

Lata Mahesh Deokar

# ***Subantarātnākara*: An Unknown Text of Subhūticandra**

**Abstract:** The Buddhist monk-scholar Subhūticandra (c. 1060–1140 CE) is known as the author of the commentary *Kavikāmadhenu* (c. 1110–1130 CE) on the *Amarakośa*. He appears to have also written a grammatical text called *Subantarātnākara*. There are altogether twelve manuscripts entitled *Subantarātnākara*: ten in Nepal and two in Cambridge. Out of these, six are indeed of the *Subantarātnākara*, while the remaining six are of four different texts, which are somewhat related to the *Subantarātnākara*. There are two Tibetan translations of the text. Many of these manuscripts mention Subhūticandra as the author of the text. There also exists a commentary on the *Subantarātnākara*. The article discusses the contents of these manuscripts, and the Tibetan translations and their mutual relationship. It also deals with the issue of the authorship of the different texts available in these manuscripts. In this connection, the article also discusses the issue of Subhūticandra's common authorship of the *Subantarātnākara* and the *Kavikāmadhenu*.

## **1 Introduction**

The Buddhist monk-scholar Subhūticandra (c. 1060–1140 CE) is known to us from his *Kavikāmadhenu* commentary<sup>1</sup> (c. 1110–1130 CE) on the *Amarakośa*.<sup>2</sup> He was one of the teachers of Pa tshab Lo tsā ba Tshul khriims rgyal mtshan (d. after 1130), who had studied the *Āryasaddharmasmṛtyupasthānasūtra* with Subhūticandra at Vikramaśīla. According to Pa tshab Lo tsā ba, Subhūticandra was ‘a scholar of grammar, poetics, and “the modality of the Sanskrit language”, (*legs par sbyar ba'i skad kyi lugs la mkhas pa*), whereby the latter phrase may, but only may, be a clumsy way of designating lexicography’ (van der Kuijp 2009, 8). An analysis of the citations from Subhūticandra's *Kavikāmadhenu* substantiates Pa tshab Lo tsā ba's statement. Out of at least 228 texts from which Subhūticandra quotes, fifty-three are grammatical works, six are on poetics, and thirty-three lexicons.

---

1 The work of a critical edition of this text has been undertaken by Prof. Mahesh A. Deokar and myself.

2 For a detailed discussion on Subhūticandra's date and place and his *Kavikāmadhenu* commentary, cf. Deokar Lata 2014, 1–91.

In the field of Sanskrit grammar, Candragomin's *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, and its commentarial literature, namely, the *Cāndravṛtti* of Dharmadāsa, the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* of Ratnamati, and the *Śabdalakṣaṇavivaraṇapañjikā* of Pūrṇacandra, are the principal authorities for Subhūticandra. On some important grammatical issues, he also brings in the discussions taking place in the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition. Apart from the main texts belonging to this tradition such as the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* and the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, Subhūticandra cites from the *Bhāgavṛtti* of Vimalamati (625 CE)<sup>3</sup> and the *Anunyāsa* of Indumitra (before 1100 CE).<sup>4</sup> Being a junior contemporary of Puruṣottamadeva, Subhūticandra cites from the former's *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, and the *Lakṣyalaṣaṇadurghaṭa*. One more important grammarian whom Subhūticandra quotes is his senior contemporary Maitreyarākṣita. The third important grammatical tradition, namely, that of Śarvavarman's *Kātantravyākaraṇa* has also found its way in to the *Kavikāmadhenu*. Subhūticandra cites from Śarvavarman's and Vararuci's *Kātantravyākaraṇa* as well as from the commentarial literature which includes the *Durghaṭikā* and the *Kātantraviśeṣākhyaṇa*. Among the Prakrit grammarians, he quotes from Hevvara's commentary on Vararuci's *Prākṛtaprakāśa* and the *Prākṛtasamjivani* of Vasantarāja. There are two more grammars of Prakrit that Subhūticandra has referred to, one of which is the *Prākṛtānuśāsana*. Subhūticandra refers to the author of this text by the honorific title Gomin. The rule he has cited from this text is found in the *Prākṛtānuśāsana* of Puruṣottama.<sup>5</sup> The second text is *Samśkṛtabhavaṇapṛākṛtānuśāsana*, which Subhūticandra has ascribed to Candragomin. Sanskritists until this date do not seem to be aware of any such text composed by Candragomin. Apart from these, Subhūticandra also quotes from a number of texts related to lists of verbal roots (*dhātupāṭha*), handbooks on grammatical gender (*liṅgānuśāsana*), and manuals on phonetics.

On the background of Subhūticandra's in-depth knowledge of the Sanskrit and the Prakrit grammatical traditions, I was curious to find out if there was a grammatical text ascribed to him. This curiosity brought me to the reference to a text entitled *Subantarātnākara* ascribed to Subhūticandra in J. P. Dwivedi's book *Samśkṛt ke bauddh vaiyākaraṇ* ('Buddhist Grammarians, Commentators and Tibetan Translators of Sanskrit Grammar'). According to the description of one of the manuscripts given by the NGMCP, namely, B 35–23 (NAK 4/148), this text deals with 'the declension of nouns and adjectives (*subanta*), following the Cāndra school of grammar.'<sup>6</sup>

3 For a detailed discussion on Vimalamati and the *Bhāgavṛtti*, cf. Dwivedi 1987, 194–202.

4 For a detailed discussion on Indumitra and the *Anunyāsa*, cf. Dwivedi 1987, 231–232.

5 *ādīdūtām alope samyoge hrasvaś ca* | (IV.7 [= 126], p. 5).

6 <http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/wiki>.

Bruno Liebich (1895, 7, 34–35) was probably the first modern scholar to mention and discuss the *Subantarātnākara* based on its Tibetan translation (*Sup mtha' rin chen 'byung gnas*). Unfortunately, he had an incomplete translation at hand. As a result, he could not obtain any information regarding the author of the text. More than a century later, Verhagen (2001, 132–136) discussed this text in greater detail based on the revised translation of the *Subantarātnākara* preserved in the collected works of Si tu paṅ chen. In 2001, in an article entitled 'Bhikṣu Haribhadra's *Vibhaktikārikā*. An Unknown Grammatical Text Edited with a Brief Introduction (First Part)', Wezler (2001, 249) commented: 'CG 37 and 38 (*Subantarātnākara* / *Vyākaraṇa-Subanta*): The author's name, I should like to add, is Subhūti.' However, Wezler has not clearly mentioned the reasons for ascribing both these texts to Subhūti(candra).

Dwivedi (1987, 289), who is probably the first scholar to discuss the Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Subantarātnākara*, informs us that there exist five manuscripts of this text in Nepal. Since I was already working on Subhūticandra's *Kavikāmadhenu*, I decided to collect and edit the manuscripts of the *Subantarātnākara* as a sequel to my ongoing research. Thanks to the Nepalese German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (NGMCP), it has been possible to have access to all the available manuscripts of the *Subantarātnākara* in Nepal. I am grateful to the late Dr Albrecht Hanisch, the then Resident Representative of the NGMCP, for promptly providing me with all the necessary information and making arrangements to send the digital copies of all the available manuscripts through Namraj Gurung, who deserves special thanks for the same. In 2013, in an article 'Subhūticandra: A Forgotten Scholar of Magadha', I briefly introduced the manuscript materials and recorded some of my early impressions of the text. In the meanwhile, after completing the first volume of the *Kavikāmadhenu*, I began reading afresh the manuscripts of the *Subantarātnākara* and the *Subvidhānaśabdāmālāparikrama*, another work also ascribed to Subhūticandra. This reading proved some of my earlier remarks obsolete, which made it necessary for me to present the analysis of the manuscripts material in a revised form. Here in the following pages, I wish to present to the scholarly world my fresh analysis of the same. I will start this analysis with a description of altogether six manuscripts:

## 2 Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Subantarātnākara*

1. NAK 1/468 (Reel No. A 1311-5 = A 1162-10) is a palm-leaf manuscript (33 × 5 cm) containing 60 folios with 4–7 lines per folio. The manuscript is written in the Nepālākṣara. Although there is no real physical damage to the manuscript, some folios are not clearly legible. At a few places, *akṣaras* are partly rubbed off, while at some other places the text is not readable due to the spreading of ink.

The name of the text *Suvantarātnākaraḥ* in both the Nāgarī as well as the Roman script appears on a piece of paper pasted on the outer side of the wooden cover. On this paper, we also find the number assigned to the manuscript, namely, *Pra. 468* (in the Nāgarī script) and No. A 468 (in Roman letters and Arabic numerals). We also find the date of the manuscript, namely, *viśaṁ 112* (in the Nāgarī script). The inner side of the wooden cover contains a didactic verse written in the Nepālākṣara script:

*dhanadhānyaprayogeṣu tathā vidyārjjanēsu<sup>7</sup> ca |*  
*āhārvavyavahāreṣu tyaktalajjo (! 'lajjah) sadā bhavet ||*

(Cāṅkya-rājanītiśāstra 3.21)

This side also preserves the date of the manuscript, namely, *viśaṁ 112* written by a different hand in the Nāgarī script.

In the top margin of fol. 1r, we find the following inscriptions: *Pra. 468*, *patra 60*, *Subantarātnākara* and *vi. saṁ. 112* (all written in the Nāgarī script). The folio contains two verses. The handwriting of these verses is different from the handwriting of the inscriptions on 1r as well as that of the text of the *Subantarātnākara*. The first three lines of this portion contain the following verse:

*āsā (!) nāma nadī manoharajalā tṛṣṇātaṁ(!)raṅgākulā*  
*rāgrāhvatī vitakra(!)vāhagā dhikyam mahābhoga(2)niḥ (!) |*  
*mohāvarttasudu(s)sahātigahanā yā tuṅgacimtāṭaiḥ*  
*tasyā[h] pāragatā visu(!)dhamana(3)sā namdatī (!) nandati jāgesvarā(h) (!) || (fol. 1r 1–3)*

This verse is found in Bhartṛhari's *Śatakṛayī* (verse 173). It reads:

*āsā nāma nadī manorathajalā tṛṣṇātarāṅgākulā*  
*rāgrāhvatī vitarkavihagā dhairyadrumadhvaṁsinī |*  
*mohāvarttasudustarātigahanā prottuṅgacintāṭaiḥ*  
*tasyāḥ pāragatā vibudhamanaso nandantu yogīśvarāḥ ||*

7 The printed edition reads *vidyāsamgrahaṇeṣu*.

The River of Hope having Desire for its water, Greed for agitating waves, Passion for its sharks, Sceptic reasoning for birds, Patience for the tottering trees on its sides, and worldly Care and Anxieties for its lofty banks, is very difficult to be crossed on account of its total whirlpool of Illusion. Those pure-minded Yogi-s who have swum over to the opposite bank of this mighty stream are therefore leading a safe and happy life. (P. G. Nath's translation; Sternbach III, 1304)

This verse is followed by one more verse, which I am unable to read at present. Isaacson suggests that 'someone at some point wrote [these] two verses on the originally blank 1r.' (email correspondence dated 29/01/2017)

The actual text of the *Subantarātnākara* begins on fol. 1v with the benedictory verse paying homage to Śākyamuni Buddha. This is preceded by homage to Vāgīśvara (*namo vāgīśvarāya*), which, in all probability, is the homage paid by the scribe. The manuscript is incomplete. The last word derived in this manuscript is *gorakṣa*. The text ends on fol. 60 with the words *gorakṣaśabdāt supaḥ so(r) lopaḥ | padānta-*. The last folio preserves an inscription *atha* preceded by an auspicious sign written in the Maithili script. Most folios are foliated with both letter-numerals as well as numerals. The majority of folios have letter numerals in the left-hand margin and numerals in the right-hand margin of the verso side of the folio, but in the case of some folios these are inverted. Other folios only have numerals in either side of the verso. The title of the text is found on fol. 19r1 in a final rubric to the section:

*uktāḥ (!) ajantā halantās ca puṃsi |  
iti subantarātnākare puliṅgakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ |*

The other three manuscripts of the *Subantarātnākara* do not mention the name of the text in the corresponding final rubric.<sup>8</sup>

**2. NAK 4/148 (Reel No. B 35–23)** is a palm-leaf manuscript (31.5 × 5 cm) containing 77 folios with 5–7 lines per folio. The script is Nepālākṣara. On a few folios, the writing is partially rubbed off. In quite a number of instances, the scribe has indicated lacunas by filling up these portions with auspicious signs. The manuscript begins with a benediction to Daśabala (*[na]maḥ śrīdaśabalāya*) and a benedictory verse paying homage to Śākyamuni Buddha. The manuscript is complete. It ends

**8** *uktā ajantā halantās ca puṃsi saviśeṣāḥ | pula(!)liṅgakāṇḍaḥ (puliṅga° NAK 4/148) prathamāḥ samāptaḥ | NAK 4/148 (20r5), Or.148 (25v2–3); uktā'jantā halantās ca puṃsi (!) viśeṣaḥ (!) | puṃliṅgakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ prathamāḥ | C 54-7(1) (Kesar 582) (27b3–4).*

with three concluding verses, followed by the final rubric to the text<sup>9</sup> and the colophon.<sup>10</sup> According to the latter, the manuscript was copied for a certain monk bearing the title Śrījñāna of the Śrīdharmadhātu Mahāvihāra. The foliation consists of letter-numerals in the middle of the left-hand margin and numerals in the middle of the right-hand margin of the verso (only on folios 1–12). From folio 13 onwards, only the numerals appear in the left-hand margin of the verso. Exposures 2 and 79 show the back of folios 1 and 77 respectively, which are used as flyleaves, showing some other inscriptions in Nepālākṣara characters. In the bottom of fol. 77r, another hand has added: *namaḥ śrīdasa(!)balāya* | preceded by an auspicious sign in the Nepālākṣara script.

