

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

BHAṬṬOJĪ DĪKṢITA ON SPHOṬA*

The philosophy of grammar has only four major representatives in the history of Indian thought. One of these is Bhartṛhari, who lived in the fifth century C.E. The other three lived more than a 1000 years later, in Benares, and may have known each other. The first of these three, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, was the paternal uncle of the second, Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa. The third one, Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa, was a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji's grandson. This shows that Bhaṭṭoji revived the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar after an interval of more than 1000 years.

The sphaṭa does not exclusively belong to the domain of the philosophy of grammar. It is true that a number of grammarians had ideas about this issue, but they were not the only, nor indeed the first ones to do so. The earliest notion of a word and of a sentence as entities that are different from the sounds that express them, may well be found in the early scholastic speculations of the Buddhist Sarvāstivādins, who were not grammarians. Not all of the later thinkers who expressed themselves on the sphaṭa were grammarians either. Some well-known examples are the following: The Yoga Bhāṣya, without using the term *sphaṭa*, propounds that the word is unitary and without parts.¹ The Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila Bhaṭṭa criticized the concept (in his Ślokaṁvārttika, chapter on Sphaṭavāda) but not without adopting an important part of it (viz., the indivisible speech sounds); the Vedāntin Śaṅkara did the same (on Brahmasūtra 1.3.28). Another Mīmāṃsaka, Maṇḍana Mīśra, wrote a treatise (called Sphaṭasiddhi) to prove its existence.

Bhaṭṭoji's understanding of the sphaṭa differs from that of most or all of his predecessors. There is a fundamental difference between his discussion of the sphaṭa in the Śabdakaustubha and most, if not all, of what had been said about it before. The sphaṭa, for Bhaṭṭoji's predecessors (and apparently some of his successors), was meant to solve an ontological issue, to respond to the question: What is a word (or a sound, or a sentence)? Within the grammatical tradition this

*Thanks are due to Madhav Deshpande, who made the *Praudhāmanoramā-khaṇḍana* of Cakrapāṇi available to me.

question had been asked in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* in the form: "What is the word in 'cow'?" (*gaur ity atra kaḥ śabdah*; *Mahā-bh I p. 1 l.6*). This question, and the answer to it proposed by Patañjali, had its role to play in subsequent discussions. Patañjali had not used the word *sphoṭa* in this context, but rather in connection with individual speech sounds. Individual speech sounds, words and longer linguistic units (called sentences in subsequent discussions) share a disturbing quality. They are all made up of constituent parts that succeed each other; these constituent parts do not coexist simultaneously. This can be illustrated with the help of the word like *gauḥ*, assuming for the time being that the constituent sounds are really existing 'things': *Gauḥ* is a succession of the sounds *g*, *au*, and *visarga*, which do not occur simultaneously. This inevitably raises the question whether such a thing as the word *gauḥ* can be said to exist; the same question can be repeated with regard to each of the constituent sounds (each of which is a succession of constituent parts), and with regard to longer linguistic units. The upholders of the *sphoṭa* maintained that all these linguistic units exist as independent unitary entities (often believed to be eternal) that are different from the vibrations whose succession manifests them. The issue discussed here is an ontological one which, in and of itself, has nothing much to do with semantic questions, even though words and sentences normally do express meaning, whereas individual speech sounds do not. All this changes with Bhaṭṭoji. For him the question is not so much 'What is a word?' or 'What is a speech sound?' but rather 'What is expressive?' The answer to this last question is, for Bhaṭṭoji: the *sphoṭa*. The *sphoṭa* is defined by its being expressive; other considerations are secondary.²

[For those acquainted with John Brough's article "Theories of general linguistics in the Sanskrit grammarians" Bhaṭṭoji's ideas may recall Brough's description of the *sphoṭa* as "simply the linguistic sign in its aspect of meaning-bearer (*Bedeutungsträger*)" (1951: 34, [406, 86]). Brough criticizes Keith's description of the *sphoṭa* as 'a sort of hypostatization of sound' and S.K. De's characterization of it as a 'somewhat mystical conception'. Whatever the applicability of Brough's understanding to the concept of *sphoṭa* held by Bhaṭṭoji and his successors, it seems clear that it is hardly if at all applicable to those thinkers who preceded Bhaṭṭoji.³ This does not imply that the *sphoṭa* as an entity was a 'somewhat mystical conception'. In many of its manifestations it is to be understood against the background of the omnipresent ontology of *Vaiśeṣika* in Brahmanical thought, in which a cloth is an altogether different entity from the thread that constitutes

it, and a pot a different entity from its two halves. This is what Bhaṭṭoji reminds us of when he points out that what he calls the *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa* is a single entity in the same way in which a cloth is a single entity.⁴ The modern study of sphoṭa and related issues is contaminated by ideas borrowed from Western philosophy and linguistics to the extent that a major intellectual effort is required to understand these concepts once again in their own cultural context.]

An article dealing with ‘Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita on sphoṭa’ should first show *that* such a changed concept of the sphoṭa finds expression in Bhaṭṭoji’s work. Next it should try to answer the question *why* this is the case; in other words, it should investigate how this concept fits in systemically along with Bhaṭṭoji’s other ideas, both philosophical and grammatical. And thirdly it might consider *what circumstances* allowed Bhaṭṭoji to deviate from the tradition which he was expected to continue.

The present article will be brief on the first point. It will show that Bhaṭṭoji’s concept of sphoṭa differs from its predecessors without presenting a full history of that concept. The question as to why Bhaṭṭoji introduced this change will be skipped in this article, to be taken up at another occasion. The remainder of this article will concentrate on the personality of Bhaṭṭoji and the circumstances in which he worked; this may help to explain his relative originality within the grammatical tradition which he represents.

BHATTOJI’S CONCEPT OF SPHOṬA

Bhaṭṭoji’s Śabdakaustubha presents in its first chapter eight points of view which are said to be possible with regard to the sphoṭa; these points of view accept respectively (i) the *varṇasphoṭa*, (ii) the *padasphoṭa*, (iii) the *vākyasphoṭa*, (iv) the *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa*, (v) the *akhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa*, (vi) the *varṇajātisphoṭa*, (vii) the *padajātisphoṭa*, and (viii) the *vākyajātisphoṭa*. This presentation comes after a long discussion which tries to determine which grammatical elements in a word are really expressive. This discussion becomes ever more complicated, and it turns out that the morphemes in a linguistic utterance are far from simple to determine. At this point Bhaṭṭoji continues (p. 7 l.1): “In reality expressiveness resides exclusively in the sphoṭa” (*vastutas tu vācakatā sphoṭaikaniṣṭhā*).

The first point of view which he then presents holds that all the constituent sounds, provided they occur in a certain order, are expressive. The Śabdakaustubha formulates it as follows.⁵

*kiñcidvarṇavyatyāsādinā śaktatāvachedakānupūrvībhaṅgasya pratipadam autsargi-
katvāt tatra ca kenacit kvacit prathamam śaktigrahāt kena kasya smāraṇam ity atra
vinigamanāvīrahād ṛṣabho vṛṣabho vṛṣa ityādāv iva kar kār kur cakar ityādīnām
prayogasamavāyinām sarveṣām eva varṇānām tattadānupūrvyachinnānām vācakateti
varṇasphoṭapakṣaḥ*

“Because a deviation from the sequence which delimits the state of denoting, by way of an interchange of sounds and the like, is natural in words, and because – since someone gets to know the denotative power of a word for the first time with regard to any one [possible sequence] – it is not possible to determine which [variant] calls to mind which [other one], the *varṇasphoṭapakṣa* is that all sounds (*varṇa*) that occur in an utterance and that are delimited by this or that sequence – as for example [the forms] *kar*, *kār*, *kur*, and *cakar* (in the case of the verb *kr*) – are expressive, just as in the case of the words *ṛṣabha*, *vṛṣabha*, *vṛṣa* etc. (which all mean ‘bull’).”

The preceding discussion of morphemes and the mention in this passage of various ways in which the root *kr* may appear in a verbal form suggest that the upholder of the *varṇasphoṭa* attributes primary expressiveness to morphemes. This is confirmed by some remarks later on in the discussion, where Bhattoji tries to show that the *varṇasphoṭa* finds support in the classical treatises. We read there:⁶

*aṣṭāv apy ete pakṣāḥ siddhāntagrantheṣu tatra tatropanibaddhāḥ | tathā hi, sthāni-
vatsūtre ‘sarve sarvapadādeśāḥ’ iti bhāṣyagranthaḥ | padyate ‘rtho ‘neneti arthavad iha
padaṃ na tu suptīnantam eva | tathā ca ‘er uḥ’ ity asya tes tur ity artha iti ṭīkāgranthaś
ca varṇasphoṭe ‘nukūlah | tathā sthānyarthābhīdhānasamarthasyaivādeśatvam iti
sthānentaratamaparibhāṣayaiva ‘tasthasthamipām’ ityādiṣu nirvāhāt tadarthaṃ
yathāsamkhyasūtram nārabdhavyam iti bhāṣyam api | padasphoṭavākyaṣphoṭau tu . . .*

“All these eight points of view have been explained at various places in the authoritative treatises. An instance is the Bhāṣya on the *sthānivatsūtra* (P. 1.1.56 *sthānivādādeśo ‘nalvidhau*) [which states:] ‘All [substitutes] are substitutes of whole *padas*’.⁷ In this passage *pada* means ‘what has meaning’, as shown by the derivation ‘meaning is obtained (*padyate*) by it’; it does not mean ‘what ends in a nominal or verbal affix’ (as it is defined in P. 1.4.14 *suptīnantam padam*). And similarly, also the Ṭīkāgrantha is in agreement with the *varṇasphoṭa* when it says: ‘the meaning of *er uḥ* is *tes tuḥ*’.⁸ Similarly the Bhāṣya [states] that, given that only something that is capable of expressing the meaning of the substituent [can be] a substitute, because one can accomplish [the desired effect] in the case of (P. 3.4.101) *tasthasthamipām* (*tāmtamtāmah*) with the help of the *sthānentaratamaparibhāṣā* (= P. 1.1.50 *sthānentaratamāḥ*), the *yathāsamkhyasūtra* (= P. 1.3.10 *yathāsamkhyam anudeśah samānām*) must not be used.⁹ The *padasphoṭa* and the *vākyaṣphoṭa* on the other hand ...”

All the examples in this passage concern morphemes, and the fact that immediately after it the *padasphoṭa* and the *vākyaṣphoṭa* are going to be discussed shows that this passage is about the *varṇasphoṭa* (as it says explicitly in connection with the Ṭīkāgrantha).

It follows from the above that the upholder of the *varṇasphoṭa* believes that primary expressiveness resides in the morphemes (primarily stems and suffixes) that make up words. And yet *varṇa* does not mean ‘morpheme’ but ‘speech sound, phoneme’.¹⁰ Bhattoji’s choice of terminology is confusing, and it appears that at a result some later thinkers ended up applying the term *varṇa* to morphemes, which was not Bhattoji’s intention.¹¹

This understanding of Bhattoji’s *varṇasphoṭa* is confirmed by the fact that the initial presentation of the *varṇasphoṭa* is followed by the statement that the expressiveness of morphemes is contested (*karprabhṛtayo vācakā na veti ceha vipratipattisarīram*).¹² The edition by Gopāl Sāstrī Nene, no doubt under the influence of Nāgeśa’s Sphoṭavāda, sees this as the final sentence of the section on the *varṇasphoṭa*. In reality it is a criticism of the *varṇasphoṭa* which serves the purpose of introducing the then following *padasphoṭa*. Indeed, Bhattoji explains two pages later that among the eight points of view on the sphoṭa each of the preceding views is refuted by the one that follows it, and that the final one corresponds to that of the authorities.¹³

It is clear that the upholder of the *varṇasphoṭa* as presented by Bhattoji does not worry about the question whether the sequence of sounds expressive of meaning really exists as an independent entity or not. The conviction that he has found what is expressive of meaning in language – viz., the sounds, provided they are used in a certain order – seems to be enough to satisfy him.¹⁴ Those who accept the then following two positions – the *padasphoṭapakṣa* and the *vākyasphoṭapakṣa* – are no more demanding. Since it is practically impossible in the spoken forms *rāmam*, *rāmeṇa*, *rāmāya* to separate the morpheme that designates the person Rāma, the adherent of the *padasphoṭa* accepts that only the whole word is expressive. Since complete words can be joined by sandhi in such a way that the resulting form can no longer be separated into two whole words (for example, *hare ava* becomes *hareva*, *dadhi idam* becomes *dadhidam*) the position called *vākyasphoṭapakṣa* maintains that only whole sentences are expressive. In these three cases the question as to the ontological status of meaningful elements is not raised, even less answered; we only know that words and sentences, like morphemes, consist of sounds that are delimited by a certain sequence.¹⁵

This changes with the positions that succeed it. The *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa* and the *akhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa*, and in a certain way also the three kinds of *jātisphoṭa*, correspond to the independent entities that had been postulated by earlier thinkers and which have a

distinct ontological status. In the case of the *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa* and *akhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa*, as we have seen, Bhaṭṭoji makes a comparison with a cloth which, from the Vaiśeṣika perspective, is ontologically different from the constituent threads. The fact, however, that three of the possible points of view which Bhaṭṭoji presents totally ignore the ontological side of the sphoṭa shows that the sphoṭa for Bhaṭṭoji is not primarily an ontologically independent entity, different from its constituent sounds or words. This is interesting if one remembers that something like an ontological craze characterizes much of classical Indian philosophy. It must suffice here to illustrate this with one example. Maṇḍana Mīśra in his *Sphoṭasiddhi*, when confronted with the view that speech sounds themselves might be expressive, responds:¹⁶ “This is not right, (i) because sounds do not singly convey [meaning], (ii) because they do not co-exist, and (iii) because they cannot act together since, as they occur in a fixed order, they do not co-occur at the same time,…” Clearly Maṇḍana Mīśra would not have been impressed with Bhaṭṭoji’s enumeration of possible points of view.¹⁷

Bhaṭṭoji insists that he did not invent the eight possible positions about the sphoṭa himself. We have already seen that he cites two passages from the *Mahābhāṣya* and one from a *Ṭikāgrantha* (probably Kaiyata) to support the *varṇasphoṭapakṣa*. The first *Bhāṣya* passage, which occurs under P. 1.1.20 (*Mahā-bh* I p. 75 1.13) and P. 7.1.27 (*Mahā-bh* III p. 2511.12), is the first half of a verse that states: “All [substitutes] are substitutes of whole *padas* according to Pāṇini the son of Dākṣī; for if there were modification of a part of a *pada*, they could not be eternal” (*sarve sarvapatādeśā dākṣīputrasya pāṇineḥ | ekadeśavikāre hi nityatvam nopapadyate*//). This verse clearly presupposes that *padas* are eternal, and it is also clear that the term is not used here in its usual technical sense. It appears to imply that according to the author of this verse, and apparently according to Patañjali as well, morphemes are eternal. This means, if anything, that morphemes are different from the constituent speech sounds, and does not therefore support Bhaṭṭoji’s *varṇasphoṭapakṣa*, the position according to which speech sounds are expressive if they occur in a certain order.¹⁸

The second *Bhāṣya* passage invoked to justify the *varṇasphoṭapakṣa* must be the following one on P. 1.3.10 (*yathāsamkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām*):¹⁹ “What example is there with regard to this [sūtra]? is... [An example is] (P. 3.4.101:) *tasthasthamipām tāmtamtāmāḥ* ‘The *tas*, *thas*, *tha* and *miP* replacements for *LA*, marked with *Ñ*, are obligatorily replaced by *tām*, *tam*,

ta and *am*, respectively.²⁰ But is not the same established by what is nearest with respect to place (by P. 1.1.50 *sthāne 'ntaratamaḥ* '[A substitute coming] in the place [of an original should be] the nearest'²¹)? How is there nearness [between these substitutes and their substituends]? Something expressive of singularity will come in the place of something expressive of singularity, something expressive of duality in the place of something expressive of duality, something expressive of plurality in the place of something expressive of plurality." This passage implies that suffixes (or at any rate certain suffixes) have meaning, but this is only part of the position which Bhaṭṭoji ascribes to the upholder of the *varṇasphoṭa*.

