

Contents

Preface.....	7
Introduction	9
Author, age, provenance	9
Author	9
Age or ages	11
Total lack of testimonia	11
Direct references to possible sources i.e. former authorities.....	11
Indirect references to datable texts.....	13
Accidental indications of various ages.....	13
Provenance.....	16
North India.....	17
South India.....	18
All-India.....	19
The structure of the work	20
Language and style.....	23
Materials for the edition	25
Manuscripts.....	25
Printed Editions	25
Translations.....	26
Editorial technique.....	28
Sanskrit Text.....	31
Transcribed by pandit. V. Vijayaraghavacharya,	93
Notes on the Text.....	93
Glossary of selected terms unattested or insufficiently recorded in Sanskrit dictionaries.....	95
Appendix One.....	103
Rural society as seen in the Kāśyapīyakṛṣisūkti	103
Appendix Two.....	108
Technique of agriculture as seen in the Kāśyapīyakṛṣisūkti	108
Agricultural meteorology.....	108
The knowledge of the soil.....	109
Crop rotation	110

Fertilizing with Manure	110
Irrigation	111
Preservation of seeds, sowing and transplantation of seedlings	112
Agricultural tools and operations	113
Plough and ploughing	113
Harrow and harrowing	114
The tools and process of reaping	114
Threshing, winnowing	115
Storing	116
Animal husbandry	117
Appendix Three	118
The role of gods in the Kāśyapīyakṛṣisūkti	118
Rites connected with the agricultural year	118
Digging up a well	118
Application of a plough and other tools. The commencement of ploughing and other operations	119
Plough worship (verses 270–276)	120
The worship of the bull-king	121
Worshipping gods at the storing of paddy	122
Rites connected with the agricultural year missing here	123
Āgrayāna	123
Sītāyajña	123
Rites concerning cooking and food	123
Worship of gods before cooking	123
Worship of gods before eating	124
Food offerings to gods	124
Appendix Four	126
Edible and inedible in the Kāśyapīyakṛṣisūkti	126
Edible things	126
Inedible things	128
Appendix Five	133
A list of Sanskrit names of plants in the Kāśyapīyakṛṣisūkti with their English and botanical equivalents and place of occurrence in the text	133
Bibliography and Abbreviations	139

Preface

My first encounter with the Kāśyapīyakṛṣisūkti can be dated from the autumn of 1973. At that time I was a postdoctoral research fellow in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology at the Benares Hindu University under the supervision of the late Professor Lallanji Gopal the foremost expert in the history of agriculture in early India. Greatly inspired by him and my *brāhmaṇa* friends such as Dr Rajbali Pandey and Dr Ram Adhar Pathak I launched out into an intensive research into various texts concerning ancient and medieval Indian agriculture. Being a bookworm, I enthusiastically visited the numerous bookshops in Benares and one day I happened to come across a book with a very promising title. It was the *Agriculture in ancient India* edited by D. Raghavan and published by the *Indian Council of Agricultural Research*, New Delhi in 1964. This book is a rich mine of information on various aspects of agricultural knowledge. It contains copious excerpts from the Kāśyapīyakṛṣisūkti and among other things a list of manuscripts on *kṛṣiśāstra* (agriculture) and *ṛkṣāyurveda* (gardening) in Indian languages. I had already taken up the study of the running English translation of the text during my stay in Benares in the same year. Simultaneously, I made a firm resolution to study it in Sanskrit original.

It took four years before an opportunity arose to get access to a microfilm copy of the Sanskrit ms. kept at the Adyar Library, Madras (Chennai). It was an immediate result of my visit to the unforgettable Professor V. Raghavan in Madras in November 1977. He was who generously helped me to procure the wanted microfilm copy. It was Mrs. Seetha Neelakanthan, librarian of the Adyar Library who granted me permission to publish the manuscript. The photocopy reached me through official channels of the Government of India in 1978. My first idea was to publish the text in Roman transliteration. I must confess that I was in two minds about whether the edition based on only a single ms. was justifiable. However, the importance of the text for research drove me to put the text before the scholarly world. This text edition was followed by my English translation of the work in 1985.

