Was Bhāṭṭa Jayanta a Paippalādin?*

Kei Kataoka

Introduction

As RAGHAVAN (1964) and DEZSŐ (2004) explain in their introductions, Bhāṭṭa Jayanta,1 the ninth century Kashmirian scholar famous for his Nyāyaśāstras, was a contemporary of King Sankaravarman (883–902), because in his play Āgamaṇḍambara he refers to himself as a minister of that king (ĀDī 46.19: taśā amace dunaṭāṇāyante). He also depicts the king, both in the Āgamaṇḍambara (ĀDī 46.19–20) and the Nyāyaśāstrī (NM 1 648 4–7), as having banned the corrupt Nilāmbara sect.

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

*sāktināmaḥbhavod gauḍo bhāratadājakakule devisā |
dvārobhāsādramūdāya keṭadāraparivrahiḥ | [5] |
tasma mitraḥbhādātān̄ bhuva ātmajās tejasām nīḥ |
janena dosoparamapravīhuddhānātcitadośayāḥ | [6] |
sa sāktisevānām putram avatpa śrutaśālinām |
rājaśa karoṣṭaramāsya muktaḍīḍasya nantṛṭām | [7] |
kalyāṇamāṁśāminśōṣayā yajñavalkya ivabhavaḥ |
tanayaḥ śuklaḥyogarādhihānirnītārthaḥbhavasukmaḥ | [8] |
agādhipradaṇgaiś tasmāt paramesvaranandam |
aḷayaṇa sutāḥ kāṃsai candro dvīphadaḥ devi īva | [9] |
putram keṭajānanandam sa jayantam aṭṭhan |
āsta karitevavakṣyatevaḥ paśya śramaivaś | [10] |
vaṭṭikṣāvhyāya uṣākṣitaḥ śramaivaśv |
eyaṣyāḥ sātrāṣṭrāṣṭrāṣṭra ṣātrāḥ sāmaṇāyaḥ | [11] |
jayantanaśmāh sudhrītaḥ sādānāsākhīyatattvān |
sūryāḥ samudābhī sūryāḥ abhinandā iti śrutaḥ | [12] |

There was a Gauda Brahman by the name Śākti, [born] in the Bhāravāja family, who moved to Dvārābhāsā 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 Einooh, Prof. Harunaga Isaacson and Dr. Helmut Krasser for comments.
1In the Āgamaṇḍambara (ĀDī, 2.23) he calls himself Bhāṭṭa Jayanta and not Jayanta Bhāṭṭa.
worshipped by the people who have woken at the end of the night. He obtained a son, Saktisvamin, versed in the Vedas, the minister of King Muktpida of the Karkota dynasty. He had a son called Kalyanavasmin, who shook off the dirt of existence with wealth acquired by pure means, like Yajhavalkya, who destroyed the states of existence with the accomplishment of pure Yoga. From that man of profound heart a beautiful son was born: Candras, an ornament of the Supreme Lord, as the lovely moon [Candra], Siva's ornament, was produced from the milk-ocean of unfallenable 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 name 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 sistras, a son was born, known as Abhinanda, conversant with the true nature of good literature.

Jayanta's ancestor, Sakti, a Gauda [Bengali] brahmin belonging to the Bhadravajagota [gandha bhadravajajhakhe dvaity], moved to Dvaravbhisrata in Kashmir. Sakti's grandson, Saktisvamin, was a minister of King Laitidadya-Muktpida of the Karkota dynasty (c. 724-761). According to Jayanta, his grandfather, Kalyanavasmin, obtained the village of Gaurumalaka as the result of a Sangrahn sacrifice. Jayanta's family history is summarized in the following chart.\(^2\)

\(^{2}\)No one has raised questions about the interpretation of gauna ... dvaity as implying that Sakti hailed from Gaua, 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 Gaua' without actually living or having lived there, or that he intended some reference to the 'Gaua' subdivision of brahmns, on which, see DVISHPANDI (2002).

