The philosophy of grammar has only four major representatives in the history of Indian thought. One of these is Bhartrhari, 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, Bhattoji Diksita, was the paternal uncle of the second, Kaunda Bhatta. The third one, Nāgēsa Bhatta, was a pupil of Bhattoji’s grandson. This shows that Bhattoji revived the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar after an interval of more than 1000 years.

The sphota 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 sphota were grammarians either. Some well-known examples are the following: The Yoga Bhāṣya, without using the term sphota, propounds that the word is unitary and without parts.¹ The Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila Bhatta criticized the concept (in his Slokavarttika, chapter on Sphotavāda) but not without adopting an important part of it (viz., the indivisible speech sounds); the Vedāntin Śaṅkara did the same (on Brahmaśūtra 1.3.28). Another Mīmāṃsaka, Maṇḍana Miśra, wrote a treatise (called Sphotasiddhi) to prove its existence.

Bhattoji’s understanding of the sphota differs from that of most or all of his predecessors. There is a fundamental difference between his discussion of the sphota in the Śabdakaustubha and most, if not all, of what had been said about it before. The sphota, for Bhattoji’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

¹Thanks are due to Madhav Deshpande, who made the Pradhananoramanākhandana 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 kah 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 sphota 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 gauh, assuming for the time being that the constituent sounds are really existing ‘things’: Gauh 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 gauh 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 sphota 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 Bhattoji. 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 Bhattoji: the sphota. The sphota 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” Bhattoji’s ideas may recall Brough’s description of the sphota as “simply the linguistic sign in its aspect of meaning-bearer (Bedeutungsträger)” (1951: 34, [406, 86]). Brough criticizes Keith’s description of the sphota 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 sphota held by Bhattoji and his successors, it seems clear that it is hardly if at all applicable to those thinkers who preceded Bhattoji.³ This does not imply that the sphota 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 Vaiśesika 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 Bhattoji reminds us of when he points out that what he calls the akhandapadasphota is a single entity in the same way in which a cloth is a single entity. The modern study of sphota 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 ‘Bhattoji Diksita on sphota’ should first show that such a changed concept of the sphota finds expression in Bhattoji’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 Bhattoji’s other ideas, both philosophical and grammatical. And thirdly it might consider what circumstances allowed Bhattoji 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 Bhattoji’s concept of sphota differs from its predecessors without presenting a full history of that concept. The question as to why Bhattoji 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 Bhattoji and the circumstances in which he worked; this may help to explain his relative originality within the grammatical tradition which he represents.

Bhattoji’s Šabdakaustubha presents in its first chapter eight points of view which are said to be possible with regard to the sphota; these points of view accept respectively (i) the varnasphota, (ii) the padasphota, (iii) the vakyasphota, (iv) the akhandapadasphota, (v) the akhandavakyasphota, (vi) the varnajātisphota, (vii) the padajātisphota, and (viii) the vākyajātisphota. 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 Bhattoji continues (p. 7 l.1): “In reality expressiveness resides exclusively in the sphota” (vastutas tu vācakatā sphotaikanisthā).

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 Šabdakaustubha formulates it as follows:
"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 varṇaśphotapakṣa 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 expressible, just as in the case of the words ṛṣabha, ṛṣabha, ṛṣa 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 varṇaśphota attributes primary expressiveness to morphemes. This is confirmed by some remarks later on in the discussion, where Bhattoji tries to show that the varṇaśphota finds support in the classical treatises. We read there:  

"All these eight points of view have been explained at various places in the authoritative treatises. An instance is the Bhāṣya on the sthānivātsātra (P. 1.1.56 sthāniyād ādēṣō naṁvadhī) [which states:] ‘All [substitutes] are substitutes of whole padas’. 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 supitiṁtam padam). And similarly, also the Tīkāgranṭha is in agreement with the varṇaśphota when it says: ‘the meaning of er uh is tes tuḥ’. Similarly the Bhaṣya [states] that, given that only something that is capable of expressing the meaning of the substituend [can be] a substitute, because one can accomplish [the desired effect] in the case of (P. 3.4.101) tāsthaṁṭhāmpūṁ (tāntamāṇah) with the help of the sthānentaratamapaṁśhāsā (= P. 1.1.50 sthāne ṃtarāvamānaḥ), the yathāsāṁkhyāṣṭu (= P. 1.3.10 yathāsāṁkhyām anuḍeṣāḥ samāṇaṁ) must not be used." The padasphota and the vākṣyasphota on the other hand...

All the examples in this passage concern morphemes, and the fact that immediately after it the padasphota and the vākṣyasphota are going to be discussed shows that this passage is about the varṇaśphota (as it says explicitly in connection with the Tīkāgranṭha).
It follows from the above that the upholder of the varnasphota believes that primary expressiveness resides in the morphemes (primarily stems and suffixes) that make up words. And yet varna does not mean ‘morpheme’ but ‘speech sound, phoneme’. Bhattoji’s choice of terminology is confusing, and it appears that as a result some later thinkers ended up applying the term varna to morphemes, which was not Bhattoji’s intention.

This understanding of Bhattoji’s varnasphota is confirmed by the fact that the initial presentation of the varnasphota is followed by the statement that the expressiveness of morphemes is contested (kar-prabhṛtayō vācakā na veti ceha vipratipattīśaṁ). The edition by Gopāl Sāstrī Nene, no doubt under the influence of Nāgēśa’s Sphotavāda, sees this as the final sentence of the section on the varnasphota. In reality it is a criticism of the varnasphota which serves the purpose of introducing the then following padasphota. Indeed, Bhattoji explains two pages later that among the eight points of view on the sphota each of the preceding views is refuted by the one that follows it, and that the final one corresponds to that of the authorities.

It is clear that the upholder of the varnasphota 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. Those who accept the then following two positions – the padasphotapaksa and the vākyasphotapaksa – 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 padasphota 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 vākyasphotapaksa 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.

This changes with the positions that succeed it. The akhandapadasphota and the akhandavākyasphota, and in a certain way also the three kinds of jātisphota, correspond to the independent entities that had been postulated by earlier thinkers and which have a
distinct ontological status. In the case of the akhanḍapadaspotra and akhanḍavākyaspotra, as we have seen, Bhatṭoji 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 Bhatṭoji presents totally ignore the ontological side of the sphonas shows that the sphonas for Bhatṭoji 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 Miṣra in his Sphonasiddhi, 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 Miṣra would not have been impressed with Bhatṭoji’s enumeration of possible points of view.¹⁷

Bhatṭoji insists that he did not invent the eight possible positions about the sphonas himself. We have already seen that he cites two passages from the Mahābhāṣya and one from a Tikāgrantha (probably Kaiyata) to support the varnasphonasapaksas. The first Bhāṣya passage, which occurs under P. 1.1.20 (Mahābhāṣya I p. 75 1.13) and P. 7.1.27 (Mahābhāṣya III p. 251.12), is the first half of a verse that states: “All [substitutes] are substitutes of whole pādas according to Pāṇini the son of Dākṣiṇ; for if there were modification of a part of a pada, they could not be eternal” (sarve sarvapadādeśa dākṣiputraśya pāṇineḥ / ekadeśavikāre hi nityatvam nopapadyate/). This verse clearly presupposes that pādas 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 Bhatṭoji’s varnasphonasapaksas, 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 varnasphonasapaksas must be the following one on P. 1.3.10 (yathāśāṃkhyam anudeśah samānām):¹⁹ “What example is there with regard to this [sūtra]? is… [An example is] (P. 3.4.101): tasthasthamipām täntamtāmah ‘The tas, tha, thas and miP replacements for LA, marked with ɴ, are obligatorily replaced by täm, tam,
But is not the same established by what is nearest with respect to place (by P. 1.1.50 sthāne 'ntaratamah '[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 Bhattoji ascribes to the upholder of the varnasphotā.

