

A PRELIMINARY STUDY ON THE INDIAN GRAMMAR MANUSCRIPTS OF THE *ĀMER ŚĀSTRABHAṆḌĀR* IN JAIPUR

ABSTRACT: The study of language and grammar is one of the most fundamental parts of an education, and India has a long and sophisticated tradition of language and grammar teaching (*vyākaraṇa*) that is as old as the Indian scripts and writing themselves. Starting around the fourth century BCE with the grammatical treatises by Pāṇini and his commentators, the Indian grammarian tradition developed through several distinct schools of grammar and language study. A historical study of these traditions done on the basis of a normal literary history focused on the places and dates of textual composition yields a chronological overview, where certain major traditions are seen as remaining popular over time through a steady production of new texts, whereas other minor systems become replaced by the development of new schools. In contrast, a microhistorical study that assesses the popularity of the different traditions of grammar by examining their concrete textual representations in a particular manuscript collection reveals a local historical record of the popularity of each system within a specific educational community. The present essay provides a microhistorical study of the Digambara manuscript collection *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* from Āmer and Jaipur in Rajasthan dating from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries. It contributes to the educational history of India by revealing an unexpected continued popularity of the late medieval *Sārasvata* grammar tradition in the Jaipur area long after this minor grammatical system otherwise has been thought to have gone out of vogue.

KEYWORDS: educational history, Sanskrit language, grammar, *vyākaraṇa*, provenance studies, microhistory, Jains

A major archival resource for researching intellectual communities and traditional Sanskrit education in Jaipur is the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* (*The Science Archive of Āmer*), a collection consisting of 4036 handwritten manuscripts. The *bhaṇḍār* originated as the personal library of the local Jain Digambara hierarch Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti (late 17th to the early 18th centuries) and continued to grow until the late 19th century. The archive was formerly kept in the Śrī Digambar Jain Mandir Nemināth Sāmvala Jī temple, located right next to the famous Āmer Fort, in the small hill town of Āmer, eleven kilometers northeast of Jaipur city. The archive therefore served the religious leaders of the Digambara Jain community, who had close ties to the local political Hindu monarchs, and it was for a time located in a major Jain temple right next to the seat of the regional political power, i.e., Āmer Fort, until king Jai Singh II began constructing the new capital of Jaipur in 1727, eleven kilometers away from Āmer. The archive, nevertheless, continued to grow with additional manuscript holdings throughout the 18th and the 19th centuries.

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement no. 615574. The authors wish to thank Professor Kamal C. Sogaṇi and Mrs. Shakuntala Jain from the Apabhraṃśa Sāhitya Academy in Jaipur and Dr. Kamal C. Yogi from the Rāṣṭrīya Sanskrit Sansthān Jaipur Campus.

In 1947, the manuscript collection was moved down from Āmer to Jaipur and is today in the care of the Apabhraṃśa Sāhitya Academy at the Jain Vidyā Sansthān Institute.¹

The manuscripts, which were made and used by learned members of the local Jain community, pertain to many different Indian fields of knowledge, ranging from religious writings to medicine and astrology. They thereby attest to the particular practical and intellectual interests that this community entertained from the 17th to the 19th centuries when the archive gradually was created. Since the study of language and grammar must be considered most fundamental in the community's educational history, the archive's holdings of 153 manuscripts (abbreviated mss) in the domain of grammar and other linguistic sciences (*vyākaraṇa*) have here been selected as the focus for a contribution to the study of the history of premodern education in India.

The grammar manuscripts of the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* were catalogued in a handwritten ledger (*granthasūci*) compiled by the great Rajasthani manuscriptologist Kastūr Cand Kāślīvāl (1920-1998) at some time during the period between Kāślīvāl's publication of a smaller catalog in 1949 and Kāślīvāl's death in 1998. The handwritten ledger, which shall here be referred to as the 'Handlist' (abbreviated H), constitutes the basic source of data for the present study. It contains varied information on the manuscripts of the archive, which can be utilized to analyze the reception history of texts and the local history of the community.

H is a bundle of fourteen separate ledgers covering distinct areas of learning.² The fourth of these areas is labeled *vyākaraṇa*, i.e., "grammar," which gives information on 153 mss ordered randomly without any further classification. The ledger is written in a large square paper format, where the mss are listed in rows across two pages with the following information given for each ms divided into ten columns: (1) H entry number, (2) ms reference number, (3) ms title, (4) remarks on author name, internal commentary title, the name of the scribe and the place of copying when available, missing folios, and the general state of the ms, (5) topic,³ (6) script, (7) folio size, (8) folio numbers, (9) language, and (10) whether the ms is complete or incomplete.

Being a preliminary study, the information presented in this essay on the 153 grammar mss is based solely on H and not on any physical examination of the mss themselves, although such examination would likely reveal more details as to the dating, handwriting, and provenance history. H records that all the grammar mss are written in the Devanāgarī script, but this detail may also require further verification through physical examination of the mss in a future study.

The mss have below been ordered and categorized based on which Indian grammatical textual tradition they represent. The mss are thus discussed along the lines of six groups: (1) Pāṇinian grammars, (2) *Kātantra* grammars, (3) Jain grammars, (4) *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa* grammars, (5) *Siddhāntakamudī* grammars, and (6) mss of minor grammatical traditions or without any assigned tradition. It should again be underlined that H does not provide

¹ For a description of the archive, see Kragh, pp. 19–22. The 2013 publication provides a general theoretical framework for the study of local manuscript collections in relation to the writing of literary histories and then examines 1848 manuscript holdings from the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* in the literary topics of religious narratives (*purāṇa*, *carita*, *kathā*), religious and philosophical treatises (*dharma*, *darśana*, *ācāra*), and epistemological and logical writings (*nyāyasastra*, *tarka*).

² For a complete list of the fourteen areas with details on how many manuscripts there are in each section, see Kragh, p. 22.

³ In the present case, the topic is always given as *vyākaraṇa*.

any categorization of the mss into such grammatical traditions or sectarian affiliations, but enumerates them in a haphazard order.

To be sure, the taxonomy of this grouping may be debatable. Yet, the purpose here is not to draw fine systematic lines between the Indian grammatical traditions, but rather to have a practical arrangement that may inform the reader about how the mss found in the archive quantitatively differ quite clearly in terms of how they represent different textual preferences in the community that was engaged in copying and using the texts. Most of the above categories thus consist of mss that are associated with a specific root-text (*mūla*). This is the case with four of the six categories, namely (1) the Pāṇinian mss, which have their roots in Pāṇini's grammatical treatise *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, (2) the *Kātantra* mss that originate with Śarvavarman's treatise *Kātantra*, (4) the *Sārasvata* mss, which are based on Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya's treatise *Sārasvataprakriyā*, and (5) the *Siddhāntakaumudī* mss stemming from Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita's treatise *Siddhāntakaumudī*.

Strictly speaking, the *Sārasvata* and *Siddhāntakaumudī* mss are also Pāṇinian in the sense that they are based directly on the *sūtras* of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, but unlike the mss included under the first category, the *Sārasvata* and *Siddhāntakaumudī* mss are not running commentaries on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* but are instead texts in which the *sūtras* of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* have been reordered and reduced in number for the purpose of achieving a simpler system of learning.⁴ Hence, in order to create a clear demarcation between textual traditions pertaining to different root-texts and thereby drawing a necessary line between the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Sārasvataprakriyā*, and the *Siddhāntakaumudī* needed for separating the manuscript transmissions in the archive, the works on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* have here been labeled "Pāṇinian," whereas the mss associated with the *Sārasvataprakriyā* and the *Siddhāntakaumudī* have been called "post-Pāṇinian."

Moreover, given that the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* is a Digambara Jain archive, the mss of the Pāṇinian and post-Pāṇinian traditions have here been characterized as 'Vedic' grammars (*vaidika*), which is meant more in a linguistic rather than a religious sense. That is to say, Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* not only presents the grammar of the Classical Sanskrit language, but also has sections that explain the archaic linguistic features of the older Vedic language. The linguistic characterization of Pāṇini's grammar as being Vedic is useful in terms of distinguishing this tradition from the mss of grammatical works composed by Buddhist and Jain grammarians, which may then be termed "non-Vedic" (*avaidika*).⁵ The non-Vedic works stand apart from Pāṇini's school by omitting all the archaic rules that solely pertain to the Vedic language, focusing instead on formulating grammatical rules only for the Classical Sanskrit language. The grammatical treatises of the post-Pāṇinian tradition, i.e., the mss of the *Sārasvata* and *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī* traditions, are also Vedic, but typically to a lesser degree than the Pāṇinian tradition.

A third category employed in the present essay is that of Jain grammars. This is a necessary but highly complex category, because the label 'Jain' imposes a religious

⁴ For the distinction between running and reordered commentaries in the Pāṇinian tradition, see Cardona 1980.

⁵ A similar categorization of Indian grammatical systems into 'Pāṇinian' and 'non-Pāṇinian' is widespread in the secondary literature, appearing, for instance, in Pollock, p. 97 and d'Avella. Kulli, pp. 3–16, similarly speaks of the Pāṇinian school and the non-sectarian schools. A religious division of the grammatical traditions into *vaidika* and *avaidika* is also commonly used today in the curricula of contemporary Sanskrit colleges in Jaipur and elsewhere. Likewise, in the secondary literature, *vaidika* appears, e.g., in Pollock, p. 169 when describing Śarvavarman, the founder of the *Sārasvata* tradition.

affiliation on the grammatical texts in question.⁶ As such, a grammatical treatise has little to do with religious denomination. In grammatical works, religious indications appear primarily in the text's opening verses of homage, in allowances for peculiar forms found in the writings of particular religious traditions,⁷ as well as in some of the vocabulary used in the examples of grammatical constructions presented in the text, when these examples are drawn from other religious works.

