

Pascale Haag

Problems of Textual Transmission in Grammatical Literature: The *pratyāhāra* Section of the *Kāśikāvṛtti**

I. A FIRST STEP TOWARDS A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE *KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI*

This paper addresses the problem of the identification of archetypal variants in a particular passage of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, a widely transmitted text for which a large number of manuscripts are available. Jayāditya and Vāmana's *Kāśikāvṛtti*, the oldest complete commentary on Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* that has come down to us, was first edited at the end of the nineteenth century by Bāla Śāstrī, and published both in the journal *The Pandit*¹ and in a book of two volumes² at approximately the same time.

The edition was apparently based on heterogeneous sources. The editor only informs us in his introduction that he has used “two or three incomplete manuscripts” (without specifying their origin or script) and acknowledges that once this had been done, he compared his reconstruction with a manuscript coming from “Gurjar” (Gujarat) provided by Georg Bühler, and “with a Kashmirian manuscript in Śāradā script”. There is no indication whatsoever of the origin of the readings retained by the editor, nor is there a critical apparatus. Only a few alternative readings are mentioned here and there as appearing “in other books” (*pustakāntareṣu*). As a matter of fact, this *editio princeps* of one of the authoritative texts of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition is nothing but a kind of patchwork.³ It nevertheless played a major role in the history of the reconstruction of the text, and consequently greatly influenced

* I am grateful to Aurélien Berra and to Vincenzo Vergiani for their useful comments on – and criticism of – an earlier version of this paper.

¹ *The Pandit*, *Old Series* 8 (1873-1874), 9 (1874-1875) and 10 (1875-1876); *New Series* 1 (1876-1877), 2 (1877-1878) and 3 (1878-1879).

² The first volume was published in 1876 and the second in 1878 (= *Kāśikā Śāstrī* in the Bibliography).

³ See Kulkarni 2000. This situation, however, is not exceptional. The majority of Sanskrit texts have not yet been critically edited and our studies often rely on nineteenth-century publications, which are not based on a systematic survey of the manuscript traditions. See Olivelle 1998.

the printed editions produced over the last 130 years, including the so-called “critical” Osmania edition.⁴

Between 2004 and 2007 a team coordinated by Saroja Bhate, Pascale Haag and Vincenzo Vergiani worked on the initial section of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (the section on *pratyaḥāras*), as well as on the first and the third *pāda* of the first *adhyāya*. The initial aim of the project was the publication of a critical edition of these parts. Seventy-one manuscripts in various scripts (Devanāgarī, Śāradā, Malayālam, Grantha, etc.) and written on various materials (paper, palm leaf, birchbark) were selected. Photocopies or digital photographs of these manuscripts from throughout the Indian subcontinent – all now preserved in various libraries in India, in Europe and in the U.S. (Yale: one manuscript) – were collected.⁵

Previous editions present a quite uniform text. This uniformity initially raised doubts about whether a critical edition of the *Kāśikā* would be worth the effort, since it seemed that new insights into the transmission of the text could hardly be expected. It would take a systematic search for manuscripts followed by scrupulous and methodical collation to determine whether our doubts would be confirmed or whether we were justified in undertaking a new edition. Encouragement came from several scholars, including those who had been involved with Johannes Bronkhorst’s project to edit the *Kāśika* and who had written their dissertations on various portions of the text at the University of Pune under the guidance of Saroja Bhate. They were all of the opinion that the launching of the research project we had in mind could be worthwhile.⁶ Moreover, Patrick Olivelle’s comments on investigations into the

⁴ This is the only edition based on a more or less systematic collation of various manuscripts that reports a number of variant readings. In preparing our own edition of the initial section of the *Kāśikā*, we again collated some of the manuscripts used by Aryendra Sharma and his team; it appears, at least as far as this portion is concerned, that about half of the reported variants are wrong, either because the manuscripts were misread or because the variants of one manuscript were erroneously attributed to another (see Haag – Vergiani 2009).

⁵ This project was conducted in the frame of a program called “Grammaire et mathématiques dans le monde indien: histoire des savoirs, histoire des textes et nouvelles technologies au service de la philologie”. It benefited from the financial support of the French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) and the Society for South Asian Studies (SSAS). Part of the collation work was realised thanks to the support of the École française d’Extrême-Orient and the project “For an ICT Archeology of Ancient Indian Texts” (Europaid).

⁶ Johannes Bronkhorst had undertaken a project to create a critical edition of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* in Lausanne, with the collaboration of the University of Pune, about ten

transmission of the Upaniṣads are also applicable to the Kāśikā (1998: 175):

If after such a search one finds only a few variants of significance, that itself will open important and interesting questions regarding the textual history and the transmission of the Upaniṣads.

Most of the manuscripts in our collection are not very old – the oldest was copied in *saṃvat* 1464 (= 1408 CE).⁷ We soon realised, as Johannes Bronkhorst had before us, that contamination affected the transmission to such a degree that it is impossible to work out a reliable *stemma codicum* at the present stage of research. Although powerful IT tools are available nowadays, the portion of the text that we had collated and were planning to edit was too short to provide enough data for a computerised (or even a non-computerised) construction of a *stemma*.⁸ Moreover, such a *stemma*, if it could be made, would only be valid for this particular section. Test probes from other sections would therefore be essential to ensure that erroneous relationships had not been inferred due to, for instance, the missing beginning of a manuscript having been replaced with text from another manuscript. It is possible that exactly such a replacement has occurred in two of our birchbark manuscripts, where the initial folios have been substituted by a text copied on paper. Nothing is known about the circumstances under which these folios were lost / disappeared and at the present stage of research there is no way to know whether the text that we have now was in fact copied from the original manuscript. If it was not, the picture could be blurred and wrong groups may emerge from the computer processing.