The evidence marshaled from authoritative works for the varnasphotā, as will be clear from the above, is weak. For the padasphotā and the vākyasphotā, on the other hand, Bhattoji can directly refer to a passage by Kaiyata on the words yenocciṛṭena ... in the Paspaśāhnikā 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 sphota.\(^{23}\) Bhattoji adds, as he must, that Kaiyata’s passage deals with the akhaṇḍapadasphotā and akhaṇḍavākyasphotā.\(^{24}\)

In order to lend textual support to his sakhaṇḍapadasphotā and vākyasphotā Bhattoji 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 sphota. By stating that there are eternal sounds in eternal words it somehow disagrees with the classical position on the sphota, which holds the opposite: the word (= word-sphota) is an entity different from the sounds, so that there are no sounds in the word. Nor does it agree with Bhattoji’s position, which does not assign ontological independence to the sakhaṇḍapadasphotā. Kaiyata interprets this Bhāṣya passage as expressing the jātisphotapotakṣa; Bhattoji, as we have seen, interprets it differently. Whatever may have been Patañjali’s original intention, Bhattoji interprets this passage in a way which deviates from the preceding tradition so as to justify his new understanding of sphota. Bhattoji refers to further passages from Kaiyata to bolster his presentation of eight positions about the sphota.\(^{26}\) The first of these passages does not read, as claimed by Bhattoji, kecid varnasphotam apare padasphotam vākyasphotam cāuh, but rather: kecit dhvanivyāṅgyam varṇātmakam nityam śabdam āuh/ anye
Contrary to Bhattoji’s claim, it does not mention the varnasphota. We may assume that Bhattoji considered the first part of this passage (… varṇātmakam nītyam śabdam …) to support his varnasphota, sakhanḍapadasphota and sakhanḍāvākṣyāphota, the second part (… varṇavyatiriktam padasphotaom …) to support his akhanḍapadasphota, and the third ([varṇavyatiriktam] vākyāphota …) his akhanḍāvākṣyāphota. The phrase kecit dhvaniv-yaṅgam varṇātmakam nītyam śabdam āhuḥ; is no doubt most amenable to an interpretation in accordance with Bhattoji’s first three kinds of sphota, but the very fact that the ‘some’ referred to by Kaiyata consider the word which consists of speech sounds (varṇ-ātmaka) to be eternal (nītya) suggests that they assign to it an on-tological status of its own, contrary to Bhattoji’s first three kinds of sphota. Indeed, this phrase looks like a paraphrase of the Bhāsya line nītyesu śabdesu kūṭastraiv anvācārāhīr varṇāir bhavitavāmyam which we considered above. We saw that Kaiyata looked upon this line as an expression of the jātisphotapakṣa. We must conclude that Kaiyata’s own phrase kecit dhvanivyaṅgam varṇātmakam nītyam śabdam āhuḥ, too, must in all probability be understood as an expression of that same jātisphotapakṣa. It does not therefore support Bhattoji’s first three kinds of sphota.

Bhattoji then refers to Kaiyata’s comments on Śivasūtra 1 a i u ṇ, which oppose a vyaktisphotavādin to a jātisphotavādin. Confusingly, Kaiyata’s comments concern the Bhāsya passage which contains the same line nītyesu śabdesu kūṭastraiv anvācārāhīr varṇāir bhavitavāmyam which, as we have seen, had been invoked by Bhattoji to support the sakhanḍapadasphota (and sakhanḍāvākṣyāphota). We had occasion to point out that Kaiyata, contrary to Bhattoji, found in this line support for the jātisphotapakṣa. It appears therefore that Bhattoji invokes a passage from Kaiyata with which he disagrees to support the greater force of the jātisphotapakṣa.28

Kaiyata’s third passage occurs at the end of the second Āhnika and comments on the Bhāsya words aksaram na ksaram vidyāt (Mahā-bh I p. 36 l. 6). Here Kaiyata mentions the varnasphota, the padasphota and the vākyāphota, and ascribes to them vyavahārānityaṁ ‘eternality for practical purposes’. If Bhattoji is to be believed, Kaiyata ascribes full eternality to the jātisphota, but this is less clear from his text as found in the printed editions.29 Bhattoji mentions a variant reading – which appears to agree with the editions I have used – in which the jātisphota is looked upon as ‘eternal for practical
purposes’. But whatever reading one accepts, the most one can deduce from Kaiyat’s statement is that he recognized six kinds of sphota, which are probably to be identified as the akhandavarnasphota (which has little or nothing in common with Bhattoji’s varnasphota), the akhandapadasphota, the akhandavakyasphota, and the varnajatisphota, the padajatisphota, and the vakyajatisphota.

At this point Bhattoji claims further support from the side of Patañjali and Kaiyat on P. 1.1.46 adyantau takitau. Patañjali is supposed to have mentioned the varnasphota and the padasphota 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 Kaiyat are relatively close to Kaiyat’s own, with this difference again that Kaiyat does not here use the expression padasphota. What he refers to would be, in Bhattoji’s terminology, the akhandapadasphota.

Bhattoji then rounds off his discussion by pointing out that all this has been clearly set out by Patañjali and Kaiyat on sūtras 1.2.45 (arthavād adhātur …), 1.1.68 (svam rūpam śabdasya …), 1.1.70 (taparas tatkalasya), and elsewhere. When looking up these passages, one is disappointed. Only on P. 1.1.70 does Patañjali use the word sphota, and Kaiyat the expression vyaktisphota. Kaiyat here refers back to the Paspaśāhnika under yenoccāritena … (discussed above), where, he says, the matter has been considered.

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

Bhattoji’s Personality and Circumstances

It is now time to consider what we know about Bhattoji Diksita 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 Bhatṛhari and most other Sanskrit authors of his time. About Bhattoji we know a fair amount.\textsuperscript{30} 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. Bhattoji came from the South (perhaps Mahārāstra\textsuperscript{37}) and ended up in Benares\textsuperscript{38} where he became the student of a well-known grammarian, Śesa Kṛṣṇa.\textsuperscript{39} Śesa Kṛṣṇa was not his only teacher – also Appayya Dikṣita\textsuperscript{40}, Saṅkara Bhatta\textsuperscript{41} and Nrśimhāśrama\textsuperscript{42} are sometimes stated to have been his teachers –, but Śesa Kṛṣṇa plays an important role in what follows. Śesa Kṛṣṇa himself is known for his commentary on Rāmacandra’s Prakṛiyākaumudi, called Prakāśa, and we may assume that Bhattoji was trained by Śesa Kṛṣṇa in the Prakṛiyākaumudi. This work was going to be the source of inspiration for his own Siddhāntakaumudi.

However, the relationship between Bhattoji 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.

Bhattoji did not only compose the Siddhāntakaumudi, which follows the model of the Prakṛiyākaumudi and improves upon it, but also a commentary on it, known by the name Praudha Manorama. In this commentary he criticizes the Prakṛiyākaumudi as well as the commentary composed by his own teacher, Śesa Kṛṣṇa.\textsuperscript{43}

Śesa Kṛṣṇa had not been the first to write a commentary on the Prakṛiyākaumudi. The grandson of its author, called Vitthala, had composed one called Prasāda. Śesa Kṛṣṇa often critically refers to this commentary, and calls its author prāc ‘the former one’.\textsuperscript{44} (Rāmacandra the author of the Prakṛiyākaumudi is referred to as ācārya, even though Śesa Kṛṣṇa does not always agree with him.) This word prāc, it appears, often designates preceding authors of similar works. Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakṛiyāprakāśa therefore refers in this way to the preceding commentator on the Prakṛiyākaumudi, viz. Vitthala. Bhattoji’s Praudha Manorama uses the term, similarly, to refer to the author of the preceding Prakṛiyāgrantha, viz. Rāmacandra.\textsuperscript{45} Bhattoji’s Šabdakaustubha, which is a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya (see below), uses prāc to refer to the preceding commentator of the Mahābhāṣya, viz. Kaiyata.\textsuperscript{46} The use of this word is not pejorative, as is shown by the fact that Pāṇḍitārāja Jagannātha’s Kucamardini, which was composed to defend the Prakṛiyākaumudi and its commentator Śesa Kṛṣṇa, refers to the
author of the Prakriyākaumudi as prācīnaprakriyāgranthakṛṣṭ (e.g. ed. Sadāśiva Sharma p. 161.1; ed. Madhusudana p. 251.5, p. 311.7).

