

Ashok Aklujkar

1.1 The first two parts of this study were published in the *Adyar Library Bulletin* (1981:581-601, Dr. K. Kunjunni Raja Felicitation Volume) and in *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Canberra: Australian National University, Faculty of Asian Studies, 1982, pp. 1-10). I am happy that this third part is also appearing in a volume dedicated to a scholar who has contributed substantially to our understanding of Sanskrit śāstras.

1.2 *Vākyapadīya* (VP in abbreviation) 2.486, the first word of which I intend to discuss here, runs thus: *parvatād āgamaṃ labdhvā bhāṣya-bījānusāribhiḥ / sa nīto bahu-śākhatvāṃ candrācāryādibhiḥ punaḥ* // The question of the precise import of this verse has given rise to a substantial body of literature extending over 125 years (Aklujkar 1978:9). As I have already examined this literature directly and indirectly in the publications mentioned above, I shall merely state here that I prefer to translate the verse along the following lines: 'Having acquired the traditional knowledge from parvata, Candrācārya and others, who followed the indications in the *Bhāṣya*, again made it (i.e., the

traditional knowledge) many-branched'. I should also clarify that in my view, as argued in the 1978 article, the verse was probably authored by a student of Bharṭṛhari (B in abbreviation) and not by B as has been commonly supposed.

1.3 Although parvata is a common Sanskrit word with 'mountain, mountain range' as its definite meaning and it would not be incompatible in that meaning with the other words of VP 2.486, it has caused much reflection on the part of scholars. Goldstücker (1861:258), Weber (1862:161), Kielhorn (1874b:285-86; 1876c:244-45), and Bhandarkar (1883-85a/1933:184) refrain from translating it as 'mountain', although they must have known its most frequently attested meaning. Instead, they leave it untranslated as "Parvata" (note the capitalized initial) in their translations or paraphrases of the verse, giving the impression that they take it as a proper name, most probably that of a person. Nearer to our time, Joshi and Roodbergen (1976:xxxiii) and Joshi (1976:138) do the same,¹ while Varma (1971a:206) and Laddu (1981:193-94) explicitly take parvata as a reference to a particular person.² Then there are scholars who, while not giving up the common meaning of the word, pay special attention to it in order to identify the mountain intended by the author of the verse. These are: Tārā-nātha Tarkavācaspati (1864: [introduction], p. 2; 1902: [introduction], p. 2), Peterson (1883-85:183), Ramakrishna Kavi (1930:239), Thieme (1956:20), Scharfe (1976:276), Cardona (1978:97, n. 36), and Bronkhorst (1983:393-97).

2.1 On the basis of *Rāja-taraṅgiṇī* (RT in abbreviation) verse 1.176, which is related in content to the VP verse we are discussing, Varma identifies parvata with King

Abhimanyu of Kashmir (and also with the land of Kashmir; see note 2). This is patently absurd. According to the context of 486, *vyākaraṇāgamah . . . dākṣiṇātyeṣu vyavasthitah*, parvata must be in the South (3.3). A king of Kashmir (or the Kashmir country) is hardly likely to have been viewed as Southern.³ Secondly, regardless of the reading one accepts of the RT verse, Abhimanyu cannot rightly be viewed as the giver or source of the *āgama* in the case of Candrācārya and others (Aklujkar 1987:228).

2.2 Laddu, too, takes parvata as a reference to an individual, but this individual is the Vedic, and to some extent Epic and Purāṇic, seer whose only distinction seems to be that he is always found in the company of Nārada; otherwise, he is singularly characterized by a lack of individuality. The Classical authors, as far as I know, do not refer to him. He is not even remotely connected with grammatical studies.

3.1 Among those who prefer to take parvata as standing for a mountain, we find (a) the author of the *Tīkā*, Puṇya-rāja or Helā-rāja (Aklujkar 1974);⁴ (b) modern scholars like Raghunātha Sharmā (1968:574), Raghavan Pillai (1971:146), and Subramania Iyer (1969:3; 1977:204) who reproduce the *Tīkā* explanation; and (c) other modern scholars such as Ramakrishna Kavi, Peterson, Thieme, Tārā-nātha Tarkavācāspati, Scharfe, Cardona, and Bronkhorst (precise references in 1.3) who either add to the *Tīkā* explanation or differ from it in the identification of the mountain.

3.2 Peterson, apparently following Müller,⁵ accepts the view that the parvata involved is “the hill of Chittore” in modern Rajasthan. The reason he gives in support of this

identification is that the hill of Chittore “was a centre of learning for the southern country.” However, the reason is hardly adequate. Peterson did not prove, and in fact could not have proved, that there were no other centers of learning for the southern country, irrespective of what he means by “centre of learning” and “southern country” (see note 3). Nor did he prove that there was something so special about the center of learning at Chittore that only it could have preserved the *āgama* in question. He did not even attempt to answer preliminary questions such as: Is it known that Chittore specialized in the study of grammar or of Patañjali’s *Mahā-bhāṣya* (MB in abbreviation) in the early centuries of the Christian era? Was it considered or likely to be considered ‘southern’ by B or his students (1.2)? Was it, or was it at least believed to be, a repository of manuscripts of rare works? Is Candrācārya said to have visited it? To propose an identification without raising even a few of these questions is to show disregard for the context of *parvatāt* (see also the point I make in note 13).

3.3 The more elaborate statement made by Scharfe is open to the same charge. In suggesting that parvata should be identified with Citra-kūṭa,⁶ he asks none of the above questions. In addition, he makes a series of unproved assumptions. Why identify parvata with Citra-kūṭa? Because, he tells us, the oral tradition of the MB was alive there. How do we know that the oral tradition was alive there when verse 485 says *vyākaraṇāgamaḥ dākṣiṇātyeṣu grantha-mātre vyavasthitaḥ* “The traditional knowledge (which would include the oral tradition) of grammar remained among the Southerners only in book form”? Because, according to

Scharfe, "the verse speaks only about the South Indian *Mahābhāṣya* tradition which had withered to the point that oral instruction had ceased." Now, how can one assert this when there is no indication in the preceding verses 481-84 that their author intends to speak of Southern Vaiyākaraṇas and Northern Vaiyākaraṇas separately? Are we going to say that *saṃkṣepa-ruci*, *alpa-vidyā-parigraha*, and *akṛta-buddhi* grammarians existed only in the South or that the confusion Baiji and others caused in MB studies was confined to the South? In the latter case, how do we account for the fact that the names Baiji, Saubhava, and Haryakṣa, although unusual, have nothing south Indian about them? In any case, why would the author of verses 481-86 be concerned with making a statement that applied only to south India? If he spoke of disintegration of MB studies only in the South, would it not follow that the state of these studies was satisfactory in the North (cf. Bronkhorst 1983:395)? Why, in that case, would he mention a single location in the North as the place where the *āgama* was recovered?⁷ How would his assertion accord with the commonly noticed state of affairs that South India in general managed to preserve transmission lines for a longer period (Aklujkar 1981:599-600)? If the Northern tradition had not been disrupted, would Candrācārya's acquisition of the *āgama* be an achievement so remarkable as to deserve special mention? Why would Candrācārya try to improve the state of MB studies in the South? Was he a Southerner? If he was, how would one account for the traditions that connect him with either Kashmir or Bengal?⁸

3.4 Even if Scharfe's contextually improbable interpretation of *vyākaraṇāgamaḥ dākṣiṇātyeṣu grantha-mātre vyavasthitaḥ* is accepted, how would it imply that Citra-kūṭa was *the* place where the *āgama* was preserved? At most, the implication would be that the study of the MB did not suffer as much in the North as in the South. Furthermore, how does Scharfe establish Candrācārya's association with Citra-kūṭa? He does so on the basis of examples in the *Cāndra Vṛtti* pertaining to *sūtras* 1.3.106-7.⁹ Therefore, the further assumptions are that: (a) Candrācārya of VP 2.486 is identical with Candra-gomin; (b) the *Cāndra Vṛtti* was in fact written by Candra-gomin;¹⁰ (c) the sentence "we shall eat rice," given as an example in the above-mentioned part of the *Cāndra Vṛtti*, means 'we shall eat rice only once'; (d) if rice was eaten only once before reaching Kauśāmbī, the journey to Kauśāmbī could not have taken more than a day;¹¹ (e) if Candra-gomin thought the journey to Kauśāmbī required only a day's travel in the direction of the eastern city of Pāṭaliputra, his place of residence could have been anywhere up to fifty miles west of Kauśāmbī;¹² and (f) since Citra-kūṭa is about fifty miles west of Kauśāmbī, it must be the place where Candra-gomin resided.

