

SAMYAG-VĀK SERIES-VI

## ASPECTS OF BUDDHIST SANSKRIT

(PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON THE  
LANGUAGE OF SANSKRIT BUDDHIST TEXTS, OCT. 1-5, 1991)

Editor

Kameshwar Nath Mishra



CENTRAL INSTITUTE OF HIGHER TIBETAN STUDIES  
SARNATH, VARANASI

B.E. 2536

C.E.1993

## Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit : the original language

—Johannes BRONKHORST, Switzerland

Languages in which the sacred texts of religious traditions have been composed and preserved tend to be looked upon as more than ordinary languages. This is not only true of India. Hebrew has been considered the original language by Christians and Jews alike<sup>1</sup>. This view, which in the case of the Jews is already attested before the beginning of our era, for the Christians of course somewhat later, survived right into the 19th century<sup>2</sup>. A similar view was held by at least some Moslems with respect to Arabic, the language of the *Koran* and therefore of *Allah* himself, this in spite of the fact that the composition of the *Koran* can be dated very precisely in historical and relatively recent times<sup>3</sup>.

In India the followers of the Vedic tradition have always kept Sanskrit, the language of the *Veda*, in high regard. Sanskrit is the only correct language, other languages being incorrect. Patañjali's *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya* (ca. 150 B.C.E.), in its first chapter called *Paspasāhnika*, distinguishes clearly between correct and incorrect words, pointing out that many incorrect words correspond to each correct word; besides correct *gauḥ* there are many incorrect synonyms : *gāvī*, *goṇī*, *gotā*, *gopotalikā*, etc\*. There are various

reasons for using correct words only, the most important being that this produces virtue (*dharma*) and benefit (*abhyudaya*)\*. Correct words are in fact used in many texts and regions; Patañjali mentions the earth with its seven continents and the three worlds, which shows that for him Sanskrit is the language of the universe\*. Sanskrit is also eternal. The reasons adduced to prove this may seem primitive to us, but they leave no doubt as to Patañjali's convictions. Someone who needs a pot, he points out, goes to a potter and has one made; someone who needs words, on the other hand, does not go to a grammarian to have them made<sup>1</sup>. Some later authors refer to Sanskrit as the language of the gods (*daivī vāk*)\*. Among them is Bhartṛhari (*Vākyapadīya* 1.182), who adds that this divine language has been corrupted by incompetent speakers<sup>2</sup>. The Mīmāṃsakas and others, too, claim without hesitation that the Vedic texts, and therefore also their language, are eternal. I limit myself here to a quotation from Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's *Ślokaṇvṛttika*, which states:<sup>3</sup> "For us the word *go* ('cow') is eternal; and people have an idea of the cow from such vulgar deformations of it as *gāvī*, etc., only when it follows the original [correct] word (*go*); and such comprehension is due to the incapability [of the speaker to utter ... the original correct form of the word]." The example is the same as the one given by Patañjali, but Kumārila adds a dimension which we do not find in the *Mahābhāṣya*: the original word is *go*, and *gāvī* is nothing more

1. Borst, 1957-63: 147 f. etc. (for an enumeration of the pages dealing with the subject see p. 1946 n. 204); Scholem, 1957: 19, 146; Katz, 1982 : 43-88.
  2. Borst, 1957-63: 1696; see also Olender, 1989.
  3. Mounin, 1985: 117; Borst, 1957-63: 337 f., 352 f.; Kopf, 1956: 55 f.; Loucel, 1963-64.
- \* *Bhūyāmsa'paśabdāḥ, alpiyāmsaḥ śabdā iti. Ekaikasya hi śabdasya bahavo'pabhrāṃśāḥ. Tadyathā gaur ity asya śabdasya gāvī, goṇī gotā gopotaliketyādayo bahavo'pabhrāṃśāḥ-Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali [Navāhnika], (Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan, Varāṇasi, 1990) p.20, also see p.33.- (editor)*

K.N. MISHRA (ed.): *Aspects of Buddhist Sanskrit: The Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Language of the Sanskrit Buddhist Texts, (Oct. 1-5, 1991), Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, Varanasi, INDIA, 221007, 1993.*

- \* *Evam ihāpi yady apy apaśabdajñāne 'dharmaḥ tathāpi yas tv asau śabdajñāne dharmaḥ tena ca sa doṣo nirghāṇiṣyate bhūyasā cābhyudayena yogo bhaviṣyati. ibid p.57 (editor.)*
- \* *Mahān śabdasya prayogavisayaḥ. Saptadvīpā vasumatī, trayo lokāḥ, catvāro vedāḥ sāṅgāḥ sarahasyā bahudhā bhinnā ..... ibid p.52. (editor)*
1. Cp. Ibn Fāris' remark: "*Il ne nous est point parvenu que quelque tribu arabe, dans une époque proche de la nôtre, se soit mise d'accord pour désigner quelque objet que ce soit, en formant une convention à son sujet.*" (tr. Loucel, 1963-64: II: 257.)
- \* *Saṃskṛtaṃ nāma daivī vāg anvākyatā maharṣibhiḥ/ Bhāmahaḥ : Kāvyaḍarśaḥ. 1.33 ab//*
2. A closely similar observation occurs in Bhartṛhari's commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* ('*Dīpikā*'), *Ahnika* I p.16 l. 29 - p. 17 l. 1: *anye manyante/ iyaṃ daivī vāk/ sā tu puruṣāśakter ālasyād vā prakīrṇā/*. See also Tripathi, 1986: 88.
3. *ŚIV, Śabdānityatādhikaraṇa, 276: gośabde 'vasthite 'smākaṃ tadaśaktijakāritā/ gāvyaḍer api gobuddhir mūlaśabdānusāriṇī// Tr. Jha.*

than a corruption of it<sup>1</sup>. Helārāja, commenting on *Vākyapadīya* 3.3.30, is even more explicit when he states that in an earlier era (*purākalpe*) language was free from corruptions<sup>2</sup>. He follows here the ancient *Vṛtti* on *Vākyapadīya* 1.182 (146)<sup>3</sup>. [The much later author Annambhaṭṭa, interestingly, holds the view that not only Sanskrit, but also other languages - like that of the *Yavanas* - were created by God in the beginning.]<sup>4</sup>

Brahmanism continued to use the language of its sacred texts. The same is true of Theravāda Buddhism, whose sacred language, at present known by the name Pāli, is called Māgadhi by the Buddhists themselves<sup>5</sup>. Māgadhi, we read in Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga*, is the original language (*mūlabhāsā*) of all living beings, the natural form of expression (*sabhāvanirutti*)<sup>6</sup>. The *Sammohavinodini*, commentary to the *Vibhaṅga* of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*, ascribes the following opinion to a monk called Tissadatta:<sup>7</sup> "[Suppose] the mother is a Damiḷi, the father an

