

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

## Udbhaṭa, grammarian and Cārvāka

(published in: *Linguistic Traditions of Kashmir*. Essays in memory of paṇḍit Dinanath Yaksha. Ed. Mrinal Kaul and Ashok Aklujkar. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld. 2008. Pp. 281-299)

The great History of Sanskrit Grammar by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (*Samskṛta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa*) mentions Kashmir (if one can rely on its index) in connection with only three grammatical authors: Patañjali the author of the Mahābhāṣya, Kaiyaṭa its commentator, and Kṣīrasvāmin the author of a commentary on the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha. The link of none of these authors with Kashmir is beyond doubt; nor is the Kashmirian connection of the grammarian to be introduced in this article, Udbhaṭa. This link, in the case of Udbhaṭa, is circumstantial: (i) We learn a great deal about him from Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, who was a Kashmirian; and (ii) he may have been identical with the learned *sabhāpati* of King Jayāpīḍa of Kashmir called Bhaṭṭa Udbhaṭa, mentioned in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī (4.495).

\* \* \*

The commentator Cakradhara, who may have lived in the eleventh century, refers in his Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga to the work of a certain Udbhaṭa in connection with the words *śobhā, cīrṇa, varṇa, vareṇya, gaṇeya, bhrājiṣṇu*, and *kāndīśīka*, whose derivation presents difficulties. Since this passage continues (and even refers back to) an earlier one, we will consider both, and also the passages from Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's Nyāyamañjarī which they explain.

[282]

The first passage from the Nyāyamañjarī occurs in the middle of a long critique of the reliability of Pāṇini's grammar. Here it states:<sup>1</sup>

**Ny1** anye tu śobheti cīrṇam iti na yāti pratibhettum iti mātur anuharatīti phalinabarhiṇau  
hy adyāseti<sup>2</sup> kāndīśīka iti bhrājiṣṇur iti gaṇeya iti vareṇya iti

<sup>1</sup> Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, Nyāyamañjarī, ed. Varadacharya vol. II p. 245-246; ed. Śukla vol. I p. 385; ed. Gaurinath Sastri vol. II p. 182-183.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of *phalinabarhiṇau hy adyāseti* two editions read *phalinabarhiṇaṃ balavānohyadyāseti* (Varadacharya) and *phalinabarhiṇau ghāsīti* (Śukla); the adopted reading seems to be the one known to Cakradhara.

lakṣyasamgrahabahiṣkṛtasmr̥tisamdehaviparyayāpratipādatkatvalakṣaṇaskhalitaṃ<sup>3</sup>  
 viplutaṃ ca pāṇinītantraṃ iti manyamānāḥ<sup>4</sup> tatra mahāntam ākṣepam atāniṣuḥ, sa tu  
 sthūlodaraprāya itīha granthagauravabhayān na likhyate /

The second passage from the Nyāyamañjarī occurs in a long defence of Pāṇini's grammar and responds to the first one:<sup>5</sup>

**Ny2** etena śobhā-cīrṇa-varṇa<sup>6</sup>-vareṇya-gaṇeya-bhrājiṣṇu-  
 kāndīśīkādiśabdāsamgrahasmr̥tisamdehaviparyayādīdūṣaṇāny api kaiścid  
 utprekṣitāni pratikṣiptāni mantavyāni, tāni ca tair eva samāhitānīti /

[283]

These passages deal with a number of words and phrases that are problematic from the Pāṇinian point of view. Some authors (*anye*, “others”) are of the opinion that Pāṇini's grammar is wrong in that it creates doubts and incorrect impressions and does not teach what it should teach,<sup>7</sup> this on account of these words which fall outside the collection of words produced by it. The second passage adds that these faults believed to be present by these authors (*kaiścid*, “some”) must be considered to have been refuted, and that they have as a matter of fact been answered by those authors themselves (*tair eva*). It will become clear from Cakradhara's commentary that with “those authors” Udbhāṭa is meant.

The problematic words and phrases mentioned in **Ny1** are: (i) *śobhā*, (ii) *cīrṇa*, (iii) *na yāti pratibhettum*, (iv) *mātur anuharati*, (v) *phalinabarhiṇau hy adyāsa*, (vi) *kāndīśīka*, (vii) *bhrājiṣṇu*, (viii) *gaṇeya*, (ix) *vareṇya*. Those mentioned in **Ny2** all also occur in **Ny1** — in a different order: (i), (ii), (ix), (viii), (vii), (vi) —, with the exception of (x) *varṇa*. Note that **Ny2** has dropped the three phrases that occur in **Ny1**, and has therefore only simple words.

