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ARTICLE I.

THE TÂITTIRĪYA-PRÂTIÇĀKHYA,
WITH ITS COMMENTARY,
THE TRIBHÂSHYARATNA:
TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES.

BY WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,
PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

Presented to the Society October 14th, 1863.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

The manuscript material on which is founded this edition of the Tâittiriya-Prâtiçākhya and Tribhâshyaratna is as follows:

1. T. A copy of the text of the treatise alone, in a modern hand, on light-colored paper. It was sent me by Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, from Benares, in 1857, and appears to be a copy made for him from some older manuscript; but it contains no intimation of its own date or of that of its original; presenting at the end, in place of the usual colophon, the beginning of a list of words which in pada-text show a final n. It is distinctly and correctly written. On the back is inscribed "Krishna-yajuḥ- prátiṣākhya, by Kârtikeya." On what ground this ascription of authorship is made, I do not know; it does not, so far as I am aware, find support from any other quarter.

2. W. A copy of the text and commentary together, each separate rule being followed by its own comment. This manuscript, like the preceding, I owe to the kindness of Prof. Hall. It is handsomely written, in a large clear hand, and fills 146 leaves (numbered 1–89, 100, 1–58), measuring about four and a half by nine and a half inches. To the end of 25a, seven lines are written on a page; thenceforward, nine lines. It has no statement of scribe, place, or date; but I imagine that a final leaf, with the end of the colophon, had been lost or destroyed some time before it was sent to me. The part remaining reads as follows: gṛikṛshnā- pabhastu gṛikālabhāiravaprasann on yāyakāndavādīvyordhvam rshayo rshayo rshih ity abhāsāmakaśāupvam rsham cē ti svarāntvratā: 1 kramyādhvano bhavasya agra pāveko rpayaṭṭi ca. This just fills up the leaf; but another hand has written below, at its edge, what purports to be the ending of the second verse: visha-
yeṣugra ity evaṇya agra ity ādi lupyate.2., and has added, as final benediction, prieṣveṣvaraṇprasann.

This is a virgin manuscript, containing neither erasures, insertions, nor alterations. Considering that it thus presents every first fault of its scribe unamended, it is very good and correct. Through the first twelve chapters, the rules of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā are distinguished from the commentary by being rubbed over with a red powder.

3. B. This authority comes from the west of India, where (see Dr. Bühler, in Zeitsch. Dent. Morg. Ges., xxii.319) the Tribhāṣhayaratna is said to be not very rare. From a manuscript there collected, a copy was made under direction of Dr. Bühler for the Berlin library, and forwarded to Prof. Weber, at whose friendly suggestion and instance it was transcribed for me, in roman letters, by Dr. Siegfried Goldschmidt, to whom I desire here to express my gratitude for a service so valuable and so kindly rendered. The manuscript contains more inaccuracies of reading than any of the others which I have used, yet they are in the main superficial, and the text given is a pretty complete and correct one.

4. O. Through the kind offices of Prof. Max Müller, I have been enabled to procure a collation (made with a copy of my own manuscript, "W.") of the incomplete Oxford manuscript (MS. Bodl. W. 478), first described by Roth (Zur Lit. und Gesch. des Weda, pp. 54, 62 seq.), and used also by Weber (Ind. Stud. iv.77 seq.). It begins in the middle of the comment upon iii.12, thus lacking somewhat less than a quarter of the entire work.

5. G. This is a romanized copy of a manuscript which belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and is written on strips of palm leaf, in the Granthām character. The copy was made for me by Dr. Julius Eggeling, who has thus laid me under deep obligation, and contributed most essentially to the success of my work. Hardly less than to him is my indebtedness to Dr. Reinhold Rost, Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, who notified me of the existence of the manuscripts in the Society's library soon after their discovery, and who suggested and aided their transcription. There are doubtless few other Sanskrit-ists in Europe, besides these gentlemen, to whom works written in the southern Indian characters are not sealed books, and there can be none, I am sure, who evince a more liberal readiness to make their peculiar knowledge of service to the rest. The catalogue which Dr. Rost is preparing to publish of the Royal Asiatic Society's collection of manuscripts will give such other particulars respecting age, condition, etc., as I am compelled here to omit.

6. M. The library of the same Society also contains a second copy of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā and its commentary, written on paper, in the Malayālam character. Of this, Dr. Eggeling has taken the pains to note the various readings as compared with the Granthām manuscript, in his transcript of the latter.

Both these manuscripts from southern India are so arranged
that the rules of the PrātiṣṭākHYa are given first, in a body, and are followed by the commentary, also in bulk.

As regards the text of the PrātiṣṭākHYa itself, all these authorities agree very closely: there are but two or three cases of well-established variations of reading among them. In respect to the text of the commentary, their accord, as was to be expected, is much less: they fall, in fact, into three well-marked classes; or, as one might say, present three different recensions of the work. The two codices belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society, the Grantham ("G.") and the Malayālam ("M."), stand in the nearest possible relation to one another, having almost all their errors, omissions, and orthographical peculiarities in common, and only by comparatively rare and inconspicuous differences proved not to be copied the one from the other. My own manuscript ("W.") and that sent by Dr. Bühler from Bombay ("B.") also offer substantially the same text, although their differences are much more frequent, and of a more important character, than those of G. and M. As for the Oxford manuscript ("O."), it is, in its earlier portions, pretty closely accordant with W. and B., having an especially near relationship to B., with whose slight variations of the text given by W. it almost uniformly agrees; later, however, it strikes off upon a track of its own, and comes to differ from both the other recensions in a much greater degree than they differ between themselves.

Such being the case, I have thought it best to adopt for publication the version offered by W., partly because this is the only one for which I possess an original manuscript (and a tolerably old and correct one), partly because it is, upon the whole, better supported than that of G. and M.—which, as I have shown above, can hardly be reckoned, both together, as constituting more than a single manuscript. I have accordingly, avoiding the making up of an eclectic text from the various recensions, followed W. as closely as I could; and especially, when it was supported by the joint authority of B. and O., or of B. alone—thus sometimes, undoubtedly, rejecting an intrinsically preferable and perhaps more original reading given by one or another of the remaining authorities, if that offered by W. was of a character to be endured. At the end of the comment to each rule are given the various readings of all the manuscripts, with sufficient fullness, I hope, to answer the desirable ends of critical comparison. Obvious and trifling errors of transcription, of course, I have not noted, but only those which made a false reading or tended to become such: I have been most liberal in overlooking the blunders of B., as being, on the whole, of least consequence.

In regard, however, to the two matters of punctuation and euphonic combination, I have taken liberties with the text of which I have given no account. The various manuscripts are in no slight degree discordant with one another, inconsistent with themselves, and careless of the requirements of the sense, in the use they make of the signs of interpolation: they offer absolutely
no standard to follow. For the occurrence of the signs as printed, therefore, I am alone responsible; and no one who can anywhere make a better division of clauses than I have made need be restrained from so doing by the belief that he is running counter to manuscript authority. Again, I have (except in certain cases at the end of a cited rule or passage, where a reference follows) put all the words of the commentary in euphonic combination according to the usual rules; while in the manuscripts (as is common in exegetical writings) they are very frequently, for the sake of greater clearness, separated from one another.* Here, too, the usage of the various authorities is too discordant and irregular to be followed. And to report their readings in these two particulars would burden the critical notes with a mass of useless and wearisome details.

In the same manner are treated such orthographical peculiarities of the several manuscripts as that G. and M. regularly write a final sibilant instead of visarjaniya before an initial sibilant, and often, where a m is assimilated to a following mute, write the nasal mute corresponding to the latter, instead of anusvāra. Moreover, in the representation of the nasal sounds, by the nasal consonants, anusvāra (\(\hat{m}\)), or \(\dot{m}\), I have followed a consistent method, with disregard of the manuscript usage.

The text given at the foot of the page contains the whole comment, with two exceptions: citations from the Tātṛtirīya-Saṁhitā, being written out in full, with references, in the notes to the rules, are indicated below only by first words or letters, with signs of omission added; and again, where lists of affected words are given in a rule, in euphonic combination, and repeated, separate, at the beginning of the comment, they are replaced by signs of omission, as having been sufficiently presented uncombined in the translation of the rule. Errors of reading in the cited passages themselves are passed without notice, unless of such importance as to cast doubt upon the identity of the passage; but, on the other hand, the frequent differences of the versions as regards the extent of the illustrative passage cited are fully noted in the sequel of the reference.

I have preferred, instead of giving an express and direct translation of the commentary, to work its substance fully into my own notes upon the rules, somewhat as in my edition of the Atharva Prātiṣṭākyāya (Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, Vol. vii., 1862). The different conditions of the case, however, impress quite a different character upon the present work. The completeness and elaborateness of the Tribhāshyaratna make its working-up by far the larger and more important part of what is to be done in illustration of the Prātiṣṭākyāya. Possessing no index verorum to the Tātṛtirīya-Saṁhitā, nor even a manuscript of its pada-text, I have not been able to try the Prātiṣṭākyāya by it with anything like the same

* Thus, to instance an extreme case, at the end of the comment on iv.10, the manuscripts read (for once, with almost perfect unanimity): śūgyasya antah śūgyāntah na śūgyāntah antaḥśūgyāntah.
thoroughness as in the case of the similar treatise to the Atharvan. What could be done in the way of testing and supplementing the rules given, by a careful reading and excerpt of the Sanhitā in a single good sanhitā-manuscript (also procured for me in India by Dr. Hall, and with one or two slight deficiencies in it made up from Berlin, by Prof. Weber), I have endeavored to do. I have been able to refer points of interest connected with the text, in its sanhitā or pada readings, to friends in Europe owning or having access to fuller manuscript material, namely to Professors Weber of Berlin and Haug of München, and have received from them important aid, which I desire here gratefully to acknowledge. Of references to the teachings of the other Prātiṣṭhākhyas I have been much more sparing in this than in the former work, in order to avoid repetition: and, for the same reason, some matters of theory which were pretty fully discussed there receive here a more compendious treatment. The present work, in short, to a certain extent presupposes the other—not, however, in such a manner or degree as should interfere with its independence and separate intelligibility.

In making reference to the Tāttiriya-Sanhitā, I have used only three principal numbers, to designate book, chapter, and section, or kānda, prāṇa, and anuvākā. The further division of the sections or anuvākas, where they are of more considerable length, into parcels of fifty words each, is so artificial, destructive of the natural connection of passages, detrimental to the proper phonetic form of the text, and wholly ignored by the Prātiṣṭhākhyā (see notes to the rules of chapter iii.), that I have preferred to express it by the use of “superior” figures attached to that which indicates the anuvākā. Of course, where such attached figure is wanting, the anuvākā is to be understood as composed of a single division.

In the notes of various readings, each figure refers only to the single word to which it is attached, unless a passage of more than one word is included between two repetitions of the same figure; in which case the reference figure, in the notes, is put within parentheses. The abbreviation “om.” means ‘omit,’ and “ins.” means ‘insert.’

In all transliterated passages of Sanskrit, a colon stands in place of a single stroke of interpunction, and a full stop in place of a double stroke. The general method of transliteration is the same with that which I have hitherto used in the Journal of the American Oriental Society; it will be sufficiently understood from the alphabet given in the note to i.1 (p. 10).
CHAPTER I.

CONTENTS: 1-11, enumeration and classification of sounds composing the alphabet; 12-14, surd and sonant consonants; 15, list of prepositions; 16-21, 27, names of letters and classes of letters; 22-24, 28, terminology of cited words, etc.; 25, 26, 29, 30, respecting the interpretation of rules; 31-37, quantity of simple sounds; 38-40, the three accents; 41-47, details respecting the circumflex accent; 48, 49, compound words; 50-53, respecting cited words; 54-55, words consisting of a single vowel; 56-61, further specifications respecting the interpretation of rules.

The commentator begins his work with a couple of rather awkwardly-constructed verses, as follows: "I, bowing low with devoted affection to the two feet of Ganeṣa, as also to the gurus and to divine Voice, shall proceed to utter this comment; which, made upon examination of the exposition of the Prātiṣṭhāyika given by Vararuci etc., shines, a Treasure of Threefold Comment (tribhāshyaratna), approved of Brahmans." He adds an exposition of their meaning, explaining giram devim, 'divine Voice,' by vāgdevim, 'Goddess of Voice,' and bhāsura, 'Brahman' (literally 'earth-god'), by vidvat, 'learned man, sage.' On lakshanam, which, as name of a comment, is least in accordance

1bhaktiyuktah pranamyaham ganeçacaranadedayam:
gurun api giram devim idam vakshyaï lakshanam.1.
vyaikhyamn pratiçkhyasya vikshya vararucadikam:
ktair tribhāshyaratnam yad bhāsate bhāsuraspriyam.2.
lakshayor anayor ayam arthaḥ bhaktiyuktah 'ham ganeçacaranadevayam:
gurun giram api devim vāgdevim ity arthaḥ tām ca praṇamaṃ lakshanam idam vakshyaKyayau lakshanam tribhāshyaratnamātman bhāsuraspriyam vidoatpriyam bhāsate: kīrçam lakshanam: pratiçkhyasa vyākhyānatāpakeśam vai vararucadikam bhāshyajatāṃ vikshya nyānātirekaparīhāreṇa kītan vicaritam: adīcābdenā treyamāhīṣheyāu grhyate: ata eva tribhāshyaratnam iti nāma upapattih: trayānāṃ bhāshyānāṃ samāhāras tribhāshyam: tasyāt ratnam bhūshanam.

1 W. prefixes with śrīgaṇēśayā namah. śrīgaṇēśa prasanno 'stu. oṁ. B. prefixes with śrīgaṇēśayā namah. śrīsarasvatayā namah. śrīdatānmayā namah: and the additional verse

"sukhambaradharain devain caçīvarçair caturbhayam:
prasannavodanair dyayāt saracavighnopacātaya.1"

1 The white-ribbon-bearing god, moon-hued, four-armed, propitious-faced, must one meditate on, in order to the successe of all disturbance. It then numbers the other verses "2" and "3," but proceeds to confess the ungenuniness of the inserted verse by reading: like the other MSS., anayah lokayah.

with common usage, he makes no remark. To *vikṣhya,* ‘having examined,’ he adds *nyānātīrekaparīhārena,* ‘with avoidance of deficiency and redundancy.’ The “etc.” after “Vararuci” is declared to refer to Ātreya and Māhisheya, these three being the authorities upon which the present work is founded, and from which it derives its name. Vararuci and Māhisheya are, indeed, often (about ten times each: see Index) referred to in the sequel, and their discordant views sometimes set forth and discussed: Ātreya has only once (under v.1) the honor of being mentioned. Who is the digester of their three works, and author of the present commentary, which has taken their place and crowded them out of existence, we are not informed; nor, so far as I am aware, has any evidence bearing upon the point been anywhere brought to knowledge. Notice of the different authorities cited by our commentator will be put together in an additional note at the end of this work, for the sake of the light cast by them upon his age.

1. Now the list of sounds.

The commentator first gives himself a great deal of trouble to explain the meaning of *atha,* ‘now,’ in the rule. He quotes Amara’s definition of *atho* and *atha* (Amarakosa iii.4.32.8; p. 349 of Deslongchamps’s edition), and points out that, as a variety of meanings is there attributed to *atha,* it is necessary to fix upon a single meaning for it here. In the first place, then, a propitiatory significance is claimed for it, by reason of its equivalence with *om;* “since the Ākśa-makṣaṇa declare, ‘*om* and *atha* are deemed propitiatory.’” Or, again, it indicates something coming next after another; “the implication being that, next after the reading of the Veda, one should gain a knowledge of the *lakṣaṇa:* there hav-

1. *maṅgalānantarārāmbhapraṇakārtsnyeshv atho athe ‘ti maṅgalādyaneśkārthavād athacabduṣyā rtham eko ‘rtho nicesetavyah: tatra prathamām tava maṅgalārthatvam ucyate: tasya pranavaśādharmyā: tathā hi samācakshate ākśaṃkārāh:*

*omkāraḥ ca thaṃcabdaḥ ca maṅgalav iti kārttāv iti: āho śivānantaśarvāt: vedaśayaṇānantaśām lakṣaṃkāntām kuryād iti sāpekaśatvāt lakṣaṇasya pūrvāṃ vedaśhyāgame saty atah lakṣaṇaparīkshāvāsaraḥ: atah vā 'dhikārārtho thaṃcabadh: te atāhi 've 'ti viniśvatikādhikārakāvādhaṛakāh (xxii.6) iti vidyamānātā: atha vanniśāmānaṃ kāraṃ 'dhikriyata iti sātrānayaḥ: sam ity ekābhave: aḥ iti maryādayām: mnāya ity ānupāreyena 'padeṣaḥ: ekābhatā akārādayo varṇāḥ svarabhaktipaṇḍayavāsāṃ ānupāreyena pūrvāḥ ċishtār upadishtaḥ.*
ing been study of the Veda before the lakṣhaṇa, now comes the occasion for the investigation of the lakṣhaṇa.” Here, lakṣhaṇa appears to be used to designate the Prātiṣṭhākhyā itself, as above it denoted the commentary to the latter. Once more, athis is declared to have the force of an introduction or heading, according to rule xxi.6, below: “tu, athis, and eva are respectively exceptive, introductory, and limitative;” and the connection of the rule is that now the list of sounds, the order of reading (pāṭhakrama), is made the subject of treatment.

The composition of samāmnaya, ‘list, rehearsal,’ is next pointed out, and the word is stated to mean “the collective sounds, beginning with a and ending with the svarabhakti, in their order, as taught by former learned men.”

The catalogue itself follows, as understood by the commentator to be taught or implied in the rules of the treatise. First come the vowels, of which only sixteen are reckoned (see rule 5, below): a, i, and u have each a short, a long, and a protracted value, r only a short and a long, l only a short (W. and B. take the pains to write a figure 2 after the long r, and a 1 after the l, to point out clearly the number of moras they respectively contain; and B. adds after the āi and āu a 2, for the same purpose); second, the twenty-five mutes (see rule 7); third, the four semivowels (rule 8); and fourth, the six spirants (rule 9). This makes fifty-one sounds, clearly specified and counted in their order in the next succeeding rules. Of the rest, there is no so direct enumeration; the commentator has to infer them from their recognition by rules found in later portions of the treatise. Thus, he finds anusvāra acknowledged as an alphabetic element in rule 34 of this chapter, which teaches that it has the quantity of a short vowel; for, he says, “since it is made the substrate of a specific quantity, it is itself a concrete thing, and not, like nasalization, a quality.” A passage from the Čikṣā, it is true, appears inconsistent with this, but finds its sufficient explanation in the circumstance that that work includes in one expression the concrete thing and its quality. The cited passage is not to be found in the known text of the

tathā hi: a ā á is i ī is u ū ú us r ē l e āi o āu iti svarāh shodācaḥ:
ka kha ga gha ṃa ca cha ja jha ṃa ta ṃa da ṃa na ta ṃa da

The text continues in the same manner, listing the other sounds and their characteristics, following the rules of the treatise.
Çikṣā (and the same is the case with several of the passages quoted later: see the additional notes): it is given again, with more fullness, under viii.15. Next, for the visarjaniya, which our Prātiṣeṣkhyā does not count among the spirants, is given as authority rule 5 of the eighth chapter, a rule introductory to the euphonic changes of a final h. The commentator brings in as next constituent of the alphabet an element which he calls raṅga, and for which he cites the rule (ii.52) that “nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nasal passage.” The word raṅga, ‘coloring,’ though a common name for the nasal tinge of utterance, is not found in our Prātiṣeṣkhyā, nor even used in the commentary excepting here and under ii.52. What is described in the latter rule is in fact a “quality” (dharma), and not a “qualified” or concrete thing (dharmin); and its inclusion in the alphabet would stultify the argument with which the inclusion of anusadvra was but just now supported. It would seem that the commentator ought to be aiming here at the nāsikya, or euphonic insertion between h and a following nasal mute, and should quote for it rule xxi.14; he does not otherwise take account of it in his list, while yet it is precisely as well entitled to a place there as are the yamas. The nasalized semivowels, it is true, into which n and m are directed to be converted before y, l, v (v.26–8), are also left out of the enumeration, unless we suppose the raṅga to be meant to apply to their nasality; and I think it altogether likely that the commentator had them in view in its definition: but this is only avoiding one difficulty by running into two worse ones—namely, by omitting the nāsikya, and by reckoning as a member of the alphabet what is really only one of the constituent elements of certain sounds. Further, rule xiii.16 is made the warrant for the lingual l, rule xxi.12 for the four yamas, and rule xxi.15, finally, for the svarabhakti: and the conclusion is reached that “by this process, the number of sixty is clearly derivable from the rules themselves as that of the letters in the Yajur-Veda.”

yājurvedikavarnānāṁ shasṭhisamikhyā sūtrata eva vispashṭā drashtavyā. namu
trishasṭić catuḥshaviśārāḥ cādvarnāḥ sambhumaṁ matāḥ:
iti ḍikṣāvaccane sati kathāṃ shasṭhisamikhyā niyamyate: etāṁ
taukāvādikasvavarnavnavishayam iti. “ḍikṣāvaccane na virodhāḥ: atra tu eva sūtrāṃ etdvatām varṇānām eva ‘palambhād esha eva’ nirvayau varnātāṁ.”

varnānāṁ samāmādyā varnāsamsamāndayāh.

(1) G. M. mahgalidyanakortha. * W. G. M. gikṣ. G. and M. always write gikṣā, B. and O. always gikṣa; W. has g- only in one other place (under xiv.28).

nītāh.
An objection is now raised and removed. “Considering that the Čikšá says ‘the letters are regarded as sixty-three or sixty-four, in the opinion of Ċambhú’ (Čikšá, verse 3; see Weber’s edition of the treatise, in his Indische Studien, iv.348-9), how is the number sixty established? Answer: there is no inconsistency with the dictum of the Čikšá, seeing that the latter has in view the whole body of sounds, as used both in the Veda and in common life; while here the determination (of sixty) is derived from the assumption of just so many letters by the rules of the treatise.”

The alphabetic scheme is, then, as follows:

Vowels
- simple, \( a \, \dot{a} \, d \, \dot{d} \, i \, \dot{i} \, l \, \dot{l} \, u \, \dot{u} \, d \, \dot{d} \) 9
- impure and diphthongs, \( r \, \dot{r} \, e \, \dot{e} \, a \, \dot{a} \, o \, \dot{o} \) 7 16
- guttural, \( k \, kh \, g \, gh \, n \) 5
- palatal, \( c \, ch \, j \, jh \, ñ \) 5

Mutes
- lingual, \( t \, th \, d \, dh \, n \) 5
- dental, \( t \, th \, d \, dh \, n \) 5
- labial, \( p \, ph \, b \, bh \, m \) 5 25

Semivowels, \( y \, r \, l \, v \) 4

Spirants, \( z \, ž \, sh \, s \, q \, h \) 6

Anuvára, \( ŋ \) 1

Visarjaníya, \( h \) 1

Lingual \( l \) 1

Násikya, (not written) 1

Yamas, do. 4

Svarabhakti, do. 1

- whole number of letters, 60

With the exception of the nasal \( y \), \( l \), \( v \), already referred to, this list includes all the alphabetic sounds treated of by the Prátičákhyá. For what concerns the peculiarities of their character or classification, see the special rules of which they are the subject; as also, for the differences between the teachings of this and of the other kindred treatises with reference to them. Only the Vája-saneýi-Prátičákhyá includes in its text a complete list and enumeration of letters, and that by an afterthought, in a later and less genuine chapter (viii.1-31).

2. Now the nine at the beginning are simple vowels.

2. athe 'ti sanijnádhikárarthah: asmin1 varnasamámnáya adita árabhya nava varnáh samánáksharasainjñá bhavanti: 'yathá: a á d á i i i á u á ñ. sanijnáyáh2 prayojanam: dirgáñh samánákshare savarnapare (x.2) ity ádi. nane idyá mahati sanijná kimartháh: ċikshádičástra-práśiddhanyánumodháye 'ti brámah.

1 B. asmin. 2 W. B. a á d á ity ádi. 3 G. M. -jáá. 4 G. M. -tham. 5 G. M. om. -di-.
Literally, 'are homogeneous syllables;' samānākṣhara and its correlative saṁdhyākṣhara, 'syllable of combination,' being the current names for simple vowel and for diphthong; the latter, however, is not used in this treatise. The nine intended are, as shown in the preceding list, a ā ē ī ū Ṛ ṭ ṭḥ ḷ. The r and ṭ vowels are denied the quality of simplicity or homogeneity, although their structure as composed of heterogeneous elements is not further described; the Rik Pr. (xiii.14), the Vāj. Pr. (iv.145), and the Ath. Pr. (i.37–9) give the details of their formation, while nevertheless the two first expressly include r and ṭ among the samānākṣharas (omitting ṭ, apparently, because no case anywhere occurs that should test its quality), and the same classification is inferrably recognized by the last.

The commentator explains the atha of this rule as signifying the introduction of the subject of names or technical appellations (saṁjñā), and cites, as example of the use of the term, rule x.2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel. Finally, the unwieldiness of the long word samānākṣhara striking his mind, he asks "why such a big name?" and relieves himself by the answer "we say, in order to correspond with the established usage of the Čikṣā and other text-books." The Čikṣā as we know it, it may be remarked, does not employ the term.

### 3. Two and two, short and long, are similar.

That is to say, as the commentary explains, of these simple vowels, two and two short, two and two long, or a long and a short, are called "similar." The meaning seems rather to be that, of the three triplets which make up the category of simple vowels, the first two in each triplet, the short and the long, will be designated as "similar"—to the exclusion, namely, of the phuta or protracted vowels. The term is used but once in the treatise (namely in x.2, the rule last above quoted), as applied to vowels, and nothing is practically gained by denying its inclusion of the protracted vowels, since these are specially protected from coalescence by the rule x.24. The ṛ-vowels are here again shut out, as in the preceding rule; and, in fact, no case occurs in the Vedic text in which two of them are fused into one.

---

3. teshu samānākṣhareshu dvede hrasvē dvedve dirghē "hravadvīrgēḥ" dirghahrasve vā 'kshare parasparam savarnaśaṁjña bhavataḥ. ijam anvarthasaṁjñā: savarnatvaṁ nāma sādṛṣyaṁ ucayate: tasmād akārādinām ikārādibhir na savarnaśaṁjñācaśaṁकā bhinnasthanaprayatnavād anayoh. saṁjñāyāḥ prayojanaṁ: dirghahṁ samānākṣhare savarnapare (x.2) iti. hravavāṁ ca dirghahṁ ca hravadvīrghe.

1 G. M. eteshu. 2 G. M. ins. vd. 3 B. om.; G. M. ins. vd. 4 B. -inād.
The word translated 'similar' means literally 'of identical color' (i.e. sound), and is several times applied later to identity of consonantal sound. It is, as the commentator points out, a self-explaining term, or one whose application is directly in accordance with its natural meaning (anvartha); and hence no suspicion is to be entertained of the inclusion of a and i, for instance, as "similar," because of their different mode of organic production. As example of the use of the term is again cited x.2.

4. Not so, when a protracted vowel precedes.

This is an arbitrary exclusion, made to fit a particular case, which might with more evident propriety have been provided for later, where such cases are under treatment, rather than here in the preliminary definition of terms (compare a somewhat similar case in the Rik Pr., i.1, r. 4). The commentator paraphrases the rule "a simple vowel having a protracted one before it is not termed 'similar,'" and goes on to cite and explain in full the case to which it applies. In the phrase ágné: iti: áha (vi.5.84), the word ágne has its final diphthong protracted, and becomes ágnási. By the rule (x.2) for the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel, this would then unite with the following word to form ágnásitiáha. The quality of similarity, however, being denied by the present rule to the final i, it is treated as a dissimilar vowel, being first converted into y by rule x.15, the y dropped by x.19, and the coalescence of the remaining ás with the following i (as prescribed by x.4) prevented by x.24: thus is assured the reading ágnás'ityáha.

5. The sixteen at the beginning are vowels.

Namely, says the commentator, the sixteen beginning with a and ending with áu. As example of the use of the technical term

4. phutapúrven samánáksharam savarnasamjnänaṁ na bhavati. phutam asmáti púrven iti phutapúrven. yathä: ágnás ity áhe

ty atra dirghaṁ samánákharem savarnapare (x.2) ity ekádecaḥ prasaktaḥ: tucá ca 'nishtam: prathishthhayaṁ te evaṁ savarnasamjnáyám páricehyād ivarñokaráv yavakárav

(x.15) iti pūrvasye 'kārasya yatvasya syāt: sa ca yakāro lupyete tv avarṇapára-v śvya yavakárav (x.19) iti luyate: yakāre

lupte sati ivarñapare ekāram (x.4) ity ekáraḥ3 prasaktaḥ: so

'pil nibhhyate na phutapragrahāv (x.24) ity anena: tasmād

agnás ity áhe 'ti prasidhayati'.

1 W. om. 2 G. M. ekádecaḥ. 3 G. M. vi. 4 G. M. sidhyati.
svara, 'vowel,' he quotes the rule (ix.10) prescribing the conversion of visarjanīya into y before a vowel.

Our Prātiṣṭhākhyā is to be commenced for not including in its list of vowels the long ī, and for postulating no useless protracted forms of r and l.

6. The rest are consonants.

As example of the term vyāñjana, 'consonant,' rule xxi.1, which pronounces the consonant a member of the adjacent vowel, is cited in the commentary, according to the two manuscripts from northern India; those from the south substitute for it the opening rule of the third chapter, and also omit the explanatory statement "beginning with k and ending with svarabhakti," which is given by the others.

7. The first twenty-five are mutes.

The commentator explains: "among the consonants, the first twenty-five letters are called mutes" (sparça, literally 'contact'). The northern manuscripts add, as under the last rule, "beginning with k, and ending with m." It is next pointed out that rules 2 and 5 contain the specification dītāḥ, 'at the beginning,' and that the different phraseology of this rule, namely ādvāh, 'first,' indicates a difference of meaning: it signifies that the sounds referred to

5. varṇasamānmāyasyāḥ "dīta ṛabhya shodāça varnāḥ svaraṣṭiñjñā bhavanti: akārādaya dukāraparyantā ity arthah. sanjnāyāḥ prayojanam: atha svarnaparo yakāram (ix.10) ity ādi.

6. svarebhyaḥ cesho vanmarḍcir vyāñjanaśanijo bhavati: 'ka-kārādisvarabhaktiparyantā ity ārthah'. sanjnāyāḥ prayojanam: 'vyāñjanaḥ svaraṅgam' (xxi.1) iti.

7. vyāñjanesho ādyāḥ pañcapānīca varnāṃ sparçasanijo bhavanti: 'ka-kārādayo makārāntāḥ'. sanjñāyāḥ prayojanam: sparca sparyaparah (xiv.27). atha navā "dītaḥ samānākṣharāni (i.2): shodāça "dītāḥ svaraḥ (i.5) itic ca dvātita iti vaktavya ādyā iti śabāntaraśrayo 'ṛṭhāntarasūcakah: vyāñjanesho ādyā na tu svaraparāḥ iti viññeyam'.

1 G. M. varṇānāṃ sam.
2 G. M. om.
3 G. M. athā "dvātadhivāhṛṣaṃ vṛṣṭiṣṭāṃ svaraṃ" (iiii.i).
are first among the consonants, not first among the vowels (better, we should say, not first in the whole list). Of this style of interpretation, which forces a special significance into very innocent variations of phraseology, we shall meet with other and more striking examples farther on.

Rule xiv.27 is given as instance of the employment of the technical term here defined.

8. The next four are semivowels.

The four semivowels are $y$, $r$, $l$, $v$. The rule cited by the commentary in illustration of the use of the term "semivowel" (antasthá, i.e. antah-sthá, 'standing between, intermediate [between consonant and vowel]'; see note to Ath. Pr. i.30) is one (v.28) prescribing the treatment of final $m$ before an initial semivowel.

9. The next six are spirants.

Namely, the three sibilants, $ç$, $sh$, and $s$, the jihvāmāliya, $z$, the upadhmāniya, $q$, and the aspiration, $h$. As regards the sounds to which the name āshman, "flatus," shall be given, the phonetic treatises are greatly at variance. The Vāj. Pr. (viii.22) limits the class to the sibilants and $h$; the Ath. Pr. (see note to i.31) apparently adds the guttural and labial spirants and the more indistinct visarjaniya; the Rāk Pr. (i.2), these and the anusvāra. We have an equal right to be surprised at the inclusion of this last in the class, and at the exclusion from it, by our treatise, of the visarjaniya.

To instance the employment of "spirant," the comment cites the rule (xiv.16) forbidding the duplication of a spirant before a vowel.

10. Of the mutes, the successive fives are the series.

The commentary paraphrases: "among the mutes, five and five sounds, in their order, have the designation ‘series,’ they begin respectively with $k$, $c$, $t$, $t$, $p$, and end with $n$, $ñ$, $n$, $n$, $m$." This

8. sparcebhyaḥ pare ca tvār varnā antasthāsanijñā bhavanti. sanijñāyāḥ prayojanam: 'antasthāparo ca savarnam anuvādikam (v.28) ity ādi.

9. antasthābhyaḥ pare saśād varnā āshmasanijñā bhavanti. sanijñāyāḥ prayojanam: āshmā svaraparaḥ (xiv.16) ity ādi.
exposition is in accordance with the requirements of the context, the treatise being here engaged in defining its technical terms. Otherwise, we might divide ---- pañca pañcavargāḥ, and translate, like the corresponding rule in the Rik Pr. (i.2), ‘there are five series, of five each.’

The illustrative rule (xiv.20) cited in the comment teaches the non-duplication of a mute of the lingual series before one of the dental series.

11. And are called first, second, third, fourth, and last.

Each series of five mutes, that is to say, is composed of a surd, a surd aspirate, a sonant, a sonant aspirate, and a nasal, as t, th, d, dh, n; and these classes are named according to their order in the several series. The commentator makes no note here of the physical difference of the classes, but says ‘In each series, the sounds, in their order, are styled first, second, third, fourth, and last. Even though a name founded on enumeration obviously belongs to them [is assured them, without a special rule to that effect], yet, for the purpose of denying appellation on the ground of any other enumeration, the technical terms ‘first’ and so on are prescribed, to enjoin a certain enumeration.’ How so? Why, to establish the designation ‘first’ and so on for k and its successors alone, and to deny to the vowels, semivowels, spirants, etc., designations founded on their enumeration.’ And he proceeds to cite four rules (ii.9; xiv.12, 24; viii.3; but the southern MSS. cite v.38 instead of ii.9) as examples of the use of the five terms defined.

10. sparçāṇām madhyā āṃśpārvyena pañcapaneca varnāḥ vargasamijnā bhavanti: ka-ca-ta-pādāy u-na-na-na-māntā ity arthāḥ. samijnādīḥ prayojanam: tavargaś ca tavargaparāḥ (xiv.20) iti. 1

1 B. om. 2 G. M. -pādāy. 3 W. om. the cited rule; G. M. ity dāti.


1 G. M. -kramam. 2 G. M. nāmēti. 3 B. samkhyaśantaraḥ; G. M. samkhyaḥ. 4 M. samjñāntaram: as to the true reading and interpretation of this clause I am by no means confident. 5 G. M. om. 6 G. M. tu samkh. 7 G. M. substitute for this rule part of v.38, viz. prathamapārve hakāro caturtham tasya sathānam.
The other Prātiṣṭhākhyas employ the same designations for the mutes (save that the Vāj. Pr. also calls the nasals pañcama, ‘fifth’), but without taking the trouble to define them or prescribe their use by a rule.

12. The spirants, visarjanīya, and the first and second mutes, are surd.

The Rik Pr. gives (i.2,3) a similar statement; the Ath. Pr. uses the terms “surd” and “sonant” without defining which consonants form each class; the Vāj. Pr. (i.50–53) substitutes for the terms arbitrary formulas.

The physical peculiarity of the surd utterance is defined in the next chapter (rules 5,10).

The commentator illustrates the use of the term by the rule (ix.2) concerning the treatment of visarjanīya before a surd.

13. But not h.

“H is not styled a surd; this is an exception rendered necessary by the circumstance that h, being [by i.9] a spirant, would otherwise be included [by the last rule] in the class of surds,” says the comment.

All the phonetic treatises treat h as a sonant. For further definition of its character, see rules ii.6,9,46,47, below.

14. The rest of the consonants are sonant.

The commentary enters into a rather lengthy defense of the propriety of this rule, which reads literally as follows: “The remainder of the consonants other than the surds is styled sonant. Even though, when the surds have already been stated in rule 12, the sonant quality of the rest, on the principle of ‘remainder,’ is assured—just as, when it is said, ‘of Devadatta and Yajñadatta,

12. uṣhmānac ca visarjanīyaḥ ca prathamadvitiyāḥ ca'ghoshasaṁjña bhavanti. saṁjñaḥ prvojanam: aghoshaparas tasya sasthanam uṣhmānam (ix.2) ity aḍi.

1 B. prathamaḥ ca de-. 2 W. B. omit the last two words of the rule. 3 G. M. om.

13. na bhavaty aghoshasaṁjño hakāraḥ: uṣhmatvād aghoshatve prāpte tadapavādo 'yam.

1 W. jātiko.
Devadatta owns no kine,’ the conclusion is assured that Yajña-datta is a kine-owner—nevertheless, the indication of the technical term is made in the text-book, for the sake of practical convenience (?). Also, because of the superiority of express mention over inclusion in a remainder. Otherwise—the name of surd is denied to $h$ by rule 13, nor is $h$ sonant, there being no rule to that effect; and so with the rest of the consonants; the vowels are also in like manner not sonant and not surd—this being the case, when the rule shall be given (ix.8) ‘also when followed by a sonant,’ the doubt would arise, ‘followed by a sonant,’ means followed by what? Let not this be so: in this view the present rule is undertaken.” It is added “In this rule, the distinctive meaning, in the form of objection and replication, is set forth by Māhisheya.” And the rule ix.8, already referred to, is quoted again by way of illustration of the use of the term “sonant.”

The Rik Pr. (i.3), after specifying the surd letters, leaves the sonants to be inferred pāriṣeshyāt, ‘by the remainder-principle,’ as is expressly pointed out in the commentary on the passage (see Regnier’s edition, note to rule i.12).

The vowels are not included under the designation ghoshavant, ‘sonant,’ although (as is explained in rule ii.8) formed of the same material with the sonant consonants.

Our treatise does not, like the other Prātiṣeḵhya (R. Pr. i.3; V. Pr. i.54; A. Pr. i.10), define the “first” and “third” mutes as soshman, ‘aspirated.’

14. aghoshebhyo 1 vyaṉjanacesho ghoshavatsanījño bhavati: yady apy uśmavisarjanīyaprathameshā 2 aghosheshā 'kteshu vyaṉjanaceshasya pāriṣeshyād ghoshavattvaṇi siddham: yathā 3 devadattavayānadattayor 4 apāṣeṣṇā devadatta ity ukte paraḥ paṣumāṇ iti siddham: tathā 'pi gāstre samaṃvavahārārthaṇi 5 saṃjñānirdēcaḥ kriyate: pāriṣeshyād api kāṇṭhoκter viṭeṣhāt: anyathā na haṅkāraḥ (i.13) iti haṅkāraṣya 'ghoshasauṃjñā nishidhyate: nā 'pi haṅkāro ghoshavān: vidhyabhāvāt: tathāi 'va vyaṉjanaceshaḥ: svarā api tathā na ghoshavanto nā 'py aghoshaḥ: tathā satī ghoshavatparaça ca (ix.8) iti yatra 6 vakṣhyati tatra 7 saṃdehaḥ syat: ghoshavatpardo nāma kimpara iti: tan ma bhūd iti 'dānā sūtraṃ 8 śrāḥdhyate 9.

vyāṉjanardapālaḥ cesho vyāṉjanaceshaḥ. 10
atra sātre codyaparuihārādāpā 11 esha viṭeṣho māhisheyaḥbhāṣhitah.

saṃjñāṇyāḥ prayojanam: ghoshavatparaça ca (ix.8) ity adi.

1 G. M. ins. nyo. 2 G. M. uśmavisarjanīyaḥ. 3 B. ins. ca. 4 W. -dattaiḥyor. 5 W. saṃkhaḥ. 6 G. M. viṭeṣhavat. 7 G. M. om. 8 G. M. yatrayaṭa. 9 G. M. tattatra. 10 B. gāstrām. 11 G. M. repeat the rule itself here. 12 W. om.; B. adds yaḥ ceshaḥ. 13 G. M. om. rōpa.
15. Ā, pra, ava, upa, abhi, adhi, prati, pari, vi, ni—these are prepositions.

These ten words are but half the number which are reckoned as prepositions by the Rik and Vāj. Prātiṣṭhāyas (R. Pr. xii.6; V. Pr. vi.24) and by Pāṇini (see the gana prādāyah). The commentator notes the discordance with Pāṇini, and inquires why the maker of this rule presumably cuts short the list of prepositions with the word iti in it. His reply is, that only so many are recognized by the Yajur-Veda. Another objection which he raises and removes, arriving at the comfortable conclusion "therefore there is no discordance whatever," I do not see the point of. The discordance is a real one, and difficult to explain. The term preposition (upasarga) is used in three of the rules of the treatise, viz. vi.4 (which is the cited instance in the commentary), x.9, and xiv.8: for the bearing of the restriction in number, see the notes on those rules.

16. A sound followed by kāra is the name of that sound.

That is, for example, akāra is the name of a, ekāra of e, and so on. The Vāj. Pr. (i.37) is the only other treatise which takes the trouble to prescribe this usage, common to them all. Our own refers to it also in a later rule (xxii.4). The word kāra means 'making, producing.' It is in the rules of the Prātiṣṭhāya added not only to simple alphabetic sounds (varna) as their names, but also to syllables like āh and an (see below, rules 23, 53), and the

15.... ity ete ḍabā upasargasaṁjñā bhavanti. nanu proporāpasamanavanirdureyāṁ ityādi pāṇiniya viceshena bhāvanītī: katam atra sūtraktā nirargalam upasargā iticabdena sanjukcitā ucyaṃ, yajureśavishaya etāvanta eva 'ti mantavyam. tarkā praperāpasām iti samuccaye viceshapāthaḥ katham upalabhyaḥ. iti parāvaidhāne tasya tātiparyayan na tā 'pasargasaṁjñāvidhāne viceshapāthaḥ: tasmin na kenacid virodhaḥ, saṁjñāyāḥ preyojanam: upasarganishṇurvo 'nudatte pade (vi.4). iticabdoḥ prakāravat.

1 W. B. and G.p.m. bhavanti. 2 B. proporāpasām; G. M. prāpasām. 3 G. M. viceshāḥ; W. viceshāṁ. 4 B. lakṣhayai. 5 W. B. viceshāḥ p.
commentator very frequently uses it to make names for brief words, like ca.

Rule iv.8, respecting e and i, is the chosen illustration of the combination here taught.

17. But with an a interposed, in the case of the consonants. That is, the name of k, for instance, is (k-a-kāra) kakāra. Compare the equivalent rule, Vāj. Pr. i.38.

The commentator cites rule v.22, respecting the conversion of t to c.


The term nāsikya designates here, of course, the nasal segments taught in rules xxi. 12–14. All these indistinct, hardly articulate, sounds must be spoken of by their descriptive titles, not by any name founded upon their form. The commentator explains that the appending of kāra to the sounds here specified—which would otherwise be regular, since they come under the category of varna, ‘alphabetic elements’—is annulled by the rule; adding as a reason, that they are nowhere met with thus treated. He then

17. akāravyavahito  varnah kāraçabdottaro vyanajananām ákhya bhavati. yathā; takāraç ca kāram (v.22) ēty ādi. akārenā vyavahito ’kāravyavetah.


1 G. M. ins. tathā. 2 G. M. om. eva. 3 W. tad. 4 G. M. ins. ēty. 5 W. B. varta- rucād; G. M. vārvarucād. 6 W. B. vācyādīnām. 7 W. -nam gam.
goes on to raise and refute a very subtle and hair-splitting objection. In rule 16, he says, *kāra* is prescribed to be added not to the vocable (*vācaka*) *varṇa*, 'sound,' itself, but only to the thing designated (*vācya*) by that vocable; so likewise in this rule it is proper to understand by *visarjanīya* etc. the things designated by those words, and nothing else (and hence, the rule must not be interpreted as implying that *visarjanīya* and the other names given are, in default of those formed with *kāra*, the accepted designations for the sounds in question). This being the case, the illustration given under the rule by Vararuci and others—namely, rule xiv.15, speaking of *r* and "*visarjanīya*" as not liable to duplication—is an unsuitable one. Such is the objection. The reply is: you must not think so; since the sounds designated by the terms in the rule are actually nowhere employed by themselves (as designations), the rule simply intends to include designation and thing designated in one expression; and the quoted example is proper enough.

19. Of *r*, however, *epha* forms the name.

That is to say, the technical designation of *r* is *repha*; *ra* being also admitted, by rule 21, below: *rakāra* is not found anywhere in the Hindu grammatical literature. This peculiarity of treatment of *r*, as compared with the other consonants, is to be paralleled with the way in which it is written in consonant groups, almost as if a vowel.

The Vâj. Pr. has an equivalent rule (i.40).

The word *tvu*, 'however,' in this rule, according to the commentator, is meant to deny the application to *r* of both the rules 16 and 17. Some, he says, hold that it denies only rule 17, or the insertion of *a* between *r* and the appended *kāra*; but this is wrong; for it would imply that the name of *r* was made sometimes by appending *kāra* and sometimes by appending *epha*, just as an alternation is in fact allowed by rule 21 below between *ra* and *repha*, and exemplified by rules vii.11 and xxi.15; while no

19. rasya *tv* *epha*çabda' ākhya bhavati. yathā: *rephoshma*parah' (xiii.2) iti. *rephasya* *va*[nyana*tvāvīcepḥ*ḥ] prāptai kārottaratvam akāravyavetatvaṁ ca: tad ubhayam tuçabdo nivārayati. anye *tv* an ṣaṁyante: akāravyavetavam ēve *ti*: tad asādhu: tathā sati kadācid ep[hotarata] kudācit kārottarata ce *ti* vikalpaḥ syat: yathā *kāra* *va*[nyana*ñān]ām (i.21) iti vidhānād vikalpaḥ: tathā hi *rephoshma*ṣaṁyoge *rephasvarahakatih* (xxi.15): rashahpūrvo hacāni (vii.11) ity ādi: na *tv* evām kārottaratvam api vikalpañ ca *svikṛtanām* kutracit: tasmād asmad ukta eva yukta tuçabdaṁrthāḥ.

1 G. M. *reph*.; and M. reads *rephas* in the rule itself. 2 W. *-shmaçabda*. 3 B. *rephakharatā*; W. *reph*-. 4 W. B. *pi* 5 W. B. om. 6 G. M. *naka*. 7 G. M. *tah*. 
instance of a name formed with kāra is anywhere to be met with. This is a very easy demolition of a very insignificant man of straw.

20. The short vowel, with varṇa after it, is the name of the three vowels.

The "three vowels" referred to are the three quantities—short, long, and protracted—of the vowels a, i, u, respectively; varṇa, in this case, indicating only the 'color,' or phonetic complexion, of the vowel, without regard to its length. The Ath. Pr. has the same usage of this term, but without defining it by rule. As our treatise acknowledged no protracted r, and neither a long nor a protracted l, it does not admit the compounds revarṇa and lvarṇa; of the other three it frequently avails itself. The instance selected by the commentator is rule x.4, which directs the combination of a with a following i, t, tā into e.

21. An a forms the names of consonants.

This rule allows us to call a consonant not only, as prescribed in rules 16 and 17 above, by a name formed by adding kāra with a interposed, but also by one formed with a alone. The commentator's example is rule v.22, where t and c are referred to as takaśra, caśa, and c, c again, and ch, as ca, ca, and cha. If something merely additional to the kāra, instead of alternative with it, were intended in the rule, we are told, rule 17 would be made meaningless. But, says an objector, why use kāra at all for the purpose, when even along with it the a has to be brought into requisition? let this alone furnish the name. The reasonableness of the objection is conceded, but the commentator alleges as sufficient justification of the practice followed, that it is in accordance with that of the Cīkṣhā and other text-books.

He continues: others assert that the a added to a consonant indicates (not that consonant pure and simple, but) a syllable composed of the consonant and any following vowel; as for instance in rule ix.3, "visarjanīya followed by kṣha is not assimilated;" where the examples are manah kṣheme (v.2.17), ghanāghanah kshobhanah (iv.6.4¹: so all the MSS., both here and under ix.3; my MS. of the Suhitā reads kshobhaniḥ), and ukthacāsah kṣāmā (ii.6.12⁴). This is unsound; for then we should have to read ishe tṛd (for ishe tṛd, i.1.1 et al.), by the rule vii.13, "after vāgha and sha, t becomes t;" which is wrong. Moreover, in the rule (xii.

20. varnottaro hrasaco ṣhrascdityaphutandam akhyā bhavati. yathā: i varnapara ekāram (x.4) ity aḍi. varṇaḥabha uttaro yasmād avadh varnottaraḥ.

¹ G. M. ins. trayādhi.
4) “ya, va, na, ha, when followed by vowels,” the final specification would be useless, because already implied in the names given to the letters. Hence the opinion referred to is wrong, and the name taught by the rule indicates the consonant alone.

As for the actual usage of the treatise, it is somewhat equally divided between the two modes of designation of the consonants: names formed with a alone occur nearly sixty times; with akāra, nearly eighty times. This is exclusive of r, which is called ra four times, repha fifteen times.

Compare rule i.39 of the Vāj. Pr.

The term grahāna is used in only two other rules of the Prāti-

The commentator, however, gives it an artificial and false etymology: it denotes, he says, either a word respecting which something is to be enjoined (lakṣha), or one which is the cause (nimitta) of an effect produced in some other word. The former is called grahāna because it is “seized” (i.e. “affected”); the latter, because something is “seized” or “affected” by it. It is, he continues, a part of a word, a theme or base. The ca, ‘also,’ of the rule brings forward, or indicates the continued implication of, the a of the preceding rule. The meaning is, then, that a forms the name of a citation, a theme, in whatever situation it may occur.

21. vyanjanānām akāra ākhya bhavati. yathā: takāra tva-

satyam: vīkṣhaḍīcāstraśhadhasamkhetāntesu śrīti pariśrāhah, aparā tu sanghirante: akāra sarvaśvarantasya vyanjanasya grā-
haka iti: yathā: man—: ghan—: ukth—: ity adā

kshaparā (ix.3) iti nishedhasyo ’dāharanaṁ syād iti. tad asā-

vukhaḥ: vāghahapārav as tash tām (vii.13) iti šapār-
vatvād takāraṣya tate kṛte ihat—: iti syād: tac ca 'nishtam:

kiṁ ca: yavanahasvaraparāşāv (xiv.4) iti atra saarpapar-
sabdo vyaarthāḥ syat: bhavanmate sarvasvarantasya svikārani-

yonāt: tasmād anupapannam eva11 tan matam manmahe: kiṁ tu

1 W. B. omit these first two words of the rule. 2 G. M. -tām. 3 G. M. -tām. 4 G. M. -yā-yaś. 5 G. M. -dīya. 6 W. om. 7 G. M. om. 8 G. M. sktavā. 9 W. yavanahaparavā. 10 G. M. -ntamātāsya. 11 G. M. evāt.
That is to say, if a word be cited in the text of a rule by its theme-ending \( a \), all its cases or other derivative forms are to be regarded as equally had in view by the rule. Reference is twice made to this principle hereafter by the commentator (under rules vi.13 and x.14), to justify such inclusions. The latter of the cases he here brings up, as example of a nimitta, or citation of an affecting cause; the cited word is oṣṭha, which is declared to occasion the loss of a preceding \( a \) or \( ā \): the only two instances of this combination which the Sanhitā contains are quoted in illustration, viz. svāh" oṣṭhābhyaṁ (vii.3.16\(^1\)), and upayānam adharen oṣṭhena (v.7.12). As example of a lakṣhya, or citation of a word to be determined by rule, he quotes the end of rule xvi.26, with its illustrative citations, kiṁcīlaḥ caturthaḥ (v.5.9\(^2\)), and kiṁcīlāya ca kshayāṇāya ca (iv.5.9\(^1\)). This latter example is not very well chosen, as the case is a somewhat difficult and anomalous one (see the note on xvi.26).

This rule, like some of those that follow, is of very small value, since final \( a \) is not the necessary sign of a cited theme in which other cases are included; and, on the other hand, parts of words not ending in \( a \) are often cited "for the sake of the inclusion of many words" (bahūpāddānārtham).

22. "lakṣhyaṁ nimittaṁ ca grahaṇam ity ucyate: gṛhyataḥ iti grahaṇam: gṛhyata anene 'ti nimittaṁ api grahaṇam: padākadeṣaḥ prātipadikam iti yāvat: cakāraḥ pārvasātrotkam akāram ākarṣhāti: grahaṇasya prātipadikasya sarvāvasthaysyā'kara' ākhyaṁ bhavati. yathā: kiṁcīlakīṁcīlā (xvi.28) iti parakīṁcīlaḥca ābhūtyam udāhoranam: yathā: kiṁcī ca keśa..... kiṁcī ca kāke.....: oṣṭhēvahpāro upāyate (x.14) iti tu nimittaṁ: yathā: svā...... upāy......

\(^1\) W. inserts this passage out of place, between rule 19 and its commentary
\(^2\) G. grahaṇyata. \(^3\) G. M. omit this example. \(^4\) G. M. om.
Rule 28, below, is very intimately connected with this, and the insertion of rules 25–27 between is quite unaccountable. 

Rik. Pr. i.14 includes the second of the three specifications here made, along with rule 28.

24. Or the simple citation.

The commentator says: “Of these—namely the increment etc,—there is in some cases, alternatively, citation; the meaning is, without any ah.” And he goes on to quote three rules, in which increment (xvi.29), alteration (vii.3), and elision (v.15) are taught otherwise than as prescribed in the preceding rule—which is not, however, thus amended into acceptableness.

25. In case of doubt, citation is made of the next.

This rule, occurring where it does, appears to have been interpolated by an afterthought, attaching itself to the word graha-nam, ‘citation,’ of the preceding rule, without regard to the connection in which that word is used. The meaning is, that when the mere citation of a word from the Sanhitā would leave a doubt as to which occurrence of the word is intended, some part of the context, a word or part of a word, is cited along with it. But the commentator’s first example and its exposition are quite peculiar. He quotes svayamātrānām ca vikārinām ca ‘uttame (v.3.73), and remarks: “There being a doubt, owing to the occurrence of two ca’s in this passage, which of them is to be taken to give the prayagraha-character [to uttame], the one next to the proper subject of the rule [kāryabhāj, ‘the word undergoing the prescribed

23. āgamādīnām ākkāra ākhyā bhavati: aṅkāla iti prathamā-

vibhakter upalaksanam. āgamasya yathā: ‘dvitiyacatur-
thayos tu vyañjanottarayoh pūrvaḥ (xiv.5): vikārinō ya-

thā: atha nakāro nakāram (vii.1): lopino yathā: tish-

thantyakayā sapūrvaḥ (v.19): ity ekavacanāni: laparāu

lakāram (v.25): iti dvivacanām: ānupārvaṃ nāsikyāḥ

(xxi.12): iti bahuvacanām. āgaṃca ca vikārī ca lopī ca "gaṃ-
vikārilopīnah: teshām.

(1) B. om.

24. teshām āgamādīnāṁ kvacīd grahaṇāṁ vā bhavati: aṅkā-

reṇa vinā ‘pi ti tātparyam. āgamasya yathā: adirāṅhatir

(xvi.29) ity ādi: vikārinō yathā: hanyādupyamānāni ca

(vii.8) ity ādi: lopino yathā: eshaśasya (v.15) ity ādi.

(1) G. M. om. iti.
effect') is to be assumed, in the rule reading 'ca ttame [iv.11].]' He seems to suppose that the "doubt" referred to in the rule concerns the point, which of the two preceding ca's is joined with uttame in the precept that establishes the latter's character as a pragraka word, and that we need authority for understanding that the latter of the two is taken. This is little less than silly. His other example is taken from rule iv.15, where a pṛshati is made pragraka, the a being the final letter of the preceding word yunaj (yunaj pṛshati, iv.6.9').

Under a later rule (iv.23) this principle is twice referred to, and very curiously and artificially applied. See the note to that rule.

26. Even of more than one.

The genitive in this rule is grammatically inconsistent with the accusative of the one preceding, which I had to translate inaccurately in order to make the connection evident. The commentator declares the "even" (api) here to continue in force the word saṁdehe, 'in case of doubt,' which is hardly to be approved. He interprets: "When there is ambiguity, citation is made of more than one word or sound," and quotes tīsthanty ekayā (v.19) and evo ttare (iv.11) as examples. But in these we have only one additional word cited, though more than one additional letter; so that both are properly examples under the preceding rule. There is no case, I believe, where more than one word requires to be cited along with that at which the rule aims; of a part of a word containing more than one letter we have instances in vi.2,5 etc. I see no good reason, however, why these should not be regarded as authorized by the preceding rule, and this one, accordingly, omitted as superfluous.

27. A first mute, followed by the word "series," is the name of the series.

25. saṁdehe satyā śaṁnānī śaṁnānī varṇam padāṁ vā grhniyāt: svay.... ity atra ca kārādvayaśambhavāt pragrahanimittevena katarasyo padānāṁ kartavyān iti saṁdehe yad śaṁnānī kāryabhājas tad eva svikartavyān ca 'ttame (iv.11) iti sātre'. varnasya yathā: a pṛshati (iv.15) ity ādi.

1 W. om. 2 G. M. padāṁ varnām. 3 G. M. yadd. 4 W. B. sartrat.


1 G. M. ādiyati. 2 W. B. om.
The commentator’s example is rule xiv.20, “the t-series, followed by the t-series;” that is to say, a lingual mute followed by a dental. Compare Vāj. Pr. i.64.

28. Am makes the name of a product of alteration.

This is the correlative rule to 23, above, from which it has become strangely separated. The commentator explains, as before, that am stands here as representative of the accusative case in any number; but the two examples he gives (v.38 and vii.1) are both of them such as the rule might strictly apply to without any such extension of its meaning.

29. By preceding is meant preceding.

A rule expressed in the form of an identical proposition cannot be claimed to cast much light of itself, but demands a comment as its essential part. Our commentator explains: “Whatever word is pointed out by the qualification ‘preceding,’ that word is to be understood as designated by its own form in that situation alone; but not, on account of identity of form, another word standing in a different situation. Thus, by the rules (iv.12,13) ‘dyāvāprthivi’ is pragraha; also the preceding word, the word yāvati is made a pragraha in the passage yāvati dyāvāprthivid mahitvā (iii.2,81); but it is not therefore pragraha in the passage yāvati vāi prthivi (v.2,31).”

30. By following is meant succeeding.

27. vargaśabdottaraḥ prathamāḥ svavargasyāḥ khyā bhavati: tvargav ca tvargaparāḥ (xiv.20) iti. vargaśabda uttaro yasmād asāv vargottaraḥ.


28. am iti cabdo vikārasyāḥ khyā bhavati: am iti devitādevi bhakterior upalakshanam. yathā: prathamapūrvo hakāraḥ caturttham (v.38): atha nakāro nakāram (vii.1).

29. yah pūrvacabdendena nirdishṭāḥ sa tatrāi ca svena rūpeno palakshito īnatayāḥ: na tu rūpasāmānyād anyo bhimadevasthāṁ. yathā: dyāvāprthiṣṭiḥ: pūrvac ca (iv.12,13) iti pragraho bhavati ‘ti vakṣhyati: pūrvevaḥ yāv-... iti yāvatacādah pragrāḥḥ: yāv-... iti tu na syat pragrāḥḥ.

1 G. M. viṣhyatā. 2 W. om. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. viṣhyati. 5 G. M. atra.
This is the counterpart of the preceding rule, and is explained by the commentator in corresponding terms. His illustration is taken from rules iv.49,50, where \( \text{dve} \) and the word following it are declared \( \text{pragraha} \). In the passage, then, \( \text{dve jayē vindate} \) (vi.6.4.3), \( \text{jayē} \) is \( \text{pragraha} \), but not in the passage \( \text{yonir asi jaya e'hi} \) (i.7.9.1); G. M. omit \( \text{e'hi} \).

The rule is only once referred to hereafter, namely under iv.52; and there for a purpose which it was not intended to answer.

31. \( \text{R} \) and \( \text{l} \) are short.

As examples of short \( \text{r} \) and \( \text{l} \), the commentator cites \( \text{rtavo vai} \) (vii.2.6.1), and \( \text{aklptasya klptyä} \) (v.4.8.6).

32. Also \( \text{a} \).

\( \text{"Also" (ca), says the commentator, brings forward the implication of "short" from the preceding rule. His example of short } \) \( \text{a} \) is \( \text{ayam purah} \) (iv.3.2.1 or 4.3.1).

33. Also any vowel having the same quantity with the latter.

Here again, the "also" continues the implication of the predicate of rule 31, we are told. The only vowels contemplated by the rule, further, are \( \text{i} \) and \( \text{u} \), since there is an absence of the attribute of like quantity with \( \text{a} \) in the diphthongs. As examples from the \( \text{Sanhitā} \) are quoted \( \text{ise tvā} \) (i.1.1 et al.), \( \text{upaiprayantu adhvaram} \) (i.5.5.1 or 7.1; W. B. omit \( \text{adhvaram} \), and \( \text{atra} \) "\( \text{ha} \) tad urugayasya \) (i.3.6.2; but see the various readings below). The commentator then raises the objection (without introducing it, as usual,

30. \( \text{yah para ity anena vícisyate so } \text{pi tatrā } \text{va svena rūpena} \) \( \text{pratyetavyah. yathā: dve: paraś ca (iv.49,50) iti } \text{pragraho bhavati} \) \( \text{ti vakshyati: paraveśd dve jā---- ity atra } \text{jāye iti} \) \( \text{pragrahāḥ: } \text{yo---- ity atra } \text{no pragrahāḥ}. \)

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. ins. \( \text{svatah} \). 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. ins. \( \text{ta} \).

31. \( \text{rkāraś ca likāraś ca hrasvastānyādu bhavataḥ. yathā: } \)

\( \text{rt----: ak----.} \)

1 W. B. om.

32. \( \text{akāraś ca hrasvasaṁyīdu bhavati: caṇāro hrasvavatvam} \) \( \text{anvādiñati. yathā: ay---- iti.} \)

1 G. M. \( \text{svaṭm}. \)
with nanu), that the matter of the three rules should have been put into this form: "A is short: also any vowel having like quantity with it;" because, as actually stated, they are liable to the reproach of saying the same thing over twice (since r and l are of the same quantity as a, and are therefore included in the prescription of the present rule). But he replies that the statement is right in its present shape; for r and l inhere in r and l; and one might therefore suppose that, being letters of more than one articulating position, they suffered an extension of quantity, and were not short: hence the special rule concerning them. The treatise, as was noticed above (under i.2), nowhere describes the formation of r and l, though it excludes them from the category of simple vowels.

The rule of the Vāj. Pr. (i.55) is nearly the same with this.

अनुस्वारः ॥ २८ ॥

34. Also anusvāra.

The implication being the same as in the preceding rules, anusvāra is here defined as having the quantity of a short vowel. The commentator explains the occasion for the rule as follows: rule xxi.6, which teaches that anusvāra and swarabhakti are to be attached to the preceding vowel in syllabication, implies the consonantal character of the former; whence, by rule 37, below, it would have the quantity of a half-mora, and its true quantity of a mora requires special definition.

The Vāj. Pr. (iv.147,148) allows anusvāra to make with a preceding vowel, either long or short, two moras, oddly enough distributing the time between the two elements, vowel and nasal, in such a way that the latter has a mora and a half after a short vowel, the vowel being itself shortened to a half-mora, while after a long vowel the nasal is itself cut down to a half-mora, and a mora and a half are assigned to the vowel—a highly artificial ar-


1 G. M. tatrā. 2 G. M. hrasvavedeakaḥ samānakālaḥ svarah iti. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. -kīlānasvarā. 5 W. om. 6 B. atrā "ha only; G. M. ātra hy; both as if the introduction to what follows. 7 G. M. om. 8 G. M. anantāre. 9 G. M. tātē. 10 B. om. 11 G. M. avagyamya. 12 G. M. ins. hraseva.
rangement. The Rik Pr. gives no special statement respecting the quantity of the nasal element, but leaves it to be included among the other consonants, which have half a mora of time each.

All the "short" elements being now enumerated, the commentator quotes, as example of the employment of the term "short," rule iii.1. As example of anuvāra, he quotes tāṇ haste (vi.1.37).

35. An element of twice that quantity is long.

The literal meaning of this rule is, says the commentator, that one of the before-mentioned short vowels, when doubled, is long; but its virtual intent is that a vowel having twice the quantity of a short is long. I have translated in accordance with the latter interpretation. As example of the use of the term "long" is quoted rule x.2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel.

36. An element of three times that quantity is protracted.

The commentator explains the virtual meaning of this rule in the same manner as that of the preceding, and quotes in illustra-

34. bhavaty anuvāraḥ ca hrasvasaṃjñāḥ, yathā: tāṇ......

35. tācān iti prakto hrasa ucyate: devir iti devirāpaḥ: tāvān

36. atrā 'pi hrasavo nucartate sāmniḥṣhyāt: trir iti trirāpaḥ:

1 G. M. apl. 2 G. M. krasvāk. 3 MSS. svarag pr.; W. -褒avidh-. 4 G. M. om. 5 G. M. tv. 6 G. M. te.

1 G. M. pm. 2 W. inserts here, out of place. sāmniḥṣhyāḥ pravojanam. 3 B. la; W. om. kāh. 4 W. om. itī.

1 G. M. ins. sa. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. om.
tion of the term "protracted" rule x.24, which directs that a protracted and a pragraha vowel are not liable to combination.
All the treatises agree closely in their definitions of vowel quantity; see Ath. Pr. i.59-62, and the notes upon those rules.

37. A consonant has half the quantity of a short vowel.

This, the comment reminds us, is a rule defining the length of a consonant, not one giving the meaning of the term consonant. For, if it were the latter, the word "time" in rule xvii.5, which speaks of "the time of a consonant," would be open to the charge of redundancy. We hardly need so trifling and technical a proof of a thing so obvious. As example of a consonant, the word vāk (e.g. i.3.91: but G. M. read instead vā) is given us.
Of the other treatises, the Ath. Pr. (i.60) alone differs from this by giving to a consonant a whole mora as its quantity.

38. A syllable uttered in a high tone is acute.

The commentator enters into no explanation of the meaning of the definition of the acute tone or accent here given, but simply refers us to a later rule (xxii.9), where the action of the organs in producing the higher tone is more particularly described. He adds as example of an acute vowel sā idhānā (iv.4.45: but all the MSS. save W. read sā iti), and quotes rule xiv.29 as exemplifying the use of the term udātta, 'acute' (literally 'elevated'). I have explained in the note to Ath. Pr. i.14-16 why I prefer, instead of transferring the terms udātta, anudātta, and svarita, to translate them by 'acute,' 'grave,' and 'circumflex,' respectively.

39. In a low tone, grave.

37. vyaṇjanam hravārthakālam bhavati: na tu vyaṇjanam iti saṁjñā: anyathā vyaṇjanakālaḥ ca svarasyā 'trd 'dhīkāḥ' (xvii.5) iti kāla-pabdasyā pāunoraktyāpattah. yathā: vāk. hravāsyā 'rdho' hravārdhāḥ: 'hravārthakālaḥ' parimāṇam yasya tat tathā 'ktam.

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. omit the last two words of the rule. 3 G. M. ins. atra. 4 G. M. -dham. 5 G. M. hravārdhān kālaḥ parimāṇakālaḥ yasya—a good and consistent reading; B. is corrupt. 6 W. -lām.

38. āyamo dārunyam (xxii.9) iti lakshanalakshitah svara udātta ucyate. yathā: sā . . . saṁjñāyāḥ prayojanam: udāttat paro 'nudāṭtah svaritaḥ (xiv.29) iti.

1 G. M. -la. 2 G. M. ity ādi.
We are again referred to the rule in one of the last chapters (xxi.10) which defines the action of the organs in producing the lower tone. The example for the accent is avatām (i.7.22: but G. M. read avatām), of which, in pada-text, all the syllables are grave; that for the term anudatta, 'grave' (literally, 'not elevated'), is, in W. B., rule iv.43; but in G. M., rule xiv.29.

40. Their combination is circumflex.

The commentator explains samāhāra, 'combination,' as from samāhriyate, 'it is taken together, collected, combined;' and adds, 'the accent arising from the mixing of those two is the circumflex (svarita). This is a precept concerning the peculiar nature of the accent; its occurrence is taught further on, in one and another place:' and he quotes not less than three of the rules (xiv.29,x.16, and xii.9) which teach under what circumstances the circumflex arises. His example of a circumflexed syllable is te 'bruvan (iii.2.29 et al.).

This rule is so far ambiguous that it does not tell us in what order the acute and grave tones are to be combined to produce the circumflex accent—whether acute and grave, or grave and acute; but we may perhaps assume that the treatise consciously intends them to be taken in the order in which they are defined by the two preceding rules.

All the authorities practically agree in their general definition of the three kinds of accent (see note to Ath. Pr. i.14–16); and Pāṇini's rules (i.2.29–31) are precisely the same with those here given. As regards the details which form the subject of the following rules of our treatise, the accordance is not so perfect (see note to Ath. Pr. i.17).

41. Of this circumflex, in case it immediately follows an

39. anvāvasargaḥ (xxi.10) iti śtralakṣīṁtaḥsvaro 'nu- 
ūdatta ucayaṃ. yathā: av-samjunāyah prayojanam: anudattona
tīmyam (iv.43) iti.

1 W. B. om. 2 G. M. -ta. 3 B. lakṣyate. 4 G. M. give xiv.29, and ity ādi.

40. tayor udattānuddattatayor yah samāhāraḥ sa' svarita ucayaṃ. 
yathā: te...... samāhriyata iti samāhāraḥ: tayor melanājan-
yasvarah svarita ity arthah, svaritaśvaraśvarāvidhir ayam: upa-
rishad tu 'tratatrata svarita lakṣyate': yathā: udattā paro 
'nuddatāh svaritam (xiv.29): udattayoc ca paro 'nuddat-
thāh svaritam (x.16): tasmin' anudatte pārva udattāh 
svaritam (xii.9) ity ādi.

1 M. om. 2 W. -ra: B. -nyah śvara. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. ruk-. 5 W. om. 6 W. tamuddatte.
acute, the first part, to the extent of half a short vowel, is
uttered in a yet higher tone.

That is, higher than the tone of acute, which properly forms its
first element; one is tempted to give the word udātāt a double
construction, as belonging in idea to uccāśāra[ām] as well as to
anant[āre].

The subject of the more particular definition of the circumflex
accent occupies the six following rules, and any comments upon
the doctrines laid down will be better reserved until the last rule.

As example of the circumflex, the commentator cites the words
sā irdhā[ā] (iv.4.4.), already once given (under rule 38); the first
syllable of the second word has the enclitic circumflex, by rule
xiv.29, under which the same quotation is repeated.
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42. The remainder has the same tone with acute.

The plain meaning of this rule is distorted by the commentator,
in an attempt to avoid a seeming inconsistency. He claims, namely,
that the word “same with” here signifies “a trifle lower than,”
“because otherwise there would be no circumflex”—the circum-
flex having been defined in rule 40 as including both the higher
and lower tone. But the inconsistency is not evaded by claiming
for the last portion of the circumflex any thing short of the actual
“grave” tone which rule 40 prescribes: if, indeed, giving to its
first portion a higher tone than “acute” be not an equal offense
against the same rule.
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43. Along with the consonant, too.

Says the commentator—“the rule as formerly given applied to
a pure vowel; now the same thing is taught of the circumflexed
vowel even in case of its combination with a consonant. The
circumflexed vowel along with its consonant, either the one which
directly follows an acute or another, is as defined. The ‘too’
(apī) continues the implication of the circumflexed vowel.” To
this explanation of apī, as simply equivalent with ca, we must
demur. As any one may see by referring to the various rules in

41. udātād anantāre yāḥ svāraḥ svaryate tasyāḥ “dis tāvad
uccāśāra[ām] udātātara bhavati yāvad dhravasyāḥ rāhām. ya-
thā: sā......

42. dhravādahakālāc cheṣaḥ udātassam bhavati: ‘na tā ‘dāt[ā]

(1) W. repeats these clauses in the comment of the preceding rule, after bhavati.
which it occurs, it is always best translated by ‘even,’ as pointing out something which is to a certain degree anomalous, or not to have been naturally expected.

As examples of circumflexed syllables containing consonants, the commentary offers sākhā sākhībhyyo vārīvah krnotu (iii.3.11): all the MSS. except W. give only the second and third words, which are the ones to which the rule applies; the second syllable of each has the enclitic svārita, and they are to be read and divided sā-khīb-bhyo vārī-vah), and tishyāḥ (ii.2.10 et al.: but G. M. omit this example).

I have not observed that any other of the treatises deems it necessary to lay down in terms the principle that the consonant shares in the accentuation of the vowel to which it is attached. Though the rule may be regarded as in a manner superfluous, it is less to be objected to in itself than on account of the place where it is thrust in, so wholly out of connection. It ought to be somewhere where it can be made to apply to all the three accents, and not to the circumflex alone.

44. Or the part following is uttered in a lower tone.

The comment explains anantara in this rule as equivalent to pēsha (in rule 42), and paraphrases by saying that “the remainder of this circumflexed syllable, after the half-mora [of which the character was defined in rule 41] is in a lower tone; that is, is anudattatara (‘lower than grave’).” Whether this is the true meaning, and not rather that the last part of the syllable, instead of being “of the same tone with acute” (rule 42), is “of lower tone (than acute),” may well be made a question. It would be, I should think, an exaggeration of the circumflex of which hardly any theorist would be guilty, to begin it higher than acute, and end it lower than grave. The latter of the two interpretations suggested is also (though not unequivocally) supported by the next rule, which may most naturally be regarded as letting down the concluding tone of the syllable one degree farther than the present rule, as this than the preceding.

43. kevalasyā 'yam vidhiḥ purastād utkāh: idānāṁ vyaṇja- nasahitave 'pi svāritasya tathātcam ucyate: 'saryajano 'pi svārīta 'udattād anantaro 'nyo 'cro 'ktavidhir ḫavati: api-pādāḥ 'svāritam ākarahati, yathā: sakhā...: ti.

(1) W. om. (2) W. -śānt-. (3) W. va mukhya vi-. (4) B. om. (5) G. M. -takar-shakah.

44. tasya svāritisya hrasvārdaḥkālāc chesho nīcāistaram anudattataraḥ bhavati: anantaraḥ pēsha ity arthāh: tad eva 'dāharanam.

1 W. -dāttaro.
45. Or in the same tone with grave.

The commentator does not attempt this time, as under rule 42, to show that "same" means in reality "a little different," but simply paraphrases (taking no account of the vā, ‘or’): "That same remainder of this circumflexed syllable is the same with anudatta."

46. Its beginning is the same with acute; its remainder is the same with grave: so say the teachers.

Or, it may be, 'so says the teacher;' the plural being used in token of respect: the word acārya is not elsewhere found in the treatise (save at xxiv.6) except in the expression ekeshām acāryānam, 'of certain teachers,' which occurs several times. The commentator does not give us his opinion upon the point, but he declares this to be the only rule that is approved or of force (ishita, literally 'desired') in the net-work (jāla) of alternative views here adduced, commencing with rule 41. It may, in fact, be looked upon as identical in meaning with the fundamental rule 40, and as presenting the only reasonable and sensible view of the true character belonging to the circumflex accent. The elaboration of the theory of the circumflex, the classification of its varieties, and the determination of their relations to one another, appear to have been quite a favorite weakness with the Hindu phonetists. The subject occupies the whole of one of the later chapters of this treatise (xx.), together with sundry rules in other chapters; and a more detailed examination of it, and criticism of the views taken respecting it, will be necessary in connection with some of those rules.

While approving this rule, for the reason that it is in accordance with the last two rules of chapter xx., which define the relation of

45. tasya' svaritasya sa eva çesha anudattasamo bhavati.

1 G. M. om.


1 G. M. omit, which is better. 2 G. M. ārabhyā 'bhihite; B. ābbiyahite (?—corrupt). 3 W. B. -hypa- (hypa ?); W. -jale.
four of the kinds of circumflex to one another in respect to hardness of utterance, the commentator rejects in advance the next following rule, as being discordant with them. The ground of the asserted accordance and discordance I am not able to discover.

47. It is all a slide, say some.

The commentator says: "The word 'slide' (pravana) is a synonym of 'circumflex': the circumflexed vowel, along with its consonants, starting from its beginning, is all of it a slide: so some teachers have said." And he adds the same example already more than once given, sákhíbyo váríeh (iii.3.11'). We have seen that, in his exposition of the preceding precept, he has rejected this one, upon grounds of inappreciable value. The view here taken is one that might well enough be held by any one, as virtually equivalent with the one before presented: the voice somehow makes its descent from the higher to the lower pitch within the compass of the accented syllable; whether by a leap or a slide, is a proper theme for hair-splitting argumentation, but of the smallest practical consequence.

48. A separable word is treated like separate words, except in an enumeration.

The meaning and application of this precept may be best exhibited by means of the examples which the commentator quotes. We have a rule (iv.40) that te and the at the end of a word of more than two syllables are pragrahā if preceded by á or e. In the passages oshátā tigmahete (i.2.14'a) and tat pravāte (vi.4.72'), then, the final syllables would be pragrahā, but that the words in which they occur are separable compounds, written in the pada-text tig-
ma-hete and pravāte, and so are exempted by this rule from the

47. pravanaçaabdah scaritaparyāyah: savyañjana eva scarita ādita árabhya sarvah pravāno bhavati 'ty eka' ácāryā úcie. yathā: saékha five...


1 G. M. -ne vish. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. ins. iti. 4 G. M. prabhavate.
operation of iv.40: the te is in each case the ending of a dissyllabic word. What is meant by “enumeration” is not, in itself, very clear, as the case already cited is, in a certain sense, one of enumeration—namely, of the syllables of a word. The commentator shows its intent by pointing out that, by rules iv.49–51, the word deve, the next word to it, and the next but one, are made pragraha: hence, in the passage deve savane sukrovati (vi.1.64), sukrovati (pada-text sukra-vati) must be counted as a single word only, or the t of vati would not be pragraha.

In this, as in the Rik and Atharva Prātiṣṭhikyas, the word in्ग्या T. W. B. and O. more usually write in्या, or in्या) means a compound word, treated as separable into its constituents in the pada-text. The St. Petersburg lexicon erroneously explains it as signifying a single member of such a compound.

Compare Rik Pr. i.25, and Vāj. Pr. i.153.

49. Of such a word, the former member is called avagraha.

The example quoted is deveyata iti deveya-yate (iii.5.5)—an instance of carec, or repetition with iti interposed, such as is usual in the krama-texts, and, to a certain extent, in the pada-texts also. The existing pada-texts of the Rik and Atharvan would write this word simply deveya-yate, reserving the repetition with iti for words which are pragraha and separable at the same time: but that of the Tāittiriya-Sanhitā treats all separable compounds in the latter method (see, for the varying usages of different texts, the note to Ath. Pr. iv.74). In deveya-yate, the part deve is denominated avagraha. As instance of the use of this technical term is given the rule (iv.2) which exempts all first members of compounds from the action of the rules prescribing pragraha.

The commentator, finally, calls attention to the mutual relation, or apposition, of the words pada and avagraha in the rule, each in its own gender (the former being neuter, the latter masculine): compare under ii.7 and v.2.

The other Prātiṣṭhikyas use the term avagraha in this sense, but without taking the trouble to define it.

50. In citations of a word, that word is to be understood.

That is to say, the cited word itself, and not a part of a word

49. tasye inyapadaṃ pūrvaṃ padaṃ avagrahaḥ ity aveya. yathā: deve-.... avagraha-sahāṣaḥ prayaṇam: nā ‹avagrahaḥ (iv.2) ity adhi. pada-avagraha-abhydharo niyati-saṃyojana-dvayaḥ sambhavat.

(1) G. M. om.  * G. M. om. avagraha.  ^ W. niyama-.
identical in form with it. Thus (to take the commentator's example), tve is later (iv.10) declared pragraha except at the end of a separable word, as in the passage tve kratum (iii.5.10\(^1\)); the exception specified is necessary, because the tve of a word like additev (p. aditi-tve) is also a pada or vocable, but it is not therefore to be inferred that the tve of kratae, in the passage kratae dakshya (iii.2.5\(^2\); 3.11\(^4\)), is also pragraha.

As the commentator had formerly derived grahanam (i.22) from grhyate, so now he derives grahanani from grhnanti, 'they seize, take.'

The principle here taught is appealed to several times (under iv. 11,38; vii.2) hereafter, in order to the settlement of doubtful points.

It would seem possible to be still made a question whether the citation in any particular rule were a pada, 'a full word,' or a padadikadega, 'part of a word,' since citations of the latter kind are also frequently made. Perhaps the commentator would settle the difficulty by asserting that no combination of articulate sounds which actually occurs in the Sanhitā as a pada is ever cited in any other character.

51. But that word, even when phonetically altered.

The commentator gives two examples. The word vāhana, he says, is cited later (vii.6) as one whose n is liable to conversion into n: this conversion, then, still holds good, though the final syllable of the word have become o: thus, pravāhana vahniḥ (i.3.3). Again, syah, by v.15, loses its final visarga; and it does so, even when its s is changed to sh, as in ayam u kṣya prā devayuh (iii.5.11\(^1\)). As regards the former of these examples, it might seem to be provided for by rule i.22, above: but the commentator would doubtless plead that the rule would apply to vāhanah, but not to vāhano.

50. padagrahaneshu sūtreṣhu grhitam padam eva gāmyeta: \(^3\) jñātayam: na padādikadegāḥ. yathā: tve ity anīńgyāntah \(^8\) (iv.10) iti vakshyati: tathā sati tve— iti pragraha bhavati: krā— iti padādikadegān na bhavati. grhnanti ti grahanān: padānāṁ grahanāṁ padagrahanāṁ: tēshu.

1 M. ins. tad. 2 G. M. = sat. 3 W. antiyāḥ: B. antiyāḥ. 4 G. M. = satvān.

51. apiśabdāḥ padam anvādiṣati: padagrahaneshu vikṛtam api padam avagantayam. yathā: nādeviddhau vāhana (vii.6) iti graḥāhyate: padam iti kṛtvā visarjanīya oṭam āpanne 'pi nātacan nāi 'eva nivartate: pra—... esahasyaḥ (v.15) iti visarjanīyalopagrahanam pathishyate: ay— ity atra sakāre śatvacan āpanne \(^1\) visargalopohavaty eva.

1 G. M. ins. 'pi.
52. And even when preceded by a.

The evident occasion of this rule is the frequent occurrence of words with the negative prefix a attached to them. But, it being once established, its sphere is not restricted to that class of compounds, as is shown in the very example chosen by the commentator to illustrate its working. By iii.2, aṣvā is included among the words whose final u is liable to be shortened; then, by this rule, aṣvā is also included: e.g. aṣvāvantāḥ (p. aṣva-vantam) sahasrinam (iii.3.11). 

Application of this principle is quite frequently made below (under iii.2.8; v.13,16; vi.5,14; viii.8,13; xi.16; xvi.6,19).

53. And when preceded by an.

The origin and aim of this rule are obviously the same with those of the preceding, but the instances of its application are less frequent: it is appealed to but three times in the sequel (under rules iii.7, viii.8, and xvi.29). The last case is the one selected by the commentator as his example. The word aṇḍu, by xvi.29, contains anusvāra; hence the same word preceded by an is to be regarded as included with it, as in the passage anāṇḍu kurvantaḥ (iii.2.21).

The commentator now raises the question: how comes kāra to

52. atrā 'py api caṇḍah padāṇvādeparah: padagrahaheshv akārādy api padāṁ viṣṇeyam: cyaartāvayunā (iii.2) iti hruśvādeṣe vahṣiyati: akārāder api tasya grahamasya hruṣva- team bhavati. yathā: aṣv-..... akāra ādīr tasya tat tathoktam.

53. cakāraḥ padam iti bodhayati: padagrahaheshv ankārādy api padāṁ viṣṇeyam: aṇḍu (xvi.29) ity anusvārāgame vaṣṣiyati: ankārāder api tasya 'nusvārāgamah syat. yathā: an-..... ankāra ādīr tasya tat tathoktam.

nāne atra sātre 'n ity asya kārottaratvaṁ kathāṁ kriyate: varṇaḥ kārottarah (i.16) iti 'sātre varṇasya kārottaratavevi- dhānabhavegamah syat. neyate: satyam: etachāstrubalān 'na kriyate: kim tu cāstṛntarabalāṁ kriyate: yathā: paniṣiṇyā 'eva- kāra api kāra- ityādīnāṁ sādhūtvām kathayanti: evam atra 'pi evam aḥkāra āgama (i.23) ity atra codyaparīhārāu viṣṇeyāṁ.

be added here to the syllable an? since offense is thus committed against the precept in rule 16, above, that kāra is added to an alphabetic sound to form its name. His answer is: true enough that it is not done by authority of this text-book; but it is done by the authority of other text-books; for example, Panini's followers establish the propriety of such expressions as evakāra, api-
kāra (for the words eva and api). So likewise in this very treatise (in rule 23, above) we have ahkāra for ah; and the same objection and answer are to be understood as applying there. See the note under rule 16.

54. A single sound composing a word is called aprkta.

The commentator explains ekavarnāḥ after the fashion usual with him in treating a karmadhāraya or determinative compound: “that is both single (eka) and a sound (varna); hence, a single sound.” The term aprkta means, he says, “uncombined with a consonant.” As example of an aprkta word, he quotes sa uv ekarivitcavartanīh (iv.3.32), where uv is, by rule ix.16, representative of the particle v; and, as counter-example, to illustrate the force of the specification “composing a word,” yajñapatāste iti (vi.6.2), where v, though in a manner isolated, is not aprkta, being only a fragment of a word. * Rule ix.16 exemplifies the use of the term.

55. And is treated both as initial and as final.

As an instance of the treatment of an aprkta word as initial, the commentary again cites the passage sa uv ekavītcavartanīh (iv.3.32), and declares that in it is to be seen the effect of rule 41, above (G. M. have here laeuna, and omit the reference to the rule, along with the other instance). This is quite unintelligible to me, since

54. ekac ca 'sau varnac ca' kavarnah: sa cet padam bhavati so prktah2 syāt. yathā: sa..... padam iti kim: yaj..... sam-
jñāyāḥ prajyomanam: ukāro prktah prakrtyā (ix.16) iti. aprkta iti vyañjananā 'sanyuta' ity arthah.


55. cakrārānādīśtaṁ tad aprktaśaṁjñam padam ādyantavac' ca kāryabhāg bhavati. ādiyad yathā: sa..... ity atra 'tasyā "dir uccāistaram (i.41) iti kāryam bhavati: antavad yathā: o te..... ity atrā 'ntah (iv.3) iti pragrahakāryam bhavati. ddy ca 'ntaḥ ca "dyantāu: tav īdā "dyantavat.

the rule referred to teaches nothing whatever that is characteristic of an initial sound,—indeed, teaches no kāryam, "effect," at all. For the treatment of such a word as a final, we have as an example the passage o te yanti (i.4.33), in which o is pragraha; with reference to rule iv.3, which teaches that only a final vowel is pragraha.

With this rule and the preceding compare Vāj. Pr. i.151-2, which are nearly identical with them in form and meaning. The Rūk Pr. does not define the term aprkta, but gives respecting it a rule corresponding with the present one. Both give in illustration the same passage, indre" "hi (indra: a: ihi), analogous with the one (bhakshe" "hi, iii.2.51) quoted below, under v.3.

55. Alteration and omission are of a single sound.

That is to say, not of a whole word. Where, as by v.19, more than one letter is omitted, each is specified. The cited examples are, of alteration, dhūrshāhāu (i.2.82: by rule v.10); of omission, sa te jānati (i.2.142-3: by rule v.15).

I find this rule expressly appealed to but once in the sequel (under ix.7).

57. Omission is complete loss.

As example of lopa, "omission," the commentator quotes the passage sa' im' andra suprayasah (iv.1.81-2), where the initial m of mandrā is lost after im (by rule v.12: see the note there given). As example of the use of the term, he gives rule v.11, which is introductory to the subject of omissions. He then proceeds to state a very curious reason why such a precept as this should seem called for: "some have maintained the eternity of sound: in order to the refutation of that doctrine, this rule hath been uttered, in conformity with general grammar." Pāṇini's corresponding precept (i.1.60) is adarcanam lopaḥ, "omission is disappearance from view."

56. varnamātrasya vikāralopādu syātān na tu sarvasya padasya. vikāras tāvat: dval-iti: 'lopas tu: sa.....

1 W. om. B. omits this whole comment, along with the following rule.

57. varnavindaco lopasonānno bhavati. yathā: sa..... saṁjñāyāḥ pryaṣṭahad: atha lopah (v.11) ity ñdi. varnasya niśyataṁ kecid dūh: tannirdkarānāya vṛddhakarānimsārena sat. tram etad abhānī.

1 G. M. varṇasya v.
58. Continued implication is of that which was last.

The term anvádeca, ‘after-indication,’ with its corresponding verbal forms, and other equivalent expressions (especially anvákarshaka, ákarshaka, etc.), is constantly employed in the commentary to signify the continued force in a given rule of some specification made in a preceding rule. And the simple meaning of the present precept appears to be, that such a bringing forward is of the predicate last used, the word last cited, or the like. The commentator’s first example is entirely accordant with this understanding: in rule vii.3, namely, to the effect that the n of hanyád and upyamánam is changed to n, the implication is “after nih,” nih being the last mentioned in a list of altering words given in the preceding rule. But he goes on to make another application of the precept: rule xv.8 says “a, however, even in saṁhitá [is protracted and nasalized];” and it is to be understood that only a “last” or “final” a is intended—as in suçlokáns (i.8.182), protracted from suçloka; while in brahmána tuva rúján (i.8.1612), agná tity áha (vi.5.84), vicítyah somáv na vicítyás iti (vi.1.91), where the words protracted are brahmán, agne, somah, and vicítyah, and the a is not a final, there is no nasalization. Evidently, this is a wholly forced and false interpretation: no rule can mean two things so utterly different. Compare the notes to iv.3 and xv.8, where the principle is appealed to.

The comment seeks a kind of support for its double interpretation by calling attention to the distinction between an “affecting cause” (nimitta), like the nih brought forward from vii.: to vii.3 in the first example, and an “affected” word or element (nimittin, ‘having a cause’), such as is concerned in the second example. The latter (nearly synonymous with lañkhyá, used in the comment to i.22) he defines as “something original (? praadhána seems to be taken here in the sense of prakrti) suffering a prescribed effect.”

No one of the other Prátićákhyaas attempts to lay down any rules as to the anvádeca (or anvártti); and its usages are, in fact, wholly irreducible to rule—a circumstance which involves the condemnation of the sútra style of composition, because the sútras are not and cannot be self-explanatory, or intelligible without an authoritative comment.

---

58. nimittasya nimittino vā āntyasya āntadeço bhavati: nimitti ‘ti pradhánaṁ káryabhág iti yávat, nimittasya yathā: hanyád upyamánam ca (vii.3) ity asyā ‘tra’ niśabdasya, nimittino yathā: akáras tu saṁhitáyám api (xv.8) ity atra suçlokáns’ ity antyasyā ‘kárasya: antyasye ‘ti kim: brah…..: ag-…..: vic-…..

1 W. -náṁ; G. M. -na. 2 G. M. om. 3 B. om, all the signs of protraction.
59. An upabandha, however, is for that particular passage, and of constant effect.

The commentator etymologizes upabandha, 'connection, tie,' as representing the meaning upabadhyate, 'it is tied up, bound to;' and he farther defines it as signifying a passage pointed out by the indication "in that," and one which is designated by an enumeration—referring to rules iv.22,23,48,52 as examples. An upabandha, then, is a connected part of the Sanhita, pointed out and defined by the rules of the Pratīcākhyā in various ways:—by citing the first words of a single verse (iv.20) or of an anuvāka (iv.25,48; xi.3); by the accepted title of a number of anuvākas, either succeeding one another or otherwise (ii.9,11; iv.52; ix.20; xi.3); by giving the first and last words of a passage (iv.22,23); or by fixing a limit within a certain number of words from a specified word (iv.52). Respecting such a passage, we are told, this rule is intended to teach two things: first, that what is prescribed for it does not hold good in other passages—this is signified by the word tu, 'however,' in the rule;—second, that an exception which applies in other passages does not apply in it—this is signified by the word nityam, 'constantly, in all cases.'

Both prescriptions, as thus stated, the commentator undertakes to illustrate by quoted cases of their application. But his first illustration is imperfectly and obscurely set forth, and is, besides, of a very questionable character. He tells us that the passage ity aha devi hy eṣā devaḥ somah (vi.1.7) is brought, by the principle laid down in the next rule but one (i.61), under the action of rule iv.25—and this is all that he deigns to say about it. The meaning is this: the passage quoted contains a series of four words, ity aha devi hi, which are also found at ii.6.79 (devi devaputre ity aha devi hy ete devaputre); and, as the i of devi in the latter passage is pragraha by iv.25; so, under the operation of i.61; it should be pragraha also in the other. Such, however, is not the case; for devi in devi hy eṣā is singular, while in devi hy ete it is dual. It would seem, then, as if we ought to understand the commenta—
tor to maintain that the present rule annuls the application of i.61, and, through it, of iv.25, to the case in question. But this is wholly inadmissible: for rule 61, below, is directly intended as a limitation to the present one, and has no force or value except as it applies to just such passages as the one here instanced; and with the latter are closely analogous a part of the examples adduced for its illustration, and leading to an opposite conclusion to the one here apparently arrived at. I cannot account for the way in which the commentator treats the matter. So far as I can see, devī at vi.1.77 is pragraha according to the rules of the Prātīcākhyā, and has only by some oversight escaped being specially excepted: and the first restriction is of a general character, meaning that directions given for an upabandha passage are intended for that passage alone, and have no wider bearing—except as they receive it from i.61. The same, as will be seen below, limits also the other restriction, that expressed by nityam.

Further, the citation in rule iv.11 of the compound sadohavriddhāne as pragraha implies that the simple word haviriddhāne would always be of a contrary character, as it in fact is in the passage haviriddhāne khyāyane (vi.2.111); but this implication does not hold in the passage haviriddhāne prāci pravartayeyuh (iii.1.31), because of the inclusion of the latter among the upabandhas of rule iv.52. Here, however, is brought up an objection: the explanation given is not satisfactory, because an exception made elsewhere is sometimes of force also in an upabandha passage. For instance, in the passage atha mithunī bhavatāḥ (vi.5.86), the word mithunī, which would else be pragraha by iv.52, is made otherwise by iv.53. Again, an example of a similar class is afforded by vāyave arohanavāhā (v.6.21), where vāyave ought to be pragraha, because occurring in the anuvāka to which iv.48 refers, while it is deprived of that character by iv.54. The answer is made, that, in the case of grāmi, vāyave, manava, and the like, the exception must be allowed to have force because those words are excepted by specific mention; while the exception of haviriddhāne is inferential only, and therefore does not hold good: specific mention being of more force than mere inference.

na pragraho grhyate: yathā: hav-. ity ajam atra nishedhah: hav-. ity atra na prasaratī: gamayato bhavataḥ (iv.52) ity ādīna prāptik. nanv etad anaparamam: anyatra nishedhasya kvacid upabandhe pi darṣanāt: yathā: atha-. ity atra gamayato bhavataḥ (iv.52) ity upabandhāprāptir na grāmi (iv.53) ity ādīna 'nyatra nishedhena nishedhyate: ta-. ity atra somāyās eva (iv.48) iti prāptir ate samānapada (iv.54) ity anena 'nyatra nishedhena nishedhyate. atro vāyate: grāmi vāyave manava ity ādīnān kaṇṭhoktavād esha nishedhā prasaratī: kevalahaviriddhān pragraho ne' ty ārthikō nishedho na prasaratī eva: ārthikakaṇṭhoktayoh kaṇ-
But this suggests a further objection: why then is not the specific mention of *ate* and *ave* in rule iv.54 enough, and what is the use of adding the word *nityam*, ‘in all cases,’ in that rule? This, replies the commentator, is for the purpose of making the exception yet more strongly binding: the specific mention merely annuls the application of the *upabandha* rule; the addition of *nityam* avoids the application of any other rule. For example, in *dve jāye vindate* (vi.6.4), *vindate* should be *pragraha* (by rule iv.51), because separated by only one word from *dve*; and in *vanaspate vidvaṅgah* (iv.6.5), the same character would belong to *vanaspate* (by iv.38) because followed by *vid*—and we are left to infer that the *nityam* renders rule iv.54 capable of reaching these passages, and taking away the *pragraha* character of the two words in question. This, adds the commentator, may be still further pursued: it has been thus drawn out in accordance with the view of Māhīshyeśa.

In all this exposition is to be seen something of the artificial and hair-splitting character which is apt to belong to a Hindu comment, while upon the whole it is sound and to the point. The term *upabandha* is doubtless better understood actively, as representing *tena pābadhyate*, ‘that whereby there is binding up:’ the presence of *deśāyā* in the rule is hardly reconcilable with the other interpretation. The intent of the specification *nityam* is to exclude general exceptions, made in view of other passages, or of the text at large, but not at all to deny the possibility of exceptions made expressly for the *upabandha* passages: and such are iv.53 and others, referred to by the objector, and refuted by an inapplicable special pleading. The force which the commentator ascribes to the *tu* of the rule belongs rather to *deśāyā*, and the *tu* has the value of a general disjunctive, bringing in a precept not connected with what has gone before.

Any additional instances of the application of the principles here laid down I have not searched for or chanced upon. The rule is appealed to but once in the sequel (under iv.54).

60. Also a cause belonging to another word, in the case of a *pragraha* or of a word containing *anuvāra*.

\[\text{thoktasya prābalyat. nanv ate ave (iv.54) ity anayoh kanthoktyād vā lām: tatra nityagrahanena kim. ucye: nitarām parihrāh: kanthokti upabandharpātipit eva nicartayati nityagabhas tu prāptyantaram api pariharati: yathā: dve... ity atra ekavyaveto pi (iv.51) iti prāptih: van... iti "vid" (iv.38) adiprāptih: evam ādy āhanīyāṃ, māhīshyeṣmatānuśārenai vam prapañcitam.}\]

1 B. upaṁbadhyata. 2 W. itya. 3 G. M. om. tu. 4 W. B. om. 5 G. M. kevalam har-. 6 G. M. sarvadāh. 7 W. om. 8 G. M. anayatra. 9 G. M. om. 10 G. M. ya-thā. 11 G. M. -rati. 12 B. kevalāṃ h-. 13 W. -he. 14 G. M. ins. atra. 15 G. M. -niyamam.
The intent of this rule is made sufficiently clear by the commentator, but he is unable to show satisfactorily its connection, or the implication in virtue of which it comes to mean what it does. He puts, however, a bold face upon it, and declares that the ca, 'also,' implies the negative (nāī: compare Pāṇini ii.2.6 etc.) meaning signified by tu (that is to say, the tu of the preceding rule). This is quite unintelligible. More defensible would be the continuance of nityam, 'constantly;' this, indeed, I conceive to be the real interpretation of the ca; although the rule is even thus left insufficiently explained by its context. The term srdīshu points us to the sixteenth chapter, where is to be found an enumeration of all the cases in the Sanhitā exhibiting an anusvāra which is not a consequence of the phonetic rules of the treatise—of all the words which in their pada form contain an anusvāra—and this enumeration is led off (xvi.2) with the syllable sra. Many of this class of words are pointed out, as elsewhere in the Prātiṣṭhākyā, by mentioning the words which they precede or follow; which latter, then, become in the view of the treatise their nimitta, or 'cause' (taking the post hoc or ante hoc for a propter hoc). Inasmuch, now, as the praṇara quality and the occurrence of this anusvāra belong to the word itself, independently of its surroundings, it becomes necessary to teach that, when a word has been defined by means of its surroundings as thus characterized, it retains its character even when separated from them, as it is in the pada-text. Or, in the language of the rule, the defined occasion of a praṇara or of a constituent anusvāra is of force, even when it is, or is in, another pada.

The commentator, in illustration of the action of the rule, refers us first to iv.28, where ghni and cakre are declared praṇara when immediately followed by p; these words are praṇara also in the pada-text of the same passages, when there is a pause between them and the p. Again, he quotes rule xvi.11, where mā is declared to have no anusvāra after it when preceded by an avagraha; that is, when it begins the second member of a compound, as in ardhamāse devaḥ (ii.5.68); here, too, the precept holds when

60. cakāras tuṣabdanigaditaṁ nañārtham anvāḍicitā: praṇarasvāraś ca nānapadasambandhiṁ nimīttaṁ asahhitaṁ yāṁ api svakāryam upadāci 'ti praṇaraṁ anusvāradakāryam' na nivartate. yathā: vukṣyati: ghni cakre papare (iv.28) praṇaraḥ bhacato ity: atra praṇaraḥve papareno 'padīte pada-kāle ś tathā 'eva. srdīshu ca yathā: na 'vagṛharpaūra vā (xvi.11) ity avagṛhaṇāḥ 'anusvārāgame nishkīḍhde pada-kāle pi ta-thā 'eva: yathā: ardh-. shatvanatvādānu tu nānapadītaṁ nimīttaṁ suhhaṁ yāṁ eva kāryam karoṁ 'ty ayaṁ ārambhāḥ: yathā: cuci--- praṇ---
the *avagraha* pause intervenes between the two parts of the compound: as, *aridha-mäse*. On the other hand, the cause (*nimitta*) of nasalization of a sibilant or nasal, if in a different *pada* from the letter it affects, is efficient only in *sahhitä*: for example, *gucishad iti-puci-sat* (iv.2.1*), and *pravähana iti pra-vähanah* (i.3.3): and this is the occasion of the rule.

I see no reason why this rule does not apply also to the cases of an original lingual nasal (*n*) enumerated in the thirteenth chapter.

61. A repeated passage, of three or more words, is as already established.

That is to say, the reading of any connected passage is as established by the rules for the first place where it occurs: if repeated in a later part of the *Sahhitä*, where other rules, there applicable, would change its reading, it is exempted from their influence.

Several examples are given in illustration by the commentator. In the third chapter (*pracnä*) of the first book (*känä*) of the *Sahhitä* occurs the phrase *devasya tvä savituh prasave śvinoh* (i.3.1); but the same phrase is found also twice before, at i.1.4² 6, and the initial *a* of its last word is cut off by the general rule xi.1; hence, when it occurs again in a *vājapeya* passage (namely, at i.7.10¹), where, by xi.3, the elision of the *a* is forbidden, the effect of the latter rule is suspended, and the passage reads as before. Again, the words *supathā rāye asmān* are first found at i.1.14³, where, as the *anuvāka* is a *yājya*, the *a* of *asmān* remains unelided by xi.3; and when they occur again at i.4.43¹, that letter still maintains its place. Once more, the phrase *sa jāto garbhō asi rodasyoḥ* is read at iv.1.4², and again at y.1.53-4; the former time in an *ukhya* passage, where the *a* of *asi* is retained by xi.3; and it is therefore retained in the other passage also.

The commentator applies to the rule the restriction that in the repeated passage the word respecting whose form there is question must hold the third place (that is to say, doubtless, that it must have not less than two other words before it). In support of this limitation, he cites a case: at iv.ii.8³, in an *ukhya* passage, occur

61. *trayānām padānāṁ samāhāras tripādam: kāryabhājāḥ padasya tritiyatām viṇēyam: idṛṣaṁ tripādam: tat praḥṛty ādir yasya tat tripadaprabhṛti yathoktam pūrṇoktām viṁhi karoti svavigeshanāṁ yatra tripadaprabhṛti pumanuktaṁ cet. tathā: 'lupyate te akāra ekāraukārapārvah (xi.1) ity anena prathamakāndatṛtiyapraṇe dev... ity atra 'käre lupte tad eva vākyāṁ vājapeye 'py alopana bādhitva tathāi 'va bhavati: tripadaprabṛti tātāt, ubhā vām (i.1.14¹) ity atra sup... ity etad ud u tyāṁ jātavedasam (i.4.43¹) ity atra 'pi tathāi
the words prthivim anu ye antarikshe ye divi tebhyaḥ (W. B. omit the first two words of the citation), and the a of antarikshe is left unelided by xi.3; but at iv.5.111 (in the last anuvāka of the chapter called rudra: see rule xi.3) we read ye prthivyāṁ ye 'antarikshe ye divi (W. B., again, omit the first two words quoted, and also give ye ant)—which, but for his restriction, would be a violation of the rule. I cannot but question, however, the right of the commentator thus to limit the rule, for I have noted at least three cases where, if it be admitted, the retention of an initial a in a repeated passage would be left without authority: they are pávako asmabhyaṁ (v.4.31 and iv.6.19), pradhhāgo agne (v.4.73 and iv.6.54), and dadhikrāvno akārīśham (vii.4.196 and i.v.114). Whether there are other cases like that to which the commentator appeals, I am unable to say; but I cannot help suspecting that he devised this modification of the rule to suit that particular passage, without sufficient regard to what might be required by other parts of the text.

But he is guilty of another piece of arbitrary interpretation which is still more unjustifiable, and which he makes yet lamer work of defending. The term tripaḍoprabhṛti means, according to him, a series of words beginning with three words of which the third is the one whose form is in question—that is to say, a series of at least four words, of which one follows the word of doubtful reading. The case to which he appeals to establish this is as follows: the words divas pari prathamāṁ jajñe aṁgrī asmāt (W. B. omit aṣmat) occur at i.3.141, in a yājñā passage, where aṁgrī keeps its initial vowel by xi.3; again, the words itah prathamāṁ jajñe aṁgrī are found at ii.2.48: there seems to be a repetition, and a reading of aṁgrī founded upon it; but it is not proper to claim that the retention of a here has this ground; it is due to the inclusion (in rule xi.16) of jajñe among the words which do not cause the elision: for such inclusion would otherwise be to no purpose (since there is in the Sanshitā no other passage to which the prescription should apply). Any other case seeming to require the interpretation here in question I have not noticed; and we have the right to presume that, if the commentator had knowledge of one which supported his view more unequivocally, he would not have failed to refer to it. So far as appears, then, the sole object of this forced

'ca. * sain te vāyur (iv.1.4) ity atra sa. . . . ity etat krāram iva (v.1.51) ity atrā 'pi tathā 'ca. brāhmaṇavākyesu tu tripaḍamātrād vā kāryam bhavaṭi: brāhmaṇavākyesu pāravasthä-lasyāi 'co 'kthā: yathā: imām agrbhana raçaṇam (iv.1.21) ity atra mar. . . . ity etad vākyam ut krāma (v.1.31) ity atrā 'pi tathā 'ca bhavaṭi. kāryabhāṣāḥ padasya tīrḥatyam iti kim: prth-. . . . ity " ukhye: ye . . . iti rudrottamāṇuvāke. prabṛti 'ti kim: tvam agne rudraḥ (i.3.141) iti yājñāyāṁ divas. . . . iti vākyam aṁgnaye nnavate (ii.2.41) ity atra
interpretation of the word tripādaprābhṛti (one which the word may be said decidedly not to admit of) is to save rule xi.16 from the charge of repetition in a single point: we shall presume with much greater plausibility that, when the rule was made, the fact that this particular case was already covered by i.61 was overlooked.

But the commentator virtually admits the unsoundness of his own work by acknowledging that in the brāhmaṇa-passages (brāhmanavākyā) of the Sanhitā a simple phrase of three words is enough to justify the application of the rule, "because," he says, "of the quotation in the brāhmaṇa-passages of a previously-occurring phrase:" that is to say, because the prose part of the Sanhitā is to so great an extent occupied with citing and comment on the phrases and words of other parts—a fact which has, doubtless, been the special occasion and suggestion of the present rule. Thus, the words maryagrī spṛhayad verno agniḥ are quoted at v.i.32 (with the customary addition, ity āha), from the previous passage iv.1.28; and although the nābhim which follows agniḥ at its first occurrence is not also quoted, and the quotation is not therefore a tripādaprābhṛti according to the commentator's construction of this term, the rule holds good, and the a of agniḥ has a right to stand.

The general value of this rule is that of a limitation to the last but one; it points out a class of cases in which a rule given for a particular passage is not limited to that passage, but also acts elsewhere; in which, moreover, such a rule does not govern nityam, 'against all opposition,' the reading of the passage to which it relates.

The commentator notices the fact that the repetition of the final word of the rule indicates the conclusion of the chapter. Such repetition is made at the end of each chapter, and by all the manuscripts; and, as it is thus farther ratified by the comment, I have not hesitated to admit it as an authentic part of the text of the Prātiṣṭhakhyā. G. M. repeat the whole rule in this case.

\[
\text{itāḥ... iti ānukramāḥ: tāḥ taṁ bāvad} \text{ iti cet: māi vam: tripādatrād} \text{ eva taṁbhāva} \text{ iti vaktūn na yuktam:}
\]

kiṁ tu jajñe saṁsphānāḥ (xi.16) iti jajñegrāhānasāmarthyaṁ: 15 anyathā tasya väiyārthyaṁ 12.

padavīpāṅdḥ dhyāyaparīsamāptiṁ dyotayati.

\[
\text{iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣṭhakhyavicarane prathamo dhyāyāḥ.}
\]

CHAPTER II.

CONTENTS: 1-11, general mode of production of articulate sounds, distinction of surd and sonant sounds, etc.; 12-29, special rules for the production of vowels and diphthongs; 30, nasals; 31-34, difference of vowels and consonants; 35-39, mode of production of mutes; 40-43, of semivowels; 44-45, of spirants; 46-48, of ḷ and ḷ; 49-52, of nasal sounds.

CHAPTER II.

I. Now for the origin of sound.

For the word ṛtha in this rule the commentator allows us our choice between two interpretations: it either indicates immediate succession—thus, the list of articulate sounds having been given, there next arises the desire to know what is the cause of these sounds, or how they become apprehensible by the sense, and then follows the explanation here to be given—or it is introductory, signifying that from this point onward the subject of the origin of sound is the one had in hand. Compare the similar and yet more lengthy discussion under rule i.1. He then goes on to draw out the significance of the rule itself. Čabda he explains by dhvani: both, when used thus distinctively, mean audible sound in general, rather than articulate sound or voice (compare xxii.1,2; xxiii.3). He paraphrases: "of the articulate sounds, a etc., the cause of perception, or their origin, their birth, their apprehension by the sense—just as, even before water is seen, there is moisture in the ground, and that becomes visible in consequence of digging—this is the subject of description." We seem to catch here a glimpse of that same doctrine of the eternity of sound to which reference was made above, under i.57: our organs do not properly produce it, but their action brings it to the cognizance of the senses, as the action of digging brings water to light.

1. ukto varnasamānmāyaḥ: teshām varnānāṁ kidṛkā kāraṇāṁ kathāṁ vā tadupalābdhir ity ākāraśānantarāṁ nirdpyata ity ānantaryārtho thaṣabdhā. atha vā: ita uttarāṁ yad vakṣhayāte tae chabdotpatiṁ ity etad adhiḥkṛtāṁ vedātyāṁ ity adhikārārthāḥ. čabdo nāma dhvaniḥ: varnānāṁ akāraddīṇāṁ upādānakāraṇāṁ tadupatīr janma upalabdhir vā: yathā 'dakasya darcanāt pūreva eva bhūmādu jalam asty eva tat khananda' dṛṣyaṁ tadvāt: se 'yam ucyata iti sūtrārthāḥ.

1 G. M. kidṛkām. 2 W. karaṇaṁ. 3 G. M. ins. tan. 4 G. M. om. 5 B. -karaṇaṁ. 6 G. M. tasya ut. 7(?) W. B. om. 8 MSS. khananda. 9 G. M. drabhyata.

VOL. IX.
2. By the setting in motion of air by the body, at the junction of throat and breast.

The first part of this rule (literally, 'from air-body-impulsion') is obscurely expressed, and of ambiguous meaning. The commentator gives three explanations of it, the first of which is also itself obscure. Agni ('fire, warmth';—'heat of the body?'), he says, impels Vāyu ('air, wind'); that is what "air-body" means (but how?). From such an impulsion—that is to say, expulsion, effort at utterance—at the junction of, or between, throat and breast, comes the origination of sound. And he quotes a verse from the Čikshā (verses 8–9 of the Yajus version, verses 6–7 of the Rik version; see Weber's Ind. Stud., iv.350–1): "the mind impels the body-fire; that sets in motion air; and air, moving in the breast, generates a gentle tone." Again (or rather, apparently, as a part of the same explanation: but its inconsistency with the rest is palpable), he makes a copulative compound of vāyu-carira; namely, 'air-and-body': "from the impulsion of those two." Once more, he quotes as the opinion of other authorities that vāyu-carira means 'the air in the body,' the compound being of such a sort that that which should be its first member is put last, after the analogy of rājadanta, 'upper incisor' (literally, 'king-tooth'—that is, as the Hindu etymologists explain it, 'tooth-king, chief among the teeth'), and the other words composing that gana (to Pān. ii.2.31). And he adds the remark that, in this interpretation, the air is understood as the cause of the impulsion, not its product.

In the translation of the rule given above, the primary division of the compound is regarded as to be made after vāyu; carira-samāraṇa meaning an 'impulsion by the body,' and vāyu being prefixed in a genitive relation, 'of the air.' This is harsh, but appears to me more acceptable and less violent than the other constructions proposed. Practically, the point is of small consequence.


3. The parts which give it audible quality are breast, throat, head, mouth, and nostrils.

The commentator explains *pratīcṛtivatā* as signifying ‘the places of production’ (*sthānāni*), having to do with the resonance (*pratīcṛt = pratidhvani, ‘resonance’), of the aforesaid sound (*gadā*).

He offers no remark upon the organs enumerated, but leaves their various offices to be derived from the rules which follow. But, in anticipation of the next three rules, he observes that they teach the three-fold quality of sound, as sonant, sord, and *h*-sound, rule 4 giving the definition of the first kind.

The Čikṣa (v.13: Weber’s Ind. Stud. iv. 351) makes an enumeration of eight *sthānas*, or places of production of articulate sounds, dividing the “mouth” of our list into root of the tongue, teeth, lips, and palate.

4. When the throat is closed, tone is produced.

The commentator treats this rule as a definition of the technical term *nāda*, ‘tone,’ and cites rule 8, below, as an example of the use of the term.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.1) gives a corresponding definition of sonant utterance, but specifies the aperture (*kha*) of the throat as the part whose contraction or closure produces the tone. Compare also Vāj. Pr. i.11. It is greatly to the credit of the ancient Hindu phonetists that they had gained by acute observation so clear an idea of the manner in which the intonation of the breath is effected in the throat; but precisely how accurate a knowledge

---


4. *saṁvṛte kānte yah ca bhūḥ kriyate sa nādasannijño bhavati, saṁjñāyāḥ pravojanam: nāda ‘nupradānam (ii.8) iti?*
they had of the nature and action of the vocal chords, whose tension produces the closure, we, of course, cannot say.

5. When it is opened, breath is produced.

The explanation given of this rule corresponds with that of the preceding, and the rule cited for the use of the term \( \text{ṛśa}, \) ‘breath,’ is ii.10.

6. When in an intermediate condition, the \( h \)-sound is produced.

Mādhya is explained as meaning ‘in a method intermediate between closed and opened;’ the rest of the comment agrees with the two preceding, and the cited rule is ii.9.

Of the other Prātiṣṭhānaṣ, only that of the Rig-Veda sets up a third kind of articulated material, besides tone and breath; and that (xiii.2) derives the material from a combination of the two others, rather than their mean. I have already (note to Ath. Pr. i.13) expressed my opinion that the attempt to establish this distinction is forced and futile, and I see at present no reason for changing it. That intonated and unintonated breath should be emitted from the same throat at once is physically impossible. In loud stridulous whispering, there is a tension of the vocal chords only short of that which gives rise to sonant vibration; and if any one chooses to claim that the aspirations used in loud speaking partake of such a character, sometimes or always, we need not be at the pains to contradict him.

7. Those are the materials of alphabetic sounds.

That is to say, the three kinds of material just described—tone, breath, and \( h \)-sound, some letters having one of these as the material out of which they are made, and others another. Just so, it is added, jars and dishes have clay for their material, and thread is the material of cloth.

The commentator then goes on to raise and answer a grammatical objection to the form of the rule. Since it is the office of a

5. \( \text{vṛtīrā te yah śabdah kriyate sa śvāsasajñāno bhavati. sanjñāyāḥ prayojanam: aghoshesu śvāsah (ii.10) iti.} \)

6. \( \text{svārtavārthayaḥ mādhya madhyaprabāre yah śabdah kriyate sa hakārasajñāno bhavati. sanjñāyāḥ prayojanam: hakāro hakaturtheshv (ii.9) iti.} \)
pronoun to call to mind things already mentioned, and the words
nāda, svāsa, and hakāra, which are referred to by the pronoun in
this rule, are masculine, why is the pronoun feminine (tāh, instead
of te)? The reply is: "by the dictum of the Mahābhāṣya, 'pro-
nouns effecting the equivalence of the thing pointed at and of that
which is pointed out respecting it assume at pleasure the gender
of either of the two,' is established the propriety of the form used
in the rule; therefore there takes place a mutual accordance, or
apposition." The passage referred to is apparently that found,
not in the Mahābhāṣya itself, but in Kaivyaśa's Mahābhāṣya-
pradīpa, nearly at the beginning of the work (I owe this reference
to the kindness of Prof. Goldstücker): in Ballantyne's edition
(p. 7) it reads, with several variations from the text given by our
commentator, uddiçyamānapratinirdīcyamānyor ekatam āpā-
dayanti sarvādānāmā paryāyena taliṅgānām upādādata iti. Ref-
ence is again made to this passage for a similar purpose under
v.2.

The Rīk Pr. (xiii.2) has this rule also, in nearly identical form.

8. In vowels and sonant consonants, the emission is sound.

The term anupradāna is etymologized as representing anupra-
dīyate 'nena varnāh, 'therewith is given forth an articulate sound,'
and anuprädiyate is farther explained by upädiyate, 'is obtained,
and jānyate, 'is generated.' As synonym for the same term is
given mālakāraṇa, 'radical cause.'

I have already (note to Ath. Pr. i.13) called attention to the
praiseworthy unanimity with which the Hindu phonetists define

7. varṇādānām prakṛtayō varṇāprakṛtayāh: tā varṇāprakṛtayō
bhavantī ye nādācvāsahakārā uktāh: nādāprakṛtayāh kacid var-
nāh: svāsaprakṛtayō 'nyc: hakāraprabhavāh 'nyc: yathā mitprā-
krtyo ghatācārāvadāyāh: yathā vā tuntuprakaṣṭāyāh potāh
nanu varṇādānāḥ prakṛtamārāmarcitvān nādācvāsahakāresu
puṁśinghesu satsu tā ti strilīngaprayogah kathain śādāh,
ucyate: nirdīcyamānapratinirdīcyamānyor ekatām āpādayantī
varṇādānāi kāmācārenā taliṅgānām upādādata iti mahābāhyā-
vacanāt pravṛtthasādhāntvam adhyavasthaye: tasmād anyonyā-
navayeḥ sambhavatea"

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. -prakāte. 3 G. M. ins. parāmarśheshu. 4 W. -prakṛti-
nirde. 5 W. -āgamā; G. M. tatālā. 6 G. M. -yasambhāva. 7 G. M. om.

8. svārṣeśu ghoshāvatsa ca varṇēśu nādō 'nupradānam bhav-
vati: anuprādiyate 'nena varna ity anupradānam mālakāraṇam:
anuprādiyate upādiyate jānyate ity arthaḥ.

1 W. om. 2 W. B. -nd.
the true ground of the distinction between surd and sonant letters. European phonetists, after long perplexing the subject with such false distinctions as are expressed by the terms “soft” and “hard,” “weak” and “strong,” and the like, seem now at last to be coming to a universal accordance in the correct view.

9. In \( \mathbf{h} \) and in sonant aspirate mutes, it is \( \mathbf{h} \)-sound.

For the quality of this \( \mathbf{h} \)-sound, see rule 6, above. The Rik Pr. (xiii.2.5: rules 6, 17) connects in the same manner \( \mathbf{h} \) and the “fourth” mutes. Our treatise evidently regards the peculiar \( \mathbf{h} \)-sound belonging to the sonant aspirates not as something that follows the breach of contact, but as inhering in the letter, in the same manner as tone in the simple sonants. Whether the Rik Pr. hints at a difference of opinion on this point may be made a matter of question. But the failure on the part of the Prātiśākhyaśas to recognize the essentially compound character of the aspirate mutes, the fact that these differ from the unaspirated mutes by interposing something between the mute and the following vowel, is one of their marked weaknesses.

The commentator enters into no labored exposition of the rule, but spends his strength, rather, in defending its situation. He first suggests the objection that it is not in proper place, as offending against the order observed in the definition of the three kinds of material (the \( \mathbf{h} \)-sound is defined last, and we should therefore expect the letters containing it to be specified last); but claims in reply that it is, after all, in place, being intended to obviate an undue extension of the preceding rule, which would otherwise be liable to be made, since \( \mathbf{h} \) and the “fourth” mutes are included (by i.13, 14) among the sonant consonants, to which that rule applies.

10. In surd consonants, it is breath.

Which are the surd consonants, was taught us in rule i.12.

9. \( \text{hākāraḥ} \text{ ca caturthaḥ ca hacaturthāḥ: teshu varneshu ha-} \)kāro 'nupradānam bhavati. nanu saṁjñāvidhānakramabhangan- 
prasangān na 'dani śūtram avatārati. ghoshaścati āti sāmā-
nyān nādo hacaturtheshu ca prasajyata ity atiprasaṅgaparihā-
rāra-HTVĀD avatārati āve 'ti vaddāmaḥ'.


10. \( \text{aghosheshu varneshu} \text{ ćvedo} \text{ 'nupradānām bhavati'.} \)

* B. omits rule and comment.
11. And more of it in the other surd letters than in the simple surd mutes.

Here \textit{cvāsā}, 'breath,' is continued by implication from the preceding rule "in virtue of vicinage" (sāṁnīdhyāt), as the commentator says (there being no ca, 'and,' in the rule, to indicate it directly). The other surd letters are the surd aspirate mutes and the spirants (excepting \textit{h}). There is no separation made of these two classes upon the important ground that in the spirants the greater expenditure of breath inures in the whole character of the sound, as being fricative, while in the aspirate mutes it consists in a brief emission between the explosion of the contact and the following vowel.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.6: rule 19) says "some regard the breath in the aspirates as quicker"—an ambiguously indefinite expression.

12. In forming the \textit{a}-vowels, the lips and jaws must not be too nearly approximated, nor too widely separated.

The plain intent of this rule appears to be to guard against an excess either of openness or of closeness in the utterance of \textit{a} and \textit{d}, while at the same time these two sounds are considered as alike in quality. Such is not, however, the understanding of the commentator; he declares it impossible to follow both directions in forming one sound, and directs that a division be made: excessive approximation is to be avoided in the case of \textit{a}, and excessive separation in those of the long \textit{d} and protracted \textit{as}. If his intention had been to recognize the same difference in quality between \textit{a} and \textit{d} which is taught by the Ath. Pr. and Vāj. Pr. and by Pāṇini (see note to Ath. Pr. i.36), he would have been likely to apply the two directions of the rule in a contrary manner, warning against over-openness in \textit{a} and over-closeness in \textit{d}.

11. sāṁnīdhyāc  

12. anvāra uceśārmyāṇa ośthāhante atyupasaṁhitṛatam atisam-

\textit{plishtain na bhavati: ativyaśam ativirtyam ca na’ bhavati. ośthāu ca hanū c’ ośthāhanu: dvandva ca prānitāryāsenān-
gānām (Pān. ii.4.2) ity ekaviṇḍhāvāh: tad etad ekasmīn uḥ-

바hahyā na čakyate kartum iti yogavibhāgah kāryah: akāre na’ 

\textit{tyupasaṁhitṛat akāre ca’ plute ca na’ tivyaśam iti.}

\textit{1 G. M. om.}

\textit{12. avarna uceśāryānā ośthāhane atyupasaṁhitṛa atisam-

plishtain na bhavati: ativyaśam ativirtyam ca na bhavati. ośthāu ca hanū ca ośthāhanu: dvandva ca prānītāryāsenān-
gānām (Pān. i.4.2) ity ekaviṇḍhāvāh: tad etad ekasmīn uḥ-

bhahyā na čakyate kartum iti yogavibhāgah kāryah: akāre na’ 

\textit{tyupasaṁhitṛa akāre ca’ plute ca na’ tivyaśam iti.}

\textit{9 W. na ca. 7 W. eva kad; G. M. om. 2 G. M. B. om. 1 W. G. nd. 8 W. B. om.}
The term oṣt̄hahānu, though singular, is declared to signify the two lips and the two jaws, and a rule of Pāṇini (ii.4.2) is quoted in justification of such treatment of a copulative compound.

13. Also in uttering o.

The "also" (ca) of this rule, we are told, brings forward only the action of the jaws prescribed in the preceding rule; this appears from the fact that the one following gives a special direction with regard to the action of the lips. In forming an o, then, the jaws are not to be too widely separated.

14. But the lips are more nearly approximated.

"Vicineage" is here again made the sufficiently obvious ground of assuming that the direction applies to the utterance of o. The "but" (tu) of the rule, according to Vararuci, one of the three authorities from whom our comment is principally derived (see the introduction), annuls the direction formerly (in rule 12) given as to the position of the lips: but Māhisheya, another of the same authorities, has explained it as exempting from the widely separated condition the o of such words as bandhoh (ii.5.87). This latter interpretation is quite absurd, or else I am very obtuse with regard to it.

As regards the precise tone of the o, such directions as these can teach us nothing satisfactory. The only valuable conclusion which we derive from them is that the authors of the Prātiṣṭākhyā looked upon the sound as a simple homogeneous tone—not phonetically diphthongal, although in classification excluded (by rule i.2) from the category of simple vowels. The same, we shall see, is the case with e also.

15. In uttering e, they are slightly protracted.

13. cakāro hanumātrakāryānvañvadeśakah: oṣt̄hakāryasya paraśatrāṇa vipeshavidhānāt. okāra uccāryamāṇe hanā atavyaste na bhavataḥ.

14. sāṁnidhyād okāra iti labhyate: okāre kārya oṣt̄hāv upasanāhrtatarau syātām: tuṣabdā oṣthhayoh pārvoktavidhīm nivārayati' ti vararucir uvaca. māhisheya tu babhāshe: bandhor ity ādikam okārāṁ savyaṁjanāṁ vyastato' nivārayati' ti.
That "they" means the lips is, we are told, sufficiently indicated by the dual number of the adjective. Prakṛṣṭha, 'protracted,' is glossed by saṁnīkṛṣṭa, 'drawn down together, brought near.'

16. The jaws are more nearly approached.

The force of the comparative is explained by the usual term ati-patena, 'with excess.'

In the utterance of e, the position of the tongue is also a matter of importance, and is explained in the next rule.

17. And one touches the borders of the upper back jaws with the edges of the middle of the tongue.

The "and" (ca) in this rule we are directed to regard as bringing forward the ekāra of rule 15, "on the frog-leap principle"—that is to say, by overlapping the intervening rule. The terms descriptive of the organs concerned I have translated in accordance with the directions of the commentator, although much tempted to render jambhyān by 'jaw-teeth, grinders.' I cannot doubt that jambhyān is the true reading here, although the MSS. give a curious and perplexing variety of forms to the word, and uttarān jambhyānt is not once read: T. comes nearest to it, giving uttarān jambhyām; W. has uttarā jambhyānt in the rule, and uttarā jambhyān and jambhyān in the comment; B., uttarān jambhyāt in the rule, uttarā jambhyān and jambhyān in the comment; G. and M., uttarān jambhyām in the rule; G., uttarān jambhyān and jambhyām; and M., uttarān jambhyām and jambhyām, in the comment. The verb sparçayati is equivalent to spṛṣet, the causative ending nic being added without altering the meaning of the simple verb (compare Pān. iii.1.25), as in pālaya for pā, and other like cases.

15. prakṛṣṭān ity atra dvivacanena prakṛṣṭān osāthaṃ grhyate: ekāra kārya osāthaṃ istic prakṛṣṭān syātām. prakṛṣṭān saṁnīkṛṣṭāt.

16. saṁnīdiyād ekāra iti labhyate: ekāra kārye hanā upasaṁhṛtāre bhavataḥ. ati-patena 'pasamāhṛte upasaṁhṛtāre.


1 G. M. pādy.- 2 G. M. -pam; W. -ntaprađe.- 3 G. M. -kaṭānty.- 4 W. mādhya anāṇ; B. mādhyaśasya anāṇ.
In order to complete the definition of the mode of production of $e$, rules 20 and 23, below, have yet to be applied; but they add nothing essential to the description of the present rule, which assures to the vowel, as clearly as any such description could do, the "continental" sound of $e$, or that which it has in they, short in met. There is no hint of a composite or diphthongal utterance, any more than in the case of $o$. A diphthongal utterance, however, as ai, au (in aisle, house), we must assume them to have had originally (compare note to Ath. Pr. i.40).

18. The jaws, also, are more closely approximated, and the tip of the tongue is brought into close proximity to the upper back gums, in $r$, $l$, and $l$.

The construction of this rule is very harsh; the subject hand, "jaws," comes into its first member again with a flying leap from rule 16, drawn by the ca, "also," while the second member starts off independently, "one approximates," with no connective to bind it to the other. These roughnesses are unremarked by the commentator, and I have smoothed them over in the translation. The word upasaṁharati, "approximates," is glossed in the commentary by nikṣhipet, "let one throw down (or apply)," and baraved is explained as the "high places behind the row of teeth"—that is, the swelling of the inner gums.

The commentator starts a question as to the propriety of the conversion of $l$ and $l$ in this rule into $r$ and $l$ after $a$ (ṛkārkārakaṇḍra, from ṛkāra-ṛkāra-ṛkāra), the cases not being covered by the prescription given below (at x.8: no case of the combination of $l$ and $l$ occurring in the Sanhitā, the Prātiçākhya makes no provision for it); he is compelled to acknowledge that this treatise does not teach the conversion, but claims that it is justified by the authority of other textbooks; and that the same explanation applies to an earlier case (rule i.31) of a like combination.

This wholly insufficient direction is all that our treatise gives.

18. caçabdo hanvō anuvdeśakah: ṛkāra ṛkāra ṛkāre ca kārye hanō upasaṁhṛtare bhavatah: jhīvaṃ ca barvēṣhā 'posaṁhṛati nīkṣhipet: barvēṣhē iti dantapāṅkter uparishṭad uccapradēśeh ity arthaḥ. nanv arūm ṛkārapare (x.8) iti lakṣanā sambhavād ṛkārakārakāreshe iti kathāṁ saṁdūkh śādhuḥ, satyaṁ nāṭ tallakṣhanat: kīn tu pāṭrāntarabālāt: evam ṛkāra-ṛkāra ṛkāra ṛkāra hrasādē (i.31) iti viṇāyam.

1 W. hanvō; B. h; G. M. hanor. 2 W. om. 3 G. M. -nas-. 4 G. M. -nān. 5 G. M. -nān. 6 G. M. -nān. 7 G. M. -nān. 8 G. M. -nān. 9 G. M. -nān.
us for the utterance of the difficult \( r \) and \( l \) vowels. By i.2, they are excluded from the category of simple homogeneous vowels. For the teachings of the other Prāticākhyaas respecting them, see note to Ath. Pr. i.37. However they may have been pronounced at the period of grammatical treatment of the Vedic texts, we have no good reason to doubt that, at the time when those texts were composed, they were phonetically the same with the semi-vowels \( r \) and \( l \), differing from them only as, for example, the \( l \) of \( able \) differs from that of \( ably \), the \( r \) of (French) \( aigre \) from that of \( aigrì \). For a theoretical discussion of this double value of the articulated sounds which lie nearly upon the boundary line between vowels and consonants, see Journ. Am. Or. Soc. viii.362 seq.

19. As also, according to some, in anusvāra and svarabhakti.

In this case, we are told, the “also” (ca) brings down the whole of the preceding rule, and the meaning is, that there is approximation of the jaws in uttering anusvāra, and approach of the tip of the tongue to the gums in uttering the svarabhakti, according to the opinion of some; while others hold that anusvāra is simply nasal, and the svarabhakti (see xxii.15) equivalent to \( r \). This, the commentator adds, is Vararuci’s explanation, and its truth is questionable. We, in our turn, may regard it as matter for question whether this attribution and expression of doubt apply to the whole interpretation of the rule, or only to its concluding part, the statement of the opinion of “others.” The latter is perhaps most probable.

So far as regards anusvāra, we can hardly ascribe any value or propriety to this rule; the definition of svarabhakti in connection with that of the \( r \)-vowels is natural enough.

20. In the absence of special direction, the tongue is thrust down forward.

When no such direction as “with the point of the tongue,” “with
the middle of the tongue" is given, then its position is to be understood as here directed. To explain *pranyastā*, the commentator gives, besides an ordinary analysis, the expression "in a quiescent state;" as example, he cites *upa mā* (ii.2.41: G. and M. spoil the citation by adding the following word, *dyāvāpythavī*), in the utterance of which words the tongue is not called perceptibly into action. But this interpretation evokes a difficulty: "since the position of quiescence is assured to all the articulating organs in the absence of any direction respecting them, of what use is this precept?" The reply is: *e* (as taught by rule 17, above) is to be produced with the edges of the middle of the tongue, and the *a* contained in that letter is of the same character; hence it might be inferred, from the identity of the *a*-quality, that *a* was to be so uttered in other situations, as in words like *atha* (i.1.131 et al., if the word is to be regarded here as a citation)—a misapprehension which the rule removes. To this reply the objection may be raised that our treatise acknowledges the presence of no such element as *a* in *e*, and that an *a* uttered with the middle of the tongue is a phonetic impossibility. The direction respecting the tongue may well enough be regarded as a not entirely negative one; or it may have been deemed desirable to fix so very mobile and unruly a member by a special law.

### 21. The lips are as in the utterance of *a*.

We are directed to include in this rule, by vicinage, "in the absence of special direction." The proper position of the lips for uttering *a* was given in rule 12, above. As illustration is added, quite needlessly, the word *indraḥ* (*passim*); the southern manuscripts read instead *indriyāvah* (vi.5.82).


1 G. M. 2 G. M. ins. anupadeṣaḥ. 3 W. B. - nibb. 4 W. B. om. 5 G. M. dyāmāvatvām. 6 G. M. astī. 7 G. M. ins. 'pi. 8 W. anuvadecaḥ; B. anādecaḥ.


1 MSS. tathā. 2 G. M. - ṣrīv. 3 G. M. indriyāva.
22. In the i-vowels, the middle of the tongue is to be approximated to the palate.

The comment supplies, without remark, the predicate “to be approximated,” and gives as example ishe ted (i.1.1 et al.).

23. Also in e.

Here the “also” (ca) brings down the whole of the preceding precept, both the specification of the active organ (kāraṇa) and that of the passive organ or place (sthāna). The exposition of the meaning of the rule is very simple and easy; but the commentator does not fail to notice that its necessity is open to objection upon two grounds, and enters into its defense at considerable length. The first objection is, why make two separate rules (22 and 23) for a single direction?—that is to say, if the i-vowels and e are all produced by the approximation of the middle of the tongue to the palate, why not include them in one rule together? The answer given is that the degree of approximation is not the same in the two cases, but is less in the e than in the i-vowels. If it be asked, why is this so? the reply is made, because the e is mixed with a, and production of this a with the middle of the tongue is on account of its constituting a part of e, and not by reason of its own natural character (compare the comment to rule 20, above)—which special qualification is sufficient ground for the less degree of approximation. The second difficulty is stated thus: both place and organ of e have been already defined in rules 15–17, above; but here is laid down for the same letter something different: and it is not possible that both directions should be followed.

22. i varne kārye jīhvā madhyāni tālāv upasaṁhartavyam.
yathā: ishe—.... jīhvāyā madhyānī jīhvāmadhyānā.

23. cakāraḥ pārevidhim anvādiyi: ekāre kārye ‘jīhvāmadhyaṁ tālāv’ upasaṁhartavyam. nanu vidhāu samāne pṛthak-
satrārmbhaḥ kimarthāḥ. ucyate: ivarne yathā jīhvāmadhyo-
upasaṁhāro na khalo evam ekāre kiṁ tu tato nyāna ity arthāḥ:
kutāḥ: akāramitrato vād ekārasya: akārasya ca tadeka deśavāj
jīhvāmadhyāntani shādyatvāṁ na tu svatāḥ: ata eva sopa dhik-
kataṁ nyānāt vopapattiḥ. ishatprakṛṣṭāv (ii.15) ity atra
sātratrayenāi kārasya sthānakaranā nirūtaḥ: iha tu tato “nyat
tasāyāḥ” va nirūcyate: tad ekasminn ubhayathā kartum na śak
yate: virodhāt tasmād atra yogavībhāgaḥ kartavyāḥ: avyaṁ.
in the production of one sound. To get rid of this difficulty, a division must be made; the former description must be understood as applying to \( e \) by itself, and the present one to \( e \) combined with a consonant. How is this determination made? Why, when we say in a general way “the letter \( e \),” it lies nearest, or is most natural, to understand that letter itself, without a consonant; hence, because of its prior suggestedness, the first definition belongs to it; and the other is left, to be applied to the same sound as combined with a consonant.

The utter artificiality of the answer to the second objection is too obvious to need pointing out; and even the first evokes more difficulties than it removes. There is no inconsistency whatever between rules 17 and 23, and we have reason to be surprised only at the repetition in the latter of what is implied already in the former. Rule 23 has the air of being an afterthought, slipped in, because of the really close relationship between \( e \) and \( i \), with disregard of what had been taught before. The alleged difference of degree of approximation exists clearly enough, but would be very insufficiently intimated by a mere separation of one rule into two.

24. In the \( u \)-vowels, there is approximation of the lips.

After his paraphrase of the rule, the commentator enters here upon an exposition, the intent of which is not altogether clear to me. “Here, he says, approximation is as formerly, and not mere drawing down together” (that is, of the same kind as was taught in rule 14, above, and not the prakṛṣṭhata, ‘protraction,’ of rule 15, which is there glossed by saṃnikṛṣṭata?). “However, ‘the lips drawn down together may be long’—this will be said hereafter” (by this phrase some direction given later in the treatise is

\[\text{[Text continues with detailed explanation]}\]
wont to be cited; but there is no such direction as this, either in text or in commentary); “the same is to be understood in rule 14, above” (compare a similar reference to a preceding rule in the comment to ii.18). A phrase is then cited from the Sanhitā, containing u and ṣ, namely utākhalabudhno yāpah (vii.2.13).

25. But, in all cases, with an interval of one from the preceding.

The commentary on this very obscure rule reads as follows:

By vicinage, “labial approximation” is here implied: everywhere, in the case of labial vowels, after the preceding labial approximation, a separate labial approximation is to be made, provided it have an interval of one: by this is understood having the quantity of a mora interposed; that, namely, has an interval of one whereof one mora is the interval or interposition. This is the distinctive condition of the separate labial approximation. The word “but” (tu) denies the necessity of the interval of one in a case where o [W. says, where ā or ē follows. Examples are: utpāta-cūśham (i.6.11); sānnyām iti su-umñyam (vi.2.41); atho oshadhāshu (iii.5.5 and vi.3.9); bāhuvr bālam (v.5.92); tanu-vānu ghurā 'nyā (v.7.33: G. M. omit the last word); catuvhūtaḥ (not found in the Sanhitā: occurs Tātt. Brāh. ii.2.32).

Objection: in yo 'āpun (iii.3.4), the anusvāra has a mora [by i.34] and the ञ a half-mora [by i.37]; since, then, the quantity being a mora and a half, there is not an interval of one, how is the separate labial approximation assured?

Answer: it is assured by the principle “a hundred includes fifty.” Where there is a mora and a half, there is a fortiori a mora; in virtue of this the prescribed effect is produced, but its excess does not vitiate the rule, because the word “one” excludes what does not belong to itself (�). For the same reason, the occurrence

25. sāmniḍhyād osāthopasaināhāra iti labhyate: sarvāt osāthya-
svaresahu prakṛtād osāthopasaināhārāt prthagoṣthopasaināhārāh
'kartavyah: sa ced ekāntaraḥ: ekāntara iti mātrākālavyādyā iti
labhyate: ekamātrā'ntaram vyavadhānaṁ yasya 'sāv ekāntaraḥ:
iti prthagoṣthopasaināhārasya viṣeṣaṁ: tāpūbābādha
parāvata' ekāntaratvaniyamānī nivartayati, udāharaṇāni: ut:
sū̃—: ato—: bāh—: tan—: cat—: naṁ
yo— ity atṛa 'anuvārasya mātrākālāḥ 'sakārasyā rdhamātrā-
kiḻaḥ: evam adhyādhamātrate saty ekāntaratvābhāvāt kā-
tham prthagoṣthopasaināhārasiddhāḥ. ucyate: śateṇa sāṃvartisa:
yena sidhyati: adhyādhamātrate 'py ekamātrataṁ sutorām'
asti: tena kāryam bhavaty adhikan tu na nīśidhyate: svāyoga-
vyaavahedakatvād ekaśabdānā: ata eva bāh— ity āderi na
of the double labial in such passages as bāhuvor bālam ūrveor ojā (v.5.92: G. M. omit the last word) is not primary (or original), but its quality as sphurita, ‘quavered,’ is shown by the likeness of the example (?).

Second object: then why is there not a separate labial approximation in the two u's following the k and r of kusurubindōh (vii. 2.21), since there occurs more than a mora and a half of interval between them?

Answer: not so; here there is denial of separate labiality only for the two u's that follow k and s, because of the absence of its necessary condition; but to that following the r this rule does not apply, because it is not a case of separateness from the preceding, but of separateness from the u that follows the intermediate s; this being so, there is no occurrence of the interval of one for a letter in this situation: thus there is no offense against the rule.

So far the comment; but either I have failed to apprehend its true meaning, or it has given a false interpretation to the rule, or the rule itself is destitute of intelligible significance. I must confess myself unable to see what peculiarity there should be in the utterance of two labial vowels following one another in two successive syllables with not less than a mora's interval between them. No precept, so far as I know, in any of the other Prātiṣṭhāṇyas, is analogous with this, or casts light upon it.

It appears to be intimated, in the course of the answer to the first objection, that the peculiar utterance of the u in such words as bāhuvoh for the usual bāhvoḥ and ūrveoh for āreōḥ is denominated sphurita. The term does not occur elsewhere; nor is any notice taken of the phenomenon, if not here. It is a well-known characteristic of Tāttvārtya texts, but is found in fewer words than one would be apt to imagine. Besides the two just given, I have noted in the Śāhāstī only the cases of tanā (tanuvam, e.g. i.1.8; tanuvā, e.g. i.1.102) and the word svar, which are often met with. Of similar resolutions of an i-vowel into iy, the cases are more nu-


---

merous, but less frequent. I have collected the following (without exhausting the Sanhitā, especially of themes in iya): āgriya (iv.5.5²), aghniya (i.1.1), ācviya (ii.2.12⁸), asmadrīyaṇe (i.4.21), idhriya (iv.5.7²), dhūshniya (iii.1.3¹), pātriya (iii.2.3³), budhniya (i.3.3), rēshmiya (iv.5.7²), vicvdēṣniyā (i.5.3²), vicvakdrīyaṇe (i.7.13³), vrśniya (iii.2.5³), ṣāgriya (iv.5.5³), sadhriyaṇe (i.2.14⁸); and, of oblique cases from themes in i or i, indrāṇiyoḥ (i.3.12), gāyatriya (ii.2.9¹), pārśniyā (iv.6.9²), pṛṣṇiyyā (ii.2.11⁴), rātriya (iv.4.1¹), lakṣṇmiyā (ii.1.5²), vicpāṇiyyā (iii.1.11⁴), svaḍhyāyam (i.3.14⁶). None of the consonantal combinations which are thus avoided by the resolution of the u are such as the euphony of the Tāittiriyaṇakas does not tolerate: but of those which are avoided by the resolution of the i, only three are met with in the text—namely, try (e.g. i.8.22¹: ii.4.3¹), try (iv.4.2²), and gny (v.5.6²). I have not entered deeply enough into the investigation to deduce the law, if law there be, by which the resolution is made.

26. The beginning of āi and āu is half an a.

Rules 28 and 29, below, tell of what constitutes the remainder of these diphthongs.

27. Which, in the opinion of some, is uttered with the organs more closed.

We have here another indication that, as intimated above (under ii.12), our Prātiṣṭhāya does not recognize the close or neutral pronunciation of the short a; for, if it did so, there would obviously be no reason for referring to the opinion held by certain authorities respecting its assumption of that utterance in diphthongal combination. Some phonetists (without sufficient reason, as it appears to me) have in like manner defined the first element in our English diphthongs ("long i" in aisle, isle, and ou or ou in house, down) to be the neutral vowel (u in but), rather than the open a (of far). But, whatever may have been the case with the Sanskrit diphthongs, our own cannot be truly described as composed of two elements each: they are slides; and to allow the organs to remain in

26. āikārasya "kārasyā ca "dir akārārdham bhavati. akārasyā 'rdham akārārdham.

27. sāṁnikhyād akārārdham iti labhyate: ekeshām mate tad akārārdham saṁveṭkaranataram bhavati. saṁveṭiṇi saṁnikṛṣṭāni karāṇāni yasya tat saṁveṭkaranam: atiṣayena saṁveṭkaṇānān saṁveṭkaranataram. B. reads saṁveṭta throughout.
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either their first or last position long enough to make the initial or
final element distinctly audible, would be an error of pronunciation.
The commentator glosses sanvṛta, "enveloped, shut up, closed," with sannikṛśita, "drawn down together, approximated."

28. Of the former, the rest is one and a half times ı.
Of the former—that is, of āı; āı and āu having been mention-
ed together in a preceding rule (ii.26), says the commentator.

29. But, of the latter, u.
That is to say, the remainder of āu is one and a half times u.
To account for the word "but" (tu) in the rule, the commentator
notes that, as the beginning of both diphthongs is the same sound,
a, it might seem to follow that their end would be the same sound,
i: this the "but" denies. This explanation merely intensifies and
makes too precise the actual meaning of the word.

For the teachings of the other Prātiśākyas as to the pronunciation
of āı and āu, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.40. As there re-
marked, the euphonic treatment which they receive proves their
first element to have had originally more than a half-mora of
quantity. If they must be limited to two moras, a better descrip-
tion of them would have been 1½a+½ı, and 1½a+½u. If, as we
may presume to be the case, the authors of these treatises defined
their own pronunciation pretty accurately, then the āı and āu, not
less than the e and o, had by their time taken on a value notably
different from that which belonged to them when the euphonic
rules of the language were the faithful representation of living pro-
cesses.

30. Anusvara and the last mutes are nasal.
As example of anusvāra, the comment cites yo 'ṇcum (iii.3.42):

28. pārvasyā́i "kārasye 'ty arthah: adhastād' āikāradukārayoḥ
sahoccaritvāt: adhyārdha ikāra āikārasya ēśho bhavati.
adhikam ardham yasyā 'souv adhyārdhaḥ.

29. uttarasyā́u "kārasye 'ty arthah: adhyārdha ukāra āukā-
rācesho' bhavati: yathā 'nayor ubhayor apy ādir akāra eva tad-
vad ikāra eva ēśahā prasaktah: tanā nishedhāti tuṣabdāḥ.

1 W. adhyārdhas tāvad. 2 G. M. uccar.
1 G. M. -rasya śe. 2 W. B. om. 3 W. B. tān.
of the "last" or nasal mutes, \textit{pratyāñ hotāram} (vi.3.15)—to which G. M. add \textit{prāñcān upa} (v.2.73), and \textit{manīnd} (vii.3.14).

The term \textit{anunāsika} is interpreted by the commentator as signifying \textit{nāṣikām anuvartate}, 'it goes after the nostril'—that is to say, doubtless, 'it finds exit by the nasal passages:' an accurate definition of this class of sounds. As employed in this Prātiṣṭhākhyā, \textit{anunāsika} means simply, as adjective, 'nasal,' and its derivative noun, \textit{anunāsikya}, signifies 'nasality, nasal utterance.' Rule 52, below, describes how such mode of utterance is produced, and in chapter xvii. (rules 1–4) is made an attempt to define the degree of nasality in the various sounds of the class. "Nasal," or \textit{anunāsika}, by the present rule, are the \textit{anusvāra} and the five nasal mutes, \textit{n, ı, n, n, m}; the same term is applied later to the nasal semivowels into which \textit{n} and \textit{m} (v.26–28) are under certain circumstances convertible; and at v.31, x.11, xv.1,6, xxi.14, we also hear of nasal (\textit{anunāsika}) vowels. The other nose-sounds, the \textit{yamas} and \textit{nāṣikya} (ii.49,50, xxi.8,12–14), do not anywhere receive this title.

It is desirable to put together somewhere a comprehensive statement of the doctrines held by the Tāttvīriya-Prātiṣṭhākhyā respecting the nasal constituents of the alphabet it recognizes, and no more suitable place is likely to present itself than is offered here.

All nasal (\textit{anunāsika}) sounds are uttered (ii.52) by the mouth and nose together. An \textit{uttama}, a "last" or nasal mute, is a sound in the production of which the intoned breath escapes through the nose, while the organs of the mouth form one of those same contacts which give rise to the corresponding non-nasal mutes of the series. In \textit{anusvāra}, on the other hand (including under that designation the nasal semivowels, of which more further on), the mouth-organs are not wholly closed, but the intoned breath finds exit through them at the same time that it passes through the nasal cavities. In all cases, then, in which the character of the nasal of a syllable is determined by that of the following consonant, the nasal will be a mute if the latter is a mute, but an \textit{anusvāra} if succeeded by a letter not forming a contact—by a semivowel or a spirant. Respecting the phonetic character and occurrence of the nasal mutes, there has been no difference of opinion, so far as we have any information, among the Hindu phonetists of the period represented by the Prātiṣṭhākhyās; none of them has allowed a final \textit{anusvāra} before a pause, or an \textit{anusvāra} before a mute, either in the same or a following word. As to the phonetic value, however, of the real \textit{anusvāra}, the nasal uttered with open mouth-organs, there was by no means the same accordance among those ancient grammarians. Some held it to be a pervading nasalization of the preceding vowel; others, a nasal addition to

30. \textit{anusvāraç ca 'uttamäç cā 'munāsikā bhavanti: nāṣikām anuvartanta ity anunāsikāh. yathā: anusvāraḥ: yo.....: utta-māc ca ': pra.....: 'pra.....: man-².}

¹ G. M. ins. yathā. ² W. B. om.
that vowel. The former view is adopted and consistently maintained by the Atharva-Prātiṣākhya, which acknowledges nasal consonants and nasalized vowels, but no tertium quid. The Prātiṣākhyas of the Rik and White Yajus are equally consistent in their recognition of an anusvāra as nasal appendage to the vowel, and the latter of them gives (Vāj. Pr. iv.147-8) detailed directions as to the quantity belonging to each element. The Tāttiriya-Prātiṣākhya adopts prevailingly the same view, but lets the other appear distinctly in some of its rules. Thus, at v.31, it is stated to be Atreyā's opinion that, when a nasal mute becomes ṭ, the preceding vowel is nasalized; and, in conformity with this, xv.1 directly teaches that, after the various conversion of m and n, the vowel before them becomes nasal, the following rules adding (xv.2,3) that some authorities deny this, and direct anusvāra to be inserted instead; here the commentary has to reverse the obvious intent of the text, and declare the latter rules approved, and the first disapproved. Further, x.11 directs that when a vowel is combined with a nasalized vowel the result is nasal (the commentary, however, gives a different interpretation: see the rule). Once more, in xxii.14, among "heavy" syllables is reckoned one that is anumāṅsika, 'nasal.'

I very much doubt whether this difference of views is founded upon an actual difference of pronunciation; it is probably due rather to a discordant apprehension and analysis of a single mode of utterance. The same point might divide into two parties our phonetists at the present day—just as they have long been divided upon the question whether a b differs from a p in being sonant, or in being soft, or weak, or of inferior aspiration, or something of that kind. Without entering into any detailed discussion of the subject, I will simply say that I incline to side with the Atharva school, and to believe in nasal vowels rather than in anusvāra. No one of the Prātiṣākhyas gives an intelligible definition of the phonetic character of anusvāra, considered as an independent alphabetic element; if it is to be so considered, we shall hardly be able to make of it anything but a bit of the neutral vowel (u of but) nasalized, or the sound of the French un, and shall have to regard it as attached to the vowel much in the same way as, by us who speak English, the same sound not nasalized is attached to most of our long vowels before an r—for example, in there, here, our, cure, fire, sour (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.353).

Which of the two views is originally favored by the Devanāgarī alphabet does not admit of much question; the writing of ainça, for example,* with a nasal sign over the vowel of the first syllable, is an unequivocal recognition of the nasality as something affecting the vowel itself. If it had seemed to the framers of this alphabet to be a something interposed between the vowel and the following consonant, they would doubtless have

* Namely, ग्रं, or ग्रं.
found for it a sign to stand between those of the other elements. This has actually been done, out of a true regard for consistency, by the writers of the Vājasaneyi and Tāttiriya texts: for lack of a better device, they have brought down one of the usual signs of nasality from above the syllable to a position between the syllables, giving it an addition which enables it to maintain its place there* —in the Tāttiriya texts, we have the dotted crescent, with the vi-rāma, the usual mark for a consonant not graphically combined with a following consonant, beneath it. The scribes of the Rig-Veda seem to have been less solicitous to make their practice square with their theory. It may well be made a question, however, whether the habit, now so common, of writing aṅka, anṭa, ambā, for aṅka, anṭa, ambā, etc.,‡ could have grown up until the opinion had become prevalent that the nasal sign in aṅca also represented a nasal sound which followed the vowel, and was accommodated in its special mode of utterance to its successor.§

One more point in the theory of the nasal sounds calls for notice. The assimilation of n to a following l, and of m to a following l, y, or v (v. 26–8), is treated by the Tāttiriya, the Vājasaneyi, and the Rik Prātiṣākhyas as resulting in the production, not of anusvāra, but of a nasal counterpart to the semivowel—that is, the case is made analogous with that of a nasal before a mute, instead of before a spirant. Here, also, the Atharva-Prātiṣākhyas pursues an independent course, and accepts no nasal y or v, but only a nasal l, as product of both m and n (see Ath. Pr. ii.35). In this case, as well as in the other, we have to assume merely a difference in the theoretical explanation of an identical mode of pronunciation; and I should not only favor the Atharvan view, but should be willing to give up the nasal l itself, as not worth distinguishing from an ordinary case of anusvāra—or of nasalized vowel, if we accept this understanding of the matter. Thus much, indeed, may be allowed—that, while the absence of sonant utterance in the spirants cuts them off from sharing in a nasal quality, it might be difficult to prevent the nasality of the preceding vowel from infecting at least

* Thus, for ग्रं, or ग्रेण, the Vāj. S. writes ग्रं, the Tātt. S. ग्रघा.
‡ That is, ग्रं, ग्रेण, ग्रेण, for ग्रं, ग्रेण, ग्रेण.
§ No valid objection can be raised against the, practically so convenient, imitation of this habit on the part of modern European scholars, so far as concerns the representation of an original m assimilated to a following consonant. To go farther than this, however, and write the anusvāra sign in the interior of a word for a nasal mute which is equally radical or thematic with the succeeding non-nasal, and, yet more, to write it for a final m, which no Prātiṣākhyas allows to be pronounced otherwise than m, seems an indefensible practice, and one wholly to be disapproved and rejected. Of Müller’s seemingly elaborate defense of his adherence to it, given in the Preface to his Hitopadeśa, absolutely the whole point lies in the phrases (p. xi): “it is easier to write avikitā than akkitā. What applies to writing applies with still greater force to printing”—which latter consideration must be pronounced destitute of weight; since, on the contrary, we do expect our printing to be superior in accuracy to ordinary writing.
the beginning of the sonant semivowels. For the exclusion of \(r\) from the same treatment with the other semivowels I can discover no good reason.

The usage of the manuscripts is pretty nearly in accordance with the theories of the Prātiṣṭhāna. For an assimilated \(m\), the distinctive anusvāra sign is always written before \(r\), as before the spirants; but before \(t\), \(y\), and \(v\) is written the sign of nasality above the preceding syllable, as before a mute. But as regards \(n\) before \(l\), my manuscript varies with complete irregularity between treating it like \(m\), as required by the Prātiṣṭhāna, and writing the \(n\) unchanged, either with virūma or conjoined with the \(l\) (instances of the latter mode of treatment are about twice as frequent as of the former). The edited text more usually follows a third method, supported neither by my manuscript nor by the Prātiṣṭhāna: it writes the \(l\) double, and puts a sign of nasality over the preceding syllable. This is nonsense: if two \(ls\) are written, the first should be separated from the other, and should have the sign of nasality written above it. But there is no reason why this should be done in the case of a combination of \(l\) with \(n\) any more than with \(m\), or than in the combination of \(m\) with \(y\) and \(v\).

It only remains to add that, in my manuscripts (T. and W.) and those at Berlin and Oxford (B. and O.), the text of the Prātiṣṭhāna follows, in regard to the treatment of the nasals as to other points of euphony, the usages of the Tāltirīya text, and that the citations from the latter in the commentary are also written accordingly; while the body of the commentary itself follows the methods of ordinary Sanskrit texts. In this edition, therefore, their example is followed as closely as possible: the proper anusvāra being represented by \(\overline{n}\), and the \(m\) assimilated to a mute or semivowel, by \(\overline{m}\). The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. and M.) do not distinguish these two from one another.

31. In the case of the vowels, that is their place of production, to which approximation is made.

The term upasaināhāra, 'approximation,' is glossed by upaśaśavīcēshah, 'a sort of embrace'—unless, indeed, we are to read, with G. and M., sanśavīcēshah, 'disunion of embrace,' i.e., 'embrace which does not come to actual contact.'

The terms sthāna, 'place,' and karana, 'organ,' denote, as in the other Prātiṣṭhānas (see note to Ath. Pr. 1.18), the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth whose concurrence gives birth to a sound.

31. svarādīn tat sthānam bhavati yatro 'pasaināhārāh syāt: upasaināhāro nāmo 'paśaśavīcēshah'.

32. That is producing organ, which makes the approximation.

Here, “in the case of the vowels” is declared to be implied from the preceding rule; upasainiharati, ‘approaches,’ is explained by prapayati, ‘attains;’ and, as example of a karana, or producing organ, reference is made to the “tip of the tongue,” spoken of in rule 18 of this chapter.

33. But in the case of the other letters, that is place of production, where contact is made.

By this expression, the commentator says, simple embrace or union is predicated of the consonants, while above a sort of embrace (or disunion of embrace) was predicated of the vowels. The difference, he adds, between approximation and contact will be inferred by any knowing person from the force of the terms themselves. The word “but” (tu) is meant to exclude the vowels; or, as Māhīsheya explains it, annuls for anusodra and svarabhakti the quality of being produced by contact merely, like the other consonants. This last is a precious bit of pregnant construction; and the whole comment is more obscure than the rule itself, whose meaning and implication are sufficiently obvious.

34. That is producing organ, whereby one makes the contact.

The commentator supplies, as subject of the verb, the noun adhyetā, ‘reader’—or, rather, ‘repeater.’


B. tat sthānam; G. M. om.


1 W. -loṣ; G. M. -matravesam. 2 W. om. 3 G. -shāvijeshah; M. -shāvijeshah. 4 G. M. -hāra iti sparçana. 5 G. M. ins. eva. 6 G. M. jñātavyah. 7 G. M. cañda. 8 G. M. om. 9 W. -nave; B. -na. 10 B. sparçakauṇinam; G. M. sparçamātrakalā nīv; M. -vartata.
In these four rules is implied that distinction of opener and closer position between vowel and consonant which constitutes their essential difference (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.367 seq.), and which the Ath. Pr. states more fully (i.29–35:—where, in rule 33, we should read eke sprṣṭam), with specifications of degree of openness and closure which are here omitted (save so far as represented by rule 45, below).

35. In the k-series, one makes contact with the root of the tongue at the root of the jaws.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.20, and the references to the other Prātiṣṭhākyas there given.

The locative and instrumental cases, in this and the following rules, correspond with the yatra, 'where,' and yena, 'whereby,' of rules 33 and 34, above, and point out respectively the place and organ of production of the different classes of sounds.

The singular number of hanūmāla, 'root of the jaws,' the commentator accounts for as used generically (jātyaṃekṣādīyaṃ, 'with reference to the whole kind or class').

36. In the c-series, with the middle of the tongue, upon the palate.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.21, and the note upon it. The sonant aspirate of this series, jh, is not met with in the text.

37. In the t-series, with the tip of the tongue, rolled back, in the head.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.22, and the note upon it. Our commentary says, 'by the word 'head' (mārdhan) is intended the upper part

34. sāṃmadhydd anyeshām iti labhyate: svarebhyo 'nyeshāṁ varṇānāṁ tat karanam bhavati: adhyetā yena vyanjanāni sparṣayati prápayati tat karanam.

35. kavarga uccāryamāne jihvāmālens' hanūmālām sparṣayati prápayed īty arthaḥ. hanvor mūlām hanūmālām: tasmin: ' jātyaṃekṣādīyaṃ ekavacanam.