3.5 Of the six assumptions outlined above, (a) and (b) are open to doubt, and those remaining, the ones that are crucial to establishing Candra-gomin's/Candrācārya's presence at Citra-kūṭa, do not form a logically tight series of propositions. They constitute a novel, and for that reason commendable, attempt to determine a location, but one that is far from definitive. Assumption (c) forms their basis, and once its validity is called into question, the

others no longer remain tenable. Now, from my notes 11 and 12 here and from Bronkhorst 1983:397, it is evident that there are serious problems in relying on assumption (c).

3.6 To sum up, the impression I get from Scharfe's discussion of VP 2.486 and *Cāndra Vṛtti* 1.3.106-7 is that the possibility of connecting the two occurred to him and the force of that new idea made him overlook many indications to the contrary. He has proved nothing more than the likelihood that the author of the *Cāndra Vṛtti* was, at the time of writing his *Vṛtti*, in an area which lay to the west of Kauśāmbī and from which a journey to Kauśāmbī and Pāṭaliputra could be foreseen.¹³

4.1 The *Ṭīkā* provides a specification of *parvatāt* with the expression *tri-kūṭaika-deśa-varti-tiliṅgaika-deśāt*. This expression is printed as °*vartti-tri-liṅgai*° in Mānavallī's (1887:285) and Raghunātha Sharmā's (1968:574) editions and as °*vartino liṅgai*° in Kielhorn's (1874:286) article.¹⁴ An examination of the manuscripts of the *Ṭīkā* reveals that the second variant reading is found only in a few inferior manuscripts¹⁵ and the first variant reading is not found in any manuscript accessible at present.¹⁶ Since this is the situation, an attempt like Thieme's (1956:20), which follows Kielhorn's reading and gives a *śiva-liṅga* in the Tri-kūṭa region as the location of Candrācārya's acquisition of the *āgama*, must be set aside.¹⁷

4.2 Besides, the word *eka-deśa* does not really compound well with *liṅga* (=śiva-liṅga) in the present context. A statement to the effect that 'the *āgama* was acquired from a part of the *śiva-liṅga* which stands on a part of the (mountain) Tri-kūṭa' is not likely to be intended, for there

is no propriety in relating the acquisition to a *part* of the *śiva-liṅga*. Thieme realizes this and remarks: "*liṅgaika-deśāt* is perhaps a mistake for simply: *liṅgāt*, or, else, for *liṅgaviśeṣāt* 'from a particular liṅga,' the *ekadeśa*-part having been nonsensically repeated, or put in place of *-viśeṣāt*, from the preceding compound by a copyist."

However, since the reading *liṅgai*° is objectively weaker than *tiliṅgai*°, there is no need to indulge in the kind of speculation that Thieme's statement contains. Besides, a corruption of *liṅga-viśeṣād* into *liṅgaika-deśād* is transcriptionally improbable. The available manuscripts do not even indirectly indicate that °*gaika-deśād* could have resulted from anything like °*ga-viśeṣād* (see note 15).

4.3 Explaining the *Ṭīkā* identification is partly easy and partly difficult. The easy part comes later, viz., *tiliṅgaika-deśāt*. Undoubtedly, *tiliṅga* is an earlier form of the modern name *Telaṅgaṇā* and refers to a part of Andhra Pradesh having approximately the same boundaries as modern Telangana.¹⁸ An element of convenience in this fact is that the identification of *parvata* as a mountain in Telangana will stand even if no agreement is reached on the identification of *Tri-kūṭa* (4.7) and on the connection of the expression *tri-kūṭaika-deśa-vartī* with the expression *tiliṅgaika-deśāt* (see note 24). I shall, therefore, postpone the consideration of *tri-kūṭaika-deśa-vartī* and turn first to determining the specific area of Telangana that the *Ṭīkā* author and, if the *Ṭīkā* author has accurately preserved the tradition, the author of 486 are likely to have had in mind.

4.4 It is indeed strange that the author of 486 should give the location of a major achievement by using a general term like *parvata*. There are two possibilities under which such use seems sensible. Either the author does not know the precise location or *parvata* does not carry for him in this instance the general meaning it usually conveys.

The first possibility can be entertained in two ways: (a) The author is uncertain about the location beyond the fact that it was a mountain; or (b) the author cannot make up his mind as to which of the two or more mountains identified as the site of Candrācārya's achievement was the true location.

If (a) were the case, a form like *kasmād api*, indicating indefiniteness, would probably have accompanied the expression *parvatāt*. Besides, a tradition identifying the *parvata* rather precisely would not, in all probability, have arisen. It seems proper, therefore, to entertain the first possibility only in the form of alternative (b). This I shall do in a later section (5.1). It is more convenient at the present stage of our discussion to explore the second possibility.

4.5 Let us assume for a moment that the ordinarily general term *parvata* could have been used in 486 as a singular term referring to a mountain.¹⁹ In other words, the question to be asked is: Is there a specific mountain in the South that could be referred to simply as *parvata*? I think Śrī-*parvata*²⁰ is the only mountain that meets the conditions contained in this question because (a) the stem *parvata* is more closely associated with it than with any other mountain frequently mentioned in the ancient and

medieval literature of India. The other prominent mountains are quite freely referred to with compound names that contain one of the synonyms of parvata such as *adri*, *giri*, *śaila*, or *acala*. Śrī-parvata, on the other hand, does not commonly attract designations like *śrī-giri* (see note 20c). In addition, (b) if a mountain is to be referred to by dropping a part of its name for the sake of brevity or for the sake of preserving the meter, the part to be dropped should be dispensable from some point of view. The stem *śrī*, figuring in the name Śrī-parvata, is so commonly employed as an honorific before names (including the names of other prominent mountains) that we should not be surprised if it was occasionally looked upon as an honorific even in the name Śrī-parvata and thus thought to be dispensable.

The thoughts expressed in the preceding paragraph are not mere speculation. There is in fact a tradition of referring to Śrī-parvata simply as parvata (Dhere 1977:106, 121-23, 135). It may not have arisen for the reasons alluded to above and may be due to the importance of Śrī-parvata as perceived by the people of India, particularly of south India ('Śrī-parvata is *the* mountain; when someone uses the word parvata, it is Śrī-parvata that first comes to mind'). However, what matters for us is that it is clearly there and that even the interpretation 'mountain of Śrī' of the name Śrī-parvata did not preclude occasional dropping of the component *śrī*.

4.6 It will thus be seen that the second possibility (general term used particularistically) need not be viewed as a possibility in theory only. Besides explaining what looks like a lack of precision (it is not that an ancient

author's usage is imprecise; it is our understanding of his usage that is deficient), it leads us to an identification that ties in well with *tiliṅgaika-deśāt* of the *Ṭīkā*, for Śrī-parvata is a part of Tiliṅga or Telangana (see notes 18 and 20). Furthermore, the identification agrees with indications in the Tibetan tradition and can be said to receive confirmation in the accounts of Chinese travellers.²¹ According to the Tibetan tradition, Candragomin²² encountered the MB exposition when he returned from Simhala (Ceylon) to southern Jambu-dvīpa (India). For the travellers from Ceylon to northern India, Śrī-parvata was not only a natural, well-trodden, and time-honored region to pass through (Moticantra 1953, map preceding index), but it was also a holy and fascinating place on account of its association with *siddhas* and *siddhis* (Aklujkar 1982:6-7). In fact, there was a regular provision at Śrī-parvata in the early centuries of the Christian era for receiving travellers (particularly Buddhist travellers from Ceylon) as we learn from an inscription of Vīra-puruṣa-datta dated in the third century A.D. (Sircar 1965:235).²³

4.7 Now, to turn to the first half, *tri-kūṭaika-deśa-vartī*, of the identification in the *Ṭīkā*, Tri-kūṭa is said to be the name of at least four mountains in Sanskrit literature and Indian inscriptions.²⁴

(a) A mythical mountain in the North that forms the southern ridge of the Meru, bears the Tri-pathagā Gaṅgā, is surrounded by the Milky Ocean, and has peaks made of iron, silver, and gold; cf. *Mahā-bhārata* 2.39.11, 2.82.11; *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* 55.6; *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* 8.2.1ff; *Śabda-*

kalpa-druma pt. III, p. 74; Wilson 1894:141, n. 2; Kirfel 1954:10.

(b) A mythical or semimythical mountain beyond the ocean in which Rāvaṇa's Laṅkā is situated; cf. *Mahā-bhārata* 3.261.53, 3.266.54-55; *Rāmāyaṇa* 5.2.1, 6.30.18 (and passage 18 on p. 950 of Appendix 1), 7.5.21-22, 7.11.20; *Vāyu-purāṇa* 1.48.26-29; *Pañca-tantra*, book 5, story 11 (Bühler's fourth ed., p. 63); Rudraṭa's *Kāvya-lamkāra* 7.20; Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*, p. 419.

