



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Temple consecration rituals in ancient India: Text and archaeology
Ślęczka, A.A.

Citation

Ślęczka, A. A. (2006, October 4). *Temple consecration rituals in ancient India: Text and archaeology*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4581>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4581>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/4581> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Ślaczka, A.A.

Title: Temple consecration rituals in ancient India: Text and archaeology

Issue date: 2006-10-04

Chapter 3

Some remarks on the present edition of the three ritual chapters from the Kāśyapaśilpa

3.1 Previous editions and unpublished manuscripts of the Kāśyapaśilpa

For an architectural text, the Kāśyapaśilpa had the rare fortune of being edited rather early on and not even once but twice; the first edition was already available in 1926. It was published in the Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, Poona, by Kṛṣṇa Vināyak Vajhe. The second edition, the work of Subrahmanya Sastri, appeared almost forty years later in 1960 (the first part) and 1968 (the second part) in the Sarasvati Mahal Series, Thanjavur.¹ Unfortunately, both editions are unsatisfactory.

The Ānandāśrama edition, in Devanāgarī script, is based on several manuscripts, the identities of which are only very vaguely indicated.² It can by no means be called critical because the readings of different manuscripts and the emendations proposed by the editor cannot be distinguished from each other. One has to agree with Pisharoti who states "If we scrutinise the text presented in the [at the time] only edition issued from the Ānandāśrama Series, it will be found that the text presented is very defective, full of all sorts of mistake" (Pisharoti 1939: 29-30). Moreover, according to Losch (1949: 152) "Kṛṣṇa Vināyak Vajhe edited the famous Kāśyapaśilpa although he only disposed of badly corrupted manuscripts."

The second edition, in Grantha script, is based on a manuscript of the Kāśyapaśilpa kept in the Sarasvati Mahal Library (Burnell No. 11078 / D. NO. 15419) and the Ānandāśrama edition (Kandaswamy 1968: iv-v). Unfortunately, it shows little improvement on the previous one and contains numerous sections that appear to be defective. The edition includes a Tamil translation, which regrettably

¹ The first part deals with the iconography and contains chapters 46 to 92. The second part deals with architecture and contains the first 45 chapters.

² The main text used for the Ānandāśrama edition was apparently obtained from a Sanskrit Library (perhaps the Government Oriental Manuscript Library) in Madras, while parts of the text were obtained from the Gurjara area, Saurāṣṭra and Mālavadeśa. See Vajhe's *upodghāta* to the edition of the Kāśyapaśilpa, page 9: *kaśyapasamhitāyā grantho madrāsasaṃskṛtapustakālaye labhyate | gurjara, saurāṣṭra, mālavadeśeṣu api karmakārāṇāṃ samīpe 'sya khaṇḍā labdhāh | asmin mudraṇe teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ upayoga kṛtaḥ |*

does not try to explain the difficult or corrupted Sanskrit passages and as such does not contribute to a better understanding of the text.

The manuscripts used in both editions are by far not the only available sources of the text. Sharing the fate of many other Sanskrit works, the Kāśyapaśilpa survived in numerous, and often fragmentary manuscripts, which had been copied several times, mostly on palm-leaf. The majority of them, with the exception of some of those employed by Vajhe are scattered throughout the libraries and private collections of South India. To gather them all together is a task that borders on the impossible. Several manuscripts are listed in the New Catalogus Catalogorum (1966), but there is no complete catalogue of the private collections of manuscripts in South India. Most of these collections are very small: they may consist of a small wooden cupboard containing piles of palm leaf manuscripts. Sadly, the manuscripts are often badly damaged and form, in the first place, a tasty treat for extended families of termites rather than a study material.