As already stated, Bhatṭoji uses the term prāc in his Praudha Manoramā to refer to Rāmacandra the author of the Prakriyākaumudi. This text contains numerous references to this ‘former one’ (prāc) whose book (grantha) is sometimes called prakriyāgrantha.47 Connected with the ‘former one’ Bhatṭoji 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

47 Connected with the ‘former one’ Bhatṭoji 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.

```
yat tu prācāktaḥ ... uktam, yac ca tādhyākhyātrbhīr ... uktam, yac c[a] ... prasādakṛṣṭa ... kṛtam, tad etat sakalam bhāṣyakāityāparyāyōpanamāṃdakam.
```

“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 Bhatṭoji criticizes his predecessors. It also allows us to identify them with precision. The words which Bhatṭoji 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 Prakriyākaumudi (ed. Trivedi I p. 167, on P. 7.3.116; cp. ed. Miśra I p. 260): veti kecit / sakhyah, sukhyah, with variants for the last word: sakhyuh and sukhyuh. Bhatṭoji attributes to the author of the Prasāda five metrical lines (two and a half ślokas). These occur in the commentary called Prasāda of Vitālha (I p. 167 l.12–16) in exactly the same form. The ‘commentator’, finally, is attributed with the following words: ubhayam apy etat bhāṣye sthitam. This phrase occurs in Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa, in exactly this form (I p. 260 1.21).49 In other words, the ‘commentator’ is Śesa Kṛṣṇa, Bhatṭoji’s former teacher.

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

```
yat tu prācoktam ‘uṇāv itāv’ itāv, yac ca tatpautreṇa vyākhyātaṁ ‘uṇāvā uṣṭikāryārtha’ iti, tad asaṅgataṁ iti bhāva.
```

“The idea is that what has been stated by the former one – viz., that u and n [in asuṇ] which is prescribed in P. 7.1.89 punsa ‘suṣuṣ’ are markers – and what has been explained by his grandson – viz., that u is there in order that the effect of having u, r or l as marker [may apply] (by P. 7.1.6 uṣṭak ca) – is impossible.”
The remark attributed to the ‘former one’ is found in the Prakriyākaumudi (ed. Trivedi I p. 283; ed. Miśra I p. 387), and the one attributed to his grandson in Vitthala’s Prasāda (I p. 283).

Bhattoji’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 also sometimes referred to as praś ‘former one’ but always, it seems, in the plural.\(^{51}\) Elsewhere Bhattoji gives no specificication as to whom he is referring to, simply saying ‘they say’. For example, his statement yat tu vadanti: ‘napumsake śasi yunīḥ ity atra num na syād’ \(^{52}\) refers to a line in Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa which says: tena napumsake śasi yunīḥ ity atra num bhavati.\(^{53}\) And Bhattoji’s yat tu vyācakhyuh: ‘upadeśakāle yau sakāranakārau tadantety arthah / devadattasya gurukulam itivat samudāyena śambandhān nāśamarthaf saṁmāsa’ \(^{54}\) literally cites a passage from Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa.\(^{55}\) Sometimes Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa is referred to under the heading ‘others’ (again in the plural). Bhattoji mentions, for example, ‘others’ in connection with Rāmacandra (praś) and Vitthala (tatpautra) in the following line: yac cānyair ‘vārttikena pūrītam 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 Tikākṛt on the Prakriyākaumudi. 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 Bhattoji 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 ((\(tad\))vākhyātrbhīḥ, anyath, prāṇcāḥ, or quite simply a plural form of the verb) where the singular has to be good enough for Rāmacandra (praścā) and his grandson Vitthala (tatpautrema, 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 Ĉakrapāṇi (or Ĉakrapāṇidatta), the son of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s son Śeṣa Vireśvara\(^{62}\), and Paṇḍitārāja Jagannātha, Vireśvara’s pupil, composed a criticism of the Praudha Manoramā.\(^{63}\) According to the latter, Bhattoji’s mind had been marred by hatred for his teacher (ed. Sadashiva Sharma p. 2; ed. Madhusudana p. 3: gurudvesadīssitamāti). These critical
attacks were answered by Bhattoji’s grandson Hari Diksita in his (Brhat) Śabdaratna. 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 Bhattoji 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. 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 Mōslem 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. He had subsequently been honored by the emperor, who is believed to have bestowed on him the title panditāraja. But Jagannātha had been careless enough to start a relationship with a Mōslem woman called Lavaṅgī, whom he married. 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. Bhattoji’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 Praudhā Manoramā were pitched against those who sympathized with Bhattoji (or simply admired the Siddhāntakaumudī for its intellectual qualities). 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 Bhattoji’s past and find out more about an earlier phase of his relationship with his teacher Śesa Kṛṣṇa.
Bhattoji is known to have written two grammatical works before the Siddhânta kaumudi and the Praudha Manoramâ. These are the Šabdakaustubha and the one known by the names Vaiyâkaraṇa Bhûṣaṇa Kârikâ and Vaiyâkaraṇamatonmajjana. 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 Šabdakaustubha has only in part been preserved, which suggests that it was not much used in the beginning. Regarding the Vaiyákaraṇa Bhûṣaṇa Kârikâ the view has been propounded that it has only survived along with – i.e., included in – the commentaries of Kaunḍa Bhatta. That would mean that, if Kaunḍa Bhatta had not composed these commentaries, this work might not have survived. Not unrelated to this issue is the uncertainty which exists regarding the name which Bhattoji himself gave to this second work. Later authors – among them Nâgâsa Bhatta, Hari Diksita and Vaidyanâtha Pâyaguṇḍa – call it Vaiyâkaraṇamatonmajjana. However, it seems that the Vaiyâkaraṇamatonmajjana was noted, and commented upon, by someone else, a pupil of Bhattoji called Vanamâli Mîśra, a manuscript of whose commentary called Vaiyâkaraṇamatonmajjini has been preserved.

Some indications seem to confirm that the Šabdakaustubha was initially barely taken into consideration even by authors who knew it. Šesa Krşṇa’s other son Šesa Nârâyana, author of a commentary on the Mahâbhâsya called Sûktiratnâkara (ed. Pt. Bhâgavata 1999) appears to have known this early work of Bhattoji. An introductory stanza to the Sûktiratnâkara states (no. 14, p. 3):

\[
\text{harikaiyatabhâtîyâs tēkâb sânty eva vady opthâdyav/}
\text{tad api gabhîtradurâhâvatvâdâyair bodhîyâ nâlanī tâh}/
\]

“Although there exist nowadays commentaries [on the Mahâbhâsya] by [Bhartr-]jâri, by Kâiyâta and by Bhatta, 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 Bhatta mentioned by Šesa Nârâyana. Yudhisthira Mîmâmsâka’s history of grammatical literature makes no mention of any commentator before Šesa Nârâyana called Bhatta. Bhattoji, on the other hand, uses that appellation for himself, for example in the fifth introductory stanza to his Šabdakaustubha: \text{bhattojibhatto janusah sâphalyam labdhum īhate.} Mîmâmsâka lists Bhattoji’s Šabdakaustubha as a commentary on the Astâdhyâyî, 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: phantiḥbhaṣṭābhāṣyābdheḥ śabdakaustubham uddhāre). The text follows throughout the division into Āhnikas which characterizes the Mahābhāṣya, and closely follows the text of that work. References to the Bhāṣya, moreover, often use the future, 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 ‘Shabdakaustubah’” etc. Baladeva Upādhyāya calls it a commentary on the Astādhyāyi which is also considered a work that critically evaluates the Mahābhāṣya.

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

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

“Either way, Śesa Nārāyaṇa here clearly enumerates eight kinds of sphota, which can be specified as follows: (i) sakhanda-padavyakṣipta, (ii) sakhandavākyavyaktisphota, (iii) akhandapadavyakṣipta, (iv) akhandavākyavyaktisphota, (v) padajātisphota, (vi) vākyajātisphota, (vii) varṇajātisphota, (viii) varṇavyaktisphota. He does
not accept all of them. His enumeration corresponds, be it in a dif-
ferent order, to the list of positions which we know from Bhattoji’s
Śabdakaustubha (and from the Vaiyākaraṇa Bhūsana Kārikā or
Vaiyākaraṇamatanmajjana along with Kaunda Bhatta’s com-
mentaries). Śesa Nārāyana himself does not appear to accept the sphota
as primarily a meaning-bearer but rather as an ontological entity,
even though the only sphotas he admits (word and sentence) do have
meaning.

