



Structure and Authorship of the *Kusumâñjali*

Ferenc Ruzsa¹

Accepted: 27 August 2022 / Published online: 30 October 2022
© The Author(s) 2022, corrected publication 2023

Abstract This paper suggests that the classic of Indian theology, the *Nyāya-kusumâñjali* is in fact two texts: an earlier treatise in 65 *ślokas*, and Udayana’s (mostly prose) commentary on it. Internal evidence consists in: (a) the *ślokas* read as a continuous text; (b) there are extremely long prose passages without verses; (c) Udayana does not comment on his own verses, only on the *ślokas*; (d) the basic plan of the two texts are markedly different; (e) different content of some chapters: ch. 1 about karma *vs.* rituals to reach heaven, ch. 2 about creation *vs.* eternity of sound, and in ch. 5 Udayana doubles the arguments for God; (f) Udayana deals extensively with atoms and yogic perception and rejects the concept of *śakti*, in contrast to the verses; (g) there are a few manifest disagreements (on *creatio continua* and the sacredness of god-images). External evidence for the thesis: (a) there are mss. of the verses only; (b) there are many commentaries on the verses only; (c) these commentators—with a single exception—do not seem to take Udayana for the author of the verses; (d) the first commentary on Udayana names his own work a subcommentary; (e) in his other works, it is atypical of Udayana to insert *ślokas* in his text; (f) a legend of the Bhāduī Brahmins stating that Udayana “received” the *Kusumâñjali*.

Keywords Theology · Logic · Authorship · Commentaries · Udayana · Kusumâñjali

The classical Hindu text proving the existence of God is Udayana Ācārya’s *Nyāya-kusumâñjali*. It consists of 73 mnemonic verses (*kārikās*) and a lengthy prose

✉ Ferenc Ruzsa
ferenc.ruzsa@gmail.com

¹ Department of Buddhist and Tibetan Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, 1088 Múzeum krt. 4/B, Budapest, Hungary

commentary on them¹. When preparing a paper² for a conference some four years ago, I noticed that the commentary does not always harmonise with the verses, and proposed that the author of the prose part (NKp) was different from the author of the *kārikās* (NKk). Now I am going to modify this thesis slightly. The NKk consists of 65 simple *śloka* verses and 8 verses in elaborate classical metres; I think that the latter belong actually to the commentary, and the work commented upon was the *śloka*-part only. This hypothetical composition in 65 *ślokas* I will abbreviate as NKś.

Udayana, Udayanācārya or simply Ācārya wrote the NKp around the start of the 11th century CE.³ The universally accepted title of the work is *Nyāya-kusumāñjali*, although in the text itself, in the first and last verses, we find only two synonyms: *Nyāya-prasūnāñjali* (1.1d) and *Nīti-kusumāñjali* (5.20a), all meaning *An offering of the flowers of logic*. These variants are not significant, since they are necessitated by the metre—“*Nyāya-kusumāñjali*” does not fit either *śārdūla-vikrīḍita* or *vasanta-tilakā*, the metres of 1.1 and 5.20, respectively. More importantly, the colophon of the whole work calls it *Nyāya-kusumāñjali-prakaraṇa* (NKp), *Treatise on the Nyāya-kusumāñjali*.⁴ The NKp-commentary *Bodhanī* also names it a ‘treatise’.⁵

The work is divided into five chapters that all the editors call *stabakas*, bunches of flowers, already in the colophons of the first four chapters of the NKp. This naming convention seems to be centuries later than the text itself, for it is absent from our earliest witness. There are many important old and modern commentaries on the NKp; the most helpful and by far the earliest extant commentary is Varadarāja’s *Kusumāñjali-bodhanī*, *Clarifying the Kusumāñjali*. It was written about a century after the NKp,⁶ while the next published commentary, Vardhamāna’s *Nyāya-kusumāñjali-prakāśa* (*Light on the Nyāya-kusumāñjali*) followed only after another two centuries.⁷ Neither Varadarāja’s *Bodhanī*, nor the text of the NKp itself uses the term *stabaka*. The *Bodhanī* consistently calls the chapters *paricchedas*,

¹ The researches of the author were supported by the NKFIH (the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office) projects no. K-112253 and K-120375.

² RUZSA (2017).

³ In dating the texts I generally follow POTTER (1995); he gives for Udayana 984 CE, which is the date given in his *Lakṣaṇāvalī*, probably one of his first works, while the NKp is a mature treatise. See CHEMPARATHY (1972: 19–25).

⁴ The colophon of the first chapter, however, uses the name *śrī Nyāya-kusumāñjali*; similarly after chapters 2–4 in two editions (NKp₂ and, without *śrī*, NKp₃). As we will see, these colophons are later additions. Chapter 5 has no separate colophon.

⁵ At the very beginning of the commentary on the prose part: *prakaraṇārambham ākṣipati “ihē” ty-ādinā “kiṃ nirūpaṇīyam” ity-antena*. “He suggests an objection to starting the Treatise with the paragraph »In this world ... What is there to investigate?«” (NKpB₁ 3.23 = NKpB₂ 14.1 = NKpB₃ 15.4.)

⁶ “Varadarāja’s date can be assumed in the range of 1075–1150 CE, or even 1100–1150 CE”, SHIDA (2015: 123). POTTER (1995) suggests 1150 CE.

⁷ POTTER (1995) gives 1345 CE as Vardhamāna’s date. He also mentions an earlier commentary (1250 CE) by Divākara (Upādhyāya) called *Parimala* available only in ms. His source, as also described in POTTER (1977: 659–660) is BHATTACHARYA (1958: 72–73), who, saying that the ms. is “quite beyond the reach of scholars”, refers to DALAL (1937: 44), where all the information given is this: “*Nyāyakusumāñjali-parimala*—by Divākara, first *stabaka* only.”

sections, in all the five chapter colophons and also in the text itself.⁸ A later, unpublished commentary by Vāmadhvaja (1561 CE) still uses this terminology.⁹ This suggests that the colophons of the NKp chapters are not original; in fact one partial ms. does not have any chapter division at all.¹⁰

The treatise consists of 73 verses (*kārikās*) and a 26 times longer prose discussion built around them. It may be seen as a very loose commentary on the *kārikās*. Therefore it would be logical to ask if it is really one work, or in fact two? And even if they are two, can they have the same author? Unfortunately it seems that these questions were never asked: modern scholarship just took it for granted that it is a single text¹¹ written by one person, Udayana.

In the NKp itself there is no obvious evidence either way. The prose does not refer to the author of the verses. Sometimes the *kārikās* are handled in a proper commentarial fashion: short introduction (*avataṛaṇa*), then the verse itself, followed by a full explanation of its terms and logic, e.g. 1.7. Other *kārikās*, e.g. 1.9., are very well integrated into the continuous flow of argument. In all cases except three, the *ślokas* are preceded by a clear delimiting expression like *ucyate* ('it is said', 26 times), *iti cet, na*¹² ('it is not so', 15 times), *tathā hi* or *api ca* ('for', 'further', 10 times). Unfortunately Udayana never uses an active verb form that would show if it is first or third person ('I say' vs. 'he says').

Considering internal and external evidence, in this paper I will suggest that the *kārikās* (or, more precisely, the *kārikās* in *śloka* metre) are in fact an independent composition, written by an earlier Nyāya author.

The *kārikās* as Stand-Alone Text

Reading the NKp one cannot fail to notice that it is not a *miśra-prakarāṇa*, a text written in prose and verse mixed, as it is sometimes stated. The *kārikās* make up a fairly continuous text, clearly written with the intention to be independently

⁸ At the start of chapters two and four. *Atha dvitīyam paricchedam ārabhamānas...* "Now, he begins the second section..." (NKpB₁ 59.3 = NKpB₂ 209.2 = NKpB₃ 233.1). *Atha turīyam paricchedaḥ. Sattve 'pi tasyāpramāṇatvād ity-asyāsiddhi-vyutpādanam paricchedārthaḥ.* "Now the fourth section. The purpose of the section is to develop a refutation to the thesis, »Even though He exists, He is no source of knowledge«" (NKpB₃ 502.1–2). In the *āryā* verse closing the first chapter, it is called—no doubt, *metri causa* only—*khaṇḍa*, part. *Udayana-gambhīra-bhāva-prakaṣaṇa-nipūṇena Varadarājaena | vyākhyāta eva gahanāḥ Kusumāñjaleḥ prathama-khaṇḍaḥ ||* "Varadarāja, skilful in bringing to light the deep purport of Udayana / has now explained the impenetrable first part of the *Kusumāñjali*" (NKpB₁ 58.26–27 = NKpB₂ 208.11 = NKpB₃ 218.1–2).

