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PREFACE

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

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

University of Calcutta

June, 1938

Manomohan Ghosh
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INTRODUCTION

1. The Present Edition. Among the large number of works known as the Sikṣās the Indian tradition accords the position of the Vedāṅga Sikṣā to the one connected with the name of Pāṇini (see § 28). Weber in his edition of the Pāṇiniya Sikṣā (Indische Studien, IV) has however remained silent on this point. In his History of Sanskrit Literature too he did not give any decisive opinion in the matter, but later on Max Müller positively denied the validity of the traditional notion about the PS. being a Vedāṅga. Since the days of Max Müller his view has been accepted by almost all the scholars without the slightest protest. Prof. Liebich may be said to have been a notable exception in this matter; for he maintains that the PS. though late in its present form, is old in its contents. This view however has received very scanty attention from scholars who are otherwise very careful. Even two very recent writers who touched the subject, Mr. C. V. Vaidya and Dr. Siddheshwar Varma, have followed the view of Max Müller. Of these two the opinion of Mr. Vaidya deserves special mention because he is frankly against what he considers to be a late date (c. 1100 B. C.) for the Rgveda suggested by Max Müller, and is for

---


3 ‘History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature?,’ p. 145.

placing this work as early as 4000 B.C.1 But Mr. Vaidya does not make any effort to explain why the PS. should not be considered a genuine Vedāṅga belonging to the great antiquity he assigns to Pāṇini 2 and Yāska.3 Dr. Siddheshwar Varma however gives some arguments to prove the lateness of the PS. But these, as we shall see later on (§§25 ff.) do not seem to be based on all available materials which might have given him a different view about the age and character of the work.4 For he has known the PS. in three recensions only, while the work itself exists in no less that what may be called five recensions which read together critically are to give one a better idea about the age and character of the text. There is yet another scholar who not only considers the PS. to be a late work and hence not a Vedāṅga, but accords the same position to a Sūtra work ascribed, on very questionable grounds to Pāṇini.5 We shall see later on (§§31-32) why this view is untenable, and this will bring us face to face with the text-history of the PS. for which a critical edition of the work is essentially necessary. Hence no apology need be offered for undertaking such an edition of the work together with that of the two commentaries attached to its two (late) recensions. Reasons which have led us to believe that the PS. is the original Vedāṅga Sikṣā will be discussed later on (§§28-30) and as such it is—to be placed as early as Pāṇini who in all likelihood was its author (see §33). This being the oldest treatise on the phonetics of Old Indo-Aryan—and possibly of Indo-European—deserves to be studied carefully for the history of the Vedic as well as Sanskrit sounds.

3 Ibid., pp. 5 ff.
4 The main arguments which Dr. Siddheshwar Varma adduces to show that the PS. is a not the Vedāṅga Sikṣā are as follows: (1) The PS. has no claim to be a mūlāgama or source of the Prātiṣṭhākyas, (2) Pāngala, and not Pāṇini, is the author of the PS. The first argument has been refuted in §§28-30, and the second in §33.
5 Dr. Raghun Vira, 'Discovery of the Lost Phonetic Sūtras of Pāṇini' in the JRAŚ, 1931, pp. 658 ff.
INTRODUCTION

2. The Critical Apparatus. It has been mentioned above (§1) that the PŚ. is available in five recensions. Each of these recensions again is available in MSS. or printed texts with more or less varying readings. Hence before reconstructing the PŚ. on the basis of different recensions we shall have to find out the most representative text of each version and its age and special characteristics. For this purpose we have consulted various MSS. and printed texts and are giving below the results together with a description of them all.

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

raṅgaś ca khe aram proktāḥ hakāram pañcaṁair yuktaḥ
taṁsthābhiḥ samāyuktaḥ ‘aurasya ‘kaṇṭhya’ eva saḥ

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

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


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

V. The Agni Purâna with Bengali translation published by the Vaṅgavâśi Press, Calcutta.

(b) The Pañjikā Recension. As the commentary called the Śikṣā-Pañjikā does not contain the particular text, it follows, in a complete form, the Pâñj. recension of the PS. had to be reconstructed to some extent conjecturally from the pratīkas of passages handled in the commentary. The compiler of the catalogue of Skt. MSS. in the India Office Library, London, has wrongly considered this to be identical with the Yaj. recension. But on comparing the latter (Yaj. rec.) with this we find that in some important points the two differ. For example, unlike the Yaj. the Pâñj. contains the hemistich anusvāra-yamāṇām ca nāsikā sthānam ucyate (PS. 11a) and upadhmāṇīya uṣmā ca jihvā-mūlīya-nāsikē (PS. 14b) and in this respect it falls in a line with the Prk. recension. Two passages (PS. 9, 10) though not explained in the Pañjikā seems to have existed in the text used by its author\(^1\) (see Notes 26a and 28) and for this reason they have been included in the reconstructed text. Except these two, the Pâñj. consists of 21½ couplets of which 4-19, correspond to PS. 1-18, respectively. On comparing

---

\(^{1}\) The name of the author does not occur in any MS. But Mahamahopadbhyaya Pānḍit Shivadatta in his introduction to the Siddhânta-kaumudi (ed. Veṅkatesvara, Bombay, says asya śiṣṭāyāh Rāgabhaṣācārya-kṛtyam bhāṣyam āgārīti dik. Now in some MSS. the Pañjikā has been called Bhāṣya (p. 17). It may be that Rāgavacārya is the author of the Pañjikā.
the Pāj. with the Prk. recension it appears that the latter is an inflated version of the former. There are no sufficient data to suggest any precise date for the Pāj. recension. But it appears by no means recent. For the Pañjikā quotes from one of the old authorities namedAudavrají of whose exact time we have no information; but as he is mentioned by the Nār. S.,\(^1\) a work, except for its interpolated passages, is as old as 200 B. C., he was probably older than this time. He has also been mentioned in the Ṛk-tantra Vyākarana (Sāmaveda Prātiśākhya)\(^2\) and in the Śikṣā-prakāśa,\(^3\) another commentary to the PŚ. There being no mention of Audavrají in phonetical works which are palpably very late we may assume that at their time his work was lost and the author of the Pañjikā flourished possibly earlier than a time when A.’s work was still available, and such was the case with the authors of the available Ṛk-tantra Vyākarana and the Śikṣā-prakāśa.\(^4\) Now the time for the Śikṣā-prakāśa being placed tentatively between 1000 A. C. and 1300 A. C. we may consider the lower limit to the date of the Pāj. recension as the 1200 A. C. Along with this should be considered the fact that the Agni Purāṇa recension can be placed at the earliest in 800 A. C. Thus it appears that the Pāj. recension existed between 800 and 1200 A. C. The representative text of this recension of the PŚ. has been worked out from the following MSS. and printed text.

A. ¹ Manuscript of the Śikṣā-Pañjikā in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, No. 2834.

A.² MS. of the Pañjikā in the same Society, No. 1169.

A.³ MS. of the Pañjikā in the same Society, No. 4180 C.

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

---

¹ Ed. SS., II, 8. 5.
² Ed. Suryakanta Sastri, Sūtra 69.
³ Ed. SS., p. 388. See also the same edited below.
⁴ See below on the Prak. recension.
The text of the Śikṣā-Pañjikā together with the PŚ. in its Rk recension printed in Benares, 1929 (Haridas Śkt. Series No. 10) [Mr. Suryakanta Sastri mentions one such text printed in Benares in 1887 (op. cit., introd., p. 33n.). But we have not seen it. From Mr. Sastri's quotation it seems to agree with HL.].

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

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

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

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

The date of the Prakāśa recension may be considered to be later than that of the Pañj. for the simple reason that the
former is much longer than the latter and the increase in bulk has needed some time. But the Śikṣā Prakāśa may not be earlier than the 10th century. For he seems to quote a long passage verbatim from the commentary of Viṣṇumitra on the Ṛk Prātiṣākhyā (vide infra). Now this Viṣṇumitra seems to be a predecessor or at best a contemporary of Uvaṭa (1100 A.C.). Besides this, from the introduction to the Śikṣā Prakāśa we learn that the anonymous author wrote a commentary to Piṅgala’s metrics. Now the only commentary available for the Chandah-sūtras of Piṅgala is by Ḥalāyudha¹ who was the minister of the king Laksmana Sena (c. 1200 A.C.) of Bengal. Hence we may tentatively assign the Prk. recension to a time about 1200 A.C. It may be that Madhusūdana Sarasvatī (c. 1500 A.C.), author of the Prasthāna-bheda described this recension as the pañca-khaṇḍātmikā and it is sure he did not mean the Ṛk recension, for that is eka-dasa-khaṇḍātmikā (see the text below).

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

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

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

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

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

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

This recension is scarcely much older than the 18th century; for MSS. of this used by Weber are all later than Saṃvat 1833 and we have come across no earlier MS. This is the most inflated version of the PS. and contains nearly 60 stanzas. Only 17½ among these may be taken as genuine. These are Rk 4-11, 13, 16-19, 22-23, 38-40a corresponding to PS. 1-8, 9, 11-13, 14a, 15, 16a, 16b-18, respectively. The nature and source of the remaining 42 couplets have been discussed below (§ 3).

3. Reconstruction. From a very close study of its five recensions eighteen only of the couplets appear to constitute the original PS. Only fourteen among them, however, occur in all the recensions,1 while the remaining couplets do not so occur. But on internal evidence they appear to be organically connected with the fourteen couplets common to all recensions and hence surely occurring in the original PS. Problems connected with them have been discussed in detail in Notes given along with the translation of the PS. Sources of more than half of the remaining forty-two couplets which we consider to be later additions to the text of the PS. have been traced to different late Sikṣā2 works. Of the remaining twenty couplets the source of which we could not explore, at least eight (Rk 1-3, and 56-60, and passages corresponding to them in other recensions), can probably be credited to the editors of different recensions. The remaining twelve were, in all likelihood, taken also from some late Sikṣās lost to us. Grounds on which we have considered a passage or group of passages spurious or later additions have also been discussed in Notes. From

---

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

2 Cases of later Sikṣās can to some extent be compared with those of the later Upaniṣads (cf. Winternitz, History of Ind. Lit., Vol. I, p. 289). In order to give authenticity to their own theory or practice later writers on Vedic phonetics have called their works Sikṣās. These late works are nevertheless important for the study of Indo-Aryan phonetics.
a study of the interpolated passages it appears that the custodians of the Vedaṅga Śiksā have at different times made desperate efforts to preserve this small treatise consisting of only eighteen couplets, from extinction. Lest it should fall out of use before later works on the subject, which for the time being gave better guidance to the reciter of the Vedic texts they culled some new materials from these and tagged them on to the Pṛś. in different relays. Even this method though resorted to sometimes were not exclusively followed. To supplement this they put it along with other works on similarly important subjects in the body of a big compilation like the Agni Purāṇa. A case which seems to be analogous to this is the alleged interpolation of the Bhagavad-Gītā in the corpus of the Mahābhārata. For a tabular statement of the growth ¹ of Pṛś. showing the distribution of genuine and interpolated passages in its different recensions,¹ see Table A.

Table A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recensions</th>
<th>Total Number of Hemisticas.</th>
<th>Interpolation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Traced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agni Purāṇa</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pañjikā</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakāśa</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yajuḥ śākhā ²</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṛk śākhā</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Compare with this the growth of the text of the Nirukta (Prof. L. Sarup’s Introduction, pp. 19-20; S. Sastri, Ṛk-tantra, Lahore, 1933, Introduction, pp. 45, 46) and of the Upādī-Sūtras (Prof. Goldstücker, Pāṇini: his place in Skt. Literature, London, 1881, pp. 131, 170; Reprint from Allahabad, 1914, pp. 130, 189; S. Sastri, ibid).

² For the meaning of the Śākhās see below (§§ 18ff.).
From a study of the above table as well as the contents of the different recension we can suggest the mutual relation of the different recensions as follows:

**Ur-text of the PS.**

- AP. Rec.
  - Pnaj. Rec.
  - Prk. Rec.
  - Yaj. Rec.
- Rk. Rec.
2

**SIX VEDAÑGAS**

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

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

---


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

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

---

1 S. K. Chatterji, op. cit., pp. 87f., 170f.
2 Oldenberg places the period of the Brâhmapas and Upaniṣads (of course old ones) between 900 B. C.-700 B. C. (Buddha, his Life, his Doctrines, etc., Calcutta, 1927, pp. 14-15). The Brâhmapas are characteristically the product of that period in which primitive Indo-Aryans were very much influenced by pre-Aryans of India.
later on their descendants began to get ashamed of their extra-Aryan origin and wished very much to pass themselves off as thorough-bred Aryans. But a great obstacle in their way was indeed the colour of their skin as well as their language and customs. For the time being difficulties seemed insuperable, but they did not remain so for a long time. Means were gradually discovered for concealing their ethnic and cultural origin.

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

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

---

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

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

---

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

2 Śrāuta Sūtras in fact represented the Kalpa sūtras most. For according to the Śikṣā Prākṛta commentary to the PS. kalpa is the science of rituals.

3 Max Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 211 ff.


6 *Ibid*, p. 268. For the time of Muḍaka, see Hertel’s edn., pp. 64 ff.
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Dharma sūtra (c. 500 B.C.)

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

---


2 J. Charpentier places without any justification the origin of the Vedāṅgas between 300-100 B.C. (see his ed. of the Uttarādhyāyanasūtra, pp. 31-32).
Brāhmaṇas, small treatises on the Vedāṅgas which, as we already noticed (§ 5), must have been a vital necessity with them about 1900 B.C. and after, were not then being prepared. Thus we are justified to assume that treatises on different Vedāṅgas might have been in existence between 1000-600 B.C.¹

SIKṢĀ

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

11. According to Pāṇini (VII. 4. 53) the word Sikṣā has been derived from the desiderative of śak, 'to be able.' Thus the literal meaning of śikṣā will be 'a desire to be able.' It is very difficult to understand how this rather curious meaning finally developed into 'phonetics.' It is indeed due to this difficulty that Weber and Max Müller have cut the Gordian knot by a bold assumption that śikṣā means originally 'a desire to know' (zu können suchen) though it must be admitted that 'knowing' cannot very well be equated to 'pronunciation.' But, from the discussion made above of the conditions under which Sikṣā as a subject of study arose, the original meaning of this word seems to be plain enough. For were not the newly Aryanized people with their different ancestral speech-habit still able to recite the Vedic mantras in a faultless manner? Now it may well be assumed that the difficulty in their case who had a totally different linguistic basis was so great that learners among them had to have indeed a very strong 'desire to be able' to recite the Vedic hymns. Possibly on such a hypothesis alone can we understand how the original meaning of 'to desire to be able' came to be narrowed down 'to desire to be able to recite the Vedas correctly,' and from this finally

---

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

12. Now the Vedic pronunciation as we see from the Śikṣās and Prātiśākhyas was more or less a complex affair. But it is not so much possible that all phases of this complexity were felt all at once at the very beginning when attention began to be given to pronunciation\(^1\); even in case of its being felt these different aspects of it could not be handled with success at the very beginning. Whatever might be the case it is pretty sure that with the early Vedic phoneticians (Śikṣākāras) matters were simple enough and only the fundamentals occupied their attention. Our evidence in this matter comes from Patañjali who in his definition of a typical priest (ārtvijīna) says that he should be able to use the (Vedic) speech with (properly inflected) words (pada), with (proper) accent (svara) and with the (properly articulated) speech-sounds (varṇas).\(^2\) From this we learn that the observation of the proper accent as well as the right pronunciation of speech-sounds were Śikṣākāras’ chief object of study. And a later authority Viśnimitra, a commentator of the ṚPr., defines the Śikṣā as svara-varṇopadesaka-śāstram,\(^3\) the science which teaches accent and the speech-sounds (varṇa). Madhusūdana Sarasvatī too says the same thing more elaborately.\(^4\) Hence we see that the correct production of speech-sounds in general and the pitch and quantity of vowels comprised

---

\(^1\) In order to appreciate these we are to take notice of different stages in the phonetic evolution of the Middle Indo-Aryan. See S. K. Chatterji, op. cit.

\(^2\) Yo va imām padaśaḥ svaraśa' kṣaraśa vācaṁ vidadhāti sa ārtvijīnaḥ (Mahābhāṣya, Vol. I, p. 3). Pada in this passage does not mean ‘Verstollen’ though in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa this is the meaning (see B. Liebich, Zur Einührung, II, §§ 3-4) and akṣara does not mean here syllable in connection with metrics but with phonetics, for Patañjali says later on that Vedic words are taught to those who know places of articulation, adjustment of organs and the vocal words. This probably shows phonetics was studied earlier than metrics.

\(^3\) v. 1. svara-varṇopadesaka ṚPr., ed. Benares, p. 10; S. Varma, op. cit., p. 4.
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the sole scope of the Śiksā at the earliest stage of its development. It is quite possible that there was no written treatise on these topics, the Ācārya teaching the young learner (brahma-cārī)\(^1\) by words of his mouth, and it was only a little later that the earliest manual on different topics of the Śiksā came to be written down. Now of the two phases of pronunciation that were considered important in the beginning, the proper instruction of the speech-sounds was probably reduced to a system first of all. We do not know what this system was like, but in view of somewhat phonetic arrangement of varṇas in the Varna-samāmnāya or the so-called Śiva-sūtras \(^2\) we are tempted to assume that this—probably in some earlier form—constituted the first treatise on the instruction of speech-sounds. The word samāmnāya ‘traditional recitation’ probably gives support to this view. Kātyāyana also seems to give it support while he says vṛtti-sama-vāyārtha upadeśah, the enunciation (of the speech-sounds in the Śiva-sūtras) is meant for arranging the varṇas in a proper order for (the facility of) recitation.\(^3\)

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

\(^2\) Prof. B. Faddegon says that the Śiva-sūtra as a phonetical classification deserves the highest praise (‘The mnemotechnics of Pāṇini’s Grammar,’ Acta Orientalia, VII, 1929, p. 54). Mr. K. C. Chatterji is against such a view (see Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol. XXIV).

\(^3\) In this translation we have ventured to differ from Patañjali on the interpretation of the word vṛtti which he explains as āstṛa-pravṛttiḥ (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 13). Our translation of the word as ‘recitation’ has its support from the well-known couplet abhyāsārthe drutāṇi vṛttim, etc. (BPṛ., XIII. 19, YaJ., 22, etc.). Compare also the word āṣṛtti recitation. If Patañjali has misunderstood Kātyāyana there is no wonder about it; according to his own testimony Patañjali lived in a decadent age as regards the proper teaching of the Vedas. He says: In the hoary antiquity it was like this: Brahmins after their upanāyana studied grammar. And when they had learnt the places of articulation of sounds, the adjustment of organs and vocal chord in producing them, they were given instruction in Vedic words. But to-day it is not so. (Thus) the Veda (straight) one quickly becomes a rector of the same. (Purā kalpa etad āsit, sanskrāttarakālam Brāhmaṇā vyākaraṇam smādhīyate, tebyas tatra sthāna karanānupradāyate Vaidikā śabdā upadāyante, tad adyatam na tathā, Vedam adhitṛa tvarītā vaktūrō bhasanti.) The use of the word kalpa is very significant. It literally means 432 million years but is used here in the sense of ‘hoary antiquity.’ This,
13. There may however be some objection to the above view on the following grounds: (i) in the Varṇa-samāmnāya long and pluta vowels have been omitted, (ii) unvoiced stops have not been arranged in the same order as the voiced ones, (iii) the absence of yama, anusvāra, visarga, jihvā-mūliya and upadhmāniya in it and (iv) the h of the sūtra ha-ya-va-ra-t and the sūtra ha-l at the end duplicating h, is inexplicable.

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

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

16. The scope of the Siksā as given in the Taittiriya Upaniṣad probably brings us to the second stage in the evolution of this Vedāṅga. According to this Upaniṣad (1. 2) the Siksā consists of svarga ‘pitch accent,’ mātrā ‘quantity,’ bala ‘stress,’ śīma ‘utterance in a medium tone,’ and santāna (sāmkāta, ‘euphonic combination.’ While referring to the Siksā in his introduction to the Rgveda-bhāṣya Sāyana thinks of the developed state of this Vedāṅga even when he says varṇa-svargāyucchāraṇa-prakāra yatra upadīṣyate sa siksā; for he brings in the

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

2. The translation of the terms given above is based on Saṅkara’s Bhāṣya of the Taitt. Up.; cf. the translation of these terms by Prof. Winternitz (A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I, p. 282). Macdonell in pursuance of Sāyana translates these as letters, accents, quality, pronunciation and euphonic rules (see Hist. of Skt. Lit., p. 256). Dr. Siddheshwar Varma translates varga as ‘individual sounds,’ svarga as ‘accent,’ santāna as ‘chanting of the Vedic verses’ and in this connexion he ignores bala totally (see his Critical Studies, p. 4).
passage from the Taitt. Up. (1.2). According to him svara-varṇādayaḥ means varṇa, svara, mātrā, bala, sāma and sattāna. But the fact that Sāyaṇa in his Veda-bhāṣya quotes from Prātiṣākhya does not invalidate his testimony about the Vedāṅga Śikṣā which according to him is the PS. For he mentions no less than three couplets (PS. 8, 9, 10) of the latter work.\(^1\) As Uvāc, one of Sāyaṇa’s predecessors, in his introduction to the commentary of the Ṛk Prātiṣākhya has considered this work to be a Śikṣā\(^2\) we can easily believe that Sāyaṇa was fully conscious about the historical relation between the PS. and the Prātiṣākhya and he surely followed a correct tradition in according due honour to each kind of works on the subject. For the Prātiṣākhya, though one of them has called itself a Vedāṅga,\(^3\) were, as we shall see presently, the Śikṣā manuals belonging to the second stage in the development of this Vedāṅga, and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī too was aware of this fact.\(^4\) The position of the Prātiṣākhya in the history of ancient Indian phonetic literature seems to have been very much misunderstood.\(^5\) And in order to appreciate their proper position as well as that of the Vedāṅga Śikṣa composed by Pāṇini we must now inquire into the nature and scope of the Prātiṣākhya and their time.

---

\(^1\) Sāyaṇa evidently used one of the very late recensions of the PS. for he says sa cāṅgabhūta-Śikṣā-granthas vā ṣaprāṇaḥ ‘ṣaṭiṣṭaḥ’ ca uṣṭasīṭaḥ vā sarvāḥ sambhavato maṭāḥ’ etc. (PsJ. Prak. YaJ. and Ṛk. 3.)

\(^2\) tathāpy aṣyaṁ śikṣāyaṁ daṇṭyamāṇya iti repho daṇṭyamāṇya ity uktāḥ (ed. Sāmaśrmi, p. 14). Madhusūdana too calls Prātiṣākhya Śikṣās; see the Note 5 below.

\(^3\) ṚPr. XIV. 30 ; Madhusūdana seems to be of opinion that the Prātiṣākhya too are Vedāṅgas.

\(^4\) tatra sāraṇa-vedāṅgadāraṇāśiṣṭaḥ Pāṇinīṇaḥ prakāśitā prātiṣākhyaśaṃ ca bhinnarūpā prātiṣākhyaśaṃ ca uṣṭasīṭaḥ angaśaṃ bhiniḥ prakāśitā.

PRATIŚĀKHYAS

17. Before entering into any discussion about the origin, nature and scope, etc., of the Pratīśākhyaśas it would be proper to examine the term about the meaning of which there seems to exist some misunderstanding. The word consists of three parts: prati, sākhā and the formative element. Of these, the exact meaning of sākhā should be determined first of all.

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

1 For details see Saśibhūسا Viśyālaṅkāra, बौद्धीकाव्य (Jñāni-kosa), Calcutta, 1841 B.E., pp. 1096 ff. (article on 'Vedavyāsa').
Sûtra we learn that one of the reasons which gave rise to sâkhâs was the manner of reading the Vedas.¹ This being the case we can well say that from one original Veda came out first of all sâkhâs like Rk, Sàman, Yajus, etc.² For, the uttering of Vedic mantras by different classes of priests was different; the Hotr recited the Rcas with his normal voice, the Adhvaryu muttered the Yajûmsi silently, while the Udgâtr chanted Sâmans loudly.³

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

¹ sâkhâbheda’ dhyayanabhedâd vâ sûtra bheda’d vâ. See Max Müller, Ancient Skt. Literature, London, 1889, p. 127.
² Max Müller also writes: ‘The word (i.e., sâkhâ) is sometimes applied to the three original Sanhitâs, the Rgveda-sanhitâ, Sàma-veda-sanhitâ and Yajur-veda-sanhitâ, in relation to one another and without reference to subordinate sâkhâs belonging to each of them’ (op. cit., pp. 123, 124). Yâka’s use of singular number with reference to the Veda deserves notice (1. 20). Prof. Sarup however takes this differently. See his transl., p. 291.
³ Max Müller, op. cit., pp. 122, 471 f.; Pûrva-Mûnâpsa-Sûtras (II. 1. 35-37).
difference of pronunciation of the mantras but also a variation of their sacrificial rules and social laws and customs. Thus the śākhās came to relate also to a difference in such matters, though Prātiśākhyaśas had nothing to do with such śākhās.

20. Now the exact sense of śākhās having been determined we shall proceed to ascertain the sense of the term Prātiśākhya. According to Max Müller who wrote in 1859, 'Prātiśākhya...does not mean, as has been supposed, a treatise on phonetic peculiarities of each Veda, but a collection of phonetic rules peculiar to one of the different branches of the four Vedas, i.e., to one of those different texts in which each of the Vedas had been handed down for ages in different families and different parts of India.' This view has been subscribed to by Whitney in his edition of the Atharva-veda Prātiśākhya (1862). Since then almost all the scholars have followed this view. But such an opinion seems to have been expressed on very inadequate grounds. For, Mādhava, quoted by Jñānendra Sarasvatī in his gloss on the Siddh. Kau. (P. IV. 3. 59), explains Prātiśākhya as pratiśākham bhavam. And Anantabhaṭṭa too in the introduction to his commentary to the Śukla-Yajus Prātiśākhya defines the word similarly and shows, after an elaborate discussion, that Kātyāyana’s work relates to all the fifteen śākhās which developed out of the Śukla Yajur-veda. From the testimony of Durga also we learn that the Prātiśākhya related to more schools than one. For in his commentary to the Nirukta (I. 17) he says: kim pārśadāni? svacarana-pārśady eva yaiḥ.
pratiśākhāṁ nityatam eva padāvagraha-pragrhyā-krama-samhitā-
svaralakṣaṇam ucyate tāni imāni pārśadāni pratiśākhīyāni ity
arthāḥ.¹ 'Those Pārśada books by which in a Pariṣad of one's
own Caraṇa, the peculiarities of accent, samhitā, krama-reading,
pragrhyā vowels and separation of words are laid as enjoined for,
and restricted to each sākhā are called Pratiśākhīyas.' Max
Müller who quoted the above passage may be said to have
misunderstood it. Pratiśākhāṁ, which he translated as 'to
certain sākhās' should be equivalent to 'to each sākhā.' It
should be noticed in this connexion that Max Müller's transla-
tion of the passage is not in agreement with his own definition of
the term Pratiśākhīya quoted above. However the fault lies
principally with commentators like the author of the Vaidikā-
bharana whom Max Müller in all likelihood followed. For in
the last named work which does not say anything about the
exclusive phonetic character of sākhās in a Pratiśākhīya, it has
been suggested that the Pratiśākhīyas relate to a group of
sākhās.¹ This suggestion seems to give partial support to
Mādhava's and Anantabhaṭṭa's testimony referred to above. For
it does not restrict Pratiśākhīyas to one only of the m a n y
sākhās.

