MÁNAVA-KALPA-SÚTRA;

BEING A PORTION OF THIS ANCIENT WORK ON VAIĐIK RITES,

TOGETHER WITH

THE COMMENTARY OF KUMÁRILA-SWÁMIN.

A FAC-SIMILE OF THE MS. NO. 17 IN THE LIBRARY OF HER MAJESTY'S HOME GOVERNMENT FOR INDIA.

WITH A PREFACE

BY

THEODOR GOLDSTÜCKER.

LONDON: N. TRÜBNER AND CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

BERLIN: A. ASHER AND CO.

ALBERT CORN AND DANIEL COLLIP.

MDCCLXI.
TO

RUDOLF VIRCHOW,

THE GREAT DISCOVERER AND DEFENDER OF SCIENTIFIC TRUTH,

THIS BOOK IS INSCRIBED

AS A TESTIMONY OF RESPECT AND ADMIRATION,

BY HIS AFFECTIONATE FRIEND,

THEODOR GOLDSTÜCKER.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Original Manuscript of the Fac-simile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Fac-simile traced by Miss Amelia Ratzenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contents of the Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contents of another Manuscript of the Mānas-Śaṅkha-Śūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Commentary of Kumārila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Connection between the Kalpa-Śūtras of the Taityāya-Saṅhitā and the Mānas-Śaṅkha-Śūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Author of the Mānas-Śaṅkha-Śūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Date of this work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literary and Chronological Questions Concerning Every Work of the Vaidik Literature, and Therefore Bearing on the Present Ritual Book**

- Professor Müller holds that the art of writing was not yet known in India when Pāṇini lived, or according to him, about 350 B.C.; and that there is not a single word in Pāṇini's terminology which presupposes his knowledge of writing. 46
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Definition of the word Śūtra  21

*Note.*—Objection to the promiscuous use made in Professor Müller's quotations, of the Śūtra of Pāṇini and the commentaries on them. Objection to his statement concerning the instances to Pāṇini's Grammar  22

- Probable origin of the Śūtra Literature  25
- Oscillations of Professor Weber caused by the word grāntaka. Doubts of Professor Müller concerning the occurrence of this word in Pāṇini. Meaning of this word  27

*Note.*—The nursery book Śakabrandya is considered by Professor Weber to be an epic poem and a forerunner of the Rāmāyaṇa  28

Needlessness of the doubts of Professor Müller in reference to the word grāntaka  29

*Note.*—Critical means of ascertaining whether a Śūtra of Pāṇini be genuine or not. Uncritical assertions made by Dr. Boehtlingk on this subject, in his reprint of the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini. Only three or four Śūtras out of 3996 do not belong to Pāṇini  50.
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IN THE PREFACE:

Page 15, line 1 of note 12, P. 21, 1. 13, P. 36, 1. 16, before “da-kéra,” insert “tha-kéra, P. on VII. 4, 46.”

Page 61, 1. 6 of note 62, P. 100, 1. 4 of note 114, P. 105, 1. 14 of note 120, P. 112, 1. 14 of note 130, P. 210, 1. 11, P. 227, 1. 14, P. 229, 1. 10 of note 296, P. 252, 1. 11, 12,

not to understand the Veda, such as it was current,
not to obtain that understanding of the Veda which was current.

FOR

Prátiśākya, Prátiśākya,
Pádāryāvikālībdhyam. Pádāryāvikālībdhyam.

READ

I (Kár. 1. a. 8)

Káśīvikālībdhyam
Káśīvikālībdhyam
avatāhī—
avatāhī—

Bhā: Pūjā

not to understand the Veda
not to obtain that understanding

IN THE FAC-SIMILE:

[In several copies only some of the following errata will be met with.]

FOR

P. 9 a, 1. 5, P. 10 b, 1. 9, P. 25 a, 1. 7, P. 27 a, 1. 6, P. 28 a, 1. 1, P. 30 a, 1. 8,

READ

Bhā: Sita

Bhā: (i.e. Sita)

P. 47 b, 1. 4, P. 47 b, 2. 4 and 5, P. 48 a, 1. 10, P. 51 b, 1. 7, P. 57 b, 1. 6 (last word), P. 59 a, 1. 5, P. 61 b, 1. 1, P. 74 a, 1. 3 (last word), P. 75 a, 1. 4, P. 76 a, 1. 6 (last syllable), P. 79 a, 1. 10,

P. 89 a, 1. 8, P. 94 b, 1. 10, P. 97 b, 1. 5, P. 98 a, 1. 2, P. 98 b, 1. 4 (last word), P. 103 a, 1. 1,

P. 103 b, 1. 9 (last syllable), P. 104 b, 1. 5 (last syllable), P. 106 a, 1. 3, P. 114 b, 1. 1, P. 114 a, 1. 3, P. 117 b, 1. 8,
WHEN collecting materials for a History of the Mīmāṃsā philosophy, I happened to find in the Library of the East India House a Manuscript (No. 17), formerly belonging to the collection of Mr. Colebrooke, which bore on its outer page the remark: “समेद्धेनार्थमात्रयं ९२०,” (i.e., “the number, of 32 syllables, in this commentary of Kumārela on the Rigveda is 2,200”), and ended on leaf 120 with these words: “प्रथंतर्कम् समारं ९२० प्रथमार्थमात्रयं समारं” (i.e., “the number, of 32 syllables, in the book is 2,200; end of the Commentary of Kumārela”).

The remark of the title, which differs in its handwriting from the rest of the book, seems to have been made by a Hindu, who, with much exactness, counted the number of the syllables for the copying of which he had to pay his scribe; but it certainly did not come from one conversant with Sanskrit literature. Nor can a better opinion be entertained of the Shaikh who finished copying this volume—“Samwat 1843 (or 1586 after Christ), when the sun was progressing south of the equator, in the autumn season, during the light fortnight of the month Kārttika (October-November), in the city of Benares, for the perusal of Devayika (Devakiya?), the son of Jāni and Mahidharn”—or of the writer of his Manuscript,—since the Shaikh professes to have copied the latter with the utmost accuracy, faults and all;—for neither were the contents of this volume a commentary on the Rigveda, nor would a learned man have mis-spelt several words, and very common ones, too, of his own composition, and, above all, the name of one of the most celebrated authors of India. In short, the Manuscript in question contained no other matter than a portion of the Mānava-Kalpa-Sūtras, together with a commentary of Kumārila-Swāmin, the great Mīmāṃsā authority.
A discovery of this ritual work, which had thus remained latent under a wrong designation, would at all times have been welcome to those engaged in the study of Vaidik literature; it gained in interest from the facts that a doubt had been raised, I do not know on what grounds, whether a copy of it had survived, and that a commentary of Kumára on these Sūtras, had, so far as my knowledge goes, never yet been spoken of in any European or Sanskrit book.

It was but natural, under these circumstances, that I should think of making the knowledge I had obtained generally available, by editing this manuscript; but, to my utter disappointment, I soon perceived, after having examined it in detail, that it belonged to that class of written books, the contents of which may be partially made out and partially guessed, but which are so hopelessly incorrect that a seeming restoration of their text would require a greater amount of conjecture than could be permitted to an editor, or might be consistent with the respect due to the author of the work itself.

When, therefore, another copy of the Mánava-Kalpa-Sūtras with the Commentary of Kumára was not to be procured, and when I began to surmise that the volume in the possession of the East India House was a unique copy of this rare work, I resolved, with the consent of Professor Wilson, to have a facsimile of it lithographed and printed. This resolution was strengthened by the consideration that even a correct text of these Sūtras would be serviceable only to the few scholars who are familiar with this branch of the oldest Sanskrit literature, and that they would be able, by the aid they might get from other existing Sūtras on the Vaidik ritual, and the Mīmāṁsā works, to turn to account even this incorrect manuscript, in spite of the many doubts it leaves. It was strengthened, too, by the conviction I entertain, that unique manuscripts, or those which are rarely met with,—every existing copy of which consequently possesses a literary value much exceeding that of ordinary manuscripts,—ought to be saved from possible casualties by mechanical contrivances, the most practical of which, as
answering the requirements of the case and entailing the least expense, seems to be that which has been used in the production of the present fac-simile.

I must, however, confess that after several disappointments in trying to secure the necessary aid, I should probably have been compelled to abandon my plan, had I not been able to avail myself of the assistance of a talented young lady, Miss Amelia Rattenbury, who, while devoting herself to the study of Sanskrit, came to my rescue, and, with much patience and skill, accomplished the tracing of the original.

Her work may, indeed, in some parts, be still open to criticism, so far as the exact thickness of the letters on a few pages is concerned, or if some shortcomings, especially those which are noticed in the Errata, be too much insisted upon; but I must in fairness state that several omissions of Anuswāras or strokes, as pointed out in the Errata, are not her fault, but the result of accidents which occurred in transferring the fac-simile to stone; and such defects could not, it would seem, have been wholly avoided, notwithstanding the careful attention which was paid to the work by the lithographic printers, Messrs. Standidge and Co., and I may add, in spite of the great trouble I took myself in revising the proofs on the stones, and in thus combining the work of a Sanskritist with that of an apprentice in lithography. Several sheets which failed to show distinctly some Anuswāras or parts of the letters themselves, though transferred to the stone and originally visible there, I cancelled at once; but this expeditious process became, by frequent repetition, so little convenient, that I had to submit at last, though reluctantly, to a list of Errata which, however small, seems to be at variance with the notion of a fac-simile.

On the whole, however, and after this censure, the severity of which, I trust, no one will see occasion to increase, I must express my belief, that the text which is laid before the reader is, when amended by the aid of the Errata list, not merely a thoroughly correct representation of the contents of the special manuscript from which it is copied, but, at the
same time, a good specimen of a fac-simile of a Sanskrit manuscript. 1

Of the work itself I have but little to say, for the Sanskrit scholars who will take an interest in it are well acquainted with the general characteristics of those ritual books which bear the name of Kalpa-Sūtras, and they know, too, that the Mānava-Kalpa-Sūtras teach the ceremonial connected with the old recension of the Yajurveda, the Taittiriya-Saṁhitā. The portion of these Sūtras contained in the present fac-simile comprises the first four books of the whole work: the first or Yājñavāla book, in two chapters (from fol. 1 to 54 a, and 54 b to 55 b); the second on the Agnyādāna book (from fol. 55 b to 84 b); the third on the Agnihotra (from fol. 84 b to 106 a); and the fourth on the original has the appearance of having been smeared or powdered over; and this carelessness, caused no doubt by putting the leaves together before the writing was dry, has produced in several instances the errors of the fac-simile, especially as it became sometimes difficult or even impossible to tell whether a dot represented an original smaareas or a smear. I have to mention, besides, that the leaves of the original are bound so as to read downwards, and that the same arrangement has been preserved in the present work in order not to allow it to deviate from the appearance of its modern prototype. There is good reason, however, to suppose that the ancient Hindus had the leaves of their MSS. arranged so as to read in the reverse or upward direction. For one liberty which has been taken in the fac-simile, I am personally answerable. The remark on the outside page, mentioned above, with its mis-spelling of the name of Kumārila and its literary error, will not be found in this volume; its place is filled by the likeness of the god of literary accuracy who is invoked in the commencement of the work.

1 It is necessary to observe that the original, in its actual bound condition, measures 94 inches in length and 33 inches in breadth, with the exception of fol. 82 which is 4 inches broad. The surplus of margin in the fac-simile belongs, therefore, to the latter. The binder, in reducing the leaves of the original to the size stated, has in various instances encroached upon the writing, and cut away either portions of letters or even whole letters; which circumstance will account for the defects in the marginal additions of, especially, fol. 1, 3 a, b, 5 a, 11 a, 12 a, 13 a, 14 a, 25 a, 26 a, 29 a, 33 a, 34 a, 48 a, b, 50 b, 52 a, 53 a, 54 a, 58 a, 60 a, 61 a, 62 a, 66 b, 68 a, 70 b, 74 b, 80 b, 81 a, 86 a, 89 b, 107 a, 108 a, 113 a. Another destructive animal, the white ant, has also added to the work of devastation in the interior of the MS., but much more rarely; on the margin of fol. 16 a two strokes (==) indicate the eaten portion. Towards the end of the MS., especially from fol. 90 upwards, the
Chiturmāya sacrifices, in six chapters (from fol. 106 a to 108 a, from there to the end of fol. 109 a, from 109 b to 112 a, from there to 113 a, from 113 a to 115 a, and hence to the end). That these books are the first portion of the Māṇava-Sūtra results not merely from the matter treated in them, but also from a fact which accidentally came to my cognizance after the printing of the present volume had been completed.

Professor Müller, who is engaged in writing a history of
Vaidik literature, had met among the MSS. of the East India House, which he consulted for his labour, one (No. 599) which bore at its end the intimation of being a part of the Mánava-Sótras; and when he showed me the MS., I saw at once that it was written by the same writer who had copied the original of the present fac-simile, in a similar, though smaller and less elegant, handwriting, and immediately after he had copied the first four books. For he states himself in his closing words...
that he finished copying "the fifth part of the Agnishtoma book of the Māṇava-Sūtra, Samvat 1643 (or 1686 after Christ), when the sun was progressing north of the equator, in the winter season, during the light fortnight of the month Pauṣa (December-January), on the fifteenth lunar day, in the city of Benares"; and the next syllable, immediately succeeded by a blank in the MS., makes it probable that he wrote this portion, too, for the perusal of the son of Mahādhara. His conscience, however, seems to have been more sensitive regarding the accuracy with which he had performed his task, at the end of the Agnishtoma portion, than it was before, since he makes a very touching appeal to the indulgence of the reader, and

Māṇava-kalpa-sūtra.

is even modest enough to count himself amongst the scribes of limited intellect.\(^1\)

The contents of this latter manuscript, viz., the description of the Agnishtoma rites in five Adhyāyas,\(^4\) now, too, explain the meaning of the concluding words of our MS. (fol. 120 b):

\(^1\) I subjoin a literal copy of the last page (37) of this MS. with all the faults, which will give some idea of the unhappy fate of these Māṇava-Sūtras in the hands of their ignorant transcriber: चायचुऽ पुत्रम् इति। तामसे चिष्टि चस्मा। चदि न नृम्रां न नृम्रां न

\(^4\) Whether the work which is mentioned in the Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. at
the gloss of Kumārila, but, though it is possible to understand the purport of his comment, it would be a fruitless task to try to construe from it the full detail of the text, since much of the latter is left unnoticed, as requiring, apparently, no gloss.

The interest connected with the present volume centres, therefore, chiefly in the commentary of Kumārila, and in the fact itself that it is this great Mīmāṃsā writer who composed a commentary on the Māṇava-Sūtras of the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā. For, since in Sanskrit literature, commentaries on works which involve scientific convictions or religious belief were, as a rule, written by those alone who shared in these convictions or meant to defend this belief, it is a matter of significance that this celebrated representative of the Mīmāṃsā doctrine, who lived before Śaṅkara, the commentator of the Vedānta-Sūtras, had attached his remarks to a Sūtra belonging to the Black-Yajus School.

Benares, p. 118, under the title श्रेष्ठव्याख्यातिपाठ्यालय (No. 2263) be the same as the Agṇiṣṭhoma portion of the Māṇava-Sūtras, I have had no means of ascertaining. The same Catalogue records the existence of the माण्डलप्रकाश (p. 78, No. 701), but without naming the Commentary of Kumārila.
That this circumstance cannot be accidental is rendered probable by collateral facts. Kumárla quotes on two occasions (fol. 14 a and 85 b) the opinion of Śabara-Svámí on passages in the Sútras, and as it is not the commentary of this author on the Jaimini-Sútras to which he refers, his quotation can only imply that Śabara had composed, besides, a gloss either on the Mánava-, or on other Sútras of the same school. Śabara, however, is, like Kumárla whom he preceeded, one of the principal authorities of the Mímánsá philosophy. Mádhava also, the commentator on the Vedas, who may be considered as the last writer of eminence on the Mímánsá, composed or indited a commentary on another Sútra work of the Taittiriya-Sahihí, the Sútra of Baudháyana. Of commentators on other Sútras of the Black-Yajur-veda I do not speak, since they have not attained a prominent rank among the Mímánsists. But it ought not to be left unnoticed, on the other hand, that neither the Kalpa works connected with the Rígveda, nor those belonging to the Sáma-, or White-Yajur-veda, had commentators who, at the same time, wrote Mímánsá works.

It would seem, therefore, and I shall have to advert to this point in detail in a more appropriate place, that the Kalpa-Sútras of the Taittiriya-Sahihí represented or countenanced, more than other Kalpa-Sútras, the tenets and decisions of the Mímánsá philosophers.

This intimate connection between the two will enable us, then, not merely to remove all doubt, if any exist, as to the identity

---

1 I may mention, on this occasion, other quotations made by Kumárla. He speaks several times of other Sákhás, without, however, specifying them (fol. 9 b, 17 a, 33 a, 38 b, 41 b, etc. etc.), once even of a Krúmákhá (fol. 50 a); of older teachers (Párváchárya, fol. 43 b—44 a, 83 a, Vírëdbiháchara, 119 a), of the Vártaka Sútras (fol. 75 a, 204, 129 b), the Bháshyakára, who is probably the same as Śabara (fol. 115 a), the Brahma-bháshyakára (fol. 60 b, 63 a, 75 b), the Gíhyabháshyakára (fol. 60 a), the Hárítabháshyakára (fol. 75 b); he names the Bhavicháda (20 a, 23 b); the Yajurveda (fol. 9 a and 6), and Yajurvedilík (fol. 12 b, 67 a), the Káthaka (fol. 9 a, 90 b), the Taittiriya (fol. 90 a, 61 b, 86 b), a Bráhmana (fol. 114 b); and the Sámyaveda (fol. 9 b); Mauna is usually called by him Sátvakára or Sátraká (e.g. fol. 43 b, 71 b, 75 b, etc., 20 a, 82 a, 85 b, etc); other authors of Sótras, Sótrakára or Sátrakrátas (fol. 38 a, 77 b).
of the author of the present commentary with the author of the Vārttikas on the Jaimini-Sūtras,—even if this identity were not proved by the peculiar style of Kumārila’s composition, by his writing alternately in prose and śloka, by his pithy remarks, and his strong expressions; but it will throw light, too, on the nature of the commentary itself.

It is not a commentary in the ordinary sense, merely explaining obsolete or difficult words, and giving the meaning of the sentences; it is often nothing else than a regular discussion and refutation of divergent opinions which were probably expressed in other Kalpa works. And the constant use it makes of current Mīmāṃsā terms, in their Mīmāṃsā sense, such as apūrva, paramāpūrva, uha, bāda, to which may be added also, vidhi, anuvāda, arthavāda, puruśārtha, kratvārtha, bheda (mantrabheda, vākyabheda), on account of the frequent application these latter words find in the Mīmāṃsā writings,—impresses on the discussions of Kumārila the full stamp of a Mīmāṃsā reasoning.

There is one fact which deserves special mention, though it has only an indirect bearing on the present work. In the Sūtras, I. 3, 10-12, Jaimini treats of the question whether the Kalpa works have the same authority as the Veda or not; in other terms, whether they must be ascribed to divine or to human authorship, and decides in favour of the latter alternative. Kumārila, in his Vārttikas on this chapter, gives instances of the works of several authors which would fall under this category; he names, in the course of his discussion, the Sūtras of Baudhāyana, Varāha, Māsaka, Aśvalāyana, Vaijavāpa, Drāhāyana, Lātyāyana, Kātyāyana, and Ápastamba; but though his “et cetera” imply that he did not intend to give a complete list, it is certainly remarkable that he should not have named the Mānava-Sūtras, which he has commented upon, more especially as he makes reference to the Dharmasāstra of Manu.

Śābara, also, his predecessor, who mentions, in his Bhāṣya on the same Sūtras of Jaimini, the Māsaka-, Hāṣṭika-, and Kaupāṇīya-Kalpa-Sūtra, does not speak of the Mānava. And, to conclude, the same omission strikes us in the Jaiminiya-nyāya-mālā-vistara of
Mádhava, who names the Baudháyana-, Ápastamba-, Áśvaláyana-, and Kátyáyana-Kalpa-Sútras, but makes no allusion to our work.

It may be, and it even is probable, that Kumárilá wrote his gloss on the Mánava-Kalpa-Sútra after he had finished his Várttikas on the Sútras of Jaimini. But this circumstance alone cannot account for the omission of this Kalpa work from his Várttikas, nor does it offer any explanation of the general silence in regard to it of the other renowned writers on the Mímánásá philosophy.

I believe that the reason for this silence must be sought for in the decision of Jaimini, and in the legendary character of Manu, the reputed author of our Kalpa work. At the time of Śábara, Manu was no doubt already viewed by his countrymen in the same light in which he appears in the Dharmasastra that bears his name but professes distinctly not to be the immediate work of Manu himself, and, consequently, could be safely alluded to. This mythical character, however, of Manu results from the legends connected with a personage of this name in the Śatapatha-Bráhmaṇa and the Rigveda itself. To prove, therefore, on the one hand, that the Kalpa-Sútras are human work, and to hold before the reader's eye the name of an individual who, if less than a god, was, at all events, believed to be more than a man, would have been a proceeding which might either have shaken the conviction which it was intended to produce, or tinged the doctrine of the propounders with a hue of heresy which certainly neither Śábara, nor Kumárilá, nor Mádhava meant to impart to his commentary. Probably, therefore, it appeared safer to evade this awkward illustration of the human character of a Sútrakára, and to be satisfied with instances of a more tangible and less delicate kind.

From our point of view, however, and I conclude from the point of view of the Mímánásists themselves, there is no reason to doubt that a Manu, the author of the present Sútras, was as much a real personage as Baudháyana and the other Sútrakárás who were never raised to a superhuman dignity. I can no more
see a valid argument for doubting the existence of this Manu, because his name would mean, etymologically, "a thinking being, a man," and because mythology has lent this character to the father of the human race, also called Manu, than there would be for doubting the real existence of the Brāhmaṇa caste, merely because they ascribe their bodily origin to the Creator of the World. And as to the name of Manu (man) itself, it does not seem more striking or even more strange than other proper names in the Vaidik time; than, for instance, the proper names Prāna, life; Eka, one; Itarā, or Anyatarā, either of two; Pancha, five; Saptān, seven; Ashtān, eight; Śīras, head; Loman, hair; Vindu, drop, etc.

To assign a date to the Māṇava-Kalpa-Sūtras, even approximately, is a task I am incapable of performing; though, judging from the contents of this work, it may seem plausible to assert that they are more recent than the Sūtras of Baudhāyana and older than those of Āpastamba. But I have not any means of ascertaining when these latter works were composed.

It may not, however, be superfluous to add that they were either younger than Pāṇini or, at least, not so much preceding his time as to be ranked by him amongst the old Kalpa works. For in an important Sūtra of his grammar he states that the names of old Kalpa works are formed with the affix ā, and it follows therefore that none of the works of this kind, which are likely to be still in existence, and amongst them the Māṇava-Kalpa-Sūtras, are, from Pāṇini’s point of view, old Kalpa works.7 And when I express the opinion that there is no tenable ground for assigning to Pāṇini so recent a date as that which has been given to him, viz., the middle of the fourth century before Christ, but that there is on the contrary a presumption that he preceded the time of the founder of the Buddhistic creed,—I have advanced as much,

7 Pāṇini, iv. 3, 105. This Sūtra is comprised under the head rule iv. 3, 101, which extends as far as 111. In the gloss on some of these Sūtras the Kālika, the Siddhik, and the Calcutta Pañjītīs who composed or compiled the printed commentary, have introduced the word यथोत्ति in addition to बोधन, I hold, arbitrarily,—since it is neither indicated by the head rule, nor met with in the Mahābhāṣya.
or as little, as I believe, can be safely advanced on the date of the present Kalpa work.

After the foregoing lines were written I received Professor Max Müller's "History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, so far as it illustrates the primitive religion of the Brahmans (1859)." To acknowledge the merits of this work, which shows the great importance of the religious development of India; to acknowledge the light it throws on the obscurest parts of Hindu literature, and the comprehensive learning it has brought to bear on many an intricate topic connected with the rise and progress of Hindu grammar, law, and theology, must be the first and not the least gratifying feeling of every one interested in Sanskrit, and more especially in Vaidik philology. The greater, however, this new claim of the editor of the Rigveda to our gratitude, the more does his work impose on us the duty of examining, among the topics of which it treats, those which seem to require additional evidence before they can be considered as having attained a definite settlement. I take advantage of this opportunity, therefore, to re-open the discussion on two points, which seem to me to fall under this predicament, especially as they concern every work of the Vaidik literature, and equally bear on the present ritual book. I mean the question of the introduction of writing into India, and the general question of the chronology of Vaidik works.

Müller's view on the first of these questions is contained in the following words (p. 524): "If writing came in towards the

---

*Müller's History, p. 497—534. This chapter is reprinted in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (No. ii, 1859), with the following note which became my first inducement to treat the matter on this occasion: "This paper is an extract from a work now in the press on the history of ancient Sanskrit literature. Professor Müller has sent it for the Society's Journal in the hope of eliciting some fresh information from European or native scholars in India on the interesting questions which it discusses."

The same, pp. 244, 313, 435, 572.
latter half of the Sûtra period, it would no doubt be applied at the same time to reducing the hymns and Brâhmaṇas to a written form. Previously to that time, however, we are bound to maintain that the collection of the hymns, and the immense mass of the Brâhmaṇa literature, were preserved by means of oral tradition only; and (p. 507): “But there are stronger arguments than these (viz., the arguments alleged by him, pp. 497-507), to prove that, before the time of Pâñini, and before the first spreading of Buddhism in India, writing for literary purposes was absolutely unknown. If writing had been known to Pâñini, some of his grammatical terms would surely point to the graphical appearance of words. I maintain that there is not a single word in Pâñini’s terminology which presupposes the existence of writing etc.”

Müller maintains, therefore, that not merely before the time of Pâñini, but to Pâñini himself, writing was unknown; and as according to his view, “Pâñini lived in the middle of the fourth century B.C.” (pp. 245, 301 ff.), it would follow that, according to him, India was not yet in possession of the most useful of arts at the time when Plato died and Aristotle flourished.

I must confess that I could not, and cannot, look upon this assertion otherwise than as a splendid paradox, which, it is true, makes up for its want of power of convincing by the ingenuity of the defence with which it is supported, and the interest which may be derived from the extraneous matter it has brought to its aid; and, had I happened to read this chapter before the rest, I should probably have thought that the idea of conceiving India without reed and ink until, or after, Pâñini’s death, did not originate with Müller before the close of his learned work, and then only that he might crown, as it were, its merits by some extraordinary feat. But though justice requires me to admit that such is not the case,—that, on the contrary, the same opinion pervades the earlier por-

10 This period extends, according to his views, from 600 to 200 B.C. (p. 244).

11 This date will be the subject of ulterior remarks.
tions of his book, I must still say that it does not seem to have taken root in his mind with that strong conviction which produces an impression on others, for it appears psychologically doubtful that an author, having that conviction, could even metaphorically speak of the "prayer-book" of the Hotri (pp. 187, 473), or say that Kātyāyana, whom he defines as "the contemporary of Pāṇini" (p. 138, and elsewhere), "wrote in the Bhāṣya" (p. 158), "wrote the Vārttikas" (p. 148), "writes in prose" (p. 229), or that he could call the Śūtrakārās "writers of Śūtras" (p. 215).

No one, I believe, will easily imagine a civilized people who at the time of the Mantras (the period prior to that of the Śūtras and Brāhmaṇas), were such as to possess "arts, sciences, institutes, and vices of civilized life, golden ornaments, coats of mail, weapons of offence, the use of precious metals, of musical instruments, the fabrication of cars, and the employment of the needle . . . . . . the knowledge of drugs and antidotes, the practice of medicine, and computation of the divisions of time to a minute extent, including repeated allusions to the seventh season or intercalary month" . . . and again, "laws of property," "laws of inheritance, and of simple contract, or buying and selling,"—having a civilization which Professor Wilson characterizes in the preface to his excellent Translation of the Rigveda (vol. ii., p. xvii), as "differing little, if at all, from that in which they were found by the Greeks at Alexander's invasion,"—no one, I believe, will easily imagine a people in such a state of civilization unacquainted with the art of writing, though no mention of this art

---

14 Ibid. vol. iii. p. xvii.
be made in the hymns to the gods. And is it really plausible that even 600 or 700 years later, the greatest grammarian of India composed a most artificial and most scientific system of grammar, utterly ignorant of the simplest tool which might have assisted him in his work? Should it be possible to realize an advanced stage of social development without a knowledge of writing, then it is needless, of course, to refer to the arts, sciences, measures, and coins mentioned in the Sūtras of Pāṇini; yet I will advert, within the limits of these preliminary remarks, to one fact, at least, which it may be as well not to overlook.

We know from Herodotus that Darius, the son of Hystaspes, subdued the Hindus, and we have inscriptions of this king himself which tell us that amongst the nations subdued by him were the Gadara and Hidhu or the Gandhāras, and the peoples living on the banks of the Indus. Could Pāṇini, therefore, who was a native of Gandhāra, had he lived after Darius, as Müller supposes to be the case, have remained ignorant of the fact that writing was known in Persia? And if not, would he not, in composing his work, have profited by this knowledge, provided, of course, that he was not acquainted previously with this art, independently of his acquaintance with the Persian alphabet? This question is answered, however, I believe, by a word which is the subject of one of his special rules (IV. 1, 49), the word yavanāṇa, explained by Kātyāyana and Patanjali as meaning the "writing of the Yavanas." Both Weber and Müller mention this word, the former as meaning "the writing of the Greeks or Semites (Ind. St. I. p. 144), or, as he later opines, of the Greeks alone (IV. 89); the latter (p. 521) "a variety of the Semitic alphabet, which, previous to Alexander, and previous to Pāṇini, became the type of the Indian alphabet." It would seem to me, that it denotes the writing of the Persians, and probably the cuneiform writing which was known already, before the time of Darius, and is peculiar enough in its appearance, and different enough from the alphabet of the

\[iv. 44: \text{μετὰ δὲ τούτων περιπλανοῦντας \text{Ινδοὺς τε κατατρέγας πολιτείαις, etc.}}\]

\[\text{Compare Lassen's Ind. Alterth. i. 422; ii. 112, 113, and the quotations given there.}\]
Hindus, to explain the fact that its name called for the formation of a separate word.

While I intend to address myself now to the special arguments offered by Müller, for the theory that writing was unknown to Pāṇini, I find myself, as it were, arrested by his own words; for, after having proposed his reasons in support of this theory (from page 497 to page 520), he makes the following remark on the word *lipikara*, "a writer or engraver," which I quote in full:—"This last word *lipikara* is an important word, for it is the only word in the Sūtras of Pāṇini which can be legitimately adduced to prove that Pāṇini was acquainted with the art of writing. He teaches the formation of this word, iii. 2, 21." Whether it is the only word which can be legitimately adduced for such a proof, I shall have to examine. But even on the supposition that it is, I must really question the purport of the whole discussion, if Müller himself admits that Pāṇini would have pointed to this word *lipikara* had it been his task to defend himself against the imputation of being ignorant of the art of writing.

For it becomes obviously immaterial whether the word *lipikara* occurs once or a hundred times in the Sūtras,—whether another similar word be discoverable in his Grammar or not; one word is clearly sufficient to establish the fact, and to remove all doubt. This admission of Müller, which upsets all he has tried to impress upon our minds, is doubtless very creditable to his candour; for it shows his wish to elicit the truth, and fully confirms our faith in what he says at the end of his essay: "It is possible I may have overlooked some words in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, which would prove the existence of written books previous to Pāṇini. If so, it is not from any wish to suppress them." But since he has not even tried to invalidate by a single word the conclusion which necessarily follows from this admission, it would be like carrying owls to Athens if I endeavoured to prove what is sufficiently proved already by himself.

Nevertheless, I will do so; not only out of respect for his labour, but because the observations I am going to make may tend to show that there is much more evidence in Pāṇini than
this solitary word for the assumption that he was not merely conversant with writing, but that his Grammar could not even have been composed as it is now, without the application to it of written letters and signs.

The chief argument of Müller is a negative one: the absence of words which mean book, ink, paper, and the like. Thus he says of the Vaidik hymns (p. 497): "Where writing is known, it is almost impossible to compose a thousand hymns without bringing in some such words as, writing, reading, paper, or pen. Yet there is not one single allusion in these hymns to anything connected with writing;" or (p. 512) "If we take the ordinary modern words for book, paper, ink, writing, etc., not one of them has yet been discovered in any Sanskrit work of genuine antiquity." I do not think that such an argument, in its generality, can ever be held to be a conclusive proof. It is not the purpose of the Vaidik hymns to tell us that pen and ink were known to the Áryas; it becomes, therefore, entirely a matter of chance whether so prosaic an object be mentioned in them or not,—whether the poets borrow their figures from paper and book, or from the life of the elements. The very instances Müller has adduced from the Psalms will probably leave in every one's mind the impression that these songs might easily have existed, without any damage to their reputation, even if they had not contained the three verses which bespeak the scholarship of their authors; and the book of Job too, if it had not that literary longing which is contained in Müller's happy quotation: "Oh that my words were now written! oh, that they were printed in a book!" But what applies to poetical songs, avails with still greater force in a grammatical work. Páṇini's object is to record such phenomena of the language as are of interest from a grammatical point of view. Sometimes the words which belong to his province, will be at the same time also of historical and antiquarian interest; but it does not follow at all, that because a word of the latter category is omitted in his rules, it is absent

12 Not even lipi?
DIVISIONS OF SANSKRIT WORKS.

from the language also; the extreme conclusion would be that it is a word of no grammatical interest; and this conclusion itself, to be correct, would imply that Pāṇini was a perfect author, and did not omit any word or words which ought to have been noticed by him on grammatical grounds.

"There is no word," says Müller, "for book, paper, ink, writing, etc., in any Sanskrit work of genuine antiquity" (p. 512). Of lip, "to write," I need say no more, since it is the base of lipi. I agree with him that the verbs adhi or vach (in the caus.) which are used in the sense "to read," contain no proof of their applying to a written work, since the former means literally "to go over mentally, to acquire," and the latter "to cause to speak." 18 I am equally willing to admit that the divisions of literary works which are frequently met with, such as anuvākas, praśnas, mandalas, -pathas, vargas, sūktas, etc., cannot be compared with such words as "volumen, a volume, liber, i.e. the inner bark of a tree; or βιβλιον, i.e. βιβλιον, the inner bark of the papyrus; or book, i.e., beech-wood" (p. 515). But I cannot admit that there is no word of genuine antiquity meaning book, or division of book, which cannot be compared with those latter words of the cognate languages. One word is indeed supplied by Müller himself, at the end of his essay; it undoes, as it were, all that precedes on this subject, in the same way as lipikara undid his arguments against Pāṇini's acquaintance with writing.

After the words I have quoted above, "if so, it is not from any wish to suppress them," he continues (523): "I believe, indeed, that the Brāhmaṇas were preserved by oral tradition only, but I should feel inclined to claim an acquaintance with the art of writing for the authors of the Sūtras. And there is one word which seems to strengthen such a supposition. We find that several of the Sūtras are divided into chapters, called pātalas. This is a word never used for the subdivision of the Brāhmaṇas. Its meaning is a covering, the surrounding skin or membrane; it is also used for a tree. If so, it would seem

18 Thus Pāṇini himself says, V. 2, 84.
to be almost synonymous with ἱβαρ and βῆλος, and it would mean book, after meaning originally a sheet of paper made of the surrounding bark of trees." But he seems to have entirely overlooked—no doubt on account of its common occurrence—the word kāṇḍa, which is the name of a division of the Taittiriya-Saṁhitā and -Brāhmaṇas, not to speak of the frequent application it has found at a later period in denoting chapters of ritual books, or ritual books themselves, such as kāmyeshṭi-kāṇḍa, kāmyāpasu-kāṇḍa, pauroḍhaka-kāṇḍa, āgnyya-kāṇḍa, haupta-kāṇḍa, adhvaryu-kāṇḍa, yajamāna-kāṇḍa, sattra-kāṇḍa, etc. And kāṇḍa, before meaning book, means "the part of the trunk of a tree whence the branches proceed,—a stalk or stem;"—it is, therefore, a fair representative of our word book. But, if such is the original purport of paṭula, and of the more frequent kāṇḍa, I cannot conceive on what grounds Müller finds his doubt (p. 513) of paṭtra meaning the leaf of a book, in works of genuine antiquity, since paṭtra means, originally, the leaf of a tree, and since palm-leaves, even now, bespeak the use which has been made of them for literary purposes. For, though Urvāśi writes her amatory letter on a "bitch-leaf,"—which, then, is called, not merely paṭtra, but bhūrja-paṭtra,—it does not follow that ordinary letters of literary works must also have been engraved on what was probably a rarer material than the leaf of a palm-tree or of a lotus.

Besides kāṇḍa and paṭula, there are, however, two other important words, in the sense of work, which could not but attract the attention of Professor Müller—the words sūtra and grantha. The former, which means, literally, "string," has become, according to him (p. 512), the well-known name of an extensive class of works, by assuming the figurative sense, "strings of rules." The latter, he says (p. 522), "is derived from a root grath, which means necere, serere. Grantha, therefore, like the later sandarbha, would simply mean a composition. It corresponds etymologically with the Latin texus. Thus it is used by the commentator to Nir. i. 20., where he says that former teachers handed
down the hymns, *granthato ’rthatakha*,\(^1\) ‘according to their text,
and according to their meaning.’ In the later literature of India,
*grantha* was used for a volume, and, in *granthakuttr*, a library, we
see clearly that it has that meaning. But in the early literature
*grantha* does not mean *pustaka*, or book; it means simply a com-
position, as opposed to a traditional work.”

That “sūtra” may have assumed the sense of “string of rules,”
before it became the name of a book, is possible; but that it must
have gone through this metaphorical process, and no other,—as the
certainty with which Müller explains the term would imply,—\(^2\)
is not corroborated by any proof he has given; nor is it even
plausible. Before, however, I give my own opinion on this word,
it will be necessary, first, to ascertain whether the word sūtra,—

---

\(^1\) Similarly, e. g., Kulikā on Maṇḍya. VII. 43, विद्यर्थवतीय एकधिवधार्थेत्. See
also, “Muir’s Original Sanskrit Texts,” vol. ii. p. 175.

\(^2\) “We meet with Brāhmaṇas, the sayings of Brahmins; with Sūtras, i. e., the
strings of rules.” (p. 512.)

which is used in the singular both as a name for a whole collection
of rules, and as a name for a single sūtra,—denoted, originally,
the latter, and then became the designation of the former, or vice
versa. Thus, the Kāśikāvṛtti calls Pāṇini’s Sūtra, V. 4, 151,
*gana-sūtram*, and speaks of the five Sūtras, I. 3, 72—76, swarita-
-nilā ili pānchabhīs sūtrair ātmanepadam, etc. . . . . . . evam
panchanātryayām uddhāyam; and Patanjali says, in the introduc-
tion to Pāṇini, Sūtrāni chāpyadhyāyaḥ ishyate vaiyākṛtaṇa iti, “he
who studies the Sūtras is termed a grammarian.” But if we
examine the use which Pāṇini himself makes of this word, we
find that he always uses sūtra as a term for the whole collection
of rules, and not as an expression for a single Sūtra: IV. 2, 65,
“Sūtrāch cha kopaḥāt”; IV. 3, 110, “Pārāśāryaśāśībhīyam
bhikṣhunātatsūtraṇoh” (where the dual shows that the analysis
requires bhikṣhusūtre and nācatuṭre). In his Rules, IV. 2, 60, and
V. 1. 58, the number of the word is less clear, since it is part of a
compound; yet the instances of Patanjali to the Vārttikas, and
some explanations of the Kūśikā (e. g. Kalpasūtram adhite, Kalpa-
would seem, therefore, since no higher authority than Pāṇini can be quoted, that sūtra,—when used in the sense of a single rule,—is

will conclude that the quotations not marked "text" are taken from the commentary; yet, "VI. 3, 75," is not commentary but text. And what does the word "commentary" mean? Patañjali, Kaśyapa, Siddhā. k., or the Calcutta Pañṭita? Again, when he says (p. 69, n. 1): "It is remarkable that, in Pāṇini also, the word śloka is always used in opposition to Vedic literature," not one of his quotations given to prove this important point, viz., IV. 2, 65; "IV. 3, 102, 1;" IV. 3, 107; "II. 4, 21," belongs to Pāṇini, but the two former to Patañjali; and the two latter to the Kaśyapa. On p. 347, n., the Sanskriti Brāhmaṇaśi are attributed by him to Pāṇini himself, but Pāṇini says nothing about them. The instances to the quotations, of page 361, n. 3, ("IV. 3, 101; IV. 2, 64") and those to n. 4. (IV. 3, 108), belong to the Kaśyapa,—none to Pāṇini. Nearly all the instances referred to, p. 364, n. 3, belong to Patañjali; and p. 368, nn., where "com." and "text" are contradistinguished, "VI. 2, 10" is not Pāṇini. P. 370, n. 10, "IV. 3, 104," ought to have been marked "com.," and a similar confusion exists, pp. 362, 371, 321, 522, etc. while, on the other hand, the commentary is correctly quoted in most of the instances of p. 184, 185, 192, 212, 230, 230, 330, 333, 357, though without any mention whether the commentary of Patañjali, or of the Kaśyapa, etc., be meant.

The text is marked correctly, pp. 125, n. 2; 340, 388, n. 1 ("IV. 3, 128"); 389, n. 1, 3; 371, n. 2, 8; 372, n. 2, 8; 372, n. 3, 8; and the gloss correctly, p. 349, n. 6; 370, n. 7, 8, 10; 372, n. 8; 373, n. 8. I do not altogether think that this want of accuracy,
pars pro toto, and that its original sense is that of a whole collection
in a writer like Professor Müller, is entirely the result of oversight; it seems to me, on
the contrary, that the reason for it lies in the words of his note to p. 46:—"It was
impossible to teach or to use Pāṇini's Śūtras without examples, which necessarily formed
part of the traditional grammatical literature long before the great Commentary was
written, and are, therefore, of a much higher historical value than is commonly
supposed. The coincidences between the examples used in the Prātiśākhya and in
Pāṇini, show that these examples were by no means selected at random, but that they
had long formed part of the traditional teaching." This coincidence, to be of that
value which is described in the words quoted, would require first the proof that the
Prātiśākhya, viz. the existing ones of Sannaka and Kātyāyana, are older than Pāṇini;
otherwise, it ceases to be of any consequence, as regards Pāṇini. As to his statement in
general, however, I must observe, that he can hardly not be received as authoritative
in the absence of all proof. I must myself, on the contrary, quite demur to its admissi-
ability. The coincidences, in the first place, between the instances of the existing Prā-
tiśākhya and those in the Commentaries of Pāṇini, considering the great bulk of
the latter, are perfectly striking. Again, as to the other instances, about 2000 Śūtras of
Pāṇini are not criticised by Kātyāyana, nor commented upon by Patanjali; with regard
to the instances, therefore, in this considerable number of rules, our oldest authority is
nearly always the Kāśīkā, the infallibility of which Commentary I have had, sometimes,
reason to doubt. Scarcely any instances of this category can be traced to the Prāti-
of rules. If such be the case the question arises, whether it is

śākya, and, unless it can be proved by Müller that these instances belong to antiquity,
I do not consider it at all safe to find any conclusions on them, as regards antiquity.
But on no account can it be consistent with critical research to use even the instances
of Patanjali as evidence for or against the Vārttikas, and much less for or against the
Śūtras of Pāṇini, since Kātyāyana never gives instances, but, like Pāṇini himself, either
lays down a general rule, or specifies the words which are the subject of his rule.

Compare also the following passage of the Mahābhāṣya (ed. Ballantyne, p. 66).

Patanjali: 服饰行Щravacaśālikā śadā kṣ: padāya: सुमस । Kātyāyana: सूँ वायकरण
varṇāṇām: guppad: । Patanjali: सूँ वायकरण वाचायणा वायकरणा सूँ 
पुनः: वचारणां सुः गुप्तम: । यस्य किया वचारण: किया वचारण: तस्य गुप्तम: ।
हारामाषित वायकरणाः किया वचारणाः: किया वचारणाः: तस्य गुप्तम: ।
हारामाषित वायकरणाः किया वचारणाः: किया वचारणाः: तस्य गुप्तम: ।
हारामाषित वायकरणाः किया वचारणाः: किया वचारणाः: तस्य गुप्तम: ।
हारामाषित वायकरणाः किया वचारणाः: किया वचारणाः: तस्य गुप्तम: ।
the figure implied by Müller's rendering "strings of rules" that has led to the word sûtra being used in the sense of "book," or nct. As, I believe, I am able to show that Pāṇini was perfectly well acquainted with the art of writing, and that written books had even existed long before his time, my own opinion is, that the name for book was, as in the case of paṭala and kāṇḍa, borrowed rather from a material fact than from the metaphorical idea of the logical connection of rules. And here I appeal to evidence, and to the admission which will be made to me that there are peculiarities and habits in the life of nations, which may be supposed to have existed at the earliest times such as we see them now. Everyone who has studied Sanskrit MSS. in the libraries of London and Paris, will have found that the oldest specimens of these MSS. are written on palm-leaves, which are pierced in the middle, and kept together by means of a "string." The natural-

ness of the material of these MSS., and the primitive manner in which they are bound,—if we can use the term "binding," for a parcel of leaves, covered on both sides with oblong pieces of wood, and kept together by a string which runs through the middle,—bespeak, in my opinion, the habits of high antiquity, religiously preserved up to a recent date by a nation which, beyond all other nations, is wont to cherish its antiquity, and to defend it, even in practical life, against the intrusions of modern arts. The MSS. I have seen are certainly not more than a few centuries old, as may be easily inferred from the fragility of the material of which they are composed; but I hold them to be genuine specimens of the manner in which books were formed at the earliest periods of the civilization of India. No one, however, ought, I should conceive, to be less surprised at seeing the word "string" becoming the name of "book," than a German who would call his own book "Band," translating, as it were, literally, the Sanskrit sûtra, and having recourse to the same figure of speech.

Since I contrast, in these remarks, opinion with opinion,—not
claiming any greater value for mine than that which may be permitted to the impressions and views of the individual mind.—I will not conceal that I hold the very nature of the works called "Sūtra," to have arisen from, and depended on, the material which was kept together by the "string." I cannot consider it plausible that these works,—"written, as they are, in the most artificial, elaborate, and enigmatical form,"—which have been so well defined and described in Müller's work (p. 71, ff.),—in which, to use his words, "shortness is the great object of this style of composition,"—should have been composed merely for the sake of being easily committed to memory. "To introduce and to maintain such a species of literature," argues Müller (p. 74), "was only possible with the Indian system of education, which consisted in little else except implanting these Sūtras and other works into the tender memory of children, and afterwards explaining them by commentaries and glosses." But, though I do not dispute that these Sūtras were learnt, and are learnt, by heart up to this day, this circumstance alone does not explain why the matter thus to be inculcated must have been written in such a manner "that an author rejoiceth in the economizing of half a short vowel as much as in the birth of a son;" why, "every doctrine thus propounded, whether grammar, metre, law, or philosophy," must have become "reduced to a mere skeleton." Müller himself says (p. 501),—and I fully concur with him,—that "we can form no opinion of the powers of memory in a state of society so different from ours as the Indian Parishads are from our universities. Feats of memory, such as we hear of now and then, show that our notions of the limits of that faculty are quite arbitrary." And, as he himself produces proof that the three Vedas and their Brāhmaṇas were learnt by heart, it does not appear at all likely that the peculiar enigmatic form of this Sūtra literature was invented simply to suit the convenience of a memory the capacities of which must have been extraordinary.

The reason which accounts for this form is, in my opinion, of a far more prosaic kind. I hold that it is the awkwardness, the fragility, and, in some parts of India, perhaps the scarcity of
proper natural leaves, which imposed upon an author the happy restraint of "economizing half a short vowel;" that the scantiness of the writing material compelled authors to be very concise; and betrayed them, as a consequence, into becoming obscure.

Vaidik hymns and sacrificial Brāhmaṇas stand, clearly, under a different predicament to works on grammar or philosophy. A god cannot be invited with anubandhas to partake of the sacrificial meal, nor the religious feelings of a nation be roused with hard and unintelligible phraseology; but the purpose of a grammar may be attained, if there be need to save space, by an artificial method; and a philosophical doctrine may be propounded in riddles, as we can testify in our own days. I draw here, of course, a line between genuine and artificial Sūtras,—the former, in my opinion, a creation of material necessity; the latter, a mere imitation when this necessity had ceased. The Sūtras of Pāṇini, in their dignified brevity, and the Sūtras of the Buddhists, in their tedious proximity, are, probably, the two opposite poles; but it requires, I conceive, no great effort to see that there is a gap, even between Pāṇini and the Yoga-Sūtras, nay, between him and the Mīmāṃsā- and Vedānta-Sūtras as well as the Nyāya-Sūtras and the Sāṅkhya-Pravachana.

Turning now to the second word I have mentioned above, with the word Sūtra, I will say at once, that grantha likewise appears to me to have become the name of a book, not on account of the connection which exists between the different parts of a literary composition, but on account of the connection of the leaves which form its bulk. Professor Weber, who makes Pāṇini live

---

38 The lamented Burnouf has given a description of these Sūtras, in his invaluable work on the "Buddhisme Indien," p. 50, ff. He particularly points out,—and the fact is important,—that amongst these caricatures of the Brāhmaṇic Sūtras, there are several which have the enigmatic brevity of the latter; he distinguishes, therefore, between Sūtras which may be attributed to Sākyamuni, and Sūtras which belong to subsequent periods. See "Introduction à l'Histoire du Buddhism Indien," p. 184, ff.
about 140 years after Christ, but who, nevertheless, is favourable to the view I take of Pāṇini’s acquaintance with writing, says, in the “Indische Studien,” vol. iv. p. 89, that “the word grantha, which is several times used by Pāṇini, refers, according to its etymology, decidedly to written texts;” yet he informs us (p. 436), that “the word grantha is referred by Böhtlingk-Roth to the composition.” Whether the latter remark is made “pijñārtham,” or whether this author,—according to his habit of leaving the reader to make his own choice amongst a variety of conflicting opinions,—intended to establish a vibhāṣā, or whether he has altered his original view, is more than I can decide, since he has neither supported his first opinion with any explanatory remark, nor expressed adhesion or dissent when he concluded his fourth volume of the “Indische Studien.”

That grantha, according to its etymology, may mean “a literary composition,” and that it has been used in that sense, is undeniable; yet I contend that it did not bear this metaphorical sense before it was used in the literal meaning of “a series of leaves;” or, in other words, before it designated a written book. Previously to supporting this opinion with other arguments than those which are implied in my remarks on sūtra, I consider it necessary to remove the suspicion which has been thrown by Müller on this legitimate word. He quotes the four Sūtras in Pāṇini where it occurs, but remarks in the note of p. 45, “The word grantha, used in the Sūtra (IV. 3, 87), is always somewhat suspicious.”

unintentional, since I have been guided in my quotations by the excellent indices he has appended to his volumes. All I mean to convey is, that the only justification he gives for the sense, “written work,” of grantha, viz., the etymology of the word, does not appear to be a sufficient one, since Müller is certainly right when he remarks (p. 522), that grantha, nectere, serere, might be taken also in a figurative sense.

Compare also, IV. 3, 101, v. 2; 105, v. 2; the Kāśikā on V. 1, 10, v. 1; प्राणायाम्य बन्ध्याः । कृष्णायाम्यासः । on IV. 2, 62: वर्णायन्तार्थां सन्योगायाम्यांति.
The reason for this sweeping doubt is contained, I suppose, in the words which immediately follow: "That some of the Sūtras which now form part of Pāṇini's Grammar, did not proceed from him, is acknowledged by Kaiyāṣa (cf. IV. 3, 131, 132);" and in the first note of p. 361, where he writes, "Pāṇ., IV. 3, 116, तौ यदि क परम्. Kaiyāṣa says that this Sūtra does not belong to Pāṇini." That there are three, perhaps four Sūtras in Pāṇini's Grammar, which poetical illusions of Professor Weber, connected with this word grantha. From the stream of imaginary narrative which meanders through the desert of his "Literaturgeschichte," emerges, à propos of the Rāmāyaṇa (p. 182), the remark, that this masterpiece of Hindu poetry was probably preceded by some other epic works. To prove that which cannot be proved without a knowledge of the date of the Rāmāyaṇa, which we have not,—and without a knowledge of those epic poems, which likewise we have not,—but which is plausible enough without any proof, he quotes Pāṇini's Sūtra, IV. 3, 88, which treats on the titles of some granthas. Among these granthas (which are, to his imagination, epic poems), is one called Siśśvauṇḍaṇya, which therefore is, to him, a forerunner of the Rāmāyaṇa. The same ingenious conjecture occurs in his "Indische Studien," vol. 1. p. 155, where he grows somewhat indignant at Wilson, who, in his Dictionary, renders this term "a work treating of infantile or juvenile grievances," for he adorns Wilson, for this rendering, with a query and note of admiration ("Wilson dict. ?!"). Now, whether Siśśvauṇḍaṇya ought to have been, by right, the title of an epic poem (in the same manner as we learn, from another work what the words in the Vedas ought to have meant, if they had profited by the last results of Sanskrit
probably did not belong to his work originally, I will concede; but amongst these three or four Sūtras out of 3996, there is no

and comparative philology, I am unable to say. Nevertheless, I believe that Wilson is right; for the Kāśīki explains this word, निःस्त्रिपत्रायुक्तम् निःस्त्रिपत्रायुक्तम् निःस्त्रिपत्रायुक्तम् निःस्त्रिपत्रायुक्तम्, and the Gāyatrī-nāthakāthi has even an additional

remark: निःस्त्रिपत्रायुक्तम् निःस्त्रिपत्रायुक्तम् निःस्त्रिपत्रायुक्तम् निःस्त्रिपत्रायुक्तम्. It is, in other terms, "a book for children, written with reference to their cries,"—a

kind of nursery-book for naughty babies.

Dr. Otto Boehtlingk was the first who drew attention to this fact. In the volume which he has annexed to his garbled and unauthorized reprint of the meritorious labour of the Calcutta editors of Pāṇini. In a note of p. xx. of his Preface, he enumerates some Sūtras, which, according to him, "were originally Vārātikas, and only at a later time became embodied into the text of Pāṇini;" viz., "IV. 1, 166, 167; IV. 3, 132; V. 1, 36; VI. 1, 62, 100, 130." It certainly raises a strong doubt as to the authenticity of a Sūtra, if it occurs also as a Vārātika of Kātyāyana; but I hold the indispensable conditions for confirming such a doubt to be—1. that the Vārātikas must really belong to Kātyāyana; 2. that the wording of the Vārātika must be identical with that of the doubted Sūtra; and 3. that both must have the same tendency. In the first place, however, we are entitled to consider as Vārātikas of Kātyāyana only such as occur in, and, what is invariably the case, are commented upon by, the Bhashya of Patanjali. Vārātikas found in the Kāśīki or Siddhāntakānūṇḍi, but not in the Bhashya,

Sūtra containing the word granthu; for I believe Müller was mistaken when he says that Kātyāyana acknowledges that the

may be, and evidently are in many instances, the critical additions of later times. They afford no basis for doubting the genuineness of a Sūtra in Pāṇini; nor is there a mere remark of Kātyāyana, the commentator of Patanjali, that "some" consider a Sūtra as having been a Vārātika, sufficient to cancel the Sūtra from amongst the original rules. Secondly, if a Vārātika is not worded in the same manner as the Sūtra,—excepting, of course, the usual addition of Kātyāyana, दृश्य वर्णन,—the mere similarity of both is no sufficient ground for doubting the originality of the Sūtra; for the difference in the wording of the Vārātika may have, as it very frequently has, the mere object of criticizing the manner in which Pāṇini delivered his rule. Lastly, if the Vārātika and Sūtra are identical in words, but not in tendency, there is not the slightest ground for doubting the authenticity of the Sūtra, though Kātyāyana may historically record that "some" have preferred to "throw it among the Vārātikas." In applying these tests to the enumeration given by Dr. Boehtlingk, we find, that IV. 1, 166 does not occur literally in the Vārātika 3 of IV. 1, 163; for, though the Calcutta editors write वर्णक वर्णनक, and append their mark, that it occurs in the Siddhā. The (printed edition of this work contains on p. 006a, line 1, the words वर्णक वर्णनकानक (probably वर्णनकानक) वर्णकानक (probably वर्णनकानक वर्णकानक) but even if the additional words belong, as is possible, not to the Vārātika, but to the Bhashya, it is clear.
Sūtra IV. 3, 116 did not belong to Pāṇini. I have not been able to discover anywhere, in the Mahābāhyasā, either by the aid of my memory or my indices, that Kaiyāyata expresses any opinion that the tendency of the Vārttika and that of the Sūtra are not identical; for, in the Vārttika, the rule is absolute, while in the Sūtra, IV. 1, 106, it is optional, through the anuvritti of the preceding च of IV. 1, 165. Therefore, Patanjali comments on the Vārttika in question, तत्त्त्वज्ञानी वालाकालिनः। वात्त्त्वणी वालाकालिनः। without the option recorded by the Kālika on IV. 1, 106, in the instances, तत्त्त्वज्ञानी वालाकालिनः। वात्त्त्वणी वालाकालिनः। A similar negative conclusion applies to IV. 1, 107. The Vārttika mentioned by the Calcutta editors, to IV. 1, 162, does not occur in the Bhāṣāya; it is not identical, even in the Siddhā.-k., with the Sūtra, IV. 1, 107; it has not the same tendency as the Sūtra, the latter being optional, the former absolute. There is no ground, consequently, for doubting that the “some” of Kaiyāyata, who maintain the antiquity of the Sūtra, are correct.—IV. 3, 132, is suspicious, for it occurs as a Vārttika in the Bhāṣāya to IV. 3, 131, and fulfills the three above-named conditions; equally so V. I, 36, which is a Vārttika to V. 1, 35, and VI. 1, 62, which occurs as a Vārttika to VI. 1, 61. On the other hand, VI. 1, 100, need not be rejected absolutely, for its wording is not identical with that of the Vārttika of VI. 1, 99; nor is it clear that both coincide in tendency. VI. 1, 99, restricts the rule to the condition of the word इति following a combination like दलितान्तरं; VI. 1, 100, exempts a similar combination, if ending in रूपम् from this condition (comp. V. 4, 57):

whatever on this Sūtra; but even should the mistake be mine, there would be little importance in the mere doubt of Kaiyāyata, since Patanjali, when commenting on the Vārttikas to IV. 3, 105, it would seem, therefore, that the Vārttika to VI. 1, 90, maintains the condition, but corrects the option च, by the word मित्रम्. I must admit, however, that Patanjali gives the instance अस्मयमपि, which would counteract the probability of this Sūtra, also, not being an original one. Lastly, the Sūtra VI. 1, 136, तत्त्त्ववाच्यम् तिथि neither occurs as a Vārttika in the Bhāṣāya, nor even as a Vārttika in the Kālika or the Siddhā.-k.; nor has its original existence, in fact, been doubted by anybody except Dr. Bochtingk, who writes in his so-called Commentary (p. 256). “This Sūtra has been interpolated at a later time; it owes its origin to the following two Vārttikas to the preceding Sūtra. सर्वस्वच्छ्य भवं कर्माणि १३१ सर्वस्वच्छ्यः च च च २०। Compare Siddhā.-k. p. 144c;” where, however, the reader will not find anything relating to the subject, while, on p. 145a, he will discover the Sūtra, IV. 1, 136, such as it is in the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini. That both Vārttikas are a criticism of Kātyāyana, who clearly disapproved of the condensed wording of the Sūtra 136, did not even occur to the mind of Dr. Bochtingk; but, considering the condition of his knowledge of Pāṇini, as displayed in this “Commentary,” and even in his very last work, I cannot but express the belief, that his “दुर्वौमूलिक” to strike out a Sūtra of Pāṇini, goes for very little indeed,— especially as it touches upon the sphere of reasoning.
distinctly quotes twice the Sūtra IV. 3, 116, which is a positive proof that it existed at his time, and was genuine enough. 39

I will now give an instance from the Mahābhārata, which, in my belief, would be perfectly unintelligible, if grantha were taken only in the sense of "composition," and not also in that of "written book," or "volume." I am met here, however, with an objection; viz., that I ought first to show that the Mahābhārata possesses the qualification which Müller has appended to his quoted remark, or, in other words, that it is a work of "the early literature," since he says that "grantha does not mean pustaka, or book, in the early literature," while he admits that it has that sense in the later literature. Both Müller and Weber agree that there was a Mahābhārata at the time of Āśvalāyana, since they quote a passage from his Gṛhītya-Sūtra, where the name occurs (Müller, p. 42; Weber, "Literaturgeschichte," p. 56), and neither denies that a work prior to Āśvalāyana would have a claim to be called a work of the earlier literature. Both scholars however question,—and very rightly too,—the claim of the present Mahābhārata, to having been that Mahābhārata which is quoted by Āśvalāyana. It is, of course, impossible for me to treat here, as it were incidentally, not merely of the question concerning the age of the Mahābhārata, but the relative ages of the various portions of this work, since it must be evident to everyone who has read it, that it is, in its present shape, a collection of literary products belonging to widely distant periods of Hindu literature. To do justice to a subject of this kind, I should have not merely to enter into details which would be here out of place, but to discuss the prior important question, as to how far the printed text in which this colossal
epos is generally known to us, as may be relied upon; and I should feel all the more bound to do so, as my collations of considerable portions of this text with the best MSS., in this country and abroad, fully convince me that it is neither advisable to make a translation of the Mahâbhárata,—a labour which, if done once, should be done once for all,—nor to found a detailed criticism of the several portions of this work, on the printed text, however much I admire the industry, patience, and scholarship, of those who have accomplished the task of laying before us a first edition of this enormous work. Without their labours, it would have been still more difficult than it now is, to perceive the defects of the MSS.; but this tribute, which I gladly pay to their merits, does not dispense with my expressing the conviction, derived from my own labours, that no conclusion founded on special passages of the present text, is safe, before the differences of the MSS.—sometimes great—are thoroughly sifted and discussed with the help of the Commentaries.  

In proceeding now to give an instance which I hold to belong to the early (though not the earliest) portions of the Mahâvaluable synopsis of the leading characters of the Mahâbhárata, as they occur in the text and the commentaries of Pâñjini. This synopsis, I conceive, must convince even the most sceptic, that Pâñjini cannot have ignored the renown of these personages, nor consequently, it is probable, the real or poetical events on which this renown was founded. It forms the subject-matter of the Mahâbhárata. Some stress has been laid by both scholars on the circumstance, that the name Pâñjû or Pâñjöva does not occur in the Grammar of Pâñjini (Weber, "Indische Studien," p. 148; Müller, p. 44); but, since both have constructed their list as well from the Gânas and commentaries as from the Sûtras, it will not be amiss to add, that Pâñjû occurs in Kalîyajna's gloss on Patanjali to IV. 1, 168, v. 4, and in the Kâlikâ on IV. 1, 171, when the observation of the former implies, what I pointed at in a former remark, that the word Pâñjû does not occur in the Vârttika, as the name of Yudhishthira's father, because the word Pâñjöva is too common a derivation to require a grammatical rule; Vârttika, p. 434 (32):

-Patanjali, Ārya—Kalîyajna, Ārya (IV. 1, 96, etc.) त्रिकोण योजिति भौमाचार दृष्टि (words of Patanjali on a previous Vârttika) वस्तुप्रथिति-रासिदुपः (words of Patanjali on a previous Vârttika)। एक रासिदुप भवति-Kâlikâ on the same Vârttika (differently worded; quoted in the Calcutta edition, under the Sûtra IV. 1, 168, in the MSS. under IV. 1, 171). परासः । वस्तुप्रथिति-रासिदुपः The word वस्तुप्रथिति occurs in the Kâlikâ on the Gâna IV. 1, 123.

Weber ("Indische Studien," I. p. 148) and Müller (pp. 44, 45, note) give a
bhárata, I must submit, therefore, to having its validity acknowledged or rejected, according to the value the reader may attach to my opinion. Not to be misunderstood, however, I will add that I consider it as posterior to Páñini. But, as the date I shall assign hereafter to this grammarian will be older than the date originated by Dr. Boehltingk, the passage in question will still be entitled to rank among the earlier literature. In the Śántiparvan of the Mahábhárata we read: 81 “Vasishtha spoke (to Janaka) ‘The doctrines of the Vedas and the (philosophical) Śástras which thou hast uttered, are rightly uttered by thee, but thou understandest them not; for the text (grantha) of the Vedas

81 V. 11339—11342 (the corrections are founded on the com. and MS8): द्वितीयोऽन्तरा देवमहानिन्द्रेष्मा।

and Śástras is possessed by thee, yet, king, thou dost not know the real sense of the text (grantha) according to its truth; for he who is merely bent upon possessing the text (grantha) of the Veda and Śástra, but does not understand the real sense of the text, his possession of them is an idle one; he carries the weight of the book (grantha) who does not know the sense of it; but he who knows the real sense of the text (grantha), his is not an idle acquisition of the text.” In this instance, grantha is used in its double sense, composition or text, and book; for there can be no doubt that in the passage, “Bháraḿ sa vahate tasya granthasya,” “he carries the weight of the grantha,” the last word can only refer to the material bulk of the book.

I will conclude my observations on this word with a remark on the phrase, “granthato ‘rthataścha,” which must undoubtedly be rendered in the sense proposed by Müller, “according to the text and according to the meaning.” An analogous contrast, exactly in the same sense, is that of kánda and padártha, which is of fre-
quent occurrence in Mimanśa writers. That, in the latter case, the meaning "text" is a secondary one of kanda, no one will dispute, since there is nothing in this word which points to "composition." It must be allowable therefore to conceive, that its synonyme grantha may, through the same mental process as kanda, have assumed the secondary meaning of "text."

There is another important word which Müller will not admit as evidence of Pāṇini's having had a knowledge of writing,—for it is used by this grammarian,—the word varna. But the only reason he gives for invalidating its testimony is, that this word which, etymologically and otherwise, really means "colour,"—when having the sense of letter "does not mean colour in the sense of a painted letter, but the colouring or modulation of the voice" (p. 507). In the absence of any proof for this assertion, he adds, in a note: "Aristotle, Probl. x. 39: "τὰ δὲ γράμματα πάθη ἔστι τῆς φωσίδος." In this respect he coincides, for once, with Weber, not merely in the point at issue, but also in the remarkable brevity of his argument. For all that Weber says on the subject ("Indische Studien," iv. 109) is: "The name varna is probably (wohl) to be understood of the 'colouring,' specializing (specialisierung) of the sound; compare rakta, which is employed in the Rikpratīśākhyā in the sense of 'nasalised' (nasalirt). With writing it has nothing to do." Now, I confess, that I always become somewhat suspicious when I meet with a definition which prefers the language of similes to plain prose. How, I must ask, for instance, does the figure of colouring apply to the notion of specialising?

It is striking, moreover, that Weber, who starts with a probability, in two lines reaches a positive certainty, founded only on the analogy of rakta. And, in turning again to Müller's words, I must, in the first place, ask, what does an analogy taken from Aristotle prove for the Sanskrit word? But, supposing it could prove anything, would it not be more plausible to make use of it in favour of the contrary conclusion to that which Müller
VARṆA.

has drawn? Aristotle speaks of γράμματα, which word applies originally to none but written signs; and if he may apply γράμμα to the voice, might not the same liberty be claimed for a Sanskrit word meaning a written letter? Again, the notion of “colouring,” itself supposes necessarily a condition which may be called indifferent or colourless: green, blue, red, are colours, because there is an indifferent condition, called white. A coloured sound is not intelligible, except on the supposition that there is also an indifferent, or uncoloured sound. Hence we speak, for instance, in modern terminology, of i, u, r, e, o, etc., as coloured vowels, because we contrast them with the fundamental uncoloured vowel a. But I shall show that varṇa is applied indiscriminately to all vowels, inclusive of a.

I do not dispute that varṇa is used like γράμμα, “letter,” also for the spoken letter,”* but I hold that there is strong evidence to prove that its original sense is that of written letter, as arising naturally from its primitive sense “colour,” and that the appearance of this word in Pāṇini or other authors, may serve as one of many arguments that they practised the art of writing. To make good this statement I must advert to another word which may also mean letter, and in this sense is always the latter part of a compound, the former of which is the letter itself designated by it, viz., the word kāra; e.g. a-kāra, the letter a; i-kāra, the letter i, etc. It corresponds with varṇa, in the synonymous expressions, a-varṇa, i-varṇa, etc. Kātyāyana looks upon it in the light of an affix, probably on account of its being always compounded with the letter itself; and Kaiyāṣṭa enlarges upon the expression varṇa, in saying that this word means, in the Vārīṭika quoted, “that which expresses a varṇa or adequately realizes a varṇa (i.e., is the adequate value of a varṇa).” He, therefore, like Kātyāyana, contrasts the purport of kāra and varṇa, though a-kāra and a-varṇa, i-kāra and i-varṇa, may appear to be,—and we shall see

* Thus Nagajībhāṣṭa explains, in the commencement of the Vivaraṇa, बालवर्नणेण च वर्षणात; or Kaiyāṣṭa says: चालब्यवेते च वर्षणात; etc.
from what reason,—convertible terms. To understand, however, this contrast, and the use of two other terms which I shall have to name, I will first give instances from Pāṇini, the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, and the Bhāṣya, which will illustrate the manner in which these grammarians have used both terms.


Vārttika 3, III. 3, 108; Patanjali—वार्त्तिकाः; 

The foregoing combinations of a letter of the alphabet with kra and varna are, I believe, all that occur in the grammarians named, and they show at once, that kra enters into composition with all vowels and all consonants, provided the latter are followed by the letter a—for it may be assumed without risk that the absence of some combinations, such as kha-kra, gha-kra, etc., or the words of the Calcutta editors: f. i. by ri-kra, vi. 1, 91, Kaalika; Kalyasa on Sivas. 5;—tha-kra, vii. 3, 7, Kaalika; vii. 3, 34, Kaalika; viii. 4, 54, Kaalika;—tha-kra, viii. 3, 55, Kaalika;—tha-kra, i. 2, 23, Kaalika; vii. 3, 7, Kaalika; viii. 3, 34, Kaalika;—sa-kra, vii. 2, 16, Kaalika;—pha-kra, i. 2, 23, Kaalika; viii. 4, 54, Kaalika;—sa-kra, i. 3, 8, Kaalika;—or ri-varna, i. 1, 9, v. 1, Siddh.-k.; v. 3, 83, v. 5, Kaalika (thus quoted in the Calcutta edition, but not met with in the MS. 2441 of the E.I.I.); viii. 4, 1, v. 1, Kaalika and Siddh.-k.;—ri-varna, i. 1, 9, v. 1, Siddh.-k. The very unusual ra-kra in the Commentary to viii. 2, 15 (it occurs chiefly in mystical, not in grammatical, works; e.g. in the dialogue between Umak and Siva of the Rudrayamalanatasila), I must leave to the responsibility of the Calcutta editors; for the Bhishya on the Varttika does not speak of the letter ra, and the Kaalika and Siddh.-k. have, instead of rakradatu, the usual rephrased. I have omitted, of course, to quote passages of the Sutras, etc., where varna or kra have other meanings than "letter."
VARṆA.—KARA.

is merely a matter of chance, not of necessity; compare the additional instances of the note 35)—while varṇa is joined merely to vowels and to such consonants as are without a vowel sound\(^\text{38}\) (cf. Śūtra, VII. 4, 53).

This circumstance is significant, but at once intelligible, if we draw a distinction between a spoken sound and a written letter. To sound a consonant (k, t, p, etc.) we must combine it with a vowel; in writing, we may omit that vowel, and should omit it, unless it have its own peculiar value: the spoken k has a different value to the written ka, which means k and a. Unless, therefore, Pāṇini intended, for instance, to give a rule on y and a, he could not employ a term ya, which merely refers to the spoken sound y; or, if he did so, he would have had to give a special rule to the effect that the sound a in this combination is mute or insignificant, as he has given various rules to a similar

d, effect when he employs for his technical purposes anubandhas or letters without significance. Now, such a rule on the suppression of vowels which appear in his grammar, but are not to be sounded when the word with which they are combined becomes a spoken word, is given by him (I. 3, 2), but for a distinct and special purpose, and not with the intent of general application; a vowel, such as it is treated in this rule, is (and ought to have been always edited with the appropriate sign) anudāśīka. Therefore, when Pāṇini gives a rule in which the vowel a is appended to a consonant, but valueless,—though the absence of its value would not follow from the rule quoted (I. 3, 2) or otherwise,—the commentators notice such an exceptional case as worthy of a special remark, and defend it in their fashion if they deem it advisable.\(^\text{39}\) In other words, expressions like a-kāra, i-kāra, u-kāra, etc., and a-varṇa, i-varṇa, u-varṇa, etc., are

\(^{38}\) Pāṇini never uses varṇa of a consonant followed by the vowel a; but the late Kāśīki writes सन्निबाजीकानि or सन्निबाजीकानि; or सन्निबाजीकानि if the MSS. are to be trusted.

\(^{39}\) The Kāśīki, e.g., observes on the Śivasūtra शम—वीकारिष्कार उत्तरार्थां भवूत्तरां। शभवार्थ शभार्तो। गुप्तांभाष्य:। प्रतिबादः; or the Śūtra VII. 1, 25 तद्भवे where the first न is mute, is excused by Kāśīki in this way: निद्रा गुप्तांभाष्यभाषाः।
VARA.—KARA.

Since an uttered sound may comprise more than one letter, we find kara, as Kātyāyaṇa already remarks (compare note 34), equally applied to complicated sounds, e.g. eva-kāra (III. 4, 67, v. 3 and 6; I. 4, 8, Kās.; VI. 2, 80 P.); and Pāṇini, who never uses it for expressing a simple letter-sound (because his terms are such as apply to a written book), applies it to the sound vashat in vashatkara (I. 2, 35). Varṇa is never used in a similar manner.

In this respect kara coincides with the term karaṇa, which occurs in combinations quite analogous, e.g., iti-karaṇa, I. 1, 44, v. 1, P.; IV. 2, 21, v. 2, P.; duk-karaṇa, VII. 1, 25, v. 3; cit-karaṇa, VII. 1, 25, v. 4; 3, 118, v. 6; chit-karaṇa, III. 1, 8, v. 4, P.; or even combined with kara, as evakara-karaṇa, VI. 2, 80, Kās., etc. Varṇa, on the contrary, is used by Kātyāyaṇa and Pā-

VARA.—KARANĀ.

...
tanjali in the same manner as in Pāṇini’s Sūtra which speaks of the varṇa y, viz., of unutterable consonantal sounds, which therefore must have been written signs. Thus, a discussion is raised by Kātyāyana on the Sūtra VI. 4, 49, which treats of the elision of ya, in reference to the question whether ya is to be dropped or merely y; and on this occasion, he calls the former sanghāta, “combination,” (viz., of y and a), and the latter varṇa. In a Vārttika to VII. 3, 50, a similar discussion is started on thā; again, thā is called there sanghāta, and the unpronounceable ū, varṇa. The same term sanghāta is applied to ēkā in a Vārttika to VII. 3, 44, and varṇa to the vowelless ēkā.

The same sense of varṇa is conveyed by a definition of Patanjali concerning the term upadesā, which literally means demonstration, and then assumes the special sense of grammatical mode of denoting, or of grammatical appearance, and of the book in which such grammatical denotations occur:” it means, for instance, the grammatical appearance of the radicals in the Dhātupāṭha, or the Dhātupāṭha itself; and, in like manner, the grammatical appearance of the letters in the Śivasūtras, “the root of Pāṇini’s Gram-

Patanjali on the Sūtra I. 3, 2: भिं पुनर्दैशयन | पार्मयन A Vārttika on I. 3, 3: निः सु बासिवितानावलाय; on which Patanjali comments: विद्वेद्य | वचम |
mar," as Nāgojībhāṭṭa calls them. For when Kātyāyana, in several introductory Vārttikas, enlarges on the purpose of the letters, as they occur in the Śivasītras, Patanjali asks: 40 "Now, what is upadeśa, or technical denotation? Pronunciation. How is that? The radical diś, 'to show,' (whence upadeśa is derived) implies the act of pronouncing; for, after having pronounced the varṇas, one may say, 'these varṇas are upadhiśṭha, or technically denoted.'" Patanjali distinguishes, therefore, between varṇas and upadhiśṭha-varṇas; only the latter are, according to him, the pronounceable varṇas; and it would have been useless for him to draw this distinction, if varṇa itself originally signified the spoken letter.

What the simple consonantal sound is to the pronounceable consonant, the simple vowel is, in some measure, to the diphthong or combined vowel sound. It is, perhaps, on this ground that, while we find a general name for vowel-letters, viz., svara-varṇa (IV. 1, 8, v. 7), the compounds e-varṇa, o-varṇa, ai-varṇa, au-varṇa, neither occur in Pāṇini nor Kātyāyana, for e is a and i, o = a and u, ai = a and e, au = a and o. Their general name is, in "older grammars," sandhy-akṣhara; and in Kātyāyana and Patanjali, for e and o, prakṛtiṣṭha-varṇa, for ai and au, samāhāra-varṇa. 41 The Kāśikā, it is true, speaks of these vowels simply as varṇas; 42 but, in the first place, it does not form a compound e-varṇa, etc., like i-varṇa, etc.; and, secondly, however great the value of this commentary, it cannot always be considered as fulfilling the conditions of critical accuracy, and cannot therefore be quoted as evidence against Pāṇini or Kātyāyana. But even if there were in Pāṇini's Grammar such compounds as o-varṇa, o-varṇa, their occurrence

40 Patanjali on the Introduction: जव य दशम्; । जवाचरणम् । कु ते लतम् । दिव्य-वचि:वचियः । जवारं हि हवानां । जवादन्ति इसे पवित्रि हिति.

41 Kātyāyana to Patanjali on Śivas. 3 and 4: संवचिराचारणवर्णम् पुङ्खारणवर्णम्। Whether this term "older teachers" applies to the present Pratītiśhyas, where the same work occurs, or not, will be included in the subsequent discussion on the relation of these works to Pāṇini's grammar.—Patanjali on the same Śivas.: हस्ताक्षरी वामाकरवर्णप् the same on I. 1, 9: (ए ची) प्रविधष्टावर्षी।

42 Kāśikā on the Śivas. 3: ए ची दशिनी पवित्रि; on Śivas. 4: ए ची दशिनी पवित्रि.
would not invalidate the conclusion that varṇa represents the written sign, since it is the combination of varṇa with a consonant that alone can enable us to decide the question at issue. And that there are other values in Pāṇini which could not have been spoken, though they are an essential portion of his Grammar, will be seen afterwards.

How far varṇa coincides, and is synonymous with akṣara, "syllable," or not, is obvious: it coincides with the latter term when it means vowel, otherwise not. The distinction between these terms may therefore be comprised in the following definition: kāra denotes the pronounceable sound, which must always be one syllable, but may also consist of more than one syllable; if denoting one syllable, it may mean a simple vowel (a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, r̥, r̥̄), or a complex vowel (e, o, a, au), or a simple consonant made pronounceable by a vowel (usually the vowel a); karana denotes more especially the pronounceable sound represented either by more than one syllable or by one syllable containing more than one consonant. Varna, on the contrary, implies merely the simple letter,—among vowels, especially the simple vowel; among consonants, merely the single consonant, not accompanied with a vowel sign. Lastly, akṣara means "syllable" in our sense of the word, and may sometimes therefore coincide in value with kāra, or varṇa, in the same way that kāra and varṇa are apparently convertible terms when they are the latter parts of compounds, the former of which are a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, r̥, r̥̄.

I have, in the foregoing observations, purposely abstained from alluding to the use which has been made of these terms in the existing Prātiṣākhya of Śaunaka and Kātyāyana; in the first place, because it was my object to show their meaning in Pāṇini's work, as well as in those old Commentaries which have strictly adhered to his terminology, and because it would have been an uncritical proceeding to confound the meaning or bearing of these terms in works belonging to a different class of Hindu litera-
ture;"44 secondly, because the date of these works, themselves,—or, at least, their relative position towards Pāṇini,—will have to be ascertained, before any conclusion can be drawn from a difference which may have existed between them in the use of these terms. Though I shall recur to this point, I may now state my belief, that even if grammatical works older than Pāṇini had used varna in the general sense of akṣara, such a circumstance would not disprove the fact that varna might have meant a written sign even before Pāṇini's time. There is, for instance, an introductory Vārttika

44 This confusion, unhappily, does not seldom occur in the definition of words, as found in our dictionaries; thus, ṛkavrata is used by Yāska in the general sense “re-duplicated,” and as applied to a dhāta, or radical portion of the verb (Nir. IV. 28: धिरर र्त्तितिापुलो ध्रव:; or IV. 25: र्तितितिातिब्ध:); in Pāṇini, however, it means the first two syllables of a reduplicated anga or base (VI. 1, 5); Ṛkavrata means reduplication, in the Nirukta (V. 19), on the form Ṛkavrata, चाहिङ्गलान्विने-प्रलोक्ष्यन्यस्त्थले न्यित्वक्ष्यक्तकितुः; in Pāṇini it means the first syllable of reduplication (VI. 1, 4). To philosophical terms this remark applies in a still stronger sense; they have been generally dealt with as if the same term, e.g., मानो, माण्ड, तुष्टि, etc., had the same sense in all the philosophical systems, which is not the case.

of Kātyāyana which countenances the assumption that varna had such a sense in some older grammarian; but the very manner in which it is brought before the reader shows that Kātyāyana contrasts the use of this word in Pāṇini with that in his predecessor, and confirms, therefore, the definition I have given before. At the same time, it leaves the question undecided whether varna was, or was not, a written letter in this older work. The Vārttika I am alluding to occurs at the end of the general introduction, and refers to the following Vaidik passage mentioned in the beginning of the introduction: "Whoever establishes this speech according to its words, its accent, and its syllables, he is fit to institute or to perform sacrificial work; and that it is a duty to study grammar, follows from the words 'let us be fit to institute, or to perform sacrificial work.'"45 The Vārttika then says: "akṣara, you must

45 Patanjali: ती वा इसं पद्म: लरोगि वर्गीय वाचविभाषितो शालिनीसिद्धान्त:। शालिनीसिद्धान्तो याचको शालिनीसिद्धान्त (का. V. 1, 71)। शालिनीसिद्धान्तो याचको शालिनीसिद्धान्त (का. V. 1, 71)।
know, means na kshara, i.e., not perishable,” and continues, “or aksara comes from ak, ‘to pervade,’ with the affix vara (Kayyapa: ‘because it pervades the sense’);” and concludes, “or they call varna so in the Sutra of a former (grammatican)” [Patanjali: i.e., “or in the Sutra of a former (grammatican) varna has the name aksara.” Kayyapa: ‘For it is said in another grammar, that the varnas are aksaras.” Nagajībhacag: “In a similar manner the term aksarasamānādya means a multitude of varnas, as seen in the Vedas].

