

Was Bhaṭṭa Jayanta a Paippalādin?*

Kei Kataoka

Introduction

As RAGHAVAN (1964) and DEZSŐ (2004) explain in their introductions, Bhaṭṭa Jayanta,¹ the ninth century Kashmirian scholar famous for his *Nyāyamañjarī*, was a contemporary of King Śaṅkaravarman (883–902), because in his play *Āgamaḍambara* he refers to himself as a minister of that king (ĀD₁ 46.19: *taśśa amacce dulaālajayamte*). He also depicts the king, both in the *Āgamaḍambara* (ĀD₁ 46.19–20) and the *Nyāyamañjarī* (NM I 649.4–7), as having banned the corrupt Nīlāmbara sect.

Raghavan and Dezső investigate Jayanta's genealogy mainly on the basis of the introductory verses in the *Kādambarīkathāsāra* of Abhinanda, Jayanta's son, together with scattered pieces of information gathered from Jayanta's own works, i.e. the *Āgamaḍambara* and the *Nyāyamañjarī*. DEZSŐ (2004: v–vi) gives the relevant text of the *Kādambarīkathāsāra* and its translation as follows:

śaktināmābhavad gaūḍo bhāradvājakule dvijaḥ |
dārvābhisāram āsādyā kṛtadāraparigrahaḥ ||5||
tasya mitrābhīdhāno 'bhūd ātmajas tejasām nidhiḥ |
janena doṣoparamaprabuddhenārcitodayaḥ ||6||
sa śaktisvāminam putram avāpa śrutaśālinam |
rājñāḥ karkoṭavamśasya muktāpīḍasya mantriṇam ||7||
kalyāṇasvāmināmāsya yājñavalkya ivābhavat |
tanayaḥ śuddhayogarddhinirdhūtabhavaś kalmaṣaḥ ||8||
agādhahṛdayāt tasmāt parameśvaramandanam |
ajāyata sutaḥ kāntaś candro dugdhodadher iva ||9||
putram kṛtajanānandam sa jayantam ajījanat |
āsīt kavītvavaktṛtvaphalā yasya sarasvatī ||10||
vṛttikāra iti vyaktaṁ dvitīyaṁ nāma bibhrataḥ |
vedavedāṅgaviduṣaḥ sarvaśāstrārthavādināḥ ||11||
jayantānāmnaḥ sudhiyaḥ sādhusāhityatattoavit |
sūnuḥ samudabhūt tasmād abhinanda iti śrutaḥ ||12||

There was a Gauḍa Brahman by the name Śakti, [born] in the Bhāradvāja family, who moved to Dārvābhisāra and married [there]. He had a son called Mitra, a treasury of majestic luster, whose rise was hailed by the people, roused due to the cessation of dangers, like the sun [Mitra] whose rising is

*I thank Prof. Shingo Einoo, Prof. Harunaga Isaacson and Dr. Helmut Krasser for comments.

¹In the *Āgamaḍambara* (ĀD₁ 2.23) he calls himself Bhaṭṭa Jayanta and not Jayanta Bhaṭṭa.

worshipped by the people who have woken at the end of the night. He obtained a son, Śaktisvāmin, versed in the Vedas, the minister of King Muktāpīḍa of the Karkoṭa dynasty. He had a son called Kalyāṇasvāmin, who shook off the dirt of existence with wealth acquired by pure means, like Yājñavalkya, who destroyed the stains of existence with the accomplishment of pure Yoga. From that man of profound heart a beautiful son was born: Candra, an ornament of the Supreme Lord, as the lovely moon [Candra], Śiva's ornament, was produced from the milk-ocean of unfathomable depth. He begot a son, Jayanta, who made people happy, and who became poet and teacher as a result of his eloquence. Then to that wise man named Jayanta, who had a well-known second name 'The Commentator', was learned in the Vedas and the ancillary Vedic sciences, and expounded the meaning of all śāstras, a son was born, known as Abhinanda, conversant with the true nature of good literature.

Jayanta's ancestor, Śakti, a Gauḍa (Bengali)² brahmin belonging to the Bhāradvājagotra (*gauḍo bhāradvājakule dvijah*), moved to Dārvābhisāra³ in Kashmir. Śakti's grandson, Śaktisvāmin, was a minister of King Lalitāditya-Muktāpīḍa of the Karkoṭa dynasty (c. 724–761).⁴ According to Jayanta, his grandfather, Kalyāṇasvāmin, obtained the village of Gauramūlaka⁵ as the result of a Sāmgrahaṇī sacrifice. Jayanta's family history is summarized in the following chart.⁶

²No one has raised questions about the interpretation of *gauḍo ... dvijah* as implying that Śakti hailed from Gauḍa, i.e. Bengal. It is unlikely that Abhinanda, in describing his family history, used such concrete words in a secondary sense, for example, 'a brahmin who has some connection with Gauḍa' without actually living or having lived there, or that he intended some reference to the 'Gauḍa' subdivision of brahmins, on which, see DESHPANDE (2002).

³For Dārvābhisāra, see RAGHAVAN (1964: i, n. 3) and DEZSŐ (2004: vi). They refer to Stein's note ad *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 1.180, where Dārvābhisāra is said to have "comprised the whole tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Vitastā and Candrabhāgā."