Moreover, to impose a religiously defined categorization on one group of texts raises a problem of considering the possible religious backgrounds of all the other categories. In some cases, it may be possible to determine the religious background of the author of a given work, but it is, in fact, less relevant to speak of the religious background of the grammatical system itself, since grammar is universal to all of language regardless of its religious value and orientation. This problem becomes especially apparent in the case of the *Kātantra* tradition, which originates from the author Śarvavarman, who seems to have been a Buddhist. Śarvavarman's *Kātantra* treatises along with its first commentary composed by the Buddhist author Durgasiṃha may thus be said to be 'Buddhist' works. However, the *Kātantra* tradition later became the focus for at least seventeen commentaries by Jain authors and it has therefore come to be widely regarded by contemporary Jain scholars as being a Jain grammatical tradition. Accordingly, it is not wholly justifiable to characterize the *Kātantra* system purely as a 'Buddhist' grammatical tradition. In the same vein, it would hardly be reasonable to describe the post-Pāṇinian *Sārasvata* and *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī* traditions as solely 'Hindu' grammars although these grammatical systems all originated from Hindu Brahmanical scholars, since works of these traditions have been widely used by readers and commentators from all Indian religious orientations. Nevertheless, it has here been considered useful to classify a group of the mss as forming a special corpus of texts belonging to the Jain tradition, because the mss of the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* were collected by members of a Jain community and are housed in a Jain temple collection. It is therefore relevant to consider which and how many works by Jain authors this archive holds.

The characterization of this group of texts as being 'Jain' is, however, complicated by the fact that two of the texts that have been included in this category are Prakrit grammars by authors whose religious affiliation is unknown, namely Vararuci, the author of the *Prākṛtaprakāśa*, and Baradarāja, the author of the *Prākṛtasiddharūpamālā*. In defense of the choice to include these two grammars under the category of Jain grammar manuscripts, it shall be argued that these texts' foci on Prakrit language has special utility for the Jain audience, since most extant texts written in Prakrit are Jain works.

In conclusion, the categorization of the 153 grammar manuscripts of the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* into six groups aims to clarify the reception history of each tradition within the local scholarly Jain Digambara community of Āmer and Jaipur that was involved in producing and collecting the mss. The outcome of the inquiry yields an understanding of which traditions were of bigger or lesser significance for this community.

⁶ A religious characterization of certain *vyākaraṇa* texts as stemming from Buddhist and Jain grammarians is widespread in the secondary literature, e.g., seen in the important survey study of Indian grammatical literature by Scharfe published in the series *A History of Indian Literature* edited by Gonda.

⁷ For an example of allowance of special Sanskrit forms typical in Hybrid Buddhist Sanskrit, see Scharfe 1977, p. 162.

16 MANUSCRIPTS OF THE VEDIC AND SANSKRIT GRAMMATICAL TRADITION OF PĀṆINI

The Vedic-Sanskrit tradition of grammar is rooted in the large treatise *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (*The Eight Chapters*) composed by Pāṇini around 500 BCE in the northwest of the Indian subcontinent (Cardona 1997, 1).⁸ The treatise is represented in the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* by five manuscripts.⁹

The core *sūtra* text or *sūtrapāṭha* of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* treatise is accompanied by several smaller ancillary works. The three most important ancillary works are: (1) the *Akṣarasamāmnāya* (*The Recollection of Phonemes*), which is also known as the *Pratyāhārasūtra* (*The Abbreviation Sūtra*) or the *Śivasūtra* (*The Benevolent Sūtra*), presenting an alphabetical cypher; (2) the *Dhātupāṭha* (*The Recitation of Verbal Bases*) providing a catalog of verbs; and (3) the *Gaṇapāṭha* (*The Recitation of Sets*) listing groups of items pertinent for understanding particular *sūtra* rules (Cardona 1997, p. 1). From among these three ancillary works, the *bhaṇḍār* contains only a short fragment of the *Dhātupāṭha*¹⁰ as well as a single manuscript of the *Gaṇapāṭha*,¹¹ but no copy of the important *Akṣarasamāmnāya* text, which, in fact, is indispensable for understanding the internal reference system of the Pāṇinian grammar. Another important ancillary treatise of the Pāṇinian tradition is the *Uṇādisūtra* (*The Sūtra on Uṇ and Other [Affixes]*), being a compendium of rules for irregular nominal derivations. The archive holds one manuscript of a *vṛtti* commentary composed by Ujjvaladatta (13th cent.) on this compendium.¹²

Traditionally, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* treatise is studied in dependence on its major commentaries, in particular the *Vārttika* (*The Glosses*) written by Kātyāyana in the third century BCE, the *Mahābhāṣya* (*The Great Commentary*) written by Patañjali in the second century BCE, and the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (*The Commentary from Kāśī*) written in Kāśī city, i.e., Benares, by Jayāditya and Vāmana in the seventh century CE.¹³ Yet, the *bhaṇḍār* holds none of these major commentaries. From among the many later grammatical works composed within the *Kāśikā* sub-branch of Pāṇinian grammar, such as the voluminous *Kāśikāvṛtti* sub-commentaries written by the Buddhist authors Jinendrabuddhi (8th–9th cent.) and Puruṣottamadeva (12th cent.), the library contains only a single manuscript of the *Padamañjarī* (*A Bouquet of Words*), which is a text on the *Kāśikā* tradition compiled by Haradatta (*alias* Haradatta Miśra, 11th cent.).¹⁴

⁸ For introductions to Pāṇini's work, see Scharfe 1977, pp. 88–116 and Cardona 1997.

⁹ Ms 22 (H 1), *Śabdānuśāsana* (*The Instruction on Language*), 8 folios, incomplete, containing only the third chapter (*pada*) of the third book (*adhyāya*); ms 44 (H 2), *Śabdānuśāsana*, 46 folios, complete, copied by Paṇḍita Jagannātha Sūri at Mālapurā in 1643 CE (VS 1700); ms 45 (H 3), *Śabdānuśāsana*, 37 folios, incomplete; ms 1842 (H 82) entitled *Pāṇinivyākaraṇa* (*Pāṇini's Grammar*), 39 folios, incomplete; and ms 2473 (H 113), *Aṣṭādhyāyivyākaraṇa* (*The Eight Chapters Grammar*), 64 folios, complete.

¹⁰ Ms 2877 (H 128), *Dhātupāṭha*, 2 folios, incomplete. For the Pāṇinian *Dhātupāṭha* list of verbal bases, see Palsule and Scharfe 1977, pp. 101f.

¹¹ Ms 1720 (H 79) entitled *Gaṇapāṭha*, 34 folios, complete, copied in 1641 CE (VS 1698) by Vādirāja Jagannātha. For general information on the *Gaṇapāṭha*, see Scharfe 1977, pp. 102f.

¹² Ms 103 (H 4), *Uṇādivṛtti* (*Commentary on the Uṇādi*), 85 folios, complete, copied in 1773 CE (VS 1830) in Tonk (i.e., the town Tonk Nagar located 95 km south of Jaipur), sponsored by Bhaṭṭāraka Surendrakīrti for his private study. For information on the *Uṇādisūtra*, see Scharfe 1977, p. 104f. and Wielńska-Soltwedel, vol. II, pp. 55–57. For a text edition and studies on Ujjvaladatta's *Uṇādivṛtti*, see Joglekar, and Ram, pp. 53–59.

¹³ For an introduction to Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, see Scharfe 1977, pp. 152–161. On the *Kāśikā* exegetical tradition, see Scharfe 1977, p. 174) and Wielńska-Soltwedel, vol. II, pp. 3ff.

¹⁴ Ms 559 (H 16), *Padamañjarī*, 106 folios, complete, copied in 1683 CE (VS 1740). For text editions and studies on the *Kāśikāvṛtti* and Haradatta's *Padamañjarī*, see Shastri and Shukla

Moreover, in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (I.4.23-55), Pāṇini teaches syntax by analyzing six fundamental types of syntactical relations referred to with the term *ṣaṭkāraka*, “the six instruments of action” or less literally “the six syntactical relations.” These include the possible syntactical relations, which are manifested through six of the seven nominal case endings (*vibhakti*), found between the verb of a sentence and the agent, direct object, instrument, indirect object, adverbial ablative modifier, or adverbial locative modifier.¹⁵ Several later grammarians penned short summaries of Pāṇini’s *ṣaṭkāraka* and the *bhaṇḍār* contains manuscripts of four such works: the *Kāraḥavilāsa* (*The Play of Syntactical Relations*) composed by Amaracandra around 1250 CE;¹⁶ Amarasiṃha’s *Ṣaṭkārakasvarūpa* (*The Nature of the Six Syntactical Relations*);¹⁷ Mahāmahopādhyāya Ratnapāṇi’s *Ṣaṭkārakapratichandaka* (*The Charm of the Six Syntactical Relations*);¹⁸ and the anonymous *Aniṭkāraka* (*The Syntactical Relations of the Aniṭ Verbs*), the manuscript of which includes a short *ṭikā* commentary.¹⁹

Additionally, the *bhaṇḍār* contains one manuscript with a short commentary on the compendium of the Pāṇinian meta-rules known as the *Paribhāṣāsūtra*,²⁰ as well as another manuscript containing a short commentary thereon.²¹ There is also a manuscript of a short anonymous commentary on the grammatical particles (*nipāta*).²²

7 MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NON-VEDIC SANSKRIT *KĀTANTRA* GRAMMATICAL TRADITION OF ŚARVAVARMAN

The Vedic-Sanskrit grammars of the Pāṇinian tradition devote many complex rules to the particularities of the archaic Sanskrit language of the Vedic literature (ca. 1500–400 BCE), which are the religious scriptures serving as the most authoritative texts of Hindu Brahmanism. Classical Sanskrit, however, belongs to a later linguistic phase of

(1965–1967), Sundaraśarma and Śrīrāmacandrudu, Sharma, Wielńska-Soltwedel, vol. II, pp. 156–167, and Haag and Vergiana.

¹⁵ On the *ṣaṭkāraka* system, see Scharfe 1977, pp. 94f.) and Meenakshi.

¹⁶ Ms 161 (H 9), *Kāraḥavilāsa*, 6 folios, complete.

¹⁷ Ms 3557 (H 141), *Ṣaṭkārakasvarūpa*, 5 folios, complete, copied in Ahipur in 1577 CE (VS 1634) by Muni Rūpacandra with Sarabasukha acting as the scribe, during the reign (*rājye*) of the Mughal ruler Akbar (Akbar Pātisah, reigned 1556–1605). It remains uncertain whether Amarasiṃha’s *Ṣaṭkārakasvarūpa* is a different work from Amaracandra’s *Ṣaṭkārakavilāsa*, or whether these mss contain the same work under different titles and authorship attributions in the mss’ colophons.