During my stay in India I managed to trace and collect a number of manuscripts of the Kāśyapaśilpa. Nine of them contain chapters relevant to the present work.³ These manuscripts served as a basis for the present edition of the three chapters dealing with construction rituals: *prathameṣṭakā-nyāsa*, *garbhanyāsa* and *mūrdheṣṭakā-nyāsa*. It should be stressed that almost all the manuscripts and transcripts obtained provide a text that is far better than the one offered by the editions. Thanks to the use of various manuscripts, some of the uncertainties in the text have now been cleared up. Many such mistakes and uncertainties are the result of the earlier scribes' lack of a thorough knowledge of the ritual. They sometimes appear to have substituted technical words with those they knew and understood (see Section 3.5 below). Moreover, the lacunae, present in some manuscripts due to damaged palm leaf, could be filled and some verses could even be reinserted. This all resulted in a much better understanding of the text.

3.2 Editorial notes

In the present edition of the three chapters of the Kāśyapaśilpa, I decided to refrain from using the stemmatic theory of recension developed by Karl Lachman.⁴ This method, while frequently applied by editors of ancient texts, has its limitations, as Pasquali has already observed,⁵ which are especially significant for the Kāśyapaśilpa and cognate texts.

³ The list of the manuscripts used for the edition is given at the beginning of Chapter 4. The manuscripts are discussed more thoroughly in Section 3.4 below.

⁴ For the evolution of this theory, see Maas (1958).

⁵ Pasquali (1952). See also the discussion on the limitations of the stemmatic methods in Reynolds and Wilson (1975: 192-194) and in Zetzel (1993: 102ff).

One of the serious limitations of the stemmatic method is “the assumption that all surviving manuscripts can be traced back to a single archetype,” without taking into consideration interpolations and revisions (Reynolds and Wilson 1975: 193-194). Such a view may perhaps only be true for certain religious texts (namely, the Vedic texts), whose oral transmission in an unchanged form was considered of utmost importance and where the slightest alteration from the original might have had severe consequences for both the offender and the whole universe. The Kāśyapaśilpa, however, while dealing with religion and ritual, is in essence a manual for temple building and the making of images, a technical text composed with the aim of being used. Such texts are most likely to be altered by later scholars and scribes in order to bring them up to date. As Zetzel observed (1993: 111) “Works that provide practical learning of whatever sort, books that have living value for their readers, are subject to alteration precisely in order to maintain that value: they are unprotected texts.” Although this remark was made with respect to ancient Greek and Latin works,⁶ it also proves to be applicable to the Sanskrit Vāstuśāstras. The descriptions of the temple gateways (*gopura*) provide an example of such later ‘improvement’ in South Indian architectural texts. Over the ages, the *gopuras* grew taller until they reached eleven storeys in the 17th-18th century AD as testified by the temple of Śrīvilliputtur (Harle 1994: 335 and fig. 263). Yet, the Kāśyapaśilpa, usually dated 11th - 12th century AD,⁷ describes *gopuras* having no less than sixteen storeys, which seems to be a later and an over-enthusiastic interpolation. Instances of possible interpolations or quotations from other works, which are perhaps no longer extant (or simply not edited), are present in some of the manuscripts of the Kāśyapaśilpa.⁸

Another restriction for the application of the stemmatic method to the present study is the fact that it does not take the ‘horizontal’ transmission of the text into consideration.⁹ Yet, it is not unthinkable that, at times, the ‘copying’ was done with the use of more than one manuscript. This might be especially true for India where, due to the short lifespan of the ‘writing material’ – the palm leaf – in the Indian climate, the copies had to be made frequently, which resulted in a very high number of corrupt readings. There were probably already mistakes in the manuscripts in the old times and the use of more than one manuscript by the scribes to revise a corrupt reading cannot be ruled out. This makes it incredibly

⁶ Here one can quote here Zetzel (1993: 110-111), who provides several, often amusing, examples of alterations and interpolations in ancient text provided to suit the scribe or the readers. For instance, the Digest of the Roman Law, which “consists of quotations from earlier jurists that have been altered to fit the state of the law in the sixth century”, the cookbook of Apicius, which has been supplemented with variant recipes “presumably by cooks who didn’t like the taste of what they found in an earlier version...” and the case of the copyist of the early Middle Ages who, discontented by Pomponius Mela’s comment that “the Irish are the most ignorant of all people” added “but they are not as ignorant as all that.”