The evidence marshaled from authoritative works for the *varṇasphoṭa*, as will be clear from the above, is weak. For the *padasphoṭa* and the *vākyasphoṭa*, on the other hand, Bhaṭṭoji can directly refer to a passage by Kaiyaṭa on the words *yenoccāritena ...* in the Paspasāhnikā of the Mahābhāṣya,²² where it is stated that according to the grammarians words and sentences are different from their constituent sounds and that only they, unlike the latter, are expressive of meaning; they are, furthermore, called *sphoṭa*.²³ Bhaṭṭoji adds, as he must, that Kaiyaṭa's passage deals with the *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa* and *akhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa*.²⁴

In order to lend textual support to his *sakhaṇḍa padasphoṭa* and *vākyasphoṭa* Bhaṭṭoji cites a passage that occurs at various places in the Mahābhāṣya and which states that there must be eternal, unchanging sounds in eternal words.²⁵ This passage may have puzzled more than one theoretician of the *sphoṭa*. By stating that there are eternal sounds in eternal words it somehow disagrees with the classical position on the *sphoṭa*, which holds the opposite: the word (= word-*sphoṭa*) is an entity different from the sounds, so that there are no sounds in the word. Nor does it agree with Bhaṭṭoji's position, which does not assign ontological independence to the *sakhaṇḍapadasphoṭa*. Kaiyaṭa interprets this Bhāṣya passage as expressing the *jātisphoṭapakṣa*; Bhaṭṭoji, as we have seen, interprets it differently. Whatever may have been Patañjali's original intention, Bhaṭṭoji interprets this passage in a way which deviates from the preceding tradition so as to justify his new understanding of *sphoṭa*.

Bhaṭṭoji refers to further passages from Kaiyaṭa to bolster his presentation of eight positions about the *sphoṭa*.²⁶ The first of these passages does not read, as claimed by Bhaṭṭoji, *kecid varṇasphoṭam apare padasphoṭam vākyasphoṭam cāhuh*, but rather: *kecid dhvanivyāṅgyam varṇātmakam nityam śabdām āhuh | anye*

varṇavyatiriktam padasphoṭam icchanti | vākyasphoṭam apare samgirante/.²⁷ Contrary to Bhaṭṭoji's claim, it does not mention the *varṇasphoṭa*. We may assume that Bhaṭṭoji considered the first part of this passage (... *varṇātmakam nityam śabdām* ...) to support his *varṇasphoṭa*, *sakhaṇḍapadasphoṭa* and *sakhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa*, the second part (... *varṇavyatiriktam padasphoṭam* ...) to support his *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa*, and the third ([*varṇavyatiriktam*] *vākyasphoṭam* ...) his *akhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa*. The phrase *kecit dhvanivyaṅyam varṇātmakam nityam śabdām āhuḥ*; is no doubt most amenable to an interpretation in accordance with Bhaṭṭoji's first three kinds of *sphoṭa*, but the very fact that the 'some' referred to by Kaiyata consider the word which consists of speech sounds (*varṇātmaka*) to be eternal (*nitya*) suggests that they assign to it an ontological status of its own, contrary to Bhaṭṭoji's first three kinds of *sphoṭa*. Indeed, this phrase looks like a paraphrase of the Bhāṣya line *nityeṣu śabdeṣu kūtasthair avicālibhir varṇair bhavitavyam* which we considered above. We saw that Kaiyata looked upon this line as an expression of the *jātiṣphoṭapakṣa*. We must conclude that Kaiyata's own phrase *kecit dhvanivyaṅyam varṇātmakam nityam śabdām āhuḥ*, too, must in all probability be understood as an expression of that same *jātiṣphoṭapakṣa*. It does not therefore support Bhaṭṭoji's first three kinds of *sphoṭa*.

Bhaṭṭoji then refers to Kaiyata's comments on Śivasūtra 1 *a i u ṇ*, which oppose a *vyaktisphoṭavādin* to a *jātiṣphoṭavādin*. Confusingly, Kaiyata's comments concern the Bhāṣya passage which contains the same line *nityeṣu śabdeṣu kūtasthair avicālibhir varṇair bhavitavyam* which, as we have seen, had been invoked by Bhaṭṭoji to support the *sakhaṇḍapadasphoṭa* (and *sakhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa*). We had occasion to point out that Kaiyata, contrary to Bhaṭṭoji, found in this line support for the *jātiṣphoṭapakṣa*. It appears therefore that Bhaṭṭoji invokes a passage from Kaiyata with which he disagrees to support the greater force of the *jātiṣphoṭapakṣa*.²⁸

Kaiyata's third passage occurs at the end of the second Āhnikā and comments on the Bhāṣya words *akṣaram na kṣaram vidyāt* (Mahā-bh I p. 36 l. 6). Here Kaiyata mentions the *varṇasphoṭa*, the *padasphoṭa* and the *vākyasphoṭa*, and ascribes to them *vyavahāranityatā* 'eternality for practical purposes'. If Bhaṭṭoji is to be believed, Kaiyata ascribes full eternality to the *jātiṣphoṭa*, but this is less clear from his text as found in the printed editions.²⁹ Bhaṭṭoji mentions a variant reading – which appears to agree with the editions I have used – in which the *jātiṣphoṭa* is looked upon as 'eternal for practical

purposes'.³⁰ But whatever reading one accepts, the most one can deduce from Kaiyaṭa's statement is that he recognized six kinds of sphoṭa, which are probably to be identified as the *akhaṇḍavarṇasphoṭa* (which has little or nothing in common with Bhaṭṭoji's *varṇasphoṭa*), the *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa*, the *akhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa*, and the *varṇajātisphoṭa*, the *padajātisphoṭa*, and the *vākyajātisphoṭa*.

At this point Bhaṭṭoji claims further support from the side of Patañjali and Kaiyaṭa on P. 1.1.46 *ādyantau takitau*.³¹ Patañjali is supposed to have mentioned the *varṇasphoṭa* and the *padasphoṭa* here. This is subject to interpretation, for these terms in any case are not to be found in this part of the Mahābhāṣya (nor indeed anywhere else in this text). The words ascribed to Kaiyaṭa are relatively close to Kaiyaṭa's own, with this difference again that Kaiyaṭa does not here use the expression *padasphoṭa*.³² What he refers to would be, in Bhaṭṭoji's terminology, the *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa*.

Bhaṭṭoji then rounds off his discussion by pointing out that all this has been clearly set out by Patañjali and Kaiyaṭa on sūtras 1.2.45 (*arthavad adhātur ...*), 1.1.68 (*svam rūpaṃ śabdasya ...*), 1.1.70 (*taparas tatkālasya*), and elsewhere.³³ When looking up these passages, one is disappointed. Only on P. 1.1.70 does Patañjali use the word sphoṭa, and Kaiyaṭa the expression *vyaktisphoṭa*. Kaiyaṭa here refers back to the Paspasāhnikā under *yenocāritena ...* (discussed above), where, he says, the matter has been considered.³⁴

It seems clear from the above that Kaiyaṭa's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya mentions many of the kinds of sphoṭa which Bhaṭṭoji enumerates. There is however a major difference. All kinds of sphoṭa accepted by Kaiyaṭa have primarily ontological status, they are existing entities that are different from their parts. Some of these sphoṭas (viz., words and sentences) have meaning, others (sounds) do not. With Bhaṭṭoji expressiveness becomes the defining characteristic of all types of sphoṭa, their ontological status being secondary. Bhaṭṭoji does not reject the ontological sphoṭas – on condition, of course, that they have meaning – but adds them to other sphoṭas that have no independent existence. The result is his list of eight kinds of sphoṭa, some of which had not figured in Sanskrit literature before him.³⁵

BHATTOJI'S PERSONALITY AND CIRCUMSTANCES

It is now time to consider what we know about Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita as a person. It turns out that to study a recent thinker like him is very

different from studying early Sanskrit authors. We know next to nothing about Bhartṛhari and most other Sanskrit authors of his time. About Bhaṭṭoji we know a fair amount.³⁶ If we take the bits of information collected in the secondary literature (all of which I have not been able to verify) we get the following picture. Bhaṭṭoji came from the South (perhaps Mahārāṣṭra³⁷) and ended up in Benares³⁸ where he became the student of a well-known grammarian, Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa.³⁹ Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa was not his only teacher – also Appayya Dīkṣita⁴⁰, Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa⁴¹ and Nṛṣimhāśrama⁴² are sometimes stated to have been his teachers –, but Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa plays an important role in what follows. Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa himself is known for his commentary on Rāmacandra's Prakriyākaumudī, called Prakāśa, and we may assume that Bhaṭṭoji was trained by Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa in the Prakriyākaumudī. This work was going to be the source of inspiration for his own Siddhāntakaumudī.

However, the relationship between Bhaṭṭoji and the descendants of his teacher turned sour after the death of the latter. Many of the details remain obscure, but a variety of facts and sources allow us to get a reasonably clear picture of the situation. They are as follows.

Bhaṭṭoji did not only compose the Siddhāntakaumudī, which follows the model of the Prakriyākaumudī and improves upon it, but also a commentary on it, known by the name Prauḍha Manoramā. In this commentary he criticizes the Prakriyākaumudī as well as the commentary composed by his own teacher, Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa.⁴³

Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa had not been the first to write a commentary on the Prakriyākaumudī. The grandson of its author, called Viṭṭhala, had composed one called Prasāda. Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa often critically refers to this commentary, and calls its author *prāc* 'the former one'.⁴⁴ (Rāmacandra the author of the Prakriyākaumudī is referred to as *ācārya*, even though Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa does not always agree with him.) This word *prāc*, it appears, often designates preceding authors of similar works. Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's Prakriyāprakāśa therefore refers in this way to the preceding commentator on the Prakriyākaumudī, viz. Viṭṭhala. Bhaṭṭoji's Prauḍha Manoramā uses the term, similarly, to refer to the author of the preceding Prakriyāgrantha, viz. Rāmacandra.⁴⁵ Bhaṭṭoji's Śabdakaustubha, which is a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya (see below), uses *prāc* to refer to the preceding commentator of the Mahābhāṣya, viz. Kaiyaṭa.⁴⁶ The use of this word is not pejorative, as is shown by the fact that Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha's Kucamardinī, which was composed to defend the Prakriyākaumudī and its commentator Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, refers to the

author of the Prakriyākaumudī as *prācīnaprakriyāgranthakṛt* (e.g. ed. Sadāshiva Sharma p. 161.1; ed. Madhusudana p. 25 1.5, p. 31 1.7).

As already stated, Bhaṭṭoji uses the term *prāc* in his Prauḍha Manoramā to refer to Rāmacandra the author of the Prakriyākaumudī. This text contains numerous references to this ‘former one’ (*prāc*) whose book (*grantha*) is sometimes called *prakriyāgrantha*.⁴⁷ Connected with the ‘former one’ Bhaṭṭoji sometimes mentions his commentator (note the use of the plural), as well as the ‘author of the Prasāda’. This happens, for example, in a passage whose structure is as follows:⁴⁸

yat tu prācā ... uktam, yac ca tadvyākhyātr̥bhir ... uktam, yac c[a] ... prasādakṛtā ... kṛtaṃ, tad etat sakalaṃ bhāṣyakaiyatāparyālocanamūlakam.

“What has been stated by the former one, and what has been stated by his commentator, as well as what has been done by the author of the Prasāda, all this is based on a lack of careful consideration of the Bhāṣya and Kaiyata.”

This passage shows us the way in which Bhaṭṭoji criticizes his predecessors. It also allows us to identify them with precision. The words which Bhaṭṭoji attributes to ‘the former one’ (*veti kecit / sakhyah, sukhyah, sakhyuh, sukhyuh*; with variant for the last four words: *sakhyah, sukhyah*) clearly corresponds to the following passage from the Prakriyākaumudī (ed. Trivedi I p. 167, on P. 7.3.116; cp. ed. Mīśra I p. 260): *veti kecit / sakhyah, sakhyah*, with variants for the last word: *sakhyuh* and *sukhyuh*. Bhaṭṭoji attributes to the author of the Prasāda five metrical lines (two and a half śloka). These occur in the commentary called Prasāda of Viṭṭhala (I p. 167 1.12–16) in exactly the same form. The ‘commentator’, finally, is attributed with the following words: *ubhayam apy etad bhāṣye sthitam*. This phrase occurs in Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa, in exactly this form (I p. 260 1.21).⁴⁹ In other words, the ‘commentator’ is Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Bhaṭṭoji’s former teacher.

We see from this passage that Bhaṭṭoji’s criticism of his predecessors is direct, but not impolite. The following passage, in which Bhaṭṭoji criticizes the ‘former one’ (*prāc*), i.e. Rāmacandra, along with his grandson (*tatpautra*), i.e. Viṭṭhala, provides another example of this:⁵⁰

yat tu prācoktam ‘uñāv itāv’ iti, yac ca tatpautreṇa vyākhyātam ‘ukāra ugīkāryārtha’ iti, tad asaṅgatam iti bhāva.

“The idea is that what has been stated by the former one – viz., that *u* and *ñ* [in *asuñ* which is prescribed in P. 7.1.89 *pumso ‘suñ*] are markers – and what has been explained by his grandson – viz., that *u* is there in order that the effect of having *u, r /* as marker [may apply] (by P. 7.1.6 *ugītas ca*) – is impossible.”

The remark attributed to the ‘former one’ is found in the *Prakriyākaumudī* (ed. Trivedi I p. 283; ed. Mīśra I p. 387), and the one attributed to his grandson in *Vitthala’s Prasāda* (I p. 283).

Bhaṭṭoji’s criticism of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa is polite, too. We have seen that the latter is sometimes referred to as ‘his commentator’ (in the plural). He is occasionally referred to as *prāc* ‘former one’ but always, it seems, in the plural.⁵¹ Elsewhere Bhaṭṭoji gives no specification as to whom he is referring to, simply saying ‘they say’. For example, his statement *yat tu vadanti: ‘napuṃsake śasi yuñji ity atra num na syād’ iti*⁵² refers to a line in Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s *Prakāśa* which says: *tena napuṃsake śasi yuñji ity atra num bhavati*.⁵³ And Bhaṭṭoji’s *yat tu vyācakhuyh: ‘upadeśakāle yau śakāranakārau tadantety arthaḥ | devadattasya gurukulam itivat samudāyena sambandhān nāsamartha[sa]māsa’ iti*⁵⁴ literally cites a passage from Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s *Prakāśa*.⁵⁵ Sometimes Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa is referred to under the heading ‘others’ (again in the plural). Bhaṭṭoji mentions, for example, ‘others’ in connection with Rāmacandra (*prāc*) and Vitthala (*tatpautra*) in the following line: *yac cānyair ‘vārttikena pūritam artham udāharati’ ity avatāritam*.⁵⁶ The phrase attributed to these ‘others’ occurs in exactly that form in Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s *Prakāśa*.⁵⁷ But however politely Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s positions are referred to, they are always rejected.

[The *Praudha Manoramā* also refers to an *Ṭikākṛt* on the *Prakriyākaumudī*. On the one occasion that has come to my notice it ascribes a phrase to him which occurs in but slightly different form both in *Vitthala’s Prasāda* and Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s *Prakāśa*.⁵⁸ This designation therefore remains ambiguous.]

It is true that Bhaṭṭoji did not write his *Praudha Manoramā* until after the death of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa.⁵⁹ It is also true that while referring to his teacher he respectfully uses the plural (*(tad)vyākhyātrbhiḥ, anyaiḥ, prāñcaḥ*, or quite simply a plural form of the verb) where the singular has to be good enough for Rāmacandra (*prācā*) and his grandson Vitthala (*tatpautreṇa, prasādakṛtā*).⁶⁰ It is even true that he begins this commentary with a verse in which he emphasizes that he has composed it after careful reflection on his teacher’s words.⁶¹ We yet learn that the family of his teacher was not amused by the systematic rejection of the latter’s points of view. Both Cakrapāṇi (or Cakrapāṇidatta), the son of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s son Śeṣa Vireśvara⁶², and Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, Vireśvara’s pupil, composed a criticism of the *Praudha Manoramā*.⁶³ According to the latter, Bhaṭṭoji’s mind had been marred by hatred for his teacher (ed. Sadashiva Sharma p. 2; ed. Madhusudana p. 3: *gurudveśadūṣitamati*). These critical

attacks were answered by Bhaṭṭoji's grandson Hari Dīkṣita in his (Bṛhat) Śabdaratna.⁶⁴ Isolated remarks in these commentaries create the impression that strong feelings were involved in these debates, yet that the most common and apparently most appropriate way to express them was through the intermediary of complex and detailed discussions of difficult technical points of grammar. The participants in these debates must have thought that this was the surest way to be heard and to score points.