⁹ The ms. is carefully described by DALAL (1937: 103–104), giving the colophons of chapters 1 and 5, in both cases called *pariccheda*. Dalal's information is somewhat analysed by RADHAKRISHNAN (1940).

¹⁰ COWELL (1864: x–xii) describes it in some detail, saying that "there is no sign of division between the two chapters,—the discussion of the second objection goes on in unbroken continuity with that of the first."

¹¹ Actually MIŚRA (1968: 2) remarks without further details that "some people think that first the verse part of the Nyāya-kusumāñjali was written, but on account of its difficulty Ācārya later wrote the commentary," *kucha logo kī dhāraṇā hai kī pahale 'Nyāya-kusumāñjali' kā kārikā-bhāga likhā gayā, parantu isakī kaṣṭhinatā ke kāraṇa bāda me Ācārya ne vṛttī bhī likhī.* (Most of the anusvāras are dropped in this text.)

¹² Or close synonyms, like *abhidhīyate* and *etad api nāsti*, *na + Ablative* etc.

memorised. And in fact they do exist as an independent text, NKk, especially in Bengal. “The book *Kusumāñjali* has two forms: one consists of the *kārikās* only, the other is accompanied by the exposition written by Udayana Ācārya. ... The first, consisting of the *kārikās* only, is well-known primarily in Bengal.”¹³

It seems even more significant that there are many commentaries on the NKk, most of them¹⁴ come again from Bengal. At least five NKk-commentaries have printed editions; the earliest one, NKkH by Haridāsa Bhaṭṭācārya (1530 CE) seems to be more popular than the NKp itself and has seven editions. The other four commentaries, by Rāmahadra Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya (NKkR, 1580 CE), Jayarāma Nyāyapañcānana (NKkJ, 1620–1659 CE), Gopīnātha Maunin (NKkG, 1650 CE), and Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha (NKkN, 1700 CE) have one edition each. The mere existence of these commentaries proves that their authors thought of the NKk as an independent work: it would seem quite unusual and disrespectful to the author to detach parts of his composition (without even mentioning this procedure) and comment only on them. Also our earliest witness, Varadarāja called his *Bodhanī* a subcommentary (*ṭīkā*) on the *Nyāya-kusumāñjali*,¹⁵ suggesting that the NKk is the root-text and the NKp is a commentary on it.

From among the NKk-commentators only Gopīnātha Maunin thinks that the *kārikās* are the work of Udayana. He says in an introductory verse that he starts his exposition because “the sayings of Ācārya are impenetrable, young people cannot comprehend them”, and in his last words unambiguously states that “Gopīnātha prepared this exposition of the *kārikās* of Ācārya.”¹⁶ The other four commentators are conspicuously silent on the question. The regular practice would be to pay homage to the author in one of the introductory verses. They don’t do this, and as a sort of compensation NKkJ and NKkN mention the title of the work commented upon, *Kusumāñjali-kārikāḥ*. Further, NKkH and NKkN give separate colophons to the *kārikās* and to the commentary—and even in the *kārikā*-colophons no author is mentioned, although this is one of the main functions of a colophon.¹⁷ So apparently these four commentators thought that the author of the NKk was unknown.

¹³ *Asya Kusumāñjali-granthasya dvīdhā rūpam. Ekaṃ kārikā-mātram, aparaṃ c’ōdayanācārya-kṛta-vyākhyā-sanātham... prathamam kārikā-mātra-rūpam tu Vaṅgesu mukhya-rūpeṇa prasiddhyati.* MĪSRA (1986: ka).

¹⁴ It is not true that all NKk commentaries were written by Bengalis, as MĪSRA (1986: ka) stated: *kārikā-vyākhyātāro Vaṅgīyā eva kevalāḥ*. For Gopīnātha Maunin lived in Āmber (now part of Jaipur in Rājasthān), see DVIVEDI (1992: [20]–[21]); and “Nārāyaṇatīrtha was a Telugu Brahmin, he lived and worked in Tanjore district”, SHASTRI (1974: xviii–xix).

¹⁵ In all the colophons to the chapters: *iti śrīmad-Rāmādeva-Mīśra-sūnor Varadarājasya kṛtau Nyāya-kusumāñjali-ṭīkāyām prathamam (dviṭīyah... pañcamam) paricchedaḥ*. “It was the first (second... fifth) section in the Subcommentary on the *Nyāya-kusumāñjali*, the work of Varadarāja, son of the illustrious Rāmādeva Mīśra.” (After ch. 3, *Nyāya-* is omitted in NKpB₁ and NKpB₂.)

¹⁶ *Ācārya-vāco gahanā navīnās / tad-artha-bodhāya bhavanti nālaṃ |* (NKkG p. 1.3); *Ācārya-kārikā-vyākhyām / Gopīnātho ’karod imām ||* (NKkG p. 176.10). Also in another *upajāti* verse, p. 176.1–2: *Nyāya-prasūnāñjali-nāma-dheyam / nirmānam Ācārya-kṛtam prakāśya | pracāram etasya sudhīsu yāce / na cet khalas tuṣyati kiṃ tato me || 6 ||* “Having explained the composition of Ācārya called *Nyāya-prasūnāñjali*, I ask for its use by wise people—or else, if the lowly like it, what does that matter for me?”

¹⁷ Actually in NKkN₁ (p. 86.11) the author’s name is given: *iti Kusumāñjalīḥ samāptaḥ Udayanācārya-viracitaḥ*. However, this is the reading of only one ms. (perhaps the latest, dated 1835 CE). The other ms. used by the edition (in Telugu script, i.e. the native script of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, undated) has *iti Kusumāñjali-kārikā samāptā*. The probably earliest ms., NKkN₂ (dated 1783 CE) writes *iti Kusumāñjali*

The commentators and their colophons refer to the NKK most often as *Kusumāñjali*, but also quite frequently as *Kusumāñjali-kārikāḥ* or simply *kārikāḥ*. Only Gopīnātha (who takes it to be Udayana's work) names it once *Nyāya-kusumāñjali*, and in a verse *Nyāya-prasūnāñjali*.¹⁸ Probably the title of the verses was originally *Kusumāñjali* only, then Udayana named his prose work *Nyāya-kusumāñjali-prakarana*, better rendered as 'A logical treatise on the *Kusumāñjali*'; thereafter, to avoid ambiguity, the verses were often called *Kusumāñjali-kārikāḥ*.¹⁹

The silence of the commentators on the author of NKK could be explained away as caused by ignorance: they may have used some text of the NKK (originally extracted from Udayana's NKp) that did not name the author. But this is not the case, for all these commentators know Udayana's treatise well and they follow him on crucial points. Rāmabhadra even names and quotes several subcommentaries on the NKp.²⁰ With the sole exception of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, they all quote from the NKp, notably the very important passage after *kārikā* 1.2.²¹

All the NKK commentators follow Udayana in his most surprising interpretation, where he says that the arguments for the existence of God listed in *kārikā* 5.1 can be doubled, for the verse can be explained in two different ways. In the NKp we find immediately before verse 5.6 the crucial sentence: "Or the verse starting with »Cause« [i.e. 5.1] is explained differently."²² There is nothing in the verse to suggest this, yet all the commentators say the same thing at exactly the same place, just before 5.6.²³

Footnote 17 continued

samāptā (fol. 67v.4). Perhaps the *pañḍita* copyist in 1835 thought that the omission of the name must be accidental, and tried to correct the mistake to the best of his knowledge. The slightly unnatural word order (*ity Udayanācārya-viracita-Kusumāñjalih samāptah* would be the usual form) also suggest an addition, maybe originally a marginal note.