1. Kumārila does not exclude the possibility that certain words, which are not (no longer?) in use among the Āryas because the objects designated are not familiar to them, survive among the *Mlecchas*; see *Tantravārttika* on 1.3.10.
2. Ed. Iyer p. 143 l. 14: *purākalpe 'nṛtādibhir ivāpabhraṃśair api rahitā vāg āsīd ...*
3. Ed. Iyer p. 233-34: *purākalpe svaśarīrajyotiṣām manuṣyāṇām yathāivānṛtādibhir asaṅkūṇā vāg āsīt tathā sarvair apabhraṃśaiḥ*. See also p. 229 l. 1: *śabdaprakṛtir apabhraṃśah*, and Iyer, 1964.
4. See Uddyotana I p. 90-91: *vastuta īśvareṇa sṛṣṭyādāv arthaviśeṣavat śabdaviśeṣa api sṛṣṭā eva .../ na hi tadānīm saṃskṛtam eva sṛṣṭam na bhāṣāntaram ity atra mānam asti, tattadyavanādisṛṣṭau tadīyabhāṣāyā api tadānīm eva sṛṣṭatvāt/ na hi teṣām api prathamam saṃskṛtenaiva vyavahārah paścād apabhraṃśarūpabhāṣāpravṛtṭir iti kalpanāyām mānam asti/*
5. Hinüber, 1977; 1986: 20.
6. *Vism* p. 373 l. 30-31; see also *Saddanīti* p. 632 l.4.
7. *Vibh-a* p. 387 l. 29- p. 388 l. 7: *mātā damiḷi pitā andhako/ tesam jāto dārako sace mātū katham paṭhamam suṇāti damiḷabhāsam bhāṣissati/ sace pitu katham paṭhamam suṇāti andhakabhāsam bhāṣissati/ ubhinnaṃ pi pana katham asuṇanto māgadhabhāsam bhāṣissati/ yo pi agāmake mahāaraṇṇe nibbatto tattha aṇṇo kathento nāma natthi so pi attano dhammatāya vacanam samuṭṭhāpento māgadhabhāsam eva bhāṣissati/ niraye tiracchānayoniyam pettivisaye manussaloke devaloke ti sabbattha māgadhabhāsa va ussannā/ tattha sesā oṭṭakirātaandhakayonakadamīlabhāsādikā aṭṭhārasa bhāsa parivattanti/ ayam ev' ekā yathābhuccabrahmavohāraariyavohārasaṃkhatā māgadhabhāsa va na*

Andhaka. Their [newly] born child, if it hears first the speech of the mother, it will speak the language of the Damiḷas. If it hears first the speech of the father, it will speak the language of the Andhakas. But if it doesn't hear the speech of either of them, it will speak the language of the Māgadhas. Also someone who is born in a big jungle, devoid of villages, where no one else speaks, he too will by his own nature start to produce words and speak this same language of the Māgadhas<sup>1</sup>. In hell, among the animals, in the realm of ghosts, in the world of men and in the world of gods, everywhere this same language of the Māgadhas is preponderant. The remaining eighteen languages - Oṭṭa, Kirāta, Andhaka, Yonaka, Damiḷa, etc. - undergo change in these [realms]. Only this language of the Māgadhas, rightly called language of *Brahma* and *āryan* language, does not change."

The *Mohavicchedanī*, which dates from the 12th - 13th century, goes to the extent of stating that all other languages are derived from Māgadhi<sup>2</sup>:

"It (i.e., Māgadhi) was first predominant in the hells and in the world of men and that of the gods. And afterwards the regional languages such as *Andhaka*, *Yonaka*, *Damiḷa*, etc., as well as the eighteen great languages, Sanskrit, etc., arose out of it."

The Theravāda Buddhists considered Māgadhi, i.e., Pāli, the original language of all living beings. Not surprisingly, the Jains reserved this privilege for the language of their sacred texts, viz. *Ardha-Māgadhi*. This position finds already expression in the *Ardha-Māgadhi* canon. The *Aupapātika Sūtra* (56) states<sup>3</sup>:

*parivattati/* Cf. Hinüber, 1977: 239 f. Similarly *Paṭiśa* I, p. 5, l. 27 ff. My wife, Joy Manné, drew my attention to this passage.

1. The idea that children who grow up without others will speak the original language is not unknown to the West; see Borst, 1957-63: 800, 870, 1050, etc. Experiments were carried out in order to identify the original language; Borst, 1957-63: 39 (Psammetichus, cf. Katz, 1982: 54), 756 (Frederick II), 1010-11 (Jacob IV, 1473-1513), etc. (See p. 1942 n. 191 for further cases.)
2. *Mohavicchedanī* p. 186 l. 14 f., cited in Hinüber, 1977: 241: *sā* (Sc. Māgadhi) *va apāyesu manusse devaloke c'eva paṭhamam ussannā/ pacchā ca tato andhakayonakadamīlādidesabhāsa c'eva sakkaṭṭādiṭṭhārasamahābhāsa ca nibbattā/*
3. *bhagavam mahāvire ... savvabhāsaṇugāmiṇie sarassaie joyaṇanihāriṇā sareṇam addhamāgahāc bhāsāc bhāsai ... sā vi ya ṇam addhamāgahā bhāsā*

"With a voice that extends over a *yojana*, Lord Mahāvīra speaks in the Ardha-Māgadhi language, a speech which is in accordance with all languages. That Ardha-Māgadhi language changes into the own language of all those, both *āryas* and non-*āryas*." The *Viyāhapannatti* adds that "the gods speak Ardha-Māgadhi"<sup>1</sup>. We find the same position repeated in a work by a Jain author of the 11th century, Namisādhu. Interestingly, Namisādhu writes in Sanskrit, no longer in Prakrit. His commentary on Rudraṭa's *Kāvyaṭīkā* 2.12 contains the following explanation of the word *Prākṛta*:<sup>2</sup>

"*Prākṛta*: The natural function of language, common to all men of this world and not beautified by [the rules of] grammar etc., this is the basis (*prakṛti*). That which is in this [basis], or that [basis] itself is [called] *Prākṛta*<sup>3</sup>. Alternatively, *Prākṛta* is *prāk kṛta* 'what has been made before' on the basis of the statement 'it has been established in the Jain canon (*ārśavacana*, lit. words of the *ṛṣis*) that Ardha-Māgadhi is the speech of the gods' and other statements. [Prakrit] is said to be a language easy to understand for children and women, the origin of all languages. Like the water released by a cloud, it has but one form, yet, once differences have entered because of the difference between regions and because of beautification, it acquires the later distinctions between Sanskrit and the other languages. This is why the author of our treatise (i.e. Rudraṭa) has mentioned Prakrit at the beginning, and after that Sanskrit etc."

*tesim savvesim āriyamañāriyāṇaṃ appaṇo sabhāsāc pariṇāmeṇaṃ pariṇamaṃ.* Leumann, 1883: 61; cited in Norman, 1976: 17; 1980: 66. Similar remarks at *Samavāya* 34; *Viy* (ed. Nathamal) 9.33.149.

1. *Viy* 5.4.24: *devā ṇaṃ addhamāgahāc bhāsāc bhāsaṃti*. Cf. Deleu, 1970: 108.
2. Namisādhu p. 31; cited in Nitti-Dolci, 1938: 159: *prākṛteti/ sakalajagajjantūnāṃ vyākaraṇādibhir anāhitasamkārah sahaṃ vacanavyāpārah prakṛtiḥ/ tatra bhavaṃ saiva vā prākṛtam/ ārisavayaṇe siddham devāṇaṃ addhamāgahā bāṇītyādivacanād vā prāk pūrvam kṛtam prākṛtam bālamahilādisubodham/ sakalabhāṣānibandhanabhūtam vacanam ucyate/ meghanirmuktajalam ivaikasvarūpaṃ tad eva ca deśaviśeṣāt samskārakaraṇāc ca samāsāditaviśeṣaṃ sat samskṛtādyuttaravibhedān āpnoti/ ata eva śāstrakṛtā prākṛtam ādau nirḍiṣṭam/ tadanu samskṛtādinī/*
3. A similar argument is found in the *Vṛtti* on Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadiya*, and in the latter's *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*; see below.

We see that Namisādhu goes to the extent of considering Ardha-Māgadhi the predecessor of Sanskrit, from which the latter has been derived. It is also clear from this passage that Namisādhu, who wrote in Sanskrit, took this idea from his sacred texts, which themselves were still composed in Ardha-Māgadhi.

