

# Saṃskṛta-sādhutā

Goodness of Sanskrit

Studies in Honour of  
Professor Ashok N. Aklujkar

Edited by  
Chikafumi Watanabe  
Michele Desmarais  
Yoshichika Honda

D. K. Printworld  
New Delhi, India

January 2012

## Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and the Revival of the Philosophy of Grammar\*

Johannes Bronkhorst

### §1. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and his Role in the Philosophy of Grammar<sup>1</sup>

Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita was a Brahmin from the south (Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh are possible candidates for his region of origin) who settled in Benares some time before 1600 C.E., where he acquired fame as a grammarian in the tradition of Pāṇini. Many Sanskrit scholars at that time received financial support from regional rulers and rich merchants; the internal structure of the Mughal empire facilitated this kind of support. Bhaṭṭoji and some members of his family were no exception. They received, it appears, patronage from two rulers belonging to the Keladi royal family, Venkaṭappa Nāyaka I (1592–1629) and his grandson Vīrabhadra (1629–1645); these were rulers of the Ikkeri kingdom, one of the fragmented heirs of the Vijayanagara state.

A number of famous scholars are said to have been Bhaṭṭoji’s teachers—Appayya Dīkṣita, Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa and Nṛsimhāśrama are sometimes mentioned—but in Benares Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa in particular comes to play an important role. Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa is a grammarian known for his commentary on Rāmacandra’s Prakriyākaumudī, called Prakāśa. We may be sure that Bhaṭṭoji was trained by Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa in the Prakriyākaumudī, a work which may later have inspired him to write a similar work called Siddhāntakaumudī.

Bhaṭṭoji’s main grammatical works are, in chronological order, (i) the Śabdakaustubha, a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali; (ii) the Siddhāntakaumudī, already mentioned; (iii) the (Prauḍha-)Manoramā, a commentary on the Siddhāntakaumudī. The first of these three works, the Śabdakaustubha, may have been composed at the same time as Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa;

---

\* This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation (U.S.A.) under Grant No. 0135069. Part of the research was carried out during a stay at The Liguria Study Centre for the Arts and Humanities in Bogliasco (Genoa), Italy, in the months of September and October 2003. An earlier version was presented at a meeting on “Sanskrit Knowledge Systems on the Eve of Colonialism,” held at the Rockefeller Foundation Bellagio Study and Conference Centre in July 2005.

1 For a fuller presentation of much of this information, along with references to primary and secondary literature, see Bronkhorst, 2005.

it was initially largely ignored. The last one, the Manoramā, was composed after Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's death. The Manoramā often criticises, politely but firmly, the opinions which Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa had expressed in his Prakāśa. This angered Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's physical and intellectual descendants. Critical attacks on the Manoramā have survived from the hands of Cakrapāṇi (or Cakrapāṇidatta), the son of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's son Śeṣa Vīreśvara, and Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, Vīreśvara's pupil. According to Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, Bhaṭṭoji's mind had been marred by hatred for his teacher. Bhaṭṭoji's grandson Hari Dīkṣita responded in due time to these attacks in his (Bṛhat-)Śabdaratna.

We do not know which was the real cause of friction between the clan of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and that of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa. Madhav Deshpande has suggested that sectarian factors may have played a role: Bhaṭṭoji and his descendants were Advaita Vedāntins, Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa and his followers Dvaitins.<sup>2</sup> This is an interesting hypothesis that deserves further study (which cannot be undertaken here), the more so since Bhaṭṭoji's brother Raṅgoji Bhaṭṭa is recorded to have defeated the Dvaita scholar Vidyādhīśayati in debate at the court of the Keladi ruler Veṅkaṭappa, his patron.<sup>3</sup> An argument against this hypothesis might be the circumstance that there are some indications suggesting that Raṅgoji Bhaṭṭa's son, Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa, maintained good relations with the Śeṣa family, and took his distance with regard to his uncle Bhaṭṭoji (§2, below).

Bhaṭṭoji was active in other fields besides technical grammar. Of particular interest is his role in reviving the so-called philosophy of grammar. He did so in two works: (i) the Śabdakaustubha already mentioned; (ii) a collection of verses which have only survived along with the comments of his nephew Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa. The Śabdakaustubha, where it deals with philosophical questions, concentrates on the nature of the sphaṭa. For earlier authors who wrote about it, the sphaṭa was primarily an ontological entity: the sphaṭa of a word is that word considered as unitary and without parts, different therefore from its "constituent" sounds. For Bhaṭṭoji the ontological aspect loses much of its interest; for him the sphaṭa is a semantic unit, "simply the linguistic sign in its aspect of meaning-bearer (Bedeutungsträger)" as John Brough called it once.

The Śabdakaustubha provides us with little information as to why Bhaṭṭoji gave a different content to the concept of sphaṭa. To answer this question, Bhaṭṭoji's other work on the philosophy of grammar—this one dedicated exclu-

---

2 See his forthcoming article "Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's perceptions of intellectual history: narrative of fall and recovery of the grammatical authority."

3 Equally interesting in this context might be the fact that Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha also wrote a criticism of Appayya Dīkṣita, the Citra-mīmāṃsā-khaṇḍana; see Chatterjee, 1992: (6).

sively to the subject—has to be taken into consideration. This is more easily said than done, for Bhaṭṭoji's verse text is short, and the implications of the ideas expressed in it can only be brought to light with the help of the two commentaries which his nephew Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa wrote on it. This raises the question whether and to what extent Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa can be considered a faithful interpreter of his uncle's ideas. This question will be explored in §2. Those readers who are willing to take the conclusions of that section on faith, can proceed directly to §3.

## §2. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa

Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's commentary exists in two versions: a longer one which is earlier, and its later abbreviation. The earlier version is called *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa*, or sometimes, to distinguish it from the shorter version, *Bṛhad-vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa*. The shorter version is known by the name *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra*. These two commentaries comment on a number of verses partly composed and partly compiled by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. The original title of this collection of verses may have been *Vaiyākaraṇa-matonmajjana*, but this is not certain; since its verses are explained in the *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa*, it is sometimes referred to as *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-kārikā*. One edition uses the name *Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhānta-kārikāḥ*.

Bhaṭṭoji's *Vaiyākaraṇa-matonmajjana* contains 76 *kārikās*, of which close to 20 appear to have been borrowed from other works, primarily Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*.<sup>4</sup> S. D. Joshi offers the following opinion about these verses (1993: 7): "It would seem to me ... that the *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana* is a collection of useful verses composed by no single author but gathered together by Bhaṭṭoji, who doubtless composed many of them himself, for the instructions of his students." This, if true, suggests that Bhaṭṭoji had a great deal more to say about the topics dealt with in these verses, but that he did so only orally, in the presence of his students. The question which we would like to see answered is whether we can with confidence assume that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's commentaries express Bhaṭṭoji's points of view, or whether and to what extent Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa is to be looked upon as an independent, and perhaps original, thinker.

At first sight there seem to be good reasons to assume that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa must have tried to stay as close as possible to the ideas of Bhaṭṭoji, and that he was in a particularly favourable position to do so. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita was Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's uncle, as indicated in an introductory verse of the *Vaiyākaraṇa-*

---

4 See Joshi, 1993: 6 f.

bhūṣaṇa.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, both may have lived in Benares.<sup>6</sup> It seems therefore more than likely that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa knew or had known Bhaṭṭoji while he wrote his commentaries. Familial piety would have prevented him from deviating more than minimally from his uncle's views.

This first impression cannot be accepted at face value. Possible objections turn around questions about Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's relationship to his uncle. We would like to know, in particular, whether Bhaṭṭoji was still alive when Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa wrote his commentaries. Also: had Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa ever been Bhaṭṭoji's pupil? And finally: what was, or had been, the relationship between Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa and his uncle? Were they, or had they been, on good terms with each other? All this is in need of analysis. The remainder of this section will bring together some material that may contribute to such an analysis.

Bhaṭṭoji's main grammatical works, as we know, were composed in the following temporal sequence: Śabda-kaustubha, Siddhānta-kaumudī, (Praudha-)manoramā. Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa refers to the Manoramā,<sup>7</sup> and was therefore composed, or at any rate completed, after Bhaṭṭoji had completed his last important grammatical work, i.e., at a time when Bhaṭṭoji may have been old or no longer alive.

Some indications suggest that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa, already while writing his Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa, was not in a position, or not willing, to consult his uncle. One of these is Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's explanation of verse 48/49. This verse states that a discussion of the meaning of the suffixes *tva* and *taL* (= *tā*) is found in Hari's Ṭikā.<sup>8</sup> The Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa does not explain which text is meant; the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra does, stating: "the meaning is: in the Ṭikā on the Mahābhāṣya by Bhartṛhari" (*bhartṛharinā mahābhāṣyaṭīkāyām ity arthaḥ*). Neither of the two commentaries gives any further details, and nor do they cite the

5 VBh ed. HPG & ed. BVP p. 1: *vāgdevī yasya jihvāgre narīnarti sadā mudā/ bhaṭṭoji-dīkṣitam ahaṁ piṭṛvyaṁ naumi siddhaye//*; tr. Joshi, 1995: 2 (modified): "For success [in my undertaking] I pay homage to my paternal uncle Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, on the tip of whose tongue the goddess of speech ever dances in joy."

6 Gode, 1941: 322.

7 E.g. VBh ed. HPG p. 10 l. 24 (ed. BVP p. 10 l. 29); p. 140 l. 27 & 28 (ed. BVP p. 127 l. 29 & 30; Despande, 1992: 245); p. 264 l. 16–17 (ed. BVP p. 216 l. 13).

8 Verse 48/49: *kṛttaddhitasamāsebhyo matabhedanibandhanam/ tvalor arthakathanam ṭīkāyām hariṇā kṛtam//*. Tr. Das, 1990: 290: "The statement necessitated by difference of opinion with regard to the meaning of (the suffixes viz.) *-tva* and *-taL* as affixed to a stem which is derived with either a primary suffix or a secondary suffix or a compound is made by Bhartṛhari in his Commentary (on the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali on Pāṇini's rules)."

passage or passages concerned from Bhartṛhari's commentary. This is surprising, for both texts, and the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa in particular, very often cite Bhartṛhari's other work, the Vākyapadīya. This suggests that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa may have had no access to Bhartṛhari's commentary, copies of which were probably already at his time becoming difficult to find. (Only one partial and corrupt manuscript has survived until today.) Bhaṭṭoji, on the other hand, must have had access to this text, that is to say, he must have had access to this text if he had indeed himself composed the verse concerned. In that case we are led to assume that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa was in no position, while writing his commentaries, to make use of his uncle's library, or to draw upon his memory. Either way one gains the impression that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa was not in direct contact with Bhaṭṭoji while he wrote his commentaries.