(c) A range of hills near the west coast of India which extends from northern Konkan to the west of the present district of Nasik; cf. Mirashi 1955:xl-xli, 1963:106-7; Gupta 1973:45, 246. Probably the same as the Tri-kūṭa mentioned by Saida Maḥammada in his *Kalpa-samūha* (Dhere 1977:201).

(d) A mountain in the eastern part of the Deccan (Mirashi 1975:186), probably the same as the one which B. V. Krishna Rao (*Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society* 10:191; reference according to Gupta 1973:246) specifies as Kotappakonda near Kavur in the Narasaraopeta taluq of the Guntur district.²⁵

4.8 Of these four mountains bearing the name Tri-kūṭa, the one described in (a) is clearly alien to the spirit of this inquiry and can safely be ignored for that reason as well as for its uniform association with the North (3.3).

Mountain (b), too, ceases to be historical if Rāvaṇa's Laṅkā is identified, as is generally the case,²⁶ with the island of Ceylon (Sri Lanka) or some part thereof. As far as I can ascertain, no mountain in Ceylon was or is called Tri-kūṭa. Secondly, not only is there no corroboration of

· discovery in Ceylon in the other accounts of Candra's achievement, but the Tibetan accounts specifically state that Candra found the equivalent of the VP *āgama* after he left Siṃhala or Ceylon (4.6).

However, while we can dismiss the idea of a Tri-kūṭa understood to be associated with Ceylon, we cannot easily dismiss the Tri-kūṭa associated with Rāvaṇa's Laṅkā. The *Ṭīkā* author mentions Rāvaṇa and *rakṣas* immediately after the statement of identification we are discussing. It is probable, therefore, that the Tri-kūṭa he had in mind was the one that figured in the descriptions of Rāvaṇa's kingdom. This observation leaves only two alternatives open to us: (a) that the *Ṭīkā* author is correct in his statement of identification about parvata, but wrong in connecting the identified (Tri-kūṭa) parvata with Rāvaṇa; and (b) the *Ṭīkā* author does not understand Rāvaṇa's Laṅkā to be Ceylon but a region near an historical Tri-kūṭa.²⁷ Both these alternatives dictate that we determine independently which mountain or mountains can historically claim the name Tri-kūṭa.

4.9 Our attempt to determine this will of course be confined to mountains (c) and (d) of the list given in 4.7, for the available evidence does not lead us in any other direction. Of them, (d) is a suspect candidate for its claim to the name Tri-kūṭa has not generally been accepted by specialists of ancient and medieval Indian geography. Gupta (1973:246-47), agreeing with V. S. Ramachandra Murty's article in volume II (p. 45) of the *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*, concludes that there is little evidence to support the identification of Kotappakonda with the Tri-kūṭa mentioned in historical records.²⁸

4.10 Mountain (c) was known as Tri-kūṭa from at least the third century A.D., as the evidence collected by Mirashi and others establishes (4.7c). Our acceptance of it as the mountain intended, or originally intended, in the tradition preserved by the *Ṭīkā* will not, therefore, be incompatible with the date of the *Ṭīkā* (Aklujkar 1982:3, 6, n. 4). It is also a mountain of the Dakṣiṇā-patha, so its acceptance will not go against the expression *dākṣiṇātyeṣu* of verse 485 (see note 3). We know that Northern scholars, *litterateurs*, and their works reached the southern part of India through the territory adjacent to this mountain.²⁹ Also, if we assume that in the *Ṭīkā* author's perception Laṅkā was situated near this mountain (4.8, note 27), we will have accounted not only for the presence of Rāvaṇa by the side of Tri-kūṭa in his statement but we will also have arrived at a hypothesis that scholars such as Shah and Sankalia, interested in determining the location of Vālmīki's Laṅkā, have independently developed (cf. Cardona 1978:97).

5.1 Taking parvata in its usual sense of 'mountain', we thus arrive at two likely locations for the retrieval of *vyākaraṇāgama*: Śrī-parvata and Tri-kūṭa. Both of these agree with contextual indications such as *dākṣiṇātyeṣu*; were well known in the period (the early centuries of the Christian era) to which the concluding verses of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* belong; are likely to have been visited by Candra whether he started from Kashmir (as in the RT account) or returned from Siṃhala (as in the Tibetan accounts); had excellent potential for preserving the *vyākaraṇāgama* manuscripts as areas of pilgrimage (Katre 1954:25-26); and were frequented by followers of both Brahmanism and Buddhism,

which jointly preserve Candrar's memory.³⁰ Besides, both are supported by a piece of information recorded as early as the *Tīkā* (see note 13 for the value of this piece as evidence).

5.2 We have now reached a point in our discussion at which we can choose between the following positions: (a) The uncertainty regarding which of the two locations was actually the place of Candrar's discovery belongs to the period of the *Tīkā*; and (b) The uncertainty goes back to the period of the author of 486 (4.4). If we accept (b), it would be pointless to press this discussion further in the hope of being able to determine one location exclusively, for the author of 486 is our earliest source on what Candrar achieved. If he is deemed to be undecided, there is practically no hope of our being able to decide what the location of the recovery of *vyākaraṇāgama* was in the original account. However, before we accept alternative (b), let us remind ourselves that we have thus far proceeded on the basis of two assumptions: that *tri-kūṭaika-deśa* and *tiliṅgaika-deśa* are separable parts of the *Tīkā* phrase, and that the word *tri-kūṭa* can stand only for a mountain (see note 24). Both of these assumptions deserve further examination.

5.3 As is well known, readings in manuscripts should, as far as possible, be interpreted as they are. Assumption of loss or change of text matter should be resorted to only if the available reading cannot make contextually acceptable sense without such an assumption. Such is not the case with the *Tīkā* phrase. It can be understood to mean 'from a part of Tiliṅga which (in turn) exists in a part of Tri-kūṭa'.³¹ There is nothing contextually incompatible in this meaning.

Mere repetition of *eka-deśa* would not be adequate justification for imagining a gap in the *Ṭikā* phrase or for emending it. If Tri-kūṭa refers to a mountain, it is not at all improbable that it would refer also to the region around that mountain.³² In fact, as Mirashi (1955:xli-xliv) notes, a name like Pūrva-tri-kūṭa-viṣaya 'East Tri-kūṭa district' is found in the Anjaneri plates of Bhoga-śakti, and Tri-kūṭa is mentioned in a list of countries in the Ajanta inscription concerning Hariṣeṇa (475-510 A.D.). A dynasty of Trai-kūṭakas, who most probably derived their name from association with the Tri-kūṭa region,³³ is also clearly attested in historical records (Mirashi 1955:xli-xliv; Mulay 1972:16, 29; Gupta 1973:246). True, Mirashi observes that "The Trai-kūṭaka kingdom at its largest extent seems to have extended from the Kīm in the north to the Krishṇā in the south, and to have comprised South Gujarat, North Konkan, and the Nasik, Poona and Satara Districts of Maharashtra," and thus it is not certain that the Traikūṭaka country included Tiliṅga. However, as the word "seems" in Mirashi's statement indicates, one cannot rule out the possibility that the borders of the Traikūṭaka country could have at times been different.³⁴ Evidence available for determining boundaries of political units in as early a period as the second to the sixth centuries A.D. rarely allows one to draw precise and final conclusions. As the Traikūṭakas emerged after the decline of the Sātavāhana empire, which included Tiliṅga, it is not unlikely that Tri-kūṭa, as the region of the Traikūṭakas, included or was thought to include Tiliṅga. Such a situation is especially likely to have prevailed in

- the early period of the Traikūṭaka dynasty, for which, as Mirashi observes, we have no records.

