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

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

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

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

[For those acquainted with John Brough’s article “Theories of general linguistics in the Sanskrit grammarians” Bhaṭṭoji’s ideas may recall Brough’s description of the sphota as “simply the linguistic sign in its aspect of meaning-bearer (Bedeutungsträger)” (1951: 34, [406, 86]). Brough criticizes Keith’s description of the sphota as ‘a sort of hypostatization of sound’ and S.K. De’s characterization of it as a ‘somewhat mystical conception’. Whatever the applicability of Brough’s understanding to the concept of sphota held by Bhaṭṭoji and his successors, it seems clear that it is hardly if at all applicable to those thinkers who preceded Bhaṭṭoji.³ This does not imply that the sphota as an entity was a ‘somewhat mystical conception’. In many of its manifestations it is to be understood against the background of the omnipresent ontology of Vaiśeṣika in Brahmancial thought, in which a cloth is an altogether different entity from the thread that constitutes
it, and a pot a different entity from its two halves. This is what Bhatṭoji reminds us of when he points out that what he calls the *akhaṇḍapadasphota* is a single entity in the same way in which a cloth is a single entity.\(^4\) The modern study of sphoṭa and related issues is contaminated by ideas borrowed from Western philosophy and linguistics to the extent that a major intellectual effort is required to understand these concepts once again in their own cultural context.\(^4\)

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

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

**Bhatṭoji’s Concept of Sphoṭa**

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

The first point of view which he then presents holds that all the constituent sounds, provided they occur in a certain order, are expressive. The Šabdakaustubha formulates it as follows:\(^5\)
"Because a deviation from the sequence which delimits the state of denoting, by way of an interchange of sounds and the like, is natural in words, and because—since someone gets to know the denotative power of a word for the first time with regard to any one [possible sequence]—it is not possible to determine which [variant] calls to mind which [other one], the varṇasphotaṇaka is that all sounds (varna) that occur in an utterance and that are delimited by this or that sequence—as for example [the forms] kar, kār, kur, and cakar (in the case of the verb kr)—are expressive, just as in the case of the words rṣabha, vṛṣabha, vṛṣa etc. (which all mean 'bull')."

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

aṣṭāv apy ete pakṣāḥ siddhāntagrantheṣu tatra tatropanibaddhāḥ / tathā hi, sthānivatsūtrey sarve sarvapadādesāḥ iti bhāṣyagranthāḥ / padyate 'rtho 'nneti arthavā iha padaṁ na tu suptiṁantam eva / tathā ca 'er uḥ' ity asiya tes tur ity artha iti tīkāgraṅṭhaś ca varṇasphote 'nukūlaḥ / tathā sthānyarthābhidhānasamarthasyaivaivaśeṣatvam iti sthāntaratamaparirbhasaṁyaiva 'tasthasthagāpām' ityadiṣu nirvāhāṁ tadarthāṁ yathāsamaṁkhyasūtraṁ nārabdhāvyam iti bhāṣyam api / padasphoṭavaṁkarṣphoṭa tu . . . .

"All these eight points of view have been explained in authoritative treatises. An instance is the Bhāṣya on the sthānivatsūtra (P. 1.1.56 sthānivad ādeśo 'naldhiḥ') [which states:] ‘All [substitutes] are substitutes of whole padas’. In this passage pada means ‘what has meaning’, as shown by the derivation ‘meaning is obtained (padyate) by it’; it does not mean ‘what ends in a nominal or verbal affix’ (as it is defined in P. 1.4.14 suptiṁantam padam). And similarly, also the Tīkāgraṅta is in agreement with the varṇasphota when it says: ‘the meaning of er uḥ is tes tuḥ’. Similarly the Bhāṣya [states] that, given that only something that is capable of expressing the meaning of the substituend [can be] a substitute, because one can accomplish [the desired effect] in the case of (P. 3.4.101) tasthasthagāpām (tāmtatāmaḥ) with the help of the sthānentaratamaparirbhasā (= P. 1.1.50 sthāne 'ntaratamaḥ), the yathāsamaṁkhyasūtra (= P. 1.3.10 yathāsamaṁkhyam anudeśaṁ samāṇāṁ) must not be used. The padasphota and the vākyasphota on the other hand ...

All the examples in this passage concern morphemes, and the fact that immediately after it the padasphota and the vākyasphota are going to be discussed shows that this passage is about the varṇasphota (as it says explicitly in connection with the Tīkāgraṅta).
It follows from the above that the upholder of the varnasphota believes that primary expressiveness resides in the morphemes (primarily stems and suffixes) that make up words. And yet varna does not mean ‘morpheme’ but ‘speech sound, phoneme’.\textsuperscript{10} Bhaṭṭoji’s choice of terminology is confusing, and it appears that at a result some later thinkers ended up applying the term varna to morphemes, which was not Bhaṭṭoji’s intention.\textsuperscript{11}

This understanding of Bhaṭṭoji’s varnasphota is confirmed by the fact that the initial presentation of the varnasphota is followed by the statement that the expressiveness of morphemes is contested (kar-prabhṛtayo vācakā na vēti cēha vipratipattiśarīram).\textsuperscript{12} The edition by Gopāl Śāstri Nene, no doubt under the influence of Nāgėṣa’s Sphotavāda, sees this as the final sentence of the section on the varnasphota. In reality it is a criticism of the varnasphota which serves the purpose of introducing the then following padasphota. Indeed, Bhattoji explains two pages later that among the eight points of view on the sphota each of the preceding views is refuted by the one that follows it, and that the final one corresponds to that of the authorities.\textsuperscript{13}

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

This changes with the positions that succeed it. The akhandapadasphota and the akhandavākyasphota, and in a certain way also the three kinds of jātisphota, correspond to the independent entities that had been postulated by earlier thinkers and which have a
distinct ontological status. In the case of the *akhaṇḍapadasphota* and *akhaṇḍavākyasphota*, as we have seen, Bhaṭṭoji makes a comparison with a cloth which, from the Vaiśeṣika perspective, is ontologically different from the constituent threads. The fact, however, that three of the possible points of view which Bhaṭṭoji presents totally ignore the ontological side of the sphota shows that the sphota for Bhaṭṭoji is not primarily an ontologically independent entity, different from its constituent sounds or words. This is interesting if one remembers that something like an ontological craze characterizes much of classical Indian philosophy. It must suffice here to illustrate this with one example. Maṇḍana Miśra in his Sphotasiddhi, when confronted with the view that speech sounds themselves might be expressive, responds:¹⁶

“This is not right, (i) because sounds do not singly convey [meaning], (ii) because they do not co-exist, and (iii) because they cannot act together since, as they occur in a fixed order, they do not co-occur at the same time,...” Clearly Maṇḍana Miśra would not have been impressed with Bhaṭṭoji’s enumeration of possible points of view.¹⁷

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

The second Bhāṣya passage invoked to justify the *varnasphotapaksas* must be the following one on P. 1.3.10 (yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśah samānām):¹⁹ “What example is there with regard to this [sūtra]? is... [An example is] (P. 3.4.101:) tāsthattamipām tāmtamūm The *tas*, *thas*, *tha* and *miP* replacements for *LA*, marked with *N*, are obligatorily replaced by *tām, tam,*
ta and am, respectively. But is not the same established by what is nearest with respect to place (by P. 1.1.50 sthāne 'ntaratamah 'A substitute coming] in the place [of an original should be] the nearest"21)? How is there nearness [between these substitutes and their substituends]? Something expressive of singularity will come in the place of something expressive of singularity, something expressive of duality in the place of something expressive of duality, something expressive of plurality in the place of something expressive of plurality." This passage implies that suffixes (or at any rate certain suffixes) have meaning, but this is only part of the position which Bhattōji ascribes to the upholder of the varnasphota.

