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PREFACE

The Pāñinīya-Sīkṣā ascribed to Pāṇini, the great grammarian of ancient India, is known as the Sīkṣā- Vedāṅga. It was eighty years ago that Weber published a critical edition of this work in his Indische Studien (IV). This edition has long been out of print and besides this later researches and accession to new materials have made it necessary that the work should be edited afresh. Hence the present edition has been prepared. The importance of this work has been discussed in the Introduction. But one aspect of the critical study of the text of the Pāñinīya-Sīkṣā which has not been noticed there is that from such a study we can more or less clearly understand how literary documents of ancient India like the present text have in course of their transmission to the posterity added to their bulk through interpolation in successive periods. Eighteen couplets in which the original Pāñinīya-Sīkṣā was in all probability composed had added to them in the present day text no less than forty-two couplets. This fact puts us on our guard against taking every syllable of an ancient work as of equal antiquity and we are inclined to turn our attention to higher criticism which has been attempted in this volume. The present editor however does not claim infallibility for himself and will consider himself to be amply paid for his labours if scholars will give him the credit for an honest attempt in pursuance of a well-known principle.

For various reasons the printing of this volume took nearly three years during which some amount of work related to the subject has been done. I have tried as far as has been possible for me to utilize or notice such work in the list of addenda. If however any important writing in this line has escaped my notice I should apologise to its author.
My best thanks are due to the authorities of the Calcutta University for giving me every facility in the work and to my esteemed friend Pandit Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha of the Skt. MSS. Department, Calcutta University, for kindly helping me in reading the proof of the text portion, and also to the authorities of the India Office, the State Library of Berlin, of Munich, the University of Lund for lending MSS. or supplying rotographic copy of them. It is with great pleasure that I should mention here that the rotograph of the Sikṣā-paṇjikā supplied by the University of Lund came as a gift to the Calcutta University. And finally I should offer my most grateful thanks to my teacher Prof. Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji for his kindly making valuable suggestions while he went through this volume in MS. as well as in proof. It however goes without saying that for all views expressed in the work the responsibility remains entirely mine.

University of Calcutta

June, 1938

Manomohan Ghosh
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Thick types (Devanāgarī) in pp. 3-6, 35-44 and asterisks in pp. 7-34 and Arabic numerals on the left of all these pages will indicate the position of the reconstructed text in different recensions.

An asterisk will indicate a spurious passage. When put before the first hemistich the asterisk relates to the entire couplet and it sometimes relates to an entire couplet together with a third hemistich. An Arabic numeral appearing on the left margin between a pair of double danūs (e.g., ॥13॥) signifies the position of the passage in the reconstructed text. A number prefixed to hemistich relates to it and the hemistich which precedes it; numbers with ‘a’ and ‘b’ after them indicate respectively the first and the second hemistich only of a couplet in the reconstructed text.
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INTRODUCTION

1. The Present Edition. Among the large number of works known as the Śikṣās the Indian tradition accords the position of the Vedāṅga Śikṣā to the one connected with the name of Pāṇini (see § 28). Weber in his edition of the Pāṇinīya Śikṣā (Indische Studien, IV) has however remained silent on this point. In his History of Sanskrit Literature too he did not give any decisive opinion in the matter, but later on Max Müller positively denied the validity of the traditional notion about the PŚ. being a Vedāṅga. Since the days of Max Müller his view has been accepted by almost all the scholars without the slightest protest. Prof. Liebich may be said to have been a notable exception in this matter; for he maintains that the PŚ. though late in its present form, is old in its contents. This view however has received very scanty attention from scholars who are otherwise very careful. Even two very recent writers who touched the subject, Mr. C. V. Vaidya and Dr. Siddheshwar Varma, have followed the view of Max Müller. Of these two the opinion of Mr. Vaidya deserves special mention because he is frankly against what he considers to be a late date (c. 1.00 B. C.) for the Rgveda suggested by Max Müller, and is for

3 'History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature,' p. 145.
placing this work as early as 4000 B. C. But Mr. Vaidya does not make any effort to explain why the PS. should not be considered a genuine Vedāṅga belonging to the great antiquity he assigns to Pāṇini and Yāska. Dr. Siddheshwar Varma however gives some arguments to prove the lateness of the PS. But these, as we shall see later on (§§25 ff.) do not seem to be based on all available materials which might have given him a different view about the age and character of the work. For he has known the PS. in three recensions only, while the work itself exists in no less that what may be called five recensions which read together critically are to give one a better idea about the age and character of the text. There is yet another scholar who not only considers the PS. to be a late work and hence not a Vedāṅga, but accords the same position to a Sūtra work ascribed, on very questionable grounds to Pāṇini. We shall see later on (§§31-32) why this view is untenable, and this will bring us face to face with the text-history of the PS. for which a critical edition of the work is essentially necessary. Hence no apology need be offered for undertaking such an edition of the work together with that of the two commentaries attached to its two (late) recensions. Reasons which have led us to believe that the PS. is the original Vedāṅga Śikṣā will be discussed later on (§§28-30) and as such it is to be placed as early as Pāṇini who in all likelihood was its author (see § 33). This being the oldest treatise on the phonetics of Old Indo-Aryan—and possibly of Indo-European—deserves to be studied carefully for the history of the Vedic as well as Sanskrit sounds.

3 Ibid., pp. 5 f.
4 The main arguments which Dr. Siddheshwar Varma adduces to show that the PS. is a not the Vedāṅga Śikṣā are as follows: (1) The PS. has no claim to be a mālāgama or source of the Prātiśākhya, (2) Pīgala, and not Pāṇini, is the author of the PS. The first argument has been refuted in §§28-30, and the second in § 33.
5 Dr. Raghu Vira, 'Discovery of the Lost Phonetic Sūtras of Pāṇini' in the JRAŚ, 1931, pp. 658 ff.
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2. The Critical Apparatus. It has been mentioned above (§1) that the PŚ. is available in five recensions. Each of these recensions again is available in MSS. or printed texts with more or less varying readings. Hence before reconstructing the PŚ. on the basis of different recensions we shall have to find out the most representative text of each version and its age and special characteristics. For this purpose we have consulted various MSS. and printed texts and are giving below the results together with a description of them all.

(a) The Agni Purāṇa Recension. The Agni Purāṇa contains the shortest available text of the PŚ., which consists of 21½ couplets only. Among these AP. 1b-10, 17-21c correspond to PŚ. 1-3a, 10, 4b-7a, 8-13a, 15a, 16b, 17, 18 (see below the text of the AP. recension). The AP. recension omits one complete couplet (14) and halves of four others (7b, 13b, and 15b-16a) which the PŚ. in all likelihood contained. Grounds for such an assumption will be discussed below in the Notes (26a, 14, 23 and 30). AP. 1a, 11-16, which are late additions to the PŚ. will also be discussed in the Notes (2, 18, 48a, 49a and 38a). Besides these twenty couplets and a half the AP. recension includes the following which may justifiy us to assume the existence of the AP. 3b-4a.

raṅgaś ca khe aram proktah hakāram pañcamair yuktah
antaḥstābhīḥ samāyuktah ‘aurasya’ ‘kañṭhyā’ eva saḥ

In this couplet we meet with the AP. 3b (italicised in the above quotation) and the two fragments of the second half of the same (put within the inverted commas). The reading vakṣye mukhe’ kṣaram (for raṅgaś ca khe aram) recorded by some MSS. seems to rule out the possibility of yathā saurāśtriṅka nārī, etc. (Yaj. 6), ever occurring in the place of the AP. 3b-4a. This interpolation seems to be the work of some late scribe who under the influence of the Yaj. recension supplied the reading raṅgaḥ ca, etc., to the erroneously repeated AP. 3b-4a, unfortunately without any advantage. From a consideration of the possible
age of the Agni Purāṇa (c. 800 A.C.) later than Pāṇini by much more than 1000 years we may be justified to make an assumption about its defective tradition.

The representative text of the AP. recension of the PS. has been obtained from the following materials:


P. The Agni Purāṇa published from the Ānandāśrama, Poona. MSS. ka, kha, ga, gha and ā used for this text have been indicated by a, b, c, d and e respectively.

V. The Agni Purāṇa with Bengali translation published by the Vaṅgavāśi Press, Calcutta.

(b) The Pañjikā Recension. As the commentary called the Śiksā-Pañjikā does not contain the particular text, it follows, in a complete form, the Pñj. recension of the PS. had to be reconstructed to some extent conjecturally from the pratikas of passages handled in the commentary. The compiler of the catalogue of Skt. MSS. in the India Office Library, London, has wrongly considered this to be identical with the Yaj. recension. But on comparing the latter (Yaj. rec.) with this we find that in some important points the two differ. For example, unlike the Yaj. the Pñj. contains the hemistich anusvāra-yamānāṃ ca nāśikā sthānam ucyate (PS. 14a) and upadhānīya uṣmā ca jihvā-mūlīya-nāsikā (PS. 14b) and in this respect it falls in a line with the Prk. recension. Two passages (PS. 9, 10) though not explained in the Pañjikā seems to have existed in the text used by its author1 (see Notes 26a and 28) and for this reason they have been included in the reconstructed text. Except these two, the Pñj. consists of 21½ couples of which 4-19, correspond to PS. 1-18, respectively. On comparing

1 The name of the author does not occur in any MS. But Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Shivasadatta in his introduction to the Siddhānta-kaumudi (ed. Venkateswara, Bombay, says asya śikṣāyaḥ Rāghavacārya-kṛtam bhāsyam jāgartī tāk. Now in some MSS. the Pañjikā has been called Bhāṣya (p. 17). It may be that Rāghavacārya is the author of the Pañjikā.
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the Pāj. with the Prk. recension it appears that the latter is an inflated version of the former. There are no sufficient data to suggest any precise date for the Pāj. recension. But it appears by no means recent. For the Pañjikā quotes from one of the old authorities named Audavraji of whose exact time we have no information; but as he is mentioned by the Nār. S.,¹ a work, except for its interpolated passages, is as old as 200 B.C., he was probably older than this time. He has also been mentioned in the Rk-tantra Vyākaraṇa (Sāmaveda Prātiśākhya)² and in the Sikṣā-prakāśa,³ another commentary to the PS. There being no mention of Audavraji in phonetical works which are palpably very late we may assume that at their time his work was lost and the author of the Pañjikā flourished possibly earlier than a time when A.'s work was still available, and such was the case with the authors of the available Rk-tantra Vyākaraṇa and the Sikṣā-prakāśa.⁴ Now the time for the Sikṣā-prakāśa being placed tentatively between 1000 A.C. and 1300 A.C. we may consider the lower limit to the date of the Pāj. recension as the 1200 A.C. Along with this should be considered the fact that the Agni Purāṇa recension can be placed at the earliest in 800 A.C. Thus it appears that the Pāj. recension existed between 800 and 1200 A.C. The representative text of this recension of the PS. has been worked out from the following MSS. and printed text.

A¹. Manuscript of the Sikṣā-Pañjikā in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, No. 2834.

A². MS. of the Pañjikā in the same Society, No. 1169.

A³. MS. of the Pañjikā in the same Society, No. 4180 C.

B. The rotograph of a MS. of the same procured by the Calcutta University from the State Library of Berlin.

¹ Ed. SS., II, 8. 5.
² Ed. Suryakanta Sastri, Sūtra 60.
³ Ed. SS., p. 388. See also the same edited below.
⁴ See below on the Prak. recension.
G. The text of the Śikṣā-Pañjikā together with the PŚ. in its Rk recension printed in Benares, 1929 (Haridas Śkt. Series No. 10) [Mr. Suryakanta Sastri mentions one such text printed in Benares in 1887 (op. cit., introd., p. 33n.)]. But we have not seen it. From Mr. Sastri’s quotation it seems to agree with HL.]

H. A manuscript of the Śikṣā-Pañjikā from the Royal Library of Munich. This was used by M. Haug.

I. A manuscript of the Śikṣā-Pañjikā from the India Office Library.

L. The rotograph of the Śikṣā Pañjikā presented to the Calcutta University by the University of Lund.

(c) The Prakāśa Recension. As was the case with the Pañjikā recension this also had to be reconstructed from the pratikas of the passages explained in the commentary called the Śikṣā-prakāśa. Having had to depend on rather imperfect materials we can never be sure that these restored texts were actually before their respective commentators. The most we can claim for these texts, is that they surely contained these particular passages in approximately the same form. But in case of the Prk. recension this claim can be admitted only subject to the limitation that the actual order in which some of the couplets occurred is not known. The Prk. passages, of the position of which in the text we are not sure, have been marked with an asterisk in the Table C, showing their relative position. This recension but for the inclusion of one hemistich (Prk. 22a) and the exclusion of one couplet (Yaj. 34) and the different order in which the different passages of the Yaj. recension have been arranged, is similar to the latter. But the confused manner in which the passages are available in the Yaj. recension gives us grounds to assume that the same were reduced to writing from memory at a time later than the composition of the Śikṣā-prakāśa and hence we have taken it as a separate recension.

The date of the Prakāśa recension may be considered to be later than that of the Pāj. for the simple reason that the
former is much longer than the latter and the increase in bulk has needed some time. But the Śikṣā Prakāśa may not be earlier than the 10th century. For he seems to quote a long passage verbatim from the commentary of Viṣṇumitra on the Rk Prātiṣākhya (vide infra). Now this Viṣṇumitra seems to be a predecessor or at best a contemporary of Uvaṭa (1100 A.C.). Besides this, from the introduction to the Śikṣā Prakāśa we learn that the anonymous author wrote a commentary to Pīṅgala’s metrics. Now the only commentary available for the Chandah-sūtras of Pīṅgala is by Halāyudha 1 who was the minister of the king Laksmanā Sena (c. 1200 A.C.) of Bengal. Hence we may tentatively assign the Prk. recension to a time about 1200 A.C. It may be that Madhusūdana Sarasvatī (c. 1500 A.C.), author of the Prasthāna-bheda described this recension as the pañcakhaṇḍatmikā and it is sure he did not mean the Rk recension, for that is ekādaśa-khaṇḍatmikā (see the text below).

The text of the Śikṣā-prakāśa or the Prakāśa Recension has been edited from:

L. The rotograph of a MS. from the University of Lund.

Be. A version of the Prakāśa printed in the Śikṣā-saṃgraha from Benares.

(d) The Yajus Recension. This recension of the PŚ. has been carefully edited by Weber in his Indische Studien, IV, pp. 345 ff., on the basis of two MSS., B and W, of which W is dated Samvat 1696. Occasional help from three MSS. of the Rk. recension C, D and L has also been taken in this. For all practical purposes this edition being faultless we have adopted it leaving out its minor details. Special characteristics of this recension have already been indicated (§ 2c).

(e) The Rk Recension. This recension has also been edited by Weber (loc. cit.) on the basis of three MSS., C, D and L. Omitting some minor details we have adopted this edition after comparing it with the following:

1 Weber places him in the second half of the 10th century. See Ind. Stud., VIII, p. 198; also Winternitz, Geschichte, Bd. III, p. 27.
Ch. The PS. published along with the Sikṣā-Pañjikā from Chowkamba, Benares, 1929.

This recension is scarcely much older than the 18th century; for MSS. of this used by Weber are all later than Sāṃvat 1833 and we have come across no earlier MS. This is the most inflated version of the PS. and contains nearly 60 stanzas. Only \( 17 \frac{1}{2} \) among these may be taken as genuine. These are Rk 4-11, 13, 16-19, 22-23, 38-40a corresponding to PS. 1-8, 9, 11-13, 14a, 15, 16a, 16b-18, respectively. The nature and source of the remaining 42 couplets have been discussed below (§ 3).

3. Reconstruction. From a very close study of its five recensions eighteen only of the couplets appear to constitute the original PS. Only fourteen among them, however, occur in all the recensions,\(^1\) while the remaining couplets do not so occur. But on internal evidence they appear to be organically connected with the fourteen couplets common to all recensions and hence surely occurring in the original PS. Problems connected with them have been discussed in detail in Notes given along with the translation of the PS. Sources of more than half of the remaining forty-two couplets which we consider to be later additions to the text of the PS. have been traced to different late Sikṣā\(^2\) works. Of the remaining twenty couplets the source of which we could not explore, at least eight (Rk 1-3, and 56-60, and passages corresponding to them in other recensions), can probably be credited to the editors of different recensions. The remaining twelve were, in all likelihood, taken also from some late Sikṣās lost to us. Grounds on which we have considered a passage or group of passages spurious or later additions have also been discussed in Notes. From

---

\(^1\) See the conspectus of Text-Units of the different recensions given at the end of this Introduction.

\(^2\) Cases of later Sikṣās can to some extent be compared with those of the later Upaniṣads (cf. Winternitz, History of Ind. Lit., Vol. I, p. 280). In order to give authenticity to their own theory or practice later writers on Vedic phonetics have called their works Sikṣās. These late works are nevertheless important for the study of Indo-Aryan phonetics.
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a study of the interpolated passages it appears that the custodians of the Vedāṅga Śikṣā have at different times made desperate efforts to preserve this small treatise consisting of only eighteen couplets, from extinction. Lest it should fall out of use before later works on the subject, which for the time being gave better guidance to the reciter of the Vedic texts they culled some new materials from these and tagged them on to the Pṛ. in different relays. Even this method though resorted to sometimes were not exclusively followed. To supplement this they put it along with other works on similarly important subjects in the body of a big compilation like the Agni Purāṇa. A case which seems to be analogous to this is the alleged interpolation of the Bhagavad-Gītā in the corpus of the Mahābhārata. For a tabular statement of the growth ¹ of Pṛ. showing the distribution of genuine and interpolated passages in its different recensions, ¹ see Table A.

Table A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recensions</th>
<th>Total Number of Hemistichs.</th>
<th>Total.</th>
<th>Traced.</th>
<th>Untraced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agni Purāṇa</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 (−1 editorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paṇḍikā</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 (−12 &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakāśa</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13 (−13 &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaujuḥ sākhā ²</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15 (−12 &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rk sākhā</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41 (−16 &quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Compare with this the growth of the text of the Nirukta (Prof. L. Sarup's Introduction, pp. 19-20; S. Sastri, Rk-tantra, Lahore, 1933, Introduction, pp. 45, 46) and of the Uṇādi-Sūtras (Prof. Goldstücker, Pāṇini : his place in Skt. Literature, London, 1861, pp. 131, 170; Reprint from Allahabad, 1914, pp. 130, 189; S. Sastri, ibid).
² For the meaning of the Sākhā see below (§§ 18ff.).
From a study of the above table as well as the contents of the different recension we can suggest the mutual relation of the different recensions as follows:

_Ur-text of the PS._

```
   |       |   |
```

SIX VEDAÑGAS

4. Before taking up the history of growth and development of individual Vedañgas it would be proper to enquire into conditions which made it obligatory for the Vedic priests to admit as a part of the sacred lore six subjects, the study of which was necessary either for the recitation, the understanding or the proper sacrificial employment of the Vedic hymns. Materials for such a study are indeed very poor. We have few relics of that early age when the Vedic seers were composing songs of praise or adoration to their deities with the least idea of their later complicated use in various rituals and ceremonies. Hence, how and when the simple utterances of the early Indo-Aryans who entered India most probably sometime after the beginning of the second millennium B.C.,¹ began to be considered sacred and meant specially to be used in sundry rituals, will probably remain a mystery for all time to come. But it will not be out of place to make here the following a priori considerations.

5. As a great many of the subsequent ramifications observable in the Vedic cult (e.g., those in the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras) have been found to be non-existent among Indo-European people of other countries it may be assumed that a great part of them owe their origin to the influence of some widespread pre-Vedic cult or cults of India.² In case of the Old Indo-Aryan


language a similar pre-Aryan influence has already been postulated to account for the development of cerebral sounds as well as a portion of the Old Indo-Aryan vocabulary.¹ If such an influence played any considerable part in giving shape to the Vedic religion it may be said to have practically finished a great part of its work about 1000 B. C.² as far as the Indian Midland was concerned; for a very long time must have been necessary for the pre-Aryan Indians to get reconciled with the hostile newcomers and ultimately to accept their faith and culture. Now the ethnic constitution of the modern Indians who profess adherence to the Vedas shows that a great majority of them has come from non-Aryan stocks. Thus one will probably be justified to assume here a conversion—may be unconscious—of the non-Aryan people to Vedic religion, which was responsible for such a state of things; and such a conversion in all likelihood began to progress with considerable force about 1000 B. C. when the Vedic people and their ways were in all probability not only no longer displeasing but also becoming attractive to the pre-Aryan people of the land, and a progressive section of them had already been Aryanised as far as their religion was concerned. And even some blood-mixture with the new-comers is much likely to have occurred at this stage. It is quite possible that the six Vedāṅgas partly grew up and partly took shape under the circumstances demanded by an effort on the part of these progressive non-Aryans and their descendants to acquire thoroughly the Vedic culture, a great deal of which was essentially connected with religious practices.

6. It is conceivable that these neo-Vedic people consisting of Aryanised non-Aryans as well as mixed Aryans took more than ordinary interest in Aryan faith and culture, and

² Oldenberg places the period of the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads (of course old ones) between 930 B. C.-700 B. C. (Buddha, his Life, his Doctrines, etc., Calcutta, 1927, pp. 14-15). The Brāhmaṇas are characteristically the product of that period in which primitive Indo-Aryans were very much influenced by pre-Aryans of India.
later on their descendants began to get ashamed of their extra-
Aryan origin and wished very much to pass themselves off
as thorough-bred Aryans. But a great obstacle in their
way was indeed the colour of their skin as well as their
language and customs. For the time being difficulties seemed
insuperable, but they did not remain so for a long time.
Means were gradually discovered for concealing their ethnic and
cultural origin.

7. The famous Puruṣa-sūkta (Rgveda, X. 90) having been
revealed (c. 1000 B. C.) the question of colour became explicable
without reference to any ethnic mixture though such a thing
had in a manner had to be recognized later in a rather queerly
formulated Varnasāṅkara theory of the Dharma-sūtras to explain
the existence of different non-Aryan groups which entered rather
late within the pale of the society organised in the Varnāśrama
principle.

8. The language and customs were from their very nature
ill suited to remain hidden under the Vedic revelation. Habits
whether of speech or of other matters die indeed very hard.
Though the exigencies of their religious rites compelled them
to recite the Vedic mantras and to use the sacred tongue, the
neo-Aryans surely used in their family or tribal circles their
traditional speech while during their intercourse with the Aryans
a jargon consisting of varying degrees of Aryan and non-Aryan
was prominent. This state of things, as can be easily imagined,
was detrimental to the purity of the Vedic speech and occasion-
ally gave rise to mlecchita (corrupted) speech condemned so much
by the custodians of the Vedic culture (Brāhmaṇena na mlec-
chitam vai, etc. Patañjali, ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 2). Thus the
necessary incentive was furnished to contemporary leaders of the
Vedic religion, who surely included neo-Aryans too, for studies
in phonetics (śikṣā), metrics (chandas), grammar (vyākaraṇa) and

1 A case parallel to this is to be found in the attempt on the part of some descendants of non-Anglo-Saxon people of America to pass as people of Anglo-Saxon origin.
vocabulary (*nighantu*). The contents of the *Kalpa*-sūtra which branched off later on to Śrauta, Grhya and Dharma-sūtras may also be said to have received attention at that time when the neo-Vaidikas were trying to assume the appearance of thoroughly-bred Aryans and for this purpose they required a set of codified rules by following which they could be trained in Vedic ways. Oldenberg who does not pay any attention to the ethnic composition of the Vedic people seems to consider that a training in the Vedic ways was a priestly imposition on the other Aryan classes. (See ‘Buddha, His Life, His Doctrines, His Order,’ Calcutta, 1927, pp. 14-15.) As, for various ceremonies the observation of correct date and days of the moon was already a necessity even before the conscious Aryanizing activities began, the study of astronomy (*jyotisa*) commenced earlier; but it is probable that its results were not gathered in a written treatise till later when some of the earliest available texts of other Vedāṅgas have been composed.

9. One of the earliest references to the six aṅgas of the Veda occurs in the Śadvimśa Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda which on linguistic grounds has been considered to be pre-Pāṇinian. And in the Mundakopaniṣad (*circa* 700 B.C.) too the six Vedāṅgas have been enumerated. In a passage of the Gautama Dharma sūtra (*circa* 500-400 B.C.) we learn that as his authorities on the administration of justice the king was to take among other things the Vedāṅga (VIII. 5; XI. 19; SBE., Vol. 33, p. 234; Winternitz, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 519). In the Āpastamba

---

1 Prof. Lakshman Sarup has a different opinion on this point (Translation and Notes of the Nighantu and the Nirukta, pp. 221-223). He is also unwilling to recognize Pāṇini’s grammar or Nighantu or similar other works as Vedāṅgas (*loc. cit.*).

2 Śrauta Sūtras in fact represented the Kalpa sūtras most. For according to the Siksā Prakāśa commentary to the Pā. kalpa is the science of rituals.

3 Max Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 211 ff.


6 *Ibid*, p. 268. For the time of Mundaka, see Hertel's edn., pp. 64 ff.
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Dharma sūtra (c. 500 B.C.)\(^1\) too Vedāṅgas have been mentioned twice (I. 10, 28, 21; II. 4, 8, 10). This sūtra work also enumerates the six aṅgas, one of which is of course the Śiksā (II. 4, 8, 10).\(^2\) In spite of these very early references to Vedāṅgas with or without their number, earlier scholars were not prepared to admit that such references implied 'the existence of six distinct books or treatises intimately connected with the sacred things' and in their opinion these references implied merely the admission of six subjects, the study of which was necessary either for the recitation, the understanding, or the proper sacrificial employment of the Vedic hymns (Max Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 109; Winternitz, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 268). But as we have seen before that conditions favourable for the rise of the Vedāṅgas were probably in existence as early as 1000 B.C. and as the beginning of these studies at the time of the early Brāhmaṇas are attested by reliable references the existence of written treatises on Vedic aṅgas about 600 B.C. can by no means be considered to be impossible. The most one can assume about such works in the absence of suitable evidence, is that they have probably been lost. But to consider them to be non-existent after a lapse of nearly four centuries during which Vedic priests could compose voluminous Brāhmaṇas will indeed be a unique piece of inconsistency. Max Müller's schematic division of the Vedic period into Chandas, Mantra, Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra periods perhaps lie at the back of this kind of unreasonable view. It is not possible that such closely divided ages ever existed; some overlapping has surely occurred; some at least of the Vedāṅga treatises were written in the Brāhmaṇa period—may be towards its end. For it is scarcely possible that when an energetic and intelligent people like the Indo-Aryans were already composing works like the

\(^1\) SBE., Vol. 38, xliii; also Batakrisnā Ghosh, 'Apastamba and Gautama' in IHQ., 1937, pp. 607ff.

\(^2\) J. Charpentier places without any justification the origin of the Vedāṅgas between 300-100 B.C. (see his ed. of the Uttarādhyāyana-sūtra, pp. 81-82).
Brāhmaṇas, small treatises on the Vedāṅgas which, as we already noticed (§ 5), must have been a vital necessity with them about 1900 B.C. and after, were not then being prepared. Thus we are justified to assume that treatises on different Vedāṅgas might have been in existence between 1000-600 B.C.¹

10. We have seen above under what possible conditions the Vedic priests might have turned their attention to the pronunciation of their sacred language and how this attention ultimately gave rise to the Śikṣā-vedāṅga. But, as can very naturally be expected, the word Śikṣā did not continue to mean the same thing during the different stages of its evolution.

11. According to Pāṇini (VII. 4. 53) the word Śikṣā has been derived from the desiderative of śak, ‘to be able.’ Thus the literal meaning of śikṣā will be ‘a desire to be able.’ It is very difficult to understand how this rather curious meaning finally developed into ‘phonetics.’ It is indeed due to this difficulty that Weber and Max Müller have cut the Gordian knot by a bold assumption that śikṣā means originally ‘a desire to know’ (zu können suchen) though it must be admitted that ‘knowing’ cannot very well be equated to ‘pronunciation.’

But, from the discussion made above of the conditions under which Śikṣā as a subject of study arose, the original meaning of this word seems to be plain enough. For were not the newly Aryanized people with their different ancestral speech-habit ill able to recite the Vedic mantras in a faultless manner? Now it may well be assumed that the difficulty in their case who had a totally different linguistic basis was so great that learners among them had to have indeed a very strong ‘desire to be able’ to recite the Vedic hymns. Possibly on such a hypothesis alone can we understand how the original meaning of ‘to desire to be able’ came to be narrowed down ‘to desire to be able to recite the Vedas correctly’ and from this finally

---

1 See Lüders, Vyāsaśikṣā, p. 1.
developed the sense of the study of pronunciation. Thus the original import of the term Śikṣā seems to have embedded in it an important history.

12. Now the Vedic pronunciation as we see from the Śikṣās and Prātiśākhya was more or less a complex affair. But it is not so much possible that all phases of this complexity were felt all at once at the very beginning when attention began to be given to pronunciation; even in case of its being felt these different aspects of it could not be handled with success at the very beginning. Whatever might be the case it is pretty sure that with the early Vedic phoneticians (Śikṣākārās) matters were simple enough and only the fundamentals occupied their attention. Our evidence in this matter comes from Patañjali who in his definition of a typical priest (ārtivijñā) says that he should be able to use the (Vedic) speech with (properly inflected) words (pada), with (proper) accent (svāra) and with the (properly articulated) speech-sounds (varṇas). From this we learn that the observation of the proper accent as well as the right pronunciation of speech-sounds were Śikṣākārās' chief object of study. And a later authority Viṣṇumitra, a commentator of the RPr., defines the Śikṣā as svāra-varṇopadesaka-sāstram, the science which teaches accent and the speech-sounds (varṇa). Madhusūdana Sarasvatī too says the same thing more elaborately. Hence we see that the correct production of speech-sounds in general and the pitch and quantity of vowels comprised

1 In order to appreciate these we are to take notice of different stages in the phonetic evolution of the Middle Indo-Aryan. See S. K. Chatterji, op. cit.
2 yo vā īmāṃ padaśāḥ svāraśā' kṣaraśa vīcām vidadhāti sa ārtivijñāḥ (Mahābhāṣya, Vol. I, p. 3). Pada in this passage does not mean 'Verstollen' though in the Aśvamedha Brāhmaṇa this is the meaning (see B. Liebich, Zur Einühring, II, §§ 3-4) and akṣara does not mean here syllable in connection with metrics but with phonetics, for Patañjali says later on that Vedic words are taught to those who know places of articulation, adjustment of organs and the vocal words. This probably shows phonetics was studied earlier than metrics.
the sole scope of the Śikṣā at the earliest stage of its development. It is quite possible that there was no written treatise on these topics, the Ācārya teaching the young learner (brahma-cāri) by words of his mouth, and it was only a little later that the earliest manual on different topics of the Śikṣā came to be written down. Now of the two phases of pronunciation that were considered important in the beginning, the proper instruction of the speech-sounds was probably reduced to a system first of all. We do not know what this system was like, but in view of somewhat phonetic arrangement of varṇas in the Varṇa-samāmnāya or the so-called Siva-sūtras we are tempted to assume that this—probably in some earlier form—constituted the first treatise on the instruction of speech-sounds. The word samāmnāya ‘traditional recitation’ probably gives support to this view. Kātyāyana also seems to give it support while he says vṛtti-samavāyārtha upadesāḥ, the enunciation (of the speech-sounds in the Siva-sūtras) is meant for arranging the varṇas in a proper order for (the facility of) recitation.  

1 The prescription of a long residence of the very young Brahmacārin (coming in some cases from extra-Aryan groups) with the Ācārya, in the Grhyasūtras resulted and seems to be meant for a linguistic rebirth (devījātā).  

2 Prof. B. Paddegon says that the Siva-sūtra as a phonetical classification deserves the highest praise (‘The moemonotechnics of Pāṇini’s Grammar,’ Acta Orientalia, VII, 1939, p. 54). Mr. K. C. Chatterji is against such a view (see Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol. XXIV).  

3 In this translation we have ventured to differ from Patañjali on the interpretation of the word vṛtti which he explains as astra-pravṛttiḥ (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 13). Our translation of the word as ‘recitation’ has its support from the well-known comp lex abhyāsārthe drutān vṛttim, etc. (RPfr., XIII. 19, Yaj., 29, etc.). Compare also the word āvṛtti recitation. If Patañjali has misunderstood Kātyāyana there is no wonder about it; according to his own testimony Patañjali lived in a decadent age as regards the proper teaching of the Vedas. He says: In the hoary antiquity it was like this: Brahmans after their upāsanās studied grammar. And when they have learnt the places of articulation of sounds, the adjustment of organs and vocal chord in producing them, they were given instruction in Vedic words. But to-day it is not so. Readinthe Vedas (straight) one quickly becomes a reciter of the same. (Pūrā kalpa etad ārtya, sanākārārthakālaṃ Brahmāṇa vṛkṣharaṇam smādhityate, tebhyaḥ tatra dhāraṇā karānāudradāñjñeha Vaidūkā sabāda upādiṣyant e tadvatva na tathā. Vedān aukṣṭhyā tvaṛtā vañjāto bhavanti.) The use of the word kalpa is very significant. It literally means 432 million years but is used here in the sense of ‘hoary antiquity.’ This
13. There may however be some objection to the above view on the following grounds: (i) in the Varṇa-samāmnāya long and plata vowels have been omitted, (ii) unvoiced stops have not been arranged in the same order as the voiced ones, (iii) the absence of yama, anusvāra, visarga, jihvā-mūliya and upādhyāniya in it and (iv) the h of the sūtra ha-ya-va-ra-t and the sūtra ha-l at the end duplicating h, is inexplicable.

14. Now in reply to the first objection it may be said that a person learning short vowels correctly will naturally find it easy to produce their long and protracted varieties, and it is for this reason that the author of the Varṇa-samāmnāya did not probably like to make it unnecessarily cumbersome for the beginner by inclusion of these sounds, for the quantity of the vowel constituted a separate subject of instruction (see PS. 7). That voiced and unvoiced consonants have not been arranged in the same order in the Varṇa-samāmnāya cannot go against its phonetic character; on the contrary, by varying the places of articulation in the utterance of the sounds their mechanical and hence wrong pronunciation has possibly been guarded against. Or it might be for the sake of his Pratyāhāras Pāṇini had to arrange the sounds like this. As for the omission of yama and anusvāra, etc., it may be said that being development of sounds already existing in the Varṇa-samāmnāya they do not appear there. Regarding the repetition of the sound h it may be said that there were possibly two h’s recognized in the Old Indo-Aryan, one voiced and another unvoiced. The fact that the second h is taken along with ś, s and ś, may justify us in making the above assumption. Prof. Sköld has tried to explain this double h by assuming that the Varṇa-samāmnāya might have been altered since its first formation and the last sūtra has probably been a later creation (Papers on Pāṇini, p. 20).

passage shows that the chronological distance between Patañjali and the early writers on Vedic phonetics as well as Pāṇini might be very great or the progress of Buddhism that preceded Patañjali must have been very detrimental to the Vedic studies or both might be facts.
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15. As for the authorship of the Varṇa-samāmnāya we have no means of deciding whether it was made by some pre Pāṇinian authority (Śiva, Māheśvara) or Pāṇini. All we can reasonably assume is that Pāṇini might have adopted the already existing material (the Śiva-sūtras in their original form), with certain changes, as the matrix of his pratyāhāras, and the Śikṣā connected with his name was perhaps the work to which was prefixed this Varṇa-samāmnāya and furnished the basis of Pāṇini’s grammar and phonetics. The relation of the Ps. to this work which in its original form may go back to the first age of the Śikṣā-Vedāṅga (1000-600 B.C.) will be considered later (§ 20).