This last impression is supported by the fact that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa was not the first to comment upon Bhaṭṭoji's Vaiyākaraṇa-matonmajjana. A pupil of Bhaṭṭoji called Vanamāli Mīśra composed, already before Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa, a commentary named Vaiyākaraṇa-matonmajjana-ṭīkā.<sup>9</sup> Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa knew this commentary,<sup>10</sup> and he indicates on several occasions that he knew one or more earlier interpretations of the verses he commented upon. He mentions such earlier interpretations on some occasions where he offers other ones instead,<sup>11</sup> without in any way suggesting that he had access to a more authentic tradition as to the intention of their author and compiler than the persons he criticises. Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's father, Raṅgoji Bhaṭṭa, indicates that he (the father) had been the pupil of his (no doubt older) brother Bhaṭṭoji.<sup>12</sup> Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa himself nowhere makes any such claim.<sup>13</sup> We are free to suspect that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa, at the occasions where he criticises an earlier interpretation, may indeed try to improve upon the interpretation which Bhaṭṭoji himself had given to the verses, and which at least sometimes had found expression in the commentary of Vanamāli Mīśra.

A passage where Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa rejects an earlier interpretation occurs under verse 11. This verse reads:

---

9 Edited by Lalit Kumar Tripathi and Bharat Bhushan Tripathi, and published in 1998.

10 See the introduction (*bhūmikā*) to the edition mentioned in the preceding note.

11 See Manudeva Bhaṭṭāchārya's introduction to his edition of the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa, pp. 45–46.

12 Upādhyāya, 1994: 63.

13 Biswal's (1995: 55) claim to the extent that Bhaṭṭoji was Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's teacher is based on the verse cited in note 3, above, which says nothing of the kind.

*dhātvarthatvaṃ kriyātvam ced dhātutvaṃ ca kriyārthatā/  
anyonyasamśrayaḥ spaṣṭas tasmād astu yathākaram//*

That an action should be that which is denoted by a root and that a root should be that which denotes an action is clearly a case of mutual dependence. Therefore, it [the word *kriyā*] should be taken as defined in the Ākara [Patañjali's *Bhāṣya*].<sup>14</sup>

The Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa on this verse contains the following passage:<sup>15</sup>

*kecit tu “mīmāṃsako vaiyākaraṇaṃ prati doṣam āha dhātvartha-  
tvam iti/ dhātvarthatvaṃ kriyātvam yadi brūyāḥ tadā  
anyonyāśrayaḥ spaṣṭaḥ ity arthaḥ/ tasmād iti/ ākhyātārthaḥ kriyā ity  
adhyāhāraḥ/ vaiyākaraṇaḥ samādhatte astu iti/ vyāpārasantānaḥ  
kriyā tadvācako dhātuḥ ity arthaḥ/ tathā ca nānyonyāśrayaḥ” iti  
vyācakṣate/*

The part within quotation marks has been taken from Vanamāli's commentary.<sup>16</sup> Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa does not agree with it, for he continues with the words: “In reality, however ...” (*vastutas tu*).

The passage to be considered next attributes an alternative interpretation to “the tradition” (*sampradāya*). It occurs in the lines introducing verse 21, which reads:

*bhedyabhedakasambandhopādhibhedanibandhanam/  
sādhutvaṃ tadabhāve 'pi bodho neha nivāryate//*

The correctness [of forms] is dependent upon differences in discriminative feature (*upādhi*) (or: is dependent upon the particularity of distinctive feature) which [in turn] are relations between distinguisher (i.e. qualifier) and that to be distinguished (i.e. qualificand). And even in absence of that [correct form] the verbal knowledge [of

14 Tr. Joshi, 1997: 3.

15 VBh ed. HPG p. 43 l. 1–5. VBh ed. BVP p. 45 l. 7–11 begins this passage with the singular *kaścit*, which calls for a different interpretation altogether.

16 See Tripathi & Tripathi, 1998: *bhūmikā* p. 7.

action from the *tiñ* suffixes] is not denied here [in the grammatical system].<sup>17</sup>

The Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa introduces this verse with the following words:<sup>18</sup>

“*vastutaḥ dhātor bhāvanānabhidhāyakatve ākhyātasya kartur an-  
abhidhāyakatve ca asādhutvaṁ syād ity āha bhedyā iti*” *iti sam-  
pradāyaḥ*

The part within quotation marks is, once again, taken from an earlier explanation of the verse (which is this time not Vanamāli’s commentary<sup>19</sup>), and once again Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa expresses his disagreement by continuing with the words: “In reality, however ...” (*vastutas tu*). It seems therefore that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa recognises here the existence of a traditional interpretation of the verse under consideration. If this verse was composed by Bhaṭṭoji, this strongly suggests that, in Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa’s opinion, the interpretation which he rejects was the one intended by his uncle. The only alternative way to understand this passage would be to assume that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa was acquainted with one or more commentaries (different from Vanamāli’s) or other forms of explanation on the verses, among which this particular interpretation had become commonly accepted. In the former case, Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa may have been aware of Bhaṭṭoji’s intended interpretation, which he then shamelessly rejects. In the latter case his knowledge of Bhaṭṭoji’s intentions was quite simply non-existent.

A word of caution is here required. Our conclusions are only valid if indeed Bhaṭṭoji had composed this verse. If the verse belongs to an older work, Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa may merely reject the interpretation that had been expressed in a commentary connected with that earlier work. In that case the opinion of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita may not here play any role whatsoever. The problem with verse 21 is precisely this—as Joshi (1997: 29) points out—that according to Nāgeśa’s *Laghumañjūṣā* it has been taken from the *Vākyapadīya*.<sup>20</sup> However, it is not found in Rau’s critical edition of that work.<sup>21</sup> It seems therefore likely that

17 Tr. Joshi, 1997: 29.

18 VBh ed. HPG p. 64 l. 30–31, ed. BVP p. 64 l. 25–26.

19 Cf. Tripathi & Tripathi, 1998: *bhūmikā* p. 21.

20 Joshi refers to p. 746 of an edition of the *Laghumañjūṣā* (specified in the references below) which is not accessible to me.

21 None of the four pādas of this verse occur in the Index accompanying Rau’s edition (Vkp), nor indeed in the indexes accompanying Iyer’s editions.



Nāgeśa was mistaken. However, since Nāgeśa's remark (which I have not been able to find) suggests that he had seen this verse in an earlier work, a shadow of uncertainty hovers over this second example.

Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa refers on some other occasions to the tradition (*sampradāya*), but it is not clear at these places whether a tradition of interpretation of the verses of the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa is intended.<sup>22</sup> On one occasion he contrasts the “traditionalists” (*sāmpradāyika*) with the “independents” (*svatantra*); the latter base themselves on the words of Patañjali, the author of the Yoga Sūtra.<sup>23</sup> In this case it is not impossible that these traditionalists are thus called because they follow a traditional interpretation of Bhaṭṭoji's verses, but since there is no direct reference here to any of these verses, this is not sure.

Equally interesting in the present context is a passage of the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa which appears to reject an opinion attributed to Bhaṭṭoji. It occurs in the midst of a rather long discussion about the meaning of verbal roots. The question is: can one really ascribe the general meaning “productive operation” (*bhāvanā*) to the verb “to exist” (*as*) in constructions such as “the soul exists” and “ether exists,” given that objects such as the soul and ether are eternal and do not change? At this point we find the following observation:<sup>24</sup>

*na ca “atrāpi bhāvanāsty eva, tatpratītau punaḥ kiñcit prati-bandhakam kalpyate, samabhivyāhāraviśeṣasya kāraṇatvam vā” iti vācyam, mamāpi etasya suvacatvāt/ ata eva bhāvanāphalayor eka-niṣṭhatvam atra doṣatvenoktam mūlakṛtā/*

It should not be objected that in these cases, too, [the meaning] is ‘productive operation,’ but some obstruction occurs in its perception, or that a specific concurrent usage is the cause [of its perception]; for this [objection] is correct, also according to me. That is why the author of the root-text (*mūlakṛt*) has stated that in these cases the claim that productive operation and result reside in one single [verbal root] is incorrect.

The “author of the root-text” (*mūlakṛt*) is Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. This is confirmed by the only other occurrence of the expression *mūlakṛt* in the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa

22 VBh ed. HPG p. 219 l. 16 (ed. BVP p. 190 l. 4); p. 294 l. 19 (ed. BVP p. 230 l. 10); *iti sampradāyavidah*).

23 VBh ed. HPG p. 47 l. 29, ed. BVP p. 50 l. 17. See note 33, below.

24 VBh ed. HPG p. 44 l. 30–33, ed. BVP p. 47 l. 7–10.

known to me, where there is question of what “the author of the root-text has stated in the Śabdakaustubha.”<sup>25</sup> The present passage must refer to verse 12, which it is commenting upon. Verse 12 reads:

*astyādāv api dharmyamśe bhāvye ’sty eva hi bhāvanā/  
anyatrāśeṣabhāvāt tu sā tathā na prakāśate//*

Even in the case of the root *as* etc. where a part of the agent is [intended to be understood as] to be accomplished there is certainly present a productive operation (*bhāvanā*); but this [operation] does not reveal itself in the same way [i.e. it is not readily apparent as in the case of transitive roots] because it is not subservient to anything elsewhere [i.e. it does not appear in a relation of subserviency to anything other than the agent].<sup>26</sup>

Also relevant in the present context is verse 13:

*phalavyāpārayor ekaniṣṭhatāyām akarmakaḥ/  
dhātus tayor dharmibhede sakarmaka udāhṛtaḥ/*

When its activity and result reside in the same substratum a root is intransitive, when they reside in different substrata it is called transitive.<sup>27</sup>

Neither of these two verses state or imply that in the case of the root *as* “the claim that productive operation and result reside in one single [verbal root] is incorrect,” as is maintained in the passage from the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa. This is at best an interpretation of these two verses, an interpretation that is here attributed to Bhaṭṭoji himself. This is of course extremely interesting, for the attribution is made in a passage which looks like a quotation, perhaps a modified quotation, from an earlier commentary. It does not appear to occur in Vana-māli’s Ṭīkā. The present claim may therefore conceivably go back to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita himself.

---

25 VBh ed. HPG p. 195 l. 1–2 (ed. BVP p. 174 l. 14; Biswal, 1995: 184 l. 3): *uktam hi śabda-kaustubhe mūlakṛtā ...*

26 Tr. Joshi, 1997: 5.

27 Tr. Joshi, 1997: 7.

Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa does not contest that this is Bhaṭṭoji's own interpretation. This does not withhold him from disagreeing with it. Against the position presented in the passage cited above, and against the position attributed to Bhaṭṭoji, he maintains that the meaning 'productive operation' is expressed by the root *as*, also in examples like "the ether exists":<sup>28</sup>

*vastutaḥ ... atrāpi ākāśo 'sti, ākāśa ātmā vāsīt iti prayogād  
bhāvanāyā vācyatvam āvaśyakam*

In reality it is necessary to accept that 'productive operation' (*bhāvanā*) is expressed in these cases, too, [as is clear] from the use of expressions such as "the ether exists," "the ether existed" or "the soul existed."