The evidence marshaled from authoritative works for the varnasphota, as will be clear from the above, is weak. For the padasphota and the vākyasphota, on the other hand, Bhattōji can directly refer to a passage by Kaiyata on the words yenoccāritena ... in the Paspaśāhnika of the Mahābhāṣya,22 where it is stated that according to the grammarians words and sentences are different from their constituent sounds and that only they, unlike the latter, are expressive of meaning; they are, furthermore, called sphota.23 Bhattōji adds, as he must, that Kaiyata's passage deals with the akhandapadasphota and akhandavākyasphota.24

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

Bhattōji refers to further passages from Kaiyata to bolster his presentation of eight positions about the sphota.26 The first of these passages does not read, as claimed by Bhattōji, kecid varnasphotam apare padasphotam vākyasphotam cāuh, but rather: kecit dhvanivyāngyam varṇātmakam nityam śabdam āuhu / anye
varṇavyatiriktam padasphoṭam icchanti / vākyasphoṭam apare saṁgirante.27 Contrary to Bhaṭṭoja’s claim, it does not mention the varṇasphoṭa. We may assume that Bhaṭṭoja considered the first part of this passage (... varṇātmakaṁ nityaṁ śabdam ...) to support his varṇasphoṭa, sakhaṇḍapadasphoṭa and sakhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa, the second part (... varṇavyatiriktam padasphoṭam ...) to support his akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa, and the third ([varṇavyatiriktam] vākyasphoṭam ...) his akhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa. The phrase kecit dhvani-vyanṛyaṁ varṇātmakaṁ nityaṁ śabdam āhuḥ; is no doubt most amenable to an interpretation in accordance with Bhaṭṭoja’s first three kinds of sphoṭa, but the very fact that the ‘some’ referred to by Kaiyata consider the word which consists of speech sounds (varṇātmaka) to be eternal (nitya) suggests that they assign to it an ontological status of its own, contrary to Bhaṭṭoja’s first three kinds of sphoṭa. Indeed, this phrase looks like a paraphrase of the Bhāṣya line nityesu śabdesu kūṭasthair avicālibhir varṇair bhavitavam which we considered above. We saw that Kaiyata looked upon this line as an expression of the jātisphoṭapakṣa. We must conclude that Kaiyata’s own phrase kecit dhvani-vyanṛyaṁ varṇātmakaṁ nityaṁ śabdam āhuḥ, too, must in all probability be understood as an expression of that same jātisphoṭapakṣa. It does not therefore support Bhaṭṭoja’s first three kinds of sphoṭa.

Bhaṭṭoja then refers to Kaiyata’s comments on Śivasūtra 1 a i u n, which oppose a vyaktisphoṭavādin to a jātisphoṭavādin. Confusingly, Kaiyata’s comments concern the Bhāṣya passage which contains the same line nityesu śabdesu kūṭasthair avicālibhir varṇair bhavitavam which, as we have seen, had been invoked by Bhaṭṭoja to support the sakhaṇḍapadasphoṭa (and sakhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa). We had occasion to point out that Kaiyata, contrary to Bhaṭṭoja, found in this line support for the jātisphoṭapakṣa. It appears therefore that Bhaṭṭoja invokes a passage from Kaiyata with which he disagrees to support the greater force of the jātisphoṭapakṣa.28

Kaiyata’s third passage occurs at the end of the second Āhnika and comments on the Bhāṣya words aksaraṁ na ksaraṁ vidyāt (Mahā-bh I p. 36 I. 6). Here Kaiyata mentions the varṇasphoṭa, the padasphoṭa and the vākyasphoṭa, and ascribes to them vyavahāranityaṁ ‘eternal for practical purposes’. If Bhaṭṭoja is to be believed, Kaiyata ascribes full eternity to the jātisphoṭa, but this is less clear from his text as found in the printed editions.29 Bhaṭṭoja mentions a variant reading – which appears to agree with the editions I have used – in which the jātisphoṭa is looked upon as ‘eternal for practical
purposes. But whatever reading one accepts, the most one can deduce from Kaiyata’s statement is that he recognized six kinds of sphotā, which are probably to be identified as the akhaṇḍavarnasphotā (which has little or nothing in common with Bhaṭṭoji’s varṇasphotā), the akhaṇḍapadasphotā, the akhaṇḍavākyasphotā, and the varṇajātisphotā, the padajātisphotā, and the vākyajātisphotā.

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

Bhaṭṭoji then rounds off his discussion by pointing out that all this has been clearly set out by Patañjali and Kaiyata on sūtras 1.2.45 (arthavat adhātur ...), 1.1.68 (svam rūpam śabdasya ...), 1.1.70 (tapa ras tatkālasya), and elsewhere. When looking up these passages, one is disappointed. Only on P. 1.1.70 does Patañjali use the word sphotā, and Kaiyata the expression vyaktisphotā. Kaiyata here refers back to the Paspaśānaka under yenoccāritena ... (discussed above), where, he says, the matter has been considered.

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

BHAṬṬOJI’S PERSONALITY AND CIRCUMSTANCES

It is now time to consider what we know about Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita as a person. It turns out that to study a recent thinker like him is very
different from studying early Sanskrit authors. We know next to nothing about Bharṭṛhari and most other Sanskrit authors of his time. About Bhaṭṭoji we know a fair amount.\(^{36}\) If we take the bits of information collected in the secondary literature (all of which I have not been able to verify) we get the following picture. Bhaṭṭoji came from the South (perhaps Mahārāṣṭra\(^{37}\)) and ended up in Benares\(^{38}\) where he became the student of a well-known grammarian, Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa.\(^{39}\) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa was not his only teacher — also Appayya Dīkṣīta\(^{40}\), Śaṅkara Bhatta\(^{41}\) and Nṛṣimhāśrama\(^{42}\) are sometimes stated to have been his teachers —, but Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa plays an important role in what follows. Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa himself is known for his commentary on Rāmacandra’s Prakriyākaumudī, called Prakāśa, and we may assume that Bhaṭṭoji was trained by Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa in the Prakriyākaumudī. This work was going to be the source of inspiration for his own Siddhāntakaumudī.

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

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

Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa had not been the first to write a commentary on the Prakriyākaumudī. The grandson of its author, called Vīṭṭhala, had composed one called Prasāda. Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa often critically refers to this commentary, and calls its author prāc ‘the former one’.\(^{44}\) (Rāmacandra the author of the Prakriyākaumudī is referred to as ācārya, even though Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa does not always agree with him.) This word prāc, it appears, often designates preceding authors of similar works. Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakriyāprakāśa therefore refers in this way to the preceding commentator on the Prakriyākaumudī, viz. Vīṭṭhala. Bhaṭṭoji’s Praudha Manoramā uses the term, similarly, to refer to the author of the preceding Prakriyāgrantha, viz. Rāmacandra.\(^{45}\) Bhaṭṭoji’s Śabdakaustubha, which is a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya (see below), uses prāc to refer to the preceding commentator of the Mahābhāṣya, viz. Kaiyata.\(^{46}\) The use of this word is not pejorative, as is shown by the fact that Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha’s Kucamardinī, which was composed to defend the Prakriyākaumudī and its commentator Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, refers to the
author of the Prakriyākaumudī as prācīnaprakriyāgranthakṛt (e.g. ed. Sadāshiva Sharma p. 161.1; ed. Madhusudana p. 25 1.5, p. 31 1.7).

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

yat tu prācē ... uktam, yac ca tadvākhyātrbhir ... uktam, yac c[a] ... prasādakṛtā ... kṛtam, tad etat sakalam bhāsyakaiyatāparyālocanamulakam.