\(^{3}\)For Dvaravbhisrata, see RACHHAVAN (1964: i, n. 3) and DZEZO (2004: vi). They refer to Stein's note ad Rajaatarigita 1.180, where Dvaravbhisrata is said to have "comprised the whole tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Vistata and Candrabhaga."


\(^{5}\)NM I 63.11-12: omajiptamaka esa yajamanaha sangrahanam krtaatma. us laksamampristam- anam eva gaurumalakum yojanam ato. "My own grandfather, desiring a village, performed the Sangrahn sacrifice. Immediately after the completion of the sacrifice he obtained the village of Gaurumalaka." (Tt. by DZEZO [2004: viii]).

\(^{6}\)For Gaurumalaka, see RACHHAVAN (1964: ii, n. 1) and DZEZO (2004: vii). They refer to Stein's note ad Rajaatarigita ad 8.1861: "Ghomalaka, which is only here mentioned, was probably situated to the north of Rajarit in the direction of the Ratan Pfr range. ... We have shown in note I. 180 (comp. also vii. 1531), that the geographical term Dvaravbhisrata included the territory of Rajapur. And in the latter the Gommalaka of our own passage was evidently situated. The phonetic difference between the forms Gaurumalaka and Ghomalaka is easily accounted for. It is a priori probable that we have in both forms attempts to Sanskritize a Kshatriya (or Pahari) village name, which in its Apabhraasa form may have sounded *Gommal, *Gauras- mal, or something similar. ... Whereas Abhinanda transcribed the name of his grandfather's Agrahara by Gaurumalaka, perhaps with an intentional approximation to his own surname 'the Gaua', Kalthana reproduces three centuries later the local name in a proper and intelligible Sanskritic garb as Gommalaka."

\(^{5}\)See also HEGDE (1984) for a detailed chronology.
1 Śakti  
Gauda brahmin of the Bhāradvājagotra  
who moved to Dārvābhishātra in Kashmir
2 Mitra
3 Śaktisvāmin  
Minister of King Lalitāditya-Muktapīda  
(c. 724–761) of the Karkota dynasty
4 Kalyāṇasvāmin  
obtained the village of Gauramūlaka
5 Candra
6 Jayanta  
Minister of King Śāṅkavarman (883–902)
7 Abhinanda  
Author of the Kādamba-kathāsūtra

Jayanta’s discussion on the authoritativeness of the Atharvaveda

Jayanta’s unique doctrine of ‘authoritativeness of all scriptures’ (sarvagama-prāṇīnya) is a topic common to both of his most important works, i.e. the Nyāya-vaibhāṣya and the Āgamasamhitā.7 There he presupposes a hierarchy of various scriptures mainly based on the classification of ‘the fourteen branches of science’ (caturdasaśāstra-dhāraṇī).

| 1-4 | 4 Vedas |
| 5   | Śruti   |
| 6   | Itilāsapurāṇa |
| 7-12 | 6 Angas |
| 13  | Mānasā |
| 14  | Nyāya   |

Śaiva, Pāṣupata, Pañcarātra
Bauddha, Arhatta
Lokāyata, Nānāmbara, (Saṃśāramocaka)

He accepts that all scriptures, except those of extreme sects such as Lokāyata, Nānāmbara and Saṃśāramocaka, 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 Nyāya-kārikā (4.12–14; edharm āgamaśatrastī api tantrīvatatud vā prāṇīnam iti vedayatā). The section on ‘the authoritativeness of the Atharvaveda’ (atharvavedapraṇīnya),8

7 For Jayanta’s unique view of sarvagama-prāṇīnya and a discussion of the religious and political situation of his day, see WEZLER (1976).  
8 For this section, there is an English translation by BHATTACHARYYA (1978), a Gujarati translation by SHAH (1989), and two summaries by NARAHARI (1946) and SHAH (1997).
which is relevant for our present concern about the Paippalada school, is located in the Nāṭyamāṭājār immediately before the section on ‘the authoritative ness 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: tamād āptakātra tatra eva vedyā pramanam iti siddhotam), and shown as well the Mīmāṃsaka reasoning (610.12-613.8) and a modified Naiyāyika one both of which presuppose the beginningless samādṛṣṭa (613.9-614.4), Jayantā refers to someone (kacāt), 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 (pratyagrasaṇaḥ) and outside the three Vedas (trāṇāditya).

