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KÂTYÂYANA AND PATANJALI:
THEIR RELATION TO EACH OTHER AND TO PÂNINI.

I.

Among all the European scholars who have been engaged in the study of the works of the, Sanskrit grammarians, no one has more patiently, minutely, and thoroughly examined the Mahâbhâshya, than the late Prof. Goldstücker. His essay on Pâñini betrays a familiarity with the work of Patanjali to which no other scholar has as yet attained, and which few are likely to acquire in the future. It is on this account that the views which have been expressed by Prof. Goldstücker regarding the Mahâbhâshya, are deserving of the highest consideration; but the very weight which justly attaches to that scholar's opinions, at the same time imposes on those who may devote themselves to grammatical studies after him, the duty of independently examining and testing their value, and of publicly discussing such doubts and objections as may occur to them in the course of their own reading. And the adoption of such a course appears to be the more called for, when we find that not only have some of the views held by Prof. Goldstücker been apparently widely adopted without such examination, but that views have even been ascribed to him which are at variance with those to which he has actually given expression in his 'Pâñini.'

In an article on the Mahâbhâshya published in the Indian Antiquary, vol. V., page 241, I ventured to express some doubts as to whether the nature and the object of the Vârttikas of Kâtyâyana and of the Mahâbhâshya of Patanjali had been correctly described by other scholars. I would gladly have deferred discussion on this point to the time when I might
have been enabled to subject the whole of the Mahābhāṣya to
a thorough and searching examination; but having been led
publicly to question the accuracy of others, I feel bound to lay
before the reader such objections to the current views regard-
ing the works of Kātyāyana and Patanjali, as have led me to
doubt their correctness.

On pp. 119—121 of his essay on Pāṇini, Prof. Goldstücker
has described the nature and the object of the Vārttikas of
Kātyāyana and of the work of Patanjali in the following para-
dgraphs:—

"The characteristic feature of a Vārttika," says Nāgo-
jibhaṭṭa, "is criticism in regard to that which is omitted
or imperfectly expressed in a Sūtra." (Note: Nāgoji-
bhaṭṭa on Kaiyyaṭa . . . . . . वार्तिकाभिति।४३४३५३५३।
नवाकर्ष्व वार्तिकाम्।). A Vārttika of Kātyāyana is therefore
not a commentary which explains, but an animadversion
which completes: In proposing to himself to write Vārtti-
kas on Pāṇini, Kātyāyana did not mean to justify and to
defend the rules of Pāṇini, but to find fault with them;
and whoever has gone through his work must avow that
he has done so to his heart's content' . . . . . . 'Kātyā-
yana, in short, does not leave the impression of an ad-
mirer or friend of Pāṇini, but that of an antagonist,—
often, too, of an unfair antagonist' . . . . .

'The position of Patanjali is analogous, though not
identical. Far from being a commentator on Pāṇini, he
also could more properly be called an author of Vārttikas.
But as he has two predecessors to deal with instead of one—
and two predecessors, too, one of whom is an adversary of
the other,—his Great Commentary undergoes, of necessity,
the influence of the double task he has to perform, now
of criticising Pāṇini and then of animadverting upon
Kātyāyana. Therefore, in order to show where he coinci-
dided with, or where he differed from, the criticisms of
Kātyāyana, he had to write a comment on the Vārttikas
of this latter grammarian; and thus the Mahābhāṣhya
became not only a commentary in the ordinary sense of
the word, but also, as the case might be, a critical discussion, on the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana; while its Ishtis, on the other hand, are original Vārttikas on such Sūtras of Pāṇini as called for his own remarks.

'I have already mentioned that Patanjali often refutes the strictures of Kātyāyana and takes the part of Pāṇini.'

'His object being, like that of Kātyāyana, merely a critical one, Patanjali comments upon the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, because such a comment of his implies, of necessity, criticisms, either on Pāṇini or on Kātyāyana; and, in consequence, no Vārttika could be left unnoticed by him. Again, independently of Kātyāyana, he writes his own Vārttikas to Sūtras not sufficiently or not at all animadverted upon by the latter grammarian, because they, too, are criticisms, viz. on Pāṇini.'

Prof. Weber, in his article on the Mahābhāṣya (Indische Studien, vol. XIII.) has adopted Prof. Goldstücker's view regarding the nature of Kātyāyana's Vārttikas, but to the same scholar's remarks on the work of Patanjali he appears to have given a meaning, against which Prof. Goldstücker would seem to have distinctly and repeatedly guarded himself. On page 297 Prof. Weber writes:

'Through Goldstücker . . . . we then learnt that Patanjali behaves much less like a commentator on Pāṇini than like a defender of the latter against the unjust attacks of Kātyāyana, the author of the Vārttikas. And this view is indeed fully borne out by appearances.'

On page 298 Prof. Weber speaks of Kātyāyana as attacking or combating the Sūtras of Pāṇini, and of Patanjali as refuting the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana.

On page 321 Prof. Weber says:

'The red thread which runs through the work (i.e. the Mahābhāṣya) is—and on this Goldstücker was the first to lay particular stress—the polemic against the Vārttikakāra;' and on the same page he speaks of the Sūtras as attacked by Kātyāyana.
On page 399 Prof. Weber writes: 'He (i.e. Kātyāyana) it is to combat whom is the special object of the Bhāshya;' and he tells us that the Bhāshya contains the Vārttikas 'together with their refutation' by Patanjali.

Finally, on page 502 Prof. Weber asks: 'What business have Kātyāyana's Vārttikas, whose object it surely is to attack Pāṇini's Sūtras, in the introduction of the Bhāshya?'

While, then, according to Prof. Goldstücker, Patanjali commented on the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana in order to show where he coincided with, or where he differed from, the criticisms of that grammarian, frequently attaching, at the same time, to quote another passage from the essay on Pāṇini, 'his own critical remarks to the emendations of Kātyāyana, often in support of the views of the latter,' Prof. Weber maintains, apparently on the authority of Prof. Goldstücker, that the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana have been refuted by Patanjali. And Prof. Weber is not the only scholar who has given this meaning to Prof. Goldstücker's words. For Dr. Burnell in his essay On the Aindra School, likewise describes the relation to each other of Kātyāyana and Patanjali in the following terms (page 91) 'Kātyāyana criticised Pāṇini, and Patanjali replied in justification of the latter,' (and on page 92) 'the Mahābhāshya is ... a skilful compilation of the views of Pāṇini's critics and of their refutation by Patanjali.'

Setting aside for the present the work of Patanjali, it would appear from the above quotations, that Prof. Goldstücker and Prof. Weber are agreed in regarding Kātyāyana as an antagonist or, to speak more accurately, as an unfair antagonist of Pāṇini, and that both these scholars are of opinion that Kātyāyana had no other motive in composing the Vārttikas than to attack, or to find fault with, the Sūtras of his predecessor. If we try to examine how far this view of the literary activity of Kātyāyana may be correct, we meet at the very outset of our enquiry with the difficulty that neither Prof. Goldstücker nor Prof. Weber has furnished us with a test by which to recognise the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, that neither scholar has shown to us a way of reconstructing out of the Mahābhāshya, as we
find it in our MSS, the work of Kātyāyana as it must have existed before it was by Patanjali embodied in his own work. And not only have both withheld from us their guidance in deciding this most important and fundamental question, but they have incidentally ventured on statements the adoption of which, in my opinion, would be sure to mislead, and have in individual cases expressed opinions opposed to those which are unanimously held by the native grammarians.

It is true Prof. Goldstücker commences his description of the nature and the object of Kātyāyana's Vārttikas with Nāgojībhaṭṭa's definition of the term वार्तिक, but it must be apparent that that definition, even supposing it to have been rightly understood, can be of but little value in determining what are Kātyāyana's Vārttikas, for we find it stated by Prof. Goldstücker that the Mahābhāṣya contains not only Kātyāyana's Vārttikas, but also Vārttikas of Patanjali. Moreover, no reader of the essay on Pāṇini can fail to perceive that practically Prof. Goldstücker has little heeded Nāgojībhaṭṭa's definition, and that he frequently, and I may add, correctly, has prefixed the words Vārttika or Kātyāyana to remarks which justify and teach the proper application of, without in any way taking exception to, the Sūtras to which they refer. Turning to incidental notices, we find that in a note on page 29 Prof. Goldstücker speaks of the usual addition of Kātyāyana दृष्टि वाक्यवर्तमान in reality this phrase appears to be entirely foreign to the style of Kātyāyana, and occurs either in the original remarks of Patanjali, or in the explanations given by this scholar of Kātyāyana's Vārttikas. Nor is another statement (in a note on page 23) that 'Kātyāyana never gives instances' less liable to objection, for there are Vārttikas, on P. I, 1, 39 and other rules, which lay down general rules and at the same time give instances.

Prof. Weber has adopted Prof. Goldstücker's rendering of the definition of the term Vārttika, and on the strength of that definition so understood, he apparently is inclined to deny, that Vārttikas occur in the first Āhnikā of the Mahābhāṣya, vis., because no Sūtras of Pāṇini's are treated of in
that Āhṇika, and because therefore there is as yet no occasion for finding fault with Pāṇini. Though I have found reason to admire their thorough knowledge of the Mahābhāṣya, I am by no means inclined to assert that men like Kaiyāṭa, Bhaṭṭojidikṣita, and Nāgojībhaṭṭa are free from error. But when I see that those scholars unanimously call certain statements which we meet with in the first Āhṇika, by the name Vārttika, while at the same time they adhere to the current definition of that term as recorded by Nāgojībhaṭṭa, I in the first instance feel strongly moved to question whether the force of that definition has been rightly apprehended by Prof. Goldstücker. And when Prof. Weber justifies his doubts as to whether the words यथा लोकिकबैगिग्न्यु in the first Āhṇika are part of a Vārttika, by stating that the same words in other passages in which they occur (vis. on pages 28b, 45a, 136b of the first volume of the Lith. Ben. Edn., and on P. VI, i, 84) are certainly not Vārttikas, I can only reply that the sentence ending with यथा लोकिकबैगिग्न्यु on page 28b is called a Vārttika by Kaiyāṭa, and that I consider those words as part of Vārttikas in the remaining passages also. On page 399 (Ind. Stud. XIII.) Prof. Weber states that on the whole the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana are easily detected in the Mahābhāṣya, because as a rule they are followed by a short paraphrase which ends with the word वन्नत्व्य or कृत्व्य. This would seem to be an improvement on Prof. Goldstücker’s remark concerning इति वन्नत्व्यः, but it contains no test by which to recognize all the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana or even most of them; nor did Prof. Weber intend to lay down a general rule. Moreover, Prof. Weber, too, has regarded as Vārttikas statements of Patanjali which end with इति वन्नत्व्यः.

So far as we know at present, the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana do not exist separately in MS. MSS. which profess to give the Śrīmadbhagavat-Kātyāyanavirachita-vārttikapāṭha are indeed to be met with in different and widely distant parts of India,* but a very superficial examination is sufficient to prove that the Vārttikapāṭha which they contain, has been compiled and, I have no

---

* A so-called Vārtikapāṭhab has also been printed at Benares.
hesitation in saying, very carelessly compiled from the Mahâbhâshya at a comparatively modern date. Nor do the commentators on the Mahâbhâshya, or other scholars who have written on Pâñini, render us any very great assistance in reconstructing the work of Kâtyâyana, for they only occasionally contrast the views of Patanjali with those of the Vârtaikakâra, and they tell us only incidentally that a particular statement is a Vârtaika or belongs to Kâtyâyana. And Patanjali himself, the author of the Great Commentary, is even more reticent.

In attempting then to determine which are the Vârtaikas of Kâtyâyana, we are mainly left to our own resources. Given the Mahâbhâshya, which in accordance with the tradition handed down to us and to judge from incidental remarks that occur in the work itself, contains both Vârtaikas of Kâtyâyana and original matter contributed by Patanjali, we must attempt to find out whether there is anything in the method and the style of the work that would enable us to separate the former from the latter. In making an attempt of this nature, we may avail ourselves of the assistance rendered to us by the later native grammarians—not indeed on account of any traditional knowledge, which they may or may not have been possessed of, but because they evince a familiarity with the work of Patanjali in which they will never again be equalled,—and if the result to which our enquiry may lead should happen to coincide with their views, such accordance will tend to assure us that our attempt has not been entirely vain or fruitless. In this spirit and from this point of view I have examined that portion of the Mahâbhâshya which treats of the rules in the first Pâda of Pâñini’s grammar; the results which I have arrived at in the course of that examination I have tested by applying them in the later portions, and having found them confirmed, I now submit them to the judgment of others.

II.

The first thing sure to arrest the attention of the student of the Mahâbhâshya, is in my opinion this, that the method of discussion followed in it, is distinctly two-fold. If we examine
that part of the work which treats of the rules in the first Pāda of the Ashtādhyaū, we find that in the case of some rules the discussion is begun, continued, and ended in a series of short epigrammatic sentences. The paraphrases which invariably accompany these sentences, and the explanatory remarks which are sometimes added, form no integral part of the discussion. They facilitate the understanding of the sentences to which they are attached; but an intelligent reader might supply them for himself. They contribute nothing to the discussion of which at first sight they seem to form a part.

On the other hand, there are other rules in the discussion of which such short sentences accompanied by paraphrase and explanatory remarks, are completely wanting. Wherever this is the case, every part of the discussion is essentially necessary, and nothing could have been omitted without either breaking the continuity of the discussion, or depriving the student of information which no mere exegetical ability of his could have supplied him with.

As instances of rules where the former method has been exclusively adopted I cite P. I, 1, 10, 48, 54, 60, and 71; as instances for the latter P. I, 1, 14, 25, 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 55, 74 and 75.

On P. I, 1, 10 all essential points of the discussion are contained in the following sentences:—

(a) अज्जलोऽः प्रतिवेधे शक्तारप्रतिवेधोऽज्जल्ल्वात् ||
(b) तन सवर्णेश्वे देशः ||
(c) सिद्धमनवथानूः
(d) वाक्यापरितममात्मार् ||

On P. I, 1, 48 in the following:—

(a) एत इगचन्न सवर्णाकारवश्चन्तुर्मू ||
(b) दीर्घमस्तु निवर्तकवल्ल्वात् ||
(c) सिद्धमेडः सस्थानल्ल्वात् ||
(d) ऐनोधोत्तरभूयस्वल्ल्वात् ||
On P. I, 1, 54 in the following single sentence:—

अलोन्तस्यस्यादि: परस्यानेकालिश्लसवेष्टेन्त्रपवार्दिवतिषेपालसवादेशा ||

On P. I, 1, 60 in the following sentences:—

(a) लोपसंज्ञायामर्शसतोहस्म ||
(b) सर्वप्रसङ्गस्तु सर्वस्यान्यासांहुष्ठत्वाः ||
(c) तत्र प्रत्ययलक्षणप्रतिषेधः ||
(d) चिन्द्र तु पाःचार्यार्यनस्य लोपसंज्ञात्वाः ||

On P. I, 1, 71 in the following:—

(a) आदिर्न्येय सहेत्तस्यसंश्चत्य: संज्ञिनोऽनिदेशात् ||
(b) चिन्द्र त्वादिरिता सह तन्मध्यस्येति वचनात् ||
(c) संबन्धितश्रद्धैव तत्तयम ||

I select the discussion on this last rule as an instance to show that all that has been stated regarding that rule of पाणिनि′s in the Mahābhāshya is really contained in the three sentences which I have pointed out, and that what we find besides is paraphrase and explanatory remark. The whole Bhāshya on P. I, 1, 71 आदिर्न्येय सहेत्तता runs thus:—

आदिर्न्येय सहेत्तस्यसंश्चत्यः संज्ञिनोऽनिदेशात् ||
आदिर्न्येय सहेत्तस्यसंश्चत्यः संज्ञिनोऽनिदेशात् || किं कारणम् || संज्ञिनोऽनिदेशात् || न हि संज्ञिनो निदेशायते ||

सिद्ध त्वादिरिता सह तन्मध्यस्येति वचनात् ||
सिद्धमेतत् || कथम् || आदिर्न्येय सहेत्तता गृहमाण: स्वस्य च रूपस्य आहकसन्ध्यानां चैवति वचक्षयम् ||
संबन्धितश्रद्धैव तत्तयम ||
संबन्धितश्रद्धैव तत्तयमेतत् || तथा || मातरि वार्तत्वं पितारि लूभूषितववमिति || न कोच्चते स्वस्यां मातरि स्वस्मिनिपितरीति संबन्धानां गम्यते या यस्य माता यथं यस्य पितेति || एवभिज्ञाया-
दिरन्त्य इति संवनिधानां तद्रत्र संबंधितेत्तदन्त्यं यथ प्रति य आदिरन्त्य इति च भवति तत्त्व्य यहं भवति स्वर्य्य च रूपस्यादिति ||

To show how this method differs from that which has been followed on P. I, 1, 14 and the other rules enumerated above, in the discussion on which we meet with no sentences that are accompanied by paraphrase and explanatory remarks, I cite for the sake of brevity the Bhāshya on P. I, 1, 25 and 30.