⁷ For the dating of the Kāśyapaśilpa, see Chapter 2.4.

⁸ For instance in T2, T47 and T411 (see Section 3.4 below).

⁹ See Reynolds and Wilson (1975: 192-193).

difficult to assign the manuscripts to ‘families’ on the basis of their common errors. Finally, this study deals with only three chapters of the Kāśyapaśilpa, which is far too little data to form a basis for a reliable manuscript tree.

The attempt to establish which manuscript should be considered the best, or most reliable, also proves futile. The Kāśyapaśilpa survived in a number of manuscripts, mainly on palm-leaf. The text of all the available manuscripts is very corrupt and almost each *pāda* shows a variant reading, which, at times, results in more than ten variant readings for one passage, none of which seem right. Certain sources seem to provide less corrupt readings than others, but this might be due to the corrections by the scribes.¹⁰ With the lack of the best manuscript and in the light of all the arguments against the use of the stemmatic method for our text, it became clear that the decision of which reading should be followed had to be made verse by verse.

An important issue for preparing an edition of a relatively late Sanskrit text is the fact that it is not known whether the original text was written in correct (Pāṇini) Sanskrit. It cannot be excluded that at least some of the ‘incorrect’ grammatical and stylistic forms found in the Kāśyapaśilpa are a part of a specific language of architects and artisans. The existence of such a jargon is borne out by the rich technical vocabulary employed by the Kāśyapaśilpa and other texts dealing with architecture. It consists of numerous words not included in standard Sanskrit dictionaries (see Appendix III: Index of Architectural Terms). Whether the jargon also comprised specific grammatical forms that deviated from the norms codified by Pāṇini is very difficult to prove.¹¹ In the present edition, I decided to leave an ‘incorrect’ reading unchanged when it was given by the majority of the sources,¹² when it was found in several parallel texts, and when the employment of a correction would result in a too high or too low number of syllables in a verse, thus rendering it unmetrical.¹³ In all other cases I attempted to emend the text and reconstruct (or perhaps rather construct) a reading which is as grammatically correct as possible.¹⁴ Hence, there is a chance that the hypothetical

¹⁰ For corrections in transcript T1, see section 3.4 and note 21 below.

¹¹ Unusual grammatical forms found in the manuscripts of the Kāśyapaśilpa are discussed below, in Section 3.6.

¹² “In the majority” and not necessarily “in all manuscripts”: in some cases the reading might have been corrected by later scribes.

¹³ See, for example, *itare* instead of *itarasmin* in KŚ *garbhanyāsa* 3d.

¹⁴ In his introduction to the edition of the *Ajitāgama*, Bhatt (1964: vii) states that a grammatically incorrect reading was often employed *metri causa* and for that reason should be accepted into the critical text. In the Kāśyapaśilpa, however, the majority of the errors are not caused by the desire to produce a metrically correct text – the acceptance of the incorrect variant reading only sporadically results in a metrically correct verse. To such exceptions belong *itare* instead of *itarasmin* in *garbhanyāsa* 3d (see note 9 above) and certain cases of double *sandhi* (listed in Section 3.6) employed perhaps to obtain the correct number of syllables in a verse. Contrary to the *Ajitāgama*, however, the cases of lengthening or shortening a syllable occur in the Kāśyapaśilpa in

text presented in the current edition is more correct than the original one. In so doing I was guided by the thought that it is better to present a text that is perhaps not identical to the original, but grammatically correct, than to present a text, which is neither identical to the original nor grammatically correct. Apart from the fact that it is impossible to know what the original might have looked like, a correct text is a better basis for the translation and one of my aims was to present a fairly coherent translation of the Kāśyapaśilpa, which, while reflecting the original ideas as much as possible, would be accessible not only to Sanskrit scholars, but also those interested in ritual and architecture.

