The Silence of the Commentaries: *Pradeśāḥ* in the Text of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*

Malhar Kulkarni

Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay

and

Eivind Kahrs

University of Cambridge

As is well known, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* is the oldest extant rule-by-rule commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini. Two major commentaries on it are available, the *Nyāsa* from the eighth century and the *Padamañjarī*, most likely from the eleventh century. In this article we focus on the term *pradeśa*, which is a familiar feature of the printed editions of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* on the *sañjñā sūtra*s of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. A closer examination, however, shows that the sentence "*Xpradeśāḥ — X . . . ity evamādayaḥ*" (where *X* is the *sañjñā*) is not met with in either of the two commentaries. This has consequences for our understanding of the textual transmission of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

As is well known, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV) is the earliest extant rule-by-rule commentary on Pāṇini's famous grammar of Sanskrit, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A). It was probably composed in the seventh century CE. Two major commentaries on it are known—the *Nyāsa* (Ny) from the eighth century and the *Padamañjarī* (Pm), most likely from the eleventh century.

What is less well known, however, is that some features very familiar to any student of the KV appear not to be met with in the two commentaries. This article will show that the sentence "*Xpradeśāḥ — X … ity evamādayaḥ*" (where *X* is the *sañjñā* under discussion at a particular rule of the A) is not read in the Ny and Pm. This has consequences for our understanding of the textual transmission of the KV.

Since the KV was first printed in 1876, throughout all the printed editions up to 1969 it seemed to be a text that was one, homogeneous, synchronic composition with very little room for variations and heterogeneity. The 1969 Hyderabad edition of the KV presented for the first time the text of the KV together with an apparatus containing information collected from eight manuscript sources and gave rise to the thought that there is an ample amount of variation that could illuminate the composition of the text. This edition could not, however, show whether there existed any stages of development in this process of the text's composition. Kulkarni 2005 and 2012 presented evidence and argued that the composition of the KV can be shown to have undergone various stages of development. Kulkarni 2005 presented a sample critical edition of the KV on A 2.2.6 and asserted that a *vārttika* statement was added to the text of the KV on this *sūtra* in the nineteenth century. Kulkarni 2012 studied the composition of a list of words, called a *gaṇa*, as stated in A 2.2.31, and established that this list of words can be shown to have come into existence in various stages, namely, (i) pre-Ny, (ii) post-Ny and pre-Pm, and finally (iii) post-Pm. These stages of development can be shown to exist on the basis of evidence available to us in the form of commentarial statements,

quotations of the KV available in the later Pāṇinian grammatical literature, and manuscripts of the KV. Kulkarni 2012 concluded that the source of the extant manuscript material can be shown to have existed in the pre-Pm period. Kulkarni et al. 2016 demonstrated that the current manuscript tradition of the KV can be shown to have close relations with a version of the text of the KV that was available to the Ny as well as to the Pm.

In this article we focus on the *sañjñā sūtra*s in the A and the KV on them (as found in the printed editions), and we present evidence from both commentaries, the Ny and the Pm, as well as manuscripts of the KV. Our main focus is *adhyāya* 1, *pāda* 1 of the A, but we have also taken into account the *sañjñā sūtra*s in other parts of the A and have collected the comments of the Ny and the Pm on them. As far as the manuscript material is concerned, we have used it wherever it was available.

<div style="text-align:center">I</div>

The KV on sixty-five of the *sañjñā sūtra*s in the A displays the *pradeśa* sentence, as outlined above. The sentence does not occur in the KV on all *sañjñā sūtra*s; for example, it does not occur in the KV on the *sañjñā sūtra* A 1.1.73 *vṛddhir yasyācām ādis tad vṛddham*. Out of these sixty-five *sūtra*s, twenty occur in A 1.1.[1] Our main focus is on the KV on these twenty *sūtra*s. Below we present the text of the KV on A 1.1.1 as a sample, analyze it, and show how it is structured.