P. I, 1, 25:—डति च || इदं डतिप्रहणं हि: क्रियते संख्यासंज्ञायं पद्यसंज्ञायां च एकं शास्त्रमकर्तुंम् कथम्। यदि ताब्धसंख्यासंज्ञायां क्रियते पद्यसंज्ञायं न कारिष्यते कथम्। ग्ञात्ता पुरवित्र उत्तित्युनुरतित्यते अथ वद्यसंज्ञायां क्रियते संख्यासंज्ञायं न कारिष्यते। डति वैत्त्व बिश्यासंज्ञापुरवित्यते ||

P. I, 1, 30:—तृतीयासमासे || समासं इति वर्तमाने पुनः समासं यहं क्रिमेचम्। अथ तृतीयासमासोऽस्त्वेव प्राथमकल्पिको यस्मि: ब्रह्मप्रवृत्तवृत्तमैक्ष्यिनेकम्बिनिमित्तं चेति। असि च ताद्वत्त्वाच च तृतीयासमासार्थीः पदानि तृतीयासमासं इति: तथावत्त्वाच च च तत्त्व्यं यहं कथम्। अथवा समासं इति वर्तमाने पुनः समासं यहं पौनेग्नै: शत्त्वाच विज्ञावचेत तति च योगांः यो-गतबिभागं कारिष्यते। तृतीयाः: तृतीयासमासे सर्वावत्त्व्याच सर्वनामसंज्ञानि न भवनि। मासपूर्वी देहि संवत्सरपूर्वी देहि ततो उसमाते। असमासे च तृतीयाः: सर्वावत्त्व्याच सर्वनामसंज्ञानि न भवनि। मासे पूर्वाच देहि संवत्सरेण पूर्वाच देहीति ||

If we now ask whether there is anything in the nature or in the object of the remarks on the two sets of rules cited above which could have induced the author of the Mahābhāshya to adopt two distinctly different methods of discussion, we are bound to answer in the negative. For the object of the discussions on P. I, 1, 10, &c., is no other than that of the discussions on P. I, 1, 14, &c., either to defend Pāṇini against objec-
tions which might be raised or have actually been raised, or to show the real meaning and the scope of his rules, or to prove that a particular rule need not have been given, &c. Nor is it the extent of the remarks appended to P. I, i, 10, &c. that could have induced Patanjali to sum up, as it were, the discussion in a few short sentences, which, it might be argued, are more easily remembered by the student than long discussions void of such summary sentences; for the remarks attached to some of the rules contained in the second set are even more lengthy than those attached to some rules of the first set.

Now I am well aware of the fact that there have lived authors in India who have furnished us with commentaries on works composed by themselves, and if Patanjali had carried on his discussions on Pâñini’s rules throughout his whole work in the manner which he follows, e.g. on P. I, i, 10, I would admit the possibility of his belonging to that class of authors. But it appears to me extremely unlikely that the same scholar in the composition of one and the same work should, for no discernible reason whatsoever, have followed two methods of discussion so different as those which Patanjali would seem to have adopted in the Mahâbhâshya, and the only way in which I am able to account for such an apparent inconsistency is by assuming that in the discussions on P. I, i, 10, &c., Patanjali has simply paraphrased and commented on the words of another scholar, while in those on P. I, i, 14, &c. he has given us his own original remarks on Pâñini’s Sûtras. In other words, I would venture to assume that those short sentences on P. I, i, 10, &c., by means of which the discussion is carried on from beginning to end, and which we find paraphrased and explained in the Mahâbhâshya, are not of Patanjali’s own authorship, but form part of the work of another scholar on which, in these instances, the author of the Mahâbhâshya is merely commenting. And this assumption is rendered the more probable when we find that the author of the Mahâbhâshya in the discussion on one of the rules which I have instanced above, on P. I, i, 10, does not merely give us his own interpretation of the sentences अब्ज्ञाज्ञानोऽपत्यमभक्तिरः.
&c., but also quotes, after having done so, the interpretation by another (अपर) of the very same sentences, which interpretation, in some respects, materially differs from his own. Such a proceeding of his would, in my opinion, be altogether inexplicable, were the sentences अज्ञातोऽपतिपितः &c. of Patanjali’s own authorship. Of whose authorship they are, I will not at present stop to enquire. I content myself with stating that the sentences (a) and (b) on P. I, i, 10 are called वृत्तिका by Bhaṭṭojidikshita in his Ṣabdakaustubha, that (c) and (d) on the same rule are ascribed to the वृत्तिकाकारा by the same scholar, and that the sentence (b) on P. I, i, 71 is called a वृत्तिका by Nāgojībhaṭṭa in his Pratyākhya-nasamgraha. On the other hand, the most diligent search has not enabled me to discover in the works of the commentators an indication that they have regarded any part of the discussions on P. I, i, 14 &c. as वृत्तिका, or have ascribed any portion of them to the वृत्तिकाकारा. On the contrary, Kaiyaṭa* distinctly ascribes the statement which we find on P. I,

* That Kaiyaṭa is older than the Kāśikā-vṛtī appears to be by no means so certain as has been generally assumed to be the case. For in his gloss on P. I, i, 75 and elsewhere Kaiyaṭa would seem distinctly to quote from the Kāśikā. Nor is it at all certain that the name of the author of the Kāśikā-vṛtī was Vāmana Jayāditya. On the contrary, it clearly follows from a remark of Bhaṭṭojidikshita’s in his Ṣabdakaustubha, that the Kāśikā-vṛtī is the work of the two scholars Jayāditya and Vāmana; that it was begun by the former and concluded by the latter. On page 122a of my MS. of the Ṣabdakaustubha Bhaṭṭojidikshita writes as follows:

तथा च ग्लाजिस्थिति सुष्मे (III, 2, 139) क्षोड़ज्ञातिकम् | कस्तील् ग्लाजिस्थिति . . . कमोश्रिकताति II जयादित्येऽध्येष्वयम् II वामनसु ग्लाजिस्थितिवच स्त्रा आ इत्याकारां भक्ष्यम् वसूलयासतस्य तिष्ठतितकार एव न त्वीवभिषित व्यास्यानादेव स्थास्यः: सिस्त्रि न कार्य गार्गारक्रियाः: कार्ये इत्यह II

Jayāditya’s view is that given in the Kāśikā on III, 2, 139; and that view is distinctly refuted, as stated by Bhaṭṭojidikshita, by Vāmana in the same Kāśikā on P. VII, 2, 11 (केचिवद विद्याकारिन्द्रेण ग्लाजिस्ति कोपें वर्ण-यन्तीयादि). It is impossible that the author of the comment on VII, 2, 11 should be the same person who composed the comment on III, 2, 139. It will, I think, be possible to show approximately where Jayāditya’s portion of the work ends and where Vāmana’s begins.
I, 75, to the Bhāṣyakāra, notwithstanding the fact that it ends with the phrase इति वन्नप्यम्.

The number of rules in the discussion of which either of the two methods described in the above has been exclusively adopted, appears small and insignificant, when it is compared with the number of those rules in discussing which the author of the Mahābhāshya would seem to have employed both methods, one by the side of the other. In the case of some rules the discussion opens with one or more paraphrased sentences, while it concludes with remarks in which such sentences are wanting; or on the other hand it opens with remarks that contain no such sentences, and it is carried on and concluded by means of paraphrased sentences. Again, there are numerous rules where both methods are continually changing places with each other.

On P. I, 1, 45 the discussion opens with the paraphrased sentences:

(a) सम्प्रसारणसंज्ञाय वाक्यस्य संज्ञा चेत्त्रिविधि: ।
(b) वर्णसंज्ञा चेत्त्रिवृद्धिः ।
(c) विभक्तिविशेषायिनेशश्च नापक उभयसंज्ञात्वस्य ।

and it concludes with remarks that contain no paraphrased sentences, but the object of which is identical with that of the paraphrased sentence (c), viz. to defend Pāṇini’s rule from the objections raised to it in (a) and (b).

On P. I, 1, 6 the discussion opens with the paraphrased sentences:

(a) दीर्घविवधोऽन्नदोविवधयत्वाद्वधीरुविवधित्यवच च्छन्दसोऽदीधे-ददीध्युरिति गुणद्वीनादादृतिदेशः ।
(b) दीर्घविवधिति च द्विन्यथयेन ।

which are intended to show that सीवनीची might have been omitted from Pāṇini’s rule; and it concludes with remarks in which no paraphrased sentence occurs, but the purport of which is similar to that of (a) and (b), viz. to prove that इति might have been omitted likewise.
On P. I, 1, 11 the discussion opens with lengthy remarks which consider the propriety of the Anubandha &c. of Pāṇini's rule, remarks in which we do not meet with any paraphrased sentences; and it is continued by means of the following paraphrased sentences which consider the several possible interpretations of Pāṇini's rule:

(a) इदायतो यथिवचनं प्रगृह्या इति चेदन्तस्य विषि: 
(b) इदायतन्त यथिवचनन्ति चेदेकस्य विषि: 
(c) न वाचन्तवस्वात् 
(d) इदायतन्त यथिवचनान्नति चेदुकिक प्रतिषेधः 
(e) सत्प्रमार्थेवहं ज्ञापक पत्याभुक्षणात्विषेधस्य 

On P. I, 1, 49 the discussion opens with remarks on the term स्थानेयोग: it is carried on by means of the paraphrased sentences:

(a) पतीस्थानेयोगवचनं नियमार्थम् 
(b) अवयवपदचारादिप्रवत्तमस्कः शासो गोह इति 
(c) अवयवपदचारानां चामःनियोगस्वासंदिर्ध्वात् 

the purport of which is to show the object of Pāṇini's rule, to state an objection to which it is liable, and to refute that objection; (c) is followed by remarks without paraphrase, identical in purpose with (c); those remarks are in turn followed by the paraphrased sentence:

(d) विशिष्टा वा पती स्थानेयोगः 

which suggests a different way of obviating the objection raised in (b); and after that the discussion is wound up with remarks in which no paraphrased sentences occur, and in which Pāṇini's rule, taken in the sense which is ordinarily ascribed to it, is stated to be superfluous.

And here again we have to observe that there is nothing whatsoever in the nature of the questions discussed, which could seem to have induced the author of the Mahābhāshya to
follow one method in preference to the other, for the remarks which contain no paraphrased sentences are of essentially and identically the same nature as other remarks conveyed to us by means of such sentences, the object of both being either to justify or to find fault with the rules laid down by Pāṇini. We at any rate fail to perceive, why Patanjali on P. I, i, 11 should have discussed the possible interpretations of that rule (ङ्गावयो याह्वचनम् or इत्यधान्तं याह्वचनम् &c.) in paraphrased and commented sentences, and should not have adopted the same method on P. I, i, 39 (युजो मान्त: or कृतं बन्मान्तसं); or why he should have discussed the propriety of the Anubandha त्रू of इत्य &c., on P. I, i, 11 without employing paraphrased sentences, and should, when considering the same question with regard to the Anubandha त्रू in P. I, i, 1, have opened the discussion with a paraphrased sentence.

The conclusion to which we are led by these considerations would again seem to be this, that, whenever the author of the Mahābhāṣya in the discussion of Pāṇini’s rules makes use of sentences to which he attaches a paraphrase and comment, he, while doing so, is quoting and commenting on the words of another scholar, and that those portions of the discussion which do not consist of paraphrased sentences contain original remarks of Patanjali’s, remarks, I may add, which adduce additional evidence in support of, or corrections of, the statements of that other scholar, or discuss questions which had not been raised by him. And there is, I believe, even in that small portion of the Mahābhāṣya on which mainly I have based this enquiry, evidence sufficient to prove that the paraphrased and commented sentences are not of Patanjali’s authorship. I have mentioned already that in one instance at least (on P. I, i, 10) the author of the Mahābhāṣya does not merely give us his own interpretation of the sentences by means of which he carries on the discussion, but also quotes the different interpretation of the very same sentences by another scholar. I may now add a similar instance which occurs in the discussion on P. I, i, 69. After having paraphrased and commented on the three sentences
Patanjali goes on to say: अपर आह।

Here then Patanjali informs us that another scholar has not only given a different interpretation, but has also adopted a different reading, of those very sentences which Patanjali himself has just been making use of. Could we wish for stronger proof that at any rate these sentences cannot be Patanjali's own?

