्रदान की -

ध्वनिकृतमालंकारिकसरणिव्यवस्थापनात्।

ध्वनि-स्थापना के बाद अनेक आचार्यों ने इसका अनुगमन नहीं किया। वक्रोक्तिजीवित के लेखक कुन्तक तथा व्यक्तिविवेक के प्रणेता महिम भट्ट का नाम इस सम्बन्ध में विशेषरूप से उल्लेखनीय है। कुन्तक अपनी वक्रोक्ति सीमा में ध्वनि के लावण्य का संग्रह या समाहार करना चाहते थे और महामति महिम तार्किक प्रक्रिया के आधार पर उस सौन्दर्य को तार्किक चिन्तन की बेड़ी में जकड़ना चाहते थे। पर ध्वनि का न तो वक्रोक्ति में अन्तर्भाव सम्भव है और न महामति महिम का साहस इसका खण्डन कर काव्यसौन्दर्य को तार्किक प्रक्रिया में बांध सकता है। वह काव्यसौन्दर्य या ध्वनि जिसे अभिनव के शब्दों में हम काव्यार्थ कह सकते हैं, प्रत्यय और उपसर्ग से लेकर महाकाव्य तक व्यापक है। आनन्दवर्धन ने ध्वनि द्वारा महाभारत के रस की ही व्याख्या नहीं की है जबकि वस्तुतः वही पहले आचार्य हैं जो समस्त काव्य से व्यंग्य ध्वनि अर्थात् प्रबन्धध्वनि की चर्चा करते हैं, बल्कि उन्होंने अमरूक के रसपेशल मुक्तक की मौलिक तरलता की भी मुक्तकण्ठ से प्रशंसा की है। उनकी काव्य-समीक्षा केवल वाल्मीकि, व्यास, कालिदास या अमरूक की ही प्रशंसा नहीं करती, जबकि आनन्दवर्धन यह भी कहते नहीं चूकते कि कवि इस संसार में दो तीन ही होते हैं, बल्कि वह प्रत्येक कवि को प्रेरणा देती है। ध्वनि जैसे महान् तत्त्व का प्रतिपादन करने के बाद भी आनन्दवर्धन को प्रत्येक कवि से अपेक्षा है कि निराशा और अवसाद को स्थान दिये बिना वह निरन्तर अपनी वाणी का प्रतान करता रहे-

प्रतायन्तां वाचो निमित्तविविधार्थामृतरसा,

न सादः कर्तव्यः कविभिरनववे स्वविषये।

परस्वादानेच्छाविरतमनसो वस्तु सुकवेः,

सरस्वत्यैवैषा रचयति यथेष्टं भगवती।।(ध्वन्यालोक, ४.१७)

सहृदय कवि समीक्षक आनन्दवर्धन का यह सन्देश प्रत्येक युग और देश के प्रत्येक कवि से है।

(टङ्कित)



5. संस्कृत साहित्य में समीक्षा का मानक ग्रन्थ वक्रोक्तिजीवित

संस्कृत में साहित्यालोचन के प्रमुख तत्त्व अथवा सिद्धान्त अलंकार, गुण-रीति, रस, ध्वनि वक्रोक्ति, औचित्य आदि से आप परिचित हैं। वक्रोक्ति को व्यापक काव्यसिद्धान्त के रूप में प्रतिष्ठित करने का श्रेय महान् ग्रन्थ वक्रोक्तिजीवित को है जो १०वीं शताब्दी के मध्यभाग में लिखा गया था। डॉ. सुशील कुमार दे ने इसका पहला संस्करण १९२३ ई. में निकाला था। इसका आधार मद्रास पुस्तकालय से प्राप्त अपूर्ण एवं अशुद्ध पाण्डुलिपि थी जिसके बारे में कहा जाता है कि वह मलाबार के तट के किसी अध्यापक से प्राप्त हुई थी। १९२६ ई में डॉ. दे को जैसलमेर में स्थित जैन भण्डार से एक दूसरी पाण्डुलिपि की प्रतिलिपि प्राप्त हुई जो शुद्ध थी, पर थी यह भी अपूर्ण। इसकी सहायता से १९२८ में डॉ. दे ने द्वितीय संस्करण निकाला।

वक्रोक्तिजीवित में कुल चार उन्मेष अर्थात् अध्याय हैं। दो पूर्ण हैं। तृतीय तथा चतुर्थ अभी भी बीच-बीच में त्रुटित अवस्था में हैं। पर जो भी मिल सका है उससे ग्रन्थ का प्रतिपाद्य पूर्ण-सा हो जाता है। आचार्य विश्वेश्वर सिद्धान्त शिरोमणि ने अपने विवेक से इस ग्रन्थ का अनेकत्र संशोधन-परिष्कार कर इसका हिन्दी अनुवाद तथा व्याख्या प्रस्तुत की है जो डॉ. नगेन्द्र की ३००पृष्ठों की विशाल भूमिका के साथ १९५५ में हिन्दी वक्रोक्तिजीवित के नाम प्रकाशित हो चुकी है। यह है अत्यन्त संक्षेप में इस महान् ग्रन्थ के संपादन और प्रकाशन की कहानी। वैदिक एवं लौकिक संस्कृत के अनेक लुप्तप्राय ग्रन्थों को सुरक्षित रखने का श्रेय राजस्थान को प्राप्त है। वक्रोक्तिजीवित भी उनमें से एक है।

इस महान् ग्रन्थ के लेखक का नाम मद्रास पाण्डुलिपि में कुन्तल या कुन्तलक है जिसका शब्दार्थ है केश। किन्तु जैसलमेर की पाण्डुलिपि में ही नहीं अपितु महिमभट्ट के व्यक्तिविवेक^१ में भट्ट गोपाल तथा सोमेश्वर की काव्यप्रकाश व्याख्या^२ में विद्याधर की एकावली^३ में तथा अरुणाचलनाथ की कुमारसंभव टीका में कुन्तक नाम ही आया है। यही ठीक है। क्योंकि सदोष काव्य की तीक्ष्ण आलोचना में वक्रोक्तिजीवितकार कुन्तक अर्थात् भाले का ही काम करता है। राजानक इस ग्रन्थकार की उपाधि है जिससे प्रतीत होता है कि इसका जन्म कविता और केसर की भूमि काश्मीर में हुआ था। सम्भवतः यह अभिनवगुप्त का ज्येष्ठ समकालीन है और ११वीं शती के महिमभट्ट द्वारा नामतः उल्लेख से स्पष्ट है कि १०वीं शताब्दी के मध्यमभाग में इसने वक्रोक्तिजीवित लिखा होगा।

इस ग्रन्थ में चार उन्मेष हैं जैसे कि ध्वन्यालोक में चार उद्योत। ग्रन्थ के दो भाग हैं-कारिका तथा उन पर वृत्ति। ग्रन्थकार वृत्ति में कारिकाओं के विषय-विवेचन के साथ संस्कृत के प्रसिद्ध काव्य, नाटक आदि से उदाहरण प्रस्तुत करता है। भामह, दण्डी, आनन्दवर्धन आदि आचार्यों के मतों का उल्लेख करता है और साथ ही अन्तर श्लोकों के माध्यम से विवेचित विषय का कहीं संवर्धन और कहीं समाहार प्रस्तुत कर देता है। प्रथम उन्मेष में भामह के अनुसार काव्य का प्रयोजन बताकर उन्हीं के अनुसार काव्य-लक्षण प्रस्तुत किया है। वक्र कवि व्यापार से सुशोभित, सहृद सहृदयों को आह्लादित करने वाली रचना में व्यवस्थित शब्द तथा अर्थ का सहभाव काव्य है-

**शब्दार्थौ सहितौ वक्रकविव्यापारशालिनि ।
वन्दे व्यवस्थितौ काव्यं तद्विदाह्लादकारिणि ।।**

कुन्तक के अनुसार केवल शब्द अथवा केवल अर्थ कितना भी चमत्कारी क्यों न हो काव्य नहीं हो सकता। काव्य के लिए शब्दार्थ का विशिष्ट साहित्य आवश्यक है। यह विशेषता वक्रता के विचित्र गुण एवं अलंकार संपदा की परस्पर स्पर्धा से आती है जिसमें शब्द तथा अर्थ न घटाये जा सकते हैं और न बढ़ाये जा सकते हैं। शब्द और अर्थ की पारस्परिक शोभा बढ़ाने वाली विन्यासभंगिमा ही साहित्य है। माधुर्य आदि गुण, विचित्र अलंकार-विन्यास, वृत्तियों के औचित्य के साथ रस-परिपोष इसी शब्दार्थ-साहित्य में स्पर्धापूर्वक विद्यमान रहते हैं। इस अलौकिक साहित्य की सृष्टि वेद अथवा शास्त्र में संभव नहीं है। यह तो केवल वक्र कवि व्यापार का ही परिणाम है। कवि-प्रतिभा के संस्पर्श से काव्य में वक्रता आती है। यह वक्रता क्या है जिसे कुन्तक ने काव्य की आत्मा घोषित किया है। वक्रोक्ति को स्पष्ट करने के लिए उन्होंने जिन अनेक पर्यायवाची शब्दों का प्रयोग किया है उनमें विचित्र अभिधा, तथा वैदग्ध्यभंगीभणिति प्रमुख हैं। पहले का अभिप्राय है कि शास्त्रादि में प्रसिद्ध शब्दार्थ-विन्यास से विलक्षण वैचित्र्यपूर्ण अभिधान वक्रोक्ति है। दूसरे में वैदग्ध्य अर्थात् कवि-कौशल की विछित्ति से मनोहारी भणिति अर्थात् उक्ति को वक्रोक्ति कहा गया है। उन्होंने स्वभावोक्ति का विरोध करते हुए भी स्वभाव के समन्वय के परिपोषण को वक्रता का परम रहस्य घोषित किया है। यह भी कहा है कि वक्रोक्ति सभी अलंकारों का सामान्य रूप है। वस्तुतः कुन्तक ने अपने ग्रन्थ का नाम ही काव्यालङ्कार घोषित किया था और शब्द तथा अर्थ को अलङ्कार्य मान कर उन्होंने कहा है कि वक्रोक्ति ही उसका एकमात्र अलङ्कार है -

**उभावेतावलङ्कार्यौ तयोः पुनरलङ्कृतिः ।
वक्रोक्तिरिव वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितिरुच्यते ।।**

संक्षेप में वक्रोक्ति शास्त्रीय एवं व्याहारिक शब्द-प्रयोग से विलक्षण होने के कारण विचित्र अभिधा है जो कवि-व्यापार से प्रसूत होती है, वस्तु के स्वभाव को विच्छित्ति प्रदान करती है तथा सहृदय के हृदय को अलौकिक आह्लाद अथवा चमत्कार का अनुभव कराती है।

इस वक्र के छः भेद हैं जो वर्ण से लेकर प्रबन्ध तक व्याप्त हैं। अतः पहला भेद वर्णवक्रता है और अन्तिम प्रबन्धवक्रता। वर्ण के बाद पद का स्थान है। पद का निर्माण प्रकृति और प्रत्यय से होता है। प्रकृति पद का पूर्वार्ध है तो प्रत्यय परार्ध। इस प्रकार पद-गत वक्रता के आधार पर दो भेद हुए-पद-पूर्वार्ध-वक्रता तथा पद-परार्ध-वक्रता। पदों का समुदाय वाक्य होता है। अतः चौथी वक्रता है वाक्य-वक्रता। वाक्यों का समुदाय प्रकरण कहलाता है जो प्रबन्ध का अंग होता है। इस पर आश्रित वक्रता प्रकरण-वक्रता कहलाती है। काव्य का महत्तम रूप है प्रबन्ध। इसके आधार पर प्रबन्ध-वक्रता कहलाती है जो छठा और अन्तिम भेद है।

वर्ण-विन्यास-वक्रता अर्थात् अक्षरों के विशिष्ट विन्यास में उन्होंने प्राचीन आचार्यों के द्वारा सम्मत अनुप्रास तथा यमक का सन्निवेश किया है। इसका उदाहरण प्रस्तुत है-

**प्रथममरुणच्छायस्तावत् ततः कनकप्रभः
तदनु विरहोत्ताम्यतन्वीकपोलतलद्युतिः ।
प्रसरति ततो ध्वान्तक्षोदक्षमः क्षणदामुखे
सरसविसिनी-कन्दच्छेदच्छविर्मृगलाञ्छनः ।।**

इस पद्य में विभिन्न वर्णों का श्रुतिमधुर उपन्यास वर्णविन्यासवक्रता को स्पष्ट करता है। इस विन्यास में कवि ने न तो प्रयत्न किया है और न उसका आग्रह ही है। अतएव शब्दार्थ साहित्य सुरक्षित है, प्रयत्नपूर्वक अनुप्रास का निर्माण होने पर औचित्य भग्न हो जाता है। यमक में भी इसी प्रकार प्रसादगुण, श्रुतिसुकुमारता तथा औचित्य आवश्यक है।

वक्रोक्ति का दूसरा भेद है पदपूर्वार्धवक्रता जिसके अन्तर्गत कुन्तक ने लक्षणा मूलक ध्वनि के उदाहरणों को रूढिवैचित्र्यवक्रता के प्रभेद में लिया है। इसी का दूसरा प्रभेद है पर्यायवक्रता। अबला, नारी, पत्नी, भार्या आदि शब्दकोश में पर्याय हैं पर सचमुच कविभाषा में किसी भी शब्द का कोई पर्याय नहीं होता। कवि-व्यापार की वक्रता उचित शब्द को पहिचान लेती है जिसे किसी दूसरे पर्याय से बदला नहीं जा सकता। नन्दिनी गौ को शंकर के अनुचर सिंह ने आक्रान्त कर लिया है, दिलीप उसकी रक्षा में बाण चलाना चाहते हैं। सिंह कहता है - अलं महीपाल तव श्रमेण।

पृथ्वी का पालन करने वाले (महीपाल) अपना श्रम रहने दो। राजा के अनेक पर्याय हैं। पर यहाँ महीपाल के अलावा वे सब निरर्थक साबित होंगे। इसी पदपूर्वार्धवक्रता का तीसरा प्रभेद है उपचारवक्रता। भिन्न पदार्थों में भेदबुद्धि मिटाकर अभेदप्रतीति कराना उपचार कहलाता है। यही रूपक आदि अलङ्कारों का प्राण है। उज्जयिनी में अभिसारिकाएँ रात के सूचिभेद अन्धकार में अपने प्रियतम के आवास जाती हैं। कालिदास मेघ से कहते हैं कि तुम उन्हें बिजली से धरती दिखा देना, बरसना-गर्जना भी नहीं क्योंकि कहीं वे परेशान न हो जाएँ-

गच्छन्तीनां रमणवसतिं योषितां तत्र नक्तम्
रुद्धालोके नरपतिपथे सूचिभेद्वैस्तमोभिः।
सौदामन्या कनकनिकषस्निग्धया दर्शयोर्वी
तोयोत्सर्गस्तनितमुखरो मा स्म भूर्विक्लवास्ताः।।

सुई से टोस पदार्थ को छेदा जा सकता है पर अन्धकार जैसे अमूर्त पदार्थ को छेदना भेद में अभेद बोध कराना ही है। इसी तरह जब सीता से बिछुड़े राम कहते हैं कि आकाश स्निग्ध और श्यामल कान्ति से लिपा हुआ है- स्निग्धश्यामल-कान्तिलिप्तवियतः तो सहृदय अमूर्त कान्ति द्वारा अमूर्त आकाश के लेपन की उपचारवक्रता से चमत्कृत हो जाता है। रुय्यक का कथन है कि कुन्तक ने इसी वक्रता के अन्तर्गत समस्त ध्वनिभेद को अन्तर्भूत कर लिया है। पदपूर्वार्धवक्रता के और भी प्रभेद वक्रोक्तिजीवितकार ने विशेषण, संवृति अथवा गोपन, प्रत्यय, वृत्ति अर्थात् समास, तद्धित, सुब्धातु आदि, भाव अर्थात् क्रिया, लिङ्ग, आदि की वक्रता के माध्यम से बतलाये हैं।

तीसरे भेद पदपरार्धवक्रता के अन्तर्गत कुन्तक ने काल, कारक, संख्या, पुरुष, उपग्रह (अर्थात् धातु के परस्मैपद तथा आत्मनेपद), प्रत्यय, उपसर्ग तथा निपात आदि को वक्रता में सम्मिलित किया है। दुष्यन्त अनुताप में कहता है: मैं उस पक्षमलाक्षी शकुन्तला का कन्धे की ओर मुड़ा मुंह किसी प्रकार उठा पाया था पर चूम नहीं पाया। कालिदास का पूरा पद्य इस प्रकार है:

मुहुरंगुलिसंवृताधरोष्ठं प्रतिषेधाक्षरविक्लवाभिरामम्।
मुखमंसविवर्ति पक्षमलाक्ष्याः कथमप्युन्नमितं न चुम्बितं तु।।

इसका 'तु' शब्द दुष्यन्त के अनुताप, सरसता, निराशा का एकसाथ व्यञ्जक है। यह व्यञ्जकता वस्तुतः कवि-व्यापार की वक्रता है। ध्वन्यालोककार आनन्दवर्धन ने भी माना था कि अलक्ष्यक्रम ध्वनि सुबन्त, तिङन्त, वचन, संबंध, कारक शक्ति, कृदन्त, तद्धित तथा समास से अभिव्यक्त होती है।

पाँचवे भेद वाक्यवक्रता के अन्तर्गत कुन्तक ने समग्र अलङ्कारवर्ग का समाहित अन्तर्भाव माना है। इसीलिये वक्रोक्तिजीवित का तृतीय उन्मेष विस्तार में सबसे बड़ा है। उन्होंने भामहादि-सम्मत रसवत्, प्रेय, ऊर्जस्वी और समाहित अलंकारों का इस आधार पर खण्डन किया है कि इन्होंने अलङ्कार्य रसादि को अलङ्कार रूप में ले लिया है। उनका कहना है कि जहाँ उपमादि अलङ्कार के साथ रसादि का विशेषरूप में समावेश हो तो उन्हें रसवदुपमा आदि नाम से कहा जाना चाहिये न कि रसवत् को भिन्न अलङ्कार मानना चाहिये। कुन्तक ने न केवल भामह, दण्डी आदि द्वारा प्रतिपादित विभिन्न अलंकारों के स्वरूप को अस्वीकार किया है अपितु अनेकत्र अपनी स्वतन्त्र मान्यता स्थापित की है। इस प्रकार वे क्रिया के अतिरिक्त वस्तु को भी दीपक मानते हैं। उपमेयोपमा, तुल्ययोगिता, अनन्वय, परिवृत्ति, निदर्शना तथा भामह-सम्मत सहोक्ति का उपमा में अन्तर्भाव करते हैं। समासोक्ति को श्लेष के अन्तर्गत मानते हैं तथा सहोक्ति का लक्षण समासोक्ति के रूप में करते हैं। उन्होंने अनेक अलङ्कारों की स्वतन्त्र सत्ता का खण्डन कर विशाल संख्या को कम किया है। अलङ्कार-प्रयोग के संबंध में वक्रोक्तिजीवित का अभिमत है कि आहार्य सौन्दर्य को उत्पन्न करने के लिये ही वागवैचित्र्यरूप अलंकार का प्रयोग करना चाहिये। वस्तु के स्वाभाविक सौकुमार्य का उन्मीलन ही कवि का लक्ष्य होना चाहिये न कि अलङ्कार के वैचित्र्य की प्रतीतिमात्र। यदि कदाचिदुपनिबध्यते तत्तदेव स्वाभाविकं सौकुमार्यं सुतरां समुन्मीलयितुं न पुनरलङ्कारवैचित्र्यप्रतिपत्तये।

वक्रोक्ति का पाँचवा भेद है-प्रकरणवक्रता जिसके नौ प्रभेद निरूपित हैं। प्रकरण प्रबन्ध का अंग होता है। अंग का सौन्दर्य अन्ततः अंगी के सौन्दर्य में फलित होता है। जिस प्रकरण से नायक के चरित्र में दीप्ति का उन्मेष हो, कमनीयता का प्रकाशन हो तथा लालित्य का लाभ हो वह प्रकरणवक्रता का एक प्रकार है। रघु तथा कौत्स का प्रसङ्ग इसका उदाहरण है। शाकुन्तल की शापकल्पना, उत्तररामचरित के प्रथम अंक में चित्रदर्शन, रघुवंश के नवम अंक में मृगयावर्णन, बालरामायण तथा उत्तररामचरित में गर्भाक की योजना कथावस्तु, चरित्र अथवा भावधारा में वक्रता का आधान करते हैं।

अन्तिम भेद है प्रबन्धवक्रता जिसका प्रबन्धध्वनि के रूप में आनन्दवर्धन ने उल्लेख किया है। एक प्रकार की प्रबन्धवक्रता वह है जहाँ मूल के रस को परिवर्तित कर दिया जाता है जैसे कि महाभारत के शान्तरस को वेणीसंहार में वीर रस में परिवर्तित कर दिया गया है तथा दूसरा प्रभेद वह है जहाँ इतिहास-प्रसिद्ध वृत्त को प्रबंध में वहीं समाप्त कर दिया जाता है जहाँ वह उत्कर्ष की पराकाष्ठा पर पहुँच जाये। इस प्रकार वक्रता वर्ण के

लघुतम रूप से लेकर प्रबन्ध की महत्तम रचना तक परिव्याप्त है। वक्रोक्ति की व्यापक परिकल्पना में अलंकार, गुण, रस, रीति, ध्वनि आदि के सभी तत्त्व समाविष्ट हैं। अतः यह अवधारणा वक्रोक्ति के एक सीमित अलंकार होने की कल्पना से सर्वथा भिन्न है। प्रथम आलंकारिक भामह ने कहा था- इस वक्रोक्ति का सर्वत्र सद्भाव है इसी से अर्थ का विभावन होता है, कवि को इसी में प्रयत्न करना चाहिये, इसके बिना कोई अलङ्कार संभव नहीं है:

सैषा सर्वत्र वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते।

यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलंकारोऽनया विना।।

भामह की यह वक्रोक्तिकल्पना वक्रोक्तिजीवित का प्रेरणा बीज अवश्य है किन्तु सभी काव्यतत्त्वों के साथ विशेषरूप से ध्वनिसिद्धान्त की नवीन स्थापनाओं के साथ संगति, सामञ्जस्य एवं समन्वय स्थापित कर वक्रोक्ति सिद्धान्त की व्यापकता कुन्तक की अपनी देन है। कुछ प्राचीन आचार्य और नवीन लेखक कुन्तक को ध्वनिविरोधी मतों में से 'भक्तिवादी' अर्थात् लाक्षणिक प्रयोग में ध्वनि का अन्तर्भाव मानने वाला मानते हैं। यह भ्रान्ति है। वे ध्वनि को स्वतन्त्र सिद्धान्तरूप में स्वीकार नहीं करते, साथ ही भामह आदि का भी अलङ्कार-विवेचन के प्रसङ्ग में खण्डन करते रहते हैं। इस प्रकार वक्रोक्तिजीवितकार स्वतन्त्र चिन्तक हैं जो प्राचीन सभी आचार्यों का रसग्रहण कर नवीन व्यापक काव्यसिद्धान्त की प्रतिष्ठा करते हैं। यह सिद्धान्त है: वक्रोक्तिः काव्यजीवितम्। वक्रोक्ति ही काव्य का जीवित, प्राण अथवा आत्मा है।

सन्दर्भ

१. काव्यकाञ्चनकषाशममानिना कुन्तकेन निजकाव्यलक्ष्मणि।
यस्य सर्वनिरवद्यतोदिता श्लोक एष स निदर्शितो मया।। पृ. ५८ ।
२. (i) वक्रानुरञ्जनीमुक्तिं चञ्चूमिव मुखे वहन्।
कुन्तकः क्रीडति सुखं कीर्तिस्फटिकपञ्जरे।। भट्टगोपाल, प्रारम्भिक पद्य सं. २ ।
(ii) सुकुमारेति यत्कुन्तकः।- सोमेश्वरः ।
३. एतेन यत्र कुन्तकेन भक्तावन्तर्भावितो ध्वनिस्तदपि प्रत्याख्यातम्। पृ. ५१ ।
४. (i) यदाह कुन्तकः।
(ii) यदाह कुन्तकाचार्यः।

(हस्तलिखित, आकाशवाणी उदयपुर, वार्ता, ४ सितम्बर, १९७५)



6. A Critique of the Anumana-theory of Mahima Bhaṭṭa

Mahima Bhaṭṭa (C-1020-1050 A.D.), the author of Vyaktiviveka belongs to the school of theorists who believe that art is an imitation of reality. He holds that the relation between the situation (Vibhāva) and the basic mental state (Sthāyin) is that of cause and effect.¹ According to Mallinātha's Tarala (p. 85, 191-7), a commentary on Ekāvalī, Śaṅkuka an exponent of Rasa-sūtra, was an anumitivādin. Mahima Bhaṭṭa undertook the task of demolishing the dhvani-theory expounded by Ānandavardhana (850-84 A.D.). The former is, in principle, a follower of Śaṅkuka, though he nowhere indicates this fact. According to him, the vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhīcāribhāvas are quite different from cause etc. in as much as they are artificial and pratīyamāna or gamya (inferable) i.e. existing only in pratīti or apprehension. The consciousness of this pratīti is the enjoyment of rasa **pratītiparāmarśa eva ca rasāsvādah.**²

To show that rasa-realisation can not go beyond the inferential cognition, Mahima Bhaṭṭa has built up his theory from the base. Language is a rational tool for communication of ideas which should be meaningful to be convincing. According to Jaimini, no vedic passage can be said to have any meaning unless it refers to some action or to some means or fruit of action. Action is the sole end of Śruti, and so those Śruti passages which do not aim at action are useless.³ The purpose of the Veda is to give the knowledge of some activity.⁴ **Activity being the aim of Śruti, passages which have no such aim are useless.**⁵ In the fashion of the Mīmāṃsakas, Mahima Bhaṭṭa also believes that the principle of activity and passivity or nivr̥tti, by and large, governs the function of language.⁶ The verbal expression is of two kinds: the word and the sentence. The latter consists of two elements, the Sādhyā or probandum (the thing to be inferentially established) and the Sādhana, or probans or reasoning. As every sentence has these two parts, it is inferential in character. Its meaning also is primary or inferable.⁷ Since a word is a simple thing, devoid of parts, it cannot have the Sādhyā and the Sādhana and therefore,

its meanings is always primary.⁸ Each of the primary and the inferable meanings of a sentence consists of Sādhyā and Sādhana. The relationship of these two is again, of two kinds, verbal and ideal. And each of such a Sādhyā and Sādhana can be the meaning of either a word or a sentence. As the latter two have different varieties, the relationship of the former two is manifold.⁹ Thus the ideas conveyed through a sentence involve the relationship of the Sādhyā and the Sādhana, and are, therefore, inferential in character. It should be stated here that like Ānandavardhana, Mahima also subdivides the poetic meaning into three types, namely, Vastu, Alaṅkāra and Rasa, etc. and admits that though the first two can be directly presented, the last is always inferable only.¹⁰ While a word or a sentence are directly and indirectly significant of the Sthāyin, a letter or a combination of them is only indirectly significant of it. It is only through the meaning of words, which are coloured by the letter that the basic mental states of love etc. are inferable. The significance (gamakatva) of the letters is tenable only indirectly, but not directly.¹¹ Mahima recognises only one power in words, namely Abhidhā or denotation which arouses the conventional meaning. He includes Lakṣaṇā,¹² Tātparya,¹³ as well as epistemological means like arthāpatti¹⁴ or presumption and Upamāna¹⁵ or comparison and Kuntaka's Vakrokti¹⁶ in inference.

According to the Dhvani-theorists, Abhivyakti (a technical term for Dhvani in its implication as a process) is the rise of the manifested meaning, real or unreal, simultaneously with the manifester without the intervening memory of the relation between them.¹⁷ In order to refute the Dhvani-theory Mahima Bhaṭṭa analyses its nature as follows. First of all the manifestation of 'real' is of three types:¹⁸

1. The effect exists potentially in the cause and is imperceptible. Its having become perceptible is one type. Thus, curd for instance, potentially and imperceptibly exists in milk and becomes manifest and perceptible. This is the Sāṃkhya-view which holds the pre-existence of effect in the cause (Satkārya-vāda); the Naiyāyikas, however, believe that effect does not potentially exist in the cause (asatkāryavāda) and that effect is a new thing. According to them curd is produced from the milk.

2. The manifestation of such a manifested one which was not perceptible on account of some impediment, through a manifester, relegated to the secondary position, but shining simultaneously is the second type. Here the manifester is spoken of as the vyañjaka cause as opposed to a kāraka or material cause. The manifestation of a jar by a lamp, for instance, belongs to this second type.
3. The manifestation of an object that has already been experienced and lies in the mind in the form of latent impressions is the third type. This is brought about by either the perception of another invariably concomitant object or by a denotative word. This is just the awakening of the latent impression of the subconscious mind. The manifestation of fire by smoke or that of an object by a portrait, painting, image or imitation or a denotative word, may be cited as illustrating the third type.

The manifestation of the unreal is of one type only. It may be illustrated in the appearance of the rainbow by the light of the sun.

Mahima Bhaṭṭa asserts that none of these types of manifestation of an object are applicable in the suggestion of meaning. It can not be admitted that like curd, suggestion is also directly perceptible. He is not prepared to allow the suggestionist to choose even the second type illustrated in the manifestation of the jar by the light of lamp. For, in this case the consciousness of the two is simultaneous, while in the case of Vyañjaka and Vyaṅgya, the order of succession is clear and distinct. Secondly, the apprehension of the Vyaṅgya from the conventional meaning of the Vyañjaka is not possible without the apprehension of invariable concomitance between them. **Otherwise the consciousness of the suggested meaning from the apprehension of the conventional should arise in all persons irrespective of the fact whether they know the invariable concomitance of the two or not.**¹⁹

The suggestionist may say that though there is admittedly a distinct order of succession when a fact or a poetic figure is suggested when Rasa is suggested there is no order of succession, or at least it is

not discernible and hence the definition of abhivyakti is offered for rasa-dhvani. This point is inadmissible to Mahima Bhaṭṭa firstly because it would then exclude the cases of Vastudhvani and alaṅkāra-dhvani and secondly because even in the case of rasa-dhvani the synchronous consciousness of the Vibhāva, etc. and the basic mental state is logically untenable as the cause and the effect can not shine simultaneously.²⁰

In order to show that Dhvani in its meaning of manifest is cannot be admitted, Mahima Bhaṭṭa discusses the fundamental character of the manifest. The manifest is of two types, one that appears as Upādhi or adjunct to something which it illumines and the other free or independent, not Upādhi to anything. While the first envelops the illumined, and is illustrated in knowledge, word, light of lamp, etc, the second precedes the illumined which is apprehended in succession and is illustrated in smoke etc.²¹ The theorists of Dhvani cannot admit the first type, for by doing so they will have to acknowledge an object of perception and a conventional meaning as piece of poetry. This will defeat the very purpose of the Dhvani theory, for, that would include only the compositions based on primary sense under the sphere of poetry and exclude Dhvani-kāvya from the same. If the Dhvani-theorist were to identify Dhvani as manifest with the second type, then his manifest will not be different from an inferential sign, and he will be compelled to give up his Dhvani theory and will have to accept the theory of inference.²²

In his refutation of abhivyakti as discussed above, Mahima Bhaṭṭa does not deny the capacity of words or ideas for manifestation but he wants to stress that the light of lamp, etc. are primarily possessed of vyañjakatva and its application in the sphere of poetry can be accepted only in the secondary (bhākta) and not in the conventional sense. A poetic word or idea can be metaphorically said to be vyañjaka and the purpose of such a metaphorical use is the clear apprehension of the conventional meaning.²³ By offering the analogy of the lamp and the jar, the Dhvani-vādin also wants to make the point that the apprehension of the suggested meaning cannot be without a manifest or vyañjaka. The analogy is not stretched beyond this point.²⁴ But it would be clear that Mahima Bhaṭṭa wants to emphatically controvert the belief of the Dhvani-Vādin that a

manifest is suggestive of a different meaning than the conventional. As the lamp illumines only the well-known nature of the jar and not its hidden or unrevealed aspect so also a suggestive word can manifest only a well-known and conventionally fixed meaning of a word. It is here that his objections against the Dhvani-vādin's conclusions on the strength of analogy are pertinent and fundamental.

In order to show that Vibhāva, etc. and the Rasas stand in temporal sequence like cause and effect and that they can be treated as the inferential signs (like smoke in the inference of fire), Mahima Bhaṭṭa reproduces the words of Ānandavardhana: 'Nobody feels that Vibhāva, Anubhāva and Vyabhicārin are nothing but rasas. As the consciousness of rasa, etc. is invariably dependent on the apprehension of Vibhāva, etc., the apprehension of the two sets stands in relation of cause and effect; therefore, the temporal sequence is inevitable. It is, however, too quick to be perceived; hence the dictum that the suggested Rasas are devoid of a perceptible temporal sequence.'²⁵

In brief, Mahima Bhaṭṭa's theory is that Rasa is essentially a reflection of Sthāyin²⁶, inferred from the artistically presented cause; aesthetic experience, (rasāsvāda) is the inferential consciousness, non-empirical in nature, of a basic mental state that shines in an aesthete in consequence of the awareness of the vibhāva etc., and when it is so, the situation, (vibhāva), etc., and rasa must be considered to be conjoint like smoke and fire. His thesis has advanced two most important points: (i) the aesthete experiences rasa only cognitively and not effectively (ii) and there is a temporal sequence not only in the apprehension of what suggests and what is suggested but also in the experience of a sthāyin from the situation etc. because both are invariably related as cause and effect. Let us now examine these points. A cognitive experience, for example the inferential knowledge of fire, involves several parts. Even svārthānumāna or **naturalistic syllogism, as internal thought**²⁷ as Benedetto Croce terms it, should consist of the knowledge of the invariable concomitance of, say, smoke and fire, leading to universal generalisation, and the consequent sub-summative reflection of the probans (Līṅga-parāmarśa).

Rasa is a single experience. And it is effective in its character. Inference is a cognitive process devoid of all effective character. Hence, the first point is untenable.

The second point, stressing the causal and invariable relation of the Vyañjaka and the Vyañgya and of the Vibhāva, etc. and Sthāyin, actually superimposes a technical meaning on simple and unsophisticated expression of avinābhāva occurring in Dhvanyāloka. Ānandavardhana had made it abundantly clear that the Vyañjaka and Vyañgya are not invariables like smoke and fire. Their relationship depends on several things, the context, etc. A word is merely a base or ground to get at the hidden meaning. Even if it be admitted for argument's sake that a particular expression is the inferential sign (Liṅga) of the suggested meaning, the Vyañjanā or power of suggestion can not be regarded as the process of inference because the latter is based on invariables alone, while the former operates between variables as well as invariables. Since the conventional meaning is not related to the suggested sense either by the relation of identity, or self-sameness (tādātmya), as for instance whatever is produced in non-eternal, nor by that of cause and effect, as fire and smoke, it is inconsiderate to regard the primary sense as the inferential sign of the suggested.²⁸

The reply of the Dhvanivādin to the point of a temporal sequence in the vibhāvas, etc. and in the sthāyin raised by Mahima is that there is a logical sequence between the two because the apprehension of the former precedes that of the latter but the simultaneity can not be denied. The apprehension of the Vibhāvas, etc. must continue for the continuation of rasa-consciousness. This is illustrated through the analogy of the lamp and the jar. The light of the lamp precedes the perception of the jar which, for its continuation, is dependent on a simultaneous cognition of both the lamp and the jar. Furthermore, even the first consciousness of rasa through the apprehension of the vibhāvas etc., is too quick to be perceived. This is the reason why the term Alakṣyakramavyaṅgyadhvani is applied to the consciousness of rasa etc. It is strange that Mahima Bhaṭṭa does not concede this point of simultaneity advanced by the Dhvanivādin, which he has himself followed in another context. According

to him, particles like ca, etc. prefixes like pra, etc. and the attributives like 'blue' in the example of nīlotpalam are dyotakas (of course in the secondary sense or upacārataḥ). There is a sequence in the meanings of the attributives and the substantives. But it is so quick that the sequence is not noticed and, therefore, the apprehension is of simultaneity.²⁹

Mahima Bhaṭṭa maintains that the aesthetic level is different from the empirical level. The cause and the effect are not real, and are therefore, designated as Vibhāva, Anubhāva and Vyabhicāribhāva; the basic mental state (sthāyin) is also not the real but only an imitation thereof. If such is the case, then what is the point in importing the logical inference, based on the invariable relation of the reals, in the realm of poetic creation. Art is an imitation of life. Its effect is not unreal. Aesthetic experience is an experiential reality. How would he then explain the real effect from the unreal cause?

If we examine the theory of inference advanced in opposition to the theory of suggestion, in the light of modern researches in the realm of the nature and function of mind with special reference to the theory of apperception, it would be clear that the case of the anumitivādin does not find support. The mind is interpretatively active in cognition of an object but it is also a tabula rasa, a recorder of impressions. Memory is active as well as passive. In the latter, the various associations arise so quickly that **there is no before or after in the experience..... it is a case of simultaneous association.** This would explain how the second type of memory can not be an impediment for aesthetic experience (rasāsvāda). It also offers a plausible explanation for the Alakṣyakramavyaṅgya type of Dhvani. If we follow the theory of inference, we have to account for all the steps of the cognitive process and term them as inference. All artistic expression and aesthetic experience would be treated as inferential. Thinking and imagination would form part of inference. This view can not be supported by modern psychology, where the cognitive process has several aspects and innumerable phases. Even perception is **a mixed state, a cerebro-sensory phenomenon produced by an action on the**

senses and a reaction of the brain.³⁰ Now, even if we extend the limits of inference, how can it exhaust them all, As Woodworth would put it, inference is a response to two facts and **the response consists in seeing a third fact bound up in the other two.**³¹ This characteristic may be found in 'associative activities' yet thinking and imagination can not be included by any psychologist in inference. This supports the case of the Dhvanivādin and goes against the inferential theory of aesthetics so ingeniously built up by Mahima Bhaṭṭa.

References

1. **Comparative Aesthetics**, (revised ed.), p. 335.
2. **Vyaktiviveka**, (V.V.), chowkhamba ed., p. 73.
3. **Jaīmini-Sūtra**, 1, 2, 1.
4. **Śābara Bhāṣya**, 1, 1, 1.
5. **Jaīmini-Sūtra**, 1, 2, 1.
6. **tasya parapravṛtti-nivṛtti-nibandhanatvāt..... nahi yuktimanavagacchan kaścit samyag pratyayabhāg bhavati**, V.V., pp. 21-22.
7. **artho'pi dvividho Vācyo' numeśaśca**, **Ibid**, p. 39.
8. **padasyārtho Vācyā eva nānumeśas taśya niraṁśatvāt sādhyasādhanābhāvābhāvatah**, **Ibid**, pp. 39-40.
9. **sa hi dvividho śābdaścārthaśceti. so'pi ca sādhyasādhanayoḥ pratyekam padārtha-vākyārtharūpatvāt..... bahuvidhaḥ**, **Ibid**, pp., 45-6.
10. **Ibid**, p. 39.
11. **varṇasaṁghaṭanaayorapi gamakatvamupapannameva pāramparyeṇa na tu sāksāt**, **Ibid**, p. 443.
12. **Ibid**, pp. 110-121.
13. **Ibid**, pp. 112-24.
14. **Ibid**, pp. 121-22.
15. **Ibid**, pp. 78.
16. **Ibid**, pp. 124-127.

17. **Ibid**, pp. 76-7.
18. **Ibid**, pp. 77.
19. V.V., p. 79 and **Comparative Aesthetics**, Vol. I, p. 358.
20. V.V., p. 79.
21. **Ibid**, p. 80.
22. **Ibid**.
23. **Ibid**, p.131.
24. **Vide**, V.V. Vyākhyāna, pp. 58-9 and 81.
25. **nahi vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicāriṇa eve rasāḥ..... ityalakṣyakramā eva santo vyaṅgyā rasādyaḥ**, V.V., p. 80.
26. **sthāyānukaraṇātmā nohi rasā iśyante**, **ibid**, p. 71.
27. Croce, **Logic As the Science of Pure Concept**, trans. by Douglas Ainslie, p. 584.
28. **vācyasya pratiyamānena saha itādātmyatadutpattyabhāvāt avicāritābhīdhānam- Alaṁkārasarasva**, p. 12 and Jayaratna's comments thereon.
29. **viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyapratityorāśubhāvitayā kṛmānupalakṣaṇāt sahabhāvapratītiḥ**, V.V., p. 131.
30. Robinson and Robinson, **Readings in General Psychology**.
31. K.C. Woodworth, **Psychology**, p. 465.

(Bulletin of the Institute of Post Graduate (evening) Studies,
University of Delhi, 1963)



7. काव्यप्रकाशकार आचार्य मम्मट का पाण्डित्य

काव्यप्रकाश (१०५०-११०० ई.) की सुधासागर टीका (१७२२-२३ ई.) में भीमसेन ने मम्मट को वाग्देवी का अवतार या वाग्देवी स्वरूप माना है। मध्यकालीन विद्वत्परम्परा में मम्मट की यह स्तुति उनके कार्य की असाधारणता के कारण की गई—किं च नायमाचार्यो मानुषः किन्तु वाग्देवतैव प्रमाणान्तु ग्रन्थस्यालौकिकत्वम् (सुधासागर, पृ. ४)।

काव्यप्रकाश के अन्तिम श्लोक में इस ग्रन्थ के वास्तविक स्वरूप एवं प्रसिद्धि के कारण की व्याख्या की गई है।^१ अपने से पूर्व विरोधी विचारधाराओं, विभिन्न मार्गों, भिन्न अभिमतों एवं विचारों के होते हुए मम्मट की काव्यालोचन-विषयक उपलब्धि श्लाघनीय है। काव्यालोचन के विभिन्न सम्प्रदायों के काव्यसम्बन्धी निर्णयों की स्थापनाओं एवं विरोधों से पाठक भ्रमित हो चुके थे। आनन्दवर्धन ने अपने ध्वनि सिद्धान्त की स्थापना करते हुए पुरानी धारणाओं का अन्त कर दिया। किन्तु आनन्दवर्धन के इस ध्वनि सिद्धान्त का विरोध कुन्तक, महिमभट्ट और भोज जैसे प्रसिद्ध आचार्यों ने अपने ग्रन्थों के माध्यम से तत्काल व्यक्त किया।

ऐसी स्थिति में काव्य-विषयक विचारों में समन्वय की आवश्यकता थी। विद्वानों को काव्यालोचन का राजपथ भ्रष्ट होता हुआ दिखाई दिया क्योंकि अब तक के सिद्धान्तों में सौन्दर्यपरक निर्णय की मूलभूत एकरूपता उद्घाटित नहीं की गई थी। सभी काव्यशास्त्रीय सम्प्रदायों में कालिदास को श्रेष्ठ कवि एवं नाटककार माना जाता था। जिस कारण से विभिन्न काव्यविचारों में इस प्रकार की मूलभूत निश्चित एकरूपता आई थी, वह एकरूपता अनेक आलोचकों के सैद्धान्तिक विवादों को पढ़ने पर प्रकट नहीं होती है। साहित्य को समझने की व्यापक दृष्टि पर इससे विपरीत प्रभाव पड़ने लगा। काव्य के लोकोत्तरत्व पर बल देने से उसके शब्द और वाच्यार्थ के सौन्दर्य के साथ न्याय नहीं हो पाता था। यदि एकान्ततः व्यञ्जना, अनुमिति या चमत्कार के सिद्धान्त का अनुगमन किया जाता तो आलोचनात्मक निर्णयों में कुछ असन्तुलन प्रकट हो जाता।

परम्परागत व्याख्याओं की विधियों से व्यावहारिक आलोचना प्रस्तुत करने एवं काव्य को समझने के लिए प्रयास किये गये तथा विभिन्न सौन्दर्यशास्त्रीय कोटियों को एकता प्रदान की गई। इस प्रकार साहित्य को समझने की एक व्यापक दृष्टि बनी। किसी एक सिद्धान्त की अनन्य भक्ति से यह व्यापक दृष्टि परिवर्तित होती हुई प्रतीत हुई। यह मम्मट की ही प्रतिभा थी कि उसने यह स्वीकार किया कि भ्रमित करने वाली विविधता काव्याधिगम की समन्वयात्मक दृष्टि एवं काव्यानुशासन के लिए अधिक नुकसानदायक हो सकती है। मम्मट ने अपने यशस्वी ग्रन्थ काव्यप्रकाश में काव्यालोचन की समन्वयात्मक दृष्टि प्रस्तुत करते हुए विरोधी तत्त्वों को एक समष्टि में संघटित किया और काव्य के विषय में एकरूपात्मक और व्यापक दृष्टि प्रस्तुत की। उसका यह ग्रन्थ वास्तव में काव्य का प्रकाश है।

भारत की विद्वन्परम्परा में विद्वन्मण्डली ने आज दिन तक अविच्छिन्न रूप से व्याख्याएँ लिखकर उनके काव्यप्रकाश को यशस्वी बनाया है। इनमें रुय्यक और माणिक्यचन्द्र उनके समकालीन ही थे। काव्यप्रकाश में अलंकार शास्त्र के तत्त्वों के व्यापक निरूपण में मूलधारा का अभाव नहीं है। काव्यप्रकाशकार ने सिद्धान्तों का दुर्बल समझौता प्रस्तुत नहीं किया है। इनका सैद्धान्तिक आधार आनन्दवर्धन द्वारा प्रतिपादित एवं उन्हीं के समान बहुश्रुत

चिन्तक अभिनवगुप्त द्वारा व्याख्यायित नवीन ध्वनिसिद्धान्त था। इसीलिए मम्मट को ध्वनिप्रस्थान परमाचार्य जैसा विरुद देकर ध्वनिसिद्धान्त का विशिष्ट आचार्य कहा गया है जिसने अपने मौलिक चिन्तन से समग्र विरोधी संस्कृत काव्यशास्त्रीय सिद्धान्तों को ध्वनि के आधार पर पूर्णता प्रदान करते हुए काव्यालोचन के व्यापक सिद्धान्त की संरचना की। उसकी यह उचित क्रियान्विति की योजना (सम्यग्विनवृत्ति-संघटना) अपनी शक्ति और अन्तः प्रेरणा अपने से पूर्ववर्ती अलंकार शास्त्र के ग्रन्थों, अनेक विद्याशाखाओं जैसे व्याकरण, मीमांसा, न्याय, वैशेषिक, सांख्य, बौद्ध और शैवदर्शन आदि पर उसके असाधारण अधिकार के आधार पर प्राप्त करती है। यद्यपि हर एक व्यक्ति हमेशा यह चाहेगा कि वह अधिक युक्ति-संगत उदाहरण चुने, फिर भी मम्मट को संस्कृत काव्यसाहित्य का व्यापक ज्ञान था। उदाहरणार्थ- भवभूति का उत्तररामचरित, भवभूति- रचित दो और नाटकों के अतिरिक्त या उनकी तुलना में उदाहरण देने योग्य है। कोई यह भी कह सकता है कि कालिदास की श्रेष्ठता द्योतित नहीं की गई। काव्य के उत्तम प्रकार को सिद्ध करने के लिए जो उदाहरण मम्मट ने चुने हैं उनसे उसकी उत्तम काव्य को समझने की उत्कृष्टता द्योतित नहीं होती है, इस प्रकार की आलोचना इस मूलभूत सत्य को स्वीकार करने में असमर्थ हो जाती है कि मम्मट का उद्देश्य मात्र विद्वत्तापूर्ण अनुसन्धान के साथ विधायक आलोचना को उत्कृष्ट रूप में प्रस्तुत करना था जिसको उसने संक्षिप्त परिभाषाएँ देते हुए १४२ कारिकाओं में प्रस्तुत किया। मम्मट ने मुख्य रूप से अनेक विचारों के मूल को इन कारिकाओं में समाहित किया। इन कारिकाओं पर स्वयं ने स्पष्ट वृत्ति लिखी एवं करीब ६०० उदाहरणों से अपने सिद्धान्तों का प्रतिपादन किया।

काव्यप्रकाश की मुख्य विशेषताओं पर दृष्टि डालते हुए डॉ. एस.के.डे. ने इस प्रकार विचार व्यक्त किये हैं-“यह संक्षिप्तता के साथ समष्टि की विशेषता को अपने में समेटे हुए है। यह संस्कृत काव्यशास्त्र एवं साहित्यशास्त्र का एक शास्त्रीय कार्य हो गया है जिसने समग्र भारत में अपनी अधिकारिकता एवं ख्याति को बनाये रखा है। यह एक देदीप्यमान ग्रन्थ के रूप में इस विषय पर लिखे गये प्राचीन ग्रन्थों की सारगर्भित व्याख्या प्रस्तुत करता है तथा यह निरन्तर व्याख्यात्मक कार्य एवं पाठ्य पुस्तकों का प्रारम्भिक बिन्दु बन गया है। इस प्रकार यह संस्कृत अलंकारशास्त्र में अपना अद्वितीय स्थान बनाये रखता है” (History of Sanskrit poetics, Vol. I, p. 154, K.L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1960)। म.म.जी.वी. काणे ने भी इसी प्रकार समान विचार व्यक्त किये हैं-“अलंकार साहित्य में काव्यप्रकाश ने एक अद्वितीय स्थान बनाया है। इसने शताब्दियों से काव्यशास्त्र में जो कुछ चिन्तन हुआ था उसका सारांश प्रस्तुत किया है। यह स्वयं एक ऐसा मूलस्रोत हो गया जिससे आगे नवीन सिद्धान्तों का प्रवाह प्रसृत होने लगा। वेदान्त के शारीरिक भाष्य या व्याकरण के महाभाष्य के समान काव्यप्रकाश भी भविष्य की

टीकाओं एवं विकास का मुख्य बिन्दु सिद्ध हो गया। इसकी मुख्य विशेषता है संक्षिप्तता के साथ सम्पूर्ण निरूपण।” (The History of Sanskrit poetics, p. 255, Bombay, 1951)

प्रो. एस.एस. सुक्थन्कर ने काव्यप्रकाश के दशम उल्लास (Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay, 1941) के प्राक्कथन (P. VI) में मम्मट की असाधारण प्रसिद्धि को व्याख्यायित करते हुए लिखा है कि “ वह बहुज्ञ विद्वान् था, ” “जिस ध्वनि सिद्धान्त ने आनन्दवर्धन के बाद विद्वानों के मस्तिष्क पर प्रबल प्रभाव किया था, उसका वह निष्ठावान् पक्षधर था और मम्मट ने अपने से पूर्ववर्ती सभी श्रेष्ठ सम्प्रदायों को एक साथ लाने का प्रयास किया।”

इसी के समान ए.बी. गजेन्द्रगडकर ने मम्मट के काव्य प्रकाश की प्रस्तावना (Introduction to the Kavyaprakāsa of Mammata, Popular Book Depot, Bombay, 1969, p. 27) में इसकी असीमित प्रसिद्धि के कारणों का विश्लेषण करते हुए लिखा है- जैसा कि हम पहले देख चुके हैं कि उसके काव्यप्रकाश ने अपने से पहले वाले महत्त्वपूर्ण मतों और सिद्धान्तों का निष्कर्ष प्रस्तुत किया है।.....विभिन्न विषयों की व्याख्या पूर्ण होते हुए भी संक्षिप्त है। विभिन्न विषयों के प्रतिपादन में सैद्धान्तिक पक्ष की तुलना में व्यावहारिक दृष्टिकोण को मुख्यता प्रदान की गई है।

काव्यप्रकाश पर लिखी व्याख्याओं की बहुलता पर टिप्पणी करते हुए काणे लिखते हैं- भगवद्गीता को छोड़कर संस्कृत साहित्य में सम्भवतः अन्य ही कोई ग्रन्थ होगा जिस पर इतनी व्याख्याएँ लिखी गई हों (वही पृ. २८३)। वास्तव में काव्यप्रकाश के एक टीकाकार महेश्वर ने टिप्पणी करते हुए लिखा है- काव्यप्रकाशस्य गृहे गृहे टीकास्तथाप्येष तथैव दुर्गमः। अर्थात् काव्यप्रकाश की घर-घर में टीका होने पर भी वह पूर्ववत् ही दुर्बोध बना हुआ है। इस ग्रन्थ की शास्त्रीय दुर्बोधता इसकी प्रसिद्ध एवं सार्वदेशिक जयघोष को द्योतित करती है। मम्मट ने अपनी मौलिकता के गीत नहीं गाये हैं। सम्भवतः किसी भी उच्चकोटि के भारतीय लेखक, कवि या दार्शनिक ने भी अपनी मौलिकता का विज्ञापन नहीं किया है। आनन्दवर्धन, कालिदास और शङ्कराचार्य के विषय में यह बात सत्य है। जिस किसी सिद्धान्त को मौलिक भी घोषित किया जाता है, वास्तव में वह इस अर्थ में मौलिक नहीं होता कि वह पुरातन के बिना नवीन या स्थित है। यद्यपि काव्यप्रकाश में जो विचार स्थापित किये गये हैं उनके पीछे एक परम्परा रही है, लेकिन इनकी क्रमबद्धता, रूप और रचना नवीन है। काव्यशास्त्रीय सिद्धान्तों को पूर्णता प्रदान करने के लिए ध्वनिसिद्धान्त के दृढ़ आधार पर पुराने विचारों का नये स्वरूप में प्रस्तुत किया गया है। मम्मट ने बिना उद्देश्यपरक निरीक्षण के पुराने विचारों का केवल सारांश व्यक्त नहीं किया

है। काव्यप्रकाश आलोचना के सिद्धान्तों का न तो सूचीपत्र है और न ही संग्रह-ग्रन्थ मात्र। अपितु एक ओर यह ध्वनिसिद्धान्त के विरोधी सिद्धान्तों के आक्रमण के विरुद्ध किलेबन्दी है तथा दूसरी ओर अन्य सिद्धान्तों की श्रेष्ठता को अपने व्यापक विस्तार में समेटे हुए है। इसकी मौलिकता इस बात में स्वीकार्य है कि इसने साहित्य में रसध्वनि की श्रेष्ठता के साथ सौन्दर्यशास्त्रीय स्थितियों का सार्थक संश्लेषण स्थापित किया है। इस प्रकार यह तीन प्रकार के काव्य के औचित्य को स्वीकार करता है चाहे उसमें लोकोत्तरता हो अथवा नहीं हो। तथ्य तक पहुँच की इस नवीनता ने, संस्कृत साहित्य की विभिन्न परम्पराओं को उद्देश्य प्रदान कर दिया जो उसी के समान प्रकृति वर्णन, विलक्षण अलंकार योजना और भावों के वर्णन में उतनी ही चमत्कारी थी।

काव्यप्रकाश दश उल्लासों में विभक्त है। इन उल्लासों में १४२ कारिकाएँ हैं, तथा ये कारिकाएँ २१२ सूत्रों में विभाजित हैं। जिन पर ६०० उदाहरणों सहित बहुत संक्षिप्त वृत्ति लिखी हुई है। ‘काव्यप्रकाश’ यह शीर्षक पुराने शीर्षकों में से प्रारम्भ के काव्य तथा अन्त में नये शीर्षक ‘आलोक’ (ध्वन्यालोक में) सहित पुराने एवं नवीन के समन्वय का सङ्केत देता है। आलोक शब्द ग्रन्थ के शीर्षक रूप में प्राचीन अलंकार शब्द के स्थापन पर आया है। यह व्यञ्जना की स्वीकृति के महत्त्व को द्योतित करता है जैसे यह आनन्दवर्धन के काव्यालोक का भावानुवाद है। काव्यप्रकाश शीर्षक ध्वनिसिद्धान्त के अनुगमन तथा इसे मूल आधार मानने की स्वीकृति है।

काव्यप्रकाश कवि-जगत् की स्वतन्त्रता की घोषणा के साथ प्रारम्भ होता है -

नियतिकृतनियमरहितां ह्लादैकमयीमनन्यपरतन्त्राम्।
नवरसरुचिरां निर्मितिमादधती भारती कवेर्जयति।।

उक्त मंगलाचरण में शिव के साथ मनुष्य के चरम तादात्म्य के साथ उसकी ज्ञान और क्रिया की स्वच्छन्दता को काश्मीरी शैवदर्शन की शब्दावली में अभिव्यक्त किया है। एक कलाकार के समान कवि अपनी इच्छा से संसार की रचना करता है। कवि की स्वच्छन्द कल्पना कवि-शक्ति द्वारा रचित साहित्यिक संसार की अनुभूति दुःखानुभूति से दूषित नहीं होती है। साहित्यिक अनुभूति अनिवार्यतः आनन्दमय होती है। साहित्य जगत् स्वयं में निराला सृजित किया जाता है, वह किसी की प्रतिकृति नहीं होता है। कवि अपने अधिकारों से रचयिता होता है, वह स्वरचित, जगत् पर स्वतः टिप्पणी नहीं करता है। कविजन काव्यजगत् की सर्वोच्चता और अपनी स्वतन्त्र उद्घोषणाओं में सशक्त होते हैं।

काव्यप्रकाश मुख्यतः कविता के सिद्धान्तों के निर्माण से सम्बन्धित है। इसके दसों उल्लासों पर विहंगावलोकन इस तथ्य को भलीभाँति प्रकट करेगा।

प्रथम उल्लास : काव्य प्रयोजन, काव्य हेतु और काव्यलक्षण के अनन्तर काव्य के तीन भेद दिखाए गये हैं। काव्य सामान्य का लक्षण इस प्रकार है- तददोषौ शब्दार्थौ सगुणावनलंकृतिः पुनः क्वापि ।

द्वितीय उल्लास : शब्द का वाचक, लक्षक और व्यञ्जक रूप में त्रिविध विभाग और अर्थ के भी वाच्य, लक्ष्य और व्यञ्ज्य ये तीन विभाग हैं। तीनों प्रकार के अर्थों की व्यञ्जकता और अभिधा, लक्षणा तथा व्यञ्जना नामक शब्द शक्तियों पर विचार इस उल्लास में है।

तृतीय उल्लास : इस उल्लास में सहृदयों को वक्ता, बोद्धा, काकु, वाक्य, वाच्य, वक्तृबोद्धव्यभिन्नसन्निधि, प्रस्ताव, देश, काल आदि के कारण होने वाली अर्थव्यञ्जकता का सोदाहरण वर्णन है।

चतुर्थ उल्लास : उत्तम काव्य अथवा ध्वनि के दो भेदों, उनके उपभेदों, रस की प्रकृति, रस के विभिन्न सिद्धान्तों, उसके स्थायी भावों ३३ संचारी भावों, शान्तरस, रसाभाव, भावाभास, भाव, भावसंधि, भावशबलता आदि रसध्वनि के अनेक भेदोपभेदों का विवेचन इस उल्लास में किया गया है।

पञ्चम उल्लास : मध्यमकाव्य (गुणीभूतव्यञ्ज्य) और उसके अगूढ, अपराङ्ग, वाच्यसिद्धयङ्ग, अस्फुट, संदिग्ध, तुल्यप्राधान्य काक्वाक्षिप्त और असुन्दर इन आठ भेदों का विवेचन किया गया है।

षष्ठ उल्लास : चित्रकाव्य या अधमकाव्य तथा शब्दचित्र और अर्थचित्र, उसके इन भेदों का वर्णन।

सप्तम उल्लास : काव्यदोष की परिभाषा शब्द के १६ दोष, वाक्य दोष, अर्थ के २३ दोष, दोषों के गुण रूप में बदलने की परिस्थितियाँ, रस के १३ दोष।

अष्टम उल्लास : काव्य के गुणों की परिभाषा, अलंकार और गुणों में भेदकता, दश गुणों का निषेध करते हुए तीन गुणों की स्थापना, गुणों के व्यञ्जक शब्द समुच्चय।

नवम उल्लास : ६ शब्दालंकार और तीन वृत्तियाँ।

दशम उल्लास : उपविभागों सहित ६२ अर्थालंकार।

काव्यप्रकाश के विषयों के मुख्य बिन्दुओं का संक्षिप्त विवरण यह स्पष्ट करता है कि मम्मट ने उल्लासों का विभाजन काव्यलक्षण के अनुसार ही बनाया था। काव्यलक्षण के अन्तर्गत आये शब्द और अर्थ उसके ग्रन्थ के सम्पूर्ण कलेवर को आच्छादित कर लेते हैं। यद्यपि उनका वर्णन द्वितीय एवं तृतीय उल्लास में मुख्यरूप से हुआ है। प्रथम उल्लास तत्

अर्थात् काव्य से सम्बन्धित है। दोष, गुण और अलंकारों का वर्णन क्रमशः सातवें, आठवें, नवें और दशवें उल्लास में हुआ है। कविता की परिभाषा के सन्दर्भ में उल्लासों का विभाजन मम्मट की एक मौलिक सूझ है।^१ यह व्याख्या को एक प्रणाली प्रदान करता है। काव्य की परिभाषा में यह अपने पूर्ववर्ती आचार्यों से अनेक बिन्दुओं पर सहमत है। 'सगुणौ' इस पद के माध्यम से वह काव्य में रस की सत्ता को स्वीकार करता है, क्योंकि गुण रस के असाधारण धर्म हैं।

मम्मट पूर्ववर्ती आचार्यों के विचारों को, केवल एक महत्त्वपूर्ण अन्तर को छोड़कर, अपने काव्यलक्षण में संगृहीत कर लेता है। अलंकारों की अनुपस्थिति में भी वह काव्य के स्वरूप को मानता है। यह उन लोगों की विचारधारा के सशक्त विरुद्ध है जो अलंकारों के बिना काव्य को मानते ही नहीं।

काव्यप्रकाश की यह पहुँच जिसमें अपनी मूल विचारधारा से बिना सहमति किये विभिन्न विचारधाराओं से सामञ्जस्य स्थापित करना और अनेक स्थलों पर इसका स्पष्टीकरण करना उसकी असाधारणता, मौलिकता और एक विशेषता है। विभिन्न विषयों पर मम्मट के योगदान पर संक्षिप्त टिप्पणियाँ नीचे दी जा रही हैं-

(i) **काव्य-प्रयोजन** : काव्य के यशप्राप्ति, व्यवहारज्ञान, अमङ्गलनाश, सद्यः पर निर्वृति और कान्तासंमित उपदेश इन छः प्रयोजनों का वर्णन करते समय मम्मट न केवल भरत, भामह, आनन्दवर्धन और अन्य आचार्यों के मतों को संकलित ही करता है, अपितु इनका सम्बन्ध कवि और सहृदय से स्थापित करते हुए सद्यः परनिर्वृति की सर्वोच्चता (सकलप्रयोजनमौलिभूतम्) एवं आवश्यकता को स्वीकार करता है।

(ii) **काव्य-हेतु** : भामह^१, राजशेखर^२ और आनन्दवर्धन^३ जिन्होंने काव्य निर्माण में प्रतिभा को सर्वोच्च हेतु माना था, के विरुद्ध मम्मट^४ ने प्रतिभा, निपुणता और अभ्यास को "दण्डचक्रचीवर" न्यायानुसार सम्मिलित हेतु माना है। दण्डी और रुद्रट् का अनुसरण करते हुए व्यावहारिक दृष्टि अपनायी और यह स्वीकार किया कि वास्तव में वास्तविक काव्यकृति में तीनों हेतुओं का मिला-जुला प्रभाव है।

(iii) **काव्य के तीन भेद** : मम्मट ही सर्वप्रथम बड़े स्पष्ट शब्दों में काव्य के तीन प्रकारों के लिए उत्तम, मध्यम और अधम शब्दों का प्रयोग करता है। चाहे आनन्दवर्धन जिसने ध्वनि को काव्य कहा है, काव्य के तीन भेदों को बिना हिचकिचाहट के स्वीकार न करे, यद्यपि उसने मध्यम और अधम काव्य के लिए क्रमशः गुणीभूतव्यञ्ज्य और चित्र शब्दों का प्रयोग किया है। संस्कृत काव्यशास्त्र में साहित्य के प्रति व्यावहारिक दृष्टि अपनाते हुए

मम्मट ने काव्य के तीन भेदों की स्थापना की है। समस्त युगों में सर्वदा संस्कृत साहित्य में काव्य उत्कृष्ट विविधताएँ प्रस्तुत की गई हैं। वे केवल ध्वनि के ही उदाहरण नहीं हैं। फिर भी उनके काव्यत्व को वैधानिक और सार्वदेशिकरूप में स्वीकार किया गया है। इनको वर्णनात्मक शब्दावली में परिभाषित करते हुए, निर्णय के एक मानक के आधार पर इन्हें अनेक कोटियों में विभक्त करते हुए, भावों और अनुभूति की सर्वातिशयिता में विश्वास करते हुए, काव्य के स्तर के पारम्परिक रूप से अविच्छिन्न क्रम का निषेध न करते हुए मम्मट ने काव्य की व्यापक विविधाओं के साथ न्याय किया है।

(iv) **शब्दशक्ति** : अभिधा और लक्षणा का वर्णन करते हुए मम्मट मूलतः अभिधावृत्तिभाजिका के लेखक मुकुल भट्ट का अनुसरण करता है। यद्यपि वह मुकुल भट्ट के समान लक्षण का अन्तर्भाव अभिधा में स्वीकार नहीं करता है। मुकुल का अनुगमन करते हुए उसने लक्षण के छः भेद किये हैं। फिर भी मम्मट अनेक स्थलों पर मुकुल से असहमत है। उदाहरणार्थ- मुकुल के अनुसार गौरनुबन्ध्या में जाति में सङ्केतग्रह होने के कारण उपादान लक्षण द्वारा जाति से व्यक्ति का आक्षेप होता है। किन्तु मम्मट के अनुसार यहाँ रूढि या प्रयोजनरूप लक्षणा के हेतु के अभाव में लक्षणा का अवसर नहीं है। अपितु अविनाभाव भावसम्बन्ध के आधार पर अर्थापत्ति द्वारा व्यक्ति का आक्षेप होता है। मुकुल भट्ट के मत में पीनो देवदत्तो दिवा न भुङ्क्ते (मोटा देवदत्त दिन में नहीं खाता है।) इस उदाहरण में “रात्रिभोजन” उपादान लक्षण द्वारा द्योतित होता है। जबकि मम्मट कुमारिल, भर्तृहरि और अभिनवगुप्त का अनुसरण करते हुए ‘रात्रि भोजन’ को अर्थापत्ति का विषय मानता है।

मम्मट व्यञ्जना के विरुद्ध प्रस्तुत किये गये सभी दृष्टिकोणों को भङ्गित करने के लिए और इसके समर्थन में तर्क देने में बहुत आगे बढ़ जाता है। व्यञ्जना के विरोधी मीमांसकों, वैयाकरणों, वेदान्तियों और प्राचीन काव्यशास्त्रियों के विचारों का उसका प्रबल खण्डन, अभिधा, लक्षणा और व्यञ्जना पर आधारित है। इस पक्ष की स्थापना के लिए अकाट्य तर्कों का प्रस्तुतीकरण अपनी विद्वत्तापूर्ण अभिव्यक्ति के परिणाम स्वरूप उच्च कोटि का है। भ्रम धार्मिकविश्रब्धः और निःशेषच्युतचन्दनं... आदि उदाहरणों में जिस अर्थ को मम्मट व्यञ्जना द्वारा व्यङ्ग्य मानता है, उसी अर्थ को महिम भट्ट अनुमान की प्रक्रिया द्वारा अनुमित मानते हैं। मम्मट महिम भट्ट के मत का खण्डन करते हुए लिखता है कि इन स्थलों पर जो हेतु दिये गये हैं वे सद्भेतु न होकर अनैकान्तिक, विरुद्ध और असिद्ध हेत्वाभास हैं। व्यञ्जना की सिद्धि और उसके विरोध के विचार-संघर्ष में मम्मट ने अपने प्रबल तर्कों के बल पर व्यञ्जना को सिद्ध करते हुए ध्वनि-सिद्धान्तवादियों के पक्ष में निर्णय कर दिया जिससे मम्मट के पश्चात् शताब्दियों तक इस सिद्धान्त के विरोधी विचार वाले महान् आचार्यों जैसे कुन्तक, महिम और भोज का नाम लेना भी नहीं रहा।

(v) **ध्वनि भेद** : मम्मट यह मानता है कि रसादि लक्ष्यक्रम का विषय नहीं है रसभावतदाभास भावशान्त्यादिरक्रमः अभिनवगुप्त ने इस विषय में आनन्दवर्धन के मत का स्पष्टीकरण करते हुए रसादि को लक्ष्यक्रम का भी विषय माना है। अभिनवगुप्त के अनुसार ध्वनि के मुख्य ३५ भेद हैं। मम्मट ने इस संख्या को बढ़ाकर ५१ कर दिया है। लोचन के अनुसार ध्वनि के उपभेदों की संख्या ७४२० है और मम्मट के अनुसार इनका योग १०४५५ है।

(vi) **काव्यदोष** : काव्यदोषों के कुछ सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर अन्तिम रूप से विभाजन का श्रेय काव्यप्रकाश को जाता है जिसमें वामन के मत का अधिक विस्तार किया गया है। मम्मट ने मूलरूप से २२ काव्य-दोषों का प्रतिपादन किया है। भामह, वामन और अन्य आचार्यों द्वारा प्रतिपादित अलंकार दोषों को मम्मट ने सामान्य त्रुटियों के अन्तर्गत रखा है।

(vii) **काव्यगुण** : काव्यप्रकाश में हम गुण और अलंकारों के भेद को स्पष्ट रूप में पाते हैं। वामन शब्द और अर्थ में प्रत्येक के दश-दश भेद स्वीकार करता है जबकि मम्मट ने इन सबका अन्तर्भाव प्रसाद, माधुर्य, ओज इन तीन गुणों में मानते हुए संख्या को सीमित कर दिया है। आनन्दवर्धन का अनुसरण करते हुए मम्मट ने यह भी कहा है कि शब्द, वृत्ति और संघटना गुणों पर ही आश्रित है। यद्यपि गुणाः परतन्त्राः संघटनादयस्तथापि १०१ सूत्र वृत्ति।

(viii) **काव्यालंकार** : काव्यप्रकाश में वक्रोक्ति, अनुप्रास, यमक, श्लेष, चित्र और पुनरुक्तिवदाभास इन छः शब्दालंकारों का वर्णन है। प्राचीन काव्यशास्त्रियों द्वारा बहुत से उदाहरणों द्वारा प्रतिपादित इनके भेदोपभेदों को अस्वीकृत करते हुए मम्मट ने इनके मुख्य भेदों को ही स्वीकृत किया है। उसे प्रहेलिका या काव्य पहेली के प्रति कोई सहानुभूति नहीं है। यह वृत्त्यनुप्रास के क्षेत्र में ही उपनागरिका, परुषा और कोमला इन तीन वृत्तियों को मानता है जबकि वामन की दृष्टि में ये अलग से वृत्ति स्वीकृत हैं। काव्यप्रकाश में ६२ अर्थालंकारों (मम्मट ने जैसा कि परम्परानुसार परिकर तक ही लिखा है) का उतना अच्छा विश्लेषण नहीं है जितना कि रुय्यक के अलंकारसर्वस्व में है। फिर भी शब्दालंकार और अर्थालंकारों को विभक्त करने के लिए अन्वय-व्यतिरेक को आधार मानने, अलंकारों की संक्षिप्त परिभाषाएँ देने, अनुपयुक्त भेदोपभेदों को हटाने और नये उपभेद स्वीकार करने के लिए यह श्लाघनीय है। मम्मट अलंकारशास्त्री होने के अतिरिक्त एक वैयाकरण था। उपमा के बहुत से भेद व्याकरण के सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर किये गये हैं। वैयाकरणों द्वारा स्वीकृत शब्द के चार भेदों के आधार पर मम्मट ने विरोध अलंकार को -

जातिश्चतुर्भिर्जात्याद्यैर्विरुद्धा स्याद्गुणास्त्रिभिः।

क्रिया द्वाभ्यामपि द्रव्यं द्रव्येणैवेति ते दश।। (सू. १६१)

इस प्रकार दश भेदों में विभक्त किया है। प्राचीन मतों को अस्वीकृत करने में मम्मट कभी नहीं डरे। वह प्राचीनों द्वारा स्वीकृत मालोपमा और रसनोपमा को स्वीकार नहीं करता है। वह रूपक, निदर्शन, प्रतिवस्तूपमा, व्यतिरेक और दीपक अलंकारों के मालारूप को स्वीकार करता है। अनन्वय और उपमेयोपमा उपमा के ही भेद हैं। रुद्रट् के इस मत के विरुद्ध मम्मट ने इन्हें स्वतन्त्र अलंकार माना है। उसकी यह मान्यता है कि परिकर, निषेध या अपुष्टार्थ का अभाव मात्र नहीं है अपितु विध्यर्थक अलंकार है। हेतु को स्वतन्त्र अलंकार मानने वाले दण्डी का विरोध करते हुए मम्मट ने इसे काव्यलिङ्ग में समाविष्ट कर दिया है।

मम्मट अलंकार शास्त्र और व्याकरण सहित अन्य शास्त्रों के पूर्ववर्ती आचार्यों का अत्यधिक ऋणी है। फिर भी वह किसी का अन्धभक्त नहीं है। संस्कृत काव्यालोचन की अनेक समस्याओं और विषयों का संश्लिष्टरूप से विवेचन करते हुए वह अपनी मौलिकता और विचार-स्वातन्त्र्य को बनाये रखता है। यह बात इस तथ्य से पूर्ण रूप से प्रमाणित हो जाती है कि वह भामह, उद्भट, वामन, रुद्रट्, आनन्दवर्धन, अभिनवगुप्त और मुकुलभट्ट के सिद्धान्तों का विरोध करने में कभी नहीं डरा है। कालिदास और भवभूति जैसे महान् कवियों के काव्यों में दोष दिखाने में भी मम्मट ने साहस दिखाया है तथा एक ओर विषयवस्तु का संक्षिप्त प्रतिपादन करते हुए एक भी शब्द का अपव्यय नहीं करता है। शौर्य बुद्धिमत्ता की आत्मा है। अलंकारशास्त्र के अधिकारपूर्ण विवेचन में काव्यप्रकाश की बहादुरी और संक्षिप्तता के लिए भीमसेन दीक्षित ने उसकी मुक्तकण्ठ से प्रशंसा की है-वाग्देवतावताराणां मम्मटाचार्याणामेकेन वर्णेन निरर्थकेनाधिकेन वा न भाव्यम् किमुत इयदिभरुदाहरणैः।

सन्दर्भ

1. भीमसेन का कथन - न हि गीर्वाणगुरवोऽपि श्री वाग्देवतावतारोक्तिमाक्षेप्तुं प्रभवन्ति किं पुनर्मानुषमशकाः।
2. इत्येष मार्गो विदुषां विभिन्नोऽप्यभिन्नरूपः प्रतिभासते यत्।
न तद् विचित्रं यदमुत्र सम्यग्विनिर्मिता संघटनैव हेतुः।।
3. उपर्युक्त तथ्य को काव्यप्रकाश के प्रथम व्याख्याकार इस प्रकार व्यक्त करते हैं- तददोषौ शब्दार्थाविति-अनेनोल्लासदशकस्य संक्षेपेण सूत्राणं कृतम्। तथा च तदिति सप्रयोजनं सहेतुकं सप्रभेदं च काव्यस्वरूपं प्रथमोल्लासनिर्दिष्टं सूत्रितम्। शब्दार्थाविति धर्मिभूतयोः शब्दार्थयोर्द्वितीयतृतीययोल्लासनिर्णीतयोः सूत्राणाम्। अनन्तरं तदित्यनेनैव सप्रभेदं यत् काव्यस्वरूपमुद्दिष्टं तस्य त्रयो भेदाः सप्रपञ्चमुल्लासत्रयेण प्रतिपादिताः। अदोषाविति दोषाणां परिधर्मत्वेन सूत्रितानां सप्तमोल्लासे निर्णयः सगुणावित्यनेन सूत्रितानामष्टमे प्रपञ्चितम्। अनलंङ्करी क्वापीति 'विशेषप्रतिषेधे शेषाभ्यनुज्ञान'मिति न्यायेनोद्दिक्तानां द्वयेषां

शब्दार्थालङ्काराणां क्रमेण नवमदशमोल्लासयोर्निर्णयः। एवञ्च पदपञ्चकेनोल्लासदशकं सूत्रितम्। The Poetic light, Vol. II appendix p. 544-45.