The word Pārśada which is a synonym for Pratiśākhīya
seems to give some clue to the solution of the problem whether
Pratiśākhīyas related to only one or all the sākhās of a Veda.
In Nārāyaṇa's commentary to a passage (ācāryāṁ sapariṣatkaṁ
bhoyayet sabrahmacāriṇaḥ-ca in the Gobhila-Gṛhyasūtra-bhāṣya
we find the following saja pariṣadā śiṣyaganenā vartata iti
sapariṣatkaḥ tam. samānaṁ tulyakālaṁ brahmacāritvam yeśāṁ ta
ime anyaśākhīno'pi sabrahmacāriṇaḥ savayo'bhī adhiyante.²
From this passage we learn that students belonging to different
Vedic schools could take their lessons from one Ācārya who
together with his pupils constituted a Pārśada or Pariṣad. Thus

¹ Max Müller, op. cit., p. 181; S. Varma translates Mādhava's words as belonging t
each individual (prati) sākhā (op. cit., . 12).
² On the T. Pr., IV. 11; Siddheshwar Varma, op. cit., p. 13.
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Pārśada sūtras evidently related to such Pariṣads comprising different schools of a Veda. Hence it seems justifiable to conclude that Pārśada-sūtras or Prātiṣākhya-s related to each one or all the śākhās of a Veda.

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

¹ See p. 427 of Whitney's ed. of this Prātiṣākhya was published in 1871.
² Whitney, T. Pr. p. 427.
³ The Paippalāda śākhā of the Atharva-veda discovered after Whitney's ed. of the Atharva Pr. should be remembered in this connexion.
requires, in many instances contemplating and providing for combination of sounds which are found nowhere in the body of Vedic scriptures, and for which accordingly the commentator is obliged to fabricate illustrations (p. 588)." Now whatever may be said about the genuineness of examples given by the commentator who was possibly very late, it cannot be said that the author of the Prātiśākhyaas based his rules on non-existing materials. In view of the tradition that Vedas, in different periods, came to be lost and had to be recovered, it will not be difficult to assume that some of the sākhās with their texts perished beyond recovery.\(^1\) Even if his allegation against the commentator in some rare cases may not be untrue, Whitney himself has admitted that ‘there are certain number of sentences among those given by the commentator which have more or less clearly the aspect of genuine citations from Vedic texts; and although some might be regarded as instances of carelessness on his part quoting by memory from another source than his own Veda, we cannot possibly extend this explanation to them all; it must remain probable that, in part at least, they were contained in some hitherto unknown cākhā of the Atharva-veda.’\(^2\) From these passages one will easily realise the untenable nature of the meaning given to Prātiśākhya by Whitney, his predecessors and followers.\(^3\)

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

\(^1\) Hopkins, ‘The Great Epic of India,’ p. 5.
\(^2\) JAOS., VII, p. 688.
\(^3\) E.g., Prof. Keith believes with Whitney that the T.Pr. relates to the Taittiriya Mantra-pāṭha alone. See The Veda of the Black Yajus School, HOS, p. xxxviii.
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manuscripts of the text agree with the data in the Prátiśākhya, we may prudently conclude that the text of the Rgveda we possess is the same as seen by the authors of the Prátiśākhya more than 2000 years ago.'"\(^1\) Along with this should be remembered what he himself wrote in this connexion eleven years earlier. In the History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature (1859) Max Müller wrote: ‘‘There is not a single MS. at present existing of the Rgveda in which rules of our Prátiśākhya are uniformly observed, and the same applies to the MSS. of the other Vedas.’’\(^2\)

22 (a). Burnell, too, in his introduction to the Rk-tantra-vyākaraṇa (Mangalore, 1879), considered by him to be a Prátiśākhya of the Sāma-veda, thought that Prátiśākhyas belonged to one of the many sākhās of a Veda. He attached the Rk-tantra to the Kauthumī sākhā alone and made some conjectures as to why this Prátiśākhya could not be connected with Jaiminīya, Talavakāra or Rāṇāyaniya sākhās, and he assumed that Prátiśākhyas connected with these sākhās had been lost. But all these assumptions seem to be uncalled for. For example, characteristics of some Sāma sākhās such as the cerebral ḷ and short e and o were in all probability phonetic developments occurring or recognized later.\(^3\) There can be nothing against such an assumption. For there is the traditional view that the difference of sākhās arising from difference in uttering mantras is without any (historical) beginning;\(^4\) and from this we may deduce that even after the Prátiśākhyas were written new differences in pronuncia-

---


\(^2\) Pp. 135, 137.

\(^3\) Patañjali’s opinion regarding the shortening of e and o in the Sātyamugriya and Rāṇāyaniya sākhās of the Sāma-veda deserves special notice in this connexion. For he is unwilling to recognize such a deviation from the tradition though the Pariṣad gave it sanction. He says, pāṇḍadaṃśrī eṣa tatravidhātāṃ nāvās loke nānyasmin veda’rtha ekāro’ṛthā ekāro vaṣṭi on the Śivasūtra (ai-au-o).

\(^4\) adhyāyana-bhedāt chākhābhedā ‘nādī quoted by Max Müller, op. cit., p. 127. See also pp. 117-118; pravacanabhedaḥ prativedaṃ bhinnā bhāyasyaṣ ca sākhā, says Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in the Prasthāna-bheda.
tion could arise between several groups of Vedic people and did actually arise and thus the process which brought into existence different śākhās was practically without an end. It will be found on a closer study of the various Prātiśākhyaśas and Śikṣās that the difference of pronunciation among Vedic śākhās owe their origin to the forces which tended to develop the Old Indo-Aryan to the Middle Indo-Aryan and the later to the New Indo-Aryan dialects. But Whitney, Max Müller and Burnell however viewed the matter differently and so did Weber before them.

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

---

1 Mr. Suryakanta Sastri in his Introduction to his new ed. of the Śk-tantra follows Burnell in assigning the work to the Kauṭumik śākhā (pp. 2-6). But Mr. Sastri has also given some fresh arguments in support of Burnell’s theory. These, however, are by no means unassailable. That the Jaininiya text of the Śāma-veda did not give the peculiarities provided for in the Śūtras 68, 94, 112 and 114 can be explained also by the assumption that the phonetic changes in question might have arisen later or the Prātiśākhyaśas being manuals of pronunciation had not much influence with the scribes, and discrepancy between the written text and its pronunciation can well be assumed to have existed in early times also. From the emphatic manner in which the use of written texts of the Vedas has been discouraged we can well infer this. For the Nārada-Śikṣā says:

Pustakaprtyayādhītan nādhītan gurusamudham
rājate na sahāmadhye jāragurbho iva striyaḥ. (II. 8. 10),

and the Yājñavalkya-Śikṣā has the following:

guḥi śighr ī kīrah-kampi tathā līkhīta-pāṭhakaḥ
anarthajñā’lpaṇaḥṣṭhā ca ṣaṭ ete pāṭhakādhamāḥ. (106).

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

2 Bloomfield and Edgerton, Vedic Variants, Vol. 2, Phonetics, Ch. I, especially §§ 20-43. See also Max Müller, Ancient Skt. Lit., p. 117.


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

24. As for the date of the Prātiśākhya which as we have seen can be called the secondary Śikṣās, their rise and development, at least of the older ones among them, can be roughly placed between 600-200 B.C. A detailed discussion about the date of the Prātiśākhya will carry us far beyond the scope of the present work. But in support of the lower limit to the date of the early Prātiśākhya it may be mentioned that the passages from the Taittirīya Pr. and Atharva Pr. occur in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali (c. 200 B.C.). Patañjali’s loan to the Pr. has already been pointed out by Dr. Siddheshwar Varma but the acquaintance of the Bhāṣyakāra with the A. Pr. has not been pointed out before. Under the Vārttika to Pāṇini I. I. 10. Patañjali quotes spr̥tam sparsāṇām karavam. īṣatspr̥tam antahsthanām. viortam uṣmaṇām īṣad ity anuvartate. svarāṇaṃ ca [MSS. A B viortam īṣad iti niorttam].

Here we have sūtras 29-32 of the APr. with the difference that the word order of the sūtra uṣmaṇām viortam ca has been changed and ca has been omitted. The accompanying vṛtti in Patañjali’s quotation shows that he has quoted from some sūtra work which was evidently the APr.

---

2 For the scope of the Śikṣā as laid down in the Taitt. Up., see § 16.
3 S. Varma, op. cit., p. 412. See also Hannes Sköld, ‘The Nirukta: Its place in Old Indian Literature, its Etymologies.’ Lund, 1926, p. 121. Before Dr. Varma we surmised that the Pr. was to be placed before Patañjali though he very rightly held that the age of the Prātiśākhya has rather been overrated. Cf. Winternitz, Vol. I, p. 268.
5 Recent attempts to show that the Saunskṛtya Cāturādhyāyikā is not the A. Pr. must be pronounced as a failure (vide The Atharva-Prātiśākhya, ed. Visva Bandhu Vidyarthi Sastrī, Lahore, 1933, pp. 13-14. S. Sastrī, op. cit., introduction, p. 6). For, Uṇāṣa in his introduction to the Rk Pr. writes, “tathā cāturāṇa-prātiśākhya idam eva prayojanam uktam evam iheti ca viṁśapraptaṁ sūmāṃya.” A. Pr. I, 2.
25. *Its contents.* The PS. as we have reconstructed it from different recensions, contains only eighteen couplets in anuṣṭubh metre though the longest (Ṛk) recension includes no less than forty-two additional couplets ¹ most of which are in the same metre. The extreme shortness of this Śīksā-Vedāṅga can well be compared with that of the Chando-Vedāṅga which is embedded in the Chandaḥ-sūtras of Piṅgala and contains only 87 sūtras which will scarcely be much bigger in extent than the PS. ² But in spite of its extreme brevity the PS. was more or less a complete manual on the pronunciation of the Vedic speech-sounds in general at the time the work was composed.

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

---

¹ Some of the additional passages, e.g. Ṛk 46, 47 are not in verse. We however, have called them couplets only as a matter of convenience.

**Table B**

*Panini’s Classification of Speech-Sounds of the OIA.*

1. According to Places of Articulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>u̱ns</th>
<th>ḵaṛ̱ha</th>
<th>j̱ẖvāṉūla</th>
<th>ṯalu</th>
<th>m̱ūrḏhān</th>
<th>ḏanta</th>
<th>ḏanta-oṣṭha</th>
<th>oṣṭha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spāra</td>
<td>alpaprāna</td>
<td>ḵg</td>
<td>e̱j</td>
<td>ṯdh</td>
<td>p̱b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mahāprāna</td>
<td>kẖg̱h</td>
<td>cẖj̱h</td>
<td>tẖc̱h</td>
<td>tẖdh</td>
<td>pẖbh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anunāsika</td>
<td>̱y̱</td>
<td>ṉ</td>
<td>̱ṉ</td>
<td>̱m̱</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ūśman</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>(ẖ) ̱hi</td>
<td>x̱</td>
<td>̱ç̱</td>
<td>̱ʃ̱</td>
<td>s̱</td>
<td>ṟ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lateral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(flapped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>̱ṟ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(semivowel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>̱j̱</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>̱w̱</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>samānākṣara</td>
<td>a̱a:</td>
<td>i̱i:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u̱u:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svara</td>
<td>sandhyakṣara</td>
<td>kaṇṭha-tālu</td>
<td>kaṇṭha-oṣṭha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(diphthong)</td>
<td>e: (−ā̱i=ō̱e̱?)</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>o: (−ā̱ũ=ō̱o̱?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. According to Prayatana.

| a-sprṣṭa | a̱a: | i̱i: | u̱u: | e: (−ʔ̱w̱e̱) | ai | o: (−ʔ̱o̱o̱) | ̱a̱u̱ |
| isat-sprṣṭa | j̱w | ṟ | ḻ | (ẖx̱ṟ) | |
| nema-sprṣṭa | ̱ç̱ | ̱ʃ̱ | ̱s̱ | | |
| sprṣṭa | all stops and h | | | | | | | | | |

1 Terms in Italic have not been used in the PŚ.
The Pāṇiniya Śikṣā

3. According to Anupradāṇa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nādin</th>
<th>ānunāsika</th>
<th>ān-anunāsika</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>य न नन्म</td>
<td>ह ग़ ज़ झ़ झ़ भ़</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iṣan-nāda</td>
<td>र ध ध ध ध ध ध</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śvāsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>क़ ए ठ़ ठ़ प़</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iṣac-chvāsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>क ए ठ़ ठ़ प</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

¹ See Wackernagel, I, p. 283.
in his first Prātiśākhya with the small śloka compilation which
is generally quoted as the Vedāṅga, the difference of old and
modern ślokas will at once be perceived.'¹ As he has not
expressly laid down the criterion with which to distinguish
between the old and the new ślokas we cannot judge the strength
of his argument; but ślokas which he considered to be modern
in structure might well have been among those which we have
had to consider spurious. Whatever may be the fact, the
anuṣṭubh metre in which the reconstructed PS. has been
composed appears by no means younger in age than that in
which works like the Bhāddevatā (c. 400 B. C.) has been
composed.

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

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

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

1 mahātā prayatnena śabdām uccaranti vāyur nābher utthitaḥ urasi vistīryah kanyātā
tevartilah mūrdhānam āhatya vaktre vicāran vividhān śabdān abhiyañjagati. PŚ. 8-4.
2 vitarkitaḥ purā buddhyā kvacidarthe nivēśitaḥ
karaṇebhiko viroṭtena dhvaninā so’nugṛhyate.
v.1 karaṇebhiko viroṭtena is evidently due to confusion.

3 Durga in his introduction to the Comm. of the Nirukta quotes PŚ. 3, from what he calls the V. dāṅga Sikṣā (see Nirukta in Bomb. Skt. Series, p. 24). The date of the author is about 1300 A.C. (Introduction to the Nirukta, by Sarup, p 59).
4 Max Müller, op. cit., p. 192.
5 Ed. Simon, p. 42; Siddheshvar Varma, op. cit., p. 5.
6 tatra sarva-vedesādavasāśīkṣā......atha śīkṣā pravakeyāmīti pāṇacakhaṇḍāt udrāḥ
7 SS. p 60.
8 svarataḥ kālataḥ sthāna-prayatnānupradānatoḥ.
savanādyaiś ca sā śīkṣā varṇānām pāṭha-sūkṣmāt.
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29. In the absence of suitable data on the point we may explain this obscurity by the fact that the ancient Indians did not set any value on history as such, their only care being the Śāstra and not its authors or their dates. They however took notice of the most important fact about the PŚ. that it was a Vedāṅga and concerned all the Vedas.¹

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

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

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

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

---

1 उदर्धि मन्द्र म कर्षि सच्चम्। तिरक्त तार्क (XXIII, 10-12. Whitney, XXIII. 10), See foot-note of § 26.

2 वध विशाविहिताः। सत्वनामादिरः कष्टसम्पणानि (I, 29-30). By Siksā Kātyāyana seems to mean the PŚ.

3 कष्टसम्पादिरः प्रयत्नवचनी च वद्वृद्धाभिः निर्दितां द्विती (I, 18.).

The view of ‘soma’ who took ‘h’ as an urasya sound can be compared with the PŚ. 10, which has ‘h’ as aurasa under certain circumstances.
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attests its existence or the story of its alleged loss before the present time. Dr. Raghu Vira’s allegation that Patañjali and other grammarians borrowed passages or their substance from this sūtra work (DPS.) is extremely unhappy. For this borrowing might well have occurred the other way round, that is, the author of the DPS. might have culled his materials from sundry sources such as the Mahābhāṣya and the Varṇa-sūtras of Candragomin.¹ In the face of facts that there is no ancient or modern MS. or any descriptive reference of it in any early or late work to vouch for its authenticity,² one may well be justified to take such a view. Along with this should be considered the following facts about the PS.:

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

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

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

32. From materials which Dr. Raghu Vira has so ably collected in his article³ we can well see that the DPS. is not an old work. On referring to a recent catalogue (p.12) of the Vaidika Pustakālaya, Ajmer (Śaṃvata 1988), publisher to the Ārya Samāja, we find that the DPS. constitutes the first among

¹ The Varṇa-sūtras have been given in the Appendix. Dr. Paul Thieme seems to disbelieve that the Pāṇini’s Sikṣā of Dr. Raghu Vira was quoted by Patañjali (see op. cit., p. 86).
² Non-existence of any MS. of the DPS. has also raised a doubt in the mind of Dr. Paul Thieme as regards the authorship of the work (ibid.).
³ J R A S, 1931, pp. 653 ff.
the fourteen sections of the Vedaṅga Prakāśa, a grammar which Svāmī Dayānanda compiled for the use of the Vedic students. It is probably due to inadvertence that Dr. Raghu Vira did not mention this fact in his article. The different sections of the Vedaṅga Prakāśa including the first one have also been issued separately. The first of these sections bears the title of the Varṇoc-caraṇa-Sikṣā by Pāṇini. This sūtra-work as has been shown by Dr. Raghu Vira (loc. cit.) resembles the Varṇa-sūtras of Candragomin, the Buddhist grammarian, who flourished about 500 A.C.¹ Considering the great influence which Candragomin exercised on the grammarians of Pāṇini’s school (the Kāśikā and the Vākyapadīya showing traces of such influence) it is quite possible that some late grammarian re-edited and amplified the Varṇa-sūtras of Candragomin and fathered this upon Pāṇini, evidently for imparting to it a superior authority. Though there is no sufficient material to prove this we are inclined to suggest that this late grammarian was Svāmī Dayānanda himself who, among other things was a very close student of Sanskrit grammars as his Vedaṅgaprakāśa and the edition of Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī show. But whatever may be the actual fact about the authorship of the DPS., it is sure that the work is neither from the hands of Pāṇini nor an old one.²

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

¹ This date is assigned by S. R. Belvalkar (Systems of Skt. Grammars, p. 59). Dr. Siddheshwar Varma places C. in the 7th century (See his Critical Studies, p. 8) at the latest.

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

³ Dr. Paul Thieme thinks that if Patañjali knew the PS. as Pāṇini’s work, he would have referred to it ‘in unambiguous terms’ and would have treated it with the same respect as Pāṇini’s grammar (p. 58). Hence, as the PS. has not been referred to by Patañjali, one may according to Dr. Thieme reject its relation with Pāṇini. But it would be a mistake to place too much confidence on the argument of silence, which may be otherwise explained.
INTRODUCTION

mentioned till very late (see § 28). The earliest evidence about
the existence of the complete work is perhaps the Agni Purāṇa
which usually placed in the 800 A.C. But it does not refer to
Pāṇini as the author of the Śikṣā though in case of the metrical
version of Piṅgala's prosody the source has been mentioned (see
Notes on 1). This can well be taken to mean that to the compiler
of the Agni Purāṇa the authorship of the PS. was not known.
But we have seen before (§ 29) that Madhusūdana Sarasvatī
in the 15th century in no unambiguous terms considers Pāṇini to
be the author of this Śikṣā though the Śikṣā-Prakāśa, a
commentary to the PS. which is possibly earlier (c. 1200 A.C.)
than Madhusūdana, ascribes the latter work to Piṅgala. Thus
the problem of the authorship of the PS. with its late and
mutually conflicting data seems to possess no dependable means
for its solution. But we need not feel hopeless in the matter.
External evidence failing we turn to the PS. itself and find
some important hints which are being discussed below.

(a) It is usually known that Pāṇini was a great grammarian
but his greatness as a phonetician is no less considerable.
But unfortunately it has scarcely been noticed and far less em-
phasised. This sort of defective appreciation of Pāṇini is due to
the mistaken notion commonly held that the Prātiśākhyas, even
if they are not actual grammars, are grammatical writings.1
But in fact the Prātiśākhyas are purely phonetical treatises.
Viewed in this light we find that Pāṇini has treated in his gram-
mar svara (pitch) and mātrā (quantity) of vowels as well as
samhita (euphonic combination).2 These items as we have seen
before (§16) are, according to the Taitt. Upaniṣad, the three

1 Winternitz, Vol. III, pp. 381-382; Lakshman Sarup, the Nighaṭṭu and the Nirukta,
English Translation and Notes, London, 1921, p. 290; S. Varma, Critical Studies in the
Phonetic Observation of Indian Grammarians, pp. 14-15; S. Sastri, 'The Ṛkṭantra,' In-
trduction, pp. 1-2.

2 The Aṣṭādhyāyī treats of svara in chapters VI (1. 58-2, 159) and VIII (1. 27-71)
and in many other places. The mātrā has been treated in chapter VI (3. 111, 128) and
the samhita in Chapters VI (1. 72 f and 3. 114f) and VIII (3. 1-4; 43-48).
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among the six branches of the Sikṣā or phonetics. Can there be a better evidence of Pāṇini's masterly knowledge of phonetics? But this evidence alone is not sufficient to identify Pāṇini with the author of the PS. What we may gather from the above is that of the two names Pāṇini and Pingala proposed for the authorship of the PS. the case for the former is stronger.

(b) Besides this a comparison of the contents of the Aṣṭādhyāyī and the PS. further strengthens the claim of Pāṇini to the authorship of the PS. From such comparison we gather the following facts1 pointing to the handiwork of the same author.

(i) In the PS. Pāṇini added Pratyāhāras, such as ac, car, ghas, yan, jaś, šar, hal, have been requisitioned.

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

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

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

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

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

1 Pāṇini's Sikṣā brought to light by Dr. Raghu Vira lacks similar facts, hence Dr. Paul Trismene rightly rejects the genuineness of the work (see op. cit., p. 86).
seen before (§ 83 a) treated svara, mātrā and santāna (saṃhitā) in his grammar. Of the remaining three branches bala and sāma can scarcely be the fit subject of a theoretical treatise. Hence varna (speech-sounds) alone was left without treatment in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Now Pāṇini, who undertook to build up his great Sabdānuśāsana, the Vyākaraṇa-Vedāṅga, could not very naturally think of leaving varna without any treatment. This is probably the reason why he wrote the PS. which as it were a companion to his famous grammar.

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

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

1 Winternitz does not admit (Hist. of Ind. Lit., Vol. III, p. 388) that the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini is a Vedāṅga, but this is against the traditional Indian view. Madhusūdana in his Prasthānasārda writes तद्विषित विशुद्धिमिदामथ तेधां काव्यविधिमिदामथ (ed. Weber, pp. 16-17). In the introduction to the Sīddhānta Kaumudi (ed. Venkatesvar, Bombay, 1914) Mahāmāyopādhyāya Pandit Shivadatta Bhattachariya discusses the claim of all extant Vyākaraṇas for Vedāṅga and concludes वाक्यनिष्ठाकारक्षको वेदाङ्गालापुरसमस्यां स्वादू (pp. 6-8).


Dr. Paul Thieme very rightly characterizes the use of this date as ‘due to a common but wholly unproved belief’ (op. cit., p. 88).
used the word *yavana* which they think could not have entered India before Alexander’s invasion. But this argument has been very ably refuted by Professors S. K. Belvarkar and H. Sköld—Belvarkar, *Systems of Skt. grammar*, pp. 15 ff.; Sköld, *Papers on Pāṇini*, pp. 24 ff.). The latter has shown very conclusively “that old Indian *yavana* must have entered this language before 520 B.C., and there is no reason at all to locate Pāṇini as late as after Alexander the Great on account of the here-quoted sūtra.” “Moreover Prof. Liebich has proved that Pāṇini’s rules apply to the language of the Brāhmaṇas, some obsolete (perhaps archaic) forms only separating his language from that of the Brāhmaṇas (Papers on Pāṇini, p. 38).” On the basis of this finding of Prof. Liebich, Prof Sköld thinks that Pāṇini must have belonged to the latter Vedic period of the Indian literature (*loc. cit.*). Prof. Liebich however is not willing to assign Pāṇini to a period before Buddha (Pāṇini, p. 8; Winternitz, *Vol. III*, p. 383). But he seems to have been over-cautious in the matter. For he himself admits, according to Prof. Sköld, that Pāṇini seems to be less lax than that of the Sūtras (*op. cit.*, p. 41.)

Prof. Sköld concludes on the basis of this view of Prof. Liebich that we could be inclined to place Pāṇini in a period shortly preceding the Sūtra literature proper (*loc. cit.*). Now the sūtra works which are considered to be among the oldest have been placed in 500 B.C. (Macdonell, India’s Past, p. 136).

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

---

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

1 Deussen, Philosophy of Upanishads, pp. 10-15. Dasgupta, History of Indian Philosophy, p. 38.
3 Dasgupta, op. cit., p. 39.
4 Dr. Paul Thiene seems to support such a conclusion in his following remark: “Pāṇini’s grammar must have been composed at a time when the language of the North was yet felt to be necessary” (op. cit., p. 81).
given rules in his grammar of the proper accentuation of the bhāṣā words (VI.1.181, vibhāṣā bhāṣāyām; VIII.2.98, Pūrvam tu bhaṣāyām) shows that the current language of his time was much ahead of the classical Sanskrit (which has lost its accents) and was nearer the Vedic phase (though in its very late form) of the Old Indo-Aryan than the latter. In addition to this we should also reckon the fact that Pāṇini’s grammar was originally accented like a Mantra or Brāhmaṇa text (vide ante § 26) and as such it should be assigned at the latest to the close of the period of the Brāhmaṇas.
37. The Sikṣā Pāñjikā. The MSS. and the printed text from which the present edition has been re-constructed have been described before (§ 26) in connexion with the text of the Pāj. recension of the PŚ. We are now giving below the main features of the commentary reconstructed. The Pāj. recension of the PŚ. as we have seen before (§ 26) came into existence between 800 and 1100 A.C. Hence the Pañjikā itself may be tentatively placed somewhere in the 12th century. Thus the work which may be as old as seven centuries is sure to contain some old materials. Some of these, such as a reference to Audavrajī, has already been pointed out (§ 2b). These materials will be discussed below. According to the Pañjikā, the Sikṣā is the science by which the pronunciation of speech-sounds is learnt (Sikṣyate'nayā varnoccāraṇam iti Sikṣā, p.8, lines 3-4). This is to be compared with the term varnaśikṣā occurring in the RPr. (XIV. 30). It is not possible that the author of this work has referred by this term to Prātiśākhyā and this being the case varnaśikṣā relates to the Sikṣā of the early period when it still lacked the later elaboration as observed in the Prātiśākhyas (see §§ 16, 23). Hence the RPr. has scarcely any legitimate claim to interpret this word as 'Prātiśākhyā', which must have existed considerably earlier than the time when the RPr. was compiled. The Pañjikā in the definition of Sikṣā quoted above seems to have preserved this tradition which agreed so well with the fact that the PŚ. deals merely with the utterance of the speech-sounds of the Old Indo-Aryan as represented in Vedic texts. Besides this it gives us rare informations on the following points:

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

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

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

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

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

1 The corruption is most palpable in the passage at p. 26, lines 22 ff.
(a) It ascribes the authorship of the PŚ. to Piṅgala, the younger brother of Pāṇini (see p. 23, line 7). The authenticity of this information has been discussed before (§23).