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

This passage shows us the way in which Bhattōji criticizes his predecessors. It also allows us to identify them with precision. The words which Bhattōji attributes to ‘the former one’ (veti kecit / sakhyah, sukhyah, sakhyuh, sukhyuh; with variant for the last four words: sakhyah, sukhyah) clearly corresponds to the following passage from the Prakriyākaumudī (ed. Trivedi I p. 167, on P. 7.3.116; cp. ed. Miśra I p. 260): veti kecit / sakhyah, sukhyah, with variants for the last word: sakhyuh and sukhyuh. Bhattōji attributes to the author of the Prasāda five metrical lines (two and a half ślokas). These occur in the commentary called Prasāda of Viṭṭhala (I p. 167 l.12–16) in exactly the same form. The ‘commentator’, finally, is attributed with the following words: ubhayam apy etad bāṣye sthitam. This phrase occurs in Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa, in exactly this form (I p. 260 l.21).49 In other words, the ‘commentator’ is Śesa Kṛṣṇa, Bhattōji’s former teacher.

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

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

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

Bhaṭṭojoji’s criticism of Śesa Kṛṣṇa is polite, too. We have seen that the latter is sometimes referred to as ‘his commentator’ (in the plural). He is occasionally referred to as prāc ‘former one’ but always, it seems, in the plural. Elsewhere Bhaṭṭojoji gives no specification as to whom he is referring to, simply saying ‘they say’. For example, his statement yat tu vadanti: ‘napumṣake śasi yuṣṭi ity atra num na syād’ iti52 refers to a line in Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāṣa which says: tena napumṣake śasi yuṣṭi ity atra num bhavati.53 And Bhaṭṭojoji’s yat tu vyācakhyuḥ: ‘upadesakāle yau ṣakāranakārau tadantety arthah / devadattasya gurukulam itivat samudāyena sambandhān nāsamartha[sa]māsa’ it54 literally cites a passage from Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāṣa.55 Sometimes Śesa Kṛṣṇa is referred to under the heading ‘others’ (again in the plural). Bhaṭṭojoji mentions, for example, ‘others’ in connection with Rāmacandra (prāc) and Viṭṭhala (tatpautra) in the following line: yac cānyair ‘vāṛtikena pūritam artham udāharati’ ity avatāritam.56 The phrase attributed to these ‘others’ occurs in exactly that form in Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāṣa.57 But however politely Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s positions are referred to, they are always rejected.

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

It is true that Bhaṭṭojoji did not write his Praudha Manoramā until after the death of Śesa Kṛṣṇa.59 It is also true that while referring to his teacher he respectfully uses the plural ((tad)vyākhyātrabhīḥ, anyaiḥ, prāścaḥ, or quite simply a plural form of the verb) where the singular has to be good enough for Rāmacandra (prācā) and his grandson Viṭṭhala (tatpautrenā, prasādakṛtā).60 It is even true that he begins this commentary with a verse in which he emphasizes that he has composed it after careful reflection on his teacher’s words.61 We yet learn that the family of his teacher was not amused by the systematic rejection of the latter’s points of view. Both Cakrapāṇi (or Cakraṇāṇidatta), the son of Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s son Śesa Viṛēśvara, and Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, Viṛēśvara’s pupil, composed a criticism of the Praudha Manoramā.63 According to the latter, Bhaṭṭojoji’s mind had been marred by hatred for his teacher (ed. Sadashiva Sharma p. 2; ed. Madhusudana p. 3: gurudvesadūṣitamati). These critical
attacks were answered by Bhaṭṭoaji’s grandson Hari Dīkṣita in his (Brhaṭ) Sabdaratna. Isolated remarks in these commentaries create the impression that strong feelings were involved in these debates, yet that the most common and apparently most appropriate way to express them was through the intermediary of complex and detailed discussions of difficult technical points of grammar. The participants in these debates must have thought that this was the surest way to be heard and to score points.

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

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

We can delve a bit deeper into Bhaṭṭoaji’s past and find out more about an earlier phase of his relationship with his teacher Śesa Krśna.
Bhaṭṭoji is known to have written two grammatical works before the Siddhāntakaumudī and the Praudha Manoramā. These are the Śabdakaustubha and the one known by the names Vaiyākārana Bhūṣaṇa Kārikā and Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana. It is in these works that we find most of his ideas about the philosophy of grammar. These ideas did not bring him instant fame, it appears. The Śabdakaustubha has only in part been preserved, which suggests that it was not much used in the beginning. Regarding the Vaiyākaraṇa Bhūṣaṇa Kārikā the view has been propounded that it has only survived along with – i.e., included in – the commentaries of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa. That would mean that, if Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa had not composed these commentaries, this work might not have survived.\textsuperscript{70} Not unrelated to this issue is the uncertainty which exists regarding the name which Bhaṭṭoji himself gave to this second work. Later authors – among them Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa, Hari Dīksita and Vaidyanātha Pāyagunḍa – call it Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana.\textsuperscript{71} However, it seems that the Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana was noted, and commented upon, by someone else, a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji called Vanamāli Miśra, a manuscript of whose commentary called Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjinī has been preserved.\textsuperscript{72}

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

\begin{quote}
\begin{flushleft}
harikaiyatubhatfīyās īkāḥ santy eva yady apihādyā/
tad api gabhīradurūhatvādyair bodhāya nālam tāḥ\
\end{flushleft}
\end{quote}

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

It is not immediately clear which is the commentary by Bhaṭṭa mentioned by Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa. Yudhisṭhira Mīmāṃsaka’s history of grammatical literature makes no mention of any commentator before Śeṣa Nārāyana called Bhaṭṭa. Bhaṭṭoji, on the other hand, uses that appellation for himself, for example, in the fifth introductory stanza to his Śabdakaustubha: \textit{bhattojibhatto janusah sāphalyam labdhum īhate}.\textsuperscript{73} Mīmāṃsaka lists Bhaṭṭoji’s Śabdakaustubha as a commentary on the Astādhyāyī, but this does not appear to be correct. Another one of its introductory stanzas announces “I extract the gem of
the word (or: gem which is the word, śabdakaustubha) from the ocean which is the Bhāṣya pronounced by Patañjali" (st. 3cd: phañibhāsitabhāsyābdheh śabdakaustubham uddhare). The text follows throughout the division into Ānikas which characterizes the Mahābhāṣya, and closely follows the text of that work. References to the Bhāṣya, moreover, often use the future, which only makes sense in a text which presents itself as a commentary on it. It is not surprising that Bal Shastri’s edition of the Mahābhāṣya with commentaries states, on its title page, that it contains the “Mahabhashya of Patanjali … with the commentaries Bhattoji Deekshita’s ‘Shabdakaustubh’ etc. Baladeva Upādhyāya calls it a commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī which is also considered a work that critically evaluates the Mahābhāṣya.

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

tad evam sakhaṇḍa-khaṇḍabhedena padavākyavyaktisphoṭaś caturdha, sakhaṇḍayos tayor jātirīpasatāpī i dvau jātisphoṭāv iti śoḍhā, jātivyaktibhedena varṇasphoṭaḥ ‘py aparītity api kaścit.