We have seen that both the Theravāda Buddhists and the Jains believed that the language of their sacred texts was the original language of all living beings. Both went to the extent of claiming that also Sanskrit had descended from their respective original language. This is not particularly surprising in the case of the Theravādins, who went on using their original language. The Jains, on the other hand, shifted to Sanskrit. Potentially this was very embarrassing for them. For by doing so they abandoned their original language, in order to turn to the very language which the rival Brahmins claimed to be original and eternal.

The example of Namisādhu shows that the later Jains based their conviction on statements dating from the time when Ardha-Māgadhi was still in use. This is of interest because the Jains who used Sanskrit were in a position closely similar to that of those Buddhists who used Sanskrit but whose sacred texts were, at least partly, in Hybrid Sanskrit. A crucial difference, however, is that, to my knowledge, no Hybrid Sanskrit text claims to be composed in the original language of all living beings.

Before we consider the question how the Buddhists explained the use of Hybrid Sanskrit in their sacred texts, we must return once more to the language of the Veda. I stated earlier that the Brahmins continued to use the language of the Veda, but this is of course not completely true. Vedic differs in various respects from the classical language, and indeed much of Vedic literature did not fail to become unintelligible even to speakers of Sanskrit. This problem was already acute in the time of Yāska, one of the aims of whose *Nirukta* is precisely to find the meaning of unknown Vedic words. We also know that already Pāṇini, who may antedate Yāska, gives an incomplete analysis of the Vedic verb. Both the Vedic Brahmins and the Buddhists whose sacred texts were in Hybrid Sanskrit found themselves therefore in closely similar situations. Both of them used classical Sanskrit, whereas their sacred texts had been preserved in languages that, though related to classical Sanskrit, were in many respects clearly different from it.

The Vedic Brahmins solved this problem by denying its existence. This is particularly clear from the well-known refutation of Kautsa in the *Nirukta* (1.15-16). Kautsa claimed that the Vedic *mantras* have no meaning. Among the reasons he adduces the most important one for our purposes is that they are unintelligible<sup>1</sup>. To illustrate this Kautsa cites a number of obscure Vedic forms. Yāska's reply is categorical:<sup>2</sup>

"It is no deficiency of the post that a blind man does not see it; the deficiency lies with the man."

Vedic is therefore a form of Sanskrit that uses words and verbal forms that are not in common use in classical Sanskrit; that is not however the fault of the Vedic language, but rather of the person who is content not to employ those forms. For essentially, the words of Vedic and of classical Sanskrit are identical.<sup>3</sup>

A similar discussion occurs in the *Mīmāṃsā Sūtra* and *Śābara Bhāṣya*.<sup>4</sup> Here too we are reassured that the sentence-meaning in Vedic is no different from classical Sanskrit<sup>5</sup>, and that

"the meaning is there; only there is ignorance of it".<sup>6</sup>

The repetition of this discussion in the basic work of *Mīmāṃsā* shows how important it was for Brahmanism to emphasize the continuity - or rather: essential identity - between

1. Nir 1.15: *athāpy avispaṣṭārthā bhavanti*.
2. Nir 1.16: *yatho etad avispaṣṭārthā bhavanti naiṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati puruṣāparādhah sa bhavati*.
3. Nir 1.16: *arthavantah śabdāsāmānyāt*.
4. MiS 1.2.31-45 (31-53): pp. 48-69 in the Ānandāśrama edition, pp. 74-86 in Jha's translation.
5. MiS 1.2.32 (*siddhānta*)/40: *avisīṣṭas tu vākyārthah*. Cp. also MiS 1.3.30 *prayogacodanābhāvād arthaikatvam avibhāgāt*, which Clooney (1990: 133) translates:  
"(A word used in ordinary and Vedic contexts) has the same meaning in both, because they are not differentiated: for there are no (special) injunctions in regard to the usage (*prayoga*) of words."  
Biardeau (1964: 84) translates the first compound of this sūtra:  
"(Sinon), il n'y aurait pas d'injonction de quelque chose à faire."
6. MiS 1.2.41/49: *sataḥ param avijñānam*. Tr. Jha.

Vedic and classical Sanskrit. Because the two are identical, there is no need to state that one of them is the original, eternal language, and the other a development of the former. In fact, both are original and eternal, because they together constitute one and the same language. (This explains how Yāska's *Nirukta* 2.2 can derive Vedic primary nouns from classical verbal roots, and classical nouns from Vedic roots.)

The situation of the Vedic Brahmins was in many respects parallel to that of those Buddhists who used Sanskrit but preserved sacred texts in Hybrid Sanskrit. And the solution accepted by the Brahmins would do equally well in the case of the Buddhists. They could simply deny that Hybrid Sanskrit is a different language, and maintain that it is essentially identical with classical Sanskrit, just like Vedic. There are some indications that this is indeed the solution that was chosen by at least some Buddhists. We consider first one of the surviving Buddhist Sanskrit grammars.

A number of such grammars have come down to us.<sup>1</sup> Generally they make no mention of Hybrid Sanskrit, and confine themselves to describing the classical language. The only exception appears to be the *Kaumāralāta*, called after its author Kumāralāta. This grammar is the first Buddhist Sanskrit grammar we know of, and only some fragments of it, found in Turkestan, have survived. Fortunately these fragments allow us to observe, with Scharfe (1977: 162):

"Just as Pāṇini has special rules for Vedic forms, Kumāralāta makes allowances for peculiar forms of the Buddhist scriptures that resulted from their transposition into Sanskrit from Middle Indo-Aryan dialects (e.g. *bhāveti* for *bhāvayati*, *bhesyati* for *bhaviṣyati* and elisions of final *-am/-im*). The name used for these forms [is] *ārṣa* 'belonging to the *ṛṣi*-s,' ..."<sup>2</sup>

Pāṇini's grammar uses once (1.1.16) the word *anārṣa*, in the sense *avaidika* 'non-Vedic' according to the interpretation of the

1. See Scharfe, 1977: 162 ff.
2. For details, see Lüders, 1930: 686, 693-95. See also Ruegg, 1986: 597.

*Kāśikā*.<sup>1</sup> Kumāralāta's use of *ārṣa* suggests therefore that he looked upon Hybrid Sanskrit as on a par with Vedic. And just as Vedic is not considered another language than classical Sanskrit by the Brahmins, one might think that Kumāralāta looked upon Hybrid Sanskrit as essentially the same language as classical Sanskrit.

Here, however, we have to be circumspect. The Jains, too, use the term *ārṣa* to refer to their sacred language, which is Ardha-Māgadhī. But the Jains do not think that Ardha-Māgadhī is a form of Sanskrit, in their opinion it is the source of Sanskrit.<sup>2</sup> All this we have seen. For the position of the Buddhists with regard to Hybrid Sanskrit we need, therefore, further evidence.

Unfortunately none of the other surviving Buddhist Sanskrit grammars deal with Hybrid Sanskrit, nor indeed with Vedic. It is possible that the *Cāndra Vyākaraṇa* once had an *Adhyāya* dealing with Vedic forms.<sup>3</sup> None of it has however been preserved, so that it is not possible to see whether these rules were used to explain Hybrid Sanskrit forms.

There is however a passage in Candrakīrti's commentary on Āryadeva's *Catuḥśataka* which can throw further light upon our question. The commentary survives only in Tibetan translation, which has recently been edited, studied and translated into English by Tom J.F. Tillemans.

Candrakīrti cites, under *kārikā* 278 of the *Catuḥśataka*, a verse which has been preserved in its original form in the *Samādhirājasūtra* (9.26) as well as in Candrakīrti's own

1. P.S. 1.1.16: *sambuddhau śākalyasyetāv anārṣe*. The *Kāśikā* explains: *ot iti vartate/ sambuddhinimitto ya okārah sa śākalyasya ācāryasya matena praghyasañjño bhavati itiśabde anārṣe avaidike parataḥ/ vāyo iti vāyav iti/ bhāno iti bhānav iti/ etc.*
2. This is not necessarily true of all Jains. Hemacandra, who uses the term *ārṣa* and describes the language concerned, does not appear to give evidence that he looked upon this language as the source of Sanskrit (unless his use of *porāṇa* 'old' in connection with this language (IV.287: see Hoernle, 1880: xviii f.) shows the opposite). Cf. Ghosal, 1969.
3. See Oberlies, 1989: 2-3.