3.3 The presentation of the text, the critical apparatus and the translation

For the convenience of the reader who wishes to compare the translation with the Sanskrit text, I have decided to include these two in a single document, one below the other. A section of the critical text – usually one verse - is given first, followed by the translation and, next, by the variant readings in small print. Each variant reading is followed by the sigla of all the sources that give it. The lacunae are indicated by square brackets and three periods: [...], the conjectural readings are also indicated by square brackets. The critical apparatus is negative, which implies that only the deviations from the constituted text are reported. When the reading accepted in the text does not occur in any of the sources, it is highlighted by means of underscoring. The apparatus is followed by a commentary, which includes references to the specific verses and *pādas* of the section above. A list of sources used in the edition is given at the beginning of Chapter 4. The list of abbreviations used both in the critical apparatus and the commentary is provided in Appendix I.

In the edition, instances of gemination and degemination of consonants in ligature with semivowels (for example: *kartavyam*) were ignored if appearing in the readings accepted into the critical text. The same approach was adopted towards the orthographical variants, such as the occurrence of *anusvāra* instead of a homorganic nasal and the substitution of a voiced dental by a voiceless one (*maṇḍapa* / *maṇṭapa*). Furthermore, it must to be noted that the verse numbering and headings are my own addition.

the 3rd, 4th and 8th syllable of a *pāda*, namely in places where the length of the syllable does not play a role, or in passages where the correct form would suit the metre as well as the incorrect one. See, for example, *adhikām* instead of *adhikam* in *prathameṣṭakā* 8b (3rd syllable), *prapāṃ* ... *atisundaram* instead of *–sundarām* in *garbhanyāsa* 30d (8th syllable) and *dhātūni* instead of *dhātūṃś ca* in *garbhanyāsa* 17c (the same metrical value).

3.4 Overview of the sources used for the edition

It is not possible, for reasons discussed above, to sketch a reliable stemma for the Kāśyapaśilpa. Nonetheless, one can draw a few tentative conclusions with respect to the mutual relation of the manuscripts and transcripts used for the edition. It should, however, be remembered that they are based on three chapters only and cannot therefore be considered valid for the whole text.

All the manuscripts and transcripts of which a copy could be obtained as well as two manuscripts, which were studied ‘in situ’ were used in the edition.¹⁵ They include nine palm-leaf manuscripts and six transcripts.¹⁶ Two of the palm-leaf manuscripts are in Grantha script (8561, Keevelur), one in Kannada (447), and the remaining six are in Malayalam script (16847, 16923, 18732, 20088, 20089, 20092). The transcripts (T1, T2, T47, T297, T400, T411), all written in Devanāgarī script, are fairly recent copies of manuscripts from various libraries. They were made around 50 years ago by the *paṇḍits* associated with the Institut Français d’Indologie at Pondicherry.

The analysis of the lacunae and variant readings shows that within the group of the obtained manuscripts some are copies of others: 16923 is, beyond doubt, a copy of 16847 and 18732 is most probably a copy of 20092. 16923 is visibly less old than 16847 and it differs from the latter only in being more corrupt. However, the main argument for it being a copy of 16847 lies in the fact that it reflects the damaged parts of 16847. As an example one can take the beginning of verse 3 of the *garbhanyāsa* chapter. The present reading of this passage in 16847 is ‘*ta ... t*’ instead of *tasmāt*, the lacuna being due to the end of the manuscript being damaged. 16923 repeats this lacuna in the middle of the palm-leaf. An identical situation is found in verse 4 of the same chapter,¹⁷ which shows that 16923 is certainly a (direct or indirect) copy of 16847 and that it must have been written after 16847 had already suffered some damage. The readings of 16923 were therefore ignored in the edition whenever the testimony of 16847 was available.

18732 shares most of its errors and lacunae with 20092, but sometimes gives a different reading, usually more corrupt, often involving common mistakes like a repetition of a part of a word in *prathameṣṭakā* 5c.¹⁸ Furthermore, 20092 is clearly an older manuscript. The view that 18732 is a copy of 20092 thus seems to

¹⁵ These are: the Kannada manuscript of Sravanabelagola and manuscript of Keevelur.