4. काव्यं तु जायते जातु कस्यचिद् प्रतिभावतः।
5. सा (शक्तिः) केवलं काव्ये हेतुः।
6. अव्युत्पत्तिकृतो दोषः शक्त्या संव्रियते कवेः।
यस्त्वशक्तिकृतस्तस्य स झटित्यवभासते।।
7. शक्तिर्निपुणता लोकशास्त्रकाव्याद्यपेक्षणात्।
काव्यज्ञशिक्षयाभ्यास इति हेतुस्तदुद्भवे।।
8. यद्यपि रसभावादिरर्थो ध्वन्यमान एव भवति, न वाच्यः कदाचिदपि तथापि न सर्वोऽलक्ष्यक्रमस्य विषयः। लोचन, २४८-४९।
9. प्रतिकूलवर्ण, लुप्तविसर्ग, समाप्तपुनरात्, अर्थान्तरैकवाचक, अभवन्मतयोग, अनभिहितवाच्य, अस्थानस्थपद, अस्थानस्थसमास, अनवीकृत, अनियमपरिवृत्त, विशेषपरिवृत्त, अविशेषपरिवृत्त, साकांक्ष, अपदयुक्त, व्यभिचारि-रस-शब्दवाच्यता, उपहितविसर्ग, सनियमपरिवृत्त, व्यक्तपुनःस्वीकृत, सहचरभिन्न, विध्ययुक्त, अनुवादायुक्त।

(हस्तलिखित)



8. Mammaṭa's originality as Revealed in the Kāvyaṭprakāśa

Bhīmasena in his commentary, Sudhāsāgara (1722-23 A.D.) on Kāvyaṭprakāśa (KP) of Mammaṭa (1050-1100 A.D.) describes him as an incarnation or personification of the Goddess of Learning. He earned this praise from the medieval scholarly tradition on account of the extraordinary nature of his work: किञ्च नायमाचार्यो मानुषः किन्तु वाग्देवतैव प्रमाणन्तु ग्रन्थस्यालौकिकत्वम् (Sudhāsāgara p. 4)

The concluding verse² of KP itself brings out the real character of this work and explains the cause of its popularity. Diverse opinions, approaches and attitudes concerning literary criticism existed before

Mammaṭa wrote his magnum opus. Readers were confounded by exposition and opposition of these various schools of critical judgment of literature.

A bridge for understanding literature was needed particularly after Ānandavardhana demolished the old concepts and established his own theory of Dhvani which was immediately opposed by equally learned critics like Kuntaka, Mahima and Bhoja (11th century A.D.). The highway of literary criticism appeared split up to the learned without revealing the underlying unity in aesthetic judgment. Kālidās was considered the best poet and dramatist by all the schools of criticism. This, in a way, underlined a certain unity in different critical opinions. Yet, on reading the theoretical discussions of various critics, this unity of judgement was not manifested. A comprehensive view of literature seemed to suffer. Emphasis on transcendental meaning of poetry did not do justice to the beauty of words and their primary meanings. A certain imbalance in critical judgement might result if one or another of the theories of Suggestion, Inference or Strikingness were followed exclusively.

Practical criticism and the practice of understanding poetry through the traditional method of a commentary generally integrated different aesthetic categories and thus took a comprehensive view in understanding literature. Exclusive works on particular theories seemed to change this outlook. It was Mammaṭa who realised that the confounding diversity may do much harm to the discipline and built a bridge of understanding, composing the diverse elements into one whole and giving an integrated and comprehensive view of poetry (Kāvya) in his celebrated Kāvya-prakāśa. It proved a real illumination (prakāśa) for literature (Kāvya). The scholarly tradition of India has celebrated his 'poetic light' by uninterrupted and continuous offerings of commentaries to this day by a galaxy of scholars, two of whom, Ruyyaka and Māṇikyacandra, may have been younger contemporaries of Mammaṭa.

The comprehensive treatment of the topics of alaṅkāraśāstra in KP does not lack a basic standpoint. The Author of KP does not present a weak compromise of principles. He takes a principled stand on the

basis of the novel theory of Ānandavardhan expounded by an equally original and erudite thinker, Abhinavagupta (10th century A.D.) Mammaṭa is therefore also spoken of as the great ācārya of the dhvani-school, Dhvani-prasthāna-paramācārya, who, through his original thinking integrated the diverse principles of Sanskrit poetics on the anvil of the dhvani-theory and constructed a comprehensive critical theory of Kāvya. His well-executed scheme of integration (Samyag-Vinirmīṭā Samghaṭanā) derives its strength and inspiration from his mastery over the works of his predecessors in alaṅkāraśāstra and various other disciplines, such as grammar, Mīmāṃsā, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya, Buddhism and Saivism.

Mammaṭa's acquaintance with Sanskrit literature is pervasive, although one would always wish that he had selected more suitable literary illustrations. Bhavabhūti's Uṭṭarāmacarita, for example, deserved to be quoted in preference to or in addition to two other plays of the same dramatist. One might even say that even the best of Kālidāsa has not been noticed. The selection of examples to illustrate the highest kind of poetry does not speak highly of the literary sensibility of Mammaṭa. However, such criticism of KP fails to realise the basic fact that Mammaṭa was pre-eminently engrossed in a scholarly pursuit of legislative criticism concerned chiefly with giving concise definitions, and systematic classification, divisions and sub-divisions and fundamentals of various concepts, so concise that they are packed in a small compass of 142 Kārikās, supplemented with a brief auto-comment (vṛtti) thereon and nearly 600 illustrations.

Dr. S.K. De makes the following observation regarding the chief merit of KP : **As it combines the merit of fulness with that of conciseness, it became one of the classic works of Sanskrit Poetics and Rhetoric which has always maintained a great authority and popularity through India. It sums up and explains in the succinct form of a brilliant text-book all the previous speculations on the subject, becoming in its turn the starting point of endless exegetic works and text-books. As such it occupies a unique position in the history of Sanskrit Alaṅkāra literature** (History of Sanskrit Poetics Vol-I, P. 154, forma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1960).

M.M. P.V. Kane makes similar observations when he says: **In the alaṅkā literature Kāvya-prakāśa occupies a unique position. It sums up in itself all the activities that had been going on for centuries in the field of poetics, while it becomes itself a fountain-head from which fresh streams of doctrines issue forth. Like the Sārirakabhāṣya in Vedānta or the Mahābhāṣya in grammar, the Kāvya-prakāśa becomes a starting point for future exegesis and expansion. The great merit of the work is that it combines fulness of treatment with conciseness** (The History of Sanskrit Poetics, P. 255, Bombay 1951).

Prof. S.S. Sukhankar in his introduction (P.vi) to the Kāvya-prakāśa, Ullāsa X (Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay, 1941) explains Mammaṭa's phenomenal popularity by pointing out that he was firstly, a man of wide learning, secondly a staunch advocate of a school, the dhvani school, which had a strong hold on the minds of scholars after Ānandavardhana and thirdly one who tried to bring together in his Kāvya-prakāśa all that was best in the systems that preceded him. Similarly, A.B. Gajendragadkar in his introduction to Kāvya-prakāśa (Popular Book Depot, Bombay, 1969 p. 27) analyses the causes of the immense popularity of the KP.

First his Kāvya-prakāśa, as we saw before, epitomizes all the important theories, and doctrines that were developed before his time..... Secondly, his treatment of the various topics, though full, is concise. Practical considerations, rather than a desire to secure theoretical exhaustiveness, evidently prevailed with him in dealing with different subjects. Commenting on the numerousness of commentaries on KP, Kane says: **Except the Bhagavadgītā there is hardly any other work in classical Sanskrit that has so many commentaries on it.** (Ibid., p. 263).

In fact, Maheśvara, a commentator on KP remarks that in spite of commentaries in every house, KP remains as difficult as before testifying thereby to its popularity, universal acclaim and the scholastic toughness of the text.

Mammaṭa does not lay any special claim to originality, perhaps, no great Indian author, poet or philosopher ever did. This is true of Ānandavardhana, Kālidās and Śaṅkara. What is proclaimed as original is not really original in the sense of being truly new or novel without any links with the past. The ideas found in KP have a history but the order, form and construction of these ideas are new. Old ideas are cast into a new form and shape in order to construct an integrated poetic theory on the solid rock of the dhvani-theory. Mammaṭa does not, therefore, merely sum up old ideas without any objective in view. KP is neither mere index nor an anthology of critical principles. It represents a fortification of the dhvani theory against the onslaughts of rival theories on the one hand and conserves the best of all other thoughts in its vast sweep of Sanskrit Poetics. Its originality lies in establishing a meaningful synthesis of all the aesthetic categories along with the supreme significance of rasa-dhvani in literature.

Thus, it affirms the relevance of all the three kinds of poetry, with or without a transcendental meaning. This novelty of approach provided the *raison d'être* for the diverse traditions of Sanskrit literature which equally revelled in descriptions of nature, fanciful imagery and delineation of emotions.

KP is divided into ten chapters (Ullāsas) in 142 Kārikās, split up into 212 Sūtras supplemented by very brief explanations in prose (vṛtti) with nearly 600 illustrations from Sanskrit literature. The title Kāvya-prakāśa itself symbolises the synthesis of the old titles beginning with 'Kāvya' with the new title ending with 'āloka' (as in Dhvanyāloka). Āloka replaces the use of the old term Alaṅkāra in the title of the book. It signifies acceptance of Vyañjanā. As a paraphrasing of Kāvya-āloka of Ānandavardhana, the title KP affirms its following of the dhvani school in its basic stand.

KP begins with a charter of independence for the poetic world. The benedictory verse is couched in popular terms of Kāsmīr Śaivism which propounded freedom of Man in his knowledge and action through his ultimate identity with Śiva who creates the world out of His free will

as does the artist. The experience of the aesthetic world created by the free imagination of a poet is not bedevilled by the sense of sorrow. The aesthetic experience is essentially blissful. The literary world is presentative and not representative. The poet is creator in his own right, he is not a co-creator with God. The benedictory verse and auto-comment thereon are forceful in their well-pronounced proclamation of the independence and autonomy of literature.

KP is mainly concerned with building up a theory of poetry. A quick glance at the contents of the ten chapters of the this work will amply reveal this.

- Ullās 1: Purposes, causes, definition and three kinds of poetry as word and sense without poetical flaws, with poetical excellences and embellished with poetic figures.
- Ullās 2: Words, expressive, indicative and suggestive, yielding expressed, indicated suggested sense, consideration of powers of words, namely, abhidhā, lakṣanā and vyañjanā.
- Ullās 3: Circumstances making the sense suggestive.
- Ullās 4: Two kinds of dhvani or best poetry; their sub-divisions, the nature of Rasa; different theories of rasa; eight rasas their corresponding, basic moods (Sthāyībhāvas), thirty three Vyabhicāribhāvas, Śānta rasa, Bhāva; rasābhāsa and bhāvābhāsa; further sub-divisions of dhvani.
- Ullās 5: Second kind of poetry (Viz mediocre) and its eight varieties.
- Ullās 6: Citra or lowest kind of poetry of word and sense.
- Ullās 7: Definition of poetic flaw; Sixteen flaws of word; flaws of sentence; twentythree defects of sense; circumstances of flaws turning into excellences; thirteen flaws of rasa.
- Ullās 8: Poetic excellence defined and distinguished from embellishment; three kinds of excellences established by refuting ten; combination of letters revealing excellences.

Ullās 9: Six figures of words and three styles (Vṛttis).

Ullās 10: Sixty two figures of speech with sub divisions.

This brief statement of the main contents of KP makes it clear that Mammaṭa planned the divisions of his chapters according to the terms of his definition of poetry. Word and Sense, the substantive terms in defining poetry, pervade the entire frame of his text although the same are dealt with exhaustively in the second and third ullāsas.

The first ullās is devoted to the tat, the Kāvya. Doṣaj guṇas and Alaṅkāras occurring in the epithets are treated respectively in the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth ullāsas. Conceiving the chapters in terms of the definition of poetry is an original approach by Mammaṭa³. It gives a system to the treatment. In the definition of poetry he reconciles the different points of view of his predecessors. Through the epithet of Saguṇau he suggests the presence of rasa in poetry to which guṇas are intrinsically related as attributes. On the face of it, the definition of poetry is otherwise a mere summing up of old views with one important difference. He visualises poetical character even in the absence of a distinct figure of speech. This is in bold contrast to the opinion of those who could not conceive of poetry without alaṅkāra. This approach of KP in achieving harmony of various views on a subject without compromising his basic stand and making it explicit on various occasions marks its uniqueness, originality and speciality. Some brief comments on the contribution of Mammaṭa in dealing with different topics are given below:

(i) Purposes of poetry

In stating six purposes of poetry, Mammaṭa does not merely sum up the views of Bharata, Bhāmaha, Ānandavaradhana and others, he relates them to the poet, the patron and the aesthete and proclaims the supremacy and immediacy of aesthetic rapture (Sadyaḥ paranirvṛti).

(ii) Causes of poetry

Mammaṭa declares collective causality of poetic genius, erudition and practice against the opinion of Bhāmaha⁴, Rajaśekhara⁵ and

Ānandavardhana⁶ who had emphasised predominant role of pratibhā in poetic creation. Mammaṭa, following Daṇḍin and Rudraṭa, takes a practical view and holds that the three together constitute the cause of actual poetic activity.

(iii) Three kinds of poetry

It is Mammaṭa who, for the first time, very clearly uses the terms *uttama*, *madhyama* and *adhama* for the three kinds of poetry. Ānandavardhana who designates *dhvani* as *kāvya* may not unhesitatingly accept the three divisions of poetry even though he had himself used the terms *guṇībhūtavyangya* and *citra* for the second and third varieties of *kāvya*. KP propounds three divisions of poetry taking again a practical view of literature in Sanskrit. After all, the great variety of Sanskrit poetry in all ages and times could not be an illustration of *dhvani* only. Yet, its claim to poetry is validly and universally accepted. Mammaṭa does justice to the vast variety of poetry by defining it in descriptive terms and by grading it according to a standard of judgement believing in the supremacy of feelings and sentiments without denying the status of poetry to other forms accepted in a hierarchical order.

(iv) Powers of words

In dealing with *Abhidhā* and *Lakṣanā* Mammaṭa primarily follows Mukula Bhaṭṭa, the author of *Abhidhāvṛttimātrkā*, although he does not accept that *Lakṣanā* can be subsumed under *Abhidhā* as Mukula does. Mammaṭa patterns his six divisions of *Lakṣanā* following Mukula. However, Mammaṭa disagrees with Mukula, in many matters of detail. For example, according to Mukula the individual in *gauranubandhyahs* is indicated but, according to Mammaṭa, it is presumed through *arthāpatti*. According to Mukula, *upādāna Lakṣanā* yields the 'sense eating during the night' in the famous illustration of a fat Devadatta not eating during the day time, whereas, Mammaṭa follows Kumārila, Bhartṛhari and Abhinavagupta in holding it to be a case of *arthāpatti*.

Mammaṭa excels in advancing arguments in favour of suggestion and in demolishing all the views opposed to this theory. His refutation of

the various shades of opinion of the *Mimāṃsakas*, grammarians, *Vedāntins* *Naiyāyikas* and old poeticists opposed to the *vyañjanā* and advancement of arguments in favour of *vyañjanā* based on *Abhidhā*, *Lakṣanā* and *vyañjanā* is marvellous for its scholarly exposition.

He demolishes the theory of inference propounded by Mahima Bhaṭṭa by analysing the examples of *bhrama*, *dhārmika* and *niḥśeṣacyuta* and by concluding that the *hetu* in such cases in *anaikāntika*, *viruddha* and *asiddha*. The powerful defence of suggestion by Mammaṭa finally settled the war in favour of the *Dhvani* theorists and great master of opposite thought like *Kuntaka*, *Mahima* and *Bhoja* were left without much following in the centuries succeeding Mammaṭa.

(v) Varieties of Dhvani

Mammaṭa finally holds that in *rasādi* sequence is imperceptible. Abhinavagupta in his explanation of Ānandavardhana's view on this point accepted perceptibility of the sequence in *rasādi*⁷:

According to Abhinavagupta there are thirty five main divisions of *dhvani*, Mammaṭa extended this number to fifty one. The subdivisions of *dhvani* numbered 7420 in *Locana* whereas in Mammaṭa they make a total of 10455.

(vi) Poetic flaws

The credit for final classification of poetic flaws on certain principles goes to KP. which makes a great advancement over the views of Vāmana. Nearly twentytwo poetic flaws⁸ are propounded originally by Mammaṭa taking one from their vague outlines in earlier literature. The flaws relating to *alaṅkāras* described by Bhāmaha, Vāmana and others were put by Mammaṭa under the general scheme of defects.

(vii) Poetic Excellences

We owe the clear-cut formulation of the distinction between *guṇas* and *alaṅkāras* to KP. Moreover, KP establishes firmly the number of *guṇas* and restrict it to three, *prasāda*, *mādhurya* and *ojas* repudiating successfully the position of Vāmana who had admitted

ten guṇas each of word and sense. Following Ānandvardhana, Mammaṭa also holds that letters, vṛtti and sanghṭanā (composition) are dependent upon guṇas.

(viii) Poetic figures

KP deals with six sabdālaṅkāras, Vakrokti, Anuprāsa, Yamaka, Śleṣa, Citra and Punaruktavadābhāsa. He gives only the main divisions of these figures discarding many subdivisions so assiduously illustrated by the old poeticists. He has no sympathy for prahelikā or poetic puzzles. In the scope of the Vṛṭṭyānuprāsa he includes three vṛttis, upanāgarikā, paruṣā and komalā which are known to be three styles according to Vāmana.

The treatment of 62 arthālaṅkāras (Mammaṭa, wrote only upto parikara in KP) is not as remarkable as in Alaṅkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka. However, it is significant for holding anvayavyatireks as the basis of their division into that of word and sense, for formulating concise definitions of the alaṅkāras, for discarding unimportant sub-divisions and in propounding new sub-divisions. Besides being an Ālaṅkārika, Mammaṭa was a great grammarian. Most of the divisions of upamā are based on the principles of grammar. Mammaṭa divides the figure virodha into ten kinds. These are based on the four classes of words accepted by the grammarians. Mammaṭa is never afraid of repudiating the old opinions. He does not accept Mālopanā and Raśanopamā accepted by Daṇḍin and Rudrata. He believes, however, in Mālā form of Rūpakanidarśanā, Prativastūpanā, Vyatireka and Dīpaka. He establishes distinctiveness of Ananvaya and upameyopamā against the opinion of Rudrata who included these under the varieties of upamā. He maintains that parikara is a positive alaṅkāra and not merely negation or absence of apuṣṭārtha. By including Hetu under the Kāvyaṅga, KP refutes the opinion of Daṇḍin who maintained its independence.

Mammaṭa is greatly indebted to his predecessors in alaṅkāraśāstra and to various other disciplines including grammar.

He is by no means a slavish follower as he retains his independence of thought and originality in systematically dealing with

the various problems and aspects of Sanskrit criticism. This is amply proved by the fact that he was never afraid of controverting the views of Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa, Vāmana, Rudraṭa, Ānandarandhana, Abhinavagupta and Mukula Bhaṭṭa. He shows courage in finding faults in great poets like Kālidās and Bhavabhūti. He wastes no words in expressing the subject in hand concisely. Brevity is the soul of wisdom. Bhīmasena Dīkṣita offers full-throated praise for this quality of brevity and conciseness of KP in its masterly treatment of alaṅkāraśāstra:- वाग्देवतावताराणां मम्मटाचार्याणामेकेन वर्णेन निरर्थकेनाधिकेन वा न भाव्यम्, किमुत इयद्विभरुदाहरणैः।

References

1. Bhīmasena says: न हि गीर्वाणगुरवोऽपि श्रीवाग्देवतावतारोक्तिमाक्षेप्तुं प्रभवन्ति किं पुनर्मानुषमशकाः।
2. इत्येष मार्गो विदुषां विभिन्नोऽप्यभिन्न रूपः प्रतिभासते यत्। न तद् विचित्रं यदमुत्रसम्यग्विनिर्मिता संघटनैव हेतुः।।
3. Ruyyaka the first commentator on KP notes the above fact thus: तददोषौ शब्दार्थाविति- 'अनेनोल्लासदशकस्य संक्षेपेण सूत्रणं कृतम्। तथा च तदिति सप्रयोजनं सहेतुकं सप्रभेदं च काव्यस्वरूपं प्रथमोल्लासनिर्दिष्टं सूचितम्। शब्दार्थाविति धर्मिभूतयोः शब्दार्थयोर्द्वितीयतृतीयोल्लास निर्णीतयोः सूत्रणम्। अनन्तरं तदित्यनेनैव सप्रभेदं यत् काव्यस्वरूपमुद्दिष्टं तस्य त्रयो भेदाः सप्रपञ्चमुल्लासत्रयेण प्रतिपादिताः। अदोषाविति दोषाणां परिहार्यत्वेन सूचितानां सप्तमोल्लासे निर्णयः। सगुणावित्यनेन सूचितानामष्टमे प्रपञ्चितम्। अनलङ्कृती क्वापीति 'विशेषप्रतिशेधे शेषाभ्यनुज्ञान'मिति न्यायेनोद्दिष्टानां द्वयेषां शब्दार्थालङ्काराणां क्रमेण नवमदशमोल्लासयोर्निर्णयः। एवञ्च पदपञ्चकेनोल्लासदशकं सूचितम्।- Dwivedi, R.C., *The Poetic light*, Vol. II. Delhi, 1970.
4. काव्यं तु जायते जातु कस्यचित् प्रतिभावतः।
5. सा (शक्तिः) केवलं काव्ये हेतुः।
6. अव्युत्पत्तिकृतो दोषः शक्त्या संव्रियते कवेः। यस्त्वशक्तिकृतस्तस्य स झटित्यवभासते।।
7. यद्यपि रसभावादिरर्थो ध्वन्यमान एव भवति, न वाच्यः कदाचिदपि तथापि न सर्वोऽलक्ष्य-क्रमस्य विषयः। Locana, 248-49.

8. प्रतिकूलवर्ण-लुप्तविसर्ग-समाप्तपुनरात्र-अर्थान्तरैकवाचक-अभ्वन्मतयोग-अनभिहित-वाच्य-अस्थानस्थपद-अस्थानस्थसमास-अनवीकृत-अनियमपरिवृत्त,-विशेषपरिवृत्त-अविशेषपरिवृत्त-साकांक्ष-अपदयुक्त-व्याभिचारि-रस-स्वशब्दवाच्यता-उपहितविसर्ग-सनियमपरिवृत्त-व्यक्तपुनःस्वीकृत-सहचरभिन्न-विध्ययुक्त-अनुवादायुक्त..... ।

(Typed)



9. प्राक्कथन

प्रस्तुत ग्रन्थ अलंकारसर्वस्व और उसके टीकाकारों के विशिष्ट सन्दर्भ में अलंकार के अनुसन्धान का एक अंश है। मूल ग्रन्थ का आलोचनात्मक संस्करण, हिन्दी अनुवाद तथा श्रीविद्याचक्रवर्ती की अभी तक अप्रकाशित संजीवनी टीका का प्रकाश इसका दूसरा अंश है। तीसरा अंश 'स्टडीज़ इन दि अलंकार शास्त्र' के नाम से प्रकाशित हो रहा है। इस प्रकार अलंकारशास्त्र, विशेषतः अलंकार सिद्धान्त, के सम्बन्ध में मेरे अनुसन्धान की सम्पूर्ण सामग्री तीन परस्पर निरपेक्ष-सापेक्ष ग्रन्थों के रूप में प्रकाशित हो रही है।

इस शोधग्रन्थ में चार अध्याय हैं। प्रथम में राजानक रुय्यक तथा उनके टीकाकारों के व्यक्तित्व और कृतित्व का आलोचनात्मक परिचय प्रस्तुत किया गया है। इसी प्रसङ्ग में अलंकारसर्वस्व के लेखक का प्रश्न, रुय्यक की अन्य कृतियों तथा उनके टीकाकारों की प्रकाशित एवं अप्रकाशित कृतियों का विवरण, काव्यप्रकाश तथा अलंकाररत्नाकर से संवाद एवं विसम्वाद भी विवेचित हैं तथा दो अप्राप्य ग्रन्थों- अलंकारसार एवं अलंकारभाष्य-का अलंकारमीमांसा में योगदान आकलित किया गया है।

द्वितीय अध्याय में अलंकार के सम्बन्ध में भामह आदि आचार्यों के मत का विवेचन है तथा अन्य काव्यतत्त्वों के साथ उसके सम्बन्ध का निर्धारण किया गया है। इस प्रसङ्ग में काव्य के स्वरूप-विवेचन तथा साहित्यशास्त्र के विभिन्न प्रस्थानों के सम्बन्ध में दार्शनिक दृष्टि से विमर्श प्रस्तुत किया गया है।

तीसरे अध्याय में अलंकारों के क्रमिक विकास की रूपरेखा, उनका शब्दार्थोभय-विभाग तथा वर्गीकरण का ऐतिहासिक दृष्टि से आलोचन है। अन्त में अलंकारों के निरूपण-क्रम के सम्बन्ध में कतिपय सिद्धान्तों का प्रतिपादन है।

प्रायः सभी अलंकारों का उल्लेख अथवा परिचय इस ग्रन्थ के विभिन्न सन्दर्भों में दिया गया है (देखिए अलंकारानुक्रमणिका)। सभी अलंकारों की पार्थक्येन मीमांसा ग्रन्थ के कलेवर को अत्यधिक बढ़ा देती, अतः केवल उपमामूलक अलंकारों की विशिष्ट मीमांसा चतुर्थ अध्याय में दी गई है जो सम्पूर्ण ग्रन्थ का लगभग आधा भाग है।

अलंकारसर्वस्व के सभी अलंकारों का निर्गलितार्थ श्रीविद्याचक्रवर्ती ने अपनी अलंकारसर्वस्व-निष्कृष्टार्थ-कारिका में दिया है। यह अभी तक अप्रकाशित थी। इसका आलोचनात्मक संस्करण तथा अनुवाद अनुबन्ध में दिया गया है ताकि एक प्राचीन कृति का अलंकारशास्त्र के अनुसन्धाताओं को परिचय भी मिल जाए, साथ ही अलंकारसर्वस्व में प्रतिपादित सभी अलंकारों का अनुवाद के माध्यम से निरूपण भी हो जाए।

प्रस्तुत शोधग्रन्थ की विशेषता तथा उपलब्धि की चर्चा मैं अधीत पाठकों पर छोड़ दे रहा हूँ। अलंकारशास्त्र के सम्पूर्ण परिप्रेक्ष्य में अलंकार-मीमांसा-अलंकारसर्वस्व के सन्दर्भ में अलंकार के स्वरूप और सिद्धान्त का अनुसन्धान-जिसे पृष्ठ-शीर्षकों (folio-headings) में मैंने अलंकारसर्वस्व-मीमांसा कहा है- अनेक नए या अपरिचित तथ्यों का प्रतिपादन करती है। विमर्शिनी और समुद्रबन्ध की व्याख्या के अतिरिक्त अलंकारसार, अलंकारभाष्य, अलंकाररत्नाकर, संजीवनी टीका आदि के मतों की मीमांसा पाठक को प्रथम बार यहाँ मिलेगी। अलंकार एक प्रतीति है। उसी प्रतीति का मनोवैज्ञानिक एवं दार्शनिक विश्लेषण करने का मैंने प्रयास किया है। इसमें मुझे कितनी सफलता मिली है इसके निर्णय का अधिकार विद्वान् पाठकों को है, मुझे नहीं।

इस ग्रन्थ में पाठक को संस्कृत के उद्धरण बहुलता से मिलेंगे। संस्कृत का लेखक नामूलं लिख्यते किञ्चित् की भावना से सदा प्रेरित रहता है। उसकी मौलिकता की जड़ें सुदूर अतीत में होती हैं; वह अतीत और वर्तमान में, प्राचीन और नवीन में, व्युत्पत्ति और प्रतिभा में सदा समन्वय खोजने का अभ्यस्त रहा है। उद्धरणों की बहुलता का एक प्रकृत कारण भी है। इस ग्रन्थ का मूल स्वरूप शास्त्रीय समीक्षा का है। स्वभावतः अलंकारसर्वस्व तथा उसकी टीकाओं के उद्धरण देना अधिक आवश्यक और अपेक्षित हो जाता है। इनसे यदि पाठक को कुछ असुविधा होगी तो उसे अपना निर्णय लेने की स्वतन्त्रता और सुविधा भी बनी रहेगी। हिन्दी का पाठक मूल के उद्धरणों से लाभान्वित होगा, इसका मुझे विश्वास है।

मैं प्रो. को.अ.सुब्रह्मण्य अय्यर, भूतपूर्व उपकुलपति, लखनऊ विश्वविद्यालय तथा वाराणसेय संस्कृत विश्वविद्यालय के प्रति श्रद्धावन्त हूँ जिनके निर्देशन में मुझे अध्ययन, अनुसन्धान और अध्यापन का सौभाग्य मिला था। तुलनात्मक सौन्दर्यशास्त्र तथा काश्मीर

शैवदर्शन के अप्रतिम विद्वान् डॉ. कान्तिचन्द्र पाण्डेय ने मुझे वैदुष्य-साधना की सदा प्रेरणा दी है। इस अवसर पर मैं उन्हें अपने प्रणाम अर्पित करता हूँ। काशी में रहकर जिन गुरुजनों से मैंने साहित्यशास्त्र का अध्ययन किया है उनमें स्वर्गीय महामहोपाध्याय नारायण शास्त्री खिस्ते, प्रो. मुकुन्दशास्त्री खिस्ते तथा पं. बटुकनाथ शास्त्री खिस्ते के नाम सादर उल्लेखनीय हैं। भारतीय साहित्यशास्त्र को अपनी प्रतिभा से आलोकित करने वाले सहृदय मनीषी डॉ. नगेन्द्र का तथा अन्य विद्वानों का मैं हृदय से कृतज्ञ हूँ जिन्होंने इस शोधग्रन्थ के सम्बन्ध में अपनी अमूल्य सम्मति व्यक्त की है।

(अलंकारमीमांसा, मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, १९६५)



10. अलंकारशास्त्रस्य दर्शनसरणिः

अपूर्वं यद्वस्तु प्रथयति विना कारणकलां
जगद् ग्रावप्रख्यं निजरसभरात् सारयति च।
क्रमात्प्रख्योपाख्याप्रसरसुभगं भासयति तत्
सरस्वत्यास्तत्त्वं कविसहृदयाख्यं विजयते।।
नियतिकृतनियमरहितां ह्लादैकमयीमनन्यपरतन्त्राम्।
नवरसरुचिरां निर्मितमादधती भारती कवेर्जयति।।

महामाहेश्वराणां अभिनवगुप्तपादानां, ध्वनिप्रस्थानपरमाचार्याणां च काव्यप्रकाशकृतं मम्मटभट्टानां सकृदुच्चारितयोपद्ययोरलंकारशास्त्रस्य दर्शनदिगुन्मीलिता भवति। साहित्यं, रसशास्त्रं, काव्यशास्त्रं, काव्यमीमांसा, अलंकारशास्त्रं, सौंदर्यशास्त्रादिकं चालंकारशास्त्रस्यैव नामान्तरम्। कान्तासम्मिततया शासनात्, साहित्यतत्त्वस्य शंसनाद्, पुरुषार्थत्रितयाविरोधेन कामस्य प्राधान्येन प्रतिपादकत्वादलंकारशास्त्रस्य शास्त्रत्वं^३ सुतरां संघटते। एतच्च शास्त्रं समग्रशास्त्राणां समष्टिर्निष्यन्दश्चेति प्राचां वाचः प्रमाणम्-समष्टिः सर्वशास्त्राणां साहित्यमिति गीयते। पञ्चमी साहित्यविद्येति यायावरीयः। नाट्यशास्त्रेण सह चिरन्तनं सौभ्रात्रं भजमानमलंकारशास्त्रं स्वस्य पञ्चमदेवत्वं ख्यापयति। ग्राम्यधर्मप्रवृत्तस्य कामलोभवशंगतस्य ईर्ष्याक्रोधाभिसंमूढस्य, सुखितदुःखीतस्य सार्ववर्णिकस्य लोकस्य कल्याणाय नाट्यशास्त्रमिव साहित्यशास्त्रमपि प्रवृत्तमिति।

अलङ्कारशास्त्रस्य शास्त्रत्वेन वैलक्षण्यम्

- भामहः - स्वादुकाव्यरसोन्मिश्रं शास्त्रमप्युपयुञ्जते।
प्रथमालीढमधवः पिबन्ति कटुभेषजम्।।

- विश्वनाथः - चतुर्वर्गफलप्राप्तिः सुखादल्पधियामपि।
काव्यादेव यतस्तेन तत्स्वरूपं निगद्यते।।
- महिमभट्टः - सामायेनोभयमपि च तत् शास्त्रवद्विधिनिषेधव्युत्पत्तिफलम्।
- अश्वघोषः - यन्मोक्षात्कृतमन्यदत्र हि मया तत्काव्यधर्मात्कृतम्।
धातुं तिक्तमिषधं मधुयुतं छद्म कथं स्यादिति।।
- रुद्रटः - ननु काव्ये क्रियन्ते सरसानामवगमश्चतुर्वर्गे।
लघुमृदु च नीरसेष्यस्ते हि स्मरयन्निशास्त्रेभयः।।
- काव्यमीमांसायां उद्धृतम् - अस्तु नाम निस्सीमा अर्थसार्थः। किन्तु द्विरूप
एवासौ विचारितसुस्थः अविचारितरमणीयश्च। तयोः
पूर्वमाश्रितानि शास्त्राणि तदुत्तरं काव्यानि। इत्यौद्धटाः।

भरतवचोभिरुन्नेतुं सुशकम्। महेन्द्रप्रमुखैर्देवैः प्रार्थितः पितामहः पञ्चमं
सार्ववर्णिकं नाट्यवेदं ससर्ज। तथा हि भरतः -

धर्म्यमर्थ्यं यशस्यं च सोपदेशं ससंग्रहम्।
भविष्यतश्च लोकस्य सर्वकर्मानुदर्शकम्।।
सर्वशास्त्रार्थसम्पन्नं सर्वशिल्पप्रदर्शकम्।
नाट्याख्यं पञ्चमं वेदं सेतिहासं करोम्यहम्।।

नाट्यशास्त्रवेदेव काव्यशास्त्रमिति व्यक्तिविवेककारः स्पष्टमाचख्यौ- केवलं व्युत्पाद्यजनजाड्यतारतम्यापेक्षया काव्यनाट्यशास्त्रदपोह्यमुपायमात्रभेदे न फलभेदः राजशेखरोऽपि पञ्चमी साहित्यविद्या तथैव प्रतिष्ठापरान्भरतवाक्यमेव प्रमाणकोटिमाटीकते। अलंकारतन्त्रप्रजापतिर्भामहश्च^३ भरतप्रामाण्यैर्नैवालङ्कारशास्त्रस्य सर्वशास्त्रनिष्यन्दत्वं प्रतिष्ठापयामास-

न स शब्दो न द्वाच्यं न स न्यायो न सा कला।
जायते यन् काव्याङ्गमहो भारो महान् कवेः।।^३

व्याकरणदर्शनं प्रतिष्ठापयिषुर्भगवान्भाष्यकारो व्याकरणशास्त्रं सर्ववेदपरिषदं विज्ञापयामास- सर्ववेदपरिषदं हीद शास्त्रम्। तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आथातुम्। (२.१.५० महाभाष्य) तथा च- शब्दप्रमाणका वयम्। यच्छब्द आह तदस्माकं प्रमाणम् (१.१२-१५ महाभाष्य)।

अमुमे वार्थमन्ववदद्भगवद्भर्तृ हरिस्तट्टी काकारश्च।^३ सार्ववर्णिकं सकलशास्त्रसमष्टिस्वरूपमपि सकलज्ञानपरिषदमपि सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्र मिदमलङ्कारशास्त्रमिति

परस्तात् प्रतिपादयिष्यते। एतस्मिन् शृंगारप्रकाशे सुप्रकाशमेवाशेषशास्त्रार्थसंपदुपनिषदाम् अखिलकलाकाव्यौचित्यकल्पन रिहस्वानां च सन्निवेशो दृश्यते (जिल्द २, पृ. ४३०)।

सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षं जगद् व्याख्यातुं तत्त्वं वा निर्णेतुं प्रवर्तन्ते दर्शनानि। कलानां काव्यस्य च किं तत्त्वं, किं नाम काव्यसौंदर्याभिति प्रसिद्धे दर्शनैरसमाहितं प्रश्नं समाधातुमुपक्रान्तमलङ्कारशास्त्रम्। काव्यं ग्राह्यमलंकारात् सौन्दर्यमलङ्कारः। इति वामनसूत्रेण। लङ्कारस्य सौन्दर्यापरपर्यायत्वं स्फुटीक्रियते। तदेव च श्रीविद्याचक्रवर्तिना अलङ्कारो हि विच्छित्ति-रित्यसकृदुद्घोषणयाऽनुद्यते। शब्दार्थसाहित्यसौन्दर्येण सहदयं ब्रह्मास्वादसहोदरमानन्दमनुभावयत् काव्यं किलक्षणं कस्तस्य स्रष्टा, कीदृशी सृष्टिः कियाकारोऽनुभवः एवं विधानां प्रश्नानां समाधाने अलंकारशास्त्रं सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रां कांचन दर्शनसरणिं स्वीकुरुते। सौन्दर्यदर्शनकारेषु च केचन बौद्धा अपरे नैयायिकाः अन्ये मीमांसकाः केचन सांख्यशास्त्रविदः बहवश्च, त्रिकदर्शनविदः ईश्वराद्वयवादिनः ब्रह्माद्वैतवादिनो वेदान्तिनश्च आसन्।तेषां बहुविधविकल्पकल्पनाभिश्चमीकृतमलंकारदर्शनं स्वतन्त्रां सरणिं ससर्जेति सूक्ष्मेक्षिकया पर्यालोचनेन प्रतिष्ठापयितुं सुशकम्।

सन्दर्भाः

१. त्रिविधं हि शास्त्रं शब्दप्रधानमर्थप्रधानमुभयप्रधानं चेति। तत्र शब्दप्रधानं वेदादि। अध्ययनादेवाभ्युदयश्रवणात् मनागपि पाठविपर्यासे प्रत्यवायश्रवणाच्च। अर्थप्रधानमितिहासपुराणादि तस्य अर्थवादमात्ररूपत्वाद् उभयप्रधानं सर्गबन्धादिकाव्यं, तस्य रसात्मकत्वात् रसस्य च उभयौचित्येन परिपोषदर्शनात्। काव्यस्यापि शास्त्रत्वं प्रतिपादितमेव। व्यक्तिविवेकः।
२. न वेदव्यवहारोऽयं संश्राव्यः शूद्रजातिषु। तस्मात्सृजापरं वेदं पंचमं सार्ववर्णिकम्॥
३. तुलनार्थं द्रष्टव्यम्-
न तज्ज्ञानं न तच्छिल्पं न सा विद्या न सा कला।
न स योगो न तत्कर्म नाट्येऽस्मिन् यत्र दृश्यते॥
४. (i) सर्वपार्षदं हीदं शास्त्रं शब्दार्थोऽर्थ इति परार्थ व्यवस्थेयम्। वाक्यपदीये, ४.१.९।
(ii) यतः सर्वपार्षदं हि व्याकरणशास्त्रम्। तत्रैव।

(हस्तलिखितम्)



11. Percept-like Experience in Bhāvika

The Poet by virtue of his poetic intuition which is described in mystic language as the third eye of Trilocana (Three-eyed) directly perceives every form of existence¹ past, present and future. Sometimes, the poet delights us by the picturesque presentation of the things gone by; on occasions, he paints a vivid and striking picture of the 'shape of things to come.' No doubt, a historian also unfolds the past and a prophet gives the glimpses of the future but, matter-of-fact as they are, they can not present the past or the future as though it were present. Only a poet can do it.

कोऽन्यः कालमतिक्रान्तं नेतुं प्रत्यक्षतां क्षमः।
कविप्रजापतीस्त्यक्त्वा रम्यनिर्माणशालिनः॥

(Rājatarangiṇī, 1.4.)

This present-like representation of the past and the future, which is the tangible result of the poet's power of visualization, is technically called Bhāvika-lāṅkāra

अतीतानागतयोः प्रत्यक्षायमाणत्वं भाविकम्।

(Alāṅkārasarvasva)

Older poeticians like Bhāmaha and Dandin described it as a quality pervading a literary work.² भाविकत्वमिति प्राहुः प्रबन्धविषयं गुणम् Here the use of **Prahuḥ** suggests that even before Bhāmaha this concept of Bhāvika was well-recognized though probably for the sake of classification, the learned poeticians were obliged to include it under alāṅkāras:-

भाविकत्वं च निजगुणालंकारं सुमेधसः

Udbhata, however, was the first ālāṅkārika who assigned to it the status of a definite alāṅkāra of a Vākya, albeit, Pratiharendurāja, his commentator struggled to retain its old concept like Atīśayokti of Bhāmaha and Ślesa of Dandin. Bhāvika in its early development enjoyed a superior status than a mere Alāṅkāra. It was probably because it is concerned with the presentation of not an aspect of a thing as the Upamā etc., are but with the presentation of the whole event, past or future. Ruyyaka (1200

A.D.) in his exposition of this Alankāra explains the word Bhāvika in two ways. They are as follows:-

- (i) कविगतो भाव आशयः श्रोतरि प्रतिबिम्बत्वेनास्तीति।
- (ii) भावो भावना वा पुनः पुनश्चेतसि विनिवेशनं सोऽत्रास्तीति ।

The first idea partly originated in Dandin³ who said: भावः कवेरभिप्रायः काव्येष्वसिद्धिसंस्थितः। And this embodies the well-known theory of poetics that poetry is the representation of the poet's vision (कवित्वं हि कवेर्भाव). In dramaturgy the term Bhāva which Bharata classified into forty-nine types, has a technical sense with which we are not particularly concerned at present though it may be noted in passing that the dramaturgical Bhāvas or mental states which suggest Rasa into being have their origin in the poet's mind.

कवेरन्तर्गतं भावं भावयन् भाव उच्यते। (अभिनवभारती)

The term Bhāva is used here in its more popular sense of a poetic idea. The reader with aesthetic susceptibility throbs with poet's ideas which are reflected in him. Bhāvika is thus a reflection of the poet's vision in the reader's mind.

**कविभावस्य श्रोतरि प्रतिबिम्बतापत्तिः।
स्वरूपं ह्यस्य श्रोतरि कविगतभावप्रतिबिम्बनम्।।**

This reflective unity or the infusion of the spirit of the poet and the reader (कविश्रोतृभावद्वितयसंमिलन- प्रतिहारेन्दुराज) makes it possible for the latter to witness the poet's creation as his own. This accounts for the visualization of the poet's idea by the reader.

The second explanation of Bhāvika viz., भावो भावना वा पुनः पुनश्चेतसि विनिवेशनं सोऽत्रास्तीति draws attention to the important role that Bhāvanā plays in the preset alankara. In the case of such scriptural texts as राभिभासत and अग्नौ प्रादात् mimamsaka admits a transformation of the literal meaning the past tense and the third person, etc., used in these sentences are turned into the present tense etc. This change is given the name of Bharana by the followers of Kumarila (Jayaratha in his comment

on Tantrāloka 1, p. 177). Bhāvanā involved in the concept of Bhāvika has some affinity with that of Mīmāṃsaka in-so-far-as it means the apprehension of the past or future as if it were present. The meaning and the function of Bhāvanā with reference to Bhāvika will be better understood by the epistemic analysis of the aesthetic cognition of this Alankāra. To begin with Bhāvika is the consciousness of the not-present as present. It is an almost perceptual cognition of the past or future i.e., mediate objects presented in imagination. An act of cognition presupposes the triple form; (त्रिपुटी) the subject who knows, the object that is known and the means of cognition and perception is distinguished by its directness or immediacy (साक्षात्त्व or अपरोक्षत्व). In the first explanation of the term Bhāvika which explained the unification of the thought and feeling of the poet and the aesthete, we were given the clue to the subject who knows. It is the Sahradaya or aesthete-who in his mirror-like heart receives the reflection of the poet's intention. It is the cogniser or the subject. The events or ideas described in Bhāvika are the objects. And they are mediate since they belong either to the past or the future. What does then make them shine as if immediate? To this Ruyyaka replies that either the theme is inherently charming or even when it is not the poet's pictorial style (Varṇanā) present it so beautifully that it seems to live before our eyes. According to Bhāmaha, the contributory causes to this are the presentation of a picturesque exalted and wonderful idea, the adaptability of the story to being presented on the stage or conveyed by gestures and a harmony of words.⁴ To this list Dandin seems to add 1. परस्परपकारित्वं सर्वेषां वस्तुपूर्वणाम् 2. विशेषणानां व्यर्थानामक्रिया 3. स्थानवर्णना 4. व्यक्तिरुक्ति क्रमबलाद् गम्भीरस्यापि वस्तुनः।

(1) Artha or idea should be extremely striking (अत्यद्भुत) and that (2) they should be presented in perspicuous style (वाचामनाकुल्येन). This emphasis on शब्दानाकुलता or perspicuity of words by Bhāmaha on उक्तिक्रमबलाद् व्यक्तिः by Dandin and on वाचामनाकुल्य by Udbhata has led Ruyyaka to believe that Bhāvika is essentially a description of such characteristics of an object which are given to it by the force of poetic style (Varṇanā) though he has not denied that even a 'real' theme which

is not poet's creation or प्रौढोक्तिनिष्पन्न can come under Bhāvika. From these observations it follows that the extremely striking ideas or events couched in beautiful words and help to make the objects as if immediate. Jayaratha-a commentator on Ruyyaka has laid a special emphasis on the charm of words and meanings-Vācyavācakaramānīyaka. According to him there will be no Bhāvika if either the word or the meaning is not beautiful शब्दार्थसाहित्य or शब्दार्थसौभ्रात्र to borrow the terminology of Kuntaka and Pārāśara Bhatta are particularly desirable; strikingness of the idea and the charming effect of the words are the modus operandi for the present-like representation of the objects. So far we have discussed the subject who knows and the objects that are known. Bhāvanā is the means. For normal perception we need the aid of an organ of sense to perceive an object which should be in immediate vicinity of the perceptive sense. In his ordinary perception the cognizer is conditioned by time and space and the law of cause and effect, an aesthete with the help of peculiar poetic power called Bhāvanā raises himself above all these. Like a mystic the poet and aesthete with aesthetic susceptibility visualize as actually present before him a thing of the past or the future. Bhāvanā is the contemplative power innate in the poet and the reader. Perceptuality in Bhāvika is thus the result of this Bhāvanā coming in contact with mediate yet wonderful objects beautifully presented by the poet.

Now we might discuss in what respect the poetic cognition of Bhāvika differs from the consciousness that results from such alaṅkāras as भ्रान्तिमान्, अतिशयोक्ति, प्रतीयमानोत्प्रेक्षा, काव्यलिङ्ग, स्वभावोक्ति and रसवत्. In both भ्रान्तिमान् and भाविक there is a cognition of a thing which is not there but while in the former where one thing is mistaken for another similar to it the cognition is erroneous and based on similarity, in latter the reader gets the vision of a thing exactly as it was or as it would be. Thus भ्रान्तिमान् represents a mistaken identity and consequently that cognition thereof is erroneous; Bhāvika gives immediate vision of mediate and is not erroneous in its cognitive results.

In Atiśayokti the विषयि swallows up the विषय e.g., in चन्द्रोऽयम् the Upamānas moon altogether takes in the उपमेय, the face. Hence Atiśayokti

is a consummated introsusception of Siddha Adhyavasāya. The process of Bhāvika-cognition has no अध्यसाय when a thing of the past or the future is visualized; the reader is conscious of its pastness and the futurity. The past and future are invariably presented here in their relevant forms which avoids the element of अध्यवसाय or आहार्यत्व in the process or resultant cognition of Bhāvika.

Bhāvika vs. प्रतीयमानोत्प्रेक्षा

When the poet presents to us a past or future thing as though it were present one is likely to mistake it for utprekṣā गम्य of course, because the words इव, मन्ये, शङ्के, etc., are absent. But there is a fundamental difference between the two. Whereas in utprekṣā there is introsusception in process of completion (साध्य अध्यवसाय) and उत्प्रेक्षा is संभावना which like knowledge and the feelings of pleasure and pain is essentially an attribute of the self. But in Bhāvika the immediacy is not the form of संभावना and thus it is not the exclusive attribute of the self because it has reference to the objects also which Bhāvanā makes to shine distinctly before the mind's eye.

Udbhata has put काव्यलिङ्ग and भाविक in one group. Mammata describes काव्यलिङ्ग immediately after Bhāvika. Are they similar in any respect.? The हेतु in काव्यलिङ्ग and the ideas in Bhāvika must be striking to be poetical. But the strikingness of ideas is not an invariable sign of the signet-the immediacy. Bhāvika-consciousness is essentially characterized by the immediate vision of the mediate. This is like a mystic's visualization of the objects of his own creation. A striking theme and an attractive style present the picture clearly but there is no invariable relation (poetic of course) between the two. Hence the cognition of Bhāvika and Kāvyalinga are different.

The distinction of Bhāvika-cognition from Svabhāvokti and Rasavad will be of greater interest. Svabhāvokti is a penpicure of such actions and dispositions of an object which must be characteristic of it. The theme must be poetically striking and should bear testimony to the poet's power of minute observation. No doubt, Svabhāvokti is based on 'realism' yet none but a poet can effect it. The matter depicted should be

Suksma which Ruyyaka interprets as कवित्वमात्रस्य गम्य. It requires a poet's power of observation to observe it in every detail-small or big. And further, it requires the poet's power of expression to present the object with perfect vividness. Take an example of Svabhāvokti:

चलापांगां दृष्टिं स्पृशसि बहुशो वेपथुमतीं
रहस्याख्यायीव स्वनसि मृदु कर्णान्तिकचरः।
करं व्याधुन्वत्याः पिबसि रतिसर्वस्वमधरं
वयं तत्त्वान्वेषान्मधुकर! हतास्त्वं खलु कृती।।

Here the picturesque presentation of the action of a bee seems to dance before our eyes. An aesthete who has the faculty of self-identification with the events feels that this is so natural of a bee. Ruyyaka calls it वस्तुसंवाद. Now so far-as perfect vividness is concerned svabhāvokti and Bhāvika resemble one another. But while the former is based on 'realism' the latter has a striking theme as its starting points and thus स्वभावोक्ति is the cognition of लौकिक वस्तु or ordinary objects possessed of subtle characteristics, the भाविक is essentially the cognition of strikingly wonderful or लोकोत्तर. There is one more important point of difference between the two which we shall take up in the course of distinction of Bhāvika from Rasavad. In both Rasvad and Bhāvika what is described shines as if dancing before our eyes (पुरःस्फुरत्) and in both there is an element of relish (चमत्कार). Beyond these there is no point of similarity between the two. Rasavad has Rati etc., which are particular mental states as its content and these are evolved by appropriate vibhāvas etc. Bhāvika describes events or ideas and does not have the particular mental states as its content. This, then is the difference in respect of the content. From Rasavad, Bhāvika differs in respect of the form of cognition too. Rasavad implies the presentation of that Rasa which happens to be subordinate to another Rasa. In this cognition, neither there is any reference to the temporal and spatial distinctions nor the cognized is known to be different from the cognition. This is in the words of Ruyyaka साधारण्येन प्रतीति as distinct from ताटस्थ्यप्रतीति in Bhāvika. This universalized cognition is the result of हृदयसंवाद or the correspondence of heart to the aesthetic object.

And the form of cognition can be represented simply as 'I' अहम्. This is like the experience at the state of परमाद्वैत or supra-monism where 'this' merges into 'I'. Thus while the cognition of Rasavad involves no distinctions, that of Bhāvika does. Bhāvika-cognition refers to the past and the future. Here the cognizer is conscious of the distinctions of the subject, object and the process of knowledge although he regards them essentially non-different. The Bhāvika-cognition can be represented as 'I know this' इदमहं जानामि. Here also 'I' is the substratum of the 'this', because ultimately 'this' or इदम् is the manifestation of 'I' or अहम् to be explicit. Bhāvika represents the objective apprehension of the events which are poet's creation and therefore ultimately rest in the poet. Ruyyaka calls it ताटस्थ्येन प्रतीति which his commentator Jayaratha explains as इदमहं जानामीति सामानाधिकरण्येन प्रतीति. This cognition resembles the experience of the subjects who belong to the Īśvara category of Śaiva system and who are technically called vidyeswaras. It follow from this that speaking in philosophical term of Śaiva-monism, Rasavad apprehends or cognizes 'I'; स्वभावोक्ति vividly represents 'this' or and Bhāvika is the cognition of 'I this' or अहमिदम् perhaps evenly balanced. The following example aptly illustrates the Bhāvika

दर्भाकुरेण चरणः क्षत इत्यकाण्डे
तन्वी स्थिता कतिचिदेव पदानि गत्वा।
आसीद्विवृत्तवदना च विमोचयन्ती
शाखासु वल्कलमसक्तमपि द्रुमाणाम्।।

Here Dusyanta narrates to his companion Vidūṣaka the love-sweet actions of his cherished one. Such as, the foot being pricked by Darbha sprouts. The event is past but Dusyanta's emotionally ornate representation makes them live again. Vidūṣaka's reaction to it is quite appropriate. किदं तु उबवणं तपोवणं ति पेक्खामि।

Here the use of पेक्खामि (I perceive) is very significant. It represents the form of cognition that arises from the vivid description of the past and the future.

References

1. सा हि चक्षुर्भगवतस्तृतीयमिति गीयते।
येन साक्षात्करोत्येष भावास्त्रैलोक्यवर्तिनः।।
2. The commentator on Bhatti would interpret the word प्रबन्ध as the part of poetic composition and not a literary work.
3. It is significant to note that Bhoja radically differs from all alamkarikas in his description of Bhāvika. But his definition of it as
स्वाभिप्रायस्य कथनं यदि वाप्यन्यभावना।
जन्यापदेशो वा यस्तु त्रिविधं भाविकं विदुः।। सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरण, ४-७६
Clearly follows the etymological meaning of Bhāvika but which is otherwise substantially different from its generally admitted concept as the presentation of past and future as if immediate.
4. चित्रोदात्ताद्भुतार्थत्वं कथायाः स्वभि (वि) नीतता।
शब्दानाकुलता चेति तस्य हेतुं प्रचक्षते।। भामहलंकार-३-५४.

(S.V., University Oriental Journal, Vol II, 1959)



12. भाविके प्रत्यक्षायमाणत्वम्

देशकालस्वभावभेदात् त्रिधा भवति भावानां विप्रकृष्टत्वम्। कालो ह्यनवच्छिन्नः स्वात्मनि स्वरूपावरकतया कञ्चुकमिव वर्तमानोऽतीतादिभेदं प्रवर्तयति। भूतभावितया कालिको विप्रकर्षः प्राधान्येन द्वैविध्यं भजति। अतीतानागतयोरर्थयोः प्रत्यक्षवद्भावे प्रत्यक्षायमाणत्वे भाविकमित्यलङ्कारविदः। कविर्हि ऋषिरिव भूतं भविष्यन्तं वार्थं प्रतिभाचक्षुषा प्रत्यक्षमिव पश्यति। यच्चार्थं स एव कारणनैरपेक्षेण निर्मिमीते। चित्रसौन्दर्यसुभगेन वर्णनाविशेषेण चालिख्य सहृदयान् दर्शयत्यनुभावयति वा-

अविद्याबीजविध्वंससादयमार्षेण चक्षुषा।

कालौ भूतभविष्यन्तौ वर्तमानमवीविशत्।।

(अनर्घराघवे, २/३४)

आर्षसहृदयेषु भवति हि कविभावस्य प्रतिबिम्बनम्। लोकोत्तरवर्णनानिपुणेन कविना वर्णिता भावाः सहृदयैः श्रोतृभिर्दर्शकैर्वा काव्ये नाट्ये च साधारण्येन ताटस्थ्येन वा साक्षात्क्रियन्ते।

भवति हि काव्यमाकर्ण्य काव्यार्थविदामनुभवः- चिरनिवृत्तमप्येतत् प्रत्यक्षमिव दर्शितम्
(वाल्मीकिरामा, १/४/१७) नाट्याचार्या लास्याङ्गभूतं भाविकमित्याहुः। पठन्ति च-

दृष्ट्वा स्वप्ने प्रियं यत्र मदनानलतापिता।

करोति विविधान् भावान् तद्वै भाविकमुच्यते।।

(भरतनाट्यशास्त्रे, २०/१५२)

कवेर्भावः, आशयः, भावना वा यत्रास्ते तद्भाविकम्। भावशब्दस्यार्थद्वयं भाविकालङ्कारे युज्यत इति श्रीरुय्यकेन स्पष्टं निर्दिष्टम्- कविगतो भाव आशयः श्रोतरि प्रतिबिम्बत्वेनास्तीति, भावो भावना वा पुनः पुनश्चेतसि निवेशनं सोऽत्रास्तीति (अलङ्कारसर्वस्वे, पृ. २२४)। काव्यप्रकाशकृता भाविकव्युत्पत्तौ केवलं प्रथमार्थो गृहीतः- भावः कवेरभिप्रायो यत्रास्ति (काव्यप्रकाशे, द. उ.)। श्रीमम्मटः काव्यादर्शशब्दानेवानुवदति- भावः कवेरभिप्रायःकाव्येष्वस्य व्यवस्थितः।। इति। सहृदये प्रतिबिम्बिता कविगता अर्थाः प्रत्यक्षा इव दृश्यन्त इति फलितार्थः। केऽर्थाः? नहि वस्तुमात्रवर्णने कविकौशलं किञ्चिन्न वा वस्तुसन्निवेशिनां धर्माणां वर्णनादात्मपदलाभः, इतिहासादेरेव तत्सिद्धेः। लोककाव्ययोः वस्तुप्रत्यक्षे च वस्तुधर्मः, प्रतिपत्ता, करणं च निमित्तम्। केवलवस्तुसद्भाव एव न प्रत्यक्षः। नहि प्रत्यक्षत्वं केवलवस्तुधर्मः। प्रतिपत्तारमनपेक्ष्य नास्ति वस्तुनि प्रत्यक्षता नाम काचित्। यदाहुः- तत्र यो ज्ञानप्रतिभासनात्मनोऽन्वयव्यतिरेकावनुकारयति स प्रत्यक्षः (अ. स., पृ. २२५) इति। काव्ये कविवेधसा वस्तुनि धर्माः समर्प्यन्ते सृज्यन्ते वा। प्रतिपत्ता चात्र प्रयोक्ता कविरेव। करणं च भावना। हृदयदर्पणकृता भट्टनायकेन काव्यं तावत् त्र्यंशमुक्तम्- अभिधा भावना चान्या तद्भोगी कृतिरेव च। तदनुसारेणाभिधया साक्षात् संकेतिता अर्थाः, शब्दार्थालंकृतयश्च भावनया भाव्यन्ते। यथाह-अभिधाधामतां याते शब्दार्थालङ्कृती ततः। भावनाभाव्यः.....। यथा लोके घटप्रत्यक्षे घटगताः परिमाणगुणादयो धर्माः, प्रमाता, चक्षुरादीन्द्रियं च करणमुपयुज्यन्ते, यथा च योगजप्रत्यक्षविषये देशकालव्यवधानादतीन्द्रियेऽर्थे योगिनामैकाग्र्यात्मकभावनारूपा साक्षात्करणसामग्री व्याप्रियते, अतीतानागतज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षात्र विशिष्यते इत्युक्तेः, तथैव कविसमर्पितानामर्थानां साक्षात्करणे काव्यतत्त्वविदां सहृदयानामपि भावनास्वभावा साक्षात्करणसामग्री। किमेतां भावनामुन्मीलयति? अर्थगतं शब्दगतं च रामणीयकम्। वाच्यवाचकरामणीयकेन कविवचसि सुस्पष्टमधिदृढानां सुभगभावानां सुभगशब्दोपारोहितया सम्पद्यते सहृदयहृदयावर्जकत्वम्। सोऽयं सुभगशब्दार्थसहभावः श्रीकालिदासेन-वागर्थ्याविव संपृक्तौ इत्यत्र, उपनिषत्सु-रुद्रोऽर्थोऽक्षरस्सोमाः इत्यादिषु, पुराणेषु- अर्थः शम्भुः शिवा वाणी इत्यादिना, श्रीकुन्तकेन शब्दार्थसाहित्यमिति, वैष्णवकविना पाराशरभट्टेन शब्दार्थयोः सौभ्रात्रमिति, भोजेन शब्दार्थसंमितत्वमिति तथा तथैकाभिप्रायेण निरूप्यते। भाविके चेदं शब्दार्थसाहित्यसौभाग्यं कथमुन्मिषतीति प्राचामर्वाचां च भाविकलक्षणविमर्शेन स्फुटीभवति।

चित्रोदात्ताद्भुतार्थत्वं कथायाः स्वभि (वि) नीतता।
शब्दानाकुलता चेति तस्य हेतुं प्रचक्षते।।

(भामहीये काव्यालङ्कारे, ३.५३)

भामहानुसारं कविसमर्पितधर्मवतां वस्तूनां प्रत्यक्षायमाणत्वे-१. चित्रोदात्ताद्भुतार्थत्वम्, २. कथायाः स्वभि (वि) नीतता, तथा ३. शब्दानाकुलता च कारणानि। कथायाः स्वभिनीतता नाम सुबोधता (जयमङ्गला)। दण्डिनः काव्यादर्शे विशिष्टं किञ्चिदुपलभ्यते यत्रास्ति भामहीये लक्षणे। तदनुसारम्- १. परस्परपकारित्वं सर्वेषां वस्तुपर्वणाम्, २. विशेषणानां व्यर्थानामक्रिया, ३. स्थानवर्णना, ४. व्यक्तिरुक्तिक्रमबलाद् गम्भीरस्यापि वस्तुनः (काव्यादर्शे २/३६४-३६६) भावप्रत्यक्षायमाणत्वे बीजानि। इतः परमौद्धट्टीये भाविकलक्षणे भावानामत्युद्भुतत्वं वाचामनाकुल्यमित्येतदेव भामहेन शब्दान्तरेण प्राग्निर्दिष्टं तत्त्वद्वयमुपलभ्यते। तथा हि भामहः- प्रत्यक्षा इव यत्रार्था दृश्यन्ते भूतभाविनः। अत्यद्भुतास्तदा वाचामनाकुल्येन भाविकम्।। (काव्यालङ्कारसंग्रहे, ६/१२)। वाचामाकुल्यं हि काव्यार्थप्रतीतिं स्थगयतीति तत्- सर्वत्रैव वर्जनीयम्।.... इह तु तदाकुलत्वेनातीतानागतयोः प्रत्यक्षायमाणत्वमेव न स्यात् (वि. पृ. २२४) इत्यस्त्यत्रास्य प्राधान्यम्। शब्दार्थगतत्वेन द्विविधं वाचामनाकुलत्वमिदं श्रीमता प्रतिहारेन्दुराजेनौद्धट्टं भाविकलक्षणं विवृण्वता विशदं विवेचितम्। अस्ति हि तद्विवेचने मौलिकं महत्पाण्डित्यमित्यविकलमत्र तन्मतमुल्लिख्यते- वाचामनाकुलता व्यस्तसंबन्धरहितलोकप्रसिद्धशब्दोपनिबन्धनाद् झगित्यर्थप्रतीतिकारिता। तस्यां हि सत्यां कवेः संबन्धी यो भाव आशयः शृङ्गारादिरससंवलितचतुर्वर्गीपाय-भूतविशिष्टार्थोल्लेखी स कविनेव सहृदयैः श्रोतृभिः स्वाभिप्रायाभेदेन तत्तत्काव्यप्रतिबिम्बितरूपतया साक्षात्क्रियते। श्रोतृणामपि हि तथा-विधस्वच्छशब्दानुभवद्रावितान्तरात्मनां सहृदयानां स्वाभिप्रायप्रतिमुद्रा तत्र संक्रामति। अतः कवेर्योऽसावभिप्रायस्तद्गोचरीकृता भूता भाविनोऽपि पदार्थास्तत्र श्रोतृभिः स्वाभिप्रायाभेदेन प्रत्यक्षा इव दृश्यन्ते।.... तदेवंविधहेतुनिबन्धनं कविश्रोतृभावद्वितयसंमी- (मि) लनात्मकं भाविकं द्रष्टव्यम् (पृ. ७९-८०)। अयमेवार्थः श्रीरुय्यकेन भाविकसूत्रं व्याचिख्यासता वृत्त्युपक्रम एव मनागुन्मीलितः (पश्यन्तु, अ. स. पृ. २२४)। तदित्थं प्रध्वंसाभावप्रागभावाक्रान्ता अपि भावाः कथमद्भुतत्वादिरूपस्वमहिम्ना वचःप्रसादवशाच्च कविनेव श्रोत्रादिप्रत्यक्षा इव क्रियन्त इतीषदाग्रातम्। वाचामनाकुलता झगित्यर्थसमर्पणं वा प्रसादगुणेऽप्यस्ति। तथा हि तल्लक्षणम्-

शुष्केन्धनाग्निवत् स्वच्छजलवत् सहसैव यः।

व्याप्तोत्यन्यत्प्रसादोऽसौ सर्वत्र विहितस्थितिः।।

भाविकस्य तु पुनः झगिति समर्पितस्यार्थस्य स्फुटत्वेन प्रतीतौ सत्यां स्वरूपप्रतिलम्भः। स्वरूपं चास्य श्रोतरि कविगतभावप्रतिबिम्बनम् पौनःपुन्येन चेतसि विनिवेशनं वेति भावशब्दस्य

व्युत्पत्तिप्रसङ्ग एव पर्यालोचितम्। तथाविधस्य च भावस्य प्रतिबिम्बनं स्फुटप्रतीत्युत्तरकालमेव। अतः प्रसादोऽस्याङ्गत्वेन प्राक्सिद्धिकः। अयं तु तदुपकृतः समनन्तरसिद्धिक (श्रीविद्याचक्रवर्ती) इत्यस्त्यनयो सुमहान् भेदः। परमिदमत्र साहित्येतिहासविद्विरवधेयं यद् भाविकत्वं प्राञ्चैर्भामहप्रभृतिभिः-प्रबन्धविषयं गुणम् इत्युदीरितम्, यद्धि प्रायः श्लेष इव पुष्पाति किमपि कामनीयकं काव्यस्य। प्रसादगुणयोगितया भावनाभाविततया चास्ति भाविके-व्यस्तसंबन्धरहितशब्दसन्दर्भ-समर्पितत्वम्। सहृदयेन कविना च विच्छित्तिविशेषवतामतीतानागतार्थानां प्रत्यक्षायमाणत्वमिदं सुभगशब्दार्थसहभावेन (वाचामनाकुल्येन वा) भावनासहकारेण च क्रियत इति फलितम्। अथेदं प्रत्यक्षायमाणत्वं भ्रान्तिरध्यवसायः संभावनाऽनुमितिः पुनः स्फुरद्रूपतयाऽभिव्यक्तिः प्रतीतिर्वा ? भूतभाविनोर्भूतभावितयैव प्रकाशनाद् नेयं भ्रान्ता प्रतिपत्तिः। नात्र भूतमभूतत्वेन भावि वाऽभावित्वेनाध्यवसायते, न वाऽप्रत्यक्षं प्रत्यक्षेणेति कुतोऽध्यवसायः? वस्तुनोऽत्यद्भुतत्वाद् भवति तत्रादरो हृदि संधारणम्। तच्च तदेकतानतया प्ररूढं सद् भावनात्वमुपयातीति काव्यार्थविदां योगिनामिव भावनाबलात् स्वकालावच्छेदेनैव भूतभाविनस्तु प्रत्यक्षतया भासन्त इति नाप्रत्यक्षाणां प्रत्यक्षतयाऽध्यवसायः (वि. पृ. २२५)। यच्चोद्योतकारः प्रत्यक्षासंबन्धेऽपि तत्संबन्धवर्णनात्। भूतादिवस्त्वसंबन्धेऽपि तत्संबन्धवर्णनाच्च (पृ. ९३) भाविकस्यातिशयोक्तिरूपमाख्यत्, तदध्यवसायस्वरूपप्रत्यक्षत्व-निमित्तयोरनवबोधादेव। नहि प्रत्यक्षत्वं केवलं वस्तुधर्मः। स हि प्रतिपत्तारमपेक्षते। स एव भावनासहकारेण प्रत्यक्षवद्भावं प्रयोजयतीति प्रागेवावोचाम। भवति हि सहृदयानां प्रत्यक्षत्वेन दर्शनमित्यप्रत्यक्षाणां प्रत्यक्षतयेव संभावनाप्यत्र नास्ति। पदार्थगता इवार्थश्रोपमाप्रयोजका; न पुनः संभावनात्मिकाया उत्प्रेक्षायाः, तस्या अभिमानरूपाया प्रतिपत्तृधर्मत्वात् (अ.स. पृ. २२५)। न वाऽत्राद्भुतपदार्थप्रत्यक्षप्रतीत्योर्गम्यगमकभावः संबन्धो येनातुमितिरभ्युपगम्येत, लिङ्गलिङ्गभावेन प्रतीत्यभावात्। योगिवत् प्रत्यक्षतया प्रतीतेः (अ.स. पृ. २२६)। अस्त्येव हि भाविके प्रत्यक्षपरिस्पन्दसौन्दर्यं यदनुमितौ नानुभूयते।

काव्ये वस्त्वलङ्काररसप्रतीतिः साधारण्येन ताटस्थ्येन वा भवति। साधारण्यप्रतीतौ स्वपरविभागाभावो देशकालावच्छेदशून्यत्वं सकलसहृदयसंवादश्च भवन्ति। रस इव वस्तु, अलङ्कारोऽपि च पुर इव परिस्फुरति, हृदयमिव प्रविशति, सर्वाङ्गीणमिवालिङ्गति। साधारण्येन प्रतीतिरतोऽभेदधीः। सेयं श्रीरुय्यकेन हृदयसंवादतया स्पष्टमाग्राता। हृदयसंवादश्च-परकीयायाश्चित्तवृत्तेरात्मीयचित्तवृत्त्यभेदेन परामर्शः (वि. पृ. २२६)। स च वस्तुगतत्वेन चित्तवृत्तिगतत्वेन द्विविधः। भवति हि स्वभावोक्तौ-ईदृगिदं वस्तु इति वस्तुनः सूक्ष्मधर्मवर्णनाद् वस्तुसंवादः, रसवदादिषु चाऽलङ्कारेषु चित्तवृत्तिसंवादः। प्रियानुरक्तहृदयाया नायिकायाश्चित्तवृत्तिः सहृदयानां स्वचित्तवृत्त्यभेदेन संवदति। सोऽयं द्विविधो हृदयसंवादः-स्वपरविभागाभावाद्

देशकाल-विभागाभावाच्च वस्त्वलङ्काररसप्रतीतिसाधारणीकरणरूप इदन्ताऽहन्तयोः सामरस्यसुभगामनुभूतिमनुभावयति। एतस्याश्च परमाद्वैतज्ञानतुल्यत्वम्, निर्विशेषब्रह्मवादिनां ब्रह्मैवेदं सर्वमित्यपरोक्षज्ञानतुल्यत्वं वा। अत्र हि- ममैवेते शत्रोरेवैते तटस्थस्यैवैत इति संबन्धविशेषस्वीकार-परिहारनियमाऽनध्यवसायः (का. प्र. चतुर्थोल्लासे)। भाविके तु भूतभावानां प्रतीतिर्न साधारण्येन, अपि तु ताटस्थ्येन स्फुटतया। ताटस्थ्यं हि भेदः। इदन्ताऽहन्ता चात्र स्फुटं प्रथिते। यथा च त्रिकदर्शने विद्येश्वराणाम्- इदमहमिति समधृततुलापुटन्यायेन विमर्शस्तथैव भाविके स्फुटा प्रथा भवति। अत एव ताटस्थ्यप्रतीतेर्विद्येश्वरादिज्ञानतुल्यत्वम्। यत्र पुरःस्फुरद्रूपतयाऽभेदप्रतीतिस्तत्र रसः (आलङ्कारिकनये च रसवदलङ्कारः)। यत्र च पुनः स्फुटत्वेन प्रथनं मित्रत्वेन प्रतीतिर्वा तत्र भाविकम्। परमस्ति भाविकत्वे कवेश्चित्तवृत्तेः (कविभावस्य) श्रोतृभावेन सह किञ्चिदभेदो येनार्थः पुरः स्फुरतीवेत्यत्रापि चित्तवृत्तिसंवादः स्वीकार्यः। भाविके वस्तुसंवादश्च श्रीरुय्यकेन भाविकस्वभावोक्तयोः समावेशे स्पष्टमानातः। अतो हृदयसंवादस्य पूर्णासद्भावेऽपि काव्यगतताटस्थ्यप्रतीतौ वस्तूनां स्वात्मना किञ्चिदभेदोऽभ्युपगन्तव्यः। अलङ्कारप्रतीतिर्हि रससाक्षात्कारस्य पूर्वभूमिः। इदन्तायाः सर्वथोच्छेदाभावेऽपि भाविकभूमावहन्तारूपतोद्रेचनम्। दृश्यद्रष्टृदर्शनभेदाभावमय्यभेदप्रतीतिर्हि परमपुरुषार्थोपायभूतेति शास्त्रज्ञाः। साऽत्र स्फुरतीवेत्यालङ्कारिकाः। कविसंबन्धिनो भावस्य श्रोतृभावाभेदाध्यवसितस्य पुरःस्फुरद्रूपस्य विद्यमानत्वाद् भाविकव्यपदेशः। यथाहुः-

रसोल्लासी कवेरात्मा स्वच्छे शब्दार्थदर्पणे।
माधुर्यैजोयुतप्रौढे प्रतिविद्याः प्रकाशते।।
संपीतस्वच्छशब्दार्थद्राविताभ्यन्तरस्ततः।
श्रोता तत्साम्यतः पुष्टिं चतुर्वर्गे परां व्रजेत् ।।(इन्दुराजः)

सन्दर्भः

१. इतः परमलङ्कारसर्वस्वम् अ. स., तट्टीका विमर्शिनी च वि. इति संकेताभ्यां निर्दिश्येत।
२. अनाघ्रातावद्य बहुगुणपरीणाहि मनसो दुहानं सौहार्दं परिचितमिवाथापि गहनम्। पदानां सौभ्रात्रादनिमिषनिषेव्यं श्रवणयोस्त्वमेव श्रीर्मह्यं बहु मुखरयत वाणीविलसितम्।। श्रीगुणरत्नकोषात् ।

(सारस्वती सुषमा)



13. The Theory of Kāvya-pāka with special reference to the kāvyamīmāṃsā

Rājaśekhara (880-920 A.D.) in his celebrated work, the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, devotes final part of the V chapter entitled Kāvya-pākakalpa to the consideration of the ripeness of poem (Kāvya-pāka) which is related by him to erudition (Vyutpatti),¹ the mother of poetry. A real poet is endowed with both creative power pratibhā and erudition.² The poetic faculty helps in ripening the Śāstric expression while being exclusively poetic mars it.³ Even scientific literature needs a tinge of poetry for its maturity, the more of poetry may harm it. In its turn, poetry or imaginative literature for that matter, is helped by the knowledge of Śāstras, though more of it or rather its exclusiveness hinders it. It is in this sense that Rājaśekhara visualises the mutually favourable relationship between science and poetry.⁴

After initial discussion on the nature and place of erudition and creative faculty, and division of poets into Śāstrakavi, kāvyakavi and ubhayakavi and their subdivisions. Rājaśekhara proceeds to discuss Pāka quoting the view of : (i) Maṅgala, (ii) Ācāryas, (iii) followers of Vāmana, (iv) Avantīśundarī and (v) his own.

It is constant practice that makes the expression of a good poet perfect, ripe or mature and hence excellent.⁵

(i) According to Mangala this ripeness (maturity or fruition) consists in the skill in the use of nouns and verbs⁶ (i.e. words).

Bhāmaha refers to the views of those who considered Rūpaka etc. as extraneous to poetry and regarded skill in using grammatically correct words perhaps as intrinsic embellishment of poetry.⁷ To Bhāmaha this is clearly unacceptable because if togetherness of both the words and meanings constitutes poetry (Śabdārthau sahītau kāvyam),⁸ then both are essential and hence intrinsic embellishments. It is in this light that Bhāmaha says that out of turn words and meanings are alaṅkara (V.66), treats purity of words (Śabdaśuddhi) in the VI chapter wherein he includes

beauty of consonants (VI. 28) and uses of nic in expressions like Śabalavanti in the domain of alaṅkāra (VI 66). Daṇḍin does not speak of sauśabdyā. Vāmana deals with the grammatical purity of words (V.2) without investing it with the alaṅkāratva, as perhaps Bhāmaha did.⁹ He even considers the Suptiṅsamskāra detestable.¹⁰ Bhoja in his Sarasvatīkaṅṭhabharaṇa¹¹ includes the Suśabdatā under twenty-four Śabdaguṇas.

(ii) Ācāryas hold that Pāka is unshakiness of fixedness in the application of words. In support of this is quoted a verse occurring in the Kāvyaṅkārasūtra (KASV 1.3.15) of Vāmana which says: **Insertion and deletion of words occur so long as the mind wavers; when the fixity of words is established, the Muse attains perfection.**¹²

It may be noted here that Vāmana quotes this verse in his definition of avekṣaṇa¹³ which he defines in the Sūtra (1.3.15) as insertion and deletion of words. To him Pāka is something different from the fixity of words. (Padaniveśanīskampatā) attained by insertion and deletion of words.