5.4 Thus, whether we accept a tradition of two locations for Candrācārya's achievement or a tradition of one location would depend on whether we are willing to concede the possibility of the inclusion of Tiliṅga in Tri-kūṭa and on how natural we find the repetition of *eka-deśa* in the *Tīkā* statement of identification. Acceptance of a tradition of one location does not involve assumption of textual corruption in the *Tīkā* but it does involve the assumption that Tri-kūṭa, as a region, at one time included Tiliṅga. As such an acceptance leads us to Śrī-parvata, it would better explain why the author of 486 used a general expression like parvata (4.5) in the singular number. But it would also enhance the possibility that even the author of 486 viewed Candrācārya's achievement as a miracle³⁵ and that the story of the recovery of *vyākaraṇāgama* is simply one of the myths associated with Śrī-parvata (Aklujkar 1982:6-7), thus having no specific historical value. Acceptance of a tradition of two locations, on the other hand, allows us to take Tri-kūṭa, in conformity with the indisputable part of the available evidence, as a region contiguous to the mountain range Tri-kūṭa. Such an acceptance leaves room for one further interesting connection. If B was a Maitrāyaṇīya and if the Maitrāyaṇīyas enjoyed a prominent presence in the Nasik area (see references collected in Bronkhorst 1983:396), the author of 486 probably belonged to the Nasik (i.e., the Tri-kūṭa) area. He could have then recorded in his composition a piece of local history and intended to refer to Tri-kūṭa by the word *parvatāt*.³⁶

6.1 At this point, I would like to return to the possibility entertained at the beginning (1.3) of this exploration of parvata, the one in which parvata could be taken to refer to a person. Although the specific identifications proposed by Varma and Laddu are unacceptable (2.1-2), I do not consider the possibility itself a weak alternative. According to the *Br̥hacchaṅkara-vijaya* of Vidyāraṇya-svāmin, quoted by Rāma-toṣaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya in his *Prāṇa-toṣiṇī* (p. 956), parvata is employed in the sense of a certain type of ascetic.³⁷ Furthermore, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, in his *Siddhānta-kaumudī* on the Pāṇinian (2.2.34) rule *alpāctaram* and the vārttika *abhyarhitam ca*, gives as an example the expression *tāpasa-parvatau*. This example is sensible only if parvata is comparable in some way to *tāpasa* 'ascetic'.³⁸ Thus, it is not improbable at all that parvata carried a meaning of the form 'an ascetic who is found in a mountain area, a wild ascetic, an ascetic given to extreme modes of ascetic conduct'.³⁹ If this meaning is assigned to parvata in 486, one can explain at least two things: the occurrence of the *brahma-rakṣas* 'brahmin ogre' element in the *Ṭīkā* and *Patañjali-carita* accounts of Candra's achievement (see note 21a), and the use of a very general term like parvata by the author of 486 when we expect him to tell us how or where the *vyākaraṇāgama* was recovered. If parvata is taken to be expressive of location, then the author has been unexpectedly imprecise; he has not specified anything beyond a mountain in the South. On the other hand, if parvata is viewed as a word used in the rather specific ascetic-directed sense, the author cannot be faulted for having used too general or too wide a term. It is not his expression

- that lacks precision; rather, it is our knowledge of the expression he uses that needs to be widened. Similarly, if *parvata* stands for an ascetic haunting mountains or caves and having a wild, frightening, or repulsive appearance, we can see how a *brahma-rakṣas* came to be associated with the verse as a benefactor of Candrar. I should also point out that the use of the ablative *parvatāt* in 486 somehow seems more natural in the case of a sentient source of acquisition than in the case of a location. If the author of 486 intended to give us the location of the acquisition made by Candrarācārya, would he not have used the locative form *parvate*?⁴⁰ These observations should explain why we cannot absolutely exclude the possibility of *parvata* being a reference to a person.

6.2 The word *parvata* in the sense elucidated just now could be a variant or a corrupt form of a secondary (*taddhita*) derivative *pārvata*. Indications available in the *Kāśikā*, *Nyāsa*, and *Pada-mañjarī* on Pāṇini 2.4.23, 3.2.53, and 4.2.144 suggest that there was an older commentarial tradition according to which the word *amanuṣya* occurring in Pāṇini did not convey a literal or etymological (*yaugika*) meaning of the form ‘anything or anyone other than a human being’ but a specific conventional (*rūḍha*) meaning like ‘a *rakṣas*, *piśāca*, etc.’, that is, ‘a member of a species thought to be similar to humans, but having strange capacities’.⁴¹ If this is so, one early, if not exclusive, understanding of *pārvata* (and *parvatīya*) derived by Pāṇini 4.2.144, *vibhāṣāmanuṣye*, must have been something like ‘a person of extraordinary or miraculous capacities associated with a mountain’. The probability that the pre-*Kāśikā*

Pāṇinīyas such as B and his disciples were aware of this meaning of *pārvata/parvata* and used the word in that sense in their writings is thus strong.⁴²

6.3 One consequence of attaching the meaning ‘mountain ascetic’ to the word *parvata*, as in the case of identifying *parvata* with *Śrī-parvata* (5.4), will be that the probability of tracing back the miraculous element in the accounts of Candra to B’s time will be strengthened. This element is indeed widespread, as will incidentally become clear in part 4 (under preparation) of the present study. Moreover, since B or his students (1.2) were not totally against the possibility of knowledge through extraordinary means (Aklujkar 1970b:42-50), it is not incongruent to associate them with the miraculous. While this realization will deprive the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* verses of some of their value as a historical statement, it cannot be avoided by any historian who, rightly, evaluates his evidence before allowing it to lead him to definite conclusions.

7.1 There is a way in which both lines of interpretation, taking *parvata* as a reference to an individual and taking *parvata* as a reference to a mountain, come together. If Candracārya and others recovered, in the eyes of the author of 486, the *āgama* from a *siddha*-like ascetic on a Southern mountain (most probably *Śrī-parvata*, which was famous for such ascetics), then, while the first-level or initial interpretation of *parvata* would differ as ‘a mountain ascetic’ and ‘a mountain’, the ultimate import will be the same. We will have satisfied both expectations to which the context of 486 gives rise: (a) Who among the *dākṣiṇātyas* had the *vyākaraṇāgama*? (b) Where in the South was the

vyākaraṇāgama found? The *Ṭīkā* explanation, *in effect*, accomplishes this, although it speaks of a *brahma-rakṣas* in the place of a parvata ascetic.

7.2 *Parvatāt* is the only “down-to-earth” detail in VP 2.486. It is unfortunate that we are required to keep two lines of interpretation (mountain and person) open and to entertain two possible identifications (Śrī-parvata and Tri-kūṭa) in the first line of interpretation. However, I believe such a course will serve the interests of future research better than a rushed, precise identification. Our ignorance of what actually happened may be disturbing but now it will at least have well-defined boundaries.

If a preference must be indicated, I would rank as follows the identifications defended above. In the present state of our knowledge, the strongest identification appears to be ‘parvata = an ascetic or *brahma-rakṣas* belonging to Śrī-parvata’. Next in strength seems to be ‘parvata = Śrī-parvata’, with the attendant assumption that some scholar, or scholarly community, on Śrī-parvata had in his, or its, possession the manuscripts in which the *āgama* of the MB was preserved. Last in terms of acceptability is the equation ‘parvata = Tri-kūṭa (as mountain or region)’.

This rank-ordering is based (a) on a consideration of how many independent lines of evidence point in the same direction, and (b) on whether an identification forces us to assume something which is not in the evidence and thus to sacrifice economy of explanation.

The elements of what I consider to be the strongest identification can be related to the evidence as shown in table 1.

a person,	<-- grammatical considerations
who is associated with parvata,	<-- <i>Kāśikā</i> (<i>Nyāsa</i> , Pada-mañjarī), Siddhānta-kaumudī
i.e., a mountain or its equivalent:	<-- <i>Ṭīkā</i> , (possibly also the) Chinese travelogues
a tall structure/ temple,	<-- Chinese travelogues, Tibetan legends
strongly associated with the word parvata, and	<-- <i>Ṭīkā</i> , Chinese travelogues, Dhere
well inside South India	<-- <i>Ṭīkā</i> , Tibetan legends, Chinese travelogues
who is seen as tran- scending the ordinary human condition, and	<-- <i>Kāśikā</i> (<i>Nyāsa</i> , Pada-mañjarī), Siddhānta-kaumudī, <i>Ṭīkā</i> , Tibetan legends, Patañjali- carita
who serves as a source well inside South India	<-- <i>Ṭīkā</i> , Tibetan legends, Patañjali-carita

Table 1

It can be seen from this table how almost all the relevant evidence converges in the case of, or can be accommodated in the frame of, the first identification. For what I consider to be the next best identification, only the boxed part of the convergence holds good. On the other hand, the 'parvata = Tri-kūṭa' identification rests only on the statement in the *Tīkā* and this, too, when the original form of that statement is assumed to be different from what it is now.

Notes

- * Conclusions reached in this part were reported in the form of a short paper on 21 March 1983 at the 193rd meeting of the American Oriental Society held at Baltimore. The author was able to study many of the sources used in the article because of financial assistance provided at various times since 1969 by the University of B.C. Humanities and Social Sciences Research Committee, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung of the Federal Republic of Germany. I also wish to acknowledge the dispassionate response to my criticism of his position that Professor Hartmut Scharfe gave in his letter of 6 November 1987. The response based on the 26 October 1987 version of the paper helped me in clarifying some points and correcting a few errors.