Let us now turn to Cakradhara's comments on these two passages. The problematic cases in **Ny1** are explained as follows:<sup>8</sup>

[284]

<sup>3</sup> The editions read °*viparyayapratipādatkatva*°; Cakradhara's explanation shows that he had °*viparyayāpratipādatkatva*°. See note 5 below.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. Gaurinath Sastri reads *pāṇinītantramanyamānāḥ*.

<sup>5</sup> Nyāyamañjarī, ed. Varadacharya vol. II p. 259; ed. Śukla vol. I p. 391; ed. Gaurinath Sastri vol II p. 195.

<sup>6</sup> Ed. Gaurinath Sastri omits °*varṇa*°.

<sup>7</sup> Cakradhara, Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga, ed. Shah p. 176 explains the compound *smr̥tisamdehaviparyay[ā]pratipādatkatvalakṣaṇaskhalitaṃ* as follows: *smr̥tisamdehalakṣaṇaṃ viparyayalakṣaṇam apratipādatkatvalakṣaṇaṃ ca skhalitaṃ doṣo yasya tad evaitat*.

<sup>8</sup> Cakradhara, Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga, ed. Shah p. 176; ed. Gaurinath Sastri vol. II p. 182-183.

**Gb1 anye tu śobhā cīrṇam iti /**

- (i) tatra śobhety atra striyām ākārpratyayasyābhidhānābhāvād asādhutā aṇi tu śubheti syāt /
- (ii) cīrṇam ity atra prāptasya iṭaḥ akaraṇam aprāptasya ca itvasya karaṇam /
- (iii) na yāti pratibhettum īdṛśa<sup>9</sup> ity atra ca yātīśabde upapade tumun prayukto<sup>10</sup> na ca tatra prāptir asti yānakriyāyāḥ, pratibhedena kriyārthatvābhāvāt / śakadhṛṣa<sup>o</sup> (P. 3.4.65) ityādau ca yāter apāṭhāt /
- (iv) mātur anuhatīti atra ca karmaṇi dvitīyāyāḥ prāptāyāḥ aprayogaḥ /
- (v) phalinabarhināu<sup>11</sup> hy adyāsety atra aster asārvadhātuke 'pi bhūrādeśo na kṛtaḥ / balavān āyuskāmaṃ rohan vṛddham ...

(what follows is lost)

Cakradhara's comments on Ny2 read as follows:<sup>12</sup>

**Gb2 tenaiva pratisamāhitānīti / tathāhi śobhetyādau udbhaṭenaiva pratisamādhānam kṛtam /**

- (i) **a pratyayāt** (P. 3.3.102) iti prāk prakṛtinirdeśe kartavye prāk pratyayanirdeśād yogavibhāgakaraṇenāpratyayaṃ kṛtvā śobhā iti sādhyet /
- (ii) cīrṇam ity atra ca pratiśedhavidher baliyastvāt kvacid vihitabādhaḥ, teneha vihitasyeṭo bādhaḥ / anityam āgamaśāsanam iti vā / utvaṃ tu **ti ca** (P. 7.4.89) ity anena [285] sūtreṇa gatyarthacares<sup>13</sup> tena lakṣaṇārthasyetvena bhavitavyam / **ṛta id dhātoḥ** (P. 7.1.100) ity ataḥ sūtrād anantaraṃ **kṛtaś ca** iti kartavye yad upadhāgrahaṇam tad āvṛtījñāpanārthaṃ cagrahaṇam caitad rephāntam avaseyam / **upadhāyāś ca** (P. 7.1.101) upadhāyā ṛta itvaṃ bhavati / caḥ caraś copadhāyā itvam ity arthaḥ / car iti luptaśaṣṭhyantam /
- (iii) na yāti vākyaṃ pratibhettum ity atra ca yāti iti tinantapratirūpako nipātaḥ śakyate ity arthe vartate /
- (v) evaṃ hi adyāsa ity atrāpi āśāśabdo nipāta eva babhūva ity asyārthe /
- (iv) **kṛtyānām kartari vā** (P. 2.3.71) ity anantare 'pi vāgrahaṇe **tulyārthair atulopamābhyām tṛtīyānyatarasyām** (P. 2.3.72) ity atra yad vikalpavāci

<sup>9</sup> Ed. Gaurinath Sastri omits *īdṛśa*.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. Gaurinath Sastri reads *pratyayaḥ*.

<sup>11</sup> So ed. Gaurinath Sastri. The editor of the other edition (Shah) proposes this as emendation for *phalabarhināṃ*.

<sup>12</sup> Cakradhara, Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga, ed. Shah p. 180-181; ed. Gaurinath Sastri vol. II p. 195.

<sup>13</sup> So ed. Gaurinath Sastri. Ed. Shah reads *gatyarthavaces*.