*Prasannapadā* (on *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* 25.3) where it is cited, too. The verse reads:<sup>1</sup>

*nivṛtti<sup>2</sup> dharmāṇa na asti dharmā*  
*ye neha<sup>3</sup> asti na te jātu asti/*  
*astīti nāstīti ca kalpanāvatām*  
*evaṃ carantāna ṇa duḥkha śāmyati//*

This means :

"In extinction *dharmas* are without *dharmas*. Whatever is inexistent in this [state] does not exist at all. For those who imagine 'existence' and 'inexistence' and practise accordingly, suffering will not cease."<sup>4</sup>

Note that this verse is not written in classical Sanskrit. In the *Prasannapadā* this fact is not so much as hinted at. In his commentary on the *Catuḥśataka*, on the other hand, Candrakīrti makes two grammatical remarks in this connection. The first one reads, in translation:<sup>5</sup>

"Here (i.e., in the words *nivṛtti dharmāṇa na asti dharmā*) the seventh case-ending (i.e., of the locative) does not appear [in *nivṛtti*], in accordance with the *sūtra*: 'for *sup*, [substitute] *su*, *luk*, etc.'"

The *sūtra* to which Candrakīrti refers is, of course, P.S. 7.1.39: *supām sulukpūrvasavarṇāccheyādādyāyājālah*. This, however, is a Vedic *sūtra* ! The preceding rule contains the term *chandasi*, and the phenomena described by 39 itself leave no room for doubt as to their Vedic nature. Candrakīrti apparently feels no

1. In Tibetan (Tillemans, 1990: II: 8):  
*mya ngan 'das la chos rnam chos yod min/*  
*'di na gang med de dag gzhar yang med//*  
*yod dang med ces rtog pa dang ldan zhing/*  
*de ltar spyod rnam sdugs bnga/ zhi mi 'gyur//*
2. The *Prasannapadā* has *nivṛtti*.
3. This reading agrees with the *Prasannapadā* and with the Tibetan. The *Samādhirājasūtra* has *yeneti nāsti*. See further Tillemans, 1990: II: 9 n. 1.
4. Tr. Tillemans, 1990: I: 117.
5. Tillemans, 1990: II: 8: '*dir "sup rnam chos kyi su mi mngon par byas so" zhes bya ba la sogs ba'i mdor byas pa bdun pa mi mngon par byas pa'o*. For the translation, cf. Tillemans, 1990: I: 118, 235-36 n. 154.

hesitation to explain a Hybrid Sanskrit form with a Vedic rule of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

Candrakīrti's second grammatical remark on the same quoted verse confirms this impression. It concerns the singular *na asti*, where we would expect *na santi*. Here Candrakīrti notes:<sup>1</sup> "Correctly speaking one would say *na santi* (Tib. *rnams yod min*). But in accordance with the rule to the effect that 'it should be stated that verbal endings (*tiṅ*) are [substituted] for [other] verbal endings', [the verse] says *na asti dharmā* (Tib. *chos yod min*)." The rule here invoked can be identified as a line from the *Mahābhāṣya* on the same Pāṇinian *sūtra* 7.1.39. This line reads: *tiṅāṃ ca tiṅo bhavantīti vaktavayam*,<sup>2</sup> and concerns, again, Vedic forms.

The above passages support the view that at least some Buddhists held the opinion that Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit was not really a different language from classical Sanskrit. We must now consider a passage in Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* which may indicate the opposite for certain other Buddhists. We have already had an occasion to refer to verse 1.182 of this text, according to the first half of which the divine language- i.e., Sanskrit - has been corrupted by incompetent speakers. The second half of the verse contrasts this view with another one:<sup>3</sup>

"The upholders of impermanence, on the other hand, hold the opposite view with regard to this doctrine."

The precise meaning of 'upholders of impermanence' (*anityadarśin*) is not specified, but it is at least conceivable that Buddhists are meant: the Buddhists, after all, considered impermanence one of their key doctrines, and used this very term *anitya* to refer to it. The point of view adopted by these upholders of impermanence is less problematic: they apparently believed that the so-called 'corrupt language', rather than deriving from Sanskrit, was

1. Tillemans, 1990: II: 10: *legs par bshad pa las ni rnams yod min zhes bya bar 'gyur mod kyi 'tingām ni ting ngor gyur ro zhes bya ba brjod par bya'o' zhes bya ba'i mtshan nyid las na chos yod min zhes gsungs so*. Cf. Tillemans, 1990: I: 118. 236 n. 158.

2. Mbh III p. 256 l. 14.

3. VP 1.182cd: *anityadarśināṃ tv asmin vāde buddhiviparyayaḥ*.

the source of the latter. This is indeed how the ancient *ṛtti* understands the line, for it explains:<sup>1</sup>

"The upholders of impermanence, on the other hand, ... say that *Prākṛta* constitutes the collection of correct words, [because *Prākṛta* means] 'that which is in the basis (*prakṛtau bhava*). But later on a modification has been established which is fixed by men of impaired understanding, by means of accents and other refinements (*saṃskāra*)."

The 'modification' here mentioned, which is characterized by accents and other refinements, is, of course, Sanskrit.

This passage from the *Ṛtti* contains points of similarity with Namisādhu's defence of Prakrit studied above. This suggests that the *Ṛtti* refers here to Jains rather than to Buddhists. Does this indicate that also the *Vākyapadīya* refers here to Jains, and not to Buddhists?

Here several points have to be considered. First of all, it is more than likely that the author of the *Ṛtti* is different from the author of the verses explained in it.<sup>2</sup> Equally important is the fact that the *Vākyapadīya* never uses the word *Prākṛta* to refer to a language different from Sanskrit. Bhartṛhari does mention the term in this sense in his commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*, but there in the context of 'some' who hold that Prakrit words are eternal.<sup>3</sup> The 'some' here referred to can hardly be the 'upholders of impermanence'.<sup>4</sup> Add to this that all the three passages considered from the *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*, from the *Ṛtti* and from Namisādhu's commentary mention the same grammatical explanation (*prākṛta* = *prakṛtau bhava*) and it is tempting to conclude that these three

1. *Ṛtti* on VP 1.182 [146], ed. Iyer p. 234: *anityavādināḥ tu ... prakṛtau bhavaṃ prākṛtaṃ sādhanām śabdānām samūham ācaksate/ vikāras tu paścād vyavasthāpitāḥ, yaḥ saṃbhinnabuddhibhiḥ puruṣaiḥ svarasaṃskārādibhir nirṇiyate iti//*

2. Cf. Bronkhorst, 1988; and Jan E.M. Houben's forthcoming article on this subject.

3. *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*, Āhnika I p. 16 l. 28-29: *kecid evaṃ manyante/ ya evaite prākṛtāḥ śabdāḥ ta evaite nityāḥ/ prakṛtau bhavāḥ prākṛtāḥ/*

4. Note however that elsewhere in the same commentary (p. 23 l. 24) Bhartṛhari ascribes a concept of eternality to the 'upholders of momentariness: ... kṣaṇikavādināṃ avicchedena pravṛttir yā sā nityatā.

passages, unlike *Vākyapadīya* 1.182cd, refer to the same current of thought, probably Jainism.