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: sarvaśākhāpratyaśaya eva kāma karma). Thus, according to this exegetical trick, it is clear that the Atharvaveda is ‘outside the three Vedas’, because it teaches śānti, puṣṭi and abhūcātra, which are performed by a single Brahman priest, as Kumārila points out even while defending its authoritativeness, and thus does not contribute to Vedic sacrifices (615.16-19).

Jayantā replies to the objection by following the same exegetical trick. He explains how the Atharvaveda contributes to Vedic sacrifices and therefore has connection with the three Vedas: it teaches ritual actions such as īṣṭi, puṣṭa, ekāhā, ahīna and saulta (620.17-18) and it prescribes the office of a Brahman priest.

9 Cf. 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 mention of the Paippalada Śākha render Bhāṭṭachāraya’s attempts to disprove Paippalada’s presence in Kashmir before ‘Yuddhahattā’ (cf. Griffiths 2002: 421) in the 15th century rather dubious: cf. e.g. Niyamaṇājī, Mysore Ed. vol. I p. 5, l. 3, 552, 8(1); 569, 2-3, 614; 619, 19 through 620, 2; 624, 10.”

10 Cf. Sāhahārtyā ad 2.4.5, 58th 635.4: 5- 6: ad uktaṃ “śākhatanaṃ karmānadyutāḥ” iti sarvaśākhā pratyāśaya sarvahālamanāṃpratyāśaya aikṣaṃ kāma. 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 Brahmanas.

11 Ezanaṭrāṭikā 189.3-6 ad 1.3.4 (quoted in NM I 615.16-19): yādi saṃgītayogottvam naḥsabhā atharvājeṣṭiḥ | arthadaṃpanoravatram kṣatrapad pratiṣāntaram | saṃgītayogottvam kṣatrapad pratiṣāntaram | kṣatrapad pratiṣāntaram (NM reads: trāṇāditya) but NMGBH 101.14-15 supports -goṣṭhad) ‘With regard to this, [even] if the Atharvavedic 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 [Atharvavedic revelation] as constituting its [i.e., the revelation’s] special domain (Cakradhara in NMGBH 101.15-16 interprets atmāgoṣṭhad as a bhūṣavati 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 āṭhavāna eva brāhmaṇi).

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 īṣṭi 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 Nyāyaśāstra, and that the preceding multi-layer arguments, including overly simple-minded ones (620.7–13), which target unspecifically either Māmāśaka 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: sarvavedāṇam ekasya tadāḥ prthibhāvanantam). Then it will make better sense that Jayanta honestly follows the Māmāśaka exegetic rule and thereby tries to refute a Māmāśaka opponent on his own terms.

Text-analysis of the Atharvavedapramāṇya section

1. Object: the Atharvaveda is not authoritative
   1.1 Because it is outside the 3 Vedas
      1.2 Supporting evidence
         1.2.1 Worldly usage and conduct
         1.2.2 śrutis passages
         1.2.3 smṛti passages
   614.5–14
   614.15–17
   614.17–615.3
   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
Was Jayanta an Atharvavedin?

It is most likely that Jayanta himself was an Atharvavedin.\textsuperscript{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’ (sarvagamanaprāmānya); 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

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. Raghavan (1964: iii): “In his discussion of Veda-prāmānya 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 austarâdhærayaṁ vinta na paritvâsat tad atharvaveda eva prathamab). But, actually, Jayanta had already adopted the present view in the opening section of the Nyågamanjåtâ, where he enumerates 14 branches of science (5.2–5: vidhiûnas ca caturdasa-deva-ândhastrâny atâasãya, katra vedâ ca castra, pratâhama atharvavedah). Similar is the case of his quoting the beginning portion of the Atharvaveda as an example of a Vedic composition (573.11–12: ‘san no devî abhâtiyate ityâdhyena vedavâkyasandaranbhætastu’). 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 Paippalâdin?