Again, after having on P. I, 1, 3 paraphrased the sentence सर्वसाधारणाशास्त्रानिगत्तस्य in the words सर्वसाधारणं गुणो निगत्तस्य प्राप्तो, Patanjali shows that so understood the sentence would be open to objection, and he therefore proposes another paraphrase and another explanation of the same sentence, which he introduces thus: एवं ताहि नामं वेदसुधचति: पूवात्मकाः ४० लेख्यान: हये चाभे च: (i.e. the च of सर्वादेशात्मक) पाठित:—In other words, Patanjali tells us that it would be possible to understand the particle च of the sentence सर्वादेशात्मकानिगत्तस्य either in its ordinary sense or in the sense of वहि, and in doing so, and by the manner in which he introduces his second explanation, he, in my opinion, clearly shows that he is commenting on the words of another. And the same conclusion we have to draw from another remark of his, on P. I, 1, 63; in which he informs us that the particle च of the paraphrased sentence क्रमेवकीर्त्तं च does not stand in its proper place, but should have been placed, or should at any rate be understood to stand, immediately after क्रमेव: (अविवेच्येष्व च: पाठित: क्रमेव वीर्येष्वम् |).
I will not try the patience of the reader by adducing many more instances which would all point to the same conclusion, but I cannot refrain from drawing attention to at least two others, because they somewhat differ from those which I have given above. On P. I, 1, 38 the discussion is carried on by means of the following paraphrased sentences:

(a) अस्वर्भिरभावाविभावक्षिरनिमित्रस्योपस्वस्थानम्
(b) सर्वस्वर्भिरभावविशेषाय
(c) चर्चादीनां स्वप्स्वस्थानम्
(d) अविभक्ताविरेतरात्मत्स्वाधरिः
(e) अविभक्तसंस्थामिति वा
(f) सिद्धे तु पाठपात्

(a—c) show that Pāṇini's rule has to be corrected; (d) and (e) show that two alterations of the rule which might possibly be suggested, can, on account of the objection to which they would be open, and which has been stated in (d), not be adopted; (f) on the other hand states that the corrections mentioned in (a—c) need not be made, and that the alterations suggested in (d) and (e) need not be adopted, as soon as all the Taddhita-affixes intended in Pāṇini's rule are put down in the Gāṇa svārādī. The statement made in (f) is opposed to the suggestion made in (e), and the particle तु in (f) is in its proper place and has its usual force. But if we turn to the paraphrase of (f), we find that there तु 'but' has been rendered by वा 'or' (पाठपात् विशेषतः). How are we to account for this rendering? By the simple fact that Patanjali, after commenting on (e), has shown that the objection to which the alteration suggested in (e) was by the author of the paraphrased sentences considered to be liable, is in reality no objection at all. Patanjali adopts the definition अविभक्तसंस्थामित्यथास्थानम् which was objected to in (e) and for him therefore the course indicated in (f) is only an alternative course. His rendering of तु by वा is inexplicable as long as we consider the paraphrased sentences (e) and (f) as his own; it admits of a reasonable explanation when we
regard them as statements made by another. And that this is the view held by the commentators, follows from Kaiyāta’s gloss: सिंधु स्थित । वार्षिककारस्वेतराजयाभ्याष: स्थित एष्टाति हुश्चरो विश्लेषस्वाध्यायः । भाष्यकारण गविलराजयाभ्याष: परिवर्त इति वाचार्यवर्षु ोष्ठब्ध्वे न्यायात् ।

On P. I, 1, 61 we find the following paraphrased sentences:

(a) हुमतः प्रत्ययमहमगत्यसंज्ञामतः यत्थार्थम् ।
(b) प्रयोजनं तद्नितरतु तकं तिरंगान्द्रयो तुष्टि च गोपकृत-तिनिवृत्तथैम् ।
(c) उल्लो वा ।
(d) पदार्थिनिदेशार्थे तु ।
(e) अनिवृत्ते हि परशायमार्थिणि: ।
(f) सब्जिदेशार्थे वा वचनार्थामाण्यात् ।

The object of the whole discussion is to prove the necessity of the word प्रत्ययम in Pāṇini’s rule; one reason for the employment of प्रत्ययम is given in (d-e), and another alternative reason in (f). Such being the case, the particle वा in (f) would seem to stand in its proper place and to convey the meaning which it usually conveys. But if we again turn to Patanjali’s paraphrase of (f), we find that he has rendered वा by तवह, a word which he elsewhere makes use of to paraphrase the particle तु. The reason for this rendering of his is similar to that for his rendering तु on P. I, 1, 38 by वा. After having commented on (d-e), Patanjali has shown that प्रत्ययम for the reason stated in (d-e) would not be necessary; and to him therefore (f) does not convey an alternative reason for the employment of प्रत्ययम.

In his opinion प्रत्ययम is not necessary for the reason given in (d-e), but it is necessary for the reason given in (f). His rendering of वा by तवह is explained, as soon as and only when we assume that the paraphrased sentences (d—f) are not his own but another’s. And here again we are able to quote Kaiyāta in support of the view we have taken; for in commenting on (f) that commentator remarks: पदार्थिनिदेशार्थेनून स्थितमेवविना वाचिकारस्व विकल्पार्थै: वाचार्य: प्रयुक्तः । . . . भाष्यकारस्व तवह्वयं वाचार्यं व्याच्यायं: पदार्थिनिदेशार्थेनून नेष्टिति।
I have shown in the preceding that the method of discussion followed in the Mahâbhâshya is distinctly twofold; I have attempted to account for this twofold method by assuming that those sentences made use of in the discussion of Pâñini’s rules, which we find to be accompanied by paraphrase and comment, are not of Patanjali’s authorship; and I have tried to render this assumption probable by drawing attention to the manner in which those sentences have been paraphrased and commented on in various passages of the Mahâbhâshya. I may be told now that, if then only that portion of the Mahâbhâshya which does not consist of paraphrased sentences were Patanjali’s, and if the paraphrased sentences themselves had really to be considered as proceeding from another author, we might well expect that the two parts of the work, being in reality works by different authors, should differ as regards their respective styles and the language employed in either of them. So far from regarding such an objection as hostile to the view which I have ventured to express, I gladly avail myself of it, to adduce the difference of style and of language as additional evidence in favour of the assumption that the paraphrased sentences do not belong to the author of the rest of the Mahâbhâshya. I cannot pretend to undertake at present to show that difference in all its details; all I shall attempt to do here, is to illustrate it by a few characteristic instances.

Very often the question is raised in the Mahâbhâshya whether a particular term employed in Pâñini’s rules conveys one meaning or another, whether we are to understand a rule in one sense or in another, whether a particular term should be understood to be qualified in this or in that way, whether a rule should be regarded as teaching something independently of other rules or as a restrictive rule, &c. In all these cases it is customary to place before the reader both sides of the question and to state the objections to which either side would be liable. And here we have to observe that whenever this is done by means of paraphrased sentences, the particles employed are always चौर or नति चौर, and that when it is done without the employment of such sentences the particle used is invariably
यहि, generally followed by अथि. In proof of this I adduce from the paraphrased sentences:

On P.I, 1, 3—(किं पुनरायमलोकोन्त्रयोप आहोसिस्विदलोकोन्त्रया-पवादः)

阒्वदिगुणावलोकोन्त्रस्येति चेन्मिदि भगम्
इद्मात्रस्येति चेज्जुसि प्रतिष्ठेः

On P.I, 1, 11—(कर्वं पुनरिदं विन्द्रयते)

इद्वादयो यहिद्विचनं प्रगुणा हति चेदन्त्यस्य विधि:
इद्वादयं यहिद्विचननमिति चेदेकस्य विधि:
इद्वादयं यहिद्विचननान्तमिति चेज्जुकं प्रतिष्ठेः

On P.I, 1, 45—(किमियं वाक्यस्य संप्रसारणसंज्ञा क्रियते...)

आहोसिस्विद्वरण्यस्य...

संप्रसारणत्रंशयायं वाक्यस्य संज्ञा चेज्जुविधिः
वर्णसंज्ञा चेिन्द्रविचि:.

On P.I, 1, 51—(किमिदमुरण्णपरवचनमन्यनिवृत्त्यथेः...

आहोसिस्विद्परवचनमात्रमनें विधियते...)

उरण्णपरवचनमन्यनिवृत्त्यथायमिति चेज्जुदात्तादिशु देशः
य उ: स्थानेश्वु र सरप हति चेज्जुवृत्त्योरवर्णांगतिपति:

On P.I, 1, 57—(किं पुनरत्तरस्य विधि प्रति स्थानिक्रिया आहोसिस्विद्वृत्तमात्रस्य)

अनन्तरस्य चेज्जुकानुरावचति पूपसंख्यानम्
पूर्वमात्रस्येति चेज्जुपवाइत्स्वत्त्वम्

(किं पुनरायमात्रायां प्रकृती स्थानिक्रियवलयाहोसिस्विदविशेषेण...)

अविशेषण स्थानिक्रियाति चेिहोपणादेशेव गुरुविधि:
भगमु स्थानिक्रियाति चेज्जग्यादिप्रदेशानुपतिपति:

On P.I, 1, 65—(किमिदमलयहमन्यनिवृत्त्येशणम्...)

उपथासंज्ञायामलयहममन्यनिद्रेष्टाश्चेदं संघात्मतिपति:
On P. I, 1, 70—(किं पुनरिदं नियमार्थमाहोस्वित्वापकम् | . . .)
तपरस्तत्कालस्येति नियमार्थ्यमिति चेदीर्थो . . . यह्यंम् 
प्राप्यमिति चेदुप्रयह्येण दीर्घंतव्रतिपदे: | 

To show how the same or similar questions are discussed when no paraphrases are employed, I instance—

On P. I, 1, 1—(किं पुनरिदं तत्त्वावित्प्रहणम् . . . आहोस्विदादेशमात्रस्य | . . .)
यदि तत्त्वावित्प्रहणं . . . न प्राप्ति | 
अथादेशात्रस्य यहं . . . प्राप्ति | 

On P. I, 1, 7—(कथयमिदं विज्ञायते | . . . .)
यदि विज्ञायते अविद्यमानं . . . न प्राप्ति | 
अथ विज्ञायते अविद्यमानं . . . न दोषो भवति | 

On P. I, 1, 20—(कथयमिदं विज्ञायते . . . .)
यदि विज्ञायते द्वादशा: प्रकृतय: स एव दोष: | 
अथ विज्ञायते द्वादशा: प्रकृतय: इति . . . न स्वात् | 

On P. I, 1, 39—(कथयमिदं विज्ञायते कृत्यो मान्त इत्याहोस्वित्तक्कर्तं यन्त्यान्त्यत्मिति | . . . .)
यदि विज्ञायते कृत्यो मान्त इति . . . न प्राप्ति | 
अथ विज्ञायते कृत्यं यन्त्यान्त्यत्मिति . . . प्राप्ति | 

On P. I, 1, 50—(सा कि प्रकृतिको भवति . . . आहोस्विदादेशार्थ: . . . |)
यदि प्रकृतित हों . . . आदेशार्थो . . . दोष: | 

On P. I, 1, 52—(किमिदमलयहंमन्त्यविशेषणमाहोस्विदादेशाविशेषणम् | . . . .)
विधवत्वविशेषणमादेशो आदेशेष्टो भवति | . . . . 

The difference of expression between the passages quoted from the discussions on P. I, 1, 11 and 65 on the one hand, and from P. I, 1, 39 and 52 on the other, is particularly instructive,
because the questions raised and discussed are in either cases exactly the same.

No reader of the Mahābhāṣya can have failed to perceive that frequently objections are raised to Pāṇini's rules, alterations proposed and additional rules suggested. But it not seldom happens that in the course of the discussion these objections are shown to be unfounded, the alterations to be uncalled for, or the additional rules to be unnecessary. And here again we have to notice a striking difference of expression as between the paraphrased sentences and the rest of the Mahābhāṣya; for in the case of the former those objections, &c., are most usually refuted in sentences commencing with the words न व या or तत्ताः व वक्तव्यः | न व वक्तव्यः, generally followed by a noun in the ablative case; while in the latter the same object is attained by such expressions as नैष्प्रेषः; तत्ताः व वक्तव्यः | न व वक्तव्यः, followed by a complete sentence which takes the place of the ablative case of the paraphrased sentences. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this difference of expression:—

On P. I, 1, 39 we have the paraphrased sentence न या संज्ञालक्षणो विपरितादिभिः सत्तुपस्थितिः; on P. I, 1, 20 not paraphrased न ताः प्रतिपद्यो वक्तव्यः | न व वक्तव्यः | चुःस्तृता कृष्णाः भवति। संज्ञालक्षणो विपरितादिभिः सत्तुपस्थितिः न भविष्यति.

On P. VI, 4, 130 the paraphrased sentence न या नित्तिर्देवमानस्यादेशावतः; on P. I, 1, 47 and 51 not paraphrased नैष्प्रेषः; नित्तिर्देवमानस्यादेशाः भवतीत्वेऽवत न भविष्यति.

On P. VI, 2, 2 the paraphrased sentence सिद्धं तु लक्षणप्रतिपदेभेऽन्नयोः प्रतिपदेन्नक्षेत्र यहानातू; on P. I, 1, 15 not paraphrased न वक्तव्यः। लक्षणप्रतिपदेभेऽन्नयोः प्रतिपदेन्नक्षेत्रेऽवत न भविष्यति.

On P. VI, 1, 1, the paraphrased sentence सिद्धं तु तद्वेण्णसंविश्वानावत्निल्येऽवतः भवति; on P. I, 1, 27 not paraphrased नैष्प्रेषः। भवति हि बहुधीशाः तद्वेण्णसंविश्वावत्निल्येऽवतः.

A common artifice of refuting an objection—less frequently resorted to in the paraphrased sentences than in the rest of the Mahābhāṣya—is to show that that objection has been indirectly guarded against by Pāṇini himself; in other words, to point out a Jñāpaka. When this is done in the paraphrased sentences, we find, so far as I have observed, invariably the noun
followed by another noun in the genitive case; in the remainder of the Mahābhāṣya we always have instead some such verbal phrase as ज्ञापकत्वाचार्ये, आचार्यमहत्त्वता। Instances of the latter mode of expression are of the most frequent occurrence. From the paraphrased sentences I quote:

On P. I, 1, 11—साम्यमाध्यक्षगर्भ ज्ञापके प्रत्ययक्षत्रगामितिपस्य;
On P. I, 1, 45—विभन्निद्विदेशरिष्टु ज्ञापक उभयसंस्तत्वस्य;
On P. I, 1, 59—अज्ञहनं तु ज्ञापके रूपस्तानिवज्ञानस्य; and

And this leads me to draw attention generally to the almost entire absence of verbal forms from the paraphrased sentences, which absence, in my opinion, constitutes one of their chief characteristics of style, as compared with the style of the unparaphrased portion of the Mahābhāṣya. In cases where in the latter we meet with such verbal forms or expressions as प्रामाणयति, विचेष्याति, नेपणपरायते, वाक्येति, हि वाक्येति, न वाक्येति, प्रामनं न कर्त्तव्यम्, महत्त्वं शाक्यमं कथौः, we are sure to meet in the former, nouns such as भस्मं, विवेग, अनुपापति, वचनम्, अवचनम्, अमहनम्, and in many instances it is altogether left to ourselves to complete the sentence by supplying some verb or phrase such as अपि, भविष्यति, स्तवं, किवति, प्रामाणयति, सत्त्वति, न सत्त्वति, कार्तिक्यति, वाक्येति, हि वाक्येति, &c. On P. I, 1, 8 where the word सूक्ष्म of Pāṇini’s rule is stated to be superfluous, the unparaphrased sentence which contains this statement is सूक्ष्मसंहं शाक्यमकत्वृः; on P. I, 1, 23 where the same remark is made with reference to the words बः &c. of that rule, the paraphrased sentence made use of for the purpose reads simply क्राह्यामाध्यक्षहम्. On P. I, 1, 36 and 75 we find the additional or corrective rules अपरीति वर्णवेदि, एवं प्राचां वेदे शैषिकेवैति वर्णवेदि, to which no paraphrase has been attached; so far as my knowledge goes, no paraphrased sentence even concludes with the phrase हि वाक्येति.

If these considerations should have rendered probable the supposition that the paraphrased sentences are not of Patanjali’s authorship, and that the author of the Mahābhāṣya has merely commented on them, and supplemented and cor-
rected the statements contained in them, by his own original remarks, that probability will be raised to a certainty, when we consider the manner in which Patanjali has referred to them and to their author in the uncommented portions of his work. The Mahābhāṣya being a work on Pāṇini's grammar, it is natural that Patanjali, in such words as पढ़ति, करोति, शास्त्रि, ताष्यति, 'he reads', 'he teaches,' &c. should have referred to Pāṇini, without being under the necessity of telling us that he was citing or referring to Pāṇini. Moreover, I have had occasion to state elsewhere that wherever reference is thus made to Pāṇini, the context would show at once and beyond doubt that the subject of the verbs पढ़ति, करोति &c. can be no other than Pāṇini. But there remain very many verbs of this kind for which it is impossible to supply the subject 'Pāṇini'; in all these cases the reference made is, so far as my own observation goes, invariably to paraphrased sentences. The verbal forms belonging to this class which occur in that part of the Mahābhāṣya which treats of the rules of the first Pāda, are:

On page 55b of the Lith. Ben. Ed. पढ़ति; the paraphrased sentence referred to follows immediately upon पढ़ति;

P. 59b वष्यति; refers to a paraphrased sentence on the same page;

P. 66b वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. I, 1, 47;
P. 69a वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on the next page;
P. 72a वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VI, 1, 101;
P. 77b वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. I, 4, 14;
P. 86b वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VI, 1, 1;
P. 88a वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VIII, 3, 59;
P. 99a वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. I, 1, 72;
P. 99b वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. II, 2, 35;
P. 102a वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VI, 2, 2;
P. 106b वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VIII, 2, 3;
P. 117a वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VI, 4, 72;
P. 133a वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. I, 1, 56;
P. 139b वष्यति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. I, 1, 58;
P. 141b वस्त्रयि; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VIII, 2, 23;
P. 146b वस्त्रयि; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VII, 3, 54;
P. 148b वस्त्रयि; to a paraphrased sentence on P. IV, 3, 163;
P. 156b वस्त्रयि; to a paraphrased sentence on the next page;
P. 157b वस्त्रयि; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VI, 4, 34;
P. 159b चीवचित्ति; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VIII, 2, 107;
P. 164a वस्त्रयि; to a paraphrased sentence on P. VI, 1, 186.