A 1.1.1. *vṛddhir ād aic*[2]

1.1.1.1 (१) *vṛddhiśabdaḥ sañjñātvena vidhīyate pratyekam ādaicām varṇānāṃ sāmānyena tadbhāvitānām atadbhāvitānām ca.* (२) *taparakaraṇam aijartham.* (३) *tād api paraḥ taparaḥ iti khaṭvaiḍakādiṣu trimātracaturmātraprasaṅganivṛttaye.*
1.1.1.2 (४) *āśvalāyanaḥ.* (५) *aitikāyanaḥ.* (६) *aupagavaḥ.* (७) *aupamanyavaḥ.* (८) *śālīyaḥ.* (९) *mālīyaḥ.*
1.1.1.3 (१०) *vṛddhipradeśāḥ sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu iti evamādayaḥ.*

In the text just presented we have added two sets of numbers, standard Western ("Hindu-Arabic") and Devanagari. The numbers in the format 1.1.1.1 indicate the meaningful, functional parts in the text of the KV. The numbers in Devanagari were added at the beginning of what we will call "sentences."[3] Thus structurally there are three parts of the text of the KV presented above and there are ten sentences in this text.

The first three sentences form the first part of this text, the next six the second part, and the last, the tenth sentence, the third part. The first part involves identifying the *sañjñā* and the *sañjñin* (in sentence 1) and explaining a detail of the wording of the *sūtra* (in sentences 2 and 3). The second part involves actual examples of words in which a result of the application of a rule involving the present *sañjñā* is visible. Thus sentences 4 to 7 are examples where the vowels *ā*, *ai,* and *au,* which are effected by rules containing the word *vṛddhi,* are visible (*tadbhāvita*).[4] Sentences 8 and 9 are examples of *ā,* which is not effected by any rule

---

1. Only the first of a group of *sañjñā sūtras* is counted here. Thus, for example, the full definition of the *sañjñā pragṛhya* is given by eight *sūtra*s, namely, 1.1.11–18. Similarly, the *sañjñā sarvanāman* is given in ten *sūtra*s, namely, 1.1.27–1.1.36. Only the first *sūtra* is counted here, not the rest.

2. The Sanskrit text presented below is quoted without strictly applying *sandhi* for reasons of clarity.

3. This "sentence" unit corresponds to the unit of text that appears between two *daṇḍa*s in the Devanagari text of the KV as printed in the 1969 Hyderabad edition.

4. In fact, sentence 4 is an example of *ā*, 5 of *ai*, and 6 of *au*. What the need is for offering another example of *au* in sentence 7 is not clear. Both the Ny and the Pm try to clarify by saying that this example is given to suggest

but is still an example of the present *sañjñā* (*atadbhāvita*). The third part of the text provides examples of the *sūtra*s in which the present *sañjñā* is used by Pāṇini.

All the passages in the KV on the *sañjñā sūtra*s have the same general structure. Let us examine one more example where we find an addition to the above quoted structure:

A 1.1.8 *mukhanāsikāvacano 'nunāsikaḥ*

1.1.8.1 (१) *mukhasahitā nāsikā mukhanāsikā tayā ya uccāryate varṇaḥ sa anunāsikasaṁjño bhavati.*
1.1.8.2 (२) *āṅo 'nunāsikaś chandasi.* (३) *abhra ām̐ apaḥ.* (४) *gabhīre ām̐ ugraputre.* (५) *na ca ām̐ indraḥ.*
1.1.8.3 (६) *mukhagrahaṇam kim anusvārasyaiva hi syāt.* (७) *anunāsikagrahaṇaṃ kim kacaṭatapānām mā bhūt.*
1.1.8.4 (८) *anunāsikapradeśāḥ āṅo 'nunāsikaś chandasi iti evamādayaḥ.*

In this text of the KV on A 1.1.8, we find eight sentences but four parts, an additional part (1.1.8.3) providing counterexamples where questions are asked about the presence of every word in the *sūtra*. Faults that would arise in the absence of each word are identified.

Out of the twenty *sūtra*s mentioned in Appendix 1, nine have three sections in the text of the KV: 1.1.1, 2, 22, 26, 27, 42, 44, 60, and 64. Nine have four sections: 1.1.7, 8, 9, 20, 23, 24, 37, 61, 65. Two have five sections: 1.1.11 and 45.

All the *sūtra*s quoted above that have three sections follow the pattern demonstrated above in A 1.1.1. All the *sūtra*s that have four sections follow the pattern demonstrated in A 1.1.8, except A 1.1.23 and A 1.1.37.

In A 1.1.23 section three does not contain a counterexample. Rather it contains an injunctive statement taken directly from the *Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya* (Mbh). As for A 1.1.37, it actually follows the pattern of A 1.1.1 with an additional statement from the Mbh added in section 4. We will deal with this statement later.