Jayanta’s quotation of the pratikâ of the Paippalâda recension of the Atharvaveda, san no devî abhâtiyate, may well be from Patañjali’s Mahabhâgâ as is indicated by his way of quotation (619.20–21: mahabheksyakåro bhagavat-patatjalir atharvavedam eva prathanam udahâryavat “san no devî abhâtiyate” iti), and may therefore not necessarily reflect his affiliation with the Paippalâda school.

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 Gopathâbrâhmana.

NM I 621.7–19: tadâ 14 ayuktam. atharvavedena brahmavâga karanâti. tathâ 15 ca gopathâbrâhmanam—

(1) prajñâptis somena yaksyamåto vedâtâ 16 uvacâ kanâ vo hotarâm vîrûdham 17 iti prahârtya

(2) tasmâd rgyidam eva hotarâm vîrûṣâ sa hi haustram veda, (3) yajurvedam evâdghârta 18 vîrûṣa sa hi udâhârañçam veda, (4) sâmvedam evodgâtâram 19 vîrûṣa sa hi audgâtrañçam veda, (5) atharvârgvâvadam eva brahmâtâm vîrûṣa sa hi brahmâtâm veda

But 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.

14tadâ MVL; tad etad K
15tathâ MVL; yathâ L
16vedâtâ MVL; devâ K
17vîrûṣa MVL; vîrûṣa iti M; vîrûṣam K
18evâdghârañçam MVL; evodgâtrañçam L; evâdghâtrañçam K
19evodgâtrañçam MVL; evodgâtrañçam K
(6) atha cen naisvatsīdham hotāram adhīvaram udgātānena bhrātmānam upa20


vṛṣute punastād eva vājaṁ22 yojita ricitā̄ 23 iti (7) tasmād gacchām eva hotāram


kuryād yojurvidam24 evadibhavgam25 sāmasvidam eva eva bhrātmānam


iti, tathā yajña,27


(8) yad stham ca virāṣṭam ca yāttāyatam ca kaḥro tu tad athavāyam28 tejasā


prajātyajāti


iti,29 tathā


(9) na re29 bhrāṣṭāyogvidbhyaḥ31 somah pātaryah


iti.

These passages correspond to the Gopathabrahmana, in GAATRA’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


20[ity evam] LVK; ity M


21[ad] MV; com. K


22[va]jām] LK (supported by NMGBh 104.1); eva vaisājey MV


23[rico]tā] MK (supported by NMGBh 104.1); rjājāt L; rjājāt V


24[yojurvidam] MVK; yojurvidam L


25[evadibhavgam] MVK; evadibhavgam L


26[athavāyogvidam] MLK; athavāyogvidam V


27[yajña] LVK (supported by NMGBh 104.1); com. M


28[ad athavāyam] MVL; atthavāyam K


29[tejasā prajātyajāti iti] LK; tejasā prajātyajāti V; tejasā prajātyajāti iti M


30[tathā na re] LK; na re M; atthānate V


31[girodhibhayaḥ] K (supported by NMGBh 104.3); girodhayaḥ MV; girodhayaḥ L


32I thank Arlo Griffiths for the references to GAATRA’s edition of the GB and his comments,


on which the following notes concerning GB are based in the main.

33GAATRA emends tṛṇija, but her ms. read tṛṇijam.