Because the need for progress on the collation did not allow for test probes to be made during the period of time granted for the project, a thoroughly critical edition – even of the initial portion of the text – could not be undertaken. However, in spite of these limitations, there have been quite a few surprises as far as the *pratyāhāra* section of the

years before us. He kindly made all the materials and preliminary work realised by his team available to us.

⁷ This paper manuscript in Devanāgarī script, preserved in the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Göttingen (MS Sanskrit 183), is described in Fick 1930: 74.

⁸ I wish to thank Philipp Maas for helping us process our data with software designed to build cladograms (PAUP 4.0, <http://paup.csit.fsu.edu/>). Because of the inconsistency of the data, the program found more than 2,500 equally parsimonious trees. These trees did not, however, differ in their overall structure, but did differ with regard to the position of a limited number of manuscripts. The computer-generated result revealed genealogical groups of manuscripts that had escaped our attention when we tried to group manuscripts “manually”.

Kāśikā is concerned, surprises important enough to justify, in our opinion, the publication of a new and preliminary edition. We did find several important variants that were not reported or wrongly reported in the Osmania edition,⁹ which mostly involve single words, word order or a limited part of a sentence. Much more unexpected was the text at the end of the *pratyāhāra* section, for which virtually all the manuscripts gave different, though at first sight similar, readings.

II. THE TRANSMISSION OF THE FINAL SECTION

In order to illustrate some of the new finds, I have chosen one passage for which the editing proved to be particularly challenging. As the whole passage is rather technical and requires basic knowledge of Pāṇinian grammar, I will first discuss its immediate context. As is well known, in order to make his grammar as concise as possible, Pāṇini resorted to a number of devices, among which the use of abbreviations (*pratyāhāra*) is central. According to one of his *sūtras*, reference can be made to all the elements of a given list by taking the first element of this list together with the *anubandha*.¹⁰ The enumeration of phonemes is as follows:

1.	<i>a i u</i>	\dot{N}	
2.	<i>ṛ ḷ</i>	K	vowels
3.	<i>e o</i>	\dot{N}	(simple and complex)
4.	<i>ai au</i>	C	
5.	<i>ha ya va ra</i>	T	voiced spirant and
6.	<i>la</i>	\dot{N}	semi-vowels
7.	<i>ṅa ma ṅa ṇa na</i>	\dot{M}	nasals
8.	<i>jha bha</i>	\dot{N}	voiced aspirated stops
9.	<i>gha ḍha dha</i>	\dot{S}	
10.	<i>ja ba ga ḍa da</i>	\dot{S}	voiced unaspirated stops
11.	<i>kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta</i>	V	voiceless aspirated and
12.	<i>ka pa</i>	Y	unaspirated stops
13.	<i>śa ṣa sa</i>	R	voiceless spirants
14.	<i>ha</i>	L	voiced spirant

Table A: The *pratyāhāras* in Pāṇinian grammar

⁹ A detailed analysis of the problems encountered in the Osmania edition is given in Haag – Vergiani 2009.

¹⁰ The rule is *ādir antyena sahetā* (A. 1.1.71) “An initial item joined with a final *it* denotes not only itself but also all intervening items” (Sharma 1990: 72).

One can thus form *aC* to refer to all vowels, *haL* to refer to all stops or *jhaL* to indicate all stops except nasals and semivowels.

A question that is discussed at great length in the commentaries on the Aṣṭādhyāyī is why the phoneme *ha* occurs twice in the list of the *pratyāhārasūtras* (i.e., in the fifth and fourteenth *sūtras*). The common explanation is that *ha* must be included in various abbreviations for all of Pāṇini's rules to apply. The Kāśikā first explains that the final *ha* is necessary for abbreviations such as *jhaL* – used for instance in the rule *jhalo jhali* (A. 8.2.26)¹¹ in order to derive *adāgdhām*, the 3rd person of the dual aorist of the root DAH-, which ends in *h*.¹² The Kāśikā then raises the issue of the necessity of the *ha* of the fifth *sūtra*: *ha ya va ra t ity atra tarhi kimartham upadiśyate* “What is the purpose, then, of teaching [*ha*] in *ha ya va ra T*?”

The reply, which is precisely the topic of the very unstable final portion of our text, is highly technical. But since grammatical works are replete with such intricacies this cannot be the reason this particular passage caused our scribes so much trouble. A summary of the arguments put forward to justify the first occurrence of *ha* will help us to grasp the main features of the variant readings that will be examined below.

Three different abbreviations (*aT*, *aś* and *haś*) are given which require inclusion of the phoneme *ha* to achieve the desired result:

1. *ha* must be included in the *pratyāhāra aT* (vowels, *ha* and semi-vowels) for *mahā hi* (< *mahān* + *hi*) *saḥ* to have correct *sandhi*.