For our present reflections it is particularly important to know
that already Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa, which was composed before the
Śūktiratnakara, appears to have been acquainted with the Śabdakaustubha. This one may conclude from the fact that the
Prakāśa refers twice to opinions of the Dīksita (in Sanskrit the plural
is used: dīksitānām vyākhyāne, yat tu dīksitānāh). Tripathī (1977: (0))
appears to think that these are references to Śesa Nārāyaṇa, the
author of the Śūktiratnakara, but no evidence is known to me that
Śesa Nārāyaṇa was ever called Dīksita. Hueckstedt (2002: 52)
accepts that these are references to Bhattoji, 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 Bhattoji 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 gargādiḥhyo yaiḥ
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 Śesa Kṛṣṇa might have been acquainted with.
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 men-
tioned only in the Śabdakaustubha. On P. 1.3.1 bhūvādayo
dhātavah 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. Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s remarks on Śivasūtra 2 are inter-
esting 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 Bhattoji’s work. This might be taken to
indicate that Śesa Kṛṣṇa knew Bhattoji’s opinions, perhaps from
oral discussions, but not necessarily their final expression in the
Śabdakaustubha.
Tripâthi (1977: (au)) and Mîmâmsaka (sam. 2030: I: 487 n. 1) cite a line from the Śabdakaustubha (*tad etat sakalam abhidhāya prak-riyāprakāśe gurucaranair utkam: ‘tajjñānam ityādau tu śutvam bhava-vaty eva’*) which shows that Bhattoji was acquainted with Sesa Kṛśṇa’s Prakriyāprakāśa at the time of writing his Śabdakaustubha, and that Sesa Kṛśṇa was, or had been, his teacher at that time. This fact, along with the circumstance that Sesa Kṛśṇa’s Prakāśa refers to the Diksita and is familiar with at least some opinions which Bhattoji 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.

The fact that Bhattoji’s early works did not initially attract much attention may be of some importance in the context of our present investigation. It means that Bhattoji’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 Kaunda Bhatta before it drew a wider readership. Commentaries on the Śabdakaustubha were written, but not until later, the first surviving one (Visamapadī) being from the hand of Nāgēśa, the second (Prabhā) from that of Vaidyanātha Pāyagunda. It is true that Jagannātha may also have written a critical commentary on it, and that Cakrapañi refers to the Kaustubha; also the name of a text called Śabdakaustubha Dūṣana by a certain Bhāskara Diksita 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 Bhattoji Diksita, it will be interesting to learn something more about the world he lived in. We know that Bhattoji 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 …

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.

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.

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 Kavîndrâcârya Sarasvati. However, Gode’s arguments are circumstantial and not totally compelling (as he himself admits). It is also clear that Bernier’s expression chef des Pandits is close to the Sanskrit title panditârâja which Jagannâtha is reported to have received from the emperor (see above); the title vidyâmidhâna ‘repository of learning’ which Kavîndrâcârya supposedly received from Shah Jahan does not correspond to this French expression. Chronologically both scholars fit. Jagannâtha is believed to have
received patronage from Shah Jahan and Dara Shikoh (perhaps already from Jahangir).\textsuperscript{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 Sanyasi 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.\textsuperscript{100} Moreover, the fact that Bernier’s chief of pandits offered him refreshments in the library of his university (\textit{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 Diksita 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.\textsuperscript{101} These were often regional kings, petty rulers of small states. Examples such as Pānditarāja Jagannātha, on the other hand, show that such support could also come from Muslim rulers, even from the emperor in Delhi.\textsuperscript{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 Simha, King of Udaipur (1628–1629 A.D.) and Prānanārāyana, King of Kāmarūpa or Assam (1633–1666 A.D.).\textsuperscript{103} Others had to be content with less prominent patrons. It is clear from the introductory verses that Śesa Kṛṣṇa wrote his Prakāśa at the command of a king Viravara, who may have been a minister of Akbar.\textsuperscript{104} His son Śesa Nārāyaṇa, author of a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya called Sūktiratnākara,
praises in his introductory stanzas a certain “king Phirimdā” (*phirimdā nyaph;* st. 8); this same Phirimdā is further on (st. 10) referred to as *caudhari,* which means as much as ‘village headman’ (Hintze, 1997: 70; cp. Richards, 1993: 81). Bhattoji, his brother Raṅgoji and his nephew Kaunda Bhatta appear to have received patronage from two rulers belonging to the Keladi royal family, Veṅkatappa Nāyaka I (1592–1629) and his grandson Virabhādra (1629–1645); these were rulers of the Ikkeri kingdom, one of the fragmented heirs of the Vijayanagara state.

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. 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. Moreover, rotation of office and resumption of property at death had the effect that Mughal nobles were inclined to ostentation and public spending. 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. 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. But debates also took place in less glamorous surroundings. Raṅgoji Bhatta, who was both Bhuttoji’s brother and Kauṇḍa Bhatta’s father, is recorded to have defeated the Dvaita scholar Vidyādhīśayati in debate at the court of the Keladi ruler Veṅkatappa. 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 Bhuttoji, 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 Bhuttoji and Panditārāja 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. 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. Bhuttoji, as we have seen, went out of his way to show that his new ideas about the sphoṭa were really not new at all.

BHATTOJI DIKSITA ON SPHOTA
Similarly Cardona, 1976: 303: “Brough's exposition of sphota is not intended to mean the smallest meaningful units like stems, roots and suffixes. To Patañjali the term sphota need not necessarily involve consideration of meaning.” Further Joshi, 1967: 10: “Patañjali has never used the term sphota to refer to a single indivisible meaning-bearing unit. The term sphota 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 Bhartrhari the term sphota 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 Bhartrhari, as for later grammarians, sphota was … simply the linguistic sign in its aspect of meaning bearer (Bedeutungsträger).” See further below.

Similarly Cardona, 1976: 303: “Brough’s exposition of sphota was heavily influenced by later Paninīyas.”

Bhatṭoṭi Dīksita, Śabdakāustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 7 1.15–17: ekah pata itivad ekah padam vākyam vety abādhita prāśārīt varṇā śīrṣita eva padam vākyam vā akhaṅ加持 varṇayāṅγyam / katvapraṇā ṣuṣṭaḥ ukṣiti cet ? pate ‘pi tathā ṣūṣṭateh?


This passage occurs twice in the Bhāṣya, not under śūṭra 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.

It seems likely that the reference is to Kuiyata on P. 1.1.56 sthānīvad adeva ‘hālvidha (I p. 399 1.11–16): dvividha ādēśaḥ, pratyaśkāś cāster bhūr ityādāh / ānunāmitaḥ ca ir ityādāḥ / atra hi ikāntakārtatam sthāyāh anuvātīte / ukāreṇokarantā cādēśaḥ / tatas tes tīt iṣu samprāyate / etc. For a discussion what is at stake, cp. Joshi & Roodbergen, 1990: p. VIII f. and transl. p. 6 n. 30.

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

Cp. Gaurinath Sastri, 1980: 60: “it is necessary to point out that by varna-sphota it is not meant that each and every letter is regarded as sphota 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-sphota] the stem and the suffix … are denotative of sense”. Joshi, 1967: 73: “The term varnasphota does not mean that each single phoneme is regarded as sphota, but the phoneme or phonemes constituting either a stem or a suffix are regarded as such.”

So Cardona (1976: 303): “in the view of such later Paniniyas the term varna does not mean ‘sound unit’ in this context; it denotes a unit lower than a word, namely a base or an affix”.

Similarly Śri Kṛṣṇa Bhatta Maunin, who in his Sphotacandrika (p. 1 122) speaks of a varna which is of the nature of a stem or a suffix (prakṛti-pratyayārīpa). Since this last author refers to the Bhūṣana of Kaunda Bhatta (p. 2 1.29), he is to be dated after the latter. Ramajña Pandeya (1954: 49 f.) tries to improve upon the scheme of Bhatṭoṭi and his successors by replacing their varnasphota with the pair prakṛtisphota and pratyaśyasphota. Further refinements lead him to a total of sixteen kinds of sphota.

Bhatṭoṭi Dīksita, Śabdakāustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 7 1.9–10. Bhatṭoṭi does not say, nor indeed intend, that this remark concerns isolated morphemes, but this is how NāgESA interprets him (Sphotavāda p. 5 1.6–7: prayujyamānāpadanantaragata
For further evidence for the unitary nature of Patanjali’s *vākyasphota*. For Nāgęśa, then, this statement deals with a minor issue within the discussion of the *vāyasphota*.


