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System of Transliteration

अ आ इ ई उ ऊ ए ऐ ओ औ
a ā i ī u ū ē ə o au
क ख ग घ ङ च छ ज झ ञ
ka kha ga gha ṇa cha chha ja jha ṇa
ट ठ ड ढ ण त थ ध न
ta ṭha ḍa ḍha ṇa ta tha da dha na
प फ ब भ व झ
pa pha ba bha ma ya ra la va sa
ष स ह ङ
sha sa ha ̀a

Visarga — ḫ; Nasalized ᵢ as in सयम — ṁ
Nasalized ᵢ as in मीमांसा — ū
The following essay (with the nom de plume वाचारम्भण विकार:) was offered in competition for the Vishwanath Narayan Mandlik Gold Medal of the University of Bombay. It was approved by the Judges with the remark: It deserves to be printed, as it collects together a great deal of interesting historical information. It is now accordingly published with the kind permission of the University of Bombay.

In preparing the essay I have utilised the labours of most of the previous workers in the field, to whose writings I have given constant references in the foot-notes. I also enjoyed the exceptional advantage of having at my disposal the entire Government Manuscripts Library at the Deccan College, Poona, and was in fact, at the time of writing this essay, actually engaged in preparing a Descriptive Catalogue of the grammatical works in that Library.

As the title indicates, it is an essay—a mere tentative attempt—and not a profound treatise; and I have thought it worth while printing it merely because, as far as I know, no work of the kind, covering exactly the field of this essay, has so far appeared. In the ‘Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie’ there was to appear a work which would have made the writing of this essay superfluous, but apparently nothing has come of it so far.

I have made a few necessary changes in the essay as it was originally submitted, especially in the light of some kind suggestions received from Professor Hari Mahadeva Bhadkamkar of the Wilson College, Bombay, and from Professor Vaijanath Kashinath Rajavade of the Fergusson College, Poona, who were appointed judges for the essay. My old and honoured teacher, Professor K. B. Pathak, had also the goodness to read the essay through and point out certain inaccuracies of fact and statement, for which I am deeply grateful to him. For the most part, however, the
essay remains just as it was written in 1909 with the excep-
tion of the Chronological Conspectus and the General Index,
without which no published work of this nature could be
regarded as complete.

I do not, of course, expect that the essay would be
entirely free from mistakes both of omission and of com-
mission. New facts are coming to light every day; and even
of facts that have been already known, it is too much to
hope—so numerous are the workers in the field and so scat-
tered their writings—that I have taken into considera-
tion all, or even the most important all. I would most thank-
fully receive, therefore, any corrections or suggestions for
improvement. I only hope that the essay contains enough
to justify its publication in this present form.

Poona,
November 1914.

S. K. Belvalkar.

*Postscript*: Little did I expect, when I wrote the
above in November last, that one of the judges for the
essay—Professor H. M. Bhadkamkar of the Wilson College,
Bombay—would not live to see it in print. But it is the
unexpected that has happened. Professor Bhadkamkar took
a genuine interest in me and my work, and by writing this
*postscript* I wish to keep his name permanently associated
with what is—though not the first—yet one of the earliest
fruits of my literary activity.

Deccan College, Poona,
15th July 1915.

S. K. Belvalkar.
AN ACCOUNT OF THE DIFFERENT EXISTING

SYSTEMS OF SANSKRIT GRAMMAR

1. Grammatical speculations in India: Their extent and value.—It would be hardly an exaggeration to say that in no other country has the science of grammar been studied with such a zeal and carried to such a perfection as it has been in India. Even a bare catalogue of the names of grammarians ancient and modern and of such of their works as are still preserved to us can amply bear out the truth of this assertion. On the lowest calculation there are yet current in various parts of India nearly a dozen different schools of Sanskrit grammar, at least three hundred writers in the field including those that are known to us only from quotations, and more than a thousand separate treatises original as well as explanatory. And it is not merely the quantity—for that need not be a source of unalloyed pride to any people—but the quality of the work produced that has won for it a recognition and an honorable mention even at the hands of the rigorously scientific philologists of our own day, who are not ashamed to own their obligations to works and authors of over twenty-five hundred years old.

Early grammatical speculations

2. Grammatical speculations in the Vedas.—The earliest speculations of a grammatical nature are to be met with in the later portions of the Rigveda itself; for, even if we condemn Patañjali’s explanation (Mahābhāshya: Kielhorn, Vol. 1, p. 3) of जन्मारि शुङ्क्या by नामाब्यातोपसर्गार्याताः or his explanation (Ibid. p. 4; Rigveda viii. 69.12) of सत सिन्धुवं भुत सङ्कल्पः as being too subtle for the Vedic
bards,¹ still passages, such as Rigveda x. 125 or Taittiriya Samhitā vi, 4. 7. 3, already evince the consciousness that the study of the forms of speech is of sufficient importance to be pursued by itself independently of the dealings between men and men which are rendered possible by them. It is not, however, necessary for our purpose to put together all the Vedic passages that have or can be made to have a grammatical significance. Suffice it to say that the available data do not warrant the supposition that the 'Seers of the Mantras' had made any considerable advance in the science of grammar. Indeed, it was not their business to do that. To observe the silent or violent workings of Nature and to record in fitting verse the feelings and thoughts awakened by their contemplation was enough to employ all their leisure hours. Philosophy arises only when the harmony of life is disturbed from within (or from without) so that the old child-like faith in the world and its laws becomes no longer possible; and grammar is a species of philosophy.

The study of grammar receives a sudden impetus when one form of speech comes into close contact with another and a different form. Thus, for example, the discovery of Sanskrit by modern Europe has created a revolution in the science of philology, just as, in ancient times, the Roman conquest of Greece and, later, the discovery of Greek after the fall of Constantinople led to equally momentous consequences in the development of thought.—The same result is also produced when in course of time there arise inevitable dialectical peculiarities within a language. These are either a consequence of the impact of the different races one of which conquers and dominates over the rest,² or they may be due

¹ Compare Tantra-vārtika, Benares edition, p. 216.
² Until the Greeks began to teach their language to the Romans, Greek grammar made little progress.
to a change in the climatic conditions—to the people having migrated from one place to another and modified their expressions and articulations in the course of their journey. Something of this sort must have happened when the ancient Sanskrit diverged into the different forms of Prākrit, and we are probably to explain in the same way the considerable difference that is observable in the language of the Brāhmaṇas when contrasted with that of the ancient Sāṁhitās.¹

3. Grammatical speculations in the Brāhmaṇas.—When we come to the Brāhmaṇic speculations on the nature and meaning of the utterances of the ancient sages, we find that they have already lost any living touch with the old form of the language. Old forms and old words as also old ideas had grown obsolete giving place to newer, less poetic and more practical ones.² Since, however, the Sacred Scriptures (the Vedas) were composed in the older form of the language, and since, for various reasons, it was deemed necessary to preserve intact from generation to generation the inherited stock of Vedic poetry, attention came naturally to be focussed upon the peculiarities of that form of the language, and this was the beginning of grammar proper.

The main interest of the Brāhmaṇas, however, was sacerdotal. They busied themselves with the details of the ritual and tried to discover—or invent—a rational, that is to say, a mythological justification for every act of the priest and every element of the sacrifice. If they discussed questions of grammar or phonetics at all, they

¹ Dr. Burnell— in his essay on the Aindrā school of Grammarians notes, "without some contact with foreign peoples, and bitter disputes among religious sects at home, such highly developed enquiry into language as Pāṇini’s treatise displays is contrary to all experience."
² Compare the Arctic home in the Vedas, p. 230.
came in mainly by way of illustration, or because no other equally cogent explanation of the Šaṁhitā passage in question was at hand. We cannot make much capital out of their stray and half poetic utterances.

4. Grammatical speculations in allied works.—It was in the next period that the study of grammar as a science was taken in earnest. This was the period when the scattered hymns of the Vedas came to be collected into family-books and elaborate rules were framed for the regulation of the parishiṣṭad or charaṇas.¹ To help students in their task there also came into being about the same time various manuals on phonetics,² which dealt with letters, accents, quantity, pronunciation, and euphonic rules. In course of time the retentive faculty came to be cultivated to an extent which is without any parallel in the history of the world. A further advance was made by the constitution of the Padapāṭha, commonly ascribed to Śākalya, which resolved the euphonic combinations and gave each word, each member of a compound, each prefix of the verb, as also each suffix or termination of the noun separately. The stock of grammatical notions familiar to this stage of development, though not very large, is already sufficient to indicate the earnestness of the search for truth.

5. The predecessors of Yāska.—We are not yet certain when the art of writing came to be invented—or introduced—in Ancient India. It was certainly much earlier than what Max Müller once believed it to be.³ Whatever that period might be, it must have been prior to the production of the Prātiśākhya literature; and by this we

¹ See Max Müller's History of Ancient Indian literature, 2nd edition pp. 128, 187, &c.
³ History of Ancient Indian Literature, p. 520. Compare on the subject Bühler's contribution to the Grundris der Indischen Philologie, especially page 18.
mean not the Prātiśākhyaśas in their present form—which are post-Pāṇinīya and pre-suppose much of his terminology—but in some earlier form, and under whatever other names they may have been then known. The contributions which these prototypes of our present Prātiśākhyaśas made to the science of grammar can now, in the absence of any really representative works of that class, be merely guessed at. If the nature and contents of our existing Prātiśākhya literature can safely be made the basis of any inference, we may suppose that these earlier treatises 1. classified the Vedic texts into the four forms of speech known to Yāska; 2. framed and carefully defined some of the primitive² saññās or technical terms; and 3. possibly also made some more or less crude attempts to reduce the words to their elements and explain the mode of their grammatical formation. The really creative period of this science is just this. Had there been for this period any works extant, they would have shown us Yāska in the making, as Yāska himself, to some extent, shows us Pāṇini in the making. It is a great pity, therefore, that the period should be all blank to us. Since, however, these tentative sallies of the earlier authors were not probably definite enough to constitute a system, and since we have here to treat of systems of Sanskrit grammar, we must next pass on to Yāska³, who, although a philologist and not a grammarian as such, can for our purpose be regarded as forming the link between the primitive Prātiśākhya type of spe-

1 Goldstücker, Pāṇini: his place in Sanskrit literature, pp. 183 and ff.; Reprint of the same by Pāṇini office, pp. 141 and ff.
2 Primitive: those namely that Pāṇini pre-supposes and uses without explaining them. Dr. Burnell would call these the terms of the Aindra School of Grammarians.
3 Yāska calls his own work a supplement to grammar: व्याकरणस्य कालस्फव योः।
culation on the one hand, and the later Pāṇinīya mode of thought on the other.

6. Yāska’s Nirukta: Its date.—In a memorable passage Yāska himself roughly indicates the course of the development of Vedic studies before his time, and, reflecting the achievements made up to his days in the sciences of grammar and philology, contributes his own quota to the same. The passage has been variously interpreted, but the explanation given below may be found perhaps as acceptable as any other. It mentions three distinct periods of intellectual development corresponding roughly to sections 2–5 above. Unfortunately the time of Yāska is by no means yet certain. It depends for the most part, on the date that is to be assigned to Pāṇinī, between whom and this great writer at least a century, if not more, must be supposed to have elapsed in order to account properly for all the advances in the matter.

1 साक्षात्कल्पितमैण सप्तयो पद्धतुः।

These are the original “Seers of Mantras”.

2 वप्रेवेशाय साक्षात्कल्पितमैण उप-वैवेशिए मन्त्रव् सम्बादुः।

These correspond to the authors of the Brāhmaṇic speculations; possibly also to the compilers of the family-books.

3 वप्रेवेशाय विषयन्तोंवरे विनम्रथ महाव्याहारे ग्रन्थ समानामासिद्धै।

These are the authors of the Pada-paṭha, the Nīghaṇṭa, and other allied works, including possibly the prototypes of our modern Prātiśākhyaas.

2 Thus, for—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal</th>
<th>कारित</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequentative</td>
<td>चर्करित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>चिकित्सित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>व्यक्तजन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak termination</td>
<td>निदीविशिष्यान</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominative termination</td>
<td>नामकरण</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly Yāska defines (rather derives) सर्वनाम अस समाहि as नामावि पद्धः. सर्वेऽद्वृत्तम समाहि नामाविः त्वाः. It is often used by him otherwise than as a technical term of grammar. Compare vi. 6. 8, vii. 1. 2, vii. 1. 5, &c. Again,
and wording of the rules of grammar that are to be met with in the Ashṭādhyāyī. We have dealt with the question of Pāṇini’s date in another part of this essay, and if that result be accepted, Yāska must be placed about 800 to 700 before Christ.

There are, however, a few facts which seem to militate against the view that Yāska flourished before Pāṇini. The Sūtras of Pāṇini nowhere make any provision for the formation of words like अपाणं, which occurs in Nirukta (Bib. Ind. edition, Vol. iv. page 258 &c.). Nor did Pāṇini apparently know Yāska’s explanation of बुर्ण (Rigveda x. 85.20) by सूर्यस्य पति. Pāṇini must, therefore, have preceded Yāska; else how can we account for such omissions in a grammarian of the calibre of Pāṇini? The utter uselessness of these and similar negative arguments can be seen on a closer examination of the instances adduced. To obviate the last of these defects Kātyāyana¹ gives सूर्यहिततायां चाउँ बलव्य: as a vārtika to sūtra iv.1. 48. Kātyāyana must, therefore, have come after Yāska whose work he here presumably utilises. On the contrary, the first omission is not rectified even by Kātyāyana who gives two vārtikas (no. 7 and 8 to vi. 1.89) to explain forms like माऽणं and क्रणणं but not अपाणं/ This would necessitate the supposition that Yāska came after Kātyāyana. A mode of argumentation which leads to such contradictory conclusions is no safe foundation for

there is a great distance between Yāska’s definition of निपातक as उद्भवेष्यथेऽपि निपातः and his giving the meanings for each individually, and Pāṇini’s classification of them into उपसार्य when joined to verbs, गति if the root develops into a noun, and कर्मवचनाय. Many more similar illustrations could be found.

¹ In Kielhorn’s edition vol. ii. p. 220, this is given not as a vārtika of Kātyāyana but as a part of the Mahābhāṣya. In that case Yāska’s explanation of अपाणं as अरण्यस्य पति and his non-acquaintance with vārtika 1 to Sūtra iv. 1, 49 may be adduced to prove the point at issue.
any chronological edifice, especially when the evidence for Yāska’s priority to Pāṇini is so overwhelming.

7. Nature of Yāska’s work.—In form Yāska’s work is a running commentary upon a list of words in five adhyāyas, known as the Nighaṅtu. The words are all taken from the Veda; the first three adhyāyas arrange them as synonyms, the fourth is a collection of certain difficult words occurring in the Veda, while the last is a list of the names of Vedic deities. Yāska takes these words one by one (in the case of the first three adhyāyas only the more important ones), quotes Vedic passages wherein they are used, and tries to connect them with radical stems and launches into various interesting social and historical discussions in his attempts to trace the later history of these words, always giving references to any conflicting views that may have been held on the subject. Certain general reflections as to the nature and utility of the study of the Vedas, the cosmological functions of the Vedic Gods, and so forth also find their proper place in the work.

That grammatical speculations had sufficiently advanced in the days of Yāska is evidenced even by the list of schools and individual teachers quoted or referred to in the Nirukta,¹ none of whose works have been preserved to us. Yāska already knew, what it required an Aristotle to discover subsequently, viz.: the fourfold classification of words, as also the distinction between personal terminations and tense affixes on the one hand, and the primary and secondary nominal affixes on the other. Nay, he definitely formulates the theory that every noun is deriv-

¹ These are: आदेश्यणः, आदेश्यणः, आचायरः, एकः, ऐतिहासिकः, औद्धुररायणः, औपलोथ्यजः, औपर्यायः, कार्यकरः, कौन्तिकः, गार्गरः, गार्रः, चर्मिलिङ्गः, तैतिकः, नैश्वर्यः, पारिवर्तकः, परवचनः, मद्रः, याज्ञवल्क्यः, पुरुषः, याज्ञवल्क्यः, वायुयुगः, वैद्याकरणः, ज्ञातायणः, ज्ञातः, गृहः, ज्ञातः, स्थौलादिपिः, हारिकृष्णम्.
ed from a verbal root and meets the various objections raised against it,—a theory on which the whole system of Pāṇini is based, and which is, in fact, the postulate of modern Philology.¹

8. Yāska’s successors.—Many valuable works on grammar subsequent to Yāska’s Nirukta but anterior to Pāṇini’s Asḍādhyāyī have been irrevocably lost to us; for, it cannot be maintained with cogency that the extremely artificial and algebraic style of the Asḍādhyāyī could have been completely evolved by Pāṇini himself in the absence of similar tentative works preceding his. We have got for this the evidence of Pāṇini’s own sūtras which use many technical words and formulas without having previously explained them²—an omission which, as indicated by Pāṇini at 1.2.53-57, is to be accounted for on the supposition that they were too well-known or already sufficiently dealt with in other works to need any exposition at his hands.