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

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

(d) This commentary ascribes to the Brhaddevatā of Śaunaka the following couplet: svaro varṇo' ksaram mātrā viniyogārtham (?) eva ca, mantram jīñāsāmanānena veditavyam pade pade (p: 24, lines 6-7).

38. Of the two available commentaries of the PŚ., the Śikṣā-Pañjikā seems to be the earlier because it is written in a simpler style and has better acquaintance with the old phonetical traditions. The first point will be clear to any one who will compare for himself the language of the two commentaries. And to substantiate the second point we shall refer the treatment of the Anusvāra. About the exact manner of its pronunciation there is difference of opinion among specialists in the Indo-Aryan linguistics (see Wackernagel, I. §§223-224). Whitney understands the phonetic value of the Anusvāra which is nothing but the nasal vowel (T. Pr. 2. 30, JAOS., Vol. 10, p. lxxxvi;
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Mem. Soc. ling. 2. 194 ff. ref. Wackernagel). But Wackernagel and others do not accept this. After a fresh examination of the various Prâtiśākhya passages together with the opinion of PS. on this point we find Whitney to be right. The Anusvāra is nothing but a nasalization of the preceding vowel. The fuller name of the Anusvāra was Anusvāra-Nāsīkyaḥ or Anusvārah Nāsīkyaḥ, a post-vocal nasal or a nasal vowel. It has sometimes been called simply Nāsika or Nāsikya too. That the name Anunāsika, which according to Pāṇini (I.1.8) means only nasal stops, has been used to indicate nasal vowels for a pretty long time, seems to have been due to a misunderstanding (more about this point in Notes to the PS.).

39. Now the anonymous author of the Śikṣā-Pañjikā seems to have been fully aware of the true nature of the Anusvāra. Hence in his comment on Pñj. 17 (PS. 14-15) he quotes from Audavraji an entire passage enumerating the Ayogavāhas as follows:

अयोगवाहः: च: इति विस्तजीनोय: × इति जिज्ञासूलीय: × इति उपप्रान्तीय: 
पं इवनुसारः नासिका: इवयोगवाहः।

This passage occurs in the first Prapâthaka of the Rktantra (ed. S. Sastri, p. 2, ll. 11-12) with the difference that the latter reads हूनिय चतुराविनिकम् (v.l. हूनिय चतुराविनिकम्, ॐनासिका). In view of the fact that the Rktantra mentions चतुरावरे not much later, and चतुरावर as one of the Ayogavāhas, it is evident that the extant Rktantra is corrupt in the passage हूनियाविनिकम:. The reading पं इवनुसारः 
नासिका: surely goes to the Ur-text of the Audavraji¹ which must have been partially included in his work by the author² or the Vṛttikāra or the Rktantra.

¹ But some of the other quotations in the Pañjikā from Audavraji are corrupt. (See below.)
² Audavraji who has been mentioned in the sūtra 60 of the Rktantra can scarcely be its author. The first Prapâthaka which is not counted as an integral part of the Rktantra by the MS. B was in all likelihood a part of the original work of Audavraji (see ed. S. Sastri, Introduction, p. 34).
40. Thus it appears that the author of the Pañjikā flourished at a time when the original work of Audavraji was still available in a more or less correct form and in fact he may be older than the Vṛttikāra of the Rktantra who appears by no means to be modern. Thus apart from offering a help in solving certain problems connected with the text of the PS. (see Note) the Sikṣā-Pañjikā has importance on account of the information it gives about Audavraji, who has been mentioned, as far as we know, in four other works:—the Nāradīya Sikṣā (II. 8. 5) and the Sikṣā-Prakāśa commentary to the PS. and the Vamsa Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma Veda (Ind. Stud. IV, pp. 374-386) and the Rktantra (S. 60).\(^1\)

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

(a) Occurring in full.

i. चन्दन्चन्दन्यासोऽभोज यमः पूर्वगुणः (R.T. 2. 14).

ii. स्वर्ग करण ब्राह्मानाम् दुःरुढ्मत्वं ब्राह्मानाम् (R.T. 3. 1).

iii. पनुलारो च च श्लेष्मुलारो, श्लेष्मकोठो दीर्घा भो वर्णः (R.T. 2. 14. 15).

(b) Occurring with different readings.

i. धी नादातुप्रदानी (cf. R.T. 3. 3. नादातुप्रदानी) The correct reading seems to have been धी नादवासातुप्रदानी.

ii. सर्वं गर्गाङ्ग सम्बंधणी च ब्रम्मम्। गर्गाङ्ग ग्रहणं खानीविलिपिकारः।
cf. सर्वं गर्गं ॥३॥ गर्गाङ्गाङ्ग ग्रहणं विभेद्यम्। खानीविलिपिकारः (R.T. 7. 1-2) The RT. reading seems to be correct.

iii. प्रयोगवाहः प्रति विस्तृतिः च प्रति जिज्ञासूनीयं प्रति उपवासैः नाभिकः। प्रयोगवाहः (Diff. with R.T. shown above).

\(^1\) The very fact that the Pañjikā does not quote from any of the late Sikṣā works except the Nāradīya Sikṣā probably show that these latter are later in origin than the Pañjikā or at least they were not yet counted as authority at its time. From this fact also we may assume the old age of the Pañjikā.
Besides Audavraji the Pañjikā has laid the following works under contribution: Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, Śrutī, Chāndogya Śrutī (Upaniṣad), Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī, Unādi Sūtras, Bhagavad Gītā, Patañjali, Manusamhitā, Ṛk-Prātiṣākhya, Nrādiya Sikṣā.

41. In spite of its importance discussed above the author of the Pañjikā seems to have misunderstood the PS. very much; for example, his explanation of PS. 13 (=Pñj. 15) may be cited (see Note 23). But in this matter he seems to have been mis-guided by Uvaṭa₁ if the latter was his predecessor, or both he and Uvaṭa born long after Pāṇini, when the Middle Indo-Aryan speech-habits had already overwhelmed to a certain extent the purity of the Phonetic tradition among the Vedic priests, have independently failed to explain correctly the difference between e and o with ai and au respectively. Other features of the Pañjikā have been discussed in Notes.

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

₁ Uvaṭa (on VP 1. 73) is right so far in his analysis of ai and au, a-element of both being taken as equivalent to a mātrā, but his remark चन्दनेन्द्र अमेत्व एकारावारी बाध्याती is not clear and the view of unnamed authority (kecīd) quoted by him is misleading.
This gives us the upper limit to the Prakāśa; the lower limit is to be had from the author’s conjectural identity with the commentator of the Pñgalacchandah-Sūtras. This is 1300 A.C.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hemistiche.</th>
<th>Pk recension</th>
<th>Yaj. recension</th>
<th>Prh recension</th>
<th>Prj. recension</th>
<th>Ap. recension</th>
<th>Reconstructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a t h a śikṣāp etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śāstrānu-pūrṇyaḥ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prasiddham api</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punar vyaktī-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triṣaṣṭī cauṣṭ-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cf 1</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prāṇaṁ Sarṇakṛte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarā vimpāṭir</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yādayā ca</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāro visargaḥ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duḥṣpṛṣṭa cāti</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śāmā bodhyaḥ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manah kāyagnim</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārutas tūrasi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prāṭab-savanayogas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaṇṭhe mahyana-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tārāṁ tārīyaśavanavyaḥ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodāro mūrdhna-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varpāṇa janayate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarataḥ kālaṁ</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iṣṇa varpa-vidaḥ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udattās cānuḍātās</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C—(contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hemistic</th>
<th>Ṛk. recension</th>
<th>Yaj. recension</th>
<th>Pāṇ. recension</th>
<th>Pāj. recension</th>
<th>Āp. recension</th>
<th>Reconstructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hrasvo dirghaḥ etc.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udātte niṣāda-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarita-prabhava</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aṣṭau sthānāni</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmūlam ca</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oohāvaś ca</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmūlam upādhaś</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yady oohāva</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarāntaṃ</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hakāraṃ pāncamair</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anrasayāṃ taṃ</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaṭhyaś abā vicu</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayūr mūrdhanāś</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmule tu.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e ai tu kaṭha-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ardhamātrā tu</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si(ōk)ārukuśairayor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upādmāniya ūśmā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samvrtam mātrkaṃ</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghoshā vā samvṛtāḥ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarāṇam ūśamāṇāṃ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tebhyo'pi viṛtāv</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāra-yāmāṇāṃ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayogavāhī viṣṇeyā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alābu-vīṇā-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāras-tu</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāre viṇṭyāṃ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE PÂNINIYA SIKSHA

**Table C—(contd.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dvir oṣṭhau tu</td>
<td>etc</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vyāghṛ yathā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhūta patasaḥbheda</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yathā saurāṣṭrīkā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>*98</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaru raṅgā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>*99</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raṅga-varṇaḥ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirgha-svaraḥ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣrdaye caika-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāśīkāyaṁ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣṛdayāt utkāte</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārdayaḥ ca dvimātraḥ,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madhye tu kampayet</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarasyaḥ kampayet</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaru varṇāḥ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samyag-varṇa-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhyāṣārthe drutān</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sīṣyāṇām opadāṣārthe</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gṛti śighṛi</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anantuḥ sa ṭap-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māḍhuryaṁ aṅgara-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āhīṛyāṁ laya-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āṅkitaṁ bhṛtraḥ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kākasvartha śrāṣṭigaṁ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urṣpaṇa-dāśtaṁ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niṣṭipṛitṛ graysa-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prāṇah paṭhien</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māḍhyandine</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. संस्कृत मूलम् (The Reconstructed Text)

[ वर्णसमान्यायः ]

[ अ द उ य || क ल त क || ए बी ड || ऐ बी छ ]
[ ह य व र ट || ल ख || अ म ड ख न म || भ भ ड ]
[ घ ठ ध घ || ज व ग ड द श || ख फ क ठ घ ठ ट त व ]
[ क प घ || श घ स र || छ ल ]

[ वर्णसूक्ष्या ]

खरा विषतिरिक्ष्य स्वर्णाः प्रत्याविष्टति।
यादवस्त्र स्रृता दशभी चत्वारस्त्र यमाः स्रृतं ता॥१॥
चनुकारो विसर्गस्त्र x क। पर्व चापि पराशयो।
ठूः स्रष्टेति विवेश्यो खकारः मुत एव च॥२॥

[ वर्णानुपादी वर्णविवर्गच ]

आत्मा बुद्धा समेत्यार्थानः मनो युक्ते विबचया।
मनः कायानिमातिः स प्रेषयति मात्मम॥३॥
मातुत्सूरसिः चर्मः मन्दं जनयति सरस।
प्रातः साधन्योऽयं तं कन्दे गायत्रमार्शितम॥४॥
पाणिनीय-प्रिच्छ

करठे माध्यमन्दिरयोगं मध्यमं वैष्ठभानुरुगम् ।
तारं तारिणयस्वनं शैर्ष्यं जागतानुरुगम् ॥५॥
सीद्धार्थो मूढ्र। भिन्हतो वस्त्रामापवं माङ्गतः ।
वर्षिण्य मणयं तेषां विभागं पञ्चथा स्रृतः ॥६॥
वर्षिण्य कालं: श्यानात् प्रयवानुप्रान्तः ।
इति वर्षिण्यं प्राहुनिँयुपां तं निबोधत ॥७॥

[वर्षिण्य कालनववन]

उद्भात्स्यानुप्राणु महत्व खरित्व परस्याः ।
ञ्ज्ञो दृष्टः मुँ तृत इति कालातो नियमां चरच्च ॥८॥

[वच्चारण-श्यानानि]

चत्ती श्यानानि वर्षिणामुरः करठ: शिरस्तयः ।
जिज्ञासूलं च दुनाचय नासिकोदः च तालु च ॥६॥
हकारं पञ्चमैण्युपाणं: खबिच्य संयुतम् ।
शैर्ष्यं चं विज्ञानीयात् कालाकालसंयुतम् ॥१०॥
कालाकालयानुप्राणु ब्रह्माण प्रापितः
खम्मूर्धन्य: कर्कर: दल्ल्या खन्तुस्थ: स्रृत: ॥११॥
जिज्ञासूले तु कुः प्रेटो दल्ल्योद्दरो वः स्रृत: तृं बुधः ।
ए ऐ तु कर्कर: अल्ल्यः चो में कर्करोज्जो स्रृत: ॥१२॥
कर्नमाता तु कर्कर: एकारीकार्योभववत् ।
एकारीकार्योभववति तयोविन्दितसंयुतम् ॥१२॥
बनुक्सारयमानं च नासिकास्यानुमुच्चति ।
उपसाध्याय जयमा त जिज्ञासूलीयनासि ॥१४॥
संख्यां मूलम्

चयोगवाहा विन्दुया चाशयस्यानभागिनः।
चलावृवीणानिवीणोंददमूल्यं खराननु।॥३५॥
चनुस्सरस्तु कपालो नियमं क्रोः शषसिदू पः।।

[ प्रयत्न-भेदः ]

चचोऽसुधा यक्षस्वीण्येश्चसुधा। शल्यः स्मृতः।॥१६॥
शेषाः सुझ्य हलः प्रोक्ता

[ वसुदान-भेदः ]

निविपदानुपदातः।

अमोजनुमानिका नक्रो नार्दनों हस्स्य॥ स्मृतः।॥१७॥
इङ्क्षप्ताः यथो जन्य ज्ञातसिनस्तु खण्डादेयः।
इङ्क्षप्तांसांश्यो विद्याद्वृ गीथःमैतलः प्रचच्च ते॥१८॥

*
II. चक्रिन्याराजाण्यां (The Agni-Purâṇa Recension)

प्रचलित: सूक्ष्म के सूक्ष्म या सूक्ष्म चलने का।
सूर्य-विश्वारूप रूपसी बालसिंह कि।

1. यादृच्छिक समृद्धिः चाहि चलनेपी।
2. चनुसयारो विसर्जित: प्राप्तां चापि पराशिती।

3. दुःखद्वेषित: अविचारो चक्कार: मृत एव च।
4. हक्कारे पन्नमहीतमत: राष्ट्रिक रंगमतम्।
5. चौरसीं तं विज्ञानीयात् कैष्ठामाहा हरसूरसम्।
6. ब्राह्मा दुष्का समीत्यार्यन्।
7. मनो नुइं विवचया।

8. मन: कायामिमा महन्ति यु प्रेममत्व माझ्यां।
9. माझ्यां सर्वसंचिक करन्।
10. प्रातः सवन्यों तं कुंटेय गायत्रामाश्चितम्।
11. कट्टे माध्यदिन्युग मध्यम वैह्मानुगम्।

1. म. प्राम्यः।
2. म. चतुरास्त्रस्योः।
3. म. समाहिः: for या।
4. म. वैधी for क्षत्ये।
5. म. पराशिती for पराशिती।
6. म. विसर्जित:।
7. MPbc. एकारा:।
8. In all MSS. after 3a occurs the following: रक्षे ये चरं मौहं इव इव: पभमयुः।
9. चलसिंह: समायुः।
10. प्रातः: पभमयुः।
11. म. नल्छे for मन्त्रः।
12. म. प्राम्यः।
13. म. माध्यस्य मुः।

10. म. मनोयुः।
1. P. praśabdāṇaṃ:
2. M. "वि.
3. M. वि. and P. वि. for वि.
4. M. "वि.
5. P. reads एकसुवार्यं पापसुवार्यं श्रम् instead of 13b (न तस्म पाद्धति) and M. एकसुवार्यं......प्रभम.
6. M. सुधार्.
7. M. राजस्ति.
8. Pbd give this couplet preceded by यथा अतिरि चरणं पुवान्. धंश्यं न च प्रेषितु.—(Yajus. 20a). P. gives 17b-18a as its 18, and 19b-20a as its 20.
पारिनीय-शिल्पा

1 सन्नावत्नावचेतुयशास्तालव्या चोढलालुपू।

11 सुचिमृध्वं कश्तुरणा दन्या खतुल्लसा: समृता: ॥ ११॥

12 जिश्वाशुरुः तु कु: प्रोक्त हन्योहोगा व: समृतो तुहै: ॥

13 ए ऐ तु २कश्तवत्तालव्यायोगी कपोलोष्णी समृती ॥ १३॥

14 चाल्माता तु ३कश्तवं एकार्तकायोभक्तिः ॥

15 चापमोगवा: विज्ञेया चाभयश्वनाभागिन: ॥ १५॥

16 चालोदस्त्रुत्वा यमात्स्वीवेद्रेमस्त्रुता: ॥ १६॥

17 शेषोऽर्थाः समृत्य: प्रोक्ता ५निबोधानुप्रदानतः ॥ २०॥

18 ऋषीनानिका नाढौ नादिनो भक्ष्य: समृता: ।

19 ऋषीनानिका नाढौ नादिनो भक्ष्य: समृता: ।

20 ऋषीनानिका नाढौ नादिनो भक्ष्य: समृता: ।

1. P. कक्षाकहाविचुपयो:
2. P. "तालव्या ए शी.
3. MV. कक्षा शाकाकालिकारः
4. P. निम्ना: (म) बुध्या: and M. नी मा: बुध्या: for -नेमस्वयः
5. MV. श्रः for श्रः
6. PM. निबोधार प्रथातः for निबोधानुप्रदानतः
7. M. श्रोतानिका नाडौ नादिनो
8. P. तस्य, M. य(न)ष्य यशः
9. M. शक्षाद्:
10. P. ऋषिकाया.
III. पाञ्जिका-सहिता (With the Pañjikā)

*चथ सिद्धां प्रवचनामि पाञ्जिनीयं मतं यथा।
शास्त्रानुपूर्वी तद्विधादृ यथोत्तं लोकवेदयोः॥१॥

'पात्त' वो निकवणाअा मतिर्दुः सरखतो।
प्रणितपरिचितं वचसैव करोतिया॥
कदन:कम्यासिन्यानि ॥विख्याताधीश सुरिमित।
पृष्णा न विभत्ता यथार्थाण्यां विभधमयमधम॥

ष ग शि शा प्र व च्या भी मर हि। चरित्यमानन्यः। वैद्यवयमानन्तरमभः पाठः। किं कारणम्? \( "ढ़ंडरे "वैद्योध्येतयः" \) इति झर्णात्। तत्र \(^5\) च शिच्चा प्रश्नम्, च प्रस्तावकुलः ा्। सा \(^6\) व वक्ताया इवत्त्यथाद्वृत्तः \( ॥र्थः। \) एतेऽव \(^8\) चिठ्ठी वेद-स्मार्कानन्तरं व्याकरणादिविषयकाद्वृत्तं एव \(^8\) नासीवत्। \( कैसे चिरु कादेव \) चिठ्ठी इति बेतु \( "धर्मानिक विवरणं", "धर्मयक्षरं समाजायक्षरं " इव विभिन्नः नैव दीपः। \)

नियमादभ: \( खः, \) "प्राचीनस्तरं कल्य एवप्रायक्षी नान्यानीति \\( ॥ ) \) मुख्यावर्ति वा। \( अट्टो सम्बन्धाविधियाधियोजनानि वलयानि। \) तत्र \(^{12}\) चार्यमव सम्भवो यन्त्रोद्वुप्रशङ्क-भावः। \( \text{नियमसत्यर्थीनि यस्माविनि}, \) \( \text{धर्मिवेच्छ तु स्वयंहिता क्षमतिः —वांग छवारशी विचिद्धं इति}। \) प्रयोजन्त भव्यांतिविशारदं। \( \) प्रयोजनमधि चूःते एव—

1. Before this \( A^1 B \) have श्रौतेर्वात् नमः; \( A^1 \) also \( ऋ नभो नययाति, \) \( A^2 \) हृ वेदांशयजार्कः स्त्रीमाद्य नमः and \( B \) पाट नो।

2. \( B \) विभागः।
3. \( IB \) निध्य लयितावायर्ग्यार धाराभावते।
4. \( A^2 \) वेदोध्येत्।
5. \( \text{A}^2 \) omits च।
6. \( \text{BHL omit } \text{श्।} \)
7. \( A^1 \) omits चः; ... वेदः।
8. \( \text{सिक्षे गा गा } \text{for } \text{सिक्षे } \text{वेदशावः।} \)
9. \( \text{H. विशीलत।} \)
10. \( B \) विचित्र चनन्तरः।
11. \( A^2 \) omits प्रति।
12. \( U \) omits एवः
13. \( HLA^2 \) भवित्ति ज्ञानि; \( B. \) भवित्ति ज्ञानि।
पाणिनीय-पिघल

*प्रसिद्धमणि शब्दार्थमविनियातमवुद्धिमः।
पुनयंतीकरियामि वाच उद्भारणे विधिम्॥२॥

"एकादिकं वर्णं तथम्कुरुसः, स्वं कृतं कामसुगुणं भवति। शिशुविज्ञानं वर्णविवाचा विष्णु। तत्र प्रवचनं वच्चामि कथाविष्णु। पा म नी यं म तं य देव ति। पाणिनीयमिति 'ढाक्का' (पा. ४।२।१२४) देवि क्रियायः। खेदे-
मिलवर्णीद्वमः। म त सि ति। "मन भावे" पाणिनीयं मतं भावे यथा। तथा व्रच्यामि तैरेव प्रवचार्यस्वरूपैः 'परिभाषया 'चचोक्षुशंग्ग्यक्षाक्षायत' व्राह्दि 'चचोक्षुशंग्ग्यक्षायतः चाप्रचयः' (पा. १।१।६८) देवि 'कापःकापशाविवर्णया'। देवि च।
तथा यावदवयमुखंसन प्रयोजनं यस्य व्याकरणात्मव ब्रह्मीत्यं 'मोचनुकारः' (पा. ५।२।१२) देवि। नन्दु व्याकरणं शब्दविलासं, चतारिकः विदितः। ततथ व्याकरणाय सिद्धविद्वादिसमनार्थम्। स्वमुः। उभ्योः शब्दविलासं, किन्तु व्याकरणे एतत्त्विन्यर्थी—नीद्रात् साक्षादिर्घयः साधृः। इस तु गोयन्त्री जिद्धामूलीनेवार्थविवर्णस्य देवि भेदः। शा शाछ दु पू खे त दि दि दि ति। शाष्णिकिति भावे: कार्ये इन्द्रप्रचयः। चावपुर्बस्यितव गुस्पपूवः। । तदति पाणिनि-मतत्परामथः। तातस् पाणिनिस्मृवाचार्यापि विचारावश्चास्त्रान्यायांपूवः। विवाद वेयस्वर्याः जानीयाः।
पाणिनि-मतस्य यदापुर्वः। दि गुस्पवेघमः स एवार्थयः। तथा च वच्यः
'चण्ड्र: शापीं प्रादानः' व्राह्दि। य च तां लोके क च वै द यो रितः। समानार्थं
मिथयः। तथा च ११ भाषाकारः—"व एव बीतकित: शब्दास्त्र एव वैदिकास्त्र एवं १२ यज्ञायांहुः।" देवि ॥१॥

नववाकराद्वयं वर्णं साक्षानेनवधार्यः। परखयानिर्वाचाङ्कलतः। निबथ्: साध्यायम् इवास्यांहुः।

१५ भस्यं च भस्यं देवि। प्रविष्णुविधििहीनः। प्रसिद्धमणि शब्दार्थमविनियातं १६ सन्तं

पवित्रका-सहिता

*चिन्माणंन्तम् पश्चिमी वर्षा: सच्चवती मताः।
प्रार्थनेत संस्कृते चापि स्वयं प्रीता: स्वयंभुवा ॥ २॥
स्त्रा विश्वारिषिकष श्रयाणां पंश्वनिषिता:।

॥ ३॥ यद्यथा सृष्टा द्वितीय चलारस्य यमः: सृष्टा: ॥ ४॥

पुनः पठाद् वत्सीकीर्षिणाम पठीतरिषिणाम। किम्? वाच् उदारार्णे विधिम् वाचो
गिरस्यु: उदारार्णे 'द्विरिषे विधिम् विधानम्। नन्तु विधिरिपलम्बानारी इति सच्चवती,
न चालारस्य वर्षा: ; उत्तरार्णे वत्सः' वर्षा: स्वाधीनाय चालारस्ये द्वित।
उत्तरार्णे, वद्यापि स्वाधीनिषिता उदारार्णे तथाप्रायाः'प्रश्' कश्चनीयोऽतिदेवः
'प्रेयनादिः' अन्तदेवः' विधिंयाित:। ॥ ५॥

वाचुवार्षणे 'वर्षा: किम्येत् कति संस्कृते इत्यत्त भाषा—

त्र्ति व पि तु यु: व पि वित। सच्चवत्र इति सच्चति सच्चायाराया: स्वाधीनः।
वर्षा: इति योऽति। चच तृतो लोकबिधायोऽ: इत्यक्षमः। तत्र किं लोकी संस्कृते
विशष्या उप वर्षा च वत्सावाविशष्य इत्यत्स—प्रार्थनेत संस्कृते चापित।
उपि
श्रयाणांश्वद्यासांशिष्यां पि वर्षा: सच्चायाराया: स्वाधीनः तदद्विपि। व यो ग्राहा: व यो
भु वेत। इत्यात् स्वाधीनाराम्य प्रकर्षणोऽचािता:। ॥ ६॥

कथां तेऽविशिष्टं कथां वा 'द्वित:पठीतरिषिणामग्राह—

विद्या तिम मिति ते क च पि ति। सच्चवत्र इति 'द्वित शब्दोपापयोऽ:। ष्वयंते
शब्दंतत्त्वनाव शब्दमिति करोऽचाित:। कथां तेऽएकविशिष्टं। ॥ १०॥ ततःशब्दारो
श्रयाणं मया वशाप्राश्वयास्तृति विन्द्रणिम्—द्र स उ ज च च चालारो स्वर्णद्विषिकषु
मेदेन्यायम्। खलारस्ये द्विपीद्यायो न सन्ति: भारस्तात् ज्ञान एवोपदिशि: चत्र च च च
व्यायम्। ए ऐ ब्रह्म सन्याचरारणि सन्याचराराम्य इत्याक न सन्ति: भारस्तात्

1. A^1A^2 विलक्षणार्थ:  2. B om., विपरीत:  3. A^1 adds कथे।
4. H *प्रदानादिति  5. A^1 पदार्थे शब्दः और A^2. पदार्थः विपरीत: for एवतथा: विपरीतः।
6. LA^1A^2 add च before this.  7. C दर्शण for दर्शणः।
11. A^1A^2 omit this word; before this I वत: श्रयाणार्थः  12. A^1 य for चतुः
पारम्परिक विचार