1. The implicit refusal to take parvata as 'mountain' is especially remarkable in the case of Weber and later researchers mentioned here. Weber (1862:161n) and Kielhorn (1974b) knew at the time of their relevant writings that Tārā-nātha Tarka-vācaspati had given a specification of parvata as Citra-kūṭa or Tri-kūṭa. An earlier edition of Tārā-nātha's *Śabdārtha-ratna* (the reference according to the third edition available to me is 1902:2) is mentioned by Weber, and Tārā-nātha's edition of the *Siddhānta-kaumudī* (1864:2) and Weber's article are mentioned by Kielhorn. Kielhorn also knew that Puṇya-rāja, an ancient commentator of VP 2.486, had understood *parvatāt* to be a reference to a region. Finally, it is beyond doubt that Bhandarkar and most of the later scholars mentioned here exhibit an awareness of Kielhorn's writings.
2. Varma (1971a:350) contradicts himself when he also takes parvata in its sense of 'mountain' and identifies it with Kashmir (as mountainous country) of King Abhimanyu's time.
3. (a) Any directional adjective like *dākṣiṇātya* 'southern' is relative in its application, for what is southern to one user can very well be northern to another. However, it is reasonable to assume that in most Classical Indian uses of *dākṣiṇātya* the reference would be to persons or objects of the Dakṣiṇā-patha unless a further specification is available in the context (Sircar 1960:172, n. 2). Another consideration one should keep in mind in the case of VP 2.486 is that, as its author belonged to the Pāṇinian tradition of Sanskrit grammar, his under-

standing of *dākṣiṇātya* is not likely to be very different from that of Patañjali (Kielhorn's ed., vol. 1, p. 8), who indicates that the author of the *vārttika yathā laukika-vaidikeṣu* was a *dākṣiṇātya* (Cardona 1976: 268-69). The third helpful consideration in ascertaining the common meaning of *dākṣiṇātya* in the Classical period is the remark by several authors to the effect that the word *cora/caura* in the language of the *dākṣiṇātyas* means *odana* 'cooked rice' not 'thief'; cf. Prabhā-candra, *Nyāya-kumuda-candra*, p. 547; Jayanta-bhaṭṭa, *Nyāya-mañjarī*, p. 242; and Abhinava-gupta, *Tattva-viveka* on *Parā-triṃśikā* 5-9ab, p. 125, who distinguishes between *saindhavas* and *dākṣiṇātyas*. With reference to the meaning of the same *cora*, Vādi-deva-sūri (*Syād-vāda-ratnākara*, p. 703) distinguishes between *gurjaras* and *drāviḍas*; the latter must obviously be *dākṣiṇātyas* in his view. Probably Śrīdhara (*Nyāya-kandalī*, p. 215) also has a relevant observation to offer in this case, although I cannot verify the reference at present.

(b) For a determination of the reference of *Dakṣiṇā-patha*, see Law 1932/1979:xv, xix, 3-4, 44, 48, 60, 66; Raychaudhuri in Yazdani 1960:3-4; Sircar 1960: 14-15, 52, 57, 73, 172-73, 178, 242; Gupta 1973:8-9; and Siṃha 1974:85.

4. (a) *parvatāt tri-kūṭaika-deśa-varti-tiliṅgaika-deśād iti.*

(b) Variant readings available for the *Ṭīkā* phrase in (a) are given in note 15. The possibility of its

having suffered some damage in manuscript transmission will be discussed in 4.2, note 24, and 5.3.

5. Peterson does not specify how, when, or where Müller's suggestion about parvata was made.
6. (a) Tārā-nātha Tarka-vācaspati offers the same identification as Scharfe's without giving any reasons to support it, as if he was simply explaining or replacing the reading *tri-kūṭa* of the *Ṭīkā* with *citra-kūṭa*.

(b) Scharfe does not indicate awareness of the information given in (a), which, one expects, would have been known to him through Weber 1862.

(c) Scharfe's presentation differs also in that he further identifies Citra-kūṭa with Rāma-giri, presumably the same Rāma-giri as the one mentioned by Kālidāsa in his *Megha-dūta*. It should, therefore, be noted that the identification of Citra-kūṭa with Rāma-giri is not universally accepted (cf. Gupta 1973:101-3) as Scharfe seems to have thought.

(d) Bronkhorst (1983), who also does not indicate awareness of the information in (a), follows Scharfe in a strange way. On pages 393 and 395, he has Candra going to the Himālaya to acquire "[correct] traditional knowledge" or "The Patañjalian oral tradition." On the other hand, on page 397, he has Candra at least contemplating a journey through Kauśāmbī, as in Scharfe's view, but not necessarily residing at Citra-kūṭa, as is Scharfe's view. In other words, Bronkhorst uses Scharfe's discussion to assign Candra to Gujarat or north Maharashtra but not to explain Candra's retrieval of the *āgama*. In so doing, he severs the direct connec-

tion between VP 2.486 and *Cāndra Vṛtti* 1.3.106-7 that Scharfe seeks to establish. Thus, his view is similar to Varma's (2.1) and is partly based on what Scharfe thought to be justified. As my discussion shows, both Varma and Scharfe have put forward views that violate contextual considerations and go against the available evidence about Candra's achievement. Bronkhorst's composite view, therefore, stands doubly refuted and need not be discussed separately.

7. (a) Note that the option of considering Citra-kūṭa as relatively southern is not open to Scharfe because in his view the verses deal with the withering of the MB tradition in the South and hence the location of *āgama* retrieval must be in the North; cf. Bronkhorst 1983:395.

(b) In his letter of 6 November 1987, Scharfe makes the following remarks, which serve to clarify his 1976 interpretation of verse 485: ". . . the VP stanza says that the southern tradition existed only in manuscripts; that implies that it existed in the north also orally, and that would be the place to get this tradition. If B had wanted to say that these manuscripts were all that existed of the Mbh [= Mahā-bhāṣya] tradition, it would be odd to refer to South India at all. He would rather have said: "The tradition existed only in manuscripts." My preceding remarks should suffice to establish that this interpretation is contextually improbable. It is also flawed by lack of logical implication. There is no incompatibility between (i) saying that the MB tradition existed only in the form of manuscripts, and (ii) saying that the MB tradition existed only in the South. Third,

there is no justification for taking *āgamaḥ dākṣiṇātyeṣu grantha-mātre vyavasthitah* as synonymous with *dākṣiṇātyaḥ āgamaḥ grantha-mātre vyavasthitah*, as Scharfe does.

8. (a) See S. K. De 1938:258-59, and Siṃha 1969:242-43, for a discussion of Candra's/Candra-gomin's province of birth.

(b) The presence of Gauḍas in early Kashmir is proved by RT 4.323-35 and Kṣemendra, *Deśopadeśa, adhyāya* 6. The latter refers to students from Bengal who had come to Kashmir to study Sanskrit and Sanskritic branches of knowledge. The grandfather of the remarkable author Jayanta-bhaṭṭa was also a Gauḍa who migrated to Kashmir.

(c) Bronkhorst (1983:396-97) actually accepts Candra's residence in the South, i.e., in Gujarat or north Maharashtra. His discussion of Candra's locality shows no awareness of the literature referred to in (a). He obviously assumes that Candrācārya is definitely the same as Candra-gomin, that a Buddhist like Candra-gomin must have lived in an area inhabited by followers of the Maitrāyaṇīya recension of the Veda, and that the possibility of the localities of Candrācārya and Candra-gomin being different need not be entertained!

9. There are some minor but complex problems, in addition to the major problems indicated here, associated with Scharfe's use of the examples in the *Cāndra Vṛtti* and other related texts. It would be better to take them up for discussion in a separate publication.

10. The problems connected with the acceptance of Candragomin's authorship of the available *Cāndra Vṛtti* are discussed in Birwé 1968.
11. It is not clear to me exactly how Scharfe deduces from "We shall eat (*bhokṣyāmahe*) rice" that Candragomin's was a one-day journey to Kauśāmbī. Since Scharfe contrasts this example with others meaning "We shall eat twice," I have assumed that in his view "We shall eat rice" implies 'We shall eat rice once' and one rice meal implies one day's journey. However, who is likely to eat only one rice meal or only one meal per day? Does the example presuppose a Buddhist monk as the speaker of the sentence? In that case, why is there nothing in the context of the example that would suggest restriction of the example to a monk's situation? If, on the other hand, the inference that the distance was to be covered in one day is to be drawn only from the grammatical form *bhokṣyāmahe*, why do other grammarians specify the number of times they would carry out a particular act in a similar situation? Why does the *Kāśikā* (3.3.136, 138) see nothing wrong in changing *odanam bhokṣyāmahe/bhoktāmahe* to *dvir odanam bhokṣyāmahe/bhoktāmahe*, although it, too, speaks of a journey through Kauśāmbī to Pāṭaliputra? Scharfe (1976:275) glosses over the problem the *Kāśikā* examples pose by stating that they "appear to be compounded renderings of the sentences found in the *Candra-vṛtti* and Abhaya-nandin's *Mahāvṛtti* . . . the example must be regarded as one of those standard examples handed down through the times and used without respect for its actual [factual?] accuracy." Before

