

A STUDY OF THE QUOTATIONS OF THE *KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI* IN THE LATE PĀṆINIAN GRAMMATICAL LITERATURE

Malhar KULKARNI

0. Introduction:

W. Rau published the Vedic quotations from the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (*KV*) in 1993.¹ The editors of the critical edition of the *Yuktidīpikā* (*YD*)² cite a line which according to them is a quotation of the *KV* in the *YD*. They used it for fixing the date of the *YD*. J.A.F. Roodbergen, in the introduction to his translation of the *Kirātārjunīya* (*KI*) mentions about the quotations he collected from the whole commentary of Mallināth on the *KI*.³ Ram Gopal dealt with a vedic quotation in the *KV* and the *Siddhāntakaumudī* (*SK*).⁴ But not once an attempt is seen made in the field of Indology, to collect independently, as far as possible, all the quotations explicitly attributed to the *KV* in at least the Pāṇinian grammatical literature. One of the editions of the *KV*, published some quotations of the *KV* found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* (*BV*).⁵ But it did not cover fully even the *BV* alone.

Such an independent attempt is made in a study carried out for the purpose of creating a tool towards critically editing the *KV*, with the help of more than 80 mss. The present paper is a part of this whole study. In the present paper an attempt is made to study especially two quotations of the *KV* in the *Śabdakaustubha* (*ŚA*), a text written by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita in the 17th century.

1 Rau [1993].

2 *Yuktidīpikā* (p. 11,10-11): “kartari yau tṛjakau tābhyām saha ṣaṣṭhī na samasyate !”

3 Roodbergen [1984].

4 Ram [1968].

5 *Kāśikā*, Vol. 1, pp. 39-40.

1.A Case Study:

'Pratidīvnā' is an instrumental singular of the word 'pratidivan'. The prakriyā to form the word 'pratidīvnā' is following:

<i>pratidivan + ā</i>	P.4.1.2
<i>pratidivn + ā</i>	P.1.4.18 & 6.4.134.
<i>pratidīvn + ā</i>	P.8.2.77.

The *KV* on P.1.1.58 (*na padānta ... /*) cites this example to explain the application of this sūtra and the negation of *sthānivadbhāva* in the operation of vowel lengthening. There the *KV* says: *pratidīvnā pratidīvne / pratidivann ity etasya bhasyety adhikṛtya trītyaikavacane caturthyekavacane ca allopo 'naḥ iti akāralopaḥ paranimittakah / tasya sthānivadbhāvād hali ca iti dīrghatvaṃ na syāt /* This means that in the form 'pratidīvnā' or 'pratidīvne' the nominal stem 'pratidivan' gets the term 'bha' when the instrumental or dative singular suffix follows, then the 'a' after 'v' gets deleted. In another instance, on P.8.2.78, the *KV* says: *pratidīvnetyatra hali ceti (P.8.2.77) dīrgha iti*. This means that in the form 'pratidīvnā' the vowel lengthening takes place by "hali ca" (P.8.2.77). Thus, it can be seen from the above instances that the *KV* accepts that P.8.2.77 is the sūtra which gets applied for the lengthening of the vowel, and rightly so.

But if we look at the *Nyāsa (N)* on the present sūtra, we find a statement saying that some mss. of the *KV* had the words "upadhāyāñ ca" in place of "hali ca" in the present passage: *upadhāyāñ cety etad idānīntana-kulekhaiḥ pramādāl likhitam / tathā hi upadhāyāñ cety atra vakṣyati – pratidīvna ity atra tu hali ceti dīrghatvaṃ iti /* (Trans.: The words "upadhāyāñ ca" are written [in place of "hali ca"], by stupid scribes, as an error. Because [the author of the *KV*] will say on [the sūtra] "upadhāyāñ ca" that in the form *pratidīvnā* the vowel lengthening occurs according to the sūtra "hali ca.")

Now, let us look at the two quotations attributed to the *KV* in *ŚA*.

1. *yat tu kāśikāyāṃ uktam upadhāyāñ ca tat prāmādikam / ... (On na padānta ... / P.1.1.58)*
2. *ata eva na padāntasūtre pratidīvnety atra upadhāyāñ ca dīrgha iti kāśikā'pi samgacchate / ācārakvibantād vicpratyaya iti tadāśayāt / (on P.3.1.11)*

We find that the opinion of *N* is echoed by *ŚA* on “*na padānt / P.1.1.58*” and in fact we see that *ŚA* there, records his opinion in the same words as the *N* does. Interestingly, the second quotation of *ŚA*, on P.3.1.11 says the contrary to the previous statement. However one thing is certain that both these quotations show that probably the mss. of the *KV* in front of *ŚA* had the reading “*upadhāyāñ ca*” in the passage on “*na padānta ... / P.1.1.58*” explaining the vowel lengthening in the form *pratidīvnā*.