- anyatarasyāṃgrahaṇaṃ tad vyavasthitavibhāṣārthaṃ tena kvacid dvitīyayāpi saha vikalpaḥ siddho bhavati tena mātur anukaroti iti siddham /
- (vi) kāndīśīka ity atrāpi abhiyuktair vyutpattiḥ kṛtaiva / sā ca darśitā / pratyayaḥ vibhaktyaluk cātrāpi prānnīyā prakāraviśeṣāśrayaṇena samarthayitavyaḥ /
- (vii) bhrājisnur ity atra tu **bhuvaś ca** (P. 3.2.138) iti caśabdasyānuktasamuccayatvād iṣṇupratyayo vṛttikāreṇa darśitaḥ /
- (ix) auṇādikānām api gamigāmibhāvīprabhṛtīnām yaugikatvadarśanāt **vṛṇa eṇyaḥ** (Uṇādi 3.98) iti eṇyapratyayena varenyah /
- (viii) evaṃ ganeyaśabde 'pi ṇer alopaḥ kayāpi bhaṅgyā cīrṇam itivat samarthyaḥ /

Cakradhara's two passages, unfortunately incomplete, supposedly present us with some difficulties (**Gb1**) and the [286] solutions suggested by Udbhaṭa (**Gb2**). Let us first concentrate on the five problematic words and phrases that are dealt with in both **Gb1** and **Gb2**.

- (i) The feminine noun śobhā is derived from the root śubh, but it is not clear what exact shape this derivation takes in terms of Pāṇini's grammar. The Mahābhāṣya and the Kāśīkā offer no help in this respect. According to **Gb1**, the feminine suffix ā (no doubt ṬāP by P. 4.1.4 **ajādyataṣ ṭāp**) cannot be added, no doubt because this requires first a suffix a after śubh. If one first adds the suffix aṅ, by P. 3.3.104 **ṣidbhidādibhyo 'ṅ**, the result will be śubhā.

**Gb2** offers the following solution. Split P. 3.3.102 **a pratyayāt** into two rules by yogavibhāga, which gives (1) **a** and (2) **pratyayāt**. The combined rule **a pratyayāt** allows for the addition of the suffix a to roots formed with a suffix. This suffix a would be very useful in the formation of śobhā, but the root śubh is not formed with a suffix. After yogavibhāga however, P. 3.3.102(1) **a** will not be subject to the condition that the root must itself be formed with a suffix, so that the suffix a can now be added to śubh. This in its turn will then justify the addition of the feminine suffix ṬāP, and the desired form śobhā will be obtained.

It is clear from Bhānuji Dikṣita's Rāmāśramī<sup>14</sup> that the formation of śobhā occupied the minds of other [287] grammarians as well. Bhānuji himself proposes to add the suffix aC, by P. 3.1.134 **nandigrahipacādibhyo lyuṇinyacaḥ**, which will lead to the desired

<sup>14</sup> Bhānuji Dikṣita, Rāmāśramī p. 45 (on Amara 1.3.17): śobheti // śobhayati “śubha śumbha śobhāyām” padādyac / yat tu mukutenoktam — śobhate 'nayā / “śubha śumbha śobhārthau” iti nirdeśāt **guroś ca halaḥ** ity akāraḥ — iti / tan na / arthanirdeśasyānārṣatvāt / yad api — **guroś ca halaḥ** iti cakārād apratyayaḥ ity tu vāyam — iti / tad api na / ākare tathānukteḥ / uktarītyā nirvāhac ca /

result. More interesting in the present context is his rejection of the position of a certain Mukuṭa, who proposed to add the suffix *a* by virtue of the rule P. 3.3.103 **guroś ca halaḥ**. This is the rule that immediately follows P. 3.3.102 **a pratyayāt**; Mukuṭa therefore opts for the same suffix *a* as Udbhāṭa, but in a slightly different way. However, Mukuṭa's solution is not without difficulties either, for P. 3.3.103 only applies to roots that have a metrically “heavy” syllable, which is not true for *śubh*. Mukuṭa tries to get around this difficulty, but his attempts do not carry much conviction. There is still a third option mentioned (and rejected) by Bhānuji: the word in *ca* in P. 3.3.103 **guroś ca halaḥ** indicates that also cases like *śobhā* are covered by this rule.

We see that Udbhāṭa was not the only one concerned with the word *śobhā*. He may however have been the only one to propose *yogavibhāga* of P. 3.3.102. The Mahābhāṣya does not comment this rule but mentions it once and silently uses it a few more times,<sup>15</sup> without ever suggesting *yogavibhāga*. The Kāśikā and its two commentaries Nyāsa and Padamañjarī do not suggest *yogavibhāga* in this connection either.