blaming the evidence that inconveniences his speculation, however, Scharfe should have asked himself: Why would the *Kāśikā* opt for compounded renderings? Is it certain that the *Kāśikā* was written later than the *Cāndra Vṛtti* and the *Mahā-vṛtti*? I am aware that, since Kielhorn's 1886 article, it has generally been held that the *Kāśikā* is influenced by the *Cāndra vṛyākarāṇa*. However, as I pointed out at the time of the 192d meeting of the American Oriental Society in 1982, this view may not be valid. Recently, Bronkhorst (1983:368) has argued that there is no *Cāndra* influence on at least the *sūtra* text in the *Kāśikā*. As for Abhaya-nandin, he has been placed in the post-*Kāśikā* period by the historians of Sanskrit grammar on very good grounds (Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, 1973/*saṃvat* 2030, vol. 1, 3d ed., pp. 458-71, 584-86; also pp. 9, 24, and 51-52 of the introductions contributed by Vāsudeva-śaraṇa Agravāla, Nāthū-rāmajī Premī, and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka to Śambhu-nātha Tripāṭhī's edition of Abhaya-nandin's *Mahā-vṛtti*, Kashi: Bhāratīya Jñāna-pīṭha, 1956). Moreover, two of the *Kāśikā* phrases that could be said to have been inspired by the *Mahā-vṛtti* are not as precise as their counterparts (compare *tatra saktūn pāsyāmaḥ* and *yuktā adhyaimahi* with *tatra . . . dviḥ saktūn pāsyāmaḥ* and *yuktā dvir adhyaimahi*). If the *Kāśikā* were at the borrowing end, why would it sacrifice the existing precision? That the *Kāśikā* elsewhere copies examples from such works as the MB hardly constitutes sufficient proof for the present purpose.

12. The questions I have about this particular assumption are: Was travel in the range of fifty miles generally viewed by Candra's contemporaries as possible in one day? Would an ordinary man eat only once during a fifty-mile journey when the journey is to be completed with ancient means? Would it be correct to hold that the *Cāndra Vṛtti* example is from the perspective of a monk who eats only one meal per day?
13. The attitude that may be implicit in Peterson's and Scharfe's attempts at identification also needs comment. Both these scholars write as if the *Ṭīkā* identification does not exist or need not be taken seriously. This is hardly a justifiable view to take of a piece of information that is about one thousand years old; that is unlikely to have been given unless it was known to earlier students and commentators of the VP (cf. *anuśrūyate* in the *Ṭīkā*); and that is in itself very plausible (especially because it contains the names Tri-kūṭa and Tiliṅga attested in a number of inscriptions, etc.). If Peterson or Scharfe had pointed out that the *Ṭīkā* detail offends common sense (has a mythic character like some other details in the *Ṭīkā*) or is contradicted by another equally old source, they would have been justified in setting it aside. By not following any such procedure they give the impression that information preserved by scholars directly in the line of transmission deserves little or no credence. This is an unwarranted and unprofitable position to take. Moreover, since their own views are based on the use of some indirectly related tradition, they are open to a charge

of self-serving eclecticism. The same comment can be extended to Bronkhorst's discussion.

14. Mirashi (1955:xl) follows a reading °*varti-tri-kaliṅgaika*° not found in Mānavallī's edition (1887), which Mirashi apparently used. As note 15 establishes, there is *some* trace of this reading in the generally inferior manuscript E7 and its transcript E14 but there is no clear support for it in any of the available manuscripts. Even in E7, the presence of *ka* is due to the copyist's inability to decide whether his exemplar reads *ta/ti* or *ka*. It would appear that Mirashi read the name Tri-kaliṅga in his source through an oversight caused by the memory of that name, which occurs in other historical records handled by him.
15. Following the designations given in Rau 1971, the deviations noticed in manuscripts from the *Ṭīkā* text accepted here can be specified as follows:

- (a) *trikūṭekadeśa*° E1, *trikūṭaideśa*° E25, *trikūṭaiddeśa*° E5, *trikūṭadeśa*° E7, *trikūṭe deśa*° E14.
- (b) °*varttinetiliṅgai* E8, °*varttinotiliṅgaika*° E1, °*vartinoliṅgaika*° E3, E9, E9a, E22, °*varttinoliṅgaika*° with *no* changed to *ti* in the margin E10, °*vartitakaliṅgaika*° E7, E14, °*varttitaligauka*° E5, °*vartitiliṅgaika*° E20, °*varttine* [or *te*] *ligaika*° E23, °*varttiteliṅgaika*° E4, E21, E25, °*vavartitiliṅgaika*° E6.

The difference of one *t* between *varti* and *vartti* is of no consequence, as anyone conversant with common features of Sanskrit orthography knows.

The generally reliable manuscripts of the *Ṭīkā* are E4, E6, E11, E13, E15, E16, E21, E24, and E25, as my

planned critical edition of the *Ṭīkā* will establish.

They agree in reading the *Ṭīkā* phrase as I have accepted it in this study, except for the redundant writing of *va* in E6 and the presence of *te* in the place of *ti* in E4, E21, and E25. The last variation does not make any significant difference. *Tiliṅga* and *Teliṅga* are well-attested names of the same *Telaṅgaṇā* region.

The manuscripts designated E2, E17, E18, E19, and E26 by Rau do not contain the required portion. Rau's E12 is a modern transcript of E2. E9a did not somehow come to Rau's notice but was made available to me at the library of the Sanskrit College in Calcutta.

16. (a) I have not yet had time to determine which, if any, of the manuscripts accessible to me *Mānavallī* followed in his *editio princeps* of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā*. It is possible that, as a nineteenth-century pandit, he showed preference for the Sanskrit-sounding form *triliṅga* over the Prakrit or *deśya*-sounding forms *tiliṅga* and *teḷiṅga*.

(b) *triliṅga* is noticed elsewhere as a variant of *tiliṅga* (see note 18cd). Its acceptance would not affect the subsequent discussion in this study.

17. For a critical examination of the other aspects of Thieme's view, see Aklujkar (1986).

18. (a) This spelling is according to the National Atlas of India. The spellings "Telingana," "Telengana," etc., are also noticed.

(b) For information on *Tiliṅga* or *Telangana*, see Raychaudhuri in Yazdani 1960:27-29; Sircar 1960:16, 71, 75-76, 88, 89; Gupta 1973:37; and Schwartzberg 1978:137, maps a and b; 38, map b; 39, map c; and 100, map a.

(c) *tri-liṅga*, *tiriliṅga*, etc., are attested as variants of *tiliṅga*. A secondary derivative *tailaṅga* is also found.

(d) "The name Tiriliṅga (Skt. Tri-liṅga) is traditionally derived from three shrines (*liṅgas*), namely, those at Kāleśvaram, Śrīśailam and Drākṣārāma . . .". (Gupta 1973:37). Bhīmeśvara in the place of Drākṣārāma is given as the third *liṅga* leading to the formation of Tri-liṅga by Lüders in *Epigraphia Indica* 6, no. 10 (1900-1): 93.

19. Parvata is also taken as a proper name of a region in northwestern India. According to Schwartzberg (1978: 184a), it refers to Jammu. It does not seem likely, however, that this reference was current in the days of B and his disciples. Besides, this Parvata was not likely to be thought of as southern in the period with which we are concerned (see note 3).

20. (a) For references to Śrī-parvata in Sanskrit literature, inscriptions, etc., see Aklujkar 1982:8. For the importance of Śrī-parvata in Indian religious history, see Dhare 1977:105-9, 179-80, 194-95.

(b) The geographical location of Śrī-parvata is shown in Schwartzberg 1978:22, map a; 27, map b; and 32, map a.

(c) Śrī-parvata and Śrī-śaila have been treated as practically identical in the publication mentioned in (b), as well as in some Sanskrit works and modern research publications. Śrī-parvata would seem to be the older of the two names and has a general as well as a specific reference. In its former role, it seems to

stand for the mountain range toward the southwestern extremity of which the Brahmanical site of Śrī-śaila took shape (cf. Sircar 1965:235, n. 3; Schwartzberg 1978:27, map b). In the latter role, Śrī-parvata appears to be a predominantly Buddhist site near Nagarjunakonda in the northeastern part of the same Nallamala (alternative spellings "Nallamalur" and "Nalamalai") mountain range.

(d) The location of Śrī-śaila is shown in plate 35 of the *National Atlas of India* and in Schwartzberg 1978:21, map a; 25, map a; 26, map a; 27, map b; 31, map a; 34, maps a and b; 38, maps a and b; 41, map a; 47, map a; 99, map a; and 140, map a.

21. (a) Accounts of Candrar's discovery, including those in Tibetan, will be compared in part 4 of this study.