⁴Cf. DEZSŐ (2004: vi, n. 6): "On the chronology of the Karkoṭa dynasty see RT(S), vol. I, pp. 66ff. Kalhaṇa does not mention Śaktisvāmin. He does however mention a minister of Lalitāditya called Mitraśarman (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 4.137f.)."

⁵NM I 653.11–12: *asmatpitāmaha eva grāmakāmah sāmgrahaṇīm kṛtavān. sa iṣṭisamāptisamantaram eva gauramūlakam grāmam avāpa*. "My own grandfather, desiring a village, performed the sāmgrahaṇī sacrifice. Immediately after the completion of the sacrifice he obtained the village of Gauramūlaka" (Tr. by DEZSŐ [2004: vii]).

For Gauramūlaka, see RAGHAVAN (1964: ii, n. 1) and DEZSŐ (2004: vii). They refer to Stein's note ad *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* ad 8.1861: "*Ghoramūlaka*, which is only here mentioned, was probably situated to the north of Rajaurī in the direction of the Rattan Pīr range. ... We have shown in note i. 180 (comp. also vii. 1531), that the geographical term Dārvābhisāra included the territory of Rājapurī. And in the latter the Ghoramūlaka of our own passage was evidently situated. The phonetic difference between the forms *Gauramūlaka* and *Ghoramūlaka* is easily accounted for. It is *a priori* probable that we have in both forms attempts to sanskritize a Kaśmīrī (or Pahārī?) village name, which in its Apabhraṃśa form may have sounded *Gōramul, *Gauramul, or something similar. ... Whereas Abhinanda transcribed the name of his grandfather's Agraḥāra by *Gauramūlaka*, perhaps with an intentional approximation to his own surname 'the Gauḍa,' Kalhaṇa reproduces three centuries later the local name in a proper and intelligible Sanskrit garb as *Ghoramūlaka*."

⁶See also HEGDE (1984) for a detailed chronology.

- | | | |
|---|---------------|--|
| 1 | Śakti | Gauḍa brahmin of the Bhāradvājagotra who moved to Dārvābhisāra in Kashmir |
| 2 | Mitra | |
| 3 | Śaktisvāmin | Minister of King Lalitāditya-Muktāpīḍa (c. 724–761) of the Karkoṭa dynasty |
| 4 | Kalyāṇasvāmin | obtained the village of Gauramūlaka |
| 5 | Candra | |
| 6 | Jayanta | Minister of King Śaṅkaravarman (883–902) |
| 7 | Abhinanda | Author of the <i>Kādambarīkathāsāra</i> |

Jayanta's discussion on the authoritativeness of the Atharvaveda

Jayanta's unique doctrine of 'authoritativeness of all scriptures' (*sarvāgama-prāmāṇya*) is a topic common to both of his most important works, i.e. the *Nyāyamañjarī* and the *Āgamaḍambara*.⁷ There he presupposes a hierarchy of various scriptures mainly based on the classification of 'the fourteen branches of science' (*caturdaśavidyāsthāna*).

1–4	4 Vedas
5	Smṛti
6	Itihāsapurāṇa
7–12	6 Aṅgas
13	Mīmāṃsā
14	Nyāya
Śaiva, Pāśupata, Pañcarātra	
Bauddha, Ārhata	
Lokāyata, Nīlāmbara, (Saṃsāramocaka)	

He accepts that all scriptures, except those of extreme sects such as Lokāyata, Nīlāmbara and Saṃsāramocaka, are authoritative because they fulfill the condition either 'being based on the Vedas' or 'being composed by a reliable person'. This view is adopted also in his shortest work, the *Nyāyakalikā* (4.12–14: *vedavad āgamāntarāṇy api tanmūlatvād āptapraṇītātvaḍ vā pramāṇam iti veditavyāni*). The section on 'the authoritativeness of the Atharvaveda' (*atharvavedapramāṇya*),⁸

⁷For Jayanta's unique view of *sarvāgama-prāmāṇya* and a discussion of the religious and political situation of his day, see WEZLER (1976).

⁸For this section, there is an English translation by BHATTACHARYYA (1978), a Gujarati translation by SHAH (1989), and two summaries by NARAHARI (1940) and SHAH (1997).

which is relevant for our present concern about the Paippalāda school,⁹ is located in the *Nyāyamañjarī* immediately before the section on ‘the authoritativeness of all scriptures’.

After having proven the authoritativeness of the Vedas with the Naiyāyika argument that they are composed by a reliable person (NM I 610.11: *tasmād āptoktatvād eva vedāḥ pramāṇam iti siddham*), and shown as well the Mīmāṃsaka reasoning (610.12–613.8) and a modified Naiyāyika one both of which presuppose the beginningless *saṃsāra* (613.9–614.4), Jayanta refers to someone (*kaścit*), either Naiyāyika or Mīmāṃsaka as is indicated by two different positions (614.6–9, 11–14), who raises an objection about the authoritativeness of the Atharvaveda (614.6–14): one can say that the three Vedas are authoritative because they teach ritual elements which are mutually connected; but the Atharvaveda is not, because it does not teach such matters and thus is separate in activity (*prthagvyavahāra*) and outside the three Vedas (*trayībāhya*).