(ii) It appears that *cīrṇa* is looked upon as a past passive participle of the root *car*, presumably besides *carita*, formed with the suffix *Kta*. **Gb1** points out two weaknesses in its derivation: a) the augment *iṭ* (prescribed by P. 7.2.35 **ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ**, [288] as in *carita*) is not introduced, as it should, and b) the long *ī*, which should not be there, is introduced.

**Gb2** is not fully clear. It suppresses the augment *iṭ*, either on the authority of the rule *pratiśedhasya vidher balīyastvāt kvacid vihitabādhaḥ* “Because a prohibition is stronger than an injunction, what is enjoined is sometimes suppressed”,<sup>16</sup> or because the addition of augments is never obligatory.

From this point onward two alternatives seem to be presented in **Gb2** to account for *ī* rather than *a* in *cīrṇa*. The first one takes as point of departure P. 7.4.89 **ti ca**, which normally prescribes substitution of *u* for *a* in *car* and *phal* before a suffix beginning with *t*. For a reason that remains obscure to me, *i* must replace *a*, presumably only in the case of *cīrṇa*.

The second alternative is different. It starts from an observation with regard to the two sūtras P. 7.1.100 **ṛta id dhātoḥ** and 7.1.101 **upadhāyāś ca**. The first of these two rules accounts for the substitution of *i* for *ṛ* in roots that end in *ṛ*, as in *kirati* from *kṛ*, the

<sup>15</sup> See Lahiri, 1935: 32.

<sup>16</sup> I read *pratiśedhasya vidher balīyastvāt* instead of *pratiśedhavidher balīyastvāt*, on the authority of Mahā-bh II p. 38 l. 23-24 (on P. 3.1.30 vt. 1): *pratiśedhabalīyastvāt pratiśedhaḥ prāpnoti*. Cp. the Paribhāṣā *niśedhāś ca balīyāṃso bhavanti*, which occurs in various Paribhāṣā works (Abhyankar, 1967: 480-81).

second rule prescribes a similar substitution for roots whose penultimate is  $\bar{r}$ . The second rule is peculiar, because there is only one such root,  $kṛt$ . Pāṇini would have saved space by formulating this rule  $kṛtaś ca$ , which he has not done. The reason, we are told, is that 7.1.101 must really be read **upadhāyāś caḥ**, i.e., **upadhāyāś** [289] **car**. This *car* is, in spite of appearances, a genitive singular. P. 7.1.101, thus interpreted, does not only express its usual meaning, it also accounts for substitution of  $i$  for  $a$  in *car* so as to arrive at  $cīrṇa$ .

These explanations of the derivation of  $cīrṇa$  (or what we understand of them) differ from the one proposed in two modern Sanskrit dictionaries. Both the Vācaspatya and the Śabdakalpadruma derive  $cīrṇa$  from *car* with a suffix  $naK$ ; the presence of  $\bar{i}$  instead of  $a$  is explained with the help of P. 6.3.109 **prṣodarādīni yathopadiṣṭam**; the Śabdakalpadruma refers in this connection to the Trikāṇḍaśeṣa, a commentary on the Amarakoṣa.

(iii) The phrase *na yāti pratibhettum* appears to be a citation from literature. According to **Gb1** it goes against Pāṇini's grammar, because *pratibhettum* does not express the meaning prescribed by P. 3.3.10 **tumunṇvulau kriyāyāṃ kriyārthāyāṃ**, nor is the root  $yā$  one of those enumerated in sūtras like P. 3.4.65 **śakadhṛṣajñāglāghaṭarabhalabhakramasahārḥāstyartheṣu tumun** which can be followed by an infinitive in *tum*.

**Gb2** counters that  $yāti$  is here not a verbal form, but a particle (*nipāta*) meaning *śakyate*. The phrase *na yāti pratibhettum* means therefore something like “It cannot be broken”.

(iv) The expressions *mātur anuhati* (**Gb1**) and *mātur anukaroti* (**Gb2**) “he/she resembles his/her mother” should use an accusative rather than a genitive according to **Gb1**.

**Gb2** presents the curious argument that, because the two succeeding rules P. 2.3.71 and 72 each prescribe [290] optionality, this has been done in view of *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* “an option which does not apply universally in all the instances of a rule, which prescribes an operation optionally, but applies necessarily in some cases, and does not apply at all in the other cases” (Abhyankar, DSG). This supposedly entails that also the accusative prescribed by P. 2.3.2 **karmaṇi dvitīyā** can in certain cases be optional.