16. The scope of the Śikṣā as given in the Taittiriya Upaniṣad probably brings us to the second stage in the evolution of this Vedāṅga. According to this Upaniṣad (1. 2) the Śikṣā consists of svara ‘pitch accent,’ mātrā ‘quantity,’ bala ‘stress,’ sāma ‘utterance in a medium tone,’ and santāna (samhitā, ‘euphoric combination.’ While referring to the Śikṣā in his introduction to the Rgveda-bhāṣya Sāyana thinks of the developed state of this Vedāṅga even when he says varṇa-svarādyuccārāna-prakāraṇa yatra upadiṣyaṇa sā śikṣā; for he brings in the

---

1 Prof B. Peddegon says: Most likely the Śiva Sūtra is of earlier date than the Aśādhyāyī (op. cit., p. 56). Dr. Mangal Deva Shastri too thinks that the Śiva-sūtras are pre-Pāṇinian (‘The Relation of Pāṇini’s Technical Devices to his Predecessors’ in the Proceedings of the Fourth Oriental Conference, Allahabad, Vol. II, 1928, pp. 469f.). Mr. K. A. Subrahmanya Iyer however thinks that the Śiva Sūtras are Pāṇini’s own (On the Fourteen Māheśvara Sūtras, ibid., p. 142). Dr. P. Thieme thinks as follows: The idea of some modern scholars that this dogma (i.e., the divine revelation of the Śiva-sūtra) contains as a ‘historical nucleus’ the fact that Pāṇini did not compose the ‘Śiva Sūtras’ himself, is nothing short of absurd (op. cit.). But his view that Patañjali took it for granted that the Śiva Sūtras are P.’s work, seems to be wrong. Patañjali merely says in this connection that stād jñāpayati ācāryah (Pāṇini). The verb jñāpayati (suggests) has the same root as jñāpaka (a suggested or implied precept) so often used in the Mahābhāṣya.

2. The translation of the terms given above is based on Saṅkara’s Bṛhmaṇa of the Taitt. Up.; cf. the translation of these terms by Prof. Winternitz (A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I, p. 282). Macdonell in pursuance of Sāyana translates these as letters, accents, quality, pronunciation and euphoric rules (see Hist. of Skt. Lit., p. 255). Dr. Siddhāshvat Varṇa translates varṇa as ‘individual sounds,’ svara as ‘accent,’ santāna as ‘chanting of the Vedic verses’ and in this connexion he ignores bala totally (see his Critical Studies, p. 4).
passage from the Taitt. Up. (1.2). According to him svara-varñadayah means varṇa, svara, mātra, bala, sāma and santāna. But the fact that Śāyāna in his Veda-bhāṣya quotes from Prātiśākhyaas does not invalidate his testimony about the Vedāṅga Śikṣā which according to him is the PS. For he mentions no less than three couplets (PS. 8, 9, 10) of the latter work.¹ As Uvaṭa, one of Śāyāna’s predecessors, in his introduction to the commentary of the Rk Prātiśākhya has considered this work to be a Śikṣā² we can easily believe that Śāyāna was fully conscious about the historical relation between the PS. and the Prātiśākhyaas and he surely followed a correct tradition in according due honour to each kind of works on the subject. For the Prātiśākhyaas, though one of them has called itself a Vedāṅga,³ were, as we shall see presently, the Śikṣā manuals belonging to the second stage in the development of this Vedāṅga, and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī too was aware of this fact.⁴ The position of the Prātiśākhyaas in the history of ancient Indian phonetic literature seems to have been very much misunderstood.⁵ And in order to appreciate their proper position as well as that of the Vedāṅga Śikṣā composed by Pāṇini we must now inquire into the nature and scope of the Prātiśākhyaas and their time.

¹ Śāyāna evidently used one of the very late recensions of the PS. for he says sa vāṅgabhūta-śikṣā-grantho spaṭam udīrītah ‘tṛiśaṅkṣe’ catuḥśaṅkṣe vā varṇā sambhavato maṭāḥ′ etc. (Pn. Prak. Yaj. and Rk. 3.)
² tathāpy aṣyāṃ śikṣāyāṃ dantyanuśīya iti repho dantyanuṣīya ity uktah (ed. Sāmaśrami, p. 14). Madhusūdana too calls Prātiśākhyaas Śikṣās; see the Note 5 below.
³ RPr. XIV. 30 ; Madhusūdana seems to be of opinion that the Prātiśākhyaas too are Vedāṅgas.
⁴ tatra saro-vedāṅghāraṇāśiśa Pāṇinī śa prakāśitā prativedāṅkham ca bhinnarūpā prātiśākhya-asamajñitā anyaiśca muṇhibhū prakāśitā.
17. Before entering into any discussion about the origin, nature and scope, etc., of the Prātiśākhyas it would be proper to examine the term about the meaning of which there seems to exist some misunderstanding. The word consists of three parts: prati, śākhā and the formative element. Of these, the exact meaning of śākhā should be determined first of all.

18. The śākhā, as is well-known, relates to the different Vedic schools; but we do not know whether the śākhā refers to the one undivided Veda or to each of the different Vedas, such as, Rk, Śāman, Yajus (Black and White), etc. Let us first consider the case of an undivided Veda. From the story occurring in the Mahābhārata and some Purāṇas that Kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana Muni divided the Veda into four parts we may infer that the Vedic mantras existed once as an undivided corpus. The fact that particular mantras are found in more Vedas than one, hints that the mantras were collected under different names chiefly with a view to their ritual use. For example, the collection of mantras made for the use of the Ṣōtṛ was called Rk and that for the use of the Adhavṛyu was called the Yajus while the Udgarś’s collection was called the Śāman. Now the principle according to which the particular mantras could be put under different labels was the same as that which has been traditionally at the root of the division of the Vedas into śākhās. For, from Mahādeva’s commentary on the Hiranyakesī

1 For details see Śāśibhaṣaṇa Vidyālāṇḍkara, Jivanīkoṇa (Jivanī-kosa), Calcutta, 1841 B.E., pp. 1060 f. (article on ‘Vedavyāsa’).
Sūtra we learn that one of the reasons which gave rise to śākhās was the manner of reading the Vedas.¹ This being the case we can well say that from one original Veda came out first of all śākhās like Rk, Śāman, Yajus, etc.² For, the uttering of Vedic mantras by different classes of priests was different; the Hotṛ recited the Ṛcas with his normal voice, the Adhvaryu muttered the Yajūṃṣi silently, while the Udgāṭṛ chanted Śāmans loudly.³

19. But the threefold śākhā, if we are allowed to postulate this, must have existed at the very beginning of the period which witnessed the growth of Vedic ritualism, or roughly in the period preceding the Brāhmaṇas. From this period onwards the Vedic people, that is, the Aryans together with the pre-Aryan ethnic element which they might have absorbed, began to scatter themselves in widely separated regions of the Indian continent where Aryanization followed. This diffusion of the Vedic people, their culture and religion gave rise, in course of time, to difference in pronunciation of the mantras, and mantras being orally transmitted some of them came, in course of time, to be read in different places with more or less different word order, and a difference in the order of stanzas constituting them also arose. It is probably these factors that brought forth different śākhās in the generally accepted sense and they were, in fact, śākhās of śākhās or secondary śākhās. Prātiṣākhyas relate to all such śākhās in existence at the time of their composition or final redaction. But separation among the different branches of the Vedic people resulted not only in the


² Max Müller also writes: 'The word (i.e., śākhā) is sometimes applied to the three original Samhitās, the Ṛgveda-samhitā, Śāma-veda-samhitā and Yajur-veda-samhitā, in relation to one another and without reference to subordinate śākhās belonging to each of them' (op. cit., pp. 123, 124). Yāska’s use of singular number with reference to the Veda deserves notice (1.20). Prof. Sarup however takes this differently. See his transl., p. 221.

³ Max Müller, op. cit., pp. 192, 471 f.; Pūrva-Mūnāpsā-Sūtrās (II. 1. 35-37).
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difference of pronunciation of the mantras but also a variation of their sacrificial rules and social laws and customs. Thus the śākhās came to relate also to a difference in such matters,¹ though Prātiśākhyaśas had nothing to do with such śākhās.²

20. Now the exact sense of śākhās having been determined we shall proceed to ascertain the sense of the term Prātiśākhya. According to Max Müller who wrote in 1859, 'Prātiśākhya...does not mean, as has been supposed, a treatise on phonetic peculiarities of each Veda, but a collection of phonetic rules peculiar to one of the different branches of the four Vedas, i.e., to one of those different texts in which each of the Vedas had been handed down for ages in different families and different parts of India.'³ This view has been subscribed to by Whitney in his edition of the Atharva-veda Prātiśākhya (1862).⁴ Since then almost all the scholars have followed this view.⁵ But such an opinion seems to have been expressed on very inadequate grounds. For, Mādhava, quoted by Jñānendra Sarasvatī in his gloss on the Siddh. Kau. (P. IV. 3. 59), explains Prātiśākhya as pratiśākham bhavam.⁶ And Anantabhaṭṭa too in the introduction to his commentary to the Sukla-Yajus Prātiśākhya defines the word similarly and shows, after an elaborate discussion, that Kātyāyana’s work relates to all the fifteen śākhās which developed out of the Sukla Yajur-veda.⁷ From the testimony of Durga also we learn that the Prātiśākhya related to more schools than one. For in his commentary to the Nirukta (I. 17) he says: kim pārṣadāni? svacarana-paṛṣady eva yath.

¹ See above, footnote 2. 'Sūtra' in Mahādeva’s comm. means Kalpasūtras, i.e., Srauta-, Gṛhya- and Dharma-Sūtras.
² The word ‘śākhā’ used hereafter in this essay will mean, unless otherwise qualified, a phonetic śākhā only.
⁷ Kātyāyana’s Vājasaneya Prātiśākhya, ed. Venkatarama Sharma, Madras University, 1934, pp. 2-5.
pratiśākhāṁ nityatam eva paddvagraha-pragṛhya-krama-samhīta- 
svaraśaṅgam ucyate tāni imāni pārśadāni pratiśākhyaṁ ity 
arthaḥ.1 'Those Pārśada books by which in a Pariśad of one's 
own Carāṇa, the peculiarities of accent, samhīta, krama-reading, 
pragṛhya vowels and separation of words are laid as enjoined for, 
and restricted to each sākhā are called Pratiśākhyas.' Max 
Müller who quoted the above passage may be said to have 
misunderstood it. Pratiśākhāṁ which he translated as 'to 
certain sākhās' should be equivalent to 'to each sākhā.' It 
should be noticed in this connexion that Max Müller's transla-
tion of the passage is not in agreement with his own definition of 
the term Pratiśākhya quoted above. However the fault lies 
principally with commentators like the author of the Vaidikā- 
bharaṇa whom Max Müller in all likelihood followed. For in 
the last named work which does not say anything about the 
exclusive phonetic character of sākhās in a Pratiśākhya, it has 
been suggested that the Pratiśākhyas relate to a group of 
sākhās.1 This suggestion seems to give partial support to 
Mādhava's and Anantabhaṭṭa's testimony referred to above. For 
it does not restrict Pratiśākhyas to one only of the many 
sākhās.

The word Pārśada which is a synonym for Pratiśākhya 
seems to give some clue to the solution of the problem whether 
Pratiśākhyas related to only one or all the sākhās of a Veda. 
In Nārāyaṇa's commentary to a passage (ācāryam saparīṣatkaṁ 
bhojyat sabrahamācarīnav ca in the Gobhila-Grhyasūtra-bhāsyā 
we find the following saha pariśadā śiṣyaganenā vartata iti 
saparīṣatkaṁ taṁ. samānām tulyakālaṁ brahmacāritvam yeśāṁ ta 
imē anyasākhino'pi sabrahamacārīnavah savayo'bhi adhīyante.2 
From this passage we learn that students belonging to different 
Vedic schools could take their lessons from one Ācārya who 
together with his pupils constituted a Pārśada or Pariśad. Thus

1 Max Müller, op. cit., p. 131; S. Varma translates Mādhava's words as belonging t 
each individual (prati) sākhā (op. cit., .12). 
2 On the T. Pr., IV. 11; Siddheshwar Varma, op. cit., p. 13
Pārṣada sūtras evidently related to such Pariṣads comprising different schools of a Veda. Hence it seems justifiable to conclude that Pārṣada-sūtras or Prātiṣākhyaśas related to each one or all the sākhās of a Veda.

21. By taking what seems very much to be a wrong view about the meaning of the word Prātiṣākhya or the scope of a work so named, Whitney felt some uncasiness over naming the Prātiṣākhya of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajur-veda as the Taittirīya Prātiṣākhya.¹ The very fact that this Prātiṣākhya mentioned the Black Yajus schools like Mīmāṃsaka and Āhvaraka as well as Taittirīya, made it very inconvenient for him to attach the Prātiṣākhya to the last named school (Taittirīya) only. But still he considered it prudent to adopt the name Taitt. Pr. for the work, though it did not quite satisfy his great critical acumen. For he confesses that 'we are far from fully comprehending as yet the origin, nature and relation of the "schools" of Vedic study and their accepted texts or cākhās...’² This, however, was not the attitude of Whitney a few years earlier when he edited the Atharva-veda Pr. and had recourse to conjectures of varying degrees to explain away the discordance between the theory current in his time about the nature and scope of Prātiṣākhyaśas and the characteristics of the Pr. in hand. He attached this Pr. to the Saunaka school of the Atharva-veda and troubled himself about the problem why in certain points it was not in complete agreement to the Veda of this school. He little dreamt the Pr. in question related also to other Atharva Sākhās which in all likelihood perished or were till then untraced.³ Hence in his edition of the Atharva-veda Pr. Whitney writes 'It is......peculiarity of the authors of our treatise to give their rules a wider scope than the vocabulary of the Atharva

¹ See p. 427 of Whitney's ed. of this Prātiṣākhya was published in 1871.
² Whitney, T. Pr. p. 427.
³ The Pāippalāda sākhā of the Atharva-veda discovered after Whitney's ed. of the Atharva Pr. should be remembered in this connexion.
requires, in many instances contemplating and providing for combination of sounds which are found nowhere in the body of Vedic scriptures, and for which accordingly the commentator is obliged to fabricate illustrations (p. 583). Now whatever may be said about the genuineness of examples given by the commentator who was possibly very late, it cannot be said that the author of the Prātiṣākhyaas based his rules on non-existing materials. In view of the tradition that Vedas, in different periods, came to be lost and had to be recovered, it will not be difficult to assume that some of the ṣākhās with their texts perished beyond recovery.1 Even if his allegation against the commentator in some rare cases may not be untrue, Whitney himself has admitted that ‘there are certain number of sentences among those given by the commentator which have more or less clearly the aspect of genuine citations from Vedic texts; and although some might be regarded as instances of carelessness on his part quoting by memory from another source than his own Veda, we cannot possibly extend this explanation to them all; it must remain probable that, in part at least, they were contained in some hitherto unknown şeṣa ṣākhā of the Atharva-veda.’ 2 From these passages one will easily realise the untenable nature of the meaning given to Prātiṣākhya by Whitney, his predecessors and followers.3

22. Max Müller, in his introduction to the Rk-Prātiṣākhya (1870) does not care to examine in details the deviations of the Prātiṣākhya from the available Ṛgveda text (of Śākala recension). This may be said to be due particularly to his strong belief that Prātiṣākhyaas were concerned with one śākhā of a Veda. Hence, he very summarily disposes of the question of relationship between the Prātiṣākhya and the Ṛgveda (Śākala) text by saying that, as ‘in all essential points our own best

1 Hopkins, 'The Great Epic of India,' p. 5.
2 JAOS., VII, p. 588.
3 E.g., Prof. Keith believes with Whitney that the T.Pr. relates to the Taittirīyā Mantra-pātha alone. See The Veda of the Black Yajus School, HOS, p. xxxviii.
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manuscripts of the text agree with the data in the Prātiṣākhya, we may prudently conclude that the text of the Rgveda we possess is the same as seen by the authors of the Prātiṣākhya more than 2000 years ago.'" Along with this should be remembered what he himself wrote in this connexion eleven years earlier. In the History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature (1859) Max Müller wrote: "There is not a single MS. at present existing of the Rgveda in which rules of our Prātiṣākhya are uniformly observed, and the same applies to the MSS. of the other Vedas.'"

22 (a). Burnell, too, in his introduction to the Ṛk-tantra-vyākaraṇa (Mangalore, 1879), considered by him to be a Prātiṣākhya of the Sāma-veda, thought that Prātiṣākhyas belonged to one of the many śākhās of a Veda. He attached the Ṛk-tantra to the Kauthumī śākhā alone and made some conjectures as to why this Prātiṣākhya could not be connected with Jaiminiya, Talavakāra or Rāṇāyanīya śākhās, and he assumed that Prātiṣākhyas connected with these śākhās had been lost. But all these assumptions seem to be uncalled for. For example, characteristics of some Sāma śākhās such as the cerebral l and short e and o were in all probability phonetic developments occurring or recognized later. There can be nothing against such an assumption. For there is the traditional view that the difference of śākhās arising from difference in uttering mantras is without any (historical) beginning; and from this we may deduce that even after the Prātiṣākhyas were written new differences in pronuncia-

2 Pp. 136, 137.
3 Patañjali's opinion regarding the shortening of e and o in the Sātyamugrīya and Rāṇāyanīya śākhās of the Sāma-veda deserves special notice in this connexion. For he is unwilling to recognize such a deviation from the tradition though the Pariṣad gave it sanction. He says, pāṛṣaḍaṇḍī rṣa tatrāhvasatām nāive loka nānyāmin veda'r dhāvā kāṇvār'dhāha okāsā vātā on the Śivasūtra (ai-ud-ō).
4 adhyayana-bhedāḥ chākhāvibhedo 'nādi quoted by Max Müller., op. cit., p. 127. See also pp. 117-118; pravacanabhedāt prativedanī bhinnā bhūyavyāś ca śākhā, says Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in the Prasthāna-bhedā.
tion could arise between several groups of Vedic people and did actually arise and thus the process which brought into existence different śākhās was practically without an end. But it will be found on a closer study of the various Prātiṣākhyaśas and Śikṣās that the difference of pronunciation among Vedic śākhās owe their origin to the forces which tended to develop the Old Indo-Aryan to the Middle Indo-Aryan and the later to the New Indo-Aryan dialects. But Whitney, Max Müller and Burnell however viewed the matter differently and so did Weber before them.

23. The Prātiṣākhyaśas belonging as they do to the second age of the study of the Śikṣā Vedaṅga had a much wider scope than the manual of the subject that was produced in the first age. From a study of the contents of the Prātiṣākhyaśas we find that the scope of the Śikṣā as given in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (I. 2) applies to a considerable extent to the Prātiṣākhyaśas which

---

1 Mr. Suryakanta Sastri in his Introduction to his new ed. of the Śk-tantra follows Burnell in assigning the work to the Kauthumī śākhā (pp. 2-6). But Mr. Sastri has also given some fresh arguments in support of Burnell's theory. These, however, are by no means unassailable. That the Jaiminiya text of the Śāma-veda did not give the peculiarities provided for in the Sūtras 58, 94, 113 and 114 can be explained also by the assumption that the phonetic changes in question might have arisen later or the Prātiṣākhyaśas being manuals of pronunciation had not much influence with the scribes, and discrepancy between the written text and its pronunciation can well be assumed to have existed in early times also. From the emphatic manner in which the use of written texts of the Vedas has been discouraged we can well infer this. For the Nārādyā-Śikṣā says:

Pustakopratyādhitam nādhitem gurusavamāna
rājate na sabīmadiya jāragurbhā iva striyāḥ.
(II. 8. 19),

and the Yājñavalkya-Śikṣā has the following:

gūś śīghr śīrah-kampi tathā līkhiṭa-pāṭhakaḥ
anarthajñīnoparṇaḥ ca sa ṣa ṣa eṣa pāṭhakādhamāḥ.
(196).

The long quotation which Mr. Sastri has given in support of his connecting the Śk-tantra with the Kauthumā śākhā alone of the Śāma-veda, is not at all convincing. According to this question the Kauthumā śākhā seems to include Nārada, Lomāśa, Gautama and Naigeya schools. He ought to have explained this fact.

2 Bloomfield and Edgerton, Vedic Variants, Vol. 2, Phonetics, Ch. I, especially §§ 30-43. See also Max Müller, Ancient Skt. Lit., p. 117.


Contra this, see Winternitz, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 285.
should be called secondary Śikṣās.\(^1\) When judged by the standard set up by the Taitt. Up. for Śikṣā (phonetics), the Prātiṣākhyaśas may be found wanting in certain respects.\(^2\) For example, the treatment of sāma and bala is non-existent in them. But it can well be assumed that as these two topics were exclusively matters of oral instruction the Prātiṣākhyaśas did not discuss them.

24. As for the date of the Prātiṣākhyaśas which as we have seen can be called the secondary Śikṣās, their rise and development, at least of the older ones among them, can be roughly placed between 600-200 B.C.\(^3\) A detailed discussion about the date of the Prātiṣākhyaśas will carry us far beyond the scope of the present work. But in support of the lower limit to the date of the early Prātiṣākhyaśas it may be mentioned that the passages from the Taittirīya Pr. and Atharva Pr. occur in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali (c. 200 B.C.). Patañjali’s loan to the Pr. has already been pointed out by Dr. Siddheshwar Varma but the acquaintance of the Bhāṣyakāra with the A. Pr. has not been pointed out before. Under the Vārttika to Pāṇini I. 1. 10. Patañjali\(^4\) quotes spṛṣṭam sparśānāṁ karaṇam. isatspṛṣṭam antahsthānāṁ. vivṛtam uṣmaṇāṁ īṣad ity anuvartate. svarāṇāṁ ca [MSS. A B vivṛtam īṣad iti nivṛttam]. Here we have sūtras 29-32 of the APr. with the difference that the word order of the sūtra uṣmaṇāṁ vivṛtam ca has been changed and ca has been omitted. The accompanying vṛtti in Patañjali’s quotation shows that he has quoted from some sūtra work which was evidently the APr.\(^5\)

---


2 For the scope of the Śikṣā as laid down in the Taitt. Up., see § 16.

3 S. Varma, op. cit., p. 412. See also Hannes Sköld, ‘The Nirukta: Its place in Old Indian Literature, its Etymologies.’ Lund, 1926, p. 121. Before Dr. Varma he surmised that the Pr. was to be placed before Patañjali though he very rightly held that the age of the Prātiṣākhyaśas has rather been overrated. Cf. Winternitz, Vol. I, p. 268.


5 Recent attempts to show that the Saunakīyā Cāturādhyaśika is not the A. Pr. must be pronounced as a failure (vide The Atharva-Prātiṣākhya, ed. Viswa Bandhu Vidyarthi Shastri, Lahore, 1923, pp. 13-14. S. Sastri, op. cit., introduction, p. 6). For, Uraśa in his introduction to the Bh Pr. writes, “tathā cāṭharaṇa-prātiṣākhya idam eva prayajanam uktam evam iṣet ca vihāṣprāptaṁ śūṁyante.” A. Pr. I. 2.
25. *Its contents.* The PŚ. as we have reconstructed it from different recensions, contains only eighteen couplets in anuṣṭubh metre though the longest (Rk) recension includes no less than forty-two additional couplets\(^1\) most of which are in the same metre. The extreme shortness of this Śikṣā-Vedāṅga can well be compared with that of the Chando-Vedāṅga which is embedded in the Chandah-sūtras of Piṅgala and contains only 87 sūtras which will scarcely be much bigger in extent than the PŚ.\(^2\) But in spite of its extreme brevity the PŚ. was more or less a complete manual on the pronunciation of the Vedic speech-sounds in general at the time the work was composed.

In the first two couplets the PŚ. enumerates the speech-sounds (*varnas*); vowels and consonants have been separately mentioned. The next four couplets (3-6) give a theory of production of the speech-sounds. This is followed by a fivefold classification of these sounds according to their pitch, quantity, place of articulation, primary effort (*prayatna*) and the secondary effort (*anupradāna*). (7-16). It goes without saying that pitch and quantity primarily concerned vowels while the remaining items all the sounds. The sounds mentioned in the PŚ. are shown below in phonetic script according to their classes.

\(^1\) Some of the additional passages, e.g. Rk 46, 47 are not in verse. We however, have called them couplets only as a matter of convenience.
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#### Table B

*Pāṇini's Classification of Speech-Sounds of the O I A.*

1. According to Places of Articulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>uṣnas</th>
<th>kauṭha</th>
<th>jīvāmūla</th>
<th>tāla</th>
<th>mūrdhan</th>
<th>danta</th>
<th>danta-oṣṭha</th>
<th>oṣṭha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spūṣṭa</td>
<td>alpaprāṇa</td>
<td>k g</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>t ā</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>p b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mahaprāṇa</td>
<td>kh g</td>
<td>e h</td>
<td>th ṭ</td>
<td>th ḍ</td>
<td>ph bh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anunāsika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ūśman</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>(h) h</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anābhisṭha</td>
<td>(lateral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(flapped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(semivowel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svāna</td>
<td>samānākṣara (monoph-thong)</td>
<td>a a:</td>
<td>i i:</td>
<td></td>
<td>u u:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>kaṇṭha-tāla</th>
<th>kaṇṭha-oṣṭha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sandhyākṣara</td>
<td>(dīphthong)</td>
<td>e: (=āi=ōē?)</td>
<td>o: (=āō=ōō?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. According to Prayatana.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-sprṣṭa</td>
<td>a a:</td>
<td>, i i:</td>
<td>, u u:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iṣat-sprṣṭa</td>
<td>j w r l</td>
<td>(h x r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nema-sprṣṭa</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sprṣṭa</td>
<td>all stops and h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Terms in Italics have not been used in the PS.
3. According to Anupradāna.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>नादिन</th>
<th>अनुनासिका</th>
<th>य न न न म</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अन-अनुनासिका</td>
<td>श गः ढः छः दः बः</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इषान-नादा</td>
<td>ग ढः ठः ठः बः</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्वासिन</td>
<td>कः एः ठः ठः वः</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इषऽ-घ्वासिन</td>
<td>कः एः ठः ठः पः</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. *Its Language.* Within the short extent of eighteen couplets we have one clear instance of Vedic usage (see Note 9, see also Note 18). There is another expression which also according to the Kaśikā follows the Vedic usage (see Note 9 on *sōdīrṇah*). Thus we may be justified to conclude that the PS. was written in a late form of the Vedic speech. The text of the Rk recension of the PS. as printed in the Śikṣā-Saṃgraha (Benares, 1893) has been furnished with accent marks. But as eighteen only of the couplets have been considered to be original we have no sufficient ground to take these accent-marks to be very old. But on looking to the archaic language of the PS. we are tempted to assume that the editor of the text of the Rk recension, which served as the basis of the ŚS. text, must have had behind him a good traditional support. It is quite likely that these accent-marks in the PS. fell into disuse just as the accent-marks in the Aṣṭādhyāyī and Pāṇiniya Dhātu-pātha did.1 Pāṇini’s sūtras such as *svarītenādīhikārah, anudāttānīta ātmane-padam* (I. 3. 11, 12) clearly indicate that these two works were once accented. This possible existence of accent-marks in the PS. again speaks for its great antiquity.

27. That the PS. has been composed in the anuṣṭubh metre has been considered by Max Müller to be the sign of its lateness. On this point, after emphasising the antiquity of the Rk Prātiśākhya he says, 1 By comparing Saunaka’s chapters

---

1 See Wackernagel, I, p. 288.
in his first Prātiśākhya with the small śloka compilation which is generally quoted as the Vedāṅga, the difference of old and modern ślokas will at once be perceived.¹ As he has not expressly laid down the criterion with which to distinguish between the old and the new ślokas we cannot judge the strength of his argument; but ślokas which he considered to be modern in structure might well have been among those which we have had to consider spurious. Whatever may be the fact, the anuṣṭubh metre in which the reconstructed PS. has been composed appears by no means younger in age than that in which works like the Bhāddevatā (c. 400 B.C.) has been composed.

Four important characteristics of the classical Skt. ślokas are: (i) of every pāda the 5th syllable shall be short and (ii) the 6th syllable long and (iii) the 7th syllable of the first and the third pāda shall be long and (iv) that of the second and the fourth pāda shall be short. Now in the PS. (as reconstructed by us) the 5th syllable of the pāda is long thrice (6a, 15a, c)² and the 6th syllable short seven times (4a, 5a, c, 6a, 8c, 11a, c) and the 7th syllable of the first and the third pāda is short seven times (4a, 5a, c, 6a, 11a, c) and the 7th syllable of the 2nd pāda is long once (2b). Considering the fact that the PS. consists of 18 ślokas only these 18 instances of metrical irregularity is enough to show their archaic nature.

28. **Its place in the Indian Literature.** In his commentary to Jaimini’s Pūrva-mīmāṃsā sūtras Sabara (c. 500 A.C.)³ once (on I. 1.22) mentions the ‘authors of the Śikṣā’ (śikṣākārāḥ).⁴ Plural being evidently used for showing respect we do not learn from this what particular author of Śikṣā Sabara had in mind.

---

¹ op. cit., p. 145.
² a, b, c and d indicate in this paragraph the first, second, third and the fourth quarter of a śloka.
⁴ nanu vāyu-kārayakaḥ syād iti vāyur udgataḥ sanyoga-vibhāgaḥ śabdo bhavati tathā ca ṣ i k ṣ ā - k ā r ā h śukāḥ vāyur āpadyate sabdatām iti. Sabara here does not quote the words of the PS but gives its view,
But he discusses later on (under I. 3. 25) a theory of the production of words, which is identical with that available in the PŚ. (3-6),² Bhartṛhari (c. 650 A.C.) too in his Vākyapadīya (I.47)² seems to follow the same theory, though he does not mention any Sikṣā or Sikṣākāra. But from Śabara’s or Bhartṛhari’s probable acquaintance with the PŚ. we do not learn anything about the authorship of this work. It may be that like the compiler of the Agni Purāṇa they were not aware of the name of its author though it was surely looked upon by them as the most authentic Sikṣā or the Vedāṅga Sikṣā. The same may be said of Durga (c.1300 A.C.)⁸ the commentator of the Nirukta, and Śāyaṇa (1400 A.C.), as well as Someśvara⁴ and Rāmakṛṣṇa⁵ about the date of whom we have no definite idea. But Madhusūdana Sarasvatī⁶ (c. 1500 A.C.) as well as the author of the Pārāśarī Sikṣā⁷ knew the PŚ. as the Vedāṅga and knew Pāṇini as its author. From the description of the Sikṣā given in the Sukranīti⁸ it appears that the author of this work too knew of the PŚ. to be a Vedāṅga. Thus we see that though there might have occurred some break in the tradition about Pāṇini’s authorship of the PŚ. it was taken as the most important Sikṣā or the Vedāṅga by eminent authorities probably from 500 A.C. to 1500 A.C. The question why the authorship of the PŚ. came later to be obscured is difficult to answer.

---

¹ mākatā prayatnena śabdām uccaranti vāgur nāḥher utthitah urasi vishṭītyaḥ kanyāthe vivartitaḥ mūrdhānam āhyata vaikṛte vīcīrān vīvidhān śabdān abhiyājyataḥ. PŚ. 3-4.
² vivarkitaḥ purā buddhyā kvaśadārthe niveśitaḥ karaṇēbhya viśṛṣṭena ṛjanīḥ sa'numāghyate.
³ v.l. karaṇēbhya viśṛṣṭena is evidently due to confusion.
⁴ Durga in his introduction to the Comm. of the Nirukta quotes PŚ. 3. from what he calls the V. āṇga Sikṣā (see Nirukta in Bomb. Skt. Series, p. 24). The date of the author is about 1300 A.C. (Introduction to the Nirukta, by Sarup, p 60).
⁵ Max Müller, op. cit., p. 192.
⁶ Ed. Simons, p 42; Siddhēswar Varma, op. cit., p. 5.
⁸ SS. p 60.

svaratoḥ dhālatoḥ sthāna-prayatnānaprodānataḥ.
svanādayaiś ca sā sikṣā varṣāṇām pāṭha-sikṣāgat.
29. In the absence of suitable data on the point we may explain this obscenity by the fact that the ancient Indians did not set any value on history as such, their only care being the Śāstra and not its authors or their dates. They however took notice of the most important fact about the PS. that it was a Vedāṅga and concerned all the Vedas.¹

But the great importance attached to the PS. by these authorities is apparently weakened on the following grounds: The places of articulation for the sounds ṛ, e, o, r and l as given in the PS. do not correspond to those given in the Prātiśākhya and some of the late Śikṣās; and sounds like ḷ (xAE) and ṁh (xAE) found in some Vedic texts do not occur at all in the PS. though they make casual appearance in the Prātiśākhyas.

30. But looking more closely into these cases we shall find that there cannot be any real difficulty on these points. For we have seen before (§ 22a) that one aspect of different treatises on the Vedic phonetics is that they in a way help to trace the development of the spoken Indo-Aryan since the inception of its tendencies towards reaching to the Middle Indo-Aryan stage, and it is pretty sure that these tendencies interfered with the correct pronunciation of the Vedic mantras. Thus ḷ (xAE) and ṃh (xAE) can easily be explained as later developments.² Mr. C. V. Vaidya thinks that these sounds were non-existent in the Vedas and developed later due to Dravidian influence.³ This opinion seems to be extremely sound. The change of place in case of the articulation of ṛ, e, o, r and l also can be explained in a similar fashion as later developments. Thus we should have no objection in admitting the Vedāṅga character of the PS.

¹ See notes above.
³ Hist. of Skt. Lit., Vol. I, Sec. I, p. 57; Sec. II, pp. 81, 114, 130, 137, 142, 154. South Indian Skt. MSS. very often interchange ḷ and ṁ without any principle. This probably points to the Dravidian origin of ḷ (vide Wackernagel, loc. cit.)
There seems to be another fact which goes in favour of the view presented above. As we have seen before (§ 25) that the PS. has a theory of production of the speech-sounds (3-6). The (Taitt. Pr.¹) surely betrays an acquaintance with it. The acquaintance of the Vāj. Pr. is probably clearer.² The Rk. Pr. (I, 18)³ too seems to have known this. It is not clear if the APr. knew of it. But the silence of the last work may well be explained by assuming that its author did not probably consider it necessary to include the theory in his sūtras, for he might well have assumed a knowledge of it on the part of the readers.

31. Thus we can well take the PS. as the Āṣṭādhya-Śikṣā. This view will be further strengthened when we shall discuss below the relation of the PS. with the Āṣṭādhya-Śīyat and will produce evidence to show that the two works in all likelihood proceeded from the same master’s hand. But before taking up the relation between the PS. and the Āṣṭādhya-Śīyat we shall have to examine the claim of another work for the position of the Vedāṅga. Dr. Raghu Vira in an article named ‘Discovery of the lost Phonetic Sūtras of Pāṇini’ published in the J R A S, 1931, (pp. 653 ff.) claims to have discovered the lost Phonetic Sūtras of Pāṇini. From the several arguments which he puts forth with great enthusiasm it may appear that the sūtra work of his discovery (DPS. or Dayānanda’s Phonetic Sūtras) is the Vedāṅga Śikṣā. But on a closer examination of the arguments we find that they are not as sound as Dr. Raghu Vira believes them to be. He starts with the assumption that the DPS. is the lost phonetic sūtras of Pāṇini though no independent authority

¹ उदमित समस्या। कवच सधायम्। मिर्धमि तारस् (XXIII, 10-13. Whitney, XXIII. 10).

² च तिष्ठाविहित:। सवन्नानेति:। तिष्ठाविहित:। (I, 29-30). By Śikṣā Kātyāyana seems to mean the PS.

³ कष्टीलार्त:। प्रथमप्रेषनी। च दारुणायिष्ठ:। चन्द्रिणी। (I, 18).

The view of ‘acoma’ who took ‘h’ as an utrasa sound can be compared with the PS. 10. which has ‘h’ as drasana under certain circumstances.
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attests its existence or the story of its alleged loss before the present time. Dr. Raghu Vira’s allegation that Pāṇini and other grammarians borrowed passages or their substance from this sūtra work (DPS.) is extremely unhappy. For this borrowing might well have occurred the other way round, that is, the author of the DPS. might have culled his materials from sundry sources such as the Mahābhāṣya and the Vārṣa-sūtras of Candragomin. In the face of facts that there is no ancient or modern MS. or any descriptive reference of it in any early or late work to vouch for its authenticity, one may well be justified to take such a view. Along with this should be considered the following facts about the PS. :

(i) It has been styled as the Vedāṅga Sikṣā by Śaṅkara and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī.

(ii) It has no less than what may be called five different recensions, and numerous MSS. of each such recension.

(iii) It has two old commentaries. Thus we see that in marked contrast to the PS. the DPS., the alleged phonetic Sūtras of Pāṇini, have remained in oblivion for about two millennia and a half to be discovered only at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Though such a discovery may not be totally impossible, one need be very cautious in such matters. The discovery of Kauṭilya’s and Bhāsa’s works cannot be brought here as a parallel case, for quotation from these works have been shown to have occurred in fairly old documents.