Some of these works must certainly have been in existence long after the time of the Mahābhāṣya, since we find many quotations from them in later writers. The chief founders of grammatical schools prior to Pāṇini are, Aphisali and Kāṣṇkritsna (compare Pāṇini vi. 1. 92). A rule of Aphisali³ is given by the Kāśika on vii. 3. 95,

¹ Compare Max Müller’s History of Ancient Sk. Literature, pp. 161-168.
² Such as, पल्लव, पधम, विकरेच, दुर्देश, चतुःचर, पत्रयम, बहरी, ससुर, सामाज, तत्तुष्ण, अपपरभाष, बहुवैध्य, कोट, तार, &c., occurring respectively in i. 1. 69, ii. 3. 46, ii. 3. 2, ii. 3. 18, ii. 3. 13, ii. 3. 23, ii. 3. 50, ii. 3. 36, ii. 1. 3, ii. 1. 22, ii. 1. 5, iii. 2. 23, iii. 1. 93, iv. 1. 76, and elsewhere. These could not all have been taken from the Prāshāskhyā works anterior to Yāska, since some of them appear to be unknown to that author and must have come into vogue since his day. Compare also Pāṇini i. 3. 120, आक्रमे नात्रप्रवम, where Bhaṭṭoṣi says, आक्रमे रत्सना गच्चाद् । आपिष्टासहस्रसम्यम्: सार्वधातुक-इव छत्त्वासमि पत्रि
while elsewhere it gives us the information that the grammar of Kāśakṛitsna consisted of sūtras thrown into three Adhyāyas.\(^1\) Kaiyayāta on v. i. 21 actually gives portions of the text of both these grammarians\(^2\)—and this is about all the information that we possess regarding these two ancient grammarians. To later writers like Bopadeva\(^3\) they are probably little more than mere names.

9. The so-called Aindra treatises.—The case stands a little different with Indra or Indragomin. Pāṇini nowhere mentions this name except under the general appellation of ‘the easterners’. An oft-quoted passage from the fourth taraṅga of the Kathāsaritsāgara informs us that the school which Pāṇini supplanted was known as the Aindra school, and numbered among its adherents Kātyāyana alias Vararuchi, Vyādi, and Indradatta. Hiuen Tsang the Chinese pilgrim, and Tārānātha the Tibetan historian, both relate a similar story, the latter adding that the Chāndra vyākaraṇa agrees with Pāṇini, and the Kālāpa vyākaraṇa with the Aindra. Tārānātha also states that God Kārttikeya revealed the Aindra vyākaraṇa to Saptā-(not Sarva-)varman (compare section 64, below). Further corroborative evidence is furnished by a passage\(^4\) from the Taittiriya-saṃhitā (vii. 4. 7), which speaks of Indra as the first of grammarians. To all this Dr. Burnell

1 Compare the Kāśikā on v. 1, 58, and iv. 2. 65: निक्रेद्विज्ञानस्यतमस्य। चित्तकाकाशकुलस्त्राः। Another bit of information about आपिष्कृतिः, which I owe to Profes- sor Pathak, is that he changed the root अस्त् ‘to be’ to स्. Compare आस्त्ति सकारामातिन्द्रे, in the Mahābhāṣya on i. 3. 22. Jīnendrabuddhi and Śūkṣayāna (i. 4. 38’) supply आपिष्कृतिः as the subject of आतिन्द्रे।

2 आपिष्कृताकाशकुलस्योरस्त्राः प्रयत्निग्रहीति सत्तनावभुव्य माः स्थितिभावान्।

3 Compare, इन्द्रवन्म: काशकुलापित: निति आतिन्द्रयन्ति। पालिन्द्रस्वस्वत्-न्म: जयनंदनादिवाचारिन्त:। from Bopadeva’s Mugdhabodha.

4 नत्ती द्व्याध्यायकावतानुसारः। ते देवत इन्द्रमुक्तविन्यायो रूपा स्वकार्यिती। ...........। तामिन्द्री मध्यतीवक्त्रम्। व्याकरूपः।
further adds that the Tolkappiyam, one of the oldest Tamil grammars, represents itself to be full of the Aindra system, and was read in the Pāṇḍya King's assembly and there met with approval. This Tolkappiyam is closely related to Kāṭantra, to Kachchāyana's Pāli grammar, and to the Prātiṣākhyas, all of which are to be regarded as treatises belonging to the Aindra school of grammarians. The conclusion¹ which Dr. Burnell reaches is that the 'Aindra was the oldest school of Sanskrit grammar, and that Aindra treatises were actually known to and quoted by Pāṇini and others, and that Aindra treatises still exist in the Prātiṣākhyas, in the Kāṭantra, and in similar works, though they have been partly recast or corrected.' And again, 'the Aindra treatises belong to a system older than Pāṇini's, though there is perhaps reason to believe that not one of them is, as a whole, older than the grammar of the last.'

That the technical terms used by the so-called Aindra treatises are connected with one another and are, further, simpler and more primitive than those of Pāṇini is quite evident; and on this ground it is not unlikely that they represent a school of grammarians prior to Pāṇini's. But since, besides the Aindra, we have at least two other schools also older than Pāṇini, it will not do to put down every one of these sañjñās as belonging to the Aindra school, seeing that we have no information regarding the sañjñās of the other two. In the present state of our knowledge, the fact that the Aindra school is nowhere quoted by name either in Pāṇini or Mahābhāshya or Kāśikā should point to the conclusion—also endorsed by Keilhorn—that the Aindra school is post-Pāṇiniya in date, though pre-Pāṇiniya in substance. Possibly it may be no other than the Kāṭantra school

¹ Compare his Essay on the Aindra school of grammarians, passim.
which belongs to the early centuries of the Christian era.

Any further details regarding the grammatical efforts earlier than Pāṇini it is not possible to give. All that we can do is, following Yāska and on the basis of references occurring in Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, Patañjali, and the earlier Prātiṣākhyaśas and Brāhmaṇas, to frame a tabular statement of the schools and teachers with the tenets peculiar to each. A beginning towards one is made in Dr. Burnell’s essay quoted before, where only the names of the teachers—some of them later than Pāṇini—are given. ¹

The School of Panini

10. The School of Pāṇini.— The work which brought to a focus these tentative efforts of the early grammarians¹ and by its accuracy and thoroughness eclipsed all its predecessors, dominating the thoughts of generations of thinkers even to present times, is the Ashṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini. It stands—and it will always stand as long as Sanskrit continues to be studied—as a monument at once of encyclopedic research and technical perfection. The work is also interesting in that it is probably the oldest surviv-

¹ A few instances are also collected in Indische Studien, iv. p. 76. Compare also History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 160.

² In his etras Pāṇini refers to the Northern and the Eastern schools of grammarians and to the following ten individual authors: आर्यप्रतिस्थिति, काश्यप, गार्गर्ग, गार्गर्ग, चाकवकार्, भाग्य, चाकवकार्, भाग्य, समस्त, and स्त्रीयोदय. It would not be far from the truth to assume that in one way or another Pāṇini’s work was an improvement upon those of his predecessors. Some of them may have confined their attention merely to the Vedic and some to the post-Vedic Literature, or, treating of both, must have given less attention to current speech and more to the scriptures. The Vedāṅga spoken of by Yāska must be such a treatise and not the Ashṭādhyāyī.
ing specimen of that type of literary activity which found expression in the aphoristic style.¹

11. Pāṇini's date—The question about the age of this greatest of grammarians is by no means yet settled, or even on the way of being settled. The late Dr. Peterson was inclined to identify him with his namesake, Pāṇini the poet, quoted in Vallabhadева's Subhāshīṭāvāli and elsewhere, and to place him 'at a date much later than that ordinarily accepted,' that is, about the beginning of the Christian era.² The identification of Pāṇini the grammarian with Pāṇini the poet was also accepted by Pischel, who however assigned to him the date cir. 500 before Christ. The question 'how far Pāṇini will eventually have to be brought down from the date now accepted for him, or how far it may be, on the contrary, advisable to push into remoter antiquity the lyrical poetry of Northern India' is finally left undetermined by Dr. Peterson.³

According to this view it would appear that the two well-known references to the ākhyāyikā called Vāsa- vādattā occurring in the Mahābhāṣya (vol. ii, p. 284) are to be taken as chronologically in touch with the celebrated romance of Subandhu, a writer of the seventh century. This will leave not even a century between Ṛṣṭipāli and Bhartṛihari the author of the Vākyapadiya. How in that case we are to account for the vicissitudes in the text of the Mahābhāṣya as recorded in the latter work⁴ and in the Rājatarangini⁵ one is at a loss to say. Since the recent discovery of Bhāsa's Svapna-Vāsavādattam, which probably was based upon an earlier epic or ākhyānaka,

---

1 That the sūtra-form was not new in Pāṇini's days is evident from the sūtra v. 1.58: संहयायनः संहयायनं संहयायनं संहयायनं।
3 Introduction to the Subhāshīṭāvāli, p. 58.
4 Towards the end of Kanda ii.
5 Compare 1.176; See also Indian Antiquity, vol. iv. p. 107.
we are no longer required to connect Patañjali with Subandhu.

Weber and after him Max Müller put Pāṇini down to about 350 B. C., thereby making Pāṇini almost the contemporary of Kātyāyana the author of the vārtikas to Pāṇini's sūtras;¹ and this opinion obtained for a time, until it was assailed by Drs. Goldstücker and Bhandarkar who have succeeded in proving that Pāṇini cannot have flourished later than B. C. 500. Goldstücker went much farther: he maintained that "within the whole range of Sanskrit literature, so far as it is known to us, only the Samhitās of the Rik, Sāma, and Krishna-Yajus, and among individual authors only the exegete Yāska preceded Pāṇini, and that the whole bulk of the remaining known literature is posterior to him."² This position in an exaggerated form has been stated at length by Pandit Satyavrata Sāmasrami, in the introduction to his Nirukta, making Yāska also a successor of Pāṇini. The date he assigns to Pāṇini is cir. 2400 before Christ.

Conclusions of this kind it was once the fashion to brush aside as carrying the starting point of Vedic chronology much farther than there was any warrant for it. Since, however, recent researches into the antiquity of

¹ History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, as quoted by Goldstücker in his note 91, p. 80 (Reprint, p. 60) of Pāṇini, His place &c.
² Goldstücker, loc. cit., p. 243 (Reprint, p. 187). This view of Goldstücker, however, is not strictly accurate. Pāṇini must have known some form of the Grihya and the Dharma sūtras. In his śātra iv. 4. 71 Pāṇini mentions prohibited places or times for study:
the Vedas have done much to throw a doubt over the starting point for Ancient Indian Literature accepted by Professor Max Müller and other writers, the best thing, in the absence of any positive evidence, is a suspension of judgment. In another place (pp. 6-7) we have given reasons for agreeing with Goldstücker in accepting the priority of Yāska over Pāṇini. Perhaps 700 to 600 B.C. would be as near an approximation to Pāṇini's time as, in our present state of knowledge, or rather want of knowledge, we are likely to get.

12. The view that Pāṇini cannot be placed before B.C. 350 examined.—The fact that Pāṇini in iv. 1.49 (इन्द्रवर्णमन्दामयमातुर्हः—

सुहिमारण्यवस्यस्तनमातु}

चार्याण्यामात्रंकः) mentions Yavanas (and the female formation Yavanānī from the stem) has led most western scholars to put down Pāṇini to a date not earlier than B.C. 350. The underlying assumptions are: i. that ‘Yavanas' can designate not but the Ionian Greeks, and ii. that India did not have her knowledge of ‘Yavanas' prior to Alexander's invasion, B.C. 327. Now regarding point i. the late Dr. Rājendralāl Mitra in his ‘Indo-Aryans' gave ample evidence to prove that for no period of Indian history could we be quite certain that the word Yavana necessarily designated the Ionian Greeks. But even if we agree to wave this consideration for the present, point ii. is by no means a settled fact. The ‘v' sound in the word ‘Yavana' represents an original digamma (Gamma) in Greek; and as the digamma was lost as early as B.C. 800, the Sanskrit word ‘Yavana' must be at least as old as the ninth century before Christ. The Ionians appear in history long before B.C. 1,000 and it is not at all improbable that the Indians knew them, as well as their neighbouring races,—such as Assyrians (अश्यक्कुर-अहूर-अक्कुर) Skythians (शक-शक्स्यानीय), Medes (मद-मेद-मद), Persians (पारसिक), Parthians (पर्थिय), etc.—perhaps centuries before Alexander's invasion. At any rate if Indian troops are
known to have formed part of the army of Darius in the battle of Platææ (B.C. 479), India’s knowledge of the Greeks can go back to the middle of the fifth century before Christ. The fact is—and scholars are just beginning to recognize it—that we have been too hasty in condemning the Paurâniic accounts of the frontier tribes and races (e.g. those in the Vishnûpurâna or in the Mahâbhârata, Bhishmaparvan, Chap. xi) as purely imaginative fabrications. We have so far altogether ignored the extensive commerce and interchange of ideas that went on between the Indian Aryans and their brethren beyond the frontiers as far as the Mediterranean—and this long before B.C. 400. So much so that when other independent proofs vouch for the antiquity of an author (in the case of Pānini we shall discuss these proofs presently) the burden of proof rests with the person who maintains that some specific reference in that author belongs to a later and not to an earlier time, when, so far as facts go, the reference might just as well be to an earlier period.

Nay, more. In this particular case Pānini’s reference must certainly belong to the earlier period. Compared with Kâtyâyana’s knowledge about the Yavanâs that of Pānini is very slight. Pānini did not know that the Yavanâs had a script of their own (comp. यवनाल्पिक्याम्, Kâtyâyana’s vârtika 3 to iv. r.49), or at least in his time there was no current Sanskrit word for that script. Nor was the fact that the Yavanâs had a native-place and a kingdom of their own sufficiently known to Sanskrit literature, as is evidenced by Kâtyâyana’s vârtika कम्बोजवल्लिखितः दुवंचन वैराजक्षेत्र i.e. चोडुकेदारकरण(कक्षयवना)वचने to iv. r.175—supposing of course that शब्द and वचन form a genuine part of the कम्बोजवल्लिखितः! Such slight acquaintance with the Yavanâs, therefore, as Pānini betrays cannot have belonged to a time subsequent to Alexander’s invasion.
But there is also independent evidence to prove that Pāṇini lived before Alexander's invasion. The internal evidence which compels us to presuppose at least a couple of hundred years between Patañjali and Kātyāyana, and Kātyāyana and Pāṇini—an evidence which even Vincent Smith finds himself compelled to accept (Early Hist. 3rd. ed., p. 451, note 4)—has been indicated in note 1, page 28 below. The most important of external evidence that has been lately brought forward (by Mr. Vishvanāth Kāshināth Rājavāde in the 'Kesari' for 30th August 1910) is Pāṇini's mention of the town Sangala (Gr. Sāngala, Sk. Saṅkala) in the sūtra धृतिरघुद्धम्बर (iv. 2. 75). Pāṇini derives the name of the town from the proper name Saṅkala. Saṅkala is a city completed by (Prince?) Saṅkala. This city Alexander razed to the ground as a punishment for the stout resistance of its defenders (Vincent Smith, loc. cit., page 75), and Pāṇini could not have thereafter spoken of it in the manner in which he does. Pāṇini, therefore, must have lived before Alexander's invasion.

Another independent evidence is furnished by the sūtra एक्कत्याधिपत्यायादिविभूत्यां (v. 3.117). Here the Parsus or the Persians (and the Asuras or the Assyrians) are mentioned as an आयुर्जीविसंग or an organization of mercenary fighters, similar to the Greeks of the fourth century B.C., or the Germans of the seventeenth century. The Persians were blotted out as a political power in B. C. 329, and the Assyrians in B. C. 538. Pāṇini's references to these people belong, therefore, probably to a time anterior to these dates.

Lastly, reverting once more to Kātyāyana's vārtika to iv. 1.175, if the word शक forms a genuine part of the कस्मोजाविचिक, it will be necessary to suppose that Pāṇini did not know that the Sakas or Skythians had a country or a kingdom of their own. Now the first King of the
Skythians was Deioces (दीशोक्त) whose date is cir. 700 B.C., and Pāṇīni must have lived before B. C. 700 or at least not long after that date.

It is of course conceded that none of these arguments are decisive taken singly. Alternative suppositions could be made to explain away some of these facts. Thus Pāṇīni may conceivably mention the city of Sangala even after its destruction by Alexander. The Persians and the Assyrians might have turned into mercenary soldiers after the loss of their independence. And in the case of the कम्बोजाचुक्र sūtra, since Patañjali in his gloss on Kātyāyana’s vārtika does not mention the Śakas or the Yavanas, the two words may not possibly form a genuine part of Kātyāyana’s addition, and consequently no cogent argument could be based on that circumstance,—waving the alternative possibility of Pāṇīni having at times made mistakes. Finally, it is not altogether impossible that the sūtras on which our arguments for Pāṇīni’s antiquity are based, were taken over by Pāṇīni bodily from some of his predecessors, just as, contrariwise, the sūtras from which his modernity is inferred (especially the word यवन in sūtra iv. 1.149) were later interpolations. But in that way anything is possible and we would be reduced to speechlessness.