Before I proceed to give other evidence as to Pāṇini’s knowledge of writing, I will draw attention to two words which have here a claim to notice; and first to the word urdhwa. It is used adverbially in the sense of “after;” for instance, in Manu, ix. 77, urdhwaem saṁvatsarāt, “after a year,” or, Chhāndogya-Upanishad: luta urdhwaem vahasyāmi, “after that I shall say.” But urdhwa means, originally, “upwards, above, high, or (in combination with an ablative) higher.” It is possible to conceive progress as an act of rising, when the sense “after” would follow from this latter acceptation. But it is more probable that the metaphorical sense of the word was first applied to passages in books,—where it is frequently used in this way,—before it became a more general one; and, if so, the figure would naturally follow from the description I have given of a Hindu book; for the beginning of a Sanskrit MS.,—as may still be seen in some of the oldest specimens,—was at the bottom of the pile of leaves which constitute its bulk. What is “above,” in a Hindu book, is, therefore, “after;” while, with us, the term “above” denotes the opposite sense, from the circumstance of the progress of our books being a descending one. And this assumption is corroborated by a second synonymous word, viz.: udaya, which also means, originally, “going upwards,” and
then, "after, following," and which, moreover, is never used in this sense, except of passages in books. It occurs frequently thus in the Prātiśākhya; but, for the reasons stated before, I content myself with quoting, for its occurrence in Pāṇini, the Sūtra VIII. 4, 67."

"If writing," says Müller, "had been known to Pāṇini, some of his grammatical terms would surely point to the graphical appearance of words. I maintain that there is not a single word in Pāṇini’s terminology which presupposes the existence of writing" (p. 507).

As Weber, in his "Indische Studien" (vol. iv. p. 89), had already mentioned two grammatical terms of "Pāṇini," viz., swarītle and udāttet, which he considers as "founded on graphical appearance," I cannot suppose that Müller has overlooked the remark of this scholar, but must assume that he has silently rejected it, either on account of its incorrectness or its inconclusiveness. It is true, that the latter term does not occur at all in the Sūtras of Pāṇini, nor the former, such as it is given by Weber; but, in the first place, there can be no doubt that, in the Sūtra I. 3, 72, swarīṭāṇītas must be analysed swarītetas and ītītas (comp. the commentaries), and on the other hand, Müller can neither have ignored that Pāṇini’s expression, anudāttēṇitas (I. 3, 12), is equivalent to anudāttetas and ītītas, nor that the term anudāttet distinctly occurs in the rules III. 2, 149 and VII. 1, 186. His absolute silence on this point was probably, therefore, not caused by Weber's partial inaccuracy, but by the reference the latter gives when naming these terms,—the reference to Dr. Boehlingk's "Comment" on the Sūtra I. 3, 11. For it must be readily admitted that the gloss of this writer is quite enough to raise the strongest apprehensions as to the sanity of Pāṇini, provided that it does not induce the reader to arrive at a peculiar view of the
I must, therefore, while rejecting Weber's reference, defend first his quotation of the Sūtra with the assistance of Kātyā- 

as the nasal vowels in the upadeśa. If I understand rightly two Vārttikas to our rule, a letter (which, perhaps, was the bearer of the circumflex) was added to an adhikāra: that is to say, as often as the adhikāra had to be supplied in the sequel; if it could not be supplied so often, one had to supply it when wanted, at the preceding (?) [this query belongs to Dr. B.] rules. Here are the two Vārttikas themselves: [then follow the Sanskrit words as given above].—The latter words ("if it could not," etc.) are beyond my comprehension; for, what reasons could prevent an adhikāra from being supplied, and if there was such an obstructed adhikāra, how could it be supplied at a preceding rule? I doubt, however, whether this sentence, which is intended to represent the meaning of the second Vārttika as quoted above, was understood by its own author. But the very words of this "Vārttika" revenge themselves on the person who has ill-used them so much: they betray the character of the work which has commented on them. For, however intelligible they are in themselves, it must be observed that the Calcutta Pañjīts have made a mistake in the wording of this Vārttika. Dr. Boehtlingk's, therefore, in giving himself the appearance of having quoted a rule laboriously examined in an original work, is simply detected in reprinting, without any examination whatever, the error of the Calcutta editors. And this, I may add, is generally the case in his "comment." The fact, in short, is this:—the Kāśikā and Siddhā. k. have no Vārttikas on this Sūtra, and in the Mahābhāskya the words given belong to two dis-
yana and Patanjali. Pánini says (I. 3, 11): "An adhikāra, or heading rule (will be recognized in my Grammar) by the accent
tinct passages, which have been erroneously contracted by the Pañjīts into one; viz., to
a passage of a Vārttika, मूर्ति ग्राममंत्र, and to a passage from the commentary of
Patanjali: मूर्ति ग्राममंत्र । पतान्जलि (Kàtyàyana ought to
have said—instead of मूर्ति, मांचु with a word following in the ablative). The second
of these passages is therefore merely a correction, by Patanjali, of the vague expression
of Kàtyàyana, and the रूति यव्यास which conveys the correction, becomes purposeless,
or assumes a different bearing, in the version of the Calcutta edition. And I may add,
that the Pañjīts have erred, too, in publishing what is their first Vārttika, for they
mistoook the comment of, and a quotation made by, Patanjali, for the text of a Vārttika.
The reprint has been, of course, as conscientious in the latter case as in the former.
Compare for both Vārttikas the following note with its translation. But to show in
its proper light the astounding explanation of Dr. Boeckhlingk on this second Vārttika, I
shall illustrate his ingenuity by taking some instances of the Kàdikà, as quoted in its
comment on this Sàstra, and apply to them his comment on the first Vārttika. Accord-
ing to the Kàdikà, the Sàstras VI. 4, 129; III. 1, 91; VI. 4, 1; IV. 1, 1; III. 1, 1, are
among those marked with a sarvita, to indicate that they are adhikārakas; the first of
these adhikārakas extends over 47, the second over 541, the third over 613, the fourth over
1100, and the fifth over 1621 Sàstras. If we credit, therefore, the explanation of Dr.
Boeckhlingk, a letter of the alphabet (he does not say which; probably, therefore, any
sarvita." ⁴⁴ Upon this Patanjali remarks: "Why does he say that?"—Vārttika: "An adhikāra . . . . to every rule belonging
to it; its object is to avoid a (repeated) designation."—Patan-
jali: "An adhikāra (says Kàtyàyana) is made (so as to
one) was added, perhaps, as he says in the parenthesis, as the bearer of this sarvita,
"that is to say, as often as the adhikāra had to be supplied in the sequel." In other
words, in the five instances quoted such a letter was added to the Sàtras VI. 4, 129,
47 times, and so on to the other Sàstras severally 541, 613, 1190, and 1821 times! And
this method, he conceives, had been devised in a kind of literature, where shortness is
the chief object, and where "an author rejoiceth in the economizing of half a short
vowel as much as in the birth of a son." Surely, it requires neither knowledge nor
scholarship, but merely something else, to deter a rational writer from eliciting such a
sense from a sane book.

⁴⁴ Pàgi. I. 3, 11: सार्विवाचिनारां—Patanjali: विविधसम्भवते—Vārttika omitted in the Cal. ed. at this Sàstra, but mentioned VI. 1, 158, where it occurs as a quo-
tation) विविधारां—प्रसि: निविन्ते तथा सिद्धां:—Patanjali: चिन्द्रियार: विविधारां निविन्ते प्रसिद्धाः तथा तबी निविन्ते—Kàtyàyana: सार्विवाचिनारां विविधसम्भवते नुपुर: । सार्विवाचिनारां विविधारां विविधसम्भवते नुपुर: न यु
apply) to every rule belonging to it; its object is to avoid a (repeated) designation. What does that mean, ‘to every rule belonging to it?’ ‘To every rule belonging to it,’ means in reference to each such rule; and he wants to imply that I must not make special mention (of the adhikāra) in each such rule.’—Kaiyyaṭa: “The words, ‘by the accent swarita’ [in Sanskrit it is only one word], are the third case in the sense of ‘such and such a mark’ (as ruled by Pāṇini, II. 3, 21); i.e. an adhikāra is marked with the accent swarita. The plan to mark words which are in the Sūtra with the swarita, is merely devised in order that the adhikāra may become recognizable, but it has nothing to do with practical application [i.e. the swarita is not pronounced].

The word adhikāra either expresses a condition or it expresses an act; in common language, adhikāra is the same as viniyoga, or appointment to an office; and this is understood here. Patanjali asks: ‘Why does Pāṇini say that?’ This question means: Will there be (in his grammar) as in common language, a connection of the matter treated under the same head, because the subjects refer necessarily to one another, and the like?” . . . . [Then follows in the Bhāṣya a discussion of Patanjali, the purport of which is to show that the word adhikāra, which literally means superintendence, government, has, in grammar, an analogous sense to that which it has in common life].—Vārttika: “But (there is) no knowing how far an adhikāra goes.”—Patanjali (repeats these words in the manner we
have seen before, adding the ellipsis ‘there is,’ as he usually repeats the words of a Vārttika which he explains, in order to ensure its proper text, and then continues): “These words mean: It might not be known to what limit an adhikāra is applicable.” —Vārttika: “However, that the extent of an adhikāra might be known.” —Patanjali: “Just that the extent of an adhikāra might be known, on that account this rule (I. 3, 11) had to be uttered; in other words, that I may know how far an adhikāra goes. But again, how can the extent of an adhikāra be known through the Sūtra, which says ‘an adhikāra (will be recognized in my grammar) by the accent swarita,’ so that I could say: ‘the adhikāra (is recognized) by the accent swarita?’” —Kaiyāla: “‘But, there is no knowing how far an adhikāra goes,’ says the Vārttika; for instance, does adhikāra III. 1, 91, stop before the Sūtra III. 4, 78, or does it go to the end of the (third) book? Does the adhikāra IV. 6, 1, stop before the Sūtra VI. 4, 78, or does it go to the end of the seventh book?” —Patanjali: “Since, as soon as (another) swarita is seen, there is an end of the adhikāra (indicated by the previous swarita); by what means, then, can there be now an adhikāra? Adhikāra is (as we have seen) a term of common life. Now, if you say there is no such adhikāra (meant in this grammar), why was it said before [in a previous discussion], ‘that a now injunction stopping (the applicability of the adhikāra), a paribhāṣā (had to be given).’ Therefore on account of an adhikāra this rule had to be uttered.” —Kaiyāla: “(When Patanjali says), ‘As soon as (another) swarita
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is seen,' etc., (his words mean): to stop the (applicability of an)
adhikāra on a subject-matter, the plan is devised to mark another
word with the swarita; thus, because the swarita mark is seen
in the Sūtra V. 1, 32, it must be inferred that the applicability
of the adhikāra, V. 1, 30 (which also was marked with the
swarita) has ceased."—Patanjali: "Now, has not Kātyāyana
said, 'But there is no knowing how far an adhikāra goes?'"
(Quite so; hence the) Vārttika (continues): "This results from
what is said elsewhere: 'whatever the numerical value of the letter
which is joined (to an adhikāra-rule), to as many rules ......'."
—Patanjali: "These words would have been better quoted thus:
'With whatever numerical value a letter is joined (as anu-
bandha to an adhikāra-rule), to as many (following) rules the

adhikāra applies.'"—Kaṇṭha: "For instance: to the Sūtra
V. 1, 30, the mute letter i (the second in the Śivasūtras) is to
be joined; therefore it applies to two subsequent rules; and
similarly in other adhikāra rules."—Patanjali: "Now, what
is to be done when an adhikāra applies to more rules, while
there are fewer letters of the alphabet?"—Kaṇṭha: "(When
Patanjali says) 'Fewer (and more),' is this comparative (liter-
ally, is the affix of the higher degree, i.e. the affix of the compara-
tive), used in reference to different species (of the same class)?
(No;) it is used in an absolute sense. (For he means): If
you think the rules belonging to the same adhikāra are few,
then (you would have to take his words as implying that) the
letters of the alphabet may be (still) fewer; on the other hand, if
you think the letters are many, then (his words would imply that) there may be still more rules belonging to the same adhikārā."—
Vārttika: "If there are more (rules for the same adhikārā than
text letters), the expression prāk, `before,' ....."—Patanjali: "If
there are more (rules for the same adhikārā than text letters), Pāṇini
(says the Vārttika) ought always to have made use of the expression
prāk, `before,' or the Vārttika ought to have rather said `before,
with a word following in the ablative.'" [The Vārttika means that
the adhikārā then should have always indicated in the Sūtra
by the expression such as such an adhikārā is valid `before,"
i.e. goes no further than, such and such a rule or word; as is
the case, e.g. I. 4, 56; II. 1, 3; IV. 4, 1 and 75; V. 1, 1
and 18; 3, 1 and 70, etc.] Ought Pāṇini indeed (in such a
case) to have expressed himself thus? No, he ought not. This is a
mere question of a doubtful case, and in all such cases there
avails the Paribhāṣā which says that `the solution of the special (diffi-
culty) results from explanation," for it does not follow that because
there is a doubt there is no criterion (to solve it)."—Kāṇḍāyana:
The foregoing words, `if there are more, etc.' mean that Pāṇini
(instead of giving, e.g. his rule, VI. 4, 1, as he does in the word
angasya, i.e. `this is the adhikārā on basis'), ought to have said,
`angasya prāg dehe,' i.e. `this is the adhikārā on basis which avails
before (i.e. does not go further than) VIII. 1, 1 (exclusively).'
The words of Patanjali, `ought Pāṇini, indeed, etc.,' mean: ought
Pāṇini to have given the contents of the two preceding Vārttikas?"
[Then follows, in the Bhāṣya, an observation of Patanjali on a doubtful passage, which is the subject of his comment in its appropriate place. He continues]: “What is the purpose of the Śūtra?”—Vārttika: “That the proper way of applying an adhikāra might be known by means of the swarīta.”—Patanjali: “Proper way of applying an adhikāra.” (Just so). (Adhikāra means) an agent placed over, or an act to be done, placed over. Now, at the Śūtra I.2, 48, the expression gotāṅg (used in the Vārttika to this rule) must not be considered as the subject of the adhikāra; for the expression stri will have the swarīta. Therefore, according to the words of the Vārttika (‘that the proper way,’ etc.) those affixes alone will have to be understood in that Śūtra (I.2, 48) which fall under the head stri, and, according to the Vārttika’s own words, there is no defect in the Śūtra I.2, 48.” [To understand this latter illustration of our rule, it is necessary to know that Kātyāyana, in giving the Vārttika gotāṅgāraṇam kriṃmicītātyartham, to the Śūtra I.2, 48, intends to point out an omission in the rule of Pāṇini. Patanjali, however, shows that the swarīta over stri in this rule obviates the punctiliousness of the Vārttika, and he therefore taunts Kātyāyana, as well on this occasion as when he comments on I.2, 48, for not having understood ‘the proper way of applying the adhikāra,’ by repeating to him his own criticisms on the Śūtra of the present discussion. Then follow other illustrations of Patanjali as to the proper way of applying an adhikāra, which it is not necessary for our immediate purpose to add to the foregoing translation].

The passage I have given here from the “Great Commentary” on Pāṇini,—and which may serve too as a specimen of the manner in which the two grammatical saints, Kātyāyana and Patanjali, scrutinized every doubtful word of the Śūtras,—will have shown that the rule of Pāṇini, which teaches the manner of defining an adhikāra, or heading rule, is interpreted by them as being based on the application of writing to his terminology. There are three modes, as we learn from them (and the fact is, of course, fully borne out by the Śūtras themselves), by which Pāṇini indicates a heading-rule in his Grammar. The one consists in his using the word prāk,
"before," with a word following in the ablative, by which expression he implies that the heading continues up to that word, which will occur in a later Sūtra. Another mode of his is merely to indicate the heading, the extent of which is then, as the Bhāṣya says, matter of "explanation." His third and last mode consists in putting the sign of a swarita,—which was not intended for pronunciation,—not over any word of the Sūtra, arbitrarily, as Dr. Bochtlingk imagines, but, as common sense would suggest, over that word which is the heading, as over the word stri, in the Sūtra I. 2, 48. Kātyāyana, moreover, indicates (by the expression bhīyasi), and Patanjali expressly states, that in those cases in which the number of Sūtras comprised under an adhikāra did not exceed the number of the letters of the alphabet, a letter representing a numerical value (without, of course, being "the bearer of a swarita"), was added to indicate the extent of the adhikāra; and from the example given by Kātyāyana we must infer that the numerical value of the letter was determined by the position it has in the Śivasūtras, since i is to him an equivalent of the figure 2. And this representation of figures by letters of the alphabet derives an additional interest from the circumstance that it is quite different from the method we meet with at a later period of Hindu progress in mathematics and astronomy.41 In short, we see that Patanjali and Kātyāyana not merely presuppose a knowledge of writing in Pāṇini, but consider the use he has made of writing as one of the chief means by which he has built up the technical structure of his work.

I will obviate, at once, an objection which may be raised,—though it could scarcely be raised by those who treat Kātyāyana as a contemporary of Pāṇini, or use the Commentaries as direct evidence for or against Pāṇini,—I mean the objection that the comments of Kātyāyana and Patanjali would only testify to their own knowledge and use of written accents; but that neither necessitate the conclusion that Pāṇini knew and employed, as they suppose him

41 Compare the system of Áryabhaṭa, who uses vowels and nasals = 0; ku, tu, pu, ja = 1; kha, tha, pha, ra = 2; gu, ṭa, ba, la = 3, etc. See Lassen’s Zeitschrift, II. 423 ff., “Journal Asiatique” (1835), vol. XVI., p. 116, etc.
to have done, written accents, nor that he was acquainted with the use of written letters for the purpose of denoting numerical values. And should there be any who attach more faith to Kātyāyana, the late commentator on Pātanjali, than to Pātanjali himself and Kātyāyana, they might, perhaps, adduce an observation of this grammarian, “that the Sūtras of Pāṇini were read in one breath, (without any regard to accent),” in order to infer that the svarita might have been sounded over the word which it intended to mark as adhikāra. Such a conclusion, however, would be invalidated, not only by the natural sense of the passage quoted, but by the remark of the same grammarian, which is contained in the translation I have given before, and which states that the svarita was not intended, in our present case, for “practical application.” It remains, therefore, to be seen whether this remark of Kātyāyana is confirmed by analogous facts in Pāṇini’s Grammar.

Pāṇini frequently refers, in his Sūtras, not only to grammarians who have preceded him, but to lists of affixes, and to arrangements of the verbal roots, which must have coincided with his own terminology. The personal relation of Pāṇini to these collections or books will be the subject of future remark; it will suffice, at present, to show that Pāṇini’s work, and these works, were based on the same grammatical system. Pāṇini refers, for instance, to a list of affixes which begin with un; where the mute letter ṇ—which has exactly the same technical value in the affix un as it would have in

22 Kātyāyana towards the end of the Introduction: युग्मम् युग्मांगां पाठान्तरपद्यं दानाइनामयादाव. Another discussion on adhikāra occurs incidentally in Pātanjali’s comment on I. 1, 49.
Pāṇini's affixes an, na, or in other terms containing this anubandha—proves that these affixes rested on the terminology which governs the Sūtras of Pāṇini. He speaks of bhūvādi, adādi, tudādi,—in short, of the ten classes of radicals, just as they are given in the Dhātupātha, and even of subdivisions of this work, e.g., dyutādi, puhādi, bhūdādi, muhādi, yajādi, radhādi, etc.; and if there existed a doubt that the expressions quoted, which contain the first word of a list, necessarily imply the whole list, and in the order in which the words of such a list appear in this work, the doubter would have at least to admit that the anubandhas or technical letters which accompany each radical in the Dhātupātha, possess the grammatical value which is expressly defined as inhering in them by special rules of Pāṇini. He refers to the Upadeśa, which is, according to Patanjali, a list, not only of the radicals, but of nominal bases, affixes, particles, increases of the base and grammatical substitutes, all of which are "settled," as Kātyāyana says.

Now, if we consult the Sūtras which treat of the verbal roots, we find, for instance, that, as a rule, a root is uddatta on the last

3, 98, of the five radicals beginning with च ( = Dhātup. § 24, 59—63); or, VI. 1, 6, of the six radicals beginning with च ( = Dhātup. § 24, 63—69); or, VI. 4, 125, of the seven radicals beginning with च (Dhātup. § 19, 73—79), etc. In all these instances, therefore, the order of the radicals in the Dhātupātha, as referred to by Pāṇini, is the absolute condition of his rule.

3 Compare the quotations in Westergaard's Radices, p. 342, 343.

3 Compare Pāṇini i. 3, 2; VI. 1, 45, 186; 4, 37; VIII. 4, 14, 18; (the term occurs frequently, too, in the Vārttikas and Kārikās), and see note 32.
sylable (VI. 1, 162). Yet (VII. 2, 10) Pāṇini states that a radical has not the connecting vowel i, if in the Upadeśa it is a mono-
sylable and anudāṭa. As the former rule concerns a radical, which is part of, and embodied in, a real word, while the latter describes the theoretical existence of the radical in the Dhātupātha, we may imagine, it is true, that for the purpose of grammatical teaching a pronunciation of the radical was devised in the Upadeśa different to that which it has in real language. But, even on the supposition that a radical could be pronounced anudāṭa, is it probable that Pāṇini or the authors of the Dhātupātha could have recourse to so clumsy a method for conveying the rule implied by the term anudāṭa? Would they, gratuitously, have created the confusion that must necessarily arise from a twofold pronunciation of the same radical, when any other technical anuvardha would have enabled them to attain the same end? Let us suppose, on the contrary, that anudāṭa, in the Upadeśa, does not mean the spoken, but the written accent, and the difficulty is solved without the necessity of impugning the ability or the common sense of the grammarians.

This inference is strengthened, moreover, by another analogous fact, which may be recalled before I give further proof from a synopsis of Pāṇini’s rules and the appearance of the radicals in the Upadeśa. This fact is contained in the last Śūtra of Pāṇini’s grammar, where he teaches that the short vowel a, which in his rules is treated as viriḍa, or pronounced with the expansion of the throat, is, in reality, samvṛita, or pronounced with the contraction of the throat. This Śūtra did certainly not intend to impose upon the pupil the task of pronouncing, during his grammar lessons, the short vowel a in such a manner as no Hindu can pronounce it, or of sounding, when learning the properties of this vowel, instead of it, some nondescript deputy vowel-sound: it can only mean that, for the sake of technical purposes defined by the commentators, Pāṇini made a fiction in his grammar, which, of course, he had to remove when terminating his book. This fiction, however, being based on
a phonetic impossibility, would be a very awkward one if it applied
to oral teaching only; it becomes quite unobjectionable if it is sup-
ported by a written text.

If a radical in the Upādesā, says Pāṇini (I. 3, 12) has the
anudātta (or न्य) as anunbandha, it is, in general, inflected in the

28 I call it a phonetic impossibility, since, if it were pronounced न्य, would
assume the properties of न्य; but as Pāṇini does not allow such an न्य to occupy the
same portion of time which is required for the pronunciation of न्य, a short न्य pro-
nounced with the expansion of the throat, becomes, to a Hindu organ of speech and
from Pāṇini’s point of view, impossible. For this reason, Patanjali, too, who on a
previous occasion had defined the letters which occur in the Upādesā, i.e., the
spandśa-varṣa, as pronounced or unpronounceable letters [see note 40], looks upon this last Śūtra
of Pāṇini as merely given to counteract the effect of the Upādesā; he thus implies that
this is the only case in which an spandśa-varṣa was not pronounceable: न्य न्य (VIII.
4, 65)। किमन्याकारम्। । किमन्याकारम्। किमन्याकारम्। किमन्याकारम्। किमन्याकारम्। किम
न्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किम
न्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किम
न्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किम
न्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किम
न्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किम
न्यायाम्। किमन्यायाम्। किम

átmānapada; if its anunbandha is the swarita (or न्य) it is, under
certain conditions, inflected in the átmānapada; under others, in the
parasna-pādapa (I. 3, 72); if it has neither of these anunbandhas
(nor is subject to any of the rules I. 3, 12—77), it is inflected in the
parasa-pādapa only (I. 3, 78). Again, from the Dhātupātha we
learn that, for instance, the radicals jyá, rt, il, vṛt, bhṛt, kahi(ś),
jñā, are anudātta (i.e., do not assume the connecting vowel i), but
have neither the anudātta nor the swarita as anunbandha.28 The
latter term implies that the sign which bears this denomination is
added after the significant element. Since, however, the roots
named are monosyllables in the Upādesā, and since it is impossible
to pronounce an accent without a vowel-sound supporting it, the
assumption that the anudātta and other accent-anunbandhas were
spoken sounds, would lead to the conclusion that the same verbal
root was simultaneously anudātta and not anudātta.29

28 Westergaard’s Radices, § 31, 29—36.
29 Other instances may be gathered from Westergaard’s Radices. I must exclude,
however, some which are not unquestioned by the best MSS. I have consulted; those,
If I had adhered to the terminology of the Dhatupatha, as it is met with in the best MSS. of Madhava's commentary, the foregoing illustration would have become still more striking; for, according to them, the roots jyá, rí, etc., are anudatta, and have the especially, which are met with in the Radtees under the term śārīrī. For when we read in the latter work (e.g. § 29 and § 31, 1, etc.) that ज्ञात, रा., ःं, ःं, etc., ज्ञात, ःं, etc., are सम्प्रदाय: and śārīrī, or (§ 31, 10, etc.) that ज्ञात, ःं, ःं, etc., are चिन्ता: and śārīrī: I could not adduce these and similar instances in support of my conclusions; since Madhava is certainly right in giving, instead of the term śārīrī, the word सम्प्रदायः or सम्प्रदायाः, as the anubandha ः would become meaningless, if these roots had, besides, the anubandha śārīrī. The term śārīrī is correctly indicated by Westergaard and the MSS., for instance, of the roots चित्र, चित्र, etc. (§ 21); चित्र, चित्र, चित्र, चित्र, etc. (§ 25); युन, युन, युन, युन, etc. (§ 38); युन, युन, etc. (§ 28); सप्त, सप्त, etc. (§ 29), etc., for all these radicals have not the anubandha ः. A proof of the accuracy of the commentators in this respect, is afforded by the instance of the root चित्र (§ 34, 7) which is described in the Dhatupatha as चित्र, and represented at the same time as चित्र, for they explain on this occasion that the anubandha ः does not indicate the átmanepada-infection, marked by the term चित्र, but refers to the effect of the Sutra III. 2, 149.

udáttā as their anubandha. In general, it may be observed, that the Sutra I. 3, 78 is apparently understood by Madhava and other commentators as referring to roots which have udáttā as anubandha: for a root which is neither anudáttet nor swarīlet, is described by them as udáttet. There is some reason, however, to doubt whether the latter term really occurred in the Upadesa referred to by Pāṇini; and as the solution of this doubt, in an affirmative sense, would add another fact to those already obtained, it will not be superfluous to advert to it here.

The misgiving I entertain is based on Pāṇini's own terminology. He speaks of roots which, in the Upadesa, are udáttā (VII. 3, 34) and anudáttet (VI. 4, 37; VII. 2, 10), which are anudáttet and swarīlet (see the preceding quotations, p. 45); but there is no trace in his grammar of radicals which are udáttet. And this omission is the more striking, as the number of roots which are marked udáttet in the present MSS. of the Dhatupatha is considerable. Nor is it satisfactorily explained by the negative tenor of the Sutra I. 3, 78, since there is no other instance in Pāṇini's
work of a technical and important term being given vaguely and inferentially.

If, however, we apply to the present case the conclusions we have been already compelled to draw as to Pāṇini’s having used accents as written signs, we may surmise the reason why udātta is not amongst the terms employed by this grammarian. Of the three accents, udātta, swarita, and anudātta, the two latter only are marked in the principal Vaidik writings, the swarita being indicated by a perpendicular line over the syllable, the anudātta by a horizontal line under it. The syllable not marked is udātta. It is possible, therefore, to say that a radical or syllable which is not marked is udātta, and that one with a horizontal stroke under it is anudātta; it is possible, too, to speak of a line added under or over the last letter of the radical; but it is surely impossible to call that ‘addition’ (anubandha) which, not being visible, could not be added at all. This explanation of the absence of the term udātta is founded, of course, on the supposition that the system of marking the accents was the same at Pāṇini’s time, as it occurs in our MSS.

of the principal Veda-Sanhitās; but it can hardly be doubted that this system is as deeply rooted in Hindu tradition as everything else connected with the preservation of the sacred books. If, then, it becomes certain that Pāṇini knew written accent signs, which were not pronounced, it will not be hazardous to put faith in the statement of Kātyāyana, that the swarita, which was intended as a mark of an adhikāra, was also a written sign, a perpendicular stroke, “but had nothing to do with practical application.”

That Pāṇini, as Patañjali tells us, and Kātyāyana gives us to understand, used letters in his adhikāra rules for the notation of numeral values, does not follow, we must admit, from his own words in the quoted Sūtra (I. 3, 11), but there is a rule of his (VI. 3, 115) in which he informs us that the owners of cattle were, at his time, in the habit of marking their beasts on the ears, in order to make them recognizable. Such signs, he says, were, for instance, a swastika, a ladle, a pearl, etc.; yet he mentions besides, eight and five. Now, either the graziers used letters of the alphabet to denote these numerals, or they employed special figures,
as we do. In either case it is obvious that they must have been acquainted with writing; in the latter, moreover, that the age to which they belonged had already overcome the primitive mode of denoting numerals by letters, and that writing must have been, therefore, already a matter of the commonest kind. At all events, and whichever alternative be taken—if even the Hindu cattle paraded the acquaintance of the Hindus with the art of writing and of marking numerals,—one may surely believe that Pāṇini was as proficient in writing as the cowherds of his time, and that, like them, he resorted to the marking of numerals whenever it was convenient to him to do so.

The absence of a letter or grammatical element, or even of a word, the presence of which would have been required by a previous rule, is called by Pāṇini lopa. The literal sense of this word, which is derived from lopa, "to cut off," is "cutting off." It will be conceded that it is not possible to "cut off" any but a visible sign, and that a metaphorical expression of this kind could not have arisen, unless the reality existed. Indeed, the very definition which Pāṇini gives of this term must remove every doubt, if there existed any. He says: "lopa ("cutting off") is the not being seen" (scil., of a letter, etc.) For, whatever scope may be given to the figurative meaning of the radical "to see," it is plainly impossible that an author could speak of a thing visible, literally or metaphorically, unless it were referable to his sense of sight. A letter or word, which is no more seen, or has undergone the effect of lopa, must, therefore, previously to its lopa, have been a visible or written letter to him. And the same remark applies to an expression which occurs several times in the Sūtras; for Pāṇini speaks more than once of affixes which are seen, or of a vowel which is seen in words.

41 I. 1. 60; और धेरे रीपु.
42 धेरे दरी धेरे III. 2. 178; 3. 130.—धेरे दरी धेरे III. 2. 75.—धेरे दरी धेरे VI. 3. 137.—धेरे दरी धेरे III. 2. 101.—धेरे दरी धेरे धेरे Y. 3. 14.

—Though in the foregoing observations no conclusion of mine is founded on statements of the later grammarians alone, it may not be without some interest to mention now that these grammarians do not seem to have conceived as much as the idea of Pāṇini's
If it becomes evident from the foregoing arguments that Pāṇini not only wrote, but that writing was a main element in the technical arrangement of his rules, it may not be superfluous to ask, whether the sacred texts had been committed to writing at the time at which grammar ever having existed except in writing. For Kaiyasa, amongst others, refers to a written text of this grammar, even when there is no necessity whatever of making allusion to such a circumstance. We must infer, therefore, that it was a matter of course to him to look upon Pāṇini’s rules as having been at all times written rules. Thus, in commenting on the vowel  in the pratyakṣa, and in advertising to its last letter, he might have simply spoken of a letter , but he speaks of a letter- sign . “ चर निः कवार्त्त प्रभावार्ती निःकृत्य सिद्धिः “ etc.”—And when Professor Müller, as we shall presently see, avails himself of so late an authority as the Mīndās Vāriśikas of Kumárla to prove or to make plausible facts concerning the highest antiquity, I will quote, as a counterpart, another later work which introduces to the god Śiva himself as recommending the writing and wearing of grammatical texts as a means for the attainment of boons and the prevention of evils. I need not add that I look upon neither work as a sufficient authority to settle the points of the present discussion. The passage alluded to occurs in the chapter of a mystical dialogue between Śiva and his wife, called Jñānakēśajīsenādhyāya, where Śiva, after having explained to Pārvati the letters of the alphabet, concludes his instruction with the following words: राजकारः which he lived, or whether they were preserved then by memory only? That the mere fact of learning the Veda does not disprove the possibility of its having been preserved by written letters also, is clear enough, and is indirectly acknowledged by Müller himself. 

रक्षित सिफ्री भुपद्धरचि जातयाचन्तयो तथा ज्ञानासुरारे। नान्या या यत् नान्या या यत् सामीये या यत् तत्त्वारे। सत्यायांसी सुद्रभाषाराज त्वाराजिः। चेष्टासात् प्रभुति पुत्र वच्चायान मम मुक्तायम। रेण राजकुमारे तिरी चापिस्ताप्रभारिः। सर्वाधिकार निमित्तावस्थायमि ति इति। “If a man writes this grammatical explanation on a birch-leaf, with a mixture of the yellow pigment Gorochakā and saffron, or if he has written it by a scribe with the quill of a porcupine on his neck or his arm or his head, he becomes after three days free from all disease; and if a wise man, wishing for progeny, reads and retains it attentively, he is sure to obtain a son, who will be like me, from his (previously) barren wife. If a battle (rages), or the royal family spreads terror, or if a tiger causes alarm, or on similar occasions, all danger vanishes in merely remembering (this grammatical explanation). What further shall I tell thee?” etc. 

History, etc., p. 246: “The ancient literature of India was continually learnt by heart; and even at the present day, when MSS. have become so common, some of its more sacred portions must still be acquired by the pupil from the mouth of a teacher, and not from MSS.”
He quotes, it is true, a passage from the Mahabharata, and one from Kumariya’s Varttikas, which condemn, the one the writing of the Veda, and the other the learning it from a written text;44 but I hold that neither quotation proves anything against the practice of writing the Veda at or before Panini’s time. Both passages might, on the contrary, be alleged to confirm the fact that the offense of writing the Vedas had already been committed.

44 p. 502: “In the Mahabharata, we read: ‘Those who sell the Vedas and even those who write them, those also who defile them, they shall go to hell.’ Kumariya says: ‘that knowledge of the truth is worthless which has been acquired from the Veda, if the Veda has not been rightly comprehended, if it has been learnt from writing, or been received from a Sutra.’—The passage of the Mahabharata quoted by Muller, occurs in the Amsudanap. verse 1845. I doubt, however, whether his rendering of वेदाविक्षेपतिः तुषा च the following: ‘those also who defile the Vedas,’ is quite correct. It seems to me that it means ‘those who corrupt the text of the Vedas,’ and that it is synonymous with the expression वेदाविक्षेपतिः which occurs in the second act of the Praheadha-chandogya (ed. Brockhaus, p. 90, l. 14; ed. Calci. p. 136, l. 5). The expression समद्वारा च च हुस्तिः which precedes a few verses (Amsudanap. v. 1630) i.e., ‘those who violate agreements’ is analogous. There is, unhappily, no comment of Nilakantha on either of these passages.

when these verses were composed. They betray, it is true, as we should expect, the apprehension of their authors lest oral teaching might become superfluous, and the services of the Brhma caste be altogether dispensed with; but they convey nothing else—not even the prohibition that the teacher or Guru himself might not have recourse to a written text of the Veda if he wanted to refresh his memory or to support his meditation. Nay, we may go further, and assert that by an authority certainly much older than both the authors of this passage of the Mahabharata and the Mimamsa-Vartikas, all the first three castes were distinctly recommended to possess written Vaidik texts. For, let us hear what the lawgiver Yajnavalkya says: “All the religious orders must certainly have the desire of knowing the Veda: therefore the first three classes—the twice-born—should see it, think on it, and hear it.” But how could Yajnavalkya order them to see the Veda, unless it could be obtained in writing?45 And that Panini, too,

45 Yajnav. III. 191: याज्ञवल्क्यो हृदयविनियोगः सम्बन्धितम युज्ञेत्तरस्य सम्बन्धसः
THE VEDAS PRESERVED IN WRITING AT PĀNINI'S TIME.

must have seen written Vaidik texts follows clearly, in my opinion, from two Sūtras, in which he says: "(the augment ā) is seen also in the Veda (viz., in other instances than those mentioned in a former rule)," and (the ādīsa an) is seen also in the Veda (viz., in other cases of asthi, dadhi, etc., than those mentioned previously)." It

NoDáví, \(\text{ViśānaŚi}\), the modern commentator of Yājnavalkya, who, like Kumárika, is evidently not pleased with the recommendation of "seeing" the Veda, twists the construction of the latter passage into the following sense: "the twice-born should first hear (the expounding of) the Veda, then reflect on it and thus (by reflection) keep it present (to their mind)." In order to impart to the word "to see" the figurative sense, he reverses the entire, and, it would seem, natural order of the injunction, which recommends the twice-born first to look into the Veda, then to reflect on it, and ultimately to ask the teacher to give his own explanation of it; the latter becoming, of course, more effectual, if the pupil is already somewhat familiar with his subject. —This is the comment of the Mitākhahā: व्याकरणादिविक्रमायामस्वभूतां व्याकरणादिविन्यासायां विज्ञानत्वयातन्त्रायां प्रवाहाण्यां द्वीपमित्रायां। विज्ञानत्वयातन्त्रायां प्रवाहाण्यां द्वीपमित्रायां। शोभायो मन्त्राँ दि। प्रवाहाण्यां वेदान्तान्त्रिकोत्तरायां मानवमुक्तिविशेषायां द्रष्टार्थायां।

is on this ground that—while disapproving the loose manner in which the Siddhānta-kumudā imparts to the word granthā in Pānini's Sūtra, I. 3, 75, the meaning Veda,—I cannot altogether reject the identity which is established by this commentary between the two words, though it would have been better, in a gloss on Pānini, to have retained the distinction which he himself established for facilitating a clearer understanding of those Sūtras which refer to revealed books, and of others which speak of unrevealed ones.67

67 Compare note 27. I alluded above to the analogy which exists between the contrasted words grantha-artha and kāya-padartha. After having shown that the Veda was a written book at Pānini's time, I may now quote a passage from the Paramārtta of the Nirukta (I. 12): वेदसंवाचकविवाहमुक्तेऽपि वेदसंवाचकविवाहमुक्तेऽपि तत्तते स तु पुष्टविषयम् सत्यविषयकः प्रविषयविन्ध्यकः निरुक्ताः, which is thus rendered by Mr. Muir, in his valuable work, "Original Sanskrit Texts" (vol. II., p. 188): "This reflective deduction of the sense of the hymns is effected by the help of oral tradition and reasoning. The hymns are not to be interpreted as isolated texts, but according to their context." In this passage the words वेदसंवाचकविवाहमुक्तेऽपि तत्तते are equivalent of वेदसंवाचकविवाहमुक्तेऽपि तत्तते वेदसंवाचकविवाहमुक्तेऽपि तत्तते.

66 VI. 4, 73, and VII. 1. 76: श्रतस्य शुभति.
RISHI, A SEER OF VAIDIK HYMNS.

There is but one other question which can be raised in connection with the present inquiry: Was writing known before Pāṇini?

One word, of frequent occurrence in the Vaidik hymns, or rather the sense which is imparted to it, may enable us, perhaps, to form an opinion on this difficult problem. I mean the word Rishi. It is explained by old and modern commentators as “a seer of hymns,” a saint to whom those Vaidik hymns referred to his authorship, were revealed by a divinity. Thus it is said in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa that the Rishi Vāmadeva obtained seeing the Rigveda-hymn, IV. 26, 1; or in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa that the Rishi seeing the hymn II. 41, 2, spoke it. For reasons which will appear from the statement I shall have to make on the chronological relation of these works to Pāṇini, I cannot appeal to these Brāhmaṇas as evidence for the present purpose; it is safer to quote Pāṇini himself, who also speaks of hymns which are seen (IV. 2, 7); and who must therefore be supposed to record an impression current at, and very probably anterior to, his time. This probability, however, becomes a certainty when we consider the distinct evidence of Yāska, who says that “the Rishis see the hymns with all kinds of intentions,” and who makes mention of a predecessor of his, a son or descendant of Upamanyu, who defined the word “Rishi as coming from seeing; for he saw the hymns.”

There were authorities, consequently, before Pāṇini’s time, who

Pāṇini, I. 1, 1: याधिकारश्लोकतः प्रवचनः; or the same on IV. I. 79: चायमिनयाचार मांकः राज्यांकः; etc.

Nirukta, 7, 3: चायमिनयाचारस्यमेव च याधिकारश्लोक च; and 2, 11:चायमिनयाचार सः प्रवचनः। भृगुभृत्त्वादिवेदांकनः। Hence Rishi becomes a synonyme of a Vaidik hymn. Compare Pāṇini, IV. 4, 96, or Sāgya on Rig-v. I. 189, 8: चायमिनयाचारस्यमेव च।
maintained the doctrine that the hymns were revealed—not to the sense of hearing, but to the sense of sight. That the act of seeing may be applied metaphorically to the faculty of thinking or imagining, and the term seen to what is imagined or thought, is no matter of dispute. But when we read numerous hymns of the Rigveda which neither express a truth, nor depict nature or events of life, but which simply manifest the desire of a pious mind;—when we read, for instance, such sentences as, “may this oblation, Agni, be most acceptable to thee;” or “may afflictions fall upon him who does not propitiate the gods;” or “we address our pious prayers to thee, Agni,” etc., what metaphorical meaning could connect such words with the notion of seeing?

And we know, too, that it is not merely the general idea conveyed by a hymn, the ethical truth, or the picture of the elementary life, or the display of sacrificial rites, or the praise of the gods, or the imprecation against foes, which is looked to by the worshipper as having been revealed to a Rishi by a divinity,—but that the very words of the hymn, and the very order in which they stand, were deemed equally a gift from above. The various methods devised by the learned to preserve the words in their integrity and to prevent their order from being disturbed, prove that they did not view these hymns in the light of mere revelations of truths, but in that of revelations of words and of sentences held sacred in the very order and form in which they appear. Nor does the fact that there were various Śākhās with various recensions of several hymns or passages of hymns, invalidate this argument; for each Śākhā claimed its text as the original one, as the revealed text; and its belief was, therefore, based on the same ground which was common to all.

If, then, such is the case, the word seer loses altogether the power of metaphorical expression; it then applies only to the material fact of seeing material words, such as the divinity holds before the seer’s material eye. The inference to be drawn from these premises is obvious. It seems to derive some corroboration from a collateral fact. The Vaidik writings from immemorial times being communicated by the teacher to his pupil orally, and
the pupil being bound to receive them in this and in no other way, their name, as we find it at the time of the Brâhmâpas and Kalpa-Sûtras, is ñruti, "hearing," or the sacred text received by the sense of hearing. Though Pânini does not use this term, we may fairly admit, on account of his using the word ñrotrîya, 79 that he was acquainted with it, and that the same mode of studying the Vedas was already usual in his time. Now the contrast is marked between "seeing" the Veda and "hearing" it. In metaphorical language both terms would be equivalent; they would express comprehension of the revealed truth. But there is no metaphor in the term "ñruti." "Hearing" the Veda rests on a material fact. Why should "seeing" the hymns be considered to rest on a less solid ground? 71

79 II. 1, 65, and V. 2, 84. Compare also the Gaṇas to V. 1, 130, 133, ñruti in the Gaṇa to V. 2, 88, and ñrûtri in the Gaṇa to IV. 2, 138.

71 The title of Rishi was, at a later period, given to renowned authors, though they were not considered as inspired by a divinity. The Kalpa works, for instance, are admitted on all hands to be human and uninspired compositions; yet Kumârila writes

To extend this view from Yâska and the predecessors he quotes, to the authors of the hymns themselves, would, no doubt, be very hazardous. For even on the supposition that the etymology in one of his Vârttikas (I. 3, 10): न तावदपूर्वः बतिष्ठादनि काव्यश्रुताः | कल्लित वेदां न वैराहस्म वाचार्यस्मातस्त्रोत्रशा.... and again: विद्वान्वति विशिष्टविविद्य लोकस्य अस्त्रोत्रशा | अविनाशोपतितविविद्य वाचार्यस्मातस्त्रोत्रशा | ....... and अविनाशोपतितविविद्य अस्त्रोत्रशा | अविनाशोपतितविविद्य अस्त्रोत्रशा | अविनाशोपतितविविद्य अस्त्रोत्रशा | अविनाशोपतितविविद्य अस्त्रोत्रशा | i.e., "No mention occurs of an author of a Kalpa work who was not a Rishi; but all that Rishis compose is like that which the authors of Mantras compose. . The word ñrûtraya is a synonym of eternal, and the quality of ñrûtraya is vested in the Kalpa-Sûtras .... Moreover, the Veda says that the words of Êâkṣâyas have authority, and the Êâkṣâyas who have composed the Vedângas are deemed Rishis." And though these words of his make part of a Pûrânapaksha, and the proposition that the Kalpa works have the same claim to divine origin as the Mantras, is refuted by him in the Siddhânta, his refutation merely concerns this latter part of the discussion, but does not invalidate the title of Rishi given by him to the authors of the Kalpas. For, as he said on a previous occasion: क वेदां श्रुतः प्रवृत्तिः पूर्वपलिन, 'the proposer even of a Pûrânapaksha should not say that which is too much at variance with truth (if his Pûrânapaksha is to be worthy of being part of a discussion). ' The title Rishi had, therefore, already lost its primitive worth in the days of Kumârila, and had undergone the same fate which is common to titles in general.
proposed by the son of Upamanyu is correct, no proof exists that Rishi is conceived in the hymns as implying the seer of words or sentences. He may be there the real representative of the Roeh who sees the general idea of his prayer or praise, but fashions it with his own—uninspired—words. There are, we may add in proof of this assertion, various instances in the poetry of the Rigveda, where the poet is spoken of as having "composed" (literally fabricated or generated), not as having "seen," a hymn; and they belong undoubtedly to real antiquity, as they show greater common sense. Thus it is said in the Rigveda (I. 171, 2) "this praise accompanied with offerings, Maruta, is made (lit. fabricated) for you by the heart;" or (VI. 16, 47): "we offer to thee, Agni, the clarified butter in the shape of a hymn made (lit. fabricated) by the heart;" or (I. 109, 1, 2): "...... my clear understanding has been given to me by no one else than by you, Indra and Agni; with it I have made (lit. fabricated) to you this hymn, the product of intelligence, which intimates my desire for sustenance. For I have heard that you are more munificent givers than an unworthy bridegroom or the brother of a bride; therefore, in offering you the Soma, I produce (lit. generate) for you a new hymn;" or (VII. 7, 6): "these men who have cleverly made (lit. fabricated) the hymn, have increased the prosperity of all (living beings) with food." And when the poet says in a Vâlakhilya hymn: "Indra and Varuna, I have seen through devotion that which, after it was heard in the beginning, you gave to the poets—wisdom, understanding of speech;" seeing is obviously used by him in none but a metaphorical sense.

32 That in रूप, the रू may be a prefix, is countenanced by the following analogies: रूङ्ग (ूङ्ग) and रूङ्ग, रूङ्ग and रूङ्ग, रूङ्ग (ूङ्गित्तिर), रूङ्ग (ूङ्गित्तिर), रूङ्ग (ूङ्गित्तिर), रूङ्ग (ूङ्गित्तिर) दित्ति (ूङ्गित्तिर) दित्ति (ूङ्गित्तिर) दित्ति (ूङ्गित्तिर) दित्ति (ूङ्गित्तिर) दित्ति (ूङ्गित्तिर).
Müller's Periods of Ancient Sanskrit Literature

There are in the Vaidik age, says Professor Müller (p. 70), "four distinct periods which can be established with sufficient evidence. They may be called the Chhandas period, Mantra period, Brâhmaṇa period, and Sûtra period, according to the general form of the literary productions which give to each of them its peculiar historical character." In the continuation of his work he then defines the Chhandas period as embracing the earliest hymns of the Rigveda, such as he conceives them to be according to the instances he has selected from the bulk of this Veda (p. 525 ff.). The Mantra period is, in his opinion, represented by the remaining part of the Rigveda (p. 456 ff.); and the Brâhmaṇa period by the Saṁveda-saṁhitā, "or the prayer-book of the Ūdgâtri priests," which is entirely collected from the Rigveda.73 The Saṁhitās of

---

73 Professor Benfer has pointed out, in his valuable edition of this Veda, the few verses which cannot be found in the Rigveda (Pref. p. xii). This redundancy, which is

the Yajurveda (p. 457), the Brâhmaṇa portion of the Vedas, properly so called, and "on the frontier between the Brâhmaṇa and Sûtra literature," the oldest theological treatises or Aranyakas and Upanishads (p. 313 ff.). Lastly, the Sûtra period contains, according to him (p. 71 ff.), the Vaidik words written in the Sûtra style, viz.: the six Vedângas or the works on "Sikhâ (pronunciation), Chhandas (metre), Vyâkaraṇa (grammar), Nirukta (explanation of words), Jyotisha (astronomy), and Kalpa (ceremonial)" (p. 113 ff.).

An author has, in general, the right of choosing his terms; nor should I consider it necessary to add a remark on the names by which Müller designates these four periods of his Ancient History, were it not to obviate a misunderstanding which he has not guarded against, though it may be of consequence to do so. Two terms which have served him for the marking of two periods of

apparently at variance with the general doctrine of the Hindu commentators, that the Sàmaveda is extracted from the Rigveda, proves, in reality, that there must have been, at one time, another recension of the Rigveda than that which we possess now; a fact clearly proved also by Müller's "Ancient History."
the ancient literature, viz., Śūtra and Brāhmaṇa, have been used by him nearly in the same sense in which they occur in the ancient writers; and if he embraces more works under these heads than those writers would have comprised, it may be fairly admitted that no misconception will result from this enlargement of the original acceptance of the words Śūtra and Brāhmaṇa. But if he designates the two first epochs by the names of Chhandas and Mantra, with the explicit remark that he has made this division of four periods "according to the general form of the literary productions which give to each of them its peculiar historical character" (p. 70), it may be inferred that, as in the case of Śūtra and Brāhmaṇa, he has chosen those names in conformity with the bearing they have in the ancient literature itself; that the Hindus, when using the words Chhandas and Mantra, meant by them the older and the more recent hymns of the Rigveda. Such, however, is not the case.

Mantra means, as Colebrooke has already defined the word—in conformity with the Mīmāṃsā writers—"a prayer, invocation, or declaration. It is expressed in the first person or is addressed in

the second; it declares the purpose of a pious act, or lauds or invokes the object; it asks a question or returns an answer; directs, inquires, or deliberates; blesses or imprecates; exults or laments; counts or narrates," etc. "Mantras are distinguished under three designations. Those which are in metre are termed rich, those chanted are śāman, and the rest are yajus, sacrificial prayers in prose," etc. 76
The first meaning of *Chhanda* is, in the ancient writers, is metre; the second is *verse* in general, and in this sense it is contrasted with the prosaic passages of the Yajurveda. Thus the Purusha-sūkta of the Rigveda—the late origin of which is proved by its contents—says: "From this sacrifice which was offered to the universal spirit sprang the Richas (Rig-verses), the Sāmans (Sāmaveda-verses), *the* metrical passages (*Chhanda*) and the Yajus," which latter words seem to referable only to the two characteristic portions of the Yajurveda, since Yajus in general designates its prosaic part. In a verse of the Atharvaveda it is contrasted, in a similar manner, with the Yajurveda, and seems to imply there the verses of the Atharvaveda: "From the remainder of the sacrifice sprang the Richas, Sāmans, the verses (*Chhanda*), the old legendary lore, together with the Yajus." In the Sūtras of Pāṇini the word *Chhanda* occurs, in rules which concern Vaidik words, one hundred and ten times, and its sense extends over two hundred and thirty-three Sūtras; in rules of this category it means Veda in general, comprising thus the Mantra- as well as the Brāhmaṇa-portion of the Veda. Whenever, therefore, such a general rule concerning a Vaidik word is restricted or modified in the Mantra portion, *Chhanda* then becomes contrasted with Mantra, and thus assumes the sense of Brāhmaṇa; or whenever such a general rule is restricted or modified in the Brāhmaṇa portion,
Chhandas then becomes contrasted with Brāhmaṇa, and therefore assumes the sense of Mantra.79

From no passage, however, in the ancient literature, can we infer that Mantra conveyed or implied the idea of a later portion, and Chhandas that of an earlier portion of the Rigveda hymns.

Some very questionable points in the distribution of the Vaidik literature will be noticed by me hereafter as touching the ground on which I have raised this inquiry into the chronological results of Professor Müller’s work. There is, however, one general question which must be dealt with previously. If Müller had contented himself with simply arranging his subject-matter as he has done, we could readily assent to the logical or esthetical point of view which, we might have inferred, had guided him in the sense brāhmaṇa]; and then “in the widest sense, generally, veda, as contrasted with loke, bhākhydūm and its slokas (IV. 3, 102 n.).” [The latter instance is not happy, since it belongs to a Vārttika of the Kālidāsa, and since there are more than a hundred Sūtras of Pāṇini which might have been referred to for the corroboration of the sense Veda]. Lastly he says, it means “metre.”—But this reversal of the meanings of chhandas is not only objectionable etymologically; it prevents our understanding how chhandas could mean both a poetical and a prosaic passage of the Vedas. Hence, the incidental question of Weber and his conjecture,—which could not have arisen if he had started from the general sense Veda, which if contrasted (but only then) with mantra, would imply the sense Brāhmaṇa, and vice versā. It seems, moreover, that the sense “desire” marks the last stage of its development; in short, that chhandas means: 1. metre; 2. a verse; 3a. a verse as prayer; 6. Veda in general, which may become modified to Mantra or Brāhmaṇa; 4. desire.
planning his work. But he does not allow us to take this view, when he assigns dates to these periods severally. The "Chhandas period," he says, comprises the space of time from 1200 to 1000 B.C. (p. 572), the "Mantra period" from 1000 to 800 B.C. (pp. 497, 572), the Brāhmaṇa period" from 800 to 600 B.C. (p. 435), and the "Śūtra period" from 600 to 200 B.C. (pp. 249, 313). In other words, his arrangement is meant to be an historical one. He does not classify ancient Sanskrit literature into a scientific, a ritual, a theological, and poetical literature, each of which might have had its coeval representatives, but he implies by these dates that when the poetical epoch, his Chhandas- and Mantra-epoch, had terminated its verses, the theological time, that of the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads etc., set to work; and when this had done with theology, the ritual and scientific period displayed its activity, until it paused about 200 B.C. I need scarcely observe that such an assumption is highly improbable, unless we suppose that India which, from the time of Herodotus, has always enjoyed the privilege of being deemed the land of supernatural facts, has also in this matter set at defiance the ordinary law of human development. But this doubt seems to derive some support from Müller’s own arguments. In the course of his researches he has confirmed the general opinion, that a Śūtra work presupposes, of necessity, the existence of a Brāhmaṇa, and that a Brāhmaṇa cannot be conceived without a collection of hymns, the Sāṁhitā. Thus the ritual Śūtras of Áswaláyana would have been impossible unless a Brāhmaṇa of the Rigveda—for instance, the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa,—had been known to him; for he founds his precepts on it; and such a Brāhmaṇa, in quoting the hymns of the Rigveda, implies, as a matter of course, a previous collection of hymns, a Rigveda itself. Yet, though this argument is unexceptionable, and may be used, perhaps—not without objections of some weight—so as to presuppose in Áswaláyana a knowledge of, and therefore as prior to him, a Sáurveda and a Taîtiriya-Śaṁhitá—where is the logical necessity that the Vájasaneyi-Śaṁhitá and the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (belonging to Müller’s third period, 800—600 B.C.) existed before Áswaláyana who lived, according to him, between 600 and 200
MÜLLER'S HISTORICAL DIVISIONS.

before Christ? His Sútras would be perfectly intelligible if neither of the two last-named works had been composed at all. And, again, where is the logical necessity that the Upanishads should have been written before the authors of the Kalpa Sútras, the Grammar, etc., since all these works are quite independent in spirit and in substance from the theosophy of Upanishads or Aranyakas. On what ground does Professor Müller separate Pásini from these latter writings by at least 250 years, when there is no trace of any description in his Sútras, either that he knew this kind of literature or that his Grammar would not have been exactly the same as it is now if he had lived much before the time of these theological works? I shall recur to this latter question; but I cannot conclude the expression of my misgivings as to this historical division without questioning, too, the usefulness of these dates in general. They are not founded, as Müller himself repeatedly admits, on any basis whatever. * Neither is there a single reason to account for his allotting 200 years to the three first of his periods, nor for his doubling this amount of time in the case of the Sútra period. He records, it is true, his personal impression alone in speaking of 1200, 1000 years, and so on; but the expediency of giving vent to feelings which deal with hundreds and thousands of years, as if such abstract calculations were suitable

* "Ancient Sanskrit Literature," p. 244: "It will readily be seen, how entirely hypo-

 ethnical all these arguments are . . . . As an experiment, therefore, though as no more than an experiment, we propose to fix the years 600 and 200 B.C. as the limits of that age during which the Brahmanic literature was carried on in the strange style of Sútras." p. 455: "Considering, therefore, that the Brähmaṇa period must comprehend the first establishment of the threefold ceremonial, the composition of separate Brähmaṇas, the formation of Brähmaṇa-charuṇās and the schism between old and new Charuṇās, and their various collections, it would seem impossible to bring the whole within a shorter space than 300 years. Of course this is merely conjectural, but it would require a greater stretch of imagination to account for the production in a smaller number of years of that mass of Brähmaṇic literature which still exists, or is known to have existed." P. 497: "I therefore fix the probable chronological limits of the Maṇtra period between 800 and 1000 B.C." (Where is the least probability of this date?) P. 572: "The chronological limits assigned to the Sútra and Brähmaṇa periods will seem to most Sanskrit scholars too narrow rather than too wide, and if we assign but 200 years to
to the conditions of human life, appears very doubtful, if we consider that there are many who will not read his learned work with the special interest and criticism which it inspires in a Sanskrit philologist, but will attach a much higher import to his feelings than he himself does. One omission, moreover, I cannot leave unnoticed in these general dates, since it has a bearing, not merely on the intervals of his periods, but on their starting points.

Colebrooke, in his essay on the Vedas, speaks of the Jyotisha, the ancient Vaidik calendar; and after having quoted a "remarkable" passage of this Vedânga, in which the then place of the colures is stated, continues (M.E. vol. i. p. 109, or As. Res. viii. p. 493): "Hence it is clear that Dhanishtâ and Aśleshâ are the constella-

the Mantra period, from 800 to 1000 B.C., and an equal number to the Chanda period, from 1000 to 1200 B.C., we can do so only under the supposition that during the early periods of history the growth of the human mind was more luxuriant than in later times, and that the layers of thought were formed less slowly in the primary than in the tertiary ages of the world."—But is 1200 B.C. a primary age of the world, except in biblical geology? 

ations meant; and that when this Hindu calendar was regulated, the solstitial points were reckoned to be at the beginning of the one, and in the middle of the other: and such was the situation of those cardinal points, in the fourteenth century before the Christian era. I formerly (As. Res. vii. p. 283, or Essays, i. p. 201) had occasion to show from another passage of the Vedas, that the correspondence of seasons with months, as there stated, and as also suggested in the passage now quoted from the Jyotisha, agrees with such a situation of the cardinal points."

We have evidence, therefore, from this passage of the Jyotisha, that an arrangement of Vaidik hymns must have been completed in the fourteenth century before Christ; and as such an arrangement cannot have preceded the origin of the hymns comprised by it, we have evidence that these hymns do not belong to a more recent date. Nor is there any ground for doubting the genuineness of this calendar, or for assuming that the Hindu astronomers, when it was written, had knowledge enough to forge a combination, or if they had, that, in the habit of dealing with millions of years, they would have
used this knowledge for the sake of forging an antiquity of a few hundred years. Yet the oldest hymns of the Rigveda are, according to Müller's opinion, not older than 1200 before Christ.

He has not only not invalidated the passage I have quoted, but he has not even made mention of it. Yet a scholar like Colebrooke, laid, as I have shown, great stress on it: it is he who calls it "remarkable;," and scholars like Wilson and Lassen have based their conclusions on Colebrooke's words. Should we, therefore, be satisfied with the absolute silence of Müller on the statements and opinions of these distinguished scholars, or account for it by the words of his preface?  

---

No one, indeed, to the best of my knowledge, has ever doubted the accuracy of Colebrooke's calculation, but Professor Weber, who, in his "Indische Studien," vol. i. p. 85, thus expresses himself:—

"I avail myself of this opportunity to observe that before Colebrooke's astronomical calculation (M. E. i. p. 110, 201) has been examined once more, astronomically, and found correct, I cannot make up my mind, to assign to the present Jyotih-çastras, the composition of which betrays—in language and style—a very recent period, any historical importance whatever for the fixing of the time when the Vedas were composed." Thus it seems that Professor Weber would make up his mind to that effect if some one would comply with his desire, and confirm the result of Colebrooke's calculation. But, we must ask, on what ground rests this desire, which, in other words, is nothing but a very off-hand slur aimed at Colebrooke's scholarship or accuracy? Is Colebrooke a third-rate writer, to deserve this supercilious treatment? Has he, in his editions or translations of texts, taken such liberties as to forfeit our confidence? Has he falsified antiquity by substituting
for its traditions his own foregone conclusions or ignorance? Has he appropriated to himself the labour of others, or meddled with subjects he did not thoroughly understand? His writings, one would think, prove that he is a type of accuracy and conscientiousness, an author in whom even unguarded expressions are of the rarest kind, much more so errors or hasty conclusions drawn from erroneous facts. But Colebrooke was not only a distinguished Sanskritist, he was an excellent astronomer. Lassen calls him the profoundest judge in matters of Hindu astronomy, and he is looked upon as such by common consent. Yet, to invalidate the testimony of a scholar of his learning and character, Professor Weber, simply because a certain date does not suit his taste, and because his feelings, unsupported by any evidence, make him suppose that the Jyotisha "betrays in language and style a very recent period," has nothing to say but that he "will not make up his mind" to take that date for any good until somebody shall have examined that which Colebrooke had already examined, and, by referring to it, had relied upon as an established fact!

It is but just to add, that three or seven years after he had administered this singular lesson to Colebrooke, Weber once more is haunted by the asterisms Dhanishtá and Aśleṣhá, and once more rejects their evidence as to Hindu antiquity. This time, however, it is no longer the accuracy of Colebrooke's statement which inspires his doubt—he passes it over in silence altogether—but the origin of the arrangement of the Hindu Nakshatras. "Since," he says, "the latter was not made by the Hindus themselves, but borrowed from the Chaldeans, it is obvious that no conclusion whatever can be drawn from it respecting Hindu antiquity." But he does not mention that Lassen, whose opinion

---


85 In an essay on "Die Verbindungen Indiens mit den Ländern im Westen," written in April, 1853, and printed in the "Indische Skizzen," 1857.

86 "Indische Skizzen," p. 73, note.
will have, I assume, as much claim to notice as his own, had aduced weighty reasons for assigning the Hindu Nakhatras to Chinese origin; and had likewise, referring to the Veda-calendar, observed:—"As it is certain now that there existed in ancient times an intercourse, not thought of hitherto, between the Hindus and the Chinese, and that, with the latter, the use of the sieu ascends to a far higher antiquity, no objection can be founded on the Chinese origin of the Nakhatras, against their having been used by the Hindus at a time which is adverted to in their oldest astronomical observations on record. These observations belong to the fourteenth century B.C., and it results from them that the Hindus at that period dwelt in the northern part of India." 86

But, strange to remark, a year after having expressed his repeated doubt, Professor Weber records his poetical views on the earliest period of Hindu civilisation in the following manner:—

"From the Kabul river to the Sadanira, from the remotest point

of the western to that of the eastern border of India, there are twenty degrees, three hundred geographical miles, which had to be conquered (by the Aryas) one after the other. Thus we are able to claim, without any further remark, 1000 years as a minimum time for the period of occupying, subjecting to complete cultivation, and brahmanizing this immense tract of land; and thus we are brought back to about 1500 B.C. as the time when the Indian Aryas still dwelt on the Kabul, and after which they commenced to extend themselves over India." 87

In short, with fantastical certainty he scruples about astronomical facts, and presents fantastical facts with astronomical certainty. I doubt whether this critical method will strengthen the faith of the general public in certain results of Sanskrit philology.

"If we succeed," says Professor Müller (p. 215), "in fixing


the relative age of any one of these Śātras, or writers of Śātras, we shall have fixed the age of a period of literature which forms a transition between the Vedic and the classical literature of India.” This inference does not seem conclusive; for neither can the age of one individual author be held sufficient to fix the extent of a period which, according to Müller’s own views, may embrace, at least, 400 years, and probably more; nor has Müller shown that the older portions of the Mahābhārata and, perhaps, the Rāmāyana, might not have co-existed with some, at least, of the authors of his Śūtra period. He says, it is true, in the commencement of his work (p. 68):—“Now it seems that the regular and continuous Anuśṭubh-Śloka is a metre unknown during the Vedic age, and every work written in it may at once be put down as post-Vedic. It is no valid objection that this epic Śloka occurs also in Vedic hymns, that Anuśṭubh verses are frequently quoted in the Brāhmaṇas, and that, in some of the Śūtras, the Anuśṭubh-Śloka occurs intermixed with Tristubhs, and is used for the purpose of recapitulating what had been explained before in prose. For it is only the uniform employment of that metre which constitutes the characteristic mark of a new period of literature.” But this very important assertion, even with its last restriction, is left by him without any proof. For, when he adds, in a note (p. 69), “It is remarkable that in Pāṇini also, the word śloka is always used in opposition to Vedic literature (Pāṇ. IV. 2, 66; IV. 3, 102, v. 1; IV. 3, 107),” I must observe, in the first place, that in none of these quotations does the word Śloka belong to Pāṇini.® The first of these instances, where Śloka occurs, cannot be traced to a higher antiquity than that of Patanjali; the second, which coincides with it, occurs in the commentary of the late Kāśikā on a Vārttikā, the

® The quotations of Müller’s note to his p. 69 are IV. 1, 66, instead of IV. 2, 66, and IV. 3, 103, 1, instead of IV. 3, 103, v. 1; but as the word śloka neither occurs in the Śūtra, nor in the Vārttikā nor in the commentaries on the former quotations, I was probably right in assuming that they were errors of the press, and in substituting for them the figures given, which are the nearest approach to them. There is indeed one Śūtra of Pāṇini where śloka and māṇtra are mentioned together, viz., the Śūtra III. 2, 23, but I am not aware that any conclusion similar to that mentioned above could be drawn from it.
antiquity of which rests on the authority of this work; and, in
the last quoted rule, the word Šloka likewise belongs to no other
authority than that of the same late commentary. But, in the
second place, it seems to me that these very instances may be used
to prove exactly the reverse of Müller's views.

I should quite admit the expediency of his observation if
its object had been to lay down a criterion by which a class of
works might become recognisable. There is, however, clearly,
a vast difference between an external mark, concerning the con-
tents of certain writings, and the making of such a mark a
basis for computing periods of literature. For, when Patanjali
or the Kāśikā, in illustrating the rules IV. 2, 66, or IV.
3, 102, says that a Vaidik composition of Tītīrīya is called
Taittīrīya, but that such a derivative would not apply to the
Šlokas composed by Tītīrīya; they distinctly contrast the two
kinds of composition, but they as distinctly state that the
same personage was the author of both. And the same author,
of course, cannot belong to two different periods of literature,

separated, as Müller suggests, from one another by at least several
centuries. The same remark applies to the instance by which the
Kāśikā exemplifies the import of the rule IV. 3, 107; it contrasts
here the Vaidik work with the Šlokas of the same author,
Charaka.

But I will give some other instances, which, in my opinion,
corroborate the doubt I have expressed as to the chronological
bearing of this word. Kātyāyana, who is assigned by Müller to the
Śutra period, and rightly so, so far as the character of some of his
works is concerned, is the author of Šlokas which are called Bhrāja,
"the Splendid." This fact is drawn from Patanjali's commentary
on Pāṇini and Kāiḥyāna's gloss on Patanjali (p. 23 and 24 of Dr.
Ballantyne's valuable edition)." Now, the word Sloka, if used in

"Patanjali (p. 23): दुष्टत्रिं श्रद्धेतः 'अष्टव् शाश्वसी। काश्वा शाश्वसी।'—Kāiḥyāna (p. 24):
वाणामात्रकमाण्यकाश्वसी। शक्तिमात्रकमाण्यकाश्वसी। एकः शब्दः
श्रद्धेतः: प्रणयम् तत्रिे तोहि वाणामाण्यकाश्वसी।—Nāgaviśālī (p. 23): 'काश्वा शाश्वसी काश्वसी।
शाश्वसी।' स्त्रिया श्वाहः
reference to whole works, always implies the Anuśṭubh-śloka: thus Müller himself properly calls the laws of Manu, Yājnavalkya, and Parāśara, "Śloka-works." (p. 86). It would seem, therefore, that the Bṛahā-ślokas of Kātyāyana were such a work in continuous Anuśṭubhs. A second instance is the Karmapradipa, which is a work of the same Kātyāyana, and is mentioned as such by Müller himself (p. 235) on the authority of Shadguruśishya; it is written in the "regular and continuous Anuśṭubh-śloka," as every one may ascertain from the existing MS. copies of this work.Vyādi, or Vyādi, who is an earlier authority than Kātyāyana (see Müller's History, p. 241), composed a work called Sangraha, or "Compendium" in one hundred thousand Ślokas; and there can be little doubt that this information, which is given by Nāgojībhaṭṭa, applies to a work in the continuous Anuśṭubh verse.∗∗ And this very

∗∗ Patanjali (ed. Ballantyne, p. 43): संधूः एवतिक्षितां च परिवर्तनाः — Kaliyāṣa: संधूः रूति — Nāgojībhaṭṭa: संधूः बारिष्टती चपत्तोत्संख्या दद्य रूति प्रविष्ठितः: — This remark concerns the use which is made of the word Śloka in reference

Vyādi, I may here state, will hereafter become of peculiar interest to us on account of his near relationship to Pāṇini. It is evident, therefore, that the "uniform employment of that metre" is not a criterion necessitating the relegation of a work written in it to a period more recent than 200 before Christ.

The "writer of a Sūtra" which, in Müller's opinion, may help us to fix the whole period of the Sūtra literature, is Kātyāyana; and, if I do not mistake his meaning, Pāṇini too. For Müller arrives at the conclusion that Kātyāyana lived about 350 B.C., and, if I am right, that Pāṇini was his contemporary.∗∗

to whole, especially extensive, works. Single verses, not of the Anuśṭubh class, are sometimes also called Ślokas; thus Kaliyāṣa calls so the Āryḍ verse of the Kārikā to II. 4, 55, or IV. 4, 9, etc., or the Duddhaka verses of the Kārikās to VI. 4, 12, or VIII. 2, 108; and Nāgojībhaṭṭa gives the name of Śloka to the Iśvaraśrem and Upan āsraśrem of the Kārikā to I. 1, 38; but I know of no instance in which a whole work written in such verses is simply spoken of as having been written in Ślokas.

∗∗ I regret that I am not able to refer with greater certainty to Müller's views on their contemporaneity. In page 138 he writes: "Kātyāyana, the contemporary and critic of Pāṇini;" p. 245: "Now, if Pāṇini lived in the middle of the fourth century
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The reason for assigning this date to Kātyāyana is contained in the following passage of the "Ancient Sanskrit Literature":—
"Let us consider," says Müller, after having established the identity of Kātyāyana and Kātyāyana Vararuci (p. 240 ff.), "the information which we receive about Kātyāyana Vararuci from Brahmantic sources. Somadevabhaṭṭa of Kashmir collected the popular stories current in his time, and published them towards

R.C., etc." [this is the date which Müller assigns to Kātyāyana]; p. 303: "the old Kātyāyana Vararuci, the contemporary of Pāñini," but at p. 184 he says: "at the time of Kātyāyana, if not at the time of Pāñini"—which clearly implies that he here considers Pāñini's time as prior to Kātyāyana's, since Kātyāyana wrote a critical work on Pāñini, the Vārttikas; and on p. 44, 45 he observes: "If, then, Āśvalāyana can be shown to have been a contemporary, or at least an immediate successor of Pāñini, etc.;" but p. 239: "we should have to admit at least five generations of teachers and pupils: first, Saṅnakā; after him, Āśvalāyana, in whose favour Saṅnakā is said to have destroyed one of his works; thirdly, Kātyāyana, who studied the works both of Saṅnakā and Āśvalāyana; fourthly, Patañjali, who wrote a commentary on one of Kātyāyana's works; and lastly, Vyasa, who commented on a work of Patañjali. It does not follow that Kātyāyana was a pupil of Āśvalāyana, or that Patañjali lived immediately after Kātyā-
yana, but the smallest interval which we can admit between every two of these names is that between teacher and pupil, an interval as large as that between father and son, or rather larger." Now, if according to the first alternative of p. 45, Āśvalāyana was a con-temporary of Pāñini, the latter becomes a doubtful contemporary of Kātyāyana, according to the quotation from p. 238; and if, according to the other alternative of p. 45, Āśvalāyana was a successor of Pāñini, there is, according to p. 239, still a greater probability that Pāñini and Kātyāyana were not contemporaries. Again, at p. 230, he says: "from all these indications we should naturally be led to expect that the relation between Saṅnakā and Kātyāyana was very intimate, that both belonged to the same śākha, and that Saṅnakā was anterior to Kātyāyana." But if Āśvalāyana is an immediate successor of Pāñini (p. 45), and an immediate successor of Saṅnakā (p. 230), Pāñini and Saṅnakā must be contemporaries; and if Saṅnakā is anterior to Kātyāyana (p. 230), and comp. p. 242), Pāñini, too, must have preceded Kātyāyana. Acting, therefore, on the rule of
We know that Kātyāyana completed and corrected Pāṇini's Grammar, such as we now possess it. His Vārttikas are supplementary rules, which show a more extensive and accurate knowledge of Sanskrit than even the work of Pāṇini. The story of the contest between them was most likely intended as a mythical way of explaining this fact. Again, we know that Kātyāyana was himself the author of one of the Prātiṣākhyaas, and Vyāli is quoted by the authors of the Prātiṣākhyaas as an earlier authority on the same subject. So far the story of Somadeva agrees with the account of Shadguruśishya and with the facts as we still find them in the works of Kātyāyana. It would be wrong to expect in a work like that of Somadeva historical and chronological facts in the strict sense of the word; yet the mention of King Nanda, who is an historical personage, in connection with our grammarian,

**Note of Müller:** “The same question with regard to the probable age of Pāṇini, has been discussed by Prof. Böhtlingk in his edition of Pāṇini. Objections to Prof. Böhtlingk’s arguments have been raised by Prof. Weber in his Indische Studien. See also Rig-veda, Leipzig, 1857, Introduction.”
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may, if properly interpreted, help to fix approximately the date of Kâtyâyana and his predecessors, Śaṅkara and Āśvalāyana. If Somadeva followed the same chronological system as his contemporary and countryman Kalhana Pândita, the author of the Ràja-tarangini or History of Kashmir, he would, in calling Pàñini and Kâtyâyana the contemporaries of Nanda and Chandragupta, have placed them long before the times which we are wont to call historical. But the name of Chandragupta fortunately enables us to check the extravagant systems of Indian chronology. Chandragupta, of Pàtaliputra, the successor of the Nandas, is Sandrocottus, of Paliboethra, to whom Megasthenes was sent as ambassador from Seleucus Nicator; and, if our classical chronology is right, he must have been king at the turning point of the fourth and third centuries B.C. We shall have to examine hereafter the different accounts which the Buddhists and Brahmans give of Chandragupta and his relation to the preceding dynasty of the Nandas. Suffice it for the present that, if Chandragupta was king in 315, Kâtyâyana may be placed, according to our interpretation of Somadeva’s story, in the second half of the fourth century B.C. We may disregard the story of Somadeva, which actually makes Kâtyâyana himself minister of Nanda, and thus would make him an old man at the time of Chandragupta’s accession to the throne. This is, according to its own showing, a mere episode in a ghost story, and had to be inserted in order to connect Kâtyâyana’s story with other fables of the Kathâ-sarit-sâgara. But there still remains this one fact, however slender it may appear, that, as late as the twelfth century A.D., the popular tradition of the Brahmans connected the famous grammarians Kâtyâyana and Pàñini with that period of their history which immediately preceded the rise of Chandragupta and his Ñådra dynasty; and this, from an European point of view, we must place in the second half of the fourth century B.C."

Thus, the whole foundation of Muller’s date rests on the

* Note of Muller: “According to the southern Buddhists it was Chandragupta, and not Nanda, whose corpse was reanimated. As. Res. xx. p. 147.”
 authority of Somadeva, the author of "an Ocean of [or rather, for] the Rivers of Stories," who narrated his tales in the twelfth century after Christ. Somadeva, I am satisfied, would not be a little surprised to learn that "a European point of view" raises a "ghost story" of his to the dignity of an historical document. Müller himself, as we see, says that it would be "wrong" to expect in a work of this kind "historical or chronological facts;" he is doubtful as to the date which might have been in Somadeva's mind when he speaks of King Nanda; he will "disregard" the fact that Kātyāyana becomes, in the tale quoted, a minister of Nanda; he admits that a story current in the middle of the 12th century about Kātyāyana and Pāṇini is but a "slender" fact;—in short, he pulls down every stone of this historical fabric; and yet, because Nanda is mentioned in this amusing tale, he "must" place Kātyāyana's life about 350 B.C.

I have but one word to add: however correct the criticisms of Müller on the value of this tale may be, the strength of his conclusion would have become still more apparent than it is now, if instead of the abstract of the story, which he has given, a literal translation of it had preceded his premises; for the very form of the tale, and its incidental absurdities, would have illustrated, much better than his sober account of it, its value as a source of chronology. I subjoin, therefore, a portion of it, from the fourth chapter of this work. Kātyāyana, the grammatical saint and author of the Kalpa-sūtras, after having told Kāṇabhūti how once upon a time he became enamoured of a beautiful damsel, by what feelings he was moved, and that he at last married the fair Upakośa, continues as follows: "Some time after, Varsha (who in another tale is said to have lived at Pāñaliputra during the reign of Nanda) had a great number of pupils. One of them was a great blockhead, by the name of Pāṇini; he, tired of the service, was sent away by the wife of Varsha. To do penance, he went, grieved yet desirous of knowledge, to the Himālaya; there he obtained from Śiva, who was pleased with his fierce austerities, a new grammar which was the introduction to all science. Now he came back and challenged me to a disputation; and seven days
passed on while our disputation proceeded. When on the eighth day, however, he was defeated by me, instantly Śiva (appeared) in a cloud (and) raised a tremendous uproar. Thus my grammar, which had been given to me by Indra, was destroyed on earth; and we all, vanquished by Pāṇini, became fools again."

It is almost needless for me to state, that the profound researches of Dr. Otto Boehtlingk in his "commentary" on Pāṇini, are based on the same interesting "Ocean for the Rivers of Stories," and have duly advocated the same date of Pāṇini’s life. But as we have become already acquainted with the reasoning of the "editor" of Pāṇini, it will not appear devoid of interest to recall his arguments, which differ in several respects from those of Professor Müller. In the Rājaratangini, the Chronicle of Kashmir, he says (p. xv), we read that Abhimanyu ordered Chandra and other grammarians to introduce the great commentary of Patanjali into Kashmir. Now, continues he (p. xvii), "the age of King Abhimanyu, under whose reign Chandra lived, can be ascertained by various ways, which all lead to the same result," viz., to the date 100 B.C.; and (p. xviii) "since we have found that Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya came into general use in Kashmir through Chandra, about 100 B.C., we are probably justified in pushing the composition of this great commentary to the Sūtras of Pāṇini, into the year 150. Between Patanjali and Pāṇini there are still three grammarians known to us, as we have observed before (p. xiv; viz., Kātyāyana, the author of the Paribhāṣās, and the author of the Kārikās), who made contributions to the Grammar of Pāṇini. We need therefore only make a space of fifty years between each couple of them, in order to arrive at the year 350, into the neighbourhood of which date our grammarian is to be placed, according to the Kathā-sarit-ságara."

"Every way," says the French proverb, "leads to Rome,"—but not every way leads to truth, even in chronology. There is one way for instance, and it was the proper way, which led Professor Lassen to the correct result that Abhimanyu did not live about

---

n "Indische Alterthumskunde," vol. II. p. 413.
100 B.C., but between 40 and 65 after Christ. As to the triad of grammarians which is "known" to Dr. Boehltingk between Pāṇini and Patanjali, and represented to his mind by Kātyāyana, and what he calls the author of the Paribhāshās and the author of the Kārikās, I must refer to my subsequent statements, which will show the worth of this specious enumeration. But, when Dr. Boehltingk required 200 years between Patanjali and Pāṇini, simply to square his account with the "Ocean for the Rivers of Stories," it would be wrong to deny that he has rightly divided 200 by 4; nor should I doubt that he would have managed with less ability the more difficult task of dividing 2000 or 20000 years by 4, if such an arithmetical feat had been required of him by that source of historical chronology, the Kathā-sarit-sāgara.

Professor Müller must have had some misgivings like my own as to the critical acumen and accuracy of Dr. Boehltingk's investigations. For, in the first instance, he does not start from the Kathā-sarit-sāgara in order to arrive at the conclusion that Kātyāyana lived fifty years after Pāṇini; on the contrary, he makes, as we have seen, both grammarians contemporaries; judging, no doubt, that two men who enjoyed a very substantial fight cannot have lived at different times, even in a story book. Then he advertts likewise (p. 243) to the little mistake of Dr. Boehltingk concerning Abhimanyu's date; in short, he denies the validity of all the arguments alleged by Dr. Boehltingk, save those which are founded on the Kathā-sarit-sāgara. When therefore he, nevertheless, says (p. 301) that the researches of Professor Boehltingk "with regard to the age of Pāṇini deserve the highest credit," I am at a loss to understand this handsome compliment, even though it strengthen his assurance (p. 310) "that Kātyāyana's date is as safe as any date is likely to be in ancient Oriental chronology."