(b) Fa-hsien's report of his travels in India between 399 and 414 A.D. contains a hearsay description of a five-tiered, or five-storied, mountain monastery (*Po-lo-yu* or *Po-lo-yue*) called approximately *pāravā* in the local language. At least some specialists of the travelogues of Chinese visitors to India have come to the conclusion that this monastery is identical with the one (*po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li*) which Yuan Chwang (=Hiuen Tsiang) visited about two hundred years later and which was on Śrī-parvata, associated with Nāgārjuna. Accordingly, Watters (1905:200-1; cf. Yazdani 1960:146-47) sees in Fa-hsien's *pāravā* the Sanskrit word parvata (not *pārāvata* 'pigeon' or 'columbarium' as Fa-hsien thought) standing for Śrī-parvata.

22. The tentative assumption here is that Candra-gomin is the same individual as Candrācārya or was confused with Candrācārya by this time.
23. Thus, Ramakrishna Kavi was on the right track when he included the guess "somewhere near Śrī Parvata, probably in the Andhra country" in his 1930 article (p. 239). However, he did not give any evidence or reasoning in support of his remark or provide a geographical specification of Śrī-parvata.
24. (a) Another possible identification of Tri-kūṭa, not as a mountain but as a region or country, will be taken up in 5.2.

The assumption in my discussion at this point is that the *Ṭīkā* phrase *tri-kūṭaika-deśa-varti-tiliṅgaika-deśād* could originally have been different (a suspicion based on the repetition of *eka-deśa*, as on Thieme's part, but not resolved in the same way as Thieme proposes). The original form of the phrase was perhaps as follows: *tri-kūṭaika-deśa-[varti . . . ity eke. anye tv āhuh . . .]-varti-tiliṅgaika-deśād iti*, i.e., the text available at present could be a result of haplography caused by the recurrence of *varti*.

Resting on this assumption is the point of view that two possible lines of identification, one based on the name Tri-kūṭa and the other based on the name Tiliṅga, should be kept apart at this stage of the discussion.

(b) As the *Śabda-kalpa-druma* (p. 655) notes, Sanskrit lexicons give the names Tri-kakud, Suvela, Tri-mukūṭa, Tri-śṛṅga, and Citra-kūṭa in the same group as Tri-kūṭa. Except for Suvela, which may be helpful in

determining the location of the Tri-kūṭa mentioned in Rāma narratives, the other mountains seem to have been grouped with Tri-kūṭa only on account of the structural similarity of the names.

25. This mountain would be very close to Śrī-parvata (see note 20) if not identical with a part of Śrī-parvata understood as a mountain range.
26. Mirashi (1975:205-19) establishes that, in the perception of many Classical authors, Laṅkā was located in Siṃhala.
27. (a) It would be simplistic to hold that only one tradition regarding the location of Laṅkā was current in as diverse and large a country as India and throughout as long a period as that of Classical Sanskrit literature.
(b) The view that, in Vālmīki's perception, Rāvaṇa's Laṅkā was situated in a place other than Ceylon, probably near the Vindhya, has been expressed for many years. Shah (1976) and Sankalia (1982) are the most recent exponents of that view known to me.
28. If, however, the identification is correct with reference to a part of the historical evidence available (see note 34) and we have in fact two Tri-kūṭas (approximately on the western and eastern borders of the Sātavāhana empire), then we will have open to us the alternative 'parvata = Tri-kūṭa = Kotappakonda', but it will not materially be very different from the alternative 'parvata = Śrī-parvata' (see note 25).
29. For understandable reasons, the ancient traveller in India had to move along those areas where the height of mountains like the Vindhya was either not to be met

with or was negotiable. A sort of western corridor for the movement of men and goods, therefore, seems to have developed near the Nasik area.

30. (a) Tri-kūṭa is near such ancient Buddhist sites as Kanheri and Ajanta, and near Brahmin holy places like Tryambakeśvara. The appeal that Śrī-parvata had for Buddhists and Brahmins can be judged from the information and sources given in note 20.

(b) I intend to discuss the problem of the religious affiliation of (B and) Candrācārya in a separate publication. One's conclusions in this regard will naturally depend on whether Candrācārya is held to be identical with Candra-gomin and, to some extent, on what view one takes of the religious affiliation of B and his disciples.

31. Subramania Iyer's (1977:li, 204) renderings of the *Ṭīkā* phrase, "Triliṅga country, near the Trikūṭa mountain" and "Trikūṭa," are not as precise as they should have been.
32. The *Ṭīkā* author could also be said to have a region rather than a mountain in mind. In the latter part of his identifying phrase, *eka-deśa* is compounded with *tiliṅga*, the name of a region. The same is, therefore, likely to be true of *eka-deśa* in *tri-kūṭaika-deśa*.
33. Thus, Schwartzberg (1978:137, map a) is right in showing Tri-kūṭa as a region.
34. As possible evidence to the effect that Tri-kūṭa could have at times denoted a larger area than the one determined by Mirashi, note the following:

(a) The word *tri-kūṭa*, probably referring to an area, occurs in a third-century A.D. plate discovered in the Vizagapatnam district; cf. Hultzsch, *Epigraphia Indica* 3, no. 3 (1894-95):19-20.

(b) A temple of Tri-kūṭeśvara is said to be near the village Koṇḍakāvūru, which is eight miles south of Narasarāvupetā; cf. Lüders, *Epigraphia Indica* 6, no. 12 (1900-1):116, 127.

(c) In a Viṣṇukuṇḍin inscription, Prince Mādhavarman II, whose headquarters were at Amara-pura (= Amarāvati near Śrī-parvata?) has been called *tri-kūṭa-malayādhipati*; cf. Sircar 1960:189.

(d) If there were in fact two historical Tri-kūṭās, (c) and (d) of our list in 4.7, it is possible that the area between them governed by rulers such as the Sātavāhanas was known as the country of the Tri-kūṭeśvaras or as Tri-kūṭa.

(f) There is a temple of Tri-kūṭeśvara existing from at least 1191 A.D. at Gadag in Dharwar district; cf. Kielhorn, *Epigraphia Indica* 3, no. 30 (1894):217-20.

(g) Mishra (1973:139), on the basis of Sumpa Mkhan-Po's *Pag-Sam-Jon-Zang* (p. lxvi) edited by S. C. Das, points out the probability that there once was a Traikūṭaka *vihāra* in West Bengal.

35. There are no expressions indicating a miracle in 486 (Aklujkar 1981:600), although a miracle is at least suggested in all the other known accounts except the one in the RT.
36. Under this possibility, what the author of 486 would, in effect, be saying would be this: 'Candrācārya and others

came from the North and acquired from the mountain the *āgama* that had survived only in a written form among the *dākṣiṇātyas*, that is, among us'. B, as the author's teacher, would then be the person who built on the foundation prepared by Candrācārya (verse 487) and revived the tradition, at least in the Nasik area.

37. (a) '*vaset parvata-mūleṣu prauḍho yo dhyāna-dhāraṇāt / sārāt sāraṃ vijānāti parvataḥ parikīrtitaḥ* // 'He who lives in the foot-areas of mountains, is advanced/mature on account of practice of meditation, and knows the quintessence, is said to be parvata'.

(b) According to the *Hindī Śabda-sāgara* (vol. 6, p. 2883), parvata is a *saṃnyāsin* who belongs to the Daśa-nāmī sect and lives at the foot of a mountain, devoting himself to meditation. This information is corroborated by the *Bṛhacchankara-vijaya* passage quoted in the *Prāṇa-toṣiṇī*. The names of the ten *saṃnyāsins* are given in that passage in this order: *tīrtha*, *āśrama*, *vana*, *araṇya*, *giri*, *parvata*, *sāgara*, *sarasvatī*, *bhāratī*, and *purī*.

(c) Prior to quoting the verse in (a) as a definition found in the Avadhūta chapter of the *Prāṇa-toṣiṇī*, the *Śabda-kalpa-druma* (III, pp. 77-78) informs us that parvata in this sense is "a specific kind of disciple/follower of Maṇḍana-miśra, who was the disciple of Śaṃkarācārya." I do not know the basis for the specific association with Maṇḍana-miśra.

38. The author of the *Bāla-manoramā* commentary is puzzled by Bhaṭṭoji's example, as can be seen from his comment:
parvatasya sthāvara-janmatayā tāpasasya tad-apekṣayā-

bhyarhitatvaṃ bodhyam. bhāṣye tu mātā-pitarāu ity udāhṛtam. ‘Since a parvata is born of a stationary entity (or is stationary by birth), a *tāpasa* should be understood as worthy of respect in comparison to him. The example in the *Bhāṣya* is, however, *mātā-pitarau*. The *Tattva-bodhinī* commentary does not even indicate awareness of the example *tāpasa-parvatau*.

39. (a) See note 37.