The Second verse, appearing under the KASV 1.3.15, defines Pāka as follows : **Expert in the propriety of words have called that Śabda-pāka in which words do abandon the capability of being exchanged (by other words).**¹⁴ Rājaśekhara says that the followers of Vāmana criticise the notion of Pāka being the fixity of words because this may result even from the vanity of a poet.¹⁵ They define Pāka as 'aversion of words' to alteration. Subtle difference between 'fixity of words' (Padaniveśanīskampatā), which is included under avekṣaṇa by Vāmana, and inexchangeability or unalterability of words is not very clear to me.¹⁶ Rājaśekhara not only distinguishes the two but clearly holds that the former idea of Pāka is criticised by the followers of Vāmana who adhere to the latter view of unalterability of words. The only distinction that I can think of is that a poet may have certain fixations in his expression and consider them inviolable out of his prejudice (āgraha-parigraha). This subjective limitation and prejudice is not Pāka, but a more objective basis of practical unalterability of expressions is considered

Pāka by Vāmana. In a given poem a reader should feel convinced that the words used by poet can't be changed. It is not the poet's prejudice but the readers' feeling about unalterability of words that determines perfection of expression. A poet who is struggling and is uncertain about choice of words may nervously admit one word and delete the other, but a poet whose search for words is complete gives expression which can't be replaced and thus marks ripeness, maturity and excellence of his creation. A poet engaged in considering various possible words (avekṣaṇa, according to Vāmana) has not mastered perfectly chiselled expression, but the one who has achieved this his expressions become immutable (Parivṛtti-asahiṣṇu).

Vāmana's idea of unalterability of words (padaparivṛtiasahiṣṇutā), spoken of as padaparivṛttivaimukhya by Rājaśekhara and paryāyaparivartāsahatva by Ratneśvara, was given a positive word 'Śavyā', repose by Vidyādhara and Vidyānātha. **Excellent mutual friendliness of words in spoken of Repose** which results from the impatience of words against any exchange by synonyms.¹⁷

In fact, for Vāmana, Pāka is much more the 'aversion of words for exchange' (Padānām Parivṛttivaimukhya). Rājaśekhara has imperfectly stated his position by quoting his verse on Pāka under the Sūtra I. 3.15 (KASV).

Vāmana is the first rhetorician who deals with Kāvya-pāka. According to him clear and complete presence of all the guṇas constitutes poetic maturity (Kāvya-pāka) which can be likened with the ripeness of mango-fruit. A poem with grammatical perfection but devoid of clear presence of guṇas is like the ripe egg-plant, which people detest. Vāmana, therefore, holds that best poetry should have all the ten guṇas clearly and completely.¹⁸ Amongst the three Rītīs of Vāmana, Vaidarbhī is defined as having all the guṇas.¹⁹ Thus Kāvya-pāka, according to Vāmana, is not merely unalterability of words but clear and complete presence of all the guṇas and can be compared to his concept of best poetic diction, the Vaidarbhī Rīti.

(iv) Rājaśekhara quotes his wife Avantisundarī to criticise Vāmanīya view of Pāka, which, as shown above, he restricted, without any justification, to aversion of words for substitution. Avantisundarī ridicules the view of the Vāmanīyas by holding that this is want of capability and not Pāka because even varied expressions of great poets with regard to one and the same object attain maturity. Pāka, according to her, consists in the composition of word and sense in consonance with the Rasas. She, in fact, extends the theory of Pāka to include the propriety of guṇa, alaṅkāra, Rīti and ukti also.²⁰ In support of her opinion is quoted a verse, which occurs in the KASV (I.II.2) to prove the superiority of Vaidarbhi style that makes rasa-realisation possible : **Even though there be speaker, sense, word and rasa, there is still not that (i.e. pāka) by which nectar of poetic creation flows.**²¹

Notwithstanding certain contradictions involved in Avantisundarī's definition of Pāka and modified reading of a well-known verse (Sati-Vaktari etc.) quoted in support of her opinion, it stands to her credit to have raised the theory of Pāka to the status of aucitya-principle found in the Dhvanyāloka²² of Ānandavardhana and the Aucityavicāracarcā²³ of Kṣemendra.

(v) Rājaśekhara, no doubt, accepts the opinion of his wife regarding Pāka, yet he puts forth his opinion separately to explain other related questions, such as, how do we know the presence of pāka, is it in the province of Denotation or suggestion, in what forms Pāka can be effected? He says: **The Pāka, which is effected by words through is inferrability from its effect, is indeed the province of denotation. It is subject to usage of what is established by the sanction of the Sahṛdayas.**²⁴

S.K. De states from this passage it would seem that **Rājaśekhara admits that the Pāka is conveyed chiefly through words, and taken as Sauśabdyā or Śabdavyutpatti, it comes primarily under the province of abhidhā, but it finds its scope only in the artha which is established by the taste of Sahṛdaya.**²⁵

Rājaśekhara's emphasis on approved expression and content (we need not separate the two, as Dr. De does) is natural for classical setting of Sanskrit literature which has preserved racial culture in standard idioms, but consequently prevented it from experimenting with new and strange expressions. Search for new words and meanings is most important part of poetic quest. What Sanskrit critic, however, aims at through the theory of Pāka (of words and ideas) is not throwing away of established expressions but attainment of classicism, chiselled, polished and perfect expression which his readers may recognise as such by their knowledge and appreciation of old classical literature of great poets like Vālmikī, Vyāsa and Kālidāsa. Ānandavardhana has, therefore, accordingly advised that the words and meanings of a great poet should be recognised with effort: **यत्नतः प्रत्यभिज्ञेयौ तौ शब्दार्थौ महाकवेः** Classical and standard expression being the aim of the theory of Pāka, it could hardly know the limitations which words have even in the best poets. Eliot tells us in *Burnt Norton*²⁶:

**Words strain,
Crack and sometimes break, under the burden,
Under the tension, slip, slide, perish,
Decay with imprecision, will not stay in place,
will not stay still.
But why? Eliot replies, in "Little Gidding"²⁷**

For last year's words belong to last year's language. And next year's words await another voice.

Vidyānātha, defines Pāka as depth of sense.²⁸ Bhāravi is famous for his artha-gaurava, to which Bhavabhūti refers in the Prastāvanā of the Mālatīmādhava²⁹ and which can be compared with Pāka as defined by Vidyānātha.

Another quality mentioned by Bhavabhūti in the above verse is prauḍhi of words. Pūrṇasarasvatī, in his commentary takes it as Pāka, quoting Bhoja and Vāmana on it.³⁰ Pūrṇasarasvatī, however, treats of arthaprauḍhi, ojas, of Vāmana³¹ when he quotes on the point. From this it would appear that according to Pūrṇasarasvatī, Pāka is restricted to the prauḍhi of Śabda only.

Prauḍhi, according to Bhoja, is the last of twenty-four Śabd-guṇas³² who defines it as mature ripeness of ukti (i.e. Vākya).³³ This is attained by practice through the beauty attested to by insertion and deletion of individual words.³⁴ Ratneśvara, in his comment on this, quotes Vāmana's verse on Pāka as the unalterability of words. That Bhoja includes Śabdapāka under prauḍhi is clear from the above. Ratneśvara further says that arthāpakas are also dealt with by Bhoja in the V chapter of the SKA.³⁵ Agnipurāna includes Prauḍhi among the six arthaguṇas³⁶ and defines it as Poṣa or full delineation of artha or the power of the poet to develop his idea.³⁷ It mentions Pāka also among the six ubhayaguṇas and defines it³⁸ after Bhoja, replacing his term ukteḥ by ucchaiḥ.

Viśveśvara, who follows Bhoja in his treatment of the guṇas in the camatkāracandrikā, separates Prauḍhi from the list of 24 guṇas and treats it in a separate chapter along with similar general subjects like Rīti, Vṛtti and Śayyā. Mahima Bhaṭṭa³⁹ and others⁴⁰⁻⁴¹ emphasise that poetry is ubhayapradhānā. The charm of poetry is lost when either words or ideas are modified. The theory of Kāvya-pāka emphasises this inviolable charm of words and ideas of a great poet. The concept of Ubhaya-Prādhānya, Sāhitya and Prauḍhi in general and the theory of Kāvya-pāka in particular underline the importance of immutability and unchangeability of poet's words and ideas which give rise to the feeling in the Sahrdaya that no other suitable word is possible.⁴²

Varieties of Pāka

Rājaśekhara mentions nine varieties of Pāka, named after the following nine fruits : picumandā, (nimba, azadirachta indica), badara (jujube), mrdvīkā (grapes), Vārtakā, (egg-plant fruit), Tintiḍīka (cucumber) and Nārikeli⁴³ (coconut). According to his description of these varieties Nālikera Pāka is the best followed by Sahakārapāka and Mṛdvīkāpāka in order Trapusa-Tintiḍīka-and Badara Pākas come next and the last in order of quality are the Kramuka-Vārtāka and Picumanda Pākas. Amongst these the first three are considered innately pure requiring no perfection and are, therefore, to be accepted and followed.⁴⁴ The second group of Pākas requires perfection which may add to their excellence, as

the impure gold purified by fire.⁴⁵ The last group of three Pākas is simply to be abandoned **For it is better not to be a poet than to be a bad poet. Bad poetry is indeed living death.** says Rājaśekhara.⁴⁶

He further mentions Kapittha-(fruit of Feronia Elephantum) Pāka. Obtaining good saying from such a Pāka is like getting good grains from shaking the straw.⁴⁷ Bhāmaha has also ridiculed this paka.⁴⁸ Vāmana quotes two old verses (under III.2.15.) which refer respectively to Sahakārapāka, with which Kāvya-pāka can be favourably compared, and to the Vṛntāka-Pāka which is detestable. Bhoja illustrates the Nālikera-Pāka and mentions two more Pākas, namely, Sahakāra-and Mṛdvīka-⁴⁹ Ratneśvara, in his comment thereon, describes characteristics⁵⁰ of all the three Pākas and illustrates the remaining two. According to him these are the only fundamental or pure Pākas, although many more may be obtained through commixture of the above three.⁵¹ He has therefore, refuted the Nīlakapittha-Pāka admitted by the author of the Kavikalpalatā.⁵² Agnipurāna states Pāka to be of four kinds and favours the Mṛdvīkā-Pāka.⁵³ Vidyānāth defines and illustrates the drākṣāpāka and Nārikelipāka, which may be clearly distinguished⁵⁴ He says that Madhuḥṣīra and other pākas also can be possibly fancied.⁵⁵ His commentator, Kumārasvāmin, adds to this list Kadalīpāka and rasāla-pāka.⁵⁶ which may be included between the two pākas described by Vidyānātha.

Not only the writer on the Alaṅkāraśāstra discussed the theory of Pāka, but the critics and commentators who evaluated and appreciated the poets spoke in terms of kāvyapāka of one or the other variety. Mallinātha speaks of nārikelpāka in the poetry of Bhāravi, in one of introductory verses in his commentary on the Kirātārjunīya,⁵⁷ Jagannātha's poetry is claimed to excel the sweetness of grapes, milk, sugar-cane and honey, ⁵⁸ so also that of Jayadeva.⁵⁹

Sanskrit critics described quality of Pāka (including drākṣāpāka) even in the so less known poets as Kṛṣṇa Śaṅkara⁶⁰ and Harihara,⁶¹ out of their misplaced enthusiasm for appreciation.

S.K. De finds similarity of the theory of Pāka with Flauberts, half-platonic view, developed by Walter Pater, that each idea has its

fixed word-counterpart.⁶² Longinus recognised the importance of appropriate choice of words when he says: **It is probably superfluous to explain to those who already know it how wonderfully the choice of appropriate and high sounding words moves and enchants an audience for words finally used are in truth the very light of thought.**⁶³

May I now conclude with Alexander Pope's lines on the harmony of sound and sense -

**Tis not enough no harshness gives offence.
The sound must seem an echo to the sense.
Soft is the strain when zephyr gently blows,
And the smooth stream in smoother numbers flows,
But when loud surges lash the sounding shore.
The hoarse, rough verse should like the torrent roar:
When Ajax strives some rock's vast weight to throw,
The line too labours and the words move slow.**⁶⁴

Reference

1. See, last verse of the IV chapter and the opening discussion of the V Chapter of the *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* (K.M.), Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1934. All subsequent references are to this edition.
2. प्रतिभाव्युत्पत्तिमांश्च कविः कविरित्युच्यते। *ibid*, p. 17.
3. काव्यसंस्कारोऽपि शास्त्रवाक्यपाकमनुरुणद्धि काव्यैकप्रवणता तु विरुणद्धि।
4. उपकार्योपकारकभावं तु मिथः शास्त्रकाव्यकवयोरनुमन्यामहे। यच्छास्त्रसंस्कारः काव्यमनुगृह्णाति शास्त्रैकप्रवणता तु निगृह्णाति। काव्यसंस्कारोऽपि शास्त्रवाक्यपाकमनुरुणद्धि काव्यैकप्रवणता तु विरुणद्धि। *ibid*.
5. सततमभ्यासवशतः सुकवेः वाक्यं पाकमायाति।
6. कः पुनरयं पाकः? इत्याचार्याः। 'परिणामः' इतिमंगलः। कः पुनरयं परिणामः? इत्याचार्याः। 'सुपां तिङां च श्रवः (?) यैषा व्युत्पत्तिः' इति मंगलः। *Ibid*.
7. रूपकादिमलंकारं बाह्यमाचक्षते परे। सुपां तिङां च व्युत्पत्तिं वाचां वाञ्छन्त्यलंकृतिम्॥ *Bhāmahālankāra*, 1.14.
8. *Ibid*, I.16.
9. तदेतदाहुः सौशब्दं नार्थव्युत्पत्तिरीदृशी। शब्दाभिधेयालंकारभेदादिष्टं द्वयन्तु नः॥ *Ibid*, I.15.

10. सुप्तिङ्संस्कारसारं यत् क्लिष्टवस्तुगुणं भवेत्। काव्यं वृत्ताकपाकं स्याद् जुगुप्सन्ते ततो जनाः॥ व्युत्पत्तिः सुप्तिङां या तु प्रोच्यते सा सुशब्दता। *Ibid*, III, 2.15.
11. Ratneśvara's comment on this is : सुप्तिङ्व्युत्पत्तिलक्षणवस्तु वार्ताकपाकः कैश्चिदुक्तः स तु सुशब्दतालक्षणगुण एव। I.72, ab.
12. आवापोद्धरणे तावद् दोलायते पुनः। पदानां स्थापिते स्थैर्ये हन्त सिद्धा सरस्वती॥ *KM*.p.20. Also *KASV*, I.3. 15 Calcutta, 1922 where आताप. reads आधान।
13. पदाधामोद्धरणमवेक्षणम्। *KASV*, I.3. 15.
14. यत्पदानि त्यजन्त्येव परिवृत्तिसहिष्णुताम्। तं शब्दन्यासनिष्णाताः शब्दपाकं प्रचक्षते॥ *ibid*, I.3. 15 and *KM*, p. 20 Where न्यास. reads न्याय।
15. आग्रहपरिग्रहादपि पदस्थैर्यपर्यवसायस्तस्मात् पदानां परिवृत्तिवैमुख्यं पाकः इति वामनीयाः। Rājaśekhara quotes the above verse from the *KASV*.
16. Kāmadhenu in its comments on the sūtra defining avekṣaṇa and quoting two verses thereunder (*KASV*, 1.3.15) states that here Vāmana supports the view of Bhāmaha, alluding perhaps to the following from the *Bhāmahālankāra* :-

शब्दाभिमेये विज्ञाय कृत्वा तद्धिदुपासनम्।
विलोक्यान्यनिबन्धांश्च कार्यः काव्यक्रियादरः॥
सर्वथा पदमप्येवं न निगाद्यमवद्यवत्।
विलक्षणा हि काव्येन दुस्सुतेनेव निन्द्यते॥ I.10-11

According to the Kāmadhenu fixity of words is to be attained through positive and negative means (*anvayavyatireka*) and this leads to Pāka of both the words and meanings. Thus he sees no difference between the two verses of Vāmana as does Rājaśekhara.

Modern scholars also have not explained Rājaśekhara's text on this difference. They have preferred to skip over. See, S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, vol. II. p.241; notes on the *KM*. p. 160-61; P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics* p.200,366; V. Raghavan, Bhoja's *Śṅgāra Prakāśa*, pp. 307, 379. Later writers generally represent Vāmana by पर्यायपरिवर्तासहत्वं and not by पदस्थैर्यं. Thus for example Ratneśvara in his comment on the *Sarasvatikanṭhābharaṇa*, I.77: शब्दानां पर्यायपरिवर्तासहत्वं पाकः and quotes यत्पदानि etc. from the *KASV*.

17. या पदानां परान्योन्यमैत्री शय्येति कथ्यते।.....अत्र पदविनिमयासहिष्णुत्वाद् बन्धस्य पदानुगुण्यरूपा शय्या। Vidyānātha, Prātaparudriya I.34.

S.K. De notes The word Śayyā is old, having been used apparently in this sense, by Bānabhatta in one of the introductory verses of his Kādambari, while the Agnipurāṇa uses the word Mudrā with a similar connotation. History of Sanskrit Poetics, vol. II. p.240.

The friendliness of words is described as brotherliness of words by Pāraśarabhatta in his Śrīgṇaratnakoṣa, SI. 8.

अनाघ्रातावद्य बहुगुणपरीणाहि मनसो,
दुहानं सौहार्दं परिचितमिवाथापि गहनम्।
पदानां सौभ्रात्रादनिमिषनिषेव्यं श्रवणयो-
स्त्वमेव श्रीर्मह्यं बहु मुखस्य वाणीविलसितम्।।

In his theory of Sahitya, Kuntaka speaks of mutual competitiveness of words and meanings. He compares the co-operation between the two to the friendly feelings: सृहदाविव संगतौ. Kālidasa compares the divine pair with वागर्थसम्पृक्तिः।

18. गुणस्फुटत्वसाकल्यं काव्यपाकं प्रचक्षते।
चूतस्य परिणामेन स चायमुपमीयते।।
सुप्तिङ्संस्कारसारं यत् क्लिष्टवस्तुगुणं भवेत्।
काव्यं वृत्ताकपाकं तत् जुगुप्सन्ते ततो जनाः।।
गुणानां दशताल्यक्तो यस्यार्थस्तदपार्थक्यम्।
दाडिमानी दशेत्यादि न विचारक्षमं वचः।। KASV, III.2.23-25.
19. समग्रगुणोपेता वैदर्भी।
अस्पृष्टा दोषमात्राभिः समग्रगुणगुम्फिता।
विपंचीस्वरसौभाग्या वैदर्भी रीतिरिष्यते।। Ibid, I.2.11.
20. 'इयमशक्तिर्न पुनः पाकः' इत्यवन्तिसुन्दरी। यदेकस्मिन् वस्तुनि महाकवीनामानेकोऽपि पाठः परिपाकवान् भवति। तस्माद् रसोचितशब्दार्थसूक्तिनिबन्धनं पाकः। यदाह-
गुणालंकाररीत्युक्ति शब्दार्थग्रथनक्रमः। स्वदते सुधियां येन काव्यपाकः स मां प्रति।।
KM, p.20,
21. सति वक्तरि सत्यर्थे शब्दे सति रसे सति।
अस्ति तन्न विना येन परिस्त्रवति वाङ्मधु।। Ibid.

The first half of this verse reads slightly different in Vamana's KASV and does not include the rasa:- सति वक्तरि सत्यर्थे सति शब्दानुशासने।

According to Kāmadhenu this characterises Vaidarbhī style without which speaker, word and sense are rendered superfluous and rasa can't be relished. Rasa flows only when it is indicated through Vaidarbhi. Change in the reading of the KM. which includes rasa also results in the superiority of Pāka even over the rasa, which then goes contrary to the earlier definition of pāka given by Avantisundarī herself, viz., रसोचितशब्दार्थसूक्तिनिबन्धनं पाकः।

22. See, III. 6.9.
23. See, 1.3 and 11.
24. कार्यानुमेयतया यत्तच्छब्दनिवेद्यः परं पाकोऽभिधाविषयः। तत्सहृदयप्रसिद्धिसिद्ध एव व्यवहारांगमसौ इति यायावरीयः। Ibid.
25. De, S.K., History of Sanskrit Poetics, vol.II,p, 242.
26. Eliot, T.S., Collected Poems 1909-1935, p. 212. Horcutt, Brace and Company, New York.
27. Lines 120-21.
28. अर्थगम्भीरिमा पाकः स द्विधा हृदयंगमः।
द्राक्षापाको नारिकेलपाकश्च प्रस्फुटान्तरौ।। Prātaparudriya, I.35.
Kumārasvāmin, in his commentary, Ratnapana, interprets this as realisability of rasādi : अर्थस्यशृङ्गारादेर्गारिमा आस्वाद्यमानता विशेषः।
29. यत्प्रौढित्वमुदारता च वचसां यच्चार्थतो गौरवम्।
तच्चेदस्ति ततस्तदेव गमकं पाण्डित्यवैदग्ध्ययोः।।
30. उक्तः प्रौढः परीपाकः प्रोच्यते प्रौढिसंज्ञया। Sarasvatikanthābharāṇa, I.77
ad.and यत्पदानि त्यजन्त्येवे etc. from KASV.
Bhavabhūti's patron, Yaśovarman, in the prologue to his Rāmābhyudaya refers to the Praudhi of both words and sense:
शुद्धिः प्रस्तुतसंविधानकविधौ प्रौढिश्च शब्दार्थयोः।
विद्वद्धिः परिभाव्यतामवहितैरैतावदेवास्तु नः।।
31. KASV, III.2.2.
32. See, SKA, I. 63-65.
33. उक्तः प्रौढः परीपाकः प्रोच्यते प्रौढिसंज्ञया। Ibid, I.77 ab.

34. पदानामावापौद्वापाभ्यां सन्निवेशचारुत्वेन योऽयमाभ्यासिको नालिकेरपाको मृद्धीकापाक इत्यादिर्वाक्यपरिपाकः सा प्रौढिरित्युच्यते। *ibid.*
35. मृद्धीकानालिकेराम्नापाकाद्या पाकभक्तयः।
Ratneśvara's comments on this are enlightening : कथं पुनरेवंविधः पाकः संभवतीत्यत आह-अत्रेति। अभ्यासेन निर्वृत आभ्यासिकः काव्यं कर्तुं विचारयितुं च ये जानन्ति तदुपदेशेन करणे योजने च पौनः पुन्येन प्रवृत्तिरभ्यासः। असावपि कथं पाकविशेषो भवतीत्यत आह सन्निवेशचारुत्वेनेति। सन्निवेशो रचना तस्यां चारुत्वम्। तदपि कथमित्यत आह-आवापोद्वापाभ्यामिति। संदर्भानुप्रवेशनमावापः। ततः समुद्धरणमुद्वापः।
36. Ch. 346. 12.
37. अभिप्रेतं प्रति यतो निर्वाहस्योपपादिकाः। युक्तयो हेतुगर्भण्यः प्रौढा प्रौढिरुदाहता। *Ibid.*, 16
38. उच्चैः परिणतिः कापि पाक इत्यभिधीयते। *Ibid.*, 22 cd.
39. उभयप्रधानं सर्गबन्धादिकाव्यं तस्य रसात्मकत्वाद्द्रसस्य चोभयौचित्येन परिपोषदर्शनात्। *Ibid.*, *Vyaktiviveka*, Chowkhamba, p. 42.
40. quoted by V. Raghavan, *Śrangīgāra Prakāśa*, p. 111.
41. Such as, *Bhāmaha*, *Rudrata*, *Ānandavardhana*, *Kuntaka*, *Rājaśekhara*.
42. भवति हि सहृदयानामेवमन्यत्पदं नास्तीति व्यवहारः। *Ratneśvara's comment on S.K.A.*, p.72.
43. स च कविग्रामस्य काव्यमभ्यस्तो नवधा भवति तत्राद्यन्तयोरस्वादु पिचुमन्दपाकम्, आदावस्वादु परिणामे मध्यमं बदरपाकम्, आदावस्वादु परिणामे स्वादु मृद्धीकापाकम्, आदौ मध्यममन्ते चास्वादु वार्ताकपाकम्, आद्यन्तयोर्मध्यमं तित्तिडीकपाकम्, आदौ मध्यममन्ते स्वादु सहकारपाकम्, आदावुत्तममन्ते चास्वादु क्रमुकपाकम्, आदावुत्तममन्ते मध्यमं त्रपुसपाकम्, आद्यन्तयोः स्वादु नालिकेरपाकमिति। *K.M.*, P.20-21.
44. स्वभावशुद्धं हि न संस्कारमपेक्षते। न मुक्तामणेः शाणस्तारताये प्रभवति। *Ibid.*, p.21.
45. मध्यमाः संस्कार्याः। संस्कारो हि सर्वस्य गुणमुपकर्षति। द्वादशवर्णमपि सुवर्णं पावकपाकेन हेमीभवति। *Ibid.*
46. तेषां त्रिष्वपि त्रिकेषु पाकाः प्रथमे त्याज्याः। वरमकविर्न पुनः कुकविः स्यात्। कुकविता हि सोच्छ्वासं मरणम्। *ibid.*

Compare this with the following -

- नाकवित्वमधर्माय व्याधये दण्डनाय वा।
कुकवित्वं पुनः साक्षान्मृतिमाहुर्मनीषिणः।। *Bhāmahānkarā*, I.12.
47. अनवस्थितपावां पुनः कपित्थपावकमामन्ति। तत्र पलालधूननेन अन्नकणलाभवत्सुभाषितलाभः। *K.M.*, p.21.
48. अहृद्यमसुनिर्मदं रसवत्त्वेऽप्यपेशलम्। काव्यं कपित्थमामं यत् केषांचित् तादृशं यथा।। V.62.
49. *S.K.A.*, p.71.
50. तद्यथा नालिकेरफलं पक्वं त्वचि कठिनं शिरास्वविवृतकोमलप्रायं कपालिकायां कठिनतरं तथा कश्चित् सन्दर्भो मुखे कठिनस्तदनन्तरं मृदुप्रायस्ततः कठिनतरो नालिकेरपाक इत्युच्यते।..... यथा द्राक्षाफलं त्वच आरभ्य कोमलमन्तरा द्वित्रिचतुरस्थिसंपादितं किंचित्काठिन्यम् एवं कश्चित् सन्दर्भ उपक्रमोपसंहारयोः कोमल एव मध्ये कठिन एव।... यद्वच्च परिणतं सहकारफलमारम्भादेव कोमलमस्थनि तु कठोरप्रायम् एवमपरः सन्दर्भो मुखादारभ्य मृदुरन्तरे कठिनतरः सहकारपाक इत्युच्यते।
51. तेऽमी त्रय एव शुद्धपाकाः। व्यतिकरजन्मानस्तु भूयांसः। *Ratnesvara on S.K.A.*, p. 72.
52. अत एव कविकल्पलताकारादिभिरुक्तो नीलकपित्थपाकश्चतुर्थो नास्ति। *ibid.*
53. मृद्धीकानारिकेलाम्बुपाकभेदाच्चतुर्विधः। आदावन्ते च सौरस्यं मृद्धीकापाक एव सः।। 346.23.
- The two well-known varieties *Mrdvikāpāka* and *Nārikela-Pāka* are clear from the above quoted text. But which are the other two remaining varieties? Could *Ambupāka* be the third one? What would be its meaning? What is the fourth one, in any case?
54. द्राक्षापाको नारिकेलपाकश्च प्रस्फुटान्तरौ। द्राक्षापाकः स कथितो बहिरन्तः-स्फुरद्रसः।। स नारिकेलपाकः स्यादन्तर्गूढरसोदयः।। I.35 ed.
55. पाकान्तराणि मधुक्षीरादीनि यथा सम्भवमूह्यानि। *Ibid.*, Under SI. 37.
56. द्राक्षापाकनारिकेलपाकावर्थस्य द्रुतविलम्बितप्रतीत्योः परां कोटिमारूढौ। अतस्तदन्तरालवर्तिन्या मध्यमप्रतीतेरनेकविधत्वात् तदनुसारेण कदलीरसालादिपाकाः स्वयमूह्याः।।
57. नारिकेलफलसंमितं वचो भारवेः सपदि तद्विभज्यते।

स्वादयन्तु रसगर्भनिर्भरं सारमस्य रसिका यथेप्सितम्।।

58. माधुर्यैरपि धुर्यैर्द्राक्षाषीरेक्षुमाक्षिकादीनाम्।
बन्धैव माधुरीयं पण्डितराजस्य कवितायाः।।

quoted in the *Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra*, p.279. Poems containing Ikṣupāka are condemned in a verse in praise of a poet named Rāmachandra.

प्रबन्धा इक्षुवत्प्रायौहीव्यमानरसाः क्रमात्।
कृतिस्तु रामचन्द्रस्य सर्वा स्वादुः पदे पदे।।

59. साध्वीकमाध्वीकचिन्ता न भवति भवतः शर्करे कर्कशासि।
द्राक्षे द्रक्ष्यन्ति के स्कत्वाममृत मृतमसि क्षीरे नीरं रसस्ते।। *Gitagovinda*, 12.
60. स्थिता माध्वी कपाकत्वान्निसर्गमधुरापि हि।
किमपि स्वदते वाणी केषांचित् कृष्णशांकरी।।
quoted in the *Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra*, p. 283
61. स्ववाक्पाकेन यो वाचां पाकं शास्त्यपरान् कवीन्।
स्वयं हरिहरः सोऽभूत् कवीनां पाकशासनः।। *Ibid*, p. 286
62. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, vol. II. p. 240
63. On the sublime, ch. 30.
64. *Essays on Criticism*, lines 364-371.

(Deptt. of Skt. and Hindi, University of Raj., No. 6 : 1973-74)



14. M. Hiriyanna's Views On Theories of Poetry

Professor Hiriyanna has dealt with theories of poetry in the general context of Indian aesthetics. This has underlined the wider applicability and significance of the principles of literary criticism in Sanskrit. Further, he has drawn our attention to parallelism of evolution of poetry and criticism with Indian religion and philosophy. He has thus given a harmonious explanation of the growth of an identical Indian mind in literature, literary theories, and in religion and philosophy. No better thesis can perhaps be propounded to expound accurately and comparatively

the unity of the religious, philosophical, aesthetic and literary expressions of the Indian mind. But, Prof. Hiriyanna does not stop at historical and comparative analysis. He takes a definite stand as does Śaṅkara in Vedānta or Ānandavardhana in literary criticism. Like them, he maintains an idealist view of the theory of poetry, and imparts to his penetrating analysis of different aspects of literary theory that rare philosophical insight and expression which characterise all the writings of Prof. Hiriyanna.

In his essay on Sanskrit Poetry : A Historical Retrospect Prof. Hiriyanna has shown that in classical Sanskrit poetry **emotion replaced beauty as the theme of poetry**. Vedic poetry, in contrast had nature and its powers as its subject-matter. Nature was replaced by Feeling in classical poetry.¹ This shifting of the poet's attitude from the external to the internal world has an exact parallel in the philosophical doctrine of the identification of Brahman with Ātman, the innermost self of man as well as in religious evolution from a number of 'devas' to the concept of god as antaryāmin, and in the growth of poetic criticism from the theories of doṣas, guṇas and alaṅkāras, which centre their attention on the outward expression of poetry, to the theory of Rasa as the soul of poetry.² The old school of poetics, represented by Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Udbhaṭa, Rudraṭa and Vāmana, dealt with the subject of poetry under the three heads of doṣas, guṇas and alaṅkāras which were intended to secure coherence of thought and embellishment of expression. The writers of this school **rarely, allude to the central essence of poetry** and are **practically confined to the outward expression of poetry**.³ The new school of dhvani concentrated its attention **on the implicit meaning which forms the essence of poetry**. This new theory of poetry 'exactly corresponds to the doctrine of Ātman.' Professor Hiriyanna observes, **Just as the passing things of experience are not in themselves real but only imperfect manifestations of reality, so word and explicit meaning are but the exterior of poetry, and until we penetrate that exterior, we do not reach the poetic ultimate**.⁴ This is clearly the Śaṅkaraite view of poetry. Should we then think that what the poet portrays, creates or reveals is just unreal like the world of Śaṅkara? Perhaps, no. Prof. Hiriyanna in his analysis of implication of

passages contrasting the poet with the creator says that a poet does not portray Nature as it is but as it ought to be, i.e. **the forms he creates disclose to us the truth of nature commonly obscured, but yet there**⁵ or that he presents something superior to nature which is not there because one may suppose **the world of nature to be imperfect and to contain evil with good, ugliness with beauty.**⁶ The poetic creation is thus idealisation of Nature, life and its experiences, which finds an imaginative response in the reader and induces in him a detached attitude. The idealised objects lack 'spatio-temporal position or physical status, the question of reality does not apply to them.' **This does not mean,** observes Professor Hiriyanna, **that they are unreal; it only means that the distinction of existence and non-existence does not arise at all in their case.**⁷ This stand is certainly consistent with the view of Ānandavardhana⁸ who finds consideration of reality or otherwise of the suggested meanings in poetry irrelevant, with that of Abhinavagupta who does not accept poetic statements as valid for activity as are Vedic injunctions⁹ and also with that of Mahimabhaṭṭa¹⁰ who seems to repeat the author of dhvani on this point. It makes poetic content alogical. This lack of logical character and process in poetry renders the views of Mukula Bhaṭṭa, who used arthāpatti and of Mahima Bhaṭṭa who tried the inferential process in poetry, meaningless because **both forgot that the dhvani lacks the element of necessity, which is essential to what is strictly logical process.**¹¹

Poetry is alogical but not amoral. According to Prof. Hiriyanna, acceptance of the ideal of Jīvanmukti, which replaced eschatological and ascetic views of life, influenced the theory of art and the ethical ideal.

The aim of life was no longer conceived as something to be sought far beyond this world, but to be realised here, and if one so willed now. For the realisation of this ideal, the training of the feeling was a necessary preliminary and in consequence, the first aim of life came to be looked upon not so much the cultivation of the intellect or the development of the will, as the culture of the emotions.¹²

This view leads him to compare poetic experience to the ideal state of Jīvanmukti. Accordingly, he considers aesthetic experience to be

an ultimate value and being characterised by a unique kind of delight.¹³ No doubt, art experience is not abiding as it does not last long. It is 'woefully fugitive' and does not require philosophical knowledge or moral worth, yet, its limitations **don't affect the conclusion that it is of the same order as that of the ideal state.**¹⁴ There could be three views about the value of poetry. First that it represents no higher value at all and that it is only Kāma or sensuous pleasure in disguise,¹⁵ second, that even if it be kāma, **it is kāma idealised and sublimated so that its selfish and sensual side is entirely eliminated.**¹⁶ There is yet a third and more profound view advocated by Rasa-theorists which makes poetic experience comparable to yogic experience. It is this view that Prof. Hiriyanna prefers. He says, **Art also, like niṣkāma-karma, may, by purging our emotions help Inner assimilation of the ultimate truth, for devotion to the beautiful is not less unselfish than devotion to the good.**¹⁷ In keeping with his spiritualistic view of poetry or art, Prof. Hiriyanna has underlined, the close connections of poetry with religion,¹⁸ and philosophy considers artistic contemplation and experience active, like the ideal state, because it involves imaginative reconstruction of the idealised content of art. **The beautiful as a value needs to be striven for() achieved (sādhyā), no matter whether one approaches it as an artist or as a spectator.**¹⁹

From the foregoing brief statement of the view of Prof. Hiriyanna on poetic content, aim, value and experience and the close connection of poetic theory with the philosophical doctrine of ātman and the ethical ideal of Jīvanmukti, it is obvious that not only has he critically elucidated the bearing of the dhvani-theory on the above-mentioned aspects but has made it more profound and spiritualistic. This has incidentally resulted in minimising the significance of earlier theories of doṣa, guṇa, alaṅkāra, and vakrokti. In his treatment of these theories in the wider context of aesthetics he finds no use for the alaṅkāra concept²⁰ of Sanskrit criticism. He is so much engrossed in and impressed with the aesthetic idealism of the dhvani-theory, more precisely its Rasa-theory, that he has hardly given sympathetic treatment to the old school of Sanskrit poetics. He has, instead pointed out its failings in conceiving Rasavadalaṅkāra, either

as vācya, directly expressed, or as deduced by presumption. An idea of emotion, he argues, can be thus conveyed but it will be conceptual and abstract, while Rasa is always a felt emotion suggested through concrete forms in poetry.²¹ He observes: **But misconceiving the status of Rasa in poetry was not the only fault of the older (prācīna) school. They also failed to explain how Rasa experience comes to be evoked at all.**²² The new school solves this problem by enunciating the theory of suggestiveness which is based upon the view that what we may call the poetic ultimate is essentially incommunicable and can at best be suggested.²³

Professor Hiriyanna has given us the Rasa-Brahma theory in all its details. He remains monistic throughout his exposition. He brooks no compromise with the realism of theorists and observes no syncretism in the theory of dhvani which may allow co-existence of all the theories of poetry in the relative supremacy of Rasa-dhvani. No doubt, classical Sanskrit poetry chiefly concerns itself with feeling. Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti remain the best poets of Sanskrit; yet, the poetry of Bhāravi, Māgha and Śriharṣa and of many lesser known poets cannot be disregarded even for their beauty of form, imagery and style. The Rasa-dhvani theory of Ānanda and Abhinava has had its supremacy in Sanskrit poetics; yet, even its one of the most brilliant exponents, I refer to Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, did concede that even the works of great poets may contain passages that have no rasa, and yet representation of nature or imaginative description will qualify them for the title of poetry. Hence, his criticism of Viśvanātha's definition of poetry. It is not without reason that the practice of treating all the elements of Sanskrit criticism even by the followers of the dhvani school has continued in Sanskrit poetics. This implies a certain syncretism in theory and in practice of Sanskrit poetry which continues to excel in imagination and representation of thought and action equally with delineation of feeling. Perhaps the realistic idealism of Kashmir Śaivism, mainting the reality of all manifestations of the ultimate will be a better philosophy to explain the theories of poetry than the absolutism of Śāṅkara which dismisses all elements of the world as

unreal appearances, positing Brahman as the only ultimate real. But then, Professor Hiriyanna is a true Vedāntin in the realm of the theory of poetry.

References

1. Beauty of nature and beauty of human thought and action are found in both types of poetry but while the earlier (i.e. Vedic) points to these as its aim, the later points from them to something which lies deeper yet, viz. Feeling. **Studies**, P. 6.
2. See, his **essay on Indian Aesthetics-1** included in Art Experience.
3. **Ibid**, p. 5.
4. **Ibid**, p.7.
5. **Ibid**, p. 20. See also p. 30 on this point.
6. **Ibid**, p. 47.
7. **Ibid**, p. 30. On p. 47-48 Hiriyanna has further observed:
But it is necessary to add that the things represented in art will not become false or fictitious through such idealisation..... Thus the things depicted in art assume a unique character which the spectator can describe as neither real nor unreal. In brief, we do not take a logical view of them. We neither believe nor disbelieve in their reality. We merely entertain them.
8. **Dhvanyāloka**, III p. 455 KSS ed. 1940.
9. Locana on the same page.
10. **Vyaktiviveka**, p. 75 KSS 1936.
तेनात्र गम्यगमकयोः सचेतसां सत्यासत्यत्वविचारो निरुपयोग एव।
काव्यविषये च वाच्यवाचकव्यङ्ग्य-प्रतीतीनां सत्यासत्यत्वविचारो निरुपयोग
एवेति तत्र प्रमाणान्तरपरीक्षोपहासायैव संपद्यत इति।
11. **Art.**, p. 50.
12. **Ibid**, p. 4.
13. **Ibid**, p. 27-28.
14. **Ibid**, p. 28.
15. Manu (I. 12) reckons song, dance and instrumental music among human weakness, Vyasana).

16. **Quest.**, p. 32
17. **Ibid**, p. 33.
18. **Studies**, p. 1. **Quest.**, p. 33 where he observes : It is common knowledge that the fine arts of dancing, architecture, painting and sculpture have been affiliated in India, as in many other countries, to religion and therefore in a way to Philosophy. Even poetry is so.
19. **Art.**, p. 23.
20. The last, alamkāras may be left out of consideration here; for, in the first place, they are not recognised by all to be essential, and in the second, they almost exclusively relate imaginative literature and have no proper place in general theory of art.- **Art.**, p. 5.
21. **Ibid**, p. 67.
22. **Ibid**, p. 68.
23. **Ibid**, p. 70; see also. P. 49-50
24. **Rasagaṅgādhra**, (N.S.ed.) p. 8-9.

(Oriental Research Institute, Mysore)



15. Sanskrit Criticism and Contemporary Literature

The renowned scholars of Sanskrit Criticism have shown great favour to this young University Department of Sanskrit by accepting all hardships of journey in winter to attend the Seminar in this city of lakes, not so well connected by trains. Your affection and generosity shall be sole refuge of our inability in making befitting arrangement for the scholars of your age and fame. My awareness of organizational limitations does not belittle my sense of pride and joy at your distinguished visit. It rather waxes to find that not only pre-eminently the scholars of Sanskrit but also of Hindi and English have found it interesting to actively associate themselves with the Seminar. This reminds me of the famous line: काव्यशास्त्रविनोदेन कालो गच्छति धीमताम्. Your participation, I am sure, will inaugurate comparative studies of the Principles of Literary Criticism

in Sanskrit in depth. In the past ages Sanskrit was the national and composite vehicle of literary and cultural consciousness of the country. It systematised, conserved and transmitted the intellectual movements of the country. The literary tradition, which originated with the languages of the masses-Pāli. Prakṛta or Apabhraṁśa- was critically evaluated by the Sanskrit ālankārikas. It is not surprising therefore that many original works on poetics are full of illustrations from the Prakrit. The movement of Bhakti was similarly popular in its origin. But its philosophy was constructed in Sanskrit by Rāmānuja and Caitany, his followers Rūpagosvāmin, Jīvagosvāmin and by Madhusūdana who expounded the principle and philosophy of Bhakti Rasa. Jainism and Buddhism originated as popular movements expressing their faith in local languages. But it was not very long after their origin that the religion, philosophy and poetry of these two great movements of India, namely Jainism and Buddhism, were composed in Sanskrit. Even the faith of Sikhism, Brahma Samaj, Arya Samaj and so on was expressed through this language of immortality, precision and sanctity. Sanskrit has played effectively its role of understanding new movements of intellect and giving them a composed, graphic and classical expression. It has been thus a repository of all expressions of Indian consciousness. It could achieve this magnificent result by honouring the sentiments of the linguistic temper of the people. Like Daṇḍin, Ānanda-Vardhana, Mammaṭa, and Rūpagosvāmin of the past, the modern scholars of Sanskrit criticism, owe a responsibility to this sensible tradition and thus bring under their analytical ken the literature of contemporary India.

Non-Sanskrit critics of contemporary literature of India which is imbued with modern sensibility, complain that the principles of literary criticism enshrined in old Sanskrit texts, though sacred yet largely ambiguous and unintelligible, are inadequate and even invalid to evaluate the new literary consciousness. They argue that an ultimate sense of despair, helplessness and alination that permeates the creative writing of today cannot be properly evaluated by the canons of criticism which are largely based on a philosophy of ultimate hope and a vision of the quietitude. The philosophy of Absolute and a religious morality sanctioned by Smṛtis, which provide a broad framework for the literary criticism in

Sanskrit have no relation with the modern literature that has lost faith in the absolute and has discovered a new sense of morality. In this world of relativity absolute has no place. However, the contemporary critics of akavitā, akahānī and what not, have not formulated so far any objective principles for the judgment of modern literature, which could be acceptable to all concerned. Interpretations and critique of old principles don't satisfy them. Strong impact of science & technology has shrunk the world and brought our contact with the moon. Change of social and economic forces has brought about a new structure of morality; faith in the old order of things, thoughts and patterns stands mutilated. Modern stage of the world has no room for outworn plays of old characters. New literary consciousness needs its understanding and critical evaluation in its own context. In the past the Sanskrit Acharyas never failed in appreciating and judging the literary mood of the people who expressed themselves in the idiom of the day. The scholars of Sanskrit criticism will no doubt revive the old tradition of understanding and evaluating the modern Prakrits-Hindi and others and if need be evolve new canons of literary criticism. Daṇḍin, Maṃmaṭa and many other ācāryas did not ignore the literature in the people's languages, nor will the distinguished critics participating in the seminar. This may open up new horizons and lay the foundations of new canons of literary criticism. I have ventured to make some observations; it was but irresistible in the enlightened presence of so distinguished ācāryas here.

(An extract from the welcome speech, Deptt. of Skt.
University of Udaipur)



16. Philosophical Consideration and Independence of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit

In this paper I propose (i) to state the obvious impact of Indian philosophical thought on Sanskrit Criticism and (ii) to assert that the criticism, though informed and influenced by philosophical thought, is yet by and large independent of philosophical considerations and that

these are incidental to it and do not constitute the essence of critical judgment of literature.

The idea of poetry and its objectives, the description of the poet and aesthete (sahṛdaya), the poetic word and its meaning and their relation, the varieties of poetic figures (alaṅkāras), the role of imagination (pratibhā) in the conception and creation of literature, the triad of poetic excellence (guṇa), the theories of rasa and dhvani and Mahima Bhaṭṭa's theory of inferential nature of poetic sense are some of the major topics that come readily to one's mind when one seeks to trace the influence of Indian philosophical thought in general and orthodox systems in particular. I propose to deal with some of these excluding rasa in particular which would require separate treatment. That the literary critic in India worked under the impact of philosophy and other Śāstras, which are not pertinent for our consideration here, is no wonder to us. Western Criticism has also been informed and influenced and even at times swept off its feet by the onslaught of psychology and philosophy. This is natural when both philosopher and poet are engaged in 'seeing' the word; the philosopher may 'see' it better but it is only the poet who describes better what he sees. The title of a poet is accorded not merely to one who is endowed with a vision of world but to one who possesses both vision and expression. The famous stanzas by Bhaṭṭa Tota bear quotation on this point:-

नानृषिः कविरित्युक्तमृषिश्च किल दर्शनात्।
विचित्रभावधर्माशतत्त्वप्रख्या च दर्शनम्॥
स तत्त्वदर्शनादेव शास्त्रेषु कथितः कविः।
दर्शनाद्दर्शनाच्चाथ रूढा लोके कविश्रुतिः॥ (Loc., Cit.)

Even the sage Vālmīki, who had a clear vision of the reality of things, was not acclaimed a poet until his poem emerged to express aesthetically what he had seen or experienced:

तथा हि दर्शने स्वच्छे नित्येऽप्यादिकवेर्मुनेः।
नोदिता कविता लोके यावज्जाता न वर्णना॥ (Ibid)

While the conception of poet in India has borne comparison with the philosopher and creator, the literary critics have always asserted

independence and freedom of literary creation¹ and have even established its supremacy over the former. The benedictory verse of the Kāvya-prakāśa clearly formulates the freedom and supremacy of the poetic creation:

नियतिकृतनियमरहितां ह्लादैकमयीमनन्यपरतन्त्राम्।
नवरसरुचिरां निर्मितिमादधती भारती कवेर्जयति।।

The poet is able to see and express by virtue of his innate faculty called Pratibhā. Bhāmaha declares that poetry dawns rarely and on an only person gifted with this faculty: काव्यं तु जायते जातु कस्यचित् प्रतिभावतः। Bhāmahālaṅkāra, 1.5.

This rarest gift², an innate faculty³ and the very seed of poetry⁴ is conceived by Rājaśekhara as both a creative inspiration (kārayitrī pratibhā) and aesthetic sensibility (Bhāvayitrī Pratibhā).⁵ Bhaṭṭa Tota, the master of Abhinavagupta, has offered best definition of Pratibhā. He says: **Pratibhā is a form of intuitive consciousness, prajñā, which is an inexhaustible source of exceptionally novel blooms. It is by virtue of this Pratibhā alone that one deserves the title of ‘poet’, of one, who is skilful in expression⁶:**

प्रज्ञा नवनवोन्मेषशालिनी प्रतिभा मता।
तदनुप्राणनाजीवद्वर्णनानिपुणः कविः।।

The doctrine of Pratibhā in Sanskrit Criticism is very comprehensive. It includes (i) creative inspiration, imagination, genius; (ii) competent poetic expression⁷; (iii) aesthetic sensibility; and (iv) poetic beauty.⁸

The literary critics had conceived this doctrine independently until Abhinavagupta, in his philosophical analysis of the Pratibhā, identified it with the ultimate consciousness, the Self and admitted that in a poet it burns with a purified light.⁹

Pratibhā in Śaiva metaphysics is identified with consciousness as creative emission (Visarga)¹⁰. However, what one notices is that prior to Abhinavagupta the literary critics did not consider its metaphysical overtones and were happy to explore it as a concept of poetic creation,

expression and appreciation. Even Ānandavardhana, who was himself a great philosopher, treated Pratibhā in its literary context only. According to him it is a unique gift which is manifested through the Muse of great poets,¹¹ attains endless forms on its journey through the dhavani¹² and so long as it is present the province of poetry is never exhausted.¹³ Similarly Kuntaka, Ruyyaka and later ālaṅkārikas considered it necessary for any description to be called poetic. Ruyyaka has redefined the poetic figures on the basis of the principle of Pratibhā-which is, in their opinion, essentially a virtue of creative imagination found in the work of great poets.

Impact of grammar and systems of philosophy on the progressive evolution of the ālaṅkāra proper is well recognized. Grammar forms the basis of many a variety of Upamā. The discussion about the distinction between upamā and utprekṣā due to the use of the word iva; of that between upamā and rūpaka, and the mergence of many ālaṅkāras like Dīpaka and āvṛtti betray the obvious influence of grammar. The recognition of figures like arthapatti, parisamkhyā and sammuccaya distinctly bear the stamp of the Mīmāṃsakas. In the emergence of figures like anumāna, kāvyalinga (also known as Kāvyaḥetu in old works), Vibhāvanā, Viśeṣokti, Virodhābhāsa, asaṅgati, atiśayokti of second variety, and adhika as well as in the hair-splitting discussion in neo-terminology of the formulation and exposition of the concepts of the ālaṅkāraśāstra the Naiyāyikas had a major share. Popular wisdom (loka-nyāya) and its tradition of expression were responsible for the formulation of many an ālaṅkāra such as sama, viśama, pratyanika, pratīpa, nimilita, tadguṇa and atadguṇa. In fact, classification of the ālaṅkāras given by Ruyyaka admits, inter alia, chain (Śṛṅkhalā), reason (tarka), sentence (Vākya) and popular usage (loka) as the basis. Under the impact of Śaivism emerged some new figures such as Smaraṇa, pariṇāma and ullekha and many old ālaṅkāras for example, rasavadādi, the second variety of the figure udātta, Bhāvika were given new orientation. The terms of Kashmir Śaiva philosophy, such as ābhāsa, anusandhāna, unmeṣa, nimeṣa and ullekha were frequently used to discuss the concepts of the ālaṅkāras.

Ruyyaka has, in fact, treated the whole sphere of the ālaṅkāras on the basis of the principle of Pratibhā. The admission of an ālaṅkāra or

its variety is, according to him, dependent upon the creative instinct of the poet on the one hand and its aesthetic meaningfulness on the other; the difference of an alaṅkāra from another is based on a distinct consciousness that each should arouse.¹⁴ Thus, for example, utprekṣā and Atiśsayokti are distinguished on the basis of adhyavasāya¹⁵, and bhāvika, rasavat¹⁶, svabhāvokti on the basis of consciousness of identity, universality and so on. Ruyyaka is never tired of repeating in essence that poetic figure being a potent media of effecting consciousness, should bloom forth from the poetic pratibhā, and never regrets to discard cumbersome varieties of the figures which hurt the aesthetic sensibility (the second aspect of pratibhā). His commentator Jayaratha, who was himself a great thinker of Śaivism, has further underlined these aspects, namely the figure must be effected by pratibhā¹⁷ and that it should produce a distinct consciousness. It is such a figure that becomes synonymous with poetic beauty and Śrīvidyācakravartin in his Sañjīvini a commentary on the Alaṅkārasarvasva often repeats that ‘an alaṅkāra is nothing but beauty’: अलंकारो हि विच्छित्तिः।

Another important entity for our consideration is the concept of poetic flaws. Among the ten types of flaws enumerated by Bharata¹⁸, nyāyādapeta (defined as pramāṇaparivarjita), Viśamdhī and Śabdacyuta are clearly Śāstric. Gūḍhārtha, (paryāyaśabdābhīta), arthāntarta (avarṇya-Varṇana) arthahīna, bhinnārtha, ekārtha, abhiluptārtha referring to impediments created in comprehension of the meaning, were also partly influenced by grammatical and logical considerations; the Viśama (metrically uneven) relates to prosody. Bharata believed that these flaws mar poetic beauty of a literary composition. Bhāmaha followed Bharata in the treatment of the above mentioned flaws and added ten more to the list. I need not go into the details of his treatment but would confine myself to two observations. This is obvious from Bhāmaha’s treatment of logical fallacies¹⁹ that logic (Buddhist as well as orthodox) exercised considerable influence on him. This was natural because Bhāmaha belonged to an age which was marked by encounter of ideas and was dominated by the works of Vasubandhu and Dinnāga. However, even

when he bases his treatment of the poetic flaws on the way shown by the logicians of the country and constructs the grammar of poetry after the style of the grammarians, he also asserts the independence of the literary criticism from the Śāstra. The logic of poetry is distinct, says Bhāmaha:

अपरं वक्ष्यते न्यायलक्षणं काव्यसंश्रयम्।

इदं तु शास्त्रगर्भेषु काव्येष्वभिहितं यथा²⁰ ॥ (KA, IV, 30)

This is constructed by critics on the basis of the poetic tradition and is based on empirical experience while the Śāstras are concerned with the reality of things:

तज्ज्ञैः काव्यप्रयोगेषु तत्रादुष्कृतमन्यथा।

तत्र लोकाश्रयं काव्यमागमास्तत्त्वदर्शिनः॥

It was perhaps to underline immanent nature of the poetic meaning that Bhāmaha advised not to believe the transcendental theory of meaning propounded by the grammarians; it would be tantamount to a belief in the reality of a sky-flower.²¹ In his discussion on the correct use of words (Śabda-sādhitva) Bhāmaha is indebted to grammar as well as to all other disciplines but when we read the Kāvyaālaṅkāra in its proper perspective it becomes clear that according to Bhāmaha it is not sauśabdyā or perfection of the word or its correct cognition that can constitute a poem rather an aesthetic harmony of both the words and meanings: शब्दार्थौ सहितौ काव्यम्।

The words and meanings both must be out of the turn²² and should emerge from one’s own experience of them.²³ It was to probe this uncommon use of word and meaning by the poet that Bhāmaha propounded the principle of Vakrokti²⁴ which, according to him, pervades entire poetic composition, constitutes essence of all poetic expression²⁵ and in media of effecting aesthetic sense in poetry anyārtho vibhāvyaṭe. Daṇḍin further asserted the empirical nature of literature and its criticism by admitting equal importance of the svabhāvokti and had even questioned the grafting of hetu and nyāya (हेतुन्यायलवोच्चय) on literary judgment:

विचारः कर्कशप्रायस्तेनालीढेन किं फलम्।

Bhāmaha had observed that flaws of logic and grammar sometimes become guṇas. Daṇḍin takes this principle further by illustrating every defect and showing how each turns into a virtue. Vāmana deals with the doṣas systematically in the III adhikaraṇa. Contradicting the opinion of Bharata he maintains that doṣas are not positive entities but merely opposite to guṇas and these are treated by him under the categories of pada, padārtha, vākya and vākyaṛtha. Rudraṭa, who follows Bharata in his conception of the poetic blemish as positive entity, treats doṣas under the broad classes of verbal and material. Bhāmaha had recognized seven doṣas of upamā which is exclusive to poetry. Daṇḍin and Rudraṭa also treated these with varying numbers. Ānandavardhana by expounding the universal and ephemeral character of the blemishes makes them subservient to the aesthetic meaning of dhvani. It is from their relation to sentiments that the blemishes derive their raison d'être in literary criticism. This is significant because critical judgment of literature should not take any independent notice of the grammatical and logical defects unless they are related to the poetic sense (Kāvyaṛtha, the rasa). Mahimabhaṭṭa's treatment of the five poetic flaws, borrowed by Mammaṭa latter on, is very systematic and is broadly speaking aims at the stylistic perfection through avoidance of impediments to clear grasp of meaning Mammaṭa followed the Dhvani school in his conception of the poetic blemish as marring the principal sense (i.e. rasa) and his broad classification of the blemishes includes rasa-doṣas along with the verbal or formal and the material (relating to meaning or content). Progressive evolution of doṣa-concept and treatment of its varieties makes it clear that the literary critics concerned themselves more and more with obstacles-formal or material-of the poetic content (alaṅkāra, Guṇa or rasa) than with the grammar and logic, pure and simple.

Another important principle of Literary Criticism is the guṇa or poetic excellence. Despite many important differences among critics from Bharata to Post-dhvani period about the nature (whether it is positive entity or simply a negation of the lemishes) and number (ten or three) the

guṇa principle has concerned itself exclusively with the stylistic perfection through aesthetic mode of arrangement of words of literary creation and was in its final analysis intimately (not indirectly as in Bharata) related to rasa, and writers on dhvani analysed properly the mental states that guṇas help to arouse. In their analysis they must have been influenced by the nature of triad of guṇas admitted in the Sāṅkhya but in any case no writer seems to be obsessed with the śāstric concept, the critic largely on his own analysed the mental states that guṇas help to arouse.

It is true that Ānandavardhana took the cue from grammatical theory of Sphoṭa which treats each letter as suggestive of sphoṭa-one, constant and unchanging like Brahman of the Vedānta, but he has himself made it abundantly clear that the dhvani as a literary principle was developed by him on the basis of a tradition of critical judgement of the readers. In his auto-comment (vṛtti) on **Kāvyaśyātmā dhvaniriti budhairyaḥ samāmnāta-pūrvaḥ** and elsewhere also in his epoch-making work, the Dhvanyāloka, Ānandavaradhana makes following observations which deserve our attention:

- (i) बुधैः काव्यतत्त्वविद्भिः। (Vṛtti on kārikā I.I.)
- (ii) यतो लक्षणकृतामेव स न प्रसिद्धः। (Ibid)
- (iii) तथैवान्यैस्तन्मतानुसारिभिः सूरिभिः काव्यतत्त्वार्थदर्शिभिः वाच्यवाचकसंमिश्रः शब्दात्मा काव्यमिति व्यपदेश्यो व्यञ्जकत्वसाम्याद्ध्वनिरित्युक्तः। (Ibid)

Mukul Bhaṭṭa and his pupil Pratihārendurāja in their observations make it clear that the Sahṛdayas (aesthetes) were responsible for conceiving the novel doctrine of Dhvani:

- (i) लक्षणामार्गावगाहित्वं तु ध्वनेः सहृदयैर्नूतनतयोपवर्णितस्य।
(Abhidhāvṛttimātrkā, N.S. ed. P. 21)
- (ii) तथा हि तत्र विवक्षितान्यपरता सहृदयैः काव्यवर्त्मनि निरूपिता। (Ibid. p. 19)
- (iii) कैश्चित्सहृदयैर्ध्वनिर्नाम व्यञ्जकत्वभेदात्मा काव्यधर्मोऽभिहितः।
(Laghuvṛtti, B.S.S. ed. p.85.)

The continuous tradition of dhvani in the learned circles and Sahṛdayas is alluded to by Ānandavaradhana who refers to them as of mature minds in the concluding verse of the Dhvanyāloka and Abhinavagupta who further states that though the principle of dhvani was not reduced to writing nevertheless it was continuously in vogue:

अविच्छिन्नेन प्रवाहेण तैरेतदुक्तं विनापि विशिष्टपुस्तकविनिवेशनात्।

(Locana, p. 32 (KSR 9 ed.)

In fact Ānandavardhana has given an independent foundation to the poetic meaning and the best that we can say about grammatical impact is that it served as a prelude to or preliminary stage in the evolution of Dhvani as a comprehensive doctrine of Literary Criticism. This is the real significance of the concluding verse of the Dhvanyāloka.

I would now like to conclude by further bringing to your notice the denunciation of the Śāstric polemics by ācāryas of great repute in literary criticism. Abhinavagupta, who has given a solid foundation of Kashmir Śaivism to Sankrit Criticism, passes strictures on the efforts of over-jealous exponents of philosophical views, as being inspired solely for deluding supple minds (Sukumāramanomohana) or mere poses (bhramaṇikāmātra)²⁶. Independence of judgment of poetry (kāvyadhī) was brought out on the basis of pre-eminence of poetic function by another critic, Bhaṭṭanāyaka, in his now lost work, the Hṛdayadarpaṇa:

शब्दप्राधान्यमाश्रित्य तत्र शास्त्रं पृथग्विदुः।
अर्थतत्त्वेन युक्ते तु वदन्त्याख्यानमेतयोः।
द्वयोर्गुणत्वे व्यापारप्राधान्ये काव्यधीर्भवेत्।।

Bhaṭṭanāyaka, in fact, did not view highly didactic value or ethical tone in literature. According to him what matters most is intrinsic merit of poem. Abhinava has similarly questioned the didactic purpose of literary creation in his commentaries on the Nāṭyaśāstra²⁷ and the Dhvanyāloka²⁸. According to him principal element is not knowledge, for in that case there would be no difference of literary work from ethics and historiography. Ānanda had also said न हि कवेरिति वृत्तमात्रवर्णनेनात्मपदलाभः इतिहासादेरेव तत् सिद्धे : Dhanañjaya stressed this idea by saying that dramas

flow with joy, and knowledge is no fruit there-from and one who seeks it as from the history etc. must be saluted, as he is hostile to the real taste of literature:

आनन्दनिष्यन्दिषु रूपकेषु व्युत्पत्तिमात्रं फलमल्पबुद्धिः।
योऽपीतिहासादिवदाह साधुस्तस्मै नमः स्वादपराङ्मुखाय।।

(Daśarūpaka, I. 6.)

Rājaśekhara has stated criticism (discipline of the literature, Sāhityavidyā) to be the fifth Veda²⁹, which asserts its independence.

In the near past when creative criticism ceased and what remained was simple re-assertion of old principles in new language of the Naiyāyikas, the ultra-logical spirit seems to have run riot. One may now fondly hope that this sin of arasika polemics will not be inflicted upon new ventures of evolving or re-interpreting the principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit and a sincere effort will be made to seek new pastures in modern context of literary consciousness.

Discussion

(i) L.L. Joshi

I have always thought that Indians are falsely accused of being too philosophical. Your paper shows very clearly that they are most worldly and practical people and thus confirms my view.

(ii) S.D. Swami

Pratibhā is essential not only for Kāvyaśāstra but for other Śāstras also. Mahimabhaṭṭa has referred to the importance of it in various branches of knowledge. (tr.).

(iii) R.C. Dwivedi

Should I assume that you are not raising any objection against what I have said? Because I pre-suppose that Pratibhā is indispensable for the creation of Poetry. That it plays an important role in other sciences also, is obvious. I do not contradict it. I have endeavoured to show how the concept of Pratibhā, based on the long tradition of poets (cf. सरस्वती स्वादु तदर्थवस्तु निष्यन्दमाना महतां कवीनां etc.) was later on explained more

and more on the basis of philosophy. Abhinavagupta is the first to explain the significance of Pratibhā in poetry and to establish it on sound philosophical foundations. It is a fact that prior to Abhinavagupta no poeticist cared to explain this term in all philosophical detail.

I have also tried to show how the concepts of Pratibhā, alaṅkāra, doṣa etc. remained primarily and prior to Abhinavagupta invariably, unaffected by the philosophical overtones. Even after Abhinava his followers, for example Jayaratha who believed that principles of Criticism are not to be interpreted exclusively on the basis of any particular system, deride at attempts for over-philosophisation of what are essentially literary concepts evolved from the judgment of literature.

(iv) Venkatachalam

Before we wind up, I would like to put one question at this stage. You have shown that various themes of the poetics have been influenced by the principles of Indian philosophy yet they have developed themselves independently, but as far the Rasa-theory is concerned, I think that a perusal of various theories on Rasa shows that in this sphere the ācāryas seldom rose above the philosophical tangle in which they had entered perhaps of their own accord. There is, therefore, very little independent development in the field of Rasa-theories. What do you think of it?

(v) R.C. Dwivedi

Rasa-sūtra has been explained in the light of almost all the schools of India Philosophy. This very fact ipso facto implies that no particular system of philosophical thought can be applied to or held to be exclusively valid in relation to the exposition of the Rasasūtra of Bharata. This makes a particular system of Indian philosophy in relation to rasa-sūtra only incidental and not essential to it.

Moreover I think that Rasa-theory is one of the few topics in Poetics whose development can be perused back to its very inception. The Rasa-sūtra of Bharata is by itself pure and simple and is devoid of every kind of doctrinaire influence of Indian philosophy.

(vi) R.P. Dwivedi

The Rasa-Sūtra which is the basis of Rasa-theories that developed later on has been proved to be an interpolation in the Nāṭya-Śāstra. (tr.)

(vii) R.C. Dwivedi

If this be finally accepted, it would support me in as much as one can hold that the later ācāryas have tailored as sūtra to suit their philosophical predisposition and design.

(viii) R.S. Jaitly

At the time of Bhārata, I think, the layer of the paint of philosophy on the Rasa-theory was not very thick. The layer became thicker and the paint darker with the later ācāryas. In this process completely new ideas were introduced in Rasa with regard to its theoretical aspect; but as far as its practical aspect, the aspect of relishing, rasana, was concerned, no worth while progress could be made. I would like to know your opinion about it.

(ix) R.C. Dwivedi

You are right in saying that the theoretical knowledge and the discussion about the actual process of rasānubhūti does not help a spectator or a reader to relish a piece of art. It is rather a hindrance than an asset. We all here have become somewhat jaḍa to enjoy rasa properly but there are many more outside this room who are fortunately not interested to know the process of relishing but would rather relish it to the brim of their heart.

(x) S.D. Swami

The elaboration of the Rasa theory has not taken place purely on the philosophical background. The various names, śṛṅgāra, karuṇa etc., the conception of different types of bhāvas, the process of sādharmaṅikaraṇa etc., all these things are originally contributed by the poetics itself. (tr.)

(xi) Venkatachalam

I do not say that in the Rasa-theory there is nothing but philosophy, what I mean to say is simple that the process of rasānubhūti has not been able to separate itself from philosophy.

(xii) R.C. Dwivedi

Recall to your mind the two famous lines: शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः and श्लोकत्वमापद्यत यस्य शोकः, which prove that both a great poet

(Kālidās) as well as a great critic (Ānandavardhan) agree to the effect that śoka becomes śloka. In which school of philosophy would you find this tradition? Is this not an independent contribution of Poetics towards Rasa-theory? And all the examples of the rasadhvani which I have quoted towards the end of my paper should also be regarded as complete originality in the Rasa-theory. Bhaṭṭanāyaka conceived two poetic functions, bhāvanā and bhoga to explain the process and realisation of rasa. Both these functions are independent of philosophic impact and were propounded independently. Dhvani-theorists replace in a way the above two functions by Vyañjanā which is not only an independent concept of literary criticism but it also staunchly refuted by the philosophers of every shade in India. For example, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, the great naiyāyika, clearly controverts its admission to the class of śabda-vyāpāra.

References

1. Vide, *Dhvanyāloka* III-43. *Abhinavabhārti*, I. 40.
2. Cf. *Agni Purāṇa* quoted in *Sāhityadarpaṇa* Ch. I.
3. Daṇḍin's *Kavyādarsa*, I. 103.
4. Vāmana, *KASV* I. 3.16.
5. See, Rājaśekhara, *Kāvyamimānsā*, pp. 12-14.
6. Quoted by Hemacandra, *Kāvyānuśāsana*, p. 3; Māṇikyacandra in Saṅketa on *KP*, p. 7.
7. On this point see also Rudraṭa, I. 15; Rājaśekhara, *KM*, pp. 12-14; Jagannātha, R.G. (*Kāvyaghaṭanānukūla-Sabdārthopasthitiḥ*). *Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra*, I. 4.
8. प्रतिभाऽपूर्ववस्तुनिर्माणक्षमा प्रज्ञा, तस्या विशेषो रसावेशवैशद्यसौन्दर्यं काव्यक्षमत्वम्।
9. See, *T.A.*, V, p. 432, and XI, pp. 60-62; *M.V.V.*, VV. 1031 onwards.
10. *Ibid*, V., P. 432.
11. सरस्वती स्वादु तदर्थवस्तु निष्यन्दमाना महतां कवीनाम्।
अलोकसामान्यमभिव्यनक्ति परिस्फुरन्तं प्रतिभाविशेषम्।। I.6 .
12. ध्वनेर्यः गुणीभूतव्यङ्ग्यस्याध्वा प्रदर्शितः।
अनेनानन्त्यमायाति कवीनां प्रतिभा-गुणः।। IV.6.

13. न काव्यार्थविरामोऽस्ति यदि स्यात् प्रतिभागुणः।
14. प्रतीतिभेदश्चालंकारभेदनिमित्तमित्यविवादः।
15. Vide, Dr. R.C. Dwivedi (ed.), *Alaṅkārasarvasva-Saṅjivini*, pp. 82-84. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1965.
16. *Ibid*, pp. 329-335.
17. Ruyyaka and Jayaratha have given a full philosophical treatment to bhāvika and other figures. For this see R.C. Dwivedi: **Percept-like experience in Bhāvika included in Essays on Indian Poetics**, Delhi, 1965.
18. See, Jayaratha, *Vimarśini on A.S.* (N.S. ed.) pp. 44, 58, 71-165.
19. *N.S.*, XVI, 88-94.
20. Vide, *KA*, IV 1-2.
21. See, also IV. 32.
22. शपथैरपि चादेयं वचो न स्फोटवादिनाम्।
नभः कुसुममस्तीति श्रद्धध्यात् कः सचेतनः।। *KA*.
23. Vide, *ibid*, I. 36, V. 66.
24. नान्यप्रत्ययशब्दा वागाविभाति मुदे सताम्।
परेण धृतमुक्तेन सरसा वृत्तसमावली।।
25. *KA*, II. 84-5.
26. To state the independence of poetic expression and free it a bit from the chain of grammar Bhāmaha said that even a faulty expression or a bad word does not matter so long as the pattern and object of description has some charm. Vide, *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, I. 54.
27. *Abhinavabhārti*, III, pp. 40 176-77.
28. ननु किं गुरुवदुपदेशं करोति, नेत्याह किन्तु बुद्धिं विवर्धयति स्वप्रतिभामेव तादृशीं वितरति। *ibid*, p. 41.
29. Vide, Locana on *Dhvanyāloka*, p. 40. *KM*, (G.O.S.)
30. पञ्चमी साहित्यविद्येति यायावरीयः।

(Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit,
MLBD, Delhi, 1969)



17. Concept of Obscenity (aślilatā) in Sanskrit Poetics

Classical Sanskrit Poetics emphasises unity and integrality of form and content. Bhāmaha (7th century A.D.) speaks of **word and meaning being together**.¹ Daṇḍin who probably followed him proclaims: **String of words combined with the intended meaning** is the body of a literary composition.² Later writers on Sanskrit criticism admitted in essence³ the unity of word and meaning either by expanding their definitions of kāvya (literary composition) in terms of presence of positive entities of poetic excellences (guṇas) and figures (alaṅkāras) and absence of negative entity of literary blemishes or by encompassing these under their concepts of Rīti (style and diction), vakratā (turn of expression) and ramaṇiyatā (charm) as Vāmana, Kuntaka, and Jagannātha did. Even Ānandavardhana (9th century A.D.), who propounded a new theory of dhvani (suggested sense) as the soul of poetry, does not deny the charm of word and meaning or their art of arrangement⁴ and, in fact, establishes the relation of part and whole or body and soul between them. In proclaiming dhvani (suggested sense) as the quintessence of poetry his concern is mainly semantic, as of the old critics. No doubt, for him content (rasa or sentiment), being the soul, is more important than the form which is really the body,⁵ whereas according to the old ālaṅkārikas form had a greater role to play in literature.

In order to perfect the form, the poetic language was coceived to be endowed with excellences (10 each of word and meaning according to Bharata, and three according to later poeticists) and ornate with various figures (both of word and meaning) and free from faults of all kinds. Sanskrit critics considered a literary flaw either as a positive entity (Bharata) or as negation of excellence (Vāmana). From their general definition or definition of a particular flaw⁶ one may make out their conception of it. A flaw detracts from the poetic beauty (Daṇḍin and Vāmana) or becomes impediment in realising poet's intention (Bhoja). It is an obstacle to rasa-realisation (according to Dhvani-theorists). It is

impropriety (anaucitya, Ānandavardhana, Mahima, and Bhoja); it is offensive to the men of literary culture (Ratneśvara, Keśava Mīśra). This general nature of a poetic flaw is applicable of the concept of obscenity as well.

Bharata lists ten types of faults⁷ which injure the grammatical, logical, metrical or literary relation between the words and their meaning and thereby damage the dramaturgical content.⁸ In this list the grāmya (vulgar) and the aślīla (which may be taken together for the purpose of comprehending the obscene) don't figure. However, the fourth variety, known as bhinnārtha (defective significance) which is of three kinds, includes the grāmya (vulgar). This is illustrated by Abhinava by a bald and indecent statement by a man to a lady, to love him in consideration of something which he holds in hand. This, in fact, is prostitution of love which goes against all sense of public or private morality. According to Bharata's conception (XVI. 91) guṇas (excellences) are negations of the doṣas (flaws), a view not shared by later writers, Vāmana (II, 1-3) and others who considered guṇas to be positive entities and the flaws to be the negations of natural excellence in a poetic composition, Poetic language by its very nature can't be considered faulty. Faults creep in inspite of poet's best efforts for positive excellence. What is vulgar or obscene is, therefore, an incident and not essence or nature of artistic creation.

In the first list (there are four lists in all) of ten defects, Bhāmaha includes the śruti-duṣṭa (offensive to the ear), arthaduṣṭa and the kalpanāduṣṭa⁹ (defective in construction). The first consists of words which apparently convey good sense but also remind us of vulgar meaning. Bhāmaha enumerates some such words, where the second meaning is considered vulgar. For example, vit : merchant, excrement ; varcas : valour, semen; klinna : wet, drenched in blood ; chinna : cut, broken; vānta : given out, vomited; pravṛtti : engagement, discharge; pracāra : propagation, motion; dharṣita : insult, outrage on women ; udgāra : outflow, belching ; visarga : release, emission ; hada : evacuation, excrement or ordure ; yantrita : fixed up, bound in intercourse. There are certain words which as a whole give a good sense but their part reminds us of indecent meaning.

In Hiraṇyaretas (fire) retas means **seman**. Similarly in sambādha (congestion), pelava (tender), upasthita (present), aṇḍaja (bird) and vākkāṭava (harshness of sound) the parts of words vādha (vagina), pela (scrotum), upastha (male organ), aṇḍa (testicles) and kāṭa (male organ or corpse-carrier according to different dialects) bring to our mind indecent meanings. Some of the words listed above have been definitely borrowed from Prakrits. If a word or part of it has vulgar meaning even according to a particular dialect, it is considered vulgar.

Where on account of indecent words a certain expression produces an idea of an indecent thing (asabhya vastu) that is arthaduṣṭa. Thus, according to Bhāmaha, words and expressions that are not acceptable to men of culture (sabhya) would be vulgar, indecent and obscene. His example of the arthaduṣṭa¹⁰ (quoted later on by Mammaṭa to illustrate the aślīla relating to sense) implies description of the male organ where the apparent meaning is not sexual:

The fall of wicked (also implying the male organ) who is always ready to kill (also indulging in forceful sexual act), arrogant (also stiff) and craving for a hole (also female organ), is such that he can never rise again.

Here the words taken out from the context and used independently do not have any sexual overtones but it is the particular setting of words in a sentence, or a twist in expression which produces obscenity, whereas in Śrutiduṣṭa the words, even without any context, are unparliamentarian, vulgar and indecent.

Where juxtaposition of two independent words conveys indecent meaning, that is called kalpanāduṣṭa (KAB I. 52).

At the end of the first chapter, Bhāmaha lays down general principles which render a faulty expression faultless, nay, even elegant. Particular arrangement or setting of words (sanniveśa-Viśeśa), elegance of the content (āśraya-saundarya), and judicious technique (yojanā) are the three principles which ultimately determine the nature and concept of

all faults including the vulgar and the obscene.¹¹ Words, expressions or the form in relation to its content or theme should be considered obscene or otherwise. Later Sanskrit critics Daṇḍin and Rudraṭa also believed that with change of conditions faults become Guṇas. After the proclamation of the dhvani-theory, the poetic faults (like the guṇas) came to be related to rasa and were defined as that which injure the awakening of rasa. Distinction between invariable (nitya) and variable (anitya) fault was maintained by dhvani-theorists on the basis of its relation with the rasa.

Daṇḍin does not mention Bhāmaha's śrutiduṣṭa and the arthaduṣṭa. He has, however, borrowed a third list of ten poetic faults (with which we are not concerned at present) from Bhāmaha and illustrated each doṣa turning into guṇa with change in conditions.