**3. NAK 5-7989 (Reel No. B 35-30)** (30 × 5 cm) is a palm-leaf manuscript containing 12 folios with 5 lines per folio. The script is Nepālākṣara. The manuscript is incomplete and damaged. At many places, the *akṣaras* are rubbed off. The text preserved in this manuscript is not continuous. These are stray leaves. The second image of the exposure 2771 preserves a final rubric to the first section:

*cāndravyākara(5) ... .. yādhyāyasya prathamah pādah samāptaḥ |*

Most probably, based on this final rubric, the NGMCP has listed this as a manuscript of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*. In the bottom margin of the first image of this exposure, we find an inscription by a second hand in Nāgarī script:

*cāndravyākaraṇasambandhiśabdarūpāvalīpada(..)(..)*

While discussing this manuscript in his *Verschiedene neu-entdeckte Texte des Cāndravyākaraṇa und ihre Verfasser* (Studien zum Cāndravyākaraṇa II), Oberlies as named this text as *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa-sambandhi-śabda-rūpāvalī* apparently based on the above-mentioned inscription. He has quoted two passages from this manuscript, which I reproduce below (Oberlies 1992, 177–178):

*etasya cānvadeśaḥ (sic!) dvitīyāyāñ caina iti etacchabdasya ya etaśabdas tasya kathitānu-kathanaviśaye dvitīyāyāñ ṭākāre osi ca (! sic) enādeśo bhavati / etaṃ cchātraṃ vedam adhyāpaya / || aṭho enaṃ vyākaraṇam adhyāpaya / iha kasmān na bhavati / etaṃ ātaṃ nītaṃ vidyād iti pūrvavad anvādeśābhāvāt / tathā hi iṣadathe kriyāyoge [/] maryādābhividhau ca ya itiṣa || dādiṣv ākārasya nirdeśaṃ kṛtvā etaṃātaṃ nītaṃ vidyād iti vedanakriyāyām āhuḥ / karm-abhāvo vidhyate / aṭho etau aṭho enān [/] aṭho enat / aṭho enāñ / [svaṃ] / a || tho enayā ... hri /*

**9** *kṛtir iyaṃ paṇḍitasthavirusubhūticandrasya | granthapramāṇa[m a]sya sahasra 1 śata 4 grantha 30 likhitam idam | (77r2–3).*

**10** *śrīdharmadhātumahāvihārasya | kramasrījñānasya bhikṣu(h) pustako 'yaṇm (!) idam likhitam iti | (77r2–3).*

*striyām / etā ene [ʃ] enā / enayā / enayoḥ / napuṃsake / dvitīyāyām iti viṣayasaptamī .. [na] pūrvavad ... ty enādeśānivr̥tti...k. [t(y)ad]ādyatvā || [bh]āvaḥ / vā virāme [C 6.4.149] iti dasya (sic! [lies: jhasya?]) cartvaṃ / enat ene enāni / enena enayoḥ // [2r1–5]*

*etasya cānvadeśe dvitīyāyām caina idamśabdasyānvādeśaviṣayasya dvitīyāyām ṭausi ca enādeśaḥ / i.. / gurupūja.. / a.. ena[m] /// || [bh]ojaya / atho enau / atho enān / anena chāttreṇa chando 'dhītaṃ / atho enena vyākaraṇam adhītaṃ / iha kasmān na bhavati / ayaṃ daṇḍo harāneneti yatra kiñcid vidhāya vākya /// || ..]ṇa nukaraṇānyad (sic!) upadiśyate so 'nvādeśaḥ / iha tu vastunirdeśamātraṃ kṛtvā ekam e(va vī)dhānaṃ tathā hi ayaṃ daṇḍa ity aneneti haraṇakriyāyā[n ca] daṇḍasya karaṇabhāv[o] /// / [5r2–4]*

I was able to trace these passages to folios 68r3–68v2 and 67r3–6 respectively of the manuscript NAK 4/148. Verhagen (2001, 133) had already identified these passages in the Tibetan translation of the *Subantarātnākara* as preserved in the collected works of Si tu paṅ chen (60r6–60v3; 59v1–4). However, being misled by Oberlies' (1992, 176–179) identification of this manuscript as *Cāndravvyākaraṇasambandhiśabdarūpāvalī*, Verhagen (2001, 133) remarked:

[a] manuscript of the Sanskrit original, bearing the title *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa-sambandhi-śabdarūpāvalī*, has been brought to light (...).<sup>11</sup>

I wonder why Verhagen did not raise any question about this identification even after tracing the said passages to the Tibetan translation of the *Subantarātnākara*. The fact that the above-mentioned passages match with the manuscripts of the *Subantarātnākara* and its Tibetan translation proves beyond doubt that these are the stray leaves of a manuscript of the *Subantarātnākara*, and not those of a previously unknown text as was earlier thought by Oberlies.

As mentioned earlier, this manuscript contains altogether 12 folios. The respective exposure numbers are from 2760 to 2772. Out of these, 2760 and 2772 have only one image while the rest of the exposures have two images. Here follows a table of folios and their corresponding images along with the word(s) discussed in them and their approximate parallels in NAK 4/148:

<sup>11</sup> MS-no. 5-7989, Reel-no. B 35/30, 11.5 ff., 5 lines per side (Verhagen 2001, 133, n. 533).

| Fol. no. | Exposure no. | Word(s) discussed     | Approximate parallels in B 35–23 (NAK 4/148) |
|----------|--------------|-----------------------|--|
|          | 2760         |                       |  |
|          | 2761a        |                       |  |
|          | 2771a        | pitṛ-                 | 9v   |
|          | 2770b        | pitṛ-, nṛ-, praśāstr- | 9v, 10r, 10v                                 |
|          | 2770a        | uktā ṛdantāḥ   rai-   | 10v  |
|          | 2769b        | go-, glau-            | 11r, 11v                                     |
|          | 2769a        | bhūbhuk-              | 12v  |
|          | 2768b        | parivrāt-             | 13v  |
|          | 2767b        | śikharalū-            | 41r  |
|          | 2768a        | śikharalū-            | 41r  |
|          | 2767a        | pratyañc-             | 46r4   |
|          | 2766b        | tiryak-, viśvadryañc- | 46v  |
|          | 2763b        | bhavat-               | 53r1   |
|          | 2764a        | adan-                 | 53v  |
|          | 2766a        | gaganarudh-           | 54v6   |
|          | 2765b        | pīvan- (?)            | 55v1   |
|          | 2763a        | bahvap-               | 56v  |
|          | 2762b        | bahvap-, arituph- (?) | 56v  |
| *69      | 2765a        | adas-                 | 66v2   |
| 70 (?)   | 2764b        | etat-                 | 67r3–6                                       |
|          | 2762a        | etat- (f.)            | 67v6   |
| *71      | 2761b        | eka-                  | 68v2   |

The second image of the exposure 2771 reads as follows:

-viṣyati | yasya punar aṅantaṃ nāma tat(r)āṅ eva | namatuv (?) ity āha | **bhāgīrathīyādi** | tasmād divāyāpi (?) matupam vyavasthārthaṃ tan nāmnīti śrayitavyam | tathā vā ... .. (2) (na)dyām deṣe matub iṣṭaḥ | madhūni sthāna(!)vo 'smin deṣe santi madhumān | sthānu(!)mān | atvasor iti dīrghaḥ | puṃsuṭy ugīta iti num | sor lopaḥ | saṃ ... .. (3) kasyādīny api matvantānīti saṃjñā(!)yām asaṃjñā(!)yām vā sāmānyena vidhāsyamāno matup atra saṃjñayām (!) bhaviṣyatīti | si ... .. (4) ity āsaṃkyāha | mādharma ityādi | tato **noṇ** m arthād a(tra) **bhaviṣyati** | tan nāmnīti niyamo[ 'tra (?) | cāndravāka(raṇe ṭṭi)(5)yādhyāyasya prathamāḥ pādāḥ samāptaḥ | samba(... ) prathamāṣāḍha (... ) saptamāṃ likhitam idaṃ puṃsaka-

This appears to be a part of some commentary on the Cāndravṛtti on *vuñcha-ṅkaṭhajīlaseniraḍhañnyayaphakphīññīnyakakṭhakchakiyaḍmatupḍvalacaḥ* (CV 3.1.68):

... *Udumbarāvati, Ikṣumatīti matvantarīn nadīnāma. Bhāgīrathī, Bhāimarathī, Sauvāstavitṛyaṇantam api dṛṣyate. Madhumān, Sthāṇumān ityādīny api matvantāni deśanāmāni. Mādhava ityādīni tu na deśanāmāniti nāto 'ṅ bhaviṣyati.*

When I requested Dragomir Dimitrov to crosscheck CVṛ on CV 3.1.68 with Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, he compared it with the photographs of the manuscript of the Pañjikā taken by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana. In an email dated 23.12.2015, he confirmed that '[s]o we have one more tiny fragment of this commentary'.

**4. Kesar 523 (Reel No. C 49-2)** (31.6 × 4.4 cm) is a palm-leaf manuscript. It is written in Nepālākṣara script. This is a multi-text manuscript, which includes altogether five portions of four texts. These are:

- a. *Amarakośa* (31.3 × 4.3 cm), 4 folios; palm-leaf; incomplete, damaged; Nepālākṣara
- b. *Amarakośa* (31.3 × 4.3 cm), 34 folios; palm-leaf; incomplete, damaged; Nepālākṣara
- c. *Kātantravyākaraṇa* (31 × 4.5 cm), 1 folio; palm-leaf; Nepālākṣara
- d. [Vyākaraṇa] (32.3 × 5 cm), 16 folios; palm-leaf; incomplete, damaged; Maithili
- e. *Subantarātnākara*: This is a palm-leaf manuscript (31.6 × 4.4 cm) containing 40 folios with 4–5 lines per folio. The script is Nepālākṣara. The manuscript is damaged. A few folios are illegible because the letters are rubbed off. The manuscript is incomplete. It begins with the words (*dvijihvā*)t *padaracanāyāṃ bhayaṃ bhavati* (2r) which is a part of the second introductory verse of the *Subantarātnākara*. The manuscript ends with the derivation of the word *prasū*: *prasūḥ | prasvau | prasvaḥ | ityādīḥ | (...)* (46r5). The foliation consists of letter numerals written in the left-hand margin as well as numerals in the right-hand margin of the verso side. On some folios, the numerals are not visible either due to the rubbing off of *akṣaras* or the physical damage to the folio. The last folio (46v) preserves two inscriptions: *idaṃ sustakaṃ (! pustakaṃ) idaṃ pustakaṃ, ra 523, kātantraṭīkāyāṃ* (..). A close scrutiny of the exposures belonging to the *Amarakośa* ('b' above) revealed that images 7924b, 7925a, 7926b and 7927a are, in fact, the exposures of two folios of the *Subantarātnākara*, which correspond to folios 24v6–25r7, and 25v4–26r1 of B 35–23 (NAK 4/148). These folios contain the declensions of the words *jāyā, jarā, and niśā*. After the analysis of these two folios, I came to the conclusion that these are the missing folios 37 and 38 of the present manuscript of the *Subantarātnākara* (Kesar 523e). Thus, we now have a text of the *Subantarātnākara* including folios 2–32, 34, 36–38, 40, 42–43, and 46.

5. **Kesar 582 (Reel No. C 54-7 and C 55-1) (= C 102-39)** (33.1 × 4.5 cm) is a palm-leaf manuscript containing 118 folios with 5 lines per folio. The script is Nepālākṣara. The manuscript is damaged. Some folios are partially rubbed off while others suffer from the spreading of ink. At many places one image is partly imposed upon another. The manuscript is complete. Before the benedictory verse paying homage to Śākyamuni Buddha, we can read the *akṣaras -devāya*. Folios 117r4–117v2 contain three concluding verses, the final rubric to the text<sup>12</sup> (117v2–3) as well as the colophon<sup>13</sup> (117v3–118r2). According to the colophon, the scribe's name was Māṇikarāja. He copied this manuscript during the reign of king Śrījyotimalla, i.e. Jayajyotirmalla (1408–1428). The folios have double foliation: letter-numerals in the left-hand margin and numerals in the right-hand margin. The year of the copy is Nepāla Saṃvat 533, which corresponds to 1413 CE. After the colophon, there are three folios, the contents of which are unclear.