(b) It might be asked if this sense of parvata could be as old as the author of 486. I am not aware of any evidence that would conclusively prove this sense to be so old. However, since Vidyāraṇya’s list of the ten classes of monks is not very logical (in the first seven location is the criterion, whereas in the last three it is not; there is also overlapping between *āśrama*, *vana*, and *araṇya*, and between *giri* and *parvata*), it may be inferred that it has old as well as new terms simply put together. See also 6.2.

40. (a) Or has he used *parvatāt* for *parvate* simply because, in the phrase *parvate āgamaṃ labdhvā*, the word *parvate*, reduced to *parvata* by *saṃdhi*, would have disturbed the meter?

(b) Scharfe (1976:276, n. 21) simply dismisses the view of “an eminent Indian Sanskritist” that *parvate* would have been proper if a mountain was intended and that the use of *parvatāt* indicates that a person was probably intended. Scharfe does not point out, as he should have, any instances in which an ‘ablative + *labh*’ construction is used to give the location (as distinct from a conscious source) of an acquisition.

Note that, for the resolution of the grammatical point involved here, it is not necessary that the acquisition be that of an *āgama*. I am not making the unreasonable expectation that another occurrence strictly of the type ‘ablative of location + *āgamam* + *labdhvā*’ be pointed out, for I do realize that there would be very few occasions requiring one to speak of the acquisition of an *āgama*. Similarly, any form of *labh* or a synonymous root would do. The point is that Scharfe should have cited at least one parallel instance favoring the ‘location’ interpretation before setting aside so casually the observation he attributes to an eminent Indian Sanskritist.

In his letter of 6 November 1987, Scharfe informs me that the observation was made by V. Raghavan at the time of the American Oriental Society meeting held at Santa Barbara.

(c) As the correct reading of RT 1.176 is *candrā-cāryādibhir labdhvādeśam tasmāt* (Aklujkar 1986), the source in that ‘ablative + *labh*’ construction is King Abhimanyu, i.e., the source is sentient.

41. (a) Since the etymological or wider meaning of *amanuṣya* is something anyone knowing Sanskrit would think of right at the outset, it does not need a tradition to come into existence, but the narrow meaning is so specific and unexpected that it is not likely to be found in commentaries like the *Kāśikā* unless a tradition to the effect that it was intended by Pāṇini existed.

(b) From Patañjali’s comments on 3.2.52-3, it seems that commentators of Pāṇini had begun by Patañjali’s

time to entertain the possibility of taking *amanuṣya* in a literal sense. The *Kāśikā* does not appear to be the first commentary to do so.

42. As the secondary derivatives tend to acquire a general meaning (such as ‘belonging to, pertaining to, associated with’) in the history of Sanskrit, *pārvata* (and *parvatīya*) probably expanded beyond the sense ‘a parvata-dwelling ogre/ghost/ascetic’ to include items associated with mountains in general; i.e., *pārvata* (and *parvatīya*) could also be used as adjectives of things such as water and fruit found on a mountain. It is likely that because of this semantic development the *Kāśikā* decided not to follow consistently the narrow meaning of *amanuṣya* it advocated in the case of Pāṇini 2.4.23.

Select Bibliography

Items for which publication details have been specified in the earlier parts of this study or can be gathered from Cardona (1976) have not been included here. The same applies to well-known works like the *Rāmāyaṇa* and well-known series such as *Epigraphia Indica*.

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1987. “Rāja-taraṅgiṇī 1.176.” In *Ancient Indian History, Philosophy and Culture, Essays in Memory of Professor Radhagovinda Basak Vidyavacaspati*.

- (Eds.) Pratap Bandyopadhyay and Manabendu Banerjee, 224-45. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1983. "On the History of Pāṇinian Grammar in the Early Centuries Following Patañjali." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 11:357-412.
- Cardona, George. 1976. *Pāṇini: a Survey of Research*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton. Indian edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- De, S. K. 1938. "Candra-Gomin." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 14:256-60.
- Ḍhere, Rāma-candra Cintāmaṇa. 1977. *Cakra-pāṇi (ādyā marāṭhī vāṇmayācī sāmśkr̥tika pārśva-bhūmī)*. Poona: Viśva-karmā Sāhityālaya. In Marathi.
- Gupta, Parmanand. 1973. *Geography in Ancient Indian Inscriptions (up to 650 A.D.)*. Delhi: D. K. Publishing House.
- Hindī Śabda-sāgara*. Revised ed. 1969. Kāśī Nāgarī Pracārīṇī Sabhā. Prayag: India Press, Ltd. In Hindi.
- Joshi, S. D. 1976. "Sanskrit Grammar." In *Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar as an Indologist, a Symposium*. (Ed.) Dandekar, R. N., 113-42. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Joshi, S. D., and Roodbergen, J. A. F. 1976. *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya Anabhihitāhnikā (P. 2.3.1-2.3.17)*. Poona: University of Poona. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, class C, no. 11.
- Katre, S. M. 1954. *Introduction to Indian Textual Criticism*. Poona: Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute. Deccan College Handbook Series, no. 5.

- Kirfel, Willibald. 1954. *Das Purāṇa vom Weltgebaude*.
Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars der
Universität Bonn.
- Laddu, S. D. 1981. "A Reconsideration of the History of
the Mahābhāṣya." In C.A.S.S. [Centre of Advanced Study
in Sanskrit] *Studies*, no. 6, pp. 187-97. Poona:
University of Poona.
- Law, Bimala Churn. 1932. *Geography of Early Buddhism*.
London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Reprint
1979. New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corp.
- Mānavallī, Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī (Ed.). 1887. *Vākyapadīyaṃ*
. . . śrī-bhartṛhari- . . . viracitaṃ śrī-puṇya-
rāja-kṛta- . . . tīkā-yutam. Benares: Braj B. Das &
Co. Benares Sanskrit Series, nos. 11, 19, 24.
- Mirashi, Vasudev Vishnu. 1955. *Inscriptions of the*
Kalachuri-Chedi Era. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum,
vol. 4, pt. 1. Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for
India.
- 1963. *Inscriptions of the Vākāṭakas*. Corpus
Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. 5. Ootacamund: Govern-
ment Epigraphist for India.
- 1975. *Literary and Historical Studies in Indol-*
ogy. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Mishra, Vibhuti Bhushan. 1973. *Religious Beliefs and Prac-*
tices of North India During the Early Mediaeval Period.
The Hague: E. J. Brill.
- Motichandra. 1953/1966. *Sārthavāha*. Patna: Bihāra-rāṣṭra-
bhāṣā-parīṣad. In Hindi.
- Mulay, Sumati. 1972. *Studies in the Historical and*
Cultural Geography and Ethnography of the Deccan. . . .

- Poona: Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute. Deccan College Dissertation Series D, no. 68.
- Rāma-toṣaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya. *Prāṇa-toṣiṇī*. (Ed.) Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara Bhaṭṭācārya. 3d ed. Calcutta: n.p., 1898. Dates of earlier editions not known.
- Sankalia, Hasmukhlal Dhirajlal. 1982. *The Rāmāyaṇa in the Historical Perspective*. Delhi: Macmillan.
- Scharfe, Hartmut. 1976. "A Second 'Index Fossil' of Sanskrit Grammarians." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96:274-77.
- Schwartzberg, Joseph E. (Ed.). 1978. *A Historical Atlas of South Asia*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press. Association for Asian Studies Reference Series, no. 2.
- Shah, U. P. 1976. "The Sālakataṅkaṭas and Laṅkā." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96:109-13.
- Siṃha, Raghu-nātha (Ed., trans.). 1969. *Kaḥaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, vol. 1. Varanasi: Hindī Pracāraka Saṁsthāna. In Hindi.
- (Ed., trans.). 1974. *Kaḥaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, vol. 2. Varanasi: Hindī Pracāraka Saṁsthāna. In Hindi.
- Sircar, D. C. 1960. *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Subramania Iyer, K. A. 1977. *The Vākyapadīya of Bharṭṛhari, Chapter II, English Translation*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Tārā-nātha Tarka-vācaspati (Ed., comment.). 1864 (saṁvatsara 1921). *Siddhānta-kaumudī, parārddham* [second half]. Calcutta: Saṁskṛta-yantra [press of the Sanskrit College?].

- , 1902. *Śabdārtha-ratnam*. 3d ed. Calcutta:
Dakṣiṇā-caraṇa Cakravartin at V. L. Press. Dates of
the first two editions not known.
- Watters, Thomas. 1905. *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*
(A.D. 629-645). London: Royal Asiatic Society. First
Indian ed./rpt. 1961, two vols. in one. Delhi: Munshi
Ram Manohar Lal.
- Wilson, H. H. 1894 (Trans., annot.). *The Viṣṇu*
Purāṇa. . . . Edition with introduction by R. C.
Hazra, 1972. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak.
- Yazdani, G. (Ed.). 1960. *The Early History of the Deccan*.
Parts 1-6 in one volume. London: Oxford University
Press.