Unfortunately we do not know whether Bhaṭṭoji lived to see his positions defended by his grandson. For his own attitude toward his critics we only have an uncertain tradition to go by, which records that he called Jagannātha a *mleccha*.⁶⁵ If it is true that he did so (which is uncertain), we do know what specific circumstance made him use this term. For Jagannātha, according to a claim which I am in no position to verify, had been introduced to the court of the Mughal ruler Shah Jahan by the Mahārāja of Jaipur, where, according to one account, he had defeated the Moslim scholars present and refuted their claim to the extent that Sanskrit was not the original language; Sanskrit, according to them, had developed out of Arabic.⁶⁶ He had subsequently been honored by the emperor, who is believed to have bestowed on him the title *paṇḍitarāja*.⁶⁷ But Jagannātha had been careless enough to start a relationship with a Moslim woman called Lavaṅgī, whom he married.⁶⁸ It is not clear whether at that occasion he converted to Islam, but it seems beyond doubt that it took some time before he once again found favor with the Sanskrit scholars of Benares. Bhaṭṭoji's accusatory use of the term *mleccha* 'barbarian, sinner, heathen' makes a lot of sense in this context.

In view of all that precedes we are entitled to conclude that for some length of time a lively debate took place in Benares, in which critics of the Siddhāntakaumudī and its commentary Praudha Manoramā were pitched against those who sympathized with Bhaṭṭoji (or simply admired the Siddhāntakaumudī for its intellectual qualities).⁶⁹ It seems beyond doubt that not only academic opinions fueled this debate, and that for the main participants it had deep personal roots, connected with judgments about how one should behave towards one's teacher, or when choosing one's bride. It is at the same time clear that these personal feelings and judgments were to at least a considerable extent funneled, so to say, through detailed academic – or if you prefer: scholastic – debate.

We can delve a bit deeper into Bhaṭṭoji's past and find out more about an earlier phase of his relationship with his teacher Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa.

Bhaṭṭoji is known to have written two grammatical works before the *Siddhāntakaumudī* and the *Prauḍha Manoramā*. These are the *Śabdakaustubha* and the one known by the names *Vaiyākaraṇa Bhūṣaṇa Kārikā* and *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana*. It is in these works that we find most of his ideas about the philosophy of grammar. These ideas did not bring him instant fame, it appears. The *Śabdakaustubha* has only in part been preserved, which suggests that it was not much used in the beginning. Regarding the *Vaiyākaraṇa Bhūṣaṇa Kārikā* the view has been propounded that it has only survived along with – i.e., included in – the commentaries of *Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa*. That would mean that, if *Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa* had not composed these commentaries, this work might not have survived.⁷⁰ Not unrelated to this issue is the uncertainty which exists regarding the name which Bhaṭṭoji himself gave to this second work. Later authors – among them *Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa*, *Hari Dīkṣita* and *Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍa* – call it *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana*.⁷¹ However, it seems that the *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana* was noted, and commented upon, by someone else, a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji called *Vanamāli Mīśra*, a manuscript of whose commentary called *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjinī* has been preserved.⁷²

Some indications seem to confirm that the *Śabdakaustubha* was initially barely taken into consideration even by authors who knew it. *Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa*'s other son *Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa*, author of a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* called *Sūktiratnākara* (ed. Pt. Bhāgavata 1999) appears to have known this early work of Bhaṭṭoji. An introductory stanza to the *Sūktiratnākara* states (no. 14, p. 3):

*harikaiyaṭabhaṭṭīyāṣ ṭīkāḥ santy eva yady apīhādya/
tad api gabhīradurūhatvādyair bodhāya nālaṃ tāḥ||*

“Although there exist nowadays commentaries [on the *Mahābhāṣya*] by [Bhartr-
]hari, by *Kaiyaṭa* and by *Bhaṭṭa*, they do not suffice to understand [that text] on
account of (its?, their?) deep and abstruse nature and other reasons.”

It is not immediately clear which is the commentary by Bhaṭṭa mentioned by *Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa*. *Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka*'s history of grammatical literature makes no mention of any commentator before *Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa* called Bhaṭṭa. Bhaṭṭoji, on the other hand, uses that appellation for himself, for example in the fifth introductory stanza to his *Śabdakaustubha*: *bhaṭṭojibhaṭṭo januṣaḥ sāphalyam labdhum thate*.⁷³ *Mīmāṃsaka* lists Bhaṭṭoji's *Śabdakaustubha* as a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, but this does not appear to be correct. Another one of its introductory stanzas announces “I extract the gem of

the word (or: gem which is the word, *śabdakaustubha*) from the ocean which is the Bhāṣya pronounced by Patañjali” (st. 3cd: *phanibhāṣitabhāsyābdheḥ śabdakaustubham uddhare*).⁷⁴ The text follows throughout the division into Āhnikas which characterizes the Mahābhāṣya, and closely follows the text of that work.⁷⁵ References to the Bhāṣya, moreover, often use the future,⁷⁶ which only makes sense in a text which presents itself as a commentary on it. It is not surprising that Bal Shastri’s edition of the Mahābhāṣya with commentaries states, on its title page, that it contains the “Mahabhashya of Patanjali ... with the commentaries Bhattoji Deekshita’s ‘Shabdakaustubh’” etc.⁷⁷ Baladeva Upādhyāya calls it a commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī which is also considered a work that critically evaluates the Mahābhāṣya.⁷⁸

These considerations make it likely that Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa was acquainted with Bhattoji’s Śabdakaustubha. It is remarkable that this author, who regularly cites Kaiyaṭa, never cites Bhattoji.⁷⁹ He does however refer to him in other ways. Towards the end of his long discussion of sphoṭa, for example, Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa attributes to ‘someone’ certain views in which we recognize without difficulty Bhattoji’s points of view. Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa says here (p. 281.28 – p. 291.2):

tad evaṃ sakhaṇḍākhaṇḍabhedena padavākyavyaktisphoṭaś caturdhā, sakhaṇḍayos taylor jātirūpatāpīti dvau jātisphoṭāv iti ṣoḍhā, jātivyaktibhedena varṇasphoṭo ‘py apara ity api kaścit.

“Someone furthermore [holds] that the *padavyaktisphoṭa* and the *vākyavyaktisphoṭa*, because [both of them] are divided [into two:] *sakhaṇḍa-* and *akhaṇḍa-*, are of four kinds, that moreover the two [of these] that are *sakhaṇḍa-* can take the form of a *jāti*, so that there are two *jātisphoṭas* [and one arrives at] six kinds, and that there is also a different *varṇasphoṭa* that can be *jāti* or *vyakti*.”

The Sanskrit is ambiguous, and it is not impossible that the following translation is to be preferred:

“The *padavyaktisphoṭa* and the *vākyavyaktisphoṭa* are therefore in this way of four kinds, because [both of them] are divided [into two:] *sakhaṇḍa-* and *akhaṇḍa-*; the two [of these] that are *sakhaṇḍa-* can moreover take the form of a *jāti*, so that there are two *jātisphoṭas* [and one arrives at] six kinds. Someone furthermore [holds] that there is also a *varṇasphoṭa* that can be *jāti* or *vyakti*.”

Either way, Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa here clearly enumerates eight kinds of sphoṭa, which can be specified as follows: (i) *sakhaṇḍapadavyaktisphoṭa*, (ii) *sakhaṇḍavākyavyaktisphoṭa*, (iii) *akhaṇḍapadavyaktisphoṭa*, (iv) *akhaṇḍavākyavyaktisphoṭa*, (v) *padajātisphoṭa*, (vi) *vākyajātisphoṭa*, (vii) *varṇajātisphoṭa*, (viii) *varṇavyaktisphoṭa*. He does

not accept all of them. His enumeration corresponds, be it in a different order, to the list of positions which we know from Bhaṭṭoji's Śabdakaustubha (and from the Vaiyākaraṇa Bhūṣaṇa Kārikā or Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana along with Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's commentaries). Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa himself does not appear to accept the sphoṭa as primarily a meaning-bearer but rather as an ontological entity, even though the only sphoṭas he admits (word and sentence) do have meaning.⁸⁰

For our present reflections it is particularly important to know that already Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's Prakāśa, which was composed before the Sūktiratnākara,⁸¹ appears to have been acquainted with the Śabdakaustubha.⁸² This one may conclude from the fact that the Prakāśa refers twice to opinions of the Dīkṣita (in Sanskrit the plural is used: *dīkṣitānām vyākhyāne; yat tu dīkṣitah*). Tripāthī (1977: (o)) appears to think that these are references to Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, the author of the Sūktiratnākara, but no evidence is known to me that Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa was ever called Dīkṣita.⁸³ Hueckstedt (2002: 52) accepts that these are references to Bhaṭṭoji, but admits that he has not been able to find the citations in the surviving works of that author; he suggests that they may have belonged to the parts of the Śabdakaustubha which have not survived. However, there are references to Bhaṭṭoji without mention of his name. Some examples have come to my notice, and a systematic investigation might bring to light more of them. The Prakāśa on P. 4.1.105 *gargādibhyo yañ* refers to 'others' (*anye*) who hold a position which actually occurs in the Śabdakaustubha on that sūtra (there 4.1.107) but not in the Kāśikā with its two early commentaries, nor in any other work known to me that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa might have been acquainted with.⁸⁴ The Prakāśa on P. 1.3.3 *halantyam* informs us that 'others' like to interpret this sūtra by repeating it; I have found this position mentioned only in the Śabdakaustubha.⁸⁵ On P. 1.3.1 *bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ* the Prakāśa mentions 'others' who maintain, on the basis of inference, that roots that occur only in sūtras (*sautra dhātu*) are covered by it; once again, I have found this point of view only in the Śabdakaustubha.⁸⁶ Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's remarks on Śivasūtra 2 are interesting because, besides attributing to 'others' an opinion which, from among earlier works, we only find in the Śabdakaustubha, they add a detail which is absent in Bhaṭṭoji's work.⁸⁷ This might be taken to indicate that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa knew Bhaṭṭoji's opinions, perhaps from oral discussions, but not necessarily their final expression in the Śabdakaustubha.

Tripāthī (1977: (au)) and Mīmāṃsaka (sam. 2030: I: 487 n. 1) cite a line from the Śabdakaustubha (*tad etat sakalam abhidhāya prakriyāprakāśe gurucaraṇair uktam: ‘tajjñānam ityādau tu ścutvaṃ bhavaty eva’*)⁸⁸ which shows that Bhaṭṭoji was acquainted with Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakriyāprakāśa at the time of writing his Śabdakaustubha, and that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa was, or had been, his teacher at that time. This fact, along with the circumstance that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa refers to the Dīkṣita and is familiar with at least some opinions which Bhaṭṭoji expresses in his Śabdakaustubha, allow us to conclude that the times of composition of Śabdakaustubha and Prakriyāprakāśa overlapped, the latter perhaps having been completed slightly before the former.⁸⁹

The fact that Bhaṭṭoji’s early works did not initially attract much attention may be of some importance in the context of our present investigation. It means that Bhaṭṭoji’s main impact was in the field of technical grammar, where he gained both acclaim and opposition. His contribution to the philosophy of grammar may have had to wait for his nephew Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa before it drew a wider readership. Commentaries on the Śabdakaustubha were written, but not until later, the first surviving one (Viśamapadī) being from the hand of Nāgeśa, the second (Prabhā) from that of Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍa.⁹⁰ It is true that Jagannātha may also have written a critical commentary on it,⁹¹ and that Cakrapāṇi refers to the Kaustubha;⁹² also the name of a text called Śabdakaustubha Dūṣaṇa by a certain Bhāskara Dīkṣita has come down to us. These critical treatises do not however seem to have survived.

Some of the personal details so far uncovered do not depict the stereotype which we may have of Sanskrit pandits. These men were not withdrawn scholars who devoted their lives to the service of a timeless tradition. The little we know about their private lives paints a different picture altogether. It introduces us to ambitious students goaded on by inflated egos and personal jealousies, keen to establish their reputations and pull down those of others, using any excuse available.

Having gained some insight into the personality and personal context of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, it will be interesting to learn something more about the world he lived in. We know that Bhaṭṭoji had ended up in Benares, and that he composed the works that made him famous in that same city. How do we have to imagine the life and daily surroundings of Sanskrit pandits of his time? We know from Muslim sources that Benares was “The chief seat of learning in

Hindustan (to which) crowds of people flock from the most distant parts for the purpose of instruction ...”⁹³

A particularly valuable source of information is the letter which the French traveler François Bernier wrote to the poet Chapelain in October 1667 and in which he describes, among other things, his visit to Benares which apparently had taken place the year before. Bernier characterizes Benares as the school for all Hindus and compares it to Athens. Brahmins and religious people who dedicate themselves to study go to Benares. However, there are no regular colleges and classes as in Europe, he writes. The teachers are scattered over the city, in their houses, or in the gardens of the suburbs, where they have been accepted by rich merchants. The number of students which each teacher has is small, ranging from four until a maximum of 15 in the case of the most famous ones. These students stay with their teacher for 10 or 12 years. Bernier is not impressed with the diligence of the students, pointing out that they do not torment themselves and eat the khichri which they are provided with by the rich merchants.⁹⁴

Bernier’s account becomes more personal where he relates that he went to see the chief of the pandits, who lives there. This scholar, he tells us, was so famous for his knowledge that the emperor Shah Jahan granted him a pension of Rs. 2000, both to honor his science and to please the Rajas. Bernier describes the appearance of this famous scholar in some detail, and adds that he had already known him in Delhi. In fact, this chief of pandits had often visited Bernier’s boss (whom he calls his Agah, i.e., Daneshmend Khan) in the hope of regaining his pension which Aurangzeb, once he had acceded to the throne, had taken away from him. When Bernier visited him in Benares, the chief of pandits received him warmly, and offered him refreshments in the library of his university along with the six most famous pandits of the city.⁹⁵

Gode has argued in two publications (1941; 1969) that the chief of pandits known to Bernier must have been a Sanskrit author known by the name Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī.⁹⁶ However, Gode’s arguments are circumstantial and not totally compelling (as he himself admits⁹⁷). It is also clear that Bernier’s expression *chef des Pandits* is close to the Sanskrit title *paṇḍitarāja* which Jagannātha is reported to have received from the emperor (see above); the title *vidyānidhāna* ‘repository of learning’ which Kavīndrācārya supposedly received from Shah Jahan does not correspond to this French expression.⁹⁸ Chronologically both scholars fit. Jagannātha is believed to have

received patronage from Shah Jahan and Dara Shikoh (perhaps already from Jahangir).⁹⁹ Some time after the execution of Dara Shikoh in 1659 he is thought to have moved to Benares, where Bernier may conceivably have met him in 1666. In the more recent of his two publications on this subject Gode refers to a passage from a work called *Padshah Namah* by Abdul Hamid Lahori, which states that a certain Kavindra Sanyāsi received from Shah Jahan two thousand rupees in cash. This is exactly the amount which the chief of pandits known to Bernier received as pension until Aurangzeb stopped it, but it does not necessarily prove that the scholar mentioned in this passage is the same as the one known to Bernier.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, the fact that Bernier's chief of pandits offered him refreshments in the library of his university (*la collation dans la bibliothèque de son université*), and that Bernier states some pages earlier that there are many Sanskrit books with which a large hall at Benares is entirely filled (p. 255: "... dont j'ai vu une grande salle toute pleine dans Bénarès"), does not necessarily prove Gode's surmise that this hall "is probably identical with Kavindrācārya's Manuscript Library". All this means that it is possible, though far from certain, that one of the actors in the drama in which Bhattoji Dīkṣita played a role has been known to and described by a visiting Frenchman. We are clearly far removed from the lifeless authors of ancient Sanskrit texts.