It is hardly necessary to tell the reader that the manner in which Patanjali here invariably speaks of the author of the paraphrased sentences, in no way differs from the manner in which other commentators continually speak, not of themselves, but of those authors on whose works they happen to be commenting, and since there is no doubt that Patanjali has commented on those sentences, it is natural to conclude that those sentences are not his own, but are the work of another. And this conclusion is further strengthened, when we find that in such expressions as पाठ्यमित्र व्याचारयः: e.g. on page 75b of the Benares Edn., or वस्त्रयि व्याचारयः: e.g. on pages 143b and 151a, the author of those sentences* is actually spoken of by Patanjali as the Āchārya, in the same way in which Patanjali elsewhere speaks of the Āchārya Pāṇini.

The first part of our enquiry is drawing to a close. Considering it unlikely that an author in the composition of one and the same work should have adopted two methods of discussion so different as those which Patanjali would seem to have adopted in his Mahābhāshya, we ventured to assume that those portions of the Mahābhāshya which have been furnished by him with paraphrase and comment, were not his own. That assumption we tried to render probable by pointing out that the manner in which Patanjali in various passages of his work has been paraphrasing and commenting, admits of a reasonable explanation only when we assume that he was commenting on and paraphrasing the words of another. We then showed that the paraphrased portions of the Mahābhāshya in style and language differ from the rest of that work as we

* See on P. VI, 1, 129; VI, 4, 104; and VI, 1, 12.
might expect the works of two different authors to differ from each other. And we finally pointed out that by the manner in which he continually refers to and quotes the paraphrased sentences and their author, Patanjali himself has clearly shown to us that that author must be another than himself. Fortunately we are not left without the means of ascertaining who that author was. For since Patanjali, when e.g. quoting on P. I, 1, 34, a paraphrased sentence from the discussion on P. VIII, 3, 13, incidentally, but obliged to be more explicit than usual because only in the preceding line and for one and the same purpose he had been quoting the Āchārya Pāṇini, has told us that that paraphrased sentence is the Vārttikakāra’s, it is clear that that author was called Vārttikakāra. And since the same Patanjali, after having on P. III, 2, 118, in his usual manner paraphrased a sentence, has in the sequel informed us that that sentence is Kātyāyana’s, it is equally clear that the name of that Vārttikakāra was Kātyāyana.

The conclusion then at which we have arrived is this, that the paraphrased sentences which we meet with in the Mahābhāṣṭya belong to Kātyāyana, the author of the Vārttikas; and this conclusion furnishes us with a means, in my opinion the only means, of reconstructing from the text of the Mahābhāṣṭya, as it has been handed down to us in MS., the text of the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana. We may as yet consider it matter for further enquiry whether all the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana have been recorded by Patanjali; but wherever in the Mahābhāṣṭya we meet with a paraphrased statement, of which Patanjali does not tell us explicitly that it belongs to another or to others, or of which the context does not prove clearly and beyond doubt that it is a quotation from the work of another, we shall regard ourselves as bound to assume that such statement is Kātyāyana’s, or in other words, that it is a Vārttika or part of one. On the other hand, we shall not allow ourselves to regard as a Vārttika of Kātyāyana any statement unless it be accompanied by a paraphrase.*

* If in accordance with this principle we examine the passages from the Mahābhāṣṭya quoted by Prof. Goldstücker in notes 141—152 of
applying this principle, we may occasionally find it difficult to
decide whether a particular statement should be regarded as
merely paraphrasing another statement by which it is preceded,
or as an explanatory remark such as an author might think
it necessary to append to a statement previously made by
himself. But, on the one hand, to judge from my own expe-
rience, such cases are exceedingly rare; on the other hand, the
more we become familiar with the manner, the style, and the
language of Kātyāyana by the study of what undoubtedly is his,
the easier and the more ready will be our decision in cases
which at first sight may appear to us doubtful.

There is yet another difficulty which is intimately connected:
with and which results from the manner in which Patanjali
has paraphrased the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana. I have found it
convenient to employ throughout the preceding investigation
the word *paraphrase*, but it would have been more correct to
say that frequently Patanjali does not paraphrase but literally
repeats the words of the Vārttika which he happens to make
use of. If I might venture to give a reason for his doing so,
I would say that Patanjali adopted that practice in order to
apprise us of the fact that he was giving us not his own argu-
ments but those of Kātyāyana; in other words, to save the
literary property of that scholar. However this may be, there
can be no doubt that the very practice which he adopted,
through the carelessness of the copyists, has in many cases led
to the disappearance of Vārttikas from our MSS., and conse-
quentially from the only complete edition of the Mahābhāshya
which has been published up to the present. One example
will suffice to prove this.

his Panini, we find that Prof. Goldstücker has correctly termed Vārttikas:
hṛṣeyāṅgō on P. I, 2, 6 (note 141); hṛṣṭāncāndrī on P. VII, 1, 26. (note
142); yamānuṣaṅke on P. VIII, 4, 45. (note 143); va gom-deva on P. IV, 2,
129 (note 152). On the other hand, the statements विक्रियागो वेदित वक्त्यम्
on P. VI, 1, 150 (note 145); आब्रवमुरु हृति व on P. VI, 1, 147 (note 147);
मोङ्गलमथ्यवहारिगित व on P. VII, 3, 69 (note 148); पध्य-धात्री हृति व on P.
IV, 2, 129 (note 152); which also have been termed Vārttikas by Prof.
Goldstücker and other scholars, are no Vārttikas, but are Patanjali's.
On pages 149 a and b of the Lithog. Benares Edn., we read as follows:—

\[ \text{किम प्रयोजनम् | कस्लोप: सलोपे | कस्लोप: सलोपे प्रयोजनम् |} \]

\[ \ldots \ldots \text{दप आकारलोप आदिचुरुब्धः प्रयोजनम् |} \ldots \ldots \]

\[ \text{हलो यमां यमि लोपे प्रयोजनम् |} \ldots \ldots \text{अहोपणिहोपै संयो-} \]

\[ \text{गानतलोपप्रमृतियु प्रयोजनम् |} \ldots \ldots \text{खिर्ब्रचनादीनि च प्रयोजनानि} \]

\[ \ldots | \text{वरेयलोपस्वरवर्जम् | वरेय-} \]

\[ \text{लोपे स्वरं च वर्जित्वा |} \]

According to what I have said in the preceding, this passage would seem to contain only two Vārttikas, \textit{viz.} कस्लोप: सलोपे and \textit{वरेयलोपस्वरवर्जम्}, for apparently only these two statements have been paraphrased by Patanjali. A comparison of other Vārttikas of Kātyāyana (on P. I, 1, 21, 39, &c.) would make us feel inclined to read the first of these Vārttikas \text{प्रयोजनं कस्लोप:} \\

\[ \text{सलोपे, and we would willingly recognize Vārttikas also in} \]

\[ \text{दप आकारलोप} | \text{हलो यमां, अहोप, and खिर्ब्रचनादीनि, were we not forbidden} \]

\[ \text{to do so by the result of our enquiry. We now turn to Prof.} \]

\[ \text{Goldstücker's photo-lithograph copy of the Mahābhāshya, and} \]

\[ \text{find that the same passage is read thus:—} \]

\[ \text{किं प्रयोजनम् | प्रयोजन कस्लोप: सलोपे | कस्लोप: सलोपे प्रयोजनम् |} \ldots \ldots \text{दप आकारलोप आदिचुरुब्धः प्रयो-} \]

\[ \text{जनम् |} \ldots \ldots \text{हलो यमां यमि लोपे २ प्रयोजनम् |} \ldots \ldots \text{अहोपणिहोपै संयोगानतलोपप्रमृतियु} \]

\[ \ldots \text{२ प्रयोजनम् |} \ldots \text{खिर्ब्रच-} \]

\[ \text{नादीनि च | खिर्ब्रचनादीनि च न पटितव्यानि मवति |} \ldots \ldots \text{वरेयलोपस्वरवर्जम् | वरेय-} \]

\[ \text{लोपे स्वरं च वर्जित्वा |} \]

Here we find that the first Vārttika is really read as we expected that it should be read, \text{प्रयोजनं कस्लोप: सलोपे, and we perceive at once that the first word} \text{प्रयोजन} \]

\[ \ldots \text{has been omitted in the Benares edition because it was preceded by the same} \]

\[ \text{word प्रयोजन म् in किं प्रयोजनम्. We further see from the figure} \]

\[ \text{after लोपे and प्रमृतियु that the words हलो यमां यमि लोपे and अहो-} \]

\[ \text{पणिहोपै संयोगानतलोपप्रमृतियु have to be read twice; and the words} \]
\( (29) \)

\text{विर्यचनादीनि च we find actually written twice. Such being the case, the result of our enquiry tells us that हलो यमा यम्मि लोपे, अर्ध-पणिलोपे संयोगान्तलोपप्रभृतिपु, and विर्यचनादीनि च which we were inclined to regard as \( \text{वृत्तिकास, are वृत्तिकास, omitted in the Benares edition, or in the MSS. from which it has been prepared, because the paraphrases by which those वृत्तिकास are followed commence with identically the same words. And having found it proved in this manner, that at least three of the four statements which we were inclined to regard as वृत्तिकास, are वृत्तिकास, we shall not I trust be accused of rashness when we venture to assume that also the fourth of those statements, द्व आकारलोप आदिवचतुर्यथां, is really a वृत्तिका, omitted also in the photo-lithograph copy, because the writer forgot to write the figure २ after the word आदिचतुर्यथां. The वृत्तिकास which the above passage contains, are therefore not two, but six:}

1. प्रयोजनं क्षत्रोप: लोपे.
2. द्व आकारलोप आदिचतुर्यथां.
3. हलो यमा यम्मि लोपे.
4. अर्धपणिलोपे संयोगान्तलोपप्रभृतिपु.
5. विर्यचनादीनि च.
6. वरेयलोपस्वर्यवर्जितं.

In a similar manner वृत्तिकास have disappeared on page 162\(a\) of the Benares edition, on page 168\(b\), 169\(b\), 173\(b\), 177\(b\), and elsewhere. Here then our only safeguard is not to trust to one or two indifferent MSS., but to compare in every instance the best and oldest MSS. which we may be able to lay hold of.

III.

There is in my opinion no better way of testing the soundness of the conclusion at which we have arrived in the preceding, than practically to apply the principle with which it has furnished us, for the reconstruction of \( \text{कात्यायन\'s वृत्तिकास. But as want of space would forbid such a reconstruction on any} \)
large scale, I am obliged to confine my attempt in this direction to a small portion of the Mahābhāshya. I shall choose for the purpose first the 7th Āhnika of the first Pāda, which treats of Pāṇini’s rules I, 1, 45—55. After having pointed out the Vārttikas which occur in the discussion of each rule, I shall, in as few words as possible, point out their tendency, and shall show (in italics) what Patanjali’s views are in regard to them, or whether he has raised any points of discussion regarding the rules of Pāṇini, which have not been noticed by Kātyāyana; but I shall not think it necessary expressly to state in each case that Patanjali has simply commented on or adopted a particular Vārttika. In notes I shall indicate whether any portions of the discussion have incidentally been called Vārttikas by Kaiyāṭa, Nāgojibhaṭṭa or Bhaṭṭojidikṣhita (in his Śabdakaustubha), and shall also state what Vārttikas or other remarks from the Mahābhāshya the editors of the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini have thought fit to append to their gloss. Having, in this manner, gone through the whole of the 7th Āhnika, I shall subject the discussions on some other rules of the first Pāda to a similar examination.

P. I, 1, 45—हरण: संग्रासारणम् ||
Vārttikas:

(a) संग्रासारणसंज्ञायां वाक्यस्य संज्ञा चेत्त्वर्गविधि: ||
(b) वर्णसंज्ञा चेत्त्वर्गविधि: ||
(c) विभक्तिविशेषविनिर्देशस्तु शापक उभयसंज्ञात्वस्य ||

(a) and (b) state the objections to which the two possible interpretations of Pāṇini’s rule would be liable; (c) shows why both interpretations are nevertheless admissible.

Patanjali agrees with Kātyāyana; and shows subsequently how the objections to either interpretation may be refuted also in other ways.

Note.—The Calcutta edition gives no Vārttikas, nor any remarks of Patanjali’s.
P. I, 1, 46—आधान्ती टकितै ||

Vârttikas:

(a) टकितौराधान्ताविधानं प्रत्ययालितमेव ||
(b) परवचनान्तिसुद्रमिति भेणापवादवात् ||
(c) सर्द्द तु परवचनिकारे वचनात् ||
(d) आधान्योवर्भ परवचनेयाचतुद्वारवेयसंगत्ययं ||

Patanjali commences with remarks on the terms of Pāṇini’s rule and on Āgamas in general.

(a) suggests a correction, and (b) obviates an objection that might be raised to (a).

(c) and (d) show in different ways that the correction suggested in (a) is unnecessary.

Note.—The Calcutta edition gives the Vârttikas (a) and (c), but states in the words इति भाष्यम् that (c) is a remark of Patanjali’s.

P. I, 1, 47—मिद्द्रो अन्त्याल्पः ||

Vârttikas:

(a) मिद्द्रो अन्त्याल्पः स्थानपर्यंत्यस्वपाबादः ||
(b) अन्त्याल्पत्रौ मस्तेनिस्तुपुष्चसंयोगादिलोपयते ||
(c) भविषयोर्जन ||
(d) अभ्ये दीर्घनोपस्वरणत्वानुस्वारशीभावा: ||
(e) परादौ गुणवृद्धेष्यते दीर्घनोपस्वारशीभावेनकारणति- भेष्या: ||
(f) पूर्वान्ते नुपुंसकोपसर्जनहृदस्वरं द्रियुव्वरथ ||
(g) न च वार्तिहेऽक्षणवात् ||

(a) states the object of Pāṇini’s rule.
(b) and (c) correct that rule.*

Patanjali refutes (c).

* The Vârttika (c) presupposes another etymology of मीरीचि than the one given in Uṇādisūtra IV. 70.
(d—f) consider the question whether the augment (नम्) is to stand by itself or to be attached to what follows or precedes it; the question is decided in favour of the last alternative, for the faults arising on that alternative are refuted in (g).

Patanjali agrees with Kâtyâyana and supports the conclusion at which he has arrived by an argument of his own.

Note.—(b) is quoted by Patanjali on P. I, 1, 7 (वस्त्रायेतल; अन्त्यायेरूपमिति;) ; (b) is called a Vārttika by Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣīta; (d) and (e) by Nāgojībhāṭṭa. The Calcutta edition gives only the Vārttikas (b) and (c), the former incorrectly. The Nyāya which it quotes is identical in purpose with remarks made by Patanjali.