A further disagreement between Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa and Bhaṭṭoji comes to light in the discussion in the *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa* of the *akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa*. Here Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa presents the view of Bhaṭṭoji as an alternative to his own, in the following words:<sup>29</sup>

*granthakṛtas tv āhuḥ "varṇamālāyām padam iti pratīteḥ varṇātirikta  
eva sphoṭaḥ anyathā kapālātiriktaghaṭāsiddhiprasaṅgāc ceti dik" iti  
sudhībhir vibhāvanīyam*

Essentially the same statement recurs in the *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra*, with the added information that Bhaṭṭoji's opinion had been expressed in the *Śabda-kaustubha*:<sup>30</sup>

*śabdakaustubhe tu "varṇamālāyām padam iti pratīter varṇātirikta  
eva sphoṭo 'nyathā kapālātiriktaghaṭāsiddhiprasaṅgāś ca" iti prati-  
pāditam*

In the *Śabdakaustubha*, on the other hand, it is stated that, since with reference to a series of phonemes we have the perception "(this is a)

28 VBh ed. HPG p. 45 l. 1–2, ed. BVP p. 47 l. 11–12.

29 VBh ed. HPG p. 320 l. 13–14, ed. BVP p. 247 l. 21–23.

30 VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 69 l. 20–21 (1st ed. p. 61 l. 5–7), ed. ChPS p. 580 l. 11, ed. KSS p. 503, ed. Pr p. 525, Joshi, 1967: 104 l. 16, Das, 1990: 166 l. 21. Cf. Joshi, 1967: 187: "By the word *tu* [Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa] indicates that he disagrees with the view of Bhaṭṭoji."

word,” the *sphoṭa* should certainly be considered different from the phonemes; (for) otherwise it would be impossible to establish that the jar is different from the potsherds.<sup>31</sup>

The preceding examples suggest that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa is not necessarily in all cases to be looked upon as a faithful interpreter of his uncle Bhaṭṭoji’s intentions. In order to find out more about the relationship between these two men we will now turn to the way in which Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa refers to his uncle. In order to evaluate this evidence correctly, it will be useful first to consider how Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa refers to other authors in general. Since there are far more such references in the longer Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa than in the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra, we will concentrate on the former work.

The main distinction to be noted here is that some authors, unlike others, are referred to with particular respect. Good examples are the ancient “sages” of grammar. Whereas Pāṇini can be referred to simply by his name, Kātyāyana is *bhagavān vārttikakāraḥ*.<sup>32</sup> Patañjali is *bhāṣyakāra* in the plural.<sup>33</sup> The plural appears to be a sign of respect, but it is not clear quite what criteria govern its use. The important grammarians (Bharṭṛ-)hari and Kaiyaṭa are throughout referred to by their mere names, in the singular. Certain other early authors are referred to in the plural, even though Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa disagrees with them. Examples are the Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, referred to as *bhaṭṭa*,

31 Tr. Joshi, 1967: 186–187. The reference is no doubt to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 7 l. 15–17: *ekaḥ paṭa itivad ekaṁ padaṁ vākyam vety abādhitapratīter varṇātiriktam eva padaṁ vākyam vā akhaṇḍaṁ varṇavyaṅgyam / ekatvapratītir aupādhikīti cet? paṭe ’pi tathātvāpatteḥ*.

32 VBh ed. HPG p. 259 l. 5, ed. BVP p. 212 l. 1. Kātyāyana is simply *vārttikakāra* (singular) in the representation of a rejected opinion; VBh ed. HPG p. 61 l. 10, ed. BVP p. 61 l. 6.

33 Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa’s non-use of the term *bhagavān* in connection with the grammarian Patañjali stands in striking contrast with Bhaṭṭoji’s frequent use of that term. For later grammarians in the tradition of Bhaṭṭoji (Nāgeśa, Vaidyanātha), Patañjali is the *bhagavān par excellence* among the three grammatical *munis*; see Deshpande, 2005.

The *bhagavān patañjaliḥ* of VBh ed. HPG p. 47 l. 31, ed. BVP p. 50 l. 17 is the author of the Yoga Sūtra 1.9: *śabdajñānānupātī vastuśūnyo vikalpaḥ*. Note the reference to the *bhagavān Vyāsa*, the author of the *pātañjala* at VBh ed. HPG p. 91 l. 18, ed. BVP p. 90 l. 20–21, Gune, 1974: 425 (*bhagavatā vyāsena pātañjale pañcaśikhācāryavacanam udāhṛtya nirṇītam*) and contrast this with the reference to the *bhagavān Vyāsa*, author of Brahmaśūtra 3.1.25, at VBh ed. HPG p. 91 l. 6–7, ed. BVP p. 90 l. 10–11, Gune, 1974: 422 (*ata eva bhagavatā vyāsena sūtritaṁ ’asuddham iti cen na śabdāt’*).

*bhaṭṭapāda* or *bhaṭṭācārya*, always in the plural,<sup>34</sup> Maṇḍanamiśra,<sup>35</sup> and Mādhavācārya.<sup>36</sup> Then there are some people who were close to Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa in time, and who were perhaps referred to in the plural because he knew and respected them. Possible examples are Nṛsiṃhāśrama,<sup>37</sup> and Rāmakṛṣṇa-bhaṭṭācārya.<sup>38</sup> Last but not least, there are the references in the plural to Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's father (*asmatpitṛcaraṇa*)<sup>39</sup> and to his teacher (*asmatguru*).<sup>40</sup>

In view of these examples one might expect that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, being both Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's uncle and the author of the verses he comments upon, should receive clear signs of respect. This is not however what we find. Apart from the introductory verse considered above,<sup>41</sup> Bhaṭṭoji is never referred to by name (except of course in the colophons). He is referred to as the author of the verse text by means of the following expressions: *granthakāra*,<sup>42</sup> *mūlakṛt*,<sup>43</sup> *mūla-*

---

34 VBh ed. HPG p. 11 l. 17 (ed. BVP p. 11 l. 17), p. 51 l. 12 (ed. BVP p. 53 l. 6), p. 125 l. 29 (ed. BVP p. 114 l. 7; Deshpande, 1992: 99), p. 220 l. 31 (ed. BVP p. 191 l. 16), p. 247 l. 28 (ed. BVP p. 205 l. 4) (*bhaṭṭa*); p. 81 l. 13 (ed. BVP p. 80 l. 2; Gune, 1974: 292) (*bhaṭṭācārya*); p. 40 l. 10 (ed. BVP p. 42 l. 12), p. 56 l. 26 (ed. BVP p. 56 l. 24), p. 67 l. 4 (ed. BVP p. 66 l. 30), p. 120 l. 22 (ed. BVP p. 110 l. 22), p. 127 l. 15 (ed. BVP p. 115 l. 22; Deshpande, 1992: 123), p. 138 l. 2 (ed. BVP p. 124 l. 24; Deshpande, 1992: 220), p. 201 l. 7 (ed. BVP p. 175 l. 25; Biswal, 1995: 187 l. 2), p. 205 l. 4 (ed. BVP p. 178 l. 11; Biswal, 1995: 191 l. 14) (*bhaṭṭapāda*).

35 VBh ed. HPG p. 126 l. 23, ed. BVP p. 114 l. 30, Deshpande, 1992: 114.

36 VBh ed. HPG p. 81 l. 21, ed. BVP p. 80 l. 10, Gune, 1974: 297. The reference is to the author of the Jaiminīyanyāyamālā according to Gune, 1974: 298.

37 VBh ed. HPG p. 76 l. 7 (ed. BVP p. 74 l. 15; Gune, 1974: 206), p. 77 l. 13 (ed. BVP p. 75 l. 24; Gune, 1974: 232), p. 174 l. 7 (ed. BVP p. 159 l. 3, Biswal, 1995: 155 l. 15), p. 309 l. 26 (ed. BVP p. 239 l. 25). The reference in the first passage is to the Vedāntatattvaviveka of Nṛsiṃhāśrama (ed. Ramasastri Telang, reprint from The Pandit, Varanasi, 1912) p. 67, according to Gune, 1974: 207; the third passage refers to Nṛsiṃhāśrama's Vivaraṇatippaṇa and Tattvaviveka. This may be the same Nṛsiṃhāśrama who is mentioned in a document of 1658; see Pollock, 2001: 21.

38 VBh ed. HPG p. 23 l. 27 (ed. BVP p. 24 l. 18), p. 82 l. 16 (ed. BVP p. 81 l. 9–10, Gune, 1974: 311), p. 286 l. 4 (ed. BVP p. 227 l. 20).

39 VBh ed. HPG p. 83 l. 28 (ed. BVP p. 82 l. 27; Gune, 1974: 331), p. 91 l. 9 (ed. BVP p. 90 l. 12; Gune, 1974: 422).

40 VBh ed. HPG p. 226 l. 27, ed. BVP p. 196 l. 13. On the identity of this teacher, see below.

41 Note 5, above.

42 VBh ed. HPG p. 3 l. 16 (ed. BVP p. 3 l. 14), p. 214 l. 31 (ed. BVP p. 184 l. 27) (both sg.).

*granthakṛt*,<sup>44</sup> and *granthakṛt*.<sup>45</sup> In total I have found seven references using these expressions, two of which (which employ the last two expressions) use the plural, the five remaining ones the singular. This raises the question why Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa, who refers so respectfully to a number of authors, is so casual with regard to Bhaṭṭoji.

At this point it may be useful to recall that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita became, toward the end of his life, a contested figure, as has been explained in §1, above. It is in this context of rivalry and wounded pride that we may have to situate Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa. He was apparently on good terms with the Śeṣa family. This is clear from an introductory verse which lauds, though indirectly, the Śeṣa family, and which occurs in both the longer and the shorter version of his commentary. It reads:

*aśeṣaphaladātāraṁ bhavābdhitarāṇe tarim/ śeṣāśeṣārthalābhārtham  
prārthaye śeṣabhūṣaṇam//*

The sequence *śeṣa* occurs four times in this verse, which allows of two altogether different interpretations:

- (1) “I pray to [Viṣṇu], who bestows all rewards, who is a raft for the crossing of the ocean of worldly existence and who has the serpent Śeṣa for his ornament, that I may grasp the complete sense [of the Mahābhāṣya composed] by Śeṣa (i.e., by Patañjali).” (tr. Joshi, 1993: 1–2)
- (2) “I request the jewel of the Śeṣas (i.e., Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa?, Vīreśvara?; see below) ... that I may grasp the complete sense of [the teaching provided by] the Śeṣas.”