As will be made clear later, this objection is motivated by a Mīmāṃsā maxim that various elements of a single ritual are known collectively from all the branches of the Vedas (621.4: *sarvaśākhāpratyayam ekaṃ karma*).¹⁰ Thus, according to this exegetic rule, it is clear that the Atharvaveda is ‘outside the three Vedas’, because it teaches *śānti*, *puṣṭi* and *abhicāra*, which are performed by a single Brahman priest, as Kumārila points out even while defending its authoritativeness,¹¹ and thus does not contribute to Vedic sacrifices (615.16–19).

Jayanta replies to the objection by following the same exegetic rule. He explains how the Atharvaveda contributes to Vedic sacrifices and therefore has connection with the three Vedas: it teaches ritual actions such as *iṣṭi*, *paśu*, *ekāha*, *ahīna* and *sa[t]tra* (620.17–18) and it prescribes the office of a Brahman priest

⁹Cf. GRIFFITHS (2004: 51–52, n. 10): “... because it is precisely this 9th century Kashmirian author whose detailed discussions regarding the status of the AV and whose particular mentioning of the Paippalāda Śākhā render BHATTACHARYA’s attempts to disprove Paippalāda presence in Kashmir before ‘Yuddhabhaṭṭa’ (cf. GRIFFITHS 2002: 42f.) in the 15th century rather doubtful: cf. e.g. *Nyāyamañjarī*, Mysore Ed. vol. I p. 5, l. 3; 552, 8 (!); 589, 2–3; 614, 12; 619, 19 through 620, 2; 623, 10.”

¹⁰Cf. *Śābarabhāṣya* ad 2.4.9, ŚBh 635.4–5: *yad uktam “śākhāntareṣu karmabhedah” iti. sarvaśākhāpratyayam sarvabrāhmaṇapratyayam caikaṃ karma* ‘It is said that ritual actions are distinguished [from each other] when the [Vedic] branches are different. [But it is not the case.] A single ritual is known from all branches and all Brāhmaṇas.’

¹¹*Tantravārttika* 189.3–6 ad 1.3.4 (quoted in NM I 615.16–19): *yadi yajñopayogitvaṃ nehāsty ātharvaṇaśruteḥ | arthāntarapramāṇatvaṃ kenāsyāḥ pratihanyate || śāntipuṣṭyabhicārārthā hy ekabrahmartvigāśritāḥ | kriyās tayā pramīyante *trāpy evātmīyagocarāḥ ||* (NM reads: *trayivātmīyagocarāḥ*; but NMGBh 101.14–15 supports *-gocarāḥ*) ‘With regard to this, [even] if the Atharvanic revelation does not contribute to a sacrifice, why is it denied that it is authoritative [at least] with regard to other things? For in this case, too, ritual actions relying on a single Brahman priest which aim at propitiation, prosperity or black magic are known from the [Atharvanic revelation] as constituting its [i.e., the revelations’s] special domain’ (Cakradhara in NMGBh 101.15–18 interprets *ātmīyagocarāḥ* as a *bahuvrīhi* compound: ‘[ritual actions] which have [the revelation’s] own [ritual elements] as [their] targets’, i.e. ‘containing its own ritual elements’).

who takes part in a Vedic sacrifice taught by the three Vedas (621.7). For this last point, he quotes evidential passages from the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* (621.8–19). Thus an Atharvavedin alone can be a Brahman priest (624.11: *tasmād ātharvaṇa eva brahmeti*).

With regard to a *Manusmṛti* passage (3.1ab) which prescribes the learning of the three Vedas for 36 years (615.5–7), Jayanta first confirms the equality of the four Vedas in Vedic education (626.5–12). He goes even further and says that the Atharvaveda is the first among the four Vedas (626.14–15: *atharvaveda eva prathamah*). Then he accepts as an option the possibility of learning the four Vedas, which lasts 48 years (627.9–11).

Finally, Jayanta replies to Kumārila, who said ‘as if out of fear, hatred, ignorance or pity’ (628.9–10) that the Atharvaveda, though it does not contribute to Vedic sacrifices, is nonetheless authoritative at least with regard to its own objects such as *śānti* etc. (615.16–19). To this, Jayanta repeats his points already made in the preceding discussions: the Atharvaveda too teaches *iṣṭi* etc. (628.11–12≈620.17–18); Kumārila’s critique is pointless, because authoritativeness of the Vedas depends on either eternality or God (628.16–17≈615.21–616.9). He also confirms the existence of *śānti* etc. in the other Vedas (628.18–19); and he negates Kumārila’s claim that rituals enjoined by the Atharvaveda are always performed by a single priest (628.21–24).

These repetitions strengthen the impression that Jayanta’s opponent is mainly Kumārila, as is often the case elsewhere in the *Nyāyamañjarī*, and that the preceding multi-layer arguments, including overly simple-minded ones (620.7–13), which target unspecifically either Mīmāṃsaka or Naiyāyika opponents, are in fact postulated by Jayanta as preparatory to refutation of Kumārila’s sophisticated critique ‘which separates one Veda from all the other Vedas’ (629.4: *sarvavedānām ekasya tataḥ prthakkaraṇam*). Then it will make better sense that Jayanta honestly follows the Mīmāṃsā exegetic rule and thereby tries to refute a Mīmāṃsaka opponent on his own terms.