It seems, then, at least possible to maintain that *Vākyapadīya* 1.182cd refers to Buddhists who held that their sacred texts were composed in a language which, though appearing corrupt to orthodox Brahmins, represents in reality the origin of Sanskrit. Since we have no reason to believe that Bhartṛhari was acquainted with the Pāli tradition and with its belief that this language was identical with Māgadhī, the original language, we are led to the conclusion that he may here refer to Buddhists who believed that some kind of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit was the original language, which formed the basis of other languages, including Sanskrit.<sup>1</sup>

The preceding considerations have made clear that the different religious currents of classical India which we have considered all shared the belief that their sacred texts were composed in the earliest language, the source of all other languages. In the case of Theravāda Buddhism and Jainism, this position was fairly straightforward. Their sacred languages, Māgadhī (i.e. Pāli) and Ardha-Māgadhī respectively, were the source of all other languages, including Sanskrit. The position of the Vedic Brahmins was slightly more complicated, for the differences between Vedic and classical Sanskrit are considerable. But neither of these two was claimed to be the source of the other. Rather, Vedic and classical Sanskrit were maintained to constitute together one single language which, of course, was the language of the gods, the eternal language. It appears that at least some of those Buddhists who preserved sacred texts in Hybrid Sanskrit took essentially the same position as the Brahmins. They looked upon the language of their sacred texts as fundamentally identical with classical Sanskrit. They even used Vedic rules of Pāṇini to account for some of the special features of Hybrid Sanskrit. One line in Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*, on the other hand, suggests that perhaps some of these Buddhists, too,

1. Hinüber (1988: 17-18; 1989) draws attention to the fact that some kinds of Buddhist Sanskrit remain faithful to Middle-Indic, whereas others manifest the desire to adjust to correct Sanskrit. It is of course not impossible that these two tendencies were accompanied, or even inspired, by different views regarding the original language. See Hinüber's (1989: 349) remarks about Aśvaghoṣa's ideas concerning the language of the Buddha.

entertained the claim that their sacred language was the source of Sanskrit.

## References and Abbreviations

Annambhaṭṭa: Uddyotana I. In: *Mahābhāṣya Pradīpa Vyākhyānāni* I (*Adhyāya* 1 *Pāda* 1 *Āhnika* 1-4). Edition par M.S. Narasimhacharya, présentation par Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat. Pondichéry: Institut Français d'Indologie. 1973.

Bhartṛhari: *Vākyapadīya*. (1) Wilhelm Rau (ed.) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 1977. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XLII, 4.) (2) *Kāṇḍa* I edited, with the *Vṛtti* and the *Paddhati* of Vṛṣabhadeva, by K.A. Subramania Iyer. (Deccan College, Poona, 1966. Deccan College Monograph Series, 32.) (3) *Kāṇḍa* III part 1, with the commentary of Helārāja, K.A. Subramania Iyer (ed.) (Deccan College, Poona, 1963. Deccan College Monograph Series, 21).

Bhartṛhari: *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*. Fasc. IV: *Āhnika* I. Johannes Bronkhorst (ed.) (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1987. Post-Graduate and Research Department Series, 28).

Biardeau, Madeleine : *Théorie de la connaissance et philosophie de la parole dans le brahmanisme classique*.- (La Haye: Mouton, Paris, 1964).

Borst, Arno : *Der Turmbau von Babel. Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*. 6 vols. (1957-1963) Anton Hiersemann. Stuttgart.

Bronkhorst, Johannes "Etudes sur Bhartṛhari. 1: L'auteur et la date de la *Vṛtti*." (Bulletin d'Etudes Indiennes 6, 1988, 105-143).

Candrakīrti: *Prasannapadā. Madhyamakāśāstra of Nāgārjuna* with the commentary *Prasannapadā* by Candrakīrti. P.L. Vaidya (ed.) (Second edition by Shridhar Tripathi. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute. 1987. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 10).

Clooney, Francis X. : *Thinking Ritually. Rediscovering the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā of Jaimini*. (Gerold & Co. Vienna: 1990), (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, XVII).



Deleu, Jozef: *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavaī)*. The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon. Introduction, critical analysis, commentary & indexes. (De Tempel, Brugge: 1970).

Ghosal, S.N. "The Āṣa Prākṛit as Hemacandra viewed it." (Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, 18, 1969, 304-314).

Hintüber, Oskar von : "Zur Geschichte des Sprachnamens Pāli." *Beiträge zur Indienforschung*. Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet. (Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin, 1977), pp. 237-246.

Hintüber, Oskar von : *Das ältere Mittelindisch in Überblick*. (Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, 1986).

Hintüber, Oskar von : *Die Sprachgeschichte des Pāli im Spiegel der südostasiatischen Handschriftenüberlieferung*. (Untersuchungen zur Sprachgeschichte und Handschriftenkunde des Pāli I. Franz Steiner, Stuttgart, 1988. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jhrg. 1988, Nr. 8.)

Hintüber, Oskar von : "Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit." (Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes. Colette Caillat (ed.). de Boccard, Paris, 1989), pp 341-367.

Hoernle, A.F. Rudolf : *The Prākṛta-Lakṣhaṇam or Chāṇḍa's Grammar of the Ancient (ārsha) Prākṛit*. Part I : Text with a critical introduction and indexes. (Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1880).

Iyer, K.A. Subramania : "Bhartrhari on Apabhraṃśa". (Vishveshvarananda Indological Journal 2 (2), 1964), 242-246.

Katz, David S. : *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603-1655*. (Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1982).

Kopf, L. : "Religious influences on medieval Arabic philology." (Studia Islamica 5, 1956), 33-59.

Leumann, Ernst : *Das Aupapātika Sūtra*, I. Theil. Einleitung, Text und Glossar. (Nachdruck: Klaus Reprint, Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1966. Leipzig, 1883.)

Loucel, Henri : "L'origine du langage d'après les grammairiens arabes, I-IV." (Arabica 10, 1963), 188-208 & 253-281; (11, 1964), 57-72 & 151-187.

Lüders, Heinrich (1930): "Kātantra und Kaumāralāta." (Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. Hist. Kl., pp. 482-538 =) Philologica Indica (Festgabe Lüders). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940, pp. 659-721.

Mbh = The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Third edition by K.V. Abhyankar. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962-72. 3 vols.

MiS = (1) *Mīmāṃsā Sūtra*. Edited, with Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's *Tantravārttika* and Śabara's *Bhāṣya*, by Pt. Gaṇeśaśāstrī Joṣī. Pādas 1.2 - 2.1. Poona: Ānandāśrama. 1981. (2) *Śābara-Bhāṣya*. Translated into English by Ganganatha Jha. Vol. I. Baroda: Oriental Institute. 1973.

Mohavicchedanī by Kassapaṭṭhara of Coḷa. Edited by A.P. Buddhaddatta and A.K. Warder. (London: Luzac & Co. 1961. Pāli Text Society.)

Mounin, Georges : *Histoire de la linguistique des origines au XXe siècle*. 4e édition corrigée. (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1985.)

Namīsādhū. In: *Kāvya-lankāra* (A Treatise on Rhetoric) of Rudraṭa, with the Sanskrit commentary of Namīsādhū, edited by Pt. Rāmadeva Śukla. Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi. (Vidyabhawan Rastrabhasha Granthamala, 136.)

Nir = (1) *Jāśka's Nirukta sammt den Nighaṇṭavas*: (herausgegeben und erläutert von Rudolph Roth. Göttingen 1852. Reprint Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 1976) (2) *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta*. Edited and translated by Lakshman Sarup. (Reprint : Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1967).

Nitti-Dolci, Luigia (1938): *Les grammairiens prakrits*. Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris.

Norman, K.R.: "The language in which the Buddha taught." *Buddhism and Jainism*. Edited by Harish Chandra Das et al. (Institute of Oriental and Orissan Studies. Part I, 1976), pp.15-23.