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 *sphota* is responsible for his negligence of the ontological side. This has confused also modern commentators. John Brough has already observed this.

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

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

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

19 Māhā-bh I p. 267 l.8–12: *kim ihodāharanam / ... tathāsthampām tāntum-tāmāḥ iti / nanu caitad api śhāne ‘ntaratamenaiva Siddham / kuta āntaryam / ekārthaśyākārtho dyarthasa vyartho bharaṁvahasa bhavartho bhavissyati /

20 Tr. Sharma, 1995: 660.


22 Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdanaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p.8 l.19–20: *padasphotavākyasphotau tu ihaiva praghattake ‘yenoccāritena iti bhāsyapratikam upādaya kaiyataṇaḥ bhāsyatthataśa vāṛṇitaḥ /

23 Kaiyata I p. 7: *vaiyākaranāḥ varṇavyātiriktaśa padasya vākyasya vā cācākataṃ iechanti / vāraṇāṃm pratyekam vācākatvā dvitiyādīvaravocāraṇārthaka-prāgamāṇāt ākhyāya-ākhyāya-ākhyāya / ānapata-kapāke svam eva-vasāya-vākya-prāgamāṇa / ekārthāśyākārtho dyārtha bhārtaḥ /

24 Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdanaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 8 l. 20–21: *vaiyākaraṇaḥ varṇavyātiriktaśa padasya vākyasya vā cācākataṃ iechanti /

25 Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdanaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p.8 l.21–23: *nītyesu sādasaḥ kūtasthāhair avicālībhī varṇair bhāvyatvam / iti tatra ātma bhāyasya sakaṁduraṭaḥ. The quoted line occurs Māhā-bh I p. 18 l.14–15 (on Sivasūtra I vt. 12); p. 75 l.8–9 (on P. I.1.20 vt. 5); p. 112 l.12–13 (on P. I.1.56 vt. 11); etc.

26 Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdanaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 8 l.26–32: *pāsparāyam eva praghātakāntare ‘kim punah ityādī bhāṣyam upādaya ‘kecid varṇasyapāhanam aparē pāsparāyanam vākyasyapāhanam cāluḥ’ iti vadāta kaiyateṇa ‘a i u n’ ity utra vyakti-sphotajātisphotayor balādaṁ cintayatā pravahādinikānte ‘aśkaṇam na kṣaraṁ vidāyati’ iti bhāṣyaryākhyāvanavasare vayavahāraṇīyataḥ tu varṇapadavadvākyapāhānam, nītyatvam tu jātisphotasyaṃ pratipādayataḥ, anupadam eva brahmātitaṃ eva hi śabdarupatayā prabhūbhidy artha iti vāyakṣānena sarve pāksahūcāt eva /.

27 Kaiyata, I p. 65 ff., esp. p. 68 (*vyakṣapāhānakṣe nirākṛte jātisphotapakṣa evaśāt) and p. 69 (*avasyastṛṣṭariyaṃ akeṭtipakaḥsasya darśayati*).
Kaiyata, I p. 117: vyavaharanityatatayá tu varnapadavakyasphotanam [nityatvam], jatisphotasya vā. The word nityatvam has been added on the authority of another edition (Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi etc., 1967). Bhattoji was apparently acquainted with a reading: vyavaharanityatatayá tu varnapadavakyasphotanam, nityatvam tu jatisphotasya.

Bhattoji Diksa, Sabdanaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 8 1.32 – p. 9 1.1: yadā tu avidyaiva jātir iti paksā tadahhiprayēna jatisphotasaya vyavahāraniyeyeteti ‘akṣaram na kṣaram vidyāt’ ity asya kaiyatyte pāthāntaram.

Bhattoji Diksa, Sabdanaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 9 1.1–4: ‘adyantau taktitau iti sūtre ca bhāṣya eva varnasphatapadasphatā uktau āsatiyam eva prakṛti-pratyayavibhāgam tadartham āśīrya rekha-gavyayanyeyena satyasya padasphotasya vyupīthānam abhipretam iti tatraiva kaiyataḥ /.


Maha-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 / vyakṣtiphoto ‘tra vivaksitah / sa ca nityah / etac ca ‘yenoccārītena ity atra puspasyām vicāritam iti tata eva bodhayaṇamu.

Judging by the summary by G.B. Pulsle in the Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies of the Sphotattattvanirūpana which may have been composed by Sesa Krsna (Coward and Kunjunni Raja, 1990: 215 f.), Bhattoji’s teacher had not dealt with these eight positions about the sphota either. The text summarized was not available to me.

There are many historical records from the time of Bhattoji (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.

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 Maharastrians, both Brahmīn and Maratha, had been investing heavily in Benares, and grants to Brahmins had greatly increased, especially under the direct patronage of the Peshwa (Gordon, 1993: 146). According to another tradition Bhattoji was of Andhra origin; see e.g. Upādhyāyā, 1994: 60.

Gode (1941a: 322) reports a tradition according to which Bhattoji Diksa built in Benares a house for himself at Kedar-Ghata (Sanskrit perhaps Kedāreśvara-Ghatta) and settled there permanently.

See note 43, below.

Appayya Diksa is saluted in Bhattoji’s Tattvakaustubha; see Mimamsaka, sam. 2030: I. 487. EIP V p. 240 (s.v. Appayya Diksa) tells the following story: “One of Appayya Diksa’s important pupils was Bhattoji Diksa, the author of the Siddhāntakaumudi, who came from the north to study Vedānta and Mimamsa and wrote Sabdanaustubha as a commemoration of his discipleship under Appayya. A story is told that Bhattoji found Appayya living unostentatiously in a village, belying widespread fame and royal patronage.” None of the claims in this passage are supported by evidence.


43 Cf. the following passage from Jagannātha’s Praudhamanoramakucamardana (as cited in Belvarka, 1915: 39 n. 1): iha । kecit [ = BhattojiDksitaḥ] nikhilavi-dvanmukutamāyukhamādālalāticaraniṇānām . . . Sesavamsāvatamsānām Srī-Krṣṇapa-ninditāīm prasadaad āśādītaśabdamūsāsanānas tesu ca prāmeśvarapadaṃ prayātesu kalikāsāmavadyadbhavantah Prakṛtyapraśāṣeṃ svayamprāmitāya manorāyaṃ ākalyakārṇaḥ | sa ca prakṛtyapraśakṣyām pauttrair asmadprapāṃśitūtṛśvarāṃ tārayair distiṣṭi svamaptipārśārthe punar asmaḥbhīr nārīkṣyate/. 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 Rasagandrāha mentioned in the bibliography; p. (15) of Sitaram Shastri’s introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā; Hickeystedt, 2002: 51–52 n. 18. Extracts from Jagannātha’s text (including this passage) can be found at the end of the introduction of the Praudha Manoramā by Pt. Sadashiva 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 Bhattoji was the pupil of Sesa Kṛṣṇa, not of the latter’s son Sesa Vireśvara, as maintained by Ranganathavasami 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 (Prāstāvīkam) by Bhāgiratha Prasāda Tripāṭhi to the edition Rāmacandra’s Prakṛtyākṣaṃudī with Sesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāṣa (see bibliography; p. (i) f.) shows that Sesa Kṛṣṇa’s prāc is indeed Vithalā the author of the Prasāda. See further below.

45 A comparison of the following passages illustrates the contrasting ways in which Bhattoji’s Praudha Manoramā and Sesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāṣa use this term: (i) Bhattoji Diksiṭa, Praudha Manoramā I p. 204: yat tu praca ‘tat-siva ity atra jaśve kṛte, kharī ca’ ity uktam | tan na | . . . | yat tu taṭaṇṭrenoktam ‘tado vā’vasāne iti cartve kṛte. paścāc chiva ity anena sambandhe, jhalam jāso ‘nte iti jaśve, kharī ca iti cartvam’tīti /. (ii) Rāmacandra, Prakṛtyākṣaṃudī (ed. Misra I p. 145; ed. Trivedi I p. 90): tad śiva ity atra jaśve kṛte – kharī ca. (iii) Sesa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāṣa I p. 146: atra pracoktam ‘tado vā’vasāne iti cartve kṛte paścāc chiva ity anena sambandhe jhalam jāso ‘nte iti jaśve tad śiva iti sthīte kharī ca iti cartvam’tīti /. (iv) Vithalā, Prasāda I p. 90: tad vāvasāne iti cartve kṛte paścāt siva ity anena sambandhe jaśvam jhalam jaśontē iti | tataś ca tad śiva iti sthīte kharī ceti anena cartve . . .