Of the two *sūtra*s quoted above that have five sections, 1.1.11 follows the pattern shown above in A 1.1.8 with an additional statement from the Mbh added in section five. A 1.1.45 has a different pattern, as it contains examples in section two, an explanation of different interpretations of A 1.1.45 in section three, and another explanation that is close to a counterexample in section four.

In all these twenty cases there appears a section, generally at the end (except in A 1.1.11 and A 1.1.37), that identifies a *sūtra* in which the *sañjñā* is used and refers to such *sūtra*s as *pradeśāḥ*.

In addition to these twenty cases, we observe that the text of the KV on two *paribhāṣā sūtra*s in A 1.1—A 1.1. 46 and 47—also displays similar structures. We have included them in the table below (17, 18).

As mentioned above, the text in this section can be prototypically described in the following manner: "*Xpradeśāḥ — X . . . ity evamādayaḥ*" (where *X* is the *sañjñā*). The purpose of this sentence is to state the example/s where the *sañjñā* introduced by that *sūtra* is used. A 1.1.1 states the technical term *vṛddhi*; therefore 1.1.1.3, cited above, cites the *sūtra* A 7.2.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu*, in which the technical term *vṛddhi* occurs. Similarly, A 1.1.2 *adeṅ guṇaḥ* states the technical term *guṇa* and therefore cites the *sūtra* A 7.3.84 *mider guṇaḥ*, in which the technical term *guṇa* occurs.

---

that the domain of the *sūtra* is manifold (*prāyeṇānyeṣv api ca sāmānyalakṣaṇeṣu vināpi nimittabhedenādhikodāhara ṇopanyāsa upalabhyate* [Ny] and *lakṣaṇasya bahuviṣayatvasūcanārthaṃ caturthasyodāharaṇasyopanyāsaḥ* [Pm]).

The word *pradeśāḥ* is used in a technical sense and is explained by Abhyankar and Shukla (1977: 268) as follows: "Lit. district; sphere of application, place of the application of a rule. The word is frequently used in this sense in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* . . . ." This dictionary entry clearly mentions the KV as a source and assumes that the sentence containing this word is an intergral part of the KV.

Can we answer the question "which KV—a pre-Ny KV, a post-Ny and pre-Pm KV, or a post-Pm KV"? Our answer is yes, and to do so we present below the complete data from both the commentaries, the Ny and the Pm, and the analysis. After that we present the data from available manuscripts. Then we try to correlate these data and reach some conclusions.

In the table below we note the relevant text of the KV. The sentence "*Xpradeśāḥ — X . . . ity evamādayaḥ*" is simply not commented upon in the Ny or the Pm at all.

II

Below is a list of all occurences of the *pradeśa* sentence in the text of the KV on the *sañjñā sūtra*s and two *paribhāṣā sūtra*s in A 1.1.

Table 1. Text of the KV on the relevant *sañjñā sūtra*s and two *paribhāṣā sūtra*s in A 1.1

	Sūtra No.	Text[5]
1	1.1.1	*vṛddhipradeśāḥ sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu iti evamādayaḥ.*
2	1.1.2	*guṇapradeśāḥ mideḥ guṇaḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
3	1.1.7	*saṃyogapradeśāḥ saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
4	1.1.8	*anunāsikapradeśāḥ āṅaḥ anunāsikaḥ chandasi iti evamādayaḥ.*
5	1.1.9	*savarṇapradeśāḥ akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
6	1.1.11	*pragṛhyapradeśāḥ plutapragṛhyāḥ aci nityam iti evamādayaḥ.*[6]
7	1.1.20	*ghupradeśāḥ ghumāsthāgāpājahātisām hali iti evamādayaḥ.*
8	1.1.22	*ghapradeśāḥ gharūpakalpaceladbruvagotramatahateṣu ṅyaḥ anekācaḥ hrasvaḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
9	1.1.23	*saṅkhyāpradeśāḥ saṅkhyā vaṃśyena iti evamādayaḥ.*
10	1.1.24	*ṣaṭpradeśāḥ ṣaḍbhyaḥ luk iti evamādayaḥ.*
11	1.1.26	*niṣṭhāpradeśāḥ śvīditaḥ niṣṭhāyām iti evamādayaḥ.*
12	1.1.27	*sarvanāmapradeśāḥ sarvanāmnaḥ smai iti evamādayaḥ.*
13	1.1.37	*avyayapradeśāḥ avyayāt āpsupaḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*[7]
14	1.1.42	*sarvanāmasthānapradeśāḥ sarvanāmasthāne ca asambuddhau iti evamādayaḥ.*
15	1.1.44	*vibhāṣāpradeśāḥ vibhāṣā śveḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*