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

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

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

Either way, Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa here clearly enumerates eight kinds of spoha, which can be specified as follows: (i) sakhaṇḍapadavākyavyaktisphoṭa, (ii) sakhaṇḍavākyavyaktisphoṭa, (iii) akhaṇḍapadavākyavyaktisphoṭa, (iv) akhaṇḍavākyavyaktisphoṭa, (v) padajātisphoṭa, (vi) vākyajātisphoṭa, (vii) varṇajātisphoṭa, (viii) varṇavyaktisphoṭa. He does
not accept all of them. His enumeration corresponds, be it in a different order, to the list of positions which we know from Bhaṭṭoji's Śabdakaustubha (and from the Vaiyākarāna Bhūṣaṇā Kārikā or Vaiyākarāṇamatonmajjana along with Kaiṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's commentaries). Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa himself does not appear to accept the sphaṭa as primarily a meaning-bearer but rather as an ontological entity, even though the only sphaṭas he admits (word and sentence) do have meaning.\textsuperscript{80}

For our present reflections it is particularly important to know that already Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's Prakāśa, which was composed before the Śukriratnakara,\textsuperscript{81} appears to have been acquainted with the Śabdakaustubha.\textsuperscript{82} This one may conclude from the fact that the Prakāśa refers twice to opinions of the Dīkṣita (in Sanskrit the plural is used: dīkṣitānāṁ vyākhyaṁ; yat tu dīkṣitah). Tripāṭhi (1977: (o)) appears to think that these are references to Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, the author of the Śukriratnakara, but no evidence is known to me that Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa was ever called Dīkṣita.\textsuperscript{83} Hueckstedt (2002: 52) accepts that these are references to Bhaṭṭoji, but admits that he has not been able to find the citations in the surviving works of that author; he suggests that they may have belonged to the parts of the Śabdakaustubha which have not survived. However, there are references to Bhaṭṭoji without mention of his name. Some examples have come to my notice, and a systematic investigation might bring to light more of them. The Prakāśa on P. 4.1.105 gargādibhyo yaṁ refers to 'others' (anye) who hold a position which actually occurs in the Śabdakaustubha on that sūtra (there 4.1.107) but not in the Kāśikā with its two early commentaries, nor in any other work known to me that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa might have been acquainted with.\textsuperscript{84}

The Prakāśa on P. 1.3.3 halantyam informs us that 'others' like to interpret this sūtra by repeating it; I have found this position mentioned only in the Śabdakaustubha.\textsuperscript{85} On P. 1.3.1 bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ the Prakāśa mentions 'others' who maintain, on the basis of inference, that roots that occur only in sūtras (sautra dhātu) are covered by it; once again, I have found this point of view only in the Śabdakaustubha.\textsuperscript{86} Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa's remarks on Śivasūtra 2 are interesting because, besides attributing to 'others' an opinion which, from among earlier works, we only find in the Śabdakaustubha, they add a detail which is absent in Bhaṭṭoji's work.\textsuperscript{87} This might be taken to indicate that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa knew Bhaṭṭoji's opinions, perhaps from oral discussions, but not necessarily their final expression in the Śabdakaustubha.
Tripāṭhi (1977: (au)) and Mīmāṃsaka (saṃ. 2030: I: 487 n. 1) cite a line from the Śabdakaustubha (*tad etat sakalam abhidhāya prakriyāprakāśe gurucaraṇaṁ uktam: ‘tajjñānam ityāda tu ścūtvam bhavaty eva’*)⁸⁸ which shows that Bhaṭṭoji was acquainted with Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakriyāprakāśa at the time of writing his Śabdakaustubha, and that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa was, or had been, his teacher at that time. This fact, along with the circumstance that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa refers to the Dīksita and is familiar with at least some opinions which Bhaṭṭoji expresses in his Śabdakaustubha, allow us to conclude that the times of composition of Śabdakaustubha and Prakriyāprakāśa overlapped, the latter perhaps having been completed slightly before the former.⁸⁹

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

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

Having gained some insight into the personality and personal context of Bhaṭṭoji Dīksita, it will be interesting to learn something more about the world he lived in. We know that Bhaṭṭoji had ended up in Benares, and that he composed the works that made him famous in that same city. How do we have to imagine the life and daily surroundings of Sanskrit pandits of his time? We know from Muslim sources that Benares was “The chief seat of learning in
Hindustan (to which) crowds of people flock from the most distant parts for the purpose of instruction ..."  

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

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

Gode has argued in two publications (1941; 1969) that the chief of pandits known to Bernier must have been a Sanskrit author known by the name Kavîndrācārya Sarasvati. However, Gode’s arguments are circumstantial and not totally compelling (as he himself admits). It is also clear that Bernier’s expression chef des Pandits is close to the Sanskrit title pandītaraja which Jagannātha is reported to have received from the emperor (see above); the title vidyānidhana ‘repository of learning’ which Kavîndrācārya supposedly received from Shah Jahan does not correspond to this French expression. Chronologically both scholars fit. Jagannātha is believed to have
received patronage from Shah Jahan and Dara Shikoh (perhaps already from Jahangir). Some time after the execution of Dara Shikoh in 1659 he is thought to have moved to Benares, where Bernier may conceivably have met him in 1666. In the more recent of his two publications on this subject Gode refers to a passage from a work called Padshah Namah by Abdul Hamid Lahori, which states that a certain Kavindra Sanyasi received from Shah Jahan two thousand rupees in cash. This is exactly the amount which the chief of pandits known to Bernier received as pension until Aurangzeb stopped it, but it does not necessarily prove that the scholar mentioned in this passage is the same as the one known to Bernier. Moreover, the fact that Bernier's chief of pandits offered him refreshments in the library of his university (la collation dans la bibliothèque de son université), and that Bernier states some pages earlier that there are many Sanskrit books with which a large hall at Benares is entirely filled (p. 255: "... dont j'ai vu une grande salle toute pleine dans Bénarès"), does not necessarily prove Gode's surmise that this hall "is probably identical with Kavindracarya's Manuscript Library". All this means that it is possible, though far from certain, that one of the actors in the drama in which Bhattoji Diksita played a role has been known to and described by a visiting Frenchman. We are clearly far removed from the lifeless authors of ancient Sanskrit texts.

We have to consider the question how these scholars earned, or tried to earn their living. Bernier mentions both rich merchants and, in the case of the chief of pandits, patronage from the Mughal court. Texts from this period often mention the patronage received from kings. These were often regional kings, petty rulers of small states. Examples such as Panditaraja Jagannatha, on the other hand, show that such support could also come from Muslim rulers, even from the emperor in Delhi. According to the New Catalogus Catalogorum, this scholar received patronage from a long list of rulers: Emperor Jehangir (1605–1627 A.D.), Shah Jahan (1628–1658 A.D.), Asaf Khan (Noor Jahan's brother, died 1641 A.D.), Jagat Simha, King of Udaipur (1628–1629 A.D.) and Pranananaraya, King of Kamarupa or Assam (1633–1666 A.D.). Others had to be content with less prominent patrons. It is clear from the introductory verses that Ses Krsna wrote his Prakasa at the command of a king Viravara, who may have been a minister of Akbar. His son Sesa Narayana, author of a commentary on the Mahabhasya called Suktiratnakara,
praises in his introductory stanzas a certain "king Phirimdā" (phirimdā nṛpaḥ; st. 8); this same Phirimdā is further on (st. 10) referred to as caudharī, which means as much as 'village headman' (Hintze, 1997: 70; cp. Richards, 1993: 81). Bhaṭṭoji, his brother Raṅgoji and his nephew Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa appear to have received patronage from two rulers belonging to the Keladi royal family, Veṇkaṭappa Nāyaka I (1592–1629) and his grandson Viṛabhadra (1629–1645); these were rulers of the Ikkeri kingdom, one of the fragmented heirs of the Vijayanagara state.106

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

Patronage did not only come from political rulers. We have seen that François Bernier mentions rich merchants in particular. The prosperity of the Mughal empire apparently filtered down to reach traditional Sanskrit scholars also through this channel.
The establishment of the Mughal empire may in this way have created more rather than fewer opportunities for bright Sanskrit scholars, both young and old. One of the priorities of these scholars was, inevitably, to attract the attention of one or more potential patrons. One way to do so would be to participate in one of the oral debates which apparently were held at the courts of various rulers. We have already seen that Jagannātha supposedly defeated Muslim scholars at the court of Shah Jahan. Indeed, it is known that already Akbar had organized debates at his court, and had even built a debating-hall (called House of Worship, 'Ibādat Khāna) in the gardens of his palace at Fathpur-Sikri; initially only schools of Muslim theology had participated, later representatives of other religions as well. But debates also took place in less glamorous surroundings. Raṅgoji Bhaṭṭa, who was both Bhaṭṭoji’s brother and Kaṇḍa Bhaṭṭa’s father, is recorded to have defeated the Dvaita scholar Vidyādhīśayati in debate at the court of the Keladi ruler Venkatappa. More complete information about the places where and the frequency with which such debates took place, and about the ways in which the winner might be expected to be rewarded, would be of great interest for an understanding of the inner dynamic of Sanskrit scholarship at that period. For the time being we have to be guided by the impressions gained from a small selection of sources.