Norman, K.R.: "The dialects in which the Buddha preached." (Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung, Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II.) Herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980, pp. 61-77.

Oberlies, Thomas : *Studie zum Cāndravyākaraṇa*. (Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV.4.52-148 und V.2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1989. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, 38.)

Olender, Maurice : *Les langues du Paradis. Aryens et Sémites: un couple providentiel*. Le Seuil, Gallimard, 1989.

Paṭi-a = *Saddhammappakāsinī*, commentary on the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*. C.V. Joshi (ed.) (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1979, 3 vols. Pāli Text Society Text Series, 103-105).

P.S. = *Pāṇinian sūtra*.

Ruegg, D. Seyfort : Review of *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, 3. (Journal of the American Oriental Society, 106, 1986, 596-597.)

*Saddanīti. La grammaire palie d'Aggavaṃsa*. (Texte établi par Helmer Smith. 6 vols. C.W.K. Gleerup, Lund, 1928-1966).

*Samādhiraṇāsūtra*. P.L. Vaidya (ed.) (The Mithila Institute, Darbhanga, 1961. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 2.)

*Samavāya Aṅga*. In: *Aṅga Suttāni I. Āyāro - Sūyagado - Thāṇaṃ - Samavāo*. Muni Nathamal (ed.) (Jain Viswa Bhārati, Ladnun, Rajasthan) : V.S. 2031. pp. 827 ff.

Scharfe, Hartmut : *Grammatical Literature*. (Otto Harassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1977. *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. V, Fasc. 2.)

Scholem, Gershom : *Die jüdische Mystik in ihren Hauptströmungen* 1957. Suhrkamp Taschenbuch, 1980.

Ś1V = (1) *Ślokavārttika* of Śrī Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, with the commentary *Nyāyaratnākara* of Śrī Pārthasārathi Miśra. Swāmī Dvārikādāsa Śāstrī (ed.) (Ratna Publications, Varanasi, 1978. Ratnabharati Series, 3.) (2) *Ślokavārttika*, translated ... with extracts from the commentaries 'Kāśikā' of Sucarita Miśra and 'Nyāyaratnākara' of Pārthasārathi Miśra, by Ganga Nath Jha. (Second edition. Sri Satguru Publications, Delhi, 1983. Sri Garib Das Oriental Series, 8).

Tillemans, Tom J.F. : *Materials for the Study of Āryadeva, Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti*. (The *Catuhśataka* of Āryadeva, chapters XII and XIII, with the commentaries of Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti: Introduction, translation, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese texts, notes. 2 vols. Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, Wien. (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 24, 1-2, 1990).

Tripathi, Dipti S. : "Apabhraṃśa in Sanskrit grammar: an appraisal of Bhartṛhari's view." *Aligarh Journal of Oriental Studies* 3 (2), 1986, 81-92.

Vibh-a = *Sammohavinodanī, Abhidhamma-Piṭake Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā*. A.P. Buddhaddatta Thero (ed.) (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980. Pāli Text Society Text Series, 116).

Viy = *Viyāhapaṇṇattisuttaṃ* Pt. Bechardas J. Doshi (ed.) for part II assisted by Pt. Amritlal Mohanlal Bhojak. Shri Mahāvira Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay, 1974-78. 2 parts. (Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 4.)

Viy (ed. Nathamal) = *Aṅga Suttāni, II: Bhagawai Viāhapaṇṇatti*. Muni Nathamal (ed.) (Jain Viswa Bhārati, Ladnun V.S. 2031).

Vism = *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghosācariya. Henry Clarke Warren (ed.) revised by Dharmananda Kosambi. Harvard

University Press - Oxford University Press, 1950. (Harvard Oriental Series, 41).

### Comments

**K.N. Mishra**

Thanking Ven. N. Samten, who kindly consented earlier to read out the paper in absentia. I request the scholars to present their responses on this paper by Prof. Bronkhorst.

**S.K. Pathak**

I think this paper has given a new dimension to our discussion. The learned author has endeavoured to press before us two important points. Outlook of each and every religion to accept certain way of presentation or communication, belong to each religious society, that is one point. In the second part he has dealt the thing very interestingly with reference to *Vākyapadīya* and other comments. How these things have been taken into consideration in respect of the language used by the Buddhists who do not claim themselves that this is the only language in which the Buddha's teachings can be declared? These are two points he has given. I think first point requires no much discussion that is a general tendency. Christians say that Hebrew and Jains say that *Ardhamāgadhī* and Buddhists say that *Māgadhi* is the original language of the teachings of the Lord. But the second part of the discussion, I think, is very interesting. I just want to be acquainted with the point he has raised. There is a passage in Candrakīrti's commentary on Āryadeva's *Catuhśataka*, which can throw further light on our question. The commentary survives only in Tibetan translation, which has recently been edited and studied and translated into English by Tom-J.F. Candrakīrti cites under the *kārikā* no 278, of the *Catuhśataka* which is preserved in original form in *Samādhirājasūtra* as well as in the Candrakīrti's own *Prasannapadā* commentary. There is cited the verse-

*nivṛttidharmāṇa na asti dharmāḥ  
ye neha asti na te jātu asti/  
astīti-nāstīti ca kalpanāvatām*

*evam carantāna na duḥkha śāmyati\*//*

In this *bhāṣya* he has given his exposition in this way. Whatever is in existence, is the state that does not exist at all. For those who imagine existence and inexistence and practice accordingly suffering will not go to extinction. Afterwards he has discussed these things. Let other scholars come forward and I will only give the conclusion that we can have better discussion on the topic. Preceding considerations have made it clear that different religions of the classical India which we have considered or share the belief that their sacred texts composed in the earliest language is the source of all other languages. In the case of the Theravāda Buddhism and Jainism, position is fairly straight forward. The sacred language Pāli, *Māgadhi* and *Ardhamāgadhī* have respectively the source of other languages including Sanskrit. Position of the Vedic Brahmins was likely more complicated for differences between the Vedic and classical Sanskrit are considerable. But neither of these two was claimed to be the source of the other rather the Vedic and classical Sanskrit were maintained to constitute together one single language on which, ofcourse, was the language of the god's internal language. It appears that atleast some of those Buddhists who preserved the sacred texts in a Hybrid Sanskrit, took essentially the same position as the Brahmins. Please note this sentence. It appears that atleast some of those Buddhists who preserved sacred texts in Hybrid Sanskrit took essentially the same position as the Brahmins. They looked upon the language of the sacred texts as fundamentally identical with the classical Sanskrit. And they even used the Vedic rules of Pāṇini to account for some special features of Hybrid Sanskrit. Bhartṛhari in the *Vākyapadīya* suggests some of those Buddhists to entertain the claim that their sacred language was the source of Sanskrit. This is the point.

**Alex Wayman**

Well, the thing is for Bronkhorst. I met him. I know more about him. But you know if you want to compare the way he does, the trouble is, you have to put these different systems in a more comprehensive way than he preferred, because the individual systems would go the wrong way without him if you try to talk

\* *Samādhirāja sūtra* 9.26 quoted in the *Prasannapadā* on MMK 25.3.

about every thing in one paper, Jainism, Veda, Buddhist texts. You have to admit it is a good write up. While speaking of all these things when he says for example in his conclusion, "it seems, then, atleast possible to maintain that..... the origin of Sanskrit". In other words there were one or two who wrote in Sanskrit because there was some value in it. That is very true but what does it mean? What is the use of saying so? In other words, I fear that the two statements in his article are some sort of things that every body agrees on anyway, and there is the other speculative which is going its own way. That is what I want to say to Bronkhorst.