We can be sure that this double interpretation was intentional, and that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa consciously wished to pay homage to the Śeṣa family through this verse.

This conclusion gains in plausibility when we take into consideration that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa may himself have been a pupil of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa (Deshpande, 1992:

---

43 VBh ed. HPG p. 44 l. 33 (ed. BVP p. 47 l. 10), p. 195 l. 2 (ed. BVP p. 174 l. 14, Biswal, 1995: 184 l. 3) (both sg.).

44 VBh ed. HPG p. 247 l. 21 (ed. BVP p. 204 l. 28) (pl.).

45 VBh ed. HPG p. 208 l. 10 (ed. BVP p. 179 l. 8, Biswal, 1995: 193 l. 5) (sg.), p. 320 l. 13 (ed. BVP p. 247 l. 21) (pl.).

74)<sup>46</sup> or of his son Vīreśvara (Das, 1990: 326).<sup>47</sup> We have already seen that the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa refers on one occasion to “our teacher” using the respectful plural: *asmatguravaḥ*. It is not clear which scholar Kauṇḍa is here referring to; some think it is his father,<sup>48</sup> but this is not certain.<sup>49</sup> As long as the origin of the passage attributed to “our teacher” has not been identified it will be difficult to be sure about who he was, but it is not excluded that he was someone from the Śeṣa family.

However that may be, there is reason to assume that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa was torn between the two conflicting camps. He may have had to choose between his family and his teacher. It seems likely that in this conflict his sympathies lay with the Śeṣa family. At the same time he could not openly choose sides against his uncle. The result was an ambiguous attitude, in which he expresses his allegiance to the Śeṣa family in a roundabout way, and refrains from showing any enthusiasm towards his uncle.

The fact that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa yet comments upon a work of his uncle suggests that the estrangement between the two men may have been gradual. We can imagine a scene in which he started working on a commentary on his uncle’s text when there were no problems as yet, that is to say, before the Manoramā had been completed and made accessible. Later on, when the Manoramā had come out, Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa began to feel uncomfortable. When, at a still later stage, members of the Śeṣa family started complaining and writing critical reactions, Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa felt ever more inclined to de-emphasise his link with Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita.

This scene is of course totally imaginary. There are yet some features which appear to support it. Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa’s discomfort with his uncle’s Manoramā may find expression in the fact that already the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa, which frequently refers to Bhaṭṭoji’s earlier work, the Śabda-kaustubha,<sup>50</sup> only

---

46 This is unlikely in view of the fact that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa’s father had been a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji, who in his turn had been a pupil of Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa; see above.

47 According to Vidya Niwas Misra (preface to his edition of the Vaiyākaraṇa-Bhūṣaṇa, p. (v)) Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa “studied grammar at the feet of Śeṣakṛṣṇa (who was also the teacher of his uncle Bhaṭṭoji) and of Śeṣa Vīreśvara (also called Sarveśvara).”

48 Joshi, 1993: 4. See in this connection the concluding verse of the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa (ed. HPG p. 331 l. 7; ed. BVP p. 254 l. 17): *gurūpamaguruṃ raṅgojibhaṭṭaṃ bhaje*.

49 See further below.

50 References to the Śabdakaustubha e.g. at VBh ed. HPG p. 72 l. 10 (ed. BVP p. 70 l. 15–16, Gune, 1974: 133), p. 117 l. 8 (ed. BVP p. 108 l. 7); p. 132 l. 8 (ed. BVP p. 118 l. 21, Deshpande, 1992: 161), p. 144 l. 3 (ed. BVP p. 129 l. 18, Biswal, 1995: 98 l. 13), p. 147 l.

rarely refers to the Manoramā.<sup>51</sup> The more recent Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra still refers twice to the Śabdakaustubha, but never to the Manoramā.<sup>52</sup>

Another feature which appears to be significant is the following. Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's original, and longer, commentary contains an introductory verse in which his uncle, Bhaṭṭoji, is praised in eulogistic terms.<sup>53</sup> This is not surprising, for in this commentary Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa is about to explain the ideas of this very uncle. However, this verse is missing in most of the manuscripts of the abbreviated version, the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra. It is hard to believe that copyists skipped this verse, for it is the only one which mentions Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. It is much easier to assume that the opposite happened: certain copyists inserted it from the longer commentary into some manuscripts of the shorter one, because they felt that it should be there. This would imply that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa on purpose failed to mention his uncle's name in the introductory verses of his Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra. The significance of this omission seems obvious.

Of similar significance may be the fact that a concluding verse of the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa mentions Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's father Raṅgoji Bhaṭṭa, whereas the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra concludes with a verse similar to the one cited above in which there appears to be an allusion to the Śeṣa family.<sup>54</sup>

---

18 (ed. BVP p. 131 l. 16, Biswal, 1995: 102 l. 8), p. 148 l. 11 (ed. BVP p. 132 l. 10, Biswal, 1995: 103 l. 18), p. 148 l. 16 (ed. BVP p. 132 l. 16, Biswal, 1995: 104 l. 7), p. 150 l. 11 (ed. BVP p. 133 l. 23, Biswal, 1995: 107 l. 2), p. 165 l. 15 & 19 (ed. BVP p. 149 l. 29 & p. 150 l. 3, Biswal, 1995: 139 l. 11 & 16), p. 195 l. 2 (ed. BVP p. 174 l. 14; Biswal, 1995: 184 l. 3), p. 220 l. 30 (ed. BVP p. 191 l. 15), p. 264 l. 10 (ed. BVP p. 216 l. 8), p. 316 l. 4 (ed. BVP p. 243 l. 27); its author is at least once simply referred to as *granthakṛt* (VBh ed. HPG p. 320 l. 13–14, ed. BVP p. 247 l. 21), and at least once as *mūlakṛt* (VBh ed. HPG p. 195 l. 2, ed. BVP p. 174 l. 14; Biswal, 1995: 184 l. 3). The mention of the Śabdakaustubha under verse 1 is of course explained by the fact that verse 1 itself mentions that text.

51 For references to the Manoramā see note 7, above.

52 References to the Śabdakaustubha at VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 35 l. 15 (1st ed. p. 31 l. 13), ed. ChPS p. 332 l. 19, ed. KSS p. 265 l. 8, ed. Pr p. 334 l. 8, Das, 1990: 134 l. 13; and at VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 69 l. 20–21 (1st ed. p. 61 l. 5–7), ed. ChPS p. 580 l. 11, ed. KSS p. 503, ed. Pr p. 525, Joshi, 1967: 104 l. 16, Das, 1990: 166 l. 21; see the index in Das, 1990: 335 ff.

53 See note 5, above.

54 VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 73 l. 17–18 (1st ed. p. 64 l. 19–20), ed. ChPS p. 610 l. 22–23, ed. KSS p. 530 l. 3, ed. Pr p. 555 l. 5–6; Joshi, 1967: 112 l. 1–2; Das, 1990: 170 l. 20–21: *aśeṣa-phaladātāram api sarveśvaram* (v.l. *viśveśvaram*/ *vīreśvaram*?) *gurum/ śrīmadbhūṣaṇa-sāreṇa bhūṣaye śeṣabhūṣaṇam*//



The above reflections will have made clear that it is not likely that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa was no more than the mouth-piece of his uncle Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. He deviates from the latter on several identifiable occasions. Since Bhaṭṭoji's verses are short and often obscure, it is practically impossible to determine his point of view with regard to numerous details. It is not at all certain that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's opinions coincide with his on all occasions.

This raises questions as to the influences Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa had undergone when writing his *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa*, and the extent of his originality. His *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa* is the first text we possess that presents a grammarian's attempt to deal with verbal understanding (*śābdabodha*) using Navya-Nyāya ideas and terminology. Was he indeed the first to make such a detailed attempt?

We have seen that on one occasion Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa refers to "our teacher" (*asmadguravaḥ*), and that it is difficult to determine who this teacher was. The position which this teacher is stated to hold is interesting in the present context. The quoted passage would seem to be the following:<sup>55</sup>

*vastutaḥ niṣprakāraṇam abhāvapratyakṣam yadi nānubhavasiddham,  
astu tarhi tatra saprakāraṇajñānatvenaiva kāraṇatā/ itthañ ca  
sarvatra viśiṣṭabuddhisāmagrī sulabhaiva iti na na iti pratyakṣam/  
samśayottarābhāvapratyakṣe ca dharmitāvacchedakāvacchinnā-  
bhāvaviṣayakatvam, yadi ca upasthitaviśeṣaṇasya asaṃsargagrahaḥ  
tadāpi dharmitāvacchedakānīyantritadviśiṣṭabodhe na bādhakam/  
evañ ca nokto guruḥ kāryakāraṇabhāva ity asmadguravaḥ/*

This passage deals with a detail of verbal cognition and uses the technical vocabulary of Navya-Nyāya. This shows that, whatever the identity of the teacher here referred to, Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa had been trained in this technical form of sentence analysis by someone else. Since he accepts the position of his teacher and is himself a grammarian, we must assume that the teacher here referred to was a grammarian, too. Indeed, while introducing the second *kārikā*, the *Bhūṣaṇa* enumerates "the feet of the teacher" (*gurucaraṇa*), i.e., the highly respected teacher, besides *Bhartṛhari*; both of them had clarified the categories accepted by grammarians (*śrībhartṛharigurucaraṇaprabhṛtibhir atitarām viśadīkṛtān api vaiyākaraṇābhimatapadārthān*).<sup>56</sup> It appears that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa was

55 VBh ed. HPG p. 226 l. 22–27, ed. BVP p. 196 l. 7–13.

56 The context does not allow us to determine whether Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's or Bhaṭṭoji's teacher is meant here. Since the understood subject of the whole sentence is Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita,

not the very first to introduce this detailed and technical form of sentence analysis into grammar. The teacher here referred to is not, as far as we can tell, his uncle Bhaṭṭoji, but someone else.

This conclusion does not, of course, imply that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa had no ideas of his own. It appears, indeed, that he had personal contacts outside the grammatical tradition, with at least one teacher of the Navya-Nyāya school of thought in particular.

We have already met the name of this Nyāya teacher. We have seen that Rāmakṛṣṇabhāṭṭācārya is one of the people who is referred with a respectful plural ending in the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa. This Rāmakṛṣṇabhāṭṭācārya is no doubt the author who is listed in the Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies as Rāmakṛṣṇa Bhāṭṭācārya Cakravartin (1570), and who has written various works on Nyāya.<sup>57</sup> From among these works only the Vyākhyā on Raghunātha's Ākhyātaśakti-vāda has appeared in print.<sup>58</sup> I have not found in this Vyākhyā anything that corresponds to the opinions attributed to Rāmakṛṣṇa in the three passages of the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa known to me that mention him. Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa apparently referred here to one or more of the other works of this author. However, the Vyākhyā contains a passage that appears to refer to the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra. This, if true, would show that Rāmakṛṣṇa was a contemporary of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa who lived long enough to maintain a constant interaction with the latter. Rāmakṛṣṇa may conceivably have been Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's most direct source of information about the latest developments in Nyāya,<sup>59</sup> and someone who kept a watchful eye on Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's experiments in the realm of *śābdabodha*.