¹⁸ Ms 162 (H 10), *Ṣaṭkārakapratichandaka*, 5 folios, complete, copied in 1784 CE (VS 1841) in the town Ghāḍā by the scholar Bhaṭṭāraka Surendrakīrti. For the Sanskrit text, see Coward and Raja, p. 531.

¹⁹ Ms 2086 (H 97), *Aniṭkāraka* with *ṭikā*, 4 folios, complete.

²⁰ Ms 1893 (H 85), *Paribhāṣāsūtra* (*The Sūtra of Metarules*), 5 folios, complete, copied in 1473 CE (VS 1530) by Bhaktiḷābha Gaṇi. The scribe is stated to have been a student of Ratnacandra Upādhyāya, who in turn was a student of the Kharataragaccha monk Śrī Jayasāgara Mahopādhyāya (first half of the 15th cent.).

²¹ Ms 610 (H 17), *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* (*Commentary on the Metarules*), 10 folios, complete. It is currently unknown whether this ms perhaps is not a Pāṇinian work but instead is to be identified with another text by the same name, namely the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* composed by the 8th-century Buddhist grammarian Durgasiṃha. On the latter work belonging to the non-Pāṇinian *Kātantra* grammatical system, see Bhattacharya and Sarkar, p. 418.

²² Ms 4006 (H 149), *Nipātavivaraṇa* (*Exposition of the Grammatical Particles*), 4 folios, complete.

the Sanskrit language that commenced around 500 BCE. For those wishing to read and write in Classical Sanskrit, the many Pāṇinian rules pertaining to the features of the older Vedic Sanskrit were unnecessary to learn. Consequently, when authors increasingly began to compose texts in Classical Sanskrit in the early centuries CE, new grammars began to appear from the pens of non-Vedic Buddhist and Jain authors. The new grammars drew on the Pāṇinian works, but offered a variety of simplified systems that eased or modified Pāṇini's grammatical model and left out the elements pertaining to the Vedic language.

The *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* contains seven manuscripts belonging to the *Kātantra* tradition of the Buddhist author Śārvavarman (ca. 3rd cent. CE).²³ Śārvavarman's treatise *Kātantravyākaraṇa* (*The Abridged Grammar*), also known in a variant version as the *Kalāpa* (*The Ornament*), is represented in the *bhaṇḍār* by three manuscripts.²⁴ The archive also holds manuscripts of four commentarial works on the *Kātantra* by Buddhist and Jain authors, namely the long *vṛtti* and *ṭīkā* commentaries by the Buddhist author Durgasiṃha (ca. 8th cent.),²⁵ the *Rūpamālā* commentary by the Digambara Jain author Bhāvasena Traividyēśa (11th cent.),²⁶ and the concise *Kātantravibhrama* commentary written in 1295 CE by the Śvetāmbara Jain author Jinaprabhasūri (ca. 1261–1333 CE).²⁷

²³ For Śārvavarman, see Scharfe 1977, pp. 162–163 and Belvalkar, pp. 82–83. Although Śārvavarman mostly is considered to have been a Buddhist (Scharfe 1977, *ibid.*), the view that he was a Jain author is held in some of the secondary literature, given that the *Kātantra* tradition in later times generated several commentaries by Jain authors; see, e.g., B.P. Tripāthī, who includes a list of eighteen commentaries. Pollock, pp. 169–170, characterized Śārvavarman both as a 'Buddhist grammarian' and as a 'Vaidika', i.e., a Vedic scholar. On a different note, it may be remarked that the *bhaṇḍār* does not contain mss of any other *vyākaraṇa* tradition with Buddhist roots, neither the very rare **Kaumāralātavyākāraṇa* tradition of Kumāralāta (2nd-3rd cent. CE) nor the more common *Cāndravvyākaraṇa* tradition of Candragomin (mid-5th cent. CE). For the **Kaumāralātavyākāraṇa* tradition, see Lüders (1940a, pp. 681–721; 1940b) and Scharfe 1977, p. 162. For the *Cāndravvyākaraṇa* tradition, see Liebich (1902; 1918), Chatterji (1953–1961), Scharfe 1977, pp. 164–167, Dimitrov and Aussant.

²⁴ Ms 157 (H 6), *Kātantravyākaraṇa*, 45 folios with marginal annotations, complete; ms 158 (H 7), *Kātantravyākaraṇa*, 20 folios, incomplete; and manuscript 159 (H 8), *Kātantravyākaraṇa*, 12 folios, incomplete (up till *sūtra* 1.1.16 on *visarjanīya*). For studies, a text edition, and a Hindi translation of the *Kātantravyākaraṇa*, see Böhlingk, Saini, Jñānamatī, and Rājārām Jain with further references. As noted by Scharfe 1977, p. 162, the present form of the *Kātantravyākaraṇa* is a later enlarged version of Śārvavarman's originally shorter work.

²⁵ Ms 450 (H 13), *Kātantravṛtti* (*Commentary on the Kātantra*), incomplete and damaged, copied in 1635 CE (VS 1692); and ms 1841 (H 81), *Kātantra* with *ṭīkā*, 3 folios, incomplete. For editions of Durgasiṃha's *Kātantravṛtti*, see Eggeling and Saini.

²⁶ Ms 2082 (H 96), *Kātantrarūpamālāvṛtti* (*The Shapely Rosary Commentary on the Kātantra*), folios 14-89, incomplete. For an edition and Hindi translation of the commentary, see Jñānamatī. The suggested dating of the author, Bhāvasena Traividyēśa, is according to B.P. Tripāthī, p. 445, who gives the dates as ca. 1093–1193 CE (1150–1250 VS).

²⁷ Ms 3379 (H 136), *Kātantravibhrama* (*The Beauty of the Abridged Grammar*), 8 folios, complete. The ms was copied by Paṇḍita Ratnasimha in 1552 CE (VS 1609) for the study of Paṇḍita Rāmvijaya. For Jinaprabhasūri's authorship of the commentary, see Udaycandra Jain (2000:33). The dating of the commentary is according to B.P. Tripāthī, p. 445.

23 MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NON-VEDIC SANSKRIT AND PRAKRIT JAIN GRAMMATICAL TRADITIONS OF VARARUCI, PŪJYAPĀDA DEVANANDIN, HEMACANDRASŪRI, KULAMAṆḌANA SŪRI, AND BARADARĀJA

Jain scholars too began early on to write grammatical works in Sanskrit, explaining the grammar of both the Sanskrit as well as the Prakrit languages.²⁸ The *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* has a single Sanskrit manuscript of the first formal grammar of Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit, the *Prākṛtaprakāśa* (*The Elucidation of Prakrit*) by Vararuci (2nd or 7th cent.),²⁹ and its commentary *Prākṛtamanoramā* (*The Intellectual Delight of Prakrit*) by the grammarian Bhāmaha (7th cent.).³⁰

The earliest grammar of the Sanskrit language by a Jain author is the *Jainendravṛyākaraṇa* (*A Grammar for the Lord of the Jains*) by the Digambara author Pūjyapāda Devanandin (ca. 540–600 CE).³¹ Devanandin not only omitted the Pāṇinian rules pertaining exclusively to the archaic Vedic language, but also achieved greater conciseness by reducing further the number of rules for the Sanskrit language, resulting in a system of a mere 3063 rules out of Pāṇini's 4000 rules (Scharfe 1977, p. 168). The *Jainendravṛyākaraṇa* is represented in the archive by two manuscripts, which respectively include two later commentaries on the text, namely the *Jainendravṛyākaraṇamahāvṛtti* (*The Great Commentary on the Jainendravṛyākaraṇa*) written by Abhayanandin (9th cent.)³² and the *Jainendraprakriyā* (*Grammatical Prescriptions of the Jainendra*) by the Jain Digambara scholar Guṇanandin (possibly 12th–13th cent.).³³

²⁸ For general surveys of the early Jain grammarians, see Belvalkar, pp. 62-91 and Scharfe 1977 pp. 168f.

²⁹ On Vararuci and the *Prākṛtaprakāśa*, see Verbeke, pp. 14–15. The religious affiliation of Vararuci is unknown. Although the *gotra* name of the Prakrit grammarian Vararuci is Kātyāyana, as, e.g., stated in his short biography given in *Kathāsaritsāgara* 1.2.1 (Durgāprasād and Parab p. 3), there is no strong argument for claiming that this Vararuci is identical to the Hindu Sanskrit grammarian Kātyāyana, who authored the *Vārttika* commentary on Pāṇini's *Aṣṭhādhyāyī* (Scharfe 1977, pp. 135 fn. 1 and Verbeke, p. 14), although such identity is hypothesized in some of the secondary literature, for instance by Lal, p. 4495. Likewise, there is no clear argument for the claim that the Vararuci who authored the *Prākṛtaprakāśa* is identical to Śarvavarman who authored the *Kātrantra*, as, for example, stated by B.P. Tripāthī p. 444.

³⁰ Ms 2746 (H 124), *Prākṛtamanoramāvṛyākaraṇa* (*The Intellectual Delight of Prakrit Grammar*), 39 folios, complete. The ms was copied in 1890 CE (VS 1947) by Pannālāl Godhā at Ujjain. For editions of the text, a Hindi translation, and studies, see Cowell, Vaidya, Verbeke, p. 14, and Sogani and Dhīngarā. The Bhāmaha, who authored this Prakrit commentary, is generally not identified with the Bhāmaha (also 7th c.) who authored the *Kāvyaḷamkāra* treatise on poetics.

³¹ The suggested date for Devanandin is according to Balcerowicz.

³² Ms 372 (H 11), *Jainendravṛyākaraṇamahāvṛtti*, 577 folios, complete, copied in 1809 CE (VS 1866). For editions of the text, see Vamśīdhara, and Tripathi and Chaturvedi.

³³ Ms 373 (H 12), *Jainendraprakriyā*, 151 folios, incomplete. For its edition, see Vamśīdhara. The identity and dating of Guṇanandin is highly uncertain, but he is perhaps to be identified with the Guṇanandin who acted as preceptor at the ordination ceremony of the grammarian Somadeva in 1205 CE, mentioned by Flügel and Krümpelmann, p. 342; the latter person is said to have written a sub-commentary on the *Jainendraprakriyā*. The *Jainendravṛyākaraṇa* commentary by Somadeva (mid-13th cent.), entitled *Śabdārṇavacandrikā* (*The Moon [over] the Ocean of Language*), is not found in the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār*. For a comparative study of the *Jainendravṛyākaraṇa* and the Buddhist *Cāndravṛyākaraṇa*, see Kar.

