

Preface

As the oldest extant complete commentary on Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Kaśikāvṛtti* (KV) occupies a unique place in the history of Indian grammatical literature. It is generally believed to have been composed in the 7th century C.E.¹ and it is traditionally considered the work of two authors, Jayāditya and Vāmana,² about whom virtually nothing is

¹ Its *terminus post quem* is set by a partial quotation of a verse from the *Kīratārjunīya* of Bhāravi, who is dated to the late 6th century (see Kane, 1961: 119-20), which is found in the *vṛtti* on A. 1.3.23. As for the *terminus ante quem*, it was previously tentatively set around the early 8th century, namely the date assigned to its earliest commentary, the *Nyāsa* of Jinendrabuddhi, that is probably alluded to by Māgha, the author of the *Sīsūpālavadha* (for the details, see Cardona, 1976: 280-81). This date is now more firmly established thanks to the recent works of Funayama (1999: 92) and Steinkellner, Krasser and Lasic (2005: xl-xlii). The latter bring new evidence, in fact, that allows the commentator of the KV to be identified with the author of the *ṭikā* on Diñnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, namely certain similarities in the colophons of the two works. As the *nyāsa* is quoted by the poetician Bhāmaha (first half of the 8th century; cf. also Kane, 1961: 118-19), three verses of whom are quoted by the Buddhist author Śāntarākṣita (725-788), who in turn seems to know the work of the *ṭikākāra*, this confirms that Jinendrabuddhi must have flourished around the beginning of the 8th century and, therefore, that the KV dates to the 7th century.

² The tradition generally assigned the first five chapters to Jayāditya and the last three to Vāmana (see Belvalkar, 1915: 30). However, D.C. Bhat-

known.³ A number of questions about its composition and relationship with other texts belonging either to the early Pāṇinian tradition or to other grammatical schools— in particular, the Cāndra and the Jainendra— still remain unanswered and require to be investigated in depth, as is pointed out by the authors of the articles that form the second part of this volume. Thus, Johannes Bronkhorst reminds us that attempts to assign certain parts of the text to either Jayāditya or Vāmana have so far led to inconclusive results, but he also points out ways in which a text-critical investigation of the KV might shed light on the transmission of the *Mahābhāṣya*; Anjaneya Sarma and Saroja Bhate independently examine the similarities and the divergences between the KV and the *Mahābhāṣya*, and while the former stresses the composite nature of the text, the latter suggests that the two works may in fact belong to two different strands of the Pāṇinian tradition; Émilie Aussant compares the *pratyāhāra* sections in the KV and the *Cāndravṛtti*, bringing out their striking affinities, while Vincenzo Vergiani shows that both these texts are likely to have borrowed from the *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* of Bhartṛhari; and, finally, Pascale Haag examines the paratextual elements and the auspicious introductory verses in the manuscript tradition of the KV, formulating a hypothesis on the influence that its two major commentaries, the *Nyāsa* and the *Padamañjarī*, may have had on its transmission.

Significantly, some of these studies could already rely on the evidence provided by the critical scrutiny of the available manuscript sources for the KV's section on the *Pratyāhārasūtras*. This evidence, which is presented in the first part of the volume, shows, against all possible skepticism, that a critical edition of the whole text is indeed a worthy enterprise, even though “the reconstruction of the stemma that depicts the historical interrelationship between the manuscripts of the *Kāśikā* may not be possible”, as Bronkhorst, who first launched such an enterprise, warns in his contribution.

tacharya (1922: 190-91) showed that this neat division is not convincing, and today the issue of the exact extent of the portions composed by each of the two authors is still debated (for recent discussions on this issue, see Bronkhorst 1983: App. I; Kulkarni 2002).

³ Some authors have suggested that at least one of them, namely Jayāditya, was a Buddhist (see Belvalkar 1915: 29; Shastri 1931: xxiv and xxvii-xviii; and more recently, Radicchi 2002), but this idea seems to be based more on their personal intuition than on solid evidence of any kind, which is in fact nowhere given.

And yet, as is explained in detail below in the Introduction, the results of our work on the *pratyāhāra* section of the KV seem to suggest that even this goal may turn out to be within reach. However, we are aware that, given the limited extent of the psū section, the results based on this section alone are necessarily of a provisional nature and need to be validated by those which will be obtained through the exercise of textual criticism on later sections of the KV.

Saroja Bhate, Pascale Haag and Vincenzo Vergiani

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BELVALKAR, Shripad Krishna (1915), *An account of the different existing systems of Sanskrit grammar* [reprint: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi 1976].
- BHATTACHARYA, Dinesh Chandra (1922), "Pāṇinian studies in Bengal", *Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes*, vol. 1, University of Calcutta, Calcutta.
- BRONKHORST, Johannes (1983), "On the History of Pāṇinian Grammar in the early centuries following Patañjali", *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 11, pp. 357-412.
- CARDONA, George (1976), *Pāṇini. A Survey of Research*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- FUNAYAMA, Tori (1999), "Kamalaśīla's interpretation of 'non-erroneous' in the definition of direct perception and related problems", in Katsura, S. (Ed.), *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy. Proceedings of the Third Dharmakīrti Conference, Hiroshima, November 4-6, 1997*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, pp. 73-99.
- KANE, Pandurang Vaman (1961), *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- KULKARNI, Malhar (2002), "Manuscript evidence on the issue of the authorship of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*", in Thite, G.U. (Ed.), *Subhāṣiṇī. Prof. Dr. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Volume*, Sanskrit Pracharini Sabha, Pune, pp. 208-216.
- RADICCHI, Anna (2002), "Two Buddhist Grammarians: Candragomin and Jayāditya", in Deshpande, M.M.,