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

1 Yoga Bhāṣya on sūtra 3.17: ... ekam padam ekabuddhivarayam ekaprayatnāksiptam abhāgam akramam avarnam bauddham antyavarnapratyayavāpyapasthāpitam ...

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

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


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

8 It seems likely that the reference is to Kāyata on P. 1.1.56 sthānāyvādā ādeṣo ‘nālvidhau (I p. 399 1.11–16): dvividha ādeśah, pratyayakas cāster bhūr ityādiḥ / ānumānīkaś caur ur ityādiḥ / atra hi ikārēnakārāntah sthāny anumāntyate / ukārenokārāntas cādeśah / tatas tes tur iti sampadyate / etc. For a discussion what is at stake, cp. Joshi & Roodbergen, 1990: p. VIII f. and transl. p. 6 n. 30.

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

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

11 So Cardona (1976: 303): “in the view of such later Pāṇinīyas the term varṇa does not mean ‘sound unit’ in this context; it denotes a unit lower than a word, namely a base or an affix”. Similarly Śrī Kṛṣṇa Bhāṭṭa Maunin, who in his Sphota candrikā (p. 1 1.22) speaks of a varṇa which is of the nature of a stem or a suffix (praktipratyayaverṣa). Since this last reference refers to the Bhūṣaṇa of Kaunḍa Bhāṭṭa (p. 2 1.29), he is to be dated after the latter. Ramajna Pandyana (1954: 49 f.) tries to improve upon the scheme of Bhāṣṭoji and his successors by replacing their varnasphota with the pair praktisphota and pratayyasphota. Further refinements lead him to a total of sixteen kinds of sphota.

12 Bhāṣṭoji Diksita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 7 1. 9–10. Bhāṣṭoji does not say, nor indeed intend, that this remark concerns isolated morphemes, but this is how Nāgēśa interprets him (Sphotavāda p. 5 1.6–7: prayujyamānapadānanantargataḥ
14 Cp. Joshi’s observations cited in note 2, above.  
15 It has already been pointed out above that Bhattoji’s emphasis on the semantic role of the sphota is responsible for his negligence of the ontological side. This has confused also modern commentators. John Brough has already been mentioned. As for Gaurinath Sastri, see note 17 below.  
16 Iyer, 1966: 9–10: naitat sāram, pratyeke apratyāyakatvā, sāhityābhāvāt, niyatakramavartinām ayaugapadyena sambhūyakārītvānupatteh, ...  
17 Nor was Gaurinath Sastri, who states (1980: 72–73): “we should like to point out that we do not appreciate their (i.e., of the later standard works of Sanskrit grammarians, JB) conception of pada-sphota and vākya-sphota as also of akhaṇḍa-pada-sphota and akhaṇḍa-vākya-sphota. ... [A]ny interpretation which tends to impair the indivisible character of sphota, cannot be accepted by us. It may be pointed out in our favour that the earlier exponents of the theory of sphota mean by pada-sphota and vākya-sphota what to the later exponents are akhaṇḍa-pada-sphota and akhaṇḍa-vākya-sphota respectively.”  
18 For further evidence for the unitary nature of Patañjali’s morphemes and words, see Bronkhorst, 1987: 46 ff.  
19 Mahā-bh I p. 267 1.8–12: kim ihoḍāharanam / ... / tathasthamipām tämtam-tāmah iti / namu caitad api sthāne ‘nitaratamenaiva siddham / kuta āntaryam / ekār-thasyaikārtho dvayarthasya dvayartho bahvarthasya bahvartho bhavisyātī /  
20 Tr. Sharma, 1995: 660.  
22 Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p.8 1.19–20: padasphotavākyasphotau tu ihaiva praghattake ‘yenocāritena’ iti bhāṣyapratikam upādāya kaiyatena bhāṣyārthatāyā varṇītau /  
23 Kaiyata I p. 7: vajiyakarana varṇavayiriktaśya padasya vākyasya vā vācaketvam icchānti / varṇnāṁ pratyeke vācakate dvītyādivarnocchārānārthakhyaprasaṅgāt / ānarthakye tu pratyeke utpattipakse yaugapadyenotpattyabhāvāt, abhiyaktipakse tu kramaṇaivābhīvyaktyā samudāyabhāvāt / ekasmyupārūḍānāṁ vācaketv ‘sarah’ ‘rasah’ ityādē arthapraptidvayiśeprasangāt tadyayiriktaḥ spoto nādābhīvyangyo vācako vistarena vākyapadye vasyasthāpītah /  
25 Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p.8 1.21–23: ‘nityesu sābdesu kūtasathair avicālibhir varnair bhavatīyam’ iti tatra tatra bhāṣye sakhaṇḍatoktā /. The quoted line occurs Mahā-bh I p. 18 1.14–15 (on Śivasūtra I vt. 12); p 75 1.8–9 (on P. 1.1.20 vt. 5); p 112 I. 24 (on P. 1.1.46); p. 136 1.12–13 (on P. 1.1.56 vt. 11); etc.  
26 Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 8 1.26–32: paspaśāyam eva praghattakāntare ‘kim punah’ ityādi bhāṣyam upādāya ‘kecid vānaspotam aparve padasphotam vākyasphotam cāhuḥ’ iti vadatā kaiyatena ‘a i u Ṉ’ ity atra vyakti-sphotajātisphotayor balābalam cintayata prayā Bàrahmkānte ‘aksaram na kṣaram vidyāt’ iti bhāṣyavyākhyānāvasare vyavahārānytāta tu vānaspadavākhyasphoṭānām, nityatam tu jātisphotayet praptipādayatā, anupadam eva brahmatațtvam eva hi śabdaraṇyatā pratiḥātyārtho arthā iti vyācaksānena sarve paksāḥ sūcīta eva /.  
28 Kaiyata, I p. 65 ff., esp. p. 68 (vyaktisphotapakṣe mūrākṛte jātisphotapakṣa evāśrīyate) and p. 69 (avaśyāśrāṇīyatām śākṛtipakṣasya darśayati).
29. Kaiyata, I p. 117: vyavahārānityatāyā tu varṇapadadvākyasphotānāṃ [nityatvam]. jātisphotasya vā. The word nityatvam has been added on the authority of another edition (Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi etc., 1967). Bhattoji was apparently acquainted with a reading: vyavahārānityatā tu varṇapadadvākyasphotānām, nityatvam tu jātisphotasya.


31. Bhattoji Diksita, Šabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 9 1.1–4: 'ādyantau takitau' iti sūtre ca bhāṣya eva varnasphotapasphotāv uktau / asatym eva prakrtipratyayavibhāgam tadartham cāśriyā rekha-agavayāyena satyasya padasphotasya vyuttādanam abhipretam iti tatraiva kaiyātah /.