We have to consider the question how these scholars earned, or tried to earn their living. Bernier mentions both rich merchants and, in the case of the chief of pandits, patronage from the Mughal court. Texts from this period often mention the patronage received from kings.¹⁰¹ These were often regional kings, petty rulers of small states. Examples such as Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, on the other hand, show that such support could also come from Muslim rulers, even from the emperor in Delhi.¹⁰² According to the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, this scholar received patronage from a long list of rulers: Emperor Jehangir (1605–1627 A.D.), Shah Jahan (1628–1658 A.D.), Asaf Khan (Noor Jahan's brother, died 1641 A.D.), Jagat Siṃha, King of Udaipur (1628–1629 A.D.) and Prāṇanārāyaṇa, King of Kāmarūpa or Assam (1633–1666 A.D.).¹⁰³ Others had to be content with less prominent patrons. It is clear from the introductory verses that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa wrote his *Prakāśa* at the command of a king Vīravara, who may have been a minister of Akbar.¹⁰⁴ His son Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, author of a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* called *Sūktiratnākara*,

praises in his introductory stanzas a certain “king Phiriṃdā” (*phiriṃdā nṛpaḥ*; st. 8); this same Phiriṃdā is further on (st. 10) referred to as *caudharī*, which means as much as ‘village headman’ (Hintze, 1997: 70; cp. Richards, 1993: 81). Bhattoji, his brother Raṅgoji and his nephew Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa appear to have received patronage from two rulers belonging to the Keladi royal family, Veṅkaṭappa Nāyaka I (1592–1629) and his grandson Vīrabhadra (1629–1645);¹⁰⁵ these were rulers of the Ikkeri kingdom, one of the fragmented heirs of the Vijayanagara state.¹⁰⁶

In order to understand how and why Sanskrit scholars should be the recipients of patronage at all, we must recall that at the time of Bhattoji Benares was part of the Mughal empire. This empire had been consolidated by Akbar in the sixteenth century by the introduction of a system of government meant to reduce tension between the different components of the population. Akbar himself showed an active interest in ancient Sanskrit literature, and had various old texts – among them the Atharva Veda, the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa and many others – translated into Persian.¹⁰⁷ Historians point out that by giving high office to the Rajputs – who were not only concentrated in Rajasthan but also scattered all over north India –, by using them as military commanders and provincial governors, the Hindu community was induced to accept the Mughal government in a way as its own.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, rotation of office and resumption of property at death had the effect that Mughal nobles were inclined to ostentation and public spending.¹⁰⁹ Together these features of Mughal government go a long way toward explaining an upswing in the number of possibilities for patronage at that time. There would be more money available for patronage, and the number of potential patrons would be large, and changing. The support which Bhattoji and his family received from the rulers of Ikkeri shows that patronage might even come from near or outside the boundaries of the Mughal empire.¹¹⁰ All this would then be responsible for the competitive atmosphere in which young scholars had to gain a place and established ones might have to justify the positions they had attained. It is not surprising that both for potential patrons and for potential recipients of patronage Benares was the scene where much of this competitive activity was carried out.

Patronage did not only come from political rulers. We have seen that François Bernier mentions rich merchants in particular. The prosperity of the Mughal empire apparently filtered down to reach traditional Sanskrit scholars also through this channel.

The establishment of the Mughal empire may in this way have created more rather than fewer opportunities for bright Sanskrit scholars, both young and old. One of the priorities of these scholars was, inevitably, to attract the attention of one or more potential patrons. One way to do so would be to participate in one of the oral debates which apparently were held at the courts of various rulers. We have already seen that Jagannātha supposedly defeated Muslim scholars at the court of Shah Jahan. Indeed, it is known that already Akbar had organized debates at his court, and had even built a debating-hall (called House of Worship, 'Ibādat Khāna) in the gardens of his palace at Fathpur-Sikri; initially only schools of Muslim theology had participated, later representatives of other religions as well.¹¹¹ But debates also took place in less glamorous surroundings. Raṅgoji Bhaṭṭa, who was both Bhaṭṭoji's brother and Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa's father, is recorded to have defeated the Dvaita scholar Vidyādhīśayati in debate at the court of the Keladi ruler Venkaṭappa.¹¹² More complete information about the places where and the frequency with which such debates took place, and about the ways in which the winner might be expected to be rewarded, would be of great interest for an understanding of the inner dynamic of Sanskrit scholarship at that period. For the time being we have to be guided by the impressions gained from a small selection of sources.

The preceding reflections suggest that at the time of Bhaṭṭoji, more perhaps than before, there was place for original characters. Success did not primarily depend upon respect for tradition and for the elders. Indeed, a scholar might deviate from traditional thinking and behavior and yet impress his readership or audience. Characters like Bhaṭṭoji and Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha had a place in this world, and may indeed have gained notoriety precisely because they did and said things that were not altogether sanctioned by tradition. At the same time it should not be forgotten that the freedom of thought and behavior of the pandits of Benares was relative. As a group they still represented traditional Hinduism which, in spite of the comparatively tolerant attitude of the early Mughal emperors, remained under threat from Islam. In the district of Benares alone 76 Hindu temples are recorded to have been destroyed by Shah Jahan, and several more by Aurangzeb.¹¹³ Innovative ideas were therefore strictly confined to areas that were not threatening to the tradition as such, even though they might be threatening to a particular thinker and his relatives. Bhaṭṭoji, as we have seen, went out of his way to show that his new ideas about the sphaṭa were really not new at all.¹¹⁴

NOTES

¹ Yoga Bhāṣya on sūtra 3.17: ... *ekam padam ekabuddhiviṣayam ekaprayatnākṣiptam abhāgam akramam avarnam bauddham antyavarṇapratyayavyāpāropasthāpitam* ...

² Cp. Joshi, 1967: 7: “Since for [later grammarians (i.e., Bhaṭṭoji and his successors)], the term *sphoṭa* necessarily refers to the significant unit, they tried to interpret the term *varṇasphoṭa* to mean the smallest meaningful units like stems, roots and suffixes. ... To Patañjali the term *sphoṭa* need not necessarily involve consideration of meaning.” Further Joshi, 1967: 10: “Patañjali has never used the term *sphoṭa* to refer to a single indivisible meaning-bearing unit. The term *sphoṭa* as used by Patañjali always stands for the structure of expression which may or may not have meaning”. Cardona, 1968: 448: “Joshi rightly and importantly stresses ... that for Bhartṛhari *sphoṭa* is not used uniquely with reference to the ‘meaning-conveyor word’. This is worth emphasizing in view of the influence exerted by J. Brough’s article ‘Theories of General Linguistics in the Sanskrit Grammarians’ ..., wherein Brough maintains that for Bhartṛhari, as for later grammarians, *sphoṭa* was ... ‘simply the linguistic sign in its aspect of meaning bearer (Bedeutungsträger).’” See further below.

³ Similarly Cardona, 1976: 303: “Brough’s exposition of *sphoṭa* was heavily influenced by later Pāṇinīyas.”

⁴ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 7 1.15–17: *ekah paṭa itivad ekam padam vākyam vety abādhitapratīter varṇātiriktam eva padam vākyam vā akhaṇḍam varṇavyaṅgyam | katvapratītir aupādhiḥ cet ? pate ‘pi tathātvāpatteh/*.

⁵ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 7 1.4–9.

⁶ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 8 1.13–19.

⁷ This passage occurs twice in the Bhāṣya, not under sūtra 1.1.56, but under P. 1.1.20 (Mahā-bh I p. 75 1.13) and P. 7.1.27 (Mahā-bh III p. 251 1.12). See further below.

⁸ It seems likely that the reference is to Kaiyaṭa on P. 1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo ‘nalvidhau* (I p. 399 1.11–16): *dividha ādeśah, pratyakṣaś cāster bhūr ityādih | anumānikaś cair ur ityādih | atra hi ikāreṇekārāntaḥ sthāny anumīyate | ukāreṇokārāntaś cādeśah | tatas tes tur iti sampadyate |* etc. For a discussion what is at stake, cp. Joshi & Roodbergen, 1990: p. VIII f. and transl. p. 6 n. 30.

⁹ The reference is no doubt to Mahā-bh I p. 267 1.8–12 (on P. 1.3.10). See further below.

¹⁰ Cp. Gaurinath Sastri, 1980: 60: “it is necessary to point out that by *varṇa-sphoṭa* it is not meant that each and every letter is regarded as *sphoṭa* but the letter or letters constituting either a stem or a suffix are regarded as such”; and p. 63: “according to [the grammarians’ theory of *varṇa-sphoṭa*] the stem and the suffix ... are denotative of sense”. Joshi, 1967: 73: “The term *varṇasphoṭa* does not mean that each single phoneme is regarded as *sphoṭa*, but the phoneme or phonemes constituting either a stem or a suffix are regarded as such.”

¹¹ So Cardona (1976: 303): “in the view of such later Pāṇinīyas the term *varṇa* does not mean ‘sound unit’ in this context; it denotes a unit lower than a word, namely a base or an affix”. Similarly Śrī Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa Maunin, who in his *Sphoṭacandrikā* (p. 1 1.22) speaks of a *varṇa* which is of the nature of a stem or a suffix (*prakṛtipratyayarūpa*). Since this last author refers to the Bhūṣaṇa of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa (p. 2 1.29), he is to be dated after the latter. Ramajna Pandeya (1954: 49 f.) tries to improve upon the scheme of Bhaṭṭoji and his successors by replacing their *varṇasphoṭa* with the pair *prakṛtisphoṭa* and *pratyayasphoṭa*. Further refinements lead him to a total of sixteen kinds of *sphoṭa*.

¹² Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 7 1. 9–10. Bhaṭṭoji does not say, nor indeed intend, that this remark concerns isolated morphemes, but this is how Nāgeśa interprets him (*Sphoṭavāda* p. 5 1.6–7: *prayujyamānapadānantargatā*

varṇā vācakā na veti vipratipattisāriram). For Nāgeśa, then, this statement deals with a minor issue within the discussion of the *varṇasphoṭa*.

¹³ Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 9 1.14–16: *yady apṭhāṣṭau pakṣā uktās tathāpi vākyasphoṭapakṣe tātparyam granthakṛtām | tatrāpi jātisphoṭe ity avadheyam, pūrvapūrvopamardenāvottarottaropanyāsāt|*.

¹⁴ Cp. Joshi's observations cited in note 2, above.

¹⁵ It has already been pointed out above that Bhattoji's emphasis on the semantic role of the *sphoṭa* is responsible for his negligence of the ontological side. This has confused also modern commentators. John Brough has already been mentioned. As for Gaurinath Sastri, see note 17 below.

¹⁶ Iyer, 1966: 9–10: *naitat sāram, pratyekam apratyāyakatvāt, sāhityābhāvāt, niyatakramavartinām ayaugapadyena sambhūyakāritvānupapatteḥ, ...*

¹⁷ Nor was Gaurinath Sastri, who states (1980: 72–73): “we should like to point out that we do not appreciate their (i.e., of the later standard works of Sanskrit grammarians, JB) conception of *pada-sphoṭa* and *vākya-sphoṭa* as also of *akhaṇḍa-pada-sphoṭa* and *akhaṇḍa-vākya-sphoṭa*. ... [A]ny interpretation which tends to impair the indivisible character of *sphoṭa*, cannot be accepted by us. It may be pointed out in our favour that the earlier exponents of the theory of *sphoṭa* mean by *pada-sphoṭa* and *vākya-sphoṭa* what to the later exponents are *akhaṇḍa-pada-sphoṭa* and *akhaṇḍa-vākya-sphoṭa* respectively.”

¹⁸ For further evidence for the unitary nature of Patañjali's morphemes and words, see Bronkhorst, 1987: 46 ff.

¹⁹ Mahā-bh I p. 267 1.8–12: *kim ihodāharaṇam | ... | tasthasthamipām tāmtam-tāmah itī | nanu caitad api sthāne 'ntaratamenaiva siddham | kuta āntaryam | ekārthasyaikārtho dvyarthasya dvyartho bahvarthasya bahvartho bhaviṣyati |*

²⁰ Tr. Sharma, 1995: 660.

²¹ Tr. Joshi & Roodbergen, 1991: 66.

²² Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p.8 1.19–20: *padasphoṭavākyasphoṭau tu ihaiva praghaṭṭake 'yenoccāritena' itī bhāṣyapratīkam upādāya kaiyaṭena bhāṣyārthatayā varṇitau |*

²³ Kaiyaṭa I p. 7: *vaiyākaraṇā varṇavyatirikṭasya padasya vākyasya vā vācakatvam icchanti | varṇānām pratyekam vācakatve dvitīyādivarṇoccāraṇānarthakya-prasaṅgāt | ānarthakye tu pratyekam utpattipakṣe yaugapadyenotpattiyābhāvāt, abhivyaktipakṣe tu kramenaivābhivyaktyā samudāyābhāvāt | ekasmṛtyupārūḍhānām vācakatve 'sarah' 'rasah' ityādāv arthapratipattiyaviśeṣaprasaṅgāt tadvyatirikṭaḥ sphoṭo nādābhivyāṅgyo vācaḥ vistareṇa vākyapadīye vyavasthāpitah |*

²⁴ Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 8 1. 20–21: *varṇavyatirikṭasya padasya vākyasya veti vadatā tayor akhaṇḍatāpy uktā |*

²⁵ Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p.8 1.21–23: *'nityeṣu śabdeṣu kūtasthair avicālibhīr varṇair bhavitavyam' itī tatra tatra bhāṣye sakhaṇḍatoktā |*. The quoted line occurs Mahā-bh I p. 18 1.14–15 (on Śivasūtra I vt. 12); p. 75 1.8–9 (on P. 1.1.20 vt. 5); p. 112 1. 24 (on P. 1.1.46); p. 136 1.12–13 (on P. 1.1.56 vt. 11); etc.

²⁶ Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 8 1.26–32: *paspaśāyām eva praghaṭṭakāntare 'kim punah' ityādi bhāṣyam upādāya 'kecid varṇasphoṭam apare padasphoṭam vākyasphoṭam cāhuḥ' itī vadatā kaiyaṭena 'a i u ṇ' ity atra vyaktisphoṭajātisphoṭayor balābalaṃ cintayatā prayāhārāhnikānte 'akṣaram na kṣaram vidyāt' itī bhāṣyavyākhyānāvasare vyavahāranityatā tu varṇapadavākyasphoṭānām, nityatvam tu jātisphoṭasyeti pratipādayatā, anupadam eva brahmatattvam eva hi śabdārūpatayā pratibhāṭīty artha itī vyācakṣāṇena sarve pakṣāḥ sūcitā eva |*

²⁷ Kaiyaṭa on *kim punar nityaḥ śabdāḥ āhosvit kāryah*, Paspasāhnikā, I p. 26.

²⁸ Kaiyaṭa, I p. 65 ff., esp. p. 68 (*vyaktisphoṭapakṣe nirākṛte jātisphoṭapakṣa evāśrīyate*) and p. 69 (*avaśyāsrāṇīyatām ākṛtipakṣasya darśayati*).

²⁹ Kaiyata, I p. 117: *vyavahāranīyatayā tu varṇapadavākyaśphoṭānām [nīyatvam], jātiśphotasya vā*. The word *nīyatvam* has been added on the authority of another edition (Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi etc., 1967). Bhaṭṭoji was apparently acquainted with a reading: *vyavahāranīyatā tu varṇapadavākyaśphoṭānām, nīyatvam tu jātiśphotasya*.

³⁰ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 8 1.32 – p. 9 1.1: *yadā tu avidyaiva jātir iti pakṣas tadabhiprāyeṇa jātiśphotasyāpi vyavahāranīyateti 'akṣaram na kṣaram vidyāt' ity asya kaiyatīye pāthāntaram*.

³¹ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 9 1.1–4: *'ādyantau ṭakitau' iti sūtre ca bhāṣya eva varṇasphoṭapadasphoṭāv uktau | asatyam eva prakṛtipratyayavibhāgam tadartham cāśrītya rekhāgavayanyāyena satyasya padasphotasya vyutpādanam abhipretam iti tatraiva kaiyatah |*.