32. From materials which Dr. Raghu Vira has so ably collected in his article we can well see that the DPS. is not an old work. On referring to a recent catalogue (p.12) of the Vaidika Pustakālaya, Ajmer (Samvat 1988), publisher to the Ārya Samāja, we find that the DPS. constitutes the first among

---

1 The Vārṣa-sūtras have been given in the Appendix. Dr. Paul Thieme seems to disbelieve that the Pāṇini’s Sikṣā of Dr. Raghu Vira was quoted by Patañjali (see op. cit., p. 88)
2 Non-existence of any MS. of the DPS. has also raised a doubt in the mind of Dr. Paul Thieme as regards the authorship of the work (ibid.).
3 J R A S, 1931, pp. 663 ff.
the fourteen sections of the *Vedāṅga Prakāśa*, a grammar which Svāmī Dayānanda compiled for the use of the Vedic students. It is probably due to inadvertence that Dr. Raghu Vira did not mention this fact in his article. The different sections of the *Vedāṅga Prakāśa* including the first one have also been issued separately. The first of these sections bears the title of the *Varṇoc-cāraṇa-Sikṣā* by Pāṇini. This sūtra-work as has been shown by Dr. Raghu Vira (*loc. cit.*) resembles the *Varna-sūtras* of Candragomin, the Buddhist grammarian, who flourished about 500 A.C.¹ Considering the great influence which Candragomin exercised on the grammarians of Pāṇini’s school (the Kāśikā and the Vākyapadiya showing traces of such influence) it is quite possible that some late grammarian re-edited and amplified the Varna-sūtras of Candragomin and fathered this upon Pāṇini, evidently for imparting to it a superior authority. Though there is no sufficient material to prove this we are inclined to suggest that this late grammarian was Svāmī Dayānanda himself who, among other things was a very close student of Sanskrit grammars as his *Vedāṅgaprakāśa* and the edition of Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭā-dhyāyī* show. But whatever may be the actual fact about the authorship of the DPS., it is sure that the work is neither from the hands of Pāṇini nor an old one.²

33. *Its Author.* Now if we are sure about the fact that the PS. is the real *Vedāṅga Sikṣā* we shall have to take up the problem of its authorship. Though the work has probably been drawn upon by very old authors³ its author has not been

¹ This date is assigned by S. R. Belvalkar (*Systems of Skt. Grammars*, p. 56). Dr. Siddheshwar Varma places C. in the 7th century (See his *Critical Studies*, p. 8) at the latest.

² Dr. Paul Thieme with a somewhat different line of argument disallows the genuineness of Pāṇini’s Phonetia Sūtras discovered by Dr. Raghu Vira (see his Pāṇini and the Veda, p. 86). We do not agree with him on all points.

³ Dr. Paul Thieme thinks that if Patañjali knew the PS. as Pāṇini’s work, he would have referred to it ‘in unambiguous terms’ and would have treated it with the same respect as Pāṇini’s grammar (p. 86). Hence, as the PS. has not been referred to by Patañjali, one may according to Dr. Thieme reject its relation with Pāṇini. But it would be a mistake to place too much confidence on the argument of silence, which may be otherwise explained.
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mentioned till very late (see § 28). The earliest evidence about the existence of the complete work is perhaps the Agni Purāṇa which is usually placed in the 800 A.C. But it does not refer to Pāṇini as the author of the Śikṣā though in case of the metrical version of Piṅgala’s prosody the source has been mentioned (see Notes on 1). This can well be taken to mean that to the compiler of the Agni Purāṇa the authorship of the PS. was not known. But we have seen before (§ 29) that Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in the 15th century in no unambiguous terms considers Pāṇini to be the author of this Śikṣā though the Śikṣā-Prakāśa, a commentary to the PS. which is possibly earlier (c. 1200 A.C.) than Madhusūdana, ascribes the latter work to Piṅgala. Thus the problem of the authorship of the PS. with its late and mutually conflicting data seems to possess no dependable means for its solution. But we need not feel hopeless in the matter. External evidence failing we turn to the PS. itself and find some important hints which are being discussed below.

(a) It is usually known that Pāṇini was a great grammarian but his greatness as a phonetician is no less considerable. But unfortunately it has scarcely been noticed and far less emphasised. This sort of defective appreciation of Pāṇini is due to the mistaken notion commonly held that the Prātiśākhyas, even if they are not actual grammars, are grammatical writings. But in fact the Prātiśākhyas are purely phonetical treatises. Viewed in this light we find that Pāṇini has treated in his grammar svāra (pitch) and mātrā (quantity) of vowels as well as samhitā (euphonic combination). These items as we have seen before (§16) are, according to the Taitt. Upaniṣad, the three


2 The Aṣṭādhyāyī treats of svāra in chapters VI (1. 58-9, 199) and VIII (1. 27-71) and in many other places. The mātrā has been treated in chapter VI (3. 111, 135) and the samhitā in Chapters VI (1. 72 f and 3. 114f) and VIII (3. 1-4; 43-46).
among the six branches of the Śikṣā or phonetics. Can there be a better evidence of Pāṇini's masterly knowledge of phonetics? But this evidence alone is not sufficient to identify Pāṇini with the author of the PS. What we may gather from the above is that of the two names Pāṇini and Pṛṇgala proposed for the authorship of the PS, the case for the former is stronger.

(b) Besides this a comparison of the contents of the Aṣṭādhyāyī and the PS, further strengthens the claim of Pāṇini to the authorship of the PS. From such comparison we gather the following facts pointing to the handiwork of the same author.

(i) In the PS, Pāṇinian Pratyāhāras, such as ac, car, ghaś, yan, jai, sar, hal, have been requisitioned.

(ii) ku, cu, tu, tu and pu have been used to indicate respectively k, c, t, t and p groups. This convention has been formulated in the Aṣṭādhyāyī (I. 1. 69) anudit savarnasya ca 'pratyayah.

(iii) The PS. (17) includes the Anunāsika into speech-sounds while its definition has been given in the Aṣṭādhyāyī (I. 1. 9.) mukha-nāsikā-vacano' nunāsikah.

(iv) The explanation of terms like hrasva, dīrgha and pluta has also been given there (I. 2. 27, ukālo'j hrasva-dīrgha-plutaḥ).

(v) According to a rule of nā-tva as laid down in the Aṣṭādhyāyī (VIII. 4.1). n after r and s turns to ŋ. From this we get r as a cerebral sound. According to the PS. (11) too r as well as s is a cerebral sound (Prātiśākhyaśas have r either in the roots of the teeth or close to the teeth (see Varma, op. cit., p. 6).

All these fairly settle the question of the authorship of the PS. Now the important question arises which of the two, the Aṣṭādhyāyī and the PS., was composed first. To find this out we must remember once more the different branches of the Śikṣā as enumerated in the Taitt. Upaniṣad, varṇa, svara, mātrā, bala, sāma and santāna. Pāṇini as we have

---

1 Pāṇini's Śikṣā brought to light by Dr. Raghuvira lacks similar facts, hence Dr. Paul Tiixome rightly rejects the genuineness of the work (see op. cit., p. 86),
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seen before (§33 a) treated svara, mātrā and santāna (saṃhitā) in his grammar. Of the remaining three branches bala and sāma can scarcely be the fit subject of a theoretical treatise. Hence varṇa (speech-sounds) alone was left without treatment in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Now Pāṇini, who undertook to build up his great Sabdānuśāsana, the Vyākaraṇa-Vedāṅga,¹ could not very naturally think of leaving varṇa without any treatment. This is probably the reason why he wrote the PS. which is as it were a companion to his famous grammar.

34. It may now be asked why Pāṇini wrote the PS. in metre and not in prose sūtras. We may think that such a question is not difficult to answer. Considering the simplicity and shortness of the subject to be treated Pāṇini, it may be assumed, adopted in case of the Śikṣā the metrical style which for the Aṣṭādhyāyī with its complex subject-matter would have been quite unfit.

35. Now this being practically certain that the PS. as re-constructed here, is from the hands of Pāṇini we get some rough idea about the age of the work. But as the PS. seems to offer some fresh data for this purpose we shall discuss below various points of view on Pāṇini’s age and try to suggest some time in which the great Indian grammarian was likely to have flourished. Pāṇini has variously been placed between 800 B.C.-400 B.C.² The view of those who hold that Pāṇini should be placed in about 350 B.C. should be considered first.³ Their main argument against an earlier date is the fact that Pāṇini

¹ Winternitz does not admit (Hist. of Ind. Lit., Vol. III, p. 388) that the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini is a Vedāṅga, but this is against the traditional Indian view. Madhusūdana in his Prasthānabheda writes तदेदतः विद्वृत्तिव्याख्याते वेदाण्ग वाक्यविषिद्वाध्याय: (ed. Weber, pp. 16-17).
In the introduction to the Siddhānta Kaumudi (ed. Venkatesvar, Bombay, 1914) Mahānāhopādhyāya Pandit Shivadatta Shastri discusses the claim of all extant Vyākaraṇas for Vedāṅgāvī and concludes पाथित्वन्याःकारकर्षे वेदाण्गायाः परशुपरमेश्वर्याः (pp. 6-8).


Dr. Paul Thieme very rightly characterizes the use of this date as ‘due to a common but wholly unproved belief’ (op. cit., p. 68).
used the word \textit{yavana} which they think could not have entered India before Alexander's invasion. But this argument has been very ably refuted by Professors S. K. Belvarkar and H. Sköld—Belvarkar, Systems of Skt. grammar, pp. 15 ff.; Sköld, Papers on Pāṇini, pp. 24 ff.). The latter has shown very conclusively "that old Indian \textit{yavana} must have entered this language before 520 B. C., and there is no reason at all to locate Pāṇini as late as after Alexander the Great on account of the here-quoted sūtra." "Moreover Prof. Liebich has proved that Pāṇini's rules apply to the language of the Brāhmaṇas, some obsolete (perhaps archaic) forms only separating his language from that of the Brāhmaṇas (Papers on Pāṇini, p. 38)." On the basis of this finding of Prof. Liebich, Prof Sköld thinks that Pāṇini must have belonged to the latter Vedic period of the Indian literature (\textit{loc. cit.}). Prof. Liebich however is not willing to assign Pāṇini to a period before Buddha (Pāṇini, p. 8; Winternitz, Vol. III, p. 383). But he seems to have been over-cautious in the matter. For he himself admits, according to Prof. Sköld, that Pāṇini seems to be less lax than that of the Sūtras (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 41.)\textsuperscript{1} Prof. Sköld concludes on the basis of this view of Prof. Liebich that we could be inclined to place Pāṇini in a period shortly preceding the Sūtra literature proper (\textit{loc. cit.}) Now the sūtra works which are considered to be among the oldest have been placed in 500 B.C. (Macdonell, India's Past, p. 136).

36. From the above discussion it appears that Pāṇini was most probably earlier than 500 B.C. And there seems to be other facts too which seem to corroborate this view. For example the \textit{Aṣṭādhyāyī} which mentions the Brāhmaṇa literature no less than four times (II. 3. 60; IV. 1. 66, 3. 103; V. 1. 62) and distinguishes between the old and the new Brāhmaṇas, does not refer to the Āraṇyaka literature though the word \textit{āraṇyaka}.

\textsuperscript{1} Keith on the doubtful authority of Pāṇini, VI. 1, 157, concludes that the grammarian knew Pāraskara the sūtrākāra. His views about Pāṇini's acquaintance with Kātyāyana the Śrautasūtrākāra, and the Kauśika sūtrākāra also seems to be inadmissible. (Translation of the \textit{Yajurveda}, p. cixix.)
in the sense of ‘forest dweller’ has once (IV. 1. 129) been mentioned. That Kātyāyana composed a Vārttika to extend the use of the word ‘āraṇyaka’ to an adhyāya (most probably of the Brāhmaṇa) may be taken to mean that in Pāṇini’s time the Āraṇyaka appendices to the Brāhmaṇas were not yet written or even if they might have been written they were not styled as the Āraṇyakas. Now accepting the second alternative as being more likely we can place Pāṇini at the close of the Brāhmaṇa period. Along with this we should mark another fact, viz., the non-occurrence of the word ‘upaniṣad’ in the sense of ‘secret instructions’¹ and religio-philosophical texts containing them in Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī (Pāṇini, I. 4. 79, indeed has the word ‘upaniṣad’ in the compound upaniṣatkṛtva)² which literally means ‘sitting very close to’, i.e., in a private manner. Now we may well conclude that the Āraṇyakas which contain Upaniṣads were not old at the time of Pāṇini, for they were not yet known as Āraṇyakas or Upaniṣads. Now the oldest among the Upaniṣads are considered to have been compiled about 500 B.C.³ Hence we should not place Pāṇini later than 500 B.C. It is likely that Pāṇini lived some time earlier than this.⁴ The diphthongal character of e and o which Pāṇini has recorded in his Sikṣā (13) shows that the language described by him was in the same stage of evolution as the Old Persian of the Cuneiform Inscriptions (600 B.C.) of Persepolis. For this latter language too has diphthongs corresponding to our e and o (see Meillet, Grammaire du Vieux Perse, pp. 55 ff.). As we have no Old Persian Sikṣā we do not know what the actual phonetic value of diphthongs ai (Skt. e) and au (Skt. o) was. It is likely that the graphic system was ahead of the phonetic development. The fact that Pāṇini has

¹ Deussen, Philosophy of Upanishads, pp. 10-15. Dasgupta, History of Indian Philosophy, p. 38.
² Cf. Keith. Tr. of Yajurveda, HOS., p. cixvii.
³ Dasgupta, op. cit., p. 39.
⁴ Dr. Paul Thieme seems to support such a conclusion in his following remark: “Pāṇini’s grammar must have been composed at a time when the language of the North was yet felt to be necessary” (op. cit., p. 51).
given rules in his grammar of the proper accentuation of the bhāṣā words (VI. I. 181, vibhāṣā bhāṣāyām; VIII. 2.98, Purvam tu bhāṣāyām) shows that the current language of his time was much ahead of the classical Sanskrit (which has lost its accents) and was nearer the Vedic phase (though in its very late form) of the Old Indo-Aryan than the latter. In addition to this we should also reckon the fact that Pāṇini’s grammar was originally accented like a Mantra or Brāhmaṇa text (vide ante § 26) and as such it should be assigned at the latest to the close of the period of the Brāhmaṇas.
37. The Sikṣā Pañjikā. The MSS. and the printed text from which the present edition has been re-constructed have been described before (§ 26) in connexion with the text of the Pāj. recension of the PS. We are now giving below the main features of the commentary reconstructed. The Pāj. recension of the PS, as we have seen before (§ 26) came into existence between 800 and 1100 A.C. Hence the Pañjikā itself may be tentatively placed somewhere in the 12th century. Thus the work which may be as old as seven centuries is sure to contain some old materials. Some of these, such as a reference to Audavrajī, has already been pointed out (§ 2b). These materials will be discussed below. According to the Pañjikā, the Sikṣā is the science by which the pronunciation of speech-sounds is learnt (Sikṣyatātānayā varṇoccāraṇam iti Sikṣā, p.8, lines 3-4). This is to be compared with the term varṇaśikṣā occurring in the ṚPr. (XIV. 30). It is not possible that the author of this work has referred by this term to Prātiśākhya and this being the case varṇaśikṣā relates to the Sikṣā of the early period when it still lacked the later elaboration as observed in the Prātiśākhya (see §§ 16, 23). Hence the ṚPr. has scarcely any legitimate claim to interpret this word as 'Prātiśākhya', which must have existed considerably earlier than the time when the ṚPr. was compiled. The Pañjikā in the definition of Sikṣā quoted above seems to have preserved this tradition which agreed so well with the fact that the PS. deals merely with the utterance of the speech-sounds of the Old Indic Aryan as represented in Vedic texts. Besides this it gives us rare informations on the following points:

(a) There are two anusvāras (p. 10, line 14; p. 12, lines 9-10). No other authorities seem to have taken notice of this fact.
(b) A quotation from the Brhadāraṇyaka Up. (p. 15, lines 22-23) occurring in this commentary varies to some extent from the text of this work as received from Saṅkarācārya.

(c) In the reconstruction of the PŚ. 13 this commentary has given a valuable hint (see p. 18, lines 6-7). From this hint we may assume that the author of the Pañjikā had PŚ. 13 as reconstructed by us. But he however could not rightly explain this passage.

(d) It gives us the old name for anusvāra as anusvārah nāsi-kyah (p. 18, lines 12-13). For details about the anusvāra see Note 27.

So much for the importance of the Pañjikā. In spite of its valuable aspects it should not be considered infallible. It has the weakness of average commentaries of Skt. and Pkt. works. Sometimes it gives information and explanation which are not accurate. For example, the Pañjikā considers prayatna as twofold in spite of its Sikṣā text (see p. 14, line 13). It is possible that he failed to understand the passage (18) properly. The same appears to be the case in its determination of the quantity of the component parts of e, o and ai, au (See p. 18, lines 6-7; and Note 23). The author of the Pañjikā is ignorant about the authorship of the PŚ. which it considers to have been written in conformity with the teaching of Pāṇini. In this he simply believed what was given in the first couplet (Pāniniyam matam yathā, of the Pāj. version of the Sikṣā). This however weakens the testimony of the author of the Sikṣā-Prakāśa commentary, who considers that Piṅgala, the younger brother of Pāṇini, was the author of the PŚ. (p. 28, line 8).

37. The Sikṣā-Prakāśa. This commentary has been received in corrupt MSS., at least the two we could directly or indirectly use are such (see § 2 c). It is inferior in worth to the Pañjikā discussed above. But it has importance in the following points:

1 The corruption is most palpable in the passage at p. 28, lines 23 ff.
INTRODUCTION

(a) It ascribes the authorship of the PS. to Pingala, the younger brother of Panini (see p. 23, line 7). The authenticity of this information has been discussed before (§23).

(b) It defines the Siksa as a science for the utterance of (proper) pitch (of vowels) and speech-sounds in general (Siksa svara varnopa rakam sastram, p. 23, line 15). This is different from the definition given in the Pañjikā (see §37). Apparently slight though this definition is, it is not without importance. In the Pañjikā definition we find speech-sounds only as subject of instruction while in the Prakāśa svara (pitch accent) comes in. It may be assumed that the two definitions point to two distinct traditions having their origin in two successive stages in study of Vedic Phonetics. That is, speech-sounds came first of all to be studied and the pitch received attention later or at least was treated in a śāstra later (see also §12).

(c) In the reconstruction of the PS. 13 this commentary gives valuable help. Though the MSS. are defective on this point the original reading of the passage before the author of the Prakāśa can easily be guessed from them (see p. 31, line 16).

(d) This commentary ascribes to the Brhaddevatā of Saunaka the following couplet: svāra varṇo' kṣaram mātrā viniyogārtham (?) eva ca, mantram jñāsamānena veditavyam pade pade (p. 24, lines 6-7).

38. Of the two available commentaries of the PS., the Sikṣa-Pañjikā seems to be the earlier because it is written in a simpler style and has better acquaintance with the old phonetical traditions. The first point will be clear to any one who will compare for himself the language of the two commentaries. And to substantiate the second point we shall refer the treatment of the Anusvāra. About the exact manner of its pronunciation there is difference of opinion among specialists in the Indo-Aryan linguistics (see Wackernagel, I. §§223-224). Whitney understands the phonetic value of the Anusvāra which is nothing but the nasal vowel (T. Pr. 2. 30, JAOS., Vol. 10, p. lxxxvi;
MEM. SOC. LING. 2. 194 ff. REF. WACKERNAGEL. BUT WACKERNAGEL AND OTHERS DO NOT ACCEPT THIS. AFTER A FRESH EXAMINATION OF THE VARIOUS PRATISĀKHYA PASSAGES TOGETHER WITH THE OPINION OF PS. ON THIS POINT WE FIND WHITNEY TO BE RIGHT. THE ANUSVĀRA IS NOTHING BUT A NASALIZATION OF THE PRECEDING VOWEL. THE FULLER NAME OF THE ANUSVĀRA WAS ANUSVĀRA-NĀSIKYĀH OR ANUSVĀRAH NĀSIKYĀH, A POST-VOCAL NASAL OR A NASAL VOWEL. IT HAS SOMETIMES BEEN CALLED SIMPLY NĀSIKA OR NĀSIKYA TOO. THAT THE NAME ANUNĀSIKA, WHICH ACCORDING TO PĀṇINI (I.1.8) MEANS ONLY NASAL STOPS, HAS BEEN USED TO INDICATE NASAL VOWELS FOR A PRETTY LONG TIME, SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN DUE TO A MISUNDERSTANDING (MORE ABOUT THIS POINT IN NOTES TO THE PS.).

39. NOW THE ANONYMOUS AUTHOR OF THE ŚIKṢA-PĀṆJIKĀ SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN FULLY AWARE OF THE TRUE NATURE OF THE ANUSVĀRA. HENCE IN HIS COMMENT ON PĀṆJ. 17 (PS. 14-15) HE QUOTES FROM AUDAvRAJĪ AN ENTIRE PASSAGE ENUMERATING THE AYOGAVĀHAS AS FOLLOWS:

\[ \text{AYOGAVĀHAS: } \text{ए: द्रति विसर्जनीयः } \times \text{द्रति जिज्ञासूनीयः, } \times \text{द्रति उपमानीयः } \]

\[ \text{पति विभुव्यार: नासिकः इवयोगवासः ।} \]

This passage occurs in the first Prapāṭhaka of the Rktantra (ed. S. Sastri, p. 2, ll. 11-12) with the difference that the latter reads नमित्तुनासिकः (v.l. नमित्तुनासिकम्, ओनासिकः). In view of the fact that the Rktantra mentions चुंबुकारो not much later, and चुंबुकार as one of the Ayogavāhas, it is evident that the extant Rktantra is corrupt in the passage नमित्तुनासिकः. The reading पति विभुव्यार: नासिकः surely goes to the Ur-text of the Audavrajī which must have been partially included in his work by the author or the Vṛttikāra or the Rktantra.

1 But some of the other quotations in the Pañjikā from Audavrajī are corrupt. (See below.)

2 Audavrajī who has been mentioned in the sūtra 60 of the Rktantra can scarcely be its author. The first Prapāṭhaka which is not counted as an integral part of the Rktantra by the MS. B was in all likelihood a part of the original work of Audavrajī (see ed. S. Sastri, Introduction, p. 84).
40. Thus it appears that the author of the Pañjikā flourished at a time when the original work of Audavrajī was still available in a more or less correct form and in fact he may be older than the Vṛttikāra of the Rktantra who appears by no means to be modern. Thus apart from offering a help in solving certain problems connected with the text of the PŚ. (see Note) the Sikṣā-Pañjikā has importance on account of the information it gives about Audavrajī, who has been mentioned, as far as we know, in four other works:—the Nāraṇiyā Sikṣā (II. 8. 5) and the Sikṣā-Frakāṣā commentary to the PŚ. and the Vamśā Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma Veda (Ind. Stud. IV, pp. 374-386) and the Rktantra (S. 60).1

Some of Audavrajī’s passages cited in the Sikṣā-Pañjikā occur in the Rktantra with its vṛtti and some occur in a distorted manner and some do not occur. Let us quote them below in a classified manner.

(a) Occurring in full.

i. चन्द्रालामवस्यो यमः पूर्वगुणः: (RT. 2. 14).
ii. कृष्ण कयमः सर्वकानाम् दूरिकालवल्क्ष्यानाम् (RT. 3. 1).
iii. पनुसारो तो च द्रविषुसारी, क्षरः द्रोहिवो दीर्घत्वो वर्णः: (RT. 2. 14. 15).

(b) Occurring with different readings.

i. दी नादानुप्रदानी (cf. RT. 3. 3. नादानुप्रदानी): The correct reading seems to have been दी नादुस्प्रदानी.

ii. वर्गोः वर्गः वर्गः वर्गः च ब्रह्मस्। ब्रह्मसं प्रह्सं स्थानिविल्लिंकारः; cf. स्थानं च व्रप ॥२॥ वर्गवर्गः प्रह्सं विशेषयम्। स्थानिविल्लिंकारः (RT. 7. 1-2). The RT. reading seems to be correct.

iii. पशोगवाहः: अः इति विस्त्रेनियय अः इति जिज्ञासूनीयय अः इति उपासनीय : इति इत्योगवाहः: (Diff. with RT. shown above).

The very fact that the Pañjikā does not quote from any of the late Sikṣā works except the Nāraṇiyā Sikṣā probably show that these latter are later in origin than the Pañjikā or at least they were not yet counted as authority at its time. From this fact also we may assume the old age of the Pañjikā.
Besides Audavraj the Pañjikā has laid the following works under contribution: Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, Śrutī, Chāndogya Śrutī (Upaniṣad), Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī, Unādī Sūtras, Bhagavad Gītā, Patañjali, Manusāṁhitā, Ṛk-Prātiṣākhya, Nāradīya Sīkṣā.

41. In spite of its importance discussed above the author of the Pañjikā seems to have misunderstood the PŚ. very much; for example, his explanation of PŚ. 13 (=Pūj. 15) may be cited (see Note 23). But in this matter he seems to have been misguided by Uvaṭā¹ if the latter was his predecessor, or both he and Uvaṭā born long after Pāṇini, when the Middle Indo-Aryan speech-habits had already overwhelmed to a certain extent the purity of the Phonetic tradition among the Vedic priests, have independently failed to explain correctly the difference between e and o with ai and au respectively. Other features of the Pañjikā have been discussed in Notes.

42. The Sīkṣā-Prakāśa or the Prakāśa does not seem to be a very old commentary to the PŚ. Some points regarding its date have been mentioned before. The Prakāśa quotes verbatim a passage (p. 23) from Viṣṇumitra’s commentary to the Ṛk-Prātiṣākhya. Now we do not possess any definite evidence about the time of Viṣṇumitra. The fragment of his writing prefixed to the available MSS. of Uvaṭā’s commentary to the ṚPr. shows that he enjoyed some popularity among the Vedic priests and hence his fragment was saved from oblivion by putting it at the beginning of Uvaṭā’s work. Thus we may assume that Viṣṇumitra was not later than Uvaṭā (11th century A.C.)

¹ Uvaṭā (on VPPr. I. 73) is right so far in his analysis of ai and au, a-element of both being taken as equivalent to a mātrā, but his remark चन्दनेन्त्र अन्नसेत्य ईश्वारीवारी वाचाली is not clear and the view of unnamed authority (kecid) quoted by him is misleading.
This gives us the upper limit to the Prakāśa; the lower limit is to be had from the author's conjectural identity with the commentator of the Pingalacchandah-Sūtras. This is 1300 A.C.

43. This commentary (Prakāśa) quotes from Pāṇini, Yāska, Nārādiya Sikṣā, Gautamī Sikṣā, Śaunaka, Patañjali and Audavrajī. The only quotation from the last authority seems to be taken not from any original work of Audavrajī but from some author who quoted him. The case with the author of Pañjikā was different, for he quoted as much as he could (see before). The fact that the Prakāśa does not quote any of the late Sikṣās except the Nārādiya and the Gautamī Sikṣā probably shows that it is not quite modern.
Table C

A Conspectus of Text-units of different Recensions, showing their relative position.

*Note.*—Numerals indicate the serial number of hemistiche in a particular recension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hemistiche</th>
<th>Rk. recension</th>
<th>Yaś. recension</th>
<th>Ph. recension</th>
<th>Pnj. recension</th>
<th>Ar. recension</th>
<th>Reconstructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a tha śikṣān etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śāstrānu-pūryaṁ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prasiddham api</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punar vyaktī</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triṣaṣṭiḥ catuṣṭ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cf 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prākṛte Saṃskṛte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svara viśatīr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yādayāś ca</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāro visargaś</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duṣṭprāśas cēti</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śātāṃ buddhyā</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manah kāyānim</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārtas tārasi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prātaḥ-savanayogap</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaṭṭha mādhyan-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tārāṃ tārtiyasavanap</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodiroḥ mūrdhna-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vārṇāḥ janaye</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarataḥ kālataḥ</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iṣi varṣa-vidaḥ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udāttaḥ cānudātaḥ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemistiches</td>
<td>Rk recension</td>
<td>Yaj. recension</td>
<td>Pūj. recension</td>
<td>AP recension</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrasvo dirghaḥ etc.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udātte niṣāda-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarita-prabhavā</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aṣṭau sthānāni</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmūlam ca</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obhāvaś ca</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>*27</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmūlam upadhma</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>*28</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yady obhāva</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarāntaṃ</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halārpaṃ pāncamāir</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anrasyaṃ tāṃ</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaṇṭhyāv abhā vicu</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayūr mūrdhanvā</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmūle tu</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e si tu kaṇṭha-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ardhamātrā tu</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a(s)kāraukārayor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upadhmnīya āṃśa</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samvṛtāṃ māṭrīkaṃ</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghosṭaḥ vā samvṛtāḥ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarāṇāṃ āṃsānāṃ</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tebhāyo' pi vīrīvāv</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāra-yamānāṃ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayogavāha viśneyā</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alību-vīṇā-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāras-tu</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāre vīrīyāp</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dvir oṣṭhau tu etc</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vyāgha yathā</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhātā patanabhadā</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yathā saurāṣṭrikā</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaṁ rahgā</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raṅga-vargap</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirgha-vargap</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydaye caika-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāśihaṁ</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydayē utkate</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārdavāṁ ca dvimātram,</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madhye tu kampayet</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarāgāṁ kampayet</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaṁ varpāḥ</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samyag-varga-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhyāṣārthe dṛutāṁ</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śīśyāṁ opadeśārthe</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gṛti śīghri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anārthajñā' īpa-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mādhuryam akṣara-</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chāryaṁ lāya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāṅkitam bhītam</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kākasaṁvarap śravagāṁ</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urāṇe-ḍaṅgaṁ</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niṣpāditaṁ grāta-</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pṛṭab pathen</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mādhyandine</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. संस्कृत मूलम् (The Reconstructed Text)

[ वर्षसमान्वयः ]

[ अ द्र उ ग् क ल क्, ए औ ड्। ऐ ब्रो च्।।
ह य वर र्।। ल श्।। अ म द श न म्।। भ भ ड्।।
घ ठ ध घ्।। ज ब ग ड द श्।। ख फ क ठ थ च ठ त व्।।
क प ग्।। श घ स र्।। ह ल्।। ]

[ वर्षसंख्या ]

खरा विश्निरिकश्च स्मर्नां पञ्चविश्वमिति।
याद्यश्च स्मृत ता द्वितीयी चत्वारश्च यथा: स्मृत ता: ||11||
अनुस्थारो विस्मर्यं ग्रं पीि चापि पराश्रयो।
तु:स्मृष्टेन्यिति विज्ञेयो खरार: स्मृत एव च ॥२॥

[ वर्षीयूपादे वर्षीयिभागः ]

श्रात्मा वुद्धा समेत्यांतु मनो युक्ते विवचया।
मन: कायामलंिकविः स प्रेषयति मातामस् ||३॥
मातास्निःसि चरणू मन्द्रं जनयति खर्स्म।
प्रातःस्वनेवयों रूि कन्टो गायमस्थितम् ||४॥
पाणिनीय-ग्रंथ

कथे साधुयनन्दनयुगं मध्यमं वैष्ठभानुगम्।
तारं तार्क्यस्वयमं शैविन्यं जागपातिुगम् ॥३॥
सोद्रवर्णोऽभावः सुर्द्रविवाहं वन्याद्यपयं मारततः।
वर्षाण्वजः जनयते तेषां विभागः पश्चात्र श्रुतः ॥६॥
स्मरतं कालं श्यानात् प्रयत्नानुप्रकाशनं।
इति वर्षाविटं प्राहुनिधुपं तं निवृद्धत ॥७॥

[ स्वर्गं कालप्रयोगं ]

उदात्सानुदातस्व सन्तल्प्तस्व खरास्वः।
ञ्ज्ञोद्रीः श्रुतं इति कालती नियममा चरचिः ॥८॥

[ वचारणं-श्यानात् ]

चत्तृशी श्यानाति वर्णानुमुरः कथः शिरस्थथा ।
जित्तामूलं च दन्ताद्य नासिकोद्धि च तालु च ॥६॥
हकारं पञ्चममेवतंमनं; ख्याभिष्य संयुतम् ।
शौरस्यं तं विज्ञानीयात् कण्ठप्रमाहरसंयुतम् ॥१०॥
कण्ठावहावात्तिकुङ्गशास्त्रालयः ब्रोज्ञावछवु।
शुमृग्न्या कटृरपा दन्त्या चतुरसः स्रृतः ॥११॥
जित्तामूली तु कुः प्रेतो दन्त्योद्धि वः स्रृतो तु वृधः।
ण ऐ तु कण्ठतालयभो चो चो कण्ठोद्धि स्रृतः ॥१२॥
शर्माक्षः तु कण्ठाः एकारीकाशयोभवत् ।
ऐकारीकायोभयोवा तयोविक्षितसंहतम् ॥१३॥
वनुशायरमानां च नासिकाश्यानमुच्छति ।
उपपायीय ऋष्या च जित्तामूलीयनासिके ॥१४॥
संख्यार्थं सूक्ष्मं

धयोगवाहा विज्ञेया चाश्यस्मानभागिनः

चलालुच्छादनिघीनियोजनसूक्ष्मः स्वराज्युः।
चनुसारस्तु कर्णवे नित्य गृहणस्य च।

[ प्रवत्त-मीदाः ]

चोयस्यं गणस्वीष्णमन्यस्यं शलं स्मृतं।
शेषं सुत्रं हलं प्रोज्ञ।

[ मन्त्रप्रदान-मीदाः ]

निन्दीतानुप्रदानत्।

अमोलसुन्नासिका नवनो नादिनो हस्यं। स्मृतं।।
इप ग्रामवे वशस्य जश्व मयासिनस्तु खवादयः।
इपच्छासाध्यो विधातू गोरखसैतव प्रचरते।।

*
II. चन्द्रिकाराष्ट्रगता (The Agni-Purãna Recension)

वक्ते १शिवां विचक्ति: सुरश्री वा २चतुरविचका:।
न्द्रा विश्वतिरिक्तं स्यर्मानां पञ्चविश्वति: ॥१॥

॥२॥ याद्येश समूता च्छोटी चत्वारश्च ३यमाः समूता:।
चनुकारो विसर्गः ४िः कः पौ चापि ५पराशिर्तै॥२॥

॥३॥ हुः सणांविश्वेति ६वनिवेसो ७खृत्व: मुन एव च ।
८हृतां पञ्चम्रेयतान्त: स्नाथि संयुतम् ॥३॥

॥४॥ चौरसौ ते विजानियात् कन्धावाहसाधुतम् ।
चाल्मा दुध्रा समेल्यार्यान् १०मनो दुध्री विवचया ॥४॥

॥५॥ मनो वायुसमाहितम् स प्रेषयति माहलम् ।
माहलसूरसि चरन् ११मन्द्र जनयति खरम् ॥५॥

॥६॥ १२प्रातः स्वतयोऽऽंते कन्धो गायत्रमाहितम् ।
कः च १३माथादिनयुग श्रध्यं दैष्ट्यानुलगम् ॥६॥

1. P. वर्षावनुप्रदानतं. 2. M. "वि.
3. M. सामान्य विनिवेश and P. चन्द्रकारी विनिवेश for चोभावस विनिवेश.
4. M. ज्ञानियां.
5. P. reads एकसंध्वरणं पापसंध्वरणं श्रमतं instead of 13b (न तथा पाठे etc.) and M. एकसंध्वरणं....अभम.
8. Pоборот give this couplet preceded by यथा आसीति चलेत पुनानि वेष्ट्रयं न च कैलेकित्—(Yajus. 20a). P. gives 17b-18a as its 18, and 19b-20a as its 20.
पारमिनय-विश्वा

1. कस्य्याल्पकविचयशास्त्राय चोढ़िजावधुः।

11. सूर्यवर्त्यां कस्याल्पकविचयशास्त्राय चोढ़िजावधुः। सूर्यां सूर्यांतः स्मृता:। ॥११॥

12. ए ऐ सा ॥कश्याल्पकविचयशास्त्राय चोढ़िजावधुः। सूर्यांतः स्मृता:। ॥१२॥

13a. चद्ममाचर्य तु ॥कस्य्याल्पकविचयशास्त्राय चोढ़िजावधुः। सूर्यांतः स्मृता:। ॥१३॥

15a. चद्ममाचर्य तु ॥कस्य्याल्पकविचयशास्त्राय चोढ़िजावधुः। सूर्यांतः स्मृता:। ॥१५॥