36. āvarge kārye jihvāmadhyena varṇāṁ tālāu sprṣet'.

1 G. M. ins. varṇām. 2 B. G. M. om. 3 W. B. om. 4 G. M. ins. mūlam iti. 5 W. 'kāham.'
of the mouth-cavity." Perhaps we shall best remove the difficulties attaching to the use of the word "head" in describing this class of sounds, by assuming that the name mūrdhanya, 'capital,' had become firmly established in use as designating them, at an earlier period of phonetic science in India, when their mode of production was less accurately understood and defined; and was therefore retained by the later grammarians, who gave to it a new definition. For, that mūrdhan should have been taken directly and without ceremony to signify the "dome of the palate" does not appear to me possible. As in the notes to the Atharva-Prātiṣṭhāṇya, I shall take the liberty of speaking of the t-sounds as "lingual"—a term, on the whole, as unobjectionable and as commonly accepted as any other.

The commentator glosses the word prativeshṭya, 'having rolled it back,' by "having done what? having rolled back (G. M. add in explanation dveshṭya, 'having rolled up') the tip of the tongue, on account of its suitableness" (i.e. of the adaptedness of this position to produce the contact aimed at).

38. In the t-series, with the tip of the tongue, at the roots of the teeth.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.24, and the note upon it.

39. In the p-series, with the two lips.

The commentator explains that here the upper lip is the place of production, as the various places of production mentioned have been the upper organ; and that the under lip is the organ of production.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.25, and the note upon it.


I. G. M. put varṇāṁ here. 2 B. G. M. mūrdhan. 2 B. śrīcet. 4 W. -tā; B. -tātaj; G. -tā; M. -mogyaṭvāṁ. 2 G. M. -oṣṭhvedeṣṭya. 2 G. M. -kāhitah.

38. tavarga kārye jihvāgrena varṇāṁ dantamūleśhu sparṣayet.

1 G. M. śrīcet.

39. pavarga kārye oṣṭhābhīyam anyonyāṁ sparṣayet: atro 'ttarosṭhāna sthānam uttaratvasāmyād esāṁ sthānām: adharosṭhah karānam.

1 W. tātro. 2 B. -rātvāt sāmānīyād; G. M. oṣṭhātave.
40. In \( y \), with the two edges of the middle of the tongue, upon the palate.

The Taittiriya-Prātiṣṭhākhyya stands alone in omitting to rank the semi-vowels along with the mutes, as palatal, etc., and in describing their formation throughout by special rule. Respecting \( y \), see the note to Ath. Pr. i.21.

The description of the mode of production of \( y \), here given, is quite accurate and sufficiently distinctive. The “edges” are mentioned, as being the parts which form contact with the palate, the central part remaining open, as taught for \( i \) in rule 22, above.

41. In \( r \), with the middle of the tip of the tongue, back of the roots of the teeth.

Pratyak is explained by the phrase, “in the interior upper portion”—that is, ‘within and above’—the equivalence of pratyag-ātman and antarātman, ‘inner soul,’ being pleaded as justification.

The somewhat discordant teachings of the Prātiṣṭhākhyas with reference to this sound are detailed in the note to Ath. Pr. i.28. The most note-worthy circumstance in their common treatment of the letter is that they so ignore its special relationship with the lingual mutes, and in part with the \( r \)-vowels: although in this treatise the definition of the latter (ii.18) is, essentially, nearly accordant with that here given for the semi-vowel. \( R \) could not possibly have the value which belongs to it in the Sanskrit euphonic system, if it were not a lingual semi-vowel, like the English \( r \), uttered with the tip of the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate.

42. Also in \( l \), at the roots of the teeth.

According to the commentator, the “and” (ca) of this rule brings down by implication from the preceding both jihvāgramādhyāya, ‘middle of the tongue-tip,’ and pratyak, ‘back from.’

40. yakāre kārye jihvāmadhyāntābhīyām tālāu sparṣayet. jihvāyā madhyam: tasyāḥ ‘ntāv: tābhīyam jihvāmadhyāntābhyām.

1 G. M. om.

41. rephe kārye jihvāgramadhyēna dantamālēbhīyāḥ pratyak sparṣayet: pratyag ity ‘abhyanthemes’y aparībhāga ity arthah: ‘yah pratyagatme ‘ty’ antarātmd pratiyate.

1 G. M. -maropari-. 2 G. M. yathā pratyagatman. 
appears obvious, however, if only from the locative case of danta-
mūleshu, that the latter item is not intended, and that we are to
regard the roots of the teeth themselves (more properly, the gums
close upon them) as the sthāna, or “place of production,” of l.
This, indeed, is nearly enough intimated by the final paraphrase
of the comment. The really distinctive characteristic of the l, that
it forms a contact in front, but allows the breath to escape at the
sides of the tongue, is here by no means clearly brought out:
rather, we are left to infer that it and the r are produced in the
same manner, only the r a little further back. No one of the other
treatises gives a better description (see note to Ath. Pr. i.24, where
I have given the Tāttviriya definition more credit than really be-
longs to it).

43. In v, with the edges of the lips, along with the teeth.

This rule cannot be commended for distinctness. The commen-
tator gives it not a little of additional precision, by his paraphrase
“with the two edges of the lower lip, along with the points of the
upper teeth.” But how comes the lower lip to have two edges?
He adds, that the teeth are the place, and the lips the organ, of
production. But then why does not the rule read danteshu, instead
of the instrumental dantāh? It gives us two instrumentals, as if
teeth and lips were joint organs, and neither of them any more
“place” than the other. The lower lip, being the more passive
organ, should be the “place” on which the teeth, as “organ,”
make their contact; but from taking this view the treatise and its
comment appear to be hindered by the analogy of the other sthā-
na’s, which have uniformly been the upper of the two parts con-
cerned in the contact. To make a good definition, the rule should
read adharoshtānte for oshthāntābhhyām.

Of the other treatises (as pointed out in the note to Ath. Pr. i.25),
the Vāj. Pr. gives the v a description corresponding with this, and
showing the letter to have had the precise phonetic value of our
English v. This, of course, should not in the least stand in the
way of our fully recognizing the fact that its original sound
was that of our w. The v is a semi-vowel, standing in the
same relation to u as y to i; but to call v a semi-vowel is a sim-

42. cakāro jīhāgramadhya-pratyaktvam anvādiçati: lukāre
dārye jīhāgramadhyañca dantamūleshu pratyak sparçayet:
ayam othoh: lukārasya ‘dantamālapratyāsannam pratyaganta-
rapradeçosthānam’ iti vijñeyam.

(1) G. M. jīhāmadhyam pratyaktvām ca “karshati. * G. M. -bhāmadh-

43. vakāre kārye ‘dharoshtāntābhhyām uttaradantāgrāhī saha
sparçayet. dantār iti sthānani rdecah: oshthāntābhhyām iti kar-
nanirdecah.
ple abuse of terms. We might nearly as well call our \( j \) a semi-vowel, because it is written with an originally vocalic sign, and represents in the majority of cases a sound which the Romans pronounced as \( y \).

44. The spirants, in their order, are produced in the places of the mutes.

By rule i.9, there are six spirants, and as there are but five "places" of mutes, these belong to the first five spirants, as is signified by the expression "in their order:" \( h \), therefore, is omitted, and its rules will be given hereafter (rules 46, 47). To this effect the commentator, who also allots the spirants to their respective mute-classes, and cites from the Sanhitā an example for each: namely, for jihvāmālyā, uttered in the place of a \( k \)-mute, yah kā-
maitya (ii.3.24 et al.: I follow the example of all the MSS., and do not attempt to distinguish the guttural and labial spirants from visārjaniya by different signs); for \( c \), in the place of a \( c \)-mute, madhuṣ ca madhavāc ca (i.4.14, or iv.4.111: W. B. omit the last two words of the citation, and W. reads manyup ca, which is found at iv.7.21); for \( sh \), in the place of a \( t \)-mute, ashtābyah svāhā (vii.2.15); for \( s \), in the place of a \( t \)-mute, stāṇd uparavāh (vi.2.114); and for upadhāmāniya, in the place of a \( p \)-mute, yah pāṇmanā (ii.3.132).

To make this rule a definition of the mode of utterance of the spirants, the one next following is to be applied to modify it. Unfortunately, both together are insufficient to give us any clear idea of the two problematical sounds, jihvāmālyā and upadhāmāniya; and there is room for us to suspect them of being, like the long \( t \)-vowel, an artificial fabrication of the Hindu grammarians. As for the \( s \), there is no question as to its value. Nor ought there to be respecting that of the \( sh \), which both the explanations of the phonetists and the phenomena of Sanskrit euphony show to have been that particular sibilant (more nearly resembling our \( sh \) than \( s \), but sufficiently distinct from either) which is uttered with the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate. It passes my comprehension how European grammarians should continue to identify

44. uṣmāna anupūrveya yathākramena sparçasthāneshū 
'cāraṇīyā bhavanti. yathā: jihvāmāliyāh kavargasthāne: yah k: 
'cakāraç cavargasthāne: madhuç: shakāraś tavar-
gasthāne: asht: ... sakāraç tavargasthāne: stāṇa: upa-
dhāmāniyāh pavargasthāne: yah p: ity anupūrveya: anupūr-
vyaṇā niyamāt pañcatā "uṣmānā 'ktescu hakāro vičiśtaḥ: 
tasya vidhim uparishādād acashte.

1 W. cavargīnas; 2 B. čakāras. 3 W. manyuc. 4 G. M. -vyā. 5 B. -rāshah; G. M. varishtāh.
it with our sh; and, yet more, how that absurd distinction of the lingual and palatal sibilants (of which, so far as I know, Wilson was the originator) which defines the former as the same with our sh in shun, and the latter with our ss in session, can still be repeated in the latest Sanskrit grammars. Absurd I call it, because there is really no difference at all between the pronunciation of sh in shun and ss in session. If our sh be found in the Sanskrit alphabet, it is the palatal sibilant c, not the lingual, sh. The question of the value of c is connected with and depends upon that of the palatal series of mutes; and upon this I have nothing more to say than I said in the note to Ath. Pr. i.21.

45. But the middle of the producing organ is unclosed.

The "but" (tu) of this rule, we are told, is intended to annul (so far) the similarity of organ of the spirants with the mutes. This prescription of an unclosure of the middle of the organ is a rather artificial device for saving the credit of the general prescription of actual contact in all the consonants. It is nearly equivalent with the rules of the Ath. Pr. (i.30,31) upon the same subject.

46. The throat is place of production of h and visarjaniya.

And, the commentator adds, they have no karana, or organ of production. As example of h, he cites aharahar havirdhānīnām (ii.5.62), but leaves visarjaniya uninstanced.

The other Prātiçākhyaśas give a corresponding definition of the utterance of these two sounds (see note to Ath. Pr. i.19). It is too indefinite to be of any particular use to us in determining their phonetic value. But the two rules which next follow in our treatise are very interesting and instructive.

47. In the opinion of some authorities, h has the same position as the beginning of the following vowel.

Our commentator first offers the simple paraphrase of this rule:

45. teshām āshmanāṁ karanamadhyam tu viśrām bhavati: sparyanāṁ karanasāmyaniśrāśturītīparas' tucādāh. karanānāṁ ma-
dhyam karanamadhyam.

46. hakāravisarjaniyātm kāntasthānātm syātām. kanthā sthā-
nam yayos tāu tathoktāu. anayoh karaṇābhāvah. ah——...
which he finds given by one of his three chief authorities, Vararuci, and then proceeds to exhibit his own superior acuteness by a very long, but not very important, discussion of it: a loose version is as follows:

The expression “the same position as the beginning,” etc., implies a difference of position in the remainder of the vowel; but there is none such in a, i, u; as a vowel has but a single position, the word “beginning” is superfluous, and the desired result would be secured by saying simply “of the same position with the vowel.” That is not so: a difference of position does in fact belong to the remainder of the diphthongs: the two rules (ii.28, 29) which teach that i and u form the final elements of di and du assure the difference of position for those two sounds; in like manner, a difference of position is to be remarked as prescribed in general grammar [though not in this treatise] for the final elements of e and o, they being included in the category of diphthongs.

But again: even granting that, the utterance in the throat of this very a which makes the initial element of the diphthongs is taught by the rule, “the throat is the place of production of a, the k-mutes, h, and visarjaniya;” hence, as sameness of position [with the a, as throat-sound] is prescribed by the preceding rule, this rule is open to the charge of superfluous repetition. You must not think so, is the reply; there is a difference between the a which forms the beginning of e and o and an a standing by itself: to the latter belongs the description given above in rule 12, “the lips and jaws not too widely separated,” etc.; to the other, that of rule 27, “with the organ of production more closed;” therefore, as place and organ correspond to one another, the expression “of the same position as the beginning” is to be understood as meaning “of the same place and organ as the beginning.” Moreover, in the former rule the absence of an organ of production was taught, but here is implied also the presence of such; hence a difference of opinions comes to light, and not merely a superfluous repetition.

47. ekeshāṁ mate hakāraḥ udayavardīdīsthānā ātmāna upari svarādīdīsthānā bhavaṭti 'ti vāraucoktaṁ' syād etat. ādinā sasthāna ity ukte cēshaya sthānantaravāṁ vaktavyāṁ tad apy akārekārokāreshu nā 'sti: svarasyādi 'kam eva 'sthānam' ity alaṅkārdvādiyartham syāt; svarasasthāna ity etavatā 'vā rthasiddhir' iti: māī 'evam sandhyakshareshu cēshaya sthānantaropapateḥ: ikāro 'dhyarjhaḥ (ii.28) iti sūtraṇeyaṇa cēshahūtavarnavayaktāvā tuo sthānantaram api prasiddham eva: evam ekārakārayor api vyākaraṇe cēshaya sthānāntaraṁ vihitam viññeyam sandhyaksharatvāvīcēshad anayoh. nav evam apy aukhavvisarjanīyānāṁ kaṇṭha iti sandhyaksha-rādāv akārasya 'pi kaṇṭha sthānantaravat tena samānasthānate; kuthyamāne pūrvasūtroktenā pūnāraktyam asya satrasya
Any detailed criticism of this cunning argument would certainly be open to the charge of superfluity, and I shall not attempt it.

A few further examples of the occurrence of $h$ before the various diphthongs, are added: \textit{tigmahete} (i.2.14$^2$), \textit{yāvatir vāsāmahāī} (vi.5.2$^1$), \textit{agnihotram juhoti} (i.5.9$^1$), \textit{samprayāt ahdā} (v.6.1$^2$).

The acuteness of observation of the “some authorities” who have made this definition of the character of a $h$ certainly deserves respectful, if not admiring, acknowledgment. It is the peculiarity of the aspiration, that it is an emission of unintonated breath through the same position of the mouth organs by which the following intonated sound receives its character: thus, the $h$ of \textit{ha} is a surd $a$, so to speak; that of \textit{he}, a surd $e$; that of \textit{who}, a surd $u$; that of \textit{hue}, a surd $y$; and so on (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc’y, viii.370 seq.). The rule would have been made better by reading \textit{udayavarna}, instead of \textit{udayasarvādī}—“the following sound,” instead of “the beginning of the following vowel”—for the assimilation is not less true of the semi-vowels and nasals than of the vowels.

48. \textit{Visarjanīya} has the same position as the end of the preceding vowel.

The commentator does not tell us whether this definition is to be looked upon as, like the preceding, expressing the opinion of “some authorities,” or as having the unqualified approval of the Prātīcākhyā. From his silence we should infer the latter, but the connection gives reason for presuming the former. He paraphrases: “\textit{visarjanīya} is of like position—that is, of like place and organ—with the end of the vowel that precedes itself;” and adds that

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

here too the language of the rule is aimed at the diphthongs, since no other vowel exhibits any difference of position between its end and its beginning. His examples, again, are only of visarjaniya after a diphthong: they are agneḥ (i.1.103 et al.), brāhmaṇaṇīr āyuḥmat (ii.3.103), bāhuvaḥ balam (v.5.92), and ā yam gāuḥ (i.5.31). In the second and third of these passages, only the first word should have been quoted, in order to exhibit the visarjaniya.

The teachings of the other Prātikākhyaas respecting the visarjanīya are rehearsed in the note to Ath. Pr. i.19. All are so indefinite as really to teach us nothing respecting the phonetic value of the sound. The present rule alone gives us positive and precise information, teaching us to regard it as, like the h, a simple uncharacterized breathing, a kind of final h.

49. The nose-sounds have the nose as their place of production.

The "nose-sounds," the commentary says, are the yamas (xxi.12,13); but why the nāsikya (xxi.14) should not be regarded as included among them I do not see. Any discussion of their phonetic character may be best deferred until the chapter where the rules for their occurrence are given. As examples of the nose-sounds are quoted ruknam aṇṭaram (v.i.103; but G. M. B. give instead rukmam, ii.2.33), yācū (i.5.74; but G. M. give instead rdiṇa, ii.6.22 et al.), cittāraḥ (v.6.53), ratnam abhajanta (ii.6.121; but G. M. give instead, if it be not merely a corrupted reading, ucca ratnam ayajanta, which I have not found in the Sanhitā), and pāpmānam (i.4.41 et al.).

50. Or they are produced by the mouth and nose.

Respecting this alternative explanation nothing need be said at present.

48. visarjaniya atmanāḥ pūrvasvarāntena sasthānāḥ samāña-
sthānakarvāno bhavati: aṭrāḥ pi pūrvāvata iti sandhyaksharam
ucyate: varāntarasyaḥ hiṣṭhanāntaravābhāvāt. yathā: ag-ḥ-ḥ
brāḥ-. .-. bāḥ-. .-. ā- .-. pūrvasyā 'ntah: tena sasthānāḥ
pūrvasasthānāḥ.

1 W. B. -ntasya. 2 B. om. 3 G. M. bhāṣya. 4 B. om. 5 B. om. 6 B. om.

49. nāsikya yamā nāsikāsthānā bhavanti, yathā: ruk-. .-. yā-:
āṭ-: raṭ-. .-. pāp-

50. ta' eva nāsikā mukhanāsikābhāyām uccaśrāntiyā bhavanti,
mukhan ca nāsikā ca mukhanāsike: tatsambandhino mukhanāsik-
yāḥ. "uktāny evo 'dāharanānāti".

1 G. M. et al. 2 G. M. mukhere nāsikābhāyām ca. 3 G. M. -ke. 4 G. M. -kāna. 5 G. M. put after bhavanti.
51. And, in them, the organ of production is as in the series of mutes.

The "and" (ca) of this rule, the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of 'the lion's look' (a distant glance backward: the phrase is used several times later in like cases), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series.

If the mouth be regarded as bearing a part in the production of the nose-sounds or *yamas*, in a way which is determined by the mode of formation of the mutes to which they are attached, it is difficult to see how their number can be restricted to four, as it is in the "list of sounds" given at the beginning of the treatise, and in the comment on rule xxi.12.

52. Nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nose.

*Anunāsikya* is the quality of being *anunāsika* or 'nasal;' and this name, as prescribed by rule 30, above, and fully supported by the usage of the treatise elsewhere, belongs to *anuvāra* and the various nasal consonants. The definition of the manner in which the quality is communicated is quite unexceptionable: the organs of the mouth remaining in the positions already given for the various classes and single sounds, the opening of the nasal passage, and the utterance through it of a part or the whole of the emitted material, makes the corresponding nasal sound.

The commentator explains *nāsikāvivarana* by *ghrānabīla*, 'hole of the nose, nasal passage;' as if *vivarana* signified the opening or cavity, instead of the act of opening or unclosing. His choice of an example also seems to betray a want of appreciation of the true scope of the rule: it is *sucūkāsa* *samaṅgalāsa* (i.8.162).

51. *siṁhāvalokanena* vargaśyo 'ktāṁ karaṇāṁ ca kāhaḥ 'nīkar-shati: eshu* nāsikāyeshu vargavat karaṇam bhavati. vargaśya 'vā vargavat.

1 G. M. -kanayāyena. 2 G. M. (as also in the text of the rule itself) eṣṇau.

52. *nāsikāvivaranaṁ ghrānabīlaṁ* *anunāsikyaṁ raṅgādi kara-
tavyam. yathā: suṣ*-——*ity ādi.

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātičākhyavivarane* 
dvitiyo 'dhyāyaḥ.

1 G. M. *nāsikāb*. 2 B. tathā; W. om.
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CHAPTER III.

CONTENTS: 1, introductory; 2–6, cases of ə at the end of the first member of a compound, requiring to be shortened in divided text; 7, of i and ə; 8–12, of final ə of verbal forms and particles; 13–14, of final i and ə; 15, of initial ə.

[Translation]

1. Now then—at the beginning or end of a word, a vowel, in case of separation, if followed by a consonant, becomes short as hereinafter set forth.

Matters of introductory explanation, of interpretation of the rules of the treatise, and of phonetic theory, being now for the present disposed of (for they are resumed, in a supplementary way, in some of the concluding chapters), the task of determining the readings of the Sanhitā is taken up. And the first subject dealt with is that of the irregular prolongations of vowels—chiefly final a, i, and u—which are so frequent in all the Vedic texts. In the other treatises (Rik Pr. vii.–ix., Vāj. Pr. iii.95–128, Ath. Pr. iii.1–25), the rules tell us in what situations a vowel originally short is lengthened: this is more in accordance with the general method of the Prātiṣṭhāṇyās, which take for granted, upon the whole, the existence of their gākhās in the analyzed condition of the pada-text, and proceed to construct the sanhitā from it. Here, on the contrary, we are told what vowels, long in the ordinary text, are to be shortened when thrown out of combination with their surroundings. Such dissolution of the continuity of the text takes place, first, in pada, whenever a pause—either the avagraha separating the two members of a compound, in its repetition after iti, or the longer pause that divides between two words—comes to stand between the vowel in question and the consonant which was its next neighbor in sanhitā: thus, devāyata iti deva-yate; ava: nah (s. avā nah). Second, it is made in the so-called jatā-text, examples of which are often quoted in the sequel, and to which the rules of the treatise are in more than one instance adapted; this text is constructed by thrice repeating each pair of words—first in

1. athe'ty ayam adhikārah: adāu padādāv uttare padānte ca vartamānāṁ sanhitāyāṁ yo dirgho 'sau vibhāge vibhāgasamaye vyañjanaparo hravam āpadyate: 'vyañjanapurātavam' atra ya-thāsanhitāsthāṁ viṣṇeyam. nanu dirghah kathāṁ labhyate. 'hravānantarabhāvētvād devācikā (iii.2) "digrāhaneshu phutā- darçanāe ce 'ti brāmāh. sanhitāyāṁ ity asyāḥ 'yam arthah: kāryabhājah padasya 'ttarapaḍena saha sambandhāniyamah': na tu pāraṇapadena saha sambandhāniyamah'. vibhāgo 'tra
their natural order, then inverted, then in the natural order again: for example, āpo āpo hi sāthā mayobhivah would become āpo āpo hi: hi sāthā stha hi hi sāthā: sāthā mayobhivoh mayo-
hvaca stha stha mayobhivaha: mayobhivaha iti mayah-bhivah: the treatment of the ā of sthā here illustrates the conditions of the re-

toration of the short vowel in such cases. Third, the same resto-

ration takes place in the saṁhītā-text of the existing manuscripts and in the edition founded upon them, when the lengthened vowel happens to come at the end of one of those passages, of just fifty words each, into which the antādikas or sections of the Saṁhītā are divided. This division the Prātiṣṭākhyā does not recognize—
or, at any rate, does not notice—not infrequently quoting in san-
dhi, without remark, words which are separated by it (for example, under rule 13, below, ucmaṣi gamadhye, i.3.612, where the edit-
ed text reads correctly ucmaṣi: i: gamadhye).

The comment upon this rule may be loosely translated, or para-
phrased, as follows:

Here atha, ‘now then,’ is an introductory heading; ādai ([litera-

ly, ‘at the beginning’] means ‘at the beginning of a word’ [inclu-
ding, also, a separable part of a compound word]; uttare [litera-

ly, ‘in the latter part’] means ‘at the end of a word:’ a vowel occu-

pying such a position, if it be long in saṁhītā, becomes short vi-
bhāge, i.e. ‘in case of separation,’ when followed by a consonant—

that is to say, when so followed in saṁhītā. But whence is de-

rived the limitation to a ‘long’ vowel? We answer, from its con-

version into a short, and from the non-occurrence of any pro-

tracted (phata) vowels among the instances included in the rules.

The limitation “in saṁhītā” implies that the word whose form is

in question is placed in euphonic connection with the word that

follows it; not, however, with the word that precedes it [unless,
as should be excepted, its initial vowel, instead of its final, is the

one liable to change of quantity]. “Separation” (vibhāga) is to

be understood as division from the words with which it stands in

natural or original connection—that is, according to the reading of

the fundamental text: otherwise, in the jātā-text of the two words

sthā mayobhivoh (see above), the stha would retain its long ā in

its second repetition, because of its standing in euphonic connec-

tion with the following word: and that should not be so. The

sense of the word vibhāga is, in case of a long initial vowel, sep-

aration from the preceding word; in case of a long final, from the

prakṛtipadāir ucyate: prakṛtir nāma yathāpāthah: prakṛtipadāir

iti kim: sthā m- ity atra jatāyān sthācābdasya deityocarane

‘pi dirighaḥ prāsājyeta: uttarapadena vibhāgabhīvahat: sa’sa

ma bhūd iti parihārah. vibhāgapadāsyā ‘yam arthah: padādātā

dirghasya pāreypadena vibhāgaḥ: padānta dirighṣyo uttarpad-

dena vibhāgaḥ. vibhāge vyanjanapara iti kim: ṛt— ity atra

ma bhūd iti: nādhāmādharayā (iii.8) iti prāptih. saṁhītā-
yāṁ dirigha iti kim: esha.... ity atra prāptisampādanārtham:
following word. The limitation "in case of separation, if followed by a consonant" is for the sake of excluding such cases as *rūtadhamā 'si (i.3.3; in separated form, *rūtadhamā : asi), which would otherwise come under the rule iii.8 [among the specifications of which, *dhāmā is included]. The limitation "a long vowel in samhitā" is intended to bring *eha vo bharatā rājā (i.8.10 et al.; pada-text, bharatāh) under the action of the rules; since thus, and not otherwise, is pertinence given to the word *yājyā in rule 11 of this chapter. Undue extension of the prescription to such cases as trā *vāyavah (i.1.1) is provided against by the rules that follow [since these specify all the cases in which it is to be applied].

The only difficulty arising in connection with the understanding of this rule, or of the interpretation of it given by the commentator, grows out of the specification *vyanjanapara, 'followed by a consonant.' Respecting this, we are explicitly told, near the beginning of the exposition, "the being followed by a consonant is to be understood here of the condition of things in the samhitā-text."—that is to say, any long vowel which appears in samhitā as a final, with a consonant following it, is to be regarded as falling under the rules of the chapter. This specification, then, makes the rules apply to such cases as bharatā rājā (the example quoted by the commentator: the pada-reading is bharatāh: rājā) and *adhā mā (quoted under rule 9; pada-reading *adhāh : mā), and they have to be specially allowed for and excepted—as is done in rules 9 and 11. It seems very strange, now, to have this implication made, requiring as a consequence that all the words which by euphonic processes come to exhibit in samhitā a long final vowel (ā) should be taken into consideration; but the number of cases actually needing to be guarded against in the rules on account of it is very small. For, in the first place, the question can arise only in regard to the words specially mentioned in the rules; and among these there are not many for which homophonous forms in āḥ or āt occur; and of these, again, only a part would occur otherwise than before a vowel, in which situation the hiatus would betray the omission of the former final element. The makers of the treatise, then, appear to have thought it safer to avoid a possible confusion of *adhā from *adāhā with *adā from adhā, and so on, by making the rules apply in general to both cases, and specially excepting the former. And this is what they have attempted to do; and it has cost them only two additional words—agniyājya in rule 9, and *yājyāsu in rule 11—together with an artifice of

(lrāta sati bharatā *yājyāsu (iii.11) iti *yājyapadān sūrthakaṁ nā 'nyathā. *vyanjananam asmāt param iti *vyanjanaparam. tvā... ity ādāv etalkajasamabhadvād ativyāptim uttarānātrāṁ pariharati.

1 G. M. ins. padādāva ca padānte ca yo dvirgo vyanjanottaro vībhoge kṛiyamāne kṛsavān samayāti. 2 G. M. -nam. 3 G. M. om.; G. kruvānti. 4 G. om. ca. 5 G. M. -dhak. 6 G. M. -yate. 7 G. M. -yate. 8 G. M. om. 9 G. M. -gaṇab-. 10 G. M. -dādi. 1 W. -nta. 11 G. M. ins. ya. 12 G. M. -ra. 13 G. M. eva tā-. 14 W. atiśrā-. 
construction under rule 8, in connection with the word prāṇāḥ. Without a complete index verborum to the Sanhitā, or a laboriously minute examination of the whole text with reference to this particular point, I cannot tell just how nearly successful their attempt has been; but I have, I believe, discovered at least one case which they have overlooked. At i.4.24, namely, we read rakshā mákiḥ (p. rakshāh), and, by rule 8, the ā of rakshā should be shortened. That the section containing these words was really a part of the text for which the Prātiṣṭhākhyā was constructed is proved by the fact that two of its peculiarities of reading are provided for in later rules (vi.5 and xi.13).

But with the interpretation thus given appears to be quite at variance the phrase containing the illustration rtadhāmā'si, where vibhāge and vyañjanaparāh are immediately connected, and made to mean ‘followed by a consonant in separated text’ (not rtadhāmā: asi). This I can hardly believe to be a genuine part of the commentary. The second ā of rtadhāmā’si cannot be said to be either final or initial: it is a combination of both: it does not furnish a case to which the rules of the chapter apply with any propriety, as the sanhitā reading cannot be affected by them. If not some later meddler, then the commentator himself, has suffered himself to be scared by an imaginary difficulty, and has unnecessarily twisted the rule a little awry in order to its removal.

The specification vibhāge, ‘in case of separation,’ applies in the Tāttvīrīya pada-text more generally and more strictly than in those of the other Vedas. Where the separation of a compound is suspended on account of its further composition, the restoration of its natural form is suspended also; and we read, for example, viśva-vat, but viśva-vat-tara; viṣva-mitra, but viṣvāmitra-jamadagni; anu-yāja and anam-anu-yāja, but pravāja-anu-vāja, and so on—and we shall find illustrations hereafter in connection with other changes than prolongation of vowels. Thus, also, in the full pada-readings, the word is given first, before iti, in its sanhitā form, without change (except euphonic combination with the iti); and this part of the reading I shall accordingly usually omit in quoting the pada-text, setting down only the separated and restored form which follows iti, or the part which corresponds to the entire reading of the Rik and Atharvan pada-texts.

2. Deva, cikā, sumnā, svā, rtā, vanyā, hrdayā, aghā,

2. ity eteshu grahanēsah avagrahēsah antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjanaparāh hrasnam āpadyate. yathā: dev-v-....: cik-v-....: sumn-v-....: dyāv-v-....: "apy akurādi (i.52) iti vacanād idam apy udāharanam: acv-v-....: tv-v-....: vay-v-....: hr v-....: agh-....: uktha-....: āpo-....

ukthâ, and çuddhâ, as first members of a compound, shorten their final when separated.

This and the following rules, including the seventh, properly form one connected passage, with the specification ity avagrahah, 'these, as former members of a compound,' which applies alike to them all, standing at the end.

The examples quoted from the Sanhitâ in illustration of the rule are as follows. For devâ: devâyate yajamánâyâ carma (iii.5.5; G. M. omit the last word of the citation), the only case, so far as I have noted, for devâyant; we have devâyate (with short vowel) twice, at i.2.12 and ii.5.9; devâyavam occurs ii.5.96 and iv.1.12, but devâyuh, iii.5.11. For skâ, ñkâyate svadhâ (vii.5.11), the only case. For sumnâ, sumnâyanto havâmaha (i.5.11), also alone. For gevâ, dyâvâprthîvâ gevâvit (v.5.20); gevâ, however, by rule i.52, includes aevâ, for which is quoted aevâvati somavatim (iv.2.64); I have noted farther only iiii.3.11, but feel less than usual confidence in the completeness of my excision. For rtâ, rtâyvah purâ 'nnam akshân (ii.2.5; G. M. omit the last word of the citation): there are more than twenty such cases in the text, for the themes rtâya (e. g. i.4.5; but rtâya once, ii.2.124), rtâyant (e. g. iv.2.9), rtâvan (e. g. i.3.142) and its feminine rtâvarî (e. g. i.1.3), rtâvarîh (e. g. i.4.5), and rtâsah (iii.4.7; but this word reads in pada as in sahmât); for vayunjà, vayunjâ vidkta it (i.2.13 and iv.1.11). For hrdâyâ, hrdâyâvidhâc cit (i.4.451). For aghâ, aghâyavo mā gandharvov yiçvâvasur ãdādhat (i.2.9; G. M. omit after gandharvah): other cases of aghâyuv are found at iii.3.11: iv.1.103, 5.104; v.7.31; and of aghâyvant, ii.3.141. For ukthâ, ukthamâdanâm ãhenuh (ii.4.11): the same compound occurs again at iii.3.21 and v.6.86, and ukthâyuv at i.4.12, twice. For āpo deviç cuddhâynuvah (i.3.82 and vi.3.84).

3. Also indrâ, when followed by vat, van, and vân.

One example is quoted by the commentator for each of the three cases enumerated: indrâvatim apacitum iñhâ "vahâ (v.7.4; G. M. omit after apacitum), indrâvanto marutah (iv.7.141), and indrâvânt svadhâ (i.1.12); and I have noted no others. As counterexamples, he quotes, first, to show that not every long ā is to be shortened before the three syllables named, ārnavatam prathamah sida yonim (iii.5.11; G. M. give only the first two words), asura prañjavan (iii.1.11; but B. reads, I presume only by an

3. indre 'ty usminn' avagrahe 'nyasvaro vad van vân ity evamparo vibhâge hrasvam ãpadyate, yathâ: indâ......: indâ......: indâ.....: indâ.....

1 G. M. etasminn. 2 G. M. om.
error, pratápaván), and prajávattir anamídáyakshmáh (i.1.12; but omitted in G. M.); second, to show that indrá is not altered except under the circumstances specified, indrávarunayor aham (ii.5.12). This last is a case in which no vibhága, or 'separation', would be made in any text of the other Vedas; but the Táittiriya pada reads indrávarunayor iti 'indrá-varunayoh', and the example is therefore to the purpose.

चित्रा वर्णः: ॥ ३ ॥

4. Also citrá, when followed by v.

The illustrative passage cited is citrávoso svasti te páram aṣṭya (i.5.54 and 75: G. M. omit after te). As counter-examples, are given mitrávarunav eva (ii.1.73 et al.: p. mitrá-varindau), and citrápánamáse dáksheron (vii.4.82)—the former to show the necessity of the restriction to citrá, the latter, of the restriction to sequence by a v. I have found no farther instances falling under the rule.

प्रस्त्योऽध्याविणाविशेषद्यादीर्धार्थाविष्णुविष्णुविष्णुविष्णु-भक्तिर्मणकावृतिः विश्वमुग्धोपरिशामाधासाधाराङ्गत्वापुष्यमि-धारास्वा ॥ ४ ॥

5. Also prasthā, indriyā, dravindā, viçvadevyā, dīrghā, viyā, viçvā, vātā, tvā, bhāṅgurā, karṇakā, vrshnīyā, sugopā, rksámā, aghā, satrā, varshā, pushpā, meghā, prā, svā.

For each of these words, the commentator cites a single example. For prasthā, prasthāvad rathavāhanam (iv.2.56), the only case. For indriyā, indriyācāte puroddāpan (ii.2.77): half-a-dozen cases of this word occur in the text, and several of indriyāvin (e.g. i.6.24: ii.1.63: vi.2.106); the latter word, however, is not separated in the pada-text. For dravindā, dravindacatath kurute (v.3.112), the only case. For viçvadevyā, viçvadevyācāte sōdatrā (i.4.11): the word occurs also at iv.1.61. For dīrghā, dīrghādhiyo rakṣhamānah (ii.1.114), the only case. For viyā, viyāvantaḥ abhimati-śāham (i.2.7): the same theme is found in other passages, as are also its comparative, viyāvāt-tura (e.g. i.7.63), and superlative, viyāvāt-tama (ii.4.21), in which the shortening of the d is not authorized by the Prátiṣṭhaknya, since, in the division, it does not stand next before the pause: and the pada-text reads accordingly. For viçvā, viçvāmitrasya sāktam bhavati (v.2.334: G. M. omit.

4. citrā ity asmin1 avagrahe 'nyasovo vakaraparo' vibhāge hrasvam āpadyte. yathā: cit...... citre 'ti kim: mitr......: vopara iti kim: citr......

1 G. M. etasmin. 2 G. M. vop-. 3 G. M. om.
the last word); the same word occurs in other passages (iv.3.22; v.2.334, 10.2; 4.22), as also in the compound viçvámitramadagní (v.4.113), where, as the division is viçvámitra-jamadagní, the ð is not shortened; and we have further the themes viçvámitram (e.g. i.1.111), viçvávant (iii.503), viçváraj (i.3.21), and viçvássah (i.4.17; p. viçvá-sáham). For vátā, vátāvad varshán (i.4.71), the only case. For tvá, tvávato maghonah (ii.2.128; p. tvá-vatāh): the Rik pada-text does not shorten the ð of this word. For bhángurá, bhángurávutáh (i.5.64 and iv.1.25). For karnaká, sární karnakávay etayá (i.5.76 and v.4.75; G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For vrshniyá, vrshniyávutas tama (iii.5.62-3). For sugopá, sa sugopátamó jánah (i.2.112; p. sugopa-tamah: G. M. omit the first word); the Rik pada writes sugopá-tamah. For rksádá, rksádábhyañ yajushá (i.2.33 and iii.1.14). For aghá, aghávád evá 'nam antar eti bhútan (iii.1.172; p. aghá-çvád: G. M. omit the last two words); the Rik and Atharvan pada-texts write aghá-acça: the themes aghánya (e.g. i.2.91) and aghá-yant (ii.3.141) are also found in the Sanhítá. For satrá, satrájítañ dhanajítam (i.1.13; p. satra-jítañ): the word satrá occurs repeatedly (e.g. i.6.121) uncompounded, and maintains its long final in the pada-text also. For varshá, varshádván júhotí (ii.103; p. varsha-hvám). For pushpá, pushpáçváñ supíppaláh (iv.1.44 and v.1.510). For meghá, megháyate sváhá (vi.5.111; p. meghá-yate; in the same division occurs also megháyishyate, which is not divided: megháyant is found at iv.4.51). For prá, právanebhih sajosahas (iv.2.43; p. pra-vanebhih); the Rik pada-text writes this word pravana, without separation; other words beginning with prá are prásaḥ (e.g. i.3.146; p. pra-sahá), práçgá (i.1.345), práscaca (vi.5.111; not divided in pada-text), prákáça (i.8.18; also not divided), and právra (iv.6.22 et al.; also not divided). And for svá, svádhiyam janyatá sádayac ca (i.3.146; p. svá-dhiyam): but this the Rik pada-text writes svá-ádhyam.

6. Also ishtá, after loka and eva.

The commentator cites the two cases: som amunshmiñ loka ishtápártena (iii.3.8 twice; G. M. omit the first word), and sa tv evé 'shápárti (i.7.32; p. ishta-párti). Then, to show that ishtá after other words uncharged, he quotes prati jághry enam ishtápárti sañ srjethám ayam ca (iv.7.135; p. ishta-párti: W. B.

5. ity desha avagraheśho antyaśvaro vibhāge vyăñajana-pára hrasvam āpastyate. yathá: prá-sá: indr: 
vá: víc-vá: dir: vír-vá: vá-tá: 
trá: bhett: sár: vír: sa: rks-tá: 
agh: satr: varsh: pushp: megh: 
prá: svá: 


omit before enam, G. M. after -pārte); and the same mode of treatment is followed by the pada-text at v.7.7²; which is the only other case I have noted. The ground of this difference does not appear. To show, further, that only ishta shortens its ठ in the defined position, the passage sākhād eva prajāpataye (v.1.2⁴) is given.

7. Also caktī, rathī, tvishi, vāci, rātri, oshadhī, āhuti, vyāhṛti, svāhākṛti, hṛdadūni, caci, citi, cronī, prṣṭhi, pūti, abhi, carshāṇi, pari, adhi, pāri, caturī, vishū, vasū, anā, hāni, su, vibhū—all these, as first members of a compound.

To the passages cited by the commentator I add, as above, notice of other cases which I have found in the text. For caktī, the sole instance is caktīvanto gabhīrāh (iv.6.6³). For rathī, rathī- 
tamānu rathānām (iv.7.15⁴). For tvishi, sasphājārya tvishimāte 
pathanām (iv.5.2¹: W. B. omit the last word, G. M. the first). For vāci, te vāćimānta ishmināh (ii.1.1¹² and iv.2.11²: G. M. omit the last word). For rātri, rātribhir asubhān (ii.4.1¹): if there are other cases, I have failed to note them. For oshadhī, oshadhibhūyo vahatam dāhbeto (i.1.5⁵: G. M. omit the last word): I have noted half a dozen other cases, but they are not worth reporting. For āhuti, āhutībhir anāyājeshu (ii.6.9¹). For vyāhṛti, 
etābhir vyāhṛtibhīh (i.6.10² and v.5.5⁵). For svāhākṛti, svāhākṛtibhīyoh preshyo 'ty āha (vi.3.9⁵: G. M. omit the last two words). For hṛdadūni, svāhā hṛdadūbhīyāh svāhā (vii.4.13: G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For pacī, vīgāvā rāpā 'bhi cashte pecī 
bhīh (iv.2.5⁴-⁵: W. B. omit before cashte). For citī, citībhīyaṃ 
upāyān (v.7.5⁷). For cronī, cronībhīyān svāhā (vii.3.1⁶⁴): another 
case is found at v.7.15. For prṣṭhi, W. B. give prṣṭhībhīr di-
vam (v.7.17), but G. M. read prṣṭhībhīyāh svāhā (vii.3.1⁶¹). For pāti, pātignadhasyād pahatayā (ii.2.2¹). For abhi, abhihrot ghrī 
vaṃ cetati tmaṇā (iii.5.1¹¹: G. M. omit the last two words): we 
have also abhishāh at ii.3.2⁶ (p. abhi-sāh). For carshāṇi, mitra-
syā carshāṇidṛhtah (iii.4.1¹¹ and iv.1.6⁴): another case at i.4.16. 
For pāri, viracantam parināsām (ii.2.1²⁶; p. parināsāṃ: com-
pare rule vii.4). For abhi, abhivāsām yā hiranyāṅ asmāi 
(iv.6.9²: G. M. omit the last word). For pāri, pārīnahasya "pe 
(vi.2.1¹; p. pārī-nahasya: compare rule vii.4). For caturī, ca-

6. loke: eva: ity evampūrva ishte 'ty asmin' grahane² 'ntyasvaro vibhūge vyājanaparā hraṣvam āpadyate, yathā: sam...... sa...... evampūrva iti kim: prati...... ishte 'ti kim: sāk.......

¹ G. M. etāminā. ² G. M. avagrahe.
trayato hantā (i.6.5\(^3\) and iv.2.1\(^2\)). For vishā, vishāvān vishāvantaḥ (vii.4.3\(^4\)) another case at vii.4.8\(^2\). For vasā, aramatir vasā-yuk (iv.3.13\(^6\)). For anā, anāruddha nakshtram (iv.4.10\(^2\)); we have it also in the compounds anāyāja (e.g. ii.6.9\(^4\)), anābandhya (e.g. ii.2.9\(^7\)), anākāca (e.g. v.4.1\(^8\)), and anārv (v.7.23). In the further compound of the first, prayājāntyāja (e.g. i.7.1\(^1\); p. prayājā-andāyājan), the shortening is not authorized, since in it there is no division after anū. Appealing to rule i.53 as his authority, the commentator adds, as contemplated by the present rule, ananāyājām prayānyam (vi.1.5\(^3\); p. anantu-yājām). For hanā, hanābhūyān svadhā (vii.3.16\(^1\)). For sū, sūyacasinī manave yaçasyā (i.2.13\(^2\)); sūyacasa occurs more than once (e.g. i.7.5\(^2\);\(^3\)). For vībhā, vībhādāvne (iii.5.8\(^3\),\(^9\)).

The commentator notes that the specification at the end of this rule defines the whole mass of words thus far enumerated as collectively avagraha (i.49), 'first members of compounds.'

8. Also avā, sacasvā, nudā, mrda, vardhā, cikshā, rakshā, adyā, bhava, bhajā, yatā, carā, pibā, nā, dhāmā, dhārayā, dharshā, gā, vardhayā, bodhā, atrā, tatā, muścā, ačasyā, prasvā, hi sītā, tvām tarā, janishvā, yukshvā, achā.

Henceforth we have to do only with independent words, the category of avagrahas, or former members of compounds, having been exhausted by the foregoing rules. There is cited in illustration, for avā, avā no deyā kṛpa (iv.1.4\(^1\)). For sacasvā, sacasvā nah vasayāye (i.5.8\(^3\)). For nudā, pra nudā nau sapatnā (iv.3.12\(^1\), thrice, and v.3.5\(^1\)). For mrda, W. B. give mrda jārīte (iv.5.10\(^4\)), but G. M. read mrda no rudra (iv.5.10\(^2\)): I have noted no other case. For vardhā, vardhā no amavac chavaḥ (ii.6.11\(^3\)). For cik-


1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. sūtrāt. 4 G. M. ins. apy. 5 G. M. 'ktil. 6 G. M. 'mucayah. 7 B. vīcesah.
shā, cikṣāḥ no asmin puruḥata yāmāni (vii.5.74: W. B. omit the last two words): it is found again at iv.6.25. For rakṣāḥ, rakṣā ca no adhi ca deva brāhi (iv.5.102 and vii.5.24; G. M. omit the last two words): the form occurs also at ii.3.141. I have pointed out in the note to the first rule of the chapter that a passage (i.4.24) in which rakṣāḥ appears as euphonic alteration of rakṣah before a sonant consonant ought to be somehow excepted here. For adyā, adyā devān jushatamah (iv.6.75): also at ii.1.116; iii.4.112; iv.6.26. For bhavā, bhavā pāyur víco asyā adabāhā (i.2.141: G. M. omit the last two words): other cases are not infrequent; see i.1.141; 4.32; iii.2.52; 4.101; iv.1.72; 2.51, 74; 4.42; and likewise ii.6.121, where bhavā, standing at the end of the first division of the anuvāka, is situated vibhāge, and loses its ā even in the saṁhitā-text. For bhajā, ā gomati vrajo bhajā team nāh (i.6.121: W. B. begin at vraje): another case at iii.3.92. For ya- trā, yatā naro marutāḥ (iii.1.118): other cases at iv.4.41; 6.64, 72. For carā, pra carā soma duryān (i.2.101). For pibā, pibā somam indra mandatu (i.4.145: G. M. omit the last word): another case at i.4.19. For nā, rāpavo nā ha debhū (i.2.142 6): in connection with this word, the commentator runs off into a lengthy discussion, which I defer to the end of the note. For dhāmā, dhāmā ha yat te ajāra (iii.1.118): we have dhāma, plural, in saṁhitā also, at iv.6.52; 7.134. For dhārayā, bhikṣapate dhārayā vasāni (i.3.71 and vi.3.61): other cases at iv.1.54, 72. For dharmā, W. B. have dharmā māṇushān abhīyāh (i.3.81), but G. M., dharmā māṇushān iti ni yenakti (vi.3.63). For ghā, uta vā ghā syātāt (i.1.141): there is another case, if my manuscript reads correctly, at iii.4.116. For vardhyā, tam agne vardhyā team (iv.6.51): other cases are at i.5.52; iv.2.44; 7.135. For bodhā, bodhā no asya vacaso yuvishṭha (iv.2.34: G. M. omit the last two words). For atrā, atrā te rāpam (iv.6.73): other cases are at iv.6.72, 82. For tatrā, tatrā ratham upa caggam (iv.6.68). For muñcā, pra muñcā svastaye (iii.2.83): again at iv.7.157. For aṣṭaṣṭhā, ekas teṣṭhā ṛṣṭhā uṣṭhā (iv.6.93). For prasva, sapta yantrā prasva ghrtesta (i.5.33 and iv.6.55). For sthā after hi, dpo hi sthā mayobhucah (iv.1.51: v.6.14; vii.4.194); and, as counter-example, to show that the correction takes place only after hi, pratishtha vā ekaviṣṇaḥ (v.2.36 et al). For tarā after team, agne team tarā mṛdhaḥ (iv.1.93), with the counter-example antarantar taptacard bhaśati (vi.2.27: G. M. omit the last word). For janished, jan-
shvā hi jenyo agne (iv.1.34 and v.1.45: G. M. omit agne). For 
vyukshvā, vyukshvā hi devahātanān (ii.6.11* et al.): other cases at 
iv.2.9*: v.5.31*3. 
For acha, acha nakshi dyumattamah (i.5.6*3 and 
iv.4.4*8): other cases at i.7.10**: ii.2.12*: ii.11**: iv.2.4*2 twice; 4.4*2 
(if my MS. is correct; the Rik reads acha); 5.1*: 6.7*: but the 
compound achaśāka (vii.1.5*5) is left undivided and unchanged.

The occasion of the commentator's delay and discussion over 
the word nā is given by the fact that the pada-text of the Tālti-
riya Sanhitā (unlike that of the Rik and Atharvyan: see note to 
Ath. Pr. iv.39) divides the word prānāh thus: pra-anāh. Hence, 
when we read in the Sanhitā, as in the passage which he quotes, 
prānā vā aṇācayah (vi.4.4*: W. B. read simply prānā vā), which 
occur in various other places; e.g. v.3.8*2, he fears that, having 
this division in mind, we shall be misled into believing that the 
specification nā of the present rule applies to prānā, because we 
are taught in the first chapter (i.51,52) that a word cited in any 
rule comes equally under that rule when phonetically altered, or 
preceded by a. He sets aside this difficulty, however, by the arbi-
trary dictum that it is not permitted to vary the same word in 
both ways at once—that we may accept the altered form only of a 
vocable which is actually quoted entire, not of one made by the 
prefixion of an a to one so quoted: hence, he infers, the present 
rule does not apply to [the anā of] prānā, as it begins with a. 
But a further objection is interposed: in that case, why does it 
not apply to the part anāt of the compound, in which is no altered 
n? He replies, because of the absence of a long vowel in samhi-
tā, in a word wearing this form—or, as would seem a better 
statement, because of the absence of any such word in samhitā as 
anā (for anāḥ) with a long vowel as its final. The second objec-
tion, in fact, is a wholly futile one, scarcely worth the trouble of 
bringing up and setting aside. The original difficulty is one grow-
ing out of the extension of the leading rule in the chapter to cases 
of final a in samhitā where a visarjaniya has been lost after it 
(see note to rule 1). The answer has a somewhat quibbling aspect, 
but the rule of interpretation which it involves is in accordance 
with that adopted in one or two analogous cases elsewhere.

9. Also aḍhā, in agni and yājya passages.

'yaṁ vidhiḥ. tarhi cīktātābhāvād anā ity asye 'ḥgyaṇgasaya'
kiṁ na syād ayaṁ vidhiḥ. evāntrapasya samhitāyāṁ dirghabhā-
vāt. dha—: brh—: dhar—: uta—: tam—: bo-
dhā—: atrā—: tat—: pra—: ek—: sap—:
dpo—-: hi ti kiṁ: pra—: agne—: team iti kiṁ:
ant—-: jan—-: yuκ—: acha—

1 G. M. ins. ity. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. ktip; B. om. pada. 4 B. om. pada. 5 W. ins. ve. 6 G. M. vāikṛtasya 'bh. 7 B. G. M. om. 8 B. G. M. -yā.
The commentator’s first care is to define what parts of the Sanhitā are styled agni and yājya. The former name, he says, designates those mantras which celebrate Agni—namely, the fourth kānda: by the latter are intended the concluding anuvākas; or sections, of every prācna, or chapter, from the beginning of the Sanhitā to the third prācna of the fourth kānda, inclusively; and, besides, the eleventh anuvāka of prācna six, kānda two (i.e. i.1.14; 2.14; 3.14; 4.14; 5.11; 6.12; 7.13; 8.22: ii.1.11; 2.12; 3.14; 4.14; 5.12; 6.11; iii.1.11; 2.11; 3.11; 4.11; 5.11: iv.1.11; 2.11; 3.13—in all, twenty-three anuvākas). The name agni does not occur again; the yājya’s are the subject of further prescription below, in rules iii.11, ix.20, xi.3. The compound agniyājya (neuter singular) is justified by a simple reference to Pāṇini’s rule (ii.2.29) defining a copulative compound.

The passages cited in illustration of the rule are adhā hy agne kroṭak (iv.4.14), adhā ca naḥ yarma yacha dvibhārh (iv.5.10: G. M. omit the last word), adhā te samnam imake (ii.6.114), and adhā yathā naḥ pitaror (ii.6.124: W. B. omit the last word): I have noted no other cases. As counter-example, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is quoted adhāme ‘ti tad vishnave ti prāyachat (ii.4.124: W. B. omit prāyachat), where adhā stands for adhāh: see, for the bearing of the exception, the note upon the introductory rule of the chapter.

10. Also kutrā, dakhinendā, svenā, hantana, jagāmā, ruhema, vidmā, rāhyāmā, caikrā, kshāmā, starimā, bharmā, varshayathā, irayathā, arithā, pāthā, athā, sinacathā, janayathā, jayata, ukshatā, avata, yātā, cmunā, kṣunā, bikrtā.

The commentator’s illustrative passages are: for kutrā, kutrā cid yasya samṛtāu (ii.1.113: G. M. omit the last word). For dakh-
shinenā, dakshinenā vāstini patiḥ sindhānām asi (iii.4.114; G. M. omit after vāstini). For svēnā, svēnā hi vṛtrā cāvasā jaghantha (vii.4.15; B. omits the last word; G. M. the last two). For hantā, tapasā hantānā tam (iv.3.134). For jagāmā, ā jagāmā para-syāḥ (i.6.122). For ruhemā, arṣavāntām ā ruhemā svastaye (i.5.115). For vidmā, vidmā te agne tredhā trayāni vidmā te (iv.2.21; G. M. stop at agne, thus instance only one of the two cases; there are two more in the same verse): also at i.7.132: ii.6.114. For rdhyomā, rdhyomā ta udāh (iv.4.47). For caḥrāmā, caḥrāmā kac candā "gah (iv.7.156): other cases at i.8.3: ii.6.122: iv.1.111: 6.83. For kshāmā, kshāmā virendhā virudhāh (i.3.142: iv.2.122: G. M. omit the last word): other cases at ii.6.124: iv.7.124. For starimā, sushtarimā jūshānā (v.1.112): here the application of rule i.51 becomes necessary. For bharemā, anho- nuce pra bharemā mūnishām (i.6.123; G. M. omit the last word). For varshayathā, yuvān erṣhitān varshayathā puniṣnānā (ii.4.82; W. B. omit the first word). For iyayathā, ud iyayathā maruṭah (ii.4.82). For ārithā, yoner udāritha yate tam (iv.9.64). For pārtā, kshaye pārtā divo vimahasā (iv.2.112). For athā, athā somasya prayaṭi yuvābhāyān (i.1.141: G. M. omit the last word): other cases are numerous, namely i.1.131 twice; 5.62, 11.2; 6.42 twice; 7.131; ii.3.142; 6.122; iii.1.112; 4.116; iv.2.114, 4.4, 5.3, 6.12, 6.34 twice; 7.138; and, as I doubt not, at the end of ii.2.112, where, however, the present svāhitā-text reads atha, because the word stands vibhāge. For sīncathā, yatrā naro marutāh sīncathā madhū (iii.1.118). For jānyathā, āpo jānyathā ca naḥ (iv.1.5; v.6.14; vii.4.194). For jāyatā, upā pre tā jāyatā nara sthīrāh (iv.6.44: G. M. omit the last word). For ukṣhatā, ā ghtam ukṣhatā madhuvarnam (iv.3.138). For avatā, asmān u devā avatā havēshā (iv.6.44): another case at iv.2.6.4. For yātā, devā ratāhīr yātā hiranyayāiḥ (iv.7.121: G. M. omit the first word). For ērnuṭa, maruṭa ērnuṭa havām (iv.2.112). For ḫṛnuṭa, savatsarāya ḫṛnuṭa bṛhnam namāh (v.7.24). Finally, for bīhṛtā, māte va putram bīhṛtā sv enam (iv.2.32: W. B. begin at putram).

भरता यात्रासु 111

11. Also bharatā, in yāṭyā passages.

G. M. om. 2 W. avag; G. M. om.
Which are the sections called yājya has been pointed out above, under rule 9.

The cited passages are: bhāratā vasuvittamam (iii.5.114), bhāratā jātavedasam (iii.5.115), and pārvyain vaco āgnye bhāratē bhrat (iii.2.111; G. M. omit the first two words), which are all that the text contains. As counter-example, to show the necessity of restricting the change to yājya passages, is quoted esha vo bhāratē rājā (i.8.102,122), where bhāratē stands for bhūratah. If the text contained a bhāratē as instrumental of the participle bharant, it would come more properly under the action of the rule, and would have a better right to be specifically excluded; but I have not found such a form anywhere. Respecting bhāratē as standing in saṅhitā for bhūratah, see what is said in the note to the first rule of this chapter.

12. Also attā, bhāratā, anadatā, taratā, tapatā, juhutā, vocatā, amuñcatā, cṛtā, ghushyā, janañyā, vartayā, sādayā, pārayā, diyā, harā, bhārā, apā, sasādā, srjā, tishtā, and yena.

The cited passages are: for attā, attā haviṁśhi (ii.6.122). For bhāratā, dādyāsa bhāratā maḍayantah (i.4.22 and iii.1.114). For anadatā, samprayatār ahāv anadatā hāte (v.6.12: W. B. omit the first word). For taratā, suo ruhānās taratā rājānśi (iii.5.42: G. M. omit the first word). For tapatā, gharmaṁ na sāmanā taptā suvetkābhī (i.6.122: W. B. O. [O. begins in the comment to this rule] omit before tapatā). For juhutā, pitre juhutā viśeṣakarmane (iv.6.24). For vocatā, viṣe devaśo adhi vocatā me (iv.7.142: G. M. omit to adhi). For amuñcatā, padi shitām amuñcatā yojātrā (iv.7.151). For cṛtā, ayasmayan vi cṛtā bandham etam (iv.2.52). For ghushyā, parushparu anu ghushyā viṣastā (iv.6.94). For janayā, manur bhara janayā dāivyan janam (iii.4.22,37). For vartayā, tābhīr a vartayā punah (iii.3.101). For sādayā, sādayā yajñāṇ sukrasya yondu (iii.5.112 and iv.1.32). For pārayā, agne team pārayā navyo āsmān (i.1.144: all but W. omit the last word). For diyā, brhaspate pari diyā ratheṇa (iv.6.42-2: the text reads diyā, as the word stands before the division between the first and second fifty of the section): another case is iii.1.116. For harā, nihāram in ni me harā nihāram

11. bhāratā ity āsmin' grahanē 'nyasvaro yājyāvishaye' viḥāge vyājanaparo hṛscam āpadyate, yathā: bhāra..... pūr..... yājyāṣe iti kim: esha.....

1 G. M. etasmin. 2 B. avagrahesve. 3 G. M. yājyāyam, and put before the preceding word.
13. Also ucmasi, krayi, krdhi, crudhi, and yadi.

The quoted examples for these words, being the only ones which the text contains, are as follows. For ucmasi, te te dhûmani ucmasi gamadhye (i.3.6.2: W. B. O. omit the first three words): here, as ucmasi stands at the end of a division, or vibhage, its ī is short in the accepted text. For krayi, rudra yat te krayi param námā (i.8.14.2). For krdhi, krdhi se asman aditeh (iv.7.15.7: W. B. O. omit the last word). For crudhi, imam me varuna crudhi havam (ii.1.11.6). For yadi, yadi bhûmi janayan (iv.6.24).

14. Also sù, tû, nù, mithù, makshù, and ù.

The cited passages are as follows: for sù, mo shù na indra (i.8.8). For tû, aù na upa gantana (i.5.11.4-5): there are two other cases, i.7.13.3: ii.2.12.7, both after ā. For nù, etacany na rane (iv.6.1.2). For mithù, gatrany asind mithù káh (iv.8.9.4: G. M. omit the first word). For makshù, makshù devavato rathah (i.8.22.8). For ù, a part of the manuscripts give two examples,


\(^1\) W. av.; G. M. grahâshè. \(^2\) O. begins here.

13. ity\(^1\) etesv\(^2\) anavagrahâshe\(^3\) antyasvaro vibhâge vyaparvā hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: tē: rudra: krdhi: imam: yadi:

\(^1\) G. M. om. \(^2\) G. M. esthr. \(^3\) W. av.; G. M. om.
15. Also an, when unaccented, and preceded by vi or ut, in a word containing no spirant.

This rule applies simply to the compounds vyāna and udāna, in which the long a of the radical syllable is treated by the pada-text as the effect of an irregular prolongation. The words are instanced by the commentator in their full pada-form, vyānāye 'ti vi-anāya (iii.5.8 et al.), and udānāye 'ty ut-anāya (iv.2.9) et al.). In the same manner, prānāya and apa-anāya are divided into pra-anāya and apa-anāya. As regards the treatment of this group of compounds, the different pada-texts are somewhat inconsistent and somewhat conflicting. The Atharvan pada (see Ath. Pr. iv.39) divides vi-āna and sam-āna, without correction of the radical a, but leaves prāna and apa-anā undivided. The Rik pada does not divide prāna: I do not know that any of the others are Rik words. The White Yajus, again (Vāj. Pr. v.33,36), divides apa-āna and sam-āna, but not prāna. The consistency of the Taittiriya gākhīnāh is to be commended; less, perhaps, their assumption that the a of āna is a mere Vedic irregularity, requiring restoration to a corrector form. They also, it may be remarked, divide prānātha (iv.1.41) into pra-anātha.

The commentator goes on to cite counter-examples, proving the necessity of the restrictions imposed by the rule. To show that an is to be shortened only after vi and ut, he gives yad ātur eva tene'yam (vii.3.1: W. B. O. omit the last word), and paryānīyā havanīasya (vii.1.68). To show that only an, not a followed by any other consonant, is shortened, he quotes yad rukmani vyāghārayati (v.2.7x), and udānāya prthivīm jirādā (i.1.93: G. M. omit the last word). To show that the an must not be accented, he gives aceyakārmanā vyānāt (iv.2.10x), and nīśāṭhā pātīm uddānāya (vii.5.88). Finally, to show that the presence of a spirant in the word prevents the correction, we have pathā madhor dhārā vyānaçuḥ (v.7.73: all but W. omit the first word), and udāniṣuḥ mahīr iti (v.6.1x).

The question is now in point, how complete is this rehearsal of the cases of prolonged vowels occurring in the Sanhitā; or, how closely does the pada-text which it assumes correspond with that
found in the existing pada-manuscripts? As regards the latter point, I am unable to speak with certainty, of course, without the possession of a pada-manuscript, and its careful examination throughout; but so much as this I can say—that, having referred a liberal selection of the most questionable cases to Dr. Haag at Munich, for verification in his pada-texts, no instance of a discordance between these and the Prātiṣākhya has come to light. Among the cases referred were several in regard to which I was beforehand very confident that I had caught the authors of the Prātiṣākhya in fault. Thus yojā, in the refrain yojā na indra te hari (i.8.51.12) which is shortened to yoja in the pada-texts both of the Rik (by Rik Pr. vii.7) and the White Yajus (by Vāj. Pr. iii.100), remains yojā in that of our Sanhitā. Again, eva occurs six times in our text with its final lengthened (viz. at i.8.22: ii.1.11: iv.2.92: 3.132: 7.15: v.2.80), as it does also not infrequently in the other Vedic texts (as noticed and provided for in their Prātiṣākhya: see Rik Pr. vii.12.19; viii.20: Vāj. Pr. iii.123: Ath. Pr. iii.16, note, I.1.c.): but the Tāittiriya pada reads in each case eva. Once more, in the passage tava dharma yuvopyama (Rig-Veda vii.89.5; Ath. Veda vi.51.3; Tātt. Sanh. iii.4.115), the pada-texts of the Rik and Atharvan read dharma (I do not find that the case is noted in the Rik Pr.; in the Ath. Pr. it would fall under the comprehensive rule iii.16), while that of our Sanhitā has dharma, like the sanhitā-reading.

I will add, as received from the same quarter, a few words respecting which a question might naturally arise as to how they were treated in the pada-text. Separated, without correction of the long vowel at the end of their first member, are uttārā-vat (v.4.85), sahasā-van (i.6.126), malmalā-bhavant (i.4.34), vrshā-kapi (i.7.132), such copulative compounds as indrā-varunayoh (ii.5.122) and agnā-vishnā (i.1.12), and ārṇā-mradas (i.1.111: while, nevertheless, we have ārṇa-mradas at i.2.22, the pada-reading agreeing in both cases with that of the sanhitā: where the Calcutta edition gets its authority for reading ārṇāmradas and ārṇāmradas is more than I can imagine).

15. vi 'ty evampārva utpārvo vā "n ity esha' svaro 'nudātto 
'nāshmanaty' āśimarohite pode vartamāno vyañjanaparoh pada-
dānu vartamānatvāt pārvapadena vibhāge sati hrasvam āpadyate.
evampārva iti kim: yad...... pary....: nakārah kimarthah:
yad...... udā...... anudātta iti kim: vičv...... nesh......
anāshmanat 'ti kim: pathā...... ud......

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣākhhyacivara-ne 
trītiyo dhyāyoh*. 

*G. M. ins. ákara. 1W. āshm. *G. M. -de. *G. M. add prīkṛṣṇyā na-
mah.
Not separated, and therefore, of course, without correction of the vowel, are such words as rtāshāt (iii.4.7¹) and turāshāt (i.7.13⁴), also traśhtimant (i.2.5²), anyādṛc (i.8.13²), ubhayādat (ii.2.6³), arātiyant (i.6.1¹) and arātiyan (vi.4.15), atikāca (i.2.2²) and prākāca (i.8.18), avadṛṣṭa (ii.1.8³) and prādṛṣṭa (ii.1.3¹): I doubt not: my information is deficient for this word), upānah (v.4.4⁴), nīvāra (iv.7.4²) and nīhāra (iv.6.2²), and purānavah (i.3.7¹).

There is not, as in the other Vedic texts, any restoration of a theoretically correct short vowel which is not strictly a final or initial: thus we read in pada-text, for example, vāvarthe (i.4.20), sasahat (i.3.14⁷), and uśhāsam (iv.4.4²).

Many of these items constitute striking peculiaries of the Tātiṣṭrapa pada, and its careful study and comparison with the other works of its class would undoubtedly bring to light much that is curious.

CHAPTER IV.

CONTENTS: 1-4, introductory; 5-54, rehearsal of cases of pragrahas, or uncombining final vowels.

1. Now the pragrahas.

A simple heading to the chapter, and explained as such by the commentator. The same subject is treated by the other Prātiṣṭākhya, at Rik Pr. i.18-19, Vāj. Pr. i.92-98, Ath. Pr. i.73-82. It occupies here a great deal more space, because the Tāit. Pr. avoids on principle the mention of grammatical categories in its rules, and is at infinite pains to catalogue, word by word, what the other treatises dispose of summarily, by classes. A rule in a later chapter (x.24) teaches that all the vowels here rehearsed and defined as pragraha are exempt from euphonic combination. The term pragraha is peculiar to this treatise, the rest using instead pragraha.

2. No former member of a compound is pragraha.

As the former member of a separable compound (avagraha: i.49) is regarded and treated as an independent pada, the rules declaring certain final vowels pragraha would apply to the finals

1. athe 'ty ayan adhikāraḥ: pragrahā ucyanta ity 'etad' adhi-krtah vedītvayam ita' uttaraṁ yad vakṣhyānah.

¹ W. om. ² G. M. om.
of such members, but for this prescription to the contrary. The commentator cites rules 5, 6, 36, 37, 49 of the chapter as needing the restriction of their application here made, and quotes from the Sanhitā in illustration tāññānapāṭh asurāh (iv.1.81: the tāññ of tāññānapāṭh would otherwise be praṇāhā by rule 5), agoaṛghaṁ yajamāṇaṁ (vi.1.101: agoaṛghaṁ would fall else under rule 6), aṇīsomaṇā mā (ii.5.22: it is implied that the pada-text would write aṇī-śomaṇa, bringing the word within the sphere of rule 36; such compounds are not divisible in the other Vedic texts), and devede puroṇvede kuryāt (ii.2.92: the pada writes devede, so that both members would be declared alike praṇāhā by rule 49). The present precept is therefore declared to be one making exceptions in advance to the rules specified.

3. Only a final is praṇāhā.

Or, as the commentator paraphrases, the end of a word is entitled to the designation praṇāhā. He cites, as example, the phrase devate samṛddhyātī (ii.1.93). The necessity of the rule, he explains, arises out of the fact that the following rules, in part—for example, rules 5, 6, 33—describe certain letters or syllables as praṇāhā without further limitation, and it is desirable to specify that they bear that character only when final. This in answer to the criticising inquiry “whether a letter not final can also be praṇāhā?”—that is, as I understand it, whether this predicate is not in the nature of things restricted to finals? But now a yet more troublesome objection is raised. The limitation to finals, urges the interpellator, is otherwise assured; for the word api of the next rule, in the sequel of this one, brings into action the principle “continued implication is of that which is last” (i.58). The objection is wholly futile and inept, both as implying that false interpretation of the rule appealed to to which attention was directed in the note upon it, and as attributing to api a mysterious force to which it can lay no claim whatever. Instead, however, of showing the


3. padasyā 'ntaḥ praṇāhāsanjño bhavati. yathā: devā-. atra "ha: kim apaddanta 'pi praṇāhā syat. ato 'cyate: aṅkāraḥ (iv.5) ity uśiśēna vakṣhyati: okāro 'sāṅhitā kāraṇyaṇja-naparāḥ (iv.6) iti: ci yatpraṇāhā (iv.33) iti ca: apaddanta-yo "kāraṇyaṇo 'kāraṇya ciṣabdasya va praṇāhāteyam mā bhūd iti.
objection to the door, the commentator proceeds elaborately to confute him. "We reply, not so: specification of finality is appropriate where there is a congeries of several letters; here, on the other hand, there is indication of a single letter. If the matter in question were the euphonic alteration or elision of a and the other letters treated of, a final would be designated in virtue of the principle quoted: but here it is a simple case of application of the term pragraha, not of an affected nor an affecting letter: hence continued implication has no force."

4. It is followed by iti.

This is the interpretation of the commentator, who declares that the "also" (api) brings in by implication, from the first rule of the preceding chapter, the specification vibhage, 'in case of separation,' or in the pada and other artificially divided texts. As example, he cites ubhe iti (i.4.22 et al.: G. M. add devate iti, ii.1.9a et al.).

If such be its real meaning, the rule is a very anomalous one, as giving a single direct prescription respecting the mode of construction of the secondary texts. These are elsewhere only referred to or implied, in a more indirect manner. I should therefore prefer to translate 'even when followed by iti'—that is to say, a word here defined as pragraha in the ordinary text has that character also in the other texts before iti, not being combined with the latter.

5. A long a is pragraha.

1 G. M. grahaya. 2 B. O. eshe; G. M. -bhit. 3 G. M. uttarasa ya sū-. 4 G. M. -vāhakah. 5 B. O. anta. 6 G. M. ins. eva. (?) G. M. 'nyapratyaya uktah. 7 G. M. -ha iti sam-. 8 B. O. om.

4. apiśabdah siñhāvalokanena 'tha 'dāv uttare vibhage (iii.1) ity atra vibhāgopadam anvādiṣati: so yam pragraho vibhāga itiparo bhavati. yathā: 9 ubhe iti. itiśabdah paro yasmād asāv itiparāh.

9 G. M. -jam. 10 G. M. ins. devate iti.
The commentator adds the limitation "if long in pada-text," the final ā is universally pragraha; referring, in justification, to the cases treated of above, in rule iii.14, of an u irregularly lengthened in saṁhitā. His examples are hanā vā ete yajñasya (vi.2.113; W. B. O. omit the last word), vāsantikāv rdā ākāraḥ ca (iv.4.111: W. B. O. omit after rdā), and harinasya bāhū upastutam janima tat te arvan (iv.2.81: G. M. omit the last four words; the others, the first word).

6. Also an o which is not the product of euphonie combination, if followed by a or a consonant.

Of words exhibiting in pada-text, as well as in saṁhitā, a final o, there are (apart from the theme go, which occurs only as first member of a compound, and therefore, by rule 2 of this chapter, does not require to be regarded in the determination of pragrahās) two classes, the one composed of vocatives from themes in u, the other of words whose final a or ā is combined with the particle u. The present rule deals, in general, with the former class; the one next following, with the latter class. The right of the vocatives in o to be treated as pragraha is a very dubious one, and is not unequivocally supported by the Pṛitiṣṭakhyā; for to say that such words are pragraha before a or a consonant is not to distinguish them perceptibly from the euphonic o which comes from a final as; since this also is not capable of combination with a consonant, and does not necessarily absorb a following initial a. The only instances in which a vocative in o exhibits a pragraha character are the three which are cited under the next rule (i.4.27: vi.7.24: vi.5.83); the cases in which it is regularly changed to av before other vowels than a are much more numerous: namely, before tridge, at i.4.39: ii.2.124: 6.111: vi.4.33: before ā, at i.2.128 before u, at i.2.132 twice; 6.122: iii.2.101: before e, at i.4.123. I have noted but two cases in the text where such an o stands before initial a without absorbing it; they are found at i.3.81,147. And there are the same

5. akāraḥ padántah sarvatra pragraho bhavati: padassamaye vartamānāḥ, yathā: hanā..... vās..... har..... padassamaye vartamānā iti kim: sātunāmīthāmakṣhād (iii.14) ity ādi.

1 G. M. omit after mithū.

6. asāṁhitā okāra 'kāraparo vā vyājanaparo vā pragraho syāt. yathā: vad..... vish..... asāṁhitā iti kim: so..... 'pra..... evampara iti kim: vish..... saṁhitānimittaḥ saṁhitāḥ: na saṁhitto 'saṁhitāḥ: akāraḥ ca vyājanam ca 'kāravyaṇjane: te pare yasmāt sa tatho 'ktaḥ.

1 G. M. om. 2 W. B. O. om.
number of cases—namely, at ii.5.12⁵ and vi.4.3⁴—in which it causes the elision of a following a.

The commentator's citations in illustration of the rule are vadh-má hi súno aśī (i.3.14⁷), and viśno havyān rakṣasavas (i.1.3). To show the necessity of the limitation asámhitā, he cites so brvacit (ii.1.2⁴ et al.), and pra so agne (iii.2.11: omitted, however, by W. B. O.), where so is the samhitā reading for saḥ; and, to show that the prescribed quality belongs to the vowel only before a or a consonant (the lacuna of W. B. O. extends through this explanation), he gives us viśnavo e'hi 'dam (ii.4.12³).

For the teachings of the other Prātiṣṭhākyas respecting this class of asserted pragrahas, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.81.

7. As also, when preceded by s, m, h, d, th, and pit.

The anuvṛtti of this rule is even more blind and equivocal than usual. Instead of bringing down either the subject or predicate of the one preceding, we are to bring down both, only with the exclusion of one of the modifications included in the former. The meaning is, that an original o, preceded as here specified, is pragaha even when followed by other vowels than a. The commentator is in error in saying that ca implies okāraḥ from above; he should have said okaro 'sámhitā.

As above remarked, this rule chiefly concerns the class of pragrahās composed of words whose final vowel, a or o, is combined with the particle u. Of these, ato is vastly the most numerous, occurring about two hundred and fifty times in the Sānhi-tā. Before a it is met with twenty times, always without occasioning elision; before other vowels, twenty-nine times, always uncombined. Along with it, tatḥo is had in view by the rule, as presenting a final o after th; it is found but once, in the passage cited by the commentator (see below). The only word showing o after s is so, found only in two passages, as noted below. After m, we have o both in mo (in two passages, once before sh; at i.8.3; the other is cited by the commentator) and in imo, which latter is found only before a (iv.3.13⁸), and so does not necessarily come within the purview of the rule. The other words of the class occur before consonants alone, and are, therefore, here made no account of: they are o (once, i.4.33), to


⁹ B. om.
Of the remaining specifications of the rule, the ā is made for but a single case of the exclamation ho, which the commentator quotes: 
upahātārās ho āty āha (ii.8.73); the d is for the vocative indo, which occurs twice: indo indriyā-vatāh (i.4.27), and indo āty āha (vi.5.83); the commentator quotes the latter passage; the pīt is for the vocative pītā, only found once, as cited: sa no mayobhāh pītā vičaśva(v.7.24-5): W. B. O. omit the first three words. These three, as was noted under the preceding rule, are the only instances which the Sanhitā affords of vocatives in o showing an uncombinal quality.

The commentator's explanation of the rule is "the o is here specially distinguished in order to the prescription of its quality even in the case of absence of the sequent determining circumstances before stated." As examples of words whose ending is combined with u, after the consonants specified, he gives so evāt 'shāt' tātāya (ii.2.97; 5.57), mā bher māro mā evām (iv.5.101), and tātho eva 'ttare nir vupet (iii.4.97: W. B. O. omit after uttare). His counter-examples are cātakratav ud vaiçam iev (i.6.123: G. M. omit iev), and pra so agne (iii.2.111): but G. M., which have given the latter passage under the preceding rule, here substitute for it mā so asman āvahāya (v.7.94); their separate application is manifest.

The treatment by the Prātiṣākya of words ending in o is awkward and bungling to a degree quite rare or wholly unknown elsewhere in its rules. We should be justified in inferring from its statements that o, to, u, u, and p were not regarded as pragrahas at all, nor the vocatives in o except under the conditions and in the places specified, and that (if the commentator's explanation of rule 4 is accepted) they are not written with āty in the pada-text: while, doubtless, in every pada-text of the Black Yajus, as in those of the other Vedas, each word is treated uniformly, whether it happen to exhibit its uncombinal quality in sanhitā or not. Through the rest of the chapter, it will be noticed, the words mentioned are defined as pragrahas, without regard to the circumstances in which they may stand in the text.

8. Now follow cases of e and i.

This is a heading for the remainder of the chapter, excluding all other vowels than final e and i from the action of its rules. The words exhibiting such finals are, of course, mainly duals, and are by the other treatises simply defined as such, with immense saving of trouble.

8. athe 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: ekārekarāv pragrahatvena vidhi-yete āty etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam.

9. Asme is pragraha.

The example cited by the commentator is, according to W. B. O., asme te bandhuh (i.2.7); according to G. M., sampatte gor asme candrāṇi (also i.2.7). Neither exhibits in sanhitā the pragraha quality of the word, as is done at i.7.13\(^3\) and elsewhere: asme is not uncommon in the Sanhitā, occurring twenty-nine times.

10. Also tve, when not the final member of a separable compound.

The office of the word iti in this rule is differently explained by the two versions of the commentary: W. B. O. say that it indicates the quality of a separable cited word (they mean, doubtless, of an inseparable); G. M., that it indicates pragraha quality. Each interpretation is as good, and as worthless, as the other. The commentary is not infrequently at much pains to put some special, even wonderful, significance into iti when found in a rule; and generally with as little acceptable result as here.

The pronoun tve occurs seven times in the Sanhitā (at i.3.14\(^2\); 4.46\(^1\): iii.1.11\(^7\); 5.10\(^1\): iv.2.7\(^3\); 6.5\(^4\): vi.1.8\(^3\)), exhibiting its pragraha-quality in sanhitā only once (at iv.2.7\(^3\)). The commentator's instance is tve kratum api (iii.5.10\(^1\): G. M. omit api); and his counter-instance, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is anāgāstī asi tve tūrāsoh (ii.1.11\(^6\): G. M. omit tūrāsoh), where the pada-text reads anāgāh-tve: aditi-tve.

9. asme ity asmin\(^1\) grahane 'ntyasaravah pragraho bhavati. yathā; asme......

\(^1\) G. M. et asmin.

10. itiṣabdu inçyagrahanatvām\(^1\) dyotayati: aninçgyāntas tve ity esha cābdha pragraho bhavati. yathā: tve..... aninçgyānta iti kim: anā..... inçgyasā 'nta inçgyāntah: ne 'ntyānta 'ntingyāntah.

\(^1\) G. M. pragrahatvām. T. W. B. O. write inçy- throughout.
11. Also devate, ubhe, bhágadhe, úrdhve, viçákhe, grúge, ene, medhye, trune, trdye, kaniñike, párve, çive, co 'ttame, evo 'ttare, çipre, rathaniare, vatsarasya rúpe, virúpe, vishúre, sadohavirdháne, adhishacae, ahorátre, dhravrate, stutacastre, rksáne, akte, arpite, rauvate, pänte, pratte, vidhrte, anste, acaïdre, bahule, pürve, kruñdhvañ sadane.

For the pragrahas catalogued in this rule—all of them dual cases of feminines and neuters—the commentator quotes illustrative passages as follows. For devate, devate samrdthâyai mårtram (ii.1.93: the last word in G. M. only). For ubhe, G. M. have acaïdre bahule ubhe: yjàcasvatti sañcasathámi (iv.1.32); but W. B. O., blunderingly, ime eva rasená 'nakti (vi.3.112: B. O. have ubhe for ime): the word occurs also in other passages. For bhágadhe, bhágadhe bhágadhá asmái (ii.5.66): also in the preceding division of the same anuvéka, and at v.5.97. As counter-example, to show that dhe (itself a pada, bhág-a-dhe) would not have anwered the purpose alone, we have agna udadhe (v.5.91: pada-text, uda-dhe). For úrdhve, úrdhve samidhá ñ dodháti (ii.6.63 and vi.2.319). For viçákhe, viçákhe nakshatram (iv.4.102a): and as counter-example, to show the necessity of including the vi (of viçákhe), we have tasmint sahasraçákhe, stated to be found “in the text of another school.” About a score of such alleged citations from “another text,” assumed to have been had in view by the authors of the Pratîcákhyâ in constructing their rules, are given in various parts of the commentary (five of them in the comment upon this rule): they will be put together, and their bearing discussed, in an additional note at the end of the work. For grúge, antár grúge tam devatå (vi.2.84: only G. M. have devatå): the word also occurs at i.2.149. The next two words, ene and medhye, occur in the same passage, medhye evåi 'ne kuroti (vi.2.91), which the comment quotes, in W. O. giving medhye last, after the rest, by way of justifying the order in which the two words stand in the rule; but B. G. M. read the whole passage as it stands in the text, and G. M. make the rule read correspondingly medhye ene (T. has, like the others, ene medhye). Ene is also found in one or
two other passages (iv.6.24: vi.2.91 again; 3.98). For trūne, asani-
trūne hi hanā aho khulu (vi.2.113: only G. M. have the last two
words). For trāde, saṇātra dhārtā (vi.2.113). For kāṇīkār,
and atirātrā kāṇīkār āgnīsthottāvat (vi.2.98: W. B. O. begin
at kān)-; the same word occurs twice more in the next division.
For pārve, pārave parahsamānav (vii.3.103): it is found a sec-
time in the same division. For cīve, pītārā somyāsah cīve
no dyāvāpphitā (iv.6.64: W. B. O. begin at cīve). For co'ttame,
vekārā ni co'ttame upa dahātā (v.3.78: only G. M. have the last
two words): and, to show the necessity of the ca, sannvatsara
samādyo 'ttame māsi (vii.5.31). For eco 'ttare, tatho eco 'ttare
nīvapet (iii.4.97): and, to show why eva had to be included in
the rule, nāi 'ti shodacy uttare tena (vii.1.43: only G. M. have
tena). For cīpre, pītāc cīpre asepaya (i.4.30: W. B. O. begin
with cīpre). For rathainare, yad bhūdrathainare ancarjevah
(vii.5.32: only G. M. have yad): the same compound occurs in
several places elsewhere. For vatsarasvya rāpe, sainvatsarasya
rāpe dmuvanty (vii.5.14). For virāpe, samanasā virāpe dhāpa
tyete (iv.1.104; 6.52; 7.123). For vishārāpe, vishārāpe ahanā dyāvār
īva'si (iv.1.113: W. B. O. stop with ahanā). The necessity of
including in the rule, besides the pada rāpe, the words vatsarasaya,
vishu (of vishārāpe), and vi (of vi-rāpe) is proved by the citation
of arākhitain dṛṣa dā rāpe annam (iv.3.132), where rāpe is loca-
tive: and the commentary adds the remark (wanting, however, in
the South-Indian MSS.), "the separate specification of the word
rāpe is to be looked upon as for the sake of distinct enunciation."
For sadhavārhdhāne, sadhavārhdhāne eva sam minoti (ii.5.58): the
compound occurs twice more, at vi.2.62; 5.14. To justify the
inclusion of sadhā, the commentator quotes uparavā havārhdhāne
khāyante (vi.2.114); but the case appears to him one not to be so
easily disposed of, and he enters into an elaborate discussion of it,
which I defer to the end of this note, in order not to interrupt the
connection. For adhishāvane, hanā adhishāvane jīvā (vi.2.114):
it is also found in the preceding division of the same section, and
at iv.7.81. The adhi is justified by reference to savanesavane bhī
gṛhātā (vi.4.114; 6.113). For āhārātre, āhārātre prā 'vicān
(i.5.97): the word occurs not infrequently elsewhere. The passage
atirātre paḍukāmasya (vi.6.114) is given to account for the inclusion
of āhāh; this implies, of course, that the Tāttiriya pada-text treats
the word as a separable compound, āhāh-rātre. For dhāravrate,
dyāvāpphitā dhāravrate āvinnā devi (i.8.125: G. M. omit the last

prativēsahanam uccāranavispaṭhāttham' drāṣṭṛavam': sad-
...... sada iti kim: up...... nanu padagrahaṇesha pa-
dāṁ gamyeta (150) iti sāmarthyaḥ 'dhāvirdhāne ity ekapa-
aya' eva kāryaśiddhiḥ: sadahpadāṁ vyartham. māi 'cam: pa-
dagrahaṇa stahāntare" bhinnarāpasya" sambhāvadvāyānīvit-
veshanāṁ sārthakam bhavati": bhinnarāpatevabhāve tu codyam
etad bhaveti" nanu tuhari devate iti padagrahaṇasya stahāntare"
word); and, to account for the inclusion of dhṛte, yasya vrte pushtipatīḥ (ii.1.11). For stuta-astre, stutāstre evī 'tena duhe (v.6.8: G. M. omit the last word): it occurs again at vii.3.13. This time, resort is had to "another text" (pādhāntaram) for a passage to explain why the rule does not say simply āstre: it is ārdhve āstre pratishtihite. For rksāme, rksāme vāi devebhyah (vi.1.31): the word is found twice in this division, and also at vi.5.9: 0.7.4. Here, again, a passage in "another text," brahma sāme pratishtihite (G. M. omit the last word, and B. O. omit the sā of sāme), is appealed to in justification of the rks. For akte, pu- rāravā ghnena 'kte vrshanaṁ dadhāthām (i.3.71 and [except pur- rāravāḥ] vi.3.59): W. B. O. omit the first word, B. also the last). For aprte, dyāvāprthivy bhuvaneshe aprte (iv.7.132: only G. M. have the first word). For rācitte, pāıkararāicite sāmāni (i.8.13 and iv.4.23): the same compound is found again at iv.3.22. For pūrte, the different recensions give different examples: W. B. O. have ishtāprte saṁ srjethām (iv.7.138); G. M., ishtāprte kṛṣṇatā (v.7.75): I have noted no other cases: for the treatment of the word in the pada-text see the note to iii. 6. For pratte, pratte kāman amūdayain duhāte (v.4.9: G. M. omit the last word). Forividrte, again, W. B. O. have vidhrte sarvatoḥ (vi.4.103), and G. M. taśmān nāśikāya cakshūsikā vidhrte samānā (ii.3.82), and the vi is justified by an alleged citation from "another text," agni- dhṛte (G. M., however, omitting the agni, thus leaving it to be un- derstood that the simple word dhṛte is found elsewhere not pragraha). For aprte, satyārte avapayān (v.6.14). For achiḍre, achiḍre bahuhe ubhe (iv.1.32: only G. M. have ubhe), which answers also for bahuhe: it is the only passage containing either word. For pārvahe, pārvehe pitarā navaśabih (iv.1.114: W. B. O. omit the last word): another passage beginning with the same word is the subject of rule 23 of this chapter. Once more a word, pratha- maje, is cited from "another text," in order to explain why the rule does not say simply je (since the pada-text writes pārve-je). For kṛṇudhvam sadāne, finally, we have the sole passage in which it occurs, girbhī kṛṇudhvam sadāne rtsya (iv.1.114: G. M. omit rtsya), with the counter-example apāṁ tvā sadāne sadāyām (iv.3.1: G. M. omit the last word), to show the necessity of kṛṇudhvam.

To return, now, to the long word sadahavirdhāne. The objection is raised, that its part sadah is unnecessary, and that it would

soma... iti bhinnarāpatvāda vīpeshanena bhavātivayam: tac ca nā'asti. ucyate, devo ity akhandapadasyai 'va kāryavidhānādd atra vīpeshanām na yujyate: akhandavidhānam iti katham pratiyate: te ity asya te mā patim (iv.42) ity ādinā prthakhka- randā iti brāmah: nāir 'caṁ havirdhāne ity asyā "khandatvādyotakāṁ " kincid apy" asti yena sadahapadavāyartham ṛtametā". hanā... adhū ti kim: sav... aho... ahar iti kim: ati... dyāv... dhṛte 'ti kim: yasya... stu-
have been sufficient to say *havirdhāne* simply; for rule i.50 teaches us that, in citations of *padas*, the cited *pada* alone is to be understood, not any collocation of words or letters phonetically equivalent with it; and *havirdhāne* is here a single *pada* (the compound being divided *sadal-havirdhāne*, while its latter member, occurring by itself as a non-*pragrahā*, is written *havih-dhāne*, and so is a congeries of two *padas*). It is replied: not so; a distinctive addition is properly made to a cited *pada*, in case of its occurrence in a different form in another passage; though the objection would hold good, were it not for such occurrence in a different form. But this explanation is not suffered to pass without challenge. In that case, retorts the objector, a distinction ought to be added to *devate*, because it occurs elsewhere in a different form (made up of two independent words), as in *soma deva te matividah* (iii.252.3); and no such addition is made. The answer is, that no distinction need here be applied to *devate*, because its treatment is defined as of an undivided word: and, if you ask how its indivisibility is established, we reply that rule 42, below, treats of *te* as a separate *pada* in the various situations in which it is *pragrahā* [whence the inference is clear that it is here an inseparable part of the word *devate*]; while there is nothing whatever to show in like manner the indivisibility of *havirdhāne*, and so to prove the addition of *sadal* superfluous. The implication is, that if the *pada dhāne* happened to be described elsewhere as *pragrahā* after certain other *padas*, of which *havih* was not one, then we could be sure that *havirdhāne* here meant a single undivided *pada*, and its mention by itself would be enough; while, as things are, one cannot be certain that its part *havih* is not, like the *vi* and *vishu* of *virāpe* and *vishurāpe*, a distinctive addition.

---


---

12. Also ami, cakshushi, kārshni, devatā phalguni, mushiti, dhī, nābhī, vapaçrapani, ahani, jannani, summini, sāmanī, vāishnavi, āikshavi, darvi, dyāvāprthivi.

The illustrative passages cited under this rule are as follows. For ami, according to W. B. O., ami vā idam abhāvam (iii.3.71); but according to G. M., ami tvā jahati (iii.2.112). I have noted elsewhere only vi.1.54. For cakshushi, cakshushi vā ete yajñasya (ii.6.21 et al.: G. M. omit yajñasya): the word occurs about a dozen times. For kārshni, kārshni upānahāv upa muñcate (v.4.44; 6.66: G. M. omit the last two words). For phalguni, pitaro devatā phalguni nakshatram (iv.4.101): again in the next division of the same section. To show the necessity of including devatā in the rule, is given yad drityānāṁ sā phalguni (ii.1.22). For mushiti, mushiti karoti vācām (v.2.17 and vi.1.43: G. M. omit vācām). For dhī, pradhī tāv ukthya madhye (vii.4.112: G. M. omit madhye). For nābhī, rajatunābhī vaiyadevāvā (v.5.24). For vapaçrapani, vapaçrapani pra harati (vi.3.96): it occurs also in the fourth division of the same section. As counter-example, to explain the presence of vāpā in the rule, is given, “from another text,” the compound pacaçrapani (or, as G. M. read, bhaccaraçrapani): our Sanhitā has pacaçrapamam at iii.1.32. For ahani, ahani dyāv ur ida’iśi (iv.1.113). For jannani, ubhe ni pāśi jannani (i.4.22). For summini, sumnāya summini (i.1.133). For sāmanī, sāmanī pratishthitā (iv.4.23): also at i.8.132. For vāishnavi, valagahanāvā vaiṣhnavi brhann asi (i.3.22: only G. M. have the last two words). For āikshavi, āikshavi tirape (vi.2.1a twice). For darvi, darvi grīnisha āsani (ii.2.127 and iv.4.46). For dyāvāprthivi, dyāvāprthivi eva svena (ii.1.47): the word is frequently found elsewhere. The commentator gives us here also a counter-example, mahi dyāuh prthivi ca nāh (iii.3.102 et al.: G. M. omit ca nāh), as if the inclusion of dyāuh required justification: but, in ordinary Vedic usage (I have omitted to inform myself in season respecting that of the Tāttviryā pada-text), dyāvāprthivi is inseparable, and therefore itself a single pada.

12. etani padāni pragrāhasanānāni syuḥ. yathā: amī:. caksh-. kārsh-. pit-. devate 'ti kim: yad-. mush-. pra-. raj-. vap-. 'vepe 'ti kim: par-. iti vākāntare: ah-. ubhe-. sum-. sām-. val-. āiksh-. dar-. dyā-. dyāe 'ti kim: mahi-.

1 G. M. ins. ii. 2 G. M. O. bhavanti. 3 W. B. O. om.
vi. The examples given are yāvati dyāvāprthivī mahitvā (ii.2.6), and ācīrme dyāvāprthivī (i.8.12; G. M. invert the order of the two citations): I have noted only two other cases of the application of the rule, at ii.2.12; 6.7.


The case intended to be excluded is quoted by the commentator: paçān eva 'ca rundhe dyāvāprthivī gacca svāhā (vi.4.19; W. B. O. omit the first three words and the last). The specification ni-tym, 'constantly, in all cases,' is intended to exclude also the operation of any other rule under which rundhe might chance to fall: for example, in rundhe yaddā sahasram (ii.1.52), where, as proceeding yaddā, it would otherwise be pragrāha by rule 38 of this chapter. I have noted no other case.

15. Also hari, sahuri, sahuti, kalpayanti, ā prshati, and āhuti are pragrāha.

The cited examples are as follows. For hari, hari te yuñja prshati abhātām (iv.6.94; G. M. omit the last two words): it occurs in toward a dozen other passages. For sahuri, sahuri sapar-yāt (iv.2.11); and the counter-example, to show the necessity of the sa, tam āhuri hvayante (but O. reads tām, B. hvayate, and G. M. ahurivacayati), claimed to be found "in another text." This would imply, of course, that the pada-text reads sahuri—as is in fact the case. For sahuti, sahuti vanatāṁ girah (ii.3.14); and, as counter-example, for the same purpose as the last, hāti punar juhoti (but G. M. read manor for punar), also from "another text." For kalpayanti, adhvarain kalpayanti ārdhvain yajñam (i.2.13; G. M. omit the first word, and W. B. O. the last): another case is found at vi.2.39. For ā prshati, the passage already quoted for hari, yuñja prshati abhātām (iv.6.94); and, to justify the ā, the counter-example prshati sthālaprshati (v.6.12). For āhuti, purodācam ete āhuti juhoti (i.5.234; G. M. omit the first two words, W. B. O. the last): nearly the same phrase occurs again at

13. cakārena 'nvadistadvāyāprthivī ity asmāt pūrvo 'pi 'kāra ekāro' vā padāntoh pragrāho bhavati. yathā: yāv—......

1 G. M. etasmāt. 2 G. M. put before ikāraḥ.

14. rundhe ity antyasvaro' dyāvāprthivī ity etasmāt pūrvo 'pi na pragrāho bhavati: paçān..... nityacābdaḥ prāpyantara-nishedhārthaḥ: rundhe..... vidādi (iv.38) prāptih.

1 W. antasv.; B. O. antah sv. 2 O. vidvārde iti.
i.5.4*. To account for the अ in this word, G. M. simply cite huti
as found in ‘another text:’ but W. B. O. give the phrase huti
tasmād evāh (but W. O. read huti, and B. ādhati: W. also has vivā iti instead of evā iti).

16. As also, the preceding word.
Namely ete, occurring before āhuti in the passage already quo-
ted: purodācam ete āhuti (i.5.2*: W. B. O. here omit the first
word).

17. Also vāsasi, tapasi, and rodasi.
The examples are: vāsasi iva vivasānāv (i.5.10*: the word is
also found at i.8.18); sākshād eva dīkshatapasi iva rundhe (vi.1.12:
the compound occurs again in the same division: only G. M. have
the first two words); and ime vāi rodasi tayōh (v.1.5*: G. M.
have dropped out vāi): the word is not rarely met with elsewhere.

18. As also, the following word.
The passage contemplated by the rule is, as cited in the com-
ment, anv indrañ rodasi vāvaśāne (i.7.13*): there is, I believe, no
other falling under it.

15. ........ 1 eteshv antyasvarah3 pragrahah syāt: harī.....
sah.....: se ’ti kim: tam..... iti śākhāntare: sah.....: se ’ti
kim: hāti..... iti śākhāntare: adhv.....: yunijá.....: ’e ’ti
kim: prśh.....: puro.....: e ’ti kim: huti..... iti śākhāntare.
1 G. M. ins. ity. 2 B. O. antyāh ev. 3 G. M. bhavati. ( *) G. M. ākāreya.
16. cakārāvādadeśāh1 āhuti ity etasmāt pūrva śikāra ekāro vā
padāntah1 pragrahāh bhavati. yathā: pur.....
1 G. M. -anvādīṣṭa. ( *) G. M. om.
17. ........ ity etāni pragrahasajñāni bhavantu. yathā:
vās.....: sāk.....: ime.....
( *) G. M. eShv antyasvarah pragrah bhavati.
18. cakārāvādisṭarodasast ity etasmāt para śikāra ekāro vā
padāntah1 pragrahāh bhavati. yathā: anv.....
1 G. M. ‘tād ro’. ( *) G. M. om.
19. Also vyacasvati, bharishyanti, and naḥ prthivi.

The examples are: vyacasvati saṁ vasāthām (iv.1.3²); a gnim antar bharishyanti jyotishmamantam (iv.1.3²; G. alone has the last word); and dyāvā naḥ prthivi imaḥ sidhra-m (iv.1.11⁴). The needed counter-example for the last is supplied by rejate agne prthivi maktebhyaḥ (iv.1.11⁴).

20. Also in the verses beginning ye aprathetām, urvī, te asya, yaṁ krandaśi, chandasvati, te ācaranti, and antara.

The commentator cites only the beginning of each verse, as a word with pragrāha final occurs at or near the beginning in every case. Thus: ye aprathetām amitebhīḥ (iv.7.15⁶: there are three other cases of pragrāhas in the verse): with the counter-example ye te panthānāḥ (vii.5.24), to show that ye alone would not have defined the verse; urvī rodasi variceah (iv.7.15⁶: G. M. omit the last word: three cases, besides rodasi, already disposed of by rule 17); te asya yoshane (iv.1.8²: one more case: the te is therefore made no account of in rule 42, below): with the counter-example te 'vardhanta svatvāvaco mahītvand (iv.1.11³), to show the necessity of asya; yaṁ krandaśi avasā (iv.1.8⁵: contains two other cases): and, as counter-example, for a like purpose, yam agne prtsu maṛtyam (i.3.13²); chandasvati ushaśā (iv.3.11¹: it contains seven cases); te ācaranti (iv.6.6²: also seven cases): with te no arvanto havanacrutah (i.7.8²) as counter-example, to prove that te alone would not be enough; and, finally, antara mitrāvarṇānārātā (v.1.11²: with four cases).

That is to say, upasthe is exempted from the action of the preceding rule: it occurs but once in the verses forming the subject of that rule, namely in māte 'va putram bibhrtām upasthe (in the verse beginning te ācarantī, iv.6.6): W. B. O. give only the last two words. To show that sīhe would not have sufficiently defined the exception (upa-sthe), the commentator quotes ye pratishthe (prati-sthe) abhavatām (from the verse beginning with urvi, iv.7.15).

22. Also in the passage beginning with īravati, and ending with dādhāra.

The passage in question is found at i.2.13, and contains six pragrahas, whereof one, rodatī, needs no further provision than was made in rule 17, above; it also contains a word in e, manave, which is not pragraha, being excepted by rule 54. The commentator quotes its beginning, īravati dhenumati hi bhūtam.

23. And in the passage beginning with pūrva and ending with ayaṃ.

Of this passage, found at ii.6.7, the commentator quotes the first four words. In order to the better understanding of the following discussion, I set it down here in full, along with the word that precedes it: havyate pūrvaṣe rtavari ity āha pūrvaṣe hy ete rtavari devi devoputre ity āha devi hy ete devoputre upahuto yam. It contains ten pragrahas endings, of which, however, two (pūrvaje) fall under rule 11, above. The word d̐, 'as far as,' in the rule, is declared here to exclude the two limiting words mentioned (cm-

21. etāse ḍkshāḥ 'pasthe ity antyasvarah' padāntah pragraho na bhavati. yathā: māt— upe 'ti kim: ye—
1 B. O. antah sv. 2 G. M. om.
22. īravatiprabhīti 'ravati iti' cabdam arabhyā' dādhāra dādhāra cabdam paryantam īkāra ekāro vai padāntah pragraho bhavati. yathā: īrā—
1 G. M. om. 2 W. B. O. paryantam.
23. pūrvajeprabhātyayamparyantam īkāra ekāro vai padāntah pragraho bhavati. yathā: pūrv— ānapadām marjyādāyān varate. nanu pūrv— ity arabhyā 'yam— ity etaparyantam stalam etatsātvavishayah kim na syāt. ucyate: bhavatpaksha upabhantahpātītāt kṛṇadhanaiḥ sadane (iv.11) iti grahanasya vaiyarthayam 'syāt: tan' mā bhūd iti: tasmād
pare Pāṇini ii.1.13)—an arbitrary restriction, directly opposed by the analogy of the preceding rule; intended, doubtless, to relieve the treatise of the reproach of declaring the word pāreaje a pragraha by two separate rules; but this is a small gain, since the same word occurs a second time in the passage, and cannot there be reached by any such device.

A protracted, not to say tedious, discussion now arises, respecting the sufficiency and propriety of the rule as stated. The first objection is: how do we know that the passage had in view by the rule is not that which begins with pāreaje pitāra (iv.1.11) and ends with ayaṃ purobhuvah (iv.3.21: B. O. omit bhuvah). Because, it is answered, the special citation (in rule 11) of ḍṛṇudhvah sadane (iv.1.114), which occurs within the limits mentioned, would in that case be rendered superfluous. Objection second: the word pāreaje, at any rate, is useless, it having been already made pragraha by rule 11; the rule should read “beginning with varī” (the concluding pada of the separable compound rta-varī). This, too, is repelled: the rule reads as it stands because varī occurs twice in the passage, and the question would arise where the defined limit should be understood to be: moreover, as we are taught (i.25) in case of doubt to take the nearest, we should have to assume as intended the latter of the two, as being nearer to the other specified limit: in which case we should arrive at the untoward result that the pragraha character of the first varī would not be established at all. But now the objector triumphantly retorts, that there are also two instances of pāreaje, and a like doubt as in the supposition last made would arise as to the identity of the one cited, and a like untoward result as was pointed out in connection therewith. Not so, is the defense: pāreaje is not desig-
nated by the rule as a word possessing the defined quality—which would indeed be a superfluous repetition (in view of rule 11); but it means ‘the former je of the two,’ and is given merely as a convenient limit to count forward from! Again: why, at the end of the passage, is ayam pitched upon as limit, to the neglect of upa-
hyātah; for, though this word is found several times in the immediate sequel, yet, in virtue of the principle already appealed to, “in case of doubt, take the nearest” (1.25), its first occurrence would be distinctly enough the one intended. This also is disallowed: to quote the whole compound word upahyātah (pada-text, upa-hyātah) would be to incur the charge of excess; and as for upa by itself, the first member of the compound, though it be a pada, its pada quality is of secondary rank, while that of ayam is primary [the latter being a complete word, but the former only a somewhat artificially separated portion of such]; hence, on the principle “where there is a primary, a secondary is not in place,” it was proper to cite ayam. The answer, however, suggests the further objection that, on the same principle, the first limit is unsuitable [je being also a fragment of a word; and its predecessor ṣvayate should have been taken instead]. That cannot be made good, is the reply; for there is a want of suitableness in the primary word suggested: if you take the primary ṣvayate, then, on the supposition that the definition of limits is to be understood inclusively [a being susceptible of both an inclusive and an exclusive interpretation], this word [as it ends in e] will appear to be cited as a pragraha: which is wrong. And if you urge that rule 54 of the chapter annuls this false inference, we reply that, on the principle “not to touch filth is far better than to wash it off,” it is better not

upe 'ty etavannatrayā "dibbhātasyā" "ncaṣya" padaena gau-
nam; ayam ity asya tu" mukhyam: mukhye sambhavati na gau-
nam iti nyāyād ayam iti yuktān brahmanam. nāv etenāvä ca
nyāyena "dyāvadher" anupapannatā. nā 'yaṃ pakshaḥ: mu-
khyasambhavabhāvatā; tathā hi: ṣvayate iti mukhye svākate
bhīvidhīvyayena tasya 'pi grahaṇāhī" syāt: tāc ca 'nīṣṭam:
ate samānapade (iv.54) iti vacanaḥ etad' anīṣṭam na" bhav-
atti "ti" cet: prakshālanād dhi paṅkasya dārād asparāṇaṁ
varam iti nyāyād ṣvayata ity ucchārya tasya nishedhakathānād
api taduṣṭārānām eva ramanīyaṁ" iti mukhyasambhavabhā-
vastuva" eva: tasmād asmint sūtre 'nupāpptilecā nā 'sti.
to quote *khyate* at all than to quote it and then make it the subject of an exception. The case, then, is one where no suitable primary word is to be found; and not the slightest charge of impropriety can be maintained against the rule as given.

Both parties to this controversy are about equally open to the charge of hair-splitting absurdity; but the objector must be acknowledged to have the right of it so far as this—that the rule is really ambiguous, considering the presence of the two words *pārva* 
j. That *pārva*, as used in it, means 'the former je,' I do not at all believe.

24. Also *ime*, when followed by *garbham*, *upa*, and *eva rasena*.

The passages referred to are: *yad ime garbham adādhātām* (iii.4.3²), *ime upārāsya* (vi.1.3¹), and *ime eva rasena nakti* (vi.3.11²). Two counter-examples are given: one to show the necessity of *rasena* after *eva*, *ima eva* 'smaī lokah' (iii.4.10³), and one to show in general the need of specifying the situations in which *ime* is *pragraha*, *adheavatavya* vå 'ima devåh' (iii.2.2³).

25. As also, in the sections beginning with *krūram*, *apah*, *sajuk*, and *brahma ja*.

That is to say, *ime* in the sections specified is always *pragraha*, even when otherwise followed than by the words mentioned in the preceding rule. The commentator quotes the beginning words of each section, and a single example from each: thus, from the section *krūram eva vā* (v.1.5: only G. M. have the last two words), *rodasyor ity dhī 'me vāi rodasi*' (v.1.5⁴): the only case in the sec-


25. *ime iti caśabdo 'nvādiça: krūram: apah: sajuk: brahma ja: 'etesah anvedakesho ime ity antyasvarah pārvoottaparotinīmit-tābhāve' 'pi pragraho bhaçati. krū-... ity atra yathā: rod-... apō ... ity atra 'me ...' saj... ity atra yathā: etaçā... brah... ity atra yathā: na...: je 'ti kim: brah... ity atra traya... ity asya' pragrahatvam mā bhūd iti.

tion: B. O. begin the citation at ime); from the section āpo varuna-
nya patnayah (v.5.4: G. M. omit the last word), ime evo 'po
dhate (v.5.4¹: there are two more cases in the following divisions);
from the section sațār abdah (v.6.4: G. M. omit the last word),
etāça ime aśvinā saṃvatsarah (v.6.4¹: the only case: only G. M.
have the first word); from the section brahma jajñānam (v.2.7),
na hi ime yajushā ptum arhati (v.2.7¹: the only case: B. O. omit
the last word). The last calls for a counter-example, to show the
need of including in the rule the syllable after brahma: there is
another section beginning brahmavādino vodanty abdhāh (ii.6.5:
B. O. omit abdhīh), which contains an ime not pragrāha: traya
ime lokāh (ii.6.5²: only G. M. have trayāh).

26. As also pūrṇe.

The ca, ‘and,’ in this rule merely brings down the heading of
the last anuvāka named in the one preceding. In that anuvāka,
pūrṇe is pragrāha; to wit, in pūrṇe upa dādhatī pūrṇe evāt 'nām
(v.2.7¹); but not elsewhere, as for example in yo vāi pūrṇa āśiś-
cati (vii.5.6¹).

27. Also dṛḍhe is pragrāha.

The restrictions imposed in previous rules no longer hold good:
dṛḍhe is pragrāha wherever met with. The example given is yena
dyāne ugrā prthivi ca dṛḍhe (iv.1.8³). There is another case at
iii.2.4."³.

28. Also ghni and cakre, when followed by p.

26. caṣabdo brahmajajñānam ity anvādiṣati: pūrṇe ity antya-
vāro brahmajajñānam ity anuvāke pragrāha bhavati. yathā:
pūrṇe.... *asminn anuvāka² iti kim: yo.......
¹ B. O. G. M. om. ² B. O. brahmaja.

27. dṛḍhe ity asminn¹ antyasaśarh sarvatrah² pragrāha bhavati.
yathā²: yena.....
¹ B. O. om. ² B. O. om. ³ B. O. G. M. om.

28. ghni: cakre: ity¹ ete pađe paṃpare pragrāhe bhavataḥ.
vār.......: cakre....... paṃpare iti kim: yad.......: saṃ.......
ghnicakre iti kim: cak.......: ye....... pakārāḥ paro yābhyaṁ
te paṃpare.
¹ G. M. om. ² G. M. -ṣṛhye. ³ W. paḥ.
The examples are: vātraghni pūramāse (ii.5.2⁵); cakre prsthāni (vi.6.8¹); I have noted no other cases. We have then two pairs of counter-examples, to show that these words are prağraha before p only, and only these words before p: the first pair are yad virāpayā vātraghni syāt (vi.1.6⁷) and samidhāna cakre nicā tam (i.2.14²: only W. has tam); the second, śakā bhāumi pāntraḥ (v.5.18) and yeshām ico paçupatiḥ (iii.1.4¹-²).

29. Also nvati.

Two examples are cited: omanvatī te smin (ii.6.9⁴: G. M. omit the last two words), and vṛdhavatī amāvāsyāyām (ii.5.2⁵): also a counter-example, proving that vati alone would not have been sufficient: karnakāvaty etayā (v.4.7³).

30. But not when followed by p.

The case here excepted—the only one, so far as I have noticed—is mārdhanvatī purunvākya bhavatī (ii.6.2²: G. M. omit the last word).

31. Samici is prağraha.

For this word, G. M. cite samici retah niçcañah (v.5.4²); B. O. cite paçcit samici tābhīh (v.2.3⁴); W. gives both passages. The word is met with a dozen times or more in the Sanhitā.

29. nvatī ity antyasvārah prağraho bhavatī. yathā: om.......

vṛdh.... nakāreṇa kim: karn.......


30. sāṁnidhyān nvatī iti 'labhyate: paparo nvatī ity' antyasvārah prağraho na bhavati. yathā: mār.......


31. samici ity antyasvārah prağraho bhavatī. yathā: sam-

1 B. antas; O. antyah s. * B. O. G. M. om.

32. sāṁnidhyāt samici iti labhyate: na khālu samici ity antyasvāro nakāraparāḥ prağraho bhavatī. yathā: sam.......

32. But not when followed by \( n \).

The case excepted is samíci námá 'si \( (v.5.10^1) \). I have noted no other.

33. \( C\iota \) is pragraha, when followed by yat or pra.

The passages had in view by this rule are: \( \text{āıkshāvāt tīrācē ti yad āvāvālah} \ (vi.2.1^2; W. O. omit the first word, G. M. B. the last; and B. has the citation out of place, after the next but one), and prācē pretam adhevaram \ (i.2.13^2 and vi.2.9^3\); besides two other cases before \( pra \) at vi.2.1\(^5\); 3.9\(^6\). The commentator gives in addition a number of counter-examples: to show that \( C\iota \) is not always pragraha, prācē dicām \ (iv.3.3\(^1\) et al.: but W. B. O. read instead \( yā \) prācē dik, which is not to be found in the Sanhitā: prācē dik, without \( yā \), occurs at several places, e. g. iv.3.6\(^2\); to prove the necessity of the \( t \) of yat and the \( r \) of pra, gāur ghrācē yajno devān jīgāti \ (ii.5.7\(^4\): only G. M. have the last two words) and tasmāt paçećat prācē patny anv āste \ (v.3.7\(^3\): only G. M. have the first two words); to indicate that other endings than \( C\iota \) are not pragraha in the situations specified, yad agrīr vajra ekādaśiṇī yad agrāṇā \ (v.5.7\(^1\): only G. M. have the first three words) and prajānane prajānanān hi vai \ (i.5.9\(^1\): only G. M. have the last two words).

34. Also \( āṅ \) mahī.

The passage is mahān mahī astabhāyat \ (ii.3.14\(^6\)). Elsewhere, mahī is not pragraha: e. g. in mahā dyān prthivi ca mahī \ (iii.3.10\(^2\) et al.: G. M. omit the last two words); and even after \( n \) precede by any other vowel than \( d \): e. g. in vayuṇāvid eka in mahī devasya \ (i.2.13\(^3\) and iv.1.11\(^1\)-\(^2\): G. M. omit the last word).

33. \( C\iota \) ity antyasvaro yatparaḥ praparā vā pragrahāḥ syāt: yathā: āıkshē..... prā..... evamārā iti kim: prā..... takārārephābhīyām kim: gāur..... tas..... ci'ti kim: yad..... praj.....

---

1. G. M. bhavati.
2. G. M. om.

34. \( āṅ \) ity etadveśiṣṭe mahāgrāhanī 'ntyasvarah pragrahāḥ syāt: yathā: mah..... āṅ iti kim: mahī..... ākārenā kim: vay.....

---

1. G. M. bhavati.
35. Also the combination of sounds pati.

The commentator explains: wherever there is gruti, i.e., ‘hearing,’ of pati, there we are to understand a case of pragraha-quality. Hitherto we have been dealing only with padas, or complete individual words; but the of pati is uncombinal, even when that audible combination is only a part of a pada. The selected examples are, first, DeVau pati vindate (vi.6.4\(^a\)) and subhas pati idam aham (iii.2.10\(^b\)): only G. M. have the last word, where pati is a pada; then yam acirā dampati vānam agnatah (iii.2.8\(^b\): only G. M. have the first two words) and priyam indrabhartpati (iii.3.11\(^{1}\)), where it is part of a pada: there are a few other cases.

It is remarked at the end of the comment, that, from this rule on, parts of words are also subjects of prescription of pragraha-quality.

\[\text{ग्री ॥ २५॥} \]

36. Also gni.

I have noted a number of cases of gni as dual of agni and its compounds. The commentator gives two: antaragni pacanām (i. 6.7\(^{1}\)), and viṣeṣāmitrajamadagnī vasishthena (iii.1.7\(^a\) and v.4.11\(^b\)).

\[\text{न वियर: ॥ २७॥} \]

37. But not when followed by hi.

The case excepted is that of gni occurring as nominative singular feminine of āindragna: āindragni hi bāhapaṭayā (v.5.6\(^{2}\)). The commentator pleads the occurrence of indragnī havaśahe “in another text,” as justification of the rule, in saying “by hi,” instead of “by h.” But we may question whether the justification is not officious and uncalled for.

\[\text{वैद्रव्यवैषयविवयतापर: ॥ २८॥} \]

35. pati ity asya yatra yatra grutiḥ gravanam asti tatra tatra pragrahatvāṁ viṁśeyam. yathā: DeVau…….. subh…….. grutir iti kim: yam…….. priy…….. ity āddā apiś padāikadeśe pragrahatvāya\(^{2}\).

\(^{1}\) G. M. om. \(^{2}\) G. M. om. \(^{3}\) G. M. -team.

36. gni iti pragraho bhavatī. yathā: ant…….. viṣv……..

\(^{1}\) G. M. om. \(^{2}\) G. M. om.

37. gni iti śāṁśidhyāl labhyate: na khālu gni iti 1 padānto hi- parah pragraho bhavatī. yathā: āindr…….. evampara iti kim: āindr…….. iti śāṁśhantare.

\(^{1}\) G. M. ins. api. \(^{2}\) G. M. om.
38. Also an i or e followed by vid, dvārū, kṛṣṇaḥ, carāvah, and yadā. The quoted passages under this rule have each its counter-example. The first is dhīshane vidā satī vidayethām (i.4.12), a double case; and, to show that vi alone would not have been enough, āpaḥ ca me virudhaḥ ca me (iv.7.51). Next, devi dvārū mā mā (iii.2.41), with dvādaṣa sam padyante dvādaṣa (i.5.75), to prove the need of the rāu of dvārū. Again, yaujñāya "tishthamāne kṛṣnaḥ rāpaṁ kṛtva (vi.1.34): only G. M. have the first word; they also omit the last two words, while B. O. omit kṛtva; and cātvīle kṛṣnavishānām prā 'syati (vi.1.38; G. M. omit the last two words) justifies the h of kṛṣṇaḥ. Again, nivacānau ye carāvāḥ (i.5.101), with ráye ca naḥ svapatyāya deca (v.5.44: G. M. omit deca) to show that ca alone would not have been enough: to prove that more than car or carā is needed, the commentator does not attempt. Finally, we have ajānam nannamāne: yade 'daṁ tāṁ (iv.6.24: only G. M. have ajānam). To this is raised the question whether yatante, as coming before yad a in gṛṇegco yatante yad ākṣiṣhur diyam (iv.6.74: only G. M. have the first word), is not also pragrahā? The answer is an appeal to rule i.50, "in citations of padaś, a pada only is to be understood:" but how we are to know that an integral pada is meant to be signified by yadā, any more than by vi, the commentator does not inform us.

39. But not jāne and ahne, under any circumstances. The passages quoted in illustration of the rule are varṇāya rājne kṛṣṇaḥ (v.5.11), and vanaspatisnāṁ evyāhā kṛṣṇaḥ (v.5.15: only G. M. have the first word): these are both exceptions to the preceding rule, and are the immediate occasion of the
introduction here of this one. But the addition of nityam, 'constantly, in all cases,' excepts the same words from the action of any other rule; for example, of rules 52 and 48, which would otherwise apply in the passages yajñē 'pi kartor iti tav abrātām (ii.6.71) and svarajñē novāhāu (v.6.21).

40. Te and the, however, are pragraha in a word of more than two syllables, if preceded by a or e.

The class of words here aimed at, of course, is composed of second and third persons plural of present and perfect tenses middle of verbs. The commentator quotes several instances: etasmin vā etāv mrjāte yo vidvishānayoh (ii.2.61:2; only G. M. have the first three words, and they omit the last word); yukrā mantināv gṛhyate (vi.4.101); pra prthivyā riricāthēdivo ca (iv.2.111: only G. M. have the first and the last two words); and drūhānā yān nudete (iv.7.152). Then, to justify the requirement of a preceding a or e, we have given us a uṛcayate vā etad yajamānāh (iii.3.81: G. M. omit the last word) of a polysyllabic word, tat pravāde vi shajanti (vi.4.72: see under 1.48) and yad ete gṛhyante (iii.3.61); the restriction to the endings te and the, anuṣayamānā a sādayati (ii.2.57,111).

As to the special significance of tu, 'however,' in this rule, two of our commentator’s three chief authorities, Vararuci and Maharṣiṇa, are reported by him as at variance. The former maintains that it indicates the cessation of regard had to the words specified in rule 38 as occasions of pragraha-quality; the latter, that it prescribes the annulment of continued implication of the exceptions mentioned in rule 39, and of what was there signified by the word nityam. Vararuci’s view is declared the better one, and with good reason—unless, indeed, we prefer to ascribe to the word a general change of subject, from mention of individual words to the description of a class.

40. bahusvarasya padusya sambandhi te iti the iti vā "kāra- pūrca ekārapūrva vā pragraho bhavati. yathā: et.....: yuk- .....: pra.....: drūh.....: evampūrca iti kim: a vṛc.....: trini.....: bahusvarasye ‘ti kim: tat.....: yad.....: tatho iti kim: anu.....: vidādi (iv.38) nimittāsāpekhatānicaritas tu- çabda iti vararucipakshah: māhishyapakshah tu vakhyate: pūroṣtrādtrānāshādhanityaṣaṇabodhaścetānāśpītanuvrtām1 nivārayati: ‘ti: tatra’ vararucimataiḥ rueiram. bahavah svarād yasmin tad bahusvaram: tasya. atra svaračabdopādānāc ca bahusvabdaena evaktihedho viṣṇeyah.

The commentator's final remark as to bahusvarasya is obscure to me.

41. But not cāryāte.

Namely, in the passage cāryāte apibah sutasasya (i.4.18: G. M. omit the last word). An exception to the preceding rule, by express mention of the excepted word.

42. Te is pragraha when followed by mā pātam, namaḥ, enam abhi, vāyuh, garbham, upa, ahas, and tu.

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are: vām ā rahe te mā pātam ā 'syā (i.2.21-2: only G. M. have the first three words), with te mā .'smi. yajñe (iii.2.41), to show the necessity of including pātām in the rule; punas te: namo 'gnaye 'prativeddhāya (i.5.10); only G. M. have the last word), with te na vy ajayanta (v.4.11), to prove that na alone would not have been enough; te enam abhi sam anaḥyatām (ii.5.6), with ta enam bhishajyānti brahmānāh (ii.3.11); W. omits the last word), to justify the inclusion of abhi; te vāyur vy avāt (iii.4.31), with te vācaḥ striyām (vi.1.65), to show why the yuh of vāyuh was needed; te garbham adadhātām (iii.4.31), without any counter-example to prove that ga would not have answered the purpose; te upā 'mantrayanta (vi.1.31); te ahorātayoh (vi.1.31); te tv āva no teṣyē ity āhuh (vii.5.71: G. M. omit the last two words), with te te dhāmānī ugaṃstī i.3.61), to show that t not followed by u is not enough to determine the pragraha quality. Then, as further counter-examples, we have te devaḥ (i.4.101 et al.) in proof that te is not pragraha before other words than those here mentioned; and bhṛad ukṣhe namaḥ (i.4.26), amushīnī loka upa cere (v.3.72), and yanti

41. cāryāta ity antyasvarah pragraha na bhavati. yathā: cār——. pūrvasūtraprāptāv satyāṁ kaṇṭhoktanishedho 'nena' vidhīyate.

1 B. -yah s.  2 O. om.  3 G. M. -treṣa pr.; B. -tre pr.  4 G. M. -kṣyā n.  5 G. M. om.

42. ...... evamparas te iti śabdah pragrahah syāt. yathā: vām:... pātam iti kim: te:... punas:... ma iti kim: te...... te e:... abhī iti kim: ta:... te v:... yur iti kim: te v:... te ga:... te u:... te ah:... te tv:.... uktāreṇā kim: te te...... evampara iti kim: te d:.... iti kim: bhṛ:.... am:... yanti......

1 W. B. O. ins. te.  2 G. M. om.
vā ete savandādyē hah (vii.5.6\(^1\)), showing that only te is praagraha in the situations defined.

These are not all the instances found in the Sanhitā of te as praagraha; one was disposed of by rule 20 above, and at least one or two others come under the action of other rules of this chapter.

43. But not when unaccented, under any circumstances.

That is to say, even in such a situation as would bring it otherwise under the preceding rule. The example quoted is bāhu-bhyām uta te namah (iv.5.1\(^1\)) if the text contains others, I have failed to notice them. The specification nityam has its usual force, as suspending the application of all rules to the contrary, wherever found: for example, that of rule 52, below, in the passage namas te aste āyudhāya (iv.5.1\(^4\)).

44. Ete is praagraha when followed by tanuvāu, vai sam, eva, hi, yajña, pad, and ishtak.

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are: tasyāī 'te tanuvāu (v.7.3\(^3\)); ete vai saṁvatasarasya cakshushī (ii.5.6\(^1\); G. M. omit the last word), with ete vai iddāyā stannā (i.7.1\(^2\); G. M. omit the last word) as counter-example, showing that before vai not followed by sam the word is not praagraha; su ete eva namsyann upā 'dhavat (ii.5.6\(^3\); only G. M. have the first word, and they omit the last two); ete hi ācānām (ii.5.6\(^6\); another case at vii.5.7\(^1\)); cakshushī vā ete yajñasya (ii.6.2\(^1\) et al.: compare also the nearly identical passage vii.2.11\(^3\)); yajñasya hy ete pada atho (v.1.6\(^3\)-\(^4\); W. omits the first word); and yad ete ishtake upadadhāti (v.3.5\(^3\)). Counter-examples would have been in place to show that, in citing the last three fragments of words, the rule had taken no more than just what was sufficient for its purpose; but

43. mā pātam ityādiparo 'pi te ity antyasvaro' 'nudattō nityam praagraha na bhavati. yathā: bāh-..... nityam iti kim: la-kshanāntarapratpasyā 'pi pratishehō' yathā syāt: nā-..... gama-yatobhavatah (iv.52) ity ādīnaś prāptih.

1 O. -yah sv. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. nish. 4 O. G. M. om.; B. antya.

44. ity evamāra ete ity antyasvarah\(^1\) padāntah\(^2\) praagraha bhavati. yathā: tas...... ete...... sam iti kim: ete...... sa...... ete...... cak...... yaj...... yad...... 'evampara iti kim: atha...... ete iti kim: man...... push...... agre...... sap-

1 B. O. ins. etc. 2 O. -yah sv. 3 G. M. om. 4 W. B. O. om.
they are not furnished. The general counter-examples under this rule, like those under the last but one, proving that only ete is praagraha before the words specified, and ete itself before them only, are given by G. M., but omitted in the other manuscripts: they are atha katama ete devā iti (ii.6.93), manuṣta evai 'nam etānī (v.5.61), pushkarapane hy enam upagritam (v.1.44: MSS. -gru-tam), agra yajñapatiṁ dhatta (i.1.51), and saptame pade juhoti (vi.1.81).

पर्व द्योः: ||५||

45. As also, the letter following the two last mentioned.

The "two" of the rule are pad and ishtak; and the commentator makes the further obvious specification that the letter following them is praagraha only when they themselves follow ete, as prescribed in the preceding rule. He quotes the passages referred to: yajñasya hy ete pade atho (v.1.6.9-4: W. omits to pade, B. O. to ete), and yad ete ishtake upadadhāti (v.3.52); adding, to show the necessity of the limitation made by him, the counter-examples saptame pade juhoti (vi.1.81), and tasyās te devi 'shtake (iv.2.92).

स्थायः: ||३||

46. Also one followed by sthah.

There is a natural reason for this rule, sthah being a dual verb, and so, apt to be preceded by a dual noun. I have noted near a dozen cases in the text; the one cited in illustration by the commentator is viṣṇoh nyapitre sthah (i.2.13a). To show that stha instead of sthah would not answer, is given etasmin loke stha yusmānas te 'nu (iii.2.58: only G. M. have the first two words, and they omit the last three).

परस्यभिः: ||७||

47. As also, one following them both.

Following, namely, a sthah and a preceding praagraha word: for example, cilpe sthas te vām ā rabhe (i.2.21: but this citation is wanting in G. M.), and dhīre sthah sithire samācit (iii.2.45). A counter-example, of a word following sthah only, is vrshanāsti stha urvaci (i.3.71).

45. nimittina upari vartamānakoh padishtakcūdbādayoh para' ikāra ekāro vā praagraho bhavati. yathā: yaj------- yad------- nimittina upari vartamānakoh iti kim: sapt------- tas-------

1 B. O. dvayoh padishtak ity etasvo cakārāvādīstayah; G. M. pat ishtakā ity etasvo cakārāvādīstayah dvayoh. 2 B. O. parata. 3 G. M. om.

46. stha ity evam para' ikāra ekāro vā padāntah praagraho bhavati. yathā: visk------- visargena kim: et-------
The commentator then proceeds to point out that the difference in phraseology between this rule and the last but one—devayoh, 'two,' being used in the one, and ubhayoh, 'both,' in the other—indicates a difference of meaning. Above, the two affecting causes (nimitta) specified in the preceding rule, each along with the word affected by it (nimittin), were intended; here, on the other hand, the two aimed at are an affecting and an affected word.

48. Also in the section beginning soma ya sva.

The section in question is v.6.21: it was necessary to add sva, in order to distinguish it from that beginning soma ya pitvma te (i.8.5). It contains thirteen pragrasahas, of which the commentator cites several together: avi dve dhenu bhūmē (v.6.21: G. M. omit bhūmi): three of these, however, would be disposed of by the three rules next following.

49. Also dve.

This word, which occurs about forty times in the Taittirīya text, is, of course, always pragrahā. The commentator cites two instances: dvedve sam bhārati (i.6.82), and yad dve nāpyatām (ii.6.38).

48. soma ya svarājīne (v.6.21) ity asminn anvākā ikāra ekāra vā padāntā pagraha bhavati. yathā: avi..... ity ādi. sve'ti kim: soma ya pitvma te (i.8.5) ity atra mā bhūd iti.

49. dve ity antyasvārah padāntāh suratra pagraha bhavati. yathā: dve..... yad.....

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. O. om.
50. As also, the following word.

The comment instances but one case, a double one: *dve cukle dve krahne marthavanath* (v.3.14: G. M. omit the last word). Of such the text contains more than a dozen, but they are not worth referring to in detail.

51. Likewise the next but one.

The *aati,* 'likewise,' in this rule is explained as bringing forward *dve* from the last rule but one; another application of the "principle of the frog's leap." The cited examples are *dve hy eite deca* (ii.1.9: but G. M. omit this citation), and *dve vadvo devasatre* (vii.4.5). By rule i.48, *devasatre,* though a divisible compound (*pada*-text, *devasatre iti deca-satre,* is reckoned as but a single *pada* for the purposes of this precept: another like case, *dve savane cukravati* (vi.1.6*), was expressly quoted as an illustration under the former rule. At vi.6.4* (dve jaye vindate) is a case where the action of the rule is suspended by a later one, iv.54.

52. Before, and within six words of, *gamayatah, bhavatah* (except when it follows *u*), *tanu yit, akarot, kuryat* (in išī passages), *abrutam, pra varta, astam, stabhnitam, vacayati, bibhrata ta, agniṃ gayatram, tāḥhyām eva, ubhāhhyām, and avāntaram.

Of the words here specified, some are duals, and so would naturally have other duals, with *pragraha* endings, in their vicinity; in other cases, the collocation is purely accidental.

The *d* in the rule is declared to be intended this time "inclusively" (tena saha, 'along with the specified limit;' compare the scholiast to Pāṇini ii.1,13); and the necessity of the specification

50. cakāro dve ity anvādīgati; dve ity etasmāt para ikāra ekāro vā padantah pragraho bhavati? yathā: dve......

1 O. asmāt. 2 B. O. vyāt; G. M. om. 3 G. M. om.

51. ekavyaveto 'pi dve ity etasmāt para ikāra ekāro vā padantah pragraho bhavati? yathā: dve...... dve...... ekena padena' vyaveto ekavyaveto. apiṣabdo dve ity anvādīgati manṭakaputiṇīdyatra.

1 B. O. vāhito. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. om. 5 W. vyavahita.
“within six words” is explained as arising from rule i.30, which would limit the meaning of “before” to “the word standing next before.” This involves a misinterpretation of the rule referred to, which was made for quite another purpose (see the note upon it). No such special and technical ground is needed to justify the terms of the present rule, which are of obvious and incontestable propriety.

The commentator’s example for gamayataḥ is te evā’t nam pratiṣṭhānīgamayataḥ (ii.1.4²): I have noted no other case. For bhavatāḥ, he gives utārāvati bhavatāḥ (v.4.8²); with the counter-example dīkshante ‘tannāmānā ev rū bhavatāḥ (vii.4.8¹); to show the necessity of the restriction imposed by the rule in the case of this word. There are quite a number of other passages where bhavatāḥ assures the pragraha-quality to words in its neighborhood: I have noted ii.2.2³,11ª,5,3.2⁵,3.5,4.4,4,8²; iii.1.2³,9⁵; 5,4⁴; v.4.8³; 5.1²; vii.1.4³; 2.1³ twice. With regard to the limitation anūkārdat, the commentator remarks that although simple absence is the primary significance of its negative prefix, yet another meaning is here assumed, in accordance with the requirements of the case: that is to say, “after a not-ā” is to be understood as “after any letter but ā.” For tantrā yat, we have ete vāi mahāyānāyāṁ ‘nyāya tantrā yat (ii.2.7: I have found no other case); and, as counter-example, to justify the inclusion of yat, paripatayevad ghrnaṇītanānapātavet (i.2.10²: only W, has the last word). For akaraṁ, bhūknavatā agravati yajjānuyāvaye akarot (ii.3.4³: another case at ii.2.8³). For kuryāt, mānavi ścavā dhāyu kuryāt (ii.2.10²: another case at ii.3.3³); with the counter-example āgnaye dātē puroddācam ashtākāpālanī kuryāt (i.5.5²), to explain the restriction to iṣṭī-passages. The iṣṭīs are defined as being “the three praṇās beginning with the tenth, but excepting their final anuvādas” (which have before received the designation yājñā: that is to say, ii.2.1-11; 3.1-13; 4.1-13. There are other passages besides the one quoted proving the necessity of the restriction in question: thus v.4.7: vii.5.5¹. For abhātān is cited te abhātāna varām evnācadvā te (i.5.2³,6³; another case at v.2.3³). For pravartaḥ, havirdhāne praci pravartayaeyah (iii.1.3¹); with the counter-

52. gamayataḥ: bhavato nākārūt: ākāravyatiriktavarṇat param bhavata iti¹: yady apy abhāvo mukhyārthas tathā ‘pi tad anyārthata sevikāt lokasyānāvāt: tanā yat: akarot: kuryād iṣṭiṣhua: iṣṭayo ḍaṣamādyas troyah praṇā uttamānāvako varjitaḥ: abhātān: ity evamparama śa shashāt padāt pārco vartamāna ikāra ekāro vā padāntah pragraho bhavatī. abhividdāv ayaṃ ākārāh: tena sahe ‘ty abhividdīhī. yathā: te.... uṭt.... anūkārūt param iti kim: dīkṣā.... ete.... yad iti kim: pari.... budh.... mān.... iṣṭiṣhua iti kim: agn..... te.... hav.... varte ‘ti kim: te.... ime.... vāiṣṭa.... uṭt.... te.... te ‘ti kim: manm.... ete.... gāya-
example te'dityān sam adhriyanta tvayā pra jānāme 'ti (vi.1.5†: G. M. end at pra), to show why varta was added to pra. For āstām, ime vāi sahā "stām (iii.4.3†: another case at iv.3.10†). For sthabhitām, vaiśvadevāgnimārute ukthe avayathayanti sthabhitām (iv.4.2†). For vēcayati, uttame ādumbari vēcayati (v.1.10‡-2). For bibhratā ta, te eva yajamānasya reto bibhratās tasmāt (v.6.8¶); with the counter-example manmahe yāv ātmance bibhrto yā (iv.7.15†), to show that bibhratā alone would not have answered the purpose of the rule. Doubtless the single case is provided for in this rule rather than in 42, above, because there are cases of to eva in the Sanhitā which it would have made trouble to distinguish properly from this one. For agnīṃ gāyatrāṃ, ete dadvēte ye agnīṃ gāyatrāṃ (vi.3.5†); with the counter-example sadhasthe gnim purishyam (iv.1.3†), to show that the addition of gāyatrām was needful. For tābhyāṃ eva, ete vāi yajñasyā "ajñasyānātīrā tābhyāṃ eva (vii.2.12; 3.5, 2.9, 4.13, 24.4). With reference to this passage, the commentator raises the difficulty that ete, one of the words intended to be determined as pragrāha, is not within six words of eva, one of the two words specified in the rule as conditioning its pragrāha-character within that distance; but he declares it of no account, since what is within reach of any part of the assigned cause (nimittā) is within reach of that cause in its entirety. For, he says, in common life also, a quality belonging to a part is ascribed to the whole which contains that part: for example, people say "Devadatta has an ear-ring," when it is really his ear that has the ring. Truly a most lucid and convincing illustration! The necessity of the eva is proved by the counter-example apa hānasy agne tābhyāṃ patena (iv.7.13†: G. M. omit the last word). For uhhābhāyāṃ, ye dve ahorātre eva te uhhābhāyāṃ (vii.4.4†). Finally, for avāntaram, utṣgye ity āhūr ye avāntaram (vii.5.7†); with the counter-example saṁ te va te hedhā (ii.5.12†), to prove that eva would not have been enough alone.

53. But not grāmī, varcsi, mithuni, māse, loke, dhatte.
These are words which, occurring within six of those mentioned in the last rule, would be *pragraha* if not thus specially excepted. The commentator quotes the passages in which they occur, as follows: *grámy eva bhavati gana vati yájyámu váye bhavatah* (ii.3.3); another nearly identical case is found at ii.2.114; *brahmanvarcasy eva bhavaty ubhayato rukná bhavatah* (ii.3.24); *ataha mithuni bhavatah* (vi.5.86); *párumáse prá yacah táv abrátám* (ii.6.23); *loke pratíthsthanto yañityá devá shadává bhavatah* (vii.4.113); and *dhatte jyotishmantác asmá indá loká bhavatah* (ii.6.24).

54. Nor *ate*, in a single word, nor *ave*, under any circumstances.

After paraphrasing the rule, in a way which shows that he regards the specifications “in a single word” and “under any circumstances” as both alike referring to each of the “parts of words” mentioned, the commentator proceeds to cite illustrative passages, as follows: *ave rundhaté tirátrév abhító bhavatah* (vii.2.63; 4.13, 25, 36); another nearly identical case is found at vii.4.541; *abhásyávate vajránam enam abhí pra vartayati* (iii.2.917); and *andatáya dhársane: ubhásyám utá tē namah* (iv.5.14; B. O. omit the last word, and G. M. the last two). To show the necessity of specifying that *ate* should form part of a single word, he quotes *eva te ubhásyám* (vii.4.43). The limitation *nityam*, ‘under any circumstances,’ is explained in the usual manner, as intended to exclude the operation of other rules besides the one (iv.52) here especially aimed at: for the appropriate examples we are referred to the comment upon rule i.59, where they are given in connection with the illustration of another point.

53. ...... *esthe* antyasvaro gamayato bhavata ityádiparo *pi pragraho na bhavati. yathā*; *grá-...... brah-...... athe-...... pár-...... loke...... dhatte......*

1. G. M. eahv. 2. G. M. om.

54. nishedham cakrá maddicát. *ate*: *ave*: ity anayoh padáikadeçayor antyasvarah samánapade vartamáno gamayato bhavata ityádiparo *pi nityam pragraho na bhavati. yathā*: *ave..... abhy..... anda-..... samánapada iti kím: eva..... otra nityaqabádah prápyantaráparihárórthah udáharanám* *upabandhas tu decahya (l.59) iti sáto prasaúgád uktam. samánaṁ ca tat padaṁ ca samánapadam: tasmánt samánapade*.

*iti tribháshyaratne prátiṣṭhákhyacivevarane caturthò ‘dhyáyah.*

1. O. om. 2. G. M. iti sódá. 3. W. sûtreñá. 4. G. M. om.
This finishes the rehearsal of the words with *pragrah-a*-endings contained in the Sanhitā. As to the economy of the method of their rehearsal—whether it would have been possible to state the facts in fewer or briefer rules—I cannot speak with confidence: it would be, certainly, a thankless task to endeavor to recast them in an improved form. Nor can I, without a *pada*-manuscript, or a much more thorough and detailed study of the text, with the aid of a commentary, than it has been in my power to make, judge absolutely the success of the method followed. It appears, however (with exception of the equivocal treatment of the words in o, pointed out under rule 7), to be complete: my exception of the text has shown me no *pragrah-a*-endings in i and e which are not duly taken account of, nor any case of final i or e not *pragrah-a* as involved in the general rules of the chapter without being duly excepted by special precept. One or two words whose endings are treated as uncombinable without being *pragrah-a* are disposed of in another chapter (x.18).

CHAPTER V.

CONTENTS: 1-2, introductory, relation of *pada* and sanhitā texts; 3, order of application of rules; 4-8, anomalous insertions of a sibilant and d; 9-10, anomalous conversions of r and h; 11-19, anomalous omissions of r, s, h, m, and yā; 20-24, treatment of final n and t before palatal letters; 25-26, before l; 27-31, of final n before a consonant; 32-33, of final h, t, n before sibilants; 34-37, of initial g after consonants; 38-41, of initial h after consonants.

1. The following rules apply in combined text (sanhitā), within the compass of a single breath.

This is an introductory heading to the main part of the Prātiṣṭhānīya—the rules for the construction of the euphonically combined text (sanhitā) from its presupposed material, the pada-text, where

1. athe 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: saṁhitāyām ekapraṇābhāva ity etad adhikrraṇam veditavyam ita uttarānya yad vakyāyaḥ. saṁhitā 'ti ko 'rthah: nānāpadasamānānasamāmyoṣaḥ (xxiv.3) iti 'sūtreṇo 'ktaḥ saṁhitārthahāḥ: parah saṁnikarāḥ saṁhitā 'ti vāyākaranāḥ pāthanti. ekasamutthah praṇa ekapraṇāḥ: tasya bhavaḥ tadbhavahāḥ: tasmin: ity ātreyamataṁ. anyathā 'pi saṁsah saṁgachante ekapraṇāna bhāvyate janyata uccāryata ity ekapraṇābhāvaḥ: ekena 'chāsena yādān uccāryate vedaḥbhāgas tāvān ekapraṇābhāva ity arthah: ata eva 'vasāne padavi-
each word stands separate, as if occurring independently. It is a rule of far-reaching force, applying through many chapters (for an attempt to define precisely how far, see the comment to xxiv.2). The matters treated in the first two chapters—the mode of utterance of elementary sounds, definitions, general explanatory precepts, and the like—were with propriety first disposed of; the separate rehearsal of the pragraha-endings, made in chapter iv., is more questionable, but defensible on the ground that those endings exhibit their pragraha character also in the pada-text, before iti: but the exclusion of the vowels irregularly protracted in sainhitā, as rehearsed in the third chapter, is quite anomalous (see note to iii.1).

The commentator defines sainhitā by quoting a later rule (xxiv.3), which declares it to be “the union of separate words in euphonic combination;” referring at the same time to the rule of Pāṇini (i.4.109), as the account of it given by “the grammarians.” For ekaprāṇabhāve he first gives us Ātreya’s simple paraphrase; but then goes on to explain it more fully, as ‘that which is brought about, generated, uttered, with a single breath; such portion of the Veda, namely, as is uttered by the help of one expiration’—the condition of pada, or separated and euphonically independent words, recurring with the pause that follows the expiration. That is to say, if the repeater of the text has to pause to take breath where there is no regular avasāna, or pause of intonation (such as separates the padas of a verse: its length is taught in rule xxii.13), his last word is thrown out of sandhi with the next, and the end of the one and the beginning of the other must assume their pada form.

Now is interposed an objection: of what use are the two specifications “in combined text” and “within the compass of a single breath”? the former is enough by itself. To this it is replied: if the latter specification were not made, then no pause after a pada would be authorized in the continuous sainhitā arrangement: and if the other were not made, then that respecting the single breath would apply also to the padas; hence doubt would arise as to where any direction to be given would have force: there is, therefore, good reason for the double specification.

dhit. nam sainhitāyām ity etavātāi ‘vā’ ‘lam: ekaprāṇabhāva iti vā ubhayārambhāṇeṇa kīm. ucyate: ekaprāṇabhāva ity anārāhyamāne prārtotaya sainhitāvidheh padāvasānatvāḥ ne’sh yate: sainhitāyām ity anārāhyamāne tu padeśe opy ekaprāṇa bhāva upapadyata iti” vakhyamānaṃ kāryāṃ kva” bhavati ’ti saindēhāḥ syāt: tasmād” asminni” ubhayārambhāne” praya- janam asti.

2. Separation from the text as combined—that is the fundamental text.

I cannot but believe the intent of this precept to be the same with that of the rule which begins the second chapter of the Rik Pr., samhitā padaprauktih, 'the pada-text is the foundation of the samhitā;' but such intent is not readily and distinctly deducible either from the rule itself or from its commentary. The latter explains that hereby is taught the prakṛti, or proper form, of samhitā, the reason being that a later rule (xxiv.5) prescribes as necessary to be understood, among other things, "prakṛti, vikrama, krama." An arrangement which does not deviate from the pada-text as constituted, taken as supreme, that is to be regarded as the fundamental text. By way of illustration is then quoted the whole series of passages falling under the action of rule x.13, below; passages in which the fundamental or pada form of certain words is maintained, against the ordinary rules of euphonic combination: they are svaḥa asy urvi cā’si (i.1.2 a), dhanavann iva prapā asi (ii.5.12 a), sahasrasya pramā asi (iv.4.11 b): G. M. put this citation before the preceding one), pra budhnyā itate (iv.3.16 a), jyā iyā samane (iv.6.6 a), a pūṣṭa eti (ii.4.5 b): W. B. O. omit this, and aminanta eviḥ (iii.1.11 b). No explanation is attempted of the bearing of these examples upon the principle which is laid down in the rule now in hand: we may suppose it to be that, the application of the rules of samhitā being denied in the case of these particular words, they remain in samhitā in their regular or natural shape as shown in pada-text—prakṛtyā, as it is elsewhere termed. And in this office of the precept is to be seen the real ground of its statement, rather than in a provision against the requirements of xxiv.5.

The grand difficulty in this exposition lies in its quiet postulation of avicalitah, 'unremoved, not deviating,' as connective between vidhiḥ and yathāyuktāt. I would sooner recur to the etymologic meaning of vidhiḥ, 'dis-posal, putting apart,' and empha-

---

1 W. vijñeyato vaidhāt; B. -aśe va; G. M. jñeyato vēnā vi. 2 G. M. -dāvau. 3 G. M. -cilinē. 4 W. B. O. -iū s. 5 G. M. om. 6 G. M. -canēnā. 7 G. M. om. 8 O. G. M. pathītān. 9 G. M. anyadrā.
size its prefix vi sufficiently to make it take an ablative adjunct, meaning 'separation from [the state] as combined;' and I have so translated above, though far from being confident that I have found the true solution of the difficulty. Neither vidhī nor its synonym vidhāna occurs elsewhere in the text, although both are frequent in the commentary (see Index), usually with the meaning 'rule, prescription;' not infrequently also 'arrangement, disposal.' The commentator concerns himself finally with the gender of sād, which, he says, comes under the rule already once quoted from the Mahābhāṣya in explanation of 'a like case (under ii.7);' and he points out further that the same principle applies elsewhere—for example, in xix.1.

नतर पूर्विर्वर्त प्रथमम् II 3 II

3. And here, that which comes first is first taken.

That is to say, in the construction of the samhitā text, both the words to be treated and the rules to be applied must be taken up in their order, as they stand in the text and in the Prātiṣeṣṭya respectively. A variety of instances are given to illustrate the working of the principle. First, in bhaksha: ā: iki (iii.2.5'1), the first two words are first combined, according to x.2, and then their result, bhakṣa, is combined with iki, by v.4, making bhakṣe "hi, the true reading; whereas, if the second combination had been first made, forming e 'hi, this would have coalesced with bhakṣa into bhakṣāhi 'hi—which (though in itself, as may well be claimed, the preferable reading) is unauthorized and incorrect. This exemplifies the application of the rule to the order in which words are to be treated; for its application to the use of rules there are three examples. The first concerns the production of the samhitā-reading śaṅnavatyā (vii.2.15) from the pada-reading śatnavatyā: it is accomplished by the successive application of vii.2, which prescribes the conversion of n to ṇ after śat, and of vii.2,

3. tatra samhitāvidhāne pārvampārveṃ padaṃ sūtrāṃ ca prathamaṃ kartavyam, yathā: bhakṣa: ā: iki: ity atra dvīghaṃ samānākṣhayate (x.2) iti dvīghah: ' bhakṣa: iki: iti sthitā ivarṇapaṇa ekāram (x.4) ity ekāre kṛte bhakṣe" 'hi 'ti bhavati: anyathāī 'hi 'ti kṛte bhakṣaḥcābeś samādhyamāne bhakṣāhi 'hi 'ti syāt: tac ca 'nishtam: pūrvapadakartavyatye etad udāharanam. pūrvavātrakartavyatve 'pi vaddhāmah: yathā: shatrigrāmanishpūrvaḥ (vii.2) iti nakārasya nāte kṛte uttamapara uttamaṃ savargiyam (vii.2) ity anena takārasya nāte kṛte śaṅnavatyā iti bhavati: anyathā 'tītamaṃ uttamaṃ (vii.2) iti sūtre prathamaṃ pravṛtte sati śaṅnavatyā iti syāt: tac ca 'nishtam, tathā: vātthū svayamāhī gūrtye 'ty atra ṭanakārapūrveṃ ca takāraḥ (v.33):
which changes $t$ before $n$ to $n$: if, on the contrary, the latter rule had been applied first, changing $v$hat to $sh$an, the former would no longer have had force at all, and the reading would have stood $shannava$t$a$ya. The next case is that in which the words $vat$ and $svayamabhig$ā$tya$ come together (iii.2.8' seven times: G. M. read $vashat$ for $vat$, doubtless by a clerical error). Here, v.33 requires the insertion of a $t$ between the $t$ and $a$, and this inserted $t$ is then, by xiv.12, made $th$; so that we are finally to read $vau$t $svay$:- if the latter conversion were first made, the reading would turn out instead $vau$t $svay$- (since v.33 would not then apply at all, but to the combination $thes$ would be prefixed a $t$ of duplication, by xiv.1,5: the manuscripts, as usual in such cases, do not give these complicated readings altogether correctly: and W. B. even make the blunder of substituting at last $vat$ $svadhā$, apparently having in mind -$vāt$ $svādā$, in the same division). Once more, in the passage $imam$: $vi$: $syāmi$ (i.1.102 and iii.5.61), we are first to convert the $s$ of $syāmi$ to $sh$ by vi.4, and then to duplicate the $sh$ by xiv.1, making $vi$ $shshyāmi$: if the duplication were first performed, making $vi$ $syāmi$, then, by rule vi.4, we should have to read $vi$ $shshyāmi$. Of the three examples thus given, only the first has to do with the form of the text as given in the manuscripts, since these very sensibly ignore the rules for duplication which make up the bulk of the fourteenth chapter of our treatise.

So far as regards the taking up of words for combination in their natural order, the Rik Pr. (ii.2) and Ath. Pr. (iii.38) have rules of like force with the present one.

4. After trapu and mithu is inserted a $ç$ before $c$.

prathama $u$shmaparo $dvitiyam$ (xiv.12) iti sūtra$devayam$ prasaktam: tatra pūrṇasvat $tana$kārapārvag ca takara ity etad eva prathama$ni$ kartavyam$: anyathā "vau$t $svay$am iti" syāt: tace $n$isatkam. athvā: $imam$ $vi$ shshyāmi $ty$ atro $pas$arganishpurvo nuddatte $pa$de (vi.4): svargaporvam vyā$njanam$ "dēvarnām vyā$njanaparam" (xiv.1) iti sūtra$devayam$ prāptam: tatra dvītmasātre "prathame kārye sati" $vi$ shshyāmī $ty$ syāt: tan mā bhād iti $shatavam$ eva prathama$ni$ kartavyam.

pūrṇamporvam iti "vipsā sarvathā" 'vam artham samartha$yatī". 

1 G. M. ins. ātena. 9 W. -dēna na. 8 G. M. om. 6 W. B. O. om. 5 G. M. om. 4 B O. sati. 7 W. O. -ma. 9 G. M. om. 8 W. B. O. om. 10 G. M. vashath; B. vata; O. vatt. 11 G. M. om. 12 0. M. put before prathamam. 13 0. B. B. vata $ti$; O. vata syām iti; G. M. vashatth $svayam$ iti. 14 G. M. om. 15 G. M. -tram. 16 G. M. prathama$ni$ kṛte. 17 G. M. ins. ātena. 18 B. G. M. shshyāmī. 19 G. M. vipasyā sarvatra$ti$ kada bhād $yam iti$ samartha$yanam$; B. vipāsā sarvatratī 'vam artha$yatī. 20 O. sarvatratī.
The passages are *sisān ca me trapuṣ ca me* (iv.7.5*1*), and *mithuḥ carantam upayāti* (iv.7.15*2*): the existing pada-text reads *trapu* and *mithuḥ*, as this rule would lead us to expect. But the right of *trapuṣ* to be recognized as an independent word by the side of *trapu* is assured by the derivative adjective *trapuṣha*, and the close analogy of *manuḥ, manuṣa, manuṣha*.

The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples: one, *vibhu ca me prabhuh ca me* (iv.7.4*1-2*), to show that not every *u* has a *a* added before *c*; the other, *asān mithuḥ kah* (iv.6.9*4*), to show that the insertion is only made before *c*, after the words specified.

5. As also after *su*, before *candra*.

The example quoted by the commentator is *suṣcandra dōsma vispute* (iv.4.4*6*): the word occurs once more, at ii.2.12*7*. The pada-text reads *su-candra*. Counter-examples are: *pra càndra-mās tirati dirgham āyuḥ* (ii.4.1*4*1): G. M. omit the last two words; and *ā ma sucarite bhaja* (i.1.12): their application is obvious.

6. After *sam* is inserted *s* before *kuru*.

The commentator's example is *yajamānah saṁskurute* (v.6.6*4* and vi.5.5*2*). The pada-text reads *sam : kuruṭe*. Counter-examples are *purodāpañḥ alam kuruṣ iti* (vi.3.1*2* : G. M. have a lacuna involving this passage), and *saṁkṛtya chāvākasānam bhavāti* (v.4.12*2*). The text has further *saṁkṛtya* and *saṁkṛta*, but (as is also implied in rule xvi.20) they are read in the pada-text as in *samhītā*, without division, or ejection of the intruded *s*.

1 *G. M. cała-rep.*


1 *G. M. om.*


1 *G. M. om. (9) G. M. om.*
7. And before akurva, after the augment.

The passage is, as quoted by the commentator, to ishūn sam askurvetā (vi.2.34); the pada-text reading sam: akurvata. The counter-example is agnihotrarāṁ vratam akurvata (iii.2.22). As prayya occurs nowhere else in the treatise, we cannot tell whether it signifies distinctively 'augment,' or, as in other of the Prāti-çāhyas, 'affix' in general. The commentator gives a scholastic explanation of the term, as indicating "that whereby the consonants are added unto, are made distinct."

8. After nicā is inserted d before uccā.

The passage is madhyān nicād uccā (ii.3.146); and the pada-text actually reads nicā: uccā. This is a proceeding to which it would be hard to find a parallel in the pada-texts of the other Vedas. To write madhyena for madhyāt just before would be in itself quite as defensible. As counter-examples, we receive lokaman yanti uccāvacāhni (vii.4.36), and nicā tām dhaksā (i.2.142).

At the end of the comment is made the remark "the above are cases of insertion" (āgama, 'accession'). The matter of irregular conversions is next taken up.

9. After asam, r becomes ar.

The passage in which this anomalous change is made is grā-ndam asamarṣyāt (iii.3.82), where the pada-text has, as the rule implies, asam-ṛtyāt. Here, again, we cannot praise the work of the pada text-maker. Nor is the rule of unexceptionable form, for the commentator is obliged to specify that the asam intended is one not made up of the parts of two words (not -a sam); else such passages as kalyānī rūpasamrddhā (vii.1.66), and vahī hy esha

---


8. nicāpārvo dākāra āgamo bhavaty uccāparah. yathā:

madh-..... evampurva iti kim: lok-..... evampara iti kim:

nicā.....

āgama etc.

1. G. M. O. om.
samṛddhāya (ii.2.21) would be included. As counter-example, to show that r, not a syllable containing r, is liable to the specified conversion, is quoted asamitrñne hi hanū (vi.2.11\textsuperscript{2}: G. M. omit hanū).

10. Of ṛcīh, dhūh, and suvah, when first members of a compound, the visarjaniya becomes r, and a following s becomes sh.

The word avagraha in this rule is the locative avagrahena, says the commentator, and applies to each of the specified words taken separately. He supplies visarjaniya, the omission of which, or of some other word answering the same purpose, is rather a serious defect in the rule. The illustrative passages quoted are ity ṛcīhpadaya rea (vi.2.9\textsuperscript{4}; the pada-text reads ṛcīh-padayā), dhanḍhahāv avagrahā (i.2.8\textsuperscript{2}; p. dhūh-sāhāv, and dādhishe swaravān jihvām agne (iv.4.4\textsuperscript{1}; p. suvah-sām: W. B. O. omit the first word of the citation, G. M. the last). The necessity of the specification "when first members of a compound" is shown by the counter-example ye devā devasuvā stha te (i.8.10\textsuperscript{2}: p. deva-suvah: G. M. omit the first two words and the last). ṛcīh shows the same irregular combination also in anācikrkena and sācikrkena (i.6.10\textsuperscript{4}), but these words are not treated as divisible by the pada-text. The commentator goes on to point out the rules to which exceptions are established by this one: viii.23 would require ṛcīhpadaya, and i.x.2

9. asam ity evampārva ṛkāro 'ram vikāram āpadyate. yathā: ḍṛ̥̃h—- tatra' nimittam ekapadastham' viṣṇeyam: anyathā kaly—- vahi—-. ity ādāv api bhānet. ṛkāra iti kim: asam—-.  

1 G. M. O. atra. *B. - dasanāstham.

10. avagraha iti saptamāntam padam ṛcīhprabhṛtibhiḥ pratyekam abhisambādhyate. ṛcīh: dhūh: suvah: ity' etehe avagraheshu visarjaniyo repham āpadyate: ebhyah\textsuperscript{2} paro yadi sākāro\textsuperscript{2} vartate tariḥ shakāram āpadyate. yathā: ity—-. dhūr—-. dād̄h—- avagrahā iti kim: ye—-. kakhapakāra-parah\textsuperscript{3} (viii.23) ity anena "cīshpadaye ti prāptam: "aghosha-paras tasya sasthānam āshmānam" (ix.2) iti dhūsāhāv\textsuperscript{4} suvassām" iti ca prāptam: tadubhayabhāngayā'yan ārambhah, itiçabda eshām evāi'sha viçesha nā'nyeshām iti prakārvadi.


dhūssāhau and suvassām (or, as it is customary to write them, dhūṣāhau and suvāsām: only G. M. are conscientious about giving the double sibilant, as demanded by the Prātiṣṭhākhyā). The iti, he remarks finally, signifies that only the words mentioned, and no others, are intended—that is to say, it has no particular meaning at all. It would be well if he always as frankly acknowledged the insignificance of this word where it occurs in the rules.

11. Now for cases of omission.

An introductory rule or heading, having force as far as rule 10, below, inclusive.

12. A m is dropped, when preceded by im.

The passage aimed at is im 'andā suprayaśāh (iv.1.82; p. im: mandrā): it is the only one of its kind in the text. The Vājasaneyi-Sanhita reads in the corresponding passage (xxvii.15) im mandrā. To treat the loss of a m here as suffered by the second word instead of the first is most arbitrary and unreasonable. The particle im is reduced to i in quite a number of Rik passages, and before other letters than m: they are duly noted in the Prātiṣṭhākhyā (Rik Pr. iv.36). A series of counter-examples is added by our commentator: imam me varuna (ii.1.119) shows that m is not dropped after another m in general; agnim mitraṁ varunam (ii.1.111), that m after short i does not exercise the specified effect; imkārāya svāhe 'mikṛtāya (vii.1.191), that im elides no other consonant than m. The yet farther restriction is applied, that im here is a padagrahāna, 'the citation of a complete pada;' for otherwise there would be an elision of a m in such cases as prthīvīṁ mā hiṁāḥ (iv.2.91): G. M. add the further example uta gravaśā prthīvīṁ mitraśa, which I am unable to find in the Sanhīta.

11. athey£y ayam adhikārah: lopa ity etad adhikṛtaṁ vedita-vyam ita uttaraṁ yad vakṣhyaṁ, ayam adhikāras tishṭhante ekayā (v.19) itisātraparyanto veditavyah.

12. makāra 'im ity evampūrvo lupyaṭe. yathā: 'im..... evampūrva iti kim: imam..... dirghena kim: aqm..... 'im ity padagrahānam: itarathā prth..... ity ādau makāro lupyaṭa. makāra' iti kim: 'im.....

1 G. M. om. 2 W. -hacarp. 3 G. M. anyathā. 4 G. M. -yate; and add lac cd 'nīṣṭā. 5 W. -apara.
13. A \( v \) is dropped when preceded by \( tu \) or \( nu \), in case these are accented.