¹⁶ For more information, see the list of the sources at the beginning of Chapter 4. The manuscripts and transcripts are referred to by their serial number in the library to which they belong. The transcripts have the letter T preceding their serial number.

¹⁷ *śā ... ram* is given by 16923 instead of *viśāṃ param*. Again, this is the present reading of 16847 due to the damaged end of the palm-leaf.

¹⁸ Other examples are *purivārāṇām* for *parivārāṇām* in *prathameṣṭakā* 2a and *ṣaṣṭhi* for *ṣaṣṭha* in 10b.

be plausible, but there are no as clear indications for it as in the case of 16847 and 16923.¹⁹ For example, 20092 leaves a fair amount of empty space at its edges. The edges – a very vulnerable part of a palm leaf manuscript – are therefore not damaged, at least not in the parts of which photographs could be obtained, and the comparison of the damaged parts in one manuscripts with the lacunae in the other could not be made. Nevertheless, I have decided to not include the readings of 18732 in the edition, except when they differ from 20092.

Apart from the cases of manuscripts being copies of each other, it should be noted that certain manuscripts and transcripts display great mutual similarity. For example, T297 shares a great deal of lacunae and errors with the manuscript of the Sarasvati Mahal Library (used for the 1960-1968 Thanjavur edition of the *Kāśyapaśilpa*) and with those used for the 1926 Poona edition of the text. There is even a possibility that the original manuscript of T297 was one of the sources for the Poona edition.²⁰ All the Malayalam manuscripts, namely 16847, 20088, 20089 and 20092 also exhibit several mutual similarities (especially in the *prathameṣṭakā* chapter) and it is plausible that they have a common archetype, even if not a direct one. Another group is formed by T2 and T47, which, however, also show mutual differences. Each of the remaining sources often gives a distinct reading.

Moreover, certain manuscripts and transcripts include additional passages that are not found in other sources. For instance, T1 in the *garbhanyāsa* chapter after verse 3cd, T11 after verse 46ab and T2 after verse 48. Such passages should be regarded as later interpolations.

None of the sources appear to be significantly better preserved than others. T1 seems to have a slightly lower number of simple mistakes, but a number of correct readings, at least in the *garbhanyāsa* chapter, are the result of emendations made by the scribe of T1. During my stay in India I managed to consult the origin of T1 - a palm-leaf manuscript belonging to the head priest of a Śaiva temple in Keevelur, Tamil Nadu – and to compare its *garbhanyāsa* chapter with T1. Many ‘faultless’ readings of T1 turned out to be corrections, which again demonstrates just how difficult it is to determine the original reading of a text like the *Kāśyapaśilpa*.²¹ Unfortunately, the Keevelur manuscript was in such a bad state

¹⁹ It is also possible that both manuscripts have a common source. Still, the amount of common errors points rather to the first hypothesis, viz. 18723 being a copy of 20092.

²⁰ T297 is a copy of the manuscript D.13032 belonging to Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras. Since Vajhe, the editor of the text, states that one of his manuscripts was obtained in Madras, there is a possibility that it was D.13032. On the other hand, T297, while being very corrupt, has sometimes a better reading than the edition made by Vahje. If D.13032 was indeed used for the edition, either T297 has been significantly corrected by its scribe or Vahje, for any reasons, decided not to employ the ‘better’ readings of D.13032.

²¹ The corrections included, for example, *anye* instead of *anyāś* (*garbhanyāsa* 2a) given, most probably, by the Keevelur manuscript (the part of the manuscript was damaged, but the long *ā* was still visible), the corrections of sandhi: *vinyasec chyāmaṃ* instead of *vinyaset śyāmam* (26a), *tataḥ*

that a comparison of the two other chapters (*prathameṣṭakā* and *mūrdheṣṭakā*) with T1 was impossible. At the other end of the group, T297, the Thanjavur manuscript and, apparently, all the manuscripts used for the Poona edition, are sources with a relatively high number of mistakes, but again, one cannot say whether their own sources were more corrupt than other manuscripts of the Kāśyapaśilpa. Perhaps they were just copied by an undergraduate student instead of by a *paṇḍit*. Unfortunately, as already noted in Section 3.1 above, just the latter, very corrupt, manuscripts were used for the previous editions of the Kāśyapaśilpa.

