BRIEF ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENT DHĀṬUPĀṬHAS

Coming to the individual classes, classes I and X show considerable difference with those in the P.Dh. Thus in the class I there are only 21451 roots as against 1050 of P. A strange feature of the arrangement of roots in this class is the complete absence of any order in it. All sorts of roots, seṭ and aniṭ, vocalics and consonants and roots conjugated in different voices have been thrown together. The Anubandhas a and ṣ appear, indicating respectively the āṭmanepadīn and the ubhayapadīn roots ending in vowels, but there is no indication whatsoever as to the voice in which a root ending in a consonant is conjugated as, apart from the absence of Anubandhas, the usual statements (viz. such and such roots are parasmaipadīs... etc.) also are conspicuous by their absence. Ten roots32 appear twice, and one, viz. bhū even thrice (1, 17, 148). On the other hand it is very curious that out of the 74 roots in the ghaṭ- sub-class only one, viz. the first root ghaṭ appears here. Then the antargaṇas are not given, separately though a few roots forming these are read here.

Similarly in the X class, yuj and katha sub-classes consist of 9 and 26 roots respectively as against 46 and 86 respectively of P.

In classes II—IX certain points are worth noticing. Some roots which have been read by P in the bhū- class follow optionally, necessarily, or under certain circumstances, different conjugation. Such roots have been removed to their proper classes. Thus the roots śru, akṣ and takṣ (also tvakṣ33) have been read in the fifth or the su- class; roots śchnu and kṛṣu (also ñhu and jñu)34 are read in the eighth or the tvā-class; the sāutra roots stambh, stambhab, skambh and skambhab are read in the ninth or the kṛ- class; and lastly the sūtra 'śā dhraṇa-bhādā'- etc. which enumerates the roots belonging to the div- class optionally, and which is read in the sūtra-pāṭha by other schools is read here in the Dāṭupāṭha, and that too twice (IV, 9-15; 147-154).

Another important point to note is that the vikaraṇas as mentioned here at the end of each class, correspond, not to those given by Śarvavarman in the sūtrapāṭha (yeva, du, ña etc.), but to those which are found in the Pāñinian system (śyen, śnu, śa etc.). There are some minor mistakes committed by the Tibetan translator. He has made a confusion between 'asana' and 'āśana'. Twice, he has mis-

---

30. 'The name of the translator is given as Mañjūṣudā-Khaḍgā.
31. And even this figure includes double occurrences of some roots.
32. gati (28.28), vadd (35.147), path (37.144), āṣṭh (37.143), bhṛṣā (76.121), dhvāna (77.122), svabhā (78.123), damā (79.124), aṇā (89.125), and ṣṛ (105.141).
33. Unlike P.
taken meanings for roots; thus, rujā which is a part of the meaning rujā-viśaraṇa-gatīvivāsādāneṇu assigned to the root ṣaṭ is torn off and given as a separate root along with ṣaṭ (Śa. Dh. I, 173), the meaning viśaraṇa-going with both.34 Further, as though this were not enough, avāsādana ‘dishearten’, is split into avāsa ‘not living’ and adana ‘eating’. Similarly vṛata gāturcūrāne is given as vṛata gātra cūrāne (X, 262). On the other hand the sūtra basta gandha ardane (P. Dh. X, 144.145) is read as basta gandhādane (X, 122) (i.e. gandha is taken as a part of the meaning). In the X class he reads yuj (215) and bicch (203) along-side yuj and bicch. A peculiar addition is that of an ātmanepadīn root kṣi (32) in the IV class, whereas kṣi is only a passive or reflexive stem from the root kṣi.

Roots peculiar to the Veda are not read in this dhātupāta except √ṛ (III, 14).

An Examination of the so-called Šarva-varman’s Dhātupātha

Now let us examine the above dhātupāta, and see how far the claim that it represents the original Dhātupāta. of Śarva-varman is tenable. At the outset we note that Śarva-varman is nowhere specifically mentioned as the author of this work. The work is only styled as ‘Kalāpādāhūtrāsūtra’.35 So all that this may mean is that this dhātupāta was believed by some as belonging to the Kāṭāntara or the Kalāpā system at some stage in its history. It does not follow that this is the original dhātupāta of the system.