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

35But note that the summary gives only punastā, whereas GB (as known to us) gives


... punastā ... paścas ... uṣṭrātā ... daksinātā ... The GB text has 4 times -vidham

and not -vidham (underlined).
(7) This corresponds to GB 1.2.24:62.2–3 for the Hotṛ (tasmād rgyadams eva hotāram ṛṣīṣvau), but for the other priests the GB has 3 times tasmāt tam eva . . . ṛṣīṣvau, and the NM quote rather resembles GB 1.3.1:65.1–3 (tasmād rgyadams eva hotāram ṛṣīṣvau yajurvedam adhivaryam sānavetam udgāṭāram athavā tigūdayogānavma brahmaṇam).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 Saunaka-Atharvavedīs and edited by GAASTRA.37 Anyhow, as the drawn-out debate between Maurice Bloomsfield and Willem Caland shows, it is not certain to which of the two extant schools, Paippalāda or Saunaka, 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 haustrum rgyedems yajurvedena adhivaryaya udgāṭetam sānavetena brahmatvaṃ athavvedena40 kriyate. paippaladīṣkāthadopa-
diṣṭam41 ca tatadadagāṣṭam tatra tatrāpadhyaṇe. tatra sarvasābhikāryapaṇam ekam karmey adhva.41

To explain, among these [four Vedas], the Rgveda prescribes the Hotṛ-office, the Yajurveda prescribes the Adhvaryu-office, the Sānaveda prescribes the Udgaṭr-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 ṛṣīṣvau everywhere, but nothing corresponding to ṛṣīṣvau 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 Kāṭhkāṣṭhāyugamadhrnabhāma in NM I 623.21–624.4, where a passage from the Apyaṭṇaḥprābaṇa (Kāṭhkāṣṭhāyugamadhrnabhāma, p. 3f. with n. 10 on p. 4) is represented in quite an elliptic way. Cf. GARGE (1952: 39–45) on Saḥarasvāmī’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.
39Atharvavedena YLK, atharvavedena ca M
40ākāthadopaṇḍiṣṭam MVL; sākāthadopaṇḍiṣṭ K
41adhva MVL; ṛṣīṣ K
Vedic branches, [such as] Paippaladā,42 is required for each [ritual]. In connection with this, they say that a single ritual is known from all branches.

Instead of Paippaladā(ka)/Paippaladin, 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 Ṛgveda, as is normally expected.

Besides Paippaladā(ka)/Paippaladin, Jayanta knows that there exists another Atharvaveda school called Maudaka, while he nowhere mentions Sau- nakiya. He quotes a Śāhasrīhitāyana passage (ad Jaimininiṣṭha 1.1.27) which refers to Vedic branches such as Kāṭhaka, Kāṭpaka, Maudaka and Paippaladā.45

NM I 619.22–620.34:

mimāṃsābhidhikarṣṇīṃ ca vedādhikaranāṃ "kāṭhukam kāṭpakaṃ maudakam paippaladakāṃ" iti yajurvedavidvat27 atharvavede48 pi paippaladakāṃ udāyātare. sarvasākhādhikaranāṃ "pi49 vedāntorāṣṭarāyaṃ maudakapāippaladakākhyānī ṛt tv. nī ṛt v. v. tv.

In the Vedādhikaranāṇa [in particular ad 1.1.27], [Śābaravāmin], the author of the Mimāṃsābhidhāsa, also refers to the Paippaladā with regard to the Atharvaveda as well, just as [he referred to some branches] with regard to the Yajurveda etc., when he said: "Kāṭhaka, Kāṭpaka, Maudaka and Paippaladā." In the Sarvasākhādhikaranāṇa [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 paippaladi-. But it is possible to emend paippaladādi- (or possibly paippaladakādi- or paippaladakādi-). 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, Paippaladā, 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 Nyāyamanjari 588.19–589.1: clam eva hi karmā vedānatattvam pāipṛthaktattva apy ēkaśīrṣāyanāḥ kāyānāḥ anuprastutā yād aśīrṣāyanāṁ āppi prastutā. 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 enumerations to paippaladādi- and paippaladāki- are less likely, it is clear that the change from paippaladādi- to paippaladāki- could easily have happened. Still, I hesitate to accept this emendation, for I do not think that Jayanta expresses the ‘Paippaladā branch’ as paippaladāki-. Instead he would have expressed it as paippaladādi- or paippaladāki- as is indicated from his usage in NM I 620.1-2: paippaladānakam... maudakapāippaladākhyānaṃ atharvaciti. Therefore I retain the present reading paippaladāki- as original. For it is possible that Jayanta forgot to add ādi, though it is necessary and intended as is clear from the following words -ādiḥētāh-.