---

mere syntactical considerations make the interpretation according to which *gurucaraṇa* refers to Bhaṭṭoji unlikely.

57 According to Joshi, 1993: 8, Rāmakṛṣṇa was the pupil of Raghunātha Śīromaṇi. Rāmakṛṣṇa Bhāṭṭa, the (older?) brother of Bhaṭṭoji's Mīmāṃsā teacher Śāṅkara Bhāṭṭa, is no possible candidate, not only for chronological reasons, but also because this Rāmakṛṣṇa was no Naiyāyika; see Benson, 2001: 114.

58 See the bibliography below under Raghunātha.

59 Ganeri (with a reference to D. C. Bhattacharya) observes that Rāmakṛṣṇa may have been the first to introduce Raghunātha's innovative ideas in Kāśī.

Let us consider the evidence which might be considered to support the above reflections. Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra contains the following passage:<sup>60</sup>

*anyathā ghaṭaḥ karmatvam ānayanam kṛtir ityādau tādrśavyutpattirahitasyāpi bodhaprasaṅgaḥ/ ghaṭam ānayetv atreva padārthānām upasthitau saty api tātparyajñāne bodhābhāvāc ca*

This passage is translated as follows by S. D. Joshi (1967: 151):

If this is not admitted, one might understand the sense from (the unconnected words such as) jar, objecthood, bringing, effort etc., even though one is not trained (to know the meaning) that way. But (it is observed) that the verbal knowledge does not arise (from the unconnected words) even if the intention of the speaker is known and (the same) meanings are represented (by the unconnected words), as they are represented by (the sentence) *ghaṭam ānaya* “bring a jar.”

S. D. Joshi comments (p. 152): “The expression *tādrśavyutpattirahitasya* ‘to him who is not trained in apprehending the meaning that way’ is purpose[ful]ly used by [Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa]. For the modern Naiyāyikas use a peculiar language for a philosophical discussion from which a layman cannot understand the meaning. Thus, [Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa] half-jokingly remarks that the modern Naiyāyikas who are trained in this peculiar fashion may understand the sense from the unconnected words mentioned above, but a layman cannot.”

The following remark, which occurs under verse 8, would seem to confirm the ironical tone of this passage:<sup>61</sup>

*ghaṭaḥ karmatvam ānayanam kṛtir ityādau viparyayeṇāpi vyutpannānām naiyāyikanavyādīnām bodho na tadvyutpattivirahitānām*

Joshi translates this passage (1995: 56, modified):

60 VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 67 l. 7–8 (1st ed. p. 58 l. 27 – p. 59 l. 2), ed. ChPS p. 558 l. 3–5, ed. KSS p. 475 l. 2 – p. 476 l. 1, ed. Pr p. 504 l. 3 – p. 505 l. 1; Joshi, 1967: 100 l. 11–13; Das, 1990: 163 l. 17–19.

61 VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 10 l. 13–15 (1st ed. p. 9 l. 12–14), ed. ChPS p. 103 l. 23–25, ed. KSS p. 88, ed. Pr p. 110; Das, 1990: 109 l. 17–18.

For the modern Naiyāyikas who are trained in perverse as well as normal speech, there is verbal understanding from [such unconnected words as] ‘jar, objecthood, bringing, effort’; but there is no understanding for those who are not so trained.

Once again S. D. Joshi comments (p. 56): “Thus Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa says, perhaps facetiously, that from isolated words like *ghaṭaḥ*, *karmatvam*, *ānayanam*, *kṛtiḥ*, though the layman cannot derive any sense the modern Naiyāyikas can.”

To the best of my knowledge this example (viz. *ghaṭaḥ*, *karmatvam*, *ānayanam*, *kṛtiḥ*) is not found in the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa. Rāmakṛṣṇa’s Vyākhyā (p. 178 l. 27–28), on the other hand, contains a very similar line:

*ata eva viparītavyutpannasya ghaṭaḥ karmatvam ityādito ’pi  
b[o]dhaḥ*

The question is: does this passage allude to the two passages from the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra cited above? All depends on the correct interpretation of the compound *viparītavyutpanna*. The very similar expression *viparyayeṇa vyutpanna* has been translated by Joshi, as we have seen, as “trained in perverse speech.” If this is correct, the almost identical expression used by Rāmakṛṣṇa can only be an ironical allusion to Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa’s remark. In that case we would have to conclude that Rāmakṛṣṇa, who is already referred to in the Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa, was a contemporary of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa who could still react to his later Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra.

One might object that neither *viparyayeṇa vyutpanna* nor *viparītavyutpanna* were meant to be ironical, that both mean no more than “trained differently.” In this case we would still have to admit that the two passages of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa and the one by Rāmakṛṣṇa have somehow exerted an influence on each other in one direction or the other: the parallelism is simply too close to assume that both authors arrived independently at almost the same formulation.<sup>62</sup> Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa might then have borrowed this phrase from Rāmakṛṣṇa. Personally I consider this less likely. The verb *vi-pari-i* and its derivatives frequently carry the meaning “change for the worse,” and I do think that Joshi was right in understanding the expression *viparyayeṇa vyutpanna* (and by implication *viparītavyutpanna*) as “trained wrongly” or “trained perversely.” This is not of course the way in which a Naiyāyika would describe his own method of sentence analysis, unless

---

62 Theoretically, of course, the two might have been influenced by an earlier passage, perhaps by another author. I will not take this possibility into consideration here.

he borrowed the very word, ironically, from someone who held that opinion, in this case Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa.<sup>63</sup>

### §3. Why did Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita innovate?

We can conclude from the preceding section that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa may not always be the most reliable interpreter of Bhaṭṭoji's thought. It is furthermore clear that he was not the first to use Navya-Nyāya tools to refine the kind of sentence-analysis that is known by the name *śābdabodha* "verbal understanding." In this respect he continues an earlier tradition that may or may not have originated with Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita; the data at our disposal do not exclude the possibility that it had started with a member of the Śeṣa family, perhaps even with Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa himself. A reason to think that *śābdabodha* was already a concern for Bhaṭṭoji is that this would explain his novel understanding of the sphoṭa. Reflections about the *śābdabodha* provided him with the challenge which prompted him to give the sphoṭa a new role to play.

Discussions about the meaning of the sentence seem to have begun in the school of Vedic Hermeneutics (called Mīmāṃsā in Sanskrit), and were soon taken over by the philosophical school known by the name of Nyāya, Logic.<sup>64</sup> The Vedic Hermeneutists were interested in the analysis of Vedic injunctions. This initially induced them to paraphrase some of these. Already Śabara—the author of the Mīmāṃsā Bhāṣya who lived in the middle of the first millennium—paraphrased the injunction *svargakāmo yajeta* "he who wishes to attain heaven should sacrifice" as *yāgena svargaṃ bhāvayet* "by means of the sacrifice he should effect [the attainment of] heaven." Subsequent thinkers of the school tried to systematise these paraphrases, by attributing appropriate meanings to the various grammatical elements (first of all the optative verbal ending), and introducing a hierarchy between these meanings. To the optative verbal ending they assigned the meaning "productive operation" (*bhāvanā*), which allowed them to

---

63 Jayarāma (Pañcānana)'s remark in his Vyākḥā (p. 28 l. 8–9: *atha viparītavayutpannasya ghaṭaḥ karmatvam ityādīta[ḥ] ...śābdabodhā[t]...*) may be considered a more recent echo of Rāmakṛṣṇa's passage. Gadādhara's Vyutpattivāda refers to the same issue (Bhatta, 2001: I: 240): *na hi yena kena cid upasthāpitayor evārthayoḥ parasparam anvayaḥ prāṭīyate tathā sati ghaṭakarmatvādīpadopasthāpitayor apī ghaṭakarmatvādyoḥ parasparam anvayabodhaprasaṅgāt.*

64 My student Bogdan Diaconescu has completed a doctoral thesis ("Debating the centre"; University of Lausanne, 2009) in which he deals with the development of these discussions.

interpret the injunction as a whole as being expressive of a productive operation that is qualified by the meanings of the other elements that occur in the injunction. In doing so, they took from Pāṇini's grammar its division into morphemes, but deviated from it in assigning altogether different meanings to a number of these morphemes, and to the verbal endings in particular.

The Logicians—i.e., the followers of the Nyāya school of philosophy—took over the general idea but proposed another analysis of sentence meaning. They adhered to an ontology in which substances play a central role; the role of actions and qualities is secondary in that these can only exist as inhering in substances. This ontological bias may be the reason why these thinkers, when they came to analyse verbal statements, decided that the subject had to be the chief qualificand.<sup>65</sup> In their analysis a simple sentence such as *rāmaḥ pacati* “Rāma cooks” gives expression to the meaning “Rāma” as qualified by the meaning of the other grammatical elements of that sentence. An important development took place among the Logicians of Mithilā and Navadvīpa, probably during the fourteenth century, when they, sometimes called Navya-Naiyāyikas or New Logicians, elaborated the position of their school in further detail and introduced full paraphrases of virtually all conceivable sentences. Once again, these thinkers used the morphemes of grammar, but assigned different meanings to several of them.

The philosophical writings of Bhaṭṭoji and his nephew Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa must first of all be seen as the defensive reaction of two grammarians who were not willing to tolerate the incorrect way the New Logicians and Vedic Hermeneuts used traditional grammar. Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa protested against the misuse of Pāṇini's grammar, and tried to arrive at a way of exhaustively analysing sentences which is in agreement with the statements of Pāṇini and, of course, his commentators Kātyāyana and Patañjali. In an important way, Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa reasserted the authority of tradition, and of the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition in particular. At the same time they undertook something different altogether, namely, the elaboration of a vision as to how sentences are understood, different this one from those presented by the Logicians and Vedic Hermeneuts, but in full agreement with the grammatical tradition. What is more, Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa incorporated the refinements and developments which had taken place in the school of New Logic, and were in so doing among the first to take over the technical language and concepts there elaborated in the

---

65 So e.g. Bhattacharya, 1991: 67: “Perhaps the Nyāya has in mind the Vaiśeṣika notion of substance (*dravya*), which is the central element to which all other qualifiers, e.g., quality (*guṇa*), action (*kriyā*), etc., relate.”

context of *śābdabodha*. The frequent respectful references by Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa to the New Logician Rāmakṛṣṇa, whom we met in §2 above, suggest that there may have been a personal element to this influence which our grammarians underwent.