¹⁸ In the colophon to ch. 3: *iti Gopīnātha-Mauninaḥ kṛtau Nyāya-kusumāñjali-vikāse tṛtīya-stabakaḥ* (NKKG p. 129.26), and in the verse quoted above, fn.

¹⁹ Of course, other possibilities could be brought forward, e.g. that *Kusumāñjali* is but an abbreviation for *Nyāya-kusumāñjali*. Based on verse 1.3ab: *nyāya-carcēyam īśasya / manana-vyapadeśa-bhāk |* ('This logical investigation of the Lord having the designation »reflection«') one could think of e.g. **Īśvara-manana, Reflection on God*. The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* says without giving any reference: "*Īśvara-kusumāñjali*—alternative name of the Nyāyakusumāñjali of Udayanācārya" (RAGHAVAN 1966: 273). Still, considering the unanimous practice of the NKK-commentators (with the sole exception mentioned above), at present *Kusumāñjali* is the most economical suggestion for the title of the NKK.

²⁰ The *Parimala* (of Divākara?) is mentioned only (NKKR p. 1.11). Rāmabhadra both names and quotes: Vardhamāna's *Prakāśa* (pp. 1.11; 7.14; 23.5); Rucidatta's *Makaranda* (pp. 1.7, 1.11, 23.5–15 lines quoted); Śāṅkara Mīśra's *Āmoda* (pp. 1.5, 42.22, 45.7, 48.11—altogether 51 lines quoted).

²¹ NKp₁ p. (1.)4.29–5.13 = NKp₂ p. (1.)3.1–11 = NKp₃ p. 4.1–9 = NKp₄ p. 14.1–19.2 = NKp₅ p. 13.1–9, quoted in: NKKH, p. 3.9–20; NKKR, p. 4.17–5.11; NKKJ, p. 4.5–15; NKKG, p. 8.29–9.8. Although Nārāyaṇa does not quote the text, he summarizes it (NKKN, p. 4.12–14).

²² *Athavā, "kāryē" ty-ādikam anyathā vyākhyāyate*. NKp₁ p. (5.)70.30 = NKp₂ p. (5.)22.11 = NKp₃ p. 312.1 = NKp₄ p. 519.4 = NKp₅ p. 619.17.

²³ In NKKH it comes six lines earlier: *athavā, "kāryē" ty-ādikam anyathā vyākhyāyate*, p. 52.16. In all the other commentaries immediately before 5.6: *athavā, "kāryāyojanē" ty-ādi-kārikānyathā vyākhyāyate*, NKKR, p. 95.26; *athavā, "kāryāyojanē" ty-ādi-kārikāyā arthāntare tātparyam ity abhipretya āha*, NKKG, p. 154.6–7; *"kāryāyojanē" ty-ādikaṃ prakārāntareṇa vyākhyātum āha*, NKKN, p. 76.25. In the ms. of NKKJ the folio containing verses 5.4–9 is missing; although there is at least one complete ms. of this text (in Tanjore, ms. 6532, see SASTRI 1931: 4723–4725), the editor did not use it.

The way the NKk commentators quote Udayana's prose is not very informative.

(a) Haridāsa Bhaṭṭācārya always clearly identifies the *kārikās*, most often (66 times out of 73) with an immediately preceding *āha*, 'he says'. When he quotes the NKp (NKkH pp. 3.9–4.6), nothing shows that a quotation starts; at the end an *iti* is ambiguous, for the quoted text itself ends with *iti*. Then he comments on many words of the quotation (p. 4.7–17) and within this section he refers to the text once with an *āha*.²⁴

(b) Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma marks neither the *kārikās* nor the Udayana-quotations²⁵ in any systematic manner, although commentaries on the NKp are normally identified (see fn. 19). In a single case he says before a NKp-quotation: *tathā Ācāryaḥ*, 'Ācārya also says so' (NKkR p. 17.16). Frequently instead of himself commenting on the NKp, he quotes immediately after the text a subcommentary, mostly Śāṅkaramiśra's *Āmoda*.

(c) Jayarāma Nyāyapañcānana, like Haridāsa, typically introduces the *kārikās* with *āha*. On the other hand, when he quotes the NKp,²⁶ there is nothing to show this (or, in a single case, a closing *iti* only, NKkJ p. 61.11).

(d) Gopīnātha Maunin, who does identify the author of the NKk with Udayana, quotes both similarly, i.e. preceded by *āha*. He quotes the NKp only once (NKkG pp. 8.29–9.8), ends the text with *iti*; no commentary added.

(e) Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha marks the *kārikās* clearly, most of the time with the usual *āha*. He does not quote the NKp at all.

To sum up: with the exception of Gopīnātha Maunin, the NKk-commentators never mention by name or describe otherwise the author of the *kārikās*. They introduce his text with a 'he says', 'he refutes' etc. Only Gopīnātha quotes the NKp similarly; the others simply include Udayana's text in theirs. In a single case Rāmabhadra names the NKp author as Ācārya, the others never name him or refer to him in any way.

There is some evidence that at least Gopīnātha and Jayarāma extracted the verses themselves from a copy of the NKp where the *kārikās* were not numbered, for they each have three extra "*kārikās*" —in each case, verses quoted in NKp at that place. They have misidentified these illustrative quotations of Udayana as *kārikās*.²⁷ Further, all the commentators take the verses in artistic metres as *kārikās*, although —as we will see below—they belong to the NKp.

In general, the text of the NKk is fairly stable and well-defined, in all probability on account of the general acceptance of the NKp as authoritative. The NKk commentators' texts differ only in minor details (in case of 31 *kārikās*, not at all)

²⁴ ... *saṃśayam āha*: "tad ihē" ty-ādi. ('... he says what the doubt is: »About this« etc.', NKkH p. 4.17)

²⁵ There are at least ten: NKkR pp. 8.29–9.8, 17.17–18, 18.10–11, 26.22–27.1, 42.16–21, 44.5–45.6, 47.4–48.3, 107.9–12, 108.1, 108.11–111.5.

²⁶ At least four times: NKkJ pp. 4.5–4.15, 35.20–24, 36.8, 61.10–11.

²⁷ The two verses quoted in NKp between 3.7 and 3.8 are taken to be *kārikās* by both commentators (NKkG p. 81.15–16, 24–25; NKkJ p. 37.15–16, 19–20). The *Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsaka śloka* quoted after 3.15 by Udayana appears as a *kārikā* in NKkJ, p. 85.24–25; while *Vāyu-purāṇa* 12.31, quoted by Udayana before 5.7 is numbered as a *kārikā* in NKkG, p. 155.7–8.

from Udayana's version.²⁸ There is not a single case where all the NKK commentators agree in a reading different from the NKp.

The picture emerging is fairly clear. Udayana's NKp was accepted by everyone as the authoritative commentary on the NKK and therefore the reliable source of the text of the *kārikās*; but before the 19th century, perhaps Gopīnātha Maunin was the only person who thought that Udayana was the author also of the verses.

There is an interesting legend mentioned by Narendrachandra VEDANTATIRTHA (1944: xxviii) that would corroborate our inference. "It is sometimes believed that Udayana did not compose N[yāya]-K[usumāñjali] himself but found it on a pilgrimage and circulated its content in Gauḍa (Bengal): *tīrtha-paryāṭane labdhaṃ tasmād Gauḍe pracāritam*. Bh[aviṣya]-P[urāṇa], Bh[akti]-M[āhātmya] 30." There cannot be the slightest doubt that Udayana is the author of the NKp. Besides the unanimous testimony of the colophons and the commentaries, and besides his unmistakable style, in the text he clearly refers to his other important monograph, the *Ātma-tattva-viveka* (*Judging the essence of the self*).²⁹ So the story, if true, can mean only one thing: Udayana learned the *Kusumāñjali*—the NKK—on a pilgrimage, popularised it in Bengal, and then wrote his *Logical treatise* on it.