According to *dīrghād aṭi samānapāde* (A. 8.3.9),¹³ a *pada*-final *n* used after a long vowel (*dīrghād*) when *aT* follows (*aṭi*) is substituted by *rU* and, according to *āto 'ṭi nityam* (A. 8.3.3),¹⁴ an *ā* followed by *rU* is obligatorily replaced with its nasalized counterpart when *aT* follows (*aṭi*), in the Vedas. We thus get the following sequence:

¹¹ “The *s* which occurs after a sound denoted by *jhaL* (all stops except nasals, plus sibilants and *h*) is deleted by *lopa* when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* follows *s*” (Sharma 2003: 524).

¹² For a detailed derivation of the form *adāgdhām*, see n. 56 to the translation of the *pratyāhāra* section in Haag – Vergiani 2009.

¹³ “A replacement in *rU* comes in place of a *pada*-final *n*, used after a long vowel (*dīrgha*) in the quarter of a hymn, when *aT* follows and close proximity between sounds obtains, provided the *nimitta* ‘cause, condition’ and *nimittin* ‘affected element’ are both contained within the same *pāda* ‘quarter’” (Sharma 2003: 614).

¹⁴ “An *ā* which occurs before *rU* is obligatorily replaced with its *anunāsika* counterpart when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *aT* (...) follows in close proximity” (Sharma 2003: 606).

- *mahā*(n → rU) *hi* (A. 8.3.9)
- *mah*(ārU → ā̃) *hi* (A. 8.3.3)
- *mahā* *hi*

If the phoneme *ha* was not understood in *aT*, the operations prescribed by A. 8.3.3 and A. 8.3.9 could not take place.

2. *ha* must be included in the *pratyāhāra aŚ* (vowels, *ha*, semi-vowels, nasals and voiced stops) for *devā hasanti* (< *devāḥ hasanti*) to have correct *sandhi*.

According to *bhobhagoaghoapūrvasya yo 'śi* (A. 8.3.17),¹⁵ there is a *y* substitute for the *r* of *rU* which occurs after an *a* (*apūrvasya*) when a sound denoted by *aŚ* follows (*aśi*). The phoneme *y* is further elided before a consonant (*haL*) according to *hali sarveṣām* (A. 8.3.22).¹⁶ We thus get the following sequence:

- *devā*(rU → y) *hasanti* (A. 8.3.17)¹⁷
- *devā*(y → ø) *hasanti* (A. 8.3.22)
- *devā* *hasanti*

If the phoneme *ha* was not understood in *aŚ*, the operation prescribed by A. 8.3.17 could not take place.

3. *ha* must be included in the *pratyāhāra haŚ* (semi-vowels, nasals and voiced stops) for *brāhmaṇo hasati* (< *brāhmaṇaḥ hasati*) to have correct *sandhi*.

According to *haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114),¹⁸ a *rU* which occurs after *a* is replaced with *u* when a sound denoted by *haŚ* follows (*haśi*). *a* and *u* are subsequently substituted by *o* according to *ād guṇaḥ* (A. 6.1.87). We thus get the following sequence:

- *brāhmaṇa*(rU → u) *hasati* (A. 6.1.114)
- *brāhmaṇ*(a u → o) *hasati* (A. 6.1.87)
- *brāhmaṇo* *hasati*

¹⁵ “The *r* of *rU* which occurs after *bho*, *bhago*, *agho* and *a* is replaced with *y* when a sound denoted by *aŚ* follows, and the context is that of close proximity between sounds” (Sharma 2003: 622).

¹⁶ “A deletion by *LOPA* comes, in the opinion of all scholars, in place of a *pada*-final *y* which occurs after *bho*, *bhago*, *agho* and *a*, provided a sound denoted by *haL* follows, and the context is that of close proximity between sounds” (Sharma 2003: 628).

¹⁷ The first operation that takes place in the word-formation – the substitution of the nominative case ending *sU* by *rU* prescribed by *sasajuṣo ruḥ* (A. 8.2.66) –, which is not relevant here, has been omitted in all three examples.

¹⁸ “A *rU* which occurs after *a* is replaced with *u*, when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *haŚ* (...) follows and *samhitā* finds its scope” (Sharma 2001: 119).

If the phoneme *ha* was not understood to be included in *haś*, the operation prescribed by A. 6.1.114 could not occur.

In short, one understands that Pāṇini's purpose in mentioning *ha* in the fifth *pratyāhārasūtra* was to include this phoneme in abbreviations such as *aT*, *aś* and *haś* so the rules can apply to syntagms like *mahā hi saḥ*, *devā hasanti* and *brāhmaṇo hasati*.

The first edition for our passage of the Kāśikā by Bāla Śāstrī reads (p. 5):

mahā hi saḥ devā hasantīty atrādgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu ca grahaṇam yathā syāt | haśi ceti hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt | brāhmaṇo hasati | haśi cety utvaṃ yathā syāt |

[The phoneme *h* is included here] so that in the case of *mahā hi saḥ* [and] *devā hasanti* it will be included in *aT* and in *aś*. [And] so that the phoneme *h* will be included in [the rule] *haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114). So that [in] *brāhmaṇo hasati* the substitution of *u* [for *r*] will occur according to *haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114).