Text-analysis of the *Atharvavedaprāmāṇya* section

1 Objection: the Atharvaveda is not authoritative

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1.1 Because it is outside the 3 Vedas | 614.5–14 |
| 1.2 Supporting evidence | |
| 1.2.1 Worldly usage and conduct | 614.15–17 |
| 1.2.2 Śruti passages | 614.17–615.3 |
| 1.2.3 Smṛti passages | 615.4–13 |

2 Kumārila’s view: the Atharvaveda is authoritative with regard to its own rituals and not Vedic sacrifices

615.14–19

3 Reply: the Atharvaveda is authoritative with regard to Vedic sacrifices

3.1 Being outside the 3 Vedas is not a reason for unauthoritativeness	615.20–616.9
3.2 Supporting evidence	
3.2.1 Worldly usage and conduct	616.10–12
3.2.2 Śruti passages	616.13–618.13
3.2.3 Smṛti passages	618.14–619.17
3.2.4 Śāstric passages	619.18–620.5
3.3 Reply to the Atharvaveda's being outside the 3 Vedas	
3.3.1 Being outside the 3 Vedas is not problematic	620.6–13
3.3.2 The Atharvaveda contributes to Vedic rituals	620.14–621.2
3.3.3 The Atharvaveda qualifies the Brahman priest	621.3–624.12
3.4 Reply to the problematic evidence	
3.4.1 Smṛti	624.13–18
3.4.2 Śruti	624.19–625.16
3.4.3 Worldly usage and conduct	625.17–626.3
3.5 Vedic study	
3.5.1 Equality of the four Vedas	626.4–12
3.5.2 Priority of the Atharvaveda	626.13–20
3.5.3 Study of the four Vedas	626.21–627.19
3.5.4 On the problem of <i>śrāddhabhojanādhikāra</i>	627.20–628.7
4 Reply to Kumārila: the Atharvaveda contributes to Vedic sacrifices	628.8–629.6
5 Conclusion	629.7–15

Was Jayanta an Atharvavedin?

It is most likely that Jayanta himself was an Atharvavedin.¹² Otherwise his whole argument and passionate or ironical expressions of mixed feelings against Kumārila (628.9–10, 629.2–6) would be difficult to explain.

One might object that Jayanta defends the Atharvaveda on neutral grounds though he himself is not an Atharvavedin; that Jayanta just corrects Kumārila's biased view from his liberal viewpoint as seen in his unique theory of 'authoritativeness of all scriptures' (*sarvāgamaprāmāṇya*); that he automatically extends the same reasoning to the Atharvaveda, too, just as he does to the Pāñcarātra and the Buddhist scriptures.

But this view of an 'unbiased Jayanta' cannot explain Jayanta's granting the Atharvaveda priority among the four Vedas (626.14–20). One may think that Jayanta's view of 'Atharvaveda First' is presented tentatively for argument's

¹²Cf. RAGHAVAN (1964: iii): "In his discussion of Veda-prāmāṇya in the NM., Jayanta not only puts up an elaborate defence of the *Atharvaveda* but even holds it as the foremost Veda (pp. 253–260) and finds fault with Kumārila for his attitude of hesitation in regard to this Veda. We may surmise from this that Jayanta belonged to the Atharvaveda."

sake as is indicated by his hypothetical words: 'Furthermore, if one is not satisfied without a rank relationship, the Atharvaveda is the first' (626.14–15: *yadi punar auttarādharyeṇa vinā na parituṣyate tad atharvaveda eva prathamah*). But, actually, Jayanta had already adopted the present view in the opening section of the *Nyāyamañjarī*, where he enumerates 14 branches of science (5.2–5: *vidvāṃsaś caturdaśavidyāsthānāny ācakṣate. tatra vedāś catvārah. prathamō 'tharvavedaḥ*). Similar is the case of his quoting the beginning portion of the Atharvaveda as an example of a Vedic composition (573.11–12: *"śan no devīr abhiṣṭaye" ityādiṣu vedavākyasandarbhēṣu*). These facts suggest that 'Atharvaveda First' is his final view. Thus it is unlikely that Jayanta would not have been affiliated specifically with the Atharvaveda.

Was Jayanta a Paippalādin?

Jayanta's quotation of the *pratīka* of the Paippalāda recension of the Atharvaveda, *śan no devīr abhiṣṭaye*, may well be from Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* as is indicated by his way of quotation (619.20–21: *mahābhāṣyakāro bhagavān patañjalir atharvavedam eva prathamam udāhṛtavān "śan no devīr abhiṣṭaye" iti*), and may therefore not necessarily reflect his affiliation with the Paippalāda school.¹³

With regard to his general Vedic, and his specific school affiliation, however, we must also note the fact that Jayanta affirms that the office of a Brahman priest is to be performed with the Atharvaveda. In order to demonstrate this, he quotes from the Atharvavedic *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*.