Unfortunately Vedantatirtha's information seems to be not fully accurate. I could not find the line quoted in the three editions of the BhP consulted, although they have very detailed tables of contents, and BhP₃ has a full *śloka*-index in vol. 3. These editions do not have a part or chapter entitled *Bhakti-māhātmya*. However, Rāmacandra DVIVEDIN (1992: [10]–[11]) also quotes four verses, first giving the source as *Bhakti-māhātmyam ity-ākhye granthe*, ('in the book called *The greatness of devotion*') then as *Bhaviṣya-purāṇe triṃśattame pariśiṣṭādhyāye* ('The thirtieth appendix-chapter in the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa*'). More than a century ago, Vindhyeśvarī-Prasāda DVIVEDIN (1916: 152–159) published a seemingly complete text in 85 *ślokas*, naming the source as *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa-pariśiṣṭe Bhagavad-bhakti-māhātmye 30 adhyāye* ('in the 30th chapter of *The greatness of the devotees of God*, appendix to the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa*'). The colophon of the text reads *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa-pariśiṣṭe Udayanācārya-caritaṃ*

²⁸ The only major difference is that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha excludes the last *kārikā*.—Interestingly in a ms. of Varadarāja's *Bodhanī* (the earliest commentary on the NKp) in the Sarasvatī Mahāl Library in Tanjore (No. 6532, and see also No. 6533), the last two verses are omitted (SASTRI 1931: 4728–4730). Unfortunately Mahaprabhulal Goswami, the editor of NKpB3 (the only edition containing also the last two chapters of the *Bodhanī*) did not utilise these mss. The mss. do not have a colophon at the end; the possibility of a lost last folio should be checked. Further, NKKH practically does not comment on the last two *kārikās*, and does not introduce them with his usual *āha*.

The printed editions give the appearance that several other verses are missing from some NKK commentaries: 1.3 (NKKH, NKKR); 3.14 (NKKJ); 5.5 (NKKG); 5.6 (NKKH). But in fact the verses are there, only not marked as *kārikās*, and sometimes even printed as prose text.

²⁹ In the commentary on verse 5.3: *etac ca sarvam Ātma-tattva-viveke nipuṇataram upapādītam, iti nēha pratanyate*. "But all this has been more completely proven in the *Ātma-tattva-viveka*, therefore it is not elaborated here." NKp₁ p. (5.)52.7–8 = NKp₂ p. (5.)12.3–4 = NKp₃ p. 295.4–5 = NKp₄ p. 502.4–5 = NKp₅ p. 578.25–26. Also the NKp is clearly referred to in Udayana's later works, NVTP and Kir, see CHEMPARATHY (1972: 22).

nāma triṃśo 'dhyāyaḥ ('Thirtieth chapter in the appendix to the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa*, called *The deeds of Udayana Ācārya*').

Now this text is in fact completely unrelated to the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa*. Already AUFRECHT (1891) listed three mss. of the *Bhagavad-bhakti-māhātmya* and named its author, Candradatta of Mithilā. Quite recently Bābūrāma Śarman critically edited the complete work in 150 chapters from three mss. In his edition the *Udayanācārya-carita* is the 31st chapter (BhBhM pp. 129–136). This is probably a relatively modern text,³⁰ but for our purposes it is irrelevant, since it does not contain the legend about the origin of the *Kusumāñjali*—actually the only work by Udayana mentioned at all is the *Kiraṇāvalī*.

Vedantatirtha's real source for the legend is probably BHATTACHARYA (1958: 5), who mentions the *Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa* immediately after discussing the legend in a footnote. (This may have caused the confusion, especially for someone quoting from memory.) According to him, there is a strong tradition in the Bhāduī family (Vārendra area in North-West Bengal) that Udayanācārya, the author of the *Kusumāñjali* belonged to them. He quotes the śloka in full:

sa evŌdayanācāryaś cikāya Kusumāñjalim |
tīrtha-paryāṭane labdham, tasmād Gauḍe pracāritam ||

“This Udayanācārya collected the *Kusumāñjali* / that he acquired on a pilgrimage; then he popularised it in Bengal.” He names his source as “a clever Vārendra scholar of the last century ... (*Laghubhārata* Vol. III, p. 160–61)”. The *Laghubhārata* is not available to me, but MONAHAN (1920: 15) says that it is “a genealogical work... published about 50 years ago”, i.e. around 1870. He takes it entirely seriously as a historical source for the circumstances of the birth of Lakṣmaṇa Sena, only a century after Udayana; therefore it is not improbable that the legend about the *Kusumāñjali* preserves some truth. Bhattacharya, however, thinks that it is impossible, for according to him this Udayana of the Bhāduī family lived after Ballāla Sena, at least 150 years too late. Unfortunately on this point Bhattacharya gives no references. Rāmacandra DVIVEDIN (1992: 11), on the other hand, finds it unproblematic to quote about our Udayana from the Bhāduī genealogies (*Bhāduī-vaṃśāvalyām*). So without further research, especially into the Bhāduī and generally Vārendra Brahmin genealogies, it is impossible to say how old this legend is.

Structure and Style

The distribution of the *kārikās* in the NKp is summarized in the table below. The number of verses in each block, if more than one, is given in parentheses. The verses

³⁰ STEIN (1894: 223) says about the ms. he describes that it was copied from a book dated *saṃvat* 1829 (1772 CE). He also gives the colophon (p. 357), where *sana* 18 may be the year of composition, probably *saṃvat* 1818, i.e. 1761 CE.

in artistic metres (*śārdūla-vikrīḍita*, for the last verse *vasanta-tilakā*) are printed in bold characters; the other verses are simple *ślokas* (in *anuṣṭubh* metre).

1. *stabaka* 2. *stabaka* 3. *stabaka* 4. *stabaka* 5. *stabaka*

Introduction

Introduction (2)

Chapter intro Chapter intro Chapter intro Chapter intro Chapter intro
(15) (2) (21) (4) (16)

Prayer **Prayer** **Prayer** **Prayer** **Prayer**
Conclusion (2)

Viewed thus, the chapter division seems quite irregular. The body of chapter two has only two *ślokas*, while chapter three has 21.

On the other hand, the length of the prose chapters appears normal. In the following table, the length of the prose is given in theoretical lines, where a 'line' means a hundred roman characters (without spaces).

1. *stabaka* 2. *stabaka* 3. *stabaka* 4. *stabaka* 5. *stabaka*

Introduction

18 *ślokas* + 3 *ślokas* + 22 *ślokas* + 5 *ślokas* + 17 *ślokas* +
337 lines 363 lines 500 lines 151 lines 584 lines

Prayer **Prayer** **Prayer** **Prayer** **Prayer**
Conclusion (2)

This huge difference between NKk and NKp in the proportions of the chapters is the result of the varying lengths of the commentaries on the *ślokas*. The average is 30 lines of prose per *śloka*, yet sometimes there is but one line of comment (on 1.4 and 5.1), or even less: *nigada-vyākhyātam etat*, 'this is self-explanatory', on 3.5. (This brief remark clearly suggests that it is a commentator speaking, not the author of the verse.) Conversely, we find some quite extensive discussions on a single *śloka*. The commentary on *kārikā* 2.1 is 229 lines long, so it makes up 12% of the whole prose! If Udayana were the author of the *kārikās*, he could have added a few more *ślokas* here. On the other hand, when a scholar comments on a fixed text (especially an older one), often he has some important new things to say for which there is no root-text. Then he inserts his sometimes lengthy discussion as an aside to a related topic.

As the chapter division fits well the NKp while for the NKk the length of the chapters is rather anomalous, we have to consider if this was really a part of the original *Kusumâñjali*, or is it an innovation of Udayana? A text of 73 verses (like the *Sāṃkhyā-kārikā*) usually does not have any formal divisions. Here however, as seen in the first table, the chapters are clearly indicated by an introductory *śloka* and a concluding prayer in *śārdūla-vikrīḍita* metre.

Now if we removed the *kārikā*-numbering from the text, it would be perfectly clear that the verses in artistic metres (printed in bold above) do not belong to the *kārikās* commented upon, but to the prose commentary. Otherwise the prose would not have the compulsory *maṅgala-śloka*, the benedictory verse invoking God at the

very start of the text, nor the almost-compulsory concluding verse. All other published works of Udayana have both.³¹ Further, all the true *kārikās* receive at least a few words of comment, and they are introduced with an *ucyate* or similar expression; while none of the artistic verses show either feature. They stand always at the extreme margin of a unit: no prose comes before the introductory verse, nor after the concluding prayer in each *stabaka*. Some of these verses are quite difficult (especially 1.1.) and they receive lengthy explanations from all commentators both of the NKp and the NKk. That Udayana does not comment on them shows that they were not part of the text he commented upon (the *Kusumāñjali ślokas*, NKś) but his own writing. (And conversely this shows that the NKś was not his own work.)