Since 1977 I have looked in vain for another ms. of the text in vain. I simply failed to trace the original in Tirupati from which the extant transcript had been made. It was a turning point in my work when an edition cum English translation was brought out by the Asian Agri-History Foundation, Secunderabad, Andhra Pradesh, India in 2002 and due to the kindness of Prof. Y.L. Nene, chairman of the Foundation I was sent a copy of this valuable publication within a short period after that. From this book it became me quite clear that the strenuous efforts of the Indian colleagues to obtain another mss. of the Kāśyapīyakṛṣisūkti

had also proved to be unsuccessful. At the same time I recognized that, in spite of good solutions of various problems rendered by the Indian colleagues, there still remained a large scope of research into the textual history not to speak of the many philological, semantical, cultural and historical issues.

The next step was to make up my mind to prepare a new edition on the ground of the single extant ms. together with an exhaustive study of the author, date and provenance of the text together with a glossary of special terms exclusively used in the text. Doing so, I could not avoid the problem of the form of the planned edition. At first I thought of a critical edition, but I gave up this idea very soon. The fact that only one ms. existed kept warning me not to opt for this form of edition. On the other hand, it occurred to me that a so-called diplomatic edition could not only be a faithful reproduction of the text but it might serve another purposes, e.g. it might allow us to look into a particular facet of scribal tradition in the Tirupati area where the extant transcript had been made. Finally I decided to publish the text in this form.

During the preparation of this volume I exploited the opinion of a large number of colleagues.

Prof. Oskar von Hinüber (Freiburg, Germany), Prof. Klaus Mylius (Frankfurt am Main), Prof. Thomas Oberlies (Göttingen) and Prof. Chlodwig H. Werba (Wien) all made many valuable suggestions at various points and patiently answered my repeated questions concerning theoretical or technical issues.

In tackling special issues I have greatly benefited from the advices and communications of Dr Gerard Colas (Paris), Prof. Rahul Peter Das (Halle), Dr G. Jan Meulenbeld (Utrecht) and Prof. Jaroslav Vacek (Prague). I wish to express best appreciation and thanks to them.

Last but not least, my thanks are due to Prof. Dieter P. Kapp (Köln) for taking up my work in the series *Beiträge zur Kenntniss südasiatischer Sprachen und Literaturen*. My sincere thanks are also due to *Harrassowitz Verlag* for undertaking the publication of the work.

Budapest 2009

Gy. Wojtilla

Introduction

Author, age, provenance

Author

The treatise has been ascribed to Kāśyapamuni, the sage Kāśyapa, both in the introductory sentence and the colophon. As for the adjectival derivative *Kāśyapīya* that stands in every colophon of the four sections of the text it can be assumed that either Kāśyapa is its traditional author, or at least that this is a work as taught by Kāśyapa.

Arguments can be advanced both for accepting or rejecting his authorship and even the very existence of such a person as Kāśyapa can be questioned.

Kāśyapa turns up as a cultural hero and a promoter of agriculture first in the KA II, 24, 27. J. J. Meyer, who takes here Devala and Kāśyapa as one and the same, thinks that he can be identical with Udalākāśyapa -an otherwise unknown god of agriculture- mentioned in the PāGS II, 13. However, as Meyer himself admits as well that to take the form Udalā as a corruption of Devala meets with some difficulties (Meyer, 1937, 157, n. 1.). Moreover, the reading Devalāya Kāśyapāya stands only in the twelfth century Bhāṣavyākhyāna commentary on the KA, while the Pratipadapañcikā and Śrīmūla commentaries as well as the most important MSS. of the main text read Devāya (BhāVyā on KA II, 24, 27). On the other hand, the author of the Bhāṣavyākhyāna might have been thinking of *jyotiṣa* experts such as Kāśyapa and Devala. This Devala can be dated from a period prior to the ninth century (Wojtilla 2006, 67). Consequently he could have not been meant by Kauṭilya or even the later hands working on the extant text of the KA. In this manner together with Kangle I take here Deva and Kāśyapa and Prajāpati as three divine patrons of agriculture (Wojtilla 2005a, 423). However, unlike Kangle (Kangle 1972, 152) I do not associate Deva with rain. I must acknowledge that theoretically Deva or probably *deva* can be an apposition to any of the two names as Meyer assumed (Meyer 1926, 183, n. 2.) or recently Unni (Unni 2006, I, 318) suggests. Whatever the facts may be, these early attestations univocally refer to a mythical person, whose name can be borrowed by anybody to give a great authority to a text concerning agriculture.