It is when the particle \( vāi \), or \( vēva \), follows \( tu \) and \( nu \) that this anomalous mutilation is made. The commentator quotes \( su \) tv \( \ddot{d}i \) yajeta (ii.6.3 and vii.1.3: p. sah.: \( tu \) : \( vāi \)), and in \( nv \) \( \ddot{d}a \) upastirnām ichanti (i.6.73: p. it.: \( nu \) : \( vāi \)). The same sandhi of \( tu \) and \( vāi \) is not infrequent elsewhere (the passages are i.7.14, 6.21; ii.4.4; 5.14; iii.2.92; 3.92; 5.13; v.5.94; vi.4.3; vii.2.10a); that of \( nu \) and \( vāi \) is comparatively rare (only at i.5.96 twice); that of \( tu \) and \( vēva \) I have found only once, at vii.5.6.3. Here, again, it would seem better to regard the final \( u \) as suffering elision, instead of the initial \( v \). The specification "if accented" is explained as intended to exclude such passages as \( anu \) \( rtrahaty \) (i.6.12; 7.13), where \( anu \) would fall under this rule by i.52 (even if the \( nu \) here, like the \( im \) in the preceding rule, were regarded as a padagrahamen). Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are \( idām \) \( vam \) \( ādye \) \( javi \) (iii.3.111), and \( pra \) \( tu \) \( jana\)ya\( ti \) (i.7.24) and \( vidusho \) \( nu \) \( yajnām \) (i.3.13.1-2).

उत्तर्य: सन्धी ज्ञानां: ॥ १३ ॥

14. A \( s \) is dropped after \( ut \), when a consonant follows.

The commentator's example is \( praty \) \( uttābdhyāi \) \( savyatvāya \) (vi.6.4: p. \( ut\)-\( sttābhyāi \)). This is, so far as I have discovered, the only case in the Sanhitā from the root \( stābh \); similar forms from \( stāh \) occur variously (\( anatthāya \), iii.4.10a; \( upothtāya \), vii.1.6a; 5.15.12; \( utthānyant \), vii.1.10a; \( utthita \), vii.1.19a; 2.9a; \( and \) \( utthānā \), vii.2.11 thrice). As counter-examples are given \( jagatsthā devāh \) (ii.1.114), \( utkraṇeyate svāhā \) (vii.1.193), and \( utśūdāna jihvām \) (v.7.11).

This familiar sandhi is also the subject of Ath. Pr. ii.18, and Vāj. Pr. iv.95.

हप्सत्स रति च ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also \( esah \), \( sah \), and \( syah \).

13. \( tu \): \( nu \):  \( ity \) evampūrvo vakāro lupyate tayos tunvors udattayoh sator iti vibhajya viyogyo viñeyah. yathā: sa tv......: in \( nv \)...... udattayor itī kīm: \( anu \)......: apy akārādi (i.32) iti prātīh: evampūrva itī kīm: 'idām......: vakāra itī kīm: pra......: \( vid \)......: tuc ca nuč ca tunī: tāu pāroṇu yaṁmat sa ta-thoktah.


14. vyājanaparāh sakāra utpūrvo lupyate. yathā: \( praty \)...... vyājanam asmit param iti vyājanaparāh. evampūrva itī kīm: \( jag \)......: sakāra itī kīm: ut......: evamāra itī kīm: ut......
Here the ca, ‘also,’ is declared to continue the implication of ‘when a consonant follows’ from the preceding rule. The iti is added for the sake of clearness; it shows the final visarjanyā of syah, and attributes it by analogy to each of the other words also. What indicates that this final visarjanyā is the letter which is to suffer elision is not so evident. The illustrative examples are esha te gāyatrah (iii.1.21), sa te jānāti (i.2.142-3; but G. M. substitute sa tapo ‘tapyata, iii.1.11), and esha sya vājī (i.7.83). The counter-example, showing that the omission occurs only before a consonant, is sama eva ‘syāi ‘sha upa tishthat (i.5.74), where, if the h of esha were lost by this rule, x.5 would require the reading esho ‘pa.

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr. ii.4, Vāj. Pr. iii.15,16, Ath. Pr. ii.57.

16. But not asah.

Namely, in the passage hrtevaso mayobhān (iv.2.112; p. hrtsu-asah), which would otherwise fall under the preceding rule for sah, by i.52.

17. And sah, when followed by id u, id agne, imām nāh, eva, oshadhīh.

These are the cases in the Sanhitā where, after the regular loss of the final of sah, its vowel is irregularly combined with the one that follows, against rule x.25. Such cases in the other Vedic texts are treated at Rik Pr. ii.33,34, and Vāj. Pr. iii.14. The commentator quotes the passages affected, as follows: sa ‘d u hotā so adhvarān (i.1.142: B. O. omit the last word; G. M. the last two), sa ‘d agne astu (i.2.142), sa ‘māṁ no havyadātim (iv.6.62), sā ‘nā ‘nikena (iv.3.132 and 6.13) and sā ‘adhāṁ amu rudhyase (iv.2.33, 112). The first two need counter-examples, to show that it not followed by u or agne does not coalesce with sa: they are sa iy

15. nyaktivishaya’ iticabdh pratyekam esha ity udin’ visarjanīyāntān’ dyotayati: cakāro vyahjanaparam anvādiṣṭati. 
yathā: esha:...: sa:...: esha:... evampara iti kim: dama

1 G. M. -tishta; O. -tishta. 2 G. M. -nām. 3 G. M. -yāntān. 4 G. M. ins. padeshu. 5 G. M. om.

16. asa ity asmin’ grāhane visarjanīyo vyahjanaparo na lupyate. hṛt... apy akārādī (i.52) iti prāpter nishedhaḥ.

1 G. M. etas-. 2 G. M. -ih. 3 G. M. om.
18. Also ity ekam, when ekam is the former member of a compound.

The passage aimed at is pápiyánt syád ity ekáikam tasya juhu-
yátm (v.1.12: but as given by W. O., without the first two words, it is also found again at v.4.55: G. M. omit juhuyátm); and the pada-
text actually reads ekam-ekam. The case is akin with that which forms the subject of the next rule. Two counter-examples are given, to justify the terms of the rule: they are ardhukán syád
ity ekam agrétha (vi.2.36: only G. M. have the first two words), and yad ekamekañ sambharet (i.8.82).

19. Also tish'ányty ekayá, along with the preceding letter.

The commentator quotes the passage: tishthanyty ekáikayá stut-
yáy (vii.5.84); the pada-reading is ekayá-ekayá. As counter-exa-
ample, where the same word remains unmutilated, is given samá-
nánán karóty ekayáikayo 'tsargam (vi.1.94: only G. M. have the first word).

In this rule and the foregoing are noted, but at the same time ignored, the first occurrences of the compound ékáka, which (see the St. Petersburg Lexicon) is not very rare in the Cátapatha Bráh-
mana and later.

17. ....... 1 evamparah sahkára 2 ity atra visarjaniyo lupyate. 
yathá: se 'd...... se 'd...... v' agna ity ábbháin' kim: sa 
...... sa...... se...... na iti kim: 'sa...... sí...... sáu...... sa 
ití kim: paro......

1 G. M. ins. tít. 2 W. B. O. sakóra; G. M. sa. 3 W. B. id.; G. M. O. u. 4 B. O. etábhyám. 5 A lacuna in B., to bear the end of the comment on rule,18.

18. iticabdaviçiśtha ekam ity asmin avagrahe makáro lupy-
yate. yathá: páp...... avagraha iti kim: ardh...... iticabdavi-
çiśtha iti kim: yad......

1 G. M. om. 5 End of the lacuna in B.

19. tishthanticabdaviçiśtha ekaye 'ty asmin grahane 'ntyo' var-
nah sapúrvaḥ pàrvasahito lupyate. yathá: tish...... tishthanti 
'iti kim: sam...... pàrvena saha varata iti sapúrvah.

1 G. M. -yāśvora. 5 O. om.
The terms in which the rule is expressed show that, from rule 15 on, the implication has been of a "final" letter as liable to the effect prescribed. We have reason to be surprised that it was not distinctly stated when first made.

20. A $n$, when followed by $c$, becomes $ç$.

The commentator's illustrative examples are $ahîç ca sarvān jambhayan$ (iv.5.12), $tāîç ca tasya nakshatriyān ca$ (vi.1.32: G. M. omit $ca$), and $karnâç cā'karnâç ca$ (i.8.93). The counterexamples, to show that only $n$ is so changed, and $n$ itself only before $c$, not before other palatal mutes, are $gaî ca me$ (iv.7.31) and $tāî chandobhir anu$ (i.5.97: G. M. omit $anu$).

The nature of the conversion taught in this rule, and of the kindred ones forming the subject of rules vi.14 and ix.20, as being a historical, not a euphonic process, has been sufficiently explained and illustrated in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.26. At the same place will be found noted the usage of the other Vedic texts as regards the sandhi $âç$: the Atharvan and the Vājasaneyi-Sanhitā make it uniformly, the Rik only occasionally. In the Tāttvārya-Sanhitā it is prevalently usual: I have noted thirty-nine examples of it, against the eight exceptions mentioned in the next rule.

The definition of the sandhi, of course, is not complete without the aid of rules xv.1–3, which teach that, where $n$ has been converted into a sibilant, the preceding vowel is nasalized, or has anusvāra added to it. A better course, according to our understanding of the history of the phenomenon, would be to teach the insertion of a $s$ (or visarjanīya) and the change of $n$ to anusvāra before it: but the makers of the Prātiṣākhya concern themselves much less about the theoretical accuracy than the mechanical aptitude of their rules.

21. But not the $n$ of āyān, āirayan, ārdhnuvan, anadvān, ghrṇivān, vāruṇān, and eva 'śmin.

The passages are: lokam āyān 'cutasrah' (v.2.34), yām āirayan

20. cakāraparo' nakāraḥ sakāram āpadyate. yathā': ah----: 
$rt$----: kar----: nakāra iti kim: $çaim$----: capara iti kim: 
$tāî$----: cañ' paro yasmād āsū caparah.

1 G. M. caparo. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. O. cakāraḥ.

21........ eteshu' grahanēshu nakāraḥ sakāram nā' padyate caparo' pi. yathā': lo----: yām----: loka----: anadv----: 
$grîn$----: vār----: eva----: $çev'ti kim:$ asm----:

1 G. M. etehu. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 B. om.
22. A t, when followed by ç, c, or ch, becomes c.

The form assumed by initial ç after this assimilation is taught in rules 34-37, below.

The commentator’s examples are: *tac chamiyoh* (ii.6.102.2.), *tac çá ‘daduh* (vii.1.51.), and *tac chándasám chandastvam* (v.6.14). He proceeds to point out that the ç, c, and ch, all mentioned in the rule as upon the same footing, are to be understood as original (not the products of previous euphonic processes), that being their chief or primary value: otherwise the mention of ç at all would be superfluous; since, the ç being (by v.34) ordered changed to ch after a mute, it would be enough for this rule to say “when followed by c or ch.” Moreover, if the later rule were applied, then, after it, the application of the earlier rule would not be suitable (svaras, ‘having its own proper flavor;’ the word is not used elsewhere, as it would constitute an offense against the third rule of this chapter.

---

22. çacachaparas takáraç kakáram ápadyate. yathá: *tac.....:
tac.....: *tac.....: atá çacachapara iti sámanyoktánám nimittánám prákrtiváikrtyayah prákrtvam mukhyatvát: tatra prákrtváikrtyah prákrtvam mukhyam: anyathá çakráragrahacáiyathyá: kuto váiyartham: sparçapúrveah çakáraç chakáram (v.34) iti çak Olivier chatve krte takáraç kakáram cachopara ity étávatai ‘va sidáh iti brámaḥ. kiin ca: parasátte pravrttē sati paścát párasātra prárasramaḥ na svarasam: *tatra párvampúrvam prathamam (v.3) iti niyamabhaángaprásanángat*.  

---

1 G. M. B. O. -nyáno ‘lét-.  2 W. O. práni-.  3 G. M. prákrtiva-.  4 G. M. om.  5 G. M. -tétam.  6 G. M. -yáca ca.  7 G. M. B. çacach-.  8 G. M. siddhir-.  9 G. M. bhavati-.  10 G. M. nyáyabh-.  
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23. When followed by \( j \), it becomes \( j \).

The cited example is *taj jayānān jayatvam* (iii.4.4): rather superfluously, a counter-example is also given: *tat pravāte* (vi.4.7²).

24. A \( n \), before the same letters, becomes \( ŋ \).

As *eteshu* is plural, we are obliged, having recourse to that which lies nearest, to regard as implied the letters pointed out in the last two rules as requiring certain changes in those that precede them; that is to say, \( r, c, ch, j \). These are, in fact, the whole class of palatals, since \( ŋ \) never occurs at the beginning of a word, nor, indeed, in any independent position, and since \( jh \) is found nowhere in any Vedic text. The dental \( n \), then, never maintains itself before a palatal, but is assimilated to it. The other treatises teach virtually the same doctrine: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.11.

The commentator’s illustrative example for \( n \) before \( r \) (where, to complete the combination, rule 34 below has also to be applied) is *tendā ’tāi nān chaya* (iii.4.8⁴). As for \( n \) before \( c \), he points out that the rule applies only to the cases where the \( n \) does not become \( r \) by v.20, as excepted by v.21, and quotes again one of the examples given under the latter rule, *lokam āyān catsraha* (v.2.3¹). Before \( ch \), he gives the phrase already quoted as counter-example under v.20, *tān chandobhir anu* (i.5.9⁷); and before \( j \), *aparāpam ātma jaya* (iii.5.7⁹). As general counter-example, finally, he gives *tānt subdhan* (ii.4.1¹), where \( n \), coming before \( s \), is treated in a quite different manner.

The occurrence of \( n \) before \( ch \), which does not once happen in the Atharvan, is found not less than nine times in the Taittiriyasūnasūnasūna. My own MS. reads every time *nch*, combining the dental nasal with the palatal aspirate. The Calcutta edition, at the only place which it contains as yet, reads *nch*.

---

23. sānimidyāt takāra iti labhyate: japaras takāro jakāram āpadyate. yathā: taj.... evampara iti kim: tat....

1 G. M. om.

24. eteshu iti bhūvacaanirdeca‘ pratyāsannam eva ’nopēkṣya‘ sūtradvayasthesu paranimitteshu sampratayayah: tasmād eteshu iti: cacchajeshu parata‘ ity arthaḥ: nakāro nakāram āpadyate. yathā: te.... yatvāpattāu nishidhā yo nakāraḥ so‘tra coparatvena vishayakriyate. lok....: tān....: apa.... evampara iti kim: tānt....

The combination of final \( n \) with initial \( l \), producing, according to all the phonetic text-books (with trifling exceptions: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.17), \( nh \), is decidedly of more common occurrence. But here, too, my own MS. reads, with but a single exception among the cases which I have noted, \( nh \): the Calcutta text is inconsistent with itself, now giving \( n \) (as at ii.2.12\(^2\)), now \( n \) (as at i.3.9\(^1\)).

Final \( n \) is found yet more frequently before initial \( j \), or some scores of times in all. As regards its method of writing the combination, my manuscript is about equally divided between \( nj \) and \( nj \). The Calcutta text is equally wavering; and there is no approach to consistency between the two authorities, or to recognizable principle in either: in both alike, the variation seems wholly accidental and arbitrary.

Such being the case, I think it clear that a careful editor of the Taittiriya-Sanhitā ought to disregard, as of no authority or consequence, the variations, or the unanimity, of his manuscripts upon all these points, and to adopt uniformly the reading prescribed by the Prātiçaṅkhyā (either \( n \) or \( nh \)), wherever a final \( n \) comes to stand before a palatal mute.

25. Both \( t \) and \( n \), when followed by \( l \), become \( l \).

The dual lapārāu indicates that the \( t \) and \( n \), already treated of, are the letters aimed at in this rule, says the commentator. He cites as examples yad-lohitam parāpati (ii.1.7\(^2\): G. M. omit the last word), and triṃ lokān ud ajayat (i.7.11\(^1\): only G. M. have ud ajayat). The combination of \( n \) and \( l \) is finished by the next rule, and will be further remarked upon in the note thereto.

26. The \( n \) becomes nasalized \( l \).

As the nasal quality of \( n \) itself is already established: by rule ii.30, explains the commentator, it could not properly be defined here again as nasal. Hence the anunāsikā of the present precept must be understood as qualifying the \( l \) of like position into which the \( n \) is converted: this \( l \) is to be a nasal \( l \). No additional example is given, the combination having been illustrated under the preceding rule.

There are in the Taittiriya-Sanhitā over a hundred cases of the meeting of final \( n \) with initial \( l \), and in fully two-thirds of them

\[ a vyācanaśāmartyād gṛhitāv prakārāv takāraṇakārāv lakāraṃ āpadyate laparāv, yatḥā: yāl...: trīn...: lāh paro yābhyaṁ tāv laparāv. \]

\(^1\) G. M. -thya. \(^2\) G. M. om. \(^3\) MSS. -yate. \(^4\) G. M. om. \(^5\) G. M. lakāraḥ.
my MS. reads \(ml\) simply, without attempting any accommodation of the two sounds to one another. In the remaining cases, it treats the \(n\) in the same way as it would treat a \(m\), substituting for it the ordinary \textit{anusvāra}-dot over the preceding \textit{akṣara}. The Calcutta text varies between \(ml\) and \(\text{ śīl}l\). Here, as in the cases treated above, there seems to be every reason why an editor should follow one consistent method, as the irregularities of the manuscripts have no ground but accident—and, not less certainly, the method prescribed by the \textit{Prātiṣṭhānaśya} is the one better entitled to be followed. As to the way in which the nasal \(l\) shall be represented, there may be some question. As I have already mentioned (note to ii.30), I cannot think that the designation of the Calcutta edition is at all to be commended, since it properly implies the insertion of an \textit{anusvāra} between the preceding vowel and a doubled \(l\), and thus quite distorts the character of the combination—except as this is viewed by Atreya, as noted in a later rule (v.31). The method followed in my MS., on the other hand, is theoretically unobjectionable, since there is no phonetic difference recognized, or to be recognized, by phonetic theory between the combination of \(n\) and \(l\) and that of \(m\) and \(\text{ śīl}l\): it has only the practical inconvenience of not distinguishing to the eye these two combinations—and this is of very small account, since there can be few if any cases where the least ambiguity would result. If the nasal \(l\) is to be written separately, it should properly have the \textit{virāma} beneath and the sign of nasality over it. That is to say, one ought always to print either \textit{Gaṁśil} or \textit{Gaṁśi} \text{śīl}, not \textit{Gaṁśiśil}\text{śīl}.

In romanized text, as the assimilated \(m\) is represented by \(\hat{m}\), so, by an analogous method and for the sake of convenient distinction, the assimilated \(n\) may be very suitably represented by \(\hat{n}\); and this is the sign with which I have chosen to write it, both before \(l\) and before the palatals.

All the \textit{Prātiṣṭhānaśyas} (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.35) agree in converting both \(n\) and \(m\) before \(l\) into a nasal \(l\).

\[\text{मकार स्यूर्ष्वरस्त्य सर्खानन्दनुनासिकम्} \text{॥} २७ \text{॥}\]

27. A \(m\), when followed by a mute, becomes the nasal of like position with it.

The commentator’s examples are \textit{yaṁ kāmāyeta} (i.6.104 et al.), \textit{caṁ ca me} (iv.7.31), \textit{taṁ te duṣcakṣāḥ} (iii.2.102), and \textit{taṁ prat-}

\[\text{28. anusvārottāmā anunāśikā} \text{॥} \text{ii.30} \text{॥} \text{iti nakārayā 'na-} \text{nāśikute śiddhe} \text{५ puṇar ātra} \text{'pi tatkhaṇānam amapapannam:} \text{tumād ātra lakṣaṇāya nakāro nāma tatsthāno lakārā} \text{५ ity ar-} \text{thaḥ: asāc' anunāśikam bhajate.} \text{pārśvoktam eva'dāharaṇam.} \]

\[\text{G. M. ins. pt.} \quad \text{G. M. nak.} \quad \text{G. M. ins. lakāro.} \quad \text{G. M. bhajeta.}\]
nātha (i.4.9). Of m before a lingual he is able to give no example, as such a concurrence is not to be found in the Sanhitā.

28. Followed by a semivowel, it becomes a nasal of like quality with it.

From the class of semi-vowels is excepted r, by the next rule. Examples are given for the others, as follows: samyattā āśān (i.5.1.4 et al.), suvargāh lokam (i.5.4.4 et al.), samvatsarah (i.5.1.7 et al.; the pada-text, like that of the Atharvān, reads samvatsarah, while that of the Rik leaves the word, undivided). No attempt is made in the manuscripts or the printed text of the Sanhitā to give a special representation to these nasal semi-vowels standing for an assimilated m; it is left to be understood that the sign of nasality over the preceding akṣara, stands for a nasal letter of like quality with the following consonant in the case of the semi-vowels, just as in that of the mutes, provided for by the preceding rule. Nor are the manuscripts of the Prātiṣeṣṭhyā and its commentary any more, particular—saving that G. M. usually write, instead of āny, the combination yy, without any sign of the nasality of the first y.

Only the Ath. Pr. disagrees with our treatise in its treatment of m before the semi-vowels, acknowledging no nasal y or v, but a l alone (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.55).

The commentator explains the word amunāsika, 'nasal,' in the rule, by amunāsikadharmavicīṣṭa, 'distinguished by nasal quality,' but afterward raises a difficulty over it, in terms which imply that he regards it as a noun, 'a nasal,' asking, how we are to understand it here as equivalent to sanunāsika, 'combined with nasality.' As it is, in fact, originally and properly an adjective, signifying 'possessed of nasal quality,' and is constant-


1 W. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 B. G. M. om.


1 B. O. om., 2 W. om.: O. ity anena sāmānākānā kathām upalambhamāhe; G. M. sākālav upalambhamāhe yathā. 3 O. om. 4 W. dharmena. 5 W. avīkā; O. avi. 6 G. M. ins. yathā. 7 G. M. ddī.
ly so used and applied in the Prātiṣeṣṭhāya, the difficulty is worse than hair-splitting; it is a downright perversion. The answer by which it is met is a quibble worthy of being matched with it: "because a word expressing a quality also designates the object possessing that quality; as, for example, when we say 'a white cloth,' 'a blue lotus.'” As if the words “white” and “blue” strictly applied to the color alone, and did not just as properly mean ‘of white color,’ ‘of blue color’!

29. But not when followed by ṛ.

Ṛ being also a semi-vowel, ṁ would be converted into a corresponding nasal before it by the previous rule, but for this special exception. The instances given of the treatment of ṁ before ṛ are pra sāmvidhaṇa prathomam adhvārānām (i.6.122: G. M. have only the first two words), and sāmvidhyāja sūkṛatāḥ (i.8.164). They are particularly ill selected, as neither case comes under the action of the preceding rule; they fall rather, under xii.4, and are, in fact, the two passages there given as examples of the peculiar treatment of sām before ṛjī. We ought to have, instead, such passages as pratyuṣaṅtaṇ rakṣah (i.1.23), vi vayāṇa ruhema (i.1.24)—which, of course, are of exceedingly frequent occurrence in the Sanshitā.

The omission of ṁ before ṛ, and the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or the insertion of anusvāra after the latter, are taught below, in rules xiii.2.xv.1–3. The written and printed texts are consistent in their recognition of the mode of combination thus prescribed, always setting the proper anusvāra sign before ṛ, while before ṹ, Ṭ, ṣ they write the assimilated ṁ just as before the mutes.
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30. Nor, according to some teachers, when followed by ṣ or ṽ.

The authorities referred to, of course, would leave the ṃ to be treated before these letters as before ṛ, and would acknowledge no

29. antosthāteśāḥ repahaparasyaḥ 'pi makārasya tatāsvārānāṃ

30. cakāra nishdhanvādeśakah: prakṛtoḥ makāra ekeshām


nasal semi-vowel save \( l \). Their opinion is again quoted in connection with the rule respecting the actual treatment of \( m \) before \( r \) (xiii.3), and the commentator there calls attention to the fact that the “some teachers” spoken of are the same with those here noticed: who they are, he does not attempt to tell us. The view held by them is the same with that taken by the Atharva Prātiṣṭhakhyā, as pointed out above (see Ath. Pr. ii.35, and the note upon it); but, until we know much more than we do at present of the history and mutual relations of these phonetic treatises, it would be highly venturesome to conclude that the authors of this Prātiṣṭhakhyā had here in mind the other one and its authors.

I find it difficult to discover any good phonetic reason why the assimilation of \( m \) should not yield a like result before all the semi-vowels, and why, if we are to admit an oasis at all, it would not find a particularly appropriate place as representing the sound into which \( m \) might naturally pass before \( y, r, l, \) and \( v \).

As examples, are repeated sameatsarah and sameyattāḥ (see under rule 28, above).

31. Ātreya holds that, when a nasal mute becomes \( l \), the previous vowel is nasalized.

As has been pointed out above, Ātreya’s view of the combination is the one represented accurately by the mode of writing adopted in the Calcutta edition. It is not elsewhere supported in the Prātiṣṭhakhyas. Its quotation here seems a little unprepared, or the expression of it given in the rule imperfect, as we have been directed to convert \( m \) and \( n \), not into \( l \), but into a nasal \( l \). One might think, too, that it would be in better place at the beginning of chapter xv., where certain other differences of opinion on kindred points are rehearsed.

The commentator gives Ātreya the title of muni, ‘sage,’ instead of ācārya, ‘teacher.’

To illustrate the sage’s style of making the combination, he cites trīṇ lokin (i.7.11) and suvargaṇī lokam (i.5.4 etc.); but not one of the manuscripts of the commentary takes the pains to write the extracts as they should be written, to serve their purpose as illustrations. Finally, he adds the caution that “this rule and the preceding are not approved.”

31. uttamasya nakārasya nakārasya vā labhāvāl lakārāpatteḥ
pārvasvoro ‘nunāsiko bhavati ty ātreyo nāma munir manyate.
yathā: trīṇ.... suv.... uttamaśvar labhāva uttamaśvāvāḥ: tasmāt.
sūtradāyaḥ etad ānisātham.

\(^1\) G. M. put before nak.  \(^2\) G. M. om.  \(^3\) G. M. om.
32. After \( \hat{n} \) is inserted a \( k \) before \( s \) and \( sh \).

The commentator’s examples are pratyāṅk soma atidrūtaḥ (i.8.21): but G. M. have instead saḍrūk samādīniḥ, ii.2.8a), and pratyāṅk shaduhuḥ bhavati (vii.4.24: O. G. M. omit bhavati). As counter-examples, showing that the insertion is made only under the circumstances specified, he gives pratyāṅk hotāram (vi.3.15), and tat savītūḥ (i.5.64 et al.) and tat shodasī (vi.6.111).

The combinations here treated of are not otherwise than rare in any Vedic text. In the Taśtriye-Saṁhitā I have found no other instance of the meeting of \( n \) and \( sh \) than the one quoted; of \( n \) before \( s \), besides the two here given, occur two others, at vi.3.16 and iv.4.47-8; but, in the latter passage, the division of the section into half-centuries falls between the two letters, as the text is at present written, and prevents the exhibition of the sandhi. Neither the Calcutta edition (so far as yet printed) nor my manuscript makes in any of these passages the insertion required by the Pratiṣṭhāṇyā; and it may properly enough be considered a question whether the latter’s authority ought to be followed in a matter of this character, any more than in regard to the duplications which form the subject of chapter xiv. Nevertheless, considering the phonetic reasonableness of this particular insertion, and its close analogy with that of \( t \) between \( n \) and \( s \) (see the next rule), I should myself decidedly incline to write \( \hat{n}k \ s \) and \( \hat{n}k \ sh \). The manuscripts of the commentary, it should be remarked, try to follow the directions of the rule, W. B. O. reading \( \hat{n}k \) as, and W. O. \( \hat{n}k \ sh \) (with the \( k \) and \( sh \) united in the usual sign for \( ksh \)); while G. M. even yield to the requirement of xiv.12, and give us \( \hat{n}k \) and \( \hat{n}k \ sh \). This last is a refinement which no one, probably, would care to see introduced into our printed texts.

As is shown in detail in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.9, the teachings of the Ath. Pr. and Vāj. Pr. are virtually in agreement with those of our own treatise as regards the insertions prescribed in this rule and the next, while the Rāk Pr. merely mentions them as enjoined by some authorities.

33. After \( t \) or \( n \) is inserted a \( t \).

The examples given for these combinations are vashūti svāhā (vii.3.12 nine times), and vidvānt somena yajate (iii.2.23); and, in order not to be without an illustration for the collision of \( t \) with \( sh \), one is dragged in from the jātā-text: anāyājau shat shat anāyājav anāyājau shat (vi.6.3): to which G. M. even add, from the
same source, tānt subdhānt subdhās tāns tānt subdhān (ii.4.12). Counter-examples are shad vā rtavah (iii.4.8), and tān rudrā abrīvan (v.5.26). The final lingual t occurs before s, according to my notes upon the text, in ten other passages (iii.2.8 i eight times; iv.4.81, 6.14, v.4.34, 4.2, 5.26; vi.2.34; 6.53; vii.1.5; 4.10); and my MS. does not once employ the intermediate t. The manuscripts of our commentary, however, all introduce it; and this time B. abets G. M. in converting it into th, by rule xiv.12. The combination is without doubt a very troublesome one, in the demand it makes upon the tip of the tongue: but whether the transition is helped by the intrusion of a t is a much more serious question—and one to exercise and gratify the subtlety of a Hindu phonetician. The Ath. Pr. also requires ttā (ii.8), but the Rik Pr. (iv.6) only notices the mode of sāndhi as enjoined by certain teachers.

It is indeed true that the strict letter of the rule requires a t to be inserted between a t and sh, as illustrated by the commentator from the jatā-text. But it would be wholly preposterous to suppose that the authors of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā intended to teach any such insertion—which would convert the consonant combination from one wholly natural and easy to one in a high degree harsh and difficult, if not absolutely impossible. They evidently relied on the non-occurrence of sh after t anywhere in the Sanhita for the annulling of that part of the rule’s prescription—either having no regard to a jatā-text, or overlooking the fact that in it the two letters would come in contact.

Twice in the Taитtirīya text we have a final t before an initial sh (at v.5.26; vii.5.6). Although their collision might seem to call for mediation in somewhat the same manner as that of t and s, the Prātiṣṭhākhyā makes no special provision for it, and the manuscript text simply combines the two letters.

The meeting of final n with initial s, the other case contemplated by the rule, is very frequent (there are sixty instances in the first two kāndas: I have not collected them through the whole text). Neither the printed text nor my manuscript is absolutely faithful in inserting the prescribed t; yet I have found but six cases in the whole Sanhita in which the latter omits it; and out of the seven passages in kāndas i. and ii. where the former leaves it out, my manuscript confirms the omission in only one. As the requirement of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā receives so much support from the usage of the scribes, and also accords with the prescriptions of the Ath. Pr. (ii.9) and Vāj. Pr. (iv.14), there can be no question that it ought to be followed by an editor of the Taíttrirīya Veda.
34. A $c$ preceded by a mute becomes $ch$

The commentator gives only an example of a $c$ converted into $ch$ after $t$, the $t$ at the same time becoming $v$ by rule 22, above: cārita cārātv (iv.3.22). He adds a counter-example, ḍuḥ gīd.nah (iv.6.41). The occurrence of any other final mute than $t$ and $n$ (for which an example is given above, under rule 24) before initial $c$ is very rare (excepting $m$, for which see the following rule); and it is properly only after a dental, or after a dental or lingual, that the conversion here prescribed has good phonetic ground—namely, in the coalescence of a $t$-sound and a $sh$-sound into the compound sound of our $ch$ in church (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.17). There is one case of a preceding $t$ (i.3.146), where my MS. reads, as the Prātiṣekhya directs, $t$ $ch$, while the Calcutta text has $t$ $c$. A single case of preceding $p$ is treated of below, in rule 36.

35. But not when preceded by $m$.

By this rule, says the commentator, is annulled the conversion of $c$ to $ch$ after $m$, which would otherwise be in order (according to the preceding rule), since $m$ is a mute. He instances saṃcitam me (iv.1.103 and v.1.102) and saṃcraeva ha (i.7.21). Being thus specially exempted from the operation of the foregoing rule, this combination, of course, falls under xiii.2 and xv.1-3, and the $m$, as before other spirants, becomes anusāra. An objection is raised against the pertinence of the present precept, on the ground that xiii.2 directs the omission of $m$ before a spirant, and that hence there could arise no occasion for any such conversion of $c$ into $ch$ as is here contemplated and guarded against. The reply, however, is a very easy one; that, by rule 3 of this chapter, the requirement of the conversion into $ch$, as it is stated earlier, would have to be applied first, and that the result of so doing would be to pro-

---

34. cākāraṇaḥ chakāram āpadyate sparčapūrvah, yathā: cārava evamāva iti kim: ḍuḥ sparčah pārvavi yam mā dasyu sparčapūrvah.

1 G. M. puts first. 2 W. G. M. om.

35. makārāpūrvah cakāraṇaḥ na "padyate, yathā: saṃ... saṃ sparčatvān makārasya tatpūrvam cakāraḥ prāptam chatvam anena nishidhyate. naev etad anupapannam: atha makāralopah (xiii.1): rephoshmaparāh (xiii.2) iti makārasya lopavidhānān na... cakārasya chatvāppatirmingham asti 'ti. māvem: chatvāpadakām malopāpdakāt pārvam: atas... tatra pūrvampūrvam prathamam (v.3) iti nyā-
duce, in the passage already quoted, the reading saṁchitam me brahma; which is wrong.

36. Nor, according to Vālmiki, when preceded by p.

There is but a single case in the Sanhitā of p before ṣ, namely the one here quoted by the commentator, anushtup chāradī (iv.3.22): so my manuscript reads, according to the requirement of rule 34, above. Vālmiki thinks it would be better to read anushtup cāradī—and I presume we shall have little hesitation in approving his opinion.

37. Nor, according to Pāṇḍharasādi, when followed by a consonant; and a preceding n, in that case, does not become ṇ.

This translation is made in accordance with the commentator's exposition. One might be tempted to understand the last part of the rule otherwise, not regarding the continuance of the negative as implied from the other part; translating 'and a preceding n becomes ṇ;' but, besides the authority of the comment against it, this would be a mere repetitious enactment of the rule already given above (v.24). The inquiry is raised, how we know that pūrṇah, 'the preceding letter,' means here 'a preceding n.' The reply is, because only n is liable to conversion into ṇ, and annulment is only made of that which would, without direction to the contrary, be liable to take place.

The examples given to illustrate this peculiar view of Pāṇḍharasādi are adityāṇ yamārubhīḥ (v.7.12), and pāpiyāṇ greyāse (i.5.74). The edition has pāpiyāṇ chreyase in the latter passage, in accordance with the approved rules of the Prātiṣeṣṭya; but my MS. seems to have been written by a sectary of Pāṇḍharasādi at this point (namely, in the margin: a line or two of the context was omitted just here by the original scribe). In the former, I

\[\text{yena chatvam eva pūrvam}^{18}\text{ kartavyāṁ syāt: tathā sati makāra sparças}^{12}\text{ tatpāre}^{12}\text{ cakāre chatvam}^{12}\text{ āpanne saṁn---- iti syāt: tan mā bhūd ity etat sūtram upapannam eva.}\]


36. cakāraḥ pratisedhārthakaḥ: vālmiker mate pakārapūrvah cakāraḥ chakāraṁ nā "padyate. yathā: an-----.
find the reading ādityān chamiṣṣrubhiḥ, which would satisfy neither side. There is one other case of the collision of n with ṣr (at vi.6.7), where I find read n chr. So also, at v.7.12 my MS. has n chr; and at vii.3.14, n ehy. These are the only instances, I believe, which the text affords of the combinations contemplated by the rule.

The commentator, at the end, declares this rule and the preceding not approved, and with reason: the evident intent of the treatise is that the conversion of initial ṣ to ch shall take place in all the cases falling under rule 34.

38. According to Plakshi, Kauḍinya, Gautama, and Pāushkarasādī, a h preceded by a first mute becomes a fourth mute corresponding with the latter.

The examples of this, the approved and customary combination of an initial h with a final surd mute are, as given by the commentator, aravag ṣhavānam (vi.3.13), sarad dhaṅvā dvavāya (v.3.122, G. M. omit dvavāya), and tad dhārvāyam (v.4.23 and vi.1.71). In giving the first two quotations, W. O. G. M. (following a vicious and indefensible mode of combination, which occasionally appears even in carefully written Vedic manuscripts, and has incautiously been admitted into some edited texts) write ghgh and dhgh instead of ghg and dg, and in the latter of them my MS. of the Sanhitā does the same (see the note to xiv.5). As counter-examples, establishing the restrictions imposed by the rule, we have pṛtyāṇ hataḥ (vi.3.15), vāk tā puṣyātām (i.3.91), vasyāte (ii.2.124); and, in W., tā tiśṭhitapate (iv.6.94), but in all the other MSS. tāt te (i.3.91 et al).

This is one of several instances in which the Prātiṣṭhakhyā, instead of stating first, categorically, its own doctrine, and then mentioning others at variance with this, puts forward the conflicting views of different authorities, without appearing itself to decide in favor of any one against the rest. The commentator here points out (at the end of the chapter) that the present rule presents the accepted doctrine of the treatise, the three that follow being dis-

37. pāushkarasāder mate vyañjana paraḥ cakāra sparcapārvo 'pi chatvam nā 'padyāte: cakārapārvo nakara ca nakarām nā 'padyate. yathā: ād——: pāp——: pārva ity ukte nakāro iti katham labhyate. nakārapattīr asyāi 'e fasthāya: prosaktanyāi 'ca hi' pratiskadhati. vyañjanaṃ asmāt param iti vyañjana paraḥ.

nāt 'tat sātradvayam isīṣtām.

1 W. om. 2 G. M. om. eva. 3 B. O. om. 4 G. M. -dhah.
approved; but this does not satisfy us. We might, to be sure, regard ourselves as justified in assuming that the doctrine of the authors of the work is first stated, with due and respectful mention of the authorities upon whom they especially rely in maintaining it; but such an assumption does not in all cases help us out of the difficulty.

39. According to some authorities, it remains unchanged.

That is to say, the authorities here referred to would read, for example, in one of the passages already quoted (vi.3,8*), ardāk hy enam.

As the euphonic treatment of h as a sonant, instead of a surd letter is one of the most perplexing anomalies of the Sanskrit phonetic system, such indications as this of the fluctuating and antagonistic views of the old Hindu phonetists respecting it, and the willingness of some of them to give it the value of a surd in making combinations, are worth a great deal to us.

40. According to Čaityāyana and others, a fourth mute is interposed.

These respectable authorities would, if their views are not misrepresented, approve the very strange-looking and hardly defensible reading ardākhy enam (so writes W., with the utmost possible explicitness; B. reads ardāk hya hy; O. gives ardāgh hy; G. M. have ardāghy). The commentator tells us (one would like to know on what authority) that the "others" are Kauhāliputra, Bharadvāja, Old Kāundinya, and Pāushkarāsaḍā. All are mentioned elsewhere (see Index) in the text itself.

38. plātkshiprabhrtinām mate prathamapārvo hakāras tasya prathamasya ssthānān caturtham bhyate. yathā: arv.-.....; sarad-.....; tad..... evampārvo iti kim: prat-.....; hakāra iti kim: vāk-.....; ar-.....; ṛṇ-.....; prathamah pārvo yasmād aśāu prathamapārvaḥ.

1 G. M. om.

39. ekṣahāṅ mate prathamapārvo hakāro. vikṛto bhaṇati. yathā: arv.-.....

40. ċaityāyanādīnām mate hakāraprathamāyor antare madhye prathamamasthānāya caturthāgamō bhaṇati. yathā: arv.-.....; adiṣṭabdena kauhāliputrabharadvājasthavirakaundīnyapāushka-rasādāyāgraḥyante.

1 G. M. -ṇīyānām, and then a lacuna to pujārtham under the next rule.
41. As also, according to the Mīmāṃsakas.

The especial mention, in a separate rule, of the agreement of this school with the view of Čātiyāyana and his abettors, is made, says the commentary, with an honorific intent.

He adds, as was above remarked, that rules 39 to 41 are disapproved.

CHAPTER VI.

CONTENTS: 1–5, conversion of s and h into sh; 6–13, exceptions and counter-exceptions; 14, insertion of s between final s and initial t.

1. Now for conversions of s and visarjaṇīya into sh.

An introductory heading to the rules of this chapter—excepting the last rule:

स्वानात्सोदिव्याक्षरोक्तमोक्तिमप्रेमितमहित्विप्रत्यथयः

न्यूँऽः || २१ ||

2. A s is converted into sh when preceded by svānāsō divi,
ápo hi, ayam u, kam u, u, mo, pro, tri, mahi, dyavi, padi, or a former member of a compound.

The illustrative passages, as given by the commentator, are as follows: uta svānāsō divi shanto agneḥ (i.2.147: only O. has agneḥ; B. omits both that and the preceding word): with the

41. cakāraḥ pārvoktavidhima anvādiṣati: māṁsaṅkāṇāṁ cā
śatārāgamamataṁ summataṁ, pārvoktam eva 'daharamam,
māṁsaṅkāṇāṁ' pājārtham prthaksātrārāmbhah,
nāi tat sūtratrayam ishtam.

iti tribhāṣhyaratne prātiyākhyaśvīvarane
pañcāmo dhāyaḥ.

G. M. om. to here.

1. athe 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ; sakāravisarjanīyāu shakāram
āpadyete ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad cak-
shyāmāḥ.
counter-example tritiyasyām ito divi soma āsit (iii.5.7¹), to show the powerlessness of divi to effect the change except after svāndharaḥ. Then āpo hi sthāṇa mayobhuvah (iv.1.5¹; v.6.14; vii.4.19¹; only G. M. have the last word); the necessity of āpo is shown by the counter-example na hi svāh svāh hinaṣṭi (v.1.7¹). Next ayam u shya pra devayuh (iii.5.11³), and kam u shva ṣya senayā (ii.6.11³); with the counter-example tad u soma āha (iv.2.8¹), to prove that u changes s only after ayam and kam. For śva, the example is ārdhva a śva na ātaye (iv.1.4²; only G. M. have the first word); the other passages in which it exerts a like influence upon an initial s are i.5.11³; iii.5.10¹; iv.6.5⁰; v.1.5³; vii.1.18²; 4.17². For mo, the only passage is the one quoted, mo śva na indra (i.8.3). For pro, only pro śva asmāi puroratham (i.7.13⁵). For tri, only tri shadhasṭhā (ii.4.11² and iii.2.11¹). For the three remaining words, also, the text affords only the single examples given by the commentator: mahi shad dyuman namah (iii.2.8²), ya uṣya dvayān sṛṣṭha (ii.4.14⁴), and padi shitām anuncaita yajurtrāḥ (iv.7.15⁷; G. M. omit the last word). To the prescription conveyed in the last item of the rule, which seems to demand that every s beginning in pada-text the latter member of a compound should be changed to sh, rule 7, below, makes the very important general exception “not after a consonant or an u-vowel”; it means, then, that s is so changed after the i, u, and r vowels and the diphthongs. The commentator illustrates only one or two of the cases in which the conversion would be required: ṣaṁsah cuciśah vasuḥ (iv.2.1¹; p. vuci-sat: only G. M. have the first word), ayā viṣṭhā yaṇayān (i.7.12²; p. viṣṭhāḥ: only G. M. have ayā), and goshtomam deviṣṭham (vii.4.11¹).

I have collected from the Sanhitā all the words coming under the operation of this part of the rule, concerning the initial s of the latter member of a compound (just about a hundred in number, and some of them of quite frequent occurrence), but I do not think the list worth the trouble of giving here. So far as regards the Prātiṣṭhākyā and its relation to them, the important point is to determine whether its rules and exceptions precisely cover them—and I have to say that I have not succeeded in discovering any want of exact adaptedness to them. There is a single participle, anuṣṭhita, whose unaltered s is unnoticed and unprovided for in the chapter, but it occurs only as final member of a compound, vishvanuṣṭhitah (ii.4.12³⁴⁵; p. vishnu-anuṣṭhitah), and so, not being itself separated into its constituents, is exempted from the action of the present rule.

2. ity evampūrvo vagrahapūrvaḥ ca sukārāḥ shakāram āpadyate. yathā: uta:... svāndsam iti kim: tṛt:...: āpo...: āpo iti kim: na:...: ayam...: kam:...: ayaṁnān iti kim: tad:...: ārdh:...: mo:...: pro:...: tri:...: mahi:...: ya:...: padi:...: hāṇ:...: aya:...: go:...: avagrahaḥ pūrvo yasmād asīc avagrahaṇaḥ.
3. Also asadâma and asiîcan.

The "also" (ca) in this rule implies, the commentator says, that the words mentioned are preceded by an avagraha, according to the final specification of the preceding rule: else such passages as ajâyân gharman prâ 'siîcan (v.4.32) would fall under the prescribed action. The examples are yena kâmena nyashadâme 'ti (vii.5.21; p. ni-asadâma), and mitrâvarunâe abhyashîcan (i.8.11; p. abhi-asiîcan). The rule is given, we are told, for the purpose of ordaining that, in the case of these two words, the conversion into sh after an avagraha takes place even notwithstanding the interposition of an a. Why not, then, puts in an objector, say “even when a interposes,” without specification of the words concerned? Because, is the reply, the rule would then apply to such cases as hrtvavasv mayobhân (iv.2.113; p. hrtv-asaḥ).

4. Also in an unaccented pada, when a preposition or nis precedes.

This rule can apply only to unaccented verbal forms, since they alone can be technically anudâta throughout, having the anudâta sign written under every syllable. In any compound beginning with a preposition like pâri, for instance, having an acute on the first syllable and an enclitic svarita on the second, the syllables of the other member of the compound would not have the anudâta accent, but the pracaya: such would fall under rule 2 of this chapter. The word pada in the rule, we are told, is intended to specify the text: “a word which is anudâta throughout in the pada-text” is what the Prātiçâkhyâ means—it being, in fact, impossible that any word should be so accented in samhitâ-text.

The commentator’s examples are, for prepositions, açcâman urjâm iti pari shîcâti (v.4.41), imam vi shyâmi (i.1.102 and iii.5.61), sâmrajyena bhī shîcâmi (i.7.103 twice, and v.6.32: but B. O. read shîcâti, I presume by a copyist’s blunder, as I find no such phrase in the text), yajamâne prati shtâpayantî (vi.1.42), and ni shasâda dhrâcâro varunâh (i.8.161: only B. O. have varunâh);

3. asadâma: asiîcan: ity etayoḥ sakârah shakâram' ápadyate.
yathâ: yena...... mitr...... cakáro vagrahapûrvatevânvâdeca-
kaḥ: anvâdeca 'nena' kim: aj...... avagrahapûrvate 'py'
akārena vyaveta ity ayam árambhaḥ. nanu lâghhavâd akâravya-
veto 'pi 'ty etácâdi 'vâ' lam: kaññhokeya kim. ucye: hrt-
ity addu má.bhâd iti.

1 G. M. satvam. 2 W. B. and O. p. m. om. pûrva. 3 B. O. G. M. om. 4 G. M. sati.
for nis, ni shtanihi duritá (iv.6.67): all the manuscripts of the comment, along with my manuscript of the Sanhitá, read thus, as required by ix.1: compare the similar cases noted under rule 13, below). A number of counter-examples are given, showing the effect of absence of any one of the conditions contained in the rule: they are sádane sída samudre (iv.3.1), bhrtah garmaní syá (iv.1.51), vi símatih surucáh (iv.2.82: G. M. omit this example), and abhi savaná páhi (i.4.10,11).

The cases coming under the rule are not so numerous but that it may be worth while to report them. Of verbal forms after odhi I have found none; after abhi, I have noted abhi shyáma (i.4.462), and forms of abhi shiádámi (i.7.102 et al.) and abhi shunomí (iii.1.82); after prati, forms of prati shthápayámi (i.7.52 et al.), and prati shthábáhti (ii.2.123); after pari, forms of pari shyé (iii.3.111 et al.), and pari shtát (i.7.133); after vi (besides that quoted under rule 13, below), vi shajántá (vi.4.72), and forms of vi shyáma (iii.4.118); after ni (besides the one under rule 13), ni shasáda (i.8.161 et al.), and forms of ni shidámí (iii.5.114 et al.). Such cases as ni-shddágyati (v.3.72), where the preposition, losing its accent before the accented verbal form, is combined with the latter in the pada-text, belong under rule 2, above. The same is the case with vyádithaíjet (vi.6.42 et al.), where the verb has two prepositional prefixes, and is therefore written in combination with them (vi-vyádithaíjet), and with altered sibilant. But for this circumstance, we should require a separate and special treatment of the word; for ati is by this Prátiçákhya (i.15) excluded from the list of upasarga, 'prepositions,' and so could not by the present rule cause the alteration of an initial s of a root. Anu is also thus excluded, whence the passage anu sthána (v.6.13) does not fall under the rule, and the retention of its dental sibilant needs no specific authorization. It is the only case, so far as I have discovered, in which the restriction of the class of prepositions to half its usual number has any bearing upon the objects of this rule.

5. Also the visarjaniya, when followed by t, of anyih preceded by rásah or sapte, and of nih, viduh, midhuh, pâyubhih,
veh, sumatih, mākih, iyuh, áyuḥ, ábhīh, sadhih, and nakīh, under all circumstances.

This is, the commentator remarks, a rule establishing exceptions in advance to rule 2 of the ninth chapter, which would require in every case s instead of sh. The examples are: for agnih, avidush-tārāsah: agnīṣaḥ tūd vacum (i.1.14*); and medhyac ca sapte: agnīṣaḥ tvā (v.1.11*); with a counter-example, varshishṭe adhi nāke 'gnis te tanuvam (i.1.8: only G. M. have the first two words), to show that agnih becomes agnis after other words than the two specified in the rule. For nis, nish tāpāmi gos̄thām (i.1.10*). For viduh, vidushtaraṇ sapema (ii.5.12*; p. viduh-taram), and also, in virtue of rule i.52, avidushtārāsah (i.1.14*; p. aviduh-tārāsah): vidushtarāḥ occurs at ii.6.11*.

Mūdhuh, mūdhuštāma ėivatama (iv.5.10*; p. mūdhu-tama). For pāyubhiḥ, pāyubhiṣ ṭvaṇ gīvebhīḥ (i.4.24): with the counter-example tasmād aṅgas trī[bhīs tishtiḥāṇa tishtuḥ (v.4.12*): only G. M. have the first two words], to show that the quotation of bhīḥ (of pāyuy-bhīḥ) alone as nimita would not have answered the purpose. For veḥ, goce veḥ ṭvaṇ hi yojac (iv.3.13*). For sumatiḥ, sumatiś te astu bādhasva (i.4.45*): only G. M. have the last word: and, to justify the text in quoting sumatiḥ (p. su-matiḥ) in full, instead of māṭiḥ simply, we receive an asserted quotation from “another text,” pramātis te devatām. For mākis, mākīṣe te vyathair ā dadharṣit (i.2.14*).

For iyuh, iyush te ye pārcatāram apacyan (i.4.33). For āyuḥ, āyuḥya ṭa āyuṛḍā agne (ii.5.12*; only G. M. have agne): we have āyuḥ te again at i.3.14*.

For ābhīh, ābhīṣe te adya ḍīrbhiḥ (iv.4.47*; G. M. omit the last word). For sadhiḥ, apsv agne sa-

5. rāsah: sapte: 'ity ētābhīyāṁ vijishtē 'gnir ity asmin' gra-
hane: nih...* nakhīh: ity esēhu visarjānīyas takāraparā
dhakāram' āpadyate. yathā: avid...: medh...: etā-
bhyāṁ vijishtā iti kim: varṣh...: nish...: vid...: apy
akārdā (i.52) iti vacanād avidushtarāsā ity apy udāhara-
nam: mī...: pāy...: pāyv iti kim: tasm...: goce...;
sum...: sv iti kim: pram...: iti cākhāntare: māk...;
iyuh...: āyuḥ...: ābhīsh...: apsv...: nakīsh;
nityaçabadhā kimarthaḥ: ṭkāra repavatvā (vi.8): avagrahā
tv (vi.9) iti nishedhain vahṣhyatvā: avidur' ity ātra visarjānīyasā
'vagrahasthatvāt skātavān na syāt: tan mā bhād iti: kañ̄ḥoktir
vidur ity avyāt'va na tv avidur ity asye 'ti-dāurvālyat: tat-
sairakshanārtho nityaçabadhā pravijnate.

aghoshaparasa tasya sasthānam (ix.2) ity asya puras-
tād apavādō 'yam.

dhish tava (iv.2.32,112). And for nakih, nakish tam ghantti (ii.1.114): nakish tam is found also at i.8.224.

The final specification of the rule, nityam, ‘under all circumstances,’ is explained as intended to assure the inclusion in the rule of the word avidushtagārah (i.1.144), already quoted, which would otherwise be liable to exclusion by the operation of rules 8 and 9, below. The word viduh itself, we are told, is all right, because of its specific mention in the text, but a little additional force is need- ed to bring in aviduh as its hanger-on. The explanation is by no means of the most satisfactory character, but I have nothing to suggest in its place. We have already once (see note to iii.8) had a case arising under i.52 treated as demanding a special handling.


An introductory heading, of force in the rules that follow (through rule 13).

7. Excepted is a s preceded by an a-vowel, a consonant, cakuni, patni, rtu, mṛtyu, malimlu, or bṛhaspāti.

The bearing of the first two items of this rule on those which precede it has been noticed under rule 2. The commentator’s examples are, for a preceding a-vowel, antarikshasad dhoti (i.8.152 et al.: only G. M. have the second word) and a sīnacasa (i.4.19: but G. M. omit the passage), of which one falls as an exception under rule 2, the other under rule 4; and, for a preceding consonant, ṛkāme vāi (vi.1.31). Then, for the words specified, we have cakuniasaṇena (v.7.14), patnisaṃvyojanām (ii.6.104: G. M. read -yādāḥ, which is found twice in the same division of the same section, but not elsewhere), rtusṭhās tasya (v.7.62: the same compound is found at v.5.81), mṛtyusāṃyuta iva (i.5.94: only G. M. have iva), nāi...

6. athi 'ty ayam adhikāroḥ: ne 'ty etad adhikrtān veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad vakṣhyaṁahā?

7. avarṇapārvo vyañjanapārvo ca cakuni... bṛhaspāti: iti evamāravac ca sakāroḥ sakāroṁś nā "paṇyate. yathā: ant-...: avagrahapūrvevat śc prōptih: 'ā sīṁ...: upasorga- pūrvevat prōptih: ṛk-...: cak-...: patn-...: rtu-...: mṛt-...: nāi...: bṛh-...: 'avagrahapūrvevād esām prōptih'.

1 G. M. om. 2 W. vadāyāmoh.

6. O. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. shateam. 4 G. M. ins. esām. 5) G. M. om.
6) G. M. om.; W. adds sa visāvyāḥ: avagrahapūrvevād prōptih.
'nam malimluseṇa vindati (vi.3.26: only G. M. have the first two and the last words), and brhospatisutoṣya te (i.4.27 and vi.5.83);
all of which, as the commentator points out, are cases falling under
the last specification of rule 2, respecting the conversion of initial
s of the latter member of a compound.

8. Also in a word containing r or r.
The commentator gives one example of each case, the former
constituting an exception under rule 4, the latter under the last
specification of rule 2: vi srjate gantyaī (i.7.67), and tasmāt sa
visrasyah (vi.2.94,107: only G. M. have tasmāt).
Of other words falling under this rule, I have noted parisrutam
(i.8.21), visavjanom (i.1.52), bahustvārī (iii.1.114), and gosatram
(vii.5.11). Compare the nearly corresponding rules of the other
treatises, Rik Pr. v.11, Vāj. Pr. iii.81, Ath. Pr. ii.102,106.

9. Also in the former member of a compound.
We should expect the word avagraha in this rule to be put in
the locative case, so as to accord in construction with the preceeding
rule; and I have translated it as a locative. Its being a nominative
makes the commentator some trouble: he declares avagraha
here equivalent to avagrahastra, ‘standing in avagraha,’ and
quotes as corresponding and customary expressions “the stages
cry out,” “the fat one knows,” where “those occupying the stages,”
“the soul inhabiting a fat body,” are really meant.
The occasion for such a precept as this arises out of rule 4, above,
which provides for the conversion into sh of the initial s of a word
wholly anudatta, after a preposition. It was aimed, as is there
pointed out, at unaccented verbal forms. But the former mem-
bers of compounds which are accented on the latter member

8. Ṛkāraṣ ca repaṣ ca Ṛkārarephau: tāv asmint sta ity Ṛkāra-
rephavit: tasmin pade vartamānah sakurah shakāram nā "pad-
yate, yathā: vi...... 'upasargapārvatvāt prāptih': tasm......:
'avagrahāpārvatvāt prāptih'.
1 G. M. shatvāni. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. B. O. om. 4 W. om.
9. avagrahasthaḥ sakurah shakāram nā "padyate: upasarga-
pāraṣ ca: avagraha ity avagrahasthaḥ lakṣhyate: maṇḍah kro-
canti 'ty atra, maṇcāstah: ' sthalo jānati 'ti' sthaladehastah.
udāhāranāni: tasy......: mukh......
1 G. M. shatvāni. 2 W. -ra; G. M. visarjanīyāḥ. 3 W. sat. 4 G. M. change
place with avagraha. 5 B. O. labhy-. 6 G. M. ins. yathā. 7 G. M. ins. yathā.
8 B. O. om. illé.
would also come under the rule, as being anudatta throughout, and also entitled to the designation pada, ‘word,’ equally with completely independent vocables: hence the necessity of providing for their exclusion from its action. The commentator illustrates with a couple of examples: tasyāṃ devā' ādhi sañvāsantaḥ (iii.5.11), and mukham yajñā'nam abhi sañvāsī (v.1.112: only G. M. have the first word). W. B. O. introduce a third, between the other two, namely abhi sāṁ agaḥanat' ti (ii.5.37); but, as is shown by the accentuation and division, it does not fall under either the fourth rule or this, and has evidently come in by somebody’s blunder.

It is very possible that the Sanhitā contains other cases requiring the application of this rule; but if so, they have escaped my notice.

\[\text{सवस्थानम्} \quad ॥ १० ॥\]

10. Also in sava and sthānam.

The cited passages are agnisavaç cityah (v.6.15), anusavanam purodāpān (vi.5.114 and vii.5.64), savanesavan bhi grññāti (vi.4.114; 6.113), prasavāya sāvīrah (vi.6.52: G. M. omit the last word; and the whole example is a blunder, since there is nowhere a rule requiring the lingualization of the sibilant in prasava, and gacha gosthānam (i.1.91.2).

The word sthānam being cited with its special case-ending, the rule would not apply to such forms as sthānah, sthāṇi, which in fact occur in the compound pratisṭhāṇa (e.g. i.7.66: ii.4.41), with their sibilant converted to sh. Sava, however, having no case-ending, falls under rule i.22, and is employed as “part of a word, in order to the inclusion of a variety of cases,” as the comment duly points out, and as his selected examples illustrate.

\[\text{न थिमृव्र्} \quad ॥ ११ ॥\]

11. But not when dhi precedes.

The examples are adhishavanam asi (i.1.52: W. omits this example), adhishavane jihvā (vi.2.114), and adhishthānam āram-

---

1. G. M. om. 2 G. M. sañvā. 3 B. bahupadān arthaḥ.

11. sava: sthānam: ity etayoh sakārah shakārah nā “padyate. save’ti padāikadeha bahupadānārthaḥ. agn-.....: anus-......: sav-......: pras-......: gacha-.....

1 B. G. M. etayoh. 2 G. M. sakārasya pūrva. 3 G. M. put first. 4 W. om.
bhānam (iv.6.24). There are no other words illustrating the rule, although adhishavāṇa occurs in one or two other passages.

Considering that an appended specification constituting a rule often applies only to the last word given in the preceding rule (e.g. iv.13,16), it might well enough have seemed advisable to the authors of the Prātiśākhya to read here dhipārvayoh, in the dual, instead of dhipārve.

12. Also in saṁtānebhyaḥ, saptābhīḥ, sammitām, stanām, sitam, spaṣṭah, sak, sani, sanīḥ, sanīḥ, sabheyah, sattvā, and sasyāyāḥ.

The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows. For saṁtānebhyaḥ, pariśaṁtānebhyaḥ svāhā (vii.4.21). For saptābhīḥ, triśaṁtābhīḥ paṇḍukāmaṣya (v.2.6.2: G. M. have only the first word). For sammitām, vediśaṁmitām minoti (v.6.8.2). For stanām, devaṁtanām karoti (v.1.6.4). For sitam, anusitaṁ cāpati (v.2.5.5). For spaṣṭah, tanḍāpānaḥ pratiṣpaṣṭah (v.7.3.1). Sak is declared a part of a word, implying a variety of forms: for example, paccāt pṛṇisaktho bhavati (ii.1.3.3), pṛṇisakthāḥ trayo hāṁmantikāḥ (v.6.2.23: G. M. omit the last word), pṛṇisakthāṁ ā labheta grāmākāmāḥ (ii.1.3.2: G. M. O. omit the last word), and pṛṇisakthāya svāhā (vii.3.18): I have noted no other cases, and should regard sakthā as (by i.22) the preferable form for the graḥana in the rule. For saṁī, tasminād etad gosani (vii.5.2.2); for saṁī, asī stānyātmanam asī (iv.4.6.2: G. M. omit the first word); for saṁī, vṛṣṭhitasaṁ upa dādvāti (v.3.12,10.1): gosaniḥ is found also at ii.2.5.7, and vṛṣṭhitasaṁ at iv.4.6.2. As it would satisfy all these cases to cite saṁ alone, in the character of part of a word (like sak, above), the commentator inquires why that was not done, and the citation of whole words avoided; and he brings up in reply mṛdhā vā esho bhishannō yasmāt samāneshe anyah creyān uta (ii.4.2.3: all but W. stop at -shanno), and nishāṇāyā svāhā

12. eteshu saṁkarāḥ shakāraṁ na "padyate. yathā: pavi...: tri...: vedi...: devi...: anu...: tan...: saṁ iti padāikadego bahūpadāndārthāḥ; yathā: paco...: pr...: pr...: pr...: tas...: asi...: vṛsh...: 'sann ity' etavatā 'va' siddhe kim akhilapadapāthena: mṛdhā...: nish...: ity āduṁ má bhūd iti: sus...: abhise...: sus...: 'sattvasaṁtānebhyaḥ ity etayor upasargapūrvatvāt prāptiḥ:'

sarveṣhām anyeṣhām avagrahapūrvatvāt prāptiḥ.

1 G. M. ehu. 2 G. M. khatvam. 3 W. B. O. san ity; G. M. sani ity. 4 G. M. om. eva. 5 G. M. om. pada. 6 W. satvāsasyādy ity ayor upasargavagrahapūrv-. B. O. saṁtānebhyaḥ svāhā: ity etayor up. 7 W. om. 8 G. M. om.
(vii.1.101), as examples of the alteration of san. Saní would not cover all the cases; and the treatise makes no provision for the citation of a theme ending in i, or any other vowel than a, as representative of all the forms derived from that theme. For sabheyah is quoted susabheyo ya evam (vii.1.81: G. M. omit evam). For sattvā, abhisattvā sahojāh (iv.6.12): all the MSS. read everywhere, in text, commentary, and Sanhitā, sattvā). And for sanyāyā, munsasyāyā supīppalābhyaḥ (i.2.23).

All these are exceptions under rule 2, being cases of compounds whose second member begins with s, after a vowel other than an a-vowel. The commentary tries (with much discordance between the different manuscripts: see the various readings below) to claim two of them as exceptions under rule 4; but there is no ground for so doing.

न स्वग्न्याधारीमानसात्तनाचतुर्विषुप्रस्तुवस्योनि
राज्योत्तप्पुपूज्याते ॥ १३ ॥

13. But not in svara, spardhāh, starima, sāhasra, sārathih, sphuranti, stubh, and in sto when preceded by jyotiḥ, āyuḥ, or catuḥ.

Of these words, the first six constitute counter-exceptions under rule 8, which excepted words containing r or ṛ from the conversion of their initial s into sh. The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows: amba ni shvāra (i.4.12 and vi.4.42); vi shpardhāc chandaḥ (iv.3.123)—these two, it is noted, are cases under rule 4, of unaccented verbal forms after a preposition—su-shtarimā jushānā (v.1.112); dvishāhasraṁ cinvita (v.6.82: G. M. omit cinvita), and trishāhasro vā asdu lokāḥ (v.6.82: G. M. omit after vai)—both forms are, we are made to observe, included in the citation of sāhasra by its theme-ending a, according to rule i.22: other forms do not occur in the Sanhitā, nor these elsewhere than in the two divisions quoted from—kāmayate sushārathih (iv.6.83); and vishphuranti amitrān (iv.6.62).

The next case is a very anomalous one, the conversion of s into sh after a, contrary to the first specification of rule 7. The phrase is sashutup chandaḥ (iv.3.122; p. sa-stup). Compare similar cases as noted in Ath. Pr. ii.95.

The combination of sto with the three words mentioned, although
not quite regular, has nothing strange in it. The final visarjaniya of the first member of the compound is lost by ix.1, and the sibilant is treated as it would be had no h been present. The examples are jyotishтомам пратхамам (vii.4.10\(^1\), 11\(^1\)), ḍyuṣṭoṃam trīyam (vii.4.11\(^1\)), and catuṣṭoṃo abhavat (iv.3.11\(^2\)); jyotishṭoma and catuṣṭoṃa occur in a number of other passages, which it is not worth while here to rehearse. The exception this time is the second specificaion of rule 7, according to which the consonant h at the end of the former member of the compound would prevent the lingualization of the sibilant. Of course, according to the theory of the Prātičākhya (by v.3), the lingualization is first performed, giving ḍyotishtoma etc., and then, by ix.1, the visarja\-niya disappears, making jyotistiṣṭoma, as all the manuscripts, of comment and Sanhitā, constantly read.

The commentator remarks the fact that, from starīma on, the cases are such as fall under the last specificaion of the second rule of this chapter. He then adds, as counter-examples under sto, yad akshnayāstomiyāh (v.3.3\(^1\)), catustanām karoti (v.1.6\(^4\)), and jyotis te 'ā asya (ii.2.4\(^8\): but G. M. omit this example).

There are a few other words which we might expect to see included among those forming the subject of this rule. Such is bara-hishad (iv.6.1\(^4\) et al.), i.e. barihī-sad: but the Kik and Atharvan pada-texts adopt the omission of the final h as part of their own reading, and the Tāttiriya (p. barhi-sad) does the same, so that the irregularity of the word lies outside the Prātičākhya. Such, again, are dushtara (iv.4.12\(^2\)) and dushtarītuna (iv.4.12\(^1\)), provided that, as seems to me probable (compare note to Ath. Pr. ii.85), they are regarded as compounds of duḥ with stara and stariṭu. But these words are written by the pada-text of the other Vedas dus\-tara and dushtarītuna, and the pada-text of the Tāttiriya-Sanhitā reads dushtara and dushtarītuna, so that there is no reason for their peculiar phonetic form being noticed by the Prātičākhya. Once more, trishasamṛddhatēdyā (ii.4.11\(^5\)) would call for inclusion here, but that the addition of the suffix tvā at its end annuls the separation which would otherwise be made of the first element of the compound, triḥ, and the word stands in pada-text trishasamṛddha-\-tēdyā, and so does not require alteration in sanhitā.

\begin{verbatim}
trish-...: kām-...: vish-...: sash-...: jyot-...: dy-
...: cat-...: starimādnām esām avagrapāvavatvāt pṛāpiṭh: jyotirādipāvavatvena kim: yād...: sto iti kim: cat---: jyot-
\end{verbatim}

\(^1\) G. M. om. \(^2\) G. M. ity ādi. \(^3\) W. B. om. \(^4\) W. B. O. om.
14. In tarhán, tasmin, lokán, vidván, tán, trīn, yushmān, ārdhvān, ambakān, rtūn, açman, krvan, pitṛn, anān, kapālān, tīsh/han when accented on the first syllable, nemīr devān, and savane paćūn, an original n, followed by a t, becomes s, when the t is a constant one.

There seems to be no particular reason why this rule is introduced here, instead of anywhere else in the work, as it has no relation with the rest of the contents of the chapter. It is a complete rehearsal of the cases in which the old s, with which most Sanskrit words in n originally ended, is retained under the protection of a following initial t. The combination, of course, is historically identical with that of n c into nçe, treated of in the preceding chapter (v.20: see the note upon that rule). The "conversion" of n into s, as the treatise chooses to state the case, involves, by xv.1–3, the prefixion of anusvāra to the sibilant.

The examples quoted by the commentator are as follows. For tarhān, catatārahānās trīhanti (i.5.7\textsuperscript{6} and v.4.7\textsuperscript{4}). For tasmin, tasmānās tvā dadhāmi (i.6.5\textsuperscript{1}; 7.5\textsuperscript{1}). For lokān, tinān eva lokānās tirva (iii.5.4\textsuperscript{2}): there is another case of lokānās at ii.3.6\textsuperscript{1}. For vidvān, ya evaṁ vidvāṁ śraddhātāvayena yajate (ii.4.11\textsuperscript{2}: G. M. stop with -yena: the Tāṭtiṭiṛya-Saṁhitā has papukāmo before yajate, which W. B. O. have doubtless dropped out by an oversight). For tán, kaksheshu aghāyavas tāṁs te dadhāmi jambhayoh (iv.1.10\textsuperscript{2}: only G. M. have the first two words, and they omit the last one): tāṁs is also found at ii.4.11\textsuperscript{4}: iii.1.9\textsuperscript{5}: iv.1.10\textsuperscript{2} twice; vi.3.14\textsuperscript{2} twice; 4.10\textsuperscript{2}.4\textsuperscript{1}. For trīn, trīṇs trēdan anu (ii.5.10\textsuperscript{1}). For yushmān, yushmānās te’nu (iii.2.5\textsuperscript{6}): we find yushmānīs again at vii.1.5\textsuperscript{2}. For ārdhvān, yān ārdhvāṁs tán upabdimateh (iii.1.9\textsuperscript{1}: only G. M. have the first word). For ambakān, tryambakaṁs tryāsavanām akurata (iii.2.2\textsuperscript{3}: G. M. omit the last word). For rtūn, rtāṁs tanvate kavyah prajānatih (iv.3.11\textsuperscript{2}: G. M. omit after tanvate). For açmam, açmaṁs te kshit (iv.6.1\textsuperscript{1} and v.4.4\textsuperscript{1}). For krvan, punah krvanās tvā pitaram yuvānam (iv.7.13\textsuperscript{2}: only W. has the last word). For pitṛn, oja iti pitṛns tantur iti (v.3.6\textsuperscript{3}):

14. ....... ayudātte tishthangrahane ...... eshu grahaneshu prākrto nakāraḥ padasamaye' vartamānas takāraparāḥ sakāram āpadyate. yathā: cat...... tasm...... imān...... ya...... kaksh...... triṁs...... yush...... yān...... tryam...... rt...... açm...... punah...... oja...... prān...... api vikratam (i.51) iti vacanād etad bhavati: dvād...... trihk...... ayudāttta iti kim: na...... api akārādi (i.52) iti prāptih: nem...... nemir iti kim: jāt...... mādh...... savana iti kim:
only G. M. have the first two words). For anán, pránaṁ tasya 'ntaryanti (vii.1.34; p. pra-anán): here rule i.51 is invoked to show that the lingualized n does not render the citation inoperative. For kapálán, dvádaśakapálāṁ试试尝试性地  tātīyasavane (vii.5.84). For tishthan, tribhia tishthais tishthu (v.4.121): as counter-example, proving the necessity of the requirement as to accent, we have na praty atishthan tā vasuko 'si (v.3.62: G. M. omit na), which would fall under the operation of the present rule by i.52. For nemir devān, nemir devāṁ team paribhār asi (i.5.92: G. M. omit asi); with the counter-example jātavedo vapa'yā gacha devān tvāñ hi (iii.1.44: G. M. omit the first word), to show that devān is so treated only after nemī. For savane paṭān, mādhyanandine savane paṭāṁ tātīyasavane (iii.2.92: G. M. omit the first word); with the counter-example prajām paṭān tenā 'vardhata (vii.4.32), to prove the need of savane in the rule. Then, as general counter-example, to bring out the fact that n is thus converted into s only before t, we have tasmin prajāpatir vāyuḥ (vii.1.51): G. M. add also lokāṁ dravināvataḥ (v.3.112). And finally, the commentator proceeds to explain and illustrate the limitations “an original (prākṛta) n” and “a constant (nitya) t,” given in the rule. An original n is one which is not the product of euphonic processes, but is read in the pada-text: in tāṁ tena śamayati (v.7.32), then, where the n represents a n, produced by the assimilation of m to the following t (by v.27), the rule has no force. A constant t, in like manner, is one which is found in all forms of the text, and not in somaḥtā alone: hence, in vidānt somena yañate (iii.2.22), the t which is introduced (by v.33) between n and s does not cause the conversion of the n into s. The t in this case, to be sure, is (by xiv.12) to be turned into th (and is so written in the citation by W. G. M.); but, as the rules of the treatise (by v.3) have to be applied in their order, the danger of misapprehension upon the point in question requires to be guarded against: for a t inserted by authority of the fifth chapter might assimilate a nasal according to the sixth, before it was itself turned into an innocuous th by the fourteenth.

The cases in which the insertion of s between n and t is made in the Tāttirīya-Saṅhitā are thus seen to number only thirty-one. On the other hand, the cases of the collision of n and t without interposition of s are very numerous: I have noted about two hundred

praj.... takārapara iti 'kim: tasmin.... lokān.... prākṛta iti kim: tāṁ.... váikṛto 'yaṁ nakāro * makāra sparṣaparāḥ (v.27) iti prāptavat: nitye takāra iti kim: vidv.... anityo 'yaṁ nakāro yataḥ padasamaye na 'sti.

   takāraḥ pero yasmād asāv tathoktaḥ'.

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśākyavivarane
shashtho 'dhyāyah.

and eighty, and presume that I may have overlooked here and there others, so that there would be in all ten times as many instances of the omission as of the insertion. In the Atharva-Veda (see second marginal note to Ath. Pr. ii.26) the condition of things is quite different: while the whole number of collisions is much less (only ninety-five), the sibilant is introduced in considerably more than two-thirds of them (in sixty-seven cases, against twenty-eight). The comparison is of some interest in its bearing upon the question of the relative age of the two texts.

CHAPTER VII.

CONTENTS: 1-12, cases of the conversion of n into ṇ; 13-14, of t and th into ṭ and ṭh; 15-16, exceptions to the conversion of n into ṇ.

1. Now for conversion of n into ṇ.

An introductory heading, stating the subject of the chapter (with the exception of rules 13 and 14). We have treated here all the cases with which the Prātiṣṭhākyā has properly to deal, as arising in the process of conversion of pada-text into saṁhitā: chapter thirteen (rule 6 seq.) takes up the occurrence of n in a different way, determining every instance in which that letter is found in the whole Sanhitā.

2. N becomes ṇ when preceded by shu, shu, kṛdhi swah, sam indra, asthūri, uru, vāḥ, shat, tri, grāma, or nih.

The commentator's illustrative examples are as follows. For shu, ārdhva u shu naḥ (iv.1.4² and v.1.5³: O. omits the first word); and, as counter-example, grhesu naḥ (ii.4.5¹), where shu, not being a complete word, does not (by i.50) lingualize the nasal: but G. M. omit this passage and the accompanying explanation. For shu, mo shu na indra (i.8.3). The commentator points out

1. athē 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: nakāro nakāram ṣaṅya yata ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad vakṣhyāmaḥ.

2. ...... exampūrevo nākāro nakāram ṣaṅya yatha: ārdh-...... 'grḥ-...... ity atra ṇaṁvaṁ na bhavati padagrahaṇeshu (i.50) iti vacanāḥ: mo......: sustā ity etayor yadda ṇaṁvaṁ na 'sti tadda naṅvanishedhāṛthāṁ vāikṛtagrahaṇam: ya-
that shu and shā are cited in the rule in their altered form (not as su simply, which, by i.51, would include them both) in order to indicate that where their consonant is not lingualized they do not lingualize the following nasal; and he quotes in illustration su na ātaye (iv.1.4) and sū na indra (i.8.3). Both these passages are the same which have been already quoted to illustrate the conversion, and G. M. O. very properly put them into the form of another text (apparently a krama), reading su nah: na ātaye, and sū nah: na indra. Shu converts n to n also at iv.6.56. For kṛdhi svāhā, the passage is brahmanā kṛdhi svār na pu$kram (ii.2.126: O. omits the first word: the Calcutta edition has the false reading na); and the necessity of kṛdhi is shown by the counter-example svāhā svār nā 'rkah svāhā (v.7.52: O. omits the first word). For sam indra, sam indra no manasā (i.4.44); and vartaye 'ndra nardabuda (iii.3.101) shows that īndra when not preceded by sam does not exercise the prescribed influence. For asthūri, asthūri no gārhapsatyāni saṁtu (v.7.21: only O. has saṁtu). For uru, uru nas kṛdhi (ii.6.118 and vi.3.22): there is another like case at iv.7.14.2. For vāh, tasmād vār nāma vo hitam (v.6.13: G. M. omit the last two words). For shat, shonnavatātī svāhā (vii.2.15). For tri, trinava stomo vasānām (iv.3.91: G. M. O. omit the last word): the word trinava is found in a considerable number of other passages. For grāma, W. B. give grāmanī rājanyah (ii.5.44), but G. M. O. have instead grāmanīyaṃ pra "pu Trayāti (vii.4.58): the word is found once more, at iv.4.3. For niḥ, nir nenijati tato 'dhī (vii.2.102: G. M. omit the last two words); and ni no rayim (ii.2.128) is added, to show that ni, without visarjanīya, has no alterant force. Nir nenikte (vii.2.104) and nirnīj (iv.6.81) are the only other cases I have noted for niḥ.

3. Also in hanyāt and upyamānam.

That is to say, after niḥ, the last of the words given in the preceding rule. The passages are: yoner garbham niḥ hanyat (v.6.91):

thā: su...: sū...: brah...: kṛdhi 'ti kim: svāhā...:

sam...: sam iti kim: vart...: asth...: uru...: tasmād...: shan...: tri...: grām...: nir...: visargaṇa kim: ni...:  


3. cakāro nishpūrvatvam anvādiṣati: niḥcabdottaryor han-
yād upyamānam ity etayor grahanayaor nakāro nakāramār épadyate. yathā: yon...: nir...: anvādeçaḥ kimarthah: na...  

G. M. -bdāryo 'tt; O. nishpūrvayor. G. M. om. W. nakātvam; B. na-
tevam. G. M. om.
O. omits the first word, and nirupyamānām abhi mantrayeta (i.6.88: O. omits the last word). A counter-example, showing hanyāt without altered n, is na ni hanyān na lohitam kuryāt (ii.6.102).

4. Also after pāri, pari, pari, and pra.

The illustrative citations of the commentator are pārinahyasya "pe (vi.2.11), pari no rudrasya (iv.5.10+), viravantam parināsam (ii.2.126), and pra no devī sarasvatī (i.8.221: O. omits the last word). For pāri (p. pāri-nahyasya: compare iii.7) there is no other case; nor for pari (p. pari-nasam: compare iii.7); for pari, I find only pari nayati (ii.3.4³ et al.). But for pra the examples are quite numerous: we have pra nah at i.5.114; 6.4; 7.10² twice; ii.5.12²; i.1.11²; 3.114; iv.2.6²; v.5.7²; vii.4.19²; pra nāmāni at iv.3.186; forms of pra nayāmi at i.6.8² et al., of pra nuda at ii.1.8² et al.; pranindya at i.3.5; praniyamānah at iv.4.9²; pra nenkti at vi.2.9¹; pranī at ii.5.9², prānīti at i.4.18 and supranīti (but p. su-prānīti) at i.5.11⁵ et al., proneta at iii.5.11², and pranena at iii.2.9⁶. Prānūntti occurs only in composition (vi.2.3²; p. bhṛatrīya-prānūnttyāi).

5. And that, even when an a-vowel intervenes.

The word "even" (api) here brings down by implication, according to the commentator, the words in the preceding rule from pari on—that is to say, virtually, pari and pra, for there is no case of pari exercising such an effect. The examples for pari are agram pary anayat (ii.3.4²: all but O. omit agram: I find besides only pary anayan, at vi.5.7²), and paryānyādī "havanīyasya (vii.1.6⁵). For pra, we have prāṇāya svāhā (vi.1.19¹; p. pra-anāya), and anu pra nyāt prathamām (v.5.5²; p. pre ti: anyāt: only O. has anu). The occurrence of prāṇa is very frequent: of other cases, I have noted only pra 'nudata at vi.2.3², and pra 'nudanta at vi.4.10³⁴—where, however, the lingualization of the n is suspended in our text, as at present constituted, by the intervention.

4. evampārvo nakāro nakāram āpadyate. yathā: pār- pari: vir: pra.....

1 G. M. O. om.

5. apiṣcāvals paryādy avādiṣcit?: paryādipārva śakāro avarṇavyaveto 'pi nateam bhajate. yathā: agram: pari: prān- anu: avarṇavyaveta iti kim: pari.....

1 B. pār. ² G. M. O. -adeṣakā. ³ B. pār. ⁴ G. M. āpadyate. ⁵ G. M. O. om.
between the preposition and the verb of the pause which separates the third and fourth divisions of the section.

A couple of counter-examples are given, to show us that the intervention of a letter of any other complexion than a prevents the change of nasal: they are pari minuyāt sopā (v.2.6\(^3\): G. M. omit the last word), and pramināma vratāni (i.1.14\(^4\)).

6. Also in vāhanah, uhyamānah, yānam, ayan, yavena, and van.

According to W. B. O., the n becomes n in these words “when they are preceded as implied by the word ‘also’ (ca),” the commentary failing to tell us what this implication is. G. M., however, confess that pra only is brought forward (from rule 4): which is a marked departure from the ordinary usage of the treatise, since in the intermediate rule pra and pari were both distinctly understood. The commentator omits, not to say avoids, noticing the irregularity. Perhaps he would be justified in claiming that pari and pari are never found preceding the words specified in the rule, and that therefore it makes no difference whether they be regarded as implied or not: still, even that consideration would not wholly excuse the want of accuracy and consistency. The examples are: for vāhanah, pravāhano vahniḥ (i.3.3; p. pra-vāhanah); to this, W. adds a counter-example, to show that, after any other word than pra, vāhanah remains unchanged—namely havyavāhanah svātro si (i.3.3): B. tries to do the same, but only succeeds in repeating one of the counter-examples of the last rule, pari minuyāt (v.2.6\(^3\)), which is not at all in place here. For uhyamānah, prahyamāno dhīpatiḥ (iv.4.9; p. pra-uhyamānah. For yānam, prayānām anv anv aja id yavuḥ (iv.1.12; p. pra-yānam: O. omits the last three words, G. M. the last two). Ayan is declared a part of a word, including a number of cases, of which G. M. give only three, tasmād ādityah prāyaṇīyāḥ (vi.1.5\(^1\): p. pra-āyaṇīyāḥ: O. omits tasmāt), prāyaṇāyam kāryam (vi.1.5\(^3\)-\(^5\)), and prāyaṇānam pratiśthām (i.6.11\(^4\): p. pra-āyaṇām); while W. B. O. add two others, prāyaṇīyasya purnavekhyāḥ (vi.1.5\(^5\)), and prāyaṇīye han (vi.2.8\(^1\)). There are a number of other passages for prāyaṇīya; and prāyaṇa occurs again at i.6.11\(^2\) and vii.1.13, besides its compounds,

---

6. eteshu grahaṇeshu cākārākṣṣhapūrveśu nakāro nātvam bhajate. yathā: prav... "pre ti kim: havy..."

proh...: pray...: ayann iti padāikadeśo bahūpādānārthah: tasm...: pray...: préy...: "préy... préy..." pray...: "cann iti padāikadeśo bahūpādānārthah": yadi...: áhav...: anvōdeṣena kim: asi...: uday...
suprāyana (v.1.112; p. su-prāyanah) and agnishtomaprāyana (vii.2.91; p. agnishtoma-prāyanah). For yavena, prayavena pañca (iv.3.112; p. pra-yavena). Van, again, is (by W. alone) declared a part of a word, intended to include many cases; only two are given, yadi va tāvat pravanam (ii.4.121), and dhavanayat pravanah syat (vi.2.64), nor have I found any other, except the compound purastātravanah (v.3.15; p. purastat-pravanah). Finally, we have a couple of counter-examples, showing the necessity of the implication from the preceding rule: they are asi havyavedāhanah (i.3.3), and udayanam veda (i.6.112).

7. As also, when preceded by prā.

The "also" (ca) of this rule brings forward from the preceding rule only the word last mentioned there, namely van. The example is prācanebhiḥ sajoshasah (iv.2.43; p. pra-canebhiḥ; compare iii.5). I have noted no other case.

8. Also enam and kena, when preceded respectively by indraḥ and ayajuh.

There is nothing in the rule meaning 'respectively,' and if enam were found anywhere in the text preceded by ayajuh, or kena by indraḥ, their n's would doubtless require lingualization; yet the evident intent of the precept is as translated. The passages are indra enam prathamah (iv.6.71), and yad ayajushkena kriyate (v.1.21; p. ayajuh-kena: G. M. O. omit yat). I find no other cases falling under the rule: there are, however, one or two other forms, analogous with the latter of those here contemplated, which we might expect to find treated in the same way, namely andīrkena and sāīrkena (i.6.104); but they are written by the pada-text without division of āīrkena, or restoration in it of the dental n (thus: andīrkena, and sa-āīrkena).

Counter-examples are added: to show that enam and kena, when otherwise preceded, retain their dental nasals, rudra enam bhūtvā (iii.4.103), and brahmavādīnāh kena tad ajāmi 'ti (vii.4.102: G. M. O. end with kena); to show that indraḥ does not exercise a lin-

7. cakārdāršte' vann iti grahaṇe nakāraḥ pre 'ty evampūrvo
natvam bhajate. yathā: prāv-.....

8. indraḥ: ayajuh: pārvayar' enam: kena: ity etayor nakāro
natvam bhajate. yathā: indra..... yad..... evampūrva iti
kim: rudra..... brah-.....' enamkene' ti kim: indro.....
gualizing effect upon other words, *indro neshad ati* (v.7.2⁴: B. omits *ati*; W. omits the whole example).

9. Also *manah*, when preceded by *nr* or *cri*.

The examples are *nrmanah ajasram* (i.3.14⁵ and iv.2.2¹: W. reads *yantri* instead of *ajasram*, but doubtless by a copyist’s blunder, for *nrmanah yantri* is not found in the Sanshitā), and *crimanah catapayāḥ* (vi.6.3²); with the counter-example *sumanā upagahi* (ili.3.11⁶). Of *crimanah* I find no other example; *nrmanah* occurs also at iv.2.2¹ (a second time) and vii.1.12.

10. Also *anāgānām, one, gāni, gānām, gyāni, and yāmena.*

These words in *samhitā*, says the commentator: that is to say, in the only cases in which they occur as *padas*, they take *n* in the combined text. The passages are: *yat tryaṅgānāṁ samavadyati* (vi.3.10⁶; p. *tri-āṅgānām*: only G. M. O. have *yat*, and O. omits the last word), *āyuhi dūroṇe* (i.2.14³; p. *duḥ-one*: the *pada-texts* of the Rik and Atharvan do not separate this word), *ati durgāṇi vieṇā* (i.1.1⁴; p. *duḥ-gāṇi*, like the other Vedas), *purogānām ca-kshuha* (ili.2.4¹; p. *puraḥ-gānāṁ*), *swargyāny āṣan* (v.3.5³; p. *svaḥ-gyāṇi*), and *antaryāmenā 'ntar adhatta* (vi.4.6¹; p. *antah-yāmena*: O. omits the last word). I have found no second example for any of these words, although there may be occurrences of *dūroṇe* which I have overlooked.

11. Also *havani, ahne, han*, when preceded by *r* or *shah*.

The cited examples are: *agnihotrahavani ca* (i.6.8³; p. *agnihotra-havani*); *parady aparāhne* (ii.1.2⁵; p. *apara-ahne*: the Atharvan *has aparā-ahnā*); and further, for *han*, which is declared to be a part of a word, involving several cases, *rakshoḥanam* (i.2.14⁶ et al.; p. *rakshah-hanam*: O. omits this example), *vāish-

9. *nr*: *cri*: *ity* evampūrvo manā ity atra nakāro natvam bha-jate. *yathā*: *nrṁ-***: *criṁ-***: evampūrva iti kim: sum-

---

1 G. M. om. ² G. M. om.

10. etesu' nakāraḥ samhitāyāṁ natvam bha-jate. *yathā*: *yat-***: *āy-***: *ati-***: *puro-***: *svu-***: an-

---

1 G. M. O. ashu. ² W. G. M. O. om.
navi rakshohanáu (i.3.22; G. M. omit the first word), and vrtra-
hanam puramdaram (iii.5.114 and iv.1.33; p. vrtra-hanam; G.
M. omit the last word). For han, besides the compounds here quo-
ted, which are found repeatedly in other passages, the Sanhitá af-
fores us also avirahanáu (i.2.81; p. avira-handu); for the other
two words I know of no additional examples. Counter-examples
are given, namely sáhna evá 'smáí (vi.6.114; p. sa-ahne), and va-
laqahanáh (i.3.21 et al.).

There is good ground for questioning the correctness of the com-
mentator’s interpretation of ra in the rule as signifying the letter
r repaha, and not the syllable ra. In none of the examples given
are the words specified directly preceded by r, and it is not at all
in accordance with the usage of the treatise to describe as “hav-
ing r before it” a word preceded by another word containing r.
All the versions of the comment, however, unite in this interpreta-
tion, and it is farther assured by the quotation of the rule above,
under i.19, as a case in which r is called ra, instead of repaha. It
looks as if G. M. had made a blundering attempt to remedy the
difficulty by reading the third word ahan instead of han, and also
by understanding sháh to mean “the 5 letter sh” (see the various
readings, below), thus parallelizing the two specifications. The
attempt, however, is an abortive one, only issuing, if carried out,
in a host of new difficulties. I have made the translation of the
rule conform to the requirements of the comment, but with much
misgiving, having hardly a doubt that the meaning properly is
‘when preceded by ra or sháh.’

12. Also mayáni and ani, when preceded by ru.

The passages are dárumayání pátráni (vi.1.72; p. dár-
ayáni; O. omits pátráni; G. M. omit the whole example), and tve
vasáni purvanika hotah (i.3.142-3; p. purvanika; O. omits
the first two words, G. M. the last): purvanika is found also at

11. havaná: ahné: han2: eshu grahanéshu nakáro repahpárvah śa ity evamápávco và natvam bhajate. yathá: agnih-
---: par---: hann2 iti pādākade állakápadánarthah: ra-
ksh---: váish---: vrtr--- evamápávca iti kim: sáhna
---: vata.

1 W. O. havani. 2 G. M. ahan. 3 W. evaín. 4 G. M. shakára. 5 W. B.
ekámp.; G. M. púrva. 6 G. M. ahan.

12. mayáni: ani: ity atra rupávco nakáro2 natvam bhajate.
yathá: 1dárum--- 2 tve --- evamápávca iti kim: yáni:-
agnaye---: repahgrahanena kim: svan.

1 W. O. ani, as also (with T.) in rule; G. M. anika, as also in rule. 2 G. M. O.
put after atra. 3 W. G. M. om. 4 G. M. om.
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iv.4.44. As counter-examples are given yāti mṛnymayāni sākṣhāt tásī (vi.4.72: B. omits the last word, G. M. O. the last two), agnaye nīkavate (i.8.41 et al.), and svanikasāndrīk (iv.3.131).

13. After vāghā and sh, t is changed to ś.

The passage for vāghā is given by O. as dārvāghātast v (v.5.151); all the other MSS. have only the first word, in its complete pada-form, dārvāghātā iti dārv-āghātah. The same word forms the subject of Vāj. Pr. iii.47. As counter-example, showing that ta does not become śa after ghā except when the latter follows vā, we have praghāta adityāndm (vi.1.1134). For the conversion of t to ś after sh is quoted āyush ta āyurdā āgne (ii.5.12¹: G. M. omit the last word, O. the last two), whose sh depends on rule vi.5, above. O adds a counter-example for this second part of the rule also, namely agnis te tejāh (i.1.10² and vii.5.17).

14. Also th to śh.

The cited example is goshtam mā nirmrksham (i.1.101: W. B. omit the last word); to which O. alone adds prati śhātāpayanti (vi.1.4²). As counter-example is given gachā goshtānām (i.1.9¹²).

15. But not when t follows.

The commentator explains the connection of this rule by pointing out that the two preceding do not come under the introductory heading of the chapter—that is to say, that they deal with a subject unconnected with the rest of its contents—and that hence they are regarded as dropped out, and the present exception does not apply to them, but to the foregoing rules, for conversion of n into n. This is well enough, though not a little awkward, as concerns the status of rule 18; but we should like to hear what he had to say in defense of the intrusion of rules 13 and 14 thus into

13. vāghā: ity evampārcaḥ shakārapūrcaḥ ca takārash takāram bhajate. yathā: dārv-..... āyush..... ve śi kim: pragh-..... śhapūrca iti kim: agnis.....

¹ G. M. om.; O. om. kāra. ² O. ēpadyate. ³ W. G. M. om. ⁴ W. vāghā; B. vāghāta. (5) Only in O.

14. cakārāh šhapūrvatvākarshakah: thakārāh shakārapūrvasi thakāram bhajate. yathā: gosh-..... prati..... evampūrca iti kim: gachā.....

¹ G. M. shakārap-; O. tvādeṣakah. ² O. om. kāra. (5) Only in O. ⁴ O. shap-
a chapter where they do not belong, and where they sorely disturb the natural and desirable connection. Considering their near relation to the rules of the preceding chapter, they might better have been added there as an appendix; or else put at the head of chapter viii., before its general adhikāra.

Only a single illustrative example is quoted, namely pary antarikshat (iii.1.102), where rules 4 and 5 of this chapter combined would require an at the beginning of the second word, but for the exception here made.

This precept is an anticipation of one of the items of xiii.15, below, and might properly enough be looked upon as open to the charge of punarukti, or unnecessary repetition, which the treatise so carefully shuns, and the commentator not seldom labors hard to remove. It is characteristic of the method of the Tātrirīya-Prātiṣṭhāna that it does not attempt to state the real nimitta or occasion of the lingual n in the words rehearsed here, although it does so, fully and distinctly, in rule xiii.6, where the subject of the occurrence of n in the interior of a word is taken up.

नञ्चतित्तिन्तूनूनूत्थत्त्थ-स्रोत-न्यायभिर-स्रोत-तत्सालोध्य \( 15 \) ।

16. Nor in nāhyati, nānām, nṛtyanti, anyāh, anyābhिह, anyāni; nor when final.

The ca in this rule indicates the continuance of the exception. These words, and a final n, are not subject to the rules given in the chapter for the substitution of lingual n. The commentator quotes as follows. For nāhyati, vāsasā paryānāhyati (vi.1.112; p. pari-ānāhyati: O. omits the first word); he notes that the case constitutes an exception to rule 5. For nānām, pra nānām pārṇavandhurah (i.8.51: O. omits the last word). For nṛtyanti, pari nṛtyanti (vii.5.10). For the three cases of anya, pra 'nyāh gānāti (vii.5.92), pra 'nyābhir yachaty ane anyāi mantrayate (v.1.64: O. omits pra in all these three examples, and in this, along with G. M., the last three words; B. omits the last word), and pra 'nyāni pātrāni (vi.5.1112): the commentator remarks that all these (since nāhyati) are cases of exceptions under rule 4. He then proceeds to raise the question why the three complete words

15. vāghāshādividhir1 anādhikrtatvaḥ utsappanaprādhaṅṇeṇi:
tasmād atrā nā 'yaṁ nishedhahaḥ: 'kīṁ tu prakṛto nātvaśvādhir
anena vishayāśvīryate. takāraparokā nātvaṁ nā "padyate.
yathā: pary......: pari-paripari-prapārvah (vii.4): avar
avyaveto 'pi (vii.5) ity etābhyām prāptih.

1 W. O. vāghā. 2 G. M. tatra. 3 B. viśeṇah. 4 O. om. 5 W. O. prak.
6 W. B. adhikṛyām.

16. nishedhākharshakaḥ cakāraḥ: ...... eshu grahāneshu na
kāraḥ padāntaḥ ca nātvaṁ na bhajate. yathā: vās......: avar
avyaveto 'pi (vii.5) iti prāptih: pra......: pari......: pra
are quoted in the rule, instead of the syllable an, which would include them all; and makes the very obvious answer, that it is on account of the passage anu pra ‘nyāt prathamām (v.5.5), already quoted under vii.5. Finally, as example of final n exempt from conversion, he cites vrtraḥaṁ chāra videān (i.4.42), remarking that it is a case otherwise falling under rule 11.

The exception of a final n from becoming ūṣṇ is also one of those made below, in rule xiii.15, for the class of cases to which that chapter relates.

I have not discovered in the Sanhitā any case of a lingual nasal arising in the conversion of pada-text into samhitā which is not duly provided for in this chapter.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONTENTS: 1-4, conversion of a final surd mute to sonant or nasal; 5-7, of k to r; 8-15, conversions of k to r after a and e; 16-22, treatment of k before r; 23-35, conversion of k to s or sh before k, kh, or p.

1. Now for changes of first mutes.

That is to say, of surds unaspirated, or k, c (only c nowhere occurs as a final), t, t, and p. The force of this heading only reaches, as the commentary points out, through rule 4—hardly far enough, one would think, to make a separate introductory rule necessary.

prā... prā...: prāriparipariprapūrvah (vii.4)

ity eshām’ prāptih. ann ity etāvatā’ siddhe nyonyābhiranyāni ‘ty kim pratipadapāthena: anu.... ity atrā ’nena’ nishedho’ na’ prasaratā’. padanto nakāra nataum na bhajate: yathā’:

vṛtra...: rāṣṭhāpūrvah (vii.11) iti prāptih.

1 B. G. M. O. put first. 2 B. O. eteshu. 3 G. M. om.; O. adds nakāro. 4 G. M. spadyate. 5 G. M. om. 6 W. B. om. prapūrvah. 7 G. M. eteshām. 8 G. M. O. -vato’ va. 9 O. puts before kim. 10 O. nās’atha. 11 G. M. pratishth. 12 G. M. O. om. 13 G. M. -it iti. 14 B. O. om.; G. M. padānta’ ca.

1. athe, ‘ty ‘ayam adhikāraḥ; prathama ‘ity etad adhikrtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad vakṣhyāmah: 2 visarjaniya (vii.5) paryanto’ yam adhikāraḥ.

14) W. adhikārārthah. 15) G. M. om. 16) O. ins. atha. 17) O. itiśūtrapa-


\[\text{उत्तमपर् उत्तमः स्वर्गीयम्} \] ॥ १॥

2. A first mute, followed by a last mute, becomes a last mute of its own series.

The examples selected by the commentator to illustrate this mode of combination are वृह ना धान (v.5.9\textsuperscript{2}), शन्मवात्यां स्वाह (vii.2.15), and तन महेंद्रस्या (vi.5.5\textsuperscript{3}). For the conversion of \(p\) into \(m\) he is able to offer no instance, as none occurs in the Sāhīta. As counter-examples, showing that only a nasal causes the conversion, and causes it only in a “first” mute, he brings up वृक ता ध प्रद्यातम (i.3.9\textsuperscript{1}: only G. M. have the last word), and \(मः नो वदम (vi.4.7\textsuperscript{3})\).

All the Prātiśākhyaśas join in treating this conversion as necessary, not as alternative with conversion into a sonant (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.5).

\[\text{तृतीयोः स्वर्गीयवत्तर्} \] ॥ ३॥

3. Followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant, it becomes a third mute.

The examples are \(रङ्ग ओढः रङ्ग ओता (i.4.44\textsuperscript{2}), औद ओटि \)

\[\text{ककुच मकारपर्} \] ॥ ४॥

4. Also in kakut, when \(m\) follows.

Namely, in the passage ककुदमान प्रतार्तिर वदजातामहा (i.7.7\textsuperscript{2}; p. kakut-mān: G. M. O. omit the last word). As counter-examples are given \(याद औद्योटि (iii.4.8\textsuperscript{4}: G. M. O. omit याद), and, according to W. B., kakut त्रयासतिरिक (vii.2.5\textsuperscript{3}) for which G. M. O. substitute kakuc चान्दाला (iv.3.12\textsuperscript{2}). The commentator

\[\begin{align*}
2. \text{uttamaparah prathamah} & 1 \text{ savargiyam uttamam āpadyate. yathā: vāñ: ...}: \text{śaṁ: ...}: \text{tan ...}: \text{evamparam iti kim: vāk ...}: \text{pratham iti kim: imāṇ: ...}: \text{uttamah paro yasmād asāv uttamaparah.}
\end{align*}\]

\(^1\) G. M. O. ins. \(ā\) manah. \(^2\) G. M. om.

3. \(\text{svaraghoṣavatparah} \) prathamah \(\text{savargiyain} \) tṛtiyam āpadyate. yathā: \(\text{ṛdhag} ... : \text{yad} ... : \) ity ādi. svarāç ca golf

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{shavantaç ca svaraghoṣavantaç: te pare yasmād asāv sa ta-}\text{thoktañ.}
\end{align*}\]

\(^1\) B. om.; G. M. O. svaraparo ghoṣavatparasa ca. \(^2\) G. M. O. om. \(^3\) G. M. om.

4. \(\text{kakud ity asmin grahane 'ntyo varṇo' makāraparac çakā-}\text{rākṣṣaṁ savargiyain} \) tṛtiyam āpadyate. yathā: \(\text{kakud} ...\)
notices, finally, that the present rule establishes an exception to rule 2 of this chapter.

5. Now for changes of visarjaniya.

Departing a little from his stereotyped mode of explanation of atha, the commentary declares it in this rule to cause visarjaniya to be understood, in the character of that respecting which something is to be enjoined (lakshya), in the precepts that follow; and he adds that this understanding is to remain in force as far as rule 10 of the next chapter.

6. Visarjaniya becomes \( r \) before the classes of sounds last mentioned.

The examples are \( tād \) agnir \( ḍha \) (iv.2.8\(^1\)), and \( ḍīr \) ma ṛjām (iii.2.8\(^5\); O. omits ṛjām); with the counter-example agnīc ca ma ṯīdrap ca me (iv.7.6\(^1\)). The commentator points out that it is the plural form of the pronoun (eteshu, literally ‘before those’) in this rule that shows the implication of the vowels and sonant consonants, in the character of following causes (paramimitta), since those are the only things which have been mentioned above (namely, in rule 3). That is doubtless so; still, the reference must be regarded as an unusually blind one, involving a “frog-leap” (mandūkapluti) over two intervening obstacles, of which one is a general heading, that changes entirely the subject under treatment.

\[ \text{kakud iti kim: ya.....: evampara iti kim: kakut..... makārah paro yasmād asū makāraparāṃ. uttamaṃ paro uttamaḥ savargiyāṃ (viii.2) ity aṣyā pavādo 'yam.} \]

\(^{1}\) G. M. takāro; \(^{2}\) W. makāraḥ; \(^{3}\) G. M. O. put after trīyam. \(^{4}\) W. prāpyate.

G. M. om.

5. athacābaḥ visarjaniyāṁ lakṣhyatvenā 'dhikaroti 'ta uttarāṁ yad ucyate'. atha svaraparō yakāram (ix.10) ity avadhibhūto 'yam adhikāraḥ.

\(^{1}\) G. M. vākhṣyāmaka.

6. \( śvareṣhu \) ghoṣavatcu ca parato visarjaniyo repham āpadyate. yathā: \( tād.....: āṣīr..... eteshvā iti bahuvačanāntasya saranāṁno nirdeśat svaraghoshavatāṁ paramimittānāṁ upadānam: teshām eva prakṛtataḥ. eteshvā iti kim: agniṣ.....\)

\(^{1}\) G. M. ānu. eteshu. \(^{2}\) G. M. om. \(^{3}\) O. paresu. \(^{4}\) G. M. O. om. \(^{5}\) W. B. svareshu. \(^{6}\) W. O. sarvāṅgama; B. -nāmo. \(^{7}\) G. M. -nt.
7. But not before r.

R, although a sonant consonant, and therefore included in the preceding rule, requires a different treatment in the final visarjaniya before it. What this different treatment is, is pointed out farther on in the chapter (rule 16 seq.). The examples here given are suvo rohava (i.7.91), and ahoratre (i.5.97 et al.; W. O. add pārve, but there is no such collocation of words in the Sanhîtā, and I suspect the word to be a corrupted reading for prāviyan, which follows next at the place referred to).

8. Visarjaniya becomes r in hvāh, abhāh, vāh, hāh, abibhāh, ajigah, akah, anantah, vivah, swah, punah, aharahah, prātah, vastah, camilah, savitah, sonutah, antutah, stotah, hotah, pitah, nātah, yashìah, esṭah, nesṭah, and tvasṭah.

With this rule begins the detail of the cases of an original r after a and a, which is protected and brought to light by a following sonant letter, being treated in quite a different manner from an original s, although both r and s are represented, as finals, by the indifferent visarjaniya. The commentator points out at the end the rules to which these cases constitute exceptions, namely ix.7,9,10. His illustrative examples are as follows. For hvāh,

7. rephaparo visarjaniyo repham nā "padyate. yathā: suvo ......: ahor......: ghoshavatvād rephasya pāravavidhipréptih. rephah paro yasmād asātu rephaparah.

1 G. M. om.

8. .. eteshu visarjaniyo repham ápadyate svaraghoshavatparah. yathā: mā......: yona......: vār......: mā me......: ab......: osh......: dev......: 'karāvar anudātte pade' (vii.9) iti vakṣyati: tenāi 'vā' 'tad' api sidhyati apy akārādi (i.52) iti vacanāt: iti cet: māi 'vam: anudātte kaḥcābde tad bhavati: idām te anyascordatham iti?: yathā": arvā......: "ādyudattas te idam". yajña......: antar anādyudātte (vii.10) iti vakṣyati: tasmād ankarādi ca" (i.53) iti vacanat sidhyati: iti cet: "māi 'vam": anādyudātte tad bhavati: ādyudattārtham" "idām grahaṇām", ca .......: suvar......: ahar-
according to W. B., mā hār varātāta (i.1.4 1); but, according to G. M. O., mā hār vasūnām (i.1.3): I have found the word only in these two sections. For abhāh, yonār abhāh ukhā (i.v.2.5 2). For vāh, vāh nānāma vo hitam (v.6.1 3). For hāh, mā me pra hār asti vā idam (ii.4.12-13; vi.5.1.1 4): only G. M. have the last two words: the word is found also at ii.4.12 5; 5.2 6. For abibhāh, as the only passage where it occurs (ii.5.1 7) does not exhibit in sanhitā the final r, we have the jātā-text quoted, namely abibhas tain tam abibhar abibhas tam. Ajīgah, for the same reason, is treated in the same way in W. B. O., namely oshadhār ajīgar ajīgar oshadhār oshadhār ajīgah: ajīgar ity ajīgah (iv.6.7 8); but G. M. read simply oshadhār ajīgah. For akāh, devatrā 'kar ajakhirānena (v.1.7.4; G. M. omit the last word): it is found also at i.3.14 2 twice; 5.2 3; ii.4.9 4; 5.7: iii.1.10 5; 4.10 6; iv.1.2: v.2.1.4 7; vi.4.8 1. As for this akāh, the commentator supposes the objection raised that rule 9, which teaches that kah and avah change h to r in an unaccented word, combined with rule i.52, which would extend the force of that rule to kāh with a prefixed r, is sufficient to cover the cases of its occurrence, without separate mention in the present rule; but he denies the pertinence of the objection, on the ground that the specification here made includes all instances of akāh, without regard to their accentuation—for example, ākāh at iv.1.2 4, which is accented on the first syllable, but exhibits r in its jātā-reading, ārā 'kar ākā ārāvā rāvā 'kāh. For anantar, yajñāparusahus nantaritādyā (v.2.5 6). A precisely similar objection is suggested to this word also, on the ground of rules viii.10 and i.53 combined; and it is similarly repelled, by reference to the difference of accent: anantar has the acute on the first syllable, which rule 10 forbids. For vivah is given, again in jātā-text, ca vivar vivāc ca ca vivah: vivar iti vivah (iv.2.8 2; only Ō. has the final repetition of vivah: the Atharvan reads vi vah, as two separate words, in the corres-

---

ponding passage, iv.1.1). For svah, svavar asi svavar me yacha (v.7.6²: O. omits the last word): the numerous passages in which this word occurs it would be quite useless to rehearse. For punah, punar ādyaya sadanam (iv.2.3³: O. omits the last word): this, too, is of too frequent occurrence to be worth detailed reference. For aharahah, aharahah havirdhānīndam (ii.5.6³): the same repetition of ahaḥ is found further at i.5.9³ twice; ii.5.6⁶. In connection herewith is made the remark that ahaḥ when not at the end of a separable compound is the subject of rule 13, below; but that that rule does not apply to a case like the one here in hand. For prātah, prātar uppāsah (vi.2.3³): prātah is found also at i.4.7: ii.1.2³; 5.6²; iii.1.7¹; 3.8⁴; 4.10¹; vi.4.2¹. For vāstah, dosā-vastar dhiyā vayam (i.5.6²; p. dosā-vastah): also at i.2.14⁴. For śamītah, śrtaḥ havish śamītur iti śrātyāḥ (vi.3.10¹: only G. M. have the first word, only O. the last). For savītah, deva savītur etat te (iii.2.7¹): the word is found also in about a dozen other passages. For śamīturah, ārda cid dvesah samitar yugotu (i.7.13⁵). For stanurat we are simply referred to “another text” (cākhantara): but G. M. read samitur, and omit stanurat in the rule itself. For stotah, etat stotar etena (vii.4.20). For hotah, hotar yavishthā sukrato (i.2.14⁵: O. omits the last word): also at i.3.14²; 6.2²; iv.3.13²: v.1.4⁵: vi.3.8²; 4.3³. For pitah, resort is had to the jatā-reading, since the only passage (iii.3.9¹) in which the word occurs does not bring to view the r: thus, marutāṁ pitāḥ pitar marutāṁ marutāṁ pitāḥ. For mātah, pṛthivi mātā mā mā hāṁ-sih (iii.3.2²: O. omits the last word). For yashthāḥ, aṣaṁ yashṭār idān namah (i.1.12). For esṭah, again a jatā-reading, aṣṭaṁ esṭṣaḥ aṣṭaṁ aṣṭaṁ aṣṭaṁ (i.2.11¹): its treatment before the word which follows it in saṁhitā is the subject of rules 18–22 of this chapter; that of the preceding word, of x.14. For neshtaḥ, once more the jatā is drawn upon, neshtaḥ pataṁ pataṁ neshtaḥ pataṁ (vi.5.8⁶). For tvasṭhāḥ, finally, civaṁ tvasṭhār ihāḥ gahi (iii.1.11²: O. omits the last word): also at i.3.7¹,10¹; iii.1.1¹: vi.3.6²,11².

The commentary adds a couple of counter-examples, illustrative of the fact that these words show their r only before a vowel or sonant consonant: they are abihbhas tam bhūtāni (ii.5.1²), and puṇas te mā tāśāṁ (iv.7.14³).

9. Also in kāḥ and āvah, in an unaccented word.

The cited examples are: mithuyā kar bhāgadheyaḥ (i.3.7²), and

9. kāḥ: āvah: ity etayor visarjanāyoh padakāle 'mudāte' pāde vartramānāh svaraghosanatpara repham āpadyate. yathā: mith-. . . . suru-. . . . anudātta iti kim: ko-. . . . 'āvo-. . . . .' evampara iti kim: adhi-. . . .

1 G. M. -da. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. om.
10. antar ity ‘asmin pade’ nādyuddätte visarjanīyah svaramgahshvatparo repham āpadyate. yathā: antar.....: agnim.....:
antar..... anādyuddätta iti kim: esho.....: evampara iti kim.
antas..... ‘antodattā iti vaktavye bahuvaratvam bahupāda
nārtham’: anyathā tv antodattasyai ‘va syāt’: antarv.....: antary.....
ādava uddatto yasya tad ādyuddattam: nā ‘ādyuddattam
āndadyuddattam: tasmin.

G. M. es.asmin. 2 G. M. āpnoti. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. om. 5 W. O. -thah.
6 B. om. 7 G. M. ky.
deed, whether ānantaḥ was not fairly included in the present rule, since the antah part of it, at any rate, is not “accented on the first;” but the treatise chooses to avoid so nice a question of interpretation, and to take the safe side.

ग्रावृत्यर: ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also a visarjaniya followed by āvrt.

The quoted examples are jinvar āvrt svāhā and ugnar āvrt svāhā (both ii.4.7; B. has bhīmar for ugnar; O. reads in each case āvṛth, according to the requirements of rule xiv.12). Other instances in the same and following divisions of the same section are bhīmar āvṛt, teeshar āvṛt, grutar āvṛt, and bhūtar āvṛt. The anomalous combination does not occur elsewhere.

वितियो अध्य: ॥ १२ ॥

12. And likewise when iti follows.

The word api in this rule, we are told, brings forward the implication of “a visarjaniya followed by āvṛt.” According to the commentator’s exposition, further, the rule is intended to apply to the jatā repetition of ĥrutah with its predecessor iti: as, iti ĥrutah ĥrutar iti ’ti ĥrutah (ii.4.72). Nor do I see of what other interpretation it is capable, although it seems strange that the irregular conversion of h into r should be retained in the jatā-reading of this word only, and not of the others, where repeated with their respective predecessors. It is clearly implied that we are to read, for example, in the first case falling under the preceding rule, varshaṇī jinavo jinavo varshaṇ̣i jinvaḥ.

As counter-example, showing the necessity of the implication signified by api, we receive rtubhīr havanaçrutah (ii.4.14; G. M. O. omit the first word; G. M. add havam, but no such word follows in the Sanshit, and the addition is doubtless a copyist’s error—possibly growing out of the attempt to repeat the compound, in its pada or jatā form). Here both the pada-text (as the word is a compound) and the jatā (as it stands before a pause) would read havanaçrūta iti havana-çrutah, the ordinary sandhi being made of çrutah and iti.

ग्रहणस: नवर्णिन्याण: ॥ १३ ॥

11. āvṛt ity evamparo visarjaniyo repham āpnoti. jinva—

12. apicaVdā āvṛta āvṛtānu visarjaniyaṁ aneddiCati: asādvi visarjaniyaṁ itiparo repham āpnoti. iti 3 ćrv-— anvedeCaḥ kim-arthaḥ: rtv— iti3 para yaśmād asādvi itiparaḥ.

1 W. O. -paro; G. M. -para. 2 W. B. iti; O. itiçabadah.
13. Also in ahāh, aha, and suvah, except at the end of a separable word.

There is a well-established difference of reading in the text itself of this rule. T. and W. read the last word anigyañatāh, as plural, to agree with the three words mentioned, or else with the three cases of visarjaniya which they present; and at the beginning of the comment, both in W. and in O., is seen an attempt to explain the word as a plural—not, however, consistently carried out in either. As both readings are equally acceptable, I have adopted the one which is best supported.

The examples given in illustration of the rule are ahār jātave-dā vicarshanih (iii.2.54: O. omits the last word), ahar mānsena (v.7.20: but G. M. substitute aharbhājo vāi, vii.4.51), and suvar devān aganma (i.7.92: O. omits the last word); and, as counter-examples, first, to show that the h in the words specified, when they stand as final members of compounds, is treated in the usual manner, abhipāriyān tryahā bhavanti (vii.3.92 et al.; p. tri-ahāh: O. omits the first word), pratyaṇ tryahā bhavati (vii.3.52 et al.; p. tri-ahāh: but B. has dropped out the whole example, and G. M. O. substitute, O. with omission of the first word, pratyaṇ shañahā bhavati, vii.4.25), and devaswā stha te (i.8.102: but W. B. O. give simply the pada-reading of devasvah, namely devaswā iti deva-svah, since thus alone is the word put into circumstances which show its h not to be convertible into r); and second, to show that the conversion takes place only before sonant letters, prāya- niyam ahas tasmāt (vii.2.8: O. omits the first word), and suvaṇ ca mūrdhā ca (i.7.91 and iv.7.112).

The commentator then proceeds to give an explanation, so far as ahāh is concerned, respecting the virtual intent of the rule, which, he says, is meant to establish an exception for that word when the final member of a compound; since the inclusion of hāh among the words cited in rule 8 would, under the operation of the often-quoted rule i.52, be authority sufficient for turning ahāh into ahar before a sonant letter. Upon this he next imagines the objection to be raised, that the reading in this rule also, as well as the other, should have been hāh, aha being then included along with it according to the principle referred to; and thus the liability to reproach for over-doing the explicitness of the rule would be avoid-
ed. But he replies, reasonably enough, that, as the rule says
"when not the final member of a separable word," it is to be in-
ferred that the words specified do occur as such members; and
with āhāḥ that is not the case; wherefore the distinction would be
meaningless with reference to āhāḥ. And it would be a poor
enough side to take, and altogether unworthy of approval, to give
a direction which did not apply to a word itself, but only to that
word with a prefixed. Hence the quotation is made in proper
form.

Just as long a discussion might have been raised with equal rea-
son over āhāḥ and svvah, both of which are also included in the
former rule. So far as āhāḥ is concerned, indeed, it is easy to see
that this is the general rule, applying to the cases of occurrence of
that word in the main, with a specific restriction; and that aha-
ra-ahāḥ in rule 8 is a sort of exception in advance, made for a single
case which would otherwise fall under this restriction (since, in
āhāḥ-āhāḥ, the second āhāḥ is in fact the final member of a com-
 pound). But I am unable to discover any justification of the way
in which svvah is treated: it is made the subject of two general
rules, to the one of which a needed restriction is attached, to the
other, not. For āhāḥ and svvah, the present rule should, it seems,
have taken distinctly the form of an exception merely: nā 'ḥāḥ-
svvah īnghāntāu; 'not, however, āhāḥ and svvah, when final mem-
bers of compounds;' and āhāḥ should have been separately treated,
or else included with them and a further counter-exception added.

न निम्नायारः ॥ १३ ॥

14. Not, however, when followed by bhīk or bhvāṃ.

There is violation of the ordinary usage of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā in
this rule also. The only one of the words mentioned in the pre-
ceding rule which is found with the case-endings bhīk and bhvāṃ
following it is āhāḥ; and hence, to it alone the present precept
applies. We should expect it, therefore, in accordance with the
principle of which i.58 is an expression, to have been placed last
in the trio of which it forms a member. The commentator does
not remark upon the irregularity, but simply points out that the

yānta īty ukteś iṅgāntataveś ītiś sambhāvaniyam; tae ca hār
īty evāṁrāpeś grahane nā īti 'tī īty' atre 'dāṁ vīcēshānam aar-
thakām syate; tathā īpyś evāṁrāpe śā mā bhād ītiś; 'kīṃ tuś ākā-
rādite svvahati 'tī jaḡhāhāḥ pakshāh; na tu saralāh; īti sūtreś'
'hārāh īti grahanām upayājyate.

1 O. ehu padeshu. 2 W. -yd. 3 W. antihāntōḥ; O. -td. 4 O. dnuvantē. 5 G.
M. O. om. 6 G. M. ins. īty. 7 G. M.'yd. 8 O. tatra gūvāvadeshoś; G. M. tatra
gūvāvadeshoś. 9 W. ukte; G. M. O. ukte. 10 G. M. -āntām. 11 G. M. O. ōpi.
12 G. M. O. -pa. 13 W. om. īty. 14 G. M. O. sati; a better reading. 15 O. om.
16 G. M. om.; O. kīṃ tu apy. 17 G. M. O. svātām. 18 MSS. akār.
circumstances of the case restrict the application of the rule to
ahah, and gives as examples uttārāhīr ahobhiṣ caranti (vii.5.14: G.
M. O. omit the last word), and sam ahobhyaṁ iti ni nayati
(vi.3.91).

15. Also not in anahah, as all agree.

Some authorities, namely, the commentator informs us, accept
this word as containing an anusvāra, others not; but all alike
regard it as an exception under rule 13 (and therefore not liable to
have its final visarjaniya converted into r under any circumstan-
ces). Those who accept the anusvāra still regard the word as
falling under the action of rule 13, in virtue of the principle "a
nose-sound occurring in the interior of a word is no bar to the ap-
lication of a rule; hence it performs the offices of letters while
itself only a quality" (if this be, in fact, the meaning of the sec-
ond line of the verse, of which I am by no means confident; the
readings of the manuscripts are here somewhat discordant, with-
out being mutually explanatory). The first words of this verse
were quoted in the commentary on rule i.1, in connection with the
discussion as to whether anusvāra was a concrete thing or a quality
(see p. 8), and were credited to the Chikshā—which, however, in
the form in which we now possess it, neither contains such a pas-
sage, nor seems to furnish a connection in which it should natur-
ally be introduced. I should question the sober verity of the con-
siderations whereby the commentator tries to justify the rule. It
is hardly credible that anahah and ahah should be fairly identified
by any authorities. And anusvāra is not a nāṣikya, but an anu-
nāṣikā, in the view of this treatise everywhere. It might be bet-

14. sāmīnīdhyena labdhaḥ pārvasātrotko visarjaniyo bhir-
bhyām evam āparo na repham āpnoti. arthād ahar ity atra vis-
sarjaniyāh parigrahate: itaratasthitasyāi evam āpnoti.
yathā: utt...: gam...

1 G. M. O. -dhāyl. 2 W. labhyah. 3 W. ins. na. 4 O. ins. ity. 5 G. M. paro.

15. cakāra 'nishedham ākārashati': anha ity asmin grahane vis-
sarjaniyo na repham āpnoti: aḥārahār (viii.13 iti prāptih.
atra) grahane kecid anusvāram ichanti 'kecin ne 'chanti: sarve-
hāṁ teshām esha nishedhā bhavati: anusvāram ichādbhīr api
prāptir evam pratipādyate:

vidher madhyasthānādikyo na virodho 'bhavet smṛtah:

tasmāt koroti kāryāni varṇānāṁ dharmā eva tv
iti: yathā: anha...: anho...
ter to regard the specific exception of *aṅhaḥ* as simply a sort of supererogatory effort at extreme explicitness, intended to guard against the confusion with *ākhaḥ*, even by a blunderer, of another word which was, indeed, definitely different from it, but different by only so inconspicuous an element as the nasalization of a vowel.

The illustrative examples are *aṅha indram eva* ṣāhōmucaṃ (ii.2.74; but O. writes *... eva*: aṅhōmucaṃ, as if the latter word were a separate citation: it is found in other passages), and *aṅho-muce pra bharema* (i.6.123; but O. substitutes aṅhōmuce purodā-çaṃ, ii.2.74).

16. But, when not preceded by an *a*-vowel, visarjaniya followed by *r* is omitted.

The commentator’s example in illustration of the action of this rule is *revati ramadhvam* (i.3.71 et al.; p. revatih); and he adds as counter-examples, first, to show the necessity of the restriction “not preceded by an *a*-vowel,” *yo rudro aṅgu* (v.5.93); and again, to show that the omission takes place only before *r*, *reva-ṭīr naḥ sadhamādāḥ* (ii.2.128; 4.144). This exhausts the evident intent of the rule: the *tu*, ‘*but,*’ which the latter contains, merely indicates the transition to a new and diverse subject; it intimates no distinction between the classes of cases in which the visarjaniya represents a *s* on the one hand and an original *r* on the other; and all the cases of final *aḥ* and *āḥ* are left to be treated alike, as prescribed by the rules given hereafter (ix.7–10)—*aḥ* being changed to *o*, and *āḥ* to *ā*. This truly represents the usage of the Sanhitā; the latter does not contain (if the special case which forms the subject of rules 18–22, below, be excepted) a single instance of *aḥ* converted into *ā* before *r*: the occurrence before *r* of *aḥ* standing for original *ar* is very rare, and the product is always *o*: besides the cases of *uhorātre* (*pada-text, aṅhaḥ-rātre*), I have

16. avarṇād anyasa-varpāruvo rephaporu visarjaniyo lupyate. yathā: rev... evampūrva iti kim: yo... evampara iti kim: rev... tuca-बārambhād avarṇapāruvo *pi hvārābhār* (viii.8) ādīnām visargo lupyate pūrasvāraṃ ca dhigam āpadyate. yathā: rukmo... tarihi suvo... ity atra lopadīrghāṃ kim na syātām. deviruktavād iti brāhmaḥ. tat katham. hvārābhār (viii.8) adisutre : ahārahaḥsvaḥ (viii.13) ity atra ca. nanv ahorātre ity atra katham otvam. anyārthena grahanasāmrthyen *ti brāmaḥ. tat* katham. ahorātre dhva-νavate (iv.11) ity ecaṁrāpasāmyād ity ahorātrābhyaṁ ahorātrayor ity ādi vijñeyan. *evam ecd adhishavane* (iv.11) iti grahanasāmrthyenī *ca* "shatve siddhe" na dhi-पावे (vi.11) iti "nishvedhanishedhena virodhaḥ". satyam: sa-
only found four instances of suvah before forms of ruk: namely suvo ruhánah (iv.1.24; 7.131), suvo roháva (i.7.91), and suvo rokshyámi (i.7.91). The other Práticoákyhas (Rik. Pr. iv.9, r. 28.29; Vaj. Pr. iv.34; Ath. Pr. ii.19, iii.20) convert ah to a in like circumstances; and at least the Rik and Atharvan afford several instances of the sandhi.

So much for the rule and its meaning. The commentator, unfortunately, has found occasion to give it a forced and false interpretation; it leads him into a nest of difficulties, through which he flounders as best he can, coming out at the end with much discredit. There happens to be a single passage (or, if there be another, I have not noticed it) where a word with original final r follows in the Sanhitá a word beginning with r—namely rukmo antah (iv.1.104²; 6.5²; 7.12³)—and, of course, in the inversions of the jatá-text, comes to stand before its predecessor. The accepted jatá-reading, it appears (as given in full by the commentator), is rukmo antar antá rukmo rukmo antah, the analogy of the Rik and Atharvan usage being followed in the treatment of antah. In order, now, to find authority for this reading, the commentator declares that tu, 'but,' in the rule signifies that, even when preceded by an a-vowel, the words specified in rule 8 and its successors lose their visarjanyá and lengthen the preceding vowel. This is an attribution of portentous pregnancy of meaning to the particle such as is not very infrequently made, rarely with more evident falsity than here. The objection is immediately suggested—why, in that case, does not suvah in suvo roháva (i.7.91), lose its h and lengthen its a? Because, is the acute reply, it has been mentioned twice, once in rule 8, and once in rule 13. What possible connection is to be discovered between this repetition and the use to which he would fain put it, he does not give himself the trouble to inform us: he takes care to raise only such difficulties as he conceived himself able to remove. The next which it pleases him to evoke is—how is the o of ahódtre to be explained? We rather

vaçabdayá 'dhishavane iti grahanasámarthyena' shatam śi-
dhyutá: shtánacasadaya kathin śidhyet: grahanádisámarthyá-
bbhávatvá: tasmát tadarthamān távatvā sátram sáarthakam iti "tad-
artham cā draśtvanyam": tadartham cē" 'ti gudadyavikámyāyávi:
tathá hi: grahanasámarthyád iti<sup>1</sup> gamanikámátram"<sup>2</sup>: kan-
thoktis tu višeṣah: tatā samaçabdarthatmān sátram iti bhávah<sup>3</sup>.

avarnád anyo 'navarnah: asú púreca yasmát sa tathokta

<sup>1</sup>B. G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup>W. B. G. M. om. <sup>3</sup>W. B. ins. aharáhar iti. <sup>4</sup>W. B. O. om. <sup>5</sup>O. adhishavane. <sup>6</sup>G. M. pragrhe evaúròp-stringyád. <sup>7</sup>G. M. -tre. <sup>8</sup>B. jñam. <sup>9</sup>O. nanu anyártvena grahanendí 'va. <sup>10</sup>G. M. om. <sup>11</sup>O. siddhí. <sup>12</sup>B. ins. nishiddhe. <sup>13</sup>O. shatanimśhamadhesáh na vidhyen; B. niśheda na iti eirodha. <sup>14</sup>B. -nám. <sup>15</sup>B. artham; G. M. tadavastham. <sup>16</sup>G. M. va tat. <sup>17</sup>G. M. O. sánhstacayam. <sup>18</sup>G. M. ve. <sup>19</sup>G. M. gula-. <sup>20</sup>O. -thamy. <sup>21</sup>O. om.; G. M. i. <sup>22</sup>G. M. kam. <sup>23</sup>G. M. savasthanoacab-. O. adda api. <sup>24</sup>G. M. gávaḥ.
expect to hear him reply—because _ahah_ also is twice mentioned, in the same two rules with _sava_. But no; we do injustice to the tenderness of his exegetical conscience, in supposing him capable of such gross arbitrariness of interpretation, when in rule 8, instead of _ahah_, _aharahah_ is read. He alleges instead the competency of a form cited for another purpose (compare Rik Pr. i.13, r. liv,55): we have read in rule iv.11 _ahoratre_, where the _pragrahas_ are under treatment, and this suffices, by analogy of form, to determine the reading also of _ahoratrabhyam_ and _ahoratranyah_. If this be so, it is next retorted, then, as the _sh_ of _adhishavane_, which is cited in the same rule, is assured by the citation itself, rule vi.11, prescribing the _sh_, in the way of an exception to an exception, is out of order. That is true, the commentator confesses: but, granting that the _sh_ of _sava_ is established by the previous mention of _adhishavane_, how is that of _sthana_, the other word specified in the same rule, established? the rule is therefore to be deemed of force so far as relates to that word, and to be regarded as intended for it. Of what follows, not all is clear to me: it appears that the rule is, after all, defended as it stands, on “the principle of sugar-candy and little tongue” (i.e. as merely giving more than is absolutely required of what one cannot receive too much of, as the palate of candy—?): for to establish the reading on the authority of a previous citation is only doing just what will answer (? _gamanikā_ occurs in only one other passage, the comment on i.18, and I find nowhere any thing that explains its use), while specific mention is a distinction; hence the rule has a meaning as applied to _sava_ also: such is the understanding.

The commentator might much better, surely, have acknowledged that his text-book had omitted to provide for the special case of _jatā_-reading which has caused all this trouble, than have forced it within the contemplation of the rules at such cost.

17. And the preceding vowel is made long.

The “and” (ca) in the rule is declared to signify that the lengthening of the vowel takes place only when _visarjanīya_ has been omitted. The cited examples are _rūd rāudraḥ_ (v.5.19), _tittiri rohit_ (v.5.16), and _vishnū rápañ kṛtā_ (vi.2.4): only G. M. have the last word. As was noticed in the comment upon the preceding rule, there is no such case of _ah_ changed to _ā_ before _r_, except the one forming the special subject of the following rules.

17. _tasmād repaharavisarjanīyād luptāt pūrvo 'pi' yah svaro hrasvaḥ sa ca dirgham āpadyate. yathā: rūrā....: titti-.....: vishnū..... yuddā _visarjanīyasya_ lopasa tadāi 'va dirghatvād yathā sydd ity evamartahaṃ caçabadhā._

1 O. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. O. ins. _tasya._
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18. As also, in esṭah.

This word has been already mentioned, in rule 8, as one of those whose final " is liable to become r. It is here made the further subject of a special rule, because it is the only case in the Sanhita of aḥ changed to ə before r (see the note to rule 16). The passage in which it occurs is esṭaḥ raṇyaḥ (i.2.111 and vi.2.26).

We have seen, however, that the commentator has felt obliged to give a false interpretation to rule 16, and one which renders superfluous the present rule, as applying to a case already included under that one. He is well aware of the objection to his interpretation thence arising, and himself points out that esṭaḥ raṇya raṇya esṭaḥ esṭaḥ raṇya (only W. gives this) is a case analogous with rukmo antaḥ antaḥ rukmo rukmo antaḥ (W. B. omit the last two words), and that the loss of a and lengthening of a in esṭah is an effect of the tu in rule 16; but he does what he can toward removing the objection by alleging that the detail of discordant opinions which is to follow (in the next four rules) renders it more desirable to cite the case specially, in order that it may be understood to what those opinions apply. This is a tolerably ingenious subterfuge—but, after all, only a subterfuge.

19. Not so, according to some authorities.

The commentator gives two alternative explanations of this rule—both, however, as he notices, leading to the same reading of the phrase under question. Vararuci, namely, holds that, in the view of some, the rule denies the conversion of " to r in esṭah, and therefore also the prolongation of the a; whence, by the general rule ix.8, the word would become esṭa (in analogy with all the other cases in the text of aḥ before r). Māhishaya, however, understands that some are said to deny that the " of esṭah is liable to conversion into r before another r—that is to say, he makes the rule establish so far an exception under rule 8 rather than rule

18. esṭaḥ ity asmin grahane visarjanyo rephaparo 'varnapūrvo 'pi lupyate . yathā: esṭaḥ . 'caçabdo lopādīghayor ākoreṣhakaḥ. nanno etad anupapannam: hvarabhār (viii.8) adyaṇṭapāttvād esṭaḥ ity asya: 'esṭaḥ ....' rukmo .... itivat: anavaranāpūrvas tu (viii.16) ity atra tuṣabdene lopādīghasiddhāv. 'mā 'cam;': vakshyamānamatabhedāgra-yatvajñāpandya gṛhitam etad upapannataram: iti parihāraḥ.

1 W. B. repah. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. ins. pūrva ca dirghak. 4 G. M. om. 5 G. M. -qārā ṣaḳroṣhatai, and put at the beginning. 6 B. G. M. O. om. 7 W. iti; G. M. iti padam. 8 G. M. padbe. 9 B. -ghācruke; G. M. O. -ddhe. 10 W. B. O. om.
18. There can be little question that Vararuci’s explanation is the true one.

In rule 21, below, we have yet another mode taught of arriving at the same result as regards the reading.

\[93\] 20. According to Uttamottariya, two become \(r\).

Here, again, there are two interpretations, Vararuci giving one, Māhisheya the other. The former says that, in the opinion of the specified authority (\(pākhi\,\text{, ‘holder of a \(pākha\) or recension of the sacred text’}\), the visarjaniya of esṭāh and the following \(r\) both become \(r\)—that is, as I should think it ought to mean, both fuse together into a single \(r\): thus, esṭarāyah—but none of the manuscripts give this reading in illustrating the case: see the various readings below. Māhisheya, on the other hand, regards the individual referred to as owning the portentous name. Dvāvuttamottariya, and as holding that the \(h\) of esṭāh becomes \(r\) before \(r\); making esṭar rāyah.

Vararuci here maintains, in my opinion, his usual superiority over Māhisheya, as regards both the plausibility of the name assumed and the admissibility of the reading taught; and I have accordingly made my translation conform with his interpretation.

It is interesting to note the uncertainty of the tradition within reach of the commentators as to the personality of the authorities quoted by the Prātiśākhya.

\[93\] 21. According to Sāmkṛtya, the visarjaniya becomes \(u\).

And this \(u\), by \(x.5\), unites with the preceding \(a\) to form \(o\), so that the reading of the passage is eshto rāyah, as it is according


(o) W. om. 2 G. M. om. 4 G. M. ca. (o) G. M. na repham apnoti. 4 O. om. sa.

20. uttamottariyasya pākhino1 mata eshtar iti visarjaniyas1 tatparo rephaḥ ca dvāv etāu repham āpadyate. yathā: eshtar1 rāyah. ayaṁ artha vāravucoktaḥ: māhisheyoktas tu dvāvuttamottariya iti kasya cin nāma: tannata eshtar1 iti visarjaniyo rephaparo repham āpadyate: ‘eshtar’ rāya iti.

1 O. -nor. 1 G. M. -vāc ca. 2 B. G. M. -tā; O. -tār. 4 W. B. O. var. 4 W. B. eshtā rāya. 4 O. ins. yathā. 2 B. G. M. -tā. 4 G. M. O. om.
to the "some authorities" quoted in rule 19, above. This is pointed out by the commentator; who, however, declares that the reference to Sāmkṛtya in a separate place shows that he is not one of the people there spoken of. B. specifies (probably by a copyist's blunder) that the exposition given of the meaning of the rule is to be credited to Māhisheya.

22. And, according to Ukhya, along with the preceding letter:

That is, eshtar becomes eshtu, the ṣ and its predecessor a coalescing into u. This is the only exposition given by W. and O. But G. M. and B., strangely agreeing for once to differ from the rest, ascribe this understanding of the meaning of the rule to Māhisheya, and report Vararuci as holding it to signify that the ṣ of eshtah, with its predecessor, becomes r. This last version of the sandhi seems little better than nonsense, and neither of the MSS. gives a reading to correspond.

The commentator declares, finally, that, in this net-work of alternative views, the first rule only (viii.18) is approved. In accordance herewith is the reading of the edited text and of my manuscript, esṭā rāyah.

The most interesting circumstance connected with this waste of half a dozen rules over the reading of a single word, is the indication afforded of the anomalousness of the combination as a phenomenon belonging to the Tāttvīrya-sanhitā, while it is in other Vedic texts a natural and usual thing.

21. sāmkṛtyasya mata eshtar iti visarjaniyo rephapara ukāram āpadyate. tata uvānakara okāram (x.5) iti otam. yathā: eshto rāyah. asya ca nāi 'keshām (viii.19) ity asyaḥ decahedād bhedā: siddhodāharaṇam 'samānām.

22. ukhyasya mate rephaparaḥ eshtar iti visarjaniyāḥ pārvavarnena saho 'kāram āpadyate iti māhisheykam. yathā: eshtu rāyah. vāraucoktaṁ te eshtar iti visarjaniyo repahaparāḥ pārvena saha repham āpadyata iti. yathā: "eshtā" rāyaḥ: pārvena saha vartata iti sāpūrvaḥ.

āmin vikalpañāḥ prathamam eshtaḥ ca (viii.18) iti sātram eva 'shtam.
24. Also in ávih, nih, idah, caçvatah, apasañ, deva rishah, añhasah, ati divah, viçvatah, açmanah, and tamañah.

This rule, the commentator remarks, relates to words which are not first members of compounds. His examples are: for ávih, ávish kryushva (i.2.142). For nih, ghṛtam nish pibati (ii.3.115).


1 G. M. -sād. 2 W. -tāvat. 3 G. M. -parāññām. 4 W. -havatara; B. -ha; G. M. -havarti. 5 G. M. om. 6 O. etc. 7 G. M. pārā. 8 G. M. -sa.

24. 1...... eshi visarjanīyaḥ kakhapakāraparo yathāvihi- tam bhājate. yathā: ávish.....: ghṛtam.....: iḍas.....: caçv.....: apasañ.....: uror.....: deve 'ti kim: sa.....: añ- hasas.....: ati.....: ati 'ti kim: divah.....: viçv.....: tvam....: ud.....

anavagrahārtha 'yam ñārāmbhah.

1 G. M. -vāridāṣiḥ viðyotā. 2 G. M. -sād. 3 G. M. -sañkarām akārapārvah cet sañkarām iti. 4 G. M. -thāsanik. 5 G. M. -om.
of nish before p, I find besides only nish padyeran (vii.3.10²); before kh, nish khidati (ii.2.10⁸); before k, the cases are more numerous, with forms of kri (e.g.v.5.7²), and kram (vi.4.10²-3: doubtless; the separation of the divisions prevents the exhibition of the sandhi); cases of nih with accented forms of verbs in k are yet more frequent, but come under the preceding rule, not this one. For idah, idas pade sam idhyase (ii.6.11⁴ and iv.4.4⁴: O. omits the last two words): on the other hand, we have idyadh pade at vi.1.8². For pacvatah, pacvatas kar haste (ii.2.12¹). For aparasa, apwasas pare asya (iii.2.11⁵: O. omits asya). For deva ri-
shah, uror ano deva rishas pahi (i.4.4⁵: O. omits to deva); with sa rishas patau naktam (i.2.14⁷; 5.11¹-3) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after deva. For anha-
sah, anhasas patau vayuh (iii.2.4³: only O. has vayuh): another case is found in the same division, anhasas pataum. For ati diekh, ati divas pahi samavactran (i.8.14²: G. M. O. omit after pahi); with divah prshtha savar gatvā migrāh (iv.6.5¹: only B. has the last word; O. omits the last three) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after ati. For vipca-
tah, vipvatas pari havāmahe (i.6.12¹: G. M. omit the last word); other cases occur at i.5.3³; ii.1.1¹; 3.14¹; iii.1.1¹; iv.2.1²; 3.3⁴; 3.13¹ (in the various repetitions of only two phrases, always before pari); and, as first member of a compound, hence falling under the pre-
ceding rule, at iv.6.2²: an exception is noted in a later rule (vii.32). For aca\nmanah, tvam acajanas pari (iv.1.2⁸). For tam\nsah, ud vayum tamasas pari pacvantah (iv.1.7⁴ and v.1.8⁶: only O. has the last word, and it omits the first two).

25. Also before krāhi, pinva, and pathe.

The examples are: uru nas krāhi (ii.6.11³), apas pinva (iv.3.4²), and sprathā namas pathe (iv.7.18²: G. M. omit the first word). For pinva and pathe I find no further examples; but s before krāhi
occurs also at i.4.2 (where the edition has the false reading h), 3:
iv.2.9⁴; 5.10²; v.7.6²⁴; vi.3.2²; 4.5⁴.

26. But not when s, kr, or gh follows.

25. ...... evamparo visarjanīyo yathāvidhim bhajate. yathā: uru...... apas...... sarp......

1 O. -vihitam. * G. M. O. om.

26. sakraghe 'ty evampare sati krāhyaddur visarjanīyo yathā-
vihitam' nā "padyate. yathā: tán...... saṁ...... repheha kim:

utā...... uru......

By its terms, the rule means that the prescription of the preceding rule becomes void when either of the words there mentioned is followed as here specified; but the cases of its application, so far as I am aware, all concern kṛdhi. The commentator’s illustrations are: tān ma āmanasah kṛdhi svāhā (ii.3.9.1; only W. has the first two words, and it omits the last one), caṁ ca naḥ kṛdhiḥ: kṛtave daksḥāya (iii.3.11.4; O. omits the last word), and uṛu khaṣa-yāya naḥ kṛdhiḥ: ghṛtam ghratayone (i.3.4.1; G. M. O. omit the last word); and to the second of these there is a counter-example, uta no mayas kṛdhiḥ kṣhayadevīryāya (iv.5.10.2), to show that only kr, not k alone, gives occasion for retention of the h. The words āmanasah kṛdhi svāhā occur again at ii.3.9.2; I find no other cases to be specified in addition to those quoted by the commentator.

27. Also before pati ve, pati, pate, pataye, patih, and patim.

The examples are: first, brahmānas pati ve dinim (iii.5.6.1), with a counter-example, to show that the word pati must be followed by ve, retodhā pati va ity āhā (vi.5.8.4; but O. reads indriyā- vataḥ patinivatam, i.4.27); further, cūhas pati idam āham (iii.2.10.2; only O. has āham), vāstosh pate prati (iii.4.10.1), prahvāvasva bhucas pate (i.2.9 and vi.1.11.4), ācas pataye pavāsca (i.4.2), vācas patir ācēam (i.7.7.1), and vācas patim vācakarīn-dnam ātaye (iv.6.2.5; G. M. O. omit the last word). The inquiry is now raised, why it was necessary to give all these words in detail, instead of comprehending them all in pati, and in reply is quoted the passage divām gacha suah pata (iv.1.10.4 and vi.1.10.8).

The cases of retention of s before the cases of pati are so numerous, that it would be highly convenient to be able to dispose of them at once by quoting in the rule the theme pati; but such a proceeding is permitted (by i.29) only with themes ending in a. I add the other combinations of this class which I have noted from the Sanhitā: manasas pati (i.1.13.2; 4.4.3), pathas pati (i.1.14.2), brahmānas pati (i.5.6.1; ii.1.57), jyotishas pati (i.5.11.1; iv.4.4.6), cāvasas pati (ii.2.12.7), jagatas pati (ii.4.5.1), sadasas pati (ii.6.8.2; iii.2.4.1), catinas pati (ii.6.11.1; iv.4.4.1), nabhinas pati (iii.3.83.6), and yas patih (iv.7.14.3). We have the genitive patch in brhas-pateh (i.7.8.4), but, as the pada-text reads brhah-pateh, the word does not fall under this rule: tapaspati (i.2.10.2; p. tapah-patih)

27. evam paro visarjanīya yathāvihitam bhajate. yathā: bhrah-...va iti kim: reto-... svāh-...vāst-... pra-...vāc-...vāc-...vāc-...pad ity etavyātī 'va siddhe prātipadapāthena kim': divām... ityādibhunādār-thah'.

-āda u v.
belongs in the same category. Of the words quoted by the commentator, bhivas pati occurs again at i.7.102, and vācavas pati at ii. 6.81-2.

28. Also in divah and sahasah, before pari and put.

The cited examples are divas pari prathamam (i.3.142 and iv.2.21), divas putrāya sāryāya (i.2.9: O. omits the last word), and sahasas putro adhahutah (iv.1.92). We have sahasas putram also at iv.4.42, and divas pari at iii.3.32 and iv.2.104; one case of divah pari is excepted by rule 34, below. As counter-examples, are given divah prthivydh pari antarikshat (iii.1.102 et al. W. B. O. omit divah, which is better, as this is used just below to illustrate another point), parushahparusah pari (iv.2.92), and puusah putrān uta vicīvyushah rayim (iv.6.94: G. M. O. have only the first two words), to show that only the words specified show before pari and put; and divah prthivydh pari (iii.1.102 et al. G. M. omit pari, which is better this time), to show that those words show it only in the circumstances stated.

Put is declared a part of a word, involving more than one case.

29. Also in rāyah, before po.

The commentator’s examples are: paçavo vāi rāyas pospha (v.4.62), sam ahañ rāyas poshenā (i.7.92), yanam uniforma rāyas posha (ii.2.51: G. M. omit the first word and add bhate, which makes the reference belong to iv.1.102), and rāyas poshasya dadi- tārah syāma (iii.2.31: only O. has the last word). As counter-examples, he gives vibhuh posha uta tmanā (iii.1.112), to show that the rule applies to no other word than rāyah before po, and eshtā rāyah pre she bhagāya (i.2.111: G. M. omit the first word),


29. rāya iti atra visarjunīyah po ity evamara yathávihitam rāyah. yathā: paçavo ... po iti padākadeço bahupadānārthāh: sam ... yam ... rāyas ... rāya iti kim: vibhuh ... ‘po ity okārena kim’ : ‘eshtā ....

1. G. M. -vithinā. 2. G. M. O. om. 3. G. M. okārañ kimārthāh. 4. B. om. to yathā in comment to next rule.
to show that only po, not p when otherwise followed, calls out the prescribed effect in ráyoh.

I have not attempted to note the numerous instances of the occurrence of ráyas posha in the Sanhitá. In the derivative ráyasposhavani (i.2.123; 3.12), where the division is before vam, the pada-text, according to its custom, leaves the s of ráyas unchanged (reading ráyasposha-vani).

नमस्कारयेत्: II 30 II

30. Also in namah, before karo.

The examples illustrating the action of the rule are sañwatsarena namas karomi (v.5.72); and ubhayibhyo namas karoti (ii.6.98; O. reads karomi); counter-examples, showing the uselessness of either specification of the rule without the other, are namah karpardine ca (iv.5.51,91: W. omits ca; O. omits the example), and ekdhyanad enah karoti (vi.8.31).

Other instances of namas karoti are found at v.5.51,72; vi.3.84; and of -vatsarena namas karomi at v.5.73 twice, 74 twice.

The printed text has greyasas karat and vasyasas karat (but, by a strange inconsistency, immediately after; pañcunatah karat) at i.8.62; but, as these combinations are unauthorized by the Prátiṣṭhākhya, and not supported by my manuscript, I do not doubt that the readings are erroneous.

वमुक्तकारयेत्: II 31 II

31. Also in vasuh, before k.

The passage is sa idháno vasusuh kavih (iv.4.45), and I have found no other. Counter-examples, of obvious application, are given: viprañ śuciḥ kavih (i.3.14; 5.53), mayi vasuh puro vasuh (iii.2.103), and vicvāvasuh pary amishnat (vi.1.62,118; B., which is quite defective just along here, omits the first word).

नाधारविष्मितो[विश्वासो]कारितोविविष्यतः: पुनः: II 35 II

30. nama  ity  atra  visarjaniyah karo  ity  evamparo yathávihi- tam  bhajate. yathā: sañv-..... ubhay-..... 'karo iti kim: namah-.....' 'nama iti kim: ekah-.------'
1 G. M. O. om. 2 G. M. -vidhini. 3 G. M. O. om.; B. omits to here. 4 G. M. O. om. 5 G. M. put before ubhay; B. puts after ubhay-..... and om. karo iti.

31. 'vasur ity  atra visarjaniyah kakároparo yathávihitam' ápadyate. yathā: sa..... vasur iti kim: viprañ-..... evam-para iti kim: mayi.....: vicvā-.....
6 B. om. 7 G. M. -vidhini. 8 G. M. O. bhajate. 9 G. M. O. om.
32. Not in adhvarāṁ visvataḥ, antaḥ, jatāḥ, vivicuh paruh, and punah.

These words constitute exceptions under the foregoing rules. The commentator specifies in each case under which rule the exception falls. The first example is yajñam adhvarāṁ visvataḥ paribhār asī (iv.1.111: O. omits the first word, W. B. the last): an exception under viii.24, which would require visvatas; W. B. O. remark that the distinctive addition of adhvarām effects the exception, and W. O. add the counter-example indraṁ vo visvatas pari (i.6.121). For antaḥ, the example is mahādevam antahporśeena (i.4.36: O. omits the first word): an exception under rule 23, antaḥ being first member of a compound. For jatāḥ, bhūtasya jatāḥ patir eka āsit (iv.2.82: O. omits the first word, and alone adds āsit; G. M. omit ekaḥ also): an exception under viii.27. For vivicuh paruh, yā dvivicuh paruhparuh (iv.2.64): with the counter-example paruhparuh anughushyā visasta (iv.6.9a: only G. M. have the last word). For punah, finally, punahpunah ky asmāt (vi.5.134: only G. M. have asmāt). Both these last are exceptions under viii.23.

The versions of the comment to this rule are more than usually discordant, all being defective except W. and O., and even these having suffered considerable disarrangement. For the details, see the various readings below.

33. Nor before a word containing dh or sh.

"By vicinage," says the commentator, is understood a negative, in this and in the next following rule. The meaning of the rule is that, when a word containing either of the letters dh or sh follows the visarjaniya, the latter is not liable to conversion into s or sh, as required by the foregoing precepts. The examples given are

32. ..... eteshāṁ visarjanīya yathāvihitani na bhajate. ya-
thā: yajñam.....: āvinir (viii.24) iti prāptih: "adhvaravi-
cshanāṁ nirūṭhīḥ: "adhvarām iti kim; indā....: mahā-
.....: kakhapakāra (viii.23) iti prāptih: bhūt.....: patni-
vepati (viii.27) iti4 prāptih: "yā.....: vivicur iti kim; pa-
rush.....: punah.....: kakhapakāraparuh" (viii.23) ity anuyah prāptih.

33. sāṁnídhyād atra 'paratra ca ' nañārtho labhyate. dhap'
ca shap' ca dhashāu: tāv asmīnt sta iti dhashavat: tasmin dha-
shavati" pade parabhūte sati "pūrco visarjanīyo" yathāvihitam'
34. Not before pari và or pra.

The examples are rocana dīvaḥ pari vājeshu (iv.2.111): only G. M. have the first word)—with the counter-example divas pari prathamam (i.3.145 and iv.2.21), to show the need of citing và after pari—and tasmād itahpradānam devaḥ (iii.2.97): O. omits devaḥ. Of these, the first is an exception under viii.28; the other, under viii.23. There is yet another passage, bahihprado và manushyāh (vi.1.144), which needs to be brought under the rule; and the commentator accordingly declares that the quotation of pra in this rule with short a is intended to connote pra also—just as, in a rule of the next chapter (ix.24), athā connotes atha also, by a converse principle. This, however, suggests a difficulty: why then is not rule vii.7, prescribing for pra an effect which had already been

na "padyate. yathā: bahih......: puru......: ubhay......: kakhapakāra" (viii.23) iti práptih. parabhūta iti kim: adhas...... rtaṣya......

34. pari và: pra: 1 evampravo visarjanīyo yathāvihitam2 na "padyate. rocana......: ve' ti kim: divas......: tasmād......
pre' ti hrasvagrhaṇam dirghasāyā 'py upalakṣaṇam: 3 yatho "dathaparasa ca (ix.24) iti dirghagrhaṇam hrvasāvya 'palakṣaṇarthaṃ: tarhi prāparva ca (vii.7) iti sātram vyarten: praçabdasyā 4 nucrttasyā ita' dirghopalakṣakavatvā: iti cet: ucyate: pratyaḥṣaṅgṛhītasyāi 'vo 'palakṣakatvāni' nā 'nu-krshtasyā ti vijñeyam: 'tathā hi: vā hanauhyāmanāḥ (vii.6) ity atra2 cakāreṇa praçabdās tatṛā 'nukṛṣṭah: atra tu' pari vā-prapara 'ity 10 upalakṣakavatvān bhavati. tathā sati 'dam āpy udbhāranaṃ: bahih——

1 G. M. ins. ca. 2 G. M. O. ins. sātra. 3 G. M. O. dhakdra. 4 G. M. O. shaka-raça. 5 B. G. M. O. om. 6 G. M. O. pūrva. 7 G. M. vitā. 8 B. G. M. O. om. 9 B. -rāpara. 10 W. adds tasminn iti nādhyate pārvasya. parīvāravārāh.
prescribed for pra, a superfluity? Because, is the reply, such connotation is only proper in the case of a word directly cited, not of one that is brought forward by implication merely: and in rule vii.6 the pra was thus brought forward [from rule 4], in virtue of the ca, 'and,' contained in the rule: whereas here the pra is expressly mentioned. This seems a case of rather questionable interpretation.

न निर्प्रेरि नि: ॥ ॥

35. Not so with nih.

That is, as the commentator explains it, the exception established by the preceding rule does not hold good in the case of nih, which is treated as prescribed in rule 24, even before pra. The cases instanced in illustration of the rule are both of a doubtful character: the one is a jatā-reading, prāṇeṇu nir nish prāṇeṇu prāṇeṇu nih (vi.4.10²), the other an extract from the ending of the same anuvāka (vi.4.10), ātmānta parā nish pra pukraçaçitāḥ, these words being those which end respectively the first four divisions of the anuvāka. We shall find other quotations of the endings later; and their appearance is at least decisive of the recognition by the commentator of the breaking up of the anuvākas into divisions of fifty words each, whatever we may have to believe respecting its recognition by the Prātīcākhya. We are not, however, to take for granted that even the commentator accepted the division as now made in our manuscripts, involving a suspension of continuity of the saṁhitā-text after each fiftieth word: there was probably at first a mere enumeration made, with an expression of its results at the end of the anuvāka. The endings, as may be seen in the Calcutta edition, are carefully accented, and written according to the rules of combination as laid down by the Prātīcākhya. The same rules are followed in the jatā-text; and hence, as (by rule vii.2, above) nih converts the following initial n into n in saṁhitā, so does it also in the repetitions of the jatā (nir nish). As a yet farther consequence, it has the same effect in the rules of the Prātīcākhya, and I have therefore accepted the reading na instead of nā in the repetition of the present rule, although it is supported only by T. and W.

35. nir ity atra visarjaniyasyaś prapatvē pi shatvanishedho na bhavati: shatam eva bhavati 'ty arthāḥ. prāṇi......: ātm-

iti trībhāshyaratne prātīcākhya vivarāne

ashtāmo 'dhyāyah.

CHAPTER IX.

CONTENTS: 1–6, treatment of final ʰ before initial surd letters; 7–10, treatment of final ɒ̂ and ɒː; 11–15, of final diphthongs before initial vowels; 16–17, of the particle u; 18–19, duplication of final ʰ and u; 20–24, conversion of final ɒ̂ in, án, to ɒ̂, ím, úm.

उधम्योऽ स्पोष्यारे लुप्ते कामांकमनया II १ II

1. Visarjaniya, when followed by a spirant which has a surd letter after it, is dropped, according to Kāndamāyana.

The commentator, after a brief paraphrase of the rule, gives a couple of examples to illustrate its working: namely, catustāṇāṁ karoṭi (v.i.64; p. catuh-standām), and vāyava sthō pāyava sthā (i.i.1). The mention of Kāndamāyana is declared to be made on account of a difference of views: others, namely, hold that ʰ is dropped before a spirant that is followed by a sonant letter as well, as adbhya svacā (i.8.139), ye yukta syus tam (ii.3.18; W. B. omit tāṁ), yo hatamāṁ svayampāpah (ii.2.83: O. omits yo; G. M. omit pāpah), and dānākāmā me proja syuh (ii.2.83, 3.41: O. omits the first word; G. M., the first two). I am not sure that I understand the consideration further alleged, in view of which it is decided that "the rule is all right;" it appears to be that, reference having thus been made to a discordance of views, those words will be hereafter specified in which there is omission made under any other prescription—but what this refers to, I am unable to see.

Every MS. that I have reads 'ghoshaparə' as second word in the rule: but the comment so plainly implies the reading -pare, and the sense so obviously requires it, that I have ventured its adoption.

Although the prescription here given is put upon the authority of an individual, it is pretty evidently to be regarded as definitely

1. āshmaparə visarjaniyāḥ kāndamāyaṇaṣya mate lupyate tasminn āshmany aghoshvatpare' sati. yathā: catu-.-.-. vāy-

kāndamāyaṇaḥ sandhīḥ viṅkapātham: anyeshāṁ mate

ghoshatpare' py āshmanī visarjaniyo lupyate: yathā: adbhya

-.-.-. ye-.-.-. yo-.-.-. dāne-.-.-. evam sa viṅkapāpyane'

sati lakshāṇántaragataṁ yeshu padshe lupyate tāṁ padāṁ

vakṣhyāmāṁ iti vacanāṁ saralāṁ bhavati.

āśma paro yasmād 'asvā āśmaparə': na ghaśoḥvān agho-

shāh: asvā paro yasmāt 'sa tathāktaḥ': tasminn aghoshapare,

1 G. M. O. om. vat. 2 G. M. -yanasa gr. 3 W. -ravaga; O. -rayagrahane; G. M. -pāṇāra. 4 W. O. -pādra. 5 G. M. O. prav. 6 G. M. sa tathā ktaḥ. 7 G. M. om. 8 G. M. om.
adopted and taught by the Prātiçākhya, and is usually (not without occasional exceptions) conformed to by the edition of the Sānhitā, and by my manuscripts both of that and of the Prātiçākhya and its commentary. I have, therefore, treated it as peremptory, and have everywhere governed by it the readings I have accepted. The same omission is prescribed by the Rik and Vājasaneyi Prātiçākhyanas, but not by the Atharvan (see Ath. Pr. ii.40, note).

2. Followed by a surd letter, it becomes the spirant of like position with that letter.

The commentator's examples are: yax kāmayeta (i.1.2³ et al.; O. reads -yate); agnīp ca me (iv.7.6¹; O. omits this and the next example), utākaç papah (v.5.18), agnis te tejah (i.1.10² and vii.5.17: O. leaves out te), and yaq pāpmanā gṛhitah (ii.1.3⁵,4⁶: W. leaves off the first word; G. M. O. omit the last).

The requirements of this rule are by no means complied with by the manuscripts, nor have I followed them in the present work. In the first place, no manuscript that I possess, or have ever seen, attempts to represent any such sounds as the jihodmātīya and upadhūmāṇīya (see i.9), or ρ and φ; for these, visarjānyā is universally substituted, as if the sect of Āgniçeṣṭ and Vālmikī (see rule 4, below) had supplanted all its rivals; and, in the second place, the agreement to leave visarjānyā unchanged before a sibilant (according to the view of the authorities referred to below, in rule 5) is nearly as general. In my MS. of the Sānhitā, I have noted about thirty cases of conversion to a sibilant, in place of unchanged retention, and they are nearly all in a single limited neighborhood (in iv.5), where a different scribe has developed his originality a little. As is hinted above, in the introduction, however, G. and M. make with great regularity the assimilation of h to the following sibilant; O. does it not infrequently; the others, almost never.

I have put together, in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.40, a statement of the variously conflicting views respecting the treatment of h before the different classes of surd letters held by the different Prātiçākhyanas, or referred to in their rules; and it is unnecessary to repeat it here. The sole point upon which all authorities agree is the conversion into c and s before palatal and dental mutes respectively—and this is also the only point left unquestioned by the rules which follow here in our treatise.

न तयः ॥ ३ ॥

2. aghoshaparā visarjānyas tasyā 'ghoshasya sasthānam āśmānām bhajate. yax..... 'agnīp..... ulā......' agnis.....
yaq.....

(9) O. om.
3. But not when followed by ksh.

That is to say, visarjaniya remains unchanged before ksh, the preceding rule for its conversion to jihvamuliya being annulled. There is nothing corresponding to the usage here prescribed in either of the other treatises. The commentator quotes a number of examples: manah ksheme (v.2.17), ubhayatubkhshunar bhavati (v.1.14: W. B. omit bhavati: the visarjaniya was exempted from conversion into s before the k by viii.33), ghandghanah kshobhanah (iv.6.41), puro rahtih kshiyate (iii.1.71), and dyauh kshamd reirhat (iv.2.12: O. omits the last word).