The *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* also contains eleven manuscripts that are representative of the Jain Śvetāmbara grammatical tradition stemming from Hemacandra Sūri (1089–1172). Hemacandra's grammar, the *Śabdānuśāsana* (*The Instruction on Language*),³⁴ drew on an earlier Sanskrit grammar composed by the Śvetāmbara author Pālyakīrti (9th cent.).³⁵ However, unlike Pālyakīrti's work, Hemacandra's *Śabdānuśāsana* not only provides a grammar of the Classical Sanskrit language, but also grammars of the Jain literary vernaculars Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa presented in the text's eighth chapter, which constitutes nearly a quarter of the overall work.³⁶ For this reason, the text with its 4500 grammatical rules is, in fact, larger than Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* having 4000 rules. The *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* holds a single manuscript of the *Śabdānuśāsana*³⁷ as well as one manuscript only containing the text's eighth chapter on Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa.³⁸

All three auto-commentaries on the *Śabdānuśāsana* are represented in the archive, including a manuscript of the long version *Bṛhadvṛtti* (*The Mighty Commentary*),³⁹ a manuscript of the medium-sized version *Bṛhannyāsa* (*The Mighty Guide*),⁴⁰ and three manuscripts of the short version *Laghuvṛtti* (*The Abridged Commentary*), also known as *Laghunyāsa* (*The Abridged Guide*) or *Svopajña* (*The Auto-Exegesis*).⁴¹ The *bhaṇḍār*, moreover, holds a manuscript of the *Laghuvṛttyavacūrikā* (*A Summary of the Abridged Commentary*) by an anonymous author,⁴² as well as a copy of the large, late 17th-century commentary *Haimakaumudī* (*Moonlight [Illuminating] Hema's Text*), also known as the *Candraprabhāvīyākaraṇa* (*The Moonlight Commentary*), composed by the Jain Śvetāmbara scholar Meghavijaya Gaṇi (ca. 1652–1703).⁴³ Further, two ancillary works

³⁴ A longer title of the text is *Siddhahaimacandraśabdānuśāsana* (*The Instruction of Language by the Accomplished Hemacandra*). For Sanskrit editions of the text, see VIDYA (1958) and Nemichandra Shastri.

³⁵ Pālyakīrti's Sanskrit grammar *Śākaṭāyanavyākaraṇa* (*The Grammar of Śākaṭāyana*) with the auto-commentary *Amoghavṛtti* (*The Unerring Commentary*) is not found in the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār*. For an edition and a study of the text and its commentary, see Tripathi and Kumar.

³⁶ For studies and translations of the sections on Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa, see Pischel (1877–1880; 1900) and Sogani and Shakuntala Jain.

³⁷ Ms 1571 (H 77), 8 folios, copied by Haribrahman, the son of Kālidās Śrī Haribrahman, in 1470 CE (VS 1527) during the reign of King Kīrtisingha, in the palace of Gopācaladurga. The palace probably refers to Gwalior Fort, since the toponym 'Gopācala' refers to present-day Gwalior (de Clercq, p. 63). For some brief remarks on King Kīrtisimha, see de Clercq (ibid.). Gwalior is located ca. 300 km southeast of Jaipur and Āmer. The manuscript is listed in H as being complete, but it would rather seem to be an incomplete manuscript given the very low number of folios.

³⁸ Ms 1783 (H 80), *Haimavyākaraṇa* (*The Grammar of Hema[candra]*), 25 folios, complete.

³⁹ Ms 1228 (H 72), *Śabdānuśāsanavṛtti* (*Commentary on the Instruction on Language*), 45 folios, incomplete.

⁴⁰ Ms 2409 (H 101), *Bṛhatnyāsaṭīkā* (*The Mighty Guide Commentary*), 20 folios, incomplete. For an edition, see Vijayalāvanya and Kanakaprabha.

⁴¹ Ms 1719 (H 78), *Śabdānuśāsanalaghunyāsa* (*The Abridged Guide to The Instruction of Language*), 127 folios, incomplete; ms 2697 (H 122), *Śabdānuśāsanalaghuvṛtti* (*The Abridged Commentary on the Instruction of Language*), folios 2-44, incomplete; and ms 3984 (H 148), *Laghunyāsa* (*The Abridged Guide*), from folio 128 onwards, incomplete. For an edition of the *Laghunyāsa*, see Vajrasenavijay.

⁴² Ms 907 (H 23), 61 folios, copied in 1288 CE (Śaka Saṃvat 1366).

⁴³ Ms 1355 (H 73), *Haimakaumudī*, 258 folios, complete. The manuscript was copied by a person named Lālji at Medinī Taṭa in 1702 CE (VS 1759). It is notable that the manuscript copy was made just a few years after the composition of the original work, still within the lifetime of the author.

to Hemacandra's *Śabdānuśāsana* are found in the *bhaṇḍār*, namely the *Dhātupratyaya* (*Analysis of the Verbal Stems*)⁴⁴ and the *Liṅgānuśāsana* (*Instruction on the Grammatical Genders*).⁴⁵

Finally, the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* has copies of two later Jain grammars. The first work is the *Mugdhābālāvbodha* (*A Wakeup Call to the Bewildered Youth*) penned by the Śvetāmbara monk Kulamaṇḍana Sūri in 1394.⁴⁶ Rooted in the view that the contemporaneous vernacular language (*ukti*) was a deplorable deviation from Sanskrit, the grandeur of which might be renewed through the grammatical study of Sanskrit, Kulamaṇḍana's text is also referred to as the *Auktika*, "Pertaining to the Vernacular." With its remarks on the spoken Gujarati language of the 14th or 15th centuries, the work is noteworthy for the historical information it supplies on Old Gujarati. The second work is a late Prakrit grammar, the *Prākṛtasiddharūpamālā* (*A Shapely Rosary Establishing [the Rules of] Prakrit*) written by Baradarāja (early 16th cent.), whose religious affiliation remains unknown.⁴⁷

66 MANUSCRIPTS OF THE VEDIC AND SANSKRIT POST-PĀṆINIAN

SĀRASVATAVYĀKARAṆA GRAMMATICAL TRADITION OF ANUBHŪTISVARŪPĀCĀRYA

The *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* holds 66 manuscripts belonging to the *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa*, a simplified grammatical system of the Vedic and Classical Sanskrit language created in the 14th century by the Advaita Vedāntin scholar Anubhūtisvarūpācārya (13th–14th cent.), who managed to reduce the 4000 rules of Pāṇini's *Āṣṭādhyāyī* to a mere 1494 rules.

While the post-Pāṇinian *Sārasvata* texts constitute a simplified version of the Pāṇinian system, it is maintained by contemporary Indian *vyākaraṇa* specialists that the *Sārasvata* commentaries generally provide more detailed information on the Pāṇinian grammatical debates than is the case with the commentaries of the other major post-Pāṇinian system, namely the *Siddhāntakaumudī* tradition.⁴⁸ Although the *Siddhāntakaumudī* today is the most popular system for the post-Pāṇinian study of Sanskrit grammar, it is notable that the *Sārasvata* system is represented by considerably more mss in the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār*, namely 43% of the total archive, than the *Siddhāntakaumudī* works, which amount to 15% of the total archive. While many of the *Sārasvata* mss predate or are roughly contemporaneous with the composition of the first *Siddhāntakaumudī* treatises in the early 17th century, it is noteworthy that a considerable portion of the *Sārasvata* mss postdate the first *Siddhāntakaumudī* works, with some *Sārasvata* mss still being copied in the 19th century. The members of the Jain Bhaṭṭāraka community of Āmer and Jaipur therefore seem to have maintained particular interest in the *Sārasvata* tradition, even long after the *Siddhāntakaumudī* had become the major system for the post-Pāṇinian study of Sanskrit grammar in India. This preference must either have been caused by a certain

⁴⁴ Ms 1966 (H 91), 3 folios, complete, copied by Sahajakīrti. The scholar who copied the manuscript could be the same Sahajakīrti who authored the *Sārasvataprakriyāvārttika* commentary in 1623.

⁴⁵ Ms 2620 (H 118), 5 folios, complete. The copy was made for Jñānakuśalamuni's personal study, who was a student of Kavicakracūḍamaṇi Paṇḍita Jīvarāja Gaṇi Miśra.

⁴⁶ Ms 810 (H 22), *Mugdhāvbodha*, 10 folios, complete. While H records the date of the text's composition as 1443 CE (VS 1500), Scharfe 1977, p. 188 fn. 4 gives the date as 1394 CE. For a Sanskrit edition of the text, see Dhruv.

⁴⁷ Ms 675 (H 20), 22 folios, copied in 1660 CE (VS 1717) at Sakṣakpur.

⁴⁸ Oral information obtained from Dr. Kamal Chand YOGI, a *vyākaraṇa* specialist at Rāṣṭrīya Sanskrit Sansthān Jaipur Campus, on 06/05/2013.

didactic conservatism in the local community of language teachers wishing to stick with the teaching methods for which there was an already established familiarity in the community or it could have been caused by an interest in the more detailed grammatical arguments found in the *Sārasvata* commentaries, which could not be satisfied by the texts of the younger *Siddhāntakaumudī* tradition. It is at least a question of some historical significance to further investigate the continued prevalence of the *Sārasvata* texts in this local community between the 17th to the 19th centuries, as represented by the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār*. It is also a desideratum to find out whether other manuscript archives in the region reflect a similar continuation of the *Sārasvata* tradition well beyond the rise of the *Siddhāntakaumudī* system from the early 17th century onwards.

The root text of the *Sārasvata* tradition is Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya's grammatical treatise, the *Sārasvataprakriyā* (*The Grammatical Prescriptions of Sarasvatī*).⁴⁹ This work is represented by 21 manuscripts in the archive.⁵⁰ The *Sārasvataprakriyā* is related to an older, shorter treatise, the *Sārasvatasūtra* (*The Sūtra of Sarasvatī*) ascribed to the ancient grammarian Narendrasarasvatī, which is represented by ten manuscripts in the *bhaṇḍār*.⁵¹

The library further contains manuscripts of ten commentaries on Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya's *Sārasvataprakriyā*, including the *Sārasvataṭīkā* (*Sārasvata Commentary*) composed by Puñjarāja Śrī Māl around 1485,⁵² the *Siddhāntaratnāvalī* (*The Jewel Rosary of the Standard*

⁴⁹ For general information on the *Sārasvataprakriyā*, see Scharfē 1977, pp. 189f. For a text edition of the *Sārasvataprakriyā* and a major study of Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya, see Joshi.

