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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. 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. 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.

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 Vāyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya (ca. 150 B.C.E.), in its first chapter called Paspaśāhnikā, distinguishes clearly between correct and incorrect words, pointing out that many incorrect words correspond to each correct word; besides correct gauh there are many incorrect synonyms: gāvī, goṇi, goṭā, 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. Some later authors refer to Sanskrit as the language of the gods (daivi vāk). Among them is Bhartrhari (Vākyapadīya 1.182), who adds that this divine language has been corrupted by incompetent speakers. The Māmānsakas 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 Slokavārttika, which states: “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

---


---


---

* Evam ihāpi yady apāsaśādajñāne dharmsa tathāpi yas tv asau śabdajñāne dharmsa tena ca sa doṣo nirghaṃśyate bhūyasya cābhūyadayaṇa yogo bhavīyati: ibid p.57 (editor.)
* Mālaḥ śabdasya pravagvīśayah. Saptadvipa vasumati, trayo lokāḥ, catvāro vedaḥ saṅgaḥ sarahasyā‘ bahudhi bhānnā ....’ ibid p.52. (editor)
1. Cp. Ibn Fāris’ remark: “Il ne nous est point parvenu que quelqu’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.)
* Sanskrtyam nāma daivi vāg anvākhyaśat mahārṣibhibh/ Bhaṃmahā : Kāvyādarśaḥ. 1.33 ab/
2. A closely similar observation occurs in Bhartrhari’s commentary on the Mahābhāṣya (Dipikā), Aṅhika I p.16 I. 29 - p. 17 I. 1: anye manyante/ iyaṃ daivi vāk/ sā tu puruṣāśakaḥ kālayād vā prakīṃṇā. See also Tripathi, 1986: 88.
3. ŚIV. Saṃdhyāntakādhikāraṇa, 276: gosābde vasthite smākaṃ tadāsaktiṣakārī/a/ gāvyaḍe api gobuddhr muśāśabdenaśaṇīṇī/ Tr. Jha.
Brahmanism continued to use the language of its sacred texts. The same is true of the Buddhists themselves. 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, Kārta, 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:

"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-Māgadhī. This position finds already expression in the Ardha-Māgadhī canon. The Aupapātika Sūtra (56) states:


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.)


3. bhagavam mahāvire ... svavabhāsāṇugāminic sarassate jayaṇanīhārinī ụreṇaṁ addhama-gāhābhāsā ... sā vi ya ụnaṁ addhama-gāhābhāsā
"With a voice that extends over a yojana, Lord Mahāvīra speaks in the Ardha-Māgadhī language, a speech which is in accordance with all languages. That Ardha-Māgadhī language changes into the own language of all those, both āryas and non-āryas." The Viyāhapāṇṇatti adds that "the gods speak Ardha-Māgadhī". We find the same position repeated in a work by a Jain author of the 11th century, Namīsādhū. Interestingly, Namīsādhū writes in Sanskrit, no longer in Prakrit. His commentary on Rudrata's Kavyālaṅkāra 2.12 contains the following explanation of the word Prākṛta:2

"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. Alternatively, Prākṛta is prākṛta 'what has been made before' on the basis of the statement 'it has been established in the Jain canon (ārṣavacana, lit. words of the rṣis) that Ardha-Māgadhī is the speech of the gods' and other statements. [Prakrit] is said to be a language easy to understand for children and the other languages. This is why the author of our treatise (i.e. Rudrata) has mentioned Prakrit at the beginning, and after that Sanskrit etc."  


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

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 Namīsādhū shows that the later Jains based their conviction on statements dating from the time when Ardha-Māgadhī 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 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 Brahmans 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. To illustrate this Kautsa cites a number of obscure Vedic forms. Yāska's reply is categorical:

"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.

A similar discussion occurs in the *Mīmāṃsā Sūtra* and *Sābara Bhāṣya*. Here too we are reassured that the sentence-meaning in Vedic is no different from classical Sanskrit, and that "the meaning is there; only there is ignorance of it".