काव्यवर्गपार्श्वाधिविश्वासवाल्मीकि: ||8||

4. Nor, according to Agniveṣya and Vālmiki, when followed by a guttural or a labial mute.

The two authorities here specified (the commentator calls them "holders of a cakha, teachers"), it appears, reject altogether the jihvamuliya and upadhamaniya, since they prescribe the retention of visarjaniya in the only situations where those problematical sounds are liable to arise. The commentator quotes a couple of illustrative passages: yah kāmayeta (ii.1.28 et al.), and agnih papur āsit (v.7.26: O. has dropped out what follows agniḥ). Then, to show that on other points these heterodox persons accept our rule 2, he cites madhuc ca mādhavaṣ ca (i.4.14 and iv.4.111), manas tatvāya (iv.1.11: but B. substitutes namas talpāyā, iv.5.91), ācuc cicānaḥ (iv.6.41), yas somaṁ vamiti (ii.3.26).

जनानस वैवेकिकाराचार्यणाम् ||1||

5. According to some authorities, not when followed by a spirant, and only then.

I believe there can be no real doubt as to the meaning of this rule, although it is not very explicitly interpreted by the commen-

3. kshaparo visarjaniyaḥ purvavidhin na bhajate. yathā: man----: ubhay----: ghanā----: purv----: dyāuh----: kshakārasya'ghoshavattvāt praptāḥ.

1 G. M. O. om.

4. 'cakāro nishedham ākārshati. āgniveṣya va ālmikyoḥ cākhini nor ācāryaṇor mate kavargaparāh pavargaparāh vdā purvavidhiṁ 'nā 'padyate'. yaḥ----: agniḥ----: kakāraḥ ca pakāraḥ ca kapālu: tavyor vargāṁ kapavargāṁ: tāu parīdu yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ. evampara iti kim: madhuc----: manas----: ācuc----: yas----

1 G. M. om.; O. caśabdo naḥkārshakah: āgn-. 2 O. om. 3 O. kavargaparāh visarjaniyaḥ. 4 O. na bhajate. 5 O. kavargā ca pavargā ca.
tator, and although G. M. O. omit the negative in the interpretation (I presume, by a copyist's blunder only). Some authorities, who do not, like Agnivesya and Vālmīki, refuse to accept the jihvādānīya and upadhānīya, nevertheless deny the doctrine of rule 2 to this extent—that they prescribe the retention of visorjanīya, not its assimilation, before a sibilant. Thus, they would write āṣuḥ cīcānah (iv.6.41). G. M., as is their constant custom, write here āṣuḥ; and so does O., as is its common, though far from invariable, usage: but this means nothing; for we have no good reason to expect the manuscripts of the commentary to conform themselves in any such case to a reading which will truly illustrate the matter in hand; they simply make the sandhi in the manner usual with them: for example, under rule 2, no MS. attempts to indicate the ṛ and ṣ, and W. B. give the h instead of the sibilant before the sibilant.

If we reject this interpretation, our sole alternative is, so far as I can see, to hold that some authorities would accept rule 2 only so far as it relates to h before a sibilant, but would retain h every where else, even reading aṅghī te teyāh, aṅghī ca me. This seems altogether inadmissible. Yet we must acknowledge that it is to some extent favored by the commentator's selection of counter-examples, namely manas tavegya (iv.1.11: but B. substitutes again nāmas talpyāya, iv.5.91) and yah kāmayeta (ii.1.29 et al.). According to our preferred interpretation, there would be no particular reason for quoting the former of these, since the combination it illustrates has been made a question by no one; according to the other, it would be required (in the form manah tavegya), to show what these dissidents held should be done in such a case.

6. Not according to Plākṣi and Plākṣāyana.

The natural interpretation of this rule would seem to be, that Plākṣi and Plākṣāyana are not of the number of those who hold the objectionable doctrine of the last rule, or of the last two rules. If, however, I rightly apprehend the commentator, he declares it

5. ekeśhām ācāryanāṃ mata āśmapara eva visarjanīyāṃ pār-
vaidhim naḥ bhajate. yathā: āṣuḥ... evakāreṇa kim: ma-

nas... "yaḥ...

1 G. M. O. om. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 G. M. om.

6. kapavargoparaḥ āśmaparaḥ ca visarjanīyāḥ plākṣiplā-
khāyanayoḥ cāikhinoḥ pakshe na khatu pārva-vidhīm bhajate. 

yah... yah... āṣuḥ... evampara iti kim: manas... 

"kapavargadādī sūtratrāyam anishītam."

1 O. kavargoparaḥ pavargoparaḥ ca. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. prefix evam, and put the whole at the end of the comment on the preceding rule; they also omit rule 6.
to mean "in the opinion of these two authorities, it does not—that is, he does not follow the prescription of rule 2 either before a guttural or palatal mute or before a spirant." This is equivalent to a ratification of rule 4, and a ratification or rejection of rule 5, according as we adopt the one or the other of the two interpretations proposed for the latter; and it is, in my view, quite unsuited to the connection. The discordant explanations of some of the other views of designated authorities given in the rules of the treatise show us that the commentators had not in all cases, at least, any certain knowledge by tradition of the matters referred to, but simply interpreted as well as they were able the notices of their text-book—and we have the same right as they in this respect. If the particular point here under discussion were of more practical consequence, I should be inclined to go into a fuller discussion of it; as the case stands, it has perhaps cost us already more words than it is worth.

The commentator illustrates by repeating several of the quotations already given—namely yah kāmaryeta (ii.1.2 a et al.), yah pāṃnad (ii.1.3 b et al.), āpy utīśvānah (iv.6.4 a): these as direct examples; as counter-example, according to W. O., manas tattvāya (iv.1.11), for which B. once more substitutes namas talpāyā (iv.5.9 b), while G. M. read agnic ca me (iv.7.6 a)—the readings of which, as regards the visarjanīya, each manuscript gives in its usual fashion (except that W. has this time āpy utīśvānah, by a blundering divergence in the wrong direction), so that we are deprived of any farther aid from that quarter to the understanding of the rule.

Finally, rules 4-6 are declared not approved.

7. Ah, the whole of it, when followed by a, becomes o.

The commentator’s cited examples are preddho agne (iv.6.5 a and v.4.7 b), samiddho añjan (v.1.11), and so ‘braviit (ii.1.2 b et al.). He then enters into a long exposition intended to prove the necessity of the specification sarvāḥ, ‘the whole of it,’ in the rule. Without it, we are told, the reading samiddho añjan (in the second example given) would not be established: for, by i.56, alteration and omission concern only a single letter; hence, if sarvāḥ were omitted, only the final visarjanīya would be converted to o; this, with the preceding a, would become ādu by x.7; the ādu would

7. aḥsarvo visarjanīyaḥ ovam bhajute kāraparāḥ: aḥsarva ity akāreno sahe ‘ty arthah. pre..... sam..... so..... aḥsarva iti kim: samiddho añjann iti na sidhyet: kim tu varnasya vikāralopāv (i.56) iti visarjanīyāndrasya syād ovam: tata okārāukāraparāḥ (x.7) ity aukāre kṛta aukāra āvam (ix.15) ity dvadeṣah: tathā satī samiddhāv añjann iti syāt. ‘yad vā: ‘ svaraparo yakāram (ix.10) iti yatvam “
be converted into āv by ix.15, and the final reading would be sam-
iddhār anjan. Or, again [supposing the present rule not to be
given], the visarjaniya would become y by ix.10, the y would be
dropped by x.19, the preceding a would be exempted from further
combination by x.25, and the smāhita-reading would turn out
samiddha anjan.

The Ath. Pr. (ii.53) avoids the same difficulty by prescribing the
conversion of the h into u, which then combines with the prece-
ding a into a. The other treatises (Rik Pr. ii.12; Vāj. Pr. iv.42)
treat the combination in the same manner as our own. What be-
comes of the following a is taught in the eleventh and twelfth
chapters.

8. Also when followed by a sonant consonant.

Only one example of this combination is cited, namely mā no
mitra varunah (iv.6.85: G. M. O. omit the last word).

The commentator raises against this rule the objection that, as
prescribing the same thing with the one preceding, it should not
have been made a separate rule at all; and, in reply, he promises
that the exposition of the meaning of tu in the next rule shall
explain the reason of the proceeding.

9. But visarjaniya, when preceded by an a-vowel, is omitted.

In these rules, from 7 to 10 inclusive, the anuvṛtti, or continu-
ance of implication, is intricate and irregular in an unusual degree,
and even beyond the measure of what ought to be tolerated. The
implication of visarjaniya being made all the way from viii.5 to

bhavati: tasmiṇc ca lupyete tv avarnapūrvāv yavakārāv
(x.19) iti yakāre lupte paraḥ ca paraḥ ca (x.25) iti
kāryaṅa-
rāprasiddheḥ samiddha anjanaḥ ity syat: ten mā bhūd ity
evam arthāḥ: aṣavaraḥ ity uktam.

1 G. M. om., and ins. apg. 2 G. M. okāram. 3 G. M. put at the beginning.
4 G. M. saḥito visarjaniya. 5 O. sidhyati. 6 B. G. M. om. 7 G. M. kīm ca; O.
kuṃ tu. 8 G. M. O. ins. atha. 9 G. M. O. ins. vda. 10 G. M. O. om. 11 O. ins.
sūtreya. 12 G. M. ṭhāpakte. 13 O. ṭhāpiḥ tathā saḥt. 14 ṭhāho; B. ṭhāhū.
15 G. M. om. 16 G. M. O. om.; B. om. evam. 17 B. om. ah.

8. cakara' okāram aṣavaraṁ ed 'nvādīcatīt. olo sarvo ghosha-
vatparaś tv evam bhajate. yathā: mā...... nanu vidhāu samāne
prthakkaravanam anarthakam iti cet: uttarasūtre tuṣa davyākhyā-
nenaṃ pṛṣṭhitakarṣyata iti parihiṭah.

1 G. M. put next before anvādīcatīt. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. O. ṭaḥ ca. 4 G. M. O.
om. 5 G. M. kāṭrak. 6 G. M. ṭhāne. 7 W. O. ṭhya.
ix. 10. (as pointed out in the comment to viii. 5): rule 7 of this chapter ought to teach that "visarjanīya, when preceded by a, becomes a along with the latter, when a follows;" instead of which a new subject, "the whole syllable ah, is introduced there; and visarjanīya, being thus replaced by something else in rules 7 and 8, ought to drop out of view altogether, or, if needed further, to be distinctly specified over again. But we find it implied without specification in the present rule; and, farther, the being followed by a sonant consonant is brought down "by vicinage" from rule 8, while the tu, but, the commentator says, merely annuls the being followed by a, as specified in rule 7. This is little less than absurd: if the sequence of a was to be annulled at all, it should have been so in rule 8—or, rather, it was annulled by rule 8, and needs to be made no further account of. The tu is here, as often elsewhere, a simple sign of a change of subject, and the commentator's attempt to give it a precise significance is—also, as often elsewhere—a failure. Our rule means, by its terms, that ah, dh, and dsh lose their h before a sonant consonant; only, as ah was already specially provided for by rule 8, it virtually applies only to dh and dsh. The statement is thus made more general than is needed for the case in hand, because the whole implication of "preceded by any a-vowel" is needed for rule 10, which is to teach that ah, dh, and dsh before a vowel—here, again, with the exception of ah before a, already provided for—convert their h into y, preliminary to dropping it altogether, by x.19. But rule 10 presents a more anomalous combination of two heterogeneous matters into one precept than is easily to be paralleled elsewhere in the Prātiṣṭhā. It is really made up of two independent parts: one, aha svaparāśvav, "Now then, when followed by a vowel," which is an introductory heading having force through this chapter and the next; the other, visarjanīyo yakāram, "h becomes y;" and their combination is made in order that the implication of visarjanīya and also of avarnapāra may be made from what precedes, and may not require to be distinctly stated.

The commentator's examples of the application of the rule are devā gātucidah (i.1.13; 4.44; vi.6.22), and vicityaḥ somāṣ na vicyāyā iti (vi.1.91; somāṣ for somāh by protraction from somah: G. M. omit the last two words, O. the last three). He adds, as his exposition of the connection of the rule, that the express spec-

9. avarnapāraṇāv gosvayatparas tu visarjanīyo tīpyate: hras-
vapārasvayā "kāra" eva dirghapārasvayā putoūpārasvayā ca lopah.
yathā: devā...ː vis..... akāram ah sarvo kāraparā (ix.7) ity akāraparāvam pratyaksham tuṣabdāna nivartayā "nu-
mānikāṁ gosvayatparatvam parīgyate saṁmīdhyāt; anyā 'nuvarṇan eva 'bhāṣṭam atre 'ti pārvatātraṇavasyāḥ prthak-
karānavam.

1 W. ins. sah. 2 B. G. M. viśāra. 3 B. -vea; O.-gāh. 4 G. M.-trāṣya.
specification of sequence by a, made in rule 7, is annulled by the word tu, and that an inferential sequence by a sonant consonant is assumed by vicinage [from rule 8]; and that the implication here of the latter only is the reason why rules 7 and 8 are given independently of one another. That is to say, such is the easiest way of arriving at the result desired, that the h of uh and uh is not directly dropped before a, but passes through the intermediate step of conversion into y, as before the other vowels.

10. When followed by a vowel, it becomes y.

That is to say, visarjaniya does so, if preceded by an a-vowel (rule 9)—except in the case of ah followed by a (rule 7). And, as is intimated by the prefixion of atha, the specification “followed by a vowel” is of force also in the following rules (through chapter x.). I have remarked in the preceding note upon the anomalousness of this rule, as striving to fuse into one the winding-up of one subject and the introduction of another. It has not seemed possible to render the atha excepting by a longer and more tedious paraphrase than I was willing to introduce; accordingly, I have left it out in translating the precept.

The commentator’s examples are ápa undantu jivase (i.2.11; G. M. O. omit jivase), tá abrwan (ii.3.52; 5.10), and anvárabhyás iti (vi.8.81; anvárabhyás for anvárabhyah, by protraction from anvárabhyah); and he gives further, as counter-examples, ápo varunasya (v.5.41: a not unexceptionably selected example, since ápah even before a vowel might not follow the present rule), and agnír ekákhareṇa (i.7.111: a case under viii.6, as the preceding under ix.8).

This conversion of visarjaniya into y is only the preliminary step to its complete loss, by rule x.19. The same course of conversion is followed by the Atharvan and Vajasaneyi Pratìcakhyas (Ath. Pr. ii.41; Vaj. Pr. iv.38), but not by that of the Rik (ii.9,10).

11. E, before a vowel, becomes ay.

10. athaçabdō dhihkarārthāh: svarah paro yasmād asāna
svarapāra. ita uttarām yad ucyate svarapara ity evam tatra
nimittatvend dhihrtaṁ veditavyam: sāṁniḥdhyād avarnapāra
iti labhyate: svaraparo visarjaniyo varnapūrvo yaktāram āpā
yate. yathā: ápa..... tá..... anvā..... svarapara iti kim:
ápo.....: avarnapāra iti kim: agnīr.....

11. E, before a vowel, becomes ay.
Of which, then, the \( y \) is lost by \( x.19 \), leaving only \( a \); and this, by \( x.25 \), is not liable to further combination. The commentator's examples are \( ima eva 'smāi (ii.4.10^3) \), and \( ta enam bhishajyanti (ii.3.11^4) \).

**12.** \( O \) becomes \( av \).

The example is \( vishnava \) 'hi 'dam (ii.4.12^3). For the further treatment of the \( v \) thus produced, see \( x.19 \) and the following rules.

**13.** But not, in either case, when followed by \( a \).

The dual number of the attribute in this rule, we are told, sufficiently shows that the two letters \( e \) and \( o \), last mentioned, are its subject. There are two different rules in the treatise applying to the case of a final \( e \) or \( o \) coming to stand before initial \( a \)--namely rule 11, above [or rule 12], and rule xi.1, which directs that the latter shall be elided—and, since the rules of this chapter are of paramount force, as preceding the other, the present precept is required in order to annul them.

The commentator's examples are \( mā te asyām (i.6.12^2) \), \( samidhō aṇjan (v.1.11^1) \), and \( te 'bruvaṇ (ii.5.1^3 \) et al.).

**14.** \( Āi \) becomes \( āy \).

**11.** 'visēṣhṭo visarjanīyaḥ. idam idānīm ucyate: svaraparāh padānta' ekaro 'yam iti vikāram āpadyate. ima...... ta......


**12.** svaraparāh padānta okaro 'vam iti' vikāram āpadyate. yathā: vish......


**13.** dvivacanasāṁarthasya-prāyaṇaḥ ekārūkāraṇaḥ akāraparāṇaḥ párvaviddhiṁ na prāpnumaḥ yathā: mā...... sam......: te...... ity āddā ekāro 'yam (ix.11) lupyate te akāra ekārūkārapāraviḥ (xi.1) iti sātradvayam prasaktam: tatrā 'pi pārvatvāt prabalāṁ yathaviddhiṁ nīshedduṁ ayam ārambhāḥ. akāraḥ paro yābhyaṁ tāv akāraparāṇaḥ.

The example is ādināhaḥ evaṁ vādāsanāmaśeṣu (vii.5.2¹; B. omits the last word, G. M. O. the last two).
To complete the sandhi, also, which is the subject of this rule and its successor, rule x.19 is needed.

15. Āu becomes āv.
The example is ahā̄ anadotā hate (v.6.1²).

16. An u, uncombined with a consonant, remains unchanged, and v is inserted between it and the following vowel.

The definition of aprkta was given above, at i.54, and such a word was directed to be treated both as initial and as final (i.55). This rule makes an exception for the particle u, which becomes uv before a vowel—which, moreover, never occurs after an a-vowel except as combined with it, forming part of the class of praṇāyas in o which were treated above, in rules iv.6.7. The examples given are so uv ekavāca vartanāh (iv.3.3²), and adanty uv evāsiya maṁṣyāḥ (ii.3.7²): I have noted further only iv.6.9⁴, but am not sure that I have been careful to mark all the cases. As counter-examples, svapatyaṇā deva (v.5.4¹; p. svapatyaṇā) shows that the u must be aprkta, and bhakṣē ṣni (iii.2.5¹), that no other aprkta vowel than u is thus treated.

17. But not in saṅhita-text, after tat and tasmāt.

The passages are tad v āhur utṣrjyam (vii.5.7¹: O. omits after āhur), and tasmād v āṣjam (vi.1.1¹). So far as I have observed, these are the only instances which the text affords of u following
a consonant and preceding a vowel. Compare the similar rules in the other treatises (Rāj Pr. ii. 28; Vāj Pr. iv. 87; Ath Pr. iii. 96). The preceding precept being thus annulled with reference to these two cases, they fall under the general rule x. 15, and the u, like any final, is converted into v. To show the bearing of the specification sāṁhitāḥ, 'in combined text,' the commentator gives us the two passages in padu and krama form: thus—tad u: śvāh: tad u: uv śvāh: śvāh utsṛjyam (but G. M. O., give simply the first two krama-pada's), and tasmāt u: avyam: tasmād u: uv avyam (here only W. has the statement in padu). It thus appears that the combination with the preceding consonant is indispensable to the treatment of the u as here prescribed, failing that, it falls under the preceding rule, and becomes uv.

18. A u, when preceded by a short vowel, is doubled. That is to say, when another vowel follows—the heading atha svaraparāh (ix. 10) still continuing in force. The commentator adds also "when occurring at the end of a padu," as he has done in his paraphrase of the preceding rules: this is a matter of course, as we are dealing only with the conversion of padu-text into sāṁhitā. His illustrative examples are nyānī agniḥ (v. 5, 32), and tam u tad dudhyayān rathī (iv. 1. 32 and v. 1. 14): only G. M. have the first two words). That the preceding vowel must be short, he shows by parān ā vartate (iii. 2. 97 and vi. 3. 83): that a vowel must follow, by sādṝkh samanātih sāyā (ii. 2. 86: only O. has the last word; only B. G. M. have the inserted k, required by v. 32, and G. M. convert it to kh, by xxiv. 12), and pratyāh kadhāh (vii. 4. 2: here all have the k, but only G. M. make it kh).

17. tataśmad ity etābhyyām sāṁhitā ukāro prktaḥ pārvanidhiśvānā "pnoti" prakṛtyāvasthānām vākaraṇ ca na bhavati ty arthāh. tad... tasmād... ivarnokārāv yavakārāv (x. 15) iti dācāme 'syā vidhiḥ vakshyate'. tataśmad sāṁhitā itī kim: tat.... tasm......

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. 'padyate'; O. prāp. 3 G. M. O. rāgāmaḥ. 4 O.-ma. 5 B. tasya. 6 O. ins. tasya purastdāpavado 'yam.

18. 'svaraparāḥ nakārāḥ padatavarti hrasvāpārvāḥ dvivaṇam bhajate. yathā: nyānī... tam... hrasvāpārva itī kim: par...... svaraparā iti kim: sad... praty..... hrasvaḥ pārvo yasmād avyāk hrasvāpārvah: dvayor varnyoḥ samāhāro dvivaṇam.

19 G. M. arrange hr- sv- pad- nak. 2 G. M. O. ins. deiteinā. 3 G. M. om.
19. As does also a n.

The a in this rule brings down, we are told, the preceding cause of duplication and the duplication itself. The cited examples are nir avapann indraya (ii.4.22), and abruvann rdhnvat (I.5.12). The counter-examples, given for the same purposes as those under the preceding rule, are niravapam ydy eva purastit (ii.4.12: O. omits the last two words), omanvati te smin (ii.6.92: O. omits the last word), yan agnoy evatapyanta (iii.2.82: O. omits the last word; G. M. omit the whole example), and vidan etam agnini cindte (v.6.53). The commentator does not give himself the trouble this time to inquire why two rules are furnished to prescribe a single process: the reason is, evidently, because continued implication of n only is desired in the rules that follow.

20. In graha, ukhya, yajya, prshthya, and hiranyavarnya passages, a n preceded by i or u becomes r, preceded by a becomes y, except before iti.

The remainder of the chapter is occupied with rules respecting these conversions of a final n after s, t, and u before an initial vowel—conversions of which the original ground is the same with that which causes the combinations uca, ust to result from the collision of n with c and t (v.20, vi.14), namely the partial retention of an original s which followed the n as part of the declensional termination of the word. See note to Ath. Pr. ii.27 for a full statement of the teachings of the other Pratishakhyas respecting them. The conversion of n to y is equivalent to its omission, since the y is dropped by x.19. Rules xv.1-3 are also needed to complete the combinations intended, by the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or the insertion of anusvra after it.

19. cakaraḥ pūrvanimittam dvitvam cā dvādhiptaḥ hrasvo pārco nakāro dvivarnam bhajate svaraparaha. nir..... abr..... evampara iti kim: nir..... oman..... evampūrva iti kim: yān..... vid.....

1 G. M. pūrvoktan. 2 G. M. O. dvītvaṃ. 3 G. M. āpadyate.

20. grahokhyādīshu vishayeha ikārapūrva ākārapūrvo vā ca kārakshato nakāro 'nūtpara' iti vyatiriktsvaraparo repham āpadyate: ākārapūrvaṣ ced yakāram, graho nāma caturo 'nuvā-
As in other similar cases, the commentator, after his preliminary paraphrase of the rule, proceeds first to define the passages of the Sanshitā designated by the titles it contains. By *gra ha* is meant the fourth chapter of the first book, excepting its last four sections—or i.4.1-42. By *ukhya*, the first two chapters of the "Agni" book (see iii.9), excepting their final sections (which are *yājya*)—or iv.1.1-10; 2.1-10. The *yājyas* have been already defined—(iii.9, note), as the concluding sections of all the chapters to book fourth, chapter third, together with ii.6.11. By *prṣṭhyā* are intended nine sections, pointed out by the citation of the first words of each: they are iv.4.12; 6.6-9; 7.15: v.1.11; 2.11; 2.12. *Hiranyavarṇīya* designates only a single section, v.6.1. Examples are then given from each set of passages. From *gra ha* passages, we have *jahi catrāṇi upa śrīdho nudasa v (i.4.42), and maruvadanta śīla vrishabhāh (i.4.19): G. M. O. omit the last word): there are four other cases, at i.4.20 twice, 21,41. From *ukhya* passages, *ye vā vanaspatrir anu (iv.2.83), and madhumāni astī śārīrāh (iv.2.93): there are ten others, at iv.1.33 twice, 9.23,10.4-2, 2.42,5, 9. twice. From *yājya* passages, *tāhāhrtupate yājye la (iv.3.134: only O. has the last two words), to which W. B. O. add *amaṇḍān ibhenā (i.2.144): but for this G. M. substitutē *madhumāni indrāyādān (iii.1.102), which is not in a *yājya* passage at all, but falls under the next rule: I have noted more than thirty other cases, namely at i.1.142; 2.142; 3.148; 4.462; 5.112; 6.124; 7.134,5; iii.1.111 thrice; 2.123,3; 3.148,5; 6.111 thrice 4 twice, 12,3; iii.1.111 thrice, 7; 2.112 twice; 4.112; 5.112; iv.2.113; 3.132,3,4 twice. The same passages contain five exceptions, which are duly provided for in rules 23 and 24, below. From *prṣṭhyā* passages, the examples are *catrāṇi anaparyayantah (iv.6.63) and jaghunāṇi upa jighnate (iv.6.63): other cases at iv.6.7,9,4 twice; 7.157; v.1.112.

---

1G. M. read *gra*- throughout. 2B. om. 3G. M. O. *tya* amid anayasaar-. 4B. iti *tya* etad asmad anyasaar-. 5G. M. O. *nyāmar-. 6G. M. -ed *et-. 7G. M. O. *isa-. 8G. M. O. *man-. 9G. M. amavākāh. 10W. O. pachyate; G. M. pathyante. 11G. M. om.
from the hiranyavarniya section, aqnir apusahadah (v.6.18), and sarvadh aqnir (v.6.18), which are the only cases. Counter-examples, of a not converted as here prescribed, because occurring outside the passages specified, are trim idh lokan iti (vii.3.2.), paga eva va rundhe (v.1.11 et al.), and tan indro 'ntaryamena 'ntar adhata (v.14.6: G. M. O. omit the last two words). And the bearing of the specification “except before iti” is illustrated by examples from the krama and pade texts, namely abhyavartanta dasyañ, dasyañ iti dasyañ (i.6.12; dasyañ is thus repeated, as being the closing word of the anuvaka; but W. O. omit this repetition, which exhibits the very point requiring illustration, and B. adds only iti dasyañ to the first dasyañ), and idavän iti 'da-vän (iii.1.11; zamhit-reading, idavän eshañ).

Any general examination of the aspect of this mode of combination in the Taittiriyam text I defer to the end of the chapter.

21. Also in the words martyña, ud ayán, amritän, duryañ not preceded by soma, so asmän, avimän, gomän, madhumän, kavishhän, hümamän before any vowel belonging to the text, ciktvän, idavän, kakhicvän, bänavän, hi payasvän, vaçän, vidaträn, amiträn, arän, poshän, and mahän.

The co in this rule, says the commentator, brings down from the preceding rule the specification “except before iti”; but we might fairly claim that it involves all the specifications there made excepting the restriction to certain passages; this exception the comment duly notes: “this and the rules that follow have a general application, without regard to special portions of the text.”

The illustrative examples are: for martyña, martyña devicava (v.7.91). For ud ayän, ud ayän ajaśram (iv.6.31): with a counter-example, vayobhira eva yän ava rundhe (v.2.107), to show that...

21. — eteshu grahaneshu nakäro 'nitiparo 'yakāram āpadyate', antitiparatekshakao 'yam cakārah, vishayän and-ditya sarvārtho 'yam itah param ārmbhah, yathā: mart...: ud ay...: ud iti kim: vayo...: ud...: bhad...: na somapārva: duryañ ity atra nakārah somapārvo yateva: nā "padyate: pra...: so...: so iti kim: indro...: avī...: gom...: madh...: avigomadhv iti kim: paçu...: hav...: hümamän ārshē": hümamän ity atra nakāra "ārshē scăre
the ṛt before ayān needed to be quoted along with it. For amṛ-
tān, ud asthān amṛtāh anu (i.2.81). For duryān, bhadṛān duryān abhy a'ki mān anvratā ny u (i.6.31; G. M. O. omit mān etc.); there are two other cases, at i.2.13: vi.2.94; and a single exception, pra card soma duryān adityāh (i.2.101), quoted by the commentator in justification of the restriction "not preceded by soma." For asmān, so asmān adhipatī karotu (i.6.64 and iii.2.72); another example is at v.7.94; and asmān becomes asmān also at i.6.124, but in virtue of the preceding rule. The counter-example, showing the necessity of prefixing so in the rule, is indra asmān asmin deśīyē (iii.1.92: W. B. omit the last word). For avimān, avimān avī (i.6.68; 7.67; iii.1.114: but the last case falls under the preceding rule also). For gomān, gomān agī (i.6.64; 7.67; iii.1.114—that is to say, in the same phrase with avimān). For madhumān, madhumān indrīyāvān (iii.1.103). Next follows a counter-example, intended to show why mān would not have been enough of itself to include the last three words, without the prefixed parts avī, go, and madhu: it is pacimān eva bhavati (vi.2.66 et al.). Then, for harsimān, harsimān a vīvasāt (i.3.12): the word occurs a second time in the same section, and also at vi.4.24. For hātānān, devahātānān ity ukhāyān juhōti (v.5.31: W. B. omit the last word): it is found again, in like form, in the succeeding division of the section. The specification "before any vowel belonging to the text (ārsha, "coming from the rshis")," is declared to be meant as an annulment of the restriction, "except before itī," made in the preceding rule. And, to show that the n remains unchanged before a vowel not forming part of the fundamental text, is given the pada-reading devahātā-
mān itī deva-hātānān. There is added further a remark which looks like a gloss that has worked its way into the text: "the specification "before what comes from the rshis" has force in both di-
rections, after the fashion of the crow's eye [Molesworth says, the
crow is regarded as having a single eye, which shifts from one eye-

pāre 1 yavām uṣadāte 2 : devo...: ārsha iti kim: dev-
1 2 ārṣhāgrahanaśāṁarthāyād itiparāte 4 pi 1 yavām bhavati: ār-
sha iti kālākṣhivād 3 ukhāyātra sambhāyate grahokhyādima-
hāṇparyantam": ārṣhavayampātha" ity arthaḥ, vikit- 3 idāv.....: kūk.....: vīta...: idākāṣhivān" iti kim: ras-
Sam....: hi'iti kim: arj.....: ārsha itiparātāvad dev-
1 2 itivad yavapraśptir hīrghānaṇena nishkhāyate 3 , stuto...: su-
vīd.....: amit.....: arān.....: posh.....: agne.....

1 For asomāpūrvaḥ, G. M. read īty esha nakāras somapūrvo 'numeṇān na pada-
yate; B. O. na som-, as do T. G. M. in the rule itself. G. M. O. esha. 2 G. M. yavām bhajate. 3 G. M. om. ayam. 4 G. M. itāhā. 5 W. sarva 'rē. 6 W. B. itī. 7 G. M. deśīyān. 8 W. O. avimādhe. 9 W. adds cikītvān. 10 G. M. O. ārṣhavārāpāra. 11 W. nājāyate; B. bhavati; G. M. O. bhajate. 12 G. M. ins. ity. 13 G. M. pāre. 14 G. M. ins. hātānān ity ukhāyān ity atra. 15 W. O. kākāh; G. M. -kāntīpya. 16 W. B. om. māhan. 17 B. ārṣhāk sv-; G. M. ārṣhabhāvān. 18 G. M. idākāṣhivān. 19 G. M. O. pratisak. 20
ball to the other, as it is needed]—namely, from the beginning of the preceding rule to the end of the present one.” This appears to mean that an iti belonging to the sacred text itself would admit the conversion of the n before it, in any case falling under these two rules. The opinion is doubtless a sound one; but, to prove its expression pertinent here, we require an example showing that there is a passage in the text requiring its application: and none such is furnished us; on the contrary, the addition of ārshe to hūtamān alone implies that none is to be found. The example for cikītān is cikītān anu manyatām (iii.1.4: O. omits the last word). For idānān, idānān esah (i.6.4; also at iii.1.11, but this is a case falling under the preceding rule). For kakshivān, kakshivān ādujīdh (v.6.5.8). For bānāvān, vigulyo bānāvān uta (iv.5.14: O. omits the first word). Next we have again a counter-example, rasavān eva bhavati (ii.2.4), showing that, of words ending in vān, only those preceded as here specified undergo the prescribed effect. For hi payasvān, sam asrkshmahi: payasvān agna a'gamam (i.4.45.4,46.2: only O. has sam; and G. M. O. omit the last two words): the necessity of the prefixed hi is shown by the counter-example drjasvān payasvān ity āha (i.7.3.4). Here, however, is a case of payasvān before an iti which comes from the rshis, and therefore might seem to require the reading payasvān, like hūtamān in the passage devahūtamān ity ukhāyān (v.5.31)—according to the extension made above of the natural and obvious meaning of ārshe; but the commentator declares that the mention in the rule of hi as necessary preceding word prevents the conversion of n to y in the passage: it is, to be sure, a case of payasvān before iti, but not of hi payasvān. For vacān, the example is stutō yāsī vacān anu (i.8.5.1). For vidatrán, W. O. give suvidratān api 'tu (i.8.5.2), while G. M. have instead suvidratān avitī (ii.6.12.3): B. is defective here, dropping out the last part of this quotation, and the first part of the next (reading suvidratān apabādhamānāh); G. M. are in the wrong this time, for the passage they quote falls under the preceding rule. For amitrān, amitrān apabādhamānāh (iv.6.4.2): an exception is provided for in the final rule of the chapter. For arān, arān ivā 'gne nemīh (ii.5.9.3: O. omits the last word). For pōshān, pōshān apushyat (vii.1.9). For mahān, agne mahān asī (ii.5.9.1): another case at i.4.20.

22. Also a n followed by indro me, akah, udhvam, ihā, apy etu, aganma, idenyān, āyojishthāh, o ca, rtu, akurvata, aduhat, adithi, agre, adharānt sapatnān, and alam.

22. ity evam pravākara 'dākapārvo yatvam āpadyate. ca tāra 'dākapārṇavākāraśhakah. yathā: sap iti kim: yush: nigr: yūy: agne: dirghena kim:
The implication here, the commentator tells us, is of a *n* proceed by a only: he does not explain why, but would have a right to appeal to the mention of *dn* last in rule 20, and the exclusion of any other cases than those of a final *dn* in rule 21. His examples are as follows. For *indro me, sapatnān indro me* (i.1.13; 6.42; iv.6.34); with a counter-example, *yuskān indro 'rnīta* (i.1.51), to illustrate the need of specifying *me*. For *akah, mārābhend ādārān akha* (i.1.13; 6.42; iv.6.34: that is to say, in the same passage as the preceding: O. omits the first word). For *ādvēm, yāyān devān ādvēm* (i.3.82: O. omits the first word). For *ihā, agne devān ihā’* *vaha* (i.3.14; 5.5: iv.6.13); with a counter-example, *yajñīyān tha yān havāmāhe* (i.5.10a: only W. has the last word), to show that the *nimitta* in this case is *ihā*, not *ihā*. For *āpy etu, gharmo devān āpy etu* (i.5.104: B. omits *gharmah*; again at i.6.32); with the counter-example, *vidvān api janyeshi* (vi.1.69), to show that *āpy* without *etu* does not cause the conversion. For *agamna, suvar devān agamna* (i.7.9b). For *idēnayān, idāmāhāi devān idēnayān* (ii.5.9b). For *āyajishtha, devān āyajishtha swayāsti* (iv.3.18; 6.15: O. omits the last word). For *ā ca, devān ā ca vakshat* (iv.6.34 twice, and vi.4.66 twice); but this example is omitted by G. M., and they also omit the item *ā ca* in the rule itself. A counter-example, *yān ā vaha upatāh* (i.4.44: G. M. omit the last word), is given by all but O.: in G. M., it should show that *ā* causes *ān* only when followed by *yajñishtha*; in W., only by *yajñishtha* and *ca*; but W. states the occasion for it in the same manner as G. M., and B. alone sets it in its proper relation to both the foregoing examples. For *etu*, the example is, in W. B., *vājo devān rtubhīh* (iv.7.12), but G. M. O. give instead *yebhir devān rtubhīh* (i.1.14): I have found no other case. For *ākravata, vitvā kāmāk akra-vata* (i.5.93). For *ādushat, yajno śardā adushat* (i.7.11). For *aditīth, vivasvān aditīth* (i.5.33). For *agre, agnis tān agre* (iii.1.4): we have also *vāyus tān agre* in the same division. For *adhārān, anyān adhārān sapatnān* (iii.2.86); with a counter-example, *bhrātryān adhārān pādayāmī* (iii.5.31). For *alama, parohācān alama kurv iti* (vi.3.12). Finally, to show that the rule applies only to *ān, paridhān akra-vata* (vi.2.15). The comment closes with an exposition which I must confess that I do not fully understand. It is evidently intended to determine the readings which the words treated in these rules shall have in *yajñī-text*; and it furnishes abundant illustrations, in reference to the form of which, however, there is not a little difference between the different recensions; G. M. O. generally citing the passage first

\[
\begin{align*}
yajñā & \ldots : ghar \ldots : eto iti kim : viddvān \ldots : suvar \ldots 
\end{align*}
\[
\begin{align*}
idā & \ldots : devān \ldots : "devān ... " : yajñishtha ceti kim : yān \ldots : vājo \ldots : vit \ldots : yajño \ldots : vivas \ldots : agnis \ldots 
\end{align*}
\[
\begin{align*}
anyān & \ldots : sapatnān iti kim : bhrā \ldots : puro \ldots : avadē- 
\end{align*}
\[
\begin{align*}
kimathāh \ldots : parti \ldots : tattapadagrahanam kartavye parapa- 
\end{align*}
\[
\begin{align*}
dagrahanam "anāršk " pī saṁhitāvidhāv " agrahānasya " ca ya-
\end{align*}
\]
in its **sāṃhitā**-form, and adding only a single **sandhi** from the **jātā**-text, while W. B. give the complete jātā-readings, and only those. The former quote first **amartyo** **martyān āviveca** (v.7.94), and add **martyān amartyah**: W. gives **amartyo martyān martyān amartyo martyān. amartyān āviveca** "āviveca martyān martyān āviveca." B. only the latter (and, blunderingly, treats it as **amartyān āviveca**, throughout); next, G. M. O. have **ud āstham amṛtān anu**: **amṛtān āstham** (l.2.94); W. B., **amṛtān anu anu amṛtān amṛtān anu.** Then, in illustration of a second point, we receive two more examples: G. M. O. read **agnē vīmaṁ āvṛte: avimāñ agne (i.6.64 et al.),** for which W. B. substitute **agnē vīmaṁ avimāñ agne (yne vīmaṁ);** and G. M. O., again, **ud āyān ajārasam (iv.6.34).** Or, this time adding the full jātā-reading, **ud āyān āyān ud ud āyān,** which G. M. also seem to mean to give (they actually have only **āyān ud āyān**); while W. B. set down the jātā-form of the other pair of words: **āyān ajārasam ajārasam āyān āyān ajārasam.** Yet once more, two examples for a third point close the tale: in G. M. O. **agnēs tān āgre: tān āgnī (iii.1.43);** in W. B. **tān āgre gṝ̄ṇaṁ tāṁ tāṁ āgre;** and, this time in all alike, **āyān adharān adharān anyāṁ anyāṁ adharān** (but G. M. have, doubtless by a copyist's blunder, **āyān the second time, before anyāṁ**). It will be seen that the two versions are in part inconsistent with one another as regards the special points of combination to which they direct attention; and I am not able to make out what are the three classes of cases meant to be distinguished. The three points which one would most naturally think of as needing to be noticed are, perhaps, first, the occurrence of a word like **amṛtān** before itself—thus, **amṛtān amṛtān**—in the jātā repetition; second, its occurrence before a preceding word (not its defined or natural **nimitta**); when that word begins with a vowel—thus, **amṛtān āstham**; and third, its occurrence in jātā before the word which causes its alteration in sāṃhitā—thus, **amṛtān anu—if, indeed, this last can be regarded as requiring any special prescription. Or, the second and third cases might be expected to concern the treatment respectively of a word, on the one hand, like **martyān,** which is itself quoted in the rule as suffering the prescribed change (which is at the same time **grañāna** and **nānimittā**, or **nānimittikāṁ grañānam**), and might therefore naturally be inferred to be liable to the change under all circumstances before a vowel; and one, on the other hand, like **anyāṁ,** which is pointed

**tvāṁ syād iti nānimittikāya ca nānimittāpekshāvatā: grañānasya yathā: amartyo... ut... evāṁ nānimittikagrañānasya: agne... ut... evāṁ grañānaṁ nānimittikāya: agnīs... anyāḥ... evāṁ sarvatra nakārasya yakārotattāṁ drashta-vyād.**

out by means of the quotation of the following word adhārāṇ (which is itself, therefore, nāṁśītiṣṭa, while adhārāṇa is grahaṇa; or which is grahaṇandāsimītiṣṭa, 'undergoing a prescribed effect under the influence of a quoted word'), and which one might suppose changeable only before that word. It is in accordance with this latter explanation that the last two pairs of examples are taken, the one from under rule 21, the other from under rule 22. At any rate, the general conclusion appears to be pretty well assured, that a word which shows a final 'ṅ' in samhitā shows it also in jatā before a following vowel of whatever kind. This is markedly different from its treatment in pada, where, by the initial specification of rule 20, its power of conversion to 'ṅ' is lost altogether: and even in jatā (as was shown in the note to iii.1), an altered letter usually exhibits its samhitā form only under the specific circumstances which condition that form in samhitā-text.

23. The 'ṅ' of račmīn, crahāyān, yamān, pataṅgān, samānān, arcān, yañīyān remains unchanged.

All these are words occurring in the passages respecting which the comprehensive prescription of rule 20 was made; needing, therefore, to be specifically exempted from its action. The commentator quotes the phrases in which they occur, as follows: pu- rụṭā ca račmīn am (iv.1.23); aditiḥ crahāyān iti (iv.1.54); suya- mān ṛtaye (iv.7.15415), pataṅgān asamādītah (i.2.1411), samānān ucca ma agne (iv.3.133; only G. M. have the first word), arcān indra grāvānā (i.8.129; G. M. have dropped out all but arcā), and yañīyān upasthe mātāh (i.8.141; O. omits the last word). The first two are from ukhya passages, the third from a prāthiṣṭa, the rest from yājya— as is noted also by the commentator (but G. M. omit these notices, save the first). Under the second, he further suggests the objection that, as the word following crahāyān is iti, the case might seem not to fall under the rule (since this expressly says "except before iti"); but he urges in reply that the word ārṣhe in rule 21 (that is to say, of course, according to his

---

Nor a n followed by ut or athā.

The phrases to which this rule relates are, as quoted by the commentator, amitrin un nayāmi (iv.1.10), and vidvān athā bhava (iii.2.11²); our sāṁhitā-text has athā, because the word stands vibhāge, at the end of a division of the section: see rule iii.10 and note: I have noted no other cases. The commentator gives a counter-example to the former, showing why ut could not have been extended to uto, but needed to stop at the consonant (hat): it is trī añ uto dyān (ii.1.11¹). Such a counter-example is quite out of the usual course, and very superfluous: the example itself would be counter-example enough; the substitution of uto for ut would have excluded the very passage aimed at. Of the two phrases, the one comes from an ukhya-passage, the other from a yājya: the commentator might better have spent his spare energy in telling us this.

What remains of the comment to this rule is not altogether free from difficulties. First the statement is made that the word athā in it implies also athā, with short a: in illustration, W. repeats, without change, vidvān athā bhava; B. gives the same twice over; only O. has, in krama-text, vidvān athā: athā bhava—which is doubtless correct, and shows the krama-reading (along, we may suppose, with the jata) to be the matter aimed at. That the now accepted sāṁhitā-reading—vidvān athā: 2: bhava—is contemplated, is not at all to be assumed. Both the statement and its illustration are wanting in G. M.: and this, although those manuscripts contain, under viii.34, the reference to it in advance there made. In regard to what follows, also, the recensions are considerably at variance. The jata-text is again under

24. ut: athā: ity evapāra nakāraṁ yathāvihitaṁ 'rephain yakāraṁ vā nā "padyate. ² yathā: amit. . . . . . halmātreṇa kim: trī añ: vide. . . . . 'dirgho 'tra hrasvopalakṣaṇam api: yathā: vide. . . . . " yathāsaṁhitāsthānam "eva nimattāni sekāryānam karoti " nishedharaṇam ³ yathā: amit. . . . . . . vidhir api " evaṁ yathāsaṁhitāsthānam ittā evaṁ sarvatra bhavaty " ato " vocāma. . . . . . so. . . . . asmr. . . . . evamādi vedītyaṁ.

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśākhyaavivekam
navamo 'dhyāyaḥ.

treatment; and it appears to be laid down that any word has in that text the same form as under analogous circumstances in samhita, whether it fall under an exception or under a rule. Then, as example of an exceptional word, is given, as established by the present precept, amitrān ud ud amitrān amitrān ut (iv.1.10\(^9\)), amitrān retaining its n throughout; and again, as examples falling under the more general rule, so asmān asmānt sa so asmān: asmān avaḥdyāh avaḥdyāh smān asmān avaḥdyāh (v.7.

So far, now, as I have been able to discover, the teachings of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā in rules 20-24 of this chapter precisely correspond with the conditions of the known Taṅkṣirya text. I have not found in the latter a single case of final əṇ, əṇr, əṇr which they do not duly notice, nor an exception to the more general rules which is not provided for. Of course, my observation is more to be trusted upon the former point than upon the latter.

The sandhi here treated of is comparatively unusual in our Sanhita, as it is in those of the other Vedas. According to my count, there are (including repetitions) 115 cases of əṇ (including also one at iv.6.6\(^7\), omitted above), 5 of əṇr, and 4 of əṇr— in all, 124; while, of final əṇ remaining unchanged before a vowel, I have noted down over 450 instances (and probably not without overlooking a score or two), of əṇ, about 150, of əṇ, 16, and of əṇ, 4— in all, about 620, or not less than five times as many. The numerical relation in the Atharva-Veda is probably nearly the same. See the end of the note to Ath. Pr. ii.27.

CHAPTER X.

CONTENTS: 1-9, combination of final and initial similar vowels, and of final a or ḍ with initial vowels and diphthongs; 10-12, resulting accentuation and nasalization; 13, special cases of uncombinable final a; 14, of elision of final a, ḍ before initial e and o; 15-17, combination of final i and u vowels, and resulting accentuation; 18, special cases of uncombinable final i; 19-23, elision of final y and e; 24-25, uncombinable final vowels.

ग्रन्थिकमुखेः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the coalescence of two vowels into one.

An introductory heading to the whole chapter. The commentator paraphrases: “both syllables become one form, of the same kind.”

1. athe’ty ayam adhikārah: ubhe akshare ekāṁ rūpaṁ sajātyam\(^1\) āpadyete\(^2\) ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad vakṣhydmah.

\(^1\) O. puta before rūpaṁ. \(^2\) MSS. -yata.
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2. In the case of a simple vowel, followed by a similar vowel, the product is long.

For the terms samānākshara and savarna, see rules i.2,3, where they are defined. The grammatical construction of the rule is not simple, or easily made homogeneous with that of its predecessor. The commentator brings it out thus: "there being a simple vowel, followed by one that is of like nature with itself, these two, being put in the relation of predecessor and successor, become a single long vowel." His examples are tvacaṁ grhīnīshvā 'ntaritaṁ rakṣuḥ (i.1.8: only K. has the first word; only G. M. the last), rāsnā 'si 'ndrānyadi (i.1.2s), and sāpasthā devo vanaspatih (i.2.2s: only G. M. have the last word).

3. Now for cases in which an a-vowel stands first.

A new sub-heading, having force as far as rule 9, inclusive. The word avarṇapārve is explained by the commentator after the manner of a karmaḥdāravya compound, as meaning "that which is both an a-vowel and first," but I do not see how such a construction can be defended; we have, rather, to understand akṣhara, and make the meaning analogous with that of rule 2: "when there is a syllable that has an a-vowel before it."

4. When an i-vowel follows, the product is e.

The commentator explains ivarṇapāre in the same manner as avarṇapārve in rule 3. The interpretations might hold good, if pāra and para were taken substantively; but they are not so used anywhere in the treatise. His chosen example is ne 'shtir bhava-
5. When an u-vowel follows, the product is ou.

The examples are sam brahma, prajnasruti, kalaya svabha (i.1.8: O. omits the last word), and somaindara bahurudalamah (v.6.15; p. soma-indrada).

The commentator again very elaborately explains ekadrikara-pare as a karmadhaaraya compound, formed upon ekadrikara as a devananda, and remarks that the same explanation applies also in the following rule.

7. When a or au follows, the product is ou.

The examples are brahmadyudnam pacati (not found in the Taitt.

4. avarnapare ivarnapare ca sadi te ubhe akshare ekaram
dumatah. ne 'sh----- mah. ivarnag ca sadi paras ce 'varna-
parah': tasmini.

1. G. M. ina. ubhe akshare. a O. om. (8) B. paras ce avarnapare.

5. avarnapare uvarnapare ca sadi te ubhe akshare okaram

dumatah. 'shey-----

1. G. M. o. om. a O. om.

6. avarnapare ekadrikarapare ca sadi te 'ubhe akshare paras

dumatah. sam------ ekadri

ceti "kara ca kara kara tad: samahara ekadrikaram: sam-

2. G. M. om. 3 O. om. 3 G. M. paras pare, and put before akshare. (4) G. M.

7. avarnapare ekadrikrapare ca sadi te 'ubhe akshare duk-

3. G. M. om. 3 G. M. o. om. 3 G. M. add uttas samahah.

1 G. M. o. om. 1 G. M. o. om. 1 G. M. add uttas samahah.
tirîya Sanhitâ, although it is read at Tâittirîya Brâhmaṇa i.1.9\textsuperscript{a}: we have brahmādudanam pacet at v.7.3\textsuperscript{a}; and brahmādudanam apa-
cat at vi.5.6\textsuperscript{1}: O. omits pacati, leaving the citation such as might
have come from either passage), and dānā ’pau”mbhan (ii.4.13).

8. When \( r \) follows, the product is \( ar \).

The examples are ardharca ekām (i.6.10\textsuperscript{b}), and āgneyya rcd
"gnādhram (ii.1.6\textsuperscript{a}; p. āgneyya: rcd).
I have not noticed a single example in the Tâittirîya Sanhitâ of
that retention of \( r \) unchanged after \( a \) and \( ā \), only with correc-
tion of the latter, which is the rule in the Rik and Vâjasaneyi Sanhitâs,
and which appears also in the Atharva-Veda, though against the
authority of its Prâtiçâkhya (see Ath. Pr. iii.46 note).

9. If a preposition precedes, the product is \( ar \).

The commentator points out that, as the implication “when an
\( a \)-vowel stands first” is still in force from rule 3, this virtually
means “if a preposition ending in \( a \) or \( ā \) precedes;” \( r \), of course,
is inferred from the preceding rule. According to the list of pre-
positions given at i.15, then, \( ā \), \textit{prā}, \textit{eva}, and \textit{upa} would be the only
words authorized to form with initial \( r \) the \textit{vyṛddhi} vowel instead of
the \textit{guna}, \textit{pard} and \textit{apa} being excluded. The commentator
brings up but one example from the text, namely \textit{upa} \textit{rchati}
(i.5.9\textsuperscript{6}: G. M. read \textit{upā} \textit{rchaty} \textit{askandāya}, which I do not find
anywhere: we have \textit{askandāya} after other words at i.5.8\textsuperscript{c}; vi.3.8\textsuperscript{1,3}; the last time following \textit{upā} \textit{‘syati}; possibly this text was
in the mind of the scribe who added \textit{askandāya} in the comment
on the present rule); he gives another from the \textit{jaṭā}-text, \textit{ṛtavyād}
\textit{upro ‘pō ṛtavyād ṛtavyād upa} (v.3.1\textsuperscript{a}; 4.2\textsuperscript{1}), and, further, as counter-
example, showing that only a preposition ending in \( a \) or \( ā \) produ-
ces the prescribed effect, \textit{vyṛddhain vā etat} (v.1.2\textsuperscript{1} et al.: O. omits
the last word). Additional cases of the same combination, with \( ā \)
and \textit{eva}, are quoted under rule 10 (at the end); if the text affords
yet others, I have failed to note them. Nor have I observed any
cases of the different treatment of \textit{pard} and \textit{apa} before \( r \); so that
here also I do not discover any reason for the strange restriction of
the class of prepositions made at i.15.

8. avarṇapārva \( r \)kārapare ca sati te\textsuperscript{1} ubhe akshara\textsuperscript{2} aram iti
vikāram āpnumah. \textit{arādḥ-}; āgn-——.
\textsuperscript{1} O. om. \textsuperscript{2} G. M. O. om.

9. avarṇapārva \textit{ity} anuvartate:\ tasmaḍ upasarga\textit{pārva \textit{ity}
\vāṇeśa}avarṇāntoktā\textsuperscript{1} avarṇānto ‘yam\textsuperscript{2} upasargas tasyād ‘va gra-
hanam; \textit{r}kāraḥ sānimidhyād labhyate. upasarga\textit{pārva \textit{rkārapare

\textsuperscript{1} O. cm. \textsuperscript{2} G. M. O. cm.
10. When an acute enters into the combination, the result is acute.

That is to say, as the commentator points out, when the first constituent, or the second constituent, or both constituents, have the udatta accent, their combination is udatta. He gives a long list of examples in illustration of the working of the rule, promising that they shall exhibit the whole series of vowel-combinations just prescribed, from the second rule to the ninth, with all possible conditions of accentual combination. Thus, savita\(^{1}\) prā\(^{2}\) rpayatu (i. l. 1.; p. prā: arp: W. reads -yatī) brāhma yachā 'pā 'yne (i. l. 7.; p. yacha; āpa), yājyāti "'edī 'nam (ii. 3. 5.; p. yājyā: ā: evā: ēnam: the pada-manuscripts have ē 'ti for ā: ; and so with the other prepositions), pūshā\(^{3}\) 'dhatta (i. 5. 12.; p. pūshā: ā: adhatta: W. B. read -te, dice 'ca cākṣhūh (i. 3. 6\(^{2}\) and iv. 2. 9\(^{4}\); p. dice: evā: for this accent, which is opposed to the teachings of all the other Prātiṣākhyas, see under rule 17 of the present chapter), adyā vāsu vasati 'ti 'ndro hi devādān (ii. 5. 7.; p. vasati: iti: 'ndraḥ: O. reads at the end 'ndram eva, which I do not find anywhere in the Sānhitā), māitrīvaraṇī 'ty āha (ii. 6. 7.; p. -mī: iti). The question is then raised, whether the word sāṇniyam (vi. 2. 4\(^{1}\)) does not fall under this rule, since it exhibits a coalescence into one syllable of two vowels, whereof one is acute; but the reply is made, that a special rule in a later part of the chapter (r. 17) prescribes for it the circumflex. The examples are continued: réto daddhātā\(^{1}\) 't sakṣhyō (vii. 4. 19.; p. daddhātu: āt), vānaspātayō nāī 't tish\(^{5}\) thantī tān (vii. 4. 8.; p. āu: āt: only G. M. have tān), and tā dikṣāḥ 'pā 'daddhata (v. 5. 5.; p. dikṣāḥ: ēpa: G. M. omit tā). So many are examples of the combination of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel: the rest illustrate the cases of coalescence in which a or ò precedes. They are sē 'māī no havyādā

cā sati te\(^{6}\) ubbe akshāre\(^{7}\) āram iti vikāram āpnutah. upā.--. 
\(\text{t}t\)---. avanantaropasargaviceshānena\(^{8}\) kim: vy?---. upasargag cā 'sāvī purvač ca 'pasargapūrvaḥ: tasmīnī 'upasargapūrve'.

---\(^{1}\) G. M. O. om. anu. \(^{2}\) W. vičeshāvar; B. vičeshokā yathā; G. M. avičeshoko 'pi; O. avičeshokā apī. \(^{3}\) O. om. ayam. \(^{4}\) G. M. o. \(^{5}\) B. G. M. O. om. \(^{6}\) G. M. O. upaś; G. M. B. -śeṇa. \(^{7}\) B. om. \(^{8}\) G. M. om.

10. udāttadharmavicīṣṭe varṇa pūrvatāḥ parata ubhayato vā sthīte sati te ubhe apy ekādečam āpante uddāttadharmakam\(^{9}\) āpnutah. udātto 'syā 'sti 'ty uddātavān: tasmīnī udāttavati. sa- 
manākṣharam ārāhyā sarvasmad\(^{10}\) ekābhive 'yathāramam uddāt 

tānudāttasvaritāpūrva ubhayor uddāte vo 'dāharanāni darçayi- 

shyānāh. sav---. brāh---. yāj---. pūsh---. div---. adya---. māt---. namu sānniṣyam iti atro 'dātte 

nāi 'kādege sati kim na syād āyam vidhiḥ: uddātāpūrūddhikāre
The commentator quotes rule xv.6, which declares it to be the

The commentator quotes rule xv.6, which declares it to be the
opinion of some authorities that final simple vowels, not *pragrabham*, are nasal; and he states that the present precept has reference to them: if such a nasal vowel, being acute, enters into a combination of the kind above described, the resulting single syllable is nasal. Examples, he says, are those already given. And he adds that the rule is not approved.

I cannot at all believe this to be the true interpretation. The rule seems, on the other hand, to belong to and represent the same view of the nature of a syllable ordinarily regarded as containing *anuvāra*, which appears so unequivocally at xvi.1, and to mean that when such a syllable, being looked upon as one containing a nasal vowel, instead of a vowel with succeeding *anuvāra*, enters into combination with another vowel (of course, a preceding one), the result is also nasal. Thus, for example, *yah with anuvāra* would make *yo 'havan*; *svādha* and *uśādha* (vii.3.16.2), *svādha* *'}}

12. When circumflex and grave are combined, the result is circumflex.

The examples of this accentual result of combination, as given by the commentator, are as follows: *kanyā* 'va tund' (iii.1.11); p. *kanyā* : *iva*, *chāvam* *chavyā* *pākatṛaya vediḥ* (v.7.20); p. *chāvam* : upa-ākṛṛaya; G. M. O. omit *svādha*, *yājñīya* 'śād va-tāpāra pākvarī' (vi.6-2); p. *yājñīya* : *esāh*; G. M. O. end with *śād*, and *atha keśa 'śād havantya' śā (v.7.4); p. *keda* : *asaḥ*; O. omits the last two words). He then goes on to point out that the word *svārīti*, 'circumflex', being used in the rule without any distinctive sign, we are to understand the "constant" (*nitya*) or "independent," circumflex (see rule xx.2) to be intended. For this alone arises at the time of production of letters and syllables, elements of words; but the other kinds of circumflex arise after the time of origin of words, in connection with the euphonic combination of

11. *apragrabham* samānākharāny anunāsikāny ekeshām (xv.6) ity ekeshāṁ matam: tān uddhīya yām vidhih. tasmāt udāttatā dharmam adharmam ākāraṇām ekādānām uktāny eva 'dāharānānī.

12. *svārītamudāttayoh samānāpata ekāde śaty ubhāv api tān svārītam apadyate. yathā: kan:; cha:; yāj: aṭha:; tīha svārītasyāt; *vīceshena* grahaṇe nityasvaritva eva grhyate: tasya svārītasyā yvanājanām akṣarānām avadānām va padd-
syllables and words, by the requirement of such rules as xiv.29 and xii.9; and therefore primary quality belongs only to the “constant” circumflex: whence, by the rule “when a general statement is made, that which is primary should be regarded as intended," it is proper that the constant circumflex should be here understood. In such cases, then, as āthā 'brahīt (iii.2.11a), where the long ā resulting from the combination of the final a of āthā, which has the enclitic circumflex (by xiv.29), with the initial a of ābrahīt, which is grave, has itself the enclitic circumflex, this is not in virtue of the present rule, but falls under the same general rule (xiv.29) that prescribes the enclitic circumflex.

To this effect the commentator: and, whatever we may think of the argument by which he attempts to prove that svarita in the rule means only nitya svarita, we shall not question the soundness of his conclusions.

13. Exceptions are dhā, mā, and pā, when followed by asi; also budhniyā, jyā, ā pushā, and aminanta—before a vowel belonging to the text.

That is to say, these words constitute exceptions, not to the last rules respecting accentuation, but to those which prescribe the combination of a final a or ā with the following initial vowel. The commentator cites the passages in which the first three occur before asi, as follows: svadhā asy urot (i.1.9a), sahasrasya pramādā (iv.4.11b): O. omits the first word, and dhanvann iva pra-pā asi (ii.5.12a: O. omits the first two words). I have also noted, for dhā, varcōdhā asi (i.2.11), dhā asi svadhā asi (ii.6.14), and abhīdāh asi (vii.1.115); for mā, pratimā asi, vīmā asi, and umā asi, all in the same section and division (iv.4.11a) with pramād, as quoted; and, for pā, cratapā asi (i.1.14a; 2.3a; vi.1.6a) and cak-sūrikā Asi (i.2.13). To explain the added specification “when followed by asi,” the pada-readings are quoted for us, namely svadhe

vayavānām utpatti-kāla eva sambhavitā: anyeshām tu padotpattikālaṃ ardhamv aksarānām padānām ca sanhitāyād udāttat paro nuddātah (xiv.29) iti vidhānāt tasminn anudattte pārva "udattāh svaritam" (xii.9) ity ādi ca: tasman nityasyāvatva mukhyatvam: sāmānyokta ca satyām mukhyasampratya yātī tasyāt va svikāro yuktah: athā ity ādāv ekādeśasyva dattanantarabhāvitvād udāttat paro nuddātah svaritam (xiv. 29) ity anendī vasa varitattvam viññeyam.

1 G. M. ekum apna. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. O. -sya. 4 B. -shana; G. M. -sham eva. 5 O. om. 6 B. -ta; G. M. sa; O. sarva. 7 W. om. 8 G. M. ca. 9 G. M. paro; 10 O. aparata. 11 W. om.; G. M. O. ed. 12 G. M. udāttam. 13 O. om. 14 W. om. 15 G. M. O. -nāt.
13. dhā: mā: pā: 'eteshe² antyasvara ārśhe⁵ pāthē⁵ siparāh: budhiya⁴: jyā: ā pāśhā: aminanta: etešhe⁴ antyasvara ārśhe⁵ svaraparāh pārevidhiṁ na prāṃpnoti. yathā': svā:....: sah:....: dhan:....: asipara iti kim: svā:....: 'pra:....: pra:
endings exceptionally uncombinable in sanhītā, nevertheless combine with iti in pada-text, and also exhibit their uncombinable quality in jata only before the words whose sequence calls out that quality in sanhītā—pāṣṭhā, for example, uniting with its predecessor d into pāṣṭhā, and aminanta with itself into aminanta 'minanta (only, if we may trust the example given, suddhat being held apart from its predecessor asi, because this happens to be the same word with its successor; and it is by no means impossible that the manuscripts are in the wrong upon this point). But this would be quite sufficiently intimated by the single restriction ārhat, without adding asi also; and that the latter is specifically intended to apply to the pada-readings, and the former to the jata, is not easily to be believed. The asi would have best reason to be introduced because the words mentioned occur also before other vowels, with which they enter into combination—only, to be sure, I have not noted any cases in which they do so.

14. When followed by eshtah, etana, eman, odman, oshtha, or evah, an a-vowel is elided.

That the elision mentioned in the rule is of an a-vowel is a consequence of the continued implication of the introductory rule 3.3, above; although as the commentator fails to point out, that implication was interrupted by rules 10-12, and was expressly stated at the outset to remain in force through rule 9. The passages contemplated are quoted by the commentator, as follows: aciy eshtā ridhayah (i.2.111), samitāra upetana (iii.1.4252), apām te" eman sādayāmi (iv.3.1), apām te" odman sādayāmi (iv.3.1: G. M. O. omit sādayāmi in both these citations), svādḥ" oshthābhaydh (vii.3.161), upayām adharen oshthena (v.7.12: O. omits the first word), and nir ammanac ātā cha pendah (v.3.54: O. omits the last word). These are, so far as I have discovered, all the cases of application of the rule that the text contains. The commentator notes that rule 1.22, which allows a theme ending in a, quoted in a rule to stand for its various derivative forms, is the warrant for regarding oshthābhaydh and oshthena as involved in oshtha. The

14.
same two cases were given by him in illustration of the previous rule (see note to i.22). As general counter-examples, to prove the implication of “an a-vowel,” we have pitoṣṭhah pitoḥṛutv (v.6.14), and pitoṣṭhṛṭya sudhā (vii.3.17).

15. An i-vowel and u become respectively ί and υ.

Here, the commentator tells us, the implication “preceded by an a-vowel,” ceases, but the implication “followed by a vowel,” has force—which implication comes all the way from rule 10 of the preceding chapter. The rule says ukāra, “short u,” instead of varna, “an u-vowel,” because long a has already (by iv.5) been declared pragrāha, and protracted as is made uncombining below (by x.24). The examples are abhy asthitā: (iv.2.81), utty apyaśma (i.3.14), and ṣaḥ pāṣa ṣaḥ vasu (ii.4.51).

16. And, when they are acute, a following grave becomes circumflex.

The word “and” (ca), we are told, brings down from the preceding rule the “i-vowel and u,” there described as suffering a certain effect. The examples given of the production of this kind of circumflex accent, later (xx.1) described as the khaṭpāra, are vy evāt neriṇā pariḥatte (v.3.113, only G. M. have the last two words), and apiṣ ṛgme (iv.2.113). As counter-examples, we have first nicātām dhakṣv atasam (i.2.142) and mādhya ugnāḥ u jahott (ii.3.28), to show that unless the converted vowels are acute, no circumflex appears; and then, to prove that the following vowel must also be grave, tad yāt cor abhy akahārān (ii.4.111: G. M. omit the first word), sāto ‘dī yajeta (i.6.6 et al.: G. M. omit this whole example), and ni no ‘dī apastāram śāḥanti (i.6.73):

syā grahamām bhavati grahaṇasya ca (i.22) ut vacāntā: upay-

nir: . ‘avarno hṛṣuṭa’ iti kim: city-

— city—


15. avarnapārākaḥ kārānā nivṛttah: svarapārādikārās tu var-
tate: atha svarapāra yakāram (ix.10) iti pārṇādikāye pra-krāntah. ‘avarnokārāu padāntāu svaraparāy yathādikārī-ya
avakārāv apadyete. abhy: . ṛty: . d pā: . dirgha-

syā praṇīhēṣhadūt pūtasya samdhinishedhad ukarasya kāro-

taratum. ‘khantam: ivarnokārāu yavakārāv iti.

1 W. pata after the next word. 2 G. M. -kāra. 3 G. M. -takār.
compare, for the peculiar sandhi in these last two examples, rule v.13.

17. Also when a is the product of the combination.

The "also" (ca) of this rule is interpreted as implying that, as in the case of the combination last considered, the first element going to form the a must be acute, and the second grave. As examples of the combination and its accentual result are given sān-
niस am i

(vi.2.41; p. sū-umnīyām), sād-gātā (vii.1.81; p. sū-ud-
gātā), and māsā 'titishthan (vii.5.22; p. māsā: ut-); to which G. M. add dikṣā 'padādhāti (v.5.54; p. dikṣā: upa-dā"). The only other case of the kind which I have noted in the Sanhitā is sū-pa-
sadaṇah (vii.5.20; p. sū-upasadaṇah). The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples: the first, sūpaṣṭhā devāh (i.2.23; p. su-upaṣṭhāḥ), shows that the former a must be acute; the other, tā 'dikṣā pā 'dādhatu (v.5.54), that the latter a must be grave.

A later rule (xx.5) gives this particular variety of the circum-
flex accent the name praṅghita.

None of the other Vedic texts has an accentual usage corre-
sponding with this. Indeed, there is not in the Atharvan a single case of a combination of two a's such as is here contemplated, nor has any from the other Vedas come to my notice; if such there be, they are left to follow the general analogy of combinations of acute and grave into one homogeneous vowel (as illustrated under rule 10, above), the acute element raising the other to its own pitch and making the result acute. On the other hand, an exception to this general analogy is made in the other Sanhitās (and duly explained in their Prātiṣṭākas: see Rīk Pr. iii.7, Vāj. Pr. iv.132, Ath. Pr. iii.56) in favor of the coalescence of two short i's into a long i; if the former be acute and the latter grave, they produce together a circumflex. Of such a combination, I have

16. caṅkārah pūrvasūtroktanimitthānē ivarnokāre anvādičati:

udāttayor aivarnokārayoḥ paro 'nudātaç ca' svarītan āpadyate.

vy.... apsv .... udāttayor iti kim: nicā.... madh

paro nudāta iti kim: tād.... sa:.... in....

1 G. M. -tī sa pa 2 G. M. om 3 O. om.

17. caṅkārah pūrvedāttatvānvākarshakāh: parasyā 'nudāta-
tvam anvādičati ca3. pūrveno 'dāttena parasyā 'nudātasyo

"bhāc kriyamāne" svarītām jāniyāt. yathā: sūn.....: sād-

.....: mā.....: 'dik-....' pūrveno 'dāttena kim: sūp-

parasyā 'nudātasye iti kim: tā....

1 B. O. pūrvaso 'd-; O. ṛvānuk-; G. M. pūrvedātah paraḥvānu'dattā ca "kar-

shatī. 2 G. M. om; O. om ca 3 G. M. om. 4 W. B. O. om.
noted about thirty cases in the Taittiriya text (examples, one in each book, are i.3.62; ii.1.31; iii.5.52; iv.1.62; v.1.72; vi.1.18; vii.5.74); the accentuation is throughout acute, as we should expect.

18. Exceptions are cyeti and mithuni.

That is to say, these words are exceptions to rule 15—and and, being thus exempt from the conversion there prescribed, and there being no other rule requiring their alteration, they remain unaltered, as if they were pragrahas. The examples are cyātena cyeti akuruta (v.5.81: O. omits the first word; cyeti occurs also in the next division of the same section, though not before a vowel), and na mithuni abhavan (v.3.62: B. omits na). The latter word is found in two other places—at iii.4.91 and vi.5.86—exhibiting the same uncombinable quality; and in the latter place it has been made (at iv.53) the subject of special exception as not a pragraha. The pada-text, in fact, writes both words as if no peculiar character belonged to them.

19. But y and v are elided, when preceded by an a-vowel.

The word “but” (tw) in this rule, the commentator says, annuls the application of the rule to any other y and v than such as are the products of prescribed euphonic processes, and makes these alone the subjects of its action. As a y or v can never occur as final except by euphonic conversion, the particle has no very useful office to fill, according to the interpretation. Evidently enough, it is used here, as elsewhere in the treatise where a specific force is sought for it by the comment, simply as indicative of a sudden change of subject.

Vastly the largest class of cases falling under the rule is that in which, by ix.10, a visarjanīya has been converted into y after a, ā, āṅ before another vowel than a. In illustration of this class, the commentator quotes āpa undantu (i.2.11), dhvātā asmin gopatāu (i.1.1: G. M. O. omit the last word), and na vicityās iti (vi.1.91). The next class consists of cases of final e and ā, converted into ay and āy by ix.11,14: the examples are ima evā smanī (ii.4.103), and āsāmahā evē 'māvā (vii.5.21). Yet another class embraces the endings in ān of which the n was turned to y (with nasalization of the ā, or with anusvāra added, by xv.1-3) according to the rules at the end of the last chapter (ix.20-24): the selected example is martyān āvīcēca (v.7.91). But the rule teaches also the

18. cyeti: mithuni: ity etayor antyasvaro yathāvihitam yatvām nā "padyate. yathā: cyāī----: na......

1 O. om. 2 W. G. M. O. om.
elision of final \( \text{v} \) and \( \text{O} \) boldly gives examples for this, as well: namely, \( \text{vāyav ishtaye} \) (ii.2.12\(^8\)), \( \text{W. adds durone} \), and \( \text{akhā anahata} \) (v.6.1\(^7\)), although the text, by a usage which the commentator ratifies under the next rule, but one (x.21), retains the \( \text{v} \) in such cases, and it is retained by \( \text{O.} \) in these very phrases given to illustrate its omission. \( \text{W.} \) has only the former of the two, foolishly prefixing to it \( \text{avarnapāreca iti kim?} \) 'why is it said, “when an a-vowel precedes”?' The other manuscripts pass the point without notice here, leaving it to be settled under rule 21. The true counter-examples for this precept, showing that the elision takes place only after an a-vowel, are given by all alike: they are \( \text{abhy asthāt} \) (iv.2.8\(^1\)), and \( \text{hrītvasah} \) (iv.2.11\(^3\)).

20. Not so, according to Ukhya.

Ukhya denies that \( \text{y} \) and \( \text{v} \) are omitted in any case; and would therefore read \( \text{dpay undantu, imay eva, martyāny a,} \) and so on.

21. Not \( \text{v} \), according to Sāṅkṛtya.

The connection of this rule is somewhat anomalous, but its meaning is sufficiently evident. Sāṅkṛtya dissents from the principle laid down in rule 19, like Ukhya; "but" (\( \text{tu} \)) his dissent does not go the whole length of the latter's; according to him, only \( \text{v} \) is "not" elided. As the commentator has it, the fact that this rule teaches an exception is inferred, "by viṣṇaṃ," from its predecessor; its \( \text{tu} \) is intended as an annulment of the opinion of former teachers. And he declares that it alone is approved, while the two that precede (the former of them, of course, only so far as it is inconsistent with this) and the two that follow (\( \text{B.} \) \( \text{O.} \) omit this) are rejected. The examples are those already given by a part of the MSS. under rule 19, namely \( \text{vāyav ishtaye durone} \) (ii.2.12\(^8\)):
W. B. om. this example; O. puts it after the other one, and leaves off durone), and ahāv anudātah (v. 12: O. omits hate). This is rather the most striking example afforded as of the overriding by the commentary of the obvious intent of the Prātiṣekhāya itself. The usage of the existing Tāttiriya text is on the side of the comments; we have a similar resolution of the final a of vocatives into au, with retention of the u, at i.2.131 twice; 4.33; 6.128; ii.2.124; 4.12; 6.11; iii.2.191; vi.4.33. Of āv as result of final āv before a vowel, I have failed to collect the examples; but had there been any cases of the omission of the v, I think I should not have omitted to observe and note them.

22. According to Mācākiya, both are omitted when followed by u or o. Instead of Mācākiya, the southern manuscripts have, both in the rule and in the commentary, Māyikāya.

All the manuscripts of the commentary declare that "respectively" (yathāsamkhyan) to be understood in the rule—that is to say, that it directs us to drop y before u, and v before o; but their examples do not support this interpretation, and it is palpably a false one. It is difficult to believe that the rule itself is not corrupted, and that it ought not to read ukārdukāraparāh. hupyate, 'v is dropped before u or o' (it does not occur in the text before ā); for, while we can discover no phonetic reason for the omission of y before a labial vowel, there is a very obvious difficulty in the utterance of v (w) before u (no real Sanskrit word begins with wu, nor can I recall it in the interior of a word except as the rare result of sandhi); and, as thus amended, Mācākiya's view would accord with the accepted doctrine of the Rik Prat. (ii.9-11), and with one mentioned, though not adopted, by the Vāj. Pr. (iv.125).

The illustrative examples given are in part those which have appeared already, even more than once, under the preceding rules:

21. sāṁnīdhyān uñcchedho labhyate. sāṁkṛtyasya mate varnāpārve vakaḥ na hupyate: yakāras tu hupyate ece 'ty arthah.  

vāy-...... ahāv...... pārvādārmatvaṁvartakas tucadhah  

sūtram idam ece 'ṣṭam: na tu pāravādavyam paravādavyam ca.  

10 W. B. om.; O. puts after the other example.  

22. yakāravakārav avarnapārav ukāravukāraparāv hupyete  
yathāsamkhyan mācākiyaśya 'cāryasya mate': āpa-...... yā...... evaparāv iti kim: ta-...... vāy-...... hupyete iti 'ha punarārāmabhāh pāraṣṭradvādavyasthitaṁ naṁ sambandha kāṭakānirākaranārthah'.

1 O. om.; G. M. after mate.  

3 G. M. mājākhyayaḥ, as in the rule itself.  

3 R. G. M. mateṇa.  

4 W. -rājana; B. -rājana; O. -rājanaḥ.  

5 O. om. rakṣaḥ; W. -rāma.
23. According to Vâtsapra, they are imperceptibly uttered.

It might admit of question whether the "they" here spoken of are final \( y \) and \( v \) in general, or only \( y \) and \( v \) followed by \( u \) and \( o \), as specified in the last rule. As things stand, the use of the demonstrative \( etayoh \) rather favors, though not unequivocally, the latter interpretation, and it is the one adopted by the commentator. But if the preceding rule be restored to what we have suggested above as its more probable original form, then the \( etayoh \) will be very well in place here as referring to \( y \) and \( v \) in general; and this interpretation is supported by the fact that the Āth. Pr. (ii.24) and Pāṇini (viii.3.18) ascribe a like opinion to another grammarian, Cākātyayana, whose peculiar views upon the subject are likewise hinted at by the Vāj. Pr. (iv.126). As the meaning of \( leça \) is defined to be \( luptavād uccāranam \), "utterance as if omitted," there is not much for the two opposing parties to contend about.

24. Exceptions are protracted and \( pragrāha \) vowels.

Such, namely, are exempt from the rules of combination—and not merely those given in this chapter, but also such as are found elsewhere: for example, at ix.11,12. There is nothing about the

23. \( \text{vâtsaprasya mata etayor}^2 \text{ yakāravakārayer}^3 \text{ avarmapār-

vayor leçah syāt. leço nāma luptavād uccāranam. etayor ity

ukārāukārapāru nirdiṣṭāt. uktāy eva 'dāharānāni.}

\( \text{(o) B. om., along with the rule.} \quad \text{(b) Only in W.} \quad \text{(m) G. M. O. yavāk.} \quad \text{(b) -tam.} \)

24. \( \text{na khalu plutaḥ pragrāhaḥ ca}^1 \text{ sandhīvidhīm bhaṣajetā.}

\text{yathā: astu... te... ityādividhau nishiddhe 'nyasmiṇc cā}

\text{'nārābhyanāme prakṛtvād bhavati.}

\( \text{(o) G. M. plutaḥ ca pragrāhaḥ ca etād na khalu.} \quad \text{(a) W. B. O. fāte.} \quad \text{(G) M. 'rābē.}

\( \text{(b) O. tyd.} \)
rule pointing out that it has a bearing so extensive. Only one example is given for each class: *asti hūḥ ity abhratām* (vii.1.61), and *te enam abhi* (ii.5.62).

The commentator points out, as he did not take the trouble to do under rule 18 of this chapter, that, the rules of combination being thus suspended with reference to these two classes, and no other rule being given about them, they remain in their natural condition.

All the Prātiṣṭhākyas have rules equivalent to this (Rik Pr. ii.27; Vāj. Pr. iv.84; Ath. Pr. iii.33: in the note to Ath. Pr. i.73 I overlooked the present precept of the Taṭṭṭīrīya-Prātiṣṭhāya); none assumes that the pronouncing a vowel to be pragraḥa exempts it, eo ipso, from phonetic combination.

**पर्ष पर्ष ॥२५॥**

25. Also the remaining vowel.

That is to say, the vowel remaining after the omission of the final *y* or *v* is, like those mentioned in the preceding rule, exempt from farther combination. According to the commentator, the “also” (ca) of the rule brings forward “*y* and *v*,” the fact of their constituting an exception is inferred from the neighborhood of the preceding rule, and *paraḥ* means ‘another,’ and qualifies *stāndhiḥ* understood: “no further combination takes place.” This seems to me inadmissible, as there has been no suggestion of any such word as *stāndhiḥ*. Perhaps *para* may be better understood of the vowel “following” the *y* and *v* of which the chapter has been treating. It needs, at any rate, some violence to bring in the rule with the meaning which it is evidently intended to bear: no one would have any right to guess, from its form and position alone, at what it is aimed.

The commentator’s examples are *āpa* *undantu* (i.2.1) and *agra* *imam* (i.1.5+). In reply to the objection that it would be enough to state the implication of the rule as “where an omission has taken place” instead of “an omission of *y* or *v*,” he brings up se ’d u hotā (i.1.14*), sāi ’nā ’nikena (iv.3.132 et al.), and sāu ‘shadhiḥ (iv.2.3*), as examples of an elision of a final which does not prevent the further combination of its predecessor and its successor under the rules of this chapter.


**iti trībhāṣhyaratne prātiṣṭhākyavivaranena**
**daçamo ’dhyāyah.**

(*) G. M. sandhīvidhin na bhajate. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. om. īti. 4 O. om. 5 O. adds prathamaprauçce.
CHAPTER XI.

Contents: 1, initial a elided after e or o; 2-18, exceptions, cases of retention of initial a after e or o; 19, dissident view as to the nature of the elision.

1. But a is elided when preceded by e or o.

The subject of the omission or retention of initial a after final e or o, and of the accent thence arising, occupies the whole of this chapter and of the one next following, the cases of retention being mostly rehearsed in this. No attempt is made, here any more than in the treatment of other similar matters in the work, to effect a real classification—much less, an explanation—of the facts dealt with. Nor have I, on the other hand, drawn up such a classification, as I did for the Atharva-Veda (see Atharva-Prātiṣṭhākhyā, under rule iii.54). Doubtless, if drawn up, it would show nearly the same state of things to prevail in the Tāittirīya as in the Atharvan text: namely, that the elision is the greatly prevailing, almost exclusive, usage in the prose passages; while, in the metrical passages, the a is more usually retained where the metre requires its retention, and omitted where the metre requires its omission—although with numerous exceptions, of which the most regular is that the a is dropped in writing at the beginning of a pāda, where, of course, it was always retained in metrical utterance. The general subject of the relation of the written and spoken texts to one another in regard to this special point is well worth an elaborate investigation, founded on all the Vedic texts.

For the word "but" (tu) in the rule is given an alternative explanation. Some, the commentator says, regard it as suspending the force of the exceptional rule x.24: others, as marking the discontinuance of the general direction "followed by a vowel," which has been in action since ix.10. As in other like cases heretofore, we have no good reason for applying it to any particular rule or phrase; it merely marks an abrupt transition to a new subject, somewhat exceptional in its relations to the principles already laid down. The subject was, however, anticipated and provided for in rule ix.13.

1 ekārāpūrva ekārāpūrve vā 'kāro' lupyANTE. yathā: te.....
2 tuṣabdo na plutapragnāhāv (x.24) iti nishedhasambandhavidhiṁ nivartayati 'ti kecit: svaraprādāhikāram nivāra- yati' ty apare saṁvīrante. "ekāraṇa 'cāu 'kāraṇa 'cāi 'kāraṇukāraṇa: ekāraṇukāraṇa pāṇīvaṁ yasmāt' sa tathoktaḥ.

1 all the MSS. akāra. 2 G. M. om. 3 B. om. 4 G. M. -bandhi; O. -bandham. 5 G. M. nivartayati. 6 in W. only. 7 B. om. 8 G. M. yasya.
To illustrate the rule, only two phrases, both of frequent occurrence, are quoted: namely te 'bruvan (ii.5.1) et al.) and so 'bravit (ii.1.2) et al.).

In the other Prātičākhyaas, the apparent loss of initial a after e or o is treated as an absorption of it into its predecessor, or a unification of the two. See Ath. Pr. iii.53 and note, and rule 19 of this chapter, where a somewhat similar view seems suggested.

All the MSS. excepting B. read in the rule ekāraokārapūrvah; and, where the rule is quoted (i.61 and ix.13), we have six cases of this reading against three of ekārāuk. But the former is simply an instance of the usage, so common in the commentary (see above, p. 4), of separating, for the sake of clearness, the elements of compound words, or otherwise disregarding the rules of sandhi.

2. Now follow cases of non-elision.

The rest of this chapter is occupied with an enumeration of the cases in which initial a is retained. First, in rule 3, a number of passages are specified in which non-elision is the rule, and elision (as determined by the rules of the next chapter) is exceptional; then, in the following rules, more isolated cases are disposed of.

The a is not elided in the following sections: those beginning with dhāta rāthih and upa; those styled vājapeya; those beginning with just'a and eyenāya; those styled ukhya; those beginning with dhruwakshithih, iyam eva sā yā, and agnir mārdhā; the first and the next to the last of the rudra chapter; and those styled vikarsha, vihavya, hiranyavarniya, yāyā, and mahāprishthya.

Here are pointed out not less than seventy-three sections or annuvākas, in which a is not elided (except in the cases specified in the rules of the next chapter). Those designated by the annotation of their first words are i.4.44; 5.5; iii.1.10; 2.8; iv.3.4,11; 4.4. The vājapeya sections are six, namely i.7.7-12. The ukhya sections (as pointed out above, under ix.20) are twenty, namely iv.1.1-10; 2.1-10. The rudra chapter is iv.5, containing eleven sections;

2. 'athe ty ayaṃ adhikāraḥ;' alopa ucyata ity etad adhikṛtaḥ
veditavayam ita uttarān yad vakṣhyāmaḥ. 'na lopo' lopah;' lopah-brhva ity arthah.

(1) G. M. om. (2) all MSS. na lopah alopa.
those here referred to, then, are iv.5.1.10. The name *vikarsha*
belongs to five sections, namely iv.6.1–5. Three sections, iv.7.12–
14, are styled *vihavya*. The *hiranyavarṇiya* section (as shown
under ix.20) is v.6.1. The *yājyās* have been repeatedly the subjects
of prescription in earlier chapters (iii.9,11; ix.30); they are twenty-
three sections, namely i.1.14; 2.14; 3.14; 4.46; 5.11; 6.12; 7.13; 8.22:
i.1.11; 2.12; 3.14; 4.14; 5.12; 6.11,12; iii.1.11; 2.11; 3.11; 4.11; 5.11;
i.1.11; 2.11; 3.13. The *mahāprṣṭhya* sections, finally, are the
first six of those which (as seen under ix.20) bear the name
*prṣṭhyā*; they are iv.4.12; 6.6–9; 7.15.

Section i.4.44 is quoted by its two first words, instead of by
*dhātā* only, according to the commentator, because of the occurrence
in another *gāhā* of a section beginning *dhātā* *devebhya*
*surān* (G. M. omit *asurān*). Again, iv.3.4 is quoted by *dhruva-
kṣitih*, instead of by *dhruva* (the first *pada* of *dhruva-kṣitih*,
i.48), because *dhruva* (by i.22) would include *dhruvah*, and there
is another section beginning with this word, and containing cases
of elision, *dhruva* *si* *dhruva* *haṅ* *saṅjātēsu* *bhāyāsam* (ii.3.91:
only G. M. have the last two words), which would otherwise be
violations of the rule. Yet again, to quote iv.3.11 by *iyam* simply
would not answer, because i.2.4 begins with *iyam* *te* *cukra* *tanūr*,
and contains a case of elision, *sagāṛbhya* *nu* *sahā* *sagāṛthhā* (i.2.42:
only O. has the last word; G. M. omit the example). But
why quote by so long a phrase as *iyam eva* *sā* *yā*, of which the
last two words are unnecessary? To this objection there is an
alternative answer: some say that it is for the benefit of the dull-
mined; others, that it is intended to include a verse which,
though occurring in another place (at i.4.33), is a remainder to
this, and which contains the case of non-elision *o te yanti ye*
*aparīṣtu* *pacīyān* (i.4.33; G. M. O. omit *pacīyān*). Now it is true
that the single verse constituting i.4.33 is of kindred subject with
iv.3.11, and in the Rig-Veda forms part of the same hymn (i.113)
with parts of the latter; and it is also true that the combination
*ye aparīṣtu* is not otherwise authorized by the Prātiḍākhyā; but
it is, of course, little less than absurd to assert that an excessive

3. 'dhātārātir ity* ādīśho anuvākeshu ekārapārva okārapārvo
dvā kāro na lupyate. 'dhātā rātir (i.4.44) ity atra yathā:*
nidh...... rātir iti kim: dhātā devebhya'surān iti gākāntare.
*upaprayanto adhvaram* (i.5.5) ity atra yathā: āre......
deva savitāḥ pra suva (i.7.7) ity 'ādī shadumāvakānām'?
vājapeyasāvijñā: 'atraīyathā: te no...... te agre......
jushtō vāca (iii.1.10) *ity atra yathā: yas...... 'yo......* 
ṇuyāya
*pavane* (iii.2.8) ity atra yathā: namah...... viśve......
ukhye yathā: ājīnu...... namo...... dhruvakṣitih (iv.3.4)
*ity atra yathā: viśve...... ārmir...... kṣitih iti kim:
dhruve 'ty 'akārāntasya yadiî' grahanām syāt111: dhruvo....
*ity atra bhaved* iti,. i11 iyam eva sā yā (iv.3.11) 'ity atra*:
quotation of the beginning of the one anuvāka has any right, or can have been intended, to include the other. The right of i.4.33, it may be remarked, to stand in the text to which our Prātiṣākhya applies, is assured by the contemplation of others of its phonetic phenomena by rules found elsewhere (most unequivocally by vi.5); its case of non-elision would seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise, but discovered by the commentators, some of whom have tried to force it violently within the ken of their rules. It is necessary to quote iv.4.4 by two words, because i.6.3 also begins with agniḥ, and in it we find yo me'nti dāre 'rātya'ti (i.6.3); the example is wanting in G. M.). Finally, instead of prsthya passages, the mahāprsthya are specified, because of such cases as prthivi te 'tarikshena (v.2.122: the anuvāka is prsthya, but not mahāprsthya).

The commentator cites one or more examples from each of the sections or sets of sections which the rule specifies, as follows. From the section beginning dhūtā rātih is taken nidhipatir no agniḥ (i.4.44); it contains three more cases, and one exception. From that beginning with upa comes āre asme ca (i.5.5); it contains six other cases, and one exception. From the vājapeya sections, te no arrantah (i.7.82) and to agrē aṣamā 'yuṣyājan (i.7.72); they contain eleven examples, and eleven exceptions. The section beginning with jushta yields yas te aṅguḥ (iii.1.10), and O. alone adds yo drāpso aṅguḥ (iii.1.10); there are two other cases, and no exception. From the gyendya section, namah pṛthivy abhi (iii.2.83) and viṣe arapā edhate (iii.2.84); there are four exceptions. From the ukhya sections, grṇauti viṣe amṛtasya purāṇ (iv.1.12); only W. has purāṇ and nāmo astu sarpebhyaḥ (iv.2.83); they yield seventy-five cases, and forty-five exceptions. From the section dhruvarṣṭhiḥ are cited the only two examples, viṣe abhi grṇautu (iv.3.42) and umer drāpso apām asi (iv.3.42); only G. M. have asi; there are no exceptions. From the section beginning iyam etc. are taken ketum krnvāne ājare (iv.3.111; G. M. omit ketum) and trayo ghumāsō anu (iv.3.111); there are three other cases, and one exception. The ketum.....: trayo.....: iyam ity "etavatāi 'vā 'lam:" iyam te āukra town (i.2.4) ity "atra saū.....: ity atra mā bhād iti: sā ye 'ti padadvayam" mandadhiyām pratipattyartham iti khec: anye te anyathā kathayanti: asyā 'nucāsaya śeshabhātā "ya ry" anyatra sthītā sā 'pi "svākrtayve 'ti": o te.....: aṅgir mārdāh "dvā (iv.4.4) ity atra yathā: sa..... enā.....: mārdhe 'ti kim: aṅgir mā dūrishṭād (i.6.3) ity atra "yo me .....:" rudrapraśnasya pratamopottamānuvākayor yathā: namo.....: drāpe.....: uta.....: uttamasaya pṛtavatāh" saṁmira śrīrā upottamaḥ. aṅmanār jam (iv.6.1) "ITY atra "nuvāka- paṇcayayā" vikarsaśāmijā: tatrā "nyāvā ....: pāvako.....: vājo naḥ sapta pradaṇa" (iv.7.12) ity atra "dyanuvāktra-
first example here is not well chosen, since the e of kṛṇvāne is pra-
graha, and pragrahas are not contemplated in the general rules for
elision: see xii.8 and note. From the agnir mūrdhā section, sa
yogate aruṣah (iv.4.44) and enā vo agnīṁ namasā (iv.4.44: O.
omits namasa); there are three other cases, and one exception.
From the specified sections of the rudra chapter are taken namo
astu nilagrivāya (iv.5.13), drāpe andhasas pate (iv.5.101), and utā
mā no arbhakam (iv.5.102); they afford fourteen cases, and five
exceptions. From the viharsha sections, anyāṁ te asmat tapantu
(iv.6.13.5: only W. has tapantu) and pāvako asmabhāyaṁ (iv.6.13
etc.); there are thirty-three cases, and ten exceptions. From the
vihavya sections, viyā adya marutah (iv.7.121: O. omits marutah)
and viyā devāso adhi vocatā me (iv.7.142: only O. has viyā);
ten cases and five exceptions. The hiranyavarnīya section affords
three cases only, of which one is cited, eko devo apy atishṭhat
(iv.6.13). The yājñā sections afford a hundred and twenty-nine
cases, with thirty-eight exceptions; the selected examples are
supathā rāye asmān (i.1.142; repeated at i.4.43) and kāmena
krto abhy āṇot (i.1.142: W. B. O. end with obhi). From the
mahāprasthīyas, finally, come vivasvad vāte abhi nāḥ (iv.4.124
and some adhi brvītu (iv.6.64: O. adds no dīṁ, doubtless for no
'ditiḥ, which follows in the text); they contain thirty-eight cases
and nine exceptions.

This rule, accordingly, disposes at one stroke of three hundred
and fifty-one cases of the retention of a; but it is at the cost of
creating a formidable body of exceptions, a hundred and thirty-one
in number, which have to be provided for by the counter-rules of
the next chapter—while, once more, a considerable number of the
cases falling under the rule have to be individually specified,
partly in that chapter and partly in the two following rules of
this, as exceptions under the counter rules. It is a complicated
process, but it successfully attains at last its purpose.

yasya vihavyasanīṇā: tatra viyā: viyā: hir-
yavarnīye yathā: eko: yājñas uṣa yathā: supathā:
kaṃena: samid diṣṭān (iv.4.12) jīmatasya (iv.6.6)
yad akrando (iv.6.7) mā no mitro (iv.6.8) ye vājīnām
(iv.6.9) agner manve (iv.7.15) iti shannām esham
anuvā-kāṇām mahāprasthīyasanīṇā: tatra vivasvad:
... : mahet'hi kim: prthivī.....

(1) W. B. -rāti 'ty. (2) G. M. kраяvого 'дёхароm. (3) G. M. uva only. (4) G. M.
ādīnāṁ shannām an-. (5) G. M. tatra. (6) G. M. om. (7) in O. only. (8) G. M. om.
W. omit yathā. (9) G. M. om. (10) G. M. om. (11) G. M. kshūtgraṁasām; O. adds
tadā after syāt. (12) O. śīvaṁmahāsaṁ. (13) G. M. mā bhūd; O. api bhvayet. (14) O.
om. (15) G. M. om.; O. adds yathā. (16) G. M. uke; B. adds 'kim anyāḥ; O. etā
vāta laṁ kim eḥ. (17) G. M. atva 'pi 'ty adhiḥsopānam. (18) W. O. yā ṛṣ; G. M.
yā ṛṣ; B. yin ṛṣ. (19) W. B. svakasīt; O. adds yathā. (20) G. M. om. (21) G. M.
4. Also in aḥhasah, aḥhatih, anishtṛtah, avantic asmān, avadyāt, and ahani.

The cases of non-elision referred to are as follows: for aḥhasah, pramucicanto no aḥhasah (iv.3.13⁵); for aḥhatih, pari devesaso aḥhatih (ii.6.11²); for anishtṛtah, vardhatāṁ te anishtṛtah (iv.1.7²); for avantic asmān, te avantic asmān (ii.6.12³), with a counter-example, te no 'vantu pitaro havocṣu (ii.6.12⁴: only G. M. have havocṣu), to prove the necessity of giving asmān along with avantu in the rule; for avadyāt, mitramahā avadyāt (i.2.14⁶); and for ahani, śucīḥ śukre ahany ejaśinā (iv.4.12¹: G. M. O. stop at ahani). All of them occur in passages which are the subject of the preceding rule, and the commentator points out that the “also” (ca) of the rule brings forward the implication of those passages, and that to any of the words specified, if occurring elsewhere in the text, the rule does not apply; citing as example sa evāi 'namā pariśeṣasiṇo ṣhase muvicati (ii.2.7⁵: all but G. M. stop at aḥhasah). At first sight, then, the rule appears to be a superfluous repetition of part of the cases involved in the preceding one; in fact, however, its value is that of a rehearsal of exceptions under rule xii.4, which teaches that even in the sections above specified, an a before a y, v, n, or ū, if those letters be followed by a vowel, is elided. The only thing calling for explanation about the matter is the connection in which the counter-exceptions are given, which is, to say the least, quite peculiar.

5. Also in anu, when preceded by gharmasah, āpah, martah, rathah, evah, datte, and vālah.

This rule belongs, in part, in the same category with the preceding, as pointing out cases in which the a of anu is retained according to rule 3 of this chapter, notwithstanding the prohibition of rule xii.4; but in part it is of a more general character, since the last two cases lie outside the sections specified in rule 3.

4. ' cakāro dhātārātir (xi.3) ityādivishayānvādecalcakāh: aḥhasah...... ity eteshu grahaneshu dhātārātirvidisthaleshv ekāropūrvo vāvā 'kāropūrvo vāvā 'kāro na bupyate. yathā: pram...... pari...... vardh...... : te.... : asmān iti 'kim: te no...... mitr...... śucīḥ...... yavanaharaparavād' (xii.4) eshu pṛpyamānalaḥpese ' alopo 'yān' vihitāḥ. anvadecaḥ kimarthah: sa......

The commentator explains the phraseology used as signifying that the words rehearsed, having their final visarga [with the preceding a] converted to o [of course, excepting datte], have the office of preceding causes—that is, of producing an effect upon the word that follows them; but he gives no hint of the partial suspension of the implication made in the preceding rule; intimating rather, that the cases rehearsed are all of them exceptions under rule xii.4. He quotes the passages, as follows: trayo gharmedo anu (iv.3.11), tasmad apo anu thana (v.6.1), yadda te marto anu (iv.6.7), anu tvad ratuo anu (iv.6.7), piyati teo anu tvah (iv.2.34; only G. M. have the last word), gukram ad datte anuhaya jaryai (iii.2.2; G. M. O. omit jaryai), and dhanus tad vato anu vatu te (v.5.7,4; O. ends with anu). To show that other words than anu are not relieved from the action of xii.4, he gives us amushmiin loke vato 'bhi pavate (v.4.9; all but G. M. begin at vato); and further, to show that anu retains its a only after these words, anu gado 'nu bhagah kannam (iv.6.7; only G. M. O. have the last word).

I have noted ten cases in which the a of anu is elided under the operation of rule xii.4.

6. Also (after vato) in abhi vatu and apaah.

The ca, 'also,' here brings down as parvanimitta simply vatah, the word last specified in the preceding rule. The cases have nothing to do with xi.3: they are mayobhar vato abhi vato 'srh (vii.4.17; G. M. omit the first word, and they alone have the last), and yad vato apo agamat (vii.4.20; O. omits agamat); and, as counter-examples, the commentator quotes vato 'bhi (v.4.94) to show the necessity of giving vato after abhi in the rule, and ava rundhe 'po 'gre 'bhivyadhari (vi.4.3; G. M. omit the last two words) to attest the implication conveyed by the ca.

6. cakaro vata ity anvadipati: abhi vatu: apaah: ity etayor akaro vatoahpuro na lupyate. mayo—— vato iti kim: vato—— 'yad—— anvadehena kim: aya——

1 W. G. M. -mitam. 2 O. om. 3 a lacuna in B. 4 G. M. yavanahasvarapa; O. shedhanisheartho.
7. Also (after apoḥ) in ann and agamat.

Here, again, the ca, 'also,' brings forward only the last word in the preceding rule, namely apoḥ—and what is more, gives that word a new character, changing it from nimittin to nimitta or affecting cause. Of this the commentator takes no notice, and we are doubtless to regard it as quite in order, and as merely adding another to the formidable list of uncertainties involved in the curious system of anvartti or continued implication. The passages had in view are apo anv acārśham (i.4.45,46): B. reads āpo adya 'n, which is the version of the Rig-Veda, i.23.23) and apo agamad indrasya (vi.4.20); as counter-example, is given paçavo 'nā 'd āyan (ii.1.51), to prove the implication of apoḥ.

8. Also in adbhih, apām nāpāt, and asmān, when preceded by apoḥ.

The passages are sam āpo adbhir agmata (i.1.8), devir āpo apāṁ nāpāt (i.2.3: vi.1.49; 4.33), and āpo asmān mātaraḥ sundhantu (i.2.11: O. omits sundhantu). The necessity of specifying nāpāt after apām is shown by vārunir āpo 'pāṁ ca (ii.1.92), and the restriction to preceding āpoḥ by so 'sman pātu (v.5.51).

9. In asmān, also, if followed by a, when rāye, saḥ, and indraḥ precede.

The ca, 'also,' again brings down the word last mentioned in the preceding rule. The passages for saḥ and indraḥ are mā so asmān acāhāya (v.7.91) and indro asmān asmin devīye (ii.1.92; O. omits devīye); and other cases of asmān after saḥ are to be found at i.6.64 and iii.2.72. As counter-examples, are given so. 'sman pātu (v.5.51), to show that the asmān must be followed by a; and smō 'sman amutra (vi.6.14: all the MSS. of the commentary have the false reading so 'sman; such a phrase would be precisely out of place here as illustration), to show that it is only
after the words specified that asmān, even before a, remains umutilated.

The other case, that of preceding rāye, makes more difficulty, since the saṁhitā contains no passage in which asmān, when itself followed by a, has rāye before it. The commentator first declares the passage had in view to belong to another text ( vakkhā); but adds, as an alternative explanation, that the precept relates to the jatā-text, where we read rāye asmān asmān rāye rāye asmān (i.1. 14); at i.4.43, then, its retention is assured. But then there ought to be no necessity for specially establishing its retention in jatā, any more than in any other case where an a is retained in saṁhitā. This difficulty the commentator evidently perceives, although he does not state it; for otherwise the jatā explanation would have satisfied him, and he would never have thought of suggesting another vakkhā. The difficulty really remains unsolved, and a serious one: either there was a blunder on the part of the makers of the treatise, or a passage not contained in the present Sanhitā was contemplated by them: I incline to think the former more likely.

10. Also in adya, andhāḥ, añcuḥ, and agne, when te precedes.

The commentator quotes the passages, as follows: pañca pañcu-pate te adya (iii.1.4): W. O. omit pañca, upo te andhāḥ (i.4.4 and iii.4.21), añcuḥ te añcuḥ (i.2.6: B. omits the example), and yat te agne tejas tena (iii.5.32: only B. has tena). Counter-examples are, first, to show that only these words keep their a after te, te īgaye pravate (ii.4.12: B. has a corrupted reading, te ānom, and W. a lacuna to the end of the comment, putting in place of it an example from under the next rule, tena tvā "dādhe'gne añgirah),

2. cakārākrṣe 'smāngrahane kārāpate sati' varmatāno kārā rāye sa indra ity evampūrva na lupyate. rāye-pūrva-śyo 'dāhara-ṇam cākhāntare: 'atha vā' jatāyām bhavati: rāye...... yathā-saṁhitāyām, no 'dāharaṇam akārāpatevabhavāt' tārhi katham alopa iti kecit: tripaduprañbrhiṃpanaratvād iti brāhma. ma..... indro..... akārāpere iti kim: so..... evampūrva iti kim: smo akārāḥ paro yasmāt "talō akārāparām", tasmin.

1 in W. only. 2 G. M. put before 'kārāpate. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 O. om. 5 G. M. O. ins. it. 6 W. O. -patvābh; G. M. -paribb. 7 O. tathā; G. M. add tadā. 8 G. M. lopa. 9 G. M. O. cet. 10 W. tad akān; G. M. akārāparāh.
and second, to show that these words do so only after te, prathamam
'ācu skandat (iii.8: only B. has skandati).

Of agne after te, the text presents eighteen other cases: namely
i.2.11² twice; 4.43²; 5.2⁴; 3⁵; 4⁵; 6.6²; 7.6⁴; iii.4.10⁵; 5.3² (a second
case): vi.4.7⁵; 7.4¹, 6⁵, 8¹ three times: vi.2.2⁷; 6.1².

मेधरय || 11 ||

11. In agne, also, when preceded by me.

Only agne, the last word of rule 10, is brought down into this.
The commentator quotes yan me agne asya (i.6.2¹, 10²: W. B.
omit asya) and imā me agna ishtakāh (iv.4.11³, 4 and v.4.2⁴); and
there is another case in iv.4.11⁴. He adds, as usual, a number of
counter-examples, of obvious intent: they are tena tvā " dadhe
'agne aṅgirah (i.2.12¹: O. omits aṅgirah), prāṇaṣ ca me 'pānaḥ
(iv.7.1¹), and tad aṣakāṁ tan me 'rādhī (i.6.6³).

ग्रामणाधिकारम् च || 12 ||

12. As also, in asya, aṣvinā, and aparā.

That is to say, when these words follow me. The passages are
viyantu devā havisho me asya (i.5.10³: O. begins at devā), punar
me aṣvinā yuvāṁ cakshūḥ (iii.2.5⁴: W. B. omit the last word, O.
the last two), and yad vā me aparāgatam (vi.6.7²).

नर्त्ती अन्द्रिणिर्घाताको भाष्मिनिमित्राययिः || 13 ||

13. Also in asat, agniḥ, agha, antamaḥ, abhi, asmin, and adya
pathi, when preceded by naḥ.

The examples are supārā no asad vace (i.2.3¹ and vi.1.4⁴), ayaṁ
no aghir varivah (i.3.4¹ and i.4.46³; there is another case of no
agniḥ at v.7.9¹), rakshā mākir no aghaṣaṇaḥ iṣata (i.4.24 and

10. adya..... eteshv¹ akāras ta ity evamūrco na lupyate.
yathā: paścuma..... upo..... aṅguna..... yat..... eteshv
iti kim: 'te..... teṇarvā iti kim: prathamam.....'

¹ O. eshv. ² in W. only. ³ B. om. ⁴ W. om., and ins: tena tvā etc.

11. 'cakāro 'guna ity anvādiṣati: mepārvo 'guna ity atrā 'kāro
na lupyate. yathā: yan..... imā..... mepārva iti kim:
tenā..... anvādeṣaṇa kim: 'prāṇaṣ.....' taḍ.....

¹ B. cakārivarāsante satya aṅga ity asmin akāro ma ity evampūrco; G. M. the same,
omitting sati; O. the same, omitting sati and the second iti. ² in W. only. ³ O.
pa iti. ⁴ O. om.

12. mepārva iti cakāro 'nvādiṣati: asya..... eteshv² akāro
mepārvo na lupyate. vi..... punar..... yad.....

¹ G. M. ins. iti. ² O. eshv.
iv.6.6*: G. M. O. omit ica), agne tvain no antamah (i.5.6* and iv.4.4*), scishtim no abhi vasyih (iii.1.9*: G. M. O. omit vasyih), cikshah no asmin (vii.5.7*), and tebhir no adya pathibhih svaebhih rakshah ca nahn (vii.5.24: all but W. end with pathibhih). The necessity of including pathi in the rule is shown by no 'daya vasu vasati ti (ii.5.36-7). Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are tasmaid acaedd yarabho sattarath (v.1.2*: G. M. omit the first two words), so 'gnir jatath (v.1.4*), uttarato 'ghayur abhidahsati (v.7.3*: B. O. omit the last word), te 'sminn dichtan (vii.2.10*), namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhaya (i.5.10*: the example is found only in G. M.), and te nah pantu te no 'vantu (i.2.3*; 8.1*: iv.3.3*).

13. atsat...... etesh akaro na ity evampuro na lupyate. yathah: suparah...... ayaah...... rakshah...... agne...... svishtim...... cikshah...... tebhir...... pathi 'ti kim: no...... nahpurva iti kim: tasmad...... so...... uttarato...... te...... etesh iti kim: 'namo...... 2 te......

1 in W. only. 2 in G. M. only.

14. 'agre...... 1 etesh akaro namahpurvo na lupyate. namo...... 2 'namo aca...... 2 namo agr...... namahpurva iti kim: apo...... etesh iti kim: namo 'gn......

1 O. om. 2 W. om.
and accordingly—resorting, as we cannot well help saying, to one of his usual subterfuges—he declares *agni* (or, according to W. B. O., *gni*) "a part of a word, intended to include a number of cases occurring in another *cākha;" not going so far, however, as to quote any of these cases. I suspect *gnipaphah* to be either a corruption of *gniḥ*, or originally intended as equivalent with it.

The passages are *āvinno agni grhopatiḥ* (i.8.12²) and *soma agni upa devah* (iii.2.4¹); and the commentator adds counter-examples, *so 'gnir jātah* (v.1.4¹) and *āvinno 'yam asūn* (i.8.12²).

16. Also *a* is retained when preceded by *dhārasaḥ*, *adabdhāsaḥ*, *ekādaśaḥ*, *rśinām putraḥ*, *cāryāte*, *ashādhaḥ*, *pitāraḥ*, *prthivī yajña*, *āsate ye*, *grhnāmy agrē*, *vān esah*, *jañe*, *saṁsphānaḥ*, *yu- vayor yah*, *prshthe*, *patir vah*, *go*, *cushnaḥ*, *pavah*, *samuddhīh*, *rshabhaḥ*, *pāthah*, *vacaḥ*, *varshishtē*, *jushāno*, *yo rudrah*, or *vrshnāh*.

The passages had in view are quoted as follows: *tām dhāraso anudrṣya yajante* (i.1.9²: G. M. O. omit the last word); *adabdhāso adābhyaṃ* (i.1.10² and iii.5.6¹); *ekādaśaṃ apusushadah* (i.4.11); *rśināṃ putro adhirāja esah* (i.3.7²: G. M. O. omit the last word), with a counter-example, *yasya putro jātah* (i.5.8⁵; 7.6⁵), to show the need of including *rśināṃ* in the *nimitta*; *yathā cāryāte apibah* (i.4.18: G. M. O. omit *yathā*); *ashādhaḥ agniḥ* (i.5.10²); *tevatītāro agne devah* (i.5.10²: G. M. O. omit *devah*); prthivī yajña asmin (i.6.5¹), with a counter-example, *te mā 'smīn yajñe* (iii.2.4¹), where, as only W. B. point out, the ātā-text shows the mutilation of *asmin* after *yajñe* not preceded by prthivī (thus, *asmin yajñe yajñe 'smīn asmin yajñe*); adhyāsa te antarikshe (iii.5.4³), with *ye prthivyāṃ ye 'ntarikshe* (iv.5.11²: only O. has the first *ye*) as counter-example; maṃi grhnāmy agrē agnim (v.7.9¹²), with ashtāu *krtego 'gre 'bhi shunoti* (vi.4.5¹: O. omits *shunoti*) as counter-example; *idāvān esho 'asura* (i.6.6⁴ and iii.1.11¹), with *cukra esho 'nto 'ntam manushyāh* (vii.2.7²: O. stops at

15. *āvinno: somah; 1 evampūravo 'kāro gniparo* na lupyate: *agni* 'ti padākadeṣaḥ gākhāntare bahnipādadānarthah. *āvinno* ....... *soma* ....... evampūrva iti kim: so-.....: evampara iti kim: *āvinno* ......

¹ G. M. ins. īty. ² G. M. *agni ity evamparah akāro; B. akāroh agniparo.* ³ W. B. O. *gni.*
ntam) to show the need of van; itah prathamān jājñē agnih (ii.2, 4): only G. M. have itah; without it, also i.3.142); see what is said of this passage, and of the rule as fixing its reading, under i.61; sāṁśphāno abhi rakṣatu (iii.3.8), as counter-example to which, to show that sphaṇāh in the rule would not have been enough, is given gasyasphāno 'gnishu “from another cākhā,” but the genuineness of the reason is open to doubt; yuvayor yo asti (iii.5.41) with yo 'psu bhama praveçayati (v.2.22: only O. has the last word) to prove the need of yuvayoh; nākasya prāṣthe adhi rocane dīvaḥ (iii.5.52: G. M. O. omit dīvaḥ; another nearly identical case at iii.5.41); yajñapati vā atra (v.7.7), with na vo 'bhāgāni havyam (v.1.11: O. omits havyam) as counter-example; goaṛgham eva somāṁ karoṭi (vi.1.10: O. omits -maṁ karoṭi; goaṛgha occurs twice more in this section, and at v.2.94 we have goaṛgna twice), to which, by rule i.52, goaṛgham (vi.1.10 three times) is to be added as further example; uchushno agne yajamāṇāyai ādiḥ (i.6.22: only G. M. have ādiḥ; and O. omits also the preceding word; there is a second case, of nīpushmah, in the same division); agrēpuvo agrégwah (i.1.5): samiddho ājjan (v.1.11: and we have samiddha agne at i.6.62; 7.64: ii.5.86), without any counter-example to show that ādīhah would not have been enough to answer the needs of the rule; dyāṁ rśabhaṁ antariṣkham (i.2.8: O omits dyāṁ, and G. M. have, like the Calcutta edition, the false reading yāṁ); priyam pātho apī 'hi (iii.3.3 three times); ugram vaço apā 'cādām (i.2.11: another nearly identical case in the same division); varshīṣṭhaḥ adhi nāke (i.1.8 and i.4.42): jushāno aptor ājyasya vetu (i.3.41 and vi.3.22: G. M. omit vetu); yo rudro agnān yah (v.5.9a: G. M. O. omit the last word), and, as counter-example, yad upatraṁyād rudro 'sya (vi.3.93: but O. reads aṇyād for upatraṁyād, which makes the reference to i.6.74); and, finally, vrshno aṇvyaṁ samāṇam asi (ii.4.72, 94: O. stops at aṇvyaṁ, which would make the reference include also vi.4.18 twice; and there are further cases of retention after vrshno at i.4.2 and vi.4.53).

16. dhūrāṣah..... evampūrevo na' khalav akāro lupyate. yathā: tāṁ..... adab..... ekād..... ṛshīnām..... ṛšīnāṁ iti kim: yasya..... yathā:..... asih..... tvat..... pṛthivī..... pṛthivī 'ti kim: te..... 'ity atra jatāyām: adhyā..... āsata iti kim: ye..... mayi..... gṛhāṇī 'ti kim: asih..... idāvān..... vān iti kim: cukra..... itah..... saṁs..... sam iti kim: gasyasphāno 'gnishv iti śahāntare: yuvayor..... yuvayor iti kim: yo..... nākasya..... yajñā..... patir iti kim: na..... go..... apy akāraṁ (i.52) vacananā agraṛgham 'iti co 'dāharanam: uchushno..... agrēpuvo..... samiddho..... dyām..... priyam..... ugraṁ..... varsh..... jushāno..... yo..... ya iti kim: yad..... vrshno.....

1 O. puts next before lupyate. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. O. om. 5 O. iti prāptih. 6 O. om.
17. Also in aratim, asya yajnasya, atidrutaḥ, ati yanti, anrṇah, avishyan, anamivaḥ, anneshu, arciḥ, ajitān, ajyānim, ahniyāḥ, ambāli, arvantam, astu, ankrnot, aṅgirah, apsu yah, askabhāyat, acyutaḥ, aṅvasaniḥ, astabhīḥ, aṅcīret, aṅge, and aṅhiṇya.

The passages had in view are quoted by the commentator as follows, with such counter-examples as are needed to justify the inclusion of more than one pada in any case: mūrdhānāṁ dive aratim pratīvaḥ (i.4.13 and vi.5.2); O. begins at divaḥ, and it alone has pratīvaḥ); yan me agne asya yajnasya (i.6.21,102), with the counter-example ete syā' mūṣhmān (vi.1.10); pratyaṅk so mo atidrutaḥ (i.8.21: all the MSS. here insert the k before soma, as required by v.32, and G. M. even convert it to kh, according to xiv.12); pacyanto ati yanti (iii.2.21), and, as counter-example to both these last examples, na' nān soma ti pava (vi.5.11: O. begins at soma); tad agne anṛṇo bhavāmi (iii.3.82: O. omits bhavāmi); na yavase avishyan (iv.4.33); svāveco anamīvoc bhavā naḥ (iii.4.101: B. O. omit bhavā naḥ); ye anneshu vividhyanti (iv.5.11: O. omits the last word); jātavedo yo archiḥ (v.7.81); carado ajitān (v.7.23); teshāṁ yo ajyānim (v.7.23); tirohyānā mā suhutāḥ (vi.3.13: O. omits suhutāḥ); ambe ambāli (vii.4.191-2 twice, 3 twice); yo arvantāṁ jīghāṇsati (vii.4.15: O. omits the last word); bahis te astu bāl itī (iii.3.102: O. stops at astu; the text furnishes eleven other cases of astu with a retained, at i.2.3; 4.45; 8.142: iii.1.14; 2.57,82; v.5.93 twice; 7.24,434; ito indro.

17. aratim......1 eteṣu akāro "na khalo ekāraṇa bā ṁ lupyate, yathāḥ: mūrdhaḥ...... yan...... yajñasya 'ti kim: ete...... pratyaṅk...... pacy...... drutoyanti 'tyābhyaṁś kim: nāi...... tad...... na...... svāv...... ye...... jātavedo...... carado...... teshāṁ...... tiro...... ambe...... yo...... bahis...... ita...... aṅgē...... yo...... ya iti kim: aṅvo...... yo...... mādāya...... yo...... sanir iti kim: aṅvebhyo...... indro...... bhirī iti kim: "gaṁ...... ity atra...... jatāyāṃ: astabhāyo...... varuno...... aṅge...... aṅhiye "ty akāraṇkāḥ padāikadeṣo bahūpadānārthah: etāni...... yad...... payo......

1 G. M. om. the enumeration, and ins. iti. 2 G. M. om. khalo, and put na next before lupyate. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 B. tābhyaṃ; G. M. etābhyaṃ. 5 B. G. M. astabhīḥ. 6 O. om. 7 B. om.
akrnot (i.1.12); agne anigiro yo’syām (i.2.12); there is another case in the same division, and one at vi.2.24; yo āpsa yo oṣha
dhikshu (v.5.9); with the counter-example aṣvē ṣuño vetaśah (v.3.12); but O. gives instead yo ’psu bhasma, v.2.25); yo askabhāyad
uttaram (i.2.13); G. M. O. omit uttaram; madāya raso acyutah (i.2.6); yo bhaksho ascesanih (iii.2.5); and, as counter-example,
acrebhīyo ‘evapatibhyac ca (iv.5.3); only O. has ca); indro daddhico
astabhādir iti (v.6.6); O. omits iti), and a counter-example from
the jatā-text of the passage ‘an astabhāyo mañjabhaya (v.2.12);
O. omits), namely astabhāyo mañjabhaya mañjabhaya ‘stabhīyo ‘stha
bhīyo mañjabhaya (G. M. give simply mañjabhaya ‘stabhīya);
varunō aṣigret (l.8.10); aṅge-aṅge ni dedhyat (i.3.101 and vi.3.112; it would have been better to include in the example the
preceding word prāno, to show that the first aṅge, as well as the
second, furnishes an example under the rule; there is another like
pair of cases, after apāno, in i.3.101); and finally, it is explained
that the quotation of aghniya with final a makes it (by i.22) a part
of a word, intended to include a variety of cases, and three such
cases (being all that the text contains) are quoted: namely etāni
te aghniye nāmāni (vii.1.68); yad āpam aghniya varumti copi
mahe (i.3.11; B. omits the last word; G. M. O. the last three),
and payo aghniyāsu kṛtsu (i.2.81; O. omits kṛtsu, which would
make the citation include also vi.1.113). This exposition seems to
prove that the proper reading at the end of the rule is aghniya,
and I have ventured to adopt it, though all the MSS. (except T.,
which is ambiguous, running rules 17 and 18 together in sandhi)
give aghniya. Aghniya would answer as including aghniyāsū,
but it would not include also aghniye.

18. Also in adhvarī, when a vowel follows [the r].

The examples given in illustration of the rule are satyadharmāno adhvare (i.2.12), havishmān deva adhvaram (i.3.12), and
upaprayantō adhvaram ity āha (i.5.71). In regard to the last of
them, it is remarked that rule i.61 is not of force for it, since the
conditions imposed by that rule do not arise in it. The rule,
namely, directs that a passage of three words or more, being
repeated in the text, is to be read as where it first occurred; now
upaprayantō adhvaram was found at i.5.51, where the retention
of the a comes under rule 3 of this chapter; but here only two

1 G. M. etamān. 2 O. ins. sati. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. O. ekārāpūrva ekārāpūrvo
ev; G. M. adds sa; B. adds ev. 5 M. tatra. 6 B. sarati.
words, instead of three, are cited in the repetition. As counter-
examples, showing the value of the restriction "when a vowel
follows," are given gug và agnih so ’dhvaryum (v.6.24) and andho
’dhvaryaḥ syāt (v.1.31 and vi.1.8²: O. alone has syāt, and, without
that addition, the phrase is found also at v.1.32). This proves
that what is to be “followed by a vowel” is the r of adhvāra;
but how that meaning is conveyed by the terms of the rule is not
easy to discover. The MSS. are at variance as to the reading of
the first word of the rule, T. W. B. O. giving adhvāra, and G. M.
adhvāra, between which I am at a loss to decide confidently,
because neither of them appears to be what is wanted. But I
prefer adhvāra, both because it is better supported, and because
it is not the usage of the treatise to put in a case-form the words
or themes which it cites from the text.

An additional case falling under the rule is ārdhve adhvāraḥ
(i.1.12); and yet others (as i.5.5¹ twice, and, doubtless, i.4.46²⁻²),
to which it would else apply, are disposed of under the general
rule xi.3.

स पूर्वमार्गस्तट्वेनकायार्थस्तट्वेनकेक्षकम् ॥ १२ ॥

19. In the opinion of some, it becomes half-similar with its
predecessor.

This is a very blind precept, and we are permitted to doubt
whether its purport is interpreted aright by the commentary; in
which, moreover, there are peculiar and unintelligent variations of
reading. What letter is the subject of the rule—the elided a, or
the non-elided? The comment says the latter (although the
majority of MSS. blunderingly say the “non-protracted” instead),
and states that it acquires a quantity similar to half a mora, or
becomes one and a half moras long. It is added, that no special
examples are given, because such would not bring to light any
difference (? only O. has the reading that means this: W. B. omit
the “not;” G. M. are unintelligible). This appears to me quite
unsatisfactory. The distinct demonstrative so in the rule ought to
point back to something distinctly stated above, and that is the

19. yo ’yaṁ akāra ’luptah’ sa pūrvasyāi ’kārasyāu ’kārasya
vā ’rdhamātrasadṛṣajāṁ’ kālām bhajataḥ ity ekeshāṁ rṣhinām
matām: ’adhyardhamātraḥ syād ity arthah, uktāny eco ’dāha-
ranāṇi vīceshādārṣanāt’, ardhena sadṛṣo ’rdhasadṛṣaḥ’: tam
ardhasadṛṣaṁ”.

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣeṣākyavicarāṇa 11
ekādaṇaḥ ’dhyāyah.12

¹ W. B. O. apulata. ² G. M. ekāraśākapūrvasya. ³ W. -taśi sad.; G. M.
-trāsad.- ⁴ G. M. lābha. ⁵ O. dcāryaṁ. ⁶ O. om. ⁷ W. O. -trāsyāṁ; B. G.
-M-tra sya. ⁸ W. B. -shadar; G. M. dārṣanāt. ⁹ G. M. yah. ¹⁰ O. om. ¹¹ O.
um. prathama-praṇe. ¹² G. M. adh śrīkṛṣṇyā namāh.
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akāra which in rule 1 is said to be dropped after certain “predecessors.” We have had no akāra alupta spoken of, but only cases of alopa of akāra. And it seems to be taught here, in accordance with the doctrines of all the other Prātiṣṭhānikhyas (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.53), that some regard the a as (not elided, but) so absorbed into the preceding diphthong as to become assimilated to, or identified with, the latter half of that diphthong. We may with plausibility conjecture the rule to be a later addition to the original substance of the chapter.

CHAPTER XII.

CONTENTS: 1–8, elision and non-elision of initial a after final e or o in exceptional and special cases; 9–11, resulting accent.

1. Now for cases of elision.

This is a general heading to the chapter (that is to say, to its first eight rules); which, as the commentator points out, has for its sphere of action the passages specified in rule 3 of the preceding chapter. This is a matter of course: the general rule (by xi.1) being elision, there can be need of an additional authority for elision only where that rule is contravened by another of opposing character, and of wider application than to specific cases only.

2. The a of asi is elided.

The examples given are suparno 'si garutmān (iv.1.10$: 6.5$: v.1.10$: O. omits the last word) and pratho 'si prthivey asi (iv.2. 9$: O. stops at 'si). The elision is not infrequent in this word, usually occurring in the little prose phrases which are inserted among the verses in the sections concerned; I have noted eighteen other cases; but they are hardly worth detailed reference.

1. athe 'ty ayaṃ adhikārah: akārasya lopa ucyata ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad vakyāmān. dhātārā- tir (xi.3) ityādivishayo 'yaṃ adhyāyārambhah'.
   1 G. M. etadadē.

2. asi 'ty asminn akāro lupyata ekārāukārapūrvah. yathā: suparno...... pratho......
   1 G. M. -rvo ed. 2 in B. only.
3. But not when garbhāḥ, saṁnaddhāḥ, yaṁaḥ, or bhadraḥ precedes.

The examples quoted by the commentator are garbhō asya osha-
dhānim (iv.2.3*), saṁnaddho asi vidayasa (iv.6.6*), asi ymo asya adityaḥ (iv.6.7*): G. M. O. omit the last word), and tvam bhadro asi kratuḥ (iv.3.13*). There is another case of asi after garbhāḥ at iv.1.4*, which is then repeated at v.1.5*, the a standing this time unelided by rule i.61.

As usual, the commentator thinks it necessary to account for the inclusion of the double pada sam-naddhāḥ, instead of simply naddhāḥ, in the rule. Some, he says, quote as counter-example upanaddho ‘suraḥ (iv.4.9); but its propriety is questionable, since the passage does not fall under xi.3, and moreover, there is no asi in it (O. has the good sense to pass without notice this most absurd suggestion); and the valid counter-example is to be sought in another cākhā. We have here an unusually clear example of the arbitrary way in which the plea cākhāntare is resorted to, in order to avoid the attribution of a slight inconsistency to the treatise-makers.

4. A is elided before y, v, n, and h, when these are followed by a vowel.

The examples given are hiranyacṛgō ’yo asya pádāḥ (iv.6.7*1: O. omits pádāḥ), vanaspate ‘va srjā rarāṇaḥ (iv.1.8*3: O. omits rarāṇaḥ), varenyo ‘nu prayānam (iv.1.10*4: and jambhayanto ‘hin vṛkām (i.7.8*2: O. omits vṛkām). These are but specimens selected from among a considerable number of cases: namely, before y, two; before v, nineteen; before o, fourteen (all but three of them, cases of anu, the counter-exceptions to which form in part the subject of xi.5); before h (which, as the counter-exceptions noted in xi.4 show, includes also ḫḥ); five; in all, forty. To show the necessity of the restriction “these when these are followed by a vowel,” are cited cūkraṁ te anyat (iv.1.11*2) and agre aṁhāṁ hitaḥ (iv.1.3*4: O. omits hitaḥ).

There is a well-established difference of reading here in the rule itself: T. B. G. M. have yavanaha svarapareshu, only W. and O. adding para (which I have amended to paraḥ) after ha. So also,

3. garbhāḥ... 1 evamāva śāmnīdhyā labdhe ‘sī ‘ty as-
min grahanē ‘kāro ‘na hupyaite. garbhō... saṁnaddho
... ‘sam iti kim: upan... ‘iti kceid udāharanti: tic cint-
yam: dhātārātri (xi.3) ītyādyantahpātivābhāeidaḥ asiṣabda-
darpanāc’ ca: mukhyam tu ca akhāntare vijnayam pratyudhāra-
nam. ‘asi... tvam...
where the rule is quoted under i.21, W. alone (there is no O. for
that part of the work) introduces *para*; under xi.4 and 5, W. and
B. alike have *yavanahaparateca* etc., but the testimony as to the
rule is equivocal, since *para* might well have been added there by
way of exposition instead of quotation. I have, as usual, followed
W., although not without suspicion that the *para* is a gloss, intro-
duced to help the otherwise blind and inaccurate phraseology of
the rule—which latter, however, is not altogether discordant with
the usage of the treatise elsewhere.

The exceptions under this rule, instead of being rehearsed after
it, as is the general habit of the Prātiśākhya, are given in rules 4
and 5 of the preceding chapter, and, in the latter rule, mingled
with instances of a wholly different character. Here, then, a par-
ticular specification of cases already included under a general rule
is regarded as insuring against inclusion in a more general state-
ment of exceptions under that rule. I believe that the treatise
offers no other example of this canon of interpretation.

5. Before *j* and *gn*, *a* is elided if acute.

The examples are *ojo* *jāyahāḥ* (i.6.124) and *gucih pāvaka
vandyo gne* (i.3.14a); and the counter-examples, of *a* unaccented
remaining unelided, are *nā tatrshānō ajārāh* (iv.6.12) and *nidhi-
pātir na agnih* (i.4.44). There is, as the examples show, a real
reason in the accent: *ajāyahāḥ* and *āgne* are both words that are
accented only at the beginning of a *pāda*, where (as remarked
under xi.1) the elision of *a* is an almost universal rule. All the
other cases of elision before *gn* (nine in number) are of the same
kind; not, however, those before *j* (only two).

6. Before *gn*, also when preceded by *mah*, *vacah*, *dadhānah*,
and *sīhe*.

The *ca*, ‘also,’ of this rule, brings down simply *gn* from its pre-
deceessor, the intent being to point out the cases where the *a* of
*agni* is elided even when unaccented. *Mah*, it is stated, is a part

---

4 1 yakāravakāranakārahakāraparo *kāro* lupyyate teshub yakā-
rādīshu svarpaśeshu satsu. hiraṇ⋯⋯: vanas⋯⋯: varenyo
⋯⋯: jambh⋯⋯ svarpaśeshv 3 iti kim: gukraṇ⋯⋯: agne
⋯⋯ 4

1 G. M. ins. ekāravakārapāra akārah. 2 G. M. om. 3 O. -para. 4 G. M. add
evam ādi.

5. *jakāraparo* gnaparaś cà *kāra* udātto lupyate. *ojo⋯⋯*:
*gucih⋯⋯ udātta iti kim: na⋯⋯ nidhi⋯⋯*

1 G. M. *jakāraça ca.* 2 O. puts after *udātto.*
of a word, so given for the sake of conciseness, and including the
two cases an̄girasvad ache 'mo 'gnim and an̄girasvad bharishyāmo
'gnim (both iv.1.23: O. omits an̄girasvad in each). The other
passages had in view by the rule are vaco 'gnaye bharatā brhat
(iii.2.11: O. omits the last two words), dadhāno 'gnir hōtā (iv.1.
34), and sadhasthe 'gnim purishyam (iv.1.31: O. omits purishyam).
To prove the implication of gn only, is given sadhaste adhy
uttarasmin (iv.6.53; 7.134; v.7.72: O. omits).

By xi.16, vacaḥ does not as a general thing elide the following
a; but there is no clashing between the two rules, as they have
reference to different parts of the text.

7. The a is elided in abhyāvartin, apūpam, api dadhāmi, adyā
'nu, adīthi čarma, agner jihvām, anāaya paprayaḥ, asmākam,
asne dhatta, acmā, acvā wherever found, acyāma, amā, aryaman,
asmatpācān, asmin yajīc, astā, avyāhamāntā, abhidrohan, adhāyī,
adah, atho, adyugdhāḥ, arishtah, arathōḥ, arcanti, antar asyām,
atra stha, annāya, an̄girasvat, and akaram.

The commentator gives an example for each specification of
the rule, with counter-examples for every case in which more than one
pada is taken, as follows: agne bhyāvartin (iv.2.12), and, as
counter-example, kāmena kṛto abhy ānād arkaṃ (i.1.141: G. M.
omits the last word, O. the last two); bhadraçoce 'pūpam deca
(iv.2.23: only W. has deca); agne 'pi dadhāmī ādye (iv.2.102),
and, as counter-example, baddho apikaksha āsani (i.7.83: O. omits
the last word); anu no 'dyā 'numatī (iii.3.113: iv.4.125; 7.158),
and, as counter-example, pra tat te adya śīpivishīta nāma (ii.2.
128: O. ends with adya, and G. M. substitute another passage,

6. gnaparo iti cakēro jñāpayati: mah......... ity evampūrvo
gnaparō "nudattō 'py 'akāralopo bhavati," yathā: an̄gī.........
ma ity 'atra padākade āgrahanī samkshepartham: an̄gir-
...... vaco: ....... dadhāno: sadhasthe: ...... "anvadecha
kimarthah: ...... sadh: ...... gnparasyā 'kārasyā' nudattārtho 'yam
ārambhah."

(1) in W. only. (2) G. M. O. akāro lepyate. (3) in W. only. (4) G. M. apadogra-
hanī. (5) G. M. anvadeṣeṇa kim; O. om., along with the following example.
(6) in W. only.
namely viçe adya marutah, iv.7.121; adhi bravitu no 'ditiḥ ārma yachatu (iv.6.64; G. M. O. omit the first two words), and, as counter-example, yathā no aditiḥ karati (iii.4.112; only O. has karati [reading it karat]; G. M. substitute a jatā reading, aditiḥ no aditiḥ aditār naḥ, without anything to show whether it is put forward as the jatā-text of this passage, or of another, occurring at iv.6.94, where the saṁhitā likewise reads no aditiḥ; adhevarāḥ no 'gner jhīvām abhi  gratam (iv.1.82; B. omits the last word, O. the last two, G. M. the last and first), and, as counter-example, vrata daḍante agneḥ (iv.1.82); te no 'gnyah paprayah (i.7.72), and, as counter-example, puriṣhīṣaṣo agnayāḥ prāvanebhīḥ (iv.2.43; G. M. omit the last word); naro 'smākam indra (iv.6.67); there are two other cases, at iii.2.8 and iv.6.43; viçe 'sme dhatta (i.4.442), with the counter-example dravinaḥ vājō asme: vājasya mā (iv.7.121: only B. has mā, and G. M. O. end at asme); pari vrūdhhi no 'śmā bhavatu nas tanāḥ (iv.6.64; G. M. end with 'śmā, and only O. has the last two words); for the phonetic complex açvā, however followed, vṛshapāṇayō 'cārā rathebhīḥ (iv.6.63; O. omits after 'cārā), pracetaso 'cān (iv.6.68), and bharanto 'cāye 'va (i.1.101; O. omits this example), with two counter-examples, cashālam ye açvayāpāya takshati (iv.6.82; O. alone has the last word, and it omits the first) and kṣatram no açvo vanatām (iv.6.94; O. omits vanatām), to show that açvā would not have answered the purpose instead of açvā: vājayaṇaḥ 'cāma dyunnam (i.3.142; G. M. omit dyunnam), punas te 'māi 'shām (iv.7.142); ye te 'rajaman (ii.3.142); te 'smatpāṇiḥ (iv.3.142), with the counter-example anyān te asmat tapantu (iv.6.1.32; v.4.45; only O. has tapantu); yah 'pītā te 'smin 'yājī (ii.6.126), with the counter-example te asmini javam ā 'dadhūḥ (i.7.72); prasīṭiṁ drūṇāno 'stā

7. abhyāvartin eteshe akāro lupyate ekāraukārapūrveḥ.
yathā: agneḥ... āvartīṁ iti kim: kāmenaḥ... bhadrāroceḥ... agneḥ... dadhāmī ti kim: baddhoḥ... anuḥ... anv iti kim: prāḥ... adhiḥ... ārma ti kim: yathāḥ... adhe... jhīvām iti kim: vrataḥ... te... papraya iti kim: purish... naroḥ... viçeḥ... dhatte ti kim: drava... pariḥ... açve 'ty asyaḥ yatrayatra grutis ś atratatra lopah... vṛṣhāḥ... grutiḥ iti kim: prace... bhar... dhigraharaṇena... kim: cashālam... kṣatram... vājayaḥ... punas... ye... te... pācān iti kim: anyāḥ... yah... yajnā iti kim: te... prasītin... mā... jane... droham iti kim: bhṛhas... upa... ye... māhyām... śūra... pūrve... ye... gāya... abhi... asyām iti kim: rukmo... ye... sthe 'ti kim: tvashtā... rāyas... prāthiyāḥ... aham...
8. An *a* is elided when preceded by *gāhamānāh*, *jāyamānāh*,
hetayah, manyamānāh, vanaspatibhyah, pate, sridhah, tapasaḥ,
svadhāvah, bhāmitah, agnayah, āyo, adhvaryo, and krato.

The quoted passages are *gāhamānāḥ dāyah* (iv.6.42); *jāyamānāḥ
hnāṁ ketuh* (ii.4.141); hetaya *nyam asmat* (iv.5.105); manyamānāḥ
*martyam* (i.4.461); vanaspatibhyo *dhi sambhrātām* (iv.6.14; O.
omits the last word), with the counter-example namah *pitrabhyo
abhi* (iii.2.83); annapate *māsya* (iv.2.31 and [by i.61] v.2.21);
nihō ati *sridho ty acittim* (iv.1.73; O. omits the first two words);
tapaso *dhi jātah* (iv.2.104); deca *svadhāvo mṛtasya dhāma* (iii.
1.116; O. omits the first word and the last), with the counter-
example anyā vo anyām aṣṭu (iv.2.63; O. omits the last word);
bhāmito *mṛtasyā bhidāsatah* (i.6.125; O. omits the last word);
yāṁ *agnayo nvatapyaṁ* (iii.2.83; O. omits yāṁ); agne *dabāhāyo
citato* (i.1.135; O. omits agne); adhvaryo *ver apāth* (vi.4.
34; O. ends at 'veh'); and patakraṭo *n te dāyī* (ii.5.128).

A special explanation is required for the passage in which *agnayaṁ*
occurr, since the following *pada* is *ānu*, which might seem to

8. *gāhamānāḥ*..... *ity evampurvā kāro luptaye. yathā*:

*gāḥ*..... *jāy*..... *hetayo*..... *many*..... *vanas*.....
vanaspati *ti kim*; *namah* : *anna*..... *niho*..... *tapaso*
..... *deva*..... *svadhā ṭi kim*; *anyā*..... *bhāmito*.....
*yān*..... *ukāroṣya vakārvikriyāyām vayājanaparānākāraḥ* iti
*yavanahā* (xii.4) *nishedhābhāvād alope prāpte tadapavādo*
fall under xi.4." Its inclusion here is necessary, because in samhitā the word becomes anuv, so that its n is no longer "followed by a vowel," as required by that rule. The question might arise, whether rule i.51 would not, at any rate, cause anuv to be implied along with anuv; but the commentator does not raise it, and the course taken by the treatise is evidently the more reasonable and safer one.

The last three cases which the rule deals with are of a peculiar character, and quite different from all the rest falling under this chapter, being those in which a final pragraha or incombinable vowel elides an initial a, either in the passages specified in xi.3 (like the last of the three) or elsewhere (like the other two). This the commentator points out, and declares that in every other instance the a remains after a pragraha. I have already noticed (under iv.6.7) what the usage of the text is after pragrahās in o: that, against the two cases here mentioned of a elided after a vocative in o, there are but two in which the a remains; but that after a final o containing the particle u we have twenty-one cases of a retained, and no case of its elision. The passages where a is retained after an e that is pragraha, I have omitted to note: but there is a considerable number of them, including many (e.g. i.4.30: ii.5.6; vi.3.52: vii.5.32: the commentator cites a single one, ime apīnā sauvatsaraḥ, v.6.41) where the retention is not otherwise authorized: so that inability to cause elision is unquestionably involved in the very character of a pragraha vowel, according to the view of the treatise, and needs not to be expressly stated. At this we have a right to be surprised, especially for two reasons: first, that it is thought necessary to teach (see x.24) that pragrahās are not liable in general to combination with the initial vowels that follow them; and secondly, that according to this treatise there is no combination of the initial a with the preceding e or o, but an actual loss of it, leaving the e or o unaffected (except sometimes as to accent). But the essential character of the pragraha vowels, the reason of their peculiar treatment, and the proper significance of the term by which they are called, are obscure points as yet in Hindu phonetics and nomenclature.

It remains to inquire how complete and accurate is the enumeration by the Prātiçakhyā of the cases of elision or non-elision of a occurring in the Taîttrīrya Sanhitā. I have, in looking through the Sanhitā, carefully considered every case with reference to the rules of the treatise, and the result is that, apart from ye aparishthu

'yam. agne...... adhvarya...... çatakṛato...... atra yavana-ha (xii.4) ityādinā 'va lope siddhe punar asya grahanām niyamārtham: āyo 'dhevya' krato ity etapadatrayapūrvasyāti 'vā 'kāraṣya' lopo na te itarapragrahalpūrvasye 'ti: yathā: ime......

1 G. M. -as tr. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 B. -rapara. 4 O. idh. 5 B. om. 6 O. kāra.
7 B. itaratra pr.
(i.4.33) already treated of under xi.3 (p. 244), I have found only two cases of a retained which are not accounted for: namely ārdhavo asthāt (v.2.15; R-V. x.1.1) and so agnih (v.2.33; R-V. vii. 1.16); and both these I suspect to fall under i.61, I having failed to note the previous occurrence of the passages. Of cases explained by i.61 there is a considerable number; only, as was remarked under that rule (see p. 47), there are three among them to which, if the commentator’s forced interpretation of its terms be admitted, it cannot be made to apply. Of cases of elision of a unaccounted for, I have found none. Of course, my examination of the Sanhitā, having been made by the help of a single samhitā manuscript, is not to be credited as absolutely accurate; yet I have a good deal of faith in the trustworthiness of its result.

9. When the elided a is grave, the preceding diphthong, if acute, becomes circumflex.

All the Prātiṣeṣṭyaḥ, and the usage of the known Vedic texts, are in accord upon this point (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.55). To the particular circumflex hence resulting, the treatise gives later (xx.4) the name abhinīhata; the others call it abhīnihāta. The examples given are tā ‘bravana (ii.5.13 et al.) and so ‘bravita (ii.1.21 et al.).

The representation of the tone of the elided a in the resulting accent of the eliding diphthong, of course, favors the view that regards it as absorbed into the latter, rather than elided.

10. When it is acute, the preceding diphthong, if grave, becomes acute.

This, also, is a universal usage. The commentator quotes two examples: āva rundhatē ‘satram vā’ī (vii.3.81: O. omits āva) and annapatē ‘nānya (iv.2.31 and v.2.21).

11. As also, in every case, if circumflex.

The commentator explains ca, ‘also,’ as bringing down udātte,

9. yaṃ1 adhikṛtya yam prabandha uktas tasmān2 akāre ‘nu-\(\ldots\) dātte lapte sati pūrva ekāra okāro va ’dattāḥ3 svaritam āpadyate. yathā4: tē \ldots\; so \ldots\;

10. tasmān1 evā kāra udātte3 lapte sati pūrva ekāra okāro va ’nudattā udāttaṃ āpadyate. yathā: a va \ldots\; anna\ldots\;

1. G. M. ayam. 2. G. M. asmr. 3. G. M. put next after pūrva. 4. in B. only.

1. O. asmr. 2. O. puts next after eva. 3. O. om. 4. in O. only.
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when the elided a is acute, from the preceding rule, and sarvatra, in every case, as signifying whether the circumflex be independent or enclitic. His examples are bhesajāin gāvē'gāvya (1.8.61) and ójó jāyathāh (1.6.124), where the final syllables of gāvē and ójāh have the enclitic circumflex by xiv.29, and átho 'kthyó 'thā 'tirārāh (vii.1.54: G. M. O. omit the first word), where the final syllable of ukthyāh has the independent circumflex before the elision.

We might perhaps also fairly conclude that sarvatra implies an inclusion of the case treated of in rule 9, and virtually teaches that a final circumflex, eliding an initial grave, is still circumflex.

With this chapter ends the first praṇa, or section, of the treatise. The division into praṇas is a purely external and formal one, and (as I gave notice would be the case, in the Introductory Note to the Atharva Prātiṣṭhāya) is made no account of in this edition. References made to the succeeding chapters by section and chapter will easily be found by adding twelve to the number of the chapter as given.

CHAPTER XIII.

Contents: 1–3, loss of m, before semivowels and spirants; 4, its retention before rājan etc.; 5–15, details of the occurrence of ŋ, otherwise than as the result of sanāk; 16, interchange of d and l.

Gṛtha Madhyāntā: II 1

1. Now for the omission of m.

11. udātta iti ca cārabdo janāpayati: tasminn1 akāra udātte2 sati sarva3 ekāra okāro vā svarita udāttam āpadyate. bhesajām4 ojo5 sarvatra 'ti vacunj nityasvarito 'pi tathāi 'va tad vidhānam syāt: atho6.

iti tribhāsayaratne prātiṣṭhāyavivarane
dvādaśo 'dhyāyān.

'iti prathamah praṇañah.'

1 O. asm.; 2 G. M. ins. lupis; O. ins. ca lupis; 3 O. sarvatra; G. M. sarvatrāsthita. 4 O. -rīṣyād. 5 O. om.; G. M. prathāmapraṇañs samāptah. harīḥ om.; ca-bhāṃ astu om; W. adds tari hi om, and, as prelude to the next section, prīga

NG prayānam namah. harīḥ om; B. adds harīḥ om.

1. athe'ty ayam udhīkārah: makāralopā1 ucyata ity etad adhi-
kṛtaṃ veditavyam 2'īta uttaraṁ yad vakṣhyānāh3. makārasya lopō makāralopāḥ4.

1 O. rasya k. 2 W. B. om. 3 B. om.
A general heading, of which, however, the force extends but a very little way (through rule 4). The subject is a supplement to that treated at v.27–31, where we are told what is done with \( m \) before a mute, or before any other semivowel than \( r \).

2. A \( m \) is omitted, when followed by \( r \) or a spirant.

This omission of \( m \) is accompanied, according to xv.1–3, by the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or else the insertion of \( anusvāra \) after it. Respecting the relation of these alternative views to one another, see the note to ii.30. The definition of the \( m \) as lost or omitted accords best with the former view: it is sufficiently logical and consistent to say that the consonant is lost and the vowel nasalized; if, however, an \( anusvāra \), as a separate vocal element, is to take the place of \( m \) after the vowel, the only acceptable form of statement must be that the \( m \) is directly converted into \( anusvāra \). This form of statement is in fact adopted by the Rik (iv.5) and Vāj. (iv.1) Prātiśākhyaśas, which acknowledge an \( anusvāra \), while the other is rightly preferred by the Ath. Prāt. (ii.32, i.67), which holds the theory of the nasalized vowel: our own treatise, as was pointed out above (p. 68), trims between the two views.

The commentator’s examples are \( pratyushtaḥ rakṣah \) (i.1.21 et al.), \( sañcitaṃ me brahma \) (iv.1.102; v.1.102), \( tañ śaṅd ahāni \) (v.5.26), \( sañ-saṃ id yuvace vrshan \) (ii.6.114; iv.4.44: only G. M. have vrshan), and \( tvañ ha yad yavishṭhaḥ \) (ii.6.111). Counter-examples are given: to show that \( m \) before other letters is not dropped, \( idāṃ vām āsye \) (iii.3.111); to show that the dropped \( m \) must be a final, \( tasmāt tāmṛta āpah \) (vi.4.24). The commentator, namely, has quietly introduced the limitation \( padāntah, \), 'when final,' into his explanation of the rule, without pointing out whence he derives it: it comes, in fact, only from the general scope of the treatise, which thus far, having the relation of \( pada \) and \( sañhītā \) texts under treatment, has dealt almost exclusively with final and initial letters.

3. As also, according to some teachers, when followed by \( y \) or \( v \).

---

2. rephaparaś ca "shmaparaś ca padānto" makāro luptate. yathā: praty-...... sañ----: tañ----: sañ----: tvañ----. repaṃ para iti kim: idaṃ----: padānta iti kim: tasmāt----. rephaḥ ca "shmAcaḥ ca 'rephoshmaṇah: te pare' yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ.

1 W. repaḥ. 2 O. om. ca. 3 B. -nto. 4 G. M. om. 5 O. om. 6 G. M. O. -nd. 7 B. G. M. O. rephoshmaṇa luo parātu.
The authorities here quoted are, as the commentator does not fail to point out, the same with those referred to above, in v. 30, where we were taught that some teachers hold \( m \) not to be assimilated to a following \( y \) or \( v \), any more than to \( r \). The accepted teaching of the treatise, however, is (v. 28-9) that \( m \) before \( y, l, \) and \( v \) becomes a nasal counterpart to those letters respectively: whence the present rule is pronounced unapproved. For the bearings of the discordant doctrine, see note to v. 30.

The examples are tvāṁ jañēśhva īdyah (i.1.14\(^4\); 2.3\(^1\)-2\(^2\): O. omits īdyah) and taṁ vā etāṁ yajamānāḥ (v.6.9\(^2\): O. omits the last word): the ordinary and approved reading would be tvāṁ, tam, and etāṁ—as all the MSS. in fact read, neglecting the illustration of the opinion set forth in the rule. A counter-example is given, yaṁ kāmayeta (i.6.10\(^4\) et al.).

4. But not the \( m \) of sam and sām, when followed by rā.

This is a precept applying only to the two words samrāj and sāmrājya, and in the other Prātiṣṭhāvakhas (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.36) these words or the root rāj are particularly specified; since, however, the syllable rā does not chance to occur in the Taṅtirīlaya Sanhitā except in these words after sam or sām, there is no inaccuracy in the more general statement as here made. The examples of the occurrence of the words in question selected by the commentator as illustrations are pru samrājam (i.6.12\(^3\)) and sāmrājyayā sukratuh (i.8.16\(^4\): O. omits sukratuh). As counter-examples, we have gaṁ rājann oṣadhībhyaḥ (iii.2.3\(^1\)) to show that no other words

3. yakāraparo \(^1\) vakāraparo vā makāro lupyata ity ekshām \(^2\) matam: ya evā sya pāṇcamādhhyāye savaranāputtim pratisedha-
yanti\(^3\) teshām evāi 'sha lopavidhīr iti tān anvādićati cakārah siśhāvalokanena\(^4\). yathā: tvāṁ...... taṁ...... evam para iti kim: yaṁ...... yakāra ca vakāra ca yavakārau: tāu parāu yasmāt sa tathāktaḥ.

\(^1\) etat sūtram anīṣtam.\(^5\)

1 G. M. ins. vd. 2 G. M. O. ins. dcāryanām. 3 B. G. M. -māṇuvāke. 4 B. savar-
nam agrē vartinaḥ; G. M. -napratip-. 5 W. B. -dhanti. 6 O. -kāṣāmyādhyena. 7 G. M. O. nāś tat sūtram ānīṣtam.

4. ’re ’ty evamparaḥ ’sainśām īty etayor grahaṇayor makāro na lupyate. yathā: pra...... sāmr...... saṁ sām iti kim: yaṁ...... rāpara iti kim: saṁrārānāḥ. padānta ca va-
āñjanaparaḥ prākṣta (xiv.28) iti' vakṣhyamanānaṁ devi-
vaniśedham itiçabdo' nivārayati: tasmād atra devi\(\text{ā}‰dhih.\(^\text{ī}ª\))

\(^1\) the MSS., as usual in such a case, rā ity. \(^5\) G. M. put at beginning; O. om. grahaṇayor. \(^2\) in G. M. only. \(^4\) O. om. \(^3\) G. M. -ṣa. \(^6\) G. M. tu-. \(^8\) G. M. add itiçabdo saṁ sām īty anayor evi ’ti samarthayati.
retain an unchanged m before rá, and sañcarānāḥ (i.4.441) to show that only rá, not ra, effects the retention.

According to W. B. O., the particle iti in the rule is intended to deny the application to the word here had in view of rule xiv.28, respecting duplication, and to assure the duplication of the m before the r. But G. M. insert tu, 'but,' in the rule after iti, ascribing to it the effect just defined, and making the iti simply signify that the words mentioned, and no others, are the subjects of the rule. And G. (not M.) writes the examples accordingly, sammrājaṃ and sāmrājyāya. That this bit of constructive interpretation is a pure figment of the commentators does not need to be pointed out; respecting its occasion and bearing, see the note to xiv.28. I have adopted the reading of W. etc., which is presumably the older and more genuine: in the comment on xiv.28, even G. M. agree with the others in making iti the bond of connection between the two rules.

5. Now of individual sounds.

According to the comment on rule xxiv.2 (see the note to that rule), we have here one of the main division lines of the treatise. Thus far, from the beginning of the fifth chapter, we have had to do chiefly with the combination of separate words or padas into connected text; now we turn to the determination of individual letters, which are read alike in both forms of text. That the intention of the treatise-makers recognized so grand a transition here may be doubted; but that the change is one of some importance is not questionable.

6. Within the same word, a n preceded by r, ṣ, r, or sh, becomes n.

5. athe 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: varṇānāṁ saṁhita vakoṣyata ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam: 'atha vá:' athaçaabdah padasaṁhitaṁniśvedhaḥ.

1 O. weyata. 2 G. M. om. 3 B. taddah. 4 B. -tāyān nish-

6. samānapada ekapada ṭkārakärarephaskārapūrve nakāro nakāre śvāparaḥ āpadyate. tribhir... tvān... esha... kṛ-śno... 'evampūra iti kim: devānām... samānapada iti kim: ebhir... samānāṁ ca tat padān ca samānapadam: tasmin.

O. has a lacuna, beginning with -napade at the end of the rule, and ending with tribhir r- in the first example. 1 G. M. ṭkārareph-. 2 G. M. nātvarum. 3 B. G. M. dpnoti. 4 O. om.
Already, in a previous chapter (vii.1–12, 15, 16), we have had detailed all the cases in which a $n$ is changed to a $n$ in the course of the combination of words into phrases, in the conversion of pada into samihitā; now, the treatise sets out to account for every single $n$ occurring in the whole text. And the present is the leading general rule, involving, with the extensions and restrictions imposed later, by far the greater number of cases.

The commentator's examples are tribhir ṛṇavā jáyate (vi.3.10\(^a\): O. has a lacuna, involving the beginning of this citation), tvan hotruṃ (iv.3.13\(^b\), esha vàrco varnah (vi.1.3\(^1\): but W. has instead esha và alno varnah, vi.1.3\(^1\)-\(^2\)), and krshno ‘si (i.1.11\(^1\)): his counter-examples are devānām và antan jagmusām (vii.5.8\(^1\): but G. M. have only devānām, which of course is found in various places; and O. omits altogether), where none of the lingual letters specified comes before a $n$, and ebhir no arkhī (iv.4.4\(^7\): O. omits arkhī), where the $r$ is in another word than the $n$. All these are cases in which the alterant letter immediately precedes the altered.

7. Even though other sounds are interposed.

Rule 15, below, puts a restriction upon this, pointing out what letters may not intervene between the affecting and the affected letter. The examples are aparāpārketkān dahati (v.1.10\(^1\): W. B. omit dahati; O. inserts ha between the other two words), ātmann evā "ramanaṁ kurute (vi.5.11\(^4\): only O. has the first two words, and it omits the last), adhishavanam (i.1.5\(^2\): but G. M. O. have adhishavane, iv.7.8 or vi.2.11\(^4\), and kṛṣhamānah pratishthākāmāh (iii.4.3\(^3\)).

8. Also in hiranmayam.

The only passage in which the word occurs is quoted by the commentator: hiranmayan dáma daksinā (ii.4.13: O. omits daksinā). The intent of the rule is to establish in advance a counter-exception to the exception “not when followed by a mute,” made in rule 15, below.

---

1. dukṣhitapārvo nakāro 'nyena 'vyaveto 'pi 'vyavahito 'pi' natvam āpnoti. yathā: ap....; ātmann....; adhi....; kṛṣh....

2. G. M. ins. nṛṣkena. 3. W. O. om. 4. G. M. om. 4. in O. only.

8. hiranmayam ity asmin grahane nakāro 'natvam āpnoti'. yathā: hira-..... sparśaparā (xiii.15) iti vākṣayamāna-pratishedhasya pratiprasādrārtham idam sātram.

2. G. M. nakāram āpadyate. 2. in B. only. 3. O. om. 4. O. -nasya pr-.
9. Also, in the inflectional and derivative forms of pāṇi, gana,
punya, kanva, kāṇa, gāṇa, bāṇa, venu, guna, and mani, the first
nasal is n.

The word pravāda is not found elsewhere in our treatise or its
commentary. From the latter's explanation and use of it we derive
for it a meaning somewhat different from that which, according to
Regnier (note to Rik Pr. ii.39), it bears in the Rik Prātiṣākhya.
The latter makes it mean 'theme;' in our comment, on the other
hand, it evidently signifies a derived form of a theme, in any gender
or case, in composition, or in extension by secondary suffix; and I
have translated it accordingly. So far as I can see, however, the
same signification belongs to it in most of the passages of the Rik
Pr. also, and Regnier's exposition of its use calls for revision.

There is an abrupt change of implication here, without any inti-
mation of it in the terms of the precept itself; it is only at the end
of rule 14, below, that we find the word prakṛtāh, which we must
understand as applying to rules 9–14—a kind of footing instead of
heading (adhibhūra); see another like case in the third chapter,
rules 2–7 (note on iii.2). In this connected paragraph of rules we
have an enumeration of the words in which a n is "original," and
hence found equally in all the forms of the text.

The examples are supānīḥ svanūrīḥ (iii.1.114: iv.1.63: O., in
this and the two following examples, has only the first word),
vṛšapānayo 'cvāh (iv.6.63), and hiranyapānīn utaye (i.4.25: ii.2.
123); the text contains a dozen other examples of the pravā-
das of pāṇi; ganaṇānṛ tva gaṇapatiṇiḥ havāmahe (ii.3.143: O.
omits the last word), gaṇa me mā vi trshan (iii.1.82), gaṇena
ganam (v.4.77), and dūreāmitraṣ ca gaṇaḥ (iv.6.56); the cases,

9. pāṇi 'tyādiçađānāṃ' pravādesu pūrcaḥ prathamo nakāraḥ
prakṛtyāi 'va veditaḥvah. prakarshena vadhā pravādaḥ: luγa-
vibhaktibhedasamāsamaddhitādibhir nirdeśa iti arthaḥ, yathā:
sup-... vṛṣha-... hiran-... gaṇaṃ-... gaṇa-... gaṇena-... dūre-... punyo-... sā-... kanvā...
tasyā-... akarnayā-... gaṇap-... viṣalyo...
venur-... venunā-... yad-... yathā-... maṇinā-
'nani gaṇaçabdopradātvād gaṇagrahanam ayuktam: 'māi
'vem.' gaṇaçabdopradātvāc sati tad bhavet: kiṃtu gaṇapatiçabda-
pravādo 'yam. pūrca iti kim: gaṇ-... ven-... maṇ-...
ityādīśhā 'ttarasya' naśvam mā bhuḍ iti.

1 G. M. -ādānāṃ gaṇaḥ\nānām. 2 W. -dah. 3 W. -vadhā; G. M. om. 4 W. om.
bhedā. 5 W. nirdiśhā. 6 G. M. om. 6 G. M. om. 7 G. M. om. 7 W. āvam. 8 G. M. O. -ra-
nakāraṣṇa.
compounds, and derivatives of gana are found by dozens in the Sanhitā;—punyo bhavati vasantam (i.6.11\(^4\); O. omits the last word) and sāmā sarvāṃ punyāṃ (vii.1.7\(^1\)); punya occurs in five other passages, once (iii.3.8\(^2\)) in composition;—kuneḥ abhi pra gåyata (iv.3.13\(^7\); O. ends with abhi): there are two other cases of declensional forms;—tasyāḥ kāṇāḥ yā datāḥ (ii.5.1\(^7\): O. alone has the last word, and it omits the first; G. M. end with kāṇāḥ) and akarnayāḥ kāṇāyāḥ 'cālonyāḥ (vi.1.6\(^7\): only W. has the last word); there is no other case;—gānapatyān mayobhūr e 'hi (iv.1.2\(^2\): O. has only the first word; only G. M. have the last two): I have noted but one other case;—vičālaṃ bānavān uta (iv.5.1\(^4\): O. omits the first word); we have a declensional case of bāna at iv.6.4\(^3\);—venur vāimē bhavati (v.1.1\(^4\): O. omits the last word), venunā vī mīnūte (v.2.5\(^2\)), and yad venoh sushirām (v.1.1\(^4\)): there are a couple more of cases;—yathā gune gunam (vii.2.4\(^2\)): we have elsewhere only dviguna, at v.2.5\(^2\);—and maninā rāpānī (vii.3.14): elsewhere only manivāla, at v.6.13. To explain the limitation pārcaḥ, 'the first nasal,' in the rule, the commentator quotes parts of passages already given—namely gānānāṁ tva, venunā vī, and maninā rāpānī (but O. omits the second example, and the second word of the third)—in which the pravādas exhibit a second nasal which is dental. He raises the objection, moreover, that the mention of gāna in the rule is unnecessary, since the word is a pravāda of gana; but replies that the word (gānapatyā) aimed at is a pravāda of ganapati, not of gana. It is true, now, that gānapatyāt stands one degree farther removed from gana than does, for instance, gānapatibhyah, or than would gānikāḥ if it occurred in the text; yet we should hardly have expected it on that account to receive a different treatment.