That Sanskrit philology should not yet possess the means of ascertaining the date of Pāṇini's life, is, no doubt, a serious

"In reply to this compliment, Dr. Boehltingk makes the following bow: "Alles was zur Entscheidung dieser Frage beitragen könnte, finden wir auf das sorgfältigste..."
impediment to any research concerning the chronology of ancient Hindu works. For Pāṇini’s Grammar is the centre of a vast and important branch of the ancient literature. No work has struck deeper roots than his in the soil of the scientific development of
India. It is the standard of accuracy in speech,—the grammatical basis of the Vaidik commentaries. It is appealed to by us in the author of a "commentary on Pāṇini" (compare note 46, etc.). Yet I must ask, whence he derived his information that it was treason towards the Brāhmaṇa caste to write or to produce a manuscript? or whence he has learnt that an author could, in olden times, pass himself off as an inspired seer who was favoured by the gods, without, of course, being chastised by his countrymen, as an impostor? Mass XI. 55, treats false boasting—जगत्तात्र असाध्यम—as a crime equal to that of killing a Brāhmaṇa; and Yiṣṇauṣān, III. 239, places it on the same level with the drinking of spirituous liquors, which crime is expiated only after the sinner has drunk either boiling spirits, or boiling butter, cow's urine, or milk, until he dies (III. 235). Veracity, moreover, is known to be one of the principal features of the character of the ancient Hindus, as, in the epic legends, a word spoken, or a promise made, is always deemed irrevocable and binding. It is notorious that the Hindu authorities did not look upon any one as an inspired seer, except the author of a Mantra, and, probably, at a more recent period, of a Brāhmaṇa. The Kalpa works were never considered to be anything but human productions, and I know only of one instance, viz., that of Pāṇini, where the author of a scientific work was supposed to have received it from a divinity.—In other words, to the mind of Dr. Boehtlingk the whole of the ancient scientific literature of India presents a picture of a gigantic swindle and imbecility; on the one side are the charlatans who write works, learn them by heart, and burn the manuscripts, in order to appear in direct communication every scientific writer whenever he meets with a linguistic difficulty. Besides the inspired seers of the works which are the root of Hindu belief, Pāṇini is the only one, among those authors of scientific works who may be looked upon as real personages, who is a Rishi in the proper sense of the word,—an author supposed to have had the foundation of his work revealed to him by a divinity. Yet, however we may regret the necessity with a divinity; on the other, is the idiotic nation which believes that the learned quacks are inspired seers favoured by the gods! It is not a little characteristic, but at the same time very intelligible, that this should be the view of the "editor" of Pāṇini.
of leaving this important personage in the chaos which envelopes the historical existence of all ancient Hindu celebrities, it is better to acknowledge this necessity than attach faith to a date devoid of real substance and resting on no trustworthy testimony. For, in doing so, we may feel induced to direct our efforts towards an investigation more likely to lead to a solid result,—I mean the investigation of the internal evidence afforded by the ancient literature—as to the position of Pāṇini relatively to the works which are its chief representatives. If we could succeed in establishing this position, or, at least, in determining the critical means by which this end could be obtained, future research into the chronology of Sanskrit literature would have, at least, some ground to build upon, as well as a test by

expression with "Śīra," who revealed to Pāṇini the first fourteen Sūtras; e.g. p. 86, 87 Note 1, Vṛttas; or when Kātyāyaṇa calls Pāṇini, Āchārya, Nāgoji-bhāṣṭa says (p. 120) अन्तर्गते वेदपीयो र वाच्यपालस् ; or p. 197, धार्मिकम् द्वितीयम् Of the first fourteen, or the Śivasūtras, Nāgoji-bhāṣṭa says that they existed from eternity, while Pāṇini made the rest: (p. 762 ed. Ballantyne) विभाषादिविशालिनिः पारंपरियां विकारतर, etc. which to recognise the place that may be allotted to many important works within the structure raised.

In making an attempt in this direction, we feel our immediate interest naturally engaged by the question whether Pāṇini and Kātyāyaṇa (the author of the Vārttikas), were in reality contemporaries or not, whatever be the age at which they lived. As a substantial record of these Vārttikas is met with in no other work than the "Great Commentary" of Patanjali, it will first be necessary for us to examine the literature embodied or alluded to, in the Mahābhāṣya, so far as it bears on this inquiry; in order to ascertain what portion of this literature is anterior to Kātyāyaṇa, and what portion belongs to his own authorship. We may consult for this purpose, Kātyāyaṇa, the principal commentator on Patanjali; but we need not descend to the recent period of the Kāśikā, the Siddhānta-kaumudi, the commentaries of Nāgėśa, Purushottama, or other Vṛttis and Tīkās, for all these works are at too great a distance from the period of Patanjali to assist us in the solution of our problem.
GRAMMARIANS PRIOR TO PÂÑINI'S GRAMMAR.

Of the grammatical writers named by the author of the Mahâ-bhâṣya, we pass over those which are quoted by Pâñini himself, as by his testimony we are enabled at once to assign to them an existence prior to his Grammar. We may pass over, too, those authorities to whom Patanjali adverts when he speaks of a “Sûtra of the former” grammarians; for such an expression on his part invariably refers to Pâñini's Sûtras; and the substance of the opinions or rules of these “former” grammarians must equally, therefore, have preceded Pâñini’s work, and, consequently, the Vârтиkakas of Kâtyâyana.

The first category of writings deserving our notice here will therefore be those Vârтиkakas and grammatical dicta which are quoted by Patanjali in relation to Kâtyâyana’s own Vârтиkakas. As authors of such writings we meet, for instance, with the grammarians of the school of the Bhâradvâjyas and Saunâyâs, with Kûnarâvâdava, Vâdava, who is perhaps the same as this grammarian, with Sauâtyâhâraya, with Kûn, who is spoken of by Kâlâyâsa as a predecessor of Patanjali, and an indefinite number of grammarians who are introduced to us under the general designation of “some” or “others.” Whether the latter term con-authorities quoted by Patanjali, under the name of Kûnâyaša, are probably also meant as “older grammarians,” e.g. in his gloss on the fifth Sûtra, on I. 1, 1 and 2, 18, etc.

praise the grammarians just named, or other authorities, we cannot infer from the words of Patanjali; probably, however, we are justified in deciding for the latter alternative, since Patanjali is a writer who chooses his words deliberately, and would scarcely have quoted his authority at one time by name, and at another by a general term which does not imply that great respect entertained for a high authority. But, whatever view we take of the matter,—setting aside those grammarians quoted by Patanjali, who will require some additional remark before we can establish their relation to Kātyāyana,—we may see that all that are named must have lived before Patanjali, and after the Bhāṣya, e.g. to the second Śīvasūtra, to I. 1, 10; 2, 50, 51; II. 2, 24; 3, 65; III. 1, 27, 112, 123; 2, 109, 123, etc.; or विविधाद्वारक चाहै e.g. II. 4, 56; चिन्ह वेधार्थः: e.g. I. 1, 27; विविध चाहै e.g. VIII. 2, 80 (विविधः । । । । । । ।); चर्चा e.g. I. 1, 1 and 2; III. 2, 123; and four sets of grammarians are contrasted by Patanjali in his comment on III. 2, 115: वचनातिसूत्रिः पुरुष, विविधतात्वः। चर्चा चाहै:। वर्षेष्ठि हस्ति परोषितमितः। चर्चा चाहै:। कुदात्ताराविति परोषितमितः। चर्चा चाहै:। तथा पुरुषान्वितः वेदितः.

Kātyāyana, since all their Vārttikas or remarks, recorded by Patanjali are criticisms on, and encomianda of, the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana.100 Of Patanjali's Isītis or "desiderata," which

100 A few instances will bear out this conclusion. Kātyāyana's third Vārttika to II. 2, 18 runs thus: विविध च वाचार्याद्वार चाहै:। and his fourth: मानव: सार्थः (omitted in the Calc. ed.). After having explained both, Patanjali adds: एदेवे च न वाचार्याद्वार चाहै:। and quotes the four Vārttikas of the Śaṅkāra as given in the Calc. edition; Kātyāyana is even more explicit on this occasion, for he says: एदेवे चाहै:। वाचार्याप्रतापि सार्थः ज्ञानज्ञातितिविषयः विविधतात्वः। — The Vārttika of Kātyāyana to I. 1, 20 reads: पुष्पेश्वराः प्रकाशितस्य सार्थः:। but, says Patanjali, the Bhāravadvijaya read it otherwise: भारधविजयः प्रकाशिताः सार्थः ज्ञानज्ञातिति विविधतात्वः, which last compound contains an important improvement on the rule of Kātyāyana.— The latter enlarges Pāṇini's rule III. 1, 80, by this Vārttika: वस्त्रसिद्धाग्रन्थितानुवदाकागयाः। but, says Patanjali, after his explanation of it, भारधविजयः प्रकाशिताः। वस्त्रसिद्धाग्रन्थितानुवदाकागयाः। ज्ञानज्ञातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति विविधतातिति

The latter Bhāravadvijaya improved them in this way: (Patanjali): भारधविजयः प्रकाशिताः। वस्त्रसिद्धाग्रन्थितानुवदाकागयाः।— The same Bhāravadvijaya have criticised Pāṇini also, independently of Kātyāyana, for Patanjali mentions at the Sūtra
are his own additions to Kātyāyana’s Vārttikas, I need not

VI. 4, 47: अस्त्रोदिताय रस्मबलवानम्, their Vārttika: अस्त्रोदिताय वाणीभोजीते. The mere comparison of their Vārttikas and the passages quoted, will clearly show that these grammarians not only lived after Pāṇini, but also after Kātyāyana; and that they were engaged on the same task which was the object of Kātyāyana, viz., that of criticizing Pāṇini. Dr. Boehtlingk, however, (vol. II. p. lv)—when speaking of the Vārttikas of the Bhāradravījaya and one Vārttika of the Āpiśālas, which improves Pāṇini’s Sūtra VII. 3, 95, गुणप्रमाण: सार्वभाष्यति in this manner: गुणप्रमाण: सार्वभाष्य: श्रवि (quoted by the Kiśkē, not by Patanjali),—draws from them the twofold conclusion, “first, that the grammatical terminology of both predecessors of our grammarian (Pāṇini) was the same, partly at least (das die grammatische Terminologie bei den beiden Vorgänger waren Grammatikern, zum Theil weniger, dießle gewesen ist), and then, that their original works, in time, received similar emendations and additions as the grammar of Pāṇini.” I know not why logical process either of these conclusions could be extracted from these Vārttikas. The passages quoted are obvious criticisms on Pāṇini and Kātyāyana,—and so are the other Vārttikas of the Bhāradravījaya named by Patanjali. There is not the slightest evidence afforded by these Vārttikas that they are in any connection whatever with works of Bhāradravīja and Āpiśāla, and any reasoning concerning the latter becomes therefore without foundation. Or do we find that in India all pupils and descendents are compelled to confine their writings or remarks to the

speak, since they are an essential portion of his own Great Commentary.]

works of their teachers and ancestors? and will their criticisms on these latter works turn out, by some marvellous process, to fit exactly the productions of other authors also? It will probably be thought desirable that an editor should at least understand the title-page of the work which he is committing to the press, even when editing is merely tantamount to reprinting the labours of others, faults and all; but I fear that this much cannot be said of Dr. Boehtlingk’s edition of Pāṇini; for, in translating the title-page of the Calcutta edition, he renders एक किर्किया “किर्कियाँ” and justifies this version in the following note (vol. II. p. xxxvii): “I take धैर्यमिति as a dwi̯ābra, and एक as synonymous with किर्किया, because I should not like to miss these (the किर्कियाः) on the title.” Thus, because the Calcutta Pandite, rightly or wrongly, did not say on the title-page of their edition that their compilation will comprise the किर्कियाः, but merely stated that it will give Vārttikas, Gaṇas, Paribhadra and Iskṭiya, Dr. Boehtlingk reasons, that “since he does not like the omission of the किर्कियाः,” Iskṭiya is the same as किर्किया. There is, indeed, nothing strange in this reasoning of Dr. Boehtlingk; we have seen already some specimens of it, and if any one would take upon himself the ungrateful task of reviewing the second volume which he has annexed to his “editions” of Pāṇini, he would have to add a good many more of the same quality. But if Dr. Boehtlingk had chosen to consult, by letter or otherwise, the editors of his edition of Pāṇini, they would in all probability have told him that Iskṭiya means a “de-ideratum,” and that Iskṭiya, emphatically
Another category of literary compositions, which are either entirely or partly embodied in the Mahābhāṣya, are the Kārikās. To assign these verses to one author, would be as so called, and not qualified otherwise (as Ishita of the Kālīka, etc.), designate the Vārttikas of Patanjali. They might, too, have referred to him the Padachandraśāstra, which in the introduction plain says: तदर्थो भाष्यवाचः or to Nāgajībhaṭṭa, who when referring to the word रुद्रī applied by Kālīyata to the Vārttika (of Patanjali to I. 1, 1, omitted in the edition) उपदेशोन्निधि अभवत् comments: रुद्रीति. ततो श भाष्यवाचादिधिरुपवृढः अस्व:काव्येनुपुत्तरिति भावः. But, for aught I know, they might have simply requested him to read their own edition, before sending it to the printer, since they have themselves written the word भाष्यवाच:, for instance, after a Vārttika to I. 1, 9, or भाष्यवाच: after a Vārttika to I. 1, 68; or the words रुद्रीश्चाबन्धन: after a Vārttika to II. 2, 28; and it is clear enough that in none of these instances can रुद्री be synonymous with वायास्त.

It is almost superfluous to state that I merely speak of the Kārikās which are recorded by Patanjali. Those belonging to Bhartrihari, who wrote a gloss on Patanjali (comp. e.g. Gaṇapatiśāhasadhi: सगुरूर्वर्षसपैरस्यदत्वाशुमागमावता, and my subsequent observations on the Vākyapadiya), as well as the Kārikās met with exclusively in the Kālīka or Siddhānta-kaumudi, can have no bearing on the present investigation.

These assertions have nevertheless been made by Dr. Boehtlingk, vol. II. p. xiv., where he states that “between Pāṇini and Anuśamāsins there are still four grammarians: Kātyāyana, the author of the Paribhāṣā, the author of the Kārikās, and Patanjali;” and p. xviii. xix., where he states that each couple of these grammarians may be separated from one another by a space of fifty years, he repeats, “as we have observed above (p. xiv), there are between Pāṇini and Pāṇini still three grammarians known to us, who made contributions to the grammar of Pāṇini.” On page xlii, it is true, he says, “no doubt the Kārikās do not all belong to the same author, since the same subject is treated sometimes in two different Kārikās in a perfectly different manner;” but as he observed before that the Kārikās are “scattered in various grammars (etc), viz. in the Mahābhāṣya, the Kālika, the Padamājari and the Kaumudi,” and as two quotations which he adds in corroboration of his statement, viz. VI. 3, 100, and VII. 2, 10, have reference to the Kālika and Siddhānta-kaumudi only, we should be in fairness bound to conclude that, in his opinion, it was the literary period after Patanjali which produced this variety of authors of the Kārikās. Yet when he presents us with a third quotation, viz. “Calc. ed. p. 274,” which clearly points to the fact that there were different authors of Kārikās at or before Patanjali’s time, it would be curious to learn how he reconciles this latter quotation with his previous statements at pages xiv and xix, according to which there is but one author of the Kārikās between Pāṇini and
sight, in four instances, that they cannot be the work of the same author; and, besides these, two other instances of the same kind may be found in the “Great Commentary.” But, to define the relation of these verses to Kātyāyana, it will not be sufficient simply to state that some of them embody the words of Kātyāyana, while others deviate from them, and others again enlarge and criticise the Vārtikas: it will be necessary to describe the characteristic features of these Kārikās such as we find them in Patanjali’s work.

An external, but very important mark, is afforded by the circumstance that one portion of the Kārikās is left by Patanjali entirely without comment, while he comments on another portion in the same manner as he does on the Vārtikas; and we may add, too, that there are a few Vārtikas which are not altogether without a gloss, but the gloss on which is so scanty Bhāṣyakaracchāditvā vijñaptiḥ. The Kārikā to VIII. 1, 69 embodies the Vārtikas 1, 2, 3 to the same Sūtra and Vārtika 2 to VIII. 1, 67, but in the latter Kātyāyana says svarūpāyatmaḥ, and the Kārikā enlarges this rule to svarūpāyatmaḥ (Nāgajībhaṭṭa: sadbhāvonair āśāyitā tattvād. The Kārikā to III. 2, 118 is thus introduced by Patanjali: veda satyaḥ sādhyāḥ. The first occurs at the end of Patanjali’s commentary on the Vārtikas of this Sūtra, is without comment, and contains, for the greater part, new matter, which is given in the shape of Vārtikas in the Siddhaḥasta-kauśumṭa. It is omitted in the Calc. ed. and runs thus:}
and so different from the kind of comment bestowed on the Vārttikas, that they might seem to constitute a third category of Kārikās.  

If we first examine the Kārikās without comment, we meet twice with the remark of Patanjali that "another," or "others," have composed the verse in question, when the Kārikā is con-

106 Without any comment of Patanjali we find the Kārikās to I. 1, 0. 14. 20. 38. 70; 2, 60; 4, 51 (Kār. 5-7).—II. 1, 10. 60; 4. 36. 85.—III. 1, 7 (= V. 2. 94. Kār. 1). 22. 27. 79. 122. 127; 3, 3. 123 (Kār. 1. 2. 4. 5. 6) ; 3, 1. (Kār. 3.) 156 (= VII. 4. 41); 4. 79.—IV. 1. 44. 63. 161; 2, 9. 60. (comp. the preceding note); 4, 9.—V. 1. 115; 2, 48; 3, 55.—VI. 1. 1. 77 (Kār. 2). 87; 2. 109; 4, 114.—VII. 1. 18. 73 (Kār. 2). 4, 46 (Kār. 2). 92.—VIII. 1, 70; 2. 58. (Kār. 3). 59. 62. 80. 108; 3, 43.—There are Kārikās commented upon by Patanjali, in his usual manner, to I. 1, 1. 97; 2. 9. 17. 80. 51; 4, 51 (= III. 3. 101). 51 (Kār. 1. 2. 1-4).—III. 1, 112; 2, 57. 109. 115. 130; 3, 1 (Kār. 1. 9).—IV. 1. 3. 10. 18. 34. 54. 78. 92. 130. 185; 2, 8. 45; 3, 60. 84. 134.—V. 1. 19; 2, 39. 45. 94 (Kār. 2); 3, 83.—VI. 1. 77 (Kār. 1) 103; 158; 2. 1. 3, 46; 4, 3. 12. 22. 46. 62. 74. 128.—VII. 1. 9. 21. 40. 73 (Kār. 1). 96; 2. 102. 107; 3, 3. 68; 4. 46 (Kār. 1).—VIII. 1, 62 (comp. the preceding note); 2, 25. 55. 58 (Kār. 1. 2); 3, 88; 4, 69.—To the third category belong the Kārikās to I. 1, 38 (om. Calcid ed.)—III. 1. 123; 2. 118. 123 (Kār. 3).—IV. 2. 13.—VI. 4. 120. 149. 122 V. 3. 45.—Other Kārikās quoted in the Calcutta edition do not occur in the Bhāṣya.

trusted by him with the preceding Vārttika; and the same remark occurs four times, when the Kārikā thus introduced to our notice is contrasted with a preceding Kārikā.  

More definite statements, I believe, are not volunteered by Patanjali; but Kaiyūṣa once tells us, that such an uncommented Kārikā was composed by the Śāloka-vaṭṭittika-kāra, or the "author of the versified Vārttikas;" and though this information is not more distinct or more satisfactory than that of Patanjali, it has, at least, the merit of having on another occasion elicited the remark of Nāgōji, that this author is not Kātyāyana.

107 Patanjali to III. 1, 27: चन्द्र चाल | धान्ता** (contrasted with the preceding Vārttika); III, 2, 123, Kār. 1: चन्द्र चालः | नागो चर्चा वर्त्तानः वाच देति | चन्द्र चाल दीशापुराणरिति | न वर्तीति* | चन्द्र प्रेमनम् देति (contrasted with the preceding Vārttika), etc.; but the last Kārikā, which is introduced by the words चचन्द्र चालः, Kārikā 2, चचन्द्र चाल देति | चन्द्र चाल दीशापुराणरिति | चन्द्र प्रेमनम् देति, is contrasted with the preceding Kārikās; at IV. 1, 44, after श्रेयः he says, चचन्द्र चालः श्रेयः; etc.; at IV. 1, 63, after चचन्द्र चालः, प्राकृतिकैन्यासः; at VII. 2, 38, after चचन्द्र, his words are, प्राकृति चालः दीशापुराणादि.
Being here merely concerned with the question of the relation of these Kārikās to Kātyāyana, we should not feel under the necessity of examining the contents of the six verses just mentioned, even if they differed in character from the rest—which is not the case—for the statements alleged enable us, as it is, to conclude that they are later than his Vārttikas. Still, as the remaining portion of these un-commented Kārikās does not admit of a similar inference without an inquiry into the evidence which they yield, it will be necessary to observe that they fall into two distinct divisions.

One class of them merely records the substance of the preceding Vārttikas. These, for the most part, stand at the end of Patanjali's commentary on the Sūtra to which they belong; but
connecting or strengthening the links of the debate by an important definition or a new argument, then again summing up the substance of the discussion itself, and throwing, as it were, some additional light on it.  

put either at the beginning or at the end, for no other reason than that it is a verse, such a method, in a book, moreover, of that equivocal class which gives dribbled extracts of an important literature, makes the same impression, on my mind at all events, as if an editor of a garbled Shakespeare were to present us first with all the prosaic and then with all the poetical parts of the play, or vice versa.

Uncommented verses of this kind are met with in the Bhāshya at or near the beginning of the discussion on IV. 1, 44 (वै दीर्घे मुद्द । द्विषेषाचारितादितुष्टे । वी द्वैबो मान । वस्ते विचाराव्यति रति आ इत्यादि इत्यादि) when he contrasts the following Kārikā-चार भाव | चार | भाव*—with the preceding words;) IV. 1, 63 (अतिरिक्ततां च भाविताय यथा भावादित्व्यक्तिः) which words are contrasted with the Kārikā of another:"चार भावविन्यासः") IV. 1, 101 (तत्तत्तज्ज्ञातात्वकम्) ; अति विचारावस्थारि रति इत्यादि इत्यादि) V 1, 115 (तत्तत्त द्वौः विचाराय इत्यादि) वस्तू चतुर्भूताय चिन्तनात्मेति किं तेन तेन तोहो तन्त्रत्वः द्विषेषाचारितादितुष्टे । वै दीर्घे मुद्दः (VI. 2, 109 (पराल्पदेव चारितादितुष्टे । वै दीर्घे मुद्दः) VII. 4, 46, Kār. 2, (री द्रुः)
A comparison of these two classes of uncommented Karikās shows, therefore, that while the former might have been omitted in the Great Commentary, without any detriment to the contents of this work, the latter was indispensable to it. We may look upon the summary Karikās as memorial verses, adapted for forming a separate collection for the convenience of teachers and pupils; but the independent existence of the commentatoral Karikās is quite unintelligible, and would be altogether purposeless. In short, though there might be a doubt whether Patanjali, or some other grammarian, poetically inclined, had versified the Vārttikas, it seems impossible to assume that the second class of those Karikās was composed by any one but Patanjali. It is very probable, however, that the author of the Mahābhāṣyā was not the author of the summary or memorial Karikās. For since there was an "author of versified Karikās," as we learn from Kātyāyanā and Nāgājībhanta, and as we shall see that a considerable number of the commented Karikās do not belong to his authorship, the literary activity of this personage would become restricted to,

"Vādik" passage in question—a very vague definition—is older than Patanjali's Bhāṣya, and not taken from it; on I. 1, 70; 4, 51 (Kār. 5—7); II. 4, 30; III. 1, 7 (which occurs once more in the middle of the discussion on V. 2, 94 as Kār. 1); III. 1, 122, 127; 3, 1. Kār. 3 (see note 118). 136 (= VII. 4, 41); 4, 79; IV. 2, 9; 90 (omitted in the Calc. ed.; see note 105, नेत्रः); V. 3, 55 (Kār. 3—5); VI. 1, 1; VII. 1, 18; 4, 92 (where Patanjali speaks in the first person); VIII. 1, 70; 2, 59.
and his fame would have been founded on, less than half-a-dozen lines, if we did not ascribe to him more Kārikās than those expressly attributed to him by these commentators, or if we fathered these summary Kārikās on Patanjali. Whether the “other” mentioned in the first six instances be the same, or not, as the “author of the versified Kārikās,” I have no means of deciding; but at all events, it becomes certain, after this brief explanation, that all the uncommented Kārikās are later than the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana.

The Kārikās commented upon by Patanjali are in one respect similar to the foregoing class, but in another wholly different from it. As regards an external mark, we again meet here with “another,” who has twice composed a Kārikā which is contrasted by Patanjali with a preceding Vārttika, and twice a Kārikā which he contrasts with a preceding Kārikā, the authorship of which is left without a remark. Another such Kārikā, too, is distinctly ascribed by Kaivyata to the “author of the versified Kārikās.” And when we examine the contents of this second class of Kārikās, we again find many which form an essential part of the arguments in the discussion of Patanjali. Here, however, the analogy stops; for the remainder have in no way the nature of summaries; they are to all intents and purposes identical in character with the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana; and even Patanjali’s commentary

Kārikā with the preceding Vārttika; III. 2, 109, चाप चाह | मानिषिक एत्यत्स्त्र चाप चाह | मानिषिक एत्स्त्र etc. contrasted with preceding Vārttikas omitted in the Cal. ed.; I. 2, 50 (Kār. 2), चाप चाह | मानिषिक एत्स्त्र etc. contrasted with the preceding Kārikā; I. 4, 51, चाप चाह | प्रभाववृक्षयाति etc. (commented on up to कवियो विप्रः: Kār. 1-4) contrasted with the preceding Kārikā.

113 VI. 4. 22. Compare note 108.

112 Such Kārikās are met with at or near the beginning of the Bhāṣya on I. 1, 45, 51 (the two first Kār. of the Cal. ed.); III. 3. 1 (Kār. 1. 2.; the last Kārikā is left without comment); IV. 1, 3. 54. 78. (the first four Kārikās stand at the beginning, before the first Vārttika; the following nine after the second Vārttika of the Calcutta edition, which, in the Bhāṣya, however, is the fourth); 92. 165; V. 2, 45; VI. 1, 103. In the middle of the discussion on I. 1, 57; IV. 1, 93; V. 1, 19; 2, 94, Kār. 2 (before the seventh Vārttika of the Cal. ed.); VII. 4, 46 (Kār. 1).
AUTHORS OF THE COMMENTED KĀRIKĀS.

on them follows the same method that he observes in his comment on the Vārttikas.\textsuperscript{114}

This method is analogous to that which has become familiar through the classical commentaries of Śankara on the Upanishads, of Medhātithi and Kullāka on Manu, of Sāyana on the Vedas, of Vijnānēśvara on Yājnavalkya, and so on. Its character chiefly consists in establishing, usually by repetition, the correct reading of the

\textsuperscript{114} Kārikās of this description occur in the Bhāshya at or near the beginning of the commentary on I, 1, 10; 2, 9, 17, 18, 50 (Kār. 1); III, 2, 115; IV, 1, 10 (the Vārttika of the Calc. ed. on this Sūtra is no Vārttika but Bhāshya); 3, 60, 84, 104; V, 3, 63; VI, 1, 77 (Kār. I, 1, 6); 158; 2, 1, 3, 46; 4, 3, 46, 128; VII, 1, 21, 40, 73 (Kār. 1), 96; 2, 107; 3, 3 (Kār. 1), 85; VIII, 1, 69 (?) 2, 25, 55, 58 (Kār. 1, 2); 3, 85; 4, 88.—In the middle, at I, 2, 51; 4, 21 (—III, 3, 16); III, 2, 57, 139; IV, 1, 18, 32 (the second Vārttika of the Calc, ed. is no Vārttika but Bhāshya on the last part of the Kārikā); 2, 8 (the second Vārttika of the Calc. ed. is misjudged; it runs thus: कत्वु रावित्वा वेदोऽर्थस्नातिस्य यीति). 43; V, 3, 59; VI, 4, 12, 62, 74; VII, 1, 9; 2, 102; 3, 3 (Kār. 2 and 3).—Towards the end, at IV, 1, 129.—In several of these instances there are no other Vārttikas to the Sūtra besides the Kārikā, which is then the subject of the whole commentary, e.g., at IV, 3, 60, 84; VI, 4, 46, 128; VII, 1, 21; 3, 98.

text, in explaining every important or doubtful word, in showing the connection of the principal parts of the sentence, and in adding such observations as may be required for a better understanding of the author. Patanjali even excels, in the latter respect, the commentaries instanced, for he frequently attaches his own critical remarks to the emendations of Kātyāyana, often in support of the views of the latter, but not seldom, too, in order to refute his criticisms and to defend Pāṇini; while, again, at other times, he completes the statement of one of them by his own additional rules.

Now this method Patanjali strictly follows in his comment on the Kārikās I am alluding to. As they nearly always constitute a whole verse, and as such a verse is generally too complicated an assemblage of words to be thoroughly intelligible without being interrupted by some explanatory remark, it seldom happens that the comment of Patanjali does not begin till he has given the whole verse in its uninterrupted order. Nor is it often that so many words of the Kārikā as constitute half a verse remain together in the Bhāshya, though it is obvious that half a verse is
more likely to afford undivided matter for comment than a whole one. The rule, therefore, is, that small portions of the Kārikā, for the most part of the extent of an ordinary Vārttika, are, like so many Vārttikas, separately commented upon by Patanjali, and that in all such instances we have to gather the scattered parts of the Kārikā, from amongst the commentatorial interruptions of Patanjali, in order to see that, put together, they form a verse,—a śloka, an Indravajra, a Dōdhasa, an Āryā, or the like.111 This trouble we are frequently saved, either by the author of the Great Commentary himself, or by the attentive copyists of his work, as he or they usually repeat, at the end of the gloss on the Vārttikas, ने तत्वाते, and then after the words प्रतिविधाय प्रवृत्तम् च चन्द्रो चाम. — The manner in which the great majority of these Kārikā is interrupted in the Mahābhāṣya may be guessed from a very few instances which have escaped the garbling process of the Calcutta editors; from IV. 1, 120, where the four Vārttikas are the literal text of the Kārikā; and from V. 3, 83, where the first five Vārttikas constitute the Kārikā. The injudiciousness of giving these Kārikā on all other occasions, without indicating the manner in which they have arisen from a number of short Vārttikas, requires no remark after the foregoing explanation; but this proceeding becomes still more subject to censure, when some portions of the Kārikā are given as Vārttikas and others are omitted, or ascribed to other works than the Bhāṣya, while the Kārikā, nevertheless, is printed as belonging to the latter work. For it becomes evident that, in all such cases, there was not even a principle which guided the so-called selection or quotation of the works wherein the Vārttikas are taken. Thus at IV. 1, 23 the Calcutta edition gives the Kārikā, but only the last portion of it as Vārttika—mistaking, moreover, the words of the commentary वा अवृत्तिः एव, प्रवृत्तिः, for the Kārikā-Vārttika, which runs thus: वा अवृत्तिः प्रवृत्तिः. A similar mis-editio of the second Vārttika to IV. 2, 8, and the attributing to the Kārikā of the fifth Vārttika, make it impossible to see that the Vārttikas 2–8 form, in the Mahābhāṣya, the text of the printed Kārikā. In ascribing the third and the fifth Vārttika of V. 3, 83 to the Siddhānta-kumudī, the

111 The text of the whole verse of Kārikās of this class is given before the comment of Patanjali, at I. 2, 51; V. 2, 94, Kār. 2; VI. 4, 46; VIII. 4, 68. There occur half verses of the Kārikās, without commentatorial interruptions, e.g. at I. 4, 21 (= III. 3, 101), III. 2, 57, 115; IV. 1, 3, 9, 32, 93, 168; 3, 4, 45; V. 2, 30; VI. 4, 3, 12, 62, 128; VII. 1, 9, 96; 2, 102, 107; 3, 3, 96.—Both modes are combined at VIII. 3, 45 (a Kār. of the third category) where Patanjali first comments on the text of the first Kārikā, which is given without any interruption; then on the first half of the second Kārikā; then on the second half of the second and the first Kārikā, both given together; then on the second half of the third; and lastly, on the first half of the fourth Kārikā. The comment on the second half of the fourth Kārikā follows first after the words विषयं च
the whole Kārikā in its metrical integrity. Sometimes, however,
they omitted to do this; and if I may judge from the copy of
the Mahābhāshya in the possession of the Library of the Home
Government for India, the Calcutta Pandits, who published an
edition of Pāṇini, have, in some instances, supplied the apparent
defect of this manuscript. 116

editors obscure the origin of the Kārikā to this Sūtra, which repeats the text of
the first five Vārttikas, such as they occur in the Bhāṣya. — At VIII. 2, 25 the same edition
does not allow us to perceive more than the first stop of the first Kārikā, while it gives
the three Kārikās in full. — I may mention, too, that there is no such Kārikā in the
Bhāṣya as that printed at VI. 4. 19. It certainly was very tempting to roll up into
a Sloka the words of Patanjali, गुणसब्धिवेत्, which explain the second Vārttika
गुणसब्धिः, together with the three other Vārtikas which belong to Kātyāyana; but
there is no evidence to show that Patanjali made this verse; nor does it occur in the
Kārikā or the Siddhānta-kauṭūkā. — For one Kārikā Patanjali seems, indeed, to be
himself answerable, for the Vārtikas to VIII. 1, 69 merely contain the material for
the first fourth and the second half of the Kārikā, which occurs at the end of his
Bhāṣya on this Sūtra. It is possible, however, under the circumstances, that this
Kārikā may be one of the summary class. See note 105.

116 Dr. Ballantyne's edition of the first Adhyāya of the Mahā-

bhāṣya, and the MS. of the E. I. H., which have the four Vārtkikas to I. 1, 57,

The foregoing remarks sufficiently express my views on these
commented Kārikās. Where the authorship of "another," or
of the Sloka-vārttika-kāra, is distinctly mentioned by Patanjali
or Kātyāyana, I see no reason to doubt that the Kārikās to which
this remark applies are neither Patanjali's nor Kātyāyana's. When
the Kārikās are part of the arguments of the Bhāṣya itself, it
seems certain, as in the case of the analogous Kārikās without comment,
that their author is Patanjali; but when they have entirely

Authors of the commented Kārikās.

Note 115: The repetition of some of these Kārīkās has no
doubt been omitted, because the commentary of Patanjali allowed
the whole verse or half a verse of this text to remain uninterrupted
(see note 115). In the Calcutta edition all these Kārikās are given
in their metrical integrity.
the character of Vārttikas—which will later be defined—they are undoubtedly the composition of Kātyāyana; and such, I hold, is the view of Kaśyapa and Nāgojīhata also. For though it is no part of their task to specify the authorship of the Kārikās, except when such a remark is essential to their gloss, they, nevertheless, have done so occasionally; and when thus we find that they plainly ascribe some of these commented Kārikās either to the author of the Vārttikas or the author of the Great Commentary, as the case may be, we must be allowed to infer that they entertained a similar opinion on other Kārikās which would fall under either of the heads I have mentioned above. 117 Nor need we hesitate at the idea of a poetical author of Vārttikas. Not only were whole grammatical works, ancient and modern, written in verse, 118 but it is a common occurrence with scientific commentators in India, that they cannot resist the temptation of running into verse, even at the risk of endangering their prosaic task. We need only remember another celebrated author of Vārttikas, Kumārīla, who writes alternately in Śloka and prose. It might seem more remarkable that Patanjali should write in verse and comment upon this himself; but Mādhava affords an analogous instance in his Jaiminiya-nyāya-mālā-vistara; Viśvanātha-Panchāguna

117 Thus, on the first four Kārikās to IV. 1, 78, Nāgojīhata observes: यतीत्र दोषा भाविकत एत स वासिकाः; which words, moreover, plainly intimate that there exist Kārikās composed by Kātyāyana; or in the latter part of Kaśyapa’s comment on the Kārikā to VI. 1, 103 we read: … लुभािन्द्राय विनिििण्वम विरुित भाविको औरताित्वस्मात्; — In his comment on the Kārikā to IV. 3, 60, Nāgojīhata, in referring to the remark of Patanjali, सुपर्कधि इन्तामि तत्त्वाध्यायणमाथास्बतः; (which words explain the beginning of the second Kārikā) observes: भाव्ये तत्त्वाध्यायणमाथ वासिके आर्ये स्यािमाति; and on a further remark of Kaśyapa: प्रवत्तानिििण्वमाथस्मात्.

118 For instance, the Pāṇiniya-Sikṣā and the Rik-Prāśākhya.
wrote a commentary in prose, the Siddhântamuktâvalî, on his metrical exposition of the Vaiśeshika Philosophy, the Bhâshâparîchchheda; Devâñjarâjâma explained in prose his versified Muhûrtachintâmani; Vârdhamâna did the same with his Gana-ratnamahoddadhi; and many more instances could be adduced to show that there is nothing striking, or even remarkable, in the assumption that Patanjali composed grammatical verses and commented on them in prose.119

119 I owe to the kindess of Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall an extract from his "Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems," which mentions besides Viśvanâtha-Panchâñana, eleven authors who wrote twelve works in verse and commented on them in prose. As this extract is, on other grounds, of considerable interest, I will, with Dr. Hall's permission, forestall the arrival in Europe of his important work, and here subjoin the substance of his communication. He names in it, besides the author of the Bhāshā-parîchchheda—1. Jirarjâ-Dikshita, who wrote the Tarûka-kâlikâ (on the Vaiśeṣhika) in verse, and a commentary on it in prose, the Tarûka-mânjarî; 2. Vîailûdrâgâhârnya, the author of the Vedântadhimârjana-mâlî (in verse) and a prose exposition interspersed; 3. Prakrânamanda or Anantânamanda-kriśnâ (?), the author of the Siddhântamuktâvalî; 4. Vismvedra-Brahma-Prasadâ, the author of the Sachchidânandâmâhâvaprâdipikâ; 5. Lakshmadhara-Kârî, who wrote the Advaita-makâralâî; 6. Sankarâchârya, to whom the Atmâbodha is ascribed, and likewise a comment on it, entitled Ajñânâbodha; 7. Sankarânamda, the author of the Atmapuruṣâ and a comment on it, the Atmapuruṣâ-dîpikâ; 8. Appayâ-Dikshita, the author of the Brahmastarkastava and the Brahmastarkastava-vivarana; 9. 10. Vâillûdrâgâhârnya, the author of the Puṣâprâvâhanarnyâdâbbheda and a Vîrâra in it, and likewise of the Antâtyâra-prâbodha and a Vîrîrî on it; 11. Gângâdhara-samarâvâti, the author of the Siddhânta-sikṣâ-manjari (an abridgement of the Siddhântasiksa) and a Prâkâsa of it; and 12. Gocâdacâdaitra, who wrote the Atharva-prâhâsya and a commentary on it.—All these works (except the first) treat on the Vedânta; their text is in verse and their commentary in prose.
the Kārikās of this class, or his comment assumes more the nature of a general exposition, which is intended to work out the sense of the Kārikā, but not to give, at the same time, a gloss, in the usual sense of this word.\textsuperscript{130} In short, a comparison of these Kārikās with those of the two other classes, must lead to the conclusion that, in reality, they are no separate class, but belong either to one or the other. They are partly Panthjal’s own arguments expressed in verse and amplified in prose, or the composition of that “other” grammarian whom we have encountered before. There are, indeed, two of these Kārikās which are distinctly ascribed by

\textsuperscript{130} Thus the two half verses of a Kārikā to I. 1, 38 (omitted in the Calc. ed.), are interrupted and accompanied by a brief remark, as will appear from the following quotation (ed. Ballantyne, p. 486): द्रविणां यथा तद्भवं यथानित्यं तद्यथानित्यं।। द्रविणां यथा तद्भवं यथानित्यं।।

The Bhashya on the first two half verses of the Kārikā to III. 1, 133 (which are left uninterupted), merely consists of the words: निष्क्रियं विनिर्देशम्, on the following portion, निष्क्रियं विनिर्देशम्, of the instances: द्रविणां यथा तद्भवं यथानित्यं।।

The comment on the Kārikā to IV. 2, 13 runs thus: द्रविणां यथा तद्भवं यथानित्यं।।

The whole Bhashya on the Kārikās to VI. 4, 136, is the following: on the first half verse: \textit{विनिर्देशम्यादिकोरिति} नम्बरा।। यथा विनिर्देशम्।।

on the rest, which is given without any interruption: चिन्तनो द्वितियं निर्धूरिति। — The Kārikā to VI. 4, 149, which also is given entire — up to the second, which is preceded only by the word चिन्तनो — is followed by these words: चिन्तनो न द्वितियं निर्धूरिति। — The Bhashya on the whole continuous first Kārikā to VIII. 3, 45, consists of these words: चिन्तनो न द्वितियं निर्धूरिति। — The Bhashya runs: चिन्तनो न द्वितियं निर्धूरिति। — The Bhashya runs: द्रविणां यथा तद्भवं यथानित्यं।।

on the uninterrupted second half and first half of the third Kārikā; द्रविणां यथा तद्भवं यथानित्यं।।

on the second half of the third Kārikā: द्रविणां यथा तद्भवं यथानित्यं।।

on the second half of the third Kārikā: द्रविणां यथा तद्भवं यथानित्यं।।
Patanjali to this grammarian, and a third which quotes Kātyāyana, and cannot therefore belong to this author of the Vārttikas.\textsuperscript{111}

Another and very important class of grammatical writings frequently adverted to in the Māhābhāshya is familiar to Hindu grammarians under the name of \textit{Paribhāshās}. They do not amend and criticize, but teach the proper application of, the rules of Pāṇini. While the \textit{Sanjñā-rules} explain the technical terms of his work, the \textit{Paribhāshās} explain the general principles, according to which the Sūtras are to be applied. Thus, when Pāṇini or other grammarians teach the meaning of the terms \textit{Guna}, \textit{Vṛddhi}, \textit{Upasarga},

\textsuperscript{111} The Kārikās to I. 1, 38; VI. 4, 149; and VIII. 3, 45, belong, in all probability, to Patañjali, and those to III. 1, 123; 2, 118, 123 (Kār. 3); IV. 2, 13; and VI. 4, 130, to the \textit{other} grammarians. The Kārikā to III. 1, 123, is distinctly introduced by Patañjali with the words \textit{चपर चाहि।}—The third Kārikā to III. 2, 123, which has no other comment than the words \textit{विमानवस्थाय वक्त|}, is thus introduced by him, together with the two preceding and the two following verses: \textit{चपर चाहि।} \textit{वक्त|} \textit{वक्त|} \textit{वक्त|} \textit{वक्त|} \textit{वक्त|} \textit{वक्त|} \textit{वक्त|}.\textsuperscript{12} Compare note 107.—The first Kārikā to III. 2, 118, explicitly refers to Kātyāyana, in quoting his second Vārttika to this Sūtra.

\textit{Gati, Dwandva, etc., the rules devoted to this purpose are \textit{Sanjñā-rules}; but when Pāṇini says, \textit{If a grammatical element in the Sūtras has the mute letter m, this anubandha indicates that such an element has to be added after the last vowel of the radical or base with which it is to be joined;} or if he states, \textit{The sixth case in a Sūtra means that, instead of that which is expressed by this case, something else, enjoined by the Sūtra, is to be substituted,—such rules are \textit{Paribhāshā-rules}.}\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Compare I. 1, 1. 2, etc., and other Sūtras marked in the edition \textit{संस्कृतम्}; and I. 1, 47. 49. and other Sūtras marked there \textit{वार्तिकायययम्}. But the Calcutta editors have failed in accuracy, also, in this respect. Thus the rule I. 1, 21, \textit{भाष्यते प्रस्तुतम्}, is marked by them as an \textit{वार्तिकायययम्}, but Patañjali calls it distinctly \textit{परिमाणम्}; or I. 1, 69, \textit{सुधुम्पम्यस्य सूक्तम्}, has their mark \textit{संस्कृतम्}, but is called by Kātyāyana himself a Paribhāshā (ed. Ballantyne, p. 763); or I. 1, 72, \textit{वेय विक्रियुक्ते कार्यम्}, is marked by them \textit{संस्कृतम्}, but Patañjali likewise calls it a Paribhāshā (ed. Ballantyne, p. 372): \textit{इत्यादि परिमाणम्:} \textit{ञाौषद्योप:} \textit{समयक्ति:} \textit{ङ्गाः} \textit{विभिन्नविभिन्नकृतिः} \textit{च:} \textit{राजस्वसिद्धिः} \textit{विभिन्नविभिन्नकृतिः} \textit{च} \textit{विभिन्नविभिन्नविभिन्नकृतिः} \textit{च} \textit{राजस्वसिद्धिः} \textit{अविभिन्नविभिन्नकृतिः} \textit{च}. \textit{राजस्वसिद्धिः} \textit{विभिन्नविभिन्नकृतिः} \textit{च} \textit{विभिन्नविभिन्नविभिन्नकृतिः} \textit{च}. \textit{राजस्वसिद्धिः} \textit{विभिन्नविभिन्नकृतिः} \textit{च} \textit{विभिन्नविभिन्नविभिन्नकृतिः} \textit{च}.
A Paribhāṣā contains either a special mark, which enables the reader to recognise at once the Śūtra to which it refers, or it is delivered without such a criterion. In the latter case, it is matter of discrimination to see whether it applies unconditionally or conditionally to a given Śūtra. In explaining, for instance (I. 1, 3), that “whenever Guṇa or Vṛddhi is the subject of a rule, these terms are used in reference to the vowels i, ī, u, ū, ri, rī, and lṛī only,” Pāṇini, by these technical terms, gives us the power of distinguishing at first sight, as it were, the Śūtras affected by this Paribhāṣā. But when he says (I. 1, 54), “If a rule is given in reference to something which follows, it concerns merely the beginning of such a following element,” it is for the reader to judge whether this Paribhāṣā prevails unconditionally at, and is an essential part of, for instance, rule VII. 2, 83, or not. Again, when a Paribhāṣā (I. 4, 2) teaches that “If two rules connected with one another, but of a different purport, apparently apply to the same case, the later rule only is valid,” it is left to his judg-
ment to decide whether it may be applicable or not to rule VII. 3, 103, for instance.23

The Paribhāṣās, however, which are to be the subject of the following remarks, are not those given by Pāṇini himself: they are the Paribhāṣās met with in the Great Cymnentary of Patañjali, and have been defined by Vaidyānātha, surnamed Pāṇagūḍa, in his gloss on the Paribhāṣhenduśekharas of Nāgo-

23 Purushottama-varittī-tikā on Pāṇini, I. 1, 3: परं परिंधिक चपुष्ठुच बापा या परिमाल या च विभ्रूयन्त विभिन्नभूत मुन त। या विभिन्नभूतार्न (सी. दो. हो. 224, 224) बापा या विभ्रूयन्त
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jībhāṭṭa, surnamed the Upādhyāya, as ‘axioms (the existence and authority of) which are established by certain Śūtras of Pāṇini, and axioms (the existence and authority of) which are established by the method that governs other works, but is applicable to Pāṇini also.” Each of these categories has been taught, as they state, by ‘older grammarians, in the shape of Śūtras;’ the former however, Vaidyanātha observes, prevail in number and authority over the latter. In other words, these Paribhāṣās are, according to the grammarians quoted, special axioms referring to Pāṇini exclusively, and general axioms which avail for his Grammar as well as for other works. The “certain” Śūtras of Pāṇini which indicate that such Paribhāṣās are in existence and are required for a proper application of the rules, are called Jnāpaka, and the method of other authors which indicates that those Paribhāṣās are applicable as well to them as to Pāṇini, bear the name of Nyāya.124 We shall see, however, that this definition, to be correct, will have to be modified; and I may mention, besides, that older commentators, Kātyāyaṇa, for instance, merely speak of Paribhāṣās and Nyāyas, not of Paribhāṣās founded on Nyāya; while the author of the Paribhāṣāhendusekhaṇa himself frequently gives the name of Nyāya to those Paribhāṣās which, according to his introductory words, are such as are founded on Nyāya.125

124 Paribhāṣāhendusekhaṇa, in the introduction: प्राचीनसौभाष्याकरमणे पालनिः.

125 The Lokaparibhāṣāhṛtyottiti is therefore divided into a gloss on what we may call the Paribhāṣā proper and a gloss on the बाध्यपुरोहित: प्रतिभाष्य: which comprise twenty-eight axioms. This distinction is somewhat obscured in the
In now adverting to the chronological relation in which these axioms stand to Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, we are, in the first place,

Paribhāshas, Paribhāshas anterior to the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana.

enabled to decide that Paribhāshās of this kind must have existed before the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, for the latter quotes such Paribhāshas in his Vārttikas.28 Another question, how-

have appended it to VIII. 2, 48, which Sūtra, however, merely illustrates its applicability. Many other instances of this kind might be alleged in order to show that the matter is one of great difficulty to the Hindu grammarians themselves, and that in this respect, also, much scope is left for a future conscientious editor of Paññāri. That the Paribhāshās are not met with at the end of Patanjali’s Bhāṣya to a Sūtra, requires no further ob-

observation after the statement of note 109; for they are an essential portion of the arguments of his discussion.—The term अर्थ is applied six times to Paribhāshās by the Calcutta editors (viz. at the Sūtras I. 1, 23, 42, 47; twice II. 1, 1; III. 1, 12); but if they followed the Paribhāshā collections quoted, they ought to have marked in a similar manner several axioms which are given by them simply as Paribhāshās. At all events, they ought not to have called the same axiom अर्थ ‘Nyāya, at III. 1, 12, and Paribhādh, at VI. 1, 71; and since they repeated it in order to show its application, they might have mentioned it also at VI. 1, 135, where it likewise occurs in the commentary of Patanjali.

28 A Vārttika to I. 1, 65, which has disappeared in the Calcutta edition, says:—

चक्रवृत्ति वृत्तिनिर्मित्तिः, चिदंबर, च ज्ञातिस्मायाब्यावारः; Its last words मालवं, etc., are a Paribhāshā, as results from the Bhāṣya on this Vārttika.
ever, is, whether those Paribhāshās which existed before Kātyāyana existed also before Pāṇini, and whether we should be justified in looking upon the Paribhāshās collected in the Paribhāshenduśekhara, the Paribhāshāsangraha, and similar works, as the original Paribhāshās to the Sūtras of Pāṇini. If we believed Vaidyanaṭha’s definition of the two categories of Paribhāshās, and of the distinction he establishes between Jñāpaka and Nyāya, as just mentioned, it would become very probable that the Paribhāshās were composed after the Grammar of Pāṇini, and by another grammarian than Pāṇini, since there is no evidence to show that he wrote other Paribhāshās than those which are embodied in his own Sūtras; and if we assumed that the collections of Paribhāshās made and commented upon by Nāgojīhāta, Śrādeva, and others, are the original collections, there would be a certainty that the “older grammarians,” whom the former quotes as his authority, did not precede Pāṇini, for one, or perhaps two, of these axioms, mentioned in each of these collections, distinctly refer to him. 137

There are, however, reasons which must induce us to doubt the originality of the Paribhāshās contained in these collections, and to doubt too the strict correctness of Vaidyanaṭha’s definition. In the first place, because these collections, each of which appears to be entitled to equal authority, differ in the number, and even in the wording, of the Paribhāshās which they contain, though they coincide in giving all those Paribhāshās which espe-

137 The Paribhāshā to IV. 1, 82: बहकुशः पावनीयम्; and the P. to VIII. 1, 1: पृष्ठपातिवधिब
COLLECTIONS OF PARIBHĀSHAS.

specially concern us here. The original collection of Paribhāshas was any of those now preserved in manuscript. But there is more ground to confirm this doubt. The Paribhāshenduśekhara states, in its introduction, that it is going to explain the axioms explicitly mentioned by the older grammarians and recorded in the Bhāṣya and the Vṛttikas;—whereupon Vaidyanaṭha comments: ‘The older grammarians’ are Indra and so on; ‘explicitly mentioned’ means read in the shape of Sūtras; in the Bhāṣya’ says the author of the Paribhāshenduśekhara, because it is not his intention to explain the Paribhāshas which are embodied in Pāṇini’s Sūtras.

The number of Paribhāshas in the Paribhāshenduśekhara is 108: it may, however, be given as 115, as several P. are contracted into one; in the Paribhāshenduśekhara of Śrīdeva it is 130; in the Laghubhāṣenduśekhā and the Paribhāshenduśekhā there are 108 Paribhāshas proper and 28 nyayaśūtras P., some of the latter being included in the 108 of the first named work. Another collection, which does not mention the name of the compiler, but bears the title of Pāṇinimatāvandgani Paribhāshā, has 123 Paribhāshas. Each of these collections has some Paribhāshas which are not named in several of the others.

and because of those mentioned by the older grammarians carry no authority with them. Now, if we compare the Paribhāshā collected in the last-named work, and in the other works devoted to the same purpose, with the Great Commentary itself, we find that they frequently call that a Paribhāshā which is not a quotation made by Patanjali from authorities which preceded him, but simply a portion of his own argument. No doubt, when this great critic considered himself justified in laying down general principles, according to which certain Sūtras are to be interpreted or applied, such axioms of his are to all intents and purposes Paribhāshā, but they are Paribhāshās of his, not of the authorities who preceded him. And this dis-

See note 124.

I mentioned in note 100 that the absence or presence in the Bhāṣya of the quo-
tational word तत्तत् affords no criterion in the case of the metrical Kārikā. It is neces-
sary to state now that this word is always met with when a Paribhāshā is quoted by Patanjali, and its absence is therefore a safe mark that a general axiom which occurs in his commentary is one of his own creation. A few instances chosen from the first
tinction we must draw in order to judge whether Patanjali originated an axiom merely for the purpose of defending Pāṇini, or whether the Sūtra in question is bond fide entitled to the benefit of chapters of the Mahābhāṣya will make good this assertion. We read in the Bhāṣya on I. 1, 30 (p. 395, ed. Ballantyne): 

also in the Bhāṣya on I. 1, 55 (p. 608) 

or at I. 1, 15 (p. 377) 

these words as Paribhāshā. Or when the Bhāṣya on the Vārttika युद्धमयायोऽस्मि वयः ...

... युद्धमयायोऽस्मि वयः etc. the words 

Pāṇini's general argument, and do not contain Paribhāshās of older grammarians. These instances will illustrate the uncritical condition of the actual collections of Paribhāshās. Some of these Paribhāshās, moreover, are nothing else than Vārttikas of Kātyāyana forming part of the discussion of the latter; they, too, are therefore not the oldest Paribhāshās, since, as we have seen above (note 138) Kātyāyana quotes a Paribhāshā which must have preceded his Vārttikas. Such Paribhāshā-Varītikas, which are commented upon by Patanjali in the same manner as the Vārttikas—while he generally contents himself with merely quoting a Paribhāshā rule— are, for instance, the P. to I. 1, 65: 

Other Paribhāshās of the Paribhāshenduśākhara, etc., do not even represent the words of Patanjali, but merely the meaning of his general argu-
from the time at which he lived down to a period of linguistic development, which could not but find them defective in many respects.\footnote{Such Paribhāṣās are, e.g., समाजाठरविधिप्रचुरः, at VI. 2, 197, and the nine P. mentioned at III. 1, 70, by the Calcutta editors.}

There is a material difference, therefore, between the Paribhāṣās contained in these collections, when taken as a whole, and the Paribhāṣās quoted by Pāṇini; and no conclusion becomes safe until we know which Paribhāṣās are quotations made by Kātyāyana and Pāṇini, and which belong to their authorship, or even to other and later works. It suffices for our present purpose to add, that neither the first Paribhāṣā already mentioned, which distinctly refers to Pāṇini, nor the second, is a Paribhāṣā quoted by Pāṇini or Kātyāyana.\footnote{The Paribhāṣā चक्रमूलः पाकिनीतः is mentioned in Kātyāyana's gloss on the}

We are left, then, free to judge of the relative age of these axioms entirely from their contents, and to weigh the probabilities which decide whether they could all have been written after Pāṇini or not. These probabilities strongly tend in favour of the latter alternative. For, however many of these old Paribhāṣās may have been additions made after Pāṇini's,

Bhāṣya to IV. 1, 82, but not by Pāṇini. The P. पूर्वभिज्ञायिणयास्वंचने is, in my opinion, a portion of Pāṇini's own argument, when commenting on the 10th Vārttika (of the Calcutta edition), to VIII. 1, 1, as results from the following quotation: .......................... पूर्व:पुनः पूर्व:पुनः दृष्टि। थमातियिंहलाभाकत: तापिनार्ति। तथा। वर्णी चार्चुः च स्वरूपमात्रानि, etc.; and other Paribhāṣās, again, so far as I was able to ascertain, do not occur at all in the Bhāṣya; e.g., the P. at I. 1, 62. 63; II. 3, 40 (par. 2), etc.

\footnote{The Paribhāṣā चक्रमूलः पाकिनीतः is mentioned in Kātyāyana's gloss on the}
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though before Patanjali’s time, we still shall have to admit that without a great number of them, a proper application of his rules is absolutely impossible. Without them, many rules would become open to equivocations and doubts, nay, to such serious objections, that it is hardly possible to conceive a grammarian of the mould of Pāṇini handing his work to his contemporaries in a condition so needlessly precarious, and so little creditable to his skill.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{132} Two instances will suffice to illustrate this character of what I consider to be the oldest Paribhāśās. In the rule III. 1, 94, Pāṇini teaches that if, in his chapter on kṛt-affixes, a subsequent rule supersedes a preceding rule, either of the kind of affixes enjoined by such rules may be at will employed in the formation of a kṛt-derivative, except when the affix enjoined is used exclusively in the feminine gender, and when the affixes in the preceding and subsequent rules are of the same form. Thus the Śūtra III. 1, 133, teaches that nouns denoting the agent are formed with the affixes yuṇmi (\(=\) akṣa) and trich (\(=\) tri). Again, Śūtra III. 1, 135, says that from kahip and other radicals there named, such derivatives are formed with the affix ka (\(=\) a); hence, according to the Paribhāśā-rule III. 1, 94, the nouns of agent formed of kahip may be kahipa, or kakopa or kahoptri, since none of these affixes is used exclusively in the feminine gender, and none has the same form as the two remaining ones. But when Pāṇini rules, in III. 2, 3, that from dā a derivative may be formed -da (as latter part of compounds like ga-dā, etc.), and,

Nevertheless, if he had delivered his grammar entirely without any Paribhāśā, we might still be free to assume, without inconsistency, that in doing so, he meant to leave to the acumen of

in III. 3, 13, a derivative -dāya (as latter part of such compounds as ga-dāya, etc.) it would become doubtful whether there be an option also in these instances, since the technical affix of the form -da is ka, and of the form -dāya, a, and since it is not clear whether ka and a could be considered as affixes of a different form, or—on account of their representing the real affix a, though with a different influence on the radical—as affixes of the same form. This doubt is not solved by Pāṇini himself, but by a Paribhāśā quoted by Patanjali, which says: नामेन भावमावस्यम्, “dissimilarity (of the affixes) is not produced by the mute āvadhan.” And Pāṇini must have supposed that his readers were acquainted with this Paribhāśā; for otherwise, as an accurate writer, he could not—in the Śūtra III. 1, 139—have treated, without any further explanation, the affixes ā (\(=\) a) and a (\(=\) a) as similar affixes, and exempted them as such from the influence of the rule III. 1, 94.—Or when, in the Śūtra VI. 1, 48 (and VII. 3, 30), he says that the radical i, before the affix of the causal, becomes dp, his rule (VI. 4, 57) on dp would be equivocal, since the form dp may represent a simple radical, too,—unless he relied on the familiarity of his reader with the Paribhāśā, which states: सम्बन्धद्रवयोऽधिकारोऽधिका, “(if there is a doubt) whether a secondary or a primitive form (be meant), the primitive form (has the precedence).”
his commentators the task of eliciting these general principles from his grammatical rules. But we know that such is not the case; his work bears evidence that he has given Paribhāśā-rules,—axioms which are in no way more important than many of those which are met with in the Mahābhāshya, but not in his work;—axioms which admit of the same arguments for or against their desirability or their indispensableness in a book of this kind. The omission of these rules, then, would not be one made on principle; it would assume the nature of a serious defect, unless we discovered a motive which would reconcile it with the accuracy that characterizes this great grammarian.

We have proof—and some will be afforded in the sequel—that Pāṇini was no: the inventor of the grammatical system preserved in his work, though he improved it of his predecessors, and made his own additions to it. We shall see, moreover, that he availed himself of the technical means of the older grammarians, and, in such a case, never gave any explanation of those technicalities which must have been known to his contemporaries, and, therefore, required no remark. If, then, we supposed that he followed the same course with regard to the Paribhāśā-rules—and there is no reason why he should not—our inference would, of necessity, be that he was compelled to give such Paribhāśās as did not occur in the works of his predecessors, and were required as special axioms for his own work; but that, without exposing himself to the reproach of carelessness, he could omit all those Paribhāśās which were already in existence, and were available, as well for the grammar of his predecessors as for his own.

And this conclusion is confirmed by the sense in which the term Jnāpaka is used in the older commentaries, especially in the Mahabhāshya itself, where by this name are called such rules of Pāṇini as "indicate" or point to other rules which show how the former rules are to be applied properly. In commenting, for instance, on a Vārttika to the Śūtra I. 1, 23, which defines the technical term sankhyā, Patanjali asks, "how will there be in rules on sankhyā a correct understanding of this term?" and
answers this question in the following manner: "(This understanding) results from the Jñāpaka-rule. What is such a Jñāpaka-rule? When Pāpini, in his Sūtra V. 1, 23, teaches that bases formed with the affix vat, have an additional vowel i before the affix ka enjoined in the preceding rule for sankhyās,—is this Sūtra V. 1, 23, the Jñāpaka-rule of sankhyā? (i.e. does this Sūtra indicate that bases formed with vat are comprised under the technical name sankhyā?) No. For the term Jñāpaka concerns the application of a rule (i.e. this term is not used of a Sūtra when its application is prohibited; the Sūtras V. 2, 51 and 52, for instance, as Kaiyayata observes, are Jñāpakas of the Sūtra on sankhyā)."

114 Vārttika to I. 1, 23 (om. in the Calc. ed.; p. 432 ed. Ballantyne): चढ़ारीवाद-वहस्. Patanjali: चढ़ारीवाद चयं चयनमार्गम्। बैन्धिकवैशेषिक हस्त वहस्तस्य भविष्यति। दाशवादित्वः। वायम् विरूपः। वैद्यवतीत्रित्वः (V. 1, 23) संबंधया भिन्दितः कस्य (comp. V. 1, 22) संबंधार्थिरः भविष्यत। सोस्तोत्तरश्च रूढः। त्रिकालान्यां।—Kaiyayata: दाशवादित्विरूपम्। एवाद्वितित्वंतथावस्थानिः। चढ़ारीवादस्य चयनतीत्रित्वम्। चयनोपि।

115 Patanjali observes, for instance, in his comment on the first Śivasūtra (p. 87 ed. Ballantyne): चचन्द्र प्रचन्द वर्ण (VIII. 4, 68) इद्धवर्णम् विद्वेशः। संबंधार्थिरः प्रकृतिः। चचन्द्र इववर्णम् वर्णवर्गम्। चचन्द्र इववर्णम् वर्णवर्गम्। etc.; or on the Vārttika to I. 1, 56, भूतभूतित्रित्वम्।—he observes (p. 633, ed. Ballantyne): चचन्द्रप्रयो-रीतित्रित्वम्। च। चचन्द्र इववर्णम् वर्णवर्गम्। चचन्द्र-
and as Patanjali expressly and repeatedly states, a rule has the character of a Jñāpaka only when it is given in reference to a rule already previously established, and when its sense becomes completed by it. Thus the Sūtra III. 2, 97, says Patanjali, is no Jñāpaka of the Guṇa-rule I. 1, 3, since the former rule does not become completed through the contents of the latter. Or, the Sūtra VII. 2, 103 is not a Jñāpaka of the rule VII. 2, 102, since its object would not be accomplished by the contents of this latter rule, though the words concerned by both rules are comprised under the term survaṇāman.\footnote{Patanjali e.g. in his gloss on the Vārttikas to I. 1.3 (ed. Ballantyne, p. 248): . . . } In consequence, a Jñāpaka rule cannot precede, but must come after the rule which is indicated by it.

In now considering the relation which exists between the Jñāpakas and the Paribhāshā-Sūtras,\footnote{Kārikā to VII. 2, 102: एवं तद्विप्रायन्तः सुनिश्चयति संवेदेऽवः सत्त्वाः संहारावस्यां भवति. सदृशं किं प इति (VII. 2, 103) वादी इ शास्ति. इसस्या दिविको स्वतंत्रतेव सुञाल्यात्माः विवेचित्ते विवेचित्ते संसारपत्यायाः भवति। व च किम इच्छा प्रविष्टमि. } we cannot but perceive that it nowise differs from the relation which exists between rules instance before and ordinary rules indicated by these Jñāpakas. In the same manner as there are Jñāpaka-rules which indicate the purpose of other rules, there are Jñāpaka-rules which indicate the purpose of Paribhāshās, and all the Paribhāshās given by Pāṇini.
himself, therefore, precede their Jñāpaka-rules. If, then, as we
learn from Kātyāyana and Panjali, there existed Paribhāṣās
which are not contained in Panini’s grammar, but which never-
theless are indicated by Jñāpakas, which are Sūtras of Panini,
such Paribhāṣās must, at least in Panjali’s opinion, have ex-
isted before Panini’s work; for otherwise the definition given by
the Mahābhāṣya of the term Jñāpaka would become inconsistent
with itself. And since Paribhāṣās or principles of interpretation
cannot be conceived without matter to be interpreted according to
them, such Paribhāṣās must not only have preceded Panini, but
they must have been taught in one or more other grammatical
works; and Vaiḍīyanātha, therefore, as I suggested above, cannot
be correct in basing his distinction between Nyāya and Jñāpaka
on the circumstance that the latter refers to Panini exclusively,
while the former applies also to other works. In all probability
the difference is this: that Jñāpaka is used especially of gram-
matical rules, while Nyāya is a synonyme of Paribhāṣā, but
applies to writings which are not grammatical.

In now summing up the result we have obtained from the pre-
vious investigation, so far as it bears on our immediate problem, we
find that the oldest author on record who wrote on Panini was
Kātyāyana, and that he was not merely the author of the Vārttikas,
properly so called, but also of a certain number of Kārikās, which,
in reality, however, are nothing else than an assemblage of single
Vārttikas, forming, combined, a stanza or a verse. We have seen,
too, that Vārttikas, which form an essential part of the Mahā-
bhāṣya itself, are of Panjali’s authorship.

What, then, is the relation of Kātyāyana to Panini, and of
Panjali to Panini and to Kātyāyana? Is it that of commenta-
tors, or is it to be defined otherwise?

Professor Müller confers upon Kātyāyana the title of “editor”
of Panini, and says that “the Great Commentary of Panjali
embraces both the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana and the Sūtras of
Panini.” In Professor Weber, on the contrary—who, even in some

10 Ancient Sanskrit Literature, pp. 333 and 243.
of his latest writings, candidly confesses that he has never read the Mahābhāṣya, but nevertheless, or perhaps for this reason, abounds in conjectures on this work, which not only is in existence but within reach,—goes so far as to throw doubt on the genuineness of those Sūtras which are not explained, because they are not explained, in the Great Commentary. 139 I fear that neither scholar will find adherents for his opinion amongst the pupils of Patanjali and Kātyāyana. The mutual relation of these latter grammarians and their relation to Pāṇini is, indeed, implied by the word Vārttika.

"The characteristic feature of a Vārttika," says Nāgojibhaṭṭa, "is criticism in regard to that which is omitted or imperfectly expressed in a Sūtra." 140 A Vārttika of Kātyāyana is therefore not a commentary which explains, but an animadversion which completes. In proposing to himself to write Vārttikas on Pāṇini, Kātyāyana did not mean to justify and to defend the rules of Pāṇini, but to find fault with them; and whoever has gone through his work must avow that he has done so to his heart's content. He will even have to admit that Kātyāyana has frequently failed in justice to Pāṇini, by twisting the words of the Sūtras into a sense which they need not have, or by upbraiding Pāṇini with

139 For instance, in the Indische Studien, vol. IV., p. 78: "Die Pāṇini kommen in dem Schol. zu Pāṇini (IV. 1, 85; 2, 112) vor (ob aus dem Mahābhāṣya?)" or in a note to the same vol., p. 108, when referring to the Sūtra VI. 2, 142 of Pāṇijal, he observes: "Allerdings: bhūyā tu na eyākyātām, also unsicher, ob ihm geböhrig." ["Also", on what basis does this conclusion rest? "Unsicher", for whom?]

The same confusion and the same conjecture occur, indeed, so often in Professor Weber's multifarious writings, that it becomes a matter of psychological curiosity to see how an author, apparently much concerned about a certain subject, instead of acquiring the necessary information—which in the present case could not have caused any great difficulty,—or of consulting at least some one who might have allayed his disquietude, constantly displays before the public his feelings and theories, whereas, by dint of a stereotyped repetition of the same words, he must convey to a confiding reader the impression that there may be some foundation, at least, for his would-be critical surmise.

140 Nāgojibhaṭṭa on Kātyāyana to the first Vārttika (of the Calc. ed.) of I. 1, 1 (ed. Ballantyne, p. 213): बालिकासिद्धिः। वृहि नुभुक्तकृत्तिकायानं बालिकासिद्धिः.
failings he was not guilty of. On this score he is not unfrequently rebuked by Patanjali, who on such occasions severely rates him for his ungenerous treatment of Pāṇini, and, as we have seen in an instance above (p. 52), proves to him that he himself is wanting in proficiency, not Pāṇini. Kātyāyana, in short, does not leave the impression of an admirer or friend of Pāṇini, but that of an antagonist,—often, too, of an unfair antagonist. In consequence, his remarks are attached to those Sūtras alone which are open to the censure of abstruseness or ambiguity, and the contents of which were liable to being completed or modified: he is silent on those which do not admit of criticism or rebuke.

The position of Patanjali is analogous, though not identical. Far from being a commentator on Pāṇini, he also could more properly be called an author of Vārttikas. But as he has two predecessors to deal with, instead of one,—and two predecessors, too, one of whom is an adversary of the other,—his Great Commentary undergoes, of necessity, the influence of the double task he has to perform, now of criticizing Pāṇini and then of animad-
could not allow him to become a mere paraphraser of another's words. An author like Patanjali can only comment on the condition that, in doing so, he develops his own mind, be it as adherent or as antagonist. And since Kātyāyana had left but little chance for a successor to discover many more blemishes in the Grammar of Pāṇini than he had pointed out, an active and critical mind like that of Patanjali would find more scope and more satisfaction in contending with Kātyāyana than in completing Pāṇini; and thus, I hold, we may explain his proneness to weaken even those censures of Kātyāyana which we should see reason to approve, did we not discover in favour of Pāṇini arguments which will appear hereafter, but which were foreign to Patanjali.

As little, therefore, as it entered into the purpose of Kātyāyana to advert to every Sūtra of Pāṇini, did it come within the aim of Patanjali to write a commentary on Pāṇini, and, according to the requirements of such a commentary, to explain every rule of this grammarian. His object being, like that of Kātyāyana, merely a critical one, Patanjali comments upon the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, because such a comment of his implies, of necessity, criticisms, either on Pāṇini or on Kātyāyana; and, in consequence, no Vārttika could be left unnoticed by him. Again, independently of Kātyāyana, he writes his own Vārttikas to Sūtras not sufficiently or not at all animadverted upon by the latter grammarian, because they, too, are criticisms, viz., on Pāṇini. And, like Kātyāyana, therefore, he passes over altogether all those Sūtras which are unexceptionable to his mind. It is obvious, therefore, that no doubt whatever concerning the genuineness of a Sūtra of Pāṇini can be justified on the ground alone that it has no Bhāṣya of Patanjali; and the unsoundness of such a doubt becomes still more obvious when we consider that a great many Sūtras of Pāṇini, which have no Vārttikas and no Bhāṣya of Patanjali, nevertheless make their appearance as quotations and as part of Patanjali's argument in his Commentary on other Sūtras criticized by Kātyāyana.

Now, if we take a summary view of the labours of Kātyāyana, we find that of the 3993 or 3992 Sūtras of Pāṇini, more than 1500 offered him the opportunity of showing his superior skill; that his
criticisms called forth more than 4000 Vārttikas, which, at the lowest
estimate, contain 10,000 special cases comprised in his remarks.

Having arrived at this point, let us ask—How could India re-
sond with the fame of a work which was so imperfect as to contain
at least 10,000 inaccuracies, omissions, and mistakes? Suppose that
there existed in our days a work of 4000 paragraphs, every second
or third of which not merely called for an emendation, an addi-
tion, and corrections, in formal respects, but which, on the whole,
compelled us to draw the conclusion that there were twice and
half times as many blunders in it as it contained matter to be
relied upon,—is it possible to assume that such a work could
create a reputation for its author except one which no sensible man
would be desirous of? If we assumed such a possibility, it could
only be on the supposition that such an author originated the
subject he brought before the public, and, as an inventor, had a
special claim to indulgence and fame; or, on the supposition of
public ignorance and individual immorality.

But there is evidence to show that Pāṇini was not the first
Hindu grammarian who wrote, nor even the inventor of the
technical system which has caused so much uneasiness to would-
be philologers. It is certain, too, that grammar was not, in
ancient India, the esoteric study of the few; and there is no
proof of any kind that Pāṇini had influenced or hired a number
of scribes to puff his Grammar and his fame. We must needs,
therefore, resort to another explanation, if we want to reconcile
the fact of the Vārttikas with the fact of Pāṇini's reputation, which
was so great that supernatural agency was considered as having
assisted him in his work.

This explanation, I hold, can only be derived from the circum-
stance that Pāṇini and Kātyāyana belonged to different periods of
Hindu antiquity,—periods separated by such a space of time as was
sufficient to allow—

1. Grammatical forms which were current in the time of Pāṇini
to become obsolete or even incorrect;

2. Words to assume meanings which they did not possess at the
period when he lived;
3. Words and meanings of words used by him to become antiquated; and
4. A literature unknown to him to arise.

It is on this supposition alone that it seems possible to realise Pāṇini's influence and celebrity; of course, on the supposition, too, that in his time he gave so accurate, so complete, and so learned a record of the language he spoke, that his contemporaries, and the next ages which succeeded him, could look with admiration on the rules he uttered, as if they were founded on revelations from above. If he had bungled along, as he must appear to have done, had he been a contemporary of Kātyāyana,—not he, but the author of the Vārttikas, would have been the inspired Rishi and the reputed father of the Vyākaraṇa. It is not necessary to exaggerate this view by assuming that Pāṇini was an infallible author, who committed no mistakes, omitted no linguistic fact, and gave complete perfection to a system already in use: we need take no other view of the causes of his great success than we should take of those which produce the fame of a living man. His work may or may not have been looked upon by his contemporaries as having attained the summit of excellency, but, at all events, it must have ascended far beyond mediocrity. At its own period it cannot have failed so signally, and in so many respects, as it would have done if Pāṇini and Kātyāyana had been contemporaries.

In order fully to substantiate this view, I should have to submit a considerable portion of Pāṇini's Grammar and the Vārttikas connected with it, to an investigation which would exceed by far the limits prescribed by the present inquiry; and such an investigation might, moreover, appear to be superficial on the present occasion, since I shall adduce hereafter arguments of another kind, which will add materially to the force of these deductions. Yet the importance of this question is so great that I will indicate, at least by a few instances, the direction in which, I believe, the facts may be found that lead to the conclusions named.

1. Pāṇini says (I. 2, 6) that the radical īndā is kit in lit., which words mean that, according to rule VI. 4, 24, the preterit of īndā is
CHRONOLOGICAL RELATION BETWEEN PĀṇIŅI AND KĀTYĀYANA. (124)

Following special rule, that, in the Veda, itara has itaram for its neuter. It is obvious, therefore, that he intended to exhaust his subject by these rules; yet Kāṭyāyana has to state that “ekatara forms ekataram in the Veda as well as in the language of common life.”

The letters k, t, ṭ, p, at the end of a Pada, says Pāṇini (VIII. 4, 45) may become g, d, ḍ, b, before a following nasal, or be changed into the nasal of their class. Kāṭyāyana adds: “If, however, the following nasal is part of an affix, these letters must always become the nasal of their class, in the language of common life.”

Now I have chosen these instances from the sphere of conjugation, declension, and phonetic laws, simply because they at once suggest the question whether Pāṇini knew as much grammar as

141 I. 2, 6: रसिभचरितां प—Vaṭṭṭika: नववेंद्रावसान्तकुट्ठी मुखो विज्ञानान्तकुट्ठी कारिकान्तकुट्ठी विज्ञानान्तकुट्ठी—Bhāṣya: नववेंद्रावसान्तकुट्ठी मुखो विज्ञानान्तकुट्ठी कारिकान्तकुट्ठी विज्ञानान्तकुट्ठी.—Vaṭṭṭika: नववेंद्रावसान्तकुट्ठी मुखो विज्ञानान्तकुट्ठी कारिकान्तकुट्ठी विज्ञानान्तकुट्ठी. (The Calcutta editors have on this occasion mistaken Kāṭyāyana’s Vaṭṭṭika for Patanjali’s Bhāṣya.)
we should fairly expect from a beginner, who had studied Sanskrit for a few months. Is it probable or not, that he was proficient enough to form the preterite of the common radical indh, “to kindle,” the nominative of the neuter of ekatara, “one of two,” — a word which, moreover, is the subject of one of his special rules (V. 3, 94)? and was he really so ignorant as not to be able to combine väk or twak, with the common affix maya into váṃgmaya or twāṅgmaya, though a phonetic influence of the affix maya on the base hiranya is adverted to in his rule VI. 4, 174? Or is it more plausible to assume that tdhe and ekatarad were forms current in his time, though no longer current and correct when Kātyāyana wrote; and that when Pāṇini lived, vāgmaya or twāngmaya were as legitimate as váṅgmaya or twāṅgmaya? That Kātyāyana’s stricture may be as much open to censure as the rule of Pāṇini, unless we, in fairness, gave it the benefit of a similar argument, is proved by the words kākudmat, kākudmin, and garummat, which “in the (classical) language of common life” are quite correct, but would have been incorrect according to the Vārttika, if they had been used in such language at the time when it was composed. 94

2. Pāṇini says (VI. 1, 150), “the bird (nominative) may be viskhrta or vikiṣṭra” (either of which means any eatable bird but a cock). This rule is thus modified by Kātyāyana: “the form may be viskhrtra or vikiṣṭra if the sense of the word is ‘bird’” (locative). Patanjali, it is true, sides with Pāṇini. The Vārttika, he says, is irrelevant, since it teaches that either form viskhrta or vikiṣṭra, is correct, if the word means “bird,” but that viskhrtra would be the only legitimate form, if the word has any other sense. Pāṇini, however, he adds, did not mean to affect the sense “bird” by his optional “or,” but the irregular form of the derivative. 95

94 It is not permitted to adduce also चावङ्गेऽ, for this word ought to be written— as, for instance, the commentators of the Amarakosha do write it—वारिष्ट्रेऽ, since its affix is not विक, but विक, according to Pāṇini, V. 2, 124: पञ्चमो विगिनिः. That is विकिष्ट्री the letter ल is not an awasthīka, results from I. 3, 8.

95 VI. 1, 150: विकिष्ट्र: पञ्चमो विगिनिः पञ्चमो विगिनिः—वारिष्ट्रे. विकिष्ट्र: पञ्चमो विगिनिः पञ्चमो विगिनिः विगिनिः पञ्चमो विगिनिः (ता) साधवधापि विगिनिः.
Nevertheless, it appears to me that both grammarians are right, and that Patanjali’s decision is open to doubt. Whenever Pāṇini binds the application of a rule to the condition of a special sense, he expresses the latter by a word either in the locative or nominative. If he gives the meaning of the word in the locative it does not necessarily follow, though it usually happens to be the case, that such a word has other meanings, too, which are then excluded from the influence of the rule; but if he expresses the sense of the word in the nominative, he seems always to indicate that the word has this sense, and this sense only,—that both sense and word, being expressed in the same case, are, as it were, congruous.\(^{144}\) His present rule would therefore imply that each form, \textit{vishkira} or \textit{vikira}, has no other sense than that of “bird;” but Kātyāyana’s corrections would mean that both forms are optional in the sense of “bird,” while in any other sense both forms represent separate words. This fact is borne out by the meanings given in Wilson’s Dictionary under each form.

The word \textit{ādhvaryya} is rendered by Pāṇini \textit{anītya} (VI. 1, 147), \textit{i.e.} “not permanent, rare.” Kātyāyana corrects this meaning, in substituting for it \textit{ābhuta}, \textit{i.e.} “that which has not existed before, miraculous, wonderful.” On this occasion, too, Patanjali defends Pāṇini, by observing that this remark might have been spared, for the sense, “wonderful, miraculous,” is implied by the sense “rare;” and he gives instances to confirm this view, viz., “the height of (this) tree is something ‘rare’ (or wonderful); the blueness of the sky is something ‘rare’ (or wonderful);” but I very much doubt whether logicians will assent to this view of Patanjali; for, though all that is wonderful is rare, not all that is rare need be wonderful. And he himself seems to break down under his third instance, which runs thus: “That the stars which are not fastened in the
and abhyavahārya mean “what is fit for consumption,” and apply to solid as well as to liquid substances; that, on the other hand, bhakṣhya means “what is fit to be eaten,” and applies to solid food only. Is it likely, however, that Pāṇini should have blundered in the application of words which, it would seem, the most ignorant would employ properly? Patanjali, who, as I have already observed, is always disposed to stand by Pāṇini, again takes up his defence, and observes, that Pāṇini’s using the word bhakṣhya instead of abhyavahārya need not have been criticised by Kātyāyana, for there are expressions like ab-bhakṣa, “one who eats water,” or vāyu-bhakṣha, “one who eats air,” which show that the radical bhakṣa is used also in reference to other than solid food.¹⁸⁹
But both instances alleged by Patanjali are conventional terms; they imply a condition of fasting, and derive their citizenship amongst other classical words from a Vaidik expression, as Patanjali himself admits, when, in his introduction to Pāṇini, he speaks of ekapadas, or words, the sense of which can only be established from the context of a Vaidik passage to which they originally belong;¹⁰⁸ they do not show, therefore, that bhaksh is applied also to other phrases of the classical language, so as to refer to liquid food. It seems evident, therefore, that in Pāṇini’s time, which preceded the classical epoch, bhakshya must have been used as a convertible term for bhūjya; while, at Kātyāyana’s period, this rendering became incorrect, and required the substitution of another word.