The upshot of all this is that there is nothing in Pāṇīni’s Ashtādhyāyī that is inconsistent with his having flourished in the seventh century B. C., and this negative conclusion is all that I am content to reach for the present, leaving the burden of proof with those who wish to maintain the contrary.

13. Known facts about Pāṇīni’s life.—As differing from himself Pāṇīni mentions (v. 3. 80, vi. 2. 74, etc.) a school of Eastern grammarians, and in later literature he is also known by the name Śālāturiya¹ which is probably derived

¹ शालातुरियाष्टाध्यायासुन्दरचन्द्रगोष्ठी &c, from भण्ड्रतमहोभि स्त्रांगा २.
Known Facts about Pāṇini's Life

from his native place. Cunningham has identified Śālavatūra with the present Lahaur in the Yusufzai valley. In the days of Huen Tsang the valley was known as Udyāna and Śālavatūra was a prosperous town. To-day it is an obscure deserted village in the North-western Frontier Province, near Attock. In his Mahābhāshya Patañjali gives another bit of biographical information about Pāṇini whom he calles कुशीपति. Dākshi then was Pāṇini's mother. The Kathāsaritsāgara (taraṅga 4) makes Pāṇini a contemporary of Kātyāyana and Vyādi and Indradatta, along with whom he studied at the house of द्रापाध्याय वर्ण. Not succeeding in his studies Pāṇini practised penance and received from God Śiva the fourteen prayāhāra sūtras. The story about his death from a tiger as recorded in Pañchatantra, if based on fact, may or may not refer to our Pāṇini. And this is about all that we know of Pāṇini's personality.

14. Character of Pāṇini's work.—Pāṇini's work consists of nearly four thousand sūtras thrown into eight adhyāyas of four pādas each: hence its name Ashtādhyāyī. The text of the sūtras has come down to us almost intact. A doubt exists as to the genuineness of only five of these sūtras, and that is because they are given in the Mahābhāshya as vārtikas to the sūtras just preceding them. When we say that the text has been preserved intact, it is not meant that it is exactly as we find it in any of our current editions. The late Dr. Kielhorn drew attention to the

1 सर्व सर्पनाविभस्त द्वारीयुज्यम् पाणिनि।
   Kielhorn's ed. vol. i. p. 75.

2 सिंहो ब्यक्तयत्सप्तादहरुप्राणान्त
   नियात्य पाणिनि। Tantra ii, stanza 33.

3 Namely, two between iv. 3.131 and 132 and v. 1.36, vi. 1.62, and vi. 1.100,—the last three being given in the Mahābhāshya as vārtikas to the sūtras immediately preceding. The
tendency to regard as sūtra what is given as vārtika, and vice versa, has created some confusion in the exact enumeration of the sūtras. The whole matter needs to be critically studied. Compare Goldstiicker page 29 (Reprint, p. 21), note 28.

4 Indian Antiquary, volume xvi, page 179.
fact that the text of the sūtras has not received from the editors all the care that is necessary. All that we mean is that with sufficient pains we can restore from the vārtikas and the Mahābhāshya the exact words as they were used by Pāṇini himself. Changes have been suggested in more than one place by more than one writer, but they were not actually made until after the times of Chandragomin, the Kāsikākāras, and subsequent writers."

Pāṇini has discussed his entire subject in a manner which is very simple in outline, could we but once grasp it, but which has proved very complex in execution. We may conceive of it in some such way as the following.

Analysing language—and this is what vyākaraṇa literally means—the first element we reach is a sentence, which again consists of a verb in the various tenses and moods, and a number of substantives in case-relations to each other. [The indeclinables we do not count for the present; they are put in towards the end of i.4.] Now the forms of verbs that we meet in sentences seem to be made up of an original root-stem and a number of pratya-yas or endings, and it is these endings that give the verbs their several modal and temporal significances. These endings, we further notice, group themselves into two sets, and some roots take invariably only one of them, others both, while a number of others change from one to the other under certain circumstances. At the outset then, and to get rid of extra complexity, we dispose of these so-called Atmane-pada and Parasmai-pada prakriyās (i. 3).

Turning pari passu to the other element of the sentence, having defined a case-relation (i. 4), we notice that there are often in a sentence substantives without any case termination at all. We explain these as the members of a whole which we technically call a samāsa or a compound. The formation and the varieties of these must
first be explained (ii. 1 and 2), before we actually treat of the kārakas or case-relations (ii. 3).

Taking up the verbs where we left them, we next, after a few preliminary definitions and other cognate matters (ii. 4 end), deal at length with the formation and the uses of the various tenses and moods; and, while we are still on the subject, we explain what are usually known as verbal derivatives, that is to say, those elements of sentences which, although by reason of their case-endings they may seem to belong to the category of substantives, do yet bear a very close affinity in meaning and formation to the root stems from which they are derived (iii. 1-4).

Now we are free to concentrate ourselves on the noun-element of the sentence. The Nairuktas or Etymologists seem to assert that all these nouns are derived from the root-stems, which were the ultimate factors that we reached in our examination of the verb-element of the sentence. Let us examine this theory.

To simplify matters we must, in the first place, dispose of a large number of nouns which are derived from other nouns by the addition of the so-called taddhita affixes (iv.1.76—v.4). Then it is that we reach the substantive divested of all external wrappings. But may not there be some changes in the very body of the nouns which we can explain? It is only when we have done that (vi.4—vii.4) that we are at liberty to style the residual as ‘अस्तुत्तरशानि प्रातिपदिकानि’,—unless, of course, we intend to step outside the rôle of a mere grammarian, as distinguished from a philologist, and try to trace even these back to some more primitive verb-stems. Pāṇini has made his contribution to philology in the form of the Unādi-sūtras (see below, § 16).

This gives us the complete programme of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, and if Pāṇini seems to depart from this in places
it is more for convenience of treatment than for anything else. He begins, as was quite appropriate, with a few definitions and canons of interpretation (i. i and 2), and he always takes care to introduce such definitions wherever they are required. Some minor topics usually found included in systematic treatises on grammar, such as the Svāra-prakāraṇa (vi. 2) or the Strī-pratyayas, Pāṇini has attempted to put into the places where they would most fit in, the only prominent exception to the above rule being the Sandhī-prakāraṇa, which may conceivably have as well been placed elsewhere than where it occurs (vi, i and viii. 2–4), and which in any case need not have been cut into two halves separated from one another by the whole matter of nearly two chapters. His system of pratyāhāras and his anxiety to secure a maximum of brevity are perhaps responsible for this lapse in regular logical sequence. But barring these paltry exceptions there is no doubt that Pāṇini has succeeded remarkably well in welding the whole incongruous mass of grammatical matter into a regular and a consistent whole.¹

15. Technical devices used by Pāṇini.—The difficulty in understanding Pāṇini comes from the very circumstance which Pāṇini himself perhaps considered as his real advance over all his predecessors, namely his attempt to economise expression where conceivably he could do so

¹ I do not wish to conceal the fact that the above topical scheme for the whole of the Āshtādhyāyī will be found wanting, if tried in details. It would seem as if Pāṇini was working alternately upon the two main aspects of his problem: the nouns and the verbs; and the present arrangement of the sūtras in the Āshtādhyāyī is the result of attempting to dovetail the two into a coherent whole, involving in the process many an addition and omission and transposition. It may even be that some sections of the sūtras are post-Pāṇinīya interpolations, just as, contrariwise, other sections of the sūtras Pāṇini may have bodily taken over from some earlier
without being misunderstood. Why Pāṇini should have
elected to strain all his nerves to bring about a result
which a student of grammar is often likely to regard as
the curse of his lot is more than what we can say. His
object may have been to give his students aids to memo-
ry, or the sūtra-style may have arisen, as suggested by
Goldstücker, in the scarcity of the material for writing.
In any case we have reasons to assume that the sūtras
from the earliest times were accompanied by a traditional
explanation of them.

Let us for a moment dwell a little longer on this
point and note the various means whereby Pāṇini attempt-
ted to secure terseness and brevity of expression. The
foremost amongst the devices used was of course that of
the pratyāhāras or elliptical statements, and of the anu-
bandhas or significant endings. The first was effected by
means of the fourteen Śiva-sūtras, which, according to
tradition, were revealed to him by God Śiva himself by
sounding his tabor. As to the second, although the anu-
bandhas used by Pāṇini are peculiar to himself, the de-
vice does not appear to have been his invention. The
practice already existed, and Pāṇini only utilised it to its
utmost limits.¹

The formation of gaṇas, by which are meant lists of
words which undergo similar grammatical changes, also
tended towards the same result. Some of these gaṇas are
complete and some ākṛiti-gaṇas, that is to say, gaṇas
which do not exhaustively enumerate all the words of a

¹ Compare Mahābhāṣya on vii. 1. 18 : अध्य य पुर्णद्वहसिद्धांशोदयम् ।
पृष्ठद्वेषेण वेद्यस्थैर्या न तेषिष्कायामणि किर्यन्ते।

grammars. But for the intrinsic difficulty of the task and
for the fact that we have no

extant authority earlier than

the Mahābhāṣya, which knows

the Aṣṭādhyāyī in practically

the same form in which we

have it now,—here would be a

splendid problem in textual
criticism.
class, but rather give merely a few leading types. Pāṇini in his sūtras gives only the first word of a gaṇa and they have hence been considerably tampered with since his times. So, although we cannot be certain whether any one word now found in the Gaṇapāṭha existed in Pāṇini’s day, still the bulk of our present Gaṇapāṭha may safely be considered as coming from the hands of the grammarian himself.

The next device to secure brevity was the invention of peculiar technical symbols such as च, वष, लक, कु, क्त &c. Some of these may have been known to Pāṇini from his predecessors, while others were probably of his own creation. Patañjali distinctly tells us that दि, ठ and थ were known to him already.¹

In the framing of the sūtras Pāṇini always scrupulously omitted all such words as may be conveniently supplied from sense or from preceding sūtras. The technical name for this process is anuvṛtti, and to secure it he has made some of his sūtras adhikāra-sūtras,² that is to say, sūtras which have to be repeated, wholly or in part, each time any of the sūtras dominated by it are to be interpreted. Lastly, in portions of the Ashtadhyāyī he has so arranged the sūtras that where two sūtras appear equally applicable, that which comes earlier in the order of the Ashtadhyāyī must obtain precedence over the one which comes later.³

1 Mahābhāshya on i. 2. 53, and Kaiyāmata in the same place.
2 Pāṇini shows that a particular sūtra is an adhikāra sūtra by i. the word मधु FOLLOWED by a word in the ablative case occurring in a subsequent sūtra to which the adhikāra is to continue; as in i. 4. 56; 2. 3 Pāṇini viii. 2. 1—पूर्वात्तांसिद्धात्
3 स्थारितम—e. g. i. 2. 48, where ख्र has it; 3. giving a numerical value to some mute letter added to the sūtra; e. g. म (५) is supposed to be added to v. 1. 30 to show the extent of the adhikāra; and 4. व्याख्यातान- ती विशेषायतिपि।
There is yet one more device serving the same end which remains to be mentioned and of which so much was made in later grammatical speculations: namely, the use of the paribhāshās or canons of interpretation. Some of them are enunciated by Pāṇini himself, but a larger number he found already current in his day, and so used them tacitly, and the task reserved for later grammarians was to discover what facts in Pāṇini's sūtras imply the use of what particular paribhāshās.  

16. Treatises accessory to Pāṇini's Ashtādhyāyī.—In addition to the Ashtādhyāyī, Pāṇini put together a Dhātupāṭha or list of roots, a Gaṇapāṭha or list of words which behave alike grammatically, and Unādi-sūtras in some form or other. Regarding the first, Pāṇini mentions in the sūtras themselves all the ten classes and even some of their sub-divisions just as they occur in the Dhātupāṭha. The anubandhas of the Dhātupāṭha, further, have the same significance as those of the Ashtādhyāyī. These facts tend to establish Pāṇini's authorship of the Dhātupāṭha. We have already spoken (p. 23 above) about the Gaṇapāṭha, which also in the main belongs to Pāṇini.

The question as to the authorship of the Unādi-sūtras cannot be so easily settled. They are commonly supposed to be the work of Śakaṭāyana on the basis of statements found in the Nirukta and the Mahābhāṣya, according to which Śakaṭāyana agreed with the नैस्कृतिक in deriving

1 For the distinction between the परिभाषाः and the ज्ञापकम् and the whole question of Pāṇini's use of paribhāshās see Goldstücker, pp. 106-118 (Reprint, pp. 81-90).
2 Compare i. 3. 1; ii. 4. 72 and 75; iii. 1. 25, 55, 69, 73, 77, 78, 79, 81; iii. 3. 104; vi. 1. 15; vii. 1. 59; vii. 2. 45; &c.
3 Westergaard's Radices Linguæ Sanscritæ, pp. 342, 343.
4 Nirukta i. 4. 1: नामान्यवाच्यां ज्ञानमिति शाकटायानो नैस्कृतिकः
5 Kielhorn, vol. ii. p. 131: नाम व धातुरामान्य विशेष व्याकरणे शाकटायानो नैस्कृतिकः

[ Sk. Gr.]
all nouns from roots. Since, however, no work of Śākaṭāyana has come down to us, and since the Śabdānuśāsana which now passes under his name is a comparatively late production (see below, § 52), we cannot say whether this ancient Śākaṭāyana left behind him any work in justification of the views which he doubtless held.

On the other hand the Uṇādi-sūtras exhibit unmistakable marks of Pāṇini’s system. They use sañjñas such as क्षुर, दृष्टि, प्रति, उद्दाल, उपचा, लोप, संप्रसारण, and अभ्यास in the same sense in which Pāṇini uses them. The anubandhas of the Uṇādis are also similar to Pāṇini’s. This raises a strong presumption that the Uṇādi-sūtras are the work of Pāṇini himself; and it is further corroborated by the fact that Kātyāyana in more than one place takes objection to the technical application of a rule in the Ashṭādhyāyī urging that it does not hold good in the case of particular Uṇādi-sūtras—an objection which could not have been urged unless Kātyāyana regarded Pāṇini to be the author of the Uṇādis; for, Pāṇini was not to be expected to frame rules that would hold good in other people’s works.¹ There is no reason why we should not accept this conclusion.

¹ We cannot, however, assign all the Uṇādi-sūtras to Pāṇini’s authorship, seeing that in some places their teaching runs counter to the Ashṭādhyāyī.² The probable view, as suggested by Goldstücker,³ is that the Uṇādi list was first drawn up by Pāṇini, but that it was afterwards modified or corrected by Kātyāyana. The extent of the changes introduced by the author of the Vārtikas must

---

¹ Examples are vii, 3, 50, vii. 4, 13, viii, 2, 78, and viii, 3, 59. In most of these cases Kātyāyana has the remark उणादीन्तं परिवर्द्धयो एकत्वयो एकत्वय: or words to this effect. Patañjali’s defence of Pāṇini is throughout ground-

² Thus, Uṇādi-sūtra iv. 226 goes against Pāṇini vi, 2, 139.

³ Pāṇini, his place &c., pp. 170 (Reprint, 130) and 181 (Reprint, 139).
have been so great as to credit him, in popular tradition, with their sole authorship. Thus Vimalasarasvati, a writer not later than the fourteenth century A. D., and Durgasimha who belongs to the early centuries of the Christian era, both assign the authorship of the Uṇādi-sūtras to Vararuci alias Kātyāyana. The poet Māgha, however, seems to look upon the Uṇādis as belonging to Pāṇini, though his words are not quite explicit.

The other works appended to Pāṇini’s system probably do not come from him. The Phīṭ-sūtras are, by unanimous testimony, the work of Śāntanavāchārya, a writer much later than Pāṇini. The Śikṣā bears on the face of it the stamp of modernness, notwithstanding the fact that a verse from it has found its way into the Mahābhāshya; and the same is true of the Liṅgānuśāsana. Regarding the Paribhāshās, in addition to those given by Pāṇini in his Ashṭādhyāyi there may have been others current in Pāṇini’s time and tacitly employed by him; but no ancient collection of them has come down to us. The Paribhāshās are usually assigned to the authorship of Vyādi who comes between Pāṇini and Patañjali.

1 In the Ṛṣyamāla, the India Office Ms. of which is dated 1381 A. D., we find: उपाभिसङ्कृत-करणाय शवंषिना प्रथमेव सुर्याणि मणीतालामि। ततथा। श्लोकार्थे ॥

2 He begins his com. on the कृत section of the Kātantra with the verse: उपाभिसङ्कृतसभ्यः कृतः। शवंसिना न कृतः। कृतः। काश्यपमने सूक्ष्म किंचिद्विदष्टिं इत्ये ॥ The kṛtās in this school also include the Uṇādis, as will be seen later.