Secondly, the set of vikaraṇas of the ten classes as given at the end of each class strongly militates against the claim of this dhātupāta, having come from the pen of the originator of the Kāṭāntara system. The vikaraṇas are all (with the sole exception of that of the first class, which is a doubtful case and to which we shall shortly return) the same as belonging to the Pāṇiniian system, and not those as are stated by Śarva-varman in the Kāṭāntara Sūtrapāṭha. Thus āyu, ānu, ā, ē, ēnu and ēna- vikaraṇas of classes IV-VII and IX—are furnished with the Anubandha ś. But what purpose does it serve here? In the Pāṇiniian system it has a definite purpose. A verbal

34. Curiously enough, the same mistake is found in the Kāśākṣāsma Dh. (I.87) also.

35. As opposed to this the current dhātupāta of the Kāṭāntara school is distinctly ascribed to Śarva-varman. Cf. the initial stanza: dhātupāṭhāṃ kṛto yena kāṭāntaropāyasthādāhyayasya/tasmāi rocayati sātu vivaśe satistuḥ śarva-varmanas/ How far such statements are to be relied upon is a different thing. Of the 3 Ms. I have used, only the Devāṅgāra Ms. of the BORI reads the stanza. The two Bengali Ms. of the India Office Library do not read it.
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suffix which is śit—which has a ś affixed to it—gets the nomenclature sārvadāhūtaka through P 3, 4, 113. A sārvadāhūtaka affix, further, when it is not pit—when it has no p affixed to it—becomes as good as a śīt (weak) affix (P 1,2,4) and thus prevents the guna of the radical syllable. That is how in the Pāṇiniian system provision is made to account for the absence of guna of the radical vowel in forms like ṛṇyati, sūnditi, tudati, ruṇddhi or kṛṇati, although a guna is expected here by the general rule sārvadāhūtukār-

dhāhūtukāṣṇaḥ (P 7, 3, 84). Does the furnishing of the vikaraṇa with the anubandha ś serve any such purpose in the Kāṭāntara system? No, because the technique of Śarva-varman in this matter is quite different. His general rule nāmāntaṇaḥ dhātusvārakaṇaṁ gūṇaḥ (3.5.1) laying down a guna when an ending follows is restricted in the case of the vikaraṇas to an by Śa. 3.5.3. So we have the above forms like ṛṇyati etc. without guna. To prevent further the guna taking place in forms like tudati where also the vikaraṇa is an, Śa. frames a special rule tudād anī (3.5.25). With these provisions in the Sūtrap to prevent guna in the undesirable places, the furnishing of the anubandha ś for the same purpose becomes superfluous and consequently could not have originated from Śarva-varman. (On the other hand, the same vikaraṇas are given in the traditional dhātupāta, which was evidently so arranged as to agree with the ancient sūtrap, as yan, nu, aguṇa an, na-kabda and nā-kabda—i.e. without a ś and agreeing thus with those in the Sūtrapāṭha).

The same is the case of the vikaraṇa of the third or the hu-class, which is given as śu i.e. the same as in the Pāṇiniian system. Now in the latter school it is meant to secure elision of the general vikaraṇa śap (P 2.4.75) and also to provide for a reduplication of the root syllable (P 6.1.10). But in the Kāṭāntara system it serves neither of these purposes. The reduplication of the radical syllable of the juhotyādi roots is laid down in Śa. 3.3.8 while the elision of the vikaraṇa is secured by the rule addād luk vikaraṇasya (3.4.32) itself, because in the Kāṭāntara system hu-class is not a separate one, but just a sub-class of the ad-class—addādyantarasm juhotyādiḥ, as Durga says.37 The reading of a separate class hu and assigning the vikaraṇa śu to it, is therefore not from the pen of Śarva-varman. (In the traditional dhātupāta on the other hand, hu-class is read within the ad-class. The concluding remark there reads: yṛ juhotyādiḥ, iti layukaraṇaḥ

36. Cf. Durga under this rule: nāmaṇa upādāḥ nāmāntaṇasya ca sa eva vikaraṇe gūṇa bhūnitaḥ, roote vartate bhūnati nayati. eva eva vikaraṇe iti kiṁ? nṛtyati sūnditi kṛṇati puṣaṇa.

37. Under Śa. 3.4.92.
in his Vārttikas, of which, to give only one instance, there are no less than sixty-six under one rule (3.2.42) alone. In the present case also it is just possible that Sa. gave only general rules about the vikaraṇas, and later on somebody filled in the details by making the necessary changes in the dhātup. much the same as Durga did it in his own way by framing Vārttikas supplementary to the sūtras.