16b. चद्ममाचर्य तु ॥कस्य्याल्पकविचयशास्त्राय चोढ़िजावधुः। सूर्यांतः स्मृता:। ॥१६॥

17. चद्ममाचर्य तु ॥कस्य्याल्पकविचयशास्त्राय चोढ़िजावधुः। सूर्यांतः स्मृता:। ॥१७॥

18. चद्ममाचर्य तु ॥कस्य्याल्पकविचयशास्त्राय चोढ़िजावधुः। सूर्यांतः स्मृता:। ॥१८॥

1. P. कश्य-कालकविशास्त्राय.
2. P. ॥रावल्लया ए च्या.
3. MV. कश्य्या तांतिकारक्यायाय.
4. P. नवाम: (म) श्याम: and M. नवा: नाम: श्याम: for -नवामश्याम:.
5. MV. श्याम: for श्याम:.
6. PM. निविषेष्यास्त्राय:
7. M. नवामश्याम: नाम: नाम:.
8. P. तांतिकारक्याय:.
9. M. चद्ममाचर्य:.
10. P. चद्ममाचर्य:.
III. पञ्जिका-सहिताः (With the Pañjikā)

श्रामणरुपं तद्विवाहायु यथोत्तरं लोकवेदियोः

'पातु वो निकामाध्या मतिनः सरसतः।
प्राच्यतरपरिचितं वर्षीयं करोति वा॥
कदनवज्ञनिष्ठानि ३विहतानीच्छ चूर्मभि।
३शिस्या न विष्ठता यथार्थाचार्या विड्डपोम्यसम्॥

ष य शि च चां प्रवव चया से भी ति। चवियमाननत्यं। वेदायुमानलरमि-पाट। किं कारणम्? 'वड़पू वेदोपवेशतः' द्रिति आरणातः। तत्र ६च शिस्या प्रयम, भाष्यबद्धुपक्षालृ। सा ६च वत्तव्ययो उल्लभयावरस्य ७प्रथः। एतनेव ८शिशु वेद-स्त्राणान्तर्य आकर्षणादिविवश्वकोषः एव ८नावीयते। केवलितु कथिते चर्चीयते द्रिति चेतु 'चाकोविविका'; 'चथातस्य समात्वस्य' इधेंवमादिय सैष दीपः। नियमार्थः सः, १०शिस्यान्तरं कल्य एवाष्टेतथौ नामानीति। मक्लायवेऽ वा। ब्राह्मणो वेदविभाषयप्रयोजनानि वनयानि। तत्र १२चार्यवेद सम्मनो वसुवो वदुशोकङ्गक्षुभ्यः। १२विनस्यव्यसनि ब्राह्मिकिः। श्रमिवेंद्र तु स्वयंवे वक्ति—'वाच चत्वारीणि विविदम्' द्रिति। प्रयोजनं सम्मयायाचार्यम्। प्रयोजनमति यूयते एव—

1. *Before this A¹B have शोषणेशाव नम्; A¹ also चौनि ससो नपापत्वे, A²H च वेदायुमार्थसमायाभि: श्रीमोथ्यानि नम्: and B पातु नि।
2. B निष्ठात्।
3. IB शिशा जनविवाहायु मानाताळः।
4. A² वेदोपवेशयेऽ
5. A² omits व।
6. BHL omit व।
7. A¹ omits चर्चः... वेदः।
8. चिन्द्रेन चे चे for चिन्द्रेन वेदायुः।
9. H. भविष्यते।
10. B, विचारम् चनलरः।
11. A² omits द्रिति।
12. B omits एव,।
13. HLA² वेदविभाषयस्य चाण्डा। B. वेदविभाषयस्य चाण्डा म्।
पारिनिय-पिचा

#प्रसिद्धमपि शब्दार्थमविज्ञातमवुढ्यिवि पुनः गोविराधारिखामि वाच उचारणे विधिम् ॥ २॥

"एकादशि वर्णेः सच्चद्रवुः, खलो लोकं कामभूमि भवति" दत्त। शिखरतेनवया वचार्यावाचरणसमि गिता, तत्र प्रकारणन वचार्याची कवयित्रामि। प्राणि नी यं म सं म य थे ति। पारिनियांमिति हुषान्तः (प्रा. ४.२.११४) दत्त क्रत्वे। २ तस्ये-मित्राग्निज्ञानः। म त आहि। इति ३"मन रात्रे" पारिनियं में देशं यथा तथा प्रवचनांमि तैशिव प्रवाहारे-सत्येव परिमाणयां श्रवेपृतपि श्रव्यावेद्याची द्रव्यादि "अणुस्तिकारणे च चाप्रययः" (प्रा. १.६.६८) दत्ता "कष्ठतावस्तुविवृत्यः।" दत्ता। इति ४। तथाविदयवनुभवन प्रयोजनेन यथात् व्यक्तेदिव चहितेऽथे "भोजनुखारः" (प्रा. ५.२.१२) दत्त। ननु व्यक्तेऽय शब्दचिन्ता, चत्रापि देशि। ततवोऽय व्याकरणेव विशेषांदित्वमनवनरस्यः। सत्तृः। द्वभोः। शब्दचिन्ता, किन्तु व्याकरणे व्याख्याति-गोविराधारिखामि सङ्कृतिवर्ण्यथे। साहित्याचिन्तामणयथे माधवः। इति वहुः च गोविराधारिखामि साहित्याचिन्तामणयथे श्रव्यात्। नृसिम्हासिं मिति भाषेः। भवे इन्द्रीयावन यथार्थायः। नृसिम्हासिं मिति युक्तप्रवृत्तम्। ५ तद्वति पारिनियांमितिप्रवा मयेः। ६"तत् पारिनियांमिति विशेषां" विशेषांमिति मूलिकम्।" तत्त्र पारिनियांमिति विशेषांमिति मूलिकम्। तद्वति पारिनियांमिति विशेषांमिति मूलिकम्। तद्वति पारिनियांमिति विशेषांमिति मूलिकम्। तद्वति पारिनियांमिति विशेषांमिति मूलिकम्। तद्वति पारिनियांमिति विशेषांमिति मूलिकम्। तद्वति पारिनियांमिति विशेषांमिति मूलिकम्। तद्वति पारिनियांमिति विशेषांमिति मूलिकम्। तद्वति पारिनियांमिति विशेषांमिति मूलिकम्। ७ कृतिकारां-"वेव वेकिसिंका। शब्दार्थ एव विशिष्टाक्षर संस्कृतेः। तथा च ११ कृतिकारां-"वेव वेकिसिंका। शब्दार्थ एव विशिष्टाक्षर संस्कृतेः। तथा च २० कृतिकारां-"वेव वेकिसिंका। शब्दार्थ एव विशिष्टाक्षर संस्कृतेः। तथा च २३ कृतिकारां-"वेव वेकिसिंका। शब्दार्थ एव विशिष्टाक्षर संस्कृतेः। तथा च २५ कृतिकारां-"वेव वेकिसिंका। शब्दार्थ एव विशिष्टाक्षर संस्कृतेः।

नवकाराद्वृतो वर्गेऽस्मातनिवौषिकायनं१८ परखानीतिरावकङ्कळतो१४ कृतिमयः।

शास्त्रार्थ इत्यादिवाद्

१५ श्रवणविनविबलिः; प्रसिद्धमपि शब्दार्थमविज्ञातां १६ संत निवर्तने।

1. HILB एको वर्णे। 2. A₁ adda च।
3. ह चत्र चार्मषः। 4. A₁A₂ चार्मषेकी परिमाणयाः। 5. B adda च।
6. A₁A₂ चार्मषेकु न्तः। 7. A₁ नई एव A₂ omitter दत्त।
8. HLA² omitter तत् पारिनियांमिति... जानियतेः। 9. B दत्त for द्रव्यादि।
10. A² स्मार्तिकाराद्वृतोः। 11. A² भाष्यापारः। 12. HL वेकिसिंका।
13. A₁ परख निराकाराकालम्। 14. HLA¹ कृतिमयः(?)।
15. BA¹ quote the entire sloka 2। 16. A₁A₂ स्थाते for चणाः।
पञ्चिका-शिक्ता

*चिन्तिष्ट्यस्तमः प्रशिंिवा वर्णी: सभवती मताःः
प्राक्तने संख्येे चापि खर्च प्रोताःः खर्चमुना †II||
खर्चा विश्वतिरिष्क्य स्मर्ताःः पश्विंिशतिःः

||I|| यादवस्य सृष्टा चढ़ी चलावत्स्य यमः: सृष्टा: †II||

पुनः प्रश्नः वज्ञकारिणी वसृष्टिकारिणीं। किम्? वाच उदाराः विविधे, वाचे
'मिर्जा: उदाराः' उद्धर्षे विवि धीमानः। नतु विविधर्ष्टत्मः प्राति साध्यां, न चालान्तमः; उत्ते च चतुरसः—चक्रान्ति वर्णःः सख्यानि चचारायाः
वति। उत्ते यथा पुढ़ान्तिः उदारानि तथा ग्रामणः स:ःः कथन्वीयोऽविद्युः
'पदानादि', एवत्ते'ः विविधः। †II

वागुवारणे वर्णःः क्रियाति, कार्तिकसंख्याः उद्वत भाषा—

ति व द्वि धर्म तु: प द्वि वें ति। सम्भवत द्रष्टि सभवति: सकाराब्रह्मःः जाताःः।
वर्णः झोपति। अङ्ग 'यथोत्ते लोकवःः' इत्युक्तः। तत्र किं लोके संख्या
विश्यया वव वर्णः चत वर्म्यान्तिः विश्यया इवाह—प्राक्तने संख्याः
चापी। श्रव्यादश्तर्याञ्चारिणी वे वर्णःः सभवताःः सन्ति: तेष्यौः। खर्च यं ग्रोत ताःः खर्च
यथा वें ति। नायण: 7वस्म्येवद्वरोऽथा प्रवक्त्याणाश्चारिणाः: †II

कथां से विषामः कथां वा 9 वतुः पारंति धा: राजः—

खरा विषाश्च विषाश्च नि: रे के वें ति। खरा द्रष्टि 'खर्च शवद्रीपतापयोः' खर्चे
शवद्रीपति जेन अन्नमिति करोऽविश्वः। कथां से 10 एकाविंधति: । 11तत्तत: रोः
स्वराः यथाप्रथय यथाश्चारि विन्धयामिति—ष इ उ र एव चलारोऽखर्च्योऽविद्युः
मेंद्रेन हादमः। खराकरक दीवारी न स्ननीिि श्रारष्टाःः खर्च एवोपिद्याःः, 12वच एव
स्नवैः। ए ऐ चो श्री सम्भवणारोः ग्यम्बराःः सम्भवराणाःः खर्चा न स्ननीिि दशराःः

1. $A'^1 A'^2$ तत्र, $B$ om., विरूपः। 3. $A^1$ adds कथ.
11. $A'^1 A'^2$ omit this word; before this I तत्रः खरायां। 12. $A^1$ व for चतः

2
पाणिनीय-शिष्या

१०

द्वितीया एव वद्गते १त एतेऽदे पूवेऽश्चैद्योर्गमी: सौंकविंविशिष्टि:। सा शो ना ध छाँ-विं भ ति:। कादया सावसना: स्वशी:। जिद्दास्मूलमातुसुमूढ़तीहोऽविशिष्टि:। परस्यं स्वरमिष्टिति: स्वशी:। ११या द्वया छ्मू ता छ्मा छ्मा वि ति:। यकाराद्वया चतुःया र ल व श य स हा द्रि ति। १५चतु पायमालारोणः: खः माः। १६युवेः द्वत्वचारिश्वा सह चतुःप्रकाशत्। च ला र ख य मा: छ्मू ता द्रि ति। १७यक्तीति यमः: स्वयः मेवोपरस्तः। के ते यमः। १८लोके कौः खः मूः व द्रि ति। १८°यत्यञ्ज्यावस्यस्योऽगी मः तायः यसः: पूवेऽश्चूः। इत्योद्धति:। ३०तथा च—

१५चतुःपायमालारोणः: प्रथमः हारस्य छ्मूः। लखारों द्वया एवेछोङ्गैः खः एवारि विशिष्टि:। पञ्चविंविशिष्टिरञ्ज्ञावि: स्वशी: खूँयाद्यो यमः। चलुकारो विश्वासः: कहः प्रो दुलखाराकः। विश्वासः वर्षः: खः खः खः धीदेव्यासिदेवतः। १९लुकाराध्यक्षारणः: पण्डितीतिरिता:।

तथा च नारादः—

चतुःपायः १८भवेत पूवेः चिन्तमः: परतो यदि।

वर्ण मध्ये यमस्सिद्धते सत्वः: पूवेः भवमः।

वर्णक्षान्ति शरसः: सर्वस्मताः वर्णाधि संहृताः।

द्वारा १८°यमः निवात्ते आदेशिक्षाविधाढः। (या. शि. २,२,८-९)

इति १५°नारादीदङ्ग्रोऽपि यमो वर्षीगम इति १५°विधोयते। १७°चान्दान्त शाश्वाद्

1. $A^1 A^2$ त एते।
2. $A^1$ omits "शिष्मि:।
3. $A^1 A^2$ "विसयः।
4. $A^2$ "पूवेः एकः।
5. MB omits चवः।
6. हुक्के: द्वत्वचारिश्वा:। I °वलारिश्वा:।
7. $CA^1$ वच्यायोगः यमः।
8. "वेपरस्तः, $A^2$ "वेपरस्तः: परस्त लोके।
9. $A^2$ "अन्तःमाः से मः।
10. HBIA° omit तथा च।
11. $I A^2$ HLB omit this and the two following slokas।
12. $A^1$ "विस्वदः।
13. $H_u$ भवेत पूवेः श्चलादः, $B^o$ $\times$ $I$ पूवैः श्चलादः। I $\times$ $L$ पूवैः श्चलादः।
14. $A^1$ वननादत्वाते।
15. IBH °वलिपिः मलेम, $A^1$ °वलिपिः न।
16. B omits निवीयते।
17. $B$ omits अविश्वै।...


“चलार्थ यमा: चूता:” इति वर्णालालेनोपेक्षे: संयोगमार्थसूत। वय चतुर-चराभासुदायश्रिति प्रक्ष्य । अत्यन्तिति गकारी ही यमो नकार इकाशिति। चन्द्र तु यस्म वर्षीय दिन मन्निते। तथाच शरिकणः—“सङ्कू मरानननुपनिकातः। न्यानु परेशु चर्हितनुपनिकातः” (कः प्र. १.६.६) इति। तूर्वेयच चन्द्र: पद्मायता सम्भारप्रार्थस्त।”

च तु सा रो वि स में श्रेण। सरसु मुखरायवला: [सरसु] चतु नारायणायहुः नृसणिनानुमुः। वच्च्यति च ‘इत्यजु: चूरादु: इति। विश्वाः इति। विश्वाः सूत्रेति विश्वाः इति विश्वाः। × कु छी च एक वि ।

प्रतिष्ठानाति पवित्र ककारपकारी चर्यस्थानं योद्धी परार्थयी। तथा च वच्च्यति—“चन्द्रगाहार विशेष आश्यस्वामनिधिः” इति।

चपर: पाठः—× कु पापितु धरी सूतो। चन्द्राकारिस्तायो: परावर्तन:।

यहाँ रोपिण पाठः—× कु छी पापित पापिताय। ककारपकारी चर्याय: खानं योद्धी कपार्षयो। चन्द्रकारातुक्करिस्तायो: विविधार्थी परार्थायी। तु: सूत्र च ती तित धूर्ख्यें देवत्स्य छो वर्षेणेम्न न वर्षेणसु। वच्च्यति च—‘चवोपस्या च वर्षेणैव वर्षेणाययोधि’ इति। तथा चौद्रज्जः—“तत् सूत्र देतं करणं चर्यानाम्। दु: चन्द्रमाला; क्षानाम्” इति। यशस्विनः ।

1. B² चन्द्रिति गकारी है, A¹ I अभिनिति वमी गकारनकाराविषित, A² अभिनिति गन नकार ककाराविषित, C अभिनिति वमी गकारी हो नकार।
2. B. खानपरेशु, H खानपरेशु, L खानपरेशु, A¹ खानपरेशु, I खानपरेशु।
3. BA² उसे वचन: चिन्तात् द्वा इ. H चिन्तात् चिन्तामिब्दि: चड़े;
4. A¹A²B, दक्करणो, IHL, दक्करणो, A² दक्करणग्रहणादः
6. IB omit तथा, IHLA² करण्य for प्रवतन्ति A adds करण्य after प्रवतन्ति।
7. BHL यकारी भिज्ञाय, IL have in the margin यस्म मन्तिर यकारी विभाज्ये यस्माधिक करण्येः; । B यस्म मन्ति च मन्तिर यकारी विभिन्ते यस्माधिक करण्येः।
चार्मा बुद्ध्या समाधृताञ्च गुणोऽवैवचयः।

सनाः कायाभिमाग्निः स प्रस्पति साक्षात्।

कार्यस्यः। मूत्य एव व वितः। लक्षारस दीवार्थयो न समतीधवस्तातु तया मतस्यमवस्त्मा, समयं चाह्-लक्षारः मूत्य एव च इति विमानः गच्छात्।

नवतः वर्णान्तः प्रववस्यपरिस्तिरीक्षेयं, विस्तारन्तः प्रवं च कथितः । चतुर्थीं विश्नानां च तावतु लक्षार उच्चार्यतः, उच्चारितः च लक्षारेः बाध्या स्वर्णोऽपि प्रयत् उच्चारितः।

चुक्तिरात् मूत्य तात्मा पशु। शृवेत्यात्मापवा- ग्रहणा सह लिपिष्ठः। चतुर्थीं पदः। चंदोस्याः विस्तारितः पाठान्तरः।

चर्या सुनारसिर्यायम् । रक्षारकमेत्रार्थः भ्रमः। तथा चौदविजः। \"इसुच्छारा व श्रां इद्युतस्याः रोजार्थाः। \"इति। अते एव च चतुर्थितिः।

चर्यं वर्णस्यापरिवर्तनानांचर्यां चिन्त्यति क एपासुचारिता, कर्म चौधार्यति, केन रसीभी चेल्लायः।

वह को विति। धाम्या श्रीरीन्द्रयमनोत्विविच्यतिरितिः।

कर्माणि पुनरित्वपवमवते यथा श्रीरीन्द्रयमनोत्विविच्यतिरितिः धाम्या। रथविद्। \"इद्युतात्, इश्वर च हि द्वारः अर्थितां भवति, प्रथोज्जलावः। तुद्धारश्विनि कार्यमयोऽथानि, कार्यालावः कृतार्थस्मात्। इति व्यायात्, शुरूतम्। धाम्यात्, \"अलिहीतं चुल्लायात् सर्गकालाः।\" इति र्मूनिंद्रामहस्याधानां महानां शोभायते। र्मूनिंद्रेण नवशरीराणां, तथातिरिक्तं धाम्यवाः। श्रीरीति। शुरूतम्, \"तथा ध्यातः इद्युत्सारस्य प्रयोगिते तेन ध्यातितीनश धाम्या निकाामति च पर्यं वायुस्यों या श्रीरीरुतम्। भविष्याः।\" (कहा, भा. ४.४.२) इति।

श्रीरीप्राक्ष्रमणं श्रीरीदिव्यितिरितिः धाम्या। वांवेश संस्थापादोऽध्यान्तरविवर्तिता पर्यं व्योरोपस्नदत्र श्री र्मूनिंद्राभिमित्यदतः। (कहा, १२.८) इति। क एपासुचारितिः प्रत्येकाः सत्त्वोऽन्तः इति। कर्मसुचारितयुक्तेन भविष्यितः प्रस्पाह्यकारस्त्र दौःथे-स धाम्या उद्यानः।

1. $A^1$ omits रष्ट्रम्।
2. IHL $A^1A^2$ अर्थम्याभासः।
3. $B$ चौधारी बिवयः।
4. BL रक्षारकों दीवारकों, LA $A^1A^2$ रक्षारकों (दो) दीवारकों (दो), I रक्षारकों दीवारकुंडसञ्च इति।
5. $A^1$ omits इद्युतात् ... इति भावायः। $A^2$ omits इद्युतात् ... इद्युतात्, HL put इति before इद्युतात्।
6. $A^1A^2$ रक्षारकों, $B$ नवशरीराभिम्।
7. HL श्रीरीदिव्यः।
8. $B$ व्योरोपिः।
परिशिष्टम्

मात्राकर्त्त्वसंहिता

॥४॥ प्रातःसवयोपणं तं क्रन्द्वे गायत्रमाध्यिकम् ॥७॥
कण्ठे माध्यमन्त्रयुगं मध्यमं तैंदृष्टानुगमः

॥५॥ तारं तारित्वसयं श्रीरेख्यं जाग्नतानुगमः ॥८॥

वाक्यानु समवेत सम्प्रगम्य अवश्यप्रायवच्चयय यदि श्रद्धा उच्चार्येण तदा
मनो व्रतवीर्य विवचया 'वर्तुसिस्मिता' विवचया तथा ।
तत्र मनो नियुक्तो भाषा ।
म न: का या भि मा ह नी ति ।
तत्र मनो नियुक्तं सत्ता कायानिवासस्ति
कायानिवं श्रीरेखाराजस्मि चाभिमुख्येन द्विति ।
स प्रेर व ति मा धं त भि ति ।
वोपिनिरमित्व: सनू मा हर्ष: वायुं प्रेक्षायि ॥६॥

मा हं त सुं र सिः च र च कर्म: ज न य ति स्रं र भि ति ।
मा हाः वायुहः

हेतु चरणार्थसंहरसं जत्वादिति ।
मन्त्रसंहितादि मन्त्रे रक्षण: म।
प्रातः: स न: ने:
यो गमि ति ।
प्रातः: सवनीन सह योगोद्वारेऽप्रातः: सवयोगाक्षमं, वथव: च
ऐतर्यव्रताधीने 'वथव' मन्त्रे तपस्ति सत्त्रात् मन्त्रव वाचा 
प्रातः: सवनी श्रमितुः' 
(१४.६) द्विति ।
'गायत्रे: गायत्रे: 'सुक्तिकरणं; भाच्छादयति क्रन्दः ॥७॥

क गह द्विति ।
मा हर्षः द्विति 'अनुवर्तति, सवनं क्रन्दः सरं चरितमित् च।
वयोणू जनयतीति यावत् ।
कण्ठे चरणः वायुमयाम सरं जनयति ।
कण्ठे द्विति
'कण्ठः' (उ. च. १०४) द्विति उपरिय: ।
सम्यं दिनं युनस्त्रीति 'माध्यममिव सवनमभाज्यां तत्वं
क्रोधपञ्चदोषसुगमिनम्।
ता र: ति ति ।
तारित्वसन्निमितिः तत्त्वं
सवनमभाज्यां तारं सर: सेर्वसंहितामिव मृतेनिन: चरनः 
वायुं जनयलुस्त्रादिति जागमं
क्रोधपञ्चदोषसुगमिनम्।
जागतं क्रन्दो: तुसुगम्बतीति जागतानुमः ।
श्रीविक्षमिति
'श्रीविक्षक्रन्दसि' (पा. ६.१२.४०) द्विति गिरवसद्वृत्त श्रीविक्षमाभावः ।
तव सम्यं
श्रीविक्षमाः ॥८॥

1. *l'omits व्रतसिस्मिता* निवचया तथा तव, BH व्रतसिस्मिता* only.
2. A¹ चरणः for 'चरनः' । 3. BHLIA² तथा 'च' मृतेन: मन्त्रव वाचा प्रातः: सवनमिनाति.
4. B has before this गायत्रमाध्यिकम् ॥
5. BHL omits सुक्तिकरणं; and *has* भाच्छादयति क्रन्दः.
6. BHLCA² *omits ७तितुः* । 7. A²L माध्यममिव सवनमभाज्याः ॥
पाशिनाय-गिरिचा

सीतीर्षी मूढ्राधिहतो वक्तमापदा मात्रतः।

||6|| वर्षाज्ञनयते तेषां विभागः पञ्चगाः स्रृतः॥६॥

स्रतः कालतः स्थानात् प्रयाक्षानुप्रदानतः।

||7|| दृष्टि वर्षाविवः प्राहुरनिर्मुष्यं तं निधोधत॥१०॥

सो दोषे दृष्टि। स वातुषीयो जर्ज्ञातो सूर्यानं यक्ष्माधिनां गतिम्
चलमानः धिरः-क्षणिकर्मणिविलयते पुनः प्रवातवः 'वक्तमेवापदा वर्षाज्ञनयते
वयादयति। पुनर्मात्रश्च एव विस्तारयति। तेषां विभागः पञ्चगाः स्रृतः दृष्टि।
तेषां वर्षानां जन्मानानां विभागो विवेकः पञ्चगाः पञ्चमकारः। ‘संज्ञाया
विवाचैं धा’ (प्रा. ५.२.८२) दृष्टि धा। ‘स्रोतस्तुतानः॥८॥

बोधेतुमि श्रीकान्त्याः वर्षानां 'पञ्चगाः विवेक इवताह—

सरतः दृष्टि। सूर्याने देवीयुताः सात्साहबाः। 'वर्षानां जन्मारां एवमाणु।—
पञ्चगाः विवेकी वर्षानाम् दृष्टि। 'सरतः उदात्तादिभिन्न। कालो ध्रुवादिः।
खानं कहादिः। प्रयोगो विधा।।।।। चनुप्रदानं स्थानानादिकं धीरादिः। चनु
प्रत्ययां दृष्टिः इववुस्तानाम्। 'ही नाद्'[सारायु]प्रदानी' इववृत्तात्रजः।
पञ्चगाः विवेका वर्षानां निपुणसूचयमाने हे जोनारं, निवर्तितं युक्तम॥

वात्र जितिन्ज्ञ्यो वालायुप्रवर्मम्। नन्द सवमैवैद्यमात्रम्। कथम्?
भाषा नुवरा सच सर्वनाम समयं मनो युक्तं दृष्टि वात्सात्मम्। भाषणम्
नियोजकह्यो नामपर्यते चर्चा-पतलातम् तस्मा। तथा च दृष्टि—'अस्रुहो
धारेः पुष्यते' (दह. भा. ४.२.११) दृष्टि। 'अस्ख्यालनवङ्कसम्दैववर्गम्' (दह. भा.
२.५.४) इवव्यञ्ज्याताः। सत्तवा चेवामाक्रमं वात्सात्मम्। भाषणम्
नियोजकह्यो श्रोतरूपमनिहृव्यतिरिक्तं दृष्टि श्रोतादियःतिरिक्तं भाषा मनो

1. HL क्षणिकर्मणि; B. ६.वर्षा जन्माति। 2. A१. धृतीहतातः।
3. A१ omits वर्षाः...इवताह।
4. BI दृष्टि वर्षाविवः प्राहु निर्मुष्यं तं निधोधत before this. H. puts. निधोधत before this.
5. BHL omit सरतः उदात्तादिः……….इववृत्तात्रजः।
6. IA१C omit "दृष्टि।"
युंजो इत्युपपत्तम्। उच्च, ब्रह्ममाया समय्यथीर्यांभनो युंजो इत्युपपत्तू ब्रह्मचारिन प्रायम्। चेतनस्वरूपे-तदन्त्व शर्प्ण यज्ञयोजनकलम्। तथा च चर्म[संहिताया]—

"योश्यायनः कार्यिता तं चेतनस्त्र प्रचररति।
यः करोति तु कामस्पर्शि स भूताभोचयि वृधे। इति।
जीवंश्रीवधतरावहायः सहजः सर्वदेहिनाम्।
वेदं बद्धयेति सर्वं सूचं दुःखं च जन्मस्व।
वाक्यो भूतंसंयोगः महानं विद्वंद्र एवं च।
उज्ज्वलये भूतेऽपि सिद्धं तं व्याय तिरंदः।" (१२,२२-२४) द्रति।

तं व्यायेति परमाभाषामाहः। तथा च व्यासः [ शीमद्वभववीतायाः ]—

"हार्मिको पुष्यों लोकों चर्माचार एवं च।
चरः सर्वस्य भूतानि कृत्स्मयोऽचर्म उच्चति।
उच्चमः पुष्यस्यः परमाभाराहः।
यो लोकत्यानाभिस्निव विभण्डव्याहृतः।" (१५, १६-१७)

नन्दो यज्ञाः बुद्धा समय्यथायनः इवुद्दार्ज्ये यो मन्िवितः चेतनस व्यायामाभिप्रेती भवेत् ततः। चेतनस च एव भास्मशृयम्यायचक्तार्थालात् शरीरायनिविन्यायस्यसत्त्वात् कतास्त्राच्छिन्नात् लस्य वर्णितं, स्माचार च ? उच्चति, ब्रह्मा वुद्धव्याहृत दायावामानी तैः चेतनस्परमाभाष्यादिप्रयवेद्यमात्री तनव्योरे।

तनव्योविनां सुप्रभासाल्पः। एवं वेदू किमेवं परमाभाषानी वर्णनिभिन्नालमः
उच्चम्? ततोच्चति, प्रपवर्गसाधनोपकारलघुक्ष्मिकहैः। पपवर्गखं चायेचिनोपायः
श्रीरायनिष्काशः परमाभाषानो बँधः। "भाववोधणः तु बुद्धाभिद्विवेकं भवति।
किं तद्यथवगसाधनं यस्मि गिरिवोपकारं चतुरं? उच्चति, वेदा यज्ञाः।
तथा च द्रति—"तत्तेतर वेदातुवचनै विशिष्येद्यस्य व्यायां च येनानायाम् कहने च" (हस. भा. ४.४.२२) द्रति। वेदातुवचनं यजोगमरम्यायालात्
समय्यथार्ज्येयानि यजस्मसाधनामात्री। वच्चारस्ति च—धयुतं च सूचं समय्यति
द्रति। अतुलं सूचं मोचं एवं भवति। ॥१॥

1. C°° तदस्त्र। 2. MSS. यकुर्म। 3. A¹ बुद्धे च।
पाणिनी-शिखर

उदात्तशास्त्रादत्तम् स्रवितश्च खरास्यः।

॥१॥

क्रमो दृष्टः सुः तद्वित्ति कालो नियमो च चचि।

॥१॥

स्वत: स्माननि वर्णानामुरः कष्टः शिरस्त्या।

॥२॥

जिष्ठामुखः च द्रनासः नासिकोऽछोऽ च तालु च।

॥२॥

अस्मीतप्राप्तेन। प्रज्ञमुपरमः—

उ दा च या हूँ दा च ये ति। खरतः कालत इवेती हि हेतु स्रेष्ठे विषयोति-स्वर उदाचारः। कालो मात्राप्रस्थातितिमात्रायणः। उदाचार इवपरिष्टादु परिष्टिहृतः। अनुरुद्दाशकीयसि; अपक्तसारः ग्राहेत् इववभः। खरतः इवति

‘न’ करानेन। खरतो इवति; अधोपनिषाधः य उदाचारुदात्तविकारः।

तथा च नारदः—

“उदात्तश्चतरं नास्ति नीचाचिन्तरं तथा।

त्रैरुपे स्वरसंख्रायं विस्मान्। स्वर उच्चति।

उदाचारस्वरूपमेव साधारण इति खरतः।

तं स्वरः स्वरसंख्रायं प्रतिज्ञानति वैविकः।” (ना. श्रि. १.५.६-७)

खर रा खर च इति। "तैय एव ज्ञेयज्ञेय यथा।"; पच्च सस च सामसु। खर एकातालो इवेति हिमातः। सुतप्रकाशः। “निमेशकाला मात्रा खराँ”

िैवद्विजः। तथा च नारदः—

“निमेशकाला मात्रा स्वरूपवालेति चापेये” (ना. श्रि. २.२.५) इति।

इतिवचः प्रकाराचः। अनेन प्रकाराय तत्तेति; हैलो; खरतः विषयभाग-नियमः।

तथा च नारदः—

“खर उच्च; खरी नीचे; खर; खरत एव च।

वाक्यान्तर्युवतेऽव यथा निषिद्धति स खर।” (ना. श्रि. २.५.२) इति।

1. B omits न.
2. A¹C खर।
3. A² read पच्च after पच्च.
4. B. puts stops after विषयः and सामसु।
5. A¹C ोवतर बोधो।
पञ्चिका-सचिता

कस्तावहाविभुयशास्तालयवा चौड़जावुपूः।

॥११॥ स्मृतैर्भवना कस्तुर्णा दन्या बुत्तुलसः स्मृतैः ॥१३॥
जित्तक्रमुः स्तु कृ: प्रेतों दन्योंष्ट्रो व: स्मृतै: तु चौः।

॥१२॥ एवेऽ तु कस्तुर्णालयवा चौढ़ी कस्तोव्रषाथः स्मृतैः ॥१४॥
चर्माम्ब्बा तु कस्तुर्णाय एकारीकार्यायोभवेत्।

॥१३॥ एकारीकार्योभवाय दण्डीविन्दसंखंदम् ॥१५॥

क्षणति इति युक्तं तदादाः—

क खड़ा व त्राविति। कस्तावहवी चकारसकारो चक्षोऽि कण्ठोऽि कण्ठोऽि जातोऽि।

हु य शा: तालश्च। "इकारसं चतुर्थं यकारश्चासरो च एते तालश्च: तालुकानि भवः। तु इकारसं चतुर्थं वर्ण न्युस्तहति। वर्गसंवसतसिपस्तु कृदुःसुपौ इकारसे मादितु उकारः। चावचार्यपरिबर्याहारः। तथाव च पाठविनि:—"अर्णवदित् सवर्णस्य चालव्यः।"

चावचार्यपरिबर्याहारः। तथा च पाठविनि:—"अर्णवदित् सवर्णस्य चालव्यः।"

हु य शा: तालश्च। "इकारसं चतुर्थं यकारश्चासरो च एते तालश्च: तालुकानि भवः। तु इकारसं चतुर्थं वर्ण न्युस्तहति। वर्गसंवसतसिपस्तु कृदुःसुपौ इकारसे मादितु उकारः। चावचार्यपरिबर्याहारः। तथा च पाठविनि:—"अर्णवदित् सवर्णस्य चालव्यः।"

हु य शा: तालश्च। "इकारसं चतुर्थं यकारश्चासरो च एते तालश्च: तालुकानि भवः। तु इकारसं चतुर्थं वर्ण न्युस्तहति। वर्गसंवसतसिपस्तु कृदुःसुपौ इकारसे मादितु उकारः। चावचार्यपरिबर्याहारः। तथाव च पाठविनि:—"अर्णवदित् सवर्णस्य चालव्यः।"

हु य शा: तालश्च। "इकारसं चतुर्थं यकारश्चासरो च एते तालश्च: तालुकानि भवः। तु इकारसं चतुर्थं वर्ण न्युस्तहति। वर्गसंवसतसिपस्तु कृदुःसुपौ इकारसे मादितु उकारः। चावचार्यपरिबर्याहारः। तथाव च पाठविनि:—"अर्णवदित् सवर्णस्य चालव्यः।"

हु य शा: तालश्च। "इकारसं चतुर्थं यकारश्चासरो च एते तालश्च: तालुकानि भवः। तु इकारसं चतुर्थं वर्ण न्युस्तहति। वर्गसंवसतसिपस्तु कृदुःसुपौ इकारसे मादितु उकारः। चावचार्यपरिबर्याहारः। तथाव च पाठविनि:—"अर्णवदित् सवर्णस्य चालव्यः।"

जि चा सूते इति। कवर्गसं जित्तक्रमुः कविति:। द क्षृतो रो वः स्मृत तो तु चै इति। द क्षृतो रो वः स्मृत तो तु चै इति। द क्षृतो रो वः स्मृत तो तु चै इति। द क्षृतो चै इति।
पाणिनीय-शिष्या