3.5 Common errors in the manuscripts of the Kāśyapaśilpa

As mentioned previously, the manuscripts and transcripts of the Kāśyapaśilpa have a very high number of variant readings: there is hardly any verse that has survived in the same form in all of the sources used in the present study. The majority of the variant readings are caused by involuntary scribal errors. The common errors encountered in the manuscripts and transcripts of the Kāśyapaśilpa include:

- lacunae (usually small) due to the damage of the original manuscript²²
- omissions of whole passages, which have dropped out by ‘saut du même au même’ - when two words in close proximity are the same or have the same beginning or ending²³
- repetitions, often due to the same reason²⁴
- the change of word order (transposition)²⁵
- confusion of similar letters (for instance *pa* and *va* in Grantha, *anusvāra* and *-ā* in certain Malayalam manuscripts)²⁶

śilpinam instead of *tataś śilpinam* (35a) and *visarge haritālakam* instead of unmetrical *visarjjanīm haritālakam* (27d).

²² For instance, in 16923, as shown above.

²³ For example, in the *garbhanyāsa* chapter the omission of 23cd-25ab in T1, 43ab in 8561, 16847, 16923, 20088, 20089, T400 and T411 and 50d-51ab in 16847, 16923, 20089.

²⁴ For example, the repetition of 51d-52ab in 16847, 16923.

²⁵ For example, *caturthopapīṭhasīmākā* and *tataḥ pīṭhaṃ caturthake* (*prathameṣṭakā* 9d) and (with a possible change in meaning) *kumbhamadhye* and *madhye kumbhe* (*prathameṣṭakā* 40c).

²⁶ The variants *pidhāna* – *vidhāna*, for instance in *garbhanyāsa* 11b, 31a, 39b etc. and the reading *adhikām apaṭam kuru* of T297 instead of *avataṃ* (*prathameṣṭakā* 8b). T297 is a transcript in Devanāgarī script, but its origin, manuscript D.13032 of the G.O.M.L. in Madras, is in Grantha.

Apart from the common errors, further instances of discrepancies between the manuscripts concern differences in genders of nouns, lack of concord between the adjective and the described noun in some manuscripts, presence or absence of *sandhi*, some variations in orthography and, unfortunately, very frequent cases of readings that are totally corrupt and difficult to explain, probably due to manuscripts having been damaged or the clumsiness of a scribe. Some of the incorrect or unusual readings are listed in Section 3.6 below.

It is impossible to determine if some kinds of erroneous variant readings were created by mistake, for example due to the confusion of two words with a similar spelling, or deliberately, when a scribe attempted to emend a passage, which he found difficult or corrupted. Still, in both cases, the person in question must have had a limited knowledge of the ritual. The reading *vinyaset*, ‘one should place’, can be taken as an example. This is used in some of the sources instead of *vinyāsa*, a technical term for one of the measuring cords (*prathameṣṭakā* 46c). To give another example, *jalādir*, ‘beginning with water’, has been used instead of *jayādir*, a name of a mantra (*prathameṣṭakā* 51b).

Variant readings also include synonyms. The occurrence of synonyms and words with different meanings that still ‘make sense’ for the text might be due to the original manuscript being damaged in this place and the scribe attempting to fill the gap. There is a great chance that one of the readings represents the original one, but in cases where variant readings are equally divided over the manuscripts it is extremely difficult to determine which one it might be.²⁷ Another possible explanation for the use of synonyms, proposed by Goudriaan (1965: 339-340), might be the existence of “a free tradition about the wordings of the texts in questions of details” by which “a free choice was possible out of a number of current synonyms.”