³² Cp. Kaiyata on P. 1.1.46 (on *athavāitayānupūrvyāyam śabdāntaram upadiśati*), I p. 349: *... arhavattām āśrītyāsatyaprakṛtipratyayopadeśena satyasya padasya vyutpādanam kriyate, rekhāgavayeneva satyagavayasya*.

³³ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 91.4–6: *'arthavad adhātuh' 'svam rūpam śabdasya' 'taparas tatkālasya' ityādisūtreṣy api spaṣṭam idaṃ bhāṣyakaiyatādāv ity alam bahunā*.

³⁴ Mahā-bh I p. 181 1.19–24 (on P. 1.1.70 vt. 5); Kaiyata on P. 1.1.70, I p. 539: *'evam tarhi' iti | vyaktiśphoto 'tra vivakṣitah | sa ca nīyah | etac ca 'yenocāriena' ity atra paspaśāyām vicāritam iti tata eve boddhavyam|*.

³⁵ Judging by the summary by G.B. Palsule in the Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies of the Sphotatattvanirūpaṇa which may have been composed by Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa (Coward and Kunjunni Raja, 1990: 215 f.), Bhaṭṭoji's teacher had not dealt with these eight positions about the sphoto either. The text summarized was not available to me.

³⁶ There are many historical records from the time of Bhaṭṭoji (see Sharma, 1938). Most of these do not however concern themselves with Sanskrit scholars; information about them has to be culled from colophons, introductory stanzas, stories that have somehow survived, etc.

³⁷ This is a debated issue. The first reliable census of the population of Benares was published by James Prinsep in the *Asiatic Researches* in 1832. According to Dalmia, 1997: 94, "Prinsep's figures provide statistical evidence that there were indeed large communities of Brahmans in the city; they constituted 12% of the population, and here again the Maharastrian Brahmans outnumbered the rest. They constituted, in their turn, 30% of the total Brahman population." It is to be kept in mind that Prinsep's census came after a period, during the 18th century, during which Maharashtrians, both Brahmin and Maratha, had been investing heavily in Benares, and grants to Brahmans had greatly increased, especially under the direct patronage of the Peshwa (Gordon, 1993: 146). According to another tradition Bhaṭṭoji was of Āndhra origin; see e.g. Upādhyāya, 1994: 60.

³⁸ Gode (1941a: 322) reports a tradition according to which Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita built in Benares a house for himself at Kedār-Ghāṭa (Sanskrit perhaps Kedāreśvara-Ghāṭa) and settled there permanently.

³⁹ See note 43, below.

⁴⁰ Appayya Dīkṣita is saluted in Bhaṭṭoji's Tattvakaustubha; see Mīmāṃsaka, sam. 2030: I: 487. EIP V p. 240 (s.v. Appayya Dīkṣita) tells the following story: "One of Appayya Dīkṣita's important pupils was Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, the author of the Siddhāntakaumudī, who came from the north to study Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā and wrote Śabdakaustubha as a commemoration of his discipleship under Appayya. A story is told that Bhaṭṭoji found Appayya living unostentatiously in a village, belying widespread fame and royal patronage." None of the claims in this passage are supported by evidence.

⁴¹ Haraprasad Shastri, 1912: 11; EIP V p. 241 s.v. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita; Salomon, 1985: xix, xxvi.

⁴² Gode, 1940: 66 ff.; Manudeva Bhattachārya's introduction to his edition of Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa's Bṛhadvaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa p. 5; Upādhyāya, 1994: 61.

⁴³ Cf. the following passage from Jagannātha's Praudhamanoramākucamardana (as cited in Belvalkar, 1915: 39 n. 1): *iha kecit [= Bhaṭṭoji dīkṣitaḥ] nikhilavidyanmukutaamayūkhamālālitacaranānām ... Śeṣavamśāvataṃsānām Śrī-Kṛṣṇapaṇḍitānām prasādād āsāditaśabdānuśāsanās teṣu ca pārameśvarapadaṃ prayāteṣu kālikālavaśamvadībhavantah Prakriyāprakāśaṃ svayamnirmitāyām manoramāyām ākulyakārsuh | sā ca prakriyāprakāśakṛtām pautrair asmādgurupanditavireśvarānām tanayair dūṣitāpi svamatiparīkṣārthe punar asmābhir nirīkṣyate |*. Mīmāṃsaka, sam. 2030: I: 486 n. 1 cites the same passage in a rather different form. See also Mīmāṃsaka, sam. 2030: I: 541; Kane, HistDh I,2 p. 967 n. 1508; p. 48–49 of the introduction to the edition of Jagannātha's Rasagaṅgadhara mentioned in the bibliography; p. (15) of Sitaram Shastri's introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā; Hueckstedt, 2002: 51–52 n. 18. Extracts from Jagannātha's text (including this passage) can be found at the end of the edition of the Praudha Manoramā by Pt. Sadāshiva Sharma Shastri. This passage is found on p. 1–2 of Madhusudana's edition. For an English translation, see Joshi, 1980: 107. This statement shows that Bhaṭṭoji was the pupil of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, not of the latter's son Śeṣa Vireśvara, as maintained by Ranganathasvami Aryavaraguru (1912), Altekar (1937: 40) and Das (1990: 326 n. 14). For another critical passage from the same work, see Sitaram Shastri's introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā, p. (13) n. 2.

⁴⁴ The introduction (Prāstāvika) by Bhāgīratha Prasāda Tripathī to the edition Rāmacandra's Prakriyākaumudī with Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's Prakāśa (see bibliography; p. (i) f.) shows that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's *prāc* is indeed Viṭṭhala the author of the Prasāda. See further below.

⁴⁵ A comparison of the following passages illustrates the contrasting ways in which Bhaṭṭoji's Praudha Manoramā and Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's Prakāśa use this term: (i) Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Praudha Manoramā I p. 204: *yat tu prācā 'tat-sīva ity atra jaṣṭve kṛte, khari ca' ity uktam | tan na | ... | yat tu taptatreṇoktam 'tado vā'vasāne iti cartve kṛte, paścāc chiva ity anena sambandhe, jhalām jaśo 'nte iti jaṣṭve, khari ca iti cartvam' iti | tad atisthaviyah |*. (ii) Rāmacandra, Prakriyākaumudī (ed. Mīśra I p. 145; ed. Trivedi I p. 90): *tad śīva ity atra jaṣṭve kṛte – khari ca.* (iii) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 146: *atra prācoktam 'tado vā'vasāne iti cartve kṛte paścāc chiva ity anena sambandhe jhalām jaśo 'nte iti jaṣṭve tad śīva iti sthite khari ca iti cartvam' iti |*. (iv) Viṭṭhala, Prasāda I p. 90: *tado vāvasāne iti cartve kṛte paścāt śīva ity anena sambandhe jaṣṭvam jhalām jaśonte iti | tataś ca tad śīva iti sthite khari ceti anena cartve ...*

⁴⁶ The following are examples: (i) Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 47 1.24–26: *atra prāñcaḥ: thakārasthāniko dhakārasthāniko vā dakāro 'tra bhāsyakṛto vivakṣitaḥ, ato na pūrvottaravirodhaḥ iti | rjvas tu vārttikamate sthīvedam bhāsyam ato na virodha ity āhuh |*. This concerns P. 3.3.57 *ḥdor ap*. The explanation of this sūtra referred to in the Śabdakaustubha is not found in the Kāśikā and its classical commentaries, nor in the Prakriyākaumudī and its commentaries by Viṭṭhala and Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa. It belongs to Kaiyata (I p. 84 1. 12–13; on Mahā-bh I p. 23 1. 21–22): *atrāhuh: thakārasthāniko dhakārasthāniko vā dakāro 'tra vivakṣitaḥ 'kas tarhi dakāra' iti*. Nothing similar is found in Bhartṛhari's commentary (Palsule, 1988: 21). (ii) Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 54 1. 23–p. 55 1.2: *tathāpy abhyāse upadhmānīyasya śeṣe 'abhyāse car ca' iti jaṣṭvena bakāra eva śrūyeta | iṣyate tv abhyāse jakāra iti prāñcaḥ |* appears to refer to Kaiyata (I p. 99 1.11–12; on Mahā-bh I p. 28 1.26: *yady ubjir upadhmānīyopadhah pathyata ubjijiṣatīty upadhmānīyāder eva dvirvacanam prāpnoti): upadhmānīyāder iti | yadi*

dvirvacane pūrvatra kartavye jaśtvam asiddham athāpi pūrvatrāsiddhīyam advirvacana iti siddham, sarvathobibhīṣatīti prāpnoti /; Bhaṭṭoji next shows Kaiyaṭa's position to be wrong.

Occasionally someone else is called *prāc*, sometimes Patañjali himself. This seems to be the case in the following passage: Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 108 l.3–5: *yat tu 'dvirvacane 'ci' iti sūtre aci kim? jeghrīyate dedhmīyate iti prācām pratyudāharaṇam, tad āpātataḥ* appears to refer to Mahā-bh I p. 155 l.16 (on P. 1.1.59): *ajgrahaṇasyāitat prayojanam iha mā bhūt / jeghrīyate dedhmīyata iti* /.

⁴⁷ Cp. Sitaram Shastri's introduction to his edition of the Prauḍha Manoramā, p. (4) ff.

⁴⁸ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 404–405.

⁴⁹ Bhaṭṭoji's use of *prāc* in the Prauḍha Manoramā is not fully consistent. Consider the following passages, where he clearly copies Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa in referring to Viṭṭhala in this manner: (i) Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā I p. 559: *yat tu **prāñcaḥ**: 'āpi' iti kakāraviśeṣaṇam / 'sarvikā' ityādaḥ tv ekādeśasya sthānivadbhāvād akāreṇa vyavadhāne 'pi vacanasāmarthyād bhaviṣyati iti / tan na /* (ii) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 433: *'āpi' iti ... / atah kakāraviśeṣaṇam / ... / 'sarvikā' ityādaḥ tv ekādeśasya sthānivadbhāvād akāreṇa vyavadhāne 'pi vacanasāmarthyād bhaviṣyati iti **prāñcaḥ** / vastutas tu ...* (iii) Viṭṭhala, Prasāda I p. 328: *nanu cāpīty anena kim viśesyate / yady ucyeta kakāra iti tadā sarvikā kārīkety atrāpi na syāt / akāreṇa vyavadhānāt / na ca vācyam ekādeśe kṛte nāsti vyavadhānam iti tasya 'acaḥ parasmin ...' iti sthānivadbhāvād iti ced ucyate / yena nāvvyavadhānam tena vyavahite 'pi vacanaprāmāṇyād ity ekena varṇena vyavadhānam āśrīyate /*

⁵⁰ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 531. See also note 45, above.

⁵¹ See the examples given in Sitaram Shastri's introduction to his edition of the Prauḍha Manoramā p. (5) n. 2.

⁵² Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 500.

⁵³ Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 340 l.14.

⁵⁴ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 484.

⁵⁵ Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 335 l.21–22. Occasionally an unspecified plural refers to both Viṭṭhala and Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, as in Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 434, where *yat tu vadanti: 'evaṃ sati supi ca iti dīrghatvam syād' iti / tan na /* rejects an opinion held by both these authors, but whose formulation follows Viṭṭhala (Viṭṭhala, Prasāda I p. 195 l.19–20; Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 293 l.15). For further examples see Sitaram Shastri's introduction to his edition of the Prauḍha Manoramā p. (4)–(5) n. 4.

⁵⁶ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 412.

⁵⁷ Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p.268 l.12–13.

⁵⁸ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 68–69: *yat tu 'ika eva sthāne stah' iti prācā vyākhyātam, yac ca taṭṭikākṛtoktam 'aniyamaprasaṅge niyamārtham idam' ityādi, tat sarvaṃ bhāṣyavirodhāt upekṣyam*. Both commentaries on the Prakriyākaumudī have: *aniyamaprasaṅge niyamo vidhīyate* (Viṭṭhala, Prasāda I p. 30 l.22; Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 52 l.14).

⁵⁹ This is clear from Jagannātha's passage cited in note 43, above. A pupil of Bhaṭṭoji, called Varadarāja, composed several abridgments of the Siddhāntakaumudī. A surviving manuscript of one of those, the Laghusiddhāntakaumudī, dates from 1624 C.E. This text refers to the Śabdakaustubha, but not to the Manoramā in a context where one would expect this. It follows that the Siddhāntakaumudī and the Śabdakaustubha were composed at any rate before 1624. A later work by Varadarāja, the Gīrvāṇapadamañjarī, does mention the Manoramā. See Gode, 1941a: 320 ff. Gode points out in another publication (1940: n. 1) that manuscripts of the Prauḍha Manoramā dating from 1652 and 1657 C.E. have been preserved in the

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. The Manoramā is mentioned in Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa, an abbreviation of which is the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra; a manuscript of this abbreviation has been preserved which dates from 1650 C.E. (Gode, 1954: 207 f.), another one that dates from 1637 C.E. according to Biswal (1995: 56). A manuscript of the Śabdakaustubha dating from 1633 C. E. has equally been preserved (Gode, 1940: 73).

Deshpande, 1992: 74 contains the remark that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa studied grammar under Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa. (The same point of view is found in the Hindi introduction to the edition of the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra by Prabhākara Miśra, p. (16).) By way of justification Deshpande refers to the introduction to S. D. Joshi's Ph.D. dissertation of 1960 (Harvard University). This dissertation has meanwhile been published (Joshi, 1993, 1995, 1997). I do not find in its introduction any statement to the effect that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa studied with Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa. Moreover, Joshi (1967: 59) speaks about "Śeṣakṛṣṇa, the teacher of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita" in a context where a mention of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa would have been appropriate, if indeed Joshi was of the opinion that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa was his teacher. See further note 62, below.

⁶⁰ Bhaṭṭoji's use of the plural to express respect is confirmed by his use of the plural in passages of his Vedabhāṣyasāra where he agrees with Mādhava the author of the Vedabhāṣya, and of the singular where he disagrees with that same author; see Gode, 1941b: 76 n. 2.

⁶¹ Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā I p. 1: *dhyāyaṃ dhyāyaṃ paraṃ brahma, smāraṃ smāraṃ guror girah | siddhāntakumudivākyāṃ kurmah prauḍhamanoramām ||*. Neither Hari Dikṣita's Bṛhat Śabdaratna nor Nāgeśa's Laghu Śabdaratna on this passage give the name of Bhaṭṭoji's teacher, but both contain the enigmatic specification that the singular *guroḥ* indicates that Bhaṭṭoji obtained all his knowledge from one single teacher.

⁶² See the bibliography under Cakrapāṇidatta. Bali, 1976: 15 claims that Vireśvara himself wrote a Prauḍha Manoramā Khaṇḍana, and supports this with a reference to Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka's *Itihāsa*. This is incorrect. Mīmāṃsaka (sam. 2030: I: 540–541), basing himself on the passage cited in note 43 above, correctly states that Vireśvara's son wrote such a criticism. This son appears to have been Cakrapāṇi or Cakrapāṇidatta. Sitaram Shastri's introduction to his edition of the Prauḍha Manoramā (p. (14)) states, on the basis of the two introductory verses it cites from this author's Prauḍhamanoramākhaṇḍana, that Cakrapāṇi was Vireśvara's pupil; this may not exclude that he was his son. (Sitaram Shastri reads *vireśvaragurum śeṣavaṃśottamaṃ* where the edition available to me has *vateśvaraṃ gurum śeṣavaṃśottamaṃ*.) See also EIP V p. 223: "We know of no works authored by [Śeṣa Vireśvara]." If it is true that both Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa and Hari Dikṣita refer to this same Vireśvara as the "ornament of the Śeṣa lineage" (Das, 1990: 326 n. 14), we may have to conclude that Vireśvara somehow managed to stay out of the conflict opposing his lineage to that of Bhaṭṭoji. Alternatively – since Hari Dikṣita's presumed reference to Vireśvara is ambiguous – one may be tempted to think that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's commentaries were composed before the conflict arose. Note that *śeṣabhūṣaṇa* in one of the introductory verses of the Bhūṣaṇa(-sāra) refers to Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa according to Prabhākara Miśra (see his edition of the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra, pp. (16)–(17), 10). See further my forthcoming article "Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita and the revival of the philosophy of grammar."