5. The Sanskrit text presented in this column is quoted without applying *sandhi* for reasons of clarity.

6. The Ny comments on a passage that occurs after this sentence in the text of the KV, but it omits this sentence for comments. The same is true of the Pm. In fact, the Pm even quotes the text of the KV that occurs after this sentence: *tatra* **maṇīvoṣṭrasya lambete** *ityatra vāśabdasyopamānārthasya prayogaḥ.* **rodasī***vetyādau chāndasatvād iti nirvāhaḥ.* (Bold refers to the quoted words.)

7. Again, both the Ny and the Pm comment on a passage that occurs after the sentence "*Xpradeśāḥ — X . . . ity evamādayaḥ*" in the text of the KV. Both the Ny and the Pm quote words from that passage.

16	1.1.45	*samprasāraṇapradeśāḥ vasoḥ samprasāraṇam iti evamādayaḥ.*
17	1.1.46	*ṭitpradeśāḥ ārdhadhātukasya iṭ valādeḥ iti evamādayaḥ.* *kitpradeśāḥ bhiyaḥ hetubhaye ṣuk iti evamādayaḥ.*
18	1.1.47	*mitpradeśāḥ rudhādibhyaḥ śnam iti evamādayaḥ.*
19	1.1.60	*lopapradeśāḥ lopaḥ vyoḥ vali iti evamādayaḥ.*
20	1.1.61	*lukśluluppradeśāḥ luk taddhitaluki, juhotyādibhyaḥ śluḥ,* *janapade lup iti evamādayaḥ.*
21	1.1.64	*ṭipradeśāḥ ṭitaḥ ātmanepadānām ṭeḥ e iti evamādayaḥ.*
22	1.1.65	*upadhāpradeśāḥ ataḥ upadhāyāḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*

It is clear that, as a pattern, the *pradeśa* sentence has not attracted the attention of the two most important traditional testimonia, namely, the Ny and the Pm. We also note that these two commentaries have invariably commented upon the section of the KV immediately preceding the sentence in question, and yet they have remained surprisingly silent throughout about an important part of the text that informs the reader about the range of application of the *sañjñā*. It is also noteworthy that there are at least two cases (A 1.1.11 and A 1.1.37) where this sentence does not occur at the end of the relevant section of the text of the KV. In each of these cases there is a further passage following the sentence. Each of these passages contains a verse, and on A 1.1.37 the verse is clearly a borrowing from the Mbh. The Ny and the Pm both comment on and quote those verses and words in those final passages, but are silent about the *pradeśa* sentence found between the text before it and the quoted verse. From this gap it becomes clear that a distinctive element in a pattern innocently assumed to belong to the KV was in fact absent from the text of the KV as received by the Ny and the Pm.

In other words, the conclusion to be drawn from a study of the two commentaries is unambiguous: Such a sentence was not part of the main body of the text of the KV known to the Ny and the Pm. Forty-five further similar cases from elsewhere in the A (as detailed in Appendices 1 and 2) display the same pattern, strongly confirming our conclusion.

We now study the same cases in the light of the manuscript evidence that we present below. This evidence will help illuminate the relation between the existing manuscripts of the KV and the Ny and the Pm.

III

For all the twenty-two cases presented in Table 1 above, we consulted seventy manuscripts, which are described in Kulkarni et al. 2016. They are found in manuscript libraries from many parts of India (BORI, Pune; ORI, Baroda; ORI, Thiruvananthapuram; GOML and Adyar, Chennai; Hoshiarpur, Jammu, Srinagar, etc.) and also outside India (IOL, London; Göttingen, etc.), written in Bengali, Devanagari, Grantha, Kannada, Malayalam, Sarada, and Telugu scripts. The oldest available manuscript dates back to 1408 CE.