3.6 Unusual grammatical and stylistic forms in the Kāśyapaśilpa

Many erroneous forms encountered in the manuscripts and transcripts of the Kāśyapaśilpa can undoubtedly be blamed on the transmission. Some instances of ‘non-Pāṇinian’ Sanskrit, however, may point to the language used in the time of the compilation of the text and to the jargon of the *śilpins*.²⁸ Certain forms also apparently occur in the epic Sanskrit and in the language of the Āgamas and the Vaiṣṇava Saṃhitās, others seem to be confined to the Kāśyapaśilpa. However,

²⁷ An example might be the synonyms *vidvān* and *dhīmān* in *prathameṣṭakā* 18a.

²⁸ As expressed by Filliozat (1985: xiv): “... le sanskrit des Āgama ... ne suit pas strictement les règles du classissime pāṇinéen.” And further: “... les écarts par rapport aux règles de Pāṇini ne sont pas habituellement des fautes accidentelles, ils sont assez constants pour représenter un usage du milieu où les textes ont été rédigés.”

without a thorough study of the language of the Āgamas and Vāstuśāstras it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions.

The linguistic peculiarities of the Kāśyapaśilpa are as follows:²⁹

- pronominal adjectives declined as nominals: *anyāś* (g. 2c), *itare* (g. 3d)³⁰
- incorrect absolutives - *lyap* for *ktivā*: *sthāpya* (p. 32a; g. 39a; m. 28a, 34a, 52c), *snāpya* (p. 32a); *pūjya* (g. 37a, 56a, m. 17c, 41c), *tyajya* (g. 48c), *lipya* (m. 14c), *bhūṣya* (p. 35a; m. 15c, 40d)³¹
- incorrect absolutives: *yaṣtvā* instead of *iṣtvā* (m. 17c, 41c)
- the loss of -y- in optatives of present class IV: *nyaset* (p. 16d, 40b, 41a, 52b; g. 15a, 17b, 17d, 19d, 26d, 27b, 48d, 50b, 51b, 51d, 52b, 52d, m. 2d, 27c, 31b, 48d, 51a) *vinyaset* (p. 2b, 52c; g. 18b, 19a, 19c, 21d, 23d, 16a, 28b, 52a, 53a; m. 2b, 47b, 48a)³²
- aberrant forms of optative: *hunet* (g. 43d, m. 35b)³³
- changes in nominal stem: i-stems declined as a-stems: *trimūrte* (g. 20d); in-stems declined as a-stems: *śikhāṇḍe* (g. 21b);
- masculine singular becoming neuter singular: *prāsādam* (g. 1c), *āyāmam* (p. 23b)³⁴
- feminine plural becoming masculine/neuter plural: *vālukaiḥ* (p. 6cd)
- masculine plural becoming neuter plural: *dhātūni* (g. 17c)
- an unusual form of absolutive: *-abhiṣecya* / *-abhiṣicya* (g. 37c)
- a compound of absolutive with the noun in which the noun further explains the action expressed by the absolutive: *gavyābhiṣecya* (g. 37c), *stotrābhyarcya* (g. 40b), *namoccārya* (g. 50)³⁵

²⁹ Abbreviations used in the list: p. – *prathameṣṭakā* chapter, g. – *garbhanyāsa* chapter, m. – *mūrdheṣṭakā* chapter). The abbreviations referring to chapters are followed by the verse numbers and *pādas* in which the particular forms were attested. Sometimes the forms were given by all the manuscripts, sometimes only by a few of them. For details, see the critical apparatus in Chapter 4.

³⁰ Instances of pronominal adjectives inflected as nominals are also known from epic Sanskrit, see Oberlies (2003: 111).

³¹ *lyap* for *ktivā* was attested in epic Sanskrit and in certain Āgamic texts, see Oberlies (2003: 283-284) and (Goodall 1998: lxix note 162).

³² The loss of -y- in optatives of cl. IV is mentioned by Oberlies (2003: 197, esp. notes 2, 3) and by Kulikov (2001: 386 note 1187). It is discussed more thoroughly, with examples from post-Vedic Sanskrit in Kulikov (forthcoming).