The introductory *ślokas* are partly an illusion caused by accepting the current *stabaka* division. Verses 4.1 and 5.1 do in fact outline the discussion in the following chapter, and 2.2–3 prove a part of 2.1 (*sarga-pralaya-sambhavāt*, ‘for the world is created and will dissolve’). On the other hand, 1.4 is not an introduction to the whole chapter, only to 1.5–9, and 3.1 is discussed only in 3.2–3. Also, there are other “introductory” verses in the NKk like 1.11 (*saṃskārah pumṣa evēṣṭaḥ*, ‘rituals influence only the soul’) to 1.11–19, or 3.10 to 3.11–14 (*upamāna*, ‘comparison’ is not a separate kind of *pramāṇa*, ‘valid source of knowledge’).

The basic plan of the NKp and the NKk differ noticeably. Udayana is explicit about the structure of the NKp (and most commentators of the NKk follow him blindly). He says that although everybody accepts the existence of God in one sense or another, “summarily there are five objections: (1) There are no transcendental means to reach heaven; (2) These means can work otherwise [i.e., without God]; (3) There are proofs for His nonexistence; (4) Even if He exists, he is not a source of valid knowledge; (5) There is no proof for his existence.”³² The five chapters answer these five objections.

The NKk follows a more continuous flow of argument, an outline of which is as follows: Human destiny has non-physical causes, and rituals can influence them (1.4–9). The substrate of these *karmic* influences is the soul, which is the eternal subject of both actions and experiences (1.10–19). Ritual knowledge is not eternal, for its decay is observed; therefore it needs an author. That can only be God, who taught it to the first Brahmins after the creation of the world (2.1–3). It is impossible to disprove God (3.1–22), nor that He is the source of scripture (4.1–5). God’s existence can be proven from the physical world needing an intelligent creator (5.1–5) and from scripture (5.6–17).

³¹ Of course the unfinished Kir does not have a concluding verse, and it is also not found in the incomplete edition of the NVTP. (On the other hand we know that “Udayana begins each chapter of the *Parīśuddhi* with a prayer verse”, BHATTACHARYA 1958: 20.) NP does not have a *maṅgala-śloka*, and this corroborates our impression that it is only the last part of a (probably lost) larger work—in its extant form it is a commentary on the last chapter only of the *Nyāya-sūtra*.

³² *Tad iha saṃkṣepataḥ pañcatayī vipratipattiḥ: alaukikasya paraloka-sādhanaśābhāvāt; anyathāpi paraloka-sādhanāmuṣṭhāna-sambhavāt; tad-abhāvavedaka-pramāṇa-sad-bhāvāt; sattve ‘pi tasyāpramāṇatvāt; tat-sādhaka-pramāṇābhāvāc cēti.* Immediately before 1.4: NKp₁ p. (1.)10.15–19 = NKp₂ p. (1.) 4.1–5.1 = NKp₃ p. 5.8–10 = NKp₄ p. 29.1–40.2 = NKp₅ p. 21.1–3.

There are three conspicuous differences between the conceptions of the two works. For Udayana the first chapter is about rituals that get us to heaven, while in the NKś argument *svarga* ('heaven') does not even appear, it is about karmic influences on our lives.³³ In the NKś, chapter two is about the creation and dissolution of the world and of scripture with it; Udayana inserts here his extremely long (220 lines) refutation of the eternity of *śabda* ('sound' or 'word'). Finally, in the fifth *stabaka* Udayana doubles the arguments for the existence of God, saying that 5.1 can be interpreted in two different ways—in the NKś there is no hint about this possibility.

The style of the two works is again markedly different, the only similarity being that both are very difficult to read. In Udayana's case, the reason is that he presupposes only highly educated scholarly readers who are well versed both in the special Nyāya terminology and methods of argumentation and in other fields of classical scholarship like Pūrva Mīmāṃsā. The style of the NKś recalls rather the *kārikās* of the old masters like Īśvaraḥṣṇa, Vasubandhu or Dinnāga. In that age writing was probably not yet the central medium of education.³⁴ The students memorised the verses, then the teacher gave them the explanation. The *kārikās* were not meant to be read and understood; they contained all the relevant terms and concepts with perhaps a hint at their relation. The verse format helped the memorization and ensured to an extent the preservation of the key elements and their structure. With their help the students could later readily recall the essence of the oral commentary received decades ago.

Of course, matters of style are difficult to judge. What can be objectively said is that using verses in the body of the text is atypical of Udayana, and he prefers artistic metres to *ślokas*. In his other works I found only five internal verses (excluding quotations): three *ślokas*, two in artistic metres.³⁵ Among the fifteen introductory or concluding verses nine are in some artistic metre.³⁶ Among the artistic metres he uses most frequently *śārdūla-vikrīḍita* (four times). All this is perfectly consistent with our hypothesis: in the NKp, the introductory and concluding verses are in *śārdūla-vikrīḍita*, except the very last (*vasanta-tilakā*, also used in Udayana's other works).

³³ In the NKp, *alaukika paraloka-sādhana* (see the previous footnote), in the NKk *pratyātma-niyamād bhukter / asti hetur alaukikaḥ* || (1.4cd), "since experiences are determined for each self, there is a non-physical cause".

³⁴ This is, of course, speculation based on some work with those texts and some knowledge on how orthodox (Vedic) education works even to-day. I have no direct evidence about the teaching methods of the first millennium CE.

³⁵ LĀ p. 78.21–29, *śārdūla-vikrīḍita*; ĀTV p. 529.2–5, *vasanta-tilakā*. The three *saṃgraha-ślokas*: ĀTV p. 780.4–5; NVTP p. 194.1–2; Kir p. 161.1–2.

³⁶ Three in *śārdūla-vikrīḍita*: ĀTV p. 1.1–4; NP p. 124.8–11; Kir p. 5.1–4. Two in *mandākrāntā* (ĀTV p. 947.5–8; NP p. 124.12–15) and in *mālinī* (ĀTV p. 947.1–4; Kir p. 7.1–4); one in *śikharīṇī* (ĀTV p. 935.6–9, not a real concluding verse, as 26 lines of prose follow it before the end) and in *vasanta-tilakā* (NVTP p. 1.5–2.2). The six *ślokas*: LM p. 1.11–12 = Kir p. 397.1–2 (introductory verse to chapter 2); LM p. 84.20–21; LĀ p. 56.3–5; LĀ p. 86.12–14; LĀ p. 86.15–17 = Kir p. 1.3–4; Kir p. 4.1–2.

Ideas and Terminology

Since both texts belong to the Nyāya school,³⁷ we can hardly expect serious discrepancies here, still some differences can be observed. The general attitude of the NKś is entirely serious and focussed exclusively on proving the existence of God. The NKp seems to think that there is no real need to prove God, but it is an excellent topic around which many interesting discussions of Nyāya tenets can be woven. Probably it was written in a dominantly theistic environment; the verses in artistic metres read in fact as pure devotional poetry, *Śiva-bhakti*.

The theory of atoms is irrelevant for the NKś. Atoms are briefly mentioned once, in the course of proving that rituals affect only persons, not objects, for “their qualities are [based on] the differences of atoms produced by heating and the like.”³⁸ Unsurprisingly Udayana—who is also a Vaiśeṣika author—writes a lot about atoms, the word occurs 39 times in comments on fifteen *kārikās*;³⁹ he even builds two of his arguments for the existence of God on the atomic theory.