43This set of Vedic branches is referred to in the Mañjūhṛdaya ad 4.1.1(3) II 191-24; 4.3.10(3) II 315.15; 4.3.12(1) II 319.5-6.

44This corresponds to L. (134v.22–135v.6), V (256-2-5), K (95r1-95r2).

45kāṭpakaṃ LV; kāṭpaka M; kāṭādakam K

46maudakaṃ LV; maudagalya MV; maudakam K

47yajurvedaLSD; LMK: yajurvedadvaita V

48atharvavedē LV; atharvavedē K

49pi LV; om. K

50ādiḥētāvāyam maudaka- ṛt; ādiḥētāvāyam maudagala- M; ādiḥētāvāyam audāla- K
Atharvaveda branches called Maudaka and Paippaladaka, and investigated [them].

There, with reference to the Šāhārabhistya passage in the Vedādhikarana, where Šēbara refers to both Maudaka and Paippaladaka, Jayanta himself repeats only Paippaladaka (underlined).

His particular concern with the Paippaladaka is also indicated by another passage from the Nyatuṣmatijīrtit in which he refers in particular to Paithinasis-Paippaladins, i.e. Paippaladins of a Paithinasi subschool, or Paippaladins who follow the sūtra of Paithinasi, in order to mention one example of a brahmin.

NM I 552.10-11: maṃ 256 caṣṭādhiḥkaḥ paitūhitasaṃpaippaladiprabhūtiṣu 24 brahmavānaprāpatiṣyau, utpādātiṣaṃpaippaladakaresv ca 25 gorōdāto api vaktāṃ śākgartit.

And cognizing someone, such as a Paithinasi-Paippaladin, 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 Paithinasi-Paippaladins as brahminds. This arbitrary exemplification does not make sense unless there existed Paithinasi-Paippaladins in ninth century Kashmir, and will be better understood if we accept that Jayanta is specifically affiliated with this very Paithinasi-Paippaladin community.

Conclusion

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

25In fact Sabarasavāmin mentions in Śāhārabhistya ad 2.4.8 only Kāthaka, Kālpaka and Paippaladaka, and not Maudaka. Maybe Jayanta, without checking the original passage in Śāhārabhistya ad 2.4.8, thought by analogy with Śāhārabhistya ad 1.1.27 that Sabarasavāmin enumerates all the four.
26Cf. [6 of Arlo Griffiths’ contribution to in this volume.
27neu L.MV; om. K
28paithinasisampaippalādī-] L.MV; paithinasisampaippalādī- K
29neu L.K; om. MV
30In the discussion of ‘brahminness’ (brahmavānaprāpatiṣyau), it is not historically common to mention Paippaladins. In Taittirīya-Samhitā vv. 3574-3576 and Taittirīya-Samhitā ad thereon, Śāntarakṣita (c. 725-776) and Kamalatila (c. 740-795) compare brahminds with śādvas without mentioning any particular group of brahminds. Neither does Karrikagomin mention any such subcategory (PVSVT 10). Prājñākaragupta has a long discussion of brahminness (PVA 10.21-12.13). There he mentions a brahmmin-subgroup Kaundinya (PVA 10.25). In the Nītā (14.24-25), Jinvendra refers to Māthāra and Kaundinya in connection with brahmminness. Kumārālia refers to Kaundinya and Kaṭha. Tattvarātrika 295.10 ad 1.3.30: puṇyatad brahmāsyaśaṃkaudānaṃkaṭṭātreṇi samētāpyaḥ [\]
brought forward that already around 700 AD, at the time of his ancestor Śakti, there was a Paippalādin family in Bengal.\footnote{Cf. Annette Schmiedchen's contribution to this volume.}
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