3 Śīśupālavadha xix. 75, and Mal- linātha’s commentary upon the same.

4 Compare नागाजिन्ध्र on फिन्दिन्द्र ii. 21, where he remarks—श्लोक फिन्दिन्द्राणि पाणिनियेक्ष्यां आयु- निकासाः। काव्याः पर्वं थोपस्व।

5 Mahābhāshya, vol. i. p. 2—श्लोकः। कृतः। कृतः। काश्यपमने सूक्ष्म किंचिद्विदष्टिं इत्ये ॥ ॥ The kṛtās in this school also include the Uṇādis, as will be seen later.
Between Pāṇini and the next great grammarian, Kātyāyana, came many authors, who attempted, more or less successfully, to emend or justify Pāṇini’s rules, and some of the metrical vārtikas found in the Mahābhāshya probably belong to these predecessors of Kātyāyana. We must needs assume this, unless we are ready to suppose that the considerable interval of time that exists between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana was altogether barren of grammatical speculations. Whoever these predecessors were, as our knowledge about their works is next to nothing, we must now pass on to Kātyāyana himself.

17. Kātyāyana: His date.—The Kathāsaritsāgara makes Kātyāyana the contemporary of Pāṇini, or more accurately, the senior of the two; and had not this tradition been to this extent accepted by so great an authority as Max Müller, we might have explained this on the analogy of a row of columns seen in perspective, where the columns which are farthest from us look nearest to each other, for the simple reason that we cannot discern any marks in the interspaces. We must be prepared however to give up this view and presuppose between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana that much time which the nature of the changes in the forms of language above indicated will reasonably require; and unless we assume that language and customs were in an extraordinarily volatile condition in ancient times,

1 Goldstücker proves this by showing that 1. grammatical forms current in Pāṇini’s time are obsolete in that of Kātyāyana. 2. So also the meanings of words. 3. Words acquire in Kātyāyana’s times significances which they had not in Pāṇini’s. 4. Literature known to Kātyāyana was unknown to Pāṇini. 5. Writers contemporary with or little separated in time from Pāṇini are looked upon by Kātyāyana as very ancient, e.g. Yājñyavalkya; on his last point the Kāśika remarks: प्राप्तवल्क्यायोऽहि न विषेक्षात्म इत्याक्षरे नेंद्र वात्ति. For fuller particulars see Goldstücker on Pāṇini, pp. 122-157 (Reprint, pp. 94-120).
about two to three centuries would not by any means be too great an interval that we can suppose to have elapsed between them. In the present state of our knowledge we cannot therefore, unfortunately, arrive at a greater approximation than 500-350 B. C., nearer to the latter limit if the relation of Kātyāyana with the Nandas mentioned in Kathāsaritsāgara has any basis in fact.

18. Nature of Kātyāyana’s work.— Kātyāyana’s work, the vārtikas, are meant to correct, modify, or supplement the rules of Pāṇini wherever they were or had become partially or totally inapplicable. There are two works1 of his which aim at this object. The earlier2 is the Vājasaneyi Prātiṣākhya, a work dealing with the grammar and orthography of the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā. Being limited by the nature of his subject to Vedic forms of language only, Kātyāyana has herein given his criticisms on such of the sūtras of Pāṇini as fell within his province. Taking up the suggestion which dawned upon him probably in the course of his Prātiṣākhya, Kātyāyana next subjected Pāṇini’s Asḥādyāyi to a searching criticism. Since here his object was not to explain Pāṇini but find faults in his grammar, he has left unnoticed many sūtras that to him appeared valid. Of the nearly 4,000 sūtras Kātyāyana

1 Kātyāyana is credited with the authorship of a third work in sūtra style, the Kātyāyana Śrauta-sūtras (published in the Chaukhandha Sanskrit series), but it has nothing to do with grammar. It might have given Kātyāyana practice in writing sūtras, but that is all.

2 That the Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣākhya is posterior to and based upon Pāṇini is clear from the fact i. that many of the sūtras there given are identical with those of Pāṇini. ii. The pratyāhyānas and anubandhas are in most cases those of Pāṇini. iii. Where there are changes they are improvements upon Pāṇini, such improvements as Kātyāyana later embodied with occasional changes for the better in his vārtikas. See Goldstücker, Pāṇini, pp. 199 (Reprint, pp. 153) and the following.
noticed over 1,500 in about 4,000 vārtikas. We must add to these the considerable number of cases where Kātyāyana has criticised Pāṇini’s rules in his Prātisākhyā. Some of these criticisms he repeats as vārtikas, generally saying there what he had to say in a more correct form.¹

Kātyāyana has not merely stated his doubts and objections in regard to some of Pāṇini’s rules, but in most cases has shown how they can be solved or removed.² At the same time he always takes care to prove his propositions, and when suggesting an alternative course, he always tells us that he does so. Notwithstanding this there are, according to Patañjali’s showing, a good many cases where his criticisms are misplaced, or are the result of misunderstanding Pāṇini.)

Some of the vārtikas are written in prose, while others are thrown into a metrical form. In a vast number of cases Kātyāyana has clearly indicated the rules of Pāṇini to which his remarks refer by repeating the sūtras verbatim,³ or with slight changes,⁴ or by taking its most important⁵ or introductory⁶ word. Cross references to his own vārtikas he gives by स्वदेशप्रोक्तक हेतु, उर्दु बा, or उर्दु पुष्पण.⁷

Kātyāyana, in that he meant to write a criticism on Pāṇini was compelled to adhere to the latter’s terminology. Notwithstanding this fact he has used स्क for अचेत.

¹ For Pāṇini’s—
ाश्रेष्ठ तपस्वी हेतु: 1-3-50
tathāgatavatāra 1-3-63
cakranāmaśākṣi 9-1-2

² Usually by phrases such as उर्दु बा. Compare Indian Antiquary, volume v, Note 2 on the Mahabhbhāṣya, where Kielhorn discusses the whole subject.

³ Vārtika 1 to sūtra iii. 1. 84;

⁴ Vārtika 1 to sūtra iii. 1. 84;

⁵ Vārtika 1 to sūtra v. 2. 47;

⁶ Vārtika 1 to sūtra vi. 4. 14;

⁷ Vārtika 2 to sūtra iii. 4. 79;

—to give but one instance of each.
Earlier and Later Vārtikakāras

19. Vārtikakāras before and after Kātyāyana.—As observed before (p. 28), Kātyāyana had several predecessors from whose works he may have taken many suggestions. In his Prātisākhya he refers to Śākaṭāyana and Śākalya, names already quoted by Pāṇini; while in the vārtikas he refers by name to Vājapyāyana, Vyādi, and Paushkarasādi, and designates a number of others under the general appellation of ēkakā, kāchit, and so forth. Some of these latter must have been scholars who, like Kātyāyana himself, subjected the wording of the sūtras of Pāṇini to a critical examination. Vyādi we know, was the author of an extensive work called Saṅgraha, referred to in the Mahābhāshya which is in fact based upon it.

Kātyāyana was followed in his task by a vast number of writers. The names of some of these are preserved for us by Patañjali. To that list we must add the author or authors of the metrical vārtikas (over 250) that are quoted in the Mahābhāshya. Some of these belong to Patañjali himself, others probably to Kātyāyana, while still others, to either the predecessors or successors of Kātyāyana.

1 Taraṅga iv. and elsewhere: तेन भुज्ञनेतस्य तदस्मात्तकरणं भवि।
2 Mahābhāshya, vol. i., p. 8, line 2: 10 Namely, आज्ञानीय, सीनग, कु-परवालुक, वायव्य, सीयङ्कमय, and
c. 11 The question as to the authorship of these ṣṭhāṅkavārtikas is discussed in the Indian Antiquary vol. v, Note 4 on the Mahābhāshya.

padiya describes the Mahābhāshya as संबिधध्यात्मतितकस्युक्तः.
3 iiii. 8: प्रत्ययस्वत्वं मुद्रि शाक्तापापमि।
4 iiii. 9: अविधार ढाकाम: अपसांज।
5 Vārtika 35 to i. 2. 64.
6 Vārtika 45 to i. 2. 64.
7 Vārtika 3 to viii. 4. 48.
8 Vārtika 4 to ii. 1. 1, &c.
9 Vol. i. p. 6, line 2; The Vākyā.
some of them at least presuppose Kātyāyana is proved by kārikā i on Pāṇini i. ii. 2118, which quotes one of his vārtikas. Unfortunately none of these successors of Kātyāyana are known to us otherwise than through quotations made by Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya. We must therefore next pass on to Patañjali, with whom ends the first period in the history of the Pāṇiniya school.

20. Patanjali: His date and personal history.—The date of Patañjali the author of the Mahābhāṣya is not subject to as vague a guess-work as that of Kātyāyana or Pāṇini. At one time scholars were inclined to make him a contemporary of Christ, but Dr. Bhandarkar has fought through the pages of the Indian Antiquary for an earlier date; and it has been now accepted by scholars all round, and formed, in fact, until the recent discovery of the Kauṭiliya, the one definite landmark in the history of ancient Indian Literature, by a reference to which the dates of Patañjali’s predecessors and successors could be approximately determined. The main arguments for assigning him to 150 B.C. are these: i. The instance ह्रेणतित्र रावणम: in such a context that the event must have occurred within the lifetime of Patañjali. ii. Similarly the instances अर्धयर्थम: साकेत and अरुःस्वभाट� मध्यसिकाष, which refer to a siege by Menander. iii. As a collateral evidence, the mention of a financial expedient of the Mauryas.¹

Regarding the personal history of Patañjali very little is known. He was a contemporary of Pushpamitra and probably much honoured by him for his learning. It is usual to suppose that the epithets Gonardiya and Gonikāputra used in the Mahābhāṣya² are his own other names

¹ The references are: Indian Antiquary i. 299-302; ii. 57, 69, 94, 206-10, 238, and 362; xiv. 2 Vol. i. pp. 78, 91, 336, &c. 80-84; xvi. 156, 172; and

² Goldstücker, pp. 228-38 (Repri-print, pp. 175-183).
derived from his native place and the name of his mother, but it has been shown by Rājendralāl Mitra and Dr. Kielhorn that they are distinct authors, and as such they are quoted by so early a writer as Vātsyāyana the author of the Kāma-sūtra. The best account of Patañjali’s time, if not of his person, is to be found in the Mahābhāshya itself; and a detailed exposition of the religious, historical, geographical, social, and literary data as resulting from the contents of that work is to be found in the Indische Studien, xiii. pp. 293–502.

We have stated that Patañjali was not the first to deal with Kātyāyana in the same way in which the latter dealt with Pāṇini. Patañjali was perhaps the most successful if not also the last of the number. Besides giving his ishītis (desiderata) on Pāṇini’s sūtras, wherever Kātyāyana had omitted to give vārtikas, his chief aim was to vindicate Pāṇini against the often unmerited attacks of Kātyāyana; and in this he has achieved a remarkable success, although in some places he overdoes his defence and becomes decidedly unfair to Kātyāyana. The style of his work is unparalleled in the whole range of Sanskrit Literature, only the Śārīra-bhāshya of Śaṅkara being worthy of a mention by its side.

Regarding the text of the Mahābhāshya the traditions recorded in the Rājatarāṅgini and in the Vākyapadiya state that it had become so hopelessly corrupt in the time of king Abhimanyu of Kāśmīr that only one authentic Ms. of it existed throughout India, from which all subsequent copies of it have been derived. The work, like

2 Indian Antiquary xiv, p. 40.
3 See Kāma-sūtra, p. 67 (Kāavya-mālā edition).—According to the nātimās are divided into four classes, while
4 Vide note 5 on p. 13 above.
5 [ Sk. Gr. ]
Paṇini's Ashṭādhyāyī is divided into eight adhyāyas of four pādas each, each pāda being further subdivided into from one to nine āhnikas. The Mahābhāshya does not notice all the sūtras of Paṇini, but only such as were noticed by Kātyāyana, as also such others as Patañjali himself considered incomplete and capable of improvement. Whether the remaining were likewise commented upon by Patañjali or not is more than what we can say.¹

21. Patañjali's Mahābhāshya as marking the end of the first period in the history of the Paṇiniya school.—Paṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali are traditionally known as the "three sages," muni-trayam, who gave the law to the science of grammar. Each took for his study the whole field of the living language, and the contribution made by each to the stock of inherited knowledge and ideas is quite considerable. Patañjali's Mahābhāshya for a time marked the highest point in the development of the science of grammar. So far as grammatical speculations go, the next three or four centuries—which coincided with the bloom of the classical Prākrit literature and which also witnessed the Scythian invasions on a large scale—are a perfect blank to us; and our next leap from Patañjali should be to Chandragomin, the founder of the Chāndra school.

22. Chandragomin and his work.—Chandragomin was a close student of Paṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali, and for his work he utilized all their labours, trying in several places, in the light of the changes that had come over

¹ A fanciful explanation of the fact that some of Paṇini's sūtras are not to be found in the Mahābhāshya is given in the Patañjala-charita (Kavyamāla, No. 51), where it is said that some of the leaves of the originally complete copy of the Mahābhāshya were blown away by the wind and others got disarranged. Another account makes a monkey बटकट-वपामालोकः responsible for the accident.

² For a more detailed account of him see §§ 42 and following.
Sanskrit since the days of the author of the Mahābhāṣyā to improve upon them in the form as well as the matter of their sūtras and vārtikas and iṣṭīṣis. Chandragomin was a Baudhā, and one of his objects in writing a new grammar must have been to supply, for the benefit of members of his Church, a grammar that would be free from the traditional Brahmanical element. The more orthodox grammarians, however, were not willing to accept his innovations. They accordingly tried to invent new maxims of interpretation, tending to show, after a very diligent analysis of the works of the three great sages, that such defects as Chandragomin and others tried to find in the Pāṇinīya grammar were in it already implicitly provided for. This procedure was no doubt unhistorical, but so was that of Kātyāyana or of Patañjali. As yet we cannot fix upon any great leading names, but the traditional elaboration of the system of jñāpakas and Paribhāṣās must be referred to the time somewhere between 470 (the date of Chandragomin) and 650 (the date of one of the authors of the Kaśikā).

23. The Kaśikā of Jayāditya and Vāmana.—Itsing, the Chinese pilgrim, speaks of Jayāditya of Kaśmīr as the author of a grammatical work called vṛtti-sūtra, which it is usual to identify with the Kaśikā, a joint work of Jayāditya and Vāmana. Itsing tells us that Jayāditya died about A. D. 660; and if the above identification is correct, this gives us the date of the Kaśikā.

1 Unless it be those of वैज्ञ, सौभ, and हर्षक mentioned in the Vākyapadīya, Kāṇḍa second, stanza 487.

2 Itsing’s account of the द्वितियत् by Jayāditya may not after all refer to the काशिका. He speaks of a com. on the द्वितियत् by Patañjali and writes as if Jayāditya completed the द्विति himself. Even so, however, we cannot bring the Kaśikā any earlier than 650 A. D., seeing that on iv. 3. 88 it mentions the Vākyapadīya by name. Jayāditya then appears to be
The Kāśikā was once believed to be the work of one author variously called Vāmana, Jayāditya, or Vāmana-Jayāditya. It has now been found out that they are two distinct persons. Bhaṭṭoji Dikshita clearly distinguishes between their views, and the concurrent testimony of Mss. from all parts of India assigns to Jayāditya the authorship of the first five chapters of it, while the last three belong to Vāmana, who probably came soon after Jayāditya and certainly before the time of Jinendra-buddhi, who comments upon the whole work.

Regarding the personality of the authors of the Kāśikā little definite is known. Neither of them begins his work with any maṅgala, both exhibit an unorthodox tendency to introduce changes into the wording of the sātras, and Jayāditya at any rate refers on i. i. 36, with evident satisfaction, to the work of the Lokāyatikas. These reasons tend to show that the author or authors were Bauddhas. It is supposed that Jayāditya is to be identified with king Jayāpīḍa of Kāśmīr, whose minister, as mentioned by Kalhana, was a person named Vāmana. This may not be strictly accurate. Dr. Bühler believed that the author was a native of Kāśmīr.

at least a contemporary of Bhartṛihari the author of the Vākyapadīya. Vāmana who probably wrote the last three chapters of the Kāśikā came soon after Jayāditya, and Jinendra-buddhi, the author of the Nyāsa on the Kāśikā came probably before 750, seeing that he is quoted by so early an author as Bhāmbha. Compare also J. B. B. R. A. S. for 1909, p. 94; Indian Antiquary, xli, pp. 232-237 and xlii, pp. 253-264.