Vāmana is the first Sanskrit critic who clearly maintains, against the opinion of Bharata, that faults are negations of guṇas¹² and they may be known by examining the content.¹³

He is again the first to give classification¹⁴ of all the faults into four: those of pada (word), padārtha (word-meaning) vākya (sentence) and vākyaṛtha (sentence-meaning) and adopts the term grāmya and aślīla (for what was known as bhinnārtha of first variety in Bharata and śrutiduṣṭa and arthaduṣṭa in Bhamaha). The grāmya, a pada-doṣa, is defined as what is used by common people (lokamātra-prayukta). He illustrates it by such slang words as phūtkṛtā (puffing sound), gaṇḍa (mentioned by Bhāmaha separately from the examples of śruti-duṣṭa), talla, galla and bhalla. Mammaṭa accepts Vāmana by admitting such words as vulgar and illustrates galla and bhalla under vākya-doṣa.¹⁵

Amongst the five kinds of padārtha-doṣa, Vāmana includes aślīla. In its conception, it is comparable with Bhāmaha's śrutiduṣṭa and arthaduṣṭa. The aślīla is of two kinds (a) a homonymous word with one of its meanings being indecent (asabhyārthāntara) and (b) where a word itself is not indecent but its part reminds of indecency. Varcas meaning valour and excrement is the example of the first variety and kṛkāṭika where its part kaṭi stands for corpse-carrier is the example of the second variety.

The word *aśrīra*, occurring in the *R̥gveda*¹⁶ stands for uncultured, unmannerly, indecent and profane. The *R̥gvedic* mantra (X. 8.5.30) recurs in the *Atharva-Veda* where its form is changed into *aślīla* although its old form *aśrīra* is also retained in the *Paippalāda saṃhitā* (XVIII. 3.6). The *R̥gvedic* word refers to person or his limbs or his faults in conduct. In the period of *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Āraṇyakas*, the word *aślīla* began to refer to objects as against a person, such as inauspicious stars,¹⁷ sorrowful way of life¹⁸ and villages where performance of a sacrifice was prohibited.¹⁹ The *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*²⁰ associated the word with speech. *Pāṇini* forms this word from *śrī* meaning grace or excellence, by suffixing *luc*²¹ and changing *r* in to *śrī* | according to the *Sūtra*: *pr̥ṣodarādi.....* (V. 2.97). The negative particle prefix to the word denotes absence of *Śrī*.

Aślīla according to *Vāmana*, is of three kinds as it arouses, (i) shame, (ii) disgust and (iii) inauspiciousness. This division is admitted by all later critics. *Bhāmaha*'s examples of *Śruti-duṣṭa*: *Vāk-kāṭava* and *hiraṇya-retas* are quoted to illustrate the first variety. *Kapardaka* means shell but its part *parda* has the disgusting sense of breaking wind downwards. The word *Samsthita* (established) in its meaning of **dead** arouses the sense of foreboding evil.²²

Bhāmaha and *Daṇḍin* had merely illustrated some cases where faults cease to be faults. *Vāmana* propounds the basis on which obscenity can be completely ignored.

It indecent meaning is concealed, i.e. no longer popular, then that word ceases to be obscene, e.g. the word *sambādha* (considered to be faulty by *Bhāmaha*).

What does not evoke obscenity in people's mind is not obscene. The meaning of *Sambādha* in the sense of **private part** is no longer popular. Its popular meaning **obstacle** alone is understood. Hence it is not obscene.

Words, which yield indecent sense through indication (*lakṣaṇā*) but are not indecent in their primary meaning, are not to be considered obscene.

Again, indecent words, which are not so taken by people and which are in popular vogue can't be considered obscene because people have approved their usage. Such words are *subhagā* (beautiful) *bhaginī* (sister), *upasthāna* (presence or prayer), *abhipreta* (desired), *kumarī* (maiden), *dohada* (longing of a pregnant woman for particular objects). These words have parts: *bhaga* (vagina) *upastha* (male organ), *preta* (dead), *hada* (excrement) etc. reminding us of indecent sense, but their use is approved by the people and can, therefore, no longer be considered obscene. *Daṇḍin* had also noted people's approval for use of such words.²³ *Vāmana* quotes an old authority in support of his theory: **It is not proper to hunt out flaws in what is accepted by the people. Who will have the notion of indecency in words like śiva-liṅga of which indecent sense is completely shrouded.**²⁴

Bhoja quotes *Vāmana* with approval²⁵ on this point and also *Bhāmaha* who had propounded three general principles: *āśraya-saundarya* (excellence of content), *sanniveśaviśeṣa* (arrangement or style) and *judicious selection* (technique) to indicate how a fault is changed into excellence. He further says that much of what is indecent, implicitly or explicitly obscene, is in vogue is in vogue, and it is not censured.²⁶

The question, whether a poet intentionally uses such words and expressions which will arouse indecency has been attempted by *Jagannātha* who opines that if an indecent meaning is out of context, there can be no intention of a poet to arouse such a sense.²⁷ *Rudraṭa* who follows *Bharata* in holding that *guṇas* are the negations of faults, divides faults into two groups-verbal and material and includes *grāmya* in the latter category. He does not mention *aślīla* separately from the *grāmya*. The *grāmya* related to inappropriateness in respect of behaviour, form, dress, speech, region, family, class, learning, wealth, age, office and characters.²⁸ Description of aggressive behaviour in love on the part of an unsophisticated girl, artless simplicity of courtesans, cleverness of rural folk, cunning and deceptive behaviour of ladies of good stock, will, thus, be an offence against the established social sense of class behaviour, morality and conduct. *Rudraṭa* is apparently an elitist in his approach

who widens the scope of grāmya by covering all aspects of social and individual character. Any deviation from the established order of things will be committing a literary offence.

Ānandavardhana, the exponent of dhvani-theory, is primarily concerned with rasa in literary creation. Sounds, words, expressions, style, diction, or any other literary form are by themselves of no consequence if they fail to create beauty par excellence. Everything is to be examined in its relation to rasa. He deals, therefore, only with the rasa-doṣas. What then is the real essence of any rasadoṣa? It is anacuitya or impropriety. Propriety in delineating rasa is the secret of poet's success. **There is no other cause for a breach in sentiment except indecorum. The greatest secret about rasa is confirmity to well-known considerations of decorum.**²⁹ Respecting the opinion of his times and literary tradition of Sanskrit, Ānandavardhana states **that both in dramas and in the poems, any description of vulgar erotic sentiment with reference to high characters like royal heroes and heroines would be as much indecorous as a detailed account of one's own parents.**³⁰ This is true of all other sentiments and emotions. Even first-rate poets (like Kālidāsa, he seems to suggest) have erred, still their defect does not appear glaringly because it is covered by their genius. Thus the artistic talent of the poet or dramatist covers up what would otherwise be considered vulgar and obscene, Bhoja gives three classes of flaws: of word, sentence, and its meaning, each having sixteen varieties. He includes deśya (words without etymology, e.g. galla and talla) and grāmya (comprehending threefold aślīla) under the flaws of word SK. I. 14-15). Amongst the sixteen flaws of sentence-meaning, he mentions aślīla defining it by repeating the same phrase : **Aślīlamiti nirdiṣṭam aślīlārthapratitikṛt** (SK. I. 53).

He illustrates it by the example given by Bhāmaha (I. 51) and follows him and Vāmana in his conception of the aślīla (defined in the context of the grāmya). Indecent meaning (asabhyārtha) may be conveyed either directly (prakṛta) or indirectly (aparakṛta) through double entendre or by bringing forth to mind such a meaning. Bhoja (SK. pp. 98-103)

gives a number of illustrations from the poems of Kālidāsa and others to show how aślīla ceases to be a flaw on the basis of principles enunciated by Bhāmaha and Vāmana (UU. 16) and admitted by him.

Mahimabhaṭṭa does not include the obscene under his five-fold classification of poetic flaws.

Mammaṭa is the most comprehensive author in dealing with doṣas, including the grāmya and the aślīla. He includes both of these under flaws relating to a word or part of it, to sentence and its part. Words such as sādhana (resources, the male organ), vāyu (air, ventris creptus), vināśa (loss, death) are indecent. Kaṭi (in the sense of buttock) is vulgar. Use of such words in a sentence with apparently decent sense as utsarpaṇa (advancing in illicit love), praharaṇa (kicks in love) and mohana (a kind of sexual gratification) produces shame.

The words vānta, utsarga and pravartana implicitly conveying the sense of vomiting, slutting and excreting respectively produce disgust. Use of pitṛvasati for father's house reminds us of crematorium. It is, therefore, suggestive of inauspiciousness. This three-fold aślīla³¹ may occur in the part of a word. For example, pela (excrement) in pelava (soft), pūya (pus) in pūyate (is sanctified) and preta (dead) in abhipreta (desired). Following Bhāmaha, Mammaṭa considers words like galla and talla as vulgar.

Both these flaws relate to meaning also. Vulgar is illustrated as follows : **While this person is asleep, I share bed with you, what harm can there be to you? O ye, accept your fees and spread quickly your folded thighs.**³²

Mammaṭa borrows the example of obscene from the Kāvya-lamkāra of Bhāmaha (I. 51). He also gives example of aślīla through the conjunction of two words, such as Rucimkuru where cinku reminds one of private part of female body. Jagannatha cites illustration of aślīla arising out of conjunction of two Sanskrit words: Jaiminīyamala.

According to Mammaṭa, obscenity turns into excellence - (i) where words with double entendre are used to convey the secrets of sex according to the Kāmaśāstra, (ii) or where quietism is advocated after condemnation of sensuous life. This only means that nothing can be considered obscene, if there is thematic justification for it. Mammaṭa syas that in imitating some thing all flaws cease to be flaws.³³ In view of propriety of the speaker, the person addressed, the suggested (i.e. rasa) or expressed sense and the context of a situation, the literary flaw turns into merit or is neither a merit nor a demerit. This may also equally apply to the flaws of vulgarity and obscenity.

Taking clue from Ānandarvardhan, Mammaṭa remarks in the context of rasa-doṣa that erotic union should not be delineated in relation to high divine characters (e.g. Śiva). Any such description would be as highly improper as describing the sexual relationship of the parents. Mammaṭa has been followed by practically all the ālaṅkārikas who came after him and they have nothing to add to the concept of obscenity as found in the Sanskrit poetics.

It is interesting to note that at all stages of consideration of the obscene words the ālaṅkārikas regarded indecent words of regional languages appearing as part of Sanskrit words, e.g. pela and cinku as indecent. Because if not every body then at least literatures knew both Sanskrit and Prakṛts.

Purāṇas prohibited obscenity in all its manifestations, in speech sight, conduct³⁴, and composition.³⁵ To make indecent remarks against the learned was strictly dis-allowed. Even Tantrics prescribed recollection of Pradyumna if obscene words were uttered.³⁶ It was considered an offence.³⁷ However, Sanskrit literature is not devoid of obscene descriptions. Rājatarāṅgiṇī³⁸ describes dirty jokes by viṭas and obscene behaviour of king's ministers. Kuṭṭinīmata prescribed obscene conduct in certain conditions of intercourse.³⁹ It recognises that on the occasions of festivals, like Holi, obscene speech and phrases can't be prevented,⁴⁰ Bṛhatkathā and Vāsavadattā and others refer to obscene words,⁴¹ songs⁴²

rāsaka,⁴³ and tales⁴⁴ Bhāṇa, monologue variety of Sanskrit Drama, freely indulges in all forms of obscene descriptions. Sanskrit literature is full of erotic absurdities and a poet of lesser calibre could not avoid such sexual descriptions obliquely or otherwise which will not be relished by men of taste and culture. Prohibitions of Purāṇas regarding obscenity were observed more in violation than in observance. It was actually the Kāmaśāstra which ruled over the destiny of classical Sanskrit literature and therefore no description of sex was barred in the literary tradition of India. Erotic mysticism gave sanctity to sensuous description with reference to divine characters.

Tantrism made respectful what would be considered profane otherwise. Changing sense of public and private morality seemed to have no impact on the legislative critics of Sanskrit. And Sanskrit poets in India accepted no restrictions on their free play of imagination. It was therefore, declared that the poets are verily free from any chains of inhibitions: Niraṃkuṣāḥ hi kavayaḥ. And yet Sanskrit did not make bold experiments in man-woman relationship or problems of sex and morality. The theory and practice of obscenity could not, therefore, go beyond its traditional confines. Being profound in its conception of Śṛṅgāra, the Sanskrit literature did not use woman simply as an object and treat sex as a sharp coarse drink. It did not, therefore, produce smutty and spicy books now in vogue in modern languages.

Kālidāsa, Amaruka and Jayadeva, to mention a few ennobled and don't degrade the human spirit by their descriptions of love in union and separation. Vasantasenā, a courtesan, is treated by Śūdraka with the same regard and respect as Śakuntalā, Umā, Rādhā or a host of other anonymous women characters delineated by a large number of Sanskrit and Prakṛta writers. As compared to amorous poems, principal form of Sanskrit Drama (nāṭaka and prakaraṇa) were free from obscenity, because physical love scenes could hardly be presented on the stages before family audience and also because the principal characters of the drama were, as a rule, noble and exalted in respect of whom indulgence in vulgarity could not be entertained.

References

1. **Kāvyaḷamkāra** of Bhāmaha, (**KAB**) I.16.
2. **Kāvyaḷarśa** of Daṇḍin, (**KAD**) I.10.
3. Vide, **Kāvyaḷamkārasūtravṛtti** of Vāmana, (**KASV**) I. 1-3; **Kāvyaḷamkāra** of Rudraṭa, (**KAR**) II. 1; **Vakroktijivita** of Kuntaka, (**VJ**) I.7; **Kāvyaḷprakāśa** of Mammaṭa, (**KP**) I.1. Mammaṭa (11th century A.D.) was paraphrased by writers who followed him, such as Vāgbhaṭa, Hemachandra, Jayadeva, Vidhyānātha, and Vidhyādhara. Viśvanātha (14th century A.D.), the author of the **Sāhityadarpaṇa** defined literary composition in terms of rasa or the poetic mood. Jagannātha echoes essentially what Daṇḍin had proclaimed.
4. **Kāvyaśya hi lalitocita-sanniveśacāruṇaḥ..... under Dhvanyāoka**, (**DA**) I. 2; and **Vividha-Vācya-vācaka-racanāprapañca- cāruṇaḥ kāvyaśya** under **DA** I.5.
5. Ruyyaka (1135 A.D.) rightly concludes that according to the opinion of the old poeticist alamkāras (including guṇa and riti in its comprehensive sense) are the essence of compositions. See, his **Alamkārasarvasva**, ed. By R.C. Dwivedi, Delhi 1977, 6. For a detailed and comparative view of form and content and their interrelationship, see W.T. Stace, **The Philosophy of Hegel**, London 1924, 443; **Fundamentals of Dialectical Materialism**, (ed.) Moscow 1967, 103, 200-201; G. Lucas, **The Meaning of Contemporary Art**, London 1962, 7 & 17; **Literature and Art** (ed.) Bombay 1956, 52; Earnest Fischer, **The Necessity of Art** (Penguin) pp. 116, 131.
6. For a detailed account of general nature of doṣa see, V. Raghavan, Bhoja's **Śṛṅgāraprakāśa**, Madras³1978, 206-210.
7. Gūḍhārtha (circumlocation), arthāntara (superfluous expression), arthahīna (want of significance), bhinnārtha (defective significance), ekārtha (tautology), abhiluptārtha (want of synthesis), nyāyādapeta (logical lapse) viṣama (unevenness metrical defect), viṣamdhī (hiatus), and śabdacyuata (grammatical lapse). **Nāṭyaśāstra**, XVI, 88-94.
8. **Vāci yatnastu kartavyo Nāṭyaśyaīṣa tanuḥ smṛtāl Aṅganaiḷpathyasattvāni vākyartham vyañjayanti hi**, **ibid**, XIV.7.
9. **KAB**, I. 47-52.
10. **Ibid**, I. 50; **KP**, vol. II R.C. Dwivedi, Delhi 1970, VII 279.
11. See, **KAB**, I. 54-59.
12. **KASV**, II. 1.1.
13. **Ibid**, II. 1.2.
14. This classification has been followed by Mammaṭa and others.
15. **KP**, V. 180.
16. **RV**, VIII. 2.20; X 85.30; VI. 28.6
17. **Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa**, V. 3.4.
18. **Ibid**, II. 440.9.
19. **Ibid**, I. 5.26.
20. II. 17; XIV. 11.27.; XVII. 5.1.
21. **Aṣṭādhyāyī**, VI. 2.42. Rāmasingh gives the following etymology, under his comment on **SKI** 14-15: **Śriḷhyasyāsti tat ślilam. Sidhmadehākṛtiganatvāt lac. Kapilakādipāḷhāt latvam. Na Ślilam aślilam.**
22. The sense of the word "obscene" includes all the above three meanings, see Cambridge Dictionary.
23. **KAD**, I.68.
24. **KASV**, I.9, also quoted in the **Sarasvatī-Kaṇṭhābharāṇa**, (**SKA**) N.S.ed. p. 98.
25. **SKA**, pp. 98.
26. **Ibid**, I.152.
27. **Rasagaṅdhāra**, N.S. ed. P. 142.
28. **Kāvyaḷamkāra** of Rudraṭa (**KAR**), II. 9.
29. Ānandarvardhan's **Dhvanyāloka**, K. Krisnamoorthy (tr.), Karnatak University, Dharwar, p. 139.
30. **Ibid**, p. 140.
31. **KP**, VII. 175-177.
32. **Poetic Light (Kāvyaḷprakāśa** of Mammaṭa) Vol. II p. 271; R.C. Dwivedi (ed. & tr.), Delhi 1970, p. 271.
33. **KP**, VII, 59.

34. See, **Viṣṇudhṛmottara** II. 86.10; III. 16.15; II. 89. 15 &^ 56.
35. **Ibid**, III. 15.9; 16.15.
36. **Jayākhyā Saṁhitā**, XXV. 106.
37. **Pañcarātra**, IV. 11.15.
38. VI. 158, III. 140, V. 391.
39. **Kuṭṭinimata**, 160 & 376.
40. **Ibid**, 894.
41. **Avantisundarī**, 163.21.
42. **Vāsavadattā**, 132.7.
43. **Harṣacarita**, 188.6.
44. **Kathāsaritsāgara**, VI.2.173.

[Sanskrit and World Culture, SCHR. OR. 18, S.689-696, Berlin, 1986 and Abhinandan-Bharati (Prof. Krishna Kant Handiqui Felicitation Volume) Assam Research Society, GAUHATI, 1982]



18. Nature of obscenity in Sanskrit Drama (Bhāṇa)

Erotic sentiment or śṛṅgāra ruled over the classical and decadent ages of Sanskrit literature in its various forms of poetry, drama, prose, lyrics etc. Other sentiments like Vīra, Śānta, Hāsya or Karuṇa did not get the major concern or attention of the poets, dramatists or lyricists. Wherever equal emphasis on Śṛṅgāra and Vīra was pronounced by theoreticians, it was the former which was preferred in practice. The literary critics like Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta propounded the spiritualistic theory of aesthetics but the literature remained earthly in its descriptions of sheer physical beauty of the hero and the heroin and other characters. In the age which followed the classical, the divine characters of Rādha and Kṛṣṇa, Śiva and Pārvati and even Rāma and Sīta were not spared from the eroticism of human characters. It was perhaps under the over-powering influence of Tantra or Agama tradition that the distance

between the divine and human was practically obliterated. This happened in spite of clear warning given by Ānandavardhana that sexual activity of divine and uttama characters should not be described. It is like describing sex-relationship of one's own parents. This warning was ignored by all those poets who followed Kālidāsa who had tempered his Śṛṅgāra with tapas or penance. The characters of Pārvati and Śakuntalā amply illustrate this point. Their matchless physical beauty acquires serene spirituality through tapas. Such a thematic spiritualisation of physical charms is conspicuously absent in the literature that followed. This is more or less true of all the literary forms where Śṛṅgāra was treated but more prominently illustrated by certain forms of drama mainly Bhāṇa and Prahāsana which have no pretension for metaphysical or spiritual treatment of love. These forms of drama indulge in various descriptions of sexual relationships from the beginning to the end. While Prahāsanas are interspersed with the humorous situations and bouts of laughter the Bhāṇas have the sole objective of describing one beauty after the other specially in relation to sex-activity. There is pretension of a leading theme or incident in each of the Bhāṇas. Factually speaking, it does not receive any major attention. The theme or a particular incident is not developed in the Bhāṇa as in the Nāṭaka. What we have actually is the description of various courtesans prostitutes and harlots without any real connection with what is seemingly a leading theme. This being so, it is difficult to say that there is any hero or heroine. Just as a lyric or muktaka is complete in itself similarly each description of la belle dame is a complete picture requiring no relation with another kindred description. Viṭa in the Bhāṇa gives all these descriptions. He is a narrator and appears as a friend and counsellor of the courtesans. He can answer all the questions relating to the affairs with courtesans. He can hardly be considered a hero. All this shows that the authors of Bhāṇa had on all-absorbing interest in painting on the spot sexy pictures of the gaṇikas and of the lovers drawn for the various social groups. There is a very bold, strong and perhaps serious defense of prostitution in the Bhāṇas. Newly married wives and housewives are decried, heaven and heavenly damsels are looked down upon and sexual pleasures are highly praised. The veśyās are endowed with respectability with occasional asides against their greed for wealth and

behaviour with old lovers rendered poor. Descriptions of love-affairs of the Pāninian grammarian Dattakalaśi with Raśanāvaticā at the time of sacrifice, of puritan Pavitraka, who will not defile himself with a touch of others, with varuṇikā of Buddhist monk samgrilaka with saṁghadāsī in the padmaprābhṛtaka, similar descriptions of sexual indulgence by such characters as intellectually sharp Nun Vilāsakaunḍinī in the Ubhayābhisārikā by a Vaiṣṇava saint with Anangasenā who was his kept, leave no doubt that the Bhāṇas spared no person from its purview. Pādatāḍitakam describes a Citrācārya Śivasvāmin who had lost all his youth, vigour. Vitality and robust health of a gymnastic through the use of guggula as a medicine for reducing his fat. We can pity on this Swamin when he is described sharing bed with Kusumavatikā. Initially he boasts of his gymnastic feats, then he resorts to the recipes for vitality and finally succeeds in nothing, leaving the resourceful Kusumavatikā in utter distress resulting from utter incapacity for sex of Śiva-Svāmina who advises us to refrain from the use of guggula which was the cause of his fat. In all such situations, there is more of laughter (hāsyā) than the Śṛṅgāra.

Description of forced sex by Maghavarman on Puṣpadāsī during her monthly course in the Pādatāḍitāka, sexual indulgence by śeṣilika with Malatikā and by Irima with Tāmbūlasenā in the Padmaprābhṛtaka, and many references to the affairs of the aged females with the young males or vice-versa and such other unmatched affairs arouse disgust only. In the Padmaprābhṛtaka, there are tempting portraits of Vanarājikā returning from her lover's abode, of Kumudvatī waiting for the arrival of her lover, of priyaṅguyaṣṭikā, a budding beauty playing with the tall in the company of her friends. Similar pictures of Anaṅgadatta and Mādhavasenā are found in the Ubhayābhisārikā. In all these descriptions different parts of the female figure are poetically treated. The legs, more particularly the thighs, buttocks, private parts, naval region with three lines (trivalī), bulging breasts, lower lips, large eyes, arrow-like eyebrows and side-long glances receive the attention of the poets. These descriptions have tended to be traditional. The male figure receives practically no sustained attention. For the authors of the Bhāṇas the wealth and position of the males were more important than their figure or attainments.

In view of the continuous and unbroken tradition of the Bhāṇas it can be said that Sanskrit poets never felt tired of describing female figures for their sex-appeal. Nothing is socially or morally ennobling, thematically important or artistically desirable in such erotic description. It is perhaps an expression of suppressed desire of sex or at best a revolt against moral puritanism imposed through the Smṛtis. It developed out of its..... (incomplete).

(Typed)



19. Women is Classical Sanskrit Literature

There are two basic attitudes, the erotic and the ascetic (religio-philosophical), which govern predominantly the classical Sanskrit literature. The female characters in literature being creations of artistic mind are imaginative constructs and as such are not pure imitations of nature much less its crude representation. The social reality may not be, therefore, fully reflected in these aesthetic creations. The women whom we meet in literature are at best a mix-up of creation, an idealistic construct and presentation, a realistic image. This is implicit in the very nature of literature which is free, autonomous and creative. It has been asserted by literary criticism in Sanskrit that the poetic world is not bound by the laws of nature, it is independent and its very autonomy and independence ensure aesthetic rapture which is different from the ordinary and the religio-philosophical experience. The artistic experience is novel and extraordinary and is essentially blissful. This means that the pen-pictures of characters including female characters or situations in literature do captivate sensitive hearts by the very force of their aesthetic forms, tragic, terrible erotic or even vulgar. Rama and Sita as depicted by Vālmīki; Buddha and Yashodharā as depicted by Ashvaghosha present a new ideal relationship between man and woman. Sita accompanies Rama on her own sweet will to face the hardships of exile expressing her deep love for Rama. She faces brutal enticements of mighty Ravana only to be forsaken

by Rama after his coronation at Ayodhya so that the king is not subjected to scandals. The king is not a private individual. The duty of a king must triumph even over intensely personal, intimate, deep and profound love. Both Rama and Sita suffer unbearable pang of separation. Sita became an epitome of purity through constant suffering without relief but without any rancour for her love which makes Sita distinct from all women characters.

Rama's love for Sita never flickers. In fact he establishes a new ideal of monogamy in a society where polygamy was the rule. His love for Sita is exceptional. Bhavabhuti, the famous playwright of the Uttarama-Charita describes Rama falling at the feet of Sita more than once in profound aplogetic sense. It is not again uncommon to find the faithless husbands touching the feet of their wives in order to please them and being ignored or kicked at. Lyrics, as for example a century of poems are full of such love-scenes. Sita represents ideal conjugal love and its purity in adverse circumstances. She herself censures the action of the king in strongest terms yet she cherishes the love of her husband Rama, even in coming births. The ideal of Sita may not be persued today by liberated women. They have three clear alternatives to lead an independent life, to leave Rama and accept Ravana or at least seek divorce from the former! Before Siddhartha leaves hearth and home to attain the enlightenment Yashodharā tries to persuade him with all the arguments as her command. **It is not sanctioned by law or convention to forsake one's beloved wife and an infant Rahula.** She preferred to stay at home and nourish the child and await the day when she herself will espouse the path trodden by the Buddha. Ashvaghosha describes charm that beautiful queen Sundarī and other women cast over fickle mind of Nanda. He prefers finally the ideal of ascetism, renunciation and spirituality. Women in this case are treated as delusion and evil. This ascetic attitude has nothing but condemnation for women. It is later on reflected in Buddhist and Jain Mahakavyas or other forms of literature. The same attitude of women's condemnation is found in the Centuries of poems by Bhartrahari. In this kind of literature women are treated as obstacles in the path of spirituality and equated with Maya who deludes men to lead the life of sins. The literature written under the influence of Tanstricism, i.e. Tantrika ideal

of union of Shiva and Shakti (in shakta and shaiva schools), Pragya and Upaya, or their variants (in Buddhist schools of Mantrayana, Sahajayana and Vajrayana), Radha and Krishna (in Gaudiya Vaishnavism). Sita and Rama (in Rasika school), Lakshmi and Narayana (in Shrivaisnavism) gave equal, if not more importance to female principle. Shakti in this view represents self-critical consciousness, dynamism, creativity grace and ananda (rapture, bliss). Various forms of Bhakti movement also partake the character of Tantricism. There is enormous literature particularly devotional (Stotras) in Sanskrit which is inspired by the Tantrika view of pre-eminence of female principle of its equality with male principle. Saundaryalahari ascribed to Shankara is beautiful poem eulogising the greatness and power of Shakti, Gitagovinda of Jayadeva is equally famous for its equal importance of Radha. She is the heart and great energy of Bliss. Those who advocated opposition between worldly objects and spiritual experience looked down upon the women and abused them in no uncertain terms and made spirituality the monopoly of men. This is also true of other religious literatures which preferred celibacy to conjugal love, romance and family life.

Puranic Catholicism and Tantric culture combined to produce collective, co-operative and dynamic powers like Durga, Kali and Chandī whom helpless gods prayed for their survival and destruction of their invincible foes, the demons and the like. Devi in various forms symbolises not merely supreme power but also knowledge, awareness and grace. She destroys the forces of evil and helps the suffering mankind in realising their material well-being and spiritual goals. There is enormous literature centring round the personality of Durga, ten Mahavidyas, Shrividyā and others, in Sanskrit. In these descriptions of Devis not merely intellectual qualities, physical, moral and mental strength are emphasised but their physical, divine beauty is never lost sight of. All women are declared to be forms of Devi, Durga and others. Poems giving thousand names of a Devi, Lalita, Tripurasundari, Lakshami, Shodashi etc. are justly famous for tip-toe descriptions of beauty and charm of the goddess. Saundaryalahari, a poem by Shankara, devoted to Shrividyā, is a jewel of Sanskrit literature. Power is expressed in terrible forms of Kali and others,

but the literature combining power with beauty and divinity is preponderate. This should prove to be of enormous interest to those who seek a more significant image of woman in Sanskrit. In creating modern image of Indian Woman, one need not disregard completely one's own cultural tradition but one has to select a particular image with care and caution.

Tradition, if critically and comprehensively examined, has much to offer, provided we develop a critical perception. This is borne out of a profound analysis of the old and the new. Traditional images are being re-created in the light of modern perceptions. Therein lies real strength of our old civilisation. A complete break with the past is not culturally possible but the tradition must always be renewed and re-created. This is what Puranas did to Vedic tradition. Purana literally means the old renewed and thus made significant in the changing world. Sanskrit poets are accused of being unfettered by tradition of grammatical language, conventions of culture and prescriptions of law-books. Kalidasa is regarded by purists, who even condemned poetry as a worst example of indiscipline or licentiousness. However, literary circles hail him as the master of supreme muse. This explains the autonomy of a poet eager to protest against what is wrong and to create a more beautiful and pleasing world outnumbered by women characters of different hue and colour.

Erotic attitude is common to vast literature in Sanskrit. Nātikā is one such example. There- in a lady is the principal character. The play is titled after her name as a rule. Ratnāvalī of Sri Harsh belongs to this class. Kalidasa is spoken of as a poet of love, shringāra. He began his career as a poet by describing love of common women-folk through all the six seasons of a year. His famous lyrical poem and cloud-Messenger, Meghaduta, describes the pangs of love in separation. King Agnimitra's infatuation for a princess, named Malavika, disguised as a maidservant, is described in one of his early dramas. The distress that it caused to the queens at harem who were naturally jealous is broadly hinted at by the dramatist but they are helplessly reconciled to their fate. The queens of Dushyanta in the famous play, Śhākuntala, were condemned to the same fate. Once the hero is enchanted by matchless beauty of Śhākuntala. She

was abandoned in her childhood by her parents, was subsequently nourished by a sage and was not accepted as a wife by Dushyanta at his court, where she admonished the king for his blissful forgetfulness. But her love conquers at the end when the king realises his mistake in renouncing her. The course of free love is never smooth. The kings in the plays of Kalidasa are polygamous but this is not true of epics.

In the first epic, the Birth of Kumara, Kalidasa describes how the daughter of Himalayas, Uma or Parvati, ignores all the divinities inhabiting her father's kingdom and prefers her love for a great ascetic, Shiva who is engrossed in deep meditation and will not brood the idea of love or marriage. Kama (cupid) himself with the help of his friend, spring, takes a vow to entice Shiva to accept Parvati for wedlock. He fails and is reduced to ashes. The wailings of Rati, Kama's consort expresses tender and pathetic feelings of wife at the demise of her husband. Parvati finally conquers Shiva through her austerities and penances. This is the divine design for conquest of good over evil through the birth of mighty and powerful Kumara Kartikeya. Parvati or Gauri becomes conquest thus a symbol of love for an asectic for a social purpose. This is the real fortune, saubhagya. Neither Sita nor Shakuntala who had to brave rough weather in the course of their married life, is invoked for matrimonial happiness or prosperity. It is Gauri or Parvati who is worshipped by newly weds in Hindu ceremonies of marriage for receiving the blessings for constancy and mutuality of love, happiness and prosperity in married life. She is eternally united physically and spiritually with Shiva, like speech and sense or like moon and her rays. Ardhanarishvara is the best image of divine couple in Indian tradition and culture.

There are numerous other examples of romantic love concluded in marriage or otherwise. Usha and Aniruddha, Nala and Damayanti, Vedic Usas and her lovers, Radha and Krishna readily come to our mind. Draupadi presents an image of brave, intelligent and devoted wife of five and yet she is regarded as Virgin in Indian tradition. Savitri is regarded as Sati because she succeeded in saving her husband, Satyavan, from the

jaws of death and was intelligent enough to ask her boons in such a manner that ensured the health and happiness of her family and the future progeny.

In his great epic, the line of Raghus, Kalidasa describes number of kings of Ikshuaku race including Rama who are monogamous. Dashratha is an exception. The last king Agnivarna, described by him, is lustful and sensuous. He is deceased and the kingdom is ruled over by the queen, Aja, the son of Raghu, after whom the illustrious poem has been named, wails over the death of his queen Indumati. **The cruel hand of death snatched you away, my wife, counsellor, friend and dear disciple in Fine Arts.** Kalidasa is equally famous for poetic descriptions of crying of Rati for Kama in the birth of Kumara and of Aja for Indumati in the Line of Raghus. He has immortalised pathetic feelings of human heart at the loss of his or her love and companion. It is significant to note that Rati, ready to join her love at the juneral pyre, is prevented by Sarasvati herself from committing Sati, the widowed queen of the last king described by Kalidasa in his epic poem, Raghuvamsha is ordained to rule over the kingdom. this she did. Poems and plays of Kalidasa present various images of women as if to lay experiments in the man-woman relationship. Sita, Uma, Shakuntala have no duplicates. They are not interchangeable images or types. They are individuals with differing attitudes to life. Even minor characters like Anasuya and Priyamvada, both throbing with the friendly feelings, have their own individuality. Love in suffering epitomised by Sita and Shakuntala or happy marriage of queens in the epic is not the only course open to life of women. Gautami in the Shakuntala and Kaushiki in the Malavikagnimitra prefer the life of solitude and celibacy but are committed to guide and help others. Renouneed Sita and unrecognised Shakuntala get institutional support of Ashramas and are not condemned to live like orphans. Vasantasena, a courtesan, in Bhāsa and in Shudraka (the author of clay-cart) prefers a meritorious but poor Brahmin to the royal relatives occupying positions of power and prestige.

All these characters, images of women in literature, may not be independent rebellious or revolutionary in modern sense of the term. Being consorts or companions these may also be regarded as inequals in the world dominated by males, more particularly by the kings but none of these is an idle doll. None of them is a victim of rape, molestation, dowry-death, child marriage, commercial exploitation and such other evils which usually visit up on their present-day sisters. Bhana is a type of drama in Sanskrit which resembles with monologues. Another variety of drama called Prahasana is not much different from the Bhana. In both of these types of drama, male characters are made a butt of laughter and ridicule for their hypocrisy and impotent lust. It is interesting to find that even the wives of Vanaras and rakshasas, Tara and Mandodari for example, are described as more meritorious, more intelligent and perceptive of the qualities of their husbands adversaries. There are villains or anti-heros in Sanskrit literature but really no anti-heroines (Pratināyikas). Vamps, whores, call girls are conspicuous by their absence. Sanskrit world had a more respectable image of women. Brahmin is Vidushaka (a Fool) who does not command real respect, whereas even minor female characters are treated with respect, consideration and sympathy which they amply deserve.

Vedas were meant for the 'twice-borne' upper castes. The drama was created for all the castes and classes. The same is true for other forms of literature. This ensured representation of all the groups of society in literature. As erotics sentiment, shrinagarasa was the predominant literary concern its attitude was obviously secular. Tantric and Bhakti literature, Buddhist and Jain movements further loosened the tight grip of elitist Vedic tradition. Classical idiom of Sanskrit changed by incorporating many hybrid forms. Hybrid Sanskrit of the Buddhists, Jainas and Tantrikas who espoused the lower-caste women in its religious rituals and practices changed the language and style of Paninian Sanskrit.

Vedic Women-seers had composed the hymns, numerous women poets (and not poetesses) (Rajashekhara says both males and females should be designated by the same term, Kavi, poet, because the sex does not determine this status) wrote verses in Sanskrit. These have survived

in anthologies. Some works may be found in the manuscripts. Maitreyi debated and discussed philosophical issues with Yagyavalkya in Upanisadic age, Avantisundari held fast her opinions on literary issues. Much of this intellectual freedom and creativity vanished gradually in medieval age and the centuries that followed. The reasons for this over-all decline of education and culture in society are historically known. Many women still took to literary, activity through their mother-tongues. With the advent of freedom of the country and the dawn of new ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity and with the emerging concepts of modernity and growth of tensions, new images of women are in making in contemporary Sanskrit literature. Flame of fire, Agnishikha, a collection of poems by Dr. (Mrs.) Pushpa Trivedi, Ira (experimentalist poems) by Devadatta Bhatti, Amrapali (a drama) by Mithilesh Kumari Mishra, Pramadvvara (a drama) by Abhiraja Rajendra, Sindhukanya (a novel) by Shrinath Hasurkar and many other literary works are experiments in new images of women reflecting the cravings, aspirations, conflicts and tensions of our times. Old types of nayikās, dhirā or Mugdhā, Padmini or Hastini etc. are no longer valid today. Sanskrit poet, like his other fellow artists, is busy carving out more sensible images of women. These cannot be photo-prints of other cultural and societal traditions. Literature, if it is good, cannot copy others, it has to be creative. Sanskrit literature is rooted in the long literary and cultural tradition of India. It has survived ravages of different times and has withstood the assaults of counter-cultures. Standing today at the crossroad of values, it has to find out or fashion out from within its time-honoured value-system, more suitable images of women who could face the challenges of disintegration, violence and growing materialism and assert their identity in the over-all interest of preserving life on this planet. Prakriti, the primordial principle, has reconciled its constituents of mutual opposition to cooperative functioning so that the cosmos may not turn out to be chaos. Woman in the Puranas, philosophical visions, literary creations and in many sciences of India is compared to her. Salutations to that auspicious Prakriti. नमः प्रकृत्यै भद्रायै।'

(Typed)



20. कालिदास के अभिनव आयाम

महाकवि कालिदास के साहित्य का अध्ययन करना अपने आपको जानना है। आत्मा को पहिचानना है। कालिदास की पहिचान अपनी स्वयं की पहिचान है। मनुष्य ने परमात्मा से सम्बन्ध जोड़कर छन्द का, कविता का प्रारम्भ किया। इसीलिये सृष्टि का आरम्भ कविता से माना जाता है।

मानवता के आदि ग्रन्थ वेद हैं और वेदों की कविता प्रार्थना की कविता है। परलोक की कविता है। वेदों में प्रकृति के प्रतीकों की देवरूप में आराधना की गयी है। देवता प्रकाश का स्वरूप हैं। मानव कमजोरियों के द्योतक हैं। आदिकवि वाल्मीकि, महर्षि वेदव्यास एवं महाकवि कालिदास की कविता सीता की तरह धरती फोड़कर निकलती है-

मानुषीषु कथं वा स्यादस्य रूपस्य संभवः।
न प्रभातरलं ज्योतिरुदेति वसुधातलात्।।

(अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलम्, १.२३)

जोड़ना संस्कृत साहित्य की विशेषता है। संस्कारपूर्वक धारण की गयी अन्तरात्मा की वाणी संस्कृत सभी भाषाओं की जननी है। इसे संस्कृति से पृथक् किया ही नहीं जा सकता। संसार में कोई ऐसी दूसरी भाषा नहीं है, जो उससे श्रेष्ठ तो क्या समकक्ष तक हो। योरोपीय कविता प्रकृति पर विजय के अभियान की कविता है, जबकि संस्कृत में प्रकृति के साथ साहचर्य स्थापित करते हुए कविता जन्म लेती है-

अनाघातं पुष्पं किसलयमलूनं कररुहै-
रनाविद्धं रत्नं मधु नवमनास्वादितरसम्।
अखण्डं पुण्यानां फलमिव च तद्रूपमनघं
न जाने भोक्तारं कमिह समुपस्थास्यति विधिः।। (वही, २.१०)

महाकवि कालिदास को प्रकृति से अत्यन्त लगाव है। वे वस्तुतः प्रकृति के कवि हैं। तभी वे कहते हैं-

उद्गलितदर्भकवला मृग्यः परित्यक्तनर्तना मयूराः।
अपसृतपाण्डुपत्राः मुञ्चन्त्यश्रूणीव लताः।। (वही, ४.१२)

भारतीय संस्कृति में प्रकृति और पुरुष की परस्पर अन्योन्याश्रित प्रीति है। वे एक दूसरे के पूरक हैं। दोनों का पारस्परिक सहयोग ही वास्तव में मूल्यवान् है। समर्पण भाव का इसमें महत्त्वपूर्ण योगदान है। प्रकृति का अपना वैभव है-

क्षौमं केनचिदिन्दुपाण्डु तरुणा मांगल्यमाविष्कृतं
निष्ठयूतश्चरणोपभोगसुलभो लाक्षारसः केनचित्।
अन्येभ्यो वनदेवताकरतलैरापर्वभागोत्थितै-
दत्तान्याभरणानि तत्किंसलयोद्भेदप्रतिद्वन्द्विभिः।। (वही, ४.५)

महाकवि कालिदास ने अर्ध-नारीश्वर की कल्पना के साथ ही सामाजिकता की कल्पना की है। शब्दचरित्र खींचने की अद्भुत कला महाकवि के पास है। कालिदास गागर में सागर भरने की अपरिमित सामर्थ्य के धनी हैं। महाकवि की धारणा है कि नारी और पुरुष के सामंजस्य से ही समाज की सार्थकता सिद्ध होती है। इसीलिये उन्होंने एक ओर कामदेव के भस्म होने पर स्त्री का विलाप चित्रित किया है-

अथ सा पुनरेव विह्वला वसुधालिङ्गनधूसरस्तनी।
विललाप विकीर्णमूर्धजा समदुःखामिव कुर्वती स्थलीम्।।
(कुमारसंभवम्, ४.४)

तो दूसरी ओर इन्दुमती की मृत्यु पर अज का विलाप व्यक्त किया है-

स्रगियं यदि जीवितापहा हृदये किं निहिता न हन्ति माम्।
विषमप्यमृतं क्वचिद् भवेदममृतं वा विषमीश्वरेच्छया।।
(रघुवंशम्, ८.४६)

स्वर्ग और धरती के सामंजस्य में महाकवि कालिदास का अपना और भी विशेष योगदान है। पद-लालित्य, उपमा, शब्द-योजना में पारंगत महाकवि कालिदास शृंगार के सर्वश्रेष्ठ कवि हैं, सौन्दर्य के अन्यतम कवि हैं। उनकी धारणा है, स्वर्ग के सौन्दर्य को धरती पर उतरना होगा, जिस प्रकार मेनका को धरती पर आना पड़ा। जैसे राजा दुष्यन्त गये थे, महाराजा दशरथ गये थे-

सख्युस्ते स किल शतक्रतोरवध्यस्तस्य त्वं रणशिरसि स्मृतो निहन्ता।
उच्छेत्तुं प्रभवति यन्न सप्तसप्तस्तत्रैशं तिमिरपाकरोति चन्द्रः।।

(अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलम्, ६.३०)

आज साहित्यिक क्षितिज पर यह अनुभव किया जा रहा है कि साहित्य, आकाश में उड़ने वाला राजहंस न होकर जीवन का यथार्थ है। अतः साहित्यकार मानव-मूल्यों का संवाहक ही नहीं, निर्माता भी है। महाकवि कालिदास मानव-जीवन को साहित्य में मूर्त रूप देने के पक्षधर भी हैं और रचनाकार भी। उन्होंने मानव-जीवन की समग्रता को साहित्य में चित्रित ही नहीं किया अपितु साहित्य का लक्ष्य मानवता के कल्याण के रूप में निर्धारित भी

किया। महाकवि ने सारस्वत का उत्कर्ष और मानवता का कल्याण सामाजिक, साहित्यिक एवं सांस्कृतिक कल्याण में सन्निहित माना है। अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलम् में वे कहते हैं-

प्राणानमनिलेन वृत्तिरुचिता सत्कल्पवृक्षे वने
तोये काञ्चनपद्मरेणुकपिशे पुण्याभिषेकक्रिया।
ध्यानं रत्नशिलातलेषु विबुधस्त्रीसन्निधौ संयमो
यत्काङ्क्षन्ति तपोभिरन्यमुनयस्तस्मिंस्तपस्यन्त्यमी।। (वही, ७.१२)

महाकवि कालिदास की कविता सौन्दर्य की कविता है, लोकमंगल की कविता है। लोकानुरंजन की प्राणमयी रसधारा है। धर्म की प्रतिष्ठा को लेकर वह शाश्वत संजीवनी है। महाकवि की धारणा के अनुसार निरासक्त होकर सुख को भोगना ही धर्म है। वास्तव में महाकवि कालिदास के साहित्य का लक्ष्य भौतिकता को तपस्या की ओर ले जाना है। महाकवि की उमा वरप्राप्ति के लिये वन में तप करने जाती है। सन्तान प्राप्ति के लिये सपत्नीक राजा दिलीप गुरु के निर्देशानुसार वन-वन विचरण करते हुए एक वर्ष तक तपस्या करते हैं।

साहित्य और इतिहास का एक दूसरे से घनिष्ठ सम्बन्ध है। दोनों एक-दूसरे के प्रतीक भी हैं और पूरक भी। घटनाओं और तिथियों को समाहित कर लिया जाय तो साहित्य को इतिहास माना जा सकता है और घटनाओं तथा तिथियों से पृथक् कर इतिहास में लोकमंगल की भावना को सन्निहित कर दिया जाय तो उसे साहित्य कहा जा सकता है। मेघदूत में प्रतीकों के माध्यम से महाकवि कालिदास ने भारतवर्ष का साक्षात्कार कराया है। कालिदास वास्तव में देश का ऐसा इतिहास चाहते हैं जिसमें सत् की अस्मिता हो, चेतना हो।

महाकवि कालिदास सम्पूर्ण भारतीय संस्कृत वाङ्मय के प्रतीक हैं। सम्पूर्ण मानव-जीवन की चेतना से सम्बद्ध हैं। यह मानव उत्कर्ष की वाणी है। प्राणी मात्र के कल्याण के लिये तपस्या की भाषा है। इसीलिये महाकवि ने शान्ति के लक्ष्य को प्राप्त करने की तपस्या को मानव जीवन की सार्थकता के लिये आवश्यक माना है।

सत्य तो यह है कि भारत राष्ट्र की एकता और अखण्डता का तेज जिन प्राचीन महाकवियों ने विकसित किया है उनमें महाकवि कालिदास का नाम सबसे अधिक प्रसिद्ध है। कालिदास की तुलना आदिकवि वाल्मीकि से करें तो अतिशयोक्ति न होगी। वह भारत के शेक्सपीयर तो हैं ही।

महाकवि शान्ति को अखण्ड मानते हैं जो अखण्ड ही अभिव्यक्त होती है। शान्ति की अखण्ड साधना वही राष्ट्र कर सकता है जिस राष्ट्र में सुव्यवस्था हो, समाज को नेतृत्व

देने वाला पौरुष हो। गुणवान्, वीर्यवान्, संघर्षशील, पराक्रमी व्यक्ति हों, राक्षस और देवता प्रकम्पित हो जायें, ऐसा पराक्रम हो। महाकवि स्वर्ग को धरती पर लाने की कल्पना करते हैं। वे कहते हैं-

प्रवर्ततां प्रकृतिहिताय पार्थिवःसरस्वती श्रुतिमहती महीयताम्।
ममापि च क्षपयतु नीललोहितःपुनर्भवं परिगतशक्तिरात्मभूः।।

(वही, ७.३५)

महाकवि कालिदास ने अरण्य-संस्कृति के प्राकृतिक अंचलों का जितनी भव्यता के साथ वर्णन किया है शहरी वातावरण का भी उतनी ही कुशलता के साथ चित्रण किया है। कवि ने दोनों ही संस्कृतियों के तुलनात्मक प्रस्तुतीकरण में वन के प्राकृतिक अंचलों की श्रेष्ठता सिद्ध की है।

अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलम् में महाकवि कालिदास ने शकुन्तला का राजा दुष्यन्त से मिलन आश्रम के वातावरण में कराया है, जबकि शकुन्तला के सौन्दर्य से आकर्षित होने वाला दुष्यन्त प्रकृति के रमणीय अंचल में मिलन के लिये लालायित है और प्रेम के माधुर्य से ओत-प्रोत राजा दुष्यन्त शकुन्तला के साथ गान्धर्व विवाह तक कर लेते हैं। महाकवि ने शकुन्तला के रूप में भारतीय नारी के शाश्वत स्वरूप को चित्रित करते हुए उसके स्वाभाविक सौन्दर्य का प्रकृति के उपमानों के माध्यम से चित्रण किया है। यथा-

सरसिजमनुविद्धं शैवलेनापि रम्यं मलिनमपि हिमांशोर्लक्ष्म लक्ष्मीं तनोति।
इयमिधकमनोज्ञा वल्कलेनापि तन्वी किमिव हि मधुराणां मण्डनं नाकृतीनाम्।।

(वही, १.१८)

अधरः किसलयरागः कोमलविटपानुकारिणौ बाहू।

कुसुममिव लोभनीयं यौवनमङ्गेषु सन्नद्धम्।। (वही, १.१९)

नागरिक वातावरण में कृत्रिमता अधिक होती है। राजा दुष्यन्त अपनी प्रियतमा शकुन्तला को पहचानने से इन्कार कर देता है। महाकवि ने इस वर्णन के माध्यम से यह सिद्ध करने का प्रयास किया है कि प्रकृति के अंचल में सहयोग है, मिलन है, आनन्द है। आश्रम के वातावरण में प्रवेश करते समय दुष्यन्त राजकीय वस्त्रों का त्याग कर सामान्य वेध धारण कर के जाता है। वह कहता है, तपोवन में विनय के साथ ही प्रवेश करना चाहिये। आश्रम के मृगों पर बाण चलाते समय उसके मन में यह आता है कि कुसुम के समान कोमल शरीर वाले मृगछौनों पर अग्निगर्भ बाण का संधान उचित नहीं। अर्थात् आश्रम के वातावरण में दया का भाव स्वाभाविक रूप से उदित होता है।

वही दुष्यन्त है, वही शकुन्तला है। जब शकुन्तला महर्षि कण्व के शिष्यों के साथ नगर के वातावरण में प्रवेश करती है तो शिष्यों को वहाँ का वातावरण कपटमय लगता है। उन्हें ऐसा लगता है मानो वहाँ कृत्रिमता की अग्नि में जो दाहक शक्ति है वह उन्हें दग्ध कर देगी। वे कहते हैं-

महाभागः कामं नरपतिरभिन्नस्थितिरहो
न कश्चिद् वर्णानामपथमपकृष्टोऽपि भजते।
तथापीदं शश्वत् परिचितविविक्तेन मनसा
जनाकीर्णं मन्ये हुतवहपरीतं गृहमिव।। (वही, ५.१०)

वहीं राजा दुष्यन्त शकुन्तला को पहचानने से इन्कार कर देता है, यही नहीं उसका अपमान भी करता है। यद्यपि महाकवि कालिदास ने इस दोष का निराकरण ऋषि दुर्वासा के शाप का अवतरण करते हुए करने का प्रयास किया है किन्तु सत्य तो यही है कि वह कृत्रिमता के वातावरण का प्रभाव था।

शकुन्तला के साथ राजा का व्यवहार ऋषि दुर्वासा के शाप के कारण क्षम्य माना जा सकता है, किन्तु रानी वसुमती के साथ जो व्यवहार राजा दुष्यन्त ने किया है, वह भी तो इसी श्रेणी में आता है। अतः इसे राजभवन के कृत्रिम वातावरण का प्रभाव ही माना जा सकता है।

शकुन्तला का सात्त्विक मन इस प्रकार के व्यवहार से आहत होता है। मर्माहत होकर वह केवल यही कहती है-

आजन्मनः शाठ्यमशिक्षितो यस्तस्याप्रमाणं वचनं जनस्य।

परातिसंधानमधीयते यैर्विद्येति ते सन्तु किलाप्तवाचः।। (वही, ५.२५)

महाकवि ने पुनर्मिलन के लिये जो आश्रम का वातावरण चुना, जिसमें सिंह-शिशु के दाँत गिनते हुए दुष्यन्त पुत्र सर्वदमन को दिखाया गया है, प्राकृतिक सौन्दर्य के सम्मोहन को यहाँ भी विस्मृत नहीं किया गया।

महाकवि कालिदास ने समाज को नेतृत्व देने वाले पौरुष की आवश्यकता प्रतिपादित की है, राक्षसों और देवताओं को प्रकम्पित कर देने वाले पराक्रमी, संघर्षशील एवं वीर्यवान् व्यक्तियों को समाज की सरंचना में तेजस्विता को विकसित करने के लिये आवश्यक माना जाता है। वहीं उन्होंने नारियों के सौन्दर्य का वर्णन करते हुए उनकी ओजस्वी भाव-भंगिमा को महत्त्वपूर्ण माना है एवं भारतीयता का तेजस्वी स्वरूप उनमें अंकित करने का प्रयास किया है। सौन्दर्य के निम्न उदाहरण द्रष्टव्य हैं-

अस्याः सर्गविधौ प्रजापतिरभूच्चन्द्रो नु कान्तिप्रदः
श्रृंगारैकरसः स्वयं नु मदनो मासो नु पुष्पाकरः।
वेदाभ्यासजडः कथं नु विषयव्यावृत्तकौतूहलो
निर्मातुं प्रभवेन्मनोहरमिदं रूपं पुराणो मुनिः॥

(विक्रमोर्वशीयम्, १.८)

संचारिणी दीपशिखेव रात्रौ यं यं व्यतीयाय पतिंवरा सा।

नरेन्द्रमार्गाट्ट इव प्रपेदे विवर्णभावं स स भूमिपालः॥

(रघुवंशम्, ६.६७)

महाकवि ने सीता को अपने प्रति श्रीराम की आज्ञाकारिणी, उनकी वशवर्तिनी एवं अनुरूप मर्यादा का पालन करते हुये कोमलांगिनी नारी के रूप में ही चित्रित किया है, किन्तु अग्नि-परीक्षा देकर अपनी शुद्धता प्रमाणित करने के पश्चात् भी जब सीता को लोकापवाद के भय से श्रीराम वनवास देते हैं तो वनवास छोड़ने वाले लक्ष्मण को उत्तर देते समय सीता का तेजस्वी स्वरूप दर्शनीय है। वह कहती है -

वाच्यस्त्वया मद्द्वचनात्स राजा वह्नौ विशुद्धामपि यत्समक्षम्।

मां लोकवादश्रवणादहासीः श्रुतस्य किं तत्सदृशं कुलस्य॥

(वही, १४.६१)

महाकवि कालिदास के पात्रों में नारियों का तेजस्वी स्वरूप है। वे वास्तव में समाज को आलोकित करने वाली ज्ञान की दीपशिखाएँ हैं जिनकी उज्ज्वल छवि युग-युग तक श्रद्धा, प्रेम और पूजा के आचरण का निर्माण करती है।

कालिदास के नारी पात्रों में चाहे शकुन्तला हो, उमा हो, सीता हो, अरुन्धती हो, सुदक्षिणा हो अथवा इन्दुमती हो या उर्वशी हो सभी में भारतीय नारियों का आदर्श है, नारीत्व का तेज है, सौन्दर्य है, गौरव का आभास है, अस्तित्व की सजगता है। इस प्रकार समाज के लिये वे आलोक-स्तम्भ के समान जीती-जागती मूर्तियाँ हैं।

कालिदास ने भारतीय संस्कृति के चार पुरुषार्थ धर्म, अर्थ, काम और मोक्ष का यथास्थान महत्त्व प्रतिपादित किया है, किन्तु इसके साथ ही वे एक सुव्यवस्थित समाज की संरचना के पक्षधर थे। वे चाहते थे कि समाज में शिक्षा अनिवार्य हो कि ताकि समाज का प्रत्येक शिशु पढ़े-लिखे। विद्या का अभ्यास करे। ब्रह्मचर्य आश्रम की तपस्या का आचरण अपनाते हुए धर्म का पुरुषार्थ अर्जित करे।

युवकों के सम्बन्ध में कालिदास की धारणा है कि वे पराक्रमी हों, संघर्षशील हों, सुखी हों, स्वस्थ एवं ज्ञानवान् हों। वे धर्मपूर्वक काम एवं सुखों का भोग करते हुये शीलवान् सिद्ध हों। गृहस्थाश्रम की मर्यादाओं का पालन करें। प्रौढ़ावस्था में संयम-धारण करते हुए निःस्पृह भाव से जीवन व्यतीत करने का अभ्यास प्राणियों में आये। वृद्धावस्था में ऋषि-मुनियों की वृत्ति को आत्मसात् करते हुये मोक्ष की साधना में दत्तचित्त हों। यथा-

शैशवेऽभ्यस्तविद्यानां यौवने विषयैषिणाम्।

वार्धके मुनिवृत्तीनां योगेनान्ते तनुत्यजाम्॥ (वही, १.८)

इस तरह कालिदास के काव्य के कई अभिनव आयाम हैं; उन्हें उद्घाटित करने वाली काव्य-रसिका दृष्टि चाहिये।

(महाकवि कालिदासः एक अनुशीलन; संपादक- डॉ. देव कोठारी, साहित्य संस्थान, राजस्थान विद्यापीठ, उदयपुर, राजस्थान, मार्च १९८९)



21. कवि प्रतिभा

संस्कृत के आचार्यों ने काव्य-निर्माण के हेतु पर विचार करते हुए प्रतिभा का स्वरूप-निरूपण किया है। भारतीय दर्शनिक भी प्रतिभातत्त्व की स्वीकृति किसी न किसी रूप में अवश्य मानते हैं। कवि-प्रतिभा पर विचार करने के पूर्व प्रतिभा के सम्बन्ध में दार्शनिक चिन्तन-मनन का उल्लेख अनावश्यक न होगा।

विशदता, समन्वयदृष्टि और व्यापकता प्रतिभा के बाह्य लक्षण हैं। न्यायमञ्जरी का लेखक जयन्तभट्ट योगी की विशेषता बताते हुए कहता है कि वे एक साथ, सर्वत्र, सभी अर्थों का प्रत्यक्ष कर लेते हैं। योगी की बुद्धि या प्रतिभा का यह एक असाधारण सामर्थ्य है। जिस वस्तु का इतर प्रमाण जैसे कि प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान शब्द आदि द्वारा ज्ञान सम्भव नहीं है उसका साक्षात्कार प्रतिभा का फल है। इसीलिये वाक्यपदीय के लेखक भर्तृहरि सभी प्रमाणों से प्रतिभा को अधिक समर्थ मानते हैं-प्रमाणेभ्योऽपि सामर्थ्यातिशयं प्रतिभायाः।

इनके टीकाकार हेलाराज ने प्रतिभा की संस्तुति करते हुए लिखा है कि प्रतिभा के साम्मुख्य से सौन्दर्य की भावना हृदय में जागृत होती है, मन गरिमा से प्रकाशित हो उठता है और एक ऐसे आस्वाद का आनन्द मिलता है जिसका विषयों से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं होता। इस प्रकार प्रतिभा का धाम सौन्दर्य, महिमा और आनन्द से ऊर्जित है।

वैयाकरण-दार्शनिकों के प्रतिभा-सम्बन्धी इस सिद्धान्त पर काश्मीर के शैवदर्शन का प्रभाव है। शैव दार्शनिक प्रतिभा को अक्रम, अनन्त एवं चेतन परमतत्त्व शिव का ही स्वरूप मानते हैं-

या चैषा प्रतिभा तत्तत्पदार्थक्रमरूपिता।

अक्रमानन्तचिद्रूप; प्रमाता स महेश्वरः।।

इसी प्रकार त्रिपुरारहस्य के विद्वान् (जो इसके परा तथा अपरा के रूप में दो भेद करते हैं) परा प्रतिभा को देवी के स्वरूप से भिन्न नहीं मानते -परा सा प्रतिभा देव्याः परं रूपं ममोदितम् (त्रिपुरारहस्य)। दर्शन के परतत्त्व के साथ एकात्मता यह सिद्ध करती है कि समग्र सृष्टि का मूलाधार यही प्रतिभा है।

वेदान्त में प्रतिभा शब्द का उल्लेख नहीं के बराबर है। सुरेश्वराचार्य ने अवश्य प्रतिभा ज्ञान को आर्षज्ञान कहा है और इस प्रकार वेदान्ती की दृष्टि में मुमुक्षु ऋषि के मोक्षमार्ग का साधक ज्ञान ही प्रतिभा-प्रसूत ज्ञान है। वेदों के अनन्य भक्त मीमांसक यह मानते हैं कि जो कुछ भी अज्ञात है वह सब वेदों में है फलतः अविज्ञात को ज्ञात और अप्रत्यक्ष को प्रत्यक्ष कराने वाली प्रतिभा को मानने के वे कट्टर विरोधी हैं। बौद्ध दार्शनिक प्रतिभा के स्थान पर प्रज्ञा शब्द का प्रयोग करते हैं। प्रज्ञा इनके अनुसार वह दिव्य तथा परिशुद्ध चक्षु है जिससे निर्मल दर्पण में बिम्बित वस्तु की भाँति, समस्त संसार को देखा जा सकता है -

ततस्तेन स्वदिव्येन परिशुद्धेन चक्षुषा।

ददर्श निखिलं लोकमादर्श इव निर्मले।।

जैन दार्शनिकों ने प्रज्ञा (Intuition) के अनेक भेद किये हैं- अवधिज्ञान, मनः पर्याय तथा केवलज्ञान अथवा केवलदर्शन आदि अनेक नाम और भेदों से जैन दार्शनिकों ने आज के मनोवैज्ञानिक की भाँति, ज्ञानकी अनन्तता तथा सूक्ष्मता का अध्ययन किया था। इनमें से केवलदर्शन या केवलज्ञान को प्रतिभा का ही पर्यायान्तर माना जा सकता है। अतीत और अनागत समस्त वस्तुओं का एक साथ साक्षात्कार ही केवल दर्शन का स्वरूप है। वैशेषिक सूत्रकार भी वेदान्ती की भाँति प्रतिभा ज्ञान के लिये आर्षज्ञान शब्द का ही प्रयोग (वैशेषिकसूत्र, ९.२.१३) करते हैं। यह शब्द सम्भवतः सर्वप्रथम योगदर्शन के आचार्यों ने योगी के लोकोत्तर ज्ञान के लिये चलाया था। आगे चलकर, जैसा कि प्रारम्भ में सङ्केत किया था, न्यायमञ्जरी का लेखक भी इसे सहसा स्फुरित होने वाले योगी के प्रतिभा ज्ञान के लिये ही पर्याय मानने लगा था। अस्तु, दार्शनिकों के इस विवेचन से इतना तो स्पष्ट है कि प्रतिभा वह प्रज्ञा है जिससे अतीत और भविष्यत् वस्तुओं का एक साथ विशदता के साथ साक्षात्कार

किया जा सकता है। इस प्रकार का प्रत्यक्ष किसी दूसरे प्रमाण के माध्यम से सम्भव नहीं है। अतः प्रतिभा को एक अतिरिक्त तथा अधिक समर्थ प्रमाण अथवा ज्ञान का हेतु मानना आवश्यक भी है और तर्कसंगत भी।

महाभारत में अनेकत्र प्रतिभा का प्रयोग प्राप्त है, प्रायः उसी अर्थ में जिस अर्थ में योगाचार्यों ने इसका स्वरूप निरूपण किया था। कादम्बरीकार महाकवि बाणभट्ट ने दिव्य चक्षु का जो वर्णन किया है उसे हम प्रतिभा का ही स्वरूप समझ सकते हैं। कादम्बरी से दो उद्धरण यहाँ उल्लेखनीय हैं-

१. अनवरततपःक्षपितमलानां करतलामलकवदखिलं जगदालोकयतां दिव्येन चक्षुषा।

२. स हि भगवान् कालत्रयदर्शी तपःप्रभावाद् दिव्येन चक्षुषा।

दिव्यचक्षु की तपस्या से प्राप्ति तथा तीनों काल और समस्त संसार को प्रत्यक्ष कर सकने की क्षमता प्रतिभा की ही व्याख्या है। केवल तपस्या से ही नहीं अपितु भगवान् के अनुग्रह से ही उस दिव्यचक्षु की प्राप्ति हो सकती है। अवश्य ही, अर्जुन जैसा अधिकारी होना चाहिये जो भगवान् कृष्ण द्वारा प्रदत्त दिव्य चक्षु से ईश्वरीय योग और उसमें समाहित अनेकरूप संसार को एक साथ देख सके -

दिव्यं ददामि ते चक्षुः पश्य मे योगमैश्वरम्।

तत्रैकस्थं जगत् कृत्स्नं प्रविभक्तमनेकधा।। (भगवद्गीता)

प्रतिभा का वरदान पाने के लिये तप, योग तथा ईश्वरीय अनुग्रह की आवश्यकता की चर्चा भारतीय चिन्तनधारा की स्वाभाविकता है। इसी तथ्य को आधुनिक शब्दावली में अंग्रेजी की निम्नलिखित परिभाषाएँ व्यक्त करती हैं-

- Genius is one percent inspiration and ninety nine percent perspiration.
- Gift, like genius, I often think means only an infinite capacity for taking pains.

संस्कृत के साहित्य समीक्षकों ने प्रतिभा के लिये शक्ति शब्द का भी पर्याय के रूप में प्रयोग किया है। इसी प्रतिभा-शक्ति को रुद्रट, वामन तथा जगन्नाथ आदि आचार्य काव्य-प्रणयन का एकमात्र हेतु मानते हैं, दूसरे आचार्य जैसे कि दण्डी मम्मट, वाग्भट तथा जयदेव प्रतिभा को प्रमुख हेतु तो अवश्य मानते हैं पर व्युत्पत्ति और अभ्यास को भी काव्यनिर्माण के लिये आवश्यक समझते हैं। रुद्रट ने प्रतिभा या शक्ति का स्वरूप एकाग्र चित्त में शब्द तथा

अर्थ की स्फुरता माना है। यह नैसर्गिक भी हो सकती है और उत्पाद्य भी। यहाँ यह उल्लेखनीय है कि रुद्रट, दार्शनिकों की भाँति, तपस्या, साधना या व्युत्पत्ति की अपेक्षा केवल दूसरी कोटि की प्रतिभा के लिये ही मानते हैं। शक्ति-सम्बन्धी इसी स्वरूप का शब्दान्तर में उपस्थापन आचार्य जगन्नाथ ने किया है जिनके अनुसार कवि-प्रतिभा काव्यनिर्माण के अनुकूल शब्दार्थ की उपस्थिति है - **काव्यं घटनानुकूलशब्दार्थोपस्थितिः।** कविप्रतिभा का यह निरूपण उसके अभिव्यक्ति-पक्ष या बाह्य स्वरूप को लेकर है। काश्मीर के भट्ट तौत ने प्रतिभा उस प्रज्ञा को माना है जो नित नवीन उन्मेष करती है- **प्रज्ञा नवनवोन्मेषशालिनी प्रतिभा मता।**

लक्षण की दृष्टि से भट्ट तौत की यह परिभाषा जगन्नाथ की परिभाषा से अधिक समीचीन प्रतीत होती है क्योंकि इसमें प्रतिभा के अन्तःस्वरूप का निर्देश है। कतिपय आलंकारिक जैसे कि वामन, मम्मट और उनके टीकाकार नागेशभट्ट कविशक्ति की परिभाषा केवल संस्कार विशेष (वामन, मम्मट) तथा विलक्षण अदृष्ट (नागेश) कह कर देते हैं। इस परिभाषा से भले ही प्रतिभा क्या है- यह न मालूम हो सके किन्तु उसकी स्थिति में पूर्वजन्म के संस्कार या वासना का हाथ रहता है, यह अवश्य प्रतिपादित होता है। इस अदृष्ट को पाने के लिये नागेश देवता की आराधना को हेतु मानते हैं। यह गीता के उसी सिद्धान्त की पुनरुक्ति है जिसमें भगवान् के अनुग्रह से दिव्यचक्षु की प्राप्ति बताई गई थी जिसे आगे चलकर भक्त-कवि तुलसी ने भी दुहराया है- **सुमिरत दिव्य दृष्टि हिय होती।**

काव्यमीमांसा के लेखक राजशेखर के अनुसार जो प्रतिभा और शक्ति को पर्याय नहीं मानते, समाहित या एकाग्रचित्त द्वारा जो आन्तर प्रयत्न है और अभ्यास द्वारा जो बाह्य है, शक्ति का उद्भास होता है। यही शक्ति काव्य का एकमात्र हेतु है। शक्ति-सम्पन्न कवि में ही प्रतिभा और व्युत्पत्ति संभव है। शब्दार्थ-समूह, अलंकार और उक्ति को प्रतिभा ही हृदय में प्रतिभासित करती है। प्रतिभाहीन कवि के लिये सारे पदार्थ परोक्ष जैसे और प्रतिभाशील को न देखने पर भी प्रत्यक्ष जैसे दीखते हैं। राजशेखर के अनुसार प्रतिभा का यही स्वरूप और कार्य है। हमारे यहाँ के साहित्य-समीक्षकों ने लेखक के साथ पाठक, कवि के साथ सहृदय, नाटककार के साथ दर्शक का भी काव्य की दृष्टि से महत्त्व आँका था। प्रतिभाशील कवि का काम (काव्य) भी निरर्थक ही रहे यदि पाठक (भावक) के पास प्रतिभा न हो। काव्य-निर्माण के लिये जिस प्रतिभा की अपेक्षा है वह कारयित्री और उसे समझने के लिए जो प्रतिभा आवश्यक है वह भावयित्री है।

इस प्रकार कवि-प्रतिभा निर्माण करती है और भावक की प्रतिभा उसे समझती है और सार्थक बनाती है। संस्कृत के एक कवि का कहना है कि भले ही विधाता सैकड़ों पाप उसके माथे मढ़ दे पर अरसिक व्यक्ति को काव्य सुनाना भाग्य में न लिखे-

**इतरपापशतानि यथेच्छया विलिखितानि सहे चतुरानन।
अरसिकेषु कवित्वनिवेदनं शिरसि मा लिख मा लिख मा लिख।।**

ध्वनिसिद्धान्त के प्रवर्तक आचार्य आनन्दवर्धन ने कवि-प्रतिभा को ही ध्वनिकाव्य का निकष माना है। प्रतिभा का गुण न रहने पर कवि को कोई वस्तु नहीं दिखाई पड़ेगी। प्रतिभा ही एक ऐसी शक्ति है जिसका पारस-स्पर्श पाकर वसन्त में वृक्षों की भाँति, पुरातन अर्थ भी नवीनश्री धारण कर लेते हैं।

साहित्य-समीक्षा के अन्य आचार्यों ने भी (जैसे कि कुन्तक और रुय्यक) यह बात स्पष्ट कर दी थी कि इतिवृत्त या वस्तु के वर्णन में काव्य का अधिवास नहीं रहता है। कवि-प्रतिभा का जहाँ उल्लेख या उल्लास नहीं है उसे हम काव्य नहीं कह सकते और चाहे जो भी कहें। रुय्यक ने अलंकारत्व का आधार ही कवि-प्रतिभा को माना है। उनकी दृष्टि से अलंकार शब्द और अर्थ पर आश्रित हैं, उसी शब्दार्थ की विच्छिन्ति जिसे जयरथ के शब्दों में वाच्यवाचक-रामणीयक कह सकते हैं, अलंकार है। इस विच्छिन्ति की सृष्टि कवि-प्रतिभा के उल्लास से ही होती है। कवि-प्रतिभा का, जिसे कवि-कौशल या कवि-व्यापार भी कह सकते हैं, पारसस्पर्श पाकर शब्दार्थ में सौन्दर्य की अनुभूति होती है। कवि-प्रतिभाकृत वैचित्र्य विच्छिन्ति, चित्रता या चारुता का जहाँ अभाव होता है वहाँ अलंकार नहीं माना जा सकता। कालिदास की कविता में लौकिक और शास्त्रीय ज्ञान की कितनी भी कमी क्यों न हो पर उनकी प्रतिभा के सौन्दर्य में वह छिप ही नहीं जाती अपितु कदाचित् सुन्दर ही दिखाई देती है। संस्कृत के सर्वतोमान्य साहित्य-समीक्षक आचार्य आनन्दवर्धन का तभी तो कहना है-

अव्युत्पत्तिकृतो दोषः शक्त्या संत्रियते कवेः।

यस्त्वशक्तिकृतस्तस्य स झटित्यवभासते।।

कविप्रतिभा से अव्युत्पत्ति को दोष छिप जाता है पर प्रतिभा के अभाव का दोष तुरन्त खटकने लगता है।

अस्तु, कवि-प्रतिभा एक दिव्यदृष्टि है जिससे कवि ऋषि की भाँति अतीत और अनागत का प्रत्यक्ष कर लेता है। पर प्रत्यक्ष ही क्यों कवि, वेधा की भाँति निर्माण भी तो करता है। अतः प्रतिभा दिव्यदृष्टि भी है और सृष्टि भी। सृष्टि भी ऐसी जो चिरनवीन है और चिरसुन्दर जिसके सौन्दर्य की आभा में कविता के समस्त दोष छिप जाते हैं।

(टङ्कित)



22. साहित्य में शब्द का सन्धान

शास्त्रकार विचार (अर्थ) का सन्धान करता है, चित्रकार रंग का तो साहित्यकार शब्द का। पोलोनियस राजकुमार के हाथ में पुस्तक देकर पूछता है: क्या पढ़ रहे हो? हैमलेट का उत्तर है: Words, Words, Words मीमांसक कहता है कि वेद अपौरुषेय है क्योंकि उसकी आस्था शब्द की नित्यता पर है, मन्त्रों को अनर्थक (सर्वे मन्त्रा अनर्थकाः) मानने में उसे परेशानी नहीं होती। शब्द की नित्यता और ब्रह्मरूपता का और इसके विपरीत अर्थ की अनित्यता तथा विवर्तात्मिकता की विवेचना^१ ही भर्तृहरि के व्याकरणदर्शन का परम प्रयोजन है। संस्कृति का लगाव शब्द से अधिक होता है, यही कारण है कि वेदों के कितने भी अनुवाद हो जायें, अर्थ उन अनुवादों में पूर्णतः सुरक्षित कर लिया जाये पर संस्कारी चेतना शब्द को नहीं छोड़ना चाहती, वह शब्दात्मा मन्त्र सुनना चाहती है, उसी से परितृप्ति पाती है। अर्थ की मानो उसे परवाह ही नहीं। भारतीय प्रज्ञा एवं संस्कृति के अर्थ अनेक नहीं हैं। पर शब्द प्रत्येक प्रादेशिक भाषा में अपने-अपने हैं, हर भाषा-भाषी एक ही रामायण को अपनी-अपनी बोली में सुनना चाहता है। यही उसकी शब्द के प्रति सहज रागवृत्ति है। धर्म की एकता बँगला देश को पाकिस्तानी के साथ नहीं रख सकी। राजनैतिक विचारधारा और समाजव्यवस्था का अन्तर उतना मर्मस्पर्शी सिद्ध नहीं हुआ जितना कि बँगला देश की अस्वीकृति। धर्म से भी अधिक लगाव शब्द से होता है। शब्दों (जैसा कि वेदों) को सुरक्षित रख लेने पर धर्म रह जाता है, पर शब्दों के चले जाने पर सर्वस्व जाने का भय रहता है।

पण्डितराज जगन्नाथ शब्द की काव्यता का प्रतिपादन करते हुए कहते हैं कि विश्वजनीन व्यवहार (काव्य जोर से पढ़ा जाता है, काव्य से अर्थ समझते हैं, काव्य सुन लिया अर्थ नहीं जाना आदि) शब्द विशेष को ही काव्यरूप में प्रतिष्ठित करता है। शब्दार्थ युगल में काव्य शब्द की शक्ति नहीं है, दोनों में मानने पर हम इस तार्किक ग्रन्थि को नहीं सुलझा पायेंगे कि काव्य एक है, शब्दार्थ दो हैं फिर एक दो कैसे हुए? और यदि शब्द और अर्थ दोनों में से प्रत्येक में काव्यत्व स्वीकार कर लिया हो एक ही पद्य में दो काव्यों का व्यवहार होगा। पण्डितराज का तर्क अर्थ की विशेषता और शब्द की विशेषता को स्वीकार करके चला है, अतः उनके प्रतिपादन की सीमाएँ अवश्य हैं पर साहित्य के सर्वोत्कृष्ट रूप कविता को आज भी अनुवाद न मानना उनकी शब्दमूलक आस्था को पुष्ट अवश्य करता है।

यूरोप के कई देशों की राजनैतिक, आर्थिक, सैन्य-सामाजिक तथा धार्मिक संघटना कमोबेश एक है पर अर्थ की एकता होने पर भी फ्रांसीसी अपनी भाषा के स्थान पर अंग्रेजी नहीं अपनायेगा और आयरलैण्ड के लोग विद्रोह पर आमदा रहेंगे। अर्थों से अधिक

शब्दों पर आस्था का यह संस्कृतिमूलक व्यवहार है। इसी से स्पष्ट होता है कि शताब्दियों तक विश्व के कोनों में फैली यहूदी प्रतिभा इजरायल के निर्माण के साथ ही उसे अपना सांस्कृतिक वेश प्रदान करने के लिये अत्यन्त प्राचीन धरोहर हिब्रू को राष्ट्र भाषा मानने से न चूकी।