Considering all these things, I am of opinion that the evidence does not warrant the claim that the dhātup. in question is the original dhātup. of Sarvarman—on the contrary it definitely goes against it. How in Tanjur it came to be associated with the Kalāpa school, is difficult to say.

**Cāndra Dhatupāṭha** 39

A major innovation introduced by Candra is that for every root he gives, as a rule, only one meaning. Where a number of meanings had been assigned to a root before, usually the first of these is retained by Candra.

In a very small number of cases we find two meanings given to a root either expressly 40 or by a ca added after a meaning, 41 probably through inadvertance.

Another important change is that Candra gives up the use of accents, both on the root and on the Anubandha syllable. The voice is indicated by the descriptive statements at the bottom of the sections, each section containing only roots belonging to a particular pāda. His terms taṇāṇīn, atāṇāṇa 42 and vibhāṣaṇa 43 correspond to Pāṇini’s áṭmanepadīn, paraśmaipadīn and ubhaya-padīn respectively.

Similarly he frames special rules in the Sūtrap. (V, 4) to indicate the roots which take and those which do not take the union-vowel i before an árdhādhātuka affix.

In the arrangement of roots in the first class, again, he differs from Pāṇini. I, 1-305 are all paraśmaipadīn roots (in the same order as Pāṇini, viz. dentals, gutturals etc.), 306-522 all áṭmanepadīns (again in the same order; with 496 begin the sub-classes).

---

38. bhṛdās-bhṛdās-bhrāmu-krāmu-trāṣṭ-jaṭṣṭi-jaṭṣṭi-vibhūṣheṣ ca under 3.2.33, etc.

39. Published by Liebich in his *Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa* (pp. 1-34), Leipzig, 1902.
40. e.g. C.Dh. I, 569; 597.
41. e.g. C.Dh. I, 348; 350.
42. The terms taṇāṇīn and atāṇāṇa were evidently suggested to Candra by Pāṇini’s rule teṣāṇa áṭmanepadam (P 1,4,100), Technique I, pp. 102-103.
43. The term appears in the P.Dh. also in the sūtra śaka vibhāṣito maresne (IV, 78), where it is interpreted variously by the commentators, one of the interpretations, being that the paraśmaipada is made optional here.
In the other classes also C follows the principle of grouping together the roots taking the same pada. He also brings together in a śūtra roots having the same meaning, thus effecting economy(44) (though this is not carried to the logical extent).

Candra's difference from P is most conspicuous in the X class. Firstly, as against about 395 roots of Pāṇini in this class, Candra has only about 114. He does not read what are apparently denominatives(45) He also does away with the sub-sections ākṣusmīta, āvadīya, ādīrśya (yugdī) and the kathādī (with the sub-section āgāravīya). The big group of bhāṣārtha (v. l. bhāṣāra) is also naturally missing.

On the whole, Candra's Dhātupāṭha does not differ much from Pāṇini's. He retains the śūtras like 'ghāṣṭdasya mītaḥ' etc., 'yāniki' and those at the end of the X class, which others (except Kx, Kt.) properly shift to the Sūtrapāṭha.

There is only one anubandha of P which is dropped by C viz. सि. Jainendra Dhātupāṭha(46)

This dhātup, has a still different order in the first class. It reads all the ātmanepadī (वादित in J's terminology) roots first, then paramapadī (called maṇvantā), and lastly the ubhayapadīn (सि)—an order which Śāktyavarna entirely follows. (By the way, J retains the root भास at its wonted top place, though he reads the section of the ātmanepadī roots first whereas Sā, who follows the same order, goes one better and removes भास to its proper place viz. paramapadī roots in सि).

In the order of classes, the hā- class precedes the ad- class. In the case of others, the old order remains.

As regards the Anubandhas, J employs two Anubandhas not used by his predecessors, viz. अ (to denote the ātmanepada) and ए (to denote an anūt root, this ए being later used for exactly the same purpose by Vopadeva also). A peculiarity as regards anubandhas in J is that he actually reads the anubandhas η and ο after all those roots which have them while P partly reads them and partly only declares, without actually adding them, certain roots as having those anubandhas. (Here Sā follows him in the case of the anubandhas η, but not in the case of ο).

With regard to meaning, J sometimes modifies the traditional meanings so as to effect economy (using mukhaikadēsē for vadayalika(45) (मुक्खाकादेशे); gupta for raksau (गुप्त) etc., or to give them in a proper form (dāšane for dandāśuke (वक्षडे); sākane for sākāyām (व्रग) etc.) or to make them more clear (ucchiḥ sābe for sābe tāre etc.) He also seems fond of action nouns in -ti (thus he prefers drṣṭau to dārake, gṛhyata to dātne, viṣikhitau to vikhyate etc.) Lastly in a few cases, the meanings are altogether different (e.g. śāthiḥye against drṣṭalaye (वक्षडे); sākṣobhē against saṁcālāne (वक्षडे) etc.)