⁵⁰ Ms 1106 (H 28), 121 folios; ms 1107 (H 29), 171 folios, given by Rūpacandra to Paṇḍe in Ṭīlā Nāgaur in 1663 CE (VS 1720); ms 1108 (H 30), 130 folios, an old manuscript with marginal annotations; ms 1110 (H 32), 104 folios; ms 1116 (H 38), 106 folios, copied by Rādhākṛṣṇa Brāhmaṇ in the request of Ghāṣṭlāl at Uniyārā in 1838 CE (VS 1895); ms 1124 (H 46), 65 folios, incomplete, copied by Nandarāma in 1806 CE (VS 1863) for Paṇḍita Vatsarāja's study; ms 1125 (H 47), 140 folios, copied up to folio 53 by Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti and thereafter by another hand in 1719 CE (VS 1776) in Ambāvātī, i.e., Āmer city, during the reign of king Sawai Jai Singh II (1688–1743) for Manohar Pāpāḍivāl's study, with a commentary in the margins; ms 1126 (H 48), 89 folios, copied by Bhaṭṭāraka Surendrakīrti in Paṭnā in 1781 CE (VS 1838) for Tejapāl's study; ms 1127 (H 49), 91 folios, copied by Bhaṭṭāraka Surendrakīrti in Jhilattigrāma in 1783 CE (VS 1840); ms 1128 (H 50), 33 folios, incomplete, containing only the first *vṛtti* of the text; ms 1129 (H 51), 107 folios, with marginal commentary in red and black ink; ms 1130 (H 52), 55 folios, copied for Mahācandra, a student of Bhaṭṭāraka Surendrakīrti, in 1816 CE (VS 1873) in Laṣkar, i.e., Gwalior city, during the reign of the Gwalior king Daulat Rāv Sindhiyā (a.k.a. Daulat Rao Sindhia, 1779–1827, reigned 1794–1827); ms 1133 (H 55), 12 folios, incomplete; ms 1926 (H 87), 29 folios, incomplete, with extensive marginal commentary; ms 1928 (H 88), 121 folios, incomplete; ms no. 2053 (H 94), folios 2–11, incomplete; ms 3189 (H 133), 49 folios; ms 3659 (H 143) copied in 1866 CE (VS 1923); ms 3660 (H 144), 74 folios, incomplete, copied by Mamanlāl Luhāyā in Jaipur in 1843 CE (VS 1900); ms 3635 (H 145), 13 folios, containing only the section on the *pañcasandhi*; and ms 3666 (H 146), 86 folios, containing the section on the *taddhita* suffixes in the first *vṛtti*.

⁵¹ Ms 1111 (H 33), 6 folios, copied in 1725 CE (VS 1782); ms 1136 (H 58), 12 folios; ms 1137 (H 59), 15 folios, copied by two different hands in 1582 CE (VS 1639); ms 1139 (H 61), incomplete, copied in 1725 CE (VS 1782) in Ambāvātī, i.e., Āmer city, by Nandalāl for Manohardās' study, who was a student of Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti; ms 1142 (H 64), incomplete; ms 1143 (H 65), folios 1–10, incomplete; ms 2058 (H 95), folios 22–47, incomplete; ms 2468 (H 110), 15 folios, complete; ms 2621 (H 119), 5 folios, incomplete, with marginal commentary; and ms 3363 (H 134), 6 folios, incomplete, only containing the section on *pañcasandhi*. For general information on the *Sārasvatasūtra*, see Scharfē 1977, p. 189 and Joshi (chapter 2).

⁵² Ms 1113 (H 35), 116 folios, complete. The 1485 dating of the text is according to Coward and Raja, p. 486.

Grammar) written by Mādhava Bhaṭṭa around 1520,⁵³ the *Subodhikā* (*The Easy to Understand*) by the Jain Nāgapurīya Tapāgaccha monk Candrakīrti Sūri (16th c.),⁵⁴ the *Sārasvatadīpikā* (*A Lamp for the Sārasvata*) by the same author,⁵⁵ the *Dīpikā* (*The Lamp*) by Bhaṭṭāraka Satyaprabodha,⁵⁶ the *Bālabodhiniṭīkā* (*A Commentary for Educating the Young*) by Miśra Vasāvana,⁵⁷ the *Sārasvataṭīkā* (*Sārasvata Commentary*) by Ravenānī,⁵⁸ the *Sārasvataṭīpanikā* (*Sārasvata Glosses*) by Vyāsa,⁵⁹ and the *Siddhāntacāndrikā* (*Moonlight [Illuminating] the Standard Grammar*) by Rāmacandrāśrama (15th–16th century).⁶⁰ Moreover, the latter commentary, Rāmacandrāśrama's *Siddhāntacāndrikā*, has four sub-commentaries represented by one manuscript in the *bhaṇḍār*, namely the *Sārasvatacāndrikāṭīkā* (*The Lunar Commentary on the Sārasvata*) by Candrakīrti Sūri,⁶¹ the two commentaries *Subodhiniṭīkā* (*A Commentary Easy to Understand*) and the *Siddhāntacāndrikāvṛtti* (*Commentary on the Moonlight [Illuminating] the Standard Grammar*) both written by Sadānanda,⁶² and Lokeśakara's *Siddhāntacāndrikātattvadīpikā* (*The Essential Lamp for the Moonlight [Illuminating] the Standard Grammar*) composed in 1683 CE.⁶³

Aside from these many commentaries on Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya's treatise, the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* also has several auxiliary works of the *Sārasvata* school. First, there are three smaller works by anonymous authors, namely a *Sārasvata* version of the *Pratyāhārasūtra* (*The Abbreviation Sūtra*),⁶⁴ a text entitled *Vibhaktiyarthā* (*The Meaning of the Nominal Cases*) giving a short analysis of syntactical analysis (*kāraka*) according to the *Sārasvata Cāndrikā* system,⁶⁵ and an anonymous *Sārasvatadhātupāṭha* (*The Sārasvata Recitation of the Verbal Bases*).⁶⁶ Secondly, there are four smaller auxiliary works by known authors, namely the *Sārasvatadhātupāṭha* (*The Sārasvata Recitation of the Verbal Bases*)

⁵³ Ms 1120 (H 42), 254 folios, complete, copied at Saṃgrāmapūra and ms 1121 (H 43), 112 folios, copied in 1727 CE (VS 1784).

⁵⁴ Ms 1109 (H 31), 166 folios, copied by Muni Keśara Gaṇi in 1692 CE (VS 1749).

⁵⁵ Ms 2005 (H 92), folios 168-216, incomplete; ms 2644 (H 121), 20 folios, incomplete, copied in 1594 CE (VS 1651); and ms 4106 (H 152), 131 folios, incomplete.

⁵⁶ Ms 1122 (H 44), 36 folios, copied in 1488 CE (VS 1545).

⁵⁷ Ms 1134 (H 56), folios 4-129, incomplete, copied in 1575 CE (VS 1632) at Mālapurā and ms 1135 (H 57), 20 folios, incomplete, copied in 1658 CE (VS 1715).

⁵⁸ Ms 1141 (H 63), 33 folios, copied in 1630 CE (VS 1687). H states that the ms was donated by Mrs. Nāriṅg, the wife of Mr. Sānāniṅg, to Ācārya Rāmakīrti.

⁵⁹ Ms 2628 (H 120), 59 folios, complete, copied in 1630 CE (VS 1687).

⁶⁰ Ms 1149 (H 70), 60 folios, complete copy of the text's chapter on *taddhitaprakaraṇa*; ms 2010 (H 93), folios 19-129, incomplete; ms 2701 (H 123), 78 folios, incomplete, including a partial marginal commentary, copied by Jasarūpa Sāgara in 1716 CE (VS 1773) in Saddhāṇānagar; ms 2971 (H 129), 82 folios, complete copy of the *kṛdanta* section, copied in 1841 CE (VS 1898) in Jaipur; ms 3372 (H 135), 88 folios, complete, copied in 1854 CE (VS 1911) in Laškar, i.e., Gwalior; ms 4086 (H 151), 23 folios, an incomplete excerpt on *varṣā bhū*; and ms 4151 (H 153), 10 folios, incomplete.

⁶¹ Ms 1114 (H 36), 251 folios, copied by Kanakakīrti.

⁶² Respectively, ms 2416 (H 102), 112 folios, complete, with a marginal commentary, copied by Rāmdal Brāhman Gauḍa for Badrīdās' study in 1829 CE (VS 1886) at Jayanagar and ms 2518 (H 103), 57 folios, incomplete.

⁶³ Ms 1117 (H 39), 112 folios, only the first half of the text; ms 1148 (H 69), 76 folios; ms 3531 (H 138), folios 16 and 18-25, incomplete; and ms 4214 (H 154), 78 folios, complete.

⁶⁴ Ms 4256 (H 155), 2 folios, complete. For brief, general information on the *Pratyāhārasūtra*, see Scharfe 1977, p. 92 fn. 24.

⁶⁵ Ms 3539 (H 139), 8 folios, complete.