The problem of *yogi-pratyakṣa*, the supposed ability of *yogins* to perceive things invisible for others is absent from the NKś; neither *yoga* nor *yogins* are mentioned in any way. On the other hand Udayana thinks that *yogins* can perceive God directly; he elaborates on the problem at some length (26 lines) and at a quite conspicuous place: this is the very end of the NKp prose.⁴⁰

Conversely, the concept of *śakti* (‘power, ability’) is important in the NKś, appearing in five verses,⁴¹ whereas for Udayana it is a faulty Mīmāṃsā concept. His commentary on *kārikās* 1.9–13 is essentially a substantial (120 lines) essay on why *śakti* does not exist. At the very end of this discussion—clearly in order to make room for the *kārikās*’ frequent use of the word—he writes: “It is not the case that our school does not have even the category of *śakti*. —What is it then? —Being a cause.”⁴² Still he avoids the word, using it only to present opponents’ views and to comment on the verses where it occurs.⁴³

A minor but noticeable difference in terminology is that the verses use for ‘perception’ both *pratyakṣa* and *adhyakṣa* (both twice), while Udayana practically always chooses *pratyakṣa* (71 times). Only when commenting on *adhyakṣa* in 1.16, he uses the same word thrice, and in a single case he freely selects this term—for alliteration’s sake.⁴⁴ As CHEMPARATHY (1972: 43) remarks, “Another interesting,

³⁷ For the NKp this is evident. In the NKś, *nyāya-carcā*, ‘logical investigation’ (1.3) and *Gautame mate*, ‘in the system of Gautama’ (4.5) leave no doubt as to the affiliation of the author.

³⁸ *Sva-guṇāḥ paramānūnām / viśeṣāḥ pākajādayaḥ* || (1.11cd)

³⁹ On 1.11, 12, 15; 2.1, 2, 3; 3.1, 6, 19; 4.4; 5.2, 3, 4, 5, 17.

⁴⁰ NKp₁ p. (5.)145.26–148.21 = NKp₂ p. (5.)57.16–59.18 = NKp₃ p. 356.1 = NKp₄ p. 573.7–575.14 = NKp₅ p. 734.30–736.4.

⁴¹ In 1.6, 7, 18 (twice); 2.3, and 3.14.

⁴² *Na hi no darśane śakti-padartha eva nāsti.—Ko ’sau tarhi?—Kāraṇatvam.* NKp₁ p. (1.)63.22–23 = NKp₂ p. (1.)32.3–4 = NKp₃ p. 45.7 = NKp₄ p. 150.1–2 = NKp₅ p. 143.19–20.

⁴³ And a few times, e.g. in the prayer after chapter 1, for God’s power; this sacred usage, of course, he cannot ban.

⁴⁴ *Na tad-artham adhyakṣa-gocaratvam apekṣaṇīyam anyatarasyāpi.* NKp₁ p. (2.)20.19–20 = NKp₂ p. (2.)9.14–10.1 = NKp₃ p. 91.2–3 = NKp₄ p. 246.3 = NKp₅ p. 222.10–11.

though less frequent, feature of his works is the use of alliteration usually rare in philosophical works.”

There are a few cases where Udayana clearly disagrees with the *kārikās*. Listing the arguments for God’s existence, the NKś says: “The omniscient and eternal one can be proven from effect, joining, keeping, etc., ...”⁴⁵ The idea is that the world is an effect, since it is not an unchanging eternal substance; therefore an intelligent being must be supposed who constructs, preserves and destroys it. That *dhr̥ṭi* (literally, ‘holding, keeping’) here means ‘sustainment, preservation’ is clear in itself, especially considering the obvious parallel of the *Brahma-sūtra*: *Janmādy asya yataḥ*, “[Brahman is that,] from whom the birth etc. of this [world comes]”, where *janmādy* is explained by Śaṅkara as “birth, continued existence and destruction.”⁴⁶ The NKś elaborates on the list of arguments, and in verse 5.2 we read *dhr̥ṭi-vināśayoḥ*, “in preservation and destruction”, which confirms the interpretation given above. In spite of this, Udayana explains *dhr̥ṭi* as ‘holding in space’: “The earth... is controlled by the will of its supporter, for, being heavy, it is not its nature to fly.”⁴⁷

The verses 3.20–22 consider the problem whether *an-upalabdhi*, ‘non-perception’ is a separate source of valid knowledge. Udayana in the introduction to 3.20 suggests that it is superfluous: “It has been considered before that non-perception cannot disprove God and it does not go beyond perception etc.”⁴⁸ (And in fact, in the NKp the problem has been profusely discussed earlier.)

According to *kārikā* 1.12cd, “god-[images are sacred] because [the gods stay] near them, or because we recognise [the particular god in the image].”⁴⁹ Udayana accepts only the first explanation and rejects the second: “nearness is our view. For others, it is recognition”.⁵⁰

Conclusion

Once it is established that the *śloka*-part of the *Kusumâñjali* is an independent, earlier work by a different author, it is clear that the first step for future research is to prepare a critical edition. For it the existence of *kārikā*-only manuscripts should be investigated. This is not very easy, for many catalogues do not distinguish the NKk and the NKp. Still, some data are visible and I found two entries explicitly called

⁴⁵ *Kāryāyोजना-dhr̥ṭy-ādeḥ... sādhyo viśva-vid avyayaḥ* (5.1ad)

⁴⁶ *Janma-sthiti-bhaṅgaṃ*, BS 1.1.2, p. 7.4–5

⁴⁷ *Kṣīty-ādi ... vidhāraka-prayamādhiṣṭhitaṃ, gurutve saty a-patana-dharmakatvāt* (after 5.4). On his second interpretation (after 5.6), *dhr̥ṭi* would be the preservation of scripture. NKp₁ p. (5.)58.8–10, (5.)75.23–24 = NKp₂ p. (5.)15.18–19, (5.)25.6–7 = NKp₃ p. 300.15–301.1, 316.10 = NKp₄ p. 506.1–2, 522.16 = NKp₅ p. 589.14–15, 621.9.

⁴⁸ *An-upalabdhis tu na bādhikē ti cintitam, na ca pratyakṣāder atiricyate*. NKp₁ p. (3.)90.29–30 = NKp₂ p. (3.)48.1–2 = NKp₃ p. 230.6 = NKp₄ p. 427.1 = NKp₅ p. 464.3.

⁴⁹ *Devatāḥ saṃnidhānena / pratyabhijñānato 'pi vā ||* We can recognise the god in the image since we have seen other images of the same god, and the iconography was fairly stable.

⁵⁰ *Samnidhānaṃ... no darśanam. Anyeṣāṃ tu... pratyabhijñāna...* NKp₁ p. (1.)61.6–10 = NKp₂ p. (1.)30.11–13 = NKp₃ p. 43.5–7 = NKp₄ p. 147.1–3 = NKp₅ p. 138.12–14.

Kusumâñjali-kārikā,⁵¹ and two others called *Nyāya-kusumâñjali*, where the small size suggests that it contains the *kārikās* only.⁵² Also the text labelled *Nyāya-kusumâñjali-saṃgraha* (AUFRECHT 1891: 3.65) may be the NKk.

For a critical edition, the unpublished commentaries of the NKk must be taken into consideration. Even when they are philosophically less interesting, as VEDANTATIRTHA (1944: xlix) suggests,⁵³ they may preserve old readings. Again it is impossible to say how many NKk commentaries there are, for many catalogues do not distinguish them from commentaries on the NKp. AUFRECHT (1891) lists eight commentaries on the *Nyāya-kusumâñjali* that are to my knowledge still unpublished. Their authors are Gadādhara, Candranārāyaṇa, Trilocanadeva, Raghudeva, Raghunātha, Rāmabhadra (son of Bhavanātha), Rudra Bhaṭṭācārya and Vāmadhvaja. It is clear that at least three among them are NKk-commentaries: those by Raghudeva Bhaṭṭācārya, by Rāmabhadrācārya Bhavanātha-putra (for both see STEIN 1894: 148) and by Rudra Bhaṭṭācārya (HALL 1859: 84). The other five are also probably NKk-commentaries (as perhaps most of the *vyākhyās* where the author is unknown), but we cannot be sure. The Nepalese German Manuscript Cataloguing Project also has at least two further NKk-commentaries, by Candraśekhara Sūri (NGMCP Acc.Nr. 5/4172 and 3/567) and by Śrīrudraṇyāvācaspati (NGMCP Acc.Nr. 4/1672 and 5/4170).