³³ The form occurs in certain Āgamic texts as mentioned by Goodall (1998: lxix note 161) and Bhatt (1986: xii). See also Bhatt (1985: 80 note 12).

³⁴ Such confusion of genders in ritual texts has already been observed by Goudriaan (1965: 336B).

³⁵ These forms are problematic. One can wonder if they are simply mistakes of the scribes or new linguistic formations. *namoccārya* can also be seen as an example of double *sandhi*. The possibility of interpreting these forms as examples of noun incorporation was discussed by Kulikov (2002).

- double *sandhi*, most probably *metri causae*: *śivottamendranīlaṃ* (g. 20a); *tatopari* (g. 50b), *tatobhyarcya* (g. 40b), *tatocchisṣṭhavisarjanam* (m. 14b), *caiveṣṭakāpi* (m. 27b)³⁶
- absence of *sandhi* in *-s s-* (p. 9d, 32a, 37b, 43a, 53a, 54a, g. 56d, m. 6d, 19d, 38c, 55c)³⁷
- other irregularities of *sandhi*: non assimilation of *-n* to *-l* (g. 41c); non assimilation of *-t* to *-j* (p. 7ab); *-as/ās/is/es ś-* becoming *-aś/āś/iś/eś ś-* (p. 20a, 33b, g. 37a, 45b, 46b, m. 13d, 37d, 38b, 43c; *-as p-* becoming *-o p-* (p. 9d), *-as c-* becoming *-o c-* (g. 48b)
- lack of concord between subject and verb in person (m. 43d-45)
- lack of concord between adjective and substantive in gender (p. 8b, g. 30d, 31cd, 32acd)³⁸
- causatives with non-causal meaning³⁹
- *vā* between words connected by *it* (g. 30a, m. 7ab)⁴⁰

Apart from the curious grammatical and stylistic forms, the Kāśyapaśilpa also uses a specific vocabulary, which includes mainly technical words not found in standard Sanskrit dictionaries, but shared with other treatises on architecture. The index of such technical terms is included in Appendix III.

³⁶ *tatopari* occurs also in Kāraṇāgama 10.39d (chapter about the placing of the crowning bricks: *mūrdheṣṭakā-nyāsa*). Numerous examples of double *sandhi* including *-as u-* changing to *-o-* are given by Oberlies (2003: 37-40). For examples from the Kiraṇatantra, see Goodall (1998: lxviii).

³⁷ According to Goudriaan (1965: 336), this feature is usual in South Indian manuscripts.

³⁸ The same is found in other Āgamas, see Kāraṇa 10.13b-d: *...yugadvārasamāyutam maṅṭapaṃ tattribhāgaikaṃ madhyame vedikāṃ kuru*.

³⁹ In some passages of our text it is not clear whether the causal meaning is intended (see *kārayet* in p. 20b, 24b, g. 3b, 6d, m. 15a, 18b, *dāpayet / pradāpayet* in g. 41c and in m. 57-58ab, *parīkṣayet* in p. 26d, *snāpayet* in g. 37d, and *bandhayet* in m. 30a). The subject of the sentence is often not specified. On the one hand, it is possible that certain actions are to be performed with the help of an intermediary agent (see Oberlies 2003: 249 note 1). On the other hand, it seems that at least in some cases the causatives in the Kāśyapaśilpa are employed to suit the metre (for a similar example, see *kārayet* in Hitopadeśa IV.5, ed Lanman 1983 and Lanman's remark on p. 143, under *ḷ*, caus.). Here the causative verbs are often employed along with non causative ones in the same context (see *nidhāpayet*, occurring alternately with *vinyaset*, in p. 36b, g. 16b, 22b, 23b, 24b and d, 25b and d). A verb with no causal meaning would also be expected in p. 33d (see the edition of the text in Chapter 4).

⁴⁰ The same feature was noted by Goudriaan (1965: 338) in the Vaikhānasa text Kāśyapajñānakāṇḍa.