This last step did not remain unnoticed. A recent article by Lawrence McCrea (2002) points out that the theoretical efforts of the grammarians subsequently exerted an influence on the Mīmāṃsā thinkers of Benares. It is under the influence of the grammarians that a scholar called Khaṇḍadeva introduced into Vedic Hermeneutics the method of complete paraphrasing that had been invented by the New Logicians, but of course now adapted to the fundamental positions of *his* school.<sup>66</sup> This indicates that the modern method of exhaustive sentence paraphrasing, having first been created by Logicians perhaps in the fourteenth century, was being taken over, first presumably by Bhaṭṭoji and his commentators and subsequently by Khaṇḍadeva and other Mīmāṃsakas in Benares from the early years of the seventeenth century onward. Bhaṭṭoji and perhaps also Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa appear to have played a crucial role in this, and in the spread of the Navya-Nyāya terminology which accompanied it.<sup>67</sup>

One may wonder to what extent this activity of our grammarians was innovative. It is clear that one can have different opinions about this. There is less uncertainty about the fact that the grammatical pandits reacted to a challenge that had been around for a while but had apparently been ignored so far. Their decision to take up the challenge had important consequences in their time and in their milieu. And yet this decision can at least in part be understood as resulting from the intellectual momentum of a development that had started with the New Logicians several centuries earlier.

---

66 Cp. Upādhyāya, 1994: 36: *Khaṇḍadeva Miśra ne mīmāṃsā śāstra ko eka navīna diśā vikāsa ke lie pradāna kī inhoṃne hī sarvaprathama Tattvacintāmaṇi dvārā udbhāsita navyanyāya kī śailī kā prayoga mīmāṃsā ke vyākhyāna meṃ kiya jīsase mīmāṃsā ke maulika siddhāntoṃ kā āviṣkāra aura pariṣkāra abhinava prakāra se kiya gayā*

67 Scharfe (2002: 190), referring back to Ingalls, mentions a tradition which, though perhaps apocryphal, may help to explain how the new developments in Navya-Nyāya took so long to become more widely known: “Mithilā, according to a tradition, tried to maintain a monopoly on this field of research by prohibiting the dissemination of any of their manuscripts. But eventually this ban was scattered when a student, Vāsudeva Sārva-bhauma, memorised the Tattvacintāmaṇi and part of the Kusumāñjali and later put it down in writing back in his home town, viz. Navadvīpa.” Did the logicians of this school resist diffusion of its views and terminology?

It is not difficult to understand what Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa were going to concentrate on in their treatises on the philosophy of grammar. Grammar, Vedic Hermeneutics, and Logic were going to fight about the exact meanings of verbal endings and roots, and about the hierarchical relationship between elements in a sentence. Mīmāṃsakas and Naiyāyikas had made their choices in these matters on the basis of philosophical considerations (influenced by some basic positions accepted in their respective schools). Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and the grammarians that followed him disagreed with these choices primarily on the basis of their understanding of Pāṇini's grammar. Against the schools of Vedic Hermeneutics and Logic, the Grammarians were going to reassert the authority of their fundamental texts. This is what Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa announces in an introductory stanza, which reads:<sup>68</sup> “Having paid homage to the [three] sages, Pāṇini and the others (viz. Kātyāyana and Patañjali), I present, with the help of arguments, the correct positions [of these three sages] which have been destroyed by commentators of the words of Gautama (the founder of Nyāya) and Jaimini (the founder of Mīmāṃsā), [and] I [will] destroy what they have said.”

Proving that other thinkers had gone against Pāṇini's words is easy in certain cases. The verbal ending, for example, means ‘productive operation’ (*bhāvanā*) according to the Mīmāṃsakas, ‘activity’ (*kṛti*) according to the Naiyāyikas. But Pāṇini's grammar assigns another meaning to it, namely ‘agent’ (*karṭṛ*) or, in passive constructions, ‘object’ (*karman*). This is what Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa proclaims, and when an opponent asks him what proof he has for this, he cites a sūtra from the Aṣṭādhyāyī in support.<sup>69</sup> Unlike the Vedic Herme-

68 VBh ed. HPG & ed. BVP p. 1; VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 1, ed. ChPS p. 7, ed. KSS p. 7, ed. Pr p. 11, Das, 1990: 101: *pāṇinyādīmunīn prañamya ... gautamajaiminīyavacanavyākhyātṛbhīr dūṣitān siddhāntān upapattibhīḥ prakāṣṭe teṣāṃ vaco dūṣaye.*

69 VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 3 l. 3–6 (1st ed. p. 2 l. 25 – p. 3 l. 3), ed. ChPS p. 29, ed. KSS p. 23–25, ed. Pr p. 35–37; Das, 1990: 102 l. 18–22: *nanv anayor ākhyātārthatve kiṃ mānam ... iti ced/ atrocyate : “laḥ karmaṇi ca bhāve cākarmakebhyaḥ” (P. 3.4.69) iti sūtram eva mānam/ atra hi cakārāt “kartari kṛt” (P. 3.4.67) iti sūtroktaṃ kartarīty anukṛṣyate/ “[Objection:] But what proof is there that these two (viz. agent and object) are the meaning of the verbal ending? ... To this we answer: Our proof lies in the sūtra laḥ karmaṇi ca bhāve cākarmakebhyaḥ. In this rule, on the basis of the [particle] ca (‘and’), the word kartari is supplied from the preceding sūtra kartari kṛt.” (Tr. Joshi, 1995: 12, modified). Cp. VBh ed. HPG p. 10 l. 10–12, ed. BVP p. 10 l. 18–19: ... *tīnsthale 'pi “laḥ karmaṇi ...” iti sūtrasya kartari śaktiparicchedakatvāt (BVP: °paricche[daka]sya sattvāt) “kartari kṛt” iti karṭṛ-grahaṇasyaivānuvṛtteh/**



neuts and the Logicians, he had apparently no other axe to grind than the defence of traditional grammar.

The Naiyāyikas and Mīmāṃsakas had of course been aware that they deviated from Pāṇini in certain respects. The New Logicians in particular had dealt with this in several of their writings,<sup>70</sup> where they had defended their positions against the grammarians. This is no proof that there had been philosophers of grammar critical of these positions during the centuries preceding Bhaṭṭoji. To the best of our knowledge there had been none, or at least none who had expressed their criticism in writing. Indeed, there was no need to make the Logicians aware that they sinned against Pāṇini's grammar. Pāṇini's grammar was well-known, and no one could deviate from it without being aware of doing so.

Another position adopted by Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa was much harder to prove on the basis of Pāṇini's grammar. This grammar does not say which is the chief qualificand in a sentence. According to our grammarians it is the meaning expressed by the verbal root. The meaning of the verbal ending—'agent' in the case of an active form, 'object' in the passive—qualifies this meaning. This, however, goes against the general rule which states that the meaning of a grammatical base should qualify that of its suffix. Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa admits this, but invokes some passages from the Nirukta and the Mahābhāṣya to show that the situation is different in this particular case.<sup>71</sup> The phrase cited from the Nirukta—*bhāvapradhānam ākhyātam*<sup>72</sup>—is ambiguous, and the passages from the Mahābhāṣya are anything but explicit about the issue at hand. Some forced and possibly artificial Sanskrit expressions given in the latter text—viz. *bhavati pacati, bhavati pakṣyati, bhavaty apākṣīt*—and the claim that

70 E.g., Gaṅgeśa, Śabdakhaṇḍa p. 834–835: ... *karṭṛkarmanī api ... lakāravācyē ... iti vaiyākaraṇāḥ*; Raghunātha Śiromaṇi's Ākhyāta-(śakti-)vāda p. 50–51 (= p. 184–187): *karṭṛkarmanī lakāravācyē ... iti vaiyākaraṇāḥ*.

71 The Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa has (ed. HPG p. 20 l. 1–2; ed. BVP p. 20 l. 14–15): *dhātvarthaprādhānyē kim mānam? iti cet, 'bhāvapradhānam ākhyātam' iti niruktavacanam eva*. The reference is to Nirukta 1.1. The Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra adds a second reference (ed. ĀnĀśr p. 4 l. 23–26 [1st ed. p. 4 l. 18–20], ed. ChPS p. 53, ed. KSS p. 44–45, ed. Pr p. 63 (!); Das, 1990: 104 l. 10–13): *yady api prakṛtipratyayārthayoḥ pratyayārthasyaiva prādhānyam anyatra drṣṭam, tathā'pi 'bhāvapradhānam ākhyātam sattvapradhānāni nāmāni' iti niruktāt, bhūvādisūtrādisthakriyāprādhānyabodhakabhāṣyāc ca dhātvarthabhāvanāprādhānyam adhyavasīyate*. See also Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's comments on verse 8.

72 Cp. Mahā-bh II p. 418 l. 15 (on P. 5.3.66 vt.2): *kriyāpradhānam ākhyātam*. See Joshi, 1993: 21–22 for Yāska's and Patañjali's use of *bhāva* and *ākhyāta*; Bronkhorst, 2002 for the different interpretations that have been given of the Nirukta passage concerned.

*paśya mṛgo dhāvati* is one single sentence according to the Mahābhāṣya are used by Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa to justify his position.<sup>73</sup> Perhaps the first relatively clear and explicit statement to the effect that the operation expressed by the verb is the main qualificand of the sentence occurs in Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya.<sup>74</sup> Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa does not invoke the authority of the Vākyapadīya to prove his point, this in spite of the fact that this text is very often cited in his two commentaries. It seems likely that Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa, where he wanted to convince his opponents, would try to base his argument on the statements of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, the three sages of grammar. Other, i.e. later, grammarians, were more hesitantly invoked as authorities, even though we can be sure that within the newly recreated tradition of grammatical philosophy Bhartṛhari was considered with much respect.