The text accepted by Bāla Śāstrī and later by Ananta Śāstrī Phadake¹⁹ thus contains two references to the rule *haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114), which seems inexplicably redundant. Moreover, the editors retain the reading *grahaṇam* construed with the genitive *hakārasya* in the second sentence, and of *grahaṇam* alone in the first sentence. One would rather expect the opposite: *hakārasya* in the first sentence and *grahaṇam* alone in the second. This probably accounts for the fact that subsequent editors like Aryendra Śarma et al. (Kāśikā Osmania), followed by Śrīnārāyaṇa Miśra (Kāśikā Miśra, p. 58-59),²⁰ adopted a different reading, which improves the sentence:

mahā hi saḥ, devā hasanti ity atra adgrahaṇeṣu (A. 8.3.3/3632) *cāśgrahaṇeṣu* (A. 8.3.22/171) *ca hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt | brāhmaṇo hasati – haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114) *ity utvaṃ yathā syāt |*

[The phoneme *h* is included here] so that in the case of *mahā hi saḥ* [and] *devā hasanti*, the phoneme *h* will be included in *aT* and in *aś*. [And] so that [in] *brāhmaṇo hasati* the substitution of *u* [for *r*] will occur according to *haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114).

¹⁹ Ananta Śāstrī Phadake (Kāśikā Phadake, p. 3) has exactly the same text, but *sūtra* numbers are added: *mahā hi saḥ, devā hasantīty atrādgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu ca grahaṇam yathā syāt | haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114) *iti hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt | brāhmaṇo hasati | haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114) *ity utvaṃ yathā syāt |*

²⁰ Śrīnārāyaṇa Miśra omits the *sūtra* numbers: *mahā hi saḥ | devā hasantīty atrādgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu ca hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt | brāhmaṇo hasati – haśi ca* ity utvaṃ yathā syāt |.

This version is without doubt far more satisfactory. But the reader's curiosity is inevitably aroused, especially in view of the suspicious scarcity of variant readings in Aryendra Śarma's critical apparatus. What are his grounds for dismissing Bāla Śāstrī's text? What do the manuscripts actually read? Will it be possible to infer from extant sources the most probable reading of the original Kāśikā? Our manuscripts' readings for this passage are described below and synthesized in tables B to F.²¹

The Position of the Examples

One of the most striking features is that only twelve of the seventy-one manuscripts contain one or both of the examples at the beginning of the passage: five manuscripts (not among the most reliable of our collection, which are those from Kashmir and Kerala) actually read *mahā hi saḥ*, *devā hasantīty atra*, like the editions, whereas seven manuscripts have only *mahā hi saḥ*.

<i>mahā hi saḥ devā hasantīty atra</i>	C ⁶ E ¹ J ¹ M ⁶ U ¹
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	B ² E ³ G ² M ² R ⁴ T ⁴ U ²

Table B: MSS that read the examples at the head of the sentence

Interestingly, fifty-six manuscripts contain either *mahā hi saḥ* alone or *mahā hi saḥ*, *devā hasanti* after *grahanaṃ yathā syāt*, as shown in Table E.²² And three manuscripts (all from Kerala) omit the examples altogether. As the position of the examples is not consistent in the Kāśikā manuscripts (cf. below, p. 55 – at least not in this section – and since we obviously cannot trust the existing editions for their presentation of the rest of the text, we have to rely on the text in what we consider to be the best manuscripts.

²¹ Scribal mistakes that can be considered insignificant have been disregarded in order to group manuscripts that conspicuously share the same readings. With the exception of “C” for the Śāradā manuscripts and a Devanāgarī ms. from Jammu, the sigla indicate the country or region where the manuscripts are located (B for Bengal, D for Germany, E for England, F for France, G for Gujarat, J for Jammu, K for Kerala, L for Karnataka, M for Maharashtra, N for Nepal, O for Orissa, P for Panjab, R for Rajasthan, T for Tamil Nadu and U for Uttar Pradesh; see the appendix at the end of this paper). A detailed presentation is provided in Haag – Vergiani 2009: 53-71. A summary can also be consulted online at <http://ehess.linguistique-mondeindien.fr/kasika/>. All relevant information for the present context is of course given in the text itself.

²² The material is presented in five tables (B-F) for the sake of clarity. One should keep in mind that this artificial division makes things look better than they are. Many manuscripts share readings for some portions of the text, but very few actually read the whole sentence in the same way.

The table below presents the readings for the portion of text that relates to the abbreviations *aT* and *aŚ*:

<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu ca</i>		C ¹ C ² C ³ C ⁴ C ⁵ E ⁴ G ⁴ K ¹ K ³ K ⁵ K ⁶ K ⁷ K ⁸ K ⁹ K ¹⁰ K ¹¹ K ¹² K ¹³ K ¹⁵ K ¹⁶ M ⁷ N ¹ O ¹ U ³ U ⁴ U ⁷
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu</i>		C ⁷ D ² E ⁵ K ⁴ M ³ P ¹
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu ca</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	B ² T ¹ U ²
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu ca</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syād iti</i>	E ⁶ M ⁴ T ²
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	G ³
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syād iti</i>	M ⁹
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu ca</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	D ¹ E ¹ E ³ G ¹ G ² J ¹ M ¹ M ² M ⁶ R ⁴ T ⁴ U ¹ U ⁸
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu ca</i>	<i>hagrahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	R ² U ⁵
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu ca</i>	<i>grahaṇam</i>	C ⁶
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu ca</i>		K ²
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu</i>		B ¹
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	L ¹
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu cāśgrahaṇeṣu</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syād iti</i>	E ²
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu cāśya</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	L ² T ³
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu</i>	<i>hasya grahaṇam</i>	L ³
<i>aḍgrahaṇeṣu</i>		K ¹⁴ L ⁴ R ¹ R ³ U ⁶
om.		M ⁸
lacuna		F ¹ M ⁵