Now, if we look at the mss. of the *KV*, we have a following picture on this point. Following mss. are used:⁶ a3(t), a6(g), a7(g), a10 (m), aa(dn), ba1(m), bh1(dn), bh2(dn), bh4(dn), bh5(dn), bh6(dn), bh7 (s), bh8(dn), g1(dn), g2(dn), g3(s), hp1(dn), hss(dn), io1(dn), io2(dn), io4(dn), io5(dn), io6 (dn), io7(s), jm2(dn), jm3(dn), jm6(dn), ld0(dn), st1(n), th1(t), v1(dn) and wai2 (dn). In all, these are 32 mss. Out of these, one is in Nandināgarī (n), two each in Telugu (t) and Grantha (g) and Malayalam (m), three in Śāradā (s), and remaining 22 in Devanāgarī (dn). After a careful study of these mss. on this point, we find that not a single ms. out of these mentions “*upadhāyāñ ca*” as a variant to “*hali ca*”. 18 mss. mention only “*hali ca*”, and most importantly 12 mss. mention both “*hali ca*” and “*upadhāyāñ ca*” as a variant reading to “*hali ca*”. In case of a6, this part of the sūtra, is illigible and in jm2 the variant goes near to the combined variant namely “*hali ca*” “*upadhāyāñ ca*”, because it reads “*hali cety upadhe varṇe* (Zill)”. The mss. which read “*hali ca*” [let us call them ‘h’] are:

bh1, bh2, bh4, bh5, bh8, g1, g2, hp1, io1, io2, io4, io5, io6, jm3, jm6, ld0 (all dn), io7 (s) and st1(n).

The mss. which read both “*hali ca*” and “*upadhāyāñ ca*” [let us call them ‘hu’] are:

a) a3(t), a7(g), a10(m), ba1(m), hss(dn), th1(t), v1(dn), wai2(dn), g3(s),

b) aa(dn), bh6(dn), bh7(s).

‘hu’b. is seperated from ‘hu’a., because the words ‘*upadhāyāñ ca*’ are recorded in them in margins. In aa, they are written in below margin, in bh6 they are written in right margin and in bh7, they are written on

⁶ The mss. are described in detail in my doctoral dissertation submitted to the University of Pune. Thus only sigla is mentioned in the present article. The letter stands for the name of the institute preserving that ms. or the city where the ms. is found. a stands for Adyar, Chennai; aa for anadasrama, Pune; ba for Baroda; bh for Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune; g for Göttingen; hp for Hoshiarpur; hss for Hindi Sahitya Sammelana, Allahabad; io for India Office, London; jm for Jammu; ld for Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Institute, Ahmedabad; st for strassbourg; th for Thanjavur and v for Vaidic Samsodhana Mandala, Pune.

top of the line. Thus it can be argued that they did not have the reading “*hali ca upadhāyāñ ca*” originally. Thus they can be considered as weak variants. But it is they that are most important to explain this variation. As mentioned earlier, the variant in jm2 can be considered as near to ‘hu’.

Thus on the basis of this above discussion, it can be said that only 9 mss. out of the 32 studied, have the words “*upadhāyāñ ca*”. If we take a closer look at ‘hu’a., we find that out of the nine, five come from different scripts of southern part of India, two in Malayalam, two in Telugu and one in Grantha. In fact, it can be said that all the mss. from these scripts, studied presently, have this reading. Out of the remaining four, one is in Śāradā and rest three are in Devanāgarī. If we look at ‘hu’b., we can see that two of them are in Devanāgarī and the remaining one is in Śāradā. If we look at ‘h’, we find that apart from 16 Devanāgarī, one Śāradā and one Nandināgarī support it.

Thus if this whole information is arranged in the chronological order, it will give us following picture:⁷

- 1408 - g1: ‘h’
- 1479 - bh6: ‘h’ and ‘u’ in the right margin.
- 1533 - wai2: ‘hu’
- 1547 - a10: ‘hu’
- 1632 - io5: ‘h’
- 1660 - bh7: ‘h’ and ‘u’ on top of the line.
- 1756 - hp1: ‘h’
- 1769 - jm6: ‘h’
- 1852 - jm2: ‘h’ and possibly ‘u’
- 1863 - io1: ‘h’
- 1868 - bh8: ‘h’

If we analyse this chronological picture, we can see that the words “*upadhāyāñ ca*” do not figure in 1408 in g1, but they do appear in 1479 in bh6, and remarkably, they appear in the margin. The characters in the margin do not seem to be different than the characters from the main text in bh6.

⁷ It is noted here, that dates of all the mss. studied are not available, thus only those mss. are mentioned here whose dates are available.