पणिवपणिवीयमाणाज्ञानोयः || १० ||

10. Also in pani, panim, viyamānah, and ānyoh.

The passages are agne deva paniḥbhīr viyamānah (i.1.13\(^2\); only G. M. have the last word), paniṁ gosau stārāmahe (ii.6.11\(^2\): O. omits the last word), viyamānah: tāṁ ta etam (i.1.13\(^2\): O. has only the first word; G. M. read -nastam etc., neglecting the pause of division between the two words), and ānyoh kavikratum (i.2. 61). These words are said to be made a separate rule of because there is no longer any inclusion of pravādas or derived forms.

रत्नमयः || ११ ||

11. Also before a lingual mute.

10. ^1 pani 'tyādigrahaṃesu nakāraḥ prakṛtyāi' va veditavyah, apravādārtho yam ārāṃbhah. agne...... paniṁ...... viy...... ānyoh......

^1 O. prefixes the whole series of words. ^2 O. -ādīsu; G. M. -ādīsu gr-.
The examples are citikāntāya ca (i.v.5\(^1\)): but G. M. have instead citikāntāya svāhā, which I do not find in the text, not even at vii.3.17, where a number of similar expressions are read) and kāndāyeta pāmanambhāvakāh (vi.1.3\(^8\): O. has the first word only). The combinations nē and nāh do not occur in the Sanshita.

12. Also in caṅkūna, phanat, sthānau, hinuyāt, hinoti, kāuneyah, anishthāh, ubaṇam, ugaṇā wherever found, cupunikā, bānijāya, anavas ca, ātvārah, sthānum, tuṇave, vīndyām, aĉlo-nyā, paṇēda, vāṇih, kalyānī, kuṇapam, vāṇah cāta, ēoṇā wherever found, dhānīkā, and m enī.

The passages aimed at are quoted by the commentator as follows: avabhṛtha nicaiṅkūna nīceruḥ (i.4.45\(^2\): all but O. omit nīceruḥ, which would allow the passage to be found also at vi.6.3\(^4\): O. omits avabhṛtha): nicaiṅkūna occurs a second time in i.4.45\(^2\); avanvāpani phanat (i.7.8\(^3\)): ayāsthānāv udātu (i.8.12\(^9\)): bhṛtṛvyāya pra hiṇuyāt (ii.2.6\(^5\)): O. begins with pra): evāśmaī pra hiṇoti (ii.2.6\(^5\)): rajaṇo vai kāuneyah (ii.3.8\(^1\)): ye 'nishthās tān (ii.5.5\(^2\)): yajña ubaṇam kriyate (iii.4.3\(^7\)), and also, by i.53, anubhaṇam (at iii.4.3\(^8\)): aveyādhitir ugaṇā uta (iv.1.10\(^9\): the example is wanting in W.) and ugaṇābhyaśa trīhatibhyah (iv.5.4\(^1\): O. omits the last word); varshayanti cupunikā nāmā 'si (iv.4.5\(^1\): only W. has the first word, and it omits the last); mantrine bānijāya kakshānām prataye (iv.5.2\(^2\): B. G. M. omit the first word, G.

---

1. 'tavarge pare' nakārah\(^3\) prāktṛyāi 'va veditavyah. cити:

---

12. caṅkūna...... eshu nakārah prāktṛyāi 'va veditavyah. avabh-

---

1 G. M. O. put before yatra. (W. om. (O. om. (O. om. VOL. IX. 35
M. the last, W. O. the last two); priyamagnač ca me 'navac ca me (iv.7.4²: G. M. omit the first word, O. the first three), with a counter-example, anavas te ratham (i.6.12⁰), to prove the need of ca in the citation; etam vai para āṭināra (v.6.5³); ya śṭhanān hanti (vii.3.1¹): we have yajñasthām twice at vi.1.2⁴; yā tānave yā vināyām (vi.1.4¹); aclonayā 'saptapahayā kriṇāti (vi.1.6⁷: only O. has kriṇāti); panéta 'goarham (vi.1.10¹); īndram vānir anūṣhata (i.6.12²); kalyāni rūpasamrddhā sā syāt (vii.1.6⁶: only O. has the last two words); kalyāni occurs in one or two other passages; puruskauṇapam āeakauṇapam gāh (vii.2.10²: only O. has gāh): we have kauṇapam as independent word at vii.2.10²; vānāh catatanter bhavati (vii.5.9³), with a counter-example, to show the necessity of adding gata in the rule, rtāvānač cayamānā śṛṇāi (ii.1.1¹: only G. M. have śṛṇāi; O. omits the example: vānāh is a pada in the word as divided, rtā-vānāh); ānāh dhṛshṭa nṛvāhā (vii.4.19: W. B. end with dhṛshṭa) and ānāya svāhā (vii.3.1⁸: O. omits the example, along with the specification of the point it illustrates), the only examples of ānāḥ that the text contains; ni jāguliti dhānākā (vii.4.1⁹³: and va-naspātinām eni (v.5.15: O. reads enya), with a counter-example, to show that the word only occurs after a m., ubhaya eni syāt tad āhū (vii.1.6⁶: G. M. O. end with syāt).

13. As final of the former member of a compound, n is found in vrshan, cīrshan, brahman, akshan, carman, and carshan.

The term avagraha, we are told, is here taken in the sense of avagrahastha. The same interpretation has been given before (under vi.9); and the whole use of avagraha in the treatise verges toward an equivalence with its derivative. Only T. O. change the c of cīrshan to ch after n; but, as this is in accordance with the teaching of the Prātiṣṭhāṣṭika (v.34), I have adopted it.

The examples quoted by the commentator are vāto apiśn vrshan-vān (ii.1.1¹¹: O. omits vāto), cīrshavān medhyo bhavati (vii.5.2⁵¹), brahmanvanto devā āsān (vi.4.1⁰¹: W. B. omit āsān), akshanvate svāhā (vii.5.1²¹), and carmanvate svāhā (vii.5.1²²): we have vrshan- also at ii.5.8⁴: iv.1.2¹: vii.5.5¹; cīrshan- at vii.5.1²¹; and brahman- at v.7.8³ and vi.4.1⁰¹ (a second time). As counter-examples, to show that the n occurs in these words only before a

13. vrshan iṭyādigrhahesha't avagraho nakārah prakṛtyāt'ca veditavyah. vāto: cīrsh: brahman: akshan: 'carm:-' 'carshangrahayasa' śākhāntare vijñeyam udāharanam: mitrasya: iti kecid udāharanti: tan na sādhu: anto 'lopād (xiii.15) iti vakshyamānapratishedhapatiprasavārtham ukte tād esām grahanānāṁ carshanādhyāta ity atra' nakārasya padāntavābhvāt. athavā: ṛkārākārārashā' (xiii.6)
pause of division, he gives (the whole subject is omitted in O.) vrshann agne vigvany arya á (iv.4.44), tasmát saptacá RN (v.1.71), brahman vírni vi (ii.3.35: G. M. omit vi), akshann amíma- danta (i.8.52), and paçánam carman (vi.1.92).

This disposes of all the avagráhas cited in the rule save carshan. No such pada as carshan is to be found in the Táttiriyá-Sánihitá, nor, so far as has yet come to light, in any other Vedic text; nor does the word seem like one that could anywhere occur. One cannot help surmising that its presence in the rule may be by a blunder merely, it being, perhaps, an unintelligent repetition of carman. But, by whatever hap or mishap it found its way in, it is now an accepted part of the text, and has to be dealt with. And the commentator first creeps out of the difficulty through the hole to which he usually betakes himself in a like case, asserting that the passage aimed at is read in another text (pákhá). He then proceeds to state that "some quote as here referred to the passage mitrasya carshani dhrtah gravah (iii.4.115 and iv.1.63: O. omits gravah): this is not good, since the words are quoted in the rule by way of antecedent exception to an exception [to rule 6] which is to be made farther on, by the words 'nor when final, nor by the omission of a' (rule 15); and in carshani dhrtah the n is not final. Or: others are of opinion that the words in question are specified for the sake of removing any doubt which might arise as to whether the n in them were a product of alteration under rule 6 of this chapter; and, in this aspect, the citation of mitrasya carshani dhrtah is to be approved." The logic of this final conclusion I entirely fail to see: for no question can possibly arise as to whether the n of carshani dhrtah falls under rule 6; that it does so is palpable and undeniable.

As we should expect, considering the way in which the Práti- cákhyá treats the cases, these words are read with n in the pada-text also: namely vrshan-ván, brahman-vantah, and so on. The same is the case in the pada-texts of the Rik and the Atharvan (see Ath. Pr. iv.99).

14. Also in rññ, shann, shñ, mn, and rññ—these are original.

The application of the term prákrtah, 'original,' in this rule is, as was pointed out above (under rule 9), to all the cases rehearsed in rules 9-14.

"diprópter atra nakáro váikrti iti cañkánirákanáartham etáni grahanáni 'ty anye manyante: tathá sati mitrasya carshani dhrtah ity udáhanáni ramaníyam. "avagraha" iti kim: vrshann .....: tasmát: ......: brahman: ......: akshann: ......: paçánam .....: avagrahasaho" avagraha iti lakhyate."
The commentary, after pronouncing the citations of the rule "parts of words, intended to include a number of cases," quotes examples, as follows: svayamātṛnavā upa (v.2.81; 3.21; 7.4; 5.4: O. omits upa), asanītvitān hi hanā (vi.2.115: O. omits hanā), and svayamātṛnavā jyotih (v.7.62): I have noted ṛṇu elsewhere only in anāTrimīram (v.1.74): abhishanān yasmāt (ii.4.23), nishanāya sēdā (vii.1.10): only G. M. have this example), and daṣamāsvād nishanā āsan (vii.5.1, 21: O. omits the first word); pūshno raṃvāyāt (i.3.102), pūshnā sayūjā sāha (iv.1.22 and v.1.24: only G. M. have sāha), and pūshne prapattyāva svēdā (vii.3.15: G. M. O. omit sēdā): I have noted further only pūshnā (i.8.92 et al.); aryanān ca rūmā nir vaper (ii.3.41 twice, 2: G. M. O. stop at rūmā): I find besides sutramā (i.8.92 et al.) and nṛṃna (i.7.132), which last, however, the rule was not specially intended for; finally, dādhiṃdā moon akārisham (i.5.11 and vii.4.19): O. omits akārīsham) and ā grāṃnah (vii.3.23: O. omits this example): further cases of dādhiṃdā and grāṃnā are met with in the text showing the combination vun; I have noted in other words in which it occurs. Counter-examples, showing that vun follows rū only, would have been easy to furnish: thus, rāyasposhadāvne, at i.2.101.

Cases of quite various and discordant nature are here thrown together. Most unequivocally calling for treatment in the Prātiṣṭhāna, in order to determine their reading, are the three passages in which sāvā is altered to sāvā after abhi and ni, since (as quoted by the commentator below) the pada-text restores the original form of the word, reading abhishanā ity abhi-sāvā etc. Its s is converted to sh according to vi.2, but there is no authority excepting here for the change of nn to ον; chapter vii. does not deal with this, because it takes up only those cases in which the alterant cause and the altered nasal are found in different padas; and rule 6 of the present chapter does not apply to it because its first n is protected (according to xiii.15) by being "followed by a mute," and its second n by "having a lingual mute interposed." The case of trīma is akin with this, only with the important difference that the alteration of its nasals lies beyond the ken of the Prātiṣṭhāna, the nn being read in every text. The remaining three all fall under rule 6 of this chapter, but they require specification because they are also covered by one of the exceptions in rule 16; for they exhibit, as compared with their

14. atra sūtre padākadeçā ete bahūpadānārtham uktāḥ: rūndēshe eshe ca nakārāb prākrēta eva viṇēyāh. svay......: asain......; svay......: abhish......: "nish......: daṣa......: pūshno.......: pūshnā......: pūshne......: aryamne......: dadhi......: ā......

prākrēta-cabdo 'ram pānyādishe eva carshaṇparyanteshu mukhyāh: catarseshu saṁhitāsa natvasadbhāvat; rūndē' ty adīshu tu' na mukhyāh: kiuṃt prāpyabhāve 'pī natvaprawaṇaṃtāh. tathā hi: rūndādu mūrcaṇkārasyās sparṣoparūtvān nishedhāh:
themes (aryaman, -krāvan, grāvan), a “loss of a” (alopa): compare what is said of this alopā below.

As regards the application of the term prākṛta, ‘original,’ their discordance is more essential, and, indeed, irreconcilable. In trūna, to be sure, the cerebral n’s are as original as in the words specified by rule 13, since, in all alike, the alteration is an accomplished fact in all the forms of text, although ultimately referable to the cause laid down in rule 6. But the last three cases, although also read alike in all texts, are introduced here as counter-exceptions to rule 15, and their n is no more original than is that of any other of the words falling under rule 6. And finally, there is no sense whatever in which the lingual nasals of -shanyā are “original.” To call them all original, then, seems even more than a looseness or inaccuracy in the use of that term: it is a blunder.

The commentator perceives the difficulty, and attempts to remove it by a lengthy passage of special pleading. The term prākṛta, he says, is mukhya, ‘of primary value’ or ‘of full force,’ as applied to the words beginning with pāni (rule 9) and ending with carshan (rule 13), since in them the lingualized nasal is found in all the four sanhitās; but in ṛṇ and the rest it is not mukhya, but is simply intended to authorize the nasalization even in the absence of a rule prescribing it. Thus, namely: in ṛṇ etc. (i.e. in ṛṇ and shann), the first nasal constitutes an exception (under rule 6) as being followed by a mute (rule 15); the other nasal, as having a t-mute between it and the altering cause (rule 15). In shn and mn, again [why not in raen?], the nasal falls under the exception touching the loss of a (rule 15). And if it be objected that the linguisticization is assured by the competency of the citation—still [it is answered], the implication is avoided that the occasion of the citation is the originality of the n [?]. Moreover, the word eva, ‘also,’ in the rule, being used in the sense of subsidiary adjunction (anvācaya), shows the linguisticization to be not of primary value; if it were primary, it would be found in all the four kinds of text; but it is not so found; for we read in pada-text abhishanna ity abhi-sannāh and nishanāyā tī ni-sannāyā. And since, from the words pūshan and aryamā, which end in n, such forms as pūshno raṅhyāi and aryamne carum are read in the varna-text, therefore the conversion into n (all but O. say “non-conversion into n”) in

"itarasyo 'ttamasya" tavargiyavyavahitativat\"; shnamagrahahānyos te alopād iti nishedhā, grahanasmarthyyā eva\" natacān sidhyati 'iti cet: evam svabhāvatvam eva grahanasya 'pi mālam iti pariharah. kiṁ ca: anvācayā\" cartamānač ca kāro 'py eteshu natacām amukhyam\" iti dyotayati: mukhyam\" cet: catasarhshu sanhitāsvi vidyeta\"; na cā 'tra vidyate: tathā hi: abhisannā ity abhi-sannāh: nishannāyā 'tī ni-sannāyā: ity atra\" padasannāhitāyām: pūshann aryamān iti nākārantaçadhāyoh: pūshno raṅhyāi: aryamne carum: ity ādi siddharāpatvād\" atra varnasannāhitāyām etatsāhacaryād ekasūtraśthayoh\"
varna-text is to be inferred also for rūna and shann (O. says rāven) in virtue of association with the others, they being found in the same rule with them; for all who understand the rules of affairs hold that the determination of equivocal classes is made by mention in connection with words unequívocal. Therefore the meaning of prākṛta (all but O. say prokṛta) as defined by us is alone acceptable.

By comparison with the explanations given above, it may readily be seen how much of reason there is in all this talk. The commentator raises an obscuring dust about the difficulty, but does not at all remove it. The mukhyateam of the term prākṛta as here applied is more easily disproved than its mārkhateam.

15. But not in shumna, agni, and yushmānita; nor when final; nor after the omission of an a; nor when followed by a mute; nor when c, s, or a palatal, lingual, or labial mute intervenes.

It would be rather more in accordance with the ordinary usage of the treatise to make five distinct rules of the five independent and unconnected specifications which are here crowded together into a single precept: in fact, we should be guilty of no great violence if we were to divide it into five, affixing to each its own (independently constructed, as if for an independent rule) portion of the comment. But in that case, at any rate, the first rule should read na shumno'gniypushmānita (not 'gni). It is not unobjectionable as it stands, since we should expect the first and third complete padas to be quoted as they stand in the text, and the second, which is only a fragment of a pada, to be distinguished as such from a possible agnih. As to the first, moreover, there is a difference of reading among the MSS. of the text: only T. W. have shumno; B. O. have sunno; G. M. have ssunmo; and, as is seen below, even W. has sunnah in the reiteration of the rule by the comment. G. M., it may be added, read vyavāyishu for -yeshu in the last specification.

apyṛuṇasahānyatarvarnasavāhityāyāṁ nataabhāvo manta-vyāh: prasiddhapadasamabhivyāhāreṇaḥ prasiddhapadārtha-
samarthanaṃ arthaçāstravidāḥ sarve khalu svikurvate. tasmād
asamadukta eva yuktah prākṛtaçabdārdarthaḥ.\n
1 G. M. om.; O. aṣṭuṇ. 2 O. om. 3 B. esku. 4 O. om. 5 in G. M. only. 6 G. M. -sambhaviṭ. 7 O. 'piṇī. 8 G. M. put after na. 9 G. M. O. om. 10 O. -navārān. 11 G. M. O. uttarasaṇa. 12 W. B. savarg; G. M. tavarg- (?). 13 O. eṣū. 14 W. om. aśū. 15 G. M. aṣuṇa yo. 16 B. G. M. mukkh-; o. anuma-. 17 G. M. -yog. 18 B. G. M. vidyād. 19 O. om. 20 O. maṇḍa. 21 W. -ya; B. -yog; G. M. -kraśṭhitāgar. 22 W. om. 23 O. āruṇapadavatvamayog. 24 W. B. G. M. -vābha-; O. eva navāsabhāḥ-. 25 W. G. M. -yog, but W. inserts a sign of omission before the following pr-. 26 B. -dārthaṃ; G. M. -dārthan na bhave. 27 B. savacāt; G. M. nīvānam yo. 28 W. B. G. M. prākrty.
Under the first part of the rule, the passages aimed at are quoted as follows: *sushmah navārāmānīh* (iii.4.71); *indrāngibhyām tvā sayujā* (iv.4.51: G. M. omit sayujā; the pada-reading is doubtless *indrāgni-bhyām*, so that the *r* and *n* are *samānapade*, as required by rule 6), and *yusmhānīto bhayaṁ jyotiḥ* (ii.1.116: only Ṣ. has jyotiḥ; from its inclusion here, the word must remain undivided in pada-text, though in that of the Rig-Veda [ii.27.11] it is read *yusmā-nītaḥ*).

Examples of final *n* not lingualized are *pitṛn havishe attave* (ii.6.121) and *pra mrnuhi catrān* (i.2.142).

The precept touching the omission of an *a* has reference, so far as I can discover, only to the oblique cases of *vṛtrahan*, of which two (and I have failed to note any others) are cited, namely *vṛtraghna indraya tvā* (i.4.11: O. omits the example) and *vṛtraghnā stomāḥ* (iv.7.151)—for the derivative adjective vārtraghna (ii.5.25 et al.) can hardly be aimed at; and yet, the authority of this rule is needed to establish the dental *n* in this word also, which would otherwise fall under rule xiii.6. The mode of definition of the cases here intended is in very remarkable contrast with the usage elsewhere of the treatise, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, differs from the other Prātiṣṭhākyas especially in avoiding all reference to grammatical categories, forms, and derivations, and defining the words to which its rules relate simply by external circumstances of position and surroundings in the text. And this departure from its custom is a quite unfortunate and ill-judged one: for, in the first place, it renders necessary a part of the specifications of the preceding rule (namely *śnu, mnu*, and *rāṇ*), which really lie outside the province of the treatise, and have no good reason to be mentioned; and, in the second place, as the commentator points out, it involves an inconsistency with the general subject of the chapter, which has to do with conversions arising *samānapade*, 'within the limits of the same pada,' while in *vṛtraghnā* etc. the affecting cause is in one *pada* and the nasal to be affected in another. The commentator explains that the intent is, by a far-reaching glance backward (literally, 'a lion's look'), to lay down a further example to a rule in the seventh chapter, where the restriction *samānapade* is not in force: *ghnāh* etc., namely, are altered forms of *han*, whose

nasal, by vii.11, is liable to lingualization. But han, by the usage of the treatise, signifies 'the syllable or audible complex of sounds han;' not 'the theme han and its derivatives;' and, as the text contains no example of the combination ghm, it would have been easy to exempt n from lingualization ghakárât, 'after gh.'

The cited examples of n remaining unchanged when followed by a mute are samkrandano 'nimishah (iv.6.41: O. has the first word only), ava rundhe tərpyam (ii.4.116: O. omits the last word), and nakhanirbhinnam (ii.8.91).

The commentator then proceeds to enter into a long discussion of more than usual subtlety and obscurity, of which I am by no means confident that I apprehend the meaning. The point aimed at, indeed, seems quite clear: by xiv.4, the n of such a word as pärna is to be doubled, making pärnna; here, then, is a case where the first n is "followed by a mute" (sparçaparəh), and so would seem to have its lingual character forbidden by the present rule. The reasonable reply to so hair-splitting and impertinent an objection would appear to be that, a duplication being ordered by the treatise, the product can be nothing but nən, since nn would be no duplication at all. The commentator, however, prefers to get around the difficulty by limiting the word 'sparçu, 'mute,' as here used, to one which is not the product of express prescription (?). For in pärnā paçeāt (iii.5.1 et al.) there is duplication, making pärnnā (not one of the MSS. writes the duplication), the one n being prescribed by xiv.4, the other being its occasion or root (māla). With this, O. prudently ends; the other MSS. go on to explain "express" (? prasiddha) by referring to the word nakhanirbhinnam, already quoted above, as, with its like, also exhibiting an instance of occasion of prescription. This word, namely, falls under rules xiv.4.5 (becoming thereby nakhanirbhinnam); and in rule 5 the term "succeeded by a consonant" (vyañjanottara) is used in a different sense from "followed by a consonant" (vyañjanapara); the meaning of which will be there explained at full length (as we shall find to our cost, in one of the obscurest discussions of the entire treatise). The appositeness of the whole reference I do not understand.

Finally, examples are quoted of the suspension of nasalization by nakha...... sparçu 'trā 'prasiddhalakshanavishayo" vivakh- yate": anyathā pärnā paçeād ity ādāv nateva na syat: re- phat param ca (xiv.4) iti hi prasiddham11 lakshanam tanāk- lam ca pärnne 'ty atra dvīteam. "prasiddhapadena kim": nakhānirbhinnam ity ādāv api katham cīr12 lakshanamā- latvam sambhavati. kim tal lakshanam iti cet: dvītiyacatur- thayor (xiv.5) ity atra sūtrokta vyañjanottarayeoryor (xiv.5) iti vāco yuktayantaram iti brāmaḥ: tasya lakshanam tatrāi 'ca spha- ōṁkarishyate" mahātā prabandhena; sparçh para yasmād asāu sparçaparəh. "casaacaṭatavargiyeshu" vyavadhāyikeshu"
an intervening ɛ or ɔ, or a palatal, lingual, or dental mute: namely rocaṇām /datte (vi.3.6³), agne rasena tejasā (i.4.46⁸: only G. M. have tejasā), rocante rocaṇā divi (vii.4.20: O. omits rocante), somaṇ rājānam (i.7.10¹ et al.), prakṛdinnah payodhā (iv.3.13⁷), pṛtanā jayāmi (iii.5.3¹²), and janaprathānaṇaḥ svāhā (iii.2.8¹: only O. has svāhā; G. M. have the false reading -pradha-, and O. has dropped out a part of the word, giving jananāya).

In the note to Ath. Pr. iii.94, I have pointed out the physical reason why these sounds, by their interposition, prevent the lingualization of the nasal: they are, all of them, such as call into action for their utterance the tip of the tongue, throwing it out of adjustment for the lingual contact. The tendency which the history of Aryan language in India exhibits toward the conversion of dentals into linguals shows itself most actively in the case of the nasal: the tongue, being rolled back into the position of lingual articulation by the utterance of ṛ, ṛ̋, ṛ, or sh, hangs suspended there, as it were, and makes the next nasal contact lingual, unless the tendency is satisfied by the intermediate production of such a contact, or frustrated by the transfer elsewhere of the articulating organ.

The Prātiṣṭhākhyāya's enumeration of the cases of occurrence of the lingual nasal is, so far as I have been able to determine, complete. No one of the other treatises undertakes such an enumeration.

प्रतिस्थात्यारी लोः इ पौष्करसादी: पौष्करसादी: III १६॥

16. In the opinion of Pāushkarasādi, l after a mixed vowel becomes ɺ.

The mention of Pāushkarasādi (O. has everywhere Pāuskarasādi), the commentator says, is out of respect, and not because the rule is not a peremptory one. "Mixed vowel" is a term which is not elsewhere employed by the treatise, nor does the latter contain anything that should intamate an explanation of its meaning. The comment glosses it by the sound r: it appears, then, that r is thus styled, from having its vocalic quality "mixed" with consonantal, namely, with the r-sound. The other Prātiṣṭākhyas (see

satru nakāro natvāni nā "padyate: yathā²²: racaṇām……: agne……: rocante……: somaṇ: prakṛi……: pṛtanā ……: jana……: rkarākār: (xiii.5)"diprāpteh²²: pratishedho²²: yam vihitah.
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note to Ath. Pr. i.87) directly define it as so composed. The $l$
labile to the change into $d$ is called in the comment duḥṣilisṭa,‘ill joined;’ i. e., I presume, ‘of difficult articulation’ (G. M., to be
sure, seem to apply this title the first time to the $d$ instead of $l$,
and only O. attaches it the second time clearly to the $l$, the others’
readings being corrupt; yet there can hardly arise a doubt as to
its true connection); it is, of course, the lingual $l$ which forms an
acknowledged part of the alphabet of the Rig-Veda (Rik Pr. i.11–2,
r. 52 etc.). But no such articulation belongs to the alphabet ac-
cepted by this treatise—although, on the strength of the present
rule alone, it is crowded into that alphabet by the commentator
under rule i.1. Nor does the edition of the Sanshitā, nor do the
MSS., so far as known to me, make any use of a lingual $l$. As for
the MSS. of the Pratīcākhya and its comment on this rule, B. O.
write the ordinary $l$ throughout; W. alternates irregularly between
the two; G. M. and T. have the lingual letter only. As regards the
binding force of the rule, the commentator is right so far as this—
that a $d$, not $l$, is read of necessity in the words to which it relates;
but that this is, to the makers of the Pratīcākhya, the result of
alteration of an original $l$ there is no reason to believe; the
euphonic exchange of the two letters is not less strange to the
Ṭāṭṭiriya text than to the Vājasaneyi (of the Mādhyandina pākhā;
see Vāj. Pr. iv.143, viii.46) and Atharvan; and the rule is really
pājārtham only, and an intrusion into our treatise of something
foreign to its system.

The commentator first gives his own explanation and illustration
of the precept. As example of the operation of the rule, he cites
mṛdātī "drye" (i.1.14$^3$); and, as counter-example, to show that the
change is made only after a “mixed vowel,” he has nothing better
to offer than an alleged passage “from another text,” nalām
plavam. For, in such words as idita (i.1.11$^1$), pravodham (i.1.
14$^2$), īḍāya (i.2.5$^1$), ayā (i.4.45$^2$), ṣaḍāha (i.5.11$^3$), ṣrāvadā (i.6.
11$^4$), where the Rig-Veda reads regularly the lingual $l$ and its
aspirate, the Ṭāṭṭiriya-Sanskṛita maintains the $d$, not less firmly
than after $r$. This, the commentator goes on to say, is an inter-
pretation (but the term he uses is pātha, properly ‘reading’ or ‘ver-

16. prktasvarād rkārdt paro lakāro duḥṣilisṭasaunijika, ḍakā-
ram āpadyate: pāushkarasāder mate. mṛdātī—. prktasva-
rād iti kim: nalām plavam iti cākhāntare. pāushkarasāder
grahanam pājārtham na tu vikalpārtham: mūrdhasthānatayā
duḥṣilisṭaladakārajovīḥ sārṣyam iti uti vyākaranānusārāḥ
sūtrapātho 'yam: katham anusāritvam iti cet: "tathā hi":
sthāne 'ntaratamah: sthāne prápyamānāham iti antaratamaḥ
ādeco bhavati 'iti.
sūtrasya" pāthāntaram api vyākhyāyate: prktasvarat paro
lo ḍam "pāushkarasādeḥ: atra samānapada" ity anya 'nvartan-
am virneyam: pāushkarasādeḥ cākhinaḥ" samānapade pṛktā-
sion') of the rule founded on the authority of the grammarians, who assert a homogeneousness of the duḥḍhīṣṭa l and of the ṭ, as being both produced in the lingual position: and if the question is raised as to how it is so founded, reference is made to a rule of Pāṇini (i.1.50), which prescribes that, in case of substitution, the most nearly related letter is to be taken. I do not see that this exposition and reference have any pertinence whatever.

Then, the commentator adds yet another interpretation, which, he remarks, is also highly esteemed. It differs from the one already given only in implying (apparently, from xiii.6) samānapade, 'within the limits of a single pada;' taking, then, a different example, te no mrdayantu (iv.4.32 et al.), with the counter-example īḍāndam bhavati (vii.5.91)—which, in view of the frequent occurrence in the Sanhitā of īḍā, īḍāvant, and their like, is not much to the point—and finally, as further counter-example, to justify the restriction samānapade, the phrase pitṛlokāḥ somena (ii.6.21; p. pitṛ-lokam), where the l does not become ṭ after r. But in this last case is involved an additional difficulty; namely, that in the compound pitṛlokakāmasya (vi.6.41; p. pitṛloka-kāmasya) the r and l do meet samānapade, and yet the l maintains itself; over this, the commentator hobbles as best he may, with the plea that, prohibition having been made in the case of pitṛloka, it is extended by association to the further compound.

The groundlessness and unintelligence of all this special pleading, resorted to for the purpose of forcing in as an integral part of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā a precept altogether foreign to it, is palpable enough; and one grudges the time and words spent in its exposure.

svarādṛkārāt 22 pari lakāro ḍakāram āpadyaṭe. yathā 23: te... prktasvarād iti kim: ilāṁ...: samānapade iti kim: pitṛ-.... sahacāriticāv 24 ekasyā 26 nishiddho 26 itarasyā 'pi pitṛloka-ḵāmasye 27 'ty asyā 'pi 28 samānapadate suti api nishedho bhavati. idam api pāṭhāntaram bahvāṛṛtām.

iti tribhāṣhyaratne prātiṣṭhākhyavivarane trayoṇḍaṇo 29 'dhyāyaḥ.

CHAPTER XIV.

CONTENTS: 1–7, duplication of one of the members of a group of consonants; 8, duplication of \(ch, kh\), and \(bh\), in certain cases; 9–11, insertion between a surd spirant and mute; 12–13, aspiration of a surd mute before a spirant; 14–28, exceptions to the rules for duplication, and discordant views of certain authorities respecting them; 29–33, occurrence of the ejective circumflex.

स्वरपूर्व व्याकरण द्विवर्ण व्याकरणपरम् II.1 II

1. A consonant preceded by a vowel is doubled, if followed by a consonant.

The intricate and obscure subject of duplication in consonant-groups is treated at more length in this than in the other Prātiṣṭākhyas (compare R. Pr. vi.1–3; V. Pr. iv.97–114; A. Pr. iii.26–32; also Pāṇini viii.4.46–52), but chiefly on account of the liberal citation here made of the discordant views of various teachers respecting it. The doctrines of the treatise itself are mainly in accordance with those of the rest. This first and leading principle, that the first consonant of a group is doubled, is stated in equivalent terms by all. The principal restrictions to its application are, as stated below, that \(r, h, z, \varphi\) (rule 15), and a letter doubled, or a mute followed by another of the same series (rule 23), are exempted from duplication. For the details, see the following rules.

Of course, in applying the rules for duplication, we have to assume the form of the consonant-groups as determined by the other precepts of the Prātiṣṭākhyya—treating visarjanīya, for example, as is prescribed in the ninth chapter, and making the insertions pointed out in the fifth (v.32,33 etc.). And further, to finish the matter, the rules for yama, nāsikāya, and svarabhakti (xxi.12–16) must be duly taken into account.

In an additional note to the Atharva Prātiṣṭākhyā, I gave a complete list of the consonant-groups of the Atharva-Sanhitā, with the forms which they come finally to assume under the laws of combination. It has been necessary to prepare a similar one for the Tāittiriya-Sanhitā, in testing the reach and bearing of the rules of the present treatise: but the scheme is hardly worth giving in full.

1. svarapūrvaṁ vyāñjanaṁ vyāñjanaparamaṁ dīvarṇam ēpad-yate. yathā: uru-..... evampūrva iti kim: tat..... evam para iti kim: uru-..... vyāñjanaṁ iti kim: pra-..... svarah pūrvo yasmāt 1 tat svarapūrvaṁ vyāñjanaṁ asmāt param iti vyāñja- naparam: dvayor varṇayoh saṃāhāro dīvarṇam. 8

1 G. M. put next before dīvarṇam. 2 O. parom. 3 G. M. om. 4 W. ins. asū. 5 B. om. 6 O. adds svarapūrvaṁ iti kim: prajñanaṁ: padbhyaṁ:..... vy- āñjanaparam iti kim: ugaṇd uta: vyāñjana iti kim: prajñam.
The commentator offers a single example, \textit{uru prathosvā}, i.e. \textit{uru prarathosvā} (i.1.8 et al.: the MSS. of the comment only very rarely and irregularly write the groups in their duplicated form, so as to illustrate the rules of the chapter), and adds counter-examples: first, to show that the consonant is liable to duplication only after a vowel, \textit{tut pravāte} (vi.4.72): hardly a well-chosen example, since, though the \textit{p} of \textit{pra} is this time unchanged, the \textit{t} before it must be doubled, \textit{att pr-}; a \textit{pra} after a pause would have answered better); second, that the duplication takes place only before a consonant, \textit{urukṛd uru nāh} (ii.6.112); third, that only a consonant, not a vowel, in the defined position, is duplicated, \textit{praśgam ukthān} (iv.4.21). O. appends a new set of counter-examples, as if a part of a new exposition; namely \textit{prajananam} (i.5.91), \textit{padbhyaṁ} \textit{deva savane} (vi.1.64: an ill-chosen example, containing cases of duplication as well as of its omission), and \textit{uganā uta} (iv.1.102).

2. Likewise, according to Pāushkarasādī, a mute preceded by \textit{l} or \textit{n}.

The commentator declares that the ca, 'likewise,' in this rule brings down from the one preceding the being preceded by a vowel, and duplication. The former part of the defined implication is at least otiose, since \textit{l} and \textit{n} never occur in the Sanshitā before a mute, except as themselves preceded by a vowel: \textit{v}, indeed, is found in combination only with the nasal mutes, \textit{n} and \textit{n}; \textit{l}, in the groups \textit{lk}, \textit{lg}, \textit{lm}, \textit{lb}, \textit{lh}, \textit{lm}, and \textit{lpy}. The examples quoted are \textit{kālpāni juhoti} (v.4.85) and \textit{vibhādāvne} (iii.5.81,92: all save B. actually read this time -\textit{dāvne}, with doubled \textit{n}). According to the interpretation given to the next rule, the worthy Pāushkarasādī does not regard the duplication of the mute after the semivowel as suspending the duplication of its predecessor also, by rule 1; and he would accordingly read \textit{kālpān} and -\textit{dāvne}: and this part of his doctrine is, as we shall see, declared unapproved.

Counter-examples are given: \textit{kalyāni rūpasamrddhā} (vii.1.66: to be pronounced \textit{kālyānī}, or, by rule 21, \textit{kālyāni}) and \textit{vāyavyam} (i.8.7 et al.: to be made \textit{vāyavīyam}), to show that no other letter than a mute is thus doubled; and \textit{kāśmān chakubhiḥ} (v.7.23) and \textit{tasmād etat} (vi.3.116), instancing other consonants than \textit{l} and \textit{n}, with the following mute not doubled: in these words, the sibilant
is itself doubled (except by Hárīta, rule 18), a first mute of the same series with the nasal is inserted before the latter (rule 9), and between the two mutes a yama (xxi.12); so that we have as final result the formidable combinations śppm and ssppm.

The Rik Pr. (vi,2) also requires a double mute after l, and the Vāj. Pr. (iv,99) after any semivowel—which last is equivalent with our rule, since y is never followed by a mute.

We have a right to be surprised at the introduction of this and the rule next following before rule 4, since the duplication they teach is analogous to that after r, and of secondary importance to it.

3. According to some teachers, the mute only.

That is to say, in the combinations just treated of, the mute is duplicated, but not the preceding semivowel also; and we are to read kalopān and vibhūddānne.

According to the commentator, this rule represents the approved usage in the cākhā. It seems very strange to find such approved usage laid down in the Prātičākhyas merely as the dictum of certain authorities. But a rule (xiv,7) is given below, without any restriction, which plainly implies the validity of the present one.

4. Also a consonant that follows r.

The r itself being, by rule 15, not liable to duplication. This is the rule second in importance in the whole system, and is found in all the Prātičākhyas and in Pāṇini. The Ath. Prāt. (iii,31), the Vāj. Prāt. (iv,98), and Pāṇini (viii,4,46) ascribe the same effect to h as to r: and it is strange that our treatise, which is so liberal in its citation of discordant opinions, makes no reference to one so well supported as this. After h we find in the Sanhitā only the three nasals specified in rule xxi.14 as requiring the insertion of a nāśīkya, and the three semivowels y, r, v; r, on the other hand, forms numerous groups as first member: I have noted twenty-four of two consonants, forty-three of three consonants, and five of four consonants; a few of them are exempted from duplication by rules 16, 20–23. The cited examples are arcanty ṣkam arkināḥ (i,6,12b):

3. ekṣhām 1 mate lavakāropūra 2 sparça 3 eva dvicarṇam 2 ópnoti: anēnā 2 vadāryanena sātrāntarārambhānena ca pāūṣkharaśādīmate lavakārayoḥ ca dvicām uṣti 'ti ganyate'.

idam eva sūtram isḥṭaṁ na tu pūrvaṁ. pārvoktāṁ evo 'dāharāṇiṁ.

1 G. M. O. ins. deśrāṇāṁ. 2 B. ṛṣyaḥ ca; G. M. put after eva. 3 G. M. -papara, as also in the rule. 4 O. dvicām. 5 G. M. O. ṣādyate. 6 O. om. 7 O. sūtram. 8 O. ukt-. 
4. repahat paraham vyajananam deivarnam apadyate: yathā: aroc...; "arkey..." urg... "svarapūравađeitayor ākarshakaç cakārah. nanu" vyajjanaparavatäkarshakah kim na syāt: ne 'ti brāmah: niyamābhāvat: tathā hi: avasāne" (xiv.15) āśhmā svarapara (xiv.16) ity etannishedhadevayena repahat parasya" vyajjanasya" vyajjanaparavatlabhāve" svarapūravate" 'pi devitam asti 'ti niçeiyate"; aprasaktapratishedhānupapatteh." svarapūravatvānvađega" kim: tryambakam ity ādā na bhūt iti: kim ca: "aco rahābhhyāṁ dve iti" pānīnīyasutrenā 'pi svarapūravate saty eva" devitam vidhiyate: "tusyā" 'yan arthaḥ: aco uttarāu yāu rephakahārāu tāḥhyām uttarasya yaro dve bhavata" iti. 39

kecid evam ācūha: svarapūrvađiçabadvad repahopūrca iti väce" vāco" yuktyantaram arthāntaram samarthayati? ahar ..... ity ādāna" vāiktrarephud" uttarasya "na syād devitam" iti. tad etadadhyañanaviruddhapaddhatim adhyāste" vayam tu va-
maintain that the analogy of svarapúrve in rule 1 would require rephapúrve, 'preceded by r,' to be employed here (instead of rephát param, 'following r'), and that the difference of phraseology intimates a difference of meaning—namely, that a consonant coming after a r which is the product of euphonic alteration, as in ahar devánám ásit (i.5.92: only W. B. have ásit), is not doubled. But this, he replies, enters upon a path which is at variance with the reading of this cakkhá; and he proposes himself to set forth the true ground of the different term employed. If rephapúrve, namely, were used, the rule would be liable to the suspicion of meaning the direct opposite of its real intent, since rephapúrve admits of being understood as rephát púrve, 'preceding r.' And if it be retorted that this false implication is of no account, since the case it would involve is already provided for in the first rule of the chapter, and the present rule would be a mere useless repetition, and that the avoidance of such repetition is of itself enough to refute the implication—then the farther reply is made, that that is not sound doctrine, in view of the principle stated in the verse "non-contact with mud is far preferable to the washing of it off," and the teacher uttered the rule in its form as given, with the intent that even a particle of suspicion of wrong meaning should find occasion from it.

There is no good reason to suppose that the author of the treatise, in saying rephát param, intended to do anything more than use a lawful discretion in the selection of his phraseology. The ambiguity which the commentator ascribes to the other reading is suffered to pass in numberless other cases. The more desirable cleanliness of him who has incurred no need of ablation has been referred to once before (under iv.23), in a case somewhat similar.

dáno váco yuktantaraprayojanam : rephapúrve ity ukte viruddhavigrahena" sútrām saúdīgadhān śyāt : rephát pūrve rephapúrve iti : bhavaít esah" vighraha iti cet : adhyáyadísutrendī 'tad gatam iti" púnaruktyam asya sūtrasya "padyate : nānu púnaruktyahāyād eva viruddhavigraham nivārayāmāh" : ne 'yaṁ varālā vṛttih : prakshālanād dhi "pañkasya dārād aspaçanaṁ varam iti" nyāyād" atra viruddhaçāṅkleçō 'pi nā 'vakaçān labhatām iti váco yuktantarereṇa sútrām ācāryah provāca.

5. In place, however, of second and fourth mutes, when followed by consonants, is put the preceding mute.

That is to say, when an aspirate occurs between a preceding vowel (as the commentator specifies in his paraphrase of the rule) and a following consonant, or in such circumstances that by rule 1 it would be doubled, it receives instead an increment (āgama) of the mute next preceding it in its own series, or of its corresponding non-aspirate. Examples are vikhyāya (i.e. vikhyāya) cakshushā tevam (īv.1.23: only G. M. have the last two words) and meghyā (i.e. meghyā) vidyuto vācāh (v.2.11: only G. M. have vācāh); to which W. B. add tat savituh (i.5.64 et al.; the t is converted to th by xiv.12, and to the th is then prefixed t, making tatth savituh) and sādhyā (i.e. sādhyā) vāi devāh (vi.3.46 et al.), to show that only the aspirates are thus treated, is quoted ādyam (i.e. ādyaṃ) asyā ’nam (ii.2.56: O. omits annam); to show that a vowel must precede, vashat svadhā (vii.3.12; by v.33, t is inserted between t and s, and the inserted letter is made th by xiv.12; then, by this rule, no farther change of the th occurs, and we read vashattth, not vashattttth; W. goes so far on this road as to read vashath svadhā) and paddhyām (i.e. paddhyām, not paddhyām) dec savane (v.i.1.84)—but G. M. O, substitute for the former another similar case, vat svayamabhiṣaktīya (iii.2.81 seven times; i.e. vatth sv—; O. writes vatth sv—) to show that a consonant must follow, ukhāyāt sadane sve (iv.1.93 et al.; W. B. omit sve) and meghyāt svadhā (vii.5.114). The word tu, ‘however,’ in the rule, the commentator (with more than his usual success in dealing with this particle) explains as intimating the denial of duplication, enjoined by rule 1. He adds that some give the particle a different interpretation, as

5. deviṣyacaturthayoh' svarapūrvayor vyañjanottarayoh pūrvāgamo bhavati: yathākramena deviṣyasya prathamaḥ caturthasya trīyæh. yathā?: vi—: me—: ’tat—: sā—: deviṣyacaturthayor iti kim: ādyam—: evampūrva iti kim: vaṣṭa—: padd—: evamparayor iti kim: ukh—: megh—: prathamasūtraṇa prasaktam deviṣavamśvartayati tuṣānabdhah. anye tv anyathā manvantya: pūrvāgamasya deviṣavamśvartayati ’ti. nāi ’tati sāram: savarnasavargiyapara (xiv.23) ity uttaranishedhaḥ eva tasya tannivṛttah:

atra kecid āhuh: vyañjanaparayor iti vācyeśa vācō yuktyantarām arthāntaram sūcayati: sāṁhitāsāṁhitāsadāhāraṇam paraṇimittam uktam: tataḥ ihā ’nyātarasthā’ āgannaśmittate prāpe sāṁhitapadānāṁ nityatvāt tadgrahāṇam eva naśyam iti kṛtvā cāikṛtyavyañjanaparthe sati nāi ’tad viśhānam bhavati”:
yathā: abhy asthād ity ādi. nā ’yam pakṣaḥ: adhyayana-
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signifying that the increment-consonant is not itself to be doubled; but justly pronounces this to be inappropriate, as such duplication is forbidden by rule 23 of this chapter.

In this and the three following rules is contained, for all the cases which come within the purview of the Prātiṣṭhākhyya, the explicit prohibition of a double aspirate. Such double aspirates are, however, sometimes written by the Hindu scribes, both in situations where the authority of the phonetic treatises directly forbids them, and elsewhere. Thus, my manuscript of the Tāttvārthika-Sanhitā has, three times, dh dh instead of d dh as the result of combination of t and h (at ii.6.12\(^2\); iii.4.1\(^4\); v.3.12\(^2\)), and the Calcutta edition, so far as printed, gives, unadvisedly, the same. Both authorities agree in reading dididdhāhi at iii.1.11\(^4\). The edition, absurdly enough, gives adhaththāh at i.1.13\(^2\), where my manuscript has adhaththāh. And I find a few cases of kkkh and chch, which will be noted under rule 8, below.

As under the preceding rule, the commentator here also enters into a tedious and useless discussion of a verbal question; namely, why ‘followed by consonants’ is represented by vyañjanottarayoh instead of vyañjanaparayoh. Some, he says, have maintained that a difference of meaning is intended by the difference of phraseology; that it is desired, namely, to except cases like abhy ashtāt (iv.2.8\(^1\)), where the following consonant is the product of euphonic alteration. The ground alleged for this claim is not entirely clear to me: it seems to be that a specified following cause (one that produces an effect in something that precedes it) is common to the sanhitā-text and that which is not sanhitā; hence, a cause of increment occurring in either kind of text being in question, a citation of words from outside the sanhitā is alone suitable, on account of their constancy—that is, abhi: ashtāt not being citable as an example under the rule in its pada-form, it must not be so treated in its sanhitā-form, as well. But the claim is disallowed, as being opposed to the actual reading, and also to the fundamental

virodhān mālasātravirodhān ca: tathā hi: mālasātra svapapravatve vyañjanaparavatve ca sati vihitān dvaśtavan utra nishpādyate\(^3\): na tu\(^2\) tatra vyañjanam vijeshhitam: tadapavādakavād utra\(^3\) 'pi tadvīgnesha vaktum ayuktah\(^3\). gikshādiparikshanād\(^3\) adhyayanānurodhāca va vācō yāktantarāpihāpyo śmāhīr abhīdhīyate\(^3\). apavādyāpavādakayor\(^3\) anayor \(nīyami nā'asti: kim iti.\) svapapravatvate sati vyañjanaparam eva vyañjanam\(^3\) dvitvam\(^3\) bhajate: \(dviṭiyacaturthau ca\) vyañjanaparāv eva pārvagam\(^3\) bhajata iti: kim tu prācuryāpihāpye 'dān śūtravayaṃ pravṛttam. katham niyamābhāvah: anyathā\(^3\) kutācita kāryadevadāncanāt. \(nītā: \) annapata ityādāu dvitvam: pra:...: adāhi... ityādāu pārvagamah: tān hasta ity utra tu\(^3\) prāptān satyām api ne 'dam kāryam drṣyata iti ca\(^3\) niyamābhāvah. gikshā cāi 'vaṃ vakshyati:
rule. For the intent is to cast out or deny a duplication established by the fundamental rule (xiv.1), where the being preceded by a vowel and followed by a consonant was implied; and there no limitation was laid down for the following consonant; hence, it is improper to lay one down here, where an exception is prescribed.

The commentator then goes on to say that he will set forth the real intent of the difference of phraseology, with due regard to the Čikṣā, and in accordance with the accepted reading of the text. But I am compelled to confess myself incapable of extracting a satisfactory meaning from his exposition and argument. The point of it is an asserted absence of niyama in the two rules (1 and 5), as of one suffering and the other prescribing exception. Niyama, ‘obligatory force,’ appears to signify here joint application, and so a mutual or reciprocal influence. When a vowel precedes, he continues, a consonant is doubled only when followed by a consonant; and second and fourth mutes take increment of the mute that stands before them in the alphabet only when followed by a consonant. But the pair of rules in question is constructed with the intent of multiplicity (‘diversity’ or ‘independence?’ prācurya is not found elsewhere). How does an absence of niyama appear? Why, from the fact that otherwise a twofold effect would in some cases come to light. In attā hāvīnśhi (ii.6.12) and in annapate (iv.2.3 et al.), and so on, there is duplication; in prachac chandah (iv.3.12: G. M. have instead acchāvākah, the reference for which I have failed to note) and addhi tvam déva prayatā (ii.6.12: G. M. O. omit prayatā), and so on, there is increment of a preceding mute; but in tāṁ haste (vi.1.37: W. has tāṁs te [iv.1.16]), but doubtless by accidental omission of ha), even though it falls under the rule, the same effect is not seen: hence, there is

svarātā pārvasya varṇasya kvacid deveśāṁ ca kathyate:
na ca varga-devitīyasya na caturthe kāde ca cana.
vākyāyuñā ca vacanam etadvidvaddhiḥ:
kutracit svarayor madhye deveśāṁ lakyhanusūrataḥ:
pārvāgasmas tathā tatra jñeyo varnavicakshanāḥ.
“evanāmam aniyamam sūcyitum vyañjanottarayor ity antar-
rasvikārah”

vyañjanam uttarāṁ yābyāṁ tāṁ vyañjanottarāṁ: tayoḥ.

1 G. M. O. put next before pārvasya. O. adding tvam. 2 G. M. O. et al. 4 G. M. O. sravapsyāt. 6 G. M. vyañjanottarayor. 8 B. uttaratmā; G. M. uttaratmā. 10 G. M. O. tvam. 12 G. M. O. add tvam. 14 G. M. O. sarvātmā. 16 G. M. O. tattvam. 18 G. M. O. et al. 20 G. M. O. add tvam. 22 G. M. O. add tvam. 24 G. M. O. add tvam. 26 G. M. O. sarvātmā. 28 G. M. O. uttaratmā. 30 G. M. O. adhyātma. 32 G. M. O. māma. 34 G. M. O. māma. 36 G. M. O. sarvātmā. 38 G. M. O. uttaratmā. 40 G. M. O. adhyātma. 42 G. M. O. adhyātma.
absence of niyama. The examples here furnished, which ought to
give us the clue to the commentator's meaning, seem to leave us
wholly in the dark, since not one of them falls under either of the
rules in question: the first, second, and fourth are by rule 23,
below, exempt from duplication; the third is a case under rule 8;
and the combination ṅḥ is (see under rule 15) treated as a simple
h. Next, the Čikṣāḥ is quoted, to the effect that "in some cases,
also, duplication of the first consonant of a group after a vowel is
prescribed; not, however, of a second mute, nor of a fourth, under
any circumstances:" and, by those versed in the subject, the state-
ment is explained [in conformity with what follows]: "in some
cases, there is duplication of a consonant between two vowels, in
accordance with rule; so there also is to be understood prefxion
of the preceding mute, by those skilled in alphabetic sounds" (in
the known Čikṣāḥ, it may be remarked, no such verses as these are
to be found). And the final conclusion is, that the different term
in vyājanottarayoh is intended to signify an absence of niyama
of this sort. That is to say, perhaps, the real independence of the
two rules is intimated by the choice of a different term in express-
ing the common factor which they contain.

रेफ्यूर्व्योध्य नित्यम् || ५ ||

6. As also, in all cases, when they follow r.

This, it is pointed out, has the value of an exception under rule
4. The dual number of rephapūrvayoh shows that the pair,"second and fourth mutes," spoken of just above, is intended.
"Also" (ca) implies the increment by prefxion of the next preced-
ing mute. And the meaning is, that second and fourth mutes,
with the limitations prescribed, as preceded by r, take always their
respective predecessors as increment. Thus, ārdhevo (i.e. ārdhevo)
bhava (i.2.142), and ārdhyavāhī (i.e. ārdhyavāhī) prānah (vi.5.22:
only G. M. have prānah). Nityam, 'in all cases,' implies that the
increment is made after r when the mute to be increased is followed
by a vowel also (not alone when it is vyājanottaru, as specified in
rule 5). Thus, in artheta (i.e. ārth-) athā 'pāṃ (i.8.11: only B.
has apām), mārkhaṃ (i.e. mārkhaṃ) tajjaghamyām (vi.1.64),
and goartham (i.e. goarthham) eva (vi.1.101).

लक्षापूर्वः छ || ७ ||

6. rephāt paraḥ ca (xiv.4) ity asiṇā pavādakam etat; dvipa-
vacanena dvitīyacaturthān gṛhyete: savashešanayoḥ rephapūr-
vayor anayor nityam pārṇaṃ gamo bhavati: āgamānvedeśakāc
cakāraḥ. yathā: ārdh-. . . . ardh-. . . . nityam iti kim:
svaparate 'pi bhavate etad iti: arthe-. . . . mārkhaṃ-. . . .
go-. . . .

1 W. avat. 2 W. B. navt.; G. M. O. -ṣaṇḍu. 3 O. tayor. 4 O. vyot. 5 in G.
M. only. 6 G. M. -cy.
7. And when \( l \) precedes.

The \( ca \), 'and,' here brings down from rule 5 only the fourth mute [the last of the two there mentioned] and the increment. The second mute is not also included, because (see note to rule 2) no second mute occurs after \( l \) in the Sanhitā. The examples are \( pragalbho \) (i.e. \( -galbho \)), 'sya jáyate' (ii.5.53; only G. M. have jáyate) and \( nama madhyāmāya ca \) 'pagalbhāyā' (i.e. \( -galbho \)) ca (iv.5.61)—but, in place of the latter, G. M. give \( apagalbho \) jáyate (ii.5.53: O. reads \( agyaylāya \) simply, which doubtless means the first word of this).

As was remarked above (under rule 3), the laying down of the present precept without any limitation appears to confirm the commentator's interpretation of rules 2 and 3, as teaching the accepted doctrine of the \( cākha \). It would, to be sure, be not impossible to understand \( lbbh \) for \( lbb \) as required here, without any reference to the other groups—\( lk, ly \) etc.—in which the duplication after \( l \) depends upon the earlier rules; but that seems quite unlikely.

8. Also the preceding mute is inserted before \( ch, khi, \) and \( bhūja, \) when these follow either a preposition, \( pātha esah, \) \( atī, \) \( dhāma, \) \( parama, \) or \( bhūte. \)

The examples after a preposition (in which situation alone the increment of \( khi \) and \( bhūja \) is made) are first given by the commentator: they are \( ā cehnattī \) (v.1.74: the preceding word, \( andechnānam, \) might well have been included, as an additional instance; my MS. has simple \( ch \) in both cases); \( nama ākkhidate ca prakkhidate ca \) (iv.5.92: G. M. omit the first word, G. M. O. the last two); \( ayakshmayā paribhujā \) (iv.5.14), with \( vihū ca me prabhū ca me \) (iv.7.412: O. stops at the first \( me \)) as counter-example, to show the necessity of saying \( bhūja, \) instead of \( bhū \) simply, in the rule; and \( yā ca vicchandāh \) (v.2.111). Then follow counter-examples: first, to show that \( kh \) is increased only when followed by \( i, nikhātam manushyānām \) (vi.3.46) and \( datso adhi khādati \) (vi.2.114: only G. M. have \( datse \)); next, to show that the increment takes place only after a preposition, \( sachandā yā \) (v.2.111). The examples after the remaining words, as particularly specified in the rule, are \( priyam apy etu pāthah : esha cāghayah \) (iv.6.81: only O. has \( priyam), \) with \( rthubhīr vā esha chandobhīha \) (vi.5.152), to prove the need of quoting \( pāthah \) along with \( esha \) in the rule; aticchan-

---

7. cakāra ca caturthāgamayor' ákarshakaḥ: caturthasparce la-
kārapūrce sati pārvagamo bhavati. prag......: namo...... la-
kāraḥ pārvo yasmād asāvā la-kārapūrveḥ: tasmin.

1 G. M. -yan. 2 G. M. -the sp- 3 G. M. O. sa.
dasam upa dadháti (v.3.8), savitra áticchandasáya (vii.5.14), dhámacchád éva khálu vái (ii.4.1022: B. O. omit vái), paramacchádá vare (iv.6.21), and yad bháteccadáh sámáni (vii.5.94).

Further examples of the increment of ch, falling under this rule, are ácchád and prácchád (at iv.3.1233) and áccháttá (i.1.21): if there are others, I have omitted to note them. The usage in the manuscripts, of our commentary and of the Sanhitá, is quite irregular, varying between ch simply, cch, and chch, without much regard to whether the case is one to which this rule applies or not. I have collected the cases in which my manuscript of the Sanhitá has chch: they are dhámacchád (ii.4.1022; but dhámacchád in the same division), prácchách chandáh (iv.3.123), and áyachchábháh (iv.5.33); and, in the combination of separate words (besides the case just quoted), ácchách chandáh (iv.3.123), kakuch chandáh (iii.1.63), and yach chreshtáh (iii.4.81). In every one of these instances, the Calcutta edition, so far as it yet reaches, reads correctly cch.

I have found no other cases of the increment of khi under the rule; but my manuscript has (without authority) udákkháhidat (ii.1.14.5), sam ákkháhidat (vi.6.111), and ákkháhidráh (iii.5.8), while (along with the MSS. of the comment) it reads kkh instead of kkh in the example (iv.5.92) cited above. The edition reads kkh at ii.1.14.5, remarking at the latter place that its manuscript authorities have kkh. Of course, the doubled aspirate is to be rejected, here as elsewhere, in obedience to sound phonetic theory as well as to the concordant authority of the Prátiśikhyas.

प्रथमोपादेशम्: परः प्रथमो जभिनिधान यथार्थात्मक साध्यां: || 1 2 ||

9. After a surd spirant followed by a mute is inserted a first mute of the same position with the latter, as abhinídhána.

The surd spirants are (see i.9,12,13) five, namely χ (jihvamúliya), g, sh, s, and φ (upadhmániya). The rule is to be paralleled with those in the Váj. Pr. (iv.99,100), which direct that a mute be doubled after a spirant, and after jihvamúliya and upadhmániya (which in that treatise are not reckoned as spirants); also with

8. upasargapávreshu pátha... evampávreshu ca śatsu cha khi bhujé 'ty etešu pārvágam bhavati'. cakára ágamáno déeyakah. yathā: a...; nam...; ayak...; je 'ti kim: vishu...; yā...; 'khi 'ti kim: nik...; datsv...; upasargá... iti kim: sa...; etany upasargapávrayáni. anyámya ' uvyante: priyam...; pátha iti kim: rtubhir...; ati...; savitra...; dháma...; parama...; yad...
that in the Rik Pr. (vi.2) which allows, but does not require, duplication of a mute after the spirants (namely ə, sh, s, h, z, ṣ). The Ath. Pr. (unless such a precept is lost by the lacuna occurring in the treatment of this subject: see note to Ath. Pr. iii. 28) and Pāṇini have nothing similar. Our rule, however, is quite alone so far as the treatment of a nasal after a spirant is concerned, making an insertion of a surd non-aspirate, instead of a nasal: and, as will be seen, the next rule quotes an opinion which would bring the Tāttviriya usage more nearly into accordance with that of the Rik and Vājasaneyi Sanhitās; but the commentator pronounces that opinion unapproved.

The examples quoted are as follows: yah kāmāyeta (i.e. yah kkām:- ii.1.2a et al.); aṣauām (i.e. aṣauām, or, after all rules are applied, aṣauāppam) āṣhām (iv.6.11: O. omits the example and puts here, instead of below, that for ṣ); grishme (i.e. grishyme or grishshyame) madhyandine (ii.1.2a); ayaśmayaṃ (i.e. ayaśpāyaṃ or ayaśppāyaṃ) vi cṛtā bandhām (iv.2.53: only W. has bandhām); yah pāṃpamā (i.e. yah ppā:- ii.3.132): O. adds to this last tasmā (vii.1.5 et al.): to be treated like ayaśmayaṃ, above, and, after madhyandine, prāśnāttā (prāṣṭṭātā: I have overlooked this citation in searching out the references). As counter-examples, we have first gorady aparāhine (ii.1.25: but O. substitutes bhavavādino vodanti, i.7.14 et al.), to show that the sonant spirant, h, does not require a like insertion (the case is one of nāsikya, xxii. 14); then ruknam upa dādhātī (v.2.71-2; the case is one for yama, xxii.12), to show that a mute receives the increment only after a spirant; and lastly ishvā ca vajreṇa ca (v.7.31), to show that a mute only is increased after a spirant. For the second of these counter-examples, O. substitutes two of the same character, namely yam apanvāṇaḥ (i.5.51) and sa praṭnavat (ii.2.121 et al.); for the last, it gives (in a passage which has strayed out of place, and got inserted near the end of the comment to rule 10) agraḷe svāḥā (i.1.22 aug et al.).

In all these combinations, ə and ṣ are exempt from duplication by xiv.15, but the sibilants are doubled, except as some authorities (xiv.17.18) would leave them unchanged.

9. sparṣaparād aghoshād uśmanāḥ parah prathamaḥ āgamasyatasya sparṣasya sasthānāḥ samānāsthaḥ bhinvhi bhavati. abhinidhāyataḥ ity abhinidhānāḥ: āropanīya ity arthah: "vedāntare tasyāh bhavād atrā "ropanīyatvam. yathā: yah...... "aṣm...... grish...... ayaṃ...... yah...... aghoshād iti kim: gorady iti kim: "ruknam...... sparṣa-parād iti kim: ishvā.......

śūtram idam eva 'sṛṣṭam: na tatparavayam.18

1 G. M. om. 2 B. O. praṭham. 3 G. M. -mo bhavati. 4 B. om. 5 W. O. -dha- yata; B. -niyata. 6 G. M. vedāntarasya; O. -reṇa tad a. 7 G. M. O. om. 8 O. om. 9 O. yam apaṇvāṇaḥ: sa praṇavat, and om. all that follows (but see various readings to next rule). 10 G. M. tu par.
The commentator illustrates with groups of two consonants only (of which the Sanhitā presents twenty-three that would come under the action of the rule); the question arises, then, whether in groups of three or more consonants (of which there are over fifty)—where the mute is followed by another consonant (as zkl, cm, sly, std, sry, sgr), or where the spirant stands second (as rcm, kshn, rshn, tsk, tshpy), or where each is the case (as tstr, tstr, ntsr), or where there are two spirants followed by mutes in the same group (as zkshn)—the rule is to be relentlessly applied. It can admit of little doubt that the sequence of another consonant would not affect the case; whether a preceding consonant would do so is more doubtful. Such resultant groups as nthstr, tthshpy, kkhshthy, and zkhs-shthn, have a tolerably frightful appearance; but whether they would stagger the heroic soul of a Hindu pākhin, is another matter.

To the inserted mute is applied the name abhinidāhāna, which the commentator explains by abhinidhiyate, ‘it is set down against,’ giving as its synonym dhrāpanīya, (I presume, simply) ‘to be inserted,’ and adding the remark, “owing to the absence of this in any other Veda, there is here insertibility” (?). He takes no notice of the doctrine of abhinidāhāna as a peculiar and imperfect utterance of certain letters in certain situations, which plays so formidable a part in the phonetic systems of the Rik and Ath. Prātiṣṭhakhyas (see especially the note to Ath. Pr. i.43): we, however, bearing that doctrine in mind, may conjecture with plausibility that the word here not merely signifies an insertion, but designates also a peculiar quality of the inserted letter.

10. According to Plākshi, when the following mute is surd.

That is to say, not when it is a nasal: Plākshi would ratify zkk, zkh, shth, shth, and so on, but would make no insertion in cm, shn, and their like. This, as was remarked under the last rule, would correspond more nearly with the teachings of the Rik and Vāj. Prātiṣṭhakhyas. The commentator illustrates with nishkevalyam (iv.4.22), yaḥ kāmayeta (ii.1.23 et al.), pascēt prācīm (v.3.73): B. reads prācī, which is found in the same division; W. has prānuac, which does not occur in the Sanhitā after pascēt, nish tapām (i.1.101), dośhavastah (i.2.144 et al.), yaḥ ātmamā (ii.3.

10. aghosha eva sparṣer pare saty aghoshād uśmananah prathamāgama bhavati: Plākshiḥ pakshah. yathā: nish-.... yah.... paco-.... nish.... aksh.... dosh-.... yah.... āsp-.... aghosha eva’ ti kim: kā ṣmān....

1 O. ins. plāksihē pakshino mate. 2 W. B. G. M. -pr. O. -pr ‘pi. @ O. prathamo bhindināno. 3 G. M. ins. parah. @ O. om. 4 G. M. O. om.; W. puts out of place, before aksh. @ O. G. M. om. 5 O. substitutes eva-candra..... sparṣaparav iṣh kim: aṣṣ....... sūram idam eva’sthaiva na tu paridevayam. 95. aghosha eva sparṣapariphramā yaḥ chaḥvasūdūm: nāc cid ati: vyātraṃ; ṛhaspatiṣūrapate. 6 O. adds abhinidhānaniyamā nā sī.
13), and ṣṭātraṇa juhār devānām (ii.5.9): G. M. have only the first word. All these are examples quite needless to be given, as they are read by Plākshi precisely as prescribed by the preceding rule. Counter-examples, exhibiting his discordant view, are kācmaṇ chakabhiḥ (v.7.23: W. G. M. have kācmaṇ only, and B. reads kācmaṇāṇi, which I have not found in the Śanhitā, although kācmaṇāṇa occurs in the Tāttī. Áranyaka, at ii.7.8) and akṣhnyā vyāghārayati (v.2.7ś et al.: given only by W. B., and introduced out of place, between nish ṭāpāmi and doshāvatoh, above).

O, follows an independent course in the interpretation and illustration of this rule. It calls the insertion an abhinidhāna (though adding at the end “there is no obligation of abhinidhāna”) and, for the examples yah kāmayaṇa to ṣṭātraṇa, it substitutes suṣcandra dasma vācpatē havyavāt (iv.4.4ś: the MS. omits dasma), yaṣ chandasāṃ (the thing nearest to this that I have found in the text is prajāpati chandasām, iii.3.7ś), naṣ cid atī (this I have overlooked in searching out the references), syātraṇa (doubtless meant for ṣṭātraṇa), and brhaspatisūrapate (probably brhaspatisutasye, i.4.27).

The present precept was pronounced unapproved in the comment to rule 9.

उत्तमपरात् प्रानायणाय ॥ ११ ॥

11. But according to Plākshāyaṇa, on the contrary, when the following mute is a nasal.

This can only mean to teach the precise opposite of the preceding rule; or, that there is no insertion when a surd mute follows the spirant, but only when a nasal follows. And it is first so explained by the commentator, who gives as examples akṣhnyā vyāghārayati (v.2.7ś et al.), açñāti (i.6.7ś et al.), and tirtthe śnāti

11. "plākshāyaṇasya tu paksa uttamanaparād aghoshād uṣmānah parah prathamāgamo bhavati. yathā: akṣhā... açnāti: tirtthe... uttamanaparād iti kim: nish...: 'yah k...': 'yah p...': paṣcāt. tuṣadbād plākṣheḥ paksham praśhipati?"

kecid evam ucāḥ: aghoshatvam uṣmānas tuṣadbādo nivartayati "tī. tatrā 'yaṁ sūtrārthaḥ: uttamanaparāt tu' ghoshavata' uṣmānah parah prathamāgamo bhavati. aṁāṇi...: gāradya...: brahma... ghoṣavata: iti kim: açmā...: grish...: ayas...".

1) G. M. om. 2) G. M. om. 3) B. om. 4) G. M. om. 5) W. apakshiyatī; B. kshiyatī. 6) G. M. om. 7) in W. only. 8) G. M. ghoshād. 9) G. M. agh.

O, substitutes for the whole comment aghoshaprakṛtya tuṣadbād nivartayā: plākshāyaṇasya pāchāno māte aghoshād uṣmānah uttamanaparparāt: sushoḥapraṣahmāgamo bhavati: akṣh...: grī...: açnāti: ayas...".
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12. A first mute followed by a spirant is changed into its corresponding aspirate.

Literally, examples given are as follows: visrpo virapçin (i.e. viraphçin; or, by xiv.i, virappheçin) udádaya (i.1.9\(^2\): only O. has the first word, and it omits the last; W. reads váratriedáya, which is evidently merely a corruption); tat shodagy (i.e. -th sh-) abhavat (vi.6.11\(^1\): only G. M. have abhavat); pratyañ somah (i.8.21: i.e. pratyañkh s- by v.32; then pratyañkh s-); and tat (i.e. tatth)

12. uśhmaparaḥ prathama spargah\(^1\) svargiyāṁ dvitiyam ápadyate. vis- s...: tat...: praty- s...: tat... 'prathama iti kim: 'tāh...': uśhmapara iti kim': vāk...: 'arvāg... ity atra prathamapárvo hakāraḥ caturtham tasya satsthānam (v.38) iti hakārasya caturthopattīr viçeśhavihitavatvāt: tatas tṛtiyān svargahoshavatparas (viii.3) tṛtiyatvam.

idām eva sūtram ishtam. uśhna paro yasmdā asāv\(^3\) uśhmaparaḥ.

\(^1\) O. átma. \(^2\) O. om. \(^3\) W. B. om. \(^4\) in O. only. \(^5\) G. M. sa.
savituḥ (i.5.6* et al.). As counter-examples, we have tāḥ (i. e. tās, ix.2) saśrohah (v.3.63*: omitted by O.; dropped out in W. B.) and vāk ta ā pāy yatām (i.3.91*: only O. has the last two words), in which no aspiration takes place.

A possible difficulty in the application of this rule is noticed and removed by O. alone. Such a case as arvāk : hi : enam : parāh (vi.3.31*) might seem to fall under its action, the spirant h following a surd mute. But it is pointed out that, in virtue of v.38, h becomes a fourth mute by special prescription; and hence that rule viii.3 alone applies to the preceding surd, changing it to a sonant.

The place of introduction of this precept and the following—coming in, as they do, right in the midst of the rules respecting duplication, with which they stand in no relation—is quite surprising and objectionable. The commentator, however, passes the matter without notice.

I have not noted any case in which my manuscript of the Sanshitā attempts the aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, as here required. The manuscripts of the commentary, however, which almost never heed the rules for duplication, even in illustrating those rules themselves, often (as we have repeatedly had occasion to notice) observe this one in their citations, although they yet more often neglect it (thus, in the examples here given, G. M. O. aspirate the mutes, and W. B. leave them unchanged). Being taught in company with the duplication, as part of the varna-krama, it has no claim to be taken account of in the construction of an ordinary Tāttiriya text. Respecting the teachings of the other Prātiṣākhya upon the subject, see the note to Āth. Pr. ii.6.

13. According to Bādabhikāra, when the following spirant is not of the same position with it.

Rule ii.44 teaches the accordance of the several (surd) spirants, in their order, with the series of mutes, in point of position—more literally, of place of production.

T. calls the individual here referred to Bādavikāra, and W. O. have in the rule vādabhikāra, but in the comment bādabh-; the rest have uniformly b as initial letter, which I have therefore adopted, as being decidedly better supported than v. Weber gives the two forms vādabh- (V. Pr. p. 250) and vātabh- (ib., p. 78).


* O. ins. rakhino. 3 G. M. O. om. (and begin the next word as-). 2 O. om. 6 O. om. 4 B. om. 8 O. ins. idarūrdhūṁ sūtraṁ yāṁ sakāraḥ.
The commentary (except in O.) is at the pains to repeat a couple of the examples of aspiration already given, namely visrpo virapgin (i.1.9): W. omits visrpo) and tat shodagi (vi.6.11): and it adds, in illustration of the peculiar view of the quoted authority, tat savituh (i.5.64 et al.), where the dental mute, being followed by the dental sibilant, remains unchanged.

This rule is pronounced unapproved.


A heading, introducing the detail of exceptions to the rules as already given, and continuing in force through rule 28.

15. A consonant before a pause is not doubled; nor r, visarjaniya, jihvamulya, or upadhmaniya.

As example of a consonant before a pause, is given urk (iv.7.41 et al.: W. has instead so 'rkah [v.4.3a], but it is not an illustration of the rule, and is evidently here only a corrupted reading of urk), of which the k would otherwise be doubled by xiv.4. Of course, it is only a final after r that would fall under the rules of duplication before a pause. The text affords, I believe, no instance of a consonant occurring in this position in samhitâ, but such words as urk and amart (vii.1.12 et al.) need to have their reading in the other forms of text determined by a rule like this. The commentator quotes urk ca (i.e. urkk ca) me sunrtâ ca me (iv.7.41: B. omits the last two words, G. M. O. the last three), as showing that the k is doubled when in sandhi with a following letter. To illustrate the exemption from duplication of the other letters specified, are given ná "rtim á rchati (ii.2.47), manah kshemé (v.2.17), yah (i.e. yas) kámayeta (ii.1.2 et al.), and yah (i.e. yas) pâymaná (ii.3.132). According to the approved usage of this våkhã (see ix. 2.3), visarjaniya comes within the ken of this rule only when it

14. athe 'ty ayaṃ adhikāraḥ: 'uktasya dvītvavidheryaḥ yathā-
sambhavām nishedho 'dhikriyata ity 'etad adhikrtaṃ vedita-
vyan ita 'uttaram yad vakshyāmah.

15. padāvāsāno vartamāno varño 'repho visarjaniyo jihvāmūl-
lya upadhmāniya cē 'ty ete varṇā dvītvāṃ nā 'padyante:
urk: reproḥat param ca (xiv.4) iti prāptih. avasānavaeacanām
virāmabhikāpayam: tasmān na samadhāne nishedhah: yathā:
urk ca..... nā..... man..... yah..... yah.....: svara-
pārvam (xiv.1) ity anenāi 'shām prāptih.
precedes kṣh, since elsewhere it can stand only in pāusa. Jihvāmūla occurs (by the conversion of final h according to ix.2) in the groups zk, zkl, zkr, zks, zksa, zksa, and zk; upadānāniya, in like manner, in q̣p, q̣py, q̣pr, q̣pl, and q̣ph: the combinations of r have been enumerated above (under rule 4).

The other Prātiçākyas have rules equivalent with this, into the variety of expression of which we do not need to enter.

It is to be accounted as a reprehensible omission on the part of our treatise, that it gives no direction as to the treatment of a group beginning with anusvāra. The Vāj. Prāt. (iv.107) expressly exempts anusvāra from duplication; and, in the Rik Prāt., in the fundamental rule (vi.1), anusvāra is ruled out of account in the estimation of consonant groups, it being taught that a consonant is doubled after it in the same manner as after a vowel. There is no good reason to doubt that the same is to be understood as the doctrine of the present work, and that it would have anusvāra, so far as duplication is concerned, deemed and taken as merely an affection of the vowel to which it is attached. That this is not explicitly stated, stands in connection with the equivocal position of the Tātt. Prāt. in reference to the nature of anusvāra (see p. 68): according to the view taken at the beginning of the next chapter (xv.1), rules respecting it are no more required than in the Ath. Prāt., where they are equally wanting.

The commentator notices that some would read the rule now under discussion as two, cutting off avasānē from the rest; and for the reason that otherwise, as the rule stands, it seems natural to understand that "r, h, z, and q, when standing before a pause," are not doubled; as a similar construction was made in rule 10 of the fifth chapter. But he denies the validity of the objection, since duplication of r and the rest before a pause is not in the remotest

'Avasāna iti: caturmān varṇānām prthag eva sūtraṁ kācid ācch: ekikaranē doșhadarçanāt: asthu doșha: avasāne var- sumānā reñcaisarjanīyadāya1 ity avayaśampādanam2: avagraha ācch dhā̤ḥ svar (v.10) itivad iti cet: nāi'sha doșha: ravisarjanīyādinām padāvasāne "deitecprāptir" dūrotsārite" ti ne 'yam atraṣeṇa 'stī: avasāṇepthakkaranē satyāv asāne1 kiṃ va bhavati 'ti sāikūkṣhatayā2 vacanam anarthaś kaṃ3 syāt: ekikaranē tu ravisarjanīyetivarṇasāhācoryād7: avasāne varsumāno varṇa iti4 labhyate: tasmat ekikaranam eva

1 W. B. yad-. 2 G. B. combine, as in rule. 3 O. om. ca. 4 G. M. -dyaun-. 5 G. M. -āva iti-. 6 O. om. 7 G. M. kācid idaṁ sutraṁ prthag evo "cah: avasāna iti ca: ravisarjanīyośvādāntiçāmuñcapadāmānā labhyate: kathāṃ prthakkaranam. 8 W. caturvarṇāh; B. om. vṛṇādām. 9 W. corrupt. 10 G. M. O. ko 'siv. 11 G. M. O. ravi-. 12 B. -nia. 13 G. M. avayaś sampādanam; O. avaya deitaś samp. 14 O. om. 15 O avasāne prthikkaranāthale vis-. 16 B. om. 17 W. raphoprapṭik. 18 W. tatā-. O. durañ-. 19 G. M. kiṃ cit; O. kiṃ ca. 20 G. M. O. prth-. 21 W. sti; G. M. nāti. 22 G. M. -kāthi tathā; O. -kāthāyā. 23 B. arth-. 24 W. savis--; B. vis--; O. om. vṛṇa-. 25 O. om.
manner suggested by the rules (literally, 'is expelled to a distance'), and consequently cannot be suspected of being taught here. If, on the other hand, avasāne, 'before a pause,' were set by itself, the inquiry would be "what under the sun is it that happens before a pause?" and the expression would appear meaningless. When, however, it is combined with the names of letters that follow, we naturally infer from the association that 'a letter in pause' is intended. Hence, the inclusion of the two precepts in one rule is alone to be approved.

This defense of the unity of the rule is evidently of the most trifling and futile character, and the objectors are in the right—not, indeed, as the separation into two rules is absolutely necessary, but as it is decidedly preferable, and more in accordance with the general usage of the treatise elsewhere.

16. Nor a spirant, when followed by a vowel.

It is only, of course, after r (xiv.4) that a spirant can be liable to duplication before a vowel, so that the combinations to which the rule applies are rg, rsh, rs, and rh. All the other treatises excepting the Vāj. Prāt. have the same rule (R. Pr. vi.2; A. Pr. iii.32; Pān. viii.4.49).

The commentator's examples are dārçapūrnamāsātu (ii.3.54 et al.), varṣābhāhyah (vii.4.13: I presume; my MS. of the Sanhitā has varṣṇābhāhyah twice instead of varṣābhāhyah and varṣābhāhyah; O. gives instead suvarṣām, iv.4.44), barsam nabhati (ii.5.1-2), and barhishā (i.7.41 et al.: G. M. have instead bārhisā 'ham, also i.7.41). To illustrate the limitation to a spirant, he gives ebhir no arkahā (i.e. arkahā; iv.4.47: O. omits); to show that a vowel must follow, pārce (i.e. pārcce; vii.3.10), varṣābhāhyah svāhā (i.e. varṣṣhā; vii.4.13: G. M. omit svāhā), barsvebhīh (i.e. barsve; v.7.11), and agnir hy asya (i.e. hhy; v.1.5)—but O. has a different series, namely dāryanv yajñam (iii.2.29), varṣyebhīh (the MS. has varṣhebhīh; I have not succeeded in finding either word in the Sanhitā), and agnir hy etat purisham (vi.2.8).

The combinations in which the spirant after r is doubled, being followed by another consonant, are rgm, rgy, rgyv, rsh, rshn, rshn, rshy, rsv, and rhy. To complete the sandhi, either with or without duplication, the rules for insertion of svarabhakti (xxi.15,16) have to be further applied.

---

16. svarapara āshmā dvitvaun nā "padyate, svarah paro yasmād asāu svaraparaḥ. yathā: darp..... varsh..... barsam..... barh..... "yepaḥ tato param ca (xiv.4) iti prāptih. āshme 'tī kim: ebhir....." svarapara itī kim: "pārce: varsh..... barsvebhīh: agnir....."

1 G. M. O. om. 2 O. om. 3 O. dā..... varshvebhīh: agner.....
17. Or, according to Plākshi and Plākshāyana, when followed by a first mute.

That is to say, these two ā̄k̄hināw would leave a spirant free from duplication before an unaspirated surd mute, contrary to the first rule of the chapter. The groups which would be thus affected are ṣc and ṣe, ṣp, ṣhk and ṣhky and ṣhkr, st and its further combinations (ṣṭy, ṣṭr, ṣṭv), ṣhp, ṣk, ṣt and its further combinations (ṣtm, ṣty, ṣtr and ṣtṛ, ṣto), and ṣp. One hardly sees why combinations with a second mute (namely ṃc and ṃe, ṃkh, ṃkh and ṃshy, ṃst and ṃṣnm, ṃph and ṃphy) should not be subject to the same rule—but then, one must not expect to see the reason of anything whatever, general rule or particular exception, in this doctrine of duplications. It may be made a question whether the single case, rṣht, falling under rule 4 is not also here aimed at; if the pair of kinsmen did not overlook it, it is doubtless included with the rest.

The examples (which are lost in W.) are succa[d]ra dasma (iv. 4.16: O. omits dasma) and ashtau kṛtvāḥ (vi.4.51); a counter-example, with a last mute after the spirant, is tasmād evām viduṣhā (vi.4.92: O. omits viduṣhā); but O. has, with B., omitted to point out that this is a counter-example, and gives further, as such, ishvā ca vajrēṇa (v.7.31).

The commentator then goes on to say that although the word ca, ‘or,’ in the rule brings down by implication a spirant pure and simple (without exclusion of any sound belonging to that class), yet the real application is only to ṣ, ṣh, s, and ḥ, since otherwise the mention of ḷ and ṗ in rule 15 would be without meaning, their exception being assured by the present precept. The interpretation is doubtless true, but the reason given for it is only acceptable on the supposition that what is here put forward as the view of two individual authorities is in fact the accepted doctrine of the Prātiṣṭhākyā; in any other case, there is no inconsistency or interference between rules 15 and 17, and the commentator should rather have said that, as the pair of dissonants doubtless accepted


1 O. om. 2 W. om. 3 B. O. om. 4 O. ins. prathamapar[ā iti kim: ishvā... 5 G. M. O. om. 6 W. om. 7 G. M. īṣhmāk. 8 W. O. hi. 9 G. M. om. 10 W. O. om. 11 O. ins. shāt. 12 W. O. -shēlīkē s.
rule 15, it was not necessary to regard the present statement of their views as having any reference to \( \chi \) and \( \varphi \). That the rule is accepted in the \( \text{cikhi} \) represented by the commentator may be inferred also from the fact that (under rule 22) he pronounces the five that follow unapproved, but says nothing of this.

\[ \text{Cikhi} \text{ in } \text{Sanskrit} \quad \text{18} \]

18. According to Hārita, a surd spirant is not doubled.

There is unusual variety and inaccuracy of reading among the different manuscripts of the commentary of this rule, and O. goes off upon a course of its own: yet the aim of all is the same, and not difficult to discover. The word \( \text{āshmā} \) (which was present or implied in the two preceding rules, and therefore might naturally enough come down into this by continued implication) is here expressly repeated, for the purpose of breaking connection with what goes before. If \( \text{aghosh} \), 'surd,' only were specified, and \( \text{āshmā} \), 'spirant,' implied, the latter would have to be implied along with the attributes attached to it above, namely "followed by a vowel," or "followed by a first mute," and to such a spirant the further qualification of "surd" would be given; while the meaning intended is that Hārita would forbid the duplication of a surd spirant altogether, in any situation.

O. alone gives as first example \( \text{dārçyā} \text{m} \text{yajñā} \) (iii.2.22); all have \( \text{va} \text{içyō} \text{manusyānām} \) (vii.1.14); to which W. B. add \( \text{puravayā} \text{pucchāh} \) (ii.4.62) and \( \text{va} \text{içvānarasa} \text{rāpam} \) (v.2.32 et al.), which O. omits, while G. M. substitute the single passage \( \text{asyā} \text{parāpam} \) (iii.5.72). As counter-example, showing the limitation to a surd spirant, W. B. give \( \text{tiroahni} \text{yā} \text{mā} \) (vii.3.13: B. omits \( \text{mā} \)); but G. M. give instead \( \text{mahyam itmān} \) (iii.1.96), and O. \( \text{sapt} \) \( \text{jihivāh} \text{ sapt} \) (i.5.32).

18. \( \text{hārita} \text{ṣya} \text{ mate} \text{ gho} \text{sha} \text{ āshmā} \text{ dīvīnā} \text{nā} \text{ pavyate} \). \( \text{dārç} \text{......} \text{va} \text{içyō} \text{......} \text{pūshy} \text{......} \text{va} \text{içe} \text{......} \) \( \text{aghos} \text{ha} \text{ iti} \text{ kim} \text{ tiro} \text{......} \text{āshmāgra} \text{hanam} \text{ pūrvāsūtraṇapēkshāratham} \text{ atra} \text{ yady apy āshmāgra} \text{hanam} \text{ na kriyata āshmē ty etat svaraparata} \text{vena} \text{ sambaddhām} \text{ tasmād iḥa } \text{pi tatsambandha} \text{syā} \text{ vā } \text{gho} \text{sha} \text{vāt} \text{vāvīceshā} \text{śyat} \text{ atas tani} \text{ṇtṛtyartham āśmāgra} \text{hanam} \text{ atra kṛtam} \text{ atāh sārvāvastha āśmā } \text{tra dīvīnishedhaḥ} \text{ḥūkā} \text{.}

1 O. begins āśmāgraḥānām pūrvāsūtraṇapēkṣāḥthām: pūrvāsūtra svaraparavatvena prathamaparavatvena ca sarībandha iti aghosaharaṇānī tasyāt 'ca vīceshānaṁ syat: atās taniśtyayasya puraḥ uṣmāgraḥānāṁ hārī-etc.
2 O. ins. 'cākho.
3 O. sarvāvastha eva āśmā 'ghoṣho nyum a devaṛṇaṁ ā.
4 In O. only.
5 O. om.; G. M. aṣyā.
6 O. simply saptā......
7 W. 'puṣkṣayag-; G. M. 'vāg-.
8 W. B. pūrṇatrān-.
9 G. M. ins. ca.
10 W. -bandham; B. -bandhak.
11 W. B. ca.
12 W. -vate vi-; B. -vate 'ti vi-; G. M. 'ghoṣhaiavīceshānaṁ.
13 W. B. ins. na.
14 G. M. 'āśma 'ti gr-.
15 W. 'naśdhyāt-; B. 'viredhaḥ, and adds, out of place, the first part of the comment to the next rule (to repahara, excl.).
Rules 18–22 are pronounced unapproved under rule 22.

19. Nor $h$, when followed by $r$.

The word ca in the rule is declared to continue the implication of “according to Hārīta.” This individual having in the former rule limited his denial of duplication to a surd spirant, and so left the sonant spirant $h$ (the MSS, say “a surd spirant”) liable to be always doubled, it is now taught that $h$ with the distinctive mark of a following $r$ remains single. The example given, alike in all MSS., is $dudhre$ ahrayah (i.5.51); counter-examples are $juvhe$ (i.e. $juhveh$) by ognis tvā "hvayati" (i.1.12; G. M. end with agnih; W. B. omit altogether, along with the introductory explanation to the next citation), to show that $h$ would be doubled by Hārīta before any other letter than $r$; and $gukram$ (i.e. $gukkram$) te anyat (i.v.1.113; O. omits), to show that any other letter than $h$ would be doubled before $r$.

O., though using two of the citations given by the other MSS., has a wholly independent exposition of this rule.

20. Nor a lingual mute, when followed by a dental.

That is to say, in the opinion of Hārīta. Thus, in vashat te vishno (ii.2.124; O. has vishat te vikshone, but it is doubtless only a corrupt reading) and vid dravinam (i.v.134 et al.), Hārīta would leave the groups $tt$ and $ddr$ untouched, while the rules of the treatise would require $ttt$ and $dddr$. The other groups in which he would teach the simpler combination are $tt'$, $dd'$, $ddhr$, and $rtr'$; and $ts$, tse and tsm would fall indirectly under the same exception, since, by v.33, $t$ (converted to $th$ by xiv.12) must be inserted between $t$ and $s$: $ts$, then, would in Hārīta’s hands become $tths$; in those of the regular adherents of this school, $ttths$. Counter-examples, of obvious application, are vāk te (i.e. vākk te; i.3.91; wanting in B. O.), tat te (i.3.91 et al.: found in W. only, and of no

19. 'pārvaṃ āśmah 'ghośha ity ukte 'ghoshośhmano nityam dvitve prāpte 'viṣīṣṭha idānīṁ rephaparō hākārasya' cakārākṛṣṭa-hārītamaṃ dvitvasī na "padyaite. yathā: dud— rephapara iti kim: juvhe...... hākāra iti kim: gukram...... rephāḥ paro yasmad asaḥ rephaparah.

20. cakāro hārītānvīdeṣakah: "tavargas tavargaparō na dviteam āpadyate. yathā: vashat......" vid...... "tavargah paro
account, since exempt from duplication by xiv.23), shatkapālavi
niḥ (i.e. shatki; i.8.5: wanting in O.), and vid vai morutaḥ
(i.e. vidād vai; vi.6.53).

21. Nor l nor a dental mute, when followed by y or v.

Hārīta is this time implied “by vicinage” merely, there being no word in the rule to which his memory can be directly fastened. Examples of l before y and v are kalyāṇi (vii.1.66) and bāileo yāpo bhavati (ii.1.81: G. M. omit bhavati); of a dental mute in like situation, kanye 'va tunāḥ (iii.1.118) and ishe tvā (i.1.1 et al.). The accepted usage of the school requires lly, lv, nny, tty, while Hārīta would leave the groups as in the ordinary text.

Combinations of a dental mute with a following y or v are quite numerous (I have noted about twenty in the Sanhitā).

22. Nor the following.

This rule completely puzzles the native comment, which has nothing of any value to say about it. Two explanations are suggested, evidently on the barest conjecture only, and it would be hard to say which of them is the more senseless. In the first place, it is said that parah, being singular, implies the sound v (as being the one last mentioned in the preceding rule); it, namely, of the two affecting causes (y and v) specified in rule 21, does not suffer duplication: examples are vibhūḍāene (iii.5.8 et al.) and drā
vān (vi.3.23: W. B. omit ā); and a counter-example, showing the limitation to v, is kalpāṇ juhoti (v.4.86). And the intent of the rule is to remove a restriction imposed in rule 3 of this chapter—that is to say, to allow the duplication of l before a mute, which is there forbidden. In the second place, parah is said to be equivalent to dévītya, ‘second,’ and to signify that, when the

yanmad asān tavaraparāh. tavarāc iti kim:  "vāk......: "tat
....." evamparam iti kim:  "shat......" vid.....

1 O. casadolo. 2 O. tasyā 've. 3 O. ins. hārītya vākino mate. 4 G. M. O. om.
9 G. M. om. 8 O. tavarapara. 7 W. -apara. 6 B. om. 9 G. M. om. 10 G. om.

21. hārīta hāmndhād labhyate: tanmate tatavaragau na khalu
yavakāraparāvā devitaṃ ēmnaθ. "yathā: lakārāḥ: " kalyāṇi:
bāileo......: "tavarge 'pi: " kanye......: ishe...... yavakārāvau
parān yāḥyān tai tatokttāv.

9 G. M. om. 8 G. M. om. 6 W. B. -ra. 4 G. M. yavakāraparāvō.

My collation of O. gives nothing whatever upon rules 21 and 22 and their comment, and I do not know whether there is a lacuna in the MS, or whether the collator has overlooked the passage.
duplication has been once performed, it is not done over again, as otherwise the process would go on ad infinitum. And if it be objected that rule 23 sufficiently forbids this repeated duplication, and that this one would therefore be an unnecessary repetition, the answer is made that that is no fault, since the matter in hand is a division of opinions—that is to say, doubtless, that here Härītā's view only is concerned, and so there is no necessary connection between the two rules.

Fortunately, the commentator is able to add that the present precept, along with its four predecessors, is to be ruled out of account as unapproved, so that what it means is of very little consequence.

**Sawarnasavargiyāṇaparāṇa: II 23 II**

23. A letter followed by one homogeneous with itself, or one of the same mute-series, is not duplicated.

By sawarna, 'of like color or sound,' we are told, is signified identity of form, not merely correspondence as regards place and organ of production. The difference is, that the latter description would apply to the spirants, in their relation to the series of mutes (ii.44,45), and it is not the usage of this school to exempt the spirants (except ḥ and r, rule 15) from duplication, even before a mute with which they are akin. The Ath. Pr. (iii.30) does so exempt them. The epithet sawarna, then, applies only to an identical letter and to the nasal semivowels into which (by v.26,28) n and m are converted before y, l, and v.

The cited examples of the application of the rule to homogeneous sounds are atvakāya (vii.5.122), attā havinkhi (ii.6.122), pippakā te paravyāyā (v.5.19: only O. has the last word), samyattāh

22. cākara hārītākarshakah: para ity ekacacanena vākara grhyate: pūrvasúrasthanimittayoh so 'pi ' na dviteem āpad-yate. yathā: vi...: ā... vakāra iti kim: kalpān.... sparṣa evāi 'keshām ācāryānām (xiv.3) ity 'atra 'vadhā- ranirākaranāyāyam' 'yam' ārambhah. athavā: taddvitve krte para-ro dvitiyaparyāyo' "dvitvavidhir nā 'stī": anavasthāpaṇaṣāt. nanu savarṇasavargiyāpapara (xiv.23) iti parasātrenā 'pi punardevvitvanishedāh: "pārunaktyam mā bhūd iti": mata-bhedān nāi 'sha" dosha iti brāhāh.

hārītamatad ashmā 'ghosha (xiv.18) ityādisūtraṇāca- kam" anīṣṭam.

---

1 G. M. -tamāk. 2 W. eva v-. 3 W. sav-. and puts after grhyate. 4 G. M. ins. parah. 5 G. M. ins. hārītamaṭe. 6 G. M. -parā. 7 G. M. evandhā. . . . . . nāgāyāyāyam. 8 W. B. yathā. 9 G. M. om. tad. 10 G. M. -āyena. 11 G. M. -dhī na prāppnoti. 12 W. om. para. 13 G. M. ins. tamāṭi. 14 W. -kto mā bhavati; G. M. -ktyam āvehati. 15 W. va. 16 G. M. -mate. 17 G. M. ītyādi paraḥ ce 'tyantam sū-. O. wanting (see above).
(i.5.11 et al.; wanting in W. B.), yāl lohitam (ii.1.72), and tvāṁ vā-

tāir arunāth (i.8.141; only O. has arunāth). Those which illus-

trate absence of duplication of a mute before another of the same

series are aukāṅ nyāṅkāṅ (i.7.72), prāṅcam uṣā (v.2.73; O. omits

uṣā), kāṅdāṭ-kāṅdāṭ (iv.2.92 et al.), tāṁ te duṣṭakāṅkāṅ (iii.2.102),

and ambha sthā (i.5.6 et al.). Then the commentator quotes from

some unnamed authority a verse prescribing that "when a nasal

precedes, a k or g is inserted before t or dh respectively," and

claims that, in virtue of it, there fall under the rule also such cases

as pāṅkto yajñah pāṅktaḥ (i.5.21 et al.; G. M. O. omit the last

word) and tāṁ brāyāda yuṅghēvaṁ iti (iii.4.82; O. omits the first

two words). From this we should draw the inference that, in

forms like those here quoted, the omission of the non-nasal mute

(specially prescribed by the Ath. Pr., at ii.20) is the regular and

proper reading of the cākāṅ, its presence, when found, being

regarded as an irregular insertion, or a process forming part of the

varṇakrama—which is just the opposite of the etymologically

correct view. I have not collected all the passages illustrating the

point, but the omission is certainly the prevailing, though not

exclusive, reading in my manuscript of the Sanhitā, as also in the

Calcutta edition. That the verse quoted is from some treatise

dealing specifically with the Tātātiriya text may be inferred (not

too confidently) from its making no mention of ṭh as requiring the

insertion of k; it being the fact that no example of ṭh in such a

situation is to be found in the Sanhitā.

Finally, as counter-examples, where the two mutes are of different

classes, we receive (except in O.) vāṅ ma āsan (v.5.92; G. M.

end with me), shan másah (vi.5.34), vidutthāni manmahe (iv.7.153),

dāmnā pāu "mbhaan (ii.4.13; W. B. have dāmnā only): here

the combinations are to be made nām, nīma, nīma, and nīma.

The illustrations are quite one-sided, both for and against the rule,

being only groups containing a nasal.

This rule furnishes the most important of all the prescribed

23. savarnāparah savargiyaparasya duitevaṁ nā "padyate:

savarnatevaṁ nāma sārūpyam' ucyate: na tulyasthānakaṁratā

mītram: savargiyah samānāvaṁrasambandhā. yathā: atvāk-

kāya: attā: . pipp... saṁyattāḥ: yāl... tvāṁ

savarnāparāṇy evaṁadīni: savargiyaparāṇy aπī vadā-

mah: aṅkāu... prāṅcam... kāṅdāṭ... tāṁ...

ambha...

anumānākāpāraṣa tu kakāro madhye aṁgaṁah:

gakāra ca takāre ca "dhakāra ca yathākramam.

itivacanād idam apy udāharanam: pāṅkto... tāṁ...

evampara iti kim: vāṅ... shan... vīda... dāmnā

1 B. -pyatev. 2 W. B. om. 4 W. savargap-. 4 W. eva. 5 W. anuvarpap-. 6 W. -dharmā. 7 O. -raṣ. 8 W. om.; G. M. yāk-. 9 O. om.
restrictions to the sphere of duplication, as there are somewhat over a hundred consonant groups to which it applies.

24. Unless, indeed, it be a non-nasal followed by a nasal.

This is a precept of counter-exception, contravening in part the exceptions established by the foregoing rule. Examples are yaduṇā (i.5.7⁴: the only example of this combination which the text affords), yajñē-yajñē (iii.1.11²: but O. has yajñena, vi.5.3¹ et al.), ātnārāh (v.6.5⁵: also the sole instance), sū pratnavat (ii.2.12¹ et al.: in O. only), and pāpmānā (i.4.41 et al.): a counter-example is tam mā devāh (iii.3.2²: wanting in O.).

The cases here denied exemption from duplication are those in which, according to xxi.12, yama is introduced between the two mutes. According to the Vāj. Prāt. (iv.111), yama suspends duplication.


A simple heading for the rules that follow, in force as far as rule 28 inclusive—or, according to the commentator's interpretation of rule 28, through 27 only.

26. A ū is not doubled when followed by h, c, or v.

The commentator's examples are mālā d'labhanta (ii.1.2⁴: but B. O. have bheta, which is found in the same division, and G. M. read bhate, which is doubtless a corruption of the same), cātavala vi roha (i.3.5 and vi.3.3²: O. omits vi roha), and tato bīvah (ii.1.8²: O. substitutes bālīvo yāpah, ii.1.8¹); his counter-examples (omitted in O.) are kālmāhi (v.1.1⁴) and kābyāni (vii.1.6⁶).

This rule, we are told, determines the usage of the school so far as the combinations lh and lv are concerned, but not in the case of

24. nakāro 'yam pratiprasavārthaḥ' uttamapaapo'uttama dovitam āpadyate. yathā: yācūṇā: yaj...; ātnārāh: 'sa...'
pāpmānām. anuttama uttamapara iti kim: tam...; uttamah paro yasmād asāv uttamaparāh. savarnasavargiyapara (xiv.23) iti pratishedhaprāptāv ayam ārambhāh.

1 O. pravrthā. 2 G. M. om. 3 O. om. 4 in O. only. 5 O. om.; B. om. anuttama; W. om. uttama.

25. athe' ty ayam ādikāraḥ: ekeshām 'mate' kriyata ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttarāṁ yad vakṣhyāmāh.

1 G. M. ins. āsṛvyādām. 2 G. M. matam; O. mācitaḥ. 3 G. M. O. adhikri-
But O. has an inserted passage, so corrupted as to be hardly intelligible, which quotes a verse (easily made such by a little emendation) from some authority unspecified, making a distinction between le as occurring in a circumflexed syllable or otherwise—that is to say, between bīḷvāḥ and bāḷvāḥ.

All the groups here treated of are quite rare, le occurring, I believe, only in cauḍa (vii.3.19) and its compounds, and īḥ only in māṭha; le is sometimes found also as the result of sandhi (as at i.5.96; ii.5.16).

The commentator adds, finally, that the next rule also is not approved.

27. Nor a mute that is followed by a mute.
This is a view of certain authorities merely, and unapproved. The examples are vāg devi (i.7.102), āpām ojmānām (iv.6.66), āṭnāraḥ (v.6.52), sa pratnave (ii.2.121 et al.), and yam apnavābh (i.5.51): O. has only the first two of them.

28. Nor an original final that is followed by a consonant.
The natural meaning of this rule would appear to be simply that, in the opinion of some authorities, a final mute which is not the product of euphonic alteration is exempted from duplication before any initial consonant whatever (not before a mute only, as in the preceding rule). The commentator, however, manages to extract from it a very different value: namely, that n final is not liable to duplication before a semivowel or spirant (i.e. īḥ); and he regards

26. ekeshām mate haçaヴァkāraParo lakāro devitvaṁ nā "padyate. māthā..... gata...... tato...... "evampara iti kim: kalmāshī: "kalyāṇī. haḳaRaç ca čakāraç ca vakāraç ca haçaヴァkāraḥ: teś pare yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ.

atra haçaヴァpare kāryam ishtam na tu vakāraPare: nā "pi parasūtram ishtam.

27. ekeshām mate spraḥparo spraṇī "devitvaṁ nā "padyate. vāg..... apām..... "āṭnāraḥ: sa..... yam..... spartaḥ paro yasmād asāu spraḥparah.

1 G. M. ins. sa. 2 G. M. O. ins. ācāryāṇām. 3 G. M. lavākāra. 4 O. om. 5 W. om. 6 O. etc. 7 G. M. O. om. 8 O. ins. lakāraṣya haçaヴァkāraparā iti sātre sthitah kim kārayām nam u vakāra iti pragojanam asti: lakāraṣya kārayāsa sanīyo gavavito yadi: tadā sanīyakta eva syād asānyuktas tadanyathā: iti vacanām asti tasmāt kāraṇāt: yadā lakāraṣya kāraparā iti: tato bīḷvāḥ. 9 O. sūtram.

1 O. ins. ācāryāṇām. 2 O. puts next after mate. 3 O. na devitvaṁ āpratiti. 4 O. om.
this as the accepted doctrine of the school, and as determining the reading in this čakha. How this strange result is arrived at, we have to follow through his lengthy exposition closely enough to discover.

In the first place, vañjanapara, 'followed by a consonant,' is declared to mean 'followed by any other consonant than a mute,' because otherwise, as we have read 'followed by a mute' in the preceding rule, the treatise would be guilty of a needless repetition so far as sequence by a mute is concerned. To this the natural answer would be that the two rules do not come into collision, since they do not occupy the same ground: the former relates to any mute in any situation, the latter only to an unaltered mute at the end of a word; and if the one is declared to have a single pronunciation before a mute only, the other before any consonant whatever, what objection can possibly be taken? Moreover, we are stating here the views of certain authorities, of whom one set might hold rule 27, and the other rule 28: and even if they partly covered one another, there would be nothing wrong about it. Once more, sparçapara is claimed to be implied here merely for the purpose of denying it, the commentator's conclusion being that there is duplication of n before a mute, though not before a semi-vowel; and that is certainly a very remarkable kind of anuvṛtti which should work thus by contraries. Of the last two considerations, the commentator takes no notice (although he has once appealed to the former of them in a somewhat similar case above, under rule 22): the first he states and replies to. It may be objected, he says, that there is a difference of affecting cause laid down in consequence of the difference of the affected letter; the latter is here qualified as final and as original; and the former as being any consonant whatever. Nevertheless, he claims, there would be meaninglessness of the qualification of the affecting cause,

28. vañjanapara iti sparçavyatiriktya vañjanapara ity arthaḥ: anyathā sparçanām api grahaṇe pārasātre 'pi sparçā ity ukta-tvāt pāmanaruktyaṁ syāt. nanu nimittaviçeṣhaṁ nimittaviçeśho 'sti: padāntatvam prākṛttaveca ni nimittino viçeśhaṁ nimittasya tu sarva vañjanatmakatvam: iti cet: tathā 'pi sparcaḥbhāge ni mittaviçeṣhaṁ väiyarthyaṁ: sparca aparā ity 'atra sāmānyend 'pi' nimittaviçeṣhaṁ viçatavāt: tasmād antasthādaya eva 'tra vañjanacañcabadeno cyante. 'ca kāko yady api sparcaṁatratrakarshakas tathā 'pi pārīcetiye 'n akārasya 'nukarshanam:" tathā hi: antasthādaya vañjanaparate 'nyasparsanām" avikṛtānām padante sthirāt nā 'sti: samrād ity atrā 'sti 'ti cet: māi 'vam: na saṁ sām itī "räpara (xiii.4) ity atrā väiyarthyaṁ:" itiçabdō makārasya dvijaasadbhāvam bodhayati 'ty" adhyayanānurodhād upapāditam: tasmān na ī 'sha nishedhavisayah. "nā 'pi brahmaṇavantah: naḥ... ityādivisyayah:" kutāh: iha
so far as mutes were concerned: the reason he gives is of course a mere quibble, and the point of it is so fine that I am not confident of seeing it rightly: it seems to be, that there is an absence of such qualification in the implied term *sparçapara*. At any rate, the comfortable conclusion is, that only the semivowels etc. are intended by the term “consonant” as employed in the rule. The next step is, to declare that ca, ‘nor,’ although it strictly brings forward ‘a mute,’ without qualification, yet really amounts, on the principle of exclusion, to an implication of *n* only. Namely, thus: no other consonant remains unchanged at the end of a word before a semivowel or spirant. It may be objected that *m* also does so before *r* (by xiii.4) in such words as *samrāj*; but this is of no account; for, if admitted as a reproach to the interpretation now under treatment, it would convict of superfluousness a part of rule xiii.4: namely, the *iti*, which was shown, in accordance with the received reading of the *cākhā* to teach the duplication of the *m*. We see now why that atrociously forced and groundless construction of the meaning of rule xiii.4 was made; it was needed to bolster up in advance the forced and groundless construction to be put upon the present precept. As the *m*, then, constitutes no ground of exception, so neither do the nasals *n* and *ṅ* in such cases as *bhramanvantah* (vi.4.101) and *nyaṅ raṃmbihī* (ii.4.102). For why? the qualification *prākṛta*, ‘original,’ in the rule involves [as belonging to the letter to which it is applied] the quality of being alterable, since it would otherwise be meaningless; and there is no case to be found where either *n* or *ṅ* is altered before a semivowel or spirant. If, then, the term *prākṛta* is to be allowed its proper force, the implication of any other mute than *n* must be excluded. Here is another most arbitrary act of construction—as if *prākṛta* meant necessarily ‘(an alterable mute) when it retains its original form,’ instead of simply ‘(a mute) that retains its original form.’

`prākṛta iti viçeśhaṇaṁ viṅkṛtasadbhāvaṁ` kalpayati: ‘anyathā svasya’ vāiśvartyāt: tae ca viṅkṛtataṁ nakārsyaṁ nakārsyaṁ vā ‘ntasthādiparatvā’ sati kvacic api padānte na dṛṣṭyate: tasmāt prākṛta iti pravogasāphalāyāṁ nakārsyaī vā ‘nukarshaṇaṁ yuktam iti pāriṣekhām.


`rephād rvarṇāt` pāraça ca taṅgādca ca paraça ca nāḥ: taṅgāstānāṁ ity āhur antasthāno ‘nya’ ucyate.

iti vacanād asti sthānabhide kṛtaṁ viṅkṛtataṁ ēti brāhmaṁ."
The authority of Māhisheya (see note to the introductory verses, p. 7) is further appealed to as making the same restriction of implication. His explanation is that, in the view of some teachers, a final unaltered n followed by a semivowel or spirant is not doubled. Examples are mitro janán yátayati (iii.4.11); only G. M. have mitro, omanvati te (ii.6.9); p. omanvati), and etán homán (i.5.4); in all which we are to understand that the n remains single. On the other hand, there is duplication in anyá (i. e. annyá) yantí (ii. 5.12) and ane (i. e. anné) aha máśáh (i.7.13), where the n is not final; in tán (i. e. táná) kopalayati (v.3.12) and imán (i. e. imáná) bhadrán (i.8.31), where the n is followed by a mute; and also in tán rakshadhvam (i.2.7) and vāishnaván rakshahanáh (i.3.22), where, it is asserted, the n does not maintain its original form. Since, however, there is no rule in the Prātiśākhya for altering a n in this last pair of cases, the commentator quotes (from the same authority, we may conjecture, which has been recently twice appealed to, under rules 23 and 26) a prescription to the effect that n when preceding a r or an r-vowel, or when following a lingual (the MSS. say, a dental) mute, is uttered in the lingual position: thus, he says, in virtue of its change of position, the n is phonetically altered. Finally, he makes an alleged citation from the Čikṣā (not found in the version known to us), which teaches that a final n preceding r exhibits a peculiarity, and is liable to duplication. Such a modification of the utterance of n forms no part of the phonetic system of any of the Prātiśākhya.

Thus is brought to an end the tedious subject of duplication, the physical foundation of which is of the obscurest, although the pains with which the Hindu cākāhiná have elaborated it, and the earnestness with which they assert their discordant views respecting it, prove that it had for them a real, or what seemed like a real, value.

"\text{cikṣā caí 'vain vakharyati:}"
\text{"repāt púrvo" nakáro yah padánta" yatra" dṛgyate:}
\text{vīçeṣaṁ tatra jāniyād dvitvam ity" abhidhāyate.}
\text{"vyañjanaṁ așmaṁ "param iti" vyañjanaparāḥ: prakṛtīṁ svabhāvāḥ: tatsambandha prākṛtaḥ.}
29. A grave following an acute becomes circumflex.

The following rule shows that the substantive here to be understood is *svarah*, 'vowel.' All the other Prātiśākhyaas, in their corresponding rules (R. Pr. iii.9, V. Pr. iv.134, A. Pr. iii.67), state the principle as applying to an *ākṣharaṃ*, 'syllable.' In his explanation and illustration, however, the commentator is not careful to bear this in mind. He states the sphere of the rule to be all the three kinds of enclitic circumflex, the *prātiḥata* (xx.3), *pādavṛttta* (xx.6), and *tāirovyāñjana* (xx.7), although these in part include cases to which only the next rule attributes the circumflexed quality. And his examples are *sā idhānāḥ* (iv.4.43), *āthā 'bravit* (iii.2.113), *rāṣey asī* (i.2.51 et al.), *prāgām* (iv.4.21), and *tāyā devātāyā* (iv.2.92 et al.); of which only the first and fourth show the circumflex vowel following the acute without an intervening consonant (rule 30). Nor are all the examples unexceptionable in other respects: for though the *i* of *idhānāḥ* and the *a* of *asi* are really *anudātta*, 'grave,' in the *pada*-text, and so show an actual conversion into circumflex, the other exhibited cases of enclitic circumflex are circumflexed in the *pada*-text as well, and undergo no alteration in consequence of their change to *sāṁhītā.* It is at this that the commentator aims, when he adds that, "there being grave quality in the condition of separation of letters, then, when these are combined together, circumflex quality appears in accordance with the present precept." That is to say, it is the natural unaccented quality of the syllable that is here implied in *anudātta*, not its being technically grave, and marked as such. This understanding is also needed in order to make good rule 31, where we are not taught that the enclitically circumflexed final of *ātha*, for example, becomes grave before an acute or circumflex (as in *ātha tvām, ātha kvā*), but that the unaccented final *a*, which was made circumflex by rules 29 and 30 after *ā*, is exempted from the change when so followed, and remains unaccented.

The enclitic circumflex is written in the recorded Tāttvārtha text in the same manner as in the Rik and Atharvan; namely, by the perpendicular stroke above the syllable, the same that is used for the independent circumflex. The method is so familiar to all students of the Veda that it does not need to be illustrated here. Certain specialties of Tāttvārtha usage will come up for notice under later rules (xix.3, xxi.10,11).

---

29. *prātiḥatapādavṛtttatāirovyāñjanavārśayam* etat: udāttāt paro 'nudāttaḥ svartam āpadyate. yathā: sa......: athā.....: vāsavy.....: pra......: tāyā.....: varnāvibhāgāvasthāyān anudāttave saty 'eva punaḥ tutsaimūhitāyām eva* *tālakṣaṇasvarīta- tvam* prāgām ityādāv vijnayām.

1 O. om. *pādavṛta*, and ins. *prāvṛttta* before -vish-.
2 W. eva 'dhaśāt śāṁ-
3 G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. O. *tālakṣaṇasvarīt* sv.
For an exposition of the place and value of the enclitic circumflex in the Hindu accentual system, see the note to Ath. Pr. iii.65. It may doubtless admit of question whether the Hindu phonetists, in noting the syllable naturally grave as being otherwise than grave when immediately preceded by an acute, would not have apprehended it better, and described it more truly, as a middle tone between acute and grave, rather than a combination (i.40) of acute and grave. Arguments drawn from the analogies of the Greek and Latin accentual systems (see F. Misteli, in Kuhn’s Zeitschrift, vol. xvii., 1868; also Prof. J. Hadley, in the Proceedings of the Am. Oriental Society for Oct. 1869 [Journal, vol. ix., pp. lxii.-lxiii.]) may press upon us this latter view as the more plausible. But that any one having access to the sources of knowledge upon the subject should dispute the substantial identity in physical character of the Greek circumflex and the Sanskrit independent svarita, and should set down the latter as a “middle tone,” in the face of all authority and of all sound phonetic theory, savors of inexcusable carelessness or prejudice.

30. Even when consonants intervene.

For the necessity of this explicit statement, see the note on the preceding rule. The commentator, having already given under the latter several cases in which the accented and the affecting vowel were separated by one or more consonants, has nothing that is new to offer; but he quotes, nevertheless, tād aṣṇe aṃro bhaṃvī (iii. 3.82: B. O. omit bhaṃvī) and yās tvā hṛdā (i.4.461): in the first case, aṅ- and bha- are circumflexed; in the second, tvā.

31. Not, however, when an acute or circumflex follows.

That is to say, the syllable naturally unaccented or grave—but which, coming next after an acute, would usually take, by rule 29, the tone of transition from higher to lower pitch—retains its low or grave tone if immediately followed by an acute, or by a (nītya or independent, of course) circumflex, of which the first element is acute: the pitch of voice is governed by the following tone in preference to the preceding, and sinks at once, without perceptible movement of transfer, to the level of anudatta, as a vantage-ground from which to rise to the immediately succeeding high point.

In this rule, as well as that to which it constitutes an exception,

30. vyaṇjanāntarhito'py udāttāt paro ‘nudattāh svoritam’ āpadyate. yathā: tād....; yas....; ‘ity ādi’. antarhito vyavahita ity arthah.

1 O. anti. 2 B. -hatram. 3 G. M. om. 46 O. om.
all authorities are agreed (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.70); although we should not less naturally expect the double attraction, of a high tone on either hand, to exercise at least as much assimilating effect upon the pitch of an intermediate syllable as a preceding high tone alone exerts.

The commentator’s examples are sā imān lokām (i.5.94; but G. M. add ajīyān, which doubtless means tā imān lokām ajīyān, vii.1.56), tāsmā tā ādyā annadhānāt (vii.1.15; only O. has the first word and the last), kīrīnā mányamānah (i.4.461), and tāsyāī vyṛddham āndām ajāyata (vi.5.61; only G. M. have the last two words): the vowels between acute and acute, or between acute and circumflex, in these examples, are anudatta, and written, as such, with the horizontal stroke beneath.

The three rules here given only apply, in strictness, to a single unaccented syllable following an acute; where there is more than one such, the rules for prācaya (xxi.10,11) come into force.

---

32. Not so, according to Āgniveṣṭyāyāna.

The significance of this rule (which is declared unapproved, in the comment to its successor) is more clearly stated by O., in an independent exposition, than by the other four versions of the comment. It is meant to exhibit an opinion contravening the doctrine laid down by its predecessor, and allowing the circumflex accent to stand, even when the following syllable has, or begins with, the high tone. No examples are given, except by O., which has vēdhavē (i.6.21 et al.) and tāsyā kvā svargāh (ii.6.58).

G. M. read, in rule and comment, Āgnivāṣṭyāyāna.

---

33. Some say not, in all cases.
According to the majority of MSS. of the comment, the denial of these skeptical people is not limited to the enclitic svarita, but extends to the whole accent, in all its seven forms (xx.1–8). Thus, namely; in the brähmana of the Vājasaneyins (that is to say, the Čatapatha-Brāhmana) there are only two accents, the acute and the grave. But O. has once more a version of its own, stating that the authorities here referred to would not, like Āgniveṣṭyāyana, annul rule 31 simply, but would also deny the rules in general for the enclitic circumflex, as in sā idhānāḥ (iv.4.45) and prapāḥ (O MS. prathā) asi (ii.5.124). We cannot well hesitate to prefer the latter interpretation; there has been no question here of the independent circumflex, and a denial of its existence would be altogether out of place and impertinent. Nor is the reference to the Čatapatha-Brāhmana one at all likely to have been intended by the Prātiṣṭhākhyā. And it is not true, except so far as the mode of designating the accents is concerned, that that treatise has no circumflex accent: it writes, to be sure, only the anudatta sign, so that, if the value of this were the same as in the other usual systems of designation, all its syllables would be either grave or acute: and on this foundation, later Hindu systematists have declared them such, and painfully elaborated an exposition of them (see Weber’s Ind. Studien, x. 397 ff).

Rules 32 and 33 are, naturally enough, declared unapproved; but to us it is both interesting and important to find that there were Hindu phonetists in the ancient time who did not admit such an element of utterance as the enclitic circumflex.

CHAPTER XV.

Contents: 1–3. nasalization of vowels, or insertion of anusvāra, in cases of the loss or alteration of n or m; 4–5, the same, in the cases detailed in the next chapter; 6–8, the same, in the case of certain finals; 9, utterance in monotone.


ne ‘dāṁ sātraudvayam2 ishtam.

O. substitutes eke cākhino manyante na kevalanudāttah udāttassavilaparapah : prati-shidhyāti kiṁ turhi udāttakapārvakaḥ ca: sa.....; prathā..... ne ‘dāṁ etc.

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣṭhākhyavivarane
caturdāsottah ‘dhvāyāḥ.

1 W. vājanepībra-; B. -nebr-; G. M. -neybr-. 2 W. -tram. 3 G. M. O. dvitīye prāte dvitiyo.
नकारसय रेफोष्मकार्यकार्यावालुते च मलोपायच पूर्वत्ववरूण्यात अनुसारिणि: II १॥

1. In case of the conversion of \( n \) into \( r \), a spirant, or \( y \)—also when the \( y \) is omitted—or in case of the omission of \( m \), the preceding vowel becomes nasal.

That this Prātiṣṭāḥya takes no distinct and consistent ground upon the question whether the so-called anusvāra consists in a nasalization of the vowel or in a nasal consonantal element following the vowel, has been already pointed out (note to ii.30); as also, that the present rule is the one where the former view is most unequivocally taken. As the school to which the commentator belongs has adopted the other view, he declares (under rule 2) that the doctrine here laid down is unapproved.

The "conversion of \( n \) into \( r \) or a spirant" is, of course, the retention of a historical final \( s \) after \( n \) unchanged before \( t \) (vi.14), or changed to \( g \) before \( c \) (v.20), or to \( r \) before a vowel (ix.20 etc.); its "conversion into \( y \)" with the (invariably) consequent "loss of the \( y \)" (ix.20 etc., x.19), goes back to the same cause. The commentator's illustrative examples are aynīṇr aupushadah (v.6.12), sa trīṇa evāagān 'tha (iii.2.113: found in O. only), karnāṇc ca 'karnāṇc ca (i.8.93), trīṇa trāṇ (ii.5.101), and mahān indraḥ (i.4.20 et al.) of which the last is by part of the MSS., rather needlessly, quoted twice, once for the conversion of the \( n \) into \( y \) (for which it should be written mahān indraḥ), and again for the loss of the \( y \). For the loss of \( m \) (by xiii.2), the examples are pratyushtaṇ rakṣah (i.1.2 et al.) and saṁcitam me (iv.1.103 et al).

The commentator explains anumāsika by saṁnāsika, as if the word were properly a noun, and needed reduction to adjective form: in this treatise, however, it is always and only an adjective, meaning 'nasal' (see note to ii.30).

नकारसय II २॥

2. Some deny this.

1. 'nakārasya repabhāvād uṣhmabhāvād yakārābhāvāc cakārākṣṭhayakāre lupte ca\(^{\text{7}}\) sāti 'makāralopāc ca\(^{\text{8}}\) pūrvasvaro 'numāsiko' bhavati: saṁnāsiko bhavati 'ty arthaḥ. 'yathā: repabhāvāt: agra...; 'sa...'; 'atho 'shmabhāvāt:" karn...; trīṇs... 'yakārābhāvād yathā: maḥān... 'yakāre lupte yathā: maḥān... "atha makāralopāt:" praty...; saṁ... "ity āti": makārasya lopa makāralopāh\(^{\text{9}}\) tasmāt.

---

\(^{\text{7}}\) wanting in B. \(^{\text{8}}\) O. om. \(^{\text{9}}\) W. om. \(^{\text{10}}\) O. om.; G. M. om. atha. \(^{\text{11}}\) O. om.; G. M. om. yathā. \(^{\text{12}}\) W. O. om. \(^{\text{13}}\) G. M. om. \(^{\text{14}}\) O. om.; G. M. om. atha. \(^{\text{15}}\) O. om. \(^{\text{16}}\) B. malo.
This is a mere introduction to the next rule, which informs us what the doctrine is which these dissidents hold instead. The commentator pronounces it the approved doctrine for this gākhā.

नतस्त्वनुस्वरः \(\text{II. \text{I}}\)

8. And claim that, on the contrary, anusvāra is inserted after the vowel.

The anusvāra here prescribed is called by the commentator an āgama, ‘increment.’ Its insertion is the alternative view to the nasalization of the vowel, and, as is pointed out, is held where that nasalization is denied—of which denial, the tu, ‘on the contrary,’ is the sign in the rule. There is one example given: sa trīṇur ekādaśaṁ iha (iii.2.11\(^9\): W. B. omit sa).

The approval of this rule is, of course, involved in that of its predecessor; and the usage of the recorded Tāṭṭīrīya text corresponds.

सादिविष चेकपद \(\text{\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.}.\)

4. Anusvāra is also inserted in the case of sra etc., in a single word, before a spirant.

“Also” (ca) in the rule, we are told, brings down the implication of the above specified increment. The srādayus, ‘sra etc.,’ are the whole detail, given in the next chapter, of the occurrence of anusvāra in the Tāṭṭīrīya-Sahihī otherwise than as the result of the rules of combination, implied in rules 1–3 of this chapter. The precept, then, is introductory to the detail referred to, and also lays down some general limitations affecting it. The commentator quotes a single case, āṃsā moda ihe tī (iii.2.9\(^9\): it falls under xvi.2); and then gives counter-examples, establishing the restrictions made: tāsāṁ trīṇa ca (ii.5.8\(^a\)) shows that the insertion is made only under the circumstances defined in chapter xvi.; tam mā saṁ srjā varcasā (i.4.45\(^a\) et al.; only G. M. have varcasā) and prastaram ā hi sīda (ii.6.12\(^c\); found in O. only) show that it is to

2. ekesām mate paurvasūtroktēshu \(\text{sānumāsikyaṁ} \text{na} \text{bhavati,}
\text{uktāṁ eva 'dāharānaṁ.}
\text{idam 'eve 'śhānī} \text{na} \text{tu pūrvam.}
\text{1 O. ins. stūnesha. 2 G. M. na 'nu-. 3 W. G. M. O. om. 4 O. eva sūtram ihe.}
\text{3. tata iti s二者ā parāṁśhātāt} \text{svaraḥ} \text{paro 'nusvāra} \text{āgamo bhavati. yathā': sa...... parāṁśhātāsvaramāya 'nunāsikaiṁ} \text{gūnāṁ tuśaṁdo nivartayati} \text{'tī': tasmād anunāsikapradānihapāksa} \text{evā 'yam anusvārāgamaṁ syāt.}
\text{1 G. M. -sāta. 2 G. M. -ra. 3 B. G. M. -svār. 4 G. M. om. 5 O. 'śhītīt svārā.}
\text{6 G. M. -ka. 7 O. -vāray-. 8 G. M. O. om. iti. 9 W. B. -dhit p.; G. M. -dhaḥ sa-}
\text{shyamāṇa.}
be made only in a single word—that is to say, if I understand the meaning, that if mā sām and hi sīda were single words, they would fall respectively under rules 8 and 13 of the next chapter, and have the increment—; and māyā māyinām (iii.117) shows that a spirant must follow (māyinām otherwise falling under xvi.8). To the specification ekapade, ‘in a single word,’ the commentator adds in his paraphrase the explanation akhandapade, ‘in an undivided word;’ and then, in his illustration, he treats this as a restriction or limitation, and establishes it by an example, trishāhastro vāi (v.6.83; p. tri-sāhasraḥ); rule xvi.25 would otherwise require the increment after tri.

5. Not before an altered final.

The illustrative example is bāhis te astu bāl iti (iii.3.102: G. M. omit the last two words): we have in it a s following hi in a single undivided word; and hence, by xvi.13, should have to read bāhiṣs, but for this restriction. The alteration is from h to s, according to ix.2. As counter-example is given mā hiṁsīr dviṣpādam (iv.2.101: G. M. O. omit the last word), a case falling under the rule already referred to.

6. According to some authorities, the simple vowels, except the prāgrahas, are nasalized.

This and the remaining rules of the chapter have the aspect of an intrusion, as they interrupt the natural connection of what precedes and what follows, and merely give the view of certain authorities on points which the Prātiṣṭākhyas in general leave untouched. They are brought in here as having to do with nasalized vowels, which are the subject of this chapter and its successor.

With the nasalization thus taught is to be compared that noticed in the Rik Prātiṣṭā (at i.16, r. 63, lxiv), which teaches that the first

4. 'āgamāṇāvādeṣaḥ ca kāraṇaḥ: srādis̄v ekapade khaṇḍapada uṣhaparō nusvārāgamo bhavati. yathā: goṁsā... srādis̄v iti kim: tāsām... ekapade iti kim: tam...: 'prast... akhandavijñehanena kim: trish... uṣhapara iti kim: māyā...

5. na khalu padāntavikārāt pūrvasmin anusvārāgamo bhavati. yathā: bāhis...: hipujigā (xvi.13) iti prāptih. antavikārāt iti kim: mā... antasya vikāro 'ntavikāraḥ: tasmād antavikārāt.

1 W. viṅ. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 G. M. om.
eight vowels (namely α, ã, ē, ē, u, ō, r, ō) are by [some?] teachers declared nasal when they are not prayrhyā, and stand as finals before a pause. This is different, first, in including r and ō (which are not samānaksharāṇi according to our treatise: compare i.2; but the difference amounts to nothing, as the vowels in question never occur avasāne, but only avagrahe); and secondly, in limiting the nasalization to finals, before a pause. But it is perfectly evident that our rule also applies to finals only, and, as we shall see, the commentator resorts to great violence to bring in the implication of “final” in rule 8, below. Again, the specification “in samhitā also,” in rule 8, and the interpretation of padam in rule 7 as signifying padakāle, ‘in pada-text,’ sufficiently prove that the present precept does not apply in samhitā—that is, that avasāne, ‘in pause,’ is implied here. And the absence of statement or anuvrtti of these two essential implications is strong additional evidence that the rules are interpolated.

By most of the MSS., only one example is given, namely kulāyini vasumatī (iv.3.41), which, if our understanding, as above explained, is correct, is to be read, in pada-text, kulāyini: vasumatī. O. adds aminanta evāh (iii.1.115), one of the cases of suspended combination falling under x.13, and (by R. Pr. ii.31,32) in the Rig-Veda requiring nasalization of the uncombined final: its citation seems to indicate that O. would not limit the operation of the rule to the pada-text. To show that the nasalization does not take place in uncombainable vowels, or prayrhyās, are quoted, in pada-form, ami iti (iii.3.71 et al.) and tanā iti (ii.2.75: omitted in O.). To illustrate the limitation to simple vowels, we find in most MSS. so evāi ‘shāi ‘tasya (ii.2.97); but O. gives instead agnaye ‘nikavate (i.8.41 et al.), vishnav e ‘hi’s dam (ii.4.123), and vāyav ishtaye (ii.2.128).

The commentator, as he has done repeatedly before (under i.49, ii.7, v.2), notices the apposition in the rule of apragrahāḥ and samānaksharāṇi, two words of different gender. He signifies, further, under the next rule, that both that and this are unapproved.

7. As is also, according to Čāṇkhāyana and Kāṇḍamāyana, a protracted pada.

By pada is here signified, according to the commentator, a word

6. 1 yāni samānaksharāṇi apragrahasamajñāni tāny ekeshām mate bhavanī amunāśikānī 2 kul…… apragrahā iti kim: ami iti: tanā iti: samānaksharāṇi ‘ti kim: ‘so…… apragrahāksharaśadāyorniṣṭhāī ṣāṣṭraṇāyogī ghatate. na apragrahā apragrahāḥ.

in the pada-text; and the interpretation, as was remarked above, is fully supported by the specification of saṁhitā in the next rule.

As examples of nasalized protracted vowels, are given tvēs ity abrajāt (ii.4.12) and astu his ity abhrātam (vii.1.61), both in saṁhitā-form, although it is again expressly pointed out that the nasalization is not made in saṁhitā: the two worthies referred to would read tvēs: and hīrṇa. It is added that ca, ‘also,’ in this rule effects its connection with what is prescribed in the preceding one—or, as O., in more customary phrase, expresses it, brings forward by implication the preceding rule.

Some, we are further informed, restrict the application of the precept to words which contain a single vowel protracted, and would not regard it as authorizing nasalization in na chinattīs iti (i.7.214) or na vicityās iti (vi.1.91: G. M. omit iti).

The rule is declared to be of no binding force.

8. An a, however, is nasalized in saṁhitā also.

The commentator’s explanation is that nasality and protraction are here implied (from the preceding rule) by vicenage; and that tu, ‘however,’ is intended to annul the implication that only the opinion of the two authorities specified in rule 7 is reported. And though the comprehensive statement “an a” is made in the rule, nevertheless, in virtue of rule i.58, “continued implication is of that which is last (or final),” the “also” (api) really brings down only a final a as suffering a prescribed effect by the attribution of nasal quality. The sense, then, is that a protracted final a is nasalized, both in saṁhitā and elsewhere. Examples are sucla-kānsa suvarṇāgalās (i.8.162), upahātānās (ii.6.7), yāço mamāṃs (vii.4.20); these are, in fact, all the cases of protraction of simple final a which the text contains; and the edition (so far as it goes) and my MS. nasalize the a, as required by the interpretation of the rule here given. The cases are much more numerous in which a final aḥ exhibits āḥ as the ultimate result of protraction, the h being lost before a following vowel or sonant consonant: namely, at i.5.9, v.5.13,32 twice: vi.1.91 twice; 3.81; 4.34; 6.23; and in one place, vi.5.84, the same final āḥ comes from a protracted e: the question might possibly arise whether these do not also fall under

7. yat plavat padam "tac ca" padakāle ‘cāṅkhaḥyanakānda-
māyanayar mate ‘munāsikam bhavati. yathā: tvēs.... astu
...... padam iti kiṃ: saṁhitāyām mā bhūt. cakaraḥ pāvrasā-
troktavādhyasamuccayam" karoti. aparā āhūh: "plavikaves-
ram padam iti: anyam mā bhūt? na....: na.....
no ‘dāna sātrakavayam" ishtam.

1 W. yatra. 2 O. om. 3 W. katra. 4 O. puts after bhavati. 5 G. M. om. 6 G. M. O. caṣādah. 7 O. -vidhīm. 8 O. avādiyati. 9 O. plavavānapadam iti ‘ha mā bhūt. 10 W. sūtram.
the rule, but it would have to be answered in the negative (see the counter-examples below); and the text reads accordingly. The manuscripts of the commentary give as found “in another cakha,” one example, read brahmāsn in W. B. O. (O. is wanting), and yadghrā in G. M.: I do not quite know what to make of this, as there seems to be no call for quoting from another text examples of what is capable of being fully illustrated from the received Veda of the school; brahmāsn is found at i.8.16 2 twice, but would be a counter-example to this rule, its a not being final; it is, in fact, of the same character with the first of the counter-examples given. These are satyadājāsn (i.8.16 2), agnās ity āha (vi.3.8 4: W. has dropped out agnās), and vicyayā somās na vicyās iti (vi.1.9 1: O. has only this).

Finally, the commentator remarks that Čāṅkhāyana and Kāṇḍa-māyana also accept this principle. He may well say this, for the natural interpretation of the rule is to make it represent simply the view of those authorities; and the action of the comment, in cutting it loose from its predecessors, and declaring it alone to express the approved doctrine of the treatise, is in a high degree forced and arbitrary. It was noticed under i.58 what an unjustifiable act of violent interpretation was there committed, by way of preparation for this one. The implication of “final” is not needed in rule 8 any more than in rules 6 and 7, and is clearly enough made in them all; whence it comes, it would be the business of those who put the passage in to tell, if they could.

The Ath. Prāt. gives (at i.105) an enumeration of the protracted vowels occurring in the text to which it relates. This our treatise omits to do, and it may be well to repair the omission in this place. A final a is protracted to āṅś at i.8.16 2 twice; ii.6.7 3; vii.4.20: —ah to āṣḥ at i.4.27; v.5.1 2; and to āṣ (the h being lost) at i.5.9 6; v.5.1 3,3 2 twice; vi.1.9 1 twice; 3.8 1; 4.3 4; 6.2 2: —an to āṃn at i.8.16 1 twice, 16 2 thrice: ii.6.5 5: —am to āṃm at vi.1.4 5: 5.9 1: vii.1.7 4; 5.7 1 twice: —i to āṣ at i.7.2 14; ii.4.12 6; vi.5.9 1; vii.1.6, 7 4: —iḥ to āḥ or ār at i.5.9 6; vi.3.10 1: —in to āṃn at vii.4.20 twice: —uḥ to āṃr at vi.3.8 1: —e to āṣi at i.4.27; vi.1.4 5: and

8. sāṃnidhyād amunāsikapatutāḥ ivaḥye: tuçabādha prakrtavāryamatanivartakāḥ: ata eva sanhitāyām asanhitāyām cā kāraṇād padāntāḥ pluto munāsiko bhavati: yady apy akāra iti sāmānyeṇo ktaḥ: tathā ṣya anvādego ntyāsa (i.58) iti vacanād apiçabdo nmuñāsikadharmatayā nimittinam padāntam eva kāraṃ anvādiṣṭāḥ. yathā: sāvīt... uṣṇa:... yaga:... brahmāsn ity anyasyānāmāḥ cakhāyām. apiçabdo kimarthaḥ: "satyā:... aghn:..." vicyayāḥ... cakhāyānakāndamāyanayor apiy ayaṃ vidhīr "akāre pluto sammatoḥ."
to ā (see i.4) at vi.5.84:—āu to āsv at vi.6.23. The protracted syllable has always the acute accent.

9. According to the former ones, all is of one pitch.

The comment is completely at a loss as to how this rule is to be understood, and gives three more or less discordant interpretations of it, the first of which we are probably to regard as the preferred one, if there be a preference. "All" means 'every kind of articulate sound;' "of one pitch" is equivalent to ekaçruti, yama denoting the tone of an acute syllable; "the former ones" are 'the sacrificers;' the meaning is, then, that in the sacrificial usage of the sacrificers everything is uttered in acute monotone. O. has an exposition of its own, which is in great part too corrupt to be read without considerable emendation, and which conducts to the same conclusion: it quotes, apropos of pūrve, a pada of a trishtubh verse from some sacred text, "the former ones spoke those words to the former ones."

The second interpretation differs from the first only in declaring pūrve, 'the former ones,' to designate certain cākhināh, or 'holders of a Vedic text."

The third is of quite another character; it makes yama to be equivalent to svara in the sense of 'vowel,' and explains 'every monosyllable is nasalized'—the intent being to annul the restriction to simple vowels only (as made in rule 6). Who the pūrve are, is not told us this time.

The commentator consoled himself at the end by declaring the rule not approved. We may fairly extend the same condemnation

9. sarvani śvarūpam ēkayamam ekacṛutī 'tī pūrveśhām' matam. yama nāma svara udātta ity arthāh: pūrve nāma yājñikīḥ: teshāṁ yajñakarmāṇi sarvam ēkacṛutī bhavati.1 anye manyaṁe pūrve nāma kecī chākhanāḥ: teshāṁ sarvam2 "ekacṛutī 'tī'.

aṁthā3 'pare kathayanti': sarvam ekasvaram anunāsikam bhavati 'tī': "samānākṣharamātrāpekshām adhiksheptum".4 ne'daṁ sātvam isḥatam.

iti tribhūjayatane pratiṣākyeyivivarane pañcedaço5 'dhyāyah."

1 O. substitutes sarvam iti lakṣñhyān lakṣñanavishayān grhyāḥ: ekayam ekacṛutik: yamaçrūtīvaru ity athāntarā pūrveśhā pūrve śvar nāma yājñikā pūrve pūrve śvāya sacca etad ucy iti dāraṇāt yājñikānāḥ yajñakarmāṇi sarvam ekacṛutī bhavati.5 W. B. sarva. 6 B. sarvaṃ ojādām; G. M. -tāyamān. 7 W. sarva. 8 G. M. pet after udātta. 9 W. -aṁtyāḥ. 10 W. puts after bhavati. 8 B. -īr. 9 O. dhuk. 10 O. om. (11) W. -cuddi; O. -cudrī bhavati. 12 G. M. om. atha. 13 O. yudekhatā. 14 O. om. iti. 15 O. sarvam iti samānākṣharamātrāpekshā grahavyudānā sarvani kathā vidhiyate; W. -ramātrakṣā kham opikṣiptanā; B. -kham adh-. 16 G. M. -mātrapakshaṁ adikṣeptum. 18 G. M. o. devāyaṇaṁ traya. 
to his treatment of it, and conjecture that, if he could only have
told us what it meant, we might have found in it something to
approve. We are tempted to seek in it some statement as to the
accent of the protracted syllable, or pada; and, if it were allowed
to amend pūrveshām to ekeshām, we might translate, ‘some hold
that the whole word in which protraction occurs is to be uttered
in the same tone’—only then, to be sure, we should look for a
statement of the usage actually followed in the text.

CHAPTER XVI.

CONTENTS: 1–31, detail of the cases of occurrence, in the Sanhitā, of 4 in the inte-
rior of a word, before a spirant.

अथ सकाराययः ॥ 1 ॥

1. Now for cases in which s follows.

A simple heading, of force through a considerable part of the
chapter (i. e. through rule 13). The essential item of the precept
laid down was given above, in xv.4, which directed that in all the
cases to be specified in this chapter is to be assumed the presence
of anusvāra following a vowel and followed by a spirant. Words
in which that spirant is s form by far the most numerous class, and
until rule 14 they alone are treated.

The Rik Pr. is the only one of the other treatises which offers
anything at all analogous with this enumeration; it (at xiii.7–10)
gives rules for the occurrence of anusvāra after long vowels only.

शशोऽन्ध्याश पराद्यः स्वायः ॥ 2 ॥

2. Sra, ço, ha, pā, and ça, at the beginning of a pada, take
anusvāra before a s that is followed by a vowel.

The commentator cites examples, as follows. For sra, visraṇṣa-
yed aneṣeṇā ’dhaṇryatā (vi.2.94,107: G. M. O. have only the first
word); we have other cases at i.5.7: v.1.6: vi.3.106, all from the
same root, sras. For ço, çoṣād modu iva ’tī (iii.2.95: G. M. omit
the last word, O. the last two); I have noted no other case: as
counter-example, to show that only o after ç takes the increment,
is given apāsānā sāmanasam (i.1.101: O. alone has the latter

1. athe ty ayam adhikāraḥ: ita uttare grahaṇaviçehāh1 sakā-
raparā  ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam. sakāraḥ paro ’yebhyas
te sakāraparāh.2

1 B.-shok. 2 B.-para. 3 G. M. yasmat sa tathoktah (and -parah in the rule).
word). For ha, haṁsaḥ cuciṣhad (i.8.15\(^2\); iv.2.1\(^5\)); various other cases of haṁsa are found in the text, and haṁṣi; that ha is not treated in the same way is shown by praṇa ma ma hāsita (v.6.8\(^4\); O. omits). For pā, pāṁsura ivaṇvati (i.2.13\(^2\)); other cases are pāṁśan and pāṁsavyya, at ii.6.10\(^2\) and iv.5.9\(^1\) respectively; that pā would not have been correct is shown by āhataṁ gabbhe pahṣah (vii.4.19\(^2\); O. omits āhataṁ); pās, which would seem to fall under the rule, is excepted by rule 17, below. For ga, yad āśinaṁ caṁsaṁ tasmāt (iii.2.9\(^7\); W. B. G. M. omit tasmāt, thus allowing the citation to be found also at iii.2.9\(^6\); cases of this combination, all of them coming from the root caṁs, are not infrequent in the Sanhitā. As general counter-examples, we have, to establish the necessity of the restriction “at the beginning of a pada,” agnir ukthena vāhasā (i.5.11\(^1\)), somam pipāṣet (ii.1.10\(^1\)), and dahā ”caṁsaḥ (i.2.14\(^6\); O. omits); while tasmāt sa visrasyah (vi.2.9\(^4\),10\(^7\); only O. has the first two words), hastayoh (iv.1.5\(^5\) et al.; G. M. O. omit), and kavīgaṁtā (ii.6.12\(^6\); all the MSS. have -caṁṣah, which I have not found in the text, but probably by my own fault) do the same service for the specification “when a vowel follows.”

The commentator goes on to say that some authorities accept hi as a part of this rule: which is not to be approved, since “at the beginning of a word” is here implied, and so ahiṁsāyā (v.2.8\(^7\)) would be left without the increment. And if it be pleaded that hiṁsīḥ parame (iv.2.10\(^1\),2 et al.) should be an example here, the reply is made, that the anuvāra is assured to it by rule 13, below, where there is no restriction to the beginning of a word; and that to repeat here the specification of hi would be useless. The only criticism to be offered upon this is that the objection has too little reason to be really worthy of notice.

2. sra: ga: ha: pā: ga: ity ete grahamacīpesāhī padādayah sākāraparās tasmīnt sākāre svarapare saty anuvāromamabhajante. yathā: vi:... gaṁsā:... okāreṇa kim: acā:... haṁsā:... “hrasva iti kim: praṇa:...” pāṁsura:... dirghena kim: āh-:... yad:... padādaya iti kim: agnir:... somam:... “dahā:...” svarapara iti kim: tasmāt:... “has...” kav-...


scaḥ paraḥ yasmād asau svaraparāḥ: tasmīn.

---

\(^{1}\) G. M. -vaṇaparāh vīc.  \(^{2}\) O. -mā.  \(^{3}\) O. syāṭ.  \(^{4}\) G. M. O. om.  \(^{5}\) O. om.; G. M. hrasvena kim etc.  \(^{6}\) O. -ṛhe.  \(^{7}\) O. om.  \(^{8}\) G. M. O. om.  \(^{9}\) W. om.  \(^{10}\) G. M. kim.  \(^{11}\) G. M. aṅgīṁsk.  \(^{12}\) G. M. -vaṁhā; O. -dombhapra.  \(^{13}\) B. om.
3. Even when the vowel is altered.

That is to say, even when the vowel that is by the last rule required to follow the s has undergone euphonic alteration, so as to become a consonant. A single example is cited, *apahañsy agne* (iv.7.13⁴; p. *apa-haṇśi*); if the text contains any others, they have escaped my notice.

4. As also, when they are preceded by *rā*.

This rule is made for the purpose of establishing a single additional case under the general rule given above (xvi.2), namely, the word *nāraṇaśīsibhyāḥ* (vii.5.11²); the case being one, as the comment points out, where the *ca* is not at the beginning of a *pada*. The *ca*, 'also,' brings down only *ca*; and we are assured that this is the reason why *ca* was mentioned last in rule 2, even at the cost of a violation of the natural order of the vowels. Of this point we need not make much, since the rule contains other and unexplained violations of alphabetic order.

5. Also in *caṇḍā*, except when it is accented on the final syllable.

Here is another single case, falling under rule 2 by the suspension of one of the restrictions laid down in that rule—namely, that the *s* be followed by a vowel. The passage is *utā caṇḍā suvīpṛah* (iv.6.8²: O. omits suvīpṛah). The restriction as to accent

---

3. *opicaṇḍāḥ *svārāṇāvādecaκāhāḥ*; *sakārāt pare tasmānt svare vikṛtam āpam te *pi vyañjanatām upagate *pi syād* anuvāravi-dhīḥ*. yathā: *apā—*- [B. *sakārān*.- ² W. and O.(?) svārad. ³ lacuna in O., from (anuvāra-) vidhīḥ to svāra under the next rule.

4. *'caṇḍāḥ sraddishu' *caκāraṃ anvādiḍati*; etadartham eva *svarāvyataye* *'pi caκāragrahanām tatār *nte kṛtam. rā*; ity evamāpyevah *caκāraḥ sakāraparā nusvārāgamanam bhajate. yathā*; nār-—* apādāyarthe* yam *ārambhah.*

5. *caṇḍā*: ity *etasmān* 'grahaṇe nantodātte sakārapare bhavatye* anuvārāgamaḥ. *uta*-—* anantodātte iti kim: aṣv—*- *sra ṣaḥ* (xvi.2) iti *pṛāptau satyāṃ* sakārasya *svarāparatvā-
is intended to exclude ācasyā viçastā (iv.6.9\(^3\): O. adds dvā yam-).

6. Also in acañsan.

Yet another case belonging with those disposed of by rule 2, but requiring special treatment because the qa in it does not stand "at the beginning of a pada." The passage is abhi vy acañsan (vi.6.11\(^3\)).

O., in an added paragraph, brings forward the objection that, in virtue of rule i.52 (which makes the citation of any word include also the same word with a prefixed), acañsan has its ī already assured by rule 2; but refutes it by pointing out that the principle appealed to has to do only with a pada or word, not with a mere fragment of one, like qa (compare rule 10, below). It adds that "another reading is cañsan."

7. But not in cañsanam and viçasanena.

These are exceptions, the only ones the Sanhitā affords, under rule 2. The passages are cañsanam vājy arvā (iv.6.7\(^3\): O. ends with vājī) and cuno viçasanena (v.7.23).

T. and O. have the simple pada cañsanena, instead of viçasanena (p. viçasanena) in the rule, and O. reads the same in its comment. This is doubtless an emendation, and makes a reading more strictly in accordance with the approved usage of the treatise. The comment has (especially in the fourth chapter) explained away many a like inaccuracy by the allegation of a phrase "in another çikha:"

and we might expect to find added here vi 'ti kim: acañsanene 'ti çakhántare.

bhāve 'pi nā 'yan vidhir nishidhyatām 'iti grahanam. anta' uddāto yasya tad antodāttam: nā 'ntodāttam anantodāttam: tasmin.\(^{11}\)

1 O. asmin. 2 W. B. O. antod-. 3 O. sydd. 4 W. antod-. 5 G. M. om. 6 W. B. çak-. 7 G. M. ins. eva. 8 B. padogr-. 9 W. O. ant-. 10 O. om. 11 O. adds apadādyartho... ity uṣṭantāi (which belongs at the end of the comment on rule 6).

6. acañsanu ity asmin grahane syād anusvārgamah. abhi

..... 'apadādyartho 'yan ārambhah.\(^{1}\)

1 O. puts at end of comment on rule 5, and adds, partly there and partly here (a little amended), kimartham idam. sraçohapāça (xvi.2) ity anenāt 'va tattiddhān: aphy akāraçī (l.52) ti vacṣatā: māi 'tām: aphy akaradī ti vacṣanam padasya padavayavah sarabdāh: cañsanān iti pāṭhāntaram.

7. cañsanam: viçasanena: ity etaiy grahanayor anusvārgamana syāt. ca-s...... cuno...... sraçoha (xvi.2) iti prāptih.

1 O. ca-, as also (with T.) in the rule itself. 2 O. om.
8. Mā takes anusvāra when beginning a pada and unaccented.

All the implications of rule 2 are here cut off (as is distinctly enough intimated by the express repetition of one of them, padādi), and hence it is to be understood that the increment takes place before a s whether this be or not followed by a vowel. The examples are āhar māṇsēna (v.7.20) and māṇspācanyāḥ (iv.6.91). The restriction to the beginning of a pada is established by quoting sīlikamadhyamāsāḥ (iv.6.74); that as to the accent, by māsam dīkṣhitāḥ syāt (v.6.73: only O. has syāt).

So far as I have discovered, this rule applies only to forms and combinations of māṇa, which are not infrequent in the Sanhitā. The four following rules give it certain extensions and limitations.

9. As also when preceded by pu or mī, under all circumstances.

The closing specification of the rule amounts to a removal of the restriction as to accent, imposed in rule 8—that as to initial position being virtually removed by the prescribed prefixation of pu or mī. The examples quoted are ut pumāṇaḥ haranti (vi.5.103: O. omits haranti, and B. runs the two citations together, having dropped out a part of each) and mīmāṇsante kārye (vi.2.68). We have pumāṇaḥ again at iv.6.63, and other forms of mīmāṇaḥ at vi.2.64 and vii.5.71: I have noted no other words as falling under the rule.

10. And when followed by sakāya.

The eva, 'and,' we are told, here brings down mā; and G. M. add that the intent of the rule is to establish an exception under

---

1 G. M. O. ayaṁ. 2 O. om.

9. caṣabdo me 'ti jñāpayati: pu: mī: ity evampūrvo me 'ti' varṇaḥ sakāraparo nityam anusvāragamam bhajate, ut.....: mīm..... anudāttavaniwartako nityasyaṣabdoḥ.

1 G. M. O. ins. ayaṁ. 2 O. -nīyamavyāvar.
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rule 8—that is to say, to bring under that rule a word which would otherwise be excluded in virtue of the requisition "when beginning a pada." The case is similar to that about which O. raises a question under rule 6. The passage is amāṇsakāya svāhā (vii.5.122).

11. But not when preceded by a former member of a compound.

Or, 'by a pause of division (between the two members of a compound),' taking avagraha in its more original sense. W. B. O. define the rule as establishing exceptions under rule 8; G. M., which have taken in this notification (less correctly) as part of the preceding comment, say simply that mā is to be understood as implied here by vicinage. The examples given are pūrnāmāse vā (ii.5.54; O. omits vā) and ardhamāse devāh (ii.5.66 twice). The words would satisfy all the conditions of rule 8, the separated element -māse or -māse being itself (by 1.48) a pada. Since māsāa nowhere appears as the latter member of a compound, this rule exempts from the increment of anusvāra all the cases in which forms of mās or māsa are found in such a situation; others are the subject of the next following precept.

12. Nor in māsi, māsu, māsah, or māsām.

These are words which, without special exception, would fall under rule 8. The examples for the last three are daçāsu māsi 'tilsthan (vii.5.22), shin māso dākshinena (vii.5.34; only O. has the last word), and māsi'm prātisthitāyā (vii.5.16): we have māsāh also at vii.5.71, and māsi'm at v.7.18. The first, māsi, raises a difficulty. Some, the commentator says, cite in illustration of it prathamā māsi prshthāni (vii.5.33; O. omits the last word; but this is wrong; for the exemption of māsi in that passage is assured by rule 17, below: we are to assume, then, the occurrence in another text of some word of more than two syllables beginning

10. caçudālo me'ti jñāpayati: me 'ty ecaṁ' varṇah sakāyaparō 'nusvārāgamam' bhujate. am—

1 B. G. M. O. ayam. 2 W. B. sakārop. 3 G. M. nityam anus. 4 G. M. add mā paddādir anusātta (xvi.8) ity asyā' yam apravādah.

11. 'mā paddādir anusātta (xvi.8) ity asyā' yam apravādah. 2 avagrahāpūrvo me 'ty ecaṁ' varno nā 'nusvārāgamam' bhujate. yathā: pūrṇa——: ardha——. avagrahā pūrvo yasmdā' asāv avagrahāpūrvaḥ.

5 G. M. have this as part of the comment on the preceding rule, and substitute here sāmnidhiyaṁ mā stī labhyate. 6 B. G. M. O. ayam. 7 B. om. na. 8 G. M. O. om. 9 G. M. sa tathātāb; W. om. asāv.
with māsi. This interpretation is, of course, forced and false: māsi is included with the rest here because it is an example of the same class with them; and the makers of the treatise, when they put it in, either overlooked or neglected the fact that it falls technically under rule 14, and so also under rule 17, establishing exceptions to 14. We have also māsi-māsi, more than once, at vii.5.16.

The following words have anusvāra before s: hi, pu, jīgha, chaṁsine, atāṁsaya, ātāṁsīt, kaniyā, jīyā, drāghīyā, raṅghīyā, chṛyā, hraṣṭyā, vasvāyā, bhūyāṁsah, jākshivā, jaghmivā, jīgivā, jīgivā, tathivā, dācivā, didivā, papivā, pipivā, vidivā, vivivā, vṛcivā, vṛcuvā, vṛsvā.

The commentator’s examples are as follows: hiṁśī parame vyoman (iv.2.10–2.3; O. omits vyoman, and G. M. substitute mā hiṁśī tanuvā, iv.2.3 et al.) and cinute hiṁśyāi (v.2.87; O. omits cinute); respecting this first specification, see further below;—tena puṁsvatiḥ (ii.5.8) and puṇsah putrāṅ (iv.6.94): I have only noted farther two cases of puṇsah, at ii.6.5 and vi.5.82;—lokam ajigāṁsan (v.5.54; vi.5.82; O. omits lokam): elsewhere only at iii.2.2;—tvāṣṭāram ajighāṁsan (vii.5.84): the text presents fourteen other cases of jīghaṁs;—brāhmāṃchaṁsine (i.8.18): the only case: a counter-example (but O. omits all the counter-examples), pra yuchasy ubhe ni pāsi (i.4.22), shows the necessity of including in the citation the ne of chaṁsine;—gabhe mūlabhīm atāṁsaya (vii.4.194), with a counter-example, atasāṁ na puṣkham (i.2.142), to explain the citation of the whole word atāṁsaya;—anvātāṁsīt tvaya (iv.7.135; O. omits tvaya), with anu evādās tova (iv.6.73), to prove the need of the final it;—kaniyāṁso devāḥ (v.3.111): the text offers half-a-dozen cases of this comparative, and about the same number of the next;—jīyāṁso bhṛṭarāh.

12. 'cakāro nishedhākashakahā: māsi……. ity etesu grahaṁskul na syād anusvārāgamah. eshām api mā padādir (xvi.8) iti práptih. kecid atra prath…… ity udāharanti: tad asādhu; na pade dvīvare nityam (xvi.17) ity anenāi 'va nishedha-siddheḥ: tasmād anyačākhyāyāṁ balusuvarnam aparāṁ udāharaṇam avadhāraniyam. daĝasu…… shan…… māsām……

(0) O. om. 7 W. -rāpan. 8 W. O. n; G. M. om. 4 W. -dhāḥ siddhaḥ; B. -dhaḥ siddhaḥ. 5 G. M. anyasyāṁ p. 4 B. G. M. param; O. om.
(ii.6.1 et al.)—drāghiyānsān bhavataḥ (v.2.51): the only case;—
atho raghiyānsah (vii.4.9): also the only case;—pra cṛ- 
ṇās (ii.4.14): but O. substitutes the only other case, cṛṇās 
pāṇiṣṭ, v.1.23;—atha Ṛṣiṇāsāṃ akṛmanm (vii.6.42): but G. M. O. omit the last word, thus allowing the citation to include 
also the only other case, found in the same division;—vasīṇā-
ṣaṁ bhāgadheyaṇa (v.4.10): there are two or three further cases;—
ḥūḥyānsaḥ nyebhyah (vii.1.15), with annadā bhāyās (i.6.2 
et al.) as counter-example, proving that the final h had to be cited 
with the rest of the word: there are seven other cases of bhāyāns 
in the text;—jukshivānsāḥ papivānsah (i.4.442: O. omits the 
last word): the only case;—vrtram jīghivānsāṁ mṛdhō bhi 
(ii.5.3): W. B. omit the first word, O. the first and last; G. M. 
have only the first two, which are read also at ii.5.445: I have noted 
the word besides only at ii.1.102 three times, with the negative 
prefix;—vājam jīghivānsah (i.7.84): the only case;—for jīghivā 
is found only a case "in another cākha," namely jīghivānsa (so 
W. G. M., though the word is not grammatically admissible); O. 
has jīghivānsamyāma [i. e. -sah syāma?]; B. is corrupt, running 
the previous citation and this together into vājam jīghivāsāṁ iti 
cākhañtare);—dyumā tathāvānsaḥ janānām (i.2.14: O. alone 
has the last word); there is one other case, at iv.2.22;—dācvasa 
dāpusah sātam (i.4.16: O. alone has sātam): another case at ii. 
2.124;—ucaya dīdevaṇsah (ii.5.122): another case at i.2.14; 
papivānsaḥ ca viṣve (i.4.442): the only case;—papivānsaḥ 
sarvavānsah (iii.1.112: O. has tas trayah, probably corrupt for -ta 
stanam, as the text reads): the only case;—videvānsa vāi purā 
hotāraḥ (ii.5.1112: only O. has the last two words) and avidvānsaḥ 
cakma (iv.7.156: O. begins viṣṭāvid; by mutilation of the pre-
ceding word in the passage): the Sauhitā has over thirty cases of 
videva;—prāvīdevivānsaṁ śāme (iv.7.151);—yac chruv-
vānsah (ii.5.92 twice): there is another case at v.3.41;—and, 
finally, vājāḥ sarvavānsah (i.7.84).

After the second example (ahōśāyād), G. M. insert the remark 
that it is brought under the present rule by the principle of "pre-
fixed of a" (i.52). This is wrong, being inconsistent with the
exposition given under rule 2 (see note on that rule) of the reason why hi was not there included: hi here is meant not as initial only, but wherever found in a word. Since, however, it is only in this one word that hi occurs otherwise than as initial, it would seem better to have disposed of the single case as of those which form the subject of rules 6 and 10, and to put hi into 2, where it would look much more at home than here at the head of a troop of perfect participles and comparatives. And why pu was not put into rule 2 without any ceremony, I cannot see at all; unless I have overlooked some case or cases of its occurrence, puḥs is invariably initial.

The commentator raises the question why rule xvi.4 does not require us to insert an anusvāra before the s of dāgva, viviśivā, and guṇrūvā, since these too are srādayāḥ; and he makes answer that it is because the restriction conveyed in xvi.1 is still in force. But in that case, he goes on to say, is there not a nasal increment before the s of hrasyā, vasīyā, tashṭivā, and susrūvā? The answer to this objection is twofold. First, the competency of the citation is pleaded—that is to say, the words being read in the rule itself without nasal, that is to be understood as their authoritative form (compare under rule 19, where this plea leads to a further discussion). Secondly, the words in question being found associated with atāṁśīt, kanyāyā, jyāyā, and so on, all of which show the anusvāra to follow a long vowel, we are to infer that in the others also it does not follow a short vowel. The first of these answers is not such as is wont to be pleaded in this treatise, and the second is evidently very weak: I should almost prefer to assume that the difficulty was not remarked by the authors of the treatise, and that the commentators who have discovered it have been forced to make the best excuse they could for it.

A more serious objection to the rule, it seems to me, is that it mixes together cases of two different classes—those in which (chaṇīśī etc.) the nasal appears in the word itself as cited, and those in which it is to be added before a following s. Of this, however, the comment takes no notice.

na syāt. otha sakāraparā (xvi.1) ity āṣhmavicleṣahasya sa-kārasaḥ 'nivṛttir iti vaddāṇam. tarhi hrasyācasyātasthiśvāsa-sve tye atra 'sakārapa eva 'gamaḥ' kim na syāt. ucdāra-sāmarthiyād eva 'ty prathamān' parihārah. otha vā: atāṁśītka-nīyāyāye 'tyadīshu sarvatra dirghāṇantaram eva 'nusvārasthapānum' iti sāhacaryād atra 'pi na syād anusvārasya kravān-taram' sthānam ity aparah parihārah.