Cakrapāṇi also continued Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's tradition by composing a commentary (called Prakriyāpradīpa) on the Prakriyākaumudī; see Mīmāṃsaka, sam. I: 532 and Cakrapāṇi, Prauḍhamanoramākhaṇḍana p. 16 l.8; p. 18 l.12–13; etc.

⁶³ Part of Jagannātha's Manoramākhaṇḍanarūpā Kucamardīnī ("She who crushes the nipple [of the lovely woman (*manoramā*)]") has been edited; see the bibliography.

A Manoramākhaṇḍana by a certain Keśava is mentioned at NCC vol. 5, p. 60. Nothing seems to be known about this author.

Already Jagannātha's father Peru Bhaṭṭa appears to have been Vireśvara's pupil (Upādhyāya, 1994: 67; Nāgeśa on the second introductory verse of Jagannātha's Rasagaṅgādhara); this suggests that Jagannātha may have been a lot younger than Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, and probably much younger than Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita as well. Jagannātha's father was also, in matters Mīmāṃsaka, a student of Khaṇḍadeva, if Nāgeśa's commentary on the Rasagaṅgādhara (verse 2) is to be believed. This Khaṇḍadeva, according to McCrea (2002), reacts in his works to the ideas of the New Grammarians, i.e., Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and, perhaps, Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa. Once again, the age difference between Bhaṭṭoji and Jagannātha appears to have been great. [Lawrence McCrea informs me that, according to his pupil and commentator Śambhubhaṭṭa, Khaṇḍadeva died in Benares in 1665 at the age of 90.]

⁶⁴ Mīmāṃsaka, sam. 2030: I: 541; Joshi, 1980: 107–108. According to Upādhyāya (1994: 63) Bhaṭṭoji's son Bhānuji Dīkṣita – known for his commentary called Rāmāśramī or Vyākhyāsudhā on the Amarakoṣa – composed a Manoramāmaṇḍana to defend his father's views against Cakrapāṇi. For examples of the way in which Hari Dīkṣita deals with criticisms uttered by Cakrapāṇi and Jagannātha, see Sitaram Shastri's introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā, pp. (16) ff. The Laghu Śabdaratna, though ascribed to Hari Dīkṣita, was composed by his pupil Nāgeśa; see Bronkhorst, 1986: 188 ff.; Joshi, 1980. (For the opposite opinion, see Abhyankar, 1952; 1964. This opinion is criticized in Bhat, 1965.)

Mīmāṃsaka (sam. 2030: I: 533) refers to a commentary on the Prakriyākaumudī called Tattvacandra by a certain Jayanta of uncertain date, which is based on Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's commentary. One wonders whether and to what extent this text participated in the debate between the two camps.

⁶⁵ Mīmāṃsaka, sam. 2030: I: 489–490; Introduction to Brahma Datta Dvivedī's edition of the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra p. 36.

⁶⁶ See Giridharaśarmā Caturvedī's introduction to the edition of Jagannātha's Rasagaṅgādhara mentioned in the bibliography, p. 4 n. 1; further pp. 46 ff. ('Jagannāthapaṇḍitarājah'); Chaudhuri, 1954: 47 ff. We may suspect that the reported topic of debate does not correspond to historical reality. For another apocryphal account of the impression made by Jagannātha on the Mughal emperor, see Sarma, 2002: 71.

⁶⁷ See Nāgeśa on Jagannātha's Rasagaṅgādhara p. 4: *vastutas tu jagannāthapaṇḍitarāja iti pṛthvīpatidattanāmābhilāpo 'yam*. Further Chaudhuri, 1954: 48, and note 98, below. According to the end of Jagannātha's own Āsaphavilāsa, the title *paṇḍitarāja* had been bestowed upon him by Shah Jahan; see Sarma, 2002: 71 n. 1.

⁶⁸ Gode, n.d.; Athavale, 1968.

⁶⁹ Sitaram Shastri's introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā gives the following romantic description of what supposedly happened in Benares (p. (16)): *[e]vam lekhaṇḍanagrāhādinā navīnakhaṇḍanagrāhāprāṇayanādinā tadānīm vārāṇasyām sabhyasabhāsu vidvatsamavāyeṣu jānāvīghattasopāneṣu devagrheṣu, viduṣāṃ kathanopakathaneṣu sahrdayānāṃ svairagoṣṭhībhandheṣu ca pratirathyam pratimandiram pratikuṭīkoṭaram ca praudhamanoramām adhikṛtyaiva vicāravi-marśas tarka āksepaṇḍitarājanādhānikam ca janasammardena śrotṛjanakolāhalena prekṣakavṛndasādhuvādakarātādanādibhiḥ ca sākam samrambheṇa tathā samudiyāya yathā sarvaṃ dīnmaṇḍalam eva kṣubhitāntarālam ivāsit*. Pathak, 1995: 15, repeats this passage without acknowledgement.

⁷⁰ Cp. Manudeva Bhaṭṭachārya's remark in the introduction to his edition of Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa's (Bṛhad-)Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa (p. 12): *yadi nāma śrīkaunḍa-bhaṭṭena bṛhadbhūṣaṇavyākhyā no vyadhāsyata, tarhi vaiyākaraṇamatōnamājjanasya majjanam evābhaviṣyat ity api kalpayitum śakyate*. Manudeva Bhaṭṭachārya is

also of the opinion (p. 16) that the Bṛhad-Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa contains many citations from lost portions of the Śabdakaustubha. Since the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa refers to the Manoramā and is therefore later than this text, we cannot be sure that Bhattoji lived to see Kauṇḍa Bhatta's commentaries on his work.

⁷¹ For references see Manudeva Bhaṭṭachārya's commentary Rūpālī on Kauṇḍa Bhatta's Bṛhadvaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa, pp. 328–332.

⁷² Joshi, 1993: 10.

⁷³ References in the Śabdakaustubha to a Bhatta are to the Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila Bhatta. An example is Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 22 1.24: *tathā cākṛtyadhikaraṇe bhāṭṭair uktam: niyogena vikalpena dve vā saha samuccite | sambandhaḥ samudāyo vā viśistā vaikayetarā ||*, which quotes Kumārila Bhatta's Tantravārttika on sūtra 1.3.30 (TanVār vol. II, p. 234).

⁷⁴ The beginning of another work by Bhattoji, the Tattvakaustubha, refers back to this line: *phanibhāṣitabhāṣyābdheḥ śabdakaustubha uddhṛtaḥ | sāṅkarād api bhāṣyābdheḥ [tattva]kaustubham uddhare ||* (Gode, 1955: 203).

⁷⁵ An indication in the text supporting that the Śabdakaustubha was intended as a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya is the remark to the extent that Kaiyata has described the word-*sphoṭa* and the sentence-*sphoṭa* in this very *praghāṭaka* (I p. 8 l. 19–20: *padasphoṭavākyasphoṭau tu ihaiva praghāṭake 'yenocāritena' iti bhāṣya pratīkam upādāya kaiyatena bhāṣyārthatayā varṇitau*). The meaning of *praghāṭaka* must be as noted in the Vācaspatyam (VI p. 4431 s.v. *praghāṭaka: ekārthapratīpādanārthagrānṭhāvayavabhede sām[khya]prafvacana]bhāṣye dṛṣṭam*), viz. a portion of a book. In this case a portion of the first Ahnika of the Mahābhāṣya must be intended, because it is there that we find the words *yenocāritena* ..., and it is on these words that Kaiyata's speaks about the word-*sphoṭa* and sentence-*sphoṭa*.

⁷⁶ E.g., Bhattoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 22 1.22: *yat tu sarūpasūtre bhāṣye vakṣyate*; p. 23 1.7–8: *vakṣyati hi vārttikakṛt*; p. 23 1.33–p. 24 1.1: *ata eva bhāṣye vakṣyate*; p. 33 1.8: *vakṣyati hi tatra vārttikakārah*; p. 46 1.11–12, p. 71 1.26: *bhāṣyakāro vakṣyati*; p. 51 1.27: *asiddhavatsūtre bhāṣyakṛtā vakṣyamānatvā[t]*; p. 61 1.4: *tathā ca vakṣyati 'nuḍ vācyā uttarārtham tu, iha kiṃcit trapo iti'* (= Mahābh III p. 267 1.12, on P. 7.1.73 vt. 3); p. 68 1.10–11: *'iti svaritam' iti sūtre bhāṣyakārair vakṣyamānatvā[t]*; p. 74 1.28–29: *'naveti vibhāṣā' iti sūtre bhāṣyakāro vakṣyati*; p. 75 1.8–9: *'ubhe abhyastam saha' iti saagrahaṇam vārttikakṛd vakṣyati, bhāṣyakāras tūbhegrahaṇam evaitadartham iti vakṣyati*; etc.

⁷⁷ The editor is not quite as explicit in the Sanskrit preceding the beginning of the edition (p. 1): *mahāmahopādhyāyabhattojīdīkṣitaviracitena śabdakaustubhena samalaṅkṛtam, vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣyam, tadvyākhyānabhūtaḥ kaiyāṭaviracitaḥ pradīpaḥ* etc.

⁷⁸ Upādhyāya, 1994: 61: ... *yaha mahābhāṣya kā bhī viveca grantha mānā jāta hai*.

⁷⁹ Bhāgavata, 1999: Upodghāta p. 013.

⁸⁰ A systematic search for references in the Sūktiratnākara could not here be undertaken and remains a desideratum. Compare, however, the following passages: (i) Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, Sūktiratnākara p. 123 1.6–8: *anye tu lkāropadeśo ṛṣvarṇayoh sāvarṇyānityatvajñāpanārthaḥ | tena klptaśīkha ity atr[a] ... plutāḥ sidhyati*; (ii) Bhattoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 42 1.30–31: *lkāropadeśas tūktarītyā klptaśīkhe plutāsiddhaye sāvarṇyānityatām jñāpayitum kartavya ev[a]*. See further below.

⁸¹ See Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, Sūktiratnākara p. 2 v. 6: *yah ... prakriyākāumudīṭikām ... kṛtavān ... so 'yam ... śrīkrṣṇa evāparah krṣṇaḥ śeṣaḥsimhasūritanayah ...*

⁸² Mīmāṃsaka (sam. 2030: I: 490) states that in his Śabdakaustubha Bhattoji criticizes the Prakriyāprakāśa at many places, but gives no concrete examples. He appears to be mistaken.

⁸³ Bali (1976: 2), referring to the introduction of an edition of the Vaiyākaraṇa Bhūṣaṇa Sāra not accessible to me, states: “[Bhaṭṭoji’s] predecessors are believed to have professed as priests in a Vaiṣṇava temple and hence were called by the designation of Dīkṣita.” Houben (2002: 477 n. 14) sees in the frequent title of Dīkṣita added to names an indication that Sanskrit intellectuals widely adhered to the Vedic ritual system. Witzel, 1994: 265 – with a reference to Kuṭṭanīmata vs. 38 – points out that in Kashmir *-dīkṣita* was the title of a Brahmin initiated to the solemn Vedic sacrifices such as the Soma ritual. Witzel also cites the following statement from Albīrūnī (ibid.): “When [a Brahmin] is busy with the service of one fire, he is called *istin*, if he serves three fires, he is called *agnihotrin*, if he besides offers an offering to the fire, he is called *dīkṣita*.”

⁸⁴ Compare the following two passages: (i) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa II p. 280 1.9–10: *anye tu manutantu ity ekam samudāyam paṭhanti na tu dvau śabdau | tathā ca bahvṛcabrahmaṇe prayogaḥ mānutantavyam uvāca’ iti |*. (ii) Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) III p. 71: *manutantuśabdo ’tra paṭhyate | samudāya ekā prakṛtiḥ | na tu prakṛtidvayam | tathā ca bahvṛcabrahmaṇam | mānutantavyam uvāceti |*.

⁸⁵ Compare: (i) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 28 1.14: *anye tu ’halantyam’ iti sarvam eva sūtram āvartayanti |*. (ii) Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) II p. 56 1.15–16: *sampūrṇasūtrāvṛtīyā halsūtrasyāntyam halantyam iti vā |*. This is, incidentally, not the position favored by Bhaṭṭoji.

⁸⁶ Compare: (i) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 56 1.21–22: *anye tu dhātavadhikāreṇa kāryavidhānāt sautrāṇām api dhātūnām pātho ’numīyate ity āhuh |*. (ii) Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) II p. 50 1.5–7: *na caivam sautresya avyāptiḥ | stambhvādīnām uditkāreṇa dhātavadhikāryakāryavidhānena ca dhātutvānumānāt |*.

⁸⁷ Compare: (i) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 16 l. 20–22: *anye tv āhuh: lkāropadeśa ṛ ṛvarṇayoh sāvarṇyānityatvajñāpanārthah, tena praklpyamānam ity atra ṛvarṇān nasya ṇatvam na bhavati, klptaśikhaḥ ity atra cārta iti plutapratishedho na bhavati;* (ii) Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 42 l. 30–31: *lkāropadeśas tūktarītyā klptaśikhe plutasiddhaye sāvarṇyānityatām jñāpayitum kartavya ev[a];* cp. note 80, above. The part *praklpyamānam ity atra ṛvarṇān nasya ṇatvam na bhavati* has nothing corresponding to it in the relevant part of the Śabdakaustubha.

⁸⁸ Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 114 1.16. The sentence which Bhaṭṭoji ascribes to Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakriyāprakāśa occurs in that work under P. 8.4.40 *stoh ścunā ścuh* (vol. I p. 138 1.18).

⁸⁹ The situation is slightly complicated by the fact that Appayya Dīkṣita, claimed to have been one of Bhaṭṭoji’s teachers, is said to have composed a grammatical work called Kaumudīprakāśa. Moreover, it is claimed that “[Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita] wrote Śabdakaustubha as a commemoration of his discipleship under Appayya” (EIP V p. 240). If all this is true, there may have been another commentary called Prakāśa on the Prakriyākaumudī, composed by another Dīkṣita, viz. Appayya. Both Bhaṭṭoji when referring to the Prakriyāprakāśa of his teacher, and Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa while referring to a Dīkṣita, might then conceivably refer to this work. This is however unlikely, for none of the above claims is supported by evidence known to me. The New Catalogus Catalogorum merely mentions a Kaumudīprakāśa “by Tolappa (wrongly Appā) Dīkṣita” (s.v. Kaumudīprakāśa).

⁹⁰ Mīmāṃsaka, sam. 2030: I: 488 f.

⁹¹ He says, for example, in his Kucamardinī (ed. Sadāshiva Sharma p. 2 1.21; ed. Madhusudana p. 4 1.3): *amum cārtham ’amudit’ sūtragatakaustubhakhandaṇāvasare vyaktam upapādayisyāmah*. Further ed. Sadāshiva Sharma p. 21 1.14, ed. Madhu-

sudana p. 43 l.11–12: *adhikam kaustubhakhaṇḍanād avaseyam*. Note however that Jagannātha frequently criticizes the Kaustubha in his Kucamardinī.

⁹² E.g., Cakrapāni, Praudhāmanoramākhaṇḍana p. 7 l.19; p. 17 l.3; p. 19 l.19.

⁹³ Cohn, 1962: 314 [486], with reference to Ābul Fzl-i-Allami, *Ain-i-Akbari* vol. II, tr. H.S. Jarrett, 2nd edn., Calcutta 1949, pp. 169–170.

⁹⁴ Bernier, p. 254: “La ville de Bénarès ... est l’École générale, et comme l’Athènes de tous les hindous des Indes, où les brahmanes et les religieux, qui sont ceux qui s’appliquent à l’étude, se rendent. Ils n’ont point de collèges et de classes ordonnées comme chez nous; cela me semble plus tenir de cette façon d’école des Anciens, les maîtres étant dispersés par la ville dans leurs maisons, et principalement dans les jardins des faubourgs, où les gros marchands les acceptent. De ces maîtres, les uns ont quatre disciples, les autres six ou sept, et les plus renommés douze ou quinze tout au plus, qui passent les dix et douze années avec eux. ... ils étudient doucement et sans beaucoup se tourmenter, en mangeant leur *khichri* ou mélange de légumes que les riches marchands leur font apprêter.” P. 259: “... Bénarès, cette fameuse école de toute la gentilité des Indes”.