1 Compare the मौढमनोर्म on

Pāṇini v. 4, 42: एतत्र सर्व ज्ञावि-र्वस्थि्न्यात् कृमुः। वर्णस्वातां ध्वनिः।

2 On the question of the different authorship of the Kāśikā see Dr. Bhandarkar’s Report for 1883-84, p. 58.

3 See Pāla Sastri’s edition of the Kāśikā, p. 62—चार्चित्र भविष्यम्। तत्सम्प्रसादासायोऽधिपि चार्चित्र च स्वीकारपि शास्त्रे पद्धार्थम् नपते। उपप्रकरिष्टिः स्वरीयत्वम् शिष्यवेयः मायायते। भुक्तिः स्थायिन्यान: सम्मानिताः प्रज्ञिता भविति।

4 Dr. Bühler’s Report for 1875-76, p. 73.
The Kaśikā is a running commentary on Pāṇini’s Ashtādhyāyī, and its merit consists in the lucid manner in which it has explained the sūtras of Pāṇini, clearly indicating all the anuvṛttis and giving numerous illustrations for each rule. Sometimes the Kaśikā gives us information which we could not possibly have obtained from any other source. Thus on sūtra vii.3.95 it gives us a rule of Apiṣali, the grammarian who preceded Pāṇini/and whose work must consequently have been known to the authors of the Kaśikā. On sūtra vii. 2. 17 it gives us a vārtika of the Saunāgas other than those quoted in the Mahābhāshya. These facts, however scanty by themselves, corroborate the tradition of the existence of a vast number of grammarians prior and subsequent to the time of Kātyāyana.

24. The Indebtedness of the Kaśikā to Chandragomin.—The object of the Kaśikā was to embody in the Pāṇiniya system all the improvements that were made by Chandragomin. As the result of an exhaustive analysis of the text of Pāṇini’s sūtras as given in the Kaśikā-vṛitti Dr. Kielhorn sums up his conclusions thus: “The text of the Ashtādhyāyī as given in the Kaśikā differs in the case of 58 rules from the text known to Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Ten of these 58 rules are altogether fresh additions; nine are a result of separating (by yoga-vibhāga) the original 8 sūtras into 17. In 92 cases new words have been inserted into the original sūtras, while in the rest there are other changes in the wording &c. of the sūtras.”

Some of these changes had been already suggested by Kātyāyana or Patañjali, especially in the matter of yoga-vibhāga. The additional words also were mostly taken

1 See above, page 9 note 3.
2 See Indian Antiquary vol. xvi, pp. 170 and following.
from the vārtikas or from the notes in the Mahābhāshya, as well as from some of the added rules. Most of the new matter found in the Kāśikā can, however, be traced to Chandragomin, from whose work he diligently draws his material without anywhere acknowledging his sources.\(^1\) This fact, as before pointed out, settles 470 A. D. as the upper limit for the date of the Kāśikā.

25. Jinendrabuddhi’s Nyāsa on the Kāśikā.—An excellent commentary on the Kāśikā called Kāśikā-vivaraṇa-pañjikā or Kāśikā-nyāsa is the work of Jinendrabuddhi,\(^2\) who styles himself श्रीमान्यविवरणविद्वद्वीपवाचार्य. This informs us about his religion; as to his date he cannot be later than 750 A. D., seeing that he is referred to by Bhāmaha, who says that a poet should never employ a compound in which a verbal derivative in छू is compounded with a noun in the genitive case, and adds that he should not support such usage by the authority of the Nyāsa, which presumably is the same as this work.\(^3\)

The Nyāsa follows closely on the lines of the Kāśikā and tries to incorporate into itself whatever new was produced up to its time.\(^4\) It is a pity that we as yet

---

1 Thus on iv. 2. 138 Kāśikā gives the vārtika वेयकादिगत्वंम्बवक्तव्य: which is Chandra sūtra iii. 2. 61; the kārikā on v. 4. 77 in the Kāśikā embodies sūtras iv. 4. 72 and 73, of Chandra, the Kāśikā further remarking तदेततवधर्मं योगविभागं छुत्वा सार्वपलिद्धि; Pāṇini’s sūtra viii. 3. 118, सदैव परस्य लिङ्गिनि, Chandra changes into सदैवक्षेत्रज्ञातिद्विद्विदि (vi. 4. 98), following herein a vārtika of Kūtyāyana (सदैव लिङ्गिनि पति; श्रन्यवस्यंवक्षेत्रज्ञातिद्विद्विदि); while Kāśikā reads the sūtra itself in conformity with the Chāndra vyākaraṇa. Many more similar instances are given by Liebich in his edition of the Chāndra vyākaraṇa.

2 Govt. Or. Mss. Library, Madras, Mss. no. 941 gives the name as स्थानविवरणम्.

3 See, however, the references cited at the end of page 35, note 2 above.

4 Compare—अन्यत्तासारामाश्रयं हूत्वा काशिका यथा। द्व_threads.php?threadid=38242&show=all&fill=1
possess not a single edition of this ancient commentary. There is no complete Ms. of it in any hitherto known collection, but the several fragments may yield a tolerably complete text. And the commentary is well worth the labours of a critical editor, to judge from such fragments of it as were available to me at the Deccan College Mss. Library.

26. Haradatta’s Padamañjarī on the Kāśikā.—There is another valuable commentary on the Kāśikā called the Padamañjarī by Haradatta. Haradatta was, as he himself informs us, the son of Padma—(or Rudra-)kumāra, and younger brother of Agnikumāra; while his preceptor was one Aparājita. He was probably a native of the Tamil country and may subsequently have acquainted himself with the Telugu literature, as the instance of a vernacular word (క్రథిమంచరి) given by him seems to indicate.\(^1\) The Padamañjarī is quoted in the Mādhaviya Dhatuvṛtti and by Mallinātha, and itself quotes Māgha.\(^2\) According to a portion of the Bhavishyottara Purāṇa giving the history of Haradatta (who is considered as an incarna-

1 Professor K. B. Pathak tells me that the Ms. in the Jain Maṭha at Śrāvana Belgoḷa, which is put down in the lists as a Nyāsa on the Śūkṣayana-sabdānuśāsana, is really a Ms. of the above work, and goes as far as viii. 3. 11. I understand that Prof. Srishti Chandra Chakravarti of Rajahshahi College, Bengal, has been able to put together a tolerably complete copy of the text from Ms. collected from all corners of India. He is also going to publish the work shortly (1912). Maitreyarakshita is reported to have written a commentary on the Nyāsa, but I have not been able to verify the statement.

2 These and the following details are taken from Sheshagiri Shastri’s Report on the search of Sanskrit and Tamil Mss. for 1893-94, Madras, No. 2.

3 Benares edition (Reprint from the Paṇḍit) pages 657, 715 line 2 (=Māgha iii. 74), &c. Kirita ii, 55 is quoted on page 237 line 8; and Bhaṭṭi-kāvya on page 541 line 16.
tion of God Śiva,) we learn that he died 3979 years after the beginning of Kali, which corresponds to 878 A.D.

This account of the Bhavishyottara Purāṇa probably does not refer to our Haradatta, seeing that it gives Vāsudeva as the name of Haradatta’s father. Moreover, Haradatta’s Padamanājari seems to be later than and partly based upon Kāiyyaṭa’s Mahābhāṣya-Pradīpa, and we cannot assign to Kāiyyaṭa so early a date as cir. 800 A.D., which would be necessary if Haradatta is to be put at 878. Probably, therefore, Haradatta belongs to somewhere about 1100 A.D.

27. Bhartṛihari’s Vākyapadīya.—From Padamanājari, the commentary on the Kāśikā, we go back to the writer who according to Itsing was a contemporary of Jayāditya, one of the authors of the Kāśikā; and this is no other than Bhartṛihari, the celebrated poet and grammarian whose date of death, according to the Chinese pilgrim, is 650 A.D. It is not necessary for us to consider in this place the different problems suggested by his name. He may or may not have been a king, a brother of a king or the author of the Śatakas. Itsing’s account unmistakably

1 Mr. Shebagiri Shāstri suggests, loc.cit., that Haradatta’s father may have been a Vaishṇava to begin with and may have later changed his name and become a Śaiva, just as Haradatta himself changed his original name of Sudarśana into the one which is more generally known. Some such change of name may appear to have been hinted at in the introductory stanzas—पञ्चिराप हरवत-संस्कारा विष्णुति वत्सहु विश्व वृक्षणा। उज्जवल पद्मनव्यरीस्री शब্দसाध-सहकारणपञ्चपत्र। All this is ingenious but not convincing, and it must yield to the chronological evidence given below.

2 Compare Padamanājari on ii. 1.66 (Benares ed. p 384 ll. 5 ff.) with Pradīpa on the same place (Nir. Sag. ed. of the Mahā-bhāṣya, part ii. p. 405). So also compare Padamanājari on ii. 1.70 (p. 385) with Pradīpa on the same place (ibid, p. 414). Many more instances can be likewise adduced to show the indebtedness of Padamanājari to the Pradīpa.
refers to Bhartṛihari the author of the Vākyapadiya and consequently also to the author of a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya. Regarding the latter work all that we can say is that it was probably never completed by the author. The Gaṇaratna-mahodadhi states that the commentary extends only to the first three pādas.¹ According to Dr. Bühler fragments of Bhartṛihari's comment exist in the Royal Library at Berlin² and in the Deccan. If they exist in the Deccan, they have not so far come to light.

The Vākyapadiya is a metrical discourse on the philosophy of grammar, distributed into three chapters: the Brahma or Āgama-kāṇḍa, the Vākya-kāṇḍa, and the Pada or Prakīrṇa-kāṇḍa. The chief historical interest of the work attaches itself to the account given in about seven stanzas, towards the end of the second kāṇḍa, confirming the statement of the Rājatarāṇī about the fate of the Mahābhbāṣya.³ The passage also contains the earliest reference to the Chāndra school, and mentions Baiji, Saubhava, and Haryaksha as grammarians who went before Chandrāchārya or Chandragomin, and who by their uncritical methods of study contributed not a little to the neglect of the Mahābhāṣya during the early centuries of the Christian era.

28. Kāliyāṭa's Pradīpa as marking the end of the second period in the history of the Pāṇiniya school.—Between Bhartrihari (650 A. D.) and Kāliyāṭa (the next great writer of the Pāṇiniya school whom we notice and who probably belongs to the eleventh century) we have no names of any consequence to mention. The period was indeed marked by a more or less general grammatical activity, but that

¹ Compare com. on Gaṇaratna-mahodadhi, st. 3.—अभूतिय स्तब्ध-भाषयििश्व भाषयपाता।
² See preface to Kiellhorm's ed. of the Mahābhāṣya, vol. ii.
³ India: what can it teach us? p. 352; Indian Antiquary for 1876, p. 245.
was confined to the systems of grammar outside the Pāṇiniya school. These we shall notice in another place. For Pāṇini's school Kāiyyaṭa's Pradīpa marks the end of the second period of development.

Kāiyyaṭa was probably, as his name indicates, a native of Kāśmīr. His father was Jaiyyaṭa surnamed Upādhyāya, and his preceptor was one Maheśvara. In a commentary on Māmmapāṭa's Kāvyaprakāśa written by Bhīmasena (Sahvat 1779=1722 A. D.) Kāiyyaṭa along with Auvaṭa has been spoken of as the disciple and even the younger brother of Māmmapāṭa. This statement is inaccurate if by Auvaṭa is meant the author of the Bhāṣya on the Yajurveda-Saṁhitā, whose father was Vajrata; and since Bhīmasena is a late writer we need not likewise attach much importance to the chronological relation between Māmmapāṭa and Kāiyyaṭa as suggested by him. Māmmapāṭa was, we know, a great grammarian as well as a rhetorician who lived cir. 1100, and there is nothing improbable in his being a teacher to even Kāiyyaṭa. Kāiyyaṭa's lower limit is given by the circumstance that he is quoted in the Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha (cir. 1300).

Regarding the nature of Kāiyyaṭa's performance it is not necessary in this place to say much. He tells us in his introduction that he followed on the lines of Hari, that is, Bhartrihari, and he may be pronounced to have been fairly successful on the whole in the task of interpreting the Mahābhāṣya. His work has been,
in turn, commented upon by Nāgojibhaṭṭa the author of the Pradīpodyota, by Nārāyaṇa who has written a Vivaraṇa upon it, and by Īśvarānanda the pupil of Satyānanda who has composed another similarly named commentary. None of these writers seems to be earlier than A. D. 1600. We have already spoken of Haradatta's Padamaṇijari, which is based upon Kaiyyaṭa's work.

For most of these writers who followed Kaiyyaṭa there was very little original work in the Pāṇiniya school that was left to be done. Sanskrit had long been established as a classical language; it ceased to be influenced by current speech in any vital manner. Hence in grammar there was no occasion for any creative work; and even the work of critical elaboration had well-nigh run its course. This was also the period of the early Muhammedan incursions, which necessarily preceded their permanent occupation of India; and it was, as was to be expected, marked by a general decadence of literature, reflecting a corresponding ebb in the tide of social and political activities. The study of grammar, accordingly, succumbed to the operation of the usual laws of demand and supply. In the next century or two there may have been petty commentators here and there, and, possibly, some really great writers, but none of their names even have survived the ravages of time. Later when the clouds cleared a little and literature began to flourish, the demand—feeble at first—which some of the enlightened Muhammedan rulers created was adequately met by popular schools of grammar, like the Sārasvata, which now sprang into existence.

29. Recasts of the Ashṭādhyāyī: The Rūpamālā.—It was clear now that if the Pāṇiniya grammar was to keep abreast of the spirit of the times, it should have been remoulded and presented in easier and less repellent style.
The earliest and on that ground the simplest of these recasts of the Ashtadhyayi that has come down to us is the Rupamala of Vimalasarasvati, a writer who, if the date given in a Ms. of the work be true,¹ must be placed not later than A. D. 1350.

The arrangement of the work is in the style of later Kaumudis. After treating of pratyahara, sarga, and parimapa the author deals with sargas in four sections: varsanata, prasthitabha, vargha, and visargabha; then follows declension in six parts: i. abhantama, ii. hantama, iii. samanama, iv. sanaya, v. irregular words like sah, pathi &c., and vi. Vedic irregularities. After these come nirapats, their meanings and grammatical peculiarities, shriyams, and kara relations. The longest section deals with the ahaarya, the peculiarities of each lokara being arranged under separate headings; and as an appendix we have lokaraarya and taksadinibham, the last giving the circumstances under which verbs change their padas. The kart and the tabhita occupy the next two sections, the work concluding with a chapter on samata.

It has been thought worth while giving the above details as they help us to show in what respects the later Kaumudis are an improvement on this their prototype. Vimalasarasvati’s manner of presenting his whole subject is quite simple and attractive, if it cannot also claim to be exhaustive. The merit of later works consists mainly in a more systematic arrangement and a somewhat more detailed treatment. All the same, the credit for having conceived the idea of such a recast and carried it into exe-

¹ India office Ms. No. 612, which is stated to have been written in Samvat 1437 = 1379 A.D. The same Ms. gives Saum 1467 as another date. A Ms. deposited at the Deccan College (No. 209 of 1879-80) is dated Samvat 1507. Vimalasarasvati is quoted by Amritabhara, a writer of the Srasvata school, a manuscript of whose work bears the date a. D. 1496.
cution must ungrudgingly be given to the author of the Rāpamālā.¹

30. Rāmachandra's Prakriyākaumudi and its commentaries.—Next in chronological order comes the Prakriyākaumudi of Rāmachandra, a writer who probably belongs to the first half of the fifteenth century. He was a Dakshini Brahman, the son of a Krishṇāchārya, and was eminently versed in grammar and Vedānta and astronomy, in all of which he has written original works of his own.² The Prakriyākaumudi is supposed to have been the model for Bhaṭṭōji's Siddhāntakaumudi.

There are several commentaries extant on Rāmachandra's Prakriyākaumudi of which the most famous is the Prasāda of Viṭṭhalāchārya. The earliest Ms. of the Prasāda is dated Saṅvat 1605-6 = A. D. 1548-9; hence Viṭṭhalāchārya cannot be later than 1525 A. D. As a grammarian Viṭṭhala is disparaged by Bhaṭṭōji, who often refers to him. Viṭṭhala, in his turn, quotes from, among others, Kaiyyaṭa, Trilochanadāsa, Kshīrasvāmin, Durgasimha, Jinendrabuddhi, Bhartrihari, Vāmana, Haradatta, and Bopadeva.³ Viṭṭhala tells us that he was the son of Nṛsisimhāchārya and grandson of Rāmakrishṇāchārya, while his own son was named Lakshmīdhārāchārya.