P. I, 1, 48—एच्र इहर्ग्रस्वादेशे ||

Vārttikas:

(a) एच्र इहर्ग्रचन सार्वत्तकारनिवृत्त्यर्थमेत् ||
(b) वीर्यमस्कर्तु निर्वर्तकल्पात् ||
(c) सत्रेषः सत्त्यात्त्वात् ||
(d) ऐघोशीचरभूतस्वात् ||*

(a) states the objects of Pāṇini’s rule.
(b) refutes a possible objection.
(c) and (d) show that the objects for which the rule has been given are attained without it, and that the rule is therefore unnecessary.

Note.—(c) and (d) are quoted on Śivasūtra 3 and 4. The Calcutta edition gives no Vārttikas, nor any remarks of Patanjali’s.

* The short substitute for ऐ is ह because ह forms a larger portion of ऐ than आ. The word अवस्तत् of Patanjali’s gloss can in my opinion only mean ‘less in number.’ One calls a village a Brāhmaṇ-village, although some of its inhabitants belong to other castes, because the number of Brāhmaṇs who live in it, is greater than the number of inhabitants belonging to other castes. For a different interpretation, see Ind. Stud. XIII, p. 333, note.
P. I, 1, 49—पद्धी स्थानेयोग ||

Vârttikas:
(a) पद्धीस्थानेयोगवचन नियमार्थम् ||
(b) अवयवपक्षचादिबिध्वस्तसःः शासो गोहह इति ||
(c) अवयवपक्षचादिरूपों चामानमित्योगस्तासंदिग्धचारवान् ||
(d) विशिष्टा वा पदी स्थानेयोग ||

Patanjali annotates on the term स्थानेयोग.
(a) states the object of Pâñini's rule.
(b) suggests the objection that if the object of the rule be correctly stated in (a), the rule is too widely applicable.
(c) refutes that objection.
Patanjali supports (c) by additional arguments.
(d) suggests a different way of obviating the objection raised in (b).

Patanjali shows that the rule, in the sense ascribed to it, is superfluous, and will retain it only because its adoption allows us to dispense with the Paribhâshâ निर्दिष्टवाचनस्तवाद्यसंवेदना भवन्ति, with which Paribhâshâ he considers it to be identical in meaning.

Note.—(c) and (d) are called Vârttikas by Nâgojibhaṭṭa.—The Calcutta Edn. gives only the Paribhâshâ निर्दिष्टवाचनस्तवाद्यसंवेदना भवन्ति.

P. I, 1, 50—स्थानेन्नतरतम: ||

Vârttikas:
(a) स्थानिन एकत्वनिर्देशादनेकादिनिर्देशाश्च सर्वेसस्तुतः स्मास्तेत्यन्नतरतमवचनं नियमार्थम् ||
(b) स्थानेन्नतरतमनिर्वित्वके सर्वेस्त्वानिनिवृत्ति: ||
(c) निर्दिष्टप्रतिपक्ती निर्दृत्ति: ||
(d) अनर्थांक च ||
(e) उच्चे वा ||
(f) प्रत्यास्तवचनं च ||
Patanjali gives an example for Pāṇini's rule which does not result from any other rule, and which therefore proves that the rule is necessary; he shows why śānto, which we read in the preceding rule, has been repeated here; and why Pāṇini has employed the superlative अन्तर्तम.

(a) shows why Pāṇini was obliged to give this rule, and states the object of the rule.

Patanjali, having accepted this, discusses the question whether the rule should be read शान्तसंतत्तम or शान्तसंतत्तम, both readings being possible when the rules of Sandhi as between this and the following rule are observed.

(b—d). Does this rule teach something independently of other rules, or does it give certain directions regarding substitutes that have been taught in other rules? The question is decided in favour of the latter alternative, for the objections which were raised to that alternative, are in (e) met by a reference to a statement made before (Vārt. (r) on P. I, 1, 3).

Patanjali, when commenting on (b), brings forward another objection in addition to the one raised in the Vārttika.
(f) suggests a correction of Pāṇini's rule, which correction (g) shows to be unnecessary.

(h) states that Pāṇini's rule is unnecessary, because what is taught in it results from the ordinary practice of life. If the rule be nevertheless adopted, it is liable to the objections stated in (i), (k), and (l).

Patanjali refutes these three objections.

(m) suggests the desirability of making a rule that should teach what the Guṇa and Vṛiddhi of के are; (n) and (q) show that no such rule is required.

Patanjali shows, by giving an additional reason, that such a rule is not required.

(o) states an objection which the adoption of (n) would give rise to; (p) refutes that objection.

(r) raises an objection to Pāṇini's rule, regarding the substitute for एच + अ; (s) refutes that objection.

Note.—(l) is called a Vârttika by Nâgojibhaṭṭa; (o), (p), and (q) are called Vârtikas by Bhaṭṭojidikshita. The Calcutta Edn. gives no Vârttikas; the Paribhâshâ quoted is taken from Patanjali's remarks.

P. I, 1, 51—उर्णरपर: ||

Vârtikas:

(a) उर्णरपरवचनमन्यनिवृत्त्वयथामिति चेवुदातादिविषु दोष: ||

(b) य उः स्थानेन्ये स रपर इति चेवुदाणवृत्त्वायचर्यवर्णाधितिपति: ||

(c) सिद्धु तु प्रसूकं रपरत्वान् ||

(d) आदेशो रपर इति चेत्रतिविद्विषु रपराधितिपर: ||

(e) उदात्तादिविषु च ||

(f) एकादेशस्योपसंख्यानम् ||

(g) अवयवमहालिस्मिति चेवादेशे रान्त्राधितिपर: ||

(h) अभस्के दीर्घत्वयग्यस्त्वस्वरहलादि: श्रेष्ठिसज्ञायप्राधिपथः प्रत्ययायवस्था च ||
(i) पूर्वान्ते ्र्वत्वारणे विस जीवितात्मिषेधा यक्त्वार (ii)

(iii) परावलकर्म णपुक्प्रतिमेवश्च चुप्पा हस्तवल्कोल्लक्ष्य- ्स्थान्यासलोपक्ष्य्यल्लतवादिष्वरो वीर्वल्ल च (iii)

(iv) and (e) state the objections to which two possible interpretations of Pāṇini’s rule would be liable; (c) suggests the correct interpretation of that rule.

(d) and (e) refute the possible objection that Pāṇini should have said merely ्रर रर (i.e. उर्वरेण रर) instead of उर्वरेर. (f) demands an additional rule, and (g) obviates an objection to that rule.

Patanjali shows that the additional rule is not required.*

(h—k) discuss the same question in regard to the augment ्र, which had been discussed in Vārttikas (d—f) on I, 1, 47, with regard to the augment नु, without distinctly deciding which alternative should be adopted.

Patanjali refutes some of the objections raised to the first and last alternatives, and all those to which the adoption of the view expressed in (i) was stated to be liable.

Note.—(b) is called a Vārttika by Bhaṭṭoji-dikshita, and (d), (h), and (k) are called Vārttikas by Nāgojībhaṭṭa. The Calcutta Edn. gives the four Vārttikas (d—g), the last of them incorrectly.

P. I, 1, 52—अलोप्न्ययय (iv)

Vārttikas:

(a) अलोप्न्ययययति स्थाने विज्ञातस्यानुसंहराि (v)

(b) इङ्गतव्या वारिष्टमश्च (vi)

(c) योगेश्वे च (vii)

Patanjali discusses the question whether अलि is a genitive qualifying अन्त्यस्य, or a nominative (plural) qualifying the अदेशा.

* Patanjali in his remarks quotes a Vārttika on P. VIII, 4, 31 which he paraphrases in the usual manner.
(a—c) show the correct way of applying Pāṇini’s rule.

*Note.*—The Calcutta Edn. gives no Vārttikas.

P. I, 1, 53—ढिंढ़ ||

Vārttika:

(a) तात्त्विक विद्वकरणस्य साववकादात्वादिरित्यमात्सर्वव्रास्ते: ||

(a) shows why तात्त्विक is not substituted for the final only, in other words, refutes an objection that might be raised to Pāṇini’s rule.

Patanjali rejects Kātyāyana’s explanation, and substitutes for it another.

*Note.*—The Vārttika is given inaccurately in the Calcutta Edn.

P. I, 1, 54—आदेवः परस्य ||

Vārttika:

(a) अशोभ्यान्तरतः परस्यानेकालिनित्यसत्तत्ववेष्यवादविविधतिषे-धातिःवर्णदैशे: ||

(a) a remark regarding the scope of this rule and of the next.

*Note.*—The Calcutta Edn. does not give the Vārttika.

P. I, 1, 55—अनेकालिनित्यसः ||

No Vārttika.

Patanjali shows that शिशु, since it would otherwise be superfluous, indicates the existence of the Paribhāshā नामनुवच्छेदमनेकालिनित्यः भवति, and he states that that Paribhāshā renders two Vārttikas (on III, 1, 94 and I, 1, 20) unnecessary.

*Note.*—The Calcutta Edn. gives the Paribhāshā.

The above are all the rules discussed in the 7th Āhnika; in the following I propose to examine the discussions on P. I, 1, 1; 6; 25; 36; 39; 65; 68; 72; and 75.

P. I, 1, 1—बृद्धिरादैच्छ ||

Vārttikas:

(a) संज्ञानिधिकः संज्ञासंस्थनयायः ||

(b) इतरथा हसंसंग्रोथयो यथा लोके ||
(c) संज्ञासंज्ञासदेहथ ||
(d) आचार्याचारालसंज्ञासनिदि: ||
(e) यथा लौकिकवैदिकेषु ||
(f) संज्ञासंज्ञासदेहथ ||
(g) अवाकृति: ||
(h) लिःपि बा ||
(i) सतो वृद्धचाहिदु संञावाचालदाहभ इतरेऽराभयवत्वाद्वनसंज्ञासनिदि: ||
(k) सिद्धं तु नित्यशान्द्रत्वात् ||
(l) किमथे शाखामिति चेतिवर्तकवस्तिःसंज्ञासंज्ञासदेहथ ||
(m) अन्यत्र सहभचनात्मुदोऽथ संञावाचालदाहभ ||
(n) प्रत्यवयं च वाक्यपरिसमासे: ||
(o) आकारस्य तपरकरण सवर्णार्थम् ||

Patanjali justifies the श्रृ of आवैचू; he discusses the question whether आवैचू means every आ, ए, and औ, or only those which are taught in grammar by the term इद्रि.

(a) and (d) demand a Samjñādhikāra, and (c) demands besides that it should be stated distinctly what is meant to be the Samjñā, whether इद्रि or आवैचू. (d—h) refute (a—c).

Patanjali does not approve of the way in which Kātyāyana has refuted (a—c), and he therefore refutes those Vārttikas differently.

(i) raises an objection, which is refuted in (k); (l) answers a question to which (k) gives rise.

(m) and (n) refute the possible objection that Pāṇini should have said घ्येकमु in this and the next rule.

Patanjali does not approve of the way in which Kātyāyana has refuted the objection.

(o) states why Pāṇini has affixed न to आ.

Patanjali does not approve of the Vārttika, and gives another reason for the न.
Note.—(a) and (b) are called Vârttikas by Kaiyata; (i), (k), (l), and (o) by Bhaṭṭojidikshita. The Calcutta Edn. gives the Vârttikas (a), (c), and (o), the last incorrectly; it also gives as a Vârttiṣa प्रश्नमें गुणस्वत्संगें भवन्, but this is a remark of Patanjali’s by which he introduces the Vârttiṣa (m).

P. I, 1, 6—दीर्घिवेदिटाम् ||

Vârttikas:

(a) दीर्घिवेदिट्योऽङ्गोऽङ्गायिनवादानुविधित्वाच चाषन्दसोऽङ्गः दीर्घिवेदिट्युर्विनुविधित्वाच ||

(b) दीर्घिवेदिट्युर्विडयन्तयेन ||

(a) and (b) show that दीर्घिवेदिट य may be omitted from Pâñini’s rule.

Patanjali states that हृ is likewise unnecessary.

Note.—The Calcutta Edn. quotes part of (a) but states that it is a remark of Patanjali’s.

P. I, 1, 25—डति च ||

No Vârttiṣa.

Patanjali shows that either the डति of I, 1, 23 or the डति of this rule may be omitted.

Note.—The Calcutta Edn. ascribes the remark हृं डतियपहणं &c., correctly to Patanjali.

P: I, 1, 36—अन्तरं बहिःयोग्यसंबंधानयोः ||

Vârttikas:

(a) उपसंबंधानमहणमांस्यकं बहिःयोग्येण कृतत्वात् ||

(b) न वा शायतंयुगायर्थम् ||

(c) वामकरणे नीयसं डित्‌सूपसंबंधामुः ||

(a) suggests a correction of Pâñini’s rule, which correction (b) shows to be unnecessary.

Patanjali adopts the correction proposed in (a) and rejects therefore the word उपसंबंधान from Pâñini’s rule.
Patanjali gives the additional rule अनुरूपितं वच्चव्ययः.
(c) suggests an additional rule.

Note.—(b) is called Vārttika by Kaiyaṭa and Bhaṭṭojuḍikṣhita. Bhaṭṭojuḍikṣhita also calls अनु-रूपितं वच्चव्ययं a Vārttika; it is given as a Vārttika also in the Calcutta Edn., but the Calcutta Edn. is wrong when it says that it has been called a Vārttika by Kaiyaṭa. (c) is given as a Vārttika in the Calcutta Edn., but inaccurately.

P. I, 1, 39—कृष्णेजन्तस्य प्रेमकृति: ||

Vārttikas:

(a) कृष्णेजन्तस्य जन्तुआनिकारोकारप्रकृति: ||
(b) अन्ययक्रृतिरिति वा ||
(c) न वा संनिपातालक्षणो विपिरिनिमित्तं विशिष्टाद्येति ||
(d) प्रयोजनं हस्तवल्बं तुविष्णुयप्राप्यमणकुलम् ||
(e) नलोपो वृत्तहर्भि: ||
(f) उद्धुपघद्वकिच्चवस्त्र निकुविते ||
(g) नामावो यति कीर्तिवस्यसामा ना ||
(h) आस्त्वं किच्चवस्योपादास्त ||
(i) तिरुश्चत्रसृत्वं दीखिते: ||
(k) तथ्यादोपियो वर्णाभयं: प्रत्ययो वर्णविचारास्त ||
(l) आस्त्वं पुनिष्वे: क्राप्यति ||
(m) पुष्मस्वत्वस्यादोदपत् ||
(n) त्यदावकाराभब्वे: ||
(o) इद्दिपिराकारलोपस्य यथिवान् ||
(p) मतुविभक्त्यदातात्वं पूर्वनिपातस्य ||
(q) नदीहस्तवलं संबुद्धिलोपस्य ||

Patanjali states the objections to which the two possible
interpretations of Pāṇini’s rule would be liable and shows that both interpretations nevertheless are admissible.

(a) suggests a correction of Pāṇini’s rule, which correction is improved on in (b); (c) states that the corrections suggested in (a) and (b) are unnecessary as soon as the Saṃnipāta-paribhāṣa is adopted; (d—i) give examples for that Paribhāṣa, and (k—q) enumerate exceptional cases in which the Paribhāṣa must not be applied.

Patanjali shows that the examples for the Paribhāṣa which have been given by Kātyāyana can be formed without that Paribhāṣa, but shows by giving three different examples that the Paribhāṣa must be adopted nevertheless.

Note.—(a) and (k) are called Vārttikas by Nāgojibhaṭṭa in his Paribhāṣhenduśekhara. The Calcutta Edn. gives (a) and (b), and the Paribhāṣa contained in (c).