Apart from these manuscripts from Nepal, one manuscript of the *Subantaratnākara* is preserved in the Cambridge University Library (Or.148).<sup>14</sup>

6. **Or.148 (31 × 5 cm)** is a palm-leaf manuscript containing 89 folios with 5 lines per folio. It is written in the Nepālākṣara. The first and the ninth folios of this manuscript are missing. The manuscript begins with *kīrtitāḥ | tatrāḍau tāvad vipraśabdāt* (2r). It ends with the three concluding verses (88r3–6), the final rubric to the text,<sup>15</sup> and colophon.<sup>16</sup> The foliation consists of letter-numerals written in the left-hand margin and of numerals in the right-hand margin of the verso side of a folio. The manuscript, which is dated Nepāla Saṃvat 540 (= 1420 CE), was copied by a certain Buddhist monk Dharmaraṣika (sic!) in the Śrīṣaḍakṣarīmahāvihāra in

12 *kṛtir iyaṃ subhūticandrasya | granthapramāṇam asya sahasra 1 śata 4 grantha 30 |*

13 *bhīmasyāpi bhaved gaṅge vyāsasya mativibhramah | yathā dṛṣṭan tathā likhitam lekhako nāsti doṣakaḥ | vahnau vahnau hi vānābde māse phālguṇa(!)kṛṣṇake | tithau (..)dābhīdhāne (.. ..) rīṣebhe śe (..) sūte | rājādhīrā(ja)parameśvaradevamūle vidyākālāśa(!)kalanītisuveeditasya | (.. ..) śa(!)kālāśāstrapraveditata(..)śrījyotimallanṛpate khalu liyato (!)[']yam | saṃlikhyate māṇikarāja iti prasiddho mātāpitāsahita(..)āmramake nivāsaḥ | śāstrisuvala(.. ..)guṇiṇām pra(.. ..) jñānarucirapadanṛmālm | śubham astu jagatām |*

14 I am thankful to Vincenzo Vergiani for bringing this manuscript to my notice.

15 *kṛtir iyaṃ paṇḍitasthāvirasubhūticandrasyaḥ (!) | granthapramāṇa (!) sahasra 1 śata 4 grantha 30 | iti subaṃtagrantha(h) saṃpūrṇa(h) | (89r6-89v1)*

16 *bhagnaprṣṭ(h)akati(!)grīvaṃ (!) taptadṛstir (!) adhomukhaṃ | kastena (!) likhitam śāstram jīvatat pratipālayet | nepālahāyanaḥ samvat 540 bhād(r)apadaśukla(2)pañcamyān titho (!) budhavāśa(!)re svātinakṣatre brahmayoge | rājādhīrājaparamēśvaraparamabhaṭṭārakaḥ śrīmat-māneśvarāva(!) pa)ralabdhaprasā(!)ādaśrīśrījayajyotimalladevasya (3) vijayarājye | śrīmad-gaṅgūlapatanake śrībaṭakṣarīmahāvīhāre śrīśrīśrīlokeśvaraścaraṇasevitabhīksunā (!) dharmaraṣikena (!) svapustakaṃ likhitam śubham astu | (4) sarvvajagatāḥ (!) | (89v1–4).*

the reign of the king Jayajyotirmalla. After the colophon, on folio 90, we find the following stray scribbles related to grammar:

(fol. 90r) *āgamo* (‘) *nupaghātī syād ādeśas copamardakaḥ* |  
*pratyayaḥ paradekaś* (!) *ca upasargaś ca pūrvagaḥ* ||  
*kriyā karttā tataḥ karma paścād vai kārakāntaram* |  
*yojaneṣām* (!) (2) *tu vijñeye* (!) *gadeṣu* (!) *ca padeṣu ca* ||  
*saṃjñā ca paribhāṣā ca vidhir niyama eva ca* |  
*pratiśedho* (‘) *dhikāraś ca ṣaḍvidhaṃ sūtralakṣaṇam* ||  
(90v) *mahān uttamaḥ vṛhan vi(sta)ra vṛṣan mṛga*  
*dau* (!) *nañau ca samākyotau* (!) *pratyudāśaprasajyakau* (!) |  
*pratyudāśa* (!) *sadr̥ggrāhi prasajyas tu niṣedhakaḥ* ||

This manuscript was purchased by Prof. Bendall during his 1898–99 tour in Nepal (see Formigatti’s contribution in this volume).

### 3 Tibetan Translations of the *Subantarātnākara* (Tibetan: *Sup’i mtha’ rin chen ’byung gnas*)

While working on the *Kavikāmadhenu*, I had already searched through the Tibetan Tanjur for any other translated work of Subhūticandra. However, that was in vain. Now, with the availability of the titles of his works and so much manuscripts material at hand, it became possible to search the Tibetan Tanjur once again. The Sna Tshogs section of the Derge edition preserves an incomplete translation of the *Subantarātnākara*.<sup>17</sup> The translation bears the title *Sup’i mtha’ rin chen ’byung gnas zhes bya ba Supadmākarānāma* (sic! *Subantarātnākaranāma*). The text abruptly ends while explaining the derivation of the word *veman*, which belongs to the second section dealing with masculine nouns ending in consonants.

In volume tha of the collected works of Si tu Paṅ chen (1699?–1774) there is a complete translation of the *Subantarātnākara*. It consists of 68 folios. According to the colophon found in this revised translation, the size of the text is 1420 ślokas and its author is Pa ṅḍi ta chen po gnas brtan zla ba (\*Mahāpaṅḍitasthviracandra?).<sup>18</sup> We are further informed that the canonical translation was done by Chos kyi rgyal

<sup>17</sup> Derge: no. 4430, Fol. 122b<sup>3</sup>–134a<sup>6</sup>; Peking: Vol. 149, Mdo-ḥgrel, Ņo-tshar, 5894, 446b7–460b1.

<sup>18</sup> *sup’i mtha’ rin chen ’byung gnas zhes bya ba ’di ni paṅḍi ta chen po gnas brtan zla bas mdzad pa’o* || (fol. 68r3) ‘This (treatise) entitled “Source of jewels” (on the derivation of forms) ending in a sUP (suffix) has been written by the great scholar Gnas-brtan-zla-ba [\*Sthaviracandra?].’ (Verhagen 2001, 134).

mtshan dpal bzang po.<sup>19</sup> The title page of the scanned copy of the text available on the website of the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center erroneously records the translator as Zhwa lu lo tsā ba Chos skyong bzang po.<sup>20</sup> According to Verhagen (2001, 132), this revised translation was done by Si tu Paṅ chen. However, from the reading of the colophon, I understand that it is not Si tu paṅ chen who actually revised the work himself, but rather it was Yon tan rgya mtsho who corrected the canonical translation as far as possible following the instructions of Si tu paṅ chen.<sup>21</sup> Be lo has also provided important assistance in the entire process of revising the earlier translation.<sup>22</sup> Karma Tshe dbang kun khyab prepared the printing blocks of the text in the monastery of Dpal spungs thub bstan chos 'khor gling. Talking about the awful state of the canonical translation, Yon tan rgya mtsho remarks that it suffers from 'very great errors of translation and at intervals there were some gaps remaining and also [widely diffused =] throughout (the work) there was a multitude of orthographical errors.'<sup>23</sup> (Verhagen 2001, 135). About his own corrections, Yon tan rgya mtsho says:

If one [could] find an Indian manuscript [of this text] it would be possible to make the final corrections, but as [I] did not [manage to] find [one], [I] did not have the means to do so (...?).

---

**19** *de ltar brda sprod pa tsa ndra pa'i sup mtha' rin chen 'byung gnas 'di lo tsā bā chos kyi rgyal mtshan dpal bzang pos bod skad du bsgyur pa la 'gyur ...* (fol. 68r4). 'The preceding (treatise), this sUB-anta-ratnākara, belonging to the Cāndra (system of) grammar, had been translated into Tibetan by the translator Chos-kyi-rgyal-mtshan(-dpal-bzañ-po).' (Verhagen 2001, 134). Verhagen (2001, 134, n. 538) says that this translator is 'thus far unidentified.'

**20** www.tbrc.org.

**21** 'jam mgon bla ma'i gsung gi legs bshad ltar legs par bcos shing rje'i tsa na ṭig chen mo'i yan lag zhabs 'degs su dpal spungs thub bstan chos 'khor gling gi chos grar par du bkod pa'i byed pa po ni ka rma tshe dbang kun khyab ces pa'i da ri dra yis so || ... *slad du'ang skyabs rje'i bka' ltar yon tan rgya mtsho bdag gis zhu dag lam tsam bgyis mod* | 'According to the aphorisms of the words of 'Jam-mgon-bla-ma [i.e. Si-tu Paṅ-chen] these (errors) have been corrected. And as [lit. a foot-support, i.e. an aid scil. for interpretation] auxilliary to the great ṭikā on Cāndra by the master [i.e. Si-tu Paṅ-chen] printing blocks [of the present text] have been prepared in the monastery of Dpal-spuñs Thub-bstan-chos-'khor-gliñ by Karma Tshe-dbañ-kun-khyab. ... Again, in accordance with the words of the master who is our refuge, I, Yon-tan-rgya-mtsho, have roughly made corrections.' (Verhagen 2001, 135)

**22** *gzhi nas 'gyur skyon che zhiṅ dpe ngan rgyun 'byams mang ba'i thog | par 'di'i ma dpe ma dag che ba la 'be lo kyang zhib cha mdzad grub 'dug cing* | 'But, as there were great errors in the initial translation [or: great fundamental errors in the translation] and a great multitude of bad [i.e. erroneous] examples [in the translation], while moreover grave corruptions [had entered] the original copy of this xylograph, 'Be-lo has also thoroughly worked through [the text].' (Verhagen 2001, 135)

**23** *skyon shin tu che zhiṅ bar skabs 'gar hol khong 'ga' re las 'dug pa dang | yig nor rgyun 'byams yang ches mang bar 'dug pa nams |*

[Therefore?] [I] have made the corrections that were certain [i.e. evidently necessary] in accordance with the contents of the basic texts on grammar.<sup>24</sup> (Verhagen 2001, 136)

## 4 About the text of the *Subantarātnākara*

### Benediction

The benedictory verse of the *Subantarātnākara* pays homage to Śākyamuni Buddha:

*maināke hariṇā svakuṣivasater ādāya toyākarāt  
kṣipte kokanadībhavatsmaracamūśastrapratichhāyayā |  
yaṃ devendram iva pratītya saruṣaṃ {vy}āvarttamāne (‘mānair ?) bhayāt  
bodhau mārabhaṭaiḥ palāyitam asau śākyo muniḥ pātu vah ||* (fol. 1v1–2) (Metre: Śārdūla-  
vikriḍita)

The exact meaning of this verse is not clear. It seems to refer to the event of Śākyamuni Buddha’s fight with Māra’s army just before the enlightenment. Here is a tentative translation of the verse, which certainly needs revision:

May this Śākyamuni protect us whom the withdrawing army of Māra considered like the angry king of gods and fled out of fear at the time of enlightenment, when Hari took mount Maināka from the ocean, in whose womb he had made (his) own residence, (and) hurled it as a return cast (*pratichhāyayā*) of those weapons of troops of the god of love (*smaracamū*), which turned into red water-lilies (*kokanadībhavat*).<sup>25</sup>

I was unable to find a similar mythological reference about mount Maināka in the Sanskrit literature. There is one reference in Kṣemendra’s *Daśāvatāracarita*:

<sup>24</sup> *rgya dpe rnyed na zhu dag dpyis phyin nus par ’dug kyang ma rnyed pas bya thabs bral sgra gzhung nams kyi bstan don bzhin sngar las dag nges su bcos yod do ||*

<sup>25</sup> I am thankful to Harunaga Isaacson (email correspondence dated 15/7/2015 and 30/12/2016) for suggesting this translation, which is so far the best translation one can offer. He suggests reading *kokanadībhavat*<sup>2</sup> as one compound, without which ‘it will be impossible (or nearly so) to construe the verse at all.’ He drew my attention to a verse in the *Buddhacarita* (13.42): *tadbodhi-mūle pravikīryamāṇam aṅgāravaraṣaṃ tu savisphuliṅgam | maitrīvihārād ṛṣisattamasya babhūva raktopalapattravaraṣaḥ ||*. Here the weapons of Māra, in the form of a rain of coals with sparks, turn into red-*utpala* petals. About the image in the second half, Isaacson suggests: ‘[w]hen Maināka is thrown by Hari, the army thinks that the Buddha is the lord of the gods (Indra, being defended by Hari = Upendra), and flees.’ In my opinion, this is a brilliant innovative explanation, which I accept thankfully.

*mānāya mainākam athārṇavena viśrāntaye ratnagirim viśṛṣṭam |  
kareṇa saṃsprṛṣya sa laṅghitābdir laṅkākaśailasya taṭe papāta || (7.190)*

Here the ocean is said to have sent forth the mount Maināka with jewel peaks for Hanumān to rest on it. Hanumān touched the mountain with his hand and, having crossed the ocean, landed on another mountain on the shore of Laṅkā. This story originally occurs in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (5.56.8ff). However, these references do not match with the present narrative.

## Purpose

The benedictory verse is followed by a verse that explains the purpose of the *Sub-antaratnākara*:

*santy eva nātra sudhiyām kim u supprabandhās  
te kin tu vistaratayālpadhiyām agamyāḥ |  
tatsāraleśam apagrhya tataḥ kṛto [']yam  
avyāsataḥ smaraṇamātraphale [']bhyupāyaḥ || (1v2–3) (Metre: Vasantatilaka)*

Is it not the case that here indeed exist compositions about *sup-[anta]s* composed by excellent scholars? However, due to the sheer vastness (of these texts), they are difficult to understand for those who are of limited intelligence (*alpadhis*). (Therefore,) after taking the essence of those texts, this (work) is composed as an excellent means (for achieving) the goal of mere memorization without being verbose.

Thus, the text is a pedagogic guide meant for beginners, which would help them in learning the vast ocean of declensions of nouns and adjectives (*subantas*), as the name of the text suggests.

The author's confidence in the merits of his own composition is evident in the next verse:

*mama parapadāvicālitaḥ  
sadvidyopāsanaikanipūnasya |  
kṛśam api kuto dvijihvāt  
padaracanāyām bhayaṃ bhavati || (fol. 1v2–3) (Metre: Āryā)*

With respect to (this) composition, for a person like me, who does not fall down from the highest (spiritual) position and is extremely skilled in good lore (of taming snakes like the *jāṅgulividyā*), from whence can there be even a little fear of a slanderer who is like a double-tongued snake?

This verse speaks of the author's higher spiritual attainments. The intended pun on the words *parapada*, *sadvidyā*, and *dvijihva* is worth noting. These three verses are testimonies to the author's poetic skills.

## Contents

Next comes a verse explaining the contents of the Subantarātnākara:

*rūḍhiśabdā nigadyante puṃsi śaṅḍhe striyām api |*  
*guṇadravyakriyāyogā[s] triliṅgās tadanantaram ||*<sup>26</sup> (fol. 1v4) (Metre: Anuṣṭubh)

Words that convey their meaning by usage (i.e. conventional words) are enumerated in the masculine, in the neuter, (and) also in the feminine. Thereafter (follow those words,) which have three genders and are associated (either) with the quality, the substance, or the action (that is to say, qualifying words).