46 The following are examples: (i) Bhattoji Diksiṭa, Sabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 47. 1.24–26: atra praṇīcāḥ: thākāraṣṭhāniko dhākāraṣṭhāniko va dhākāro ‘tra bhāṣyakṛte vivakṣaṁ, ato na purvottaravirodhah itī / eyas tu vārttikamate shiśvīdham bhāṣyam ato na virodha ity ādah /. This concerns P. 3.3.57 ādor ap. The explanation of this sūtra referred to in the Sabdakaustubha is not found in the Kūśkā and its classical commentaries, nor in the Prakṛtyākṣaṃudī and its commentaries by Vithalā and Sesa Kṛṣṇa. It belongs to Kāiyata (I p. 84 1.12–13; on Mahā-bh I p. 23 1.21–22): atrādhāḥ: thākāraṣṭhāniko dhākāraṣṭhāniko va dhākāro ‘tra vivakṣaṁ ‘kas tarhi dhākārā’ itī. Nothing similar is found in Bhārṭṛhari’s commentary (Pulsule, 1988: 21). (ii) Bhattoji Diksiṭa, Sabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 54. 1.23–p. 55.1.2: tathāpy abhyāse upadhiṃtyayasya sese ‘abhyaṣe car ca iti jaśvena bhakāra eva śrayeta / eyate tv abhyāse jākāra iti praṇīcaḥ / appears to refer to Kāiyata (I p. 99 1.11–12; on Mahā-bh I p. 28 1.26: yady ubhir upadhiṃtyapaddhū prātyayata ubhyāsuṣṭeṣu upadhiṃtyāyau eva dīvṛvacanam prāṇī).: upadhiṃtyāyau iti / yadi
dvirvacane purvatra kartavye jasvam asidham athapi purvatrasidhyam advirvacana iti siddham, sarvathobbisattvapi prapiṇoti \\); Bhattoji next shows Kaiyata's position to be wrong.

Occasionally someone else is called prāc, sometimes Paṭaṅgali himself. This seems to be the case in the following passage: Bhattoji Dikṣita, Sabdakautubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 108 1.3–5: yat tu 'dvirvacane' ci' iti śūtre aci kiṃ? jaygṛṣṭyate dedhṛṣṭyate iti prācāṃ prayuddhāranam, tad apiṣṭah appears to refer to Mahā-bhā I p. 155.1.16 (on P. 1.1.59: agraḥanāyata taprayojanaṃ ita mā bhūt / jaygṛṣṭyate dedhṛṣṭyata iti \\). 47


Bhattoji Dikṣita, Praudha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 404–405. 48

Bhattoji's use of prāc in the Praudha Manoramā is not fully consistent. Consider the following passages, where he clearly copies Sesā Kṛṣṇā in referring to Vitthala in this manner: (i) Bhattoji Dikṣita, Praudha Manoramā I p. 559: yat tu prācāc: 'āpi' iti kakāravīṣesānam / 'sarvīkā' ityādau tv ekādeśasya sthānādībāhāvād akārena yava-vadhānē 'pi vacanasāmartyād bhavisyati iti / tan na / (ii) Sesā Kṛṣṇā, Prakāśā I p. 433: 'āpi' iti ... atah kakāravīṣesānam ... / 'sarvīkā' ityādau tv ekādeśasya sthānādībāhāvād akārena yava-vadhānē 'pi vacanasāmartyād bhavisyati iti prācāc / rastutus tu ... (iii) Vitthala, Pasāda I p. 328: namaś cāppītā anena kim vīśayate / yady ucyeta kākāra iti tadā sarvīkā kārikeya atriṣā na syāt / akārena yava-vadhānaṁ / na cā vacyam ekādeśe kerte nāṣṭī yava-vadhānaṁ iti tasya 'acah parismin ...' iti sthānādībāhāvād iti eed ucya / yena nāvyavadhānam tena yava-vadhānāṁ iti ekena varnena yava-vadhānaṁ aśṛṣṭya ī . 49

Bhattoji Dikṣita, Praudha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 531. See also note 45, above.

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


Bhattoji Dikṣita, Praudha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 484.

Sesā Kṛṣṇā, Prakāśā I p. 335 1.21–22. Occasionally an unspecified plural refers to both Vitthala and Sesā Kṛṣṇā, as in Bhattoji Dikṣita, Praudha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 434, where yat tu vadaṇi: 'evam sati supi ca iti dirghatam syād iti / tan na / rejects an opinion held by both these authors, but whose formulation follows Vitthala (Vitthala, Pasāda I p. 195 1.19–20; Sesā Kṛṣṇā, Prakāśā I p. 293 1.15). For further examples see Sitaram Shastri's introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā p. (4)–(5) n. 4.


This is clear from Jagannāthā's passage cited in note 43, above. A pupil of Bhattoji, called Varadarāja, composed several abridgments of the Siddhāntakaumudi. A surviving manuscript of one of those, the Laghusiddhāntakaumudi, dates from 1624 C.E. This text refers to the Sabdakautubha, but not to the Manoramā in a context where one would expect this. It follows that the Siddhāntakaumudi and the Sabdakautubha were composed at any rate before 1624. A later work by Varadarāja, the Girvāṇapadamaṇi, does mention the Manoramā. See Gode, 1941a: 320 ff. Gode points out in another publication (1940: n. 1) that manuscripts of the Praudha Manoramā dating from 1652 and 1657 C.E. have been preserved in the
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. The Manoramā is mentioned in Kaundā Bhatta’s Vaiyākaraṇabhuṣāṇa, an abbreviation of which is the Vaiyākaraṇabhuṣāṇasāra; 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 Subdakausṭubha dating from 1633 C. E. has equally been preserved (Gode, 1940: 73).

Deshpande, 1992: 74 contains the remark that Kaundā Bhatta studied grammar under Sesa Kṛṣṇa. (The same point of view is found in the Hindi introduction to the edition of the Vaiyākaraṇabhuṣāṇasāra by Prabhākara Misra, 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 Kaundā Bhatta studied with Sesa Kṛṣṇa. Moreover, Joshi (1967: 59) speaks about “Śesakṛṣṇa, the teacher of Bhattoji Dikṣita” in a context where a mention of Kaundā Bhatta would have been appropriate, if indeed Joshi was of the opinion that Sesa Kṛṣṇa was his teacher. See further note 62, below.

Bhattoji’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 Madhava the author of the Vedabhāṣya, and of the singular where he disagrees with that same author; see Gode, 1941b: 76 n. 2.

Bhattoji Dikṣita, Praudha Manoramā I p. 1: dhīyāyam dhīyāyam param brahma, smāram smāram guror girah / siddhānta+kāma+vyakhyāram kumāh praudhāmanoramām //. Neither Hari Dikṣita’s Bhāt Sabdaratna nor Nāgēśa’s Laghu Sabdaratna on this passage give the name of Bhattoji’s teacher, but both contain the enigmatic specification that the singular guroh indicates that Bhattoji obtained all his knowledge from one single teacher.

See the bibliography under Cakrapāṇidatta. Bali, 1976: 15 claims that Vireśvara himself wrote a Praudha Manoramā Khaṇḍana, and supports this with a reference to Yudhishṭhira Mimāṃsaka’s Itihāsa. This is incorrect. Mimāṃsaka (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 Praudha Manoramā (p. (14)) states, on the basis of the two introductory verses it cites from this author’s Praudhamanoramākhandana, that Cakrapāṇi was Vireśvara’s pupil; this may not exclude that he was his son. (Sitaram Shastri reads vireśvaragurum āvaramottamamam where the edition available to me has vateśvaram gurum āvaramottamam.) See also EIP V p. 223: “We know of no works authored by [Sesa Vireśvara].” If it is true that both Kaundā Bhatta and Hari Dikṣita refer to this same Vireśvara as the “ornament of the Sesā 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 Bhattoji. Alternatively – since Hari Dikṣita’s presumed reference to Vireśvara is ambiguous – one may be tempted to think that Kaundā Bhatta’s commentaries were composed before the conflict arose. Note that sesabhūsāna in one of the introductory verses of the Bhūṣana-(sāra) refers to Sesa Kṛṣṇa according to Prabhākara Misra (see his edition of the Vaiyākaraṇabhuṣāṇasāra, pp. (16)-(17), 10). See further my forthcoming article “Bhattoji Dikṣita and the revival of the philosophy of grammar.”