P. I, 1, 65—अलोकन्त्यात्पूर्वे उपथा ||

Vārttikas:

(a) उपथासञ्जायामल्यहणमन्त्यनिदशेशतंस्वातंसर्विषेधः ||

(b) अन्त्यविश्वासनासिद्धमिति चेचानर्थकेजोन्त्यविधिकरन-भ्या-सविकारे ||

(c) प्रयोजनविधानानुकरणस्यात हतो ||

(d) ध्वस्तवेद्धाब्यासलोपष्ठ ||

(e) आपि लोपों दकोजनचि ||

(f) अत्र लोपों भ्यासस्य ||*

(g) अलोकन्त्यात्पूर्वेर्तुपचेति वा ||

(h) अवचनाहोकविश्वासनासिद्धः ||

It might appear as if Pāṇini’s rule should either be restricted (a); or altered (g). In reality it is quite correct (h). (b) shows, by quoting a Paribhāṣa, how (a) cannot be refuted; and (c—f) give examples for the Paribhāṣa cited in (b).

* MS. of I. O. reads अत्र लोपोंभ्यासस्य। अत्र लोपोंभ्यासस्येत्य।
Patanjali objects to all the examples given in (c—f) and rejects therefore the Paribhāṣā cited in (b).

Note.—(g) is called Vārttika by Nāgojibhaṭṭa.—The Calcutta Edn. gives (a), and the Paribhāṣā contained in (b).

P. I, 1, 68—स्वरूपं शब्दस्याश्चवद्यां सः

Vārttikas:

(a) शब्दनार्थगते यथायत्वसंभवात्तहालिचिन्: संज्ञापलिपिधार्थे स्वरूपवचनम्।।

(b) न वा शब्दपूर्वको यथे संग्रमत्यस्माद्वर्त्तन्विरुचि:।।

(c) शब्दस्यान्तिपालिपिधार्थस्वरूपवचनात् वचनमामाण्यात्।।

(d) मन्त्रायत्वमिति चेच्छालब्धसामर्थ्याद्वगते: सिद्धम्।।

(e) सिलस्थियोपाणां वृत्तायत्थम्।।

(f) पित्यायत्ववचनस्य च स्वायत्थम्।।

(g) जित्यायत्ववचनस्येव राजायत्थम्।।

(h) जित्या च तहल्योपाणां च मत्यायत्थम्।।

Patanjali shows that रूपम् conveys the sense conveyed by the Paribhāṣā अर्थवृद्धि नामयोगसः, and renders that Paribhāṣā unnecessary.

(a) shows why it was necessary for Pāṇini to give this rule;
(b—d) show that the rule can be dispensed with.
(e—h) give additional rules.

Patanjali corrects the additional rule (h) by adding to it.

Note.—The Calcutta Edn. gives the Vārttikas (e—h), and (inaccurately) Patanjali's remark on (h). It also cites the Paribhāṣā mentioned by Patanjali.

P. I, 1, 72—चेच्छालब्धसामर्थ्यसः

Vārttikas:

(a) चेच्छालब्धसामर्थ्यति चेच्छालब्धोपाणां तदन्तोपाधिभूतम्।।
(d) सिद्धे तु विशेषविद्वानोपयोगे देशवात्
(e) समात्मविद्वानेऽपि तत्ततेषः
(f) उपनिषद्वर्गसनामम्
(g) अके च भवत: सबूतामञ्जिवेतुविधानपरस्यायाम्
(h) सिद्धे तु तदन्तङ्गतततचनात्
(i) तदेककेषायज्ञानाहा सिद्धम्
(j) प्रयोजनं सबूतामञ्जिवेतुविधानपरस्यायाम्
(k) उपपदविवध प्रयोजनम्
(l) भीष्णपितुजुगोहम्
(m) अपरिव्यविधानिन्द्रहणं च प्रतिष्ठे
(n) दिति: ||
(o) रोण्या अण
(p) तस्य च
(q) रथसितांश्च यद्विश्व यथाश्च
(r) गुस्ता विखं मुश्न्त्वमतिभवत्ववायाम
(s) तथिवविवधानिन्द्रहणं
(t) ठिकविधेः संख्यायः
(u) धर्मा च

* MS. of I. O. प्रयोजनं सबूतामञ्जिवेतुविधानां सवृतामञ्जिवेतुविधानां प्रयोजनं।
† MS. of I. O. उपपदविवध प्रयोजनम् ९ प्रयोजनम्।
‡ Should be read twice both in the Benares edition and in the I. O. MS.
§ MS. of I. O. अपरिव्यविधानिन्द्रहणं च प्रतिष्ठे २ प्रयोजनम्।
|| MS of I. O. दिति: दिति: प्रमणं च प्रयोजनम्। Bhattojīd. reads दिति::
¶ MS. of I. O. रथसितांश्च यद्विश्व यथाश्च २ प्रयोजनम्।
** MS. of I. O. गुस्ता विखं मुश्न्त्वमतिभवत्ववायाम।
†† MS. of I. O. तथिवविवधानिन्द्रहणं २ प्रयोजनम्।
‡‡ MS. of I. O. ठिकविधेः संख्यायः ९ प्रयोजनम्।
§§ MS. of I. O. धर्मा च २ प्रयोजनम्।
(v) पदाधिकारे तस्य च तदुत्तरपदस्य च

(व) प्रयोजनमिहिषिकामालानि चित्तूलभारिषु

(उ) प्रयोजने महद्वस्सूनमुष्यां दीर्घविवेचः

(ग) पथ्युष्मदस्स्त्रावयन्नुसू तुम्ध

(घ) बुधविषम्यिपुगोसविच्चतुरन्द्रुद्शिष्णम्

(aa) तवद्विविधिभाष्यादिनीयपहः च

(bb) वर्णप्रवहण च सर्वस्य

(cc) प्रत्ययप्रवहण चापन्नभवया

(dd) वर्सस्षिचिप्तदातावत्मपहः

Patanjali shows, by giving the proper meaning of वेन, that Panini's rule is not too widely applicable, and that it need not be changed to प्रकृते तब्बिंचिषः—

(a) raises an objection, which is refuted in (b).

(c, d) limit the rule.

(e) demands an additional rule; (f) shows how Panini's rule might be altered so as not to necessitate the additional rule (e); (g) shows that in reality no additional rule is required. (h—cc) teach where and with what limitations or modifications to apply Panini's rule.

Patanjali rejects (v); he says that Panini's rule is sufficient, or even preferable, if the statement अत्रैयान्यकेन नायन्यन्यकेनेति वक्तव्यम्, limited again by the other statement अनिनस्मन्न्त्रानि चापेष्वता चान्यथकेन च वस्तविधि प्रकृतष्यन्ति, be adopted.

(dd) corrects Panini's rule.

---

* Should be read twice in Benaras edition and I. O. MS.
† MS. of I. O. प्रयोजने महद्वस्सूनपुष्यां दीर्घविवेचं.
‡ MS. of I. O. reads this twice.
§ MS. of I. O. बुधविषम्यिपुगोसविच्चतुरन्द्रुद्शिष्णम्.
|| MS. of I. O. त्वद्विविधिभाष्यादिनीयपहः च प्रयोजनम्.
¶ Should be read twice in Benares edition and I. O. MS.
** The Benares edition omits अनिनस्मन्न्त्रानि after 'बल्मपहः'.
Note.—(p) is called a Vārttika by Kaiyaṭa; (a), (g), (h), (v—s), (bb) and (cc) are called Vārttikas by Nāgojībhaṭṭa, and (a—d), (h), (i), (l—s), and (dd), by Bhaṭṭojidikṣita; Bhaṭṭoji also calls अत्यन्तयथेन a Vārttika. The Calcutta Edn. gives, not always correctly, (c), (d), (e), (f), (h), (i), (n—t) and (v).—Of the Paribhāshās cited in it, (6) is a Vārttika (dd), (4) equivalent to Vārttika (cc), and (1) similar in purpose to what is stated in Vārttika (g); (5) and (7) are statements of Patanjali; (2) occurs in and (3) is based on Patanjali’s remarks.

P. I, 1, 75—एक्षः प्राचारं देवि ||
No Vārttika.

Patanjali corrects Pāṇini’s rule.

Note.—The Calcutta Edn. apparently mistakes Patanjali’s correction for a Vārttika.

From the above it will appear that by adopting and practically applying the principle with which the first part of our enquiry had furnished us, we have been enabled to point out in Patanjali’s discussions on 20 of Pāṇini’s rules 135 Vārttikas; and I venture to hope that the reader who will examine the several Vārttikas appended to each of Pāṇini’s rules, and compare the style and phraseology exhibited in all, and the manner in which Pāṇini’s rules have been discussed in them, will grant that these Vārttikas bear the stamp of having been composed by one and the same author, and that taken together they form part of a work, complete in itself* and independent.

* A very strong argument in favour of the assumption that Patanjali has recorded and commented on all the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, is furnished by the fact that whenever Kātyāyana in such words as भक्त or भक्त्वा refers to another of his Vārttikas, the Vārttika so instanced or referred to is invariably to be found in the Mahābhāṣya. The same argument holds good with regard to the Mahābhāṣya itself, and deserves perhaps some little consideration at the hands of those who maintain that the
of the rest of the Mahābhāshya. Of this, at least, there can be
no doubt, that the result at which we have arrived accords
with the views held by the native grammarians. That these
scholars have not made it their business to point out all
the Vārttikas, but have told us only occasionally and inci-
dentially that a particular statement was regarded by them
as a Vārttika, has been mentioned already. I have also
shown that out of the 135 statements which I have been led
to consider as Vārttikas in the above, no less than 48 have
actually been termed Vārttikas or ascribed to Kātyāyana the
Vārttikakāra, by Kāyātā, Nāgojībhātā, and Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣītā,
and it would be easy to prove that, if these 48 statements
were regarded as Vārttikas by those grammarians, the same
must necessarily have been the case with many more. On the
other hand, to the best of my knowledge, the term Vārttika
has, with two exceptions, never been applied to any of those
remarks which I have considered as Patanjali’s; and as regards
those two exceptions, I feel no hesitation in saying that
Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣītā has been in error; for both the statements
which he terms Vārttikas, अनुरीति विन्दद्यम् on P. I, 1, 36, and
असैन्यन्यावेन नान्यन्यावेनकैति विन्दद्यम् on P. I, 1, 72, end with the
phrase हृति विन्दद्यम् which is foreign to the style of Kātyāyana,*
and in the case of the latter of those statements the context of
the discussion in my opinion proves beyond doubt that it is
Patanjali’s.

IV.

Having fixed on a principle by which to distinguish in the
Mahābhāshya, as it has been handed down to us, between the

* Setting aside those cases in which Patanjali is commenting on
Vārttikas, we find in the Mahābhāshya on P. I, i, altogether only
9 statements which end with विन्दद्यम्, or हृति विन्दद्यम्. Of these, three, on P. I,
1, 36; 72; and 75 have been given already above. The remaining ones
occur on P. I, i, 1; 27; 57; 69; and 72; in them Patanjali states clearly
the objections which are supposed to be refuted in particular Vārttikas;
or he states objections which he refutes himself.
Vârttikas of Kâtyâyana and the original remarks of Patanjali, and having tested the worth of that principle by applying it practically for the reconstruction of a portion of the work of Kâtyâyana, we now recur to the question which led to this enquiry, the question as to the nature and the object of Kâtyâyana's Vârttikas, and of the work of Patanjali; and we may hope to answer that question the more readily and satisfactorily because we already have shown in the case of 20 of Pâñini's rules, chosen at random, what is the tendency of Kâtyâyana's Vârttikas in regard to them, and what the relation of Patanjali in regard to those Vârttikas on the one hand and to the Sûtras of Pâñini on the other. We begin with the Vârttikas of Kâtyâyana.

It is true that the Vârttikas are not a commentary on the rules of Pâñini's grammar, and that it was not Kâtyâyana's intention to explain the meaning and the import of those rules, as they have been explained, e.g. by the author of the Kâsikâ Vrîtti. But it is in my opinion equally true that Kâtyâyana, in composing his Vârttikas, did not propose to himself the task of finding fault with Pâñini; for he justifies the rules of his predecessor as often as he finds fault with them. So far from calling Kâtyâyana an unfair antagonist of Pâñini, I would rather claim for him the title of a follower and judicious admirer of Pâñini, who dispassionately examines the rules laid down by his master, considers the objections which have actually been or which might be raised to them, is ever ready to defend and justify Pâñini, and corrects, adds to, or abandons the rules propounded by him, only when no other course is left open. It is true, Kâtyâyana states the objects of some of Pâñini's rules in order to show that those objects are attained without those rules, and that the latter may therefore be dispensed with,—but he also explains to us the object and the purport of other rules in order either to show that those rules are not too widely applicable, or to obviate the objection that they are unnecessary. He states the objections to which the possible interpretations of a particular rule would be liable, but he also shows that those interpretations are nevertheless
admissible, or suggests himself a correct interpretation. He discusses the several views that might be entertained regarding the objects of Pāṇini's rules, or their relation to other rules, and he states the objections to which those views would be open,—but in many instances he also refutes the objections advanced, and brings forward arguments in favour of one or more of the views propounded. He raises objections to whole rules or to particular terms employed in them, but he not seldom also proves those objections to be unfounded, and shows the correct way of applying a rule, or explains the import of a particular term, for the very purpose of meeting objections that might possibly be raised. If it cannot be denied that in many cases he corrects Pāṇini's rules, or suggests additional rules, it must also be admitted that there are many instances in which he proves that such corrections or additional rules are altogether uncalled for, or rendered unnecessary so soon as we adopt one or another maxim of interpretation the validity of which is proved by examples covering the whole range of Pāṇini's grammar. And if it is true on the one hand that some of Pāṇini's rules are declared by him unnecessary, it is on the other hand equally true that other rules which at first sight might seem to be unnecessary, are upheld by him and justified.

The object of the Vārttikas is then no other than this, without bias or prejudice to discuss such objections as might be raised to the rules of Pāṇini's grammar, and on the one hand to justify Pāṇini by defending him against unfounded criticism, and on the other hand to correct, reject, and add to, the rules laid down by him, where defence and justification were considered impossible. And this is in my opinion the true meaning of the definition of the term वार्तिक, as recorded by Nāgojibhaṭṭa, छबे स गुणदुरुपल्लिकाबलाकरखं वार्तिकत्वम्. The Vārttikas consider whether anything has been omitted in the Sūtras that should have been stated, and whether there is in them anything that is superfluous, faulty, or objectionable. A consideration of this nature would lead either to the justification of Pāṇini or to his condemnation, and
Kātyāyana has given us ample proof that he has both justified and condemned the Sūtras of Pāṇini, the former perhaps even more than the latter. And from this point of view it will no longer be possible to question whether certain statements in the introductory Āhnika of the Mahābhāshya have been correctly called Vārttikas by the native grammarians; for it must be patent to every one that the nature and object of those statements in no way differ from those of the rest of Kātyāyana's Vārttikas. If it is admitted that the words and their meanings are fixed and settled by common usage, it may well be questioned whether the rules laid down by Pāṇini are at all necessary, and it must therefore be shown that and why they are necessary*; and if it is the object of grammar to lay down rules for the correct formation of those words which people actually use, it does not seem improper to enquire whether Pāṇini, in teaching the formation of such words as would not appear to be in use, has not laid himself open to just censure.† If, moreover, we are promised some transcendent benefit from the study of Pāṇini's grammar, we may well ask whether, to secure that benefit, it is sufficient for us to know the right words, as they have been taught by Pāṇini, or whether we only have to employ them.‡ It is also fair matter for discussion whether the name chosen for the science taught by Pāṇini is altogether appropriate and unobjectionable.§

* सिद्धे संबन्धसंबन्धे लोकोऽ ॐ पंचयुक्ते शान्त्यमयोगे सालागे गर्मिनि सयोऽ तीर्थिके नीतिके देवाके।
† अस्त्यमयुक्ते तत्त्वे चेतायथे शान्त्यमयोगात्।
अन्ययोगः प्रयोगान्तऽऽ वां दीर्घसतवात्।
सर्वं द्विधयैः॥
‡ शाने धर्मं इति चेतायथे भर्मायणात्।
आजारे नियमः॥
प्रयोगे सर्वनरुकः ।
शास्त्रप्रवृत्ते प्रयोगेऽ । युद्धसरध्वनिये वेदशास्त्रे॥
§ सुचे व्याकरणे वहतथा वृद्धया।
शान्त्यमतिपृलः।
शान्ते लघुदेः।
भवे प्रोकार्यम् तद्भिता।
सत्यसरध्वनि व्याकरणम्॥
"
And finally, when we are told that Pāṇini intended to teach the correct formation of words actually used, we may well raise the question why he should have commenced his grammar with an enumeration of the letters.*

Though I am obliged to differ from Prof. Goldstücker, I am not altogether at a loss to understand what may have led him to describe the nature and the object of the Vārttikas as he has done. The work which first brought the Sūtras of Pāṇini and the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana within the range of the studies of European scholars, was the Calcutta Edition of Pāṇini. The editors of that work did not consider it necessary to append all the Vārttikas to their gloss; and unfortunately they in most cases selected those which contained objections and corrections, and omitted those others in which the corrections were rejected and the objections refuted † (see on P. I, 1, 1; 7; 12; 20; 22; 24; 26; 29, &c). Starting from such a selection of Vārttikas as they had given, it was not unnatural to arrive at the conclusion, which Prof. Goldstücker actually has arrived at, a conclusion which not even his subsequent profound knowledge of the Mahābhāshya could induce him to modify.