NM I 621.7–19: *tad*¹⁴ *ayuktam. atharvavedena brahmatvasya karaṇāt. tathā*¹⁵ *ca gopathabrāhmaṇam—*

(1) *prajāpatis somena yakṣyamāṇo vedān*¹⁶ *uvāca kaṃ vo hotāraṃ vṛṇīyam*¹⁷

iti prakramya

(2) *tasmād ṛgvidam eva hotāraṃ vṛṇīṣva sa hi hautraṃ veda*, (3) *yajurvedam evādhvaryuṃ*¹⁸ *vṛṇīṣva sa hi ādhvaryavaṃ veda*, (4) *sāmavidam evodgātāraṃ*¹⁹ *vṛṇīṣva sa hi audgātāraṃ veda*, (5) *atharvāṅgirovidam eva brahmāṇam vṛṇīṣva sa hi brahmatvaṃ veda*

¹³But it is also noteworthy that Jayanta quotes it elsewhere in order to give an example of a Vedic passage, as was mentioned just above: NM I 573.11–12, 580.3.

¹⁴*tad*] MVL; *tad etad* K

¹⁵*tathā*] MVK; *yathā* L

¹⁶*vedān*] MVL; *devān* K

¹⁷*vṛṇīyam*] VL; *vṛṇīyam iti M*; *vṛṇayām* K

¹⁸*evādhvaryuṃ*] MV; *evādhvaryam* L; *evādhvaryavaṃ* K

¹⁹*evodgātāraṃ*] MVK; *evodgāraṃ* L

ity evam²⁰ abhidhāya punar āha

(6) atha cen naivamvidham hotāram adhvaryum udgātāram brahmānam vā²¹
vṛṇute purastād evaiśām²² yajño ricyate²³ iti (7) tasmād rgvidam eva hotāram
kuryād yajurvedam²⁴ evādhvaryum²⁵ sāmavidam evodgātāram atharvāṅgiro-
vidam²⁶ eva brahmānam

iti. tathā yajñe²⁷

(8) yad ūnam ca viriṣṭam ca yātayāmam ca karoti tad atharvaṇām²⁸ tejasā
pratyāyayati

iti.²⁹ tathā

(9) na rte³⁰ bhr̥gvaṅgirovidbhyah³¹ somah pātavyah

iti.

These passages correspond to the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*, in GAASTRA's edition, as follows (peculiar differences are underlined in the above text).³²

(1) GB 1.2.24:61.11–12³³

(2) GB 1.2.24:62.2–3

(3) GB 1.2.24:62.11–12

(4) GB 1.2.24:63.1

(5) GB 1.2.24:63.5–6³⁴

(6) This is a summary of GB 1.2.24:62.10–11, 62.14–15, 63.4–5, 63.13–15³⁵

²⁰ity evam] LVK; ity M

²¹vā] MVL; om. K

²²evaiśām] LK (supported by NMGBh 104.1); eva vaiśām MV

²³ricyate] MK (supported by NMGBh 104.1); riṣyate L; riṣyati V

²⁴yajurvedam] MVK; yajurvedam L

²⁵evādhvaryum] MVK; evādhvaryam L

²⁶atharvāṅgirovidam] MLK; atharvāṅgirasovidam V

²⁷yajñe] LVK (supported by NMGBh 104.1); om. M

²⁸tad atharvaṇām] MVL; tatharvaṇām K

²⁹tejasā pratyāyayati iti] LK; tejasāpyāyayatīti V; tejasā pratyāpyāyayet iti M

³⁰tathā na rte] LK; na rte M; athānante V

³¹-girovidbhyah] K (supported by NMGBh 104.3); -girobhyyah MV; -girebhyyah L

³²I thank Arlo Griffiths for the references to GAASTRA's edition of the GB and his comments, on which the following notes concerning GB are based in the main.

³³GAASTRA emends vṛṇīya, but her mss. read vṛṇīyām.

³⁴Notice that these sentences (2–5) are not contiguous in the source text as we know it.

³⁵But note that the summary gives only *purastād*, whereas GB (as known to us) gives ... *purastād* ..., ... *paścād* ..., ... *uttarata* ..., ... *dakṣiṇata* The GB text has 4 times *-vidam* and not *-vidham* (underlined).

- (7) This corresponds to GB 1.2.24:62.2–3 for the Hotṛ (*tasmād rgvidam eva hotāraṃ vṛṇīṣva*), but for the other priests the GB has 3 times *tasmāt tam eva ... vṛṇīṣva*, and the NM quote rather resembles GB 1.3.1:65.1–3 (*tasmād rgvidam eva hotāraṃ vṛṇīṣva yajurvedam adhvaryuṃ sāmavidam udgātāram atharvāṅgirovidam brahmānam*)³⁶
- (8) GB 1.1.22:15.6–7
- (9) GB 1.1.28:20.15

It is not certain that what Jayanta quotes as the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* is the same *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* as we have, but the differences — often abbreviated forms which seem to have been introduced by Jayanta in order to avoid repetition — between his readings and those of the known GB are not enough reason to assume that he knew a recension of that text different from the one transmitted by Śaunaka-Atharvavedins and edited by GAASTRA.³⁷ Anyhow, as the drawn-out debate between Maurice Bloomfield and Willem Caland shows, it is not certain to which of the two extant schools, Paippalāda or Śaunaka, the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* belongs, although Caland's arguments for Paippalāda-affiliation are weighty.³⁸ Thus Jayanta's quotations of the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*, though suggestive, are not themselves definite evidence for his affiliation to the Paippalāda school, but do seem to add to the weight of evidence discussed above for his Atharvavedic affiliation.

However, Jayanta's affiliation with the Paippalāda school is unambiguously hinted at by his peculiar way of reference.