### B. Oguibenine

I would like to say that this paper is interesting in so far as it seems to point out that since Buddhists use Sanskrit preserved in their texts in Buddhist Sanskrit. It seems to imply that they composed their text directly in the variety of Sanskrit. This may be confirmed. This is the major point which I collected from Bronkhorst's paper. Now the other question. One point seems to be most important and I don't know exactly the answer. Since he says rightly that some Buddhist Hybrid or Buddhist Sanskrit usages are explained by Sanskrit scholars like Candrakīrti by reference to Pāṇini, they always consider that their language is to be analysed according to Pāṇini. At the same time they looked upon their Sanskrit as superior as the Vedic. It is little bit contradictory so far as Vedic Sanskrit does not concern with Pāṇini's rules. And the next important point is, I think, the grammarians at that time had a certain prestige, and it was not quite natural to refer to Pāṇini, because it evinced prestige. This does not prove much that the desire to refer to Pāṇini is exactly reflecting the nature of language.

### K. Bhattacharya

First I have to congratulate Bronkhorst, in his absence, of course, for bringing together all these valuable materials, some of which are well known and others not well known. I am to say much about the title. The title seems to me to be a little misleading. So, when I started reading the paper yesterday, I thought that I was going to get something very sensational, that is, he was going to reveal to us that the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit is the original language. But the matter is entirely different. This is a minor question. I think that he can modify the title a little bit. I come to the

same point as the one asked by Prof. Pathak. It has been mentioned by Prof. Oguibenine also. I was wondering. I don't know the context, he refers to the very recent study which I have not read. I don't know the context. Bronkhorst may be right. I may be wrong. But I am saying what I feel this moment about this. Now, first of all Candrakīrti, as far as I know, was of a very scientific mind among all the commentators on Nāgārjuna. He is the only one to point out the grammatical background of Nāgārjunian thought. And "*prathamē hi vidvāṃso vaiyākaraṇāḥ, vyākaraṇa-mūlatvāt sarvavidyānām*." It had not been still said in this form. But Candrakīrti was aware of this. In this context it is quite natural that Candrakīrti tried to justify the forms by referring to Pāṇini. He had read entire Pāṇini, he had read the Vedic sūtras whether or not they were read by the Buddhists in general, whether Candragomin had commented upon them or not, is a different matter. At least, so far as Candrakīrti is concerned, he was well versed in Pāṇini. As far as I know, in his *Prasannapadā*, he has never tried to explain grammatically. This is a canonical quotation. There are so many quotations from the *Samādhirājasūtrā* in the *Prasannapadā*, as far as I know, he did not explain them grammatically. Here is an instance where he did that. I am rather reluctant to draw the conclusion that Bronkhorst draws. I was forgetting something in this connection. I was talking about his scientific mind. Now so far as the *Catuhśataka* itself is concerned, I would mention just one thing to show his scientific mind. I don't have the passage here, I think it is in the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka*. Āryadeva just denies motion while *denying Ātmā*, *denies* that if *Ātmā* were eternal, and omnipresent. Sarvaṇ or *Śāśvata*, well, it could have no motion at all. *kriyāvān śāśvaśto nāsti, nāsti sarvagata kriyā*. It is a very simple thing and I don't think that Āryadeva had any grammatical idea in mind. But in explaining that Candrakīrti brings in a very complicated grammatical theory which started from *Kātyāyana*, but developed precisely in his own time. We find that in Jinendrabodhi. That is he refers to the distinction. It is not clear in Vidhushekhara Śāstri's reconstruction. The idea is there. I could get that from what he says, but I don't think that the Sanskrit terms that have been used in place of the Tibetan are quite adequate. This is a very technical point. Candrakīrti has to explain

\* *Vṛtti* on *kārikā* 13 of the 1st chapter of the *Dhvanyāloka* p.26 of K. Krishnamoorthy's edition. Dharwar, 1974.

\* This verse of the *Catuhśataka* (10.17) is quoted in the *Prasannapadā* of MMK 2.5ab

why there should not be any motion? An eternal entity of omnipresent entity, refers to the four kinds of the *Dhātu*, well known in the Pāṇinian tradition. *karṭṛ-prakriyā*, *karṭṛ-bhāvaka*, *karma-prakriyā*, *karmatva-bhāvaka*. Now this was the procedure that Candrakīrti was following. So, I am not quite surprised, Perhaps he adopted different methods in his commentary in *Catuhśataka*, a little bit different from the one he followed in *Prasannapadā*. Of course in the *Prasannapadā*, so far as Nāgārjuna is concerned, he explains Nāgārjuna in the light of Bhartṛhari. Now I think he is right. Nāgārjuna was not aware of Bhartṛhari. Bhartṛhari just developed the idea of Patañjali. It is quite understandable that while Nāgārjuna was basing himself upon Patañjali, Candrakīrti coming after Bhartṛhari, was just citing Bhartṛhari. Here, so far as, the reference of the Vedic *sūtra* is concerned, he felt that he should explain those things grammatically. There was no choice here, because it was only the Vedic *sūtras* which could explain that. Now, we may confine ourselves to the conclusion or go a bit further. Given by the scientific mind of Candrakīrti, I am rather inclined to think that he was conscious of certain similarities between Vedic Sanskrit and Buddhist Sanskrit as some of us have been calling in the Hybrid Sanskrit and which I call simply Buddhist Sanskrit. Perhaps he was aware, he was conscious of these similarities, so he quotes the Vedic *sūtra* just to explain that. That does not necessarily mean to me that he was just treating Buddhist Sanskrit as something other than the Vedic Sanskrit. It is just his proceeding as a linguist, as a grammarian here. Either of these, he had no choice. If he had to explain these things he had no choice, but to refer to the Vedic *sūtras* of Pāṇini. And on the other hand, perhaps he was just conscious, aware of certain similarity between Vedic Sanskrit and Buddhist Sanskrit. That is all.

G.C. Pande

I mainly want to raise some questions for you to discuss in your own. I would like the audience to comment. It seems to me that the paper raises two different questions. One is the question of original language, which is a philosophical question, not historical one. The other is a historical question about the language of Buddhist scriptures. Throughout the paper, there seems to be a literary interpretation of different views.

There are scholars who distinguish their goal from the sound. It is not the sound which is determined, that something has been expressed in the sound. It is an ideal form that they had in mind, combination of the different feelings. A language may be an ideal concept. It seems the Vedic language, as a spoken language, has the perpetual existence. Buddhists believe in the sayings, the Vedāntins believe in the sayings, yet there is no similarity at all. My point is the paper begins with the discussion with the idea that Buddhists like others believe in original language, and then goes on to discuss the explanations offered by Candrakīrti and others, deserving the unique usages. Now how do we take these two different levels which are very widely separated. That is my question, I would like you to comment on, if you feel so.

L.N. Tiwari

As the author of this paper is not present, it is very difficult to raise questions or criticism or observations on this paper. But it seems that it has been written in a haphazard way. For instance he says "The example is the same as the one given by Patañjali, but Kumārila adds a dimension which we do not find in the *Mahābhāṣya*". That is a totally incorrect statement. The author of the *Mahābhāṣya* has cited the example of *go* itself and gives certain aberrations of the word *go*. So, how he says that the exposition given by Patañjali is not like that as it has been given by Kumārila. Then he mentioned at the same page that Kumārila takes this in reference to the language of the *mlecchas*. In the very beginning of the *Paspaśāhnikā* of the *Mahābhāṣya*, where aims and objectives of the study of grammar is explained. He says *na mlecchitavai*. That means that one should not speak as the *mlecchas* speak, therefore, one should study grammar. Thus the intentions of the *Mahābhāṣyakāra* and Kumārila, are the same. Both are misrepresented here. The author brings forth the idea that Vedic language is also Hybrid Sanskrit. That is very peculiar. He says that like Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, also stands the Sanskrit. Both are Hybrid because both are *Ārṣa*. A new trend had started to call Vedic language as a Hybrid language. Look at his statement when he writes. "The situation of the Vedic Brahmins was in many respects parallel to that of those Buddhists who used Sanskrit but preserved sacred texts in "Hybrid Sanskrit." It is a typical statement. Thereafter he says 'Pāṇini's grammar uses once (I. I. 16) the word *anārṣe*, in the sense of *avaidika* 'non-vedic according to the interpretation of the *Kāśikā*'.