Table C: The abbreviations *aT* and *aŚ* (*aḍgrahaṇeṣu* and *aśgrahaṇeṣu*)

The Example *devā hasanti* and the Reference to *aśgrahaṇeṣu ca*

As we have already seen in Table B, the example *devā hasanti* is missing in a number of manuscripts; it has been very difficult to decide whether it ought to be considered as part of the original text. It is logically needed, because it illustrates *aśgrahaṇeṣu*, which is widely attested in our sources (although omitted in eight manuscripts). Its absence can easily be explained, for Patañjali does not take the abbreviation *aŚ* into account in the corresponding section of the Mahābhāṣya and therefore does not require the example *devā hasanti*.²³ On the other hand, the Cāndravṛtti, dealing briefly with the same problem, mentions *aŚ* but not

²³ See Mahābhāṣya on the fifth *pratyaḥārasūtra* (I/27, l. 5-7).

aṭ, without giving an example.²⁴ This could perhaps explain why both are taken into account by the authors of the Kāśikā (regardless of whether the Kāśikā is directly indebted to Candrar's tradition). In the Mahābhāṣya tradition, the abbreviation *aś* appears for the first time, as far as I am aware, in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā.²⁵

The Syntagm *grahaṇam yathā syāt*

It has been noted that the syntagm *grahaṇam yathā syāt* occurs twice in the earliest printed editions. It is indeed attested – with some variants – in twenty-nine manuscripts.²⁶ In the other manuscripts (excluding those which have a lacuna at the relevant spot), either the first *grahaṇam yathā syāt* or the second appears (see Table C). Both are syntactically possible, although the passage's construction with only the second seems more plausible; it is indeed attested more often than the first. The fact that forty manuscripts omit the first occurrence easily justifies its absence in new editions.

Minor Variants

Each segment contains minor variants, for instance *aḍgrahaṇeṣu cāś-grahaṇeṣu ca*, *aḍgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu ca*, *aḍgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu* or *aḍgrahaṇeṣu* alone. The word *grahaṇam* is either used alone or in composition with *ha-* or *hakāra-* as its first member, or is accompanied by a genitive *hakārasya* or *asya*. The verbal form *syāt* is sometimes followed by *iti*, etc.

Most of the manuscripts take the rule *haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114) into account in the middle of the passage, with, again, a number of minor variants:

<i>haśi ceti</i>	<i>hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	C ⁶ E ¹ E ³ G ² J ¹ K ¹ K ¹⁰ K ¹² K ¹⁶ M ² M ⁶ M ⁷ R ⁴ T ⁴ U ¹ U ²
<i>haśi ceti</i>	<i>hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syād iti</i>	K ³ K ⁷ L ⁴ N ¹ U ³ U ⁴
<i>haśi ceti</i>	<i>hakāragrahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	D ¹ E ⁶ G ¹ M ¹ M ⁴ R ² U ⁵ U ⁸
<i>haśi ceti</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	C ¹ C ² C ³ C ⁴ C ⁵ K ⁶ K ⁸ K ⁹ K ¹¹ K ¹³ K ¹⁵ O ¹
<i>haśi ceti</i>	<i>grahaṇam yathā syād iti</i>	C ⁷ M ³
<i>haśi ceti ca</i>	<i>hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt</i>	B ¹ G ⁴ P ¹

²⁴ The Cāndravṛtti simply reads: *aśgrahaṇe haśgrahaṇe ca grahaṇam yathā syāt* (p. 9).

²⁵ See Mahābhāṣyadīpikā, p. 27, l. 22-23.

²⁶ The number of manuscripts that share a common reading is, however, in no way a criterion for the detection of an archetypal reading as long as the relationship between the manuscripts is not well established.

<i>haṣi ceti ca</i>	<i>hakārasya grahaṇaṃ yathā syād iti</i>	R ¹ R ³ U ⁶
<i>haṣi ceti ca</i>	<i>grahaṇaṃ yathā syāt</i>	K ² K ⁵
<i>haṣi ceti ca</i>	<i>grahaṇaṃ yathā syād iti</i>	E ⁴ K ¹⁴ U ⁷
<i>haṣi ceti</i>	<i>grahaṇaṃ yathā syāt haṣi ceti</i>	D ² E ⁵
<i>haṣi ca</i>	<i>hakārasya grahaṇaṃ yathā syāt</i>	K ⁴
<i>haṣi ceti</i>	<i>hakāro pi</i> ^{⌘*} <i>bhāve yathā syāt</i>	B ²
<i>haṣi ceti ca</i>		L ² T ¹ T ² T ³
<i>haṣi ceti</i>		G ³ L ¹ L ³
om.		E ² M ⁹
lacuna		F ¹ M ⁵ M ⁸

Table D: The rule *haṣi ca* (A. 6.1.114)

Some more surprises were in store for the manuscripts' collators in the latter part of this passage, where in a number of manuscripts the examples *mahā hi saḥ* and *devā hasanti* (when the latter is not omitted) appear together with *brāhmaṇo hasati* instead of being placed at the head of the sentence:²⁷