The text found in all seventy manuscripts with minor variations[8] is the same as the twenty-two sentences presented in Table 1 above; that is, an overwhelming majority of manuscripts have this sentence as a part of the text of the KV. Thus, the common ancestor of all the manu-

---

8. In addition to these minor variations, manuscript Hss (Hindī Sāhitya Sammelana, Allahabad, No. 7247/4102 cat. 1398, Devanagari script) does not read *saṃyogapradeśāḥ saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ iti evamādayaḥ* on A 1.1.7, manuscript a7 (Adyar Library, Chennai, No. 69214, grantha script) does not read *ṣaṭpradeśāḥ ṣaḍbhyaḥ luk iti evamādayaḥ* on A 1.1.24, and manuscripts Io2 (India Office Library, London, No. 4064, Devanagari script) and Jm2

script sources we used appears also to have had this sentence as part of the text of the KV. This observation is further strengthened by the data that are presented in Appendix 2, where all the available manuscripts on the other *sañjñā sūtra*s in the A agree on the existence of the *pradeśa* sentence as part of the text of the KV. So the question arises: What is the relation between the common ancestor of all of our manuscripts and the two commentaries?

When a *sañjñā sūtra* was explained in a commentary, it is possible that the most easily understood part of the resulting text could have been the mention of other *sūtra*s where the *sañjñā* occurs. Accordingly, this part of the commentary might not have appeared to require any further elucidation. Also, as this section almost always appears at the end of the relevant section of the text of the commentary, it is possible that it was overlooked, or disregarded, and did not receive due attention. These two reasons, simplicity of understanding and final position, might explain the absence of these sentences in the commentaries. However, these suggestions are perhaps lacking in strength, given the strong pattern on the part of the commentaries consistently and throughout to omit this sentence from their comments, even when it appears in the pre-final position in the text.

IV

The only plausible answer to the question posed above is that the common ancestor of all our manuscripts is post-Pm, and when Abhyankar and Shukla refer to the KV as a source in their dictionary, they are primarily referring to the text of the KV that came into being in the post-Pm period. The present evidence points to the existence of a textual tradition that caused the addition of this material to the text of the KV after the Pm. This addition was indeed crucial in shaping the form of the text of the KV as we see it today, in the form of printed editions. But there are strong reasons to assume that these sentences were not part of the text of the KV in the pre-Pm period. In Kulkarni and Kahrs 2019: 40 we classify the indirect evidence available from the Ny and the Pm into two broad categories, namely, *parokṣa* and *atiparokṣa*, and we count the patterned absence discussed above as part of *atiparokṣa* indirect evidence, displaying it visually as a separate category of evidence in the Textual History Tool, as described in Kanojia et al. 2019. This investigation also suggests that there must be a single archetype of all the manuscripts of the KV that we have studied, from which a hierarchical tree can be drawn to show the transmission of the text of the KV, and that this archetype must be later than the Pm.

APPENDIX 1

Other *sañjñā sūtras* from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* where the Ny and the Pm fail to comment on
KV passages containing the word *pradeśāḥ*

The data presented in the table below show that neither the Ny nor the Pm comment on this sentence on *sañjñā sūtra*s in other parts of the A as well, thereby confirming the observation that this is consistent behavior on the part of the commentaries.

(Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute, Jammu, Devanagari script) do not read *avyayapradeśāḥ avyayāt āpsupaḥ iti evamādayaḥ* on A 1.1.37.