In the tenth class, J discontinues the practice of reading roots like sūtra, mūtra etc. (i.e. roots ending in a conjunct) with a final a, since it serves no practical purpose. Here also Sā follows him.

The tenth class is broadly divided into two sections, (1) roots which belong to the tenth class alone (1-312), and (2) roots which belong to this class only optionally (313-351). Each of these two groups is further divided into the usual 3 groups, paramapadīs (1-263, and 313-342), ātmanepadīs (264-311 and 343-348) and ubhayapadīs (312 and 349-351).

J does not read roots restricted to the Vedic use.

The Jainendra grammar has come down in two recensions, a shorter one which is commented on by Abhayanandin, and a longer one with the commentary Śaṅkāravandikārī of Somadeva. The shorter version is quite insufficient, the deficiency being filled by Abhayanandin with his Vārttikas. The longer recension is a complete one and it is to this recension that the extinct J Dh belongs. The dhātup. of the shorter recension, if there was one, has not apparently come down. The roots cited in Abhayanandin's commentary agree with those in the P.Dh. even including the same use of the accents to denote voice and the presence or absence of the union vowel i. This would show that the shorter version had no dhātup. of its own. The Śaṅkāravandikārī dhātup, however, abandons the use of accents, and uses throughout a to denote ubhayapada, and ㎟ to denote ātmanepada while the absence of any of these signs denotes paramapada, roots belonging to this last category being called mahantāḥ in the dhātup. Whereas, on the one hand, it is impossible that a new system should not have its own dhātup, or that a Jain author belonging to a comparatively later age should resort to the use of accents for a technical purpose, on the other hand it is very
likely that the present dhatu has undergone a subsequent revision and has received a considerable addition. This is particularly so in view of the fact that it contains a number of roots which are a creation of a later age and are missing even in the Sākṣatyaṇa dhātup. (e.g. khrud, manth, etc.) which usually follows J.

Kāṣākṛṣṇa Dhatupāṭha 48

This dhatupāṭha is a recent discovery. The students of Sanskrit grammar already know one Kāṣākṛṣṇa, 49 references to whom or to whose work are found occasionally in the Sanskrit grammatical literature. 50 A few quotations from his work are found scattered in different Sanskrit works. 51 This is all that was so far known about Kāṣākṛṣṇa. This is the first time that a whole work going by his name has been discovered.

48. Kāṣākṛṣṇa-Ābda-Kalpa Dhatupāṭheśa of Cannavirakavi, ed. by A. N. Narsimha, pub. in the ‘Sources of Indo-Aryan Lexicography’ Series by Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Poona, 1962. Cannavirakavi is only the name of the author of the Kannada commentary which is also printed along with the text. The edition is in the Kannada characters in which both the ed. on which the ed. is based, were written.

49. Mimamsaka Sattras, I, p. 79, has raised a subtle point by saying that the word Kāṣākṛṣṇa as the name of a system of grammar presupposes (by P 4.2.112) Kāṣākṛṣṇi as the name of the author, and not Kāṣākṛṣṇa which, by P 4.2.114, would give the form Kāṣākṛṣṇi as the name of the grammar. But since Kāṣākṛṣṇa actually appears as the name of the grammarian, he concludes that the same author was sometimes referred to by the name Kāṣākṛṣṇa, and sometimes by Kāṣākṛṣṇi. It seem, however, that it is not quite imperative to bring in Kāṣākṛṣṇi. The form Kāṣākṛṣṇa (grammar) can be derived from the base Kāṣākṛṣṇa (author) itself by resorting to abhedopacara, just as Bhātījī does in the case of the word ‘ādhibhūta’ (bhāṣya) in the Kaumudī (under P 4 IV, iii, 87). It is also worth considering whether, on the basis of the Vārttika of ṇāmaśeṣavarga vṛddhāśaṅkā vaitkṣap, the word Kāṣākṛṣṇa (author) could not optionally cease to be technically called vṛddhā, in which case Kāṣākṛṣṇa becomes as legitimate as Kāṣākṛṣṇa as denoting the work of Kāṣākṛṣṇa.