⁶⁶ Ms 2789 (H 126), complete, and ms 3100 (H 130), 4 folios.

composed in the mid-16th century by Harṣakīrti, who was a student of Candrakīrtisūri,⁶⁷ Padmasundara's short analysis of verbs entitled *Sārasvatakriyārūpamālā* (*The Shapely Rosary of Verbs according to the Sārasvata School*),⁶⁸ a short study of verbs entitled *Sārasvatakriyākālāpa* (*A Sārasvata Ornament of Verbs*) written by Vijayānanda Kāyastha,⁶⁹ and the short treatise *Seṭaṇiṭkārīkāvṛtti* (*Commentary on the Syntactical Relations of the Seṭ and Anīṭ Verbs*) by Bhaṭṭāraka Candrakīrtisūri composed in 1600 CE (VS 1656).⁷⁰

23 MANUSCRIPTS OF THE VEDIC AND SANSKRIT POST-PĀNINIAN *SIDDHĀNTAKAUMUDĪ* GRAMMATICAL TRADITION OF BHAṬṬOJĪ DĪKṢITA

In the course of time, even further simplified grammars of the Sanskrit language appeared.⁷¹ From among these, only the *Siddhāntakaumudī* (*Moonlight [Illuminating] the Standard Grammar*) composed by Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita in the early 17th century is found in the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār*, represented by 12 manuscripts.⁷² The archive also holds six mss of three commentaries on the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, including Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita's own elaborate commentary *Prauḍhamānoramā* (*An Intellectual Feast for Grown-Ups*),⁷³ Jñāendra Sarasvatī's *Tattvabodhinī* (*Illuminating the Nature*),⁷⁴ and Nāgeśa's *Śabdenduśekhara* (*The Moon Tip of Language*).⁷⁵

Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita also made a shortened version of his grammar entitled *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī* (*The Abridged Moonlight [Illuminating] the Standard Grammar*). The *bhaṇḍār*

⁶⁷ Ms 1123 (H 45), 26 folios, complete, copied in 1763 CE (VS 1820) in Jaipur by Śambhūrām, a student of Bhaṭṭāraka Kṣemendrakīrti, during the reign of King Mādhav Singh of Jaipur (a.k.a. Madho Singh I, 1728-1768, reigned 1750–1768); ms 1131 (H 53), 6 folios; and ms 1140 (H 62), folios 2–8, incomplete, copied at Pīpalāj. For information on the text, see Vogel pp. 358f.

⁶⁸ Ms 1112 (H 34), 7 folios, noted in H as being an old (*prācīn*) manuscript.

⁶⁹ Ms 1138 (H 60), 6 folios, and ms 3132 (H 132), 10 folios, complete.

⁷⁰ Ms 1883 (H 84), 3 folios, complete, copied by Muni Vākā Rṣi in 1634 CE (VS 1691) in Bhamarāṇā.

⁷¹ Simplified systems of Sanskrit grammar, which are not represented in the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār*, are found in the Sri Lankan author Dharmakīrti's *Rūpāvatāra* (10th cent.), Vimalasarasvatī's *Rūpamālā* (14th cent.), and Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa's *Prakriyāsarvasva* (1616). For an edition of Dharmakīrti's *Rūpāvatāra*, see Lalithambal. For an edition of the *Prakriyāsarvasva*, see Iyer.

⁷² Ms 1119 (H 41), 103 folios, copied in 1829 CE (VS 1886); ms 1145 (H 66), 341 folios, copied and corrected in Jaipur by Ācārya Surendrakīrti in 1783 CE (VS 1840); ms 1146 (H 67), 75 folios containing only the *kṛdanta* section on nominal participle formation; ms 1147 (H 68), 134 folios containing only the *tiṅanta* section on verb formation; ms 1874 (H 83), 10 folios, incomplete; ms 1905 (H 86), 21 folios, incomplete; ms 2372 (H 98), 56 folios, incomplete; ms 2378 (H 99), 118 folios, complete; ms 2379 (H 100), 76 folios, incomplete; ms 2467 (H 109), 7 folios, incomplete; ms 2471 (H 111), 76 folios, incomplete; and ms 3529 (H 137), 8 folios, incomplete. For general information on the text, see Scharfe 1977, pp. 174f.

⁷³ Ms 2565 (H 107), 98 folios (complete) and ms 2472 (H 112), 152 folios, incomplete. Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita's simpler auto-commentary *Bālamānoramā* (*An Intellectual Feast for Youths*) is not found in the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār*. For editions of the *Prauḍhamānoramā* commentary, see Sitaram Shastri and V.L. Joshi.

⁷⁴ Ms 2474 (H 114), 13 folios, incomplete; ms 3127 (H 131), 10 folios, incomplete with a marginal commentary; and ms 1118 (H 40), 254 folios, complete. For an edition of the *Tattvabodhinī*, see Pansīkar.

⁷⁵ Ms 2475 (H 115), 32 folios, incomplete. The text is a sub-commentary on Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita's *Prauḍhamānoramā* (Scharfe 1977, p. 175). For an edition, see A.S. Śāstrī.

has two mss of the text, including one with a sub-commentary.⁷⁶ Further, Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita's student, Varadarāja, compiled a middle-length version of the grammar entitled *Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī* (*The Medium Moonlight [Illuminating] the Standard Grammar*), found in the archive with a single ms.⁷⁷ Moreover, the *bhaṇḍār* holds a ms of another grammatical work authored by Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita, the *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣanā* (*The Grammar Ornament*),⁷⁸ along with its commentary *Bhūṣaṇasāra* (*The Quintessence of the Ornament*) composed by Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita's nephew, Kaundabhaṭṭa (17th cent.).⁷⁹

18 MANUSCRIPTS OF MINOR GRAMMATICAL TRADITIONS OR WITHOUT ANY ASSIGNED TRADITION

The *Āmer Sāstrabhaṇḍār*, moreover, contains seven minor grammatical works by named authors, which either belong to a variety of other minor traditions of Sanskrit grammar or the tradition of which could not be identified here. There are two manuscripts of the *Dhātupāṭha* (*Recitation of the Verbal Bases*) belonging to the system of the grammatical treatise *Mugdhabodha* (*A Wakeup Call to the Bewildered*) by Vopadeva (late 13th cent.).⁸⁰ There is a manuscript of the Vedic grammar *Vaidikī Prakriyā* (*The Grammatical Prescriptions of Vedic*) by Kāśīnātha.⁸¹ There are single manuscripts of the *Śabdabhedaprakāśa* (*A Light [Illuminating] Linguistic Divisions*) by Maheśvara,⁸² the *Vīśvaraprakāśaprakriyā* commentary (*The Prescriptions of Vīśvara's Light*) by the author Kṛṣṇa on the *Vīśvaraprakāśa* (*Vīśvara's Light*) by Vīśvara,⁸³ the *Śaradaśomā* (*The Autumn Moon*) composed by Nīra Śukla in 1633,⁸⁴ and the *Arthaprakāśa* (*The Illumination of Meaning*) by Induśekhara.⁸⁵ There are four manuscripts of the short Sanskrit treatise *Samskṛtamāñjarī* (*A Bouquet of Sanskrit*) composed by Mahātmā Agata.⁸⁶

Finally, the *bhaṇḍār* contains single manuscripts of eleven anonymous grammatical works, including the *Śabdabhedā* (*Linguistic Divisions*),⁸⁷ the *Laghusopasargavṛtti*

⁷⁶ Ms 1950 (H 87), 21 folios, incomplete, and ms 2427 (H 104), with a commentary entitled *Laghubhāsyavyākaraṇaṭīkā* (*A Commentary on the Grammar of the Abridged Explanation*), 200 folios, incomplete. For an edition of the *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī*, see B. Shastri.

⁷⁷ Ms 787 (H 21), 65 folios, copied by Bhaṭṭāraka Surendrakīrti in 1792 CE (VS 1849) at Taumka.

⁷⁸ Ms 987 (H 24), 72 folios, copied in 1687 CE (VS 1744) at Vidyāvinoda.

⁷⁹ Ms 1419 (H 75), 15 folios, incomplete. For an edition and translation of the *Bhūṣaṇasāra*, see Das.

⁸⁰ Ms 488 (H 14), 22 folios, copied in 1641 CE (VS 1698) by Jagannātha and ms 589 (H 15), likewise copied in 1641 (VS 1698). For general information on Vopadeva and his *Mugdhabodha* tradition of grammar, see Scharfe 1977, pp. 188-189.

⁸¹ Ms 623 (H 19), 118 folios, copied in 1632 CE (VS 1689). For general information on Kāśīnātha, see Scharfe 1977, p. 190; and 2002, pp. 238f.). For an introduction to and translation of the *Vaidikī Prakriyā*, see B.P. Bhattacharya.

⁸² Ms 4019 (H 150), 20 folios, complete, copied by Ratnasukha for Nainasukha's study, who was a student of Bhaṭṭāraka Surendrakīrti. For an edition of the *Śabdabhedaprakāśa*, see Kümmel.

⁸³ Ms 622 (H 18), 255 folios, the copy of which was sponsored by Kamalaharṣa in 1745 CE (VS 1802) for the study of Paṇḍita Lālcandra from Takṣaka Nagar.

⁸⁴ Ms 1227 (H 71), 27 folios, incomplete, copied in 1786 CE (VS 1842) by Bhaṭṭāraka Surendrakīrti.

⁸⁵ Ms 1414 (H 74), 67 folios, incomplete.

⁸⁶ Ms 1053 (H 25), 8 folios, copied by Paṇḍita Akhairāja in 1660 CE (VS 1717); ms 1054 (H 26), 6 folios, copied in 1657 CE (VS 1714) at Saṃgāmpur; ms 1055 (H 27), 5 folios, copied by Vidyāvinoda at Kāraṭīkālaya; and ms 3882 (H 147), 6 folios, complete.

⁸⁷ Ms 116 (H 5), 15 folios.

(*Abridged Commentary on the Prepositions*),⁸⁸ the *Avyaya (The Indeclinables)*,⁸⁹ the *Vyākaraṇa (Grammar)*,⁹⁰ the *Sumanapraśnāvalī (A String of Questions to the Intelligent)*,⁹¹ the *Upākaraṣaprayoga (Combination Exercise)*,⁹² the *Liṅgādhikāra (The Properties of the Grammatical Genders)*,⁹³ the *Samyakkaumudīvr̥tti (Commentary on the Perfect Moonlight)* with the sub-commentary *Bhāṣadr̥ṣṭi (A View on Language)*,⁹⁴ the *Pañcasandhi (The Five Junctures)*,⁹⁵ the *Sagāsacakrama*,⁹⁶ and *Kṛdantaprakriyā (The Rules for Participles)*.⁹⁷

CONCLUSION

The 153 grammar mss from the *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār* have here been distributed into six groups with the following quantifications:

- 16 mss of the Vedic and Sanskrit tradition of Pāṇini: 10%
- 7 mss of the non-Vedic Sanskrit *Kātantra* tradition of Śarvavarman: 5%
- 23 mss of the non-Vedic Sanskrit and Prakrit Jain traditions of Vararuci, Pūjyapāda Devanandin, Hemacandra Sūri, Kulamaṇḍana Sūri, and Baradarāja: 15%
- 66 mss of the Vedic and Sanskrit post-Pāṇinian Sārasvata tradition of Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya: 43%
- 23 mss of the Vedic and Sanskrit post-Pāṇinian Siddhāntakaumudī tradition of Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita: 15%
- 18 mss of minor grammatical traditions or without any assigned tradition: 12%

The small percentage of Pāṇinian mss, along with the archive's lack of many significant texts of this textual tradition, suggests that Pāṇinian grammar was not a central focus for Sanskrit studies in the Āmer Digambara community. It seems that the Pāṇinian mss primarily were used for general reference.