	Sūtra No.	KV text
1	1.2.27	*hrasvadīrghaplutapradeśāḥ hrasvaḥ napuṃsake prātipadikasya akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ dīrghaḥ vākyasya ṭeḥ plutaḥ udāttaḥ.*
2	1.2.29	*udāttapradeśāḥ ādyudāttaḥ ca iti evamādayaḥ.*
3	1.2.30	*anudāttapradeśāḥ anudāttau suppitau iti evamādayaḥ.*
4	1.2.31	*svaritapradeśāḥ tit svaritam iti evamādayaḥ.*
5	1.2.41	*apṛktapradeśāḥ veḥ apṛktasya iti evamādayaḥ.*
6	1.2.42	*karmadhārayapradeśāḥ karmadhāraye aniṣṭhā iti evamādayaḥ.*
7	1.2.43	*upasarjanapradeśāḥ upasarjanam pūrvam iti evamādayaḥ.*
8	1.3.2	*itpradeśāḥ āditaḥ ca iti evamādayaḥ.*
9	1.4.7	*ghipradeśāḥ dvandve ghi iti evamādayaḥ.*
10	1.4.10	*laghupradeśāḥ pugantalaghūpadhasya ca iti evamādayaḥ.* [9]
11	1.4.11	*gurupradeśāḥ guroḥ ca halaḥ iti evamādayaḥ.* [10]
12	1.4.13	*aṅgapradeśāḥ aṅgasya iti evamādayaḥ.*
13	1.4.14	*padapradeśāḥ padasya padāt iti evamādayaḥ.*
14	1.4.45	*adhikaraṇapradeśāḥ saptamī adhikaraṇe ca iti evamādayaḥ.*
15	1.4.49	*karmapradeśāḥ karmaṇi dvitīyā iti evamādayaḥ.*
16	1.4.54	*kartṛpradeśāḥ kartṛkaraṇayoḥ tṛtīyā iti evamādayaḥ.*
17	1.4.55	*hetupradeśāḥ hetumati ca iti evamādayaḥ.*
18	1.4.57	*nipātapradeśāḥ svarādinipātam avyayam iti evamādayaḥ.*
19	1.4.59	*upasargapradeśāḥ upasarge ghoḥ kiḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
20	1.4.60	*gatipradeśāḥ kugatiprādayaḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
21	1.4.83	*karmapravacanīyapradeśāḥ karmapravacanīyayukte dvitīyā iti evamādayaḥ.*
22	1.4.99	*parasmaipadapradeśāḥ sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu iti evamādayaḥ.*
23	1.4.100	*ātmanepadapradeśāḥ anudāttaṅitaḥ ātmanepadam iti evamādayaḥ.*
24	1.4.101	*prathamamadhyamottamapradeśāḥ śeṣe prathamaḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
25	1.4.104	*vibhaktipradeśāḥ aṣṭanaḥ ā vibhaktau iti evamādayaḥ.*
26	1.4.109	*saṃhitāpradeśāḥ saṃhitāyām iti evamādayaḥ.*
27	1.4.110	*avasānapradeśāḥ kharavasānayoḥ visarjanīyaḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
28	2.1.3	*samāsapradeśāḥ tṛtīyāsamāse iti evamādayaḥ.*
29	2.1.5	*avyayībhāvapradeśāḥ avyayībhāvaḥ ca iti evamādayaḥ.*
30	2.1.22	*tatpuruṣapradeśāḥ tatpuruṣe kṛti bahulam iti evamādayaḥ.*

9. The Pm neither comments upon nor quotes this sentence. It does, however, mention the word *pradeśāḥ* three times while commenting on this *sūtra*.

10. There is no Pm on this *sūtra*.

	Sūtra No.	KV text
31	2.1.52	*dvigupradeśāḥ dvigoḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
32	2.2.23	*bahuvrīhipradeśāḥ na bahuvrīhau iti evamādayaḥ.*
33	2.2.29	*dvandvapradeśāḥ dvandve ca iti evamādayaḥ.*
34	2.3.48	*āmantritapradeśāḥ āmantritam pūrvam avidyamānavat iti evamādayaḥ.* [11]
35	2.3.49	*sambuddhipradeśāḥ eṅ hrasvāt sambuddheḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
36	3.1.92	*upapadapradeśāḥ upapadam atiṅ iti evamādayaḥ.*
37	3.1.95	*kṛtyapradeśāḥ kṛtyaiḥ adhikārthavacane kṛtyānām kartari vā iti evamādayaḥ.*
38	3.4.113	*sārvadhātukapradeśāḥ sārvadhātuke yak iti evamādayaḥ.*
39	4.1.76	*taddhitapradeśāḥ kṛttaddhitasamāsāḥ ca iti evamādayaḥ.*
40	4.1.162	*gotrapradeśāḥ ekaḥ gotre iti evamādayaḥ.*
41	4.1.174	*tadrājapradeśāḥ tadrājasya bahuṣu tena eva astriyām iti evamādayaḥ.* [12]
42	5.3.119	*tadrājapradeśāḥ tadrājasya bahuṣu iti evamādayaḥ.* [13]
43	6.1.4	*abhyāsapradeśāḥ tu atra lopaḥ abhyāsasya iti evamādayaḥ.*
44	6.1.5	*abhyastapradeśāḥ abhyastānām ādiḥ iti evamādayaḥ.*
45	8.1.2	*āmreḍitapradeśāḥ āmreḍitam bhartsane iti evamādayaḥ.*