Each of these sections is further sub-divided into nouns ending in vowels and consonants. There are two more sections, which are not mentioned in this verse. These are of pronouns and numerals. It seems that for the author they are included in the section dealing with qualifying nouns (*triliṅgas*). Thus, altogether there are six sections:

1. The masculine nouns ending in:
  - a. vowels<sup>27</sup> (fols 1v5–11v5)
  - b. consonants<sup>28</sup> (fols 11v5–20r5)
2. The neuter nouns ending in
  - a. vowels<sup>29</sup> (fols 20r5–22v1)
  - b. consonants<sup>30</sup> (fols 22v1–24v2)
3. The feminine nouns ending in

<sup>26</sup> The NGMCP records a text entitled *Syādyantakoṣa* (A 54–3) of unknown authorship. Just as the *Subantarātnākara*, it deals with nominal declensions following the Kātantra system of grammar. Interestingly, this text, after its benedictory verse, also contains this and the next verse, namely, *rūḍhiśabdā nigadyante ... and viprāgnī*<sup>27</sup>. According to the NGMCP, '[t]his text, styled *Syādyantaprakriyā* [Si la sogs pa'i mtha'i bya ba, Derge 4287] and attributed to a certain Mañju(śrī)kīrti or Mañjughoṣakīrti [']am dpal grags pa], is equally following the Kātantra system and might very well be the translation of the original Sanskrit version preserved on (sic!) A 54/3.'

<sup>27</sup> *uktāḥ puṃsy ajantāḥ |* (fol. 11v5)

<sup>28</sup> *uktā ajantā halantās ca puṃsi saviśeṣāḥ | pulaliṅga(!)kāṅḍaḥ prathamah samāptaḥ |* (fol. 20r5)

<sup>29</sup> *idānīm napuṃsakaliṅgā ucyante |* (fol. 20r5–6)

<sup>30</sup> *halantā ucyante |* (fol. 22v1), *napuṃsakakāṅḍo dvitīyaḥ samāptaḥ |* fol. (24v2–3)

- a. vowels<sup>31</sup> (fols 24v3–33r3)
- b. consonants<sup>32</sup> (fols 33r3–37r4–5)
4. Adjectives ending in
  - a. vowels<sup>33</sup> (fols 37r5–44r6)
  - b. consonants<sup>34</sup> (fols 44r6–61v1)
5. Pronouns<sup>35</sup> (fols 61v1–72v4)
6. Numerals (fols 72v4–76v5)

### Method of explanation

Each of these sections begins with a list of words to be dealt with in that particular section. Cf. for instance, the beginning of the first section dealing with masculine nouns ending in vowels:

*viprāgnisakhipatyamśukroṣṭṛpratibhuvah pitā |  
nā praśāstā ca raigāvau puṁsy ajantāḥ prakīrtitāḥ || (1v4–5) (Metre: Anuṣṭubh)*

In the masculine, (nouns) ending in vowels (such as) *vipra*, *agni*, *sakhi*, *pati*, *aṁśu*, *kroṣṭṛ*, *pratibhū*, *pitṛ*, *nṛ*, *praśāstṛ*, *rai*, and *gau* are explained.

The order within each of these sections is alphabetical, that is to say, nouns are arranged according to their last vowel or consonant.

After this list, the noun under discussion is mentioned. For instance, at the beginning of the section dealing with masculine nouns ending in vowels, we find:

*tatrādau tāvad vipraśabdāt ... (fol. 1v5)*

There, at the outset, after the noun *vipra* ...

Many a time, the author provides a derivation of these nouns. For instance, cf. the derivation of the word *hāhā* (fols 3v7–4r1):

*ādanto gandharvvanāma hāhāśabdaḥ | heti kṛtvā jahāti | hāhā | ‘kv(i)b-vic-manip-kvanip-vani-paḥ’ iti vic | cakāraḥ sāmānyagrahaṇārthaḥ | “ikāro ‘ver anaca’ iti cihnārthaḥ”<sup>36</sup> vakāra-syānenaiva lopah | ‘kārakaṁ bah(u)lam’ iti samāsaḥ |*

31 *idāniṁ strīliṅgā ucyante* | (fol. 24v3), *uktāḥ striyām ajantāḥ* | (fol. 33r2–3)

32 *halantā ucyante* | (fol. 33r3), *strīliṅgakāṇḍas tṛtīyaḥ samāptaḥ* | (fol. 37r4–5)

33 *idāniṁ vācyaliṅgā ucyante* | (fol. 37r5), *uktā ajantāḥ* | (fol. 44r6)

34 *uktā halantāḥ* | (fol. 61v1)

35 *idāni(ṁ) sarvādaya ucyante* | (fol. 61v1), *uktāḥ sarvādayaḥ* | (fol. 72v4)

36 Cf. CVṛ on CV 1.2.53: *ikāro ver anaca (5.1.64) iti cihnārthaḥ*.

The noun *hāhā* ending in the vowel *ā* is the name of a *gandharva* ‘celestial musician’. (He is called) *hāhā* (because) he leaves by making (the sound) *hā*. (The suffix) *vic* (is added by the rule) *kvibvicmanipkvanipvanipaḥ* (CV 1.2.53). The (indicatory letter) *c* (in the suffix *vic*) is for the sake of common reference. The (vowel) *i* is for the sake of marking it distinctly (as in the rule) *ver anacaḥ* (CV 5.1.64). The (phoneme) *v* is elided by this very (rule). The compound (*hāhā*) (is formed by the rule): *kāraḥ bahulam* (CV 2.2.16).

The author then proceeds to derive various declensions of that particular noun. For this, he relies on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*. Cf. for instance, the derivational procedure for various declensions of the masculine noun *hāhā* ending in the vowel *ā*:

*svādayaḥ* | *so rutvavisarggau* | *hāhāḥ* | ‘*prathamayor aci*’ iti *dirghatvasya* ‘*dirghāj jasi ca*’ iti *pratiṣedhe ākāraukārayor* ‘*eci*’ ity *aūkārah* | *hāhau* | *adantayor* ‘*ako*’ ki *dirghaḥ*’ | *hāhāḥ* | (fol. 4r1–4)

(The case terminations) *su* etc.<sup>37</sup> (The suffix) *su* is replaced by *ru* (which is further substituted by) *visarga*. (Thus, the nominative singular form) *hāhāḥ* (is derived). When the lengthening (of the vowel) by the (application of the rule) *prathamayor aci* (CV 5.1.109) is prohibited (by the rule) *dirghāj jasi ca* (CV 5.1.112), (the substitution of the vowel) *au* in the place of (the vowels) *ā* and *au* (together) (takes place) by the rule *eci* (CV 5.1.84). (Thus, the nominative dual form) *hāhau* (is derived). Both *a* (which is the initial letter of the suffix *as*) and the final letter (of the noun *hāhā*, i.e. *ā*) are substituted by the long (vowel) (by the rule) *ako* ‘*ki dirghaḥ*’ (CV 5.1.106). (Thus, the nominative plural form) *hāhāḥ* (is derived).

## Authorities

The author of the *Subantarātnākara* appears to be an erudite scholar well versed in various genres of Sanskrit literature. This is evident from occasional citations scattered in his work. Noteworthy is his expertise in the Cāndra grammatical tradition. He cites not only from the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* but also from its commentarial literature, such as the works of Ratnamati (fols 17v5–7, 17v6, 21v4, 27r5 and 28v4), and Pūrṇacandra (fols 21v4, 28v4 and 47r3). Apart from these two authorities, the author has also cited from ‘verses on gender by the master [i.e. Candragomin?]’ (67r7) (Verhagen 2001, 134). At times, he also refers to the other two important grammatical traditions, namely, the Pāṇinian and the Kātantra (51v4). From the former, he has cited Maitreyarakṣita and Puruṣottamadeva’s *Bhāṣāvṛtti* (35v5, 39v6). At a few places, we find citations from the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* (37v5). At one place, the author has

37 Cf. *svaujasamauṭchaṣṭābhyāmbhisnebhyāmbhyasāsibhyāmbhyasāsosāmīyos sup* (CV 2.1.1).

cited from a hitherto unknown text called *Yid bzhin nor bu'i bstod pa'i rgya cher 'grel* (\**Cintāmaṇistutiṭīkā*) composed by a certain Śākya'i blo gros (18r4).<sup>38</sup>

### Concluding verses

The text concludes with three verses:

*iti ghaṭitam idaṃ mayā s(uvarṇṇaiḥ  
sulalīta)*<sup>39</sup>*kṣaṇaratnabhūṣitaṃ ca |  
sravasi (!) vinihitaṃ dhṛtaṃ ca kaṅṭhe  
śiśumukhamaṇḍalamaṇḍanaṃ dadhātu ||* (Metre: Puṣpitaḡrā)

Thus, with gold-like excellent letters, I have fashioned this (ornament-like treatise), which is decorated with jewels of extremely charming marks in the form of very beautiful jewel-like aphorisms. When put on ears and wore around the neck by way of paying an (attentive) ear and learning it by heart may it decorate the face of children.

*aye kumārā vibudhaśriyaṃ parā(ṃ)  
d(rutaṃ bhavanto yadi labdhum icchava)*<sup>40</sup>*ḥ |  
punaḥ punaḥś (!) cintanamantarāḍiṇā (! °mandarāḍriṇā)  
subantaratnākara eṣa mathyatām ||* (Metre: Vaṃśastha)

O young men! If you want to achieve quickly the divine glory, that is to say, the fame of a learned person, then (you) should churn again and again this ocean of nouns (ending in a SUP suffix), that is to say, the treatise *Subantaratnākara*, with the mount Mandara of (your) contemplation.

*śubham abhavad idaṃ vidhāya yan me  
vacanarucā jaḡa(tas)*<sup>41</sup>*tamo nihatya |  
mihira iva tataḥ sadartharāśer  
aḡam upadarśayitā sadā bhaveyam ||* (fols 76v5–77r2) (Metre: Puṣpitaḡrā)

**38** Verhagen 2001, 134. Śākya'i blo (\*Śākyaobodhi) (!) is the author of *Āryadaśabhūmisūtra-nidānabhāṣya* (P 5500). He is also the author of the *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* (P 5718). Śākya'i blo gros (\*Śākyaamati) is the author of the *Āryagayāśirśasūtramiśrakavyākhyā* (P 5493).

**39** Since the folio of NAK 4/148 is damaged, this portion is supplied on the basis of Or 148 (89r3–4).

**40** *parāṃ drutaṃ bhavanto yadi labdhum icchavaḥ* (Kesar 582–1, 117r5). Since the folio of NAK 4/148 is damaged, this portion is supplied on the basis of Kesar 582. *padāṃ* (p.c.; *parā* (a.c.)) *druta bhavanto yadi labdhum icchavaḥ* (Or 148 (89r4–5))

**41** So reads Or 148 (89r5).

Whatever merit has occurred to me after composing this (ornament-like treatise), on account of that (merit), having destroyed the darkness (of ignorance) of the world with the light of words may I become one who always illuminates the heap of excellent things like the Sun.

### The issue of authorship

Neither in the introductory nor in the concluding verses of the *Subantarātnākara* we come across the name of the author of this text. It appears only in the colophon:

*ḳṛtir iyaṁ paṇḍitasthāvirasubhūticandrasya* | (fol. 77r2)

This is a composition of the scholar-monk Subhūticandra.

Not a single final rubric mentions either the name of the text or its author. The two commentaries on the *Subantarātnākara* (discussed below) ascribe this text to Subhūticandra. The colophon of the Tibetan translation records the author of this text as Pa ṅḍi ta chen po gnas brtan zla ba (\*Mahāpaṇḍitasthāviracandra).<sup>42</sup> Although Verhagen (2001, 135, n. 542), while discussing the Tibetan translation of the *Subantarātnākara*, mentions that ‘in the introductory section [of his commentary on the Cāndra grammar], Si-tu enumerates the many grammatical treatises he investigated, including a sUBanta-ratnākara by Subhūti (su-bhū-tis-mdzad-pa’i-sup-mtha’-rin-’byuñ, vol. 1 fol. 6v3)’, he does not seem to conjecture that Pa ṅḍi ta chen po gnas brtan zla ba should, in fact, point to Pa ṅḍi ta chen po gnas brtan [Rab ’byor] zla ba (\*Mahāpaṇḍitasthāvirā[Subhūti]candra). The facts that a) the three Sanskrit manuscripts in which the end of the text is preserved unequivocally mention Subhūticandra as the author of the text, and b) the Tibetan translation of the *Subantarātnākara* matches with these Sanskrit manuscripts prove the identity of Gnas brtan zla ba and Sthāvira Subhūticandra beyond any doubt.

The question whether Subhūticandra, the author of the *Subantarātnākara*, is the same as the author of the *Kavikāmadhenu*, however, needs further consideration. Unfortunately, I have not come across any reference to the *Subantarātnākara* in later works. In spite of that, the following external evidence is worth considering. As mentioned above, Subhūticandra, the author of the *Kavikāmadhenu*, had a scholarly command over all the three important Sanskrit grammatical traditions.

<sup>42</sup> *sup’i mtha’ rin chen ’byung gnas zhes bya ba ’di ni paṇḍi ta chen po gnas brtan zla bas mdzad pa’o* || ‘This (treatise) entitled “Source of jewels” (on the derivation of forms) ending in a sUP (suffix) has been written by the great scholar Gnas-brtan-zla-ba [\*Sthāviracandra?].’ (Verhagen 2001, 134)

There are at least 288 citations from as many as 53 grammatical texts in his commentary. Pa tshab lo tsā ba has referred to Subhūticandra as a scholar of grammar (van der Kuijp 2009, 8). This statement would make more sense if we accept that the same author had composed a grammatical work.

Besides this, there are internal evidences, which prove the identity of both the authors. From the benedictory verses of both these texts paying homage to the Buddha, it is clear that their author was a Buddhist.<sup>43</sup> Both these benedictions express a wish that the Buddha may protect and bestow his grace on the mankind.