दृष्टिग党内 एक ग्रहणसे 'तत्त्वेर्द्धी पूर्वाक्ष्योदयम्: सदेवकविकर्मित:। त्य शाय न य श्रा
वित्त:। कादयो मायावसान: समाःः। जिज्ञासुसन्तापसुमुदाकोपहिष्ठित:॥ रसिकर
स्नेहभिनिषया साहित्यविनिवेतित समाःः। 'पूर्वविकविकर्मी सह श्रुतचलारिष्ठ
या द य च ध्येय ता ध्येय ता वित्त:। यकारादयव प्रश्नम् य च व य श्र श्र स का
दित:॥ अतः प्राध्यातमाभोलोकन्तःश्रव्या:।, उपरितमा ज्ञात:। ६८.पूर्वविकविकर्मी श्रस
चतुः पश्चात्। च ला र च य मा:। ध्येय ता दित। ५त्तेतौतित यमः पर्यावेश्वरसमस्त:।
के ते यमः। लोके कु छु गुं घु घु दित। ५५ कन्यान्यायसंयोगी
मध्ये यमः पूर्वाक्ष्यः।' इहोद्वशी।। १० तथा च——

\[11] क्लासिकादिविदेशारार: प्रथमा हादश्य ध्येय:।
खारो क्षेत्र एवैवैचर्यो तत्त्वो एवकविकर्मित:॥
पद्यविषयितव्यः सम्बंधः सहायदयो यमः।
भनुकारी विश्रवः × क—पो हुनन्दकारकः॥
विशिष्टिर्भवः सहबः प्रकाशादिविदेशः।
भनुसाराध्यायपारोपः विश्विनिवेतित:॥

तथा च नारदः——

पान्यायः १८महेन्द्र पूर्वां प्रकाशः परस्ते यदि।
तत्र मयं यमस्तिक्षेत सम्बंधः पूर्वविवयः।
वर्गाचारण श्याम: सार्वमर्यादितीपि संयुततान्।
ह्यां १६८यमा नववतले आदिमन्मिविवाच्या:। (५ा. ७२.४-५)
दितिः १६५नारदद्रोहेछोचित्वेतन यमो वर्णागम दितिः १६५निवेच्ये। १७अर्जुण शास्त्रात्

1. A²A² न एते। 2. A² omits 'दितिः।
3. A²A² 'निर्युछः। 4. A² पूर्वेके एकः। 5. MB omits चषः।
6. H. पूर्वेके घटस्वलारिष्ठः; I 'चलारिष्ठः। 7. CA² यवचनस्ति यमः।
8. चौपरसेवः A² 'चौपरसेवः। 9. A² 'चन्द्रमयी मध्ये यमः।
10. HBI² omits तत्त्व च। 11. I A²HLB omit this and the two following slokas। 12. A³ 'विसर्गः।
13. H.भवेतु पूर्वां शास्त्राय:। B.वयस्ति ध्रुविशालम्। I पूर्वाः शास्त्राय:। 13. L पूर्वाः शास्त्रायः।
A³A²पूर्वां शास्त्रायः। 14. A³ यमस्तिक्षेतन:।
15. IBH 'प्रज्ञां शेतेन। A. "प्रज्ञां न। 16. B omits 'विचाये।
17. B omits 'विचाये।
पञ्जिका-संहिता

बनुकारी विसंगत्र X कैसे प्राप्‌त परामर्शही

॥२॥ दु:खद्वेषित विन्ययो लकःकारः मुँत एवं च ॥२॥

चलायत यमः भृताः। इति वर्णांतरलङ्गेश्वरी: संयोग्याःक्षात्। यथा चहुतः
चरायतुदाइशेषभिः प्रकरः एवम् वन्यित्तिः गकारी हि यमो नकार दकारेष्ठति।
चन्द्रे तु यमं वर्णाःपूर्वः मन्त्रक्षणः। तथा च शीनकः—"स्मान् यमाननुमनासिका:
क्षानु परेयु स्त्रायंसुनुसिस्तिके" (क्र: प्रा: १६,५) इति। ५पूवे यथा चतु:पद्धागता
सत्तापयास्वामः ॥४॥

ते तु लकःका ते स में से चेति। खरम्यु भवतोब्युक्तसहः [खरम्]
चन्द्रः । शकारा[थ]ःतुगमेनातुसः। वल्लिते च 'इन्द्रमुकः खरानुः' इति।
विलिच्छ इति। विलिच्छ ललिते चिच्छिते इति विसमेगः। X कै सो चा पि
पः रा ज्ञ या वि चति। परायायाविति परो ककारे:पकारो चायवाञ्चः यस्योः
परायायोः। तथा च चल्लिते—"यायोग्यान्हा विचित्रेयाः चायवाञ्चः भानाभानिमः।" इति।

चपः पाठः—X कै पापायी परो मुत्ती। बनुकारीविसंगतोः पराविविधः।
चपःपापायी पाठः—X कै पापायी पावायोः। ककारे:पकारो चायवाञ्चः यस्योः
ककारोः। चचयदाघुकारीविसंगतीवापिप्रायायोः। तु: सृ द्वै से सति
हुःकर्ता ईश्वर्य हो वसत्मानाः न वसत्मारः। वल्लिते च—'चवोपायम् हा
यशस्वीव्रीण्' इति। तथा चहुदब्रजः—'तत सृं द्वै करणम् स्त्रायीवम्,' चुःसृ द्वैमक्रः
क्षानमथुः' इति। ययान्तिसः ६खकारो विचित्रीति। चतो लकःकारो हुःसृ द्वैमक्रः
चचयदाघु चकारः। इतिश्च: पादपूरणाय:। लक ता र इति। लक्ष्यवान्

1. B₇ चरितित गवारी हि, A₁ I चरितित यथी गकारनबालाविति, A² चयम(?)चिति ग
यम नकार ककाराविति, C चरितित यथी गवारी हि नकार,

2. B. कानपरेदु, H कानपरेदु, L कानपरेदु, A₁ कानपरेदु I कानपवातु,

3. BA² कै सो चा पि पद्धागता चायवाञ्चः इह। चुःसृ द्वैमक्रः पद्धागतभिः चइः

4. A₁A₂B, चकाराधनः, IHL. चकाराधनः, A² चकाराधनगमनाधनः


8. IB omit तथा, IHLA² करणभो प्रमाणे A adds करणभो after प्रमाणे,

9. BHL चकारी बिचित्रे, IL have in the margin ययान्तिसः ६खकारो विचित्रीति यस्तकरखः
इतः; B यथा मन्त्रिः च मन्त्रिः चकारी विचित्रै यस्तकरखः इतः;
चालम्ब बुद्ध्या समयांग्निनो गुड्डे विवचया।

||भग 3|| श्रम: कायांमिराङ्खलि स प्रेरयति माताभूमि ||

कारप्रत्ययः। शुः त ए वे ति। लहारास्य दीर्घस्थ क न सनाश्वास्तः पर-
मतसुप्यपरम्पराः, समतं चाहः—लहारः शुः एव च दृति सिराजः चालवादु दुःक्षच।
नवं वर्षोऽन्तः प्रविश्रुसप्रथाविज्ञानेव, विनमर्यमप्रवृत्तः प्रयोः। कथाः? उच्चतः, शुः-
विवाहार्ज्जुतां ताकुतु लहार उचारिताः। ज्ञाति य लहारं लावान्वमप्रवृत्तोऽपि
प्रयोः उचारितः। दुःस्य दुःविष्ठः। अतुसारादयः। शुः तान्नः: पदः। शूरायास्तु प्राप्ता-
विशिष्टम् च दितकं। चतुःपदः। कथाः। अतुसारारी विसर्गचित् पाण्डवाराजः।
कचूं पूर्वतुलासारयम्। कर्मदीवमालेनिनिः ब्रूमः। तथा कौटविनः।—"अतुसारारायं
पां मयुखसारीयं प्रगुणवार्ज्जुतो वशीलो" दृश्यम्। अत एव च। चतुःपदः।

धारण वर्षं संक्षेप्यार्चनानीतानां विनयति क एपासुचारिता, कर्म
चौधार्याति, कैन अभेष चेलानां—

त्यथा ये ति। आक्षा श्रीरिन्त्रायमनोदीतविरितः। कर्म पुनर्दशतिः वसति
यथा श्रीरिन्त्रायमनोदीतस्परितर्विरितः आक्षा। उच्चतः—"कृष्णलालः, इरा य इ इष्णादु
आयतितः भविः, प्रयोजकलातुः। कुरुवातिः नारायणसिन, कार्षिकलातुः,
कुस्तिताः इरि नायातः, इरतः। नायातातः, "अम्बिकरः जुडवातः स्नानिः।"
इरि स्नानातिकलामायितनिः कामाणिः शुभतः। स्नानिः नवश्रीरिन्त्रायमि; भविः
स्नानि श्रीरिन्त्रायमि। इरतः, "तसः देवताः इष्णालायम् प्रकृतिः वै वै वै
विनान्ति त श्रीरिन्त्रायमि।" (इष्ण, श्रम, 4.8.2)
इरि। श्रीरिन्त्रायमि नारायणश्रीरिन्त्रायमि। इरिः। कृष्णाध्यात्मक "एवमेव
संप्रसादामीश्चरीरायमि वार्ज्जेतः कृतिः सदामिनिष्ठकर्मिः"
(इष्ण, 12. 3) इरि। क एपासुचारितमिः पुष्टे तारांशि दृश्यम्—भाबे।
कायमुच्छार्याति कैन अभेष चेलानां प्रगुणाभोक्तः दृश्यम्—स अतुस्सार दुःस्य दुःक्षच।

1. A¹ omits शैवम्
2. IHLA¹A² पुस्रितपर्यायः, B पूः-पुष्षः।
3. B चतुःपदः।
4. BL कौटविनः, दीर्घस्थ, LA¹A² कर्मदीवम्।
5. A¹T omits दुःस्य दुःस्ति, A² omits उच्चतः।
6. A¹A² वायुसरसमि, B वायुसरसभयः।
7. कैन दीर्घस्थ
8. B शैवम्।
पञ्चका-सहिता

मातस्तृसिसि चरन्मान्ने जनयतिः खरस्。

||4|| प्रातः सवनयोऽनं कर्न्दे गायत्रमाशितम् ॥9॥

कषुः मात्यन्तिनुगायं मध्यमं वैधुवैभानुगम्।

||5|| तारं तात्तियसवनं शीर्यश्च जागतानुगम् ॥10॥

बाद्वानुः समर्थं समवम् प्रवयस्य प्रवेद्वायवाय यदि शब्दा चचाच्ये तदा
मनो शुद्धके विवचया 'विवुभिच्छा' विवचया तदा। तत्र मनो नियुक्तो भावम्।
म न: का या नि म इ न्तो तिः। तत्र मनो नियुक्तं सदृ कायानिविनाशिति
कायामें ग्रीराणिनम् अभिमुखयैलं चतिः। स प्रे व य ति मा त त त च ति।
सीमिन्तिरोऽभिन्तः सन्नातां वाहूं प्रेरियति ॥11॥

मा त च ह त सू र च र च चर च च ज न य ति म त च ति। मातसी बायुष्ठानुः
रेशि 'चरन्मान्ने खरस् उत्यादिति। सन्त्रिन्तिसि मनो रक्षप्रवहः। प्रात: त: स त: न
-यो ग भिः। प्रात: सवनेमन सत्य सोऽक्षयेति प्रातः सवनयोगसमु:। 'सत्या च
ेतरेयायान्मे 'वध मनो तयति तत्सात मनवे वाहा प्रातः त: त: श्रमित्
(१४.६) द्रिः। 'गायत्रे गायते: 'सत्तिकमित्: ; 'बायुष्ठायिति कर्न्द: ॥12॥

क च यह द्रिः। माति चतिः 'अनुमुतिः सवनं चर्दः साद्रं चर्बिति च।
वष्णूः जनयतिः यात्रूः। कषुः चरन्म बायुमेधम्म साद्रं जनयतिः। कषुः चतिः
'कषुः' (उ. खु: १०४) द्रिः यत्रावः। शार्य: दिनं चुनकेति 'मात्यन्तिनः
सवनभाजनं निन्दुपक्षःदुङ्गामिनः। तात: र भिः। तात्तियसवनिति चात्तीय-
सवनभाजनं तात: साद्रं शीर्यस्मिति मूविनि चरन्म वाहूं जनयतिः यात्रूः द्रिः
कर्न्दोद्रुगितम्। जागतां कर्न्दोद्रुगितीति जागतानुगमः। शीर्यस्मिति
'शीर्यस्मिति' (पा. ६.१.६०) द्रिः शिर्यस्मि शीर्यश्चायामः। तत: भवं
शीर्यश्चायामः ॥13॥

1. L omits वृषुभिच्छा विवचया तदा तथा, BH वृषुभिच्छा only.
2. A1 चावः for चरः। 3. BHLIA2 तथा च श्रुतः मनवे साद्रः प्रात: सन्त्रिन्तिसि।
4. B has before this गायत्रकर्न्दोद्रुगितमः।
5. BHL omits शूलिकमितः and has चाच्यश्चायाम: for चाच्यकाळिति कर्न्दः।
6. BHLCA2 omit श्रुताः। 7. A2L मात्यन्तिनं सवनभाजनं।
वर्णिन्यज्ञनयते तेषां विभागः पञ्चव्य व्रतः। ॥ ॥

करतः कालतः स्थानात् प्रयम्बानुप्रदानतः। ॥ ॥

इर्ति वर्णविवदः प्राइत्तिंशुण्यं तं निवोधतः ॥ ॥

सो दोषे इर्ति। स वायुष्कों जहांगतो मृछीत यावदुपरितनां गतिम् 
प्रलम्बनः गिरि: कपालेणवर्षयकास्तु पुनः प्रव्याहुल्ये वञ्चनिवापद पर्णिन्यज्ञनयते 
सवपायति।। पुनर्मतिष्ठतयत्र विस्थापायम्। तेषां विभागः पञ्चव्य व्रत इर्ति।

तेषां वर्णनां जन्मानानां विभागो विबेकः पञ्चव्य पञ्चप्रकारः। ‘संख्याया 
विधायें घा’ (पा, ५-२.४२) इर्ति यथा। ॥ ॥

वेदेविभिषेषः वर्णनां पञ्चव्य विबेकः इवादः—

१ रत इर्ति। स्थानां वियूहुः याख्यायम्। ‘वर्णना ज्ञातार एवमाद्वः—

पञ्चव्य विबेकः पञ्चव्याः इर्ति। ॥ ॥

करतः उदायसादिवेजनं। कालो क्ष्मादि।

क्षानं कपालादि। प्रयोज्युज्ज्वल्या (१)। अनुप्रदानं स्थानावादिन्द्रं घीदादि। अद्य 
प्रक्षेत्रस्व दीयते इवादुप्रदानम्। ‘है नाद त्वागायुप्रदानो’ इवादुप्रदानो।

पञ्चव्य विवेकः वर्णनां नियुष्मुद्धमानं हे योरां, निवोधत उपस्त।

वेद विद्वानेच्यते वालयुप्पुवहः। ननु सव्यावेयदुप्रदानम्। कथम्? भाषा वक्रता सह बचनं समयं मनो युक्तं इर्ति याख्यायम्। भाषन्य मनो 

नियोजकभावः नौपपदते वर्त्तेन्दुक्कलातु तस्य। तथा च इर्ति—‘सवण्ये 

ग्रान्य युक्तं’ (दह. भा. ४-२.१२) इर्ति, ‘सवण्येन ज्ञातार एवमाद्वः’ (दह. भा. 

३-२.४) इवादुप्रदानका च। भवता चेवमालक्षबूढ़ं याख्यायम्। भाषन्य 

नियोजकभावशे गृहरंस्थिययमयीविविधतितिक इर्ति गृहरंस्थिययतितिक भाषा मनो 

1. HL वञ्चनिवापदः; B. ८रा जनवर्षि। 2. A1 चूरी:बुधवः।
3. A1 omits वषयद...वहः। 4. BI इर्ति वविहितः प्राङ्क नियुष्मु तं निवोधतः before this. H. puts. निवोधतः before this.
5. BHL omit वर्णतः उदायसादिवेजनं...इवादुप्रदानजः।
6. IA1C omit ध्रुवः।
पाठ्यता-संक्षिप्त

युक्ति इत्यनुपन्नम्। उच्चते, प्राध्यापक सम्बन्धितार्थोऽन्तरो युक्ति इत्यनुपन्नै विवेकाभि प्रायम्। चेतन्तनाये-तत्तद्व वचनं यथियोजङ्कलम्। तत्ता च मनः[संहिताय]—

"योस्याम्: कार्यिता तेन चेतन्त प्रचालि ।
य: करोति तु कार्यित स भूताभावते वृजः॥
वृजाक्षेत्रंतरावऽवदः सहान: सर्वदेशिनाम्।
चेतन वेद्यिते सर्वं सर्वं च च च जसक स।
वावतो भूताभावते महान: चेतन एव च।
उद्धवचिथु भूतं स्थितं तेन ब्यायं तिङ्गत॥ (१२, २२-१४) प्रति।

तेन ब्राह्मणां परमान्वाधाराः। तथा च ब्यास: [ श्रीमद्भगवतीताया ]—

"हाविन्नु पुष्करी लोकी चाराचार एव च।
चरं वर्णिणा भूतानि कुटुकोषवर उच्चय।
उत्तमं पुष्करं नरमाधोत्वः।
यो लोकतंयविविभ निवलक्ष्य द्रेश्वर॥। (१५, १६-१७)

नन्द यशवान युक्तः सम्मानायोऽन्तरो यो नितः: चेतन एवावारामाधिक-प्रेतो भविति ततः: चेतनः एव भाष्मशब्दा चारितार्थालात: शोरीनित्रित्रयमनोदशियतिरिजवं कतंशेष्वयन्तितौ तथा वर्णितं, स्वाभावः च। उच्चते, भाषा इत्यदेवव द्वारायामानी तत्र चेतनपरमान्वाभियावप्पाधिकारी तन्त्रेयोचारिते।

तन्त्रेयोचारार्थ त्वासामायलः। एवं चेतु किमवेन वर्मान्वनो वर्णिनिमित्तितलम्
उत्तमः ततैः। तत्रतस्य, भव्यं वसाधिचंद्रकालिचक्षुः:। भव्यं च वैदार्थिकम्:। शोरिरदिव्यतिरिजसं परमान्वनो बोधः।। "अनवसंध्यत्र तु उद्दाधिनिरेकं भवति। किं तद्वसाधिचं यथा विषोपकारे वतिः? कथने, वेदा यथाच।

तत्ता च ज्ञाति:— तमेवं वेदान्तवचने विविधाधिविनं ब्रह्मचर्यं तपसा भवति यथार्थं
यशोवंचस्मीतयां च (ः भ. भा. ४.४.२२) प्रति। वेदान्तवचने वश्यगतमन्वाभिक्षुः
सवयमविशारङ्गेन यस्मानोपत्तिः। वच्चित्ता च—‘चतुर्द्रक च सर्वं समर्थि
द्रिति। अतुलं समतं मोच एव भवति॥१०॥

1. O तद्देश । 2. MSS. युहुकम्म । 3. A¹ बुद्धे च।
उदात्तावनुदात्तावृक्षतिष्ठ सखाप्यः।

||8|| दृष्टो दृष्टि: मृत दृष्टि कालो नियमा चाँचि॥11॥
चद्री साधारणि वर्णनानामः काठः शिरस्तथा।

||9|| जिह्वामूलं च दनात्स्य नासिकोषी च तालु च॥12॥

चलमतिप्रस्फृक्षे | प्रक्षतमुनसरामः—

उद च च चा न दा च चे ति। खरत: कालत इत्येको हो हेतू शीशे विज्ञोति- 
खर उदात्तावः। कालो मात्वाप्रस्फृक्षतिमात्रायनः। उदात्त इत्युपारिनितावु 
परिष्क्रीयः । बनुदात्तावसदयितं: अन्यान्दश यशोत्र इत्यर्थः। खरित इति।
'न सखानन्दसु। खरत्तीति खरिति: वाचेरवियायः य उदात्तावनुदात्तविकारः।
तथा च नारदः—

"उच्चादुःक्तःतर्न नासिक्नीचाच्योच्चर्तर्न तथा।
तैःस्य खरसंबंधाया विश्रानः' खर उच्चते॥
चनोकाष्ठायोऽथ साधारण इति खरितः।
तस्य खरसंबंधाया प्रतिज्ञानिन्ति वैचित्र्यः।" (ना. शि. १.८.५-७)

"व्याख्या खर यो इति। "तय एव क्रमवृत्तिपथया:।; पञ्च स्वस स्वामसु। इति 
एकात्मानः दृष्टिः हिमातः; सुतकः इति। "निमित्तकाला मात्रा स्थायः 
इत्यद्विद्विजः; तथा च नारदः—

"निमित्तकाला मात्रा स्थायित्वालेति चापिरे।" (ना. शि. २.३.५) इति।

इतिहासः प्रकारार्थः। चनोन प्रकारिणः कालत: हेतौ: खरलिच विषयभाग- 
नियमः। तथा च नारदः—

"खर उच्चः खरी नीचः खर: खरित एव च। 
व्याख्यात्वस्तर्वतेः यथ तिन्ति स खरः।" (ना. शि. २.५.२) इति॥11॥

1. B omites n.
2. A<C चाः।
3. A< read पद अग्नि पञ्च।
4. B. puts stops after विषया; and सामसु।
5. A<C ोत्व वर्षेः,
पण्डित-व्यायाम

कष्ठगावाचार्यशास्त्राचा बळूळावपूः

११॥ खुमुळेमा कुटुरण दन्विया लूतुलसा: सःतः। १२॥ जिब्रामुळे तु कु: प्रेरिते दन्वःधिरो वः सःतः ती वुढः।

१२॥ एजे तु कष्ठतालवत्ता चोठी कर्णोद्धनी ख्रूःतः। १३॥ चर्चामात्राते तु कष्ठभाष्य एकरीकारयोभिवित्।

१४॥ एकारीकारयोभिविताते तयोवित्तसंहारम्। १५॥

ख्रूत द्रष्टा यदूंतं देशां—

क खुर वा या विति। 'कष्ठगावाचा एकारीकारयोभिवितक ख्रूःतं तालो।

१६॥ दु: या: तालो:। िकरवश वर्गवश एजे तालो: तालोः।

१७॥ अिकरवश वर्गवश एजे तालो। तालोः। कष्ठगावाचा एकारीकारयोभिवितक ख्रूःतं तालो:।

१८॥ एकारीकारयोभिवितक ख्रूःतं तालो।
पाषिनीय-पिथा

चनुकारयमाना च नासिका स्वास्ति होते।

||14|| उपभानीय ऋषि च जिवांसूकृतियनासिकी
चयोगवासा विलयेच चाथ्रयांस्वारनागिरजः ||१५||

||15|| अलाववीणादिरीवी द्वारं स्वात्मवा: धरानानुः
ननुसारसती कर्तव्यो निध्वं क्रोः शष्णिशुत च ||१७||

च हे मा चा चृत। चम्प्रानंता तु 'कष्ठारस्य स्वातिः। कभोः? ॥२५कारस्य चोकारस्य च। सर्वप्रथावालाभुं ॥५कारास्य चोकारस्य स्वात्त्विनु ग्नातैै। अतत्त्वार्थार्थगतिपर्यथ असचारसस्माहाताः कष्ठासंबन्धिनी भवितु। ॥५चतुर्ध्वासात्लोकः

ध्रुणा: ॥१५॥

च गै नी निः चित। चयोगवासा इवनसाराद्वयवाल उच्चने। अनुसारो
विवर्गांः इति कः इति कः कः कः। तथा च चोकारस्य: इति इति
विवर्गांः पुराणां ॥१५काराः इति इति जिवाः ऋषियाः। ॥१५काराः
नासिकाः, इत्यादिवासा। न निः विवर्गांः मात्रो वर्णां सर्वां च
चयोगवासा। ॥५चाथ्रयांस्वारनागिरजः इति। ॥५चाथ्रयांस्कः
ककारस्य: स्वात्त्वां मात्रतु शोभायाः ते चाथ्रयांस्वारनागिरजः।
चन्द्रा तु यमान्याययोगवासाः वाचने। तेषां मते च इति
चयोगवासशब्दः प्राथमित्वायाः। कष्ठासंबन्धविषयाः 
चनुकाराय अर्धयात्-चनुकाराय प्रकृति: पाषिनीवाच कथिता "मोक्षसारः
(पाः २२.२२) इति ॥१५॥

च ला हिव निः चित। अलाववीणी, ॥१०तथा वीणात्या इव निः चितः। कष्ठो वर्ण
सोऽलाववीणानिध्वं। स्वात्त्वां द्वारमूलः तत्र भवेऽ ॥१५मूलः। धरानाः

1. H. कष्ठासात्लोकायामात्रो विस्तारमा कष्ठान्तिः। कभोः;
2. OA² एकारस्य चोकारस्य। A³ एकारस्य चोकारस्य।
3. A³ एकार चोकारस्य B. चोकारस्य। 4. A³ कष्ठ अनापेक्षा।
5. H चथो तारः, B. चर्मं तास्य तथा चथो चे से स्त्रायी।
6. I A³ चं इत्यादिवारसांगिरजः। A³ चभान्ति। नासिकाः।
7. HLH put घट इटिय्यीस्टाइल。
8. A³ अनापेक्षा।
9. A³ omits चाथ्रयाः। B. चाथ्रयाः।
10. L. कष्चारायामात्रो इव निः चितः। कष्ठो वर्ण
11. A³ L. द्वारमूलः।
16. चचोध्याय सरस्वतीस्वरूपेऽद्रेष्टः शरस्वतः।  
शेषस्वरूप छलः प्रतिः निरोधानुप्रदानः।  

17. जमोदनुसारिकान्तलः नादिनो इम्वः स्वरातः।  
द्रेष्टद्रक्षाद्र यक्षजस्तु ग्यासिनस्तु खक्काद्रः।  

dhāraka-dīnaḥ bhūtān vātā vā tāvā vā tāvā vā yā
dhāraka-dīnaḥ bhūtān vā tāvā vā tāvā vā yā  

“अवयवार्णातः तथावर्णार्थाः प्रकर्षेण वोकार्मः।”  
यववेदुपमासुः सर्वसुः चोडिमापविष्यः। (प्राद. २, १४, ४) इति ॥१७॥  

dhāraka-dīnaḥ bhūtān vā tāvā vā tāvā vā yā  

कालसूः खानानि वर्णानायाः कालः गिरस्तातः।  
निधामुः कर्मकार्यस्य नाभिकाहः तद्भावः।  

सारः कारः खानानि वर्णानां भेदः कर्थितोऽधुः।  
प्रयत्नातः भेदः कारः।  

प्र ता च यद्य यथो वर्णावर्गाधिकारां प्रवत चस्त्रादिविभासोऽस्मिन्।  

च जिति ।  

सारः प्रवाङादेशाः।  
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1. A²A³ omit.  
2. A¹ prabhāgaḥ.  
3. BBL read after this वत्तान्वम् च वर्णाणां च विहालं कर्या शुभम्। वेदीप्ति (तत्त्विपि  
विहालेऽवै तथायामेव तदेव च; अयो only in E).  
4. HL omit ऋ।  
5. H omits शर्यनि...नेमस्युः ।  
6. L य य द्वादशा।  
7. A¹A² omit up to प्रकर्षेण द्रेष्टद्रक्षाद्रः: MSS. ही नादात्राद्रम्। (I प्रत्याद्रम्)।  
8. B omits तेषैः।  
9. A¹C भक्तवादः।
पाश्चिमी विद्यालय विद्याधर्ममित्तु प्रचारितः ॥ १८॥