चनुसारयमां च नासिका खानसुच्चे।

||14|| उपधामीय अध्याचा च जिज्ञासूनीयनासिकी

चयोगवाहा विष्णुयाचा चालशखानभाजिनः ||१४॥

||15|| अलाबुवीशानिधिदेशं दत्तमूलः खराननु।

चनुसारसू कर्तेयो निम्नं क्रोः शपसिद्धः च ||१५॥

पवेशसंवाद सुकर्षाः सत्वति। कर्तोऽवपकारस्त्री 

कोकाकाक च। सवर्णार्थकालात् यकारारस्त्री दाह्रपि रघुवति।

अतिवत्तुष्णाभिनव सर्व्याचारणासम्मांतः कर्षार्थवनिश्चितः। अध्यायोद्धारलोक- 

खानः ||१५॥

च्योगवाहा इत्युथखराद्यखराद उच्चने। चनुसारो 

विश्वं च क च क च कर्ष्टी। तथा च चौद्रवजे:- 'च्योगवाहः', च दृष्टि 

विश्वार्थीः; क च दृष्टि जिज्ञासूनीयः; क च दृष्टि इत्युथखराद नासिकः, 

इत्योगवाहः। न चर्तयति योः संयोऽनुभासंतरेऽ येषा ने 

च्योगवाहः। धार्शिकानासिकू इति। धार्शिकः ककाराविनः खरान भाजितः 

प्रेमार्थकालात्येषाः प्रवृत्तप्राप्तवको कृहवीশ्वराभिध्वरादनिन्यः।

चनुसारसू खड्डमहादणां चनुसारार्थ प्रकारः पाणिनिनव कथिता “वाचक्षुकारः”

(पा. प.३.२३) इति ||१५॥

अ ला दिव निति। अलाबुवीष्यी, १०तथा वीणाया इत्य निर्दिष्टः शक्स्त्र यथा 

शीताबुवीशानिधिदेशः। खानः दत्तमूलः तत्र भवेऽ ११दत्तमूलः। खरानः

1. H, शिष्यकारीकोभोग्नेन खेलमाणा खानसुच्चे भवति। कर्तोऽ
2. ०००० एकार्शीकारां। A४ एकार्शी कोकारां
3. A४ एकाराकोकारां, B, ०००० कोकारां।
4. A४ कहा A४ o m i t s.
5. H छथी तात्क्रोऽच, B ०००० तात्क्रोऽच । अस्थे तु ते ते से खानेको
6. H A४ अं इत्युथखराद्यखरादनामकः। A४ खरानां, नासिकः।
7. हलब put. सह after this।
8. A४ o म भाजितः।
9. A४ o m i t s ख्यातमुंगारा।
10. L पचालुलुक्षेषाया and H पचालु तू वीणाया A४ ख्यातमुंगालुक्षेषाया for तथा वीणाया।
11. A४ L दत्तमूलः।
16. सचोत्साह सणस्विनमस्तेश्वरं शरस्तथा।
शेषा स्वतं हसः प्रीता निवोधानुप्रदानतः ॥ १७॥

17. अमोदलुनासिकानाथी नादिनो भक्षणं: सृवतं।
दशप्रार्था यज्ञशस्तु प्रवासिनस्तु खफाद्यः।

अकारारोदः एव भवतीति ग्रेघः। दक्षरेवयोऽपि प्रवेशेन्त्रे च सदा भवति। तथा
च मार्द:—

“आपदते मकारे रक्षशेषम् प्रवेष्यन्तुहारम्।
यवलेख प्रस्मवं श्रेष्ठं चोत्मातपितस्” (नार. २४८४) इति ॥ १७॥

चतुर्दशी खानानि वर्जनामुवः कालं सरस्वता। चित्रमुखं च दन्तदाय
नासिकानि च तांतु च” इति। इत्यं श्रीमन्मुददाश्च एकाचित्वं प्रतिष्ठित।

स्वतं: कालानि खानाते वर्जनानि भेदः। कथितोधुनां प्रयास्ते भेदः। कथ्यते।
प्र क च य यथो वर्त्तरायणं प्रति चस्पूष्टादिविष: स प्रयासः ॥३॥

च नि निः। अनम्बर्तति प्रवाहाराध्यं। च इ उ न च य चै एव ति च।
एति प्राप्तं। यथ: य वर ला एति देशवस्तुः। ॥ ५॥ रितं प्रवाहाराध्यं।
श्रवसा एति नमस्तेन:। एवंस्तुता इववर्यः। तवतित पादपूर्णः। श्री पाः सु श्रा
ह च:। भो ता इति। चतु इति प्रवाहाराध्यं इकारायश्च इकाराय।
शेष इकुजाद्धः। श्रेष्ठः। यथा: श्रवः ईत्येवमस्तेनुभिज्ञाता च:। श्रुतः।
स्वागनेष्टवतिः। कथित:। नि वशे धा च भ्रमन न त इति। अनुप्रदानमवति।
स्तव: खाना: चोतुदि च त्रुक्ते इति प्रति अनुप्रमादनम:।

“हेऽनाद:-[शास्त्र]महें-प्रदानो” चत्रोदर्शिः। अनुप्रदानोहेलोः:। वर्जनानि भेदे श्रृवः ॥ १८॥

अ भिति प्रवाहाराध्यं अ मः गः न मः। अ बनु ना सिः का इति
स्वामार्गिकः। ॥ २५॥ पाठतानु नासिकामुदवतीति अनुप्रसिका अमक्षणमः।

1. A² A³ omit.
2. A¹ प्रवेशपदः ॥
3. BBL read after this अस्मातु च वर्जना च धित्ते करुन्य बृहस्पति। तेव्रेष्टि (तेव्रेष्टि
चिज्जते वार्धानीति तवस्मादि च; यथा only in E).
4. HL omit च।
5. H omits शरविति……नमस्तेन:।
6. L च च व व श्रवः।
7. A³ A² omit up to चत्रोदस्त्रन: MSS. है नादानुप्रदानो। (I 9प्रदानम्).
8. B omits हेलोः।
9. A¹ C चत्रोपायः.
पार्श्विणीय-शिवा

॥१८॥ ईश्वरैंसांस्यो विभाजोपितत् प्रचचति ॥१६॥

चतुर्दशिकानिमान्य जानियत्। तथा च पार्श्विणः—मुखासिसकारचनोऽधि
नासिककः। (प्रा. ११,१२) इति। च जो इति। श्वाकारे रेखाय श्वाकारे भ्रमण, प्रवाहारारूपम्
अष्ट इति भ म घ ढ घ घ, एते ज्ञातो नारिणः ज्ञानः। नाद एवामस्तोति
नारिणः। चयंः पाठः—च सो कु न न सि का च जो। अष्ट इति प्रवाहार-
श्रव्याम्। च इ घ क घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ घ
अष्ट इति एकस्य नासिकः। न जो न तु रेखाकारेः अमाव्यः सन्नी। न दि नो च भ म
हृढः। श्वाकारे भ्रमण नारिणः भष्मभ म घ ढ घ घ। अष्टाद्वः। पाठमयात्
अमां १ श्वाकारेकवर्जितानां विकल्पोबुद्धिनासिकिलम्, न अमां तु विद्वाम्। तथा
च श्रीरः—च चः श्री या विभिन्ता विनियोगः श्रुतोपवाल्या अष्टाद्विपथायः।
(कः, प्रा. २,२२) इति। तथा “वाकार्षविति करणे युक्तो रक्तः वाको
श्राविनः शाक्षेपः” (कः, प्रा. २,२२) इति। श्वाकारेकवः प्रथमे पाठे नारिलम्
हितेः पाठे १ श्वाकारेवषो्युक्तिसिद्धलयाधिकारिष:। इष वा दा य न ज घ ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु जगरात्रः। शाक्षेप प्रवाहारः। ज घ ख ख ख ख ख ख ख ख
घः। वाकितः। जगशु ज

१. एव भवायः।
२. एवं बोध भवायः।
३. प्रवाहारः।
४. एवं बोध भवायः।
*मन्वो हृति: खरतो वर्णो वा
भिध्याप्रयुक्ती न तमर्क्ष्माहः
स वाम्बङ्गो यज्ञमानं हिन्नति
यिथिन्द्रशकु: खरतोपराधात् एक।

*श्रड्रः श्रड्रः प्रादाहाचोपुबाय धीमती ।
वाण्येव तमात्यद। देवों वाचमिति स्थिति: एक।
श्रेनारसामायामधिम्म शहिन्दरात् ।
कल्पनें व्याकरणं प्रोक्तं तथोऽपाणिनं नमः एक।

'चर भन्ति: ब्याप्यासालच्यामाहः
मन्वः मन्वानान्तः खरत: उद्यातिदिग्भतः वर्णत: चिन्तितिर्वादिभिन्दतः
भिध्याप्रयुक्त: यः खरो यो वर्णसंबङ्गालेव प्रयुक्तत: न तमर्क्ष्माहं तथायें न वेद ।
स प्रज्ञो मन्वो वाम्बङ्गो ववस्माद यज्ञमानं हिन्नति ।
तव द्वादशामाहः—यथा
खरतोपराधात् द्रव्य एवः । शबुद्धलाभुभूति एक।

इदानीं युक्तपर्वकमाह—
श्रड्रः द्रव्य धिति।
श्रड्रः । यें सुखं करोतीति शंकर: सुखकरः शंकरः सुखकरों
विभागाः दाशोपुबाय कर्पे दाशोपाण्यो क्षितकल्या ततृत्याय धीमति ।

सम्रात् प्राणिनिलुतिपरं श्रीकमाह—
यें न दृति।
नवध्रात्रं सतित्पुर्वेकं पाणिनिनेमस्मारकरणं किमस्मू? उचितः
श्रेणसङ्ग्रहः यस्मादवरितमति प्रायाहारे।
शिष्या चिन्तता प्रवाहाराय पाणिनिनां
शंकरादिविम्मया जतम्यां समर्थे व्याकरणं प्रोक्तं शिष्योपकाराय स्मार्याहारा
श्रेणें हेकस्तित; तद्भवं सुति।
चरसामायामधिमिति प्रवाहारानाह:।

1. IHLB omit भन्ति नमार्थायाः...शाकुनिखाभूति; A^1 omits भन्ति मनम्वायाः, etc.
but puts it after बुद्धिभन्ति प्रवायाः
2. A^1 omits वेदः
3. HL omit मन्वो...श्रड्रः

*
विनयनमुखनिः सतामिचां
य इह पठत् प्रयतः सद्य हिजः।
स भवति धनधान्यप्रायुक्तीः
माणतुलं सुखसम्भवेऽसुमवः॥२३॥

भवतः शिखायाः साधारः लूसिमिं शीकमाः—
विनयनमुखः सतामिचाः
विनयनमुखः सतामिचाः
शिखायाः साधारः लूसिमिं शीकमाः—

1. BH omit भवतः शिखायाः
2. विनयनमुखः सतामिचाः
3. विनयनमुखः सतामिचाः
4. BMA. चन्द्रः IHL omit चन्द्रः
5. शक्तिः सीताभ शर्माभिंगकालक्षणिं सुखसम्भवः
6. MBHL द्वितीया-मिश्रिता-समासः

(प्राकृति-प्रश्न-प्रायीः)
(प्राकृति-प्रश्न-प्रायीः)
(प्राकृति-प्रश्न-प्रायीः)
(प्राकृति-प्रश्न-प्रायीः)
(प्राकृति-प्रश्न-प्रायीः)
(प्राकृति-प्रश्न-प्रायीः)
IV. शिखारकाम-सहिता (With the Śīkṣā-prakāśa)

* यथा शिखार प्रवद्धामित पाविनीय दत्त यथा ।
शास्त्रानुपूर्व तत्तिथादु यथोक्त लोकविद्याः || 1 ||

श्योतिकारणं छन्नं कथाशिचारिकतयः।
नेत्राय-पद्धार्मीः-कर्णं यथा तं सतं सुम।
व्यायाम प्रिय्या चायश्रुतीश्वरे व्यायामयः।
शिखारं तद्रूया व्यायामं पाविनीयानुसारिणो।

श्योधनात्मिकविवेकति आकर्षिणेन नजः भगवान् पिन्नलाचार्यद्वन्द्वमतन्मुभावः ॥

शिखारं च यथा यथा।

पद्यतः शिखार-विवेक तस्यं वेदविवर्तितं विभूति तथा।
सत्येन वेदविवर्तितं परमलोकं विभूति तथा।

d. 1. Be. पदोभः।  2. L वाच for "भाषि।  3 MSS. इति च।  4. Be. omiss. हि।
प्रसिद्धमिपि गद्यामध्यनिदानातमशब্দसमिः।

पुनःयत्र तीकरणामिष्ठा वाच उच्चारणे विद्विदम्॥२॥

अभ्यादने प्रव्यायायश्रावत्। यत् ‘भवनो होनः सर्वोत्तमा वा मिथ्या-
प्रयुक्ती न समस्थातिक। स वायुवचको ज्ञातान् चिन्तित त्वषुद्रबृत्
श्रवः सर्वोपरिवर्तते’ इति। अयावतोष्कासात्तान्यो बष्ठेनेततां श्रेष्ठः
‘सर्वो बणिज्यः’ माता विनियोगार्थवेदः । ३। मन्नसं जिद्दासमनने वेदितवत्
पदे पदे’ इति। श्रृष्टिनी निद्धलमु उक्तगतः सिद्धम्। जन्यादी मझालाप्रयोगादाय
श्रवं गद्यादाय ४ आनलावरी वा। आयारणायणानान्तर चतुर्मृत्राचः पदे
पराप्रथानी-मध्यम-वेधी-संज्ञारामनो बणिज्यवृत्तिविवास्थव नियत्तदुन्वादक्षर
विश्वासयन् । ५। श्रिमण्डल्यानया वाल्नयो तक्षोदङ्गुनिद्रादानुदातात्सिरितोरोऽत्तरोऽत्तरो
कार्मिको जिद्दामुलखदन्तनाति श्रवतानि यथा तत् यथा पाणिनिदरि द्विया
स्वस्यायामात्रमिर्दिक्षकष्ठिः” इति (पा.१.१.२२) इद्यववधा पाणिनि “द्विया
स्वस्यायामात्रमिर्दिक्षकष्ठिः” (पा.४.२.२३)। रश्म भाषाविद्या(पा.३.३.२)
कार्मिको जिद्दामुलखदन्तनाति श्रवतानि यथा तथा प्राचीनायणाविशिष्टी।
न तत् तवालं श्राव्यात्तिविशिष्टी भविष्यति श्वाय य ठो तत् भि पाणिनिदरि
द्रपु यथा जो केदः द्रायोऽन्तरारम्भं द्रायोऽन्तरारम्भं श्राव्यात्तिविशिष्टी।
‘श्रवं श्रवं प्रादांद्र’ इति तदुपपरविद्या आयारणायणाविशिष्टी। “य एव” लोकिका
काश्चात् एव “वेदितवास्त्रां एव तिथामत्या” इति, मध्यान्य। ७। ‘एको वर्षः
सम्य क्रिया। खण्ड लोको नामकुण्डः भवितते’ इति प्रयोगनम्। यतज्ज्ञानायामात्राः
चालितार्थः। आयारणि तु द्विया गुरूवरूपः सलोचना
जिद्दामुलखक्षोटिनां गौरवते इति विभेदार्थक्षारं श्रवति। अत्यन्तरवृत्तिने
क्षरविद्या चतुर्मृत्राचः मद्यायणाविशिष्टी प्रकाळस्तम् श्रोक्ष्यम्।
“पावद्याव
वृल्लखर” (पि.५.८.)। “न प्रयमालू ली” (पि.५.१०) “बालवन्त” (पि.५.२२)
“धर्मस्य च” (पि.५.११) “प्रथा युजोज” (पि.५.१४)। युम्म-पायप्रथा चतुर्मृत्रायणाविशि
श्वायात्तिविशिष्टी। इति प्रविशिष्टी। इति प्रविशिष्टी।
“उदात्ते निद्धलमात्रार्थि यथा प्रयमो शृद्धि
श्रवं प्रादां।” इति प्रविशिष्टी। इति प्रविशिष्टी।
“जन्मस्कृति
नैकम् निद्धुभूमीस्त्या, हायायात् विसार्कारणी” (पि.२.५.६.११)।

1. L (श्रवणकेरिण)। 2. Be. मध्यालिकाणी। 3. L Be. श्रवणकेरिण।
4. Be. वृहत। 5. L स एव श्रवपञ्च एव। 6. L देहिकः। त एव।
7. L (भाषार्थ)। 8. Be. खण्डोद्वारः। for श्रवात् श्रवात् प्रादाः।
प्रकाश-सहिता २५

* विषषितम् परिवर्त वर्णः संक्षेपः मतः।
प्राकृते संक्षे पतिच ख्र्यः प्रीतः: ख्र्यः वा॥२्र॥
ख्रा विशिष्टिर्विख्य स्पर्शांनां पञ्चविष्णि:॥

१॥ याब्यक्ष मृता ढाँठी चलार्य यमः: मृता:॥४॥

शुद्धद्वनम् आदिवर्णारात् कष्टादिउष्णान्नां भविष्यति।
किमः क्रियम्
चारस्य इत्याध्यानः—प्र स्य द मिति।
पाथिन्यादिभि: प्रसीवीक्तः सघाप्रत्
दर्शिरविश्वासः चत्वते अतोकार्यासि।
वाच वर्णांतस्य चत्वारीं उद्गिरिणे
'विधि: विदानम्; चन्तनाचारै विधि:।
स चात्र प्रवेशाःप्राप्ताणां ब्रह्मः; तम्॥२॥

[विवरण]। नाबुद्धार्थादिविनाय वर्णः संबोध से विधि दिति।

प्रियति:
संक्षे भर भर तिन्द्र प्रां ज ते शुरुस्वाचारी्॥ से ख ते [यथा] प्रियतिम्यादि

विभागी: संक्षे प्राप्ताधिका।
विभागी गोरयाचार्याक्रमः भवावा
चतुर्मिरिका विकोन्नी: ख्र्यः व्रुत्सारः
प्रविष्टा: ख्र्यः ब्रह्मादिप्रदानकालः
सज्ज्युति: श्रृवणाराजान्॥ मता भ्राता:॥१॥

तान्नुकम्पेष गणिन्यु दशंगिति ख्रा दर्थः।
चर्या ख्रा दर्थः प्राचा
संज्ञा।

"ख्रः: ख्रात्वर्णः करोषवच्। किरिति: एकः। ने ब्रह्माराविचि
द ि ओ ए इ ए ए ए ए ए ए ए ए ए ए ए
ज्ञानोस्मि ज्ञानोन्मुः। (प्रा ३६ २७)”
स्मान एकाविष्टामात्र एव उदारानुदात्तकरिता दर्थः प्रेक्षां बिशिष्टार्थान्
सुष्ठकालः कालाध्यायुना। एकाविशिष्टार्थान्तः
वनः अ धर स्रोत: १ दृष्टि २ ३ ४ ५ ६ ७ ८
२ ३ ४ ५ ६ ७ ८ ९ ०
चालकार्यान्विता: हादम्।
एक्षः
ज्ञानान्वितां दोषोऽन्तृ मुर्वसे [च,] यथा ए ए ए ए ए
उँ ओ ओ ओ ओ ओ ओ ओ ओ ओ ओ
प्रियः।
...

1. MSS, विषिन्ति।
2. L देवोनन्ति।
3. Be, विषिन्ति।
4. MSS, विषिन्ति।
5. Be, निषिन्ति।
6. MSS, निषिन्ति।
7. Be, निषिन्ति।
8. L नि नि नि।
9. Be, नि नि नि।
10. L नि नि नि।
11. MSS, ब्रह्मोऽन्तो।
12. MSS, नि नि नि।
यशो उत्तराणे यशवन्त यशोः प्रणीति गावलुण्यतीति गाम्भरः तोऽ। 'प्रत्यदाये नामीः कपीशिंसप्रभावहौ तत्रभवतविनौतीति तत्रमःः, श्रृविः शरानानित्यम सञ्चायते दृश्ये वाक्यसः तोऽ। एते वच्चमावः सि धरितीष् दृष्टः। [प्रद्यूः]नासाकक्षोरसातु-जिशादानेभ्यो जातः ध्रुवः, नाम्युरीशुकररसावरीम्यो जातः गणनये पद्मसीधा-पूर्वक द्रिति वा पद्धमः। २९ुःदुः: समाध्यीते नामिं प्राप्तः स दिमाहः; ते उदाचारी-हिमः एव, एष्ट प्राधिन्यभोजिनीदातोऽ व्याख्यातः। स शी नां प द्रुसं वि भ नितः।—पत्र्यंभित्तिका विविधति: चरुपान्यादान(!)-धर्मवादुः समर्थः तेषां संख्यः। तेषां पद्म वा: कुदु कु दु तु पूः। च पुनः यादिकाति सृतः: ते य र ल व ह द श य सा।।  
धरा अर्धप्रक्षः यरवानलुका किविस्तुः, शपसा चकुस्तुः; "लो नक्ष-इल्लविसः" (री, २.२०) द्रिति यासः। वैया इतिौतुः: श्रुतः प्राचार्यः; प्रके शोः सूतः। अर्हितः, च पुनःसनारो यमः: कुूः खुूः खुूः द्रिति। २६शायानल्यात्तरसः  
सूतः: ते ूः कुूः ूः कुूः खुूः खुूः द्रिति चानल्यः[ूःूः]संयोगिनः[ूः]व्युक्तीनल्यात्तरसः अध्यायः  
बाजिते तद यमः बवलिन्ये न सर्दिः द्रिति। (गी, विर. २)। "सनन्तनसन्योगी मध्ये यमः: पूर्व- 
गुणः," धृशीददशितः, नारदः—"अनन्यक्ष भवेत् पूर्वः ह्याताः परस्तो यदि। तद मध्ये  
यशस्तिष्ठेत् सवर्णः: पूर्ववेणः। वर्मायात् ग्यायः: सार्वःनः:कौशिकैपिंबिताः। 
हया यमः निवलतीता चारियकिमिवावःः।" (गी.भि. २.२. ६-८) द्रिति। भ्रमपित्य  
वाधिको विधियात् कालात्ताः। च चा ू श य सा द्रिति वर्णांदरलेवोऽदेतः: 
संयोगात्ताः। तद संयोगविन्योऽगी गीतमुन द्राजितः।। "सन्य विविधाः संयोग- 
पिक्षः भवेत्यस्वयंदृष्टः दाशपिक्षःश्रीपापिक्षः विशेषः। यससहित्यविख्यातः दास- 
पिक्षः:कौशिकः यमः: यमातः:कौशिकः तुम्बार्यारिविशेषः। अन्नः:स्यासंस्कारी विवेचनाये 
नोपलिते द्रिति ूः। अमोरन: यमः: विविधाशिष्यः: विष्णुकायः।" (गी, विर. १) द्रिति  
२७थे परिलक्षिती ककारकृपः पूर्ववेणस्वर्णः। याशस्तिष्ठः: प्रयामस्तुकारा- 
स्नानाय यमः: ककारःः। ककारःः तकारक्कारायारा अल्लः[ूः]की 
पत्र्कृकृतिबहुः च सवलुण्यतुल्यः २८ककारःः। चम्विर (ग्रुणीः?)निबाब 
गकारःः। अधि[ूः]प्रतिविक्षः ककारःः। यथा ( यथा ूः?) हेतुः जगाणः:
अनुसारी विसगृह × क छैली चाप तराइती।

(जजा:?)। अत्र चारगृहीयो जससख संख्यावर्णो युक्तासमश्चियो।
वर्षक्रमं यथा जकार-जकार-जसकार-साबुनमाकार-जकारा। वर्गिक्यानतुत
किम्? उदगृहक्रमं। अन्तःक्षेत्रित किम्? काश्यं, काश्यं।

अधु खा र दिति, “मोहुसार:” (पा. ३१.२१३) सङ्गम् भसू भवधिवसारः।
विविधः छण्यत दिति विसम कुश्यप परस्परं ती। च लाते न सङ्कोचय प्रश्न का ब्राह्मणो
तन्त्राचारीयो दलमूलब्रमणियो, स्वरां चक्कारामीयो अत्र चक्कारामः प्रासो-
विन्यासं संस्कृ त। खाराकुरोणो यथा तथा ‘निलं च: श्रेष्ठं’ प्रवेशं परिपुरं कर्तवः।
नारदोपि—“आपणवे मकारो रेफ़ोप्रैवयवतुसारः।
यथेशु प्रस्तवः श्रेष्ठं परिपुर्व: चोत्तादानिनिम्” (नम. २५.६.८।)
अनुसारास्र्संहरणं चतुःपितसहितामानस्त
प्रवृत्तः चक्कारायिनी।
स तथा यथा सुराट्सेविजाति चो साहसिन्यं
रंगम् चारं दिति यथाध्यक्षः यथाध्यक्षः भविष्याति तद्भवते रूपं दितिस्यम्
अनुसर्णं जान्यायात। वीर्यमेव सवर्गनोद्वरयायम् चाह ‘ये गर्ध्यं इति
हेतु’ विज्ञानादुस्वा विज्ञानादुस्वा विज्ञानादुस्वा विज्ञानादुस्वा विज्ञानादुस्वा विज्ञानादुस्वा
तथा “अनुसारी व्यवहरनं वा स्वरो वा” (२१.११) इति चक्कारामाण्यो चेष्टकोषी।
दृष्ट्य च “हेंं: श्रेष्ठचर्मः” (कक्ष. ४४०.९) “लोमान्यं सिरमू” (कक्ष. १.१५.१)
द्रव्यादुस्वात्तचतुर्मिति। विसमास्र्संध्यतिहः गतः। भोकारामारः।
यद्य तद्युक्तचूनक्यो विसगृहयो चचन्द्रानु विसगृहां विना चोहस्यप्रस्तवमानं
श्रवणाय सचलालोकितुत्सारणेति परेः (?) भोलम् चात्मकोषी६ भवायं। केवलं
गुणवत्वं अभ्योगदानार्यायों: साह्यं जिन्तपति। चकार भावदिव्यं तद्ध
प्रभोऽस्य सचलाय अथवा च सचलाय अथवा च सचलाय अथवा
लोका। गृहीतः। भोकारान्तः खरान्तः तत्र विसगृहर्मगित:।
चत पदमर्दकिवः।
विद्वति सिद्धिताधमः। य इश्वः। [सज्जा] सज्जानां भागः। रे फः
ए व च राकारामारः। १०उद्धर्यः। निपुःमाणः। भ्रयतौसः। उपर्य-

1. Be. शुद्धारी। 2. L कांस, Be. कांस। 3. Be. भकारामारः।
4. Be.,”सङ्गम।” 5. L पर। 6. Be. भकारामारः। 7. MSS. साह्य।
8. MSS. पर। 9. MSS. भकारामारः। 10. L दु:म (२५।)° 11. Be. निपुःमाणः।
पाषिनीय-विचा

चाटमा बुझा सेेवाहयान् मनो युक्ते विवचया।

२३॥ मनः कायारिनमाध्यं स प्रेयरित मारतम् ॥२॥
मारतमारसि चरन् मन्द्रे जनयति ख्रम्।

२४॥ प्रातः समनयोगं तं क्रन्दो गायचमारितम् ॥२॥

सुखवः। जि द्वा सूर ल सु या चेति। ×कं वी कारपावको। विन्नो बृहिः।

भविः यः। पावः। अनुसौरवविन्द्रविन्दुपौरपश्चात् बाहुगोविशाख चाययस्त्रायन-भागिनों यमातिरतस्या खान भनेकलाढः। दुः सु धे चति ति। रूपव-स्त्रोणाः: साधस्वामि खान; सुतपि; एववरे दीर्घोन्द्रवत:। चकारादु राखः

वसन्तात्त्वः: कायः। अनुसौरवविन्द्र खुटुनात्ता: पचः पठि वा। एवमेटी त्रिपिट-वतु: प्रतिदें वायान्ति:।

वर्षसंख्या विवाह समारोह वर्षोत्पति वदक्तः उपदाशविताविक्षेम्याम् काष्ठ-चा के ति। अतः बीरः राष्ट्रीयो वाचनश्रीयो वा राष्ट्रियात्मकः

कर्मो(ता)॥ भा “तस्य देहस्य द्वदयार्य चरोति तेन प्रयोत्तेन चाचा नियामाति

चरुत्ति वा सूर्यो वानस्यो वा श्रीरिद्वेभः” (हछ.भा.३.३२) द्रष्य विन्यायः।

“एवभय स्वप्नसारो राक्षसश्वरसूक्ष्म दसत्याय र्द्रा ज्योतिषप्रसंख्य लेन देशानिय-विन्यायः” (कान्नो.२.१२०) इन्द्रः क एपमु चव्याविता प्रयोगोतस्याः

भा के ति कान्नो श्रावणी प्रतिपादितो दनानात्रेण भ्रातान्त्र प्रयोजनानि

निषिद्ध मन इन्द्रः: वक्त्य योजयति प्रेयरित, तवानः कायालीविन्तैन जातार्थम्

[प्रारंभ] प्रेयरित। सोपाध्यक्सिक्तं वायु यान्ति प्रेयरित ॥६॥

मा भ तं क्विच। स वाचयुगः तं दितं द्वेद्ते चरन् मन्द्रे खरं,

“स्वायतिसं तिः” (भ.भा.२.१२) खादना मन्द्रे रक्षा प्रवक्त, जनयवविपयायत।

तं स्वरं प्रातः स्वनयुग माहुर्मो चन्द्र चारितं जानियत। मन्द्राना वाचा

प्रातः समनयोगं स्वस्वनिमिति सोमयन्त:। (ययं? ) कथा। ॥७॥

1. L प्रारंभीः।
2. L भाविनो।
3. Be. "विनियम"।
कधैः माध्यमन्युङ्ग मधवम् तैद्राणानुगमम्।

|| 5111 तारं तारीयंस्वमं श्रीशेष्यं जागतानुगमम् ॥ ॥

सोद्रीणौ श्रुतिभिष्टो वज्रामाध्यम मार्गः।

|| 6111 वर्षिजः जनयते तेषां विभागः पञ्चवा स्रूतः ॥ ॥

खरम् वाचतः श्रीवानात् प्रववानुप्रदानतः।

|| 7111 डिति वर्षिजः प्राकृतिनिर्धारणं तं निविधेिः। ॥ ॥

उदरात्मानसुतानः खरित्य खराश्यः।

|| 8111 ऋषि दौवः श्रुति डिति कालतो नियमम् चरिची। ॥ ॥

* उदरान्ति निपादागायारावनुदात्र क्रयमधैवतः।

खरित्रभवा च रूटे पञ्चमध्यमपञ्चमम्। ॥ ॥

क पढ़ डिति। तं मासं कधैः माध्यमन्युङ्ग मधवमार्गं
विद्युष्कन्दसं जानीयताम्। तं श्रीशेष्यं श्रीवाननं भवं।
“श्रीवानानुभिष्टो” (पा. 6, 1, 60) प्रसेः। सोद्रीणः।
श्रुतिभिष्टो वज्रामाध्यमम्।

सोद्रीणः मणिध्वानात् प्रववानुप्रदानतः।

“संहितायाम्” (पा. 6, 1, 32) चधिक्खः
“सोद्रीणः सोद्रीणः। प्राकृतिकामुरे” (पा. 6, 1, 134) डिति श्रुती “गुणः।

तथा।

“श्रीवाननं श्रीशेष्यं जानीयताम्।
“यासो” मित्रवासणादनुवधरीन्द्राय विभ्रमं वर्णनम: प्रववानुप्रदानतः।
तं पञ्चमं प्रथमसुदिनम् मधवम् विपर्यक्षं वाचि वन्र्मी करणविधानं वैकीर्जेः
च प्रववे।” डिति। तथा च मन्वाणं।

“चवारी वाक्यपरिवर्तनानीति
विद्युष्कन्दसं न निरीक्षणं तुरीयं वाचि
मणिध्वानं वदन्ति।” (रक्त. 1, 164, 44) डिति ॥ ॥

तेवरं वर्षिजः वज्रामाध्यमं विभागः पञ्चप्रकारं श्रूतः।
भवं दृष्टं दृष्टं दृष्टं

1. Be. omits कड़ प्रति। 2. MSS. after this तत्र मभं। 3. MSS. बाह्य।
पाश्चिन्यग्रिहा

चष्टी स्थानानि वर्षानामुर: कर्ण: श्रिरस्थथा।

॥9॥ जिल्लासूलं च द्रनव क्नसिकोशी च तालु च ॥१३॥

* चोभार्त्थ विभिन्नश श्रेष्ठा रेव एव च।

जिल्लासूलमुपया च गतिरबिंधुद्विभाषणः ॥१४॥

* यदीभावस्थानामुकारादिपं पदम्।

खरान्तं तादं तथाद यदन्युक्तातसूचणः ॥१५॥

हकारः पद्मेन्युक्तात्मनः श्लाभिष्ठ संयुतम्।

॥१०॥ चीरसं तं विजानीयात् कण्ठामाहरसंयुतम् ॥१६॥

कण्ठाविठाविचुयशास्तलया शीघ्रजावुरू।

॥१॥ सुमृत्यद्वि कठुरा दन्या चतुरसा: सम्यतः।

॥१२॥ जिल्लामूलि तु कु: प्रेतो दन्योष्ट्रो व: सम्यते बुधे। ॥१७॥

च सा वित्त निगदरोयम् ॥२-१५॥

इ कार सन्दित। वर्गीयाः पद्मं: श्रवणमेव: च पुनः चन्तःकः: यथेव: संयुतः

हकारं चीरसं दर: स्नानीयं ते विजानीयात्। चं प्रवंतं केवलं हकारं

कण्ठाम् प्राडः। ॥१६॥

क संह च हा चिति। अही अवर्णकारो कण्ठरी स्वाताम्। पुनस्य श्रुत: सङ्गतेयम्।

इवर्णस्वर्गो यकारः शकारेवति तालया:। [यदृ:-यत्स्थानकलाभितं

हलु तत्त्वस्तुत्काराविवर्णम्] श्रेयम्। अलोकारोश्रवण्यो वर्षेण बोधयति

हुद्धवत्वं। उवर्षेण वर्मस्वर्गो यकारः यकारसं सुदेव्या: सक्षु:।

लक्ष्यः श्रवण्यो यकारः सकारसं दन्या: सम्यतः।। तु पुनरः जि द्वा मूले कवरः:

प्राचार्यपर्मात् प्रात्स: “चर्च घट जया जिल्लासुलीया: प्रवचनम् वर्गः।” (३५: प्र: १.१६)

दृवति वशेषाकोः।। वकारो कीमदुमिद्वितीयाया जातो दलोष्ट: सम्यत: ॥१७॥

1. Be. मात्राकमसाधिकाः
2. Be. वसाकारी०।
15b चलावुषवाणिचारणीयो उत्तमालयः खरान्नूऽ।

16a चतुर्दशसु करत्वभो निल्यो ष्ट्रोः शवसिवपि ॥१५॥

| यथा सौराष्ट्रिका नारी ततः इवभिंभापति।
| एवं रहस्या प्रयोक्तया खे प्राणा इव खेदया।

12b एते तु कपहताल्लवा चोंचे कपहोङ्गजी समृति। ॥१६॥

| अध्याया चतुः एकारीकार्योऽविवः।

13॥ एकारीकार्योऽपमिच तथोपविवसंहतम् ॥२०॥

14b उपवासीय अभ्धा च जिद्धामूलीनानसेनी।

15a योगवाहा विन्योऽया चाश्रयस्त्रान्यभागिनः ॥२१॥

| स्वराष्माल्लोणां चैव विहंजः करण्यां स्मृतम्।
| तेष्यदपि विन्ताकेवारा ताभ्यामेचरी तथैव च ॥२२॥

चनु स्वर श्वरिति। चनुवारी नासिकाः चोः ॥। एते संवस्य व्याख्याती।

| वंगार्याः पद्ममाः द्विकोन्या नासिकाः (॥))। श्रीपश्चात् खर्कास्त्रानीया चति ॥१५॥

| कपहताल्लुम्भाः जाताविवेचपिमी खरी। चिरावेचपिमी कपहोङ्ग-नार्म्यां जातो खरी।
| कपहोङ्गुत्तप्यलाबः सत्यं: 'प्रवर्णः' ज्ञिनवत।
| तव विविन्तिकः चैव को का र यो खर्कास्त्राः कपहोङ्ग भवेतु, चन्द्रा लख[ख]प्त-माना युजः[दन्य]र्याः।
| इकारीकार्यान्त्विनासी ए(चो) ॥ क्षेत्र विहंज-संह्वत्सम्यानाः ॥ श्रेयोः।
| च प भा नो न इति याच्यात: ॥१८-२०॥

| जपण श्रा मिति। इशपातानामः इच्छा विहंजः करण्यां प्रयत्नः ॥ खरीं श्रीं।
| तेष्योः एकी एश्रोसुची विन्ताकेवारा ताभ्यामः [चेतो] ए चोः विहंजः।

| व्याख्यातमन्यत: ॥२२॥

1. Be. भेषंतः। 2. Be. L जातविवेचपिमी। 3. L चर्चाबोधी।
4. L इकारीकारः। 5. Be. L इकारीकारात्। 6. Be. L एः।
7. L प्रायत्नी। 8. L प्रवर्णः। 9. Be. तेष्योः एः।
10. Be. adds तेष्योः ताभ्याममपि च युनासारी विहंजः।
पार्श्वनीय-शिचा