NM I 589.1–4: *tatra hi hautram rgvedena yajurvedenādhvaryavam audgātram sāmavedena brahmatvam atharvavedena*³⁹ *kriyate. paippalādisākhābhedopa-*
*diṣṭam*⁴⁰ *ca tattadaṅgajātaṃ tatra tatrāpekṣyate. tatra sarvaśākhāpratyaṃyam ekaṃ*
*karmety āhuh.*⁴¹

To explain, among these [four Vedas], the Ṛgveda prescribes the Hotṛ-office, the Yajurveda prescribes the Adhvaryu-office, the Sāmaveda prescribes the Udgātṛ-office, and the Atharvaveda prescribes the office of the Brahman. And each and every [ritual] element which is taught in various

³⁶The known GB text has *vṛṇīṣva* everywhere, but nothing corresponding to *kuryāt* in NM (underlined).

³⁷Though further research should be done, it seems certain that Jayanta did not necessarily quote Vedic passages verbatim. See, e.g., his quotation of the *Kāthakaśatādhyayanabrāhmaṇa* in NM I 623.21–624.4, where a passage from the *Agnyādheyabrāhmaṇa* (*Kāthakasamkalana*, p. 3f. with n. 10 on p. 4) is represented in quite an elliptic way. Cf. GARGE (1952: 39–45) on Śabarasvāmin's often imprecise manner of quoting Vedic passages.

³⁸For a summary of the debate, see GAASTRA's introduction to her GB ed., pp. 14–15.

³⁹*atharvavedena*] VLK; *atharvavedena ca* M

⁴⁰*-śākhābhedopadiṣṭam*] MVL; *-śākhopadiṣṭaṃ* K

⁴¹*āhuh*] MVL; *āha* K

Vedic branches, [such as] Paippalādin,⁴² is required for each [ritual]. In connection with this, they say that a single ritual is known from all branches.

Instead of Paippalāda(ka)/Paippalādin, Jayanta could have mentioned another name in order to give one example of a Vedic school. This would even have been more appropriate, because he enumerates the four Vedas in the order beginning with the R̥gveda, as is normally expected.

Besides Paippalāda(ka)/Paippalādin, Jayanta knows that there exists another Atharvaveda school called Maudaka, while he nowhere mentions Śaunakīya. He quotes a *Śābarabhāṣya* passage (ad *Jaiminisūtra* 1.1.27) which refers to Vedic branches such as Kāthaka, Kālāpaka, Maudaka and Paippalādaka.⁴³

NM I 619.22–620.3⁴⁴: *mīmāṃsābhāṣyakāreṇāpi vedādhikarane “kāthakam kālāpakam”⁴⁵ maudakam⁴⁶ paippalādakam⁴⁷ iti yajurvedādivad⁴⁸ atharvavede⁴⁹ ‘pi paippalādakam udājahre. sarvaśākhādhikarane ‘pi⁵⁰ vedāntaraśākhāntaravan maudakapaippalādakākhye⁵⁰ atharvaśākhe apy udāhṛtya vicāraḥ kṛtaḥ.*

In the Vedādhikaraṇa [in particular ad 1.1.27], [Śābarasvāmin], the author of the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya*, too, referred to the Paippalādaka with regard to the Atharvaveda as well, just as [he referred to some branches] with regard to the Yajurveda etc., when he said: “Kāthaka, Kālāpa, Maudaka and Paippalādaka”. In the *Sarvaśākhādhikaraṇa* [in particular ad 2.4.8], too, he quoted, just as [he quoted] other branches belonging to the other Vedas, two

⁴²All the editions and manuscripts that I have consulted read *paippalādi-*. But it is possible to emend *paippalādādi-* (or possibly *paippalādakādi-* or *paippalādyādi-*). If one interpreted the sentence as it reads without *ādi*, then it would be translated as follows: ‘And each and every [ritual] element which is taught in a particular Vedic recension, Paippalādin, is required for each [ritual].’ But this is unnatural and does not fit the context, in which Jayanta emphasizes the point that all the elements taught by the four Vedas have organic unity. See the preceding passage in *Nyāyamañjarī* 588.19–589.1: *ekam eva hi karma vedacatuṣṭayopadiṣṭaiḥ pṛthagbhūtair apy ekārthasamavāyibhir āṅgair anvitam prayujyate* ‘For a single ritual is performed being accompanied by the constituents which are taught by the four Vedas, and which, though separate [from each other], belong to [and aim at] the same goal.’ While the emendations to *paippalādakādi-* and *paippalādyādi-* are less likely, it is clear that the change from *paippalādādiśākhā-* to *paippalādiśākhā-* could easily have happened. Still, I hesitate to accept this emendation, for I do not think that Jayanta expresses the ‘Paippalāda branch’ as *paippalādaśākhā*. Instead he would have expressed it as *paippalādiśākhā* or *paippalādakaśākhā* as is indicated from his usage in NM I 620.1–2: *paippalādakam ... maudakapaippalādakākhye atharvaśākhe*. Therefore I retain the present reading *paippalādiśākhā* as original. For it is possible that Jayanta forgets to add *ādi*, though it is necessary and intended as is clear from the following words *-śākhābheda-*.