लॉजिनस ने कहा था कि उत्कृष्ट शब्द-व्यापार ही प्रतिभा का मानदण्ड है। हैरल्ड ऑसर्वोन कहता है कि अनुभव तभी साहित्य बनता है जबकि वह शब्दायित हो, अन्यथा वह उपादान भर है। साहित्य-कला का जन्म शब्द-ग्रहण में होता है।^२ वैज्ञानिक अथवा शास्त्रकार शब्दों का प्रयोग तथ्य या विचार की अभिव्यक्ति के लिये करता है। उपयुक्त शब्दों का चयन वह तटस्थ और निरपेक्षवृत्ति से भावनाशून्य होकर करता है क्योंकि उसका लक्ष्य शब्द नहीं अपितु तथ्य या अर्थ है। इसके विपरीत साहित्यकार को उन शब्दों का चुनाव करना होता है जो भावुक में, रसपरक वर्णन में, चित्तवृत्ति संवाद (परकीय चित्तवृत्ति का आत्मीय चित्तवृत्ति के साथ अभेद), वस्तुपरक वर्णन में वस्तु-संवाद उत्पन्न कर सके। इस भारतीय मान्यता को आई.ए. रिचर्ड्स ने यह कहकर मान्यता प्रदान की है कि कवि का शब्द भावक होता है तथा काव्य की भाषा चतुरंगिणी होती है जिसमें शब्द का मुख्यार्थ, कवि का मनोभाव, स्वरभंगिमा तथा तात्पर्य क्रमशः सेन्स, फिलिंग, टोन तथा इन्टेन्शन के चार अंगों में समाहित रहते हैं। भट्टनायक ने क्रमशः अनिधा (जिसकी पूँछ में लक्षणा अन्तर्भूत है), भावना तथा भोजकता के माध्यम से कवि-शब्द की इस विशिष्टता को परिलक्षित किया था। भारतीय काव्यशास्त्री जिन तीन चार शब्द व्यापारों (अभिधा, लक्षणा, व्यञ्जना, तात्पर्य) की मीमांसा करता है उन सबका समन्वय मुख्यतः शब्द से है। ये सभी शब्द की वृत्तियाँ हैं, अर्थ की नहीं। शब्द ही वाचक, लक्षणीय या व्यञ्जन बनकर रमणीयता का आधार बनता है। शब्द के गहन और रहस्यमय अतीत में गोता लगाकर (auditory imagination) किस समान्यतया अर्थ से निरपेक्ष होकर शब्द का संधान करती है। इस सम्बन्ध में टी. एस. इलियट का विवेचन द्रष्टव्य है।^३ ध्वनिवादी जब धातुरूप प्रकृति प्रातिपदिक, प्रत्ययांश, वचन, विभक्ति, उपसर्ग तथा निपात आदि तक की व्यञ्जकता की प्रतिष्ठा करता है^४ तो वह वाच्यात्मक पदसमूह के शब्द से भी सूक्ष्म अवयवों तक जाकर काव्य में शब्द का ही महत्त्व प्रथमतः प्रख्यापित करता है। ग्रामीण, आंचलिक, जनजातीय शब्दों की भांगिमाओं से साहित्य की साधना इस शब्द-संधान की काव्य-प्रक्रिया का ही रूप है। इस सबको किसी वैज्ञानिक या शास्त्रकार की आवश्यकता महसूस नहीं होती क्योंकि वह शब्द का भावुक साधक नहीं है अपितु अर्थ या तथ्य का तटस्थ विश्लेषक है।

यदि कवि शब्द का संधाता है तो फिर पहला प्रश्न सहज ही उठता है कि वैयाकरण क्या करता है? भारतीय परम्परा तो उसे भी शाब्दिक (शब्दकार) कहती है, कवि या साहित्यकार को तो नहीं। इस प्रश्न का उत्तर मेरी दृष्टि में संस्कृत काव्य शास्त्र के

प्रजापति भामह ने दिया है। व्याकरण का सम्बन्ध शब्द की व्युत्पत्ति मात्र से है। सुबन्त, तिङन्त की साधना या निर्दोषता वैयाकरण के लिये पर्याप्त है। शुष्को वृक्षस्तिष्ठत्यग्रे तथा नीरसतरुरिह विलसति पुरतः। ये दोनों समानार्थक वाक्य शब्द-व्युत्पत्ति की दृष्टि से निर्दोष हैं, पर कवि को इन दोनों में महान् अन्तर प्रतीत होता है। तारुण्य और तरुणिमा दोनों एकार्थक हैं, दोनों में केवल प्रत्यय का अन्तर है। दोनों ही व्युत्पत्ति की दृष्टि से शुद्ध हैं पर सधा हुआ कवि किसी एक का ही चयन करेगा। पिनाकी, कपाली दोनों शिव के पर्याय हैं स्थाणु भी। पर कब किस शब्द की विच्छित्ति उपयुक्त है इस का अनुभव कवि को है, वैयाकरण को नहीं। काव्य का यह व्याकरण सामान्य भाषा के व्याकरण से भिन्न है। इसका भेद पहिचानने के लिये भामह के अनुसार शब्द-प्रयोग में साधु वक्रवाक् कवियों तथा प्रयोग में अकुशल कवियों में भेद जानना आवश्यक है।¹⁴ निरन्तर शब्द-संधान से ही सुकवि का वाक्य पकता है।¹⁵ इस शब्द पाक के कारण ही उत्कृष्ट कवि के शब्द बदले नहीं जा सकते- पर्यायों के द्वारा भी नहीं।¹⁶ शब्द-पाक की आवश्यकता साहित्य को है, व्याकरण विज्ञान अथवा अन्य किसी शास्त्र को नहीं। उन्हें तो सही (शुद्ध) शब्द भर चाहिये जो उनके अर्थ को पका पचा सके। यह सही है कि कवि प्राचीन साहित्य-परम्परा से शब्द भंगिमाओं को, उनके कुशल प्रयोग को पहिचान पाता है। (इसीलिये आनन्दवर्धन ने महाकवि के शब्दार्थ को प्रयत्नपूर्वक प्रत्यभिज्ञान का उपदेश दिया है) पर जैसा कि इलियट ने Burnt Norton नामक कविता¹⁷ में लिखा है- शब्द थकते हैं, चरमराते हैं, टूटते रहते हैं, फिसलते, खिसकते और खत्म होते रहते हैं। अपनी-अपनी जगह ठहर नहीं पाते, थिरते नहीं क्यों? इसका उत्तर उन्होंने लिटिल गिडिंग नामक कविता में दिया है (पंक्तियाँ १२०-२१) क्योंकि पिछले साल के शब्दों का वास्ता पिछले साल की भाषा से है। और नये साल के शब्दों को नयी आवाज की प्रतीक्षा है। इस तरह कवि को तलाश बनी रहती है नये शब्दों की। अर्जुन की तरह महाकवि की प्रतिभा को सारे शब्द-भण्डार में एक शब्द दीखता है। दूसरे पाण्डवों की तरह उसे चिड़िया के सारे अंग नहीं दिखते- सारे पर्याय बेकार हैं। केवल एक शब्द चाहिये जो सटीक कह पाय। यदि वह संधान नहीं है तो वह शब्द न तो फूहड़ (ग्राम्य) है न वक्र, न सरल है और न श्लिष्ट। वह तो मात्र उपयुक्त काव्य-शब्द है जिसे किसी ने वक्रोक्ति कहकर पुकारा, दूसरों ने रीति, उचित, अलंकार, ध्वनि और न जाने क्या क्या कहकर। पर सच यह है कि ग्राम्यता और पाण्डित्य से दूर साहित्यिक शब्द शास्त्रीयता के बन्धन को तोड़कर ही अपने स्वरूप की उपलब्धि करा पाता है। अन्यथा रसवाद और ध्वनिवाद की प्रतिष्ठा के बाद संस्कृत में तीसरी कोटि की श्रांगारिक कविता की भरमार नहीं होती। और न शब्दों से लड़कपन करने की प्रवृत्ति भड़कती। जैसा कि अनुप्रास, यमक के व्यायाम से परे परवर्ती संस्कृत काव्य में दिखाई देता है। काव्य शब्द का संधान बोझिल,

चमत्कारी, नानार्थक, अक्षरबन्ध का प्रयासपूर्वक विन्यास नहीं है। अपितु सहज, स्फूर्त एवं प्रातिभ एवं विकल नहीं किन्तु सकल शब्द का दर्शन तथा चयन है। ध्वनिकार ने कुशल शब्द-प्रयोग (अलंकार) को इसलिये अप्रथायत्ननिर्वर्त्य कहा है अर्थात् कवि उसके प्रयोग में अलग से प्रयत्न नहीं करता, शब्द स्वयंसिद्ध होकर अवतीर्ण होता है। इस प्रकार काव्य में शब्द की साधना निश्चित शब्दालंकार की योजना नहीं है।

दण्डी और पण्डितराज जगन्नाथ ने शब्द को काव्य अवश्य माना है। पर भामह, मम्मट आदि आचार्यों ने साहित्य की परिकल्पना शब्द तथा अर्थ के सहभाव में ही की है। उन्हीं का बहुमत है। इस परिकल्पना और बहुमत का एक रहस्य है। संस्कृत के अधिकांश काव्यशास्त्री कश्मीर के हैं जहाँ शिव तथा शक्ति के सामरस्य का दर्शन प्रतिष्ठित था। इसलिये उन्हें दोनों को मानकर चलना था। शिव शक्त्यात्मा और शक्ति शिवात्मा है। शिव का शक्ति से नित्य अविनाभाव है। तो एक ही कहने से दार्शनिक दृष्टि से कोई हानि नहीं है। पर परम्परा चली तो चलती रही। हाँ, सत्रहवीं शती के काव्यदर्पण के प्रणेता राजचूड़ामणि दीक्षित ने शब्द तथा अर्थ दोनों को मिलाकर काव्य का घटक मानने वाले लक्षण के सम्बन्ध में एक महत्त्वपूर्ण टिप्पणी की है- काव्य कहलाने के लिये अधिक महत्त्व शब्द का ही होता है। इसी को ध्वनित करने के लिये (काव्य लक्षण में) शब्द पद का ही पहले उपादान किया जाता है।¹⁸

आज के तान्त्रिक युग में यातायात एवं संचार के द्रुत साधनों का बहुत विस्तार हुआ है। प्रचार के लिये सभी पक्षों को इतने सशक्त साधन प्राचीन युगों में कभी-भी उपलब्ध नहीं थे। इस स्थिति ने जीवन के सभी आयामों को छुआ। फिर साहित्य अछूता कैसे रह सकता है? विचारधाराओं की बहुलता तथा संघर्षात्मिकता साहित्य के शब्द की अपेक्षा अर्थ या विचार की प्रमुखता को प्रतिष्ठित करना चाहती है। अर्थशास्त्र, समाजशास्त्र और दूसरे कई शास्त्रों द्वारा ही नहीं अपितु साहित्य के द्वारा अपने पक्ष में जिन्हें अभीष्ट है वे कवि के स्वानुकूल कथ्य को प्रधान बनाकर उसे अपनी विचारधारा की अभिव्यक्ति का माध्यम बनाना आवश्यक समझते हैं। जहाँ शब्दवाद का अतिरेक काव्य में प्रयास-साध्य अनुप्रासादि के चमत्कार में पड़कर साहित्य के मूल से च्युत हो गया, वहाँ अर्थ (विचार या तथ्य) को काव्य का मूल लक्षण मानने से साहित्य भी विचार का वाहक शास्त्र बन जायेगा। इसलिये आज और भी आवश्यक है कि हम कविकर्म का मुख्य उद्देश्य शब्द का सन्धान मानें। सामाजिक शास्त्र भिन्न-भिन्न हो गये हैं। प्रत्येक विचारधारा का अपना शास्त्र, अपना पुराण, अपनी स्मृति है। विज्ञान अभी बँटा नहीं है। उसकी विश्वजनीनता अभी प्रादेशिक, संकीर्ण और विशिष्ट विचारधारा की अनुगामिनी नहीं बनी है।

साहित्य भी यदि इससे बच सके तथा संवेदन की सत्यता और अखण्डमानवता के प्रति प्रतिबद्धता के अतिरिक्त उस पर बन्धन न बाँधे जायें तो उसका शब्द-संधान निर्बाध रहेगा। अन्यथा अर्थपरतन्त्रता से उसकी स्वतन्त्रता को खतरा तो बना ही हुआ है जैसे कि उपयोग और व्यवहार में विज्ञान को।

सन्दर्भ

1. अनादिनिधनं ब्रह्म शब्दतत्त्वं यदक्षरम्।
विवर्ततेऽर्थभावेन प्रक्रिया जगतो यतः।। वाक्यपदीय, १/१
2. Unit it is verbalized, experience is not literature but the material of literature only, it is in verbalization that literature born.
3. the feeling for syllable and rhythm penetrating for below the conscious levels of thought and feeling covigorating every word sinking to the most primitive and for forgotten, returning to the origin and bringing something back, seeking the beginning and the end. It works through certainly, or not without meaning in ordinary and fuses the old and the obliterated and the trite, the old and the new and surprizing the most ancient and civilized mentatily.
4. द्रष्टव्य, मम्मट, काव्यप्रकाश, चतुर्थ उल्लास का अन्तिम भाग।
5. वक्रवाचां कवीनां ये प्रयोगं प्रति साधवः।
प्रयोक्तुं ये न युक्ताश्च वध्विवेकोडसमुच्यते।। भामहलंकार, ६/२३
6. सततमभ्यासतः सुकवेः वाक्यं पाकमायाति। राजशेखर, काव्यमीमांसा, बड़ौदा संस्करण, पृ. १७।
7. यत्पदानि त्यजन्त्येव परिवृत्तिसहिष्णुताम्।
तं शब्दस्यासनिष्णाताः शब्दपाकं प्रचक्षते।। वामन, काव्यालंकारसूत्रवृत्ति, १.३.१५.
8. टी.एस. इलियट, कलेक्टेड पोयम्स, पृ. २१५, हरकर्ट प्रेस एण्ड कम्पनी, न्यूयार्क।
9. काव्यत्वव्यवहारेभ्यर्हितत्वं शब्दस्यैवेति द्योतनायैव, शब्दपदस्य पूर्वनिपातः कृत इति ध्येयम्। खण्ड १, पृ. ११.

(टङ्कित)



23. उपमा कालिदासस्य

बंगला में लिखी उपमा कालिदासस्य पुस्तक का सन् १९५६ तक द्वितीय संस्करण हो चुका था। इसका हिन्दी में होना आवश्यक था। डॉ. दासगुप्त ने स्वयं शब्दशः अनुवाद के माध्यम से (कहीं-कहीं एकाध शब्द या पंक्ति भूल से छूट गई है) अपनी कृति को हिन्दी-जगत् के समक्ष रखा है।

उपमा की सम्पदा को लेकर १८९० ई. से प्रारम्भ कर कई दृष्टियों से भारत के क्लासिक साहित्य का अध्ययन हुआ है। आर्नेल्ड, हिर्जेल्ड तथा श्रीमती राइस डेविड ने संस्कृति का इतिहास प्रस्तुत करने के लिए; वर्गेन, गेरिने तथा भारतीय विद्वान् काणे ने अभिव्यञ्जना-कला के माध्यम की दृष्टि से और ओल्डन बर्ग तथा वेबर ने धर्म तथा पुराण (Mythology) का इतिहास जानने के लिए उपमा के प्रयोगों का अध्ययन, प्राचीन साहित्य में वेद-विशेषतः ऋग्वेद तथा बौद्ध साहित्य को सामने रखकर किया था। इस परिमित परिधि को छोड़कर प्रसिद्ध मनीषी जे. गोन्डा ने हाल में रीतिशास्त्र (Stylistics) की दृष्टि से समग्र संस्कृत साहित्य (वैदिक एवं लौकिक) का अनुशीलन किया है। उपमा के इस चतुर्मुख अध्ययन से इतना स्पष्ट है कि इस वचनभङ्गी के माध्यम से साहित्य में प्रतिबिम्बित देश के चतुरस्र अतीत को जाना जा सकता है।

इस व्यापक परिधि के अतिरिक्त भी कालिदास की उपमासम्पदा का श्री पिल्लई ने इसी नाम से एक और पुस्तक में आकलन किया था। इसकी भूमिका में महाकवि के उपमा-प्रयोगों का वर्गीकरण और सौन्दर्य दर्शन भी उपलब्ध होता है। पर निश्चित ही, कालिदास की इस स्वाभाविक वचनभङ्गी की सुकुमारता, शुचिता और शालीनता का स्वतन्त्र और कदाचित् भावनाप्रवण अध्ययन शेष था। इस कार्य की पूर्ति डॉ. दासगुप्त ने की है- बड़े भावुक मन से। उन्होंने निम्नलिखित छोटे-मोटे तेरह शीर्षकों में महाकवि के उपमा-वैचित्र्य पर अपना चिन्तन प्रस्तुत किया है। अन्त में उपसंहार है।

१. काव्य में उपमा-प्रयोग एवं साधारण रूप से अलंकार-प्रयोग का तात्पर्य (पृ. १-१५)।
२. शब्दालंकार और अर्थालंकार का मूल रहस्य (पृ. १६-२२)।
३. कालिदास की सालंकार भाषा ही यथार्थ काव्य भाषा है (पृ. २३-२९)।
४. उपमा का मूल रहस्य- वासनालोक (पृ. ३०-४६)।
५. कालिदास की उपमाओं में प्रकृति और मनुष्य का नैकट्य (पृ. ४७-५२)।
६. कालिदास की उपमाओं में आनुपातिक सम्बन्ध (पृ. ५३-५९)।
७. कालिदास की उपमाओं में औचित्य (पृ. ६०-६२)

८. कालिदास की उपमाओं में वैचित्र्य और विराट् तत्त्व (पृ. ६३-७०)।
९. कालिदास की उपमाओं में तुलनात्मक चित्र (पृ. ७१-७२)।
१०. कालिदास की उपमाओं में चेतन-अचेतन का अद्वयत्व (पृ. ७३-८६)।
११. अमूर्त मानसिक अवस्था-प्रकाशन और कालिदास की उपमा (पृ. ८७-९४)।
१२. अलंकारों में सामान्य से विशेष और विशेष से सामान्य का विवेचन (पृ. ९५-९८)।
१३. कालिदास की उपमाओं में मौलिकता और शुचिता (पृ. ९९-१०३)।
१४. उपसंहार (पृ. १०४-१०६)।

शीर्षक को इस त्रयोदशी अथवा (उपसंहार को मिलाकर) चतुर्दशी पर (जिसका उल्लेख पुस्तक के प्रारम्भ में न होने से उसे यहाँ देना मैंने और भी आवश्यक समझा है।) आपाततः दृष्टि-निक्षेप से यह स्पष्ट हो जाएगा कि उपमा प्रयोग के किन पक्षों का लेखक ने आलोचन किया है। उपमा-प्रयोग अथवा अलंकार-प्रयोग पर विमर्श (शीर्षक १), इसके मूल रहस्य (शीर्षक २) तथा उसके माध्यम से चेतन-अचेतन के अद्वैत पर डॉ. दासगुप्त ने अधिक विचार किया है; शेष पक्षों पर अपेक्षाकृत कम, यह भी पाठक स्वतः जान लेगा। इस सूची पर आपाततः दृष्टिपात से, सम्भव है पाठक की यह अपेक्षा भी जाग्रत हो कि कालिदास की उपमा से प्रकृति और मनुष्य के नैकट्य (शीर्षक ५), उपमाओं में औचित्य (शीर्षक ७) तथा तुलनात्मक चित्र (शीर्षक ९) पर अधिक विचार और विश्लेषण होना चाहिए था। और शायद वह यह भी सोचे कि उपमा-प्रयोग (शीर्षक १) तथा शब्दालंकार (शीर्षक २) पर कुछ कम लिखा होता तो हानि न होती। पाठक को कदाचित् यह अनुभूति भी हो कि कुछ एक को छोड़कर शीर्षक परस्पर निरपेक्ष हैं, असम्बद्ध हैं, उन्हें स्वतन्त्र नहीं अपितु परस्पर तन्त्र होना चाहिए था।..... खैर, यह ऊपरी बात थी, कदाचित् बहिरंग।

कालिदास प्रणय (रसशास्त्रीय परिभाषा में शृंगार) के कवि हैं, और जैसा कि कुछ मनीषियों (ए. श्चशार्द, मात्र हार्ट आदि) का कथन है, प्रेमी हृदय उपमाओं के प्रयोगों का मूल स्रोत है, अतः आश्चर्य नहीं कि कालिदास के काव्य-नाटक उपमा में आमूलचूल स्नात हों। ऋतुसंहार की समदा प्रमदाएँ नदियाँ हैं (४९)^१, बरसाती नदियाँ सुदुष्ट स्त्रियाँ हैं (५१), मालविकाग्निमित्र की नायिका मालविका मधुयामिनी (चैत्र विभावरी, ४४) है, पिपासार्थी की सरिता है (९१), पर राज्ञी धारिणी कौशिकी के साथ वेदान्तविद्या से विभूषित वेदत्रयी है; मूर्च्छाभंग के बाद उर्वशी तट-पतन-कलुषा गंगा लगती है (९९), पर जब वह राजा के मनमृणाल को खींचकर चल देती है तो वह राजहंसी प्रतीत होती है। (९१); शकुन्तला यौवनकुसुम से पुष्पित लता है (३८), अनाघ्रात पुष्प, नखों से अक्षत किसलय, अनाविद्ध रत्न, अनास्वादित मधुरस है (पृ. ४३ वस्तुतः दुष्यन्त की भावुकता का

प्रवाह उपमा भण्डार को भरता ही गया), वह श्रद्धार्ह राजा की मूर्तिमती सत्क्रिया (६१) है, जो प्राची की भाँति तनयसूर्य को जन्म देगी (६४) पर अभी अग्निगर्भा शमी है, संशयविपन्न दुष्यन्त का मन उसे स्वीकार करने में हिचकता है जैसे अन्तस्तुषार कुन्द को चखने में भ्रमर (८९); उमा शिव अर्थ की भारती है (१५), वसन्तपुष्पाभरण धारण किए पार्वती संचारिणी लता है (३९), जो विवाह के समय आभूषणों से भूषित हो, कुसुमित लता, नक्षत्रभास्वर त्रियामा तथा विहगविभूषित तटिनी बन जाएगी (४०), उसकी भावभंगिमा विकसित बालकदम्ब है (४१), गोरोजना से अंकित हो वह त्रिपथगा को भी मात देती है (५५); सुदक्षिणा प्रभातकल्पा शर्वरी (२६), अन्तःसलिला सरस्वती (६४), अग्निगर्भा शमी (६४), संन्ध्या (६९) आदि के और इन्दुमती सुप्रसिद्ध संचारिणी दीपशिक्षा (२७), नवाम्भः पृषता स्थली (२८), मानसराजहंसी, नलिनी (९६) आदि के उपमानों से वर्णित है; कौशल्या शरत्कृशा जाह्नवी (४५) है, सुमित्रा सम्यगाराधित विद्या (१०१) है और सीता गायत्री (१०१) है। मेघदूत की विरहिणी यक्षिणी का कहना ही क्या! वह तो मेघच्छाय दिन की न सोती न जागती स्थलकमलिनी है, निराशा के बादल छाते हैं, तो मुँद जाती है, आशा की सूर्यकिरण झलकती है तो जग जाती है। सौन्दर्य की महिमा की दृष्टि से पार्वती, शकुन्तला, यक्षिणी सभी विधाता की मानसी प्रथम सृष्टि हैं। कालिदास की नायिकाओं का जीवित ही उपमाओं में निहित है। संचारिणी लता कहने से पार्वती की तथा संचारिणी दीपशिखा कहने से इन्दुमती की मूर्ति कालिदास के हर पाठक के सम्मुख आ जाती है। उचित ही तो है कि कालिदास को ही दीपशिखाकालिदास कहा जाए।

उपमाओं के व्याक क्षेत्र, उनके सुकुमार, सहज, शालीन, विचित्र एवं मनोहारी प्रयोग का संग्रह, वर्गीकरण एवं अध्ययन भावुक एवं वैदुष्यपूर्ण मन से डॉ. दासगुप्त ने किया है पर उनकी अनेक स्थापनाओं से सहमत होना कठिन है। उनका यह कथन कि कालिदास की उपमा के विचार-विश्लेषण या आस्वादन का अर्थ उनके काव्यनाटक आदि से चुन-चुन कर केवल उपमाओं का ही विचार-विश्लेषण या आस्वादन नहीं है, वास्तव में यह कालिदास द्वारा व्यवहृत समस्त अलंकारों का विचार, विश्लेषण एवं आस्वादन है (पृ. ४) अतिशयोक्तिपूर्ण है। उपमा सादृश्यविधान का माध्यम है। उसके विवर्त में अनेक अलंकार समाविष्ट हैं, यह सही है पर कालिदास ने-उपमा के शिल्पी कालिदास ने-सादृश्य की विधा से हटकर दूसरे माध्यम का भी आश्रय लिया है, उनमें से एक अर्थान्तरन्यास है। इसीलिए संस्कृत की एक प्रसिद्ध सूक्ति में कहा गया है-

उपमा कालिदासस्य नोत्कृष्टेति मतं मम।
अर्थान्तरस्य विन्यासे कालिदासो विशिष्यते।।

अर्थान्तरन्यास दो वस्तुओं के सामान्य-विशेष भाव या कार्यकारणभाव (रुच्यक, पण्डितराज जगन्नाथ) पर आश्रित होता है। इस सामान्य विशेष में कवि की दृष्टि समर्थासमर्थक भाव में रहती है। प्रतिवस्तूपमा तथा दृष्टान्त में (जहाँ दो सधर्मी वस्तुओं का उपन्यास होता है) समर्थन का अंश होता है पर वह सम्भावनात्मक होता है वास्तविक, स्वाभाविक या निश्चित नहीं। अतः अर्थान्तरन्यास समर्थन का समर्थ माध्यम है। सामान्य-विशेष रूप दो वस्तुओं में सादृश्य का अंश गर्भित रहता है, किन्तु उसका प्रत्यायन कवि का उद्देश्य नहीं होता। अतः प्रयोजन-भेद और फलतः प्रतीतिभेद के नाते, अर्थान्तरन्यास की विधा सादृश्य की विधा से भिन्न है। अस्तु, शीर्षक १२ के अन्तर्गत तथा प्रारम्भ में व्यक्त डॉ. दासगुप्त की उस मान्यता से सहमत होना मेरे लिए सम्भव नहीं है जिसमें अर्थान्तरन्यास जैसे अलंकार-विधान के अन्तर्गत आने वाली वचनभंगिमा को उन्होंने उपमा में रखा है।

कदाचित् यह कथन कि अभिनवगुप्त प्रभृति ने भी काव्यसृष्टि के भीतर अलंकार को मुख्य स्थान दिया है भ्रान्ति न पैदा करे अतः यह लिखना आवश्यक है। रसध्वनिवादी आचार्य रसाक्षिप्त गुण या अलंकार को ही गुण या अलंकार मानते हैं। रसरूपव्यंग्यार्थ उनके लिए मुख्य आत्मस्थानीय है, शेष का आत्मलाभ रसोद्बोधन में ही है। पुस्तक की छपाई साफ है। हाँ कहीं-कहीं छापे की भूलें रह गई हैं। भूमिका के प्रथम पृष्ठ में मन्दः कवियशःप्रार्थी का अनुवाद मुझ मन्दकवियशः प्रार्थी देना या रघूणामन्वयं वक्ष्ये का रघुगण का अन्वित वर्णन करूँगा, भयंकर भूले हैं, जिसमें लगता है लेखक की दृष्टि ही नहीं गई। संस्कृत श्लोकों के उद्धरण, यदि यह कहूँ कि प्रारम्भ से अन्त तक अशुद्ध छपे हैं, तो अत्युक्ति न होगी, बानगी के लिए कुछ पृष्ठ संख्याएँ दे रहा हूँ: ८-१०, १२, २७, ६८ तथा ९१। शकुन्तला के स्थान पर उमा (पृ. ३७), मानो के स्थानो पर तानो (पृ. ४३), अतीत्य के स्थान पर अनीत्य (पृ. ५५), हिन्दी के पाठक को भ्रम में डाल देंगे। लेखक के बंगाली होने के नाते शैली में कुछ भिन्नता है, पर मुझे वह प्रिय है। कुछ-एक वचनों को बाद देकर (पृ. ८-९) अर्थात् छोड़कर जिसके लिए उसने महिमा दान की है (पृ. २६), यह कहना कठिन होगा।

डॉ. दासगुप्त ने उपमा-प्रयोग को अलंकृत अभिव्यक्ति का पर्याय बताकर, अनुभूति और अभिव्यञ्जना की प्रक्रिया का कालिदास में द्वैत स्थापित कर, उपमाओं में संगीत एवं चित्र का योग दिखाकर, कवि के संस्कार, वासना तथा भावना में उनका मूल खोजकर रूपसादृश्य के साथ गुण-कर्म-सादृश्य का उपमाओं में अध्ययन कर, उपमाओं के औचित्य और वैचित्र्य की मौलिकता और शुचिता की ओर कालिदास के पाठक का ध्यान आकृष्ट कर निश्चित ही हिन्दी जगत् को अपना चिर-ऋणी बना लिया है।

उपमा प्रणय की अभिव्यक्ति का प्रधान माध्यम है, पुरुष एवं प्रकृति के मिलन का, चेतन और अचेतन के सामरस्य का, काव्यात्मक उपाय है। इससे अधिक उसका क्या स्तवन होगा! शिवाद्वैत के उपासक कालिदास के लिए इसे अपना कितना स्वाभाविक प्रतीत होता है।

सन्दर्भ

१. कोष्ठक की संख्याएँ आलोच्य पुस्तक के पृष्ठों की हैं।

(उपमा कालिदास्य, लेखक डॉ. शशिभूषणदास गुप्त,
नेशनल पब्लिशिंग हाउस, दिल्ली, पुस्तक समीक्षा)



24. साम्प्रतिकं संस्कृतम्

अर्वाचीनम्, आधुनिकम्, इदानीन्तनमन्यानि चैवंविधानि विशेषानि वर्तमानकालं बोधयन्ति न पुनस्तदौचित्यम्। साम्प्रतं, साम्प्रतिकं तु पुनः पदद्वयं कालस्थितिं तदौचित्यं चोभयमपि युगपदेव द्योतयतः। अर्वाचीनसंस्कृतविषये साम्प्रतिकपदप्रयोगो उभयार्थतयाऽत्र कृतः। वेद-वेदाङ्ग-पुराणेतिहास-धर्मशास्त्र-साहित्यसङ्गीतादिकलाभिः ब्राह्मणैर्बौद्धैर्जैनैः पारसीकैर्मोहम्मद-मतानुयायिभिश्च शास्त्रकारैस्तेषु तेषु काव्येषु वैविध्येन पुरा यथा समृद्धं संस्कृतं विश्वस्य पूजास्थानं तथैव नवैर्भावैर्नवाभिर्भङ्गीभिर्विचित्ररचनानुवादप्रकारैश्च सम्प्रति सेव्यमानं संस्कृतमिति सर्वथा साम्प्रतम्।

वस्तुतः सर्वेषां विज्ञानानां, शिल्पानां, कलानां, शास्त्राणां निधिरिदं संस्कृतं विगतेषु शताब्देषु चेरिवदमानमतिष्ठत न चास्मिन् नवीनशास्त्राणां प्ररोहो विकासो वाऽभवत्। लालित्यमध्यात्मं च साहित्यमथ दर्शनं यथा नैरन्तर्येण ववृधुर्न तथाऽधुनिकं ज्ञानं विज्ञानं च। एतदेव निदानं दारिद्र्यस्य। सुकुमारवस्तुनि साहित्ये दृढन्यायग्रहग्रन्थिले तर्के नवनवोन्मेषमहिते शास्त्रान्तरे च समानलीलाविलासं न प्राप सुरभारती नायं ज्ञान-विज्ञान-संकोचो, न वा पुराणपरिपाटीपरावृत्तिर्देशस्य सर्वतोभद्रं विकासं चुचुम्ब। उत्तरोत्तरं मुनीनां प्रामाण्यं व्यवस्थापयन्तो वैयाकरणाः, महतां प्रज्ञावतां सर्वतन्त्रस्वातन्त्र्यमुद्घोषयन्तः शास्त्रकाराः, ऐश्वर्यमदमत्तोऽसि मामवज्ञाय वर्तसे, उपस्थितेषु बौद्धेषु मदधीना तव स्थिति रिति स्वाभिमानं रूपयन्तस्तार्किकाः, सदाचारं स्वप्रियं च धर्मलक्षणे विनिवेशयन्तो धर्मशास्त्रनदीष्णाः नवनवोन्मेषशालिनीमेव प्रज्ञां प्रतिभात्वेन लिलक्षयिषवः साहित्यशास्त्रपारङ्गताः, सार्ववर्णिकं पञ्चमं वेदमाम्नासिषवो नाट्यशास्त्रकाराः, वयमिहपदविद्यां तन्त्रमान्वीक्षिकीं वा, यदि

पथि विपथे वा वर्तयामः स पन्थाः, उदयति दिशि यस्यां भानुमान् सैव पूर्वा नहि तरुणिरुदिते दिक्पराधीनवृत्तिरिति कवयन्तस्तान्त्रिकाः, ते तं स्वर्थन्तस्तर्कमृषिं प्रायच्छन् इति तर्कस्य महत्त्वं प्रतिष्ठापयन्त औपनिषदाः आत्मद्वीपो भव आत्मदीपो वा भव इत्युपदिशन्तो बुद्ध्याः सर्वथा नव्यस्य भव्यस्य च प्रतिष्ठामकार्षुः। क्षणे क्षणे यन्नवतामुपैति तदेव रूपं रमणीयतायाः इति माघकृतं रमणीयतालक्षणं नवं सत्यं शिवं सुन्दरं चेति कटाक्षीकुरुते। वज्रसमुत्कीर्णं मणौ सूत्रस्येव गतिं मन्वानः कविः कालिदासः पारिपार्श्विकप्रश्नोपन्यासमुखेन मालविकाग्निमित्रे विवेकविश्रान्तं वचः सूत्रधारमुखेनावितथमेवावादीत् -

पुराणमित्येव न साधु सर्वं न चापि काव्यं नवमित्यवद्यम्।
सन्तः परीक्ष्यान्यतरद् भजन्ते मूढः परप्रत्ययनेयबुद्धिः॥

ध्वनिप्रस्थानप्रवर्तकः साहित्यशास्त्रशिखामणिरानन्दवर्धनो यद्यपि अस्मिन्नतिविचित्रकविपरम्परवाहिनि संसारे कालिदासप्रभृतयो द्वित्राः पञ्चषा वा महाकवय इति गणयन्ते (ध्वन्यालोके प्रथमोद्योते षष्ठकारिकावृत्तिभागे) इत्येवं स्वीकुर्वाणः कवीनां रसपरतन्त्रतामादिदेश-कविना काव्यमुपबिध्नता सर्वात्मना रसपरतन्त्रेण भवितव्यम् (तत्रैव तृतीयोद्योतस्य चतुर्दशकारिकान्तर्गतवृत्तौ)। रसपरतन्त्रतया च स्वतन्त्रतया कथान्तरोत्पत्तिं, सन्धीनां च घटनमनुमेने। प्राप्तकीर्तीनां विशृङ्खलगिरां कवीनां मार्गमुत्सृज्य रसानुगुण्येन प्रवृत्तिं च चोदयामास। तथाहि तत्रैव -

नीरसस्तु प्रबन्धो यः सोऽपशब्दो महाकवेः।
स तेनाकविरेव स्यादन्येनास्मृतलक्षणः॥
पूर्वे विशृङ्खलगिरः कवयः प्राप्तकीर्तयः।
तान्समाश्रित्य न त्याज्या नीतिरेषा मनीषिणा॥
(ध्वन्यालोकतृतीयोद्योतस्यैकोनविंशकारिकास्थाः परिकरश्लोकाः)

इतिवृत्तपरतन्त्रतां, शास्त्रस्थितिसम्पादनेच्छां, विश्रुतकविपरम्परानुकृतिं च परिहाय स्वातन्त्र्येण रसानुगुणः नवकाव्योन्मेषः श्रीमताऽऽनन्दवर्धनाचार्येणात्र स्वतात्पर्यं विषयीकृतः। एष समीक्षाशास्त्रपरमाचार्यो ध्वन्यालोकस्य चतुर्थ उद्योते तु नवत्वमेव रसादेराश्रयाद् ध्वनिमार्गेणोपदिशति। तथा हि -

१. अनेनानन्त्यमायाति कवीनां प्रतिभागुणः।
२. वाणी नवत्वमायाति पूर्वार्थान्वयवत्यपि।

३. मितोऽप्यनन्ततां प्राप्तः काव्यमार्गो यदाश्रयात्।^१
४. दृष्टपूर्वा अपि ह्यर्थाः काव्ये रसपरिग्रहात्।
सर्वे नवा इवाभान्ति मधुमास इव द्रुमाः॥
५. न काव्यार्थविरामोऽस्ति यदि स्यात्प्रतिभागुणः।
६. अवस्थादेशकालादिविशेषैरपि जायते।
आनन्त्यमेव वाच्यर्थं शुद्धस्यापि स्वभावतः॥
७. वाचस्पतिसहस्राणां सहस्रैरपि यत्नतः।
निबद्धा सा क्षयं नैति प्रकृतिर्जगतामिव॥^३
८. अक्षरादिरचनेव योज्यते यत्र वस्तुरचना पुरातनी।
नूतने स्फुरति काव्यवस्तुनि व्यक्तमेव खलु सा न दुष्यति॥
९. अनुगतमपि पूर्वच्छायया वस्तु तादृक्।
सुकविरुपनिबध्नन् निन्द्यतां नोपयाति॥

पर्यन्ते च परमाचार्यो नवकाव्यनिर्माणे सारस्वतं प्रसादमाशंसते -

प्रतायन्तां वाचो निमित्तिविविधार्थामृतरसां
न सादः कर्त्तव्यः कविभिरनवद्ये स्वविषये।
परस्वादानेच्छाविरतमनसो वस्तु सुकवेः
सरस्वत्यैवेषा घटयति यथेष्टं भगवती॥

प्रतिबिम्बवदालेख्याकारवच्चान्यसादृश्यमनुपादाय तुल्यदेहिवत्संवादं तु स्वीकृत्य नवकाव्योन्मेषार्थं कवीन्, सुकवीन्, महाकवींश्च प्रेरयति ध्वनिप्रस्थानं परमाचार्यः, स्वातन्त्र्यं चाप्रतिहतं प्रतिष्ठापयति कवीनां काव्यमार्गं। साहित्यशास्त्रस्य विश्वगुरुणा श्रीमताऽऽनन्दवर्धनाचार्येण कृतेयं नवकाव्यनिर्माणदीक्षा साम्प्रतमप्यनुशास्ति संस्कृतकवीनिति साम्प्रतिकसंस्कृतसाहित्यस्य सिंहावलोकनेन सपद्येव स्फुटीभवति।

योरोपीयैतिह्यलेखकैस्तदनुसारिभिश्च भारतीयविद्वद्भिः प्रायेण पण्डितराज-जगन्नाथपर्यन्तमष्टादशशताब्दपूर्वं संस्कृतसाहित्यमधिकृत्येतिहासग्रन्था लिखिताः। अर्वाचीनसंस्कृतसाहित्यविषये डा. कृष्णाम्माचारियर, डा. वेंकटरामराघवन्-डा. श्रीधरभास्करवर्णेकर-डा. हीरालाल शुक्लप्रभृतिभिलिखितम्। वैज्ञानिकपाण्डुलिपीनां शास्त्रग्रन्थानां च विवरणं तदीयेष्वपि ग्रन्थेषु प्रायेण दुर्लभम्। आंग्ल-मराठीहिन्दीभाषादिषु

लिखितमर्वाचीनसंस्कृतैकभाषाजुषां विदुषामविदितप्रायम्। अतः संस्कृतपांडित्यपरम्परायां लब्धकीर्तयो विद्वदप्रेसरा आधुनिकं साहित्यं न बहु मन्यन्ते। विश्वविद्यालयस्थाश्च प्राध्यापका अर्वाचीनग्रन्थानामसुलभतया प्राचीनकाव्यपरम्पराबद्धादरतया, सप्तदशशताब्दीपर्यन्तमेव साहित्यं वा बहु मन्वाना अर्वाचीनं साहित्यं न तथाऽद्रियन्ते। तथापि बहुत्र विश्वविद्यालयेषु आधुनिकं संस्कृतसाहित्यं स्वप्रभावेण गरिम्णा च क्रमेण पदं धत्ते इत्यत्र नास्ति सन्देहलेशावसरः। वस्तुतो बहुविद्वन्मान्यंटीकोपबृंहितमाधुनिकसंस्कृतसाहित्यसंकलनमावश्यकं यस्य सर्वेषु विश्वविद्यालयेषु महाविद्यालयेषु च पाठप्रतिष्ठा भवेत्।

सप्तदशशताब्दीत आरभ्येदानीन्तनकालपर्यन्तं कालखण्डो द्विधा विभाजयितुं शक्यते। गौराङ्गनामागमनात्पूर्वमष्टादशशताब्दीम् एकोनविंशशताब्दीपूर्वभागं वाऽभिव्याप्य कालखण्डः प्रायेण प्राचीनमित्रकाव्यपरम्परामनुसरति। तत एव कवयः स्वात्मनः (समीक्षका वा कवीन्) अभिनवकालिदासः, नूतनकालिदासः, कलियुगकालिदासः, केरलकालिदासः, अभिनवभवभूतिः, अभिनवरामानुजः, अभिनवभर्तृहरिः, अभिनवपण्डितराजः, अभिनवभोजः, अभिनवजयदेव इत्यादिना प्रख्यापयामासुः। ग्रन्थनामसु तथैव प्रथा पप्रथे। तथाहि अभिनवकादम्बरी, अभिनवभारतम्, अभिनवभारतचम्पूः, अभिनवगीतगोविन्दम्, अभिनवरामायणम्, अभिनवभागवतम्, अभिनववासवदत्ता, अभिनवहितोपदेशादि रामायणं महाभारतं पुराणकथाश्चोपजीव्य बहूनि काव्यानि (रूपकाणि, वंशस्तुतिपराणि महाकाव्यानि) यथा हि लक्ष्मणशास्त्रिणः 'गुरुवंशम्', युवराजकवेः भट्टवंशम्', अप्पाशास्त्रिण-अस्यास्य जार्जवंशम्, उर्वीदत्तशास्त्रिण 'एडवर्डवंशं' दारिद्र्योपहतानां संस्कृतकवीनां यशोधनं चावर्धयत। वीरचरितस्तुतिपराणि काव्यानि (यथा हि छत्रपतिशिवाजीविषये परमानन्दकृतं शिवभारतं, कालिदासविद्याविनोदकृतं शिवचरितम्, अंबिकादत्तव्यासकृतं शिवराजविजयं वी.वी. सोवनीकृतः शिवावतारप्रबन्धः, डा. श्रीधरभास्करवर्णकरविरचितं शिवराज्योदयं, डा. त्रिपाठिकृतं छत्रपतिचरितं) स्वदेशसेवार्थं प्राणपणैरपि भारतीयान् प्रेरयामासुः। गौराङ्गमहाप्रभूणां स्तुत्यर्थं कृतानि काव्यानि (विक्टोरियाचरितसंग्रहः, विक्टोरियामाहात्म्यं, प्रीतिकुसुमाञ्जलिः, आंग्लसाम्राज्यं, आंग्लजर्मनीयुद्धविवरणं, समरशान्तिमहोत्सवः, यदुबुद्ध (एडवर्डसौहार्दं) संस्कृतकवीनां स्तुतिश्रोत्रियतां प्रकटीचक्रुः। तथापि तेन ववृधे नवविषयारम्भेण नवशब्दप्रयोगसंस्कारः। स्तोत्रकाव्य-शतककाव्य-दूतकाव्य-गीतिकाव्य-गद्यकाव्य-चम्पूप्रभृतीनां काव्यप्रकाराणां सहस्रशो निर्दर्शनानि अर्वाचीन-संस्कृतकाव्यपरम्परायां प्राप्यन्ते।

तथाहि कालिदासकृतं मेघदूतमुपजीव्य हंस-पवन-चन्द्र-हनुमद्रोपी-तुलसी-पिक-काक-भ्रमर-पान्थदूतानां कोकिल-कीर-हंस-मयूर-मानस-सन्देशानां च काव्यानां संख्या

प्रतिपदमेधते।

राष्ट्रभक्तिप्रेरितानि काव्यानि महाकाव्यानि अन्ये च काव्यप्रकाराः संस्कृतसाहित्यजुषां स्थिरं देशप्रेमाभिव्यञ्जयन्ति जयदेवस्य गीतगोविन्दमुपजीव्य गीतराघवं, गीतगिरीशं, गीतगौरीपतिः, गीतरघुनन्दनम् शास्त्रिगीतविलासः, कृष्णलीलातरङ्गिणी, तीर्थभारतम्, श्रीरामसंगीतिका, श्रीकृष्णसंगीतिका प्रभृतीनि काव्यानि विदितवेदितव्यानां विदितान्येव। तेषु काव्यप्रकारेषु बहवोऽप्रकाशिताः सन्तस्तेषु तेषु पाण्डुलिपिसंग्रहेषु संकुचितानि तिष्ठन्ति। महापुरुष-चरितनिरूपणाव्याजेन प्रवृत्ता काव्यपरम्परापि बाहुल्येनाधुनिककाले दरीदृश्यते, तथाहि अनेककाव्यादिनिर्मातृणां शर्मोपाह्व-ओगटीपरीक्षितमहोदयानां यशोधरामहाकाव्यम्, पी.सी. देवसियाकृतं क्रिस्तुभागवतम्, सोमवर्मराजामहोदयस्य येशुसौरभम्, डा. सत्यव्रतस्य श्रीगुरुगोविन्दसिंहचरितं, के. बलरामपणिकस्य श्रीनारायणविजयम्, सुन्दरेशशर्मणः त्यागराजचरितम्, वी. राघवस्य दीक्षितेन्द्रचरितम्, नारायणपिल्लेकृतविश्वभ्रातृप्रभृतीनि काव्यानि प्रेरणायाः कर्तव्यपरायणतायाश्चामराणि निर्दर्शनानि सन्ति।

सुप्रसिद्धानां ततद्भाषानिबद्धानां साहित्यग्रन्थानां संस्कृतानुवादाः उपन्यास-लघुकथा-निबन्ध-पत्रिका-पत्रादिभिर्नवीनमार्गनिर्माणमाधुनिकसंस्कृतसाहित्यस्य वैशिष्ट्यमादधाति। क्षेत्रीयभाषाशब्दानां पाश्चात्यभाषाप्रयोगाणां चार्वाचीनसंस्कृतस्वरूपनिर्माणे नव-नव-शब्दार्थसमृद्धिः पाणिनीयं संस्कृतमन्यथाकुरुते। वस्तुतः सप्तदशशताब्दीतोऽद्यपर्यन्तं कृतानां प्रयोगाणां विवेचनमावश्यकम्। तेषां संग्रहः संशोधनं संस्कृतकोशेषु समीक्ष्य सन्निवेशश्च सर्वेषामस्माकं विशेषतश्च वैयाकरणानां कोशकाराणाञ्च कर्तव्यम्। अस्मिन्विषये गीर्वाणगिरागौरवस्य सम्पादकस्य भूमिकाकारस्य च देवर्षिकलानाथशास्त्रिणो वचांसि सविशेषमुखमर्हन्ति।

यदि 'यदेव पाणिनिर्भगवानुक्तवान् तदेव संस्कृतस्य स्वरूपम्, नेतरत्' इत्यादि कठोरतया अनुस्रियते तर्हि नैकमपि दिनं संस्कृतभाषा परिचलेत्। यदि तथा समभविष्यत्तर्हि किमित्यभविष्यन्बहवो मुनय आचार्याश्च, किमित्यसाधयिष्यत औणादिकानां सूत्राणां संख्या बहूनां लोकप्रचलितानां शब्दानां साधुत्वम्? अभूवन् हेमचन्द्रादय आचार्या यैर्बहूनां देशीयशब्दानां संस्कृते प्रवेशः साधुत्वप्रवेशपत्रं प्रदाय स्वीकारितः। भाषातरुर्हि लोकव्यवहारजलेनैव पुष्यति विकसति च।

उक्तमपि पतञ्जलिना। लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे शास्त्रेण धर्मनियमः। यथा-यथा नवीनानामर्थानां सृष्टिर्भवति तथा तथा नवीनान्पदार्थानिभिव्यञ्जयितुं शब्दा अपेक्ष्यन्ते, निर्मायन्तेऽपि। ते प्रयुज्यन्ते, प्रचलन्ति परिगृहीता भवन्ति च। लोकोपचाराद् ग्रहणसिद्धिः इति कातन्त्रव्याकरणम् (१/१/२३) पाणिनीयव्याकरणमनुशिष्टा एव प्रयोगा उपादीयेरन्निति

व्रतमवलम्ब्येत चेन्नवीनानामाविष्काराणां कृते, नवीनानां विषयाणां च कृते शब्दाः कुतः आनाय्या भवेयुः।

गीर्वाणगौरवभूमिकायां साधयितुं प्रभविष्यति। काव्योगोष्ठीसु संस्कृतकाव्यपाठं, प्रश्नानां नूतनानां च रूपकाणामभिनयः, आकाशवाणी-दूरदर्शनादिद्वारा विविधप्रयोगपरम्परा माध्यमिकशालासु सर्वैः संभूय पठन्तं सर्वमेतत् भारतीयसंविधाने भाषान्तरैः सह प्रदत्तं महत्त्वपूर्णं स्थानं प्रतिष्ठापयति।

संस्कृतं सुरभारती, अमरभारती, गीर्वाणवाणीति भण्यते। नेयं हि भाषा लोकस्य। अस्या अमरत्वं स्वमहिम्ना ज्ञानगौरवेण च विश्वप्रतिष्ठम्। ये मनुष्येषु संस्कारसम्पन्नाः स्वज्ञानप्रकाशेन द्योतमाना देवाः सन्ति तेषामियं भाषा। संस्कृतं न हि प्राकृतं न वा वैकृतम्। वस्तुतः या काचन वाणी भाषा भवति सा संस्कारद्वारैव भाषेति संपद्यते। भाषा नाम प्राकृतानामपि पुरुषाणां महान् संस्कारः भाषा हि सांस्कृतिकी क्रिया। एतस्मिन्नर्थे सर्वाः भाषाः संस्कृता एव भवितुं शक्नुवन्ति नान्यथा। अमुमेवार्थं दृढयति कृते संस्कृतशब्दप्रयोगः। संस्कारो हि गुणाधानेन दोषादनयेन च सम्पाद्यते। अयं च संस्कारः प्रत्येकं भाषायां तत्तद्भाषाभाषिभिः शिष्टैः क्रियते। अतः भाषा नाम संस्कृतमेव। ईदृशी च भाषा न कस्यापि वर्णविशेषस्य, जातिविशेषस्य, समुदायविशेषस्य वा सम्भवतीति द्योतयितुं संस्कृतं केवलं संस्कृतमित्येव भास्यते। नेयं गुर्जरो, महाराष्ट्री, वंगीया, शर्मण्या, आंग्ला वेति भण्यते। सा चेयं भाषा प्रकृतिप्रत्ययसंस्कारेण संस्क्रियते व्याकर्तुं च शक्यते इति पाणिनीयाः।

पुराणी युवतिश्चैयं सुरभारती कथमद्यापि आधुनिकानपि स्वस्वरूपोचितान् निरन्तरं प्रसूय सौरसारस्वततपोभिःक्षणे क्षणे नवतामुपैति।

राजस्थानप्रदेशे पुरा विश्रुतयशसो वैदग्ध्यलब्धकीर्तयो मधुसूदनओझा-भट्ट मथुरानाथशास्त्रिप्रभृतयः सारस्वतमुत्कर्षमवर्धयन्। अद्यापि राजस्थानं तथैव राराजते महाकविहरिराय-नवलकिशोरकांकर-जगदीशचन्द्र-प्राणचन्द्र आचार्य-नारायणशास्त्रिकांकर-द्विजेन्द्रलालशर्म-पुरकायस्थ-मधुकरशास्त्रि-देवर्षिकलानाथशास्त्री-चन्द्रधरशर्म-रसिकबिहारीजोशि-शिवदत्तचतुर्वेद-प्रभृतीनां विविधाभिः रचनाभिः। संस्कृतगीतकारः श्री हरिरामआचार्यस्तथैव गीतेषु सुश्रुतः। अतः आधुनिकसंस्कृतसाहित्यगोष्ठीं सम्पादयितुं राजस्थानं महिष्ठं स्थानम्। अस्यां गोष्ठ्यां पठितानां निबन्धानां संग्रहोऽधुना प्रकाश्यते। अत्र प्रदेशविशेषेषु रचितस्याधुनिकसंस्कृतसाहित्यस्य समीक्षा वर्तते। आधुनिकतायाः नवीनताया दार्शनिकचेतनायाश्च विवेचना विद्यते, राजस्थानस्य विश्रुतयशसां सुकवीनां संस्तवः स्तूयते, श्रीरेवाप्रसादद्विवेद-

श्रीनिवासरथ-नलिनशुक्लादिभिः कृतं स्वकाव्यसमीक्षणमीक्षते, काव्यविशेषाणां च समीक्षा प्रस्तूयते।

संगोष्ठीसम्पादने ये नैसर्गिकं साहाय्यमकुर्वन् तेषु राजस्थान-संस्कृत-अकादमी-अध्यक्षाः श्री लालबहादुरशास्त्रि-राष्ट्रीय-संस्कृत-विद्यापीठस्योपकुलपतिर्माधुर्येण, सौजन्येन संस्कृतसेवया च विश्वविश्रुतकीर्तिः डा. मण्डनमिश्रः प्रथमम्।

सन्दर्भाः

1. (i) तत्रेतिवृत्ते यदि साननुगुणां स्थितिं पश्येत्तदेमां भङ्क्त्वापि स्वतन्त्रतया रसानुगुणं कथान्तरमुत्पादयेत्, ३.१४।
(ii) सन्धीनां घटनं 'रसाभिव्यक्त्यपेक्षया न तु केवलं शास्त्रस्थितिसम्पादनेच्छया'-तत्रैव।
2. अत्रेयं वृत्तिः- यस्य रसादेराश्रयादयं काव्यमार्गः पुरातनैः कविभिः सहस्रसंख्यैरसंख्यैर्वा बहुप्रकारं क्षुण्णत्वान्मितोऽप्यनन्ततामेति।
3. उद्धरणमर्हत्यत्रत्या वृत्तिरंशतः- यथा हि जगत्प्रकृतिरतीतकल्पपरम्पराविभूतविचित्रवस्तुप्रपञ्चा सती पुनरिदानीं परिक्षीणा पदपदार्थनिर्माणशक्तिरिति न शक्यतेऽभिधातुम्। तद्देवेयं काव्यस्थितिरनन्ताभिः कविमतिभिरुपभुक्तापि नेदानीं परिहीयते, प्रत्युत नवनवाभिव्युत्पत्तिभिः परिवर्धते।
4. अत्रत्यं ग्रन्थादिविवरणं श्रीधरभास्करवर्णेकरसम्पादितं संस्कृतवाङ्मयकोषादतीव संक्षिप्य गृहीतम्। विस्तरार्थं तु राघव-वर्णेकर-शुद्धादिकृता आकरग्रन्था एव द्रष्टव्याः। देवर्षिकलानाथशास्त्रिणा संपादितं स्वपितृपादभट्टश्रीमथुरानाथशास्त्रिकृतं गीर्वाणगौरवं सम्पादकीय-भूमिकया सह द्रष्टव्यम्। आधुनिक संस्कृत साहित्य इति नामा डॉ. दयानन्दभार्गव-सम्पादितः ग्रन्थोऽप्यवलोकितार्हः। अस्मिन् ग्रन्थे युगबोध-अभिनवशब्दप्रयोगादिविषये लेखा विशेषतयाध्येतव्याः।

(नवोन्मेषः, राजस्थान-संस्कृत-अकादमी, जयपुरम्, १९९०)



25. संस्कृत कवियों के उपनाम

संस्कृत के सूक्तिसंग्रहों में तथा काव्यशास्त्र के विभिन्न ग्रन्थों में ऐसे अनेक कवियों की कविताएँ मिलती हैं जिनके सही नाम का पता ही नहीं है। केवल उनके साहित्यिक नाम प्राप्त होते हैं जिन्हें हम उपनाम कह सकते हैं। पर ये उपनाम ऐसे हैं जो कवि ने सम्भवतः स्वयं नहीं चुने थे, बल्कि परवर्ती साहित्यिकों ने उन्हें दिये थे। कालिदास को रघुकार कहना या दीपशिखा-कालिदास कहना, अथवा माघ को घण्टा-माघ कहना

आज के किसी भी पाठक को इस परेशानी में नहीं डालेगा कि यह रघुकार या घण्टामाघ कहीं कालिदास या माघ से भिन्न कवि तो नहीं है। पर जिन उपनामों की चर्चा मैं कर रहा हूँ उनके नाम ही नहीं पता है। अब चाहे आप इन्हें उपनाम कहें या नाम या और कुछ, इन कवियों का आत्मपरिचय या प्रसिद्धि इन्हीं से है।

ये उपनाम भी अनेक आधारों पर हैं। कोई उत्प्रेक्षा का सुन्दर प्रयोग करता है तो उसका नाम उत्प्रेक्षावल्लभ है, कई अपना सम्बन्ध विभिन्न पुष्पों से करते हैं या करना पसन्द करते हैं तो उसके आधार पर अनेक उपनाम मिलते हैं जैसे कि कुमुद, कर्णोत्पल, पुष्पाकर आदि। अनंगहर्ष और अनंगभीम भी कवि के नाम हैं और कवि शब्द आगे या पीछे लगाकर आपको संस्कृत में अनेक विचित्र नाम मिलेंगे जैसे कि- कविकलि, कविदर्पण, कविदर्पण-राघव, कविरत्न, कवीश्वर, कर्पूर कवि, सोम कवि और सुनिये एक हैं 'कपोलकवि'। उस समय मेजर यूरी गागरिन की भाँति उड़ने को भले ही न मिला हो पर एक उड़ूय-कवि नाम भी मिला हुआ है; पता नहीं पर शायद वह उछल-कूद लेने के बाद ही कविता के 'मूड' में आ पाते हों।

मुझे नहीं मालूम आज के साहित्यिकों में जुड़वा-उपनाम हैं कि नहीं पर संस्कृत में तो जुड़वा-उपनाम तीन चार मिलते हैं जैसे कि अश्विनीकुमारौ, रामिलसौमिलौ गोयिधोयी-कविराजौ। अगर ये दो कवि हैं और एक ही कविता एक साथ मिलकर लिखते थे तो सचमुच इनका भावनात्मक एकत्व प्रशंसनीय है। आजकल दो गद्य-लेखक एक साथ मिलकर कुछ लिखें यह तो आम बात हो रही है पर दो कवि जुड़वा-उपनाम लेकर रचना करें यह बात कितनी पुरानी है पर कितनी नयी-सी मालूम पड़ेगी। एक वचन या बहुवचन का प्रयोग एक के लिए भी आ सकता है और अनेक के लिए भी। अर्थात् एकवचन और बहुवचन के व्यक्ति निश्चित नहीं होते हैं पर द्विवचन के व्यक्ति सदा निश्चित और नियत रूप से दो ही होते हैं न एक न दो से ज्यादा। अस्तु ये जुड़वा-उपनाम बताते हैं कि किस तरह संस्कृत के दो कवि मिलकर एक पद्य बनाते थे।

अब इन विचित्र नामों की सूची देखिये। एक से दूसरा विचित्र है- आकाशपोलि, इच्छाल, उच्छट, अरगट, उथकट, केटस, कोक्कोक, कुम्भक, गन्धिकभुल्लक, गेल्लुक, घोरक, भेरीभांकार, छितम और.....। पर यह पूरी सूची नहीं है। सूची में से कुछ नाम आप को और बता सकता हूँ पर इनका प्रचार होना अच्छा नहीं है। ये हैं-जघनस्थलीघटक, सीत्काररत्न और निशानारायण।

कवियों की इस घुड़दौड़ में कवयित्रियाँ भी पीछे नहीं थीं। भले ही भाग न पाती

हों क्योंकि एक का नाम है विकटनितम्बा। हाँ, दूसरे नाम आप को उतने परेशान नहीं करेंगे जैसे कि मारुला, मोरिका और शीलाभट्टारिका। आप भले ही जागडनुश, जोयिक, चतुर्मुख महादेव-जलमानुषी, रुद्र, बाल सरस्वती और अपराधसुन्दर की कविता न पढ़ें पर एक कवि की तो पढ़ लीजिए क्योंकि आपने उनकी बेकसी नहीं सुनी। सुन लीजिए नहीं तो कौन जाने इन निद्रादरिद्र नामक कवि को नींद कभी न आये इनका श्लोक है -

जाने कोऽपराड्मुखी प्रियतमा स्वप्नेऽद्य दृष्टा मया -
मा मा संस्पृश पाणिनेति रुदती गन्तुं प्रवृत्ता ततः।
नो यावत्परिरभ्य चाटुशतकैराश्वसयामि प्रियां।
भ्रातस्तावदहं शठेन विधिना निद्रादरिद्रीकृतः।।

स्वप्न में देखा था क्रोध में भरी मानिनी प्रियतमा को, मत मत छुओ मुझे, रोती हुई वहाँ से चली गयी। मैं हजारो मनुहारों से मनाने में लगा था कि तभी भाई! दुष्ट विधाता ने निद्रा से ही दरिद्र बना डाला।

(राजस्थान पत्रिका)



सप्तम परिच्छेद : विविध विषय

1. भारतीय संस्कृति : चिन्तनकण

अंग्रेजी शब्द कल्चर के अनुवाद के रूप में संस्कृति शब्द का प्रचलन इस देश में हो चला है। वस्तुतः जिस प्रकार यज्ञ या मोक्ष के लिए कोई सही शब्द अन्य संस्कृतियों में नहीं मिल सकता उसी प्रकार 'कल्चर' का भी भारतीय भाषा में सम्पूर्णतः एकार्थक पर्याय नहीं है। इसी प्रकार धर्म शब्द है, उसका भी पर्याय अन्य भाषाओं में नहीं पाया जा सकता। इसका यह अभिप्राय नहीं है कि संस्कृति शब्द भारतीय है ही नहीं। वस्तुतः यह शब्द हमें वैदिक काल में ही प्राप्त हो जाता है - इयं संस्कृतिर्विश्ववारा। किन्तु वहाँ इसका अभिप्राय भिन्न है।

एक और महत्त्वपूर्ण अवधारणा जन्म के पूर्व से मृत्यु के बाद तक किये जाने वाले संस्कारों की है। ये संस्कार सभी व्यक्तियों के होते हैं- अर्थात् द्विजों के भी और शूद्रों के भी। अन्तर केवल इतना ही है कि द्विजों के संस्कार समन्वयक होते हैं और अन्यो के अमन्त्रक। पर संस्कृति शब्द व्यक्तियों के संस्कार (गुणों का आधान और दोषों का अपनयन) तक सीमित नहीं है। वह उसका उपयोगी लघुवृत्त भले ही मान लिया जाय। हमारे समय में धर्म शब्द का प्रयोग इतना संकीर्ण और कर्मकाण्डपरक हो गया है कि संस्कृति की व्याख्या के लिये वह भी अधिक उपयोगी नहीं रह गया है। एक ओर कृषिकर्म से मूलतः सम्बद्ध होते हुए भी कल्चर शब्द का अर्थ-विस्तार हुआ है तो दूसरी ओर समग्र वैयक्तिक और सामाजिक अभ्युदय और निःश्रेयस् का वाचक होने पर भी धर्म शब्द का क्रमशः (और विशेषतः दूसरे रिलीजनों और सभ्यताओं के सम्पर्क में आने के बाद) अर्थ-संकोच हुआ है।

संस्कृति के सम्बन्ध में विचार करना एक सनातन प्रक्रिया है जो कभी इदमित्थं के रूप में निर्धारित होकर समाप्त नहीं हो सकती। यह अपनी और अपने समाज की आत्मा की खोज है। यह आत्मा गतिशील है और सनातन भी। इतिहास के प्रमुख क्षणों में संस्कृति की पहिचान करना और भी आवश्यक हो जाता है। इसीलिये स्वतन्त्रता के लिये संघर्ष छेड़ते समय और स्वतन्त्रता के बाद भारतीय समाज और उसकी संस्कृति की जिज्ञासा अधिक बलवती है। हम कहीं खो न जाएँ हमारी स्वात्मा नष्ट न हो जाय, इसकी चिन्ता प्रत्येक संस्कृति को निसर्गतः रहती है। इसलिये उसे अपनी पहिचान निरन्तर जाननी और स्थापित करनी पड़ती है। दूसरी संस्कृतियों और मूल्यों के सम्पर्क में आने पर यह चिन्ता और जिज्ञासा अधिक उदग्र हो उठती है। १८वीं शती से प्रारम्भ कर आजतक भारतीय

संस्कृति का विवेचन इसलिये अधिक और अनेकरूप में हुआ है। शास्त्र की संस्कृति शासित पर प्रहार करती है- भाषा, साहित्य, वेष, मूल्य, न्याय, आदर्श सब कुछ अपने अनुरूप करना चाहती है ताकि शासन के लिये सहयोगी समाज बन सके। शासित संस्कृति इस विपदा में अपने अतीत के गौरव का स्मरण कर शक्ति जुटाती है ताकि वह शास्ता की संस्कृति के आगे घुटने न टेक दे। भौतिक पराजय के बाद आध्यात्मिक पराजय को बचाना चाहती है। इस पराजय को बचाने के साथ ही वह भौतिक पराजय को विजय में बदलना चाहती है- बदल लेती है तो उसके मूल्यों की प्राणवत्ता प्रमाणित हो जाती है। इस प्राणवत्ता की खोज और उसके विकारों की पहिचान संस्कृति और विकृति का परीक्षण है। शासक और उसकी राजनीति मुख्यतः वर्तमान में जीती है। अतः वह संस्कृति का विश्लेषण वर्तमान विकारों को उजागर करके करता है। वह इस क्रिया में स्वयं भी सांस्कृतिक दम्भ से प्रभावित होकर विकृत हो जाता है। अतः शास्ता की मूल संस्कृति कुछ भी हो वह शासक के रूपों में विकारों को जीने लगता है। भारत में अंग्रेज शासकों की वही स्थिति थी। उनकी संस्कृति के उदारवाद, प्रजातान्त्रिकता आदि गुण यहाँ के शासकों से लुप्त हो गये थे। भारत में शासन करने वाला अंग्रेज इंग्लैण्ड के सामान्य नागरिक से भी गुणों में हीन हो गया था। वर्तमान की हीनता का बोध होने से भारत की संस्कृति की प्राणवत्ता विद्वान् को भी नहीं दीखती थी। यही कारण है कि इतिहास के अनुसन्धाता भारतीय समाज और संस्कृति का विश्लेषण अतीत को स्वर्णिम मानकर ही कर सकते थे, वे भविष्य की सम्भावनाओं और वर्तमान की शक्ति की पहचान नहीं करते थे। इसी कारण जो पुस्तकें लिखी गईं उनके शीर्षक ग्लोरी दैट वाज़ इन्डिया थी या उसी की तरह की थी जैसे कि भारत की संस्कृति स्वर्णिम अतीत जीकर अब जीर्ण-शीर्ण या मृत हो गई है। क्लासिकल एज की धारणा भी इसी से मिलती जुलती है। संस्कृत को क्लासिकल भाषा कहना या कि वर्तमान में उसके व्यवहार को नकार कर उसे मृत कहना लगभग एक ही बात है। जैसे पश्चिम में ग्रीक, लैटिन मर चुकी थी वैसे ही संस्कृत भी मर गई है। यह विश्वास आज भी शिक्षित जनों में घर कर गया है। पर यथार्थ यह नहीं है। गीता को आधार बनाकर या उससे प्रेरणा ग्रहणकर तिलक, गांधी, सुभाष, नेहरु, विनोबा और न जाने कितनों ने स्वतन्त्रता की लड़ाई लड़ी थी। यह उनके लिये जीवन की भाषा थी जिससे राष्ट्रजीवन का व्यवहार प्रवर्तित था। जो भी हो अनेक अंग्रेज विद्वानों और उसी दृष्टि का अनुगमन करने वाले अन्य विद्वानों द्वारा संस्कृति का इस प्रकार अध्ययन मूलतः अतीतोन्मुख होता है, वह अतीत को गौरव से मण्डित करता है पर वर्तमान को दीनहीन और भविष्य को सम्भावना-शून्य छोड़ देता है। इस तरह का संस्कृति का विश्लेषण करने या नष्ट संस्कृति का अजायबघर बनाने में प्रवृत्ति का अन्तर नहीं है।

इससे मिलती-जुलती किन्तु प्रकृति और प्रेरणा में सर्वथा भिन्न एक देशी पण्डित-मण्डली है। यह संख्या में भले ही कम हो पर अत्यन्त कट्टर होती है। उसका दृढ़ विश्वास है कि एक कूटस्थ नित्य, निर्विकार सांस्कृतिक मूल्य है जिसमें सभी ज्ञान समाहित है। वह उस मूल्य के प्रति इतना श्रद्धालु होता है कि उसे केवल ह्रास दीखता है या फिर जो कुछ नया और अच्छा होता है वह प्राचीन में ही समाहित लगता है। वह इतिहासबोध को नकारता है और परिवर्तन को अस्वीकार करता है। इस पण्डित-मण्डली को वेद में वह सब कुछ मिल जाता है जो निश्चित ही बाद की उपलब्धि है। इस मण्डली का प्राचीन परम्परा से आलोचनात्मक और विकासोन्मुख सम्बन्ध नहीं होता है। वह रटता अधिक है उसे तात्पर्य-बोध कम होता है। भक्ति की अवधारणा हो या फिर नवीन वैज्ञानिक अविष्कार-सबकुछ मूल ज्ञान (वेद) में ही प्रतिष्ठित है। यह संस्कृति की सनातनता और अस्मिता को तो बनाये रखता है पर नये प्रयोग का साधक और प्रेरक नहीं बन पाता। उसे सतयुग के बाद निरन्तर मूल्यों का ह्रास दिखता है। उसे त्रेता, द्वापर, कलियुग में क्रमशः धर्म (मूल्य) के पैर कटते दिखते हैं। मूल्यों के सम्बन्ध में ह्रासवादी धारणा संस्कृति-संरक्षण की गहन चिन्ता से पैदा होती है। भले ही उस चिन्ता का दुष्परिणाम यह हो कि भौतिक अभ्युदय की वह प्रतिरोधक हो जाय। वह इस चिन्ता के कारण मूल के चारों ओर अनेक कण्टकाकीर्ण आलवाल बनाता है जिनके कांटे संस्कृति के मूल को संकीर्ण बना देते हैं। इतिहास-बोध न होने के कारण विभिन्न युगीन और सामयिक समस्याओं के निराकरण के लिये जो उपाय और अपाय अपनाये गये थे उन्हें यह पण्डित-मण्डली शाश्वत सत्य मान लेती है और उस सब के लिए मूल को ही प्रमाण बना बैठती है और नरबलि, पशुबलि, शूद्र व चाण्डाल की अस्पृश्यता, बालविवाह, सतीप्रथा, दास-प्रथा, लिंगमूलक विषमताएँ आदि सब कुछ वेद या तदनुकूल स्मृति में खोज लेती है। यह संस्कृति के विश्लेषण की सही दृष्टि नहीं है। इसीलिये कालिदास को कहना पड़ा था - **पुराणमित्येव न साधु सर्वम्।**

मनुस्मृति में धर्म के अनेक लक्षण दिये गये हैं। श्रुति, स्मृति, सदाचार और अपनी आत्मा को जो प्रिय हो- यह धर्म का एक लक्षण है। धृति, क्षमा आदि नैतिक और स्वच्छता आदि शारीरिक गुण कुल मिलाकर दस गुण धर्म का दूसरा लक्षण है। परम्परा से प्राप्त देशज आचार धर्म हैं। धर्म के इन तीन लक्षणों में अनुसर्ताओं की दृष्टि से तात्त्विक भेद है। एक शास्त्र-सम्मत शिष्ट जन का धर्मलक्षण है, दूसरा सामान्य और व्यापक लक्षण मानवीय नैतिकता के आधार पर है, तीसरा विभिन्न सामान्य जनों के अपने समय और परिवेश में अपनाये गये आचार को धर्म का लक्षण मानता है। धर्म न केवल अल्पसंख्यक शिष्टों से परिभाषित किया जा सकता है और न मात्र सामान्य जनों से। संस्कृति भी इसी प्रकार न केवल पण्डित का लक्षण है और न सामान्य जन का। वह दोनों को स्वीकार करती है, उनकी सीमा और सामर्थ्य को मानकर। और इनसे परे यह भी स्वीकार करती है कि उसके

कुछ गुण ऐसे हैं जो शिष्ट तथा सामान्य का लक्षण है। फलतः जो विद्वान् संस्कृति का विश्लेषण केवल उच्च दार्शनिक या नैतिक विचार-सम्पदा या शास्त्रों में निर्धारित विधिनिषेध के आधार पर करते हैं वे समाज के आदर्शों को तो प्रस्तुत कर देते हैं। पर व्यवहार की व्याख्या सही नहीं कर पाते। अतः संस्कृति के विश्लेषण में शिष्ट और शास्त्र के साथ-साथ सामान्य जन और उनके व्यवहार का भी, अतीतोन्मुख होकर नहीं अपितु भविष्योन्मुख होकर, चिन्तन-मनन करना आवश्यक है। संस्कृति की अतीतोन्मुख व्याख्या मात्र शव साधना है, शिव साधना नहीं है। शव निष्क्रियता का प्रतीक है। शिव क्रिया के साथ चैतन्य का और प्रकाश के साथ विमर्श का प्रतीक है। चेतन कर्तृत्व के बोध के बिना संस्कृति का विश्लेषण वर्तमान को आन्दोलित और भविष्य को मंगलमय नहीं बना सकता। इकार शक्ति है, शिव का इकार हटा देने पर शव शेष रहता है। शव अतीत में जीवित था, उसका वर्तमान निःशेष हो जाता है और भविष्य में नहीं होता। अस्तु, संस्कृति शवसाधना नहीं अपितु शिवसाधना है।

जब हम अपनी संस्कृति को भारतीय कहते हैं तो उसका क्या अर्थ है? भारत में अभिव्यक्त संस्कृति या कि भारत की संस्कृति यह भारतीय संस्कृति का पर्याय मात्र है। उसे हिन्दु संस्कृति कहना भारत को काटना है और उसे एक बड़े समुदाय-विशेष से जोड़ना भर है। आर्यसंस्कृति कहें तो इतिहास का अपलाप है। आज कोई नहीं कह सकता है कि अमुक आर्य है और अमुक अनार्य। समुद्र में गंगा, यमुना, रेवा, कावेरी आदि अनेक नदियों के मिल जाने के बाद अनेक इतिहासकार अपनी बुद्धि की गंगाजली में समुद्र से पानी भरकर कहें कि यह गंगा का जल है और जो दूसरे लोटे में जल भरा गया है वह कावेरी का है तो उसके तर्क पर विस्मय के साथ-साथ हँसी आती है। कारण स्पष्ट है कि इतिहास के लम्बे प्रवाह में सब कुछ इतना घुलमिल या रच-पच गया है और साथ ही इतिहास के प्रारम्भिक पृष्ठ इतने धूमिल और अस्पष्ट हैं कि उन्हें सही तरह से पढ़ पाना सम्भव नहीं रह गया है। एक बात और है- घुलमिल जाने और रच-पच जाने के बाद ही हम अपनी संस्कृति को भारतीय कहते हैं। अन्यथा आर्य, मुस्लिम, ईसाई, द्रविड़ संस्कृतियाँ कहते- जैसा कि कुछ विद्वानों का आग्रह है। भारत की प्रकृति और परिवेश में जो भी पनपा है वह अपने मूल से एकाकार नहीं है। इसीलिये भारतीय मुस्लिम, ईसाई, पारसी अपनी संस्कृतियों के मूल देशों से अनेक रूपों में भिन्न हैं। इसी प्रकार आर्य भी वैदिक आर्य से भिन्न हैं। इन सबको जिन समान तत्त्वों, आदर्शों, व्यवहार, परिवेश परम्परा आदि ने ढाला है वह भारतीय संस्कृति है। इसका यह अर्थ नहीं है कि कोई एकरूप शाश्वत सांस्कृतिक सत्ता है जिसकी अभिव्यक्ति मात्र अनेक रूपों में हुई है। संस्कृति की अद्वैतवादी धारणा आवश्यक नहीं है। यह भी माना जा सकता है कि कोई भी संस्कृति अपने में नानात्व समाहित किये रहती है किन्तु उस नानात्व