(v) The crucial word in this case appears to be  $\bar{a}sa$ , third person singular perfect of the root *as*. This form is problematic because *as* should have been replaced by *bhū* before

*ārdhadhātuka* suffixes, including the *ārdhadhātuka* suffixes of the perfect, by P. 2.4.52 **aster bhūḥ**. **Gb1** notes the difficulty. **Gb2** resolves it by stating that *āsa* is an indeclinable particle (*nipāta*) meaning *babhūva*. *Babhūva* is, of course, the form the perfect of *as* takes in case *as* is replaced by *bhū*.

Only **Gb2** preserves the discussion of four more problematic words:

(vi) “With regard to the form *kāndiśika*, too, the derivation has already been given by the expert, and it has already been shown. Here, too, the suffix [*ika*] and the non-elision of the [accusative] case-ending have to be justified in the previous manner by resorting to a specific procedure.”

This translation has been inspired by Bhānuji Dīkṣita's explanation of the same word (p. 490, on Amara 3.1.42): “*kām diśam yāmi*” *ity āha / tad āheti māśabdādibhyaḥ* (P. 4.4.1 vt. 1) *iti thak / pṛṣodarādīḥ* (P. 6.3.109) /. The suffix *thak* (= *ika*) is in this manner added to the words *kām diśam*, and the accusative ending of *kām* is maintained inside the new formation.

[291]

Bhānuji also gives another possible derivation of the word *kāndiśika*, this one proposed, once again, by Mukuṭa, with which he does not express disagreement. Since it is very different from the one first proposed by Bhānuji, and from the one presented in the passage under consideration, we will not deal with it.

(vii) “In the case of *bhrājiṣṇu*, however, the suffix *iṣṇu* has been shown [to be applicable] by the Vṛttikāra because the word *ca* in [P. 3.2.138] **bhuvāś ca** is [for the sake of] including cases not mentioned.”

The Vṛttikāra is most probably the author of the Kāśikāvṛtti, which indeed contains under sūtra 3.2.138 **bhuvāś ca** the remark: *cakāro 'nuktasamuccayārthaḥ / bhrājiṣṇunā lohitaandanena /*

(viii) “In the same way in the case of the word *ganeya*, too, the absence of elision of [the suffix] *Ṇi* has to be justified by some tortuous method, as in the case of *cīrṇa*.”

(ix) *varenya* is here clearly derived with the help of the suffix *eṇya* prescribed in Uṇādi Sūtra 3.98 **vṛṇa eṇyaḥ**.

(x) varṇa is dealt with neither in **Gb1** nor on **Gb2**.

The derivations proposed in **Gb2** fall automatically into two groups. Cases (i)-(v) strike us through their audacity. Their inventor, no doubt Udbhaṭa, does not hesitate to split a rule in order to accommodate the word *śobhā*; reckless changes in some rules do not deter him, if he can in this way find a derivation for *cīrṇa*; the decision to call *yāti* and *āsa*, in (iii) and (v) respectively, *nīpātas*, is daring but not very imaginative; the *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* presented in (iv) is artificial to the extreme. The derivations proposed in (vi)-(ix), in contrast, are completely regular, and refer to recognised authorities. The expert (*abhiyukta*) of section (vi) is either Kātyāyana (the author of P. 4.4.1 vt. 1), or Patañjali (who is [292] also elsewhere called *abhiyukta*). Section (vii), similarly, refers to the author of the Kāśikā. And section (ix) cites an Uṇādi sūtra to justify its derivation. The two groups represent in this manner derivations that seem to make fun of the Pāṇinian tradition and such as are examples of the correct use of that tradition, respectively.

This differentiation between two altogether different kinds of derivations is confirmed by passage (viii). This passage does not offer any derivation at all, but makes fun of another one. It obviously criticises a derivation that arrives at the form *gaṇeya* by suppressing “by some tortuous method” the suffix *Ṇi* that follows the root *gaṇ* because it belongs to the tenth class. In passing it also makes a scathing remark about the derivation of *cīrṇa*.

What can we conclude from all this? It seems beyond doubt that passage **Gb2** is corrupt. It starts off as what looks like a direct quotation from a work of Udbhaṭa. Passages (i)-(v) no doubt belonged to this work. Passages (vi)-(ix) disagree with Udbhaṭa and show the correct Pāṇinian derivations of some of the words concerned. Passage (viii) confirms that Udbhaṭa is being criticised here.

There is no reason to doubt that passages (vi)-(ix) represent Cakradhara's own opinion. In the original version of his text he no doubt cited passages from Udbhaṭa's work that dealt with **all** the difficult words announced at the beginning: *śobhā*, *cīrṇa*, *varṇa*, *vareṇya*, *gaṇeya*, *bhrājiṣṇu*, and *kāndiśīka*. Somehow only Udbhaṭa's discussion of the first two words was preserved in the one manuscript used for the edition of Cakradhara's text, followed by Cakradhara's discussion of the last four. The derivation of *varṇa* somehow lost out altogether.