14. The vowels á, õ, and ō have anuvāra, when they are followed by si or shi final.

This rule, of course, applies to the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural of neuters in as, is, and us. The illustrative examples are vāyūni pakṣagandhena (v.7.23), tamāñhi gāhatām ajushtā (i.8.22²), only O. has ajushtā, daça havinshi (vii.5.14²), jyotiṣhi kurute (v.4.1⁴; O. omits), agna āyūnshi (i.3.14⁷ et al.), and avabhṛthayājūnshi juhoti (vi.6.3¹: G. M. omit juhoti). To show that the si or shi must be final, are quoted tasmād vāsiṣṭho brahmā (iii.5.2¹: only G. M. have brahmā), and maniṣhino manasā (iv.6.2⁵: O. omits manasā). To show that the preceding vowel must be long, we have yathā 'nosi yuktā údhāyate (v.4.10²: only G. M. have the last word), jyotistvā jyotiṣhi (i.1.10³), and āyushi durśe (i.2.14³); and, finally, to show that no other vowel than ō after the s or sh calls out the increment, prajāv eva prajātāsū (vi.4.1³), oshadhishu (iii.5.5² et al.), and tāṇuṣhu buddham (i.8.22⁵).

The last six counter-examples are omitted in O., which adds at the end the obvious remark that, as si and shi are here indicated as occasions of the preceding anuvāra, that value no longer belongs to s merely—that is to say, the force of the heading given in rule 1 is henceforth at an end.

15. Even when the i is altered

That the i of the ending si or shi is here aimed at is in the nature of the case obvious enough, but not at all distinctly intimated by the terms of the rule. The commentator quotes in illustration candaśy upa dudhāti (v.3.8¹²), havinshy ā śādāyē (i.6.10²), and tapāṁshy aṅgajuhvā (i.2.14¹: G. M. omit juhvā).

14. sishiparā ākārakārād tayoh sishyoh padāntayoh sator anuvāragamam bhajante. yathā: vay-.....: taṃ-.....: daça-.....: jyot-.....: agna-.....: avarbh-.....: padāntayoh iti kim: tasmād-.....: mani-.....: ākārakārād iti dirghena kim: yathā-.....: jyotis-.....: āyushi-.....: sishi 'ty' atre 'kāreṇa kim: praj-.....: osh-.....: tan-.....:

1 MSS. sate. ² O. om. ³ O. -ta. ⁴ G. M. dirghāth; O. om., with all that follows. ⁵ W. B. ity. ⁶ O. adds sishiparamittayor nidecit sakārasya param- nimitana bhāti.

15. opīcabadāṇvādānte sishyor ākārre viṣkte 'pi yakaram āpanne 'pi bhavaty anuvāragamah. yathā: chand-.....: hav-.....: tap-.....:

¹ W. B. O. -bdon-; G. M. -bdend 'ne-. ² G. M. O. om.
16. According to Sāṅkṛtyya, the vowel, except ā, is short.

That is to say, the two vowels ī and ā, to which alone reference has been made above, become short in the cases here referred to: for example, in haviṁ śi bhavaṁti (v.5.17 et al.; O. omits bhavanti) and samihśīrjavāśi juhoti (vi.6.21; G. M. O. omit juhoti), where Sāṅkṛtyya would read haviṁśi and yajuṁśi, while in vayāśi (v. 7.23 et al.; O. omits) he would admit the long vowel.

A curious case of dissent upon a point in grammar which we have not been accustom made to regard as open to any difference of opinion. The rule is, naturally enough, pronounced unapproved.

G. M. add ca to the rule, after sāṁkṛtyasya.

17. Not, under any circumstances, in a disyllabic word.

This is a rule prescribing exceptions under rule 14; the addition nityam, 'under any circumstances,' confirms its application to words ending in ī or śi after ā, ē, or ū which would otherwise fall under any other rule prescribing the increment.

Examples under rule 14 alone are first quoted, namely stuto yāsi vacāṁ anu (i.8.51; G. M. O. end with yāsi) and yāsi dātaṁ (iii.5.53; G. M. have dropped out yāsi). Then, as a case also under rule 2, we have vidhataṁ pāsi nu tmanā (i.3.141); and, as one under rule 8, prathame māsi prsthāni (vi.7.531; G. M. omit the last word), which has been already made the subject of discussion under rule 12, above. The force of the nityam does not go so far as to prohibit an anusvāra in every disyllabic word before ī, what-


ne 'daṁ sūtram iṣṭām.

1 O. om. 2 O. om.

17. deśavare' pade vartamānād ākārekārākārāḥ padāntasishiparād nā 'nusvāragamam bhajante. yathā: stuto...... yāsi...... nityaçabdaḥ prāptaṁantarapratishedhārthaḥ: vidhataḥ...... 'sraçoha' (xvi.2) iti prāptih: prathame...... mā pa- dādir (xvi.8) iti prāptih. dvāu svarāu yasim iti vidyete tad deśavaram: tasmin.

1 O. deśavere. 2 G. M. -na. 3 G. M. ākārāḥ ākāraḥ; O. ākāra-ākārāḥ. 4 G. M. -nās sāṁkṛtya; O. -nā śi. 5 B. om. 6 G. M. nityaḥ nā. 7 B. ins. na; O. ins. niṣṭhān. 8 G. M. O. om. 9 W. om. 10 B. om. 11 O. -hapāya paddādaya. 12 O. -dir īyā. 13 G. M. ins. pade.
ever vowel precedes, or it would include haṃsi also, and possibly other cases.

18. Nor in rjīshi, jīgāsi, jīghāsi, ajāsi, yajāsi, dadāsi, dadhāsi, and vartayāsi.

These are verbal forms which need to be excepted under rule 14, and which, as containing more than two syllables, are not reached by rule 17. The passages in which they occur are quoted by the commentary, as follows: tena rjīshi sarvāni (iii.2.21: only O. has sarvāni), acaḥā jīgāsi (iv.2.42), dvam ajāsi garbhadham (vii.4.191), havishā yajāsy agne bhṛhat (iii.5.112 et al.: O. omits the last two words), yābhīri dadāsi dāgushe (iii.3.115: G. M. omit dāgushe), dadhāsi dāgushe kave (iv.2.72), and acaṃ a vartayāsi naḥ (vii.4.20). Yajāsi I have noted in two or three other passages; if the rest occur elsewhere, I have overlooked them. This leaves unaccounted for jīghāsi, which is declared to occur "in another text," in the passage prathame jīghāsi.

19. In daṃsanābhyyaḥ, daṃsabhīḥ, daṃsamaḥ, vrshadaṇḍaḥ, daṃ-čukā, and daṃshtābhyyāṃ, anusāra is taken in the latter place.

The commentator’s citations are vāvyānarasya daṃsanābhyyaḥ (i.5.111); sajosāv aṣvinā daṃsabhīḥ (v.6.41), to which is added as counter-example, proving the need of the -bhīḥ, yushmāko "ti ri-γādasah (iv.3.135: O. has only the last word, and G. M. begin

18. 1 cakāro nishedhākārashakaḥ: rjishiprabhrtiṣhuḥ grahanēshuḥ nā 'nuscārāgamah sāyāḥ: ākārekārokārā (xvi.14) iti prāp- tiḥ, bahusvaratvād eshuḥ puzvasūtranishedo sa sidhyati 'ty atrāḥ 'yam ārāṃbhāḥ, yathā: tena...... acaḥā...... jīghāsi...... ti cākhāntare: "prathame jīghāsi 'ti: a...... havishā...... yābhīr...... dadhāsi...... acaṃ......

1 O. ins. an enumeration of the words in the rule. 2 G. M. -ṭṭī. 3 G. M. -ṛtī. 4 G. M. -ṛtī. 5 B. esha; G. M. om. 6 G. M. -tṛś mi; W. B. -dham. 7 O. om. atra. 8 G. M. O. om. 9 G. M. -aṃsī. (10) O. om.; W. prathame — — (as being illegible in the MS. from which the copy was made); B. -gāsaṭṭi.

19. 1 daṃsanābhyaḥ ityādiṣhuḥ grahanēshu para eva 'nuscārā- gamo bhavati; yathā: vāipv...... saj...... bhīr iti kim: yushm...... purud...... vrsh...... paṇūn...... daṃsh...... daṅse 'ty etāvātāi 'vā'lam; kim akhilapadapāthena, kur-
with āti); purudaṁśāṁ sanin (iv.2.4); vrshadanaṁ te dhātuh (v.5.12); there is another case at v.5.21; paścin daṁcukāṁ syur yad visñācinam (v.2.9); O. omits the first word, and it alone has the last two); and daṁshtābhīyāṁ mahāmāliaṁ (iv.1.10); there is another case at v.7.11. To the objection that the citation in the rule of daṁsa simply might have saved the rehearsal of whole words [in a part of the cases given], the commentator replies by quoting kurvato me mo 'pa doṣaṁ (i.6.3 et al.) as an example of cases which need to be excluded. The addition of paraḥ, 'in the latter place, is because vrshadanaṁ contains two places at which, by xv.4, the anusvāra would otherwise require to be inserted.

This last point, however, does not pass (except in O.) without further question and discussion. The objection is raised that the mere citation of vrshadana without anusvāra before the former sibilant is enough to settle its reading, according to the same principle that was appealed to under rule 13, for hraśiyā, eṣayā, and so on. This is undeniable; and the only real answer to be made is that there was no harm in adding para here, to make the matter sure, while it could not have been employed in rule 13 without occasioning a great deal of additional trouble. The commentator, however, prefers to have recourse to a plea of exceptionally puerile character. In xv.4 (the rule here in force), he says, the spirants in general are implied, but in xv.1 (in force at rule 13) a special spirant, ś; and it is an acknowledged principle that, as between a generality and a specification, the specification is the more powerful. That being the case, the putting down of that

vato… ityādāṁ ma bhūd iti. 'para iti kim: vrshadanaṁ ity atraś thānadvayye pi śrādishu cai 'kapada (xv.4) iti prāptāṁ savyāṁ pūrvatraṁ ma bhūd iti. namu grahaṇasāmereśyād evā 'nusvāraḥ" pūrvatra na bhavati; yathā hraśiyāvāsiyā (xvi. 13) ityādāṁ grahaṇasāmereśyād" upāpaditam, nā 'sha doshoḥ: śrādishu cai 'kapada (xv.4) ity atra" shnasāmānyām uktam: atha sakāraparā (xvi.1) ity atra tu tadviṣeshā uktah: sāmaṇyaviṣeṣhayor viçeśho balavān iti nyāyah; tathā sati "balavad-bādhanam" eva bhūṣaṇaṁ "na tu" durbalabādhanam iti" tatrāi 'va grahaṇasāmārthyaṁ" samarthanīyām: na tu atra" durbalasthāne; tathā "pi"; "adhibhā potusmA virodhinam iti" adhikam eva bādhave bhūṣhanatvat: na tu kādićid alpabalam iti" paraçabadaprayogā "upapadyate."
which is powerful, not of that which is weak, is honorific; hence, the competency of the citation was to be insisted on in the former rule, but not here, in a weak position. Moreover, a superior man puts down, for honor's sake, a mighty opponent, but never a weak one. Therefore, the use of the word para here is right and proper!

All the MSS. except B. (and G. M., which have a slight lacuna, involving the word) read daśaṁ instead of daśaṁ in the rule.

20. Also in maṁśye, maṁsatāi, yaṁsad, yaṁsan, vaṁsate, and vaṁsagah.

The commentator quotes as follows: paćaṁ na 'bhi maṁsyat iti (iii.1.96), anu nāv cāru maṁsatāi bhadrā indrasya rātayah (vii.4. 15: O, alone has the first two words, B. alone the last one), pocishā yaṁsad virocinām ny atrinam (iv.6.12: G. M. O. omit pocishā), iṣhavah śarma yaṁsan (iv.6.64), agnir no vaṁsate rāyim (iv.6.12), and tijmagṛgo na vaṁsagah (ii.6.114). The words here dealt with occur only in the passages quoted, except yaṁsat, which is found also at iv.1.112; 7.143. To the objection that it would have been enough to give maṁs, yaṁs, and vaṁs (the MSS. leave it doubtful whether these are the precise forms suggested) in the rule, instead of citing whole words, the commentator replies by giving the counter-examples uttamasya eva dyati (vi.3.104), yasya bhūyaṁso yojjakratavah (iii.1.73), and adya vasu vasati (ii.5.37).

21. Also in vaṁcaṁ, after ut or na.

The passages are ud vaṁcaṁ iva yemire (i.6.122: W. has dropped out yemire, along with all the rest of the comment) and prācinavaṁcaṁ karoti (vi.1.11 twice). A counter-example, with a different preceding word, is brahmaṁca eva bhavati vaṁcaṁ va eṣa ca rati (ii.1.77: only O. has the first two words, and it omits the last two).


1 O. prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule. 2 B. -di. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 W. bhadrāyi; B. saṁsūr yāṁs vaṁs; G. M. maṁsa; yāṁsa: vaṁsa; O. maṁsa: yaṁs: vaṁs.

21. ut: na: ity evamārca vaṁcaṁ ity asmin grhahe syād anuvārāgamah. ud......: 'prā......: 'evamārca iti' kim: brahm......

1 O. uṣṇayatebhrat. 2 W. -reś; B. -reśa. 3 W. om. 4 O. unne 'tī.
praṇāṣṭākṣara-sūryottānta-āśrāṇi ॥ २२ ॥

22. Also in akraṇsta, kraṇṣyate, raṇṣyate, and bhraṇṣate.

The passages are dyāṁ vyāj akraṇsta (vii.5.19), utkraṇṣyate svāhā (vii.1.19), uparaṇṣyate svāhā (vii.1.19: B. O. omit), and nā 'smād rāṣṭrām bhraṇṣante (v.7.4: O. omits the first two words); bhraṇṣate occurs also at i.6.11 twice.

G. M. read utkraṇṣyate for kraṇṣyate in the rule.

रक्षी च ॥ २३ ॥

23. And also in raṇhyāi.

The only passage is pūṣhno raṇhyāi (i.3.10). The significance of the ca, 'and,' which is here out of its proper place, will be given, we are told, under the next rule.

वेश्कार उपयोग नितान्तः ॥ २४ ॥

24. The ṛ, according to Ukhya, is excessive.

That is to say, according to the commentator, the ṛ of the word raṇhyāi, here brought forward by the ca, 'and,' which is read in the preceding rule. Nītānta, 'excessive,' is explained as signifying 'uttered with more violent effort.' The whole business is a very queer one—Ukhya's opinion itself, its introduction here at a place where it is entirely impertinent, and the bit of interpretation whereby it is worked into the connection.

विरित्रि संवयां ॥ २५ ॥

25. Also in vi, ri, and tri, in numerals, except in su.

22. 'akraṇste tyādīshu syād anuvārāgamah. dyāṁ......

utkr......: 'upa......: nā......

(1) O. substitutes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule (except the last), and etashu grahaṇesu anuvārāgam gavat. (2) B. O. om.

23. raṇhyā ity asmin grahane syād anuvārāgamah. pūṣhno

.... cakārasya 'vyatihārenā 'naya uttarasūtre prayojanam ucyate.

(1) G. M. vyavahārōd anvayād.

24. raṇhyā ity asmin grahane pūrvasūtrasahcakārasamar-
pitā ādikōro nītānto bhavati 'ty ukhyasya 'mate. nītāntas tier-
taraprayatnā ity arthāḥ.

nādi 'tan matām ishtām.

The syllable su is here, the commentator tells us, the ending of the locative case, just as ah (at i. 23) is used as representing the nominative case. This remark is called for, because (see the example below) the actual form in which the syllable appears in the cases aimed at is su. We have a right to be surprised at finding it given as su in the rule; and perhaps, also, to conjecture that sanākhyaśu was originally simply the locative plural of sanākhya, and that the other value was interpreted into it when the cases calling for exception were noticed.

The quoted examples are viṁcataśaś svāhā (vii. 2. 13 et al.; O. omits), yad viṁcatis deka tena virājau (v. 3. 32; G. M. omit the last two words, O. the last three), catvāriṁcete svāhā (vii. 2. 17; G. M. O. omit svāhā; B. has dropped out -te svāhā, the next example, and the first word of the next but one), triṁcete svāhā (vii. 2. 17; O. omits svāhā), and triṁcet trayac co (i. 4. 111); there are other cases, which I have not taken the trouble to collect. The inclusion of tri in the rule, the commentator says, is for the sake of greater plainness, since ri, of course, involves tri also; it is to be compared with the inclusion of the v of vāghā in rule vii. 13. Begging the commentator’s pardon, however, the two cases are not at all analogous; and the citation of tri and ri together must be esteemed an oversight, and an offense against the law of economy of expression, obligatory in the sūtra-style. The need of restriction to numerals is illustrated by viśe janāya (ii. 5. 123), sa rishah pātu naktam (i. 2. 141 et al.; G. M. O. omit naktam), and triṣṭubhāti vā śmaī (ii. 5. 104 et al.). Finally, the specification “not before su” is established by trishe a rocane divah (iv. 2. 44 et al.; O. omits divah); if there is another case of this kind, I have failed to note it.

There is yet another word, triṣṭhāasrah (v. 6. 83; p. triṣṭhāasrah), which would properly fall under this rule, but is exempted by a pregnant interpretation of the word ekapade in xv. 4 (see the note to that rule).
26. Also in ciñcumārah, ciñshat, sañcvā, sañsrā, sañsrśtha, sañskṛtya, sañskṛta, sañcita, sañcitā, kiñcilā, and kiñcilā.

The passages, as quoted, are sindhoh ciñcumāro himavañah (v. 5.11: only O. has the last word); kiñ tota uc ciñshati 'ti yad dhīranyeshtakāh (v.5.52: only O. has the last two words, and it omits the first two); ubhayaḥsañcvāyi kuryād avadāya 'bhi (ii. 6.84: only O. has the last two words, and it leaves off ubhayaḥ); sañsrāvabhāgā stha (i.1.132); sañrsṛṣṭajīt somapāh (iv.6.41: W. B. put this after the next following example; see farther on); ca- cārīcau eva sañskṛtyā 'bhyārohaṭi (v.6.83-4: O. omits the first two words; and all but O. omit the last one, thus making a citation which is also found again in v.6.64); tan nath sañskṛtam (i.4.432); brahmaśaṅcito hy esha gṛhhāvacaḥ (ii.5.92: only O. has the last word); ca- cārīye brahmaśaṅcita (iv.6.44); kiñcilā vanyā yā ta āvah (v.5.91: all but G. M. end with te); and kiñcilāc caturtho vanyāh (v.5.92: G. M. alone have vanyāh) and kiñcilāya ca kshayanāya ca (iv.5.91: O. ends with the first ca). The commentary prefaces the last two passages with the remark that the second citation of kiñcilā is that of a part of a word, including a variety of cases. But this, in the first place, would imply that the reading of the rule at the end was kiñcilakīñcilā, which is the case only in T.; and, in the second place, even were that the reading, the explanation would be a bad one, and the repeated kiñcilā should be defined as a theme ending in a, and so including the declensional forms of that theme, by i.22: in fact, it was expressly cited under that rule, as an example of its application. If kiñcilā is the true reading (as I presume to be the case), then we must suppose that the makers of the rule intended both words as padāikadeça's, the one involving the first two examples quoted, the other the third, and the case being quite parallel with that of sañcita and sañcitā, just preceding: but the comment has discovered a difficulty, namely, that kiñcilā is actually a pada in the text (v.5.91), and therefore cannot be quoted without ceremony as a padāikadeça (see under rule 29, where this is more distinctly brought out); and hence its efforts to amend the reading and interpretation—efforts in which it is too intent upon the end to be gained to be mindful of consistency in the means employed. In short, here as in many other places, the Prātiṣeṣāhyā is less minutely accurate in its modes of statement than the commentator would fain have it, and he undertakes to make it what it should be by forced interpretation.
Cases of various character are here intermingled. The first two and the last are indivisible words, of which the anusvāra forms an essential part, as of those cited in rules 19 and 20, or 29 and 30. The others come from combinations with the preposition sam, and are of two classes: saṅskṛtya and saṅskṛta the pada-text does not attempt to analyze, although (see v. 6.7) it divides saṅskṛturata and saṃaskṛturata, ejecting the intrusive sibilant: those remaining are compounds with sam which enter into further composition, so that their compound character does not appear in the pada-text. And one or two cases of this last class seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise; they are svāduṣaṅsaṅadah (iv. 6.62; p. svādu-saṅsaṅadah) and strishaṅsaṅadam (ii.5.18; p. strīsaṅsaṅadam). The former of them, indeed, is noticed in G. M., which introduce saṅsaṅadah into the rule, after saṅskṛta, and quote the compound in the comment—seeming to betray their consciousness that the word is not a part of the ordinary reading of the rule by saying “when saṅsaṅadah is read, the instance is svāduṣaṅsaṅadah.”

There are further varieties of reading in the rule: G. M. have gīnshati; W. B. put saṅsṛśhta between saṅskṛtya and saṅskṛta, and give its example a corresponding place among the examples; T. B. G. M. read saṅskṛtoṇi, which is perhaps to be preferred; other differences are mere copyists’ errors, and not worth reporting.

So far as I have discovered, saṅskṛtam (i.2.9) and saṅcita (iv.6.44 a second time) are the only words included in this rule which occur further in the Sanhitā.

The commentator raises the question whether we must not suppose that an anusvāra is also to be inserted before the spirant śh in saṅsṛśhta; but, without this time appealing to the “competency of the citation” to settle the reading, replies that, the word being associated here with others all of which have anusvāra only after the first vowel, we must assume the same to be the case with it also; all but O. adding that “there is no reason for inconsistency” in this respect.

27. Also after si, tr, or dr, when h follows.

The quoted examples are siṁho vayah (iv.3.5), cataturhāṁ trihanti (i.5.78 et al.), and drūhasva mā ṛvāḥ (i.1.3 et al.). Of the caryād atr āpi tathāi ‘vo ν vyāneyam: “na vai ‘paryāpte kārānam asti”.

1 O. prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words cited in the rule. 2 G. M. -disu gr.: 3 O. -disu. 4 G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. ins. saṅsādīti pōthe svāduṣaṅsaṅadāḥ. 6 W. paraṃ kri. 8 G. M. om. 7 W. G. M. sarva. 8 W. varṣ.; G. M. -gaṇcaram. 8 O. sāh. 10 B. ’va ’pi. (18) O. om.; W. om. na.

27. si: tr: dr: ity evampūrvo hakāraparāḥ syād anusvārāgamah. yathā: siṁho...... catat......: drūh...... ‘evam-
noun śīna, and of forms from the roots trūḥ and drūḥ, which alone come under the action of the rule, there are other cases in the Sanhitā. Counter-examples are given (excepting in O.): to show that no other syllables take the increment before h, sapatnasāhī svāhā (i.2.12²: but G. M. substitute sapatnasaḥīṁ sam mārjīṁ, i.1.10¹) and anatidāhdyo vācā (v.2.10²); that r takes the increment only when preceded by t or d, gṛhānām asamartyaī (iii.3.8²); that the increment is taken only before h, sishāsantih (vii.5.2¹: G. M. read sishāsah, but doubtless by a blunder only), trśvīṁ anu (i.2.14¹), and naktaṁ ḍṛṣe dīpyate (v.6.4⁴).

मश्रितस्य च ॥ २८ ॥

28. As also, in maṁhisṭhasya.

That is to say, before the h, which is brought down from the preceding rule by ca, expressly in order to exclude the assumption of anusvāra before the śh and s in the same word. The passage is maṁhisṭhasya prabhṛtasya (iv.2.3⁴), and there is no other.

आदिर्भुतिर्भासोऽस्मिन्नन्नन्न्दित्रवर्षाणामप्रायत्तिकोत्तरसंग्रहितम् ॥ २९ ॥

29. Also, after the first vowel, in aṁhatih, aṁhah, aṁhoḥ, aṁhōmuc, atyaṁhāh, aṁhasah, aṁhasā, aṁcām, aṁcubhīh, aṁcabhūvā, aṁcu, aṁcā, aṁcavah, aṁcuh, aṁcūm, aṁcūnā, aṁcūnā, aṁcoh, aṁcāya, upaṁcu, and aṁcāu.

We have here a detailed list of complete padas (or, in one or two instances, more than a whole pada), in which anusvāra is found. The illustrative examples are as follows. For aṁhatih, pari dveshāso aṁhatih (ii.6.11²): the only case. For aṁhah, aṁhomucam vṛshhakam yaṁniyānām (i.6.12²; p. aṁhah-mucam: G. M. O. omit the last word); aṁhah is found four or five times in the Sanhitā as an independent word, and about fifteen times in the

pārva iti kim: sap—....: anati—....: rīkārenai'vad'lam: kim
takāradakārabhyām: grh—....: evampara iti kim: sish—....
tṛśvīṁ—....: naktam—....: hakārah paro yasmād 'asāu hakāraparaha.'

¹ G. M. -raç ca. Ṭ O. asāu hakāraparaha. ² B. G. M. O. om. Ṭ O. om. ³ G. M. om. eva. Ṭ G. M. su tathākāra.

28. maṁhisṭhasye 'ty asmin grahane cakārakṣṭuhakāraparo
'nuscārāgamo bhavati'. yathā: maṁḥ—.... 'cakārah kimarthakah: atrāi'va grahane sushakāraparo ma bhūd iti.'

¹ G. M. O. syāt. Ṭ G. M. O. om. Ṭ O. om.
compound aḥhomuc—one of the forms of which, as we shall see farther on, has to be made separate account of. For aḥhoḥ, aḥhoḍ cid yā (i.4.22 and ii.1.114): there is no other case. For aḥhomuk, aḥhomugbhyaḥ devikapālāḥ (vi.5.22: O. omits devikapālāḥ, and W. B. put it in out of place); of all the forms of aḥhomuc, this is the only one in which aḥḥoh does not form a pada (it is divided, of course, aḥhomuk-bhyām), and which therefore is not disposed of by the citation of aḥḥah. For atyaḥḥah, ṛtapāg cā' tyayāḥḥah (i.8. 132-3): the word is found again at iv.6.55; it is more than a simple pada (p. ati-aḥḥah), and the ati is included in the citation, we are told, to prevent confusion of aḥḥah with aḥḥah in such phrases as shadahā bhaveṇṭi (vii.5.14; shat-aḥḥah). For aḥḥasah, te no muṇcatam aḥḥasah (iv.7.156: all except B. read muṇcante, which does not occur before aḥḥasah): of this case of aḥḥas I have noted about twenty instances. For aḥḥasā, the only example is the one quoted, aḥḥasā vā eha gṛhitāḥ (ii.4.23: O. ends with vāi). The commentator next raises the question why whole padas should have been cited, when aḥha (as part of a word) would have been sufficient to assure the reading, and replies by quoting sa rasam aha vasantāyā (vii.2.101: O. begins with aha), as an example of cases that required to be excluded. For aṇṭam, pari pasyāmo 'raṇam a (vii.1.58: O. omits a); the form is found again in the same division. For aṇḍubhiḥ, shadbhir aṇḍubhiḥ pṛcayati (vi.4.57: O. omits pṛcayati; W. B. put this example off until after that for aṇḍu, which would be, to be sure, a more suitable place for it, if the same order were followed in the rule; but there all authorities agree; see further on). For aṇḍubhavā, tenvā 'raṇabhavā somam (vi.4.82: G. M. O. omit somam): the word is found again at vi.4.83. For aṇḍu, tenā 'raṇamut (iii.2.21); and it is pointed out that, by rule i.53 (the comment blunderingly quotes i.52 instead), aṇḍu kurvantaḥ (iii.2.21) is involved with aṇḍu (O. has lost of this, all but the example aṇḍu ku). For aṇḍaḥ, vṛṣhno hy etāv aṇḍaḥ (vi.4.53). For aṇḍavaḥ, prāṇā vā aṇḍavaḥ (vi.4.44). For aṇḍuh, aṇḍur aṇḍus te (i.2.111 et al.): the word is found in eight other passages. For aṇḍum, yam ādityā aṇḍum āpyāyaṅaṁti (ii.3.53 et al.: only W. has the last word); there are five other instances. For aṇḍun, aṇḍun apa grihṇāti (vi.4.44: lost in W.): it occurs further in the
same division, and in no other. For aṅguṇā, aṅguṇā te aṅguḥ (i.2. 6: G. M. O. end with te). For aṅghoḥ, yo ca aṅghor ayaṭananām veda (vi.6.10²: O. omits the last two words, and B. has lost the whole example, with most of the preceding one). For aṅgya, aṅgya svāhā bhagāya (i.8.13²: G. M. omit bhagāya). For upāṇcu, upāṇcuvānayo yad upāṇcuvānayam (vi.4.4¹: O. omits the first two words). The word upāṇcu, when not further compounded, is separated in pada-text into upa-aṅcu, and so most of its forms come under the various citations of the cases of aṅcu already illustrated (thus, it furnishes additional instances, not counted above, to aṅcu, aṅguḥ, aṅguṃ, and aṅghoḥ, twenty in all); but in its compounds it makes, of course, a single pada of itself (thus, upa-aṅcu-savanah), and so has to be cited in the rule as such (we have other combinations, namely, with pātra, yāja, and antaryāma); and, moreover, we have one case, upāṇcāu, showing a form of aṅcu which does not appear independently, and so furnishing the final citation, for which the example is tam upāṇcāu sam asthāpayan (vi.4.6¹): there is another in the same division.

The restriction oḍāh, 'after the first vowel,' is intended to guard against any one's imagining that the s of aṅhaṣaḥ and so on is to be preceded by anusvāra.

What has thus been given represents the whole comment as found in O.; the other MSS. make two or three troublesome additions, to which it is necessary to return. The last of them regards the citation of aṅcu and its inflectional forms (namely, those that contain aṅcu as a part, or aṅcuḥhiḥ, aṅguḥ, aṅguṃ, aṅguṇā); and, if I understand it aright, it asserts that, if aṅcu alone were cited, the other forms would not be included, because aṅcu itself occurs as a pada (and would therefore have to be taken as such, and not as a part of a word, padaikadega); and if it be proposed to cite it with each value, as was done with kūṣīla (in rule 26: see note to that rule), there remains the difficulty that, as a phonetic complex only, it would involve such cases as paṇum paṇipate te adya (iii. 1.4¹: W. omits paṇum)—where, namely, we have the same elements in combination, only without the anusvāra. With regard to aṅga, a somewhat similar statement appears to be made: namely, that if aṅga simply were quoted, it would be understood as a pada (being such in aṅga-bhuvā), and hence aṅgaṃ would

... tvayā... "bhuvē 'ti kin: aṅge 'ty etāvatā" grahāne tathāvidhadaṇḍhābhāvād aṅgaṃ" ity atra na" syāt;" tenā... "apy akārādi (i.52) iti vacanād anaga... ity apy" udāhāramān:" vrshno... pranā... "aṅgur..." yam... "aṅga..." aṅgaṇā... yo...: aṅgāya... upāṅcu...: tam... "aṅge " ity etāvatā" grhāta itaresbān aparigrahaḥ" syāt "tathāvidhadaṇḍhābhāvāt: atho 'bhayaṃ grhyate padam ekadēgaṃ" ca kūṣīlāvat: tathā sati padāikadeṣeṁ, puṇaḥ ityādiṣu práphuyad anusvāraḥ": tac ca "nis̄-
not be included. The comment, however, puts this forward as a reason for including the bhūvā of aṅga-bhūvā, which, according to the interpretation here offered, it would not be; and perhaps my comprehension of the argument is insufficient. I do not see any reason why, if the pada-text divides aṅga-bhūvā, the bhūvā should be given in the rule. Equally unexplainable to me is the special citation of aṅga-bhūhī, which, being divided in pada into aṅga-bhūhī, falls under aṅga; we have also in the Sanhitā aṅgubhyām (i.4.2 and vi.4.5a), which is a case analogous with the other, and ought to be treated like it. Possibly we may infer from the unsuitable position of aṅga-bhūhī in the rule, and from the place of its example as given in W. B., next after that containing aṅga-mat (as if it were, like the latter, a case of aṅga), that it has been interpolated, by an awkward and blundering hand; but the conjecture is a more daring one than I venture seriously to make.

The first excursus of the comment is in connection with the second citation, aṅhaḥ. Since the sanhitā-form of this word, we are told, appears by the rule itself to be aṅho, the rule does not apply to aṅhaḥ, which shows a different result of combination in ahar devānām (i.5.92; G. M. read aharahar, which is not found in the Sanhitā before devānām), but only to a word the visarjanīya of which does not become r. This seems plausible enough; but what shall we say of the ahaḥ which appears in sanhitā as aho in ahābhyaṁ, ahobhiḥ, and ahorātre (p. ahaḥ-rātre)? Either the makers of the treatise overlooked these words, or they did not attribute to the form aṅho in the rule the significance which is here claimed for it.

The remaining passage is more obscure to me than any of the others. In G. M., it is both preceded and followed by the examples for aṅhoḥ and aṅhomuk; in W. B., these examples precede it, excepting the last word of the second, which comes after it. I imagine that its true place is between the two, and that its intent is to turn against the rule the argument just pleaded respecting aṅhaḥ, pointing out that, as aṅhoḥ becomes aṅhor in the rule, it ought not to exhibit anusvāra except when occurring in that phonetic form; the objection being then evaded by the plea that the form is given merely as it happens to occur, and not with any

tam. ādir iti kim: surveshu sthānesu mā bhūd iti: yathā 'nhasa ityādi.
intent of prescription. But I have too little confidence in the correctness of this conjecture to be led to attempt amending the text into giving it consistent expression.

30. Also in añse, añsāya, añsābyām, and añsāu, when accented on the first syllable.

The term avagraha is declared by the commentator to be equivalent here to advi or pudādi, 'beginning of the word.' This is, of course, wholly and entirely inadmissible, except as we are driven by the irresistible force of circumstances to give it that meaning or none. There has evidently been some blunder committed, but we can hardly venture to attempt its rectification. Not one of the words here cited occurs, or could occur, as avagraha, 'former member of a compound.' The restriction is made with reference to añsāu alone, in order to distinguish it from asāv. The examples are dakshine 'ūṣa upa dadhāti (v.3.12): O omits dadhāti; W. has lost the whole), cityaṅsāya (vii.3.17: W. has lost city), añsabhyaṅ śvāhā (vii.3.16), and uttare 'ūṣe eva pāti dadhāti (v.3.15: O. reads tiśthati for dadhāti, but doubtless by a copyist's error only); the counter-example is asāv abhavīc cittavihitā (ii.5.2: O. omits the last word); añsābyām alone is found more than once in the text (namely, again at v.7.13).

31. But not in asāv ā.

There is a single passage where the pronoun asāv, in the vocative case, stands at the beginning of a clause, and is, accordingly, accented on the first syllable; hence the necessity of the present rule, establishing an exception under its predecessor. The passage is brāyād āsāv 'ēhi 'ty evām evā (ii.4.9): O. alone has evā; G. M. omit also evam, and B. blunderingly reads instead of it atra.

The Prātiṣṭhākhyā's rehearsal of the cases of interior anusvāra is,
so far as I have been able to discover, complete for the present Tāttviriya-Sanhitā, with the exception of the two compounds (strīshaṁśaśāda and svādushaṁśad) noticed under rule 26. Whether its rules are so drawn as to involve no cases that require to be excluded, is a much more difficult question, and one which my examination of the text has not been close enough to enable me to determine; but I have noted no instances of inaccuracy, unless the possible confusion of vāhah and ahaḥ, pointed out under rule 29, is to be so considered.

CHAPrer XVII.

CONTENTS: 1-4, opinions of various authorities, as to the degree of nasality in different nasal letters; 5, as to increase of quantity in connection with anusvāra; 6, as to increased effort required by certain accents; 7-8, as to other more general matters of utterance.

नैवितमानुनासिकविडमनुस्वारात्मचिन्तित्र शैत्ययाय: ॥ १ ॥

1. Čāityāyana says that the nasal quality is stronger in anusvāra and the nasal mutes.

We have here a chapter entirely composed of the cited opinions of certain specified authorities, and none of them of any definite value or importance in themselves, though interesting as affording us a glimpse of subjects to which the attention of the old Hindu phonetists was drawn, and to their hair-splitting and discordant speculations respecting them.

The commentator’s exposition adds nothing to our comprehension of the rule. It quotes the rule at the end of the second chapter (ii.52) as to the cause of nasal quality, and tries (without good reason) to connect with it the present one. Examples of the stronger nasal utterance are given, as follows: agnīḥ or āpsushūdāḥ

1. ‘anusvāraṣ ca uttamadś cā ‘nusvārottamāḥ: teshu tīvrataram bhacaty ānumāsikyam iti ācyāyano nāma munir manyate. tīvraḥ adhikam tīvrataram: ānumāsikatāḥ ‘numāsikyam: nāsi-kāvīvaradād ānumāsikyam (ii.52) ity asya vidheḥ praya-nadārthyaṁ upadīgyate. 2 yathā: agnīḥ:... tāns... martyāṇ:... yam:... ‘vañcate:... maninā... etc.:... ity kim: rukmam:... tigam:... sucf:...'

(0) O. om. 1 W. -maḍ. 2 W. -ṣikā; B. -ṣikmān bhacah. 4 W. O. -dirgham; B. -dārbyām; G. M. prāyadārthym. 1 O. ins. anusvārottamā ānumāsikā ity etavyo ānumāsikasthānāṁ. anusvārottamsah tīvrataram ānumāsikyam bhacati ācyāyano nāmā manyate. 6 G. M. O. om. (7) in O. only. 8 O. praḥ:... 9 O. anusvārottameshe. (8) O. sa:... eteshu cāi ‘sa tīvrataram.
(v.6.12), yaṁ kāmāṁ kāmayate (vii.1.12; G. M. O. substitute yaṁ kāmayeto, i.6.10⁴ et al.), vaṁcāte paraṁvaṁcate (iv.5.3¹), and muniṅaṁ rāpāṁ īndrena (vii.3.14); but O. introduces after the first tāṁs te dādāṁi (iv.1.10³) and martyāṁ āviveça (v.7.9¹), and substitutes for the last two prāṁ prādṛava (v.7.10¹). Counter-examples, of the weaker utterance, are ruknam upa dādāṁi (v.2.7²; but W. substitutes, by an evident blunder, kürnam upada-dhāti, v.2.8³), digmam āvudham (iv.7.15⁴), and sucīkāṁ suvan-galāṁ (i.8.16²); O. giving instead of the last sa imaṁ lokam (i.5.9⁴), and spoiling the whole illustration by adding, “in these likewise it is stronger.” The first two counter-examples are evidently given for the yama which, by xxi.12, is to be inserted between the mute and nasal in each: the last is a case falling under xv.8, which prescribes nasalization of a protracted final a. The other nasal sounds are the nāsikya (xxi.14), and the nasal semivowels into which m and n are to be converted (v.26.28) before k, y, and v: these last are instanced by the phrase quoted in O. alone.

The manuscript O. follows an independent course in the exposition of this rule, as of the rest composing the chapter.

2. Kauhaliputra says that it is the same everywhere.

The comment interprets samem, ‘same,’ as signifying here tivrataram, which it had explained above as an absolute rather than a relative comparative—very excessive, rather than more excessive. That does not seem likely to be the real meaning. As examples, are cited, rather needlessly, saṁraraṇāḥ (iv.6.1¹ et al.), saṁnyātāḥ (i.5.1¹ et al.), naṁn agnic cetavyah (v.5.3²: only O. has cetavyah), and upahātāṁ ho (ii.6.7³). O. gives an entirely different, though equivalent, exposition, and only the last two of these examples, with two others, namely saṁvāṁ agnīr apsushadah (v.6.1²) and imaṁ lokān (i.1.3¹).

The name of the authority quoted is given by G. M. as Kauhaliyaputra, and by O. as Kohaliputra, in both the text and commentary.

3. Bhāradvāja says it is faint in anusvāra.

2. sarvatrā ’nunāśikacārneshu tivrataratvain ’samam iti’ kauhaliputres manyate. saṁr—: saṁy—: naṅk—: upa—

<1. W. B. sīkyas; G. M. sīkyas v. 2. G. M. (as also in the rule) sīkyas.

O. substitutes for the whole anusvāratamādāśū sarvesu sarvaśceṣeṣeṣaḥ ’nunāśikṣasay oṣad iti kohaliputra: dhārṣya manyate sma: tivrataram ity arthah: naṅk sarvāḥ: imaṅ: upa—>
The term anu, 'faint,' is explained by sūkshmatamam (or, in G. M. O., sūkshmataram), 'exceedingly gentle.' In other nasals than anusvāra, we are told, Bhāradvāja accepts Čaityāyana's rule, that the nasal quality is extra-strong in the nasal mutes, and simply strong in the yamas etc. Most of the MSS. quote only tanuvā jaya tevaśa (iv.6.6): B. has dropped out all but the beginning, nanu, and O. has lost tanuvā ja from the beginning; but O. adds counter-examples, brahmañfanto devaśa (vi.4.10), ruknam upa dadhāti (v.2.7), and ita sānyatatā sānyatevam (v.2.10).

**Nakārasya Ṛṣitaṁyakāśakpaśivāção c Mālopyaśivānt-gūtarā Nīçatamamit śvaśvār: Kāṇapita: II 8 II**

4. Old Kāundinya says that when n is converted into r, or into a spirant, or into y (with loss of the y), or when m is lost, it is stronger in each case successively.

The alterations of an original nasal mute are here rehearsed in the same order, and in the same terms, as in a previous rule (xv.1). The comment gives an example for each case: namely triṁr ekadāgān iha (iii.2.11): G. M. have lost iha, along with all that follows, to the last example; O. substitutes triṁr uta dyān, ii.1.11: guklāṇa ca kṛṣhṇāṇa ca (ii.3.1: O. substitutes rūns tanvāte, iv.3.11), mahān indrah (i.4.20 et al.: O. substitutes sāvāṇa indro amis, i.7.13), and saṅgītan (iv.1.10 et al.: O. substitutes viharya ḍasyam, vii.5.5). The first combination is styled saṁyo-

3. 'anu sūkshmatamam' ānūnsādyanam anusvāre syād iti bhāradvājo manyate, yathā; tanuvā..... anusvārago anuvyatra ċaityāyanavidhiḥ: uttameshu tīvratatvam ānantarh śvratam iva iti.

1 G. M. anusūkshmataram. 2 G. M. om.

O. substitutes for the whole bhāradvājayā 'cāryaṇa matā 'anuvāre 'sur bhavaty ānūnsādyān: sūkshmataram ity arthak: ya tva₄..... anusvāra iti kih: uta 'nātra ċaityāyanavidhiḥ: brahma..... ruk..... tat.....

4. nakārasya rephoshmayakāśakpaśivāc cakārākrṣhtatayākāre śvāte sati malopāc co 'taram uttaram' ānūnsādyān: ānūpūrvyo tīvratatvam syād iti sthavirah kāundinio manyate, yathā:

' triṁr..... ity 'atra 'nātraśikyan samyogamātratāvat: yuktā..... ity 'atra samśīṣtān: mahān..... ity 'atra tīvratatām: saṁ-

..... ity 'atra tīvratatām: ity ānūpurvyān viṣṇeyam: 'ato 'nātra ċaityāyanavidhiḥ.

1 O. repabhāvad ' śubhakāhāvad yak. 2 O. 'sya yati. 3 G. M. ins. ca. 4 G. M. om. (and read 'taram for uttaram in rule). 5 O. om. 6 O. ānūnsādyan bhavati. 7 G. M. om.; O. sīma. 8 O. substitutes triṁr..... rukanā..... dviveṣa: vih..... triṁr..... ity 'atra tīvratā samyogamātram; rukanā..... ity 'atra samśīṣtān: sīma..... ity 'atra tīvratatām: vih..... tīvra tīvratatām. 9 G. M. om. 10 W. 'ātra tu pl.; B. 'ātraṁdāna samīc. 11 W. B. G. M. 'ātra.
And to the vowel is added, in this case, the time of a consonant.

The "and" (ca) in the rule is declared to continue the implication of Old Kāṇḍinya's opinion: according to this authority, here, in the prescription of anusvāra, the time of a consonant, half a mora (i.37), is to be added to the vowel that is accompanied by anusvāra; an example is yuṣjāthāṁ rāsābhāṁ yuvam (iv.1.21 et al.). And "in this case" (atra, literally 'here') is added in the rule because the prescription of increased quantity is not of force in the cases detailed in the sixteenth chapter, in nasal mutes, nor where n or m is converted into l (v.25, 26, 28).

O. states the same thing in other language, giving two additional examples, caturārī anāpavayantaḥ (iv.6.63) and aṅghomeṣa (i.6.123 et al.)—of which the latter, being one of those established in the sixteenth chapter (xvi.29), ought to be a counter-example—and remarking further that in the opinion of other teachers the anusvāra merely was added to the vowel. Anusvāra, namely, was declared by i.34 to have the quantity of a short vowel; and we should be grateful if the commentator had pointed out in what relation this rule really stands to that; if, indeed, there is any connection between them, and if this does not belong properly to a doctrine that regards the anusvāra as an affixion of the vowel merely; causing the latter's prolongation, to be sure, but not adding an element with independent quantity to it. O. appends the further restriction that the vowel undergoing prolongation is to be a simple one (not a diphthong). And it mentions another interpretation, as put forward by some authorities: that atra signifies wherever anusvāra is prescribed: and that where there is anusvāra, there the quantity of the vowel is to be short in every case.

5. cakāra sthavirakāṇḍinām vinādiṣṭaḥ: atra 'nusvāravaśdhāne sāmnāsākascarasya vyāṇjanakālo hrasvārādhakālo 'dhikah syād iti sthavirah kāṇḍinyo manyate: yuṣjī ityādi; atra 'ca svarasye 'ti kiṁ: śrādīṣhā 'ttameshā 'ttamalabhāve cātād adhikākāvan idānāmā má bhūd iti.

1 W. B. -rah kān.; G. M. -nyamatam. 2 W. B. -mābhā. 3 B. nāi; G. M. vāi. 4 W. adhikā; G. M. adhikākāl.

The Rik (xiii.13) and Vājasaneyi (iv.147–8) Prātiṣṭhākhyas also concern themselves with the respective length of a vowel and of anusvāra as constituents of a syllable, but their rules stand in no definable relation to the one here given.

6. Pāushkarasādī says the utterance of svāra and vikrama is attended with firmer effort.

Most of the manuscripts supply in the comment prayoga, 'use, application,' as the subject involved in this rule; O. supplies simply varna, 'alphabetic sound.' Svāra, we are told, means svarita, 'circumflex,' O. signifying the same thing by pointing out that the svāras are enumerated in the twentieth chapter (xx.1–8). Vikerama is a particular kind of amudātta, 'grave;' or, O. says, is explained in the nineteenth chapter (xix.1,2). As examples are given yd 'syay sv' gnis tām āpi (v.7,91): G. M. O. omit the last two words) and āsyē havih priyām (iii.3.111), for the latter of which O. substitutes ċikyām abhy ṣa ṣa daḥdāhi (v.2.43): we have here two kinds of svāra or svarita, namely abhinīhata (xx.4) and nitya (xx.2), and one or more cases of vikrama (the grave syllable standing directly between two that are either acute or circumflex) in each example. A counter-example is gaṁ vdm ṭāv tā tā pāy avadātām (i.7.22: only O. has the last two words), which contains (except in O.'s addition) neither svāra nor vikrama.

7. Čāityāyana says, of all the letters, according to their difference of effort.

The comment (except in O.) supplies the same subject as in the preceding rule, namely prayoga; and also continues the predicate of that rule, dṛḍhāprayatnatarah. The latter we can hardly approve, since to assert a specially firm effort of all alphabetic sounds without exception is little better than nonsense. Čāityāyana may rather be credited with meaning that each constituent of the alphabet has its own proper (svocita) degree of articulative effort—which is more true than edifying.

6. svāre vikrame ca prayogah pāushkarasāder mate' dṛḍhāpraya-

yatnataro bhavati. svāraḥ svarita ity arthah: vikramo nāmā

'mudātaviceshah. yathā: yd: āsyē: svāravikramayor

iti kim: gaṁ: dṛḍhaḥ prayatna 'yasyā 'sau' dṛḍhāprayat-

nāh: atiṣayam dṛḍhāprayatno dṛḍhāprayatnatarah.

1 B. tā.  2 G. M. om. 3 W. B. -dha; G. M. -dha eva. 4 G. M. om.

O. substitutes for the whole svāra viṇaḍānadevā āṇante: ekātāvāvādānadevā

vikramāḥ svāreshu vikrameshu ca dṛḍhāprayatnaro vānu bhavati pāushkarasāder

mate ċikyām . . . . . . yd: svāravikramayor iti kim: gaṁ: . . . . . .
As example, is cited the first phrase of the Sanhitā, ishe tvo "rje ted (i.1.1: only O. has the last two words).

The manuscripts of the commentary leave us quite in a quandary as to the value of these seven rules, W. B. calling them approved, but G. M. O. unapproved.

8. Ātreya says, one must utter the sounds not over-distinctly and not indistinctly; taking, as it were, a vessel filled with drink, steady, according to the sense.

The commentator gives only a simple paraphrase of this verse, and casts no real light upon its meaning, even as regards the naïve and not very instructive comparison in the second line.

**CHAPTER XVIII.**

CONTENTS: 1–7, opinions of various authorities as to the mode of utterance of the suspicious syllable om.

---

7. sarvavārṇāṇāṁ prayogaḥ svocitaprayatnavigesāḥ dṛdhaprayatnataro bhavati 'ti śātyāyano manyate. yathā: ishe.... ityādi.

'nāi 'tāni' sapta sātrāni 'shtāni.

1 B. -ga. 2 S. yoc.; W. B. -shā; G. M. -shat. 4 W. -tnah prayatnamo; B. -tnah prayatnataro. 4 G. M. om. 9 W. B. elāni.
O. substitutes for the whole śātyāyano 'śātyāyana mate svaprayatnavigesadhāth sarvavārṇāṇāṁ vāceshyāḥ dṛdhaprayatnataro evam varṇeshu bhavati: na svāvārṇikrammayo eva 'ti: yathā: is he...... nāi 'tāni' etc.

8. ativyaktam atispaśtam avyaktaṃ aspaśtaṃ ca yathā na bhavaty evaṁ varṇān udiṅgayed uccārayed ity arthāḥ: payoh-pārnam ivā 'matraṁ kṣhīrapūritam' bhājanāṁ 'harann iva' yathāmati matim anatikramaṃ 'dhiro 'dhyetā' bhaved' ity ātreyo manyate.

iti tribhāṣhayatnake prātiṣṭhākyavivicarane saaptadāco dhyāyaḥ.

1 W. nā 'tāni. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. om. 4 O. om. iṣa. 5 W. kṣhiram apū; B. -iraparipū; O. -iraṁ pū. 6 G. M. anatram. 7 O. pārmatēa. 8 W. O. m. 9 W. O. om. dhiro; G. M. adhyatā yathā dhiro. 10 G. M. -vet tatha. 11 G. M. O. devyapraṇāme paścamo.
1. As pranava, some utter o with two and a half moras.

In the text of this rule, T. reads oṅkāram, and B. oṁkāram; in the comment, at the beginning, W. B. have oṁkāram. Doubtless the unasalized form is the true reading; that oṁ or oṁ should be uttered with more than the quantity of a long syllable would not be worth the trouble of specifying, in view of rules i.34 and xvii.5, which would require either three or two and a half moras for the combination. Whether we are to infer that this holy exclamation was not yet uttered with a nasal ending at the time when the Prātiṣṭākhya was made, is a more doubtful question; the whole matter lies, at any rate, outside the proper province of a Prātiṣṭākhya. By way of examples, the comment appears to intend to quote the first and last words of the Sanhitā and of the Brāhmana: namely oṁ ishe tvā (i.1.1), samudro bandhuh oṁ (vii.5.25² see below: B. omits the oṁ), oṁ brahma samādhattam (Ṭātī. Brāh. i.1.1), and yebhyaṣ cāi 'nat prāhuh oṁ (B. omits the oṁ: the Calcutta edition of the Tāttviriya-Brāhmana being incomplete, I can only presume that these are the concluding words of that treatise). The manuscripts G. M. O. put these extracts in a different order, giving the two conclusions first, and then the two beginnings; G. M. add oṁ at the end of each, while O. gives no oṁ at all. G. M. further append two more citations, bhadrāṁ karnebhiḥ oṁ, and āi 'va tapati: oṁ, of which the former is the beginning, and the latter, I presume, the end, of the Tāttviriya-Āranyaka. With regard to the phrase samudro bandhuh, it is to be observed that the Sanhitā as found in my manuscript (or rather, manuscripts, for mine contains the last leaf of another and entirely independent one, which has the same reading), and in those to which Prof. Weber has access, ends with samudrah simply; but another word like this is evidently wanting to complete the sense (the concluding sentence is samudra vā aṣasya yonih samudrah), and is not less needed to make up the tale of words as enumerated in the ending, which counts "twelve" after avahat, while without bandhuh there are

1. pranava' okāram² 'ardhatṛtyamātram eke bravate²: 'eka dvāryā ardhatṛtyamātram² 'ahur ity arthah². 'ardhaṁ tṛtiyaṁ yayos te ardhatṛtye: ardhatṛtyamātre yasya 'sau² ardhatṛtyamātrah², yathā²: 'om ishe tvā: samudro bandhuh: oṁ: oṁ brahma samādhattam: yebhyaṣ cāi 'nat prāhuh: oṁ². kālanirnaye 'py evam² 'varnitaṁ:

svādhyaṁyārambhaceshasaya "pranavasya svarasya ca²":
adhyāsyā² "muvākasya 'nte syād ardhatṛtyatā²".

tuṣabdasya² prayojanam ucyate: saṁdhyaksharāṇāṁ vedāpranavāṁ c'ntarā tat 'ti kālanirnaye: saṁdhyaksharāṇāṁ "hrasvā na santi² 'ti² pāṇiniye 'py okāramātrasya² dērghakālo²"
only eleven. This is a very strange fact, and calls for a wider examination of Taittiriya manuscripts, to see if any of them have saved the lost final word.

Then is quoted a verse “from the Kālanirnaya,” to the effect that “the quantity of two and a half moras belongs to the pranava and to a vowel forming the beginning or end (?) of a passage that one reads in the Veda, also at the end of a chapter or section.” The Kālanirnaya quoted here and below must, of course, be a very different work from that of Mādhava bearing the same title (Weber’s Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS., No. 1166).

In explanation of the word tu in the rule, another half-verse, from which I extract no suitable meaning, is quoted from the Kālanirnaya, and the authority of Pāṇini is further appealed to to prove that among the diphthongs there is no short quantity; hence for simple o long quantity is determined: here, “however” (tu), when the diphthong stands in pranava, that quantity is negated; and (quoting, apparently, another half-verse) for the pranava, as occurring in the Veda, is prescribed long quantity along with [the quantity of?] a m. That is to say, the tu intimates a denial of the ordinary quantity of the diphthong o. And the remark is finally added that a difference of quantity is to be recognized in the different pranavas.
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2. Čāityāyana says it is to be uttered with either one of acute, grave, or circumflex.

The comment simply paraphrases the rule, adding nothing in its explanation—not even telling us in what relation it stands to rule 7, and whether Čāityāyana would let us give the word, in any given case of its use, whatever accent we chose, or would have us governed by reasons in our choice between the three accents.

nirūpitaḥ: iha tu pranavasthatcavicēshāḥ sādu kālo nishidh-yate: vedasthapranavā tu syāt samakārādvevitātāte ti. pranavavīceshāh pratyetavyah.

1 W. B. -ve; G. M. -vena. 2 W. B. onkā- (a) O. -tīyamārāte. (b) G. M. O. om. 3 B. ins. iti. (6) W. ardhatīyamātron brvacete: pranave okāram. 1 B. O. ardha. 4 G. M. O. mātre. 5 G. M. -tīyas tam; O. tīyam tam: sārdhādevatān ity arthak. 6 B. O. pranavo. 1 G. M. sam-. (a) O. sam-. (b) G. M. om. 1 G. M. sam-. (a) O. sam-. (b) G. M. sam-. 11 G. M. -dāh ca pr.; O. -dāh ca pranavām. 12 B. O. -dāh iti. 13 W. O. m. 14 G. O. oka. 15 W. G. M. -dāh. 16 G. M. -dāh. 17 B. O. on. 18 G. M. -shā. 19 W. B. O. -shā pr. 20 B. -kilo de-; G. M. -kile de-; O -kile dvimatete. 21 G. M. pranavo vīcesah.

2. udātāyudātāsa varitam madhye kasmīc cit scave pranavāh pratyoktavya iti ċāityāyana brūte: yathā: oṁ.

O. substitutam ite annātāte svarite vā ebhā madhyatamena svaena pratyoktavya svād i ċāityāyana manah deśaka manyate: oṁ ca.
3. According to Kāṇḍānyā, it is a sustained prācaya.

I have ventured to translate the word dhṛta in dhṛtaprācaya by ‘sustained,’ but without feeling sure that it might not have been better to follow the lead of the commentator, who treats dhṛtaprācaya as equivalent to simple prācaya. He brings up, it is true, the objection that in xix.2 the use of the term prācaya itself is attributed to this same Kāṇḍānyā, and that hence it should have been used here; but replies “not so; by this pair of words, even, an appellation is given: thus, namely: on the principle that even where there is no difference of meaning there may be a difference of application, the teacher exhibits a nicety of application: other examples of the principle are the names [of the second Pāṇḍava] Bhīmasena and Bhīma, [of one of Čiva’s wives] Bhāmā [G. M. say Satyā] and Satyabhāmā, pidhāna and apidhāna, dipā and pradīpa.” The prācaya is defined as the fourth accent; and O. adds that it is to be explained in the twenty-first chapter (namely, at xxi.10,11): it is there said to be of the same tone as udātta, ‘acute;’ so that, unless dhṛta is to be regarded as signifying a modification, one does not see in what respect Kāṇḍānyā’s opinion differs from that of Vālmiki, given in rule 6 of this chapter.

4. That application of the voice is with middle tone.

The meaning of this precept is very obscure, and the commentator’s exposition does not give the impression that he comprehended it. According to him, the sa, ‘that,’ points us back to the utterance as prescribed by Kāṇḍānyā in the preceding rule: in whatever pitch of voice the application is made, the pranava is to be used with medial effort, or with one that takes into account the


1 W. -nya. 2 B. G. M. -tha. 3 G. M. dhṛtaçabdo nāma: evam. 4 G. M. eva ‘bh-. 5 B. ardhabh-. 6 G. M. ilham bhe-. 7 B. -gaprabh-. 8 W. -gānkarac-. 9 W. -ne; B. -na. 9 G. M. om. 10 G. M. ins. satyā.

O. substitutes dhṛtaprācaya nāma turiyasvarak sa eva ‘kauśie’ nāvāke vahkat-ya dhṛtapracyay iti nāmadheyan prāyāhām api vyappadīyata iti kāṇḍānyā acāryah manyate dhṛtapracyay pranava bhavati yathā om iti: udātpracyay ratiyābhedām tat svaravijānukṛtāṃ phalam anuṣṭyate.
combination of high and low tone. The relation of vāk in the compound is described as that of a locative case, and the word is paraphrased by vācāh sthāne, 'in position (i.e., I presume, 'quality' or 'temperament:') compare xxii.11, xxiii.4,5) of voice.'

5. According to Plākshi and Plākshāyana, it is circumflexed. This rule is, along with its three predecessors, pronounced by the commentator unapproved.

6. According to Vālmīki, it is acute.

This is the only rule in the chapter, except the first, which the commentator allows to stand as approved. In his school, then, the vowel part of the sacred exclamation is to be two and a half moras long, and of acute tone. This agrees with the teaching of the Vāj. (ii.51) and Rik (xv.3) Prātiṣṭhikhyas, save that these give (what is really equivalent to the same thing) three moras to the whole word om; and the Rik Pr. mentions other opinions both as to its quantity and its accent.

7. All allow that it may also be according to the application. The commentator first quotes an absurd opinion of Māhisaṭha's, to the effect that yathāprayogam, 'according to the application,' here means udattā, 'acute;' but then goes on to set forth, as given by Vararuci, what appears to be the real meaning of the rule: namely, that with whatever tone the passage to be read [i.e., its beginning] is used, that tone is to be given also to the introductory exclamation. Thus, before ishē tvā (i.1.1 et al.), which begins with

4. prajñyāta iti prayogah: madhyameno 'ecanicasamhāravivakshanena prayatnena pranavah': yatra-kvācānu vācā sthāne prayogah bhavati. sa iti kāundinyābhikitaḥ pūrvkoṭo gṛhyate. vācā prajyogah vākprajyogah.

5. plākshiplākshāyanaḥ pakshe svarito bhavati. nāi tat sītracatushtubham ishtam.

1 W. vā; G. M. vah prayoktavyah. 2 W. anya-. 3 W. B. na-. 4 B. om. O. substitutes ko 'yam prayavo nāma cānopravyogah [i.e., vākpr-] kāundinyāmatam ādiyā yatra kvācānu sthāne drṣyate: tena madhyamena saresya prayoktavyah.

6. vālmīker mate praṇava udattō bhavati.

1 O. adds yathā.
grave, the om is to be grave; before āpa undantu (i.2.1; wanting in W. B.), acute; before vyṛddham (v.1.2; W. B. have instead, evidently as a corrupt reading only, vyūdhah, with which word no anuvāka in the Sanhitā begins), circumflex.

The rule is declared unapproved—rather hard treatment for one which professes to lay down a principle accepted by all authorities.

CHAPTER XIX.

CONTENTS: 1-2, occurrence of vakrama, between syllables of high tone; 3-5, of kampa, in a circumflex followed by a circumflex.

स्वरितगौरणिणि यथा नीचे ध्वनिवर्तिनियतरतिविशिष्टत्वार्थितियोः स विक्रमः \[1\]

1. Where a syllable of low tone occurs between two circumflex syllables, or two acute, or two of which either one is acute and the other circumflex, that is vakrama.

The commentator paraphrases the rule as if anyataratāh meant 'between a preceding circumflex and a following acute,' and the following udāttasvaritayoh 'between a preceding acute and a fol-

7. yathāprayogaśabdena 'dātto bhidhiyata iti māhisheyapakṣah: pranavē yathāprayogam va kuryād iti sarveshām vishnām matam. vararucipakshas tu vakhyate: adhyeshyamāṇāh yathāprayogam yathāvidhasevarān tathāvidhena va svarena pranavabh prakṣeyā tāh iti sarveshām matam iti. yathā: istic tve 'ty anēna dvīhyeyamāṇena 'udāttanā pranavabh 'py anudāttah: 'āpa undantu ity udāttanā ṛittah: vyṛddham iti svaritena svaritah.

ne 'dañ caī sūtram īśtām.

O. (corrected a little) substitutes yathāvidhena svarena 'dvīhyeyamāṇo bhavati: tathāvidhena svareṇā 'pranavabh prakṣeyāh: istic tve 'ty etad adhyeshyamāṇena udāttah pranavabh va kṣeyāh: 'āpa ... ity udāttah: vyṛddham iti svaritah: dvīhyeyamāṇām tesāṁ kuryarthām: pakṣaparāgraṇaśūnānādṛṣṭah paricālayā: ne 'dañ caī sūtram īśtām.

iti tribhāshyatātena pratiçakhyavevavane ashtādaco 'dvīhyeyah.

1 W. -pasū-. 2 G. M. -cām. 3 W. adhyayamāṇām. 4 G. M. -vidha. 5 W. B. om. 6 W. 'dvīhyeyamāṇā; B. -māṇ. 7 G. M. O. devīyapraṇeśe shakṣaḥ.
ollowing circumflex. He adds examples of a vikrama syllable in each of the four defined positions: namely yo 'sya svā 'gnīs tām āpi (v.7.91: G. M. O. omit the last two words), vodhavē (i.6.21 et al.), dhāwanā gāh (iv.6.61), and tāsya kva svārāgō lokāh (ii.6.55: O. omits the last word, G. M. the last two). In the third example, the circumflex by which the vikrama syllable is preceded is the enclitic; this shows us (what we should have inferred without it) that, as regards the application of the present precept, no distinction is made between the independent and the enclitic circumflex. As an example of the use of the term, and showing the necessity of its definition here, is quoted rule xvii.6, where we are told that Pauṣkaraśādī asserts the utterance of svāra ('circumflex') and vikrama with a firmer effort. The word occurs elsewhere only at xxiii.20 and xxiv.5, where we have no assurance that it signifies the same thing as here. It is found, among the other Prātiśākhyaśas, in that to the Rig-Veda only, and has there no such meaning.

The vikrama is marked by the usual sign of low tone, the horizontal stroke beneath. The following rule, as we shall see, extends its definition so as to include nearly all the syllables so marked.

The construction of so in the rule, as agreeing in gender with vikramah, though referring to nīcami (akṣharam), was alluded to above, under v.2.

1. 'yatrasvāritayor madhyā udāttayor vā 'nyatarato ve 'ti svāritodāttayor ve 'ty arthāh: 'udāttasvāritayor vā madhyā nīcām yad akṣharam sa vikramo bhavati. svāritayor madhyā yathā: yo...... 'udāttayor yathā: vodhavē. svāritodāttayor yathā: dhāve...... udāttasvāritayor yathā: tāsya...... vikramasāmīyād prāya janam: svāravikramayor dr̥ ḍho-prayātanatara (xvii.6) iti.


2. caṅkāri vikrama iti jñāpayati: 'kāundināmaṣya mata udāttaparāh svāritaparāh vā praca[yapārecaḥ ca vikramo viṇēyāḥ. udāttaparo yathā: pary...... svāritaparo yathā: upar...... praca[yapārecaḥ praca[yapārecaḥ yasmād 'asū praca[yapārecaḥ.

(1) G. M. O. caṅkāri. (2) W. om. (3) G. M. sa tathoktktah.
series, which retains its grave tone, is here declared to be, on Kāṇḍinya’s authority, likewise entitled to the appellation vikrama. This makes the term apply to all syllables in the sainhītā that are marked by the horizontal stroke below, excepting those which, after a pause, precede the first accented syllable. The commentator cites two examples: pāry avadatāṁ yaṁ yaṁye divyāte (i.7.2; lost in W.; only O. has the last two words) and upārishtālakshmā yājña (ii.6.23-4 et al.), in the first of which the pracaiva is followed by an acute, in the second by a circumflex.

It is to be observed that the vikrama appears, so far as this treatise is concerned, to be a mere name; no peculiarity of tone is claimed to belong to it: the other treatises offer nothing analogous.

As nothing is said of the non-approval of the rule, we may regard it as accepted in the school represented by the commentator.

3. According to some, in a circumflex syllable that is followed by a circumflex, quarter-moras are so.

I have rendered this rule according to my own persuasion of its true meaning, and not at all in conformity with the interpretation of the commentator, who says “yama [W. alone says devi-yama] is a synonym of svarita; where there are two such yamas, without intervention of anything, that is a devi-yama; what is followed by such a devi-yama, that is devi-yamapara: in the former, and also in the latter, where there is a third yama [so in G. M., which is the best reading: the others perhaps mean triyama], whatever circumflexed materials there are, all those are depressed at the end to the extent of a quarter-mora: so some think. An example of a devi-yama is tē nyō nyāmāi (ii.2.11.5: but B. G. M. have instead tē nyō nyām, vi.1.51); of a devi-yamapara, sō pō bhy āmiyata (vi.1.17; 4.23). Whence do we derive the implication ‘at the end?’ from the precept ‘and likewise, at the end of a word are kampas, quarter-moras depressed at the end.’ And the implication of


nityo ‘bhinihataḥ’ caī ‘va kṣāiprah praśīṣa eva eva ca:
ete svāraḥ prakampante yatro ‘cesvaritodayā’ itī”;
çeṣṭasyo ‘dāttāt vā syāt svāratā vā vyavasthaye” itī;
depression comes by vicinage from rule 1, above, where a syllable of low tone between two that are circumflexed is spoken of. This seems to me entirely inadmissible. In yama as a synonym of svarita, and meaning 'circumflex,' I cannot in the least believe; and the designation of a case of three successive circumflexes as deviyamapara would be excessively awkward, even without the omission of the ca, 'and,' which would be needed to connect it, in that signification, with deviyama. On the other hand, deviyama, 'of double pitch,' is an entirely natural and acceptable synonym for svarita, 'circumflex,' the essential characteristic of which is that it combines the high and the low tone within the limits of the same syllable; and a circumflex followed by a circumflex includes every possible case. The limitation 'at the end' is properly enough left to be understood from the nature of the case; but that the predicate "depressed," the most important part of the precept, should remain to be inferred by vicinage only, and from the subject, not the predicate, of the two preceding rules, is not to be tolerated. And I have no doubt that the tāh in the rule is the predicate, and represents vikrama, its gender and number being adapted to those of anumātrā by the grammatical figure anonyānwaya, to which the commentator (see under ii.7, v.2) has several times appealed in other like cases. There remains, as the only difficulty, the plural number of both words: we should certainly expect rather sā 'anumātrā; but even if we have to let this pass unexplained, it is vastly more easy to get along with than the difficulties which beset the other interpretation. One hardly dares presume to suggest that the present reading is the result of an alteration, made after the meaning given in the comment was ascribed to the rule.

The commentator goes on to quote a verse from the Čikṣa, to the effect that the four kinds of independent circumflex (see xx.1, 2,4,5) suffer kampa when they precede either an acute or a circumflex. This verse is (save that it gives the Taittirīya instead of the Rik names to the accents) the same with that which is interpolated in the Rik Pr., at the end of the third chapter (iii.19). He adds further, in another half-verse, doubtless from the same authority, that "of the remainder, there may be either the quality of acute or of circumflex, respectively;" and explains this "respectively" as

vyavasthācābdenā 'nena26 dvividhāh kampa utkaḥ: saṁhārayaṁ
svaritakampa27 itaracchedāhāga27 udātta kampa27 ity ye25 kampaḥ
prasiddhās25 tesve25 etal lakshanān na tu kampavidhāyakam:
anyathā yo.... ityādū kampaḥ prasajyeta.

ne 'daṁ sūtram ishtam.

1 W. devi. 2 W. naraḥ; O. narāhatary. 3 G. M. tritiyanye. 4 W. yamā; M. val. 5 O. yamā. 6 W. niyata; B. abhihitā; G. M. bhūhitā. 7 O. om. 8 O. yata. 9 O. ku. 10 W. B. yathā. 11 O. ki hat. 12 G. nihiḥ; O. -tāvani. 13 B. om. 14 O. -shā. 15 B. -hitāc. 16 G. M. svar. 17 W. kravi; M. cecease; O. cecevaye; G. M. -yād; 18 O. ye. 19 O. om. 18 B. -tor; G. M. svarito. 20 W. -net; O. om. anna. 21 W. -tāh k.; B. -sa ukāh k. 22 G. M. -re ve. 23 W. -tāh k. 24 W. B. O. om. 25 G. M. om. 26 B. O. ins. eva.
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implying that there are two kinds of kampa: in the Sanhitā, that before a circumflex; in other parts of the Veda, that before an acute; and concludes the exposition with pointing out (if I understand him) that this is a definition applying to those cases of kampa which are otherwise established; but that it is not a precept requiring kampa, since this would otherwise have to appear in such passages as yd́ 'pām pūśpaná veda (only G. M. have vedu: the passage is not to be found in the Sanhitā, and possibly is intended to be quoted from one of those "other parts of the Veda," referred to above). Finally, he remarks that the rule is unapproved.

The term kampa is not found anywhere in the text of our Prātiṣṭākhya, or of that of the Rig-Veda, although the commentary to the latter (under iii.3,4), like our own, employs it to signify the peculiar modification undergone by the circumflex, when immediately followed by a high tone. The Atharva-Prātiṣṭākhya (iii.65) gives to the same modification the kindred name of vikampita. It is signified, in the Rik and Atharvan texts (as is fully explained and illustrated in the note to Ath. Pr. iii.65), by appending to the vowel of the circumflex syllable a figure, either 1 or 3, and applying to the figure the signs of both circumflex and grave accentuation. The theory of this mode of designation is obscure, and no account of it is given in any Prātiṣṭākhya, nor, so far as I am aware, in any other Hindu authority that has yet come to light. We should imagine the figure to be a mere point d’appui for an added sign of grave tone, but that there appears in a part of the Vedic texts an accompanying prolongation of the vikampita vowel (if the vowel be short), of which the figure, therefore, appears to be the sign: of this prolongation the Prātiṣṭākhyas give no hint.

This accent wears a quite peculiar aspect in the Tātttiriya text, as compared with those to which reference has been made. In the first place, being limited to the case of a circumflex before a circumflex, it is relatively of rare occurrence, there being fewer examples of it in the whole Tātttiriya-Sanhitā than in the first book alone of the Atharvan (it occurs in the former, if I have overlooked nothing, only at ii.1.6; 2.11; v.4.3; vi.1.17,51,112-5; 2.21; 3.25; 42; 4.23,92,101; 6.81: and in the ending to v.2.1). Secondly, it is always intimated by an appended figure 1, with simply the mark of anudatta tone, or of vikrama, written beneath, while the circumflex vowel retains the mark of circumflex accent*—and this is clearly the method most easily defensible on theoretic grounds:

* That is to say, this is uniformly the case in my manuscript, which, for example, writes the commentator’s quoted instances as follows:

and the MSS. of the comment all add the figure 1, although, as everywhere else, they omit the accent signs. In the two cases that occur in the part of the Calcutta edition thus far printed, it seems to be by mere unintelligent blundering that the above method is departed from, a 3 being added in the one (ii.1.6), without any sign of vikrama beneath it, and no designation being attempted in the other (ii.2.11).
the figure represents the quantity that is added to the syllable to make room for the vikrama tone at the end, and it gets, therefore, the vikrama sign. Thirdly, in the only two passages (vi.3.42; 6. 84) in which the vowel of the circumflexed syllable is short, it is made long.

What the commentator means by declaring the rule of no force, it is not easy to say. It can hardly be that his school acknowledged no kampa at all; and we should have expected him rather to interpret into his text the usage which he and his fellow-pākhīnīh accepted as proper—as he has done in so many other cases. There appears to be no discordance between the teachings of the Prātiçākhya in this chapter and the practice in the known Tāttiriya text (but see the note on the next rule); the former, to be sure, do not fully explain the latter; but this is the case also with the other Vedas.

The denial of kampa in a circumflex syllable before an acute constitutes the most important and conspicuous peculiarity in the Tāttiriya system of accentuation as compared with that of the Rik and Atharvan, and also puts the former at a disadvantage in respect to clearness. Its effect is to deprive us of any constant means of distinguishing whether the syllable following a circumflex is an acute, or a grave with pracayā tone (xxi.10); and whether that distinction shall be shown at all depends upon mere accident. For example, sō śmaḥt and sō śmat would be accented before a pause precisely alike; and so with any number of acutes or graves following a circumflex before a pause: e.g. sō śmaḥ abhavat and sō śmaḥd yō vārī tatt.* And even if, instead of a pause, other syllables follow, there must be at least two grave syllables in succession to bring out the true condition of things: we see that the syllable after the circumflex is acute in hy ेṣā prthivyāh, but not in hy ēṣā devāh, and the sanhitā does not tell us whether in sō śmaḥ etarhi the āsmat is accented or toneless.† And so often does this ambiguity arise, that in the first chapter of the third book there are not less than twenty cases of pracayas, all whose syllables except the last admit of being understood as true acutes.‡ Other possible cases of ambiguity, of less frequency and importance, I pass without notice.

This same peculiarity belongs also to the existing Tāttiriya-Brāhmaṇa and Aranyaka, so that the commentator’s allusion to “other parts of the Veda” as differing from the Sanhitā in respect to kampa is of doubtful meaning.

* Thus, sō śmādavat । and sō śmāgo vāt tatt।
† Thus, kau pāṇiḥ and kau tātvaḥ; and sō śmādavitāḥ.
‡ Thus, sō śmaṇyaṇaḥ pratā may be either sō ‘kāmayatā praṣṭāḥ or sō ‘kāmayatā praṣṭāḥ.
4. In that very material.

The commentator's interpretation of this rule is just as violent and unsatisfactory as is that which he gave of its predecessor, and with which he forces it into strange connection. He says, "in a dviyama passage there is depression to the extent of a quarter-mora only in that—namely, the former—circumflex material; but, in a passage where a dviyama follows, there is depression to the extent of a quarter-mora of the two former materials; but they do not all share in the quarter-mora effect: that is what the eva means. And Kāuhaileyā says thus: 'of two, the former is anumātrika; of three, the two former are anumātrika; beyond that, the natural condition holds.'"

I think we can have no hesitation whatever as to rejecting this: if the treatise had been intending to say what is here claimed, it would have said it in a very different manner. What is really meant, may be much more doubtful; but I imagine that we are directed to find our quarter-mora of vikrama in the very substance of the circumflex syllable itself; that is to say, not in any protration of it; and so, that that treatment of the case which is signified by the insertion of a figure after the circumflex vowel is rejected. This, if established, would make the doctrine of the authorities (eke, rule 3) here reported in fact discordant with the practice followed in the recorded text.

5. Not in the former teaching.

A rule of very obscure import, and respecting which the commentator has only his guesses to give us. He ventures two: first, that pūrvacāstāstra signifies the rule respecting vikrama, and that in it this affection of the quarter-mora finds no place; second, that pūrvacāstāstra means the first rule of the chapter (which amounts, so far, to the same thing with the other), and that the name of

4. dviyamasthale pūrvasyām 'eva tasyām' svaritaprakṛtāv anumātraya 18 'pi' nihatatvam bhavati: dviyamapare tu śthale pūrvayor eva prakṛtyor 19 anumātraya 18 nihatatvam bhavati: na tu tāh sa eva anukāryabhāja 16 ity evakāro bodhayati. evam eva kāuhaileyā 11 āha: deayoh pārvo 12 'numātrikas 13 trishu 14 pūrvō 15 anumātrikāv 16 uttaraḥ 17 prakṛtye 'ti.

---

1 W. aparasyām. 2 B. -atra; G. M. anumātrām a. 3 O. om. 4 B. -hit. 5 G. M. tañ. 6 B. -tyaño. 7 B. numātrayor; G. M. anumātrāyā. 8 B. -hit. 9 W. O. nu. 10 G. M. anuk.; O. anumātrakā bhajate. 11 W. -iyu. 12 W. -rau; B. O. -ruk. 13 W. B. O. anu.; M. O. -trakā. 14 W. ins. ca. 15 O. prāvo vi; G. M. pārvo yathā uparishṣēt etc. (end of comment to rule 2, above). 16 W. -ki; M. -trakā; O. -trako 'py. 17 W. -rataḥ.
vikrama, there given, does not apply here in the rule for kampa, since, by xvii.6, vikrama is uttered with a firmer effort of the organs, while that is not the case with kampa. There is nothing in either of these proposals to commend it to our acceptance. If we were ourselves to guess, we should perhaps say that the reference was to rule 4 only, which teaches kampa without any protraction, and that this was confessed to be a doctrine not before authoritatively taught. But we should not presume to put the conjecture forward with any confidence.

**CHAPTER XX.**

**CONTENTS:** 1–8, names of the different kinds of circumflex, independent and enclitic; 9–12, different degrees of force of their utterance.

I. When i, i, and u are converted into y or v, the accent is kshāipra, if they were acute.

The conversion of i, i, and u into y or v is by rule x.15; u does not fall under such a rule on account of its being always pragraha (iv.5). Rule x.16 prescribes the conditions under which a circumflex accent is the result of such a conversion; and the addition of udāttayoh to the present rule is wholly unnecessary—a case to exercise the ingenuity of the commentator in defending the treatise from the charge of pāmaruktya: but either it escapes his notice, or he declines to touch it, as beyond his powers. Of course, if it be necessary to explain here that the altered vowel is acute, it needs to be added that the following vowel is grave.

5. 'pūrvaçāstraṁ nāma vikramavidhiḥ: tasmin etad anukāryaṁ na bhavati. evam vā sūtrārthah: pūrvaçāstre3 'dhyāyapratthamasūtre yā vikramosāṁjñio 'ktā 3sā kampavidhāvé atra' na bhavati: vikramasya dṛḍhaprayatnaṁvā kampasya tadbhāvād iti.

* iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣṭhākyavivarane ekonaviṁśo4 'dhyāyah.

---

The examples are vy ēvā'ī'nena (v.3.11) and kṛdhī sv āsmā'ṅ (iv.7.157); counter-examples, where the altered vowel was not acute, are vāsey asi (i.2.51 et al.) and ānv enam māta', which is not, I believe, to be found in the Sanhitā; the nearest thing to it is ānv enam viprāh (iv.6.83); ānu tvā māta' occurs several times (i.8.101 et al.).

All the Prātiṣākhyaśas agree in calling this particular kind of circumflex by the name kṣāipa (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.58).

2. But where a syllable containing a y or v is circumflexed in a fixed word, being preceded by a grave syllable, or not preceded by anything, that is to be known as nitya.

This definition of the original circumflex accent, which belongs to the word in which it occurs, and does not merely arise as a consequence of the combination of words into phrases (although ultimately of the same nature with the kṣāipa, just described), is a long and awkward one, but fairly attains its purpose: only we do not see why the reading is not anudātāpārvam apūrvaṁ vā, qualifying akṣharam formally, as it does logically. A syllable that has the circumflex in pado-text (to which sthīte pade is explained as equivalent), otherwise than enclitically after an acute, is an original (nitya, constant, invariable) circumflex. The other Prātiṣākhyaśas (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.57) call it jāṭya, 'natural.'

The commentator defines akṣharam, 'syllable,' in the rule as meaning svarāḥ, 'vowel;' and, in fact, the use of akṣharam here is somewhat at variance with the general custom of the treatise, which elsewhere talks of the vowel, not the syllable, as having tone (compare i.43, xiv.29). He inserts sarvatra, 'everywhere,' in his paraphrase, and then explains it, as if it were a part of the rule, to signify that the accent holds in saṁhitā, pado, and jāṭa text. His examples are vāyanyām (i.8.71 et al.), kanyē 'va tumā' (iii.1.118): O. omits tumā, tāto bīlāh (ii.1.82), nyāncāṁ cinuyāt (v.5.32): W. B. add, after a pause, as if a new example, anyaṇcāṁ [B. 2. sayakāraṁ vā savakāraṁ vā 'kṣharam' svara ity arthāḥ: sthīte pade padadāla ity arthāḥ: yatra sthale svarāya: anudātāpārvac 'pārva' vā pūrvabhāce 'sati': nitya eva 'ti sarvatra jāniyāt: sarvatre 'ti saṁhitāpada pado: ity arthāḥ. yathā: vāy...: kanye...: tato...: nyān...: 'kva...: kvā...: iti jāṭyām: tuṣabdo nityādāc uccodayavishaye no 'dattasa rita padoḥ (xiv.31) iti nishedhām nivārayati. nanu nityāḥ kathām etannishedhavishayah11: udāttāt pari 'nudātta' 12 (xiv.29) itilakshansambhavāt12. atro 'cyate: varnavibhāgacayām12 udātāpārvatvam12 asti: saṁhārāḥ svarīta (i.40) ity ucca-
reads -cāṁ], but no such word is to be found in the Sanhitā, and it is probably only a blundering repetition of nyāñcam), and kvā jágata ca (vii.1.4); and, from the jatā-text, kvā 'syā' sya kvā 1 kvā 'syā (v.7.42): B. has lost a part; it involves a case of kampā, with resulting prolongation, and use of the sign 1: see xix.3). Counter-examples are given in O. only: namely, of a circumflex not found in pada-text, vy évā i 'nena (v.3.112: the MS. has evēyāi), dṛānnah sarpīḥ (iv.1.92; p. dṛu-annah): of one which has an acute before it, māryāñ āviçeça (v.7.91) and sārvāñ agmēn (v.6.12). We have also a few common attempts to give a profound significance to the word tu, 'but,' in the rule; and, as usual, it is abortive, involving difficulties which the commentator only pretends to get rid of. He says the tu signifies that, so far as the nītyā circumflex etc. (i.e. and the other varieties of the independent circumflex) are concerned, the exception laid down in rule xiv. 31—namely, that the circumflex character is not retained before a following acute or circumflex—has no force. But it is objected, with entire reason, that rule xiv.31 has nothing to do with the nītyā at all, but only with the enelic accent prescribed in rule xiv.29. His reply is, that in the condition of complete separation of sounds, there is, after all, a grave element preceded by an acute, as required in rule xiv.29, the combination of the two, by i.40, giving the circumflex character. Whether this implies his recognition of the fact that the semivowel in every nītyā syllable really represents an acute vowel, pronounced as such in an earlier stage of the language—kvā being equivalent to kāa, and kvāñ to kanīa—admits of question. He expounds anudattapurse as a descriptive instead of a possessive compound, and apūrce as a substantive of the same character, as if the construction were 'there being a preceding grave, or there being no preceding accent;' it is doubtless better to supply in idea tasmān akhare, and to render 'that syllable is,' etc. The remaining bit of exposition is much corrupted in its readings, and the drift of it is not clear to me. O. brings it in very differently from the rest, and makes it involve an additional example, yājya i' ev i' nam (ii.3.52; p. yājya : ā : eva : enam).

pūrvavatāṁ svaritasye ti nishedhavishayatvam. anudattaṣ ca 'sau pūrvaṣ ca 'nudattapūrvaḥ: 39 tasmān. "pūrvabhāvo pūrcah: tasmān. '"çunye tu senevatupūrvatām" pūrvavaciveshanadavasyāt" nyathā" vāiyarthyaṁ: tasmāt tatraḥ nityasyavaritavānam eva na saṁjñāntaram iti vijñeyam.

1 W. B. om.; G. M. add yastra svarate. 2 O, ins. va. 3 B. om. 4 G. M. ins. va. 5 G. om. 6 O, p. 7 W. B. ins. : anyavacaḥ. 8 G. M. O. 'darhan'; O. 'shaya. 9 G. M. na tu. 10 O. nish. 11 G. M. ins. svarātām. 12 O. lakaḥ. 13 all MSS. have the lingual l. 14 W. -vecau. 15 W. B. ucāte pūr. 16 W. ins. tasmāt. 17 G. M. om. 18 O. na caunyā ity arthāḥ: sthile pada iti kim: vy... drv... anudattapūrva iti kim: mārīt... sar... kicē evam icaḥ: yāj... ity adī: prāthoanvīna-kāroty evakārōḥ: padasvaucaye anudattapūrvaḥ; G. M. cunyāpūrvacapūrvadāt; W... sarvatāḥ; B. bhūsaḥ etc. 19 W. pūrvavaciveshanad- O. pūrvačī. 20 O. nathā. 21 W. -thyan; G. M. -thyan vyāt. 22 W. am; B. tat; O. tra. 23 W. O. nityatvam; B. svaratāvan nityatvam. 24 B. ca.
3. If, moreover, there is an acute standing in another word, then, if there be a circumflex resulting from a rule of combination, it is prātihiṭa.

The phraseology of this rule is very peculiar indeed, and its peculiarity hard to account for. The Rīk and Atharva Prātiṣṭākyas distinguish only two kinds of enclitic circumflex: the pādadvṛta, in which a hiatus intervenes between the acute and its successor, and the tāiroevyānjana, in which the two are separated by consonants. According to the explanation, now, of our commentator, the present treatise sets off from the latter, as a separate class, a circumflexed syllable at the beginning of a word, following an acute at the end of the preceding word. He gives us four examples (of which, however, W. B. omit the first two, and O. the last two): mā te asyām (i.6.12\textsuperscript{b}), yās tvā hṛda kṛīṇā (i.4.46\textsuperscript{i}: only O. has kṛīṇā), iṣīhe tvā (i.1.1 et al.), and tāṁ te duṣcākshāh (iii.2.10\textsuperscript{a}): the second word in each has the prātihiṭa circumflex. As counter-examples, we have yān nyānca (v.5.3\textsuperscript{2}: W. gives instead yān nāvam [ii.3.10\textsuperscript{a} et al.], but it does not illustrate the point arrived at, and so is doubtless a corruption of the other), to show that the following circumflex must be a result of a rule of combination, and tāyā devātayā (iv.2.9\textsuperscript{a} et al.: O. substitutes tas-
mād vacpan, which is corrupt; I have overlooked it in searching out the references, and do not know how, if in fact represents a real citation, it ought to be amended), to show that the acute must stand in another word.

In working out this meaning for the rule, the commentator declares api, ‘moreover,’ to have the office merely of bringing down from the preceding rule the quality of going before (pār-
vatva); atha, ‘then,’ according to him, either cuts off the continued implication of nitya (that is to say, means nothing at all), or else gives the value of a heading to ‘the being preceded by an acute standing in another word’—which is wholly to be rejected; in the first place because unnecessary (tasmāt in the next rule having just that purpose), and in the second place because the word could at any rate make a heading only of what followed it in the rule, not of what went before.

3. apiṣabdāh ‘pārvaratvamātrārakshakaḥ’; atahaçabdo nityaśanin-
jāvyāvachedakah: nānāpadasthadattapārvatvādhihkarako\textsuperscript{a} vā: nānāpadastham aksharam udāttapārvan\textsuperscript{b} cet parato nicaṁ sāṁ-
ḥitena vidhiṁ śavyate cet sa prātihiṭo ‘tra’ veditavyah. ‘yathā:
mā.... yās....’ ‘iśhe.... tāṁ....’ sāṁḥitene ’ti kim: ‘yān.... nānāpadastham iti kim: tāyā....’

\textsuperscript{a} W. pārvarc simply. \textsuperscript{b} G. M. om. -tra-. O. om. -ātras. \textsuperscript{c} O. -kāro. \textsuperscript{d} G. M. om. (W. B. om.; G. M. om. yathā. O. om. O. tasmād vacpan.)
If this be indeed the original intent of the rule, it would seem that, to the apprehension of the Hindu phonetists, there was difference enough between the enclitic circumflex which te in tāṁ te assumes in saṁhitā, having been grave in pada-text, and that which the shāh of duṇeśkāh has in saṁhitā as well as in pada, to furnish ground for a difference of classification and nomenclature.* But there are various obstacles in the way of our accepting the interpretation as satisfactory. In the first place, why ought not the same distinction to apply where the acute and circumflex are separated by a hiatus, as well as by consonants? or why, when a circumflex after an acute in the same word is called tāirovyañjana, alike whether a hiatus or consonants intervene, should a circumflex after an acute in another word have a different name according as it is preceded by a consonant or not? In the second place, why should the rule be thrust in here, wholly out of connection with the others respecting the enclitic circumflex, and with such a frightful sacrifice of that economy of expression which the sūtra kāra proverbially rates so highly? for, following rule 7, a simple nīnāpadasthā tu prātiṣṭhāt would have done the whole business, and much more unequivocally. Not one of the other treatises mixes together thus the enclitic and independent svarita, when they come to be defined and named. Nor, again, does any other authority found a separate species of accent upon the basis here laid down. I have been inclined, therefore, to conjecture that the rule ought to be rendered when there is besides (api) a [preceding] acute in another word, then, provided a circumflex arises as the result of a rule of combination, it is prātiṣṭhāt understanding an independent svarita (except a nitya) to be intended, whenever that svarita was preceded by an acute, and so held a position which would make it an enclitic svarita as well; and the reason for thus calling attention to it being that, as written, it is not distinguished from a mere enclitic accent.† But there are too many difficulties connected with this interpretation also to allow of its being accepted as at all satisfactory.

The Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣṭhākhyā (i.118) gives a special name, tāirovirāma, to the enclitic circumflex which falls in the pada-text upon the first syllable of the second member of a compound, under

---

* And this difference, it should be noted, applies in the same manner where division is made between the two parts of a compound word; for the extant Tāttiriya pada-text, in marked contrast with those of the other Vedas, regards the avagraha pause as suspending, like the avasana, all accentual influence, and writes sūkra-sati, for example, in the same fashion as it writes sūkram: asti—that is to say, sṛukṣaṁti instead of sṛukṣajanti, as the rest would read.

† For example, ghrtaēr vy udgote (i.1.114) and ṣna caṇḍaḥ svaiśtim (iii.1.92) are written precisely as if they were ghrtaēr vy udgote and ṣna caṇḍaḥ svaiśtim; namely, pṛuṣita and graṇaṇaṁ stīritāṁ: this is an ambiguity which is common to all the Vedic texts.
the influence of an acute on the final of the first member, and which
is therefore 'separated by an intervening pause' from the tone
which calls it forth. Thus, the va of pukrā-vati (as written the
second time in the first marginal note on p. 369) has a táirovirāma
svarita, being marked by the ordinary svarita-sign. Now the vati,
as well as the pukra, in this word, is to the apprehension of the
present treatise (i.48) a pada; and hence its syllable va appears
to fulfil all the conditions laid down in rule 2, just above, as deter-
mining a jātya: it is circumflexed in the pada-text; it is apārva,
or preceded by no other accent in the same pada; and it is savakāra,
or contains a v. Here, now, as it appears to me, we have the
best explanation of the value, and at the same time of the posi-
tion, and also, at least in part, of the phraseology, of the rule
under discussion. This accent needs definition, though enclitic,
immediately after the nitya, lest it be confounded with the latter:
"even if all the conditions of the previous rule are fulfilled, if
there is likewise an acute [preceding the syllable] in another word,
and the accent is one which is produced by a rule of combination,
this accent is not nitya, but pratihata."

The most conspicuous difficulty in the way of accepting this
interpretation is the fact, already referred to, that in the extant
pada-text of the Tāittirīya-Saṅhitā there is no such circumflex as
is here assumed; the va of pukrā-vati, and all other syllables in
like position, being grave, and marked as such. But the difficulty
is more apparent than real, since we have no right to assume that
this pada-text is precisely the same with that held by the school
from which the Prātiṣṭhāya, or this particular rule, emanated:
they may have accented their iñgas, or separable words, after
the same fashion which prevails in the pada-texts of the other
Vedas. Of more account is the awkwardness of the whole expres-
sion, and especially the use of nāṇḍapadastham instead of avagra-
haṣṭham, which would be the proper term to use in this treatise
(compare i.49) in the sense here indicated. But, if not completely
acceptable, the interpretation has more for it and less against it, in
my opinion, than either of those given above.

Professor Roth, in his early digest of the teachings of the Prāti-
ṣthāya respecting accent (introduction to the Nirukta, p. lvii. etc.),
identified the pratihata accent with the táirovirāma, but, only in
consequence of a misunderstanding of the character of the latter,
which he supposed (ibid., p. lxv.) to designate an enclitic circum-
flex separated by consonants from its occasioning acute in a pre-
ceding word, thus giving it the same meaning which is attributed
by our commentator to the pratihata in the present rule. And
Weber (under Vāj. Pr. i.118), while defining the táirovirāma
correctly, repeats the same identification; I do not know whether
as taking it incautiously from Roth, or as having arrived by
conjecture at an independent interpretation of our present rule.
He does not allude to any difficulties as connected with the latter,
nor state his identification to rest upon a different basis from that
of Roth.
4. After such a one, in case of the loss of an a, it is abhinihata.

The word tasmāt the comment explains as bringing down nānapadastham udattām from the preceding rule: 'after an acute occurring in another word.' But the specification (like that of udattayoh in rule 1) is wholly unnecessary: rule xii.9 prescribes the circumflex and defines its conditions: here we need only to have given us the name by which it is to be called.

O. has an independent exposition, but of equivalent meaning.

The examples are sō 'bravit (ii.1.21 et al.) and te 'bruvan (ii.5.1² et al.); and a counter-example, where, as the eliding diphthong is not acute, no circumflex results, is bhrājo 'si devānām (ii.4.3²).

All the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.55) give to this circumflex the name abhinihita, of which our own term has the aspect of being an artificial variation.

5. Where an ū results, it is praçlishta.

Rule x.17 prescribes the circumflex to which the name of praçlishta is here assigned; and the examples given are to be found there also, being all the instances save one which the Sanhitā affords. They read in this place sūnnyam iva (vi.2.4¹), sādgātā (vii.1.8¹), māśi 'tishthan (vii.5.2²: G. M. omit mā), and dikshā 'podādhi (v.5.5⁴: G. M. O. omit).

The same name (or, in the Ath. Pr., praçlishta) is given by the other treatises to the circumflex which results from the fusion of two short ā's, the first acute and the other circumflex (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.56).

6. Where there is a hiatus between two words, it is pādavṛttta.

Here there is abrupt change, without notice, from the independent to the enclitic circumflex. The examples given are tā' asmāt sṛṣṭāḥ (ii.1.2¹: B. omits sṛṣṭāḥ), sā idhānāh (iv.4.4⁸), and yā

4. 'tasmān nānapadasthodattat parabhūtānudāttākārasya² lope suti yah svaritah so bhinihato veditavyah. yathā: so.....: te..... tasmād iti kim: bhrājo.....


5. ābhāvē yatra svaryate sa praçlishto veditavyah. sūn.....: sād.....: māsā.....: 'dikshā.....'

G. M. O. om.
7. Where an acute precedes, it is táirovaṇyājana.

The form of this rule, again, is almost unaccountably peculiar. The term táirovaṇyājana means 'with consonant-intervention,' and all the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.62) define the accent in accordance with this, as being one in which the circumflex is separated by intervening consonants from the occasioning acute. Here, to be sure, such a definition would hardly answer, as there is a single word in the Sanhitā, praṇgam, in which a vowel is regarded as having táirovaṇyājana, although there is no consonant between it and the acute. But why specify udāttapūrva, 'preceded by an acute,' in this rule, when it was just as necessary in rule 6? The commentator says that, as the implication has been made all along, its repetition here is for the purpose of signifying that the acute is now to be understood to be in the same word with the circumflex. That may satisfy him, but is not calculated to content us. If nānāpadadātham udāttam was implied in rule 6 from above, then padavīrttyād should have been simply vivṛtyām. Things would be made much better by putting rule 6 after rule 7: then we should be able to give udāttapūrva in rule 7 a meaning, as recalling to mind the actual cause of these two accents; and rule 6 would stand as an exception to the other and more general statement, pointing out a class of cases in which, though depending on a preceding acute, another name was applied to the accent.

The commentator's examples are yuṇjānty asya (vii.4.20), vàsy

6. padayor vīrtthiḥ padavīrtthiḥ: tasyāṁ yah svaryate sa pādavṛtto veditavyah. yathā: tā... sa... ya... vīrtthī vṛtyārī tīḥ arthaḥ: padayor iti kim: pra...  
1 W. B. O. om. 2 B. bhavati. 3 in O. only. 4 B. vyāptātirikta.

7. udāttapūrveādhikāre sati pumān atra tatkathanād ekopada-sthodāttavīrasno 'vagamyate: tasmād ekopadosthodāttapūrve yah svāritah sa tāirovaṇyājano veditavyah. yathā: yuṇj-... vās... sa... tād... pra... tām...  
1 G. M. kath-; O. tu k-. 2 G. M. -sthityavi-; O. -sthatavi-. 3 O. gam-. 4 O. asū. 5 in O. only.
8. Ity etani septa svaritanamadheyany akhyatani. yathā: 'abhy...... adhe...... iti kshaipta. vay...... kvā...... iti nitya. sa...... yat...... iti pratihatā. so...... iti abhinihatah.  

sud...... iti praślīshath. ta...... iti pādavṛttāh. mama...... iti tāirovyañjanaḥ.

1 W. -māny; B. -yāni svaritanām. 2 O. vyākh. 3 G. M. om.
9. In the kṣāipra and nitya, the effort is firmer.

The commentator makes very short work of the remaining rules of the chapter, and we can afford to do the same, as they teach us nothing of value.

10. As also in the abhinihata.

The commentator says that ca in this rule is used in the sense of secondary adjunction (anvācaya), and so signifies that the effort of utterance in the abhinihata is drdha, 'firm,' merely—a less degree than the drdhatarah, 'firmer,' or 'quite firm,' of the preceding rule. The same may be also inferred, he adds, from the fact that the abhinihata is made the subject of a separate rule, instead of being included in rule 9, with the other two.

11. In the praclihta and prátihata, it is gentler.

Nothing is to be inferred from its association here as to the real character of the prátihata. This rule and its successor were referred to under 1.46, but for no intelligibly useful purpose.

12. In the tāirovyānajana and pādavṛtta, it is feebleer.

9. kṣāipre nitye ca prayatno drdhatarah kāryah.
1 W. -ma; B. -ma; O. yatno. 2 W. B. om.

10. anvācaye vartamānac ekāro drdhamātram bodhayati: abhinihate ca prayatno drdhah syāt: na tu drdhatarah: iti prthakṣātrārambhād api praṭiyate.
1 B. -hāte (as also in the rule). 2 O. om. 3 G. M. insert mrdutarah, and rule 12.
4 O. -shatarah. 5 W. abhi; B. om.

11. pracliṣṭe prátihate ca prayatno mṛdutarah kāryah.

12. tāirovyānajane pādavṛtte ca prayatno 'ipatarah syāt. 'yady apy' alpamrduḍṛdhahāvas 'tatro 'ktas tathā 'pi dipavād vemupatracad iti pīkshānurodhaḥ komalaçiraskatvam sarvatra vijñeyam." 2

iti tribhāsāyaratne pratīcākhyavivaraṇe viṅgaḥ dhyāyā. 3

9 O. ca 'ipatarah karanem bhavati. 10 W. om. 2 G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. ins. tatra. 5 M. 'pi 'li. 6 B. kṣāthānurodhoktā. 7 B. dharīk; G. M. kācalyacirastav.
8 O. jñeyam: yathā: yuvā kavi. 9 G. M. O. dvitiyapraṇe ashtama.
CHAPTER XXI.

CONTENTS: 1-9, division of consonants in syllabication; 10-11, praśna accent; 12-13, yemas or nasal counterparts; 14, nāśikya; 15-16, svarabhakti.

1. The consonant is adjunct of a vowel.

This brief principle calls forth a long discussion. Reference is first made (except in G. M.) to rule xxiv.5, as, by its requirement of a comprehension of aṅga, 'adjunct' (literally 'limb, member'), creating a necessity for the present precept (and for those that are to follow). Objection is then at once taken to the principle: if, in such cases as kāpa and yāpa (and G. M. add yet other words as illustrations), it is the consonant that indicates the difference of meaning, ought not the vowel, rather, to be considered as adjunct

1. "vyāṅjanaṁ svarāṅgam bhavati: vṛāso nādo 'ṇgam eva ca (xxiv.5) iti vijnayatena' vidhīnād ayam ārambhah. nanu kūpo yāpa ityādāṁ vyāṅjanam eva 'rthavijeshahodhakam' iti svaro vyāṅjaṅgaiṁ kiṁ na syat. ucyate: vyāṅjanaṁ kevalam avasthātavaḥ na čaknoti: kiṁ tu sāpeksham: svaras tu nīrapekshak: sāpekshanirapekshayor nirapeksham eva viṣisṭham ācakshate prekhāvantaḥ: viṣisṭapratyaṅgateṁ aṅgirāṣṭhyāyaṁ 'eva. kiṁ ca: svarāṅgacishtyabodhakam anvad api vidyate":

durbalasya yatā rāṣṭreṇa harate" balavān nīpah:
durbalāṁ vyāṅjanaṁ tadvad dharate" balavānt svarah."

"kiṁ ca: cikshāyākyāṁ
yah svayaṁ rājate taṁ tu svaram āha pataṅgaliḥ:
uparisthāyinā téna vyāṅgaiṁ vyāṅjanam ucyate." svarás tu" brāhmaṁ jñeyā ityādi.
udāttag ca 'nudāttag ca" svaritaç ca svaras tryah":
"hrasvo dirghah pluta itī" kālato" niyamā" aśa."

"ti "
of the consonant? The answer given is, that a consonant is incapable of standing alone, and so is dependent, while a vowel is independent; and that, as between a dependent and an independent, the enlightened regard the independent as superior; and it belongs to the inferior to be adjunct to the superior. Moreover, there is found also another proof of the superiority of the vowel, in the verse “as a mighty monarch takes possession of the realm of a weak one, so the mighty vowel takes possession of the weak consonant.” The beginning of another verse is added: “the vowels are to be known as belonging to brahman.” But between this part of a verse and the whole verse that precedes, G. M. insert another, which is asserted to come from “the exposition of the Čikṣā,” and which gives a highly imaginative derivation for śvarā, ‘vowel,’ and vyāñjana, ‘consonant:” “Patanjali styled that a vowel which shines by itself [śvarā from sva-yam rājate]; the consonant is so called as being imperfect [vyāñjana from vyāṅga, literally ‘limbless’] without [? the expression needs mending, to bring out a desirable sense] the other following it.” Then all start together upon a new argument for the superiority of the vowel with yet another verse, which is actually found in the known pāṇiniya: Čikṣā (verse 23; see Weber’s Indische Studien, iv.353): “acute, grave, and circumflex, the three accents, and short, long, and protracted, these, in regard to quantity, are the necessary characteristics of the vowels;” which shows that acute tone and so on are attributes of vowels only; and of consonants in virtue of their being adjuncts of vowels.

śvarānām eva ‘dattadayo dharmāḥ: “vyāñjanānāṁ tu” tadaṅgatayā. vyāñjanam ardhamātrān: śvarā ca mātrākālaḥ: tayoḥ sāṁdhir adhyārdhamātrān: ity evam dirghakālaḥ prasaktah; tatra pratishthāṁ vyāñjanam śvarāṅgam ity uktam; svarasannirṣṭhaśa vyāñjanasya śvarāṅgāla eca kālo drutavṛttāna na tu “svarasāyī ‘eva” sarvate “ty orthah. “drutavṛttān iti kim:” krasāvrdhakaśa vyāñjanam (i.37) iti “vyārtah svād iti brāhmaḥ. yathā” kṣirādakasampanke” kṣirāsāyī ’eva ‘palabdhir na ‘dakṣaśya tothā śvarāvyāñjanasampanke” śvarāsāyaś “no ‘palabdhir” vācīṣṭhyam.”

Next we pass to the consideration of another reason why the principle stated in the rule needed to be laid down. The consonant (by i.37) has half a mora of quantity; and a vowel has [for example] a mora: their combination, then, would seem to have a mora and a half, and so would be liable to be understood as of long quantity: this untoward conclusion is avoided by the present rule, which implies that in fluent utterance the quantity of the vowel belongs in all cases to the combination of consonant and vowel, and not to the vowel alone. The specification “in fluent utterance” (literally, ‘in running action’) is made in order to save the significance of rule i.37.

Finally, the superiority of the vowel is once more inferred from the fact that, when it is combined with a consonant, it alone is perceptible; just as, when milk and water are mingled, the milk alone is perceived, and not the water.

2. And it belongs to the following vowel.

The commentator explains parasevaram as a descriptive compound (karmadhāraya), governed by bhajate understood; such an ellipsis, however, is so violent as to be hardly admissible, and the word is perhaps better taken as a possessive (bahuvrīhi), somewhat anomalously used. The occasion of the rule, we are told, is the doubt which is liable to arise as to when the consonant—which, owing to its having the vowel as a superior, is unable to stand by itself—is an adjunct of the preceding, and when of the following vowel. A single phrase is quoted as example, namely imān eva lokān upadhāya (v.5.53: O. omits the last word).

This is the leading and introductory principle in all the Pratīcākhyas (see note to Ath. Pr. i.55); it is greatly restricted in its application by the following rules.

3. A consonant in pautā belongs to the preceding vowel.

The commentator explains avasītam as meaning ‘standing at the end of a pada,’ and gives as examples ārk (i.2.22 et al.; W. has instead ṛk [iv.7.91 et al.], and O. has vāk [i.3.91 et al.]), vashaṭ

1 O. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. O. om.; G. M. kadācād apar. 4 G. M. -kakā. 5 W. aṅgabh; O. egasātrata. 6 B. om. 7 W. ins. paraṁ svari. 8 O. om. 9 G. M. O. om.
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(ii.2.124 et al.), tat (passim: given by G. M. only), and havih (i.2.44 et al.)

This principle, of course, is without exception in its application. It is either stated or implied in the rules of the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. i.57).

4. Also the first consonant of a group.

That is to say, as the commentator points out, of a group consisting of either two consonants or more than two. The "also" (ca) expressed in the next rule is declared to be implied here also, and to prescribe adjunction to the preceding vowel. The examples given are yañnān vyādičat (vi.6.11) and apsv antih (i.4.45 et al.: but G. M. substitute apsv agne [iv.2.111], and W. has the corrupt reading avvatah). If, now, we had only to take the groups of consonants as they stand in the ordinary text, and divide them, the application of this and of the remaining rules for syllabication would be simple enough; but we are required to apply also the rules for duplication etc. as found in chapter xiv., and to make the insertions required by the rules of the fifth (v.32,33) and the present chapter (12-16), which puts quite a different face upon the matter. In fact, in the examples furnished, ut is the only group which is divided n-t without farther ceremony; gr becomes and is divided g-gr; nvy in like manner, n-ny; psv is expanded into p-phsv; and jn into j-jn (writing the yama, as I have done elsewhere, with a straight line above the letter), where, by the action of the next rule, two consonants go to the preceding vowel. The class of groups consisting of two consonants only, and such consonants as (by xiv.23) are not liable to duplication, is the only one of which the division is settled by the present rule alone: it contains (in the Tāttvikya-Sanhita) thirty-nine groups, such as ut, tth, pp, yy, ny, yy.

The other treatises hold this same principle, and teach it in an equivalent manner (see Ath. Pr. i.56 and note)—save that the Rik Pr. (i.5, xviii.18) allows the letter to be adjointed to either the preceding or the following syllable.

3. avasitam pudāntavarti vyāñjanam pūrvasya svarasyā 'ñgam 'syit. yathā: ārk: vashat: tat: havih.1

1 G. M. antar., 2 G. M. pūrvasvarāgañā, 3 B. om., 4 O. om., 5 W. O. om.

4. dvayor bahuñmā vā sāmyogō bhavati 4: tasya sāmyogasvā 'yam 'pūrvasvarasyā 'ñgam bhavati. yathā: yajñānām apo... parasitā cakāruh "pūrvasvarāga-tevahodhaka" ity atrā 'pi tal1 labhyate.2

2 B. om., 3 G. M. om., 4 W. varṣanām; G. M. sāmyogānām, 5 G. M. ins. yati.
6 G. M. ins. yati, 7 G. M. ins. tat, 8 W. pūrvasā; O. -savrā, 9 O. om., 9 G. M. om., 10 W. O. om., 11 G. M. svarasyā 'ñg-, B. -ñgam bo-
12 G. M. om.
The manuscripts of the commentary are more than usually defective in this neighborhood: B. has lost the present rule, with something of what precedes and follows it; O. omits the next rule, with passages before and after; W. has done the same, to a somewhat less extent; but rule 5 and the lacking part of its comment were apparently restored on the margin of W.'s original, and its copyist has put them in in the wrong place, next before rule 6.

5. And one that is not combined with the following vowel.

The comment supplies the word svarena, ‘vowel,’ as that with which parena here agrees, and the whole interpretation is constructed accordingly. The meaning is, then, that (with the exceptions to be further specified in the following rules) only the final member of a group of consonants is to be adjoined to the following vowel, the rest belonging to that which precedes. By way of illustration is given merely tat savituh (i.5.6 et al.); a most insufficient and ill-chosen example; since, in the final form of the group ts, only one consonant goes with the preceding syllable: thus, t-ths. But the commentator is obliged to spend his strength, and vainly, in endeavoring to refute an obvious objection to the rule itself, which he thus states: “well, but then the foregoing rule is meaningless, since by this one also the quality of adjunction to the preceding vowel is assured to the consonant that begins a group.” And he replies, “you must not think that, for, in such cases as maryacristh (iv.1.25 et al.) and arvā ’si (i.7.81 et al.), in which the y and v are doubled after r, by rule xiv.4, the former y or v is by the present rule made an adjunct of the preceding vowel, but the r, by rule 7 below, would become an adjunct of the following vowel; and that is impossible, since no such pronunciation ever takes place. So, as one or the other must needs be annulled, the question arises which is to be annulled; and here rule 4 comes in to settle the question.”

This is not a very acceptable exposition, although it in a manner involves the true relations. Rule 4 is not meant as a safeguard against the misapplication of following precepts, but as a fundamental principle, with reference to which the present rule stands in a subordinate position; and the two must be understood as if they read “the first member of a group belongs to the preceding vowel; and, along with it, such other members as are not immediately combined with the following vowel.” The former principle obtains everywhere, without exception; to the latter, rules 7-9

establish very important and extensive classes of exceptions. If
the mode of statement adopted in the treatise is open to some
objection, we cannot help it; the slight inaccuracy is perhaps a
consequence of the general prevalence of the doctrine of rule 4, to
which its successor is added as an extension peculiar to this school.

No one of the other Prātiṣākhyaśas recognizes any such principle
as this: those of the Rik (i.5, xviii.18) and Atharvan (i.58) add
to the initial consonant of a group only, the first of a following
pair, which is the result of duplication, that of the White Yajus
including further (i.104, 105) the other one of the pair, provided a
mate follows. Its sway is, as already remarked, much more limited
than would be thought at first sight, because rule 7 establishes a
different usage for the immense class of groups of which a semi-
vowel stands as final member, and rule 9 for the much smaller but
yet important class in which a spirant stands last, or followed by
a semivowel. Its general effect is to attach to the following vowel
only such consonants or groups as could begin a word, leaving the
rest to belong to the foregoing syllable. There seems to be need of
illustrating more fully than the commentator has deigned to do,
the sphere of its application.

This is, in consonant-groups originally of two members, to
1. Groups in which a mute is doubled (or its corresponding non-
aspiret prefixed to it, as will be understood hereafter without
special remark) after a surd spirant (z or q, xiv.9,15), l (xiv.2,3), or
r (xiv.4,15), the first member of the group remaining unchanged:
thus, zk-k, lk-k, rk-k. These are twenty-seven in number; and to
them may be added xy-y, rl-r, rn-n, which, by the final specification
of rule 7, follow the same mode of division. In regard to these,
the usage as fixed by our treatise is the same with that sanctioned
by the rest, as already mentioned.

2. Groups in which a mute, or n, is doubled before a mute of
another series: thus, kk-e, en-n. Of these there are fifty-one in the
Sanhitā.

3. The same, but with the addition (by xxi.12) of yama before
the final member: thus, gg-ā. Twenty-three groups.

4. Groups in which the initial spirant (sibilant) is doubled, and
also the following mute (by xiv.9), only the last of all going to the
following syllable: thus, gē-e. Thirteen groups.

5. The same, but with yama: thus, gg-pm (cm). Six groups.

6. Groups in which h is doubled before a nasal, with nōśikya
(by xxi.14: but see the note to that rule, for a different interpreta-
tion): thus, kh-īn. Three groups only.

Against these one hundred and twenty-six groups, growing out
of original simple pairs, there are eighty like \textit{k-ky} (from \textit{ky}) and \textit{k-khs} (from \textit{khs}), in which, by rules 7 and 9, only the initial consonant of the finally resulting group goes with the preceding vowel.

When, now, the pairs here rehearsed come to be extended to triplets by the addition of a third member, if that member be a semivowel, or a spirant (sibilant) following a mute, the point of division remains just where it was before. And so also, of course, in the like extension of the groups mentioned under rule 4, above, as undergoing no change in the 

\textit{varnâkrama}. Thus, \textit{ggg} (\textit{g-g}) is divided like \textit{gg} (\textit{g-g}); \textit{c-sy} (\textit{c-s-c}) like \textit{c-c} (\textit{c-c}); \textit{n-ksh} (\textit{n-ksh}) like \textit{n-k} (\textit{n-k}); and \textit{rksh} (\textit{rk-khs}) like \textit{rk} (\textit{rk-k}). And the very great majority (one hundred and fifty-four) of the groups of three consonants occurring in the Sanhitâ have a semivowel as their final member; with final sibilant there are only seven.

If, on the other hand, double groups are extended to triplets by appending a mute, either non-nasal or nasal (which happens in thirty-one cases), the point of division is, by the operation of the present rule, shifted toward the end of the group. Thus, we have

1. \textit{n-k}, but \textit{n-k-t}, two groups; and \textit{n-h}, but \textit{n-jh}, two groups;
2. \textit{rk-k}, but \textit{rk-k-c}, five groups; and \textit{rj-j}, but \textit{rj-j-m}, five groups;
3. \textit{dd-gh}, but \textit{ddgh-jn}, two groups;
4. \textit{st-st}, but \textit{sttt-in}, two groups;

which are extensions of the groups of two members already treated of, and advance the division only one point. But further, groups ending in a sibilant, and falling under rule 9, below, and those which by rule 15 have \textit{sevarabhakti}, exhibit, when a mute is added, a still greater transference forward of the point of division, and we have

5. \textit{k-khs} (\textit{ksh}), but \textit{kkhs-t} (\textit{kst}), four groups; and \textit{k-ksh} (\textit{ksh}), but \textit{kksh-pm} (\textit{kshm}), five groups; and, finally,
6. \textit{r-} (\textit{rsh}), but \textit{rsh-st} (\textit{rsh-t}), and \textit{r-g}, but \textit{r-gg-pm} (\textit{rgpm}), three groups.

In the yet further extension to groups of four members, the same principles prevail. There are found nineteen such groups in which the additional letter, being a semivowel, has no effect upon the division; and only three in which the division is altered by an added mute. These last are: \textit{khs-t} (\textit{ksnh}), from \textit{ksh}; \textit{khs-t} (\textit{ksnh}), from \textit{ksh}; and \textit{nhs-t} (\textit{nsts}), from \textit{n-ths} (\textit{nsts}).

Finally, the only two groups of five consonants occurring in the

\begin{quote}
tatra niççâyakatvena" samyogādi" (xxi,4) stūram upatish-thate.\footnote{O. om., with the rule; W. puts, with the rule, at the end of the comment, having here also pita-varavâgham bhavati.} \footnote{B. śva-; W. adds śarena.} \footnote{G. M. śūndr- (as also in the rule).} \footnote{W. ins. ca; G. M. ins. yad.} \footnote{G. M. ins. tat.} \footnote{B. G. M. om.} \footnote{W. -dhā.} \footnote{G. M. om.} \footnote{G. M. ins. ca.} \footnote{G. M. śuvās.} \footnote{O.-tvā.} \footnote{O.-ākh.} \footnote{W. B. om.} \footnote{O.-tvā.} \footnote{O.-ākh.} \footnote{W. B. anyadē.} \footnote{O. cāryam.} \footnote{G. M. -ha syât.} \footnote{W. niyatā-; B. niççayāte.} \footnote{G. M. -di 'ī.} \footnote{O. iva hi.} \end{quote}
Sanhitā (ntstr and tstry) are formed by added semivowels, and so do not come under the further action of the present rule. G. M. read asāṁhitam instead of asāṁhitam in the rule.

6. Also anusvāra and svarabhakti.

By G. M., this rule is divided into two, anusvārah and svarabhaktic ca (while, on the other hand, T. reads anusvārasvarabhakttyog ca); and such a division is noted, if not accepted, in the comment, by all the manuscripts, which say "of this rule (svarabhaktic ca) is made a setting-apart, although the prescription is identical (with that made in the other rule, anusvārah)." And the object of thus separating what is confessed properly to belong together is stated to be "to bring about the conjunction of svarabhakti, in some cases, to the following vowel," on the authority of a verse which is quoted, to the effect that "the knowing man should connect with its predecessor (?) the bhakti that follows a short vowel; and in rṣasya dhūrshadām the bhakti is said to do as it pleases"; but G. M. substitute for the latter half of the verse "to it should be assigned one mora, also before a pause and in cases of hiatus." The whole matter is exceedingly obscure, or quite unintelligible, without aid from the context of the quoted verse. The words cited as examples are not found in the Sanhitā; but they occur in the Rig-Veda (at i.143.7), and also in the Tāttvāryā-Brahmana (i.2.112), where the svarabhakti has assumed the form of a full vowel, and the word reads dhūrshadām. It looks as if the commentators had set out to divide into two rules what they nevertheless have to acknowledge to be really only one, for the purpose of interpreting into the latter half of it, when set by itself, a license to the element in question to be treated either way; but, as they have not fully carried out their intention, I have preferred to retain the unity of the rule. It is quoted, we may further remark, under rule i.34, in all the manuscripts of the comment, apparently without any thought of a division.

6. cakārah samuccayakathānāsvārāh pūrvasvarāṅgatavākṣarakaḥ. 'anusvārah' pūrvasvarām bhajate. yathā: anu... svarabhaktic ca pūrvasvarām bhajate. yathā: gārh... vidhānā samāne' sūtrasyā syā prthakkarānam: kecāt svarabhaktē parāṅgate ca apidāyitum. tathā hi:

"svarād dhrāvastā parām bhaktim pracayate samāyēd" buddhāh: "rtasya dhūrshadām ca 'ti svatantrā bhaktir ucyate".

1 B. -va; G. M. -hanāva; O. -devi. 2 G. M. put after anusvārah, as its comment, giving all the rest as comment to svarabhaktic ca as a separate rule. 3 O. om. 4 W. G. M. O. -svarāṅgam. 5 G. M. sūy. 6 G. M. O. om. 7 O. svar-. 8 G. M. O. om. 9 O. samavr-. 10 O. -na; G. M. add anusvāra svarabhaktic ce 'ti. 11 B. -kkār-. 12 O. prthakkarānum. 13 W. B. G. M. -(padā-. 14 W. B. -dītum. 15 B. svarāṅga hr-. 16 G. M. na ced. 17 G. M. substitute tasyā maitrī bhaved evā virāme ca vicīlīṣvā; O. adds 18 from comment to next rule.
Anuvāra appears here once more with the distinct value of a consonantal element following the vowel—and yet not as a full consonant, else it would fall under rule 4 above, and would require no separate treatment. The treatise is not so explicit as were to be desired in defining what is to be done with it in syllabication; but I presume we may infer that it does not count as sanyogādi at all, but only as if an affection of the preceding vowel; and hence, that all the groups which it introduces are to be divided as if it were not there; that ācē, for example, is to be made into ācēcē, āsm into āsēpm, and āstr into āsttr tr. The example given by the commentator is anuvāsī te (i.2.6); but it is an ill-chosen one, and quite worthless, as, in any view of the nature and treatment of anuvāra, no question could arise as to the division anuvādī.

For svorabhakti, see the concluding rules of this chapter (xxi. 15,16). The example given is gārhapatyāh (i.6.7 et al.), which we are to read and divide gār-hapatyāh.
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7. But not a consonant that is followed by a semivowel, if dissimilar with it.

The negative here signifies a direct reversal of the implication, as it denotes a denial of adjunction to the preceding vowel, and hence necessarily involves adjunction to the one that follows, since the consonant cannot stand by itself. "Dissimilar" is simply explained by vilakshana, of diverse characteristics, different; it excludes from the operation of the rule the doubled semivowel itself, and would also exclude the nasal semivowel into which u and m are converted before l, and m before y and e (v.28,28), if these occurred where the rule could apply, which is not the case.

The examples quoted by the commentator are adhyavasāyā

dīka (vi.1.5; i.e. ad-dhyā-), madhumigrena (v.2.86 et al.; i.e. mi-c-pre-), aglonāyā (vi.1.67; i.e. ag-clo-), and ishe tvā (i.1.1 et al.; i.e. i-shet-tvā): they are not to be commended as at all fully illustrating the wide range of application of the rule. This has been sufficiently set forth above, under rule 5. It helps to determine the division of one-third of the groups of two consonants, of fourth-fifths of those of three, of six-sevenths of those of four, and of all those of five—or of four-sevenths of the whole number of consonant

7. nakārah pārvasvarāṅgatavayāvartakaḥ: antasthāparām

vyayājanānas tasyā antasthāyā asavarnām vilakshanam pārvasvarāṅgām na bhavati: arthāt pārvasvarāṅgam 'tad iti vedātyam':

"sceta sthātum açakya avāt. yathā: adhy..... madh------
açl------ ishe..... antasthā parā yasmāt tad antasthāparām.
asavarnām iti kim: pari------"
groups. By way of further examples, we may cite the two groups of five; they are vi-yu-yidthat-tryas-sya (ii.6.545) and ab-bra-
vantish-tri-ka-ma (vi.1.85).

But if the commentator's direct illustration of the rule is scanty, his counter-illustration is yet less satisfactory. To establish the necessity of the specification asavarnam, 'dissimilar,' he cites only paridhyayin vinśita (v.4.118). Such cases as this, however, are rather covered by the fundamental rule saṁyogādi (xxi.4), and the application of the present one is to the groups in which a semi-vowel is doubled after r, and which we are to read ry-y, rl-l, re-v; while, on the other hand, in the half-dozen groups in which two different semi-vowels follow a mute, both of them, along with the preceding mute, go to the succeeding vowel: thus, viśh-shevaṁ-
vṛṇādṛc-chat (ii.3.26), a-vit-traya-vat (i.8.221), and gr-hād-dvē-
kin (ii.3.18).

नासिक्या: || 8 ||

8. Nor the nose-sounds.

The "nose-sounds" are here again (as under ii.49) defined as the yamas (xxi.12.18) only; but there is no reason why we should not regard the nāsikya (xxi.14) as likewise included (see the note on rule 14). The examples given are also of yamas only: ruknum upa dadhāti (v.2.71 et al.: O. has ruknum only) and rājē sāru-
rah (v.5.11: O. substitutes svarāṇe, v.6.21). The groups, in their full form, are read and divided kk-ṃ and ṣṣ-ṃ. An example of the nāsikya would be vahh-ni-ta-mam (i.1.41).

The Vāj. Pr. (i.103) reckons the yama to the preceding vowel; neither of the other treatises says anything about it.

स्पश्चिभ्यान उम्बा वेत्याङ्ग || 9 ||

9. Nor a mute that is followed by a spirant—provided the following spirant is likewise in the same case.

The first ca (translated 'nor' here), the commentator says, effects the connection of the rule with its predecessor; the second (rendered 'likewise') implies adjunction to the following vowel. This is not very lucid, for the two things are really equivalent to one another. And in the further exposition, the parah appears (the readings are not consistent or clear) to be taken as signifying parasaṃdāgam; but this cannot well be correct. The phrase-
ology of the rule, indeed, is very peculiar, and I do not see how it is to be accounted for unless we may conjecture that the proviso uṣma ca cet parah ca is a later addition, made after it had been noticed that the more general statement sparca ca "shmaparaḥ

8. nāsikya° yamāḥ° parasaṃvaram° bhajante. yathā° rukṣmaṃ

..... rājē.....

1 B. om. 2 G. M. yah. 3 W. svaraparam. 4 G. M. O. om.
included too much. The meaning is clear: that a spirant which itself belongs to the following syllable, as being either directly combined with the vowel of the latter (xxi.5) or followed only by a semivowel before that vowel (xxi.7), carries with it a preceding mute; but if, on the other hand, it be cut off from the succeeding vowel by a mute, so as itself to belong to the antecedent syllable, a mute before it goes on, of course, to the same syllable. The examples given in the comment are this time well selected, and illustrate the three cases involved: they are šhatt sam padyante (v.4. 3^4 et al.) and vacshatt svāhā (vii.3.12); in both of them a t is inserted, by rule v.33, between the t and s, and the final reading and division is t-ths and t-thae. As counter-example we have akshayā vyāghārayati (v.2.7^5 et al.), where, after all rules are satisfied, we have kkshst-tu.

As compared with those to which rule 7 applies, the consonant groups falling under this rule are few, only forty-six in all; in thirty of which the spirant carries the mute before it to the following vowel, while in the remaining sixteen both go together to the one that precedes. The detail is as follows.

Of double groups, composed of a single mute and spirant, there are seven: for example, k-kšh (kšh).

Of groups containing three consonants, the largest class is that formed by the addition of a semivowel to the preceding: for example, k-kšhsy (kšhsy): it contains ten groups. Then there are two like n-kšh (ńkšh), three like t-kšhs (tkšh), and the isolated r-kšs (rks).

Of groups of four consonants there are seven on this side, all but one (rtt-ths=rtts) like those of three, but with an added semivowel, which does not (xxi.7) change the division.

On the other side, where the spirant goes back to the vowel of the antecedent syllable, there are, of course, no groups of two consonants. Of groups of three we have nine, four with following non-nasal mute (as kkhsı-t=ksı), and five with following nasal (as kkhsı-t=ksın). Of groups of four, there are two (as ttıhs-t=ttıts) formed from the foregoing with added semivowel, and three from triplets ending in a sibilant increased by a mute, either non-nasal (namely nhıhs-t=ntıs) or nasal (as nkhsı-t=ńkshı). The two groups of five consonants, which also belong here, have been given above, under rule 7.

This finishes the subject of the division of consonant-groups in syllabication, the special elaborateness and intricacy of whose treat-

---

9. pāraç cakāro nāsikā (xxi.8) ity anena samuccayanaça-
kaḥ: uttaras tu parascarañgatvākarshakah: āshmapara sparaç ca parascarañgam bhavati: nāsā śhā mā paraç cets parascarañ-
gam eva ity arthāḥ. śhā:... vāshāt:... āshmaparaç ced
iti kim: aksh:... āshnā para yasmād asśā āshnaparāh.

1 G. M. cakāra 'pi. 2 B. aś. 3 MSS. -ma. 4 W. cem na; O. cem : sa. 5 W. B.
-ga; O. -ga.
ment in this Prātiṣṭhākhyā has rendered necessary a fuller illustration than was thought worth while in connection with the others, in order to render apprehensible the views held regarding it by the authors of the treatise.

10. Of grave syllables following a circumflex in sāṁhitā there is praçāya, having the tone of acute.

The theory of the praçāya accent has been so fully set forth in the note to Ath. Pr. iii.65 that I do not need to spend many words upon it here. Its effect is, as there pointed out, to give to all the syllables which are left in the written text without any accent-mark the same high tone, whether they be udāttā, acute, or anudāttā, grave. Thus, in the example given by the commentator, ágne duḍhra gāhyā kiṅgīla vanya ya te (v.5.9; G. M. omit ya te), which is written in pada-text

the sāṁhitā-reading is

the grave syllables duḍhra gāhyā kiṅgīla van- being without written designation of accent, like the two acute syllables ág- and ya, and being by this rule uttered upon the same pitch with them. It makes no difference whether the circumflex which precedes the praçāya is enelitic (as in the illustration given) or independent; and I have pointed out above (under xix.3) that, owing to the absence of kāma in the Tātttirīya-Sāṁhitā where a circumflex precedes an acute, there are very numerous cases in the text where the sāṁhitā alone does not show us whether the unmarked syllables following a circumflex are udāttā or praçāya—whether, for example,

are to be read hy ētād devāh or hy ētād devāh, sō śmaḍ ētārhi or sō śmaṭ ētārhi, sō kāma-jātā praṣāh or sō kāma-yātā praṣāh.

In the note referred to, I ventured the conjecture that the mode

10. svaritāt pareśām anudāttanām anudāttayor anudāttasya va sāṁhitāyām praçāya nāmā dharman bhavati. yathā: ágne...

anudāttanām iti kim: ágne... sāṁhitāyām iti kim: ágne... udāttasya śrutir eva śrutir yasyā śivā udāttā-śrutir iti praçāyasvarapārāpanāpanam: ato na punarupāti śivā.

1 B. ins. ca. 2 G. M. dhyā. 3 G. M. su for asāu. 4 W. om. 5 B. svarapānam. 6 W. -ātikānāvādi.
of writing the accent might not have been without influence on the theory as to its character—that is to say, that the Vedic phonetists may have come by an afterthought to declare the praveya syllables of acute tone, and to pronounce them so, because they agreed with the acute in being without a sign of accent, while originally no such correspondence in character was perceived or intended to be signified. The conjecture will doubtless have appeared to many somewhat wild, but I think that in studying the development of the Hindu theory respecting accent it at any rate deserves to be taken fully into account and carefully considered. I am far from regarding it at present as anything more than a conjecture; yet one or two matters have come to light since it was put forth which at least add to its plausibility. Haug, namely, in a valuable and interesting communication from India to the Journal of the German Oriental Society (vol. xvii., 1863, p. 799 ff.), shows that the modern Hindu reciters of the Veda give tonic distinction only to the syllables that have the accent-signs, the svartita and anudatta, so that the udatta appears to be no accent at all, and is entirely confounded with the toneless praveya—thus, under the influence of the mode of written designation, turning topsy-turvy, as it were, the whole system of spoken accent. And again, the peculiar system of writing the accent practised in the Catapatha-Brahmana (which uses only one sign, the horizontal stroke beneath the syllable, applied in all the other known systems to mark the anudatta tone), has been turned in later times into a peculiar system of accenting, and treatises have been written to explain and teach it as such (see Kielhorn and Weber, in Weber’s Indische Studien, x. 397 ff.*).

The commentator points out that two grave syllables, or even one, following the circumflex, receive the character of praveya (of course, with the restriction made in the next rule), and not more than two only, as is literally signified by the plural anudattanum in the rule. To show that the conversion into praveya is limited to grave syllables, he quotes apanye pratwate (ii.4.12 et al.); to show that the conversion is made only in saunhita, he gives part of the other passage in pada-form, namely agne: duhira: gohya: kingila: vevya (O. adds ya). We might naturally infer from this that the praveya accent does not occur at all in pada-text; but the inference is not a necessary one (since the rule only says that syllables which are anudatta in their pada-form become praveya in saunhita, without implying that there may not be praveyas in pada-text which remain such in saunhita), and would doubtless be erroneous; for at least the extant pada-text of the Taittiriya-Sanhitá agrees in this respect with those of the other Vedas, and writes gvevanase, antariksham, and samaguchanta, for example,

---

* It ought to be added, that Haug and Kielhorn do not look at the matter in the same light in which I have placed it, but incline to believe in the reality and antiquity of what I have called the modern and artificially substituted systems: this is no place to discuss the subject; but I feel confident that the view I have taken will prove the only one tenable.
The peculiarity of this pada-text in treating the avagraha as a full avasána in regard to the designation of accent (as shown in the third of the examples), has been already spoken of above (under rule xx:3).

The terms of the rule would justify us in understanding pracaya to have its etymological meaning of 'accumulation, continued series,' and translating 'a series of grave syllables following a circumflex in sanhítá is of acute tone,' and perhaps this was actually the intent of the rule-makers; but I have preferred, as the safer course, to follow the authority of the commentator in translating. To him, indeed, the term is so distinctly a technical one, implying utterance with acute tone, that he thinks it necessary to explain that udáttapraúth is added by way of definition of the peculiar character of the pracaya, and therefore is not open to the reproach of punarúkti, or superfluous repetition.

11. But not when an acute or circumflex follows.

That is to say, when such a series or pracaya of grave syllables is followed by an acute or a circumflex syllable, the one next preceding the latter is not made to be of acute tone, but retains its proper grave character, and is marked with the anudáta sign. The commentator offers as examples táyā deváh sátām (iv.1.2: W. B. omit sútām, without which the passage is found elsewhere; G. M. substitute táyā devátāyā, iv.2.9 et al.) and tád áhuh kvá jágati (vii.1.4: G. M. omit jágati). These illustrations are wanting in variety, inasmuch as they show between the two independent accents only two original grave syllables, whereas one becomes an enclitic circumflex and the other remains grave; we may take the first example under the preceding rule as showing how an actual pracaya ends with a grave before the following original accent.

The subject to be supplied with the predicate in this rule is svarāha, of course. There is an objectionable ambiguity in the form of the rule, inasmuch as there might most naturally seem to be anuvṛtti of pracayāh, and so a denial of that accent anywhere excepting before a pause.

We have seen at xix.2 that the name vikrama is given to the

11. udáttaprauvah svarataporo vā 'nudátoḥ pracayo na bhavati.
yathā: táyā......; tad...... udátaḥ ca svaritaḥ ca dittavari-
táu: táu parām yasmāt sa tatho, ktaḥ.

1 O. -ro rd. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 B. om.
grave following a pracaaya, as well as to one that comes immediately after a circumflex:

12. After a non-nasal mute, when it is followed by a nasal, are inserted, in their order, nose-sounds.

Which nose-sounds, as we are told in the next rule, some call yamas; and by this familiar name, which the other Pratīcākhyas apply to them directly, we shall here, as we have done elsewhere, know them. The treatise teaches us nothing more about them, except (ii.49–51) that their place of production is either the nose or the mouth and nose, and that the producing organ is as in the series of mutes; and further (xxi.8), that in syllabication they are to be reckoned with the following vowel.

The theory of these curious and equivocal constituents of the ancient Hindu alphabet I have discussed pretty fully in the note to Ath. Pr. i.99, and I have no new light to throw upon the subject here. They are transition-sounds, assumed to intervene between non-nasal and following nasal, as a kind of nasal counter-part to the non-nasal, and therefore called its yama or 'twin.'

The meaning of anupāryat, 'in their order,' is ambiguous, as it might be understood to refer to the order either of the twenty non-nasal mutes or of the five nasals; or, of the four kinds of non-nasal mutes in each series—in which last sense the comment understands it, declaring that the first yama follows a first mute, the second a second, and so on; and he has before (under i.1) reckoned the yamas as four in the catalogue of alphabetic sounds. I have pointed out under ii.51 how difficult it is to reconcile this view with that of a variation of their organ of production as in the five series of mutes.

The commentator’s examples are tam prathnathā (i.4.9), vimath-anah (iii.5.49), vidmā te agne (iv.2.21: O. omits agne), and dārāmi dadhmasi (iv.1.101)—one, namely, for each of the four classes of mutes. As rule xiv.24 expressly enjoins duplication of the non-nasal mute in these combinations, we are to read and divide prathanam, vidma, and so on. The counter-examples (of which all but the last are lost in W.) are as follows: to show that the insertion is made only after a mute, kalmāśi bhavati (v.1.14: O. substitutes brahmavadīnah, i.7.14 et al.); that this mute must be a

12. uttamaparād anuttamāt sparśād anupāryād yathākramam nāsikyā āgma bhavanti; prathamasparsat prathamāsiyāh; dvitiyād dvitiyāh; evam 'anyatra 'pi. yathā; tam viṁśatviṁśat dārīyā itīyā sparśād iti kim 'kalm... anuttamād iti kim: summ... uttamaparād iti kim: sabdah....

1 G. M. ins. parata; O. ins. parah. 2 G. M. O. kyāh. 3 O. -gasparśād. 4 G. M. -yāh. 5 G. M. anye. 6 O. om. 7 W. om.
non-nasal, sūmnāya sanātini (i.1.13 et al.; O. substitutes sushumnah, iii.4.7'); and that it must be followed by a nasal, sabdah sagarah sunekhat (iv.4.73; G. M. omit sunekehat; O. substitutes vashhata sādhā, vii.3.12).

These examples are one-sided, in that they only exhibit the simplest form of group in which the yama is taken as increment. Of such simplest groups there are twenty-three met with in the Sanshitā; namely, after first mutes, kn, kn, ktn, cn, cm, in, tn, tm, pn, pm, pm; after second mutes, chm, thm; after third mutes, gm, jn, jm, dm, am; after fourth mutes, ghn, dhm, dhm, bhm. Then, of groups of three consonants involving such combinations: jhn (ji-jny), tny, sdm, jn (j-jn); dghn (ddgh-šn), dhn; jmn (ji-jmn), rtm, rtm, rodh, rodh; sm (ss-tmn), stn. And of groups of four consonants, jny (ji-jny).

According to the phonetic systems of the other Prātiṣekhyas, this would finish the tale of yamas. But, by the peculiar rule (xiv.9) which here requires a surd mute to be everywhere inserted between a sibilant and a following nasal, is brought forth a new and numerous brood of these curious twins. Thus, in double groups, gm (cttgm), sm, sdm, sdm, sm. Of groups of three containing these: smy, sdmv; kshm (kksdp-mn), ksm, tsm, tsm, pen; cpr (crpp-pm), rshn, rshm; sm. Of groups of four, nksnh, hksnh, csmv. In all, of both classes, fifty-seven groups.

13. Some call these yamas.

The commentator adds nothing of value.

14. After k, when followed by n, n, or m, is inserted nāsikya.

I have translated this rule according to its obvious and incontrovertible meaning, which, if it needed any external support, would find it in the almost precisely accordant rule of the Ath. Pr. (i.100: the teachings of the other treatises upon the subject are much less distinct: see the note on the Atharvan rule). But the commentator gives it an entirely different interpretation. The ablative hakārān, he says, is here used in the sense of an accusative (his addition, “in the absence of lyap [the suffix yo],” I do not accept, but I believe that my rendering is more correct.

13. tán nāsikyaṇ eke śākhino yamān brvacatī, utkānī ēvo dhārānānī.

G. M. iti vadanti.

14. hakārād iti karmani lyabole pañcamī. tasman nanamparaḥ hakārama arūhyu nāsikyam bhavati: samunāsikyaḥ hakārāh syād ity arthah. ahnām: apar: brahm:...
not understand); and the sense is, that a nose-sound is imposed upon the \( h \) itself, or that the latter becomes nasal. It is not difficult to see on what this theory of the quality of a \( h \) preceding a nasal is founded—namely, a recognition of the fact that such a \( h \) is really an expiration of breath through the nose: it being not less true of \( h \) before a semivowel or nasal than before a vowel, that it is (borrowing the phraseology of an earlier rule, ii.47) "udaya-varnadīnādha, 'produced in the position of the succeeding letter.' The commentator's exposition might have come from the "some authorities" to whom the doctrine of that rule is attributed.

The examples given are \( ahūnām ketuh \) (ii.4.141), \( apārdehe \) (ii.1.29), and \( brahmaśatūnāh \) (i.7.14 et al.). 'Giving to the rule its real meaning, and applying the principle laid down at xxii.8 for the syllabic division, we should read \( ahū̇nām \) and so with the rest. As was suggested under Ath. Pr. i.100, it is probably this separation of the \( h \) from the nasal in syllabication that has led to the division of the two in point of utterance, and then to the thrusting in between them of a transition-sound.

G. M. have adapted the reading of the rule to the new interpretation, and give \( hakāran nanamaparār nāśikṣyam \) (the writing of \( n \) instead of \( m \) before \( n \) is frequent with these MSS.):

\[ \text{र्फोष्टेनियणे रफ्तावरमणी:} \ || 11 || \]

15. In the combination of \( r \) and a spirant, there is a svara-bhakti of \( r \).

The doctrine of our Prātiçākhyā respecting the svarabhakti is less detailed, and less distinctly expressed, than that of the other treatises (for which, see the note to Ath. Prāt. i.101–2); from the statement here made, we should not even understand that this "vowel-fragment" is to be an insertion between the \( r \) and the spirant, although that is doubtless intended to be signified. The commentator enters into a long exposition of the subject; by no means, however, limiting himself to explaining and illustrating his text. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. M.) are in some parts of this exposition fuller than the rest, and will be followed

---

15. "rephasya ca "shimanaç ca sainyoge sati" rephasvarabhaktivitāṇi jāniyāt: "svarasya bhaktiḥ svarabhaktiḥ": yo 'syā rephasya samānasvaras tadbhaktiḥ syāt: "rkāraç ca 'syā jihvāgrakarana-teṇa rvṛṣṭyā ca samānadharmah: bhaktiḥ avayana ekaeṣa iti yavañ: etad uktam bhavati: "rkāvayavo bhavati 'ty arthah, sūrenā 'nena svarabhaktiḥ eva vicitā: svarabhaktisvarāpān tu" vispashtaini vyācāske vararuciḥ: "rkārdīr aṇumātā" repho 'rdhamātā madhye ēṣhā svarabhaktiḥ iti" asayā 'yam arthah.\n
indriyavishayo" yo" 'sāva anur ity ucyate budhāiḥ: caturbhir" anubhir mātṝparimāṇam" iti smṛtām."
in the abstract of it here given: the version of W. B. O., indeed, has rather the aspect of being an abbreviation of the other, and one not everywhere skillfully made.

At the outset, G. M. alone specify that the svarabhākti is combined with the spirant (and yet, by xxi.6, it is to be separated from the spirant in syllabication, going with the r to the preceding vowel). The term svarabhākti means 'a fragment, piece, or part of a vowel;' and a rephasaṃvarabhākti, 'r-vowel-fragment,' means a bit of the vowel that is akin, or has the same mode of utterance with, the r. Now the r is of like quality with r in being produced with the tip of the tongue and in having the sound of r: and it is a part of r that is intended. The rule merely prescribes the insertion; the nature of the latter is clearly set forth by Vararuci (one of the three principal sources of the present comment: see note to the introductory verses, pp. 6,7). The vowels are defined at i.5, and since among them only r agrees in place and organ with r, the "fragment" is of r. The r is by i.31 declared to be short, or of one mora; and Vararuci defines the short r as composed of a quarter-mora of vowel at the beginning, a half-mora of r in the middle, and a quarter-mora of vowel (W. B. O. say, of vowel-fragment) at the end. Then a verse is quoted describing the word au as signifying a quarter-mora. This half-mora of r, now, found in the middle of r, being divided, its two parts, each combined with the quarter-mora of vowel, severally receive the name of svarabhākti. Hence there are two svarabhākti's. And in answer to the question where this svarabhākti of half a mora occurs, the makers of the Cīkṣā have declared that the one ending with the vowel element occurs before Ğ, sh, and s, and the one ending with the consonant element before h; the former, moreover, being open, and the latter close. And it is added that in yo vādi ēroddhām (i.6.81) there is no svarabhākṣi, on account of absence of the order prescribed in the rule.

mātrikṣya rcūṇasyā "dir ānunātṛā" svarabhāgo madhye repho 'rdhamātṛā" āsāho" py ānunātṛā" svarabhāgāh: etad rcūṇasa- rāpam. atra " rephe 'rdhamātre bhajyamāne" sati" tāu bhāgān pāreottarāvā amasahitāvā pratyekān svarabhaktināmadheyam bhujeto": "sā ca svarabhaktir ardhamātṛa. kutra" vā" svarabhakti" ity ācāriyā cīkṣākārāir 31 uktam:

caṣāseṣhāvā taroradbājām" hakāre vyahjanodāyām";
caṣāseṣhāvā tu" eṣṭāṃ" hakāre savēṭāṃ" vidur itī".

yo... ityādāu "sātroktakramābhāvān na svarabhaktiḥ,"
svarabhaktiṣyantaraṃ" cīkṣāyām uktam:
"karenhā karviṇi vā eat hariṇī hārīte" 'ti ca:
ahāsāpade" 'ti vijñeyāḥ panḍā tāh svarabhaktayāh.
"karenhā" rahayor" yoge" karviṇi lahekarayoh;
harīnī "raçasēnām ca" hārītā" lāçakārayoh.
So much by way of (would-be) explanation of the rule. But the commentator goes on to say that the Čikṣā teaches other svarabhaktī's, to the number of five: namely, the karenū, between r and h, as in barhi (i.1.2¹ et al.); the karvini, between l and h, as in malkäh (i.1.2⁴); the harini, between r and g or s, as in dora-pārnamāsāu (ii.2.5⁴ et al.) and barsam (ii.5.7¹); the hārītā (or hārītā), between l and g, as in suhāsra-vakalāh (vi.3.3²); and the hānsapādā (or hānsapādā), between r and sh, as in varshāhāvāṃ (ii.4.10³)—and he who wants to go to heaven (on the score, no doubt, of patience, faith, and punetiousness) must utter the five kinds of bhakti, as thus laid down. It appears, then, that the commentator's Čikṣā, like the Vāj. Pr. (iv.16), regards l, not less than r, as followed by svarabhakti before a spirant.

16. But not in case of krama, when first mute follows the spirant.

The commentator defines krama as the equivalent of devīta, 'duplication,' and refers as authority to rule xxiv.5, where the word occurs again without, according to him, admitting any other meaning; whereas, he infers, it must signify the same thing here also. We should rather turn the argument the other way, and say that, as krama can have no other meaning here, it may be conjectured to signify the same thing at xxiv.5. He further coolly

"yā tu hānsapādā nāma sā tu" rephashakārayoh:
"evam pañcevidhām bhaktim uccaret svargakāmukah."
inserts an "or" in the rule, and declares it to mean 'either when the spirant is doubled or when it is followed by a first mute.' This must evidently be condemned: for, in the first place, the text contains no "or;" and, in the second place, if that were the meaning, the specification would be superfluous, since the spirant is always doubled before a first mute, and so krama would include all the cases—except, indeed, according to the doctrine of Plākṣi and Plākṣhāyana, who (xiv.17) deny the duplication of the spirant in such a situation; and we are perhaps to connect his interpretation of the present rule with his apparent acceptance of the doctrine referred to, and suppose that he would read rṣh-t, and rṣp-pm etc. (namely, for rṣm, rṣhn, and rṣhm), while the reading actually approved by the treatise is rṣhsh-t, rṣhp-pm etc. There are five groups—namely rṣy, rṣv, rṣhy, rṣv, and rḥy—in which the difference of interpretation would make a difference as regards the presence or absence of svarabhakti; if the "or" is implied, they will be read and divided rṣcy etc.; if not, they will be rḥcy etc.

The commentator's examples are dārṣyaṁ yajñam (iii.2.29): only O. has yajñam; G. M. read dārṣyaṁ hi, which, if it be an actual passage, I have overlooked in searching out the references), varṣhyābhyah (vii.4.13: W. B. O. read varṣabhāyah), barsvebhīh (v. 7.11), and etarhy ārdhah (v.1.55: found in O. only), illustrating four of the five cases in which his interpretation would exclude the svarabhakti; and further, for cases in which a first mute follows, adarṣma jyotih (iii.2.54: omitted in O.), kārṣṇi upānahā (v.4. 44 et al.), and varṣṭā parjanyah (vii.5.20; found in G. M. only).

CHAPTER XXII.

Contents: 1-2, formation of articulate sounds in general; 3-8, definition of terms used in the treatise; 9-10, mode of production of high and low tone; 11-13, established tone and pitch; 13, length of pauses in the text; 14-15, heavy and light syllables.

16. 'kramaçabdo devitaparyāyah: katham etat: prakṛtir vi-

kramaḥ krama (xxiv.5) ity atra devitasyāi "va' kramaçab-
dena" bhidhānād atrā 'pi sa evā "rtha iti niçeinumah." 

āśma-

naḥ krama satā tasmiṁ āśmanī prathamapare ca sati na 

svarabhaktir bhavati." krama yathā: 

dārṣ.... varṣh.....

bars..... "prathamapare yathā: ad......" kār.... " pratha-

mam paro yasmād asāu prathamaparakah.

iti tribhāshyaratne prátiçākhyaçivarāne ekaviñoḥ dhyāyah.

(1) 0. om. 2 G. M. -ham asty e. 3 W. -do nāmā. 4 W. rād. 5 G. M. "rtha 
nīcītaḥ. 6 O. om.; G. M. add va. 7 G. M. put after sati. 8 W. -set. 9 O. om.

(10) O. etar.....; G. M. etasam prathamaparō y. 11 G. M. add varṣṭā......

12 G. M. O. devitaparāne navamo.
शब्दः प्रकृति: सर्ववर्णानाम् ॥ २ ॥

1. Tone is the material of all articulate sounds.

The putting-together, as well as the material, of this and the following chapter is rather peculiar, and makes the impression of a supplement to the Prātiṣṭhākyya proper. This present rule and its successor are akin with the first two of the next chapter, and all these with the rules of the second chapter. As under ii.1, the commentator explains 阇da by धवनि; for प्रकृति he gives as synonym मुलकारणम्, ‘radical cause,’ and वर्ण the he declares to designate the whole congeries of vowels and consonants.

तत्त्र द्रावणये वर्णान्तरितम् ॥ २ ॥

2. In the difference of form of the former consists the difference of the latter.

That is to say, in the difference resulting from the variety of positions giving audible quality: compare ii.3.

नत्र शब्दव्याप्युत्कृतरिग्नान: ॥ २ ॥

3. Here we will instance the offices of terms.

A complete and violent change of subject is introduced by this rule, continuing to rule 9; which last, again, attaches itself closely enough to the beginning of the chapter to have been its natural continuation. The intervening batch of rules looks like an interpolation, thrust in at this point apropo of गद्ध in rule 1; the word being taken here, however, in an entirely different sense. The commentator tries to smooth over the transition by pronouncing गद्ध a synonym of गद्ध, ‘text-book, body of doctrine;’ which latter is formed by the putting to use of combinations of the alphabetic sounds just above spoken of. He distinctly ascribes to द्रव्य the sense of ‘office, aim,’ as the connection also requires,

1. sarvavarnānāṁ 阇bdः धवानिः प्रकृतिः मुलकारणम: बहवति: varṇaṣabdana sarvavyaṇjanātmako rācīr ucyate. sarve ca te varṇaḥ ca sarvavarnāḥ: teshāṁ.


3. teshāṁ varṇānāṁ sarvaatra' svaṅghatoprayoge' गात्रां ʿitī ucyate: toṣya tobdः iti paryāyaṁma: tatra tasmiṁ chāstre yāni dravyāṇi bhavanti tāny udāharishyāṁḥ. yat karma-yaena kriyate: tath toṣya dravyaṁ: sādhanam iti yāvat: yathā gha-
giving sādhana, 'efficiency,' as its equivalent. As clay to a vessel, we are told, so are alphabetic sounds to a text-book.

4. Varna and kāra are indicatory.

These two terms have already formed the subject of rules i.16–20. Rules vi.1,7 are cited as examples of their use.

5. Ca and api are implicative.

Rules vi.3 and iv.4 are cited as containing examples of the use of these signs of continued implication from something that has gone before.

6. Tu, atha, and eva are exceptional, introductory, and restrictive, respectively.

The use of these connectives is instanced by quoting rules i.19, v.1, and xiv.3 (G. M. substitute vii.1 for the second).

These rules are too trivial and superficial to make it worth while to enter, in connection with them, into any discussion of the use of the particles in the text of the Prātiṣākhya. The index, and the notes on each rule, will give the means of investigating the matter. We have often had occasion to animadvert upon the commentator's


4. varnaçaabdah kāraçaabdah ca nirdeçakau nirdeçavācakau syātām. yathā: avarṇaivyānjanaçaakunā (vi.7) iti: atha shakārañ sakāravisarjanyāv (vi.1) iti. varna ca kāra ca varnakañāu.

5. ca: api: ity etāv 'anvādeçakau syātām. pūrvapaksho' yāvādeça ity ucyate. yathā: asadāmāsiniça ca (vi.3): iti- paro 'pi (iv.4).

tendency to put into them (especially into tu) a meaning which they were never intended to bear.

7. Vā is alternative.
Rule ii.50 is quoted as example.

8. Na is prohibitive.
The example this time is xiii.15 (G. M. substituting xiv.14); and in it appear again some of the differences of reading which were noted in the rule itself where it occurred.

9. Tension, hardness, smallness of aperture, are producers of high tone.
Reference is made to rule i.38, in which the acute accent is defined as consisting in high tone; and the present precept is declared to be given for the sake of that, and in order to prohibit that slack or indifferent utterance which prevails in common life. Āyāma, ‘tension,’ is explained as meaning rather ‘extension (literally ‘longness’) of the members;’ dārūnya, as ‘severity of the vowel;’ and anūtā khasya, as ‘closure of the orifice of the throat;’ this is what one who would utter a sound in high tone must do.

There is evidently much more guess-work than true observation in this rule and the one next following: if they had been given as definitions of sonant and surd utterance, instead of high and low


1 G. M. -mañ. 2 G. M. O. ins. ce 'ti. 3 G. M. atha nakāro nakāram (vii.1). 4 O. om. 5 G. M. -apara. 6 W. O. G. M. -raḥ.

7. ne 'ty esha çabdo váibhāshiko' váikalpiko bhavati. yathā: mukhāndāsīkyā vā (ii.50).

1 G. M. -shako (as also in the rule).

8. ne 'ty esha çabdo pratisedhako bhavati: yathā: 'na shumnognir (xiii.15) iti.'

10. Relaxation, softness, wideness of aperture, are producers of low tone.

The exposition of this rule runs quite parallel with that of the preceding (only O., however, referring to the definition of anudatta, 'grave,' as of low tone, at i.39). To anuvavasastra is given vinata, 'drooping condition,' as synonym; to mardava, snigdhati, 'smoothness,' and to urutat, sthulat, 'bigness.' There is nothing at all to commend in such a description of the way in which low tone is produced.

11. Soft, middle, and loud are the three qualities.

Their use, we are told, will be explained farther on—namely, in rules 4-10 of the next chapter. I have ventured to render sthana, literally 'place' or 'position,' by 'quality,' as better expressing the nature of the distinctions implied. The name apparently comes from such theories as that laid down in rule xxii.10 as to the "place" of production of the different qualities of tone.

In answer, we are told, to the suggested inquiry, "of what are


11. 'mandram madhyaman tairai ce 'ti sthanani bhavanti:' mandram iti prathamam: madhyaman iti devityam: tairai iti
these positions or qualities?" the subject is continued in the next rule.

तत्ततिकतिविशालित्यमः ॥ १२ ॥

12. In them are twenty-one tones.

For the application of these tones or keys, also, we are referred to a later passage (xxiii.11 etc.). As synonym of yama is given śvara, 'tone.'

The commentator chooses to connect these rules with those that follow in the next chapter, and to overlook the obvious fact that in the two chapters we have separate and independent statements upon the same subject, which cannot have come from the same hand, and of which the second renders the first wholly superfluous.

कृत्तिकाम: पदविशालो विवृतितिविगितमः समानपदविवृतितिविगितमस्तिमात्रो दिमात्र एकमात्रो अर्थात्र उत्पन्नर्थिणा ॥ १२ ॥

13. The verse-pause, pada-pause, pause for hiatus, and pause for hiatus in the interior of a word, are respectively of three moras, two moras, one mora, and a half-mora.

As example of the pause of three moras at the end of a verse is quoted ubhā vājasya sātaye hūve vām: (i.5.52: O. omits the first two words); of the pause of two moras, in pada-text, between the padas, ishe: tvā: ūrje: tvā (i.1.1 et al.): and, for all that the Prātičākhyya tells us, we are to regard the avagraha pause, dividing the two parts of a compound word, as of the same length (the Rik [i.6, r. 29] and Vājasaneyi [v.1] Prātičākhyas give it only one mora); of the hiatus-pause, sa iḍhānaḥ (iv.4.45), ta enam (ii.3.114), and tā asmāt (ii.4.4): W. prefixes ̀, but doubtless only by

tr̥t̥yam: eteyānāṁ sthānānām prayojanāṁ uttaratratvā vahcyate. 'etāṁ sthānāṁ kṣetram ityapakshāyām āha parasāttram'.

(0) G. M. om. *(0) G. M. O. esh.* *(0) G. M. O. et. *(0) B. tātra. *(0) G. M. om.

12. teṣhūṁ sthānesvo ekaviṁśatim yamāḥ svard bhavanti: teṣhūṁ yamānāṁ uttaratra prayojanaṁ vahcyate.

1 O. tatra tr̥shu; B. adds tr̥shu.


*(0) G. M. et. *(0) G. M. O. esh.* *(0) G. M. O. et. *(0) B. tātra. *(0) G. M. om.
of the pause of interior hiatus, *praṅgam* (iv. 4.21), which is, I believe, the only case. The commentator also quotes a couple of verses from his Çikṣā, laying down four subdivisions of the pause of hiatus, and assigning them different quantities; that between a short and long vowel is *vatsānusṛti*, and is one *mora* long; that between a long and following short is *vatsānusārinī*, of the same length; between two short vowels, *pākavatī*, three quarters of a *mora*; between two long vowels, *pipālikā*, a quarter-*mora* only (Uvāta’s comment on the Rik Prāt. [ii.1] states the intervals quite differently). In W. there are two verses which are not found in the rest; as they stand, their meaning is in great part obscure to me, and I prefer to leave them unamed and untranslated.

14. A syllable that ends with a consonant, one that has a long vowel, one that precedes a conjunction of consonants, one that is nasal—all these are to be accounted heavy; the rest, other than these, are light.


The commentator instances the different kinds of "heavy" syllable, as follows: one ending with a consonant, māte va putram (iv.2.32 etc.; G. M. omit); one long by its vowel, te te 'dhipatayah (iv.4.113; G. M. omit the last word); one followed by a consonant-group, açmā ca me (iv.7.51; W. has damoyinda, which appears to be merely a corrupt reading; I have found nothing at all like it in the Sanhitā); one that is nasal, viṇçatyāī (vii.2.13 etc.).

The distinction of the syllable as "heavy" or "light" has value only in a metrical point of view, and does not make its appearance elsewhere in our treatise (except as it is referred to in rule xxiv.5—which rule we might have expected the commentator to quote here, as the occasion of this one). The quality of "long" or "short," belongs to the vowel alone, and (see xxi.1 and its comment) the consonants accompanying the latter are regarded as absorbed into it, and forming part of its natural quantity. This separation of "heavy" and "long," or of weight and quantity, is practically convenient, perhaps, but theoretically indefensible; and we have reason to be surprised that phonetic observers so acute as the Hindus had not worked the theory of syllabic quantity into a more consistent shape. The other treatises agree with this: see Ath. Pr. i.51-54, and notes.

The use of the word anumāsika in describing a syllable containing anuvāra is (as already noted, under ii.30) one more sign of a theory which regards the anuvāra as a quality and not an element. The Ath. Prāt., which holds this theory, uses the same term in its definition (i.58). It deserves to be noted, however, that to read anuvāram instead of anumāsikam in the verse would help the metre, making the four pādas similar.

This rule is enough by itself to determine the weight of any syllable whatever: but, as the commentator points out, the one following is added to resolve any doubts which might after all arise as to what syllables were light.


(1) G. M. put at beginning. 2 G. M. -tā. 3 G. M. ins. yad. 4 G. M. ins. yogat pūream. 5 G. M. om. 6 B. G. M. om.; O. -panā. 7 O. om.; G. M. anu-. 8 G. M. evañjanāndam ity abra. 9 G. M. om. 10 O. puts before yathā. 11 B. omits from here to the middle of rule 15 (beginning again with saṁyogapūram). 12 G. M. O. ins. tato laghāṁ. 13 W. etc. 14 G. M. om. 15 G. M. jān-. 16 W. -byi ti. 17 W. -ke.
15. A syllable that does not end with a consonant, that has a short vowel, and that is not followed by a conjunction of consonants, and one that is not combined with anusvāra—know that to be light.