2. This fact can be possibly explained in following ways:

1. That either the scribe of bh6 himself made an addition, owing to the fact that he had a manuscript in front of him which had these words, but he was influenced by the remarks of the *N*, that the reading “*upadhāyāñ ca*” was a wrong one, and hence did not think it fit to incorporate it in the main body of the text and decided, however, to remain faithful to the ms. he was copying and hence wrote it in the margin.

2. If the above is not appropriate, it can be argued that the scribe who might have been a learned one, knew also the reference of “*upadhāyāñ ca*”, where the *KV* explicitly states that the vowel lengthening in *pratidīvnā* takes place because of “*hali ca*”, and hence mentioned it in the margin. Whatever possible reasons might be supplied in order to explain this marginal addition, but one can not deny the fact that this can be said to be the first occurrence of the words “*upadhāyāñ ca*” in the present scheme of the mss. Later on, we see that the two mss. of the 16th century dated, namely 1533 and 1547, both incorporate the words “*upadhāyāñ ca*” in the main text along with the words “*hali ca*”. It is difficult to say whether the mss. from the 16th century had in front of them, the ms. from the 15th century which first mentioned these words in the margin. But it can be said that it is possible that these mss. might have some interrelation through some other source, possibly another mss. which we do not know.

It can be said that when Bhaṭṭojī Dikṣita composed his *ŚA* in the 17th century, he had mss. in front of him which mentioned “*upadhāyāñ ca*”. Possibly that ms. must have had some connection with the two mss. from the 16th century which incorporated “*updhāyāñ ca*” in the main body of the text. Then, if we look at the mss. from the 17th century, which is the date of *ŚA*, and onwards, we find that all the mss. have only “*hali ca*”. Thus they can be said to be possibly influenced by the remark of *ŚA* which states in the first quotation mentioned above that “*upadhāyāñ ca*” is a wrong reading.

3. About the possible relation between the *N* and the *ŚA*:

It can be observed that the *ŚA* followed the *N* verbally in quoting the *KV*. But there is a possibility, although remote, that the remarks of *ŚA* might have influenced the mss. of the *N*, and might have led the copyists of the *N* to incorporate these remarks as the remarks from the

N. The reason behind conjecturing this possibility is the absence of any comments from any commentator previous to Bhaṭṭojī and even after him on the issue. Any way, further study is required to explore these hidden truths.

4. Conclusion:

We however for the time being, can conclude from the above discussion that the ŚA and the N, both had some mss., common between them, in front of them which mentioned “*upadhāyāñ ca*” in the concerned passage. It can be also concluded that these “common mss.” must have some relation with the presently available mss. of the KV, which mention “*upadhāyāñ ca*” in the concerned passage.

REFERENCES

PROMARY SOURCES:

Kāśikā (a commentary on Pāṇini’s grammar) of Jayāditya & Vāmana. 11 Volumes. Edited by Jaya Shankar Lal Tripathi and Sudhakar Malaviya and with the foreword by Biswanath Bhattacharya with the *Nyāsa* or *Vivaraṇapañjikā* of Jinendrabuddhi, the *Padamañjarī* of Haradatta Miśra and the *Bhāvabodhinī*, and Hindi exposition by Jaya Shankar Lal Tripathi. Vārāṇasi: Tara Book Agency (Prācyabhāratigranthamālā), 1986-1995 [Gives the vedic quotations with accent marks], Vol. 1.

Kāśikāvṛtti (KV). Edited by Swami Dwarika Das Shastri and Pt. Kalika Prasad Shukla. Varanasi: Pracya Bharati Prakashan, 1965.

Bhāṣāvṛtti (BV). Edited by Swami Dvarikadas Shastri, Varanasi: Tara Publications, 1971.

Yuktīdīpikā (YD), the most significant commentary on the *Sāmkyakārikā*. Critically edited by Albrecht Wezler and Shujun Motegi, Vol. 1, Alt und Neu Indische Studien 44, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998.

Śabdakaustubha (ŚA), 3 Vols. Edited by Vindhyeśvarī Prasāda Dvivedī and Gaṇapati Śāstrī Mokate, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1991.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Ram, Gopal

1968 “Vedic quotation in the *Kāśikā* and *Siddhāntakaumudī*”, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 48-49: 227-230.

Rau, Wilhelm

1993 *Die vedischen Zitate in der Kāśikā Vṛtti, nach Vorarbeiten S. Sharma Peris zusammengestellt von Wilhelm Rau*. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse / Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Roodbergen, J.A.F.

1984 *Kirātārjunīya* (I-VI) edited with Mallinath’s commentary *Ghaṇṭāpatha*, Introduction, translation and notes, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Lecturer

Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages

University of Pune

Pune