*Anārṣa* means *avaidika* no doubt, but *avaidika* in the sense different from the language of the Vedas. That is the meaning here. As he uses *bhāṣā*, as he uses *laukika* and for Vedic language Pāṇini uses *mantra* Pāṇini uses *Chandas*, Pāṇini uses *Veda*. So far the language of the common people the grammar of which he was writing, he uses *anārṣa* and does not use *anārṣa* in this very sense that language was not spoken by *ṛsis*. While speaking about this Hybrid Buddhist Sanskrit, he says that both are *anārṣa*. The Vedic language is *Ārṣa* and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit is also *ārṣa*? So they are equally at par with. That is not the thing, which is said in this paper. How can we adopt this idea? That is the difficulty. We call the uses which are aberrations which are not in conformity with the Pāṇinian rules used in the *Purāṇas* and *Mahābhārata* or in other *ślokas* of *Jyotiśaśāstra Sāmudrikaśāstra* in *ślokas* like *yāsundarī sā patinā* etc. The word *patinā* is called *ārṣa prayoga*. So, such ages are called *ārṣa*, which are oldest than Pāṇini, which we should not judge from the rules of Pāṇini and here he says that every aberration in the type of the language used by Buddhists is *ārṣa*, these are the things and other philosophical things to be discussed in detail.

Alex Wayman

I may, in agreement, say that this kind of argument is like saying that the Aśoka Hotel is Jewish. You know that they named this hotel Aśoka. And we can use the same when we are using the word- *ārṣa*. It would make this hotel *Atri*, that is what he has done. What I said last night, also I realise, I should mention here, that he tried to cover too many subjects in one paper. If you can talk about *Kumāralāta*, why don't you study *Kumāralāta*, why not a paper on *Kumāralāta*. If you could talk about Jainas, then study the Jainas, write, a paper on the Jainas. If you are talking about the Hebru then study what they do and write a paper on them. Otherwise everybody would be dissatisfied. Why could say about Vedic, why could't you say about *Kumāralāta*? Nobody is satisfied because he tried to cover everything in one paper.

N.H. Samtani

I think consensus here is not much appreciative of the jumbling of facts. Last conclusion is even very much dissatisfying when he said that Buddhist "look upon the language of their sacred texts as fundamentally identical with classical Sanskrit". Now I

would bring some issues on these contexts. The first issue is about that *cullavagga* quotation which is the most important one about what was Buddha's attitude towards the language. And he says "*sakāya niruttiyā Buddha-vacanāṃ parayāpanitum*" and main thing is that he not only says that but it has *āpatti-dukkata* etc. This is peculiar in that context also that *Buddhavacanāṃ dūṣayanti*. (That they are mispronouncing.) This complaint of the Brahmins had come and in spite of that Buddha was very clear in saying *sakāyaniruttiyā*. It is quite different that Buddhagosa presents differently. But that is the gap of one thousand years. In that contexts, I think it is impossible that Buddhists will have any accessive estimation of sacredness to any one language. Now number two. It is absolutely in the tradition and the whole Buddhists doctrinal and ethical stand, that Buddhists will not attach importance to one language or sacredness of it, because they found that with Brahmins. Here it was unconventional when the *Bodhisattva bhūmi* clearly says that "*prākṛtayāpi bhāṣayā*", when it is *arthapratisaraṇaṃ na-vyāñjana-pratiśaraṇaṃ*, I think these are quite clear even doctrinally and ethically which emphasise on the purification of mind. It is impossible to think that Buddhists or the Buddha attached importance to a particular language.

N. Samten

In the absence of the author of the paper, may I request the august gathering of the scholars if anyone may make some clarification or give some information regarding *Kumāralāta*'s *vyākaraṇa* which the author has mentioned here. This is the first Buddhist grammar which shows rules on certain words or forms which are not used in other Sanskrit texts. I, therefore, want to know that, whether this grammar is deviating from the two basic traditions of Sanskrit grammar, i.e. *Māheśvara* and *Aindra* traditions or it is written by a Buddhist scholar on Sanskrit in general. On which points it gives rules and formulas whether on verbs and forms which are peculiar and used in the Buddhist texts?

S. Dietz

Very few fragments are available of this grammar of *Kumāralāta* which were edited by Heinrich Lüders (1930) under the title *Kātantra* and *Kumāralāta*, and as far as I know, it was reprinted again in 1940 by Waldschmidt of Göttingen. This is the only thing I

know about it. But I can enquire in Germany if there is something else. *Cāndravṛtti* was edited in fragments by Peter Schlingloff in the series of Berlin Academy.

G.C. Pande

The first paper convincingly argued that the language of Āryasūtra is pro-classical Sanskrit and the reasons for thinking of hybridism in its case are unclaimable. It has also commented on the aspects of the style of Āryasūtra. The second paper, was somewhat similar commenting on the ancient stylistic feature of *Avadānakalpalatā* of Kṣemendra. The third paper, we have just discussed, wide ranging paper which, similarly seems to suggest or consider the possibility of original Buddhist language which the Buddhists regarded as the original language of the whole universe. That idea has been at par with similar ideas in other religious traditions. Therefore, in some sense, different philosophical issues connected with the language are wide ranging in the sense that different languages are different symbolic systems. Then they translate the ability and suggest that they say transformation, a sort of transformation of views which means that logically all the languages are united. See the concept of the speech about the *Gāyatrī Madhyamā* is the speech available to the mind from which this spoken speech has its origin. Where logical articulate issues exist, differences are these, objects are distinguished. So is the case of their sign, but they are all different as these spoken words. Though they can correspond between them in the way, I think, of the object and the word which are used. Resources of correspondence are unique. And even there in the level of logical thought, there is some kind of import if understanding the distinction between the mind and its object is also lost. There is an undifferentiated consciousness, I mean not that they derive the objects but objective consciousness.

Now in this sense, this has been argued by many different schools. Infact the Buddhist schools believe that after the enlightenment the Buddha had the *tūṣṇīmbhāva*.

In *Vedānta* too, the Upaniṣads themselves declare the truth of human mind, they are in speech and thought both. They are all placed by *Vedānta* in the *Vijñāna*, even including the Vedas themselves. All schools identify the words of the scriptures with the

words of truth. Every religious tradition has been contested by their people. Religious truth belongs to the realm of realization which exceeds not only talking about speech, but also the logical particular thoughts. There is a question in the *Goraṣasiddhāntasaṅgraha* enquiring about Vedas. It is a kind of knowledge realised in the *Ājñācakra* wherever it is.

I am only trying to say that the question of the original language of Buddhism has two kinds of levels. One is on the larger level, where I should not be confused with questions of the history of the language. The other thing is as far as the linguistic historical point of view is concerned. I am afraid that, there seems to be different points of view that the spoken language in the days of Buddha was constituted different from the tradition of Sanskrit. It's influence on later Sanskrit also makes it different from classical Sanskrit. This idea has not been unfortunately critically examined. The evidence of believing that there was a different language than the current Sanskrit of that time. Ofcourse, Sanskrit like any other language, was damaged in different ways. But that there was a language other than Sanskrit in structure, grammar and so on, at the time of the Buddha. This is probably re-established. What is called *Māgadhī* or Pāli is possibly the spoken dialect. Aśoka himself uses the language throughout his vast empire from east to west & north to south, Kandhāra to Mysore.