50. The Kāṣākṛṣṇa system of grammar is referred to in the Bhāṣya Vol. I, p. 12. From remarks like ‘tridhā Kāṣākṛṣṇam’ (Candavruttī 3.1,42) and ‘ādite kāṣākṛṣṇam’ (Kāśikā to P 5.1.28) it appears that Kāṣākṛṣṇa’s work consisted of three Adhidhyāyas. It also seems that he was the first to introduce the principle of brevity (ūpākāra) in the construction of the grammatical rules, cf. the oft-quoted statement ‘Kāṣākṛṣṇam puruṣā-pūrṇam’ (Kāśikā to P 4.1.115; Comm. to BKSB 4.3.244; Comm. to Šā. 3.1.39). In his comm. to Bhāṣya under P 2.1.50 and 5.1.50 Kāṣākṛṣṇa cites two rules of Kāṣākṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇavāmin (quoted by Sāyana in the M. Dh.) in his comm. to P. Dh. II, 60 says that the followers of Kāṣākṛṣṇa have the form vāttra. Vopadeva (Kkīd. 2) mentions Kāṣākṛṣṇa as one of the ‘āḍābādikas’.

51. For a good collection of these, see Mimamsaka, Sattras, I, p. 84.
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It must, however, be stated at the outset that the present work cannot have come from this Kāṣākṛṣṇa known so far—the ādābādikas Kāṣākṛṣṇa, to use Vopadeva’s term. He is usually supposed to be anterior to Pāṇinī, evidently owing to the association of his name with that of Āpiṣāli in the grammatical literature. But unlike Āpiṣāli he is not mentioned by Pāṇinī in the Aṣṭādhyāyī and so some have disputed that claim. 52 Anyway the work which we have now before us must be certainly a post-Pāṇinīan work since it uses all the twenty-one Anubandhas of Pāṇinī’s dhatup exactly in the same sense. It does not reject any of Pāṇinī’s Anubandhas nor does it add any. This single fact suggests strongly that the author of the present dhatup has built on Pāṇinī and consequently he must have come after Pāṇinī. It cannot be argued that it is Āpiṣāli who borrowed from Kāṣākṛṣṇa since such a wholesale borrowing on the part of P is unthinkable. Besides, Patañjali (under P 7.1.18) expressly tells us that P does not make use of the Anubandhas of his predecessors. 53

Further, there are other circumstances which would show that our work belongs to a still later date. Thus the set of meanings assigned to the roots here is almost the same as given by Bhāmasena and so cannot be earlier than the beginning of the Christian era, which is approximately the date of Bhāmasena.

Coming to the arrangement of roots, it has striking resemblance with the traditional Kāṭāntra dhatu. Lastly, many of the roots in this dhatu, like dhunḍā (I, 191) daṣ (X, 50), dīṣ (X, 48) etc., seem to be of a very late origin. In fact this is the most inflated of the Dhatuśāṭhas. All these things would tend to show that the present dhatupāṭha—at least in the form in which we have it now—is the product of a very late age and cannot have come from the pen of the ancient Kāṣākṛṣṇa who in any case was anterior to Patañjali. For all practical purposes the present dhatu may be assigned to a period not earlier than 600 A.D.

It will be advisable to give here some aspects of the work in detail because, firstly, the work, which is a new discovery, has been printed for the first time and, secondly, the Kāṇḍa script is unfortunately retained in the printed edition.

52. Chatterji, Technique I, p. 2.

53. This statement of Patañjali is, of course, true only to a certain extent. There are many Anubandhas in the Pāṇinīan system which were used by his predecessors for the identical purpose; see particularly in this respect Mangala Deva Shastri, The relation of Pāṇinī’s technical devices to his predecessors, Proceedings of the 4th Oriental Conference, Vol. II. pp. 699-742.
At the end of every Present class there is a colophon which gives minute details about the commentator. The final colophon runs thus:

\[ \text{iti śrīYaṅgṣiṣāraḥbhāṣyopapādasīnas} \]

TittiraYajuḥākāḥdāyayanyasya Vāmadевamukhodbhātasya
Gajakarasuprasya Atrigotrasya Viṃmēhavarantarāṇasūtrasārya
Śivalakāmānacanapāṇīdīrādhyayaparavarsasya Kokilā-
kunḍapurasāya mahāmāthasya Saṅgaguruśaśva
nandayambākumārasya Tumukūraṃmahāmāthakahankhārārya-
pitṛya Nambyaṇaguruḥariṇājātasya Sahuḍikāṣaka-
Kaladinagarasamīpasya gāḍēkasāya Kuṇḍikāpurasya
Kāśikāśa- Cannavirāvakṛtyau Śākakṛṣṇa-sabdaśakalāpasya
dvādaśasahasradhātupāṭhasya Karṇaṭaṭikāyām in-vikaraṇā
curādī. samāptam.