The small body of *Kātantra* mss attests that this old Sanskrit grammatical tradition continued to be an object of some interest for grammatical studies within the Jain community at least until the 16th and 17th centuries, being the period during which two of these mss are dated in their colophons. Although the origin and early history of the *Kātantra* tradition seems to be Buddhist, a large number of Digambara and Śvetāmbara Jain authors wrote commentaries on the *Kātantra* system between the 11th and the 14th centuries, and it is probably for this reason that the Jain scholars from the Āmer community collected mss belonging to this grammatical tradition.

The archive's collection of several mss of Sanskrit and Prakrit grammars by Jain authors is to be expected, given the religious affiliation of the library to the Digambara Jain tradition. It is notable that the *bhaṇḍār* holds many texts by Digambara authors as well

⁸⁸ Ms 1579 (H 76), 4 folios, complete, including a marginal commentary.

⁸⁹ Ms 1959 (H 90), 2 folios, incomplete.

⁹⁰ Ms 2435 (H 105), 30 folios, incomplete.

⁹¹ Ms 2537 (H 106), 10 folios, complete.

⁹² Ms 2477 (H 116), 12 folios, complete, copied by Paṇḍita Nānurāma in 1829 CE (VS 1886).

⁹³ Ms 2504 (H 117), 16 folios, incomplete.

⁹⁴ Ms 2760 (H 125), 129 folios, complete, copied by Kālikāprasād in 1857 CE (VS 1914) at Maimatapur.

⁹⁵ Ms 2816 (H 127), 1 folio, complete, written in mixed Sanskrit and Hindi.

⁹⁶ Ms 3548 (H 140), 2 folios, complete, copied by Paṇḍita Haricandra.

⁹⁷ Ms 3582 (H 142), 24 disconnected folios, incomplete.

as some works belonging to the highly influential grammatical tradition of the Śvetāmbara author Hemacandra Sūri.

A similar number of Sanskrit grammars relating to the post-Pāṇinian *Siddhāntakaumudī* system is indicative of the great popularity that this simplified tradition of Sanskrit grammar has enjoyed from 17th century till today (Scharfe 1977, pp. 174f.).

The greatest surprise in the findings of this study is the substantial amount in the *bhaṇḍār* of mss belonging to the *Sārasvata* tradition. Scharfe (1977, p. 189) wrote that “the *Sārasvata* grammar enjoyed for some time great popularity and was patronized by both Hindu and Muslim princes,” and it is commonly held that the *Sārasvata* school eventually was eclipsed by other Sanskrit grammatical traditions (Coward and Raja, p. 20) in particular due to the rise of the *Siddhāntakaumudī* grammatical system in the 17th century. While most of the dated *Sārasvata* manuscripts of the *bhaṇḍār* were copied prior to the early 17th century when Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita wrote the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, it is nevertheless notable that many of the *bhaṇḍār*’s *Sārasvata* manuscripts were copied after the early 17th century, all the way up to the mid-19th century, with the last datable *Sārasvata* ms having been copied in 1866 CE. It thus seems that the *Sārasvata* tradition continued to be a major focus of Sanskrit education in Āmer and Jaipur long after the *Siddhāntakaumudī* had begun to take over as the main didactic system for the post-Pāṇinian study of Sanskrit grammar in India.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BCE = Before Common Era

CE = Common Era

cent. = century / centuries

H = Handlist of the Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār

ms = manuscript

mss = manuscripts

VS = the Indian *Vikram Saṃvat* calendar, which began in 57 BCE. H only indicates years in the *Vikram Saṃvat* calendar, extracted from the mss’ scribal colophons when available. The dating of a ms in CE is therefore based on a calculation by the subtraction of 57 from the VS year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aussant, Emilie. “Kāśikāvṛtti and Cāndravyākaraṇa: A Comparison of the *Pratyāhārasūtra* Section.” *Studies in the Kāśikāvṛtti: The Section on Pratyāhāras*, edited by Pascale Haag and Vincenzo Vergiani, Anthem South Asian Studies, Anthem Press, 2009, pp. 191–214.
- Balcerowicz, Piotr. “On the Relative Chronology of Dharmakīrti and Samantabhadra.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 44, 2016, pp. 437–483.
- Belvalkar, Krishna. *An Account of the Different Existing Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*. Poona, Aryabushan Press, 1915.
- Bhattacharya, Bhabani Prasad (edited by). *Vedic Grammar: Text, English Translation, Sanskrit Composition and Exhaustive Grammatical Notes with Illustration*. Calcutta, Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1986.
- Bhattacharya, J.N. and Nilanjara Sarkar. *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit Literature*. volume 1: A-Dh, Global Encyclopaedic Literature Series vol. 3, Delhi, Global Vision Publishing House, 2004.
- Böhtlingk, Otto von. “Über die Grammatik Kātantra.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 41.4, 1847, pp. 657–666.
- Cardona, George. *Pāṇini: A Survey of Research*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980, reprint 1997.

- Cardona, George. *Pāṇini: His Work and Its Traditions*. vol. 1: Background and Introduction. Second revised edition, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1997.
- Chatterji, K.C. *Cāndra Vyākaraṇa of Candragomin*. Poona, Deccan College Postgraduate & Research Institute, 1953–61.
- de Clerco, Ewa. “Bhaṭṭārakas and Digambara Monastic Lineages of Fifteenth Century Gwalior: Glimpses from Raidhū’s Writings.” *Journal of Asian History* 45.1, 2011, pp. 63–83.
- Coward, Harold G. and K. Kunjuni Raja. *The Philosophy of the Grammarian*. Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies vol. V, edited by Karl H. Potter. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1990.
- Cowell, Edward Byles. *The Prākṛta-Prakāśa or the Prākṛta Grammar of Vararuci, with the commentary (Manoramā) of Bhāmaha*. Stephen Austin, 1854.
- Das, Karunasindhu. *A Pāṇinian Approach to Philosophy of Language (Kaundabhaṭṭa’s Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra critically edited and translated into English)*. Calcutta, Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1990.
- D’Avella, Victor B. *Creating the Perfect Language: Sanskrit Grammarians, Poetry, and the Exegetical Tradition*. 2018, the University of Chicago, unpublished PhD dissertation. <https://knowledge.uchicago.edu/record/194> (accessed on 29/04/2019).
- Dimitrov, Dragomir. *Lehrschrift über die Zwanzig Präverbien im Sanskrit: Kritische Ausgabe der Viṃśatyupasargavṛtti und der tibetischen Übersetzung Ñe bar bsgyur ba ñi śu pa’i ’grel pa*. Editionen von Texten der Cāndra-Schule vol. 1, Indica et Tibetica vol. 49, Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2007.
- Dhruv, H. H. *The Mugdhāvabodha Auktika, or A grammar for beginners of the Gujarati language*. Prācīna Gujarāti Sāhitya Ratnamālā 1, Bombay, Subodha Press, 1889.
- Durgāprasād, Pandit & Kāśīnāth Pāndurang Parab (edited by). *The Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadevabhaṭṭa Mahākavi Śrīsomadevabhaṭṭaviracitaḥ Kathāsaritsāgaraḥ*. Bombay, Pānduranga Jāvājī, Nirnayasagar Press, 1930.
- Eggeling, Julius. *The Kātantra with the commentary of Durgasiṃha*. 2 vols, Bibliotheca Indica. Calcutta, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1874.
- Flügel Peter & Kornelius Krümpelmann. *Johannes Klatt: Jaina-Onomasticon*. Jaina Studies vol. 1, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2016.
- Haag, Pascale & Vincenzo, Vergiani. *Studies in the Kāśikāvṛtti: The Section on Pratyāhāras and Other Contributions*. Anthem South Asian Studies, Anthem Press, 2011.
- Iyer, S. Venkitasubromonia. *Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa’s Prakriyāsarvasva: A Critical Study*. Thiruvananthapuram, Department of Sanskrit, University of Kerala, 1972.
- Jain, Rājārām. “Ikkīsavī sadī: Kātantra vyākaraṇ kā svarṇayug” [“The Twenty-First Century: The Golden Age for Kātantravyākaraṇa”]. *Prākṛt Vidyā* 12.1, edited by Sudeep Jain, New Delhi, Kundkund Bharti (Prakrit Bhavan), 2000, pp. 18–24.
- Jain, Udaycandra. “Kātantravyākaraṇ aur uski Upādeyatā” [“Kātantravyākaraṇa and Its Acceptance”]. *Prākṛt Vidyā* 11.4, edited by Sudeep Jain, New Delhi, Kundkund Bharti (Prakrit Bhavan), 2000, pp. 30–33.
- Jñānamatī, Mātājī. *Śrīmad Śarvavarma Ācārya praṇītā Kātantra-rūpamālā with the Commentary of Bhāvasena Traiyavidya*. 2nd edition, Vīr Jñānoday Granthmālā Puṣpa vol. 83, Hastinapur, Digambar Jain Shodh Sansthan, 1992.
- Joglekar, Moreshwar Vasudeo. *A Critical Edition of Ujjavalādatta’s Gloss (Vṛtti) on the Uṇādi Sūtras*. (see Shodhganga) 1975, University of Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, unpublished PhD dissertation. <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/175414> (accessed on 29/04/2019).
- Joshi, Milind Sanatkumar. *Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya and His Sārasvataprakriyā: A Critical, Historical, and Textual Study of the Sārasvata School of Sanskrit Grammar*. Vadodara, Mahiman Publishing House, 2011.
- Joshi, Vankatesh Laxman. *Prauḍa Manoramā with commentary Śabdaratna of Hari Dikṣita*. Deccan College Monograph Series vol. 31, Poona, Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1966.