⁹⁵ Bernier (p. 259 f.): “Lorsque je descendais le long du Gange et que je passai par Bénarès ..., j’allai trouver le chef des *Pandits*, qui fait là sa demeure ordinaire. C’est un *fakir* ou religieux tellement renommé pour son savoir que Shah Jahan, tant pour sa science que pour complaire aux *Rajas*, lui fit pension de deux mille roupies, qui est environ mille écus. C’était un gros homme très bien fait et qu’on regardait avec plaisir. Pour tout vêtement il n’avait qu’une espèce d’écharpe blanche de soie qui était liée à l’entour de la ceinture et qui pendait jusqu’à mi-jambe, avec une autre écharpe rouge de soie assez large qu’il avait sur ses épaules comme un petit manteau. Je l’avais vu plusieurs fois à Delhi dans cette posture devant le roi dans l’assemblée de tous les *Omrahs*, et marcher par les rues tantôt à pied tantôt en palanquin. Je l’avais aussi vu et j’avais conversé plusieurs fois avec lui, parce que, pendant un an, il s’était toujours trouvé à notre conférence devant mon *Agah*, à qui il faisait la cour, afin qu’il lui fit redonner sa pension qu’*Aurangzeb*, parvenu à l’Empire, lui avait ôtée pour paraître grand musulman. Dans la visite que je lui rendis à Bénarès, il me fit cent caresses, et me donna même la collation dans la bibliothèque de son université avec les six plus fameux *Pandits* de la ville.”

⁹⁶ He is followed in this respect by Pollock (2001: 407–408; forthcoming).

⁹⁷ Cp. Gode, 1969: 71: “I could not ... produce direct and independent evidence in support of this identity.” Upādhyāya (1994: 77 f.) yet takes it for granted that Gode’s identification of Bernier’s *chef des Pandits* is correct.

⁹⁸ Gode (n.d.: 452 n. 1) refers to a paper by Dr. Qanungo (“Some sidelights on the character and court-life of Shah Jahan”, *Journal of Indian History*, Madras, vol. 8, 1929, pp. 49 and 50) according to which: “Jagannātha Kalāwant was first given the title of Kavirāya and after some time that of Mahā Kavirāya.” See further note 67, above.

⁹⁹ Jagannātha appears to have composed a work called Jagadābharaṇa in honor of Dara Shikoh; Upādhyāya, 1994: 67–68.

¹⁰⁰ According to Qanungo’s article specified in note 98: “On the 22nd Rabi-us-Sani Jagannātha Kalāwant presented to the emperor 12 literary pieces composed in the name of His Majesty (Shah Jahan), who was so pleased that Jagannātha was weighed against silver and the whole amount of Rs. 4500 was presented to Jagannātha.” Moreover: “Jagannātha (Kalāwant) headed the list of authors at the Mughal Court.”

¹⁰¹ Cp. Sherring, 1868: 346–47: “One of the principal reasons that Benares is so famous is, that it was formerly the resort of large numbers of Brahmans, who, divided into schools and colleges, pursued the study of the ancient Sanskrit writings. At one time there were many hundreds of such establishments, in which thousands of

students were taught the philosophical tenets of Hinduism; and princes and nobles, in all parts of India, vied with each other in the support they rendered to the priests and pandits of Benares, and to the numerous Sanskrit colleges established in it. Enormous sums were annually given for this purpose, so that learned pandits and their disciples were alike nourished and cared for. Such munificence to teachers and pupils naturally attracted to Benares aspiring young Brahmans, from every province of India, who, receiving a thorough education in certain branches of philosophy, during their long and severe course of study, returned, eventually, to their native villages and towns, and became great local authorities on all religious topics, and the defenders and expounders of the national creed." Sherring further indicates that, "especially since the mutiny, the amount of ... support has greatly diminished" (p. 347).

¹⁰² Further examples are discussed in Chaudhuri, 1954; see also Chaudhuri, 1954a.

¹⁰³ NCC vol. 7 p. 137 s.v. Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja.

¹⁰⁴ So Hueckstedt, 2002: 50–51, which draws upon Tripāthī, 1977: (ā), (u); similarly Pathak, 1995: 13. See further Upādhyāya, 1994: 60. Belvalkar (1915: 38) describes this patron as "a (petty) king of Patrapuñja, a small place in the Duab formed by the Ganges and the Yamunā."

¹⁰⁵ Gode, 1954: 209 ff.; 1955. See also note 112, below.

¹⁰⁶ Schwartzberg, 1978: 200b. Ikkeri was situated near Shimoga in the present state of Karnataka, at the higher end of a path crossing the Western Ghat (Deloche, 1968: 55, 92). A map from 1737 made for Jesuits which clearly indicates the "Prince d'Ikkeri" is reproduced opposite p. 1 in Murr, 1987: vol. II. It is not without interest to note that Bhattoji's patron Veṅkatappa Nāyaka I, according to the information provided by Pietro della Valle in 1623, gave in to the same temptation as his enemy Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, viz. that of becoming "fond of a Moorish Woman", as a result of which his chief wife no longer engaged with him in the "Matrimonial Act" (Grey, 1892: II: 207–209). We further learn from Della Valle that Veṅkatappa was a Lingavāt (Lingayat), a vegetarian, and stingy (p. 246), a worshipper of Aghoreśvara (p. 272), and having "neither State, Court, nor appearance, befitting a true King" (p. 216). The rulers of Ikkeri were no doubt perfect examples of what Nicholas Dirks calls *little kings*, to be distinguished from a *great king*; cp. Frenz, 2000: 45 ff.

¹⁰⁷ Smith, 1902: 423.

¹⁰⁸ Cp. Richards, 1993: 19 ff.; Spear, 1973: 31–34: "Akbar's stroke was to raise himself from the position of a leader of a minority Indo-foreign group (the Muslims) to the accepted ruler of all Hindustan. The previous sultans of Delhi had, it is true, employed Hindus largely in their administration and used Hindu contingents in their wars, but they were always subordinate with no say in policy, the troops mercenaries to be hired and fired. ... Akbar's method was to make a deal with the Hindus and to do this through their militant representatives, the Rajputs. ... The Rajputs were not only concentrated in Rajasthan, the area of their continued independence, but scattered all over north India as chiefs and groups of sturdy cultivators. They were the spearhead of Hinduism as the Brahmins were the mind. ... [B]y a series of understandings Akbar brought the Rajput chiefs into the service of the empire. In effect the Rajputs were to be given high office and imperial honours in return for allegiance and loyal service. The method was the employment of Rajput chiefs as military commanders, provincial governors, and members of Akbar's confidential circle or 'privy council'. ... Thus in effect the Rajputs became partners in the empire and through them the whole Hindu community came to accept the Mughal government as in some sense their own." Cp. also Dalmia, 1997: 67: "The revenue-paying patterns estimated by the information given in the *Ain-e-Akbarī* for the districts of Jaunpur, Ghazipur-Ballia and Banaras, according to Bernhard (sic) Cohn [(1969: 347)], were roughly 50 percent Rajputs, 30 percent Bhūmihar, 11 percent

Brahmans and 3 percent Muslims, though in the Banaras region the Bhūmihars owned as much as 79 percent of the land.” (p. 65–66: “The Bhūmihars were a caste settled mainly in what is today western Bihar and eastern Uttar Pradesh. They had always tended to claim Brahmanical status, but they did not carry out priestly functions and were essentially landed classes with distinct customs and practices.”) See further Cohn, 1969: 346–349: “[The] position [of Rajputs] as land controllers and revenue payers was usually based on conquests of semi-aboriginal tribes ... in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries and of other Rajput clans or of Muslim jagirdars from pre-Mughal times. ... In general, Rajputs were replacing Muslim families as zamindars during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.”

¹⁰⁹ Spear, 1973: 41 draws attention to two measures in particular that were installed: “The first was rotation of office; Mughal officers rarely held high appointments, such as governorships, for more than three or four years at a time. The second was the resumption of their property at death. The assignments of land were for life only; the next generation had to start from the bottom with an official appointment. During life, payments were always in arrears so that they were only able to make ends meet by means of advances from the Treasury. At death, the great man’s property was sealed and nothing was released until the advances had been recovered. The process amounted to death-duties of about a 100%. Aware of the fate which hung over them the Mughal lords accentuated the situation by heavy spending. Why not get the glory to be derived from ostentation and public works when you could pass nothing on to your family? Thus the Mughal nobles were notable for their ostentation, their crowds of retainers with even more than the average insolence of office, their works of piety in the shape of mosques, wells, and rest houses, of ease like their gardens and summerhouses, and of remembrances like their great domed tombs.”

¹¹⁰ Pietro della Valle says the following about Venkatappa Nāyaka (Grey, 1892: II: 243): “I style him King because the Portugals themselves and the Indians do so; but, in truth, Venk-tapā Naieka, (not only because his Predecessors were a few years ago Vassals and simple Naiekas, that is feudatory Princes, or rather Provincial Gouvernours, under the King of Vidianagher; and at this day he himself reigns absolutely by Usurpation, and is in effect no other then a Rebel; (and God know how long his House will abide in greatness); but also much more by reason of the smallness of his territory, though it be great, in respect of other Indian Gentile-Princes) deserves not the Appellation of King; and the less because he pays Tribute to Idal-Sciàh, who although a greater Prince, is but small for a King and payes Tribute to the Moghol. In short, Venk-tapā Naieka, although now absolute, should in my opinion, be call’d a Royolet rather than a King ...” For some remarks about indigenous banking techniques, esp. the so-called *hundi*, see Bouchon, 1994: 144, Chatterjee, 1996: 187 ff.; for further remarks concerning the following century, see Kieffer, 1983: 234 ff. (“Les banquiers et les techniques bancaires”).

¹¹¹ Smith, 1902: 130 ff.; 1958: 346 f. Richards, 1993: 35 observes: “Father Monserrate gives a vivid picture of a series of bitter disputations with the ulema at the Mughal court. On these occasions, from the Jesuit point of view at least, Akbar was noticeably sympathetic to the Christian point of view and impatient with the inability of the Muslim theologians to argue effectively against them.” Richards further points out (p. 37) that from 1578 onward Akbar dispensed pious grants of land to learned and religious men of all religions – not just Islam: “Yogis living in monasteries (maths) received lands. Zoroastrian divines (Parsis) obtained lands. Even Brahmin priests enjoyed Akbar’s largess.”

¹¹² NCC vol. 5, p. 92, with reference to Adyar D. VI.560, and following dates: 1619–1631 A.D. for Vidyādhīśayati and 1592–1629 A.D. for Venkatappa. This information is no doubt based on the following verse which occurs at the end of Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa’s *Bṛhadvaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa* (p. 331): *vidyādhīśavaderusañjñakayatim śrī*

madhvabhāttārakam, jītvā keladiveṅkatayyasavidhe 'py āndolikām prāptavān | yaś cakre munivaryasūtravivṛtiṃ siddhāntabhāṅgam tathā, mādhvānām tam ahaṃ gurūpamagurum raṅgojibhattam bhaje||. We learn from this verse that the real name of the opponent must have been Vaḍeru / Baḍeru, and that *vidyādhiśa* and *yati* were his attributes. Gode (1940: 65 n. 1) cites the following passage from an article in the *Karnatak Historical Review* (January–July 1937) by Dr. Saletore: “As regards the age in which [Bhattoji Dīkṣita] lived we learn from the opening verses of Tattva-Kaustubha that he wrote it at the order of Keladi Veṅkatendra (*Keladi Veṅkatendrasya nirdeśāt viduṣām mude*). (Read Hultzsich, Report on Sanskrit Mss of South India, II, Intro, Pp. xii, 122, Madras, 1895–1896). The ruler Veṅkatendra mentioned here is to be identified with king Veṅkatapa Nāyak I, who ruled from A.D. 1582 till A.D. 1629 (Rice: Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 157). King Veṅkatapa Nāyak was noted for the patronage he gave to learned men (Read Keladi Basavarāja, Śivatattvaratnākara, Kallola VI, Taraṅga XIII. Ed. by B. Ramarao and Sundara Sastri, Mangalore, 1927; cf. S.K. Aiyangar, Sources of Vijayanagar History, p. 345). He himself seems to have composed a commentary in Sanskrit on the Śiva Gītā of Padmapurāna (Trien. Cata. of Mss in the Govt. Ori. Mss Library, Madras, p. 2623).” See further note 106, above.

¹¹³ Smith, 1958: 380, 416; Richards, 1993: 175; Altekar, 1937: 35 ff.

¹¹⁴ This suggests that the contrast which according to Houben (2002: 463 f.) exists between Bhattoji, who highlights his differences from his predecessors, and Bharthari, who tries to hide them, is in need of careful specification.

REFERENCES

- Abhyankar, K.V. (1952). Date and authorship of the Śabdaratna and the Bṛhat-Śabdaratna. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 32 [1951], 258–260.
- Abhyankar, K.V. (1964). Authorship of the Laghuśabdaratna. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 45, 152–158.
- Altekar, A.S. (1937). *History of Benares (from the Earliest Times Down to 1937)*. Benares: Culture Publication House, Benares Hindu University.
- Athavale, R.B. (1968). New light on the life of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Golden Jubilee Volume, pp. 415–420.
- Bali, Suryakant (1976). *Bhattoji Dīkṣita. His Contribution to Sanskrit Grammar*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Bal Shastri (ed.) (1988). *Mahabhashya of Patanjali* vol. I part I (Nawahnikam), with the commentaries Bhattoji Deekshita's 'Shabdakaustubh', Nagojibhatta's 'Uddyota' & Kaiyata's 'Pradipa', Ab[h]inavarajlakshmi by Pt. Guru Prasad Shastri. Vārāṇasī.
- Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna (1915). *An Account of the Different Existing Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*. Second revised edition: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi/Varanasi, 1976.
- Bernier, François (1981). *Voyage dans les États du Grand Mogol*. Fayard.
- Bhāgavata, Vāmanaśāstrī (ed.) (1999). *Śeṣa-Nārāyaṇaviracitaḥ Sūktiratnākaraḥ I*. Pune: Anandāśrama.
- Bhānuji Dīkṣita: *Rāmāśramī*. In: Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana or Amarakośa of Amarasimha, with the Rāmāśramī (Vyākhyāsudhā) commentary of Bhānuji Dīkṣita (Rāmāśrama), edited with the easy Maṇiprabhā (Prakāśa) Hīndī commentary and notes etc., by Pt. Haragovinda Śāstrī. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1970. (Kashi Sanskrit Series, 198.)