में परस्पर भिन्नता में भी सहयोग होता है- एक दूसरे से भिन्न होने पर भी, यहाँ तक कि विरोधी होने पर भी सह अस्तित्व, पारस्परिक आश्रयशीलता, आपसी कार्यकारणभाव तथा सहकारिता सर्वथा सम्भव है। इसी कारण नानात्व के साथ-साथ वह एक है, और दिखती है। शतदल एक है यद्यपि उसके पत्ते अनेक हैं, खरबूजा बाहरी अलग-अलग चिन्हों के रहते हुए भी एक है, विभिन्न दिशाओं में बहने वाली नदियों का गन्तव्य एक है। इसी कारण विविधताओं को अन्तर्गर्भित करने वाली भारतीय संस्कृति एक है, वह संस्कृतियों या अनेक उपसंस्कृतियों का समुदाय मात्र नहीं है। संस्कृति के विश्लेषण में दार्शनिक दृष्टि स्पष्ट होनी चाहिए अन्यथा वह आत्मघाती विश्लेषण बन सकता है। स्वगत किन्तु सहयोगी नानात्व को अस्वीकार करने वाला संस्कृति का लक्षण सारे संसार पर अपना साम्राज्य स्थापित करना चाहता है, उसे श्रेष्ठ होने का अहं आक्रान्त कर लेता है और वह वैचारिक असहिष्णुता और प्रतिरोध को आमन्त्रित करता है। संस्कृति के विशुद्ध एकत्व की अवधारणा अन्ततः साम्राज्यवादी दृष्टि है।

अपने इतिहास के उषःकाल से भारत विभिन्न विचारों का संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ रहा है। यहाँ चिन्तन का प्रजातन्त्र प्रारम्भ से स्थापित है। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि सर्वथा भिन्न विचारों का समन्वय सर्वदा होता रहा है। किसी भी ऋषि (मौलिक चिन्तक) के विचार का सर्वथा अनादर नहीं किया गया। चार्वाक और बृहस्पति की ऋषि और देव रूप में मान्यता आज भी प्रतिष्ठित है। भारत में चिन्तन और अभिव्यक्ति का प्रजातन्त्र सदा रहा है। इसीलिए ये इतने विपरीत मत-मतान्तर, आचार-विचार, आहार-विहार, वेष-भूषा, भाषा-विभाषा, जाति-प्रजाति की मान्यता स्वीकार की जा रही है। एक ओर वेद को स्वयंप्रकाश, नित्य, अपौरुषेय और सर्वज्ञ मानने वालों का मत है तो दूसरी ओर उसे भांडों, धूर्तों और निशाचरों की कृति बताने वाले लोग रहे हैं। एक देश के वितान में धार्मिक पुस्तक के सम्बन्ध में उत्तर-दक्षिण ध्रुवीय धारणाएँ शायद ही किसी अन्य धर्म ग्रन्थ को लेकर किसी देश में स्वीकृत और प्रचारित की जा सकी हो। ज्ञान का भक्ति से, कर्मसिद्धान्त का भक्तिसिद्धान्त से, धर्म का मोक्ष से सर्वथा विरोध है। ज्ञान की अद्वैतवादी धारणा में किंवा कर्मानुसार फल के सिद्धान्त में अनुग्रह की कोई गुंजाइश तार्किक निष्कर्ष से नहीं दिखती। पर अद्वैतवाद में तथा कर्मसिद्धान्त के साथ-साथ भक्ति की प्रतिष्ठा है। भगवान् भक्त पर अनुग्रह के द्वारा जैसा चाहे तैसा कर दे सकता है, वह अहेतुकी कृपा कर सकता है। धर्म व्यक्ति और विशेषतः समाज की दृढ़ता और सुरक्षा एक शब्द में अभ्युदय की परिकल्पना द्वारा करता है, वह मुख्यतः गृहस्थ द्वारा साध्य है। मोक्ष गार्हस्थ्य से, संसार से छुटकारा दिलाता है, वह व्यक्ति को समाज से, संसार से, लौकिक एवं शास्त्रीय विधि-निषेध से काटता है। अश्वघोष की यशोधरा बुद्ध से कहती है कि तुम मेरे प्रति परिवार और समाज यहाँ तक कि गोदी में

खेलने योग्य नन्हें शिशु के प्रति ऋषि-मुनियों की परम्परा से प्रतिष्ठित कर्तव्य को, राजधर्म, पतिधर्म, पितृधर्म सब कुछ छोड़ रहे हो। अतः प्रव्रज्या उचित नहीं है। गृहस्थ धर्म में प्रवेश किये बगैर शिशु शंकर जब प्रव्रजित होना चाहता है तो सामाजिक कर्तव्य को प्रमुख मानने वाले धर्मनिष्ठ प्राणी उसका अनुमोदन नहीं करते हैं। मोक्ष के लिये प्रवृत्ति धर्म का अपलाप और निषेध है। धर्म, अर्थ और काम से समन्वित होकर लौकिक अभ्युदय और पारलौकिक निःश्रेयस् का साधक है। मोक्ष संसार-विरोधी व्यक्तिनिष्ठ सिद्धि है। अतः दोनों में विरोध स्वाभाविक है। इस विरोध की शास्त्रकारों ने चर्चा भी की है। गीता में कर्मकाण्डपरक वेद की निन्दा अनेकत्र है। वस्तुतः वेदवाद के विरोध का आरम्भ उपनिषदों से ही हो गया था। सांख्यकारिका के अनुसार जिस प्रकार लौकिक उपाय हैं, उसी प्रकार वैदिक उपाय भी हैं। उनमें अशुद्धि, क्षय तथा अतिशय है। अतः धर्म (धर्म का कर्मकाण्डीय रूप निश्चित ही) ज्ञान (प्रकृतिपुरुष विवेक) की तरह ऐकान्तिक और आत्यन्तिक दुःखनिवृत्ति या कि कैवल्य का साधक नहीं माना जा सकता। आचार्य शंकर ने भी साध्यरूप धर्म और सिद्धरूप ज्ञान का विषय, फल आदि की दृष्टि से भेद किंवा विरोध चतुःसूत्री में स्पष्ट किया है। धर्म और मोक्ष को उदाहरण के लिये, मीमांसा दृष्टि और वेदान्त दृष्टि का सर्वथा विरोध होने पर भी, पुरुषार्थचतुष्टय की धारणा में एक साथ रख लिया गया। प्रारम्भ में त्रिवर्ग की धारणा थी, मोक्ष का उसमें स्थान ही नहीं था। पर जब मोक्षशास्त्र बहुत प्रबल हो गया तो उसका भी समावेश पुरुषार्थ में हो गया। मोक्ष किस अर्थ में पुरुषार्थ है? वह पुरुष द्वारा काम्य और साध्य कैसे होगा? इसी प्रकार परमार्थ-विषयक दृष्टि में हुआ है। निर्गुणवाद की प्रतिष्ठा के साथ सभी को निर्गुण का प्रतीक मानकर साकार की प्रतिष्ठा स्वयं शांकरभाष्य में मिलती है। मोक्ष जो आत्मा का कैवल्य था उसमें सर्वमुक्तिवाद की प्रतिष्ठा बौद्ध और वेदान्ती विचारधारा में कर ली गई। जो वेदेतर आगम, तन्त्र, साधना-सम्प्रदाय आदि विकसित हुए उन सब को वेद में खोज लिया गया। वेद भी हम किसे कहते हैं? प्रार्थना प्रमुख संहिता तो वेद है ही, कर्मकाण्डमूलक ब्राह्मण भी वेद है और कर्मकाण्ड को प्रतीकात्मक रूप देने वाले आरण्यक तथा कर्मकाण्ड का ज्ञान से निषेध करने वाले उपनिषद् भी वेद हैं। और फिर वेदों, स्मृति, पुराण आदि जो कुछ हैं वे भी तो वेद के भाग हैं या फिर वेदानुकूल हैं। शुक्ल और कृष्ण दोनों (जैसे कि यजुर्वेद के) (उत्तर दक्षिण के) (जैसे सूर्य के) दोनों एक ही के भाग या मार्ग हैं। नदियाँ कहीं से निकली हो, किसी मार्ग पर चल रही हों पर सब का गन्तव्य एक है- अन्ततः सारी सरिताएँ समुद्र में विलीन होती हैं। रुचि, व्युत्पत्ति, संकल्प भिन्न हो सकते हैं और हैं पर उन सबका अन्तिम लक्ष्य एक है। यह है भारत की सामुद्रिक संस्कृति का समन्वय सूत्र। आचार्य शंकर ने परस्पर भिन्न प्रतीत होने वाले उपनिषद्-वाक्यों की व्याख्या जब अपने निर्गुणब्रह्मवाद में प्रस्तुत कर दी तो उसमें तार्किकता की कमी नहीं है और इसे उन्होंने समन्वय कहा है (द्रष्टव्य, तत्तु समन्वयात्, १.१.४ का शांकरभाष्य)। समन्वय का

अर्थ बेतरतीब, असंगत और असंबद्ध प्रतीत होने वाले वाक्यों को एक तार्किक संगति प्रदान करना है। यह संगति संस्कृति के हर मोड़ पर गहन विश्लेषण से तलाश करनी पड़ती है। समन्वय, सम्यक् अन्वय या सही सम्बन्ध है जिसे कोई रचनाशील व्यक्ति अपने चिन्तन से उसी प्रकार एक स्वरूप देता है जैसे कुशल मालाकार बिखरे हुए फूलों को धागे में पिरोकर माला का रूप देता है। यदि तार्किक विश्लेषण के साथ रचनाशीलता, सूत्रकारिता नहीं है तो वह निरर्थक शवसाधना है। आचार्य शंकर ने सब आकारों को मिथ्या बताकर विज्ञानवादी और शून्यवादी से मिलते-जुलते रूप में निर्गुण की प्रतिष्ठा की थी-नानात्व मिथ्या है, सत्य चेतन परन्तु निराकार है। उन्होंने देशकी अनेकताओं को झकझोरकर सत्य को उनसे परे प्रतिष्ठित कर संस्कृति की व्याख्या की थी। आचार-व्यवहार, भाषा या परिधान की अनेकताएँ, नानात्व व्यावहारिक सच भर हैं, परमार्थ सत्य नहीं हैं। इस उद्बोध के साथ देश में चार पीठ स्थापित किये, केरल से काश्मीर तक स्थानीय और क्षेत्रीय नानात्व को मिथ्या समझा जाने लगा। इसके ठीक विपरीत सन्तों और सगुण ब्रह्मवादियों ने सब जग को सियाराममय जान कर उसे प्रणम्य बताया। सब शून्य है, सब कुछ शिव या नारायण है, दोनों विचार तत्त्वमीमांसा की दृष्टि से भिन्न हैं पर दोनों की सांस्कृतिक अर्थवत्ता एक है। यदि तुम्हें नानात्व नहीं भाता तो सारे नानात्व को एक साथ मिथ्या समझ लो। औद यदि नानात्व भाता है तो सबको बिना किसी झगड़े के नारायण या हरिहर मान लो। संस्कृति के सम्बन्ध में यही समन्वय की दृष्टि है।

संस्कारशील द्विज प्रातः उठकर उस धरती को नमन करता है जिसकी करधनी समुद्र है और जिसके स्तन पर्वत हैं, (समुद्ररशने देवि पर्वतस्तनमण्डले) वह जानता है कि मेरी यही माँ है (माता भूमिः, पुत्रोऽहं पृथिव्याः) जिसके पास रहने के लिये उसे स्वर्ग भी नहीं सुहाता और न कोई वैभवसम्पन्न नगरी (अपि स्वर्णमयी लंका लक्ष्मण मे न रोचते। जननी जन्मभूमिश्च स्वर्गादपि गरीयसी)। वह स्नान करता है तो इस देश की सातों नदियों का स्मरण करता है, स्नान करने के बाद पूजा के लिये संकल्प करता है तो अपने देश के द्वीप, खण्ड, पर्वत आदि का नामग्रहण कर करता है। उसके लिये अपनी धरती का हर खण्ड, हर क्षेत्र, हर, पर्वत, नदी-नद, स्थल, कुण्ड आदि पवित्र तीर्थ हैं जिनकी यात्रा करना उसका पवित्र कर्तव्य है। वह कहीं रहता हो पर उपनयन के समय उसे विद्याध्ययन के लिये काशी या काश्मीर जाना है। उसकी साधना के केन्द्र शक्तिपीठ के रूप में सर्वत्र बिखरे हैं। प्रत्येक आचार्य ने अपने मत की स्थापना के साथ देश के विभिन्न महत्त्वपूर्ण भागों में अपने पीठ या मठ स्थापित किये। इस प्रकार विचारप्रधान व तत्त्वचिन्तन-प्रधान दृष्टि से भारत का, सांस्कृतिक भारत का, निर्माण किया। कलाओं के क्षेत्र में भी यही हुआ। शास्त्रीय नृत्य, संगीत, नाट्य के साथ-साथ जन-जन में प्रचलित लोकधर्मी कलाओं

को समन्वित किया। भाषा के क्षेत्र में यह सांस्कृतिक अवदान अत्यन्त महत्त्वपूर्ण है। संस्कृत ने विभिन्न क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं का पोषण और संवर्धन तो किया ही उनसे स्वयं ग्रहण भी किया और जो भी महत्त्वपूर्ण आन्दोलन-चिन्तन दूसरी भाषाओं के द्वारा हुए थे उन्हें सम्पूर्ण भारत में प्रचार के लिये और भावी युगों तक संरक्षण के लिये उसने अपने शब्द, तर्क और व्यवस्था दी। भगवान् महावीर, बुद्ध या सन्त कवियों ने जो भी पालि-प्राकृत, ब्रज या अन्य भाषाओं में कहा था उस सबको अपने शब्दों में दूसरे क्षेत्रों और युगों तक पहुँचाया। इसीलिये संस्कृत किसी प्रदेश की न होते हुए भी सारे देश के संस्कार की भाषा बन गई। जो भी श्रेष्ठ और प्रेष्ठ था उसे उसने अपनाया, म्लेच्छों को भी ऋषियों की तरह पूज्य मानकर (म्लेच्छास्ते ऋषिवत्पूज्याः) उनके ज्ञान को आत्मसात् किया। यह दृष्टि संग्रह की है, निषेध और त्याग की नहीं। संस्कृत को देवभाषा अमरभारती आदि कहा जाता है। देवता किस भाषा में बोलते हैं, यह वही बता सकता है जो स्वर्ग में रहने वाले देवताओं से बात करके उसी देह से वापस आ जाय। पर मनुष्यों में जो श्रेष्ठ ज्ञानी हैं, प्रकाशस्तम्भ हैं, संस्कारशील तत्त्वद्रष्टा हैं, उन्हें भी देव और अमर कह सकते हैं। यह उनकी भाषा अवश्य रही है। इसीलिये हम संस्कृत को संस्कृति की भाषा कह सकते हैं, यह न तो प्रकृति है और न विकृति। यह किसी की न होकर सबकी है। भारत की एकता का यह सबसे महत्त्वपूर्ण सांस्कृतिक उपादान है। वस्तुतः भारत की एकता और अस्मिता राजनीतिक और भौगोलिक आधार पर उतनी व्यवस्थित नहीं रही है जितनी कि सांस्कृतिक आधार पर। इस अर्थ में भारत एक सांस्कृतिक बिम्ब है। वह भौगोलिक और राजनीतिक सीमाओं से बँधा होने पर भी उससे अतिक्रान्त है। वह दिक् और काल दोनों की सीमाओं से संपूर्णतः बँधा हुआ नहीं है। इस सांस्कृतिक भारत के दर्शन भारतीय संविधान में उल्लिखित एवं मर्यादित भारत देश या राष्ट्र के अतिरिक्त अन्य देशों में भी हो सकते हैं। इतिहास के विद्वान् उसे बृहत्तर भारत कहते हैं। इस शब्द में राजनीतिक गन्ध है। सांस्कृतिक भारत केवल उन उच्च आदर्शों और मूल्यों की अभिव्यक्ति है जो अन्य देशों में भौतिक विजय-पराजय के बिना या उसके साथ अभिव्यक्त हुआ है। यदि भारत का आधार सांस्कृतिक न होता केवल राजनीति, भाषा या धर्मविशेष होता तो विगत अतीत में न जाने कितने खण्डों में यह विभक्त हो गया होता। इसीलिये भारतीय संस्कृति को मात्र भौगोलिक, राजनीतिक राष्ट्रियता का पर्याय न मानकर उसे मूल्यों और आदर्शों की सामासिक चेतना मानना आवश्यक है। राजनीति खण्डित करती है, वह सत्ता या शक्ति को हथियाने का और आपसी संघर्ष का अस्त्र है, संस्कृति सत्ता के लिये नहीं अपितु नीति के लिये संघर्ष करती है। नीति निर्बल, अशक्त, दीनहीन का अवलम्ब होती है। वैदिक ऋषि, शास्त्रकार, कवि, सन्त तथा साधु-संन्यासी सभी सत्ता से अलग रहकर संस्कृति के उन्नयन में सजग रहे हैं। महात्मा गांधी और सन्त विनोबा भारत के इसी सांस्कृतिक इतिहास के उदाहरण थे। रामकृष्ण परमहंस, रमण महर्षि,

विवेकानन्द, कांची के शंकराचार्य, श्रीश्री मां आनन्दमयी भारतीय संस्कृति के मूर्तिमान उदाहरण हैं। जो ऋषि होकर भी सत्ता से जुड़ते थे उनके लिये राजर्षि की एक अलग श्रेणी थी। इस प्रकार, संस्कृति की पहिचान और प्रतिष्ठा भारत में सांस्कृतिक पुरुषों (ऋषि-महर्षि, साधु-सन्त) से स्थापित हुई है न कि राजाओं और शासकों से। भगवान् महावीर, बुद्ध और राम ने राज्य को छोड़कर सांस्कृतिक आदर्श की बोधि प्राप्त की थी। भारतीय संस्कृति की परिकल्पना में दार्शनिक विदेह राजा के रूप में तथा राम की चरण पादुका को राजसिंहासन पर प्रतिष्ठित करने वाले भरत अधिक महनीय हैं।

सामान्यतः राजा तो दुराचारी, शठ और लंपट रहे हैं। शकुन्तला, शार्ङ्गरव और शारद्वत ने शाकुन्तल के पञ्चम अंक में राजा को जो कहा है- वह यथार्थ है।अपूर्ण।

(टङ्कित)



2. Concept of the Śāstra

The term śāstra derived from śās, to rule or to instruct, by adding the unādi (4-159) suffix ṣṭrn is analysed as śiṣyate anena. A more fanciful etymology of this term is suggested as <<what instructs and protects>>¹. This is generally translated as science and includes religious or secular treatise. It represents organized and systematic body of knowledge, branch of learning and so on. A wide variety of the śāstras includes such exact sciences as Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy and mathematics, Social Sciences, such as, Economics and Politics, Life Sciences, like Āyurveda, Sciences of language, such as, phonetics, linguistics, grammar and etymology, practical arts and crafts or śilpāśāstra, speculative systems represented by the philosophical schools, vast religious and mythological literature, Purāṇas, Epics, Tantra, Āgamas, Koṣas and so on. The only exception to the category of śāstra seems to be kāvya, representing artistic creation and loka wordly phenomenon². Veda (including Āgama, Śruti, Nigama), Tantravidyā, saṃhitā, vidyāsthāna and kalā may be broadly treated as synonyms of the śāstra³. So far as the linguistic form is concerned sūtra in prose epitomized by kalpasūtras and the Sūtras of Pāṇini appears first and is followed by the śloka and Āryā metres which

are termed as kārikā or even sūtra. But the sūtra form was never given up. It was adopted by the Buddhist and Jain traditions also as illustrated by the Suttapiṭaka a << basket of doctrinary lectures >> and the Sūtrakṛtāṅga⁴. In later ages it was accompanied by auto-comments (vṛtti, vivṛti, vivaraṇa) of the author of the sūtras with necessary illustrations. Reputed śāstric works were commented upon by other scholars. Medieval age of scholasticism is marked by plethora of commentaries and sub-commentaries thereon. Orthodox Brahmanical schools refer to Vedas as omniscient, self-valid, infallible and eternal science or śāstra which are the ultimate source of and final authority for all the knowledge including that of the six Vedāṅgas or limbs of the Vedas, the four Upavedas, vidyāsthānas or branches of learning and so on⁵. Non-Vedic śāstras propounded by the Buddhists, Jainas and others are unreliable and invalid in orthodox view⁶. This is, however, not borne out fully by the facts of the evolution of the śāstras in India. The Vedic literature consisting of the Saṃhitās, Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads is not uniform. It does not represent one consistent thesis. It shows change and evolution. The mood of prayer in the mantras is hardly reflected in the ritualistic explanations of the Brāhmaṇas or these in turn hardly form the symbolism of the Āraṇyakas or the mysticism of the Upaniṣads. There is no real thematic unity and continuity in the evolution of the Vedic literature. Vedas changed their form and content through continuous evolution and self-criticism. The constituent elements of the Vedas took shape in different times and different places to respond to different needs. It is, therefore, no surprise that Pūrvamīmāṃsā declares primarily on the basis of the Brāhmaṇas that the action is the sole end of the śruti (Jaimini Sūtra, 1.2.1) whereas the Uttaramīmāṃsā based on the Upaniṣads holds that the Vedas reveal Brahman or knowledge which is never defiled by action. This mutually contradictory and even hostile approach to the Vedas amongst its closest adherents is possible because the nature of each constituent is different from the other. Upaniṣads are themselves critical of the Vedic knowledge and ritualism⁷. The theistic Gītā is similarly critical of the ritualistic Vedism, although it declares unequivocally that the śāstra is the real authority to determine right and wrong⁸. Cārvāka, Buddhists and the Vaiśeṣikas did not accept śabda, scriptural authority,

as a means of knowledge. Jainas who accept the śabda pramāṇa posit their faith in their own Āgamas (religious literature). The attitude of the heterodox schools of Indian philosophy is hostile to the Vedic authority. The Tantric tradition, post- Śaṅkara schools of Vaiṣṇava Vedānta, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava religious sects, Pāñcarātras and the Bhakti movement derived its inspiration mainly from the non-Vedic sources, Their relation with the Vedas and attempts at reconciliation with the Vedic tradition are superficial. Similarly the << Purāṇas have only a superficial acquaintance with the Vedas >>. One orthodox school accuses the other of going against the Vedic meaning. Mahābhārata, Nāṭyśāstra. Sāhityaśāstra were declared as the fifth Veda, different from the four Vedas. Āyurveda, although treated first as Upaveda, secondary to Veda, asserted itself as an independent Veda. All this signifies that notwithstanding the efforts at reconciliation with the Vedas not occasional lip-service to the authority of the Vedas, these were more of a symbol or a myth than the real factual source in the development of the śāstras in India¹⁰. This shows that the śāstras including the philosophical systems carved out their own destiny. In doing so they compromised their position slightly formally and occasionally so that the intellectual and cultural link with the Vedas may be maintained even with regard to the secular subjects. Vedas in the orthodox śāstras were admitted as an authority (Āgama, śabda) for knowledge but were never allowed to impose uniformity of thought, meaning or style. Reason was not only an aid to the authority of the scriptures. It was also the other way round. The scriptures, even when not abused or held guilty, were bended to yield the desired meaning which was sought by a śāstra on other grounds. Independence and reasoning were not compromised in order to proclaim faithfulness to the tradition. This does not, however, mean that there is complete or sharp or revolutionary break from the Vedic tradition. Marginal, occasional, symbolic, mythical and dialectical relationship has always existed between the Vedas and subsequent development of the śāstras. Even the heterodox schools for that matter imbibed certain features of form and content of the Upaniṣadic idealism. Asceticism of the Jainas and the Buddhists can also be traced back to the Upaniṣads. It was on the pattern of the Vedic

authority that the Jainas developed their own Āgamas and accepted śabda as a pramāṇa, which in a sense undermines the supremacy of the reason. This is also evident from their acceptance of the right faith as a prerequisite of right knowledge.

Dialectical tension persists in the origin and development of the śāstras as a result of continuous though contrived efforts at reconciliation and synthesis with the past represented in orthodox schools by the Vedic authority and acceptance of śabda as a pramāṇa on the one hand an overpowering necessity for change, assertion of supremacy of reason over authority, conflict between opposite points of view within the orthodox schools and outside of it on the other. Even such śāstras which are based primarily on the reasoning, observation and experimentation, Āyurveda, for example, are constrained to quote the authority and accept śabda in order to justify their position.

The six Vedāṅgas, limbs of Veda, i.e. śikṣā, Phonetics, kalpa, science of rituals with its fourfold division of Śruata-, Gṛhya-, Dharma- and Śulva-sūtra, vyākaraṇa, grammar, nirukta, etymology, chandas, metrics and jyotiṣa, astronomy, originated in the Vedic schools, carāṇas or śākhās and in some special technical Schools of the Vaiyākaraṇas, Grammarians, Niruktas, etymologists and the Yājñīkas, experts in the science of sacrifice, referred to by Yāska in his Nirukta. These Vedāṅgas as a body of knowledge were better organized than the Vedas and systematized the matters within their scope. Śāyana in his commentary on the Baudhāyanasūtra explains that since the Brāhmaṇas were numerous and since the rites prescribed by the Vedas could not be easily comprehended through them, therefore, the kalpasūtras were written which had such advantages as being clear, short, complete and correct¹¹. Belief in degeneration of the values with the advent of the age of Kali, gradual decline of powers of perception and understanding, necessity for providing short treatise in view of very extensive literature on a subject are generally cited as the basis for writing a śāstra. There is no doubt about the Vedic origin of the Vedāṅga but it is significant to note that many extant works of the Vedāṅga are of late origin (such as śikṣās ascribed to Pāṇini and others, the Chandas-Sūtra of piṅgala and the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini). Even

in the face of Patañjali's assertion that Pāṇini deals with both Vedic and laukika (non-vedic) words. It can be said that the Aṣṭādhyāyī is mainly concerned with the Bhāṣā (classical Sanskrit) than the Chandas (Veda)¹². There are a number of Sūtras which refer to the vedic accent exclusively but it is a very insignificant part of the whole where we have little or no treatment of the Vedic grammar. Chandas-Sūtra of Piṅgala treats mainly Prakrit and Sanskrit metres and includes only a few of leading Vedic metres. Closely allied to the Vedāṅga is the concept of Upaveda implying Vedic linkage of Āyurveda, science of life, Dhanurveda, science of archery, Gandharva-Veda, science of music and the śāstra--śāstra, science of arms, which according to the Carañavyūha(xxxvk. 4) are related to the Ṛk-, Yajur-, Sāma- and Atharva Vedas respectively. While Caraka, Suśruta, Bhāvaprakāśa and Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdaya-Sūtra (8.8) declare Āyurveda as the subordinate limb of the Atharvaveda, the Kāśyapasaṃhitā and the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa (1.16.9-10) consider the Āyurveda to be the fifth Veda (Pañcama Veda). This notion of fifth Veda propagated to gain respectability is also applied to Mahābhārata, Nāṭyśāstra and the Sāhityaśāstra. This implies more of independence and difference in character of these sciences than their dependence on the Vedic authority, although it is always declared that these constitute the essence of the Vedas. Some other śāstras, such as Arthaśāstra, Kāmaśāstra do not lay claim to their Vedic origin. There is, however, a pathetic anxiety amongst some puritans and obscurantists to trace everything, even the latest scientific and technological discovery to the Vedas. Such a belief is extremely dangerous more particularly in secular fields because this means that all knowledge is rooted in the hoary past and that it can never grow, it can not be forward-looking and futuristic. Acceptance of verbal testimony has fortified this belief. However, inspite of this belief, new śāstras continued to flourish exercising their independence by way of either interpreting the past or by open and hostile criticism.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad (VII.1.2., repeated in VII.1.4., VII.2.1. and 7.7.1) gives a long list of the vijñāna, knowledge derived from the śāstras. Nārada says to Sanatkumāra (VII.1.2) - << Sir, I know the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda, the Sāmaveda, the Atharvaveda, Itihāsa-Purāṇa as the

fifth, the Veda of the Vedas (i.e. Grammer). Propitiation of the manes, Mathematics (rāśi), Augury (Daiva), Chronology (nidhi), Logic (Vakovākya), Polity (ekāyana), Science of the Gods (deva-vidyā, etymology according to Śaṃkara), the Science of Veda (i.e. Śikṣā, kalpa and chandas according to Śaṃkara), Demonology (bhūtavidyā), the science of Rulership (kṣatratravidyā; Dhanurveda according to Śaṃkara), Astrology (nakṣatratravidyā), the Science of Snake-charming and the Fine Arts (Sarpa-devajana-Vidyā)>>. The list of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (II.4.10. recurring in IV. 1.2 and IV.5.11 and also in Maitrī Upaniṣad, I. VI.32) perhaps includes grammar to Fine Arts given in the list of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, under vidyā and further adds Upaniṣads, verses, sūtras, explanations and commentaries to the list. Thus another term which may be treated as synonym for the śāstra is vidyā. Nyāya enumerates four vidyās (i) Ānvīkṣikī, logic and metaphysics, (ii) Trayī, the triple Vedas, (iii) Vārtā sciences of agriculture, commerce, medicine, etc. (iv) Daṇḍanīti, the science of government. Manu adds Ātma-vidyā, science of spirituality, to this list. According to others vidyā has fourteen divisions, viz., the four Vedas, the six Vedāṅgas, Dharma śāstra, Purāṇa, Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya (Nandipurāṇa; Yājñavalkya Smṛti, 1.3). By adding four upavedas to this list the Vidyā has eighteen divisions (Vidyāsthānas). This implies that the concept of śāstra was extended to include philosophy purely secular subjects like agricultural sciences, political sciences and economics and the Purāṇa, mythology, which were not earlier included in the Vedāṅga concept. Śilpaśāstra, practical arts and crafts, included under the upaveda, was further elaborated under the term kalā. Kāmaśāstra (I.3.17.) and Śaivatantra mention the sixty-four kalās which include science of architecture and metallurgy and the technology of manufacturing weapons.

The enunciation of the trivarge¹³ or three objects of human life to which was added at a later stage mokṣa, liberation, as the fourth and final goal under the impact of asceticism and spirituality, sought to establish one of these four objects as the subject of a śāstra. While Dharmaśāstra deals mainly with the Dharma, Arthaśāstra with the artha, Kāmaśāstra with the kāma, matters falling within the domain of one śāstra are also treated in the other. Hence the dictum : śāstram

śāstrāntarānubandhi¹⁴, one śāstra is related to the other. This interdisciplinary character of many a śāstra is dictated not only by the interrelatedness of certain subjects but also because the trivarga, set of three values or the puruṣārtha-catuṣṭaya, set of four values, of human existence was integrated and harmonized. Thus it is said that the Mahābhārata contains all the four values, Vātsyāyana (3rd century A.D.) pays collective obeisance to the trivarga at the very outset and Kṛṣṇa declares in the Gītā (7.11) that << I am kāma uninimical to Dharma>>. The first three values are believed to lead to the final and ultimate end of human existence, the mokṣa. All the philosophical schools except the Cārvaka believe in this ideal and are thus declared the mokṣa-śāstras i.e. sciences of spirituality¹⁵. This position is seriously questioned and integral relationship between Indian Philosophy and mokṣa and characterization of Indian Philosophy as spiritual is disputed on the grounds that there is hardly any school, except the Vijñānavādin which denies the independent reality of matter in an ontological sense and that on a comparative study of the role that God plays in the Indian and Western philosophical traditions, one would find that this role in the Indian intellectual tradition, in the field of philosophy is far more marginal than in their counterpart systems in the western tradition¹⁶. The great intellectual debate between the Buddhists and the Naiyāyikas lasting from the fifth to the eleventh century and then the development of Navyanyāya which covers a period of nearly five hundred years, from twelfth century to the seventeenth century A.D. and its contribution to logical thought to practically all the branches of learning, disprove exclusive concern of the Indian philosophy with mokṣa and spirituality. The great intellectual debate carried on by stating all counter-positions (pūrvapakṣas) and defending the final position is the very characteristic of a śāstra based on reasoning (tarka).

The Nirukta of Yāska (700 B.C.) is one of the most authoritative, richly documented and closely knit exegetical work. The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini (500 B.C.) is universally recognized for its thoroughness, with which it investigates the roots of the language and the formation of its words, for its precision of expression and above all, for its wonderful competence in using a concise terminology and a style which covers the

entire material of the language within the shortest possible compass. The well-known definition¹⁷ of the sūtra is based on the nature of Pāṇini's Sūtras. This emphasizes economy of words, clarity, meaningfulness, comprehensiveness, consistency and flawlessness. The vast literature in Sanskrit written in the sūtra form, e.g. the Kalpa Sūtras, Pāṇinian Sūtras and the earliest formulations of the six systems of Indian philosophy, bears witness to the concise nature of the Sūtras written to memorize and explained through the oral and recorded tradition of interpretation in the unbroken line of teachers and their students. Upaniṣads employed a number of methods in their exposition. Amongst these the method of disputation or dialogue, as found in the dialogues between Yama and Naciketas in the Kathopaniṣad, between Āruṇi and Śvetaketu and between Nārada and Sanatkumāra in the Chāndogya and between Yājñavalkya and Maitreyī and Yājñavalkya and Janaka in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka is very important. Amongst other methods are the symbolic¹⁸, the aphoristic, the etymological and the synthetic. The maxims (nyāyas) such as Arundhatīnyāya and analogies (dṛṣṭānta) are frequently employed as also the tales (ākhyānas) are told to drive home a point. Mīmāṃsā had enunciated various principles of interpretation of philosophy. Nyāyasūtras are pre-eminently devoted to the methods and techniques of argumentation, disputation and dialectics. Out of the sixteen padārthas of Nyāya, all excepting only the prameya, object of valid knowledge, are directly related to the methods of disputation. The Nyāyabhāṣya on it further explains the threefold methodology of the Nyāyaśāstra, or of any other śāstra for that matter, consisting in enumeration (uddeśa), definition (lakṣaṇa) and analysis (parīkṣā). Kauṭilya in the last fifteenth Chapter of his book the Arthaśāstra explains and illustrates the 32 methods, devices or techniques used to elucidate a scientific treatise. These are known as tantra-yuktis. The Suśrutasaṃhitā (Uttaratantra, Ch. 65) describes closely allied 32 tantrayuktis. These are also stated in the Viṣṇudharmottara (I.6.). The Carakasamhitā (Siddhisthāna, ch. 12.78) mentions 36 tantrayuktis. The later works like the Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdaya and the Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha (49.98) mention 36 tantrayuktis. The commentator of Caraka, namely, Cakrapāni mentions that an old commentator Bhaṭṭāra Haricandra had added

pariprasna, counterquestion, vyākaraṇa, elucidation, yutkrāntābhidhāna, explication and hetu, means of knowledge, to the list of 36 tantrayuktis. Kālaṃgha wrote an independent work called Tantrayuktivicāra¹⁹ in view of their importance for scientific methodology. According to S.C. Vidyabhusan²⁰, the tantrayukti was compiled possibly in the 6th Century B.C. to systematize debates in the pariśads or the learned assemblies and considers the tantrayuktis as the terms of Scientific argument. According to S.N. Dasgupta²¹ these are modes of expression and maxims, Dr. Radhakrishnan translates them as technical terms and R. Samashastri as paragramphical divisions of treatises. The Suśrutasaṃhitā states the nature and purpose of the Tantrayuktis as reputation of the wrong statement of opponenet and establishment of his own sentences. In a nutshell the tantrayuktis serve the well-recognized system of stating and meeting the pūrvapakṣa and finally establishing a thesis (siddhānta). The tantrayuktis have been explained and illustrated by Kauṭilya and Caraka in the context of their own śāstra but these are of general application. According to the Arthaśāstra (1) prakaraṇa or topic is the object with respect to which a statement is made (2) vidhāna or statement of contents is the serial enumeration of the sections of a science (3) yoga is the syntactical arrangement (4) padārtha or a meaning of the word is restricted to technical meaning of a particular term (5) hetvartha is reason proving a thing (6) uddeśa is a statement in brief (7) nirdeśa is a detailed statement (8) upadeśa is general advice for regulating the conduct (9) apadeśa is reference to the opinions of others on a given subject (10) atideśa is application to a new context (according to Caraka it is prognostication) (11) pradeśa is indication of what is to be explained later on (12) upamāna (accepted by some as a pramāṇa) is analogy which proves the unknown with the help of the known (13) arthāpatti is implication or presumption (accepted by the Mīmāṃsā and the Vedānta as a distinct means of knowledge) of somethings not directly mentioned but is understood or implied by the statement (14) saṃśaya is doubt with reasons on both sides (15) prasaṅga is similarity of a situation, (16) viparyaya is proving a thing with the help of the opposite (17) vākyaśeṣa consists in supplying a word or an idea not expressly mentioned (18) anumata is approval by

non-contradiction of other's opinion (19) vyākhyāna is the description of a speciality (20) nirvacana is derivation of a word on the basis of its components (21) nidarśana is illustration by analogical description (22) apavarga is exception to a general rule (23) svasañjñā is technical use of a term not sanctioned by others, (24) pūrvapakṣa is prima facie view meant for rejection (25) uttarapakṣa is the final view in a matter (26) ekānta is an invariable rule that is applicable unexceptionally (27) anāgatāvekṣaṇa is reference to a future statement (28) atikrāntāvekṣaṇa is reference to a past statement (29) niyoga is direction, such as, << thus and in no other way >> (30) vikalpa is alternative or optional direction (31) samuccaya is combination of two ways (32) ūhya is understanding of the implicit.

The great significance of the tantrayuktis is underlined by Caraka (12.86) by saying that without these none can grasp the meaning of a śāstra, these are like lamps (66.43) knowledge of which makes a doctor venerable. Caraka has discussed in the Sūtrasthāna and the Vimānasthāna of his Saṃhitā important methodological issues relating to theoretical investigation (parikṣā), the strategy or methods of verification (siddhi upāya), standards of investigation (vimāna) and the ways of discussion in a friendly and hostile assembly of experts (vādamārga). Discussion through dialogue (saṃvāda) has been very popular way of advancing arguments. This is found not only in the Upaniṣads, Gītā and the śāstric works but also in the poems, Raghuvamśa, Kirātārjuniya, Śiśupālavadhā and others and is perhaps precursor of the śāstrārtha, disputation regarding the meaning of śāstra. Even now this is popular in all the traditional centres of Sanskrit learning, such as, Varanasi. The old Ācāryas like Śaṃkara, resorted to śāstrārtha in order to establish supremacy of their school of thought or śāstra. Āgamadambara (Act I) has given even rules of conducting a debate and disputation. The whole logic and methodology of science, discussed in the Carakasāṃhitā in great details, amply prove the rational and scientific basis of the śāstra. Caraka (Saṃhitā, Siddhisthāna Sūtra 49) has declared that a śāstra like a weapon destroys if badly handled and protects if handled deftly, In the very beginning of the VIII Chapter of the book, Vimānasthāna, the question is raised as to how one should

determine that a particular śāstra, a scientific treatise, is better than the others in the field. In reply to this the characteristics of a good śāstra are stated as follows :

tatra yanmanyeta sumahadyaśasvidhirapurūṣāsevītamārthabāhulamāptajanapūjitaṃ trividhaśiṣyabuddhihitamāpagatapunaruktadoṣamārṣaṃ suprañitasūtrabhāṣyasaṃgrahakramaṃ svādhāramanavapatitaśabdamaḥkāṣṭhaśabdaṃ puṣkalābhīdhānaṃ kramāgatārthamarthātattvaviniścayapradhānaṃ saṃgatārthamasamkulaprakaraṇamāśuprabodhakaṃ lakṣaṇavaccodāharaṇavacca, tadabhiprapadyeta śāstram / śāstram hyevaṃvidhamamala ivādityastamo vidhūya prakāśayati sarvam //

This characterization of a śāstra underlines comprehensive treatment of a subject, stylistic perfection, logical order and recognition by experts of great eminence. Aruṇadatta in his commentary Sarvāṅgasundarā, on the Aṣṭāṅghṛdaya mentions 15 flaws to be avoided in a śāstra. These are (i) use of unfamiliar words (aprasiddha śabda) (ii) bad composition i.e. lacking in the objectives of the sūtra and bhāṣya (duḥprañīta) (iii) unrelatedness to the aphorism (asaṅgatārtha), (iv) harshness in pronunciation (asukhārohi) (v) opposition to example, rule and convention (viruddha) (vi) over-elaboration (ativistrta) (vii) being extremely brief (atisamkṣipta, opposite of the ativistrta) (viii) lacking in proper statement of objectives (aprayojana) (ix) lacking in logical order (bhinnakrama) (x) doubt on account of fallacies (samdigdha) (xi) tautology or repetition of the same meaning (punarukta) (xii) lacking in evidence (niḥpramāṇa) (xiii) lacking in complete or conclusive treatment of a subject (asamāptārtha) (xiv) use of a word incapable of conveying the intended meaning (apārthaka) and (xv) self-contradiction (vyāhata). Some of these flaws are just the opposite of the qualities mentioned by Caraka, others are actual defects. Out of these, apasiddha śabda, asukhārohi and apārthaka relate to the word, ativistrta, atisamkṣipta, bhinnakrama and duḥprañīta to the logical and stylistic imperfection and the others to the meaning or content of a śāstra. Many of these qualities and flaws of a śāstra remind us about the whole scheme of guṇas and doṣas found in the works of Sanskrit poetics, such as the Kāvya-prakāśa (see, Ch. VII and XIII) and

one can say that many merits and demerits of an artistic work apply equally well to the composition of a śāstra. The author of an anonymous commentary Yuktidīpikā on the Sāṃkhyakārikā in its introductory verses (9,13,14) declares the latter as a śāstra, as distinct from the Prakaraṇa (a monograph dealing with one part or topic of a śāstra) mainly because it deals with the entire subject-matter of the Sāṃkhya in a logical order through definitions and characterizes the treatise as concise (alpagantha), full of contents (analpārtha), possessed of all the tantraguṇas and reflecting the original image of tantra, i.e. śāstra of the great sage Kapila. According to an old Kārikā quoted in this commentary (p. 2) the tantra-guṇas, merits or characteristics of a śāstra, are (1-3) possibility (uppapatti or sambhava) of sūtra, pramāṇa and avayavas i.e. the śāstra should contain (i) aphoristic statements which by their very nature will contain lakṣaṇas or definitions (ii) pramāṇas on which the thesis is based and (iii) the avayavas or parts, which are of two kinds: (a) enquiry (jijñāsā), doubt, purpose, possibility of attainment and removal of doubt for self-understanding and (b) five members of syllogism for making others understand : i.e. pratijñā, proposition (i.e. statement of proposition which is sought to be established, hetu, reason, dṛṣṭānta, verificatory evidence exemplifying the reason, upasaṃhāra, showing relevance of the evidence in a given case and nigamana, deduction of conclusion. These three terms, namely, sūtra, pramāṇa and avayavas may be said to constitute the logical aspect of the tantraguṇas (4) anyūnatā or completeness (5-6) mention of doubt (samśaya, is sāmānyābhīdhāna), that is general statement and of decision (nirṇaya) that is specific statement which may be expressed or implied (7-8) uddeśa, brief statement and nirdeśa, detailed statement (9) anukrama, putting the things in sequence (10) samjñā, term, which is either rooted in the technical meaning (arthanibandhanā) or is merely conventional (svarūpanibandhanā). In a śāstra terms are coined and used on the basis of their conceptual significance. The same technical terms are used subsequently in a discipline as there is no fun in coining new terms when the old ones can be usefully employed. (11) Upadeśa, statement of the result (phala). The commentator has illustrated all these characteristics of a śāstra for his text, the Sāṃkhyakārikā. By way of his -iti used in the

Kārikā quoted by him, he adds utsarga, general rule, apavāda exception and atideśa, extended application, to the list of eleven guṇas or sampat which are identified with the tantrayuktis. He further points out that on account of these guṇas the Sāṃkhya is an independent śāstra although it may, like other śāstras, such as yoga, may have some common points. What really constitutes it as a śāstra is the fact that it explains the entire subject-matter of the Sāṃkhya²². The discussion on the nature of a śāstra in the Yuktidīpikā emphasizes logical and stylistic perfection, its convincing presentation and completeness in its treatment of the subject. It also points out that one śāstra may share certain common points with others but in order to be treated as an independent śāstra it should fulfil the basic condition of exhaustive treatment of a subject critically examined and logically presented, otherwise it would be either a dependent treatise or a prakaraṇa dealing with a topic or two.

It was to lay down the logical structure of a śāstra that the concept of four-fold anubandhas, preliminaries was developed. Kumārila says that Jaimini in his very first sūtra has stated the subject-matter (viśaya) and prayojana, objective and has implied its connection (saṃbandha) with the śāstra which thus persuades the listeners (see Ślokavārtika, 1.1.12, 16-19). To this was added the consideration of the adhikārin or competent student. This again is implied by the term atha in the sūtra. Like Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta (see Vedāntasāra) also accepts the scheme of four-fold preliminaries of a śāstra. Another closely allied concept is the definition of an Adhikaraṇa or chapter of a śāstra. Each Adhikaraṇa or chapter consists of live limbs namely, statement of the subject or topic under consideration (viśaya), doubt (Samśaya) related to it, prima facie view (pūrvapakṣa), rejoinder (uttara) and final conclusion or thesis (siddhānta). Thus various methods and standards relating to both the form and content of a śāstra were prescribed so that rational, logical, objective and scientific tradition may be maintained.

Science and technology flourished not only in ancient India but it continued to grow with the same vigour throughout the medieval period. According to A. Rahman²³, the projection of science and technology as a

European tradition was dictated by political objectives of the colonizers who over-emphasized the mythological and mystical traditions of Indian thought and denigrated the rational and scientific tradition. This distortion of Indian tradition is sharply corrected when we look at the rich wealth of manuscripts in the field of science and technology in medieval India. A Bibliography²⁴ has listed a number (indicated against the name of science) of manuscripts written in Sanskrit during 8-19 centuries A.D. in agriculture - 15, Architecture - 246, Astronomy - 2136, Botany- 33, Geography including Gemology and Geology - 83, Mathematics - 126, Medicine - 4106, Physics - 103, Zoology - 102. General attitude towards sciences and scientific literature may be summed up in the oft-quoted sūktis selected at random from various sources and appended to this paper.

APPENDIX

1. Vidyayā vindate' mṛtam, **Kenopaniṣad**, 12.
2. Vidyayāmṛtamaśnute, **Iśopaniṣad**, 11; **Maitryupaniṣad**, VII, 9.
3. Sā vidyā yā vimuktaye.
4. Sāstrānyadhītya medhāvī, **Amṛtopaniṣad**, 1.
5. Yasya nāsti nijā prajñā kevalam tu bahuśrutah /
na sa jānāti śāstrārtham darvī sūparasāniva //
Mahābhārata, Sabhāparva, 54, 4.
6. Paṭhakaḥ pāṭhakaścaiva ye cānye śāstracintakāḥ /
sarve vyasanino mūrkhāḥ yaḥ kriyāvān sa paṇḍitaḥ // **Ibid**, 313, 110.
7. Śāstradṛṣṭānavidvānyaḥ samatītya jighāṃsati /
sa pathaḥ pracyuto dharmāt kupathe pratihanyate //
Mahābhārata, Sautikaparva, VI, 20.
8. Yaḥ śāstravidhimutsrjya vartate kāmakārataḥ /
na sa siddhimavāpnoti na sukham na parām gatim // **Gītā**, XVI, 23.
9. Tasmācchāstraṃ pramāṇam te kāryākāryavyavasthitau /
jñātvā śāstravidhānoktam karma kartumihārhasi //
Ibid, XIV, 24.
10. Sarvaṃ śāstramavidvadibhirmṛgyamāṇam na siddhyati,
Agnipurāṇa, 337, 4.

11. Sarvameva kalau śāstraṃ dvija, **Viṣṇupurāṇa**, VI, 1, 14.
12. Svakarmadharmārjitajīvitānām śāstreṣu dāreṣu sadā ratānām /
jīhendriyāṇāmatithipriyāṇām gr̥he'pi mokṣaḥ puruṣottamānām //
13. Tarkaśca vādahetuḥ syānnīstivaihikasādhanam /
purāṇānī mahābuddhe ihāmutra sukhāya vai //
Bṛhannāradyapurāṇa, 9, 106.
14. Kalatrinam vā śāstrajñam śrotriyam vā guṇavitam /
yo dattvā sthāpayed vṛtīm tasya puṇyaphalam mahat // **Ibid**, 13, 28.
15. Prabhuḥ svāmī yathā bhṛtyamādiśatyetadācara /
tathā śrutismṛti cobhe prāhatuḥ prabhūsammatam //
itihāsapurāṇādi suhṛtsammitamucyate /
suhṛdavatpratibodhyainam pravartayati tattvataḥ
kāvyālāpādikaṃ yacca kāntāsammitamucyate //
Skandapurāṇa, Mā., Kau., 40, 69-70.
16. (i) bhūyo vidyāḥ praśasyo bhavati, **Nirukta**.
(ii) naikaṃ śāstramadhīyāno gacchati śāstranirṇayam, **Caraka**.
(iii) ekaṃ śāstramadhīyāno na vidyāt śāstrainścayam /
tasmād bahuśrutaḥ śāstraṃ vijānīyāccikitsakaḥ // **Suśruta**.
(iv) ekameva śāstraṃ jānānaḥ na kiṃcidapi śāstraṃ jānāti.
(v) śāstraṃ śāstrāntarānubandhi, Daṇḍin, **Viśrutacarita**.
(vi) sarvapārśadaṃ hīdaṃ śāstraṃ, **Vākyapadiya**.
(vii) śāstraṃ ca vividhāgamam, manusmṛti, 12, 105.
17. (i) maṅgalādīni hi śāstrāni prathante, **Mahābhāṣya**, Paspasāhnikā
(ii) maṅgalādīni, maṅgalamadhyāni maṅgalāntāni ca śāstrāni
prathante / **Ibid**, under Bhuvādisūtra.
18. Dharmamarthaṃ ca kāmam ca pravartayati pāti ca /
adharmānarthavidveṣānidam śāstraṃ nihanti ca //
Arthaśāstra, 15, 72.
19. Śāstraṃ vinayavṛddhaye, Kāmandaka.
20. Ākārasadṛśaprajñāḥ prajñayā sadṛśāgamah /
āgamaiḥ sadṛśārambhaḥ ārambhasadṛśodayaḥ //
Raghuvamśa, 1, 15.

21. Senā paricchadastasya dvayamevārthasādhanam/
śāstreṣvakunṭhitā buddhirmaurvī buddhirmaurvī dhanuṣi cātātā //
Ibid, 1.19.
22. Āgamadipadṛṣtena khalvadhvanā sukhena vartate lokayātrā /
divyaṃ hi cakṣurbhūtabhavadbhaviṣyatsu vyavahitaviprakṛṣṭādiṣu ca
viṣayeṣu śāstraṃ nāmāpratihatavṛtti/ tena hīnaḥ
satorapyāyatalocanayorandha eva janturarthadarśaneṣvasāmarthyāt //
Daṇḍin, **Daśakumāracarita**, Aṣṭamocchvāsa.
23. Yauvanārambhe ca śāstrajalaprakṣālananirmalāpi kāluṣyamupayāti
buddhiḥ, **Kādambari**, Śukanāsopadeśa.
24. Anekasaṃśayocchedi paroṣārthasya darśakam /
sarvasya locanaṃ śāstraṃ yasya nāstyandha eva saḥ //
25. Dve vartmanī girāṃ devyāḥ śāstraṃ ca kavikarma ca /
prajñopajñam tayorādyam pratibhodbhavamantimam //
Bhaṭṭatauta, quoted in Gopālakṛta-Kāvya prakāśa-Vyākhyā.
26. Samaṣṭiḥ sarvaśāstrāṇam sāhityamiti gīyate.
27. Gurūpadeśādadhycetum śāstraṃ jaḍadhiyo' pyalam /
kāvyam tu jāyate jātu kasyacitpratibhāvataḥ //
Bhāmahālamkāra, 1, 5.
28. Śāstreṣu mūrkhāḥ kavayo bhavanti.
29. Tatra lokāśrayam kāvyamāgamāstatvadarśinaḥ // **Bhāmahālamkāra**.
30. Śabdaprādhānyamāśritya tatra śāstraṃ pṛthagviduḥ /
arthatattvena yukte tu vadantyākhyānametayoḥ /
dvayorguṇatve vyāpārprādhānye kāvyadhīrbhavet // **Ibid**.
31. Ānandanīyandiṣu rūpakeṣu vyutpattimātram phalamalyabuddhiḥ /
yo' pītihāsādivadāha sādhusmasmai namaḥ svādaparānīmukhāya //
Daśarūpaka, 1, 6.
32. Sarvaśāstrārthasampannaṃ sarvaśilpapravartakam /
nātyākhyam paṃcamaṃ vedaṃ setihāsam karomyaham //
Nāṭyaśāstra, 1, 55.
33. Dhigjivitaṃśāstrakalojjhitasya.
34. Na śāstraṃ vedataḥ param.
35. Mūrkhasya kiṃ śāstrakathāprasamgaih.

36. Śāstraṃ hi niścitadhīyaṃ kva na siddhīmeti, Māgha, **Sisūpālavadhā**.
37. Śāstrādrūḍhirvalīyasi.
38. Śrotrasya bhūṣaṇaṃ śāstram.
39. Babhāra śāstrāṇi dṛṣam dvayādhikām, **Naiśadhiyacarita**, 1, 6.
40. Sāhitye sukumāravastuni dṛḍhanyāyagrahagaṃthile tarke va mayi saṃvidhātari samaṃ līlāyate bhārati, Śrīharṣaviṣaye.
41. Śāstreṇa rakṣite rāṣtre śāstracintā pravartate.
42. Śāstrānyadhītyāpi bhavanti mūrkhāḥ.
43. Kāvyaśāstravinodena kālo gacchati dhīmatām, Bhartrhari, **Nitīśataka**.
44. Rṣiṇāmapi yajñānaṃ tadapyāgamapūrvakam, **Vākyaṇḍīya**, 1. 30.
45. Śaktirnipuṇatā lokaśāstrakāvyaḍyavekṣaṇāṭ, **Kāvyaṇḍīya**, 1. 2.

References

1. Yacchāsti vaḥ kleśaripūnaśeṣān saṃtrāyate durgatito bhavācca / tacchāsanāt trāṇaguṇācca śāstrametadvayaṃ cānyamateṣu nāsti // Nāgārjuna, **Mādhyaṃaka-kārikā**, 5.
2. See, appendix, sūkti nos 25, 27, 29-31 and 45.
3. See, Manu, 12.94 & 99; **Jaimini Sūtra**, I.2.2; Śāṅkarabhāṣya on the **Vedānta - Sūtra**, 1.1.3.
4. See, Kōgen Mizuno, **Buddhist Sūtras, origin, development, transmission**, Tokyo, Kosee Publishing Co. Ltd., 1982.
5. **Mahābhārata** (Śāntiparva, Ch. 122) mentions that eighteen Vidyās (i.e. six Vedāṅgas, four Vedas, Mīmāṃsā, Nyāya, Purāṇa, Dharmasāstra, Āyurveda, Dhanurveda, Gandharva Veda and Arthaśāstra) were elaborated by Maheśvara which were again elucidated into 300 śāstras and 70 Tantras into thousands of ways and that these are all derived from the Veda: **Śāśvad abhyasyate loke veda eva tu sarvaśaḥ** and these śāstras may therefore be termed as vedavādas or elaborations of the Veda.
6. See, **Praśastapādabhāṣya** and Kandalī thereon, p. 428; (I.3.4.) ; Nyāyatātparyāṭikā, II. 1.68; Kumārila (I.3.4.) includes Sāṃkhyayoga, Pāñcarātra and Pāsupatas also along with the Buddhists ; Kusumāñjali II.3; **Ātmatattvaviveka**, pp. 430-33; **Sāṃkyatattvakaumudī** on Kārikā 5.

7. **Muṇḍaka**, I.1.5 specifies knowledge derived from the four Vedas and the six Vedāṅgas as inferior (aparāvidyā which is equivalent to avidyā). See, also, **Isāvāsya** 9-11; Kāṭha, 2.4.5; 2.22; **Chāndogya**, VII.1.3.4.
8. See, **Bhagavadgītā**, II, 42-46; XI, 48; XV, 20; XVI, 23-24.
9. R.C., Hazra, **Puranic records**, p. 222.
10. See, Louis Renou, **The Destiny of the Veda in India**, Delhi, Motilal Banarasidass, 1965.
11. Tataśca coditānāṃ karmaṇāṃ sukhāvabodhāya bhagavān baudhāyanaḥ kalpamakalpayat / yato brāhmaṇānāmānantiyaṃ duravabodhatayā [...] ato na taiḥ sukhaṃ karmāvabodha iti kalpasutrāṇīmāni pratiniyataśākhāntarānyaṅgīcakruḥ pūrvacāryāḥ / kalpasya vaiśadya-lāghava-kārtsnyaprakaraṇasūdhyaḍibhiḥ prakarṣairyuktasya /
12. **Nirukta**, I.20; **Mahābhāṣya**, I ; **Nāṭyaśāstra**, I.8-12 (N.S.ed); **Vākyaṇḍīya**, II.478-484 (University of Poona, Sanskrit Series, Vol. II).
13. **Hiraṇyakeśi Gṛhyasūtra**, II.19.6 mentions the trivarga for the first time. It is accepted in the Purāṇas and Smṛtis of Viṣṇu and Manu and is alluded to in the Gītā. The set of four values of human life with the supremacy of the mokṣa is axiomatic in classical Sanskrit literature and consequently śāstra is defined as what teaches the means of and warns against the obstacles to the caturvarga, set of the four values.
14. See, Appendix, Sūkti No. 16.
15. See, **Sāṃkhyapravacanabhāṣya**, p.7, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi, 1977.
16. See, Daya Krishna, (i) Three conceptions of Indian Philosophy, in << **Philosophy East and West**>>, (January, 1965), pp. 37-51; (ii) Three Myths about Indian Philosophy, in << Diogenes >>. For opposite view see, Karl H. Potter (i) Indian Philosophy's alleged Religious orientation in << **Philosophic Exchange** >> vol. I, No. 3 (Summer 1972), pp. 159-174 (The Journal of the Centre for Philosophic Exchange of the State University of New York, College of Arts and Science at Brockport, New York, U.S.A.); (ii) **Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies**, Vol. II, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1977. Daya Krishna's

reply to Karl H. Potter's counter-position is contained in his recent paper, *Indian Philosophy and Moksa, revisiting an old controversy*, in << Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research >>, vol. II, no. 1.

17. (i) *Alpākṣaramasamdigdhamasāravadvīśvatomukham / astobhāmanavadyaṃ ca sūtraṃ sutravido viduḥ //*
quoted in the *Nyāyatātparya-ṭīkā* 1.1.3, and **Padamañjari** of Haradatta.
- (ii) *Laghūni sūcītārthāni svalpākṣarapadāni ca / sarvataḥ sārabhūtāni sūtrāṇyāhurmanīṣiṇaḥ //*
quoted in the **Yuktidipikā**, p. 2, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1967.
18. Satya Prakash Singh, **Upanisadic Symbolism**, Delhi, 1981.
19. Edited by N.E. Muttuswami, Keral State Publication, 1976.
20. **History of Indian Logic**, pp. 211-25.
21. **History of Indian Philosophy**, vol. II, p. 392.
22. *Siddham tamtrayuktīnām sambandhopapattestāntramidamiti/ sakalapadārthasamgrahātāntrānyetāni, evamiḥāpi sakalapadārthasamgrahātāntrāntaratvamabhyupagantavyam / tasmād yuktametātāntramidam / Yuktidipikā*, p. 5, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1965.
23. **Science and Technology in Medieval India** - A Bibliography of Source Materials in Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian, ed. A. Rahman, et al., New Delhi, Indian National Science Academy 1982, Introduction, p. xi. See also, A. Rahman, et al., **Science and Technology in India**, Delhi, Indian Council for Cultural Relations, 1973, also A. Rahman, Trimurti, **Science, Technology & Society**, Delhi, Peoples Publishing House, 1972.
24. **Ibid**, and **A Bibliography of Sanskrit Works on Astronomy and Mathematics**, New Delhi, Indian National Science Academy, 1966.

[ESTRATTO DA, INDOLOGICA TAURINENSIA (Official Organ of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies, Vol. XIII, 1985-86) Proceedings of the sixth world Skt. Conference, Philodepphia, October 13th - 20th, 1984]



3. Suggestions for Indo-German Co-Operation in Indology

**Tubingen-nagari ramyā pratnā Kaśiva Viśrutā
Yatratyā Viduṣām vācah pānti Gangeva Bhāratim.**

My observations in this paper are mainly based on Sanskrit studies which constitute the major part to Indology. Sanskrit has been studied outside India as a relic of the past than as a living reality. Sanskrit signifies the essence of Indianness. And for a vast majority of Indians it represents a living religion, philosophy and culture of India. Literary writings in Sanskrit - prose, poetry, drama, Campu, novels, tales and lyrics present a living tradition. Few know it, fewer still speak it but many more above it. Contemporary Sanskrit literature is immense and is varied in its form and content. Old themes with fresh insights and idioms or modern themes with classic idioms are not rare in today's creations in Sanskrit. Sanskrit scholarship is considered at its best when it combines profound knowledge of the sciences with significant creativity. The late prof. V. Raghavan, who is known for his critical studies and creative writings, illustrates this understanding. However, contemporary Sanskrit literature which has created new words and phrases, which has creatively interpreted old myths and tales has failed to catch the imagination of the European Indologists. A constant and critical evaluation of this literature will change our perceptions by relating Indology to the living present. As a result of this encounter with the present, dictionaries will entertain words coined in our times, a book on Sanskrit Grammar will explain new un-Paninian forms and constructions, prosody will welcome new metres, criticism will expound and formalise new chances in diction and style and explain varied forms of poetic creation, the mythology will discover shifting meanings of old myths. This is just illustrative. The character of Indology or Sanskrit studies is bound to undergo a significant change as a result of its encounter and involvement with the living present.

lack of awareness about the continuing massive German contribution to Indology is growing amongst the students of Sanskrit

being educated through the regional languages of India. Their knowledge of English is barely sufficient to know even the results of research available in English, access to works written in German and other European languages is practically prohibited. The number of scholars doing doctoral work is swelling in the universities of northern India. However, the quality of research is decreasing for want of information on international researches in a particular discipline. The program of Indo-German co-operation need not ignore this stupendous number of research scholars being trained in Indology mainly through the medium of Hindi in northern India. Qualitative improvement of their lot should be consciously aimed at by international community of Indologists. Today these scholars are being spoon-fed by second-rate works giving them no guidance or inspiration for consulting the best minds in Indology. The number of colleges and the universities offering courses in Sanskrit at under-graduate and graduate levels has tremendously increased in free India. These students rely on Bazar notes for success in the examination and are thus very poorly equipped for research at a later stage. Studies in Indology at pre-research levels can definitely be improved by providing standard works in the language that they can understand.

There is yet another stream of Sanskrit students which continues to be trained through native traditional method followed in the pathshalas, Sanskrit colleges, two Sanskrit universities and the six Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapithas established under the auspices of the Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan an autonomous organisation set up by the Government of India, Ministry of Education and Social Welfare. The traditional stream has remained more or less unaffected by modern studies and researches, It clings to its old beliefs and methods of understanding and preserving the Sāstras without any analytical, historical or critical judgement. It has not corrupted itself with modernity. But the traditional stream has a distinct advantage. It knows the traditional meaning of each and every word of a Sāstra, which is still in vogue. It may not have a sense of history and might lack in sharpness of comparative analysis and reasoning based on historical sense, yet it remains the torch-bearer of the old faith and culture of the Indians. The best products of this system are pride of the nation,

because it is only with their help that one may be able to research the tradition of a particular science. Creativity is yet another merit of this class of scholars. Amongst them we find writers at home with Sanskrit using the classical language with uncommon felicity and ease like a profound commentator of by gone age or composing verses like the poets of the past. Lack of modern scholarship in these Pandits is more than compensated by their traditional knowledge and creativity. Indological studies have made no special effort to penetrate this class of traditionalists. Max muller mastered Sāyaṇa to know the meaning of the Vedas. Now the Sāyaṇas must know what the Max Mullers have to say on the Vedas. This alone will finally determine the success of Indology. Indian students who combine the best of the two systems may be small in number yet they constitute the hope for the better future of Indology in India. The suggestions that follow have these two streams of students in view. First and foremost consideration should be given to such students in future training in Indology who have acquired training in both the systems of education must importantly the traditional system. They should be preferred in the award of scholarships. A good grounding in the language is prerequisite for any critical study or research. The edifice of historical analysis is to be built on the second foundation, Traditional training provides such a grounding.

While all steps necessary for promoting education in the German language in India may be taken so that Indian students continue to benefit from the tremendous progress made by the Germans not only in Indology, but also in Science and technology, yet translations of important German works in English and of same in Hindi and Sanskrit also will remain a necessity for regular exchange of ideas and their propagation amongst the vast number of students taking to Indological studies. Results of research should not be confined to the small number of experts, they should be shared by the whole society, Untranslated works of such savants of Indology as Friedrich Von Schlegel, Hermann oldenberg, Alfred Hillebrandt, K.F. Geldner, Hermann Jacobi, Richard Pischel, Heintch Luders, Otto Von Brhtlingk, Sheodor Anfrecht, Adolf Friedrich Stenzler, Albrecht weber, Georg Buhler, Parl Deussen, Heinrich Zimmer, M.

Winternitz, Adolf Holtzmann, Rudolf Otto, Paul Threme, Walter Ruben, Klaus Fischer not excluding the renowned Indologists who worked at Tubingen: Rudolph Von Roth, Richard Garbe, Jacob Haur, Helmuth Von Glasenapp and of those who are currently engaged in Indological researches bearing on cotemporary India, should be translated for the benefit of the students of Indology in India. A tentative and brief list of such works is appended to this paper. Germany is the Varanasi, Taxila and Nalanda of modern Indology. A need for perennial feedback and regular flow of information and results of research from this land known for its profundity and precision in scholarship can't be ove-stated. An average Indian believes that the real Vedas are in Germany and that the modern progress in Science and technology has been made possible through the knowledge of the sciences contained in those Vedas which the Germans had mastered. This belief may be naive, yet it underlines the profound respect for the German scholarship that the Indians have. Although French, British and Indologists of other countries have made their over valuable contribution to international scholarship in Indology. Yet no such belief has been generated in respect of them. There is an innate and spontaneous respect for the views of the German scholars. This then casts a special responsibility on the German Indologists. Their works must be continuously brought to the notice of Indian students of Indology and many others interested therein. In order to achieve this not merely translation of important Indological works into Indian languages will be necessary as suggested above. In fact to make this contact continuous and infectious, a bi-annual journal/digest giving brief abstract of current studies by way of papers, monographs, projects should be published in English. This should carry brief information on researches and studies in India and Germany.

Some other suggestions which need no elaboration may be put as follows :

- (i) Short-term and long-term scholarships/fellowships on reciprocal basis may be instituted/increased for education and research in Indology.

- (ii) Indological books and journals published in India and Germany may be exchanged mutually. These may be placed in research centres/universities selected for this purpose keeping in view the specialisations being pursued in a particular centre.
- (iii) Max Muller Bhavans and Indo-German societies in India and their counterpart in Germany could be assigned a more active role in organising literary and cultural activities, in acting as the clearing-house of information and ideas for promoting Indo-German co-operation.
- (iv) Visit to important Indological centres, manuscript libraries and extension lectures by eminent German and Indian Scholars, on reciprocal basis should be further engaged.
- (v) Indian and German scholars planning any work jointly should be encouraged with financial support to execute their project and publish the results of their research.

Critical edition of the Mahābhārata is complete that of the Rāmāyaṇa is under way. The Sanskrit Dictionary on the historical principles at the Deccan College is yet to go a long way. Similar is the fate of new catalogues catalogorum begun by the late. Dr. V. Raghavan. A vast number of Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhramśa manuscripts remain still uncovered by an all India Survey of the manuscripts. Agamas and the Tantras immense variety, eighteen Puranas and the Upa-Puranas, scientific and quashi-scientific literature, an astronomy, astrology and a host of other sciences are in urgent need of critical editions. A number of important works are still in the manuscripts. Their publication will fill many a gap in the literary linguistic and cultural history of India. Indo-German co-operation in the areas suggested above will be necessary, particularly with a view to promoting inter-disciplinary approach to the studies so that different disciplines and sciences help in constructing a clear and comprehensive image of the past and relate to the contemporary India. Linguistics, mythology, art and architecture, religion, philosophy and culture, history, archaeology, sociology and economics to name only a few should be co-ordinated to study a subject say the pilgrim centres of India or the temples of Orissa. Works available in print or in manuscript

either in India or Germany should be mutually exchanged by providing micro-film copies and through other mechanical devices. The areas suggested above may now be listed in brief.

- (i) Survey of Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhramsa manuscripts.
- (ii) Critical editions of the Agamas, Tantras, Puranas and the scientific literature.
- (iii) Publication of important manuscripts.

There are certain disciplines which could not enjoy the same fortune as did the Vedic studies or the science of the languages. Amongst these may be included the Navya-nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, Yoga and Tantra. These perhaps deserve better attention to gain depth and profundity.

At the outset I had pleaded for orientation of our aim to deal with Indology or rather the Sanskrit studies as a living tradition and culture of the Indians. In order to achieve this aim and proceed in this direction while a guru-sisya tradition has no real substitute but one might recommend some devices which modern science and technology have placed at our disposal. Cultural events including classical dance and drama, places and objects may be filmed and Video tapes of selections from the Vedic and the classical literature, graded lessons in Sanskrit middle Indo-Aryan and modern Indian languages of Sastrarthas (traditional form of Sastric disputations), poetic recitations etc. may be prepared to give a vivid and life-like account of Indology in Germany. This will equip much better the German students of Indology to embark upon the Indological education and research and might radiate inspiration for creativity. The classical age of Indological research has given way to specialisation in our times. We still need an integrated approach which will co-ordinate various disciplines. For this, not merely national but international co-operation is solicited.

**Moksamūladibhih prajñair puraṇi yuvatih
Jnana-Vijñāna-vraddhyartham Bhāratim stuta tāmupāsmahe.**

(Typed)



4. Influence of Sanskrit on the Rajasthani language and literature

Sanskrit gave rise to the first Middle Indo-Aryan languages and finally Modern Indo-Aryan languages, of which it continues to be the basic and a rich linguistic and literary source. Rajasthani is no exception to the rule. It was around the 11th century A.D. and onwards that from the Apabhramśa¹ developed a number of dialects in the region comprising the whole of modern Rajasthan, parts of Malwa, Saurashtra, Sindh and the Panjab. Important amongst these dialects are : (1) Mārawārī² Dhumdhādī (ढूढाड़ी)³ (3) Mālvi⁴ (4) Mevātī⁵ and (5) Vāgarī⁶.

Rajasthani is the collective name for the above dialects. While the language of Rajasthan today imbibes the characteristics of all the above dialects and is a natural heir to their linguistic and literary treasury, it is Marwari which like Khari Boli, in the case of Hindi, has the chief claim to forming the standard Rajasthani. Mārawārī, as the literary language, is known as Dingal since the 19th century A.D.⁷

An observation by John Beames regarding the relation of Sanskrit with modern Aryan languages of India holds good in the case of Rajasthani also. **Let it then be granted as a fact sufficiently proved... that the spoken Sanskrit is the fountain from which the languages of Aryan India originally sprang; the principal portion of their vocabulary and the whole of their inflectional system being derived from this source. Whatever may be the opinions held as to the subsequent influences which they underwent, no doubt can fairly be cast on this fundamental proposition.**⁸

The Vocabulary of early Rajasthani⁹ contains a comparatively small percentage of Tatsama words (say 20%) whereas the percentage of Tadbhava words derived from Sanskrit (either through Prakrit or directly) and of Deśaja words is extremely large. Words of Persian and of non-Āryan sources are also found in a small number. In view of a large

percentage of Tadbhava and Deśaja words, a thorough study of Rajasthani language in all its developments will prove amply rewarding. An examination of the three thousand words occurring in the Kanavajja Samaya of the Pṛthvī Rāja Rāso reveals¹⁰ that the percentage of Tatsama words is 16 and that Persian words constitute a very small fragment as they are only fifty. Among the Tatsama words occurring in the above text, the following may be noted :

अंकन, अंगना, अंगुलि, अंचल, अम्ब, अंबर, अम्भोरुह, अंखंड, अथ, अच्छ, अनुहार, अपर, अर्क, अलक, अस्तमित, आगत, आबद्ध, आसने, इतो, इह, उच्च, उच्चार, उभय, एव, कथित, किरण, कुंभ, कुसुमित, कोट (Fort), गंडस्थल घनसार, तंबूलस्यः, ततो, तटाक, तामस, नग्न, नभ, पावन, पुनर्, पूजा, बिम्बेन, मरंति, मंजीर, मध्याह्न, मनोमय, यज्ञार्थे, रद, लोल, विवर्जित, शृंग, संवेग, समादाय, सह, सहस्र और सीधु।

An analysis of the nature of Tadbhava words in the Pṛthvī Rāja Rāso will require a comprehensive discussion on the Rajasthani language proper, its phonology, formation of nouns and verbs in it etc., which is not very pertinent for our purpose here. The poet of the Pṛthvī Rāja Rāso suffers from a pathetic desire to introduce Sanskrit in his work. He fails miserably in writing any verse correctly in Sanskrit. Nevertheless, a number of stanzas are found here which are full of some kind of corrupt Sanskrit. Sanskrit was employed perhaps to demonstrate one's knowledge of the language of the learned and thus to earn recognition of the Pandits. Some examples of this may be found interesting and will eventually illustrate how early literature in Indo-Āryan languages imitated, though very poorly, the form of Sanskrit. What they wrote was a semblance or imitation of Sanskrit and never Sanskrit. In the Kanavajja Samaya there are eight chandas in this corrupt Sanskrit. They are: Kāvya : Verse Nos. 20, 95, 141, Śataka : 140, Āryā : 147, Śloka : 179, 188, 194, The Kāvya (Verse No. 20) is as follows:

बंभे कंडकमंडले कलिमले कान्तिहरः कःकविः ।
तं तुष्टां त्रैलोक्यतुंगगहनी तुं गीयसे सांमनी ॥
अर्धं विष्णु अगामिनि अविज्रते अस्टष्ट ज्वालाहवी ।
जंजाले जग मार पार करनी दरसाइ सा जाह्वी ॥

The Āryā is as given below :

तुलसाइ विप्र हस्तेषु विभूतिः वर योगिनां ।
चंडिय पुत्र तवोरह त्रीणि देयानि सादरम् ॥ Verse No. 147

The Śloka is :

धर्मार्थेषु च यज्ञेषु कामकालेषु शोभितं ।
सर्वत्र वल्लभा बाला रणकालेषु मोहिनी ॥ Verse No. 188

The other Śloka is :

गुरुजनो नाम नास्ति तातमातविवर्जितः ।
तस्य काम विनश्यंति जाम चन्द्रदिवाकरः ॥ Verse No. 194

In Troṭaka also 'm' is used to give the semblance of Sanskrit as in Troṭaka Nos.21-31:

सुरनर टट चालं कुसुमति लालं अतिजालं ।
हिम रिम प्रतिवालं हरिचर नालं विधिवालं ॥ Verse No. 28

Similarly, again, in Troṭaka Nos. 203-211, 282-298 m is employed to symbolise Sanskritism. Gāthā (see verse No. 179), Nārāca (see verse No. 248) also at times employed the m trick. The following Gāthā is interesting as it embodies, with necessary modification and simile, an oft-quoted Sanskrit saying न गृहं गृहमित्याहुर्गृहिणी गृहमुच्यते।

यतो नलिनी ततो नीर यतो नीर ततो नलिनी ।
यत्र गेह गेहिनी तत्र यत्र गेहिनी तत्र गृह ॥ Verse No. 273

The above examples of the use of corrupt Sanskrit in Pṛthvī-Rāja-Rāso demonstrate indubitable impact of Sanskrit literature on Rajasthani. There is a popular saying that म् लगन्तं संस्कृतं बनन्तम्. The poets of early literature in Rajasthan seemed to follow this dictum to maintain their popular prestige as poets of considerable calibre. The tradition of Saḍbhāṣākavitā or a poem containing use of six languages, which invariably included Sanskrit, had such an unchallenged sway over the writers of poetry that such tricks as use of 'm' for poor Sanskritisation came into vogue.

One of the important characteristics of Rajasthani is the use of Tadbhava words in more than one meanings. For example, the word Karatāra from Kartā in Sanskrit occurring eight times in the Pṛthvī-Rāja-Rāso means maker (Kartā), cymbal (Karatāla) and Palm tree (karatala); the word kara (occurring 400 times) stands for hands, ray of light and trunk of the elephant. Being pronounced as Kaḍa it also stands for buttocks (the word Kada being derived from Kati).