This incomplete analysis of the text allows us to draw certain further conclusions. Udbhaṭa was obviously a [293] grammarian, or at least someone who felt entitled to



propose Pāṇinian derivations for difficult words. In doing so he felt almost completely free from the traditional interpreters of Pāṇini's grammar, most notably Patañjali and the author of the Kāśikā. He split rules where this suited him, and gave forced interpretations where this helped him to obtain the results he wanted. In a way he behaved in the same way as Patañjali had behaved many centuries earlier, but he did so at a time when many other grammarians had opted to recognise Patañjali as an authority. Udbhaṭa did not, apparently, look upon Patañjali as an authority.

This conclusion is confirmed when we consider the passage of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's Nyāyamañjarī on which Cakradhara comments. We find here a long section dealing with grammar as an instrument for Vedic interpretation.<sup>17</sup> Jayanta represents the opinion that grammar, like the Veda, is either beginningless (this is the Mīmāṃsā position) or it was pronounced by God at the beginning of creation (the Naiyāyika position); either way Pāṇini was not its real author. If people think that Pāṇini made it, that merely means that Pāṇini gave a specific shape to contents that are beginningless or created by God.<sup>18</sup> Jayanta [294] further points out that problems raised by the critic have been satisfactorily dealt with by the expert (*abhiyukta*), no doubt Patañjali.<sup>19</sup> Intelligent people (*nipuṇamatī*), who according to Cakradhara are “Bhartṛhari etc.”, have explained the irregularities that occur in Pāṇini's grammar.<sup>20</sup> It is clear from these passages that for Jayanta, Pāṇini's grammar contains the words of God himself and represents therefore the highest authority, if only interpreted in accordance with Patañjali's and Bhartṛhari's comments.<sup>21</sup> For him free interpretations of Pāṇini's rules that deviate from these commentators are inadmissible. Clearly Udbhaṭa was one of those who did not bide by these rules.

Our discussion so far has brought to light the existence of two kinds of grammarians, both apparently within the Pāṇinian tradition. On the one hand there were

<sup>17</sup> Nyāyamañjarī, ed. Varadacharya vol. II p. 219 ff.; ed. Śukla vol. I p. 373 ff.

<sup>18</sup> Nyāyamañjarī, ed. Varadacharya vol. II p. 258; ed. Śukla vol. I p. 391: *vedavat amṅānām<sup>a</sup> anādītvāt īśvarapraṇītatvād vā ... / saṃkṣepavistaravivakṣayā hi pāṇinipīṅgalaparāśaraprabhṛtayah tatra tatra kartārah prasiddhiṃ gatāḥ / paramārthatas tu veda iva tadartho 'pi, tadarthāvagamopāyo<sup>b</sup> 'pi hi<sup>c</sup> sarva evānādayaḥ, prajāpatinīrmitā vety evam aparyanuyojyā eva /*

<sup>a</sup> Ed. Śukla has *vedavedāṅgānām*.

<sup>b</sup> Ed. Śukla has *tadarthāvagamo*.

<sup>c</sup> Ed. Śukla has *prāyo hi*.

<sup>19</sup> Nyāyamañjarī, ed. Varadacharya vol. II p. 259; ed. Śukla vol. I p. 391: *yat tu śiṣṭānām api pramāditvam upavarṇitām kila purāṇair munibhir api bahubhir apaśabdāḥ prayuktā iti tatrābhiyuktaiḥ tadapanayanamārgaḥ pradarśita eva /*

<sup>20</sup> Nyāyamañjarī, ed. Varadacharya vol. II p. 259; ed. Śukla vol. I p. 391: *yad api pāṇinitantre dhātuprātīpadīkakārakādyanuśāsanaviśamṣṭhulativam anekasākham ākhyāpitaṃ tad api nipuṇamatibhiḥ pratisamāhitam eva /*

<sup>21</sup> This traditional attitude finds already expression in an introductory verse (no. 8) to his Nyāyamañjarī, translated as follows by B. K. Matilal (as cited in Pollock, 1985: 515): “How can we discover any new fact or truth? One should consider novelty only in rephrasing the older truths of the ancients in modern terminology.” (*kuto vā nūtanam vastu vayam utprekṣitum kṣamāḥ / vacovinyāsavaicitryamātram atra vicāryatām //*)

those who followed the rules of this grammar as interpreted by Patañjali and Bhartṛhari. Others, however, did not feel bound by the interpretations proposed by these commentators, and felt free [295] to propose altogether different interpretations where this seemed useful; one of these relative free-thinkers was Udbhāṭa.