APPENDIX 2

*Sañjñā Sūtra*s in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and Further KV Manuscript Information

For passages 1–31, 34, 35, 38, 42, 43, 44, and 45 in the table above, no manuscript information is available to us. For passages 32 and 33, data from seventy manuscripts are available, described in Kulkarni 2000. For passages 36 and 37, data from seventy manuscripts are available, described in Deo 2001. For passages 39–41, data from forty-five manuscripts are available, described in Dash 2004. It is clear from an examination of the available manuscripts that almost all of them read the *pradeśa* sentence as part of the main body of the text of the KV, thereby confirming the observation made earlier that the common ancestor of all the manuscript sources we used had this sentence as part of the text of the KV.

ABBREVIATIONS

Texts

A: *Aṣṭādhyāyī*
KV: *Kāśikāvṛtti*
Mbh: *Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya*
Ny: *Nyāsa*

---

11. Here the Ny mentions the word *pradeśa* twice, but does not comment on this passage.

12. The Ny and the Pm both read *tadrājasya bahuṣu tenaiva astriyām ityatra kāryāśrayam udāhṛtam*. Could the word *udāhṛtam* indicate that both commentators are aware of the *pradeśa* sentence?

13. Not commented on in either of the commentaries.

Pm: *Padamañjarī*

Library Names

BORI: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune
ORI: Oriental Research Institute
GOML: Government Oriental Manuscript Library
IOL: India Office Library

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Kāśikāvṛtti, together with the Nyāsa and the Padamañjarī, ed. Dwarikadas Shastri and Kalika Prasad Shukla. 6 vols. Varanasi: Sudhi Prakashan, 1983–85. (First ed. 1965–67.)

Kāśikā, a Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar by Vāmana and Jayāditya, ed. Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D. G. Padhye. Hyderabad: Osmania University, vol. 1 (*adhyāya*s 1–4), 1969; vol. 2 (*adhyāya*s 5–8), 1970. (Rpt. in one vol., 2008.)

Secondary Sources

Abhyankar, K. V., and J. M. Shukla. 1977. *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. Baroda: Oriental Research Institute.

Dash, Sasmita. 2004. Critical Edition of Kāśikā (4.1). PhD diss., Univ. of Pune.

Deo, Puja. 2001. Critical Edition of Kāśikā (3.1). PhD diss., Univ. of Pune.

Kanojia, Diptesh, Malhar Kulkarni, Pushpak Bhattacharyya, Sayali Ghodekar, Irawati Kulkarni, Nilesh Joshi, and Eivind Kahrs. 2019. An Introduction to the Textual History Tool. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Sanskrit Computational Linguistics Symposium*, *IIT Kharagpur*, ed. Pawan Goyal. Pp. 167–81. Kharagpur: Association of Computational Linguistics.

Kulkarni, Malhar. 2000. Critical Edition of Kāśikā (2.2). PhD diss., Univ. of Pune.

———. 2005. A Sample of the New Edition of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*: 2.2.6. *Bharatiya Vidya* 65 (ed. J. H. Dave and S. A. Upadhyaya): 116–27.

———. 2012. Some Issues in Editing the Ganapathas in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. In *Studies in Sanskrit Grammars: Proceedings of the Vyākaraṇa Section of the 14th World Sanskrit Conference*, ed. George Cardona, Ashok Aklujkar, and Hideyo Ogawa. Pp. 213–58. New Delhi: D.K. Printworld.

Kulkarni, Malhar, Anuja Ajotikar, Tanuja Ajotikar, and Eivind Kahrs. 2016. Discussion on Some Important Variants in the *pratyāhārasūtra*s in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. In *Vyākaraṇaparipṛcchā: Proceedings of the Vyākaraṇa Section of the 16th World Sanskrit Conference*, ed. George Cardona and Hideyo Ogawa. Pp. 209–36. New Delhi: D.K. Publishers.

Kulkarni, Malhar, and Eivind Kahrs. 2019. Some More Reflections on the Role of the *Nyāsa* and the *Padamañjarī* in Reconstructing the Textual History of the Transmission of the *Kaśikavṛtti*. *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā* 35: 35–48.