<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	<i>devā hasanti</i>	<i>brāhmaṇo hasati</i>	E ⁶ G ¹ K ⁷ L ⁴ M ⁴ R ¹ R ³ U ⁶ U ⁸
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>		<i>brāhmaṇo hasati</i>	B ¹ C ¹ C ² C ³ C ⁴ C ⁵ C ⁷ D ¹ F ¹ G ³ G ⁴ K ³ K ⁴ K ⁸ K ¹² L ¹ M ¹ M ³ M ⁵ M ⁷ M ⁸ O ¹ P ¹ U ⁷
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	<i>devā hasanti</i>	<i>brāhmaṇo</i> <i>hasatīty atra</i>	R ² U ⁵
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	<i>devā hasantīty</i> <i>atra</i>	<i>brāhmaṇo hasati</i>	E ⁴
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>		<i>brāhmaṇo</i> <i>hasatīti</i>	K ⁶ K ⁹ K ¹¹ K ¹³ K ¹⁴
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	<i>devo hasati</i>		L ³ T ³
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	<i>devo hasati</i>	<i>brāhmaṇo hasati</i>	N ¹ U ³ U ⁴
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	<i>bho hasati</i>	<i>brāhmaṇo</i> <i>hasatīti</i>	K ⁵
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	<i>brāhmaṇo hasati</i>	<i>devo hasati</i>	K ¹
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	<i>brāhmaṇo hasati</i>	<i>yādavo hasantīti</i>	K ¹⁶
<i>mahā janaḥ</i>	<i>devo hasati</i>		T ¹
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>		^{⌘*} <i>ṇo bhavati</i>	L ²
<i>mahā hi saḥ</i>	lac. (4-5 akṣaras)		T ²
		<i>brāhmaṇo hasati</i>	C ⁶ E ¹ E ³ G ² J ¹ M ² R ¹ T ¹ U ¹
		<i>brāhmaṇo</i> <i>hasatīti</i>	B ²
		<i>brāhmaṇo</i> <i>hasatīty atra</i>	U ²

²⁷ Sigla in italics indicate that the manuscripts attest the example(s) at the beginning. It is thus not surprising that they would not appear here.

<i>mahā hi saḥ ity atra dīrghād aṭi</i> <i>samānapāde iti rutvaṃ</i>	<i>brāhmaṇo</i> <i>hasatīty atra</i>	E ² M ⁹
<i>mahā hi saḥ ity atra dīrghād aṭi</i> <i>samānapāde iti rutvaṃ</i> <i>devo hasatīti</i> <i>bhobhagoaghoapūrvasya yo `śīti</i>	<i>utpanna hasatīty</i> <i>atra</i>	D ² E ⁵
om.		K ² K ¹⁰ K ¹⁵ M ⁶

Table E: The examples *mahā hi saḥ*, *devo hasati* and *brāhmaṇo hasati*

Even if we ignore the minor variants or scribal errors and the interpolation of remarks inspired by the commentaries in D², E², E⁵ and M⁹, a certain amount of confusion can be observed. The plural *devā hasanti* is sometimes replaced by the singular *devo hasati*, which would exemplify the application of the abbreviation *haś*, as we see in *brāhmaṇo hasati*. The variant *bho hasati* in K⁵ is borrowed from Patañjali's parallel passage in the Mahābhāṣya.

Much more surprising, considering the fact that it appears in all printed editions, is the recurring absence in forty manuscripts of the last proposition, namely *haśi cety utvaṃ yathā syāt*. It is not logically necessary, since the allusion to the rule *haśi ca* suffices to convey the meaning; it rather looks like an additional explanation in the thirty-one manuscripts which have it:

<i>haśi cety utvaṃ yathā syāt</i>	C ⁴ C ⁶ D ¹ D ² E ¹ E ³ E ⁵ E ⁶ G ² J ¹ L ⁴ M ¹ M ² M ⁴ M ⁷ M ⁸ N ¹ R ¹ R ³ R ⁴ T ⁴ U ¹ U ² U ³ U ⁴ U ⁶ U ⁷
<i>haśi ceti grahaṇaṃ yathā syāt</i>	R ² U ⁵
<i>haśi ceti yathā syād iti</i>	E ² M ⁹

Table F: End of the passage

Taking into consideration all of the variant readings, the attempt to determine “correct” readings eventually became a nearly insoluble dilemma. When no other criterion prompted us to select one reading over another, we chose the one closest to the majority of the Kashmirian and Keralite manuscripts. For instance, our choices differ from the text given in previous editions for the beginning of the passage (*mahā hi saḥ*, *devā hasantīty atra*), even though this reading is indeed found in some of our sources, on the ground that it intensifies the dissymmetry between the first two abbreviations – *adgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu ca* – and the third, expressed by the citation of *haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114). Despite the pronounced discrepancies in the manuscripts, we did retain *aśgrahaṇeṣu* and its illustration *devā hasanti* in order to maintain the structure of the text,

but we expunged the first occurrence of *grahaṇam yathā syāt*, which according to the early editions belonged to the original text. Finally, we also deleted the last portion of the passage (*haśi cety utvaṃ yathā syāt*), which we considered to be a later addition.

The passage, which shrank considerably during this process, thus appears in our edition as:

aḍgrahaṇeṣv aśgrahaṇeṣu ca haśi ceti ca grahaṇam yathā syāt: mahā hi saḥ, devā hasanti brāhmaṇo hasati.

So that it [= *h*] will be included in *aT* and *aŚ*, as well as in [*haŚ* in the rule] *haśi ca* (A. 6.1.114), [for instance in] *mahā hi saḥ, devā hasanti* [and] *brāhmaṇo hasati*.

CONCLUDING NOTE

The discussion above is an instance of the kind of problems one faces when all the material available is used to edit works customarily regarded as “well known”. The passage described is by far the most problematic in the whole section on *pratyāhāras*.