॥१६॥ चरोधस्य द्वा यशस्वीष्णेनस्य द्वा: शलक्षाय।
श्रेष्ठः स्य द्वा हि: प्रीतका निवाधानप्रदानतः ॥२३॥

॥१७॥ अमोऽसनासिका नस्तो नादिनो हभवः स्रूताः।
ईश्वराय यशस्वी ज्ञानसन्तु हस्ताक्षः।

॥१८॥ ईश्वराः सांवधरो विहारः गोर्वमीतलः प्रचच्चति ॥२४॥

* कुःतीर्थादातां दुःखारपवर्जित्वा च भवितम्।

न तस्य पाठे मौछोछित्ति पापाविरि किल्लिष्टाः ॥२५॥

* सुतीर्थादातां व्यक्तं स्वाभावः सुव्यवस्थितम्।

सुखरेण सुवव्यः प्रयुतं ब्रह्म राजति ॥२६॥

नि वो घा तु प्र दा न त द्वति। वर्तु पवात् प्रदानं स्वस्वारात्त अन्येश्वरात्
सुविधामेव देन प्रदीयते तत्त्वाः शिष्य निवेध जानोहि ॥२३॥

च मो तु ना दिता इति। च इ तु ए। क्ष ल कः। ए चो जः।
ऐ भी चू। ज य व र टू। ल एू। ज म ड ए न ए। एतत्समोऽसनासिका
हरस्विचित्व:। हभमहद्वः: नादिन: नादरुप्रदानः। जगन्धराः ईश्वरः
किलिष्टाः नानाधृतात्त्वादः:। हस्ताक्षः: स्वासनसु [चतुर्भु]प्रसा: किलिष्टाः
नानाधृतात्त्वादः जानोहि ्। एतद गोर्वची धाम स्वासनम् प्राचायः प्रचच्छति ॥२४॥

श्रीमिन्द्रोर्ज्जापकमुद्यन्तु कृप्यादेवाङ्क निन्द्वति कु ती त्यादि दि ति। अनन्तः
चानात् तीर्थात् युःः। “निदापतांगमोऽस्योध्यम् क्रियं शिवते जले गुराविता”ति नाम:
लिन्काश्रयस्। प्रास् दश्व भस्वादु गतसरस्य षोवणतवर्षस्य ज्योर्दुःतस्यानबर्षते
च भवितम् श्रुतः दृढः तस्य घोषित:ं: परिमोचो नासितः। कश्चेव? पापाविरि,
इत्तविक किलिष्टाः भोजो नासीती ॥२५॥

स्वतः च च ती त्यादि दि ति। सूक्तोः प्रासम् चाभस्य सुभाष्यदायि ब्रह्म
वेदाख्यं राजति गोर्वते ॥२६॥

1. Be, omits नादरुप्रदानः...ईश्वरः
2. Be. गोर्वची
प्रकाश-सहिता

न करालो न लम्बोटी नाय्यतो नालुनासिकः।
गद्दरो वहजिंवस्य प्रयोगान् वत्तुमहः॥२७॥

यथा व्यासी हरेत् पुवानुं दंग्राभिनं च पीड्येत्।
भीता पतनेमद्राम्यां तदहु वर्णान् प्रयोज्येत्॥२८॥

एवं वर्णः प्रवोत्ताया नाय्यता न च पीडिता:।
सम्यग्वर्षप्रयोगेण ब्रह्माण्डोऽऽ महीयते॥२९॥

चम्बासार्थं दुःखं द्रतिं प्रयोगार्थं तु मथमामः।
शिष्याशासनकेशार्थं कुर्याद् द्रतिं विलम्बिताम्॥३०॥

श्रद्धर: श्रद्धरोऽप्रांद्रास् द्राचीपुबाय धीमते।
द्राचीपुबायाशिनिना वेनेदं व्याचतं भुवि।
रबभूतसिद्धं शास्त्रं पृथियां सम्प्र काशितम्॥३१॥

न कर ल चरि। नकारो ‘नालुनासिक’ पदार्थ भ्रमे योजनायः॥३७॥

य चेति। पतनं च संदर्शन तौ ताथां भीता व्यासो श्यापद्वातिष्ठो यथा
पुवानुं बालानुं दंग्राभिनं पीड्येत् तदहु वर्णान् ब्रुयादिति॥३२॥

ए च मिति। एवं नाय्यतः: न पीडिताः वर्णः प्रयोजनाय:। सम्यकः
मथामथामथादिविनिः योतिनेन प्रयोगेन ब्रह्माण्डोऽऽ प्रयोक्ता पूज्येति किं
पुनः तन्त्र द्रति भावः, एवं सम्यकः स्मारं: मथामथामथावर्षी: श्रावु इत्यः॥३८॥

यमेत्या सा तेन चरि। दूतानं विलम्बितां मथामथां चम्बासार्थं कुर्यादु।
श्यामातमान्यात्॥३९॥

श्रृङ्ग एव चरि। यं सुखं चक्षुलादिविदिगर्भं श्रावं करोतीति श्रद्धरः
शिवं: श्रद्धकारणोऽऽ श्रद्धाप्रासादिवाम्। द्राची द्वारा प्रप्योऽऽ “तस्याप्यां”
(पा. ४.१.८२) इवणम् “शिक्षापूर्दा” (पा. ४.१.१५) इवादिनां डीपा तस्यां: पुवाय
घोमतितिस्थुबध्ये राहस्य:। कोलासाविधातकाराणाः पाराघः-दा चो यु व
इति। य: पाणिन: पाणिनोऽऽ यूच्यापालभम्। “चरत इत्यः” (पा. ४.१.८५)

1. I पाणिन।
पाणिनीय-प्रकाश

* विनयनमुखनिःखण्डामां

य धृष्ट पठतः प्रयतः सदा विजः।

स भवति पश्चपुलकीर्तिमानः

सुखमत्तलं च समस्मुते दिविवि दिविवि।।३२॥

वेन पाणिनिना वर्ण प्रवचन शब्दशास्त्रं व्याकरणं उज्जवलः। तस्मान पाणिनिन्य नम 
\[\text{इत्यदि} \] पूर्ववेण समवयः। पाणिनीय दिविविपाल शब्दालिङ्गं (पा. ४.१.१२२) कन्यारुः।

र ब भूत्य त हिन्दी य शहा।।३२॥

"ति न य न सुख नि:। ता मिति। यो हिजो वैद्यविज्ञारो [प्रयतः]

सावधानः सदा निराकारः [दमा] पठतः स [धृष्ट] पश्चपुलकीर्तिमानः भवति। दिविवि 

सुखम् अच्छुलं समस्मुते मुख्यति, संग्रं व्यापोति वा। हिरवचन शिबाचार्यसमा- 

समासः। विज्ञानीच्छविसमस्मपरवंक्रणतः "चधिम्मा ओऽ" (पि. ५.३२) 

इवधिविज्ञाय। "अपरवङ्गः नी लीणु गुनः गजः" (पि. ५.४०)विवि लघस्थुतात्।।

दिविविशिष्ठप्रकाशः समासः।।३२॥

---

1. L Be. ओति। 2. Be. omits शति। 3. L Be. विनयनमुखनिःखण्डां

4. L reads also संवतः १५४१ धिन्डलादि कैरे सुचारितपदः दम्मधरंगमिनि श्रीकाःशा

श्रीदेवीनाथचंदारश्री वर्षक्षणमात्रानिष्ठे दिविविपाल सिद्धिः।। ३२॥ श्रीस्वामीनरपेश्मस्तु॥
V. यजुःशाख्याय (The Yajus Recension)

कथ गिराण प्रवेलांमिनि पारिवोक्षय मतें यथा ।
'शास्त्रानुपूर्वे तदु विवाह यथोल्ल सोकवेद्यो: ||१
प्रसिद्धमिक शब्दार्थम् अविभाज्यम् अवन्ति: ।
पुनर्यथोकितावै वाच उदाहरणे विदिम् ||२
विषयित्वतः पदिणव वर्षि: = 'स्मरवते मतः ।
प्राकृति संस्कृति चापि सर्व प्रोज्जा: स्मरयुवा ||३

खरा विशिष्टिर्देक सप्तर्नान पञ्चविशिष्टि: ।

||१|| यद्यथा भृता द्वितीय चलवार्य यथा: भृता: ||२||
चनुद्वारो विसर्गं भ्यो चापि धपरिश्ययि ।

||३|| तुःसङ्केते विनेरो त्राकराः = 'सु: तस्य एव च ||४

यथा सीराक्रिका नारो 'भरं 'इवभिषायते ।
एवं 'राज्य विज्ञानयातु: के 'भरं 'इव खेद्या ||५

dकारं पञ्चमेयतम्मु 'चत्तःक्षेत्रापि संयुतम् ।

||६|| ओरसं तं विज्ञानीयातु: कस्मात्माकाहसंयुतम् ||७
चालमा वुद्द्रा 'समस्तार्थिनः मनो वुद्द्रो विवचया ।

||८|| मन: कायामिथिष्ठिनि स प्रेरयति मारुतम् ||९

1. B दूपूः ।
2. C जयमी, L_स जयमी
3. B परवथ, L. परवथैः ।
4. CD तस्य इवभिषायते, L_स तस्य प्रवेद्यादि,
5. CL िःप्रयोजनः ये भरा इव खेद्या ।
6. CL चालःक्षेत्रापि
7. CL बौद्धराढः ।
8. CDL वसेलवायनः ।
पाणिनीय-शिल्प

माहत्सुरसि चरन् मन्त्रं जनयति खरम् ।

॥४॥ प्रातः सवनयोगं तं छद्रे गायत्रमाखितम् ॥६॥
कचि माध्यन्दिनयुगं मध्यमं तै० ब्रम्हानुगम् ।

॥५॥ तारं तारातिसवनं शृष्टिश्च जागतानुगम् ॥१०॥
सोद्रेषु चुम्मः ग्रहितो वचनमापयं मारतः ।

॥६॥ वर्णांच्छ जनयति तेषां विभागः पद्ध्या स्मृतं ॥११॥
करतः कालः स्थानात् प्रयोगानुग्रहाने ॥

॥७॥ इति वर्णिविदः प्राचीनपुराणं तं निविधस्त ॥१२॥
ब्रक्तं स्थानानि वर्णानादमुः कचि शिरस्या ।

॥९॥ जिथासूलं च द्वन्द्वय नासिकोऽऽ च तालु च ॥१३॥

वदानि निषादगामावर्णवातां ओषधंधवेति।

श्रितिप्रभवः छैत भज्जयचममध्यमः ॥१४॥
श्रीभवनच विदितः भावसा रंगेश एव च।

जिथासूलम् उपाधि च गनिर्देवविवेषयः ॥१५॥

'यवीभावप्रचन्नानम् एकारादिपरं पदम् ।

श्रान्तं नासिकं विधाद्वं यदु अच्छं अध्याम् अवधिः ॥१६॥
क्तौतीयोऽऽ चागतं द्रष्टम् अपवर्यं च भवितम् ।

'न तथा परिमोचास्ति पापार्या विविषायात् ॥१७॥
क्तौतीयोऽऽ चागतं गतं हस्तं चायत्र च सुखविने ॥

सुखरेषु सुवचनं प्रयुक्तं ब्रम्हां राजनि ॥१८॥

न काराको न लक्ष्योऽऽ नासिकं नानुनासिकः।

gःसूलो वस्तिजित्वा प्रयोगानु वक्तम् अभिन्ति ॥१८॥

1. Weber reads "समानमादिपरं.
2. CDL न तथा पद्धः सोष्टि.
3. CDL ब्रहं ब्रह्मायं.
4. CDL राजनि.
गळ्याशास्त्रिया

३था वाकऱ्ये दहरेत् पुत्रान् दंडाभिनं च प्रेषिते।
भीता पतन्निधित्वां तद्रूच विष्णू प्रयोजिते।॥२०॥
एवं बैठी: प्रयोजिता नाथकं न च वैदिता।
सम्बन्धेऽप्रयोगेण ब्रजळीकः संहैयते।॥२१॥
चतुर् दृष्टं दृष्टं प्रयोगां तु मध्यमम्।
विज्ञाप्तां उपरिदाने कुवस्य हतिं विलम्बितां।॥२२॥
उदात्त्यानुदात्त्य श्रवितस्य व्रासयः।

॥८॥ ज्ञको दोर्धे: कुत्त दृष्टं कालतो नियमा ३०चिः॥२३॥
कथा अवधाविषुव्यासालया चोपलारुपः।

॥११॥ सुमुखेऽवाच कटुरणा दल्या चतुरसा: स्रोता:॥२४॥
जिद्धमूलं तु कु: प्रेक्षो दन्यौऽवा: स्रोतो वुः।

॥१२॥ ए ऐ तु कथात्तालया ची की कथोष्टः स्रोतस्ती।॥२५॥
चर्ममाता तु कथास्य एकारीकार्योभेवित्।

॥१३॥ ऐकारीकार्योमाता तयोरिलतसंहितम्॥२६॥

॥१४॥ उपायानीय जप्ना च जिद्धामूलीयनासिके।
अन्योत्तरा विद्येया ७आश्रयाश्चानामविन:॥२७॥

॥१५॥ चलावृक्षालीनिधि: ६मन्त्रसूक्तः ६क्षरानु:।

॥१६॥ चन्दुरस्वतू कर्तवे नियं ज्री: शरस्वेषु च॥२८॥

१०क्षरां च खराणा च विद्वतं करणं खरातु।

तैयःपिद: ११विश्वतत्ततः १२साधाम: ऐच्छे ततोपिद: च॥२८॥

16|| चोंप्धाणम् 1यशस्वीविष्णुस्मरणः श्रीः नमः ताः॥
श्रीः: स्मुद्य ह्यः प्रोत्ता निविर्धानुप्रदानः ॥२०॥

17|| यमोत्रनासिका 2नक्षी नाधिनो 1हक्षः: स्मृता: ॥
हर्षवती� 3वद्ध: 2नक्षनामण्डलः ख्याताः: ॥२१॥

18|| हर्षकोऽस्माश्चरो विद्यादृ गोपामैतत् प्रचावते ।

श्रीः 4शान्ते प्रादलुः दाचिपुत्राः धीमते ॥२२॥

वाचिकत: 6पायिनीयो चेनिद्रे वाहतं भवि ।
रक्षुवतम् 6इदं शास्तनव चुविवां सम्भकावितम् ॥२३॥

वेनाचरसमाहारैयं अविग्नम महस्मरातु।

कह़े आकर्षण प्रोत्तं तक्षे पायिनये नम: ॥२४॥

विनयसुखनिनः रताम् इरां

य इह पहुँचे 10प्रयतः सदा दिजः ।

स भवति 11पशुपुरनारीमान

12सुखम् अतुलं च समयुः दिवि दिवीति ॥२५॥
VI. क्रमशाखोप (The Rāk Recension)

[१]
चथू शिवां प्रवचनामि पाण्डिनेयं मर्तं यथा।
'प्राण्यालेपिव्याहारः'-तत्त्वं बोधित्वं लोकवेद्य:।
प्रशिवाप्रि शब्दार्थः अविश्वातः चतुष्क्रमिष:।
पुनःव्याख्यातस्मात् चार्य उच्चारणं विनिधम्।
विषंत्य开支वाच्च चतुर्वर्गोऽविक्रमोऽविचित्र।
प्राप्तवेत संस्कृते चापि स्यं प्रस्ता: स्वयंभूवा।

वरा विद्विषिमेक्ष स्पर्शानां पत्तविनिषिद्ध:।

[२]
चाम्बा बुधा समिष्यायमेत् मनो युक्ते विवचया।

[३]
मन: कायामनिमात्तति स प्रेरयति मानतम।
मानतसूरससं चार्य मन्न्म जनवति खरम्।

[४]
प्रातः सवन्योगं तं कदन्ते गायलमार्थवित्तम।
कथां माध्यर्दिन्युगं मधयं बैछ्यभानूम।

[५]

पश्चिमिन्नितिनिमित्तं वर्णेषुपत्तं मात्रसं ॥

6. वर्णणं जनयते वेषं विभागं पद्माः स्मृतं ॥

6. खरं कालं श्रानात् प्रयवसानात् ॥

7. इति वर्णविदं प्राणसिद्धम् तं विभोधत ॥

8. उदात्तस्यानुदात्तस्य खरित्वं खराख्यं ॥

8. त्रिको दौरं मुच्छेऽद्विति कालो नियमा झचि ॥

9. उदात्तं निवादाग्नारावुदात्तं कथमभवेतः ।

9. खरित्वप्रभः श्रीतं 'व्रजमिथमप्रभमः' ॥

9. चष्टो हर्षानि वर्णानामुक्तं कालं शिरस्था ।

9. जिज्ञासूलं च 'दर्शनार नासिकोत्री च तालु च' ॥

9. त्रिको दौरं विविधिं मायसा रेव एवं च ।

9. जिज्ञासूलसं उपसा च लगितरंविवोधणाः ॥

9. जिज्ञासः प्रभावस्नानम् उक्तार्द्विरं पदम ।

9. खराख्यं तालमयं विवादं यद्यद्यं यत्सं अध्य ॥

9. दकारं वटमायं तालमृ 'भन्नं श्राभित्वं संयुतम्' ॥

10. व्रजमिथानामु जनायतं कंठामाहसंयुतम् ॥

10. नालमधवस्यजयित्वमानाः धोषाजातुपूर्व ॥

11. चुमुंखवचा कंठरशा दल्हा दुतुलसा: स्मृता: ॥

11. जिज्ञासूलेति तु कु: प्रोक्ति दल्होश्री: व: स्मृत्ति बुधे: ॥

11. ए ए तु कंठातालां चो क्रो कंठोधज्ञे स्मृति ॥

1. ॥ 2. ॥ 3. ॥
च्छक्ष्याखिया

चतुर्भुजात ४ कषायस्य चेन्नारीकार्योभेंदुः।

१३॥ चेन्नारीकार्योपर्वत तयोरिविधसंदहतम् ४८॥
संडत्तं मार्दिकं जेत्यं विवतं तु दिवासिकम्।
घोषा वा संडत्तं: सर्वं चर्चोत्त विवताः छूताः ४२॥

[५]

साधारणम् कष्यां चैव विवतं करणं छूतम्।
तेघोपिः विवताविवेको तास्माद् ऐंिी कतेवा च ४३॥

१४॥ जलाशयमानां च नासिकाः स्थानसुचनते॥

चर्चखुता विज्ञेया ४४॥ आश्रयस्थानामाको ४२॥

१५॥ अलावोधाणिधियं त्वतामूलं: ४५॥ चसाराणुः:।

१६॥ अनुष्कारस्तु कर्तव्यो निलं ज्ञी: स्स्वसेषु च ४३॥
अनुसारी विवतां सु विगमे चाचरवमे।
हीरोबं तु विवतेषीयां यस्तीर्यवेंकर्वायो: ४२॥
'योगी यथा चतुरेत्युपवान् इत्यभां न च वीडियेवः।
मौता प्रतन्मेदायं तदनं वर्णान् प्रयोजयेव ४५॥

[६]

यथा सीरादिका नारीं ततः स्वभावः।
एवं राेका प्रयोत्त्वं: खे चर्मं इति वेद्याः ४२॥
रुपपरं प्रमुन्दवनं नो धेतु पूर्वम् अधरम्।
दीपस्तवम प्रज्ञायोत्तमणपाशा-सिङ्कम् चाचरतुः ४२॥
इदवे चैकार्यस्तु बध्माणां स्मृतिन।
नासिकायं लताधे च राजश्वेव हिमारत्ता ४२॥

1. Ch कणब्र शान्तारीकारं, Y कणमाण एकारीकारं
2. Y जस्यां च स्वायत्तां च.
3. Y तस्मिनीं च.
4. Y has after this उपपाणियो नाग्या च जिन्दामृतीयमालिके.
5. Y अस्तानामाणः।
6. CL, स्थानं चनु.
7. Y चतुरा ज्यारी...इदारिनीं च.
8. Y राजं बिजनायता,
पाणिनीय-शिष्या

1. दद्यादुक्तः सिन्हाकां सांस्करण सख्मबुधरू।
   मादेवत्र च हिमांतत्र च जनवं इति निद्रणम् ॥२॥
   सम्येव तु कम्परूप कम्पसं उभो पाषां समो भवेत्।
   सस्त्रं कम्परूप कम्पं राणियति निद्रणम् ॥३॥

[७]

एवं वर्णः प्रयोगम् नामयोऽन च पाणिता।
सम्यवर्णप्रयोगः वरणानि सहीयते ॥२१॥
गौती श्रीमती गिरि-कश्यी तथा लिखितपाठकः।
चन्द्रधाराक्ययक्ष्यः यहेति पाठकाधमः ॥२२॥
माध्येम् चर्चवस्ति: पदकोडः सुसरः।
वैवेद्य लयसर्वः (?) च यहेति पाठकः (?) गुणः ॥२३॥
शिष्यस्मृ भोगम् ॥२४॥
कालारम् गिरिसंगम् तथा ख्यानविवर्जितम् ॥२५॥
वाष्ट्रम् दश्च निरस्तं विस्तयं निलृतं गहिरं गृहिरं गृहितम्।
निषोदितं वस्त्रपदाचरं च वायवर्तादनं न तु सातुरायसम् ॥३॥
प्रतः पदुपायम् उर्ध्वितरित्य स्नेत्य शापृं वेश्वरपुर्ययः।
मधुबन्धु चक्षुकतिं वेदेच्छवं उपजितं समिहितम् ॥२६॥
तां तु विधात्वः सवन्ति तत्तथे शिरोगतं तथा सदा प्रयोज्यम्।
समुत्तमानन्दसुखस्त्राणिः तुकेति नाङ्ति गिरिविधिनिः ॥३७॥

[८]

॥१६॥ अचोद्यन्थः यशोस्वीश्चरमस्थानः भर: समृताः।
श्रेषा: सृष्टा दल: प्रीता निवाधानुप्रजानत: ॥२॥

॥१७॥ यमोऽनुसरिका ॥नको नान्दिनीहक्ष्य: समृताः।
ईवद्वारे ॥यशो जन्य प्रासिनसः ख्फाद्यः ॥३॥

1. C दद्यादुक्तः। 2. CL समी। 3. Weber reads दद्यादुक्तः।
4. Weber reads श्यानुप्रनायत। 5. सवन्ति तत्तथे। 6. Ch ख्फाद्यः।
वर्णन त्वां संत्कोलकर्मणि विदात् गोर्धमित्व प्रचारकर्ति।

'द्वाचीत्रि': पारिनिना चेलिञ्चि व्यापिनं सुविच ॥४०॥

यमः पाली तु वेदस्य इस्वी कव्योजय प्रजाति।

क्षोतियः अन्यं चचुनिशय्येको शोभम् उच्चिन्ने ॥४१॥

शिवचा व्राणं तु वेदस्य सुधि व्याकरणम् गृहतम्।

तद्वात् सामस्य भोजलेख ब्रह्मसङ्के मद्यर्थं ॥४२॥

[५]

उदास्तम् प्राप्यविति व्योज्ञतान्त्रां प्रदेश्यिनीसूक्तचन्द्रिष्टमूर्त्ति।

उपायम् चे वर्णितं: श्रूतं च कनिष्ठायामनुदात्त मेव ॥४३॥

उदास्तं प्रदेश्यिनो विद्यात् प्रचयः मध्यस्तेविन्तम।

निहतं तु कनिष्ठोऽरुपितोपकनिष्ठायाम ॥४४॥

प्रणोदास्तम् चारुदास्तम् उदास्तम् चन्द्रादात्तं नोचस्वर्तितम।

मध्योदात्तं स्त्रियं हुदांस्तं हुदांस्तिति नवपदश्या ॥४५॥

चिन्त: सोम: प्र: दो वीरयं द्विविअ श्रुत: वृहस्पति: इन्द्रावश्यतो।

अन्तर्विमोचनोदात्तं सोम इन्द्रावश्यतां प्रेणुदात्तं

व इन्द्रावश्यते वीर्यं नोचस्वर्तितम ॥४६॥

हविवा मध्योदात्तं स्त्रियं स्त्रियं वहस्तितिर्तति हुदांस्तम्

इन्द्रावश्यतो इति व्रादास्तम् ॥४७॥

चन्द्रादात्तं हुदं वीर्यं स्मुदास्तं उदास्तम:।

स्त्रियं: कर्मेछुलीयं: सर्वेन्त्रेषु प्रचयं: श्रृत: ॥४८॥

[१०]

चापशु बदनां मावाङ्किता हन्तां चैव वायस:।

ग्रीगो रीति ब्रमानां तु नकलस्तवात्मकम् ॥४९॥

कुलितांद्वार्तेन द्रम्मपत्रम् च कर्मितम्।

न तस्म चाठो भोजोजस्तिः पापार्थैवविकिरितम् ॥५०॥

1. Ch द्वाचीयुः, Y. द्वाचीयोः।
2. Y व्याहतं सुनि।
3. Weber reads द्वाचं. Ch हसि च।
4. Y यात्रोजस्तिः।
पाणिनीय-शिष्या

चुलियाधारां 1वां साधारण सुव्यवस्थात।
सुखरेण सुव्यवस्था प्रयुक्तं जड्ड 2राजते ॥ ॥
मनो हौनः स्वरतं वर्णतो वा मिथ्याप्रयुक्तो न तमस्यमाहः
स वामको व्यजमान दिनस्ति यथेच्छव: स्वरतोपराधातु ॥ ॥
वचनरसम् (१) अनाबुधं विशरं व्याधिपोषितम्।
चतुर्णाकरश्चूक्तेः (२) वर्णं पतनं मस्तकेः ॥ ॥
एसऽहोने वोतेरते स्वरवर्णविवर्जितम्।
क्रम्यज्ञुः सामभिद्धोऽऽ वियोधितम् अधिग्राह्यम् ॥ ॥
क्रम्यज्ञुः वेदेः वोतेरते स्वरवर्णविवर्जितम्।
क्रम्यज्ञुः सामभिः पूतो ब्रह्मलोके महोत्त्वः ॥ ॥
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शब्दः शाश्वती प्रादानः दाशीकुत्त्व घीमति।
वाच्यप्रेमः समाल्लवे वो वाच्यप्रेमः सहित: ॥ ॥
शेनाधरसमाभ्यः अधिग्राह्य महेंषरात्।
कतुम्य व्याकरणेऽप्रोतं तस्मां पाणिनि नमः ॥ ॥
शेन दोता गीतः । उक्ति विचित्रः श्रद्धारितः।
तमस्यानानं भिन्न तस्मां पाणिनि नमः ॥ ॥
वश्चनामनस्य लोकस्य धाराचन्नन्त्याकयः।
चुलियाधारां शेन तस्मां पाणिनि नमः ॥ ॥
“विनयनमभिसुखनिः स्वतामिनां
य इह पंढरूः प्रयत्नं सदा हितः।”
स भवति धनपाणियमुख्याकृतिमानः।
“अतुलस च सुसं समस्याते दर्शीति दर्शीति ॥ ॥
चतुर्मशीमाः, पाणा, उदात्तस, हकारं, खरां, यथा,
गीतो, अचौथ्या, उदात्तं, चामु, शब्दं एकादश।
इति पाणिनीय-शिष्या समासः।

1. य राजते। 2. य साधारण। 3. य विनयनमभिसुखः।
4. य उदात्तं। 5. य सुसंसमयं च सः।
प्रारम्भिक–मिथ्या

विभवत्मू अष्टांत खराण्यां च ॥२४॥
तेभी विभवतवः लैःदीतोः (लैःदीतोः) ॥२५॥
ताभामू ऐदीतोः ॥२६॥
ताभायामयकारासः ॥२७॥
खुट्टलू खशीणांमू ॥२८॥
खुट्टलू खशीणांमू ॥२८॥
बा खा: ॥२९॥

वर्गाण्य प्रथमहिंतिः: प्रयत्नसविद्धेनीयजित्तामृत्तीयोपानियायां
विभवकथा [च-]नादानुप्रदाना चार्याः: ॥३१॥
प्रथमहिंतियांजा चान्त:खशाल्यायायाः: ॥३२॥
दत्ते स्वं महारायाः: ॥३२॥
दत्तीयचतुर्थप्रभासः: सारुकारानाःखशकाराः
संहतकथा[१] नादानुप्रदाना प्रायवर्त: ॥३४॥
दत्तीयचतुर्थः: प्रयत्नसविद्धोपायाः: ॥३५॥
वाण्यो मार्दासाना: खशी: ॥३६॥
शस्त्र:खा यशस्वा: ॥३७॥ दतुवें बाण्यः: प्रयव: ॥

प्रथम चार्यां खशी दौर: मृत इति विधा भिच: प्रथेकमू ददासानुदादा
खर्विनेशेमेन सारुकारानांजित्तामृत्तीयोपायां चान्त:खशाधवां भवति ॥३८॥

एवप्रवर्गांवर्गां खवर्षसः ॥३८॥
खवर्षसः दौरां मांसः च महाश्वा भवति ॥४०॥
एकामात्रिको खशा: ॥४१॥
हिमाबः दौरः: ॥४२॥
हिमाबः: मृत: ॥४२॥
शवेददास: ॥४४॥
नोचरत्वदास: ॥४५॥
समाडः: खरित: ॥४६॥
खशालानुसार्वां निर्दिश्वन्यिकेश: ॥४७॥
चक्षा: खम्बेमेदा रंगवर्धितर: सारुकारानां निर्दिश्वन्यिकेशित: ॥४५॥

इति चान्त्रर्षस्वर्गाणि समासानि।
THE PĀṆINĪYA-SIKṢĀ

With Translation and Notes (Critical and Exegetical)
THE PĀŅINĪYA SIKṢĀ

with Translation and Notes (Critical and Exegetical)

[a i u-ṇ || r l-k || e o-ṇ || ai au-c || ha ya va ra-t || la-ṇ || ā ma nā na-m || jha bha-ṇ || gha ḍha dha-s || ja ba ga ḍa da-s || kha pha cha ḍha tha ca ṭa ta-v || ka pa-y || śa sa sa-r || ha-l.]

Note 1. The Varna-samānāya (or the so-called Siva-sūtras) whether it was composed by Pāṇini or any of his predecessors was in all likelihood an essential part of the PS. and constituted its beginning, for pratyāhāras like ac, yan, śar, etc., have been used in that work. But there being no direct evidence about its assumed place in the PS. we have put it within square brackets. (For detailed discussion on its age and authorship as well as other points, see Introduction, §§ 12-15).

Note 2. The Pāj., Prk., Yaj. and Rk recensions begin with the three following couplets:

Atha sīkṣāṃ pravakṣyāmi Pāniniyam matam yathā | sāstrānapūrṇyaṃ tadbhid yathāktaṃ loka-vedayoḥ II (1)
Prasiddham api sabdārtham avijñātam abuddhībhikṣa | punar vyaktikārśyāmi vāca uccarane vidhim II (2)
Tri-suṣṭiḥ catuh-suṣṭir vā varṇāḥ sambhavato matāḥ | Prākṛte Sanskritē cāpi svayam proktāḥ Svayambhuvā II (3)

Tr. Now I shall give out the Sikṣā according to the views of Pāṇini. In pursuance of the traditional lore, one should learn it with reference to the popular and the Vedic languages. Though words and their meaning are well known, yet these are not within the knowledge of persons intellectually deficient, (hence) I shall dwell once more on the rules regarding the pronunciation of words. That speech-sounds in Prakrit and Sanskrit are sixty-three or sixty-four, according to their origin, has been said by Brahman (Svayambhū) himself. [1-3].
a. The expression Pāṇiniyaṁ matanī yathā agrees with the following which occurs later on in all recensions (except the AP.): Saṁkaraḥ Saṁkarīṁ prādād Dākśiputrāya dhīmate. It appears that the compiler of the AP. did not know who the author of the PS. was. For, though in the introduction of his metrics (ch. 328 AP. ed. Ānandāraṁ) he writes: chando vakṣye mālañais taṁ Pīṅgalōktam yathākramam he is quite silent about the source of the Sikṣā given by him. It is not so much likely that Pāṇini like later authors would put in his own name in his work, for in his Āstādhyāyi too he does not mention himself. This ignorance of the compiler of the AP. along with the defective nature of the text of the PS. as given in his work probably goes to show that at his time (c. 800 A.C.) the PS. was not a frequently studied work. The Prātiśākhyā which are later than PS. must have supplanted it to a considerable extent at that time. That the author of the AP. leaves out as many as six hemistichs out of eighteen couplets shows the damaged condition in which his material had already reached at the time of the compilation of the AP.

b. The expression tri-jaśtiṁ catuh-jaśtiṁ vā shows how the author of these spurious verses felt a difficulty over the meaning of the first two couplets of the PS. and could not say for certain whether 63 or 64 letters were meant by Pāṇini. Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra (c. 300 B.C) knows only 63 letters (see ed. Jolly, II. 9.14). The AP. contains none of these couplets except the first half of the third in the following form: vakṣye Sikṣāṁ trijaśtiṁ syur varṇā vā catur-adhikāḥ. It is evident that the compiler of the AP. too felt a difficulty over first two couplets of the PS. It cannot be ascertained whether the authors of the other recensions have imitated the indecision of the AP. in this matter or independently had their own confusion.

c. The expression Prākṛte Saṁskṛte cāpi, scarcely older than the AP. (c. 800 A.C.), has sometimes been erroneously referred to as the earliest mention of the names of Sanskrit and Prakrit languages (e.g. Hari Narayan Apte, Wilson Philological Lectures of 1915, Poona, 1922, p.5).

Svarā vimśatīr ekas ca sparśānāṁ pañca-vimśatīk 1
yādayās ca smṛtā hy aṣṭau ca tavāraś ca yamāh smṛtāh 1 (4)

Anusvāro visargaś ca xa-phau cāpi parāśrayau 1
duḥṣprṣṭaś cēti vijñeyo ?-kāraḥ pluta eva ca 1 (5)

Tr. Vowels are twenty-one, stops twenty-five, the group beginning with ya (i.e. semivowels, sibilants and h) eight and yamas four; anusvāra, visarga χ and φ are dependent on others and the pluta 1 is duḥṣprṣṭa. [4-5].
Note 3. The order in which the different groups of speech-sounds have been mentioned seems to be due to exigency of metre. The twenty-one vowels according to the commentaries, the Pañjikā and the Prakāśa are: a, ā, ē, ̄a; i, ī, ̄i; u, ū, ū; r, ṛ, ̄r; l, e, ̄e; o, ̄o; ai, ̄ai; au, ̄au.

The earliest enumeration of vowels has probably been in the so-called Śiva-sūtras. But there we have only nine vowels, long and short ones being altogether omitted. The omission has been discussed before (see Introduction, § 14). The Prātiṣākyas are not in agreement with one another as regards the treatment of vowels. The following is a tabular statement of vowels recognized in the extant Prātiṣākyas compared with the vowels of the PS.

Table I.

Vowels according to the PS. and the Prātiṣākyas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS.</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>ā</th>
<th>ē</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ī</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>ū</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>̄o</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>̄e</th>
<th>ai</th>
<th>̄ai</th>
<th>au</th>
<th>̄au</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APr.¹</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ṛ</td>
<td>̄r</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>̄ai</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṚPr.²</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ṛ</td>
<td>̄r</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>̄ai</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPr.³</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ṛ</td>
<td>̄r</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>̄ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPr.⁴</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>̄o</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>̄e</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>̄l</td>
<td>̄l</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>̄e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT⁵</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>̄o</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>̄e</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>̄l</td>
<td>̄l</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>̄e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The APr. according to the commentary does not include the short vowels in the Varṇa-śāmānmāya, but admits their existence in the Atharva Veda (I. 105). It is possible that the short vowels arose late in the recitation of this Veda.

² In his enumeration of vowels, Uvāṭa (e.g., on ṚPr. I. 14) does not mention short vowels, though the ṚPr. recognizes them (see I. 16; II. 32 etc.). In the ṚPr. r (also long r?) does not enjoy the full status of a vowel. For it can stand neither at the beginning nor at the end (I. 9, 11).