As I have shown in the introduction to the critical edition of the *Kavikāmadhenu* (2014, 58–61), this commentary was composed sometime between 1110 and 1130 CE. It is interesting to note that the latest authority referred to in the *Kavikāmadhenu* as well as in the *Subantarātnākara* is Puruṣottamadeva, who, according to Vogel (2015, 53), flourished in the first half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Thus, both the texts share the same lower limit. In this connection, it is worthwhile to note that in the *Kavikāmadhenu*, Subhūticandra has referred to many grammatical texts and authorities while deriving a particular word. However, despite being an important text in the Cāndra tradition, there is not a single reference to the *Subantarātnākara* or its author. As far as I have studied the manuscript material, there is no reference to the *Kavikāmadhenu* in the *Subantarātnākara*. This evidence, though negative, is important, as it at least does not prove the antithesis.

---

**43** The initial portion of the original Sanskrit text of the *Kavikāmadhenu* is missing. I have attempted at translating the Sanskrit behind the not always correct Tibetan rendering of Si tu's Tibetan translation of these verses (1b–3b):

*sa chen po yi rtser gshegs shing || rdzu 'phrul 'dab ldan bdud rtsi brnyes || thams cad mkhyen pa'i dpag bsam shing || khyod la me tog 'bras dud shog || gang gi thugs rje lam gsum 'gro || mtho ris las 'bab ga ngā bzhin || dpal mtsho bdud rtsi'i gter srid pa'i || zla phyed rab sbyin der bdag 'dud || srid pa'i mtsho chen sgrol bar byed pa chos kyi gru || snying rje'i dpag bsam ljon pa'i shing las grub khyod kyis || rab dangs sems kyi tshogs chen skya bas rab bskul nas || pha rol phyin te mngon 'dod rin chen thob par mdzod || 'May the Wish-Fulfilling Tree, the Omniscient one (the Buddha), standing at the summit of the great bhūmis (i.e. who has attained all the stages of a Bodhisattva), endowed with the leaves of supernatural powers, and has attained immortal state (nirvāṇa) bend down for you with its flowers and fruits. I bow unto him whose compassion, like the river Ganga that originated from heaven, has gone three ways, who is an ocean of prosperity, and the reservoir of immortality, and dispeller of worldly existence. May you reach the other shore and acquire the most desired jewel (of enlightenment) by the ship, the Dharma (teachings) carrying one across the great ocean of worldly existence, which has been accomplished from the Wish-Fulfilling Tree of compassion; being propelled by the great multitude of the oarsmen with a perfectly serene mind.' (Deokar Lata 2014, 97, 301). For the benedictory verse of the *Subantarātnākara*, cf. the section on the benediction.*

In the *Kavikāmadhenu*, the principal grammatical authority for Subhūticandra is Candragomin's grammatical aphorisms and the Cāndra grammatical lineage. In the same way, the *Subantarātnākara* is also based upon the Cāndra grammatical tradition. Both these works draw upon common authorities such as the grammarians Maitreyarākṣita, Puruṣottamadeva, and Śārvavarman, the lexicographers Rudradāsa and Rudra, and literary works like the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* and the *\*Cintāmaṇi-stuṭiṭīkā*.

There are a number of passages in the *Kavikāmadhenu* and the *Subantarātnākara* that show a close affinity. Two instances may be cited in this regard:

i. *sarvo 'nayā lakṣaṇīyaḥ syād iti lakṣmīḥ | 'lakṣer muṭ ca' iti ipratyayaḥ | (lakṣmī, AK I.1.27, Deokar Lata 2014, 143)*

(She is called) Lakṣmī since Sarva, that is, Lord Viṣṇu is to be marked by her. The suffix *ī* (is added) by the rule *lakṣer muṭ ca* (Cāndra Uṇādi 1.89)

*sarvo 'nayā lakṣaṇīyaḥ syād iti lakṣe(r) muṭ ceti ... (lakṣmī, Subantarātnākara, NAK 4/148, 27r2)*

(She is called) Lakṣmī since Sarva, that is, Lord Viṣṇu is to be marked by her. Thus, by the rule *lakṣer muṭ ca* (Cāndra Uṇādi 1.89) ...

ii. *niśyati tanūkaroti sarvavyāpāram | 'ātaḥ prādībhyaḥ' iti kaḥ | (niśā, AK I.4.4a, Deokar Lata 2014, 284)*

(She is called *niśā* since) she reduces, i.e., lessens all the activities. (The suffix) *ka* (is added by the rule) *ātaḥ prādībhyaḥ* (CV 1.1.142).

*niśyati tanūkaroti sarvavyāpāram ity 'ātaḥ prādībhyaḥ' iti kaḥ | (niśā, Subantarātnākara, NAK 4/148, 25v3)*

She reduces, i.e., lessens all the activities. (The suffix) *ka* (is added by the rule) *ātaḥ prādībhyaḥ* (CV 1.1.142).

From the literary point of view, the opening verses of the *Kavikāmadhenu* and the opening and the concluding verses of the *Subantarātnākara* exhibit a special liking for *śliṣṭarūpakas*. The following two verses from the *Kavikāmadhenu* and the *Subantarātnākara* are worth considering from the stylistic point of view:

*Kavikāmadhenu:*

I will prepare in the manner of decoration and accomplishment (*rab tu sgrub byed cho ga*) this well-arranged 'Necklace of the Wise Ones' using this treasure (lexicon), which is full of word-

jewels gathered from the infinite ocean of treatises, with the help of the excellent strings (*sūtras* ‘aphorisms’) of the illustrious Candragomin.<sup>44</sup>

### *Subantarātnākara:*

Thus, with gold-like excellent letters I have fashioned this (ornament-like treatise), which is decorated with jewels of extremely charming marks in the form of very beautiful jewel-like aphorisms. When put on ears and wore around neck by way of paying an (attentive) ear and learning it by heart may it decorate the neck of children.<sup>45</sup>

In these verses, the author is talking about his own composition. Their parallel structure is quite striking. In both the texts, the composition is compared to an ornament decorated with jewels. Similarly, there is a pun on the words *sūtra* and *lakṣaṇa* while referring to the aphorisms of the Cāndra grammar.

It is quite unlikely that two persons bearing the same name flourished around the same period and had so much in common. Hence, in all likelihood, one and the same Subhūticandra composed both the treatises. In the concluding verse of the *Subantarātnākara*, the author expresses his wish to become an illuminator of a heap of good meanings. This may well be taken as an indirect reference to the composition of the *Kavikāmadhenu*, which, being a commentary on the *Amarakośa*, actually clarifies the meanings of the words occurring in it. This might be an indication that Subhūticandra first composed a comparatively simpler text in the form of the *Subantarātnākara* and then at a mature age wrote the *Kavikāmadhenu*, which is much profound than the former.

## 5 Commentarial literature

The *Subantarātnākara* was commented upon at least twice. The first reference to its commentary is found in a collection of 1820 entitled ‘Hodgson’s Private Papers at the British Library’. The corresponding entry reads as follows:

44 *mtha' yas gzhung lugs rgya mtsho'i mngon brjod rin chen gang || mdzod 'dis mkhas pa'i mgrin pa'i do shal nam bkod pa || dpal ldan tsa ndra go mis byas pa'i mdo mchog gis || de ni rab tu sgrub byed cho ga sbyar bar bgyi ||* (Deokar Lata 2014, 302).

45 *iti ghaṭitam idaṃ mayā s(uvarṇṇaiḥ sulalitā)kṣaṇaratnabhūṣitaṃ ca | sravasi (!) vinihitam dhṛtaṃ ca kaṅṭhe śīsumukhamāṇḍalamaṇḍanaṃ dadhātu ||* (*Subantarātnākara*, NAK 4/148, 76v 5–6).

[t]he manuscript is written on machine-made paper. Colophon of a commentary on a Buddhist scripture known as Suvantarātnākara of Subhūticandra written by Pandit Abhayaraj during the reign of King Yaksha Malla of Nepalmandala (c. 1428–1482).

The said manuscript is neither found in the Hodgson’s collection nor listed in the catalogue of the NGMCP. The second reference to a commentary on the *Subantarātnākara* is found in Hara Prasad Shastri’s catalogue of the palm-leaf manuscripts belonging to the Durbar library, Nepal. Shastri (1905, 128) has described the manuscript as:

1076 | kha | Rūpasāadhanam. By Subhūticandra. 10 × 1½ inches. Folia, 96. Lines, 6 on a page. Extent, 2160 çlokas. Character, Newāri. Date, (?). Appearance, old. Prose. Incorrect. Beginning. Om namo vāgiśvarāya |

*natvā śivaṃ vidhuviriñcikaṅdravakraṃ  
vāgiśvarīṃ gurupadaṃ janakaṃ kaviñ ca |  
cetaḥ śīṣor jaḍaruḃāntakajāyū divyaṃ  
śrīrūpasāadhanavaraṃ vimalaṃ pravakṣye ||  
maināka ityādi | pātu rakṣatu kau(!)sau muniḥ sarvvākāreṇa sarvvapadārthānāṃ yathāvad  
bodhanātmanāṃ muniḥ | athavā akathyakathane maunayogān munir bhagavān samyaksam-  
buddhaḥ || kathambhūtaḥ | śākyaḥ śākeṣu bhavaḥ śākyaḥ | athavā śākyaśāpatyaṃ pautrādi-  
kaṃ śākyaḥ | ityādi |*

The *pratīkas* commented upon in this opening portion reveal beyond doubt that the *Rūpasādhana* is a commentary on the *Subantarātnākara*. Interestingly, the derivation of the word *muni* found in this commentary and in Subhūticandra’s *Kavikāmadhenu* is almost identical. Cf. the *Kavikāmadhenu* on the Buddha’s epithet *muni* (AK I.1.14):

*sarvvākāreṇa sarvvadharmāñāṃ mananād adharmāvavādeṣu vā maunān muniḥ |* (Deokar Lata 2014, 124)

However, from the benedictory verse, which pays homage to the lord Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahman, Gaṇeśa, Sarasvatī, teacher, father and poet, this does not appear to be the commentary written by Subhūticandra described by Shastri.

The manuscript of the *Rūpasādhana* appears to be incomplete. For, Shastri (1905, 128) further says:

End. *uktārtheyādi | un lopaḥ | akāreṇa sandhiḥ | manas śabdarūpasāadhanam | 62 ||  
hakāraḥakārāntāny aprasiddhāni ||  
Colophon. iti subhūticandramahākaver viracite supprakaraṇe napuṃsakakāṇḍāni dvitīyāni  
paricchadāni samāptāni (!) || (?)*

In the *Subantarātnākara*, the last neuter noun ending in a consonant is *vetas* and not *manas*. However, we do come across a comment in the *Subantarātnākara* at the end of the section dealing with the neuter nouns similar to the one mentioned above:

*hakāraḥ sakārāntā aprasiddhāḥ* | (*Subantarātnākara*, NAK 4/148, 24v2)

It is worthwhile to note that this manuscript mentions Subhūticandra as the author of the root text. However, the latter is called *Supprakaraṇa* instead of *Subantarātnākara*. This tendency of using a generic name instead of a specific one seems to be in vogue. I am particularly reminded of Subhūticandra's *Kavikāmadhenu*, which is mostly referred to as *Subhūtiṭikā*. (Deokar Lata 2014, 67). This is probably the first time where Subhūticandra is referred to as a great poet (Mahākavi). At other places, he is mentioned as a great monk-scholar (Mahāpaṇḍitasthavira).

Apart from the six manuscripts of the *Subantarātnākara* discussed above, there are six more manuscripts with the title *Subantarātnākara*. Out of these, four are listed by the NGMCP, and one each by the Cambridge University Library and the Durbar library:

**1. NAK 1/813 (Reel no. A 585-4 (= A 1211-3))** is a paper (?) manuscript (22.3 × 7.2 cm) containing 154 folios with 6–7 lines per folio. The website of the NGMCP mentions 'Folio number 131 is missing but the text is continuous. Fol. 151 is missing.' However, the said information is incorrect since both the folios are available. The script is Nepālākṣara; the first folio is written in the Rañjanā script. The manuscript is illegible at many places due to the spreading of ink. The foliation figures are written in the middle of the right-hand margin on the verso side of a folio. The manuscript was copied by a scribe named Kāśirāma in NS 737 (= 1617 CE) during the reign of King Jagajjyotirmalla. This description matches with the one found in Dwivedi (1987), according to whom, the number of this manuscript is *pra.* 813 with the subject code (*viṣayāṅka*) 361.

## About the text

### Benediction

The manuscript begins with the benediction to the All-knowing one (*oṃ namaḥ sarvajñāya*) and the benedictory verse, which is the same as that of the *Rūpāvatāra* of Dharmakīrti:

*sarvajñam anantaḡuṇaṃ praṇāmya bālaprabodhanārtham aham |*  
*rūpāvatāram alpasukalāpam ṛjuṃ kariṣyāmi ||* (fol. 1v2-3) (Metre: Āryā) (*Rūpāvatāra* p. 1)

After paying homage to the All-knowing one, who has infinite qualities, I shall (now) elucidate the *Rūpāvatāra* in a brief and well-classified manner with the purpose of enlightening the ignorant ones.

## Purpose

The benedictory verse is followed by a verse describing the purpose of this work. It is apparently not written by Dharmakīrti himself:

*kṛtā sukṛtinā ceyaṃ prakriyā dharmakīrtinā |  
potānā(ṃ) potavat kṣipraṃ śabdābdhau pāragāminām ||* (fol. 1v3) (Metre: Anuṣṭubh)  
(*Rūpāvatāra* Intro. ii)

The learned Dharmakīrti has prepared this boat-like (treatise) dealing with the derivational process for the (benefit of the) young ones who wish to quickly cross over the ocean of nouns.