⁴³This set of Vedic branches is referred to in the *Mahābhāṣya* ad 4.1.1(3):II 191.24–25; 4.3.101(3):II 315.15; 4.3.120(11):II 319.5–6.

⁴⁴This corresponds to L (134v22–135r3), V (256.2–5), K (95r1–95r2).

⁴⁵*kālāpakam*] LV; *kālāpam* M; *kālādakam* K

⁴⁶*maudakam*] L; *maudgalam* MV; *modakam* K

⁴⁷*yajurvedādivad*] LMK; *yajurvedādikavad* V

⁴⁸*atharvavede*] LMV; *ātharvavedo* K

⁴⁹*‘pi*] LMV; om. K

⁵⁰*-śākhāntaravan maudaka-*] LV; *-śākhāntaravat maudgala-* M; *-śākhāvad audāla-* K

Atharvaveda branches called Maudaka and Paippalādaka, and investigated [them].⁵¹

There, with reference to the *Śābarabhāṣya* passage in the *Vedādhikaraṇa*, where Śābara refers to both Maudaka and Paippalādaka, Jayanta himself repeats only Paippalādaka (underlined).

His particular concern with the Paippalādaka is also indicated by another passage from the *Nyāyamañjarī* in which he refers in particular to Paithīnasi-Paippalādins, i.e. Paippalādins of a Paithīnasi subschool, or Paippalādins who follow the sūtra of Paithīnasi,⁵² in order to mention one example of a brahmin.

NM I 552.10–11: *na*⁵³ *caupādhikah paithīnasipaippalādi* *prabhṛtiṣu*⁵⁴ *brāhma-napratyayah, upādher agrahanāt, aupādhikatvasya ca*⁵⁵ *gotvādāv api vaktum śak-yatvāt.*

And cognizing someone, such as a Paithīnasi-Paippalādin, as a brahmin is not based on an additional condition, because an additional condition is not grasped, and because one could [equally] claim with regard to cowness etc., too, that [cognition of a cow as a cow] is based on an additional condition [and not a *jāti*].

Here Jayanta refers to a well-known fact that people recognize Paithīnasi-Paippalādins as brahmins. This arbitrary exemplification does not make sense unless there existed Paithīnasi-Paippalādins in ninth century Kashmir,⁵⁶ and will be better understood if we accept that Jayanta is specifically affiliated with this very Paithīnasi-Paippalādin community.

Conclusion

It is very likely that Bhaṭṭa Jayanta, the ninth century Kashmirian scholar, was a Paippalādin brahmin. Moreover, it results most naturally from the evidence

⁵¹In fact Śābarasvāmin mentions in *Śābarabhāṣya* ad 2.4.8 only Kāṭhaka, Kālāpaka and Paippalādaka, and not Maudaka. Maybe Jayanta, without checking the original passage in *Śābarabhāṣya* ad 2.4.8, thought by analogy with *Śābarabhāṣya* ad 1.1.27 that Śābarasvāmin enumerates all the four.

⁵²Cf. §6 of Arlo Griffiths' contribution to in this volume.

⁵³*na*] LMV; om. K

⁵⁴*paithīnasipaippalādi-*] LMV; *paithīnasam pappalāda-* K

⁵⁵*ca*] LK; om. MV

⁵⁶In the discussion of 'brahminness' (*brāhmaṇatva*), it is not historically common to mention Paippalādins. In *Taittirīya-Saṃhitā* vv. 3574–3578 and *Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā* thereon, Śāntarakṣita (c. 725–788) and Kamalaśīla (c. 740–795) compare brahmins with *śūdras* without mentioning any particular group of brahmins. Neither does Kaṇvakagomin mention any such subcategory (PVSṬ 10). Prajñākaragupta has a long discussion of brahminness (PVA 10.21–12.13). There he mentions a brahmin-subgroup Kauṇḍinya (PVA 10.25). In the *Nyāsa* (14.24–25), Jinendra refers to Māthara and Kauṇḍinya in connection with brahminness. Kumārila refers to Kauṇḍinya and Kāṭha. *Tantravārttika* 295.10 ad 1.3.30: *pumstvād brāhmaṇakaundīnyakāṭhatvādi samāpyate* ||.

brought forward that already around 700 AD, at the time of his ancestor Śakti, there was a Paippalādin family in Bengal.⁵⁷

Textual sources

Āgamaḍambara

ĀD₁ *Āgamaḍambara Otherwise Called Ṣaṇmatanāṭaka of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa*. Ed. V. Raghavan & Anantalal Thakur. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1964.

ĀD₂ See DEZSŐ (2004).

Kāṭhaka-saṃkalana

Kāṭhaka-saṃkalana. Ed. Sūrya Kānta. Lahore: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1943 [Reprint New Delhi 1981].

Kādambarīkathāsāra

The Kādambarīkathāsāra of Abhinanda. Ed. Durgāprasād and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang. Bombay: The Nirṇaya-Sāgara Press, 1888.

Gopathabrāhmaṇa

GB *Das Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*. Ed. Dieuke Gaastra. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1919.

Tattvasaṅgraha

TS *Tattvasaṅgraha of Ācārya Shāntarakṣita*. Ed. Dvārikadāsa Śāstrī. Vol. 2. Varanasi: Baudha Bharati, ²1982.

Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā

See TS.