A third position that characterises the thinking of Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa concerns the exact meaning of verbal roots. Our two grammarians maintain that roots have a double meaning: an operation (*vyāpāra*, *bhāvanā*) along with its result (*phala*).<sup>75</sup> Once again, they had not invented this point of view themselves. We find it more or less clearly expressed in Kaiyaṭa's commentary

---

73 VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 5 l. 1–11 (1st ed. p. 4 l. 22 – p. 5 l. 3), ed. ChPS p. 53–62, ed. KSS p. 47–53, ed. Pr 65–67; Das, 1990: 104 l. 14–24: *tathā ca paśya mṛgo dhāvatiṭy atra bhāṣya-siddhaikavākyatā na syāt/ ... / paśya mṛgo dhāvati pacati bhavatiṭy anurodhād iti dik/*; VBh ed. HPG p. 20 l. 20–21, ed. BVP p. 21 l. 5–6: *mukhyataḥ prathamāntārthasya viśeṣyatvābhyupagame paśya mṛgo dhāvati iti bhāṣyādyabhyupetam ekavākyam na syāt*; VBh ed. HPG p. 57 l. 8, ed. BVP p. 57 l. 6–7: *... paśya mṛgo dhāvati pacati bhavati ityādau kartṛtvakarmatvenāpi anvayāc ca*; also VBh ed. HPG p. 59 l. 26–29 (ed. BVP p. 59 l. 24–28), p. 74 l. 3–4 (ed. BVP p. 72 l. 8–9; Gune, 1974: 161). Cp. Mahā-bh I p. 256 l. 18–20 (on P. 1.3.1 vt. 7): *katham punar jñāyate bhāvavacanāḥ pacādaya iti/ yad eṣām bhavatinā sāmānādhikaraṇyam/ bhavati pacati/ bhavati pakṣyati/ bhavaty apākṣid iti/* The sentence *paśya mṛgo dhāvati* does not in fact occur in the Mahābhāṣya; it does occur in the Kāśikā (on P. 8.1.39) and in Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya (Vkp 3.8.52); see also Bhattacharya, 1991.

74 Vkp 3.8.40–41: *bahūnām sambhave 'rthānām kecid evopakāriṇaḥ/ samsarge kaścid eṣām tu prādhānyena pratīyate/| sādhyatvāt tatra cākhyātair vyāpārāḥ siddhasādhanāḥ/ prādhānyenābhidhīyante phalenāpi pravartitāḥ/|*; cp. Bronkhorst, 2002.

75 Bhaṭṭoji, Vaiyākaraṇa-matonmajjana verse 2: *phalavyāpārayor dhātu[ḥ smṛtaḥ]*; VBhS thereon (ed. ĀnĀśr p. 2 l. 7–8 [1st ed. id.], ed. ChPS p. 14–19, ed. KSS p. 14–15, ed. Pr p. 22–24; Das, 1990: 101 l. 24–25): *phalam viklityādi, vyāpāras tu bhāvanābhidhā sādhyatvenābhidhīyamānā kriyā.*

on the Mahābhāṣya on P. 1.4.49.<sup>76</sup> It seems however likely that writers preceding Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa, or those not acquainted with their work, did not associate this particular position with the grammarians. Those who did were probably acquainted with their work, or at least with that of Bhaṭṭoji.<sup>77</sup>

We have seen that Bhaṭṭoji and his early commentators appear to be the first to adopt into their own discipline the new technique of sentence analysis created

---

76 Mahā-bh I p. 332 l. 17 (on P. 1.4.49): *dvyarthaḥ pacirḥ*. Kaiyaṭa thereon (II p. 408 l. 10–18): ... *paceś ca viklityupasarjanavikledanavacanatvā[t] ... ; dvyarthaḥ pacir iti/ vikledanopasarjane nirvartane pacir vartate/*. Cp. VBhS on verse 7 (ed. ĀnĀśr p. 8 l. 25 [1st ed. p. 8 l. 4–5], ed. ChPS p. 97, ed. KSS p. 81, ed. Pr p. 97; Das, 1990: 107 l. 23–24): *ata eva dvyarthaḥ pacir iti bhāṣyaprayogaḥ saṁgacchat[e]*.

77 Authors whom we know lived before them do not mention the double meaning of verbal roots even in passages that criticise grammarians. And those who do mention this double meaning may be considered to be acquainted with their work. Gaṅgeśa, for example, who lived well before Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa, mentions grammarians in his discussion of verbal endings (see note 70, above), but gives no hint that he is acquainted with the theory of the double meaning of verbal roots in the chapter concerned. The Mīmāṁsaka Khaṇḍadeva illustrates the opposite: he knows the theory of the double meaning of verbal roots, and was no doubt acquainted with the work of Bhaṭṭoji. (See Khaṇḍadeva, Mīmāṁsā-kaustubha on sūtra 2.1.5, p. 12–13: *nanu ... pacyādīdhātavaḥ tāvad vik[li]tyādirūpe phale tajjanakavyāpāre ca śaktīḥ ...*; Bhāṭṭadīpikā I p. 135: *nanu ... dhātūnām eva vik[li]tyādi-phala iva tatprayojakavyāpāramātre phūtkārādau yatnādau ca śaktatvāt ...*; Bhāṭṭatantra-rahasya p. 58–59: ... *ubhayaṁ phalaṁ vyāpāraś ca dhātvarthaḥ ubhayatra ca pratyekam śaktiḥ ... iti vaiyākaraṇāḥ*.) The New Logician Gadādhara, too, is acquainted with this theory, and even appears to accept it (see Bhatta, 2001: I: 52 f.; p. 244 section II (i). 13 for the relevant passage in his Vyutpattivāda; cp. Ganeri, 1999: 56–57); Gadādhara's late date (middle of the seventeenth century according to Bhatta, 1990: 3; 1604–1709 according to Jonardon Ganeri citing D. C. Bhattacharya) confirms that the work of Bhaṭṭoji, and perhaps that of one or more of his commentators, may have been known to him. Raghunātha Śīromaṇi's Ākhyāta-(śakti)-vāda p. 167 (= p. 220) *tatra tatra tattatphalānukūlatattad-vyāpāraviśeṣa eva dhātvarthaḥ* constitutes no proof that already Raghunātha accepted the double meaning of verbs. This statement says nothing of the kind; it gives moreover expression to the point of view of Prabhākara, as is clear from what follows (*iti gurumatam*) and from the commentaries.

and elaborated by the New Logicians.<sup>78</sup> Once they had adopted this, it spread further, Khaṇḍadeva being the first Mīmāṃsaka to accept it. Techniques of Navya-Nyāya spread in this way beyond the school to which they originally belonged, and came to be accepted by other thinkers. Bhaṭṭoji and his early commentators appear to have been the first to do so in the area of sentence analysis.

Recall that the technique of semantic analysis which we are discussing, called *śābdabodha* in Sanskrit, takes as point of departure a clear definition of the meanings of the smallest meaningful elements of the sentence. We have seen that there was plenty of disagreement about what precise meanings these smallest elements conveyed. But everyone agreed that the sentence expresses more than the mere accumulation of the meanings of its constituent morphemes. Somehow these meanings are structured, so that the sentence meaning goes beyond the meanings of its constituent parts. Where does this extra meaning come from?

It is in answering this question that Bhaṭṭoji and Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa could make good use of the discussions about the *sphoṭa* that had taken place before them, both within and outside the grammatical tradition.<sup>79</sup> In these earlier discussions the idea had been launched that a word is ontologically different from its “constituent” sounds, the sentence from its “constituent” words. Bhaṭṭoji and Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa were less interested in ontological questions, so they represented these earlier positions in the following, modified, way: The *padasphoṭa*, i.e. the word, is a different meaning-bearer from the “constituent” *varṇasphoṭas*, the morphemes; and the *vākyasphoṭa*, i.e. the sentence, is a different meaning-bearer from the “constituent” *padasphoṭas*, the words. The expressive power of the word is not, therefore, the mere accumulation of the meanings of its morphemes, and the expressive power of the sentence is not the mere accumulation of the meanings of its words. A sentence expresses its own meaning, which though not unrelated to the meanings of its constituent morphemes and words, is not simply the sum of those meanings. The *sphoṭa* theory, as reinterpreted by Bhaṭṭoji and Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa, provided a perfect justification for the complex and

---

78 Note however, as pointed out in §2, that Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa’s teacher, who may have been a grammarian different from Bhaṭṭoji, and whose chronological position with regard to Bhaṭṭoji remains unknown, was influenced by the terminology of the New Logicians.

79 For a more detailed discussion of Bhaṭṭoji’s understanding of the *sphoṭa*, based primarily on the *Śabdakaustubha*, see Bronkhorst, 2005.

structured meaning, different from the mere accumulation of the meanings of the constituent parts, which these grammarians assigned to the sentence.<sup>80</sup>

Our grammarians did in this way make use of the *sphoṭa* theory to solve a problem that accompanied the semantic analysis of the sentence called *śābdabodha*. This solution was a grammarians' solution, but the problem was common to all who were interested in this kind of analysis. The Logicians and Vedic Hermeneuts had proposed other solutions to this problem, solutions which tried to bridge the gap between the meaning of the sentence and the meanings of its constituent parts.<sup>81</sup> This gap was real according to those other thinkers, and therefore had to be bridged. The grammarians' solution was more elegant in that it denied the importance, or even the existence, of this gap: the sentence being an expressive unit by itself, they considered it a mistake to even think that it expressed the meanings of the constituent words.

Our grammarians were not totally original in postulating the sentence as a single meaning bearer. Bhartṛhari had said similar things.<sup>82</sup> However, Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa were no longer interested in ontological issues, so that their different kinds of *sphoṭa* were, in spite of lip-service to predecessors, meaning bearers. It was convenient for them to know that the grammatical tradition had long maintained that sentences are different from their constituent words, and words different from their constituent morphemes, for it justified certain steps in their adoption of the *śābdabodha* procedure into grammar.

---

80 A similar argument could of course be made for the compound (cp. VBhS ed. ĀnĀśr p. 42 l. 9–10 [1st ed. p. 37 l. 7], ed. ChPS p. 384, ed. KSS p. 304, ed. Pr p. 380, Das, 1990: 140 l. 17–18: *samāse ... āvaśyikaiva samudāyasya ... viśiṣṭārthe śaktiḥ*), yet there is no such thing as a *samāsasphoṭa* for Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa. See further Biswal, 1995: 40 ff.

81 See Kunjunni Raja, 1963: 191 ff.; Joshi, 1967: 142 ff. The sub-school of Vedic Hermeneutics linked to the name of Prabhākara denied that a sentence expresses more than the sum of the meanings of its constituent parts. For this position, known as *anvitābhidhānavāda*, see Kunjunni Raja, 1963: 197 ff.; Joshi, 1967: 146 ff.

82 Cp. Vkp 2.42: *sambandhe sati yat tv anyad ādhikyam upajāyate/ vākyārtham eva tam prāhur anekapadasamśrayam/* “Was aber, wenn der Zusammenhang [der Wörter im Satze hergestellt] ist, an Weiterem hinzukommt, das allein nennen [diese Lehrer] den auf mehreren Wörtern beruhenden Sinn des Satzes” (tr. Rau, 2002: 52). Cf. Kunjunni Raja, 1963: 224 ff.