3. The words and the meanings of words employed by Kātyāyana are such as we meet with in the scientific writers of the classical literature: his expressions would not invite any special attention nor call forth any special remark. This cannot be said of the language of Pāṇini. In his Sūtras occur a great number of words and meanings of words, which—so far as my own knowledge goes—have become antiquated in the classical literature. I will mention, for instance, pratyavasāna, eating (I. 4. 52; III. 4. 76); upasamvāda, making a bargain (III. 4. 8); rishi, in the sense of Veda, or Vaidik hymn (IV. 4. 96); utsanāna, throwing up (I. 3. 36); vyaya, application, employment in (I. 3. 36); upasambahāšā, talking over, reconciling (I. 3. 47); svakaraṇa, appropriating, especially a wife, marrying (I. 3. 56); vālimkarana, humbling (I. 3. 70); mati, desire (III. 2. 188); abhresha, propriety (III. 3. 37); avakripti, imagining (III. 3. 145); abhyādāna, commencement (VIII. 2. 87); hotré, in the sense of ritvij, priest (V. 1. 135); upājekri and anuājekri, to strengthen (I. 4. 73); niwakanekri, to hold one’s speech, to be silent (I. 4. 76); kaśchān and manohān, to fulfil one’s longing (I. 4. 66), etc. etc.¹³⁰

¹⁰⁸ For the quotation from Patanjali’s preface to Pāṇini (ed. Ballantyne, p. 46) see my Dictionary, s.v. अनामहार.

¹³⁰ Some of these expressions, or others belonging to the same category, occur also
4. To prove a negative, is, no doubt, the hardest of all problems. There are circumstances, however, which may lessen the danger of drawing the conclusion that an author cannot have possessed such and such knowledge when he wrote. If we take into account the evidence afforded by the author's character and work, the judgment passed on his writings by his countrymen, and the condition of the latter,—these elements put together into the scale of criticism will show whether the scale of the author's proficiency can spare, or not, a certain amount of weight without disturbing the balance required. That Pāṇini was an eminent writer, is not only manifest from his Grammar, but acknowledged by the common judgment of his countrymen; and the learning and civilization of ancient India was such that we must admit the fullest

In the Koshas, and in the artificial poetry, especially the Bhaṭṭi-kāvyas. This circumstance, however, does not disprove that they are obsolete in the real literature, since the Koshas have borrowed them from Pāṇiṣa, whereas the Bhaṭṭi-kāvyas is expressly written to illustrate the rules of Pāṇiṣa, and the artificial poetry bases its chief merits on the strangeness of its style and words.

competence in those who established his celebrity. But we know, too, that Pāṇini was a Brahmānic writer. No amount of scholarship could have ensured to him the position he holds in the ancient literature if he had been a professor of the Buddhistic creed. In forming, then, an opinion on Pāṇini we must always bear in mind his learning and his religious faith, and the consequences which follow from both these premises.

After these preliminary remarks I will first advert to the Sātra (IV. 2. 129) in which Pāṇini teaches the formation of the word Āranyaka, and says that it means “a man who lives in a forest.” That Āranyaka has this meaning is unquestionable. It means, too, if we consult the lexicographers, “a forest-road, a forest-elephant, a jackall, etc.;” but above all it is the name of those theosophical works which are the precursors of the Upaniṣads, and are held in the greatest awe by the Hindu authorities. If a learned Hindu were

143 Manu, IV. 123, for instance, applies the same injunction to the termination of a lecture of an Āranyaka as to that of a whole Veda: सामथननायधुकुलो नद्धधूति

विक्रमस | विद्यूषाधिक सांवलमार्गविद्धि ध।
asked the meaning of Aranyaka, he would certainly first point to the sacred works which bear this name, and then refer to the meaning "forester," just as, I suppose, a European questioned on the sense of the word "Bible," would first say that it means "Testament," and then remember its etymological sense, "book." Yet Pāṇini merely speaks of Aranyaka, "the forester." No wonder that Kātyāyana supplies, in a Vārttika of his, the defect which must have struck him if, and since, he was acquainted with this portion of the sacred literature. But is it possible to assume

Pāṇini, IV. 2. 199: चर्चास्सहि।—Patanjali: चर्चासिद्धृष्टं सत्यं रतिः।—Kātyāyana: पञ्चाधिकायाविविधार्मणुपारिविचित्रिता वाणवः।—Patanjali: चर्चासिद्धृष्टं सत्यं रतिः।—Kātyāyana: चर्चासिद्धृष्टं सत्यं रतिः।—Vārttika: चर्चासिद्धृष्टं सत्यं रतिः।—Kātyāyana: वचोऽपि विनः।—Patanjali: वचोऽपि विनः।—Kātyāyana: वचोऽपि विनः।—Vārttika: वचोऽपि विनः। (Both Vārttikas are marked in the Calcutta edition, as if they did only occur in the Siddhanta-kumudi). Professor Müller has pointed out that Pāṇini does not mention the principal meaning of Aranyaka, but expresses himself thus (page 339): "Whether Pāṇini knew the Aranyakas as a branch of sacred literature is uncertain. Although he mentions the word that Pāṇini could have known this sense of the word Aranyaka, when he is altogether silent on it; and if he did not know it, that the works so called could have already existed in his time?

The acquaintance of Pāṇini with a Yajurveda is evidenced by several Sūtras of his. But in speaking of a Yajurveda, he does not tell us whether he knew the Black as well as the White version, or only the Black version of it. That the former, which is considered as the literary property of the Tittiri school, is older in form and contents than the latter, the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā, requires no observation of mine, after the conclusive proofs which have been given by previous writers. To decide, however, whether Pāṇini had a knowledge of the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā or not,—in other words, whether both versions of Aranyaka, he only uses it in the sense of 'living in the forest;' and it is the author of the Vārttikas who first remarks that the same word is also used in the sense of 'read in the forest.'

12 For instance, by the Sūtras II. 4. 4 ( aññāyuras); VI. I. 117; VII. 4. 38; VIII. 3, 104, etc.
this Veda are separated in time or not, by the Grammar of Pānini, is a matter which touches closely on our present inquiry with regard to the chronological relation between Pānini and Kātyāyana.

In mustering the facts which bear on the solution of this question, we shall have, first, to observe that the word Vājasaneyin does not occur in a Sūtra of, but only as a formation in a Gaṇa to, Pānini (IV. 3. 106), while the formation of Taṅtirīya, from the base Taṅtiri, is taught in a Sūtra (IV. 3. 102). There is, consequently, a prima facie doubt against Pānini’s acquaintance with the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā. And this doubt is heightened by the circumstanece that the sacred personage, also, who is believed to have collected not only the Saṁhitā, but the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajurveda, Yājnavalkya, is also not mentioned in the Sūtras of, but merely in the Gaṇas to, Pānini.136

Since the question, however, whether Pānini knew the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā, coincides with the question whether he had a knowledge of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, I will first quote a passage from Professor Müller’s work, which, in a correct and lucid manner, describes the relation of Yājnavalkya to both these works:—“A comparison,” he says (p. 353), “of the texts of the Taṅtirīyas and Vājasaneyins shows that it would be a mistake to call Yājnavalkya the author, in our sense of the word, of the Vājasaneyi-saṁhitā and the Satapatha-brāhmaṇa. But we have no reason to doubt that it was Yājnavalkya who brought the ancient Mantras and Brāhmaṇas into their present form, and, considering the differences

136 Professor Weber has already drawn attention to the fact that in the Gaṇas to Pānini only the first word may safely be ascribed to the knowledge of Pānini, since it is mentioned by himself; and I may add, those words of a Gaṇa, too, which are impliedly referred to by him; for instance, तत्त, तत्तम, तत्तर, चत्त, चत्तर, of the Gaṇa to I. 1. 27, adverted to in the Sūtra VII. 1. 25, which otherwise would be unintelligible. See also note 55. With these exceptions, we have no real certainty of deciding whether the words of a Gaṇa were those which Pānini had in view when he wrote; for not only are there considerable differences in the readings of the Gaṇa collections in existence, but it is certain that these lists have been subject, at various periods, to various interpolations, which materially lessen their critical worth.

137 In the Gaṇas to IV. 1. 106 and 2. 111.
between the old and new text, we must admit that he had a
greater right to be called an author than the founders of the
Charuvas of other Vedas whose texts we possess. In this sense,
Kâtyâyana says, in his Anukrama, that Yâjñavalkya received
the Yajur-veda from the Sun. In the same sense, the Satapatha-
brâhmaṇa ends with the assertion that the White Yajur-veda was
proclaimed by Yâjñavalkya Vâjasaney.

If, then, we turn our attention to the word Śatapatha, we have
again to state that it occurs only in a Gaṇa to V. 3, 100 (compare
also note 105), but is not mentioned authentically in any Sūtra of
Pâṇini. Yet Kâtyâyana, I hold, has helped us to untie this knot,
which has been drawn still tighter than it was by Professors Müller
and Weber, in spite of the excellent counsel which the latter gives,
“not to increase, by inattention, the darkness, which is great
enough already in the history of Sanskrit literature.”

A rule of Pâṇini’s, which, literally translated, runs thus,

---

104 Indische Studien, vol. I., p. 483: “We have already darkness enough in the

"amongst the Brâhmaṇas and Kalpas which have been proclaimed by
an Old one (or by the Old).” 107 teaches, in its connection with pre-
ceeding rules, that names of Brâhmaṇas and Kalpas are formed
by adding the (technical) affix nini (i.e. the real affix īn with
Vriddhi in the base), to the proper name of the personage who
proclaimed them, provided that such a personage is an old auth-
ority. Kâtyâyaṇa gives as an instance of a Brâhmaṇa so formed,
the word Sâtûyaṇiṇi, derived from Sâtûyaṇa, the saint who pro-
claimed this Brâhmaṇa; and other instances are mentioned by
Patanjali in his comment on a previous Sūtra. To this rule
Kâtyâyaṇa added a Vârttika, which, according to the text in the
Calcutta edition, would mean literally: “In reference to Yâjñavalkya
and so on (there is) an exception, on account of the contemporaneous-

history of Hindu literature; let us abstain at least from increasing it through our own
inattention!"

107 IV. 3, 105: पुरावमोक्तः माहवमेलु, which words are completed by the
Sūtras IV. 3, 101 and 103.
and the comment on this additional rule is afforded by Patanjali, in the instance he gives: याज्ञवल्क्यः ब्राह्मणानि, where the Brāhmaṇa referred to the authorship of Yājnavalkya, is not formed by means of the (technical) affix ni, but by the (technical) affix an (i.e. a, with Vṛiddhi in the base).

The great importance of this additional rule of Kātyāyana is obvious. It has been made the subject of several remarks in the "Indische Studien," where Professor Weber writes (vol. i. p. 57, note) — "By the Yājnavalkānī-brāhmaṇāni [Yājnavalkyāṇi, as the "Indische Studien" writes it, is probably an error of the press] there [i.e. in the commentary of the Calcutta edition to IV. 3, 105], and also in the Vārtika, and in IV. 2. 66, there can probably be meant none but the Čatapattha-brāhmaṇa, either the whole of it, or from XI. to XIV., which, therefore, Patanjali even did not consider as purāṇa-proktam [i.e. proclaimed by an old...

For this query of Professor Weber, compare note 129. But I cannot help asking how he reconciles the statement of the note to vol. i. p. 57, just quoted, where he speaks of Patanjali in terms of that assurance which can only proceed from personal knowledge,—with his repeated avowal of not having read the Mahābhāṣya, and with the text itself of p. 57 to which this note refers, since he is doubtful even there whether the Calcutta editors have taken their instances to IV. 3, 105 from Patanjali or not? As a guess, his attributing the words याज्ञवल्क्यः ब्राह्मणाः to Patanjali happens to be quite correct; but it would have been certainly much better to give it distinctly as such, than leave us doubtful now as to the nature of other statements of his.
CIRCHRONOLOGICAL RELATION BETWEEN PANINI AND KATAYAYANA.  (134) WEBER'S GLOSS ON A VARRTIKA TO IV. 3, 105.

ninah." And (vol. i. p. 177, note) — "Now we have seen (pp. 57 note, and 146) that the Yajnavalkâni-brâhmaṇâni ["Yajnavalkyâni" again, which now becomes very suspicious], are considered by the author of the Varrtikas as contemporaneous with Pânini. The question, therefore, is whether by it [i.e. the Yajnavalkâni-brâhmaṇâni] we have really to understand the Çatapatha-brâhmaṇa itself, or, in general, Brâhmaṇas only, which were composed by Yajnavalkya, or such as merely treated of him. In the former case, it would follow, too, from his proved contemporaneity with Uddâlaka, and from Uddâlaka's preceding Pându, that the epoch of Pându is later than that of Pânini." But (vol. ii. p. 303) he observes: "By the Yajnavalkâni-brâhmaṇâni we, probably, have not to understand those [Brâhmaṇas] which have been composed by Yajnavalkya him-

self, but those which merely treated of him; and a specimen of these is preserved us in the Yajnavalkyâm-kândam of the Vrûndâvari aranyaka (see my Akad. Vorles. p. 125-26); therefore, if this [my] second view is correct, the contemporaneity of Yajnavalkya and Uddâlaka with Pânini, which is the necessary consequence of my first view, would fall to the ground, together with Pânini's preceding Pându, whose priority in time is again the consequence of such a contemporaneity." 161

There is nothing novel or remarkable in the circumstance of the "editor" of Pânini likewise writes यज्ञवल्क्यानि IV. 2, 66 and 3, 105, intending probably to improve on the Calcutta edition, which IV. 3, 105 writes यज्ञवल्क्यानि, but IV. 2, 66 यज्ञवल्क्यानि. Haberi non fata libell ! 162

The self-quotation of Professor Weber (Akad. Vorles. p. 125, 126) need not be repeated here, since it merely contains the same conjecture that the Yajnavalkâni (correctly written in the Akad. Vorles., but re-quoted from this word "Yajnavalkyâni" in the Ind. Stud. vol. ii. p. 300) brâhmaṇâni are the same as the Yajnavalkyâm-kândam which treats of Yajnavalkya.—The text of the quotations given above, it is superfluous for me to mention, is in German. To save space I have confined myself to communicating merely a translation of it, which, I trust, no one will find wanting in strictest

161 Professor Weber again writes "Yajnavalkyâni." Being compelled, therefore, to abandon the hypothesis of an error of the press, the more so as the same "Yajnavalkyâni-brâhmaṇâni" make their reappearance, in their alphabetical place, in his Index to the first two volumes of the "Indische Studien"—I must refer him for the correct form "Yajnavalkâni," to Pânini VI. 4, 151.—It is needless for me to say that
Professor Weber's recanting on one page what he maintained with the most specious arguments on another, or of his leaving the bewildered reader between a chaos of what are to him established facts; but however interesting it may be thus to obtain from him an autobiography of his mind, and an insight into the state of maturity in which he presents us with his researches, I must, this time, defend him against himself, and show that, **within the sphere of his own presumptive facts**, there is not the slightest ground for immolating by his last conjecture the statements contained in the first three quotations from his essays.

The exception made by Kātyāyana to the rule of Pāṇini (IV. 3, 105) is contained in the word **Yājnavalka**, as we learn from the authentic comment of Patanjali. There is no proof, whatever, that it can extend to any other derivative of Yājnavalkya. Whatever, therefore, be the import of the word **Yājnavalkiya**, the fairness and literal accuracy. The words between brackets, marked [ ], are my own parenthetical explanations, as the reader will easily see for himself. The italics in the quotation are Professor Weber's own.

Yājnavalkiyaṃ kāṇḍam has nothing to do with the Yājnavalkāni brāhmaṇāni mentioned by Patanjali in reference to our Vārttika. But, in the second instance, the word **pratishedha**, or "exception," used by Kātyāyana necessarily concerns works of the same category. As little as an author could, for instance, call geology an exception to astronomy, as little, I hold, could Kātyāyana speak of an "exception" to names of Brāhmaṇas when he had in his mind, as Professor Weber thinks, the name of a particular chapter of an Āraṇyaka. And thirdly, this same word 'exception' in the Vārttika must likewise concern the proclaiming of such a work by the personage who becomes the base of the derivative; for Pāṇini uses the word **prokta** "proclaimed," distinctly enough in the Sūtra which is criticized by the Vārttika. There would be no "exception," if the formation alluded to by Kātyāyana, meant a work "treating of" the personage who is the base of the derivative. But, when Professor Weber, in his "Akademische Vorlesungen" (pp. 125, 126) crowns his syllogism by the remark that he prefers his last conjecture because it "appears, indeed, extremely ticklish (bedenk-
llich)" to him "to consider the whole Cātapathtubhrāhmaṇa or as much as its last books, as bearing distinctly the name of Yājnavalkya —however much it may contain his system [?]—or as contemporaneous with, or as preceding even by little, Pāṇini's time;" and when he adds, in the fullness of his authority, "but for the Yājnavalkiyam-kāndam I have not the slightest hesitation in doing the latter" [Letzteres zu thun,—what latter?], I fear I should overstep the limits of scientific criticism, if I attached a single remark to a passage like this, which treats its readers as if the personal feelings of Professor Weber had all the weight of scientific arguments, and deals with one of the most important problems of Sanskrit literature in such a manner as if it were matter for table talk.

Before I proceed in my observations on the point at issue, I will state the views of Professor Müller on this Vārttika. He writes (p. 353): "In the same sense Pāṇini, or rather his editor, says in the first Vārttika to IV. 3, 105, that there were modern Brāhmaṇas proclaimed by Yājnavalkya, and that their title differed by its formation from the title given to more ancient Brāhmaṇas;" and (p. 363): "It is wrong, for instance, to speak of the Yājnavalkyas in the same sense as we speak of the Taittiriyas, and the works promulgated by Yājnavalkya, although they are Brāhmaṇas, are called Yājnavalkyāṇi [sic] Brāhmaṇāṇi. 'And why?' says Kātyāyana; 'because they are of too recent an origin; that is to say, they are almost contemporaneous with ourselves.'"

Where, I must now ask, does Kātyāyana speak of Brāhmaṇas "more ancient" than the Brāhmaṇas proclaimed by Yājnavalkya? and where, I must further ask, does he say that the latter are "almost" contemporaneous? Again, what proof has Professor Weber that Kātyāyana meant by contemporaneous, as he says (see above, p. 134), contemporaneous with Pāṇini? and what proof has Professor Müller that Kātyāyana implied by this word, contemporaneous with himself? Assuredly, all these questions ought to have been settled first, and by very substantial proofs, before an edifice of chronology was allowed to be built on them. Not only does Kātyāyana nowhere indicate a degree, either in the relative age of the Brāhmaṇas of Yājnavalkya and those subject to the
Sūtra of Pāṇini, or in the contemporaneousness of the former with him,—but, in my opinion, the word pratisēdha, “exception,” already adverted to, is altogether fatal to the ellipses supplied by Professors Weber and Müller when they refer to the word contemporaneous. This word “exception” clearly proves that Kātyāyana could never have held the dialogue with which Müller enrols the scene of the Vārttika. For if the Brāhmaṇas spoken of in the Vārttika, were contemporaneous with Pāṇini or with Kātyāyana, the Vārttika would have made an addition, not an exception to the rule of Pāṇini, since the latter merely treats of such Brāhmaṇas as are old from his point of view, and is no wise concerned with any Brāhmaṇas of his time.

In short, the Vārttika can, on account of the word exception, convey no other sense than that Pāṇini himself was guilty of an inaccuracy, by omitting to state that the Brāhmaṇas which had been proclaimed by Yājñavalkya (and others) were exempt from his Sūtra IV. 3, 105, these Brāhmaṇas being as old as those which he had in view when he gave this rule.

Did the words of the Vārttika, such as they are printed in the Calcutta edition, admit of the slightest doubt—if interpreted properly,—or had the inferences drawn from them been propounded with less consequence, and did not the discussion I have raised concern a principle, viz. the method of examining the relation of Kātyāyana to Pāṇini, the course I should have taken, in refuting the opinion of Professors Weber and Müller would have been a different one. I should have at once stated the fact, that the inadvertence of the Calcutta editors of Pāṇini,—(need I repeat that Dr. Boehtlingk’s reprint is as conscientious in this case as in all analogous instances?)—has skipped two words which belong to the Vārttika,—words, which, indeed, are not absolutely required for a correct understanding of the Vārttika, but the presence of which would have prevented as much as the possibility of a misconception, however inattentive the reader of the Vārttika might be. These words are no other than the words of Pāṇini’s Sūtra itself, which Kātyāyana, no doubt with the distinct purpose of obviating the very possibility of a misunder-
standing, has embodied again in his Vārttika in placing them before his own critical remark. In short, the Vārttika runs thus: “Among the Brāhmaṇas and Kalpas, which are proclaimed by an old one (or by the old), there is an exception in reference to Yājñavalkya, on account of the contemporaneousness,” viz., of these latter Brāhmaṇas with the old Brāhmaṇas spoken of by Pāṇini. In this sense, then, Panjani remarks, after having named the Brāhmaṇas of Yājñavalkya and Sulabha, “Why is there an exception to these?’ ‘On account of the contemporaneousness;’ that is to say, because they, too, are of the same time;” and Kaiyāṭa adds: “because they belong to the same time as the Brāhmaṇas proclaimed by Sātyāyana, and so on.”

Pāṇini, IV. 3, 105: दुर्लभं भूतस्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्—Kātyāyana: पुरावेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्—Patiala: पुरावेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्: प्राचैवेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्:—Patanjali: पुरावेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्: प्राचैवेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्:—Kaiyāṭa: पुरावेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्: प्राचैवेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्:—Panjani: पुरावेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्: प्राचैवेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्:—Kaiyāṭa: पुरावेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्: प्राचैवेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्:—Panjani: पुरावेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्: प्राचैवेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्:—Kaiyāṭa: पुरावेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्: प्राचैवेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्: For the sake of greater clearness, and in order to anticipate any objection, I will mention, that the Śōtra of Pāṇini itself precedes the words of the Vārttika in the MS. E.I.H. 330, whence this passage is quoted; so that there can be no assumption of a meaningless or careless repetition of the words पुरावेंश्च स्वयम्भरी गृहस्त्यम्. Moreover, the beginning of Panjani’s commentary on the Vārttika, and his method of commenting, as explained above, is sufficient to remove all doubt—if any still existed—that they belong to the Vārttika.—Professor Benfey, too, is therefore mistaken, when, in his learned and valuable "Vollständige Grammatik der Sanskritsprache" (§ 518) he says, “it has been explicitly stated [viz. by our Vārttika] that Yājñavalkya and some others do not belong to the old.”
of Brāhmaṇas? So much so, that we have heard only by name of the Brāhmaṇas of Bhallu, Śātyāyana, and Sulabha; but are full of the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa, proclaimed by Yājnavalkya?

In my belief there is but this alternative: either Patanjali, who mentions the Bhālavins, together with other Brāhmaṇas, in his comment on the Vārttika 26 to IV. 2, 104, is correct in saying that the Brāhmaṇa of Yājnavalkya is coeval with them, in this case all these Brāhmaṇas must have been unknown to Pāṇini, and other Brāhmaṇas must have been before his mind’s eye, when he wrote the Sūtra IV. 3, 105; or Pāṇini did know and meant to imply in his rule the Brāhmaṇa of Bhallu, and of others named by Patanjali,—then the error must be on Patanjali’s side, when he asserts that Yājnavalkya was their contemporary. I say purposely, it must be an error of Patanjali, for there is no evidence to show that Kātyāyana alluded to Bhallu, for instance, when he speaks of contemporaries of Yājnavalkya; he may have referred, for aught we know, to proper names belonging to other old authorities—old

from Pāṇini’s point of view; and his error would then have consisted in making Yājnavalkya the contemporary of the personages who were the authors of those old works.

Yet both—the error of Patanjali and the error of Kātyāyana—become explainable on the assumption that there is such a considerable period of time between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, and much more so between Pāṇini and Patanjali that Kātyāyana even could consider as “old” that which was not only not old, but in all probability did not yet exist in Pāṇini’s time.

It is curious, though I lay no stress on this circumstance, that the Kāśikā-vṛtti should pass over in silence the whole Vārttika of Kātyāyana, but should, in giving the counter-instance, “Yājnavalkāni Brāhmaṇāni,” add: “Why does this rule of Pāṇini (restrict the formation of Brāhmaṇa-names with the suffix in) to those Brāhmaṇas proclaimed by the ‘old?’ Because the Brāhmaṇas of Yājnavalkya, etc., are called Yājnavalkāni Brāhmaṇāni, etc.; for, according to legendary reports, these and similar Brāhmaṇas do not belong to a
remote time. Thus, on traditional grounds—which we should have thanked Jayāditya if he had designated in more precise terms—the Kāśīkā, too, discards the notion of the Yājñavalkāni Brāhmaṇāṇi being an exception to the much-quoted rule of Pāṇini. On the contrary, it looks as we see, on the derivative Yājñavalka as a counter-instance, which confirms the statement of Pāṇini; but, I hold that this commentary was wanting in judgment when it passed over in silence the Vārttika of Kātyāyana, since the latter, by its very mistaken reproach, affords us a valuable means of judging on the chronological relation between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana.

Before I support with further arguments the conclusions I have drawn with regard to this chronological relation between the two grammarians, it will be expedient to take a cursory view of the principal categories of known ancient writings not already mentioned; acquaintance with which, on the one hand, is shown by Pāṇini himself; and the existence of which, on the other, may either be assumed to fall within a period not very distant from the time when Pāṇini wrote, or in his time, to be open to doubt, on account of the reasons previously alleged.

Since Pāṇini teaches, in the rule I have so often referred to, that all ancient Brāhmaṇas and Kalpa works bear names which end in the (technical) affix mānī, the names of the former by the common consent of all commentators, ancient and modern, being used in the plural only, we are justified in inferring that none of the works of the category now preserved in manuscript, so far as my knowledge
That Pāṇini was conversant, not only with a Black Ṭajur-

Perron's Osmpkhát, "which contains the translation of fifty Upanishads from Persian into Latin." Since his bibliographical sketch cannot fail to be of much interest and use to many of his readers, it will not be superfluous to correct a mistake of his when he states that the French translation of Anquetil du Perron was "not published."

It was not published entirely; but in the well-known work of Tieffenthaler, Anquetil, Rennell, and Bernardi: "Description historique et géographique de l'Inde, etc. Berlin; vol. I. second edition, 1791; vol. II. 1796; vol. III. 1798," the second part of the second volume contains his translation "en français barbare," as the author himself calls it, of the "Osmpkhát Naśin (tūr) de l'Āthērān Bēid" (p. 297 ff.); of the "Osmpkhát tadie (tūr) du Djiējūr Bēid" (p. 301 ff.); of the "Osmpkhát Aṭhērā (tūr) de l'Āthērān Bēid" (p. 308 ff.) and of the "Osmpkhát Šot Roudri (tūr) du Djiējūr Bēid" (p. 323 ff.). The same volume also contains an interesting paper of his:

"nouvelles preuves que l'Osmpkhát ne parle nulle part du Kälamān, ni des trois autres iswāmā (Table des Articles; p. 548 ff.).—There is another work, published anonymously, which comprises, besides other interesting matter, translations in German of portions of Oriental works; the first volume of this work—the only one that appeared, I believe—bears the title "Sammlung Asiatischer Original-Schriften.—Indische Schriften. —Zürich, 1791," and contains, amongst others, a German translation of the first three Upanishads published in the work of Tieffenthaler, Anquetil du Perron, etc. As this volume is curious and of great scarcity, I subjoin a list of its contents, as given by the

Pāṇini mentions the word Upanishad once, viz. I. 4, 76, but not in the sense of a sacred work. It occurs twice in the Āgamas, viz., to IV. 3, 73 and 4, 12; in the former it has the sense of such a work, but it is doubtful whether it has in the latter also.—In a note at page 325, Professor Müller gives a detailed account of the history of Anquetil du
Sifat of this. We may expect, too, that, as every other Hindu looked upon the Rigveda as the principal Veda; and this assumption is confirmed by the circumstantial fact of his calling a Pada of the Rigveda "Word of the Rigveda." But there is no evidence to show that he knew an adharmana's name of a priest. We may add, also, that the word adharmana is found in two Sutras (YT. 6, 13, and YT. 1, 14), where it is used as the occurrence of Adharmana. See note 134.

For the geology of the Rigveda, compare VI. 4, 34, 133, VII. 4, 30, ete., for Adharmana, I, 1, 12, ete.
plaine by Patanjali as meaning "the office and the sacred record of the Atharvan,"—that Patanjali confirms the occurrence of the word *ātharvan* in the Gāṇa to the Sūtra IV. 2, 63, where it can only mean a literary work; and, besides, that the word *ātharvana* occurs twice in the Gāṇas. Yet even the testimony of Patanjali cannot entirely remove the uncertainty which, as we have seen above, must always adhere to the Gāṇas as evidence for or against Pāṇini, with the exception of their first word, mentioned by himself, or such of their words as are referred to by other rules of his. Nor does the occurrence of the word *ātharvanika* in the two Sūtras quoted necessarily confirm the interpretation of Patanjali. It may there only mean the office of an Atharvan priest, who, probably, was employed in the performance of sacrificial acts. In short, there is no valid ground for attributing to Pāṇini a knowledge of the fourth and least sacred Veda, the Atharvaveda; and this doubt derives some additional weight from the fact that, though the word *Angiras*, one of the reputed Rishis of the Atharvaveda, is mentioned in a Sūtra (II. 4. 65), neither the compound *Atharvāṅgirasas*, nor its derivative, *Atharvāngirasa*, is met with in the Sūtras of Pāṇini, though the former is the name, as well of the two seers of the Atharvaveda, as especially of the hymns of this Veda itself,—while the latter means the observances connected with the Atharvaveda, and would have deserved a place amongst grammatical rules.

In the last chapter of his learned work, Professor Müller gives instances of hymns which he considers as belonging to the oldest portion of Vaidik literature. It seems difficult to follow his arguments so as to arrive at a settled conviction on this point; for the
Müller's View on the Oldest Rigveda Hymns.

reasons he gives in assigning these hymns to the earliest portions of Hindu poetry rest on impressions so individual, that assent or dissent of those who read the Rigveda hymns will depend much on their own disposition. I should, for instance, for my part, hesitate very much to assign to a hymn which speaks of thirty-three gods a place amongst the most ancient hymns, since it betrays, in my opinion, a very artificial and developed condition of religiousness, and a considerable deviation from what I hold to be the primitive feeling of the human mind. The impression I derive from another hymn, a poetical version of which Professor Müller gives (p. 564), and a prose translation of which we owed already to Colebrooke (Misc. Ess. i. p. 33), would be to the same effect,—that it belongs, not to the earliest, but to the very latest hymns of the Rigveda-Saṁhitā; for it seems to me that a song which begins, "There was no entity, nor non-entity . . . . . death was not, nor was there immortality;" and concludes: "Then who can know whence it proceeded, or whence this varied world arose, or whether it uphold itself, or not? He who, in the highest heaven, is the ruler of this universe, does indeed know, but not another can possess that knowledge"—it seems to me that such a song must be already the result of the greatest struggles of the human heart: the full-grown fruit of a long experience in thought,—in other words, that it marks the end, and not the beginning, of a phase of religious development.

I agree with Müller in one important point, viz. (p. 566): that "the evidence of language is the most decisive for settling the relative age of Vedic hymns," and I should have agreed with him still more if he had said that it is the only safe criterion with a European of the nineteenth century to settle this point. Therefore, when he adds that "the occurrence of such a word as tadánti is more calculated to rouse doubts as to the early date of this [last-named] hymn than the most abstruse metaphysical ideas which may be discovered in it,"—though I do not share the opinion expressed in his latter words,—I hold the adverb he men-

188 Müller's Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 531.
tions to be quite sufficient authority for removing this hymn from the earliest portion of Hindu songs.

But setting aside our personal feelings, which, after all, are of no consequence, we cannot be indifferent about learning what Pāṇini considered to be the older or the more recent Vaidik hymns. A direct opinion on this point we can scarcely expect to obtain from himself; but indirect evidence of his own impressions, or, more probably, of the tradition current in his time, I believe may be collected from his Sūtras; and, however scanty it be, and however much we may think we may be able, without his aid, to arrive at a similar result in regard to the hymns I am going to name, it will not be superfluous to advert to it here. The hymns of the Rīgveda—and, consequently, those collected from it for the version of the Sāma-, and the two other Vedas—were "seen," as I have shown above (p. 62), by the Rishis, who received them from a divinity. This general belief was, as I there proved, shared in by Pāṇini, who, therefore, was not so unshackled by the inspiration-doctrine as Professor Müller represents him to have been in his discussion on old and new Brāhmaṇas. But there is a marked difference in the language he uses when speaking at one time of one category, and, at another, of another category of hymns; and it is this difference which induces me to express a doubt whether he looked upon all Vaidik hymns as immediate revelations from above.

In his Sūtras IV. 2, 7 to 9, he teaches the formation of words expressing the name of Sāmaveda-hymns, and he applies to the latter the word "seen," i.e., received by inspiration from the divinity. In the Sūtra IV. 3, 101, on the other hand, he heads a chapter, which comprises the next ten rules, with the words, "proclaimed by him," which words imply that the Vaidik compositions—the names of which he teaches the student to form in these rules—were promulgated by the Rishis, whose names are the bases of the several derivatives. That these two different expressions were

168 Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 301: "Pāṇini, whose views are not shackled by the inspiration-doctrine which blinded and misled all the followers of the orthodox Mīmāṃsā school, broadly states the fact that there are old and new Brāhmaṇas, etc."

170 IV. 2, 7: तिथिः शास्त्र—IV. 3, 101: तिथि प्रारम्भः—Praṇāhmanorāne: प्रक्षेपंचि
chosen by Pāṇini deliberately, results from the contents of the last-named rules. They contain amongst others (IV. 3, 105), names of Kalpa works, which, at no period of the Hindu religion, were "seen" or ascribed to superhuman authorship. This word "proclaimed" has also been noticed especially by Kātyāyana and Patanjali, who judge as follows of its import in these rules:—

Kātyāyana: "(It might seem that) this word 'proclaimed' is purposeless, since no affix is visible in (certain) derivatives (which imply its sense)."—Patanjali: "Why is it purposeless? 'Because,' says Kātyāyana, 'no affix is visible.' That is to say, if 'proclaimed' means that the Vaidik version of the Kalāpas or Kaṭhas is recited village for village, a derivative implying such a sense has no (special) affix."—Kātyāyana: "(It is purposeless, too) if applied to the sense 'book;' for (in this case) an affix is taught (elsewhere)."—Patanjali: "There is an affix, if the sense 'composed, as a book,' is implied by it; but such an affix is provided for by another rule of Pāṇini, viz., IV. 3, 116. Could we, then, consider this word 'proclaimed' (in our rule) as used in reference to the Veda? But again, the Vedas are not made (like a book); they are permanent (or eternal)."—Kātyāyana: "If (however, one should assert that this word) concerns the Veda, (he would be correct, provided that he meant to impart to the word 'proclaimed') a figurative sense."—Patanjali (after repeating these latter words): "Is it not said, however, that 'the Vedas are not made, but that they are permanent (i.e., eternal)?" (Quite so); yet, though their sense is permanent, the order of their letters has not always remained the same; and it is through the difference in the latter respect that we may speak of the versions of the Kaṭhas, Kalāpas, Mudakas, Pippalādakas, and so on."  

111 Now, whatever opinion we may entertain of...
Pāṇini’s accounting for the various versions of the Vaiḍika hymns, it is evident that Pāṇini—who comprises Kalpas under the term “proclaimed”—looked upon the works, the names of which are taught in these rules, not as having been “seen” or received immediately from the divinity. They must, in his mind, therefore, belong to a later period than the Śāmaṇḍa hymns which he treats.
of the rules IV. 2, 7-9 as having been "seen." Nor would there
be anything remarkable in this view, if it merely referred to the
Brāhmaṇa works which also are the subject of his rules; for this

class of inspired literature is looked upon by all the authorities as
being inferior in degree, and, I hold therefore, less immediate,
as an emanation than the hymns of the Saṃhitās. But there

I have quoted the full gloss of the three principal commentators on this important
Sūtra and its Vārttikas, because it is of considerable interest in many respects and, at
the same time, bears out my statement at page 65. We see Kāliyaṭṭa and Nāgojībaṭṭa
writing under the difficulty of reconciling the eternity of the Veda with the differences
of its various versions, which nevertheless maintain an equal claim to infallibility.
Patañjali makes rather short work of this much vexed question; and unless it be
allowed here to render his expression ṛṇas (which means "letter"), "word," it is
barely possible even to understand how he can save consistently the eternity or perma-

nence of the "sense" of the Veda. That the modern Mīmāṃsāists maintain not
only the "eternity of the sense" but also the "permanence of the text," which is
tantamount to the exclusive right of one single version, we learn, amongst others,
from Nāgojībaṭṭa. But as such a doctrine has its obvious dangers, it is not shared in
occurs in midst of these rules one (IV. 3, 106) which contains the word Chhandas, which, being contradistinguished from the word Brāhmaṇa in the preceding rule (IV. 3, 105), cannot have there any other sense than that of Mantra, as I have shown above; or, if it should be thought that it is contrasted there with Kalpa as well as with Brāhmaṇa in the preceding rule, it would mean Veda in general—Mantra and Brāhmaṇa. And, in connection with this by the old Mīmāṃsāists, nor by Nāgoji, as he tells us himself. He and Kaśyapa inform us therefore that, amongst other theories, there is one, according to which the order of the letters (or, rather, words) in the Vaidik texts got lost in the several Pralayas or destructions of the worlds; and, since each Manwantara had its own revelation, which differed only in the expression, not in the sense of the Vaidik texts, the various versions known to these commentators represent these successive revelations which were "remembered," through "their excessive accomplishments," by the Rishis, who, in this manner, produced, or rather reproduced, the texts current in their time, under the name of the versions of the Ka śas, Kalāpas, and so on. In this way each version had an equal claim to sanctity. There is a very interesting discussion on the same subject by Kūmbirāla, in his Mīmāṃsā-Pārtīkā (1. 3, 10). I forbear, however, quoting it on the present occasion on account of its great length, and because I hope to be able to give it in a more appropriate place.

word Pāṇini writes, "Śaunaka." Śaunaka, however, we know, from Sāyaṇa's commentary on the Rigveda and the Anukramani, was the Rishi who is supposed to be the author of the second Mandala, as we now possess it, though in a former version it appears to have belonged to the Rishi Gritsamadā. 178

Should, then, my view of Pāṇini's rule be correct, it will follow that Pāṇini considered this second Maṇḍala as of a later date than the other Mandalas; and we cannot but admit that even the first hymn of the second Mandala fully confirms this impression, for, by speaking of Hotri, Potri, Neshtri, Agnīdhra, Prānāstri, Adhvaryu, and Brāhmaṇ priests, it certainly betrays a very advanced development of sacrificial and artificial rites.

Mīmāṃsā is a word of special grammatical interest, not in so

178 Compare Sāyaṇa in the beginning of his commentary on the second Maṇḍala; Professor Wilson's detailed account in his translation, vol. ii., p. 207; and Professor Müller's Ancient Literature, pp. 231, 232; as well as the corresponding passage from Shāṅgūrūṣīshya, at p. 237.
far as its affix ái is concerned—for the latter belongs to a general category of derivatives dealt with by Pánini in his rule III. 3, 102—but on account of the irregular formation of its base. It must be admitted that the Sútra I. 3, 62 may be looked upon as including this base also; but whether the instance mímánsá, given by the commentators, has there the general sense of considering, or the special sense of the philosophical reasoning of the Mímánsá, cannot be inferred from the general tenor of this rule. This latter sense is emphatically expressed by two words derived from mímánsá, viz., Mímánsá, the name of the philosophy; and Mímánsaka, a Mímánsá philosopher. Neither word occurs in Pánini.¹¹² Nor

¹¹² Even Kátyáyana gives no Vártika to teach the formation of mímánsaka, though this word is of some interest from a grammatical point of view. Amongst those words which designate followers of a doctrine or philosophy, it is the only one formed with a krit-affix. It occurs, e.g. as an instance of Patanjali, to I. 2, 64, v. 17, II. 2, 29, and in a Káriká of the latter to III. 2, 123, where it is rendered by Káliyaśa vicháráka; it occurs, too, as an instance, not in the Mahábhárata, but the Kálika and Siddh.-k. to II. 1, 53, in the compound sállakṣéṣṭhá; and it is probably the property of the Calcutta Páñjits, as an instance to IV. 3, 9.

does he mention Jaimini, the author of the Mímánsá-Sútra; and it is, perhaps, worthy of our attention, that not even the Ganas to Pánini contain the formation of this word, which is of as much interest as any other word of the Gaña Báhuwádi (IV. 1, 96).¹¹⁴

The word Vedánta having no remarkable grammatical peculiarities, had no claim to the notice of Pánini; but had he been aware of the word Vedántin, “one who knows the Vedánta,” it would certainly have required a special rule of his, since there is no Sútra in his Grammar by which the sense of this derivative could be made out satisfactorily. And as Pánini notices but one single word in which the base is not a proper name, and the affix in (technically ini) imparts to the

¹¹⁴ With regard to Jaimini, I have only to add that the instance भवरसीभवन्तिः or भवरसीभवन्तिः to II. 2, 38 has not yet found a place in the Bháshya or in Káliyaśa’s commentary; it occurs in the Kálika and the Gañaratanaśabhadhí; but on what authority Jyáditya and Vardhamána give this handsome epithet to the old Jaimini, or whether it is levelled against another Jaimini, I have no means of stating.
derivative the sense of studying or knowing, viz., anubrañmanin,
“one who studies or knows a work like a Brāhmaṇa” (IV. 2, 62),
the omission of Vedántin acquires increased significance.\footnote{178}

Sánkhyā is a peculiar form. It comes from sankhyā, and de-
signates the philosophy which is based on synthetic (sam) reasoning
(khyā). Its very name shows that it is the counterpart, as it were,
of Nyāya (ni-āya), or the philosophy founded on “analytical
reasoning.” For while the former builds up a system of the
universe, the latter dissects it into categories, and “enters into”
its component parts. Yet a grammatical rule would have had to
explain why the name of the former system is not a kriṭ-formation,—for instance, its very base, sankhyā, analogously to the
kriṭ-formation nyāya. It has not been noticed by Pāṇini. Nor
does he teach—as he probably would have done had this philo-
sophy existed in his time—that the same word means, as a
masculine, a follower of the Sánkhyā philosophy.\footnote{179}

The word Yoga occurs several times in the Sūtras,\footnote{176}
but never in the sense of a system of philosophy; and the only
two derivatives of this word which are taught by Pāṇini, viz.,
yoga and yonaka (V. 1, 102) are two words which have no

\footnote{178} For the various explanations, given by native authorities, of this term, I need
now refer to one essay only, since it probably comprises all the literary information—

and not only on this point—which can be obtained in our days on Sánkhyā writers,
and certainly more than any one scholar in Europe would have at his command—I mean
the learned and excellent preface of Dr. Hall to his elaborate edition of the Sánkhyā-
Pravachana. The latter sense of the word Sánkhyā, “a follower of the Sánkhyā philo-
sophy,” occurs, e.g. in the Bhagavad-Gītā, III. 3; or, together with the word Kāpāla, “a
follower of the Vyāsaśīka doctrine,” in the commentary of Śaṅkara on the Vedānta
Sūtras, II. 3, 51: अन्नमद�घ्न सर्वजनशिरसंसारोपितामर्थानाशकाभिषेकं विशिष्टेः
मनोविधायमानायपरमार्थसंविस्तारे। साध्यांनां तत्त्वतः । . . . . . . . वातावरा -
माश्योऽदि. 

\footnote{179} I. 2, 54. 55.—III. 4, 20.—V. 1, 102; 4, 44. 47. 50. 126.—VI. 4. 74. 75.—VIII.
1, 59.
connection whatever with its philosophical meaning. In the sense of "religious austerity," it seems to have been known by Pāṇini, though he has no rule on the formation of this word, apparently because it offers no other grammatical interest than that which would be satisfied by his general rules III. 3, 18 and VII. 3, 52; for he has a rule on the formation of yogin (III. 2, 142). But this word means a man who practices religious austerities; it does not mean a follower of the Yoga system of philosophy.

That Nyāya was known to Pāṇini in the sense of syllogism or logical reasoning, or perhaps logical science, I conclude from the Śūtra III. 3, 122,’ where its affix conveys the sense of instrumentality, i.e. that by which analysis (lit. entering-into) is effected, for the same form, nyāya, is made the subject of another rule (III. 3, 37), where Pāṇini gives as its meaning "propriety, good conduct," which would lead to its later meaning, "policy." Unless we drew this distinction between the two Sūtras named, the first Sūtra would become superfluous. Nor is it probable that a civilization like that which is traceable in Pāṇini's rules could have done without a word for syllogistic thought. But between this sense of the word nyāya, and its designating the special come from the to lead," an etymology which, of course, is absolutely impossible. Nor is there any trace of it in any of the commentaries known to me. Patanjali and his commentators have no remark on this easy word. The Kālika, which explains every Sūtra, writes नियाय यथाभिषेक कारणः, but neither allows these words to be preceded by "बः" nor, as this quotation shows, to contain a third person of the plural (प्रक्रिया). Its gloss obviously means, "because entering is made (प्रवेश + द्वैत) by it, the derivative is वचनः." The Siddhānta-kaumudi (fol. 211a, line 7) has an analogous interpretation: "चिन्तिता . . . चालितम्," etc., which is still more transparent. But what must one think of the profidency of an "editor" of Pāṇini, who has none of the laborious work—which always gives a title to indulgence—of comparing MSS. and compiling a commentary—who merely reprints the labour of others,—and yet, even in a simple case like this, does not feel induced to consult the Kālikā or Siddhānta-kaumudi, though he talks a great deal, even on this occasion, of the Kālikā "A. B. and C." but without mastering its "a, b, c," simply repeats the gross blunder of the editors of his edition of Pāṇini!

179 I regret that I must again animadvert on an error of the Calcutta editors. In their gloss on the Śūtra III. 3, 122 they give the following etymology of बाधा., "दीर्घ | दीर्घे | कृति | बाधा." According to them, this word would therefore
system of Gautama there is a vast difference. Nay, had Paṇini even written the Gaṇa IV. 2, 60, which implies, in its present version, the formation naiyāyika, this latter word would not require us to infer that it means there a follower of Gautama’s school; it may only signify a man who studies or knows the laws of syllogism. To substantiate this conclusion, with all the detail it deserves, would be a matter of great interest; for no philosophical school has dealt more largely with grammatical subjects than the Nyāya school, and its branch, the Vaiśeṣika. The nature of “sound” and “word,” the question whether word is “eternal or transitory,” the “power” or purport of words, the relation of base and affix, and such kindred matters are treated of in a vast literature based on the Sūtras of Gautama; and the controversies of the Naiyāyikas with the Vaiyakaranas or etymology need not blush before those of our modern philosophers. I must, however, confine myself on the present occasion, as heretofore, to giving a small amount of proof, that Paṇini could not have known the Sūtras of Gautama.

After having refuted the opinion that the sense of a word conveys either the notion of genus or that of species, or that of individual, each taken separately, Gautama continues:—“1. The sense of a word conveys (at the same time) as well the notion of genus (jāti), as that of species (ākriti), as that of an individual (vyakti). 2. An individual (vyakti) is a bodily form as a receptacle for the particularization of qualities. 3. Species (ākriti) is called the characteristic mark of genus. 4. Genus (jāti) is that which has the property of (intellectually) producing (species) of the same kind.”

179 To arrive at the form पैदाृच्छिक it is necessary to combine with the Gaṇa quoted, the Sūtra VII. 3, 3. The same word जाप in the philosophical sense, occurs in the Gaṇa to IV. 3, 73, where a MS. of the Kālikā has even the reading बाप्राप्चा; and probably, in the same sense in the Gaṇa to VIII. 1, 27; but even if Paṇini himself had written it there, we should not be justified in giving it a more definite sense than the one stated. In the Sūtra IV, 4, 92, and the Gaṇa to IV. 3, 54, it has the sense of “propriety.”

180 Nyāya Sūtras II. 131–134: न्यायसूत्रसमव यदां: । तत्समर्थस्तिश्चतथादि ।
Let us now refer to the terminology of Pāṇini, and see how he dealt with similar notions. In the first place, we find that he does not make use of a term ákṛiti. We meet, in his Grammar

only with the two terms jāti and vyakti. In the rule I. 2, 52, he speaks of (words which express) "qualities as far as a jāti goes;" and the instance of the jāti, given by Patanjali, is a tree.}\n
181 I. 2, 52: विभेदार्थाना चाहिः:—I must observe here that the Kālidāsa and, on its authority, the Calcutta edition, are quite at variance with Patanjali, in explaining the last words of this Sūtra, as if it had the sense च चाहिः: Patanjali distinctly rejects such an explanation, on the ground that it is impossible to speak of qualities which are not jātis. He rejects, too, such instances as पद्याला वचनः. सूचिन्सा संबंध-पायिनिः. दण्डायमानः, which illustrate his परेकपंक्तः; an instance of his conclusion is च च यत्रूपदाय सन्धृत सूचिः.—Patanjali: वर्णविन्दीय किशाधिकारिः। वाताविभेदातिनिश्चिति समयालायिणीभिः। सूचिन। वर्ण विभेदानी वाताविभेदायिणीभिः। सूचिन (MS.8) समयालायिणी। दण्डायमानः दण्डायमानः। सूचिन (MS.8) समयालायिणी।

181 I. 2, 52: विभेदार्थाना चाहिः:—I must observe here that the Kālidāsa and, on its authority, the Calcutta edition, are quite at variance with Patanjali, in explaining the last words of this Sūtra, as if it had the sense च चाहिः: Patanjali distinctly rejects such an explanation, on the ground that it is impossible to speak of qualities which are not jātis. He rejects, too, such instances as पद्याला वचनः. सूचिन्सा संबंध-पायिनिः. दण्डायमानः, which illustrate his परेकपंक्तः; an instance of his conclusion is च च यत्रूपदाय सन्धृत सूचिः.—Patanjali: वर्णविन्दीय किशाधिकारिः। वाताविभेदातिनिश्चिति समयालायिणीभिः। सूचिन। वर्ण विभेदानी वाताविभेदायिणीभिः। सूचिन (MS.8) समयालायिणी। दण्डायमानः दण्डायमानः। सूचिन (MS.8) समयालायिणी।

181 I. 2, 52: विभेदार्थाना चाहिः:—I must observe here that the Kālidāsa and, on its authority, the Calcutta edition, are quite at variance with Patanjali, in explaining the last words of this Sūtra, as if it had the sense च चाहिः: Patanjali distinctly rejects such an explanation, on the ground that it is impossible to speak of qualities which are not jātis. He rejects, too, such instances as पद्याला वचनः. सूचिन्सा संबंध-पायिनिः. दण्डायमानः, which illustrate his परेकपंक्तः; an instance of his conclusion is च च यत्रूपदाय सन्धृत सूचिः.—Patanjali: वर्णविन्दीय किशाधिकारिः। वाताविभेदातिनिश्चिति समयालायिणीभिः। सूचिन। वर्ण विभेदानी वाताविभेदायिणीभिः। सूचिन (MS.8) समयालायिणी। दण्डायमानः दण्डायमानः। सूचिन (MS.8) समयालायिणी।
At I. 2, 58, he treats of the optional use of the singular or plural: “if the word expresses a jātī,” (e.g. a Brāhmaṇa or the Brāhmaṇas); at V. 2, 133, he applies the term jātī to the elephant,—at V. 4, 37, to herbs,—at V. 4, 94, to stones and iron, a lake and a cart,—at VI. 1, 143, to the fruit Kustumburu,—at VI. 3, 103, to grass;—and IV. 1, 63, is a rule on “jātī-words, which are not permanently used in the feminine gender.” It is not necessary to multiply these instances, in order to show that Pāṇini understands by jātī the same thing that Gautama understands by ākṛti, viz., species; and I may add at once, that he has no word at all for the notion of “genus.”

As to vyakti, it occurs but once in the Sūtras, viz., I. 2, 51, parison which I have made between Pāṇini and Gautama, and which, moreover, has an additional import in affording evidence that Gautama is prior to Patañjali. I mean the Kārikā to IV. 1, 63, which says: शुचिप्रकटया गृहिनिस्मरय | गृहीतोऽपि शुचिप्रकटया | श्रुति-कारतिर्थियो | गृहीतोऽपि शुचिप्रकटया | i.e., “jātī has (in Pāṇini) the sense of ākṛti; it does not possess all the genders, and, once determined, is easily recognized (elsewhere); but it is, too, a family with its schools.” The following passages from Kāliyāya will bear out my translation: शुचिप्रकटया गृहिनिस्मरय | गृहीतोऽपि शुचिप्रकटया | [For these last words compare Viśvanātha’s comment on the Nāḍya Sūtra II. 133, in note 180]. शुचिप्रकटया गृहिनिस्मरय | गृहीतोऽपि शुचिप्रकटया | गृहीतोऽपि शुचिप्रकटया | गृहीतोऽपि शुचिप्रकटया | श्रुति-कारतिर्थियो | गृहीतोऽपि शुचिप्रकटया | गृहीतोऽपि शुचिप्रकटया | गृहीतोऽपि शुचिप्रकटया |

There is, indeed, a Kārikā of Patañjali which explicitly corroborates this com-
and means there "linga" generic mark, which, in grammatical
technology, is gender. The notion of individuality is not repre-
sented by a special word in the language of Pāṇini; the nearest
approach to it is his word adhikaraṇa, as it is used in the rules
II. 4, 13, 15, and V. 3, 43, where it is rendered by the com-
mentators by drava "substance." The term viēshya may be
compared to adhikaraṇa; but as it signifies "the object to be
have remained doubtful, had he not availed himself, in another of his Vārttikas, of the
term drava exactly in the sense in which it is defined by the Nyāya Sūtra—viz., in the
Vārttika 5 (ed. Calc.) to VII. 1, 74: न वा समावधामाकारी सामिलपुन्नविधानात्
and though Patañjali observes that this Vārttika is superfluous, since its contents are a
matter of course, we may, nevertheless, be thankful for its word drava, and the con-
cclusions it enables us to draw in our present case.—Patañjali: न वा सत्यम्। वि याभ्यम्।
समावधामाकारी सामिलपुन्नविधानात्। समावधामाकारी द्वारानिर्विधानात्।
चारवन्ति पीतद्रवानि विषयाणि। वि चचत्वताः। न वि द्वारानिर्विधानात्।
उद्भवनि तथा द्वारानिर्विधानात्। इत्यद्वैतानि समावधामाकारी द्वारानिर्विधानात्
चारवन्ति—Whether Kātyāyana, in using the expression चारवन्ति विषयाः (I. 4, 1,
v. 3, of the Calcutta edition), merely adapted himself to the manner in which Pāṇini
uses विषय, or whether he, too, had not yet a knowledge of Gautama's definition would

108 Vyākrtti is used in the same sense by Kātyāyana in the Vārttika 1 (of the Calc.
ed.) to I. 2, 52.
qualified,” it is not the counterpart of jātī, but of viṣeṣaṇa, “the quality.”

The result of the foregoing comparison between Pāṇini and Gautama must remove, I believe, every doubt as to the chronological position of both. The expressions of Pāṇini show that he had not even conceived so much as the philosophical problem started and solved by Gautama. The very manner in which Patanjali is compelled to answer the question, whether “the sense of a word” in Pāṇini “implies species or individuality”—viz., that at one time it implies the former, and at another, the latter, shows that philosophical investigations into the “sense of the word” had not yet troubled Pāṇini’s mind. A mere difference of opinion between the grammarian and the Nyāya philosopher would be no proof for the posteriority of the latter; but the absence of the problem itself, in the Sūtras of Pāṇini, is, I hold, sufficient ground for this inference. A problem of this kind could not have been slighted by Pāṇini if he had been aware of it; it would have entered unconsciously, as it were, into his terminology, and into the mode of delivering his rules. There is abundant evidence in Patanjali’s Great Commentary, that his training must have been a philosophical one; and it is Kātyāyana’s superiority, too, in this respect, which inflicts on Pāṇini a quantity of Vārttikas finding fault with his empiric and unphilosophical treatment of grammatical facts.

After this conclusion, it seems needless to add that the Sūtras ignore the word vaśeṣhika, which, from a grammatical point of view, would have had as much claim to being noticed by Pāṇini as any word comprised in his rules IV. 2, 60 and 63. The formation vaśeṣhika is taught in the Gaṇa to V. 4, 34, but merely in the sense of viṣeṣa.

There is an important class of ancient works the chronological relation of which to Pāṇini deserves our peculiar attention here, from the circumstance that their contents are more or less kindred

164 Compare II. 1, 57; also V. 1, 119, v. 5 (ed. Cal.).
with those of Pāṇini’s work,—I mean the grammatical works known under the name of Unnādi-Sūtras, Dhātupātha, Práti-sákhya, Phīl-Sūtra, and we may add to them the Nirukta, the exegetical work of Yāska. Each of these works, with perhaps the exception of one, if I am not mistaken, is unanimously considered by Sanskrit scholars, as prior to the Grammar of Pāṇini.

Before I proceed to examine whether this view can be upheld or not, I will quote Professor Müller’s opinion on the age of the Unnādi-Sūtras. “We do not know,” he says, “by whom these Unnādi affixes were first collected, nor by whom the Unnādi-Sūtras, as we now possess them, were first composed. All we can say is, that, as Pāṇini mentions them, and gives several general rules with regard to them, they must have existed before his time.”

On the same subject, Dr. Aufrecht, to whom we are indebted for a careful edition of the Unnādi-Sūtras, together with a commentary by Ujjvaladatta, expresses himself thus:—“We have no direct tradition as to the author of the sūtras. They were composed before the time of Pāṇini, as they are referred to by him in two different passages of his Grammar. The fact, however, that both Yāska and the author of the above-quoted Kārikā [viz., to III. 3, 1] specify Cākatāyana as the grammarian who derived all nouns from verbs, speaks in favour of Nāgojī’s conjecture, that the authorship is to be attributed to Cākatāyana. Nor is this supposition entirely unsupported by the evidence of the sūtras themselves. In one place (II. 38) we are told that the people of the north used the word kāṛhaka for ‘a husbandman;’ in another (IV. 128), that they employed kṛtri in the meaning of an artisan.” This distinction refers to a period of the language

183 Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 151.
of which no mention is made by any grammarian after Pāṇini. In another rule (III. 144,) we find the name of Cākravarna, an old grammarian who is only once more quoted, namely, in Pāṇini, VI. 1, 130. It is of some importance also, that the author of the sūtras considers açman (stone) and bhuvana (world) as Vaidic, whereas they are treated by Pāṇini as words of common occurrence. These facts, even when taken collectively, furnish no decisive evidence as to the authorship of the sūtras, but they show, at all events, that they were composed a considerable time before Pāṇini."

I have in the first instance, to demur to the correctness of one of these "facts," which, if it were real, would dispense with any further proof of the Unnādī-Sūtras having preceded—not, indeed, Pāṇini, for such an inference would always remain hazardous—but his grammatical work. It is true that this grammarian speaks twice of Unnādī, but he never speaks of Unnādī-Sūtras.\footnote{III. 3, 1: चवाहयो वक्षरं; and III. 4, 75: सामायाम्बोवाहयः.}

The former term merely implies a list of Unnādī affixes, and may imply, according to analogous expressions in Pāṇini, a list of words formed with these affixes;\footnote{Vaidyandita on the Paribhāshā चवाहयो चूतमाधि प्रातिविधिकाथि—: तवाहयः। तहुभाषि तस्किंभासिनवति या.} but it can never imply a work which treats of these affixes and these formations, like the Unnādī-Sūtras which we are speaking of. Between a list of Unnādī—affixes or words—and Unnādī-Sūtras, there is all the difference which exists between a lexicographical and a grammatical work. All the conclusions, therefore, which are based on the identity of both, vanish at once.

With the conjecture of Nāgojibhaṭṭa I shall deal hereafter; but when Dr. Aufrecht quotes the meaning of kārshaka, 'husbandman,' and of kārī, 'artisan' as proving his conclusion, I candidly confess that I do not understand how the fact of these words having been used by the people of the north, in the sense given, can have the remotest bearing on the point at issue, even if in
the whole stretch of the voluminous grammatical literature subsequent to Pāṇini, all of which, of course, is covered by his assertion, no grammarian had made mention of the distinction he is adverting to.198 The Unnādi Sūtras profess to give such information as is not contained in Pāṇini’s work; he himself informs us of this character of the Unnādi list in the two rules alleged. It is but natural, therefore, that we should find in these two Unnādi rules, as indeed we find in all the rest, much interesting matter of which no trace occurs in the Sūtras of Pāṇini.

But even assuming that my inability to understand this premiss of Dr. Aufrecht only proves my own incapacity, I might go further and ask—What proof does there exist that these two Sūtras, which have nothing characteristic or peculiar in them, were not added to the original Sūtras at a later time, since Dr. Aufrecht himself has shown that the genuineness of sixteen Sūtras was suspected by Ujjwaladatta himself? And I may add—Are there not, for instance, in a valuable commentary on more than 300 of these Unnādi-Sūtras, composed by Nrisinha, who lived Samvat 1577, or 1520 after Christ, at least in the MS. I have consulted, not only many readings which differ from the text of Ujjwaladatta, as edited by Dr. Aufrecht, but three Sūtras the substance of which is now in the Commentary, and three Sūtras which are neither met with in the text of Bhatṭoji nor in that of Ujjwaladatta?199 It seems,

198 Between the Sūtras III. 60 and 61 we read in the E. I. H. MS. 98 of Nrisinha’s Swaramanjari (on accentuation)—where these Unnādi-Sūtras occur—a Sūtra which is neither amongst those of Ujjwaladatta, nor in his Commentary, viz.: भांरसिग्निक हृदेनि:। भिसो भर्म भरतसि:। भरसिंक वाचिः।।
Comm.: भांरसिग्निक हृदेनि। भिसो भर्म भरतसि। भरसिंक वाचिः। ।
Between IV. 2 and 3, it has a Sūtra the contents—but not the wording—of which are embodied in Ujjwaladatta’s Sūtra IV. 2: क्रंदोंत्रोऽविनिः। Comm.: क्रंदोंत्रोऽविनिः।
मयानित्वमथानि:। भक्तिविक्षमः। Between IV. 90 and 91: तत्रैवैत्तकस्य:। (11 substance occurs in the commentary on Sūtra IV. 90); Comm.: तत्रैवैत्तकस्य:। कृतमल्ली दीर्घः।
. . . . . . . ( ? ) | सम्बित्तिस्नेति तोपा:। एवमेकं तुषितविविष:। एवमेकं तुषितविविष: (embodied also in the Commentary of Ujjwaladatta) | Comm.: मयानित्वमथानि:। कृतविक्षमः। मयानित्वमथानि नाहोः। | सम्बित्तिस्नेति तोपा:। Before V. 28, it mentions a Sūtra which is neither
therefore, that with the actual doubts we must entertain as to the origination of several Īnādī-Sūtras, it is by no means safe to appeal to two or any such Sūtras for chronological evidence, unless they be able to show cause why they should not be ranked amongst the additions of later times.

amongst those of Ujjainaldatta nor embodied in his Commentary: द्राक्षो। Comm.: मिलिन्ति विषयति यो नुसूचि। द्राक्षायाः लाशेऽ। etc. Before V. 52 which precedes V. 70, and follows V. 69 and the new Sūtra (i.e. V. 69—the new Sūtra—52. 70): दिनिष्ठितसहितम्। Comm.: दोषतीति शोः। दिनिष्ठ:। दिनिष्ठ:। दिनिष्ठ:। this Sūtra, too, is neither amongst the Sūtras nor in the Commentary of Ujjainaldatta.

Dr. Aufrecht himself observes (p. 1x) with perfect accuracy: “the upādīdītrās have not been handed down to us in their original form. It was not the intention of the author to give a complete list of all the upādī-words, but merely to collect the most important of them. Hence we frequently meet with the sentence: वर्णविवाच्यं ‘in various other words, too,’ or विवाच्यं वर्णविवाच्यं ‘the same suffixes are found in other words, too.’ ” The former of these expressions, quoted by Dr. Aufrecht, occurs, indeed, five times and the latter once; and Patanjali says in his Kārikā to III. 3, 1, and in his comment on it: शब्दविवाच्यं ‘word-swarm of words’ विवाच्यं।

And again, what possible conclusion as to the chronological relation of the Īnādī-Sūtras to Pāṇini can be drawn from another quotation made by Dr. Aufrecht? Chākhravarnana, he says, is once quoted by the Īnādī-Sūtras, and “only once more, namely, in Pāṇini.” I will make no remark on these latter words. That they are quoted by both is undeniable; but since it happens that both Dr. Aufrecht and I have quoted Pāṇini, does it follow that either of us lived a “considerable time” before the other, or before any other writer who may also have quoted Pāṇini? When, however, Dr. Aufrecht points out that the author of the Īnādī-Sūtras “considers aṣman (stone) and bhūvana (world) as Vaidé, whereas they are treated by Pāṇini as words of common occurrence,” I, too, lay much stress on the statement contained in this passage of the Īnādī-Sūtras, but by it arrive at the
very opposite inference to that which has suggested itself to him. For, if Pañini treated these words which occur in the Vedas as words of common life, and, on the other hand, the author of the Sūtras in question had ceased to use them in his conversational speech, and records the fact that they belong, not only to literary language, but to that of the very oldest literature,—I do not conclude that such facts "show, at all events, that they (the Unnādi-Sūtras) were composed a considerable time before Pañini;" but I conclude that Pañini lived in that Vaidik age when āśman and bhuvana were as well Vaidik as common words, and therefore required no distinctive remark of his; that, on the contrary, the author of the two Unnādi-Sūtras in question belonged to a period when these words had become obsolete in common life,—in short, that Pañini lived a considerable time before this grammarian.

An inference, however, of such importance as this could not be considered as resting on sufficiently solid ground if there were no other means of establishing it than two Sūtras of a work avowedly open to interpolations at various periods of Sanskrit literature.

In order to support it with stronger arguments, I must raise a previous question, which does not concern the Unnādi-Sūtras alone—the question, whether or not Pañini was the originator of all the technical terms he employs in his work? Since he adverts, several times, in his rules, to grammarians who preceded him, it would probably—not necessarily—be possible to answer this question if we possessed the works of these grammarians. Sākṣatikāyana's grammar seems indeed, to have come down to us, but though, in such a case it would be within my reach, it must still remain at present a sealed book to me, and I must treat it like the works of Gārgya, Kāśyapa, and the other predecessors of Pañini who merely survive in name and fame.

192 See note 97.

193 The knowledge that Sākṣatikāyana’s Grammar exists, and is preserved amongst the treasures of the Library of the Home Government for India, we owe, like so much of our knowledge of Sanskrit literature, to the lamented Professor Wilson, who speaks of
There are, in my opinion, two Sūtras of Pāṇini which may serve as a clue through the intricacies of this problem.

In five important rules of his, Pāṇini states that, on principle, he will exclude from his Grammar certain subjects, as they do not fall within his scope. But since he gives reasons for doing so, he at the same time enables us to infer what he considered his duty, as a grammarian, to teach. Amongst these rules, one

It in his *Mackenzie Collection*, vol. I. p. 100. Many years ago I obtained sight of the precious volume; but as it is written on palm leaves in the Hāḍa Karnāta character, and as I could not attempt to make it out without a magnifying glass, and then only with much difficulty, I was compelled to abandon my desire of mastering its contents. It is to be hoped now that a learned, laborious, and competent Sanskrit scholar will transcribe and publish this awkward MS., and thus relieve Sanskrit studies from a suspense which no one can feel more keenly than I do in writing these lines. I must add, at the same time, that doubts have been lately expressed to me whether this MS. contains really the original work of Śākapūrṇa, or merely a Grammar founded on his.

These rules are I. 2, 53-57. They contain Pāṇini’s grammatical creed, and are the key-stone of his work. But all that the “editor” of Pāṇini has to offer with respect to them is the following attempt at an epigram (vol. II. p. 47): “Pāṇini makes an expedi-

(I. 2, 53) referring to a subject touched on by him in a previous Sūtra, says: “Such matter will not be taught by me, for it falls under the category of conventional terms, which are settled (and

tion against his predecessors.” And thus, in taking up that which is merely incidental, and, compared with the subject itself, quite irrelevant, he completely leads the reader away from the real importance of these rules. The Kālikā, it is true, mentions that Pāṇini differs in the principles he lays down in these rules from previous grammarians; but it is far from making a joke or concentrating the essence of its comment on so futile a point. It shows, on the contrary, the full bearing of these rules, and, I believe, it would have done still better had it embodied in its gloss the remarks of Patañjali on some of these Sūtras. At all events, the commentary of the Kālikā on them was deemed important enough even by Dr. Boehtlingk to be quoted by him on this occasion in its full extent, though his reason for doing so is merely to show the

“expedition of Pāṇini against his predecessors.” “The whole,” (viz., this expedition) he writes in introducing the Kālikā, “becomes sufficiently clear through an excellent commentary, I mean the Kālikā-vṛtti, which will make any other remark superfluous.” As the quotation he then gives from the Kālikā is the only one, of any extent, in his whole second volume, and as he assumes all the appearance of treating it with that minute and critical and conscientious circumstance which even in an incidental quotation must be extremely welcome,—I mean by giving the various readings of his MSS. (“A” = MS. 829; “B” = MS. 2440 of the East India House—wrongly
therefore do not require any rule of mine; literally: for it has the authority of a sanjña or conventional term.)." To these words Patanjali appends the following gloss: "When Pāṇini speaks of

conventional terms which he will not teach, because they are settled, does he mean, by this expression, such technical terms as ti, ghu, bha, and the like? No; for sanjña is here the

on his edition of Pāṇini and on some of his other "editions," too, the point I wanted to ascertain, once more, did not so much concern a question of scholarship as one of scientific reliability. The result of my comparison was this. Dr. Boehtlingk records at his quotation from the Kāśīkā to I. 2, 53, the various readings of Ms. A: निर्देशात्मक (for B प्रतार्था), वषया (for B कुद्रा), वशसार (for B सूचका), जिसवषय (for B जिकएल्या), और शवाद (for B शवाद); but he does not say that A reads the last words: अपी दहर हुँदा: विषय (sic) शवाद (sic).—At I. 2, 54 he mentions that MS. A has omitted the word शवाद; but he does not state that A reads शवाद instead of B's reading शवाद; nor does A have a marginal note on the word शवसार which runs thus: शवसारमपि: चर्चाप्रियोऽवस्था: शवसारमपि: तथापमपि: युक्तस्मिनात् तदाद्यादि:। And he edits on his own authority—without any remark whatever—प्रार्थनेश्वरमिथा: which is perfectly meaningless—while both MSS. read प्रार्थनेश्वरमिथा:—At I. 2, 55, he mentions that A has omitted शवसार and तदादि; moreover that B reads: विशेषार्थस्वयं परी प्रार्थनेश्वरमिथा:। तदा; but he does not say that A omits also शवसार before शवाद, and adds तदादि before the last words प्रार्थनेश्वरमिथा:। And what is much worse, he not only edits शवसारपरिवर्तनमयादि: while both MSS. read शवसारपरिवर्तनमयादि:, but शवसारपरिवर्तनमयादि:—which is simple nonsense—while both MSS. have the intelligible reading शवसारपरिवर्तनमयादि:—At I. 2, 56, he observes that तदादि is omitted in B and
same as sanjñāṇa, ‘understanding’ (i.e. a name which has a real meaning, that may be traced etymologically’).” And Kayyātu enlarges upon these words in the following strain:

The question of Patanjali is suggested by the rule of analogy. His answer is in the negative, because context itself has a greater weight than (mere) analogy. Now, though such terms as ti, ghu, bha, and the like, are settled terms, this circumstance would not have been a sufficient reason in an etymological work (like that of Pāṇini) for leaving them untought, for they have no etymological value. ‘Understanding,’ (as Patanjali paraphrases sanjñā) means mentally entering into, understanding the component parts of a word, [or it means the words which admit of this mental process.] 195

Pāṇini, I, 3, 53: द्वितीयं संस्कृतमाध्यमालयाः. —Patanjali: विन च यति: कष्टिक—
From this rule of Pāṇini and the commentaries alleged we learn therefore—

1. That his Grammar does not treat of those sanjñās or conventional names which are known and settled otherwise.

2. That this term sanjñā must be understood in our rule to concern only such conventional names as have an etymology.

3. That it applies also to grammatical terms which admit of an etymology, but not to those which are merely grammatical symbols.

4. That such terms as ti, ghu, and bha, were known and settled before Pāṇini’s Grammar, but that, nevertheless, they are defined by Pāṇini because they are not etymological terms.

Having thus obtained, through the comment of Patanjali on the Sūtra in question, a means by which to judge of the originality of Pāṇini’s terms, we must feel induced to test its accuracy before we base our inferences on it; and the opportunity of doing so is afforded not merely by the technical symbols which Patanjali himself names,—we easily ascertain that Pāṇini has given a definition of them,—but also by another of these important five Sūtras. This Sūtra (I. 2, 56) says: “Nor shall I teach the purport of the principal part of a compound (pradhāna), or that of an affix (pratyaya), because they, too, have been settled by others (i.e. people know already from other authorities, that in a compound the sense of the word gravitates towards its principal part, and in a derivative towards the affix.)”

Thus we learn here from Pāṇini himself that the term pratyaya (affix) was employed before he wrote his work; and if Patanjali’s interpretation be correct, Pāṇini, who also makes use of this term,

Pāṇini, I. 2, 56: प्रधानप्रत्ययाःप्रवर्त्तकप्रत्ययाःप्रभावालार्. There is no Bhāṣya on this rule.
CHRONOLOGICAL RELATION BETWEEN PAÑINI AND THE UNÑADI-SUTRAS. 

must have left it undefined, since it has an etymology and was "settled" in his time. And such, indeed, is the case. Pánini uses the word pratyāya many times (e.g. I. 1, 61. 62. 69; 2, 41. 45; 3, 63. etc. etc.), he heads with it a whole chapter which extends over three books of his work, yet he gives no definition whatever of its sense. Finding, then, that Patanjali's comment is confirmed by Pánini's own words, we may proceed; and we then obtain the result that the Sutras employ but do not explain such heads, for instance, as prathamā (nominative), dwityā (accusative), trityā (instrumental), chaturthi (dative), panchamī (ablative), shashtithi (genitive), and saaptamī (locative). And the commentators apprise us that these words were technical names used by the eastern grammarians, which are referred to by Pánini in some of his rules.137 We likewise meet in his work with such terms as samāsa (compound II. 1, 3), tatpurusha (II. 1, 22), anuvyābāva (II. 1, 5), bahuśthi (II. 2, 23), kriṅ (III. 1, 93), taddhita (IV. 1, 76), etc. etc.: he enumerates all the special compounds or affixes which fall under these heads, but does not give any definition whatever of the meaning of these names. Again, the commentaries, in advertising to them, tell us that the terms expressing compounds, for instance, belong to "older grammarians."

When, on the other hand, we see that he does give a definition of karmadharaya (I. 2, 42), or of saññūga (I. 1, 7), or of anuñāsika (I. 1, 8), terms which are conventional and admit of an etymological analysis, we are at once compelled to infer that he was the first who employed these technical names in the sense stated by him. And this conclusion would apply with equal force to all other terms of a similar kind which do not merely head an enumeration of rules but are clearly defined by him, e.g. to savarna (I. 1, 9), prāgrihya (I. 1, 11), lopa (I. 1, 60), kruṣva, dirgha, piuta (I. 2, 27), udātta (I. 2, 29), anudātta (I. 2, 30), svarita (I. 2, 31), aprākta (I. 2, 41), etc. etc. Nor do I believe that this conclusion becomes invalidated in those instances in which Pánini gives a definition, while yet there may be a strong presumption that the term defined was already
used in his time, for it seems to me that, in such a case, his definition either imparted an additional sense to the current term, and, in reality, thus created a new term of his own, or had a special bearing on the technical structure of his own work. When, for instance, he defines the term \textit{dvandva},\footnote{MS. 829, E.I.H., on I. 2, 57.} though there is a probability that this term was used by previous grammarians,\footnote{MS. 2440, E.I.H., reads \textit{sa} instead of \textit{kṣaya}, but both readings are objectionable, as we may infer from the \textit{Mahābhāṣya} on II. 1, 20.} his definition may have corrected the current notion on the subject implied by it, as I infer from the lengthened discussion of Patanjali. Or, when he uses the term \textit{upasarjana} in one of those five rules already mentioned, thus allowing us to conclude that it was a current term in his time,\footnote{MS. 829, E.I.H., on I. 2, 57.} and still appears to define it in two other rules,\footnote{MS. 2440, E.I.H., reads \textit{sa} instead of \textit{kṣaya}, but both readings are objectionable, as we may infer from the \textit{Mahābhāṣya} on II. 1, 20.} his definition is in reality no definition at all; it merely instructs the pupil how he may recognize an upasarjana-rule in his work.\footnote{MS. 2440, E.I.H., reads \textit{sa} instead of \textit{kṣaya}, but both readings are objectionable, as we may infer from the \textit{Mahābhāṣya} on II. 1, 20.}
CHRONOLOGICAL RELATION BETWEEN PAÑINI AND THE UŚNADĪ-SUTRAS. (169)

To extend this inference to purely grammatical symbols like those mentioned by Patanjali, e.g., *gha, skash, luk, ślu, lup*, etc. etc., would be wrong, after the remark of this grammarian; for, as we learn from him, that they are not *sanjās*, in the sense in which Pāṇini uses this word in his rule I. 2, 53, we cannot decide to what extent he may have invented these names, or whether he even invented any of them, since Patanjali distinctly tells us, as we have seen, that *ti, ghu, bhu*, were terms already known to Pāṇini.

If, then, we apply the test we have obtained to the Uṇādī-Sūtras, we shall have, in the first place, to observe that the technical, and, at the same time, significant names which would fall under the category of Pāṇini’s rule (I. 2, 53), and which are not only used in, but are indispensable to, the mechanism of these Sūtras are the following: *abhyāsa*, *avyaya*, *udātta*, *upadhā*, *upasarga*, *dirgha*, *dhātu*, *pada*, *vṛiddhi*, *lopa*, *sampradāraṇa*, *hrasva*.

Amongst these, Pāṇini gives no definition whatever of *dhātu*; for his explanation is merely an enumeration (I. 3, 1); and the same remark applies to *upasarga* (I. 4, 59), and perhaps to *vṛiddhi* (I. 1, 1) and *avyaya* (I. 1, 37, 38, etc.). It is probable, therefore, that Pāṇini did not invent these terms, but referred to them as of current use. On the other hand, he distinctly defines *hrasva*, *dirgha*, *udātta*, *upadhā*, *lopa*, *sampradāraṇa*, and *abhyāsa*. The term *pada* is also defined by him, but it seems that he merely extended its current application for his own purposes, since the commentaries tell us that “the former grammarians” gave a definition of the terms for compounds, and this definition contains the word *pada*. That the Uṇādī-Sūtras contain no definition of any technical word requires no confirmation from me.

---

233 B.g. I. 12. 15. 27. 32. 48.—II. 16. 59. 65.—III. 114.—IV. 55. 136. 144.—V. 19, etc.
234 I. 2, 27: विज्ञेयः सम्बन्धीप्रेसुतः.—I. 2, 29: विघच्छतः.—I. 1, 65: चक्सी विनयाः कपालः.—I. 1, 60: विद्यान्ति सापा:.—I. 1, 45: दशमः वेश्माराभः.—VI. 1, 4: पुरुषः आयः: (comp. also note 44).
Now, had Pāṇini not written the five Sūtras (I, 2, 53-57) in which he explains the method of his Grammar, or had he explained all the technical terms used by him, the absence of a definition of such terms in the Uṇṇādi-Sūtras would not justify us in arriving at any conclusion as regards the mutual relation of the two works. But since we know that Pāṇini does not define all his terms; and, on the other hand, that a treatise like the Uṇṇādi-Sūtras uses those terms which are defined by him, and exactly in the same sense in which they occur in his work, the only possible conclusion is that this treatise was written later than the Grammar of Pāṇini. And this also must have been the opinion of Ujjwaladatta and Bhaṭṭojīdikshita, for both grammarians, in their comment on an Uṇṇādi-Sūtra, which is an original one, if any be, since it treats of a whole category of Uṇṇādi words, state in the plainest possible language that this Sūtra is given as an exception to a rule of Pāṇini.299 Nay, we owe to Dr. Aufrecht himself a very interesting passage from Vimala’s Rūpaṇādi, which distinctly ascribes the authorship of these Uṇṇādi-Sūtras to Vararuci. But as Vararuci is a name of Kātyāyana also,300 this work seems to intimate that Kātyāyana completed the Grammar of Pāṇini, not only in his Vārttikas, but in the important work which concerns us here.301

299 Uṇṇādi-Sūtra, IV, 226: विभक्तिर्देशादयेत्—Ujjwaladatta: तत् विभक्तिर्देशादयेत्; (Pāṇini, VI, 2, 13). 299 नयं उपन्यासम् प्रातं वरा-रचितम्। 300 See also Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 240. 301 I subjoin a literal copy of this extract from the edition of Dr. Aufrecht, p. i.: “पद्धतिजीवनीय विभक्तिर्देशादयेत्। तत्र तद्धितोर्द्धादयेत्।” He adds to this quotation the following curt rejoiner: “This assertion, which makes Vararuci older than Pāṇini, has no claim to probability.” But I must ask—Is there one single word in this passage which justifies, in the slightest degree, the stricture passed by Dr.
Although it follows from all these premises that the treatise on the Upanādi-words, the existing collection of Upanādi-Sūtras, is later than the Grammar of Pāṇini, there still remains the question: What relation exists between the latter work and a list of Upanādi-affixes or words which Pāṇini twice quotes in his rules?

Yāska relates, in an interesting discussion on the derivation of nouns, that there were in India two classes of scholars, the one comprising the Nairukta, or etymologists (his commentator Durgā adds: except Gārgya), and the grammarian Śākatāyana; the other consisting of some of the Vaiyākaraṇas, or grammarians, and the etymologist Gārgya. The former maintained that all nouns are derived from “verbal roots;” the latter that only those nouns are so derived in which accent and formation are regular, and the sense of which can be traced to the verbal root, which is held to be their origin. They denied, as Yāska tells us, the possibility of assigning an origin to such words as go, “cow,” áśvā, “horse,” puruṣa, “man.”

Now, it is this latter description of words which is the subject of the Upanādi list: they are the Upanādi words. We must ask, therefore, did Pāṇini belong, as regards his linguistic notions, to the Nairukta or to the “some of the Vaiyākaraṇas?”