- Bhat, M.S. (1965). In S.N. Gajendragadkar & S.A. Upadhyaya (eds.), Authorship of the Laghuśabdaratna. *H.D. Velankar Commemoration Volume* (pp. 203–205). Bombay.
- Bhattoji Dikṣita: *Praudha Manoramā*. (1) Edited, with the Bṛhacchabdaratna of Hari Dikṣita and the Laghuśabdaratna of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa, by Sitaram Shastri. First volume. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University. 1964. (Hindu Vishwavidyālaya Nepal Rājya Sanskrit Series, 8.) (2) Edited, with the Laghuśabdaratna of Hari Dikṣita, the Jyotsnā of Jagannātha Śāstrī Pāndeya, ... the Kucamardinī of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, ... by Pandit Sadāshiva Sharma Shastri. Benaras: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1991. (Haridas Sanskrit Series, 23.)
- Bhattoji Dikṣita: *Sabdakaustubha*. (1) Vol. I, ed. Pt. Gopāl Śāstrī Nene and Pt. Śrī Mukund Śāstrī Puṅtāmkar (navāhnikā); Vol. II with Sphotacandrikā of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa Mauni, ed. Pt. Gopāl Śāstrī Nene; Vol. III, ed. Vindhyeśwarī Prasād Dvivedī and Gaṇapati Śāstrī Mokāte. Reprint: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1991. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 2.) (2) See under Bal Shastri.
- Biswal, Banamali (1995). *The Samāsaśaktinirṇaya (Chapter V of the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa) of Kaṇḍa Bhaṭṭa*. Critically edited with introduction and exhaustive explanatory notes. Allahabad: Padmaja Prakashan.
- Bouchon, Geneviève (1994). *L'Empire dans sa Prospérité* = Markovits, 1994: 133–157 (chapitre VII).
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1986): *Tradition and Argument in Classical Indian Linguistics*. Reidel, Dordrecht. (Studies in Classical India, volume 6.) (Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 2003.)
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1987). *Three Problems Pertaining to the Mahābhāṣya*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Post-graduate and Research Department Series, 30; Pandit Shripad Shastri Deodhar Memorial Lectures, Third Series.)
- Brough, John (1951). Theories of general linguistics in the Sanskrit grammarians. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 27–46. Reprint: Staal, 1972: 402–414; Brough, 1996: 79–98.
- Brough, John (1996). *Collected Papers* In Minoru Hara & J.C. Wright ed., London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Cakrapānidatta: *Praudhamanoramākhaṇḍana*. Ed. Vidhyeśwarī Prasāda Dvivedin. Benares: E.J. Lazarus. (Published in *The Pandit* 32, 1910, 1–60; 33, 1911, 61–76; 34, 1912, 77–120; 35, 1913, 121–134; 36, 1914, title page).
- Cardona, George (1968). Review of Joshi, 1967. *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, 17, 445–450.
- Cardona, George (1976). *Pāṇini, A Survey of Research*. The Hague: Mouton. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1980.
- Chatterjee, Kumkum (1996). *Merchants, Politics & Society in Early Modern India, Bihar: 1733–1820*. Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill. (Brill's Indological Library, 10).
- Chaudhuri, Jatindra Bimal (1954). *Muslim Patronage to Sanskrit Learning*. 2nd ed. Calcutta: Prācyavāṇī.
- Chaudhuri, Jatindra Bimal (1954a). *Contributions of Muslims to Sanskrit Learning: Khān Khānān Abdur Rahim (1557–1630 A.D.) and contemporary Sanskrit learning (1551–1650 A.D.)*. Calcutta: Prācyavāṇī.
- Cohn, Bernard S. (1962). Political systems in eighteenth century India: the Banaras region. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 82, 312–320. Reprint: Cohn, 1987: 483–499.
- Cohn, Bernard S. (1969). Structural change in Indian rural society 1596–1885. (*Land Control and Social Structure in Indian History*. Ed. Robert E. Frykenberg. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.) Reprint: Cohn, 1987: 343–421.

- Cohn, Bernard S. (1987). *An Anthropologist Among the Historians and Other Essays*. Delhi etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Coward, Harold G. & K. Kunjunni Raja (ed.) (1990). *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Volume V: The Philosophy of the Grammarians*. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Dalmia, Vasudha (1997). *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions. Bhāratendu Hariśchandra and Nineteenth-Century Banaras*. Delhi etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Das, Karunasindhu (1990). *A Pāṇinian Approach to Philosophy of Language (Kaundabhatta's Vaiyākaranabhāṣanasāra critically edited and translated into English)*. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.
- Deloche, Jean (1968). *Recherches sur les Routes de l'Inde au Temps des Mogols (Étude Critique des Sources)*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 67.)
- Deshpande, Madhav M. (1992). *The Meaning of Nouns. Semantic Theory in Classical and Medieval India: Nāmārtha-nirṇaya of Kaundabhatta*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer (Studies of Classical India, 13).
- Frenz, Margret (2000). *Vom Herrscher zum Untertan. Spanningverhältnis zwischen lokaler Herrschaftsstruktur und der Kolonialverwaltung in Malabar zu Beginn der britischen Herrschaft (1790–1805)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. (Beiträge zur Südasiensforschung, Südasiens-Institut, Universität Heidelberg, 188.)
- Gaurinath Sastri (1980). *A Study in the Dialectics of Sphoṭa*. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Gode, P.K. (n.d.): The tradition about liaison of Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja with a Muslim lady (yavanī) – is it a myth? (Bhāratīya Vidyā 6(1), 57–62.) Reprint: Gode, 1954: 452–459.
- Gode, P.K. (1940). A new approach to the date of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. *Annals of the S.V. Oriental Institute (Tirupati)* 1, 117–127. Reprint: Gode, 1954: 65–74.
- Gode, P.K. (1941), Bernier and Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī at the Mughal court. *Journal of S.V. Oriental Institute, Tirupati* 1(4), 1–16. Reprint in: Gode, 1954: 364–379.
- Gode, P.K. (1941a). Varadarāja, a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and his works – between A.D. 1600 and 1650. (*Festschrift Prof. P.V. Kane* (1941), pp. 188–199.) Reprint: Gode, 1954: 316–329.
- Gode, P.K. (1941b). A rare manuscript of the Vedabhāṣyasāra of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. *Adyar Library Bulletin* 5, 176–180. Reprint: Gode, 1954: 75–78.
- Gode, P.K. (1954). *Studies in Indian Literary History*. Vol. II. Bombay: Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan. (Shri Bhadur Singh Singhi Memoirs, vol. 5.)
- Gode, P.K. (1954a). The chronology of the works of Kaundabhatta (a nephew of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita): between A.D. 1610 and 1660. *Adyar Library Bulletin* 18(3–4), 210–216. Reprint: Gode, 1956: 207–211.
- Gode, P.K. (1955). The contact of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and some members of his family with the Keḷadi rulers of Ikkeri – between c. A.D. 1592 and 1645. *Journal of the Oriental Institute (Baroda)* 4(1), 33–36. Reprint: Gode, 1956: 203–206.
- Gode, P.K. (1969). Some evidence about the location of the manuscript library of Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī at Benares in A.D. 1665. In *Studies in Indian Cultural History* vol. III (P.K. Gode Studies vol VI), I: 71–76.
- Gordon, Stewart (1993). *The Marathas 1600–1818*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (The New Cambridge History of India, ed. Gordon Johnson, vol. 2/4.)
- Grey, Edward (1892). *The Travels of Pietro della Valle in India*. From the old English translation of 1664 by G. Havers. Edited, with a life of the author, an introduction and notes. 2 vols. London: Hakluyt Society.

- Haraprasad Shastri (1912). Dakshini pandits at Benares. *Indian Antiquary* 41, 7–13.
- Hintze, Andrea (1997). *The Mughal Empire and its Decline. An Interpretation of the Sources of Social Power*. Aldershot, Brookfield USA, Singapore, Sydney: Ashgate.
- Houben, Jan E.M. (2002). The Brahmin intellectual: history, ritual and ‘time out of time’. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30, 463–479.
- Hueckstedt, Robert A. (2002). Some later arguments on *iko yaṅ aci*. In Madhav M. Deshpande & Peter E. Hook. (eds.), *Indian Linguistic Studies. Festschrift in Honor of George Cardona* (pp. 44–72). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Iyer, K.A. Subramania (ed., tr.) (1966). *Sphoṭasiddhi of Maṇḍana Miśra*. Poona: Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute. (Deccan College Building Centenary Series, 25.)
- Jagannātha Paṇḍita: *Rasagaṅgādhara*. With the commentaries of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa and Mathurā Nātha śāstrī. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass. Reprint 1983.
- Jagannātha Paṇḍita. *Kucamardīnī or Kucamardana*. (1) See under Bhattoji Dīkṣita, Prauḍha Manoramā. (2) Manoramā-Kuchamardanam of Paditarāj Jagannāth, with the Balakrida Hindi commentary, ed. Acharya Madhusudan Shastri, Krishnadas Academy, Varanasi, 1983.
- Joshi, S.D. (1967). *The Sphoṭanirṇaya (Chapter XIV of the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇasāra) of Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa*. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Critical and Exegetical Notes. Poona: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 2.)
- Joshi, Shivaram Dattatray (1993, 1995, 1997). “Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa on the meaning of Sanskrit verbs.” *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism, Sambhāṣā* 14, 1–39; 16, 1–66; 18, 1–34.
- Joshi, S.D. & J.A.F. Roodbergen (1990). *Patañjali’s Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Sthānivadhbhāvāhnikā*. Part I (P. 1.1.56–1.1.57). Introduction, text, translation and notes. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Research Unit Publications, 11.)
- Joshi, S.D. & J.A.F. Roodbergen (1991). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. With translation and explanatory notes. Volume I (1.1.1–1.1.75). New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Joshi, Venkateshshastri (1980). Authorship of the Laghuśabdaratna. In D.G. Koparkar & G.U. Thite (eds.), *Problems in Sanskrit Grammar*, by Venkateshshastri Joshi. (pp. 107–161) Poona: Dastane Ramchandra & Co.
- Kaiyata: *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa*. See Patañjali (2).
- Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa: *Brhadvaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa*. Edited, with ‘Rūpāhī’ notes and appendix, by Pt. Manudeva Bhaṭṭachārya. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan. 1985. (Harjivandas Prachya Vidya Granthamala, 2).
- Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa: *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra*. (i) Edited, with ‘Prabhā’ commentary by Pt. Śrī Bālākṛṣṇa Pañcholi, and with ‘Darpaṇa’ commentary, by Śrī Harivallabha Śāstrī. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1969. (Kashi Sanskrit Series, 188.) (ii) Edited, with Prābhākara Hindi and Sanskrit commentary, by Prābhākara Miśra. Varanasi: Arabindamiśra, Makarandamiśra. 1982. (iii) Edited, with ‘Darpaṇa’ Hindi commentary, by Brahma Datta Dvivedī. Varanasi, Delhi: Chaukhambha Orientalia. 1985. (Chaukhambha Prachya Vidya Series, 17.)
- Kieffer, Jean-Luc (1983). *Anquetil-Duperron. L’Inde en France au XVIIIe siècle*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Markovits, Claude (ed.) (1994). *Histoire de l’Inde moderne 1480–1950*. Fayard.
- McCrea, Lawrence (2002). Novelty of form and novelty of substance in seventeenth century Mīmāṃsā. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30, 481–494.
- Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira (sam. 2030). *Samskrta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa*. 3 parts. Bahālagadhā, Sonīpāta (Haryana): Ramlal Kapur Trust.
- Murr, Sylvia (1987). *L’Inde philosophique entre Bossuet et Voltaire*. I: Moeurs et coutumes des indiens (1777), un inédit du Père G.-L. Coeurdoux s.j. dans la

- version de N.-J. Desvaulx. II: L'indologie du Père Coeurdoux: stratégies, apologétique et scientificité. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 146.)
- Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa: *Rasagaṅgādharatīkā*. See under Jagannātha.
- Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa: *Sphoṭavāda*. Edited, with his own commentary Subodhinī, by V. Krishnamacharya. Adyar, Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre. 1946. Reprint 1977.
- Palsule, G.B. (ed., tr.) (1988): *Mahābhāsyadīpikā of Bharṭṛhari*. Fascicule V: Āhnika II. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Post-Graduate and Research Department Series, 31.)
- Pandeya, Ramajna (1954). *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar*. Banaras: Government Sanskrit Library. (The Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavana Studies, XI.)
- Patañjali: *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*. (1) See abbreviations, under Mahā-bh. (2) Edited, with Kaiyata's Pradīpa and Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa's Pradīpodyota, by Vedavrata. Rohataka: Harayānā-sāhitya-saṁsthāna. 5 vols. 1962–1963.
- Pathak, Parushottam Prasad (1995). *Nāgeśamate paribhāṣāṇaṁ vivecanam*. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.
- Pollock, Sheldon (2001). The death of Sanskrit. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43(2), 392–426.
- Pollock, Sheldon (forthcoming): The languages of science in early-modern India. In K. Preisendanz (ed.), *Halbfass Commemoration Volume*. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Rāmacandra: Prakriyākaumudī. (1) The Prakriyākaumudī of Rāmachandra, with the comentary Prasāda of Viṭṭhala. Ed. Rao Bahadur Kamalashankar Prana-shankar Trivedi. 2 vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1925, 1931. (Bombay Sanskrit and Prakṛit Series 78, 82.) (2) Prakriyākaumudī by Rāmacandrācārya with Prakāśa by Śrīkṛiṣṇa. Edited, with his Raśmi, by Muralidhara Miśra. Introduction (Prastāvīkam) by Bhāgiratha Prasāda Tripāthī. 3 vols. Varanasi: Sampurnanad Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya. 1977–1980. (Sarasvatībhavana-Granthamālā, 111–112.)
- Ranganathasvami Aryavaraguru, S.P.V. (1912). On the Seshas of Benares. *Indian Antiquary* 41, 245–253.
- Richards, John F. (1993). *The New Cambridge History of India, I.5. The Mughal Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salomon, Richard (1985). *The Bridge to the Three Holy Cities. The Sāmānya-praghaṭṭaka of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's Tristhalīsetu*. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sarma, Sreeramula Rajeswari (2002). From yāvanī to saṁskṛtam: Sanskrit writings inspired by Persian Works. *Studies in the History of Indian Thought/Indo-shisōshi Kenkyū* (Kyoto) 14, 71–88.
- Schwartzberg, Joseph E. (ed.) (1978). *A Historical Atlas of South Asia*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Śeṣa Kṛiṣṇa: *Prakriyāprakāśa*. For the edition used, see Rāmacandra.
- Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa: *Sūktiratnākara*. See Bhāgavata, 1999.
- Sharma, Rama Nath (1995). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Volume III. English translation of adhyāyas two and three with Sanskrit text, transliteration, word-boundary, anuvṛtti, vṛtti, explanatory notes, derivational history of examples, and indices. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Sharma, Sri Ram (1938). *A Bibliography of Mughal India (1526–1707 A.D.)*. Bombay: Karnatak Publishing House. Reprint: Porcupine Press, Philadelphia, 1977.
- Sherring, M.A. (Matthew Atmore) (1868). *Benares, the Sacred City of the Hindus in Ancient and Modern Times*. Reprint: B.R. Publishing Corporation, Delhi, 1975.

- Smith, Vincent A. (1902). *Akbar the Great Mogul, 1542–1605*. 2nd edn., revised. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, Vincent A. (1958). *The Oxford History of India*. 3rd edn., edited by Percival Spear. ... Part II, revised by J.B. Harrison. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Spear, Percival (1973): *A History of India. Volume Two*. Reprinted with revisions. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Śrī Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa Maunin: *Sphoṭacandrikā*. Ed. Pt. Gopal Śāstrī Nene. See under Bhattoji Dīkṣita: Śabdakaustubha.
- Staal, J.F. (ed.) (1972). *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1985.
- Tripāthī, Bhāgīratha Prasāda (1977). Prāstāvīkam. See under Rāmacandra, Prakriyākaumidī (2).
- Upādhyāya, Baladeva (1994). *Kāśī kī pāṇḍitya-paramparā* (kāśīstha saṃskṛta vidvānom ke jīvanacarita evam sāhityika avadānom kā prāmāṇika vivaraṇa) [1200–1980]. 2nd edn. Vārāṇasī: Viśvavidyālaya Prakāśana.
- Vācaspatyam*. Vachaspatyam (a comprehensive Sanskrit dictionary), compiled by Sri Taranatha Tarkavachaspati. 3rd edn. 6 vols. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1969–1970. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 94.)
- Viṭhala: *Prakriyāprasāda*. For the edition used, see Rāmacandra.
- Witzel, Michael (1994): The Brahmins of Kashmir. In Y. Ikari (ed.), *A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir* (pp. 237–294). Kyoto: Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University.

ABBREVIATIONS:

ASS	Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, Poona
Kane, HistDh	Pandurang Vaman Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, second edition, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 5 vols., 1968–1977
Mahā-bh	Patañjali, (Vyākaraṇa-) Mahābhāṣya, ed. F. Kielhorn, Bombay 1880–1885
NCC	New Catalogus Catalogorum, by V. Raghavan, K. Kunjuni Raja, etc., Madras: University of Madras, 1968 ff.
TanVār	Tantravārttika of Kumārilabhaṭṭa (ASS, 97)

Section de langues et civilisations orientales
Université de Lausanne
 BFSH 2
 CH-1015 Lausanne
 Switzerland
 E-mail: johannes.bronkhorst@unil.ch