Rangacharya, the editor of the *Rūpāvatāra*, who has quoted this verse in his introduction (p. i–ii) to the text, informs us:

In the catalogue of the manuscripts published by Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasāda Śāstrī, it can be found that the *Rūpāvatāra* is one of the texts available in the manuscripts collection in the royal palace of Nepal. Moreover, at the beginning of the text printed there, the following verse occurs: *kṛtā sukṛtinā ceyaṃ prakriyā dharmakīrtinā | potānām potavat kṣipraṃ śabdābdhau pāragāminām ||*<sup>46</sup>

The statement of Rangacharya is indicative of the fact that the text listed by Haraprasāda Śāstrī differs from the text of the *Rūpāvatāra*, at least as far as the opening verse is concerned.

## Contents

A close comparison of our present text with that of the *Rūpāvatāra* shows that the present text is either a commentary on or some text based upon the *Rūpāvatāra*. Cf. for instance, the initial portions of both texts. The edited text of the *Rūpāvatāra* reads:

<sup>46</sup> Translation mine. The original Sanskrit reads: *nepālarājabhavanasthalikhitagranthasamudaye rūpāvatāro 'py ekatama iti mahāmahopādhyāyahasaprasādaśāstriprakaṭitāyāṃ tatsūcīkāyāṃ dṛśyate | api ca tatramudritaitadgranthādau śloko 'yaṃ vartate - kṛtā sukṛtinā ceyaṃ prakriyā dharmakīrtinā | potānām potavat kṣipraṃ śabdābdhau pāragāminām ||*

*atha saṃjñāvatārah* || *tatrādau tāvat pratyāhāras śāstre saṃvyavahārajñāpanārtham anuvaryate | tadyathā* || aiuṅ, ṛḷk, eoñ, aiauc, hayavaraṭ, laṅ, ṅamaṅanaṅam, jhabhañ, ghaḍhadhaṣ, jabagaḍadaṣ, khaphachaṭhathacaṭataṣ, kapay, saṣasar, hal | *iti pratyāhārasūtrāṅi* || *tatra prathamam aṅ ity eṣa pratyāhāro gṛhyate | kathaṃ? aiuṅ ity atra ṅakārasya, upadeṣe*ḥ anuṅāsika it (I.3.2.) *ity ataḥ upadeṣe it iti anuvartamāne, halantyam* (I.3.3.) – *upadeṣe yad antyaṃ hal tad itsaṃjñāṃ bhavati | ke punar upadeṣāḥ? āgamādeṣadhātugaṅapāṭhapratyayapratyāhārasūtrāṅy upadeṣāḥ -*

*dhātusūtragaṅoṅādivākyaliṅgānuṣāsanam* |  
*āgamapratyayādeṣā upadeṣāḥ prakirtitāḥ* ||

*itisaṃjñāyāṅ; svaṅ rūpaṅ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā* (I.1.68.) *ity ataḥ svaṅ rūpaṅ iti anuvartamāne, ādir antyena sahetā* (I.1.71.) - *ādivarṅo*ṅtyena *itā saha gṛhyamāṅas tanmadhyapātitaṅam varṅānāṅ grāhako bhavati svasya ca rūpasya | iti aṅ itī akārekarokārā ucyante | evaṅ ak ik uk ityādayo grāhyāḥ* || ... *aṅdayaṣ ca pratyāhārā ekacatvāriṅṣat* | (p. 1–2)

NAK 1/813:

*tatrādau tāva(2)t pratyāhārah sā(!)stre saṃjñāsaṃvyavahārajñāpanā(rtha)ḥ anuvaryate | tadyathā* | aiuṅ | ṛḷk eoñ aiauc (3) *hayavaraṅ ṅamaṅanaṅam jhabhañ ghaḍhadhaṣ jabagaḍadaṣ khaphachaṭhatha caṭataṣ kapay saṣasar hal iti pratyāhāra (!) | aṅ | a ā a3 i i i3 u ū u3 | ak | a ā a3 (fol. 2r1) i i i3 u ū u3 (... ..) || ik ... (3b5) ... upadeṣe ḥ anuṅāsika it ity a(6)dhikṛtya tatropadeṣe (..) dhātusūtragaṅoṅādivākyaliṅgānuṣāsanam | upad(e)(... ..) ti pā(..) rūpā(fol. 4r1)deṣavicaṣaṅāḥ | upadeṣe ḥ anuṅāsika ita<sup>47</sup> i(..)ṣi | upadeṣā(d a)supy āṅ yo ac anuṅāsi(2)kaviṣiṣṭaḥ sa itsaṃjñāko va (!) (deleted) bhavati | halantyam | upadeṣe yad antyaṅ hal tad itsaṃjñākaṅ bhavati | itsa(3)ṅjñāyāṅ svaṅ rūpa(ṅ) śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā ity ataḥ svaṅ rūpa(ṅ) ity anuvarttane ādir antyena sahetā | ādir vṅā(4)(..)'kena itā itsaṃjñākena saha gṛhya(m)āṅas tanmadhyapā (!) tināṅ varṅānāṅ grāhako bhavati | (5) i(..)ti pratyāhāragrahaṅavi(bh)āgaḥ | kathaṅ punar ihānupa(..)i(.. ..) savarṅa(6)sya grahaṅāt k(ār)yā(r)thaṅ anudīt savarṅasya cāpratyayah | anandvad (!) it(..) uccāryamāṅaḥ savarṅasya grāhako (7) bhavati | svasya ca rūpasya ca rūpasya pa(..)yaṅ varjyavitā | taparas tatkālasya bhavaro (?) yasmāt samayenaḥ (?) (fol. 4v1) (..)paro (... ..) g(r)āhako bha(va)ti | kiṅ punaḥ savarṅa(.. ..) (2) savarṅa(ṅ) tu (... ..) (sthā)naṅ prayatnaḥ spṛṣṭatā (..)i (... ..) ete yathākramam hrsvadīrghaplutasamjñākā bhavati (!) | (fols 1v3–4v5)*

As can be seen, both the texts bear a considerable similarity. An interesting point worth noting here is that the *Rūpāvatāra*, following the Pāṅinian tradition, has two *pratyāhāras*, namely, *hayavaraṭ* and *laṅ* whereas following the Cāndra school, the author of the present text has only one *pratyāhāra*: *hayavaraṅ*.

After this explanation of *pratyāhāra* formation, we come across an explanation of the *Saṃjñā* and the *Saṃhitā* sections of the *Rūpāvatāra*.<sup>48</sup> At the end of the

47 ita p.c. ] ikata a.c.

48 *iti saṃjñāvatārah* | (fol. 6v1), *atha saṃhitāvatāra ucyate* | (fol. 6v1).

*Samhitāvatāra*,<sup>49</sup> the author announces the beginning of the next section, namely, the *Vibhaktyavatāra*:

*atha vibha(ktya)vatāra ucyate* | (fols 22r6 – 22v1)

Now, the *vibhaktyavatāra* will be taught.

What one would expect next is a brief explanation of the *Vibhaktyavatāra*. However, this is not the case. Instead, we find homage to Mañjuśrī (*om namaḥ mañjuśriye* |) followed by the benedictory verse of Haribhadra's *Vibhaktikārikā*:

*mañjuśriyaṃ praṇamyādau bālānāṃ pratibodhaye* |  
*bhikṣuṇā haribha(2)dreṇa kṛtā vibhaktikārikā* ||<sup>50</sup> (fol. 22v 1–2)

After paying homage to Mañjuśrī in the beginning, the monk Haribhadra has composed (the text called) *Vibhaktikārikā* for the understanding of the ignorant ones.

Instead of continuing with the *Vibhaktikārikā*,<sup>51</sup> our author provides an explanation of seven cases based on the *Vibhaktyavatāra* section of the *Rūpāvatāra*:

*dve vibhakti (|) kā (?) supaś ca tīnāś ca* | *vibhak(t)is cety anena supān tīnā(3)ñ ca vibhaktisaṃjñā*  
*(..)(i)(..)(ā)(..)(te* | *supaḥ sapta vibhaktayaḥ sarūpeṇopadiśyante* | *kāḥ punas tāḥ* | (4) (*svau*)*jasa iti*  
*p(r)athamā* | *am(au)ṭa(!)śas iti dvitīyā (|) ṭābhyāma(!)bhis iti tṛtīyā* | *ñebhyāma(!)bhyas iti* (5)  
*catu(r)thī (|) ṇasibhyāma(!)bh(y)as iti pañcamī (|) ṇasosām iti ṣaṣṭhī* | *ṇiosa(!)sup iti saptamī* |  
*etāś ca sapta* (6) *vibhaktayaḥ iti paṭhitā daś (?) ca bhavanti* | *dvivi(..)dhañ ca prātipadikam* |  
*ajantaṃ halantañ ca (|) tada t(r)īṣu* (fol. 23r1) *(..)ividha(m) (tat trividhañ ?) (p)u(mli)ṅgam*  
*(na)puṃsakaliṅgañ ceti* | (fols 22v2–23r1)

Cp. the *Vibhaktyavatāra* of the *Rūpāvatāra*:

*atha vibhaktyavatārah* ||  
*ajantapumliṅgaprakaraṇam* ||

<sup>49</sup> *iti samhitāvatārah samāptah* | (fol. 22r6).

<sup>50</sup> That this is a benedictory verse of the *Vibhaktikārikā* is confirmed by its Tibetan translation (Derge 4272, 46a–65a): *thog mar 'jam dbyangs phyag 'tshal te* || *byis pa'i blo can rnam kyī phyi* || *rnam dbye'i tshig ler byas pa dag* || *dge slong 'phrog byed bzang pos bya* ||.

<sup>51</sup> The introductory portion of the *Vibhaktikārikā* (fols 46r7–46v2) reads as follows: *su | au | dzas* | *am | auṭ | śas | ṭā | bhyām | bhis | ñe | bhyām | bhis (!) | ṇa si | bhyām | bhyās (!) | ṇas | os | ām | ṇi* | *os | sup* | *'dī mams su la sogs pa'i mam dbye'o* || *gang las pha rol du 'gyur na* | *don gcig nyid la sogs pa'i tshig gi sgra las pha rol du'o* || *de la | don tsam la dang po'o* || (CV 2.1.93) *zhes pa rnam dbye dang por 'gyur ro* || *gang yang dang po'i mam dbye su au dzas zhes pa dang po'o* || *de la gcig gnyis mang po'i tshig rnam las don gcig la gcig gi tshig su* | *don gnyis la gnyis kyī tshig au* | *don mang po rnam las mang po'i tshig dzas zhes pa 'dī mams ni mam dbye dang po'o* ||.

*dve vibhaktī | tīnaś trīṇi trīṇi prathamamadhyamottamāḥ* (1.4.101.), *supaḥ* (1.4.103.), *ity anuvartamāne, vibhaktīś ca* (1.4.104.) – *suptīṇau pratyāhārau; supaḥ tīnaś ca trīṇi trīṇi vibhaktisanjñāś ca bhavanti | evaṃ supāṃ tīnāñ ca vibhaktisanjñāvidhānāt tatra trīṇi trīṇity anena supaḥ sapta vibhaktayaḥ | kāḥ punas tāḥ? svaujas ityādiṣu – su au jas iti prathamā; am auṣ śas iti dvitīyā; ṭā bhyām bhis iti tṛtīyā; ṇe bhyām bhyas iti caturthī; ṇasi bhyām bhyas iti pañcamī; ṇas os ām iti ṣaṣṭhī; ṇi os sup iti saptamī | etāḥ sapta vibhaktayaḥ prātipadikāt pare bhavanti | dvidvidham prātipadikam ajantaṃ halantaṃ ca | tat punaḥ trividham pratyekaṃ pumliṅgam strīliṅgam napuṃsakaliṅgam ceti |*

From here onwards, our text takes another turn and starts following the *Subantarātnākara*. This would be clear from the following passages from both the texts, which deal with the derivation of the nominative singular of the noun *vīpra*:

*tatrājanteṣu pulliṅgeṣu p(r)athamam akārāntād vipraśabdā(2)(t sa)pta (vibha)ktayaḥ prada(r)śyante | tatrādau tāvad akārād vipraśabdāt ‘mid aco ’ntyāt paraḥ’ (CV 1.1.14, P 1.1.47) | ‘yuṣmadi madhyama(3)traya(m)’ (CV 1.4.146)<sup>52</sup> (. ..) ‘ekadvibahuṣu’ (CV 1.4.148) iti cānuvartamāne svādisūtreṇa<sup>53</sup> sahekavākye (!) kṛte yā tata svauja(4)samau(ṭchaṣ)ṭābhyāmbhisṇebhyāmbhyasṇasibhyāmbhyasṇasos-ām(ṇyos)sup | i (... ..) (vi)(5)bhakta(yo) bhavanti | tata arthamātre prathameti (CV 2.1.93)<sup>54</sup> a(rth)ātri(!)rikte śabdārthamātre prathmā vibhaktir bhavati | kā puna(6)(ḥ) p(r)athamā (!) svaujas iti p(r)athamā (!) tatraikasminn arthe ekavacanam su (!)*

Cf. *Subantarātnākara*:

*tatrādau tāvad vipraśabdān ‘m(i)d aco ’ntyāt paraḥ’ (CV 1.1.14) | ‘yuṣmadi madhyamatrayam’ (CV 1.4.146) ity etābhyāṃ paran trayam ity adhikṛtya ‘ekadvibahuṣu’ (CV 1.4.148) iti cānuvartamāne svādisūtreṇa sahaikavākyā(6)tayā arthamātre prathameti (CV 2.1.93) prathamā vibhaktir bhavati | tatrekasminn (!) arthe ekavacanam su | (1v5–6, NAK 1/468)*

Thus, this text (NAK 1/813), although certainly different from the *Subantarātnākara*, is definitely based upon it. The order of nouns, the nouns themselves, and the division of the text is also similar in both the texts. Cf. for instance, the final rubrics of our present text:

*iti halantāḥ (!) pumliṅgakāṇḍaḥ prathamāḥ samāptaḥ | (fol. 62v2)  
iti subantagranthe napuṃsakakāṇḍo dvitīyaḥ samāptaḥ | (fol. 70v4)  
iti subantagranthe strīliṅgakāṇḍas tṛtīyaḥ samāptaḥ | (fol. 90v5)  
idāni(ṃ) vācyaliṅgā ucyante | (fol. 90v5), uktā halantāḥ | (fol. 132r3)*

52 *yuṣmady upapade samānādhikaraṇe sthāniny api madhyamaḥ* (P 1.4.105).