As said above, this dhātupāṭha has striking affinities with the Daurge dhātup, of the Kāṭāntra grammar. Thus, both treat hū class as a subclass of ad-class. In both, the order of roots in all classes is the same. In both, the wording of three dhātu-sūtras55 in the ghaṭāḍi subclass which differs from P and C is identical. Both agree in the matter of omission and inclusion of certain roots (e.g. both read \( \sqrt{v} \) after \( \sqrt{k} \); both read roots like huel, dhrulu, mṛt (for mṛt), \( i \) which are not read by any other schools), in assigning meanings different from others (thus both assign only one meaning viz. pālana to \( \sqrt{v}a\)\( v \) against the nineteen meanings of all other schools; saukhya against sukhe to \( \sqrt{v}\)hand; asvādyaye against samādyaye to \( \sqrt{v}c \); jignāhāyām against ākandane (or hināyām, etc.). Sometimes this relationship extends even to minor things—and indeed even to discrepancies (thus both assign the meaning kathana against kathana of others to \( \sqrt{v}\)abh; both read \( \sqrt{smav} \) twice (Kk, I 227 and 262; Kt, I, 163 and 196b), both read erroneously saka mṛṣa kṣamāyānī ca (Kk, IV, 115; Kt, 118) instead of saka kṣamāyān, mṛṣa ca, or saka mṛṣa ca kṣamāyām).

The only difference which Kk. shows from the Kāṭāntra dhātup, consists in reading about 500 roots of a rather odd character which have no

55. This must be amended into hase b krtau; otherwise there arises the absurd position of all the previous adjectives in genitive, which are meant to qualify Cannavirakvi, going with dhātupāṭhasa.

56. āvula-āvula-āvula-namo'nuṣaparā 'a and the following two. Whereas the compounds end in genitive in P and C, they end in nominative in Kk. and Kt.
parallel anywhere. Some of these roots are added by extending the present sūtras (i.e. new roots are added against an old meaning) while in the case of many others new sūtras (i.e. both roots and meanings) are framed. A good many of these are evidently meant to supply a verbal basis for certain derivatives which are supposed to be derived from them while a few are cases of error, pure and simple. The anubandhas, e.g. are erroneously taken as roots. Thus the root mim-γ is separated into two roots mi and mγ, the commute giving the two forms māyati and mārti (?). The root o-vai is read as u vai with the forms avatī and vāyati. Even the preverbs are mistaken for roots. Thus sti is given as a root with the meaning krama-himasyoḥ whereas really speaking atikrama-himasyoḥ is the meaning of the root sti (which is here given as stid); sūtra K, 173 reads as bhū kṛp ava avakṛtīpuna where the first ava is really an erroneous repetition of the preverb ava—(forming a part of the meaning) turned into a root.

If one ignores this mass of additional roots, then what remains is nothing but the Kt. Dh. There is a highly significant fact to be noted in this connection. The name of this dhātup is as it appears in the final colophon of the commentary is Kāśākṛtāṇa-abāda-Kālāpa. Now it will at once be recalled that Kalāpa is also another name of Kāntantra. The commentator might have deliberately used this name to suggest that the dhātup, which he has commented upon is just a version of the Kalāpa or the Kāntantra dhātup.

There is another aspect of this question. The commentary has quoted a number of sūtras, evidently from the Kāsākṛtāṇa grammar, in the course of its explanations. On an examination of these sūtras it is found that they betray a strong affinity with the Kāntantra grammar. Indeed a number of the sūtras and technical terms are identical with those in Kāntantra. This shows that the whole system of the Kāsākṛtāṇa grammar is just another version of the Kāntantra grammar.