203 See Roth’s Nairukta, I. 12; Müller’s Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 164; and Aufrecht’s Upanādi-Sūtras, p. vii. Yāska, according to the present edition, adds to the three instances given the word śritācaka also. He can scarcely have meant the word “elephant,” which is not a krit, but a regular taddhita derivative of hasta: nor does this word occur in the Upanādi-Sūtras. It seems therefore probable that he said, or at least meant, the real Upanādi word hasta, “hand.” But as Durgā, too, at all events in the MS. at my command, writes śrīkṛta, I do not venture upon more than a conjecture that the latter words are to be corrected in the text of the Nairukta: śrīकृत. 
Since the former designation is chiefly applied to the exegetes of the Vaidik texts, and the latter is emphatically used by the grammarians, it seems probable that Pāṇini, in this question of the derivability of Uṇḍādi words, would stand on the side of these Vaiyākaraṇas. And this unquestionably is the opinion of Patanjali, as may be judged from the following facts:—In the rule VII. 1, 2, Pāṇini teaches, amongst other things, that when an affix contains the letters ðh, or kh, or cḥh, these letters are merely grammatical symbols, the real values of which are severally ey, in, ṣy. To this rule Kātyāyana appends the remark that the Uṇḍādi affixes form an exception, when Patanjali explains this view of the author of the Vārttikas by the instances sankha, sandha; for though these words are formed with the affixes kha and ḍha, the letters ðh and kh, in their affixes, are real, not symbolical.

"And," continues Kātyāyana, in two subsequent Vārttikas, "though Pāṇini speaks himself, in Sūtra III. 1, 29, of an affix iyāṅ (not chhaṅ, as might be expected according to rule VII. 1, 2), this does not invalidate my exception, for the latter is based on the circumstance that Pāṇini treats in his rule VII. 1, 2, not of verbal but of nominal bases." "True," rejoins Patanjali; "but Kātyāyana might have spared this discussion, for "nominal bases formed with Uṇḍādi affixes are bases which have no grammatical origin." 270

In rule VII. 3, 50, Pāṇini teaches that the letter ḍh in the affix ḍha has the value of ḍh; that ḍha, therefore, means in reality ṣka; 270


**VII. 3, 50: छुः — A Vārttika: चल्यात्स्यान्त स्वदायित्वानिधियानि। प्रतिभा: — प्रति:।

**VII. 4, 103; IV. 104) etc., — Vārttika: चल्यात्स्यान्त स्वदायित्वानिधियानि। प्रति:।
in rule VII. 4, 13, that a long vowel $a$, $i$, $u$, becomes short before the affix $ka$;\textsuperscript{201} in VIII. 2, 78, that the short vowels $i$ and $u$ become long before a radical consonant $r$ and $v$, if these consonants are followed by another consonant;\textsuperscript{212} in VIII. 3, 59, that the $s$ of an affix is changed under certain conditions to $sh$.\textsuperscript{213} To all these rules Kātyāyana takes exception by excluding from them the Ṣaṅskṛti words. Thus kantha, puntha, kanta, are formed with the affix $tha$ which does not mean $ska$; rukā and dhākā retain their long $ā$ before the affix $ka$; from $jri$ is derived $jīri$, not $jīri$; $kiri$ and $giri$ form their dual $kiryos$ and $giryos$, not $kīryās$ and $gīryās$; and in the words krisara, dhisaara, the $s$ has not become $sha$; while, on the other hand, this change has taken place in rarasā and tarsha,\textsuperscript{214} though the conditions named by Pāṇini in rule VIII.

\textsuperscript{201} VII. 4, 13: \textit{dvīdhi}:—\textit{Vārttika}: \textit{dvīdhi} $ka$. \textit{Patanjali}: \textit{dvīdhi} $ka$. (comp. V. 2, 35, where the affix is not a $kṛi$, but a $tadākha$).


\textsuperscript{213} VII. 3, 59: \textit{Vārttika}: \textit{Vārttika} $ka$. \textit{Patanjali}: \textit{Vārttika} $ka$. (cf. U. S. V. 49); and again

\textsuperscript{214} In the E. I. H. MS. of the Mahābhāṣya and in the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini the instances to VIII. 3, 59, v. 2, are वर्ण and तदः (instead of वर्ण and तदः); but it is evident that this reading is erroneous; for, in his first \textit{Vārttika}, Kātyāyana intends to show that \textit{Patanjali}'s rule is too wide; and, in the second, that it is too narrow, if applied...
3, 59 would not justify it there. But Patanjali, who supplies us with all these instances, in order to establish, first, the sense of the
to certain Upaniṣad words. Compare also the Commentary on the Upaniṣad-Śūtra III. 62.— It is needless to observe once more that in this, as in all similar instances, the reprint of Dr. Boehtlingk has simply continued the mistake of the Padmaś, though it always assumes the air of having taken its information from the MSŚ. Thus, in this very Vārttika, the Calcutta edition has a misprint सर्वार्थसिद्धि, and Dr. Boehtlingk writes—not "the Calcutta edition," but—"Ein vārttika: सर्वार्थसिद्धिः (sic)," as if this reading were an original one. But the E. I. H. MS. of the Mahābhāṣya reads quite correctly: "सर्वार्थ: प्रतिशिक्षाः;" and Kātyāyana has even a special remark to the effect, that though the Upaniṣad-Śūtra III. 73 (comp. also 70) teaches the affix सर्वार्थ, the Vārttika and Bhāṣya write सर्वार्थ (of which सर्वार्थ: is the genitive), because this affix is विषय: ; प्रतिशिक्षा: प्रवेदयत: (Per. स्तो: ) क्रुद्दिदिक: विकितक: – शुद्धि: (Up. S. III. 73) विकल्पतिसः विपरीता: 'ब्रह्म: विपरीति:। In all these instances, and others too (e.g. to VII. 2, 8, v. 1 of the Cal. ed.), the E. I. H. MS. of the Mahābhāṣya, and the Calcutta edition—as often as it gives this passage—writes: उपनिषदं शुद्धिदिकाः प्रतिशिक्षाः (the MS. of the Mahābhāṣya without the ग), the correctness of the reading given, however, does not only result from the commentaries, but from the Paribhāṣā works; MS. 778 of the Paribhāṣāḥdušekeśhāra e.g. writes उपनिषदं च चु: ); when the first word, though literally meaning "the affixes उष, etc." has the sense, "the words formed with the affixes उष, etc." (comp. I. 1. 72), in con-

Vārttikas, always rejects the criticism of Kātyāyana, and defends Pāṇini with the same argument which he used before, viz., in saying that "nominal bases formed with Upaniṣad affixes are bases which have no grammatical origin," and therefore do not concern an etymological work like that of Pāṇini.

But if Kātyāyana were really wrong in his censure of Pāṇini, can the argument used by Patanjali in defence of Pāṇini be right? Let us imagine that there existed amongst us two sets of grammarians, the one contending that the words red, bed, shed, are derived from radicals re, be, she, with an affix d; and another refuting these etymologists, and asserting that their derivation is

formity with the use which Pāṇini makes of the words देव and तत्त्व: (in the masculine gender), e.g. I. 1. 38; 2. 46; VI. 2, 155. Compare also Vaidyanātha's explanation, in note 188. The reading "उपनिषदं शुद्धिदिकाः प्रतिशिक्षाः," which is given by Dr. Aufrecht, p. vi., I have never met with, though I have frequently met with the phrase quoted above, not only in the grammatical commentaries, but in all the Paribhāṣā works, which give it as a Paribhāṣā. I, therefore, very much doubt its correctness, even if it should really be found in any MS.
absurd; that red, bed, shed are “bases without a grammatical origin.” Is it probable, on the same supposition, that a member of the last-named category, in writing a grammar and in dealing with these words, would ascribe to them an affix $d$? Yet, if Patanjali were right, Pāṇini would belong to this latter category, and he would have committed such an incongruity. He has not only spoken of an Unnādi affix $u$, but he calls it by its technical name $un$, which means that he bore in mind a distinct form of a radical, the vowel of which would become subject to the Vṛiddhi increase if it is joined to this affix $u$. The Unnādi words must, consequently, have been to Pāṇini words in which he perceived a real affix and a real radical,—words, in short, with a distinct etymology. There is other evidence to the same effect besides the two rules of his which contain the word unnādi. In rule VII. 2, 9, he mentions the affixes $ti$, $tu$, $tra$, $ta$, $si$, $su$, $sara$, $ka$, $sa$; all these are Unnādi affixes, and consequently represent to him as many radicals as are capable of being combined with them for the formation of nominal bases. That there is a flaw in the defence of Patanjali, must have been already perceived by Kaiyāgata, for this commentator tries to reconcile the fact I have pointed out with the assertion of Patanjali. I will quote his words, but merely to show that it was a desperate case to save Pāṇini from the Nairukta school, and to give him the stamp of a pure-bred Vaiyākaraṇa. On the occasion of Patanjali’s commenting on the Vārttika to VIII. 3, 59, and repeating the remark already mentioned, Kaiyāgata says: “Though the Unnādi words have been derived for the enlightenment of the ignorant, their formation is not subject to the same grammatical influence as it would be if they had an origin;” and, after having endeavoured to prove the correctness of this view through rule VIII. 3, 46, he winds up with the following words: “Therefore . . . . in the Unnādi formations, kṛisara, etc., sara etc. do not fall under the technical category

**VII. 2, 9: नित्यस्फलितवृद्धिसः।**
of affixes, so that the rule which concerns the change of an affixal s to sh, would have to be applied in their case."

That Kātyāyana, when he found fault with Pāṇini, must have taken my view, is obvious. He must have looked upon Pāṇini as judging of the Unnādi words in the same way as Śākataśīyana did: otherwise his "pratisedhas" exceptions, or even his additions to the rules in question, would have been as irrelevant as if he had increased them with matter taken from medicine or astronomy.

The conclusion, however, at which I have thus been compelled to arrive, viz., that Pāṇini shared in the linguistic principles of Śākataśīyana, is of importance, if we now consider the relation in which he is likely to have stood to the original Unnādi list and to the criticisms of Kātyāyana.

Nāgojībhātta, who wrote notes on Kaiyāṭa's gloss on Pāṇini, conjectures from the Kārikā to III. 3, 1, that the Unnādi Śūtras were the work of Śākataśīyana.77 His conjecture rests on the statement of Yāska, alluded to by Pāṇini, that this grammarian con-

77 See also Dr. Aufrecht's Preface to the Up. S. p. vii, where the Commentary of Nāgojībhātta is quoted, and translated by him.
tended for the possibility of deriving all nominal bases from verbal roots. Now, I have shown before, that the opinion of Nāgojiḥaṭṭa cannot be adopted so far as the Sūtras are concerned, for they were written after Pāṇini's work, and Sākaṭāyana wrote before Pāṇini.\textsuperscript{18} It may, at first sight, however, appear to be consistent with fact, if only the Unnādī list were meant, for Sākaṭāyana's views are such as would admit of nominal derivation by means of Unnādī affixes. Yet, since Nāgoji's conjecture is purely personal, and is not supported by any evidence, I may be allowed, after the explanation I have given, to assume that the Unnādī list is of Pāṇini's authorship. Indeed, how could Kātyāyana take exception to the technical application or to the working of a rule of Pāṇini's, and supply this defect by pointing to the Unnādī list, unless he looked upon Pāṇini as being the author of both? Had he thought that the Unnādī list was written by Sākaṭāyana, he would have laid himself open to serious reflections, in censuring the anubandhas of Pāṇini for not fitting the system of Sākaṭāyana. We might make an assumption, it is true, by which we could reconcile Sākaṭāyana's authorship of the Unnādī list with Kātyāyana's strictures on Pāṇini,—the assumption that Pāṇini's work represented, as it were, besides its own property, that of Sākaṭāyana's too,—that both grammarians owned one set of technical signs, and that perfect unanimity reigned between their works. The Ganaṁatnamahodadhi of Vardhamāna gives numerous quotations from the Grammar of Sākaṭāyana, but as several of them merely give the substance of his rules, it would scarcely be safe to judge of his system on the authority of this valuable Gana work.\textsuperscript{19} Unless, therefore, it can be shown that there was no

\textsuperscript{18} See note 97.

\textsuperscript{19} Relative to this work, which is of the greatest importance for the study of Sanskrit grammar, Dr. Boehtlingk gives the following information (vol. II., p. xxxix.—xlii.):—

"A third work, which contains the Gaṇas, is the Ganaṁatnamahodadhi (the great Ocean of the Gaṇa-peals). In London there exist two MS. copies of this work: the one in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society, the other in that of the East India House. [He adds some remarks on the age of the former MS., and continues]: The work
difference whatever and, much more so, if it can be shown that there was a difference between the technical method of both these grammarians, common sense would lean in favour of the conclusion that Kātyāyana, in his Vārttikas, hit at but one of his predecessors, and that this predecessor was the author as well of the eight grammatical books as of the Uṇādi-list,—Pāṇini.

sense that there are only two catalogued Nos. of this work in the libraries he is speaking of. Yet I am compelled to take this favourable—though very unreasonable—view of his statement, in order not to be compelled to qualify it otherwise. For, the fact is that the bound volume No. 949 of the Library of the E. I. H., which he is speaking of, is, indeed, one volume only, but contains two distinct copies of the work in question, written in different handwritings, and constituting, therefore, two separate MSS. These, added to the copy in the R. A. S., form, therefore, at first sight, three MSS., not two, as he says. But I should trifle with my readers if I considered this correction as sufficient to illustrate the character of Dr. Boehltingk's statement. The first MS. of No. 949 contains the text of the Gaṇaratnamahodadhi only, on 30 leaves. The second MS. of the same No. 949, which is a commentary, by the same author, on his work, contains, first the text, and afterwards the comment, which repeats every word of the text, either literally or impliedly, by stating the derivatives from the word or words as they occur in the text. The same method is observed in the MS. belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society. Hence we possess, in London, not two texts, nor yet three, but in reality five texts of this work.

2. The MSS. in question are, no doubt, open to correction, as, indeed, probably every Sanskrit MS. in existence is, but I hold that at all events the ancient copy of the R.A.S.
CHRONOLOGICAL RELATION BETWEEN PAñINI AND THE ÜNñADI-LIST.

The proof that such a difference existed between Páñini and Śákatáyana, indeed, between him and all the grammarians who preceded his work, is afforded by a statement of Patanjali, which

will, in spite of its inaccuracies, be ranked by every one conversant with MSS., amongst the best Sanskrit MSS. in existence. And having considered it incumbent on me to study this book carefully, I have no hesitation in maintaining that even a tolerable Sanskrit scholar would be able to make a perfectly good edition of at least the text of this work, with the aid of these five copies of the text, the two copies of the commentary, and, as a matter of course, with the aid that may be got from Páñini and his commentaries.

3. As to the nature of this work: I must allow the reader to draw his own conclusions with regard to the credit that may be attached to the information given by Dr. Boehmlingk, when I state that there is not one single Gaṇa in the Gaṇapratamahodadhi, the contents of which may not be referred either to Páñini's Sūtras or to the Vártikas of Kátyáyana, the Kálikā, etc., and the commentaries on them, or to the Gaṇas connected with these works, though the latter frequently do not contain so much matter as the Gaṇas of Vardhamána, who is later, and, as we may expect, made his own additions to previous lists. The substance of its Gaṇas, increased sometimes in the manner stated, is often contained in several rules of, and in the commentaries on, Páñini and Kátyáyana, which have been brought into Gaṇa shape, while, at other times, several of its Gaṇas, also increased, as the case may be, differ

is so important that it settles definitely, not only the question of the authorship of the Ünñadi list, but of all the other works which follow the anubandha terminology of Páñini. In his comment on from the Gaṇas to Páñini merely in so far as the heading word of the one occurs in the middle of the other, and vice versa. Thus the two combined Gaṇas भ्रमन-हिहरातिं of the G. R. M. do not occur in the Gaṇas to Páñini, but give the substance of Páñini's Sūtra, and the commentaries on, IV. 1, 42; its Gaṇa भ्रमन-हिहरातिं that of the commentaries on II. 1, 62; भ्रमन-हिहरातिं that of the comment on II. 1, 65; भ्रमन-हिहरातिं that of VI. 3, 76; भ्रमन-हिहरातिं that of Vártika I. to IV. 1, 97; भ्रमन-हिहरातिं that of IV. 2, 38, 40; भ्रमन-हिहरातिं that of the Vártikas to V. 1, 77; भ्रमन-हिहरातिं that of IV. 3, 72, etc. etc.—On the other hand, the Gaṇa of the G. R. M. भ्रमन-हिहरातिं is equivalent to the Gaṇa to Páñini भ्रमन-हिहरातिं (V. 1, 111), its Gaṇa भ्रमन-हिहरातिं to भ्रमन-हिहरातिं (V. 1, 94, v. 3); भ्रमन-हिहरातिं to भ्रमन-हिहरातिं (IV. 1, 84); भ्रमन-हिहरातिं to भ्रमन-हिहरातिं (V. 2, 64); भ्रमन-हिहरातिं to भ्रमन-हिहरातिं (IV. 3, 88); भ्रमन-हिहरातिं to भ्रमन-हिहरातिं (IV. 2, 80); भ्रमन-हिहरातिं to भ्रमन-हिहरातिं (IV. 2, 45), etc. etc.—There are omitted, on principle, in the G. R. M., all the Gaṇas (1) which have reference to the enumeration of affixes, e.g., भ्रमन-हिहरातिं, भ्रमन-हिहरातिं, etc.; (2) of radicals which are referred to by Páñini in rules on conjunction, such as भ्रमन-हिहरातिं, भ्रमन-हिहरातिं, etc.; (3) those which concern Vádik words; and (4) those appended to Páñini's rules on accentuation.—Of other Gaṇas to Páñini and the Vártikas, mentioned in the Kálikā, Siddhánta-kaumudi, and the Gaṇa Lists, which do not fall under
of Pāṇini. After some discussion on the various modes in
which this anubandha could be dealt with, so as not to interfere
with the consistency of the method of Pāṇini, he concludes with
acquainted with the real character of the Gaṇaratnamahodadhi. Its Gaṇas, as I men-
tioned before, are all based on rules of Pāṇini, which very frequently are literally quoted
for their authority; while even, when they are not literally quoted, the refer-
ence made to their contents plainly shows their close relation to them. The com-
mentary not only enumerates every derivative formed—thus securing in most instances,
beyond a doubt, the reading of the text,—but often gives instances from other works—
grammatical, lexicographical, and poetical, several not yet published; as, for instance,
those of Gaja, Chandra, Jayāditya, Jijendrabuddhi, Durga, Bheja, Śīkatāyana,
Halāyudha, etc. And, above all, it supplies us with the meanings of a considerable por-
tion of such Gaṇa-words as have been hitherto either not understood at all, or understood
imperfectly. Of the 12,000 words and upwards, which I have collected from this work
for grammatical and lexicographical purposes, there are at least 3,000 which would fall
under the latter category; and they have signally avenged themselves on the detractor
of this work, as, in his own Dictionary, he is now compelled to leave, in a great many
instances, a very telling blank space, which would have been filled up if he had
really read the Gaṇaratnamahodadhi, while in other instances he would have obtained
additional meanings to those which he assigns to certain words. When I mention, more-
over, that this Gaṇaratnamahodadhi is the only known work in existence which gives a
the following words: "Or this rule belongs to a Sūtra of a former grammarian; but whatever anubandhas occur in a Sūtra of a former grammarian, they have no anubandha effect in this work."

Hence we learn from Patanjali, who is the very last author that can be suspected of having made such an important assertion without a knowledge of the works anterior to the Grammar of Pāṇini, that, commentary on the Gānas to, or connected with, Pāṇini—so obscure in many respects,—comprising also, as I before observed, many Sūtras of, and Vārttikas to, Pāṇini; and when, thus, it becomes evident that a conscientious editor of Pāṇini ought to have eagerly availed himself of the instruction afforded him by this unique work, it will, perhaps, be intelligible why a certain Nemesis has induced Dr. Boehtlingk to divert the attention of the scientific public from the MSs. of this work, by describing their condition and contents as he has done. As a matter of curiosity, I may, in conclusion, add, that the only Gāna of the G. R. M., the various readings and meanings of which he has registered in his "Alphabetical Gānapāṭha"—the Gāna कसुठित्त—occurs very near the end of the whole work, viz., at fol. 29, in the text of MS. 949 of the E. I. H., which ends on fol. 30; and at fol. 110 of the combined text and commentary of the same MS., which ends on fol. 121. In the palm-leaf MS. of the R. A. S., which ends on fol. 178, this Gāna stands at fol. 168. The title of a Sanskrit book, I need not mention, is always given at the end of a manuscript.

though Pāṇini adopted from his predecessors such technical symbols as ti, gh, bha, and though he availed himself of other terms of theirs which have a meaning and an etymology (see page 166).—he did not adopt their technical anubandhas; and if he avails himself of such an anubandha, as that in rule VII. 1, 18, we must look upon it as a quotation made by him, but not as influencing the rule in which it occurs.320

Now, all the Unnādi affixes have anubandhas, which are exactly the same, and have the same grammatical effect, as those used by Pāṇini. They cannot be later than his work, for it refers to them: they cannot have preceded it, for Patanjali says that "whatever anubandhas occur in a Sūtra of a former grammarian, they have no anubandha effect in Pāṇini's work." Consequently the Unnādi list must be of Pāṇini's own authorship.

320 VII. 1, 18: चिन्द्र चालि.—Patanjali (towards the end of his discussion): चिन्द्र पुरवत्तितिं देन। पुरवत्तितिं ये गृहस्त। ये तैतिरिक्यायायाय विषयम्।—Kātyāyaṇa: चिन्द्रवत्तिपुरवत्तितिं ये विषयम् निर्दिष्टं ये वै तैतिरिक्यायायाय विषयम् ।—Kātyāyaṇa: for Pūrvavṛtta, compare also note 46.
Having settled this point, we may now ask, whether the
criticisms of Kātyāyana do not lead to a further inference?
When Kātyāyana finds fault with Pāṇini for having overlooked
the fact that the vowel ā remains long in ráka, dhāka, or for having
given an inadequate rule for such derivations as kriṣara and dhūsara,
varṣha and tarṣha, such criticism applies to omissions which may
occur in the case of an author, even a Pāṇini. But when he
reproaches him with having spoiled the consistency of his anu-
bandhas—so dear to a Hindu grammarian—this blemish seems to
me so important, and would probably appear so much more important
to a Hindu Pandit, that it compels my conclusions to take
another course. For it was obviously so easy for him to modify
his rules VII. 1, 2, and VII. 3, 50, in order to meet the objections
raised by Kātyāyana,—to do, in other words, that which he has
done in an analogous case; 231 and the matter he is reproached with

231 Nominal bases derived with the kiṭ affixes तुष or तुष have certain properties of
decension which are taught by Pāṇini. The Uṇādī say (11. 96) that some of the bases
बपु, बूपु, लपु, दीपु, पीपु, धापु, हापु, गापु, सापु, दिपु, इपु are derivatives

in the Vārttikas must have been so deeply impressed on his mind
that it seems almost impossible not to draw another result
from the strictures of Kātyāyana. And this result is no other
than that which the words which are alluded to by the author of
the Vārttikas in these criticisms did not yet exist when Pāṇini
wrote, or that they had in his time another etymology than that
stated by Kātyāyana. And if this view be correct, it would also
add another fact to those I have advanced in favour of the argu-
ment that Pāṇini and Kātyāyana cannot have been contemporaries.

The passage just now quoted from Patanjali’s Great Commen-
tary, and the conclusions which had to be drawn from it, enable us
at once to see that Pāṇini must also have been the author of the
Dhātupāṭha frequently referred to in his rules. This list makes
formed with तुष and others with तुष. But since all of them do not share in the declen-
sion properties of the तुष and तुष bases, Pāṇini gives a rule, VI. 4, 11, which obviates
an objection that might have been made, like that brought forward by Kātyāyana in
his Vārttikas to VII. 1, 2 and VII. 3, 50.
use of the same mute letters which are the anubandhas of Pāṇini’s Grammar, and their grammatical value is exactly the same in both works. According to Patanjali’s statement, therefore, the Dhātupāṭha of Pāṇini cannot have been arranged by any one else than Pāṇini. Whether another Dhātupāṭha existed previously to Pāṇini does not concern us here, since it is not known to us; nor does it belong to my present purpose to examine whether the Dhātupāṭha which has reached us has received additions from those who wrote, and commented on, it, and if so, to what extent. There is the same probability for such additions having been made to the original list as in the case of all other Gaṇas; and we may fairly, therefore, ascribe the present Dhātupāṭhas to various authors, who also, perhaps, added meanings to the list composed by Pāṇini, since there is no direct evidence to show that Pāṇini did more than arrange this list with the anubandhas attached to the radicals. All these questions, however, are foreign to the present subject. It is quite enough for the settlement of this question that the groundwork of the only Dhātupāṭha we now possess, is, like the groundwork of the Unṇādi list, the work of Pāṇini.

The problem which concerns the chronological relation between Pāṇini and the Prātiśākhyas, more especially those of the Rigveda and the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā, has a still greater claim to our attention than that discussed in the foregoing remarks. I can here only speak of those two Prātiśākhyas which have become generally accessible—the Rīk P. through the valuable and learned edition of Mr. Regnier, and the Vājasaneyi P. through that of Professor Weber—because I am not sufficiently acquainted with the two others, which are not yet published, and are not met with in the libraries of London, as so to feel justified in uttering opinions which I could not fully substantiate. But as I have no ground for doubting the matter-of-fact statements concerning these two latter works, for which we are indebted to the industry of Professor Weber in his preface to his edition of the Vājasaneyi P., I should infer from them that the Atharvaveda P. must be more recent than the Rīk P., and that, in all probability, the Taittirīya P. also is posterior to the same Prātiśākhyya. So far, therefore, as this latter inference—but this latter inference only—is concerned, and with

322 Compare my previous observations at page 54 and the following pages.
immediate connection of these grammatical writings with the collections of Vaidik hymns, gives to them an appearance of importance which some may deny to the Dhātupātha and the Uṇādi list. Besides, the speculations to which they have been subjected by several authors show that in spite of the seeming unanimity of their results, there is no work of Hindu antiquity which has caused more uncertainty, as respects the question of date, than these Prātiṣākhya works.

There are, I conceive, two ways in which the solution of the problem of which I am here speaking, may be attempted, the one literary, the other historical. But before I offer from the evidence at my disposal such facts as may enable us to arrive at a settled conclusion on this point, it is my duty to state the prevalent opinion as to the relation of these works to Pāṇini, and the reasons with which this opinion has hitherto been supported. I take for this purpose the works of those authors who have dealt more comprehensively than others with subjects which concern the Vaidik literature, and whose conclusions express, I believe, on this point, the creed of actual Sanskrit philologers.

Professor Müller writes in his History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature (p. 120), as follows: “The real object of the Prātiṣākhya, as shown before, was not to teach the grammar of the old sacred language, to lay down the rules of declension and conjugation, or the principles of the formation of words. This is a doctrine which, though it could not have been unknown during the Vedic period, has not been embodied, as far as we know, in any ancient work. The Prātiṣākhya are never called Vyākaraṇas, grammars, and it is only incidentally that they allude to strictly grammatical questions. The perfect phonetic system on which Pāṇini’s Grammar is built is no doubt taken from the Prātiṣākhya; but the sources of Pāṇini’s strictly grammatical doctrines must be looked for elsewhere.”
Thus, according to this author, all the Prātiśākhyaas "no doubt" preceded Pāṇini’s Grammar; and we must infer, too, from Professor Müller’s words, that he meant by Prātiśākhyaas those either edited or preserved in MSS., since his conclusions cannot consistently have been founded on any imaginary Prātiśākhyaa which may or may not have preceded those that we now possess,—which may or may not have dealt with the same subjects in the same manner as the works we are here alluding to. Nor can it have been his object merely to state what is sufficiently known, that there were other grammarians, though not authors of Prātiśākkhyas, before Pāṇini who gave rules on Vāḍik words, since Pāṇini himself makes mention of them.

Professor Roth, whom we have to thank for an edition of Yāska’s Nirukta, states his view to the same effect in the following words: 234 "Grammar, therefore, took the same natural course of develope-

234 In the Preface to his edition of the Nirukta, p. xliii.—The original text of this quotation, it is superfluous to mention, is in German, and in very good German, too.

ment as we find it has taken elsewhere. It did not proceed from the foundation of the living language, but owed its origin to the observation of that difference which exists between certain forms of language in the actual intercourse of life and those of written works; and, at first, it confined itself to pointing out chiefly these differences. Then, again, it comprised, not the whole mass of literature, but only single books, especially important to certain classes of society (einzeln in den betroffenen Kreisen besonders wichtige Bücher). Thus the path was opened to a general grammar treating as well of written as of spoken language; we meet this first in Pāṇini, and from this time all those special grammars gradually disappear from general use."

There is but one thing wanting to this very interesting statement of Professor Roth’s, viz., that he should inform us whence he obtained this invaluable historical account of the rise and progress of Sanskrit grammar. No doubt he has some voucher of high authority for the important fact that grammar began and proceeded in India in the manner he describes; and that these special gram-
masks, the Prātiṣākhya, which he enumerates immediately afterwards, were the pioneers of Pāṇini's work. But as he has forgotten to give us the name of his authority, we must, for the present at least, be permitted to look upon this graphic narration of his as a contribution to Vaidik poetry.

Professor Weber, with a caution that almost startles one in so bold a writer, who, as we have seen above (p. 77), has witnessed the progress of the Arians in their conquest of India 1500 B.C., does not sweep over all the Prātiṣākhya with his chronological brush, but merely records his views of the relation of Pāṇini to one of them, the Prātiṣākhya of Kātyāyana, or that of the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā.

"We now come to Pāṇini himself," he says in his preface to his edition of this work, "that is to say ("resp."), to the description of the relations which exist between him and the Vājas. Prāt. These relations are, on the one hand, very close,—since a great number of the rules contained in it re-occur, individually, either literally or nearly literally in Pāṇini, and since the Vāj. Pr., like Pāṇini, now and then makes use of an algebraic terminology; but, on the other hand, there is again a vast gulf between them, since this algebraic terminology does not entirely correspond, like that of the Ath. Pr., with that of Pāṇini, but, on the contrary, partly thoroughly (zum Thiel ganz) differs from it. The particulars on this point are the following:—There correspond with Pāṇini—tīn I, 27, ān VI, 24 (MS. A, however, reads merely ā), luk III, 12, lup I, 114 (r̥ lup —"resp."—lōpa occur several times, but already, too, in the Rik Pr. and Taitt. Pr.); the use of t in et and ot, I, 114, IV, 58, may likewise be added, and, amongst other expressions which are not algebraic, upapadam VI, 14. 23; yadvritam VI, 14 (compare Pān. VIII. 1, 48, kīvaḥṛita); anudēca I, 143; dhātu, verbal root, V, 10; anyataratas V, 15 (Pān. anyatarasyām); linga, gender, IV, 170 (only in BE); saṁjña IV, 96.—But there belong exclusively to the Vāj. Pr., and there have been nowhere shown to exist the algebraic terms: sim I, 44, IV, 50, for the eight simple vowels; jīt I, 50. 167. III, 12. IV, 118, for the tenues inclusive of the sibilants (except h); mud I, 52. III, 8. 12. IV, 119 for ḍ, ṣh, s; dhi I, 53. IV, 35. 37. 117, for the sonant sounds; and to
these may be added—bhāvin I, 46. III, 21. 55. IV, 33. 45. VII, 9, for the designation of all vowels except а; rit = riphita IV, 33. VI, 9, and sāmkrama III, 148. IV, 77. 165. 194; for they, too, are peculiar to the Vāj. Pr. alone.

"If thus, then, the independence of this Pr. of Pāṇini be vouched for with a tolerable amount of certainty (mit ziemlicher Sicherheit), we shall be able to look upon the numerous literal coincidences between both, either as [the result of their] having drawn [them] from a common source, or of Pāṇini having borrowed [them] from the Vāj. Prāt., just as we have the same choice in the case of the rules which are common to the Kāṭiya-crauta-sūtra I, 8, 19. 20, and Pān. I, 2, 33. 34. In the latter case the former conjecture may be preferable (compare also Vāj. Pr. I, 130); but in our present case I should myself, indeed, rather (in der That eher) prefer deciding for Pāṇini’s having borrowed [them] immediately [from the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya], on account of the great speciality of some of these rules. For, a certain posteriority (eine gewisse Posteriorität) of the latter—indepedently of [his] having much more developed the algebraic terminology—seems to me to result with a tolerable amount of certainty (mit ziemlicher Sicherheit), from the circumstance also, that the pronunciation of the short а was in his time already so much (bereits so sehr) saṃvṛita, covered, that he does not make this vowel, but u, the type of the remaining vowels, whereas the Vāj. Pr. (and likewise the Ath. Pr.), it is true, agree with him in the saṃvṛita of the vowel а, but still retain it as the purest vowel; compare the note to I, 72. But it is true that local differences might have been the cause of this, since Pāṇini seems to belong to the North-West, but the Vāj. Pr. to the East, of India.

"For the posteriority of the Vāj. Pr. to Pāṇini (für eine Posteriorität des Vāj. Pr. nach Pāṇini) it might be alleged, at the very utmost (höchstens), that the author of the Vārttikas to Pāṇini bears the same name as the author of the Vāj. Pr. There are, indeed, between both some direct points of contact,—comp. III. 13. 41. 46,—but then again there are also direct differences; comp. (III. 85) IV. 119. In general, sameness of names, like that of
Kātyāyana, can never prove the identity of persons [who bore them]; there is nothing proved by it, except that both belonged to the same family, or ("resp.") were followers of the same school,—the Katsā.

"Amongst the Sūtras which are identical in the Vāj. Pr. and in Pāṇini, we must now point out, first, some general rules which are of the greatest importance for the economy of the whole arrangement of both texts, and which, indeed, are of so special a nature that they seem to claim with a tolerable amount of force (mit ziemlicher Entscheidheit) [the assumption of the one] having borrowed from the other. They are the three following (called pari-bhāṣā by the scholiast to Pāṇini): tasmāna iti nirdiṣṭe pārśvaya, Vāj. Pr. I, 134. Pān. I, 66;—tasmād ity uttarasyāde, Vāj. Pr. I, 135. Pān. I, 1, 67 (without ādeh, but sec 54);—sāsthi sthāneyogā, Vāj. Pr. I, 136. Pān. I, 49.—There are very remarkable also: saṁkhyā-tinām ānudeco yathāsānikhyam,Vaj. Pr. I, 143, compared with Pān. I, 3, 10 yathāsaṅkhyam ānudecaḥ samānām; and vipratisēdha uttaram balavad alope, I, 159, compared with vipratisēdha paraṁ kāryam, Pān. I, 4, 2. But both [passages] do not require [the supposition of] such a special relation (beide bedingen indeed nicht ein so spezielles Verhältniss), for they might be brought home to a common source in the general grammatical tradition (sondern könnten auf gemeinsame Quelle in der allgemeinen grammatischen Tradition zurückgeführt werden) (the sāmānyam of the Ath. Pr. I, 3, evam iheti ca vibhāṣā-prāptamā sāmānyam). Likewise, varnasyādarçanām lohopā, I, 141, Pān. I, 60 (without varnasya);—uccair udattabh—nicair anuddattabh—ubhayavāṃ svaritāḥ I, 108-110; Pān. I, 2, 29-31 (where samāhāraḥ stands for ubh.);—tasyādītā udattāṃ svarārdhamātram, I, 126, Pān. I, 2, 32 (where ardhahrasam);—udattāc cūntadattāṃ svaritāḥ—nodattasvaritodayam IV, 134, 140, udattād anuddāsaya svaritāḥ—nodattasvaritodayam, Pān. VIII. 4, 66. 67;—samānaṣṭhāna-karana-yapratyayatnāḥ savarnāḥ, I, 43, tulya-yapratyayatnāḥ savarnāḥ, Pān. I, 1, 9;—āśiśd ṣāt cotti sthūraṃ viśāre, II, 53, upari svid āśid iti ca, Pān. VIII. 2, 102 (97);—nuṣ čāṃredite, IV, 8, kān āṃredite, Pān. VIII. 3, 12.—There are besides these a very great number (eine sehr große Zahl) of coincidences [between them]; for instance,
IV, 49 (Pañ. VI. 1, 84), VI, 19-23 (Pañ. VIII. 1, 58-63), which, however, may be accounted for simply (einfach) by the similarity of their subject. In some of these instances the Vāj Pr. is decidedly inferior (sicht entschieden zurück) to Pañini (comp. the note to II, 19, 20). Its grammatical terminology does not appear to have attained the survey and systematic perfection represented in Pañini; but compare also my former general statement on the want of skill or ("resp.") probably want of practice of the author (vgl. indess auch das bereits im Eingange—p. 68—über die Ungeschicklichkeit resp. wohl Ungeübtheit des V/s. im Allgemeinen Bemerkte). In most instances, however, from being restricted to the one text of the Vājas. Sañhitā, he is in a better position than Pañini, who has to deal with the whole linguistic stock; and therefore he is enabled to give rules with a certain safety and precision, when Pañini either wavers in indecision (bahulam) or decides in an erroneous and one-sided way (comp. the notes to II, 30. 55. III, 27. 95. IV, 58).

Two distinct reasons have induced me to give a full hearing to Professor Weber on this important question. I do so, in the first

226 The words of the text are: "Die grammatische Fixierung scheint eben daselbst noch nicht zu der in Pañini repräsentierten Übersicht und systematischen Vollkommenheit gelangt gewesen zu sein." I confess my utter inability to guarantee the correctness of the translation of this passage. What is the "grammatische Fixierung?" and of what? I have assumed that these words may have been intended for "terminology;" but for what I know they may mean anything else. And what "survey" is represented in Pañini?
place, because the lengthened passage I have quoted from his Preface to the Vājasaneyi-Prāśākhyā—*in my opinion, his most important literary work*—is a thorough specimen of the manner and of the critical method—of the scholarship also, as I shall show hereafter—in which he deals with, and in which he brings to bear on, all his learned investigations; in the second place, because to give him a hearing at all—and his great industry and his merit of having touched, with no inconsiderable damage to himself, upon all the burning questions of ancient Sanskrit literature, entitles him to one—was to give him a full hearing, in the fullness of all his words. For, though it be possible to perceive the qualities of a clear spring by taking a draught from it, however small, a whirlpool can only be appreciated by seeing it entire and in the condition in which it happens to exist.

If I had attempted, for instance, to maintain that Professor Weber looks upon the algebraic terminology of Kātyāyana’s Prāśākhyā and Pāṇini’s Grammar, “on the one hand as very close to, and on the other hand as thoroughly differing from, one another” (p. 186, lines 15-21), he would have justly upbraided me with not representing him faithfully, for he really says: the one differs “partly thoroughly” from the other. Again, should I have ventured upon the statement that he considers Pāṇini’s work as later than this Prāśākhyā, because he says that it has borrowed a good deal from it; he would have pointed at p. 187, line 18, where he speaks of a “certain posteriority” of Pāṇini, which kind of posteriority is just as intelligible to my mind as the answer which some one, whom I asked about his travels, gave me, viz., that he had been, but not exactly, on the Continent. Or, if I had said that his chief argument for this “certain posteriority” is the difference in the pronunciation of the short ā, between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, since this difference led to his conclusion with “a tolerable amount of certainty” (p. 187, line 20), he would reply: “You are mistaken. I stated that this difference may have been caused by local reasons (line 27); it has, therefore, not the slightest conclusiveness.” Or, if I gave his opinion on the relative proficiency of both authors to this effect, that he considers the Vājasaneyi-
Prātiṣākhya as being “decidedly inferior” (p. 189, line 4) in this regard to Pāṇini’s work, he would have pointed to line 15, in showing me how much I erred in attributing to him the idea of such “a decided inferiority;” for it is the Prātiṣākhya, on the contrary, which, “in most instances, gives the rules with a certain amount of safety and precision, when Pāṇini either wavers in indecision, or decides in an erroneous and one-sided way.”

We must, therefore, leave the whirlpool, such as it is; and in doing so we cannot but appreciate the immense advantage which an author enjoys, when he is impartial enough to arrive at his conclusions unbiased by a knowledge of the subject of which he is speaking. Professor Weber has made up his mind that the Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣākhya must be anterior to Pāṇini, probably because it “appears extremely ticklish” to him to decide otherwise; hence he is not troubled with any of those cares which are likely to disturb the minds of scholars who would first endeavour to study both works before they drew their inferences from them. He meets with an overwhelming amount of identical passages in the two works: he finds that their terminology is likewise identical to a certain degree,—hence he concludes: either Pāṇini has borrowed these passages and this terminology from Kātyāyana, or both authors have borrowed them from a common source. For, as to a third alternative,—that Kātyāyana may have borrowed such passages from Pāṇini, it is dispatched by him “with a tolerable amount of certainty,” as ranging amongst things impossible, because Pāṇini is later than the Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣākhya; and this posteriority, again, he chiefly bases on the argument that the pronunciation of the short ā was, in the time of Pāṇini, “already so much covered,” that he had to take the vowel u for his type of a vowel sound, whereas Kātyāyana could still make use of the vowel a as the typical vowel in his Vaidik rules. Now, though I have already mentioned that this great argument is strangled by him as soon as it is born, I must nevertheless take the liberty of asking for the authority which supplied him with the circumstantial account of this phonetic history of the vowel ā? Pāṇini and Kātyāyana both state and imply, as he himself
admits, that the vowel ā is pronounced saññvīra, or with the contraction of the throat; they do not say one single word more on the pronunciation of this sound; nor is there any grammarian known to me who does so much as allude to the fantastical story narrated by Professor Weber relative to this vowel ā. An ordinary critic, then, would content himself with the authentic information supplied him by both grammarians; and if he perceived that Pāṇini, in his rule I. 2, 27, gives the vowel ā as a specimen vowel, and not as a type, while Kātyāyana chooses the vowel ā for such a specimen, he would conclude that, even should there be a real scientific motive for this difference, it cannot be founded on a different pronunciation of the vowel ā, since it is repudiated by both grammarians. But a critic like Professor Weber, who looks upon facts as worsted if they do not agree with his theories, concludes that this vowel ā was “already so much saññvīra” in the time of Pāṇini, that he must needs throw it overboard, and receive ā into the ark of his grammatical terminology.

And here I may, in passing, advert once more to a practice sometimes met with in literary arguments. It consists in quietly introducing into the premises some such innocent words as “more,” or “almost,” or “already,” or “so much,” or similar adverbs of small size, which have not the slightest claim to any such hospitality; and then, suddenly, these little interlopers grow into mastership, and sway the discussion into which they had stealthily crept. Thus, Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, as I have just said, speak of the vowel ā simply as saññvīra; and upon these words Professor Weber reports that “ā in the time of Pāṇini was already so much saññvīra”—that important secrets may be extracted from this grand discovery.

The foregoing illustration of Professor Weber’s critical remarks does not embrace the arguments in which he splits into two, Kātyāyana, the author of our Prātiśākhya, and Kātyāyana who wrote the Vārttikas to Pāṇini; for I shall first quote the observations of Professor Müller on this treatment of Kātyāyana. In speaking of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya he expresses himself
CHRONOLOGICAL RELATION BETWEEN PĀṇINI AND THE PRATISĀKHYAS.

KĀTYAYANA SPLIT INTO TWO BY PROFESSOR WEBER.

thus: "It was composed by Kātyāyana, and shows a considerable advance in grammatical technicalities [viz., in comparison with the Prātiśākhyas of the Black Yajurveda]. There is nothing in its style that could be used as a tenable argument why Kātyāyana, the author of the Prātiśākhyas, should not be the same as Kātyāyana, the contemporary and critic of Pāṇini. It is true that Pāṇini's rules are intended for a language which was no longer the pure Sanskrit of the Vedas. The Vedic idiom is treated by him as an exception, whereas Kātyāyana's Prātiśākhyas seems to belong to a period when there existed but one recognised literature, that of the Rishis. This, however, is not quite the case. Kātyāyana himself alludes to the fact that there were at least two languages. 'There are two words,' he says (I. 17), 'om and atha, both used in the beginning of a chapter; but om is used in the Vedas, atha in the Bhāṣyas.' As Kātyāyana himself writes in the Bhāṣyās, or the common language, there is no reason why he should not have composed rules on the grammar of the profane Sanskrit, as well as on the pronunciation of the Vedic idiom."

In other words, Professor Müller sees that in no grammatical work known to him—and I may safely add to anyone else—mention is made of two Kātyāyanas; he sees, no doubt, too—though he does not state the fact adverted to by Professor Weber himself—that several Vārttikas to Pāṇini correspond in substance with the Sūtras of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhyas; he deducts, moreover, from very correct and plausible premises, that there is nothing in either work to discountenance the possibility of the author of the Vārttikas having also written a work on the pronunciation of Vādik words; and since he doubtless coincides with me in the opinion that even Sanskrit philology can neither gain in strength nor in esteem by freeing itself from the fetters of common sense,—he arrives at the result that the hypercritical splitting of the one Kātyāyana into two, as proposed by Professor Weber, is utterly fantastical. I shall support his view with stronger proof than may be gathered from the quotations I have made; but in leaving for a while the
whirlpool of the Indische Studien, I must now take up Professor Müller’s own theory.

After the words just given, he continues as follows: “Some of Kātyāyana’s Sūtras are now found repeated ipsissimis verbis in Pāṇini’s Grammar. This might seem strange; but we know that not all the Sūtras now incorporated in his grammar came from Pāṇini himself, and it is most likely that Kātyāyana, in writing his supplementary notes to Pāṇini, simply repeated some of his Prātiṣākhya-sūtras, and that, at a later time, some of these so-called Vārttikas became part of the text of Pāṇini.”

Thus, in order to establish the theory that Pāṇini’s work is later than the Prātiṣākhya of Kātyāyana, whom Müller, as we know, conceives to be a contemporary of Pāṇini, he presents us with this very plausible sequence and chain of works:—1. The Prātiṣākhya of Kātyāyana. 2. The Grammar of Pāṇini. 3. The Vārttikas of Kātyāyana. And since some rules of the second work are identical with some of the first, he assumes that such rules marched from the first into the third, and they then gradually in-

vaded the second work. Now even supposing that such a migration of rules could be supported by a particle of evidence, what becomes of those stubborn Prātiṣākhya-Sūtras and Vārttikas of Kātyāyana which are identical in their contents—as I shall hereafter show—and which have not ventured to walk into the Sūtras of Pāṇini? They become the stumbling-block of the whole theory; for since Pāṇini, and especially Pāṇini the contemporary of Kātyāyana, could not have written rules of which the defects must have been apparent to him, if he had seen rules so much better in a work written before his own, the substance of these Sūtras of Kātyāyana could not have simultaneously preceded and followed the Grammar of Pāṇini. But I need not go further in showing the weakness of this theory, for I have already explained (p. 29, etc.) that out of the 3996 Sūtras which form the present bulk of Pāṇini’s Grammar, only three, or perhaps four, may be ascribed to Kātyāyana, on critical and tenable grounds. A mere supposition, unsupported by any proof, that the Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣākhya is older than Pāṇini’s work, can certainly not justify the sweeping doubt which
is levelled by Professor Müller against the whole work of Pāṇini, and which is not even substantiated—as we might have expected it to have been—by a distinct enumeration of all or any of those Sūtras which he would propose to restore to their rightful owner, Kātyāyana.

In now proceeding to state the reasons which induce me to look upon all Prātiśākhya-Sūtras, not only as posterior to Pāṇini's Grammar, but to Pāṇini himself, and separated from him by at least several generations, I must, in the first place, point out the general fallacy which has led to the assumption that these works are anterior to Pāṇini. It consists in applying the standard of the notion of grammar to both categories of works, and having done this, in translating the result obtained, which is less favourable to the Prātiśākhyas than to Pāṇini's work, into categories of time—priority and posteriority. An analogous fallacy would be too apparent to require any remark, if it premised conclusions concerning the chronological relation of works of a totally different nature and character. It may assume however, as it has done, a certain degree of plausibility if it be applied to works of a similar category.

I must observe, therefore, in adverting to Professor Müller's own words, as before quoted, that the term vyākaraṇa, grammar, though constantly and emphatically given to Pāṇini's work, has not been applied by any author within my knowledge to a Prātiśākhya work. This circumstance, however, implies an important fact which must not be overlooked. Tradition, from immemorial times, as every one knows, connects with the Veda a class of works which stand in the most intimate relation to it—the Vedāṅga works. One of them is the Vyākaraṇa. The Prātiśākhyas do not belong to them. Thus, tradition even in India,—and on this kind of tradition probably the most squeamish

I may here observe that the full title of Patanjali's Great Commentary is not simply Mahābhāṣya, but Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. The end, for instance, of a chapter in the sixth book of the Great Commentary runs thus: दृष्टि सीमितस्यब्धताः

विविधानी अवकाशसहायी व्याख्याया विरिताया विशालम्।
critic will permit me to lay some stress,—does not rank amongst the most immediate offsprings of the Vaidik literature, those works which apparently stand in the closest relation to it,—which have no other object than that of treating of the Vaidik texts of the Saṁhitás;—but it has canonized Pāṇini’s Vyākaraṇa, which, on the contrary, would seem to be more concerned with the language of common life than with that of the sacred hymns. Is it probable, let me ask, even at this early stage, that tradition would have taken this course if it had looked upon these Prātiśākhya as prior to the work of Pāṇini?

But this question will receive a more direct answer if we compare the aim and the contents of both these classes of works. Vyākaraṇa means “un-doing,” i.e., analysis, and Pāṇini’s Grammar is intended to be a linguistic analysis: it un-does words and un-does sentences which consist of words; it examines the component parts of a word, and therefore teaches us the properties of base and affix, and all the linguistic phenomena connected with both; it examines the relation, in sentences, of one word to another, and likewise unfolds all the linguistic phenomena which are inseparable from the meeting of words.

The Prātiśākhya have no such aim, and their contents consequently differ materially from those of the Vyākaraṇa. Their object is merely the ready-made word, or base, in the condition in which it is fit to enter into a sentence, or into composition with another base, and more especially the ready-made word or base as part of a Vaidik hymn. These works are no wise concerned in analyzing or explaining the nature of a word or base; they take them, such as they occur in the Pada text, and teach the changes which they undergo when they become part of the spoken sentence, i.e., of the spoken hymn. And the consequence implied by these latter words entails, moreover, on the Prātiśākhya the duty of paying especial attention to all the phenomena which accompany the spoken words; hence they deal largely with the facts of pronunciation, accent, and the particular mode of sounding a syllable or word in connection with ritual acts.

This brief comparison will already have hinted at the point
of contact which exists between Pāṇini and the authors of these Prātiśākhya works. Leaving aside the wider range of the domain of the former, and the narrower field of the Vaidik pursuits of the latter, we may at once infer that both will meet on the ground of phonetic rules, of accentuation, and of the properties of sound; but we shall likewise infer that any other comparison between both would be as irrelevant as if we compared Pāṇini with Sūrūta, or the Prātiśākhyas with the Jyotisha.

The aim of both categories of works being entirely different, there is neither a logical nor an historical necessity, nor does there exist a fact or a circumstance which would enable us to conclude, from the absence in these Prātiśākhyas of certain grammatical matter, that their authors were not as much conversant with it as Pāṇini, who treats of it, because it is his object, and therefore his duty, to treat of it.

These facts being beyond the reach of doubt, we may again raise an a-priori question whether it is more probable that the plan of Pāṇini's work preceded in time the plan of a Prātiśākhyya work, or the reverse?

Throughout a great portion of his admirable Introduction to Pāṇini, Patanjali endeavours to impress on the reader the great importance of grammatical study for promoting the objects of religion and holiness. He shows that a knowledge of language is necessary to a proper understanding of the sacred texts; that no priest is safe in the practice of rites without a thorough comprehension of the grammatical laws which define the nature of sounds and words,—in short, that nothing less than eternal bliss depends very much on the proper and correct use made of words, and, as a consequence, on the study of Pāṇini.

Here, then, we have a distinct definition of the relation of Pāṇini to the Vaidik texts,—a distinct statement of the causes which have produced the Vyākaraṇa. And what do they show else, than that Pāṇini must have stood in the midst of a living religion, of a creed which understood itself, or at least had still the vigour to try to understand itself?
In Pāṇini there is organism and life. In the Prātiṣākhyaśas there is mechanism and death. They do not care for the sense of a word. A word antaḥ, for instance, is to them merely a combination of five sounds, nothing else; for whether it represent the nominative of anta, "end," or the adverb antar, "between," is perfectly indifferent to them. The rule of Kātyāyana's Prātiṣākhya on this word (II. 26), is, therefore, as dreary as a grammatical rule could ever be imagined to be, and the critical remarks which Professor Weber has attached to this rule merely prove that, on this occasion, also he beats the air.

It does not follow, as I have before observed, that, because linguistic death reigns in these Sūtras, Kātyāyana or their other authors must have been as ignorant of grammar as it would seem if these works made any claim to be grammars at all. It merely follows that, in the period in which they were written, there existed a class of priests who had to be drilled into a proper recital of the sacred texts; and it may follow, too, that this set of men had none of the spirit, learning, and intelligence, which Patanjali would wish to find in a man who practices religious rites.

In other words, it seems to me that between Pāṇini's living grammar and these dead Prātiṣākhyaśas, there lies a space of time sufficient to create a want, of which a very insignificant trace is perhaps perceptible in some of Pāṇini's Vaidik rules, but which must have been irresistible at the period of the Prātiṣākhya works.

In substantiating with material proofs the priority of Pāṇini's work, I may dispense with giving evidence that Pāṇini meant, in his eight grammatical books, to concern himself with Vaidik language as well as the language of common life. For I should have simply to quote hundreds of his rules which are entirely devoted to Vaidik texts, and I should have to carry the reader through the whole Introduction of Patanjali, which proves, as I have already mentioned, that one of the chief objects of grammar is the correct apprehension of the hymns. I will merely therefore compare, first some matter treated by Pāṇini with some matter treated
by the Rik-Prātiśākhya,—such matter, of course, as admits of a point of contact between both, and therefore of a comparison at all.

The fifth chapter of the latter work treats of the cases in which the consonant ś becomes śh; the same subject is comprised in the latter part of the third chapter of Pāṇini's eighth book; but this book does not contain the smallest number of the cases mentioned in the Rik-Prātiśākhya. The same work enumerates in the same chapter the words and classes of words in which ś becomes n, and very few only of these instances are taught by Pāṇini in the last chapter of his work. A similar remark applies with still greater force to a comparison of Pāṇini's rules on the prolongation of vowels with those given by the Rik-Prātiśākhya in its seventh, eighth, and ninth chapters. In short, there is not a single chapter in this work which, whenever it allows of a comparison between its contents and the contents of analogous chapters of Pāṇini's Grammar, must not at once be declared to be infinitely more complete than the rules on them delivered by Pāṇini.

In addressing myself for a like purpose to the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya, I might seem to do that which is superfluous. For, as I have shown before that Pāṇini was not acquainted with a Vājasaneyi-Saṅhita, it would require no further proof that he must have preceded a work which is entirely devoted to this collection of hymns. But as such a comparison, being extended also to the Vārttikas, would involve at the same time the question whether the author of the Vārttikas and the author of the Prātiśākhya is the same person or not; and as it would, too, bear on the very appreciation of the character of this Vaidik work, I will enter into it with greater detail than was required for the conclusions which follow from a comparison between the Rik-Prātiśākhya and Pāṇini.

It is a remarkable feature in the explanatory gloss which Professor Weber has attached to his edition of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya, that he evinces much pleasure in school-ing Kātyāyana for introducing irrelevant matter into his work; now upbraiding him for his remarks on the common dialect, which
ought not to have concerned him in a Sūtra of this kind; then finding fault with him for treating of words which do not occur in the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā, and which, likewise, ought not to have troubled him. Professor Weber gives us too, in the beginning of his preface, a valuable collection of instances, which in his opinion prove either that Kātyāyana must have had before him a different version of the White Yajurveda than the one known to us, or that he has botched on to his Prātiṣākhya a number of rules which, for his purpose, were out of place; or, to sum up in the words of the Indische Studien, already referred to, that Kātyāyana shows neither skill nor practice in his treatment of the matter edited and commented upon by Professor Weber. But what would the latter think if Kātyāyana applied this very reproach to him? if he told Professor Weber that he did not even understand the character of the Prātiṣākhya which he was editing and subjecting to all this learned criticism?

Let me, then, take the place of Kātyāyana, and maintain for him, that he is not only the very same Kātyāyana who wrote the Vārttikas to Pāṇini, but that his Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣākhya has the double aim of being a Vaidik treatise as well as of containing criticisms on Pāṇini. And let me, therefore, tell Professor Weber that since there is abundant proof of this view in Kātyāyana's Vaidik work, all his handsome epithets are put out of court. And this, I hold, will also settle the question why we meet with so many Sūtras in Kātyāyana which are identical with those of Pāṇini; for we shall presently see that this identity is merely an apparent one, and, in reality, no identity at all.

I will take this point up first, and show that Kātyāyana merely repeated the words of Pāṇini in order to attach his critical notes to them, just as I sometimes literally repeated the words of Professor Weber himself, merely for the purpose of improving on him.

Pāṇini says (I. 1, 60) aṭarasaṅkāra lopaḥ. "This is not distinct enough," I hear Kātyāyana say; hence he writes (I. 141) varṇasyāṭarasaṅkāra lopaḥ.—Pāṇini gives the definition: (I. 2, 29. 30) uchehair udāttaḥ and nichair anudāttaḥ. "So far so good," I suppose Kātyāyana to say; "but you give the necessary com-
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Criticisms of the Vajasaneyi-Pratisākhya on Pāṇini.

plement of these two rules in the words (I. 2, 31) ‘samāhāraḥ swaritah’; I object to this definition, for the swarita would better have been defined thus,” ubhayavān swaritah (K. I. 108–110).—P. I. 2, 32: tasyādita udāttam ardhaḥraswam; but K. I. 126: tasyādita udāttam swarārdhamātram.—P. VIII. 4, 67, 66: nodāttasvaridakṣayam (with the quotation of a dissent on the part of Gārgya, Kāśyapa, and Gālava); udāttād anudāttasya swaritah. The former rule is approved of by Kātyāyana, who repeats it literally, but the latter he words thus: udāttāch chānudāttaṁ swaritam (IV. 140, 134).—P. I. 1, 8: mukhāṅgāvocchano ‘nunāśikah; but K. I. 75: mukhāṅnunāṅkakaraṇo ‘nunāśikah.—P. I. 1, 9: tulyāyatprayatnaṁ savarnam. “Would it not be clearer,” we hear Kātyāyana say, “to give this definition thus: (K. I. 43) samānāsāthānākaraṇādyaprayatnāh savarnāḥ.”—P. VI. 1, 84: ekāḥ pāraṇaparāyaḥ; but K. IV. 49: athaḥkam uttarach ēḥ.—P. I. 1, 66: tasminn ētā nirāśikhe pūrvamy. “This rule I adopt,” Kātyāyana probably thought, (I. 134) “but for your next rule (I. 1, 67), tasmād ētā uttarasya, I prefer the clearer wording” (I. 135) tasmād ētā uttarasyādeḥ,

“and your shashthi sthāneyogā (I. 1, 49), evidently a rule which you ought to have put with those two preceding Paribhāṣā rules which are its complement, instead of separating it from them by seventeen other rules, I place it, therefore, immediately after these” (I. 136).

I will not add more instances of the same kind; they have all been carefully collected by Professor Weber; but he is far from perceiving that the identity between the language of both authors is merely an apparent one, and that the additional words of Kātyāyana, either in the same Sūtra or in one immediately following, but intimately connected with it, are so many criticisms on Pāṇini, which are even made more prominent by the repetition of a certain amount of Pāṇini’s words. For to assume, even without any of the further proofs which I shall adduce, that Kātyāyana first delivered his clearer and better Sūtras, and that Pāṇini hobbled after him with his imperfect ones, is not very probable.

The following synopsis of rules is an extract from those I have collected for the purpose of determining whether it could be
a matter of accident that the Prātiṣākhya Sūtras of Kātyāyana are, to a considerable extent, nothing but Vārttikas to Pāṇini.

Pāṇini writes (VIII. 2, 87), "om abhyādāne," which rule proves that in his time om was not confined to Vaidik use only; but Kātyāyana writes (I. 18 and 19), "omkāraṁ vedeshu" and "athakāram bhāshyeshu." No doubt if Kātyāyana had not written with a direct glance at Pāṇini, this latter rule would be out of place, but in this combination its origin becomes intelligible. P. says (VIII. 1, 46), "ehi manye prakṛte trī." Though this rule does not treat of the accent of manye, it nevertheless would follow from other rules of Pāṇini, that manye is ādyudātta in its combination with ehi. This inference is emphatically corrected by K. 2, 15: manye padapūrvam sarvatra. Professor Weber, it is true, says that this word sarcatra—which embodies the emphasis of the censure of Kātyāyana—is meaningless: once moro, no doubt, Kātyāyana has bungled through "want of practice and skill." How much Pāṇini's rules VIII. 1, 19 and 72, āmantriṣya cha, and āmantriṣtam pūrvam avidyaṁanavit, are the torment of com-

mentators, may be seen from many instances in Sāyaṇa's Commentary on the Rigveda. K. improves them considerably by II. 17 and 18: padapūrvam āmantriṣam anānārthe 'paddādou and tenānantarā shashṭya ekapadavat.—K. writes II. 22: bhūtir ādyudātta: this rule again reuses the critical indignation of Professor Weber. "Why," he exclaims, "is this word singled out (by Kātyāyana)? Assuredly, it is not the single kli̊ formation in the V. S." My answer is, because Kātyāyana had studied Pāṇini, and Professor Weber, it is clear, has not; for Pāṇini says, III. 3, 96, that bhūtī is anoltātta in the Veda; and Kātyāyana therefore singled this word out with the decided intention of stating that in the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā Pāṇini's rule would be erroneous. This instance, I hold, moreover, is one of those which add some weight to the proof I have already given, that Pāṇini did not know, and therefore preceded, the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā.—K. says, II. 48, devatāśwandelōni chānāmantriṇā; and his words are a distinct criticism on P. VI. 2, 141, devatāswandelō cha.—In rule VIII. 3, 36, Pāṇini teaches that Visarjaniya may remain such (or, as
the Sūtra expresses itself, on account of previous Sūtras, may
become Visarjanīya), before sibilants, or may become assimilated
to the following sibilant. But he committed the venial offence of
not stating that this latter alternative rests on the authority of
Śākatāyana, and the former on that of Śākalya. Could Kātyāyana,
therefore, forego the opportunity of writing (III. 8): “pratyaya-
savarṇam mudi Śākatāyanaḥ,” and (III. 9), “avikāraṁ Śākalyah
śāhasenaḥ”?—In VI. 1, 134, Pāṇini gives a comprehensive rule on
the elision of the final s in regard to the Vaidik use of the nominative of
tad. “No,” says Kātyāyana (III. 14), “in the V. S. this elision occurs
before vowels only in two instances: sa osahūtimayoḥ.”—K. (III. 22)
says āvir nir ida idāya vasatīr varīcaḥ, and thus criticises the imper-
fection of P.’s rule VIII. 3, 54, idāya vā.—In III. 27, adhvano rajaso
rīhah sprīcā pāṭau, he shows the clumsiness of P.’s rule VIII. 3, 52,
pāṭau ca bahulan; in III. 30, parāv avasāne, the perfection of
P.’s VIII. 3, 51, panchaṁyaḥ parāv adhvarthe; in III. 55, bhāvi-
bhyaḥ saha saṁsārāpatade, that of P.’s VIII. 3, 59, ādēṣapratiya-
yayoḥ.—In the Sūtras III. 56 and 57, Kātyāyana teaches that the
intervention of anusvāra, k and r do not prevent s from becoming
sh, if this change would have to take place otherwise. “These
rules,” says Professor Weber, “have no business here, for Saṁhitā
and Pada-text agree in this respect, and these rules are quite
general grammatical rules;” and in support of this argument he
quotes Uvata, who also points out the superfluity. The latter
consoles us for it, it is true, by the remark that a man should not
complain if he found honey though he intended only to fetch fuel,
or a fish though his object were to fetch water, or fruits though he
went out merely to pluck flowers. But as Professor Weber is
not so easily consoled, and not so leniently disposed towards
Kātyāyana as Uvata is, I may tell him that these rules are levelled
against Pāṇini’s rules VIII. 3, 57 and 58, which omit to include r.
At II. 55, dvaṁdvaṁ ċendrasomapārvam pūṣāṁnighaṁ jyushu, Professor
Weber discharges a witticism. “None of the compounds” (re-
ferred to in the Sūtra), he says, “occur in the V. S. or the Sat.
Br. . . . . How is that to be explained? Did our Homer nod
when he composed this rule? or did he have before him passages
of the V. S. which it no longer contains [Professor Weber probably meant to say, ‘which was not the V. S. we now possess’]? or is the text of our Sūtra corrupt, and have we to read another word for soma?” I will try to relieve his anxiety by expressing the belief that this Sūtra and the next, II. 56, are criticisms on Pāṇini’s general rule VI. 2, 141, and on his special rule VI. 2, 142.—The rule of Pāṇini VIII. 3, 107, suṣah, is criticised in three Sūtras of Kātyāyana III. 59, 60, 61, okāraḥ sv; och chápriktāt, and abkhē cha.

The Vārttika 3 to III. 3, 108 says varṇāt kāraḥ; K. I. 37, kārena cha; both are identical in their contents, and complete Pāṇini’s rule III. 3, 108. The same remark applies to the Vārttika 4 to P. III. 3, 108, rād īphaḥ, and to K. I. 40, ra ēphena cha, in reference to the same rule of Pāṇini.—K. III. 38, aharpatau repham, points out an omission in P. VIII. 2, 70: the same criticism is conveyed by the Vārttika 2 to this Sūtra of Pāṇini, aharādinaṃ patyādishlyu.—K. III. 12, lūṅg mūḍi jītpare fills up a blank in P. VIII. 3, 36, vā kṛtī; and likewise a Vārttika on this Sūtra to the same effect, vā īṣprakaraṇe kharpare lopah.—P.’s rule VI. 3, 109,

prishodarādini yathopadāshṭam, is criticised by K. III. 41 and 42, ukāram dur de and nāse cha, as well as by a Vārttika to the former rule, which has the same contents: duro dāhmnāsadhābhady eşñāteaṃ vaktaryam uttarapadādēs cha śhūtvam.—A Vārttika to the same rule of P., khasha ucaṃ datρādhaasūttarapadādēh śhūtvam cha, is identical in contents with K. III. 46, shad daśasatayoh saṃkhyā- navyorthayoḥ cha: both are criticisms on P. VI. 3, 109.—The first Vārttika to III. 2, 49 (improperly marked, like the two others, in the Calcutta edition, as if these Vārttikas did not occur in the Mahābhāṣya), dārāv dāhano ṣanantyaaya cha ṣaḥ saṃjñāyām, is similar in contents with K. III. 47, ta ṣghāda anādombarat: both complete P. III. 2, 49, āśiṣa kanaḥ.—The important omission in P.’s Sūtra VIII. 4, 1, rashābyyūn no nāḥ saṃmānapade, is, with almost a literal reference to these words, criticised by K.’s III. 83, ṛṣṭharebhyo nakāro nakāraṃ saṃmānapade, and by his Vārttika to the former rule, rashābyyūn natva rikāragrahanaṃ.

I need not increase the foregoing quotations by a comparison of the contents of whole chapters of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣākhyā with the
analogous contents of whole chapters in Pâñini. For, though the result would be exactly the same as it has been in the case of our comparison between the Rik-Prâtiśâkhya and Pâñini’s work, even the isolated Sûtras which I have contrasted in these quotations sufficiently show that Pâñini could never have laid his Grammar open to such numerous criticisms as he has done, if the work of Kâtyâyana had been composed before his own. My synopsis, moreover, shows that many rules of Kâtyâyana become utterly inexplicable in his Prâtiśâkhya work unless they be judged in their intimate connection with the Grammar of Pâñini. And, as it is simply ridiculous to assume that “Homer constantly nodded” in writing an elaborate work, which evidences considerable skill and practice in the art of arranging the matter of which he treats, there is no other conclusion left than that the Prâtiśâkhya of Kâtyâyana had the twofold aim which I have indicated above.

There might, however, remain a doubt as to whether Kâtyâyana first wrote his Prâtiśâkhyas or his Vârttikas to Pâñini. Two reasons induce me to think that his Prâtiśâkhya preceded his Vârttikas. In the first place, because the contrary assumption would lead to the very improbable inference that a scholar like Kâtyâyana, who has given such abundant proof of his thorough knowledge of Sanskrit grammar, left a considerable number of Pâñini’s rules without those emendations which, as we must now admit, are embodied in his Prâtiśâkhya work. If we made a supposition of this kind, we should imply by it that he belongs to that class of authors who present their writings in a hurried and immature state, and, upon an after thought, make their apology in an appendix or an additional book. If we assume, on the other hand, that he first wrote his Prâtiśâkhya Sûtras, which neither imposed upon him the task, nor gave him an opportunity, of making a thorough review of Pâñini, we can understand that they might have seduced him now and then into allowing himself to be carried away by the critical tendency which he afterwards fully developed in his Vârttikas; and we can then, too, understand why these Vârttikas treat merely of those Sûtras of Pâñini which were not included in his former work.
My second reason for this view is derived from a comparison between such of his Sūtras and such of his Vārttikas as are closely related to one another. For if we examine the contents and the wording of either we cannot fail to perceive that some of Kātyāyana's Vārttikas show an improvement on some of his Sūtras, and we may infer that they were given on account of this very improvement. Thus the Vārttika to VIII. 3, 36, quoted before, contains the word śā, which is not in the Sūtra III. 12; the Vārttika duṣṭo, &c., to VI. 3, 109 embraces more formations than the Sūtras III. 41 and 42; the Vārttikas 1-3 to III. 2, 49 do not contain, it is true, the word adambara alluded to in III. 47—perhaps because it was already contained in this Sūtra—but increase considerably the contents of this rule; the Vārttika 2 to VIII. 2, 70 treats of a whole Gana, while the Sūtra III. 38 merely names its heading word; and so on. Nor could we forego such a comparison on the ground that there is a difference of purpose in the Sūtras which are attached to the Vājasaneyī-Samhitā, and in the Vārttikas, which are connected with Pāṇini,—that, consequently, an improvement of the Vārttikas on the Prātiśākhya need not tell on the chronological relation between both. For we have seen that Kātyāyana's Prātiśākhya does not strictly confine itself to the language of his Samhitā or even to that of the Vedas in general. Already the instances given before would suffice to bear out this fact, in the appreciation of which I so entirely differ from Professor Weber's views; and a striking instance of this kind is afforded by Kātyāyana's Sūtra III. 42, quoted before. It treats of a case entirely irrelevant for the Vājasaneyī-Samhitā; this case is taken up again and enlarged upon in a Vārttika to VI. 3, 109, and there is no reason why the additions made in this Vārttika might not have been entitled with equal right to a place amongst Kātyāyana's Sūtras, as Sūtra III. 42 itself. Their not standing there shows to my mind that this Vārttika is later than this rule of the Prātiśākhya work.

It will readily be seen that I have arrived at the result of the priority of Pāṇini's work to the Prātiśākhya of Kātyāyana, in entire independence of all the assistance which I might have
derived from my previous arguments. I have hitherto abstained from availing myself of their aid, because an inference must gain in strength if it be able to show that two entirely distinct lines of argument necessarily lead to the same goal. Such is the case with the question before us. For if we now appeal, once more, to the important information which Patanjali supplied, viz., that the "anubandhas of former grammarians have no grammatical effect in the work of Pāṇini:" in other words, that if a grammarian uses anubandhas employed by Pāṇini in the same manner as he did, his work must have been written after Pāṇini’s work,—we need only point to the pratāyahāra tūṅg, in Kātyāyana’s Sūtra I. 27, in order to be relieved from any doubt that Pāṇini’s grammar is prior to the Sūtra of Kātyāyana. That Kātyāyana added in his Sūtras other technical terms to those of Pāṇini, cannot be a matter of surprise; indeed, it is even less remarkable than it would be under ordinary circumstances if we consider that he made—either as inventor or as borrowing from older grammarians—such additions to the terminology of Pāṇini in his very Vārttikas, where one would think there was the least necessity for them,—where, for instance, he might have easily done without such new terms as sīl, pīt, jīt, jīhit, ghu, in the sense in which he uses them.239

Thus far my literary argument on the chronological relation between Pāṇini and the Prātiṣākhya works. The historical proof, that not only the work of Pāṇini, but Pāṇini himself, preceded, by at least two generations, the author of the oldest Prātiṣākhya, requires, in the first place, the remark that by the latter designation I mean the Prātiṣākhya of the Rigveda hymns.

Since Professor Weber, in his introduction to his edition of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣākhya has given proofs that this work as well

239 Vārttika 1 to Pāṇini I. 1, 68: क्षत्रियमात्रायुः ज्ञापितम्; Vārttika 2: पद्यरूपसः के न लाभः; Vārttika 3: क्षत्रियमात्रायुः ज्ञापितम्; Vārttika 4: क्षत्रियमात्रायुः ज्ञापितम्.—In his Kārikā to VII. 1, 21 (compare note 114) Kātyāyana uses the term तु in the sense of उत्तरपद, as results from the commentary of Patanjali.—Kārikā: औषधीयो इति.—Patanjali: औषधीयो इति सर्बभूतं वि- निदर्शनाविविचितं च। अष्टाध्यायम् हि इति.—The same term तु occurs in Patanjali’s Kārikā to VI. 4, 140 (see note 121): औषधीयो इति सर्वभूतं वि-निदर्शनाविविचितं च।
as the Atharvaveda-Prātiṣākhya—and I infer too, that of the Taittiriya-SAṃhitā—are more recent than the Rīk-Prātiṣākhya, and since these reasons are conclusive to my mind, I need not, by the addition of other proofs to that which he has afforded us on this point, weaken the great pleasure I feel, in being able, for once in a way, to coincide with him in his views.

It is necessary, however, that I should first touch in a few words on the question of the authorship of this Rīk-Prātiṣākhya. It is adverted to in the first verse of this work, in a passage which contains all the information we possess on this point. The passage in question runs thus: "After having adored Brahma, Śaunaka expressed the characteristic feature of the Rīg-veda verses."

Now, as it is not unusual in Sanskrit writings for the author to introduce himself in the commencement of his work by giving his name, and speaking of himself in the third person, this verse alone would not justify us in looking upon the words quoted as necessarily containing a mere report of Śaunaka’s having delivered certain rules which another later author brought into the shape of the Rīk-

Prātiṣākhya as we now find it. But it must be admitted, also, that it does not absolutely compel us to ascribe this work to Śaunaka himself. It leaves us free to interpret its sense according to the conclusions which must be derived from the contents of the work itself.

These contents have already required us to establish the priority of Pāṇini’s Grammar to this Prātiṣākhya work. If, then, we find that Pāṇini speaks of Śaunaka as of an ancient authority, while there is no evidence to show that the Śaunaka named in both works is not the same personage, there is from the point of view of my former “literary” argument, a certainty that Śaunaka was not the author of the Prātiṣākhya here named.

230 IV. 3, 103: पृष्ठभाविति ताद्रवभाविति; 106: प्रायविति भविति. Compare also page 149.

231 This is the view, too, of Urofa, the commentator on this Prātiṣākhya. He says that Śaunaka’s name is mentioned for the sake of remembering him: नामवद च परामाणम. See Mr. Regnier’s edition of the Rīk-P. in the Journal Asiatic, vol. VII. (1856), p. 183.
This inference, however, it must be admitted, is only entitled to be mentioned thus at the beginning of the historical argument, in so far as it may afterwards strengthen and corroborate it, but not, if it had to be used in order to premise the conclusions which will have to be drawn.

Another preliminary remark, also, must be devoted to the sweeping assertion of Professor Weber, already quoted, which is to this effect, that “sameness of names can never prove the identity of the persons” who bear these names. It is true he qualifies this dictum by adding after “names,” “like Kātyāyana;” but, even with this restriction, I cannot convince myself that literary criticism gains in strength by carrying Pyrrhonism beyond the confines of common sense. If great celebrity attaches to a name in certain portions of Sanskrit literature; and if the same name re-occurs in other and kinred portions of this same literature, I believe we are not only free, but compelled, to infer that the personage bearing this name in both such places is the same personage, unless there be particular and good reasons which would induce us to arrive at a contrary conclusion. I thus hold that a critic has no right to obtrude his doubts upon us until he has given good and substantial reasons for them.

After this expression of dissent from the critical principles of Professor Weber, I may now recall the fact I have mentioned on a previous occasion (p. 80), that there is a grammatical work, in a hundred thousand Ślokas, called Sangraha, whose author is Vyādi or Vyādi. I know of no other grammatical work bearing this name Sangraha, nor of any other celebrated grammarian named Vyādi. Both names, however, are not unfrequently met with in the grammatical literature. Vyādi is quoted several times in the Rik-Prātiśākhya, and there is no valid reason for doubting that he is there the same person as the author of the Sangraha. This same work and its author are sometimes alluded to in the illustrations which the commentators give of the Sūtras to Pāṇini or the

387 Rik-P. III, 14. 17; VI, 12; XIII, 12. 15. See Mr. Regnier’s Index des noms propres to his edition of the Rik-Prātiśākhya, e. Vṛṣṭi.
Chronological Relation between Pāṇini and the Pratīṣṭhākhyas.

Vārttikas of Kātyāyana;\(^{233}\) and both, indeed, as I shall show hereafter, appear to have stood in a close relation to the Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali. We are, however, only concerned here with one instance with which Patanjali illustrates the second Vārttika of Pāṇini’s rule II. 3, 66.

It is this: “beautiful indeed is Dākshāyana’s creation of the Sangraha.”\(^ {234}\)

From it we learn, then, in connection with the information we already possess of the proper name of the author of the Sangraha, that Vyādi and Dākshāyana are one and the same grammatical authority. Dākshāyana, however, is not only a descendant of Dāksha, but of Dākshi also,\(^ {235}\) and of the latter, at least in the third generation, while he may possibly have held a far more distant place in the lineage of this personage who is so often named in the ancient literature. For Pāṇini, who defines the term yuvan as the son of a grandson or of a more remote degree in the lineage of a family chief,\(^{236}\) gives a rule in reference to this term, which the principal commentators illustrate by the name of Dākshāyana.\(^ {237}\)

---

\(^{233}\) Pāṇini, IV. 1, 95: चतुर्दश:—Kātyāyana: इत्यो युवार्थमानिः परिमितात्विद्ध:—Patanjali: इत्यो युवार्थमानिः परिमितात्विद्ध:। इत्यया:।

\(^{234}\) Pāṇini, IV. 1, 102: चतुर्दश: चतुर्दश: चतुर्दश:।

\(^{235}\) Pāṇini, IV. 1, 102: चतुर्दश: परिमितात्विद्ध:।

\(^{236}\) Pāṇini, IV. 1, 102: चतुर्दश: परिमितात्विद्ध:।

\(^{237}\) Pāṇini, IV. 1, 102: चतुर्दश: परिमितात्विद्ध:।
If we now turn to Pāṇini himself, we have it on the authority of Patanjali that his mother bore the name of Dākṣā. And the genuineness of this Śūtra on account of there being no Bhāṣya to it (compare note 138), for Patanjali refers to it in his comment on the fifth Paribhāṣā (in the Calc. ed.) to I. 1, 72 and has also, amongst others, the instance ṛṣīpaṇḍu; viz. (ed. Ballantyne, p. 720); Paribhāṣā: pravatapaśaṇaḥ śāṣṭrayaḥ; pravatapatāḥ śāṣṭrayaḥ; pravatapāraṇaḥ śāṣṭrayaḥ; pravatapāraṇaḥ śāṣṭrayaḥ; pravatapāraṇaḥ śāṣṭrayaḥ; pravatapāraṇaḥ śāṣṭrayaḥ; pravatapāraṇaḥ śāṣṭrayaḥ; pravatapāraṇaḥ śāṣṭrayaḥ; etc.—That Dākṣāṣṭraṇa is the yucca, not the son of Dāksha is sufficiently clear from the Kālikā itself, since it refers to IV. 1, 94. For this reason it also gives as an instance of a yucca to I. 2, 66, besides Kālikā: and Śāstraṇa (omitted in the Calc. ed.), the word Śāstraṇa:—Patanjali confounds himself with the instance Śāstraṇa; but it commences its counter-instance to II. 4, 58 in this way: चिबित्वितरितिक्रमः। राष्ट्रपति युध्याश्वाय।: We must, consequently, consider it an inaccuracy when the same Kālikā gives its counter-instance to II. 4, 69 in these words: pravatapatīतिक्रमः। दार्शनिक युध्याश्वायः।: The Calcutta edition corrects it, and Dr. Boehtlingk, of course, reprints it without a single remark. In short, wherever we open his discreditable reprint, we understand perfectly well why he writes in his preface, p. xxviii: “The Calcutta edition is very correct, so much so that only on the very rarest occasions have I had an opportunity of preferring the readings of the Manuscripts.”

Dākshi, again, is, on the faith of all commentators on a rule of Pāṇini, the female family head of the progeny of Daksha, standing in the same relationship to Daksha as the male family chief Dākša; she is, in other words, the oldest sister (vrīḍāhā) of the latter personage. Vyādī, therefore, was a near relative of Pāṇini, and Pāṇini must have preceded him by at least two generations.
Now since the Rik-Prātiṣākhya quotes Vyādi, as we have seen, on several occasions, and since the Prātiṣākhya of Kātyāyana is more recent than this work, I must leave it to the reader to determine how many generations must, in all probability, have separated Pāṇini from the author of the Rik-Prātiṣākhya on the one hand, and from the author of the Vājasaṇeyi-Prātiṣākhya and the Vārttikas on the other.

After this statement, which I fear, is entirely fatal to a great many chronological assumptions which have hitherto been regarded as fully established, and to the critical and linguistic results which have been built on these assumptions, it is not necessary—but it will nevertheless be interesting—to see that modern and ancient grammatical authorities contain additional testimony to the conclusion I have here arrived at.

When explaining the uncritical condition of the Paribhāṣā collections, I pointed out that if they were looked upon as an indivisible whole, there could be no doubt that they must be later than Pāṇini,—since one of them uses the word Pāṇinīya. I pointed out, too, that the compilers of these collections, Vaidyanātha, for instance, must have taken this view of their chronological relation to Pāṇini. Now at the end of the Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti we read that “some ascribe the composition of all the Paribhāṣās to the Muni Vyādi.” They must consequently have considered him as posterior to Pāṇini.