53 *svaujasamauṣṭchaṣṭābhyāmbhisṇebhyāmbhyasṇasibhyāmbhyasṇasosāmīyossup |* (CV 2.1.1).

54 *prātipadikārthaliṅgaparimāṇavacanamātre prathamā* (P 2.3.46).

*idāni(ṃ) sarvvādaya ucyante* <sup>55</sup> (fol. 132r3–4)

From these final rubrics, the name of the text appears to be *Subantagrantha*, a text dealing with *subantas*. The text ends with the first two concluding verses, namely, *iti ghaṭitam idaṃ ...* (fol. 153v3) and *aye kumārā ...* (fol. 153v5), and the colophon of the *Subantaratnākara*:

(fol. 153v6) *iti* (fol. 153v7) *subhūticandraḥto( ')yaṃ subantaratnākara(h) samāptaḥ |*

Thus ends this (text called) *Subantaratnākara* composed by Subhūticandra.

### Concluding verse

This is followed by the concluding verse:

*śuddhād bhāvād aśuddho 'pi* (fol. 154r1) *yatnena likhito (mayā) |*  
*ayaṃ śu(!)bantasā(!)st(r)aṅ ca śodhaṇi(!)yo vidujanāṃ (!) ||*

Even though (this text or manuscript?) is incorrect, I have written it with pure inclination and with (great) effort. The wise ones should correct this treatise, which deals with nouns.

This concluding verse, either corrupt or written in bad Sanskrit, talks about the corrupt state of the manuscript. It calls this text by the name *Subantaśāstra*, which, like the other title *Subantagrantha* mentioned in the final rubrics, is general in nature. It can be taken to refer to the *Subantaratnākara*. It may be noted that the *Rūpasādhana* (mentioned above) refers to the *Subantaratnākara* as *Supprakaraṇa*.

### Colophon

The colophon of the manuscript mentions that in the reign of king Jagajyotirmalla, a certain Kāśirāma copied this text for the benefit of his son Rāma on Thursday, the second day of the bright half of the lunar month of Caitra in Saṃvat 737.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Cf. corresponding final rubrics of the *Subantaratnākara* (mentioned above).

<sup>56</sup> *akhilabhūva(2)nasāraṃ trailokyamallanarendraḥ bhūvaḥ patiratnaṃ ca jagajyotirmalla(!)-  
nṛpendraḥ | ga(3)ganodayacandravantaḥ sarvvaḥ sā(!)strārthapāṇau etat samaya (!) likhitaṃ tam  
nābhidha(4)k (!) kāśirāmaḥ | caitramāse śukrapakṣe | dviti(!)yāyāṃ tithau bṛ(ha)spativāre taddine  
(5) likhitaṃ | kāśi(rā)masya ātmaputraḥ | santerāmaḥ bodhanārthaṃ asmimṃ puṣṭaka likhi(6)taṃ  
tasya śubham astu punaḥ punaḥ | sambat 7037 (! 737) | śrī śrī śrī paśupatiḥ (!) bhaktir a(s)tu |.*

## Issue of authorship

The text in its present form, although complete, is not entirely that of the *Subantarātnākara* and cannot be ascribed to Subhūticandra. As mentioned above, Kāśīrāma compiled this text for the benefit of his son. He must have brought together portions related to nouns, namely, *saṃjñā*, *sandhi*, *vibhakti*, and nominal declensions from the *Rūpāvatāra* and the *Subantarātnākara*. It is possible that the NGMCP has designated this manuscript as that of Subhūticandra's *Subantarātnākara* solely on the basis of the colophon of this work (mentioned above) found in the manuscript. While describing the manuscript of the *Subvīdhānaśabdamaṭāparīkrama*, also ascribed to Subhūticandra, the NGMCP remarks:

Subhūticandra (11<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> c.), its author, is known to have commented in his *Kāmadhenu* on Amarasīṃha's *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* and in his *Subantarātnākara* on Dharmakīrti's *Rūpāvatāra*.

As our enquiry has already proved, this information is partly incorrect as what we find in this manuscript is a compilation from two different texts.

**2. Kesar 528<sup>57</sup> (Reel No. C 49-6)** (19.5 x 4.3 cm) is a palm-leaf manuscript containing 26 folios with 5 lines per folio. The script is Nepālākṣara. The manuscript is damaged. This incomplete manuscript begins with the derivation of the word *upānah*, which is the last word discussed in the section dealing with feminine nouns ending in a consonant. The manuscript ends abruptly while explaining the derivations of the word *kaṭacikīrṣ-* (?), which belongs to the adjectives ending in consonants, with the words: *kakāra kitkāryārthaḥ* | (.. .. .) (fol. 52v). The foliation numbers appear in the right-hand margin of a folio. The website of the Kaiser library records this manuscript as that of Vyākaraṇa (*Sarvaliṅgakāṇḍa*).

A comparison of this manuscript with that of the *Subantarātnākara* reveals the fact that the former is not a copy of the latter:

*upap(ū)rvvaṃ* | *upanaḥyatīti* | *kvip* | *nahivṛtivrṣi(i)tyādinā pūrvvapadasyātvaṃ* | *upānahaśabdaḥ* | (.. ..) ... (fol. 17r1–3)

Cf. *Subantarātnākara*:

*upapūrvvasya naheḥ kvip* | *nahivṛtivrṣi(i)tyādi(2)nā pūrvvapadasya dīrghatvam* | 'nahāho dhaḥ' (CV VI.3.65) *iti padānte* ... (NAK 4/148, 37r1–2)

<sup>57</sup> The website of the Kesar library records this manuscript as that of Vyākaraṇa (*Sarvaliṅga*). The NGMCP, however, records it as a manuscript of the *Subantarātnākara*.

The present text also differs from NAK 1/813, which reads:

*upānahśabdaḥ | nahāh(o) dha iti padānte ... (fol. 90r6)*

## About the text

### Name of the author

The manuscript in its present form preserves the last word of the section dealing with feminine nouns and an incomplete next section, which deals with adjectives. Thus, there is only one final rubric available. It reads:

*ī(ti) (..) (5) (śrī)mahāgurubhūticandraviracite strīliṅgakāṇḍe tritīyaḥ paricchedaḥ | (fol. 17r 4–5)*

Thus (ends) the third part of the section dealing with feminine nouns composed by the great teacher Subhūticandra.

The name of the text, however, does not appear anywhere in the manuscript.

**3. NAK 1/1078 (Reel no. B 35–29)** (24 × 4.5 cm) is a palm-leaf manuscript containing 10 folios with 4–5 lines per folio. It is written in the Nepālākṣara script. The manuscript is complete. The writing on fol. 1v, and 6v/7r is partly rubbed off. Foliation figures appear in the middle of the right-hand margin of the verso; on fol. 1–2 letter numerals occur in the middle of the left-hand margin. On the right-hand margin of 1v, a modern hand has written in Devanāgarī characters: *pra 1078 subantaratnākara*.

## About the text

### Benediction

The text begins with a benediction to Kṛṣṇa:

*praṇamya devakīputraṃ lakṣmīvāgīśvarīpriyaṃ |  
vakṣe (!) (°)haṃ śabdaśloka 'yaṃ ligam(!)trayādisaṃgrahaḥ || (fol. 1v1)*

After paying homage to the son of Devakī (i.e. Kṛṣṇa), and to the one who is the favourite of Lakṣmī and Vāgīśvarī, I (now) teach this compendium of three genders etc. composed in the form of a *śabdaśloka* (i.e. a verse consisting of nominal stems).

## Title and contents

On the basis of the benedictory verse, the text can be tentatively called *Līngatrayādi-saṅgrahaḥ Śabdaślokaḥ* ‘A Compendium of the Three Genders etc. [composed in the form of a] *śabdaśloka* (i.e. a verse consisting of nominal stems).’ The NGMCP has recorded this as a manuscript of the *Subantarātnākara*, the title being ‘drawn from a verse (cited below),<sup>58</sup> which also occurs in B 35/23 (*Subantarātnākara*).<sup>59</sup>

## Contents

Regarding the contents of the text, the NGMCP remarks:

... the contents of this MS are, however, different from B 35/23. Thus, this MS might be really another specimen of Subhūticandra’s works.

The text only gives lists of nouns and adjectives, which are grouped into masculine, neuter, and feminine stems, in the same sequence as that of the *Subantarātnākara*. These stems are given again in the alphabetical order of the final sound. That the division of this text is similar to that of the *Subantarātnākara* is evident from the final rubrics:

*pumliṅgaḥ kāṇḍaḥ* | (fol. 3v5)  
*subhūticandraviracite dvitīyo napuṃsakaḥ* (!) *kāṇḍo dvitīyaḥ* | (fol. 5v3–4)  
*sū(!)bhūticandraviracitāyāṃ tṛtīyaḥ paṭalaḥ* | (fol. 8v1)

The fourth section dealing with adjectives is not marked by a final rubric. There is no section dealing with numerals.

Each section begins with a mnemonic verse providing a list of nouns ending in a particular vowel or a consonant. Cf. for instance, the mnemonic verse occurring at the beginning of masculine nouns ending in the vowel *a*:

*ghaṭamaṭhakaṭabādhagrāmasaṃgrāmakāmaḥ*  
*prahararakasamīraḥ sarggasvarggāpa(va)rggāḥ* (!) |  
*paṭapaṭahacakoravādadevodayārthaḥ*  
*kṣayabhujagabhujā(ri)go* (!) *rāmakumbhīrakumbhāḥ* ||  
*śārdūlakramaśikaradrumasuronmādapramādayayo*  
*vyādhabrāhmaṇamāraśarkaraśarakrośapradośagrahāḥ* || *śiṃgha* (!) *vyāghraturaiṅgabhaṅga-*  
*subhaṭasvāsāśvadantādhaka-drohaḥ krodhakuṭhārakaṇṭhakamaṭhagrāsapravāsāśramāḥ* ||  
*paṇḍītaḥ plavaḡakūpakuberaślokaḥkasukasāvakaḥṛiṅgāḥ*

58 *iti ghaṭitam idaṃ mayā suvarṇṇaḥ* ... (fol. 10r1).

59 [http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/wiki/Main\\_Page](http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/wiki/Main_Page).

*saṃganādamadamanmathanāthaḥkvāthadantacaṭakaviṭapās ca ||*

After this mnemonic verse, we find single words in their stem forms together with their synonym:

*vīpraḥ | brāhmaṇa(h) | [akārāntaśabdah] || 1 ||*

### Name of the author

The name of the author is found in two final rubrics:

*subhūticandraviracite dvitīyo napuṃsakaḥ (!) kāṇḍo dvitīyaḥ | (fol. 5v3–4)*

(Thus ends) the second section dealing with neuter (nouns) composed by Subhūticandra.

*sū(!)bhūticandraviracitāyāṃ tṛtīyaḥ paṭalaḥ | (fol. 8v1)*

(Thus ends) the third section composed by Subhūticandra.

**4. Or.133** (30 × 4 cm) is a manuscript from the Cambridge University Library.<sup>60</sup> It is a relatively recent palm-leaf manuscript (14<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> century CE) containing 33 folios. It is written in medieval Bengali. According to a modern inscription on the manuscript, ‘it agrees with HP Shastri Nepal cata. I. p. 38’. The text preserved in this manuscript does not seem to be continuous. Rather, these appear to be stray leaves. Folios 1–7, 11–12, 14–16, 19–27, 29–31, 33, 35, 39–41, and 43 seem to be available. However, it should be noted that this conclusion is still tentative as more work needs to be done on the manuscript. The manuscript begins with a homage to Nārāyaṇa (*oṃ namo nārāyaṇāya*) and a benediction to Sarasvatī:

*namaḥ sarasvatīpādapaṅkajāya hitaiṣiṇe |  
yat prasādāj jagat sarvvaṃ amyakam (?) upajāyate || (fol. 1v1–2)*

Salutation to the lotus-like benevolent feet of Sarasvatī, due to the grace of which the entire world becomes ... (?).

This benedictory verse is followed by the second and the third introductory verses, namely, *rūḍhīśabdā nigadyante ...*, and *vīprāgnī*, found in the manuscripts of the *Subantaratnākara*. The last word described in this manuscript seems to be *div-*, which belongs to the feminine nouns ending in consonants.

<sup>60</sup> <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OR-00133/1>.

Within each section, we find derivations of words following the Cāndra system of grammar. However, that this is not a manuscript of the *Subantarātṇākara* is clear from a comparison of the derivation of the declension of the word *pathin* from this manuscript with that of NAK 4/148:

NAK 4/148

*pathinśabdasya 'pathimathyrbhukṣām ād' (CV 5.4.38) iti sor akārasyātvam | (fol. 16v1–2)*

Or.133

*pathinśabdāt svādayaḥ | 'pathimathyrbhukṣām āt' (CV 5.4.38) iti nakārasyātvam | (fol. 19r1)*

The first section dealing with masculine nouns ends on fol. 20v (*prathamah kāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ*). As is evident from this final rubric, neither the name of the text, nor its author are mentioned. I have so far been unable to find any other final rubric in this manuscript.