प्रदुषिताकानिमान्तः जानीयात्। तथा च पाणिनि:—"सुखवनसिकांच्छनोगुनासिका,"
(पा. ११.२) इति। अ झी इति। रक्षारो रक्षारो भक्ष्य, प्रवाहारपहङ्गभस्
इति भं भं घ ठ घ पु, एते ज्ञातयो नादिनः स्थापते। नाद एवामस्तौति
नादिनः। चपरः पाठः—च मो तु न सि का न झी। ज्ञात इति प्रवाहारः
चहः। च त च ठ ठ ए पो ऐ चो ठ ठ च य र र ज म स श न मु एते अनु-
नासिका। न झी न तू रक्षारयो भस्मायिणि सहः। ना दि नो च भम प्र,
झूताः। रक्षारो भक्ष्य नादिनः भस्म भम घ ठ घ पु। प्रक्ष्याधः, पाठविद्यात्
क्षमः। "रक्षारेभवनजितानं विकलेपयुनासिकालम्, अमृतं तु निलम्मू। तथा
च योनिः—"सचाद्यो या विधिता विधेय: ज्ञापनान्तः ज्ञात सिद्धान्तः।"
(सू, प्रा. २.३२) इति। तथा "उकारशिति करणि यथो रात: यथो दृष्टिः शक्लेन्"
(सू, प्रा. १.२८) इति। रक्षारेवयो: प्रत्यमे पाठे नादिलम्,
हितोऽपि। पाठे रक्षारेभवनसिकालम् वि.प्रतिष्ठेऽ।। इ य च च चा य य ज ज च च च इति।
घसः काष्ठतः। जयसु जगऽरायः। शक्लेण प्रवाहारः। ज व ग ड द शु
एते यथो जयसु रक्षारभवनान् नादः।। ज्ञा सिन न खु खा दा य इति।
खालिसः। एते शासिनः। रक्षारो एवामस्तौति शासिनः। "श्वासोधारणां
[घिती]नाममान्यमान्यम्, [नादों] धारणां चतुर्थेऽऽतित्ययनः, यम्मा सोऽविषयः।"
इति चौद्रामः। ॥ १९॥

१. A² भाषायः।

२. HB omit कार after ॥

३. IHB एवरो चोयान्य चरिताः। प्रवाहारः (°नरामात्वंशः A²) चोयान्त्वपांनामः
युम्मा।; IH. °नल्लभवमान्यायो चरिताः।

४. A³C वेदाष्ट्रम्,
*मन्दी हीनः खरती वर्ष्टो वा
भिध्याप्रयुक्तो न तमर्यमांः
स वाम्बची यजमानं हिन्निः
यथेन्द्रशतुः खरतोपराधात् \|२०\|

*श्रद्धः शादृशः प्रादात्राचीपुष्पाय धीमते इति
वाद्मयेभः समाहतुः देवों वाचमितः स्थिति: \|२१\|
*श्रेयंशरसमाध्यमभिगम्य महेश्वरात्
कन्तुस्य व्याकरणं प्रोत्तं तस्मै पाणिनिये नमः \|२२\|

1. कथा मन्दा-ख्यासलशब्दमांह—
मननः मन्दनान्याः खरता: उदात्तादिविद्यतः वर्ष्टोः चित्तिन्तिविद्विदेहतः
भिध्याप्रयुक्तः यथा: खरो यो वर्ष्टस्मधालेव प्रत्युष्न: न तमर्यमामां तस्मां न वैदा। स
श्रद्धोऽस्मी मन्दौ वाम्ब्यो वचस्मौ यजमानं हिन्निः। तत्र ह्वात्माः—यथा
खरतोपराधात् प्रस्तुते स्वधुश्रुतामभूदिति \|२०\|

2. इदानीं युष्मपुष्पकसमाह—
श्रद्धः इति। श्रद्धः 'थं सेवे करोतीति श्रकरः सुक्तकरः शाकरः सुक्तकरः
विभा दाचीपुष्पाय कथये दाचीनात्री संकीकर्ष्या तत्प्रुषाय धीमते उविमते
प्रादात्राचिन्तमाः \|२१\|

3. सम्प्रति पाणिनिलस्तिति श्रोकमाः—
वें न निः। नन्वप्रफळं सुतिपुष्पं पाणिनिलस्तितिये किमभिन्मू। उच्चति,
श्रद्धां श्रद्धां यथं श्रद्धांधितिः प्रयाहारे:। शिवा चिन्ता प्रयाहारास्त्र पाणिनिना
श्रद्धान्तविगम्य कल्लुं समर्थम व्याकरणं प्रोत्तं शिवोपकाराय ख्यात्वादाय लोके
प्रकरिताः। तद्वर्मं सुविः। श्रद्धान्तविगम्य प्रयाहारानाः। ऋत्विकम् \|२२\|

1. IHLB omit कथा मन्दनान्याः...श्रुतिश्रुतामभूदिति; A⁴ omits कथा मन्दनान्याः, etc.
but puts it after दुर्शिते प्रादात्।
2. A⁴ omits येन।
3. HL omit वे सेवे...श्रद्धः।
পাণিনীর শিখন

#বিনয়নসূচনি:স্তামিনাম

য এই পঠিত প্রত্যেক সেটা হিন্দু

স ভবতি ধনাধান্তথাকানীতি-

মানতুল্য সুখময় ভিক্ষুল ভ্রাতুল্য॥২৩॥

'ভগবতে শিখিয়ায় সারাতু কুতুর্কে শ্রোকামথ—

বিন যে নি তি। বৈতালিভ কাং্টোসখ বহুরস্তুব্ধ কাংসিোত্তৎ। 'বিনয়নঃ

শিবাস্তে সুখানি:স্তাম যথা সুখায; সিংহো নিকাম্বিতি তথা নিম্নত্র গুত্তারা

বিনয়নানীযু ন কৃত্তায়থি। তাতো হিন্দু পঠিতায়োত স [এই] ধনাধিপুঞ্জ্যতঃ

সুখমতলঃ ৫মভাক্ত ও মোচমন উজ্জ্বলকমৰাণ বসতী ব্রাহ্মী ৩তুনাসুমিন

়োকে। [বাদ্য] ধনাধান্তথাকানীতি ভুজভঃ সুখমভতে মুক্তভাষ।

অধ্যাদ্বান্তভাতী শ্রোকামথ পরিমধা কালান্ত ত ত তল্লন্ত 

শ্রিকৃতোন্ত, মোচমন লু প্রপরিমধ-কালান্তিক্রু সুখভূমিক্রু।॥২৩॥

'হিন্দু শ্রোকামথান্তরকালে সমাসাঃ।

1. BH *omit* ভগবত: শিখাযায়।
2. *B* বিনয়মধ্যপঠিতা *and* *H* বিনয়মধ্যপ:স্তাভা বিনয়মধ্যপঠিতা *ফর* বিনয়মধ্যপায়া: ভিক্ষুল।
3. *A¹C* পরস্তন্তে-রচনি।
4. BMA. শ্রিক্রু; IHL *omit* শ্রোকামথীন পালান্তি।
5. *A¹* শ্রিকৃত। মোচমন পরিমধকালান্তিত্যাগ:সুখমভতান্ত:শ্রীযুক্তবাদীয়োকাত সুখম প্রত্যেক।
6. MBHL হিন্দু পাণিনী-শিখন-আঞ্জন্য সম্বন্ধ। (B বাদ' পুরঃ ভ্রাতুল্য ভ্রাতুল্য শিখন বিভিন্ত সমাস।)

সংখ্যা ১৫৫১ দিনস্তি পিনীতা ল: সংখ্যা ১৫৫১ নিমিনাপ্রে অধি বিঙ্গানাবা শীলাভাব দৃঢ়ভিখুবাবকে

শ্রীবিজীভাষবাসু। শ্রী:। শ্রী:। *A¹* after সমাসাঃ।

প্রথম ষে স্বর্ণমধ্যপালাভা শীলাভাবাবকালান্তেন যিন্দ্র সাধ্য পার্থভাব চ 

শ্রীবিজীভাষবাসু। সাধ্যাবাসুপ্রাপ্তমাঃ সংখ্যা ১৫৫২ বোধ রূপ রূপ শ্রী:। শ্রী:। শ্রী:। শ্রী:।

I হিন্দু শ্রোকামথান্তরকালে সমাসাঃ &c. *Aº* হিন্দু শিখাযায়: পালান্তিকা সমাসাঃ।

সংখ্যা ১৫৫০ বাদ চাইনী থেকে ২ নার বীঝীী বিখ্যাত: সুলেমান।
IV. शिचार्मप्रकाश-सहिता (With the Śiksā-prakāśa)

* अथ शिचार्म प्रवचन्याति पारशुनाय यतं यथा ।
शास्त्रानुपूर्व तत्त्वायादृः यथोक्तः लोकविद्यः || ॥

श्योतिर्याकरण क्रन्दः कलयिच्छानिन्यः ||
निग्राज-पद्मेनीः १-कच्छः यथा तं सतं सुमः ॥
श्याम सिक्षाचार्य सुदृढ़ाश्वानो यथायथम् ।
शिचार्म तद्भवः श्यामसी पारिनीयात्मसारिनिम् ॥

श्योभाभासिनिं व्याकरणेतदज्ञ समवानः पिक्ष्याचार्य स्वभाषतमुभाष्यः
शिचार्म वक्र्तः प्रतिज्ञानीते—

च य शिच चा भि ति। वेदिकवभौतिकनातु पुस्वी निबोवयाकाव्यक्तवान्
इष्टेव वैदिकः सिद्धान्तः। चलिन्दारस्य वेदसाधारानातुतातुः गणको
वेदमारः। प्रति: साधारण-सततप्रभिम्बेर्यथोऽविक्ष्प्तार्थविनिविस्मिताय विषय-
आपांतिकानि प्रवर्तितानि। तत्त्वं शिचा कथो व्याकरणं निकल्वं केन्द्रो च्योतियं
ध्वन्याश्च पुराणं च व्यायिक्षरो सीमांसारोऽदोनि। तथा च यथावचनः
"पुराणक्यायमीमास्तं-ध्वन्याश्चाश्चातिक्षितः। वेदा: श्यामसी विद्यातां वसंख्य
च चतुर्थम्" स्वति। तथा हि १—शिचा सर्ववचनोऽवाकः शास्त्रम्। कथो
वेदविष्टतकब्रणाम् चानुपूर्वश्च कल्यानाश्चास्त्रम्। व्याकरणं वद्योधकम्
अस्तेन्द्रविलकारः शास्त्रम्। नित्यम् पद्विभाग-मन्त्रार्थ-देवता-निर्दयार्थे
शास्त्रम्। केन्द्रो गायत्रादिकृतं द्वारा शास्त्राः। [च्योतियं कालप्रियानाथेऽ
शास्त्रम्। धर्मशास्त्रम् चाचारादिपूड्येशायं शास्त्रम्।] पुराणं रक्षितवत्त-प्रलयादितिवर्जयं
शास्त्रम्। व्यायिक्षरः मामार्थप्रियाचार्यशास्त्रम्। सीमारः वद्य-
वाकाध्यविचारशास्त्रम्। तत्विन्द्रियायां यथोदितसारवचनार्थम्।

1. Be. पद्मायः । 2. L वायर् for ’भाष्य’ । 3 Mss. त्रैं च । 4. Be. omits हि।
पाण्डुलिपि-शिल्प

* प्रसिद्धमण शब्दार्थमविश्लेषतमवुद्धिमः।
युन्यत्रौ लोकार्थमवाच उच्चारणो विधिम्॥२॥

चाने अनन्यवाक्यस्यमः। यतः 'मनोद्रो होनः प्रतीति वर्णिता वा मिथ्या-
प्रयुक्ती न तमश्चमाह। स वाग्वतः यज्ञां विद्वते यस्येनुतः
दशुः प्रतीति प्रवदातानुष्ठानम् स्वाभाविकः
"प्रतः वर्णिते माता विनियोगसंबंधेन' च। मनः जिज्ञासामानेन वेदित्वाः
पदे पदे' इति। अद्वितीय जित्यमुः दक्षगतः सिद्धम्। गदाधरः मन्त्रार्थयोगादित्याः
श्च शब्दोऽहनकारः भान्ति भान्ति वा। आकर्षणाध्यायानां परं च तुम्भिविचारः।
परं यथाचारते-संधिरां वर्णीयमधुक्षपाकं कियतैः दत्तात्रेयूपः
विश्वाश्च[न]ः। चित्तत्त्वनवा वालिभो रूपदेवे कुलोदृशादनातुद्दाससनिताते
चक्रार्धिनिजिल्लात्रदक्षानांतर्यता यथा तत्त्वाद् यथा पाण्डुलिपिः
"हि-ग्राह्याचाचारादित्यस द्वादशम्" इति (पा. १. १३३) हड्डरंस्याङ्गः बहुताच्चः (पा. ४. २. १२९)
तथा "अध्योपि" (पा. ३. १२३) वाणिज्यादिः, पाण्डुलिपिं मातं तथा प्राचीनविद्याम्।
न तत सत्त्वं शास्त्रादित्वादेवच विविधतिस्तवह य तथा कमिति। तथैव यथा कोक-
कविद्योः प्रतिश्रवणातुकुलोन्नतां शास्त्रानुप्रेक्षा गुरुपरम्पराप्रांत जनेवादाः।
"शाताः शाकुरी ग्राह्याचारः" इति दुधिपितादाय अच्छायामः। "य एव" कोकिका:
"प्रवद्यास्त एव "वेदिकाप्रवत एव तेवामध्" इति, महाभाषे।" । एवो वेषः
संप्यः शाताः धर्मः लोकी कामसंघर्षिताम् भवति इति प्रयोजनम्।
एतत:-
बानामलतायका चतर्कारिणैः। आकर्षणे तु गौधर्योऽगर्भां सन्नेत्रोऽषिद्धमुः
जिशामुच्चायककेल्लातां गोवर्ण सति विभेदवाच्चारस्ब इति। अवमानिकाः
सन्नेत्रोऽषिद्धमुक्षम् शिष्यं वेदिकिविधाताः वस्त्राधिनिर्विन्यालां धौकालम्।
"पादस्यानुरुद्धश्चम्", (पा. ५. ८), "न प्रमाणं सी" (पा. ५. १०) "वाचनयम्" (पा. ५. १२)
"य चित्तविकारं" (पा. ५. ११) "पाधयोजनीय" (पा. ५. १४), युम्मा-पादस्य चतुर्गाढ्यहर्षादं
मायोऽव्रुवक्त वेष इति चचावपः। "ददाते निवादगाममित्राविष्णु प्रथमो मुरुक्का
अनुधवाद्या। दिति: धर्मः ६ वरूधवाद्या। उत्तरात्म पूर्ववत्। "जानाधिके
नेत्रेण निवादस्वरूपिजः, भास्म विनाभाववालोः" (पा. ५. ५८-५५) इति चचावपः॥१॥

1. ले. सिद्धवृद्धिः। 2. Be. महाबलान्तम्। 3. LBe. शिल्पः
4. ले. सिद्धतः । 5. L स एव वाद्य च एव। 6. L देविका। 7 एवः
7. L ६भाषाः। 8. Be. खरीखुपाद् पुपाद्: for घाटस्य ।
प्रकाश-सहिता

* विषमविवातः पशुवा विश्वम् क्रियायित्र सम्भवतो मताः।

प्रारंभिक संवेदना चापी स्वर्य प्रोत्सा: स्वर्यभुव मवा।

खरा विशिष्टिरेक्ष श्यामानां पद्मविशिष्टः।

1. यादृच्छ समुद्रा श्राष्ट्री चलारंच स्मार्ता।

सुभूम्यन्त्रम् भादिकोलीवारात् कपालदिर्शानां भविष्यति। विमर्श्यायम्
आरामः इत्याश्चाराध्—प्र स्वतः स्वतः। पारिष्यायिनीः प्रसिद्धीभावात् अभावसंप्रती-
कर्मभिंविद्वारात् अध्ययनां व्यक्तिविशिष्टाम्। वाची वर्षंजाततः उचारणे उद्दिश्ये
विधि: विवाहम्; श्यामानारसी विधि: स चात प्रयासारुपदानार्दो ध्व्रये।; तम्।

2. [तबप्राप्ते] तावदुरायाः विसंविश्वायाः वर्षन् संवेदिते त्व विषि रिति।

प्रकृतिः
संवेदने तथा भवं संवेदने प्राप्ने तद्वर्णने 3 च संवेदने [तबप्राप्ते] प्रकृतिप्रविषयादि-
विभागे: संवेदनार्दोनार्दो तथावर्णः गोवर्षयवशयाः, विनिर्भावः पद्मः प्रथमः । श्रवणे
चतुर्मुख्रीतिष्ठति स्मार्तोः:। स्वर्यभुवारो; प्रोत्सा:। प्रदित्:। श्रादि:।

3. घण्टारुपदानकाले: सम्भवतः समुद्रतेजस्[ता]: मताः भाषाः।

4. तानुमानेण सम्भवन् दर्ष्यति खरा द्रति। श्रवणे खरा द्रतिः प्राचः

5. संवेदना। 6. विषमविवातः

7. अकारायारतः

8. इति 1.2.20 इति

9. इति।

10. इति।

11. इति।

12. इति।

1. MSS, विषि:। 2. L इति। 3. Be. इति। 4. MSS. इति।

5. Be. omits श्रवणे। 6. MSS. इति। 7. Be. इति।


11. MSS, इति। 12. MSS. इति।

4.
फसंविनय-शिखर

युक्त उच्चारणं चतुर्या ज्ञिनं प्रशी गालुषाययतनीतिः गण्यात्। तत्। अनुदाने नामः
काश्यिनःप्रस्तावः अन्तर्थवर्धतीति द्वियम्। गच्छ कर्तनित्यां सम्बोध्यते
द्रति चैत्यत्। तत्। एवं वच्चमारा हि चरित्रादुभावः। [पुढळे] नासाक्षिकोरसङ्गुः
जिश्वकारणेऽत्यो जाता: गच्छ। नाम्पुरोऽत्तुक्षिद्योर्ज्ञो जात: चतुर्या पाब्धरसः
पुरुष कु द्रति वा पञ्चम:। अद्युत: समामितो नामिन प्रसा: स मध्यमः। ; तत् उदाराने
दिस्ये एवं, एसो प्राध्यामेवभृतोहारीः। व्याख्या:। या श्यो नां व य व विर श्यो:—
पञ्चभित्तिकः सिंहारि: कु कु व न: तु पुः। च पुनः: यादवोऽति क्षणः। ते य र ल व स च य चा:।
वच्छ अब्जरम्यः त्यजताृ शिन्याः कठित्सः। श्याल्पुरचन्द्रसः। तिरो नेमि
द्रव्यस्ः (निः, २.२०) द्रतिः यास्कः। यैव इलोतजः: क्षट: भाचारः। प्रोक्तस्ये
साहि: सम्प्रज्ञयः; च पुनःकारः यथा: कु कु यु व व द्रतिः। चाह्याकल्याणादसः
सम्यः: ते ७ कु जु यु यु द्रति चन्द्रयः [न्ये] सम्योऽसः। [न्युपूरे]कुऽड्योतरी अवधान
व्यवहरिते तत्र यथा वर्तनी न सन्ध्रोऽः द्रतिः। (मी, विः, २)। “चन्द्रादसंयोऽगधे यथा: चमः। पूर्वसः।”
दवीद्विनिधिरि: नारायः।“चन्द्रादसंयोसः” भंवेतु चूऽर्वोऽत्तुञ्जः पहः पः विदः। तत् मधः
यस्यस्त्रैृवेदः सावः: सावः: खेमाष्टि सददत्ताः। दवाः च या निवासीते भार्तियनिबावणः।” (नाध्रण: २.२, ६-८) द्रति:। भायमपि
वर्णाके विद्यायशस्त्राणकः। च ला र च या न एव द्रतिः वर्णार्तलनोदयें:।
संयोगान्तः। तत् संयोगाविशयो गोईत्वमि दश्यथीतत्। “र्ग्य मिर्नः: संयोगाविशयोऽः
सावः: चार्यविनधियः: श्रवणमानः। यथा च: तृवणि श्रवणमान:। चन्द्र: सावः: स्योऽगतिः। नीपकास्ते: न द्रति च।
श्रीरीः यथा मिर्नः विद्याविषेयः: श्रवणायकः।” (वो, विः, १) द्रति
च। १३वर्घा निलक्ष्मीति काकार्य: पूर्ववेद्यस्वयः। व्यासाद्वः। प्रयोगार्थकारः
स्यनायं वर्णकः: काकार्यः:। काकार्यः:। तत्राकारन्वा:कः त्रात्म्यः। पनि[कु]कीलायादि।
चक्षुमनुष्टितः।” (बाजाे, १२) द्रतिः
गकार्यः:। जय[चु]लालियाद्वारा। काकार्यः:। यथा (यम्बः? ) ६८६ जगातः।

1. L चावताः। 2. MSS. द्विवर:। 3. Be. साहवाः। 4. Be. “मेरे नामो” द्वारा:।
5. Be. चावताः। 6. L चैमित:। 7. L वासाः।
8. Be. द्वारा:। 9. L अड्डा मेरे नामो। 10. This passage is very corrupt.
11. Be. अध्यात्मिक शिक्षा प्रमाण:। 12. Be. द्वादेशर्वः or चद्यायः।
अनुसारेण विसर्गः त्र च —प्री च चापि परास्त्रिते ।

II.2 II. दुःख्य दश्रेणि विन्येयो खंकार: स्त्रुत एव च II.5 II.

(गजजा: 7)। अत्र चवास्तैतीयो जस्तवं संख्यासवर्णं सुकारसामालितः ।
वर्णक्रमः यज्ञाकर-जयाकर-पुरोवर्णवंगसान्तरी-सवर्णसमगः जयाकर: ।
त्वमञ्चानानिति किम्? उद्द्वारकु। अन्तःखेलितं किम्? काम्बु, न कल्न म II.8 I.

अनुसारः” (पा: द. 2. 2.3) खारस्मर: अनुर भवेत्तत्वनुसारः ।
विविधं सहजतं द्रवितं विसर्गं जःप्यपारस्त्रितं तृतीयं ।
च लातु न सुब्धीफलं यस्ते वीणा तत्वावृत्तो दलभोच्या छान्नस्मा: ।
सरान्तः भक्तारामभु कत्वोऽस्त्रूर्वम् प्रासो-सब्धस्यसंस्करः ।
उद्दाुगी यथा तता निन्यं किं शियानी निम्नमें तथापि ।
तादोरति च “आश्वेते सकारो रोगोप्रक्षेपे चारस्मरः ।
यवलेप परस्त्र् श्रेणि परिपु चोत्तमार्मिकः” (ना: भा. 2. 4.8)।
अनुसारद्वयव्रचयं चतु: शिलस्यमास्त्रान्ति चारस्मरां घटितं चारस्मां विविधे तित् पारस्त्रितः ।
स च यथा सुराश्चेद्यस्त्रा सः सादनानितं रोगः संहि द्रवितं वायुमाक्षस्याश्च दातुकारिकम् ।
भविष्यं कत्षात् । स च यथा सुराश्चेद्यस्त्रा सः सादनानितं राममण्डितं चारस्मां घटितं ।
तथा “अरुतारो अरुतारं वा अरुतारं वा” (१०.११) द्रवितं चक्षुपरवदेशं श्रीकोकिरं ।
इति च “इंस्यः श्रविष्टो” (द्र. ४.४०.५) “सोमानं षरणम्” (द्र. १.३५.१)
उद्दाबाद्वादात्तलमिति । विसर्गम् धातुरितः मलिनः ।
“ोकारभाषेः” युरोहितम् ।
यद्यदेवानुसरणेश्वरी विसर्गाः चन्द्राः विसर्गाः विना ब्राह्मणप्रस्माने गुणाधिकृतम्
अरुतारो अरुतारं शब्दमालालोकायेन विनियोजितं परे? (११) श्रविष्टो चतुर्वेदिनी श्रावानं ।
चारां शब्दमालालोकायेन विनियोजितं परे? (११) श्रविष्टो चतुर्वेदिनी श्रावानं ।
चारां शब्दमालालोकायेन विनियोजितं परे? (११) श्रविष्टो चतुर्वेदिनी श्रावानं ।
लोकः । प्रीतः ।
चारानंस्तरे सुशास्त्रेऽ तत्वेऽ विसर्गान्तं परेऽ चारानं सुशास्त्रेऽ तत्वेऽ विसर्गान्तं परेऽ ।
चारानं सुशास्त्रेऽ तत्वेऽ विसर्गान्तं परेऽ ।
चारानं सुशास्त्रेऽ तत्वेऽ विसर्गान्तं परेऽ ।

पाणिनिय-शिचा

चात्मा बुझ्या समेत्यार्थानु मनो युड्क्तो विवचया ।

/// मनः कायामिवसाहि स प्रेरयति मारतम् ///

मारतस्वरूपि चरन् मन्द्रं जनयति खर्मः।

/// प्रातःसवनयोगं तं क्रड्को गायचमारितम् ///

सूयनः। जि भा सू ल स घा चैति। × काक्तुकः कञ्चपफायती। व्रताः कुपि ।

शसी योः पश्चातः। बुझ्यार्विवसःजिल्लामुनोपशानीया जयोगवाहा जायायखान-भगिनोः

यमाभिसत्तकः ख्वानं भजनितवर्धः। तुः सुई ड्ड ती ति। धैर्याः

सङ्कोचनः ख्वालम्स्त्रा हुतं। एववारो द्वारेष्मेवायतः। 

चक्षुरारुः धैर्यः

कायः। बुझ्याराजयो ख्वालतानाः पवच पहुः वा। एववैस्त्रीर्षिर्गतः

वधार्याः विधाय सम्ब्राति वर्णोतप्तिः वक्रमः उत्तप्ताधित्याविधिविशेषमः

चाहः—भा अनि ति। अतनिीलः सरणस्तिग्रो बादनश्रो तो त्रयोदशिन्धृतितीतः

कर्मःतः)भा “तस्य हेतुसः सद्दस्वार् प्रथोति तेन प्रयोगोतिपयु भांमा निजामतिः

चल्यो वा मुर्ध्वम् वान्यश्रो वा शरीरदेभिः।” (हक्खाए.४४.२) इति विन्द्यायने।

“एववै सम्ब्रादीद्वारा अन्त्तरा तु समुदाय पारं ज्योतिशस्याम्बे खेन क्रपेदानिष्टम्

निषेध्याः” (काल्पो.५.१२) इत्येवं क प्रायो उदाहरितते प्रयोगश्रावर्तमाना

था वेति बुझ्याराजयो प्रतिपादितो बुझ्याराजयिन्ध्रयेन वर्धनम् प्रयोगनाति

निविल मनि इन्द्रयेन वासं बोजयति प्रेरयति, तवि भानि कायार्वसमिति जाताधिनिम्

आनिकाः प्रेरयति। सौधायनिन्तम्तसं वादव प्रेरयति ///

माहौ तिथि ति। स बाणुप्रक्षिपत्ता उरसि ड्डेये चरन् मन्द्रं खरं,

“सहितं चोः” (त.५२.१२)।वाच्यना मन्द्र रक्त प्रस्योः, जनयकुशः पद्यायति।

तं खरं प्रातःसवनयुङ्गायमं छन्दः चारितं जनाविताः। मन्द्रया बाचा

प्रातःसवनमिति तोममसं। (यद्विषयः एव) कल्यः। ///
कसए माध्यमिन्युः मध्यमं तैधुभानुग्मः

||5|| तारं तारियसवनं श्रीपाल्यं जागतानुगमः ||6||
सोद्वरीणि मूःगभिषितो वधनामपि मार्तः ।

||6|| वर्षिज्ञ जनयते तेषां विभागः पञ्चया स्रूतः ||7||
खरतः कालतः ख्याततः प्रयोगानुप्रदानतः ।

||7|| इति वर्षिनितः प्राण्यनिर्मितः तेन निवेर्यतः ||8||
उद्धारणुवर्तात् खरितश खरस्वयः ।

||8|| क्षो दृष्टिः सुति इति कालति निमाय सुचि ||9||
* उद्धारे निषादगणावरावनुदात्र कथभवैवति ।