Why was it so difficult for the scribes? It is rather intriguing that there is apparently no close parallel to this passage in the Cāndravṛtti.²⁸ One could suggest that the absence of the abbreviation *aT* in the Cāndravṛtti (as well as the absence of *aŚ* in the Mahābhāṣya) was rather confusing for the scribes, who must have coped with the problem as well as they could. It is well known that the texts of the Kāśikā and the Cāndravṛtti are very similar (whether the Kāśikā copies the Cāndravṛtti or they both derive from another lost text is unclear). Could it be that for the rest of the section (and possibly for most of the Kāśikā), the scribes relied on the Cāndravṛtti or on some hypothetical third source to establish their text whenever there was doubt – but were obviously unable to do so here? If this hypothesis proves valid, one wonders what the whole text of the Kāśikā would have looked like without the support of the Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa or of their common ancestor!

²⁸ See above, note 24. At least there is no parallel passage in the text given by Kshitish Chandra Chatterji, but a critical edition of the Cāndravṛtti is still a desideratum.

APPENDIX: SIGLA OF MANUSCRIPTS

- B¹ Calcutta, Asiatic Society, MS III.E.17 (new number: Society collection 1455), Devanāgarī, paper.
- B² Rajsahi, Varendra Research Museum, MS 2569, Bengali, paper.
- C¹ Jammu, Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute, MS 20-gha, Śāradā, birchbark and paper.
- C² Jammu, Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute, MS 3-G, Devanāgarī, paper.
- C³ Benares, Benares Hindu University, MS C 921, Śāradā, paper.
- C⁴ Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 283/1875-76, Śāradā, birchbark.
- C⁵ London, India Office Library, MS 3345 (No. 4985), Śāradā, birchbark and paper.
- C⁶ Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, MS Mu I 94, Śāradā, paper.
- C⁷ Yale, Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, MS y 35, Śāradā, paper.
- D¹ Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, MS Sanskrit 183, Devanāgarī, paper.
- D² Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, MS Sanskrit 184, Devanāgarī, paper.
- E¹ London, India Office Library, MS Bühler 133 (No. 4986), Devanāgarī, paper.
- E² London, India Office Library, MS Burnell 346 (No. 4983), Devanāgarī, paper.
- E³ London, India Office Library, MS 829-831 (Nos. 593-595), Devanāgarī, paper.
- E⁴ London, India Office Library, MS 2440-2441 (Nos. 591-592), Devanāgarī, paper.
- E⁵ London, India Office Library, MS 3113 (No. 596), Devanāgarī, paper.
- E⁶ Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Chandra Shum Shere 249(4), Devanāgarī, paper.
- F¹ Strasbourg, Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire, MS Bundle no. 93, 4563 (formerly Sanscr. 466), Nandināgarī, palm leaf.
- G¹ Baroda, Oriental Research Institute, MS 9586, Devanāgarī, paper.
- G² Ahmedabad, Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Institute of Indology, MS LD 5451, Devanāgarī, paper.
- G³ Baroda, Oriental Research Institute, MS 6613, Grantha, palm leaf.
- G⁴ Baroda, Oriental Research Institute, MS 25421, Malayāḷam, palm leaf.
- J¹ Jammu, Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute, MSS 4-gha and 5-gha, Devanāgarī, paper.
- K¹ Calicut, University, Department of Malayalam, MS 2939, Malayāḷam, palm leaf.
- K² Calicut, University, Department of Malayalam, MS 3115, Malayāḷam, palm leaf.
- K³ Calicut, University, Department of Malayalam, MS 3640, Malayāḷam, palm leaf.
- K⁴ Trichur, Kalamandalam, MS 42, Malayāḷam, palm leaf.
- K⁵ Tripunithura, Government Sanskrit College, MS 336, Malayāḷam, palm leaf.
- K⁶ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 25A, Malayāḷam, palm leaf.

- K⁷ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 82, Malayālam, palm leaf.
- K⁸ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 10820, Malayālam, palm leaf.
- K⁹ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 11035A, Malayālam, palm leaf.
- K¹⁰ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 13413, Malayālam, palm leaf.
- K¹¹ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 14959, Malayālam, palm leaf.
- K¹² Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 18830, Malayālam, palm leaf.
- K¹³ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 18857, Malayālam, palm leaf.
- K¹⁴ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 19727, Grantha, palm leaf.
- K¹⁵ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 19730, Malayālam, palm leaf.
- K¹⁶ Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute, MS 22409, Malayālam, palm leaf.
- L¹ Mysore, Oriental Research Institute, MS P. 1556 (No. 33683), Malayālam, palm leaf.
- L² Mysore, Oriental Research Institute, MS P. 1625/2 (No. 33684), Nandināgarī, palm leaf.
- L³ Mysore, Oriental Research Institute, MS P. 1832/1 (No. 33685), Grantha, palm leaf.
- L⁴ Mysore, Oriental Research Institute, MS C. 649/2 (No. 33688), Devanāgarī, paper.
- M¹ Pune, Ānandāśrama, MS 6004 (No. 7119), Devanāgarī, paper.
- M² Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, MS 532/1887-91 (No. 65) Devanāgarī, paper.
- M³ Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, MS 34/1882-83 (No. 62), Devanāgarī, paper.
- M⁴ Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, MS 234/1895-98 (No. 63), Devanāgarī, paper.
- M⁵ Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, MS 7/1868-69 (No. 61), Devanāgarī, paper.
- M⁶ Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, MS 61/1866-68 (No. 64), Devanāgarī, paper.
- M⁷ Nasik, Tatyasaheb Garge Collection, Bundle 25, MS 1, Devanāgarī, paper.
- M⁸ Pune, Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala, MS 11809, Devanāgarī, paper.
- M⁹ Wai, Prājña Pāṭhaśāla Maṇḍala, MS 9138A, Devanāgarī, paper.
- N¹ Kathmandu, National Archives, MS 5/3850. NGMPP Reel No. A 553/2 (Computer Document 08.10.91) (Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz). NGMCP No. 30780. Devanāgarī, paper.
- O¹ Bhubaneshwar, Orissa State Museum, MS Gr/19 (No. 3387), Oriya, palm leaf.
- P¹ Hoshiarpur, Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, MS 2065 (No. 3119), Devanāgarī, paper.
- R¹ Alwar, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, MS 3199 (Nos. 4647-4654), Devanāgarī, paper.