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 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 Yāṣka's *Nirukta* 2.2 can derive Vedic primary nouns from classical verbal roots, and classical nouns from Vedic roots.)

The situation of the Vedic Brahmans 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 Brahmans 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. Generally they make no mention of Hybrid Sanskrit, and confine themselves to describing the classical language. The only exception appears to be the *Kuṭṭarālāta*, called after its author Kuṭṭarālāta. 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, Kuṭṭarālāta makes allowances for peculiar forms of the Buddhist scriptures that resulted from their transposition into Sanskrit from Middle Indo-Aryan dialects (e.g. ṣāvati for śāvati, bhesyati for bhaviṣyati and elisions of final -am/-im). The name used for these forms is ārṣa 'belonging to the rṣi-s, ...'"

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

2. For details, see Lüders, 1930: 686, 693-95. See also Ruegg, 1986: 597.
Kāśīkā. 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. 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 Adhyāyā dealing with Vedic forms. 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 Catuḥsataka 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 Catuḥsataka, a verse which has been preserved in its original form in the Samādhīrasūtra (9.26) as well as in Candrakīrti's own

---

1. P.S. 1.1.16: sambuddha śākalyasyetav anāre. The Kāśīkā explains: ot iti varata/ sambuddhinimitto ya okārah sa śākalyasya ācāryasya mataena praghṛṣayānīho bhavati itişabde anāre avaidike paratah/ vāyo iti vāyav iti/ bhāno iti bhānāv 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.

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

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 Chandrakīrti notes:1 "Correctly speaking one would say na santi (Tib. rnam yod min). But in accordance with the rule that 'it should be stated that verbal endings (tiiti) 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 Pāṇinīnaṃ sūtra 7.1.39. This line reads: tīṭām ca tīṇo bhavantīti vaktavyam,2 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 Bhartrhari's Vākyapadiya 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:3

"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 the source of the latter. This is indeed how the ancient vyrtti understands the line, for it explains:1

"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 (saṁskāra)."

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

This passage from the Vṛtī contains points of similarity with Namīsādhu's defence of Prākṛta studied above. This suggests that the Vṛtī refers here to Jains rather than to Buddhists. Does this indicate that also the Vākyapadiya 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 Vṛtī is different from the author of the verses explained in it.2 Equally important is the fact that the Vākyapadiya never uses the word Prākṛta to refer to a language different from Sanskrit. Bhartrhari 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.3 The 'some' here referred to can hardly be the 'upholders of impermanence'.4 Add to this that all the three passages considered from the Mahābhāṣya dipikā, from the Vṛtī and from Namīsādhu's commentary mention the same grammatical explanation (prakṛta = prakṛtau bhava) and it is tempting to conclude that these three

---

1. Vṛtī on VP 1.182 [146], ed. Iyer p. 234: anityavādinas tu ... prakṛtau bhavaṁ prakṛtaṁ sādhūnāṁ sādabāṁ samāgām ākṣāte/vikāras tu paścād vyavasthāpitaṁ, yaḥ saṁbhinnabuddhibhiḥ puruṣāṁ svarasamkārādibhir nirṇiyate iti//
2. Cf. Bronkhorst, 1988; and Jan E.M. Houben's forthcoming article on this subject.
3. Mahābhāṣyadipikā, Āhnika 1 p. 16 1. 28-29: kecid evaṁ manyante/ ya evaṁ prakṛtaḥ sādāḥ ta evaṁ nityāṁ/prakṛtau bhavāḥ prakṛṭāṁ/
4. Note however that elsewhere in the same commentary (p. 23 1. 24) Bhartrhari ascribes a concept of eternity to the 'upholders of momentariness: ... kṣānīkavādīnāṁ avicchedana pravṛttir yā sā nityāṁ.
passages, unlike Vākyapadiya 1.182cd, refer to the same current of thought, probably Jainism.