Another commentary on the Prakriyākaumudi that demands a passing notice is the Prakriyāprakāśa of Śesha-Krishṇa the son of Śesha-Nṛsisimhāsūri. As he tells us in the introduction to his commentary, which extends to 46 stanzas, he composed this comment for the benefit of Prince Kalyāṇa, the son of a (petty)king of Patrapuṇja,

1 Bhaṭṭōji Dīkhita acknowledges his indebtedness to him in that he quotes him in the Prandha-Manorama.
2 The information comes from Viṭṭhala who also gives other details, for which see Bendall's Cat. of Ms. in the Durbar Library of Nepal, p. vii.
3 Aufrecht's Oxford Catalogue gives these and other names.
a small place in the Duab formed by the Ganges and the Yamunā. Śesha-Krishna, as we shall presently see, was the preceptor of Bhaṭṭoja Dikshita, and must accordingly be placed cir. 1600 A. D.¹

31. Bhaṭṭoja’s Siddhāntakaumudi and other works.—We next pass on to the deservedly famous Siddhāntakaumudi of Bhaṭṭoja Dikshita,—a work which is remarkable not only by reason of the host of commentaries and sub-commentaries that it called into being, nor again because it is at present practically the only popular introduction to Pāṇini’s grammar, but also owing to the fact—strange as it may appear—that it has eventually ousted Pāṇini himself and most of the other ancient authors of grammar, as also the numerous new schools that had lately sprung into existence. The work is too well known to need any detailed exposition. From the list of previous authors quoted by Bhaṭṭoja in this and his other works² we can gather that he freely availed himself of such help as he could possibly get. His indebtedness to one work, however, we learn, only from Meghayijaya, the author of Haima-Kaumudi, who tells us that Bhaṭṭoja’s Kaumudi was largely modelled upon Hemachandra’s Śabdānusāsana.³

Bhaṭṭoja was the son of Lakshmīdhara and the brother of Raṅgoji Dikshita, while his son was variously known as Bhānu-dikshita, Vīreśvara-dikshita, or Rāmaśrama. Regarding the other details of Bhaṭṭoja’s life Jagannātha, the court pandit of the Emperor Shahajahan, informs us in his Manoramākuchamardinī that Bhaṭṭoja was the pupil of Śesha-Krishṇa, to whose memory he does

¹ Other commentaries on मक्यर-कोश्यी are सार by कायसिनधे, आयुक्तमित्र by सारणवेष्कशास्त्रिन्, व्याक्तित्व by विब्रतकर्मशास्त्रिन् &c.
² An exhaustive list is given in Aufrecht’s Oxford Catalogue, p. 162.
³ Peterson’s report iii, p. 291. I am not sure about the truth of this statement.
very scant justice in his Praudha-Manoramā. As Jagannātha himself was the pupil of the son of this Śesha-Krishṇa, this gives us Bhaṭṭoji’s date, which must be about A.D. 1630. This is also confirmed by the fact that a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji wrote a work in Śaṃvat 1693.  

Bhaṭṭoji himself wrote a commentary on his Siddhānta-kaumudi, called Praudha-Manoramā to distinguish it from an abridgment of the same called Bāla-Manoramā also by the same author. Besides shorter works such as commentaries on the Pāṇiniya Dhatupātha, Liṅganuśasana, &c, Bhaṭṭoji wrote the Śabda-kaustubha which is a voluminous commentary on Pāṇini’s Ashtādhyāyī similar in plan to the Kāśikā. This was left, probably, incomplete; though he must have written as far at least as the fourth śūnika of adhyāya iii, and not only the first pāda of the first adhyāya, as is usually supposed.  

Besides Jagannātha’s commentary on the Praudha-Manoramā, there is another written by Nāgeśa, but ascribed by him to his teacher Hari-dikshita, just as Nāgeśa ascribed another work, a commentary on the Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa, to his parton. Śabda-kaustubha similarly is commented upon by Nāgeśa and by Nāgeśa’s pupil Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍa. To commentaries ancient and modern on the Siddhāntakaumudi there is no limit. Those most famous are the Tattvabodhinī by Jñānendrasarasvati, pupil of Vāmanendra-sarasvati, which treats  

1 Compare Ṣrī Kṣetraśīkhitāṃśaṃ-śevaḥ-puṣṭaśāstraśायिनी-राजेन्द्रिय-  

2 Deccan College Ms. No. 183 of A.1882-83, the author of which is Śrīlakṣaṇa.    

3 Gov. Or. Mess. Library, Madras, Ms. no. 1328 goes up to the fifth śūnika of adhyāya iii.
of the classical language only and omits the svara and vaidikī prakriyā. It is mostly modelled on Bhaṭṭojoji’s own commentary and is very useful for beginners. Jaya-krishṇa, son of Raghunāthabhaṭṭa of the Mauni family has written a commentary on the svara and vaidikī prakriyā only of the Siddhānta-kaumudi, thus completing that of Jñānendra-sarasvati. Both these writers probably belong to the first half of the eighteenth century. Regarding the abridgments of the Siddhānta-kaumudi and other shorter manuals based upon it we shall speak presently.

The family of Bhaṭṭojoji Dikshita seems to have been a family of great writers and grammarians up and down. Bhaṭṭojoji’s nephew Koṇḍabhaṭṭa wrote an original work on syntax and philosophy of grammar modelled on the lines of his illustrious uncle and being in fact a discursive gloss on some 74 kārikās of Bhaṭṭojoji. Bhaṭṭojoji’s son Bhānuji taught several pupils, as also his grandson Hari-dikshita. Among the pupils of the latter is ranked no less an illustrious name than that of Nāgojibhaṭṭa or Nāgeśa.¹

¹ These relations would be clear from the following genealogical table—
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32. The works of Nāgeśa and of Valmīkī-Rāmāyana and Adhyātma-Rāmāyana as also on Saptaśati, Gitagovinda, Sudhālahari, and other works. We are here concerned with his grammatical treatises, and prominent amongst these is the Udyota on Kaiyyata's Mahābhāshya-pradīpa; Paribhāshenduśekhara, a collection of Paribhāshās handed down in connection with Pāṇini's grammar and followed by a concise explanatory commentary on them called the Sabdenduśekhara (in two editions a major and a minor); a commentary on the Siddhānta-kaumudi and intended as a companion to the Manorāma; Sabdaratna, a commentary on the Prauḍha-Manoramā, ascribed by him honoris causa to his teacher Hari-dīkshita; Vishami a commentary on Bhaṭṭoji's Śabda-kaustubha; and finally the Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhāntamaṇjūśā (in three editions) on the philosophy of grammar.

The genealogical tree given above exhibits Nāgojibhaṭṭa's spiritual descent from his illustrious predecessors; it also helps us roughly to determine his time. In addition we have a tradition current at Jeypur, and mentioned by the learned editor of the Kāvyamālā in his introduction to Rasagaṅgādhara, which refers to an invitation for a horse sacrifice received in 1714 A. D. by Nāgeśabhaṭṭa from Savāi Jeysimha, ruler of Jeypur (1688 to 1728 A.D.), an invitation which Nāgeśa courteously declined on the ground that he had taken kṣetra-sannyāsa and could not, therefore, leave Benares to attend the ceremony. Regarding himself he informs us that he was a Mahratta Brahman surnamed Kāle, the son of Śivabhaṭṭa and Satī, a resident of Benares and a protegee of 7 [Sk. Gr.]
Rāmasimha, a local prince of Śrīṅgaverapura (now Singarour) a few miles north of Allahabad.

Vaidyanātha or Bālambhaṭṭa Pāyaguṇḍa, a direct disciple of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, wrote like his teacher several works on Dharma and Vyākaraṇa-sātra. He was the son of Mahādeva and Veṇī, and Lakshmīdevī the wife of king Chandrasiṁha of Mithilā was probably his patroness, in whose honour he is reported to have composed a commentary on the Vyavahāra-kāṇḍa of the Mitāksharā, which is usually known as Bālambhāṭṭi. His grammatical labours are mainly confined to writing comments on the works of his predecessors. Thus he has written a Gada on the Paribhāṣhenduśekhara, a Chhāyā on the Mahābhāṣya-pradīpodyota, a Kalā on Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntamānjūśī, a Prabhā on the Śabdakaustubha, a Bhāvaprakāsikā on the Šabdaratna, Chidasthimālā on the Šabdenduśekhara, and a host of others.

33. Grammatical works outside the Dikśita school.—Independently of the Dikśita school there are very few notable names of grammarians belonging to the seventeenth century. We may perhaps mention, as belonging to the early decades of the century, Annambhaṭṭa the author of the Tarkasaṅgraha, who has written an independent commentary on the Ashtādhyāyī, called Mitāksharā. The school of profound grammarians which is now almost dying out was already on the decline since the middle of the eighteenth century, as is evidenced by the numerous easy manuals that have come into existence during the last two centuries. Some of these popular epitomes ally themselves to no particular school, and these will be dealt with in another part of the essay. We now confine our attention to those belonging to the Pāṇinīya school.
34. Abridgements and Manuals.—Prominent among these are the abridgements of the Siddhānta-Kaumudi itself by Varadarāja. There are three editions of them—a madhya-, a laghu-, and a sāra-Siddhāntakaumudi,—the difference consisting only in the more or less thorough eschewing of unnecessary details. Strange as it may seem, even these epitomes stood in need of commentaries for their further simplification, or rather the reverse of it. The major abridgment was commented upon by Rāmaśarman at the request of one Śivānanda; the middle one by a Jayakrishṇa, son of Raghunāthabhaṭṭa and grandson of Govardhanabhaṭṭa of the Mauni family.\(^1\) There are a few other easy texts framed independently of the Siddhānta-kaumudi, but they hardly deserve special mention. The last stage of this progressive simplification is perhaps reached when we come to works such as Rupāvali, Samāsachakra, etc.

35. Later history of treatises accessory to Pāṇini’s grammar.—It only remains now, finally, to speak of the further history of the treatises accessory to Pāṇini’s grammar mentioned by us on pages 25 and following of this essay. These works, although originally framed for a particular system, had so much in common with other schools of grammar that they have been transferred with very little modifications from one school to another. The successive stages of this process deserve to be made the subject of an independent study; we cannot in this place afford to dwell on them at any length. We shall only allude to a few notable works in each line.

36. Dhātupātha.—The Dhātupātha as we find it embodied in the Pāṇiniya system was commented upon by

---

\(^1\) The मकिया कौस्त्फी has a similar abridgment called तत्तवबन्ध, the work of one of the pupils of the author, जयस्त, and written in A. D. 1631 (?).
Kśñrasvāmin. A Kāśmirian tradition makes him teacher to king Jayāpiḍa, which brings him into the eighth century. This conflicts with the fact that Kśñrasvāmin quotes Bhoja, and in so far as he is quoted by Vardhamāna in the Gañaratnamahodadhi, this settles his date, which is roughly 1050 A.D. Besides the Dhātuvaṛitti Kśñrasvāmin wrote five other works: i. commentary on the Amarakosha, ii. निपाताल्योपपमण्डळिति, iii. अच्छतराःक्रिण्णि referred to in the Dhātuvaṛitti (which is more usually known as श्रीतराःक्रिण्णि), iv. निपण्डुराःिति mentioned by Devarāja in his Niruktanirvachana, and v. Gañavṛitti referred to by Vardhamāna in his Gañaratnamahodadhi, a work presently to be mentioned.

In the introduction to the Dhātuvaṛitti Kśñrasvāmin notes that several people, including the great Chandra, had essayed before him to write about the roots, but not always successfully. The Chandra here referred to must be Chandragomin, the founder of the Chānda school, whose Dhātupātha was subsequently incorporated by Durgasimha with the Kātāntara) grammar. About the nature of the contents of the Dhātuvaṛitti Kśñrasvāmin tells us that one can find therein:

सूज्वालाःकार्यार्थांगणां सेवङ्गनिद्र्योक्ष्यश्राव: फळ: च।
अद्यात्माःव्यः बविवेष्या प्रयोगमात्रोपापत्तिःक्विशयाः बिवेष्यादः।

Of other works of Kśñrasvāmin it is not necessary to say much in this place.

We next turn our attention to the Mādhviya-Dhātuvaṛtti, which deals with the same subject and which was written by Mādhava or Sāyāṇa, the great Vedic Bhāshyakāra (1350 A.D). Sāyāṇa also mentions numerous workers in the same field whose labours he partly utilised. Among

1 See Introduction to Mr. Oka’s edition of Kśñrasvāmin’s com. on Amara.
2 Compare—भ्रम: पारापणिकाशः—न्याया अपि च यद्रिव विवशान्ता:।
तान्यात्सुनिविठतः महनमहो अध्ययनस्तितः स्म:।
these may be mentioned, as belonging to the Pāññinīya school, Bhīmasena and Maitreyarakṣita. Of Sāyāṇa’s successors we need only specify Bhaṭṭoji and Nāgēśa. The Dhātupāṭhas belonging to the other grammatical schools will be found in their proper places elsewhere.

37. Gaṇapāṭha.—The Pāññinīya Gaṇapāṭha has not received from commentators the attention that it merits. Different portions of it, such as nipātas, avyayas, and upasargas have been individually explained by various writers, and Kshīrasvāmin, as we saw, is reported to have written a Gaṇavṛitti, which is no longer extant. The only complete work on the Gaṇapāṭha is the Gaṇaratnamahodadhi, which is a metrical arrangement of the Gaṇas followed by a lucid commentary, both composed by Var-dhamāna in A. D. 1140.

38. Liṅgāṇuśāsana.—Besides Rāmachanda and Bhaṭṭoji, who have embodied the Liṅgāṇuśāsana in their Kaumudīs and written commentaries upon it, we find mentioned in connection with the Pāññinīya treatises on genders the names of Harshavardhana, Śabarāsvāmin and Vararuchi. Of these the first is probably not the same as the celebrated patron of Bāṇa, while the second may or may not be identical with the great Māṁsākāra. Vararuchi is another name for Kātyāyana, and even if these be considered as different, so many late and spurious works are assigned to this great name that it is well-nigh difficult to determine the genuineness of any one of them. A palm-leaf Ms. at Cambay, dated Sarīvat 1287 contains a Liṅgānuśāsana by Vāmanāchārya, which mentions among its predecessors the works of Vyāḍi, Vararuchi, Chandra, and Jinendra. This would at least decide for the existence of

1 See note 1 on page 39, above.
2 Cambay, No. 266; व्याहितिकितमथ वारसव च सत्रावट्र आयनमाथलक्षणगति

विविधम तथान्यत् दिइशस्वय हि सरस्य विशेषवक्षुक्त्वा नया परिमिलित

&c. See also Dr. Peterson's
these works prior to 1200 A. D., and, if Dr. Peterson's identification of Vāmanāchārya with the author of the Kāśikā be correct, prior also to 800 A. D.

39. Uṇādi-pātha.—The question as to the authorship of the Pañiniya Uṇādi-sūtras has been already dealt with (p. 25, above). These Uṇādis have been very readily absorbed—with only slight modifications—by the various non-Pañiniya schools such as Kātantra, Haima, Jaumara, Saupadma, &c. In the school of Pañini the future development of the Uṇādis has been only by way of commentaries, the best known being Ujjvaladatta's Vṛitti, which, as pointed out by Aufrrecht in his introduction to his edition of that work, must be assigned to cir. 1250. Ujjvaladatta quotes the Vṛttis of Kshapaṇaka, Govardhana, Purushottamadeva, and the Satī-vṛitti,—all of which preceded his own commentary. Later than Ujjvaladatta come Māṇikyadeva, Bhaṭṭoji, and others.

40. Paribhāshās.—Already we have more than once alluded to the Pañiniya paribhāshās. Pañini himself gave a few of these as his sūtras, but he can be proved to have tacitly employed a still larger number.1 Kātyāyana quotes one, according to Patañjali’s showing, in his vārtika 3 to sūtra i. r. 65, while Vyādi, who according to some was a near relation of Pañini, is credited with the authorship of almost all the paribhāshās now current. The doctrine of the paribhāshās was, however, fully elaborated by Patañjali and the writers who came after him.2 So much ingenuity and energy has been spent on the

---

1 Goldstücker: Pañini, page 114 (Reprint, p. 87).
2 For the distinction between वृत्तिभावलेखन and जापकशूचन and the whole theory of paribhāshās see ibidem, pp. 115 (Reprint, p. 89) and the following.
paribhāṣās that eventually it has become, for the Pāṇīniya student, the hardest nut to crack. This feat has usually been attempted in the body of the commentaries themselves. Regular treatises specially dealing with paribhāṣās come much later. Perhaps the earliest known is that of Sīrādeva, who is quoted in the Mādhaviya-Dhātu-vṛtti. Nāgesa’s Paribhāshenduśekhara contains the most popular exposition of the paribhāṣās, and it has been commented upon by Pāyāgūnda, Bhairavamisra, Śeshaśarman, Bhīmabhaṭṭa, and many others. Non-Pāṇiniya schools copied most of their paribhāṣās from Pāṇini, the earliest of them being the Kātantra for which Durgasimha put together a list of paribhāṣās and wrote a commentary on the same.

This is also the place where we can introduce a host of treatises on the philosophy of grammar—dealing with questions such as the nature of sound, the connection between word and its meaning or of sentence and its component parts, and so forth. The issues have been raised and dealt with in the Mahābhāṣya itself, and later writers have derived most of the material for their lucubrations from that source. The earliest of such treatises is the Vākyapadiya of Bhartṛihari and the latest deserving a special mention is the Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntabhāṣaṇa of Kṛṇabhaṭṭa, a commentary on which was written by Nāgesa. A multitude of smaller and larger lights came in between. The works are mainly special monograms on particular topics, the kāraka relations alone having engaged over forty writers of different schools and opinions.