Cakrapāṇi also continued Sesa Kṛṣṇa’s tradition by composing a commentary (called Prakriyāpradīpa) on the Prakriyākāmuṇḍi; see Mimāṃsaka, sam: I: 532 and Cakrapāṇi, Praudhamanoramākhandana p. 16 1.8; p. 18 1.12–13; etc.

Part of Jagannāthā’s Manoramākhaṇḍana-rūpā Kucamardini (“She who crushes the nipple [of the lovely woman (manoramā)])” has been edited; see the bibliography.
A Manoramākhandaṇa 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 Bhatta appears to have been Vireśvara’s pupil (Upadhyāya, 1994: 67; Nāgesa on the second introductory verse of Jagannātha’s Rasagangādhara); this suggests that Jagannātha may have been a lot younger than Ṣesa Kṛṣṇa, and probably much younger than Bhattaṭi Diksita as well. Jagannātha’s father was also, in matters Mīmāṃsaka, a student of Khandadeva, if Nāgesa’s commentary on the Rasagangādhara (verse 2) is to be believed. This Khandadeva, according to McCrea (2002), reacts in his works to the ideas of the New Grammarians, i.e., Bhattaṭi Diksita and, perhaps, Kaunda Bhatta. Once again, the age difference between Bhattaṭi and Jagannātha appears to have been great. [Lawrence McCrea informs me that, according to his pupil and commentator Sambhubhatta, Khandadeva died in Benares in 1665 at the age of 90.]

Mīmāṃsaka, sam. 2030: I: 541; Joshi, 1980: 107–108. According to Upadhyāya (1994: 63) Bhattaṭi’s son Bhānuṭi Diksita – known for his commentary Rāmāśrami or Vyākhyaṇudāh on the Amarakosa – composed a Manoramākhandaṇa to defend his father’s views against Cakrapāṇi. For examples of the way in which Hari Diksita deals with criticisms uttered by Cakrapāṇi and Jagannātha, see Sitaram Shastri’s introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manorāma, pp. (16) ff. The Laghu Sabdaratna, though ascribed to Hari Diksita, was composed by his pupil Nāgesa; 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 Prakritīya kaṃḍuḍūḍī called Tattvavacandra by a certain Jayanta of uncertain date, which is based on Ṣesa Kṛṣṇa’s commentary. One wonders whether and to what extent this text participated in the debate between the two camps.


See Giridhararāma Caturvedi’s introduction to the edition of Jagannātha’s Rasagangādhara mentioned in the bibliography, p. 4 n. 1; further pp. 46 ff. (‘Jagannātha Paṇḍita-raja’); 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.


Sitaram Shastri’s introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manorāma gives the following romantic description of what supposedly happened in Benares (p. (16)): āraṇīya tekapralekhadina navatah khandaṇagranthapraṇayanadina tadātma varanayāṁ sabhyaṣaḥbhāṣa vīdvasaṃvāyāyasyāṁ jāṅhāryaḥ tattvasaṃvāyasya devātṛasvāḥ, vidvām kathopakathānesu saḥdhayanāṁ svairagosthitbandhasu ca praitrāthayaḥ pratimandiram pratikurktotaram ca praudhamanorāmaṁ adhiśṛṣṭiḥvai vīravāmarśaṁ tarka aśeṣapratītaṣaṃdānādikam ca janaśammandeṇa śrotajjanakolahalena prekṣakavṛntasya adhuvādakaraṇadānādibhiḥ ca sākama samrambhena tathā samudāyā yathā sarvam dināṇādalam eva saubhitāntarālam āvāstāḥ. Pathak, 1995: 15, repeats this passage without acknowledgement.

Cp. Manudeva Bhattachārya’s remark in the introduction to his edition of Kaunda Bhatta’s (Brhad-)Vaiyākaranabhusana (p. 12): yady nāma śrīkaunda-bhattaṁ bhṛhadbhūsaṇavīkhyāḥ no nyadhāyata, tathā vaiyākaraṇamānumajjñānasya maṣṭgajam evabhāvīṣyaḥ iti api kalpayītam sakyate. Manudeva Bhattachārya is
also of the opinion (p. 16) that the Brhad-Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣana contains many citations from lost portions of the Śabdakaustubha. Since the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣana refers to the Manoramā and is therefore later than this text, we cannot be sure that Bhattojī lived to see Kaunḍā Bhatta’s commentaries on his work.

For references see Manudeva Bhattacharya’s commentary Rūpāli on Kaunḍā Bhatta’s Brhadvaiyākaraṇabhūṣana, pp. 328–332.

72 Joshi, 1993: 10.

73 References in the Śabdakaustubha to a Bhatta are to the Mimāṃsaka Kumārila Bhatta. An example is Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 22 1.24: tathā cākṛtyādikaranaḥ bhattair uktama: niyogena vikalpena dvē saha samuccite / sambandhah samudāyo va visītā vaikāyetara /; which quotes Kumārila Bhatta’s Tantravārttika on sūtra 1.3.30 (Tanvār vol. II, p. 234).

74 The beginning of another work by Bhattojī, the Tattvakaustubha, refers back to this line: praṃbhāsūttābhāśyādibhe śabdakaustubha uddhārttaḥ / śāṅkarād api bhaṣyābhādibhe [tatvā]kaustubham uddhāre // (Goede, 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-sphota and the sentence-sphota in this very praghāttaka (I p. 81, 19–20: padasphtavākṣayasphtou tu hiavata praghāttaye ‘yenoccārito tī bhāṣya prajñām upādiya kaiyataena bhāṣyārthātaya varṇitaun). The meaning of praghāttaka must be as noted in the Vācaspātyam (VI p. 4431 s.v. praghāttaka: ekārthāpratipādanārthaṃ vāyuvabhedā śām [khyā]pravacanaḥbhāṣyey drstam), viz. a portion of a book. In this case a portion of the first Aḥnika of the Mahābhāṣya must be intended, because it is there that we find the words yenoccārito ... and it is on these words that Kaiyata’s speaks about the word-sphota and sentence-sphota.

76 E.g., Bhattojī Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 22 1.22: yat tu saranāsūtire bhaṣye vāksyaṭe; p. 23 l.7–8: vāksyaṭi hi vartiṣākeraḥ; p. 23 l.33–p. 24 l.1: att eva bhaṣye vāksyaṭe; p. 33 l.8: vāksyaṭi hi tatra vārtiṣākaraḥ; p. 46 l.11–12, p. 71 l.126: bhāṣyākāro vāksyaṭi; p. 51 l.27: asiddhāvatāsūte bhāṣyāketa vākṣyaṃvāravat[ṣa]f; p. 61 l.4: tathā ca vāksyaṭi ‘nuḍ vaṣya uttarārtham tu, uha kīmci trapa iti (= Mahābh. III p. 267.1.12, on P. 7.1.73 vt. 3); p. 68 l.10–11: ‘tī svaritam’ iti sūtre bhāṣyākārār vākṣyaṃvāravat[ṣa]f; p. 74 l.28–29: ‘nāvēti viṃhāṣa’ iti sūtre bhāṣyākāro vākṣyaṭi; p. 75 l.8–9: ‘ubhe abhyavastam saha’ iti sahagraham vārtiṣākṛde vāksyaṭi, bhāṣyākaraśa tābhegrahaṇam evaiṭadartham iti vāksyaṭi; etc.

77 The editor is not quite as explicit in the Sanskrit preceding the beginning of the edition (p. 1): mahāmahopādīyabhāṭtojidyā(r)kṣivaṃvaṇitena śabdakaustubhena samānākhyam, vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣyam, tadyakṣayaḥabhūsau kaiyatavaṃvācitaḥ pradhānē etc.