³ The commentaries to the TPr. do not recognize short variety of r, l and diphthongs.

⁴ This enumeration is according to Uvāṭa. For his view on ṚPr. vowels see Note 2 above. The first seven chapters of the VPr. are genuine. The last (VIII) chapter seems very much to be a late composition (see Weber, Ind. Stud. IV, p. 65). Hence by VPr. we shall understand the first seven chapters, and the chapter VIII will be designated by the name late VPr. or l VPr.

⁵ The view of the RT. as regards the number of vowels it recognizes has been gathered from its vr̥tti which might have been built on Aṇḍavrajī’s work (see Introduction § 40). The recognition of a long l by the RT. is curious. PS. and other Prātiṣākyas do not accept this.
The difference between the PŚ. and the Prātiśākhyaśas is due to their originally different character, for the former was a manual for helping the recitation of all the Vedas or it may have belonged to the one undivided Veda that existed at the very beginning (see Introduction, § 18), while the latter (the Prātiśākhyaśas) were treatises related to the peculiar mode of reciting or chanting one particular Veda, or its many recensions (tatra sarva-veda-sādhāranī śikṣā. Pāñininā prakāsitā. prativeda-sākhaṃ ca bhinna-rūpā prātiśākhya-saṃjñitā anyaireva munibhiḥ pradarśitā, Prasthāna-bheda, Weber’s Ind. Stud. I, p. 16). The fact that the PŚ. was accessory to the study of all the Vedas, required that it should be a treatise of general kind and in this respect differs from the Prātiśākhyaśas which related to one kind only of the mantra-text in its different śākhās. Hence we find the Atharva and Rk Prātiśākhyaśas omitting from their treatment of vowels the pluta ones which probably arose late in the recitation of their respective mantra-texts. The TPr. includes pluta a, i and u in its treatment of vowels while the diphthongs (e, o, ai, au) as well as r and l have no pluta variety in it.

Note 4. Yamas are said to be particular nasal sounds occurring before the nasal stops when plosives precede them. The enumeration of yamas as four in the commentaries appears to be a bit puzzling; for, according to the definition of the Prātiśākhyaśas and the Nār. Ś. the yamas become 20 or 21 in number (see APR. I. 99; TPr. XXI. 12, XXII. 12; ṚPr. VI. 8). Uvaṭa in his commentary of the ṚPr. has a defence for both the enumerations. He sums up his first discussion, with evam vinśatir yamā bahu-ṛcānām bhawanti sva-ṛpaśi catvāra eva tad uttaratra yama-lakṣane vicārayisyāmaḥ (on I. 20) and in discussing the character of yama (on VI. 8) he says tasmād iva ‘sparśā yamānānanunāsikā ity ucyamāne vinśatīvāt sthānānām adeśānām api yamānām vinśatītva-prasaṅgaḥ; sa mā bhūt. caturṇām eva yamānām prathamaḥ prathamam dvitiyā dvitiyam evam ā pācamād āpadyerann ity ucyate. The sum and substance of what Uvaṭa says seems to be that in pronunciation the yamas do
not partake of the characteristics of their respective groups to any considerable extent, hence they are to be called the first yama the second yama and so on, making the yamas four in number. But the Bahy-ṛcas however thought otherwise and gave an extremely logical interpretation to the definition of the Prātiśākhya without caring for its practical aspect (Whitney has a difficulty over the nature and number of the yamas; see his comments on APR. I. 99, TPR. II. 51; XXI, 12; XXII, 12. A great deal of his difficulty is due to the peculiar nature of the TPr.). The late Vai. Pr., i.e., its ch. VIII (29), has recognized four yamas only though curiously enough Uvaṭa explains their number to be twenty. In the Rktantra also (ed. Burnell, p. 2) only four yamas have been recognized. (For more information about yamas see Siddheshwar Varma’s ‘Critical Studies’, pp. 99ff.)

Note 5. Anusvāra. All the Prātiśākhyas except the Rktantra have recognized one anusvāra only. The Pañjikā as well as the Prakāśa recognizes a reading anusvārau according to which two anusvāras are available. In this matter the Pañjikā invokes the authority of Audavraja. But the recognition of two anusvāras seems very much to be a late development and did not find favour with the majority of early Vedic phoneticians (Saikṣikas). It is possibly the author of the spurious verse tri-śaṣṭi śatuḥ-śaṣṭi vā, etc., that has first honoured the view of Audavraja in connexion with the PS.

Note 6. Duḥṣprṣṭaḥ. The pluta ṭ has been called the duḥ- sprṣṭa or ‘touched-with-difficulty.’ This may be one of the reasons why some Prātiśākhyas did not recognize this sound (see Table I). But the PS. being meant for all the Vedas had to notice this. It should be known that the commentator to the RṬ. recognizes this (see ibid). Weber was inclined to understand duḥṣprṣṭa as a nāsikya (Ind. Stud. IV, p. 349). But his view seems to be untenable. The Pañjikā on the authority of Audavraja takes it in the sense of īṣat-sprṣṭa (p. 11). For according to the latter, ṭ partakes of the character of semivowels which are īṣat-sprṣṭa according to PS. See also Uvaṭa on RPr. XIII. 3.
Tr. Ātmā with buddhi perceives things and sets the mind to an intention of speaking; the mind (then) gives impetus to the fire within the body, and the latter drives the breath out [6].

The breath circulating within the lungs creates the soft (mandra) tone; this is connected with the morning offering (pratāḥ-savana) and rests in the Gāyatrī (metre) [7].

(The same breath circulating) in the throat (produces) the middle (madhyama) tone and relates to the midday offering (mādhyandina-savana) and follows the Tristubh (metre); and the shrill (tāra) tone (which is produced by the breath circulating) in the roof of the mouth relates to the third (i.e., evening) offering (of the day) and follows the Jagati (metre) [8].

(The breath which is thus) sent upwards and is checked by the roof of the mouth attains to the mouth and produces speech-sounds (varṇas), which have a fivefold classification—according to their pitch, quantity, place of articulation, the primary effort and the secondary effort. So said those who were versed in (pronouncing) speech-sounds. Learn this carefully [9-10].
NOTE 7. Prātah-savanayogam. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa has the following: atha mandram tapati tasmāt mandrayā vācā prātah-savane samset (XIV. 6).

NOTE 8. Śṛṣṭīyam. This is a form allowed by Pāṇini, in his grammar, for the Chandas only (śṛṣṭīyam Ś charadas, VI. 1. 60). By Chandas the grammarians surely meant the Vedic language as opposed to the current language of his time. There is nothing peculiar in his use of the Vedic language in the Śikṣā which is a Vedāṅga (see also Notes 9 and 18 below).

NOTE 9. So'dīrṇah. The peculiar sandhi observable here sah+udīrṇah has been supported by Pāṇini (so'ci lope cet pādāpūraṇam. VI. 1. 134). According to the Kāśikā this sūtra relates to the foot of a Ṛk (iha Ṛk-pāda eva grhyate). Hence this also is an indication of the archaic language of the PS. (see also Notes 8 and 20).

NOTE 9. Varnāṇ, the speech-sounds (see Note 14 below).

NOTE 10. Janayate. The use of Ātmanepada in this verb as opposed to that of Parasmaipada in PS. 4 deserves to be noted. But the meaning in both the cases is almost similar.

NOTE 11. Svarataḥ. The word svara in this place means pitch accents, such as udātta, anudātta and svarita. The translator of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad in the S. B. E. series once translated this word as 'syllable' (I. 4). This is indefensible.

NOTE 12. Prayaṭna. This word means 'primary (pra = forward) effort' (yatna). Patañjali, however does not seem to be willing to allow such an interpretation (on Pāṇini, I. 1. 9, ed. Kielhorn, vol. I, pp. 61f.) But as he has objected to it from a different stand-point we can well have our interpretation. For in articulating speech-sounds, first of all we adjust the different parts of the mouth. This adjustment as opposed to setting the vocal chords to action (which has; been termed as anupradāna) has been

---

1 For a searching enquiry into the meaning of Chandas as used by Pāṇini, see Dr. Paul Thieme's 'Pāṇini and Veda', Allahabad, 1935, especially pp. 67ff.
justly called *prayatna*. This *prayatna* is included in the *āsya-prayatna* of the Aṣṭādhyāyī (I. 1. 9). *Āsyā* in this work means 'the place of articulation (sthāna) in the mouth' (*āsya*). The use of *āsya* instead of *sthāna* has been meant for brevity (lāghava): prolixity should always be guarded against in a sūtra. The *prayatna* in *āsya-prayatna* has been identified with the *ābhyantarapravatana* by Bhaṭṭoji-dīkṣita (on Pāṇini I. 1. 9). According to him it is of four kinds: *sprṣṭa, ḍsat-sprṣṭa, sanvṛta* and *vivṛta*. As opposed to the *ābhyantarapravatana*, he has *bāhya-prayatna*, which is another name for Pāṇini’s *anupradāna*, which according to Patañjali consists of the following: *vivāra, sanvāra, ṣvāsa, nāda, (ghoṣatā, aghoṣatā)*, alpa-prāṇa and mahā-prāṇa (on P. I. 1. 9) Kaiyyaṭa adds to this three more: *udātta, anudātta* and *svartta*, and Bhaṭṭoji follows the latter in this matter (S. Varma, op. cit., p. 9). The use of two different sets of derivatives of the root *vr* (such as *sanvṛta, vivṛta* and *sanvāra, vivāra*) in the classification of both kinds of efforts is not happy. Nevertheless it can be justified; for in the case of the *ābhyantarapravatana*, the root *vr* relates to space between the two parts of the mouth, which touching or coming very close to each other, produce speech-sounds; while in the case of the *bāhya-prayatna*, it relates to the vocal passage where vocal chords are situated.

The fact that Patañjali and his successors use *ābhyantarapravatana* and *bāhya-prayatna* instead of simple *prayatna* and *anupradāna* demands some notice. A change of practice in this matter probably points to the advance of phonetic studies which evidently took place during the time that elapsed between Pāṇini and Patañjali. Some of the early Prātiśākhyaśas such as the APr. and TPr. were written in this period (see Introduction, §24).

1. *Ghoṣatā* and *aghoṣatā* are simply synonymous to *nāda* and *ṭvāsa* respectively. Later grammarians however have taken *ghoṣatā* and *aghoṣatā* as something other than *ṭvāsa* and *nāda*. Evidently a marginal gloss crept into the Mahābhāṣyas as early as Candragomin (c. 600 A. C.), who in his Varṣa-Sūtras has imitated this in using expressions like *nādānupradāna ghoṣavantah* and [a]-*nādānupradāna ghoṣavantah*. The mistake involved in the superfluous use of terms has been detected neither by Candragomin or any of his successors like Kaiyyaṭa or Bhaṭṭoji-dīkṣita.
Prātiśākhyaṣ very rarely use the terms prayatna and anupradāna. The ĀPr. never uses prayatna, but anupradāna is used in it once (I. 12). In the ĀPr. each of these terms occurs once (XIV. 10; XIII. 1). In the VPr. prayatna occurs once (I. 43) and anupradāna never. TPr. coins a new word karāṇa for prayatna (II. 32, 34, 45; XXIII. 6) and uses prayatna once (XVII. 6, 7), but in the next occasion (XXIII. 2) uses for it the word karāṇa-vinaya (adjustment of different articulating organs.) Other Prātiśākhyaṣ too use the term karāṇa (e.g., ĀPr. I. 18; VPr. I. 75; RPr. VI. 8). Whitney’s translation of prayatna simply as ‘effort’ is vague. Weber’s translation of the word as ‘Mundbewegung’ is however more accurate. Anupradāna is twice used in the TPr. (II: 8; XXIII. 2). The disuse into which prayatna gradually fell seems to have caused the substitution of its radical sense ‘first effort’ by the more generalized sense ‘effort’ which without any adjective did not distinguish between the primary (ābhyaṃtara) and the secondary (bāhya) efforts. As unambiguity and precision of terms is an essential condition in scientific discussion, the post-Pāṇinian phoneticians almost gave up the old terminology and had new terms like ābhyaṃtara-prayatna and bāhya-prayatna for the simple prayatna and anupradāna respectively.

Note 13. Anupradāna. The term as we have seen above is equivalent to ‘after-effort’ or ‘secondary effort’, which means stiffening or loosening of vocal chords. Whitney translates this as ‘emission’ (ĀPr. I. 12; TPr. XXIII. 2) and Weber has rendered it by ‘Ausstossung’ (Ind. Stud. IV, p. 107). Dr. Siddheshwar Varma translates this as ‘sound-material’, or ‘breath-voice material’ (op. cit., pp. 3, 9); but such translations though not altogether incorrect are not happy. Whitney, Weber and Varma all seem to have missed the etymological implication of the word. The author of the Śikṣā-prakāśa however extends the meaning of anupradāna which according to him includes nasality too (p. 29). This evident innovation seems to have justification from the separate mention of anunāsikas in Ps. 17b. (For other points regarding this word see above the Note 12 on prayatna).
NOTE 14. *Iti varna-vidah prāhuh.* So said those who were versed in the lore of (pronouncing) the speech-sounds. This evidently shows that there were other masters of phonetics (*Saikṣikas*) before Pāṇini wrote his *Sikṣa.* This hemistich does not appear in the AP. It is possible like the *P Ś.* 14 it has been left out (see Note 28 below). *Vṛṇa* also means a ‘written sign’ representing a speech-sound (see Th. Goldstücker, ‘Pāṇini: his place in Skt. literature’, London, 1861, pp. 34ff.).

The theory of producing speech-sounds as given here recognizes three principal places of articulation: chest (*uras*), throat (*kaṇṭha*) and the roof of the mouth (*śiras*). *Patanjali* too while explaining *caṭāri śṛṅgā,* etc., interprets *tridhā baddhaḥ* as *trīṣu sthāneṣu baddhaḥ: urasi kaṇṭhe śirasīti.* (ed. Kielhorn, *Vol. I,* p. 3)

From the fivefold division of speech-sounds mentioned in the *P Ś.* 7 we may well expect that each class of sounds will be discussed next one after another. But authors of the inflated versions such as *Rk.*, *Yaj.*, *Pāj.* and *Prk.* recensions without paying any heed to this fact have interspersed passages (treating five divisions) with couplets from different sources.

*Udāttaś cānudāttaś ca svaritaś ca svarās trayāḥ ī \ hrasvo dīrghaḥ pluta itī kālato niyamaḥ acī \ (11)*

Tr. There are three kinds of (pitch) accent: udātta, anudātta, and svarita. Among vowels short, long and pluta varieties are distinguished by their time (of articulation) [11].

Note 15. *Acī. Ac* meaning vowels is a pratyāhāra of Pāṇini. The *Yaj.* recension reads *P Ś.* 8 as its 23rd couplet.

Note 16. The *Prk.*, *Yaj.* and *Rk* recensions read the following couplet as the 11th, the 14th and the 2th respectively:—

*Udātte niśāda-gāndhārav anudātta ṛṣabha-dhaivatau \ svarita-prabhavāḥ hy ete ṣadja-madhyama-paṇcamāḥ \ (12) \*

12. Of the seven musical notes *niśāda* and *gāndhāra* can arise in the high pitch (udātta), ṛṣabha and dhaivata in the low pitch (anudātta), while
sadja, madhyama and pañcama have their source in the medium pitch (svarita).

This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (I. 8. 8) and seems to be original to it; for this work belonging to the Śāma Veda has a direct concern with an elaborate theory of seven musical notes. Besides this the fact that the couplet has been composed in the Āryā metre while the passages common to all recensions are in the Anuṣṭubh seems to create a presumption in favour of its spurious character with reference to the Ps. Its absence from the AP. as well as uncertain position in other versions probably strengthens this presumption. Hence this has not been included in the reconstructed text.

Aṣṭau sthanāni varṇānām uraḥ kaṇṭhah śīras tathā
dhāvā-mūlam ca dantāś ca nāsikōśthau ca tāku ca || (13)

Tr. The speech-sounds have eight places (of articulation): chest, throat, roof of the mouth (lit. head), root of the tongue, teeth, nostril, lips and palate [13].

**Note 17.** The RPr. and TPr. do not recognize any pure dental sound and they place most of the dentals at the root of the teeth and according to the RPr. urasya (lit. from chest) sounds are existent only in the opinion of others (I. 18). The other Prātiśākhyaśas admit dantā-mūla as an additional place of articulation (For details see the Table II).

**Note 18.** The Pañjikā does not comment on the two following couplets. They seem to be irrelevant in the position they occur in the AP., Prk., Yaj. and Rk recensions. But they occur in the Nār. S. (II. 5. 4. 9), Yv. S. (143-144) and Māṇḍ. S. (107-109) too.

O-bhāvas ca vivṛttiś ca śa-śa-sā repha eva ca
jīhvā-mūlam upadhmā ca gatir aṣṭa-vidhōṣmanah || 14 ||

Yady o-bhāva-prasandhānam ukārdī-param padam
svardāntam tādṛśam vidyād yad anyad vyaktam uṣmānāh || 15 ||

Tr. Uṣmans (spirants) have eight ways (of development) : change to o, hiatus, ś, ṣ, ṣ, r, jīhvāmūliya and upadhmāniya [14].
When a word ending in o (out of an āsman) is followed by another word beginning with u, the former should be considered as ending in a vowel coming from an āsman [15].

a. These two couplets, though probably not belonging to the Ps., seem to be very old. On the antiquity of the first (14), see B. Liebich, ‘Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft,’ II. § 22. The second couplet is not quite intelligible. Weber is willing to read akārādi against ukārādi of all MSS. (Ind. Stud. IV, p. 352).

b. The APr. according to its commentator recognizes four āśmans k, q, s and h (I. 81). The VPr. (I. 51). has also the same number. The TPr. adds χ and φ to these and has six (I. 9). The RPr. has recognized two more: h and m, making altogether eight āśmans (I. 10, 12). The reckoning of anusvāra as an āśman seems to be very strange.

Hakāram pañcamair yuktam antahsthaḥbhiṣ ca samyutam ।
aurasyam tam vijāniyōt kunthyaḥ āhur asamyutam ॥ (16)

Tr. When combined with nasal stops (lit. fifth ones) and semivowels, h should be known (as arising) from the chest; while h not so combined is said to be from the throat [16].

Note 19. This couplet stands in a wrong place in the Yaj. recension, and the Pañjikā has not commented on it. Besides this it is missing in some MSS. of the AP. Still we have considered it to be belonging to the original Ps. on the following grounds: (i) Ĉuras according to the Ps. 9 is a place of articulation for some of the speech-sounds, (ii) Indigenous Pali grammarians too have recognized some sounds as auras (Pali, orasa sounds; Minayeff, PGr. p. 2; Geiger, Pāli Lit. und Spr., p. 41), (iii) This couplet Ps. 10 occurs also in late Śikṣās such as the Lomāsī S. (V.9), the Varṇaratna-pradīpikā S. (26) and the Yv. S. (177). Considering the position of this couplet in these works it does not seem to be possible that it originally belonged to them. The RPr. (I. 18) and the RT (II. 3) too recognize urasya sounds.

Note 20. Antahsthaḥbhiṣ ca. Its feminine gender creates difficulty in construing this with ‘varpa’ (masc.) or ‘akṣara’ (neut.)
in the instrumental plural [understood]. This difficulty was felt by some redactor who changed the expression to antahsthaiś cápi. But the genuine original reading might well have been *anta*hsthebhiś ca, and the late redactor probably finding this Chândasa form unexplainable by the grammar of the classical Skt., which he thought to have been the language of the PŚ., changed it to antahsthiś ca and brought it within the control of the ordinary grammar, though the new difficulty which arose escaped his notice. The redactor of antahsthaiś cápi made it faultless and removed all trace of the assumed original.

Kanṭhyāv ahāv i-cu-yaśās tālavyā oṣṭhajā vu-pā | syur mūrdhanyā r-tu-ra-śa dantyā l-tu-la-sāḥ smṛtāḥ \( \text{(17)} \)
Jihvā-mūle tu kuḥ proktā dantyāṣhya vaṅ smṛto budhaiḥ | e-ai tu kaṇṭha-tālavyā o-au kaṇṭhāṣṭhajau smṛtau \( \text{(18)} \)
Ardha-māṭrā tu kaṇṭhyasya ekārākārayor bhavet | aikārākārayor māṭrā tayor viṁśta-saṁvartam \( \text{(19)} \)

Tr. A and h are throat sounds; i, cu (i.e., c, ch, j, jh and ñ) and š are palatals; u and pu (i.e., p, ph, b, bh and m) labials; \( r, tū \) (i.e., t, ṭh, d, dh and n) and š cerebrals; and l, tu (i.e., t, ṭh, d, dh and n) and s are dentals [17].
Ku (i.e., k, kh, g, gh and ñ) is uttered from the root of the tongue, and v is a denti-labial sound; e and ai are throat-palatal, and o and au are throat-labial sounds [18].

The throat element of e and o is half a māṭrā and of ai and au is (one) māṭrā; these two latter (i.e., ai and au) are open-close sounds (i.e., their first half or the a-element is open and the second half or i- and u-element is close) [19].

Note 21. At the time of the Prātiśākhyas the speech-sounds of the Old Indo-Aryan did not all retain the places of articulation which they had at the time of Pāṇini.
Table II.

Places of articulation for speech-sounds of the OIA as given in the PS. and the Prātisākhyaas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>uras</th>
<th>kaṇṭha</th>
<th>mūrdhan</th>
<th>jihvä-mūla</th>
<th>danta</th>
<th>danta-mūla</th>
<th>tālu</th>
<th>oṣṭha</th>
<th>kaṇṭha-tālu</th>
<th>kaṇṭha-oṣṭha</th>
<th>danta-oṣṭha</th>
<th>nāsīkā</th>
<th>nāsīka also</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS.</td>
<td>a, h</td>
<td>ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, ṭh, ṭ, dh</td>
<td>n, l, s</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>o, ch, j, jh, n, y, ś</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, φ</td>
<td>e, ai</td>
<td>o, au</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR.</td>
<td>a, h, ḍ</td>
<td>ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>o, ch, j, jh, n, y, ś</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, v</td>
<td>ai4</td>
<td>au4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPr.</td>
<td>ḍ</td>
<td>a, h, ḍ</td>
<td>ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>o, ch, j, jh, n, y, ś</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, φ</td>
<td>ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPr.</td>
<td>a, h, ḍ</td>
<td>ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>o, ch, j, jh, n, y, ś</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, φ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>c, au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPr.</td>
<td>ḍ</td>
<td>a, h</td>
<td>ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>o, ch, j, jh, n, y, ś</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, φ</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT.</td>
<td>ḍ</td>
<td>a, h</td>
<td>ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, ṭh, ḍ, dh</td>
<td>n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, ai</td>
<td>o, ch, j, jh, n, y, ś</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, φ, v</td>
<td>yamas, n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H in combination with n, n, o, n, m, y, r, l and v is pronounced in uras.
2 The PS. does not know any mūrdhanya l or lh. This sound is probably a later development due to Dravidian influence (See Introduction §529, 30).
3 The APR. does not mention the place of articulation of this sound. However the commentator informs us of its articulation.
4 See APR. I. 41. and its commentary on the same.
5 The RPr. says that h and b are aurasya according to others (I. 18). Probably the same authorities place r, l and s in vartaya (I. 20).
6 According to the RPr. Vedamitra is the authority who considers d, g, l and lh (usually known as cerebral l and lh) as the jihvāmūlya sounds (I. 21, 22).
7 The TPr. is silent about the places of articulation for vowels.
8 Ai does not appear in the sūtra 5 of RT, but it might be due to the corruption of the MSS. As this sound has not been discussed elsewhere in this work we are sure that it existed here.
For details of this variation see the Table II in which views of Prātiśākhyaḥs have been compared with that of the PS.

Among these, typical is the case of r and ṛ. According to the Prātiśākhyaḥs the first is velar, while they are not unanimous about ṛ. But Pāṇini considers ṛ to be cerebral (Siddheshwar Varma, op. cit., pp. 6-7). The fact that r and ṛ cerebralize, according to Pāṇini (VIII. 4.1) as well as the Prātiśākhyaḥs (RPr. V. 11, 20; VPr. III. 85; TPr. XIII. 6-7), the dental sounds that follow them, shows that these sounds were originally cerebral, and Pāṇini testifies in the original state rather than the Prātiśākhyaḥs which have ṛ as a dental or an alveolar sound.

Note 22. Cu. It indicates c, ch, j, jh and ū. Appending u to the first sound of the groups (vargas) of stop consonants for indicating all the five members is a Pāṇinian device used in the Aṭṭādhyāyī (anudit savarnasya odpratyayaḥ, I. 1. 69)1. Pu, tu, tu and ku have been similarly used.

Note 23. Ardha-mātrā tu, etc. This couplet (PS. 13) has suffered very badly in transmission, and its second half does not occur in the AP. Uvaṭa in his comments on the VPr. I. 73, has wrongly quoted its first half as ardhamātrā tu kanṭhasya aikārukārayor. It appears that the s a n d h y a k s a r a s (diphthongs) e and o having lost their diphthongal character in later times2 this couplet became unintelligible and gave rise to variants of perplexing nature. Weber’s reading kanṭhasyādikārūkārayor spoils the metre, but his conjectural emendation (in translation) of aikārūkārayor was a very happy suggestion and finds actual support from the Pañjikā (p. 18). His reading madhye e-ai for mātrā tayor however cannot be accepted, for it has evidently arisen due to a misunderstanding.

1 It is on the basis of Pāṇini’s use of pratyākāras that Dr. Paul Thiele makes the statement that “it is self-evident that the Aṣṭādhyāyī presupposes the Sīva Sūtras and the Sīva Sūtras presuppose the Aṣṭādhyāyī.....” (op. cit., p. 109). The PS. can well be substituted for the ‘Aṣṭādhyāyī’ in this remark.
2 See Note 1, in p. 64.
THE PĀÑINIYA SĪKṢĀ

All the sandhyakṣaras\(^1\) being long, consist of two mātrās (ṚPr. I. 16; VPr. I. 57; TPr. I. 35; APr. I. 61). Hence from PS. 13 we have the quantitative distribution of the two elements of e, o and ai, au as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{in } e (\leq a + i) & \quad a \text{ is } \frac{1}{2} \text{ mātrā} \quad \text{and } i \text{ is } 1\frac{1}{2} \text{ mātrā} \\
\text{,, } o (\leq a + u) & \quad a \text{,, } \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{,, } u \text{,, } 1\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{,,} \\
\text{,, } ai (\leq \ddot{a} + i) & \quad a \text{,, } 1^3 \quad \text{,, } i \text{,, } 1 \quad \text{,,} \\
\text{,, } au (\leq \ddot{a} + u) & \quad a \text{,, } 1 \quad \text{,, } u \text{,, } 1 \quad \text{,,}
\end{align*}\]

Note 24. The Ṛk recension reads the following couplet after PS. 12. This does not occur in the AP. and Yaj. recensions, and none of the two commentaries comment on it. Hence we have considered it to be spurious.

\textit{Samvrtam mātrikam jñeyam, vivṛtam tu dvimātrikam}$^1$
\textit{ghoṣā vā samvṛtāḥ sarve, aghoṣā vivṛtāḥ smṛtāḥ [[20]]}

Tr. A samvṛtā (close) sound is one mātrā long, and a vivṛtā (ope) sound is two mātrās long; voiced sounds are all samvṛtā while breathed ones are vivṛtā [20].

This couplet like other spurious couplets discussed above must be a borrowing from some unknown source. But the substance of the second half of the couplet occurs in the TPr. (samvṛt̓a-kaṇṭhe nādāh kriyate, vivṛte śvāsaḥ II. 4-6).

\(^1\) Wackernagel (I. § 39), does not admit that all e and o in OIA were \textit{originally} sandhyakṣaras, i.e., combination of two vowel sounds. His objection is based on e and o not arising out of actual sandhi in OIA. But the Vedic phoneticians in using the term evidently recalled the Indo-Iranian diphthongal character of e and o such as appears in Av. vásdā (Skt. vāda) and Av. zauthra (Skt. hōtra), as well as e and o arising from a combination of a with and u respectively.

\(^2\) The VPr. (I. 76) only among all the Prātiśākyas expressly recognizes the fact that ai and au have one mātrā for a and one mātrā for i as well as u. From the direction as to the production of ai and au given in the APr. (I. 41) it appears that this latter work too agrees with the PS. But as regards the pronunciation of e and o the APr. expressly says that they have only one place of articulation (I. 40) and hence we are to understand that at the time of this Prātiśākhyas, e and o no longer retained the trace of their diphthongal character which we see in the PS. 18. The VPr. is silent about the production of e and o. The ṚPr. in its attempt to describe their nature simply mystifies the issue (see XIII. 15-16) Hence it appears that the Prātiśākhyas in question are later than the PS.
TRANSLATION AND NOTES

Note 25. Next occurs the following couplet in the Ṛk and the Yajus recensions and it has been commented on in the Prakāśa commentary. But as it appears irrelevant in the present context and contains the term karaṇa which as we have seen before is a term of later origin than Pāṇini (see Note 12) we have considered this couplet to be spurious.

Svarāṇām uṣmanām cáiva viṁtam karaṇam śmrtaṁ \n\ntebhyo'pi viṁtāv evau tābhyām aicau tathāiva ca \n\n(21)

Tr. Vowels and sibilants are open in enunciation; e and o are more open than they, and ai and au are still more so [21].

Note 26. This couplet like other spurious ones must be a borrowing from some unknown source. The substance of the first half of the couplet is available in the APr. uṣmanām viṁtam ca, svarāṇām ca, I. 31. 32). But according to this Pratīṣākhyā, e and o as well as ā are the most open sounds (aikār’kārayor viṁtātamam, tuto’pykārasya I. 34. 35) and not ai, au as in the present couplet.

Anusvāra-yamanām ca nāsikā sthānam ucyate \n\nupadhmanīya uṣmā ca jihvā-mūliya-nāsihe \n\nayogavāhā vijñeyā āśraya-sthāna-bhāginaḥ \n\n(22)

Tr. Anusvāra and yamas have the nose for their place (of articulation); upadhmanīya, uṣman (i.e., visarjanīya), jihvāmūliya as well as nāsikyas (i.e. the anusvāra and yamas) are ayogavāhas and as such they share the place of articulation of sounds on which they are dependent [22].

Note 26a. The hemistich anusvāra-yamanām ca etc., does not occur in the Yaj. and the AP. recensions (see Introduction § 2). As anusvāra and yamas have been mentioned earlier in the PS. (1-2) we have to consider this as belonging to the original text.

Note 27. Anusvāra. The ‘anusvāra-nāsikyaḥ’ and ‘anusvāraḥ nāsikyaḥ’ seem to have been synonymous and probably the original name for anusvāra by which the TPr. (I. 34; II. 30; XVII. 1) understands only a nasal vowel. This meaning of the term was known to the author of Paṇjikā too. For he says svaram anu bhavati ity anusvāraḥ, ‘as it arises after the vowel it is (called) the anusvāra’ (5).
The term anusvāra-nāsikya has sometimes been shortened also simply as nāsikya or nāsika. But this shortening seems to have created some misunderstanding. For example, in the APR. (I. 26)\(^1\) and in the RPr. (I. 20) nāsikya has been used to denote sounds pronounced directly from the nose (i.e. yamas and the anusvāra)\(^2\) as opposed to anunāsikas (nasal stops)\(^3\) which are pronounced in the mouth as well as in the nose (APR. I. 27 and P. I. 1. 8). But in spite of such an use of nāsikya some interpolators and commentators of the Prātiśākhyas have taken anusvāra and nāsikya\(^4\) to be two different sounds (VPr. VIII\(^5\) 25, 27, 29; Uvaṭa on VPr. I. 74; Māhiṣeya on TPr. I. 18). But curiously enough in his commentary to the RPr. I. 20, Uvaṭa has explained nāsikya as the term including yamas and the anusvāra as well as nāsikya.\(^6\) Though the later writers on Vedic phonetics at times differed from him about the meaning of the term anusvāra, Pāṇini understood by this a nasalized vowel. For he explains the anusvāra as a nasal sound (PS, 14) and gives directions as to how it should be correctly produced (PS, 15b-16a). The term ‘nāsika’ which is used to denote a nasalized vowel in the Prātiśākhyas has also been used in the PS, (14b). Among the western philologists a controversy went on for some time about the correct pronunciation of anusvāra; but

---

\(^1\) The APR. never uses the term anusvāra. It is from the commentator that we learn that the nāsikya is equivalent to yama and anusvāra (see Whitney on APR. I. 26).


\(^3\) The TPr. sometimes takes nāsikya in the sense of yama alone (XXI. 12, 14).

\(^4\) The view that anunāsika is equivalent to a nasalised vowel arose probably from a confusion of this word with a somewhat similarly sounded term anunāsika (=nasality) as used in the Mahābhāṣya, gathāḥ triṇyās tathā paścāmā...adīśko guṇah (ed. Kielhorn, I, p 61, line 18, 99). Patañjali is clearly against such a view (see Note 2 above). Among the old authorities who seem at times to identify anunāsika with a nasal vowel is APR. (I. 53). But the relevant sūtra has probably been corrupt. TPr. once understands by anunāsika nasal stops and anusvāra (II. 30. See also III. 129; IV. 3, 9, 13, 51, 90; TPr. V. 26-28, 31; X. 11(?), XV. 1. 6; XXII. 14).

\(^5\) Weber considers this chapter of the VPr. as a later addition (oppost cit., p. 69).

\(^6\) ke te nāsikyāḥ? ity aṣyām apekṣyāṁ āha nāsikyā yamānuṣvārāḥ (ed. Sāmaśrami, p. 80).
among them all Whitney, in spite of the bewildering opinions of
the Prātiṣākhyaśas or rather the commentaries of such works,
could correctly guess the true pronunciation (on TPr. II. 30).
Wackernagel however considered him to be mistaken and
Thumb\(^3\) did not venture to give any opinion on the matter.

Note 28. Upadhmanīya ūṣmā ca etc. This hemistich does
not occur in the Ṛk and APr. recensions. Still, upadhmanīya and
visarga being mentioned in the PS, 2,\(^9\) we can reasonably
expect the treatment of their mode of articulation in the Sikṣā.
Hence we have considered this hemistich as a genuine part of the PS
(see Introduction, § 2b). One of the reasons why it came
to be ignored in the Ṛk recension is probably to be sought in
the varying later uses of the term ūṣman which in this context
surely means visarga\(^4\) or the final aspiration preceded by a vowel
(-ḥ). This term meaning visarga as well as final ḥ occurs in the
Ṛk Pr. (I. 22; II. 4). In the VPr. (I. 54), the APr. (I. 20),
the Ṛktantra (16) as well as in some other part of the ṚPr.
(I. 13) the term sōṣman has been used to indicate aspirated
stops. It seems that by the earlier acāryas visarga as well as
aspirated stops, due to their almost similar nature, was included
in the term ūṣman. Pāṇini, however, does not use this term
because in his grammar, his pratyāhāras evidently served the
purpose. By this term the TPr. however means ś, ś, s, h,
χ and φ (I. 9), and curiously enough the ṚPr. also means by the
term same sounds in I. 12; and in the Chapter VIII (considered
to be a late addition by Weber) of the VPr. we understand by
the term ś, ś, s and h (sūtra 22, ed. Weber).

Note 29. Ayogavāha. This term has been variously ex-
plained, and Weber felt a difficulty over its correct interpretation

\(^1\) Altindische Grammatik, Vol. I (§ 223), p. 237. In the opinion of Prof. Irīders the
anuvära of the TPr. is anything but a nasal vowel (see Die Vyāsa-Qikāhā, p. 51).

\(^2\) Handbuch des Sanskrit, § 54.

\(^3\) This couplet occurs in all the recensions of the PS, and must have formed a part
of the original work.