34. Mahā-bh I p. 181 1.19–24 (on P. 1.170 vt. 5); Kaiyata on P. 1.1.70, I p. 539: 'evam tarhi iti / vyaktisphoto 'tra vivakṣitah / sa ca nityaḥ / etac ca 'yenocāritena ity atra paspaśāyām vicāritam iti tata eva boddhavyam./

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

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

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

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

39. See note 43, below.

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


Cf. the following passage from Jagannātha’s Praudhamanoramākucamardana (as cited in Belvarkar, 1915: 39 n. 1): iha kecit [= Bhatṭoja dīksitaḥ] nikhilavādyanukutamayukhāmālālāhitacaranānām ... Śesavāmāvatamāṇām Śrī-Kṛṣṇaṇanditaṁ prasadād āsāditaśabādāvāsāsanās tesu ca pāramēśvarapadam prayāteṣu kalikālavaśamvadibhavantah Prakriyāprakāsām svayamnimitāyān manoramāyām ākulyakārsuḥ / sā ca prakriyāprakāsākṛtām pautra ir asmadgurupanditavīsvarānām tanayāir dāsitāpi svamatiparīkṣārthe punar asmābhīr nirikṣyate /]. Mimāmsāka, sam. 2030: I. 486 n. 1 cites the same passage in a rather different form. See also Mimāmsāka, sam. 2030: I 541; Kane, HistDh I,2 p. 967 n. 1508; p. 48–49 of the introduction to the edition of Jagannātha’s Rasagāṅgādhara mentioned in the bibliography; p. (15) of Sitaram Shastri’s introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā; Hueckstedt, 2002: 51–52 n. 18. Extracts from Jagannātha’s text (including this passage) can be found at the end of the edition of the Praudha Manoramā by Pt. Sadāshiva Sharma Shastri. This passage is found on p. 1–2 of Madhusudana’s edition. For an English translation, see Joshi, 1980: 107. This statement shows that Bhatṭoja was the pupil of Śesa Kṛṣṇa, not of the latter’s son Śesa Viśeṣvara, as maintained by Ranganathasvami Aryavarakara (1912), Altekar (1937: 40) and Das (1990: 326 n. 14). For another critical passage from the same work, see Sitaram Shastri’s introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā, p. (13) n. 2.

The introduction (Prāstāvikam) by Bhāgiratha Prasāda Tripāthī to the edition Rāmacandra’s Prakriyākaumudi with Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa (see bibliography; p. (i) f.) shows that Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s prāc is indeed Vitthala the author of the Prasāda. See further below.

A comparison of the following passages illustrates the contrasting ways in which Bhatṭoja’s Praudha Manoramā and Śesa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakāśa use this term: (i) Bhatṭoja Dīksita, Praudha Manoramā I p. 204: yat tu prācā ’tat-siva ity atra jaśive kṛte, khari ca’ ity uktaṁ / tana ... / yat tu tatpaurtenoktam ‘tado vāvāsāne iti cartve kṛte, paścāc chiva ity anena sambandhe, jhalām jaśo ’nte iti jaśive, khari ca iti cartvam’ iti / tad atisthāvīryah /]. (ii) Rāmacandra, Prakriyākaumudi (ed. Miśra I p. 145; ed. Trivedi I p. 90): tad śiva ity atra jaśive kṛte – khari ca. (iii) Śesa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 146: atra prācoktam ‘tado vāvāsāne iti cartve kṛte paścāc chiva ity anena sambandhe jhalām jaśo ’nte iti jaśive tad śiva iti sthite khari ca iti cartvam’ iti /]. (iv) Vitthala, Prasāda I p. 90: tado vāvāsāne iti cartve kṛte paścāt śiva ity anena sambandhe jhalām jaśone iti / tataś ca tad śiva iti sthite khari ca iti anena cartṿe ... .

The following are examples: (i) Bhatṭoja Dīksita, Śabda-kāstubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 47 1.24–26: atra praṅcāh: thakārasthānīko dhakārasthānīko vā dakāro ‘tra bhāṣyakro vivasītah, ato na pūrvottaravīrodhah iti / ṭajas tv vārttikamate sthitvedam bhāṣyam ato na virodha ity āhuh /]. This concerns P. 3.3.35 ṭodar ap. The explanation of this sūtra referred to in the Śabda-kāstubha is not found in the Kāśikā and its classical commentaries, nor in the Prakriyākaumudi and its commentaries by Vitthala and Śesa Kṛṣṇa. It belongs to Kaiyata (I p. 84 1. 12–13; on Mahā-bh I p. 23 1. 21–22): aṭrāhuh: thakārasthānīko dhakārasthānīko vā dakāro ‘tra vivasītah ‘kas tarih dakārā’ iti. Nothing similar is found in Bhartṛhari’s commentary (Palsule, 1988: 21). (ii) Bhatṭoja Dīksita, Śabda-kāstubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 54 1.23–p. 55 1.2: tathāpy abhyāṣe upadhāmāṇīyasya sēṣe ‘abhyāṣe ca ca’ iti jaśvenā bākāra eva śriyeta / isyate tv abhyāṣe jakāra iti praṅcāh / appears to refer to Kaiyata (I p. 99 1.11–12; on Mahā-bh I p. 28 1.26: yady ubjir upadhāmāṇīyopadadh pathyata ubjījīṣāty eva dvīrvacanam prāṇnoti): upadhāmāṇīyāder iti / yadi
dvirvacane pūrvatra kartaye jaśtvam asiddham athāpi pūrvatrasiddhiyam advirvacana iti siddham, sarvathobibjisafti prāṇotit; Bhaṭṭoji next shows Kāyāta’s position to be wrong.

Occasionally someone else is called prāc, sometimes Patañjali himself. This seems to be the case in the following passage: Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 108 L.3–5: yat tu ‘dvirvacane ’ci’ iti sūtre aci kim? jehṛyiate dedhmiyate iti prācām pratyudhāhanam, tad āpātatah appears to refer to Mahā-bh I p. 155 L.16 (on P. 1.1.59): ajgrahanasyaitat prayojanam iha mā bhūt / jehṛyiate dedhmiyata iti /


Bhaṭṭoji’s use of prāc in the Praudha Manoramā is not fully consistent. Consider the following passages, where he clearly copies Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa in referring to Vitthala in this manner: (i) Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Praudha Manoramā I p. 559: yat tu prāṇaḥ: ‘āpi’ iti kakāravīśesānam / ‘sarvikā’ ityādau tv ekādesasya sthānivadbhāvād akāreṇa vyavadhāne ‘pi vacanasāmarthyād bhaviṣyati iti / tan na / (ii) Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 433: ‘āpi’ iti ... / atah kakāravīśesānam / ... / ‘sarvikā’ ityādau tv ekādesasya sthānivadbhāvād akāreṇa vyavadhāne ‘pi vacanasāmarthyād bhaviṣyati iti prāṇaḥ / vastutas tu ... (iii) Vitthala, Prasāda I p. 328: nanu cāpy anyena kim visēṣyate / yady ucyeta kakāra iti tadā sarvikā kāriketi atrāpi na syāt / akāreṇa vyavadhānāt / na ca vācyam ekādeśe krte nāsti vyavadhānam iti tasya ‘acah parasmin ...’ iti sthānivadbhāvād iti ced ucyate / yena nāvyavadhānam tena vyavahite ‘pi vacanaprāmānyād ity ekena varṇena vyavadhānam aśrīyate /.

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

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


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

Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 335 1.21–22. Occasionally an unspecified plural refers to both Vitthala and Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, as in Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Praudha Manoramā (ed. Sitaram Shastri) p. 434, where yat tu vadanti: ‘evam sati supi ca iti dirghatvam syād’ iti / tan na / rejects an opinion held by both these authors, but whose formulation follows Vitthala (Vitthala, Prasāda I p. 195 1.19–20; Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 293 1.15). For further examples see Sitaram Shastri’s introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā p. (4)–(5) n. 4.