Kāśyapa is allocated a similar role in medieval Kashmirian sources such as in the Rt. V, 115) and the NīP 300. Bhaṭṭotpala in his commentary on the Bs LIV, 7 calls Kāśyapa an expert in agricultural meteorology. This later seems to have nothing to do with the author of our text because he does not figure there as an astronomer or climatologist. The existence of a religious text called

Kāśyapajñānakāṇḍa, 'The wisdom-book of Kāśyapa' from the Tirupati area tentatively dated from the second half of the first millennium A.D. (Goudriaan 1965, 10) is also of no use because there is no evidence of a relation between this work and our text (Goudriaan and Colas). Nalini Sadhale ascribes KāKS and Kāśyapadharmasūtra to one and same person (SE, 124). Her statement is not entirely probative because it is founded on incomplete knowledge of the issue. The later text as whole is surely a modern work (Winternitz 1967, 543). There is no evidence of any correlation between these texts and their authors are merely namesakes. Kāśyapa otherwise figures in history as an authority on grammar, medicine, music, poetics, classical prosody and *bhakti* (NCC IV, 144–145).

It is also noteworthy that Kāśyapa calls himself a *muni* and so lists himself among such authorities as Vyāsa the traditional author of MBh, Bharata the author of Nāṭyaśāstra or the famous triad of grammarians viz., Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali (Apte 1957, 1278). On the other hand the name Kāśyapa signifies a man belonging to the *Kāśyapa-gotra*, a clan of Brahmins which 'is notorious for being able from early days to absorb (as the name Mātaṅga Kassapa shows) aborigines who wanted to become brahmins' (Kosambi 1975, 118). The distribution of the *Kāśyapa-gotra* between 475–1030 known from epigraphy is instructive: Orissa 6, Gujarat 1, Madhya Pradesh 2, Bengal 2, Uttar Pradesh 1 and South India 1 (S. Datta 1989, 288). The small number in the South is striking.

All in all, we must regard Kāśyapa as a nominal author. He can be neither the author or more precisely the creator nor the compiler of the text. Because the text is regarded as a didactic work in order to give it more prestige is attributed to this semi-god and mythical sage.

It is a puzzling question how Kāśyapa, whose name I use as a shorthand term for the author, exactly worked. He refers to himself as *iti ca proktaṁ kāśyapena maharṣiṇā* 'so said the great saint||sanctified sage Kāśyapa' (179), or *śāstre 'sminn api kāśyape* 'also in this textbook of Kāśyapa'(verse 536) ,or he uses the phrase *mataṁ mama* 'my opinion'(verse 6), or he uses the expression *iti matir mama* 'this is my opinion' (verse 607) because such devices are employed in *śāstric* literature without a compulsory, real author. All this may simply indicate that he had some predecessors and he does not agree on their statements. Unfortunately, he does not give the names of the authors of these statements. Unlike to Surapāla or Parāśara, the authors of the Vā. and the KṛP respectively, he does not take care of any concord of contents and form. He did not employ special metres if they could better fit the contents. Composing sentences he frequently transgresses the verse limits.

Had he Sanskritized vernacular sayings or verses he would have kept sentence limits or verse limits. Verses 681–682 lend some support to the Sanskritization hypothesis. 'Then the *kṛṣiśāstra* related by the [Goddess] Earth (Bhūmi= Bhūmidevī) was brought to Earth by the sages. It was preserved by the kings who bear the burden of the protection of their subjects and then in the course of

time it was particularly studied by the *śūdras*. Then the *kṛṣīśāstra* was greatly extended by the inhabitants of the Earth according to the time of rainfall.’

Or, does the extant text bear the touch of the editorial work of more hands i.e. less educated editors copyists? One can easily single out instances of symptoms of the loose edition of the text. The fact that Kāśyapa the agriculturist has not been quoted in any Sanskrit text known to me seems to advocate the later hypothesis.

In the light of the tradition he is a nominal author in much the same way as Kautilya of the KA or Manu of the MāS.

Age or ages

Sanskrit texts are notoriously difficult to date and our treatise exemplifies this vexed problem too. Randhawa proposes a date from the 5th and 10th centuries A.D. (Randhawa 1980, 484). Nene thinks of a date between c. 700–800 A.D. (SE, 132). The above discussion on Kāśyapa’s person might allow us to think tentatively of the early medieval period. However, this is only one aspect of the problem. Therefore we have to look for further evidence.

Total lack of testimonia

The KāKS has not been cited in any known Sanskrit text. The twelfth century Pratipadapañcikā of Bhaṭṭasvāmin that comments upon numerous passages of the KA concerning agricultural production mentions only Parāśara as an authority on agricultural science, but keeps silent about Kāśyapa. More disturbing is the fact that the modern commentary on the same work called Śrīmūla written by T. Ganapati Sastri, a southerner, does not know Kāśyapa either.