खरितग्रामवा स्रोते गड्डमध्यमपञ्चमः ||10||

क वष इति । तं मार्तं कसए माध्यमिन्युः मध्यमस्वर्तः
विद्युपक्षुः जानिवयात् तू सीरणां श्रीपाल्योऽसि । "श्रीपाल्यस्वर्ती"ति (पा. ६.१.६०)
भिषरः श्रीपाल्यः ॥ तत्तत स्वर्वः जागतानुगमः जानिवयात् ॥॥

तौ हरे श्रीति ॥ स वायुवदारणि सुविन्य । चहारी (? ) अभिन्नः फलितः
वन्यिवर्तं प्रायश सरणोऽरं जनयते । “संहितायामः” (पा. ६.१.७२) भविषयः
“सोद्वरी लोपे चेतु पादपुरुषः” (पा. ६.१.१२४) इति सोद्वरी सुपि तथा ।
“वानी” निर्विशेषसदनादुचरणि श्रीपाल्यस्वर्ती वर्णगंगामवर्णकरणीः
नामी प्रममुखिताः मध्यमें वृहस्वर्ता वाचकी कर्मविश्वदु वीर्यां
जः इति ॥ तथा च मकरः । “वासारी वाक्यपरिमितदानीति
विद्युप्तमे मेन सन्निविषयः । शुद्ध त्रिः निषादिता वेश्यक्ति तुरीयं वाची
मनुष्यो वदनि” (रक्षा । १.९४,४४) इति ||

तेषां सरणां वधनामपि विभागः पञ्चयाः स्रूतः । तमेव दर्शयति
खरतः इति उद्धारणुवर्तात्रिदिशिः कालत उच्चारात् ख्यातदर्शित्वात्
प्रयोगः पञ्चयाः पञ्चयाः अनुप्रदानतः । पञ्चयाः पञ्चयाः अनुप्रदानकारी
व्याख्याः । तत्तत्त्व वधनामपि नितरं जानिवी ||१०-१२||

1. Be. omits कः इति. 2. MSS. after this त्य भवः. 3. MSS. याब्राह्म.
पाणिनीय-मित्रा

चतुः स्मानानि वर्णानामाः कण्ठः शिरस्था ।

॥९॥ जिज्ञासूलं च दन्ताश नासिकोऽहो च तालूः च ॥१२॥

* चोभावश विधतिष्ठ शपसा रेभ एव च ।

जिज्ञासूलमुक्तगम्य च गतिर्दहनविधीयनः ॥१४॥

* यदोभावप्रसभान्तमुकारायान्वितं पदम् ।

खरानः ताहसं वियातुः यदन्वधारामुक्तगम्यः ॥१५॥

हकारं पद्माभिक्रमाः स्थासनमुक्तम् ।

॥१०॥ चौरसं तं विजानीयात् कण्ठकमांशसंयुक्तम् ॥१६॥

कण्ठकाव्याविरुचियशास्तालयं चिक्षाजानितः ।

॥११॥ सुपुष्वन्या कदुरा दन्या खुतुलसा: स्मृता: ।

॥१२॥ जिज्ञासूली तु कुः प्रोकतो दम्योऽधोऽवः स्मृतो वुः: ॥१७॥

च द्वा विष्ठिन निगदीयः ॥२-१५॥

का र भित्र वर्णाः पंचमे; क्रजयनमे; च पुनः चन्द्रे; संयुक्तं

हकारं चौरसं च वर्णानीयाः संयुक्तं। चतुर्नेत्रं के लवं हकारं

कण्ठकाम च चुः ॥१६॥

क खुत्ता व द्वा विष्ठिन। अहो अवर्णेहकारी कण्ठेऽहो स्मानाम। धुनयभंगः

स्मानामाः। उच्छवसंगगां यकारः प्रकाशिते विष्ठित:। [वद्]-वद्युत्कशानवर्तितं

हलं तत्तत्तुसुरस्मानारमात्रं स्वयं। 'अभोकारोऽवर्णनी वर्णां वोधिते

उद्देश्तितव।। उच्छवसंगगांस्कारः। उच्छवसंगगां नकारः सकाराश दश्यः स्मृतः।

तु पुनर्सैत्वम् सूले कवर्गः

शाचायनरन्निध्रेः प्रोक्त: “स्यथ पषव जस्या जिज्ञासुमुक्तोऽयोः प्रथमसं वर्गः”। (वद् प्र. १.१५) ।

दि शैतिकाः ॥। चतुरां धीमदिमिदनातोऽवाः सुभोऽद्वस्तः ॥१७॥

1. Be. माझकमाधिकर। 2. Be. चचाकार।
15\(b\) चलावुवेरीनिविषेषी दत्तमूल्यं स्थाननु।
16\(a\) चनुकारस्य कर्तव्यो निल्यं ज्ञोः श्रवणिवापि।
   * यथा सौराष्ट्रिका नारीत तथा कृत्यमिहायते।
   एवं रहगः प्रयोक्तव्यं खे चराः इव खिद्या।
12\(b\) एवं तु कष्ठतालव्या चोथिः कष्टः तथाः स्मृतः।
13\(a\) चर्चांतु। कष्ठस्य एकारीकायोभवेत्।
14\(b\) उपसाधनीया ज्ञाना च दिक्षासूचीयायनासिनि।
15\(a\) चयोगाविद्या विद्वेदाः चायस्यवधान्यादिनः।
   * स्मृतमुपयोगाय चैव विधतं करणं स्मृतम्।
   तेषांपि विनिवागिनी ताम्यामेची तथैव च।

च तु स्मः र ख्ये। चचन्तकारी नासिनिको ब्रह्मेः।
एतते ह्वार्गि ब्रह्माय त्।
वर्गीयं पदमाः ग्रंथिनमा नासिनिकः। (१)।
हरिप्रस्वर्गश्च नवर्गश्चान्यस्य भविः।
कष्ठतालुष्यां जातविवेणवयिः स्मृतः।
चोथिः कष्ठोऽर्थां जाती स्मृतः।
सूचिपीघ्रादिक्यो जस्तो प्रचुः प्रतिवेदः।
तत्र विवेणिः—च रो र यो नवर्गावर्तमा कष्ठाः भवेतः।
चया व्यक्तोऽर्थां वदवद्वा भाषा ज्योऽर्थां
इकारीकारार्थापीः एः [चोः] ्
कस्मेव विनिवागिनी संहत्याब्रह्मे च।
ए या नी य इति व्याख्यातः। (१५-१७)।

ज्ञष्ठा निविषे।
हरिप्रस्वर्गश्च चया विधतं करणं प्रयोगः स्मृतं ग्रहे।
तेषां एडः एडः चयास्यवधानाविन्यासी ताम्यामुः [चोः]
एः चोः विनिवागिनी।
व्याख्यातमन्यते। (२२)।

1. Be. चे।
2. Be. लालर्वानविषेषी।
3. लालर्वानविषेषी।
4. लालिकार।
5. Be. लालिकारार्थापिठानी।
6. Be. लाली।
7. लालिकार।
8. लालिकार।
9. Be. तेषां एडः एडः।
10. Be. adda तेषां एडः ताम्यामुः ए बनराजगया विनिवागिनी।
||16b|| चौप्रय द्वा यथायोऽवनेनमस्य क्षण: शलस्यः।
शेषा: स्पर्शः इव: प्रोता निविधानुप्रदानन्तः। ||23।।
||17|| चमोतुलनासिकानोऽनि नादिनो भभिषः सृष्टः।
द्वाप्रभुवः यज्ञशंक्य प्रवासिनर्तुः ख्यातः।
||18|| द्विप्रच्छुपासांसूत्रो विदयाँ गोपामेतत् प्रचंचवति।
* कुतीर्यार्यानतं दश्ममपवर्षं च भयवितम्।
* मुतीर्यार्यानतं व्यतं लामार्यः मुश्ववधितम्।
मुखरेण सुवनोऽध्रुवः प्रयुतं ब्रह्म राजति। ||24।।

नि यो भा नु प्र दा न च द्रति। ब्रह्म प्रवाख्यमद्वाणं स्वसाधानात् ब्रह्मसाधानं
मुखार्यमेत्त्वनं द्रव्यं द्रव्यं निवेदित जानोहि। ||25।।

भ सो नु ना सि का द्रति। भ इ उ ए। कः च। 
ऐ ची च। च य व रट। ल च। जाभ डः न म। एतिमोलनासिकाका
धर्मान्विता। भजभवतः: नादिन: भाजनौद्राणाः। जवगद्गा वपुः
किर्मिनयुनानादुनुप्रदानः: खऽमलः। ख्यासिनस्तुः [चन्तकय]श्रपसा किर्मिन- 
नन्यानुभावः जानोहि। एतद्गोर्वेचो: धाम खानाम: भाचायाः: प्रचंचवति ||26।।

चेतस्यां वशयसुपुरुषमन: श्रवर्ज्जक्ष निवृत्त चू ती ब्रत दिति। अनन्तर- 
चनानात्त तोवार्दु युगोः। “नन्यातागमयोऽसोऽससः कथितुणू जले: गुराविः”तिनाम- 
विस्मितभावैः। प्राप्त: द्रम्य भवतवद्व गतरसस्य च यरवतवर्षमृ: प्रत्यावलितस्वावलित स्वावलित स्वावलितः च 
भयवितम् आनुदारादु छष्टं तत्तथ चौप्रयवितु: परिसोचो नास्ति। 
क्योः प्राप्तिः च, इशहिः किर्मिनयुत मोचो नास्तिनी। ||2५।।

धीर्यति च सु ती तृत्य दिति। सुसुरोः प्रामस्य: चायस्य: स्वसाधारणी ब्रह्म 
वेदाश्च राजति श्रीमते। ||२६।।

1. Be, omits नादानुद्राणा:.....प्रसतः
2. Be. प्रेमबनी
न करालो न लम्बोढी नाम्यतो नानानासिकः।
गद्र्दि वन्दन्जन्म योगानः यथोमहात्॥२७॥

* यथा व्यासी हरेत् पुनान् दंशामिनि च पार्थिवे।
भीता प्रतिमेधिन्ययः तदाद्व वर्णान् योगायेत्॥२८॥

* एवं वर्णः प्रयोज्यवा नाम्यता न च पीडिताः।
सम्यक्ष्यान्याये त्रह्लोकं महीयते॥२८॥

* अभ्यासार्यं दुःखं अनुः योगार्यं तु मध्यमाम्।
शिवायातमुपदेशार्यं कुयांटं अनुः भिविताम्॥२०॥

* श्रद्धा: श्रद्धा द्वाराद् द्राचीपुरुष धीमते।
द्राचीपुरुषाधिनिना धनेन्द्र यथातं भुविः।
रक्षभूण्डसिद्ध शास्त्रं सृष्ट्याः संप्रथा कार्यत्वाम्॥२१॥

न क रा ल द्रति। नवारो ‘नानानासिक’पदार्थ अभिये योजनि:॥२७॥
य थाति। पतनं च भेदज्ञ तौ ताम्यं भीता व्यासी भ्रापद्वातिक्षो यथा
पुरान्ते वालान्ते दंशामिनि पीडविते तदाद्व वर्णान् बुधाद्विति॥२८॥

एं व मि ति। एवं नाम्यता: न पीडितात्व वर्णः प्रयोजनः॥। सम्यकः
स्त्रान्नप्रयोज्याग्निनां योगोत्तेन योगायेन व्र्द्धोको योगोत्तेन पूर्वते किं
पुनमूलं लोकत्वम् द्रति भावः, एवं सम्यक्ष्या: खरङ्गामधितुष्ट्यः: खादू ध्वर्धः॥२८॥

भ भ्या सा संं द्रति। दुःखं विलब्बतं मध्यमाम् अभ्यासायर्यं कुयां॥
अवस्थानमयतु॥२०॥

श च द द्रति। म सुखं श्रावच्चालिरिगाणथं श्रमनं करोतिति श्रद्धा: प्रिवः: श्रद्धकरणोऽत्र श्रद्धास्त्रिविवाहः।
द्राची द्राचिकापला “तस्यापल्लू” (पृ. ४.१८२) अक्षण: “श्रवद्रापल्लू” (पृ. ४.१६५) इवादिना भोपत्तु: पुनर्या
धोमेतत्संगुन्ये प्रातादु। कोंकावालितः श्रद्धायाम् भाष—दा श्री यथा
द्रति। य: पाणिणि: पाणिनोऽसुवापल्लू “ब्राह्म वद्य” (पृ. ४.१५५)

1. इ पनिः।
पाणिनीय-मिच्छा

* लिनयनमुखनं:प्रस्तामिमां
  य दृढः पठेत् प्रयतः सदा हिजः।
  स भवति पश्चपुवकीर्तिमानं
  सुखमत्तलं च समस्तु ते द्रिवि द्रिवीति॥२॥

वेन पाणिनिनं इच्छं प्रवचनं श्रद्धाश्रयं व्याख्यातमं उक्तम्।
तभी पाणिनियं नम
 द्रिति ॥ दूरवण सम्बन्धं।
 पाणिनियं द्रिति पाठं श्रुतादिलं (पा. ४.१.१२२) कथ्याम्।
 र द्रव्यं च सामुन्ति उक्तम्॥३॥

"द्रव्यं य न न सुख निति छ तत् सामुन्ति॥ यो हिजो वेदार्थिकारो [प्रयतः]:
 साधारणं सदा निर्मलस्य [इभम्] पठेत् स [दृढः] पश्चपुवकीर्तिमानं भवति।
 द्रिवि शुभम् चतुरं समस्तु ते भुनिति, सर्गं व्यापृय वा।
 दिविचयं शिष्याध्यायेन समासारङ्गः॥
 विष्णुतिच्छद्विषद्विधममपरब्रह्मत्तम् “श्रवणमा च चर्चा” (पि. ५.२१)
 इद्यविकाय, “परस्परं नौ लोभनू जोत्स”(पि. ५.४०)विति लब्धा प्रस्वरात्॥
 द्रितिः शिष्याध्यायेन: समासः॥३॥

---

1. L Be. ७४,
2. Be. omits द्रित।
3. L Be. लिनयनमुखनिं प्रस्तामी
4. L reads also संवत् १५५१ विंवादे औऽहो यशांतिपदं दूरवणारंभदिनी औकायम्।
   औद्धत्विनायकसरिसौ प्रभुप्राणाय शुखमंगलमणिञ्च विन्क्षितसिद्धम्।
   ॥ ॥ श्रीकीर्तिकादेशसमाः ॥
V. यजुःशाणीया (The Yajus Recension)

पश्च शिष्योऽपवलस्य पालिनोयं मतं यथा।
शैवानुवृत्तं तदृ विद्वान्त यथोत्ते लोकवेद्योः॥१॥
प्रविष्टमवि श्रवाध्यः अवनिष्ठात्तम् प्रजुविन्मिति:।
प्रवेशः लोकवेद्योऽवि उच्चार्यने विधिम्॥२॥
तिथिषियुः विद्विन्य वर्षाः। सम्भवतो मनः।
प्राश्यते संख्यति चापि छयां प्रोक्ता: छयामुवा॥३॥

खरा विशिष्टिरिक्ष स्पर्शः पद्धविषिः।

॥१॥ याद्वयस्मृता च्छोदो चलवारः चमा:। स्मृताः॥४॥
चनुसारो विसर्गः व्ययोऽः चापि ोऽराश्योः।

॥२॥ दुःस्माध्योऽवि व्याय: खङ्गारः। सुते एव च।॥५॥

यथा सेराधिका नारो ोऽद्धो ख्यामाथ्ये।
एवं राजः विज्ञानीयतः। के चरां द्रव खेदया॥६॥

खङ्गारः प्रज्ञमेवुत्तमः ोऽन्तः ख्यामाथ्यो संयुतम्।

॥१०॥ त्रैरसं तं विज्ञानीयतः कष्टामाहसंयुतम्॥७॥

आत्मा उद्भवः ोऽमयो व्यक्ता ोऽवधाय।

॥३॥ मनः कायानिमान्नान्ति स प्रेरयति माहतम्॥८॥

1. B यूअ.।
2. C सम्पूर्ण, L5 दुमुंदे।
3. B पराश्ये, L पराश्यती।
4. CD तक राविविभीष्टे, L5 तक राविविभीष्टे।
5. CL राजः: प्रयोज्यतः। के चरा द्रव खेदया।
6. CL भवः: ख्यामाथ।
7. CL चीरः।
8. CDL सम्बलारामुः।
पाणिनीय-शिचा

मात्रत्सूर्यसि चरण्र मन्द्र जनमति खरम् ।

॥४॥ प्रातः सवनयोगः तं स्थनो गायत्रमालिन्यम् ॥७॥

करते माध्यान्तनुयुगः मध्यमं बैद्यभानुगम् ।

॥५॥ तारं तात्तिष्यसन्वन्ध शैवल्यां जागतानुगम ॥१०॥

सोदरेणी सूध्रस्वभिषतो वल्लमापम्य सारतः ।

॥६॥ वर्षात् जनमते तेषां विभागः पञ्चवा स्रूतः ॥११॥

खरतः कालः स्थानात् प्रवःनातुप्रदर्शानतः ।

॥७॥ इति वर्षावंदः प्राकुविन्युगः तं निवृत्त्व ॥१२॥

चष्टी स्थानानि वर्षानामुरः कष्टः शिरस्यथा ।

॥९॥ जित्रानुशृं च दुन्ताय नासिकोषी च तालु च ॥१३॥

उदात्स नियादग्राम्यारावसन्द्रचो ऋषभचैवरतीः

स्थिरभ महा श्रेते वज्जयवममध्यमः ॥१४॥

भौरावख विभिषिन्च ब्रह्मसा निर्द एव च ।

जिद्धामूलम् उपयो च गतिर्दिविहोन्त: ॥१५॥

'वधोभावासमानम् उकारारिपुपदम्

स्त्रातं तात्त्बं विवाह सुदु ब्रह्मद्व अङ्गम् जनमण: ॥१६॥

सम्मेधोऽचामते द्राम्मु अध्यमु च भवितम् ।

'न तथा परिमौचोचस्ति पापार्दिव किलिपालः ॥१७॥

सुषागीयदं चामते 'पमे स्त्रायायः सुयविशिलम्

सुकर्णः सुविन्दियां प्रयुत्स्म यशा 'राजतिः ॥१८॥

न करालो न सम्वेशो नाथको नासिकसिकः

गात्रो वर्जनित्व प्रयोगानु बहुमु भैरवतः ॥१८॥

1. Weber reads ोवशानमकारारिपरः
2. CDL न तद्द पारते मौचोचस्ति
3. CDL भवान-सायणे
4. CDL राजते.
यज्ञःशाखीया

'यथा व्यांति चरतुः पुत्राः राजमिनः च पीड्यते।
भोज वाजिहेस्तामाः तत्तदां वर्गिणः प्रयोजयते॥२०॥
एवं वर्षीः प्रयोजाः नाथ्यका न च पीडिता।
सम्यगवर्धीयोगेष्मा ब्रजालोके 'सहीयते॥२१॥
चत्यासार्धं हुनं हस्तिं प्रयोगार्धं तु मध्यमाम।
शिष्याध्यामुः उपदेशार्धं कुदाठूः हस्तिं विलबितामू॥२२॥

उद्वत्तत्तुल्रात्र्त्रथ सहितथा सरङ्गः।

॥८॥ ऋक्षो दौर्वः सुत इति कालों नियमं ८वचि॥२३॥
काष्ठावहचित्वशुषोपरालोकं चौहाणुपु।

॥१॥ सुमयेश्वर्णा कुटुर्णा रन्या यंतुम्: सूर्याः: िेर्माः॥२४॥
जिद्वासूति तु कः प्रोक्तो दन्यायों वः सम्बोधी दुर्वे।

॥१२॥ ए ए तु ४कष्ठातळा चो धो कष्ठोत्तरी च चारः॥२५॥
चार्यतानाः तु ५कण्ठाक्ष्या एकारीकार्येभिः।

॥१३॥ ६एकारीकार्योमांगा तथोविविधसांवतमः॥२६॥
॥१४॥ उपाधानीय जप्ता च जिद्वासूयानासिकः।
चयोगवाहा विनेया ७काश्यक्षणानामविन्॥२७॥

॥१५॥ चलावनीपिण्यानिविन्धो द्वलमूल्यः ६खरानुः।

॥१६॥ चनुकारस्तु करत्वो नि१ः धो: श्रविषेषु च॥२८॥

ॐ भस्माः च सरसाः च विहतं कार्यं स्रुतम्।
तेजोपिः ११विविविहाराण्डो १२शक्यामुः ऐचारी तत्तोऽपि च॥२८॥

1. CDL वाणी यदा...द्राम्याः न च ।
2. CDL न दीयैते।
3. A दचि।
4. CL काष्ठालावा।
5. A कःशः; CDL. कःशः चाठ एकार्योर।
6. Weber reads १कारीकार्योमांगा ए ए, CDL चीकारीकार्योमांगा तथोविविधसांवतम्।
7. CL शायवायासानामवि:।
8. AL द्वलमूल्यः, BW दलः, CW मूल्यः।
9. CL चर्चाः पर्वः।
10. CL सरासः उद्यः।
11. ABW विविविहाराण्डो।
12. AW तारासमी, CL तारामेनी सचैद्वः।
पाणिनी-शिवाचा

16|| चाचोनसुष्ठा १ऽणस्कीवेशने सस्त्रा: शल: स्रृताः।
शेषा: स्त्रा हल: प्रोक्ता निवोधायुपदानतः। ||२०||
17|| यमोङ्गुनासिका १५नधी नादिनो १४हभेष: स्रृताः।
विश्वादा ५स्यजशशय प्रसातिसन्तु खकादयः। ||२१||
18|| विषवं अस्तंब्रो विवादु गोचरंते प्रचक्षल।
शिर: शाही म्रान्तु दाचीपुत्राय घीमति। ||२२||
दाचीपुत्र: पाणिनियो वेनिद्व अवायतं शुभ।
रवभूस्थम् इदं शास्त्रं दुधिप्रवयं सम्रकाशितम्। ||२३||
वेनाचरसमाश्चायम् विद्वाग्य महेश्वरात्।
कल्प्मे आकर्ष्यं प्रोत्तं तथे पाणिनियं नमः। ||२४||
६ब्रम्हस्य: खमिन: सतास्मू इमां
य इह पाठे। १०प्रयत: सदा विजः।
स भवति ११बद्धपुनर्वितिमात्रः
१२कामां च भूतां च समुहाते दिवि दिवीति। ||२५||

1. CL नेमे: सूर्या शर, B नेमसूर्या: शल: ; AW नेमसूर्या
2. CL यो, B वस्ती (पूर्वी sec. m) AW अमो.
3. CL नडो.
4. B शनुश; CL वस्ती यशु, ABW य य वस्तु।
5. AW देशस्वामरी. 6. B देशस्वाम, C देशस्वाम. 7. ABW शवरी।
8. CL पाणिनिना. 9. CL विमयोमभिवृक. 10. CL प्रयत्न.
11. Weber reads चन्द्रिकाम before प्रस्तुतान्य. 12. CL चतुं च समुहं समुहते.
VI. कठक्षाप्रवचन (The Rk Recension

[१]

श्रन्थीप्रक्ष्णाल्यि पाणिनीसं मतं यथा।
’गाः गाः गाः गाः तदवादु यथोत्कोकवेदयो।'॥१॥
प्रसिद्धमय शन्यार्थम् अविश्वातमु अवशुभिम्।
पुनार्थोकादिकम् वाच वङ्ग वाचारिकम् विषम्।॥२॥
चिरिया/सद्विक वक्षोऽिष्मे। 'शशुभमति मताः।
प्रांकति संध्विति चापि द्वयं प्रोक्ता। खयमव्या।॥३॥
खरा विश्वतिरेक्ष्य स्थारां स्वादिकसं प्रचविष्यति।

॥१॥ यदमश्व स्मृता तत्र चाप्ते चत्वारस्व यमा। स्मृता।॥४॥
चनुकारी विसर्गम् ३ ्सर्य चपि परापिर्मित।
॥२॥ दुप्पाप्तिस्ति विकार: खाकारः समु एव च।॥५॥

[२]

चाचा बुश्रा 'समेय्यार्थानू मनो युक्ते विवचया।

॥३॥ मन: कायाग्निमाहिनि स प्रर्थिति मार्तम्।॥६॥
मार्तमार्तसुरसि चरनु मन्द्रे जनयति कर्म।

॥४॥ ग्रात: सवनयोंगं तं कर्त्ते गायमााश्रितम्।॥७॥
कष्ठे माध्यमन्दिनयुगं मथं मेतुभानुगम।

॥५॥ तारं तारं तारं वसवं श्रीपश्यक्याण्यं जङ्गलानुगम।॥८॥

पाणिनी-विश्वा

सोद्रणी मूष्णं ब्रिहत्तो वाक्यमापदा मारतः।

॥६॥ वर्णाच्छ जनयते तेषां विभागः पद्धथा सृृतः ॥८॥

सरतः कालतः स्थानात् प्रयवानुप्रदानतः।

॥७॥ इति वर्णविवि: प्राहुणिनियिणं तं निवोधत ॥१०॥

[३]

उद्दत्तव्यानुदात् खरितशाखाराश्य:।

॥८॥ इति दौर्शं सृृत इति कालतो नियमा प्रचि ॥११॥

उदात्ते निवाद्गामारावनुदात् कथमभेदैति:।

खरित्तमभवा इति 'पद्धमथमपद्धमा: ॥१२॥

चछी स्थानानि वर्णानामव: कालः: शिरस्यथा:।

॥९॥ जिज्ञामूलम् च दृष्टाण्य नासितोष्ट्वी च तातु च ॥१२॥

ब्रोयभाव विद्विषिः शपसा रेर एव च।

जिज्ञामूलमु उपस्था च गतिरस्तविधिविण्याः: ॥१४॥

योगभावप्रसणानम् उदारादिपरं पदम्।

खराणं तात्तन्त किदाद यदवदु यथतम् अप्रण:॥१५॥

[४]