We know from some verses at the end of the second Kāṇḍa of Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya<sup>22</sup> that some time before Bhartṛhari Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya had been recovered (by Candra) and made the basis of grammatical studies. The implication is that Pāṇini's grammar was, until that recovery, studied rather independently of the Mahābhāṣya. Various indications confirm that this was indeed the case.<sup>23</sup> The question that has not yet been answered is whether also after this turning point there were grammarians in the Pāṇinian tradition who did not follow the example of Candra and Bhartṛhari, and went on interpreting Pāṇini's grammar independently. The data discussed above show that Udbhāṭa was one such grammarian. We can conclude from this that there were “non-orthodox” Pāṇinian grammarians at least until the date of Udbhāṭa.

Of the writings of these “non-orthodox” Pāṇinian grammarians virtually nothing has survived.<sup>24</sup> This is not surprising. Orthodox grammar — i.e., grammar that looked upon Patañjali as the highest authority — gained the upper hand in the Pāṇinian tradition, so that works by unorthodox grammarians were not longer copied. Our information about these “deviant” grammarians depends therefore on references in works that *have* survived. Given the lacunary nature of our [296] information even about the orthodox grammarians, it comes as no surprise that we know very little about the unorthodox ones. Cakradhara's remarks about the grammatical views of Udbhāṭa are therefore most welcome.

Let us now turn to what else we know about Udbhāṭa. As it so happens, Cakradhara's Granthibhaṅga offers us various pieces of information about this remarkable person. It tells us that he was a Cārvāka, a denier of a yonder world. But within the Cārvāka movement, we further learn, he was a bit of a rogue (*dhūrta*). He interpreted the Lokāyata sūtras in ways that suited him, but were different from tradition (*yathāśrutārthatyāgenānyathā varṇayām āsa*).<sup>25</sup> Perhaps his most daring reinterpretation of Lokāyata sūtras concerned the

<sup>22</sup> These are the concluding verses of the commentary (Vṛtti) on the Vākyapadīya, and were written by someone different from Bhartṛhari.

<sup>23</sup> Some of these indications have been collected and studied in Bronkhorst, 1983; see further Bronkhorst, forthcoming.

<sup>24</sup> The one exception is the Paribhāṣāsūcāna or Paribhāṣāvṛtti probably wrongly attributed to Vyāḍi; see Abhyankar, 1967: 1-38; Wujastyk, 1993.

<sup>25</sup> Cakradhara, Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga, ed. Shah p. 43; ed. Gaurinatha Sastri I p. 100: *cārvākadhūrtas tv iti udbhāṭaḥ, sa hi lokāyatasūtreṣu vivṛtiṃ kurvan 'athātas tattvaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ' 'pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyur iti' sūtradvaṃ yathāśrutārthatyāgenānyathā varṇayām āsa / prathamāsūtre tattvapadena pramāṇaprameyasankhyālakṣaṇaniyamāśakyakaraṇīyatām āha, dvitīyasūtram api*

sūtra **bhūtebhyaś caitanyam**. Earlier Cārvākas had interpreted this to mean “Consciousness out of the elements”, taking the word *bhūtebhyaḥ* to be an ablative. Udbhāṭa preferred to read it as a dative, “Consciousness for the elements”, which profoundly changed a fundamental tenet of the system.<sup>26</sup> But Cakradhara [297] also identifies Udbhāṭa as one of the “well-educated Cārvākas” (*suśikṣitacārvāka*) mentioned by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa.<sup>27</sup> This suggests that Udbhāṭa's learning was generally recognised.

Further information about Udbhāṭa has been collected and discussed by E. A. Solomon (1978). She points out that he may have written a sub-commentary on the Nyāya Sūtra and may have been an Ālaṅkārika as well. (Does this explain Jayanta's characterisation “well-educated Cārvāka”?) She dates him in “the final quarter of the eighth century and the first quarter of the ninth century” or somewhat later.

For our present purposes it is of interest to note that at this relatively late date, around the year 800, Udbhāṭa united in his person two intellectual traditions which were both destined to disappear from Indian soil during the following centuries. The philosophy of the Cārvākas was of course one of these two. No texts of this school have survived, with the single exception of Jayarāśi Tattvopaplavasimha, which also contentwise is a special case. Around the year 800 the Cārvākas apparently still constituted a living tradition which had not yet disappeared.

But Udbhāṭa's style of practising grammar, too, was to disappear. Our reflections may have created the impression that he was a unique kind of theoriser, sometimes reckless in his proposals. However, this was more than just a personal trait of this particular person. We know that Pāṇinian grammar had gone through a period in which Patañjali's authority was not recognised and grammarians felt free to invent new interpretations of sūtras of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. This lineage of [298] Pāṇinian freethinkers had to compete with an orthodox tradition at least from the time of Bhartṛhari onward, a competition which the orthodox tradition won, so that the freethinkers lost out. Almost no texts belonging to the lineage of freethinkers have been preserved, partly no doubt because orthodox authors and readers felt no need to copy those texts. Some of their ideas can however be reconstituted by analysing the texts that have reached us.