### References

- Bal Shastri (ed.): *Mahabhashya of Patanjali* vol. I part I (Nawahnikam), with the commentaries Bhaṭṭoji Deekshita's 'Shabdakaustubh,' Nagojibhatta's 'Uddyota' & Kaiyata's 'Pradipah, Ab[h]inavarajlakshmi by Pt. Guru Prasad Shastri, Vārāṇasī 1988.
- Benson, James (2001): "Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa's family chronicle: The Gādhivamśa-varṇana." In: *The Pandit. Traditional scholarship in India*. Ed. Axel Michaels, New Delhi: Manohar. Pp. 105–118.
- Bhatta, V. P. (tr.)(1990): *Vyutpattivāda (of Gadādhara). Theory of the analysis of sentence meaning*, Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.
- Bhatta, V. P. (2001): *Navya-Nyāya Theory of Verbal Cognition. Critical study of Gadādhara's Vyutpattivāda*. 2 vol, Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.
- Bhattacharya, Gopikamohan (1991): "On *paśya mṛgo dhāvati*," *Pāṇinian Studies. Professor S. D. Joshi Felicitation Volume*. Ed. Madhav M. Deshpande & Saroja Bhate. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan. Number 37. Pp. 65–73.
- Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: *Śabdakaustubha*. 1) Vol. I, ed. Pt. Gopāl Śāstrī Nene and Pt. Śrī Mukund Śāstrī Puṇtāmkar (navāhnikā); Vol. II with Sphoṭacandrikā of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa Mauni, ed. Pt. Gopāl Śāstrī Nene; Vol. III, ed. Vindhyeśwarī Prasād Dvivedī and Gaṇapati Śāstrī Mokāte. Reprint: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1991. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 2.) 2) See under Bal Shastri.
- Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: *Vaiyākaraṇa-Siddhāntakārikāḥ, Kauṇḍa-Bhaṭṭa-viracita-Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasārākhyavyākhyāsametāḥ*, Pune: Ānandāśrama. Second edition, 1978. (Ānandāśramsamskṛtagranthāvali, 43.) (First edition, 1901.) See further under Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa.
- Biswal, Banamali (1995): *The Samāsaśaktinirṇaya (Chapter V of the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa) of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa*. Critically edited with introduction and exhaustive explanatory notes, Allahabad: Padmaja Prakashan.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2002): "Yāska and the sentence: the beginning of *śābdabodha*?" *Subhāṣiṇī: Dr. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Volume*. Ed. G. U. Thite, Pune: Prof. Dr. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Committee (c/o Dr. Malhar Kulkarni). Pp. 44–62.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2005): "Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita on sphoṭa," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 33(1), 3–41.
- Chatterjee, Chinmayi (1992): *Rasagaṅgādhara of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha*, First Ānana, vol. I. Edited with the commentary Marmaprakāśa by Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa as also with Bengali and English translations, Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.

- Das, Karunasindhu (1990): *A Pāṇinian Approach to Philosophy of Language (Kaṇḍabhaṭṭa's Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra critically edited and translated into English)*, Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. (1992): *The Meaning of Nouns. Semantic theory in classical and medieval India: Nāmārtha-nirṇaya of Kaṇḍabhaṭṭa*, Dordrecht - Boston - London: Kluwer. (Studies of Classical India, 13.)
- Deshpande, Madhav M. (2005): "Ultimate source of validation for the Sanskrit grammatical tradition: elite usage versus rules of grammar," *Boundaries, Dynamics and Construction of Traditions in South Asia*. Ed. Federico Squarcini, Firenze University Press—Munshiram Manoharlal. Pp. 361–387.
- Ganeri, Jonardon (1999): *Semantic Powers. Meaning and the means of knowing in classical Indian philosophy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gaṅgeśa: *Tattvacintāmaṇi, Vol. IV Part 2: Śabdakhaṇḍa*. Edited, with the commentaries Rahasya by Mathurānātha Tarkavāgīśa and Āloka by Jayadeva Miśra, by Kamakhyānath Tarkavagish, Reprint: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishtan, Delhi, 1990.
- Gode, P. K. (1941): "Varadarāja, a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and his works—between A. D. 1600 and 1650," (*Festschrift Prof. P. V. Kane* (1941), pp. 188–199.) Reprint: Gode, 1954: 316–329.
- Gode, P. K. (n.d.): "Vanamāli Miśra, a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and his works: between A. D. 1600 and 1660," (*Adyar Library Bulletin* 10(4), pp. 231–235.) Reprint: Gode, 1956: 13–16.
- Gode, P. K. (1954): *Studies in Indian Literary History*. Vol. II, Bombay: Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavan. (Shri Bhadur Singh Singhi Memoirs, vol. 5.)
- Gode, P. K. (1956): *Studies in Indian Literary History*. Vol. III, Poona: Prof. P. K. Gode Collected Works Publication Committee.
- Gune, Jayashri Achyut (1974): *Kaṇḍabhaṭṭa on the Meaning of Verbal Endings*. The text of Kaṇḍabhaṭṭa's Lakārārthanirṇaya, with English translation, explanatory notes, and introduction. Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania. (Facsimile: University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, 1986.)
- Gune, Jayashri A. (1978): *The Meaning of Tenses and Moods*. The text of Kaṇḍabhaṭṭa's Lakārārthanirṇaya, with introduction, English translation and explanatory notes, Pune: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.
- Jayarāma: Vyākhyā. See under Raghunātha.
- Joshi, S. D. (1967): *The Sphoṭanirṇaya (Chapter XIV of the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra) of Kaṇḍa Bhaṭṭa*. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Critical and Exegetical Notes, Poona: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C No. 2.)

Joshi, Shivaram Dattatray (1993, 1995, 1997): “Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa on the meaning of Sanskrit verbs,” *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism, Saṁbhāṣā* 14, 1–39; 16, 1–66; 18, 1–34.

Kaiyaṭa: *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa*. In: Patañjali’s *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*. Edited, with Kaiyaṭa’s *Pradīpa* and Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa’s *Pradīpodyota*, by Vedavrata, Rohataka: Harayānā-sāhitya-saṁsthāna. 5 vols. 1962–1963.

Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa: (*Bṛhad-*)*Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa*.

- 1) Edited, with ‘Rūpālī’ notes and appendix, by Pt. Manudeva Bhaṭṭachārya, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan. 1985. (Harjivandas Prachya Vidya Granthamala, 2.) (= VBh, ed. HPG).
- 2) Edited, with *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra* and the commentary *Kāśikā* of Harirāma Kāla, by K. P. Tripathi, Bombay 1915. (Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, 70.) (= VBh, ed. BPS). (this edition has not been used)
- 3) Edited by Vidya Niwas Misra. Vol. 1, Delhi - Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan. 1987. (= VBh, ed. BVP).
- 4) Edited by the pandits of Benares Sanskrit College, under the supervision of R. T. H. Griffith and G. Thibaut. (= VBh, ed. BSC). (this edition has not been used)

Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa: *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra*.

- 1) Edited, with ‘Prabhā’ commentary, by Pt. Śrī Bālakṛṣṇa Pañcholi ... and with ‘Darpaṇa’ commentary by Śrī Harivallabha Rāstrī, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1969. (Kashi Sanskrit Series, 188.) (= VBhS, ed. KSS).
- 2) Edited, with *Prābhākara* Hindi and Sanskrit commentary, by Prābhākaramiśra, Varanasi: Arabindamiśra, Makarandamiśra. 1982. (= VBhS, ed. Pr)
- 3) Edited, with ‘Darpaṇ’ Hindi commentary, by Brahma Datta Dvivedī, Varanasi - Delhi: Chaukhambha Orientalia. 1985. (Chaukhambha Prachya Vidya Series, 17.). (= VBhS, ed. ChPS).
- 4) See under Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: *Vaiyākaraṇa-Siddhāntakārikāḥ*. (= VBhS, ed. ĀnĀśr).

Khaṇḍadeva: *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya*. Edited, with introduction and notes, by A. Subrahmanya Sastri, Varanasi 1970.

Khaṇḍadeva: *Bhāṭṭadīpikā*. Vol. I. Edited, with the *Prabhāvalī* commentary of Śambhu Bhaṭṭa, by Ananta Krishna Sastri. Reprint of the edition of Bombay, 1921–22, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications. 1987.

Khaṇḍadeva: *Mīmāṃsākaustubha*. Edited by Chinnaswami Sastri. Second edition, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1991. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 58.)

Kunjuni Raja, K. (1963): *Indian Theories of Meaning*. Adyar, Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.



- McCrea, Lawrence (2002): “Novelty of form and novelty of substance in seventeenth century Mīmāṃsā,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30(5), 481–494.
- Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa: *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntalaghumañjūṣā*. Ed. Mahādevśāstri and Sītārāmsāstri Śende, Benares. 1916–1925. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 44 (2 parts).) (this edition was not accessible to me)
- Pollock, Sheldon (2001): “New intellectuals in seventeenth-century India,” *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 38(1), 3–31.
- Raghunātha Śiromaṇi Bhaṭṭācārya: *Ākhyāta-śakti-vāda*. Edited by Mahādeva Gangādhara Bākre, with the following six commentaries: (1) Ākhyāta-vāda-rahasya by Mathurānātha, (2) Ākhyāta-vāda-ṭippanī by Rāmacandra, (3) Ākhyāta-vāda-ṭippanī by Raghudeva, (4) Vyākhyā by Jayarāma, (5) Vyākhyā by Nyāya Vācaspati, (6) Vyākhyā by Rāmakṛṣṇa, Bombay: The “Gujarati” Printing Press. 1931.
- Rāmakṛṣṇa: *Vyākhyā*. See under Raghunātha.
- Rau, Wilhelm (2002): *Bhartr̥hari's Vākyapadīya. Versuch einer vollständigen deutschen Übersetzung nach der kritischen Edition der Mūla-Kārikās*. Hrsg. Oskar von Hinüber, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. (AAWL Einzelveröffentlichung Nr. 8.)
- Scharfe, Hartmut (2002): *Education in Ancient India*, Leiden etc.: Brill. (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Sect. II: India, 16.)
- Tripathi, Lalit Kumar & Tripathi, Bharat Bhushan (ed.)(1998): *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjanaṭīkā by Vanamāli Miśra*, Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Sansthan. 1998.
- Upādhyāya, Baladeva (1994): *Kāśī kī pāñḍitya-paramparā* (kāśīstha saṃskṛta vidvānoṃ ke jīvanacarita evaṃ sāhityika avadānoṃ kā prāmāṇika vivaraṇa) [1200–1980]. 2nd edition, Vārāṇasī: Viśvavidyālaya Prakāśana.
- Vanamāli Miśra: *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana-ṭīkā*. See Tripathi & Tripathi, 1998.

### Abbreviations

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| AAWL    | Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse |
| Mahā-bh | Patañjali, (Vyākaraṇa-)Mahābhāṣya, ed. F. Kielhorn, Bombay 1880–1885   |
| VBh     | (Bṛhad-)Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa; for the editions see the bibliography under Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa                             |
| VBhS    | Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra; for the editions see the bibliography under Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa                                |
| Vkp     | Bhartr̥hari, Vākyapadīya, ed. W. Rau, Wiesbaden 1977   |