It seems, then, at least possible to maintain that Vākyapadiya 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 Māgadhi, 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.¹

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, Māgadhi (i.e. Pāli) and Ardha-Māgadhi 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 orthodox 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 Bhartrhari's Vākyapadiya, on the other hand, suggests that perhaps some of these Buddhists, too, entertained the claim that their sacred language was the source of Sanskrit.
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P.S. = Pāninian sūtra.


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 Vākyapadiya 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 Ardhamagadhi 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 Prasannapada commentary. There is cited the verse-

\[
\text{nirṛtiḥdharmaḥ na asti dharmāḥ} \\
\text{ye neha astī na te jātu astī} / \\
\text{asti-nāstī ca kalpanāvatām}
\]

In this bhāsyā 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. Preceeding 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, Māgadhī 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, of course, 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 Pānini to account for some special features of Hybrid Sanskrit. Bhartrhari in the Vākyapadiya 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
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, at least 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 at least possible to maintain that. The origin of

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 Candrakirti, 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 "pratha-me hi vidvānto vaiyākaraṇāḥ, vyākaraṇa-mūlattvāt sarvavidyānāṁ." It had not been still said in this form. But Candrakirti was aware of this. In this context it is quite natural that Candrakirti 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 Candrakirti 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 Sānadhiṣṭasūtras 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 Catuhsātaka 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 Catuhsātaka. Āryadeva just denies motion while denying Ātmā, denies that if Ātmā were eternal, and omnipresent. Sarvan or Śāsvata, well, it could have no motion at all. kriyāvān śāsvaśto nāsti, nāsti sarvage sāriyā. It is a very simple thing and I don't think that Āryadeva had any grammatical idea in mind. But in explaining that Candrakirti 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. Candrakirti has to explain


* This verse of the Catuhsātaka (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. kartr-prakriyā, kartr-bhāvaka, karma-prakriyā, karntva-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 Catuhsātaka, a little bit different from the one he followed in Prasannapādā. Of course in the Prasannapādā, so far as Nāgārjuna is concerned, he explains Nāgārjuna in the light of Bhartrhari. Now I think he is right. Nāgārjuna was not aware of Bhartrhari. Bhartrhari just developed his idea of Patañjali. It is quite understandable that while Nāgārjuna was basing himself upon Patañjali, Candrakīrti coming after Bhartrhari, was just citing Bhartrhari. 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 Paspaśānika 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, 1. 16) the word anārse, in the sense of avaidika 'non-vedic according to the interpretation of the Kaśikā".
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 lanukika 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 rṣis. 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 Jyotiṣaśāstra Sāmudrikaśāstra in ślokas like yāsundari sā patinā etc. The word patinā is 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 Kumāralāṭa, why don't you study Kumāralāṭa, why not a paper on Kumāralāṭa? 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 couldn't you say about Kumāralāṭa? Nobody is satisfied because he tried to cover everything in one paper.

N.H. Samten

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 indentical 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 Buddhas attitude towards the language. And he says "sakāya niruttipāya Buddha-vacanam parayāpanītum" and main thing is that he not only says that but it has āpatti-dukkata etc. This is peculiar in that context also that Buddhavacanam dūṣayanti. (That they are mispronouncing.) This complaint of the Brahmins had come and inspire of that Buddha was very clear in saying sakāya niruttipāya. It is quite different that Budhagosa presents differently. But that is the gap of one thousand years. In that contexts, I think it is impossible that Buddhists will have any accessible 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 bhumī clearly says that "prākṛtyāpi bhāṣayā", when it is arthaprasāraṇam na-vyānjanapratisaraṇam. 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 Kumāralāṭa's vyākarana 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 Kumāralāṭa which were edited by Heinrich Lüders (1930)under the title Kātantra and Kumāralāṭa, 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 Āryaśūra 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 Āryaśūra. The second paper, was somewhat similar commenting on the ancient stylistic feature of Avadānakalpa-latā of Kśemendra. 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 Madhyāmā 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 tūṣṇiṃbhāva.

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 Vijnāna, 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 Gorakṣasiddhāntasaṅgraha 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. Of course, 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.