We turn to Patanjali. That Patanjali has refuted some of the objections, that he has rejected some of the additional rules of Kātyāyana, no student of the Mahābhāshya would think of denying. But it is altogether contrary to fact to say that all the Vārttikas have been refuted by Patanjali, or to maintain that the Mahābhāshya has been composed for the justification of Pāṇini. In proof of this assertion it would suffice to refer the reader to the analysis of part of the Mahābhāshya which I have given above, and in which I have shown

---

* वृद्धिसमवायार्थ उपदेशः।
अनुव-अहस्तरणायेषः।
इत्युत्तरमेवैति चेतुदानादातस्वतीतानुसाराःस्कृतियात्रपदाक्षरानामस्युपदेशः।
आकृत्युपदेशासारस्वतीति चेतुदानादातानां परिवर्तः।।

† To use two terms which have been employed, e.g. by Bhaṭṭoṣhidikshita on P. I. 1, 10, the Calcutta editors have given us the Pūrva-paksha-vārttikas, but they have omitted the Siddhānta-vārttikas.
that more than half of the 135 Vârttikas pointed out have been unreservedly adopted by Patanjali; but I will try to corroborate it by additional evidence. I have stated already that whereas in the case of P. I, i, 6 Kâtyâyana only objects to the words शैविवेदी of that rule, Patanjali proves the whole rule to be superfluous; and that while Kâtyâyana defends P. I, i, 36 from an objection, his defence is not accepted, and Pâñini’s rule altered, by Patanjali. I have also shown that Patanjali declares the डति either of P. I, i, 23 or 25 to be superfluous, and that he rejects the rule I, i, 49, which had been justified by Kâtyâyana, in the sense ordinarily ascribed to it, altogether. Similarly, while Kâtyâyana thinks it right to defend P. I, i, 8 from a possible objection, Patanjali rejects the word सुख from that rule; and while Kâtyâyana on P. I, i, 41 enumerates three cases as the only ones for which it would be necessary to term an Avyayibhâva Avyaya, Patanjali rejects the rule altogether. In the same way Patanjali refutes a Vârttika on P. I, i, 56 which shows the purport of that rule, and he tries to prove that Pâñini’s rule may be dispensed with; and he shows on P. I, i, 62 that either the प्रत्ययत्व of the preceding rule or the first प्रत्यय of I, i, 62 may be omitted. Such a proceeding cannot be called justifying Pâñini.

The Mahâbhâshya is in the first instance a commentary on Kâtyâyana’s Vârttikas. This must be evident from all I have had occasion to state in the first part of this enquiry, and this too is the view entertained by the native grammarians. Puñyarâja informs us that Patanjali composed his work वासितिकवाय-ख्यानपुरसरस, and Jînendrabuddhi, when commenting on the word भाष्ये in the introductory verse of the Kâśikâ-vrîtti, tells us distinctly भाष्ये कात्यायनप्रणीतानां वाक्यानां पतवयित्षप्रणीतम. But Patanjali did not rest satisfied with being a mere commentator. Having started as a commentator, he became a follower and imitator of the man whose work he was explaining. He unreservedly adopted Kâtyâyana’s method of discussing the Sûtras of Pâñini, and like most imitators carried that method to extremes. Finding that Kâtyâyana had left unnoticed certain Sûtras of Pâñini which were or which might
appear to be liable to objection, he drew those rules within the range of his discussion, and either refuted the objections to which they seemed to be open, or showed that Pāṇini was really in the wrong and that his rules ought to be corrected. Or finding that Kātyāyana had failed to notice objections to rules which had been discussed by him, he thought it necessary to do what had been left undone by his master. On the other hand, not approving of the way in which certain objections had been met by Kātyāyana, or finding that the objections refuted by the latter admitted of different refutations, he either substituted his own refutations for those of Kātyāyana, or strengthened the views held by that scholar by additional arguments of his own. Again, believing himself to be in the possession of arguments by which to refute objections to Pāṇini’s rules which had been stated by Kātyāyana, but which the latter had been unable to refute, or by which to prove the uselessness of corrections or additional rules which Kātyāyana had thought fit to adopt, he employed those arguments to refute those objections, corrections, and additional rules, and in doing so he refuted the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana. On the other hand, there are not wanting instances in which he proved his superior skill by showing that Kātyāyana had done wrong in defending Pāṇini, and by supporting the very objection which Kātyāyana had laboured to refute. If by adopting such a course of procedure Patanjali has defended Pāṇini from some of the objections brought against him by Kātyāyana, it is on the other hand equally true that in many cases his criticism is much more thorough-going and destructive than Kātyāyana’s, and that Pāṇini has suffered more at his hands than at those of the Vārttikakāra.*

* Where there is a difference of opinion between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, or between Kātyāyana and Patanjali, or between all the three, the native grammarians attach a higher value to the views of Kātyāyana than to those of Pāṇini, and a higher value again to those of Patanjali than to those either of Kātyāyana or of Pāṇini. That such should be the case is not unnatural, and it might appear unnecessary to allude to it here, were it not that Prof. Weber has expressed a somewhat different view when discussing the meaning of the word Āchāryadeśya (Ind. Stud. XIII,
The object which Kātyāyana and Patanjali have in view throughout their works, is one and the same; the nature of their remarks on Pāṇini’s rules is identically one; both differ in the form which they have given to their discussions and in the extent to which they have carried them, and to which they have availed themselves of such artifices as Nipātana, Jñāpaka, &c. Were we to omit the text of the Vārttikas and to retain only Patanjali’s explanations of them, or were we to page 317). Prof. Goldstücker was of opinion that this word denoted Patanjali as the countryman of the Āchārya, understanding by Āchārya Kātyāyana. Prof. Bhāṇḍarkar had referred it likewise to Patanjali, but had understood it to mean ‘Āchārya the younger.’ Prof. Weber, without actually refuting these two interpretations, is apparently inclined to take the word, in accordance with Pāṇini’s rules, in the sense of ‘an unaccomplished teacher,’ and he disposes of the objection that Kaiyāṭa, who uses the word Āchāryadeśiya, would not have called Patanjali an unaccomplished teacher, by stating, that since Kaiyāṭa once has placed the Vārttikakāra even above the Sātrakāra, it would seem even less strange that he should have placed the same Vārttikakāra also above Patanjali, ‘although it would appear curious enough that he should have spoken of Patanjali in so disparaging a manner.’ Here Prof. Weber appears to have overlooked the fact that Kaiyāṭa in another place of his work has distinctly told us his views as to the relative value of the teachings of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patanjali. For when commenting on a passage of the Mahābhāshya on P. I, 1, 29, Kaiyāṭa lays down the well-known maxim यथेऽविद्वेयं विद्वेययथ भाग्यसम्, ‘the later the the Muni, the greater his authority;’ Kātyāyana is a higher authority than Pāṇini, and Patanjali a higher authority than Kātyāyana or Pāṇini.

The word Āchāryadeśya does mean ‘an unaccomplished teacher,’ and it is opposed to Āchārya; but it is not synonymous with Patanjali, nor does the word Āchārya necessarily denote Kātyāyana. Those who are acquainted with the method followed in the Mahābhāshya, must be aware that in many cases Patanjali does not at once acquaint us with the final and correct view (Siddhānta) on the matter under discussion, but leads up to it by degrees. While doing so, he not seldom propounds views which contain a part of the truth, but which, as they contain truth mixed with error, are subsequently abandoned in favour of the Siddhānta. And in these cases it is customary with the commentators to consider those views which are partly correct and partly incorrect, as views of an Āchāryadeśiya, a disputant who has some idea of the true state of the case but does not know the whole truth, and to contrast with them the views of the
translate Patanjali’s original remarks into the language of Kātyāyana, we should find it an exceedingly hard task, a task in most cases altogether impossible of solution, to distinguish between the two grammarians. Of this fact the native commentators were well aware, and hence discussions such as those of Nāgojībhaṭṭa on P. I, 1, 12, as to whether Patanjali is giving his own remarks, or is commenting on Vārttikas which have been omitted in the MSS.\

It is not seldom that in the works of European scholars we meet with the statement that Patanjali has commented on and explained the rules of Pāṇini; but that statement can be accepted as true only if a meaning be assigned to the words Āchārya, the disputant whose views are entirely correct and finally adopted. They in fact employ the two terms in the same manner in which they also use the words Siddhāntyakudelīn and Siddhāntin. Where Patanjali leads up to a Vārṭika which is finally adopted by him, by stating a view which is only partly correct, the view to which he thus gives expression, is the view of an Āchāryadeśīya, and the view taken in the Vārṭika that of the Āchārya. But where the two views, as happens to be the case not unfrequently, are both propounded by Patanjali, Patanjali himself is both the Āchāryadeśīya and also the Āchārya. When commenting on the Vārṭika pūruṣamaṇḍī on P. I, 1, 72, Patanjali raises the question whether the word pāḍ of that Vārt. is an instance for pāḍādipikārī or for abhivādikārī in the preceding Vārt. pāḍādipikārī. In the words eva tathābhāṣikārī pravāhinē nāṭītē he first states the view that it is an instance for pāḍādipikārī; but that view he afterwards abandons in favour of the correct view that pāḍ is an instance for abhivādikārī. In this case there is no question between a view of Patanjali’s and one of Kātyāyana’s; both views are propounded by Patanjali. And yet Nāgojībhaṭṭa contrasts the two views with each other, by calling the view first stated that of the Āchāryadeśīya. It is the view of an Āchāryadeśīya, because it is partly correct and partly incorrect; pāḍ is an instance for the Vārṭika pāḍādipikārī, but it is an instance for the term abhivādikārī of that Vārṭika, and not for pāḍādipikārī. See also for a similar example Kaiyaṭa on P. IV, 1, 162.

* The question on P. I, 1, 12 is, whether in the words abhyāma pāḍārūṣamāṇḍī—maṭhadiśāravānamāṭī (on page 79a of the Benares Edition) Patanjali is giving his own arguments or is commenting on the three Vārṭikas vaṇṇamāṇḍyaśrī योगविभागार्यम् माट्ठदीर्घवाणिज्ज वा omitted in the MSS. (कोशे).
explanation and comment, which those words do not convey generally. For, so far as my own experience goes, Patanjali never tells us the import of a whole rule or of a particular term of a rule, he never quotes instances or counterinstances, for the simple purpose of explanation, but always does so either to show that such rule is absolutely necessary, and that the objects for which it has been given are not attained by other rules, in other words, to justify Pāṇini; or he does so for the purpose of showing subsequently that such rule or part of a rule is not necessary, and that it therefore may be dispensed with. The Bhāṣyakāra, in short, is not a Vṛttikāra, and the functions of both are carefully kept separate by the commentators. When Patanjali on P. I, 1, 4 asks why Pāṇini has employed the terms धातु and आर्थात्तु in his rule, and when he quotes counterinstances, apparently to explain the meaning and import of those terms, Kaiyāṭa shows us the real purpose of Patanjali's proceeding by saying क्रमेण सृजनेत्त्वाक्यमादानार्थात्तुक-स्य च लोकविशेषणमेव धातुमहणयक्ष्ययमतिप्रवीणवेग्मण्यादः, and Nāgojībhaṭa justifies Kaiyāṭa's remark by adding नु पदप्रमूलानविच-न्ता तत्त्वतिकारस्थापिता न भाव्यकारस्थेत्तत आह क्रमेणेनित। तत्त्वद्वयोजननव्ययद-क्रमेणेवये: ॥ And when Patanjali on P. I, 1, 57 asks why Pāṇini has employed the term अच्छ in his rule, and when in answer to that question he quotes a number of counterinstances which by the term अच्छ: would seem to be excluded from Pāṇini's rule, Kaiyāṭa again considers the occasion worthy of remark and tells us that the question has been raised (not to explain Pāṇini's rule, but) to show that for some of the Pratyudharaṇaḥ which are given in the commentaries, the term अच्छ: would be unnecessary (‘वार्तानि प्रत्युत्तरणानि कानिचिप्प्लक्ष्यमतिप्रवीणानि ननिति प्रभो ५ च हतिनिर्मिति’), and Nāgojībhaṭa again appends to Kaiyāṭa's remark the explanatory statement प्रत्युत्तरणाप्रवीणन्त तत्त्वात्तिकारस्थापिता न नु भाव्यकारस्थेत्तत अह वार्तानिति. When on P. I, 1, 50 Patanjali asks for an example of that rule, Kaiyāṭa shows the reason for that question by saying कानिचिप्प्लक्ष्यम्यम्यम्यं सिद्धमिति प्रभः; and when Patanjali on I, 1, 56 enquires why Pāṇini has employed the term स्थानिवेत् instead of saying merely स्थानी, Kaiyāṭa informs us of the real import of Patanjali’s question
by stating विनायि वतिना तवथ्यलभो यथा विष्ठिकिर्ति भवि. Nowhere does Patanjali explain Pāṇini for the simple purpose of explanation, but like a second Vārttikakāra, he enquiries whether anything has been omitted in the Sūtras that should have been stated, or whether in them there is anything superfluous, faulty, or at all liable to objection.

Here I conclude. To show in detail the differences between Kātyāyana and Patanjali would be a task full of interest, and highly instructive, as showing the progress which the science of grammar had undoubtedly made from the time of Kātyāyana to that of Patanjali, and as tracing in the work of the latter the germs of those failings which have continued growing and increasing in the works of the later grammarians ever since. But that task does not lie within the scope of this enquiry, nor would the materials at my command justify my undertaking it at present. My purpose is attained if in future it will be impossible to stigmatize Kātyāyana as an unfair antagonist of Pāṇini, and to speak of Patanjali as refuting the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, or justifying Pāṇini.
APPENDIX.

In order to enable the reader to judge for himself of the value of the Vārttikapātha which I have mentioned on page 6, I publish below the first chapter of that work from the MS. in my possession.