57. See in this connection the present writer’s paper entitled ‘A Glimpse into the Kāśākṛtāṇa School of Sanskrit Grammar’ read before the 17th session of the All-India Oriental Conference at Ahmedabad, 1953. As this paper is not printed so far, I quote from it a few instances here. Some technical terms used by Kk. which do not appear in Pāṇini and are otherwise first seen in the Kāntantra are: ophoṣa, svānbandha, svapārga, svamudaṭhukas, kavarga etc., caturaśa, bhūṣa, nāmīna, vihareṇa, svam-dhāyaṇa, samāna, naur. The common vikaraṇa are: en, anu luk, yun, ni, nī and in. The common sūtras are: pibha (Kk. p. 11 = Kt. 3.6.70), dhamo dhūmā (Kk. 71 = Kt. 3.6.72), ‘mo mano’ and dhamo yogca (Kk. 71 = Kt. 3.6.74-75), dhoṣam udhabhaṅgatam (Kk. 175 = Kt. 3.3.5), vyādhi dēvaṣa (Kk. 300 = Kt. 3.6.49) etc.—Of course there are also a number of technical terms and sūtras which are not found in any other known school of Skt. grammar, including even the Kāntantra.

58. I have no knowledge of any publication of this dhātup. so far. I have here used chiefly BORCH’S devāngāri Ms. No. 252 of 1884-86. Two Bengali Ms. of the India Office Library, viz., No. 773 and 774 were also constantly consulted.


60. Though all these three sections appear in the current Kt. grammar, and are commented on by Durgāsinha, they did not come from the pen of Sarvavarman, but are later additions, see LIEBICH, Einführung, 1, 17; Kt. p. 233.
both the sets of endings. Now what exactly do the expressions rucādi and yajādi mean? Obviously they do not refer to the gaṇas or classes in the usual sense of the term. While the roots ruc and yaj belong to the first class, atmanepad and ubhayanapad roots are scattered over all the ten classes, and so it is impossible to form gaṇas of such roots. Taking, therefore, the word dādi in the sense of prākāra ‘similarity’, Durgā interprets the word rucādi to mean ‘roots with an anudatta anubandha-vowel’, the term yajādi is similarly explained as meaning ‘roots with a sammākāra (i.e. svarita) anubandha- vowel’.61 Now are we to understand from this that Sa. had his own dhātup and that in this dhātup, accents on the anubandha-vowels were actually used to indicate the pada of the roots? I hardly think so. Sa. has nowhere taught accents in the grammar and so it is inconceivable that he would employ these for technical purposes in the dhātup. Secondly, if he had actually used the accents in the dhātup, then in the sūtrap, he would have straightway said e.g., something like anudattāṁanubandhakheṣṭhaṁ (3,2,42) instead of using the round-about expression rucādi62. I think that Sa. had no dhātup of his own at all and that when occasion arose he referred to the P. Dh.

It is true that such an outright denial of any dhātup, originating from the founder of the Kātantra school might not be compatible with some features of the Kātantra grammar where it differs from the Pāṇinian school. For instance, there is no rule in the Kt. sūtrap, which teaches directly the dropping of the vikaraṇa (en) in the case of roots belonging to the third i.e. hū class, Sa. 3, 4, 92 covering only the ad class. But in his commentary to this rule Durgā cites, along with ati and hasti, also forms like jukoti and bhihiti, remarking that hū-class is a sub-class of the ad-class (adāyantar-gaṇo jukoti adītī)63. From this one would naturally be led to believe that Sa. had his own dhātup, and that therein he had read hū-class as a sub-class of the ad-class, thus dispensing with a reference to it in the sūtra 3, 4, 92. I feel, however, that the position can be explained otherwise. The omission of a statement in the sūtrap, declaring the hū-class to be a sub-class of the ad-class might have been inadvertent and subsequently rectified in the oral vṛtti until finally the hū-class came to be actually read within the ad-class in the traditional Kt. dhātup. There are many other similar cases of inconsistency or mistakes of omission in the Kt. Thus Sa. 3,6,1 speaks of roots with the anubandha i, but actually it is nowhere taught in the

61. rucā śty anudattāṁ anubandhakheṣṭhaṁ, under 3,2,42; anubandhakheṣṭha ye te yajāsāyaṁ, under 3,2,45.
62. The reduplication is taught in Sa. 3,3,8.
for explanations, it might be inferred from this that Durga had also written a commentary on his dhātupāṭhas.