---

*prameyānyamapratipādakam tena vyākhyātam / tatra hi 'pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyur iti' ya itiśabdaḥ sa evaṃprāyaprimeyāntaropalakṣaṇatvena tasyābhimataḥ /*

<sup>26</sup> Cakradhara, Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga, ed. Shah p. 197; ed. Gaurinatha Sastri II p. 257-58: *cirantanacārvākair hi bhāvīviktaprabhṛtibhiḥ bhūtebhyaś caitanyam iti sūtram bhūtebhya iti pañcamyantapadayojanayā vyākhyātam, bhūtebhya utpadyate caitanyam iti / udbhaṭena tu bhūtebhyaḥ iti padam caturthyantatayā vyākhyātam, bhūtebhyaś caitanyam bhūtārthaṃ caitanyam svatantram eva śarīrāmbhakabhūtopakāraḥ ity arthaḥ /*

<sup>27</sup> Cakradhara, Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga, ed. Shah p. 19; ed Gaurinatha Sastri I p. 52: *suśikṣitacārvākā udbhaṭādayaḥ.*

It may be more than coincidence that Udbhaṭa united in his person these two lost traditions. Neither of these traditions was slavishly traditional. The Cārvākas were against the belief in a here-after, and we have seen already that Udbhaṭa was not even willing to continue the Cārvāka tradition unchanged. The lineage of Pāṇinian freethinkers, too, was not willing to accept the final authority of a person such as Patañjali. It is true that they went on using Pāṇini's grammar; to the best of our knowledge they did not write altogether new grammars. Did they consider Pāṇini an authority, or did they just use his grammar for convenience's sake? It is hard to be sure about this. The way Udbhaṭa felt free to apply almost any trick to the rules of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, and to those of the Lokāyata Sūtra, suggests that he at any rate hardly looked upon these texts as authoritative in any literal sense.

### References

- Abhyankar, K. V. (1967): *Paribhāṣāsamgraha. A collection of original works on Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Post-graduate and Research Department Series, 7.)
- Bhānuji Dīkṣita: *Rāmāśramī (Vyākhyāsudhā)*. Commentary on the Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana or Amarakoṣa. Ed. Pt. Haragovinda Śāstrī. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1970. (Kashi Sanskrit Series, 198.)
- [299]
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1983): "On the history of Pāṇinian grammar in the early centuries following Patañjali." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 11, pp. 357-412.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (forthcoming): "Critique et transmission textuelles dans la tradition pāṇinéenne." *La transmission de textes en Inde*. Ed. Gérard Colas and Gerdi Gerschheimer. Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (section des Sciences religieuses).
- Cakradhara: *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga*. Ed. Nagin J. Shah. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology. (L. D. Series, 35.) (see also under Jayanta Bhaṭṭa)
- Jayanta Bhaṭṭa: *Nyāyamañjarī*. Vol. I (1969) & II (1983). Ed. K. Ś. Varadacharya. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute. (Oriental Research Institute Series, 116 & 139.)
- Jayanta Bhaṭṭa: *Nyāyamañjarī*. Ed. Surya Nārāyana Śukla. Second edition. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. Part I (1971) & II (1969). (Kashi Sanskrit Series, 106.)
- Jayanta Bhaṭṭa: *Nyāyamañjarī*. With Cakradhara's *Granthibhaṅga*. Ed. Gaurinath Sastri. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit Visvavidyalaya. 3 vols. 1982-1984.
- Lahiri, P. C. (1935): *Concordance Panini-Patañjali (Mahābhāṣya)*. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus. (Indische Forschungen, 10.)
- Solomon, E. A. (1978): "Bhaṭṭa Udbhaṭa." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 58-59 (1977-78), 985-992.
- Uṇādi Sūtra*. Edited, under the title *Uṇādi-koṣa*, with the commentary of Dayānanda Sarasvatī, by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka. Sonapat: Rāma Lāl Kapūr Trust. 1974.
- Wujastyk, Dominik (1993): *Metarules of Pāṇinian Grammar. Vyādi's Paribhāṣāvṛtti*. 2 tomes. Groningen: Egbert Forsten. (Groningen Oriental Studies, 5.)

### Abbreviations

- Abhyankar, DSG      Kashinath Vasudev Abhyankar and J.M. Shukla, A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar, Second revised edition, Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1977.