This is clear from Jagannātha’s passage cited in note 43, above. A pupil of Bhaṭṭoji, called Varadarāja, composed several abridgments of the Siddhāntakaumudi. A surviving manuscript of one of those, the Laghusiddhāntakaumudī, dates from 1624 C.E. This text refers to the Śabdakaustubha, but not to the Manoramā in a context where one would expect this. It follows that the Siddhāntakaumudī and the Śabdakaustubha were composed at any rate before 1624. A later work by Varadarāja, the Girvānapadāmanājari, does mention the Manoramā. See Gode, 1941a: 320 ff. Gode points out in another publication (1940: n. 1) that manuscripts of the Praudha Manoramā dating from 1652 and 1657 C.E. have been preserved in the
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. The Manoramā is mentioned in Kaunda Bhatṭa's Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa, an abbreviation of which is the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa; a manuscript of this abbreviation has been preserved which dates from 1650 C.E. (Gode, 1954: 207 f.), another one that dates from 1637 C.E. according to Biswal (1995: 56). A manuscript of the Śabdakaustubha dating from 1633 C.E. has equally been preserved (Gode, 1940: 73).

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

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

Bhatṭoji Dikṣita, Praudha Manoramā I p. 1: dhyāyam dhyāyam param brahma, smāram smāram gūrah gūrah / siddhāntakaumudīvyākhyām kurmah praudhamaṇoramām // Neither Hari Dikṣita’s Bṛhat Saḍāratna nor Nāgėsa’s Laghu Saḍāratna on this passage give the name of Bhatṭoji’s teacher, but both contain the enigmatic specification that the singular gūrah indicates that Bhatṭoji obtained all his knowledge from one single teacher.

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

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

Part of Jagannātha’s Manoramākhaṇḍanarūpā Kucamardini (“She who crushes the nipple [of the lovely woman (manoramā)]”) has been edited; see the bibliography.
A Manoramākhaṇḍana by a certain Keśava is mentioned at NCC vol. 5, p. 60. Nothing seems to be known about this author.

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

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

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


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


Sitaram Shastri’s introduction to his edition of the Praudha Manoramā gives the following romantic description of what supposedly happened in Benares (p. (16)): [e]vam lekhapraklekhādīna navinakhaṇḍanagranthaprayanāndinā iadānim vārāṇasaṃ sabhyasaḥ ṣaḥvidvatamāvayeṣu jānvenīhṛtaṣopanēṣu devaghyasu, vidūṣāṁ kathopakathanesu sahṛdayānām svairagosthibandhesu ca pratirathyam pratimandiram pratikutikotaram ca praudhahanoramam adhikṛtyaiva vicāravani marṣaḥ tara kṣepapratimādhānādikam ca janasamāśmassa śrotṛjanakolāhaṇaḥ preksakavandasadāhuvādakatātādanādibhiḥ ca säkam samrambhena tathā samudiyāya yathā sarvam dināndalam evā kṣubhāntārālam ivāūt. Pathak, 1995: 15, repeats this passage without acknowledgement.

Cp. Manudeva Bhattachārya’s remark in the introduction to his edition of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa’s (Brhad-)Vaiyākaraṇabhasāna (p. 12): yadi nāma śrikauṇḍa-bhaṭṭena brhadbhīṣanavāyākhyāḥ no vyadhāṣyata, tariḥ vaiyākaraṇamantomajjanaṣya majjanaṃ evabhavisyat iti api kalpayitum śaṅkya. Manudeva Bhattachārya is
also of the opinion (p. 16) that the Brhad-Vaiyākaraṇabhūsana contains many citations from lost portions of the Śabdakaustubha. Since the Vaiyākaraṇabhūsana refers to the Manoramā and is therefore later than this text, we cannot be sure that Bhattoji lived to see Kauḍa Bhatta's commentaries on his work.

For references see Manudeva Bhattachārya's commentary Rūpāli on Kauḍa Bhatta's Brhadvaiyākaraṇabhūsana, pp. 328–332.

Joshi, 1993: 10.

References in the Śabdakaustubha to a Bhatta are to the Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila Bhatta. An example is Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 22 l.24: tathā cākṛtyadhiṇkaranē bhāttair uktam: nīyogena vikalpena dve vā saha samuccite / sambandhāḥ samudāyo vā viśīṭa vaikayetarā //, which quotes Kumārila Bhatta's Tantravārttika on sūtra 1.3.30 (TanVār vol. II, p. 234).

The beginning of another work by Bhattoji, the Tattvakaustubha, refers back to this line: phaniḥsāstatabhāṣyābhādheḥ śabdakaustubha uddhrtah / sāṅkarād api bhāṣyābhādheḥ / tattva/kaustubham uddhare // (Gode, 1955: 203).

An indication in the text supporting that the Śabdakaustubha was intended as a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya is the remark to the extent that Kaiyata has described the word-sphota and the sentence-sphota in this very praghāttaka (I p. 8 l. 19–20: padaphotavākya/aphotā tu ṣaiva praghāttake 'yenoccāritena' iti bhāṣya pratikam upādaya kaiyatena bhāṣyārthataya varṇitau). The meaning of praghāttaka must be as noted in the Vācaspatyam (VI p. 4431 s.v. praghāttaka: ekāriḥpatipādaṁārthagraṁhāya/ya/avābhede sāṁ[khya]/praf[ vacana]/bhāṣye drśtām), viz. a portion of a book. In this case a portion of the first Āhnikā of the Mahābhāṣya, because it is there that we find the words yenoccāritena ..., and it is on these words that Kaiyata's speaks about the word-sphota and sentence-sphota.

E.g., Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 22 l.22: yat tu sarūpasūre bhāsyē vaksyate; p. 23 l.7–8: vaksyati hi vārttikakṛt; p. 23 l.33–p. 24 l.1: ata eva bhāsyē vaksyate; p. 33 l.8: vaksyati hi tatra vārttikakāraḥ; p. 46 l.11–12, p. 71 l.26: bhāṣyākāro vaksyati; p. 51 l.27: asiddhavātsūre bhāṣyakṛtā vāṣyāmānatvā[ t]; p. 61 l.4: tathā ca vaksyati 'nud vācyā uttarārtham tu, iha kimeit trapo iti' (= Mahābh III p. 267 l.12, on P. 71 l.73 vt. 3); p. 68 l.10–11: 'iti svaritam' iti sūtre bhāṣyākāraṁ vakṣyamānātvā[ t]; p. 74 l.28–29: 'naveti vibhāsa' iti sūtre bhāṣyākāro vaksyati; p. 75 l.8–9: 'ubhe abhyastam saha' iti sahāgraṇaham vārttikakṛd vaksyati, bhāṣyākāras tuḥbhegraṇaham evaitadartham iti vaksyati etc.

The editor is not quite as explicit in the Sanskrit preface beginning the edition (p. 1): mahāmahopādhyāyabhāṭṭotidikṣitaviracitena śabdakaustubhena samalaiṅkrtam, vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣyam, tadvyākhyānabhūtah kaiyataviracitāh pra-āpāḥ etc.

Uppādhyāya, 1994: 61: ... yaha mahābhāṣyā kā bhī viveca/ka grantha mānā jātā hai.


A systematic search for references in the Śūktaratnākara could not here be undertaken and remains a desideratum. Compare, however, the following passages: (i) Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, Śūktaratnākara p. 123 l.6–8: anye tu Ikāropadeśo ṛvarnayoh sāvavyānityatavajñānāpārthāḥ / tena klpaṭiṣikha ity atr[a] ... puthaḥ sidhyati /; (ii) Bhattoji Dikṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 42 l.30–31: Ikāropadesas tūktaritva klpaṭiṣikhe/putasiddhaye sāvavyānityatām jñāpayitum kartavya ev[a]. See further below.