Lintenschmidt, followed by almost all the modern scholars, says that Durga's dhātupāṭha is really just the revised and remodelled Candra dhātupāṭha itself. It is not clear what direct evidence Lintenschmidt had on the strength of which his statement is based, but there are certainly some points of resemblance between the two dhātupāṭhas which suggest that Durga had Candra's dhātupāṭha before him and that he adopted some of its features which had impressed him. The striking resemblance which the Kt. Dh. everywhere (except in the class X) bears with the C.Dh. (as against the P. Dh.) in the matter of arrangement of roots will be patent even to the most casual reader. Occasionally, though rarely, Durga prefers meanings in the C.Dh. to those in the P.Dh.77 Also, Candra's peculiar term for the ubhayapadin, viz. vībhāsita is frequently met with in the Kt. dhātupāṭha. there is one point in the tenth class which bears the most eloquent testimony to the close affinity between these two dhātupāṭhas. Along with many other roots the yuvāḍi class of roots i.e. those belonging to the cur- class optionally, are not read by Candra. In his dhātupāṭha Durga also first gives all the regular roots of this class at the end of which he remarks: keśi keśi ute yuvāḍiṇaḥ pāṭhaṇaṇa.68 and then reads the yuvāḍi roots. This shows that he generally regarded C.Dh. as the model, and therefore was not very enthusiastic about reading the yuvāḍi roots in the tenth class.

Durga has taken proper care to see that the dhātupāṭha, which he wrote conformed to the Kt. śātrap, and that there was no discrepancy. The agreement of vikaranas, inclusion of the jāhoṭāḍi class in the addi class etc. fully demonstrate this.

The Kt. dhātupāṭha however differs from the Candra Dh. in two important respects: firstly, the meanings given by Bhūmasena are, as a rule, retained, and not curtailed as in C.69 secondly, the tenth class is not curtailed but given fully. As regards anubandhas, ifi, the only anubandha which was rejected by Candra, is restored by Durga.

66. The NGGW 1885, where Lintenschmidt has made the statement, was not available to me.
67. Cf. e.g., keśi vībhāsita utte P, but keśi bēhane C Kt, keśi pītiśākubhaṇjaneyo P, but keśi bēhane C Kt.
68. This remark is found in the BORI Ms. but not in the IO Ms. Since, however, it also occurs in the closely allied Kk dhātupāṭha, there is no doubt regarding its genuineness.
69. The case of the vāt to which only one meaning viz. pālana is assigned as against the nineteen meanings in the P.Dh. is an exception.

BRIEF ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENT DHATUPĀṬHAS

The order of roots (excepting the tenth class) is, as said above, the same as in Candra, though occasionally Durga changes the arrangement so as to effect economy or regularity. (Thus of the anit roots, trap, yaṃ and yam are shifted to their proper place in the general block [the others however are retained]; similarly 7 roots ri, pi, etc. (C.Dh. VI, 101-106) have been removed and given their proper place in other paraśaśatin roots). Durga also differs from Candra in omitting certain roots (like taṅg, tvaṅg, dhvaṅg, tej, gaj, sphaṭ, vina, hrāṇa etc.) and adding certain new ones (like dhraja, jīva, cua, jiva, tānas, nis etc). He also reads some roots in different classes (e.g. vīdhau not in the I class but in V). The wording of three dhātusūtras in the ghatādi group is also slightly changed by him.

In the tenth class, Durga reads, as said above, all the roots known to him and also follows a different principle in their presentation. As mentioned above, he first reads all the roots which belong necessarily to this class (including the sub-classes), then gives certain rules governing the formations of certain denominatives, and only after this he introduces the roots belonging to this class optionally. This process of segregating the optionally curradi roots and reading them at the end is also followed in the Jainendra dhātupāṭha, and the arrangement followed here is also the same as in that dhātupāṭha.

A peculiarity of this dhātupāṭha is that it avoids artificial technical terms and in their stead uses simple ones. Thus, pānubandha (for yitaḥ), mānu-bandha (for mātāḥ) etc.

Vedic roots are, as in C, retained.

A fact to note about this dhātupāṭha is that it has greatly influenced the later development of the P. Dh. through Maitreyarakṣita. There are many roots (like hṛdaya, mātṛ, yonih, karaṇa, karaṇā, tāka, tāka, yonih etc.) which must have crept from the Kt. Dh. into the P. Dh. through M, seeing that though they have been regularly read by M, Ks. did not find them in this version of the P. Dh., but added them on the express authority of Durga. And this is not to be wondered at, since M hails from Bengal which had been a stronghold of the Kt.

The close affinity between the Kk. and the Kt. dhātupāṭhas has been already noticed above. However, in the absence of the exact knowledge of the relative chronology of Kk. and Durga, it is difficult to say who is indebted to whom; is, therefore, equally probable, that Kk. came after Durga. Under these circumstances, the priority given to Kk. here is to be regarded as purely provisional, and subject to revision in the light of future researches.