- R² Alwar, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, MS 3207 (Nos. 4655-4662), Devanāgarī, paper.
- R³ Jodhpur, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, MS 23889 (No. 863), Devanāgarī, paper.
- R⁴ Jodhpur, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, MS 26569 (No. 1235), Devanāgarī, paper.
- T¹ Adyar, Adyar Library, MS 22.J.23, Telugu, palm leaf.
- T² Madras, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, MS D.19102, Grantha, palm leaf.
- T³ Tanjore, Sarasvati Mahal Library, MS 5430 (Burnell's catalogue no. 9967), Telugu, palm leaf.
- T⁴ Tanjore, Sarasvati Mahal Library, MS 5433 (Burnell's catalogue no. 865), Devanāgarī, paper.
- U¹ Allahabad, Allahabad Museum, MS 303 303/20B, Devanāgarī, paper.
- U² Prayag, Hindī Sāhitya Saṃmelana, MS 7247/4102, Devanāgarī, paper.
- U³ Benares, Sampūrṇānanda-Saṃskṛta-Viśvavidyālaya, MS 37926, Devanāgarī, paper.
- U⁴ Benares, *ibid.*, MS 38099, Devanāgarī, paper.
- U⁵ Benares, *ibid.*, MS 38677, Devanāgarī, paper.
- U⁶ Benares, *ibid.*, MS 38896, Devanāgarī, paper.
- U⁷ Benares, *ibid.*, MS 39365, Devanāgarī, paper.
- U⁸ Benares, *ibid.*, MS 40035, Devanāgarī, paper.

Bibliography

- A. Aṣṭādhyāyī: *Pāṇini's Grammatik*. Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von Otto Böhtlingk. Abteilung I & II. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1998 (repr. of the edition Leipzig: Haessel, 1887).
- Cāndravṛtti *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa of Candragomin*. Ed. by Kshitish Chandra Chatterji. Poona: Deccan College, 1953.
- Fick 1930 Richard Fick, Kielhorns Handschriften-Sammlung. *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen aus dem Jahre 1930, Philologisch-Historische Klasse*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1930.
- Haag – Vergiani 2009 *Studies in the Kāśikāvṛtti. The Pratyāhāraprakaraṇa: Critical Edition, Translation and Other Contributions* by Pascale Haag and Vincenzo Vergiani. Firenze: Società Editrice Fiorentina – New Delhi: Manohar, 2009.
- Kāśikā Mīśra *Kāśikāvṛtti of Jayāditya-Vāmana. Along with Commentaries Vīvaraṇapañjikā-Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Mīśra*. Ed. by Śrī Nārāyaṇa Mīśra. Vārāṇasī: Ratna Publications, 1985.

- Kāśikā Osmania *Kāśikā, a Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar, by Vāmana and Jayāditya* (Part I, *adhyāyas* 1-4). Ed. by Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D.G. Padhye. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University, 1969.
- Kāśikā Phadake *The Kashika, Being a Commentary on the Sutras of Panini*. Edited with notes by Pandit Ananta Sastri Phadake. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1931.
- Kāśikā Śāstrī *Kāśikā, a Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammatical Aphorisms by Paṇḍit Vāmana and Jayāditya*. Ed. by Paṇḍit Bāla Śāstrī. 2 vols. Benares: Medical Hall Press, 1876-1878.
- Kulkarni 2000 Malhar Kulkarni, On Identifying the Manuscript at the Base of the First Printed Edition of Kāśikāvṛtti. *ABORI* 81 (2000) 203-212.
- Māhābhāṣya *Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Ed. by Franz Kielhorn. 3 vols. Bombay: Government Central Press, 1880-1885. 3rd Edition revised ... by K.V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962-1972.
- Mahābhāṣyadīpikā *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā of Bhartṛhari*. Fascicule V: *Āhnika II*. Crit. ed. by G.B. Palsule. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1988.
- Olivelle 1998 Patrick Olivelle, Unfaithful Transmitters. *JIP* 26 (1998) 173-187.
- Sharma 1990 Rama Nath Sharma, *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Vol. II: *English Translation of Adhyāya One* with Sanskrit Text, Transliteration, Word-boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1990.
- Sharma 2001 Id., *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Vol. V: *English Translation of Adhyāya Six* with Sanskrit Text, Transliteration, Word-boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2001.
- Sharma 2003 Id., *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Vol. VI: *English Translation of Adhyāyas Seven and Eight* with Sanskrit Text, Transliteration, Word-boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2003.