I will at once, however, ascend to the author of the Great Commentary. In illustrating the first Vārttika to Pāṇini’s rule VI. 2, 36, Patanjali writes down the following compound: Āpiśala-Pāṇinīya-Vyādiya-Gautamīyāḥ. It tells its own tale: it names first the disciples of Āpiśali—of whom we know, through Pāṇini himself, that he preceded him,—then those of Pāṇini,
afterwards those of Vyādi; and ultimately those of Gautama. There
can be no doubt that we have here a sequence of grammarians
who wrote one after the other; but, if any doubt still existed,
it would be dispelled by the grammatical properties of the com-
 pound itself; for a Vārttika to II. 2, 34, teaches that—unless
there be reasons to prevent it—the name of the more important
part must come first in a Dwandwa compound; and for a
similar reason other Vārttikas teach that, for instance, in forming
such a compound of the names of seasons, the name of the earliest
season in the year must precede that of a subsequent one; or in
compounding the names of castes, they must follow one another
in their natural order; or in making a Dwandwa of the names of
two brothers, the name of the older has precedence of the name
of the younger. But as none of the grammatical reasons taught

by Pāṇini in previous rules would compel the component parts of
the compound alleged to assume another order than that which
they have, we can only interpret their sequence in the manner
I have stated.323

The descent from the height of the Prātiśākhyaś to the level
plain of the Pṛṣṭhātras would almost seem to require an explana-
tion. Before I give it, however, I will refer to Professor Müller's
Ancient Sanskrit Literature, and state its opinion on the rela-

323 Pāṇini, II. 2, 34: चचास्कारसद्वाद्वाद्वाते पूर्व नियमतत्त्वी विधयते।—Vārttika 3 (of the Calc. ed.) चचास्कारसद्वाद्वाद्वाते पूर्व नियमतत्त्वी विधयते।—Patanjali: चचास्कारसद्वाद्वाद्वाते पूर्व नियमतत्त्वी विधयते।—Vārttika 2 (of the Calc. ed.) चचास्कारसद्वाद्वाद्वाते पूर्व नियमतत्त्वी विधयते।—Patanjali: चचास्कारसद्वाद्वाद्वाते पूर्व नियमतत्त्वी विधयते।

323 Such a reason would be, for instance, if one part of the compound belonged to the
words technically called रिक्त (I. 1, 4, 7—9); for in such a case the base रिक्त would have
precedence of a base ending in च (compare II. 2, 32). On this account the names
of the three grammarians, Sākalya, Gārgya and Vyādi, form in the Rik-Prātiśākhya,
XIII. 12, the dwandwa: चचास्कारसद्वाद्वाद्वाते।
tion of these Sūtras to Pāṇini. It is contained in the following words: 244

"As to Śāntana’s Phītsūtras, we know with less certainty to what period they belong. A knowledge of them is not presupposed by Pāṇini, and the grammatical terms used by Śāntana are different from those employed by Pāṇini,—a fact from which Professor Boehtlingk has ingeniously concluded that Śāntana must have belonged to the eastern school of grammarians. As, however, these Sūtras treat only of the accent, and the accent is used in the Vedic language only, the subject of Śāntana’s work would lead us to suppose that he was anterior to Pāṇini, though it would be unsafe to draw any further conclusion from this."

Once more I am unable to assent to the arguments of my learned predecessor on this subject. If the knowledge of a work, as he admits, is not presupposed by Pāṇini, it would seem to follow that such a work is not anterior but posterior to him, since it is scarcely probable that he could have ignored the information it contains. Nor has Professor Müller given any evidence to show that the contents of the Phītsūtras are restricted to the Vaidik language only. On the contrary, the great bulk of the words treated of in these Sūtras belongs with equal right, and, in some respect, with much greater right, to the classical language, in preference to that of the Vaidik hymns or Brāhmaṇas. And as no word can be pronounced without an accent, it is not intelligible why such a treatise should not be of as great importance for the student who recites the Mahābhārata as for the priest who reads the Rigveda poetry. Pāṇini himself has, indeed, embraced in his rules on accentuation a great number of words no trace of which occurs in the Saṃhitās. But even if the statement made by Professor Müller were unobjectionable, why should it follow that an author who—and because he—writes on a Vaidik subject, must, or is even likely to, be anterior to an author who treats of the classical literature? And Pāṇini moreover treated of both.

"As little as I can adopt, on these premises, the conclusions Prof.

---

244 Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 152.
Müller draws, so little can I join in the compliments he pays to the
ingenuity of Dr. Boehtlingk.\footnote{As in the case of the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini, and of the Uṇādi-Sūtras, the edition of the Pīṭṣūtras also was entrusted by Dr. Boehtlingk to his compositor, who reprinted the text of these Sūtras from the Calcutta edition of the Siddhānta-kumudini.—The difficulties offered by these Sūtras are not inconsiderable, and might have yielded good materials for many remarks. Dr. Boehtlingk’s Commentary on them consists of 32 lines, which contain the substance of about 12, nearly all of which are insignificant. Even his very small Index to the Sūtras is imperfect; for it omits the Sūtra चर्चित पादानि which he mistook for a part of the commentary on IV. 15, and the Sūtra उपवनमयार्ये-
मित्रे तु which also he has reprinted as if it were a portion of the commentary on IV. 12, though he himself is doubtful as to its proper position there. He professes, too, to have given an Index of the contents, “for those who mean to pursue the subject.” But as one of the latter, I had to make a thorough Index of all the technical symbols in the Sūtras, and also of a good number of real words which occur in the commentary and text, but which, in accordance with his notion of an Index, or through his usual inaccuracy, are omitted in his Index; e.g. चन्द्र H. 13; चन्द्रि IV. 15; शनि IV. 13; शम्भ I. 2; सौर I. 4; पार्श्व IV. 11; रुक्ता III. 10; क्रतु H. 22; द्रव्य-भाषा II. 22; कल्याणका I. 21; शास्त्र H. 8, and very many more. Of compounds he has never enabled the reader to find the latter part; and such general terms as चन्द्र, चन्द्रि, चन्द्रि, चन्द्रि etc., which are as indispensable for a student as the
shown before, makes use of the terms prathāma, dvitiyā, tritiyā, chaturthi, etc., and of auṣṭ, āṅg (in the sense of an instrumental in the singular), all of which are terms of the eastern grammarians, and, as everyone knows that Pāṇini did not belong to them, I can see no ingenuity in assigning Sāntana to this school on the sole ground of his having used terms which differ from those of Pāṇini; especially when these terms have no grammatical influence whatever, like the anubandhas of Pāṇini, and are not distinctly defined in the commentary as terms of the eastern grammarians.\footnote{See notes 107, 230, and Pāṇini, VII. 3, 105.}"

individual words themselves, are of course, also omitted. All these remarks are suggested by the edition of a text which comprises no more than 88 Sūtras. It is, of course, needless for me to add that the trouble of consulting or using a very valuable commentary on these Sūtras, the Pīṭṣūtra-ṛṣṭī, does not enter into the plan of an editor whose activity in editing grammatical Sanskrit texts only consists in putting the printed Calcutta works into different type.

\footnote{Dr. Boehtlingk enumerates the terms which induced him to draw the inference alluded to by Müller, that Sāntana belonged to the eastern grammarians; and he adds also the Sūtras where they occur, viz. चन्द्र H. 14, 20; क्रतु H. 3; कर्म H. 1; चन्द्रि}
The real reasons for this assumption, which I share in, must, in my opinion, be sought for elsewhere; and as they are connected with the question of the chronological relation of the Phīṣṭūtras to Pāṇini, I will first explain why I speak of them after the Prātiśākhya works.

It is because they stand on the same linguistic ground as the latter writings, and because it was safer to survey this ground in the wider field of the Prātiśākhya literature than in the narrow precincts of the Sūtras of Śántana. This having been done, we need now merely recall the results obtained.

II. 18; घट्ट II. 6; सिंहव II. 16; शुष्म II. 25. Amongst these, सिंहव does not occur in the text of the Sūtras of Bhaṭṭoji, but is a curious reading mentioned by him in his commentary, which reports on this curious reading that it is a term of the eastern grammarians. The text of his Sūtras has जूठ instead of सिंहव. As to the other quotations given by Dr. Boehtlingk, not one tells us that these terms are terms of the eastern grammarians. There was, consequently, not a particle of evidence to draw from them that inference which he so positively draws. It is a mere guess, the probable correctness of which is corroborated, but by such evidence as never occurred to him.

We have seen that the Prātiśākhyaṣ represent the mechanic treatment of the language, unlike Pāṇini’s method, which is organic and shows the growth and life of the language he spoke. The same is the case in these Phīṣṭūtras. Whereas Pāṇini endeavours to explain the accent of words by connecting it with the properties of the word,—whereas he seeks for organic laws in the accents of uncompounded or compounded words and, only reluctantly, as it were, abandons this path whenever he is unable to assign a general reason for his rules,—the Phīṣṭūtras, like the Prātiśākhyaṣ, deal merely with the ready-made word, and attach to it those mechanical rules which bewilder and confuse, but must have been well adapted for an intellectual condition fitted for admiring the Prātiśākhya works. They belong, in my opinion, like the Prātiśākhyaṣ, not to the flourishing times of Hindu antiquity, but to its decadence.

In the second place, we have seen that on the ground which is common to both, the Prāśākhyas possess a far greater amount of linguistic material than Pāṇini does; and we had to conclude that Pāṇini could on no account have ignored the knowledge they conveyed, had they existed before his time. Precisely the same remark applies to the little treatise of Śāntana; for, brief as it is, it is richer in many respects than the analogous chapter which Pāṇini devoted to the same subject; and it would be inconceivable that Pāṇini should bring forward his rules, so much more incomplete in substance than the Phīṭsūtras, had they been the precursor of his work.

But, thirdly, we were compelled to admit that, at least, one of the Prāśākhyas, that of Kātyāyana, was written with the direct intention of completing and criticising Pāṇini; and I may here observe, that Professor Weber has, with very good reasons, assigned to this grammarian a place within the Eastern school. These features, too, characterise the tract of Śāntana.

Some of his rules are delivered with the evident purpose of criticising Pāṇini, and we meet on one occasion with the remark of the commentator that the eastern grammarians point out the difference between a rule of Pāṇini and one of Śāntana, when the context in which this passage occurs leaves no doubt that they meant a criticism on Pāṇini. And from this remark alone I should conclude that Śāntana was one of their school, while, from all these reasons combined, I draw the inference that he must have written after Pāṇini.

I will give some proof to substantiate this view, and to show, moreover, that there are grammatical authorities in India who expressly imply the view here taken of the posteriority of these Śūtras to Pāṇini.

According to Pāṇini's rule, VI. 1, 213, a word āhṛya would have the utāṭa on the first syllable; Bhāṭṭoṣijidīkshita, in his comment on the Phīṭsūtras, quotes this rule in order to show that Śāntana gave his Sūtra I. 5, with a view of stating that Pāṇini's
rule would not apply to this word. He quotes the same rule of Pāṇini for a similar purpose when he comments on I. 18, for, according to this rule, arya is not udātta on the first, but on the last syllable; and also in his comment on IV. 8, for, according to this Śūtra, the words tiṣya, sīkhyā (martya), dhānya and kanyā, are not udātta on the first, but swarita on the last syllable. On the rule I. 7, Bhaṭṭoja reports that, in the opinion of certain grammarians, Sāntana gave it in order to “kill” Pāṇini’s rule VI. 2. 2.

Sāntana’s rule I. 23, Bhaṭṭoja says, contravenes Pāṇini’s rule VI. 1. 197. And it is the same grammarians who, when explaining that sāha, as a part of Sāntana’s rule IV. 13, is udātta on the last syllable, reports: “The eastern grammarians inform us that sāha in Pāṇini’s rule VI. 3. 78, is udātta on the first syllable;” and he adds the advice: “think on that.” But I find no evidence in the arguments of Dr. Boecklingk, as regards the relation of Sāntana...
to the eastern grammarians, of his having followed the advice of Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣhita.

Of equal importance with these observations of Bhaṭṭojī, is a passage in the notes of Nāgojībhaṭṭa on Kaiyṛaṭa, when the latter accompanies the gloss of Patanjali to Kāṭyāyaṇa's Vārttika 6, to Pāṇini VI. 1, 158, with his own remarks. For Nāgojībhaṭṭa, after having observed that a rule of Pāṇini would contain a fault when compared with the standard of the Phītsūtras, pointedly winds up with the following words: "But, on the other hand, these Phītsūtras, when considered in reference to Pāṇini, are as if they were made to-day." 325

325 Vārttika 6 (of the Calc. ed.) to VI. 1, 158: प्राकृतिमायकये: सर्वसाधनवादै-दमिविहिः—Patanjali: प्राकृतिमायकये: सर्वसाधनवादै-दमिविहिः—Kaiyṛaṭa: प्राकृतिमायकये: सर्वसाधनवादै-दमिविहिः—Nāgojībhaṭṭa: सम साधन साधनसम्बन्धी बन्धनाधीन (Phītsūtra, IV. 10) प्राकृतिरुद्धस्ता: तितिरिति: युक्तिनिः य युक्तु-पुष्पिरिति (Phītsūtra, II. 21) सम्प्रदायः—परिद्विप्रय स्थितुप्रीक्षा: धान्यतिकुणिकरितव भये विविधविविधायमणियोऽयो विविधविविधायमणियोऽयो विविधविविधायमणियोऽयो विविधविविधायमणियोऽयो विविधविविधायमणियोऽयो विविधविविधायमणियोऽयो विविधविविधायमणियोऽयो विविधविविधायमणियोऽयो विविधविविधायमणियोऽयो

It is clear, therefore, that the best Hindu grammarians, too,

---Patanjali: प्राकृतिकमायकये: सर्वसाधनवादै-दमिविहिः—Sāyaṇa’s Commentary on Pāṇini I. 1, 1, in order to obviate a misunderstanding of it.
looked upon these Sūtras not only as not anterior to Pāṇini, but as quite recent, when compared with his work.

On Yāsaka, Professor Müller expresses himself thus: 256

"There are some discussions in the beginning of the Nirukta which are of the highest interest with regard to etymology. While in Greece the notions of one of her greatest thinkers, as expressed in the Cratylus, represent the very infancy of etymological science, the Brahmans of India had treated some of the vital problems of etymology with the utmost sobriety. In the Prātiṣākhya of Kātyāyana we find, besides the philosophical division of speech into nouns, verbs, prepositions, and particles, another division of a purely grammatical nature and expressed in the most strictly technical language. 'Verbs with their conjugal terminations; Nouns, derived from verbs by means of Krit-suffixes; Nouns, derived from nouns by means of taddhita-suffixes, and four kinds of compounds,—these constitute language' [Vājas. Prāt. I. 27.]

"In the Nirukta this division is no longer considered sufficient. A new problem has been started, one of the most important problems in the philosophy of language, whether all nouns are derived from verbs? No one would deny that certain nouns, or the majority of nouns, were derived from verbs. The early grammarians of India were fully agreed that kārti, a doer, was derived from kṛi, to do; pāchaka, a cook, from pach, to cook. But
did the same apply to all words? Śākaṭāyana, an ancient grammarian and philosopher, answered the question boldly in the affirmative, and he became the founder of a large school, called the Nairukta (or Etymologists), who made the verbal origin of all words the leading principle of all their researches.  

It is sufficiently clear from the preceding words that Professor Müller considers Yāska as more recent than Kātyāyana, and since he himself admits (see above p. 193) “that there is nothing in the style of the Prātiśākhya composed by Kātyāyana that could be used as a tenable argument why Kātyāyana, the author of the Prātiśākhya, should not be the same as Kātyāyana, the contemporary and critic of Pāṇini,” he must also consider the author of the Nirukta as subsequent to Pāṇini.

To refute his view on the relative position of Kātyāyana and Yāska, we need now merely point to the facts with which we are already familiar. Müller’s reason for Yāska’s posteriority to Kātyāyana is founded, as we see, on the assumption that the problem of the derivability or non-derivability of all nouns from verbs had not yet been proposed in the time of Kātyāyana. But whence does he know this? The Prātiśākhya of Kātyāyana is no sufficient testimony for establishing this theory. When Kātyāyana there says that nouns are either nouns derived from verbs, or nouns derived from nouns,—either kṛt or taddhita derivatives,—he has already said too much in a work of this kind, which has nothing to do with the origin of words, and which alludes to this and other matter, foreign to a Prātiśākhya itself, only because, and in so far as, it concerns its other purpose, viz. that of criticizing Pāṇini. Whether or not therefore it dealt with a problem such as that of which Müller is speaking, is merely a matter of chance.

But this problem itself, as we have seen, is epitomized in the term upnādi. A grammarian who uses this term shows at the same time that he is cognizant of that division between the old grammarians which Yāska describes. For whichever side he

---

327 In the continuation of this passage Professor Müller gives the statement similar to that which is contained above, on page 171.
espose, he has expressed by the term unnáti, that there are kriti-
derivatives which are of an exceptional kind and which are looked
upon by some as being, strictly speaking, no derivatives at all.
Now, I have quoted several instances which prove that Kátyáyana
dealt with the question of Unnáti words. Hence he was aware of
that problem discussed in the Nirukta; it was not "a new problem"
to him; and all the inferences that may or may not be built on
its absence in the Vájasaneyi-Prátiśákhya become invalidated at
once.

But the knowledge possessed by Páñini, of this problem itself
would, of course, not prove anything as to his priority or pos-
teriority to Yáśka, who speaks of it. It leaves this question just
where we find it, and we must seek for other evidence to settle it.

Such, I hold, is afforded by the fact that Páñini knows the
name of Yáśka, for he teaches the formation of this word and
heads a Gána with it.278 And as we know at present of but one

278 Páñini, II, 4, 63: बालकादिबो नीचे

real Yáśka in the whole ancient literature, a doubt as to the
identity of the author of the Nirukta and the family chief adduced
by Páñini, would have first to be supported with plausible argu-
ments before it could be assented to.

A second and equally strong reason is, in my belief, afforded
by the test I have established above, on the ground of the gram-
matical sanjñás which occur in Páñini's work.

Amongst these terms there is one especially which allows us
to judge of the relative position of Yáśka and Páñini, viz., the
term upásarga, prefix or preposition. Páñini employs it in many
Sútras; he does not define it; it must consequently have been in
use before he wrote. Yáśka, however, enters fully into the notion
expressed by it, as we may conclude from the following words of
his Nirukta: 279

279 Nirukta, I, 3 (according to the edition of Professor Roth): न निर्वेष्ट स्वयमः
बाप्पातितादि हस्तिकादिबो नामा सारिणीम् तर्कप्रकटोत्तेत्तत्त्वः
पदार्थं अवस्थात्तित नार्य्यवाच एतु पदार्थं प्राप्तिः संस्कृते सं नामाभावायः
"Śāktaśāyuksa says that 'the prepositions when detached (from noun or verb) do not distinctly express a sense;' but Gārgya maintains that 'they illustrate the action which is the sense expressed by a noun or verb (in modifying it); and that their sense is various (even when they are detached from a noun or verb).'

Now they express (even in their isolated condition) that sense

---

Chronological Relation between Pañci and Yaska

Yaska on the Prepositions.
which inheres in them; it is this sense which modifies the sense of a noun or verb. The preposition á expresses the sense of limit (e.g. up to the mountain); pra and pará express the reverse of á (e.g. gone forth or away); abhi, the sense of towards (e.g. gone towards—in a friendly sense); prati, the reverse of abhi (e.g. gone against); ati and su, excellence (e.g. having much wealth, an excellent Bráhmana); nir and dur, the reverse of these two (e.g. having no wealth, a bad Bráhmana); ni and ava, downwardness (e.g. he takes down); ud, the reverse of these two (e.g. he takes up); sam, junction (e.g. he takes together); vi and apa, the reverse of sam (e.g. he takes away); anu, similarity or being after (e.g. having a similar appearance, he goes after); api, co-existence (e.g. let it be a drop of butter, a drop of honey); upa, excess (e.g. he is born again); pari, surrounding (e.g. he puts round); adhi, being above and

superiority (e.g. he stands over, a supreme lord). In this manner they express various senses, and these have to be considered.”

This passage records, as we see, besides the definition of Yáska, the opinions of Śákaññana and of Gárgya; it is silent on Pánini. Yet how much more complete and scientific is his treatment of the prepositions! Durga, the commentator of Yáska, feels this defect in Yáska, for at the end of his gloss he says: “upasargas can only be joined to a verb, not to a noun; it is therefore only through the mediation of the former that they can ascend also to the latter” (viz. in so far as nouns are derived from verbal roots).

Pánini teaches that the first and general category to which prepositions belong, is that of nipáta or particles: he then continues, that they are upasargas when they are joined to “verbal action” (i.e. to a verb); gatis, if the verbal roots to which they are attached become developed into a noun; and that they are karma-pravach-niṣa if they are detached and govern a noun. Of such

380 It seems to me doubtful whether संबन्ध in implies the sense which is illustrated by the instance of Durga; without his words, which clearly refer to Patanjali’s comment on Pánini, I. 4, 56, I should have rendered संबन्ध by नियौ, and thought of an instance like चालिंग्यति.

381 Pánini, I. 4, 58: प्राध्य; 59: उपसङ्गे: विस्पाश्चिदि; 69: मन्त्रि; 83: संमर्थ-चक्रि. .
a distinction there is no trace in the Nirukta, which stops, as we see, at the speculations of Sākṣatāyana and Gārgya, both predecessors of Pāṇini. Nor can the meanings which Yāska assigns to the prepositions, so far as completeness is concerned, be compared to those we meet with in the rules of Pāṇini. *Abhi* for instance, has with him not only the sense mentioned by Yāska, but that of "towards, by (severally), with regard to;" *āti*, that of "excellence and transgression;" *apa*, that of "exception;" *ānu*, that of "in consequence of, connected with, less than, towards, by (severally), with regard to, to the share of;" *prati*, the sense of "towards, by (severally), with regard to, to the share of, instead of, in return of;" *pari*, the sense of *prati*, except in the last two meanings, and that of an "expletive;" *adhi*, that of "superiority and of an expletive."

It seems impossible, therefore, to assume that Yāska could have known the classes of *upasarga* as defined by Pāṇini, and whose meanings as enumerated by him when he wrote the words before quoted. But not knowing the grammar of Pāṇini, is, in the case of Yāska, tantamount to having preceded it.

Though Yāska be older than Pāṇini, and Pāṇini older than Kātyāyana, there still remains the mystery as to the era of Pāṇini. No work of the ancient literature, within my knowledge, gives us the means of penetrating it. But as the remotest date of Hindu antiquity, which may be called a real date, is that of Buddha's death, it must be of interest to know whether Pāṇini is likely to have lived before or after this event.

Not only is the name of Śākyamuni, or Śākyya, never adverted to in the Sūtras of Pāṇini, but there is another fact connected with this name which is still more remarkable.

*The formation छायः occurs in three Gaṇas; as a derivative from छायः with छायः in the Gaṇa to IV. 1, 108; with छायः to IV. 3, 92, but there it becomes doubtful, through the difference in the readings of the MSS.; and as a derivation from छायः with छायः in the Gaṇa to IV. 1, 151.

---

221 Compare I. 4, 84–97.
The great schism which divided ancient India into two hostile creeds, centres in the notion which each entertained of the nature of eternal bliss. The Brahmanic Hindus hope that their soul will ultimately become united with the universal spirit; which, in the language of the Upanishads, is the neuter Brahma; and, in that of the sects, the supreme deity, who takes the place of this philosophical and impersonal god. And however indefinite this god Brahma may be, it is nevertheless, to the mind of the Brahmanic Hindu, an entity. The final salvation of a Buddhist is entire non-entity. This difference between the goal of both created that deep and irreconcilable antagonism which allowed of none of the compromise which was possible between all the shades and degrees of the Brahmanic faith, from the most enlightened to the most degenerate. The various expressions for eternal bliss in the Brahmanic creed, like apavarga, moksha, mukti, nibbaya, all mean either “liberation from this earthly career” or the “absolute good;” they therefore imply a condition of hope. The absolute end of a Buddhist is without hope; it is nirvana or extinction.

This word means literally “blown out;” but there is this difference, if I am not mistaken, between its use in the Brahmanic and in the Buddhistic literature,—that, in the former, it is employed, like other past participles, in any of the three genders, whereas in the latter it occurs only in the neuter gender, and there, too, only in the sense of an abstract noun, in that of extinction, i.e., absolute annihilation of the soul. I have no instance at my command in which nirvana, when used in the classical literature, implies any other sense than the sense “blown out,” or a sense immediately connected with it. Thus Patanjali, when illustrating the use of this past participle, gives the instances: “the fire is blown out by the wind, the lamp is blown out by the wind;” and Kaitya who, on the same occasion, observes that a phrase, “the wind has ceased to blow,” would not be expressed by “nirvana vatah, but by nirvato vatah,” corroborates the instances of Patanjali with one of his own: “blowing out (has been effected) by the wind.” But Pani, who teaches the formation of this participle in rule VIII. 2, 50, which has indirectly called forth all these instances, says:
"(the past participle of tu with prefix nīr is) nirvāṇa (if the word means) ‘free from wind,’ (or, ‘not blowing, as wind’)."

This is the natural interpretation of Pāṇini’s rule. Kātyāyana, it is true, gives a Vārttika which corrects the word avāte into avātābhidhāne “(if it have) not the sense of wind (or of blowing);” yet it is very remarkable that Patanjali, in commenting on this Vārttika, does not interpret its words in his usual manner, but merely adds to them the instances I have just named; it is remarkable, too, that he introduces them with the observation: “(this Vārttika is given in order to show) that (nirvāṇa) is also or is emphatically used in the following instances.” Still he has no instance what-

ever for the sense stated by Pāṇini, and his word “also” or “emphatically” does not appear to be justified by the criticism of Kātyāyana, which simply corrects the word avāte into avātābhidhāne without any additional remark.

In short, my opinion on this Vārttika is analogous to that which I have expressed in previous instances. The sense of nirvāṇa, “free from wind (or not blowing),” had become obsolete in the time of Kātyāyana, who merely knew that sense of it which found its exterior and special application in the nirvāṇa of the Buddhistic faith. But since there is no logical link between this latter word and the nirvāṇa, “wind-still,” of Pāṇini; and since it is not probable that he would have passed over in silence that sense of the word which finally became its only sense, I hold that this sense did not yet exist in his time; in other words, that his silence affords a strong probability of his having preceded the origin of the Buddhistic creed.

The task I had proposed to myself would now seem to have
reached its natural close for the present; yet if, after this brief and imperfect attempt to do justice to one of the most difficult questions of Sanskrit literature, I were now to take leave of Pāṇini, even temporarily, without devoting a special word to Patanjali, I should fail in gratitude to this great teacher, who has supplied us with nearly all the materials for this discussion and its results.

"At what time," says Professor Müller,²⁸ "the Mahābhāshya was first composed, it is impossible to say. Patanjali, the author of the Great Commentary, is sometimes identified with Pingala; and on this view, as Pingala is called the younger brother, or at least the descendant of Pāṇini, it might be supposed that the original composition of the Mahābhāshya belonged to the third century. But the identity of Pingala and Patanjali is far from probable, and it would be rash to use it as a foundation for other calculations."

This is the only date, the fixing of which is called "impossible," in Müller's Ancient Sanskrit Literature; and as it has hitherto been my fate to differ from this work in all its chronological views, I seem merely to follow a predestined necessity in looking upon the date of Patanjali as the only one which I should venture to determine with anything like certainty.

I do so, because Patanjali, as if foreseeing the conjectural date which some future Pandit would attach to his life, or the doubt that might lift him out of all historical reach, once took the opportunity of stating a period before which we must not imagine him to have lived, while on another occasion he mentions the time when he actually did live.

"If a thing," says Pāṇini, "serves for a livelihood, but is not for sale" (it has not the affix ka). This rule Patanjali illustrates with the words "Śiva, Skanda, Viśākha," meaning the idols that represent these divinities and at the same time give a living to the men who possess them,—while they are not for sale. And, "why?" he asks. "The Mauryas wanted gold, and therefore established religious festivities. Good; (Pāṇini's rule) may apply to such (idols, as they sold); but as to idols which are hawked

²⁸ Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 244.
about (by common people) for the sake of such worship as brings an immediate profit, their names will have the affix *ka.*

Whether or not this interesting bit of history was given by Patanjali ironically, to show that even affixes are the obedient servants of kings, and must vanish before the idols which they sell,

because they do not take the money at the same time that the bargain is made—as poor people do,—I know not. But, at all events, he tells us distinctly by these words that he did not live before the first king of the Maurya dynasty who was Chandragupta, and who lived 315 B.C. And I believe, too, if we are to give a natural interpretation to his words, that he tells us, on the contrary, that he lived after the last king of this dynasty, or in other words later than 180 before Christ. But he has even been good enough to relieve us from a possibility of this doubt when commenting on another rule of Pāṇini, or rather on a criticism attached to it by Kātyāyana.

In Sūtra III, 2, 111, Pāṇini teaches that the imperfect must be used, when the speaker relates a past fact belonging to a time which precedes the present day. Kātyāyana improves on this rule by observing that it is used, too, when the fact related is out of sight, notorious, but could be seen by the person who uses the verb. And Patanjali again appends to this Vārttika the following instances and remark: "The Yavana besieged (imperfect) Ayodhya; the
DATE OF THE MAHABHASYA.

Yavana besieged (imperfect) the Mādhyaṇikas. Why does Kātyāyana say, 'out of sight?' (because in such an instance as) 'the sun rose' (the verb must be in the aorist). Why 'notorious?' (because in such an instance as) 'Devadatta made a mat' (the verb must be in the preterit). Why does he say: 'but when the fact could be seen by the person who uses the verb?' (because in such an instance as) 'According to a legend Vāsudeva killed Kansa' (the verb must likewise be in the preterit).

Hence he plainly informs us, and this is acknowledged also by Nāgojībhāṣṭa, that he lived at the time—though he was not on the spot—when "the Yavana besieged Ayodhyā," and at the time when "the Yavana besieged the Mādhyaṇikas." For the very contrast which he marks between these and the other instances proves that he intended practically to impress his contemporaries with a proper use of the imperfect tense.

Now the Mādhyaṇikas are the well-known Buddhistic sect which was founded by Nāgārjuna. But here, it would seem, into the critical condition of the later commentaries on Pāṇini, when we find, for instance, that the Kāśikā copies these instances, but without saying that they belong to Patanjali. The same is the case in the present edition of Pāṇini. On account of the importance of this passage of the Mahābhāṣya, I will remind the reader that it is contained in the MS. E.I.H. No. 330, the only one I could consult. The two MSS. of the Kāśikā in the library of the E.I.H. have instead of माध्य्याणिक, a word माध्याणिक; but since the latter is not only meaningless, but grammatically wrong, there can be no doubt that the reading of the MS. 330 is the only correct one.

that at this early stage we are already at a chronological standstill. For the Northern Buddhists say that Nāgarjuna lived 400, and the Southern Buddhists that he lived 500, years after Buddha's death. And again, while we believed that the researches of that admirable work of Professor Lassen had finally settled this latter date, and "for a last time,"—while we believed, in other words that it was 543 before Christ, Professor Müller seizes and shakes it once more and makes Buddha die 477 before Christ. Were I to agree with the opinion which he has elsewhere expressed,\textsuperscript{30} that "in the history of Indian literature, dates are mostly so precarious, that a confirmation, even within a century or two, is not to be despised," I should be out of all my difficulties. For since the difference stated as regards the life of Nāgarjuna would not amount to more than 166 years, it would fall within the allotted space. But I am not so easily satisfied. Dates in Sanskrit literature, as anywhere else, are either no dates at all—and then they are not so much as precarious—or they are dates, and then we must look closely at them.

The doubts which Prof. Müller has expressed in reference to the assumed date of Buddha's death, viz., 543 B.C., are by no means mere vague and personal doubts. On the contrary, they are embodied in an elaborate discussion, which not only proves a conscientious research, but is extremely valuable on account of the opportunity it gives of surveying the real difficulties of the question, and of forming one's own opinion, with greater safety and ease: and, whether dissenting from him or not, one is happy to deal with his arguments.

My objection to them may be summed up in the commencing and the closing words of his own investigation.

"It has been usual," he says in his Ancient Sanskrit Literature (p. 264), "to prefer the chronology of Ceylon, which places Buddha's death in 543 B.C. But the principal argument in favour of this date is extremely weak. It is said that the fact of the Ceylonese era being used as an era for practical purposes speaks in favour of its correctness. This may be true with regard to the

\textsuperscript{30} Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 243.
times after the reign of Aśoka. In historical times, any era, however fabulous its beginning, will be practically useful; but no conclusion can be drawn from this, its later use, as to the correctness of its beginning. As a conventional era, that of Ceylon may be retained, but until new evidence can be brought forward to substantiate the authenticity of the early history of Buddhism, as told by the Ceylonese priests, it would be rash to use the dates of the Southern Buddhists as a corrective standard for those of the Northern Buddhists or of the Brahmans."

And, towards the close of his inquiry, he expresses himself thus (p. 298):—"At the time of Aśoka's inauguration, 218 years had elapsed since the conventional date of the death of Buddha. Hence if we translate the language of Buddhist chronology into that of Greek chronology, Buddha was really supposed to have died 477 B.C. and not 543 B.C. Again, at the time of Chandragupta's accession, 162 years were believed to have elapsed since the conventional date of Buddha's death. Hence Buddha was supposed to have died 315 + 162 = 477 B.C."

In quoting these two passages, I show at once that Professor Müller attaches no faith to the tradition which concerns the date of Buddha's death, but that he attaches faith to that which places Aśoka 218, and Chandragupta 162, years after that event. But if tradition is to be believed in one portion of the history connected with the rise and progress of the Buddhist faith, why not in another, and in all? The arguments which are good for the one case will equally apply to the other; and if tradition be wrong in fixing Buddha's death at 543 B.C., we must also reject it when giving the dates 162 and 218, and the sum total will then have no quantities out of which it can be produced. And this objection would seem to derive additional force from the very words of Professor Müller just quoted; for he says himself that the argument in favour of the date 543 B.C., so far as it is founded on the practical use made of this date, "may be true with regard to the times after the reign of Aśoka." But 218 after Buddha's death, is the date of Aśoka himself, and 162 that of Chandragupta, who preceded that king. Both, consequently, would, in Professor Müller's
opinion, deserve the same amount of belief as the date of Buddha’s death itself.

The grounds on which Professor Müller differs from Professor Lassen have been fully discussed by him, as already observed; but as the essentials of this discussion lie in a nutshell, they admit of being here stated in reference to the question which actually concerns us.

Both scholars assume—and so long as Greek chronology deserves any credit at all, they do so, I hold, without the possibility of a contradiction—that Chandragupta, who is Sandrocottus, reigned 315 B.C. Buddhistic tradition, however, says that he lived 162 years after Buddha’s death, which means that if this event took place 543 B.C., he reigned 381 B.C. But since 315 must be right, and 381 must be wrong, either Buddha’s death occurred 477 B.C., or Chandragupta lived 66 years later than Hindu traditions allows him to live, viz., 228 years after 543 B.C. Lassen decides in favour of the latter alternative, no doubt, by saying to himself that since there is an error of 66 years, it was more likely committed by tradition in remembering the duration of the reign of kings who preceded Chandragupta, than in recording an event that was engrossing the national mind, and much more important to the national feeling and interest than an exact chronicle of by-gone, and some of them insignificant, kings. Müller prefers the precise tradition of 162 years, and therefore arrives at 477 B.C. as the date of Buddha’s death.

Let us return, after this statement, to the events which Patanjali tells us occurred in his time, and confront them with the opinions of the two scholars named.

If Nāgārjuna lived 400 years after Buddha’s death, his date, according to Professor Lassen’s conclusions, would be 143,—or, if he lived 500 years after this event, 48 years B.C. Again, his date, according to Professor Müller’s conclusions, would be 77 B.C., or 23 after Christ. But I must mention, too, that Professor Lassen, on the ground occupied by him, supposes a further mistake of 66 years in the tradition which places Nāgārjuna 500 years after Buddha’s death, and that he thus also advocates the date of the
founder of the Mādhyamikas as 23 years after Christ.\textsuperscript{70} Now, since the sect which was founded by Nāgārjuna existed not only simultaneously with, but after, him, that event which was contemporaneous with Patanjali and the Mādhyamikas, \textit{“the siege of Ayodhya by the Yavana”} must have occurred within or below the circle of these dates. The latter alternative, however, is again checked by the date of Abhimanyu, who reigned about 60 years after Christ; for we know from the chronicle of Kashmir that he introduced into his country the Commentary of Patanjali, which must consequently have been in existence during his reign.

In other words, the extreme points within which this historical event must have fallen, are the years 143 before, and 60 after Christ; and as in the time of Abhimanyu the Great Commentary had already suffered much, according to the report of Rājatarangini, it is necessary to limit even the latter date by, at least, several years.

\textsuperscript{70} Indische Alterthumskunde, vol. II. p. 412, 413.

Yet the word \textit{“Yavana”} carries with it another corrective of this uncertainty. According to the researches of Professor Lassen it is impossible to doubt that \textit{within this period}, viz., between 143 before and 60 after Christ, this word Yavana can only apply to the Greco-Indian kings, nine of whom reigned from 160 to 85 B.C.\textsuperscript{71} And if we examine the exploits of these kings, we find that there is but one of whom it can be assumed that he, in his conquests of Indian territory, came as far as Ayodhya. It is \textit{Menandros}, of whom so early a writer as Strabo reports that he extended his conquests as far as the Jumna river, and of whom one coin has actually been found at Mathurā. He reigned, according to Lassen’s researches, more than twenty years, from about 144 B.C.\textsuperscript{72}

If then this inference be correct, Patanjali must have \textit{written his commentary} on the Vārttika to Pāṇini III. 2, 111, between 140 and 120 B.C.; and this is the only date in the \textit{ancient} literature of India which, in my belief, rests on more than mere hypothesis.

\textsuperscript{71} Indische Alterthumskunde, vol. II., p. 322.

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid. vol. II. p. 328.
But it has also the merit of giving that "new evidence" which Professor Müller requires for a corroboration of the chronology of Ceylon. For none of the fluctuating dates I have mentioned will allow us to look upon Menandros and the Mādhyamikas as contemporaries, except the date 143, which was the extreme limit of the date of Nāgārjuna's life. And since, on the basis of tradition, this date again becomes impossible,—unless we claim amongst those alleged, 543 for the time of Buddha's death, and 400 years for the succession of Nāgārjuna,—Patanjali's Great Commentary becomes invaluable also in this respect, and more especially to those who are concerned in Buddhist chronology.

Of the lineage of Patanjali all the knowledge I possess is that the name of his mother was Gonikā.713 It occurs in the last words of Patanjali on a Kārikā to Pāṇini. Of more importance, however, is the information he gives us of his having resided temporarily in Kashmir,714 for this circumstance throws some light on the interest which certain kings of this country took in the preservation of the Great Commentary.

His birthplace must have been situated in the East of India, for he calls himself Gonardiya;715 and this word is given by the Kāśikā in order to exemplify names of places in the East. Patan-

Patanjali to I. 1, 21, v. 2 (of the Calcutta edition ; p. 412 ed. Ballantyne); Nāgajīvanā etc.—Kātyāyana: भाष्याकर्तवः पत्नीहरूनामानुसारात्। रूपांतरः—It is on this authority that the word Gonardiya has found a place amongst the epithets of Patanjali in Hemachandra's Glossary.
jali's birthplace had therefore the name of Gonarda. But that he is one of the eastern grammarians is borne out also by other evidence. Kaiyyaṭa calls him on several occasions Āchārya-dēśīya.\(^{274}\) If we interpreted this word according to Pāṇini's rules

\(^{274}\) The Kāḍākā to I. 1, 75: दक्खिण प्राचार रे, gives the instances: एकीयकवी: | भौगोलीक: | रे | भौगोलीक: | रे (thus MS. E.I.H. 2440; the MS. 829, which is generally more incorrect than the former, has the plurals instead of the singulars: रे, रे). Professor Lassen (Indische Alterthumskunde, vol. II., p. 484) assumes a connection between Gonardiya and Gonarda, the name of a king of Kashmir; but I believe that my explanation is supported by the whole evidence combined.

\(^{277}\) For instance, Patanjali to VI. 1, 158, v. I (of the Calcutta edition) writes: ...... विद्वानोऽविवेचरां विश्लेषित एवैवः etc.; and Kaiyyaṭa introduces his comment on these words with: चालायदेशीयां चाह यदि चुङ्किति and so on, in a similar manner, on other occasions. An instance, however, which will better bear out my conclusion, is afforded by the combined Vārttika-Kāḍākā of Kāṭyāyana (see note 114), and the commentaries to V. 2, 39. After the words of the Śōtras, Patanjali says: चिह्नमर्मम् परिसमयं रुक्तवचां। न नामय दत्तत च वाच्यां। अर्थात् दश्य मूलिकाः करितां। बाहुल्यवाक्योपनिवेशार्थार्थिनिविवेचित्ति.\(^{288}\) then follows the first Vārttika (or first portion of the Kāḍākā of Kāṭyāyana): ज्ञातादयदेशीयांसिद्धिं गुण-वृत्तिः, which again is followed by the further comment of Patanjali. In reference to V. 3, 67 and 68, it would mean "an unaccomplished teacher;" but as there is not the slightest reason for believing that Kaiyyaṭa intended any irony or blame when he applied this epithet to Patanjali, it is necessary to render the word by the teacher "who belongs to the country of the Āchārya." Now, since Kaiyyaṭa also distinctly contrasts āchārya, as the author of the Vārttikas, with āchāryadēśīya, the latter epithet can only imply that Patanjali was a countryman of Kāṭyāyana. Kāṭyāyana, however, as Professor Weber has shown by very good arguments, is one of the eastern school; Kaiyyaṭa, therefore, must have looked upon Patanjali also as belonging to it.

Another proof is afforded by a passage in the comment of Bhaṭṭo-
Bhartṛhari's Account of the Early History of the Mahābhāṣya.

Bhartṛhari's Account of the Early History of the Mahābhāṣya.

After Patanjali had obtained the aid of [or had come to] grammarians who had mastered the new sciences more or less [literally: in their full extent and in their abridged form], and after he had

Government for India, which in a few days will have ceased to be the Library of the East India House. It bears on its outer leaf the corrupt title वाक्यपदियो वाक्यपदियो, but at the end of its three chapters the words: दूत लोकांत्विको भाषाप्रदीपिते प्रवर्तकस्यां (etc.) ... हि तीव्र वाक्यस्: ... तत्त्वान: वाकस: ... I call it Vākyapadiya, because, the MS. in question being very incorrect, I cannot give its reading any preference to the reading वाक्यपदीय by which this work is several times quoted in the portion of the Mahābhāṣya edited by Dr. Ballantyne. For, the identity of both results from a comparison I have made between the passages quoted in this highly valuable edition and the MS. before me. It is right, however, to mention that the second chapter of the work concludes in this MS. in the following manner: भाषाप्रदीपिते वाक्यपदीय विशेष वाक्याम्. समाप्त वाक्यपदियोऽकारः, where the reading वाक्यपदियोऽकारः, when corrected to *वाक्यपदियोऽकारः, admits of a sense, but suggests also the conjecture that it may be a corruption of वाक्यपदियोऽकारः. I now transcribe the passage in question literally, in order to show the condition of the MS., and also to enable the reader to supply better conjectures than I may have made; but some conjectures I have been compelled to make in order to impart a meaning to a very few desperate lines. These conjectures are added in [ ]. After the words एवचिन्त्य निःश्च शाम्य एव रसिकैः, which are

778 See page 218.

779 The text of this passage belongs to the MS. No. 354 in the Library of the Home
acquired the Sangraha [of Vyādi], he, the Guru, well versed in the sacred sciences, connected all the original nyāyas in the Mahābhāshya. But when it was discovered that this Commentary could not be fathomed on account of its depth, and that the minds of those who were not quite accomplished floated, as it were, on connected with the subject treated of in the second chapter, Bhartrihari continues:  

Bhartrihari's Account of the Early History of the Mahābhāshya.

330 This passage will now aid us also in a correct understanding of the interesting verse from the Rājasatāngī, which has been quoted, but blighted, by Dr. Boehtlingk in the version he gave of it (vol. II. p. xv and xvi). This verse reads in the Calcutta edition of the latter work (l. 179): महाभाष्याचिन्तवाचिन्तवाचिन्तवाचिन्तवाचि । प्रत्ययं्ति महाभाष्याचिन्तवाचिन्तवाचिन्तवाचि। Mr. Troyer, in his edition, substitutes for the latter words

the surface, in consequence of their levity, those grammarians who liked dry reasoning, Vaij, Saubhava, and Haryaksha, who were partisans of the Sangraha, cut in pieces the book of the Rishi [Patanjali]. That grammatical document [or manuscript of the Mahābhāshya], which was obtained from the pupils of Patanjali, then remained for some time preserved in one copy only amongst the inhabitants of the Dekhan. Chandra, again, and other grammarians, who went after the original of the Bhāshya, obtained this document from Parvata, and converted it into many books [that is to say, took many copies of it], and my Guru, who thoroughly knew the ways of logical discussion and his own Dāsana, taught me the compendium of this grammatical work.”
A perusal of the foregoing pages will probably have raised the question in the reader's mind, why I have attached an investigation of the place which Pāṇini holds in Sanskrit literature to the text of the present ritual work?

I will answer this question without reserve. It is because I hold that an inquiry like this was greatly needed in the present critical position of Sanskrit philology; and that no ancient text, whatever its nature, should remain any longer,—much less should come for a first time,—before the public without pre-supposing in its readers a full knowledge of the literary problems I have here been dealing with. For whether my views meet with approval or not, I have, I believe, at least shown that the mode in which these problems have hitherto been discussed, is neither adequate to the difficulties with which they are beset, nor to their bearings on the scientific treatment of the Sanskrit language itself.

No one, indeed, can be more alive than I am myself to the conviction of how much may be added, in the way of detail, to the facts I have adduced; for, however imperfect my present attempt and my own knowledge may be, I still could have largely increased the foregoing inquiry with materials taken from the
Brāhmaṇa-, Upanishad-, and the philosophical literature. I have not done more than allude to the contents of Pāṇini’s Grammar and I have scarcely hinted at the linguistics results which may be derived from a comparison between Kātyāyana and Patanjali, on the one side, and the recent grammatical literature (which is represented by the Kāśikā, the Siddhānta-kaumudi with its Pauruṣaṇāmanorāṇa, and the commentators on the Dhātupāṭha and the artificial poetry), on the other. For my present object was merely to convey a sense of the inherent difficulties of the questions I have been speaking of, and while tracing the outlines of my own results, to offer so much evidence, as was strictly necessary for supporting them with substantial proof.

Before, however, I add some words on the practical object I had in view in entering upon this investigation, both justice and fairness require me to aver that the immediate impulse which led to the present attempt was due to Max Müller’s Ancient Sanskrit Literature. So great is my reluctance to the public discussion of literary questions, if such a discussion requires a considerable amount of controversy, and so averse am I to raising an edifice of my own, if, in order to do so, I am compelled to damage structures already in existence, that this feeling would in all probability have prevented me now, as it has done hitherto, from giving public expression to my views, had it not been for the importance I attach to Müller’s work. This work reached me, as already mentioned, when the first pages of this Preface were completed; and it was the new material it brought to light, and the systematic and finished form by which its author imparted to his theories a high degree of plausibility, which induced me to oppose to it the facts I have here made known and the results I have drawn from them.

And, as everyone has his own way of paying compliments, this avowal is the compliment which I pay to Professor Müller’s work. For as I myself care but little for blame, and much less for praise, so long as I consider that I have fulfilled my duty, I could not but assume that he, too, would much prefer, to uninstructive panegyrics which anyone could inflict on him, such...
dissent as I have here expressed, as it can only lead either to con-
firmation of the opinions he has advanced, or, by correcting them,
to an attainment of that scientific truth for which both of us are
earnestly labouring.  

And now I shall speak my mind as to the necessity I felt for
writing these pages in view of the present critical position of
Sanskrit philology.

The study of Sanskrit commenced, not with the beginning but
with the end of Sanskrit literature. It could not have done other-
wise, since it had to discover, as it were, the rudiments of the
language itself, and even the most necessary meanings of the most
necessary words. We have all been thankful—and our gratitude
will never suffer through forgetfulness—for the great advantage

we have derived from an insight into the Mahábhárata, the
Rámayana, the Hitopadesa, the Sakuntalá, through the labours
of those great scholars, Sir William Jones, Schlegel, Bopp, and
others, who are before the mind’s eye of every Sanskritist. But
the time of pleasure had to give way to a time of more serious
research. The plays and fables are delightful in themselves, but
they do not satisfy the great interests of Sanskrit philology. Our
attention is now engrossed, and rightly so, by the study of gram-
mar, of philosophy, and, above all, of that literature of ancient India,
which—very vaguely and, in some respects, wrongly, but at all
events conveniently—goes by the name of the Vaidik literature.
With the commencement of that study we always associate in our
minds such great names as those of a Colebrooke, a Wilson, a
Burnouf, a Lassen, the courageous and ingenious pioneers who
opened the path on which we are now travelling with greater safety
and ease.

But whence was it that they were able to unfold to us the first
secrets of ancient Hindu religion, of ancient Hindu philosophy and

31 Almost simultaneously with the last proof sheets I received the second edition of
Professor Müller's "History of Sanskrit Literature." As both editions entirely cor-
respond in their typographical arrangement, and I believe, in their contents also, the
quotations here made from the first edition, will be found on the same pages of the
second.
scientific research? It was through the aid of the commentaries, in the first rank of which stands that of Patanjali; in the second the works of those master minds, the most prominent of whom are Śaṅkara and Mādhava-Sāyana. Without the vast information these commentators have disclosed to us,—without their method of explaining the obscurest texts,—in one word, without their scholarship, we should still stand at the outer doors of Hindu antiquity.

But to understand the value of these great commentators and exegetes, we must bear in mind the two essentials which have given them the vast influence which they have acquired. The first is the traditional, and the second the grammatical, element that pervades their works.

The whole religious life of ancient India is based on tradition. Śruti, or Veda, was revealed to the Rishis of the Vaidik hymns. Next to it comes Smṛti, or tradition, which is based on the revealed texts, and which is authoritative only in so far as it is in accordance with them. Hence a commentator like Mādhava-Sāyana, for instance, considered it as incumbent on him to prove that he had not merely mastered the Vaidik texts, but the Mīmāṃsā also, one portion of which is devoted to this question of the relation between Śruti- and Smṛiti-works. It is known that he is one of the principal writers on the Mīmāṃsā philosophy. Without tradition, the whole religious development of India would be a shadow without reality, a phantom too vague to be grasped by the mind. Tradition tells us through the voice of the commentators, who re-echo the voice of their ancestors, how the nation, from immemorial times, understood the sacred texts, what inferences they drew from them, what influence they allowed them to exercise on their religious, philosophical, ethical,—in a word, on their national, development. And this is the real, the practical, and therefore the truly scientific interest they have for us; for all other interest is founded on theories devoid of substance and proof, is imaginary and phantastical.

But it would be utterly erroneous to assume that a scholar like Sāyana, or even a copy of him, like Mahādhara, contented himself with being the mouth-piece of his predecessors or ance-
tors. They not only record the sense of the Vaidik texts and the sense of the words of which these texts consist, but they endeavour to show that the interpretations which they give are consistent with the grammatical requirements of the language itself. And this proof, which they give whenever there is the slightest necessity for it—and in the beginning of their exegesis, even when there is no apparent necessity for it, merely in order to impress on the reader the basis on which they stand,—this proof is the great grammatical element in these commentatorial works.

In short, these great Hindu commentators do not merely explain the meanings of words, but they justify them, or endeavour to justify them, on the ground of the grammar of Pāṇini, the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, and the Mahābhāṣya of Pāntajali.

Let us recall, then, the position we have vindicated for Pāṇini and Kātyāyana in the ancient literature, and consider how far this ground is solid ground, and how far, and when, we may feel justified in attaching a doubt to the decisions of so great a scholar as Sāyana.

We have seen that within the whole range of Sanskrit literature, so far as it is known to us, only the Śaṅhitās of the Rig-Sāma- and Black- Yajurveda, and among individual authors, only the exegete Yāska preceded Pāṇini,—that the whole bulk of the remaining known literature is posterior to his eight grammatical books. We have seen, moreover, that Kātyāyana knew the Vājasaneyi-Śaṅhitā and the Śatāpara-brāhmaṇa, and that, in consequence, we may assign to him, without fear of contradiction, a knowledge of the principal other Brāhmaṇas known to us, and probably of the Atharvaveda also.

Such being the case, we must then conclude that Sāyana was right in assenting to Patanjali, who, throughout his Introduction to Pāṇini, shows that Pāṇini’s Grammar was written in strict reference to the Vaidik Śaṅhitās, which, as I may now contend, were the three principal Śaṅhitās. He is right, too, in appealing, wherever there is need, to the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana; for the latter endorses the rules of Pāṇini when he does not criticise them, and completes them wherever he thinks that Pāṇini has omitted to
notice a fact. And since we have found that the Rāja-Prāśākhyā fulfills the same object as these Vārttikas, viz. that of completing the rules of Pāṇini, and that Kātyāyana's Prāśākhyā, which is later than that attributed to Saunaka, preceded his own Vārttikas, we must grant, too, that he was right in availing himself of the assistance of those works, all of which are prior to the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana.

That analogous conclusions apply to the Ishṭis of Pantanjali and to the Phīṣṭātras of Śāntana is obvious.

But it is from the chronological position in which these works stand to one another that we may feel justified in occasionally criticizing the decisions of Śāyana. Without a knowledge of it, or at least without a serious and conscientious attempt at obtaining it, all criticisms on Śāyana lay themselves open to the reproach of mere arbitrariness and superficiality.

For, if the results here maintained be adopted, good and substantial reasons—which, however, would first have to be proved—might allow us to doubt the correctness of a decision of Śāyana: if, for instance, he rejected an interpretation of a word that would follow from a rule of Pāṇini, on the sole ground that Kātyāyana did not agree with Pāṇini; or, if he interpreted a word merely on the basis of a Vārttika of Kātyāyana, we might fairly question his decision, if we saw reason to apply to the case a rule of Pāṇini, perhaps not criticized by Kātyāyana. Again, if we had substantial reasons for doing so, we might oppose our views to those of Śāyana when he justified a meaning by the aid of the Phīṣṭātras alone, though these Śūtras may be at variance with Pāṇini, for we should say that these Śūtras, "when compared to Pāṇini, are as if they were made to-day."

In short, the greater the distance becomes between a Veda and the grammarian who appended to it his notes, the more we shall have a plausible ground for looking forward, in preference to him, to that grammarian who stood nearer to the fountain head. Even Pāṇini would cease to be our ultimate refuge, if we found Yāska opposed to him; and Gārgya, Śākalya, Śākatāyana, or the other predecessors of Pāṇini, would deserve more serious consideration.
than himself, if we were able to see that they maintained a sense of a Vaidik word which is differently rendered by him.

This is the critical process to which I hold that the commentaries of Sāyāna may be subjected, should it be deemed necessary to differ from them.

These remarks apply, of course, only to the Saṃhitās which preceded Pāṇinī; for, as to the literature which was posterior to him, Kātāyāna becomes necessarily our first exegetic authority, and after him comes Patanjali. I need not go further, for I have sufficiently explained the method I advocate, and the exception I take to that dogmatical schooling of these ancient authorities, which, so far from taking the trouble of conscientiously ascertaining their relative chronological position in the literature merely exhibits, at every step, its own want of scholarship.

I must now, though reluctantly, take a glance at the manner in which the Vaidik texts, more especially their groundwork, the Saṃhitās, nay, how the whole Sanskrit literature itself, is dealt with by those who profess to be our teachers and our authorities. And still more reluctantly must I advert to one work especially, which, above all others, has set itself up as our teacher and authority—the great Sanskrit Dictionary published by the Russian Imperial Academy.

The principles on which this work deals with the Vaidik texts is expressed by Professor Roth in his preface to it, in the following words: "Therefore we do not believe, as H. H. Wilson does, that Sājana better understood the expressions of the Veda than any European exegete, and that we have nothing to do but repeat what he says; on the contrary, we believe that a conscientious European exegete may understand the Veda much more correctly and better than Sājana. We do not consider it the [our] immediate purpose to obtain that understanding of the Veda which was current in 1850.

India some centuries ago, but we search for the meaning which the poets themselves gave to their songs and phrases. We consequently hold that the writings of Sājana and of the other commentators must not be an authority to the exegete, but merely one of the means of which he has to avail himself in the accomplishment of his task, which certainly is difficult, and not to be effected at a first attempt, nor by a single individual. On this account we have much regretted that the meritorious edition of the commentary on the Rgveda, by Müller, is not yet more advanced.

We have, therefore, endeavoured to take the road which is prescribed by philology: to elicit the sense of the texts by putting together all the passages which are kindred either in regard to their words or their sense; a road which is slow and tedious, and which, indeed, has not been trodden before, either by the commentators or the translators. Our double lot has, therefore, been that of exegeters as well as lexicographers. The purely etymological proceeding, as it must be followed up by those who endeavour to guess the sense of a word, without having before them the ten or twenty other passages in which the same word recurs, cannot possibly lead to a correct result.

It would be but common fairness to allow these words of

---

Note of Professor Roth: "Wilson, a. a. O. II. p. xxiii." But the page quoted by Professor Roth does not contain one single word in reference to the passage which it apparently intends to bear out.

The first part of the Dictionary of Professor Roth and Dr. Beelheilig was issued in 1892; the first volume, which is prefaced by the words quoted, in 1855: the first and second part of the second volume in 1856; the third part of the same volume in 1857. Professor Müller's first volume of the Rgveda appeared in 1849, the second in 1854, the third in 1856.
Professor Roth to be followed by the entire preface which the
lamented Professor Wilson has prefixed to the second volume of
his invaluable translation of the Rigveda: the more so, as his
views have been unscrupulously distorted in the statement here
quoted; for though his views are supposed to be refuted by this
passage, they could not shine brighter, in genuine modesty, in true
scholarship, and in thorough common sense, than when placed by
the side of this passage, which I will not qualify but analyze.
But as I could not easily quote some twenty pages from Professor
Wilson's excellent work, and as I should scarcely do justice to the
manners of that distinguished man if I did not allow him to give his
full answer, I must leave it to the reader to obtain for himself that
contrast to which I here advert.

If, then, we analyze the ideas and principles presented in
the passage just quoted, they come before us to the following
effect:

(1) Sáyana gives us only that sense of the Veda which was
current in India some centuries ago.

(2) Professor Roth is far more able than Sáyana and other
commentators to give us the correct sense of the Veda.

(3) For, he can put together some ten or twenty passages re-
ferring to the same word, whereas Sáyana and other commentators
could not do this, but had to guess its sense.

(4) He is above confining himself to the purely etymological
process, which is that of these commentators.

(5) His object is not to understand the sense of the Veda which
was current in India a few centuries back, but to know the mean-
ing which the authors of the hymns themselves gave to their songs
and phrases.

(6) Professor Roth is a conscientious European exegete.

Before I give my Várttikas to these six Sútras, which define
the exegetical position of the Sanskrit Wörterbuch, I must observe
that I am compelled, by the very nature of this Preface, to leave
them in a similar position to that occupied by the Preface of Pro-
fessor Roth itself. His Dictionary is the test of the assertions he
makes. The test of my remarks would be a critical review of his
Dictionary. I hereby promise him that my earliest leisure will be devoted to this review, especially as my materials for it are not only collected and ready, but so abundant as to give me a difficulty of choice. But my present answer must, of necessity, deal with his generalities only in general terms.

(1) Sāyaña or the other commentators give us, he intimates, only that sense of the Veda which was current in India some centuries ago.

A bolder statement I defy any scholar to have met with in any book. Sāyaña incessantly refers to Yāska. All his explanations show that he stands on the ground of the oldest legends and traditions—of such traditions, moreover, as have no connection whatever with the creed of those sects which represent the degenerated Hindu faith in his time; yet Professor Roth ventures to tell the public at large, authoritatively and without a particle of evidence, that these legends and his version of the Rigveda are but some centuries old. I believe, and every learned Hindu will hold with me, that Sāyaña would have been hooted out of the country where he lived, had he dared to commit the imposition implied in this charge, on King Bukka, his lord, or on his countrymen. I hope, however, that Professor Roth will free himself from the reproach expressed by these words, by showing on what authority he gives such a piece of information, which is either all important for Europe as well as for India, or places him in the most ridiculous position that is conceivable.

(2) When an author tells us that he is able to do that which another author cannot do, we are entitled to infer that he is, at all events, thoroughly acquainted with all that this author has done. I am well aware,—I may add through the pleasure of personal remembrances,—that Professor Roth passed some time at Paris, and some little time in London also, when collecting his valuable materials for his edition of Yāska's Nirukta. Only in London and at Oxford, and, in some small measure, at Paris also, are the materials requisite for studying the Vaidik commentaries of Sāyaña obtainable in Europe. Does Professor Roth intimate by the statement above quoted, that his stay in these cities enabled him to
study and copy, for his lexicographical purposes—then not thought of—all the works of Sāyana, or that he, at Tübingen, is in possession of all those materials, the knowledge of which alone could entitle him to claim credit for a statement like that which he has ventured to make? But I need not pause for his reply. He regrets, as we have read, that “the meritorious edition by Müller, of Sāyana’s Commentary was not further advanced” when he closed the first volume of his Dictionary. Thus, when he began his “exegetical” work, he was only acquainted with the Commentary of Sāyana as far as the first Ashṭāka; and when he wrote these lines, he may perhaps have known its continuation up to a portion of the third Ashṭāka—in other words, no more than a third of Sāyana’s whole Commentary on the Rigveda; and yet he ventures to speak of the whole Commentary of Sāyana, and to say that he can do what Sāyana was unable to perform? But we almost forget that the words of Professor Roth are by no means restricted to the Rigveda Commentary alone; it embraces the commentaries to all the Saṃhitās. And here I am once more compelled to ask—Does he assert that he knew, when he wrote these words, Sāyana’s Commentary on the Sāmaveda and the Taittirīya-SAṃhitā, or even Sāyana’s Commentary on the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa? For surely he would not think of calling that Sāyana’s Commentary to this Brāhmaṇa, which has been presented to us extracted and mangled in Professor Weber’s edition of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. And yet he has the courage to pass this sweeping condemnation on all these gigantic labours of the Hindu mind, while ignorant of all but the merest fraction of them?

(3) Professor Roth no doubt enjoys a great advantage when he can put together some ten or twenty passages for examining the sense of a word which occurs in them; but I beg to submit that there are many instances in which a Vaidik word does not occur twenty or ten, nor yet five or four times, in the Saṃhitās. How does he, then, muster his ten or twenty passages, when, nevertheless, he rejects the interpretation of Sāyana? For it would seem that in such a case the “guessing” of Sāyana, as he calls it, stands on as good ground as his own. But the assurance with
which he implies that Sāyaṇa was not capable of mustering ten or twenty passages which are at the command of Professor Roth, presupposes, indeed, in his readers a degree of imbecile credulity which is, no doubt, a happy condition of mind for those who rejoice in it, and perhaps that best fitted for reading assertions like these, but which may not be quite so universal as he seems to assume. Mādhava-Sāyaṇa, one of the profoundest scholars of India, the exegete of all the three Vedas, as he tells us himself,—of the most important Brāhmaṇas and a Kalpa work,—Mādhava, the renowned Mīmāṃsik—he, the great grammarian, who wrote the learned commentary on the Sanskrit radicals, who shows at every step that he has Pāṇini and Kātyāyana at his fingers’ ends,—Mādhava, who, on account of his gigantic learning and his deep sense of religion, lives in the legends of India as an incarnation of Śiva,—in short, the great Mādhava, we are told, had not the proficiency of combining in his mind or otherwise those ten or twenty passages of his own Veda, which Professor Roth has

the powerful advantage of bringing together by means of his little memoranda!

(4) "The purely etymological proceeding," he says, "as it must be followed up by those who endeavour to guess the sense of a word, cannot possibly lead to a correct result."

By these words he compels us to infer, in the first instance, that the meanings which Sāyaṇa gives to Vaidik words are purely etymological; for when he illustrates his statement in a subsequent passage, by alleging such instances as "power, sacrifice, food, wisdom, to go, to move," it is clear that his sweeping assertion cannot be considered as merely embracing these six words, which, in his opinion, sometimes admit of a modification of sense. Just as he cancels the whole spirit of Sāyaṇa’s commentary, he tells us with the utmost assurance that the whole commentary of Sāyaṇa is purely etymological. There is, I admit, an advantage in boldness; for if you tell a man while gazing on the noon-day sun that he is actually in the darkness of mid-night, he may probably prefer
to doubt the evidence of his senses rather than venture to reject
the extraordinary news you bring him. I open at random the
three quartos of Max Müller; I look at every page once, twice,
many times. No doubt Professor Roth must be quite correct, for
my eyes are blind. But, since I suffer under this sudden dis-
ability, I may at least be permitted to quote that very page from
Wilson's preface to the second volume of his translation which
Professor Roth quotes above, as if it bore out his statement con-
cerning the "some centuries."

"As many instances of this elliptical construction," we read
there, "have been given in the notes of both this and the former
volume, a few additional instances will here be sufficient:—thus
(p. 301, v. 9) we have the 'grandson of the waters has ascended
above the crooked ——'; 'the broad and golden —— spread
around.' What would the European scholar do here with-
out the Scholiast? He might, perhaps, suspect that the term
crooked, curved, or bent, or, as here explained, crooked-going,
tortuous, might apply to the clouds; but he would hesitate as to
what he should attach the other epithets to, and the original author
alone could say with confidence that he meant 'rivers,' which
thenceforward became the traditional and admitted explanation,
and is, accordingly, so supplied by the Scholiast."

Thus, has Sāyana stopped at the etymological sense of "crooked-
going," or of "gold-coloured?"

But, in the second instance, though Professor Roth, of course,
possesses all the knowledge which these ignorant Hindu commen-
tators were wanting in, he implies by his words, that the mean-
ings he creates in overstepping the purely etymological process,
nevertheless rest on it. Since my reply on this point would have
to enter into detail, and since I have promised to give much detail
in the review which will be the commentary on my present re-
marks, I will merely here state that I know of no work which
has come before the public with such unmeasured pretensions
of scholarship and critical ingenuity as this Wörterbuch, and
which has, at the same time, laid itself open to such serious
reproaches of the profoundest grammatical ignorance. And, as
an etymological proceeding without a thorough knowledge of grammar is etymological thimberlig, I may at least here prepare the reader who takes an interest in such plays, for a performance on the most magnificent scale. Or to speak in plain prose, I shall prove to Professor Roth by means of those same authorities which I have so often impressed on the reader's mind, that his Dictionary has created many meanings without the slightest regard to the grammatical properties of the word, and, in consequence, that his Vaidik exegesis in all these numerous and important instances has just that worth which a Veda revealed by Professor Roth has in comparison with the Veda of India.

(5) The object of Professor Roth is "not to understand the Veda such as it was current in India a few centuries back, but to know the meaning which the poets themselves gave to their songs and phrases."

This is unquestionably most important intelligence. Sāyana gives us the sense of the Veda, such as it was handed down to him—not indeed a few centuries ago, but from generation to generation immemorial—yet within this Kaliyuga, I suppose. Nāgoji-bhāṭa, again, we have seen, tells us that in the various destructions of the world, the Rishis received new revelations from the divinity, which did not affect the eternal sense of the Veda, but merely the order of its words. But now we learn, for the first time, that Professor Roth has received a revelation at Tübingen, which as yet has neither reached the banks of the Thames nor those of the Ganges. He is going to tell us the sense which the original Rishis gave to their songs and phrases, at a period of Hindu antiquity, which is as much within scientific reach as the commencement of the world itself. Who will not hail this revelation which dispenses with grammar and all that sort of thing, and who will not believe in it?

And yet I have one word more to add in regard to Professor Roth's "direct communication with the Hindu divinities." He does not attach any importance, as he tells us, and abundantly proves, to that Veda which is the foundation of the religious

≈ See note 171.
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development of India; for that Veda is the Veda of Śāyāna, and that Veda, too, which alone concerns us uninspired mortals. But even Professor Roth himself professes, in another part of his Preface, the greatest respect for the native commentaries on theological and ritual books. There he emphatically exclaims (p. iv.): “Indeed, for one of the two portions of the Vaidik literature, for the works on theology and the rites, we cannot wish for any better guides than these commentators, accurate in every respect, who follow their texts word for word, who are untiring in repeating everywhere that which they have already said wherever there could arise even the appearance of a misunderstanding, and who sometimes seem rather to have written for us foreigners than for their priestly pupils grown up under these ideas and impressions.” How far his work has embodied the conviction expressed in these words which could not have been expressed with greater truth, I shall have to examine in my review. But I fear that these eloquent words must have escaped his memory in the midst of all the revelations he received. On the Rigveda we have already exchanged our views; but not yet on the other Vedas. These are avowedly extracted, or “milked,” as the Hindus say, from the Rīk. That the Sāmaveda is entirely taken from it, we have proof, and that the metrical part of the Yajus likewise rests on a version of it, no one will dispute. But both these Vedas are professedly not poetical anthologies. They are purely and simply ritual Vedas, and therefore belong—not only from a Hindu, but from an European point of view also—to the ritual literature. At the Jyotishṭoma, for instance, the priest chants, not the Rīg-, but the Sāma-veda hymns, though the verses are apparently the same in both. At the Asvamedha he mutters, not the Rīg-, but the Yajur-veda hymns. This means that, whatever may have been the “original sense” of such Rigveda verses, in their Sāma- or Yajur-veda arrangement which, in numerous instances, has brought Rigveda verses of different hymns or books, into a new hymn,—the Sāmaveda hymns and the Yajurveda hymns have only a value so far as their immediate

See note 75.
object, the sacrifice, is concerned. Hence even the most transcendental and the most inspired critic has nothing to do in these two Vedas with "the sense which the poets themselves gave to their songs and phrases," he has simply to deal with that sense which religion or superstition imparted to these verses, in order to adapt them to the imaginary effects of the sacrifice. As little as it would be our immediate object, when assisting at the horse-sacrifice, to ask what is the etymology of horse? or as little as it would be reasonable to trace the linguistic origin of a cannon-ball when it whistles past our ears, just so little have we to impart "the original sense"—I mean that sense revealed to Professor Roth—to the verses of the Sáma- and Yajur- veda, even when we are "both exegetes and lexicographers." And yet I shall give abundant proof that, even on these two Vedas, Professor Roth has had revelations of a most astounding character.

(6) "We believe that a conscientious European exegete might understand much more correctly and thoroughly the sense of the Veda than Sáyana." I should encroach on the judgment of the reader, if I ventured upon any remarks on this latter statement after what I have already said.

In now advertng to the treatment which the scientific and classical literature has received in the Sanskrit Wörterbuch, I need only say that this department is in the hands of Dr. Boehltingk. In saying this, I have said everything. After such an expression of opinion, it will, of course, be my duty to show, at the earliest opportunity, that Dr. Boehltingk is incapable of understanding even easy rules of Pánini, much less those of Kátyáyana, and still less is he capable of making use of them in the understanding of classical texts. The errors in his department of the Dictionary are so numerous and of so peculiar a kind—yet, on the whole, so thoroughly in accordance with the specimens I have adduced from his Commentary on Pánini, that it will fill every serious Sanskritist with dismay, when he calculates the mischievous influence which they must exercise on the study of Sanskrit philology.

On the present occasion, I must confine myself to these preliminary remarks, or at best content myself with advertng to one
other passage in the Preface to the Wörterbuch. It runs thus (p. vii.): “In order to facilitate the finding (of the words) for those who will make use of our Dictionary, we have to make the following observation. We have banished completely from the verbal roots the vowels ri, ri, and īrī, as well as the diphthongs at their end; for ri at the end of nominal bases we have substituted ar.”

Thus the Wörterbuch does not give, like the Hindu grammarians, a radical kṛi, but it gives kar; not klirip, but kulp; not jri, but jar; not pīkri, but pilar; not dāтри, but dālar, etc. Now, this Dictionary professes to be a Dictionary of the Sanskrit language, not of some imaginary idiom which may be current at Tübingen or St. Petersburg. One would therefore have supposed that the public was entitled to expect some reason for these changes,—to know by what scientific considerations the authors of this work were guided, when they took upon themselves the responsibility of thus abolishing the radical and nominal bases taught by Pāṇini and subsequent grammarians. But, in the fullness of its authority, this work does not condescend to meet any such demand: it simply cancels whole categories of grammatical forms, and those of the greatest importance and comprehensiveness. Whether I am right or not in inferring the arguments which were in the minds of its writers when they presumed thus dictatorially to impose their theories on Sanskrit philology, may be a matter of doubt, but my supposition is that this innovation is founded on researches belonging to comparative philology. It cannot rest on mere Sanskrit ground, since all the forms they have cancelled really occur as thematic forms in the Sanskrit language itself. Thus, to use the same instances: kṛi occurs in kṛi-ta, klirip in klirip-ta, pīrī in pīrī-bhis, dāтри in dāтри-bhis; and as to jṛī,—jirna can only follow from jṛī, not from jar. Their reasons, founded on comparative grammar, must then be these: that some bases in ri are represented in Latin by er and or, and in Greek by ἐρ, πρ, and ἐρ; pīrī-, for instance, corresponds with Latin pater-, Greek πατερ-, dātrī with dator- and ἔτερπ, etc.

Now even supposing that such an argument had any weight at all in a dictionary of the Sanskrit language, the application made
of it would be incongruous. For though pilār- corresponds with pater-, dātār- does not correspond with datār-; its representa-
tive would have had to assume the form dātār-. The whole
theory therefore, on the supposition I have made, would practically
break down, and the innovation would be inconsistent with itself as
well as at variance with comparative results.

But can such an argument be at all admissible? If a Sanskrit
Dictionary were concerned, like Professor Bopp's Comparative
Grammar, with eliciting from the forms of sister languages the
forms of that parental language whence they may be supposed to
have derived their origin, it would be defensible to give the forms of
that parental language itself. But a Sanskrit Dictionary can have
no such aim. Its immediate object is the actual language which it
has to deal with. It must take it such as it is, in its very devia-
tions from the germ whence it has sprung. Its function is not to
correct the real historical language, but to record its facts; and
in doing so, to collect the materials which are to be used as well by
the special as by the comparative philologer. And in so far as its
direct purpose is concerned, this is all it has to do. Any obser-
vations it may choose to attach to the real historical facts may of
course be given; but it shows an utter want of judgment, to say
nothing else, when it presumes to alter the very forms of the
language itself.

I may venture also to add a few other observations on the forms
thus cancelled in this "conscientious" Sanskrit Wörterbuch. It
is known that many Sanskrit bases, and amongst them the bases in
ri, undergo various changes in their declension and otherwise.
Pitri, for instance, becomes pilār, in the accusative pilār-am, while
it remains as it is, in the instrumental pitri-bhis; adhi remains so
in adhi-bhis, but its base is adhan, with the loss of a, in adhan-ā;
asti forms asthi-bhis, but asthi-ā. Now there exists a paper of
Dr. Boehtlingk on the Sanskrit declension; but whoever reads it
must fancy that the language either played dice with these and
similar forms, or is undergoing some remarkable cure. He talks of
bases "which are strengthened as well as weakened," of bases
"which are only strengthened," and of bases "which are only
weakened.” Why language should nurse and physic its bases, as we learn from him, no one will understand. But a sadder spectacle of the treatment of a language or of linguistic facts than is presented in that paper, it is not possible to imagine. The reasoning there is exactly on the same level as the reasoning in the “edition” of Pāṇini, of which so many specimens have now become familiar to the reader of this Preface. Exactly the same game at dice or the same vagaries of disease reign in this Dictionary: thus, though the declension phenomena of akṣhi, asthi, dadhi, are identical, and acknowledged to be so by Dr. Boehtlingk himself in his paper on Declension (§ 69), in his Dictionary he discourses on the first noun under akṣhan, and again under akṣhi, while, on the contrary, if we look to asthi, he refers us to asāhan; and if under his guidance we now go to dadhan, he requests us to seek for information under dadhi.

But since the linguistic hospital, which is opened in the works of Dr. Boehtlingk, is fortunately not the place in which the Sanskrit language lies,—for this language has had a sound and rational development—it will be obvious to everyone who happens not to be placed under Dr. Boehtlingk’s treatment, that there must be reasons for this variety of thematic forms which constitute the declension of the same base. And as there are such reasons, the immediate consequence is that we cannot decide, a priori, whether kartar be the “strengthened” form of the original base kartri, or “kartri” the “weakened” form of the original base kartar. Such a decision can only be taken after a thorough investigation of the influences which cause this change, of the nature of these influences themselves, and of the manner in which they work. And as language does not sit down like a school-boy, first to master the declensions, then the conjugations, and so on,—but as the influences I am speaking of are influences which are traceable in the whole organism of language itself, it is obvious, too, that such an investigation would not restrict itself to the phenomena of declension merely, but extend over the whole area of the linguistic development.

When I myself assumed the responsibility of writing a Sanskrit
Dictionary, I considered it incumbent on me to devote a most serious research to those little facts which, as we have seen, are despatched in five lines by our modern "exegetes and lexicographers." Six years have elapsed since I laid my first results, so far as lexicographical purposes are concerned, before the London Philological Society, and it is only the desire of giving them in their full bearing and extent that has hitherto delayed their presentation through the press. Now, it is questions like these—questions which, in my mind, ought to be decided with the very utmost circumspection, and which cannot be decided without very laborious research,—it is questions like these which have been trifled with in this Wörterbuch in the most unwarranted manner. It does not show that it even understands the important problem which lies in its path; it briefly informs the reader that it has cancelled all the bases in $ri$, $ri$, $iri$, etc. and bids him—good-bye.

Patanjali,—let us for a moment repose after this dreary journey through the Wörterbuch,—Patanjali on one occasion thus speaks to us: "When a man is in want of a pot, he goes to the house of a potter and says: (potter), make me a pot, for I have occasion for it. But (surely) a man who wants to employ words will not go, like the other, to the house of a grammarian and say: (grammarian) make me some words, I have occasion for them." Happy Patanjali! blessed in thy ignorance! Here we have potters who can fabricate—and not simply meanings of words, but the very words themselves, and words, too, which you laboured so earnestly, so learnedly, so conscientiously, to save from the pottering of all future "exegetes and lexicographers." Nay, we have, too, men who can repair to these potters, and call for, and admire, their linguistic wares!

When in the presence of these extraordinary facts, which, unhappily, must silence the expression of all the acknowledgment—
nay, of all the admiration I really entertain for the immense industry displayed in this Wörterbuch,—when with that deep sense which I entertain of the duties and of the influence of a Dictionary, and, in the actual condition of Sanskrit philology, more especially of a Sanskrit Dictionary,—when with these convictions, the earnestness of which, I believe, is proved throughout the whole of this investigation,—when—I will not conceal it,—under the indignation and grief I felt in seeing a magnificent opportunity thrown away—as I shall abundantly prove that it has been thrown away in the case of the Sanskrit Wörterbuch,—when under these impressions I uttered a warning, five years ago, in the "Westminster Review," a warning contained in three pages, there ensued a spectacle which, during my literary experience, stands without a parallel.

Professor Kuhn,—not indeed a proficient in Sanskrit, nor having ever obtained any position amongst those who are earnestly engaged in Sanskrit philology, but—as a contributor of quotations to the Wörterbuch, launched against me the grossest personal invectives which ever disgraced the pages of a scientific journal. As sound, literary argument was beyond his range, he indemnified himself, and gratified his employers, by calling me names. Unfortunately for him his abuse could produce no effect upon me, for the following reason. Amongst the few critical remarks for which I had room, in the "Westminster Review," there was one which illustrated the manner in which Professor Roth had translated a ritual text. This remark was expressly written for Professor Kuhn's amusement as well as that of Professor Weber. For, at a small Sanskritic party which used to meet every fortnight at Berlin during the years 1847 and 1848, I had shown them the Commentary of Mādhava on a Mīmāṃsā work, the editing of which I had then commenced, this Commentary being the proof of the assertion I had made in 1855 in the "Westminster Review." Professor Kuhn heartily enjoyed, at one of these meetings, the precious translation of the passage in question from the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, given by Professor Roth, in the preface (pp. xxxviii-xli) to his edition of the Nirukta. Nay more, so anxious was he to possess its substance, before it was published, that in my presence he took notes from
the Commentary I am speaking of,—viz., that of the Jaiminifya-
nyáya-málá-vistara. And in the invectives to which I am allud-
ing, he does not deny the existence, nor yet the value, of my
evidence, but he words his defence of Professor Roth in so studied
and so ambiguous a manner as to create in the minds of his readers
a suspicion as to the reliability of the statement I had made,
though its truth was perfectly familiar to him. 260

20 In possession of the information I am speaking of he writes as follows: "Der
letzteren stellt der verfasser eine bedeutend abweichende des commentators gegenüber,
da er aber nur der kommentator und nicht all the commentators oder almost all the
commentators sagt, so ist stark zu vermuten, dass noch andere commentare existieren,
welche den text wahrscheinlich in der Rothschen weise erklären werden; dabei nehme
ich natürlich den Fall als ganz unmöglich an dass der verfasser (der nichts als die
übersetzung giebt) etwa selber den commentar missverstanden haben sollte" i.e. "In
opposition to the latter [viz. the version of Professor Roth of the passage in ques-
tion] the reviewer gives another of the commentator which is considerably different from
it; but as he merely says the commentator, and not all the commentators or almost all the
commentators, there is a strong probability (sic!) that there are other commentators
who probably (sic!) explain the text in the manner of Professor Roth. With these
words I assume it, as a matter of course, to be plainly impossible that the reviewer who

Now, a writer who has recourse to such weapons as these has
laid aside those qualities which are necessary to retain a man within
the pale of a gentlemanly consideration, and his language, however
gives nothing but the translation, should have misunderstood the commentary."—That
Professor Kuhn had not the slightest doubt as to who was the author of the review in
question, even he will not venture to deny; for he has stated the fact in letters and in con-
versation. But even if he had any such doubt, he knew that I was in possession of the
commentary, for he had taken notes from it. If, then, the asseretment of truth alone
had been the object of his remark, as the public might expect of an author, and if
his notes were not complete enough—which, however, I do not admit—the time required
for a letter to me and an answer back, that is to say, five days, would have sufficed to
give him all the information he could wish for. It requires, however, no statement from
me that his object was not to inform his readers of the true state of the facts; it better
suited his purpose to insinuate a doubt as to the correctness of the translation I had
given. Indeed, Professor Weber,—who, as I have mentioned, possessed the same know-
ledge and had obtained it in the same manner, as Professor Kuhn, settles the point.
Though he did not remain behind his colleague in scurrilous abuse, and though, in
speaking of my translation, he shows his usual levity, he, nevertheless, plainly and
openly acknowledges the full reliability of the translation I had given, on the ground of
the Mīmāṃsā work. He says: "er kennt nämlich offenbar nur die systematisierende
Erklärung der Mīmāṃsāschule, etc.;" i.e. "the reviewer obviously knows only the sys-
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gross, and adapted to his own character, can not touch one who does not stand on the same level with him.