It was observed earlier that the percentage of Tatsama words in the Pṛthvī-Rāja-Rāso is very small (about (20%). This increased in later works of Rajasthani, particularly from the 16th century A.D. onwards. The Veli Kriṣṇa Rukmiṇī Rī (1580 A.D.) by Pṛthvī Raj Rathor bears testimony to this. To illustrate, we quote :

मेली तदि साध सुरमण को कमनि रमण को कमनि साधु रही।
फूले छंडी वास प्रफूले, ग्रहणो सीतलता इ ग्रही।
धुनि उठी अनाहत संख भेरी धुनि अरुणोदय थियो जोग अभ्यास
माया पटल निसामें मंजे प्राणायामें ज्योति प्रकाश।

The Sanskrit words, such as Aruṇa, Abhirāma, Kañja, Nayana, Grīvā, Pataṅga, Dhanuṣ are abundantly used in the Dingal literature of the centuries that followed. The most brilliant poet of Dingal in the 19th century, Suryamala Misraṇa, freely mixed Sanskrit in his historical poem the Vamśabhāskara. It may also be noted in passing that in Rajasthani works dealing with Śāstric subjects (prosody, rhetoric, astrology, Darśana etc.) and in translation or adaptations or in works based on Sanskrit literature (for example, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata) the percentage was still higher. However, the Rajasthani works in prose had always a higher percentage of Tadbhava words; even words of Persian origin, such as सुरताण, आदाब, जमात, तमास, दखेस, फील, दस्ते, फरमाण, बन्दगी, were freely used. So much about the impact of Sanskrit on the vocabulary of Rajasthani. Now we pass on to its structural and inflectional elements.

Sanskrit is synthetical or inflectional. Hindi, like English and many other modern Indian languages, is analytical¹¹. In a synthetical language particles are not separable. They are incorporated into the words

which they modify by varying the terminal syllable or syllables. In an analytical language, particles are not even recognisable as constituent elements of the word with which they are used and new auxiliary words have to be brought in to express the necessary modifications of sense¹². Rajasthani, unlike Hindi, preserves both the inflectional and analytical forms. To illustrate

1. Nominative singular, masculine (by termination in e): ढोले करह चलावियो करि सिणगार अपार (ढोला मारु रा दोहा)।
2. Nominative singular, masculine (by termination in simple stem):
 - (i) जप्यो प्रिथिराज (कनवज्जसमय, ३३६.२)।
 - (ii) चहुवान गाउ (Ibid, 302.6)।
 - (iii) सिर तुट्टे (Ibid, 189.1)।
3. Nominative singular, masculine (by termination in 'u')
 - (i) कहे चन्दु (कनवज्जसमय, ३३६.६)।
 - (ii) पर्यो माल चँदेलु ।
4. Nominative plural, masculine (by termination in a) कायरड़ा मंजन करे आँसू धार मंझार (कायर बावनी)।
5. Nominative plural, masculine (by termination in आँ) पारस कीधी पंडिताँ सरब मिले संताँह (वचनविवेकपच्चीसी)।
6. Nominative singular, feminine (by termination in 'i' and 'a')
 - (i) धरणि
 - (ii) अरधंगा
7. Nominative plural, feminine (by termination in आँ or याँ)
 - (i) अखियाताँ वाताँ बचे (सुजसछत्तीसी)।
 - (ii) जाया रजपूताणियाँ वीरत दीधी वेइ।¹³

The accusative singular of masculine is formed by either termination in simple stem or in 'u' or in 'e'. For example -

- (i) वज्जपति वज्ज गहि ।
- (ii) दिव दिवान गो देवरउ ।
- (iii) हाथी घोड़ाए मार्यो (वेलि.) ।

The accusative plural of masculine and feminine is formed by औँ and यौँ¹⁴. For example -

- (i) भिड़जाँ भड़ा चारणाँ भाटों मुंहगा वतरणहार ।
- (ii) नराँ नटीणों नारियाँ (सूर्यमल्ल) ।

The accusative singular of feminine is formed by termination in 'i' and 'a'. For example: कट्टारि and अरधंगा ।

The instrumental singular of masculine and feminine is formed by 'i' and 'e' and plural (both masculine and feminine) by 'e' and 'ām'¹⁵. For example -

- (i) कनवज्ज दिख्खन कारणइ (कनवज्जसमय)।
- (ii) रुके निरदलिया रवद (राजरूपक) ।
- (iii) पितनू कमलाँ पूज बारणमुख बड़भाग ।

The dative is formed by 'e' 'nu' and औँ in singular and by only औँ in plural. For example -

- (i) कलह करे मत कामणीं घोडे यी देताँह ।
- (ii) हंसाँ नग हरनूँ तुचां, दांत किराताँ दीध (सीहछत्तीसी)।

The ablative is formed by ऐ and औँ. For example -

- (i) नारवै हियै निसास पास न राण प्रतापसी। (दुरसाजी) ।
- (ii) चिहुरै जल लागो चुवण (वेलि.) ।
- (iii) तात विदेसाँ आवियो (नाथूदान) ।

The genitive is formed by अ, ऐ and औँह¹⁶. For example -

- (i) ढोले मन आणंद भयो (ढोला मारु रा दोहा)।
- (ii) भाव टालिये भवाँह (पृथ्वीराज) ।
माथै मुगलाँह वधि वधि खाँडा वाहती (रतनरासो) ।

The locative singular is formed by ऐ and plural additionally by औँ. For example -

- (i) कंत घरै किम आविया (सूरजमल) ।
- (ii) चंचलाँ चांद महा सरवर री पाल आइज्मो रही (रतनरासो) ।

For vocative, either a simple uninflected stem is used or ए and ऐ are prefixed to the stem.

From the above examples, two facts stand out. Rajasthani maintains, like Sanskrit, synthetical forms and secondly, its particles inseparable from the stems are few and many of these are employed in different cases. Thus particle 'S' can be used in all cases of singular masculine. In plural, generally औँ or यौँ is used. Another important feature is the use of the uninflected stem in a number of cases like instrumental, dative, genitive and locative, Side by side with synthetical forms, Rajasthani developed analytical forms under the influence of the Apabhraṁśa. In Rajasthani, two or more postpositions are found for different cases except the nominative and the vocative which have none.¹⁷

It is clear from the above that the Rajasthani language has, in its declension of nouns, a great variety, namely :

(1) Uninflectional i.e. where simple stem is used without ending. We have in Sanskrit such uncharacterised nominative neuters to the stems in-h and in nominative feminines ending in ā (Ramā) and those in ī of the Devī class. The locative without ending (which is the oldest form in Sanskrit) appears in n- stems (for example, Ahan, Śīrṣan, Mūrdhan,) and in the vṛddhied forms of the i and u stems.

(2) Inflectional form has been treated at length and it has been pointed out how Rajasthani, unlike Hindi and some other modern Indian languages, is similar in this respect to Sanskrit.

(3) Analytical form of the Rajasthani brings it closer to Hindi and other modern languages of India and marks the impact of the Apabhraṁśa.

Other important linguistic peculiarities of Rajasthani marking the influence of Sanskrit may now be noted briefly :

(1) In Diṅgal both dental and cerebral 'I' are found. While dental 'I' is common to classical Sanskrit and other modern Indian languages, cerebral 'I' is found in Vedic Sanskrit, Marathi, Gujarati, Lahandi and Oriya only. There are a number of words ending with cerebral 'I' where if 'I' were pronounced dentally, it would change its meaning¹⁸. For example:

- (i) Mālī, gardener ; Mali, financial.
- (ii) Mahal, woman ; Mahal, palace.
- (iii) Cañcala, horse ; Cañcala, fickle.

(2) In Vedic Sanskrit, accent or stress on a particular syllable determines the meaning of a word. In Rajasthani, stress on a particular syllable or lack of it changes the meaning. For example :

Nara Woman, Lion.

Kaḍa Height, When.

Maur Coin, Back.

Pira Pain, Bride's parental home.

(3) Although palatal s does not exist in Rajasthani and it is always represented by a dental s in its script, in pronunciation both are distinguished. Thus Sastra in writing is read as Śastra, Caturdasa as Caturdaśa. This was clearly to maintain correct pronunciation of the Tatsama and Tadbhava Sanskrit words. Similarly a cerebral ṣ is generally pronounced as kha but in Tatsama Sanskrit words the cerebral pronunciation is respected. For example, Poṣa, Āṣāḍha and Bhīṣma.

(4) Independent ṛ changes into ri. For example, Ṛṣi in Rajasthani becomes Risi but in words with conjoined syllables, generally Tatsamas, the ṛ has been retained as in Smṛti and Vṛta.

(5) Words of Sanskrit origin are changed into Tadbhavas, by various devices, as illustrated in the following examples :

- (i) दुर्लभ – दुर्लभ, दुरग – दुर्ग, कीरत – कीर्ति, ध्रम – धर्म, क्रम – कर्म (by changing ṛ into ra or its position)।
- (ii) हेक-एक, एक- हेव, तुलछी-तुलसी, छमा-समा, रामण-रावण (by replacing e by he; s by ch and va by ma)।
- (iii) कैरव-कौरव (by replacing au by ai)।
- (iv) समहर-समर, अँवहर-अँबर (by placing ha before ra)।
- (v) आरण-रण (by adding a vowel in the beginning)।
- (vi) जीवण-जीवन माण-मान (by changing words of N-stem in o ṇa)।
- (vii) पीवइ-पिबति, हुई- भवति।

(6) F or tadbhava indeclinables, the following words of Rajasthani may be listed : परभातइ-प्रभात, रातई-रात्रि, अज्ज'अद्य, पुण-पुनः, दूरइ-दूरे, तटे-तत्र, अनेठि-अन्यत्र, पाखलि-पक्षे, जेण-येन, जथा-यथा, अवस-अवश्य, अउझकइ-अकस्मात्, अत-अति, आगा-अग्रे, नएवि-न तु।

(7) In old Rajasthani, which was influenced to a large extent by Gujarati, there were three genders as in Sanskrit. But, later on, the neuter was assimilated to the masculine as in Panjabi and Hindi.

(8) Agreement of the adjectives with their substantives is found both in Sanskrit and Ḍingal.

(9) A simple future derived from the synthetical tense in Sanskrit exists in Rajasthani For example : करस्युं, करसी, करस्यां, करस्यो, करसी and करसूँ. It is the Sanskrit future iṣya as in kariṣyāmi which is retained by Rajasthani through karissāmi in Prakṛita¹⁹. Side by side with karissati we get in Prakṛita करिहइ and thus in Chand's simple future हैं- forms are found as in Tulasī -

हम सावंत सब जुझिहैं
कै सिर तुमहि समप्यि हैं
कै सिर धरिहौं छत्र।

Rajasthani has an interesting variety of metres. Dohā, Kavitta, Chhapaya, Nisani, Jhūlaṇa, Kuṇḍaliyā, Davavaita, Vacanikā, Jhamal, Be-akkhari and Gīta and more particularly Dohā (perhaps from Dodhaka or Dogdhaka in Sanskrit) Kavitta and Gīta are mostly favoured by the Rajasthani poets²⁰. A number of varieties of the Dingala metres were named in Sanskrit such as Vidyādhara, Lakṣmīdhara, Sārnga, Modaka, Nārāca, Ardha-Nārāca, Carcari and Amṛtadhvani. Amongst Sanskrit metres freely used in Rajasthani are Upendravajrā, Bhujaṅga-prayāta, Taralanayana, Mukhadama, Trotaka, Cāmara, Śārdūlavikrīḍita, Gītikā, Harigītikā, (i.e. Harigīta in Sanskrit), Chappaya, (Aṣṭapadi in Sanskrit) Vacanikā and Paddhari (Padhari in Rajasthani). Use of a great number of Sanskrit metres in Rajasthani signify their close relationship.

Employment of the Alamkāras is a sine que non of literary language. Alamkāras of Sanskrit are not only discussed and illustrated in Rasjasthani Rhetoric but are freely used in literature. Given below is the list of important Alamkāras employed with or without any effort in important works of Dingal.

Sanskrit Alamkāras in the Veli Kriṣaṇa Rukmaṇī Rī:

(1) Anuprāsa- 13 Yamaka- 10; Ślesa-9 Vakrokti-7; Citra-1.

(2) Rūpaka-58; Utprekṣā-44; Upamā-37; Svabhāvokti-16; Dīpaka-10; Apahnuti- 10; Yathāsamkhya-9; Vyāghāta-9; Parikara-8 Ullekha-7; Virodhābhāsa, Saṁdeha, Udātta, Samāsokti, Atiśayokti (each six times), Hetu-5; Samuccya-5; Vibhāvanā-4; Vyatireka-4; Pratīpa-4 Nidarśanā, Kāvyaṛthāpatti, Atyukti, Bhrāntimān, Parikarānkura, Paryāya (each three times); Dṛṣṭānta, Sāra, Paryāyokti, Ekāvalī, Mīlita, Anyonya, Viśeṣa, Anumāna and Pramāṇa (each twice) and Viśeṣokti, Tulyayogitā, Adhika, Udāharaṇa, Sahokti, Praharṣaṇa, Sūkṣma (each once only).

● Dhavalapacīsī of Bankidas

Each Dohā or Sorathā has one or more Alamkāras. However, only 14 arthālamkāras have been used. Besides Hetu and Vicitra, each occurring eight times, Sama occurs four times and Ākṣepa three times. Each of aprastuta-praśamsā, Samuccaya, Vidhi and Udātta are employed twice only. The remaining alamkāras, Adhika, Ananvaya, Sambhava, Nirukti, Viśada and Vinokti occur only once.

In another work of his, namely, the Nītimañjarī, Bankidas has used twelve arthālamkāras including Dṛṣṭānta, Pariṇāma, Upamā, Krama and Vyāghāta (which are not found in the Dhavalapacīsī). The best poet of Rajasthani even in using alamkāras of Śabda and artha is Suryamala Miṣaṇa. In his Vīrasatasai, Śabdālamkāras (besides Vayanasagai alamkāra of Rajasthani) include Chekānuprāsa, Vṛṭtyānuprāsa, Śrutyānuprāsa, Antyānuprāsa, Lāṭhānuprāsa, Yamaka and others. The arthālamkāras used in this Vīrasatasai include Upamā, Utprekṣā Rūpaka, Parikarānkura, Kāvyaṛthā, Apahnuti, Dīpaka, Atiśayokti, Atyukti (a kind of Udātta), Anumāna, Vibhāvanā, Dṛṣṭānta, Svabhāvokti, Rūpakātiśayokti,

Paryāyokti, Anyokti, Asaṁgati, Samāsokti, Saṁdeha, Bhrāntimān, Vyatireka, Viśeṣokti, Vyājastuti, Nidarśanā, Viṣama, Adhika, Udātta and Praharṣaṇa. Besides onomatopoeia, personification and euphemism are also used in Vīrasatasai²²

The poet of the Dholā Mārū Rā Dohā, having 41 alamkāras, is very fond of using alamkāras based on similitude. Thus Upamā is used 109 times and Rūpaka and Utprekṣā 37 and 32 times respectively.

Rajasthani literature has been enriched by all important sections of society. Cāraṇas take the lion's share and their contribution is the largest. Jainas are next to Cāraṇas only and their contribution to Rajasthani may not be excellent but is very important²³ for a study of the evolution of the Rajasthani language from its earliest beginning to the modern times. Kings contributed to Rajasthani in no small measure. The Kriṣaṇa Rukmiṇī Rī Veli by king Prithvi Raj is an outstanding work of Rajasthani literature. Amongst the Brahmins, the names of Narapati Nath, the celebrated poet of Bīsaladeva Rāso, Sridhara Vyas who composed Raṇa Mala, Chand and Saptasatīchand of Padmanābha who is famous for Kanhana De Prabandha and of Vyas Bhandā the poet of Hammirayana, deserve special mention. A Kāyastha poet, namely, Ganapati composed (Samvat 1554) the Kāmakandala Prabandha, a love poem containing 2500 Dohās. Another Kāyastha versified in Rajasthani the Bhāgavata and the Gītā (available in the collection of Manuscripts of Agarachanda Nāhata). A muslim poet, named, Dhadhi Badara wrote Biravana. Jana, a muslim poet of great repute is credited with the authorship of seventy five works many of which are in Rajasthani and deal with Sṛṅgāra. He was well-versed in Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit and Rajasthani.

The most important class of literature is by Cāraṇas and Bhāṭas which is in Dingal and is predominantly poetry of bravery abounding in Vīra Rasa²⁴. This constitutes the largest part of Rajasthani literature. The Cāraṇa poetry is found in the form of Prabandha²⁵ (which partakes of certain characteristics of a Mahākāvya in Sanskrit), Gīta²⁶ and in the form of other chandas such as Chhappaya, Dohā, Savaiyā, Kavitta. The Prabandha form is borrowed from Sanskrit. However, Prabandhas called

Visara eulogising valiant deeds and the poetry of bravery of vīrakāvya are specially and almost exclusively developed in Rajasthani. The erotic and devotional Prabandhas are, to a large extent, based on either the Bhāgavata or the Rāmāyaṇa. Rītikāvya, such as, Hari Piṅgala Prabandha, Lakhapata Piṅgala, Raghunātha Rupaka Gitaro, describe elements of prosody and rhetoric of Sanskrit. The Gīta in Rajasthani is the type of Khaṇḍakāvya like Meghadūta of Kālidāsa.

Rajasthani literature by Jainas deals mainly with Jaina religion, culture and tales of both religious and secular character. I have already stated that the contribution of the Jainas to Rajasthani literature has been uninterrupted from its very beginning and though it may not have produced excellent literary treasures, its importance in the study of the Rajasthani language cannot be minimised. Many Jainas wrote both in Sanskrit and Rajasthani and it is natural therefore that Sanskrit literature created by the Jainas influenced their Rajasthani literature in both content and style.

A number of sects of saints flourished on the liberal soil of Rajasthan. Their literaturer generally ponders over God, Self, Māyā, the ephemeral nature of the world, identity or intimacy of self with the supreme self, life of saints, Haṭha Yoga, glory of guru, word, Om, love of all human beings and instructions for leading a meritoriously good life. In the immense literature of the saints of various sects, such as, Nātha, Lāladāsī, Rāmasnehi, Carandāsī and Dādūpanthi, we breathe the atmosphere created by devotional, Tantric and religious literature in Sanskrit.

An important form of literature preserved in Rajasthani is known as Vacanikā, for example, Acaladāsa Khici Rī Vacanikā (15th century), Rao Ratan Mahesadasota Rī Vacanikā (18th century), Khiriya Jagga and Mātā Jī Rī Vacanikā (18th century) by Jayacanda, a Jaina Saint. In this class of Rajasthani literature prose is mixed with verse as in campū of Sanskrit. We have no such form developed in Hindi. Bāta, a word derived from Vārtā in Sanskrit, is a form of prose literature in Rajasthani. However, Bāta by Dholā Mārū and Sadayavatsa are also found in both verse and prose giving a campu form as to the Vacanikā. Intimate, informed and respectable relationship between Sanskrit and Rajasthani is attested to by

the fact that more than one Sanskrit Tikā is found on the Veli Krisaṇa Rukmiṇī Rī (1581 A.D.) of Prthvi Rāja, which is a poem based on the tenth Skandha of the Bhāgavata. Impact of Sanskrit on Rajasthani is underlined by the fact that all the important works in Sanskrit, more particularly the Rāmāyṇa, the Mahābhārata, Gītā, Bhāgavata (or parts of it, especially the tenth Skandha), Purāṇas, dramas, tales, poems and Śāstric works have been and continue to be translated or adopted or used as sources by a number of poets of the past and the present in both prose and verse in Rajasthani. A list of such works is too long to be presented here and can be briefly illustrated by mentioning -

1. Works based on the Rāmāyṇa, the Mahābhārata and Bhāgavata

गीता भाषा, दशम भागवत रा दूहा, दसरथरावउत, वसुदेवरावउत, हरिचरित, भागवत भाषा निबन्ध by कृष्णदास, जानकीविजय रामायण, भागवत भाषा of किशोरदास।

2. Poems, Dramas and Tales of Sanskrit in Rajasthani

गीतगोविन्द टीका by महाराणा कुम्भा, भर्तृहरिशतकत्रय, वेतालपच्चीसी शिवदास, नासिकेतोपाख्यान २७ (नासिकेतरी बात १७९७), नासिकेतरी कथा, नासिकेतो-पाख्यान भाषा (१९१८), पंचाख्यान भाषा, पंचाख्यानवार्तिक, बृहत्कथा भाषा, डोकरी री बात, नैषधचरित भाषा, सिंहासनबतीसी, हितोपदेश भाषा, प्रबोधचन्द्रोदय by जसवन्त सिंह (१७२०-३७) प्रबोधचन्द्रोदय भाषा by माधोदास, मालतीमाधव भाषा। ब्रह्माण्डपुराण भाषा (प्रथमखण्ड) (१८०६), हरिवंशपुराण भाषा, भूगोलपुराण (१८७८) वाराणसीविलास (18th Century) by देवकरण पंचोली, गणेशपुराण भाषा, मार्कण्डेयपुराण भाषा (in verse) by दामोदर, दुर्गासप्तशतीव्याख्या, देवीचरित by बुधसिंह (translation of देवीभागवत in verse), अश्वमेध भाषा, एकलिंगमाहात्म्य भाषा, गंगालहरी। विजयादशमीमाहात्म्य, श्रीकृष्णजन्माष्टमीव्रतकथा, शनिकथा। तन्त्रभेद, नम्सार, पश्चिमाधीशस्तोत्र, त्रैलोक्यबोधिका, वेदान्तपरिभाषा by मनोहरदास। (१८६६), षट्प्रश्नि by मनोहरदास निरंजनी, सर्वबोधसार by नाथूराम, ज्ञानसार, सिद्धान्तसार, अनुभवप्रकाश, अपरोक्षसिद्धान्त, आनन्दविलास।

3. Jyotiṣa, Music, Āyurveda

लीलावती भाषा, शकुनसंवत्सरसार, ज्योतिषरत्नमाला, राधागोविन्द संगीतसार (based on the संगीतरत्नाकर)। रसरत्नाकर, षट्सगुणागुण, द्रव्यशुद्धिदीपिका भाषा।

4. On Prosody, Rhetoric and Dramaturgy

रसमंजरी by रत्नसुन्दरसूरि, चमत्कारचन्द्रोदय by रसपुंज (१८६६), भाषाभूषण by जसवन्तसिंह, रससरस by शिवदास, ध्वनिव्यंग्यार्थचन्द्रिका by ईश्वरकवि, भाषाभूषण, रसिकसिरोमणि by रामसिंह, छन्दसार रत्नावली by हरिरामदास, पिंगलशिरोमणि by कुशललाल, हरिपिंगलप्रबन्ध by जोगीदास, डिंगलकोश by मुरारिदान, छन्दसार पिंगल and a number of other works by Surati Misra.

Jainas developed various forms of comments on Sanskrit, such as Bālāvabodha, Tāvā and the number of such works is very large²⁸.

What has been given above is simply a casual illustrative list of Rajasthani (Dingal and Pingal) works hastily taken down from the catalogue of Sanskrit and Rajasthani manuscripts deposited with the Rajasthan Oriental Research institute, Jodhpur. In many cases, the names of writers are unknown and even the dates of the manuscripts are not traceable.

Sanskrit contributed words, content, form and style of Rajasthani, which in its turn inspired the poets of Rajasthan to write Sanskrit works eulogising bravery, chivalry and culture of Rajasthan. These works in Sanskrit have at times the same atmosphere as found in the popular speech. It was but natural because a poet who wrote in both Sanskrit and Rajasthani could not split himself emotionally. The result is that we have a number of small and big poems in Sanskrit eulogising Hindu kings of Rajasthan and not surrendering literary results of their talents to the Dillīśvara as the king amongst Pandits, Panditarāja Jagannātha did (दिल्लीश्वरो वा जगदीश्वरो वा मनोरथान् पूरयितुं समर्थः). Rajasthani (particularly Dingala) is known primarily for its cāraṇa literature glorifying the deeds of the brave kings. Sanskrit poets also gave a number of Sanskrit Kāvya and Mahākāvya such as the following : राजरत्नाकर (१७०९)^{२९}, अमरसार (१६६५), श्रीजगतसिंहमहाकाव्य (१६८५), अमरकाव्य, पृथ्वीराजविजयमहाकाव्य (१८४९), प्रबंधचिन्तामणि (१३६१), वीरतरंग (१९८१), वीरवंशवर्णन (१९८२), पृथ्वीराजविजयमहाकाव्य (१३th century A.D.) मानप्रकाश महाकाव्य (१६th century A.D.) ईश्वरविलास महाकाव्य (१६th century A.D.), कच्छवंशमहाकाव्य (१८th century A.D.), जयवंशमहाकाव्य (१९th century A.D.), मानवंशमहाकाव्य (२०th century A.D.), वीरभूमि (१७८७), हमीरमहाकाव्य (१४६०), सुरजनचरित्र (१६३५), प्रतापोदय, प्रतापविलास काव्य ।

Like Rajasthani, Sanskrit also used words of local and Persian origin, such as : लत्ता, सलामं, डूंगरपुरं, नबाव, लड्डूक, चौकड़ी, जहाज, सिसोदिया, राणा, नाल (as found in the राजप्रशस्ति of रणछोड़ भट्ट, a work of 1718-1732 V.S.).

It is not only that poets like Vālmīki, Vyāsa, Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti of the distant past inspired Rajasthani literature but in fact, contemporary poets of Sanskrit and Rajasthani together sang the chorus of Rājput chivalry and displayed loyalty to their kings and love and admiration for the history and culture of Rajasthan.

A detailed and critical study of the Rajasthani language is still a desideratum. Much in literary works is awaiting publication and much of what has been published needs critical editing. A standard etymological dictionary of Rajasthani is yet to be conceived. One expects and hopes that this will be done before long. But until that is done, any study such as mine will suffer from a lack of critical source material. Similarly, works in Sanskrit written in Rajasthani need to be edited, translated and published so that the rich source material may become available to the students of history, culture, language and literature.

References

1. Prākṛtacandrikā lists twentyseven varieties of Apabhraṃśa.

ब्राह्मणो लाटवैदभावुपनागरनागरौ ।
 बाबरावन्त्यपांचालटाक्कमालवकैकयाः ।।
 गौड़ोढहैवपाश्चात्यपाण्ड्यकौन्तलसैहलाः ।
 कालिङ्गप्रच्यकर्णाटकांच्यद्रापिणगौर्जराः ।।
 आभीरो मध्यदेशीयः सूक्ष्मभेदव्यवस्थिताः ।
 सप्तविंशत्यपभ्रंशाः वैतालादिप्रभेदतः ।।

George Abraham Grierson in his *Linguistic Survey of India* identifies Nāgara Apabhraṃśa as the source of the language of Rajasthan. S.K. Chatterjee has preferred to call it Saurāṣṭra Apabhraṃśa (Vide Rājasthānī Bhāṣā, Udaipur, 1949 P.65) while K.M. Munshi calls it Gurjari Apabhraṃśa.

2. Mewārī spoken in Udaipur division is considered a sub-dialect of Mārwārī. It is spoken in Jodhpur, Bikaner, Sirohi, the south-west parts of Ajmer-Merwārā, in some parts of Kishnagarh and Palanpur, Shekhavati, Sindh and in the southern parts of the Panjab.
3. Spoken in areas comprising the old state of Jaipur : (excluding Shekhavati), Lava, parts of Kishanagarh, Tonk and in the north eastern parts of Ajmer-Merwara. Its popular form is influenced equally by Gujarati and Marwari and its literary content, abounding in works of saints like Dādu, is influenced by Brij Bhāṣā.
4. Current mainly in Mālwa but spoken in parts of Mewar also. Besieds Mārwārī and Dhunḍhāḍī, Marathi has also influenced it.
5. Spoken mainly in the north-western parts of Alwar and Bharatpur and in Gurgaon (in Haryana). This is also greatly influenced by Brij Bhāṣā. Much of its literature is the creation of Saint Charan Das and his disciples.
6. The language of the old states of Dungarpur and Banswara. Influence of Gujarati is marked over them called Vāgaḍa.
7. The earliest and clear reference of this name is found in a verse of Kukavi-Battisi by Bankidas, vide Bankidas Granthavali, Pt. II. p 81. Budhaji, a near relation of Bankidas uses the term Digal and Dingal in his Dhaveta :
 - (i) डीगल का तो क्या संस्कृत भी जाँगे। Verse No. 155.
 - (ii) डीगल में खूब गजब जस का गीत। Verse No. 156.
 - (iii) डींगल पींगल संस्कृत फारसी में निसंक। Verse No. 157.

From these it is clear that Dingala was recognised as a language different from the Piṅgala (or Brij Bhāṣā - i.e Hindi) and from Sanskrit and that this language was characterised by the songs of glory of the brave Rajputs. Rajasthani has been referred to as Marubhāṣā in Kuvalayamālā vide, अपभ्रंशकाव्यत्रयी, P. 91

8. John Beames, *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Āryan Languages of India*, Chapter I. P. 2, Munshi Ram Manoharalal, New Delhi, 1970.

9. Speaking about the percentage of Sanskrit, Prakṛta and Apabhramśa words on the one hand and words of Arabic and Persian origin on the other in the Dingal literature as a whole, Motilal Menaria has observed: 'अनुमानतः डिंगल में ८० प्रतिशत शब्द संस्कृत, प्राकृत और अपभ्रंश के ५ प्रतिशत शब्द अरबी, फारसी आदि मुसलमानी भाषाओं के और शेष शब्द प्रान्तीय हैं।' डिंगल में वीर रस, मोतीलाल मेनारिया, हिन्दी सा. सम्मेलन प्रयाग।
Hindi and other modern Indian languages have definitely more of Arabic and Persian words and less of Tatsama words than Rajsthani.
10. Vide, **Prṥhui Rāja Rāso Kī Bhāṣā**, P. 148 by Manvar Singh. Sarasvati Press, Banaras, 1956. Vipin Bihari Trivedi has listed 450 words in his edition of the text **Chandavardai Aura Unakā Kāvya**, pp. 313-346. Considering the size of the text, this number is very small.
11. From synthetical to analytical is a natural stage of linguistic growth and one need not import the question of Dravidian influence over analytical Indo-Aryan languages like Hindi, Gujarati, Sindhi, Panjabi, Bengali and Oriya as John Beames has rightly pointed out vide fn. 1 on p. 221.
12. Vide, Intro, Vol. I Ch. I in **A comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India**. By John Beames, Munshi Ram Manoharalal, New Delhi, Reprint 1970.
13. It is clear from the above examples that Nominative singular of Masculine is formed by termination in (i) u (ii) ए (iii) simple stem and of feminine by termination in 'i' and 'औँ'. The Nominative plural of masculine is formed by termination आ and feminine by औँ.
14. In the Prṥhui Rāja Rāso 'hi' is used for the accusative. As in - वीर चुनहि मुकुताफलहि। कनवज्जसमय, ९८.४।
15. For plural 'na' is often used here which is perhaps the short form for 'औँ' in Sanskrit. Examples पुरखन, राइन, सुगंधिनि।
16. The Genitive is also found without any ending. In such cases the Tatpuruṣa compound may also be suspected.
17. Postpositions are as under :
 - (i) Accusative : ने, प्रति।
 - (ii) Instrumental : करि, नइ, पाहि, साथि, सिउँ, सूँ।

- (iii) Dative : कन्है, ने, प्रति ।
 (iv) Ablative : कन्हई, कनै, तांइ, थी, मझारि, मझि, मा, माहि, हूंत, हुंता, हुंती।
 (v) Genitive : रा, री, रे चा, ची, चे, चो, केरी, केरा, केरो, तपा, तपी, तपी।
 (vi) Locative : मंझार, मांझ, माँ, माझल, मधि, में।
18. In old Rajasthani script cerebral 'T' was written like the dental. However, it was always pronounced as cerebral as in Gurumukhi where also there is no separate character for the cerebral.
19. In Rajasthani simple future is also found with ending lā, as in -
 (i) बूड़ैला बुधवायरा जल विच छोड़ जहाज (हरिदास) ।
 (ii) पाकड़ जम धतेला फांसी पापी इण दिन ने पछतासी ।
20. A number of metrical works were written in Rajasthani. The most important amongst them are listed below.
 (i) हरिपिंगल प्रकाश, (ii) लखपतगुण पिंगल (iii) रघुनाथरूपक गीतारो
 (iv) रघुवरजसप्रकाश (v) डिंगलकोश (vi) पिंगलसिरोमणि।

A number of poetical works in Rajasthani are named after the metres that they use. For example : गोगैजी चहुँवाण री नीसाणी, अमरसिंह जी रा झूलणा, राजकुमार अनोपसिंह जी री वेल, झमाल आउआ री, राठोड़ रामसिंह जी रा गीत, महाराज अभैसिंह जी रा कवित, सांगे राणे रा दूहा।

21. Vaina - Sagain (or harmonious relationship of the syllables) is an exclusively Rajasthani alamkāra. It has a bewildering variety and is most frequently used. It may not be Anuprāsa or any of its varieties found in Sanskrit but there can be no doubt that it evolved under the great impact and extensive use of the Anuprāsa and other Cītrālamkāras in Sanskrit. Figures after the Alamkāras indicate number of times that the alamkāra has been used.
22. Some illustrations of the alamkāras from Vīrasatasai:

Upamā	Rūpaka
बाला, चाल म वीसरे	घोड़ां घर ढालां पटल
मो थण जहर समान	भाला थंम वणाय।
रीत मरंता ढील की	
अङ्ग छियो घमसाण।।	

Kāvyaṅga

में तो विण सब हांसिया उण भड़ एक महेस।
 काय दिये छण मेहणूं हूँ भड़ हेतु विसेस ।।

Apahnuti	Atiśaiyokti (with Utprekṣā)
सींह न वाजो ठाकरां	तोपां घर दरजां पड़े
दीन गुजारो दीह।	झड़े गिरां सिर झाट
हापल पाड़े हाथियां	जाणे सागर-खीररे-
सो भड़ वाजे सींह ।।३४।।	मंदर रो अरडाट ।।१६४।।
Sandeha	Vibhāvanā :
आँख हिये कै सीस ।।१७४।।	विण माथे बाढ़े दलां ।।१७४।।

Dīpaka

मायड़ खाय दिखाय थण
 थण पण वलय बताय।

23. The list of Jaina writers is very large. They contributed to Sanskrit and Rajasthani literature to a very great extent. Some of the Jainas like Jinavallabhasuri, Jinaprabhasūri, Samayasundara, Dharmavardhana, Jñānasāra wrote in Sanskrit and Rajasthani with equal felicity.
24. Some cāraṇas have composed secular love-poems and still others have translated **the Rāmāyaṇa** and **the Mahābhārata** and other Sanskrit works.
25. The number of Prabandhas is very large, the more important being Canda Baradai's Pṛthvī Raja Raso ; **Veli kriṣaṇa Rukmani Rī** (1581 A.D.) of Pṛthvī Rāja (based on the 10th Skandha of the Bhāgavata).
26. **Gīta** is a type of khaṇḍakāvya. The best examples of this class are Kallola's **Ḍholā Mārū Rā Dohā** (composed in 1473 A.D.), **Hala Jhala Rā Kuṇḍaliyā** (1563 A.D.), **Vīra Jaitasi Ro** (1534 A.D.).
27. All figures within brackets signify dates of the manuscripts in Samvat. The mss are deposited with the Rajasthan Pracyavidya Pratisthana.
28. See, राजस्थानी साहित्य की गौरवपूर्ण परम्परा - अगरचंद नाहटा, राधाकृष्ण प्रकाशन, दिल्ली - १९६७ ।
29. Dates within brackets are in Vikrama era unless otherwise specified.

(Charudeva Shastri Felicitation Volume)



5. चतुर्थ विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनम्

द्वितीयविश्वयुद्धादनन्तरं पूर्वपश्चिमयोर्विभक्तः शर्मण्यदेशो यो हि संस्कृतस्यापरं भारतं जेगीयते स्म। अत्रैव वेदाः सुरक्षिताः सन्ति येषां ज्ञानेन साम्प्रतिकं विज्ञानं प्रवृत्तम् अयमेव हि निधिः भारताद्बहिष्कृतस्य विविधविद्यास्थानोपबृंहितस्य साहित्यस्य, यस्य साहाय्येन शर्मण्यदेशः सर्वासूयाकरिं सिद्धिमाससादैवविधो विश्वासोऽद्यापि नैकेषां मुग्धहृदयानां भारतीयानां मनस्सु जागर्ति। द्विधा विभक्तेऽपि तस्मिन्देशे आचारविचारदृशा वामदक्षिणयोः सम्पन्नेऽपि वैपरीत्ये देहलीस्था दीपशिखेव सुरभारती उभयमपि भागं स्वमहिम्ना प्रोज्ज्वलयति। न पुनः शर्मण्यदेशं, समग्रमपि विश्वमेकनीडायन्ती भाषा विश्वस्मिन् विश्वे केवलं संस्कृतमेव विद्यते। एतस्य प्रत्यक्षं प्रमाणमस्ति विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनम्। अन्या कापि भाषा नास्ति यस्याः परशताः चित्र-विचित्राचारविचारा विबुधा इव बुधा विविधेभ्यो देशेभ्यः संभूय तेजस्विनावधीतमस्तु मा विद्विषावहै इति मन्त्रं साक्षात्कुर्वन्ति। विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनमिव न दृष्टं न वा श्रुतमन्यभाषासम्मेलनम्। राजनीतिदृशा अर्थसाहाय्येन वा यथाकथंचित् सम्पादितमपि बुद्बुद इव विलीनतां याति न च सार्वभौमं रूपमवगाहते, यथा हि विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनम्। किमस्य कारणम् ? मन्ये संस्कृतेऽस्ति कश्चन पीयूषप्रवाहः, सकलं विश्वमाप्यायमानः कश्चिदादर्शः, यो हि विश्वबन्धुत्वमापादयति, तादृशं विश्वबन्धुत्वं यत्र विश्वं भवत्येकनीडम्।

फ्रान्सदेशस्य राजधान्यां पेरिसनगरे स्थिता अन्ताराष्ट्रिय-संस्कृताध्ययन-परिषद् (इन्टरनेशनल-असोसियेशन आफ् संस्कृत स्टडीज) संयुक्तराष्ट्रसंघ-तत्तद्देशीयसर्वकार-विश्वविद्यालयादीनामार्थिकसहयोगेन द्विवर्षीयं विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनमायोजयति। अस्य प्रथमं भारते, द्वितीयं रूसदेशे, तृतीयं फ्रान्सदेशे, चतुर्थञ्च सम्मेलनमस्मिन्वर्षे २३-३० मई दिनांकेषु पूर्वशर्मण्यदेशस्य विश्वविश्रुतकविवरगेटेशिलरमाहात्म्यमण्डिते, साहित्यसंगीतकलाललिते बर्लिननगरात्तिदूरं सुरम्यघाटीस्थिते सहस्रवर्षप्राचीने प्रकृतिललिते वाइमार नगरे सम्पन्नम्।

इदं च चतुर्थं विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनं पूर्वबर्लिनस्थितेन हम्बोल्डविश्वविद्यालयेन स्वदेशीयविविधविश्वविद्यालयानां विज्ञानअकादम्याश्च सहयोगेन समायोजितम्। संयोजकप्रमुखोऽत्र हम्बोल्डविश्वविद्यालयीयप्रो. मार्गनरॉथमहोदय आसीत्। अस्याश्रान्तं श्रमः, समायोजनपाटवं च सम्मेलनसाफल्यं निश्चिकाय।

सम्मेलनस्य विचारार्थं विषयाः सामान्य-विशेषसूच्योर्विभक्तास्तत्र सामान्य-विषया आसन्ः -

१. मानवविज्ञानस्य कृते संस्कृताध्ययनस्य महत्त्वम्।
२. प्राचीनभारते (संस्कृतमूलानुसारं विशिष्य च अर्थशास्त्रवाङ्मयानुसारं) राज्यं समाजश्च।

३. विश्वसंस्कृतौ संस्कृतस्य तन्निष्ठसंस्कृतेश्च स्थानम्।

- (i) अस्यैवोपाङ्गभूता विषया आसन्। संस्कृतस्य तन्निष्ठसंस्कृतेश्च एशियायूरोपोपरि प्रभावः (भाषा-दर्शन-धर्म-विज्ञान-काव्य-कलाविषयकः)
- (ii) विश्वसाहित्यस्य मौलिक-सैद्धान्तिकसमस्याः विश्वसाहित्यस्यांगभूतं संस्कृतसाहित्यञ्च।
- (iii) संस्कृतम् ऐतिहासिकं तुलनात्मकञ्च भाषाशास्त्रम्।
- (iv) पाणिनिः - विवरणात्मकभाषाशास्त्रे अधुनातनाश्च प्रवृत्तयः।

४. भारते संस्कृतस्य तन्निष्ठसंस्कृतेश्च कर्तव्यता।

अस्योपाङ्गा आसन् -

- (i) भारतस्येतिह्ये संस्कृतस्य तन्निष्ठसंस्कृतेश्च भूमिका।
- (ii) सांस्कृतिक-ऐक्यस्य मूलभूतसैद्धान्तिकसमस्याः संस्कृतनिष्ठसांस्कृतिक-ऐक्यस्य साम्प्रतिके भारते प्रभावः।
- (iii) आधुनिकं संस्कृतसाहित्यम्।
- (iv) संस्कृतम् आधुनिकभारतीयभाषाः नव्ययूरोपीयाः द्राविडीयाः च।

विचारार्थं विशिष्ट-विषया -

१. भाषा तदुपाङ्गतया च २. संस्कृतस्यैतिहासिकं व्याकरणम् ३. संस्कृतस्य (वैदिकस्य) विवरणात्मकं व्याकरणम् ४. संस्कृतस्य-वेदस्य शब्दकोशः ५. साहित्यिक - मध्यवर्ति-भारोपीयभाषाणां व्याकरणम् ६. दर्शनं धर्मश्च तदुपाङ्गतया च ७. वेदाः ८. बौद्धविद्या ९. जैनविद्या १०. वैज्ञानिकसाहित्यम् ११. विधिशास्त्रम् १२. भैषज्यशास्त्रम् १३. प्राकृतिक-विज्ञानानि १४. काव्यम् तदुपाङ्गतया च १५. महाभारतं रामायणञ्च १६. संस्कृतनाटकम् (विशिष्य मुद्राराक्षसम्) १७. कथासाहित्यम् १८. पुरातत्त्वं कलाश्च (प्राचीन-भारोपीयमध्यवर्तिमूलप्रसंगेन) १९. वैदिकपरम्परा पुरातत्त्वञ्च २०. भारतीयकला-संस्कृत-प्राकृत-साहित्यञ्च २१. भारतीयकला-सिद्धान्तः।

चतुर्थविश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलने समागतेषु विद्वत्सु भारतीयानां (विदेशेषु निवासिनां देशादागतानां) संख्या सर्वातिशायिनी स्वभावत आसीत्। तेषु मूर्धन्या आसन् पुण्यपत्तनस्था अखिलभारतीय-प्राच्यविद्यासम्मेलनस्य महामन्त्रिण आर.एन. दाण्डेकरमहोदयाः। इतो पूर्वनिर्वाचितसम्मेलनसभापतीनां वी. राघवन्महोदयानां ब्रूरेण दैवेनाकालेऽपहतत्वात्सभापतिपदार्थं सर्वैरभ्यर्थिताः सन्तो सौजन्यवैदुष्यसंगमेन स्वकार्यकौशलेन च भारतगौरवं वर्धयन्तः सम्मेलनस्य सभापतित्वं सहजेन साफल्येन निरवहन्। तदनन्तरं संख्यया गुणवत्तया च रूसदेशात्समुपागता विद्वन्मण्डली सम्मेलनमलञ्चकार। सम्मेलनस्य

प्रतिदिवसं सम्पन्नेषु विविधेष्वधिवेशनेष्वध्यक्षत्वमलञ्चक्रुः रुसदेशीय-जी.एम. बोग्गाईलेनितमहोदयः फ्रान्सदेशीयौ जॉफिलियोजामहोदयः स्टर्नवरवमहोदयश्च, पश्चिमशर्मण्यदेशीयः क्लासफिशरमहोदयः, भारतस्य आर.एस. शर्मा अन्ये च विभिन्नदेशीया लब्धप्रतिष्ठा विद्वांसः। वर्कलेविश्वविद्यालयस्थेन जे. फ्रिट्सस्टालमहोदयेन संकलितं वेदमंत्रोच्चारणमग्निचयनचित्रं च विदुषां श्रवणानि चक्षुषि च हृदयैः सह पावयामासतु।

सम्मेलने पठितानां विचारितानां च निबन्धानां भाषा प्रामुख्येणांगलदेशीयाऽऽसीत्। संख्यया न्यूना अपि जर्मन-फ्रांसीयादिभाषासु निबद्धा निबन्धाः सादरं श्रुताः। सर्वेषां निबन्धानामेकपदे आंग्ल-शर्मण्य-फ्रांसीय-रूसीय-भाषास्वनुवादेऽपि सम्मेलनप्रबन्धकैरायेजितः।

सम्मेलने पठितानां विमृष्टानां च निबन्धानां प्रामुख्यं भजमानाः केचन निबन्धाः लेखकानां पुरस्सरमधस्तान्निरदिश्यन्ते : -

लेखकः	निबन्धः
१. जॉफिलियोजा (पेरिसतः)	संस्कृत-परिशीलनं मानवविज्ञानञ्च, संस्कृतं विश्वसंस्कृतिश्च ।
२. ग्रेगरी एम. बोन्गाई लेनितः (मास्कोतः)	प्राचीनभारते राज्यं समाजश्च ।
३. विल्हामरॉ (मार्बुर्गतः)	प्राचीनभारते सूर्य-कान्तमणिः।
४. रामशरणशर्मा (देहलीतः)	गोपात् भूपतिः भारतीयराज्ञः परिवर्तमानेषु कर्तव्येषु भाषादृशाध्ययनम् ।
५. पीटर ग्राइनर (ट्यूविंगटनतः)	पुराणग्रन्थानां ट्यूविंगटनपद्धत्यनुसारं पाठप्रक्रिया विमर्शः ।
६. मिस्ले जेसिक्स (जाग्रेबतः)	भगवद्गीतायाः पाठस्तराः भारतीय-सांस्कृतिकैतिह्यस्य चिह्नभूताः ।
७. हिलट्रुस्नोवः (बर्लिनतः)	भारतीयदर्शनस्य साम्प्रतिके युगे महत्त्वम्।
८. वाल्टररुबेन (पूर्ववर्लिनतः)	इतिहासपुराणसंबंधविमर्शः ।
९. जे. तिलकश्री (पारेडिनियातः)	संस्कृतकाव्यरूपाणां रीतेश्च सिंहलकाव्ये प्रभावः ।

१०. तातियाना रूत्कोस्का (वार्शीतिः)	मध्यकालिकहिन्दीसाहित्ये अलंकार - प्रभावः ।
११. बाल्फगाना मार्गनराय (पूर्ववर्लिनतः)	विश्वसंस्कृत्यन्तःसंस्कृतस्य तन्निष्ठसंस्कृतेश्च स्थानम् ।
१२. हाइंज वेखर्टः (गोटिंगटनतः)	श्रीलंकायां वर्मायां च संस्कृतवाङ्मयम्।
१३. प्राणी लेपनिश (वंगकोकतः)	थाईकाव्ये संस्कृतसंस्कृतिभावः ।
१४. सावेरोज, पो (लीड्सतः)	ख्मेररामायणम् (रामकीर्तिः)
१५. लुडविक स्टर्नवख (पेरिसतः)	दक्षिणभारते, श्रीलंकायां श्यामदेशे च प्रचलितो विलक्षणो व्याप्तसुभाषितसंग्रहः।
१६. क्लास ब्रू न (पश्चिमवर्लिनतः)	संस्कृत-छात्राय सूक्तिसंदोहः ।
१७. अशोकअकलूजकरः (मार्बुर्गतः)	वाक्यपदीयस्य (२-४८६) व्याख्यानम्।
१८. परमेश्वर अय्यरः (सीलिस वर्गतः)	पौरुषेयभाष्यम्
१९. संयुक्ता गुप्ता (उतरेख्ततः)	पाञ्चरात्रे भक्तियोगः प्रपत्तियोगश्च ।
२०. कातरिना कोनिओ (पिसातः)	स्वच्छन्दतन्त्रदर्शनम्
२१. जान फिलिप्की (प्रागतः)	भगवद्गीतायां योगस्वरूपम् ।
२२. टी.एस. रूक्मणी (दिल्लीतः)	योगवार्तिके विकल्पस्य विज्ञानभिक्षुकृतं लक्षणम् ।
२३. आर.के. शर्मा (दरभंगातः)	रामायणमहाभारतयोः प्रतिबिम्बिता मौखिक-परम्परा।

२४.	मारिया किस्तेफर तिरस्की (वार्शातः)	मुद्राराक्षसविश्लेषणम् ।
२५.	अर्नेस्ट वेन्डर (फिलाडेल्फियातः)	बुद्धस्य सप्तविभंगाः ।
२६.	सी.जी. डीटल (लुण्डतः)	भविष्यपुराणस्य (३-२-२१-२३) सन्दर्भे कालविमर्शः
२७.	क्लास फिशर (वॉनतः)	मिथुनशिल्पप्रतीकवादः ।
२८.	गियोवानी बंदिनी (हाइडिलवर्गतः)	भर्तृहरिसम्मतः क्रियाविमर्शः ।
२९.	आर.एन. दाण्डेकर (पुणेतः)	बृहस्पति-ब्रह्मणस्पतिः ।
३०.	पी. ऐघल (हाइडिलवर्गतः)	नृसिंहयज्वनः प्रयोगरत्नम् ।
३१.	मोरक मेजर (वार्शातः)	प्रतीत्यसमुत्पादमधिकृत्य नव्याः काश्चन टिप्पण्यः।
३२.	कल्लू. एम. काल्वर्ट (लीवनतः)	निर्गुणवाङ्मयम् ।
३३.	ग्यूला वोजटिल्ला (बुडापेष्टतः)	कृषिसम्बन्धिसंस्कृतशब्दकोषस्य काश्चन समस्याः।
३४.	मोहम्मदः सुलतानः (सार्सलेष्ट)	संस्कृतं मुगलकाले मुस्लिमलेखकाश्च।
३५.	अयालिया पेजानी (वालोग्नतः)	नागार्जुनकृतयः
३६.	अन्ना रादिच्ची (कागलिआरीतः)	इन्डोनेशियाभाषायां संस्कृतस्य प्रत्ययादयः।
३७.	के.वी. शर्मा (होशियारपुरतः)	प्राचीनमध्यकालीनभारते नक्षत्रविद्यायाः गणितस्य च कानिचिद् वैशिष्ट्यानि

३८.	रमारञ्जनमुखर्जी (वर्दवानतः)	ध्वनिसिद्धान्तः ।
३९.	यू. पोले (पूर्ववर्लिनतः)	ऋतस्य ब्रह्मणश्च (ब्रह्मोधस्य) संरचना
४०.	ह्वान्ज कुहास्की (लेष्ठांगतः)	वर्णमालाः कालीप्रतीकवादविचारः
४१.	एलस पौले (कोपेन हैगनतः)	डेनिशकाव्ये संस्कृतप्रेरणा।
४२.	पीटर जीमे (वर्लिनतः)	मध्येशियायाः युग्रग्रन्थेषु ब्राह्मीलिपि- प्रभावविचारः ।
४३.	क्लॉस मिलेयुस (लाइपिगतः)	अच्छावरः पोत्रश्च, एका तुलना।
४४.	इवा रिन्शाल (वर्लिनतः)	प्रकृतिप्रकोपो जनपदकोपश्च प्राचीन- भारतीयसमाजे सामाजिक-राजनीतिक संघर्षयोः रूपे।

(नाम-स्थानादीनामुल्लेखे भ्रमादागतानां-स्खलितानां कृते क्षन्तव्योऽस्मि)।

साहित्ये च संस्कृतस्य प्रभावमधिकृत्योपस्थापिताः अन्ये चापरिचितानां कृतीनां परिचयाय, परिचितस्य वा कस्यचित्सिद्धान्तस्य पुनर्विमर्शाय प्रस्तुताः कियदासीत् पाश्चात्यविदुषामौत्सुक्यं नव्यं किमपि ज्ञातुमिति स्फुटीभवति मामकीनेन निबन्धेन सह घटितवृत्तान्तेन। शर्मन्यदेशीयो महामनीषी फिशरमहोदयो मदीयनिबन्धसारं श्रुत्वा तदधिगन्तुमुत्सुको रात्रौ मामन्विष्य समग्रं निबन्धं वाचयित्वा स्वकीयं च निबन्धं मत्पाठनाय प्रदाय बहुवारं मिलित्वा संयुक्तलेखनाय प्रस्तावमकार्षीत् । मदीयनिबन्धस्य विषय आसीत् “संस्कृते अश्लीलता सिद्धान्तः” तस्य च विषयः कलासु चित्रितं श्रृंगारमधिकरोति। यदधिकृत्य जर्मनभाषायां तस्य पुस्तकमपि प्रकाशितम्। यादृशं विनय-व्यवस्थान्वितं सहजं ज्ञानौत्सुक्यं पाश्चात्यविद्वत्सु दृष्टं तादृशो विनयो, व्यवस्था, सत्यं, सहजं चौत्सुक्यं किमस्मासु भारतीयेष्वपि तिष्ठति? किं न सन्ति अस्मासु केचन ये यथाकथंचिद् अर्धसिद्धिं कृत्वा विषयनिरपेक्षा अपि कादाचित्केन गौरवर्णपरिचयेन सविषयाः ज्ञानलवैः स्फीतदर्पाः सन्तः तिर्यग्ग्रीवाः स्वजनमपि स्वजनमिव पश्यन्तो यथा तथा स्वार्थं साधयन्तो ज्ञानक्षेत्रं कलुषयन्ति। भारते यादृशं सौविध्यं ग्रन्थादीनां न तथाविधमन्यत्र विशेषतः

समाजवादिदेशेषु तथापि ते भारतीयविद्यायाः सर्वेषु प्रदेशेषु सर्वदा समाहिताः सन्ति। अत्रस्थितानां संस्कृतज्ञानां कश्चानानादरः समाजेन सर्वकारेण परिजनेन च क्रियते। संस्कृतं प्रति भारते काचन श्रद्धा वर्तते अतः संस्कृतजुषां कार्यं परिचिन्वन्ति कदाचिदाद्रियन्त अपि भारतीयाः। विदेशेषु अतीवन्यूना वर्तते भारतीयविद्याविदां संख्या। ते किं कुर्वन्ति किंवा न कुर्वन्तीति, कियन्मूल्यं तेषां परिश्रमस्य तत्तद्राष्ट्रायेति तत्रत्याः न जानन्त्येव सर्वथा स्वसमाजेऽसंस्तुताः सन्तः पाश्चात्यविपश्चिदपश्चिमाः ज्ञानसाधनरता विद्यावयोवृद्धाः सन्तः औपनिषदा ऋषय इव अरण्ये सारस्वतीं साधनां कुर्वन्ति। तेषामेव मित्राणि स्वसाहित्ये विज्ञाने वा प्रवृत्ताः बहुपार्जयन्ति। तेषां समाजोऽपि तान् परिचिनोति माहात्म्यं च जानाति। वस्तुतः सुरभारतीयसमाराधनसिद्धैस्तैरेव मनीषिभिः संस्कृतं विश्वभाषापदं नीतम्।

एतादृशेषु विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनेष्वेवेदं प्रतिभाति यत् संस्कृतं न हि भारतस्य अपि तु विश्वस्य संस्कृतेः भाषाऽस्ति यस्याः गृहं कोऽपि देशविशेषः प्रदेशविशेषो वा नास्ति। अस्याः वास्तवं गृहं वर्तते निर्दोषं सगुणं सौन्दर्यस्थानतया सहजमलंकृतं मानवहृदयम्।

भारतसर्वकारेण सादरमामन्त्रितं पञ्चमं विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनं सर्वतोभद्रं साफल्यमधिगच्छेत्तदर्थं सर्वैरेव भारतीयविद्वद्भिः प्रयतितव्यम्।

(स्वरमङ्गला)



6. The life of Ramkrishna as Viewed by Romain Rolland

Preliminary

[I had first proposed to present a paper on the impact of Ramkrishna, Vivekananad and Aurobindo on the French Civilization and Culture. I did not realise that it was beyond my capacity to collect and analyse the vast source-material for such a study which would also be beyond the scope of a paper and can hardly be encompassed successfully within the limitations of time and space, I had to renounce my original proposition and on the eve of my departure from India, I chose to write on the present subject, i.e., the lives of Ramkrishna and Vivekananda as viewed by Romain Rolland. Even this has proved stupendous in the light of a large number of works bearing on the subject which ought to have

been consulted and referred to for writing a scientific paper for a distinguished international gathering such as this. A traditional Sanskrit scholar in India has an outstanding tradition of commenting on each and every word, even a syllable of his text without caring to dress up his comments with copious notes and references to related works of other authors. This Indian tradition has rescued me from making a last-minute excuse for my absence from the Conference for want of a proper paper. I could pick the courage to attend the learned conference mainly because of the organisational promptness, love and affection which were manifest in the letters of the Secretary-General, M. Marie-Claude Buxtorf and the Honourable President of this Conference, M.C. Wanquet. To the authorities of the Conference and the fellow-delegates, I am particularly grateful and crave their indulgence for the shortcomings of my brief paper on the subject.]

France has been the cradle of European Civilisation and Culture. It has nurtured new ideas and movements of thought. Spiritual notions of liberty, equality and fraternity seeded in many cultures and their scriptures found their socio-politico-economic and religio-philosophical bone and flesh in the soil of France. This country in particular was for long the most respect European School of Indology where German, British and even American scholars learnt their lesson to understand and interpret India, its civilisation and culture. British Indologists were suspected to lack in sympathy and respect for India and its tradition and were even accused of serving the interests of the then rulers through their bias against India's past. German scholars of India were thought to be so exact and objective that they seemed to lack warmth and passion for its continued greatness and sympathy occasional failings of a culture. France which did not lack in scientific, objective, critical and historical approach in its studies of India was also credited with its love, sympathy, passion and respect for India's past and present. It did not merely sing the glory of India's past related it to its living present. It saw the fusion of the past in the contemporary life and perceived perennial flow of consciousness marking slow and subtle changes in various ages. The long line of French Indologists made an author like Romain Rolland possible. He fell in love with India and its people. He had a facile pen soaked in love, sympathy

and understanding of great contemporary sons of India - Ramkrishna, Vivekanand, Gandhi, Tagore, Dayananda, Aurobindo and all those who have shaped India of today from the embryo of the past. He expressed his love for India more softly and delicately without shouting out harsh political slogans which disturb the peace and tranquility of soul and are usually short-lived in their impact. He penetrated into the religious consciousness of India and its unique philosophical message of absolute unity and indivisibility of the highest truth and ultimate reality of the world, nay, universe. His works, 'the life of Ramkrishna'. (Part I) 'The life of Vivekanand and the Universal Gospel (Part II) amply bear it out. Originally written in French and published in 1928 and the following year respectively and translated in English and other languages, these have proved to be the most durable and firm bridge of understanding between East and West (this term loosely used includes all such countries and their people who can read, write or understand French, German and / or English in particular).¹

The very fact that a well-known French author wrote with love, sympathy and understanding about the great souls of dependent India inspired confidence and commanded great respect amongst the Indian masses and the educated elites and spiritually uplifted them from the abyss of tragic loss of self-confidence and identity. This also corrected their blind and uncritical attitude of acceptance or rejection. The lives of Ramkrishna and Vivekanand as viewed by various segments of Indian society itself without a balanced judgment illustrates how the writings of Romain Rolland inspired a better understanding of its own great contemporaries. He may have faltered in recording some details or even facts (which have been pointed out by the publisher of English translation in his occasional interventions throughout) but his great perseverance and hard labour in collecting the facts and shifting them for the own original and inspiring study cannot be doubted. He loved Ramkrishna but did not consider him an **Incarnation** as his devout Indians did. He says, in his address to his eastern readers, **Ramkrishna lies very near to my heart because I see in him a man and not an 'Incarnation' as he**

appears to his disciples². The river of God is open to all rivers and all streams, but its total unity is realised more fully by some like Christ, Buddha, Ramkrishna. But they can also not be isolated either mutually or from **the thousands of their companions, past and present** or from **the great army of the spirit marching on their own time**. It is on this basic idea of universality, continuity and contemporaneous sharing of spirituality that his love finds its rock without espousing a sectarian or narrow outlook of religious life. This basic postulate of Romain Rolland implies that there is invariable cultural linkage or continuity from the past to the present that the individual is a product of his age and times and that a Hindu belief in incarnation cannot be shared or sustained by others, particularly by persons of different religious persuasion and faiths.

His address to the western readers³ is much more important primarily because his writings, although widely read by eastern readers, were mainly addressed to the western audience and such of those Indians who took to westernisation and were educated through medium of English in India or abroad. Romain Rolland dedicated his whole life, as he says, to the reconciliation of mankind by interpreting east to the west, by reconciling the authentic forms of reason and faiths by which the twins were supposed to be permanently divided. Here he lays solid foundation for the lasting bridge of understanding between men of different lands and cultures, religious persuasions and even political ideologies of socialism, communism, humanitarianism, nationalism, rationalism. In order to weave his idea of unity in the differing patterns of religious, political ideologies and philosophical speculations he turns poetical in delivering his gospels : **From the source to the sea, from the sea to the source, everything consists of the same energy, of the Being without beginning and without end. It matters not to me whether the Being be called God (and which God?) or Force (and what Force?).** It may equally be called matter, but what manner of matter is it when it includes the forces of the spirit?). Words, words, nothing but words. Unity, living and not abstract, is the essence of it all.⁴ Does it not poetically convey unity of science and religion, belief and agnosticism and above all

secularisation of religion through its spiritual process? In this poetic perception of mystic unity of men and his ideas, matter and spirit, could even be partly realised by suspending our belief in division it will pave the way for universal brotherhood and peace. But the falsity, as the Vedantist would say persists, even though the life of Ramkrishna who realised Truth as Kali, Allah and so on, is a testimony of perceived unity of religious beliefs or various denominations. But then what faith proposes, reason disposes as hallucination.

It was really a very difficult task to explain and interpret to the west the greatness of Ramkrishna who was born in a small village, received no formal education, had no robust personality or strong and impressive physical appearance, lacked style or flow in speech, knew no foreign language or country, had not travelled far and wide even in his own country, who led the life of a priest of small means in a temple (not a very respectable vocation) and could be taken as a mad man by many while he was lost in trance. The most simple yet innately great Indian who may appear naive, foolish and uncouth but who is on his own and does not live on borrowed identity is still a mystery to many. This should explain why most objective and thoroughly penetrating probes into such a personality are usually waylaid and fail to encompass the mystique of simplicity of a great soul. Romain Rolland's portrayal of Ramkrishna could do him justice in great measure but not fully. His presentation of his spiritual life in terms of Christian mysticism, i.e., the Christian pathway to spiritual realisation, will benefit a study in comparative mysticism, his presentation of the lives of contemporary social reformers would give marginal advantage in knowing the man, the great master, the incarnation of Śiva to devoted disciples, yet for a fuller understanding of him, little more than very brief and casual references to the whole mystic tradition of saints and of living yet liberated souls, **Jivanmuktas**, is called for. His contacts with his great contemporaries may be a true biographical account, yet it does not relate to the real life of a great swan soaring high in the spiritual sky, aloof from the den and dust of commoners, in his unique journey. Contemporaries are a contrast and not fellow-travellers. The supreme swan had no equals. He has only

disciples, the followers. Amongst them was a great disciple, Swami Vivekananda. He immortalised his Master and his order by his matchless exposition of his message to the world which could not otherwise fully understand and much less appreciate the language, idiom and style of Ramkrishna. Perhaps the Master knew this and therefore chose Naven (who was later on known as Vivekananda) and transmitted all his powers to him for interpreting and propagating his philosophy, an active Vedanta in the service of the poor, the wicked and the repressed all the world over. The contemplative and ecstatic Ramkrishna is transformed into an active, bold and challenging Vivekananda who at the end of his worldly life became one with his Master through the Nirvikalpa Samadhi (delayed in the case of Vivekananda who had an assignment to fulfil). Romain Rolland compares (P.8) the Master and his worthy disciple to Mozart and Beethoven, Pater Seraphicus and Jove, the thunderer. I should turn back to the Master as Romain Rolland saw him.

Since the French Savant wrote his book, the Life of Ramkrishna, for the Western audience or to interpret East to the West and he was dully conversant with the Christian theology and mysticism, his writings are full of allusions to it from the beginning to the end. He regards Ramkrishna as younger brother of Christ only removed in time and space (P.12) whose precocious intellect astonished the learned men Jewish doctors⁵ (P.26). According to the author, intense concreteness of religious vision experienced by Ramkrishna and other Indian mystics of his kind shall strike the European believes to Protestant Christian even more than to Catholic. Ramkrishna's vision of Kali is compared to that by St. Theresa of Avila (P. 34) and his seeing of Gods Rama, Radha, Sita, Hanuman or Krishna in a young English man is presented as delirium of soul or hallucination (P. 37). One may not agree with his own explanation that Ramkrishna saw Kali **he saw nothing, but that he was aware of her all-permeating presence**. The mystic vision can't be explained by resort to psychology which has yet to finally experiment with para-psychological states or transcendentalism of human soul. There are numerous references and allusions to Christian theology legends such as the part of such in Christian mysticism (P. 66), Ariadne leading Theseus by the hand through

the mazes of the labyrinth (p. 69) Divine flesh and Lord's supper (P. 71), appearance of Christ to repentant sinner Mary Magdalene (p. 78), love of fishermen of Galilee becoming the chosen disciples of their God and the founders of Church (p. 78, 147) comparison of common men and women serving God in the world to the third order, a name given by St. Frances of Assisi to pious people living in the world (p. 186) touch of the Master on the forehead of Vivekananda to the sign of St. Christopher (p. 247), the conquest of Galilean in breaking the resistance of his disciple (p. 245), description of Ramkrishna as combining the nature of Martha and Mary (Page 253), healing of others by the Master by taking their ills upon himself like the Christian mystics (p, 261), renunciation of one's share of joy for doing task of love reflecting the Christian Gospel (p. 267) and Ramkrishna's beg of agony at the time of his death to cross.

Even with the immense learning and facile pen it is extremely difficult to make comparisons between two cultural beliefs. But that is the only way to make a search for Romain Rolland for his perception of spiritual unity of mankind, Brahma Satyam Jagat Mithya. Absolute Unity is true and real, diversity is phantom and appearance on the ground of reality.

References

1. All subsequent references unless otherwise specified are to the following edition : Romain Rolland ; **The Life of Ramkrishna**, E.F. malcolm-Smith, Advait Ashrama, Delhi, Entally Road, Calcutta, June 1979, The pages within brackets in the body of the text refer to this book.
2. P.I. He looked upon man of the French post-Romantic era. He equates Ramkrishna's singing of heroic hymns at the death of his friend's son to the instance of Beethoven playing on the piano to help a mother in mourning. Further without speaking of Indian notion of avatara-hood he speaks of Ramkrishna's human feelings and his sensitivity for poetry of medieval saints without full working out his spiritual uniqueness in India's saintly tradition.
3. pp. 4-14.
4. p. 7.

5. In fact he is eager to establish the co-existence of scientific reason and the visionary spirit of ancient times'in (p. 17). In order to present him as a 'man', the author never misses an opportunity to speak about his sense of humour, common sense and sensitivity of heart for arts and letters. The madman of love is simultaneously portrayed as a born lover and artist who talked in the manner of Socrates (page 52).

(Typed)



7. M.M. Pandit P.N. Paṭṭābhirāma Śāstri

Śāstri Jī passed away on 1st September, 1992 at 11.15 p.m. in a private hospital in Delhi. He was born in Pwlasur village near Kanchipuram in 1908 and educated at Tirupati and Varanasi under M.M. Chinnaswami Śāstri whose daughter he married later on. At the time of his sad demise he was the Chancellor of the Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati and National Professor of Veda appointed by the Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan.

Initially he served Banaras Hindu University and later on was appointed Principal of Maharaja Sanskrit College, Jaipur by Sir Mirza Ismail on the recommendation of Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya. In 1952 Śāstri Jī was invited by the University of Calcutta to grace the Chair of Mīmāṃsā. He wished to spend last years of his career in Varanasi where he was appointed as Professor and Head, Department of Sāhitya, Mīmāṃsā and Tantra in 1975. He was honoured by the President of India in 1973, by Jagadguru Sri Sankaracharya of Kanchipuram, Kanchi and he received the award of Padmabhushan from the Government of India. U.P. Sanskrit Academy gave him Vishva Bharati award for international eminence which carried a cash prize of Rs. 1 lakh, Sampurnananda Sanskrit University and the University of Burdwan conferred upon him Mahamahopadhyaya and D. Litt. degrees (honoris causa) respectively. Various other academic bodies and organisations honoured him with titles.

Born, and initially educated, in South India, he spent his life in East, West and North and thus represented a real unity and integrity of this country in his person and disposition. He has numerous śiṣyas in Jaipur, Calcutta and Varanasi and particularly in the centres of traditional learning pursuing various Śāstras, more particularly Mīmāṃsā. Śāstrī Jī's contribution to Mīmāṃsā is unique in many respects. His writings (also editions of Mīmāṃsā texts) which are nearly fifty in number and lectures, spread over half a century, demonstrate his absolute mastery of the śāstric tradition of India, pre-eminence of Mīmāṃsā therein and its contemporary relevance. This is fully borne out by his works, such as Mīmāṃsānyāya Mañjarī and the exposition of the Artha-saṅgraha. His discovery of several texts of Mīmāṃsā and their scholarly editions has enriched the extant literature. He has shown applicability of Mīmāṃsā principles in other śāstras and shown their usefulness in present democratic and egalitarian structure of the country. This is a unique contribution.

Śāstrī Jī was a living symbol of the glorious tradition of a Pandit who could weave the past into the present fabric of thought and culture. Till his last day, there was not a single moment of his wakeful state when he was not either editing a text, correcting a proof, writing a paper or giving instructions to his very old and very young pupils in Varanasi where he was directing the activities of Veda Mīmāṃsā Anusandhāna Kendra. India has lost a Pandit of unique achievements who had shown the path for India's unity and integrity through learning and culture on traditional lines. In his death the country has lost a great Sanskrit scholar and champion of Indian heritage and culture. As an erudite scholar in Vedas, Vedāṅgas, Upaniṣads and Darśanas, he has contributed substantially to the correct interpretation and appreciation of ancient knowledge inherited by us from our ancient seers and philosophers.