Direct references to possible sources i.e. former authorities

On the other hand there are few references to former authorities on various subjects dealt with in the text. Verses 523–524 say that ‘In this world various foods are made from rice which comes from the paddy for the sake of protecting life. The *pākaśāstraka* gives instruction concerning this matter. King Vīrasena composed a big *pākaśāstra* and his son Nala and the great sage Garga did likewise.’ Vīrasena looks like a misnomer for Bhīmasena i.e. Bhīma who disguised himself as a cook of soups sauces (*sūpakartṛ*: MBh IV, 2, 7) and who, according to the ninth century Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha of Budhasvāmin (BKS XVI, 61 and XVIII, 20), was an expert in *sūdaśāstra* ‘the science of cooking’. Nala, alias Bāhuka, served Ṛtupaṇa, the king of Ayodhyā, as his chief charioteer and also as his cook. We learn from the Nala story (MBh III, 73, 10–12) how once he prepared a meat dish for Ṛtupaṇa. Somadeva shows him as a miraculous cook (KSS IX, 6, 395–96). Nevertheless, as Basham justly put it, ‘no ancient textbook on cookery has survived’ (Basham 1981, 215–216).

At the same time, the extant work under Nala’s name, called Pākadarpaṇa, ‘The Mirror of Cooking’ is a relatively late text on Indian dietetics. Since it does

not mention chili (red pepper) and other vegetable stuff introduced by the Portugese, it may have been composed before the sixteenth century, but this inference is not certain (Das 2001, 121–122). As I see it, the book is clearly a text that belongs to that branch of *āyurveda* which became popular after the sixteenth century (Meulenbeld 1984, 66 n. 70 and Wojtilla 2004, 339). This kind of cooking was no longer practised by professionals other than kings. The wording of the Pd. concides with that of the MBh as far as its anonymous author speaks of the preparation of *sūpa* from pulse and vegetables (Pd. pp. 11 - 12). However, this account significantly differs from that of the MBh. This texts prescribes a healthy soup while the latter refers to a delicious one. At the same time it is noteworthy that at the commence of the Pd. beside the here usual god Gaṇeśa Veṅkateśa and Dhanvantari are invoked. The first one is known as the physician of gods in Hindu mythology and the traditional author of a medico-botanical glossary called Dhanvantarinighaṇṭu. Veṅkateśa is a form of Viṣṇu worshipped in Tirumalai, near Tirupati. It can be conjectured that at a certain time both the KāKS and the Pd. had simultaneously gained currency in the Tirupati area.

The thirteenth century commentary called Jayamaṅgalā on the Kāmasūtra (Jm. I, 3, 15) says that the sauce (*vyāñjana*) made of vegetables makes food especially tasty. Kāśyapa uses also the term *vyāñjana* (verses 522 and 525) in the same context but not *sūpa*.

It is not without interest that there is an unpublished text of the genre of the Pd. and it is ascribed to Bhīmasena (Wojtilla 2004, 344).

These data allow us to make some tentative assertions. First of all, it is clear that here we have to do with a strong tradition of attributing books on traditional sciences to gods, demigods or mythical persons. This practice works in the case of the above cookery books. It stands to reason to think that in verses 523–524 these books are meant. Being so, the dating of the Pākadarpaṇa of Nala may be helpful for the dating of our treatise to a period around the sixteenth century. Further research into the textual history of the Pākadarpaṇa and Bhīmasena's book may refine the dating. Of course, it calls for further explanation of why in the above verses stand *Pākaśāstraka* instead of Pākadarpaṇa and Vīrasena for Bhīmasena. It can simply be due to the contamination of names of persons and books ascribed to them. All in all, I find the coincidence of wording in our treatise and the Jm. a strong argument for the thirteenth century as *post quem* in dating.

The name of sage Bhārgava occurs in the text in three times. In the context of fruitful cooperation in agricultural activity verse 218 says 'Simultaneous uttering and unanimity is seen everywhere with the bees – so declared in this world Bhārgava the sage.' Verse 311 reads 'From the protection of cows the highest pleasure is born for gods and therefore welfare for the subjects – so said Bhārgava.' While Bhārgava recommends table-land for growing *ādhaka* (pigeon pea, *Cajanus indicus* Spreng.) and *māṣa* (bean marked with black and grey spots,