A similar exhibition took place, I am grievous to say, in a journal of high standing and respectability, in the “Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.” It is a salutary practice in the journals of all learned societies, not to admit into their pages scurrilous or libellous attacks against individuals; and this practice has been rigidly adhered to in the journal to which I am advertising, with the single exception of my own case. Professor Weber, who is also in the service of the Wörterbuch, suddenly attacked me in this journal,—not, indeed, with anything that deserves the name of argument, but with personal abuse of the coarsest kind. Five years have passed by, and at last a sense of justice, which does credit to himself, has re-entered the mind of Professor Weber; and in the last number of the “Zeitschrift,” which reached me when this Preface was nearly completed in print, he has fully and honestly retracted all his former calumnies; still, however, combining with the compliments he now pays to my Dictionary, the remark that my views of the Wörterbuch show a perfect derangement of my mental faculties, since I do not reject the authority of the greatest Hindu scholars as freely and easily as the work he so assiduously praises.

I am certainly in no humour to find fault with the opinion which he entertains of my mental condition, for it will always give me a sense of safety and satisfaction when I find him bearing testimony to the vast distance which separates our respective modes of studying, and judging of, Hindu antiquity. But, as he has chosen to connect his opinion of me with a piece of scientific advice, this seems a fitting opportunity for illustrating, once more, his competence for passing a judgment on matters of Sanskrit philology.

He says: “Another, third, essential difference [between the Wörterbuch and my Dictionary;—I, myself, trust and hope that
attentive readers will find many more essential differences than
three between the two works] consists . . . . . in [my] not mark-
ing the accent of the words."

In his opinion, therefore, the Wörterbuch does mark the accent.
Now, setting aside the very considerable quantity of words which
are not marked with any accent in this work, the instances in which
it is marked there seem to satisfy the scientific requirements of
Professor Weber. I ought, then, to mention, in the first place, that
in all such cases the accent is put there over the word without any
further explanatory remark. But I have shown that there are periods
in the known Sanskrit grammatical literature—that the first period
is that of Pāṇini, the second that of the Rik-Prātiṣākhya, the third
(perhaps fourth) that of Kātyāyana, the fourth (or perhaps fifth) that
of the Phīṣṭisūtras; and that, as we continue our descent, we have
the period of the Kāśikā, Kaumudi, etc. Thus, marking an accent
without saying to what period such an accent belongs, and up to
what period it remains in force, is giving evidence of the greatest
superficiality,—it is showing, too, that the difficulties of the question
we are speaking of, were not at all understood. As regards myself,
I believe I might have entered into such detail, since I have con-
sidered it my duty to turn my researches into this channel also;
and if the scientific and liberal disposition of my publishers could
have disregarded all material considerations in the case—and could
have added still more to the great concessions of space which they
have already made me, to their own material detriment, since the
publication of the third part of my Dictionary,—I should have been
able not only to give quotations historically, which the Wörterbuch,
notwithstanding Professor Weber's bold assertion—I will not attach
to it another epithet—does not give, and to discuss the matters of
accent,—but even to re-edit, little by little, the Commentary to the
Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa, as I have already done on several occasions,
in order to prove the meanings I give, and which meanings no one
could gather from the text as edited by Professor Weber. No
doubt, I might have done all this had I been perfectly independent
of material considerations. But, at all events, had I, in marking
the accents, contented myself with that which satisfies completely
Professor Weber's scientific wants, my Dictionary would have become as superficial as the book which he has qualified as a work of the "most scrupulous conscientiousness." 291

In adverting to Professor Weber's advice, I may as well quote one more instance from his impartial illustration of the difference between the two Dictionaries. It concerns the meanings of words in both. But as I have adverted to this subject before, I need now only say, that he describes the Wörterbuch in the following manner.

"It represents," he writes in the 'Zeitschrift' "the principle of reality in contrast with the historical proceeding of interpretation [which he says, is mine], by allowing the words to interpret themselves through the chronological order (sic. !) of the quotations added to them, and through these quotations themselves, the authors always quoting the native exegesis also, but merely as a secondary means." 292 And of myself he says, that my "orthodox faith in the authority of native exegetes and grammarians" is something perfectly bewildering; indeed, it presupposes the "deregangement of my mental faculties." 293

It requires all the levity, on the one hand, and all the hardihood, on the other, which are the mixed essentials of Professor

291 In his libel he says; "dieses Werk des bewundernswerthesten Fleisses und der sorgsamsten Gewissenhaftigkeit."

292 "Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft," vol. XIV. p. 755: "Die Haupttendenz, die er [i.e., myself] hierbei verfolgt, besteht eben—and dies markirt einen ferneren Haupt-Unterschied von Boeckhings-Roth—darin, dass er es sich zur Aufgabe macht, die Ansichten der einheimischen Erklärer und Sprachforscher zur prägnanten Geltun gen zu bringen, während Boeckhings-Roth diesem historischen Erklä rungsverfahren gegenüber das sachliche Prinzip vertreten, die Wörter nämlich durch zeitliche Ordnung der betreffenden Stellen und durch eben diese Stellen selbst sich unmittelbar erklären zu lassen, wobei sie die einheimische Exegese zwar auch stets anführen, aber doch nur als sekundäres Hilfsmittel betrachten."

293 Ibid. p. 756: "Persönliche Beziehungen haben uns seitdem überzeugt, dass der Verfasser bei Abfassung jenes, für uns allerdings immer noch geradezu unbegreiflicher, Angriffe auf das Petersburger Wörterbuch dennoch wirklich im völligen Rechte zu sein glaubte. Es setzt dies freilich nach unserer Ansicht eine Art Verirrung des Denkvermögens voraus, wie sie auf sonstigen Gebieten nicht selten ist, hier aber in der That be-
Weber’s literary productions, to allow an author to come before the public with statements like these. As for myself, any one may see that there are various instances in my Dictionary where I plainly state that I differ from the etymologies or meanings given by the native authorities. These cases of dissent are certainly not frequent, because a serious investigation of the native grammarians led me in most instances to appreciate their scholarship and the correctness of its results; nor have I the presumption to supersed them with mere vague and vapouring doubts; but that I have ground sometimes to differ even from the views of a Kátyáyana or a Patanjali, Professor Weber will have probably learned now from the foregoing pages, though he might have learned it already from my Sanskrit Dictionary, which he is good enough to favour with his advice. His statement, therefore, concerning my blind belief in all that the Hindu scholars say, is founded on that same overweening superficiality which, as we have seen, leads him to assume the responsibility of schooling Kátyáyana, whom he does not even understand.

But as to his description of the Wörterbuch, I know not how to qualify it without using language which could only be used by a Professor Kuhn. It is one of my most serious reproaches against the Sanskrit Wörterbuch, that it not only creates its own meanings, and by applying them to the most important documents of the literature, practically falsifies antiquity itself, but deliberately, and nearly constantly, suppresses all the information we may derive from the native commentaries. I have intimated that the great injury they have thus done to the due appreciation of Hindu antiquity, would have been lessened had they at least, as common sense would suggest, given by the side of their own inventions the meanings of Sáyána or Mahádhâra or of other authorities, and thus enabled the student to judge for himself. Yet while the reader may peruse their Dictionary page after page,
sheet after sheet, without discovering a trace of these celebrated Vaidik commentaries, while the exceptions to this rule are so rare as to become almost equal to zero, Professor Weber dares to speculate on the credulity of the public in telling it that this Dictionary always quotes the native exegesis!

When a cause has sunk so low as to have such defenders and require such means of defence as these, when its own contributors and its noisiest bards have no other praise to chant than such as this, it seems almost cruel to aggravate its agony by exposure or reproach.

But the spectacle exhibited on the appearance of my remarks in the "Westminster Review" does not end here, and its epilogue is perhaps even more remarkable than the play itself. In the same "Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft" there followed another act, which is so characteristic of the system pursued in these attacks, that it deserves a special word, merely for the sake of curiosity. An individual whose sole connection with Sanskrit studies consists in handing Sanskrit books to those who can read them, a literary naught, wholly unknown, but assuming the airs of a quantity, because it has figures before it that prompt it on,—this personage who, as his own friends informed me, is perfectly ignorant of Sanskrit, he, too, was allowed to give his opinion on the Wörterbuch. I need not say that, in the absence of all knowledge of the subject itself, it merely vented itself in the most grandiloquent praise; but, to complete its mission, there was added to this fastian language, in reference to me, such as certainly was never heard, or admitted, before in a respectable journal of any society. He need not tremble lest I should drag him into notoriety. Nature has not fitted him for estimating the ridicule to which he exposed himself in becoming the mouthpiece and the puppet of his instigators. If he deserve anything, it is not chastisement, but pity, and the mercy of a charitable concealment of his name.

And all this outrage, not only against the interests of science and truth, but against the commonest rules of decency, was committed in a series of planned attacks, because I had warned the Sanskrit Wörterbuch of the danger of its career, and had not expressed any admiration for Dr. Boehlingk's competence or scholarship.
It was then, and on the ground of observations I had made in regard to his want of proficiency, that I was called upon by one of his men, not only to have respect for the "editor of Pāṇini," but even for the hidden reasons he might have had in foisting on the public his blunders of every kind. The "editor of Pāṇini" was held before me as a symbol of scientific accomplishment; his "edition of Pāṇini" was the great thunderbolt which was hurled at my head by one of these little Jupiters.

For eighteen years I have been thoroughly acquainted with the value and the character of this "edition" of Pāṇini; and yet, from a natural disinclination to antagonize with those who have similar pursuits to my own, I have refrained from appraising the public of the knowledge I possessed in regard to it. Twelve years have passed since I explained my views on this book personally and for doing so." The real nature of this statement of Professor Kuhn will become apparent from the review which I shall give of the Wörterbuch. But his information, as it is, is not without great interest. Thus, according to this quotation of the Wörterbuch, its authors pass over in silence the labours of the Hindu grammarians—not because they see reason to adopt the results of the latter—but because these labours have the honour to meet with the approval of Dr. Boehtlingk and Company. Under any circumstances, however, it was but natural and rational to pass them over in silence and to suppress the information they give.—for, either they have the honour of being approved of by Dr. Boehtlingk, or "the editor of Pāṇini" had probably his well-weighed reasons for not agreeing with them; and, in the latter case, there was of course not the slightest necessity that he should give or even allude to these important reasons. The passage quoted would alone quite suffice to illustrate the character of the fulsome adulation and of the puffing advertisements—written, of course, exclusively by the employed scribbs of the Wörterbuch—which for some years have made their appearance in some literary journals of Germany, and have not only misled, but imposed upon, the public unacquainted or imperfectly acquainted with Sanskrit philology.
privately, at our Sanskritic parties, to Professors Weber and Kuhn; and the longer the interval passed over, the less I felt disposed to speak of it in print. At present, after twenty years' time, I should have considered it almost unfair to rake up the past; for a sense of charity would have told me that the moral and intellectual condition of a man may undergo considerable changes during so considerable a period of his life. But in spite of my strongest desire to combine the defence of literary interests with a regard for all the circumstances connected with the author himself, I am not allowed to remain silent, in consequence of the insolent provocations which I receive. Not only does Dr. Boehlingk quote his "edition" of Pāṇini, in his Wörterbuch,—not only does he thus force it, as it were, on us by the references he makes to it, and acknowledge it to this day as his legitimate child,—but one of his own scribes, well acquainted with the judgment I should pass on it, has the hardihood to defy me publicly, by bidding me have respect for the "editor of Pāṇini."

Well, then, I have taken up this impertinent challenge. In so far as my present subject permitted, I have illustrated the nature of this immaculate book; and it will not be my fault if I am compelled to recur to it again.

Still a provocation of this kind alone would have as little induced me to take up my pen now as it did heretofore; but when I see the public told authoritatively, yet without any proof, that Śāyana teaches that understanding of the Veda which was current in India no longer than a few centuries ago;—when I see that the most distinguished and the most learned Hindu scholars and divines—the most valuable, and sometimes the only, source of all our knowledge of ancient India—are scorned in theory, mutilated in print, and, as a consequence, set aside in the interpretation of Vaidik texts;—when I see that the most ancient records of Hindu antiquity are interpreted to the European public in such a manner as to cease to be that which they are;—when a clique of Sanskritists of this description vapours about giving us the sense of the Veda as it existed at the commencement of Hindu antiquity;—when I see that the very forms
of the language are falsified, and that it is made a principle to slur the grammar of Pāṇini, and to ridicule those who lay stress on it;—when I see that one of the highest grammatical authorities of India is schooled for a "want of practice and skill," while this censure is passed without even an understanding of the work to which it refers;—when I see that they who emphatically claim the epithet of "veracious," make statements which are the very reverse of truth;—and when I consider that this method of studying Sanskrit philology is pursued by those whose words apparently derive weight and influence from the professorial position they hold;—and when,

moreover, departing from rule and precedent, I see the journal of a distinguished Society—I fully hope through an oversight of its editor, though a Professor of Sanskrit himself—permanently made the channel for propagating such statements as I have described and qualified, together with these scandalous personal attacks and calumnies,—then I hold that it would be a want of courage and a dereliction of duty, if I did not make a stand against these

Saturnalia of Sanskrit Philology.

On this ground I have raised my voice, however feeble and solitary for the moment, and have endeavoured to examine the competence of those who set themselves up as our masters and authorities. On this ground I have endeavoured to vindicate for Pāṇini the position he holds in Sanskrit literature, and the position he ought to hold amongst honest Sanskrit philologers.

University College, London,
November 2, 1880.
लेखक: [लेखक के नाम]

आयात: [आयात का सार]
तत्र तपस्वी रजतं पदं अस्वरुपं तुष्यं कल्याणं विद्यं कोशलं तथापि भयं कृत्यं बुद्धिः।
धर्मेन्द्रते धर्मपर्यंत च भयं कर्म पर्यंत धर्मैप्रवर्तयात्।

चित्रेशुर्गति द्वारं तत्र तपस्वी रजतं तुष्यं कोशलं तथापि
धर्मेन्द्रते धर्मपर्यंत च भयं कर्म पर्यंत धर्मैप्रवर्तयात्।

चित्रेशुर्गति द्वारं तत्र तपस्वी रजतं पदं अस्वरुपं तुष्यं कल्याणं
विद्यं कोशलं तथापि भयं कृत्यं बुद्धिः।
धर्मेन्द्रते धर्मपर्यंत च भयं कर्म पर्यंत धर्मैप्रवर्तयात्।
मार्यादाविद्यार्थी उदारों किल्ले तरंगपथा रश्मियांतः वांछित त्रयोग्य पत्ता युधि सः विद्यमान करते निःस्थान विद्या प्रति मौर्ययुता समीपपत्रा हैमसुखी त्रिष्णा दमिदस्त्रक वृक्ष दस ताहिते तेजस्वीस्य वर्णलेखन पद्म निष्ठावाज विलास स्त्रियां ध्यात वक्ष्यादप्तात तुहाँ यथार्थ रहिराहिरायां स्त्रिया मनन्तविक्रिया तृतीय एवं स्त्रियां स्याह्यस्त्रां वस्त्ररहित श्रीदः स्त्रिया पर्यंत न सत्वो दृष्टीनाथ विद्या रसेन श्रावणपञ्चमवर्षो य पवार संकृतिविद्या रस्यात्ता श्री स्त्रीचल लक्ष्य पवार जन साधनां अंतः राज्यां गानिंद्रीदिवस विद्यामित्रो वात्मिक हिरायां श्रीस्वरूप अंतर्महत्त यमी स्त्रियां मानिसि मैथिली विद्या ब्रह्मी नित्यपूर्वत राज्यनिःयविद्या रस्यात्ता दिव्य ब्रह्मीकरणीक वात्मिकी दिव्यवात्माः निःयो गानित सहा दुर्यश्च चक्षु नन्तज्जातसामासाः दुर्यश्च चक्षु नन्तज्जातसामासाः
विन्दुराज के बाद दिनली दिन पहुँचती गानी सालां गाने गये राज्य अधिकारिक युग मानवता तरंग की नींवें जन मानव वर्तमान तथापि वे ये साज़ीद के दृश्य, दुःख दुःख रोमांचलया।

वर्तमान अवस्था में, मूल भाषा में लिखा गया।
नस्यात्मन् मातृश्रिः धार्ततिति पुनः नमी कादिर्ज्ञकर्त्या वर्त्तति तत्त्रात्म महादेवेऽस्य स्मातत तासां तनुवं च तत्त्वत्त्वार्द्धसंग्रहा न परंत्यात सिद्धमे तिथिः समस्ते वै वैश्विकम् यहामना दुः स्थाने दिनिगित्याय द्रविद च ग्राह हु यक राशुप्य सुन्दरविद पर गणित द्राहा तनोत्तिविद र यथाश्रयश्च इति भास्करे भगवद्गुरु महादेव जोत्तमर्मणा सृजयो श्रुत्यात्मानं स्मात्ति सह च चिं दनयाय मश्वरासाधुं च एकस्य एकस्य इति दिनिये क्रियानुसार न ज्ञातस्य चतुर्भूतं दिनिये क्रियानुसार सत्स्रिगुणां न ज्ञातस्य चतुर्भूतं दिनिये क्रियानुसार सत्स्रिगुणां न ज्ञातस्य चतुर्भूतं दिनिये क्रियानुसार सत्स्रिगुणां न ज्ञातस्य चतुर्भूतं दिनिये क्रियानुसार सत्स्रिगुणां न
न्याय

उपक्रम २

अर्थादिपिपदे शैवसंदा वालमय न निर्ग मुर्तिन द्वार श्रीराम न यथोत्वे कर्माणि कोषम वर्तितं द्वैत्याय व मेंदा नारायण स्वीकार सुपालितता सार्वम राधृष्टीवर्णमेते सविक्षेपणा। महेश्वर द्वितीये रूपे बहुविविध तीर्थहृदये तवु तत्त्व स्वविशिष्ट या मयाप्य क्रिययशीतितः स्वतित यो हुम्हमी। कार्यनिषेठ साप्ताहिक तत्त्व द्वार समाप्ति विज्ञानविद्या व वर्णन वर्धमान कु ल परिदृश्यान्तर रंगत मध्ये कक्षे न परंतु रन स्तरात स्तुतिः हनुमन्तो का प्राप्त के अनुरोध गुंडा व अनुरोध स्रियं के समय तत्प्रथम स्वतः निश्चित तप स्त्राद पद्मादी हुम्हमी। सम्भार ताप वर्तीता निबिधानी कोराय दना दैवत सीरा द्वारन लायुषत सर्वे विशिष्ट मानिसू प्रतिपादित की तत्त्वोत्तर दृश्यत र प्रथा प्रथा हृदयनार्कत स्वतः।
ब का ४

चृत्तिविवेक या प्रतियोग्यता अवतिर्प्यते प्रमृत्व सबै देर निधाना दृढ़। चतुरुं गड़करी नक्शेणपात्र सादनाकै दाहिन्योत्तेष नाग्नतत्त्व प्रतियोग्यता आवतीति त्य अद्य ग्य नश्यकर तै तत्र निवेद्य प्रतियोग्यता मा अतिसों मय्या व यणा कुरु राजन नादी ज्य वर्षिते प्रजन्य रत्नेर दिन ज्ञन मा नयेव यायु गम्भीरता पद्धती या ध्रुवते 

तेनत्र एक क वनात त तु से सिक मनाता स मानदेश्विरिस्स्तम्योग्मात्रायथि 

de 

व धाविकरणाति त यु रंग पक्ष वनात त तु मन्त्रस्या दृतिनिविदितिप्रक्षानन्दरे 

नरुणात दृति रचिहीय मानवान्ध सरिषतीयान्त्त्विदिं दृष्टिं ज्ञान न्यायामर्गाया}

9 धायकुलामें अस्स
चिह्नाना छत्राला दश्यापूर्वक एवं वर्षा तथा दाटू तालीगांव र झुल्लरी के निर्मितित में विलीरित रही गाड़ी ठाकुरनगर गाय दाटानर बैठे से कलौन जा ती निर्मिति के देश नामे सह राजाप्रदेश काष्ठ के वर्षा तथा दाटानर बैठे सह नै शासन वर्षा के देश नामे सह देश नामे वर्षा के देश नामे सह देश नामे सह देश नामे सह देश नामे सह देश नामे वर्षा के देश नामे सह देश नामे सह देश नामे सह देश नामे आधिकारिक तैत एवं हानिवाला तथा जाति पथकार तेंदुल्ला साईत प्रेमरेण्य ग्रीवा के फंसाने का रही गाते दाटानर त्रिशार्दीय दाटानर त्रिशार्दीय दाटानर त्रिशार्दीय दाटानर त्रिशार्दीय दाटानर त्रिशार्दीय दाटानर त्रिशार्दीय दाटानर त्रिशार्दीय दाटानर त्रिशार्दीय
रूप का लेस्टर विनिदिनद्वार द्वारा ताप टांक तक किक डाला ना। यूं नां नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां यूं नां

तोत माति किच दा तो मधुबन दिवों दर्दुरुप वह हो। आदिश्वर ज्ञात श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री

तिविरुद्ध अंग्रेज शास्त्र अंग्रेज मिश्रित शिक्षा संस्कृति द्वारा तेत्रुप युग पदेवर द्वी पदेवर द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी

विवृतृ मर या दी युगप दादावे दों सा दन्त वंदना जीवनधारी नरपपूजा। सदन सूर्य ज्ञानिति उपलोक्य संपरक चित्रित्व वातावरण तथा रञ्जिन तारा यूं शिष्य शिक्षित रूप वे त्रान युगप के द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी

यो गोपिनाथ जी मुरली भवानी भट्टाचार्य एवं गुरुदेव से प्रारंभ निर्मिति स्त्रादे वे द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी द्वी
न च्यादमाहै दैवत्य का तुलना दीनार्थिपथ्यानं प्रतिवाक्यं मंत्रानन्दः तथा य तपस्या न रत्नकाले चरित्रस्तोत्रं ताप्य मेताः संका श्रद्धा वनिम्तीर्गतिस्त्रात् त्रस्ती विनाकृपाः प्रतिप्रतियोग्यस्य मंत्रार्थं संस्कृतिमन्द्रीपि धौत्तर्वृत व विलिः तद्यहिंद्रैस्तेर्गते स्तिपस्तिन्ह रमे कं स्याृते न चषार्थं न हेकत्संकुलं वेदाविचारं तथा सैनावपतिधावस्य पद्यम् तिस्त्रिस्त्रिवव पतितं सर्वा दैष्ट्रापि सर्वस्कृतिमन्द्रीपि नात्रुदास्यम् तं तथा विप्रमधुमेत्त्रकं मृत्तिकयाः दीनामुनि क्षणस्तिना नान्त्र्यावयविश्वासिकं ध्वनिन्यात स्था संमले संहितिवथा एण्णनिविभाति स्या संज्ञोत्सर्वोत्सर्वोमेव दानं संधि च चित्रम सत्त्वाद्वृत्तं दानं संज्ञोत्त पूर्वेण नामी नामयमेव नामिन संहितियाः नात्रुदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्वनि नात्रूदास्य ध्यायं काठ्स्तु स्वभावनः प्रत्यक्तर्वं निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वं खो निगयत्र्योत्तर्वः
चंडे के कुलान हैं नैसर्गिक रूप से प्राकृतिक सदिक ज्ञान की रूप में वर्तमान रूप से रोजित तो होया नहीं। अतः स्मारक अनुपालन वाले रूप से नहीं रहें। इतर दृष्टि के मत में स्मारक अनुपालन वाले रूप से नहीं रहें। इतर दृष्टि के मत में स्मारक अनुपालन वाले रूप से नहीं रहें। इतर दृष्टि के मत में स्मारक अनुपालन वाले रूप से नहीं रहें। इतर दृष्टि के मत में स्मारक अनुपालन वाले रूप से नहीं रहें। इतर दृष्टि के मत में स्मारक अनुपालन वाले रूप से नहीं रहें।
संते दायुरितिव आरतिकानं प्रके वाक्य समा अस्मिन ज्ञाते तोसीत्या दिनानं यज्ञो सीतलं तीन नयवतत् तलनिधा मन्त्रिधा युक्तु दयामेदातु ज्ञातप्रसंजीवा ध्यान निन्दाः अरु यख्या स्वातोतिज्ञस्वा हृता घटातृ त्यात्मक संबंधे ध्यानि घुड़ा कुशाव क्रोणी युक्तु नता द्वारा वाक्य स्मितमन्त्रं तपस्या संशया मानिकया वो सुधात्रा तीता देविवर्धेन निन्दाः हादरविर द्विविरिलत्र्यों तोतु हृत्यों तत्र प्राप्तवर्त्या व्यापारी न वीरयावतिन्त्रा स्यूत्सु योग्यवक्तु रुद्धित्वत स्या एक वस्त्र निन्दीशः समाकृष्णिदिनायो दिनायेत सत्यमथनविया तीत्या वीरन डीप्रयोगित इति वनिश्चयेकं संबंधे य जिनं दिनायं देवों स्थानात व दृश्यों अर्थितिप्रभेकं संबंधे विशेष येष्वी दीनः तवस्त्रविव्यासविशेष्यत घान य घृतवियत प्रवीत इति वहे द्विवर्धेनान्तः अव मकराविशेष धर्मियां न तीति तत्त्वान्तं न समाचारियभिषिंक्ष्यां किम ध्यामिदं स्तुत्या
तत्त्विनिर्मेयः

तत्र स्मात क्रत्रा प्रश्नति क्रमेत्। स्माय चित्त हैं। तपस्विनं वर्तिक्षितं धर्मं युक्तं धर्मं च।

तस्माच्छानुसारं यथार्थं तत्स्मात् कथ्यते। स्माय चित्तो तस्मात् कथ्यते।

तिबबुद्वीर्दाशीलितं हस्तिनं यथार्थं धीरं। उपायमोहस्तां योजयति श्रु।

मरियात्। त्रजनणेन तत् काले कुसम्बराचकारात्मक प्रवर्तिते।

तात्त्विक हस्तिनं उपस्तास्ति। तथापि तत्र आनु चतुर्वेदौ यथार्थ धीरं जन्युर्तयति।
यस्मिनकर्ता तत्तद्वन्द्वा याप्राप्तिः सीतोलि नर्मकर्ता स्याने ते इरु ख्याता राज्यावर्ग्या द्वारमें प्राप्ताता दिन आला न जन्मा। तत्थत ततका नागं पदवी तृतीया पादोऽपि कुचिन्या यस्मि ते कृतम् नानास्वरूपं। यस्मि न्यायान्तरिता तयादिरस्त्रापणपुंजाः। युद्धवर्त न उपाधिः। केदार में यादितिः। उपाधि। यत् एवंपुरेश एवं ग्रंथाय एवं ग्रंथाविशेष एवं। धर्मविशेषं एवं विशेषेश्वराविशेषन। प्रतिष्ठावस्त्रिता ववनाति। कण्ठनाधर्मः। कमतिं यानुरुक्त। देविरूपाः। या राज्यायमिकं। वर्योत। तत्र सा रघुकुपम्येनविशेषं ऐवं पाश्चिमी संचयं तिनापना। रक्षण्यान्तरत। स्तान्तरत। तस्माजपम्यन्ति पाल्या। यजु वेदी। नेपाल सत्कर्मम्यन्तितलकृति। ज्यापुर्वकेष कान्तकक्षकी। दहनतित्र। युक्तिः। समर्पितेऽस्या त्यज्ज्वाति। वेदिनेश्वरेऽपि दितिः। या तु नुँसु त्यज्ज्वाति। ज्याद्वादूऽद्वीपः
नजिकित्व ने पिताभ्यक्ति दिया यज्ञतंत्र वचन मात्र ज्याधी वह उर्दू विधितता पाठक कौर दियते छिपे बनाकर ने साधी वार वंती या दे जान्यांशे बेटेन कर बंगले जा यहाँ घनान निर्धारित तुरुपारा ज्यावे तुमारे द्वार वार वंती या दिसायंगु ल्यात्पुर प्रक्षेत्र नागान स्थितता। स्वायं साम चाहे नाकारे विद्वान मस्तित चामी प्रतिहार कान्तिरेष्टार ज्यानांशे ए बाला तेका धान न्योग उत्खानियार दो देवनिवधा नात्शाह धानी गः साम दा नाम लाल मेले जदुं वापसे न तर द्वार धान काम हेतु बड़े निरंदेशित स्थाय वार धार्मिक देवी हरियाल्याय निर्पय ते मो एमास; ये अग्नि सीलिय द्वार धार्मिक वास्तविक कितां स्थान या यागत्यां र शिखर गात रिष्ट नाण्याते। अगरी एमास नाथ योई शिखो एमास यो। अंधान या मात्रिक योक्त्रिक ने कर्त्तान्ते।
पाठ चैनल तट्टकि। सच्च दया कुलता समाज में कुछ विद्वान निर्माण का काम करते हैं। सच्च दया स्मरण करने अवश्य आवश्यक है। हां सुधीरसुधीर ही समय में सामाजिक विकास का समय है। समाज के लिए उपयोगी उपकरण है। दया का समय आयुष्य का समय है। दया का समय समय से अधिकतर है। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा। दया का समय समय से होगा।
सहै दक्ष्याय नमस्ते
यह न्यायशास्त्र दृष्टि से नहीं है कि क्या यह न्यायसाधी या किसी अन्य साधारण न्याय के रूप में विचार किया जाता है।
चरित्राश्रथा दावा सा सामाद्वादी धस्यादेशां प्राणाविश्वेत तनो दोऊँ। पवित्र आरसाना नेत्रहपा दीना मायापूजा हुए ए लिं गति विगल्गित स्वस्थ सिसः कु नीतिक तिच्या धारणविशिष्ट उनिमायशाधिकार मान स्था वा किंचीतिग्राहकार ए तान्यां विद्राहिरस्मा वसलेखिक पालिक्षेत तिस्व सी राज्य स्थानात दीर्घित स्यास्ना तू या मार होम वषमबुद्धा ती मिस्िर तिस्व स्या विस्मायाय यथा दीनेन्द्रस्ते उल्लभेन्द्रेष्य ब्रह्मण पाठ्यलाभ स्याव राज्य स्त्राभ्यास्त्रानंदात् मान स्याव धर्मिने दीर्घशिरसीये वनस्पतिकर्षरुत्तमयायाय। किम हिमरा दीर्घशिरसीये वनस्पतिकर्षरुत्तमयायाय। द्वाराध्वरं ब्रह्म दीनेन्द्रस्ते उल्लभेन्द्रेष्य ब्रह्मण पाठ्यलाभ स्याव राज्य स्त्राभ्यास्त्रानंदात् मान स्याव धर्मिने दीर्घशिरसीये वनस्पतिकर्षरुत्तमयायाय। किम हिमरा दीर्घशिरसीये वनस्पतिकर्षरुत्तमयायाय।
परम व तैतिका ल नियमात्मकता निर्देशनें कुर्नात्रूष्य नविधानं। कर्त्तर हरसीणुतातृत्या द्रिप्तिप्रस्ततं तस्यहं च रत्नाविधानं न वल्लक्ष्मी अन्नां। उपहिता नैव त्रिषुं समर्थिन्द्रहर्षदद्रवीयोऽभिकारः। स्त्रिविष्णुछुट्टाधारनेनेनेनर्च्योऽध्यास्योऽच्चित्तस्यात्तुखः। सत्तिजचतिस्यर्जितायुन्मेयः कर्मन्तीतो त्वरिष्णुनुस्तिपुष्प मानस्पदितामार्धीपः। द्वार दद्व्यमात्र तत्रा दद्व्यमात्र दद्व्यमात्र सरस्यां। ततः शंकर दद्व्यमात्र ततः शंकर दद्व्यमात्र ततः शंकर दद्व्यमात्र ततः शंकर दद्व्यमात्र ततः शंकर दद्व्यमात्र ततः शंकर दद्व्यमात्र ततः शंकर दद्व्यमात्र ततः शंकर दद्व्यमात्र ततः शंकर दद्व्यमात्र ततः शंकर
तत्रस्मात्ति क्षितिङ्गला वत्कम्मधूतिः सुदृढ़हृदया त्रिधम्ममतुपत्रमपन्तपे विपक्षं तिंयं धर्ममहं अनेकं रत्नं विस्तुर्तिस्पर्शं रत्नं विद्धरतिम् यतं दृष्टिन्तसंविकर्षन्त यं नं दृष्टिन्तसंविकर्षन्त तत्त्वं नं दृष्टिन्तसंविकर्षन्त तत्त्वं नं दृष्टिन्तसंविकर्षन्त तत्त्वं नं दृष्टिन्तसंविकर्षन्त तत्त्वं नं दृष्टि‌
त समान दुःखनां दंग चिदाभासुः। दृष्टा वक्ता लपिन्दित्या गता सा त्रिच्यः।
अत्तिदयात्त्र देव मुक्तिवानं ततो नागानांतरं प्राचीन देवानामितिविश्वास चिन्ति दिति
चरगेते प्राणेऽन्द्रा मनोज्ञकं न कर्मान्तित्विनां गतामितिविश्वास यो शापादशु प्राणां शरीरं
हवधासा। स्वयं समानतानिवेदित्यस हृदयं स्वयं श्राद्ध श्रुता श्रृंगार श्रुतं विशिष्टं धितू स्वतंत्र ततो विषयं ग्राहितन्तो जीवितम्।
कलंकिते। ततानं च त्वा वायुर्माणि सुभुत्वाद तिथिनस्तेष स्वातिति हृदृदं कृतिकान।
वायुवाच तु वायुर्माणि सुभुत्वाद तिथिनस्तेष स्वातिति हृदृदं कृतिकान।
नात्र वायुर्माणि सुभुवन्तेष स्वातिति हृदृदं कृतिकान।
नात्र वायुर्माणि सुभुवन्तेष स्वातिति हृदृदं कृतिकान।
विज्ञापत्र लिखने से पहले हमें स्पष्ट नहीं तरीक़ा नॉट ग्रहण किया है यदूनाथ ताला ज्ञान के बाद हुए से हम ऋतु वादातित्र की तरह प्रशिक्षण वादाति का शास्त्र में नहीं है। विदेशी ग्रामीणों के आर्थिक स्तर या गाढ़ी का शास्त्र वादाति में स्थान देखते हैं। वह अभिनव कुलदीप के ग्रामीणों को हिन्दी वादाति वादाति का शास्त्र वादाति में स्थान देखते हैं। वह अभिनव कुलदीप के
नील ग्रीष्मकाल जननी वादागिरी गामळ नादी में लाटिशुला अंकुकरी स्वाध्यायमान के प्रियजन माता चित्रनाथ रत्न। पर चिट्ठी जनतरों के छेँटे नल्ला जन गामळ एक थुक नगरी सिखिये गामळ नगरी दिल्ली का माता उनले तल रतों। इतर जानका अंधाधुंडा रतों ने गा ईंपत्ति सिलचापन बुला। असिने असस्तिरुख चुने तो। अस्पोर्षा राज्यों देश्य निल्ली दर्शन स्प्रे मन्दिर स्थापना रतेविभिन्न नुतल सिद्धकर नेत्र निमित्तिक निलिंग के नील सिलचापन असस्तिरुख कलन्तुर्य तृती को श्री हैंगे दाद मसिल मुख चितन्तु भी श्रीत वर तर तून्द्र जन्ध। गोपुर को नैन्यापरस्पर नक्षार्य ने देवतादुर्गने गाम नें मुख एक हर दण्डनिप्पन। अनाशावत तुलापने। प्रेयम गा लौं दादधुरें रंगें नुछ। देव दुर्बाणिज तुलुकुलु दुर्बाणिज वारुं नातिन्दर नहुन्त्यास्त यतस्तायी अत्य रात स्वरुपरिरितिने असरी तीर्थ
तांत्रिको स्वप्नापरिष्ठतानालागु मध्यातृपति तिरस्करणस्य नित्यश्रवणार्थ भाष्यितस्य नामध्याने केंद्रातिस्तम्भिताः।
अनेन तथावतु केवल तद्धित सर्व सुभव्यता तीर्थाष्ट्रवर्ण द्रापुश्चिरं क्षेत्रंतिरि़ अविश्वसनाः।
श्रावो त राजिविष्ट्यतं विद्यां यथ्यथा। श्रिविष्णु प्रस्सराय नातिस्तव्याद्यसमम्।
सोऽञ्ज्ञानं प्रकटस्य राजाः। नु नातिस्तव्याद्यसमम्।
त्वेपित्वेक निपुदारसाम्यक्षेत्रसमुक्त्युतनातिस्तव्या चार्दीवेच्यु न खेजुन र्वार्तेद्वादिक्षविष्यां।
महाकर्मोऽहो न विष्णुर्दवार्तेद्वादिक्षविष्यां। भाष्यां त्रावणं त्वस्ततिरिति। श्रवणं त्रावणं त्वस्ततिरिति।
कृतार्थका तत्त्वस्तेन रुपात्रकला र्वाच प्राधुत आश्रयी यथा। राज्यार्थांसमस्यं त्रावणं
त्वस्तएस्ति। त्वस्तार्थस्ती। रुपात्रकला र्वाच नातिस्तव्याद्यसमम्।
जानन्त्युत्तुनाग्रनिमित्ताः कृतार्थका तत्त्वस्तेन। रुपात्रकला र्वाच रुपात्रकला र्वाच।
श्रवणं त्रावणं त्वस्ततिरिति। श्रवणं त्रावणं।
ब्रह्मजित् शंकयते दार्शनिक विद्वाना संस्करण सुस्मानुसार अनेक नेवण संस्कृत विचार से ज्ञान कम सविरण पिता छेत्र को जन नैसुल्य निर्माण स्थापना राहत नैसुल्य निर्माण स्थापना जन नैसुल्य निर्माण स्थापना जन नैसुल्य निर्माण स्थापना जन नैसुल्य निर्माण स्थापना जन नैसुल्य निर्माण स्थापना जन नैसुल्य निर्माण स्थापना जन नैसुल्य निर्माण स्थापना जन नैसुल्य निर्माण स्थापना जन नैसुल्य निर्माण
मृत्यु वर्गमय कर दें ज्योति जगत दिखानेदर व एमहवा धर्म तुर का एक संन्यास अग्नि, अवेन। तत्काल रहे युद्ध काल वैराग्य दीक्षा दी पूर्ण। तत्काल रहे युद्ध काल वैराग्य दीक्षा दी पूर्ण।
महत्त्वपूर्ण रूप से, संस्कृति के वंश मार्ग में द्वारा दर्शाया गया है, जिसमें संबंधित विषयों का महत्त्व दर्शाया गया है। यह विषय में संबंधित है तथा संबंधित है, जिसमें संबंधित है, जिसमें संबंधित है।
यहूदी स्थापत्य व भंडारण अनुसार यह निर्मित भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्या मनोहारी भवन समग्र संगीत लीला निर्मिति भवन प्रायोगिक रूप से मनोहारी यह ब्रह्मचर्यা
दिनु राय दर्पण तिलक राय दर्शित चारा। पैरंदिलक क्षार कर्ण करंगत तिलक कृष्ण दीः।

भावासो भावासो भावासो भावासो।

व्यंजन लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय।

न व्यंजन लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय।

न व्यंजन लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय।

न व्यंजन लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय।

न व्यंजन लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय।

न व्यंजन लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय।

न व्यंजन लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय कृष्ण लय।
तेन वर्तमानां स्वरूपम्। तद्रस्ते जानन्तर दाधिं तु
श्रेष्ठाः सरूपां विशेषविनयाः। साध्विषेत् तदावख्यानिविभूति। ते द्वैतस्तु ब्राह्मकृत्व च तन्नेतां न भवेद्। उत्तरतं इतिर्हि द्वियो शास्त्रादिश्तीश्च श्रेणयोऽभिभगुरस्वदहिष्ठितात्।
प्र रशोक्षिताः स्वाभवः तत्त्वात संगतज्ञः तद्विज्ञान ध्यायिनः। हेद्याद्विविधानेन श्रवणक्षिप्तातु ध्यानमात्रात्सु त्रित्वेतिरं दद्धितां। नो च श्रवणं विनयं ज्ञेयं योऽहः। गान्तर धीरे रोगा गायम्
स्येति स्यात्मात्विक्षत स्वात्मः नान्यत्वात् चिन्तनं विज्ञविनयं। शास्त्रीयः उप्रव लसंहिअसलेनूतराः
ज्ञु सति सुय धित्ता शास्त्रादिनीतो ते नागात्मात्विक्ष्योमित्रोपनिविनीतते। पुनाच्छाय धितिवननस्ता धितिवननस्ता धितिवननस्तातु धितिवननस्तातु धितिवननस्तातु धितिवननस्तातु धितिव
धितिव
धितिव
धितिव
धितिव
धितिव
धितिव
�ितिव
धितिव
धितिव
क्यामुखक विज्ञानिक शास्त्री एवं उन्होंने किम कर्मकांति विज्ञानिक निर्देशक देवको वर्तमान संयुक्त विकास और विज्ञान द्वारा विश्वविद्यालय में किया गया। वर्तमान संयुक्त विकास और विज्ञान द्वारा विश्वविद्यालय में किया गया।
दृश्य स्थानमात्र यथा। दासिनें नौकर दंगवीस्ति स्या पयामान संस्कृतबुद्विने रहस्याद प्रभुकशाल रीतिविशेषात् दितीयो दृश्यीमय विशेषात्। दरबार स्थिरतापूर्वक प्रवर्तित ब्राह्मण महर्षि राजेन्द्र प्रसाद पूर्वरूपवत्र स्वराज वि-वंवित कारुणिकता विनाश्य प्रज-अल्पत्विता धरात्मा जातकमाण अपा घटित। यहाँ समान विषयों विषयों तीव्र संस्कृतिक विज्ञान विधाय विपरीत तत्त्वों विकास कर्माधारी विभिन्न रूपों सहायता स्वरूप स्थान प्रवर्तित कर्मों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपসे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वांछित विभिन्न रूपों सहा विशेष रूपसे वां�ि
चरणोंके तांत्रिक चर्चा करते हुए हर छात्र द्राक्षनुकूल नारायण चतुर्वेदी द्वारा टिप्पणी की गई है। किन्तु द्राक्षनुकूल नारायण चतुर्वेदी द्वारा टिप्पणी की गई है। इससे मान्यता अद्वोक तथा न्यायालय में अध्याय के नीचे बिंदुओं में नोटिकल में स्थिति कार्यान्वयन के लिए एक नई श्रेणी में संगठन की गई है।

चरणों के तंत्रिक चर्चा करते हुए हर छात्र द्राक्षनुकूल नारायण चतुर्वेदी द्वारा टिप्पणी की गई है। किन्तु द्राक्षनुकूल नारायण चतुर्वेदी द्वारा टिप्पणी की गई है। इससे मान्यता अद्वोक तथा न्यायालय में अध्याय के नीचे बिंदुओं में नोटिकल में स्थिति कार्यान्वयन के लिए एक नई श्रेणी में संगठन की गई है।

स्वामी जय जय श्री राम
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शास्त्रीयद्वारा कहा जा रहा है कि यदि नाते स्वतंत्रता की प्रतिभा नहीं हो तो यह नहीं होगी। यदि मानव जानसाना हो तो वह नहीं होगा। तब तक जीवन का सत्ता होगा। इसलिए यह भी स्पष्ट है कि जीवन का सत्ता होगा। इसलिए यह भी स्पष्ट है कि जीवन का सत्ता होगा।
विद्वान् मानविको निरूपणात्मक विज्ञानाः संस्कृत शृद्धावृत्त सार्वजनिक रितिविद्या पित्र पाल्यन्न नलम्पृते। आत्मसिद्ध समाधिको नला द्वारा बहुधृष्टसहित दशननय उगान पित्रुण्या दर्शने चतुर्थय ते जीव चिन्तित करितवात मध्युरविषयम नक्षिकारिक तद्धे विष दिणो मिरित द्विशाश्रयमुद्रास्वरूपीपान्तिहृदियं चित्रेण पहिरी कर्तव्यं नापृते वाक्यो विश्लेषणात् तद्विषयम गुढ़ितिशालाय ति दहलिया नृत्य तरालिपिक्रम वाक्यो यथा यथा यथा यथा यथा यथा --- हीं इस आयुष्मानी उदारायास मकालिपिक्रम करित्वा दुस्तलक्षमित्व्यानां ध्येयं कृतं ध्येयं नाम न मण्डितिश्वर पवित्रतीति सर्वात्मक स्थायित्वं कुमारिनिः प्राणवंकुपिती यज्ञो स्थानं कमलफूल अति यज्ञवादन प्रेमिको तस्मात् बतृत्वं रूपानि दृश्यं । । ।
इस्माइल घाटेय द्वारा जीव तैयर नसिमियिंद्रनिधि नां लुभाते ते परितोषित मस्तिराज वो नुकुल हेलर देव याना। श्रीमती वेलोपित दिव्यता मर्द मन्त्रातिक म्‌इक्श्यं दं च त्रित्य मा। पिंड मित्रो।

इस्माइल घाटेय द्वारा जीव तैयर नसिमियिंद्रनिधि नां लुभाते ते परितोषित मस्तिराज वो नुकुल हेलर देव याना। श्रीमती वेलोपित दिव्यता मर्द मन्त्रातिक म्‌इक्श्यं दं च त्रित्य मा। पिंड मित्रो।
यात्रिने जैविकांबाहिनंसतं स्मृतिमिवन्तीष्ट्रो। साधित्यो तस्मात्सुपर्वस्त्रों तत्क्षे एवंतत्क्षे तिष्ठते परिधानमात्रात्न द्वेयत तत्त्वादित्यावद्वेय स्मृतिमिवा च यास्मिन्त्यप्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। त्त्वात तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति। तथा द्वावेयाः प्रवेशातः श्रवणं तर्त्वेति।
संन्हनानारंगनरथ्यतिदीपः संभवा स्फूतः स्वरुपमन्त्रः मांसः प्रति वासुकिः।
वसुणारयः रंदेनः दुर्योहेतुदारिकाः गितं प्रसंस्य द्वारे प्रघातमिनगेशः।
अरुङ्गे वर्षजयेन तरियाः सल्वते द्रिष्टिनाथाः।
हृद्यमध्ये श्रीतरूपं श्रीतारिणी।
सतरजा सुलभाय देवीश्रीहृद्यगृहसाधनः।
प्रक्ष्यमुनि प्रवेश्यस्ति विखलाताः प्राप्तिसमिति विषयकृतमृतमण्डलः।
प्राप्तिश्रीमाण्डलः न तेजस्वि।
प्राप्तिसमिति विषयाः प्राप्तिसमिति विषयाः।
प्राप्तिश्रीमाण्डलः न तेजसः।
निकृष्ट लघुपाठ दें। अमर देव देवनदिव्य रूप अधिष्ठित ज्ञान त्वाहिः निर्णये दर्शन संतानिः। अनुज च तद् नामसंरक्षणात्मक रूपे सहित्य गम्यात् श्रवणी तत्तत्त्वोपरिपूणे दर्शन महाशिव रुपम्। नित्य तत्तत्त्वोपरिपूणे दर्शन महाशिव रुपम्। नित्य तत्तत्त्वोपरिपूणे दर्शन महाशिव रुपम्।
रक्ती पूर्ण मणि नों लें। चंद्र मंत्रिशीर वर्षवृत तार्किक चंद्र मंत्रिशीर वर्षवृत तार्किक चंद्र मंत्रिशीर वर्षवृत तार्किक चंद्र मंत्रिशीर वर्षवृत तार्किक चंद्र मंत्रिशीर वर्षवृत तार्किक चंद्र मंत्रिशीर वर्षवृत तार्किक चंद्र मंत्रिशीर वर्षवृत तार्किक
तिरा त्रिवेणु तुग्रां ब्रह्माद्वितीयमाविविधेयो तिरिविमिश्रित्रमेविश्वासित्रुतिरस्तिः\nसुरक्षितमेवहितोष्ट्रायानन्दोत्सवीत्रमेक्षणात्
तिरिविबन्धोत्सवीत्रमेक्षणात्

tiraa trivedhu tugraam brahmaavitriniyam evvimishretram evishesvarasritratrasat
savesvarahetvarasmayogasravanandatosvaa

tiraa trivedhu tugraam evamesvarahetvarasv-Assishtiranandatosvaa
विषयार्थमात्रातिरेकमेषकीसङ्कल्पितानीयसार साधारण व्यक्तिकी \nराजीमात्र आठके होते. वे व्यक्तिकी चारणीय सारसंग्रहानि काहीसङ्ग्रहानि \nराजीमात्रातिरेकमेषकीसङ्कल्पितानीयसार साधारण व्यक्तिकी \nराजीमात्र आठके होते. वे व्यक्तिकी चारणीय सारसंग्रहानि काहीसङ्कल्पितानीयसङ्ग्रहानि
न भसाजिन नास्त्रेणाः
सनस्य दर्ध्रयतात्रादर्शादियाः स्वाग सत्ति प्राणु युक्त विच्युतर्वने मानिवदत्ता स्वाते चतुर्वती विन मच्चे प्रत्य रस्त्यतिक देवेश्वरिकुण अपूर्वर्तप्रपात्यतियां ध्याना स्त्राद्वितिसम्साजित स्त्रातिसिद्ध सौभावस्तुतिरितिरिक अवलहणाधिक पद्मासनानिव स्त्राजनिविवस्य स्त्रायूज्यात छेड छेड़ फलविभाषावत्व
ग्यात्य एव एव मनुश्रवास मध्यमं तरवर रस्यानां सुभाष्यन अविभाय कर्तारा नैश्चर्यमात्स्यातुर्विद्विद ध्रुवादेशी लयान्सर्वावताए मने करि तौतिकां मयाय या युपुप्रशङ्कात्मक नैराश्च तस्मानी मातिज्ञ मिदन विनाशक अविभाय कर्तार धर्मान्ति विश्व शुभिप्राणिको ज्ञानितहृदयिन्क नागरंत्रिताय प्रतिनिधित्वी चुतुः प्रवन ले जो ज्योति तथा तदनुष्ठानोत्तरत्री वर धेरेष्मित्यधीयादेश भूलित्वान्वप्रतिन इव
25
बादुं जाते नापिएरूपम्बा संस्कृतविश्लेषणयोग्यिता विश्वविद्यालय में देने का वर्णन नहीं है।
西藏地方，其海拔4000米以上，冬季严寒，夏季温暖。地理位置的重要性在于它的战略位置，连接着中国与印度、尼泊尔、不丹等国家的贸易通道。该地区拥有丰富的自然资源，包括高原草场、矿产资源和河流资源。西藏地方的行政管理由中央人民政府负责，其政治领导由西藏自治政府承担。
वाद्योग्न कृतिभिऽ मृत्युशिला व श्रापयोग्न च नेवहे दिवानिमित्त यज्ञसिद्धं मेधे बिचार येकथा मुद्दितमात्र तस्य तथा वशस्वप्रक्ष्या श्रविशिष्टादि दुन नानोदिति देवताश्च विश्वासां त्वो प्रभुक्ष्यास्तु धर्मत्। श्रवान्तर्घाता दिलीताय निमित्तः मृत्युं तस्ने अन्नमा योग्याः पुत्रात्मनुः पत्तमारहक्का एव द्वितोषाय भगवायो ते तत्सहास्यं श्रवण्यं श्रवणेऽर्थातवं श्रवणं तत्सहायसं विशिष्टाय पुत्राः लोकबनिष्ठ यस्तिसं बैंड्याये अर्थात्स्मापिता ज्ञायते अन्तः सक्षरतं शुद्धमण्डलसिद्ध। नित्रेणंप्रपदेक्षीयो निमित्तं अतिरं ते देव सुमुख्यं देवान्तः समतमानं दिवस्य निर्क्षुद् यथाक्षेत्र इति देवशास्त्रपुराणम् नात्यभाषाओ तत्त्वमिति सिद्धो द्वन्द्वते सन्मानेतर्घाते तुषादिकायो गृहस्थानात्मकाः संधित्तं सन्नियते।
सन । श्री प्रदेव लाल की धीरवती धीरौषधी नितिन्त्रिथ धीरौषधी दिने वृद्ध हो रही है। उन्होंने ज्ञान देव के साथ खेल हुए। बालक हुए वे देखते हैं। उन्होंने बालक की मदद की और किसानों को उन्होंने निर्देशित किया। उन्हें तत्कालीन क्रियायें पूरी करना पड़ा। उन्होंने अति सहज तात्पर्य से बहुत कठिन अवस्था में तरीक़े सोच कर उत्साहित ती सहन कर निर्देशित करने का प्रयास किया।
फल्वाकानीय सिमलितता तितिदी धर्मकुसंतंत्रसंतश्रृंखलायतिसुभाषेतेत्कलसंतंत
उपायातंत्रमाधुर्यस्वयमाकालिकतिमलिकिया योंत्र चारसंतनायस्यसंतिकृतम
त्रसेतौः त्रसेतौः। प्राप्तेनलिपिसुवग्नानायानुपुर्वकरूपसे स्वरूपायतितिदी ईश्वरानन्दकालिक
वहृत्या एकिप्रियहिदेशात्मकाध्यायानमस्वरूपः सादी क्षिप्रमुखुष्मानिमित्रस्य। अवेदनोत्र द्वयः
प्राप्तेनलिपिमभावदेवेवां संवेदनायास्यमोत्सर्वस्य लोकः। अनालवत्मकमा निशाचरत
स्रूत्तुस्यात्रशास्त्रवोद्योगस्विप्रस्तुतप्रौन्तुष्पूर्वककालिकतितिमेवार्थिवे। एक वर्षालिंगः
ञ्च नैवेद्यनेममा नवार्थिवेद व अनौषधियोगाम्य। वाचुमन्त्राद्यस्य तत्वस्य तत्स्वरूपतत्त्वानाश्रयति
ध्यासत्तात्स्य एकाश्च स्त्रियाँ विवाहकार्यतिधिभिन्न इतिप्रथम रंजसूक्तव्रक्षानी तत्त्वेवकर्तकाना
दिति के अधिकारिक हा एलो एक धामपुरुषेतस्यः परिप्रेक्ष्येतें निर्दितास्य घरजुश्रेरिक वचना
प्रतिस्तिध्वनिक्रमनात्मक स्त्रतां स्त्राः स्त्राः ॥१॥
न भ्रष्टेष्वर्यांनंतरैः अन्यायंवा बलद्वैव चतुरंतरानि।

१२. चित्रसीमयोऽवेषसैद्धान्तकूटस्य अनंते

अत्रुप्तरूपदृश्यते। विकल्पवेषसैद्धान्तकूटस्य

अनंते। तथा साधृणु कालयानुपवर्तितस्य विद्वेषसैद्धान्तकूटस्य

अनंते। विकल्पवेषसैद्धान्तकूटस्य अनंते।
तक्षकुमार सिंह वाल्मिकी द्वारा पुस्तक में लिखित है कि यह कहा गया है कि यह धर्मसौध जी के जीवन के दृश्य के लिए विश्वासपूर्वक संस्कार होता है। इसलिए, इसे ध्यान से पढ़ना जरूरी है।
उपरोक्त संदर्भ से उपलब्ध दृष्टि से यह स्पष्ट है कि इस कथा का समाप्ति स्तर यह है कि क्षणों के दौरान राजपूत राजा का जीवन पूरा था जिसमें उन्होंने सामाजिक संस्कृति, संस्कृति और आधारित राजनीति के लिए सही दिशा दी।
कृपया विवरण सहित प्रश्न करें।
तत्त्वज्ञानेन मम चिन्तास्वरूपेण प्राणिभवति। यदां बालयमानी ज्ञानेन प्राप्तं श्रवणं च। नामस्वरूपम् प्राणिभवति। यदां भूमिधिन्यं खस्मस्वरूपं च। नामस्वरूपम् प्राणिभवति। यदां विद्ययमानी ज्ञानेन प्राप्तं श्रवणं च। नामस्वरूपम् प्राणिभवति॥

भूरुपे नामस्वरूपे लोकमय। नामस्वरूपे च भूरुपे कर्ममय। नामस्वरूपे च भूरुपे च ज्ञानमय। नामस्वरूपे च भूरुपे कर्ममय। नामस्वरूपे च भूरुपे च ज्ञानमय।

चन्द्रकाण्ठ ब्रजवस्त्र ।

गुरुदेवस्वरूपनाम्।
गाँव के समारोहों

परम्परागत वाणिज्य का महत्त्व पहलू खोजते हैं। यह समारोह वाणिज्य और सांस्कृतिक परम्पराओं को दर्शाता है। यह समारोह वाणिज्य के हिस्से के रूप में रखा जाता है। इन समारोहों का महत्त्व उन्नयन के लिए बढ़ाता है।

इन समारोहों का उद्देश्य उन्नयन के लिए सांस्कृतिक कला-कलाश को बढ़ाता है। इन समारोहों का महत्त्व उन्नयन के लिए महत्वपूर्ण है।
श्रुण्यसमीक्षण सत्ते चित्रकिति प्रमाणात्। का सौरिपुरस्तर यज्ञानुसार प्रस्तुत्रिते । नृत्येषु कार्योपाल कांस्त्का योज्य वाहिकाः प्रमाणात्। नृत्येषु कार्योपाल यज्ञानुसार प्रस्तुत्रिते ।

श्रुण्यसमीक्षण सत्ते चित्रकिति प्रमाणात्। का सौरिपुरस्तर यज्ञानुसार प्रस्तुत्रिते । नृत्येषु कार्योपाल कांस्त्का योज्य वाहिकाः प्रमाणात्। नृत्येषु कार्योपाल यज्ञानुसार प्रस्तुत्रिते ।
सिंहर लिखित है कि तिथि नामक व्याख्यायों में तीतर क्रमागतात्मक वशों द्वारा वाक्य क्रम अपनी सेवा करती है। नागरिकावि नोतितक इतिहास योगीतारविधाना दो माँदिरंदिवंभन्य होता संदर्भ तीतर मन्दिर स्थापित है। इसको तत्काल स्थापना किया जाता है। ज्योतिष तीतर समाप्ति हो तो उसे योजना में व्यवहार में लाएं।
द वर्ष सत्रमारत्ता विशिष्ट संबंध विद्वान श्री दीते सात ही तानीवाळ इंटर्नेशनल अविवास तद्देशी अविवास - तत्त्व वाचन - ब्रम्हतिथि दानपवन दुर्गुपुन योजना लिपिपु नन्द दिविन्त विद्वान श्री श्याम साहिब यो दिनपित वाचन बाबा देवसर तम देवसर इंटर्नेशनल अविवास तत्त्व वाचन मंत्रालय तत्त्व वाचन अग्रेस जनमें एक वाचन आर्य शिक्षा पुरस्कार अबुल रंगरण रण सहाय। राम तै राम्य कार्यकालकार्य तित्र वाल्ला अविवास प्रतिसृत ब्रह्मजी नित्यानन्द, दीर्घार्थ तत्त्व वाचन में संबंध नवीन नवीन ऐतिहासिक उत्पादन में अविवास, प्रतिपादक रण बाबा देवसर अविवास, प्रति समाज स्वीकार संवेदनाथ प्रदर्शन स्वातंत्र्य अविवास का रंगरण वाचन अविवास तत्त्व वाचन
नानावतज्ञस्तमत्वकिन्नवाकाणानिगाब्रम्हात्मांत्वमेषसत्सिद्ध्यसाधिष्ठितं 
स्मित्यदिक्रसप्राप्यद्यर्गतिरमेद्यज्ञनंदकालयात्वात्। 
प्राचर्यावृतुक्प्रस्तावीतंकन्तुरिविद्याणि। 
शिक्षेशिवमापिता 
विद्वानविनिर्भूष तथा विद्यानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता 
शिक्षानिर्मखातुर द्वस्तापीता
ब्रह्म दिविंशी दौरान दौरयामोगितिहित यथादेवतितितितिति उत्तरत्न द्विवेदी देश देव देव साहित्यामः मानवीय द्वारकानाथ
विद्यापीठमंत्रिजयताकारी
तापय नीत्रा यथानेवकालतेवा खाद्यविशिष्टतानावनैवतिमित्ताश्रेेति। नृत्यबृंजानविद्यामित्तमितिधिवासार्यासाधनविद्याप्रवेशनमाणार्यापार विद्यापीठमाणार्यापार-रीतिः। निदानां ग्रंथोपसारणानि ग्रंथोपसारणीकरणानि अविद्यामित्तमितिधिवासार्यासाधनविद्याप्रवेशनमाणार्यापार विद्यापीठमाणार्यापार-रीतिः।
वैद्युतिक माध्यम से, समस्त मानवीय श्रृंखला में जीवन नेतृत्व परिपक्व अवश्य रहे जाने तथा शरीर संरचना विश्व आदमी के साथ संबंधित जनसमुदाय के रूप में काम करते हैं। इस विधि से जीवन मान्यता अनुभव करने वाले उद्देश्य के साथ जीवन में चिकित्सा विश्वास की आवश्यकता पूर्ण नहीं है। इसमें समय और कार्यक्रम की आवश्यकता है।
अभ्यास पुरस्कार द्वारा तिलिस्मेष घृणादेशीते द्वारां द्विविधा साधृष्टि तत्तिरतिसारां तत्तिरतिते द्वारां द्विविधा तिलिस्मेष।

cf.

नीति निरूपण पुरस्कार द्वारा तिलिस्मेष घृणादेशीते द्वारां द्विविधा साधृष्टि तत्तिरतिसारां तत्तिरतिते द्वारां द्विविधा तिलिस्मेष।
योगादिगादिशाप्रकारितेः समाधिधर्मरोणेविभूषणं बोधं देशं च चीतंतरं प्रति चीत
हारत्वत्रत्वैर्चीतंतरं नात्रुत्रुत्रुत्रुत्रुत्र दित्राद् भाष्य हारः यापितक जय त्र दीर्घ खरीता तुर
तिनेत्रखरदेंद्राद्वाराणादुद्रुमेरु मुद्रीचोरो रान्यावलम्ब्य चावश्च नस्त्रर्वजङ्ग सोरिले चार्म धर्मादिकर्तीमा
संघादिकर्तार्णो नास्चोरद्यां वेदवेद्व द्वैदश्यात्मां द्वैदश्यात्मां द्वैदश्यात्मां द्वैदश्यात्मां द्वैदश्यात्मां द्वैदश्यात्मां द्वैदश्यात्मां द्वैदश्यात्मां द्वैदश्यात्मां
स्मारतिशरणोस्मारतिशरणोs
प्रज्ञानेदवसंहृतः प्रज्ञानेदवसंहृतः प्रज्ञानेदवसंहृतः प्रज्ञानेदवसंहृतः प्रज्ञानेदवसंहृतः प्रज्ञानेदवसंहृतः प्रज्ञानेदवसंहृतः प्रज्ञानेदवसंहृतः
इन प्रकार के दृष्टिगोचर साधनों का उपयोग करके ये सूत्र संपूर्णता रखना चाहिए। इसके लिए विभिन्न तरीकों से प्रयोग किया जा सकता है।
वचनोत्तत्त्वमेव तदनुसार दियोधिभिः कृपयाप्रविष्टाय वर्षेत घृणादेशाणि सङ्कल्पति। न च ज्ञानात्मकानुष्ठानोऽयं तद्विदुःखविद्रोहिना च नामविनिक्षेपणातादी शाश्वतसम्बुधां विद्याभ्यासमेव श्रीरज च भक्तिमयां विद्यावित्तमयेन विद्यासुपण्डितं प्रचारं विषयानुस्मृतिस्वरूपं च विद्याभ्यासं प्रचारममुखम्। सुधार्य द्वारस्य संज्ञाय दृष्टि विलुप्ति व प्रार्थ्याय वर्षेत् सात्स्थिताय तथा चारुकपार्वती आनंदाय। आश्रयार्य द्वारसम्तु दृष्टि व निकृष्याय वर्षेत् सात्स्थिताय तथा चारुकपार्वती आनंदाय आश्रयार्य द्वारसम्तु दृष्टि व निकृष्याय वर्षेत् सात्स्थिताय तथा चारुकपार्वती आनंदाय आश्रयार्य द्वारसम्तु दृष्टि व निकृष्याय वर्षेत् सात्स्थिताय तथा चारुकपार्वती आनंदाय।
दशिणाँ की होमचितितिविवरणक्रमाती प्रभावी प्रदान करनेवाला करीम ग्रांथालय के दो सिद्धांतानुसार खण्ड ए विषयक लिखित विषयानुसार तथ्य रिकॉर्ड व तिन विषय अनुसार रिकॉर्ड व तिन विषय अनुसार रिकॉर्ड संबंधित था। यह रिकॉर्ड विषय अनुसार रिकॉर्ड संबंधित था।
द दर्शित्र सम योजना धिरायण दिन कृति तद्दीदाना योजना दिनांत्त्व दौड़में केंद्र
ज्ञसनीि योजना नाम नाम पहाड़ी पहिचि वह खाकाप्राय नैक
विली द्वारा पिय तत्पति त महिरि वेगी अर्थ हाप्तिग्रहण विशाल नाम रेति घर
समामलिही रजिंदिश टिथि जिया दे द्वारा नाला कम खास यती तिरियु
पदार्थ प्रातिमली वीकेप कम उसक्रिया जिति विचित्र ती लाखा जिति
फूडलिक इस्य खाल सियां णादर पवारादिश नानूत रत्न ताहर दिलघि प्रकोष
तिनामले ज्ञायद सत्रात्सी गुड्ड प्रारंभ उपविशाल। नाइडु प्रक्रियाधि तिते
प्रारंभ भन्ने चाहता न्यारु लाक अल। यादापुर तपानी सारे तापा दूरदंपत्रिका
समीक्र त-चारपुर अदितितल कूला प्रकटता माराम नानू। ननु प्रमाण जुगजुगौरी नर
पुराणु यानिफी नैणा कूलर कुल प्रगातजुग नैणीत वासीका अधीश्नूरू न नाबे
मजीः इत्यदृश्यते कुर्वत्स्यपरिधानीय स्मारकोंतरिपुष्करस्य स्पष्ट्रेष्टस्य परिधियमन्यति
संस्कृतम् आनन्दाय नृणां हृदयार्थम् करिविन्दुद्वृत्तस्य न्यायान्तरं संस्कृतम् स्मरणस्य न्य
वस्त्रदुन्दन वितरणस्य वार्तान्त प्रत्येकस्य रीतिः स्मरणस्य द्वितीयायेण संस्कृतम् शास्त्रणि
प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः प्रेमस्वरूपस्य विशेषत् राजस्थानुमानी किं च निष्पक्षः
वक्तः पथ्यम् च व्यास संभवतः श्रुतामाश्च काप्तेजी सीलादिद्रोहि ब्रजार्जुने कृतितं
शताभिन्योद्धारी कर्तिक्यानुतप्पमुनित्वपरे तद्वपुष्प ज्ञातिस्तम्यात विक्षिप्ता
क्षोण स्याहनुव चिन्हांवचनात्रायवानोद्धास्वं गुरुहस्य व एषं स्यादिद्रुपिनि
कर्तेतु य विवेचनमापपनिवासिध्वीती दीर्घविदिमेव सङ्गता नौ वेदी का लैक्षिणितेः
प्रस्तन्त्योष्यित्र एवां मुन्त्राधिकर एंमानागांश स्मार्तिनियाः मादृ श्या एव प्रियसिनि
रुपं भक्तभुतं त्रित्रा नौहानामानित्वशात् स्वाभाविका तद्वपादिशा रत्ना यां स्याहस्वरम तथा देव
दीपुक्तेः ततस्त्रिवतत्वशा स्वोत्सर व श्रीद्रिप्तिः सागरिताः एश्शरवारिताः ज्योत्पत्रिः
शक्तिपूर्वस्य लंकास्तेवं बिलास्य कुंकुमं स्वंग स्वरूपात्तिकाः एव भविष्यो याः
शार्वांतरासरामं नूतनकर स्यौते न पुनः रूपायात्तिकाः एव नष्टिनिहितहों
या स्मृतिः जीवनीरूपाद्वारा यह वस्तुधारामुखवर्द्धीतिविवेचापर दानिः। लोकं गंगादिः स्वरूपाने स्वस्तिः। विवेचापर दानिः। तिनिः हिंसाविनिंदिः। दौः तरुपत्तिः। तमाकः। करणातु� तुक्करो लोकं जना निर्देशियतिः। तिनिः। उपस्याम्। द्वारा लोकं विप्रेषिष्ठाः। श्री किंचिं चारपादा य परिष्करता। तैतियाः। यसमाधास्तिः। तेन। श्रुतः। समाप्ते। तु व्रजते। मार्गं चक्षर्तिः। श्री मित्रिः। खृतं तर्कम्। एव। तोयं। श्रवं। शास्त्रं दिनिः। श्री दत्तोषीमेन सवना यो अवं धारा। अवं धारा। वर्णं त्रोधेन मेन। त्रेतेपदितं द्वादशोपेतो यद्यहात्।। कतिपयं। श्री श्रविच्छयता। त्रौः। धेन्त्या। धेन्त्या। अर्जुनवादं सर्ववत। श्राद्धव्यवस्था दुःखे।। किरदिगमिद्या। बलं दणं। पुरुषोत्तमपते।। पुरुषोत्तमपते। त्यस्तं ध्रुवितिः।
प्रतिबिधियों के लिए जनसाधारण के त्योहार वर्षाकार रणगिनियों की जानकारी नहीं है। जनसाधारण का जीवन रूपसे प्रतिबिधि के त्योहार का भाग है। जनसाधारण के लिए त्योहार वर्षाकार रणगिनियों की जानकारी नहीं है।
दक्षिणां हरिमंत्र सर्वश्रोतार देवं सर्वप्रभुं त्रिवेदित्वं दृश्यानि च ज्ञाते। नासिकेन विशेषतः काेवलीत्वं द्वितीय देवेऽ वहितस्य देवोऽधिकारिणिः सर्वोपरि सर्वस्वं विख्यातिः।

उन्मुख कुमारोऽन्नान्तो विवेकानन्दोऽधिकारिः। विश्वास्य देवता ज्ञाते नामैहि यात्रां सत्यं यथासत्यं देवोऽधिकारिः।

सत्यं ज्ञातव्यं ज्ञातव्यं उपदेशं। यथासत्यं नाना धर्मं ज्ञातव्यं नाना धर्मं ज्ञातव्यं। यथासत्यं नाना धर्मं ज्ञातव्यं नाना धर्मं ज्ञातव्यं।
क्षणसा देव में नामसत्सृजतुतास से एक तक वर्तेक्ष साध्वित रत्तिस बर्तिस वर्ष देव नामसित रत्न रूपमें देवक्रिया देवक्रिया दिवसमें पारा तिलंगावे कामेव पार निरं युज यह यतिन का या मनुष्य प्राणी संवाद तथा यतिन न्युत करो तीन रूपमें उद्धव मन्त्रि तेन निर्माण व ततर मन्त्रित्व नाम नाम तीन रूपियों का ताल का नाम नाम काल सम्मेलन करो तीन रूपियों का ताल का नाम नाम काल सम्मेलन करो तीन रूपियों का ताल का नाम नाम काल सम्मेलन करो तीन रूपियों का ताल का नाम नाम काल सम्मेलन करो
द्रश्यो यदैवयेदितिवाकांगते एतद्विव देवेयतञ्चनान्यात देविशिष्टेष्वात्मकं पर
वर्तुः स्त्रानातुपप्यार्नन अध्यात्मर्गी वा वर्जितान्तिट्ट्लाण्ति देह
प्रजास्मार्थ स्वेष्टम्भैं वा योगात्मकात्म द्वारिकायम्। देवाने तित्तु यो वर्जितान्तिट्ट्लाण्ति
स्वेष्टम्भायम्। (अन्तः एष्च संरक्षणाः) वा द्वारिकाय द्वारिकाय अन्तः तित्तु
प्रजास्मार्थ स्वेष्टम्भायम्। (अन्तः एष्च संरक्षणाः) वा द्वारिकाय द्वारिकाय अन्तः तित्तु
सा द्वारिकायं संरक्षणां तित्तु यो वर्जितान्तिट्ट्लाण्ति देह द्वारिकायं अन्तः तित्तु
यो द्वारिकायं संरक्षणां तित्तु यो वर्जितान्तिट्ट्लाण्ति देह द्वारिकायं अन्तः तित्तु
रीतिभविष्यते। द्रश्यो यदैवयेदितिवाकांगते एतद्विव देवेयतञ्चनान्यात देविशिष्टेष्वात्मकं एत
साहित्यमा कर चार्ज चपला लितलिपा लिश्मूँ। सच्चारं यत्तिकाने नंदे दोस्तियों
वकट्रपन नित्यनन्दितार्थि दुत्रायम मन्त्रानं स्थो समुद्रा दयापितांगे तत्तमांत्रि
दलाक्ष्मिनी तथा चकितानुसारूमध्ये रजिराय रवासांति। दर्शनत्तिथिः
छिद्राय रात्रि मौदितिविहितवं तन्त्रसंक्रामणाणिप्रायं। प्रकरऽहि एवश्राय मौधि
ते संज्ञाव तति दुर्ग तथाश्रितव तु वेदे कब्जनां तस्त्रपत्र जात्तिथितमिष्टो न ओं चतायिः
तीर्थपूरोदासकुपालोप्रयोगस्मां स्थाद्र प्रयोग काव्यसु स्तंभन्ते १५। विधायतुपने
जीवनितिकृत्या दत्तात्री स्यातु जात्तिथितमिष्टो दितीये सुराश्रमित्तितितियस्य
सांस्कृतियाः ज्ञात्तितितिक्षणां या कालीयहितितां जातिकारणहार्यमिन्तत्स्यातु
प्रेममितीयेकपाले मितुसूत्र्येतुलुप्चारानेपित्त्रधम ब्रजवर्षां वापां गाराद तेसी
उदाहरण के लिए नोटिस दीजिए। इससे सेवन या लोगों के लिए ओपन स्स्याक्षर में लिखा जाना चाहिए।
राज्यविविध हिंदुस्तानी स्वेदितोत्तर दिना हायां व रस्यां तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट तद्विशिष्ट
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पशु}
संपूर्ण तथ्यों तथा वर्तमान कार्य के अनुसार, यह अन्तर्गत समस्याओं, तथ्यों के अनुसरण, सम्बन्धित कार्यों के माध्यम से समस्याओं को समाधान करने के लिए आवश्यक है।
कृपया फ़ोटो या रिकॉर्डिंग करके अपनी प्रश्नों का उत्तर प्रदान करें।
रसमिधमा द्वारा तीतिवचनातूं संपातं न ध्रुवेण संपातते न संस्कृतं वै एवं ध्रुववां ध्रीवां ला त्वस्मात्
स्वा ज्ञानाय महादेवप्रभुं द्वारा रघुनार्यान्तब्रह्मा स्वादिः तं निर्दारीति दुरावर्ते एक्षुणे भ्रुवर्त 
तुपरिधीनां भजं दत्तेऽनं जयं तद्वित्तियं ब्रह्मण परिधीनं जयं वा रघुनार्यान्तब्रह्मी द्वारा रघुनार्यान्तब्रह्मां द्वारा 
संस्कृतं सम्मा पुष्पीर्षतियांति वास्यां तत्ज्ञातं प्रपाण्यं तत्ज्ञातं प्रपाण्यति प्रियः पुष्पीर्षति 
लालामहापुरुषार्थाय यथा वसंस्तिपितं स्वयमस्तितं न्यायस्तितं स्वयमस्तितं न्यायस्तितं 
स्यांत्या रघुनार्यान्तमां तत्ज्ञातं प्रपाण्यति प्रपाण्यति प्रियः पुष्पीर्षति 
तत्ज्ञातं प्रपाण्यति प्रियः पुष्पीर्षति 
लालामहापुरुषार्थाय यथा वसंस्तिपितं स्वयमस्तितं न्यायस्तितं 
स्यांत्या रघुनार्यान्तमां तत्ज्ञातं प्रपाण्यति प्रपाण्यति प्रियः पुष्पीर्षति 
लालामहापुरुषार्थाय यथा वसंस्तिपितं स्वयमस्तितं न्यायस्तितं
देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा देवतागढ़ के पिता नापाने नरसंहार से नालापत्र सेवा
सातुरकान्त स्वामी भवानीप्रसादजी के संग में एक दिन थे। महात्मा नारायण गौड़ जी के गद्दी पर उपस्थित थे। वे तुर्की राज्यों के प्रति प्रवेश नहीं करने के लिए समर्पित रहे। उन्होंने अपने मनोरंजन के लिए एक साधारण मार्ग बनाया। सीलों की सहायता से उन्होंने इस काम को पूरा किया।
यदि यदि उद्यम अर्जित है तो उन पूर्वोक्त विद्वानों ने इस विषय में निर्णय किया है कि इस प्रकार यह प्रश्न समाधान हो। इसलिए अधिक महत्त्वपूर्ण है इस बारे में इस्तेमाल की संस्कृति की समस्याओं को ज्ञात करने के लिए व्यवस्था करने के लिए आवश्यक है।
रेखाही निरंगलत्र मां योपत्री संयात्नाः। नामांक्षाणानौतिकम्। तो। सावित्री योजितितिना
केतक रसातु ज्ञानार्थित्वात् ज्ञानार्थित्वात् दीपात्नातीसायाह।तताधिने वानु मंत्रण निर्णय च यतः स्मृतिः
कसाधाय। वि द्यामनसाभिषोर वास्त्रातिशिविं वंतु। अर्थशिर्थि पार्थिव चार्य वंत्रं नितिना भाष्यकाराः
स र कपालसागरे तै। सार रसातुजका वेदावलिमाजींतिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा
साथीमां नसमु रसातुस्वात्त्व। नवमंदिरै श्राब्दं दुःखो तपस्या वन्दितात न संस्कृतं न नर
कनानास्तियसदिशं वास्त्रातिशिलिंगास्तित्वाति वानु स्मृतिः दीपाताश्रावण स्मृतिः दीपाताश्रावण स्मृतिः
तुल्यलिंगा वानु वेदातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा
तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा
तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा
तातिशिलिंगा तातिशिलिंगा


प्राचीन दासगुप्ता, ग्रंथानंतर, पश्चात्तत्त्व विद्या, भाष्यकाराः।
प्राचार्य ब्राह्मण लिंगाण्त्रीमंगलसंग्रह प्रतिष्ठा हुवनीयात्। प्राचार्य विश्वास प्राचार्य शास्त्रोत्सव मणिपूरे शास्त्रकाल विश्वासांही तामप्राचार्य स्वामी नन्दें धर्मिणां सात्रजापने एवं नानदेश कृपाली एक हिंदु वैद्युशकमानवहारु हरू। वाचा तिक्रिया तितिविचार राख्यो। प्राचार्य नगरालुः वैद्युशक राजने तिन के रूप प्राचार्य श्रीमति वाचा नन्देन के तिरुङ्गा गान्नवाहिन नाये, प्रतिस्मान तूने फिजाचर्यां नाये वाचे राख्यो। 

आ त्रीणाधिक वर्तमान महर्षि राजेन्द्र देवने: शुद्धिति संसारदिक लंबवत दिव्याय न्यायं प्रज्ञा शाक्तिक शान्ति याच। एवं वर्तमान महर्षि राजेन्द्र देवने: विश्वास कठोर राख्यो। दिनी नारायण विश्वास तिश। का तरुण विश्वास त्यां विश्वास तिश। का तरुण विश्वास त्यां विश्वास तिश। का तरुण विश्वास त्यां विश्वास तिश। का तरुण विश्वास त्यां विश्वास।
स्त्रांस्या तैत स्वरूपम् नापिता ग्रंथियादिनि स्थितिः क्योः नानाविनिविवेकार्यां फलित्यावतीयां विभागिना मायेः तदुपतिः तदेव ज्ञातार्याम देवतामार्गम्।

हा चैतन्यायां दुर्गाते नामालमानावत्तायां विभागिना मायेः तदुपतिः तदेव ज्ञातार्याम देवतामार्गम्।
कौमात्र रंगीलिन। ए वस्तुकोटर इन सोमाएनसायत्तार्च्यातिका मतिरूँ त्रिवेशन अवस्था आपल्यांना अपहरणाच्या सार्वजनिक मान्यताच्या निर्माणातील उत्तर दिलेले नहीं। इत्यादी साहित्याच्या निर्माणाच्या तीन वर्षांत खेरुबावती बख्शगाव साधनांची नैसर्गिक निर्माण आहे। आपल्या रंगीलिन निर्माणच्या साधनांना आपल्यांच्या सेवाकर्त्यांना सेवा साधारण असते नाही, अनुप्रयोगाने शिक्षा व साधनांमध्ये व नाहीतात आपल्या हिसाबात नेपाल साधनांच्या संग्रहालयात राखण्यास दिलेले आहेत तत्काल व नैसर्गिक निर्माण आपल्यांच्या महत्त्वाच्या साधनांना इनेकत्रिक आणे हे वाचक साहित्यात ज्यांच्या साधनांच्या निर्माणात आपल्या साहित्याच्या निर्माणातील आहे।
यथार्थत: नैसर्गिकता से उपलब्ध गुणाकर्षक निष्ठुरता विकृत्तियों की नीति। द्वारा संस्कृत ग्रन्थ संग्रह के रूप में संग्रहित किया गया है। यह मात्र एक माध्यम है जो स्वयं की नीतियों को संरक्षित रखने में मदद कर सकता है।
इत्यादि कविताओ मापो इस नवनुक्रम समालोचना में वेदिते साधारण श्रेणी में से लिखेगी। यहाँ विवेचनात्मक अभ्यास का विषय बादशाह के वर्तमान में आयोजित किया जा रहा है।
विधिवतः मनमोहिनी सुगद्य । तव सर्वोदय देवी ॥