See Śeṣa Nārāyaṇa, Śūktaratnākara p. 2 v. 6: yah ... prakriyākau-mudarikam ... krtvan ... so 'yam ... śrīkrṣna evāparyah krṣṇah śesanśīnhasūrināyayah ...

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

84 Compare the following two passages: (i) Šēṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa II p. 280 l.9–10: anye tu manvantu ity ekam samudāyam pathanti na tu dvau śabdau / tathā ca bahvrcabrāhmaṇe prayogah ‘mānuntavayam uvāca’ iti /; (ii) Bhattōji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) III p. 71: manvantuśabdō trauma pathyate / samudāya ekā prakṛti / na tu prakṛtidvayam / tathā ca bahvrcabrāhmaṇam / mānuntavayam uvāceti /

85 Compare: (i) Šēṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 28 l.14: anye tu ‘halantyam’ iti sarvam eva sūtram āvarthaṁ /; (ii) Bhattōji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) II p. 56 l.15–16: sampūrṇasūtraṁtyā halsūrasyantyam halantyam iti vā /; This is, incidentally, not the position favored by Bhattōji.

86 Compare: (i) Šēṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 56 l.21–22: anye tu dhātvadhikeṇa kāryavidhānāt sautrāṇām api dhātunām pātho ’numiyate ity āhū /; (ii) Bhattōji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) II p. 50 l.5–7: na caivaṃ sautresv avyāptiḥ / stambhvādirānām utdīkaranena dhātvadhihiyakāryavidhānena ca dhātuvānunmānāt /

87 Compare: (i) Šēṣa Kṛṣṇa, Prakāśa I p. 16 l.20–22: anye tv āhūḥ: ḍhāropadeśa r lvaranyoh sāvannyānyatatvaṁpanāṁratih, tena prakṛpyamānam ity atra vr̥ṇaṁ nasya natvam na bhavati, klpaśikhaḥ ity atra cāṁṭa iti plutaṁpratisadho na bhavati; (ii) Bhattōji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 42 l.30–31: ḍhāropadeśas tūktaritīya klpaśikhe plutasiddhayē sāvannyānyatāṁ jīiṭpayuṁ kartavyā ev[a]; cp. note 80, above. The part prakṛpyamānam ity atra vr̥ṇaṁ nasya natvam na bhavati has nothing corresponding to it in the relevant part of the Śabdakaustubha.

88 Bhattōji Dīkṣita, Śabdakaustubha (ed. Nene et al.) I p. 114 l.16. The sentence which Bhattōji ascribes to Šēṣa Kṛṣṇa’s Prakriyāprakāśa occurs in that work under P. 8.4.40 sthō ṣcunā ṣcuh (vol. I p. 138 l.18).

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

90 Mīmāṁsaka, sam. 2030: l. 488 f.

91 He says, for example, in his Kucamardini (ed. Sadāshiva Sharma p. 2 l.21; ed. Madhusudana p. 4 l.3): amum cārtham ‘anudī’ sūtragatakauṣṭhubhakhaḍanāvyāsare vyaktam upapādayisyām. Further ed. Sadāshiva Sharma p. 21 l.14, ed. Madhu-
sudana p. 43 l.11–12: *adhiyak kaustubhakahanandāv avaseyam*. Note however that Jagannātha frequently criticizes the Kaustubha in his Kucamardini.

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

101 Cp. Sherring, 1868: 346–47: “One of the principal reasons that Benares is so famous is, that it was formerly the resort of large numbers of Brahmans, who, divided into schools and colleges, pursued the study of the ancient Sanskrit writings. At one time there were many hundreds of such establishments, in which thousands of
students were taught the philosophical tenets of Hinduism; and princes and nobles, in all parts of India, vied with each other in the support they rendered to the priests and pandits of Benares, and to the numerous Sanskrit colleges established in it. Enormous sums were annually given for this purpose, so that learned pandits and their disciples were alike nourished and cared for. Such munificence to teachers and pupils naturally attracted to Benares aspiring young Brahmans, from every province of India, who, receiving a thorough education in certain branches of philosophy, during their long and severe course of study, returned, eventually, to their native villages and towns, and became great local authorities on all religious topics, and the defenders and expounders of the national creed.” Sherring further indicates that, “especially since the mutiny, the amount of ... support has greatly diminished” (p. 347).

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

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

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


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

Smith, 1902: 423.

Cp. Richards, 1993: 19 ff.; Spear, 1973: 31–34: “Akbar’s stroke was to raise himself from the position of a leader of a minority Indo-foreign group (the Muslims) to the accepted ruler of all Hindustan. The previous sultans of Delhi had, it is true, employed Hindus largely in their administration and used Hindu contingents in their wars, but they were always subordinate with no say in policy, the troops mercenaries to be hired and fired. ... Akbar’s method was to make a deal with the Hindus and to do this through their militant representatives, the Rajputs. ... The Rajputs were not only concentrated in Rajasthan, the area of their continued independence, but scattered all over north India as chiefs and groups of sturdy cultivators. They were the spearhead of Hinduism as the Brahmans were the mind. ... [B]y a series of understandings Akbar brought the Rajput chiefs into the service of the empire. In effect the Rajputs were to be given high office and imperial honours in return for allegiance and loyal service. The method was the employment of Rajput chiefs as military commanders, provincial governors, and members of Akbar’s confidential circle or ‘privy council’. ... Thus in effect the Rajputs became partners in the empire and through them the whole Hindu community came to accept the Mughal government as in some sense their own.” Cp. also Dalmia, 1997: 67: “The revenue-paying patterns estimated by the information given in the Ain-e-Akbarī for the districts of Jaunpur, Ghazipur-Ballia and Banaras, according to Bernhard (sic) Cohn [(1969: 347)], were roughly 50 percent Rajputs, 30 percent Bhūmihar, 11 percent
Brahmans and 3 percent Muslims, though in the Banaras region the Bhūmihars owned as much as 79 percent of the land.” (p. 65–66: “The Bhūmihars were a caste settled mainly in what is today western Bihar and eastern Uttar Pradesh. They had always tended to claim Brahmanical status, but they did not carry out priestly functions and were essentially landed classes with distinct customs and practices.”) See further Cohn, 1969: 346–349: “[The] position [of Rajputs] as land controllers and revenue payers was usually based on conquests of semi-aboriginal tribes ... in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries and of other Rajput clans or of Muslim jagirdars from pre-Mughal times. ... In general, Rajputs were replacing Muslim families as zamindars during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.”

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

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

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

112 NCC vol. 5, p. 92, with reference to Adyar D. VI.560, and following dates: 1619–1631 A.D. for Vidyādhīṣayati and 1592–1629 A.D. for Venkatappa. This information is no doubt based on the following verse which occurs at the end of Kaunda Bhatta’s Brhadvaiyākaraṇabhūṣana (p. 331): vidyādhīṣavaḍerausaṇīnjakayatim śrī
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Bhattoji Diksita on Sphota


Nāgēśa Bhattachā: Rasagāṅgādharatikā. See under Jagannātha.


Śeṣa Krṣṇa: Prakriyāprakāśa. For the edition used, see Rāmacandra.


Vīttalā: *Prakriyāprāśāda*. For the edition used, see Rāmacandra.


**ABBREVIATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>Ānandārama Sanskrit Series, Poona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māhā-bh</td>
<td>Patañjali, (Vyākaraṇa-) Mahābhāṣya, ed. F. Kielhorn, Bombay 1880–1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TanVār</td>
<td>Tantravārttika of Kumārilabhaṭṭa (ASS, 97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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