78 Upādiyāyā, 1994: 61: ... yaha mahābhāṣya kā bhi vivecaḥ grantha māna jātā hai.


80 A systematic search for references in the Śūktratnākara could not here be undertaken and remains a desideratum. Compare, however, the following passages: (i) Sesa Nārāyaṇa, Śūktratnākara p. 123 l.6–8: anye tu ikāropadesasī rvanayoh sāvarṇyāntiyaatvajāhatāpanārthah / tena kāpitaṣikha ity at[e]a ... pūtaḥ sidhāyati; (ii) Bhattojī Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 42 l.30–31: ikāropadesas ruktaśītyā kāptasikhe platasiddhaye sāvarṇyāntyatam jāyayitum kartavya ev[a]. See further below.

81 See Sesa Nārāyaṇa, Śūktratnākara p. 2 v. 6: yah ... prakriyākau-muḍhāktam ... kṛtvām ... so yam ... śrīkṣyam evaśārā samyuktah sāvarṇyāntyatam kṛtya vērīṣyante vē[ṛ]. See further below.

82 Mimāṃsaka (sam. 2030: I: 490) states that in his Śabdakaustubha Bhattojī criticizes the Prakriyāpraṇās at many places, but gives no concrete examples. He appears to be mistaken.
Bali (1976: 2), referring to the introduction of an edition of the Vaiyakaranabhuta Sastra not accessible to me, states: “[Bhattoji’s] predecessors are believed to have professed as priests in a Vaishnava temple and hence were called by the designation of Diksita.” Houben (2002: 477 n. 14) sees in the frequent title of Diksita added to names an indication that Sanskrit intellectuals widely adhered to the Vedic ritual system. Witzel, 1994: 265 – with a reference to Kuttanimata vs. 38 – points out that in Kashmir –diksita was the title of a Brahmin initiated to the solemn Vedic sacrifices such as the Soma ritual. Witzel also cites the following statement from Alibirini (ibid.): “When [a Brahmin] is busy with the service of one fire, he is called istic, if he serves three fires, he is called agnihotrin, if he besides offers an offering to the fire, he is called diksita.”


Compare: (i) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 28 l.14: anye tu ‘halantyam’ iti sarvam eva suśram avartayantu / . (ii) Bhattoji Diksita, Sabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) II p. 56 l.15–16: samprāṇāsārvatāryaḥ halsūtrasyāntam halantyam iti vā / . This is, incidentally, not the position favored by Bhattoji.

Compare: (i) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 56 l.21–22: anye tu dhātadvikāreṇa kāryavitdhiṇītāt sautrāṇam api dhātinām patho ‘numtyate ity āhuh / . (ii) Bhattoji Diksita, Sabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) II p. 50 l.5–7: na caivaṃ sautresv avyāpytī / stambhavāṇīm udhikaranena dhātadvikārtyakāryavidhāṇena ca dhātu- 

Note 80, above. The part prakṛtyānām ity atra rvarāṇāṃ nasya nātvan na bhavati has nothing corresponding to it in the relevant part of the Sabdakaustubha.

Bhattoji Diksita, Sabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 114 l.16. The sentence which Bhattoji ascribes to Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakṛtiapraḵaśa occurs in that work under P. 8.4.40 stoh ścena ścuh (vol. I p. 138 l.18).

Comparing the following two passages: (i) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 16 l. 20–22: aryavāḥ ṛṣa śvam prakṛtyānām ity atra rvarāṇāṃ nasya nātvan na bhavati, kṛptāśeṣah ity atra caṇta ity pūrṇaprasiddho na bhavātī; (ii) Bhattoji Diksita, Sabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 42 l. 30–31: ṛṣaśeṣaśeṣaḥ tūkārtvāya kālpāśeṣah pūrtāśeṣah reṣyaśeṣaḥ vatsottāvatāṃ jñāpayitum kartavya ev[a]; cp. note 80, above. The part prakṛtyānām ity atra rvarāṇāṃ nasya nātvan na bhavati has nothing corresponding to it in the relevant part of the Sabdakaustubha.

Bhattoji Diksita, Sabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 114 l.16. The sentence which Bhattoji ascribes to Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakṛtiapraḵaśa occurs in that work under P. 8.4.40 stoh ścena ścuh (vol. I p. 138 l.18).

The situation is slightly complicated by the fact that Appayya Diksita, claimed to have been one of Bhattoji’s teachers, is said to have composed a grammatical work called Kaumudipraḵaśa. Moreover, it is claimed that “[Bhattoji Diksita] wrote Sabdakaustubha 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 Prakṛtyaṅkṛtah, composed by another Diksita, viz. Appayya. Both Bhattoji when referring to the Prakṛtyapraḵaśa of his teacher, and Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa while referring to a Diksita, 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 Kaumudipraḵaśa “by Tolappa (wrongly Appā) Diksita” (s.v. Kaumudipraḵaśa).


He says, for example, in his Kucaṁaṁritāḥ (ed. Sadtēśhāvīra Sharmā p. 2 l.21; ed. Madhusudana p. 4 l.13): amūm ca rātham ‘umālīt śuṭrataḥ̣kaustubhakhandanāvāsare vyaktam upapādayasyāṁah. Further ed. Sadtēśhāvīra Sharmā p. 21 l.14, ed. Madhu-
sudana p. 43 l.1–12: adhikam kaustubhakhandanid avaseyam. Note however that Jagannātha frequently criticizes the Kaustubha in his Kucamardini.

92 E.g., Cakrapani, Prawdhamanoramakhandana p. 7 l.19; p. 17 l.3; p. 19 l.19.


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 gentilété des Indes”.

95 Bernier (p. 259 ff.): “Lorsque je descendais le long du Gange et que je passai par Bénarès ..., j’allai trouver le chef des Pandits, qui fit 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).


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 Dura Shikoh; Upadhyaya, 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).

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

NCC vol. 7 p. 137 s.v. Jagannātha Panḍitārajā.

So Hueckstedt, 2002: 50–51, which draws upon Tripathi, 1977: (ii), (tu); 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 Yamuna.”


Schwartzberg, 1978: 200b. Ikkeri was situated near Shimoga in the present state of Karnataka, at the higher end of a path crossing the Western Ghats (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 Venkatappa Nāyaka I, according to the information provided by Pietro della Valle in 1623, gave in to the same temptation as his enemy Panditaraja 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 Venkatappa was a Lingavant (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; cf. Frenz, 2000: 45 ff.

Smith, 1902: 423.

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 Brahmans 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-Akbari 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 insolvency 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 Nayaka (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-Scia`h, although a greater Prince, 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 ulama 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 Vidūyādhisāyati and 1592–1629 A.D. for Venkatappa. This information is no doubt based on the following verse which occurs at the end of Kaunḍa Bhatts’a Bhavadvaiyākaranabhusanā (p. 331): vidyādhiśāvaherutaśiṣṭhakayatīṁ ॐ
madvabhāhattārakam, jītvā kāla-devatāyaśya-sa-vardhī / py andolikam prāptavān / yaś ca kāre mutivar-yasatravārvīṁtām siddhāntah-haṅgam tathā, madhvānām tam aham gurupamagaram raṅgojībhātattām bhajey/. We learn from this verse that the real name of the opponent must have been Vāderu / Bāderu, and that vidyādhiṣṭa and yāti 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. Saleto: “As regards the age in which Bhattoji Dikṣita lived we learn from the opening verses of Tattva-Kaustubha that he wrote it at the order of Keladi Venkatendra (Keladi Venkatendrasya nīrdesāṁ vidusāṁ mude).” (Read Hultsch, Report on Sanskrit Mss of South India, II, Intro, Pp. xii, 122, Madras, 1895–1896). The ruler Venkatendra mentioned here is to be identified with king Venkatappa Niyak I, who ruled from A.D. 1582 till A.D. 1629 (Rice: Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 157). King Venkatappa Niyak was noted for the patronage he gave to learned men (Read Keladi Basavāraja, Śivatattvaratnākara, Kalolā VI, Tārānga 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 Gitā of Padmapurāṇa (Trien. Cata. of Mss in the Govt. Ori. Mss Library, Madras, p. 2623).” See further note 106, above.

113 Smith, 1938: 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 Bhrārtharī, who tries to hide them, is in need of careful specification.
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