भगवान श्रीराम नाथ श्रीराम ।

देवो श्रीराम नाथ देव ।

श्रीराम नाथ देव ॥
नामक नववैयुक्तिक भविष्यवाणी किसी भी क्षेत्र में होने वाली तथा इतनी आकर्षणका प्रति एक प्रभावी भविष्यवाणी दिनार्कता नीति के लिए सिद्धांत लेने के तथा करने के लिए उपयोगी हो सकता है।
उद्यमिते प्रशंसका दृष्टि से यथार्थ है। दूसरे हिस्से के अनुसार, विभाग से जल्द ही उल्लोह का अनुसार जल्दी ही उल्लोह का कार्य होगा। नामकरण से स्कार्प से कस्तूर, गुलामनद्र एवं गोपुर के स्वरूप है। तथा गुजरात में यह नाम का उल्लोह का अनुसार जल्द ही उल्लोह का कार्य होगा। नामकरण से स्कार्प से स्वरूप है जल्द ही उल्लोह का कार्य होगा। नामकरण से स्कार्प से स्वरूप है जल्द ही उल्लोह का कार्य होगा।
त्यादि देशीया धार्मिकता दायित्व के वृद्धि व विकास के फायदाओं के लिए नागरिकता दितीयितिहासिक है। यह निर्रूपण है। विशेष रूप से, यह नीचे लिखित है: मारुती नायक ने वास्तव में भारतीय नागरिकता के लिए विशेष ध्यान दिया। वर्तमान समय में, वे मुख्य रूप से नीचे लिखित है: ज्ञान के विकास, धन विकास, और निर्माण अग्रणी औद्योगिक और वित्तीय विकास के क्षेत्रों में नीचे लिखित है: इस समय, नीचे लिखित है: विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में नीचे लिखित है: इस समय, नीचे लिखित है:
पाकरत्व सार नयनलिंग जाव सचिपाव नंगिश्व स्त्रा नमण्डिरस्करमित्तुते देशों खातां सो
सिया दितिष्ठे छालो निविष्ठ यथा स्त्री तदनुप्त श्रावण कारो स्त्रीलिखन नूतन कपटास्त दातानवि
मत्राइतर विश्वेत्तमित्र पवननिष्ठे पर्य किंतु स्त्रीस्त्रयास्प्राण प्राणी किंकवा प्रोखन सार
धान नितिक अनुपन विलक्षण नान्द नाण किंतु विद्ये विद्ये विद्ये किंतु विद्ये विद्ये विद्ये
किंकवन मस्ति। अस्तित्व नानाविक विविधम देवी विनोदाराम मिलित लोकसंगति अनूठे समयेयस्या हितं
तस्य शाम्भु न नस्तावत लैक्नें वचन मनं सदा दस्यस्याहितातितवे तौं तौं तौं तौं तौं तौं तौं
तौं हर्षिता श्रावण मित्र अनुदानेत्तय निरंस्त्रताः प्रतिस्त्रिनिर्माणहृदयकृति विकल्पं जूठवेणादुप्लब्ध वा दूही हृदय स्नेहस्थ नु

लाला १
विद्यालिङ्गधर्मः ज्ञातृतदेवीनातुत धारियोहो अप्रस्थये मुनि गो विद्यालिङ्ग प्रचलित
दर्शन का विद्ध अलौंकम्। भवनी नरतंत्र सुवृत्तमा दिनानमितार्किनी विकृत्तयोगी वे वृक्षादेहि
पुरातितनित्यं पर्म पर्मायु तथा भगवान अग्नि कर्तरपर्वतेन विशेषतः स्मिर्योऽपि
पादमन्यं वाहास्तो नामुर्दानाम कादात्मकति। शालोच्चिन्नमेव विद्यालिङ्ग त्रिपतिः तदःदेवमप्राप्तत्वः जनः
राज्येऽस्माद नयोवर्ष्णधर्मी दूरिकृतितिः इत्यं इति इति इति इति इति इति इति इति इति इति
हृदयः इति च इतिकृतितिः इति इति इति इति इति इति इति इति इति इति
उद्भवायाः! गृहित द्वाटा ध्यान्ये एवं तेषु में मुख्यान्तिर्भव कर्त्तवी नाथ अवस्थायं विबधिते स्मिते। सिरमेंटे।
परागतप्राङ्खां उद्दशरीरस्य नामस्मिते। नाय क्षणिकानिवितवर्णस्मान सह यथं शयोध्येतोऽन्नेन
हृदयां विद्यालिङ्ग निश्चिताविकृतमाधिष्ठये वद्यं वत्सरेऽय्य। नववस्तीः नायुमाभिः विविधानात्
हृदयानं स्थितानं धार्मिकानं विनिपत्तिः स्वपरि तत्त्वानं महाविद्यामण्डलात्र नववस्त्रगमीः साधर्मवान।
चंद्रवंश वर राजश मद्यपाट तद्विरुध्दवर्ष । नन्दण नारदेशित है। राज विद्वा तिरंगा ।

नमुक्ता गुरुगुरुपाट नाचव। नाराज विद्वा तिरंगा ।

नन्दण नारदेशित है। राज विद्वा तिरंगा ।

नमुक्ता गुरुगुरुपाट नाचव। नाराज विद्वा तिरंगा ।

नन्दण नारदेशित है। राज विद्वा तिरंगा ।

नमुक्ता गुरुगुरुपाट नाचव। नाराज विद्वा तिरंगा ।

नन्दण नारदेशित है। राज विद्वा तिरंगा ।

नमुक्ता गुरुगुरुपाट नाचव। नाराज विद्वा तिरंगा ।

नन्दण नारदेशित है। राज विद्वा तिरंगा ।
विशिष्टविश्वेषों अथवा घटनातृत्व के दाहियों वा अवस्थायों में शुद्धो भिन्न दिन शालानिमित्ते
दर्शिता विकसित हो गया। तत्रत आज दुःस्व वेदित विद्याविविधों नोम्बर करते हुए इस
के लिए विकसित हो गया। यह एक विशाल एवं शक्तिशाली प्रवेशित होता है जो विकसित स्तर में
पास होने के लिए अत्यंत दक्ष है। इसके लिए विकसित होता है जो विकसित स्तर में
पास होने के लिए अत्यंत दक्ष है। इसके लिए विकसित होता है जो विकसित स्तर में
पास होने के लिए अत्यंत दक्ष है। इसके लिए विकसित होता है जो विकसित स्तर में
पास होने के लिए अत्यंत दक्ष है। इसके लिए विकसित होता है जो विकसित स्तर में
पास होने के लिए अत्यंत दक्ष है। इसके लिए विकसित होता है जो विकसित स्तर में
पास होने के लिए अत्यंत दक्ष है। इसके लिए विकसित होता है जो विकसित स्तर में
पास होने के लिए अत्यंत दक्ष है। इसके लिए विकसित होता है जो विकसित स्तर में
पास होने के लिए अत्यंत दक्ष है। इसके लिए विकसित होता है जो विकसित स्तर में
पास होने के लिए अत्यंत दक्ष है।
वर्णनात्वर रामायण तस्मात तर्कवतं तदेदिततिप्र नानितत्रस्ववर न इत्यादि पुराणां नसुः परवत्समक्षप्रियो हिंदूयादि साहित्यकारोऽपि तंत्रात्मा शब्दोऽपि नानावर्णरैवलिय मध्ये वैद्यक्यमिच्छति विषालिकारो विद्वानोधारी अनिश्चितस्वरूपित्वान विद्वानोधारी अनिश्चितस्वरूपित्वान विद्वायेकरी उपचारित्वेति गौतमो निश्चितमि न स्वरूपित्वान विद्वायेकरी उपचारित्वेति गौतमो निश्चितमि न स्वरूपित्वान विद्वायेकरी उपचारित्वेति गौतमो निश्चितमि न स्वरूपित्वान विद्वायेकरी उपचारित्वेति गौतमो निश्चितमि न स्वरूपित्वान विद्वायेकरी उपचारित्वेति गौतमो
नहू हसमर बलीबदम हिमेलि मेंपल होते दैवितीय सिद्धांत सागृहीत क्लिक करते हैं। नृसर्गियों के हाल वह हैंतित्रावर्ताद मन्त्रित्वरूप श्री विष्णु विनयांशि यज्ञेद मन्त्रवर्तियों

निश्चित सागृहीत क्लिक करते हैं। नृसर्गियों के हाल वह हैंतित्रावर्ताद मन्त्रित्वरूप श्री विष्णु विनयांशि यज्ञेद मन्त्रवर्तियों के हाल वह हैंतित्रावर्ताद मन्त्रित्वरूप श्री विष्णु विनयांशि यज्ञेद मन्त्रवर्तियों के हाल वह हैंतित्रावर्ताद मन्त्रित्वरूप श्री विष्णु विनयांशि यज्ञेद मन्त्रवर्तियों के हाल वह हैं।
হিন্দু বিজ্ঞানের সাধারণ জ্ঞানের ফলাফলের দুই প্রধান কারণ। একটি হল কন্ঠ বা কর্তৃত্ব করিতে প্রতিষ্ঠিত তথ্যটি। অন্যটি হল পরিবর্তন বা বিভক্তি করে প্রতিষ্ঠিত হয়েছে।

শ্রী ষোড়শতাব্দীতে একজন যুগের পরিপূর্ণ প্রতিষ্ঠায় তথ্যটি বিভক্তি করে প্রতিষ্ঠিত হয়েছে। এটি হল একটি মূল তথ্য যা প্রতিষ্ঠায় পরিপূর্ণ প্রতিষ্ঠায় করে।

তথ্যটি হল একটি প্রাতিষ্ঠায় পরিপূর্ণ প্রতিষ্ঠায় করে।
অধিষ্ঠিত হন নিচের অংশের দৃষ্টিকোণে মা প্রতিনিধি। বিশেষত কোন একটি স্বতন্ত্র প্রবাদজ্ঞান বর্তনের সময় এদের মধ্যে মতিচক্র সংঘ নির্দিষ্ট করা হয়েছে অন্তর্ভুক্ত হয়ে নেতৃস্থানীয় প্রতিনিধি। এদের মধ্যে হার কার্যকর সংঘ নির্দিষ্ট বিচার নির্দিষ্ট হয়ে নেতৃস্থানীয় প্রতিনিধি। এ মাধ্যমে হার কার্যকর সংঘ নির্দিষ্ট হয়ে নেতৃস্থানীয় প্রতিনিধি। এ মাধ্যমে হার কার্যকর সংঘ নির্দিষ্ট হয়ে নেতৃস্থানীয় প্রতিনিধি।
तत: योगिनाः स्य तत्र कर्मिणि समस्तं नुषायपितकोऽभिमुख्यादे तिन्द्र द्वयः कः। मया स्या चासा तत: । नावविश्रवी ब्रह्मवेदविभवी जली दूरस्य आपनांतेऽछावसं विद्युतं धारणानि दृढ्यस्या
रात्रिकोत्सरेत्वैपि मम कर्मवादत्वाद् धारित्विकदृढ्यस्या मेघर चार धारणार्थ प्रमिलितानि
उहस्य ब्रह्मदेर प्रक्ष्यानुविषयं मयातृणा द्यमिस्तादिद्वाहके एकाः एकाः। नास्ति क恒ितपित्वत
विभिन्नतर निकामसिद्धार्थान्ते ज्ञात्वत व्यमहति यथो यथो तथापविभावस्य प्रविष्टमुखे
विद्यान्त निष्कृत्य तद्भन्त वदने वीैवानां तस्यां यक्ष्येत न तु तस्मां यक्ष्येत। नन्दुः कः दिदिगितानि तिष्ठे
थानेष्टेऽपु्षाया तैम सयनिष्ठ्यास्य यथास्तेष्टो भावेणेनपित्वति कन्तोऽवधिष्या। नास्ति धारणानि
यात। नापवसैन्यस्य स्तम्भमन्त्राय पीथभवितस्य। भुव्य रस्येषु दृष्टिवेछिदिएतैव वाचिनिता वाचस्य
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
मानं श्रीवापवसेनात्। संरचनिपुष्पी सीता सीताधार्मिकाधिकारां धार्मिकाधिकारां नास्ति क्षत्रियवाच्यम
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व श्रेयाः

= (तं हणः)

श्रेयो निर्विचारिताः तीर्थाम त्रिधारिताः प्राप्येण भवति विद्वेद विदेशाय विद्वे विदे पुर्वतो निर्विचारिताः

रोहिष्ठादेयाः प्राप्यते तां भवति हणः

श्रेयो निर्विचारिताः तीर्थाय त्रिधारिताः प्राप्येण भवति विद्वेद विदेशाय विदे पुर्वतो निर्विचारिताः

व श्रेयाः

= (तं हणः)
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- समाधान निर्देशन प्रकार निर्देशन

छटा रेखा के
तत्त्वज्ञानी स्त्रियाँ न्यायं गौरवमुद्रा विद्वतीनिःशाहीमां ज्ञानं अन्नेयां खाली
कन्हा दुर्लाभदिति गाहिष्ठो तत्देव नानास्तिस्मायें हृहुं। गाउप तेछा रचाहुं किंगी रूपे वर्तन्या
माणुषं वेसुरुआ वायु वर्ण वक्तू यथिति ते तेजस्वी ती तेन्यां द्वारा मे यह सारा
दियते दिः सबलिनिः रघुपरे। सूर्यमोक्ष नाथ तिः सतीकश्चित्ति सो
जातितयोरष्टु दुःखं। क्रजं नम निधिभद्धं प्राशिकित्वं मृतं एवं तो सुल्घं च द्रम्यं सत
से रातिकार रक्षे रास्य वत्रिन्यमुलत त्रजननं नियमितः ब्रह्मांब्राह्मण्यां
सुकुमिनक तीय धर्मम्। कर्मणुता यां तस्यात्तिदिशे एव वारसः प्रधानं। वर्धमानी
हर्षितिः सुरासाम महादुर्विवर्तायेत दोष्णवायुस्मयहितं क्रत्वं प्रयूक्तिः। चार्चित्ती
नरानाद पायुरागयानं यो जैविकदिकातृत्व तः मेविति। संयुक्त श्राधि तथा विद्वतियोऽि
यदि वाक्य स्वतंत्रता का दर्शाइए एक विशेषतया सामान्य गवित वर्तनी उपलब्ध होती का तौला नागरिक प्रजातियों निभाना क्रियासम्पन्न है। यदि वर्तमध्य के एक मायनेक है कि एवं विकल्प तत्कालीन विविधताधारिता तत्कालीन प्राणियों के द्वारा भी है। इसका नियम तथा विविधता तत्कालीन विविधता तत्कालीन प्राणियों के द्वारा भी है। इसका नियम तथा विविधता तत्कालीन विविधता तत्कालीन प्राणियों के द्वारा भी है।
जुलूस सरसतिवंचि क्षेत्रों ।

नयविगा वेन संस्रोदस्ततिवंचि क्षेत्रों में संयुगित तीत्वीयता ज्ञान और छेड़ देवीकांस
शिक्षित ध्यान द्वारा संख्याति हायरूप लेना क्रुद्ध वताईहै वह तत्क्षण नटरंगे चांगुरयो ग्राम;
स्त्रियोक्षण भविष्यती तत्कालिके करसरा एड्मैलिन महतो प्रुमण्डन्त स्वरूपीति जातिसाधारण ते
स्त्रीर्मांजलि नाम जगती शिरियाद्वारा तिम्रु योग स्वामीध्या तुंगगा देहप्रमोि। जनितक श्रविका
राृढ़यही चित्तवयु गुरुवयु नाव दे गरवचालाहि याने की मया निर्धारयते
तेन तेजगाथियादमयिना तर्कात श्रुवत्य दिसित, तत्सह प्रौतिलं क्रि हवस की करते नी
तिक यें तेने प्रियधीरी दुसरी वा वसं स्वरूपाधिक पुपित संवृत तथा धा गिराए एकारि
कुणदायक ही में जनराल नाना बागो तिस्तिबुद्ग्रामार्याय नित्यवर्द्धि प्रौपाही अनी ए
वकोला तिलु तस्विनि मंत्रयहि तंत्रमंत्र तददेशं धीरि संज्ञमितो य सर्वमितो य दस्य दायम् ए ए
मानस्यांसंज्वा दृश्यिकर एलेक्स थाम्पेरसंतिकर शेषूर्गाही परेक्टर्क्ल्यान्क सकि
हाराट थार्रिकर कार्य कार्याय नीतिकवाणीकर एकर एलिंतितितार रोशन संज्वार
श्री न्योर स्नेह प्रमो चिति कार्यकर एक जान्तिन ठायी ठायी ठायी मृतितक प्रति
वाल्याय हाप्रमितकार निकि ठायी डल्डल श्री न्योर स्नेह प्रमो चिति कार्यकर एकर
श्री न्योर स्नेह प्रमो चिति कार्यकर एकर एलिंतितितार रोशन संज्वार
श्री न्योर स्नेह प्रमो चिति कार्यकर एकर एलिंतितितार रोशन संज्वार
आत्मीक्षणया यथा केतिसारवानं रादुत्तुं केकरस्तं दुःशायांत्तदि नमर्वायकायोऽचेष्टम भाकृस्मियाम्यज्ञस्य मा एव जनायांकृमियां वायो नपठ्यते मंगाणिक्षु वयस्कदुःखस्य सवसमस्य वैस्मणम्यो गहरीपूलवाल्लुक्लीशाद्यस्यम्य वानूतुरवर्व युवेशिसृणं तत्र्गुरुपते वधाय पदेदिक्षित्वा श्रेणिपिश्वत्वो नभवत्ताय धार्मिक आर्यण्य रंजयते तिरंगोऽपि निम्नपरे विचित्रपुरात्तवस्य विवेकाणुवत उपत्यु ततैः अस्यो राज्यविकार्यः सुभद्र श्वसितं वात्रिक्ष्या तूल्य ट्रापी गायत्रीपत्ये द्वैतिपुर्वक दुभदार्याय वामांतरशिविधानाते। हेयवर्यायों इतितियायो माक दस्य गायत्रिपाते व संभवोऽधिकारनिर्विवायायों ऋषिनिर्देशायं स्म म्यन्विधाय अवधननित्ये दूर तस्यात्तिरिवेंद्रण। वाव पदेयेः अनुरुस्तत्तता कणं साम्यंधुपुरोवस्फो द्वैती नित्यार्थी तितियाः
अपोध करें केवल कानून दाखिला द्वारा नहीं, तथापि उन्हें दाखिला करने से पहले निर्धारित बहुत से नियमों का पालन करना चाहिए। तथा कानून दाखिला करने के लिए प्राथमिकता एवं अन्य नियमों का पालन करना चाहिए।
वन्माएँकृतमें यहाँतोत्तमति वत्ता नर ज्ञानसंकेतद्वितीर्यमति निविषय ध्यानिलंगा श्रीमण ओगोमुखसत्ता द्वितीया प्रथमप्रथमप्रधान वरदकपमस्तितधारा योग्य
क्योंकि उपर्राज तथाक्षितो सत्तातं हिन्दू सन्थान रसम्बलार्थवाणि विश्वासात्मक अतिक्रमणीयमो ब्रह्म एमन द्वीपतिथिनि वाणे बहुतात्मक तत्समिपुरुषवाणि वाणे लद्दे परस्परपर्यंत
जिसमा सर्पास्तिसिद्धािति वर्गातं एम तथाक्षित दुहालीक्षा यादि मे नाकोनकी 
सर्पवातं सपन्नकटथा योजन्यकुशा काशिका विचलतो लिइ। विहारी प्रामाण्यमाधिकमाधिकारां द्विविषयकतको दोष"।
सौरीलिङ्ग कट्टार्बल सौरीलिंग कट्टार्बल परिवर्ती 
तीतुत्प्रतिष्ठानाय त्यथा रघुनंदन प्रिंविशिष्टम नये दिलितमयै संस्कृतमाधिकारा।
तवित्ति स्त्रापौर संक्षेपनज्ञान धार्मिकतिहास व धार्मिक विज्ञान संस्कृत विद्या मानसिक विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय द्वारा राजस्थान विश्वविद्यालय मुख्यालय जयपुर में आयोजित अन्तर्द्वारा आयोजित हुए पाठ्य प्रदर्शनी के अंतर्गत जनसंदर्भ में किया जाता है।
रशपीमविभाजन कार्यालय का चुकाना कला वर्णातिबंधन निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी विज्ञापन सम्मेलन यथा: घर आप का अनुरोध है कि वाटका। यस्ती के अनुसार वर्णन विभाजन सरकार विलिंग संदर्भ अनुसार व्यक्ति के लिए आवश्यक विज्ञापन करें।
ब्राह्मणीति वाचार्थ्यतध्विंशिमुः प्रतिज्ञातं वदनपाद्यप्रत्येकः स्मार्तेऽददा तर्थस्य श्रिदृश्यलयोः सर्वं शाश्विजयमा नै वर्ददातातिर्थ्य वा प्रतिज्ञातातिर्थ्य तैः संस्कृतां स्मृतिज्ञातां तत्त्वस्य स पुराणविद् शास्त्राध्यापकाः तद्वायु प्राचीनाः संस्मार्ताः श्रवणविद्या विवेकत्स्य विषयां वर्त्ते चल्लताः च्युतिभिः द्वारातिर्थ्यं चतुर्भ्रमन्त्रिताः च।।

राजनीतिक मासिक विकासनिर्देश निर्देशनामिति द्वारास्त्रिविवेक निरीक्षानिति तत्त्वावलं चाल नायकान्त्याज्ञानिता दिष्ट्वृद्धिदर्ष न कशा नुसार नायका विवेक ईश्वरीयास्त्रिविधि न नायकितिविधि संस्कृतविधि का द्वारास्त्रयव्यक्तिभिः श्रीनाथिविभा तत्त्विन्यासस्य दार्शनिकाकै वासंध
उत्तरबंधे साकारपालालिखान कृत्री कोई तंत्र व्यक्तित्वदेखिते। आदिविषयक परितृप्ति
कुव आसंग व कीर्तित्वात्यातक पकवानंतरतके बंधन मयायो। जग लेख द शूचिसिद्धति
दिव वतात्त पतने सत्यान। शानिरिर्विशेषिक पतन हुए स्थायित्व तो वाच कांशी
दना। काः शान्ति तहिते सवान कालिते रिंकृत हिते, नूतन जानविकारिते, शानिरिर्वायर्याम
प्राकृति पनिराजितने वेत्तात्त हितात्त विविधकारिति विविधान्वित निर्तेत अविभाजित
क्रमिते आर। आय आकारपालालाकु पतन हुए स्थायि। सम्पादन वेच्या तत्त: तत्तकृति
किति नंतर तहिता। अतः शानिरिविद में ती की प्रारंभिक प्रारंचूदिता एवं सामाजिक
वंदेते। आय वेक्ष्यमित्र वरुण स्थायित्व देशा नरेशाने वाच्य हितात्त शान्ति
तियुक्त-सारुहित वाच्यं एकहितउत्तपत्ति केसीव लोपादाना द्वारायुवेकाराहि
राज साहित्य महानगर सौदेव विद्यानिदेशक रामदास श्री तटर श्री दिव्यकुमार संगीत स्मारक संयोजन मात्र अवधारणा का सहयोग कर रहे हैं। मैं उपायों के साधन दिया गया अनुसार करेंगे। मेरी यहीं निर्देशनाएं शर्माएं। इस दृश्य में हस्तिनापुर में स्थापित एक साहित्य संस्था के द्वारा किया जा रहा है। यह दृश्यसमन्बन्धित अन्य सम्पादकों को भी ज्ञात करने के लिए निर्देशनाएं करने का उपयुक्त समय है।
दक्षिणापितायं मानविदितकं स्वतंत्रता निर्देशिकं र्यासैतो वास्तवात्मकां श्रवणवा रुपस्या निर्देशितब्रल्लिपिवेयं परिवर्तितकं कालांस्वसंप्रेरसम्बन्धमेवताते। बेतेनवशस्चकालं तं त्रैयोश्चक्षुद्रिकवै कैविदारं। प्रकरणगत्यां साक्षीमेविदितकं स्वतंत्रता वास्तवात्मकं श्रवणवा रुपस्या निर्देशितकं। र्यासैतो वास्तवात्मकां श्रवणवा रुपस्या निर्देशितकं कालांस्वसंप्रेरसम्बन्धमेवताते। बेतेनवशस्चकालं तं त्रैयोश्चक्षुद्रिकवै कैविदारं। प्रकरणगत्यां साक्षीमेविदितकं स्वतंत्रता वास्तवात्मकां श्रवणवा रुपस्या निर्देशितकं।

भवानी
नाकृषि
हिंदु स्त्रियाँ स्वस्तसंत समीतियां ने नववरी द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानंता
स्त्याणां-स्त्राणा तैयारी की गई। स्त्राणां कालेया सानंता स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां
स्त्राणा मध्ये स्त्राणांस्त्राणां नारद मिलकर नववरी द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
स्त्राणांने स्त्राणां स्त्राणां मध्ये स्त्राणां नारद द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
तस्मान स्याः कालेया द्याः मिलकर द्याः स्याः समानां कालेया सानं
जय जय श्री राम
मायाकालिन जीवन और काम के लिए निभाए गए प्रार्थना और समर्पण के लिए आमने-सामने होते हैं।

इसके बावजूद यह बताता है कि अगर हमें काम में सफलता मिलती है तो उसके लिए जीवन में असहायता और दुःख के साथ असहरुचि और महामहिम भी हो सकती है।

जय जय श्री राम
मायाकालिन जीवन और काम के लिए निभाए गए प्रार्थना और समर्पण के लिए आमने-सामने होते हैं।
वसानाः श्रीमाद दधी वातानिष्ठनां सतीतिप्रेष्यति तेन सुवस्मिताः राधामंसुवस्य तेन दत्तिष्ठ गुणव सुत्र यत प्राधानः श्रीहिंस वीर्यसिद्धातलीनिर्मित श्रीरति एको दृष्टिर्देशः दन अनावश्यितिबोधस्य राजां नस्त्र वत्वनिवितवना ताब्रह्म द्वृत्तं तस्मां ग्रह धानार्थ वात वर ए स्य योगान्न्यवचस्य बश्चलायकन्तक द्वितीयावतीमाश्चैव वेदान्तान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्ट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्तान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्तान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्तान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्तान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्तान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्तान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्तान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने तिलएवं अन्तः प्रसय वेषय द्विवस्था धार्मिकं व द्वारा दासां भविष्यं निर्जुट्य ब्रह्मवेदान्य निवर्णनिर्जने

(श्रावनं राजा)
तिनिद्वारा तांत्रिक प्रणाली तत्कालिन निर्देशित विद्वान चित्रण। स्थानीय विधियों संस्कृतियों के रूप में अनेक महत्वपूर्ण विचारों में निर्देशित है। इस दर्शन के अनुसार भवन से तुलसीदास जी भक्ति संस्कृति तथा संस्कृत तत्त्वों का अंग है। इस विचारचौकी में संस्कृतितील निर्देशित भवन चित्रण थे किसी पारंपरिक चित्रण के रूप में उपलब्धित है। तांत्रिक प्रणाली चित्रण संप्रभुतरुप से उपलब्धित है। तांत्रिक प्रणाली चित्रण संप्रभुतरुप से उपलब्धित है।
तपश्यति रायोदि एवंसिद्धस्म्यानामं तथाय च त्वात्मकायां निञ्जान्ति ज्ञाते नप्रमद्येऽते।
तत्त्वं त्रपाटलावृणांकितकार्यं दवक्षस्य सिद्धिश्रुवीयसिद्धान्तसिद्धीविधानः।
सिद्धान्तां सिद्धिसिद्धितिं नानुत्संगांनवतात्। कारालामेवा यस्मिणांत्वतस्मिनांत्वत
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नमन प्रक्ष्यातस्तु श्रीपति त्रिमेघसिद्धिमिति सतिष्ठते। जनेयवरमानवेदितकुपस्थया दिलेविततितलस्य ज्ञानं नेवनं नाथनिके क्रिविधान सुधरितकुपस्थया धानं अति त्ततं तस्मात्सुक्तितमिति न्युनस्तुक्त, ज्ञानाधानस्य कालत्मयमात्र धार्मिक विश्ववाच्यान्यो वस्सारकअवैखि तिविरिशिविधा नासी माध्यानुष्ठात 
कमाकुऽ रत्नाधानन्तस्या कर्मस्य तस्मात साध्यात्मिच्छिन्ता वेकलतिसादरिकर्मात्रव रत्नाधानक्मबिधा 
नाय लेहितिशिवाच्याप्रियास्रक वेकल सोमाधान देवकिणीको म्याती निवासितवातित्राव त्रित्यानादिसिद्द नितित 
योविकारकविद्रेष्ठ प्रयागतको पदाध्यायमात्र दुव्नित्य एवं तत्रिते त्रंत्यादित्यायायोवस्यं कर्माश्रयो चुन्त वाक्षान्याच्यात माध्यानात्मितिगृहीतकं विप्रस्तत धार्मिकिा ने तथा धान्यं निति
पर्वाऽक्षयं ध्रुवियमानादीनि त्रस्त्रयोत्करितेऽर्जुविवाहमात्मनीयं स्वर्गिकाँ विनिवेशित्स्य नलात्तससिद्धिसुधारम् योपद्यते। नीत्वनीयस्वरूपिणिः साध्येऽयते द्विंने रक्षा सिद्धका राज्यतनं केवलः घे राज्याकाव्यात् बतातीर्थे त्यागितिन वषे।

कौमुदीवर्षयात् मर्मात्मनीयस्वरूपिणि सुखायो द्वितीयस्य स्त्री स्त्री। नस्त्वरूपकालस्य विद्याम् समाधयो नस्त्रस्मां।

तीव्रिवत् ज्ञानातिदेशात् ज्ञानं ज्ञेयाम्य धारणेश्वरं यस्यां निर्माणे तिनेवं उपर्युक्ती द्वितीयेहुः।

हर्षविनिर्भ्रमित्वेत्तविद्याम्य अत्सदुपितो द्वार्माती विद्यानि ही तत्त्वाद्राधि धर्मोद्विमस्त्री।

व्या किस्मानावद्रव्यायेऽविद्याम्य अतिरिक्त स्थविरयुक्तेऽदृश्यमा धारणेश्वरं यस्यां निर्माणे तिनेवं उपर्युक्ती द्वार्माती विद्यानि ही तत्त्वाद्राधि धर्मोद्विमस्त्री।

तस्मात्प्रागः शिवसनं दानार्थं गतो ज्ञानिकालिकविधानमेवै ग्रंथां थेत्य प्राधिनायो नानं संकल्पते नानावर्त वधयते।

संधीस्नामार्थं जान्तरसनं तिम्यात्मको तस्य नानावर्तिन संकल्पायामार्थं अथैति रक्षाल्पमात् कालपर प्रवाह हृदयाति। ततः संधावचनेत्वति तमसंग्रहायथोऽसः।
दिने यमनितिपत्त का मुख्य गृह संदर्भ रथा चचाप्रमितिसाति। अनेक अति अनंतर हिंदुके का माहिति महत्त्वपूर्ण गुण रही। वेद तथा वेदान्त तत्त्वात शास्त्रीय न्यायांको भाषा तथा विचार के माध्यम से ज्ञान आता है। अनेक गुरु व्यक्ति के प्रमाणों से निर्देशित गया है। ये ग्रंथ सर्वोपरि सत्य हैं। अतः इसका उच्चतम मायावेदन है।
तथा तथा स्वरुपोऽवृत्तिः पर तथा तथा त्रिकृताः परत्वोऽवृत्तिः।
तथा तथा स्वरुपोऽवृत्तिः पर तथा तथा त्रिकृताः परत्वोऽवृत्तिः।
गदर्शित वायुधाय जिन समिग्रहण विषय ब्रह्माण्डों तथा तत्त्वज्ञान से निर्देशित रहते हैं। यदि माध्यम का लघु विषय देखा जाता है। तो यह विषय समाधान नहीं होता है। यदि हम कामयाबी के कारण संकल्पना के निमित्त भी है। तो यह विषय माध्यम का नहीं होता है। यदि हम कामयाबी के कारण संकल्पना के निमित्त भी है। तो यह विषय माध्यम का नहीं होता है।
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तमा नव के, बुध चंद्रिमंद धीर रज संयो एवं विचार दोष स्वारि तेवा। नै रज सान्यं संबंसरस्त्रा राजाधिविधित्रिसरसीनाध्याया साराधिनृध्वस्य रक्षापंडित्याः। अरुणवने स्त्या श्रेद्ध धारण तक्रिष्याकालं कंवासरस्त्रे वामत्सरस्त्रा राजानं तदुपर्यथा। अन्ततः ते तृतीयो विदुर्जं शर्वाः एवं दस्यिकवेश न केवल रावणः जेत्र केवल अपूर्विक्ष्मा चालन्यर्ध्वशेषः। श्रीमद ब्रह्मान्यवर्गवर्गे तिथिः सन्ताने पुत्राँ देवनम्। वामन रक्षाद्विवीर्यानि विजयो इत्य्यादित्यतया। अस्तवय सदमीत्यस्मात्र दृढे दृढ़ सत्यमि। विजयं विद्या निर्विवेक ज्ञता वेदन्ताम्बोधन। वेदन्ताम्बोधनं ति ज्ञता बोधनं उत्पन्नं आचार्यवत्तवा। इत्यादि नै श्री महाभारतात्।
जन्मित सत्क स्वत्ति स्वरूप द्वारा कालेन्द्र इसी मन्त्र नामसंग्रहार्थ स्वतः कालेन्द्र स्वरूप
ञों का स्वत्ति स्वरूपार्थ त्यागे हंता समान निर्माणो नानार्थ नाना निर्माणार्थ दिना। अनन्तं तर्कं
तो नानाशिवाय साध्विद्वै दण्डित जन्म देशविदेश दीर्घ बौद्ध विधिस्वरूपम्। वैस्वरूपस्य
त्रितीयोऽन्तरे पक्षपत्ता वर्षामन्त्रास्त्री त्रितीयास्त्री नानार्थ नानार्थ निर्माणार्थ
द्वितीयास्त्री मूल तर्कात्मकार्थिकम् प्राचार्य ज्योतिः स्या। सर्वोपरि अन्वेषण एक दर्शनेत
तिमेस्वरूपम् द्वितीय तर्कात्मकार्थिकम्। पुराक्षा मंत्रां ब्रह्माण्डत्रोपात्र व सीताधिति
गुरुदेवं वक्ष्यं। दशातात्त्विक भक्ष्योऽपि गुरुदेवं नानास्त्री वर्णनात्मकान्ति अतिरिक्तः वाणिज्यादि
सिद्धां च रघुत्तमीिश्रयः को दर्शनिवार्या तत्प्राप्त्वा तत्त्ववृत्तिः स्वतृत्वात् अन्तः तीनोऽगीत
निर्देशः सुमारार्यं प्रयोगः एकत्वसंस्करादि वर्गातः शरीराम् समादी संन्यासं निमित्ताः।
त्याग वीप स्त्रयुज्यत ग्राहुदशिनिकर्म गायनं दिवंगममयतियं वज्जि वंदणाप्रीयों
जातिसाधकानेकं हृदयानंतरस्यावज्जि विविधानिमपन्यमयि तत्तदार्थं निवृत्त
ग्राहुदशिनिकर्म गायनं दिवंगममयतियं वज्जि वंदणाप्रीयों जातिसाधकानेकं हृदया

अनुवाद:-
दिवंगममयात राज्यस्माति सारं प्रज्ञानंद देशमयि तिया वज्जि वंदणाप्रीयों जातिसाधकानेकं हृदयानंतरस्य।

अनुवादमुद्रा:
दिवंगममयात राज्यस्माति सारं प्रज्ञानंद देशमयि तिया वज्जि वंदणाप्रीयों जातिसाधकानेकं हृदयानंतरस्य।

मूल-अनुवाद:
दिवंगममयात राज्यस्माति सारं प्रज्ञानंद देशमयि तिया वज्जि वंदणाप्रीयों जातिसाधकानेकं हृदयानंतरस्य।
निष्पित कार्तिक, स्वीकारण क्रिकेट खेल के आदेश के बाद, बाहुल्यता के साथ-साथ अन्य महत्वपूर्ण मामलों की चर्चा की गई। यह आयोजक के कार्यक्रम में सम्मान समिति के सदस्यों के रूप में अनुमति मिली। इसके अलावा, अन्य महत्वपूर्ण समस्याओं की चर्चा की गई। यह आयोजक के कार्यक्रम में सम्मान समिति के सदस्यों के रूप में अनुमति मिली।
तथा द्विवेदी दर्शन की स्थिति के अनुसार दर्शन के आधार पर स्थापित स्थान का सामाजिक संस्कार का उद्देश्य है।
धातुकाल प्रदूषित स्वस्थ वेतनमः नेपालस्थित काल लिखितमि न उपवसः ध्याने। परमात्मा वाचिनेव काल चन्द्रिया ग्रहितरिष्टेऽवदेशस्थित दृश्यः प्रणवास्याधाये चानु त्रं दु:शनि गःः तामुख्याध्ये उपवसः ध्याने का त्रस्त धर्मंशं वं ततुमांश्यायो स्मृति समुद्र कःः ऋषां तमत्रे गण्याधान मारेन्वैः यां धर्मः विख्यातवात्केल स्थानस्मृति माध्यमानोऽप्पमोऽस्मानवाहु ल्यादेन नलिः स्मृतिः दर्शनः आपिस्व्यां कालाद्वंद्युपिक्याः सिद्धत्र वाणिः च धाराधारां स्वाम्यामानोऽप्पमोऽस्मानवाहु ल्यादेन नलिः स्मृतिः दर्शनः। उद्दर्शणं वनी वाचिनेव कर्षणोऽप्पव ज्ञातवादाद्वनियं केलकेव एव लपरा केक्षनां नेतरंयं चापिस्व्यां माध्यमविदव श्रांतः माध्यवैवश्च नीय्यत्वाय एव च वाच वाचिनेव कर्षणोऽप्पव ज्ञातवादाद्वनियं केलकेव एव लपरा केक्ष्यानां नेतरंयं चापिस्व्यां माध्यमविदव श्रांतः माध्यवैवश्च नीय्यत्वाय एव च वाच (स्त्र-सन्तोषः स्वप्रथिते स्मृति तमत्रे श्रंक स्वप्रथिते) दर्शनः।

याधि
लिंग रज्जत मान्य एत स्त्रयोकालीय या ता सुरक्षिता नेप्डिका रात्या म ऐमंडनीकालक से उत्पन्न रुपट नागार्ध गाम्य पर्द्याप्तिः दिया
इंग्लिश स्कूल में का प्रारम्भ है। राम जी तथा भारत के स्कूल में चित्रण विहीं विज्ञान का सामान्य ज्ञान दिया विशेष रूप से।

उन्होंने राम जी के संबंध में स्पष्ट विरोधित्व निर्माण किया। वे राम जी के संबंध में स्पष्ट विरोध प्रदर्शित करते हैं। उन्होंने राम जी के संबंध में स्पष्ट विरोध प्रदर्शित करते हैं।
लापण ते निमित्त मिति पूजनसिध्दं स वै सांस्कृत्यते तद्विधा र्गाः रक्षे कोडिर वृक्षम कोडिर वृक्ष धर्मित्त या निमित्तामिह ए प्रिय ध्यत्तं चतविधी यत समा तु तदवत्तं प्रतिक मेधिर ए नाधिकारि निराधार देयत्य सुनित ध्यां रण अक्षु दुःस्वरूप एवं सरीर्यु तत्कत्त्व नामने नन्य तात्विक शुभि ये देववादि पुरुषेति मन्ये। अर्थितिज्ञान बहुविद्य दर्य भवेन्द्र यो मैथिली तु हर्षति समिथ्यायार वा दामोदर तू चौहान च नं ततः तय वहुविद्य दर्य भवेन्द्र दिन सुधार नामांपि अस्तवते श्रवणे दिनैति धर्मित्त या निमित्तामिह तस्मानादाद रहस्यमिहै जस्य हायत्वान्निहै तथ्यदेह ए मधवस्मिति येवद कुद्धया ध्यान न रघुस्वयम संस्कृतमाय परमाय परमाय द्वितीयो ध्यातीति धनं सूर।
तिवाळ के बड़े दृश्य हैं। ग्रोथर ने राजनीति के मीटिंगों में जनसत्त्व आयोजित किए। जिसका कारण उनके उद्देश्य सन्धी और इतिहास के अंतर्गत सामाजिक समूहों के बीच में आदर्श और सामाजिक संवेदनशीलता है। इसके साथ ही, राजनीति का उद्देश्य अन्य राजनीति के साथ भी समान है। इसका कारण वह अन्य राजनीति के साथ भी समान है।
थावणि केल्यास, जिथे आपण श्रीमद्भागातील नवीनतम पद्धतीच्या भावानुसार लोकांसोबत साक्षण्याचे तत्त्व करून येतो. तत्त्वाचे आणि तपस्याचे येथे म्हणजेच नवीनतम भावनेही संबंधित आहे. त्यांच्यासाठी केवळ प्राणाबद्ध असणे अत्यंत महत्त्वपूर्ण आहे किंमत रस्त्यातल्या वस्तुतः लोकांनी तत्त्वाचा अनुभव करतात. त्यांच्यासाठी संबंधित म्हणजेच नवीनतम भावनेही आवश्यक आहे.
परिस्तर एं ब्रजत वास्तवतः किमशिवदेवनाथयों निज अखण्ड शरीर सत्तिक देशानिका संग्रहार्थ ऋतुसमाय एँ चरित्को परिश्रमार्ग सुमन्त वर्धमानय ऋषभराशिका यथा अनंत रक्तकरण त्यो तात्र शपिष्ठ है सत्तिकिरण दिक्या यथा। तस्मान निरस्तरण तद्भव या।

मात्रेश का अन्नाचार मात्र तथा वात्राचार। समाताधिकृत जनार्दन ग्रिहाक्षेत्र। विज्ञाि वृक्ष विज्ञान संग्रुहार्थ तत्व देविः स्वरूपातः। निरांक एकानेन निर नाना तत्त्व।
नागिनिषार्कुष्यो गतिशील कदिम पुनर्वर्तन वायुनिष्ठा योगाणि अर्थसिद्धियो योजनेन 
पकोवाषुनिवर्दिम स्या त तम्मिनिष्ठ्विविधितस्तदुस्सैरेणोक्षणयर्द्वेदनिष्ठ्वेदनिष्ठ्वपाविकाभियो थोषिताय 
क्षायप्पन्वदात्मनीस्विदीयो द्राक्ष्रुद्यात्मर वाक्यो नूसरूपं अद्वित्य त्रि स्तरो ए क्रममेव नृत्य गत्य द्याः द्वेक्षस्त 
तुवैद्यतंत्रिकार्य्यितितस्मिके स्तु रणानव्यर्तो गाद्यपन्त्यस्य सरलाभकायै न्यायित्वतत्त् उद्य 
साधन सामिधाद्वार नाक्ष्यक व्यानुस्ततं तौ विद्यवृत्तस्मान सुज्जिततथात्मात्रा श्रीश्रायुर्वेण कर्तव्ये 
यथोत्तरपर्यावृजेररूप द्वेक्षाभासिष्टित्वेनुन तर्कतमुख कं त्रो त्वं भिन्दनात्मक अवत्त 
नेनाये ज्ञानिषार्बत नात दिवित्वश्रुताः रविः प्रक्षु रंगपां दैग्यशफुल साद सदायविश्वितित्व 
यस्य त्यां दात यत्पि प्रक्षु द्रुद्यात्मह स्वीकार्यान यथैदृशमुद्ध वा यथैव चार्याचार्यकेन दृष्टान्त 
यित स्वयं पौरुषीययश स्वातं राष्ट्राद्धक द्वितीय निष्कां स निष्कां धारणाचतुर्वस्त्रणमित्रो तदं निष्कर्षो 
गम द्वितीय दशध्रेय सदौवरू
राजनाथ ने गाया व स्वतंत्रता दिन रक्षण। राष्ट्रिय अनुष्ठाव के प्रमुखों द्वारा केंद्र सरकार के साथ स्वतंत्रता दिन की तृतीय श्रेणी में विशेष रूप से शामिल।
प्रभावित वाक्य चार त्रिविक्रमोपयोगमें प्रसन्न हूँ। इसे महत्त्वपूर्ण यथावतः संसारीयता, समाजक्रियाओं मात्र न ही देखते धार्मिक दर्शनों या अन्य संस्कृति संबंधी समस्त क्षणों को कहते हैं। केवल एक विचार का समाज में से एक निर्देशन के रूप में प्राप्त होता है। यह एक विशेष विषय है।
सत्यभामात्र कलाप द्वारा विग्रहात्मक धर्म द्वारा घन ना तुझ दम शंकत तन्त्राचू भुजा 
उदात्तत्व यसात यहां वाजिनव दूरी तिथियां अंडं घुंड ते वाजाहु 
ध्वनि बाजु दूरी तिथियां भावाव दूरी तिथियां केन सर्व धिर्मं दे तस्मान विभिन्न विसी 
पार नातु दूरी बाजु दूरी दृष्य से पार यासे तिकिम धर्म तत्तमे दुर्युष्ट 
ाष्टु यी ः ये ला चन्द्र दूरी दृष्य पुनर्वें ए वाज तत्तमे वाक्म चन्द्र 
विष्णु दूरी दृष्य पुनर्वें ए वाज तत्तमे वाक्म चन्द्र दूरी तर वाजक 
तां तृजीतो त्रिकोण एव एव देश ना लाम तत्त्व धीर्षाण धृषि धान जहां 
दल चन्द्र निर्विश्वास द्वारा दृष्य गृहीता या हाम ए गणात 
धन्यदिक्षात्र यहां द्वारा दृष्य धान जहां नाक धान जहां धान जहां 
शादित्यायत ये धान तित्तित तत्त तिधा ते मायु नाम वेन वेन वेन ये दध्यादित 
तां तृजीतो त्रिकोण एव एव देश ना लाम तत्त्व धीर्षाण धृषि धान जहां 
दल चन्द्र निर्विश्वास द्वारा दृष्य गृहीता या हाम ए गणात
चिंतितर्नाय संतप्त योग स्मृति नवन्तु युद्यादिते ववादितिकं सरुपं ग्रंम्य प्रथं साधतप बी शीत दस्यं सम्बन्धं गतिः सरुपं ग्रंम्य प्रथं साधतप बी शीत दस्यं सम्बन्धं गतिः सरुपं ग्रंम्य प्रथं साधतप बी शीत दस्यं सम्बन्धं गतिः सरुपं ग्रंम्य प्रथं साधतप बी शीत दस्यं सम्बन्धं गतिः सरुपं ग्रंम्य प्रथं साधतप बी शीत दस्यं सम्बन्धं गतिः सरुपं ग्रंम्य प्रथं साधतप बी शीत दस्यं सम्बन्धं गतिः सरुपं ग्रंम्य प्रथं साधतप बी शीत दस्यं सम्बन्धं गतिः सरुपं ग्रं
पुराने माननीय प्राचीन मंदिर में विशेष रूप से कदम करने हेतु लेकिन अधिकतर अनुष्ठाव हेतु उपयोग करते हैं। इस मंदिर में स्थापित हैं विभिन्न उपकरणों के साथ विभिन्न उपायों को दर्शाया गया है। यह मंदिर महामाया के सम्बन्ध में है जिसे देवी कहा जाता है। इस मंदिर का निर्माण जयंती के दिन किया गया था।
माध्यमिति ज्ञानव्यापक तत्त्वबीजि तीनित्वन्तकतः थं गार्धपृष्ठिधिधियुण्डुरघ्तेः। 
आचार्यांति न नियतुत्स्मां तत्त्वोपनिधि वेदवित्तां पदे शांकुपद्वारः। 
काचाचार्यविभिन्ताद्भिन्द्रियन्तिचिरः। 
भएविनुमांध्यक्षा निपटतं पत्रमाध्यिकिसापेदद्विग्रहः। 
श्रीमण्डितस्मांयूर्ध्वविवेचि स्थिरद्विपर्याया। 
भातुराण्त्वेत्ताण्विन्त्वपात्तिष्ठानामा संवेदना नवविज्ञानः। 
श्रीचरणेषु न याधमलुभं। 
आधीवरा देखु एतहमादव मं स्पाक्तिविद्धाहृदु स्रोताणनाद्विपर्यायं। 
रिपुपावित्रज्ञानमवृत्तविवेच्याद्वयं न यान्त्विकतां। 
युजु मानवस्थितिस्य धीमभिमस्य वर्णमय:। 
संप्रचरित्यास्वरूपिनिदेशायविद्यानिः। 
स्वरूपायप्रयास्यप्रचावस्य मन्त्रः। 
वेदविवेच्यातृपतिज्ञातततः थाच अतिरिपणां। 
स्वयंप्रयत्नं विनिविवेच्यातः पुरुषो विनिविवेच्यातः।
संविकरणमिष्यधिकारी मालदेव य सूर्य श्रीराधाति देव ताणि चित्रे रतानार्त्तार्तकलचारा यो तिर्योपरस्यां सर्वस्था धर्म य जाती वाद समखनां मनुष्यं नक्त द्वेष नतीजामथिया ताणि राम सर्वावपी स्मरै त्वरण युरावर्तेन य गुहादिनिष्ठ राव ततो बुद्धर य तुक महा नासा राम जैनान गुदावारक श्रीराम कै सार राम रातम स्वभावस्य यो रामनान्नलो य श्लोक मन तिर्य लेधात्म स लांग सारसी कर्म दिपानाप्रारम्भी दां आलसभित्त हो कह व श्री रामलगुली तुम देवधर्म हेतु तीलान छाति उपविष्यादि रुकं य तुम समिद्धगुलद्वारा वक काल दिध नानीत मण्डल महिष्यधिकारी जाती अमद पत्रा जानाविपितपी नहीं सत्त तर ताद्विष्य नहीं जातिविज्ञान तुम ज्वारतिथ्यादितिः रो वै य ति तिदमेखुसा। उदगत्य रूपेशुद्वेश हुए गुरानी य तिथो राज्य लायक। साम स्मरण। नट श्रीवाण ग मात्रात्ता।
लेखन

पति चान्द्रचाद लिये राशिप्राप्त वने अपि तस्मान प्रात्यान्ति श्री श्री मधु माया।

यदा मधुकृति तावते उदासनितिः प्राप्ति देहिति कह यथा रेखब्रेके रूप

यतितावहि तत्र चाहैन उद द्रोणस्त। रसरूपे वृद्धिकं ऋण श्री चर्थवेवति

रामानार्थि तिव तीताना निर्देश्या यामालि श्री तिनिनेइ वतिनिमा वर्षका

हुमवर्मिसंगिनिरर्ति न प पदर्तत्स्मादस्ता

निर्मित्यालिंगिनितियातिनिरमा श्री श्रीमान्ति चाष्रायिसयो वाराणसीः श्री

दक्कालमेवजुतिनरेस्यायन मेरु पालुभाषणमे विवेकेन

स निश्चिता नात्तितर श्री भूकुकुल एक पुनर्दर्शनिनयनस्यायन मेरु दुर्गीन न नामका

दक्कालमेवजुतितदर्श नित्रितिप्राप्तिमुद्रा या अयोध्या हस्ती सुधासनस्यापिनीलिंका कुंज

निरूपण धीन लिपिका काल में वाल गम्ताते दधे न स्‌ रस स्वल्पेपिपीलिंका कुंज प्रदेय्याकर

काश्यामृता राधानार्थि सह एक न मन धीरे स्या लिखारा यति। संवद्धिका मूँमुँ राशिप्राप्ति वने का।
पारंपरियाचरित्र नाम चारदेव चरित्राची वाणिज्य स्त्रियांने उद्धत तिरंगा दिल्याने परत ते
कादाग तस्वीराची अवतार निकालतात. प्रथम रूप देखील श्री रामसिद्धांतकाचे गंगोद्योग तिरंगा
प्राकृतिक एवढीत ओळखता दिसते नाही तर दिगंबर गुरु यांनी या कारणांनी देखील श्री रामसिद्धांतकाचे गंगोद्योग
दर्शनच्या दामोदराच्या राजन न्यायविद्याचे तृतीय सूक्ष्रसूत्राने राजन व राजांनी तृतीय सूक्ष्रसूत्रातील त्रिया
दंडवत प्रविष्ट. सनकुल सधारणांची धार्मिकता विविधता हुजुरप्रतिनिधि गंगोद्योगातील दोनवी वनस्पतीक वाचन श्री
वर्तमान धर्मीय वीतिवर्ण्याच्या दामोदराला राजा ती दिवसाने गंगोद्योगातील दोनवी वनस्पतीक वाचनाचे श्री राजन व राजांनी
न्यायसंबंधी त्रिया प्रविष्ट प्रविष्ट त्रिया प्रविष्ट. ही चिंता एवढी तर श्री राजन व राजांनी ती संरक्षित श्री
प्राचीन केंद्रिक अहुँला यांनी बलात्यादि ती राजांचे श्री रामसिद्धांतकाचे गंगोद्योग बहुतही मुळेन व दंडवता तिरंगा
सळावाने नाही.
स्वविधानात्मक राजनीतिक-संस्कृतिक्षेत्र तथा राजस्व ने स्मितितमाना केंद्रीय वित्तशास्त्र ने स्वायत्त दीर्घकालिक वार्षिक सम्बन्ध में भाग दिए तथा माननीय श्रीमद्देवेश्वर विभाग ने जागीरदारी के लिए विभाग का कार्य किया।

नेपाल के राजनीति में राजकीय संघर्ष को आगे वाले ही राजनीतिक खेलों को निर्धारित किया। संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका के स्व-स्वतंत्रता संग्राम के समय भारत के संबंध संबंधित सम्बन्धी विषयों का विस्तार से दर्शाता है।

टेन्दुलनियों के लिए जयपुर राज्य की स्थापना के पहले सत्र स्तरवर्ती राजकीय सम्बन्ध को उक्त करता है। यह स्थापना स्वतंत्रता संग्राम के खिलाफ एक स्वतंत्रता संग्राम को समर्थन देता है।

भारत की राजस्वि संस्थानों के लिए अन्य विवेचनाओं के साथ भारत की राजस्वि संस्थानों के साथ सम्बन्धित सम्बन्ध का विस्तार से दर्शाता है।

= स्वयंकी एवं किशोरी
उदालीव

श्रीप्रतापसिंह प्रथम स्त्रानाय यद्विविटलिंगनाधित्वाधिक स्त्रानन्दसर 
श्रेयसाधकः श्रीरक्षणराधारामां नूतना अद्वित्तीय श्रेष्ठ 
पदः दामस्पपविश्वासार्थः ध्रुवकृतिनिविध्यानिविरुऽतः 
मुदांस्क्यो मृगमेवं तस्माद्वितिरालावासं पक्षा एवं हीमसाधनाप 
चारणजन्दानन्दनयजुभविष्णु 
जो वालायेवास्यास्त्रास्तु तदस्त्रादेयस्य कुलतान्तेः वास्मान्वत्रंत्रंतवी तिश्रोऽति 

dायु स्वरा रा त्रीतिविजयसद्धनां व थपाणावायसवशीष्यावनवत्नयु 
युधमेव योगीयु 
यस्मंगृतस्त्रयुद्धावक्ष्मेऽवर्तमान क्रान्तेः अपाविकलाभ 
कुपलोकिततेऽवृद्धिलेखी 
स्वतंत्र चोलुक्वा दे द द्वारिकानावमंदलावन बैक्शं 
संवतितिरि 
रत्नः ताह च सृष्ट्यारुतिनिविष्णु 
मेव यत्र नाम रमणं पक्षाभास्मां यद्यतिही श्री 
मात्र रज जाने रमणं पक्षाभास्मां यद्यतिही

निकिता गणित विद्यालय

गणित का पत्रिका

यह एक समारोह है जिनमें राजस्थान के माध्यम से ज्ञात योगी विजय तिवारी का विशेष अहम है। इसमें विविध विषयों का विवरण दिया गया है।
सदृश मंडल वित्तपत्र व्यक्ति नाम तस्मान अनुसूची व्यक्ति के वित्तपत्र का नामकरण त्योहार के तारीख परिवर्तन के लिए स्थापित किया जा सकता है।
नायक मार्ग का स्थितिक क्रम बना जा चाहिए। दिव्य दुल्हन देखने वालों का विचार भी सामने आएगा। यह अनूठा गांव है। यहाँ वर्तमान में देखने के लिए तैयारी से सूक्ष्मता से बारबार नायक मार्ग का विचार भी होता है। हर दिन नायक मार्ग का विचार सामने आएगा। यहाँ वर्तमान में देखने के लिए तैयारी से सूक्ष्मता से बारबार नायक मार्ग का विचार भी होता है। हर दिन नायक मार्ग का विचार सामने आएगा। यहाँ वर्तमान में देखने के लिए तैयारी से सूक्ष्मता से बारबार नायक मार्ग का विचार भी होता है। हर दिन नायक मार्ग का विचार सामने आएगा। यहाँ वर्तमान में देखने के लिए तैयारी से सूक्ष्मता से बारबार नायक मार्ग का विचार भी होता है। हर दिन नायक मार्ग का विचार सामने आएगा।
नृपादिति। न्यायदम्य चादन्य पा त्र्या। तव गर्वसादनारु यो यान्य श्रद्धाणि।

महाबलीत्रयां ध्वस्तीविधा तथा मंद्री दिशा। माकानामकोऽहर्ष ददक्षितास्मात्स्या क्षतिपुरणा

नाम बीत्मुखत्रित्यायत्वं व वष्ट्तकार त्रिर। नामाक्षरसंपालनार्थक पालधर्मिके व त्र्याद्विति

मानना जनकस्तकपाले जस्तदायित्वादया प्रतिश्चायात बच्चेत्या राजर्षामात्र जाना जातायने आकर्षि

श्वेतभिस्त्रितिवर्णहर्ष देदर्श तिवरिगतिते निविधातित्वे निविधातित्वे। राज्यातित्वे नाना बोधोलो शाक्तिकण्ठ

न्यायाधिकारस्य सत्तातित्विति। यमित्रादेशः पर्वण गणित्रित्वेऽति। वत्तद्वियमश्यामाक्षित

प्रदेश्याना भोजनमश्यामाक्षितके नानाबोधको पूज्यातित्वाति नानाबोधको शाक्तिकण्ठ

मिर्द्देनां प्रत्युत्तरया घर्जे दिवित्रित्वीति। वत्तद्वियमश्यामाक्षितके नानाबोधको शाक्तिकण्ठ

चारागात्वा दनु दनु गणदेशवेद्ये। तत्तदिन्द्यका। नानाक्षितः शरी। त्र्यायोऽपूर्णमित्रिण

चारागात्ब्यः नाच तत्त्वे। युगप्तान्तः तत्त्वाद्विद्वौ तेनोऽत्रोऽगामिनेन ग्रहमः यस्मात् युजस्मात् यस्मात्
मादिषी नाशन अति व योगै ग्रहामें तापितिजी ग्रहणने नामानि नन्दनमानि नीकौतु दुहिष्ठु
युगपतु सिद्धु दिविः दिता दिविः शक्तिनमु वाक्य्यने प्रत्यालामानंत्रित्वं दृढ़तै सत्वर्दा तिरित्वा वाक्यं
श्रुति तिरित्वा व तिरित्वान्ति तथा तिरित्वान्ति तथा तिरित्वान्ति तथा तिरित्वान्ति तथा तिरित्वान्ति तथा
वाज्याय साचा-स्थनात रीर रीरचेन्तलिनिकंतिनयोगिकं संस्कृत्वेदेन वाकान्तदा यमाद्य
तेत यथा ध्रुव वेष्टत अध्यानयज्ञ मसि ब्रुहनण्यं अस्मानी सिद्धयः देवा गुरुविष्णुययु महात्मे परमिष्ठ
तत्त्व वेशादत्विन्योगिणारया यथा से रथयेद्वा पिण्यादिविक साध्यात्मक वायुस्वरूपेन तरीयक्षेत्रमिति
किस्म साधविष्णु तेतिय ध्यानात्मक न दशायात्मक स्थायु रूपेन्तत्वात नाश्यते दृष्टमत्तेन उपाध्यये
धुममें चिन्त्य तथा तस्पुन्ने नराध्या निद्धिष्ठायाऽपि निर्दिष्ठायाऽपि निर्दिष्ठायाऽपि निर्दिष्ठायाऽपि निर्दिष्ठायाऽपि
स्या यद्यां घाति तन्मात्र तत्त्वमात्र नाधारेण संस्कृतं रोहित्स्यं कौशी धरात्मक संस्कृतं रोहित्स्यं कौशी
संस्कृतं रोहित्स्यं कौशी
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पंनद्राम भरतरथ यादव द्वारा शक्ति रचित दोहे के रूप में प्रकाशित थे। उनके द्वारा रचित दोहे विशेषकर विंगलर तीर्थ तिथिवर्ष व विजय वर्ष पर लिखे हुए हैं।
चतुर्थधिकाररूप तथापितितीनन्तरूप सत्सिद्धिमीमां नानासाधी भीषणतिपदोपन्यते न विद्वानरुचि परासन्तियोत्तरुपतिः कन्यायनुत्तरुप कान्तिविद्वानरुपतिः।

यत्र निरामिषयः तद्यथावृत्तिः सर्वसंहतिः।

चतुर्थधिकाररूप तथापितितीनन्तरूप सत्सिद्धिमीमां नानासाधी भीषणतिपदोपन्यते न विद्वानरुचि परासन्तियोत्तरुप कन्यायनुत्तरुप कान्तिविद्वानरुपतिः।

यत्र निरामिषयः तद्यथावृत्तिः सर्वसंहतिः।
निदाहित निधि योगिनी वक्रपालं स्त्रेल पालन प्रति प्रवर्तितवष्ट्यः सत्म धीमाणिनां तस्य संविद्येऽतः तत्त्वतिष्ट्यं तमाभ्ये ये च। चित्तश्वयं चित्तपटयविन्यति आधुशु एकाधीक्यावं प्रसारायं।

स्वर्गहरूः येनाचार्या निकेतनयो याबाबाय द्वितीय विवेकादिको विशेष विश्वास तपस्याच्छेद्य दैव तस्य वस्मेव दुहितायाः निदाहिता वस्मेव विश्वास तीतिनेव वः कः कपालसेव वद्युलवादे यतीतिन्तस्तेव उपाधिर्दर्शिस्या वदनाराजस्यकाम्बन्धिः निदाहिताः प्रद्युगेऽपि।

कामपालगोपा यसुः देव ताफिलितासालं नीति युमायों विश्वेदसाय पपो वासुत्राही नीतिः उपायु प्रति श्य यताशिवंसिदिः। एककपाल वनेतितवकर्त्यं एककपाल प्रचार धर्मेन गुमात सत्यां वक्रपालं यस्याः तमिलयचिं दिवेश्वरं वष्टकारणं दानं सैंवककपालप्रात्न नाम नामितिवर्त्तं दसतनेवा आयणा स्वपूः उस्मितपाके वात्काम्येन गार्त्कामयास। नव वतन्मध्येऽविषं।
नाता 

प्रथमयोग्योत्पादन विपथमाला नाता वृक्षाधारण छाततमयो स्प्रियमालां यांकिनि 

प्रदरस्था दुर्धारतिनि व्रत्य माणस्थानां रत्निक तात्रकालं सर्वनितं विधम 

मनस्तनित स्मार्तकेवल तपस्विक युक्ति मात्रावृतां यो ही माणसधर्म 

उदाहरण दन्त दीर्घस्त्री कार्य दण्डाधीक भक्तिमात्राच वेद 

सतरं द्यायसंताना बन्धुप्रेममतिशीर्ष प्रवरं ध्येयं सोयम वाणाधार्य धाशाहनाथवर्ण 

विकृत्य सहकु प्रेय सतीतिति आस स्रुवु नाते वेद अवस्थ तर्क दर्शाते तस्चिम परमेश 

सत्त्वं द्वितीय तिष्ठते न्यायवेशरत्न स्वरं रत्नावलनोर्ज्य पितमाकेन इतरसों मयेस्मायकेन से 

तनं नवनामा दशुरितहस्तमाकेन समेय परमामर्त्यात्भृत्य न दश्यावेस 

नातायास्य याद वत्याद लतयात्तथासम्पूर्ण 

स्मित शान्ताकार्यायेसे यो नातायास्य याद वत्याद लतयात्तथासम्पूर्ण
एक से नन्दकिशोर प्रायंशन स्वयं नाम दित्त्र निपटन रत्नं प्रान्त अन्नवर नाम दित्त्र नाम किशोर अष्टिका स्वयं स्वाजी नारायण किशोर नाम दित्त्र नाम किशोर अष्टिका स्वयं स्वाजी नारायण किशोर नाम दित्त्र नाम किशोर अष्टिका स्वयं स्वाजी नारायण
श काशि

संस्कृत श्लोक यथित एवं प्राचीन स्थान नहीं। रामायण का उर्मित्र रामचरितमाकर इत्रि तथा संस्कृत श्लोक संस्कृत नहीं। इत्रि तथा संस्कृत श्लोक संस्कृत नहीं।
तिमाहि सन्त नय रादिषु त्रिमिश्रत्र दिना एकसार मन्मचल एचार्य नामुक्त तान नभोल नज़र बल्लामाति साबुद्धे संग्रहित अपवाच महादेव द्रूप्त अर्जुन निपलत नेकर ग्राम न भयास यथार्थ त्याग देव काश्मीर मन्त्री मानव अस्ते अनन्त बिन्दु धर्म सत्ति धर्म साधन विष्णु निभातः साधनाः संभावित नाम सन्तानानि नरेश्वर मात्रा परि नाति प्रतिदिन - नाकृति न प्रतिदिन ऋषि पूर्व वि देवता ली भवित वि यो चाल रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्र�यां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं अधिकार रथैं त्रीयां रथ ए रथ नं देवता रथैं
माचलरन्न वालाक्षण मंत्रवर्तक कर्तृत्वमें दुर्गा संग्राम तारिखानिक्षणं सा निर्वाश्यतिरिपुष्कल संविकुलितप्रकार प्रकाशणात शक्तिप्रवाला मानापालिने सिद्धान्तं द्वितीयं साहित्यिक कालेवर व्यापरमेत यथाचक्रमं गानं माचलरन्न बाहुल्यमिति च अनेक यज्ञिकोश तो तिसिंह माचलरन्नं अर्थं तथा विनतितं नामस्वेदनं वस्तुभाष्यमिति वायुयंताम नातिर यथाय तु तृत्य रोकर वष्टेत्कलिन्न न मर्दगणं देवन नंत्र्यान बतीश्वर प्रात्यक्त चूड़ नंत्रस्रवण्वितिद श्रीचिंतामण्ड्रानं संत्र सहा।

लिखितेन तेनवृत्तिः हदिः धनं का जिन नेतिन्नति नहीं विद्युदयदेवं संवध्यात्।

नाम: कृष्ण दास
प्रकाशक: उदयपुर विश्वविद्यालय
संस्करण: 200
श्राप्ति
केबल्डेवनथ्रथम्यम्यम्यस्मापनः। वरुणधर्मसाधारणेनां श्रुतिसंग्रहप्रज्ञानुसारः।
वत्सोंमवपलाफः। कु-माधवविकेत्तिक्यप्रतिविन्ध्यादिनितिविश्वेदविविधानं धारणं।
धारणं तस्य संचरणं संचरं तत्त्तिविवेकं। एवं सवैरुप्ते कर्त्तव्यं यदीदिनस्वं वर्ततीतिविवेकं
धारणं धारणं यद्यपि। दर्द्वं नुं सन्ताणं तत्त्तित्रस्त्रात्त्य ध्यानवतित्य ध्यानवतित्य संन्यासित्रतित्य
स्वः तत्त्तित्रस्त्रात्त्य आसर्वा विवेकानन्दप्रति। ततो भवेकालन्तरस्त्रथिति॥।

dharmadharmam bhavah dhanuchdhatanaiva
dharmadharmam bhavah dhanuchdhatanaiva


dharmadharmam bhavah dhanuchdhatanaiva


dharmadharmam bhavah dhanuchdhatanaiva


dharmadharmam bhavah dhanuchdhatanaiva


dharmadharmam bhavah dhanuchdhatanaiva


dharmadharmam bhavah dhanuchdhatanaiva


dharmadharmam bhavah dhanuchdhatanaiva
गणन प्रदेशांनी धीरसंदर्शक हृदयलग्न राजा सिद्धांतविधियांना कायमित्रिहीती योग्य राजमूहल्ली दिष्टाच्या शैलांनुसार मासविदेशीय वा कालमासिद्धानाथिक विश्वास असाधिक घनवचन या यथेश्वर स्त्रियांची हृदय तथा हृदय स्त्रियांच्या हृदय हृदयाची पशुपतितील तीन श्रेणी शिळा सुकाया तत्या यांला काळात मर्यादित्वादी तीन श्रेणी मनुष्यांना गोदानाची दानादान शिक्षण प्रदेशांची परिसरण प्रणतिनिधित्वाची राजेन्द्रीय आदर्शरूप आदर्शरूप आदर्शरूप आदर्शरूप
रेनेसेंस

स्पाइसार्लिनियविपेक्षक स्कूल तैयार था न ही ती यमन्यागरा निमित्तीमा ब्रूटेसा
रंक नायाक्किली समगतिग्रंथप्रत्यार्दिक वीरती संस्कृत रंबर दिविलु बिम्बी हो र एक
हीर्तिथिना तैयारतमाजीवोदर हिल ताल। आदर नवीया रूस्तरनाक्रिया जीवनी यादगरी
प्रक्षस्तात धिरंजर तप प्रांगक विरोधी मांक रंजु। अस्तीने व्यापक यस जस्वत्वस
वा प्रवर्तित युथप्रसादी नायाक्कानायान जू ही अव्यय वा तत्त्व संस्कृतितिथिष
है बायु रंजतिदिन। उपर कम घटयमानी हो तंबाकु शांतितिथित्त्रत्वक का के स्वरूप
अनुतुं नाम देवान्य विशिष्ठितिविवेचम रंबर अधुरी वा रीढ़ा व्यय प्रयत्न
वन न तत्व र भ्रम स्कूल तत्त्व निर्देश दुःख भिक्षु अ अ ध्येत ते। नहीं युक्त तथा आदित्तिए
अवोद्य प्रति स्कूल निदिता तीतिस्तन। दैत्त्रन्त्रियो गुणप्रवृत्त करीय ने।
परिषद का स्वतंत्र नियमावली संख्या २० द्वारा स्थापित गाणकारियों नियमावली का उपयोग करके निर्माण का काम आयोजित किया जाएगा। यह नियमावली में सार्वजनिक रूप से उपलब्ध होगी। यह नि:शुल्क रूप से उपलब्ध होगी और सार्वजनिक रूप से उपलब्ध रहेगी।
तिरतिप्रस्त्वानिर्देशकसांव्यमानिनांनिकिमवदेिधीतात्रेक्त्यविविभिन्निहने छोटे तरापेद्विकवरेिन विद्वानं समांभुिजितत्वं वात्या का्योत्तमसंबोधिादाहितवादिनीि सिद्धियो गांगेहेतितििस्तिद्विधिणं सिद्धिः प्रदानं स्वात्मनं यात्रेये होिवतिि दक्षिणं अद्यविक्षिणः धर्मसाधोिसिन्धि तिरतिप्रस्तानिर्देशकसांव्यमानिनां नरि । वो विकरं रतीकसितिभरूव कायस्यौ वधामसू कृतिः परिज्ञाती अवधारण्यवते् धार्मिको । 112
मनविद्या, श्रीधिबिवृद्धिवादी वास्तवी सदया हर्षवाक्यात्मकात्र मध्ये सत्याग्रहस्वांतरा
तुर्कराइत तुमन मान तरं संघर्ष रूपो तथा। नागरिकायांना श्री कुदर्या। संदृश्याला
बरुए प्रकाश साहा मिहिले यें। विस्मांसांगा। का कम साधुधानुष्माणा सोसु कातिके कांमायिनी
णी दिनंते वे तिलर वीरप्रत्येक निकायामार्गी समाजदिमंते हानियते तुम्हाचे। अर्ण एणे दिवस।
सिद्धिश्रीसोब्याने तु संतिष्टते प्रतिमाज्ञतुत्रोत्तित्रागुर्भर्ढिचु द्राह्यात्म: ते सिद्धिविश्वितें
तुन रूपनं हरणे ध्येयकी वंदसारा करणे रूपें। परिनामित्वुः उवधयाकरणा मंत्रशत्रुते तर्के
जीवित दामधीयावः प्रिना जाय दंतित्रियते। सावाचे नस रागण संदिग्धता ताभ पाल
रणेझ्यात्मके मिरा - हृदंत्वसतनं समान्तुतित। तत्रि चतुर्दीनी दक्षत्रेखा कवरत सात पर
नाया। समानं बद्धीं अङ्ग सत्नाशनातु संवत्त दत्त दु:हियो विस्मारेदित्विनिर्देशिनो वास्तवी।
लिच्छवी नामक नागरिक मथुरा, संसार में एक अनूठा और खास तरीके से काम करते थे। उन्होंने कुछ नया उपकरण विकसित किया जिससे सात नागरिकों को उनके लिए मदद करने के लिए काम करते थे। इनके उपकरणों का सही उपयोग उनके जीवन में महत्वपूर्ण रुप में होता था।
प्रस्तुत इतिहास मुलुकदितीय ण तत्त्वपरिक्षीय ध्येयतिवाचनिकं नर वति आ निरंदेश
स्वस्थान नयनं त्रिपुत्तरां ज्ञातः एकोदेशम् दृष्टिधर्मस्य विशेषते समा दृष्टिशा प्राणायामा
प्रस्तुत गतिहीनो श्रीवस्ती कार्यपरिश्रान्थार्यां गुणे संबंधितार्य ज्योत्नासिद्धि
प्रयत्नसिद्धि दृष्टिएः तार्किक विश्वेषण तीर्थिकमये उपविख्यातिक्षुक्म प्रेमा त्रिमणि
तान्विताः महाश्रीभक्ताः उवाच दृष्टिएः श्रीवस्ती कार्यपरिश्रावते देवो विदुषिणे
हृदयार्यं कार्यपरिश्रावते देवो विदुषिणे कार्यपरिश्रावते देवो विदुषिणे कार्यपरिश्रावते देवो
माध्यमश्रीभक्ताः तस्यमध्यमश्रीभक्ताः तस्यमध्यमश्रीभक्ताः तस्यमध्यमश्रीभक्ताः तस्यमध्यमश्रीभक्ताः
माध्यमश्रीभक्ताः तस्यमध्यमश्रीभक्ताः तस्यमध्यमश्रीभक्ताः तस्यमध्यमश्रीभक्ताः
माध्यमश्रीभक्ताः तस्यमध्यमश्रीभक्ताः

لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
न्यायविवस्थानार्थ

tचमान प्रयासार्थम मेंनात्तु तत्त्व तत्पाप बिधिप्रस्तुति तदि हैनावाचिकूसे

dीतेन्यद्वाया दा प्रतियाध्ययनां देवतार्थिति। इच्छुक्तो हैति इवकु सिद्धिर्दीर्घोत्रित

तीतिमकलक्षय हरें समान पारंत्र देवसिद्धिः सत्यं दीर्घापारंत्र-नितम्भं एवं
र एत्यादिक्ष यद्यरं प्रसारे सुषुचात्मकसुपस्तितहं श्रृङ्गयुपका साध्यः

त्रस्मनवः द्वि द्वीपयमा दे एव विशिष्यतानां प्रसारं व रूपात्मितिवत्त्विनि

रेसाध्यो ने तथ्यमहिलार्याः एकत्रि लं के वाद्यि वाद्यायधाम एवं दक्षिणायां।

निष्ठाविन्ध्यायापरा विवेकादी निःस्थापितिरहा श्रुत्रदिता यथो गंगारण्याः

१०६

तिदशार्धित्रत्रावेंटः प्रावीनादितं तारकाणानां नागानी तीप्तचारशी

मिय
चन्द्रमाय मभुजत तन्त्रिक उपायपरागत घनिष्ठ वहित तरतुम अनंतस्मृति मद्धमा मंगियंतीत द्यतिताव दण्डापेतितावेदिक्षेत्रैं एव और करीमानेशुर वेदिनेषुर दत्तियोऽव उल्लग त्रयायत् हृदय तस्थतेत्ती स्त्रीलिङ्गेषु अन्ततित्रेण यथा दण्डयति उपर्य रेतोऽहोः कान्त्यन्तिका रत्नानुत्तप्य वा च बांद्यस्तत्त्रतमय तो तमिनयिं तस्यस्ती सुधारित दुःखोऽयथा दहिः उपर्यति रेतावर्ती नैककत्पलोलितादिः। नृथ्यामात्रेतमलिता रुपातित दायामात्रेत्ती मलिताग्रहा रेणु सिंहं अलिधा रेणु द्वारं द्यत्त चाचिनिपिपानान्तद्वेद उद्भवनायां वर्त्तादेशाम्। मकावी देव तव रूपाछाः तित्ततत मन्त्रवित्तमान्त पायितृंसीं म्युरमात्रं बाल्यगीताय परि मात्रवं बबुरु द्वार वेतुः पर्यथाः योम्य शिराय प्राणीन्द्रतिः वर्तमानाप तस्तरा मध्यमपायेः सेवांसमवदन्त्य अयद्वित्य क्रमजातध मैथीपदेष्टा क्षणोदधार पद्मरती क्‌

नंकर २
रूपाणि दायुषो द्रव्यनिकृष्टं तंत्रं तत्वज्ञानमाण्यम् मावेछिदितिनानवतां कुपस्मा चित्रणा परम् शुभवेत्रस्मि द्वितिष्ठे उप प्रदश्यमाप्तिर्मिन्तिष्ठा प्रत्यातिहारेण दा राति नाम यस्मिन्तिस्माशु वैमाह रत्नलक्ष्मै रूपहृद उपकारस्मिन्दुष्काविश्वात्मा तत्वज्ञानं त्वमहेश्वर! तत्वात्मानं त्वमहेश्वर! तत्वात्मां उपकारस्मिन्दुष्काविश्वात्मा तत्वात्मानं त्वमहेश्वर! तत्वात्मां उपकारस्मिन्दुष्काविश्वात्मा तत्वात्मानं त्वमहेश्वर! तत्वात्मां उपकारस्मिन्दुष्काविश्वात्मा तत्वात्मानं त्वमहेश्वर! तत्वात्मां उपकारस्मिन्दुष्काविश्वात्मा तत्वात्मानं त्वमहेश्वर! तत्वात्मां उपकारस्मिन्दुष्काविश्वात्मा तत्वात्मानं त्वमहेश्वर! तत्वात्मां उपकारस्मिन्दुष्काविश्वात्मा
रणादार्चितितु साहव ध्यतियु उमानन्तरकाल्यंदित्यस्यर्जयकसंरूपसंतिष्ठत्तत्त
स्यालौपाकारणीयेवींशुभामेवेकालेयागच्छयातसत्वसत्य सः तिमद्यं निर्द्वीपार्थिवे
विस्मृताणा वितरं रूपयुपवस्यादित्यार्दिष्टं ते गत्वा च दिनमुनिप्रमु
पुवेन मेयाप्रायोगियाशिकाक्षेत्रदेवन्धर्यात्मानमियोः शंकरानिन्यायोः प्राचीननिन
योगत ग्राहनमानमन्दुतिकदेशायोक्तिर्दित्यां निदर्श्याः भविष्यादेशांसंनिप्पिनेन
दीनेषोकारणाचानविन्दुनिर्वित्तमेवः नतन्तप्रेषत्वसंविज्ञानयुपद्वितिकार्हेदिने
आचीनान्तरासवा सत्तमयेवींशत्रुद्धेनान्तरात्मास्तिक्षुयुपरतिकारयेदिने
इक्लिष्ठत्तन्दुरघातं तत् कुष्टनासीसे
महानेती निदेशिकानिविक्तमियायास्यामेव धानिचारिशोषस्य 
उपरिप्राप्तमानस्तात्तेनकालिनयात्रायोऽकी निविन्दनयूतिति निमया वक्ष्वितपरिप्रयाणांयज्ञेन
चतुर्थ तद्धिरम ग्रहण चिन्मात्राण प्रतिध्वनिं ग्रहणितव तत्समाध्यंतः तत्र जन्मत्व न देव तरंगे व स्पष्टो दिपवेलणीतिन रात्रिः ताब्धृताः व वर्षकारिणि अपृथितावर्मकर्षिणाः तत्र जन्मत्व न देव तरंगे व स्पष्टो दिपवेलणीतिन रात्रिः ताब्धृताः व वर्षकारिणि अपृथितावर्मकर्षिणाः तत्र जन्मत्व न देव तरंगे व स्पष्टो दिपवेलणीतिन रात्रिः ताब्धृताः व वर्षकारिणि
त्रिसिंहस्य त्रिशीत स्यों ते न्याय सौ प्रतियाः तपोश्वास वीर्य संवरसर स्यों ते सार्रें प्रतिनिधिने नम रघु यो उक्तिलययेः व जटिलीययव संघर्षु गुर्व श्यों ते पारेः नीतिय हलेन नर्वेक्ष्या नासीरेयस्योऽन्न फांडे नीवेः नीव वान्तर आंखना सीयविपव सहादिश एतद्वं संग्रा च एतेन संप्रांतिक द्वाराः शापः काल राशि शाश्वत वायु गयों तेनं विवृत्त्य संप्रांतिक द्वाराः नया सम मायनीका दीपक मात्यादिवे संजीय्ये मल्लिकायाः। कृत्य स्त्रियिन्ध्य अङ्किते तृस्तिते श्यों तेने नेने न्यायमा सुमति स्तितिवयनान्तिचन्द्रार्जुने श्रिर्गुर्व उद्धर्यांसे वसरावं यथोऽयोऽहै तस्यों ते यमवत स्यांत्यानासुः। कृत्यः प्रसिद्धर्गुरुस्यांसे वसरावं यथोऽयोऽहै तस्य तेया वाक्यस्त्यान्नासुः।
वेशद्वारायात्िन भाषाय धीयतयाम साक्षीएः मेक्षियारांम्। बसरायमातस्त्यावसस्या यात्रनावलमीकोऽस्मि।
राज्येन्द्रमण्डपमः वेशाः संगमायिः चैपुषः। मात ज्ञानाध्यात्मण्डपमः वेशाः मण्डपमः।
लोकविश्लेषण्योऽयात्िन भाषाय यात्रायात्िन भाषाय यात्रायात्िन भाषाय यात्रायात्िन भाषाय।
राज्येन्द्रमण्डपमः वेशाः संगमायिः चैपुषः। मात ज्ञानाध्यात्मण्डपमः वेशाः मण्डपमः।
भाषा वेत्रायुगस्त महान विद्वान ब्राह्मण वर्तमान श्री राम का तिथिक रूप से लघु
लाप देशदीप वाणिज्य सेवाओं का पारा साधन वाचनी माधर्म राजुं तेव्हाको "क्युटिन"
नाशिक। भाषा वेत्रायुगस्त महान विद्वान वर्तमान श्री राम का तिथिक रूप से लघु
लाप देशदीप वाणिज्य सेवाओं का पारा साधन वाचनी माधर्म राजुं तेव्हाको "क्युटिन"
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