सिद्धे शास्त्रार्थसंवन्धे लोकतोऽयस्मयुक्ते शास्त्रप्रयोगे शाखेण धर्मनियमो यथा लैकिकवैविद्धेनु | समानायामर्थववगतः शास्त्रेन चापशास्त्रेन च शास्त्रनेत्रार्थोऽयस्माये हृति नियमः ||

तत्र शास्त्रपूर्वके प्रयोगे परमः ||

न चेदानीमाचाराः सूत्राणि कुलवा निर्ववेयतिः ||

वृत्तिसमवायाः ५ नुवन-धकरणार्थस्य वर्णानामुपदेशः | शाख-प्रवृत्तितिकलको वर्णानां क्रममेण निवेशो वृत्तिसमवायः ||

अ इ हृणु ||

आदुराविहारणातितिद्वम् | रूपसामान्यायः ||

क्ष लक्ष् ||

समाने चार्येन शाखान्वितोऽय शाखान्वितस्य निर्ववेको भवति | एवं समाने चार्येन शाखान्वितोऽयस्य ५ पर्थोऽय स्य निर्ववेको भवति तुल्य-न्यायात् ||

पक्षान्तिररिपि परिहारारा भवन्ति ||
ए ओहुँ ॥
वर्गक्षेत्राः वर्गप्राप्येऽनु गृह्यते ॥
नाय्यपृक्तस्यावयवस्यं तद्विधि: ॥
अथवा न गृह्यते ॥
ह य व रद्व ॥
रेफ्यानुशासिकस्यसवर्गमात्रिधिः वक्तव्य: ॥
रेकोष्मणं सवर्गी न सन्ति ॥
नेमौं रहितो कार्यिणार्थिति च ॥
भयोग्यावहारानन्नमद्वपदेशः कार्यः ॥ शापु: च ॥
अर्थवन्तो वर्गी धातवादीमेकवर्गीसामर्येदशनासः ॥
अनर्थकास्तु प्रतिवर्गमार्येनुपल्लवः ॥
तत्र स्वभावार्जायत्वा एकवर्गी अर्थवन्तो सन्ये स नर्येका दृष्टि
तत्त्वम् ॥
प्रत्याहारे स साबवन्धानं कथमात्महेण न ॥
भावाराद्भवानल्वाविश्वोपवः सल्ववतः ॥
अक्षरे न क्षरे विबादभोतियां सरो स कर्मः ॥
वर्गं वाहुः पूर्वस्त्रे किमर्यमुषन्देशयात् ॥
वर्गान्तः वाच्यिष्ठो यत्र च त्वद्रश वर्णवेते ॥
तद्धियस्यदुवुद्धचरयः तद्धियो चोपिदेशयो ॥
वृद्धिरादिअ ॥ १॥
छन्दोवत्स्तुस्त्राणि भवति ॥ छन्दोववाक्रण: कुर्वन्तिति नेत्रिः ॥
अथ संज्ञाति वक्तव्यम् ॥
भावाराद्ब्यवहारालसंज्ञालसिद्धिः ॥
पूर्वोऽचारितं संज्ञी परोचारितं संज्ञा ॥
सतो हि कार्यण: कार्यण भवितव्यम् ||
मुक्तलोकिनि शाख्याणि प्रथमः बीरपुत्रशाणि च भवन्त्यायुपममापु-रूपाणि वाध्येतारञ्ज बृद्धियुक्ता भवानि ||
इतरेतराभयाणि च कार्याणि न प्रकल्पन्ते ||
प्रत्येक वाक्यपरिसमापि: | समुदाये वाक्यपरिसमापि: ||
गुणा भेदका: | अभेदकाथ | तत्राभेदका इत्येव न्याय्यम् ||
तकार: मुखार्यो च चारणार्थः ||
हि को गुणवृद्धि || ॥
षं विविधे प्रत्युपदेशो $ स नर्त्कः स विविधविधे यस्य तु विविधनि-
नित्यमेव नासिक वाक्यस्य ||
मन्नूक्कफति: $ धिकारः ||
न धातुशो आर्धार्धातुकः || ॥ ॥
प्रस्तकस्यानसेरियृतस्य प्रतिशेषेन निवृति: ||
( दौधिक्रीटम् ॥ ॥ )
उद्भनिबिधे ॥ चन्द्रसि ||
हस्तो नन्देश: संयोगः || ॥
अत्तज्ञातिविव्याये नानन्तर्यम् ||
तुल्यायायप्रयत्नं सर्वायम् || ॥
कर्कारस्यायोः सर्वा संज्ञा विशेषा ||
उरण रपर इत्यत्र तपरवं वच्च्यम् ||
अद्यो मात् || ॥
नैक्कं प्रयोजनं योगार्यभं प्रयोजनयति ||
नियात क्षेत्रजनात || ॥
ईशद्धे क्रियायोगे मर्यादामिविधे च यः ||
एतमायं दितं विद्यान्यथेत्वमस्मरणयोर्प्रवित्तः ||
(60)

तर्पणमूः घः॥ २२ ॥

इह व्याकरणे स्वेतविभाव सातुरक्रमवेत्त्व रूपमात्रियते यत्रात्र स्वेतविभाव रूपसत्तमिति रूपसत्तमिति नान्तरेण तैरिकं प्रयोगं तयस्मां तैरिकं प्रयोगं सातुरक्रमवेत्त्व प्रयोगं नास्तित्वं कृत्त्वं क्षतिन्यं यथा पुराणे उपास्यत उपदेशेऽनाम॥

बहुगवषुद्वति संख्या॥ २३ ॥

कृत्रिमाकृत्रिमयोः कृत्रिमेऽकार्यसंग्रंथयाः॥

अत्यकर्षणाः प्रति सोपलक्षमाणवेत्त्वुपि स्वयंगतिस्तत्त्वं भवति।

साधियो यदहस्तं गमीयति॥

अव्यध्यास्तवं संख्यासंस्था वक्त्व्या समासकान्वित्यप्रथम्॥ तुकी चाप्रभणम्॥

अव्यध्यास्तवं पूर्णप्रत्यत्वातं संख्यासंस्था इति वक्त्व्यं समासकान्वित्यप्रथम्॥

अधिकारण्यां चातुर्कि समासोत्तरपदवृढ्यचर्या॥ बहुश्रीहो चाप्रभणम्॥

ग्यानत्ता पदः॥ २४ ॥

उपदेशेऽग्यानत्ततिव कवक्त्व्यम् || न वा इ॥

यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते || तत्र तक्षणमाबास्योपायतेवत्यः॥

तस्तवृढ्य निष्ठा॥ २५ ॥

अनुवन्धयो तुमो चपित कालकारकादिविद्विधोगानुसारक्यति॥

सर्वादीनि सर्वनामाचि॥ २६ ॥

बहुश्रीहो नतुरंसविज्ञानामपि॥

वाक्यान्वयं निपातनाचि॥

संज्ञापरसवर्जनीभूतानां पाठवर्युद्वासो कवण्याः॥

भूवर
अंतराविकारे यदुच्छते गृहमाणविभक्तेसतःतवःतवः। सत्मीनिर्धिष्टे
यदुच्छते प्रकृतिविभक्तकौ तन्वतवः। ॥

अन्तर्व बहियोपस्तवानवः॥ ३६॥

अपूर्वति वक्तव्यम्॥
वाङ्करणे तीयस्य दिन्त्वपसंध्यानम्। विभाया ह्यिनेत्यवादि न
कर्तव्यम्॥

ताहितत् आसवटिविवभिन्नः॥ ३७॥

एवं गते कृत्यापि तुल्येमतन्मानतस्य कार्यं यहं न तन्त॥
ततः परे चाभिमता न कार्याविक्रयः कृत्यां यहैंन योगः॥
कृत्यत्ततानां यहं तु कार्यं संख्याविवेशों श्याभिनिष्ठायते।
तस्मात्स्वराहिद्यां च कार्यं कृत्यां यहं च पाते॥
सदृशम् त्रिवु तिरुदेविविदि च ॥

कृत्यमेव जन्तः॥ ३९॥

अनन्त्राकुर्मीणिरति वाच्यम्। न वा सन्निपातान्क्षणेयवादि ॥

अन्योपारः॥ ४१॥

लुग्नकुस्वरोपचारः। प्रोज्यातिनिति परिष्यनते कर्तव्यम्॥

मिद्वचोम्यात्यातः॥ ४७॥

नैवेद्यार आज्ञायतिनाय। धर्मसूत्रकाराः। पवन्तसमवेत्वादैवेदः
सर्वाः वायुभवतानि। किं तत्तद् तौ। तौत्तिको हृद्यान्। तौत्तिको हि
सदृश्यम् समवेत वायुभवन भवति। यथा दिव्य ब्राह्मणेऽयृहादै। सत्यम्
समवेत तदन्तदान द्वितियादस्य निवर्तकं भवति॥

अन्त्यावृत्ताभि महङ्गेयोपसुःक्षणेयवादि पारायणवृत्ति वक्तव्यम्॥

अन्त्यावृत्ताभि महङ्गेयोपसुःक्षणेयवादि पारायणवृत्ति वक्तव्यम्॥

अन्त्यावृत्ताभि महङ्गेयोपसुःक्षणेयवादि पारायणवृत्ति वक्तव्यम्॥
एच इथ्यस्वादेशी || ५५ ||
सिद्धेश्वरः सत्यान्तव्यादेशोथोत्सरभूमयस्वादिति ॥
पञ्ची स्थानेयोगा || ५६ ||
अधिकारै धिमकारकं || कथिदेवक्षेत्रस्य: सर्वं शाखमभिज्जलं
यति प्रदीपवत् || अपरं यथा रज्ज्वा वर्ज काउमुकुञ्ज्वते तत्रदुकुञ्ज्वते
चकारेण || अपरं प्रत्येकं सत्यान्तिरेवार्थं दृष्टं योगं योगं उपस्थितं ॥
स्थानन्दवदेशोऽन्नलिप्ति || ५६ ||
सामान्यान्तिरेऽग्नितिरेऽग्नितिरेऽग्नितिरे ॥
एकदेशविविक्तेऽण्योपण्यायर्म || लोकन्यायात्तिरिज्ञमेतत्र हि अहा
पुच्चे छिछे गर्दमो भवति ॥
स्थानी नाम यो भूतवा नो मध्यादेशो नाम यो ॥ ५ भूतवा भवति ॥
बुझ्विन्याविपरिणामानुत्रं वा ॥
तयादेश उभयान्तिरेऽपो वर्णव्यः || ब्याक्षप्रत्येकसिद्धम् ॥
चतुर्दशां सत्यस्य प्रत्येकेऽपो वर्णव्यः || ब्याक्षप्रत्येकः ॥
आमिन्दाः च सत्यस्य प्रत्येकेऽपो वर्णव्यः || विमालिपिधाहः ॥
स्त्रां वस्त्रवदेशोऽपो प्रत्येकेऽपो वर्णव्यः ॥
गोः पूर्वापिन्तंवात्मस्वरे यो प्रत्येकेऽपो वर्णव्यः ॥

न प्रदानः ॥ ५५ ॥
स्त्रादीध्योत्तापेशु होपाजादेशा एव न स्थानन्दवदि वर्णव्यम् ॥
किंतुगुप्ताध्वंसक्षराभिस्वपूर्णस्य अयायम् ॥
पूर्वापिन्तं न स्थानन्दवदि वर्णव्यम् ॥
बङ्करुपस्वरवर्जेन हिन्दुचनादीनि च न करिकवा ॥
तस्य देशः सर्वोगादिबोधाद्वंस्वेच्छिति वर्णव्यः ॥
न लुमताःद्वस्य \( \text{II} \ 63 \text{II} \)

लुमति प्रतिषेध एकपदस्वरस्योपसंख्यानम् \( \text{II} \)

सर्वामनतिरतस्तमुक्वस्वरवंजयम् \( \text{II} \)

प्रयोजनं लुकि विनिकिष्टवरा इति \( \text{II} \)

अहं रचिष्यो लुमता लुके प्रत्ययलक्षणं नेति वाच्यम् \( \text{II} \)

न लुमता तत्स्मिनिः परम्पराः \( \text{II} \)

तस्मिनिः निर्देशं पूर्वस्य \( \text{II} \ 66 \text{II} \)

उभयनिर्देशं पञ्चमीनिर्देशो बलीयान् \( \text{II} \)

स्वं रूपं शब्दस्या नवदसंजा \( \text{II} \ 68 \text{II} \)

सत्तवित्रेशाणूं वृक्षावर्तम् \( \text{II} \)

पित्यवच्चनस्य च स्वाधर्मम् \( \text{II} \)

नित्यवचनस्यैव राजावर्तम् \( \text{II} \)

श्वच्च स्तरधिशेषाणूं च मल्ल्वाहर्तम् | महीनस्य पर्ययस्यवेव्यते \( \text{II} \)

तयारस्तकालस्य \( \text{II} \ 70 \text{II} \)

ध्वनि: स्फोटो दश्यानां ध्वनिस्तु खलु रक्षयते \( \text{II} \)

अल्पो महां शेखाप्रियुभं तत्त्वभावतः \( \text{II} \)

येन विखिष्ठदर्तस्य \( \text{II} \ 72 \text{II} \)

उगिद्रर्थपहवनवें समासाम्प्रत्यविषैः प्रतिषेध: \( \text{II} \)

अकृत्तदनम्भत: सर्वनामावयवर्तित्रिवंदिक्षुपसंख्यानम् \( \text{II} \)

तदेकदेवश्रवात्वानातिवित्रम् \( \text{II} \)

प्रयोजनं सर्वनामावयवसंज्ञायाम् \( \text{II} \)

उपपदविधाभ्य भवाचार्यविधिवाणम् \( \text{II} \)

प्रतिषेधं स्वच्चाधिध्रुवम् च \( \text{II} \)

वितिप्रसंहं च प्रयोजनम् \( \text{II} \)

रोणया अणु \( \text{II} \).
तत्स्य चैति वक्तव्यम् ॥
रथसीताहेत्यथा यथेकियो प्रयोजनम् ॥
खसवर्धियुद्धस्येऽजनपदस्य ॥
कस्मोद्भूमिद्विधाववायवानाम् ॥
दिन्येऽसेक्यायः ॥
धर्माचारः ॥
पदाचेपाधिकारेत तस्य तु जन्तरपदस्य च। तत्देवेत्येव ज्यायः ॥
वर्णव्रहणं च सर्वे प्रयोजनम् ॥
प्रत्ययप्रहणं चापद्याम्यः ॥
अवैवाचार्यकैन नायेनायकेनेति वक्तव्यम् ॥
अविनिस्तम्रहणायन्येवता चाचार्यकैन च ॥
यस्मिन्विधियस्वादाल्यप्रहणं इति वाच्यम् ॥
दुध्विद्यायाम् ॥ ३३ ॥
वा नामावध्यस्य वृहस्पंशा वक्तव्यम् ॥
गौत्रेन्तरपदस्य च सा वक्तव्यम् ॥
गौत्रान्तरादस्मस्तत्वयोज्योत्तीति वक्तव्यम्। जिन्हाकाय्यहरितकालेन्त्रे ॥
इदमेव ज्यायः ॥
(त्यदादीनि च ॥ ५५ ॥)
कधिकान्तारे समुपस्यते सार्वसुपाद्वे स यदा निध्वान्तकान्तारो भवति तदा सार्व जहाति ॥
एह प्राचां देहेऽ ॥ ७५ ॥
शैष्ठिक्षित्विचि वक्तव्यम् ॥
|| इति ( श्रीमंद्रिवत्कायायनवित्ति वार्तिकपाते ) प्रथमाभ्यास्य प्रथमः पादः ॥
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