Tantravārttika

See ŚBh for the *Śābarabhāṣya*.

Nyāyakalikā

The Nyāyakalikā of Jayanta. Ed. Ganganath Jha. Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavana Texts. Allahabad, 1925.

Nyāyamañjarī

NM For the *Nyāyamañjarī*, I mainly consult M, which is also the edition to whose volume, page and line numbers I refer throughout this paper. For correcting the text, I consult another edition V and two manuscripts designated as K and L. See below and also KATAOKA (2003), (2004) and (2005) for more information on editions and manuscripts.

M *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhaṭṭa with Ṭippanī – Nyāyasaurabha by the Editor*. Ed. K.S. Varadācārya. 2 vols. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute, 1969, 1983.

⁵⁷Cf. Annette Schmiedchen's contribution to this volume.

- V *The Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa*. 2 parts. Ed. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailaṅga. Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, No. 10. Benares: E.J. Lazarus & Co., 1895, 1896.
- K A manuscript preserved in the Malayalam Department of the University of Calicut, No. 2602. Malayalam script. Palm leaf. 177 folios. Incomplete. [I thank Dr. Dominic Goodall for kindly making accessible to me his photographs of this manuscript.]
- L A manuscript preserved in the Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, Lucknow, Serial No. 27E, Access No. 2381. Śāradā script. Paper. 138 folios. Incomplete.
- Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga*
 NMGBh *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga*. Ed. Nagin J. Shah. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1972.
- Nyāsa*
 Nyāsa. Ed. P. Śrīrāmacandra & V. Sundaraśarmā. Part 1. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, 1985.
- Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkāra*
 PVA *Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣyam or Vārttikālaṅkāraḥ of Prajñākaragupta*. Ed. Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1953.
- Pramāṇavārttikasvavrttitikā*
 PVSVT *Ācārya-Dharmakīrteḥ Pramāṇavārttikam (Svārthānumānaparicchedaḥ) Svopajñāvrttyā Karṇakagomiviracitayā Tattīkayā ca Sahitam*. Ed. Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana. Allahabad, 1943.
- Manusmṛti*
 Manu's Code of Law. Ed. Patrick Olivelle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Mahābhāṣya*
The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. Ed. F. Kielhorn. 3 vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, ⁴1985, ³1965, ³1985.
- Rājatarāṅgiṇī*
 RT *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr*. Ed. and tr. M.A. Stein. 3 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989, 89, 88 (first published in 1900, 1900, 1892).
- Śābarabhāṣya*
 ŚBh *Śrīmajjaiminipraṇītaṃ mīmāṃsādarśanam*. Ed. Subbāśāstrī. 6 bhāgas. Poona: Ānandāśramamudraṇālaya, 1929–34.

Secondary literature

- Bhattacharya, Dipak
 1991 "The Identity of the Atharvavedic Tradition of Kashmir." In: *Prajñājyoti. Prof. Dr. Gopikamohan Bhattacharya Commemoration Volume*. Ed. Debabrata Sen Sharma and Manabendu Banerjee. Kurukshestra: Nirmal Book Agency, 1-7.
- Bhattacharyya, Janaki Vallabha (tr.)
 1978 *Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's Nyāya-Mañjarī*. Vol. 1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Deshpande, Madhav
 2002 "Pañca-Gauḍa und Pañca-Drāviḍa. Umstrittene Grenzen einer traditionellen Klassifikation." In: *„Arier“ und „Draviden“*. Ed. Michael Bergunder und Rahul Peter Das. Halle: Verlag der Franckeschen Stiftungen zu Halle, 57-78.
- Dezső, Csaba
 2004 'Much Ado About Religion': A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of the *Āgamadambara*, a Satirical Play by the ninth century Kashmirian philosopher Bhaṭṭa Jayanta. D. Phil. thesis submitted to Balliol College, Oxford.
- Garge, Damodar Vishnu
 1952 *Citations in Śabara-Bhāṣya*. Poona: Deccan College.
- Griffiths, Arlo
 2004 "Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra." In: *The Vedas. Texts, Language & Ritual. Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop, Leiden 2002*. Ed. Arlo Griffiths & J.E.M. Houben. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 49-99.
- Hegde, R.D.
 1984 "Bhaṭṭa Jayanta." *Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 64, 1-15.
- Kataoka, Kei
 2003 "Critical Edition of the *Vijñānādvaitavāda* Section of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī*." *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 144, 115-155.
 2004 "Critical Edition of the *Āgamaprāmāṇya* Section of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī*." *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 146, 131-175.
 2005 "Critical Edition of the *Īśvarasiddhi* Section of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī*." *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 148, 57-110.
- Narahari, H.G.
 1940 "The Atharvaveda and the Nyayamanjari of Jayantabhatta." *Indian Culture* 6-4, 369-376.

Raghavan, V.

1964 Introduction to the *Āgamaḍambara*. See AD.

Shah, Nagin J.

1989 *Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's Nyāyamañjarī*. Part 4. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology. [Edition and Gujarati translation.]

1997 *A Study of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's Nyāyamañjarī*. Part 3. Ahmedabad.

Wezler, Albrecht

1976 "Zur Proklamation religiös-weltanschaulicher Toleranz bei dem indischen Philosophen Jayantabhaṭṭa." *Saeculum* 27, 329–347.