5. The catalogue of the palm-leaf and selected paper manuscripts from the Durbar Library, Nepal, records **1152 (nga)** as a manuscript of the *Subantarātṇākara* (Shastri 1905, 38).<sup>61</sup> This manuscript is written in the Maithili script. Its benedictory verse is the same as that of Or.133. Just like Or.133, the benedictory verse is followed by the third introductory verse of the *Subantarātṇākara*, namely, *rūḍhiśabdā nigadyante ....* From this, it appears that 1152 (nga) is a copy of Or.133 or vice versa. Dwivedi (1987, 189) might have referred to this manuscript, which has the number Pra. 1152 with the subject code (*viṣayāṅka*) 364. So far, I have not been able to locate this manuscript.

6. **NAK 1/1152 (Reel No. B 35–15)** was originally recorded as a palm-leaf manuscript of the *Subantarātṇākara* (31.5 × 5 cm) containing 63 folios. The manuscript is written in the Maithili script. It is incomplete, and damaged. The NGMCP has now identified this text as that of the *Prajñāvistārikā*, a sub-commentary on the *Kātantravyākaraṇa* written by Billeśvara.

The NGMCP records one more text ascribed to Subhūticandra. It is entitled as *Subvidhānaśabdāmālāparikrama*. This palm-leaf manuscript is numbered **NAK 5/416 (Reel No. B 34-16)** (21 × 4 cm) and contains 18 folios with 4 lines per folio. It is written in the Nepālākṣara script. The letter-numerals appear in the middle of the left-hand margin and numerals in the middle of the right-hand margin of the verso side of a folio. Folios 3–11 are slightly damaged; the writing on fols 6v, 7r, 9v, and

<sup>61</sup> I am grateful to Prof. S. S. Bahulkar for bringing this manuscript to my notice.

10r is partly rubbed off. The manuscript is dated Nepāla Saṃvat 560 (= 1440 CE). It, in fact, contains two texts ascribed to Subhūticandra:

- a. *Subvidhānaśabdāmālāparikrama* (fols 1–11). The manuscript begins with a homage to Vāgīśvara:

(fol. 1v1) *oṃ namo vāgīśvarāya* |

Homage to the Lord of Speech.

This is followed by a homage to Subhūticandra:

*namo mā(!)hāsubhūticandragurave* |

Homage to the great teacher Subhūticandra.

The text begins with a verse introducing the first section that deals with a list of masculine nouns ending in the vowel *a*. This verse also mentions the name of the teacher Subhūti as the author of this text:

*prathamapuliṅgakāṇḍe ajantā śabdāmālikā(2)ḥ* |  
*kathitāś ca akārādiṃ (!) sū(!)bhūtiguruṇā kṛtāḥ* || (fol. 1v1–2)

In the first section dealing with masculine nouns, lists of nouns ending in vowels composed by the teacher Subhūti are explained starting with the sound *a*.

nlke other texts concerned with nominal declensions in the widest sense, this text does not give any paradigms of declension, but only enumerates the respective *sub-antas* in the form of the nominative singular, stating in what kind of final vowel or consonant the stem ends. For instance, *vīpraḥ* | *ākārāntaḥ śabdaḥ* || 1 || *hāhāḥ* | *ākārāntaḥ śabdaḥ* || 2 ||.

## Division

There are five sections in this text, namely, those dealing with masculine,<sup>62</sup> neuter,<sup>63</sup> and feminine genders,<sup>64</sup> adjectives,<sup>65</sup> pronouns, and numerals. Numbers 1 to 100 are given in full. Within the first four sections, nouns are arranged alphabetically according to their stem final.

## Authorship and title

The name of the text, namely, *Subvidhānaśabdāmālāparikrama*, as well as the name of its author Subhūticandra, are found in the colophon:

*iti subhūticandraviracitaḥ subavidhānaḥ śabda(2)mālāparikrama saḥ pūrṇṇabhūtaḥ samāptaḥ | saṃkṣepamātraḥ | samvat 560 dīnāśāḍhavadī 3 | (fol. 11v1–2)*

Thus (ends) the (text entitled) *Subvidhānaśabdāmālāparikrama* composed by Subhūticandra. It is completed, i.e., has come to an end. (It is) an abridgement only. (It was composed in) *saṃvat 560* (= 1440 CE) on the *Āśāḍha* day (?).

After the colophon, there is an inscription listing eight metals:

*suvaṃṇarajataṃ kāśyaṃ (!) āraṃ śulvasavaṃgakaṃ |  
ayaḥ śisakaṃ ity aṣṭau lohāni kāṣṭakuṭake (!) ||  
śubha || śubha || (fol. 11v3)*

Gold, silver, bronze (*kāśya*), brass (*āra*), copper (*śulva*), together with tin (*savaṃgaka*), iron, lead (*śisaka*) – these are eight (kinds of) metals in the *kāṣṭakuṭaka* (?). (May) auspicious (be everywhere), (may) auspicious (be everywhere).

The NGMCP remarks:

This text is styled *Suvidhānaśabdāmālāparikrama* on the index card of the NAK. Subhūticandra (11<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> c.), its author, is known to have commented in his *Kāmadhenu* on Amarasimha's *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* and in his *Subantarānākara* on Dharmakīrti's *Rūpavātāra*.

**62** *iti sū(!)bhūticandraviraci*(fol. 3v)*tāyāṃ puliṅgakāṇḍasagaṇaḥ prakaraṇaḥ prathamāḥ | (fols 3r4–3v1).*

**63** *iti (3) sū(!)bhūticandraviracitāyāṃ dvitīyanapuṃsakakāṇḍaḥ sagaṇaḥ dvitīyāḥ | (4r2–3).*

**64** *ity etat subhū*(fol. 6r)*ticandraviracitāyāṃ striligaṃ(!) kāṇḍe pariṇṇaḥ paṭalatrayaḥ | (fols 5v4–6r1).*

**65** *iti vācyaligaṃ(!)kāṇḍaḥ subhūticandraviracito (')yaṃ caturthaḥ paricchedaḥ (!) | (fol. 9r4).*

It appears that the mention of a commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Rūpāvatāra* is probably a reference to manuscript NAK 1/813, which shares the benedictory verse of the *Rūpāvatāra*.

- b. *Liṅgatrāyādīsaṅgrahaḥ śabdaślokaḥ* (fols 12–18). This appears to be an incomplete copy of NAK 1/1078 mentioned above. The text is available up to the section dealing with adjectives. In this manuscript, homage is paid to Vighneśvara:

*om namo vighnesvarāyaḥ* (!) | (fol. 1v1)

This is followed by the word *vipraḥ* and the mnemonic verse found in NAK 1/1078, namely, *ghaṭamaṭha*<sup>66</sup> (fol. 1v1–3) As is evident from the final rubrics, this text is also divided in a way similar to that of the *Subantarātnākara*.<sup>66</sup>

In the Derge edition, immediately after the *Sup mtha' rin chen 'byung gnas*, there occurs a text called *Lung du ston pa su ba nta zhes bya ba* (\**Vyākaraṇa-subanta nāma*).<sup>67</sup> The text is not handed down to us in its entirety. The first section dealing with the masculine nouns ends on fol. 141b. The first noun dealt with in the next section of neuter nouns is *mana* (?). The text ends abruptly while describing the nominative plural of this noun. As a result, we do not know either the author or the translator of this text. While *Subantarātnākara* starts with the declensions of the word *vipra*, this text starts with that of the word *rudra*. From the noun *hāhā* onwards, the sequence of words in the \**Vyākaraṇasubanta* and in the *Subantarātnākara* is the same. From the derivations given for all the nouns, it also becomes clear that, just like the author of the *Subantarātnākara*, the present author has also followed the Cāndra system of grammar. On the basis of these similarities, we can probably say that the \**Vyākaraṇasubanta* is also somehow related to the *Subantarātnākara*.

It appears from the foregoing discussion that NAK 1/813 is a compilation from various texts, and its last part is related to the *Subantarātnākara*. The remaining six manuscripts, except NAK 1/1152, preserve four texts ascribed to Subhūticandra: 1. *Śabdasaṅgrahakāṇḍa* (Kesar 528), 2. *Liṅgatrāyādīsaṅgrahaḥ Śabdaślokaḥ* (NAK 1/1078, NAK 5/416b), 3. *Subvidhānaśabdāmālāparikrama* (NAK 5/416a), and 4. the text preserved in Or.133 and 1152 (nga) from the Durbar library. Interestingly, in all these texts, the division of the text and the nouns dealt with in each of the sections remain the same. We find salutation to Subhūticandra at the beginning of NAK 5/416a. It also mentions Subhūticandra in the first verse. The

<sup>66</sup> *prathamaḥ puliṅgaḥ* | (fol. 4v1); *dvitīyaḥ kāṇḍanapuṃsaka(4)ṃ* | (fol. 5v3–4); *striliṅgakāṇḍas tṛtīyaḥ* | (fol. 7v3); *vācyaliṅgaḥ samāptaḥ* || (*ity ete*) (2) *ślokā(s te)* | (fol. 8v1–2).

<sup>67</sup> Derge no. 4431, fols 134a<sup>6</sup>–141b<sup>7</sup>; Peking no. 5895 460b1–470a6.

other three texts, just like the *Subvidhānaśabdāmālāparikrama*, are basic in nature. From the abridged and enumerative nature of all these texts, it appears that these are later handbooks based on the *Subantarātñākara* prepared by those belonging to Subhūticandra's lineage. It should be kept in mind, however, that these conclusions are still tentative. It will be possible to say something more conclusive only after a diplomatic edition of all these texts is prepared.

I am thankful to Prof. Harunaga Isaacson for going through the draft of this paper and making valuable suggestions.

## References

### Primary sources

- The Buddhacarita: Or Acts of the Buddha*. Ed. by E[dward] H[amilton] Johnston. Pt. 1. Sanskrit Text. Pt. 2. Cantos i to xiv transl. from the original Sanskrit supplemented by the Tibetan version, together with an introduction and notes. Calcutta 1935-36. (PUOP. 31. 32.)
- Cāṇakya-nīti-text-tradition (Cāṇakya-nīti-śākhā-sampradāyaḥ)*, Vol. I, part II: V. The Laghucāṇakya Version, VI. The Cāṇakya-Rāja-Nīti-Śāstra Version. Ludwik Sternbach. Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute Publications. 1964.
- Candra-vṛtti: Der Originalkommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra*. hrsg. von Bruno Liebich. Leipzig 1918. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 14).
- Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa. Die Grammatik des Candragomin. Sūtra, Uṇādi, Dhātupāṭha*. hrsg. von Bruno Liebich. Leipzig 1902. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft unter der verantwortlichen Redaktion des Prof. Dr. E. V. Windisch. XI. Band. No. 4.)
- Das Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa*. Bruno Liebich. Aus den Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Heft 3. 1895.
- Daśavatāracaritam*. By Kṣemendra. Edited by Pandit Durgāprasāda and Kāśinātha Pāṇḍuraṅga Parab. Nirṇayasāgara Press. Mumbai. Second edition. 1891.
- Sup'i mtha' rin chen 'byung gnas*. Collected Works of The Great Ta'i Si-tu-pa Kun-mkhyen Chos-kyi-'byun(!)-gnas-bstan-pa'i-nyin-byed. Vol. tha. Kangra. 1990.
- The Epigrams Attributed to Bhartṛhari Including the Three Centuries* for the first time collected and critically edited, with principal variants and an Introduction. D. D. Kosambi. Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 2000. (First edition: 1948 Singhi Jain Series, no. 23).
- Le Prākṛtānuśāsana de Puruṣhottama*. Paris. Luigia Nitti-Dolci. (1938).
- The Rupavataṛa of Dharmakīrti*. Part I. Edited by M. Rangacharya. G. A. Natesan & Co., Esplanade, Madras.
- Subhūticandra's Kavikāmadhenu on the Amarakośa 1.1.1–1.4.8 Together with Si tu Paṇ chen's Tibetan Translation*. Lata Mahesh Deokar. Indica et Tibetica, Vol. 55. Marburg, Germany. 2014.

## Secondary sources

- Deokar, Lata Mahesh (2013), 'Subhūticandra: A Forgotten Scholar of Magadha', in *Journal of Buddhist Studies*, Vol. X. 137–154.
- Deokar, Lata Mahesh (2014), See *Subhūticandra's Kavikāmadhenu on the Amarakośa* 1.1.1–1.4.8.
- Dwivedi, Janaki Prasad (1987), *Sanskrit ke bauddh vaiyākaraṇ* (Hindi)(Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica XIII), Sarnath:
- Kosambi, D. D. See *The Epigrams Attributed to Bhartṛhari*.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W. J. (2009), 'On the Vicissitudes of Subhūticandra's Kāmadhenu Commentary on the Amarakośa in Tibet', in *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies*, Issue 5: 1–105.
- Liebich, Bruno. See *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*.
- Nitti-Dolci, Luigia. See *Le Prākṛtānuśāsana de Purushottama*.
- Oberlies, Thomas (1992), 'Verschiedene neu-entdeckte Texte des Cāndravāyākaraṇa und ihre Verfasser (Studien zum Cāndravāyākaraṇa II)', in *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, 16/17: 161–184.
- Rangacharya M. See *The Rupavatara of Dharmakīrti*.
- Sastri, Hara Prasād (1905), *A Catalogue of Palm-Leaf & Selected Paper Mss. Belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal*. Vol. I. Calcutta.
- Sternbach, Ludwik. See *Cāṇakya-nīti-text-tradition*.
- Verhagen, Pieter Cornelius (2001), *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Assimilation into Indigenous Scholarship*, Volume Two, Leiden: Brill.
- Vogel, Claus (2015), *Indian Lexicography*. Revised and enlarged edition. Edited by Jürgen Hanneder and Martin Straube. Munich: Indologica Marpurgensia
- Wezler, Albrecht (2001), 'Bhikṣu Haribhadra's *Vibhaktikārikā*. An Unknown Grammatical Text Edited with a Brief Introduction (First Part)', in *Journal of Nepal Research Centre*, Vol. 12: 243–254.