41. Résumé of the history of the Pāṇiniya school—Here perhaps we may draw a deep breath and, before proceeding with the history of the non-Pāṇiniya schools of grammar, cast a hurried glance over the field that we have already travelled.
Beginning with the dim and half poetic speculations of the Brahmanic exegetes, we saw how the science of grammar flowed onward broadening down from precedent to precedent until we reach the age of Yāska who sums up the results achieved by his predecessors and makes his own contribution to the stream. The leap from Yāska to Pāṇini is probably a very great one, but the course of development is, to a large extent, hidden from us—is underground as it were—until it issues in a perfect form in the Ashṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.

The subsequent history of the science is marked by three well-defined stages. The first which ends with the Mahābhāshya busies itself with the perfection of Pāṇini’s work, adding a rule here, restricting the application of another there, and so on. This period may be characterised as the creative stage of the science.

This is followed by a period of critical elaboration, the chief work of which consists in giving a precise point to these rules, changing the wording of some for the sake of brevity, of others for including in it a word or two inadvertently left out by the earlier grammarians, or not in vogue in their time; but for the main part in writing vast commentaries on the works of their predecessors so as to explain their intention. This was also the stage when the theory of the paribhāshās and jñāpakasas was worked out in details. The branching off from the main stem of a separate school, the Chāndra, which belongs to this period, is to be explained as due rather to the necessities of the times, than to any real split in the domain of the science itself. This period extends roughly to about 1000 A. D.

The last stage marks a progressive deterioration in the study of grammar. We have in the first place the rise of a number of new and popular schools of grammar intended to simplify, the science for the enlightenment of
the laity. Following the wake of the times we have, side by side, numerous recasts of the Ashṭādhyāyī tending towards the same object. The lowest stage is reached when we come to the popular handbooks of the eighteenth century. How far this decline is to be attributed to the political aspects of the time is more curious than profitable to inquire. Certain it is that they could not have failed to produce their influence, though it is easy to exaggerate it. Nor, finally, should it be forgotten that broad characterisations of long periods in the history of any country or science have always to be accepted with limitations. The periods often overlap, and in this present case they are tentative only and may have to be revised in the light of later researches.

It is time now that we turned to the non-Pāñinīya schools of grammar.¹

**The Chāndra School**

42. *The Chāndra School.*—The earliest reference to the Chāndra school of grammarians occurs in Bhartrihari’s Vākyapadiya (see p. 41 above), while one of the latest is perhaps that of Mallinātha, who quotes a rule of his in his commentary on Kālidāsa’s Meghadūta, stanza 25 (नीचे-राष्ट्र निरिष्किस्चे:).² Mallinātha, however, does not appear to

---

¹ The order in which schools are here presented is not strictly chronological, the allied schools being taken together.

² In the passage cited Mallinātha says that while Pāñinī allows only the form विषम Chandra allows विषम also. As a matter of fact Chandra allows only one form (Chāndra sūtra vi. 1.42); it is Śūkṣṭasya and Hemachandra who allow both the forms, which are indiscriminately used in classical Sanskrit. Presumably, therefore, Mallinātha either had access to a work of the Chāndra school not known to us, or more probably he meant by Chandra Hemachandra, unless the whole is a positive mistake. I owe this note to Mr. Kṛishṇāji Govinda Oka, editor of the Kṣhīrataṛaṅgaṇī.

8 [ Sk. Gr. ]
have had a direct access to the Chāndra vyākaraṇa, seeing that Ms. of the work have been extremely rare, none of the various ‘Searches for Sanskrit manuscripts’ instituted by Government having been able to bring to light any works of the school except a fragment brought by Dr. Bühler from Kāśmir in 1875, and a complete copy of the Chāndra vyākaraṇa written in the Nepalese year 476 (i.e. 1356 A.D.) brought by Haraprasāda Shastri from Nepal. However, by the labours of Dr. Bruno Liebich, the whole system has now been recovered in the original or Tibetan translation. The same scholar has also published the Chāndra vyākaraṇa (Leipzig 1902). The account of the system given below is mostly based on his writings.

43. The date of Chandragomin.—Chandra, or more accurately, Chandragomin must have lived at least some time before the authors of the Kāśikā, which has borrowed, always without acknowledgment, such sūtras of Chandra as have no parallel either in Pāṇini or in Kātyāyana. This gives us 650 A.D. as the lower limit for Chandragomin. The upper limit is supplied by a vr̥itti on the Chāndra sūtras, most probably the work of Chandragomin himself, which gives the sentence अज्जयब्रसे(? Ms. जते or जाते) हृणाद as an illustration of the use of the imperfect to express an event which occurred within the lifetime of the speaker. This victory over the Hūnās can refer either to their temporary defeat by Skandagupta soon after 465 A.D., or (less likely) to their final expulsion by Yasodharma in 544 A.D. This gives us 470 as the approximate date for Chandragomin. This result is further confirmed by the fact that Vasurāta the preceptor

1 See Nachrichten der Goettinger Gesellschaft 1895, pp. 272-321. Datum Chandragomin’s und Kālidāsa’s”, p. 3.
2 See Dr. Liebich’s paper “Das Who, however, was not a Gupta.
of Bhartrihari acknowledged Chandrāchārya (Chandragomin) as his master. Chandragomin must have lived therefore at least two generations before the author of the Vākyapadīya. All accounts agree in stating that Chandragomin was a Baudhā. He was one of the laity, and is not to be confused with Chandradāsa who belonged to the order.2

44. Nature of Chandragomin’s work.—Chandragomin’s grammar was meant as an improvement on that of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali, mainly in the way of greater brevity and precision. Accordingly he has omitted, for obvious reasons, the Pāṇinīya rules about Vedic accent and grammar, although he includes some Vedic roots in his Dhātupāṭha. He has lessened the number of pratyāhāra-sūtras by one (fusing हयवर्ष and यष्ट into हयवर्लय), omitted some of the Pāṇinīya pratyāhāras and coined others. In many cases, the rules of Pāṇini are recast simply for the sake of securing facility of pronunciation.3 The really original contributions of Chandragomin amount to about 35 sūtras and these have been incorporated in the Kāśikā. In all these cases Kaiyyaṭa has the remark अपाणिनीयः स्त्रुतेन पाणमि. The total number of the Chāndra sūtras is about 3100 as against 4000 of Pāṇini. The work consists of six chapters of four pādas each, the matter of Pāṇini’s first two chapters being scattered all through.

The object of Chandragomin was to ‘rearrange the grammatical material with the object of bringing together all the rules that deal with the same phonetic or grammatical operations as well as the same part of

1 See Vākyapadīya. Kāṇḍa ii, stanzas 489-90 and com. thereon.
3 For Pāṇini’s अनेकाष्ट्र विन्द सर्वेश्य (i. 1. 55) Chandra reads सिद्ध-नेकाष्ट्र सर्वेश्य (i. 1.12).
speech.' The Chândra terminology with slight changes is that of Pâṇini. The mode of presenting the subject is also artificial, after the fashion of Pâṇini. The grammar goes by the nickname of असंस्कृत, perhaps because the सूत्रास are not here treated of separately, but probably because wherever in his sūtra Pâṇini has used the word सूत्र Chandragomin uses the word नामचः. 1

45. Accessory treatises of the Chândra grammar.—In addition to the sūtras in six adhyāyas Chandragomin has put together an Uṇādi list in three parts, a Dhatupātha in ten sections (both published by Dr. Liebich), as also Liṅgakāriks or Liṅgānuśāsana, Gaṇapātha, Upasargavrītti, and Varṇa sūtras. The Uṇādis differ from those belonging to the Pâṇiniya school principally in their mode of presentation, the suffixes being here arranged according to their final letter. In a few cases Chandra also derives the words differently. The Dhātupātha, as we saw (p. 52, above), is referred to by Kshīrasvāmin and was subsequently incorporated in the Kātantra system. The Liṅgānuśāsana is referred to by Vāmanāchārya, Ujjvaladatta, and Rāyamukuta (see above, p. 53). As to the Gaṇapātha no separate work of the kind has yet been discovered, but we must assume the existence of such a work as we find it embodied in the sūtra-vṛtti, just as the Kāśikā has done with regard to the Pâṇiniya Gaṇapātha. The Upasarga-vṛtti is found in Tibetan version only, and explains the meaning and use of about twenty upasargas. Finally, the Varṇasūtra (Ms. no. 289 of 1875-76 in the Deccan College collection) is a very short treatise2 corresponding to the Pâṇiniya Śikshā and gives in about 40 sūtras

1 Compare Chândra sūtras i. 2, 30, i. 3, 77, ii. 2, 14, &c. with Pâṇini’s iii. 2, 46, iii. 3, 174, ii. 1, 21, &c. A few cases do occur, however, where Chandra permits the use of the word: e.g. Chandra i. 1. 123=Pâṇini iii. 1. 112.

2 I take this occasion to publish the work entire on the basis
the स्थान and प्रयत्न of वर्णस. No work on Paribhāshās in connection with the Chāndra school has come down to us.

Besides the above grammatical works Chandragomin is credited with the authorship of a religious poem called Śishyalekhā, and a drama called Lokānanda, neither probably of much consequence.

46. Later history of the Chāndra school.—We have already alluded to Chandragomin's own vṛtti on his grammar. Fragments from it extending from about v. i. 13 to v. i. 176 are still extant. This vṛtti was later incorporated in a commentary by Dharmadāsa, a complete Ms. of which exists in the Library of the Mahārāja of Nepal.

It is undoubted that there must have been written numerous commentaries on the Chāndra Vyākaraṇa during the palmy days of Buddhistic literature; and they must have been very popular, seeing that a good many of them have been translated and freely circulated in Tibet at least since 1000 A. D., if not earlier, when Śhiramati, one of the translators of most of the Chāndra texts in the Tibetan language, probably lived. Some of these works had also gone to Ceylon along with other Buddhistic texts. However, at present, in addition to the works above mentioned, only a few more—about fifteen—are known to exist, mostly in Tibetan translations.¹ Such of the Sanskrit Mss. as we know of, come all from Nepal.

Having once enjoyed such a vast circulation, the almost total disappearance of the system from India requires explanation. We can account for this fact, firstly, on the ground of its want of originality, such of the original matter as there was—and it was not much—be-

¹ For a list of these see Ind. Ant. xxv, pp. 103 and following.
ing already incorporated in the Pāñinīya school through the Kāśikā. Mainly however we must look to the cause of its disappearance in its non-secular character. Being the work of a Buddhist for the Buddhistic community, it shared the fate of Buddhism, and having obtained vogue for a few centuries it gradually ceased to be cared for, its aid being invoked in later times only for the sake of justifying an otherwise unjustifiable word, or for pointing out and rejecting such of its rules as went counter to the established system of grammar. The Grammar, we are told, is still extensively studied in Tibet.

In Ceylon its fate was different. Being a Buddhistic country we expect the Chāndra system to be diligently studied there. As a matter of fact, the current Sanskrit grammar in Ceylon belongs to the Chāndra school, but we shall look in vain for any original Mss. either of the Chāndra-sūtras or of commentaries thereon.

The reason is that about 1200 A. D. a Ceylonese Buddhistic priest, Kāśyapa by name, wrote a popular recast of the Chāndra grammar called Bālavabodha. It corresponds to Varadarāja's Laghu-kaumudī in treatment and subject-matter. The work was so popular in Ceylon that it quite superseded the original Chāndra text, with the result that all other Chāndra works have disappeared in course of time, just as the works of the pre-Pāñinīya grammarians did after the advent of Pāṇini.

Under these circumstances, it is quite impossible to pursue any farther the history of the Chāndra school of grammarians in India.

The Jainendra School

47. The Jainendra School.—The traditional author of the aphorisms of grammar which go under this name is Jina or Mahāvīra, the last of the Tīrthaṅkaras. The tradition
of the Digambara Jains as embodied in several of their works such as Samayasundarasūri’s commentary on the Kalpasūtras or Lakshmīvallabha’s Upadeśamālākarnikā is, that Indra asked certain questions to Jina when of eight years, and had the science of grammar revealed to him by way of answers; the grammar in consequence came to be known by their joint name. A Ms. (no. 1223) belonging to Professor Kathavate’s collection for 1891-1895 launches, in its marginal notes, into a detailed verification of this tradition, trying to answer all the objections raised against it.

The chief objection, of course, is the concurrent testimony of the colophons of all the Mss., which invariably ascribe the work to Devanandī. This is also confirmed by the introductory stanza—

ढळ्मीरात्यंगतिकी यस्य निरवधारमास्ते ।
देवनांदेवित्यप्रेषेण नमस्त्यस्मै स्वयंधुवे ॥

which is given by all Mss., wherein the first word of the second line, obscure in meaning as it is, appears to be purposely used to indicate the name of the author. Further, works like Dhanaṇṭjaya-kośa or Jaina-Harivarha (A. D. 783) and writers like Bopadeva or Hemachandra refer to Devanandī as the author of this grammar. The point then may be regarded as fairly settled. This Devanandī is otherwise known as Pūjyapāda.

1 The Jainendra-sūtrapātha belongs to the Digambaras from whom the Śvetāmbaras have borrowed it wholesale. The tradition, therefore, belongs more strictly to the Śvetāmbaras.

2 शब्दव्यवहार जिनेव्येण कौमारेपि मित्र-पितवस। एतश्रु जिनेव्यभिमितिस्तऽधुः शब्दव्यवहाःसासनम् ॥

3 Except the one above quoted, which gives a different māṅgala.

4 In the opening praśasti of the work there is a reference to the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa. Akaṇkadeva also quotes a Jainendra sūtra in the तत्तांत्रिक i. 5.1.
Dr. Kielhorn once believed that Pūjyapāda was a *nom de plume* assumed by a late writer, with the view all the more readily to make the work pass under the name of the last Tīrthaṅkara. The historical existence of the founder of this school thus doubted by Dr. Kielhorn has been conclusively established by Professor Pathak, who quotes a verse from the Nandisaṅgha Paṭṭāvali and gives other references to prove that Devanandī was no other personage than Pūjyapāda himself.

48. Date of the Jainendra-vaśkarana.—The foundation of this school dates from about the same time as that of the Chāndra. If anything, the Jainendra would come a little before the Chāndra. Professor Pathak in his paper on the Jaina Śākaṭāyana (Indian Antiquary, Oct. 1914) gives evidence to assign the Jainendra-vaśkarana to the latter part of fifth century A. D. Among his arguments are: 1. the fact that the Kāśikā seems to betray a knowledge of the Jainendra-vaśkarana; 2. the circumstance that the Jainendra sūtra alludes to Īsvarakrīṣṇa the author of the Śāṅkhya-kārikās (who is assigned by Dr. Takakusu to A. D. 450) and to the twelve year cycle of Jupiter according to the heliacal rising system a system which was in vogue in the time of the Early Kadamba kings and their contemporaries, the Early Gupta kings; and 3. the collateral evidence to be derived from later references to the Jainendra from the ninth century on. Thus the Śākaṭā-

---

1 Indian Antiquary xii, pp. 19 ff.
2 वनाकृतिकृतशोलनन्दी देवनन्दी महा-चति। श्रीचन्द्रवाप्तारस्तिः सुधामन्द्री णापीकरः॥
3 Kāśikā iii. 3.40 उत्तरप्रस्थ मार्गिते ब्रह्म: presupposes Jainendra sūtra ii. 3.36 इतस्तदेवेच्छलस्ते चे चे, as Kāśikā could not have derived it from elsewhere.
4 Sūtra iii. 3.134—शास्त्रकवर्षबर्म-गिनियतकृत्यमालात्रान्त भूमिकाभाष्यपण- वर्णनमाद्यान्विते। Contrast Pāṇini, iv. 1.102. The Amogha-vritti of Śākaṭāyana explains आत्मनमानयो वार्षिकम्, the latter being another name for Īsvarakrīṣṇa.
5 Sūtra iii. 2.5 उच्छवायुधापितेष्वि
yana Śabdānuśāsana (which dates from 1025 A.D., as we shall see) is largely indebted to the Jainendra. A Digambara Darśanaśāstra of 853 A.D. mentions, as stated by Dr. Peterson,¹ a pupil of a certain Pūjyapāda as being the founder of a Draviḍa-saṅgha. Lastly, an inscription from the Śaṅkhambasti temple at Lakshmīsvara records a gift in Śaka 652 (730 A.D.) of Śrī-Pūjyapāda to his house-pupil, although this last is not quite a trustworthy evidence, being not contemporaneous, and there may have been more than one Pūjyapāda.