This is a mere negative to the preceding rule, and a wholly superfluous addition to it—and an addition made, we may conjecture, by a different and later hand: the use of the term anusvāra distinctly suggests this.

The commentator quotes, by way of example of light syllables, simply madudayand asan (vi.1.5: B. O. omit the last word).

CHAPTER XXIII.

CONTENTS: 1–3, causes of the differences of articulated sounds; 4–10, qualities or temperaments of voice; 11–19, tone or pitch of utterance; 20, general mode of correct utterance.

1. Now for the origin of the differences of articulate sounds.

15. 'avyaṇjanāntaṁ yad akṣharaṁ yac ca hrasvaṁ yac 'cā 'sanyogaparam' yac ca 'n anusvārasaṁyuktam etat sarvam akṣharaṁ laghuṁ nibodhataṁ jānīdhecaṁ. yathā: mad-.---- ity ādi. vyaṇjanam ante yasya tad vyaṇjanāntam: "na vyaṇjanāntam avyaṇjanāntam: sanyogah paro yasmāt tat sanyogaparam: 'na sanyogaparam' asanyogaparam: "anusvāraṇa saṁyuktam" anusvārasaṁyuktam: "nā 'n anusvārasaṁyuktam" anusvārasaṁyuktam.

iti tribhāshyaratne pṛātīcākhyavivaśce deśāviṇo* 'dhyāyaḥ.

(1) G. M. om. (2) W. ca sanyogapūrveraṁ. 3 W. B. laghā. 4 W. om. 5 G. M. antaṁ. 6 G. M. tadbhinnaṁ. 7 O. om.; W. yuktam only. 8 B. om.; G. M. anusvārayogavārhaṁ. 9 G. M. O. dvitiyaaprape daçamo.

1. athe 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: varṇanāṁ viṣeṣhottattīr ucyata ity etad adhikrtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad vaktṣyamah. varṇanāṁ viṣeṣo varṇaviṣeṣah: tasya 'ṭpattih sā tatho 'ktā.
It was hardly worth while to give a rule introductory to so very brief a treatment of the subject as is here to follow.

2. The differentiation of articulate sounds arises from emission, closure, position, disposition of producing organ, and, fifthly, from quantity.

That is to say, according as any sound is different from another in respect to one or more of these five constituent or determining elements, so its nature or quality is different. The *anupradāna* is the emitted material, whether tone, breath, or the intermediate *h*-sound (ii.8-10); by *saṁsarga* (a term not elsewhere used) is doubtless intended the degree of approximation of the articulating organs, as contact (*sparcāṇa*, ii.33), approach (*upasaṁhařa*, ii.31), and the like (ii.14,16,45 etc.); *sthāna*, ‘place, position,’ and *karaṇa*, ‘producing organ,’ are the familiar names given respectively to the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth by whose contact or approach the sound receives its articulate character (*vinyaya*, which the commentator explains by *vinyāsa* [B. reads this in the rule itself], seems to be added more to make up the verse than for the sake of its meaning); *parimāṇa*, ‘measure’ (used only here), is synonymous with *kāla*, ‘time, quantity’ (see i.31-37). The commentator takes *a* as an example, and says of it that its “emitted material” is tone; its “closure,” in the throat; its “position,” the two jaws; and its “disposition of producing organ,” the two lips. Excepting in the first item, this is blundering work: *a* is, of all the alphabetic sounds, the one least easy to try by the tests laid down in this rule; and the commentator would have done well to choose some more manageable illustration.

3. Sound combined with articulation is the origin of voice.

The commentator defines *prkta* by *mīra*, ‘mixed,’ and *utpatti*
by upādāna and kārana, ‘cause.’ This combination denies the quality of voice to the mere “sound” of drums and the like.

4. Of voice, there are seven qualities.

Here is a different and expanded version of the doctrine of three qualities, as laid down above, in rule xxii.11. The following rules give the details. The commentator gives of sthāṇa the lucid definition “those whereby the voice is put to use, and that wherein it stands—that is sthāṇa.”

5. Namely, inaudible, murmur, whisper, mumbling, soft, middle, and loud.

The rules that follow define the senses in which we are to understand the terms here given. They indicate plainly enough a continual progression, from inaudible and merely mental utterance up to loud and distinct speaking; but it is not easy to find words which shall represent them closely.

6. “Inaudible” is without sound, without application of mind, but with articulating action.

The commentator explains karanavat by prayatnavat, ‘with effort,’ and states its object to be to deny absolute silence to the upāṅgu. “Without sound” signifies the exceeding litness of

1 MSS. -cru. 2 B. G. M. O. -na. 3 B. -sama.

4. ‘vacāḥ sapta sthānāṁ bhavanti;’ tānya uttarasātre vakhshyante. yāir vāk prayujyate yasiṁ ca tisṭhathi tat sthānam: tāni yathākramam udāharisyāmah.

5. upāṅge iti prathamaṁ vāca sthānam: dhvāna iti dvitiyam: nimañca iti tṛṣṭiyam: evam itarāny api nāmataḥ saptāḥ tāni sthānāṁ jāniyate. uparitaṁ naṁ sūtram abhivyaktam pratyekam eshaṁ lakṣaṇaṁ vakhshyate.

6. karanavat prayatnavad ity arthāḥ: nā ‘sti ca bādo dhvānaṁ asmin āty açabdam: manasaḥ prayogo manahprayogyah: nā ‘sti
sound in this mode of utterance. "Without application of mind" excludes any intentional use of 'udatta etc. This last is not very satisfactory; and, indeed, we should as soon expect the contrary term, *manaḥprayoga*, 'with application of mind,' to be read, as indicating an utterance in which the mind does its full part, though not the voice also (G. M., in fact, read it in the rule).

7. "Murmur" is inaudibleness of syllables and consonants.

The commentator explains *akshara*, 'syllables,' as meaning here 'vowels,' but there seems no need of refusing the word its ordinary signification. Inaudibleness, we are further told, being a characteristic of *upāśya* also, it is here again specified in order to teach that there is no actual sound heard. Of what follows, a great part has dropped out in B. G. M., and is much corrupted in the other two manuscripts, so as to be very obscure. The separate mention of syllables and consonants is for the sake of clearness (?), and indicates exceeding inaudibleness: and there is added a comparison with tame and wild cattle, of which I fail to make any sense. Others say that the inaudibleness is of *s*, *h*, and so 'on.' All of which is very trivial and unedifying.

8. "Whisper" is their audibleness.

*manaḥprayogo yasmin* ity *amaṇaḥprayogam*. *vāca sthānam idṛṣya upāśya ity upadīgyate. tatra karaṇavat iti tūṣṇimbhāvanivṛtttyortham*: *acābdam iti pabdasyā tyantarpatārtham*: *amaṇaḥprayogam ity udattādīnāṁ sāṅkalpikaprayogapratishādhārtham*.


8. akṣarāvyājjanānāṁ upalabdhir nimado nāma tṛtiyam vāca sthānam bhavatī.
I have rendered nimada by 'whisper' rather at a venture: whether the word accurately represents it or not is at any rate of very small consequence.

9. "Mumbling" is the same, with sound.

Cabda would seem to be used here in the sense of nāda, 'tone,' if the definition is to be made anything of; the term upabdīmat is found in the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā (at iii.1.91), used in antithesis to upāṅgu.

10. "Soft" is in the chest, "middle" in the throat, "loud" in the head.

The South-Indian manuscripts (G. M.) divide this rule into three, and break up the comment into three corresponding parts, without other change. I presume that the treatment of the whole as one rule is more original; the subject joins on, as it were, to rule xxi. 11, and gives the received doctrine as to the mode of production of the three qualities of voice there laid down. And the distinction of the four other qualities by which "soft" shades off into utter inaudibility is a later addition to the doctrine—one of those pieces of useless over-refinement which are thoroughly characteristic of the Hindu mode of working.

The commentator points out that the first four of the seven sthānas described in this chapter are used "in sacrifices etc.,” and the last three, at the morning, noon, and evening savanas, or somalabitations, respectively. And he quotes "from the Čikṣā" a pair of verses which are found in the Rik-version of the pāniniya Čikṣā (verses 36, 37; see Weber's Indische Studien, iv.365-4), to the effect that "in early morning, one must always read with chest-tone, resembling the growl of the tiger; at noon, with throat-tone,

9. 1 aksharavayjananānāṁ saśadamb upaladbhir3 upabdīman1 nāma caturthaṁ vāca sthānam bhavati1.

1 G. M. ins. cabdāna soha vartata iti sadabdam. 2 W. O. om.; B. bhadham. 3 B. om. 4 W. B. O. om.

10. yatratrasi sthāne prayoga upalabhya tatra mandaṁ nāma1 vācaḥ pañcamāṁ2 sthānam3. yatra kanṭhe sthāne prayoga upalabhya tatra madhyamaṁ nāma shashṭhaṁ vāca sthānam 4. yatratrasi sthāne prayoga upalabhya tatra tāraṁ nāma sapta- 

madhyamāṁ vāca sthānam. 5. etesve ādiś ca taurāṁ 6. yojādīshu prayogāḥ; mandram prātahāvane upajjugate; madhyamāṁ mā 

dhyandine savane; tāraṁ tṛtiyasavane. Čikṣā cāt vaman vak-

shyati:
like the warble of the cakravāka; the third soma-libation is known as accompanied with loud tone, and this is always to be employed as head-tone, with sound proceeding from the head, and resembling the cries of the peacock, hūnasa and kokila.”

The Rik Pr. (xiii.17) teaches the same three sthānas, but calls the third uttama instead of tāra. The Vāj. Pr. (i.10,30) lays down their number and their place of production (assigning to the third the bhṛumadhyā, ‘middle of the brows,’ instead of cīras, ‘head’), but gives them no specific names. We cannot well avoid regarding them as involving a difference of pitch, as well as of force or loudness of utterance; the first is low, the third high and shrill, the other intermediate between them, or at the ordinary natural pitch of the voice. They answer to the lower, middle, and upper “registers” of a voice; and our modern musical theory recognizes an analogous distinction of chest-tone and head-tone. Each register, as the following rules go on to explain, is divided into seven tones or pitches.

曼्द्रादिपु चिपु स्थानेषु सतसत समाः: || 11.11

11. In the three qualities beginning with “soft,” there are seven tones each.

As synonym of yama, the commentator gives svara, doubtless here to be understood as ‘musical note, tone of the gamut;’ he adds ‘acute, and so on,’ which might be said blunderingly, as if the word he had just given meant ‘accent’ instead of ‘musical tone,’ or also intelligently, as implying the identity of accent with

prātaḥ pathen10 nityam urasthitena11 svareṇa cārdalarutopamena12;

madhyandine kaṇṭhaṅgatena cāi’va cakrāhvavasāṅkūjaṁrasaṁmbhena.
tāraṁ tu vidyāt savanāṁ13 śṛtiyāṁ14 cīrogatāṁ15 tac ca sadā16 prayojyam:

mayūrakāṁśanāybhratrasvanānāṁ tulyena nādena cīrasthitena17.


11. trīṣu mandrādīshu sthānāḥ evaīkāsmint saptaśaṃpta yanā bhavanti: yanāḥ ‘svarāh udāttādaya’ iti yāvat. saptaśaṃpta ‘ti vīpsāya evaīkāsminn iti labhyate. ke te yanā ity āyaṅkayo ‘ttrasaṭṭreno’ ‘ttaram dāha.

1 G. M. svarādaya. 2 W. B. -yāk; O. -yām. 3 W. O. ne; G. M. O. put before ke. 4 W. -tro.
musical pitch—an identity which is the ground of their common appellation.

The same statement, as to the seven yamas or 'tones' in each sthāna, 'register' or 'scale,' and the same identification with the svaras, are made in the Rik Prāt. (xiii.17). We are to assume, without much question, that the scales pass into one another by a constant ascending series, like the bass and soprano scales in our own system of musical notation.

कृष्णमद्यितीयतृतीयचतुर्थमन्द्रातिश्वरिण: II १२ II


These are not the ordinary names of the seven notes of the Hindu scale, or svaras (for which, see Jones “on the Musical Modes of the Hindus,” As. Res., vol. iii.; Weber’s Indische Stu- dien, viii.259 ff.); but they are, apparently, alternative appellations for the same thing; they are given by Uvāṭa, in his com- ment on Rik Prāt. xiii.17, as used sāmasu, 'in the sāmasa,' or 'in the Sāma-Veda' (Müller’s Rik Pr., p. cxlxxii). Uvāṭa calls the first krushṭa, instead of krṣṭa, and the same is the reading of G. M. in our rules and their commentary, as also of T. in rule 14 only (Müller, l. c., p. cxlxxiii., marginal note, states krushtḥa or krṣṭa to be the reading of O. also, but the maker of my collation does not note the fact, except once, under rule 14, in putting in on the margin a passage inserted out of place).

नैवां दीर्घियोपलिथि: II १२ II

13. Of these, the perception is born of brightness.

I have simply translated the problematical word diptijā literally, without claiming to understand what it signifies. The comment throws no light upon it, nor do I get any from any other quarter. The former says merely that the perception of each preceding one is "born from the brightness" of its successor; namely, the per-

12. krṣṭaṣ ca3 prathamaṣ ca3 deitiyas ca tṛtyaṣ ca caturthas ca mandras ca tisvāryas ca krṣṭa-prathamadviśayatṛtyacatur- thamandrātisvāryaḥ: te tatho kṛtāḥ: 'ete khalu' yamā nāma.

1 G. M. krṣṭaṣ (as also in the rule). 2 O. om. ca. 3 O. om. ca. 4 B. O. om. 5 G. M. om. 6 B. krṣṭādaya.


1) W. diptijopalabdhik. 2 G. M. O. saptaa-yanām. 3 B. -rād-. 4 G. M. -ram d-. 5 O. pārvop-. 6 G. M. om. 6 W. B. mantr-. 7 G. M. nimadop. 8 G. M. krṣṭaḥ; O. krṣṭaḥ ity.
ception of *manda* from that of *atisvāra*; that of the fourth, from *manda*; and so on through the series. Perhaps the expression is nothing more than one violently figurative, signifying that each tone receives light from, or is set in its true light by, the rest, or the ones or one nearest it: only, in that case, we should look for some word combined with *dīpti* to indicate the source of the light.

Müller (under Rik Prāt. xiii.17, r. decl.) surmises that the present rule may mean the same thing with the rule of the Rik Prāt. *anantarasa ca *tra yamo *vīcesah, which he translates 'in these three places (sthāna) a yama without another yama is undistinguishable.' It is very doubtful, however, whether he is justified in rendering *anantarā* by 'not having another,' and whether his rule is not rather intended to signify that the three scales pass directly into one another, the first note of the second being equivalent to an eighth of the first, and so on.

**13**

14. "Second," "first," and *krṣṭa* are the three tones of the Āhvārakas.

This rule makes a *gloka* with the one that follows: which is, of course, a marked indication that both are interpolated here. The same thing may be inferred from the fact that rule 15 teaches nothing which is not found also in 16.

The comment adds nothing whatever to our understanding of the rule.

The Āhvārakas are mentioned in the Caranavāyuḥa (paragraph 12: see Weber's Indische Studien, iii.257) as holders of one *gākhā* of the Yajur-Veda.

**15**

15. The four beginning with *manda* and ending with "second" are those of the Tāittiriyas.

This second half-verse, as already pointed out, is superfluous in view of the next rule, which treats the same subject, and much more explicitly.


O. inserts the whole comment out of place, after that to the next rule. 1 G. M. *kuśh-*(as also, with T., in the rule); O. *kuśh-. 2 B. ins. *dēvitiyādah-. 3 W. *kāśv-. O. *kārā. 4) O. om. 5 G. M. *te-. 6) B. *kāstāsvarān; G. M. *kāsvarā.

15. *mandaśya ca caturāh* *devitīyāntāḥ svarāḥ* mandracaturtha-teṣṭāyādviśyās tāttiriyakāḥ syuh2.

1 G. M. O. *ra svarā. 2 G. M. O. om. 2 O. *tēsāṁ tāttiriyakē prayaḥ veditavyāḥ.
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16. According to the Tāttiriyaś, the *māndra* proceeds from the "second," and the "third" and "fourth" come next after: this they style the tone-quaternion.

The order of the four tones is not made entirely clear by this rule, nor by the commentator’s explanation of it. The latter says that “the *māndra* of the Tāttiriyaś is born or produced from the ‘second;’” and, if the expression be used in a manner akin with those under rule 13, this would imply that the *māndra* came first, and the “second” after—which would, of course, accord best with the value of the two names: *māndra* would thus be the lowest of the four *yamas*, as it is the lowest of the three *sthānas*. But the commentator then goes on to say that the series of *yamas* thus “beginning with ‘second’” is styled tone-quaternion: and this would imply that the order is second, *māndra*, third, fourth. Yet further, he adds that “second” is *udāṭta*, *māndra* is *anudāṭta*, and “third” and “fourth” are *svarita* and *pracaya*. This makes the impression of a purely formal and unintelligent identification, or a forcing through of a parallelism between the four tones and the four accepted accents (which, however, are in respect to tone only three, since the *pracaya* is “of *udāṭta* tone,” xxi.10), without the slightest regard to the already defined tonic quality of the accents. The comment, in truth, through this whole subject, seems to be written with a very insufficient comprehension of the meaning of the text: see especially the rules that follow.

Our attention is called to the fact that the preceding rule laid down the number of the Tāttiriya *yamaś*, the present one undertaking nothing more than to describe their order; and that the intention of the last words of the rule is therefore simply to give a name to the series. I have pointed out above, however, that rules 14 and 15 seem to have been put in by themselves, without any regard to 16.

16. ‘tāttiriyaṇāṁ dvitiyāṁ khaṇu mandro jāyate: tadananta-\footnote{1} raśi \footnote{2} tṛtiyacaturthaṁ syātām: etad eva dvitiyāṁ \footnote{3} svaramandalam \footnote{4} caturyamāṁ \footnote{5} ity ácakshate. yo \footnote{6} dvitiyāṁ sa udāṭhatā: yo \footnote{7} māndraṁ sa anudāṭhatā: \footnote{8} yau tṛtiyacaturthaṁ tā॒u svaritapracayaṁ \footnote{9} ity orthāṁ. anena sātretā pūrveshāṁ \footnote{10} eva caturnāṁ svaramāṁ kramaniyamāṁ kriyate: catuḥsaṅkhyaṁ tu pūrvasūṇīṁ. \footnote{11} eva ‘ktā: tasmād atra caturyamāṁ ity etat saṁjñāvidhiparamāṁ \footnote{12} iti pratiyate.

\footnotesize{(1) B. om. (along with all the rule save the first three words). (2) G. om. (3) W. B. O. -\footnote{13} ṣaḍik. (4) W. B. -\footnote{14} nādam. (5) G. M. -\footnote{15} yam. (6) B. dvitiyo udāṭhayor. (7) G. M. O. om. (8) W. dvitiyāṁ. (9) G. M. om. (10) W. sarv-. (11) G. M. O. pūrvasūṇīṁ. (12) G. M. -\footnote{16} dhanap.}
The mention of the Taittiriyas here, and in this manner, seems to indicate that the Prātiṣṭākhya does not belong to their school, or concern itself with their cākhā; although, perhaps, both stand in an especially near relation to it. See what is said upon this point in the concluding note.

The mention of the Taittiriyas here, and in this manner, seems to indicate that the Prātiṣṭākhya does not belong to their school, or concern itself with their cākhā; although, perhaps, both stand in an especially near relation to it. See what is said upon this point in the concluding note.

17. In it, progression is by intervals of two tones.

I have rendered this rule according to what seems to me most likely to be its real meaning—although, at the same time, I do not feel by any means confident that I understand it correctly. If the Taittiriyas acknowledge only four notes in the scale or octave, it seems natural that they should fix these at wider intervals from one another; and the phraseology of the rule is well enough calculated to express this. The verification or rejection of my version may be left till we shall better comprehend the Hindu musical system, and its modification or adaptation as here presented. I am, at any rate, persuaded that my guess is more likely to be right than either of the two which the commentator ventures. Of these, the first is nothing less than absurd: it makes tasmin refer to anudātta, although such an antecedent can only have tumbled in out of the clouds, there having been nothing whatever to suggest it in the preceding rules; and renders 'in this anudātta there is a being-within of two yamas;' that is to say, in anudātta inheres the quality of svarita and also that of pracaya.' And, as examples of this wonderful anudātta, are quoted sā naḥ parshat (not found in the Taittirīya-Sanhitā, but occurs Rig-Veda i.99.1; x.187.1-5; and Atharva-Veda vii.63.1), and pāry avadatām (i.7.22).

The commentator's second guess is so far better than his first that he gives the obviously correct interpretation of tasmin, as referring to caturyamam in the preceding rule; but he makes out the meaning to be that, in this series of svaras, two are contained in the interior, or are included between the other two. And he

17. devāu ca tāv yamāu ca deviyamāu: deviyamayor antara-vrttir madhyavrttir tasminn anudātta bhavati: svaritacam pracayatvam cā 'mudātta' bhavati 'ty arthah, yathā: sa.....: pāry....

'kecid anyathā kathayanti: tasmiṁ caturyamame svaranandale deviyamāntarā vṛttih: svaradacyasya madhye cartamanāṁ syāt ।

anudātto hridd jñeyo mṛdhny udātta udāṛtoḥ: svaritakah karmamālikahy asmānī ā svarāṅgeḥ pracayah smṛtah.

'sasyā 'yam arthah: udāttamudāttaḥ 'madhye svaritapracaयyayor antaravṛttir bhavati. "tathā kāuḥalayahastavinyāsasasyamayे 'pi svaritapracaयyayor antaravṛttir upadīcyate:
cites a verse: "anudātta is to be known as in the heart; udātta is uttered in the head; svarita is at the root of the ears (or of the throat, as G. M. have it); pracaṣya is declared to be in the whole member (or to belong to the whole mouth, W. says);" the meaning of which he states to be that svarita and pracaṣya are found between udātta and anudātta—forgetting that under the previous rule he had assigned them a different position. Further, he says that the interior position of svarita and pracaṣya is shown in Kāñkaleya's system of motions of the hand, as appears from the verse "the chief of the digits (i.e. the thumb) points out udātta when its apex is applied to the root of the forefinger; when to the last but one (i.e. the ring-finger) and to the middle finger, it points out the svarita and the dhṛta; when to the little finger, the anudātta." This verse occurs in the Rīk-version of the pāṇiniya Cikṣā (as verse 43: see Weber's Indische Studien, iv.365): the commentator does not regard it as a Cikṣā verse, but adds yet another which he claims to take from his Cikṣā, although it is not found in either version of the known treatise of that name (but compare verse 44, l. c., p. 366): "the little finger, the ring-finger, the middle finger, and the forefinger—these, along with the tip of the thumb, severally point out the grave, circumflex, dhṛta, and acute accents." The pracaṣya is here twice called dhṛta, and it again, apparently, receives the same name in the last rule of the chapter (unfortunately, I overlooked these passages when commenting on the term dhṛtapracaṣya in rule xviii.3): "sustained" or "continued" is a sufficiently natural substitute for pracaṣya, as appellation of the accent in question.

I do not understand precisely what and how much credit the commentator intends to claim for these two explanations in calling them (in his final remark) mukhya: if he means that they are the best among a number which had been suggested and might have been reported, it is so much the worse for the rest.

1udātām ākhyāti vṛṣho 'ṅgulinām 
pradeṣināmālani vishtamārdhā: 
upāntamadhye3 svaritām dhṛtam ca 
kanishtikāyām anudātām eva 

18. That progression we will set forth.

The commentator declares tām here to bring forward solely the word vṛttim from the preceding rule (not that word with its qualifications), and the vṛtti aimed at to be the fourfold progression of the caturyama taught in rules 16 and 19. This is, of course, forced and unacceptable. I imagine that, on the contrary, in the oral tradition of the Prātičākhya, an uttered illustration of the four tones, separated by double intervals and so covering the whole octave, was given—which illustration, of course, could not be set down in the written text.

19. That is what is called the quaternion of tones.

This is naturally enough explainable as a winding-up remark, after the exemplification of the four Tāttviriya tones notified in the preceding rule has been duly given. To the commentator, it is a mere repetition of what had been already stated above, in rules 15 and 16; and he excuses it as being intended, under the guise of a summing-up, to confirm the view laid down, and repel other opinions inconsistent with it. For, he adds, some people hold the doctrine that there are three svaras only, as appears from the half-verse "acute, grave, and circumflex are the three accents." This verse (from the pāniniya Čikshā) was quoted in full above, under rule xxi.1; and W. adds the second half of it here also.

The futility of this exposition, as well as of much that precedes it, will, I think, be obvious to any one. Instead of tracing and pointing out the relation which actually exists between the accents and the yamas, and letting us see what musical intervals are re-

18. yaḍ etad ácāryādiḥ caturyamaṁ ity uktam tasya caturbheda- bhinnāḥ vṛttir nāma: tām upadekṣyāma ity ucyate. ’tām iti tachabdena pūreoktvrittimātram anukṛṣhyate’.

1 G. M. -āṁ. 2 G. M. -āṁ. 3 W. O. tāṁitiṣṭṭhābād; B. tām iti labhāt. 4 W. -kathy.

19. ity anena prakāreṇa caturyamam ity uktam. yady api mandrādayo dvitin'yantā (xxiii.15) ityādisūtradevyena yama- catushtubhyatevā' siddham tathā 'py upasmiḥāramisēna matān- taraniśṛtyarthāṃ 4 drdhayati. yataḥ kāraṇād evam anye man- yante svaratrayamātram:

udātta ca ’nudātta ca svarita ca svarās trayeḥ: *

'hrasvo dirghaḥ pluta iti kālato niyamā aci.'

1 O. om. 2 W. caturyamanacatushtubhyāṃ pra; B. -tayahna; O. cat. 3 W. śhetā; G. M. -hērena mi. 4 G. M. ins. īmam artham. 5 B. O. -ya iti; G. M. trayasvārd iti manyante. 6 in W. only.
20. It must be uttered with krama and vikrama, not hurried, not delayed, with grave, acute, and circumflex accent, with pracaya, and even.

The commentator supplies vṛttim as the subject of all these attributes, accounting for it as derived from rule 17, above. This is hardly admissible; but what is to be understood instead is doubtful, depending upon the connection in which this verse may have stood in the text from which it was taken. The same connection would perhaps explain what krama and vikrama are to be regarded as meaning: the commentator defines krama by deiveva, ‘duplication’ (taught in chapter xiv.), and vikrama as the accent of that name prescribed at xix.1.2; but it seems very unlikely that two things so dissimilar would be thus combined, or that a detail of accent would not be put in the second line, with the rest of its kind (compare rule xxiv.6, where krama and vikrama are found again in conjunction). Dhṛta is defined as synonymous with pracaya: compare the note to rule 17, above. Šamāni means, we are told, ‘free from the faults of deficiency and excess in the matter of udatta and the other accents.’

There are slight variations of reading in the rule, T. giving adhūtaṁ in pāda b; B. svara for śvāra in c; W. G. M. having vade for vaded, and W. drutavati and T. drataśr- after it; but they are mere errors of scribes, as the comment plainly shows.


iti triḥ-bhāshyarato prātiśākhyavivarane trayaṁ-śrī 12 dhṛtyāh.

1 W. B. -rakam etam nir; O. -rakāmatan nir. 2 W. -vikrama. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. deśatoparyāy. 5 O. -coḥ syād. 6 B. -ritapracayasanā. 7 B. nyānātirik-tādā; O. nyānādīrēti. 8 G. M. ins. śāma. 9 B. om. 10 O. v. 11 O. -kṛtāv. 12 G. M. O. deśiyapracye ekādaśo.
CHAPTER XXIV.

CONTENTS: 1–4, the four sanhitás or texts; 5–6, qualifications of a Veda-reader and teacher.

1. Now for the four texts.
A simple heading to the following rules.

2. Word-text, syllable-text, letter-text, and member-text, namely.

Here is a very curious and problematical enumeration and designation of sanhitás. The commentator divides up among them the teachings of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā. To the "word-text" he assigns chapters v.–ix., xi., xii., and xiii.1–4—that is to say, the great body of rules for the combination of pada-text into sanhitā. To the "syllable-text" he assigns chapter x., which has to do chiefly with such euphonic combinations of vowels as make one syllable out of two. With the "letter-text" are concerned chapters xiii. (i. e. except rules 1–4), xiv., and xvi., mainly occupied with the subjects of duplication and of the occurrence in the Sanhitā of n and ñ, otherwise than as these are results of the rules of euphonic combination. And the "member-text" is said to be taught in chapter

1. athe 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: catasraḥ sanhitāḥ 'ucyantaḥ ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditāyaṁ ita uttaram yad vakṣhyaṁahā.

1. G. M. ins. ity. 2. O. om. 3. O. -yate.

2. padāksharavarnāngacrayaś ca catasraḥ sanhitāḥ kramaṇa boddhavyāḥ. pañcamāndhyāyaṁ "ārabhyā " navamād ekādaśa-devādaśa" trayodayaṁyāṁ ca padasannihita. daśamaṃ 'ksarasaṁhitā. trayodaśa-caturdaśaś ca śodarač ca varṇasaṁhitā. "vyājanaa vaśaśyāgām (xxi.1) ity esā "āgasannihitā. etāḥ catasraḥ sanhitāḥ. etesve anyatra" vihitān nishhadhān ca kāryān sarvasanhitānaś ca kuryāt; yatā" "rśa-grahaṇādikā viçeśho nā 'sti".

xxi. (rules 1–9), which prescribes of what vowel each consonant shall be regarded as "member" or adjunct, or lays down the rules of syllabication. And it is added that whatever is prescribed or forbidden elsewhere than in [the rules belonging to each of] these is of force in all the different texts, unless there be some special restriction, as by the use of the word ārṣha (ix.21; x.13) or the like.

It is unnecessary to point out that the Prātiṣṭhāna contemplates no such division of its rules and restriction of their application as is here made, and that, unless the distinction of texts laid down in the rule means something different from what the commentator explains it to be, it is trivial and worthless.

3. Conjunction of independent words by euphonic combination is called word-text.

The commentator first explains saṁdharma as modifying saṁyoga in quality of a locative, and then declares the use of the two equivalent terms to be for the purpose of signifying the exceeding closeness of the combination (if, as I presume to be the case, the reading of B. is here the correct one). And he quotes the rule of Pāṇini (i.4.109) as what "the grammarians" say upon the subject, giving the definition of saṁhitā or combined text. As example of word-text, he gives agne dudhram gahyakā niṅcila vahyā yā ta ivaṁ (v.5.91: only G. M. have ivaṁ).

This interpretation makes padasamhitā signify what we are wont to call samhitā simply, in distinction from padapatha, or padasamhitā as usually employed, 'pada-text.'

4. And in like manner with the syllable-text and the rest, in accordance with their several names.

The commentator explains yathāsvar as signifying 'it goes on without exceeding that which is its own,' and pronounces it a 'distinction of office or use;' thus, namely, the peculiar form of all the other specified texts is to be determined; the combination of inde-

3. nānabhūtayoh padsayoh saṁdhāne yaḥ saṁyogah sa pada-
samhitē 'ty abhidhiyata ucyata ity arthah. yathā: agne......
ekārthayoh saṁdhanasamyogacādayoh prayogah saṁdhanādhi-
kyārthah. tathā ca vaiyākaranāḥ pathanāt: paraḥ saṁnikar-
shah saṁhitē 'ti.

1 G. -yogah; O. saṁyogasvānbadhānac. 2 W. -nādikyādityarthah; G. M. sambandhikārthah; O. sambandhikthādārthah. 3 G. M. o. nā. 4 G. M. bhaññanti; O. api.

4. saṁsvam anatkramya vartata iti yathāsvam: kriyāviṣe-
shanam 'evaī 'tath': evam akshara-saṁhitādinaṁ api yathāsvam
pendent syllables is syllable-text—and so on. And he quotes three passages from the text, by way of illustration: athā bravīt (iii.2. 11), adhkṣhavanam asi (i.1.5), and akṣhṇayā vyāghṛrayati (v. 2.7 et al.). Of these, the first is an example of the combination of two separate syllables (vowels) into one syllable, by a rule (2) of the tenth chapter; the second, of the occurrence of n after sh, by rule xiii.6,7; the third offers (like almost any other pair of words in the Śāhāti) cases of the division of consonant-groups, akṣhṛṣṭ-ṭrṇa-vāde-vyā- etc. Or, by a different treatment of the successive distinctions, it is said that the combination of two vowels alone is “syllable-text;” that of a vowel and consonant in one word is “letter-text;” that of consonants alone in one word (consonants being “members” or adjuncts of vowels, xxi.1) is “member-text;” anything else than these is “word-text.”

It appears from all this that śāhāti is here used nearly in the sense of śānḍhi, ‘euphonic combination,’ and that these four rules have no significance whatever, being a mere bit of outside classification, in which some one has amused himself by indulging.

Ⅸ

5. Heaviness, lightness, evenness; short, long, and protracted quantity; elision, increment, and euphonic alteration; natural state, vikrama, krama; circumflex, acute, and grave quality; breath, tone, and adjunction—all this must be understood by him who reads the Veda language.


1 W. B. swam. 2 O. m. eva. 3 O. eva. 4 G. M. pura also after rule 4 in the text of the Pratīcākhyā, as if rules 5 and 6. 5 O. m. 6 W. m.; G. M. vyāharāmuk. 7 G. M. m. 8 B. om.

5. yad gurutvadvyāṣṭādaśavidham etat sarvāṁ chandobhaśāṁ vedarāpāṁ vācām adhitvā paṭhitā vijneyam. atha vā chandobhaśāṁ vedalakshanam ity arthaḥ. tuṣabdō dhvyetvyātiriktaśādhiḥārthakak. anena tu sarvāḥ vijneyam ity arthaḥ.
The commentator explains \textit{vedabhāṣām} as meaning either ‘voice having the form of Veda,’ i.e. the uttered material of the Veda, or (according to another sense of \textit{bhāṣā}) ‘explanation of the Veda.’ The particle \textit{tu} in the last half-verse (which I have omitted in translating, as being a mere expletive or \textit{pādāpurāṇa}), he states to mean that the reader referred to must by all means understand all this, but not any one besides. And he adds at the end that \textit{vijñeya} indicates the peremptoriness of the rule, there being risk of harm in the absence of the required knowledge, as is shown by the verse “a mantra deficient in respect to accent or to letters” etc. This is the familiar verse, found in the \textit{pāṇiniya Čikāṣā} (verse 52; see Weber’s \textit{Indische Studien}, iv.367–8), and quoted times innumerable in Hindu works, where the present subject is under consideration: O. alone adds the second \textit{pādo}, “being falsely applied, does not express the intended sense;” the rest is, “it, an uttered thunderbolt, harms the sacrificer, like the word \textit{indrapātra} [when used by Tvāshtar] with false accent.”

The rest of the comment is occupied with illustration of the points referred to in the rule, along with now and then a few words of explanation. For “heavy” quality (see xxii.14) is cited \textit{vashat svāhā} (vi.3.12); for “light” (see xxii.15, \textit{akuruta} (v.5.81 et al.: W. B. give instead \textit{akuruta} [i.7.39 et al.], which is less acceptable, as containing also a heavy syllable). \textit{Sāmya}, “evenness, sameness,” is defined as implying that, of two elements compared, there is—in respect to place and organ of articulation, quantity, etc.—sameness (so G. M., but B. O. read ‘bigness’ instead, and W. has ‘steadiness’): what is really meant, is obscure; we may compare the use of the adjective \textit{sama} in xxiii.20. The examples for short, long, and protracted, respectively, are \textit{gamyati} (i.7.34 et al.), \textit{vāyāv evā ’sya} (vi.3.74), and \textit{astu hi iī} (vii.1.61: G. M. omit \textit{iī}). Elision is instanced by \textit{im ’andrāsu} (iv.1.82; see above, v.12); increment, by \textit{trapaṇca ca me} (iv.7.51: see above, v.4); euphonic conversion, by \textit{sam īndra no manasa} (i.4.44: only O. has \textit{manasa}: a case under vii.2). To illustrate \textit{prakṛti}, ‘original condition,’ are given three phrases, \textit{agni dudhra gahya kuṇeila vyā yā te} (v.5.91: W. B. end with \textit{kuṇeila}, and G. M. with \textit{vanyā}; and G. M. O. omit \textit{agne}), \textit{prapā asi} (ii.5.124), and \textit{na mi-}


\textit{kāro yathā: sam..... prakṛtir yathā: agne..... prapā..... na.....} \textit{vikramo yathā: vodhave. krama naṁ nāma devtvaṁ”}

\textit{yathā: yad..... “yad..... svaritodāttanicānām bhavāḥ svari-}

\textit{todāttanicātac: “tad yathākramam” nirdīṣyate: nyaučam: gāṁ..... avadatām. viṁte ṣvāsa (ii.5) ity uktah” peśa}

\textit{yathā: pā..... “samvīte” kaṇṭhe nādāḥ kriyāta (ii.4) ity}
thuñi abhavan (v.3.62: G. M. omit na). Of these, the second is a case under x.13; the third, under x.18: both exhibiting a vowel which irregularly remains prakṛtyā, or exempt from alteration. But the particular bearing of the first example on the point of prakṛti is more obscure: the phrase is one in which the samhitā-reading is (except in respect to accent) the same with the pada; and this, probably, is the reason why it is taken. Compare the comment and note to v.2, where this part of the rule now in hand is quoted. For vikrama is given the word vādhavā (i.6.21 et al.), of which the second syllable has the accent called vikrama, by xii. 1. Krama is again (as under xiii.20) defined as ‘duplication,’ and a phrase is quoted containing a case that calls for duplicated utterance, yad vai hotā (iii.2.91: i.e. yad dvāi, by xiv.1): O. adds another of like character, yad venaḥ (v.1.14). We are permitted to doubt, however, here as at xiii.20, whether these terms were intended by the maker of the rule in the sense which the commentator assigns to them. The three accents are instanced, in their order as mentioned, by nyāñcam (v.5.32); gām vā vā tā tā tāt (i.7.23), and avadatām (i.7.22). Reference is made to rule ii.5 as defining “breath,” and as example of breath-sounds, or surd consonants, is cited pūshaḥ te (i.1.22: B. has instead pittte, and W. pūrte, which occurs at iv.7.135). Rule ii.4, again, is referred to as defining “tone” or sonant utterance, and the example is bhāgaḥ bhāgadāḥ (ii.5.63). Finally, āṅgam, which I have rendered ‘adjunction,’ is interpreted as alluding to the subject of syllabication (xix.1 etc.), and a phrase is quoted, tam mātvyah prayāvriti (ii.6.61), which we are to divide tam-maṭ-thasya-prāv-brāv-vit.

The verses composing this rule are found in a passage prefixed to the proper text of the Rīk Prāt. (see Müller’s edition, p. viii.).

6. He who understands the distinctions of the pada-krama, who is versed in the varna-krama, and knows the divisions of accent and quantity, may go and sit with the teachers.

ukto nādo yathā: bhāy— vyañjanañi svarāṅgam (xxi. 1) ity uktam āṅgam yathā: tam— vijñeyatvam iti nityavidhiḥ: vipakshe bādhāt: mantram hinaḥ svarato varnato vyañjeyatvam iti.
This verse also is prefixed to the Rik Prat. (Müller, p. viii.).

The commentator gives a merely mechanical explanation of the two terms composing the first half-verse, without telling us what he understands them really to mean. Doubtless the pada-krama is that which is commonly known as the "krama-text," and for the construction of which the other Prātiṣṭhākhyas (Rik Pr. x., xi.; Vāj. Pr. iv.179-194; Ath. Pr. iv.101-126) give full directions; and the varna-krama is the text with duplicated consonants, according to the rules of our fourteenth chapter. The compound svaramātrāvibhāga we are taught to treat as a dependent one; we might also be tempted to regard it as copulative, and to understand vibhāga in the sense of 'separation' (as in pada-text etc.), as in the only other place where it occurs in the treatise (ii.1). "Going to the assembly of teachers," is interpreted to signify not merely the sitting with them on earth, but the enjoyment with them of the abode of felicity, the brahmaloka—it being explained (except in G. M.) that "the teachers" are Vyāsa and his like. Then, apropos of this promise of heaven to those versed in the class of subjects of which the Prātiṣṭhākhyas treats, the commentator proceeds to quote from various purāṇas and kindred works the praises and promises there given to those who teach the Veda.

Thus, from the Garuda-purāṇa: "Of all kinds of knowledge, that of the Veda is called highest; hence, he who communicates that wins heaven and final beatitude. As chief of all sciences has been produced the brahma-science; hence, he who is devoted to giving it will receive the whole recompense of giving." From the Devi-purāṇa: "To those twice born, the Veda is the chief means

6. 'padānāṁ kramaḥ padakramah': tasya vīcēshaḥ: taṁ jānāti 'ti padakramavicēshajñāh. varṇānāṁ krama varnakramah': tasmānic vikshano nīpūṇa varnakramavicakshanah': svarāc ca 'mātrāc ca svaramātrāh: tāsāṁ vibhāgaḥ: taṁ jānāti 'ti svaramātrāvibhāga jñānāh'. mātrācābdenā kālavīcēshah kapcid uavyate: so 'pi caturānur ityādīśuḥ. evāvīdham purusha ācāryasamādaṇi ' gachet: "ācāryā" vyāsādayah: teshām "brahma-loke" sthānam: yāç ca 'dāṁ' cāstrāṁ jānte so 'py ācāryatvāt teśām sañārām" brahma-lokaṁ gachati".

tathā ca" purāṇikā bhananti". gārūdatpurāṇe":

ātah saṃstavāvidyānāṁ vedāvidyām anuttamāṁ":
atas taddātur asty eva lābhaḥ svargāpavargayaḥ.
vidyānāṁ paramaṁ" vidyā brahmavidyā" samūritā:
atas "taddānaclāc ca" saroṁ" dānaphalāṁ labhitā.
deśpurāṇe":
veda eva dvijātinnāṁ sādhanaṁ "yaçaṁ phalam":
ato" saśādhyayāmabhyaṁ" param brahmā 'dhigachati.
"tam eva śilayet prājñāḥ śishyebhyās tam praddāpayet:
tadābhyaṁsadāṇābhyaṁ "etat kim nā" 'dhigachati".
of obtaining good things; hence, by application to the reading of the Veda one attains the highest brahma. To that let him who is wise especially devote himself; that let him deliver over to pupils; by application to that and communication of it what is there that one does not attain?” From Yājñavalkya: “Above all sacrifices, and ascetic practices, and pure works, the Veda is the highest means of felicity to the twice-born ones. The Brahman who, not reading the Vedas, expends his labor in other directions—he quickly falls, while living, into the condition of a Cūdra, and his posterity with him.” (the latter of these two verses, which is not given by W. B., is found in Manu, at ii.168). From the Mahābhārata: “Whoever shall repeat to pupils the religious, sacred Sarasvatī, he shall gain a reward equal to that from the giving of land and kine.” From the Vishnudharmottara-purāṇa: “By imparting the Veda, a man attains all the fruits of sacrifices; by imparting an upaveda, he shares in the bliss of the Gandharvas.” From the Brahma-purāṇa: “That reward cannot be told in a thousand apons, which, oh sage! one obtains by even a very little teaching of the Veda.” And from the Bhavishyat-purāṇa: “The sonless obtains sons; the poor becomes rich; but he who is ever devoted to the study of the Veda is dissolved in the highest brahma.”

Next we are told the characteristic form of the Veda: “The Yajur-Veda is brown-eyed, slim-waisted, big-throated, big-footed, dusky, born of the family of Kāçyapa.” If there is (as may be the case) real meaning hidden under these apparently senseless epithets, it escapes my discovery.
Once more, the *vedāṅgas* and *upāṅgas* are rehearsed; the former, in the usual number and with the usual names: the latter, as *amapada, amapada (?), chandobhāṣa, mīmāṁsa, nyāya, and tarka*—the first two of these last are elsewhere called *pratipada* and *amapada* (see Weber's Indische Studien, iii.260-261, and the St. Petersburg Lexicon).

With this, in W. B., the Tribhāshyaratna ends; but G. M. O. have an added passage, the bearing of which is not in all points quite clear to me. It begins with stating that he who reads the Veda thus accompanied by the *āṅgas* and *upāṅgas*, and with knowledge of the characteristic form and family, becomes purified. A verse then follows, in which it appears to be laid down how far the rules of the Pratīcākhyya have force: namely, as regards other texts, and passages which are not the subject of *sūtras* and are of human authorship (?). By way of illustration, nine passages are quoted, not one of which is to be found in the Sanhitā proper, although five are from its endings of sections, or the summaries of words with which the divisions of sections (half-century, *kandikā*) conclude: they are *pra nakshatradya devyāya* (G. M. omit *devyāya*, and O. begins *anaksh*), *sa im mamida mahi karma kartave* (O. omits *karma*: Tāttiriya-Brāhmaṇa ii.5.8; Rig-Veda ii.22.1), *mahisaptadacend-vasyavatāḥ* (from the ending of iv.4.12), *apishita-mithuny ashtau ca* (from the ending of vi.5.8), and *amīnas-tanuva-sthu-prinākām* (from the ending to iv.5.10): in these the rules are said not to hold good; and *sinhe vyāghra uta yā pradākau* (Tāttiriya-Brāhmaṇa ii.7.7; Atharva-Veda vi.38.1; Kāthaka xxxvi. 15), *dvādaśi 'gnishtomasya stotrāṇi* (O. stotroṇi), *ātmāparānī na-cukraṣōcīśāḥ* (from the ending of vi.4.10: G. M. stops at *pra*), and *agni-paśham ekānnaviṣṭac cā* (ending of i.3.6: G. M. stop at *posham*), in which the rules are said to hold good. So much as this, now, seems clear: that the first two quotations in each class are given as coming from some other Vedic text than the Tāttiriya-

**vedāṅgāny ucyante:**

*giksha kalpo vyākaraṇaṁ niruktāṁ jyotishāṁ tathaḥ:
chandasaṁ ca laksanaṁ evaśad aṅgāṁ vidūr buddhāṁ*.

*amapadaṁ caisa* *pratipadaṁ chandobhāṣāsanaviṇatāṁ:
mīmāṁśāyāvatarkāṁ ca upāṅgāṁ vidūr buddhāṁ*.

*evam sāṅgopāṅgavedasya laksanatāṁ sampūrṇam.*

**iti tribhāshyaratne pratīcākhyavivarane**

*ghurviṇo dhṛyāya,
iti dvitiyopraṇah samāptah.*

Sanhitā (I should guess that they would all prove to occur in the Brāhmaṇa or Aranyakā), and that the first class are offered as containing cases of combination at variance with the rules of the Prātiṣṭākhyā, while in the second class these rules are observed throughout. Thus, in the first example, vi.4 would require nakṣṭhaṃ after praḥ; in the second, v.12 would require īṃ 'amādaḥ; in the third, the s of navāta should be śh by vi.2; in the fourth, the t of mithunī should remain unchanged by x.18; in the fifth, asmin is not included among the words which by vi.14 have an increment of s before t. In the other class, on the contrary, agnishtomasya follows vi.2, nish praḥ is by viii.24 and 35 (see the comment to viii.35, where the passage is quoted as illustration), and ucmāsi by iii.13; the first example has nothing but cases under the general laws of euphony. I conjecture, then, that the na in the second line of the introductory verse is to be amended to caḥ; and that we are instructed that the rules of the treatise are followed, outside the Sanhitā proper, only according to the nature of each particular case, or even by arbitrary choice. If there is any definite system according to which the phonetic peculiarities of the Sanhitā are observed or neglected in putting together the endings of sections and other divisions, I, at any rate, have not been at the pains to study it out, and the work belongs rather to an editor of the Prātiṣṭākhyā: it seems somewhat strange to find the prolonged i of ucmāsi retained in the ending, while the uncombining character of the final of mithunī is neglected.

There can be little question that the passage here treated is an appendage to the proper text of the Brāhāshyaratna, which, with the Prātiṣṭākhyā, takes in general (the only exception is at viii.35) no account of the subdivisions of evamātras.

By way of conclusion, the remark is added that the repetition of the final words of the rule indicates the end of the treatise. This is not to be approved, for the repetition is simply that which is made at the end of every chapter, and so shows nothing more than the conclusion of the chapter.
CONCLUDING NOTE.

It seems desirable to present here, at the end of the work, a discussion and exposition of certain points which could not be connectedly or fully treated in the notes upon the rules.

A first important question is that of the relation of the Prātiṣṭākhya to the known text of the Black Yajur-Veda, or to the Tāttvīrīya-Saṁhitā.

In considering this question, it is impossible to separate entirely the Prātiṣṭākhya itself from its commentary. The former does not quote passages in its rules, but defines situations or specifies words, singly or in combination. Sometimes, indeed, either of these virtually amounts to the citation of a passage; but, in the great majority of cases, only the commentator can inform us what are the passages had in view. For example, we may regard eshtā (viii.18) as in effect a reference to i.2.11 and vi.2.28; but the words cited in vi.8 (as abibhār, akar, punar, pitor) are indefinite in their indications, and it would be impossible to say that any given passage in the Saṁhitā in which one of these words occurs either was or was not contemplated by the makers of the rule. I shall therefore present in connection with one another the evidence derivable from the text itself and that from the comment.

There are four words or parts of words specified in the Prātiṣṭākhya-text which are not to be found in the Tāttvīrīya-Saṁhitā: they are stanutā (viii.8), cārshan (xiii.13), jīgivā (xvi.13), and jīghāsi (xvi.18). It is very remarkable, however, that each of these is a kind of reflex or varied repetition of another word preceding it in the same rule: thus, we have sanuta stanutaḥ, carman cārshan, jīgivā jīgivā, and jīghāsi jīghāsi. And this, taken in connection with the fact that all of them appear to be in themselves unegenuine, never having been found, so far as I am aware, in any Vedic text, and being, at least in part, impossible or highly implausible forms, is sufficient to stamp them as probable corruptions, blundering intrusions into the Prātiṣṭākhya, and of no force to prove that the latter was made for a text that contained them.

The cases are much more numerous in which the commentator declares the Prātiṣṭākhya to have in contemplation phrases not to be found in the Saṁhitā. They are nearly all of this kind: in iv. 11, viçākhe is declared praçraha; now the word is divided in pada-text, viçākhe, and cākhe is by itself a pada (according to i. 48); and therefore, unless there were some other cākhe not a praçraha in the Saṁhitā, it would be enough to cite cākhe alone in the rule; hence, as the citation of bhāgaḍhē (p. bhāga-dhe) just before implies that the maker of the rule had in view such a word as uḍa-dhe, whose dhe was not praçraha, so the citation of viçākhe is declared to have in view such a word as sahasra-cākhe, not a praçraha, “in another text.” The phrases thus quoted from outside the Saṁhitā by the commentator are as follows: under iv.11, tas-
mint sahasraçâkhe, ârâhhe castræ pratishthite, brahmäsâme pratishthite, agniñhite, and prathamaje; under iv.12, pâpcârapanî (or bhâsmâçrapanî); under iv.15, tâm (or tâm) âhûri hâyante (or vâcâyate), hâti punar (or manar) juhoti, and huti tasmâd vivâh (or evâh); under iv.37, instrûcî havâmahi; under vi.5, pramâtis te devânâm; under xi.3, as beginning of an anuvâka, âhûtâ decebhyo 'sûrân; under xi.16, gajasphâno 'gnishu. All this, in my view, is false and arbitrary interpretation; the Pratiçâkhyâ is less careful to limit itself to the minimum citable than the commentator would fain have it, and it quotes, for example, the whole word viçâkhe instead of -çâkhe alone, simply because çâkhe occurs as pragraha only in that word. The same implication is appealed to by the commentator under xi.9,15, xii.3, xvi.12 (though without actual citation of phrases), to explain away what would otherwise be inaccuracies in the Pratiçâkhyâ; nataṃ pâvam is given under xiii.16, in the course of the unjustifiable exposition of that rule; and brahmâm, though found in the Sanhitâ, is credited under xv.8 to another gâkhâ. I do not regard anything in this whole class of cases as authorizing us to suppose that the Pratiçâkhyâ had in view a text including anything not found in the Tâtîtiyâ-Sanhitâ.

Next, as to citations made in the commentary as if from the text to which the Pratiçâkhyâ relates, but not found in the Sanhitâ. And here I have first to report a few phrases which are among those occurring only in the manuscripts that came last to my hands, and which escaped my notice when preparing for my last search through the Sanhitâ, so that I have not looked for them (not having had the courage to undertake the long and tedious quest through the Sanhitâ a fourth time for so little). They are achâvâkah (xivi.5), uccâ ratnam ayajanta (ii.49), tasmâd varâpam (xx.3), dârçayâh hi (xxi.16), naç cid âti (xiv.10), prâçâti (xivi.9), and brhaspati sârapate (xiv.10). Respecting several of these, it is doubtful whether they are not mere corruptions of phrases actually found and referred. Then there is kaviçastah (xvi.2), instead of which, by an error, I sought and found kaviçastâh. There remain, of quotations hunted for but not discovered, the following: adya cau vasat 'tâ nâm eva (x.10: O. only), ane enam mâtâ (xx.1): Weber refers me for this to Çânk. vi.17.2 [2], Āeval. iii.3; also Àit. Brâh. ii.6), ahôtrâte pârçve (viii.7: only W. and [?] O.: found in Tâitt. Âr. iii.13.2), uta gravaçâ prthivim mitrasya (v.12: only G. M.), upârçhâtya askândâya (x.9: only G. M.), ca-trhotâ (ii.25: Tâitt. Br. ii.2.3, brahmâdudanam pacati (x.7: Tâitt. Br. i.1.9a), yaç chandasam (xiv.10: O. only), gâ práci dik (iv.33: W. B. O.), varshâbhya (xiv.16: but I am not certain that I did not satisfy myself with varshya bhya and omit to search for this), varshyebhih (xiv.16: O. only, and it reads varshebbhi),

* The quotation of dhâtâ rûth (xi.3), to be sure, is more out of the way, and only to be explained as irregularly pleonastic, like that of iyam eva sa gâ (xi.3), into which the commentator, with equal arbitrariness, tries to interpret a very different meaning.
citikanthāya svāhā (xiii.11; only G. M.), and sa naḥ parśhat (xviii.17; Rig-V. i.99.1 et al.).

Along with these may properly be reported the few phrases which are quoted by the comment, confessedly or impliedly from outside the text contemplated by the Prātiṣākhya. Thus, we have under xviii.1 the beginning and concluding words of the Tāttvīrīya-Brāhmaṇa and the Tāttvīrīya-Āranyaka (that is to say, of the latter, the concluding words, ā́r 'eṣa tapati, of the fifth propāthaka, with which, accordingly, to the apprehension of our commentator, the whole treatise appears to have ended); under xxiv.6 are given (by G. M. O.) dvādāca śnishtomasya stotrāṇi, pra nakṣatrdvā de-vjāya, su im mamāda maḥi karma kartave (Tātt. Br. ii.5.89 etc.), and śiśhe vyāghra uta yā prdākāu (Tātt. Br. ii.7.71 etc.); in a quoted verse under xxii.6 is read rtasya dhārṣhadam (Tātt. Br. i.2.112 etc.); and the comment to xix.3 has yo pām pushpaṁ veda.

Finally, we note that the comment gives, under xviii.1, a word, bandhuh, which ought to form the conclusion of the Sanhitā, by its own count, but which is lost in the known manuscripts.

In all this, again, there is no satisfactory evidence that the Sanhitā of the Prātiṣākhya or its commentators was other than the one we know. The missing citations are in part found in a minority of the MSS.; in part, they are perhaps corruptions; in part, they are likely to have been taken by an error of the quoter's recollection from some other Tāttvīrīya-text—and the remainder, if there be a remainder, is too scanty to prove anything.

When we come farther to inquire whether any part of the Tāttvīrīya-Sanhitā as it exists was not before the authors of the Prātiṣākhya, we seem to be brought to the same negative result. There are, to be sure, here and there points in the text which the rules do not cover, but we have reason only to wonder that in executing so immense and intricate a task as that undertaken by the Prātiṣākhya there should have been so few oversights. These, so far as they have been discovered, have been pointed out in the notes; I recapitulate them here. The word rakṣhā (p. rakṣhāḥ), at i.4.24, should have been exempted in some way from the operation of rule iii.8, which requires its ā to be shortened when separated from the following word. Devī, at vi.1.72, is made pragrāha by the strict letter of rule i.61 (see under i.59), though the passage in which it occurs is not one to which that rule was meant to apply. In the rehearsal of cases of elision or non-elision of initial ā (chapters xi. and xii.), there are a couple of cases which the commentator is driven into attempting to provide for by forced and false interpretations of the rules (see under i.61 for ye 'ntarikshe at iv.5.112, and under xi.3 for ye aparishu at i.4.33); and I have noted beside (under xii.8, at the end) only so agniḥ at v.2.33 as unaccounted for thus far (its companion case, ārdhevo asthā, is read first in an ukhya-passage, at iv.2.14, as Prof. Weber has pointed out to me; and so agniḥ may yet find a like solution). And in the enumeration of cases of interior ā (see under xvi.26), two compound words appear to have been overlooked, svādushaṁśadāḥ (iv.6.63) and strī-dhaisādam (ii.5.15).
I would repeat here, what I have already said, that my testing of the precise adaptation of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā to the Sanhitā is not absolute, since I possess neither an index verborum to the latter nor a padma-manuscript, and my results will probably admit of rectification in some points—but I trust not to any such extent as should invalidate the general conclusion.

This conclusion is, that the Prātiṣṭhākhyā probably contemplates the same text, neither more nor less, as that which constitutes the Taittirīya-Sanhitā, the only ākha left us (unless the Kāthaka be regarded as another) of the many which formerly represented the Black Yajur-Veda. The name Taittirīya-Prātiṣṭhākhyā, then, is both a convenient and a suitable one to be applied to the treatise.

If, however, this name be understood as implying that the textbook emanates directly from the Taittirīya school, its propriety is much more questionable. Besides the numerous teachers and "holders of ākhaś" referred to in the rules, whose names in some cases are related with those of traditional schools of the Black Yajus (see Weber's notes to the Caranavyūha, in his Indische Studien, iii.256 ff.), three schools are mentioned by name, those of the Mīmāṃsakas (v.41), Āhvārakas (xxiii.14), and Taittirīyas (xxiii.15, 16). Now we do not expect the text-book of a school to name that school; its rules are those which apply "here," "with us," and only outsiders need specification; besides, the Taittirīyas are represented as holding a doctrine which is not that of the treatise itself, although it is deemed of consequence enough to be set forth with a detail elsewhere unknown. We are far from fully comprehending as yet the origin, nature, and relations of the "schools" of Vedic study and their accepted texts or ākhaś, or the causes which have preserved to us so few of the latter, and of the school-treatises or prātiṣṭhākhyās; but we must of course assume that there were various degrees of difference among the ākhaś, and that some were only infinitesimally unlike some others. And it is perhaps possible to point out certain minor points, in which the orthoeopical form of the Taittirīya-text as recorded differs from that to be inferred from the Prātiṣṭhākhyā.

Among these points we are not allowed to reckon the retention of h before surd gutturals and labials and before sibilants (against ix.2), nor of n before palatals (against v.24) and l (against v.25), nor the omission of t (required by v.33) between t and s, nor of the various duplications and insertions and aspirations taught in chapter xiv., since these are matters on which we are to expect discordance between theory and practice. Nor would it be safe to make anything of the consistent and emphatic acceptance in the Sanhitā of anusvāra as an alphabetic element, while the Prātiṣṭhākhyā wavers (see under ii.30) between regarding it as such and as a mere affection of the preceding vowel. Of more consequence is the division of the sections or anusvākas in the recorded text into fifties of words, or kandikās, which causes the disappearance of more than one specialty of reading expressly prescribed in the treatise (e.g., of the of ucmati, at the end of i.3.61: see under iii.
13. The retention of the final e of ae and de (from o and du) before a vowel is also against the letter of rule x.19, and in accordance with a dissenting opinion quoted in x.21. The kampa of a circumflex accent followed by a circumflex, consistently made in the Sanhitâ, is only mentioned in the Prâtiçâkhyâ (at xix.3) as taught by some authorities, nor is the form of the doctrine taught in full and clear accordance with the practice followed. And it is very questionable whether the prescription of nasalization of a final protracted a (xv.8) is not merely reported by the treatise as made by certain specified teachers. These are small matters, and few, and a degree of doubt, perhaps, hangs over them all; but they are worthy of notice, as being all that we have on which to found any discordance between the Sanhitâ of the manuscripts and that of the Prâtiçâkhyâ. While, on the other hand, the points of accordance, even in matters which are most specially characteristic of the Tâttvârîya-text, are very numerous and important.

Of course, the existence of other forms of the text besides the ordinary sanhitâ is assumed by the Prâtiçâkhyâ. Such a work without a pada-text at least as its foundation would be a thing inconceivable. Our treatise does not give, as the others do (see add. note 1 to the Ath. Prât.), formal rules for the construction of any of the other texts; its nearest approach to doing so is in the third chapter, where (see note to iii.1) it teaches us what final or initial vowels, long in sanhitâ, are to be shortened whenever the word in which they occur is thrown out of sandhi with its next neighbor—a form of statement which applies to krama and jatu text as well as pada. The occurrence of such terms as pada, nānapada, īngya, avagraha, implies also the familiar usages of the pada-text; and the employment of iti is directly alluded to in iv.4 and ix.20, and indirectly assumed in the use of ārsha in ix.21 and x.13. What were the limits to the use of iti in the pada-text held by the school from which the Prâtiçâkhyâ proceeds does not appear: its combination in the extant pada with the prepositions (thus prâ’iti for pra, vi’iti for vi, and so on—and without restriction to the ten words which alone are allowed by the Prâtiçâkhyâ, at i.15, to count as prepositions) does not come to light anywhere either in the text or commentary. Nor does the treatise chance to show whether its pada treated the īngyas or separable compounds after the same manner as the extant Rik and Atharvan texts—writing simply upa-āyavah, for example—or as the extant paddas of the Yajur-Veda (including that to the Tâttvârîya-Sanhitâ) and the one assumed by the Atharva-Prâtiçâkhyâ (see note to Ath. Prât. iv.74)—writing upâyava ity upa-āyavah. The commentator, however, accepts and follows the latter method. Reason has been

* I have pointed out under rule ii.25 that the peculiar Tâttvârîya orthography of such words as svâvar, tavanâ, ughniyâ finds no occasion for mention in the Prâtiçâkhyâ; nor is the very strange change of a final labial in certain words to a guttural (as in trîshung īndriya, ii.4.112; trîshung yâjñâ, ii.6.29; trîshungbhâk, v.1.45) noticed anywhere; I presume (I have omitted to obtain distinct information upon the point) that in every such case the pada-text also has the guttural—which would take the whole matter out of the sphere of the Prâtiçâkhyâ.
found (under xx.3) for questioning whether in the pada-text belonging to the makers of the Prātiṣākhya the peculiar rule followed by the known Tāttvādīya pada-text as to the accentuation of its separable words was of force. The latter text is of a very peculiar, not to say an anomalous, character in many respects; in these it is supported by the Prātiṣākhya, so far as the latter goes (I will instance as examples only the treatment of yojā and evā, and other cases noticed under iii.15, of nīcād, v.8, and of ekākāyād, v.19); whether it does not contain other peculiarities which are ignored by the Prātiṣākhya, and which consequently prove it not to be the one which this presupposes, I cannot say; but, from an item or two of information received from Prof. Weber, I imagine that it does so. The question will, at any rate, be cleared up by the discussion of the Tāttvādīya pada-text which Weber, as I rejoice to learn, intends to add to his transliterated edition of the Sanhitā, now going through the press.

I attribute it only to a (very unusual) awkwardness of statement on the part of the Prātiṣākhya, that it appears to leave a part of the words ending in an original o out of the category of pragrabhas (see under iv.7), and so to deny them the right to be followed by iti, as they are in fact followed in the known pada-text.

The krama-text ("word-krama") appears to be mentioned in rules xxiii.20 and xxiv.5, and more unequivocally in xxiv.6 (all of them, however, of suspicious authenticity as original parts of the Prātiṣākhya: see below); but it is only three times quoted in the comment (under vii.2, ix.17,20), and so makes but a small figure there as compared with the jatā. Examples from the latter are given under iii.1, v.33, viii.8,12,16,35, ix.22, x.9,10,13, xi.9,16,17, xii.7, xx.2, and sometimes in considerable number and at great length; and once (under xx.2), where the commentator has occasion to mention the various kinds of text, he specifies sanhitā, pada, and jatā, ignoring the krama altogether. This seems strange, inasmuch as the jatā is regarded* as a secondary form of krama, and founded upon it; but the simple explanation appears to be that the krama brings up no questions of sandhi which do not arise also in sanhitā and pada, and so needs no special attention where only methods of sandhi are taught; while the inversions of the jatā bring new elements into contact, and so create new cases of combination which require to be settled. If we may trust the commentator’s interpretation, rules vii.12,35 are given expressly for cases that arise only in jatā-text; under viii.16, he commits an obviously false explanation in order to reach a jatā-case; under v.33, he makes a sandhi which the Prātiṣākhya certainly never intended, because it is required by the letter of the rule, in a case which the makers of the treatise had apparently overlooked; under xi.16,17, the jatā is resorted to, apparently with reason, for counterexamples to justify the form of statement adopted in the rule. The weight of evidence, upon the whole, is decidedly in favor of

* See Dr. Thibaut’s “Jatāpaṭala,” Leipzig, 1870.
the assumption that the peculiar jatá combinations were had in view by those who constructed the Prātiṣṭākhya—or, at least, by those who brought it into its present form. I would add, that it seems to me not unlikely that the term vikrama (in the sense of kramavikṛtī) signifies the jatá-text in rules xxiii.20 and xxiv.5.

The names of the divisions of the Sanhitā, kānda, prācīna (not prapāṭhaka), and anuvākā, are found only in the commentary (see Index); respecting the absence of the subdivision of anuvākas into kāndikās see above, p. 427 (also under viii.35 and xxiv.6, where this division is acknowledged by the commentator). But the Prātiṣṭākhya itself gives names to certain parts of the Sanhitā; which names, for the sake of convenience, I will put together here, with a reference to the rule under which the part designated by each is stated (for further details of their occurrence, see the Index): they are agni (iii.9), ishti (iv.52), ukhya (ix.20), graha (ix.20), pr śhthya (ix.20), mahāprśhthya (xi.3), yādyā (iii.9), rudra (xi.3), vājapeya (xi.3), vi karsa (xi.3), vībhrāṇya (xi.3), and hiranya varṇāṇya (ix.20).

A marked feature of the Prātiṣṭākhya is its frequent citation of authorities by name. The list of names has been repeatedly put together by students of the Prātiṣṭākhyaas (in Weber's Indische Studien, iv.77–8, may be found notices respecting the historical and geographical indications derivable from them), but ought not to be omitted here also. It is as follows (including the cases of mention in the commentary, distinguished by an added e):

Āgni vṛćṣya, ix.4.
Āgni vṛṣyāyaṇa, xiv.32.
Ātroya, v.31, xvii.8.
Ukhya, viii.22, x.20, xvi.24.
Uttamottariya, viii.20.
Kānda māyana, ix.1, xv.7, 8c.
Kāmpīntya, v.38, xvii.3, 4e, xix.2; (śhwa vira), v.40c, xvii.4, 5c.
Kūñhali putra, v.40c, xvii.2; (Kūhaleya, xiv.4c, xxii.17c).
Gāntana, v.38.
Pāushkarāśā, v.37, 38, 40c, xiii.16, xiv.2, 3c; xvii.6.
Plākkṣāṇya, ix.6, xiv.11, 17, xvii.5.
Plākṣi, v.38, ix.6, xiv.10, 11c, 17, xvii.5.
Rādabhikāra, xiv.13.
Bhāradvāja, xv.3; (Bharadvāja, v.40c).
Mācākāya (or Māyikāya), x.22.
Vatsapra, x.23.
Vālukki, v.36, ix.4, xvii.6.
Cānkhāyana, xv.7, 8c.
Cāyāyana, v.40, xvii.1, 3c, 4c, 7, xvii.2.
Sanātṛya, vii.21, x.21, xvi.16.
Harita, xiv.18, 19c, 20c, 20, 22c.

Of the three schools cited, the names have been already given (above, p. 427). And we have besides ācāryāh quoted in i.46; eke ācāryāh in v.30, ix.5, xiii.3, xiv.3, 25; eke simply in i.47, ii.19, 27, 47, v.39, vi.19, xi.19, xiv.33, xv.2, 6, xviii.1, xiii.3, xxi.13; pūrce in xv.9; and sarve in xvii.7.

The questions which all this array of authorities is called in to help settle may be classified as follows:

I. Matters of phonetic theory, with others of a general nature.
The nature of the tone of a circumflexed syllable, i.46-7; with this is combined an uncertainty of view of the Prātiṣākhya itself, expressed in rules 44-5; there is nothing else like it in the treatise; perhaps we may best assume that rules 44-7 are a later intrusion. The mode of production of anuvāra and svarabhakti, ii.19. The quality of the a-element in āi and ău, ii.27. The phonetic character of h and l, ii.47-8. The nature of the combination of e or o with (elided) a, xi.19. The occurrence of lingual l, xiii.16; this the comment vainly endeavors to make out an accepted doctrine of the Prātiṣākhya. A denial of the enclitic circumflex, xiv. 32-3. Nasalization of final vowels, xv.6-8: the comment treats rule 8 as the direct teaching of the text-book. Accent of protracted vowels (?), xv.9. Correction of the final theme-vowel of neuters in as, is, us in the nom. pl. before ń, xvi.16. Utterance of āi final in a single case, xvi.24. Degrees of nasalization, xvii.1-5. Utterance of accents and alphabetic sounds generally, xvii.6-8. Kampa between two circumflex syllables, xix.3-5. Use of the term yama for the nasal counterparts, xxi.13. Utterance of the syllable om, xviii.1-7. Yama-tones held by certain schools, xxiii.14-19.

II. Matters of sandhi or euphonic combination.

1. The most important cases in this division are two or three in which the views of different authorities are reported without any clear expression by the treatise of the opinion held, or the rule to be followed, by its school. Thus, with regard to the combination of a final mute with an initial h, v.38-41; where, indeed, the view first stated, as that of certain specified teachers, is doubtless to be regarded as that of the Prātiṣākhya, notwithstanding the equivocal way in which it is put forward. Again, at ix.1, the dropping of final h before a sibilant followed by a surd mute must probably in like manner, though referred to the authority of a single teacher, be taken as a binding rule. And it is hard to believe that rule x. 19, prescribing the invariable omission of final v, was not meant to be modified by x.21. That the treatment of anuvāra as a distinct consonantal element is put by xv.2-3 upon certain dissidents, must not be looked at by itself alone; it stands connected with the general equivocal attitude assumed by the Prātiṣākhya with reference to this vexed question in phonetics (see note to ii.30). Once more, the mode of duplication in groups beginning with l as reported in xiv.2-3, with reference to the authorities who teach it, seems to be acknowledged by a later rule (xiv.7) as binding: this interpretation, however, is not free from doubt.

2. In all other cases, the Prātiṣākhya is liberal enough to record the opinions of respected authorities upon points as to which its own teachings are distinctly opposed to theirs. Thus, as to the treatment of m before y and v, v.30 and xiii.3 (the repeated mention of this shows it to be regarded as a view entitled to the most respectful consideration); the combination of p with g and of n with g before a consonant, v.36-7; the sandhi of eshtar with rāyah, viii.19-22; the treatment of h before an initial consonant, ix.4-6; the utterance or omission of final y and v, x.20-23; the insertion
of a surd mute between spirant and mute, xiv.10–11; aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, xiv.13; duplication in certain specified cases, xiv.17–22,25–8 (but the comment treats 28 as the direct prescription of the authors of the treatise); and vikrama accent after pracaeya, xix.2.

Thus it is evident that, while this arraying of discordant opinions is a quite distinctive and a very interesting feature of our Prātiṇḍakhyā, it does not, except to a very limited extent, detract from the character of the latter as a consistent and positive record of the views of a school of Vedic study. Nor is it fairly to be brought into any relation to the peculiar character of the Black Yajur-Veda, as a text of which the constituent parts had been gathered together more miscellaneously, and less fully fused into conformity, than the other Vedic texts. No text could be so definitely constructed, and be made the object of so thorough and systematic study as the setting up of a text-book like the Prātiṇḍakhyā evinces, without assuming an established character, and being as authoritative handed down and as accurately learned as any Vedic text.

It is by no means improbable that a part of these citations of authorities have been interpolated in the Prātiṇḍakhyā after the latter ceased to be a mere body of practical rules for the guidance of a school, and, in virtue of its thoroughness and comprehensiveness, gained more the character of a phonetic "treatise" on the Black Yajur-Veda, and was used in other schools than that which originated it. The commentator (as will be pointed out below) uses the citations as a cover under which to put upon the treatise certain doctrines which do not properly belong to it; and in other hands it may have undergone a like distortion in other directions.

Accretions of other kinds to the original text of the Prātiṇḍakhyā are plausibly to be presumed in various places. All the metrical rules (namely xvii.8, xxii.14,15, xxiii.2,14–15,20, xxiv.5,6) are to be set down without much question as unauthentic; they are proved such by their character not less than by their form; and several of them are found in other parts of the Prātiṇḍakhyā literature. We may include in the same category, indeed, with considerable show of reason, the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters, and all that follows the twenty-first, on the score of content alone: a part of their matter is inferior repetition of what had been given before; a part deals with subjects, and in a style, unsuited to a Prātiṇḍakhyā. That there is room at least to suspect the intrusion of rules in other parts of the work has been pointed out here and there in the notes: at this place, I will merely refer to certain rules which are put in strangely out of place, interrupting the natural connection of passages: such are i.25–7,60, vii.13,14, xiv.12–3, xv.6–9, xvi.24, xxii.3–8; of these, only vii.13,14 are indispensable parts of a treatise like the present.

Another notable characteristic of our Prātiṇḍakhyā is its sparing use of technical terms belonging to general grammar, consequent upon its refusal to deal with words or classes of words according to their grammatical character, its laborious definition of its subject-
matter in the Sanhitā by position and surroundings merely. There
are but two cases of its departure from this method; namely,
its use of *alopā* at xiii.15, and of *samkhyaśu* at xvi.25; and in
neither one is its success precisely of a character to make us wish
it had gone farther in the same direction. This peculiarity renders
impossible any profitable comparison of its phraseology with that
of other grammatical works.

The general character of the Prātiṣṭhāṇya is that of an earnest,
sensible, consistent treatise, thoroughly worked out and dealing
with its proper task with completeness and accuracy, and confining
itself quite strictly to that task. There is no labored feebleness
and artificial obscurity, as in parts of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣṭhāṇya,
or any inclusion of matters pertaining to general grammar, as in
the Atharvā-Prātiṣṭhāṇya. It has its minor inaccuracies and incon-
sistencies, its obscurities of *auvṛtti* inseparable from the *sūtra-
style*, and its rules that seem to defy interpretation; but these are
inconspicuous blemishes; no one of the other works of its class is
more thoroughly respectable throughout.

Turning, now, to the more special consideration of the commen-
tary, we have to note, as the most important point, a break of
continuity between it and the Prātiṣṭhāṇya. The commentator is
not the recipient of a certain tradition, that gives him surely and
precisely the import of the rules which he has to expound; the
text-book has come down to him as something authoritative and
sacred, indeed, yet in some points obscure, so that he is in doubt
as to what it means; in others imperfect, so that it needs emenda-
tion; in others not in accordance with the views held by him and
his school respecting the text, so that these have to be interpreted
into it.

Thus, in the first place, the instances are frequent in which, to
his own interpretation of a rule, he adds a different view held by
other interpreters; either without naming them (as under i.19,21,
xiii.16, xiv.5,11, xvii.5, xxii.7), or referring to one of his special
sources and predecessors (as under ii.19,33), or setting off against
one another the views of two of these, Vārācārya and Māhīṣēya (as
under ii.14, iv.40, viii.19,20,22, xviii.7). In a large proportion of
the instances, it is true, the difference of opinion is upon some
utterly trivial point, turning on the interpretation of a *tvṛ* or the
like, and only illustrating the hair-splitting tendencies of the native
exegesis; but in some cases it is of more consequence, and once
goes so far as to question (under viii.20) whether an authority
referred to is Uttamottarīya or Dvāvuttamottarīya. Again, where
a rule is really obscure, the commentator has sometimes, palpably,
nothing more than guesses to give at its meaning, and ventures
two or three of them (as under ii.2, xiv.22, xv.9, xix.5, xxii.17),
among which it would be hard to choose the least acceptable; or,
if he gives but one (as under xi.19, xviii.4, xxii.18,19), it is no less
unsatisfactory. There are yet other cases in which what seems to
be the evident meaning of a rule is misapprehended and distorted,
without reason (as under ii.52, iv.4, v.29, vii.11, xix.3). Occasionally, false interpretations, of every degree of violence, are committed, for the purpose either of correcting an oversight or inaccuracy of the Prātiṣākhya (as under i.61, iii.1, viii.16, xi.3, xvi.26), or else of imposing upon the latter a doctrine which it was not intended to teach, but which is held by the commentator and his school (as under i.58, xiii.4, xxi.14,16). For this last purpose, too, advantage is sometimes taken of the citations of varying opinions so liberally made in the rules; the dictum of the quoted authority is declared to be approved in usage, or is even imposed upon the Prātiṣākhya, to the setting aside of what the latter really prescribes. Thus, Pāushkarasādi's doctrine of the conversion of l to d (xiii.16), which belongs neither to the Prātiṣākhya nor to the Sanhitā, is accepted; and the duplication of consonant-groups beginning with l which is ascribed (xiv.3) to certain unspecified teachers; and Plākshi's mode of treatment of a spirant before a first mute (xiv.17), which has as further result a misinterpretation of xxi.16; and a part of rule xiv.28, respecting the duplication of l; and rule xiv.28, to which a strange interpretation is given, prepared for by a yet stranger one of xiii.4; and rules xv.2, 3, which require anusvāra instead of nasalization of a vowel; and the nasalization of a final protracted a (xv.8); and two rules (xviii.1,6) from among those which concern the utterance of oṁ; and rule x.21, as to the retention of final v, is given the preference over 19, which requires its omission; and the first rule (y.38) as to the combination of initial h with a preceding mute is ratified; and, in the variety of opinions respecting the circumflex tone, one (i.46) is selected for approval. In the few cases where the commentator does not express himself as to whether a rule is ishta or anishta (they are ii.19, 27, 47–8, xi.19, xix.2, xxi.13, xxiii.14–9), there may be question whether he means to have it regarded as approved, or thinks the matter of no consequence either way. There remain the majority of cases, in which he stands by the Prātiṣākhya, rejecting the intruded doctrine (for further details, refer to the words ishta and anishta in the Sanskrit index).

Besides these more serious cases of misapprehension or intended modification of the teachings of his text-book, the commentator is not free from the ordinary and characteristic weaknesses of his craft in India: from feeble and puerile expositions, from attempts to find a wonderful pregnancy of meaning in some innocent particle or unintended difference of expression, from groundless etymologies, and the like; to these attention has been directed in the notes, and they are not of consequence enough to be recapitulated here.

For determining the personality of the commentator we have no data whatever, and for his place and period we have only the references to other authorities, which, though too few and indefinite to yield any stabile result, need to be put together in this note. The three earlier commentators on whom the work is avowedly founded—namely, Vararuci, Māhiśeya, and Ātreyā—are repeatedly appealed to, especially (as has been pointed out above)
in the settlement of difficult or controverted points (for the details, see index). Vararuci is a name very common in grammatical literature; to identify our commentator with any other of the various individuals who have worn it would doubtless be daring in the extreme. Nor does Atreyau, probably, stand in any definable relation to the grammarian of that name who is (see p. 430) twice quoted in the Prātiçākhyā itself. From Pāṇini, rules are directly quoted under ii.12, iii.9, v.1, xiii.16, xiv.4, xxiv.3; and the pāniniyāḥ or the vyākaraṇa are farther referred to under i.15,53,57, ii.47, xviii.1. Pāṇinean terms are, further, naṅ, i.60, x.22, nic, ii.17, hal, ix.24, yar, xiv.4, and lyap, xxi.14. The Mahābhāṣyā is professedly quoted under ii.7, v.2; but the passage given is actually from Kāiśyarta’s gloss. A definition is taken from the Amarakoṣa under i.1. Kāuhaḷeya is quoted under xix.4, xxiii.17; and the Kālanirnaya under xviii.1. The Brāhmaṇa of the Vājasaneyins is referred to under xiv.33, and extracts from the Mahābhārata and various Purāṇas are set forth under xxiv.6.

But the authority most often appealed to is the “Cikśā,” by which the commentator intends a very different work from the pāniniya Cikśā, and one much more comprehensive. He takes extracts from it, of a verse, or part of a verse, or more than one verse, under i.1 (three times), ii.2, xiv.5,28, xix.3, xx.12, xxi.1,15, xxii.13, xxiii.10,17. Among these extracts are (under i.1, ii.2, xxi.1, xxiii.10) several passages which are found also in the pāniniya Cikśā; and among the metrical extracts which are new and then given without specifying their source (under xiv.23,26,28, xix.3, xxi.1,6,15, xxiii.17,19, xxiv.6) are likewise one or two (under xxiii.17,19) which occur in the same treatise. That the commentator is inclined to regard his Cikśā as of higher authority than the Prātiçākhyā itself was pointed out under xx.12; that it was a work specially appertaining to the Tāttvārṇya–Sanhitā may be inferred with probability from the words which it cites (under xxi.15) in illustration of the varieties of sevarabhakti.
ANALYSIS.

I. EXPLANATORY: TERMS AND THEIR USE, INTERPRETATION OF RULES, ETC.

1. Terms and their use:

kāra forms names of letters, xxii.4; of vowels, i.16; of consonants, i.17; exceptions, i.18. —varga forms names of letters, xxii.4; includes short, long, and protracted vowels, i.20. —spha forms name of r, i.19. —varga, with first mute, forms name of series, i.27. —a forms name of consonant, i.21; of a cited word, i.22. —apṛkta, a pada of a single letter, i.54. —acagara, first member of a separable word, i.49. —lopā, loss, i.57. —upasarga, "preposition," includes what words, i.15. —offices of ca, api, tu, atha, eva, va, na, xxii.5–8.

2. Interpretation of rules and forms, etc.:

an increment, or word having euphonic change or elision, put in nominative, i.23; or in its text-form, i.24. —product of euphonic change put in accusative, i.28. —next element, or more, taken in case of doubt, i.25, 26. —a cited pada means that pada only, i.50; but applies to it even when euphonically altered, or preceded by a or as, i.51–3. —rules for a specified passage apply only there, and peremptorily, i.59; but a series of three or more words, if repeated, reads as the first time, i.61. —pūrva, "preceding," and uttara, "following," designate a word only under the specified circumstances, i.29, 30. —continued implication is of what stood last, i.58. —words to be combined, and rules to be applied, in their order, v.3. —a separable word treated as two words, except in enumeration, i.48. —an apṛkta treated as initial and as final, i.55. —elision and euphonic alteration affect single letters only, i.56; after elision of y or u, no further combination made, x.25. —in pragrabhas, and in enumeration of words containing anusvāra a case in another word maintains its force, l.60.

II. PHONETIC: ENUMERATION, CLASSIFICATION, DESCRIPTION OF ALPHABETIC SOUNDS, QUANTITY, ACCENT, ETC.

1. Enumeration and classification of alphabetic sounds:
nine simple vowels [u, a, ē, i, e, u, ē, ə, ʊ], i.2; sixteen vowels [the above, with r, ɐ, l, e, d, o, ə], i.5; the rest consonants. i.6. —mutes, i.7; in five series, i.10; called "first," etc., i.11. —semivowels [y, r, l, v], i.8. —spirants [χ, ɾ, h, s, φ, ɦ], i.9. —surd consonants, i.12; h, i.13; sonants, i.14.

2. Mode of formation of alphabetic sounds:

general mode of production of articulate sounds, ii.2, 3, 7, xvii.7, 8, xxii.1, 2, xxiii.2, 3. —difference of surds, sonants, and h, ii.4–6. —mode of utterance of vowels, in general ii.4, 8, 31, 32; in particular, of o, a, ii.12; of i, ii.20–22; of u, ʊ, ii.20, 24, 25; of r, ɾ, l, ii.18; of e, ii.15–17, 23; of d, ii.26–8; of o, ii.13, 14; of ə, ii.26, 27, 29. —similar vowels, i.3. —mode of utterance of consonants, in general, ii.33, 34; of surds, ii.10, 11; of h and sonant aspirates, ii.6, 9; of nasality, ii.52; difference of nasal quality in different nasal sounds, xvii.1–4; of nasal mutes, ii.30. —mode of utterance of consonants in particular: of k-series, ii.35; of c-series, ii.36; of t-series, ii.37; of t-series, ii.38; of p-series, ii.39; of y, ii.40; of r, ii.41; of l, ii.42; of v, ii.43; of s
rants, ii.44,45; of h, ii.6,9,46,47; of visarjaniya, ii.46,48; of anuvrātra, ii.19, 30; of nāśikya (yamas etc.), ii.49-51; of svarabhakti, ii.19.

3. Quantity:
quantity of short and long vowels, i.31-3,35; of protracted vowels, i.36; of consonants, i.37; of anuvrātra (or nasalized vowel), i.34, xvii.5; of syllables ("heavy" and "light"), xxii.14,15; of pauses and hiatus, xxii.13; of om, xviii.1.

4. Accent:
general character of accents: acute, i.38, xxii.9; grave, i.39, xxii.10; circumflex, i.40-47, xvii.6.—varieties of independent circumflex: nītiya or original, xx.2; its quality, xx.9: kshātra, xx.1; its occurrence, x.16; its quality, xx.9: abhinātha, xx.4; its occurrence, xii.9; its quality, xx.10: praśītha, xx.5; its occurrence, x.17; its quality, xx.11.—enuclic circumflex: its occurrence, xiv.29-33; its varieties: prāthāta, xx.3; its quality, xx.11: pādavritta, xx.6; its quality, xx.12: tātārogaṇjana, xx.7; its quality, xx.12.—pracāya accent, xii.10,11.—vikrama, xix.1,2; its quality, xvii.6.—kampa, between two circumflexes, xix.3-5.—accent resulting from combination of two syllables into one, x.10,12,16,17, xii.9-11.—accent of om, xviii.2,3,5-7.—accent of protracted vowel (?), xv.9.

5. Syllabication:
division of syllables, xxi.1-9.

6. Mode and tones of utterance:
general mode of utterance, xxiii.20; the three sthānas or qualities, xxii.11; the seven do, xxiii.4-10; the twenty-one yamas or tones, xxii.12, xxiii.11-19.
—tone of om, xviii.4.

III. Sandhi or euphonic combination:
introductory, v.1-3; four kinds of combination, xxiv.1-4.

1. Final vowels:
final vowels not liable to combination, praṇaḥas, iv.1-54, x.24; special cases of uncombiable finals, x.13,18; protracted finals, x.24; their nasalization, xv.7,8.—nasalization of final vowels, xv.6.—the particle u, ix.16,17.—lengthening of final a, iii.2-6,8-12; of final i and u, iii.7,13,14.
combination of simple final vowels: with similar initial, x.2; of final a with initial vowels, x.4-9; exceptions, x.13; lost in certain cases before e or o, x.14; i, i, u, final, x.15, ix.17; exceptions, ix.16, x.18.—combination of final diphthongs, ix.11,12,14,15; e and o with initial a (see also Initial vowels), ix.13; treatment of the resulting y and v, x.19-23; after their loss, no further combination, x.25.
accent resulting from combinations of final vowels, x.10,12,16,17, x.1,5,9,11; resulting nasalization, x.11.

2. Initial vowels:
initial vowel lengthened, iii.15.—loss of a after final e or o, ix.13, xi.1; detail of cases of loss, and exceptions, xi.2-19, xii.1-8; resulting accent, xii.9-11, x.4,10 — to or in special case, v.9.
3. Final consonants:

surd to nasal before nasal, viii.2; to sonant before all other sonant letters, viii.3; and, in a special case, before m, viii.4; to aspirate before spirant, xiv. 12,13.

\textit{visarjaniya} to spirant before surds, ix.2–6; except before \textit{ksh}, ix.3; to \textit{sh} before \textit{t}, in certain cases, vi.5.—omitted before spirant and surd mute, ix.1; also in \textit{sa} etc., v.15–17; also before \textit{r}, vii.7,16,17; special case before \textit{r}, viii.18–22.—changed to \textit{r}, viii.6; do, after \textit{a} and \textit{e}, viii.8–15; exceptional cases, v.10.

—changed to \textit{s} or \textit{sh} before \textit{k}, \textit{kh}, \textit{p}, in compound words, viii.23; do, in independent words, viii.24–35; exceptions, vii.32,33.—\textit{ah} final to \textit{o}, before \textit{a} and sonants, ix.7,8; special exception, viii.18–22; before other vowels, ix.10; \textit{ah} final, ix.9,10.

final mutes: \textit{u} doubled before vowel, ix.18; \textit{u} before \textit{s}, \textit{sh}, v.32.—\textit{t} before \textit{s}, \textit{sh}, v.33.—\textit{t} before palatal, v.22,23; before \textit{l}, v.25; before \textit{r}, v.22.—\textit{n} before palatal, v.20,21,24,37, xv.1–3; before \textit{t}, vi.14, xv.1–3; before \textit{l}, v.25,26, 31, xv.1–3; before \textit{r}, v.24; before \textit{s}, \textit{sh}, v.33; changed to \textit{r} or \textit{y} [i.e. to \textit{anuśvara}, xv.1–3]. ix.20–24; doubled before vowel, ix.19.—\textit{m} before mutes and semivowels, v.27–31, xiii.3; before spirants and \textit{r}, xiii.1,2, xv.1–3; unchanged before \textit{rā}, xiii.4; special case of loss, v.18.

4. Initial consonants:

\textit{ṣ} to \textit{ch}, v.34–7.—\textit{s} to \textit{sh}, in words independent or compound, v.10, vi.1,2,4,6–13.—\textit{l} to \textit{t}, vii.13.—\textit{h} after a mute, v.38–41.—\textit{n} to \textit{y}, vii.2,4.

elision of initial \textit{m}, v.12; of \textit{n}, v.13; of \textit{u}, v.14.

5. Interior consonants:

\textit{t}, \textit{th} to \textit{t}, \textit{th}, vii.13,14.—\textit{n} to \textit{y}, in same word with its cause, xiii.6–9,11,13–15; in other word, vii.3,5,6–12,15,16.—\textit{t} to \textit{d}, xiii.16.

6. Abnormal insertions and elisions, duplication, etc.:

insertion of \textit{s} v.4–7; of \textit{d}, v.8; of surd mute between sibilant and mute, xiv. 9–11; of nasal counterparts (\textit{yamas} and \textit{nāsīkya}), xxi.12–14; of \textit{svarabhakti}, xxi.15–16.

elision of initial \textit{m}, \textit{n}, \textit{s}, see Initial consonants.—in composition of forms of \textit{ekha}, v.18,19.

duplication in consonant-groups, xiv.1–7,14–28; of initial \textit{ch}, \textit{kh}, \textit{bh} in certain cases, xiv.8.

IV. Sundries:

enumeration and specification of cases of \textit{y}, otherwise than euphonic, in interior of words, xiii.9,10,12; of \textit{anuśāra}, do, do, xv.4,5, xxvi.2–31.

requirements in a scholar or teacher, xxiv.5,6.
INDEX OF CITATIONS
MADE IN THE COMMENTARY, FROM THE TATTIRIYA-SANHITA.

This Index contains the references reported above in the body of the work, as made by the commentator to the fundamental text. If, however, a cited word or passage is reported as occurring more than once in the text, reference is given only to the first occurrence. It has been found impracticable to carry out any scheme of distinction of the value of the citations; and any one using the Index will have to turn back to the notes in order to determine whether a given passage is quoted merely as an example of some general class, or as one that was more or less probably had directly in view, as example or counter-example, by the makers of the treatise; whether it is a unique phrase, or one more than once repeated, or even a word of frequent occurrence—and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TS. I</th>
<th>TS. I</th>
<th>TS. I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 L.21,33, il.22, ill.1,3, ix. 1, x.5,10,19, xiv.21, xvii.7, xviii.1,7, xx. 3, xxi.7, xxii.13, 2</td>
<td>1.1 xii.11,17; xvi.27. xiii.2, iv.34; ill.7, iv. 15,22,33, xvii.2; iv. 46, xii.17. 13</td>
<td>1.4 xii.4, ix.4. 10 xiii.16. 18 iv.41, xi.16. 19 vi.7, ix.20. 20 xv.1, xvii.4. 29 ill.12, iv.12, xvi.13,29. 24 xi.7, xii.13. 25 xii.9. 26 iv.42. 27 vi.7, viii.27. 30 iv.11. 33 xiii.14, vii.5, xi.3. 36 viii.32. 41 ii.49, xiv.34. 42 vii.16, ix.20. 43 iii.2, iv.5, xii.5,7, xiii. 4, xxiv.5; iii.3, xiv. 22, xii.7, xviii.13 bis. 45 iii.2, iv.5, vii.24, xiii.12, 12, xix.4; ix.21, xli.7. 46 vi.8 xiv.30,31, xx.3; xii.2, xli.15. 51 x.28,30, xiv.23, xvii.9; xv.19, x.10,13; xiv. 28,30, xx.7. 2 xii.30, xiv.23; iv.16; 3 xiv.15; xix.18; ill.8, ix.22. 3 i.48; xiv.18; ill.8, 22. 4 xx.8; xiv.31, xiv.28. 5 ill.8, xii.3 bis, xiv.9,19, 27; xii.13; ill.8. 6 x.10, xiv.33; ill.8, 7 xii.8; ill.8, ill.5, xii.13; 8 ill.5, v.32, xiv.5,12, xiii.15. 7 xii.18; iv.38; ill.9, 19,15,37, xiv.24; ill.5, vi.14, xvi.27. 8 xii.16. 9 iii.47, iv.33, xiv.1; iv.4, xiv.29; ix. 22; vi.7, xiv.31, xvii.1; xii.9; xiv.11, xiv.29, xvii.7, x.10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tāttirīyā-Prāticākhya and Tribhāshyaratnā.

TS. vi. 4.8 xvi.29.
5 xiii.17. 6 xii.7.
7 xii.6. 8 izii.11. 9 iv.10.
10 iv.11. 11 xvi.17. 12 riv.11.
13 iv.35. 14 xvi.37. 15 xiv.8. 16 xii.17.

TS. vii. 2.17 xvi.23 bis.
3.1 xiii.12. 3.3 iiii.15.
2 ix.30. 3 iv.21. 4 ii.13.
5 xii.10. 6 xii.13. 7 xiv.10.
8 xiv.11. 9 xii.14. 10 xvi.16.
11 xii.14. 12 xiv.5. 13 xii.9, 12.
14 xiv.5. 15 xiv.17.

TS. vi. 3.3 xii.14. 5 xii.17. 6 xii.6.
7 xii.5. 8 xii.16. 9 xii.14.
10 xii.13. 11 xii.12. 12 xii.9.
13 xii.11. 14 xii.13. 15 xii.12.

TS. vii. 3.1 xiii.12. 3.3 iiii.15.
2 ix.30. 3 iv.21. 4 ii.13.
5 xii.10. 6 xii.13. 7 xiv.10.
8 xiv.11. 9 xii.14. 10 xvi.16.
11 xii.14. 12 xiv.5. 13 xii.9, 12.
14 xiv.5. 15 xiv.17.
16 xii.12. 17 xvi.17.
18 xii.13. 4.3 xii.13.
19 xii.18. 2 iv.14. 3 iiii.17.
4 iv.54. 5 iv.52.
6 iv.51. 7 iivi.2.
8 iv.39. 9 iv.10.
10 iv.13. 11 iv.8.
12 iv.12. 13 iv.53.
14 iv.16. 15 iv.29.
16 iv.17. 17 xiv.18.
18 iv.19. 19 xii.12.
SANSKRIT INDEX.

The following Index contains the whole matter of the Prātiṣṭhāya itself—both the proper vocabulary of the treatise, and the words and parts of words which it quotes from the Sanhitā; the latter being distinguished by being printed with spaced letters. To this is added a very liberal selection from the vocabulary of the commentary; perhaps more liberal than may seem to some worth while, but I preferred to err in this direction rather than the contrary. The references to the commentary are designated by a prefixed c; and an added v indicates that the word is to be sought among the various readings given at the foot of the comment.

agnayah, xii.8; agnaya-yak paprayah, xii.7.
agni, tiv.9=ci.2, iv.20 (kaṇḍā).
agni, xii.15.
agnik, vi.5, vi.13, xii.15.
agnism gāyatrīm, iv.52.
agnir mūrdhā, xii.3.
agna, xii.10.
agnern jīvām, xii.7.
agniṣṭhāya, xii.14.
agric ika, iv.2, xii.16, xiv.14.
agha, xii.13.
agnē, xii.2.
agoshāḥ, v.10, xii.12, xii.16, xiv.10, xiv.12, xxi.3.
agniyā, xii.13.
agnikar, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, c.13 (-te).
agnirāval, c.13.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agniṣṭhāya, c.13.
agnipāta, c.13.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
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agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
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agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
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agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
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agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
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agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
agnisālākṣa, xii.2.
tā (t), v.33, vii.13, xiii.15.
tāva, c.i.21.
tāvarga, i.i.37, xiii.11, xiv.20:-c-i.44, xiv.28.
tāvargiya, c.xiii.14.
thu (th), vii.14.
da (d), xiii.16.
dakāra, c.iv.38.
ṇa (n), xii.14.
ṇakāra, vii.1, xiii.6.
ṇatvā, c.i.51,60, v.3, vii.2 etc., xiii.7 etc.
ṇic, c.i.17.
ta (t), vii.13.
ta (pron.), l.33,41,49, i.3,7,31-4, v.27,38, ix.2, xii.9, xiv.9, xii.3,4, xx.4, xii.2, xiii.13, xii.2, xiii.12,16.
takāra, v.22,33, vi.5,14, vi.15.
tat, ix.17.
tatah, xv.3, xii.14.
tatra, v.3, xxii.3,12.
tatād, ii.8.
tathā, xxii.14.
tathāvā, c.i.43, ii.20.
tathābhāva, c.i.61.
tathānām, c.i.21.
tathāhita, c.xiii.9.
tanuvā, iv.44.
tanāyat, iv.52.
tantu, c.i.7.
tapāt, iii.12.
tapasah, xii.8.
tapasi, iv.17.
tamasah, viii.24.
ra:tar:+āvā, ci.i.9.
tarat, iii.12.
tarā, iii.8.
tarhā, xii.14.
tarih, c.i.15,21, ii.25, iii.8, etc.
tavarga, c.i.38, xv.20,21:-c.i.44.
tavargiya, xii.15.
tasthita, xvi.13.
tasmāt, ix.17.
tasmēn, vi.14.
tātsparya, c.i.15,24,35,36.
tāt, vi.14.
tābhīyam eva, iv.52.
tāmra, c.xxiv.6.
tāra, xxii.11, xxii.5,10.
tāhu, ii.22,36,40.
tāvant, c.i.35:-c.i.1,41,56, ii.3, 29, viii.16.
tīshthau, vi.14.
tīshthanty ekayā, v.19.
tīshtā, ii.12.
tīrthara, xvii.1,4:-c.xvii.24, xvii.2,3:-c.xvii.10.
tu, i.19,59, ii.14,25,29,33,45, iv.40, viii.16, ix.9, x.19, 21, x.1, x.5,11, xv.3,8, xviii.1, xx.2, xxii.6, xxiv.5.
tu, iv.42, vi.13.
tulya, c.i.33, ii.19:-c.xvii.23.
tā, iii.14.
tūṇave, xii.12.
tūṇām, c.i.20:-bhāva, bhāva, bhāva, xxii.6:-bhāva.
tṛ, xvi.27.
tṛpe, iv.11.
tṛṣa, i.11, viii.3, xxii.12, 16:-c.i.61:-c.xii.10:-savana
trdy, iv.11.
tev, iv.40,42, xi.10.
tesy, iv.20.
tetaranty, c.xvi.20.
Tāṭatīrīya, xxiii.16,15:-ka
ṭīrōvayanā, xvii.7,12:-c.xvii.29, xx.8.
travu, v.4.
tri, i.20, xxii.11,14.
tri, vi.2, vii.25.
trī, iii.6.
tripadāprabhṛti, i.61:-c.i.59,61:-c.xvii.9,18.
Ṭīrōvayanā, c.intr. and
endings of chapters.
trimātra, xxii.13.
trirūpa, c.i.36.
trī, vi.2.
trīn, vi.14.
trīśvīdaya, c.i.3.
trīṣṭha, xi.8.
trīṣṭaṁ tārā, iii.8.
r. t:avaritam, c.xxii.20.
trīṣṭha, vii.8.
tved, iii.5.
trīṣṭha, iii.7.
tve, iv.10.
-thē, iv.40.
da (d), iv.7.
dāvakā, dānshtrābhāṣyām, dānṣam, dānśanābhikā, dānśabhikā, xv.19.
dakāra, i.8.
dakṣiṇendā, c.iii.10.
datte, xi.5.
dādāśi, xvi.18.
dādāṇaḥ, xii.6.
dādāśi, xvi.18.
danta, c.i.43:-c.xxii.18:-paṁkṛti.
dantamāla, c.iii.38,41,42.
darā, iv.2.
darg, c.i.1, ii.2,5, iv.11, vii.16, ix.22, x.10, xiv.5, 28.
darcana, c.i.59, ii.1, iii.1
(ad), xi.19 (ad), xi.13
(ad), c.iv.5,15, xv.vi, xvi.26.
r. dō:+aunmpa, c.ii.8:+aunmpa, c.ii.7,8:+aunmpa,
apuṣṭā, c.xi.19,21, xii.16.
dakāra, iv.22.
dārya, xxii.9.
dārya, cv.7.
dāvā, xvi.13.
divāk, vii.24,28.
divī, vi.2.
r. div: + saṃ, c.xxv.4.
diś: divā, xvi.13.
dūpa, c.xxii.3, xx.12:-c.xvii.24.
dvīṭā, xxii.13.
dvīṭā, iii.12.
durgā, l.35, viii.17, x.2, xxii.14, xxiv.5:-c.xii.24, c.i.1, vi.12, etc.: and dārīghya
durgā, iii.5.
dukhiṣṭā, c.xxxii.16.
dundubhi, c.xxxii.3.
durbhala, c.xxxiii.3.
darulā, c.xxxi.19, xxi.1.
duryān, ix.21.
dṛ, xvi.27.
dṛṣṭha, xvii.6, xx.9:-c.xvii.5, xx.10.
dṛṣṭhayā, c.xxxii.19.
dṛṣṭa, iv.27.
dṛṣṭānta, c.xxxii.13.
devū riskha, xvii.24.
devātā phal guni, iv.12.
devate, iv.11.
Devadatta, c.i.14, iv.52.
dved, ii.2.
dved, vi.14.
dvipārāya, c.xxvii.6.
deva, c.i.59:-c.i.29, ii.17, vii.21, x.13.
dīka, cv.9.
dārīghya, c.xxxii.9.
puṇavaścana, c viii.13, xxiii.7.
puṇastā, ci.43, iv.2, vi.5.
puṇah, xi.16.
punśpā, ili.5.
pūja, ev.41, xiii.16.
pūtī, ili.7.
pūrī, c vii.8.
pūrga, xvii.8.
purī, iv.28.
purlī, iv.11.
pūravī, i.39, ii.28, iv.13,16, v.3,31,37, viii.17, xii.19, xii.9, xiii.9, xiv.5, xv.3.
puṣṣa, i.4, ili.15, iv.7,40, v.4,6,8,9,12-14, 32-5,38, vi.2,4,7,11,13, vii.2,4,7-9,11-13, viii.16, 23, ix.9,18,20,21, x.3,9, 19, xii.1,5-8,11-13, xiii.6, 3,6,8, xiv.6, xiv.1,2-6,8, xiv.4,11, xiv.2, xx.2, (ap.), 7, xii.14, puṇava, ii.48, xv.1, xiv.5, purī, xv.9, puṇava, i.1, ili.1.
pūrvavāja, iv.11,23.
pūrvatā, c x.10,11, xi.3.
pūrvatara, c xvi.19.
pūrvanimitta, c xix.19, xv.6.
pūrvapada, i.49, (ap.), ci.i.15, v.3.
pūrvāparibhāṣa, c x.2.
pūrvākī, ci.19, etc.
pūṣa, x.13.
pūta, xiii.16 (svara), xxiii.3 (varga): and ap.
pūrṇa, xi.8.
pūtrakā, i.23,23,25  (ap), v. 41, xiv.15, xx.10.
pūrakaranā, c xiv.11, xiv.8, xiv.9, xiv.15, xiv.6.
pūrī, iv.19.
pūrī, ci.19, xi.16.
pūrhatti, iv.15.
pūrhitāśa, iv.7.
pūrkhā, xii.16.
pūrāhyā, xii.20, c xiv.23, (ap), xii.20, c xiv.23.
po, viii.29.
pūshā, iv.21.
pūnavākṣa, c iii.37, ili.47, iv.23, iv.4,22,28.
pūnavāpi, c xiv.6.
Pūnakārttikā, see p. 430, pra, li.16.
pra, iv.33, vii.4, vii.34.
prakāśa, c vii.13, pra, vi.17, pra, vii.34.
prakṣa, ci.20, xii.9.
prakrīt, ci.15, ili.6, ili.7, v.10, xii.19.
praṅa, sic.13.
prakṛi, c.1.15, ili.3, vil.15, vil.6,
(prayā, sic.16, (ap), v.8, vil.16, (ap), vil.20, (ap).
prakṛi, c ili.7, vi.16, xii.9, xii.11, xii.15, (ap),
4 xii.2, xii.6, xii.7, xii.13, (ap),
prakṛita, ii.12, xii.15.
prakṛiti, ili.12, xii.15, xii.16, xiii.14.
prakṛiti, xii.9,13.
prakṛiti, xii.13, xii.15, xii.16, xiii.14.
prakṛiti, xii.15.
prakṛitapada, ci ili.1.
prakṛitā, xii.15.
prakṛitâlayana, ci vi.23, xiv.4.
pragroha, i.60, iv.1, x.24, xvi.6 (ap), (ap), xii.2, etc.,
15, xii.8, etc.
pracaya, xiii.3 (dhṛtā),
pracaya, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.10, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
pracaya, xvi.11, xvi.10, xvi.9, xvi.2, etc.
sparaśa, i.7, 10, ii.44, v.27, 34, xiii.15, xiv.2, 3, 9, 27, xxi.9, 12.

sparśana, ii.33: and as-
sparśa, vi.12.

spāstha, c xvii.8 (atis-, as-): and vis-

spāṣṭhitakṣa, c xiii.10 e.

spuṭhitakṣa, c xii.8, xiii.15.

spuṭhitakṣa, c xii.8, xiii.15.

spūṭhitakṣa, vi.15.

spūṭhitakṣa, c xii.25.

svāh, v.15.

śṛa, xvi.2.

śṛi, i.60, xv.4, c xvii.5.

śṛidha, xii.8.

sva, xxiv.4 (yathā): c xxiv.28.

svaṭa, c ii.23, xxi.7.

svaṭantara, c xxi.6.

svaṇḍa, c i.59.

svaḍāka, xii.8.

svaḍāka, c xii.14 (-ta).

svaṇḍā, c xii.14 (-ta).

svaṇḍā, i.24, xix.14, 15.

r. sva, xx.2, 3: c i.41: and

atsvārya.

svaru, 1.5, 33, ii.8, 31, 47, viii.3, ix.10, xii.18, xii.4, xii.16, xiv.1, 16, xvi.1, xvi.2, xvi.5, xvi.1, xii.14, xvi.6: c xvi.3, xii.12, xii.7, 11, 15: etc. etc.

svara, vi.13.

śvara, c i.19, xxi.6, 15: c i.1, 6, ii.33, xxi.16.

śvarasa, c v.22.

śvarāja, xri.1.

śvarita, i.40, x.12, 16, xii.9.

+ eṣṭa. cxxiv.4 e: + pari, cii.59, iii.1: + upasam, cii.18, 23: - cii.22, 23: and u-

dāharaṇa, parīhāra, upa-

ṣaṃkṛta, -hāra, samāhā-

ra.

haṛā, iii.12.

haṛiṣṭa, c xxi.15.

haṛiṣṭa (or hār-), c xxi.15.

haṛi, iv.15.

haṭ, c ix.24.

haṇḍa, vii.11.

haṭāśāk, vii.21.

haṭāśāk, c xii.17.

haṭ, viii.8.

haṛi (or hār-), c xxi.15.

haṛiṣṭa, see p. 430.

haṭ, vii.12, xii.13;

hi, vii.44, vii.12, xii.13;

hi, vii.44, vii.12, xii.13;

hi, vii.44, vii.12, xii.13;

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.

hātra, see p. 430.
GENERAL INDEX.

The references by Roman and Arabic figures together are, as in the other Indexes, to chapter and rule; those by Arabic figures alone (with p. prefixed), to page of the volume.

a, ā: how uttered, ii.12; how combined with a following vowel, x.3-9:—ā is short, i.32; ḍh to o before, ix.7; lost before initial e or o of certain words, x.14; when initial, lost after e or o, xi.1; detail of cases of its elision or non-elision, xi.2-xii.8; resulting accent, xii.9-11:—ā, final, result of irregular prolongation, iii.2-6, 8-12: initial, do., iii.15:—ā, nasalized when final, xv.8.

abhinidhāna, xiv.9.

abhisāhota circumflex, xx.4: its occurrence, xii.9; its comparative tone, xx.10.

Accent: see Analysis, p. 437; also Acute, Circumflex, Grave, and the names of the various accents.

Acute accent (udālta), defined, i.38; mode of production, xii.9; acute tone of grave syllables after circumflex, xii.10-11.

ā, how uttered, ii.26-8; peculiar utterance in a single word, xvi.24; combination with following vowel, ix.14, x.19-23; with preceding a, d, x.6.

Alphabetic sounds, enumeration of, p. 8-10; classification, mode of production, etc., see Analysis, p. 436; names for, i.16-9.

anudālta, see Grave.

anuśvara (ō)]: its equivocal treatment by the Pāṇḍitā, p. 67-70; is an independent element, p. 7; how uttered, ii.19,30; how designated, i.18; belongs to preceding vowel, xii.6; its quantity, i.34; makes a heavy syllable, xxii.14; its occurrence, xv.1-3; do. otherwise than as result of euphonic combination, xv.4-5, xvi.1-31.

Articulate sounds, see Alphabetic.

Aspirate mutes: sonant, contain h-sound, ii.9; surd, contain more breath than non-aspirates, ii.11; substituted for non-aspirate before sibilants, xiv.12-3; how duplicated, xiv.5; double aspirates in the MSS., p. 290,294.

ā, how uttered, ii.26,27,29; combination with following vowel, ix.15, x.19-23; with preceding a, d, x.7.

 Authorities quoted in the rules of the treatise, p. 430.

a, ā, ā, ā: labial mute, ii.39.

bb, labial mute, ii.39; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.

Brāhmaṇa-passages in the Sanhitā, p. 48.

c, palatal mute, ii.36; insertion of c before, v.4,5; t to c before, v.22; n to ə or ə before, v.20,21,24.

c, palatal spirant, i.9, i.44-5; initial, to ch after any mute save m, v.34-7; t to c before, v.22; n to ə before, v.24; irregular insertions of, v.4,5; inserted after m, v.20-1.

č, palatal mute, ii.36; product of c after a mute, v.34-7; t to c before, v.22; n to ə before, v.24; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.

Cerebral mutes, see Lingual.

Cikār, quoted in the comment, p. 435.

Circumflex accent (vārī), mode of utterance, i.40-7; degree of effort in, xvii.6, xx.9-12; kinds of independent circumflex, xxi.1,2,4,5; their occurrence, x.16,17, xii.9; kinds of enclitic circumflex, xx.3,6,7; its occurrence, xiv.29-33; kampa between two circumflexes, xii.3-5; nature of enclitic circumflex, p. 315.

Citation rules of, i.22,24,50-3.

Citations in the comment not found in the Tālikārya-Sanhita, p. 425-6.

Commentary, see Tribhāhyyaratna.

Compound words, separable, count as two, i.48; first member called avarāha, i.49.

Consonants, i.6; their classification and description, i.7-14, ii.8-11,30,33-52; names, i.17-8,21; quantity, i.34,37, p. 377; accent, i.43; belong to what vowel, xxi.1-9; relation of consonant and vowel, p. 72,375-7; see also the several letters and classes, and Groups.

d, dental mute, ii.38; irregular insertion of, v.8.

d, lingual mute, ii.37; product of alternation of t, xii.16.
Dental mutes (t, th, d, dh, s), how formed, il.38; see also the several letters.

dh, dental mute, ii.38.
dh, lingual mute, ii.37.
Diphthongs (e, ai, o, as): see the several letters.

Duplication, of a, a, final, ix.18-9; of ch, kh, bh, xiv.8; of aspirate mutes in the MSS., p. 290,294; duplication in consonant groups, xiv.1-7,9-28.

e, how uttered, ii.15-7,23; combination with preceding a, a, x.6; with following vowel, ix.11,13, x.19; initial a elided after, xi.1 etc.; resulting accent, xii.9-11; final a elided before, xii.14; pragraha ending, iv.8-54.

Ellision, see Omission.

Euphonic alternation, concerns single element only, i.56; of a cited word, does not suspend rules, i.51; mode of intimating in rules, i.23,28.

Final consonant, belongs to preceding vowel, xxi.3; makes heavy syllable, xxi.14.

g, guttural mute, ii.35.
gh, guttural mute, ii.35.
Grammarians quoted by name in the rules and comment, p. 430.

Grave accent (anuddatta), defined, i.39; how produced, xii.10; grave syllable, when converted to enclitic circumflex, xiv.29-31; when uttered at acute pitch, xiv.10-1.

Groups of consonants, occurring in Taittiriya-Sanhitā, detail of their division in syllabication, p. 380-2,385; make a heavy syllable, xxi.14.

Guttural mutes (k, kh, g, gh, h), how formed, ii.35; see also the several letters.

h, a spirant, i.9; not surd, i.13; intermediate between surd and sonant, ii.6; inheres in sonant aspirates, ii.9; uttered in the throat, ii.46; has same position as following vowel, ii.47; combination with preceding final mute, v.38-41; before a nasal, varānaya inserted after, xxi.14.

h, see visarjanya.

Heavy syllable, xxi.14.

i, i: how formed, ii.22; combination with preceding a, a, x.4; with following vowel, x.15; resulting circumflex, x.16-4; final, result of irregular prolongation, iii.7,13; pragraha ending, iv.8-54.

Increment, how intimated, i.23.

Insertions, of r, s, d, anomalous, v.4-8; of k, t, v.32,33; after spirant before mute, xiv.9.

j, palatal mute, ii.36; t before, to j, v.23; a before, to a, v.24.

k, palatal mute, ii.36; not found in the Sanhitā, p. 72.

kāmantā (x), guttural spirant, i.9, ii.44-5; its designation, i.18; occurrence, ix.2-4.

k, guttural mute, ii.35; inserted after a before s, sh, v.32; k to s or sh before, viii.23 etc.

kampa, peculiar affection of a circumflex followed by another circumflex, xix.3-5; differences between the Taittiriya and other texts as to its occurrence and treatment, p. 362-3.

kāṇḍikās, division of anusvārās into, not recognized by the Prātiṣeṣṭya, p. 5,83, 427,430.

Kārttikeya, asserted author of the Prātiṣeṣṭya, p. 1.

kh, guttural mute, ii.35; k to s or sh before, viii.23 etc.; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.

krama-text, p. 429.

kṣaipra circumflex, x.1; its occurrence, x.16; its tone, xx.9.

semitwowel, i.8; how produced, ii.42; assimilates preceding t, m, n, v.25,26, 28; resulting nasal l, v.26,28; changed to d, xiii.16; duplication after, xiv.2,3, 1.

f, not a simple vowel, p. 11; of short quantity, i.31; how produced, ii.18.

Labial mutes (p, ph, b, bh, m), how formed, ii.39; see also the several letters.

Light syllable, xxi.15.

Lingual mutes (t, th, d, dh, n), how formed, ii.37; see also the several letters.

Long vowel, i.35; and see Prolongation.

m, labial mute, ii.39; assimilated to following mute, v.27; and semivowel (except r), v.28-31, xiii.3; irregularly dropped, v.12; to h before r or spirant, v.29, xiii.2; unchanged before r, xiii.4.

Manuscripts of Prātiṣeṣṭya and commentary: see Taittiriya-Prātiṣeṣṭya.

Mutes, i.7; division and names, i.10,11; what mutes are surd, i.12; mode of formation of the various series, ii.35-9; their designation, i.27; see also the several series and letters.
pado-text, peculiarities of, in Taittiriya.
padānīta enclitic circumflex, xx.6; its
tone, xx.12.
Palatal mutes (c, ch, j, ṣh, ḥ), ii.36; see
also the several letters.
Pāṇini, cited in commentary, p. 435.
Pauses, quantity of, xxii.13.
ph, labial mute, ii.39.
pluṭa, see Protracted.
prāṣaya accent, xxi.10-1; of om, xviii.3;
skrīrama after, xix.2.
prācīnsīta circumflex, xx.5; its occurrence.
x.17; tone, xx.11.
pragaha finals, detail of, iv.1-54; are
uncombinaible, x.24; rarely elide a, p.
264.
Prātiśākhyā, see Taittiriya.
pratīhāta enclitic circumflex, xx.3; its
tone, xx.11; discussion of its true
character, p. 369-70.
Prepositions, list of, i.15; a of preposi-
tion combines with r to ar, x.9; usu-
tally take iti in pada-text, p. 229,428.
Prolongation, irregular, of vowels in saṁhī-
hī, iii.1-15; of vowel after loss of final r,
vi.17; of nasalized vowel, xv.9; of circumflex vowel taking kama, p. 362-3.
Protracted (pluṭa) vowel, quanntity of, i.
36; uncombinaible, x.24; detail of cases
occurring in Sanhitā, p. 323-4; a vowel
following, is not styled "similar," 1.4;
nasalization of, when final, xv.7.8; tone
of (?), xv.9.
Qualifications of a scholar and teacher,
xxiv.5.6.
Qualities (etōma) of sound, xxii.11, xxiii.
4-10.
Quantity, see Analysis, p. 437.
ra, semivowel, i.8; how uttered, ii.41; its
name, i.19; takes saṃrauhakī before a
spirant, xxi.15; ṣ converted into, v.10.
vi.6-15; but lost before r, and pre-
ceeding vowel lengthened, vii.16-7; r
converted into, ix.20-4; causes duplica-
tion. xiv.4,6; changes following a to
y, xiii.6; m to a before, xiii.2, xv.1-3.
r, f; not simple vowels, p. 11; their
composition, p. 392; how uttered, ii.
18; change following a to y, xiii.6 etc.; quantity of r, i.31; combination with preceding a, d, x.8.9; anomalous
conversion to ar, v.9.
Repeated passages, treatment of, i.61.
Repetition of compound words, with iti,
in pada-text, p. 85.

a, dental mute, ii.38; change of, to a,
before palatalas, v.24,37; to nasal l, v.
25-3,31; to ṣg, v.20,21; to ṛs, vi.14;
to ṛr or a (through y), ix.20-4; to y,
vii.1-12,15,16, xiii.6-8,13-5; physical
ground of this change, p. 281; adds i
before s, ṣh, v.33; doubled ix.19.
ā, guttural mute, ii.38; adds k before s,
ṣh, v.32; doubled, ix.18.
ā, palatal mute, ii.36; a changed to, v.
24, 37.
ā, lingual mute, ii.37; a changed to, vii.
1-12,15,16, xiii.6-8,13-5; detail of its
occurrence when not result of euphonic
causes, xiii.9-12.
ā, see anusvāra.
Nasal, what sounds are, ii.30; nasal
quality how given, ii.32; its differences
of degree, xvii.1-4;—nasal mutes, surd
mutes to nasal before, vii.2; exception,
viii.4; take a prefixed surd after a sibi-
lant, xiv.9; take yama after preceding
non-nasal, xii.12; take adisīka after preceeding h, xli.14; see also the several
letters;—nasal semivowels, result
of change of m, n, v.26,28;—nasalized
vowel, alternative for ṣ, v.31, xv.1;
result of combination, x.11; discussion of
the doctrine of the treatise as to ṣ or
nasal vowel, p. 67-70; nasalization of
a final vowel, xv.6-8; its prolonga-
tion, xvii.5.
adisīka, or yama, xxii.12; nose-sound,
inserted between h and nasal mute,
xxi.14.
āṁyā circumflex, xx.2; its tone, xx.9.
Nose-sounds (yomas, adisīka), how pro-
duced, ii.49-51; how designated, i.18;
ocurrence, xxii.12-4; how treated in
syllabication, xxi.8.
o, dīphthong, how produced, ii.12-4;
when pragaha, iv.6.7; combination
with preceding a, a, v.17; with following
vowel, ix.12-3, x.19-23; final a elided before, x.14; aḥ changed to,
before a and sonant consonant, ix.7.8;
initial a elided after, xii.1 etc.
or, om, utterance of, xviii.1-7.
Omission (laga), defined, i.57; how in-
imated, l.23; affects single elements
only, l.56; cases of, irregular, v.11-19;
omission of a, before surd followed by
surd, ix.1; before a vowel, ix.9; of
a after e or o, x.1 etc.; nature of this
omission, ix.19.
Organs of articulation, i.3; their mode
of action, i.31-4; and see the several
letters and classes.
p, labial mute, ii.39; a to ṣh or ṣ before, v.8.23 etc.
conversion to śh, v.10, vi.1-13; inserted after s before t, vi.14; insertions of k and t before, v.3-32; s from k before k, kh, p, viii.23-35.

Schools of Vedic study cited by name, p. 427.

Semivowels (y, r, l, v), i.8; their effect on division of syllables, xxi.7: and see the several letters.

śh, lingual spirant, i.9, ii.44; conversion of s to, v.10, vi.1-13; insertions of k and t before, v.32-3; changes following t, th, to t, th, vii.13-1; k to y, xi.16 etc.; s from k before k, kh, p, viii.25-35.

Short vowels, i.31-3.

Sibilants (r, sh, s), see the several letters, and Spirants.

Similar vowels, i.3,4.

Sonant utterance, ii.4; sonant consonants, i.14.

Spirants (r, s, ś, s, ṣ, h), i.9; quality as regards sonancy, i.12-3; require more breath, ii.11; mode of articulation, ii.44-5; k converted into, ix.2-6; insertion after, before mute, xiv.9-11; aspiration of a surd mute before, xii.1-3; effect of, on division of syllables, xxi.9: see also the several letters.

Surd mute, converted to sonant before sonant, viii.3; to nasal before nasal, viii.24.

Surd utterance, i.5,10; surd consonants, i.12.

śvarabhākti, how uttered, ii.19; occurrence, xxi.15-6; belongs to what syllable, xxi.6; various kinds of, p. 392-3.

śvarita, see Circumflex.

Syllabication, xxi.1-14.

Syllables, heavy and light, xii.14-5.

t, dental mute, ii.38; changed to c or j before palatals, v.22,23; to t before t, v.25; s becomes śs before, vi.14; inserted after t, s, before s, sh, v.33; changed to t after sh, vii.13.

ṭ, lingual mute, ii.37; adds t before t, s, sh, v.33; t changed to, after sh, vii.13.

tātraṇayaṇaḥ enclitic circumflex, xxi.7; its tone, xii.12.


Tātātiriya-Prātiṣṭhākhyā, manuscripts of, p. 1-3; various readings in its text, see Additions and Corrections, p. 467; its commentary, see Tribhāṣhyaratna; right to its name, p. 427; relation of the text to it implies to the known Tātātiriya-Saṃhitā, p. 424-8; grammarians quoted by it, p. 430; classification of their quoted doctrines, p. 430-2; presumable alterations in it, p. 432; its character, p. 432-3.

Tātātiriya-Saṃhitā, relation of, to the text assumed in the Prātiṣṭhākhyā, p. 424-7; its divisions, p. 430; names of different parts of, p. 430.

Text, four kinds of, xxi.1-4; various forms of, assumed by the Prātiṣṭhākhyā, p. 428-30.

th, dental mute, ii.38; changed to th after śh, vii.14.

ṭh, lingual mute, ii.37; th changed to, after śh, vii.14.

Tones (gaṇa), the twenty-one, xxi.12, xii.11 etc.; tone of om, xvii.4.

Tribhāṣhyaratna, manuscripts of, p. 1-3; different versions, p. 3; its sources, and meaning of its name, p. 6-7; works quoted in it, p. 455; its relation to and treatment of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā, 433-4; quotation of phrases not found in the Saṃhitā, 424-6.

u, ̄: how formed, ii.24-5; combination with preceding a, ̄, x.5;—combination of u with following vowel, x.15; resulting circumflex, x.16;—u, praṇayaḥ as final, iv.5; result of irregular prolongation, iii.17,14; occurrence of praṇayaḥ circumflex in x.17.

u, particle, combination of, x.16-7; finals combined with, p. 102-4.

udātta, see Acute.

Uncombinable final vowels, x.13,18,24,25.

upādhyāṃya (o), labial spirant, i.9, ii.44-5; its designation, i.18; occurrence, ix.2-4.

Upāṇgas, enumerated, p. 422.

v, semivowel, i.8; how uttered, ii.43; irregular omission of, as initial, v.13; final, dropped, x.19-23; nasal v from m, v.28,30; duplication after, xiv.2; resolution of usual v into ur, p. 64.

Vājasaneyi-Brāhmaṇa, referred to in commentary, p. 317.

carpaṇakrama, see Duplication.

Veda, rewards promised for studying or teaching, p. 420-1; see also Yajurveda, Tātātiriya-Saṃhitā.

Vedāṅgas, enumerated, p. 422.

vīrakrama accent, xix.1,2; its tone, xvii.6.

vīṣavāṃśa (b), not a spirant, p. 14; how uttered, ii.46,48; is surd, i.12; its designation, i.18; authorized in saṃhitā only before pause and kṣh, ix.3; becomes spirant before surd, ix.2; dropped before spirant followed by surd, ix.1; to s or sh, before k, kh, p, viii.23-35; to sh before t, vi.9; omitted in saḥ etc., v.15-7; to r (except before r), viii.
6, 7, 16-7; do. in anomalous cases, v. 10; do. after a, á, viii. 8-15; dropped after á, áä, ix. 9; to y (which is dropped) after a-vowel, before vowel, ix. 10:—
yk to o, ix. 7, 8; do. before r, p. 192-3, 
viii. 18-22.
Vocatives in o, treatment of, as pragráha, 
iv. 6.
Vowels (a, á, ó, i, ī, u, ú, ñ, r, r̥, 
e, ã, ø, ñ), i. 5; the first nine simple, 
i. 2; similar vowels, i. 3, 4; their com-
mon designation, i. 20; quantity of, i. 
31-3, 35-6; are sonant, ii. 8; how pro-
duced, ii. 17-29, 31-2; combinations of 
vowels, and resulting accent, x. 1-18; 
relation of consonant and vowel, p. 72,
375-7: see also the several letters, and 
Nasal vowels.

Weight or quantity of syllables, xxi. 14-5.
y, semivowel, i. 8; how uttered, ii. 40; 
dropped as final, x. 19-23; h converted 
into, after a-vowel, ix. 10; a converted 
into, ix. 20; resolution of usual y into 
y, p. 64-5.

Yajur-Veda, depiction of, p. 421.

yamas, nasal counterparts, xxi. 13; occurrence, xxi. 12; how produced, ii. 49-51; 
belong to what syllable, xxi. 8.

yamas, tones, xxi. 12, xxi. 11 etc.

yā, irregular omission of, v. 19.
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Part of these emendations are due to Prof. Weber, who has called my attention to them in private communications. A few slight misprints, of obvious character, are not noted here.

p. 2, l. 25. The MS. used by Weber was another (No. 504) in the same collection, containing only the text (incomplete) of the Prātīcākhya.

p. 3, l. 1. Dr. Ross's description of these MSS. has not yet appeared. It appears, however, that the rules of the Prātīcākhya are read interspersed in the commentary also, as well as prefixed to it in a body (with separate paging).

p. 3, l. 4. The differences of reading in the Prātīcākhya text itself are more numerous than is here stated. They have been pointed out in the course of the work (either in the notes on the rules, or in the various readings to the comment)—namely, as occurring (with here and there an addition, omitted in its proper place) in i.61, ii.17,51, iv.11,39 (T. W. akne, for 'hne', v.13,20 (G. M. čakāra, for 'ra': a mere blunder), vi.8 (G. M. yajush, for yajā), 12, vii.8 (T., it should be added, has dropped both sanata and sanmata), 13,30, ix.21,22, x.11 (T. W. B. O. anumāśkam, for 'nun;'), 13 (G. M. pā asīpara budhamā yجي a pāsha aminanta ārse, which is perhaps the more acceptable reading, since it gives the uncombinable finals their uncombinable quality in the rule also), 22, xi.16 (G. M. adabhāsa and asdhāthak, with unelided a), 17 (G. M. abhuyā mā 'mohii), 18,19 (G. M. repeat the whole rule, instead of its last two words only), xii.4,9 (T. O. asmin, for 'tas'), xiii.4,13,14 (see farther on), 15, xiv.3,8 (G. M. upasaurga ca pitha: a blunder only), 13,32, xvi.1,5 (G. M. caśiṣṭa anvayā: a blunder), 7,13 (G. M. omit pripa in the rule, as well as its example in the comment; but give the word in the rehearsal at the beginning of the comment), 16,19,22,26, xvii.2,4, xvii.5 (T. scwrut ca pl., xx.9 (G. M. substitute in the text-MS. rule xvii.6, except the word pūrakhavāsadeh), xxii.6,14, xxiii.7 (W. O. also have śakun in the rule, but not in the comment), xxvii.6,14,12,14,20, xxviv.4. The reading adopted for rule xiii.14 is that of T. G. M. (save that T. has śhtha for śhna, and vīrāvā, with vīrāna under the v; and G. M. have rūma in the text-MS., and rāva in the MSS., with comment); W. gives ṛṣṇ śhna śhnta mṛṣṇa rāva (with vīrāna under both v and a); for 0. the collator has noted nothing; B. reads ṛṣṇ śhna mṛṣṇa rāva grāva. Other evident copyists' errors occur, of too little account to be worth notice.

A reading has been adopted contrary to the authority of all the MSS. at ix.1,20 (where the MSS.-reading is śkrāvādṛap.), xii.1,17. The writing of śhṇa for śhṇa was noted under i.48.

p. 9, l. 16. The commentator, as will be seen under xxi.14, interprets out of existence the nādikya as an independent element.

p. 11, l. 7. The structure of ṛ is defined by the commentator under xxi.15.

p. 18, l. 12. The commentator refers to some "different reading" (perhaps in his Čikāśa? there is no trace of it in the Prātīcākhya), beginning pra pardi 'pa sam, but declares it to have to do only with the addition to all these words of ṛ (in the pada-text, namely, which writes e 'ti for a, ape 'ti for apa, and so on) and not to their receiving the name upasarga. I still fail to see any reason for the limitation of the class to half its usual number.

p. 23, l. 13. Dele the hyphen at the end of the line.

p. 33, l. 14. One may conjecture that rule 43 formerly concluded the treatment of accent in this chapter, and applied to all the three kinds of accent; but, rules 44-7, on the circumflex, being later interpolated, the connection made it necessary to understand this also as applying to the circumflex alone.

p. 34, rule 46. The same example (from iii.3.1111) is quoted by the commentator under this rule as under rules 43 and 47.

p. 37, l. 19. Compare under rules xvi.28,29, where this claim is distinctly made. But it is not entirely well founded, for there are cases where combinations of sounds which are padaś are quoted as padaikadeças: thus hān in vii.11, pā in xvi.2, ḥi in xvi.13, etc.
p. 42, ll. 28,32,43, read iv.23 (for iv.25).

p. 46, l. 3. Read (in part of the edition) alteration for nasalization.

p. 82, last line. Restore (in part of the edition) the lost figure 6 before sa, at the beginning of the line.

p. 83, l. 2. The passage is found at iv.1.51.

p. 87, rule 5. For agá in rule and translation, read adyá; and the example, on the next page, is adýavád (p. adya-céd). The St. Petersburg lexicon (in the Appendix) has this word in its proper form, but I unfortunately overlooked it.

p. 88, l. 28, and p. 99, l. 5. No division is made of práfrága in pada-text.

p. 96, l. 28. Read kah (for kák) (in part of the edition).

p. 101, l. 20. I have little or no doubt that the interpretation here suggested is the true one.

p. 103, l. 7 from below. To is not an independent word: see the St. Petersburg lexicon, s. v. tóth.

p. 104, l. 24. So far as the vocatives in o are concerned, the existing pada-text appears to accord with the Prátičákhyá: we have them with iti, as prakáhas, for example, at l.3.81,147; 4.27, and without iti at l.2.132; 4.39. But o, úto, upo, and pr are followed by iti wherever they occur (for to, see the preceding correction), although this is not authorized by the Prátičákhyá.

p. 110, l. 32. The pada-text divides ñyává-práhiává.

p. 121, ll. 23,24. Read (in part of the edition) áinfrágni and áinfrágni.

p. 123, l. 18. Insert the omitted example triti evádati vidhate autar esáh (ii.1, 17).

p. 124, l. 12. Read (in part of the edition) pátam for patam.

p. 132, l. 15. But note the case reported under l.59 (p. 43).

p. 133, l. 13. Read (in part of the edition) nícá (for nicá).

p. 153, l. 27. I have omitted part of the passages in which t occurs before sh, namely vi.6.111-2; vii.2.87. It should have been added, too, that the Sáhítiá furnishes no example of a before sh.

p. 159, l. 23. The citation is from vi.3.34, as under the two preceding rules.

p. 160, l. 24. This is not correct, so far as the existing pada-text is concerned. I was not aware at the time of writing the note that the text treated the avagraha-pause as suspending the continuance of accentual influence (see p. 369, first marginal note). The application of the rule, however, is as stated, compound words having been already provided for by rule 2.

p. 167, l. 14. The peculiarity of accentuation referred to in the preceding correction would allow of these examples being brought under rule 4.

p. 173, l. 20. Read -parāññttyá.

p. 176, rule 11, translation. Read havani.

p. 179, l. 12. The suggestion of punaruká here is not well-founded, the sphere of action of the rules in this and in the thirteenth chapter being different.

p. 183, l. 10. Anvátre paríye is found in Tátt. Áranýaka, at ii.13.2.

p. 193, ll. 9,10. References should have been given for the words anvátrá-bhápyá and anvátranyá: the former is found at ii.1.73 et al., the latter at vii.1.31. Adishávavne occurs only at vi.2.114.

p. 194, l. 14. The reference for rukmá autar is iv.1,104-5 et al.

p. 199, l. 9 from below. The pada-text leaves bháspati undivided, so that the combination does not come within the ken of the treatise at all.

p. 199, l. 13 from below. Read (in part of the edition) bháspati undivided, so that the combination does not come within the ken of the treatise at all.

p. 205, l. 14. The omission of h before a spirant followed by a sonant consonant, here referred to as a doctrine held in schools of the Black Yajus, is practised in the manuscripts of our treatise and its commentary to a degree far beyond what can be regarded as merely accidental. G. M. observe it almost without exception, and it prevails also in the others.

p. 209, rule 7. Doubtless áksáro is to be understood here as an adjective, qualifying visarjányáh understood, 'h completed to ah,' as the comment clearly intends. This also removes the difficulty of anvi-śí treated of on pp. 210-11, so far as the implication of visarjányáh is concerned.

p. 216, l. 2. Read is for does.

p. 218, l. 5. The example paráin etc. occurs first at i.5.21.

p. 222, l. 12. Read (in part of the edition) gue'vimáin (for -máin).

p. 224, l. 4. Read Also for Nor.
I have noted here all the cases in which the sanhitā-text shows dha, ma, or pa before asi; it appears, however, from Weber's edition of the Sanhitā, that a part of them have k in pada-text after the d.

Read (in part of the edition) prape 've (for -pa).

Read a for o.

The combination ārdhev asthāt is in fact read first at iv.2.14, in an ukhya-passage.

There is, however, a case in which a is omitted according to the general rules, when by the letter, though not the spirit, of i.61 it ought to be retained; see under i.61 (p. 47).

I should doubtless have done better to adopt the reading vārjīdaya (for bān), in rule, version, and example.

Achādvikāh is found at vii.1.55.

Read ḫkṣṣy (by ix.3); and this would change the treatment of the group, since a (i.9) is not a spirant.

Read ḫkṣṣ, ḫkṣḥ, ḫkṣṣ (by ix.3); so that jivāmāṭyāḥ occurs only in the four remaining groups.

I can give no reference for varṣāhībhyaḥ, the reading at vii.4.13 being varṣāḥyābhyaḥ svāhā 'varṣāyābhyaḥ'

I was heedless enough here to overlook the fact that a spirant never stands, according to the rules of this chapter, before either an aspirated surd or a nasal, since a first mute (by rule 9, above) is always inserted in such cases between the two. The groups cḥ etc., therefore, would be read according to this rule ccḥ, instead of ḫcḥ. The groups in which a nasal originally follows the spirant will be found catalogued under rule xxi.12 (p. 390). The example tasmud etc., below, is therefore no counter-example, and it is G. M. that are in the wrong in so calling it; it is to be read tasspay, according to Plākshi etc., instead of tasspay (or, with yama, tasspay).

See also under xxi.16.

Read dhakore for -ra.

Prof. Hadley's paper may be found reproduced in full in the Transactions of the American Philological Association (vol. i., 1871, p. 1 ff.).

Read vii.5.152 (for vii.5.142).

"Verbal forms"—that is, of course, all excepting rjishī.

See p. 426. Prof. Roth's MS. also ends with samudraḥ; he calls my attention, further, to the passage in the Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka (i.1.3), samudra eva śyā (i.e. aṣṭaśyā) bandhuh samudro yonih.

For dṝba as synonym of pracayā, see below, under xxiii.17 (p. 412).

For accordant, it may be added, with the practice followed in the Vājasaneyi-Sanhitā, where there is no added figure, and no prolongation of the vowel.

The anusāsā-mark under cu- (the second time) has fallen out.

Read i.2.54 (for i.2.52).

The e sign has broken off in the sanhitā-reading of dyaṃ.

I have considered this point more fully in a paper on the Sanskrit accent in the Transactions of the Am. Philological Association (vol. i., 1871, p. 20 ff.).

Read (in Devanāgarī) kramāvik-, for kramāvek- (altered in the type, by some mishap, after the last correction).

Achādvikāh is found at vii.1.55.

But see, for the commentary, the additional note above to i.15 (or p. 18).

The krama-text is also quoted under ix.24 (p. 224) by O. alone.

Last line but one. Read xvi. for xxvi.
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 16th, 1866.

The Annual meeting was held at the usual place (the American Academy's room, in the Athenæum building, Boston), on Wednesday, May 16th, at 10 o'clock, A.M. In the absence of the President, the chair was taken by Dr. Jenks, the only Vice-President present, but was by him relinquished to Dr. Anderson, who conducted the deliberations of the meeting.

After the reading and acceptance of the minutes of the last meeting, the Committee of Arrangements announced their proposed programme for the present session, which was, on motion, ratified by the Society. After the noon recess, from 1 to 4 o'clock, the Society would reassemble for hearing communications at Prof. Peabody's in Cambridge, and would adjourn at about 8 o'clock, in order to accept an invitation to a social gathering at Mr. L. R. Williston's.

1. Treasurer's Report.

RECEIPTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 17th, 1865</td>
<td>$632.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members' fees: ann. assessments for the current year</td>
<td>$265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do. do. do. for other years</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of the Journal</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total receipts of the year</td>
<td>415.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,045.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing of Journal (vol. viii, Part 2), Proceedings, etc.</td>
<td>$479.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding and sundries</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses of Library and Correspondence,</td>
<td>45.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures of the year</td>
<td>$541.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 16th, 1866</td>
<td>504.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,045.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Librarian's Report.

The accessions to the Library, though not so numerous and valuable as last year, had been important. Besides many continuations of series, 34 new printed works and 3 manuscripts had been received. The names of the donors were read, and the donations briefly described.


The second half of Vol. viii of the Journal was reported as completed, and in process of distribution to the members. The Committee were unable to state when the printing of the next volume would be begun.

The Directors appointed the next meeting of the Society to be held at New Haven, in October, and designated Professors Salisbury and Green and the Corresponding Secretary as a Committee of Arrangements for it.

They recommended for election as Members of the Society the following persons:

as Corporate Members,

Rev. Oliver Crane, of Carbondale, Pa.
Mr. Richard J. Haldeman, of Pittsburgh, Pa.
Mr. Charles W. Zaremba, of St. Joseph, Wisc.

as Corresponding Members,

Mr. Hyde Clarke, of Smyrna.
Prof. Constantine Tischendorf, of Leipzig.

whereupon, ballot being taken, they were declared duly elected.

The Corresponding Secretary presented a list of the Members who had deceased since the last annual meeting:

CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Prof. Charles Beck, of Cambridge.
Rev. David Green, of Westboro, Mass.
Rev. Edward C. Jones, of Philadelphia.
Dr. Joseph E. Worcester, of Cambridge.

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Rev. Henry Ballantine, of Ahmednuggur, India.
Rev. J. Edwards Ford, late of Sidon, Syria.
Rev. C. C. Hoffman, of Cape Palmas, W. Africa.
Rev. Homer B. Morgan, of Antioch, Syria.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

Prof. Friedrich Rückert, of Coburg.
H. M. Pawarendr Ramesr, Second King of Siam.

Of Dr. Beck—one of the oldest surviving members of the Society (he was elected in May, 1843, within a few months of its origination), for many years a Vice-President, and always one of its most active friends—an eloquent eulogy was pronounced by Prof. George M. Lane, of Cambridge, embracing a history of his life, an account of his literary labors, and an estimate of his character as a scholar and as a man.

Dr. S. H. Taylor, of Andover, and Mr. Charles Folsom, of Cambridge, also expressed in a feeling manner their sense of the loss which the Oriental Society, the community of American scholars, and the public at large, had sustained by the death of Dr. Beck.

Mr. Folsom farther set forth the services rendered to learning by the eminent lexicographer Dr. Worcester, and paid a merited tribute of respect to his memory.

Rev. E. Burgess and Dr. C. Pickering, of Boston, spoke in recognition of the labors and virtues of the veteran Indian missionary Rev. H. Ballantine.
Dr. R. Anderson, of the American Board, performed the same office toward his former colleague, Rev. Mr. Green, and the missionaries whose names are included in the list.

The Corresponding Secretary added a few words respecting some of them, and spoke more particularly of the renowned Orientalist and poet, Rückert, describing an interview which he had with him in 1852.

The election of officers being next in order, Mr. Folsom of Cambridge, Dr. Taylor of Andover, and Prof. Packard of New Haven were, in accordance with custom, appointed a Nominating Committee to make up and propose a ticket. To them was referred a communication from Prof. Salisbury, of New Haven, referring to the unwillingness with which he had accepted the office of President, to which he was elected three years before, and positively declining a re-election. The Committee presented the following candidates, who were then duly elected by ballot:


**Vice-Presidents**
Hon. Peter Parker, M.D., of Washington.
Prof. Edward E. Salisbury, of New Haven.

**Corresp. Secretary**—Prof. W. D. Whitney, Ph.D., of New Haven.

**Secr. of Classical Section**—Prof. James Hadley, of New Haven.

**Recording Secretary**—Mr. Ezra Abbot, of Cambridge.

**Treasurer**—Prof. D. C. Gilman, of New Haven.

**Librarian**—Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.
Mr. A. I. Cotheal, of New York.
Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., of Princeton.

**Directors**
Prof. A. P. Peabody, D.D., of Cambridge.
Dr. Charles Pickering, of Boston.

Mr. Folsom accompanied the report with remarks upon the withdrawal of Prof. Salisbury, which he was requested to commit to writing. This being done, those remarks were, on motion, formally adopted by the Society as an expression of its sentiments, and ordered to be entered upon the records of the meeting. They were as follows:

"When the Committee accepted their appointment, it was with the belief that they should find their duty limited to the indication of a successor to our late lamented Vice-President, Dr. Beck; and it is with deep regret that they have yielded to an understood necessity of naming for the office of President some other than the present incumbent. Not that they have hesitated for a moment whom to propose, if there must be a change.

"But the actual President of the Society so early began, and has so long continued, to contribute much of the best labor of his scholarly life to enriching the pages of the "Journal," and, in all its pecuniary exigencies, has taken such liberal care for its publication, that we have rejoiced in the hope of seeing him long at the head of an institution he has done so much to foster and adorn.

"As the Committee are happy to learn that the President's retirement from his present office is not owing to reasons of health, they propose that the Society do not relinquish him from the corps of its officers, feeling assured that in no condition will his personal efforts or other means of influence be withdrawn from that department of learning which he has hitherto so signally served."
The following communications were made:

1. Rev. M. A. Sherring, English missionary at Benares, being introduced to the meeting by Dr. Anderson, gave, by request, an account of Benares, as one of the chief religious and literary centres of India, and of its antiquities, which he had for many years been engaged in exploring.

2. Prof. Geo. E. Day, D.D., of New Haven, made a brief written communication, which was read by the Corresponding Secretary, respecting the Syriac version of the Revelation of St. Paul, of which the translation had been published in the last volume of the Journal. He explained the circumstances connected with the transmission to this country of the manuscript, which had been, at his own suggestion, searched out and transmitted to him by the late Rev. D. Stoddard. He then pointed out that the impression under which the Society had published the translation—namely, that the long-lost Revelation referred to by some of the Church Fathers had been now for the first time recovered—appeared to have been an erroneous one. On visiting Prof. Tischendorf in Leipsic, last summer, he had found him "just then engaged in preparing for the press a Greek text of the same apocryphal book, which he had discovered in Italy in 1843, and which he did not doubt was the original work referred to by Augustine and Sozomen. The volume in which it is contained, entitled "Apocalypse Apocrypha Mosis, Esdra, Pauli, Johannis, item Mariae Dormitio" (Lipsie, 1866, 8vo), has just been received in this country." Dr. Tischendorf, it seems, had given an account of the contents of this Revelation of Paul in the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken" for 1851. He still holds the view he there expressed, that the book was probably composed in the year of the death of the emperor Theodosius (A.D. 395), but now hesitates to fix upon Palestine as the place in which the author lived. On comparing the Greek text, as given in two different manuscripts, with Dr. Perkins's translation of the Syriac text, he pronounces the Greek form undoubtedly the purer and more ancient. Considerable additions, together with transpositions and other changes, have been made in the Syriac version. Occasionally, however, the Syriac text appears to supply some deficiency in the original Greek. The Syriac additions (as translated into English), together with other variations, Dr. Tischendorf has given in notes at the foot of the page. As the matter now stands, we may regard the recovery of this part of the apocryphal literature of the New Testament as more complete than if either the Greek or the Syriac text alone had been published."

3. Specimens of the recently printed Turkish Commentary on the Koran, by Mr. John P. Brown, of Constantinople; read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Brown's letter, accompanying this paper, is dated January 16th, 1866, and reads as follows:

"I send you a translation of the 1st and 112th chapters of the Koran, made from a very interesting work which has recently been printed here, under peculiar circumstances. You are aware that the Sunnee Moslems have always held that it is sinful to print the Koran, and even to attempt to translate it. Many commentaries, nevertheless, exist; some of them, probably, printed, though mostly to be found only in manuscript. It is said here that the Sultan, having become aware that the Christians possess the Bible in each of their own languages, while the
Koran remains in Arabic, and therefore unknown to the masses, ordered that a concise version should be printed in Turkish, under the title of a “Commentary.” It is styled “A Translation (called Mevakkib, ‘Gifts’) of the Commentary called the Mevakkib, ‘Escorts,’ by the Member of the Divan of the Sublime Porte, Ismail Ferrakh Effendi.” The title Mevakkib, ‘Gifts,’ may also denote that it is printed mostly for private distribution; though it is, at the same time, actually for sale. I have a copy for the Oriental Society.

Most of the versions of the Koran are open to criticism, and I have not found one which does justice to the ideas of its author. Translated literally, and restricted to the words of the original, without some necessary license, a version gives but little satisfaction; and to explain the definition by notes is tedious. In making my literal translation of the Turkish definition, I have not examined any existing translation, to see how far the two agree with each other. It would be of interest to translate the whole of this work, as I am sure that it would throw some more light upon the ideas of the able and talented man who, for the purpose of withdrawing his fellow-men from idolatry, imagined so many sublime verses. I have selected the two chapters mentioned, as they are the basis of his particular creed, or belief, respecting the Deity.

The translation of the two brief chapters, and of the commentary upon them, is expected to be given in full in the next volume of the Society’s Journal.

4. On the Origin of the English Possessive Case, by Prof. James Hadley, of New Haven; read by the Recording Secretary.

The paper of Prof. Hadley was a review of an essay on “The English Possessive Augment,” by Serjeant James Manning, of Oxford, Eng., published in the Transactions of the Philological Society (London, 1864). Mr. Manning holds that the Anglo-Saxon genitive was given up in the 13th century, and its place supplied by of with the accusative; but that, for the possessive relation, a special form was then introduced, such as “father his book,” “mother his gown,” “children his plaything,” which gradually passed into “father’s book,” “mother’s gown,” “children’s plaything.” Against the common view, which identifies the s of our possessive with that of the A-S, genitive, he urges that the latter was not applied to feminines and plurals, and that it was used for many relations which are not expressed by our possessive. But Prof. Hadley referred to examples of grammatical forms (as the s of plural nouns in French and Spanish) extended to classes of words that once excluded them, and of forms (as the Latin perfect indicative active in all Romance languages) restricted in the range of meanings that once belonged to them. He examined the constructions of our possessive which Mr. Manning regards as inconsistent with its genitive origin. In “Cesar’s crossing the Rubicon,” we have only the ordinary use of a genitive to denote the subject of an action. In “John and Walter’s house,” the possessive s is added to “John and Walter” taken as a complex whole: compare at in “three-and-twentieth.” The same explanation applies to “King of England’s crown;” compare is in “Church-of-England-ism.” In “a servant of my brother’s,” Lowth regarded “brother’s” as depending on “servants” understood—an explanation which fails for “that wife of my brother’s.” It is better to regard the genitive here as dependent on a general idea of “belongings,” “that which belongs,” the same idea which is evidently understood in “all mine is my brother’s.” Positive arguments for his own view Mr. Manning draws from the popular dialects of modern Germany, and from the usage of Semi-Saxon and early English writers. But while the common German says “des Vaters sein Buch,” he says “der Mutter ihr Kleid;” if our English possessive were of the same nature, we should have, not “mother his gown” (according to Mr. M.’s theory), but “mother her gown.” That the Gothic reflexive seins and the Latin reflexive suasus mean her and their as well as his, proves, at most, only a possibility that his might be so used in place of her: that it was actually and currently used in this way, there is no sufficient reason for believing. In almost every instance where it seems to be used, his refers to a word like wife, maiden, child, which in Anglo-Saxon were neuter, not feminine. Mr. Manning gives great prominence to a comparison between the two manuscripts of Layamon’s Brut, in the first of which, written about 1200 A.D., the genitive expressed by his is rarely, if ever, met with; while in the second, written perhaps sixty years later, such forms are of common occurrence. Even here, in ex-
ining the first 9000 lines of the poem, Prof. Hadley had found, from common 
nouns, about eighty genitives with inflectional s, and only two expressed by his: 
from proper names of place, thirteen with inflectional s, and two expressed by his: 
even from proper names of persons, where the genitives expressed by his are 
numerous, there are nearly as many with inflectional s, and the two forms are freely 
and capriciously interchanged. In the Ormulum, written by a very careful scribe 
at a time not earlier than the second text of Layamon, the form with his is never 
alone used. And although this form is often seen in old English writings, and down 
to the beginning of the last century, yet it appears, on the whole, as an occasional 
—and, seemingly, a merely orthographic—variation of the inflectional genitive—a 
variation suggested by a false, though plausible, etymology, and favored by the 
general confusion of early English orthography.

In connection with this paper, Prof. Whitney referred to another and wholly new 
account of our possessive suffix, given in the “Reader” for Sept. 24, 1864, in the 
form of a critique upon Mr. Manning’s essay, under the signature of Th. G. [Prof. 
Goldstücker]. Its author accepts as satisfactory Mr. Manning’s disproof of the 
relationship between the suffix in question and the ancient genitive-ending, but regards 
the former as a mere connecting link between the name of the possessor and the 
thing possessed, binding them together into a kind of compound. Prof. Whitney 
combats this view, as in a high degree far-fetched and fanciful, and attempted to 
overthrow the arguments by which it was supported. There is no more difficulty, 
he claimed, in supposing the retention of a true synthetic form along with the elabora-
tion of an analytic substitute for it in the case of John’s son and the son of John, 
than in the case of I loved and I did love. The position of the possessive before 
the thing possessed is no more fixed in the case of a noun than in that of a pro-
noun, as his or her, which no one would think of denying to be ancient genitives. 
And the s in such German words as Hilfsstruppen, Liebesgabe, is really a genitive-
ending, or introduced after the analogy of such; precisely as is the s of nachts, 
formed after the analogy of abends, morgens, etc.

5. On the Beginnings of Indo-European Speech, by Prof. W. D. 
Whitney, of New Haven.

This paper was intended to meet the objections of those who are unwilling to 
receive the prevalent belief respecting the character of the germs of the languages 
belonging to our family—namely, that these are radical syllables, indicative of ac-
tion or quality—and who hold that the first words must have been, rather, signs for 
concrete things. The fundamental error with such persons is that they confound the 
primium cognitum and the primium denominatum, which are, in fact, entirely in-
dependent of one another. Without doubt, the synthetic apprehension of concrete 
objects as such preceded the analytic apprehension of their qualities; but no lan-
guage-making was possible until analysis had begun. It is impracticable to make 
a sign directly designating a complex existence; we can get hold of it only by its 
distinctive qualities. All the processes of word-making, throughout the later his-
story of language, are based upon this principle, and the earliest must have been of 
the same character. The writer argued at some length against the doctrine that 
thoughts are impossible without words, and that general ideas are not conceived by 
beings inferior to man; and he endeavored to set forth and illustrate the character-
istic differences between the mental action of man and of the lower animals. It 
was because all language-making is a devising of intelligible signs, to be used in 
communication between man and man, for ideas which have been conceived and for 
which expression is desired, and because an intelligible sign, uttered or acted, can 
only body forth an act or quality, that the first utterances must have directly meant 
the latter, and have been applied by a secondary process to designating the beings 
to which these belonged.

E. Burgess, of South Franklin, Mass.

Mr. Burgess defended at considerable length the originality of the Hindu science. 
His arguments were briefly controverted by Prof. Whitney.

No farther communications being offered, the Society adjourned.
Pursuant to adjournment, the Society assembled on Wednesday, October 24th, at 3 o'clock, p.m., in the Library-room of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale College, at New Haven.

The chair was taken by the President, Pres. Woolsey of Yale College.

The minutes of the preceding meeting were read by the Recording Secretary and approved.

The Committee of Arrangements reported the order proposed by them for the present meeting: that the literary session be adjourned at about 6 o'clock, till 9 o'clock on Thursday morning, and that the Society accept the invitation of the Corresponding Secretary to meet socially at his house on Wednesday evening. The report was accepted, and the order adopted.

The Directors announced that they had designated Wednesday the 15th of May, 1867, as the day on which the next Annual meeting should be held in Boston, and had appointed Prof. Peabody of Cambridge, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, a Committee of Arrangements for that meeting.

They further recommended for election to membership, as Corporate Members:

Rev. William H. Fenn, of Portland, Me.
Mr. Henry M. Pierce, LL.D., of New York.
Rev. Thomas C. Pitkin, D.D., of Buffalo, N.Y.
Dr. Ernst Schmid, of White Plains, N.Y.
Mr. E. Bailey Smith, of Middletown, Conn.
Gen. A. von Steinwehr, of Wallingford, Conn.
Mr. Albert B. Watkins, of Fairfield, N.Y.

and, as Corresponding Member:

Dr. Adolf Bastian, of Bremen.

The correspondence of the past half-year was next presented, and read in part. Among the extracts read were the following:

From Rev. E. B. Cross, dated Toungoo, May 17th, 1866:

"I enclose to you a paper which I have prepared on the Karens and their language. In 1858, I gave the Society, by request, an article on the traditions and religious beliefs of the Karens. A great deal which was then unknown in regard to the different tribes of this remarkable people has since been discovered.

"I have dwelt on the peculiarities of Karen grammar, without entering into extended comparisons with the grammars of other languages. It will be seen that this is plainly a member of the general family of languages of Farther India; and the distinctness of its peculiar features might almost entitle it to claim the place of typical language of the family. The philosophy of its grammar is essentially different from that of the grammars of the West. It may be safely said that, if an intelligent and competent scholar should reduce the Karen grammar to its true system, without taking western grammars for his model, nearly the whole nomenclature of the science would be changed.

"I have by no means exhausted the subject, either of the general characteristics,

or of the number and peculiarities of the dialects of this language. The gospel is
advancing among the Karen people, and revealing new tribes and new varieties of
speech.

"But this people are interesting not solely by reason of the variety of dialect
exhibited by them. Like the Jews of heathen Greece and Asia Minor in the
times of the Apostles, the Karens are the lodging-place for the beginning of the
gospel.".....

From Rev. H. H. Jessup, dated Beirut, Sept. 19th, 1866:

"I take pleasure in sending you, for the Society, the first volume of Mr. Butrus
Bistany's new Arabic lexicon, the Muhit el Muhit. Mr. Bistany is going on with
the publishing of the two remaining volumes as rapidly as possible. The price to
non-subscribers will be four pounds sterling for the three volumes. I think you
will be pleased with it."

From Hyde Clarke, Esq., dated Smyrna, July 7th, 1866:

"What is going on in these districts is chiefly in the way of illustration. For
the Troad, Mr. Frank Calvert has communicated to me a new memoir, with his
latest observations, which I publish in Murray's Handbook for Turkey, with other
observations. The Baron Paul Des Granges, of Athens, a photographer of emi-
nence, has just visited me on his return from the Troad, where he has taken numer-
ous views for the new work of the learned Dr. von Hahn, the Austrian consul at
Syra, who has lately taken up that region. Mr. R. Poppleton Pullane, an archeolo-
gist of reputation, has just arrived here. He is charged with a mission from the
Dilettanti Society to excavate on the site of the temple of Apollo Smyntinus, near
Assos, in the southern Troad.

"It may be mentioned, as a curious confirmation of ancient traditions, that dur-
ing the spring the fields in the neighborhood of Pergamus have been ravaged by
hosts of mice. The Smyntian Apollo was the foe of mice. These vermin have
this year done much harm to Turkey.

"On the Lydo-Assyrian monuments of our district I have already communicated
to you the latest news.

"In the Ephesus district Mr. Svoloda has continued to take numerous photo-
graphs, and has proposed to me the publication of a joint work. I hope he will
next take Magnesia ad Meandrum. He has also executed fourteen views for a
work on Ephesus proposed by Mr. J. T. Wood, an architect employed on excava-
tions by the British Museum.

"M. Ernest Renan, I understand from his communications, will in his next vol-
ume embody his observations made during his investigations at Ephesus. I exami-
ined at his request the church of St. John, and obtained further evidence. My
opinion is that this church and the great mosque are identical.

"I have not found anything in my late explorations of the Ephesus district. I
spent some time fruitlessly on the question of the Roman roads beyond Asizel,
one the main road from Ephesus to Magnesia ad Meandrum, and the other, per-
haps, a road from the Panionium to Magnesia.

"Mr. Wood thinks he has discovered the shrine of St. Luke at Ephesus, but this
opinion rests on no good evidence.

"Mr. Svoloda has photographed Aidin, the ancient Tralles."

From the same, under the same date:

"I send you the Revue Archéologique of Paris, with a memoir by Messrs. Georges
Perrot and Edmond Guillaume on the Pseudo-Seaostris of Ninfi. It gives some of
the most recent opinions of the learned world on the Lydo-Assyrian monuments of
Asia Minor, with many notes of my own, and will put the Society in possession of
the present state of this new and important subject, which involves a modification
in the ancient history of Asia Minor.

"I differ from the learned authors as to the road from Sardis to Smyrna and that
from Ephesus to Phocaea, as referred to by Herodotus, and I think I have informed
the Society of my last year's explorations. It is quite true that the present monu-
ment is off the road from Sardis to Ephesus; but this is only an error of Herodo-
tus, and I doubt if he ever saw the monument. The present is not the first attempt
to represent the pass in which the monument is as the road from Ephesus to Pho-
But I doubt the identification, for the following reasons: The pass in question does not appear to represent a main road. If treated as the road from Ephesus to Phocaea, the traveller would, on reaching the plain of Cassaba or the Ninfi Chai, have a troublesome route to Phocaea, either all the way around by Magnesia ad Sipyllum and the valley of the Hermus, or crossing the difficult pass of Kayakil Dereh (the present road from Cassaba to Smyrna), and so along the Boornabat plain.