हकारं श्च श्रमिन्नामम् ॥चन्तः: स्थाभित्र संयुतम्।

॥१०॥ चौरस्यं तं विजनानीयात् कह्नामहस्तान्युतम् ॥१६॥

कह्नामहव्याहस्तान्यशास्त्रव्याः चौरस्यायुपु:।

॥११॥ सुभृवेंद्या कह्नश्च दृश्या लक्षुलः स्मृता:॥१७॥

जिज्ञामूले सुदूरः कालो दृश्योष्ट्रो व: सृृताः कुस्व:।

॥१२॥ ए ए तु कह्नाधानाय चो चौरस्यान्तोष्ट्री ॥१८॥

1. Y शहारपमथमपद्धमा: 2. Y जनाः: खौष्पथा: 3. Y चौरस्य,
कठक्षाशीया
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चर्मावता तु दक्षाया चेङ्कायारोथेवित् ।

[[13]] चेङ्कायारोथेविता तयोविरूपसंहात ॥ २८ ॥

संहातं मार्गिनं चेपं विनंतं तु हिमालिकम् ।

घोषा वा संहाता: सवं अग्रोषा विन्वता: खृष्टा: ॥ २० ॥

[[५]]

सचाराम् कथेण दैव विनंतं कर्मं खृतम् ।

तेष्योपि विन्वताविविदी ताभ्याम् ऐची तथैव च ॥ २१ ॥

[[14]] रनुकारयमानां च नासिका स्थानमुख्ये।

चयोगावहा विन्यो: ॐ ाशयस्थानभागिनः ॥ २२ ॥

[[15]] चलावुविवावानिर्घिरी दन्तमूलः ॐ खरानुः।

[[16]] रनुकारस्तु कर्त्यो निलं जी: शपसिषु च ॥ २३ ॥

रनुसारे विन्वतं तु विरामे चावराहिते।

विरोधी तु विग्रहीयादु यत्तिकारबारणे: ॥ २४ ॥

्यायी यथा हरेतु पुनानु इद्धाभ्यान न च प्रेरिततु।

भोता पतनेहद्धाभ्यां तदइ वर्षान् प्रयोजयेतु ॥ २५ ॥

[[६]]

यथा ० एराठ्ठिका नारी तकां इलिमिनावित।

एवं ॐ रक्ष: प्रयोजयाः खे चरां देव खृदया ॥ २६ ॥

राज्यवर्म वेयुजीर्युमा नो ग्रेशु पूर्णम् अचराम्।

दोर्च्य सिंहरुपुजोयानु पदाभासंकम चाचरेतु ॥ २७ ॥

हदये चैकामान्तु चर्ममायिनु मूर्त्तिन।

नासिकामा लघार्य च रसुताविहिमावता ॥ २८ ॥

1. Ch कठक्षाया चादिकारीकरः, Y कठक्षाया एकार्यकरः
2. Y जापणां च खराणां च.
3. Y तसोपि च.
4. Y has after this वह्यावागिन्य ज्ञाता च व्यासायुविनाथमात्रिक.
5. Y ाशयस्थानभागिनः.
6. CL. खरानु च.
7. Y यथा अभ्यार्यः इद्धाभ्यान च.
8. Y रक्ष: विकासीवात।
पाशिनी-शिचा

'श्यामाषुकेन तिथनु कांदेन श्रमलुस्चरन् ।
मार्क्ष्यं च हिमालं च जयवं देव निदर्पनाम् ॥२॥
मथे तु कम्येतु कम्यम् उमी पार्व्यं ॥सभो भवेत् ।
सर्वं कम्येतु कम्यं श्रीस्वति निदर्पनाम् ॥३॥

[७]

यवं वर्षसः प्रयोक्तव्या नावर्तका न च पोडितः ।
सम्पुर्णमप्रयोगिणः व्रजङमोकते महीयते ॥३१॥
गोदर्शकृ शिरःकम्यो तथा सिद्धितपाठः ।
चलनर्तस्वगाधरे स्थिते पाठकार्थाः ॥३२॥
माधुर्यम् च चाचरव्यतः पद्धते दस्तु सुकारः ।
देवः कल्याणः (?) च स्थिते पाठकाः (?) सुशुः ॥३३॥
श्रीभद्रम् भृगुभद्रम् षुद्धुपुष्टम् अनुवस्थम् अनुवस्थितम।
काकश्चरं 'रीविम्रसं तथा खानाविवजितम् ॥३४॥
उपवृष्टि दर्शनः लगिनं स्रवितं विलसितं ग्रजितं प्रजनस्तम्।
निषोदितं ब्रह्मस्तवाचरं च वर्जेऽवर्जे न तु मार्क्ष्यमास्तम् ॥३५॥
प्रातः पयातिवाचम् ज्ञ्ज्ञिनीन खरेई शाशू लक्षतोमिन ।
मध्यदिनी चाकारम्भं चेतु चक्रार्दशेच्छृतिलक्षणमिन ॥३६॥
तारं तु विवाहां सवनं श्रोतर्वियोगितं तच सदा प्रयोक्तम।
'भयूरचर्चायकामकराणा तुवेन नादिन शिराप्रिनीति ॥३७॥

[८]

॥१६॥
चाचोसुदाः यथास्वत्तेश्वरसुदाः: 'श्याः समु ताः ।
श्रीमता: सुधा हल: प्रीता निवेदात्तुप्रदानत: ॥३६॥

॥१७॥
यमोऽनुवसितका 'नकसि नादिनो हभव: समु ताः ।
ईश्वराद्रा 'त्यसि जयशासिनस्तु ख्याताय: ॥३८॥

1. C "नादिन" ए "समो".
2. CL समी.
3. Weber reads वाडुर्दश.
4. Weber reads शिराप्रिनी.
5. श्रमलुस्चर.
6. च "समुदायतु".
7. Y शब.
8. Y नादि.


कक्षाखिया

18। ईष्णु सांभरो विदाँत गोर्धमितत् प्रचारति।

'दाचीपुजः पाणिनिना वैनेते 'द्यापिनं भूवि।
कहि: पाठी तु वेदेष्ब्रह्म। क्रियोध प्रजाति।
ध्वनियाम् अजनने चचुलिनिश्चां खोडः उचाने।
शिवा प्राणी तु वेदेष्ब्रह्म सुदूर व्याकरणं ग्रहतम्।
तथात् साइम् अधीवैव ब्रज़लोके महोदयि।

[५]

उदात्मम प्राच्यारति वषोऽज्ञातान्म प्रदेशिनीचूक्लिनविष्टम्।
उपानामः खरितं च कनिष्ठाकायामुदातस्मव।
उदात्म प्रदेशिनां विधात् प्रचयं मथ्योजीवलम्।
निउरतं तु कनिष्ठकाः सुरितयावकारिकाम्।
प्रतिवादस्म खाउदात्मः उदात्मः खुदात्मः नोचसरितम्।
मधोदात्मां खरितं वुदात्मा खुदात्मा निन्यदक्षिण्या।
अनिनिर्विवनोदात्माः सोम द्वाकायाद्वात्म प्रवृद्धातं।
व इववुदात्मां सोम नोचसरितम्।
इविवा मधोदात्मा खरितं खरितं वंद्यसरितम् खुदात्मः
इन्द्राकसरितो इस्ति ब्रह्मचात्मः।
सर्वादातो छद्दि श्रीवो सर्वादात उदाश्चत्।
खरितं शास्मूलीय: सर्वोऽनोधात्म: खृस्त:।

[१०]

चापक्तु वधी कालं हिमां चैव वायसः।
धीवो शैल विनां तु नकृत्स्वर्द्धामालकामः।
इन्द्राधिकारं द्रम्मपवर्षैं च महिम।
न तस्मां पाठे भीवोकिष्ट पापाहिरि सितिक्षिष्ठाभः।
पाषिनीय-शिचा

सुतीर्थाद्यागतः "यथा सच्चायं सुवर्ण्यतत्
सुभोगः सुवर्ण्यः प्रयुक्तः ब्रह्म राजति" ॥५१॥
मन्दो दीनः स्वतः वर्त्ति वा मिथ्याप्रयुक्तो न तमस्यात् ॥
स वाजव्यो धर्मानं हिन्दुस्ति यवेन्द्रव्रतः स्वरत्वपराधात् ॥५२॥
बहुवर्मम् (ि) अनुयुक्तं विशरं व्याचिपोरितम् ॥
चतुर्युपरि विभ्रमिः विवश्यादि (ि) वर्तं पतिः ममके ॥५३॥
इत्यथादानं योधितेः वर्षव्यवहितिम् ॥
कर्त्त्वयु: सामसर्द्धो विपोरितम् अधिगच्छति ॥५४॥
इत्यथा वेदं योधिते वर्षव्यवहितं संयुतम् ॥
कर्त्त्वयु: सामसिं पूतो ब्रह्मस्य विमोहयेत् ॥५५॥

[११]

शाकर: शाकरी प्राणदू दाचीपुत्राय धीमते ॥
वास्तेयम्: समाख्ये इति वाचसमि स्वित: ॥५६॥
शेनाचरसमाख्ये ध्रुवभम् अधिगच्छति मधेन्द्ररत: ॥
कतुष्म ब्याकरणे प्रोत्ति तस्य पाणिनये नम् ॥५७॥
शेन धौला निर: पूंसं विस्मते: ग्रह्वारितिः ॥
तमस्यानन्तं भिनं तस्य पाणिनये नम् ॥५८॥
भानान्यान्य लोकस्य भानान्यनागलाका ॥
चुगुलोकतिः शेन तस्य पाणिनये नम् ॥५९॥
"विनयनमभिन्नि:सशतामियां
य इश पठितु 'प्रयतन्त सदा हिज: ॥
स भवति धनधायुऽपस्पर्कोकातिमानः
"भावलस च सहस्य समयुक्ति दिवीति दिवीति ॥६०॥

प्रथ शिचाम, प्यन्म, उदात्तस, दक्कारं, स्वारां, स्वात:, नीती, अचरोषण, उदात्त, चायल, श्रावं एकादश ॥

द्रति पाषिनीय-शिचा समासा ॥

1. य अभाः । 2. य राजत। 3. य विनयगमभिन्निःशतामियाः
4. य प्रबन्धः सदा । 5. य सुखमयुक्तेः च सम् ।
परिशिष्टम्

चान्द-वर्णचूळवाणि

Varṇa-Sūtras of Candragomin

॥ ५ ॥

स्खानकरणप्रयत्नेभ्यो वर्णी जायले ॥१॥

तत्र स्खा न मु ॥२॥

कष्टः प्रकृतिविस्मित्वायमाः ॥३॥

कष्टतालुकम् इदेदैताम् ॥४॥

कष्टदृढम् उददैताम् ॥५॥

सूर्यः भद्रवशाम् ॥६॥

दन्ता: हतुसानाम् ॥७॥

नामिका अनुस्कारसं ॥८॥

स्खाननुनामिका: ड्रणस्मयः: ॥९॥

तातु: नदियानाम् ॥१०॥

चौदी: उपपानायीश्वः ॥११॥

दन्तीह: वकारसं ॥१२॥

जिष्मात्सूलं जिष्मात्सूलियश्व (यथौ:) ॥१३॥

कर या मु ॥१४॥

जिस्मायं दन्तानाम् ॥१५॥

जिस्मावर्ष तालवानाम् ॥१६॥

जिस्मापर्व तिलसानाम् ॥१७॥

श्रेष्ठः स्खानका(क)रणा: ॥१८॥

प्रयो तो हिवलः ॥१८॥

आभ्यंतरी वाल्लतः ॥२०॥

तत्त्र चा भ्य का छ: ॥२१॥

संबंधतवं विद्वतवं स्पष्टम् प्रेयुस्पष्टलम् च ॥२२॥

संबंधतवं प्रकारसं ॥२३॥
पाणिनी-मिथ्या

विन्दुमू जष्यां खराण्यां च इ।
तेभ्यो विन्दुट्वं लैटैदीतो: (लेवटैतो:) इ।
ताभ्यामू ऐदीतो: इ।
ताभ्यामःवणं इ।
खर्तुः खार्नामू इ।
प्रेषुखः लन्तःखानामू इ।

वा ख: इ।

वर्णां प्रथमदिनियां: प्रधानविषर्जनीयविज्ञामूलवियोधवानीवाच।
विन्दुकर्णः [बु:] नादानुप्रदाना ध्रुवे: इ।
प्रथमदिनियांप्रमाणम: गन्तःखार्नप्राणः इ।
विन्दुकर्णः सर्वः महाप्राणः इ।
वर्णांचर्तव्रकर्णः: सातुखारानःखस्तकरः
संज्ञकर्णः सु: नादानुप्रदाना घोरवन्तः इ।
विन्दुकर्णः: प्रधानविषर्जनीयवाचः इ।
का:यो मायवानाः: खर्नः इ।
खर्न: याहचः याचः इ।

भव चार्योः खर्नो दीर्घः प्रत्येकम् तदानुपदात्
खर्नेद्रभेदनेन सातुखासिकनिरतुनासिकेन चाही।
दशामध्यवर्तमानी भवति इ।

एवमिववृत्तिः खर्नेः इ।
खर्नेः दीर्घः मात्रेन भवहारः भवति इ।

एकाकारिको खर्न: इ।
हिमादिको दीर्घः इ।
हिमादिक: खु: इ
चैद्रद्वारः इ।
नीचेश्वरद्वारः इ।
सामार्गः: खर्नितः इ।
खर्नानुतनासिको निरतुनासिकः इ।
विन्दुखर्नाय रेववाजिता: सातुनासिका निरतुनासिकार्यते इ।
इति चान्द्रवर्णसुवर्णि समासानि ॥
THE PĀṆINIYA-SIKṢĀ

With Translation and Notes (Critical and Exegetical)
THE PĀṇINĪYA SIKSĀ

WITH TRANSLATION AND NOTES (CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL)

[a i u-ṇ || r l-k || e o-ṇ || ai au-c || ha ya va ra-t || la-n ||
āma na na-nam || jha bha-ñ || gha ḍha ḍha-ś || ja ba ga ḍa da-ś ||
kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta-ṛ || ka pa-y || ṣa ṣa sa-ṛ || ha-l.]

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

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

Atha sīkṣāṁ pravakṣyāmi Pāṇinīyaṁ matam yathā |
śastrānupūrvyam tad vidyād yathāktaṁ loka-vedayoh || (1)
Prasiddham api sābdārtham avijñātam abuddhibhiḥ |
punar vyaktikarisyāmi vāca uccārane vidhim || (2)
Tri-ṣaṣṭiḥ catuk-ṣaṣṭīr vā varṇāḥ sambhavato matāḥ |
Prākṛte Sanskrte cápi svayam proktāḥ Svayambhuva || (3)

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

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

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

Svarā vimśatir ekaś ca sparśānām paṅca-vimśatih I
yādayas ca smṛtā hy aṣṭau catvāraś ca yamāḥ smṛṭāḥ II (4)

Anusvāro visargaś ca ḫau cāpi parāśrayau I
duḥśprṣṭaś cēti vijñeyo ḫ-kāraḥ plutā eva ca II (5)

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

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

Table I.

| Vowels according to the PS. and the Prātisākhyas. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PS. | a | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā |
| APR. | a | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā |
| RPr. | a | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā |
| TPr. | a | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā |
| VPr. | a | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā |
| BT | a | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā | ā |

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

2 In his enumeration of vowels, Uvāṣa (e.g., on RPr. I. 14) does not mention pluta ones, though the RPr. recognizes them (see I. 16; II. 33 etc.). In the RPr. ँ (also long ?) does not enjoy the full status of a vowel. For it can stand neither at the beginning nor at the end (I. 9, 11).

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

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

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

Note 4. Yamās are said to be particular nasal sounds occurring before the nasal stops when plosives precede them. The enumeration of yamās as four in the commentaries appears to be a bit puzzling; for, according to the definition of the Prātiśākhyaśa and the Nār. Ś. the yamās become 20 or 21 in number (see APR. I. 99; TPr. XXI. 12, XXII. 12; RPr. VI. 8). Uvaṭa in his commentary of the RPr. has a defence for both the enumerations. He sums up his first discussion, with evam viṃśatir yamā bahv-rcāṇāṃ bhavanti sva-rūpāś catvāra eva tad uttaratra yama-laksane vicārayiṣyāmaḥ (on I. 20) and in discussing the character of yama (on VI. 8) he says tasmād iha 'sparśa yamānanaṇunāsika' ity ucayamāne viṃśatīvāt sthāninanām ādesānām api yamānāṃ viṃśatīvā-prasaṅgāḥ; sa ma bhūt. cauterām eva yamānāṃ prathamāḥ prathamāṃ dvitiyā dvitiyam evam a paṇcamāḥ āpadyerann ity ucayate. The sum and substance of what Uvaṭa says seems to be that in pronunciation the yamas do
not partake of the characteristics of their respective groups to any considerable extent, hence they are to be called the first yama the second yama and so on, making the yamas four in number. But the Bahr-rcas however thought otherwise and gave an extremely logical interpretation to the definition of the Pratiśākhyya without caring for its practical aspect (Whitney has a difficulty over the nature and number of the yamas; see his comments on APR. I. 99, TPr. II. 51; XXI, 12; XXII, 12. A great deal of his difficulty is due to the peculiar nature of the TPr.). The late Vāj. Pr., i.e., its ch. VIII (29), has recognized four yamas only though curiously enough Uvaṭa explains their number to be twenty. In the Rktantra also (ed. Burnell, p. 2) only four yamas have been recognized. (For more information about yamas see Siddheshwar Varma’s ‘Critical Studies’, pp. 99ff.)

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

Note 6. Duḥṣprṣṭaḥ. The pluta ḷ has been called the duḥ- sprṣṭa or ‘touched-with-difficulty.’ This may be one of the reasons why some Pratiśākhyas did not recognize this sound (see Table I). But the PS. being meant for all the Vedas had to notice this. It should be known that the commentator to the RT. recognizes this (see ibid). Weber was inclined to understand duḥsprṣṭa as a nāsikya (Ind. Stud. IV, p. 349). But his view seems to be untenable. The Pañjikā on the authority of Audavraji takes it in the sense of īṣat-sprṣṭa (p. 11). For according to the latter, ḷ partakes of the character of semivowels which are īṣat-sprṣṭa according to PS. See also Uvaṭa on RPr. XIII. 3.
Atmā buddhyā samarthyārthān mano yuñkte vivakṣayā
manah kāyāgnim āhanti sa prerayati mārutam II (6)
Mārutas tārasi caran mandram janayati svaram
prātaḥ savana-yogam tam chando-gāyatram āsritam II (7)
Kaṇṭhe mādhyaṁda-yugam madhyamaṁ triśṭubhānugam
tāram tārīya-savanaṁ śīrṣanyāṁ jāgatānugam II (8)
Sōdīrṇo mūrdhny abhihato vaktram āpadya mārutak
varṇāṁ janayate tēśaṁ vibhāgaḥ pañcadhā smṛtaḥ II (9)
Svarataḥ kālataḥ sthānāt prayaṭnānuṇādānalaḥ
iti varṇa-vidhaḥ prāhur nipuṇaṁ tam nibodhata II (10)

Tr. Atmā with buddhi perceives things and sets the mind
to an intention of speaking; the mind (then) gives impetus to the
fire within the body, and the latter drives the breath out [6].

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

Nota 13. Anupradāna. The term as we have seen above is equivalent to ‘after-effort’ or ‘secondary effort’, which means stiffening or loosening of vocal chords. Whitney translates this as ‘emission’ (APr. I. 12; TPr. XXIII. 2) and Weber has rendered it by ‘Austossung’ (Ind. Stud. IV, p. 107). Dr. Siddheshwar Varma translates this as ‘sound-material’, or ‘breath-voice material’ (op. cit., pp. 8, 9); but such translations though not altogether incorrect are not happy. Whitney, Weber and Varma all seem to have missed the etymological implication of the word. The author of the Sīkṣā-prakāśa however extends the meaning of anupradāna which according to him includes nasality too (p. 29). This evident innovation seems to have justification from the separate mention of anunāsikas in PS. 17b. (For other points regarding this word see above the Note 12 on prayatna).
NOTE 14. *Iti varṇa-vidah prāhuḥ*. So said those who were versed in the lore of (pronouncing) the speech-sounds. This evidently shows that there were other masters of phonetics (Saikṣikas) before Pāṇini wrote his Śikṣā. This hemistich does not appear in the AP. It is possible like the PS. 14 it has been left out (see Note 28 below). Varṇa also means a ‘written sign’ representing a speech-sound (see Th. Goldstücker, *Pāṇini: his place in Skt. literature*, London, 1861, pp. 34ff.).


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

_Udattāś cānudattāś ca svaritaś ca svaras trayah 1
hrasvo dīrghaḥ pluta iti kālato niyamā aci II (11)_

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

NOTE 15. Acī. Ac meaning vowels is a pratiyāhāra of Pāṇini. The Yaj. recension reads PS. 8 as its 23rd couplet.

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

_Udattē niṣāda-gāndhārav anudattā ṣabha-dhavatau 1
svarita-prabhavā hy ete ṣadja-madhya-maṇḍacamāḥ II (12)_

12. Of the seven musical notes niṣāda and gāndhāra can arise in the high pitch (udātta), ṣabha and dhavata in the low pitch (anudātta), while
ṣadja, madhyama and pañcama have their source in the medium pitch (svarita).

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

Aṣṭau sthānāni varṇānām urauḥ kaṇṭhaḥ śiras tathā ।
jihvā-mūlaṃ ca dantāś ca nāsikāṭhau ca tālu ca ॥ (13)

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

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

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

O-bhāvaḥ ca vivṛttiḥ ca ṣa-ṣa-sā repha eva eva ca ।
jihvā-mūlaṃ upadhāma ca gatir aṣṭa-vindhōṣmaṇah ॥ 14 ॥

Yady o-bhāva-prasandhānam ukārdī-param padam ।
svaṁtāṃ tādṛṣṭaṁ vidyād yad anyad vyaktam uṣmaṇah ॥ 15 ॥

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

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

b. The APr. according to its commentator recognizes four ūsmans ś, s, s and ḫ (I. 31). The VPr. (I. 51). has also the same number. The TPr. adds ḱ and φ to these and has six (I. 9). The ṚPr. has recognized two more: ḫ and ṇ, making altogether eight ūsmans (I. 10, 12). The reckoning of anusvāra as an ūṣman seems to be very strange.

Hakāram pañcamair yuktam antahsthābhis ca samyutam i
aurasyam tam vijānyāt kanṭhyam āhur asamyutam II (16)

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

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

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

Kaṇṭhyāv ahāv i-cu-yasās tālavyā oṣṭhajā vu-pū 1
syur mūrāhany ā r-ṭu-ra-ṣā danṭyā l-tu-la-sāḥ smṛtāḥ II (17)

Jihvā-mūle tu kuh prokto danṭyōṣṭhyo vah smṛto budhaiḥ 1
e-ai tu kaṇṭha-tālavyā o-au kaṇṭhōṣṭhajau smṛtau II (18)

Ardha-mātra tu kaṇṭhyasya ekārdukārayor bhavet 1
aikārdukārayor mātra tayor vīrta-samvartam II (19)

Tr. A and h are throat sounds; i, cu (i.e., c, ch, j, jh and ū) and s are palatals; u and pu (i.e., p, ph, b, bh and m) labials; r, tu (i.e., t, ṭh, d, dh and n) and s are dentalis [17].

Ku (i.e., k, kh, g, gh and ū) is uttered from the root of the tongue, and v is a denti-labial sound; e and ai are throat-palatal, and o and au are throat-labial sounds [18].

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>uras</th>
<th>kauṭha</th>
<th>mūrdhan</th>
<th>jihvāmūla</th>
<th>danta</th>
<th>danta-mūla</th>
<th>tālu</th>
<th>oṣṭha</th>
<th>kaṭha-tālu</th>
<th>kaṭha-ōṣṭha</th>
<th>danta-ōṣṭha</th>
<th>nāsikā</th>
<th>nāsikā-also</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS.</td>
<td>a, b, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>k, kh, gh, n, l, s</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>i, c, ch, j, bh, ni, y, ś</td>
<td>u, p, ph, b, bh, m, v</td>
<td>e, ai</td>
<td>o, au</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>yamās, m</td>
<td>n, ni, q, n, m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APr.</td>
<td>a, b, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, q</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, c, ch, j, bh, ni, y, ś</td>
<td>u, o, p, ph, b, bh, m, v</td>
<td>ai^4</td>
<td>au^4</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPr.</td>
<td>a, b, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, q</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, c, ch, j, bh, ni, y, ś</td>
<td>u, o, p, ph, b, bh, m, v</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPr.</td>
<td>a, b, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, q</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, c, ch, j, bh, ni, y, ś</td>
<td>u, o, p, ph, b, bh, m, v</td>
<td>ai^5</td>
<td>au^5</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPr.</td>
<td>a, b, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, q</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, c, ch, j, bh, ni, y, ś</td>
<td>u, o, p, ph, b, bh, m, v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT.</td>
<td>a, b, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, q</td>
<td>k, kh, g, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, c, ch, j, bh, ni, y, ś</td>
<td>u, o, p, ph, b, bh, m, v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yamās, m</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H in combination with n, n, q, n, m, y, r, l and v is pronounced in uras. 2 The PS. does not know any mūrdhanya l or lh. This sound is probably a later development due to Dravidian influence (See Introduction § 29, 30). 3 The APr. does not mention the place of articulation of this sound. However the commentator informs us of its articulation. 4 See APr. I. 41, and its commentary on the same. 5 The RPr. says that h and l are vartaya according to others (I. 18). Probably the same authorities place r, l and s in vartaya (I. 20). 6 According to the RPr. Vedamitra is the authority who considers d, dh, j and lh, (usually known as cerebral l and lh) as the jihvāmūla sounds (I. 21, 22). 7 The TPr. is silent about the places of articulation for vowels. 8 Ai does not appear in the sūtra 5 of RT. but it might be due to the corruption of the MSS. As this sound has not been discussed elsewhere in this work we are sure that it existed here.
For details of this variation see the Table II in which views of Prātiṣākhyaśas have been compared with that of the PS.

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

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

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

---

1 It is on the basis of Pāṇini’s use of pratyāhāras that Dr. Paul Thieme makes the statement that “it is self-evident that the Aṣṭādhyāyi presupposes the Śiva Sūtras and the Śiva Sūtras presuppose the Aṣṭādhyāyi.....” (op. cit., p. 109). The PS. can well be substituted for the ‘Aṣṭādhyāyi’ in this remark.

2 See Note 1, in p. 64.
All the sandhyakṣaras¹ being long, consist of two mātrās (ṚPr. I. 16; VPr. I. 57; TPr. I. 35; APr. I. 61). Hence from PS. 13 we have the quantitative distribution of the two elements of e, o and ai, au as follows:

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

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

\[\text{Samértam mátrikāṃ jñeyam, vivṛtaṃ tu dvimátrikam} \]
\[\text{ghośā vā samvṛṭāḥ sarve, aghośā vivṛṭāḥ smṛṭāḥ} 20\]

Tr. A samvṛta (close) sound is one mātra long, and a vivṛta (open) sound is two mātrās long; voiced sounds are all samvṛta while breathed ones are vivṛta [20].