Since we saw that the (direct or indirect) source of the NKk text in the commentaries is Udayana's treatise, it must be carefully investigated: perhaps some other *ślokas* in the NKp do in fact belong to the NKś.

The next step may be an attempt to interpret the verses on their own, counting with the quite real possibility that some *ślokas* are not in their original location. Then a comparison with other relevant works (especially Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā and Buddhist) may suggest the historical position of the work.

Our results so far advise some caution with 'self-commentaries' in the Indian tradition. They are usually early and quite reliable commentaries, but often not in fact the work of the same author. I have arrived at this result with Nāgārjuna's *Viṅgraha-vyāvartanī* and with Vasubandhu's *Viṃśikā* and *Abhidharma-kośa*;⁵⁴ I also have suspicions about Dīnāga's *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*.⁵⁵

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this

⁵¹ One in Srinagar, Śāradā script, 7 folios (YACH-KAUL n.d.: 168, accn.no. 1043-11); and one in Benares, Bengali script, 20 folios ([SCLBJ] 1911: 223, item 1437 = Nyāya Čāstra no. 206).

⁵² One in Vrindaban, Bengali script, 11 folios (Gosvami 1976: III.158–159, Ser.No. 7653, Acc.No. 8071); one (possibly in Kathmandu), script unspecified, 12 folios (NGMCP, Acc.Nr. 5/6873).

⁵³ With the exception of Raghudeva Nyāyālamkāra's commentary, VEDANTATIRTHA (1944: xlix)

⁵⁴ Such claims cannot be substantiated in a footnote; their main basis is always the different content. But there may be other traces like the commentator calling the author of the verses *ācārya*, 'teacher' in the *Abhidharma-kośa* (in the introduction to 1.3, AKBh₁ p. 2.17 = AKBh₂ p. 3.4). For the *Viṃśikā* see RUZSA-SZEGEDI (2015: 101–104, 116).

⁵⁵ Here suspicions only, since I am not a Tibetologist and therefore with the Tibetan text I have to rely mostly on translations, and from the Sanskrit text of the commentary we have but fragments. Also I have studied the fifth chapter only.

article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Funding Open access funding provided by Eötvös Loránd University.

References

- AKBh = Vasubandhu: *Abhidharma-kośa* and *Bhāṣya*. (1) P. Pradhan (ed.): *Abhidharm-Koshabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8. K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna 1967. (2) Yasunori Ejima (ed.): *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu. Chapter I: Dhātunirdeśa*. Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhica 1. The Sankibo Press, Tokyo 1989.
- ĀTV = Udayana: *Ātma-tattva-viveka*. Vindhyesvariprasada Dvivedin; Lakshmana Sastri Dravida (eds.): *Udayanācārya: Ātmatattvaviveka, with the commentaries of Śankara Miśra, Bhagīratha Thakkura and Raghunātha Tārkikaśiromaṇī*. Bibliotheca Indica 170, The Asiatic Society, Calcutta 1907–1939 (repr. 1986).
- BHP = *Bhaviṣya-purāna*. (1) Govinda Śāstrin (ed.): *Bhaviṣya Mahāpurāna*. 2 Vols., Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Mudrālaya, Muṃbaī 1896–1897. (2) Khemarāja Śrīkṣṇadāsa (ed.): *Bhaviṣya Mahāpurāna saṭippaṇī mūlamātra*. Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Śīm-Pres, Bambaī 1959. (3) Khemarāja Śrīkṣṇadāsa; Rājendranātha Śarman; Nāgaśaraṇa Siṃha (eds.): *The Bhaviṣyamahāpurāna*. 3 Vols., Nag Publishers, Delhi 1984.
- BhBhM = Candradatta: *Bhagavad-bhakti-māhātmya*. Bābūrāma Śarman (ed.): *Candradatta-vīracitam Bhagavad-bhakti-māhātmyam*. Aprakāśita-pāṇḍulipi-grantha-prakāśanam 18, Rāṣṭrīya Saṃskṛta-Saṃsthānam, Nava-Dehalī 2012.
- BS = Śāṅkara: *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya*. Vāsudeva-Śarman (ed.): *Brahma-sūtra-Śāṅkara-bhāṣyam saṭippaṇaṇi, mūlamātram*. Vidyābhavana Prācyavidyā Granthamālā 87, Caukhambā Vidyābhavana, Vārāṇasī 1998 (reprint).
- Kir = Udayana: *Kiraṇāvalī*. Siva Chandra Sārvvabhūma; Narendra Chandra Vedantatīrtha (eds.): *Kiraṇāvalī by Udayanācārya. With the commentary of Yardhamānopādhyāya*. 2 Vols., Bibliotheca Indica 200, The Asiatic Society, Calcutta 1911, 1956.
- LĀ = Udayana: *Lakṣaṇāvalī*. Musashi Tachikawa: "A translation and the Sanskrit text of the *Lakṣaṇāvalī*," in: —: *The Structure of the World in Udayana's Realism. A Study of the Lakṣaṇāvalī and the Kiraṇāvalī*. D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht–Boston–London 1981: 53–107.
- LM = Udayana: *Lakṣaṇa-mālā*. Sri Sasinatha Jha (ed.): *Lakṣaṇamālā of Udayanācārya*. Mithila Institute Series, Ancient texts Series 13, The Institute, Darbhanga 1963.
- NKk = *Kusumāñjali* or (*Nyāya-*) *Kusumāñjali-kārikā*, the 73 verses as they appear in NKp and in NKkG, NKkH, NKkJ, NKkN and NKkR.
- NKkG = Gopinātha Maunin: *Kusumāñjali-vikāsa*. R. C. Dwivedi (ed.): *Nyāyakusumāñjalivikāsa of Gopinātha Maunī*. Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Jaipur 1992.
- NKkH = Haridāsa Bhaṭṭācārya: *Kusumāñjali-kārikā-vyākhyāna*. E. B. Cowell: *The Kusumāñjali, or Hindu Proof of the Existence of a Supreme Being, by Udayana Āchārya, with the Commentary of Hari Dāsa Bhaṭṭācārya*, edited and translated by —, assisted by Paṇḍita Maheśa Chandra Nyāyaratna. Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta 1864. (Repr. Caxton Publishers, Delhi 1983.)
- NKkJ = Jayarāma Nyāyapañcānana: *Kusumāñjali-vivṛti*. Vidyāvācaspati Śrī Rāmacandra Miśra (ed.): *Jayarāma-Nyāyapañcānana-kṛta-Vivṛti-sahitā Kusumāñjali-kārikā*. Kāmeśvarasiṃha-Darabhāṅgā-Saṃskṛta-Viśvavidyālaya, Darabhāṅgā 1986.
- NKkN = Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha: *Kusumāñjali-kārikā-vyākhyā*. (1) Shrinivas Shastri (ed.): *Kusumāñjali-Kārikā-Vyākhyā of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha*. Kurukshetra University Sanskrit Series 2. Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra 1974. (2) A clear Devanagari ms., not used by Shastri, dated *samvat 1840* (= 1783 CE), downloaded from the Digital Library of India on 15.05.2014 (barcode 1990030041751).
- NKkR = Rāmbhadra Sārvvabhūma Bhaṭṭācārya: *Kusumāñjali-kārikā-vyākhyā*. Narendrachandra Vedantatīrtha (ed.): *Kusumāñjalikārikā of Udayanācārya. With the Commentary Kusumāñjalikārikāvākyā of Rāmbhadra Sārvvabhūma and Sanskrit Notes Compiled by Mahāmāhopādhyāya Chandidasa Nyaya-Tarkatīrtha*. (Asutosh Sanskrit Series 2.) University of Calcutta, Calcutta 1944.