(Obituary, Editor, Prof. Daya Krishna, Journal of ICPR
Volume IX, Number 3, May-August, 1992)



8. भारत की एकता और अखण्डता के प्रतिमान पण्डित पट्टाभिराम शास्त्री

शास्त्री जी का जन्म और प्रारम्भिक शिक्षा-दीक्षा भारत के दक्षिण भाग में आन्ध्रप्रदेश के तिरुपति नगर में हुई। बाद में उन्होंने वाराणसी को अपने उत्तराध्ययन के लिए चुना। यहाँ उनके गुरु ने उन्हें मीमांसा का अप्रतिम पण्डित बनाया। एक शास्त्र का सम्बन्ध दूसरे शास्त्रों से होता है। वे अन्तरनुशासनीय (इण्टर डिस्प्लिनरी) व्यवस्था के जिसका आजकल बहुत जोर है, प्रबल समर्थक थे। इस विचार का समर्थन करने वाली बहुत-सी सूक्तियाँ संस्कृत में हैं। जैसे कि-

१. भूयो विद्धो प्रशस्यो भवति (निरुक्त)।
२. नैकं शास्त्रमधीयानो गच्छति शास्त्रनिर्णयम् (चरक)।
३. एकं शास्त्रमधीयानो न विद्यात् शास्त्रनिश्चयम्। तस्माद् बहुश्रुतः शास्त्रं विजानीयाच्चिकित्सकः (सुश्रुत)।
४. एकमेव शास्त्रं जानानो न किञ्चिदपि जानाति (वही)।
५. शास्त्रं शास्त्रान्तरानुबन्धि (दशकुमारचरित)।
६. शास्त्रं च विविधागमम् (मनुस्मृति)।

साहित्यशास्त्र को सभी शास्त्रों की समष्टि कहना, नाट्य शास्त्र को 'सर्व शास्त्रार्थ सम्पन्न' पञ्चम वेद घोषित करना, महाभारत में धर्म, अर्थ, काम, मोक्ष सभी का समन्वित होना एवं भर्तृहरि द्वारा व्याकरण को 'सर्वपार्षद' घोषित करना भी शास्त्रान्तर ज्ञान की अपेक्षा सिद्ध करता है। इसी परम्परा के अनुसार शास्त्री जी केवल मीमांसा के ही नहीं अपितु अनेक शास्त्रों के प्रकृष्ट विद्वान् थे। पर शास्त्रज्ञ होना ही परम्परा में पर्याप्त नहीं माना जाता है। अपनी प्रतिभा, प्रज्ञा और पण्डा से शास्त्रों में निष्णात होना तथा मौलिक चिन्तक हो पाना भी वास्तविक पण्डित होने का लक्षण माना जाता है। इसीलिए उसे सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्र कहा गया है। शास्त्री जी मीमांसक थे, षट्शास्त्री थे और तत्त्वतः सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्र थे। यह बात उनके मीमांसा शास्त्र पर या किसी शास्त्र पर लिखे लेखों से सहज ही समझी जा सकती है। उनका प्रत्येक लेख अपनी मेधा और प्रतिभा से अतीत को वर्तमान से जोड़ता है, उसे परिष्कृत करता है और सार्थक बनाता है। इस स्थिति तक पहुँचने के लिए विद्या-साधना के जिस गहन कान्तार को, अपार समुद्र को पार करना होता है, उसे शास्त्रीजी ने पार किया था। शास्त्र-ज्ञान इस प्रक्रिया में यदि बोझ और अभिमान बन जाय या फिर विद्या विवाद मात्र का

साधन बन जाय तो खलता है। उसका जीवन के रस के साथ जुड़ना आवश्यक है। शास्त्रीजी का सहज विनोद, शिशुसुलभ निरभिमानत्व, सहज वात्सल्य, शिष्यों के प्रति सन्ततिभाव और वह भी बिना किसी भेद-भाव के तथा आत्मीयता-प्रकाशन के इस बात का पुष्ट प्रमाण है कि उन्होंने अपने सम्पर्क में आने वाले व्यक्तियों में राष्ट्रपति, प्रधानमन्त्री, राज्यपाल, श्रेष्ठिवर्ग ही नहीं मुझ जैसे सामान्य अध्येता को भी अपने आत्मीय भाव से सदा आप्यायित किया है। उनके व्यक्तित्व का यह चुम्बक दक्षिण, उत्तर, पूर्व, पश्चिम सभी दिशाओं और कोणों में फैले हुए उनके शिष्यों, सम्बन्धियों, परिचितों, प्रशंसकों और स्नेहीजनों को आज भी उनके पुण्यस्मरण से अपनी ओर खींचता है। उनका स्नेह अमृत वर्षा की तरह सभी पर बरसता था। अहेतुकी कृपा करने वाला मैंने उस जैसा व्यक्ति इस जीवन में अभी तक नहीं देखा है। आयु की और ज्ञान की बहुत बड़ी दूरी होने पर भी मैं जब भी उनसे मिलता था तो कुछ न कुछ उनकी ही गलती बता दिया करता था- आशुतोष व्यक्ति प्रकृति से औदरदानी होता है। इसीलिये दोषज्ञ की दृष्टि के अनुसार उसका कार्य असंगत माना जाता है। उनके पट्टशिष्य श्रेष्ठय डॉ. मण्डन मिश्र भी जब तब क्या करना चाहिए और क्या नहीं यह बता देते थे। ज्येष्ठ और श्रेष्ठ द्वारा अपने से छोटे को परामर्श देने हेतु अधिकार प्रदान करना, उसके परामर्श को सहज स्वीकारना और छोटे व्यक्ति को निरन्तर प्रोत्साहन और प्रेरणा देना किन्हीं महापुरुषों में ही देखने को मिलता है। शास्त्री जी में ये सभी बातें स्पष्ट परिलक्षित होती थीं।

पर इस सबसे परे एक बात और है। आज छिछली राजनीति और भोगवाद के कारण यह राष्ट्र टूट रहा है। मन और कर्म में कुछ होता है और उपदेश उससे भिन्न होता है। शब्दों के मायावी उपदेशक राष्ट्र को घुन की तरह खाते जा रहे हैं। ऐसी विषम परिस्थिति में आयातित ज्ञान और आचार वाले व्यक्तियों द्वारा राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा और विकास की कथा, छलना की उक्ति के समान प्रतीत होती है। शास्त्री जी एक छोटी-सी कोठरी में बैठकर निरन्तर सारस्वत साधना में तल्लीन रहते थे। कभी लिखते रहते थे; कभी किसी नये शिशुशिष्य को कुछ आचार और अर्थ सिखाते रहते थे या फिर अस्सी से ऊपर की वृद्धावस्था में प्रुफ पढ़ते रहते थे। इसी परिस्थिति में सदा मैंने वाराणसी में उनके घर के कक्ष में देखा है। किसी दूसरे विद्वान् को इस प्रकार सदा विद्याभ्यासरत नहीं पाया और इस रूप में वे भारत की उस सांस्कृतिक परम्परा के प्रज्वलित प्रदीप के समान लगते थे। उन्होंने भारत की एकता और अखण्डता का प्रतिपादन अपने आचार द्वारा किया था। इस दाक्षिणात्य महापुरुष के प्रमुख शिष्य भारत के पूर्वभाग, उत्तर भाग एवं पश्चिम भाग के हैं, उनमें कई सनातनी हैं, कुछ आर्यसमाजी हैं और वे सब अलग-अलग राजनीतिक विचारधाराओं वाले हैं। पर उन सबका सूत्र एक है- पण्डित पट्टाभिराम शास्त्री । राष्ट्रिय संस्कृत विद्यापीठ, तिरुपति में कुलाधिपति के नाते कार्य समिति के सदस्यों का जब मनोनयन का अवसर आया तो उन्होंने अपने अधिकारों का उपयोग करते समय अपने को न दक्षिण में सीमित किया और

न काशी और न केवल अपनी शिष्यमण्डली तक। यही कारण रहा है कि कलकत्ता, जयपुर, वाराणसी, दिल्ली, तिरुपति आदि स्थानों पर समानरूप से उनके प्रति श्रद्धा एवं सम्मान दिखाई देता है। पट्टाभिराम शास्त्री जी जैसे - महापुरुष से त्याग, तपस्या और निरपेक्षा तथा निर्व्याज स्नेह की प्रेरणा यदि हम ले सकें तो यह समाज प्राणवान् बना रहेगा। अन्यथा हमें खण्डों में जीना होगा, अखण्डता में नहीं। अर्थ का प्रभुत्व और राजनीति खण्डित करती है, पण्डित-परम्परा हमें एकता, अद्वैत और अखण्डता का सांस्कृतिक पाठ पढ़ाती है, उसी के आचार्य थे पण्डित पट्टाभिराम शास्त्री जी। उनकी सनातन स्मृति को मैं शतशः नमन करता हूँ।

(शोध प्रभा, केन्द्रीय संस्कृत विद्यापीठ, दिल्ली)



9. भारतीय परम्परा के मूल स्वर : डॉ. गोविन्दचन्द्र पाण्डे

अज्ञेयजी द्वारा स्थापित वत्सल निधि की प्रवर्तना से स्व. हीनानन्द शास्त्री स्मारक व्याख्यान माला का श्रीगणेश डॉ. पाण्डे के चार व्याख्यानों से हुआ था। प्रस्तुत पुस्तक उन्हीं व्याख्यानों का पुस्तकाकार प्रकाशन है। इतिहास, अध्यात्म, धर्म एवं साहित्यालोचन किंवा संस्कृति के दर्शन से सम्बन्धित व्याख्यान-ग्रन्थ संस्कृत के चार प्रतीक-वाक्यों में विभाजित है। अपनी समर्थ सांकेतिक अभिव्यक्ति के कारण भारतीय परम्परा-विश्लेषण की यह चतुःसूत्री मुझे अविचारित रमणीय लगी। पाठकों की सुविधा के लिए तथा विषयमूलक अभिप्राय-निर्धारण की दृष्टि से चारों प्रतीक वाक्य एवं उनके उपशीर्षक निर्मांकित हैं-

१. संभावामि युगे युगे - सनातनता और ऐतिहासिकता ।
२. आत्मानं विद्धि - अध्यात्मविद्या और योग ।
३. धर्मस्य तत्त्वं निहितं गुहायाम् - नैतिक आदर्श और सामाजिक यथार्थ ।
४. रसो वै सः - अनुभूति और अभिव्यक्ति ।

चिन्तनशील भारतीय अपनी पहिचान स्थापित करने के लिए निरन्तर भारत को खोज रहा है। इस अनुसन्धान-पथ में उसे अनेक देशी-विदेशी व्याख्याकार मिले। कई उसे अतीत की गौरवगाथा सुनाकर छल गये और कई निपट अनाड़ी निकले। किसी ने अन्तर्दृष्टि दी भी तो नये प्रश्नों और मूल्यों के कंटक-जाल में वह उलझ गई। इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि कोई मनीषी भारतीय परम्परा के सर्वांगीण तात्पर्य का निर्धारण करे। यह कार्य कठिन है क्योंकि पारम्परिक पण्डित वेद में आधुनिक विज्ञान के नवीन आविष्कार प्रमाणित करने में अपनी सिद्धि मानते हैं तो दूसरी ओर बौद्धिक परतन्त्रता से अभिभूत साक्षर जन विकासवाद

की धारणाओं को चेपते रहे हैं। वे मात्र अनुकरण कर सकते हैं या बिरा सकते हैं या फिर परम्परा के दोषों की सूची प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं - **जीर्णमङ्गे सुभाषितम्**।

डॉ. पाण्डे इतिहास, धर्म-दर्शन, सामाजिक विज्ञान तथा सौन्दर्यशास्त्र के पारंगत प्रकाण्ड पण्डित ही नहीं हैं, वे वस्तुतः आस्थाशील तात्त्विक भारतीय हैं, उन्होंने इतिहास खोजा है, धर्म जिया है और उनमें कविता रची-पची है। प्रज्ञा एवं प्रतिभा (कारयित्री तथा भावयित्री) के मञ्जुल समन्वय के कारण डॉ. पाण्डे तत्त्वद्रष्टा एवं भावक दोनों ही एक साथ हैं। यही कारण है कि इस देश की सांस्कृतिक अस्मिता का जो चित्र अथवा संस्कृति-दर्शन का जो तत्त्वचिन्तन डॉ. पाण्डे की व्याख्यान-चतुष्टयी में मिलता है वह अन्यत्र दुर्लभ है। उनके चिन्तन का मूलाधार बौद्ध, वेदान्त एवं शैव दर्शन के अन्तरंग त्रिवेणी-संगम में प्रतिष्ठित है। पुस्तक को आद्योपान्त पढ़ने के बाद कम से कम मेरी यही धारणा बनती है। डॉ. पाण्डे की आदर्शवादी मूल्यमीमांसा का मेरुदण्ड व्यापक अद्वैतवाद है। पर इसके साथ यह भी कहना आवश्यक है कि संस्कृति के तलस्पर्शी विवेचन में डॉ. पाण्डे की स्वयं की अन्तर्दृष्टि भी है जो कि सर्वतन्त्र स्वतन्त्र है।

१९वीं शताब्दी के विकासवाद तथा प्राकृतिक वस्तुवाद की धारणाओं के अनुरूप मूल्य-व्यवस्था को अन्तर्हित करते हुए भी संस्कृति का आधार प्राकृतिक मानवता एवं प्रत्यक्ष से सत्यापित अर्थ से व्यतिरिक्त नहीं है। इतिहास भी इसी दृष्टि का अतिगामी है। इसके विपरीत, प्राचीन सांस्कृतिक परम्पराओं एवं भारतीय चिन्तनधारा तथा संस्कृति का तात्त्विक विश्लेषण करते हुए डॉ. पाण्डे का अपना अभिमत है कि **“संस्कृति तत्त्वतः एक मूल्यव्यवस्था है जिसका ज्ञान आदर्श-बोध के विवेचन से होता है। सांस्कृतिक जगत् अर्थगवेषणा अथवा आत्मपर्येषणा के सनातन इतिहास की सांकेतिक अभिव्यक्तियों का विश्व है।”** इसी धारणा के अनुरूप वे संस्कृति की वस्तु-वैज्ञानिक या समाज-शास्त्रीय व्याख्या स्वीकार नहीं करते। साथ ही युगीन या जातीय अभिव्यक्तियों को एक सार्वभौम सांस्कृतिक चेतना का संकेतमात्र मानते हैं जो संस्कृति के आन्तरिक पक्ष को अपनी बहिरंग सामाजिक परम्पराओं में व्यक्त करते हैं। अस्तु, सनातनता तथा सार्वभौमिकता संस्कृति का आत्मधर्म है, ऐतिहासिकता उसकी द्वन्द्वात्मक क्रमिकता है। सामाजिक उपयोगिता की दृष्टि से साधनों का संयोजन सभ्यता का कार्य है तो संस्कृति स्वतन्त्रता का अनुसन्धान एवं मूल्य तथा विश्व के निर्माण की प्रक्रिया है। इस भेद को अपनाकर डॉ. पाण्डे ने अनेक स्थापनाएँ एवं खण्डन-मण्डन किये हैं जिनमें से आर्य शब्द को देशपरक या जातिपरक न मानकर दास या म्लेच्छ की प्रतियोगी सभ्यता का वाचक मानना, संस्कृत एवं कलाओं को संस्कृति की सांकेतिक व्यवस्था का वाहक प्रमाणित करना तथा विदेशी एवं भारतीय विद्याविदों अथवा साम्यवादियों की भारतीय संस्कृति की व्याख्या तथा उसकी तथाकथित समन्वयात्मकता या सामासिकता का खण्डन करना प्रमुख है। वस्तुतः साम्राज्यवादी और

राजनीतिक राष्ट्रीयतावादियों या साम्यवादियों के द्वारा संस्कृति की जो व्याख्या की गई है वह या तो बाह्य मानदण्ड पर आधारित है अथवा संस्कृति को सभ्यता से भेद न कर पाने का परिणाम है। दूसरी ओर आध्यात्मिकता को भारतीय संस्कृति का निगूढ़ तत्त्व मानने वाली प्राचीन दृष्टि का दोष यह है कि वह संस्कृति की अन्तरंगता का सामाजिक-भौतिक इतिहास के सन्दर्भ में अनुशीलन नहीं करती। संस्कृति को, सांस्कृतिक मूल्य चेतना को सभ्यता के दर्पण में इतिहास के उत्थान-पतन के साथ समझना चाहिये। इस प्रकार डॉ. पाण्डे एक ओर प्रवृत्ति के आधार पर संस्कृति की व्याख्या की आलोचना करते हैं तो दूसरी ओर प्रकृति की उपेक्षा पर आधारित संस्कृति की। यद्यपि इस मूल स्थापना में उनकी दृष्टि अनातिल है तथापि निर्गुण ब्रह्म को मानकर माया के साथ स्वलक्षण पूर्व स्थापना कर सामान्य या विकल्पों के साथ इन्द्रियातीत सामान्य को मानकर विशेष के साथ सम्बन्ध और संगति के जो प्रश्न उठते हैं वे डॉ. पाण्डे के विवेचन में भी उठाये जा सकते हैं।

अध्यात्मविद्या और योग के बिना भारतीय संस्कृति की चर्चा का अथ या इति सम्भव नहीं है। डॉ. पाण्डे ने प्राचीन एवं मध्यकालीन युगों में पश्चिमी यूनानी एवं ईसाई ज्ञान की आत्मप्रधानता के विपरीत उसकी विषय-प्रधानता का उल्लेख करते हुए तथा उनके रिलिजन का तथा परलोक-प्राप्ति में पर्यवसन मानते हुए भारतीय (आध्यात्मिक) धर्म की विलक्षणता स्थापित की है। यह आध्यात्मिक चेतना पूर्णता तथा शून्यता अथवा प्रवृत्ति एवं निवृत्ति की दो धाराओं में प्रवाहित है। प्रथम को मुख्यतः वैदिक और दूसरी धारा को मुख्यतः श्रमण परम्परा से प्रभावित एवं प्रेषित मानना चाहिये। डॉ. पाण्डे के इस अभिमत से मैं नितान्त सहमत हूँ कि श्रमणों की अवैदिक धारा वैदिक धारा के साथ-साथ अप्रसिद्ध रूप से प्रचलित थी। उसका ऐतिहासिक स्तर पर उन्मेष वैदिक काल के अन्तिम युग में हुआ। वस्तुतः भारतीय चिन्तन-परम्परा का विकास आत्मालोचन एवं साधना के विविध माध्यमों के अनुसन्धान की सहज प्रक्रिया से हुआ है न कि बाह्य आन्दोलनों के झटकों से। यही कारण है कि वैदिक साहित्य में संहिता एवं ब्राह्मणों में प्रवृत्ति का जो स्वरूप है वह आरण्यकों एवं उपनिषदों तक आते-आते निवृत्ति को अन्तर्गर्भित कर लेता है। निवृत्ति के जीवन-निषेधक सिद्धान्त का कितना भी जयघोष वेदाचार काल में विभिन्न धाराओं में प्राप्त होता हो पर मेरी यह सुनिश्चित धारणा है कि भारतीय संस्कृति की मुख्य दृष्टि प्रवृत्ति एवं निवृत्ति में सामंजस्य स्थापित करने की रही है। ऐसा न मानने पर आश्रम व्यवस्था, चतुर्विध संघ, धर्म, अर्थ, काम की पुरुषार्थता के सिद्धान्त, वाल्मीकि, व्यास, कालिदास के काव्यों में प्रतिफलित जिजीविषा, साहित्य एवं कलाओं में शृंगार की समृद्ध प्रतिष्ठा, वस्तुवादी दर्शनों की निरन्तरता, विभिन्न दार्शनिक सम्प्रदायों की जीवनमुक्ति-परिकल्पना, शांकर निर्गुण ब्रह्मवाद में सगुण की स्वीकृति, विशिष्टाद्वैत, शुद्धाद्वैत आदि वेदान्ती सम्प्रदायों में निवृत्ति मार्ग का प्रतिषेध तान्त्रिक दृष्टि से समग्र जीवन की चिन्मयता का प्रतिषेध, शैव, वैष्णव

आदि भक्ति की प्राणप्रतिष्ठा एवं भोग एवं मोक्ष की एकरूपता का प्रतिपादन, सम्प्रदायों में राग का भावात्मक उच्छ्वसित, लौकिक गुरु में भगवान् की प्रतिष्ठा, निर्वाण-संसार की एककोटिकता, पुराणों के तीर्थ-क्षेत्र आदि की कल्पनाओं का कोई अर्थ नहीं रह जायेगा। मध्यकालीन सूत्र-साहित्य में ही योगी-विरागी का तिरस्कार नहीं हुआ है अपितु उसकी एकान्त प्रतिष्ठा प्राचीन साहित्य एवं कलाओं में भी नहीं मिलती। आज योग का जो चमत्कार भारतीय संस्कृति के नाम से विज्ञापित हो रहा है उसे मायावी (राक्षस) की माया तो माना जा सकता है, वह सात्त्विक एवं तात्त्विक योग निश्चित ही नहीं है। वस्तुतः योग अध्यात्मविद्या का साधना पक्ष है जिसकी अर्थवत्ता तत्त्वदृष्टि में है- आसन लगाकर और नथुने बन्द करदारी करने में नहीं है। मूल वैदिक दृष्टि एवं श्रमण दृष्टि का भेद स्पष्ट करते हुए डॉ. पाण्डे ने अनुषंगतः वेदों के सम्बन्ध में मीमांसकों के स्वतः प्रामाण्यवाद का तथा वैदिक धर्म को प्राकृतिक शक्तियों की कल्पना और उपासना के अन्धविश्वासी अविकसित धर्म मानने का प्रखर खण्डन करते हुए वेदार्थ-ज्ञान के लिए परम्परागत विभिन्न व्याख्याओं, आधुनिक ऐतिहासिक-भाषा वैज्ञानिक अर्थानुसन्धान तथा अध्यात्मवादी अर्थवत्ता से अर्थ के अनुशीलन में समन्वय स्थापित करने की प्रेरणा दी है। वस्तुतः प्रकृति-पुरुष की एकात्मकता, समग्र विश्व की चिन्मयता (देवशक्ति) एवं जीवन की पारमार्थिक आनन्दमयता का जो भावात्मक रूप वैदिक दृष्टि में मिलता है वह श्रमण-दृष्टि के परिष्कार को स्वीकार कर अविच्छिन्न रूप से भारतीय संस्कृति का अन्तस्तत्त्व बना हुआ है। वैदिक एवं श्रमण दृष्टियों की तार्किक परस्पर-विरोधिता होने पर भी आध्यात्मिकता की उभयनिष्ठ अविच्छिन्नता के कारण भारतीय जीवन को न तो कर्मकाण्ड पूर्णतः जकड़ पाया और न जीवन-विरोधी वैराग्य। जो विरोध शास्त्रों में दिखता है वह सामाजिक जीवन में समन्वय पाकर सदा रूपान्तरित होता रहा। ब्राह्मण-श्रमण का विरोध ही प्रसिद्ध नहीं है अपितु ब्राह्मण के श्रमण हो जाने से वह (ब्राह्मण-श्रमण-न्याय) हीनयान के महायान में परिवर्तन का भी मार्ग प्रशस्त करता है। इसलिए वैदिक एवं श्रमण दो धाराओं की भिन्नता की चर्चा के साथ-साथ उनके संगम-स्थलों की चर्चा भी अपेक्षित है।

पशुत्व और मनुष्यत्व, प्रवृत्तिमूलक पारतन्त्र्य और विवेकमूलक स्वातन्त्र्य के पूर्ण द्वन्द्व, अपेक्षा और विरोध से जिस भारतीय सामाजिक व्यवस्था का उदात्त आदर्शों के विपरीत निर्माण एवं विकास हुआ, जिन दोषों ने भारतीय समाज को विषमता, दरिद्रता और पाखण्ड का शिकार बनाया, उन सब का समाधान डॉ. पाण्डे मूल्यों के क्रमिक हास, आस्था की शिथिलता तथा सत्ताधारी के आचरण में खोजते हैं। मूल्यों के सम्बन्ध में हासवादी दृष्टि प्रत्येक धर्म, संस्कृति अपनाती है-पहले सतयुग था अब कलियुग है। पर क्या यह मूल्य-सम्बन्धी अशक्तता का, सांस्कृतिक असामर्थ्य का अथवा आदर्श और व्यवहार में अन्विति के अभाव का द्योतक नहीं है? निरन्तर विकासमान मानवीय स्वतन्त्रता

एवं प्रतिष्ठा के सन्दर्भ में भी क्या हासवादी प्राचीन सांस्कृतिक दृष्टि ही सही है? वैदिक धर्म में ऋत, सत्य, दान ऋणशोधन, श्रेयस् की प्रेयस् की अपेक्षा श्रेष्ठता, समग्र सृष्टि की एकात्मकता के प्रतिपादन के साथ ही क्या उस चतुर्वर्णात्मक समाज की व्यवस्था प्रस्फुटित नहीं हुई थी जिसका बुद्ध, महावीर, तान्त्रिक, सन्त, गांधी सभी विरोध करते रहे पर विषमता कभी निर्जीव नहीं हो पाई। यज्ञ-प्रधान वैदिक सांस्कृतिक प्रसार के साथ ही ब्राह्मण की श्रेष्ठता एवं शूद्र की हीनता का सामाजिक धर्म भी विकसित हुआ था। सूत्रों एवं स्मृतियों में, दण्डनीति एवं अर्थशास्त्र के साहित्य ने जिस धर्म-व्यवस्था को विकसित किया उसमें भी विषमता की व्यावहारिक व्यवस्था है। श्रमण-परम्परा के साहित्य में और श्रौत-स्मार्त धर्म के सामान्य लक्षण में जिस सार्वभौम आदर्श का शंखनाद बारम्बार सुनाई देता है, वह सामाजिक व्यवहार एवं न्याय में स्वीकृति नहीं पा पाता। आदर्श की हार्दिक अस्वीकृति का ही यह परिणाम हुआ कि धर्म शास्त्रीय व्यवस्था और विषमता को मजबूत बनाते चले गये और यह कह कर सदा छलते रहे कि स्मृति श्रुति की अनुगामिनी है। मूल वैदिक धर्म में सामान्य प्रतीति के अनुसार आदर्श की श्रेष्ठता का जो बिम्ब मिलता है स्मृति की धर्म-व्यवस्था को निश्चित ही उनका प्रतिबिम्ब नहीं माना जा सकता। यदि प्राचीन परम्परा के अनुसार स्मृति को श्रुति का स्मारक माना जाता है तो निश्चित ही वैदिक धर्म वह नहीं है जिसका डॉ. पाण्डे ने या आस्थाशील अनेक प्राचीन-अर्वाचीन मनीषियों ने प्रतिपादन किया है। वर्णाश्रम धर्म के साथ जिन सामान्य धर्मों की चर्चा स्मृति ग्रन्थों में है उन पर वास्तविक आग्रह साधनामूलक श्रमण (बौद्ध-जैन) या अश्रमण (योग-तन्त्र-भक्ति की) परम्पराओं में है। वस्तुतः ब्राह्मण (वैदिक) एवं श्रमण परम्पराओं का धर्म की दृष्टि से विवेचन यदि उनके पारस्परिक आदान-प्रदान को रेखांकित करते हुए किया जाये तो यही प्रतीत होगा कि दोनों परम्पराओं की आध्यात्मिक साधना में धर्म का अर्थ एकरूप होकर परमार्थ के अनुसन्धान में पर्यवसित होना था और सामाजिक व्यवस्था में वह युगीन कुलक्रमागत आचार-व्यवहार का तथा राजनीति का पर्याय बन जाता था। मनुस्मृति में धर्म का त्रिविध लक्षण मिलता है। एक वर्णाश्रम धर्म (श्रुति-स्मृति-सदाचार) का और उसके साथ ही मानवीय-विवेक स्वस्य च प्रियमात्मनः का प्रतिपादक है, दूसरा धृति, क्षमा आदि गुणों का पर्याय है तो तीसरा देशगत, कुलक्रमागत आचार-विचारों का। प्रथम को श्रमण-परम्परा सिद्धान्ततः स्वीकार नहीं कर सकती थी पर दूसरे का साग्रह समर्थन और तीसरे की मौन स्वीकृति उसमें भी है। वस्तुतः वैदिक एवं श्रमण परम्पराओं के पार्थक्य की अपेक्षा उनमें वैचारिक पारस्परिकता निरन्तर बढ़ती रही। इसी का प्रतिफल गीता का आसक्तिहीन कर्मयोग है तथा जीवन्मुक्ति का समान आदर्श है जो कि स्थितप्रज्ञ, अरिहन्त तथा बोधिसत्त्व की समान धारणाओं में तथा बाद में तान्त्रिक साधना की एकधर्मिता में प्रतिबिम्बित होता है। आर्य-अनार्य, ब्राह्मण-क्षत्रिय की भाँति ब्राह्मण-श्रमण के विरोध की चर्चा पारस्परिकता की लम्बी यात्रा के बाद अधिक सार्थक नहीं रह गई - सतां साप्तपदीनं सख्यम्।

आत्मपरामर्श ही मौलिक अनुभूति है जिसमें अपनी अभिव्यक्ति अपने लिए होती है। उपाधि एवं संकेत के भेद से अनुभूति में तनुता एवं सघनता एवं अभिव्यक्ति का वैचित्र्य सम्पन्न होता है। सात्त्विक और अन्तर्मुख मनोवृत्ति में अपने अनुरूप प्रस्फुट विषय की उपलब्धि से जिस सघन आत्मानुभूति का सूत्रपात होता है, वही काव्य और कला की प्रेरणा बनती है (९८)। अनुभूति एवं अभिव्यक्ति का यह लक्षण डॉ. पाण्डे ने अपनी वृत्ति के साथ दिया है। (पृ. ९८-९९)। इसी भक्ति को अपनाकर उन्होंने भारतीय काव्य एवं कला की विवेचना की है और उसमें आत्मिक अनुभूति की अभिव्यक्ति का प्राधान्य स्थापित किया है। साम्प्रदायिक तथा प्रतीकात्मक साहित्य में यह आत्मिक अनुभूति कितनी भी मुखर क्यों न हो तथा आत्मवादी आलोचना में उसका कितना भी स्वीकार क्यों नहीं हो पर समग्र साहित्य एवं विभिन्न कलाओं का पर्यवेक्षण करने पर मुझे यही प्रतीत होता है कि इन्द्रियता या विषयता का तथा देहवाद का विषयिता या आत्मिकता के साथ लौकिक शृंगार एवं वैराग्य, आदर्श एवं यथार्थ की दोनों धाराएँ समान रूप से काव्य एवं कला का विषय रही हैं। वैदिक सूक्तों को उत्तम काव्य मानने की परम्परा भारतीय आलोचना के क्षेत्र में प्रतिष्ठित नहीं हो पाई। वस्तु-केन्द्रित अलौकिक अर्थ- निरूपक साहित्य की अपेक्षा मानव-केन्द्रित भावजगत् की अभिव्यक्ति होने पर, मानवीय शोक के श्लोक बनने पर आदि काव्य का जन्म माना जाता है। डॉ. पाण्डे की परिभाषा आध्यात्मिक एवं दार्शनिक साहित्य एवं कला को जो प्रमुखता प्रदान करती है वह परवर्ती साहित्य के विकास में परिलक्षित नहीं होती। हासवादी धारणा के अनुसार उसकी व्याख्या अवश्य की जा सकती है पर वह संस्कृत-साहित्य की समृद्ध परम्परा का सही लेखा-जोखा नहीं होगा। डॉ. पाण्डे की भाषा-शैली संस्कृतनिष्ठ, विचार-प्रधान एवं सूत्रात्मक है। उसके पढ़ने और समझने के लिए पाठक का प्रबुद्ध होना अत्यन्त आवश्यक है। अनधिकारी को इसमें न तो प्रवाह प्रतीत होगा और न आवश्यक स्पष्टता। वस्तुतः जिस विचार-गाम्भीर्य को और उसके अनुरूप भाषा को लेकर डॉ. पाण्डे ने विवेचन प्रस्तुत किया है वह मुझे शंकर के भाष्य का स्मरण दिलाता है जिसका अध्ययन गम्भीर बौद्धिक निष्ठा के साथ ही किया जाना चाहिये। भारतीय परम्परा की खोज मात्र अतीत का बौद्धिक निर्धारण नहीं है, वह आस्था एवं सचेतन निर्माण का भी प्रश्न है। डॉ. पाण्डे ने भारतीय संस्कृति के विवेचन में पुरातात्विक दृष्टि को अपनाकर शवसाधना न कर शिवत्व की साधना की है। इसके लिए प्राचीन एवं नवीन दोनों प्रकार के विद्वान् उनके ऋणी होंगे।

(भारतीय परम्परा के मूल स्वर, लेखक - डॉ. गोविन्द चन्द्र पाण्डे, नेशनल पब्लिशिंग हाउस, नई दिल्ली, पुस्तक - समीक्षा, टिङ्कित)



अष्टम परिच्छेद : संस्कृत कविताएँ

1. अभिनवसूक्तिसन्दोहः

कालिदासेन कविना यद्वाग्वर्त्म निषेवितम्।
सर्वे तदेव सेवन्ते कवित्वं शाश्वतं पदम् ॥1॥

अन्यायेन हता नीती रक्षसा राघवो जितः।
मृत्युर्जीवनमाप्नोति किमाश्चर्यमतः परम् ॥2॥

भीष्मद्रोणायिताः सर्वे कौरवाः सुप्रतिष्ठिताः।
भीमार्जुनविहीनाश्च किं विधास्यन्ति पाण्डवाः ॥3॥

लक्ष्मणो मूर्च्छितो जातो रावणो रौति भीषणम्।
रामो हनुमता त्यक्तः सीतायाः किं भविष्यति ॥4॥

पुण्यः पापं सदा हन्ति सत्यं जयति नानृतम्।
सर्वमेतन्मृषा भाति दुश्शिले प्रभुतां गते ॥5॥

नैव रुद्रो विषं भुङ्क्ते विष्णुर्नो पाति रक्षसः।
ब्रह्मा सृष्टिपरावृत्तो निर्देवं जीवनं नवम् ॥6॥

सर्वे देवाः स्वकार्येभ्यो विरताः शेरतेऽधुना।
केवलो निस्सहायश्च नरः स्वातन्त्र्यमश्नुते ॥7॥

प्रज्ञावन्तोऽपि सद्वृत्ताः पापान्प्राप्य निरर्थकाः।
दुश्शीला निष्प्रतिभाश्च तादृशेष्वेव सिद्धिदाः ॥8॥

केचिद्दुष्टाः परे मन्दाः सद्वृत्ताश्चापरे श्रुताः।
चक्राकारं विवर्तन्ते राजानो नैकधा स्थिताः ॥9॥

दुष्टे विन्देत तच्छन्दं मन्दे स्वच्छन्दमाचरेत्।
सेवाकौशलविज्ञो ना सद्वृत्त गुणभागभवेत् ॥10॥

संस्पृष्टं रजसा सत्त्वं ज्ञानं कर्म च विन्दते।
रजस्तमोविनिर्मुक्तं सत्त्वं सीदति नान्यथा ॥11॥

(हस्तलिखितम्)



2. पुराणमित्येव न साधु सर्वम्

सन्त्यनेकानि शास्त्राणि ज्ञानं निस्सीम विद्यते।
समुद्रमज्जत्यौ कर्तुं प्रभवेत्को विचक्षणः॥1॥
प्रायेण प्रत्नदेशेषु पुराणं बहु मन्यते।
नवकल्पविरोधस्तु शब्दप्रामाण्यतः स्थितः॥2॥
चतुर्युगेषु क्रमशो धर्महानिर्माता तदा।
प्रभविष्णुभविष्यस्य मान्यता खलु दुष्करा॥3॥
अदृष्टो यो नवारम्भः श्रुतिभिः स्मृतिभिस्तथा।
पुण्यपापव्यवस्थायां को हेतुस्तत्र संभवः॥4॥
चक्राकारगतिः सृष्टेर्यथापूर्वं च कल्पना।
मता श्रुतिविदां तत्र कार्यं नव्यं न सेत्स्यति॥5॥
नव्यं भव्यं च नैवास्ति सर्वं वै पूर्वतः स्थितम्।
एतन्मतस्वीकारे तु व्यवहारो विरुध्यते॥6॥
दिव्कालविहिता भेदा पुरुषोत्प्रेक्षिताश्च ये।
आचारा व्यवहारा वै भिद्यन्ते नात्र संशयः॥7॥
परिवर्तिनि संसारे नित्यं कूटस्थमव्ययम्।
नास्ति यदवलम्बेन धर्मतत्त्वं स्थिरं भवेत्॥8॥
त्वरिता गतिरूर्ध्वा वा भव्यता यस्य वर्ण्यते।
साध्यस्य तस्य धर्मस्य सिद्धिभावो न सिध्यति॥9॥
महाजनानुरोधोऽपि स्थितमेवानुधावति।
नवीनमार्गनिर्माणं तत्र नैवोपदिश्यते॥10॥
नवं ज्ञानं नवं कार्यं विकासपथमृच्छति।
प्रत्नानुसरणेनैव विकासो नैव दृश्यते॥11॥
स्वार्थबुद्धिं परित्यज्य परभूतहिते रतः।
नैव स्वर्गं न वा मुक्तिं कांक्षते लोककाम्यया॥12॥

पण्डितः स्थितप्रज्ञो यो लोकदुःखैर्न तप्यति।
किन्त्वस्य प्रज्ञया कार्यं किं वा मुक्तेः प्रयोजनम्॥13॥
प्रवृत्तो लोकयात्रार्थं स्वार्थं कामयते जनः।
मुक्तयेऽपि प्रवृत्तस्य स्वार्थबुद्धिर्न शोभते॥14॥
परदुःखैर्न संस्पृष्ट उदासीनोऽथ प्रेक्षकः।
ब्रूरो निश्चेतनप्रख्यश्चैतन्ये दुःखमाहितम्॥15॥
कैवल्यलाभे मुक्तिः स्यान्निर्वाणे भावनाशमः।
व्यक्तिनिष्ठमिदं सर्वं संसारोच्छेदकारणम्॥16॥
मुक्तस्य केवलस्याथ यदि स्याद्दुःखवेदना।
तद्विनाशे प्रवृत्तिश्च तदा मुक्तेः प्रयोजनम्॥17॥
स्वातन्त्र्यं हीयते यत्र नव्यं नैवोपदिश्यते।
पुराणं मन्यते साधु न तच्छास्त्रं शुभावहम्॥18॥
शूरा वा कृतविद्या वा पुराणं न सिषेविषुः।
मूर्धन्यास्ते मता सद्भिर्नवमार्गनिषेवणात्॥19॥
नव्यं तदेव भव्यं स्याद् यल्लोकहितमाचरेत्।
जनं राष्ट्रं च ग्रामं च विकासपथमानयेत्॥20॥
स्वच्छन्द आचारो यो विचारो वा दुःखावहः।
स नूत्नोऽपि परित्याज्यः परोद्वेगकरो यदि॥21॥
परार्थाय प्रवृत्तो यो दीनहीनवशंवदः।
अकर्मकाण्डी पुरुषः पूज्यः श्रेयोऽर्थिभिः सदा॥22॥
अद्वैतं श्रद्धधानानां सर्वं ब्रह्मेति वादिनाम्।
वैषम्यव्यवहारार्थं मतिः पाखण्ड एव हि॥23॥
अद्वैतवादः सिद्धान्ते व्यवहारेऽतद्रूपता।
मनोवाक्कर्मणामैक्यं न्यक्कुरुते ह्यसंशयम्॥24॥
कीदृशः परमार्थो यो व्यवहारे विरुध्यते।
विचारे संस्थितो धर्म आचारे नैव दृश्यते॥25॥

अद्वैतभावस्पर्शोऽपि साम्यबुद्धिकरो भवेत्।
गुणैकपक्षपाती स्यान्न पुनर्जातिमाद्रियेत्॥26॥
परतन्त्राः कृता नार्योऽस्पृश्याः शूद्रादयः कृताः।
सर्व एव समाजोऽपि दीनहीनो निरक्षरः॥27॥
नेदं फलं हि धर्मस्य सारो वा संस्कृतेर्मतः।
नायमद्वैतभावश्च नैष धर्मः सनातनः॥28॥

(स्वरमङ्गला, 1990)



3. सती-प्रथा

वेदधर्मविरुद्धोऽपि प्रथितो भारते क्वचित् ।
सतीधर्म इति ख्यातः क्रूरः प्राणापघातकः ॥1॥
मृतं पतिमुपादाय चितायां संस्थिता सती ।
ज्वलन्ती विधवा वह्नौ सतीशब्देन संज्ञिता ॥2॥
निन्द्याशयैः प्रेरिता या देहं दहति स्वेच्छया।
अन्यैर्वा भस्मतां नीता सतीत्वं सा न विन्दति॥3॥
पतिप्रेमपरा या तु सावित्री सदृशी दृढम्।
प्राणान् रक्षति पत्युः सा सतीधर्मपदं गता॥4॥
दम्पत्योः साहचर्यं वै रघूणामन्वये श्रुतम्।
नृशंस आत्मदाहस्तु नैकदापि विभाव्यते॥5॥
विधवा वा परित्यक्ता पतिप्रेमपरा सती।
नैकापि मुमुचे प्राणान् राज्ञी रघुकुले ध्रुवम्॥6॥
कौसल्या वा सुमित्रा वा सीता वा परिदेविनी।
अग्निवर्णस्य जाया वा सर्वाः सत्यः स्त्रियो मताः॥7॥
कौसल्या न जहौ प्राणान् सुमित्रा वा यशस्विनी।
अग्निवर्णस्य जाया तु शशास विधवा सती॥8॥

कामस्य सुप्रियां भार्या रतिं पतिपथानुगाम्।
सरस्वती समाश्वास्य स्वात्मदाहान्यवारयत्॥9॥
आत्मदाहस्तु नारीणां स्वेच्छया रूढितोऽथवा।
पापाचारो जघन्यो वै रोद्धव्यो धर्मभीरुभिः॥10॥
नायं सनातनो धर्मः स हि जीवितरक्षकः।
धर्मो जीवितघाती चेत् को हि तच्छरणं ब्रजेत्॥11॥
जीवतो मुक्तिराख्याता देहपाते स्वयं पुनः।
विदेहमुक्तिः सहजा स्वात्मदाहस्तु निन्दितः॥12॥
योगेनान्ते तनोस्त्यागो विसृष्टिर्योगतोऽथवा।
घृतकाष्ठाग्निसंश्लिष्टे देहदाहे न दृश्यते॥13॥
धर्मदर्शनयोर्दृष्ट्या या हि जीवनपद्धतिः।
स्वर्गमोक्षफले तस्या अन्यथा नरकं स्थितम्॥14॥
आपत्सु विकले काले प्रथन्ते रीतयो नवाः।
न ता धर्मस्य मर्यादास्त्याज्यास्ता धर्मगोप्सुभिः॥15॥
सतीप्रथा तथैवास्ति मध्ये काले कृता क्वचित्।
सा सर्वथा परित्याज्या क्रूरा धर्मापघातिनी॥16॥
ये पश्यन्ति दुरात्मानो ज्वलन्तीं विधवां स्त्रियम्।
जयघोषं च कुर्वन्ति क्रूरास्ते पापवृत्तयः॥17॥
उद्धृत्य शास्त्रवाक्यानि पिशाचसदृशः पुनः।
प्रथामेतां प्रशंसन्ति मूढास्तेऽनर्थकारकाः॥18॥
अहिंसा-करुणाभावो यस्य सारतया स्थितम्।
गुहास्थितं धर्मतत्त्वं ते न जानन्ति शाश्वतम्॥19॥
साक्षरा विपरीतास्ते राक्षसा एव केवलम् ।
वेदशास्त्रादिपठनं येषु रावणवद्भवेत् ॥20॥
ऊर्ध्वबाहुः स्थितो व्यासो विरोति बधिरान्प्रति।
परोपकारः पुण्याय पापाय परपीडनम्॥21॥

कृता दृष्टा श्रुता पीडा गर्हणीया सदा बुधैः।
पीडिता विधवा नारी रक्षणीया प्रयत्नतः॥22॥

तस्याश्च लोकयात्रार्थं कल्प्याः जीवनवृत्तयः।
वैधव्यजनितं कष्टं यथा हि लघुतामियात्॥23॥

एष एव सदाचार एष धर्मः सनातनः।
सर्वभूतानुकम्पा हि विश्वधर्मपदे स्थिता॥24॥

विकलस्यासहायस्य दुःखतप्तस्य सर्वदा।
अविद्यस्य जनस्याथ सेवया धर्मशीलनम्॥25॥

ख्याता वागर्थसम्पत्तिर्दम्पत्योः कविवर्त्मसु।
अद्वैतं च समाख्यातमुभयोः सुखदखुःयोः॥26॥

तत्र प्राणपरित्यागः सम्मतः केवलं स्त्रियः।
विधुरस्यानुरक्तस्य पुरुषस्य न विश्रुतः॥27॥

अयं स्वार्थो न धर्मार्थः पुरुषैः परिकल्पितः।
स हि सर्वात्मना त्याज्यः स्वार्थे धर्मो न विद्यते॥28॥

प्रत्नं शास्त्रमपि त्याज्यं पथिकृद्भिर्मनीषिभिः।
साधु सर्वं न विज्ञेयं पुराणं गर्हितं यदि॥29॥

बलिः पशूनां नृणां च नारीणां परतन्त्रताम्।
दास्यमस्पृश्यताञ्चैव शूद्राणां विदधुः पुरा॥30॥

अन्ये च केचिदाचारा व्यवहारास्तथाविधाः।
लिंगवर्णविभेदेन धर्मशास्त्रेषु योजिताः॥31॥

सर्वे वैषम्यमूलास्ते निरस्तास्तत्त्वचिन्तकैः।
सनातनश्च धर्मो नः संस्कृतः साधुकर्मभिः॥32॥

मनुष्यतापरो धर्मः करुणा तस्य शासनम्।
धर्ममूलमहिंसा सा सती रीतौ न विद्यते॥33॥

(स्वरमङ्गला, 1987)



4. प्रकीर्णश्लोकाः

जयति जगदुदञ्चज्जाड्यघोरान्धकारापहरणपटुतेजःपुञ्जबालार्कदीपितः।
सुमतिमतिपथोद्यत्कल्पनाकल्पवल्ली प्रसरणमधुलक्ष्मीर्देवता वाङ्मयस्य॥

(i) आमुखम्

विविधागमशाखाभिर्विद्यास्थानैश्च कल्पितम्।
इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां शिल्पादिभिरनावृतम् ॥1॥

दिव्यं लोकोत्तरं दिष्टमदृष्टमिति कीर्तितम्।
विस्मयाधायकं तत्त्वं तर्कप्रत्यक्षदुर्लभम्॥2॥

शापादि प्रथारूढं नवकल्पविधायकम्।
सर्वत्राद्भुतरूपेण काव्ये नाट्ये प्रतिष्ठितम्॥3॥

रहस्यदृष्टिप्रत्येतं लोके शास्त्रे च संभूतम्।
अप्रावृत्तमिति ज्ञेयं विज्ञानेन निरावृत्तम्॥4॥

कालिदासादिभिर्जुष्टं विश्ववाङ्मयशोभितम्।
प्रकीर्णैर्विविधैर्मृष्टं निबन्धनैः प्रबन्धतः॥5॥

तदेव तत्त्वं प्रथमं प्राच्यपाश्चात्यशास्त्रतः।
प्रबन्धेऽत्र समाम्नातं नाट्यशास्त्रदृशा तथा॥6॥

अप्रावृत्तप्रयोगाणां वस्तुशिल्पविभेदिका।
रूपके चित्रतां प्राप्ता शतधा भिद्यते गतिः॥7॥

रसनेत्रानुवूल्येन स्थापिता सा कवीश्वरैः।
गतानुगतिकैश्चान्यैराश्रिता कविपद्धतिः॥8॥

न केवलं पुराकाले सम्प्रत्यपि प्रयुज्यते।
किन्तु द्वित्रा विदग्धा स्युः कालिदासो निदर्शनम्॥9॥

रहस्यं सकलं सम्यग् ध्यात्वा संस्कृतरूपकम्।
आमूलचूलमामृष्टं मूलचन्द्रेण धीमता ॥10॥

तदुपज्ञः प्रबन्धोऽयं कीर्तिप्रीतिकरो भवेत्।
सदसदव्यक्तिहेतूनां पण्डितानां प्रसादतः॥111॥

(आचार्यमूलचन्द्रपाठकैः प्रणीतात् संस्कृत नाटकों में अतिप्राकृततत्त्व नामकात् पुस्तकात्)

(ii) श्रीमानाचार्यरुय्यको जयति

वसुधावलयविभूषणकाश्मीरधराविभूषणीभूतः।
सूक्तिविभूषणनिपुणः श्रीमानाचार्यरुय्यको जयति॥1॥
रसभेदं गतखेदं मतिहंसी वेद यस्य शिवभावा।
स जयति जयरथनामा गुणगणधामा सुधीन्द्रमूर्धन्यः॥2॥
रुय्यक-जयरथ-प्रमुखैराचार्यैर्या निभालिता सरणिः।
तामनुसृत्य प्रवृत्ता तद्गीःपूता कृतिर्जयति॥3॥
नास्ति प्राच्यैरलंकारकारैराविष्कृतं न यत्।
वृत्तिस्तु तद्वचःसारविमर्शव्यसनादियम्॥4॥

(अलंकारमीमांसापुस्तकात्)

सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्राणां तर्कप्रवणबुद्धिषु।
यः संशयसमुन्मेषः स साक्षात्परमेश्वरः॥1॥

(न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिविकास इतिपुस्तकात्)

(iii) रागः

मोक्षं हि परमं मत्वा विरागं पूजयन्ति ये।
मोक्षो न साध्यते तैस्तु तेषु लोको विरज्यते॥
न रागेण विना सृष्टिस्तस्यां मोक्षश्च संस्थितः।
तस्मादेव महामान्याः कवयो रागमाश्रिताः॥
गोपाः गोपाङ्गनाश्चैव रागविह्वलमानसाः।
मुक्तिदासीं निराकृत्य कृष्णलीलासु रंजिताः॥

पुष्पाणां विकचीभावः पक्षिणां कलकूजितम्।
सङ्गीतं सरिताञ्चैव वायोर्वशेषु पूरणम्॥
तरङ्गणं समुद्रस्य प्ररोहः कलिकासु च।
पर्वते निर्झरस्यन्दः शिशूनां च मधुस्मितम्॥
यूनोः प्रीतिसमुन्मेषः सौहार्दं वृद्धयोस्तथा।
अज्ञातजनबन्धुत्वं देहे देहे च प्राणना।
सर्वं रागसमुद्भूतं रागे सृष्टिर्विवर्तते।
जिजीविषा च लोकस्य रागमेवालम्बते॥
निरक्षरत्वं दारिद्र्यं नारीणां च विपन्नता।
ज्ञानविज्ञानशून्यत्वं सर्वं वैराग्यदुष्फलम्॥

(iv) वामा

शिक्षया स्वात्मवृत्त्या च स्वाधीना स्वात्मरक्षिता।
पुरुषेण समानारी साम्प्रतं परिभाष्यते॥
धर्मे पुरुषशेषत्वं कामे स्वैरत्वमिष्यते।
अर्थे पुरुषतन्त्रत्वं मोक्षे प्रत्यह एव सा॥
सुशीलाः शिक्षिताः कन्या लभन्ते नोचितं वरम्।
पितुर्धनेन विक्रीता उह्यन्ते निर्गुणा अपि॥
विधिना परिणीताश्च दाह्यन्ते धनलोभतः।
एष एव दुराचारो लोभे धर्मो न विद्यते॥
मातृरूपेण या देवी प्रसूते पाति वा मुदा।
स्नुषा सती च स्नेहेन सौभ्रात्रं कुरुते सदा॥
पत्नीरूपेण या देवी गृहकर्मसु सज्जते।
विपत्तौ व्यसने चापि प्रियचिन्तां न मुञ्चति॥
सैव साध्वी चारुशीला निन्द्यते पुरुषाधमैः।
मौक्षार्थं चैव धर्मार्थं शत्रुर्हि परिगण्यते॥

प्राधान्यं केन्द्रभावो वा नारीणां नैव दृश्यते।
रूपके काव्यमार्गे च पुरुषस्य प्रधानता॥

स्वातन्त्र्यं हीयते यत्र नव्यं नैवोपदिश्यते।
पुराणं मन्यते साधु न तच्छास्त्रं शुभावहम्॥

स्वच्छन्द आचारो यो विचारो वा दुःखावहः।
स नूत्नोऽपि परित्याज्यः परोद्वेगकरो यदि॥

(v) अस्पृश्यता

अद्वैतं श्रद्धधानानां सर्वं ब्रह्मेति वादिनाम्।
वैषम्यव्यवहारार्थं मतिः पाखण्ड एव हि॥

अद्वैतवादः सिद्धान्ते व्यवहारेऽतद्रूपता।
मनोवाक् कर्मणामैक्यं न्क्कुरुते ह्यसंशयम्॥

परनिन्दारसे मग्नाः स्वात्मसंस्तुतिश्रोत्रियाः।
प्रायेण पण्डिताः सर्वे संस्कृतस्य विशेषतः॥

(राजस्थान-संस्कृत-अकादम्याः स्वरमङ्गलापत्रिकायां (दिसम्बर, १९९१)
डॉ. रामचन्द्रद्विवेदिनाभिनवकाव्यव्यापार इति श्रीभरतेशपाटिलेन लिखिताल्लेखादिमे
श्लोकाः समुद्धृताः।)



परिशिष्ट

1. रामचन्द्रस्मृतिः

आचार्यराधावल्लभः त्रिपाठी

प्रेयो मित्रं सहृदयमणिर्बन्धुताभावमूर्ति-
र्यो नः शङ्काकुलितमनसां सान्त्वनायालमासीत्।
यस्य स्मृत्या भवति हृदयं प्लावितं मानसं नो
विस्मर्तव्यः कथमिह बुधो रामचन्द्रो द्विवेदी॥1॥

विद्याऽवाप्ता मदनपुरगते येन विद्यालये या
कष्टेनाप्ता गतिरपि तथा सम्प्रदाये च शास्त्रे।
पश्चात् गत्वा अमलधवले लक्ष्मणाख्ये पुरेऽसौ
शिक्षां लेभे प्रवरगुरुभिर्विश्वविद्यालयस्य॥2॥

शैवे शास्त्रेऽध्ययनविधिना साधिकारं प्रविष्टः
पाण्डेयाख्यः सुविहितमतिः कान्तिचन्द्रो महात्मा।
सुब्रह्मण्यः परिणतमना अय्यरो ब्रह्मवादी
द्वावप्येतौ परममुदितौ प्राप्य यं योग्यशिष्यम्॥3॥

यस्यैवासीदमलधवला कीर्तितुल्या यथाऽऽर्या
भार्या सौम्या कमलसदृशी नाम सार्थं वहन्ती।
हर्षो हर्षो दयिततनयश्चात्मजा सोदयाऽसौ
तस्याकस्मात् सुखमयमिदं हन्त विश्वं प्रणष्टम्॥4॥

पाषण्डानां निरसनपटुर्मण्डनो मण्डनानां
पीयूषेऽस्तं गतवति ययौ नैव सादं महात्मा।
मानी मानं कथमपि न जहौ वारितो नैव विघ्नै-
रात्मानं यो दयितदयितां चापि धैर्याद् दधार॥5॥

प्रज्ञा मेधा धृतिरथ मतिः सा दृढा च स्मृतिर्वा
शैवे शास्त्रेऽप्रतिहतगतिर्मम्मटस्य प्रकाशे।
सा जिज्ञासा कुतुककलिता नूतने चिन्तने वा
सर्वं यातं गतवति दिवं रामचन्द्रे द्विवेदे॥6॥

(पीयूषोऽस्य ज्येष्ठःपुत्रः, अष्टादशवर्षीयोऽत्यन्ताकस्मिकदुर्घटनायां दिवङ्गतः)

2. राष्ट्रपतिपुरस्कृताः श्रीरामचन्द्रद्विवेदिनः

डॉ. जगन्नारायणपाण्डेयः

शास्त्रे वादे कवित्वे क्वचिदपि विदुषां मण्डले भाषणे वा,
दिल्ल्यां वित्तादिगोष्ठ्यां ललितसुरवचो नीतिनिर्धारणे वा।
सर्वत्राचार्यमालामणिरिव भुवने भासमानोऽसमानो
मान्यः प्राच्यप्रतीच्योभयसरणिविदां रामचन्द्रो मनीषी॥1॥

श्रीनारायणशास्त्रिणः कविगुरोर्नैसर्गिकानुग्रहात्
साहित्याब्धिमुकुन्दशास्त्रिबटुकाचार्यान्तिके बाल्यतः।
काश्यां काव्यरहस्यमाशु निखिलं शास्त्राणि चाधीत्य वाग्-
देव्याराधाकमण्डले सुविदितः श्रीरामचन्द्रोऽभवत्॥2॥

शिष्या विशेषमहनीयपदेषु नैके
विस्तारयन्ति भुवि यस्य सुकीर्तिवल्लीम्।
सस्कृत्य राष्ट्रपतिना ननु तं भवन्तं
कार्यं व्यधायि निजगौरवयोग्यमेव॥3॥

करक्वणितवल्लकीललितनादलीलाशत-
स्फुटीकृतपरापरश्रुतिरहस्यनिःस्यन्दिनी।
बुधोपरकणोद्यमं सफलतासमालम्बिनं
तनोतु भवतां सदा सरसिजासनप्रेयसी॥4॥

(स्वरमङ्गला, राजस्थान संस्कृत-अकादमी-जयपुरम् अप्रैल-जून, 1987)



3. वैदुष्यवन्दनम्

आचार्यशिवदत्तशर्मचतुर्वेदिनः

अद्य पुनः पुण्यतरश्लोकस्य श्रीद्विवेदिवर्यस्य।
पुण्यस्मरणे किञ्चिल्लिखितुं सत्प्रेरणा जाता॥1॥

श्रीमान् सूर्यप्रकाशो व्यासस्तेषां द्विवेदिवर्याणाम्।
श्रीरामचन्द्रसन्नाम्नां रचनानां प्रस्तुतौ लग्नः॥2॥

आचार्य रामचन्द्र द्विवेदी की रचनाएँ

श्रीमद्व्यासमहाशयवर्योऽयं सिद्धसंकायः।
यस्मिन्कार्ये लग्नः प्रपूरणां तत्र केवलां सूते॥3॥

खिस्तेगुरुवर्याणामुन्मीलनमत्र चादाय।
साहित्यस्याकाशे सूर्योदयतामुपायातः॥4॥

श्रीरतिनाथमहोदयरचनावलीं तावदाहूय।
दिव्यमनुपमं कार्यं सम्पादितमेव तैः सूर्यैः॥5॥

ततोऽपि पूर्वं तावदुद्गारं सम्मुखीकृत्य।
मामपि सर्वसमक्षं स्थापितवान् पुण्यसन्दोहैः॥6॥

अन्ये तावद् बहवो विज्ञानोन्माथिता ग्रन्थाः।
व्यासमहाशतकरतो दीपितकायाः प्रकाशिता जाताः॥7॥

उत्तरोत्तरमुन्नततरं साहित्यं समाहृत्य।
स्वीयोल्लेखपुरस्सरसंपादनजागरूकोऽयम्॥8॥

श्रीरामचन्द्रवर्याणां कर्तृत्वं विशृंखलितम्।
सम्पादनकलया तत्सौन्दर्यं बहुगुणं कुरुते॥9॥

विद्वन्मान्यास्ते वा द्विवेदिवर्यास्तु रामचन्द्राख्याः।
स्वीये निखिले काले साहित्यं प्रास्तुवन्नित्यम्॥10॥

तेषां जीवनचर्यायामप्येकोऽस्ति सद्ग्रन्थः।
पीयूषपथसुनाम्ना प्रकाशितो व्यासवर्यैर्हि॥11॥

तत्रैव सूचनाऽऽस्ते द्विवेदिवर्यस्य रचनानाम्।
तत्र क्रमेण नैके संग्रहरूपाः प्रकाशनीया हि॥12॥

तत्र प्रथमः कश्चित् लेखानां संग्रहः सोऽयम्।
संप्रस्तुत एवाऽस्ते विदुषामग्रे समायाति॥13॥

मान्यास्ते विद्वांसः कियत् श्रमं तावदास्थाय।
आलेखान् प्रस्तोतुं प्रयतन्ते वा कथं ज्ञेयम्॥14॥

इदमेव तपो नाम तु यत्र चर्यात्मिका सरणिः।
पुञ्जीभूतनिकाया स्वैरं सञ्चारिणी दृष्टा॥15॥

आचामन्ति ज्ञानं विज्ञानं वाथ विद्वांसः।
 नैकजन्मसंसाधितरमणीयत्वान्विता तु सा सिद्धिः॥16॥
 कीदृग् रमणीयत्वं कुत्र तु केन च कुतः प्राप्तम्।
 जिज्ञासेयं निखिला नव्यतरं मार्गमादिशति॥17॥
 अत्र तु शोधः सर्गः प्रवर्तितो नूतने काले।
 भूमण्डलीकरणमिवमायातं सम्मुखेऽस्माकम्॥18॥
 द्विवेदिवर्यैर्या या ज्ञानार्जनपुण्यमयधाराः।
 आस्वादिताः समासंस्तास्ता एतेषु राजन्ते॥19॥
 यद्यपि शतगुणतास्ता तेषां हृदये विराजमानाः स्युः।
 किन्तु तदीये लेखे यद्यायातं तदेव सर्वस्वम्॥20॥
 पतञ्जलिर्ननु भगवान् स्वीयायां भाष्यरचनायाम्।
 ऋषिवरपाणिनिविषये यत् कथयति तद् प्रकाशकरम्॥21॥
 यत् पाणिनिना लिखितं तज्ज्ञाने तच्छतेन गुणितं वा।
 संस्थितमास्ते नित्यं कश्चन भागः प्रकाशितो लेखे॥22॥
 इयमेव कला सर्वा ज्ञानं निलिखं तदात्मसात्कृत्वा।
 सारभूततत्त्वं किल दयाप्रपूर्णा लिखन्ति विद्वांसः॥23॥
 अद्य वयं देशेऽस्मिन् सर्वाधिसाध्यसंसिद्धाः।
 अक्षरमाला दिव्याऽस्मदीयतायां विराजिता सेयम्॥24॥
 विश्वगुरुत्वं त्वनया संसाधितमेव देशस्य।
 धावन्यद्यत्वेऽपि च पाश्चात्याः पूर्णतामाप्तुम्॥25॥
 पारतन्त्र्यवेलायां पौरुषहानिर्यदा जाता।
 सत्वरमेव विनाशे लीला सा चात्र संघटिता॥26॥
 अत एव तन्त्रमखिलं स्वायत्तीकर्तुमिह देशे।
 संग्रामे जनमानसमासीदुद्वेलितं सर्वम्॥27॥
 कंकालमात्रधारकमनुजाः परतन्त्रता काले।
 जन्ममरणविधिभागं यापितवन्तः संजाताः॥28॥

निखिलाऽस्मत्संपत्तिर्याता पारे समुद्रं सा।
 दीना हीना जनताऽत्रत्य प्राणान्विधारयन्त्यासीत्॥29॥
 स्वातन्त्र्याधिगमत्वे स्वीयं सर्वं समाहर्तुम्।
 स्व स्व क्षेत्रे सर्वे यतमानास्ते प्रदृश्यन्ते॥30॥
 विद्वांसः किल सर्वे स्वीयं विज्ञानमयराशिम्।
 नव्याकर्षकरूपे संप्रस्तोतुं समालगनाः॥31॥
 पौर्वात्यां पाश्चात्यां तुलनात्मकसंविदां धाराम्।
 सम्मेलनेषु वक्तुं गतवन्तस्ते द्विवेदिमूर्धन्याः॥32॥
 संस्कृतवाङ्मयमखिलमाद्योपान्तं समालोड्य।
 रत्नानां किल तावद् भाण्डागारं तदीयसाहित्यम्॥33॥
 विदुषां कृतेऽद्य सुलभीक्रियते तद्वा निखिलमिदम्।
 श्रीमद्व्यासवरेण्यैरेतैः सूर्यप्रकाशैर्हि॥34॥
 उभयोरेव नितान्तं गुरुशिष्यवदन्ययोस्तावत्।
 अन्योन्यभाग्यधारा सम्मिलिता तत्र जागर्ति॥35॥
 तैरेतादृशशिष्यावाप्तिर्भाग्यात् सुसाधित जाता।
 एतैस्तादृशगुरवः सम्प्राप्तभाग्यरेखाभिः॥36॥
 यदि नामैते सूर्यप्रकाशव्यासा न कुर्युरिदम्।
 कालेनैव कवलितं भूयादेतत्सुसाहित्यम्॥37॥
 लेखानां रूपेषु प्रकाशितास्ते च सन्दर्भाः।
 क्षणिकत्वं बत याता बौद्धे मार्गे प्रयान्ति निखिलास्ते॥38॥
 तेषां सनातनत्वं संसाधयितुं तु सद्ग्रन्थे।
 सम्पादनप्रकाशनरूपे जागर्ति सरणिरियम्॥39॥
 विद्वद्वरलेखानां वैशिष्ट्येषु प्रगणनीयाः।
 नाना बिन्दव एते निभालनीया विशेषेण॥40॥
 शैली तावत्प्रथमं बुद्धिं या सत्वरं किञ्चित्।
 सुगभीरमपि विषयं सरलीकृत्य प्रबोधयन्त्यास्ते॥41॥

सर्वेषामपि विदुषां तत्तद्विषयेषु पार्थक्ये।
 सैषा तेषां शैली प्रकाशनेषु प्रबोधयति॥42॥
 शैलीमहिमानं किल पतञ्जलिर्बोधयामास।
 आचार्यस्य प्रतिभां शैलीं सः प्रस्तुवन्नासीत्॥43॥
 शैलीशतके ऽस्माभिःशैलीविषयं समादाय।
 नानाभेदास्ते ते प्रकटितकायाः समाकलिताः॥44॥
 श्रीरामचन्द्रविद्वद्वरेण्यैः समीकृता शैली।
 प्रारम्भे पठितेऽप्यथ तच्चित्रं प्रस्तुतं कुरुते॥45॥
 हानोपादानानामुपेक्षपूर्णत्वभावानाम्।
 शैली सैषा सत्वरमेवाधिष्ठानमाह्वयति॥46॥
 संस्कृतभाषायमथ हिन्दीभाषामये च वाङ्निवहे।
 आंग्ले प्रबन्धरचनावलिवलये सा द्विवेदानाम्॥47॥
 शैली पृथगेवैषां माधुर्यं संविभासमाना वा।
 विनयान्विता समस्तानाकर्षयते दिव्यतोल्लासे॥48॥
 काश्मीरशैवदर्शनमथवा साहित्यमितिहासः।
 नवन्यायेऽपि च ते शैलीं स्वीयां विबोधयन्त्येव॥49॥
 इत्थं स्वीयाभिमतं मार्गेऽग्रेऽग्रे प्रगुणयन्तः।
 एते द्विवेदिवर्याः सहृदयहृदयेषु राजन्ते॥50॥
 अपरस्तावद् बिन्दुर्भाषण-लेखान्तरालसन्दृश्यः।
 यत्र भाषणाभ्यासे लेखाऽभ्यासे च वैविध्यम्॥51॥
 अत्र बहूनां विदुषां भाषणसंश्रुतसुवाणीनाम्।
 योऽयं प्रभाव आस्ते लेखे पठनेषु नो तद्वत्॥52॥
 अन्येषामथ लेखे या काचिन्माधुरी स्वदिता।
 सा नो तेषां भाषणसंश्रवणे सिद्धसाधर्म्या॥53॥
 भाषणकाले सहृदयसंश्रोतृणां च प्रत्यक्षे।
 विद्वान् भाषणकर्ता संगत आस्तेऽत्र वैशिष्ट्यम्॥54॥

श्रीमद्द्विवेदिवर्यैर्द्विविधेऽपि च सम्प्रकाशनेल्लासे।
 पूर्णः प्रभावपातः सहृदयसंमोहको लब्धः॥55॥
 आगामिनि काले ये पाठकवर्याः समायान्ति।
 यैर्न श्रुतमप्यास्ते भाषणमथ तद् द्विवेदिवर्याणाम्॥56॥
 विशेषतस्तेषामथ यत्नेनानेन कल्पकलिकेयम्।
 काचिद् वितीर्णसुषमा हृदये नीराजिता भूयात्॥57॥
 श्रीरामचन्द्रवर्या भाषणकालेऽथ लेखने वापि।
 अन्योन्यस्पर्धायां प्रवर्तमानाः सदा दृष्टाः॥58॥
 तेषां भाषणकाले मन्त्रवन्मुग्धविद्वांसः।
 नित्यं कामयमाना आसंस्तेषां तु सांमुख्यम्॥59॥
 अद्य पुनस्तेषामथ भाषणमालां तु लेखेषु।
 प्रपठनकाले मुग्धाः सर्वे जायन्त एव वा नित्यम्॥60॥
 एतदर्थमयमास्ते धन्याञ्जलिरेव सर्वेषाम्।
 सम्पादकवर्येभ्यो यैरास्वाद्यत्वमानीतम्॥61॥
 देहलीस्थसंस्थानं नूनं नित्यं प्रशंसार्हम्।
 यैरद्यत्वे सुलभः प्रयास एषोऽपि सर्वहस्तगतः॥62॥
 एको बिन्दुरयं भूयो भावे समायातः।
 विरोधमूले केचनभावा विस्थापिताः पूर्वम्॥63॥
 कामं ते वैदेशिकनीत्या संस्फोटिता जाताः।
 अथवाऽज्ञानविजृम्भणमासीत्तद्वरेण्यानाम्॥64॥
 प्राचां हस्ते नासीत् सुलभा सामग्री सा यथाऽद्यत्वे।
 एतेन हेतुनाऽपि च विरोधिताः क्वचन संचाराः॥65॥
 तेषां दूरीकरणप्रयास आस्ते विपुलतरः।
 नोचेत्खण्डितभावे समागतं वा भवेज्ज्ञानम्॥66॥
 ज्ञानमेव यद्यन्यद् संजातं शेषरूपेण।
 सोऽनर्थो ननु भूयात् परम्परा सा तु चलिता स्यात्॥67॥

यद्यप्यनन्तमास्ते ज्ञानं विज्ञानसहितमिदम्।
 तत्र तु यद् यद् येन तु कथितं तत् सिद्धमेव बोध्यात्॥68॥
 अनुकूलैस्तु सुतकैरेषा विज्ञानशृङ्खला निखिला।
 संमोदयति नितान्तं तत्तद्विदुषां सुचित्तालिम्॥69॥
 किन्तु यदा नीतिगता काचित् सा बुद्धिपूर्विका भ्रान्तिः।
 परिचालिता प्रजाता तेन तु हानिः प्रजातेयम्॥70॥
 हानिरियं हीनत्वे गौरवपूर्णं समानयति।
 तद् दूरीकरणेषु तु विद्वांसोऽग्रे समायान्ति॥71॥
 यद्यप्यांगलास्तावद् विद्वांसः श्रद्धया पूर्णाः।
 निखिले किल संसारे ज्ञानं विस्तारयामासुः॥72॥
 अन्यजातिवत्तेषां विज्ञाने द्वेषभावे नो।
 विज्ञानस्य प्रेम्णा ते तु सेदेवाऽभ्यसन्निविष्टम्॥73॥
 किन्तु समासन्नेते शासनकार्येऽपि दक्षतां याताः।
 भारतविद्वत्संघं प्रोन्नमितुं ते न जानन्ति॥74॥
 जागतिकत्वं तेषां साधयितुं ते समुद्युक्ताः।
 नियमावलिं स्वकीयामेवात्यन्तं विवेचयामासुः॥75॥
 एषा भ्रान्तिः काचित् या वा परिचालिता तैस्तैः।
 सा खण्डनीयभावे विद्वद्भिर्नित्यमानीता॥76॥
 तत्र द्विवेदिवर्या नानाशास्त्रे कृतश्रमाः सन्तः।
 आचमन्ति स्म चिरं नूतनधारां विनायासम्॥77॥
 उच्चावचस्वरूपं तुलनात्मकतामथानीय।
 स्वीयैर्वाक्यकदम्बैस्तथ्यं ते सम्प्रकाशयन्तितराम्॥78॥
 भारतीयविदुषामथ विशेषतोऽभयविनिश्चितानां वा।
 सामर्थ्यं तदिदं यत् भ्रान्तेरुन्मूलनं नाम॥79॥
 श्रीरामचन्द्रनामा द्विवेदिवर्यस्तथा मल्लः।
 विज्ञानक्षेत्रेऽसौ विपक्षपक्षान् समाह्वयन् दृष्टः॥80॥

नानारूपास्ते वै सिद्धान्तत्वेन येऽभिमताः।
 पूर्वपक्षरूपेष्वथ ते नीताऽथो समाहिताः सर्वे॥81॥
 कालो ह्ययं बलीयान् तेनेमे वञ्चिताः सर्वे।
 कियती किल संपत्तिर्विलोपिता पुण्यशीलानाम्॥82॥
 तेषां भाषणकालेऽन्तिमे प्रभागे समायाताः।
 स्वीयपुनर्भवलोपं प्रायस्ते श्लोकयामासुः॥83॥
 तेषां निखिला सिद्धिः संजाता कष्टवेलाऽपि।
 निर्गतमाले निखिले संस्मृतिमालां प्रपूरयन्त्यास्ते॥84॥
 धन्याः सूर्यप्रकाशव्यासा एते महाभागाः।
 अन्तिमकाले त्वेते निदानभूता स्थिता आसन्॥85॥
 एतेषामद्यत्वे महदेवं, कार्यमिदमास्ते।
 श्रीरामचन्द्रनामा द्विवेदिवर्योऽमरो भूयात्॥86॥
 तन्नामिका च संस्था व्यासैः संस्थापिताऽद्यत्वे।
 वैपुल्येनैकैकं कार्यं परिचालयन्त्यास्ते॥87॥
 वाराणस्यामस्यां जयपुरनगरेऽपि चैवमियम्।
 संस्था नाना कार्यं सततं सम्पादयन्त्यास्ते॥88॥
 एते सूर्यप्रकाशा व्यासा नौ वैकरूपा वा।
 शतशो वदिन्तविभवाः संलग्नास्तैर्निरूपितास्ते॥89॥
 न केवलं वैकमिमं स्वर्गीयं वा द्विवेदं ते।
 तत्सम्बद्धान् निखिलान्कार्यत्वेनाभिजानन्ति॥90॥
 श्रीमद्गुरुरखिस्तेमहानुभावस्य रचनालिम्।
 महता श्रमेण चैते विद्वत्सु स्थापयामासुः॥91॥
 श्रीरतिनाथे काचिद्व्या लहरी तु कवितायाः।
 सर्वाऽपि सा प्रकाशितविभवा तैरेव सं साधा॥92॥
 अद्य पुनर्लेखानां संग्रह एषोऽपि मुद्रितो जातः।
 क्रमशो निखिला चैषा ग्रन्थानां मालिकैव संज्ञेया॥93॥

मयाऽपि काले सैषा सरणिः कार्यान्विता कृतैवासीत्।
किन्त्वधिकः कालोऽयं मत्पूज्यपितृचरणानाम्¹॥94॥

रचनावलीं समस्तां प्रस्तोतुं साधितः सम्यक्।
अद्य प्रभूतरचनास्तेषां सम्मुद्रिताः जाताः॥95॥

पुनरप्यवशिष्टा वा रचना अद्यापि मत्कार्यम्।
सम्पादनसंलग्नं चित्तं सबोधयन्त्येव॥96॥

तेनैवाहं जाने कियान् श्रमो बोभवीत्यत्र।
प्राक्तनरचनावल्याः सम्पादनसत्प्रकाशने वाऽपि॥97॥

श्रीमद्व्यासमहोदयवर्यैस्त्वत्रापि तत्तत्त्वम्।
नानानवसुविधाभिः प्रपूरितं सच्चमत्कृतं जातम्॥98॥

शतशो वा विद्वांसो व्यापृतकाया विलोक्यन्ते।
ससुखं येषां जीवनयापनमहोत्सवानां समारम्भः॥99॥

यत्किमपि तैरधीतं तस्य च्छात्रेषु यत्किञ्चित्।
पाठनमात्रं कृत्वा नीतः कालोऽन्यथाऽन्यथाऽयासैः॥100॥

सम्पादनसौख्यानां महतीमेकां परम्परां दिव्याम्।
पीयूषरसाधारामास्वादयितुं प्रवृत्तानाम्॥101॥

तत्रैव नित्यविचरणशीलानां काऽस्ति संभाषा।
काऽस्ति च तेषां जीवनशैली विलोक्यतां व्यासवर्यैः सा॥102॥

धन्यास्तेऽपि समासन् श्रीमन्तो वा द्विवेदिनो याताः।
यैरेतादृशशिष्यप्रस्तुतिकरणे मनो दत्तम्॥103॥

वयमप्यद्य पुनस्तं व्यासं श्रीसूर्यपूर्वकं सद्यः।
सम्बोधयितुं वाप्यथ वर्धापयितुं प्रवृत्ताः स्मः॥104॥

एतेनैतत्पुण्योपार्जनमाला सा साधिता जाता।
या हि भवन्तं नित्यं ज्ञानाकाशे विलासयेत्सुचिरम्॥105॥

कालः कश्चन तावत्तादृशरूपोऽपि चायाति।
यत्र भवन्तो व्यासाः सर्वत्राह्वानमर्हन्ति॥106॥

श्रीमद्व्यासप्रेरितरूपेणैवात्र रचनेयम्।
मयैका शिवदत्तेन तु प्रस्तुतरूपा विभासतां काचित्॥107॥



4. प्रणामाञ्जलिः

प्रो. शिवसागरः त्रिपाठी

द्विवेदिवंशीयकुलावतंसःस कान्यकुब्जो द्विजको वरिष्ठः।
प्राच्यप्रतीच्योभयमार्गवेत्ता, विद्वद्धुरीणः मनने गरिष्ठः॥1॥

समादधादाङ्गलवेशभूषां विचक्षणःसंस्कृतिपोषको यः।
आभूतलालम्बिदुकूलधारी समीक्षितःपण्डितसंसभासु॥2॥

मान्यो वदान्यो स्मितपूर्वभाषी प्रशान्तमूर्तिः कुशलः प्रविद्यः।
शिष्यप्रशिष्येषु बहुप्रसिद्धः तेषां च कार्येषु सदैव नद्धः॥3॥

शास्त्रार्थतर्केषु च भाषणेषु चर्चासु वार्तासु च चिन्तनेषु।
वैदुष्यपूर्णप्रखरप्रवाहैस्तिरस्कृता वै बहुवाग्मिनोऽपि॥4॥

अधीतिबोधाचरणप्रचारैः, गवेषणाशोधमयैः प्रकारैः।
निदेशकाचार्यमहापदैश्च, स्वच्छं छविं प्राप महामनस्वी॥5॥

समाजमुख्यो विदितो यशस्वी, श्रुतिस्मृतिस्थापितधर्मशीलः।
विज्ञापने संस्तवने न रक्तः परस्वकार्येषु रतः प्रसक्तः॥6॥

प्रचारणार्थं सुरवाच आर्यो, देशे विदेशे भ्रमणञ्चकार।
हिमालयासेतुसमस्तदिक्षु, यशःप्रसारः समभूत्पुराऽस्य॥7॥

साहित्यवेदान्तखगोलसेतुः वेदस्मृतिन्यायनिरुक्तकेतुः।
साक्षात्कृताः येन गभीरधर्माः विद्वद्वरोऽभूत् खलु रामचन्द्रः॥8॥

सर्वोच्चसम्मानपदप्रतिष्ठः विद्यामृतध्यानचये महिष्ठः।
जिज्ञासुभावेन गृहीतविद्यः सौम्यप्रवृत्तिः ननु चारुचर्यः॥9॥

1. स्वर्गीयानां महामहोपाध्यायश्रीपण्डितगिरिधरशर्मचतुर्वेदानाम्।

वेदेषु शास्त्रेषु च दर्शनेषु, तन्त्रेषु साहित्यमयीषु गीष्षु।
संस्थासु गोष्ठीसु सभादिकेषु प्रकाशितं प्रातिभवाक्पटुत्वम्॥10॥

राघवस्य तु मर्यादां, चन्द्रस्य प्रियतां तथा।
द्विवेदज्ञानसम्पन्नो, रामचन्द्रो विचक्षणः॥11॥

आस्पदत्वेन द्वौ वेदौ, राजेतेस्म द्विवेदिनाम्।
ननु चतुर्मुखी मेधा चतुर्वेदत्वमास्थिता॥12॥

मुखस्य भूषणं पुंसां, ताम्बूलं वा सरस्वती।
द्विवेदिनां मुखे किन्तु, शोभते स्म द्वयं समम्॥13॥

हारीत-राष्ट्रपत्यादिपुरास्कारैः सभाजिताः।
सम्मेलनेषु गोष्ठीसु बहुधा ह्यभिनन्दिताः॥14॥

लेखने कवने शोधे, पठने पाठने सदा।
व्यस्तं समर्पितं चैवं नमाम्यमरजीवनम्॥15॥



5. श्रीरामचन्द्रं हृदि भावयामि

डॉ. शिवरामः शर्मा

सुसंस्कृतेश्चार्यं परमम्परायाः सत्यं शिवं सुन्दरमार्षमार्गम्।
येन प्रसंस्कृत्य नवं कृतं तं श्रीरामचन्द्रं हृदि भावयामि॥1॥

यस्याद्वितीयप्रतिभाविलासप्रभाञ्जिताञ्चिन्तनसारयुक्ताम्।
वाणीं समाकर्ण्य सभासु सभ्यः को नाभवत्तूर्णमुदीतहर्षः॥2॥

यः शिक्षणे लेखनभाषणादौ निर्देशने शासनकार्यभारे।
निमग्न एवाभवदस्ततन्द्रः कथं न वन्द्यः स हि रामचन्द्रः॥3॥

येनाधिकाशि निखिलागमबोधराशिः सिद्धप्रसिद्धबुधसेवनया गृहीतः।
प्राकाशि चखिलभुवि भ्रमता सुवाचा यायावरं मलहरं तमहं नभामि॥4॥

यस्यासीद् विमलं कुलं कलिमलप्रक्षालनैकाकुलं-
स्वान्तं सन्तसमुन्नतं ततदयाव्याप्तं नितान्तं मृदु।
वाणी वेणुमनोहरा मधुरसव्याप्ताक्षरैर्निर्भरा-
धातः ब्रूहि कथं त्वया स विबुधः श्रीरामचन्द्रो हतः॥5॥



6. दास्तां तेरी.....

प्रो. दयानन्द भार्गव

तू गया तो दोस्तों में से हँसी जाती रही।
फिर भी तेरी मुस्कराहट दिल पै मँडराती रही॥1॥

वो तेरा अन्दाज़े-महफ़िल, कहकहे तेरे क्रमाल।
कौन-सा दिन है के तेरी याद न आती रही?॥2॥

वो तेरी बाँकी अदा वो दिल-लुभावन गुफ्तगू।
वो तेरी तर्जे-बयानी किस-किस को न भाती रही?॥3॥

इस तरह से खोलता था गाँठ तू अशयार की।
शायरों की शायरी भी तुझ पै इतराती रही॥4॥

तूने जब-जब श्लोक दोहराये थे कालिदास के।
कण्व की बेटी भी उनको सुन के शरमाती रही॥5॥

तू जहाँ बैठा वहीं आते रहे भँवरे तमाम।
तेरी खुशबू हर जगह ऐसी करामाती रही॥6॥

तू चला तो इक दिया-सा संग तेरे चल दिया।
फिर भी उसकी लौ हमेशा राह दिखलाती रही॥7॥

तू मसीहा बनके कैसे ले गया सबके गुनाह।
दास्ताँ तेरी हमारे दिल को बहलाती रही॥8॥