- Kar, Himanshu Shekhar. *A Comparative Study of the Cāndra and Jainendra Vyākaraṇa*. (see the Shodhganga database), 1999, Bhubaneswar, Utkal University Vani Vihar, unpublished PhD dissertation. <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/118711> (accessed on 29/04/2019).
- Kartre, Sumitra Mangesh. *Dictionary of Pāṇini*. 3 vols., Poona, Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1968-1969.
- Kāślīvāl, Kastūr Cand. *Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār Jaypur kī Granthasūcī*. [Part 1], Jaipur, Digambar Jain Atiśay Kṣetr Śrī Mahāvīr-jī, Vīr Nirvāṇ era 2475 ≈ 1949.
- Kragh, Ulrich Timme. “Localized Literary History: Sub-Text and Cultural Heritage in the Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār, A Digambara Manuscript Repository in Jaipur.” *The International Journal of Jaina Studies* 9.3, 2013, pp. 1–53.
- Kulli, J.S. *History of Grammatical Theories in Kannada*. Trivandrum, International School of Dravidian Linguistics, 1991.
- Kumar, Arun. *Śakaṭāyana vyākaraṇa aura Siddhāntakaumudī ke tulanātmaka adhyayana kā (kṛt prakaraṇa)*. Delhi, B. S. K. Publishers and Distributers, 2015.
- Kümmel, Auguste. *Maheśvara’s Śabdabhedaprakāśa mit dem Kommentar des Jñānavimalagaṇi*. Harrassowitz, 1940.
- Lal, Mohan. *Encyclopedia of Indian Literature: Sasay to Zorgot*. Volume 5, Delhi, Sahitya Akademi, 1992.
- Lalithambal, K. S. *Dharmakīrti’s Rūpāvatāra: A Critical Study*. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica vol. 153, New Delhi, Sri Satguru Publications, 1996.
- Liebich, Bruno. *Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa: Die Grammatik des Candragomin: Sūtra, Uṇādi, Dhātupāṭha*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 11.4, Deutschen Morgenländisches Gesellschaft (F.A. Brockhaus), 1902.
- Liebich, Bruno. *Cāndra-Vṛtti: Der Original-Kommentar Candragomin’s zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes vol. 14, Deutschen Morgenländisches Gesellschaft (F.A. Brockhaus), 1918.
- Lüders, Heinrich. “Kātantra und Kaumārālāta.” *Philologica Indica: Ausgewählte kleine Schriften von Heinrich Lüders*, reprint of 1930, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 659–721.
- Lüders, Heinrich. “Nachträge zum Kaumārālāta.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 94 (new series 19.1), 1940b, pp. 25–33.
- Meenakshi K. “The Genitive in Pāṇini and in Epic Sanskrit.” *Studies in Sanskrit Syntax: A Volume in Honor of the Centennial of Speijer’s Sanskrit Syntax (1886–1986)*. Edited by Hans Heinrich Hock, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1991, pp. 145–152.
- Palsule, G.B. *The Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas*. Poona, 1961.
- Paṇṣīkar, Vasudev Lakṣmaṇ Śāstrī. *The Siddhāntakaumudī with Tattvabodhinī Commentary of Jñānedra Sarasvatī and Subodhini Commentary of Jayakṛṣṇa*. Bombay, Tukārām Jāvājim 1908.
- Pischel, Richard. *Hemacandra’s Grammatik der Prakritsprachen (Siddhahemacandram Adhyāya VIII) mit kritischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen*. (1877–1880), reprint 1969, Biblio Verlag.
- Pischel, Richard. *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde vol. I heft 8, Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner, 1900.
- Pollock, Sheldon. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 2006.
- Ram, Kanshi. *Uṇādi-Sūtras in the Sanskrit Grammatical Tradition*. Delhi, Shivalik Prakashan, 2001.
- Sharma, Peri Sarveswara. “Haradatta’s Padamañjarī: an Analysis.” *Aligarh Journal of Oriental Studies* 2, 1985, pp. 75–94.
- Saini, R.S. *Śarvavarmadeva praṇītam: Kātantra vyākaraṇa*. Delhi, Bhartiya Vidya Prakashan, 1987.
- Śāstrī, Ayodhyānātha Sānyāla. *Baiyākaraṇa Siddhāntakaumudī: Kārakabihaktiprakaraṇam, Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣhitakṛta sūtrabhṛtī ebaṃ sampādaka kartṛka Baṅgabhāshāra nijasvā Kādambinī nāmaka bisṛta byākhyā, Baṅgānubāda, tattvabodhinī-Bālamānoramā-Nāgeśabhaṭṭakṛta Śabdenduśekhara-Haradattamiśrakṛta Padamañjarī-Jinendrabudhikṛta Nyāsa prabhṛtira biśada ālocanāsaha*. Kalikātā, Bengal, Saṃskṛta Pustaka Bhāṇḍār, 1975.
- Scharfe, Hartmut. *Grammatical Literature. A History of Indian Literature*, vol. V fasc. 2, edited by Jan Gonda, Otto Harrassowitz, 1977.

- Scharfe, Hartmut. *Education in Ancient India*. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 2: India, vol. 16, edited by J. Bronkhorst, Brill, 2002.
- Shastri, Bhimsen. *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī Bhaimi-Vyākhyā*. Delhi, Bhaimi Prakashan, 1926.
- Shastri, Dwarikadas & Kalikaprasad Shukla (ed.) *Nyāsa or Pañcikā Commentary of Ācārya Jinendra-buddhi and Padamañjari of Haradatta Miśra on the Kāśikāvṛtti*. Varanasi, Prachya Bharati Prakashan, 1965–1967.
- Shastri, Nemichandra. *Ācārya Hemacandra aura unkā Śabdānuśāsana: eka adhyāyana : sāmājika-sāmskr̥tika viśleṣhaṇa, vyākaraṇaśāstra kā tulanātmaka-ālocanātmaka vivecana, Prākṛta bhāṣhā kī prakukha pravṛttiyoṃ kā nūrīpaṇa evaṃ bhāṣhāvaijñānika tattvoṃ kā anuśīlana*. Raṣṭrabhāṣā Vidyābhavana Granthamālā vol. 62, Varanasi, Chaukhambā Vidyābhavana, 1963.
- Shastri, Sitaram. *Praudhāmanoramā of Śrī Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita together with Bṛihachchhabdaratna, an unpublished commentary of Śrī Hari Dīkṣita and Laghuśabdaratna of Śrī Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa*. Varanasi, Banaras Hindu University, 1964.
- Sogani, Kamal Chand & Shakuntala Jain. *Advanced Prākṛta Grammar*. 2 vols., Jaipur, Apabhraṃśa Sāhitya Academy, 2009.
- Sogani, Kamal Chand & Sīma Dhīngarā. *Vararuciprākṛtaprakāśa*. 2 vols., Jaipur, Apabhraṃśa Sāhitya Academy, 2010.
- Sundaraśarmā, V. and Pullela Śrīrāmacandruḍu (ed.). *Padamañjarī Vāmana Jayāditya Viracitāyāḥ Kāśikāyā Vyākhyā Haradattamiśraviracitā*. Hyderabad, Saṃskṛtapariṣat Usmānīyāvīsvavidyālayaḥ, 1981.
- Tripāthī, Bhagirath Prasād. “Kātantra Vyākaraṇa.” *Pañḍit Jaganmohanlāl Śāstri Sādhuvād Granth: Jain Vidyāyem – Vividha Vidyāyem*. (Jainology Manifold Facets), edited by V.A. Sangway et al., Rewa: Pt. Jaganmohanlal Shastri Sadhuvad Samiti, 1989, pp. 443–446.
- Tripāthī, Shambhu Nath and Mahadeo Chaturvedī. *Jainendra Vyākaraṇam by Pūjyapāda Devanandī with Jainendra Mahāvṛtti of Shri Abhayanandī*. Varanasi, Bharatiya Jnanapitha Kashi, 1956.
- Tripāthī, Shambhu Nath. *Śākaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇa of Ācārya Śākaṭāyana (with the svopajña commentary, Amoghavṛtti) (Ācārya-śākaṭāyana-viracitam-śākaṭāyana-vyākaraṇa (svopajña-amoghavṛtti-alamkṛtam)*. Varanasi, Bharatiya Jnanapith, 1971.
- Vaidya, P.L. *Prākṛta-Prakāśa of Vararuci with Bhāmaha’s Commentary*. Poona, Oriental Book Agency, 1931.
- Vaidya, P.L. *Prakrit Grammar of Hemacandra: The eighth Adhyāya of the Siddha-Hema-Śabdānuśāsana*. revised edition with notes and index of Prākṛit words, Bombay Sanskrit and Prākṛit series vol. 60, Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1958.
- Vajrasenavijay, Muni. *Prākṛt-Vyākaraṇam (Aṣṭamo ‘dhyāyāḥ), Svopajña-vṛttibhūṣitam, paramārhatā-kumārāpālabhūpālpratibodhaka-kalikālasarvajña-śrī-Hemacandrācāryaviracitasya*. Śrī Ātmanand Jain Grantharatnamālāyāḥ Caturnavatitamam series vol. 74, Bhāvnagar, Śrī Jain Ātmanand Sabhā, 1982.
- Vaṃśīdhara, Pañḍit. *Jainendrapriyā: Śrīmad devanandyācāryaviracita ‘Jainendra’ vyākaraṇasya śrīmad Abhayanandikṛta-mahāvṛttim āśrītya*. Ākalūj, Śreṣṭhī Nāthā Raṅga-jī Gāṃdhī, 1917.
- Verbeke, Saartje, *Three Prakrit Grammars*. Pandit Nathuram Premi Research Series vol. 35, Mumbai, Hindi Granth Karyalay, 2010.
- Vijalayāvanya and Kanaprabha. *Śrīsiddhahemacandra-śabdānuśāsanam: svopajña-tattvaprakāśikā, śabdamaḥārṇavanyāsa*. Śrīvaijayanemisūrigranthamālā ratna vol. 33, Ahmedabad, Jaina Grantha Prakāśaka Sabhā, 2007.
- Wielńska-Softwedel, Małgorzata. *The Bhāṣāvṛttivaraṇapañjikā of Viśvarūpa: The First Adhyāya and a Detailed Examination*. 2 vols., Universität Hamburg, 2006, unpublished PhD dissertation. <https://d-nb.info/979754704/34> (accessed on 29/04/2019).