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

¹ Wackernagel (I. § 33), does not admit that all e and o in OIA were originally sandhyakṣaras, i.e., combination of two vowel sounds. His objection is based on e and o not arising out of actual sandhi in OIA. But the Vedic phoneticians in using the term evidently recalled the Indo-Iranian diphthongal character of e and o such as appears in Av. vaśā (Skt. vāsa) and Av. saothra (Skt. hótro), as well as e and o arising from a combination of a with u and n respectively.

² The VPr. (I. 76) only among all the Prātiṣākhyaśyas expressly recognizes the fact that ai and au have one mātra for a and one mātra for i as well as u. From the direction as to the production of ai and au given in the APr. (I. 41) it appears that this latter work too agrees with the PS. But as regards the pronunciation of e and o the APr. expressly says that they have only one place of articulation (I. 40) and hence we are to understand that at the time of this Prātiṣākhyya, e and o no longer retained the trace of their diphthongal character which we see in the PS. 13. The VPr. is silent about the production of e and o. The ṚPr. in its attempt to describe their nature simply mystifies the issue (see XIII. 15-16). Hence it appears that the Prātiṣākhyās in question are later than the PS.
Note 25. Next occurs the following couplet in the Rk and the Yajus recensions and it has been commented on in the Prakāśa commentary. But as it appears irrelevant in the present context and contains the term karaṇa which as we have seen before is a term of later origin than Pāṇini (see Note 12) we have considered this couplet to be spurious.

Svarānām uṣmanām cāiva viṃtaṃ karaṇaṃ smṛtam
	
tebhyo'pi viṃtāv enau tābhyaṃ aicau tathāiva ca

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

Note 26. This couplet like other spurious ones must be a borrowing from some unknown source. The substance of the first half of the couplet is available in the AP. uṣmanāṃ viṃtaṃ ca, svarānāṃ ca, I. 31. 32). But according to this Prātiśākhyā, e and o as well as ā are the most open sounds (aiśkaraśrayor viṃtatamam, tato'pyākārasya I. 34. 35) and not ai, au as in the present couplet.

Anusvāra-yamanāṃ ca nāsikā sthānam ucyate
	
tapadhmaṇīya uṣmā ca jihvā-mūliya-nāsihe
	
tyogavāhā vijñeyā āṣraya-sthāna-bhāginaḥ

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

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

Note 27. Anusvāra. The ‘anusvāra-nāsikyaḥ’ and ‘anusvārah nāsikyaḥ’ seem to have been synonymous and probably the original name for anusvāra by which the TPr. (I. 34; II. 30; XVII. 1) understands only a nasal vowel. This meaning of the term was known to the author of Pañjikā too. For he says svaram anu bhavati ity anusvāraḥ, ‘as it arises after the vowel it is (called) the anusvāra’ (5).
The term anusvāra-nāsikya has sometimes been shortened also simply as nāsikya or nāsika. But this shortening seems to have created some misunderstanding. For example, in the APr. (I. 26)¹ and in the RPr. (I. 20) nāsikya has been used to denote sounds pronounced directly from the nose (i.e. yamas and the anusvāra)² as opposed to anunāsikas (nasal stops)³ which are pronounced in the mouth as well as in the nose (APr. I. 27 and P. I. 1. 8). But in spite of such an use of nāsikya some interpolators and commentators of the Prātiṣākhya have taken anusvāra and nāsikya⁴ to be two different sounds (VPr. VIII 5.25, 27, 29; Uvaṭa on VPr. I. 74; Māhiṣeya on TPr. I. 18). But curiously enough in his commentary to the RPr. I. 20, Uvaṭa has explained nāsikya as the term including yamas and the anusvāra as well as nāsikya.⁶ Though the later writers on Vedic phonetics at times differed from him about the meaning of the term anusvāra, Pāṇini understood by this a nasalized vowel. For he explains the anusvāra as a nasal sound (PS, 14) and gives directions as to how it should be correctly produced (PS, 15b-16a). The term 'nāsika' which is used to denote a nasalized vowel in the Prātiṣākhya has also been used in the PS, (14b). Among the western philologists a controversy went on for some time about the correct pronunciation of anusvāra; but

¹ The APr. never uses the term anusvāra. It is from the commentator that we learn that the nāsikya is equivalent to yama and anusvāra (see Whittoey on APr. I. 26).
³ The TPr. sometimes takes nāsikya in the sense of yama alone (XXI. 12, 14).
⁴ The view that anunāsika is equivalent to a nasalised vowel arises probably from a confusion of this word with a somewhat similarly sounded term anunāsikya (=nasality) as used in the Mahābhāṣya, yathā tṛtiyās tathā patacam...adhiṣṭuno guṇah (ed. Kielhorn, I, p 61, line 18, 29). Patañjali is clearly against such a view (see Note 2 above). Among the old authorities who seem at times to identify anunāsika with a nasal vowel is APr. (I. 53). But the relevant sūtra has probably been corrupted. TPr. once understands by anunāsika nasal stops and anusvāra (I. 30. See also III. 129; IV. 8, 9, 13, 51, 90; TPr. V. 26-28, 31; X. 11(?), XV. 1. 6; XXII. 14).
⁵ Weber considers this chapter of the VPr. as a later addition (opp. cit., p. 65).
⁶ ke te nāsikyāḥ? ity asyam apekṣayām āha nāsikyā yamānusvārāḥ (ed. Sāmāsrami, p. 80).
among them all Whitney, in spite of the bewildering opinions of the Prātiśākhyaśas or rather the commentaries of such works, could correctly guess the true pronunciation (on T.Pr. II. 30). Wackernagel however considered him to be mistaken and Thumb did not venture to give any opinion on the matter.

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

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

1 Altindische Grammatik, Vol. I (§ 223), p. 257. In the opinion of Prof. Iāders the anusvāra of the TPr. is anything but a nasal vowel (see Die Vṛṣa-Cīkṣā, p. 51).
2 Handbuch des Sanskrit, § 54.
3 This couplet occurs in all the recensions of the PS, and must have formed a part of the original work.
(op. cit., p. 354). According to the Pañjikā it means (15) "na vidyate yogaḥ varṇāntarenaṃ yeṣām te ayogavāḥāḥ": Those sounds which do not combine with other sounds are ayogavāhas. This definition does not convey any meaning to us. Uvaṭa says "akārādinā varṇa-samāmānyena samhitāṃ santaḥ etc vahanty ākāmalābhāṃ prāpnuvanty ayogavāhāḥ" (on VPr. VIII. 8): They are ayogavāhas because they attain their selves when combined with sounds like a (i.e. vowels). Similar is the view of the commentator of the Pratījñā Sūtra on II. 1 (see Benares ed.). This explanation too does not satisfy us and seems to be rather fanciful. Patañjali who is earlier and more authoritative than the writers mentioned above defines the term as "yad ayuktā vahanty anupadiśtāś ca śrūyante" (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 28): 'Those sounds which are heard even though they have not been included in the Varṇa-samāmānya (or the so-called Śiva-sūtras).’ Besides these there are other interpretations of the term by late authorities, but it will scarcely be of any use to discuss them. The explanation given by Patañjali can be followed without any scruple.

Alābu-vīnā-nirghoṣo’danta-mūlyah svarānugaḥ
anuvāras tu kartavyo nityaṃ hroḥ śa-śa-seṣu ca II (23)

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

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

Note 32. Nirghoṣo' danta-mālya should be taken as nirghoṣo + adantamālya.

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

Anusvāre vivṛtyāṁ tu virāme cākṣara-dvayē |
 dvir oṣṭhau tu vigṛhṇīyād yatrāukāra-vakārayoh II (24)

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

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

Vyāghri yathā haret putrān damśṭrābhyāṁ na ca pīṣayet |
bhītā patana-bhedābhyāṁ tadvad varnān prayojayet II (25)

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

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

1 'The anusvāra followed by consonants other than s, ś, ṣ and h is changed to the saṃsvara (homogeneous nasal sound) of the following sound; the possible homogeneous sounds in the above case are ṣ, ɾ, ś, n and m. This rule is optional when the anusvāra stands at the end of a word.'
tendency to drop intervocal stops as in the so-called Mahārāṣṭrī or the late phase of Sauraseni, was already beginning. This couplet occurs in the Yv. S. (195) and the Māṇḍūki S. (48) too. We are not sure whether it originally belonged to the Yv. S. or the Māṇḍ. S., but it is sure that the couplet did not form a part of the PŚ. which may go back to a time earlier than 500 B.C. (see Introduction, § 36).

Note 85. The following couplet occurs next in the Rk recension and in the Yaś. recension it is no. 6. Of the two commentaries, only the Prakāśa touches it. AP. omits it.

Yathā Saurāṣṭrīkā nārī takrāḥ ity abhibhāṣate

evaṃ raṅgāḥ prayoktavyāḥ kheśāḥ iva kheyāh [26]

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

Note 86. Next occur the four following couples in the Rk recension only.

Raṅga-varṇāḥ prayuṣṭhītaḥ no grast pūrvam aksaram

dirgha-svaram prayuṣṭiyāt paścān nāsikyam ācaret [27]

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

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

Hṛdaye caikamātras tu ardha-mātras tu mūrdhāni

nāsikāyam tathārdhām ca raṅgasyaiva dvimātratā [28]

1 See the present writer’s ‘Mahārāṣṭrī, a later phase of Sauraseni,’ Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta, XXIII (1929).

In the Nār. S. (II. 4. 9) this couplet occurs with variants nāry drām ity, raṅgaḥ prayoktasyo Nārādasya mātāṃ yathā. In the Māṇḍ. S. (112) it occurs with the variants: nārī arā śity raṅgāḥ prayoktasyāḥ nakāra-parivivairjītā. The Yv. S. (190) however reads it almost like the Māṇḍ. S.

2 This couplet occurs in a slight different form in the Yv. S. (189) and the Lomaśī S. (I. 8). The Māṇḍ. S. 110 can also be compared with this.
TRANSLATION AND NOTES

$Hṛdayād utkāte tiṣṭhan kāṁsyena samanusvaran$  
mārḍavam ca dvi-mātram ca jaghavā $^{2}$ iti nidārśanam $^{II}$ (29)

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

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

Madhye tu kampayet kampam ubhau pārśvau samo bhavet  
saraṅgam kampayet kampaṁ rathīvēti nidārśanam $^{II}$ (30)

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

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

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

$Evam varṇāḥ prayoktavya ndvyaktā na ca pīditāḥ$  
samyag-varṇapravogena brahma-loke mahīyate $^{II}$ (31)

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

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

$^{1}$ With the above couplet may be compared the Lomaṭī S. I. 7. This passage seems to be corrupt.

$^{2}$ This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (II. 4. 8) with some variation. In the Māṇḍ. S. (113) too this occurs in a varying form. Whatever be the true reading of the couplet it is sure the PS. in its original form did not contain it.
Note 39. In the Yaj. recension the above couplet is succeeded by the following one:

Abhyāṣārthe ḍrutāṁ vṛttim prayogārthe tu madhyamāṁ
śisyānāṁ upadesārthe kuryād vṛttim vilambitāṁ

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

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

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

Gītī sīghrī śīrah-kampī tathā likhitā-pāthakah
Anarthajñō ḍpa-kaṇṭhaś ca ṣad ete pāṭhakādhamāḥ
Mādhuryam aksara-vaṃtīḥ padacchedas tu susvarah
dhairyaṃ laya-samarthano ca ṣad ete pāṭhaṅge gunāḥ

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

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

Śāṅkitam bhītam udghuśtam avyaktam anunāsikam
kāka-svaram śirasigam tathā sthāna-vivarjitaṃ

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

Shyness, fear, extreme loudness, indistinctness, undue nasalisation, repressed tone, undue cerebralization, non-observance of the places of articulation (in general) and (proper) accent [34], and

harshness, creating undue separation between words, uneven tone hastiness, want of due palatalisation: these are the fourteen faults in the Vedic chant.
Note 41a. These two couplets occur also in the Yv. S. (26-28) but they relate there to faults of recitation (pāṭha-dōṣa) instead of the faults in chant (gīt-dōṣa) of the Nār. S. But as the couplets in this latter work have been preceded by the expression bhavanti ca' tra ślokaḥ they are surely quoted there from some earlier work. It is probable that the couplets in question occurred in the Yv. S. first.

Uṇāṃsu daṣṭam tvarītaṃ nirastam
   vilambitaṃ gadjaditaṃ pragītam
nisprāṇitaṃ grastapadākṣaram ca
   vaden na dīnam na tu sānunāsyam II (35)
Prātaḥ pāṭhan nityam urāk-sthitena
   svareṇa sārdūla-rūṭopamena
madhyama-dine kānta-gatena caiva
   cakrādāva-saṃkūjita-sannibhena II (36)
Tāram tu vidiyāt savane tṛtiye
   śiro-gatam tac ca sūdā prayojuṃ
mayūra-hamsānyabhṛta-svarāṇām
   tulyena nādena śirāk-sthitena II (37)

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

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

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

Aco'sṛṣṭā yavan tv iva nema-sṛṣṭāḥ talaḥ sṛṣṭāḥ
   sēṣāḥ sṛṣṭā halah proktā nibodhānupradānataḥ II (38)
Tr. The vowels are without touch, semi-vowels slightly touched, ś, ṣ and s are half-touched sounds, and the remaining consonants are touched (i.e. stops) [38].

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

\[ \text{Nama}° \text{ anunāsikā nahro nādino ha-jhasah smṛtāḥ \rceil} \]
\[ \text{iṣan-nādā yan-yāsaś ca śvāsīnas tu kha-phādayah \rceil (39) } \]
\[ \text{Iṣac-chvāsāṁś caro vidyād ghor-dhāmaītaṭa pracakṣate \rceil} \]

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

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

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

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

Note 46. The following couplet occurs in the Yaj. recension (33). The Ṛk recension gives only the first half of it.

Dāksīputraḥ Pāṇinir yasenēdam vyāhṛtam bhuvi || (40)
ratnabhūtam idam śāstrāṃ pṛthivyāṃ samprakāṣitam (40a)

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

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

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

Chandah pādau tu vedasya hastau kalpo’tha paṭhyaye ||
jyotiśām ayanām caksur niruktam śrotam ucyate || (41)
Śikṣā ghrāṇām tu vedasya mukhāṃ vyākaraṇāṃ smṛtam ||
tasmāt sāngam adhītyādīva brahmaloke mahīyate || (42)

Tr. (First) Metrics which is the two legs (of the Veda) is read and then the Kalpa which is its two hands. The Science of the Movement of luminaries (Astronomy) is its eyes, and the Nirukta is called its ears; the Śikṣā is the nose of the Veda, and Grammar is its mouth. It is for this reason that one studying the Veda with all its limbs (i.e. accessory studies) attains a high position in the realm of Brehman [41-42].
Udāttam ākhyāti vrṇo‘ṅgulīnām
pradesinī-mūla-nivīṣṭa-mūrdhā
apānta-madhya svaritaṁ dhṛtaś ca
kaniṣṭhikāyāṁ anudattam eva u (43)

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

Udāttam pradesinīṁ vidyāt pracayāṁ madhyato‘ṅgulim
nihatāṁ tu kaniṣṭhikāyāṁ svaritopakaniṣṭhikāṁ u (44)

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

Nors 47a. These two couplets have not been traced in any available Sikṣā.

Antōdāttam ādyudāttam udāttam anudattam nīca-svaritam
madhyōdāttam svaritam dvuṣudāttam tryuṣudāttam
iti nava-pada-sāyāṁ u (45)

Agniḥ somaḥ pra vo vīryam haviṣāṁ
svar Bṛhaspatir Indrā-Bṛhaspati u

Agniḥ ity antōdāttam, soma ity ādyudāttam, prēty
udāttam, va ity anudattam, vīryam nīca-svaritam u (46)

Haviṣāṁ madhyōdāttam, svar iti svaritam, Bṛhaspatir
iti dvuṣudāttam, Indrā-Bṛhaspati iti tryuṣudāttam u (47)

Tr. There are nine kinds of accents in padas: antōdātta, ādyōdātta, udātta, anudātta, nīca-svarita, madhyōdātta, svarita, dvuṣudātta, tryuṣudātta. Examples of these are Agniḥ, Somāḥ, pra, vo, vīryaṁ, haviṣā, svaḥ, Bṛhaspatiḥ, Indrā-Bṛhaspatiḥ, (Agniḥ, Somaḥ, prá, vo, vīryaṁ, haviṣā, svār, Bṛhaspatiḥ, Indrā-Bṛhaspatiḥ) [45-47].

Nors 47b. This passage with slight variation occurs in the Nūr. Ś. (II. 7. 5. 6) and seems to be quite relevant there. It is almost certain that the Rk recension took it from there.
**Anudatta** hr̥di jāyeyo mūrdhny udāttya udāhṛtaḥ |
svaritaḥ karna-mūliyah, sarvasye pracayaḥ smṛtaḥ H (48)

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

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

**Cāsaś tu vadate mātrāṁ dwi-mātrāṁ tv eva vāyasah |**
śikhī rauti tri-mātrāṁ tu nakulas tv ardha-mātrakam H (49)

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

**Notes** 47d. This passage occurs in the Lomāśī S. (VIII. 9), the R.Pr. (XIII. 20) and with slight variation in the Yv. S. (15-16) and in the Māṇḍ. S. (138), but it seems to have occurred first in some of these Śiṣṭās and not in the PS.

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

**Kutārthād āgatam daydham apavarṇam ca bhakṣitam |**
na tasya parimokṣo’sti pāpāher ēva kilvisāt H (50)

_Sutārthād āgatam vyaktam svāmnāyyam svavyacasthitam |_
suvareṇa svaktrena prayuktam brahma rājate H (51)

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

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

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

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

**Na karālo na lamboṣṭho nāvyakto nānunāsikaḥ |**
gadgado baddhajīvaḥ ca prayogān vaktum arhati H (51a)
THE PAṆINIYA SIṇṆĀ

Tr. One ought not to repeat mantras with teeth shown, lips unduly protruded and with indistinct, unduly nasalised and half choked-up voice and immobile tongue [51a].

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

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

*Mantro hinaḥ svarato varṇato vā
mithyā prayukto na tam artham āha ।
sa vāg-vajro yajamānam hiniṣti
yathēndraśatruh svarato 'parādhāt ॥ (52)

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

Nors 50a. This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (I. 1. 5) and the Amoghanandini S. (122). Besides this the couplet occurs in the Mahābhāṣya with a variant duṣṭāḥ sābdah for mantrō hinaḥ (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 2).

Nors 51. The following couplet occurs next and in the Rk recension only.

*Avāksaram anāyusyaṃ visvaram vyādhi-piḍhitam ।
akṣatā(ra?)-śastra-rūpeṇa vajraṃ(?) patati mastaKE ॥ (53)

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

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

Nors 52. The two following couplets occur next in the Rk recension and there only.

*Hasta-hinaṃ yo’dhiṣte svara-varna-vivarjitam ।
Rg-Yajuḥ-Sāmabhir dagdho viyonim adhigacchati ॥ (54)
Hastena vedāṁ yo'adhīte svāra-vārṇārtha-saṁyutam
Rg-Yajuk-Saṁabhiḥ puṭo brahma-loke mahīyate || (55)

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

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

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

Note 53. The two following couplets occur in the Yaj. and the Rk recensions and have been commented on by the Pañjikā and the Prakāsa:

Saṁkarah sāṁkarīṁ prādād Dākṣi-putrāya dhīmate
vāṁmayebhyaḥ saṁārtya devīṁ vācam iti sthitih || (56)
Yenākṣara-saṁāmnāya adhigamyā Maheśvarat
krtsnam vyākaranam proktam tasmai Pāṇinaye namaḥ || (57)

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

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

Note 58a. These two couplets do not occur in the AP. rec. and 57 is wanting in the Prk. As to the authorship of the so-called Sivasūtras, which is clearly mentioned in them, there is a great divergence of opinion. But it is possible that even if Pāṇini was not their author he was at least responsible for their present form (for details see Introduction, §§ 12-15).

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

Yena dhautā girāḥ punsāṁ vimalaiḥ sabda-vāribhiḥ
tamas cājñānajāṁ bhinnam tasmaì Pāṇinaye namaḥ|| (58)
Ajñānāndhasya lokasya jñānānājana-salākayā
cakṣur unnīlitaṁ yena tasmai Pāṇinaye namaḥ || (59)
Tr. Homage to that Pāṇini who has washed off the human speech with pure water of words and has pierced through the gloom of ignorance [58].

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

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

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

\begin{equation}
\text{Trinayana-mukha-niḥśrtām imām}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
yā āha paṭhet prayataḥ sadā dvijaḥ
da bhavati paśu-putra-kārtimān
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
sukham atulam ca samaśnute divi divi tītī \text{n} (60)
\end{equation}

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

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

Page xii  Line 23  for and  read before
24  ,, it  ,, the Yaj
xvi  9  ,, re  ,, re-
19  ,, more than  ,, nearly
22  ,, omit twenty
26  ,, eleven  read ones
29  after the fullstop read :

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

xx  line 18  for was  read were
xxii  6  ,, following  ,, following
xxiii  11 from the bottom
for lie  ,, lies
xxvi  footnote line 2  ,, op. cit., pp. 18-19.
"  ,, 3  " svaraśo
xxix  "  ,, 9 for (op. cit.)  " (Pāṇini and the
Veda, p. 109).
xxx  "  ,, 1 after Śāyāna  " (Introduction to the
Ṛgveda-bhaśya, ed. Peter Peterson
p. 56).

xxxiv  line 2  " (op. cit., p. 12).
xxxviii  footnote last line  4. contra
xxxix  line 16  for the Pr.  the TPr.
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

Add to the footnote 3 the following:


Page xlix line 12 after Pingala read:

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

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

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

lviii Add to the footnote 2 the following:

It came to my notice afterwards that Bhaṭṭojīdīksita ascribes the Rktantra-vyākaraṇa to Audavraji. In his Saddakaustubhā he writes: तथा चक्तन्वयाकर्ष्याः सान्दीयोङ नवेच्छय प्रणिता चालाविजिरिण प्रस्तुतयत् अनन्तान्तसंधियोऽऽ शम: पूर्ववश्व गुण द्वित (Chowkhamba ed., p. 113).

lxi line 3 read Piṅgala’s Chandaḥ-śūtras.

lxii-lxvi for Hemistiches read Hemistichen

9 line 9 for गिरस्वः, " गिरस्तास्यं

" 6 जाता, " जाताः,

10 footnote 5 read ‘omit’

11 line 14 " भाष्यवह्याने ययोस्ती

12 " 15 " कच्चःप्रयोज्यानि करण्वतः

footnote 5 " ‘omit’

13 " 5 " ‘omit’ and ‘have’

15 line 16 " विस्मेगे च

17 footnote 7 " ‘omits’

30 line 14 for हकारं " हकारं

41 " 13 " यत्तीकार " यत्तीकार

42 " 12 " श्रद्धिते " श्रद्धिते
Page 53  Line 14 after pp. 99 ff..read See also Tripāṭhī, p. 5 and Miśra, pp. 28 ff.

65 last line after to PŚ. read:

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

58 After the Note 15 add the following:

Udāṭṭa, anudāṭṭa and svarita arise from the peculiar conditions of the body called āyāma, viśrambha and ākṣepa respectively. For the definition of these terms see Miśra, p. 7.

59 line 20 read ‘dantamūla’

Add to the Note 17 the following:

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

line 4 from the bottom read ‘ukārādi param padam.’

60 ,, 1 for (out of ūṣman) is followed by read:

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

line 3 for coming read: but in other cases the final o is

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

line 6 from the bottom, after the fullstop add:

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

64 line 15 read vivṛta (open).
,, 21 add after the fullstop the following:
Miśra thinks that the saṃvṛta sound mentioned in this couplet relates to half e and half o (i.e., short e and short o) and refers to Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya (pp. 11 f.)

line 6 in the footnote read i and u respectively.


Last line, add the following:
As Šarmā comments on the Ṛk. recension (p. 10) he feels a difficulty about the interpretation of the passage and invokes the authority of the Śābdaratna but such a difficulty does not arise when we read upadhmāniya, etc., between the two hemistichs of Ṛk. 22.

66 line 14 after ‘nāsikya’ add:

line 4 from the bottom omit T Pr.
,, 3 from the bottom, add the following:
See also Mangal Dev Shastri, op. cit., pp. 143-44
(Notes on p. 20)

67 line 4 after the fullstop add:
But in this matter Macdonell follows Whitney; see ‘A Vedic Grammar for Students,’ §§ 10f. 29b, 39.
The Ālābu-vīṇā used in modern Indian music was probably invented after the Gupta period, but this should not bring down the date of the above passage. For Ālābu-vīṇā mentioned in this passage was in all likelihood a very primitive instrument like our modern ekatāra or one-stringed vīṇā quite different from its late development the modern vīṇā. Its very crudity speaks for its great age.

69 line 12 read ‘devi oṣṭyau’ and ‘yathaukārau.’
   " 20 for does  "  do
   " 21  "  ‘dāṃstrābhyaṃ’

70 2 after the fullstop add the following:

From what Miśra says we understand that patana (dropping) of letters means spirantizing them and bheda (or differentiating) is de-aspiration of them (pratītāvādibhāsā- chārāḥ vaśāḥ suḥāḥ bhavānī n samvaram bhavataḥ; śatam kākāroṣānāṁ bhatāroṣānāṁ). न च प्रवीषीयायार्येऽऽन खङ्गारेविषिक पक्करधोत् प्रतीयते (p. 15).

 line 4 from the bottom read ‘arā"ity’ and ‘raṅgāḥ’
   " 3 from the bottom "  Māṇḍ.

71 " 14 add the following:

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

 line 6 from the bottom, add the following:

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

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

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

line 5 from the bottom read the place of.

Page 74 line 2 for ś, ṣ and s read ś, ṣ, s and h.
12 Insert ; (semicolon) after nose and , (comma) after r.

74 line 8 from the bottom read the following:
rephasamyukto' nādir, etc.

line 7 from the bottom read always as an unvoiced sound.

lines 6-4 omit 'He seems to have.....of the Amoghmanandinī Sikṣā.'

75 line 9 read Pāṇinir yas tenedam'
76 line 14, add the following:
Sarmā considers the couplet No. 44 to be spurious (p. 18).

77 line 5 ff cancel the Note 47c and read the following:
This passage with a slight variation occurs in a late work named the Svarāṣṭaka S. by one Ananta (see SS., p. 365. Tripāṭhī, p. 25).

78 line 6 for the Pñj. read some MSS. of the Pñj.
8 after the fullstop read:
The original Pñj. probably did not contain this (see p. 22, line 6).

79 12, add the following:
Miśra considers couplets 54 and 55 to be spurious (p. 27) and so does Sarmā (p. 21).

**
ADDITIONAL CORRIGENDA

Page vi  *lines 1 and 3 for London read Lund*

xxii  *line 21 for 700 B.C. read 500 B.C.*

lii  "" 4 from the bottom, *for concludes read suggests, last, read p. clxvii*

liii  "" 13 *insert as if before sitting*

55  *lines 21-23 omit The translator of........indefensible.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrower's Name</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>Date of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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