(op. cit., p. 354). According to the Pañjikā it means (15) na vidyate yogaḥ varṇāntarena yeṣāṃ ti ayogavāhāḥ: Those sounds which do not combine with other sounds are ayogavāhas. This definition does not convey any meaning to us. Uvaṭa says akārādinā varṇa-samāmnāycena samhitāḥ santaḥ etc vahanty ātmalabhāṃ prāṇuvanty ayogavāhāḥ (on VPr. VIII. 8): They are ayogavāhas because they attain their selves when combined with sounds like a (i.e. vowels). Similar is the view of the commentātor of the Pratijñā Sūtra on II. 1 (see Benares ed.). This explanation too does not satisfy us and seems to be rather fanciful. Patañjali who is earlier and more authoritative than the writers mentioned above defines the term as yad ayuktā vahanty anupadiṣṭāḥ ca śrūyante (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 28): 'Those sounds which are heard even though they have not been included in the Varṇa-samāmnāya (or the so-called Śiva-sūtras).’ Besides these there are other interpretations of the term by late authorities, but it will scarcely be of any use to discuss them. The explanation given by Patañjali can be followed without any scruple.

Alābu-vīnā-nirghosodanta-mūlyah svarānugah
anūsvāras tu kartavyo nityāṃ hroḥ śa-śa-seṣu ca // (23)

Tr. The anusvāra after the vowels not pronounced at the root of the teeth, should be made sonorous like the sound of an alābu-vīnā, but when it stands before h, ś, ś and s this pronunciation is compulsory [23].

Note 30. All the recensions except the AP. contain the above couplet. The anusvāra being a frequent sound in Vedas and the classical Skt. it appears very much likely that Pāṇini gave attention to it. Besides this for interpreting śaṣa-seṣu ca we must invoke the help of Pāṇini’s Paribhāṣā tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya (I. 1. 66). This also may be taken to show that this couplet belongs to the original PS.
Note 31. From this passage we derive a hint about an alternative pronunciation which the anusvāra had before stops. This alternative pronunciation has been provided for by Pāṇini in his grammar (anusvārasya yayi parasavarnāḥ, vā padāntasya. VIII. 4. 58,59)\(^1\) and it is equivalent to the pronunciation of what according to Prof. S. K. Chatterji is a ‘reduced’ nasal occurring also in the late Middle Indo-Aryan (op. cit., p. 360).

Note 32. Nirghoṣo’ danta-mūlya should be taken as nirghoṣo +adantamūlya.

Note 33. The next couplet occurs in the Rk recension only.

Anusvāre vivṛtyām tu virāme cākṣara-dvaye 1
dvīr oṣṭhau tu vigṛhṇiṣyād yatrādukārah vākārayoh \(\text{II (24)}\)

Tr. In the anusvāra, hiatus, virūma and double consonant the two lips should be separated as also in case of au and u [24].

Note 34. This couplet has been taken from the Lomaśī S. (III. 7) where it is fully relevant. The reading atraukāra in the Rk recension is evidently corrupt. Due to this corrupt reading Weber had a difficulty over the passage (op. cit., p. 361). The following couplet occurs next in the Rk recension. In the Yaj. it is no. 20. The Prakāśa comments on it though the Pañjikā passes over it, and some versions of AP. does not know it.

Vyāghri yathā hareṇ putrān damṛṭābhyaṃ na ca pīdayet 1
bhītā patana-bhedābhyaṃ tadbhav varṇān prayojayet \(\text{II (25)}\)

Tr. As the tigress carries her cubs between two (rows of) teeth taking care lest they should either be dropped or bitten, so should one pronounce the (Vedic) speech-sounds lest they should be dropped (i.e. elided) or differentiated (i.e. mis-pronounced) [25].

There is pun in the words patana and bheda. The fact that the couplet mentions the dropping of varṇas in the Vedic recitation shows that the upper limit to the date of the composition of the couplet is c. 200 B.C. when the

---

\(^1\) ‘The anusvāra followed by consonants other than \&, \& and \(\text{h}\) is changed to the savarna (homogeneous nasal sound) of the following sound; the possible homogeneous sounds in the above case are \(\text{h}, \text{t}, \text{r}, \text{n} \) and \(\text{m}\). This rule is optional when the anusvāra stands at the end of a word.’
tendency to drop intervocal stops as in the so-called Mahārāṣṭrī or the late phase of Sauraseni, was already beginning. This couplet occurs in the Yv. S. (195) and the Māṇḍūki S. (43) too. We are not sure whether it originally belonged to the Yv. S. or the Māṇḍ. S., but it is sure that the couplet did not form a part of the Pā. which may go back to a time earlier than 500 B. C. (see Introduction, § 36).

Note 35. The following couplet occurs next in the Rk recension and in the Yaj. recension it is no. 6. Of the two commentaries, only the Prakūśa touches it. AP. omits it.

Yathā Saurāṣṭrikā nāri takraḥ ity abhibhāsate
| evam raṅgāḥ prayuktavyāḥ khearaḥ iva khedayā || (26)

The couplet as it stands in the Rk and the Yaj. recension and in the Prakūśa seems to be corrupt. The true reading may be that of the Nār. S. The Māṇḍ. S. and the Yv. S. gives the couplet in a developed form. The purport of the couplet in all the above different forms is that raṅga is the nasalization of a vowel.

Note 36. Next occur the four following couples in the Rk recension only.

Raṅga-varṇāν prayuñjīrān no graset pūrvam akṣaram
| dīrgha-svaram prayuñjīyāt paścān nāsikyam acareṇ || (27)

Tr. In pronouncing the raṅga sound one should not swallow up the preceding sound; the preceding vowel should be uttered long and then the nasal sound should be uttered [27].

This couplet occurs in different Sikṣās. It is difficult to say where the couplet originally stood, but it is sure that it came in the Pā. from another source.

Hṛdaye caikamātras tu ardha-mātras tu mūrdhāni
| nāsikāyam tathārdham ca raṅgasyainā dvimātrāta || (28)

1 See the present writer’s ‘Mahārāṣṭrī, a later phase of Sauraseni,’ Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta, XXIII (1933).

In the Nār. S. (II, 4, 9) this couplet occurs with variants nāry drām ity, raṅgāḥ prayuktavyo Nāradasya matam yathā. In the Māṇḍ. S. (112) it occurs with the variants: nāri arā ity raṅgāḥ prayuktavyāḥ nākara-parivairjītā. The Yv. S. (100) however reads it almost like the Māṇḍ. S.

2 This couplet occurs in a slight different form in the Yv. S. (189) and the Lomāśi S. (I, 8). The Māṇḍ. S. 110 can also be compared with this.
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Hṛdayād utkate tiṣṭhan kāmsyena samanusvaran ।
mārdavaṁ ca dvi-mātraṁ ca jaghanvāḥ iti nidarsanam ॥ (29)

Tr. In the heart (i.e. chest) there should be one mātra and half a
mātra in the roof of the mouth and another half in the nostril. These
are two mātrās of a raṅga sound [28].

A raṅga sound rising from (lit. existing in) the heart (i.e. chest)
has a sound like that of the bellmetal (bronze), (and it has) softness and
is two mātrās long. Its example is jaghanvaḥ 2 [29].

Madhye tu kampayet kampam utbhau pārśvau samo bhavet ।
sarangam kampayet kampaṁ rathīvēti nidarsanam ॥ (30)

Tr. The kampa should be made in the middle and its two sides should
be made equal and the kampa should be accompanied by a raṅga. Its
example is rathīva [30].

Notes 37. The meaning of the passage is not clear. This couplet
appearing only in the Rk recension and not being relevant with couplets
which are undisputedly genuine we have considered it spurious. This, like
other spurious passages, occur probably in some text not yet brought to light.

Notes 38. Next occurs the following couplet which has not been
commented on in the Panjikā though other recensions include it.

Evam varnāḥ prayoktavyā nāvyaktā na ca pīditāḥ ।
samyag-varnaprasyogena brahma-loke mahīyate ॥ (31)

Tr. The speech-sounds should be pronounced like this. On uttering
them in the proper manner one attains elevation in the world of
Brahman [31].

Notes 38a. This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (II. 8. 31) and also in the
Mānd. S. (44) and might have originally belonged to any of these works.
It does not fit in with those stanzas of the PS. which occur in all recensions
and are undoubtedly genuine.

1 With the above couplet may be compared the Lomasī S. I. 7. This passage seems
to be corrupt.
2 This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (II. 4. 8) with some variation. In the Mānd. S.
(113) too this occurs in a varying form. Whatever be the true reading of the couplet it is
sure the PS. in its original form did not contain it.
Note 39. In the Yaj. recension the above couplet is succeeded by the following one:

Abhyāsārthe drutāṃ vṛttīṃ prayogārthe tu madhyamām
śisyānām upadesārthe kuryād vṛttīṃ vilambitām // (31a)

Tr. In memorizing the Vedas one should make his reading quick but in applying the same in rituals the recitation should be of medium speed, while at the time of instructing pupils, the Vedic passages should be recited slowly [31a].

Note 39a. This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (I. 6, 21) and Yv. S. (54) and in a slightly different form it occurs also in the Māṇḍ. S. (3). It seems that the couplet occurred originally in the Nār. S.

Note 40. The next six couplets occur in the Rk recension only. They are being taken up serially.

Gītī śūgṛt śīraḥ-kampī tathā likhita-pāthakah
Anarthajñō 'ipa-kanṭhaś ca saḍ ete pāthakādhamāḥ // (32)
Mādhuryam aksara-vaṃṭikā padacchedas tu susvarāḥ
dhairyaṃ laya-samarthaṃ ca saḍ ete pāthake guṇāḥ // (33)

Tr. Those who recite the Veda in a singsong manner, (too) quickly, with a nodding of the head, use a written text at the time of recitation do not know the meaning of passages read, and have a low voice, are six kinds of bad reciters. Sweetness, clearness, separation of words, right accent, patience and ability to observe time are six merits in a reciter [32-33].

Note 40a. These two couplets occur in the Yv. S. (198-199) and seem to have occurred there for the first time.

Śāṅkitam bhītam udghuṣtam avyaktam anunāsikam
hāka-svaram śirasigam tathā sthāna-vivarjītam // (34)

Note 41. In the Nār. S. (I. 3. 11-12) this couplet together with another enumerates the fourteen faults of the Vedic chant. A translation of the two couplets are given below.

Shyness, fear, extreme loudness, indistinctness, undue nasalisation, repressed tone, undue cerebralization, non-observance of the places of articulation (in general) and (proper) accent [34], and
harshness, creating undue separation between words, uneven tone hastiness, want of due palatalisation: these are the fourteen faults in the Vedic chant.
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Note 41a. These two couplets occur also in the Yv. S. (26-28) but they relate there to faults of recitation (pātha-dosa) instead of the faults in chant (gīti-dosa) of the Nār. S. But as the couplets in this latter work have been preceded by the expression bhavanti cā' tra ślokāḥ they are surely quoted there from some earlier work. It is probable that the couplets in question occurred in the Yv. S. first.

Upāmsu dasṭām tvāritam nirastām
   vilambitaṁ gadvaditaṁ pragitam 1
nispiditaṁ grasta-paddākṣaram ca
   vaden na dīnam na tu sānunāsyam 1 (35)
Prātaḥ patheṇ nityam uraḥ-sthitena
   svareṇa śārdula-rutōpamena 1
madhyan-dīc kāṇṭha-gatena caiva
   caikrāhu-saṃkujita-sannibhenā 1 (36)
Tāram tu vidyāt savane tṛṇye
   śiro-gatam tac ca sadā prayojyam 1
mayūra-hamsānyabhṛṭa-svarāṇām
   tulyena nādena śiraḥ-sthitena 1 (37)

Tr. One should not recite a Vedic passage in under-tone, between one's teeth, quickly, haltingly, slowly, with a hoarse voice, in a sing-song manner, with repressed voice, omitting (occasionally) words and syllables and in a plaintive voice [35].

In the morning (the Vedic student) should read (mantras) with a voice from the chest, which should be (as deep-toned) as the growl of a tiger. In the midday he should read it with voice from his throat, which should be like that of a caṅkavāka. In the third savana (i.e. the evening offering) he should recite it in the highest pitch from the roof of his mouth and his voice should be like that of a peacock, goose or cuckoo [36-37].

Note 41b. These couplets occur also in the Mānd. S. (41-42) but we are not sure whether they originally belonged to this work.

Aco'sprṣṭā yanas tv iṣan nema-sprṣṭāḥ śalah smṛtāḥ 1
   sesāḥ sprṣṭā halāḥ proktā nibodhānupradānataḥ 1 (38)
Tr. The vowels are without touch, semi-vowels slightly touched, ś, ṭ and s are half-touched sounds, and the remaining consonants are touched (i.e. stops) [38].

Note 42. The "degree of touch in this connexion is with regard to the cavity of the mouth or rather the space between the two parts of the mouth which touch or approach each other before speech-sounds are produced.

\[\text{Na}^\text{mo}^\text{'} \text{ anunāsikā nahro nādino ha-jhasah smṛtāḥ |}
\text{iśan-nādā yan-yasāś ca śvāsinas tu kha-phādayah | (39)}
\text{Iṣac-chvāśāṃśe caro vidyād gor-dhāmaitat pracakṣate |}

Tr. Naṃ (i.e. ň, ņ, m, ņ, and n) are produced through nose, and h except when it is combined with r ; and jhas (i.e., gh, jh, dh, dh, bh) are voiced, semivowels (y, r, l, v) and jas (i.e., j, b, g, d, d) slightly voiced, the group beginning with kh and ph (i.e., kh, ch, ṭh, ṭh and ph) breathed, car (i.e., k, c, ṭ, t, p) slightly breathed. This has been called the basis of speech [39-40a].

Note 43. The hemistich 39a seems to have created difficulty from very early times. The Pañjikā (19) explains the passage first with the reading HaNo and this seems to be the right reading. The second reading discussed in it could not have been original in spite of its quoting Saunaka's Rk-Prātiṣākhya.

Note 44. In the Amoghanandini, S. 40, we have ḫakāro rephasanyukto nādir bhavati nityaśah: 'h combined with r is always as a voiced sound. The true nature of the nahro has not been marked by the author of the Pañjikā. He seems to have been misled by a wrong apprehension of the testimony of the Amoghanandini S.

Note 45. The terms nādi, iśunnāda, śvāśi, iṣac-chāsa stand for voiced aspirate, voiced non-aspirated, unvoiced aspirate, unvoiced non-aspirated respectively. The term iśan-nāda
practically mean having śvāsa as well as nāda or ubhayātmaka i.e., śvāsa-nāddimaka. Hence in the RPr. (XIII. 2) we have terms like śvāsa, nāda and śvāsa-nāda. The TPr. (II. 9) however uses śvāsanāda in case of ha-kāra and seems to describe it as a sound midway between voiced and unvoiced (II. 6) and at the same time calls it voiced (I. 13).

Note 46. The following couplet occurs in the Yaj. recension (38). The Ṛk recension gives only the first half of it.

Dākṣiputraḥ Pāpinir yasanēdāṃ vyāhṛtam bhūvi ॥ (40)
ratnabhūtam idam śāstrāṃ prthivyāṃ samprakāśitam (40a)

Tr. By Pāpinī, the son of Dākṣiṇī, who has promulgated in this world this science which is as it were a jewel, has also revealed it to the world (for the first time) [40-40a].

Note 46a. The PS. has been called the mūlāgama in the Indian tradition (S. Varma, op. cit., p. 5). This spurious verse which may be very old seems to follow this. There is scarcely any doubt about the importance attached to phonetics by the ancient Hindus. Patañjali too stresses the importance of the subject in the following terms: tobhyas tatra sthāna-karaṇānu-
pradānajñobhyo vaidihā sadā upadiśyante (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 5). 'Those who are acquainted with the places of articulation and manner of adjusting vocal organs accordingly were taught the Vedic text.'

Note 47. The following nine couplets occur in the Ṛk recension only:

Chandah pādau tu vedasya hastau kalpo’tha paṭhyate ।
ijotisāṁ ayaṇaṁ ca kṣur niruktam śrotam ucyate ॥ (41)
Śikṣā ghrāṇaṁ tu vedasya mukhaṁ vyākaraṇaṁ smṛtam ।
tasmāt sāṅgam adhītyāda vṛddhimahe mahīyate ॥ (42)

Tr. (First) Metrics which is the two legs (of the Veda) is read and then the Kalpa which is its two hands. The Science of the Movement of luminaries (Astronomy) is its eyes, and the Nirukta is called its ears; the Śikṣā is the nose of the Veda, and Grammar is its mouth. It is for this reason that one studying the Veda with all its limbs (i.e. accessory studies) attains a high position in the realm of Brāhmaṇ [41-42].
Udāttam ākhyāti vrṣo'ṅgulīnāṁ
pradeśinī-mūla-nivīṣṭa-mūrdhāḥ
upānta-madhye svaritam dhṛtas ca
kaniṣṭhikāyāṁ anudattam eva

Tr. The top of the thumb when held at the root of the index finger indicates the udātta tone, and held at the middle of the ringfinger (upānta or last but one) and at (the middle of) the little finger it indicates respectively svarita and anudatta [43].

Udāttam pradeśinīm vidyāt pracayam madhyato'ṅgulīm
nihatam tu kaniṣṭhikyāṁ svaritōpakananiṣṭhikāṁ

Tr. The index finger should be known as the udātta, the middle finger pracaya, the little finger as nihata and the ringfinger as svarita tone [44].

Norns 47a. These two couplets have not been traced in any available Sīkṣā.

Antōdāttam ādyudāttam udāttam anudattam nīca-svaritam
madhyōdāttam svaritam dvvudattam tryudattam
iti nava-pada-sagyā
dagā somah pra vo vīryam haviṣāṁ
svar Brhaspatir Indrā-Brhaṣpati

Tr. There are nine kinds of accents in padas: antōdāta, ādyōdāta, udāta, anudatta, nīca-svarita, madhyōdāta, svarita, dvvudāta, tryudāta. Examples of these are Agniḥ, Somaḥ, pra, vo, vīryam, haviṣā, svah, Brhaṣpatiḥ, Indrā-Brhaṣpatiḥ, (Agniḥ, Somaḥ, pra, vo, vīryam, haviṣā, svār, Brhaṣpatiḥ, Indrā-Brhaṣpatiḥ) [45-47].

Norns 47b. This passage with slight variation occurs in the Nār. S. (II. 7. 6. 6) and seems to be quite relevant there. It is almost certain that the Rk recension took it from there.
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Anudātto hṛdi jñeyo mūrdhny udātta udāhṛtaḥ |
svaritaḥ karna-mālīyaḥ, sarvāsyāḥ pracyaḥ smṛtaḥ ॥ (48)

Tr. Anudātta is to be known in the chest (lit. heart), udātta at the root of the ear, and pracya in the entire mouth.

Notes 47c. This passage has not been traced in any of the available Siksās. Perhaps it has been taken from some Ś which has not yet come to light [48].

Cāsas tu vade te mātrāṁ dvi-mātrāṁ tv eva vāyasah |
sikhī rauti tri-mātrāṁ tu nakulas tv ardhā-mātrakam ॥ (49)

Tr. The cāsa gives out one mātrā and the crow two mātrās, the peacock three mātrās and the mongoose only half of a mātrā [49].

Notes 47d. This passage occurs in the Lomāśi S. (VIII. 9), the RPr. (XIII. 20) and with slight variation in the Yv. S. (15-16) and in the Mānd. S. (188), but it seems to have occurred first in some of the Siksās and not in the PS.

Notes 48. The following two couplets occur in the AP., Rk and Yaj. recensions, and the Prakāśa comments on them.

Kutirthād āgataṁ dagdham aparavānam ca bhaksitam |
na taṣya parimokṣo’sti pāpāher īva kilviṣāt ॥ (50)
Sutirthād āgataṁ vyaktam svāmnāyam suvyavasthitam |
suvareṇa suvaktreṇa prayuktam brahma rājate ॥ (51)

Tr. In the repetition of that which has come from a bad ācārya, that which is indistinct (lit. burnt), mispronounced, from the faulty text there is no deliverance from its demerit as from the snake-like sin [50].

But in repeating with good accent and voice (lit. mouth) that which has come from a good ācārya, and is distinct, from the good text and is well established, the Veda shines [51].

Notes 48a. These two couplets occur in the Nār. S. (II. 8. 10, 11) and the Mānd. S. (160, 159). It seems that they occurred for the first time in the Nār. S.

Notes 49. In the Yaj. and AP. recensions the following couplets occur after the passages given above.

Na karālo na lambāṣṭha na rīvyakto nānunāsīkāḥ |
gadgado baddhajīhavs ca prayogān vaktum arhaṁ ॥ (51a)
Tr. One ought not to repeat mantras with teeth shown, lips unduly protruded and with indistinct, unduly nasilised and half choked-up voice and immobile tongue [51a].

Note 49a. This couplet occurs in the Nś. (II. 8. 12), the Māṇḍ. S. (156) and the Yv. S. (25). It seems to have occurred originally in any of these.

Note 50. The following couplet occurs in the Rāk recension and the Ṛṣṭ comments on it. Though the Prakāśa quotes it we are not sure whether the author reads it in the text of the Sīkṣā. (For further notes on this point see below.)

*Mantro hīnāḥ svarato varṇato vā
mithyā prayukto na tam arthām āha ।
sa vāg-vajro yajamānaṁ hinasti
yathāndrasaṭruḥ svarato 'parādhāt ॥ (52)*

Tr. A mantra uttered either with a defective accent or pronunciation is badly done and it does not carry the proper sense. And it is like a thunderbolt of speech and kills the yajamāna just as 'Indraśatraḥ' did on account of its wrong accent [52].

Note 50a. This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (I. 1. 5) and the Amoghanandinī S. (122). Besides this the couplet occurs in the Mahābhāṣya with a variant duṣṭāḥ sabāh for mantra hīnāḥ (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 2).

Note 51. The following couplet occurs next and in the Rāk recension only.

*Avāksaram anāyuṣyam visvaram vyāḍhi-pūjitam ।
akṣatā(ṛa?)-sastra-rūpena vajraṁ(?) patati mastake ॥ (53)*

Tr. (When a mantra is) deficient in a syllable it tends to diminish life, and (when it is) lacking in proper accent it makes the reciter troubled with illness, and the syllable (wrongly treated) will strike one at the head as a thunderbolt [53].

Note 51a. This corrupt couplet has not been traced anywhere. It may be a late composition in imitation of the preceding couplet.

Note 52. The two following couplets occur next in the Rāk recension and there only.

*Hasta-hīnam yo'dhīte svara-varṇa-vivarjītam ।
Ṛg-Yajuḥ-Sāmabhīr dagdho viyonim adhigacchati ॥ (54)*
Hastena vedan yo'dhite svara-varnārtha-samyutāṁ

Ṛg-Yajuk-Sāmabhīk pūtō brahma-loke mahīyate

Tr. If anybody reads (the Veda) without a show of hands and does not observe proper accents and places of articulation Ṛk, Yajus and Śāman burn him and (on death) he attains rebirth as an inferior animal [54].

And a person who reads the Veda with a show of hands, observes proper accent and places of articulation and knows the meaning of what he reads is purified by the Ṛk, Yajus and the Śāman and is placed high in the realm of Brahman [55].

Note 52a. These two couplets with slight variation occur in the Yv. S. (40. 44) and the Māṇḍ. S. (31-32, 33-34). It is possible that the Ṛk recension has adapted them from any of these.

Note 53. The two following couplets occur in the Yaj. and the Ṛk recensions and have been commented on by the Pāṇjikā and the Prakāśa:

Saṃkaraḥ saṃkarīṁ prādād Dākṣī-putrāya dhīmate
vāṁmayebhyāḥ samāhṛtya devīṁ vācām iti sthitīḥ

Tr. Drawing the divine words from the entire domain of speech (vāṁmaya) Saṅkara gave this, his science (Saṃkarīm) to the wise son of Dākṣī. This is its basis [56].

Homage to that Pāṇini who having received the traditional lore of speech-sounds (Varṇa-samāmnāya) from Śiva has told us the entire grammar [57].

Note 53a. These two couplets do not occur in the AP. rec. and 57 is wanting in the Prk. As to the authorship of the so-called Sivasūtras, which is clearly mentioned in them, there is a great divergence of opinion. But it is possible that even if Pāṇini was not their author he was at least responsible for their present form (for details see Introduction, §§ 12-15).

Note 54. The two following couplets occur in the Ṛk recension only:

Yena dhauta giraḥ punsāṁ vimālaṁ sabda-vāribhiḥ
tamaś cājñānajam bhinnam tasmai Pāṇinaye namah-

Tr. Drawing from the entire domain of speech sounds (vāṁmaya) Pāṇini gave this, his science (Pāṇinī) to the wise son of Dākṣī. This is its basis [56].

Homage to that Pāṇini who having received the traditional lore of speech-sounds (Varṇa-samāmnāya) from Śiva has told us the entire grammar [57].

Note 53a. These two couplets do not occur in the AP. rec. and 57 is wanting in the Prk. As to the authorship of the so-called Sivasūtras, which is clearly mentioned in them, there is a great divergence of opinion. But it is possible that even if Pāṇini was not their author he was at least responsible for their present form (for details see Introduction, §§ 12-15).

Note 54. The two following couplets occur in the Ṛk recension only:

Yena dhauta giraḥ punsāṁ vimālaṁ sabda-vāribhiḥ
tamaś cājñānajam bhinnam tasmai Pāṇinaye namah-

Tr. Drawing from the entire domain of speech sounds (vāṁmaya) Pāṇini gave this, his science (Pāṇinī) to the wise son of Dākṣī. This is its basis [56].

Homage to that Pāṇini who having received the traditional lore of speech-sounds (Varṇa-samāmnāya) from Śiva has told us the entire grammar [57].

Note 53a. These two couplets do not occur in the AP. rec. and 57 is wanting in the Prk. As to the authorship of the so-called Sivasūtras, which is clearly mentioned in them, there is a great divergence of opinion. But it is possible that even if Pāṇini was not their author he was at least responsible for their present form (for details see Introduction, §§ 12-15).

Note 54. The two following couplets occur in the Ṛk recension only:

Yena dhauta giraḥ punsāṁ vimālaṁ sabda-vāribhiḥ
tamaś cājñānajam bhinnam tasmai Pāṇinaye namah-

Tr. Drawing from the entire domain of speech sounds (vāṁmaya) Pāṇini gave this, his science (Pāṇinī) to the wise son of Dākṣī. This is its basis [56].

Homage to that Pāṇini who having received the traditional lore of speech-sounds (Varṇa-samāmnāya) from Śiva has told us the entire grammar [57].

Note 53a. These two couplets do not occur in the AP. rec. and 57 is wanting in the Prk. As to the authorship of the so-called Sivasūtras, which is clearly mentioned in them, there is a great divergence of opinion. But it is possible that even if Pāṇini was not their author he was at least responsible for their present form (for details see Introduction, §§ 12-15).

Note 54. The two following couplets occur in the Ṛk recension only:
Tr. Homage to that Pāṇini who has washed off the human speech with pure water of words and has pierced through the gloom of ignorance [58].

Homage to Pāṇini who has opened with the collyrium pencil of knowledge the eyes of people blind with ignorance [59].

Note 54a. These two couplets, have not been traced in any available Sikṣā, but the second one seems very much to be an adaptation of the opening śloka of a not very old tract called the Guru-gitā. In the latter work we have Śri-gurave for Pāṇinaye.

Note 55. The next couplet occurs in the Yaj. and the Rk recensions and both the commentaries have touched it. But AP. does not contain it.

\[ \text{Trinayana-mukha-nihsṛtām imām} \\
\quad \text{ya iha paṭhet prayataḥ sadā dvijah} \\
\quad \text{sa bhavati pāṣu-putra-kārtimān} \\
\quad \text{sukham atulam ca samaśnute divi divēti} \parallel (60) \]

Tr. Those among the twice-born who always devoutly read this (work) which has come out of the mouth of Śiva (lit. three-eyed one) obtains cattle, progeny, fame and will attain happiness in heaven [60].

Note 56. This couplet again ascribes the whole work to Śiva, though from some of the spurious couplets we have already learnt this. But the fact that this work goes in the name of Pāṇini and not in that of Śiva—in which case it would have had a name like the Saiva or Śiva Sikṣā, seems to give strong grounds for considering this story as an apocryphal one.
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ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

Page xii  Line 23  for and  read before
   24  ,, it  ,, the Yaj

xvi  9  ,, re  ,, re-
   19  ,, more than  ,, nearly
   22  ,, omit twenty
   26  ,, eleven  read ones
   29 after the fullstop read:

In his commentary to the PS. (Benares, Sāmvat 1990) Pandit Kāliprasād Miśra thinks that Rk. 31, 37, 48, 54 and 55 are spurious (p. 27), while another recent editor Pandit Rudraprasād Sarmā in his commentary to the same work (Chowkbamba, Benares, 1937) considers Rk. 28, 33, 34, 44, 54 and 55 to be spurious (see his comments on these).

xx  line 18  for was  read were

xxii  6  ,, following  ,, following

xxiii  11 from the bottom

   for lie  ,, lies

xxvi  footnote line 2

   ,, 3  ,, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

xxix  ,, 9 for (op. cit.)  ,, svaraśo

   (Pañini and the Veda, p. 109).

xxx  ,, 1 after Sāyaṇa  ,, (Introduction to the Rgveda-bhāṣya, ed. Peter Peterson p. 56).

xxxiv  line 2  ,, (op. cit., p. 12).

xxxviii  footnote last line  ,, 4. contra

xxxix  line 16  for the Pr.  ,, the TPr.
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

85

Add to the footnote 3 the following:


Page xlix line 12 after Pingala read:

Misra evidently under the influence of the commentary Śikṣāprakāśa ascribes the PŚ. to Pingala (pp. 1 and 27). Tripāṭhī too does the same (p. 30). Sarmā however refutes the view and quotes Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in his support (p. 23).

Last line after the fullstop add: See also Mangal Dev Shastri, RPr., Vol. III, Appendix III (pp. 329-44).

lvii line 24 after the fullstop add: See Mangal Dev Shastri, RPr., Vol. III, p. 141.

lviii Add to the footnote 2 the following:

It came to my notice afterwards that Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣita ascribes the Rktantra-vyākaraṇa to Audavraji. In his Śabdakaustubha he writes: तथा ऋक्तन्त्रव्याकरणस्य छान्तीभन्दुः लघुस्य प्रभुता चौदशरजिरपि प्रस्तुतयत् अनन्तान्यसंयोगि मधे यम: पूर्ववेश गुष्य इति (Chowkhamba ed., p. 113).

lxii-lxvi for Hemistiche read Hemistichs

9 line 9 for गिरञ्जः ,

" 6 " जाता ,

10 footnote 5 read ‘omit’

11 line 14 

12 , 15 

footnote 5

13 , 5 

15 line 16 

17 footnote 7

30 line 14 for हक्कां ,

41 , 13 " यमोकार ,

42 , 12 " श्रीलं
Tripāṭhī suggests that dviḥ-sprṣṭah and not duḥ-sprṣṭha is the correct reading and quotes the Varnaratna-Pradīpikā (15) to support this view (pp. 5 f.). Sarmā contradicts him and considers the reading of the passage in the printed text (in the SS.) of the work to be defective (see p. 4). Misra refers to the above-mentioned passage and quotes another view which reckons weakly pronounced y and v as duḥṣprṣṭa (p. 4). The ĀPr. (XIII. 3) however takes y, r, l and v as duḥṣprṣṭa, but Dr. Mangal Dev Shastri translates duḥṣprṣṭa-karana as imperfect contact (p. 95 of his ĀPr., Vol. III).

Add the Note 15 the following:

Udāṭta, anudāṭta and svarita arise from the peculiar conditions of the body called āyāma, viśrambha and ākṣepa respectively. For the definition of these terms see Misra, p. 7.

Add to the Note 17 the following:

Sarmā considers the reading nāsikoṣṭhau to be wrong and corrects it to nāṣikaunṣṭhau (p. 7). The grammatical objection raised by him against the accepted reading is valid but the laxity in this matter may be an original feature of the text which was written in the Chāndasa style (vide Introduction, 26).

Made from the bottom read ‘ukārdi param padam.’

1 for (out of ṣman) is followed by read:

due to sandhi (prasandhāna) is followed (in pausa) by.

For coming read: but in other cases the final o is

7 after second couplet insert: in its present form.
Page 63 Line 12 after the fullstop read: See Miśra on the couplet 18 (p. 10).

line 6 from the bottom, after the fullstop add:

Miśra has very intelligently ascertained the correct reading (see p. 11, ll. 18-19). Tripāṭhī too has correctly taken ekaraikārayor as the correct reading but his interpretation of the passage is misleading (p. 11, ll. 1 ff.).

64 line 15

read vivṛta (open).

,, 21 add after the fullstop the following:

Miśra thinks that the sanvṛta sound mentioned in this couplet relates to half e and half o (i.e., short e and short o) and refers to Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya (pp. 11 f.)

line 6 in the footnote read i and u respectively.


Last line, add the following:

As Śarmā comments on the Ṛk. recension (p. 10) he feels a difficulty about the interpretation of the passage and invokes the authority of the Sābdaratna but such a difficulty does not arise when we read upadhmāṇiṇya, etc., between the two hemistichs of Ṛk. 22,

66 line 14 after ‘nāsikya’ add:


line 4 from the bottom omit T Pr.

,, 3 from the bottom, add the following:

See also Mangal Dev Shastri, op. cit., pp. 143-44
(Notes on p. 20)

67 line 4 after the fullstop add:

But in this matter Macdonell follows Whitney; see ‘A Vedic Grammar for Students,’ §§ 10f. 29b, 39.
Page 68  

last line add the following:

The Alābu-vīnā used in modern Indian music was probably invented after the Gupta period, but this should not bring down the date of the above passage. For Alābu-vīnā mentioned in this passage was in all likelihood a very primitive instrument like our modern ekatāra or one-stringed vīnā quite different from its late development the modern vīnā. Its very crudity speaks for its great age.

69 line 12 read ‘dvīr oṣṭyau’ and ‘yathaukārau.’
,, ‘20 for does ,, do
,, 21 ,, ‘damśtrābhyaṃ’

70 2 after the fullstop add the following:

From what Miśra says we understand that patana (dropping) of letters means spirantizing them and bheda (or differentiating) is de-aspiration of them (अन्तोवाञ्चेन-चारणि वषों सुत्का भवति न सम्यग चव्यता: सन्ति ककारोवें खकारो वा। न च प्रवीचोचारखेन वेन खकारोवेषि ककारवेत् प्रतीयते (p. 15).

line 4 from the bottom read ‘arāḥity’ and ‘raṅgāḥ’
,, 3 from the bottom ,, Miṇḍ.

71 ,, 14 add the following:

MSS. read samau bhavet. But this is grammatically wrong. Hence we tentatively read samo. Miśra explains this as an ārṣa usage (p. 17).

line 6 from the bottom, add the following:

Tripāṭhī explains pīḍita as ‘pronounced with more breath which lengthens short vowels’ (p. 17).

72 line 19 read recitation,
,, 24 add the following:

Tripāṭhī explains ‘likhita-pāṭhakah as one reading from a book written by oneself’ and alpakaṇṭha as ‘one
who has not practised recitation' (p. 18). So does Sarmā (p. 14) and besides this he considers the couplet No. 33 to be spurious (loc. cit.).

_74 line 5_ from the bottom _read_ the place of.

Pag _line 2 for ś, ś and s read ś, ś, s and h._

,, _12 Insert; (semicolon) after nose and_ , (comma)

_after_ r.

74 line 8 from the bottom _read_ the following:

_rephasamyukto_ nādir, etc.

_7 line 7_ from the bottom _read_ always as an unvoiced sound.

_lines_ 6-4 _omit_ 'He seems to have......of the Amogha-

_nandini_ Sikšā.'

75 _line 9 read_ Pāninir yas tenedam'

76 _line 14, add the following:

Sarmā considers the couplet No. 44 to be spurious (p. 18).

77 _line 5 ff_ _cancel_ the Note 47c and _read_ the following:

_This passage with a slight variation occurs in a_ late work named the Svarāśṭaka Ś. by one Ananta (see SS., p. 365. Tripāṭhi, p. 25).

78 _line 6 for_ the Pñj. _read_ some MSS. of the Pñj.

,, _8 after the fullstop read:_{

_The original Pñj. probably did not contain this_ (see p. 22, line 6).

79 _12, add the following:

Miśra considers couplets 54 and 55 to be spurious (p. 27) and so does Sarmā (p. 21).

**
ADDITIONAL CORRIGENDA

Page vi  lines 1 and 3 for London read Lund
xxii  line 21 for 700 B.C. read 500 B.C.
lii  ,, 4 from the bottom, for concludes read suggests,
    ,, last, read p. clxvii
liii  ,, 13 insert as if before sitting
55  lines 21-23 omit The translator of.......indefensible.