- NKp = Udayana: *Nyāya-kusumāñjali-prakarāṇa*. (1) Laxman Shastri Dravid (ed.): *Nyāya Kusumāñjali*, by *Nyāyāchārya Śrī Udayanāchārya*, With the Commentary of *Mahāmahopādhyāya Vardhamānopādhyāya*, And the Gloss of *Mahāmahopādhyāya Ruchi datta*. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Book Depot, Benares 1912. (2) *Nyāya-kusumāñjalih ... Udayanācārya-viracitah ...* Brahmasūtriyuta-Kollūru-Somaśekharaśāstrin: *‘Āmoda’ samākhya vyākhyā ...* Bhāgavatācāryaśiromaṇi: *Viśama-shāla-ṭippanī*. Tirupati-nagara-saṁsthāpita Kusumāñjali-Samiti, Tirupati 1940. (3) Uttamur T. Viraraghavachārya: *Nyāya Kusumāñjali of Udayanācārya with the Kusumāñjalivistara, a lucid Commentary, and Annotation on Particular topics*. Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati, Series 31. Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati 1980. [Originally 1941.] (4) Padmaprasāda Upādhyāya; Dhunḍirāja Śāstrī (eds.): *The Nyāya Kusumāñjali of Śrī Udayanāchārya with four commentaries—The Bodhinī, Prakāśa, Prakāśikā (Jalada) and Makaranda by Varadarāja, Vardhamānopādhyāya, Megha Thakkura and Ruchidattopādhyāya and Notes by Śrī Dharmadatta (Bachchā Jhā)*. Kashi Sanskrit Series 30. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi 1957. (5) Mahāprabhulal Goswami (ed.): *Nyāyakusumāñjali of Udayanācārya. With the commentaries Āmoda of Śaṅkara Mīśra, Viveka of Guṇānanda, Bodhanī of Varadarāja, Parimala of Mm. Shri Harihara Kṛpālu Dvivedī*. Mithila Institute Series, Ancient Texts 23. Mithila Research Institute, Darbhanga 1972.
- NKpB = Varadarāja: *Kusumāñjali-bodhanī*. (1) Gopinath Kaviraj (ed.): *The Kusumāñjali-Bodhanī of Varadarāja Mīśra*. The Princess of Wales Saraswati-Bhavana Texts 4. Government Press, U. P., Allahabad 1922. [Chapters 1–3 only.] (2) Part of NKp. [Chapters 1–3 only.] (3) Part of NKps. [Complete.]
- NKś = (perhaps) *Kusumāñjali*: the 65 *śloka*s of the NKk.
- NP = Udayana: *Nyāya-pariśiṣṭa*. S. N. Srirama Desikan (ed.): *Udayana’s Nyāyapariśiṣṭa with Pañcīkā of Vāmeśvaradhvaṇa*. Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series 25, Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati 1976.
- NVTP = Udayana: *Nyāya-vārttika-tātparyā-pariśuddhi*. Pandit Vindhyeśvarī Prasād Dvivedin; Pandit Lakshmana Sāstrī Drāviḍa (eds.): *Nyāya-Vārttika-Tātparyā-Pariśuddhi by Udayanāchārya with a gloss called Nyāya-nibandha-prakāsa by Vardhamānopādhyāya*. Bibliotheca Indica 205, fasc. I—VIII. Asiatic Society, Calcutta 1911–1924. [First five *sūtra*s only.]
- AUFRECHT 1891 = Aufrecht, Theodor: *Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works and Authors*. Parts 1–3. F.A. Brockhaus; Otto Harrasowitz, Leipzig 1891; 1896; 1903.
- BHATTACHARYA 1958 = Bhattacharya, Dineshchandra: *History of Navya-nyāya in Mithilā*. Mithilā Institute Series 3, Studies No. 2. Mithilā Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, Darbhanga 1958.
- CHEMPARATHY 1972 = Chemparathy, George: *An Indian Rational Theology. Introduction to Udayana’s Nyāyakusumāñjali*. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, Vienna 1972.
- COWELL 1864 = Cowell, E. B.: “Preface,” in: NKkH: v–xv.
- DALAL 1937 = Dalal, C. D.: *A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Jain Bhandars at Pattan*. Ed. Lalchandra Bhagawandas Gandhi. Vol. 1. Gaekwad’s Oriental Series 76. Oriental Institute, Baroda 1937.
- DVIVEDIN 1916 = Dvivedin, Vindhyeśvarī-Prasāda: “Nyāyavārttikasya bhūmikā,” in: — (ed.): *Nyāyavārttika*. Vidyā-Vilāsa-Yantra, Vārāṇasī 1916: 1–170.
- DVIVEDIN 1992 = Dvivedin, Rāmacandra: “Prastāvanā,” in: NKkG: [9]–[24].
- GOSVAMI 1976 = Gosvami, V. B.: *A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Vrindaban Research Institute*. Parts I–IV. Vrindaban Research Institute, Vrindaban 1976–1985.
- HALL 1859 = Hall, Fitzedward: *A Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems*. Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta 1859.
- MĪŚRA 1968 = Mīśra, Śrī Nārāyaṇa: “Nivedana,” in: Śrī Nārāyaṇa Mīśra (ed.): *Śrīmad-Udayanācārya-viracitah Nyāya-kusumāñjalih, Śrī-Haridāsa-Bhaṭṭācārya-viracitayā vṛṭṭyā, Prabhā’khyayā saṁskṛta-vyākhyayā, Vibhā’khyayā hindī-vyākhyayā ca vibhūṣitah*. Bhāratīya-Vidyā-Prakāśana, Vārāṇasī 1968: (1)–(3)
- MĪŚRA 1986 = Mīśra, Vidyāvācaspati Śrī Rāmacandra: “Prastāvanā,” in: NKkJ: pp. ka–ca.
- MONAHAN 1920 = Monahan, Francis John: “The Early History of Bengal—VII.,” *Bengal Past & Present*, 21, July–Dec. (1920) 1–18.
- NGMCP = Nepalese German Manuscript Cataloguing Project, online catalogue at <https://www.aai.uni-hamburg.de/en/forschung/ngmcp>

- POTTER 1977 = Potter, Karl H. (ed.): *Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology. The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa*. Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. 2. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey 1977.
- POTTER 1995 = Potter, Karl H. (ed.): *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies. Bibliography*. Continuously updated online version (viewed 05.02.2018): <https://faculty.washington.edu/kpotter/xhome.htm>
- RADHAKRISHNAN 1940 = Radhakrishnan, E.P.: "A rare commentary on Nyāyakusumāñjali," *The Poona Orientalist* 4,4 (1940) 170–173
- RAGHAVAN 1966 = Raghavan, V: *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*. Vol. 2. Madras University Sanskrit Series 26. University of Madras, Madras 1966.
- RUZSA 2017 = Ruzsa Ferenc: "Istenérvek a hindu logikai iskolában" [Arguments for the existence of God in the Hindu school of Logic], in: Kendeffy Gábor; Vassányi Miklós (ed.): *Istenfogalmak és istenérvek a világ filozófiai hagyományában* [Concepts of God and Arguments for the Existence of God in the Philosophical Traditions of the World]. Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem; L'Harmattan Kiadó, Budapest 2017: 133–147.
- RUZSA–SZEGEDI 2015 = Ruzsa Ferenc; Szegedi Mónika: "Vasubandhu Viṃśikājának kritikai kiadása" [The Critical Edition of Vasubandhu's Viṃśikā], *Távol-keleti Tanulmányok* 7,1 (2015) 99–125.
- SASTRI 1931 = Sastri, P. S.: *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahāl Library, Tanjore*. Vol. XI. *Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya, Sāṅkhya & Yoga*. Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam 1931.
- [SCLB] 1911 = *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Sanskrit College Library, Benares*. Government Press UP, Allahabad 1911.
- SHASTRI 1974 = Shastri, Shrinivas: "Introduction," in: NKkN: xv–xxiii.
- SHIDA 2015 = Shida Taisei: "On the Date of Śivāditya. From the Viewpoint of the Theistic Definition of *pratyakṣa*," *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 63,3 (2015) 122–128.
- STEIN 1894 = Stein, M. A.: *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Raghunatha Temple Library of His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir*. Nirnaya Sagara Press; Luzac & Co; Otto Harrasowitz, Bombay; London; Leipzig 1894.
- VEDANTATIRTHA 1944 = Vedantatirtha, Narendrachandra: "Introduction," in: NKkR: xxvii–lx.
- YACH–KAUL n.d. = Yach, Dinanath; Kaul, Srikanth: *A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Library, Jammu & Kashmir Research and Publication Department, Government of Jammu & Kashmir, Srinagar, India*. [No publication date, compiled after 1989.]

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.