There is another well-defined pass leading off the Ephesus road at the foot of the Takhlato mountain by the villages of Takhlato to the village of Achiklar, right into the Boornabat plain. At Takhlato are such large remains as are only to be explained by a well-frequented route. I now conceive that the second Sesostris is to be sought for at the back of the mountain on which is the first.

"I may observe that on the cliffs near Ephesus are some niches as well-defined as those of the Pseudo-Sesostris or Niobe."

From the same, under date of June 18th, 1866:

"The receipt of the Pseudo-Sesostris has been already acknowledged by the Society, and I have since sent the photograph of the Niobe. I now send the photograph of the newly discovered colossal head near Smyrna, found by Mr. Frederick Spiegelthal, and photographed by Mr. A. Svoboda. This monument is on a smaller scale than the others, and does not embrace the whole figure. I consider it, however, as belonging to the same general group, and class it as Lydo-Assyrian. It is about one mile from the Caravan Bridge, and the same distance from the Baths of Diana (Hulka Boonar), on a part of the Boojah range, in the valley of St. Ann or the Meles, opposite Mt. Pagus. It is on the cliff or wall of an amphitheatral opening, partly quarried, and, as I think, partly natural, and which has doubtless been used as some kind of theatre.

"The head is carved on a projecting knob of limestone, and Mr. Svoboda's photograph shows the best side of the figure, but the necklace is not so well defined on that side as on the other. The nose, left eyeball, and mouth are marked and injured by musket-balls, some of them fired by shepherds within the last few years. The large ears we consider to represent horns. The necklace is well cut, and consists of oblong dies strung together. What by others are considered as a human arm and hand I rather look upon as the paw and claws of a beast.

"On each side of the head, down below, are large rock-cut tombs, one of which, to the left, consists of two chambers, and is inhabited by a beggar. The neighboring amphitheatral formations also show signs of tombs.

"We continue our researches, in the hope of finding the other Pseudo-Sesostris described by Herodotus. In this month, Mr. Spiegelthal has made a most interesting discovery, namely, of a reproduction or replica of the well-known Pseudo-Sesostris of Nymphseum, described in my former paper. It is close by on the same brook, but lower down on the margin of the brook, and obscured by brushwood.

"Mr. Spiegelthal affirms that it is colossal, like the other, and has the same details, lance, bow, etc., but that the face is more injured. He has arranged for me to examine it.

"Mr. Georges Perrot has called my attention to a rock-cut monument mentioned by Mr. Hamilton as near Isbarteek (Sparta tès Pisidias), in the interior, and I had despaired of getting any account of it; but fortunately an archaeologist has proceeded there, and I have applied to him."

After the reading of the correspondence, communications were declared in order.

1. On the Niobe of Magnesia ad Sipyllum; and, On the newly discovered Lydo-Assyrian Monument of Smyrna; by Hyde Clarke, Esq., of Smyrna.

These two brief papers were read by the Corresponding Secretary, in connection with the letters of Mr. Clarke on the same and kindred subjects, given in full above, each was accompanied by a photograph of the monument treated of. Mr. Clarke expresses his opinion that the Niobe is altogether an artificial work, against those who hold that it is a natural formation, or such a formation touched up and per-
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ected by artificial labor. Besides the tomb near the other monument now occupied by a beggar, spoken of in the letter, Mr. Clarke says that in the adjoining hollow are evidences of rock-cut tombs blocked up with masonry, which he is hoping to explore.

These papers bear date of May 5th, 1866.


Mr. Syle gave a succinct account of the characteristic features of the Chinese, and of its mode of writing, illustrating his remarks by reference to written documents. He described the process of learning the written language practised in the native schools, and thought that the absorption of time and mental effort in the task of acquiring and handling an instrument so unmanageable and burdensome was one of the main causes of the comparative stagnation of the Chinese mind.

3. Rev. S. H. Calhoun, D.D., of the Syrian Mission (at Abyth), explained the present position of affairs in the neighborhood of his field of labor, and described various journeys which he had made in and about the chain of Lebanon, speaking more particularly of his visits to Baalbee, and of the aspect of the ruins there.

The Society met again at 9 o'clock on Thursday morning, in the same place.

Before the reading of communications was resumed, the Corresponding Secretary brought once more to the notice of the Society the subject of the Bopp Fund, first presented before them a year ago, and read from the last circular of the Committee (dated May 16th, 1866) their proposal as to the disposition to be made of the income of the fund (which now amounts to 8000 thalers): it is to be applied to “the support of a young scholar, of whatever country, who shall have already completed his university studies, in order to the continuance of the same, wherever it may be; as also, to the bestowal of prizes for completed scientific labors, or to the support of scientific undertakings—in all cases, of course, only within the departments cultivated by Prof. Bopp, of Sanskrit philology and comparative grammar, with special reference to the Indo-European family.” The Secretary stated that the American subscriptions to the fund now amount to two hundred dollars, which sum he hoped would be yet farther increased.

The Secretary also read, from the last-received number of the Monatsberichte of the Berlin Academy, an account by Prof. Lepsius of his recent discovery of a bilingual (hieroglyphic and Greek) monument at Tanis in Egypt, longer than the celebrated inscription of the Rosetta stone, and in a perfect state of preservation. He pointed out the exceeding interest and importance of the discovery.

4. On the Chinese Musical Notation, by Rev. Mr. Syle.

Rev. Mr. Syle explained the method in which the Chinese managed to indicate musical tones, their length, and their accent, and in which the combination of the tones with the words intended to be sung to them was made. He further characterized the Chinese gamut and the style of the national music. His explanations were fully illustrated with charts and other documents.

5. On the Cedars of Lebanon, by Rev. Mr. Calhoun.

The speaker described his visits to the celebrated grove of these trees, so well known by the accounts of travellers, and gave a very interesting description of its
situation and aspect, with details respecting the age and mode of growth of the trees. He also spoke of other groves of the same tree upon other parts of the same range.


This paper was stated to be mainly an extract from a general treatise upon language and its study which the writer had now in press. The classification of languages into families, on the ground of proved or probable descent from a common ancestor, was first succinctly sketched, and the evidences on which it reposes were reviewed, being shown to be in part correspondences of material, in part morphological correspondences, or analogies of structure. The less certain and satisfactory character of the latter kind of evidence was alluded to. The morphological classification, depending upon style of structure only, was then set forth—the division of human tongues into monosyllabic and polysyllabic, into isolating, agglutinative, and inflective, and so on. The defects of this mode of classification were pointed out: as its inequality, there being but one genetic family in the isolating class (the Chinese etc.), and two in the inflective (Indo-European and Semitic), while the great mass of languages was agglutinative; the heterogeneity of its classes, there being differences of structure between the two inflective families, as also between certain of the agglutinative families, hardly, if at all, less important than those which separate the great classes; and its indistinctness, certain languages constituting transitional forms between one class and another. Müller's distinction of "family," "nomadic," and "state" languages was criticised. Schleicher's scheme of formal notation for the characteristic features of linguistic structure was explained and illustrated. Classification by general value as means and instrument of expression was also spoken of, the various and diverse items of value which have to be taken into account in making out such a classification were pointed out, and the difficulty of the task indicated. Finally, the superior value and importance of the genetical method was shown; it is the first and directest object at which the comparative philologist aims, it furnishes the necessary foundation of all the others, and with its establishment are directly connected those more general ethnological conclusions which form so conspicuous a part of the interest of linguistic science.

7. Rev. Mr. Syle exhibited a number of Chinese pictures illustrating the national superstitions, especially those connected with the doctrine of transmigration, and accompanied the exhibition with oral explanations.

8. On the Karens and their Language, by Rev. E. B. Cross, Missionary in Farther India; read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Cross's letter accompanying this paper has been given above.

The paper begins with an account of the name "Karen," which Mr. Cross explains as signifying 'first, aboriginal,' and regards as indicating the belief by the Burmans that this was the race of original possessors of the soil. Their language was first reduced to writing, by the missionaries of the American Baptist board, about thirty years ago, in two principal dialects, the Sgau and Pgo (Pwo, Sho), of which the former is looked upon as the especially typical language of the race. The grammatical and lexical works in which they have been already treated are mentioned, and Mr. Cross then proceeds to draw out his own independent statement of the peculiarities of Karen speech, treating first of the spoken alphabet, including the five (or six) tones which, as in the other monosyllabic tongues, are used to help the variation of meaning of the words, then taking up the means of expression of grammatical relations, by the means of affirmatives or adjective words. Into the details of the statement it is impossible here to enter. The clumsiness and segregation of the tribes of Karens, and their necessary consequence, the great variety of dialects, are spoken of, and an enumeration of many of these dialects is given, with indication of their relations and respective importance—it being stated, however, that there are not a few tribes of which the names only are known.
of their race, in two versions, as given by the Sgau Karens and by the eastern Bghais, two extreme members of the race. It represents them to have come from the west, along with their brothers, the Chinese, and to have been left behind by the latter. The Bghai tradition speaks of a metal plate as left by the departing Chinese for their ancestors, and of this plate Mr. Cross remarks: "The book, or brass and gold plate, spoken of in this tradition, is still in existence. It is said by a trustworthy and learned Karen, Rev. Quala, who has seen and examined it, to be a thin lamina of metal, of a very dark color, and smooth and shining; and one end seems to have been cut off, so as to destroy some of the letters. The letters are said by Quala to resemble those of the Hindustani, and to be entirely unlike the Burmese. The same authority states that the Red Karen King, Kaiphogyee, who holds this plate, has also in his possession five ivory plates, in shape and size like the ordinary Burmese palm-leaf strips, or about two feet in length by two and a half inches in width, and covered with the same kind of characters."

After the reading of this communication, the Society adjourned.
The Society met at the usual time and place, and was called to order by the President soon after 10 o'clock.

After the reading of the minutes of the last meeting, it was voted, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee of Arrangements, to adjourn the morning session about 1 o'clock, to re-assemble at 4 o'clock, at Dr. Peabody's, in Cambridge, and to adjourn at 8 o'clock, in order to accept an invitation kindly tendered by Dr. Peabody, to take tea socially with a few friends at his house.

The Treasurer's Report was presented, audited, and accepted. It showed the receipts and expenditures of the year to have been as follows:

**RECEIPTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 16th, 1866</td>
<td>$504.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members' fees: ann. assessments for the current year, $410.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do. do. for other years,</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of the Journal,</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total receipts of the year,</td>
<td>601.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,105.12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Binding books</td>
<td>$21.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses of Library and Correspondence,</td>
<td>34.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures of the year</td>
<td>$55.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 22d, 1867</td>
<td>1,049.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,105.12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Librarian made a brief statement respecting the additions to the library and cabinet during the past year, and said that the full acknowledgments would be printed along with the Proceedings at this meeting (see below).

The Committee of Publication reported that, owing to unfavorable circumstances, nothing had been issued from the press by the Society during the past year; it was hoped that the printing of Vol. ix of the Journal would soon be begun: the Tațțirinya-Prātiçākhya, text, commentary, translation, and notes, was expected to occupy a considerable part of it, as already some time since announced. In view of the intermission of any issue of the Journal since the last annual meeting, the Committee had recommended that no annual assessment be levied upon the members for the year 1867–8, and this recommendation had been considered and approved by the Directors, and was, by their authority, presented to the Society for acceptance.

Hereupon, on motion, the recommendation was accepted by the Society, and the assessment for the year suspended.

The Directors announced that they had appointed the autumn meeting to be held in New Haven, on Wednesday, Oct. 16th, 1867, unless
the Committee of Arrangements—Prof. Salisbury of New Haven, Mr. Coheal of New York, and the Corresponding Secretary—should see reason to fix on some other day in the same month. Also, that they had designated Prof. Hadley of New Haven and Mr. J. H. Trumbull of Hartford, with the Corresponding Secretary, a committee to examine, at the request of Prof. Henry, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, an ethnological essay by Mr. L. H. Morgan of Rochester, on systems of consanguinity, and to report upon its worthiness to be accepted for publication by the Institution.

The following gentlemen, recommended by the Directors, were elected Corporate Members of the Society:

Rev. Edson L. Clark, of Guilford, Conn.
Mr. John Fiske, of Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. Charles M. Mead, of Andover, Mass.

Announcement was made to the meeting, by the Corresponding Secretary, of the Society's loss by death during the past year of three of its members, Rev. Dr. William Jenks of Boston, Rev. Dr. William Goodell, late of the Constantinople mission of the A.B.C.F.M., and Mr. Theodore Dwight of Brooklyn.

Rev. Dr. Anderson, of Boston, gave a sketch of the life and labors of Dr. Jenks. With him, as much as, or more than, with any other person, originated the idea of the American Oriental Society, one of whose Vice-Presidents he had been from its inception in 1842, although long prevented by deafness from taking an active part in its deliberations. He was born in 1778. He held for some years the Professorship of Oriental and English literature in Bowdoin College. His chief literary work was the compilation of the Comprehensive Commentary. He was a man of profound learning and extensive reading, and his private library, thirty years ago, was reputed one of the best in New England.

Dr. Parker, of Washington, also spoke of the services rendered by Dr. Jenks to various departments of learning and philanthropic effort.

Rev. Dr. Clark, of Boston, paid the merited tribute to the worth of the venerable Dr. Goodell, who had finished his missionary labors in the East a year or two since, and returned to pass a brief remnant of life among his friends at home.

Rev. Mr. Syle, of Pelham, N. Y., spoke briefly and with much feeling of the character of Mr. Dwight, his devotion to every good work, and his services as for a long time Secretary of the American Ethnological Society.

Out of the remarks of Dr. Parker grew a discussion of the recent progress of western ideas and institutions in China and Japan, in which, besides himself, Rev. Mr. Syle, and Rev. Dr. Pitkin, of Buffalo, took a part.

Mr. J. S. Ropes, Dr. Clark, and Prof. Hoppin were appointed a committee to nominate officers for the next year. Pres. Woolsey desired to decline a nomination for re-election as President, but was prevailed upon by the general remonstrances of the members present to withdraw his objections. The following ticket was offered by the committee, and elected without dissent:
Communications were next called for.

1. Rev. N. G. Clark, D.D., Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M., read extracts from a letter lately received from Rev. O. P. Allen, Missionary at Kharpūt, relative to certain ruins in Kurdistan, north of Diarbekir. The letter bears date of Nov. 5th, 1866. Mr. Allen says:

Our road to-day leads out of the valley in which Hazro is built, and we come up upon the highlands of the Diarbekir plain. We are now entering the Kooridish speaking region. We stopped awhile at Hashtar, an Armenian village of fifty or sixty houses, where they know only Kooridish. Passing by Bulbul and Atsha and other villages, we reached Farkin early in the afternoon. This was once a large city. It was surrounded by a wall which is still standing, being broken down in only a few places. The foundation is built of round stones, but the upper portion of huge hewn stones. The Armenians of the place all speak Kooridish, and know scarcely anything of Christianity. This will be one of the first places to occupy as an outstation. We went over some of the ruins, having with us Consul Taylor's pamphlet giving an account of his explorations. We first went to the southeastern corger, where is a stately pile of ruins, said to have been built by St. Marutha over the graves of the Christian martyrs slain by the Persian king Shapur. It was once a beautiful building, and seems intended rather as a monument than for a church. The outside walls and some of the pillars and arches are still standing. Other columns two and a half feet in diameter, of porphyry, beautifully polished, had fallen. The capitals of the columns are singular, looking exactly like a basket of wicker work set on the top of a column. These were finely carved from a softer kind of stone. There are many other buildings near this, but so broken down that we could not determine what they were. The ground about the monument church is thickly laid with grave stones. Passing on around the eastern end, the wall is double, and in a good state of preservation. There are many inscriptions, but none of very ancient date, it is said. An extensive ruin at the north-east corner looks like an old palace. Considerable space inside the walls is cultivated. At the western side is a beautiful mosque, which, from an inscription read by Mr. Taylor, seems to have been built in the year 624 of the Hejira or 1213 of our area, by Modhufer ed Deen Ghazi, nephew of Sel-lah ed Deen, or Saladin, as he is usually called. The most interesting ruin was an old Christian church which seemed much older than the mosque. Its walls, 3 feet thick, are made of large blocks of hewn stone. Three sides are standing. The two gable ends show that it had a slanting roof, like the Grecian temples. A portion of the eastern wall is semi-circular, to form a space for the pulpit or altar. This space was frescoed, probably, as the stones are fitted to hold the plaster. Above this is a beautifully carved cornice. The capitals are the real Corinthian, carved in stone. Its interior width is 75 feet, its length 108 feet, its height
to the eaves about 30 feet. But we could not examine the ruins as we would gladly have done, as we had only a couple of hours where one would need to spend weeks to examine all there is to be seen. Another object of interest is a watch tower, about 100 feet high, some distance from the present walls, said to have been built by Saladin's nephew. It overlooks a valley in which an enemy might have approached the city unnoticed, but for this tower. The present ruins appear to have been built since the Christian era, but the mounds and scattered stones outside the city indicate a much earlier date. Some geographers suppose this to be the ancient Caranthiocerta.

Out of the remarks upon this paper grew a discussion respecting the advisability and value of archeological, literary, and scientific investigations made by missionaries in their various fields of labor. Part was taken in the discussion by Dr. Anderson, Dr. Pitkin, Rev. Mr. Syle, Mr. Ropes, and Prof. Whitney. The opinion was unanimously expressed that such investigations, undertaken and carried on as opportunity occurred, in the intervals of missionary work, were of very high importance in their bearing on the culture and freshness and activity of mind of the missionary himself, on his relation to the people and conditions among which his lot was cast, and on the general public—both in the way of direct enlightenment, and by attracting attention, admiration, and sympathy to the missionary cause and its representatives. Reference was made to the immense amount of valuable contributions to knowledge which had been brought before the world by missionaries, to their abundant labors in connection with this Society, as recorded in its Journal, and to the honorable estimation in which American missionaries were held everywhere by reason of these and other similar labors. It was thought that only the narrowest and least enlightened apprehension of the missionary work, could find ground for aught but praise and satisfaction in the literary and scientific activity of the missionaries.


Dr. Van Lennep first rehearses the myth of Niobe, turned to stone upon Mt. Sipylus, as related by Homer and the other classic writers. He then gives a description of the mountain and its surroundings, and goes on to describe a journey which he made near it last autumn, in the course of which he observed and visited the remarkable and ancient work which he regards as Niobe's Image. The situation is about five miles east of Magnesia, upon the highroad which skirts the mountain, and at the first café. There is a pond at the base of the mountain, and directly above it, about four hundred feet up, is an artificially smoothed wall of rock, in which is sunk a double niche, containing the colossal bust upon a pedestal, cut in very high relief—the whole much defaced, but still plainly recognizable. The rock is a hard white marble, with occasional blue veins, and one of these veins "begins at the region of the eyes, covers the lower part of the face, trickles down the neck and breast, and, falling upon the pedestal, there divides into two broad streams, which flow down to the platform beneath, perfectly representing the pouring of a dark-colored flood of tears."

Mr. Van Lennep quotes the passages of Pausanias, Strabo, etc., referring to the Niobe, and argues that their descriptions are applicable to this monument. He also encloses a sketch of the monument and its immediate surroundings, taken from a little distance at its left.

3. On the old Egyptian Chronicle, by Dr. Charles Pickering, of Boston.

Dr. Pickering presented some of the main features of this document, with chronological conclusions of his own founded upon it.

Hon. J. D. Baldwin pointed out that the chronicle in question was by the best authorities, such as Lepsius, regarded as spurious, and that he fully concurred in their opinion.

This was an essay on the Chinese equivalents for our word God which have been used by Christian missionaries. A historical account was first given of the terms adopted by the Catholics, from Ricci's time until the settlement of the disputes in relation to that matter at Rome near the beginning of the 18th century. Then the views of the Protestant missionaries in China were noticed, the decision of the American Bible Society in favor of Shin and against Shang-ti in 1850, the continuance of a part of the missionaries to use Shang-ti in their versions, and the rise in recent years of an opinion on the part of some very able translators in favor of Tien-chu. A comparison was then instituted between these three terms. It was claimed that Tien-chu—the term adopted by early Catholic teachers and authorized at Rome—had no shade of heathenish or pantheistic thought attached to it, and was well understood through China, as the term in use to denote the supreme object of Christian worship. At the same time it was admitted that Tien-chu was not properly a translation of the original words used for God in the Bible. The term Shin was next examined, and it was shown from printed statements of Mssrs. Hartwell and Poet, as well as from the testimony of other missionaries, that it is far too vague to take the place of God in general, although, as most concede, it cannot be wholly dispensed with. Next, Shang-ti was discussed at considerable length, in connection with the disputes of the Jesuit and other Catholic preachers, and with the Chinese religious philosophy. The essay of the honest and able Jesuit, Langobardi, who condemned Shang-ti and strove to show that the Chinese were atheistic (or, as we should say, pantheistic) in their view of the universe, not only in modern times but from the very origin of Chinese speculation, was cited with approbation. The opinions also of modern writers on philosophy, of Schelling, and especially Wuttke in his Geschichte des Heidentums, were made use of to corroborate the position taken by the author of the essay, that Shang-ti, as properly denoting a personified, a conception of naturalism and of pantheism, was an unsafe representative of the scriptural idea of God. On the whole then, Shang-ti being condemned, and Shin as a leading term pronounced too vague and general, Tien-chu had the preference given to it.

Extended remarks were made upon this paper and its subject by Dr. Parker and Rev. Mr. Syle, both of whom agreed with the writer in his definitive rejection of Shang-ti, but thought more favorably than he of Shin, and less favorably of Tien-chu.


In this paper Prof. Whitney defended the current methods and commonly accepted results of comparative philology against the attacks of Prof. Key (in the Transactions of the Philological Society of London, 1862-3) and M. Oppert (in the Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne for 1866). He began with pointing out the nature and grounds of the dependence of general linguistic science upon Indo-European philology, and of the latter upon Sanskrit study, the limits to this dependence, and its liability to misapprehension and exaggeration by insinuous or ill-informed students. The faults of detail which Mr. Key indicates in the work of particular scholars, as Müller and Bopp, do not affect their general philological method, and if his own basis of scholarship had been so extended as to embrace a good knowledge of Sanskrit, he might have been able to criticize their work from a higher point of view, separating its sound from its unsound portions, and duly estimating both. While many of his objections are well taken, others are insufficiently founded, and cannot be maintained. M. Oppert's assault is one of much more serious intent, but much weaker substance and result. He fully accepts the Boppian method, even going so far as to maintain that Bopp has exhausted the whole field of linguistic science, leaving nothing of consequence for others to do after him: but its conclusions he allows to be grammatical only, refusing them any value as historical or etymological data; he strongly condemns also the introduction of any elements of the new historical philology into the methods of classical instruction. His conception of the scope, bearings, and condition of the science is as far as possible out of the way. He is not a general skeptic as to etymological connections, as might be expected from his denial of the accepted sources of information respecting them: on the contrary, he puts forth the most detailed and definite state-
ments about the derivation and composition of the Indo-European races, in general and in particular; but they are mere dicta, resting upon no assignable basis, and in no small part explainable as the conversions of doubtful or half-understood hypotheses of linguists, drawn from linguistic data, into absolute facts. A main, if not the main, object of the essay is to deny that there is any race-connection, any tie of common descent, between the various nations speaking the branches of Indo-European language: the author does not attempt to disprove the connection, but treats it as a palpably unsound and absurd dogma; but his allusions show that he regards the exceptional propagation of the Latin and Arabic as, by their analogy, sufficiently accounting for the extension of Indo-European language over half a world of heterogeneous tribes. The analogy, however, is a wholly insufficient and inapplicable one, as was attempted to be shown by an inquiry into the causes of the spread of Latin and Arabic, and an indication of their absence in the ancient history of Indo-European speech. M. Oppert's essay is, from its beginning to its end, a tissue of misrepresentations, unwarranted assumptions, and unsound inferences, and cannot but seriously damage his reputation as a linguistic and ethnological scholar.


Mr. Burgess, basing himself mainly upon the discussions of the subject in the introduction to the last volume of Dr. Legge's edition of the Chinese Classics, attempted to show the unauthentic character of the accepted Chinese chronology in its earlier period, previous to the time of Confucius.

After the reading of this paper, the Society adjourned, to meet again in New Haven in October next.
ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY AND CABINET.

MAY, 1865—MAY, 1867.

From Prof. G. J. Adler.


From the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.


From the American Antiquarian Society.


From the American Philosophical Society.


From Prof. G. L. Ascoli, of Milan.

Studj Ario-Semitici .... Articolo Secondo.—Studj Irãi, di Graziadio Isaia Ascoli. [Extracts from the Memoirs of the Royal Institute of Lombardy, Vol. x.] Milan: 1865. 4to.

From the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

American Oriental Society:

The Badshah Námah, by 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Lahawrī. Edited by Mawlawis Kabir al-Dīn Ahmad and Abd al-Rahīm, under the superintendence of Major W. N. Lees, LL.D. Fasc. i, ii.

From the Asiatic Society of Paris.

From Rev. J. G. Auer, of West Philadelphia.

From Hon. J. D. Baldwin, of Worcester.

From Dr. A. Bastian, of Bremen.

From the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences.

From Rev. Cephas Bennett, of Rangoon.
Genesis and Exodus in Burmese, with Dr. Judson's last emendations. .... Rangoon: 1864. 8vo.
The Psalms and Proverbs. Translated by Francis Mason. Rangoon: 1865. 12mo.
Pwo Catechism. .... By H. L. vanMeter. Rangoon: 1865. 24mo.

From the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin.
Additions to the Library and Cabinet.

Philologische und Historische Abhandlungen der etc. 1864, 1865. Berlin: 1865-6. 4to.

From Prof. Otto Böhtlingk, of St. Petersburg.


From Professors Böhtlingk and Roth.


From the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.


From the Royal University of Norway, at Christiania.

Nine scientific essays, published as University programmes, etc. Christiania: 1851-1865. 4to.

Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, herausgegeben und in Abhandlungen erläutert von Dr. C. P. Caspari. I. Christiania: 1866. 8vo.

From Mr. Hyde Clarke, of Smyrna.


A Help to Memory in learning Turkish. By Hyde Clarke. Constantinople: 1862. 12mo.

From Prof. Edward B. Cowell, of London.

The Kavya Prakasa, or a Treatise on Sanskrit Rhetoric, by Mammata Bhatta, with Explanatory and Illustrative Notes. By Mahesa Chandra Nyayaratna .... By order of E. B. Cowell .... Calcutta: 1866. 8vo.

From Rev. Oliver Crane, of Carbondale, Pa.


An imperial firman, given by the Sultan Abd-ul-Mejid, of Turkey. One sheet, 22 by 31 inches.

A collection of coins (not yet identified and described).

From Rev. C. H. A. Dall, of Calcutta.

Dictionarium Anamitico-Latinum, primitus inceptum ab .... P. J. Pigneur, .... dein absolutum et edition a J. L. Taberd .... Serampore: 1833. 4to.

Dictionarium Latino-Anamiticum, auctore J. L. Taberd .... Serampore: 1833. 4to.

From Mr. Frank R. Forbes, of Shanghai.


From M. Garcin de Tassy, of Paris.


From the German Oriental Society.


American Oriental Society:


From Prof. D. C. Gilman, of New Haven.
Seven pamphlets on Java, bound in one volume, viz.: A Discourse delivered on the 11th Sept., 1815. By the Honorable Thomas Stamford Raffles. — Essay on the Geography, Mineralogy and Botany of the western portion of Java. Addressed to the same, by Dr. Thos. Horseyield. — Short Account of the Medicinal Plants of Java. — An Inscription from the Kawie or Ancient Javanese Language. — Translated into the modern idiom by Nata Kusuma, rendered into English by Mr. Crawford, and submitted to the Society by the President, Thos. S. Raffles. — Eruption from the Tomboro Mountain in the Island of Sumbawa on the 11th and 12th of April, 1815. — Byna Woordelyk Traslaat van een Javansch Geslacht-Register van de Vorsten van Java. — Uittreksels uit enige Aanteekeningen upens den Javan. — Door F. van Boeckholtz. 1775.

From the Ducal Library at Gotha.

From Prof. S. S. Haldeman, of Columbia, Pa.

From Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, of London.

From Prof. C. A. Holmboe, of Christiania, Norway.

From Mrs. Wooster Hotchkiss, of New Haven.

From Rev. H. H. Jesup, of Beirut.

From M. Nicolas de Khanikoff, of Paris.
Additions to the Library and Cabinet.


From the University of Kiel.

Schriften der Universität zu Kiel. XI. Aus dem Jahre 1864. – XII. Aus dem Jahre 1865. 4to.

From Prof. Adalbert Kuhn, of Berlin.

Beiträge zur Vergleichenden Sprachforschung. iv. 3, 4; v. 1, 2. Berlin: 1866–7. 8vo.

From Prof. Christian Lassen, of Bonn.


The Oriental Picture Gallery.—The Missionary Picture Gallery .... With ex-
planatory remarks, and missionary information. Edited by the Rev. John Lig-
gins. New York: 1866. 4to.

From M. L. Léon de Rosny, of Paris.


From the University of Lund, Sweden.


From the Minister of Public Instruction of France.

Mission de Phénicie, dirigée par M. Ernest Renan. Textes, I; Planches, I–III. Paris. 4to and fol.

From Mr. John Muir, D.C.L., of Edinburgh.

Six essays on Hindu religion, by J. Muir (extracts from the Journal of the Roy. As.
Soc’y), viz.: Progress of the Vedic Religion towards Abstract Conceptions of the Deity,—Yama and the Doctrine of a Future Life according to the Rig-, Yajur-, and Atharva-Vedas.—Contributions to a knowledge of the Vedic Theogony and Mythology, No. II.—Miscellaneous Hymns from the Rig and Atharva Vedas.—On the Relations of the Priests to the other Classes of Indian Society in the Vedic Age.—On the Interpretation of the Veda.

From the Royal Bavarian Academy at Munich.


Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der etc. Vols. i–viii, ix. 1, 2: x. 1, 2. München: 1833–66. 4to.

Abhandlungen der Philosophisch-philologischen Classe der etc. Vols. i–x; xi. I. München: 1855–66. 4to.

Monumenta Secularia. Herausgegeben von der etc. zur Feier ihres Hundertjährige-
gen Bestehens am 25 März 1869. München. 4to.

American Oriental Society:

From the Royal Library at Munich.

From Mr. John Murdoch, of India.
The same, for 1862.

From the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

From Rev. A. T. Pratt, M.D., of Syria.
Grammaire de la Langue Arménienne .... par J.-Ch. Ciribied .... Paris: 1823. 8vo.
A Grammar of the Ottoman Turkish language, in Turkish, by Foad Pasha. Constantinople. 8vo.
A manuscript of the New Testament, in Ancient Armenian; on parchment, 311 leaves, about $\frac{3}{4}$ by $\frac{3}{4}$ inches.

From Babu Râjendralâla Mitra, of Calcutta.
Prâkrt-Bhūgola; etc. A physical geography, in Bengali; by Râjendralâla Mitra. Calcutta: 1861. 12mo.
Vâyakarana-praveça, etc. An Introduction to Bengali grammar, in Bengali, by the same. Calcutta: 1862. 12mo.

From the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

From the Royal Saxon Society of Sciences.
Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Classe der etc. iv. 5—6; v. 1, 2. Leipzig: 1865—6. roy. 8vo.

From the Sanskrit Text Society, of London.

From Her Majesty’s Secretary of State for India.
The Aitareya Brahmanam of the Rig-Veda .... Edited, translated, and explained by Martin Haug .... Bombay: 1863. 2 vols. 12mo.

From the Imperial Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg.
Mémoires de l’Ac. Imp. etc. v. 1; vii. 10; vii—ix; x 1, 2. St. Petersburg: 1862—6. 4to.
Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Iranischen Sprachen. II. Theil, 1 u. 3 Lief. Masanderanische Sprache .... herausgegeben von B. Dorn. St. Petersburg: 1866. 8vo.

From Rev. M. A. Sherring, of Benares.
The Transactions of the Benares Institute, for the Session 1864-5. Benares: 1865. 8vo.
An illustrated work on natural history. do. Urdu Series. No. VI. Mirzapore 1864. 8vo.

From the Smithsonian Institution.
Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge. xiv. Washington: 1865. 4to.


From Prof. C. J. Tornberg, of Lund.

From the Tübingen University Library.

From the U. S. Sanitary Commission.

From the Imperial Royal Geographical Society of Vienna.
Mittheilungen der Kaiserlich-königlichen Geographischen Gesellschaft. vii; viii 1, 2; ix. Vienna; 1863-5. roy. 8vo.

From M. F. Wallmass, of Cairo.
Paleologia Copta di Felice Wallmass del Cairo di Egitto. Pisa: 1865. 8vo.

From Prof. Albrecht Weber, of Berlin.
Indexes, Latin and German, of lectures delivered at the University of Berlin, during the years 1859-66. 4to.

From Dr. M. C. White, of New Haven.

From Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.
Phrasis: a treatise on the history and structure of the different languages of the world .... By J. Wilson. Albany: 1864. 8vo.
From Mr. C. W. Zaremba, of St. Joseph, Mich.

A Calendar for 1833, in the Church Slavic, elegantly illuminated; one sheet, 8½ by 22 inches, folded.
Manuscript copy of a papyrus, inscribed with hieratic characters, in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg; one sheet, 10 by 30 inches.—Also, a description and translation of the same, by Dr. C. W. Zaremba.
The gospels of Matthew and John, in Chinese. 8vo size.
Die Atlantis nach Griechischen und Arabischen Quellen von A. S. von Noroff....
St. Petersburg: 1854. 8vo.

Bemerkungen über die Phönizischen und Punischen Münzen. Erstes Stück .... von Johann Joachim Bellermann. Berlin: 1812. 12mo. (The last two stitched together in one volume.)

From an unknown donor.

A Hebrew Grammar. no title, place, or date. 8vo.

By exchange.

Seven Tamil works, printed on native presses, for native use, viz.: Pansa Perakaranam. On Saiva philosophy.—Agastya's Science of Divination by Birds.—Nannul, a grammar by Tavananti, text and commentary; edited by Vesaka Perumal.—A work in praise of Krishna.—A comedy entitled Aressentera.—Tiruvala ur Puranam: a local Purana.—Nana Vettiyan, by Tiruvalluvar.
Proceedings at New Haven, October 16th and 17th, 1867.

The Society was convened by notification, on the day appointed at the last meeting, and in the same place as last year—namely, the Library-room of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale College. The President took the chair and called the meeting to order at 3 o'clock.

The minutes of the last meeting having been read by the Recording Secretary and accepted, the Committee of Arrangements gave notice that the Treasurer of the Society, Prof. D. C. Gilman, invited the members to come together at his house in the evening, for a social gathering, at which, however, it was arranged that a single paper, that of Rev. Dr. Thompson, should be read. The invitation was accepted, with thanks, and the meeting so ordered.

The Directors announced that the Annual meeting for 1868 would be holden in Boston, on Wednesday, May 20th, and that Mr. Joseph S. Ropes, of Boston, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, had been designated as Committee of Arrangements for it.

The following gentlemen, proposed and recommended by the Directors, were chosen Corporate Members of the Society:

Prof. Edward B. Coe, of New Haven.
" D. Stuart Dodge, of New York.
" E. P. Evans, of Ann Arbor, Mich.
Mr. Michael Heilprin, of New York.
Prof. Ammi B. Hyde, of Meadville, Pa.

The Corresponding Secretary presented the correspondence of the past six months, extracts from which are given below.

Among the numerous letters of excuse from members unable to be present was one from Rev. J. G. Auer, dated from the Mission House of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at West Philadelphia, saying that his time of service in this country was now ended, and he was just leaving for his mission-field in West Africa, where he hoped to arrive about Christmas. He sent with the letter copies of the Grebo prayer-book and the Grebo-English dictionary of Bishop Payne, just published.

Another, of similar tenor, from Rev. G. W. Wood, of New York, was accompanied by an Armenian prayer-book, of which Mr. Wood writes—

"The book is in the Modern Armenian language, and is the revised prayer-book issued by that party in the Armenian church which desires a reform in that church. It is put forth by those who reject the Protestant name; yet, by its omissions and positive teachings, it is a decided approach toward the Protestant faith."
Dr. S. Wells Williams, under date of Pekin, March 12th, 1867, says—

"You will be interested to learn that the Nestorian monument at Si-ngan-fu in Shensi has been recently visited by two foreigners, English missionaries, who found it in a good state of preservation, on the whole; the building in which it formerly stood, or in whose wall it was embedded, was in utter ruin, and the tablet remained upright, exposed to the weather. Mr. Lees and Mr. Williamson were quickly directed to the place, for the people knew the character of the inscription, and had no trouble in getting impressions of the engraving. It is a great and thick slab of black marble, and shows signs of the effects of the weather.

"The region around Si-ngan is now almost destitute of population, its inhabitants having fled to escape the horrible cruelties and exactions of the insurgents and Mohammedans during the last three years, who are still ravaging the country south of the mountains toward Hankau. Another Bible agent, Mr. Wylie, has just reached Peking from a journey across from Hankau through Kailung, and narrowly escaped the hands of these marauding bands.

"I have just received the Society's Proceedings for 1866, which are very interesting. The notice of Mr. C. W. Bradley contains a just tribute to a very energetic and liberal promoter of Oriental studies. It was, however, Mr. Reed, our minister, who induced him to come up to the Pei-ho; I do not remember that Mr. Bradley had much intercourse at that time with Lord Elgin. Mr. Reed, too, sent him with the Treaty to Washington in July 1858, and he returned soon to China. The expedition was not in the winter, at which time ice covers the stream. Mr. Reed was also the means of getting him placed on the Commission of Claims, which were all settled in six weeks; it was the refusal of the government at Washington to pay what all regarded as his just salary for this work as Commissioner that led him to resign.

"My spare time is all employed in the revision of my dictionary, or I would try to send something for the Society."

Dr. J. Muir, of Edinburgh, writes under date of July 10th, 1867—

"I sent you some time ago Prof. Goldstücker's summary in the Examiner of his reply read in the winter to my paper on the interpretation of the Veda. Lately I wrote to Dr. Rost to find out if the article in extenso was yet in type, as I was naturally desirous to read the author's propositions in detail. But I was informed that Prof. Goldstücker was reserving the paper till he should be able to complete it by the addition of his proofs. When, then, if ever, the article is to see the light, must be left for the future to clear up; but I really wish he would let us have it, and show how he is going to demolish all his adversaries.

"Prof. Aufrecht is working steadily at his vocabulary—or concordance, as he calls it—of the Rig-Veda, having already sent his vocabulary of the Atharva-Veda to the press. Max Müller, as you will have become aware, is about to bring out a new translation of the Rig-Veda. He has been in rather weak health, but, I am glad to learn, is better now.

"I have been working all winter at a new edition of the first volume of my Sanskrit Texts, on Caste: it is partly printed, but will not be ready for at least another six months. It is very much enlarged."

Dr. W. F. A. Behrnauer, of Dresden, writes from Leipzig, June 12th, 1867—

"I send you my programme of the Oriental Photolithographic Album, destined to be printed in Leipzig, Paris, and Beyroot; with a proof. Have the kindness to print it in your Journal."

The Corresponding Secretary read the chief parts of the detailed (manuscript) prospectus, as follows:

"This great collection will contain in the first part fourteen Arabic works, in the second part six Persian works, in the third part four Turkish works, and in the fourth part the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions of the Royal Museum of Antiquities of Dresden; namely,

Section II. No. 1. A musical treatise of the poet Jâmi, with the latter's biography, being an account of the relation of the Persian musical system to the Arab, the names of instruments from the dictionary Haft Kulzum, etc. — 2. The grand mystical work, Rebab-Nâmâ, 'Book of the Violin,' by Sultân Walad, son of the great poet Jelâladdîn Rûmi, with biographical account and notes. — 3. A Persian work on astronomy by the astronomer 'Alâeddîn 'Ali Kushji (son of the first Turkish mathematician, Kâşi Zade), named Merkez-i-zâlem, 'Middle of the World'; with commentary. — 4. Molla 'Abdul-'Ali's astronomical treatise on the division of time; with biography of the author. — 5. An arithmetical treatise by the epitomiser of the Persian work Hâlî-i-takwîm. 6. The remainder of Waizî Rashîdaddîn's great work Jâmi' at-Tawârîkh, of which the first volume was published by Quattâmerâ, together with the forty pages on the Chinese kings, with their portraits.

Section III. The four Turkish works composing this section are of a historical and scientific character, with appendices, translations, and biographies. Their special description, as well as that of the Nineveh slabs whose photolithographic representation constitutes the IVth Section, is omitted here.

From Rev. D. D. Green, Missionary of the Presbyterian Board at Hang-chau, China, comes a finely executed impression of a Chinese monument, with accompanying letter (dated May 7th, 1867), and translations:

"Enclosed please find a rubbing from a tablet in one of the monasteries near this city. It is a representation of the Goddess of Mercy, with her hundred hands, ready to do good to all. The inscription above the image is a Buddhist chant, and contains so many foreign words that but few Chinese scholars can read it. Of the inscriptions under the image I send you a version. It is very unsatisfactory, but the best I can do with my present knowledge of the Chinese, in connection with the manifest ignorance of Chinese teachers as to the doctrines of the Buddhists. I send you this as an acknowledgment of the receipt of a copy of the Proceedings of the American Oriental Society for 1865, read about Jan. 1st, 1867."
The commemorative part of the inscription reads as follows:

"In the reign of the emperor Yün-long, in the fiftieth cycle, during the spring, in [the city of] Yü-ling [i.e. Hang-chau], one having a good and believing heart sculptured this image of the Goddess of Mercy, and the sacred chant over it, and erected the tablet in the Dzin-n monastery, which is situated in the plain south [of the lake to the west of Hang-chau], in the hall of the god of longevity, by the favor of the Goddess of Mercy, the god presiding over the great present, and Buddha, whose ages cannot be numbered—to whom belong blessedness of community, in hope of the original unity without the least diversity. For the purpose of celebrating the praises of the pure perfection, these three chants were most carefully prepared. On examination, it is found that these three chants were anciently handed down from their author Wang, of the district city of Kyla-ding. His honorary title was Dzäo-an, and his name was Zwüün-yiao."

Mr. Green adds a note or two:

"The monastery was first built during the Ts'in dynasty, a few years before the beginning of the Song. The buildings have been repeatedly burned down, and again built up, sometimes by imperial patronage, but more often from funds collected by the priests. The place is now in ruins, like most of the temples in this vicinity, destroyed by the Tai-ping rebels. The tablet, however, is still standing.

"The date given in the inscription as that of the erection of the tablet is about A.D. 1795. The author of the verses lived about eight centuries earlier: the exact date could be ascertained, if access was had to the hysén-że of his native place. The chants show that during the Song dynasty (A.D. 960-1280) scholars of no mean pretension were Buddhists."

The following communications were presented at the different sessions of the Meeting:

1. On the Routes and the Chief Articles of Commerce from the East to Europe during the Middle Ages, by Pres't T. D. Woolsey, of New Haven.

President Woolsey spoke of the route which led from India, by the Persian Gulf and the Euphrates, to Babylon, and so to the Mediterranean, and by the Red Sea to Egypt, and so to Alexandria. These were ancient routes, and the trade passing through them was principally in the hands of Constantinople, although Venice at an early day shared in it. Venice dealt even in Christian slaves with the Mohammedans. The Popes long tried to prevent commercial intercourse with these enemies of the faith. From Constantinople the route of trade lay especially up the Danube, by Vienna and Ratisbon, and thus penetrated into the regions of northern Europe.

During the crusades, so long as the avenue by the Persian gulf and the Red Sea were controlled by hostile Mohammedan powers, it became necessary to adopt another more expensive and circuitous route, requiring much land-carryage and several transfers of freight. This route led up the Indus, across the mountains on beasts of burden, thence by the Oxus, and so to the Caspian Sea. This, which was an ancient route, was now adopted by Venice and Genoa. From the Caspian it took especially the direction of the Volga, to a place called Zarizyn, thence across the country to the Don, where, at the river's mouth, in the town of Tana, now Azov, both Venice and Genoa had commercial privileges, and the former had a consul from the end of the 12th century. Afterwards an important entrepôt for Genoa was Theodosia, now Kaffa, in the Crimea.

When, in 1258, the Mongols under Hulagu Khan overthrew the Caliphate of Bagdad, Egypt being still hostile, it became possible to take the path by the Persian gulf and the Tigris to Bagdad, and so through the Mongol dominions to the west. Two subordinate routes—one across the country to Taurin (Tabria) and the Black Sea, the other via Tabris to the north-eastern corner of the Levant—sent the productions of the Orient into Europe. The important marts of the Italians on the Black Sea and the coast of Cilicia were noticed. The trade also of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem was illustrated by reference to a chapter of the "Assises
of the Burgesses' court of the kingdom of Jerusalem," in which the tariff on eastern products is carried out into a multitude of particulars.

After the crusades were over, the Popes having now softened down their prohibitions of commercial intercourse with Musulmans, the Venetians made arrangements with the rulers of Egypt, by which they were enabled to engross the trade with the east along its most convenient path through the Red Sea, and this continued until towards the end of the Middle Ages, when the Portuguese found out a cheaper and better way of communication.

The principal products of the east imported into Europe were then spoken of, especially silk, until its manufacture was introduced into the Byzantine empire under Justinian, and from thence into Sicily and Italy. Of sugar also, and of the sugar refineries on the Tigris, whence the knowledge spread, not only westward with the cultivation of the cane, but eastward to India and China, an account was given, which was based on Ritter's valuable illustration of that subject in his great geographical work.

2. Translation of the Siamese Work entitled Bre-Temiy-Jataka, a life of Buddha in one of his previous existences, by Dr. A. Bastian, of Bremen; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

The Buddhists, Dr. Bastian says, distinguish five hundred and fifty lesser Jatakas, and ten principal ones, treating of the life of Buddha in his various existences anterior to the historical one. The whole, collected together, form the Nīsāt, thirty books of which have been translated out of Pali into Siamese by Bana Dammapiyat. The Temi Jataka is the first of the ten principal ones; the last, which relates the saint's life next preceding his being re-born as Gautama Ckikamuni, in Kapilavastu, being entitled the Vēsantara, or the Mahā-Jāt, 'great Jataka.'

This, like so many other Indian biographies, begins with telling of a king (sovereign of Vārānasi, 'Benares'), who lives long childless, until the merits and prayers of one of his numerous wives move Indra to come to the relief of the royal pair. The god's regard falls upon Bre-Boron-Bodhisat, who, since his previous existence as a king of Benares, had spent 10,000 years in hell in expiation of his misdeeds committed in that capacity, and then had lived long in heaven in reward of his good deeds; and now, his debt and credit being both cancelled, was just ready to be born once more. Indra proposes that he choose for his next life the condition of son to the present king and queen of Benares, and promises that it shall tend to the further perfection of his merits. He assents; and five hundred other inhabitants of heaven, whose time is nearly up, are also despatched below to be born as his contemporaries and playmates. Sixteen wet-nurses are provided for him by the delighted king; the good points which led to their selection are fully detailed. The Brahmans prophesy all manner of good-fortune for him, and give him the name Temiya.

When a month old, he chances to be sitting in his father's lap when the latter pronounces sentence of torture and death on four malefactors. This offense against mercy, which the king will have to expiate hereafter by the torments of hell, startles and alarms him. He reflects on his own past history, and perceives that for such acts during his previous reign he had suffered almost endlessly in hell-fire, and that, if he allows himself to grow up a prince and become again a king, the same or a worse fate awaits him anew. He resolves, therefore, for the purpose of evading the royal dignity, to feign himself lame, deaf and dumb, and stupid; and he rigidly carries out his vows, emaciating his body by abstinence from his natural food. Now commences a series of severe tests, in which his unfortunate five hundred comrades have to share, intended to try whether he cannot be made to act like them, and to exhibit the desires and capacities suited to his age. But the prince, reflecting on the torments of hell, so much greater, bears all the tests unfinchingly, and shows an utter impassiveness. Deprivation of food, temptation by cakes, sweetmeats, fruits, playthings, and other sensual pleasures, alarms of fire, of wild elephants, of arms, of terrible noises, of darkness, distress by flies, by stench, by heat—all are fruitless. When he has thus reached the age of sixteen, his father again consults the Brahmans, who confess that their former prognostications were lies; and now advise that he be
sent away and buried in the cemetery of spectres. But the queen interferes, and, in fulfilment of an old promise made her at the time of the child's birth, extorts a cession of the royal authority to him for the space of seven days, and, during their continuance, lavishes upon her son her entreaties that he will have pity on her, give up the part she is sure he is acting, and show the powers he possesses. This also failing, he is carried out, in accordance with the directions of the Brahmans, to be killed and hidden away. But while the king's charioteer, charged with putting him to death, is digging his grave, he tries and finds himself possessed of superhuman powers, receives consecrated garments from Indra, and preaches the law to his intending murderer till the latter is fully converted, and desires to join him in a hermit's life in the forest. He refuses the proposal, and sends the charioteer back to the palace with the apparel he had worn and the tidings of his condition. The king and queen, the court and army, come out to see him in his hermitage, are also converted by his preaching, and, forsaking the capital, take up a religious life. The same fate befalls five other kings with their armies, as they come in succession with the intent of warring upon Benares.

"There was room enough for all these reclines, and for more to come. The elephants were turned loose in the jungle; the horses returned to their wild condition; the royal chariots decayed and fell in pieces, mouldering in the forest. Gold, silver, precious gems, and jewels were strewn about and covered the ground like sand. And all these Brea-Dabos and Brea-Dabosi, on the extinction of life, ascended to the upper terraces of the Brahma-world, abiding there together. Those beings which were brute animals, if they had shown themselves of a kind and benevolent disposition toward the hermits, were re-born, on their death, in one of the six heavens, where they enjoyed celestial riches, and all became sons and daughters of divinities, in god-like existence."


Of this long and elaborate paper, the following are the leading points: The legend of Isis and Osiris, which was but a spiritualizing of the yearly phenomena of nature in the Nile valley, lay at the foundation of the Egyptian doctrine of the future life. The departed soul is called the son of Osiris, sometimes Osiris himself, and repeats in his own course through Hades the various experiences of that divinity. He is furnished also with statuettes which represent the mummified form of Osiris bursting its wrappings and coming forth to renewed activity. The sources of Egyptian eschatology are limited: Herodotus, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, Empedocles, and others, have given a fragmentary account of the Egyptian belief; but our principal source is the "Book of the Dead."

This Book, which Champollion had already designated the "Funereal Ritual," was published entire by Lepsius in 1842, from the text of a hieroglyphic papyrus at Turin, which dates from the twenty-sixth dynasty, or the seventh century before Christ. The most important chapters of the book are found in papyri of a much older date, and also upon tombs of the eighteenth dynasty and sarcophagi of the eleventh. Indeed, fragments of it can be traced back to the age of the third pyramid.

Fragmentary, repetitious, without logical order, it revolves about two central points—the judgment of the deceased after death, and his passage onward through various transformations, unto the highest felicity in the presence and likeness of "the Chief God."

Dr. Samuel Birch, of the British Museum, has published in volume fifth of Bunsen's "Egypt's Place in Universal History" the first translation of the entire book. This translation is so extremely literal as sometimes to be unintelligible, while the prevailing mysticism of the book throws a degree of obscurity over its doctrines. Translations of the most important chapters have been made by Vicomte de Rouge, Pleyte, Chabas, Reinsch, Brugach, and others. Rouge is now issuing a superb edition of the text, illustrated with vignettes, which sometimes furnish a most effective commentary; and Lepsius has just published the fragments of the Book of the Dead written upon the inner sides of the sarcophagi of the Old Empire in the Berlin Museum, under the title Aeusstes Texte des Todtenbuchs.
The Book teaches that the souls of all men, good and bad alike, continue to exist after death; that they all pass immediately into Hades, a doleful region, full of enemies and terrors, from whose ordeal the righteous cannot escape; here the wicked may be arrested and delivered to some devouring monster, or remanded to earth, for the discipline of animal transmigration, such being the Egyptian idea of metempsychosis. The righteous pass through a form of justification, and then, emerging at the gates of the West, follow the sun-bark in its bright career; they pass through various transformations, each advancing to a higher plane of existence, by the elimination of the mortal and the evil; then follows a solemn judgment-scene, in the Hall of Two Truths, where the heart of the deceased is weighed in the balance against the image of righteousness, and he is compelled to clear himself of each of the forty-two deadly sins, against as many accusers, who dispute his passage. Being acquitted, he enters the Elysian fields, and partakes of the food of the gods; after which he rises by a succession of grand halls and stair-ways to the Empyrean, the luminous presence-chamber of Osiris.

The consummation of blessedness, however, is not absorption into the divinity, for the soul retains throughout its consciousness and personal identity: and moreover, the soul visits the body, which has been so carefully preserved, and this is revivified. The book clearly recognizes moral distinctions as the basis of divine judgment in the Hereafter, and the personal accountability of man to a supreme tribunal beyond the grave. There is not only a purgatory for the wicked, but a hell for the finally incorrigible.

Such, in general, is the theology of this remarkable book. The researches of scholars will eventually bring out its minuter shades of meaning, and perhaps reduce its doctrines to a well-ordered system.

4. A Plan for a Universal History, by Prof. Joseph W. Jenks, of Boston; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

Prof. Jenks states that he has been long engaged upon a work which he proposes to call "History re-read, or an attempt at a simple and instructive philosophy of history," of which he presents the fundamental outline. He claims that man is of necessity the universal type; that humanity in the complex resembles, in nature, progress, and destiny, humanity in the individual; and that, accordingly, the periods of human history correspond with the successive stages in the life of the individual. He hopes to be able to present, in a year or two, a true historic view of the "childhood" of the race, extending from the end of the period of mythology and fable to the time of Abraham, or about 2000 B.C.


This grammar was issued last year from the press of J. A. Barth, in Leipzig. It is as yet unfinished, there being a second volume still to appear, which will be furnished with complete indexes to the whole work. The present volume is of six hundred and fifty-four royal octavo pages. Prof. Day recognized and commended the fidelity and care exhibited by the editor, Dr. Ferdinand Mühlan, a pupil of the deceased author, and characterized the work itself as deserving the attention of Hebrew scholars on account of its scientific treatment of Hebrew grammar, and the large number of methodized facts brought together in it. Dr. Böttcher has aimed to produce an exhaustive work, in which all the phenomena of the language should be subjected to the modern rational treatment. His divisions and subdivisions, although sometimes excessive and tedious, exhibit great thoroughness, and an evident mastery of the subject. After speaking favorably of the historical introduction, Prof. Day criticised the plan of the grammar. This volume is divided into two books, the former of which treats of the phonology, the other of the etymology of the language. The syntax is to follow in the second volume. In developing the sound-relations of the Hebrew, the author makes a constant distinction between what he calls "sonitals" and "spiritals," the latter class embracing the semivowels, as Vav and Vow, and the gutturals, the formers the vowels and most of the consonants. On the ground of this distinction, he
treats all the inflected words, whether nouns, verbs, or even particles, as either sonantal, guttural, or semi-vocal. The treatment of the verb is quite general, while that of the substantive, which occupies two hundred and fifty pages, is unnecessarily long, in consequence of being burdened with an excessive citation of particulars. The paper dwelt upon a number of special points, in which the views of the author were either accepted or criticised, and closed with an appreciative estimate of the work, as in reality a thesaurus of materials for Hebrew grammar, and a valuable contribution to Semitic philology and to comparative philology in general.*


One of the leading philological problems of the present day, Prof. Whitney remarked, is to make a translation of the Veda, the Hindu Bible, both on account of its importance as exhibiting the ground-work of Hindu history, and because it is the most ancient existing Indo-European record, and the one that shows us the most primitive attainable phase of Indo-European life and institutions. By the Veda, we mean especially the Rig-Veda, the earliest and most extensive of the four hymn-collections which constitute the kernel of the sacred literature of India—together with such parts of the other collections as are akin with this in character. It has been handed down to us accompanied with a great body of accessory and explanatory works, of which the latest and fullest is the elaborate commentary of Sūyana, made in southern India, in the fourteenth century; in which is summed up the whole learning of the Hindu pandits, as gathered and transmitted by a long succession of generations. By the aid of this, especially, were made the first researches of European scholars into the Vedic language and antiquities. A question, now, has arisen as to the absolute value and authority of the commentary and its more ancient sources; the one side maintaining that it represents an immemorial tradition, and is to be, in the main, implicitly followed by us; the other, that it is the final product of a long-continued course of learned inquiry, and must be freely and searchingly criticized in every item, before acceptance. A number of important articles bearing on the controversy have been published within no long time, and of these Prof. Whitney's paper was mainly an abstract and review.

The first article is by Prof. Roth, of Tübingen, and is published in Vol. xxi. (for 1861) of the German Oriental Society's Journal. It sets forth the general principles bearing upon the point under discussion, the conditions under which a so-called "traditional" interpretation grows up, and the impossibility that it should ever have the authority claimed for it; and points out that the historical circumstances which should make the case otherwise in India are wholly wanting, and that an examination of the interpretation itself shows it to be of the ordinary character—namely, founded only on a grammatical and etymological basis.

Into such an examination of Sūyana's commentary and its chief predecessor, Yāsaka's Nirukta, the next article reviewed enters in detail. It is by Dr. Muir of Edinburgh, and published in Vol. ii., Part 2 (1861), of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. With unimpeachable fairness, with great industry and learning, with clear statement and logical method, it goes over the whole ground, with great fulness of illustration; reaching the conclusion that "there is no unusual or difficult word or obscure text in the hymns in regard to which the authority of the Indian scholar should be received as final, [or his interpretation accepted] unless it be supported by probability, by the context, or by parallel passages;" and that hence, "no translation of the Rig-Veda which is based exclusively on Sūyana's commentary can possibly be satisfactory."

* At the moment that this abstract of Prof. Day's notice is passing through the press, the first half of the second volume has come to hand. Its first ninety-five pages are occupied with the pronouns and pronominal suffixes, the remaining two hundred and twenty-four pages with the verb. The conclusion of the work is expected to be ready early in 1863.
Of the principles of Vedic interpretation thus established in the abstract by Prof. Roth, and in the concrete by Dr. Muir, a striking exemplification is furnished by Prof. Max Müller, in his article on the "Hymns of the Gāṇapayanas and the Legend of King Assamāti" (published in the same volume with the one last spoken of). He selects a set of four hymns from the concluding book of the Rig-Veda, to which the tradition has attached an explanatory legend: he shows how this legend has grown up by degrees, by misapprehension and distortion of epithets and phrases of the hymns themselves, and that neither it nor the version made in conformity with it (and which he gives in full) really belongs to them; ending by giving a true version, founded upon independent study, and a determination of the relations of the parts of the text to one another.

In these three papers, we have the case of the anti-comment party presented from every point of view and with all desirable fulness.

The first European scholar of note to set forth and defend the contrary view was Prof. H. H. Wilson. He, however, had long passed the prime of his scholarly activity when the Veda began to attract attention in Europe, and, though his influence and patronage were freely given to the new study, and were of great importance to its progress, he was never in sympathy with its votaries, nor ever won a right to be called a Vedic scholar. The arguments by which he defends the commentaries show the prejudice naturally engendered by an Indian education, and sometimes involve gross transfers to the old Vedic time of the conditions of modern Hindu literature.

Since Wilson's death, his mantle has fallen upon Prof. Goldstücker of London, author of the fourth and last paper reviewed. This is entitled "On the Veda of the Hindus and the Veda of the German School," and was read before the Royal Asiatic Society early this year, but is not yet published otherwise than in a full and careful abstract (evidently made by the author himself) in the London "Examiner" for February 2, 1887. The title of the paper is in two respects open to criticism. In the first place, it seems to involve a *petitio principii*—the "Veda of the Hindus" being the object of all parties, and the point in dispute being whether this is to be arrived at by the methods of the modern Hindu schools, or of the modern European. In the second place, the name "German school," upon which the author dwells, and which he claims to borrow from Dr. Muir, is not found in the latter's paper, and is to be avoided, as seeming to appeal to whatever of prejudice may exist in English minds against foreign scholars and methods. At the same time, Dr. Goldstücker endeavors to disprove the existence of any such school, alleging that those who are claimed to belong to it are discordant in their methods and results. He overlooks, however, the fact that it is only with reference to one common doctrine—the non-acceptance as paramount authority of the commentator's interpretation—that they are ranked together as a school at all; and that they all in the fullest manner acknowledge the true interpretation to be attainable only as the final result of more or less discordant individual effort. Indeed, it may with much more truth be claimed that there is but one school of Vedic study in Europe, with Prof. Goldstücker as its opponent; since it is not known that any other Vedic scholar of eminence shares his views. And whether even he is its opponent on principle has been made doubtful by Dr. Muir, who shows that in his Dictionary he not infrequently criticises unfavorably and rejects Sāyana's version. It becomes, then, merely a question of personal capacity between the one side and the other; whether the right to deviate from the native authorities is to be confined to any person or persons, or restricted within the limits which these shall prescribe. Of course, each scholar must exercise his independence under responsibility, and he who, on a foundation of insufficient learning and judgment, attempts to translate the Veda, will render himself liable to be condemned and laughed at; there is doubtless temptation to over-confidence on the one side, as to a comfortable and labor-saving submissiveness on the other; yet all hope of progress is bound up with the former method. Prof. Goldstücker, in justification of the alternative versions so often given by the commentary, proposes to recognize them as originating in and held by different native schools: but, in so doing, he distinctly asserts to the fundamental doctrine of his opponents—that these versions are the products of learned study, not of authoritative tradition. He declares that the determination of the grammatical cognateness of Vedic passages (upon which he
assumes the independent interpretations of the other party to be founded) is a peculiarly difficult problem, which has not yet been broached, much less settled. This claim requires farther explanation to make it intelligible: but, meantime, we are justified in going on to interpret simply by aid of the comparison of parallel passages—about which, certainly, there is no mystery, as it is the method successfully employed in every other language and literature besides the Vedic; not only as between authors of the same age, but through all the periods of every literature.

The principles of the "German school" are the only ones which can ever guide us to a true understanding of the Veda. We have within our reach precisely the same means of research which the Hindu schools had—namely, a knowledge of the classical Sanskrit and of modern Hindu institutions, and if our command of such knowledge is in some respects inferior to theirs, the deficiency is much more than made up by the superiority of our methods of research, and by our possession of a critical and historical spirit which was denied to them.


Prof. Gilman gave an abstract of the results of several works which have appeared within no long time past, treating of this interesting region, especially of the alleged wanderings and observations of an anonymous writer, brought to light by the Russian traveller, M. Veniuikof, and recently printed in the London Geographical Society's Journal—the authenticity of the original document having been called in serious question by English geographers. He exhibited maps of the region, and pointed out how it was being approached from more than one side by geographical exploration and discovery.

Rev. Cyrus Byington, for nearly fifty years a missionary among the Choctaw Indians, being present, gave, by request, some account of the progress of civilization and religion in that community during his presence with them, and described, partly in answer to questions, some of the striking peculiarities of their language.

The Society then adjourned to meet again in Boston, on the 20th of May, 1868.
Proceedings at Boston, May 20th, 1868.

The Annual meeting of the American Oriental Society was held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 20th, at the usual hour and place. The President being absent, the chair was taken by Rev. Dr. R. Anderson, Vice-President. The day was very stormy, and the attendance of members unusually small.

The minutes of the preceding meeting (at New Haven, Oct. 1867) were read by the Recording Secretary and approved. Reports from the retiring officers were then called for.

The Treasurer's report was presented, in his absence, by the Recording Secretary. It showed the income and expenses of the year to have been as follows:

**RECEIPTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 22d, 1867</td>
<td>$1,049.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Assessments</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of the Journal</td>
<td>149.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on deposit in Savings Bank</td>
<td>107.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total receipts of the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,382.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing of Proceedings, etc.</td>
<td>$92.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses of Library and Correspondence</td>
<td>29.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures of the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$122.53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 20th, 1868</td>
<td>1,259.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,382.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accounts, having been audited by a committee of two, appointed for that purpose, were accepted.

The Librarian presented a list of donors during the year to the Society's collections, and gave oral explanations of the character and value of the donations made. To the catalogue of the Library have been added 41 new titles, besides one manuscript title.

In behalf of the Committee of Publication, a report was made by the Corresponding Secretary. There has been no issue of the Journal during the past year, owing mainly to the lack of suitable material. Preparation of the edition of the Ta'ittiriya-Prātiṣākhya and its commentary, the Tribhāshyatratna, which work has been intended and expected to occupy a part of the next volume, has been delayed by unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances. The delay, however, was to turn out greatly for the advantage of the work, since new and very important manuscript material has been
recently secured. Besides a collation of the (imperfect) Oxford MS., obtained through the kind offices of Prof. Müller, a copy and collation of two other manuscripts, recently discovered in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society in London, has been secured. Information of these was sent to Prof. Whitney by Dr. R. Rost, Secretary of the Roy. As. Soc., last autumn; and the copy and collation has been made, with his kind cooperation and aid, by Dr. Julius Eggeling, a German scholar now residing in England, to whose generous and friendly devotion the work will be greatly indebted for its completeness. The manuscripts referred to have been for many years in the possession of the London Society, but, being written in the southern Indian characters (one in Malayalam, the other, on strips of palm leaf, in Grantham), they have until now escaped identification and notice. Their assistance will render it possible to furnish a satisfactory text of the commentary, which it is accordingly proposed to add in full to the treatise and notes. There is no reason to believe that a half-volume will not be ready for delivery to the members by the next annual meeting, and the other half-volume in the course of 1869.

The Board of Directors announced that the autumn meeting would be held in New Haven, October 14th, and that Mr. Coheal of New York, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, would act as a Committee of Arrangements for it.

They also gave notice that they had appointed Prof. Salisbury and Rev. Dr. Clark to aid the Corresponding Secretary in endeavoring to secure a more extended and active participation of American Missionaries in the work of the Society; and had committed the lists of members for revisal to Professors Salisbury, Hadley, and Whitney, with directions to report at the next annual meeting.

Two gentlemen, recommended by the Board for election to membership, were ballotted upon, and duly elected, namely:

as Corporate Member,

Prof. John B. Feuling, Madison, Wisc.

as Corresponding Member,

Rev. Charles H. H. Wright, of Dresden.

The Corresponding Secretary called the attention of the meeting to the unusual loss it had suffered during the past year in the death of four of its Honorary Members—namely, Prof. F. Bopp of Berlin, the Due de Luynes and M. Reinaud of Paris, and Raja Radhâkânta Deva of Calcutta. He gave a brief statement of the claims of each of these gentlemen to the respectful and grateful remembrance of Orientalists, entering into more detail respecting the brilliant achievements of Bopp in the department of comparative philology.

Notice was also taken of the death of Prof. C. C. Jewett of Boston, a Corporate Member, Prof. Peabody of Cambridge giving some account of his life and literary labors.
Messrs. Ropes of Boston, Sanborn of Springfield, and Brigham of Taunton, were appointed a Nominating Committee to propose a board of officers for the next year. They presented the following ticket, (the same with last year's), which was elected without dissent:

Vice- Presidents—
Hon. Peter Parker, M.D., Washington.
Prof. Edward E. Salisbury, New Haven.
Corresp. Secretary—Prof. W. D. Whitney, Ph.D., New Haven.
Secr. of Classical Section—Prof. James Hadley, New Haven.
Recording Secretary—Mr. Ezra Abbot, Cambridge.
Treasurer—Prof. D. C. Gilman, New Haven.
Librarian—Prof. W. D. Whitney, New Haven.
Mr. A. J. Coetheal, New York.
Prof. W. W. Goodwin, Ph.D., Cambridge.
Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., Princeton.
Directors—
Dr. Charles Pickering, Boston.

A few extracts were read from letters received since the last meeting. Among them was the following, from Mr. John P. Brown of Constantinople, dated Jan. 24, 1868:

I see in Trübner's catalogue that my little work on "The Dervishes" is out and for sale, although I have not yet received a copy of it. It have just had printed, also, in London, a small work, called "Ancient and Modern Constantinople," which will soon be for sale. I shall try, and send you a copy of each. During the spring and summer months I have been absent, and have done but little in the literary line. I am collecting materials for a "Life and Times of Ali, the 4th Caliph," which I hope sometime to publish. This will have a religious rather than a historical character—or rather, will partake of both.

Dr. Paspati is employed on a large work on the Gypsies and their Language, with their Tales and Ballads. This will interest you, as the roots of their language are Sanskritic. The secret religion of the Gypsies would be of much interest, and may be found in their tales and ballads, but as yet, no one has taken it up. Dr. Morris of this city has promised to do so, but has not as yet accomplished anything, so far as I am aware.

Only one communication was presented at this meeting, namely On Bell's "Visible Speech," by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

The work in which this new system of phonetic writing is laid before the public is entitled "Visible Speech; the Science of Universal Alphabets; or, Self-interpreting Phonological Letters, for the writing of all Languages in one Alphabet, Illustrated by Tables, Diagrams, and Examples, By Alex. Melville Bell, etc., etc., Inaugural Edition, London, 1867." (4to, pp. 126). It begins with an account of the circumstances attending the origination and development of the system, of the attempt made by its author, to get it taken up and propagated through the community by the British Government; and the failure of this attempt, of the tests through which it had triumphantly passed, and of the testimony given in its favor by practical phonetists like Mr. A. J. Ellis. The system is one which cuts loose from all alphabets in present use, and sets up a new scheme of signs, of
which every element is intended to be directly symbolic of a physical act, so that each letter represents the whole method of production of the sound it stands for, and is, after the symbolism is learned, self-interpreting. Not only articulate sounds, but /all audible utterances of which human organs are capable, are claimed to be representable by it: it aims at, and fairly accomplishes, more than any other system ever invented. Prof. Whitney gave an account of the contents of the work, and an analysis and criticism of its signs for sounds. He showed that, while these are exceedingly ingenious, and in the main sufficiently exact, they nevertheless are, far from being entitled to all the credit claimed for them. Even in the consonantal part of the alphabet, Mr. Bell's analysis of not a few sounds is faulty, and his designation false; for example, in M, N, T, he neither introduces symbols of airstreams, or omits to symbolize other real acts of articulation, or both. With his treatment of the far more difficult matter of vowel utterance much more fault was found: his whole scheme of classification and description of the vowels was rejected, as being a step backward rather than forward, when compared with the labors of his predecessors. On the whole, it was asserted that Mr. Bell has not in a single point sensibly advanced the science of alphabetic, although he has shown superior skill in the art of alphabetic notation. He is disposed also to overrate the value and usefulness of his invention, imagining that it is going to do away with the difficulties of learning to read, of learning to pronounce a foreign language, of analyzing and representing the sounds of unwritten tongues, and the like. Whereas, a scheme of alphabetic symbols is like a scheme of chemical symbols or a nomenclature in any branch of science; a good nomenclature efficiently facilitates the mastery of a science, as a bad one throws obstacles in the way of it; but the nomenclature is of secondary consequence, and to acquire it is not to master the science. It is to phonetists that Mr. Bell's system must be chiefly valuable, and there seems no good reason why the task of spreading the knowledge and use of it should have been assumed by Government.

The construction of the volume presenting the system was criticized as being far too obscure and difficult. By first giving the physical descriptions of sounds complete, and putting off all illustration to another part of the work, the author has doubtless repelled many who might otherwise have learned to understand and favor the new alphabet.

After some discussion of the subject of this communication, the Society adjourned.
Proceedings at New Haven, October 14th and 15th, 1868.

The Society met, as adjourned, at New Haven, in the Library-room of the Sheffield Scientific School, the President in the chair. The minutes of the last meeting having been read, the Committee of Arrangements presented their plan for the conduct of the present session, which was, on motion, adopted. The Society would adjourn at about 6 o'clock, in order to accept an invitation from the President, Dr. Woolsey, to take tea at his house. After tea, it would receive a communication from Dr. Martin, and would assemble again at 9 o'clock on Thursday morning, to hear further communications.

The Directors gave notice that the next Annual meeting would be held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 10th, 1869, and that they had appointed for it the same Committee of Arrangements as last year—namely, Mr. Joseph S. Ropes of Boston, and the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries.

They also recommended the election, as Corporate Members, of the following gentlemen:

Mr. John W. Barrow, of New York.
Prof. Albert S. Bickmore, of Hamilton, N. Y.
Rev. Edward L. Clark, of New Haven.
Mr. Albert F. Heard, of Boston.
Rev. William W. Hicks, of Williamsburg, N. Y.
Hon. Elisha R. Potter, of South Kingston, R. I.

Ballot being had, these gentlemen were declared duly elected.

Prof. Whitney, for the Committee of Publication, stated that still another manuscript of the Tāittiriya Prātiṣākhya and its commentary had been furnished for the benefit of the publication to be made of those works in the Journal. It was a copy, made by Dr. S. Goldschmidt, of a manuscript recently sent to Prof. Weber, at Berlin, by Prof. Bühler of Bombay. The Directors had suitably acknowledged the kindness of Dr. Goldschmidt in making the transcription. The work, it was further mentioned, was already in part prepared for the press, and its printing would be soon commenced.

The correspondence of the past six months was presented, and extracts from it were read, by the Corresponding Secretary.

Babu Rāmachandra Ghosha, under date of Calcutta, Jan. 4, 1868, writes:

"The cultivation of Sanskrit in Europe and America excites a general interest; it has formed a new era in philology, it has opened the dark vistas of antiquity, and contributed to the establishment of great ethnographical facts. It is highly delightful to see a taste for the study of Sanskrit reviving in Bengal. Seven hun-
dred and ninety-five years ago, the Brahmins of Bengal were so ignorant in the higher branches of the Hindu Sûtras, that King Adinâr had to request the Raja of Kâñj to send down five Brahmins well known for their erudition. Schools of an elementary character may have existed at this time, but no institutions of a higher order were then to be found in Bengal. Now, many schools are found in Halîsahar, Bhatpâra, and Nudda, where the higher branches of the Hindu Sûtras are carefully studied. Celebrated schools, especially of the Nyâya philosophy, however, had been established long before in Mithila. This prevalence of the Nyâya Philosophy in Mithila can be accounted for by the fact that Gotama established a school at a place not far distant from that renowned city, and the study was kept up by his pupils for a considerable time. The first regular school of philosophy established in Bengal was that of Bashudeva Sarvobhauama. Of the numerous students of that Pandit, the names of three have become known throughout the land. This constellation of bright names is composed of Raghunandana, Chaitanya, and Raghunâtha Siromani. The first compiled the Sîrâ, whose dictum is now law; the second was the famous Vaishnava reformer; and the third, the genius whose philosophical acumen Bengal, nay India, may well be proud of. Raghunâtha wrote a work exposing the fallacies of the several expositions of the Chitâmâ, a book written by Gangeshopâdasârâya, who had graduated at Mithila. This treatise is a full development of the abstruser parts of the science, as laid down in "Samkhya" by Gotama. Nudda is still regarded as the focus of philosophical learning. A number of geniuses appeared one after another, and the profound works of these mighty minds have shed a glory on India itself. Thus number of the Pandits in Calcutta who have written treatises on different branches of learning in Sanskrit is very small. Here we have a very small number of men who take any interest at all in the labors of an antiquarian. Babû Râjendralâla has already written several papers on different subjects appertaining to the pramâval history of India, but has only reproduced the facts which have long since been brought to light by Lassen and others, in a different garb. Babû Râjendralâla is now engaged in compiling a Prakritâ Dictionary. Prof. Bühler of Punâ College has finished his very learned essay on the Asvinis, and is now busy with an edition of Gobhâla's Grihyâ Sûtra, with Nârâyana's commentary.

"Having lately had occasion to refer to the Ganeśâ Purâna, I found that the author of this has artfully blended Buddhism with the other subjects of his work. The Ganeśâ Purâna comprises two Kândas. Both the Kândas sanction the worship of Ganeśâ. An account of Gritsamada forms a part of this Purâna. Gritsamada was the grand-son of Râja Bhâma of Vidarba."

"My work on the Vedas is now in the press. When it is published, I shall be very happy to send you a copy of it. My essay on the Aryans is out of print."

Rev. A. P. Happer, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa., June 17, 1868:

"I have been quite interested in looking at the Proceedings of the two meetings as published, which you have kindly sent me with your circular. I have been especially interested in reading the summary of the contents of the paper read by Pres. Woolsey, of Yale College, on the word for 'God' in Chinese. That is a subject which has engaged great attention in China. The discussion has all been conducted during the twenty-four years of my residence in China and connection with Chinese missions. The question is not, what word or compound term would be free from difficulties? That question could be easily settled. But the question is connected with the translation of the Sacred Scriptures, and it is very definite and precise. What Chinese word is the best to translate Elohim of the Hebrew and Theos of the Greek Testament? When answering the question, no philologist can say that Thea-clus, which is not a simple word, but a compound term, made by the Jesuit missionaries, and which means 'Heaven's Lord,' can in any way be regarded as a translation of Elohim, or Theos, or God."

"As a title of the true God, it may and it is very properly used; but it is so used very sparingly by Protestants, for this reason. By general usage of the Chinese, Roman Catholicism is designated "The religion of the Lord of Heaven," i.e. Tsea-chu kian, while, by a like general usage of the Chinese themselves, Protestantism is called "The religion of Jesus," Ye-su kian. This usage originated from the Romanists' using that term to designate the true God; while, of course,
Protestants in their preaching have principally spoken of Jesus as the Savior of sinners. Protestants here used Jesus to represent the proper name Jehovah, the true God, as they use Jesus to represent the name of Jesus. It appears very undesirable that Protestant should be confounded by the Chinese with Romanists. This would be the case if they used Tien-chu. This, however, is a subordinate raised. The chief reason is that compound term is not a translation for the words in the original languages. Neither is the term Shang-ti, a translation of the words in the original, this is also a compound term, originally meaning "Ruler above," or "Supreme Ruler" among gods, as Hsuan-ti is the highest ruler among men, and is the name of the Emperor in China. Shang-ti is now also used as the title of an idol—the proper and distinctive name of an idol, as much as Jupiter was.

"While shih may be admitted to be "vague and general," yes, were not Elohim and Theos vague and general words? Are they not applied in the Scriptures to false gods, to many gods, to male and female gods, to gods of the hills and of the valleys, gods of great dignity and of small dignity, to gods of many divinities and goddesses who had qualities which are not divine—in a word, to all that class of beings which, by polytheists were worshipped? And yes, by usage, they are very properly used, without any derogation of his character or dignity, to designate the only living and true God, whose name is above every name. The use of these words, thus applied to the true and the false, to the one only God and to the multitude that are false gods, does not produce any confusion, either in Hebrew, Greek, or English.

"Now shih is such a "general and vague" word. It is applied by the Chinese to all the objects of their idolatrous worship, which are represented by idols of wood and stone and paper, and for the worship of which they erect temples, and to worship which they have shrines in every family residence, store, and workshop. There are shih of the hills and valleys, a shih of fecundity, a shih, a goddess, the hearer of prayer and the most compassionate one who saves from suffering and misery, shih in Heaven, shih on the Earth. The Chinese go to their temples to worship shih. They pray to shih to restore their health. They return thanks to shih for prosperity. There is a shih called the shih of wealth. Now what word in English would translate shih in all these cases? Why, manifestly, "god," "gods," "goddess"—and if that is the word that represents all the various objects of false or idolatrous worship, what should be done when we wish to teach that idolatrous people to worship the true God, but to tell them there is a true shih, whose name is Jehovah, and who is the Maker of the Heavens and the Earth. Is there any vagueness in such a statement? Does it not avail of all the knowledge which they have of God, in general from the light of nature and tradition, and tell them that the Bible teaches there is only one object of proper divine worship—that Jehovah is therefore the only and the true shih, while all those shih which they have hitherto worshipped are false shih, and they must cease to worship them? Will any other word so definitely state to them the only true object of worship, and so distinctly cut them off from all worship of false gods? Can any person preach to a polytheistic people, without having a word which, like Elohim and Theos and "god," will admit of being applied to only one and to many, to the true and the false, to male and female, etc., etc.? I think not. Can Tien-chu be so used? No, there is only one "Heaven's Lord." It is a title, and cannot be used to translate Elohim or Theos. Try it in the passage "The great goddess Diana" (Acts xix. 35). It would read, "Great Heaven's Lord Diana," which is an absurdity; but "great shih Diana" is as idiomatic in Chinese as "great goddess Diana" is in English. When the teaching of the Bible has driven away idolatry, the now "vague" word shih will be as definite, meaning the one true God, as "God" is in English, or Theos is in Greek.

"The arguments that shih is the true, the proper, and the only word to use in translating Elohim and Theos, are, in my opinion, unanswerable. At the same time, I think the best titles as Tien-chu, Shang-ti, Maker of Heaven, etc., etc., may be properly and wisely applied to Jehovah, to assist in conveying to the Chinese mind the character and power of Jehovah, the one true shih.

"Excuse me for writing so much; I had no such purpose when I commenced."
Upon the subject of this letter, Dr. Martin, of Peking, at the invitation of the President, remarked somewhat as follows:

"The common objection that Tien-cho was coined by Europeans, and therefore no Chinese word, is founded on an error. That term is found in the works of Sun-Mu-tien, the great historian of the Han dynasty, B.C. 122. It is there applied to one of eight divinities, who is called Tien-cho, the Lord of Heaven. In distinction from Ti-cho, the Lord of Earth, Hai-cho, the Lord of the Sea, etc. The composition of the term is therefore not original with the Roman Catholic missionaries. Nor was its application to the supreme and only God altogether so.

"On a mountain in the vicinity of Peking, a stone gateway, bearing the inscription Tien-cho-kung. 'Palace of the Lord of Heaven,' marks the site of a ruined temple. This might have been taken for the ruins of a Christian church, but for a more extended inscription on an adjacent pillar, which describes the temple as erected in honor of Shang-ti, the Jupiter of the Chinese Pantheon, who is there represented as the God of Nature. The term, in its later as well as its earlier sense, had become obsolete; and to the Roman Catholic missionaries belongs the credit of reviving it in its later and purer signification.

"In the recent movement towards the adoption of Tien-cho, those Protestant missionaries who favored it were influenced by four considerations: 1st. a desire to escape the difficulties besetting the use of the rival terms Shih and Shang-ti; 2d. to find a common ground on which all Christians, Catholic and Protestant, might unite; 3d. to profit by the experience of their Roman Catholic predecessors; 4th. to avail themselves of the advantage derived from the popularity which has been given to Tien-cho by the Roman Catholics, and to Chiu by the Mohammedans.

"Dr. Happer was wrong in supposing that Tien-cho was to be taken promiscuously for God, god, and gods. It was only used in a special signification, shih being retained for idol gods, and divinity in general. Nor does this use of shih preclude its use in the formula Shang-shih, for 'Holy Ghost.' shih in the one case not departing more widely from its popular sense, than ghost does in the other."

Dr. John Muir, Edinburgh, July 17, 1868:

"In preparing the new edition of the third volume of my 'Sanskrit Texts,' I have had my attention drawn again to the Vedânta-Sûtras, and to 'Sankara's' account of the use made by the rival schools of Indian philosophy of the Vedic texts, to support their own views-interpreting them as variously as Christian divines do the Bible. I have had the desire, experienced before, renewed in me of seeing a complete English version of Sankara produced; as I think that these Indian speculations, even if they should be found to contribute little or nothing to the true theory of Being and the relation of the Finite and the Infinite (which I should be slow to affirm), are at least deserving of notice, more notice than they have yet received. In the history of human thought, I have recently written to K. M. Banerjea, to see if he can be induced to translate Sankara. I also wrote not long ago to my brother (the author of the Life of Mahomet), who has lately been appointed lieutenant-governor of the North-West Provinces of India, and has the Benares College under his control, to ask if he could get any one to complete the late Dr. Ballantyne's translations of the Sûtras, of which only the Sánkhya and most of the Nyâya were finished...."

Rev. William Tracy, Norwich, Conn., Sept. 3, 1868:

"Just before leaving India last year, I procured a number of small copper coins, most of them apparently of considerable antiquity. There were also among them two small ancient gold coins, and a few silver ones, the latter mostly recent.

"These coins, of which I send you specimens, are dug up from the ruins of ancient towns and villages in the South of India, and their devices indicate the different dynasties under which they were coined; and in some cases, also, the religion dominant at the time. Some appear to be Buddhistic, some Brahmanic, of the Vaishnava sect, and others of the Saiva sect. A few are Mohammedan. I
regret that I am unable to give a more definite description of these coins, but
since obtaining them I have had neither time nor facilities for making a satisfac-
tory examination of them. If you think they are of enough interest to warrant
their being placed in the Cabinet of the Society, please make such a disposal of
them.

I take the liberty, also, of sending a few specimens of pottery, from what I
suppose to be ancient Buddhist sepulchres, such as are found in various parts
of India. Some of the best specimens I have procured were entirely destroyed
by the carelessness of the native coolies in India. Those which I send have been
restored as far as possible; in one instance only a few fragments remain to show
the original form of the vessels.

The only metallic remains found in these sepulchres in Southern India, so far
as I know, are in the form of daggers, or sacrificial knives. The oxidized frag-
ments of an instrument of this kind, apparently a dagger, accompany the vessels
sent. Similar remains are found in all parts of Southern India, and closely re-
semble those found in the Buddhist Tombs of the Punjab.

These ancient burial places, as found in Southern India, are of two kinds. The
first is simply a large funerary urn, of coarse pottery, from three to four feet in
height, pointed at the bottom, and covered with a closely fitting top, within which
are deposited various earthen utensils, such as those I send you. These contain
small fragments of bones and ashes; and, in one instance, I have found in them
the husks of rice, in a good state of preservation. A large slab of stone, five or
six feet square, is sometimes placed above the urn, one or two feet below the
ground, and the place of burial is indicated by a large circle of stones on the sur-
facing. The places of burial were usually selected in a hard and dry gravelly soil.

The second class of these ancient sepulchres is less common than the first.
They are formed of slabs of stone, enclosing a small chamber, and covered by an-
other slab, generally on a level with the surface of the ground. Quite a large
collection of these is found about twenty-five miles from Madura, and a few rods to
the east of the Trichinopoly road. Some of these are covered with heaps of stones,
but most are surrounded with a circle of stones similar to those mentioned above.
Some, I found on visiting them, had been opened, probably by some one in search
of treasure. One or two, of better workmanship than the rest, were uncircled by
a carefully built and well-preserved platform of stone. The sides were formed
of slabs from six to eight feet square, and three or four inches thick; and a simi-
lar slab divided the room into two equal compartments. Three or four feet from
the top, a shelf of stone, twenty inches wide and three inches thick, ran across
the whole length of the tomb. Near the bottom of each compartment, a hole, fif-
ten to eighteen inches in diameter, was cut through the stone, forming a passage
into the tomb, which was closed by a flat stone placed against it on the outside.
Through this passage, probably, the remains of the dead were conveyed to their
final resting place.

One or two of the tombs were almost entirely above ground, and, having one
of the sides partially broken out, were used as an occasional place of rest and
shelter by the shepherds of the neighborhood.

From the form of these tombs, I should judge that the bodies were deposited
in them without having been burned. No signs of funeral utensils were seen,
and my limited time would not allow me to make any fresh excavations.

Tombs of this description are found in several places in the Madura district—in
the mountains as well as in the plains, and also in the districts north of Madras.
The present inhabitants have no knowledge of the people who constructed them.
One tradition regards them as a race of men who never died, and who were
placed in these tombs with a little rice and water in cups, for their sustenance.
Another tradition is, that in ancient times there lived here a race who were the
enemies of the gods, and whose great wickedness led the latter to determine
upon their destruction. They first attempted to accomplish this by a shower of
fire, but the people constructed these stone dwellings, and thus protected them-
selves from the fiery storm. Afterwards, the gods poured out a flood of mud and
water, which filled their dwellings and destroyed the wicked race.
This tradition possibly refers to the destruction of the Buddhists, who were always regarded as the enemies of the Brahmanical deities, and who, if other local traditions are true, were persecuted, and finally exterminated, by the Brahmins and their adherents, a few scattered remnants alone having continued in existence till the eleventh or twelfth century.

Reoretting that the remains I send are so scanty, and my information respecting them so meager, I remain, etc.

Annexed to Mr. Tracy's letter is a list of the coins sent, numbering about one hundred and fifty, among them a dozen silver coins and two gold ones. The coins and the remains from the tombs were laid upon the table, for the inspection of the members present.

Mr. Hyde Clarke, London, Sept. 13, 1868:

After giving a statement of the various ethnographical inquiries which he is engaged in pursuing, Mr. Clarke concludes:

Next season I lay the foundations of a new subject by a course of lectures at the London institutions on Comparative History, or the phenomena common to the history of many nations.

After the reading of the correspondence, communications were called for.


After tracing briefly the connection between alchemy and chemistry, the paper proceeded to its main object: viz., to demonstrate that the origin of European alchemy was to be sought in China.

In support of this view the following considerations were adduced, and illustrated by citations from Chinese and other works.

1. The study of alchemy had been in full vigor in China for at least six centuries, before it made its appearance in Europe. It did not appear in Europe until the fourth century, when intercourse with the Far East had become somewhat frequent. It appeared first at Byzantium and Alexandria, where the commerce of the East chiefly centered, and was subsequently revived in Europe by the Saracens, whose most famous school of alchemy, was at Bagdad, where intercourse with Eastern Asia was frequent.

2. The objects of pursuit in both schools were identical, and in either case two-fold—immortality and gold. In Europe the former was the less prominent, because the people, being in possession of Christianity, had a firm faith in a future life, to satisfy their longings on that head.

3. In either school there were two elixirs, the greater and the less, and the properties ascribed to them closely correspond.

4. The principles underlying both systems are identical—the composite nature of the metals, and their vegetation from a seminal germ. Indeed, the characters *trig* for the germ, and *fas* for the matrix, which constantly occur in the writings of Chinese alchemists, might be taken for the translation of terms in the vocabulary of the Western school, if their higher antiquity did not forbid the hypothesis.

5. The ends in view being the same, the means by which they were pursued were nearly identical—mercury and lead, being as conspicuous in the laboratories of the East, as mercury and sulphur were in those of the West. It is of less significance to add that many other substances were common to both schools, than to note the remarkable coincidence that, in Chinese as in European alchemy, the names of the two principal reagents are used in a mystical sense.

6. Both schools, or at least individuals in both schools, held the doctrine of a cycle of changes, in the course of which the precious metals revert to their baser elements.

7. Both are closely interwoven with astrology.

8. Both led to the practice of magical arts, and unbounded charlatanism.
9. Both deal in language of equal extravagance, and the style of European alchemists, so unlike the sobriety of thought characteristic of the Western mind, would, if considered alone, give us no very uncertain indication of its origin in the fervid fancy of the Orient.


Mr. Leonard gave a brief description of Amasia in northern Asia Minor, where he has resided for several years as a missionary. It was the birth-place of the geographer Strabo, and at an earlier period had been the royal residence of the princes of Pontus. He spoke of the remains of ancient constructions found in and about it. Greek inscriptions were occasionally met with; several of them were given by Hamilton in his "Researches in Asia Minor." Mr. Leonard himself had copied seven or eight others, which he presented to the Society. Three were from a place called Vezir-Koopen, in the plain of Amasia; one was from Ak-Tepe, and two from Aydan-Koopen villages (each of them) about three miles distant from Vezir-Koopen. He entered into some details as to the places where the inscriptions were found, the size and shape of the stones, the size of the letters, etc.

Professor Hadley, after stating that he had had only a few minutes to look at the inscriptions, proceeded to make some remarks on their appearance. They seemed to be wholly of a sepulchral character. They were all more or less imperfect, having suffered losses, either by the breaking of the stone, or by degradation of its surface, making many letters illegible. One or two inscriptions could hardly be made to yield any continuous sense. The most legible was that inscribed on the face of the rock at the entrance of a tomb in Amasia. It was also the most interesting in its contents, being in verse, and consisting of four elegiac distichs, which, however, were obviously rude and faulty in their metrical structure. Some further account of these inscriptions will probably be given in the Journal of the Society.

3. On Onomatopoeia in the Algonkin Languages, by Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of Hartford, Conn.

In Dr. Wilson's "Prehistoric Man" (2d edition, p. 56) is given a list of twenty-six names of animals which he regards as of onomatopoeic origin, and as illustrating the fact that "primitives originating directly from the observation of natural sounds are not uncommon among the native root-words of the New World." This list has been used by Mr. Farrar (Chapters on Language, pp. 24-5) in support of his averment that, in savage vocabularies, "almost every name for an animal is a striking and obvious onomatopoeia." Hence the inquiry raised in this paper as to the actual derivation of the names in question.

Mr. Trumbull premised by saying that, considering our imperfect comprehension of the Algonkin dialects, we could not be expected to refute every assumed and doubtful onomatopoeia by a true etymology. Of a part of the words in the list, it can only be said that their origin is not prima facie mimetic. Respecting others, the fact can be proved. Thus koo-kooosh, "sow," is demonstrably derived, by an adaptation of the name for "porcupine," from a root signifying "sharp," and it designates "a bad bristly or prickly animal." As to pe-zeh, "wild cat," forms of which are widely distributed, and used to denote various of the feline animals, there is a bare possibility that it may be imitative, but no more. These are the only names of quadrupeds in the list. Of the nineteen names of birds, four or five are presumably mimetic (including those of the owl and crow), six or seven possibly so, and the rest obviously derivative and significant. Shi-shesh, "duck," like duck itself, comes from a root signifying "dive." Paun-pan-say, "the common spotted woodpecker," means "a spotted bird." Meosh-kah-ooz, "bittern," denotes a frequenter of marshes. No-no-soo-cas-ee, "humming-bird—a strange enough onomatopoeia!—means "the exceedingly delicate creature." Of the asserted mi-
metric names for "frog," one signifies "dive," and the other, as it belongs also to the loach, is not likely to be truly imitative. And so on. If only one fourth of a list carefully gleaned from three dialects can be fairly set down as onomatopoeic, how much less is likely to be the proportion of such names to the whole vocabulary of any one tribe?

Mr. Trumball affirmed that most Ateptic names of animals are descriptive derivatives, and that the few apparent exceptions, belong to species which are more often heard than seen, while it is doubtful if any name of a quadruped is purely mimetic. To illustrate this, he gave a brief list of names, with their derivations. He further drew attention to certain curious features of Indian nomenclature, especially to the combination of a general characteristic with specific names; as, for example, certain swimming animals have a common suffix of derivation coming from a root that means, "out the head above water" others, one that means "bite," others, "scratch," or "tear," of plants, some are thus marked as to be eaten green, as nut-bearing, as having edible roots, and so on. Such a suffix, in the Chippewy and allied tongues, is *sun*, the formative of the instrument used, the occurrence of which at the end of the name for "shooting-instrument" has misled Mr. Farquhar in affirming (p. 34) that "in some cases the onomatopoeic instinct is so strong that it asserts itself side by side with the adoption of a name," from a foreign language.

At the evening gathering at Pres. Woolsey's, the Society was called to order, after ten, at about 8 o'clock, and listened to a lecture by Dr. Martin, on the present and prospective relations of China to the Western world. Some of the topics which he treated of and illustrated, may be briefly stated as follows:

It was a mistake to suppose that the Chinese mind is utterly immobile and incapable of change.

China, too, passed through no fewer than twenty-two, dynastic revolutions. Most of these, had, indeed, originated in a better motive than the lust of power, and had left the wheels of the government to run on in their old rut. But some of them had involved high political principles; as, for instance, that which led to the overthrow of the feudal system, and the establishment of a centralized government, B. C. 240.

The whole mass of the population had more than once been profoundly agitated by what may be called a religious movement; especially when the three prevailing systems rose from small beginnings, and succeeded, made their way to the throne of the empire and a place in the heart of the nation.

Periods of intellectual awakening had also occurred, distinct from these great systems of morals and religion; such, for example, as that which followed the restoration of the ancient classics, after their destruction by the tyrant of Ts'in; such as that occasioned by the invention of paper in the dynasty of Han; the discovery of the art of printing in the dynasty of Tang, and the rise of speculative philosophy in that of Sung.

The movement now in progress involved all three of these elements—politics, letters, and religion.

The political change was exhibited in the foreign relations of China, not in her domestic administration, and the Embassy that had recently arrived in the West was its proper exponent. The liberal policy they had adopted, the Chinese learned in the school of adversity. War, the great civilizer, had been their teacher. The unequal conflict they had waged with the nations of the West had taught them that knowledge is power, and set them on the career of improvement on which they have now entered.

At two places might be seen bodies of troops training in foreign tactics. At four places they had established arsenals, for the manufacture of foreign arms; and at two places they had commenced navy yards, for the building of war vessels.

They were not, however, limiting themselves to learning the art of war. In three of the provinces, schools had been opened, under the auspices of the pro-
vicial viceroy, for instruction in the languages and sciences of the West; and at the capital, a College had been established, under the patronage of the Emperor, which it was intended to expand into the proportions of a University.

The concluding session of the Society was held in the Sheffield Library at 9 o'clock on Thursday morning.

Prof. Salisbury first gave the meeting an account of a volume of Arabic manuscript written by a slave at the south, which had a few months ago been placed in his hands for examination.

Rev. Hyman A. Wilder, missionary to the Zulus in South Africa, presented, in an off-hand way, some interesting details respecting the language, character, and manners and customs of that people.

Dr. Martin exhibited a roll of the law from the Jewish congregations at Kai-fung-fu in China. It was written on kid skins, neatly sewed together, and measured over one hundred feet in length, by two feet in breadth. He proposed at a future time to say something with regard to its character. The circumstance was mentioned that a much older roll from the same locality had been recently presented to the library of the American Bible Society in New York, by Dr. S. Wells Williams.

The following additional communications were presented:


Mr. Edkins complains that comparative philologists have paid less attention to the Chinese than its merits deserve, while those who have treated it have taken generally without question the modern forms of the Mandarin dialect, disregarding the secular changes which the language has undergone. These are to be traced out by the aid of the phonetic elements in the written characters, as interpreted especially by the dialects of the southeastern part of the country. The phonetic re-spelling used in Chinese native dictionaries of 1200 years ago shows the initials and finals in a very different condition from the present, and gives at least 700 separate words, instead of the 532 now in use. The odes of the Shi King, in part from before 1100 B.C., are written in rhyme, which renders possible the restoration in many cases of the pronunciation then usual. The beginnings of Chinese writing were explained by Mr. Edkins, in order to show how the phonetic elements were used to determine earlier pronunciation, and many examples were given in illustration. The application of evidence from the existing dialects was in like manner illustrated. A summary of general results teaches us that the early vocabulary of the language may have contained from twelve to sixteen hundred words, with few or none of the distinctions of tone now prevalent, which have gradually grown up to supplement the deficient resources of expression, the p'ing and ju appearing first, then, after B.C. 1000, the shang, and about the time of Christ the t'ou and the modern Mandarin, with a fifth tone, since A.D. 700.

Through the whole paper, abundant comparisons are made between words of the Chinese language and words of similar sound in the Mongol and Manchu, and also in various western tongues, including the English.

Prof. Whitney remarked, in criticism of this paper, that, while its attempts at restoration of an earlier phase of the Chinese were highly important and interesting, and the successful prosecution of such researches would bring that language under the consideration of comparative philologists in quite a different way from hitherto, the same value could not be attributed to the author's comparisons of
words. Mr. Edkins estimated the difficulties of comparison between tongues of
different family far too lightly, neglecting for the western languages the histori-
cal inquiries whose necessity he very properly insisted on for the Chinese, and
calling attention to verbal resemblances which could in many cases be clearly
proved valueless, and in the rest were presumably so. The way was not yet
cleared for fruitful comparisons of the kind here essayed.


Mr. Clark pointed out how the investigations of the Palestine Exploration So-
ciety have confirmed many of the statements of Josephus which were once held
in doubt, and proved the truth of the conjectures of later writers, such as Dr.
Gustav Schultze, T. Tobler, and Dr. Edward Robinson. The site of the sepulchre
of David on Mt. Zion is shown to be that claimed by the Moslems, but a lower
cave contains the actual burial place; and the former approach is found on the
western side of Mt. Zion, through a large vestibule of native rock, with the re-

The strength of the ancient fortress of the Jebusites is attested by stairs cut on
the western face of the hill upon which it stood.

The valley of the Tyropoeon is found to be filled with rubbish nearly ninety feet
deep, near the southwest angle of the temple walls; and, at that place, the massive
pavement is laid bare. At the same time, piers decreasing in size as they are
found successively on the west toward Mt. Zion, and opposite the wall whence
spring the arches of Dr. Robinson's "bridge," suggest that this so-called bridge
may have been a steep, broad stairway, an "ascent" to the holy house from the
ancient Xystus. A corresponding break in the wall is noticed by Tobler on the
southeastern side, over against the Kedron.

Beneath the temple area, the substructions of walls, piers, and massive arches,
many of them as old as the days of Solomon, are found in perfect preservation.
The subterranean passages, the stables of the Knights Templars, bearing the
marks of the horses' hoofs, and the stairways from the south gate, now closed,
were described.

The supply of water from Etham and the "upper pool" were alluded to, and
the system of conduits and sewers in the ancient temple, with their cisterns, were
illustrated as they are given by Ernests Pierotti, architect-engineer to Surrya,
Pasha of Jerusalem.

The water supplies for the district of Ophel, the towers over the "Virgin's pool"
and Siloam, and the proofs that Mt. Ophel, rather than Mt. Zion, was the site
of Solomon's palace, other points were touched upon. Some facts were added
which may have weight in deciding as to the course of the first and second walls
of the city.

No further papers being offered, the Society adjourned, to meet
again in Boston on the 19th of May, 1869.
The Society met at the usual time and place. In the absence of the President, the chair was taken by Prof. E. E. Salisbury, one of the Vice-Presidents.

After the reading of the minutes of the preceding meeting, reports of the retiring officers were called for. The Treasurer’s Report showed the transactions of the past year to have been as follows:

**RECEIPTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 20th, 1868</td>
<td>$1,259.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual assessments paid in</td>
<td>290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of the Journal</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total receipts of the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,557.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing of Journal (ix. 1), Proceedings, etc.</td>
<td>$1,163.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses of Library and Correspondence</td>
<td>33.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid for binding of books</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures of the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,200.07</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 19th, 1869</td>
<td>337.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance on hand, May 19th, 1869</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,557.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accounts were audited by a Committee appointed for the purpose, and accepted.

The Librarian made a verbal report, mentioning the principal donors to the library during the past year, and describing their contributions.

The Committee of Publication announced that the first half of vol. ix. of the Journal was out of the hands of the printer, and ready for delivery to the Members. It was hoped that the other half-volume would be published by the time of the next annual meeting.

The Directors gave notice that they had appointed the autumn meeting to be held in New Haven, on the 20th of October next, unless the Committee of Arrangements should see reason for changing the day: *that committee was composed of Prof. Chas. Short of New York, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries.*

Further, they recommended to the Society the Election as Corporate Members of

---

*The day was in fact changed, and the meeting took place on Thursday, the 21st.*

**VOL. IX.**
and the transfer, from the list of Corresponding to that of Honorable Members, of the names of Hermann Brockhaus, Gustav Flügel, Adalbert Kuhn, Max Müller, John Muir, Adolphe Regnier, Ernest Renan, Rudolf Roth, Friedrich Spiegel, Constantin Tischendorf, and Albrecht Weber. These recommendations were, by ballot and vote, duly accepted and adopted by the Society.

The Corresponding Secretary called attention to the decease within the year of two of the Corporate Members, Rev. Swan L. Pomroy, D.D., of Portland, Me., and Prof. John J. Owen, D.D., of New York, for many years a Director of the Society. Dr. Proudfoot, being called upon, paid an appropriate tribute to the character of Dr. Owen.

The correspondence of the past six months was laid upon the table, and extracts from it were read. Of most interest were a letter from Mr. Alexander J. Ellis, of London, in reference to Bell's system of "Visible Speech" (criticised in a communication presented to the Society at the preceding annual meeting; see the Proceedings of that meeting), expressing and explaining his high opinion of the system; and a letter from Prof. B. Jülg, of Innsbruck (in the Tyrol), from which the following is an extract:

"In 1866 I published (at Brockhaus's in Leipzig) the Tales of the Siddhi-Kür in the Kalmuck language, and, in 1868 (at Wagner's, Innsbruck) the supplementary tales to the Siddhi-Kür and the History of Arji-Borgj-Chân in Mongolian. Although I received from the Vienna Academy a subsidy toward the expense of publication, I was obliged to add a very considerable sum out of my own pocket, which can only be covered by sale of the volumes. Of scholars interested in this special department there are but few, and the sale is almost exclusively to the larger libraries, so that I am very far from being reimbursed as yet. Hardly a copy has hitherto gone to America; and I beg that you will use your influence to have at least the original edition in Kalmuck and Mongolian procured by one and another College or University or other public library, where philological studies are pursued."

The Corresponding Secretary commended the works in question to the attention of the members present, as contributions of great and acknowledged importance to an interesting and little cultivated branch of linguistics.

The following gentlemen were next chosen by ballot, upon nomination of a special committee appointed for the purpose, as officers of the Society for the ensuing year:


**Vice-President**—Rev. Rufus Anderson, D.D., "Boston.

**Vice-Presidents**—Hon. Peter Parker, M.D., "Washington.

**Corresp. Secretary**—Prof. Edw. E. Salisbury, LL.D., "New Haven.
The following communications were then presented:


Dr. Martin spoke of the various inventions, or discoveries, or applications of the resources of nature, in which China has preceded the rest of mankind, and the knowledge of which has, either demonstrably or probably, found its way to the western world from China. He first referred to tea, as an important contribution to human comfort, and the chief staple of a commerce which has led to important political results. Porcelain and silk were made only in China, until Europe learned to rival or surpass its teachers in these arts. Gunpowder is probably Chinese. The discovery of America is in a double sense owing to China, as the wealth of Cathay attracted Columbus westward, and the magnetic needle, which had been used in China for more than two thousand years, directed his course. Paper-making the Chinese invented in the first century of our era, and printing at least eight hundred years before its reinvention in Germany. Inoculation for the small-pox they had long practised before Europe learned it from the Turks, to whom it had probably found its way from the extreme East. And alchemy, the forerunner of chemistry, was pursued in China, before the Christian era, for the same objects which the early alchemists learned from the Arabs to seek after. The Chinese of the present day have ceased to invent; and while, a few centuries ago, they were in advance of all the rest of the world in the arts of civilized life, they are now, simply by having ceased to progress, as far behind the most civilized nations. Their stagnation is to be in the main attributed to their reverence for ancient times, their absorption in the study of language, literature, and antiquity, with consequent neglect of physical science, and the absence of Christianity.

2. On a Hebrew MS. of the Pentateuch, from the Jewish Congregation at Kai-fung-fu in China, by Mr. John W. Barrow of New York; presented by Dr. Martin.

This is a synagogue roll, written on 112 skins of white leather, in 237 columns, of 49 lines each; it measures 143 feet in length. The skins are in two or three places put together in the wrong order, and one passage, from Exodus xxxviii. 18 to Leviticus i. 6, is wanting. They are generally in good condition, but a little water-stained. The character is clear and legible, though not elegant, and approaches the Spanish type. The text is the Masoretic, and the deviations from the received text are almost entirely mere errors in spelling. The original of which this is a representation must evidently have been of European and comparatively modern origin.

In the 26th chapter of Davidsohn's "Biblical Criticism" (ed. 1866, pp. 366-70), reference is made to the collation of another synagogue roll from the same source, with similar results. Dr. Lee, in the "Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Lovaniensia Minora," gives extracts from Koessler's "Notitiae S. S. Bibliorum Judaicorum in Imperio Sinensi" (Halle, 1805), in which the Kai-fung-fu manuscripts are discussed.

Appended to Mr. Barrow's paper was a detailed conspectus of the various readings of the MS. in question, as compared with the received text.
After reading this paper, Dr. Martin gave, by request, an account of his journey to Kai-fung-fu, his intercourse with the remnants of the Jewish colony there (from whom he obtained the roll forming the subject of the paper), and the conditions in which they now exist.


Prof. Jenks detailed the instances of occurrence in the Bible of the word Ophir, with their different orthography, and with their varying representation in the Septuagint. He briefly stated the views which had been put forward respecting the position of the country; and he proposed to harmonize their discordance by assuming that the Hebrew-Syrian fleet of Hiram and Solomon sailed through the Red Sea to rendezvous at some port of southern Arabia; that it there separated, a part going eastward to India, and a part southward to Zanguebar and Mozambique; and that, re-assembling in due time, and adding the valuable articles of traffic of Arabia itself, it returned to Elongebah laden with the products of three countries. Sheba was claimed to be the region on both sides of the straits of Babelmandeb.


This communication was mainly a defense of the current views of ancient history and chronology, founded on the Bible. It opposed especially the opinions of Mr. J. D. Baldwin, as set forth in his recent work entitled "Prehistoric Nations" (New York, 1869).

5. On the Hill-People of Kamaon, India, by Rev. J. T. Gracey, Missionary of the Methodist Board in Central India.

Mr. Gracey explained that what he had to say referred to the general population of the province of Kamaon, not to the Bhotiyas of the mountain passes, nor to such exceptional tribes as the Nathas. These people appeared to be destitute of legends or traditions accounting for their origin. They acknowledge but three castes, Brahmins, Rajputs, and a low degraded class called Doms. Among their peculiar customs is a game called patharārd, 'stoning,' in which two parties, of about two hundred each, pelt one another with stones, in a valley between hills, which are crowded with spectators; the players defending their heads by aid of a brass-studded skin shield. Polyandry is said to have prevailed formerly, but is now replaced by polygamy, and the marriage-tie is a very loose one. Among the divinities worshipped in the Hills are Geel and Seem, and the goddess Nain. Mr. Gracey gave some details respecting their worship, and related legends told of them. The people have an excessive dread of ghosts; those residing in the mountain passes are propitiated by the sacrifice of a bit of the clothing of each one who goes by. A vocabulary of about two hundred words from the language of the hill-people of Kamaon, with their equivalents in Hindustani, was subjoined to the paper.


After briefly referring to the practical importance of his subject, and its bearing upon the question of an improved civil service in the United States, Dr. Martin began with speaking of the completeness and elaboration of the Chinese system, of the success with which it attained its object, the drawing in of the ablest minds of the empire to the service of the State, of the general capacity and culture of the mandarin class, and of the essential democracy of a constitution which neither recognized a hereditary aristocracy, nor left offices to be filled by the favorites of the Emperor or his representatives. The origin of the system is referred to the time of Shun (about B.C. 2200), who examined his officers every third year, for promotion or degradation. Under the Chau dynasty (about B.C. 1100), candidates for office, as well as officers, were examined in the six arts of music, archery, horsemanship, writing, arithmetic, and social and public etiquette. About the beginning
of our era, under the Han, candidates selected in the provinces for filial piety and integrity were examined at the capital in the arts above specified, and in civil and military arts, agriculture, and geography. A thousand years later, under the Tang, the present classification of candidates and of officers was already established. Now, the subjects for examination are the same as of old, but, in accordance with the circumstances and spirit of modern times, the mode is prevailingly literary rather than practical. The three grades of candidates are called sii-tsa, chii-jin, and tsin-shi, or 'budding genius,' 'promoted scholar,' and 'ready for office.' The trial for the first degree is held in the chief city of each district or hien; about two thousand competitors are present, of every age, and each produces a poem and essays on assigned themes, during a night and a day of close confinement; and the authors of the few best, about one in a hundred, receive the degree of sii-tsa. The holders of this title assemble once in three years at the capital of a province, and, after examination on a much wider range of subjects, in three sessions of near three days each, about one in a hundred is again advanced to the dignity of chii-jin. Each chii-jin is authorized to repair the next spring to Peking, to compete with his peers for the first degree, which is won by about three in a hundred. The successful tsin-shi has now open to him the highest offices in the empire, but begins usually as mayor, or sub-prefect, or sub-chancellor, to which place he is appointable by lot — if not first admitted, upon an examination presided over by the Emperor in person, into the highest literary body in the empire, the Han-hia ('Forest of Pensels'), or Imperial Institute. Once in three years the Emperor designates a chuang-juen, or laureate scholar of the empire.

This system amounts to the most powerful incubent possible to study—more efficient, in fact, than common schools, colleges, and universities; and it wakes the most persistent and energetic labor, continued as long as the powers last. Of a certain list of ninety-nine successful competitors for the second degree, the average was above thirty years of age, while one was sixty-two, and one eighty-three. Nearly all who enter the first examination (many millions) devote their lives to education; and for readiness with the pen and retentiveness of memory are hard to parallel elsewhere. That their education is one-sided, devoted to words rather than things, exclusively literary and not scientific, the fault is not in the system, but in the national standard of knowledge. And the system affords the most powerful lever by which the standard might be raised and changed, under an enlightened central board.

In its political aspects, the system operates as a safety-valve, giving to those who are able and ambitious of distinction the means of receiving it legitimately; it affords a counterpoise to the authority of an absolute monarch; it makes administrators who understand the people whom they have to rule; and it furnishes an immense educated class who are interested in the permanence of existing institutions.

The strict standard of the examination has sometimes been lowered by allowing a greater number of successful competitors, and even, in times of special need, by selling the right to compete in a higher examination without having passed the lower; but, on the other hand, the purity of the system is carefully guarded, and a few years since the first president of the examining board at Peking was put to death for granting two or three fraudulent degrees.

In illustration of the style of the examinations, Dr. Martin gave translations of several examination-papers, or lists of questions given to the candidates to write upon.

After the reading of this paper, the Society adjourned, to meet again in October, at New Haven.
Proceedings at New Haven, October 21st and 22d, 1869.

The Society assembled for its autumn meeting on Thursday, October 21st, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the President in the chair. After the reading of the minutes, the Committee of Arrangements gave notice that they had accepted on behalf of the Society an invitation from the Secretary of the Classical Section, Prof. Hadley, to take tea and hold the evening session at his house. On motion, their action in the matter was approved.

The Directors announced that they had appointed the next Annual Meeting to be held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 18th, 1870, and had designated Mr. J. S. Ropes, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, as Committee of Arrangements for the meeting.

They also recommended for election as members of the Society:

to Corporate membership,
- Rev. Mytton Maury, of Cold Spring, N. Y.
- Rev. Joseph K. Wight, of New Hamburg, N. Y.

to Corresponding membership,
- Rev. John T. Gracey, Missionary in Central India.

The gentlemen thus recommended were elected without dissent. The Directors also informed the Society that, by a disastrous fire which occurred in the printing office of Messrs. Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor, on the 21st September last, all the undistributed part of the edition of the half-volume of Journal just published (vol. ix. No. 1), along with the extra copies of the Taittiriya-Prâtiçakhya, had been destroyed. The Committee of Publication was now authorized by them to proceed to reprint the work and replace the loss, as soon as should be found convenient: the expense would be, it was expected, not far from two-thirds covered by an insurance of five hundred dollars which had been taken upon the Society's property in the building burnt.

Extracts from the correspondence of the past half-year were read by the Corresponding Secretary; among others, the following:

From Prof. G. Seyffarth, Dansville, N. Y., June 28th, 1869:

"I am about to publish a work entitled "Clavis Aegyptica: collection of all bilingual and some other hieroglyphic inscriptions, translated and explained. With the syllabic alphabet in hieroglyphic, hieratic, and demotic characters, and with glossaries and indexes." This volume will contain thirty-four inscriptions, of which the famous one found in the ruins of Pompeii, on the altar in the temple of Isis, will interest the Italians."
From the Rev. J. Perkins, D.D., Chicopee, Mass, Oct. 9th, 1869:

"... I am sorry to be obliged to report myself as confined to my room by protracted sickness, and not even able to use a pen. By another hand I send you two manuscripts, which I beg you to present to the Society's attention at your convenience. They are a brief grammar and vocabulary of the Kuridish language, prepared by the late lamented Rev. Samuel A. Rhea, one of your corresponding members. He had commenced copying the grammar for you before his death. Of Mr. Rhea you already know something. He was one of the most gifted men of all our missionaries. He resided eight years in Kurdistan, a much longer time than any other civilized man ever lived in the country; and, while he made the Nestorians and their language the objects of his special attention, he yet freely mingled with the Kurds also during the whole period. Yet it is to be presumed that Mr. Rhea would not claim for his grammar and vocabulary any merits beyond those of the briefest epitome of the language. I would present these manuscripts to the Oriental Society in the name of his widow. ... I hope in a few weeks to send you a copy of an admirable memoir of Mr. Rhea [by Rev. D. W. Marsh]."

Mr. Rhea's manuscripts here spoken of were laid before the Society later in the meeting.

From Mr. William Gamble, Superintendent of the Presbyterian Mission Press at Shanghai, dated May 18th, 1869:

"I shipped by the American Mail of March 20th two boxes of type for you, being the Chinese font ordered some time since for the American Oriental Society. Of the fund collected by Dr. Bradley there will still remain in your hands a considerable balance after paying for what are now sent. If you wish still to expand it in Chinese type, I would advise that, instead of having a larger font, you purchase the matrices for the more common sorts. In this way your font would be much more serviceable, if you wished to use it in printing. The great difficulty in printing Chinese with moveable type comes from our constantly running out of sorts. The total number of different characters in the font is 6000 full body, and 7500 primitives and radicals, which will by combination make a total of nearly 25,000 different characters. The type are in the cases, which are well packed in the boxes, and all you will have to do is to get a small cabinet made for the cases, and slip them into it according as they are numbered. ... The Chinese and Japanese are commencing to use our method of printing to some extent."

The Secretary explained that the font procured was one of small pica size, recently cut at Shanghai under the direction of Mr. Gamble himself, and highly approved both by Chinese and foreigners for the beauty and delicacy of its style, and its convenience of practical use with English type.*

He was obliged to add that the packing had proved insufficient, and that the boxes had come to hand with most of the cases broken, and their contents in a state of *pt*, so that the font was not for the moment in condition to be used. The Directors have authorized such expenditure as should be required in order to restore its serviceableness.

From Dr. W. F. A. Behrmauer, dated Dresden, April 7th, 1869:

"I communicate herewith an account of the Arabic inscription found on the hypogrof of the Campo Santo at Pisa, with a rubbing made by my friend Dr. Detlef sen, during his studies, made in Italy at the end of 1859 and the beginning of 1860."

Dr. Behrmauer refers to the interpretation of this inscription given by M. Marcel

* The following is a specimen of it: 人之初性本善
in 1839, in the Journal Asiatique, and characterizes it as hardly satisfactory. Lan-<br>ci's plate, in his "Trattato delle simboliche rappresentanze Arabiche" (Paris, 1845,<br>4to, vol ii., pp 54, 154), is more accurate than Marcel's, but his explanation is also<br>not to be approved; such is the opinion of Mr. Michel Amari, who gives a new<br>reading of the inscription, copied by Dr. Behrmauer and translated as follows: "ex-<br>cellent benediction and high favor, perfect prosperity without envy, and perpetual<br>wealth and unalterable health and happiness, and revenue not diminished for its<br>possessor." Dr. Behrmauer quotes from De Morrona ("Pisa illustrata," Pisa, 1787,<br>vol. i., p. 196-195) some account of the monument. It is 14 metres (about five<br>feet) high, and 11 metres (a little over three feet) broad. It is said to have been<br>found under ground while the foundations of the cathedral of Pisa were laid; and<br>was placed as an ornament upon the point of the gable of the cathedral, where it<br>remained until the beginning of the present century. It was somewhat damaged by<br>muset-ball, fired at it while in that position.<br>The inscription of this monument has a great resemblance to the other legendary<br>texts which are to be found on monuments of metal, on bowls and on vases, and<br>the like.<br>The Corresponding Secretary also exhibited a copper fac-simile (electrotyped)<br>of a supposed block-tin coin, stated to have been found, a foot and a half below the surface, at a place in Vermillion Co., Indiana, surrounded by forests but in the neighborhood of so-called "Aztec" mounds; and supposed to be a relic of the<br>"mound-builders." It belongs at present to Mr. John Collett, of Eugene, Vermillion Co., Ind., who is desirous of having its true<br>character determined. The characters on the coin were evidently<br>Arabic, and several gentlemen present, practically familiar with Eastern coins, had no doubt of its being a quite modern Arabic<br>coin, although no one was able to make out the legend. It was<br>generally pronounced to belong to a class of spurious relics of<br>which the West has been somewhat prolific of late.<br>Communications were now called for, and the following were<br>presented:<br>1. On a Set of Ancient Chinese Scrolls, containing representations of early Emperors and other distinguished characters, by Dr.<br>Peter Parker, of Washington, D. C.<br>These scrolls purport to be fac-similes of stones engraved during the Han dynasty (ended A. D. 269). They represent Hwang-ti (alleged date, B. C. 2556), Chuen-heu-ha kou-yang, son of Chang-i, and grandson of Hwang-ti (B. C. 2400),<br>Fuh-hi, the inventor of writing, and Tsang-taing (B. C. 3254), Chuh-tsong, Shin-<br>nung the Divine husbandman (B. C. 3114), Te-you (B. C. 2330), the illustrious,<br>benevolent as heaven, wise as god, whom the people approached as the sun, and<br>looked up to as the clouds," and various other worthies celebrated in the annals of<br>China.<br>Dr. Parker gave a partial explanation of the contents of the scrolls. The fac-<br>similes are highly valued by the Chinese, and their treatment serves to illustrate<br>the zeal and cleverness of Chinese antiquarians. Scores of the latter have expended<br>study upon them, with results which are recorded on the scrolls, each comment<br>being dated, and having the signature and the seal of its author affixed. The original<br>inscriptions are in part so effaced by time that only portions of the characters<br>remain; but from these the reading has been restored and the sense determined.<br>A set of the scrolls was presented to the Society by Dr. Parker, who proposed<br>to furnish later a complete translation of their contents, with notes.<br>2. On the Algonkin name Manit or Manitous, sometimes translated 'Great Spirit' and 'God,' by Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of<br>Hartford, Conn.
This paper was introduced by remarks on the difficulty of distinguishing, in the present habits and opinions of the Indians of North America, that which they have inherited from remote ancestors and that which they have derived from foreign sources. In the absence of historical records and reliable traditions, traces of primitive beliefs must be sought in language; and such evidence as language supplies is the more valuable because it cannot be suspected of a European origin, or as of modern invention.

An analysis was given of the name *Manit* or *Manitou*, by which various Algonkin nations expressed their highest conception of an existence and a power superior to man's. *Manitou* (otherwise written *Mannitou*, *Manito*, *Mandé*, etc.) was shown to be formed from *Manit*, by affixing the representative of the verb-substantive. It means 'Manit is,' or 'it is Manit.' The next step in analysis separates the initial *M*, which is an indefinite and impersonal prefix, from *Man-it*, a participle of the verb *sau-eu*, meaning 'to be more than, to exceed, to surpass.' The adverbial form, *sau-e* (in the Massachusetts language), is the sign of the comparative degree, and means 'more, beyond.' *An-it* does not connote life, spiritual existence, or any moral attributes. One of its uses is in the sense of 'corrupt,' 'rotten,' or 'decayed,' that is, 'gone beyond' or 'more than' the natural and proper state. In this sense the Mass. *an-it* and *an-euk* (from the same verb) are used by Eliot; the Abnaki *an-abouit* by Rale, and the corresponding *al-et*, in the Delaware, by Zeisberger.

The primary meaning of *Manit* was thus found to be, 'Somebody who or something which goes beyond, exceeds, or is more than the common or the normal; something extra-ordinary or *preter*-natural—not, necessarily, *super*-natural.' And this was shown to agree with the explanation of the word given by several early writers.

Other Algonkin words were mentioned, having similar meaning but no etymological affinity to *Manit*; such as the Abnaki *Niçeù* and Miensac *Nikoun*. The Dakota *wekaun*, which has been translated 'God, a spirit, something consecrated; medicine,' etc., was derived from the preposition and adverb *ska*, 'above, superior.' Hence, *wekaun* is as appropriately used to characterize a bad spirit as a good one, or any extra-ordinary natural phenomenon as either.

In a paper printed with the Proceedings of the Am. Philosophical Society for September, 1864, was pointed out the resemblance between the Algonkin *Manitou* and certain old-world names or titles of the Supreme Being, such as the Chinese *mang taou*, Egyptian *ma ntr*, Latin *magna dea*, Greek *μίγας δήσ*, and Sanskrit *maha deva*.

Mr Trumbull remarked that, with the reduction of *manitou* to its root *man*, this resemblance disappears, and with it the mathematical probability, which had been computed as not far from "a hundred millions to one," of the derivation of these names from the same original source. This analysis also deprives of all special significance what Dr. Schoolcraft regarded as 'the remarkable fact, that the *-do* or *-do* of the Algonkin name of God is in sound both the Greek [Latin?]* do* and the Azteck *teo* *transposed." Mere verbal resemblance was proved (as Mr. Trumbull believed) as it has been in many others, to be valueless as evidence of the genetic relationship of languages.

3. Brief Grammar and Vocabulary of the Kurdish Language, by the late Rev. Samuel A. Rhea, Missionary among the Nestorians of Kurdistan; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

The letter of Dr. Perkins accompanying this paper has been given above.

In his grammatical sketch, Mr. Rhea goes through with the different parts of speech, explaining their inflections and modes of use; spending by far the most space upon the classification and conjugation of verbs. His vocabulary contains not far from fifteen hundred words, with very brief indication of their meaning, usually limited to a single synonym.

The Secretary read some extracts from the grammar, pointing out the very close accordance between the facts detailed and those of the Persian language. He remarked that the question of publication of the manuscript would of course remain to be determined by careful comparison with the already published data for the Kurdish, which alone could show how much that was new, and an addition to knowledge, was brought to light in it. There could hardly fail to be matter of de-
cided value here; and the collection and working up of it, in the leisure of a laborious life, was an evidence of scholarly taste and devotedness on the part of Mr. Rhea which was highly creditable to him, and could not but add to our sorrow for his early death.


Dr. Van Lennep gave a summary account of some of the results of his own explorations in Asia Minor, mentioning at the same time that most of them would be found more fully described and illustrated in a forthcoming work of his, entitled "Travels in Asia Minor," now in process of publication (by Murray, London).

He spoke first of the remains of a very ancient fort on the top of a mountain which is called Star mountain (Yildiz Daghi). Strabo describes a mountain by this same name, asserting that the most valuable treasures of King Mithridates were kept in the castle at its summit, and that it was taken by the Romans. Dr. Van Lennep pronounced Strabo's description to apply closely to this mountain, as regards both its situation and its character. Two streams gush forth high upon its side and flow not far apart; when they reach the base, they turn in opposite directions, pass completely around the mountain, and, uniting on the other side, form what is still called the Star river. The mountain lies between Tocat and Sivas, and the fort is more than eight thousand feet above the level of the Black Sea. It commands a view as far as that sea on the north, and Mt. Arges on the south.

Referring to the sculptures on Yazili Kayah (near the ancient Pterium, one day's journey north of Yuzghat), Dr. Van Lennep assented to Texier's explanation of them, as representing the introduction of the worship of Astarte into Phrygia; but claimed that the youth behind the goddess, whom Texier calls simply a prince, must be recognized as the Cupid of the Greeks. Mr. Layard had equally failed to recognize the child-god in the procession he copies from the carvings at Nineveh. Dr. Van Lennep supported his view by a gem recently obtained by him in Asia Minor, on which is cut an intaglio figure of the Assyrian Astarte, with the three-pointed crown on her head and the star and crescent moon on either side; while behind her, on a chair, sits a child, who is none other than Cupid. This gem was pronounced to be of Assyrian subject and Greek workmanship, pure Greek and Assyrian intaglios being exhibited to illustrate its character.

Next were described the remains of an unfinished Egyptian building at Eynuk, a day's journey north of Yazili Kayah. Its material is black granite, while Greek monuments are usually of marble. Egyptian sphinxes stand on either side of the entrance, from which a line of sculptured stones extends to the right and left, as in other ancient monuments, both Assyrian and Egyptian. The sculptures seem to represent the erection of the building, and the festivities and ceremonies observed on the occasion. The bull Apis stands on a platform, and sacrifices of goats and oxen are offered to him by the king and queen. The features and hair of nearly all the figures are African.

Farther, the figure of Sesostria was spoken of, found carved on a ledge near the mouth of a pass through Mt. Tmolus, not far from the ancient road from Smyrna to Sardis. This is one of the two figures of the conqueror described by Herodotus.

Finally, Dr. Van Lennep described the interesting remains that lie around Smyrna; especially the old rubbish-heap of ancient Smyrna, where valuable remains are often brought to light by the rains. He spoke of the opening of several tombs of a very ancient date. He also exhibited to the Society various figures or fragments of figures in terra cotta, of the highest artistic merit, which had been found in those tombs or in the soil, and which appear to him to have been originally gilded, and to have represented the household divinities of the ancient Smyrnites.

5. On a Chinese Tablet illustrating the religious opinions of the literary class, by Dr. D. B. McCarter, Missionary of the Presbyterian Board at Ningpo, China.

Dr. McCarter said that the scroll which he exhibited was interesting both as a very favorable specimen of Chinese calligraphy, and as showing the views held by
a large proportion of the literary men of China, with reference to the popular religion. He went on to set forth briefly the peculiar religious condition of China, explaining that the Chinese as a nation, instead of being divided between the Confucian faith, Buddhism, and the doctrines of Lao-tse, really accept them all, having recourse always to the particular divinity or rite which is reputed to be serviceable in such matters as they happen to have in hand. 'It has been stated that the literati, or so-called Confucianists, do not worship idols; but this is an error, for the stellar gods Win-chang (Ursa major) and Kwai-sing (polar star) are worshipped by the literary class as such, and by them alone, as the speaker could testify from personal observation, living in a temple with these idols for more than a year. The scroll exhibited was an impression or rubbing from a stone tablet erected in the Chéng-Hwang Mau, or Temple of the Tutelar Deity of the Wei-hien or district city of Wei,' in the province of Shan-tung, China; and the inscription was in the handwriting of Cheu Pau-Keu, the Ché-hien or magistrate of the district—a literary gentleman celebrated as a poet, a calligrapher, and a wit, whose "Remains," consisting of poems, pencil drawings, and epistolary writings, have gone through many editions in China. The sentiments expressed in this document clearly mark Mr. Cheu as a disciple of the school of Chu-ki, who may be said to have been the Comte of China. The inscription bears the date of the 17th year of Kien-lung, the 9th of the then current cycle (of 60 years), and the 5th moon (about June, A. D. 1759). Mr. Cheu commences by referring to the Ki-tin, the fang or phoenix, the serpent, and the dragon; to each of which are ascribed bodily members, and distinct personal characteristics. He then speaks of the heavens, as an azure vault, and the earth as a massive clod, and man as the being who, dwelling between heaven and earth, is characterized by certain bodily organs, the faculty of speech, a sense of propriety, etc. But, he asks, how can we suppose Heaven to possess bodily organs like man's, and ascribe to it a personal existence? He says that from the time of the Duke of Chou (B.C. 1130) the name "Supreme Ruler" (Shang-ti) has been applied to Heaven, and that the vulgar have styled it the "Gemmeous Emperor" (Yú-Hwang), and invested it with bodily organs, clothing, regalia, and a personal existence; have made images of it, and accompanied them with retinues of followers; and that subsequent ages have regarded it with awe and reverence. He then speaks of the Ch'eng, or wall which surrounds every city, and of the Huang, or moat which encircles it, and asks why people have personified these as a god, and attributed to this god power over life and death, and jurisdiction over happiness and misery, surrounding (its images) with awe-inspiring objects, so that not only the common people are struck with awe, but even he himself confesses that, on entering the dark recesses of its temple, his hair stands on end, and his frame shudders, as though he stood in the presence of a demon. He quotes an ancient sage who says "these things are what make the people seek to conciliate them" (i.e., the gods), and adds that, unless the ignorant populace have a desire to conciliate the gods, the officers could not trust them (nor control them). After describing the repairs that had been thought necessary, and the expense incurred in making them, and in suitably furnishing the temple, he adds that some might be disposed to question the necessity, or propriety, of expending several thousand ounces of silver in erecting a pavilion and stage for theatrical exhibitions; and asks "Can it be that there are gods who delight in theatrical exhibitions?" He quotes from an ancient tablet an account of a female musician who "delighted the gods" with her performances, and cites from the Book of Odes the following passage: "With lyres and harps and strokes of the drum, welcome the Lord of the Fields;" and then asks, "Is there really a Lord of the Fields? and does he really delight in lyres and harps? If so, who, ever heard of him?" He then explains it as being simply the natural way in which people give expression to their gratitude to the gods. He expresses his approbation of this system of instructing (and ruling) the people, devised by the ancients; and says that, since people have sacrificed to the Ch'eng-Hwang (literally, 'City Wall and Moat') as though it had a personal existence, why not please it with songs and dances? And as to theatrical representations, he thinks the theatre, as a school of morals, has conferred great benefits upon mankind. All that he would stipulate is that indecent and otherwise unsuitable plays should be prohibited. In summation, he says that Fu-hi, Shen-nung, Hwang-ti, Yau, Shum, Yü, Tang, Wén-wang, Wu-wang, the duke of Chou, and Confucius,
really did exist personally before they were deified, and there seems to be a propriety in sacrificing to them as though they (still) had a personal existence. But Heaven, earth, the sun, moon, wind, thunder, hills and streams, rivers and mountains, soil and grain, the wall and moat, the corners of the house, the well, and the fire-place, although they have been deified, have really no personal existence, and should (properly or per se) be sacrificed to as though they had. Yet even the sages from the ancient times have all sacrificed to them, as though they really and personally existed; and he asks, do the deities of heaven enjoy the viands or make use of the utensils used in sacrificing to them? And he replies that, although the sounds, the colors, and the odors and tastes of things in heaven cannot be imitated, yet all these devices are but the modes of giving expression to the feelings of reverence and veneration which naturally arise in the human heart. Hence he concludes that the erection of a tablet to perpetuate the memory of the repairs made upon the Ch'eng-Hwang temple is not an affair of mere local or temporary interest, but is inseparably connected with the doctrines and ceremonial observances of remote antiquity; and since others (whose names he mentions) had liberally contributed funds to defray the expenses, he (the writer) could not be so parsimonious as to grudge a contribution of penmanship to the same object.

Dr. McCartee remarked in conclusion that he had often heard similar sentiments advanced by officers and litterati in China, and it was interesting to observe that the wisest of that ancient nation gave such unequivocal assent to the doctrine that belief in a personal God, who will render to every man according to his work, is both a natural act of the human heart, and absolutely requisite in order to secure good government.

Dr. McCartee further exhibited a set of very fine rubbings, taken from stone tablets set up in a Buddhist temple at Hangchow, and representing, nearly in life size, sixteen of the eighteen Lo-han (Sanskrit arhant), or personal attendants of Buddha. These rubbings he presented to the Society's collection.


The Greeks distinguished one syllable in each word by sounding its vowel on a higher key; this higher key was represented by the acute accent. The ordinary lower key was not represented in writing. But when it followed the higher key on the same long vowel, it was represented by the grave accent, which then united with the acute to form the circumflex. And when a high-tone ultima, followed by other words in close connection, dropped down to a lower key, it was written with a grave accent instead of the acute. The melodic character of the Greek accent Prof. Hadley illustrated from Dionysius Halle's (de Comp. Verb., 12), who calls the interval between the higher and lower keys a fifth (three tones and a semitone). That there was any difference in stress or force of utterance between accented and unaccented syllables, is not intimated by the ancient writers; that such difference, if it existed, cannot have been great, is made probable by the total disregard of accent in ancient verse. The question has been raised whether any distinction was made among the lower tones; whether there was any middle tone, intermediate between the highest and the lowest. Some ancient writers speak of a middle tone, but the statements are not so definite as could be wished. G. Harnann (de emend. gram. Græc.) recognized a middle tone in the grave accent where it takes the place of an acute on the ultima. G. Curtius (Jahn's Jahrh., vol. 72) recognized it also in the grave accent where it forms part of the circumflex. Recently, F. Mistell (Kuhn's Zeitschr., vol. 17), founding on the analogies of the Sanskrit accent, holds that the high tone (acute accent), where it was not final, was always followed by a middle tone. Prof. Hadley set forth a theory based on that of Mistell, but with additions and modifications of his own. In the undivided Indo-European, as in Sanskrit, there was no restriction on the place of the accent; it might fall on any syllable of the longest word. Hence the high tone with the following middle tone might be separated from the end of the word by a succession of low-tone syllables. If now there came to be a prevailing dislike for such a succession, an unwillingness to hear more than one low-tone syllable at the end of a word, the result would be to confine the accent to the last three syllables. This
result, as it is found both in Greek and in Latin, may be referred to the time of Graeco-Italic unity. But for the Greek we have to assume also a subsequent restriction; the final low tone must not occupy the whole of a long syllable; if it came upon a long vowel, the first half of that vowel must be sounded with middle tone. Thus "high tone, middle tone, short low tone," became a prevailing cadence for Greek words, and was brought in wherever it could be attained without throwing back the accent. The leading rules of Greek accentuation—no accent allowed before the antepenult; only the acute used on that syllable, and not even this if the ultima is long; an accented penult must take the circumflex if it has a long vowel and the ultima a short one; an accented penult must take the acute in any other case;—all these are explained by this cadence, being all necessary to secure it. As for throwing back the accent to obtain this cadence (or as much of it as possible), one branch of the Greeks, the Aeolians of Asia Minor, did so; whence Aeolic forms like χαλεπός, χαλέπως, λεκάτος, for which the common Greek has χαλεπός, χαλέπως, λεκάτος, with the primitive accent.

The Latin took a different, though analogous course. It allowed the final low tone to have either quantity, but would not allow the middle tone before it to occupy the whole of a long syllable, whether long by nature or position. Hence the cadence, "high tone, short middle tone, low tone," which the Latin procured, or as much of it as possible, in all words, even by throwing back the accent like the Aeolic Greek. In this way all the varieties of Latin accent—lęgeris, lęgerat, mıséras, mısérat, lęgındus, vìxit, rís—may be easily accounted for.

In conclusion, Prof. Hadley referred to the hypothetical character of this theory, pointing out the unproved assumptions contained in it; but remarked that these assumptions are so natural in themselves and furnish so simple an explanation for so many seemingly unconnected facts, that it is difficult to believe them wholly unfounded.

7. On the Order of Words in Attic Greek Prose, by Prof. Charles Short, of Columbia College, New York.

This communication was a verbal account of an Essay which Prof. Short was about to publish. The immediate occasion of the Essay is the republication in this country of Mr. Yonge's English-Greek Dictionary. That work being intended chiefly as an aid to students in Greek Composition, it seemed well to prefix to it something on the order of the words.

Prof. Short stated that, while there were several monographs on this subject by European scholars relating to single authors or to single points, as by Darbe, Braun, and Engelhardt, and while several commentators on Greek authors had here and there touched the matter, as Stallbaum, Weber, and Rehdantz, yet he was not aware that any systematic treatise upon the subject had anywhere appeared, and he had therefore undertaken to supply such a one as he could. The general subject being large, he had confined himself to the usages of prose, and to one form of that, the Attic.

Taking Xenophon as a basis, he had then carefully examined Thucydides, next the Attic Orators, and lastly Plato. His method had been to gather under each head a very large number of examples from these writers in the order just mentioned, and then to deduce the general law, noting the exceptions, and giving them in classes where this was practicable. When the reason for a particular order appeared, he had in many instances stated it, but his main purpose in the present Essay was rather to develop the laws of order than to discuss them, and by adding the exceptions to show the range within which diversity of order might take place.

Some of the general laws were specified; that the adjective follows the word it qualifies; that the genitive follows the noun it limits, with the curious exception that when the limited noun has the article, the genitive in general relations may stand between the article and the noun, but the partitive genitive, as a law, may not; that the predicate noun, pronoun, or adjective, stands directly before the verb finite, or an infinitive, or a participle either with or without the article; that the Greeks in respect to collocation made no distinction between the objective and the subjective infinitive, putting both alike after the leading word; that the modification of a word having the article intervenes between the article and the word, and
that it sometimes follows both wholly or in part, but only in the rarest instances (except in limiting genitive) precedes them, and that he had observed only one case in which an adverb modifying an infinitive with the article stood before the article, and that in a suspected piece of Xenophon, the Apologia.

In his treatment of the prepositions, he had first given their position with reference to the region and then added an elaborate section on a perplexing subject, the omission and repetition of the preposition under various circumstances; and after setting forth the prevailing usage in simple cases, he had considered the complex cases, and shown that the latter could be resolved into the former. He has perhaps discovered a law here not previously observed.

Where various readings existed, affecting the matter of order, he had given the variation under its appropriate head and subjoined the name of the Editor who adopted it, and the examples in connection with which such reading was given might be regarded as so much testimony on its behalf.


Prof. Whitney said that not more than two or three other Sanskritists had studied the Veda so long and so deeply as Prof. Max Müller, or were in position to furnish so authoritative a version of it. Hence, scholars had been looking forward with eager expectation to his translation, promised many years ago, and of which the first volume has left the press this season. The work as published would not be found in all respects to fulfill the expectations they had formed. Though advertised as one of a series of eight volumes, it actually contains only one seventy-fifth of the Vedic text (12 hymns out of 1017). The bulk of the volume is filled with a variety of material, which, though much of it valuable in itself, would gladly have been spared. The author has taken as his model Burnouf's work on the Avesta. But the circumstances of the two cases are so different that the model is an ill-chosen one. Burnouf was breaking a path in an entirely new subject. His work was left a fragment, and never could have been made anything else. Müller has undertaken an impracticable task, that of accounting for and establishing his version of every passage. How incomplete, and open to criticism in regard to proportion, it is, appears from the circumstance that to the first verse translated there is a note of eleven pages on an adjective meaning 'ruddy,' while the making of an accusative plural (or gen. or abl. sing.) the subject of a verb, and the assumption that the sun could be regarded as Indra's horse, were let pass without any remark —and so in other cases, which were pointed out in a detailed criticism of a few verses. To the extension of the work by including a romanized text of the original hymns themselves, and the detailed versions of other translators, objection was taken on the score of want of necessity: since such things can be of service only to a professed Vedic scholar, who must be presumed to possess them in another form. If Müller would give simply his own understanding of the meaning of the hymns, with limited exposition of especially difficult points, he would consult the interests not only of the public at large, but also of his fellow-students in the same department.

The selection of this particular body of hymns (those to the Maruts, or storm-gods) for inclusion in the first volume is unfortunate, since they are among the most obscure and tedious of the collection, and may repel from a study of the Veda some who would have been attracted by a more pleasing first taste.

On the score of his over-abundant introductory and expository matter, Müller claims that his is the "first translation" of the Veda: a claim which few will be ready to admit. Burnouf called his work a "commentary," not a translation, though he had no real predecessor: while Müller has to quote several, one of whom (Benfey) has worked upon the same basis and with the same principles as himself, although doubtless with less thorough preparation. To Müller's method no exceptions can be taken: he utterly discards the native commentators as authority, and founds his interpretation upon grammar, etymology, and the comparison of parallel passages. He is also perfectly fair and modest in estimating the value of the results reached by him; putting forward his version as only a provisional solution of its very difficult problem, and as sure to be superseded by and by, when longer study shall have brought a better comprehension of the whole Vedic antiquity.
9. Notes on a Surveying Trip from the Phenician Coast to the Euphrates River, by Mr. Henry M. Canfield, of South Britain, Conn.

Mr. Canfield had expected to be present at the meeting, and to give an oral account of his trip; but, being unavoidably kept away, he sent instead a brief paper, which was read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Canfield joined Col. Romer's party, engaged to survey a route for a railroad from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, in April, 1868. The line surveyed started at the mouth of El Kebir, and followed the road to Hamath nearly to the Nessaarich range. With some difficulty, a practicable route was found through the pass between the Nessaarich and the Lebanon, then across the beautiful fertile plain of the Beka'a, through the Jebel Homs to Homs, and north-easterly over the desert to Selaamich, the farthest outpost of civilization; then, after extensive exploration reaching as far as Aleppo and Palmyra, through the great Wady in Jebel Assouet nearly to the Euphrates at Sheik Omar or Balh; when difficulties with the Arab tribes put an end, for the time, to the enterprise.

Mr. Canfield describes the Nusaari inhabitants of the mountains and desert as a large-framed race, usually with light hair and brown eyes, laborious, but treacherous and inhospitable; and speaks of their semi-subterranean dwellings, of their customs and religion. He was unable to discover or learn how they dispose of their dead. He calls attention to the square towers, called by the Arabs bourgh, scattered across the whole country to the Euphrates; also to the numerous castles of the middle ages, of which the finest he saw is Khalat el Huns, at the northwestern edge of the Beka'a. This is so immense a structure that it is now inhabited by 5000 people. The desert country beyond Selaamich is marked in places by groups of broken columns and heaps of ruins; at one point, west of the Orontes and east of Sherbt el-Humun, forming regular streets and squares over a space three miles long and two wide; deserted villages, in various styles of building, are also numerous.

A chief of the Ismaeliyeh was met with who had just returned from a trip to India; showing that the old Assassins have and maintain correspondence with some Indian sect.

Rev. Mr. Blodget, missionary at Peking, addressed the meeting briefly respecting the religion of the Chinese, and respecting the translation into Chinese of the word God.

After this (at one o'clock, Friday noon) the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston, on Wednesday, May 18th, 1870.
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Proceedings at Boston, May 18th, 1870.

The Society assembled at 10 o'clock A.M. at the rooms of the American Academy. President Woolsey being absent, the chair was occupied alternately by Dr. Anderson and Dr. Parker, Vice-Presidents.

The record of the preceding meeting was read by the Recording Secretary. It was arranged that there should be a recess of only one hour at noon, that the business of the meeting might be finished before evening.

The Treasurer's Report was read, audited, and accepted. It was as follows:

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, May 19th, 1869
Annual assessments paid in
Life-membership,
Sale of the Journal
Total receipts of the year

$387.53
$515.00
75.00
18.75
698.75

$966.28

EXPENDITURES.

Printing of Proceedings, etc.
Expenses of Library and Correspondence
Paid for binding of books
Total expenditures of the year
Balance on hand, May 18th, 1870

$43.24
40.64
1.25
$88.13
831.15
$966.28

The Treasurer also made a statement respecting the condition of the fund for the purchase of Chinese type, provided by the kind offices of the late Hon. Charles W. Bradley. The arrival of the font ordered from Shanghai was reported at the last meeting. Its cost was as follows:

For type (180 lbs., small pica).
Type-cases,
Packing, freight, and insurance
Premium on $358 in Mexican dollars
Expenses in New York, duty, cartage, etc.

$324.00
12.00
22.00
136.79
75.00

Total expense,

$569.79

To meet this, the Treasurer had drawn on Messrs. Baring, Brothers, & Co., of London, with whom the fund was deposited by Mr. Bradley, for £100, which yielded in currency $670.08. The balance, about $100, is deposited in the Townsend Savings Bank at New Haven to the credit of the fund, and about £92 still remains in the hands of Messrs. Barings.
The Librarian excused himself, on the score of other pressing occupations, for having come unprepared with a full Report of the condition of the Library, and gave a brief oral statement respecting the additions made to it during the year. The most important donations had come from the Vienna Academy of Sciences, and from Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall of London.

The Committee of Publication reported that, as authorized by the Directors last fall, they had commenced the reprinting of Vol. ix., Part 1, of the Journal, as soon as the printing office had been restored to working order after the fire; and that the work had since gone on without interruption, but was not yet quite finished. It was intended to proceed with the printing of Part 2, as soon as the other should be out of the way.

The Directors notified the next meeting, as to be held in New Haven on the nineteenth of October, unless the Committee of Arrangements (Prof. Hadley of New Haven, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries) should alter the appointment—which they were authorized to do, if it appeared desirable.

The following persons, on recommendation of the Directors, were elected members of the Society: namely,

as Corporate Members,

Mr. Erastus B. Bigelow, of Boston.
Prof. Ferdinand Böcher, of Boston.
Prof. J. Lewis Diman, of Providence, R. I.
Mr. James B. Greenough, of Cambridge, Mass.
Mr. Thomas S. Perry, of Cambridge, Mass.
Mr. Charles T. Russell, of Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. J. Herbert Senter, of Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. Peter H. Steenstra, of Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. Francis Wharton, D.D., of Brookline, Mass.
Rev. Henry A. Yardley, of Middletown, Conn.

as Corresponding Members,

Rev. Hyman A. Wilder, Missionary in South Africa.

Mr. J. S. Ropes of Boston, Rev. W. H. Ward of New York, and Hon. J. D. Baldwin of Worcester, were appointed by the chair a Nominating Committee, to propose a ticket for officers for the ensuing year; and the following gentlemen, nominated by them, were elected without dissent:

Vice-Presidents—Hon. Peter Parker, M.D., " Washington.
Corresp. Secretary—Prof. W. D. Whitney, Ph.D., " New Haven.
Secr. of Class. Section—Prof. James Hadley, LL.D., " New Haven.
Recording Secretary—Mr. Ezra Abbot, LL.D., " Cambridge.
Treasurer—Prof. D. C. Gilman, " New Haven.
Librarian—Prof. W. D. Whitney, " New Haven.
While the committee were deliberating, an interesting series of photographs from India and Farther India were exhibited to the members, and briefly commented on, by Rev. J. T. Gracey.

The Corresponding Secretary then announced the losses which the Society had suffered by death during the year; namely, two Corporate Members, Rev. E. Burgess and Rev. Dr. Proudfit (the latter during some years past a Director); and three Corresponding Members; Prof. Romeo Elton, late of Exeter, England, Rev. Dr. Justin Perkins, during many years a missionary in Orūmiah, and Mr. William Winthrop, American consul at Malta. He said a few words with regard to each of these gentlemen, briefly setting forth the claims that they had upon the respectful and affectionate remembrance of the Society, as well as of scholars in America and through the world. He spoke especially of Mr. Burgess, who would be remembered in connection with the translation of the Sūrya-Siddhānta published some years since in the Society’s Journal, and with whom he had himself for some time been thrown into intimate relations while that work was in preparation and passing through the press. Mr. Burgess returned to this country in 1854, after more than fourteen years of service as a missionary in western India. He died of pneumonia, near Boston, on the first day of this year.

Prof. Hadley gave a somewhat detailed account of the life and literary labors of Dr. Proudfit, and a view of his character as a scholar and as a man.

The eminent services of the venerable Dr. Perkins in the cause of Christian philanthropy and of learning were set forth by Rev. Mr. Treat, Dr. Parker, and others.

The correspondence of the past six months was presented, and read in part. The following are extracts:

From Mr. Freeman A. Smith, Treasurer of the American Baptist Missionary Union, dated Boston, Nov. 9th, 1869:

"Knowing you to be interested in such things, I send herewith a copy from an ancient metallic plate found by Mr. Bunker, one of our missionaries, among the Red Karens, together with a copy of our magazine, where you will see what he writes respecting it."

Mr. Bunker says:

"It has been long known that an ancient metal plate, having strange characters engraved on it, existed among the Red Karens. While at Kontio’s village, we succeeded, after much difficulty, in obtaining a sight of the famous plate, and were also allowed to copy it. The plate is composed of copper, brass, and probably some gold. They regard it as very sacred, and guard it with most zealous care. It is supposed by them to possess life, and they say it requires to be “fed with metal.” I fed it with a piece of silver of the value of about fifty cents, but did not
see it eat while I was near. The common people fear its power greatly, and dare not look at it, as they say it has power to blind their eyes. The traditions of most of the Karen tribes point to this tablet, I think, and it may be of very ancient origin. The character in which it is written is quite different from any of the characters in which the languages of the East are written, so far as I have been able to learn."

A copy of the inscription was exhibited to the members present, but no one could cast any light upon its strange characters. The Secretary said that he was hoping to obtain additional information upon the matter from Farther India, to be laid before the Society hereafter. The plate is one referred to in Mr. Cross's paper on the Karens and their language, read at the meeting in October, 1866, and reported in the Proceedings of that meeting (Journal, vol. ix., p. xii.).

From Rev. C. H. A. Dall, dated Calcutta, Nov. 27th, 1869:

"In Bombay, lately, I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Bhau Daji at the monthly meeting of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, and was surprised to hear him say that within a year or so, or as soon as his practice (as a physician) would permit, he expected to visit England and America. I am not very sorry that you are likely to see, yet sooner, Babu Keshub Chunder Sen; of whom you have heard as the eloquent leader of the partly christianized Hindus, the Brahmos. He does not feel settled as to the American part of his visit; but, when calls reach him, as they are sure to do, he will yield to the pressure, and accomplish a visit which I am very desirous that he should make. The presence of these two cultured Oriental gentlemen will, I am sure, make Orientalism dawn on America as never before."

From Mrs. S. J. Rhea, dated Jonesboro, Tennessee, Dec. 5th, 1869; respecting her late husband’s Kurdish papers, presented at the previous meeting, giving some explanations as to their character, and expressing her desire to be helpful in any way toward their publication.

From Dr. A. T. Pratt, dated Constantinople, March 16th, 1870:

"... I procured a fine copy of a Cufic inscription some time since and sent it to you; but, together with a valuable lot of coins, it was lost on the way. I am now hoping to send you the stone itself in the course of the summer.... I have a grammar of the Turkish language of my own, which I hope to forward as soon as I can get an English translation to go with it. During nearly two years past I have been here, engaged on the revision of the version of the Bible made by Dr. Goodell. Dr. Paspati is getting out a large work on the Gypsy language, of which I presume you will receive a copy."

Communications being now in order, the following were presented:

1. On the Glagolitic Alphabet, by Rev. A. L. Long, of Constantinople; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

This was an inquiry into the origin of the Glagolitic character, in which a part of the oldest Slavic literature is preserved, and into its relation to the more usual character, the Cyrillic. Of the two, the Cyrillic is usually ascribed to the Slavic apostle Cyril, who used it for his translation of the Scriptures (about A.D. 862); respecting the other, opinions have been much divided, some attributing its invention to Methodius, Cyril's brother, others to Clement, archbishop of Velitza in Bulgaria, and pupil of Cyril and Methodius; while yet others regard it as some centuries older than Cyril, and many accept the Dalmatian traditions which would make St. Jerome its inventor. Dr. Long, now, differing from all these, maintains that
the Glagolitic was the alphabet devised by Cyril, and was exclusively used in his time, while the so-called Cyrillic, which is no independent invention, but only an adaptation of the Greek alphabet to the Slavic language, was the work of Clement (who died A.D. 916). The various considerations which appear to support this view are detailed in the paper. At the end, the author acknowledges his obligations to P. J. Schaffarik's work "On the Origin and Home of Glagolitism" (Prague, 1858).

Remarks upon this paper, approving its conclusions, were made by Mr. J. S. Ropes.


Mr. Ward first detailed the history of the securing of the inscription by M. Ganneau, from the first discovery of the monument by the German Klein. After showing that it was undoubtedly genuine, and dated back to nearly nine hundred years before Christ, Mr. Ward laid before the meeting a transliterated copy of it in Hebrew characters, and the following translation:

'I am Mesha son of Chemosh [nadab] King of Moab [the D.] *Jebite. | My father reigned over Moab thirty years and I reigned *after my father. | And I made this high place to Chemosh in Karhah and [this House of Sal-] *vation because he has saved me from all the attacks and because he has caused me to look on all my enemies. | O [m r] i *was King of Israel, and he afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh was angry with his [land]. | *And his son succeeded him, and he also said, "I will afflict Moab." | In my days he spake thus, *And I looked on him and on his house, | and Israel kept continually perishing. | And Omri held possession of the land (?) of *Medeba. | And there dwelt in it [Omri and his son and his grand-] son forty years. [But] *Chemosh restored it in my days. | And I built Baal-Meon and I made it in it. | And I [besieged] (?) *Kirjathaim. | And the men of Gad had dwelt old in the land [of Kirjathaim]. | And the King of Israel built 11for him [Kirjathaim]. | And I fought against the city and took it. | And I slew all the [men of] 17the city, a spectacle to Chemosh and to Moab. | And I brought back from thence the altar of Jehovah, and put it before Chemosh in Kerioth. | And I caused to dwell therein the men of Shiran; and the men of 14Sharash. | And Chemosh said to the, "Go and take Nebo from Israel." | And I 15went in the night and I fought against it from the overspreading of the dawn till noon. | And I took it and I 16utterly destroyed it, and I slew all of it seven thousand—

11for to Asher Chemosh had 11devoted [them]; and I took from thence 18the vessels of Jehovah, and I presented them before Chemosh. | And the King of Israel [built] 19Jahaz and dwelt in it while he was fighting against me. | And Chemosh drove him from 18before me. | 20And I took from Moab 200 men, all told; | and I attacked (?) Jahaz and took it, 21adding it to Dibon. | I built Karhah, the wall of the forests and the wall of 22the hill (Ophel). | And I built its gates and I built its towers. | and 23I made a royal palace, and I made reservoirs for the collection of the waters in the midst of the city. | 24And there was no cistern in the midst of the city in Karhah; and I said to all the people, "Make 25for you each a cistern in his house." | And I dug ditches (?) for Karhah in [the road] 28Israel. | I built [A]roer, and I made the high way to Arnon. I built 27Beth-Ramo, for it was ruined, | and I built Bozrah, for it was deserted. And I 28set in Dibon garri-sons (?) for; all Dibon was submissive. | And I filled (?) 39in the cities which I added to the land. | And I built — 30the temple of Diblathaim, and the temple of Baal-Meon, and I raised up there — the land. | And there dwelt in Honoraim— 40Chemosh said to me, "Go, fight against Honoraim." | And I 41Chemosh in my days . . .

Mr. Ward explained that in most points he agrees with either Ganneau, Schlottmann, Dénébourg, Nöldeke, or Neubauer in their versions and corrections of the defective text. He drew, however, more special attention to certain matters with regard to which he differed from previous commentators. The latter have made the perpendicular stroke near the end of the third line a mark of division between the sentences. This it cannot be, as the dot which divides the words also appears
here, and in no other case are both found together. The stroke can be either ' or ‘p, and is no doubt the former. This puts a repetition of ταύτα out of the question. The reading suggested, ταύτα ταύτα ταύτα, seems plausible. The doubtful character at the beginning of the eighth line must be either ταυτα or ρα. The feminine form ταύτα is often used for πλατα, which is just what we want. The masculine is put in the text. Still in Capt. Warren’s impression the letter looks more like ταυτα, which would allow ταύτας. The suggested emendations for the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth line, and for the seventeenth line, are new. The facsimile of Ganneau seems to show in line twenty-three a flaw in the stone. The fact that the letters as they stand hardly make sense is an indication that the flaw did not exist when the inscription was made, in which case the scribe would have continued the unfinished word on the other side of the flaw, as is the case in the ninth line of the great Sidonian inscription of king Ashmunezer. But the letters which we have, ταύτα ταύτα, cannot be translated, the last word being neither plural of ταυτα, nor anything else imaginable. Schottmann and others have suggested ταύτας, ‘outpouring’. This word and its masculine form are only used in the Bible in connection with the geography of the region of Moab, and ταύτας ταύτας of the old song of which we have a fragment in Num. xxx. 15 compares well with the ταύτα ταύτα or ταύτα ταύτα, which even may be preferable, which I would suggest. Such expressions as ‘trenches of the waters’, Gen. xxx. 38, ‘brook of the waters’ 2 Sam. xvii. 20, ‘well of the waters’, ‘well’ or ‘fountain of waters’, ‘storm of waters’ 2 Sam. xvii. 20, are frequent in the Bible. The third word in the eighteenth line I read ταύτας from Capt. Warren’s photographs, which he has misread. The first word in the second-twenty-five line is read from the photographs as ταύτας, giving us exactly the biblical phrase ‘wall of Ophel’.

The language of the inscription is almost pure Hebrew, but with an approach toward the southern Semitic tongues. This appears in the comparative scarcity of quiescent letters, in the plural in Nus., and especially in the Hiphilael conjunction, which has its correspondences in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Assyrian. Another evident example of this is the use of verbs ταυτα instead of ταυτας. Thus we have ταυτα in and ταυτας for ταυτα and ταυτας. In these cases Nöldeke assumes that the final ταυτα is a personal suffix, and that thus a double-object is expressed, as is common in Syriac. But the language shows little assimilation to Aramaic peculiarities, and it is more probable that the root is preserved in these forms in a more archaic shape than it is in Hebrew.

The form of the characters proves the correctness of de Vogüé’s assertion, that the oldest Canaanite alphabet was distinguished by its sharp angles. Among the more interesting forms are the ταυτα, which is the first time found as a simple triangle, like the Greek Δ; ταυτα, which we first find here as a perpendicular crossed by three horizontal lines, which suggest the Greek Ε; ταυτα, which suggests the Greek Τ; ταυτα, which is precisely the Greek Καππα; and ταυτα, which is an oblique cross, or Χ.

The separation of words is found in some other very ancient inscriptions, as in the second insc.ption of Cittim, that of Tushka, and two others. The lacuna in the eighth line is very unfortunate, as it leaves the chronology in some doubt. Schottmann is certainly wrong in supposing it possible to make forty years out of the Bible chronology of the reigns of Omri, Ahab, and Ahaziah, which occupied only thirty-one years. If these scriptural figures are correct, and they appear to be, it must be supposed either that Omri began to afflict Moab before he became king, while general of Baasha’s army, or that the successes of Mesha occurred after the campaigns mentioned in Scripture, and during the latter years of Jehoram. The “round number,” which Nöldeke, Schottmann, and others have suggested, would have been thirty instead of forty, if this campaign be referred to the first rebellion of Mesha—even if a round number is assumable on such a monument.


In this very brief paper, Mr. Baldwin called attention once more to the inscription of Tanis, brought to light by Lepsius in 1866, and published as a “bilingual decree” in the same year, the existence of its third, or Demotic, text being not then known. He refers from a letter received by him from Lepsius, to the effect that the original is now in the Museum of Bulaq. Its complete disinterment,