49. Character of the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa.—There are two versions in which the Jainendra grammar has come down to us. The shorter one which consists of about 3,000 Sūtras is followed by Abhayānandī in his gloss on the grammar, while the longer one which, besides other minor differences in the wording and the arrangement of the sūtras, gives over 700 sūtras not found in the shorter version, is followed by Somadeva in his commentary called Śabdārṇavachandrikā, which, as he himself tells us, was composed in A.D. 1205. Professor Pathak has accumulated evidence tending to show that the longer version followed by Somadeva is the truer one, while that of Abhayānandī is much later.²

The Jainendra grammar is altogether wanting in originality. It is nothing but Pāṇini and the vārtikas condensed as much as possible. The merit of the work solely consists in the number of ingenuous shifts resorted to for the purpose of securing the maximum economy of words. Even the most trifling changes such as that of विभाषा or अन्यतरस्यां into वा, of मुख्य into दृ, and the alteration of the order of the words in the sūtras³ so as to

1 Report for 1883–84, p. 74. subject.
2 Professor Pathak intends short- 3 Pāṇini vii. 1. 9 अलो भिस देय is ly to write a paper on the changed into भिसोपव देय.²
9 [ Sk. Gr.]
produce by coalescence a syllable less are not disregarded. The Pāṇiniya pratyāhāras are retained without a change, though the fourteen Śiva-sūtras together with the section on Vedic grammar, are omitted. In addition, Devanandi has invented a large number of shorter technical terms¹ which bristle throughout his work and make its study the most complex imaginable.

Devanandi alias Pājyapaśa has, as is the wont of most Digambara writers, nowhere quoted by name or acknowledged his obligations to authors and works not belonging to his own religion. He has in his sūtras quoted six names.² The Deccan College Ms. no. 1223 of 1891-95, which makes it its business to prove that the author of this grammar is Jina himself, gives on this point a rather incorrectly written note³ which tends to say that since one of the above names, that of Prabhāchandra, which occurs in the sūtra राजः प्रभाचन्द्रस्य, appears on the face of it to be a fiction, we may presume the same for all the rest. We can couple with this the statement of one of the commentators on Hemachandra’s Dvīśrayamahākāvya to the effect that Siddhasena, another of the quoted names, was not a grammarian at all. Dr. Kielhorn similarly believed that all these names were fictitious and thought that the practice of thus quoting names honoris causa was not confined to the Jainendra school alone. Unfortunately we cannot decide the matter now.

50. Later history of the Jainendra-vyakaranā.—The absence of any originality accounts for the paucity of works connected with this school. Two commentaries only have

---

¹ Such as त्य for मतय, य for कर्म - 3 प्रश्नप्रकीर्तिः (?)तां स्फुरत्वादि। राजः प्रभाचन्द्रस्य भावति। द्वेषनिमित्तं मोहः प्रश्नप्रकीर्तिः चेति। चिराय भवतां।
² नामित्, श्रीतुष्ट, यथोऽभ, धूतितवलि, प्रभाचन्ध्र, सिद्धसेन, समतमभावं।
³ नामित्, श्रीतुष्ट, यथोऽभ, धूतितवलि, प्रभाचन्ध्र, सिद्धसेन, समतमभावं।
been preserved, one by Abhayanandi whose date is probably 750 A.D., and another called Šabdārjava-chandrikā by Somadeva. Somadeva represents¹ himself as the contemporary of the Šilāhāra King Bhojadeva (Bhoja II) and an inhabitant of Ajurikā (which is probably to be identified with Ājārē in the Kolhapur State). It is probable that in addition to these two commentaries that have come down to us, some others were written, and possibly the grammar was at one time made the object of diligent study; but our information on this point is extremely scanty.

There is also a recast of the Jainendra grammar meant to facilitate its study for beginners. It is called Pañchavastu, and, as is to be expected, it follows the shorter text of the sūtras as given by Abhayanandi. The work is said² to be that of Devanandi; but this is clearly a mistake founded on the fact that the sūtras followed are those of Devanandi. The introductory section of the Pañchavastu which deals with the pratyāhāras seems to be an interpolation. This section mentions a person called Ārya-Śrutakīrti³ as the author of the whole work. Is he then the author of this recast? If so, the absence of any other allusion to him in the body of the work becomes rather curious. Professor Pathak mentions a Śrutakīrti as having flourished about Śaka 1045.

About the history of the Jainendra grammar since the thirteenth century very little definite is known. The work probably shared the fate of all imitations and ceased

¹ Compare the Colophon—स्वस्ति श्रीकौशालपुरेर्द्वस्त्यवेदाविशेषायकामा स्थानं जीतान्ते त्यामलिङ्गाय श्रीमद्विन्द्रास्ताधरकुलकमलस्वर्गस्यादिशेषं श्रीसीर भोजविजयस्य शायकचंकसायक-शतसार्विशालीतमकोषगंगामंशतसरे दं...

² Indian Antiquary, x., p. 75; Dr. Peterson's Report for 1888-84, pp. 67 ff.
to be attended to when the original on which it was based came to be studied more and more. It was meant to appeal to a sect and even there it was not without a rival. To this day it draws a solitary student here and there from amongst the Digambara Jains, especially of Southern India.

The Saktayana School

51. The Śākaṭāyana School.—Separated from the Jainendra school by some two centuries or so but much allied to it in its object and the mode of treatment comes the Śākaṭāyana Śabdānuśāsana, which, like its predecessor, was meant to appeal to a limited body of co-religionists: the Śvetāmbara Jains. To judge from the number of regular commentaries and other accessory treatises in connection with this school and from the numerous references to it in works like the Gaṇaratna-mahodadhi, Madhaviya-Dhātuuvṛtti and so forth, it would appear that at one time the Śabdānuśāsana was largely studied among members of communities other than those to whom it was primarily addressed. There is not much originality in the work itself to deserve this popularity.

52. The founder of the Śākaṭāyana Śabdānuśāsana not the ancient Śākaṭāyana but his modern namesake.—The name Śākaṭāyana suggests, as we have seen, a very high antiquity in that it is quoted in the Nirukta (i. 3) and in Pāṇini’s Ashtādhyāyī (iii. 4.111, viii. 3.18, viii. 4.50). Here, however, we are dealing not with the ancient Śākaṭāyana—none of whose works have survived even in name—but with a modern or abhinava Śākaṭāyana: with the person who under this appellation is quoted, for instance, in Bopadeva’s Kāmadvenu, by Hemachandra, and other later writers.

The late Dr. Kielhorn once expressed doubts as to the historical existence of this modern Śākataśyana. He inclined to the view that it was some modern Jain writer who has presented his own grammatical labours under the auspices of a revered name, carefully trying to follow the views attributed to him in ancient works and possibly having for its basis some of the teachings of the earlier Śākataśyana. Professor Pathak's paper on the Jaina Śākataśyana (Indian Antiquary for October 1914) has now conclusively established not only the historical existence of the author of the Sabdānusāsana but his exact date. The Śākataśyana who wrote the Sabdānusāsana also wrote the Amoghavṛtti, which was written in the time of Amoghavarsha I, the great Rāṣṭrakūta king whose known epigraphic dates range from A. D. 817—877.

53. Character of the Śākataśyana Sabdānusāsana.—Besides the older grammarians such as Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, Patañjali, and Chandragomin, Śākataśyana has freely drawn upon the work of Pāñjapāda the author of the Jainendravyākaraṇa. Many sūtras of Śākataśyana are identical with those of Pāñini, and in cases where they differ the object has been to say in shorter and fewer words what

1 Carefully but often inaccurately: Thus in sūtras iii. 4. 111 and 112, Pāñini tells us that the Imperf. 3rd pers. plu. of है is अध्याय only according to Śākataśyana, but not so in his own opinion. This establishes विवेकाय. Now the modern Śākataśyana also makes the rule optional and allows both forms in his sūtra अध्यायें. This is what Pāñini teaches, and not what Pāñini represents Śākataśyana to have taught.

2 The most conclusive proof for this is the use of the instance अदभूतमार्गवृद्धितल्लक्षित to illustrate the use of the imperfect (sūtra iv. 3. 207) to describe a well-known past event which the writer might have personally witnessed but did not. There is inscriptions evidence to prove that the event in question took place shortly before Śaka 789 or A. D. 867 (see Ep. Ind. vol. i, p. 54, Ind. Ant. vol. xii, p. 181).

3 E. g. Pāñini's i. 3. 11, ii. 1. 1, viii. 4. 40, &c.
was already intended by Pāṇini. Most of the new matter is taken from Chandragomin (without acknowledgment of course) and where he has improved upon Chandragomin, the improvement was already suggested by the Jainendra sūtras, independently of which there is hardly anything new that we can put to his credit. In his sūtra i. 2.37 Śākaṭāyana seems to quote Indra who probably is to be identified with Pājyapāda, the founder of the Jainendra school.

The Śākaṭāyana śabdānuśasana consists of four adhyāyas of four pādas each, the total number of sūtras being about 3,200. The arrangement of topics is similar to that of later Kaumudīs. He gives thirteen praṇavaḥs and following the suggestion of Kātyāyana has omitted from them the vowel Ṛ and assigned therein a place to the apogāha. He does not, of course, treat of the Vedic grammar. His ingenuity is mainly confined to economising the wording of the sūtras. Except in three cases, he has invariably substituted the monosyllabic Ṛ, wherever Pāṇini had used viśāpa, or anvṛtasthāpa or had quoted the name of some ancient authority. The most striking instance of this tendency is given perhaps by

1 E.g. sāmesetēd for ādibhūṣyey sahetta of Pāṇini (i. 1. 71).
2 Instead of Pāṇini’s iv. 4. 29, parīṣukṛ cha, Chandra gives parīṣuṣkṛpaḥrsvitaḥ and so also does Śākaṭāyana.
3 In giving Chandragomin’s improvement sābhyātmacchāyē v: on Pāṇini’s sārāddhā (v. 1. 126) Śākaṭāyana economises one syllable by giving the sūtra as sābhyātmacchāyē, herein imitating Pājyapāda.
4 For Pāṇini’s ādēṣṭe v. 2. 133, Chandra gives ādēṣṭe v. 2. 130, Jainendra gives ādēṣṭe v. 4. 143, and so also does Śākaṭāyana. The like holds true of Pāṇini’s ii. 1. 18, ii. 3. 34, &c.
5 Namely Śākaṭāyana sūtras ii. 1. 229, i. 2. 13, i. 2. 37 (corresponding to Pāṇini’s v. 4. 154, vii. 1. 79, and vii. 2. 101 respectively), where Śākaṭāyana quotes śudratimśi, ārṇītṛcch, and āśvya. Whether these three names are merely pūja or there were before him grammarians of that name cannot be determined.
Pāṇini’s sūtra v. 2.1.28, which runs दुःश्रोपताध्यात्माणिष्ठानिष्ठिनः Chandra changed this into चार्य( =द्वृ) रोम( =उपत्य)गहिताः-
प्रागिष्ठादेद्वारानिष्ठिनः, where the substantial change is the
addition of the qualifying clause अव्याख्यात। Sākaṭāyana
says just what Chandra said, but instead of रोमगहित puts
a form which is shorter by full two syllables—हृद्विन्य। In
his technical terminology also he has often taken up
Chandra words in preference to Pāṇini’s wherever the
former were shorter. Thus he has used चार्यि, सर्वांि, तद्रा
and अत्रू instead of निपाति, सर्वनामि अत्मानि and परस्मायि
of Pāṇini.

54. Other works of the Sākaṭāyana school.—Besides the
Sabdānuśāsana and the Amogha-vṛitti Sākaṭāyana is credited
with the authorship of i. Paribhāsha-sūtras, ii. Gaṇapāṭha
in sixteen pādas, iii. Dhatupāṭha, iv. Uṇādi-sūtras in four
pādas, and v. Liṅgānuśāsana in seventy ārya stanzas.
Of these none is older than the corresponding Pāṇiniya
treatise. One expects to find in the Uṇādi-sūtras at least
traces of the ancient Sākaṭāyana and his works, but he
is sure to be disappointed in his expectations. The other
treatises also do not call for any special notice. Hemachandra based his own Liṅgānuśāsana on that of Sākaṭa-
ayana, of which, in fact, it is only an enlarged edition.

55. Later history of the Sākaṭāyana school.—The later
history of the Sākaṭāyana school—as is the case with al-
most every grammatical school—is to be divided into two
parts: the period of commentaries and sub-commentaries,
and the period of digests and manuals. The periods
often overlap chronologically. Of commentaries on the
Sākaṭāyana Sabdānuśāsana the most noted are i. a Nyāsa
quoted in the Mādhaviya Dhatuvaṃśi. Probably this is

1 The Ms. in the Jain Maṭha at Sravanga Belgoja is not, as re-
ported, a Ms. of the Sākaṭāyana Nyāsa; it is a Ms. of
Jinandrabuddhi’s Kāśikāvivā-
raṇapaṇīkā, and an almost complete Ms. for that, written
in Canarese characters. See
before, note 1 on page 39.
no other than the Nyāsa by Prabhāchandrāchārya, which is in the nature of a commentary on the Amogha-vṛitti.¹
And ii. a commentary called Chintāmaṇi by Yakshavarman. This was throughout based upon the Amogha-vṛitti and lays no claim to originality.² Nevertheless it has been honoured by many sub-commentaries such as the Maṇiprakāśikā by Ajitāsenāchārya, Chintāmaṇipratipada by Maṅgarasa, and a Tippani by Samantabhadra.

Besides regular commentaries there have been produced at least two or three recasts of the Śaṅkara-yana grammar. The best of them is the Prakriyāsaṅgraha by Abhayachandrāchārya, published at Kolhapur, 1907. Abhayachandra's date follows from that of his pupil Keśavavarṇi who in Śaka 1281 (=A. D. 1359) wrote a Sanskrit commentary on Gomāṭasāra, a philosophical work in Prākrit. Abhayachandra thus flourished during the first half of the fourteenth century. In his recast Abhayachandra has omitted a large number of the original sūtras, which were unnecessary in a work for beginners, and amplified a few others. His arrangement is closely modelled upon works like the Prakriyākaumudi. Another and a still shorter abridgment of the Śaṅkara-yana grammar is the Rāpasiddhi by Dayāpāla, pupil of Matisāgara and a fellow-student of Vādirāja alias Jayasimha II, the Chālukya emperor who was reigning in Śaka 947 (=A. D. 1025).³ The work is somewhat similar in scope to the Laghukaumudi.

¹ Regarding the Amogha-vṛitti, Śaṅkara-yana's own commentary on his sūtras, see Professor Pāṭhak's paper (Ind. Ant. for October 1914).

² Compare—तस्यालंतहति श्रृति संहृते तदःस्वयं प्रदीपकः। सूम्बृत्तप्रकाश्या श्रुतिः
प्रक्षेपः पञ्चमर्गा ॥ Extracts to prove the dependence of this commentary on the Amogha-vṛitti are given by Professor Pāṭhak, loc. cit.

³ For these facts I am indebted to Professor Pāṭhak's paper in the Ind. Ant. for Oct. 1914.
In course of time the Śakaṭāyana Śabdānuśāsana came to be fairly ousted from the field by a powerful rival in the shape of Hemachandra’s Śabdānuśāsana, which like its predecessor\(^1\) was addressed to the Śvetāmbara Jains, with the result that even Mss. of works belonging to the school are at present very rarely to be met with outside of Southern India, which was once the centre of its greatest influence.

**The Hemachandra School**

56. The Hemachandra School.—The last, but not on that account the least, of these sectarian schools that we have to notice is the one which is known under the name of its founder, the Jain monk Hemachandra. About Hemachandra and his times we know a good deal more than what we did regarding the founders of the other schools hitherto described. The biographical material regarding Hemachandra has been brought to a focus in Dr. Bühler’s German pamphlet\(^2\) entitled ‘Über das Leben des Jaina Monches Hemachandra,’ Wien, 1889.

57. Life of Hemachandra.—Hemachandra was born on the full-moon night of the month of Kārttika in the year of Vikrama 1145 (corresponding to A. D. 1088 or 1089, November-December) at a place called Dhunduka, now in the British Collectorate of Ahmedabad. His parents were humble banias, Chachiga and Pahini by name. He was originally named Chaṅgadeva. The mother was a

---

1 That Śakaṭāyana was Śvetāmbara Jain is proved by the numerous references to the Āvaśyaka-sūtra, Chheda-sūtra, Niryukti, Kālikā-sūtra, and other Śvetāmbara works found in the Amoghaśrītī.

2 Besides the prakṛtis found in Hemachandra’s writings this work is based upon Prabhaṅka-śāriya by Mērudevācārī and Mūrtakūta (1250 A. D.), Prabhāṇḍa-vidyāntāmaṇi by Mērudevācārī (1305-6 A. D.), Prabhāṅka by Rājasekhara (1348-9 A. D.), and Kūmaṇa-śāhācāritī by Jinanandam (1435-6 A. D).
good pious woman, and the birth and the greatness of her would-be son was conveyed to her in a dream which was interpreted for her by a religious teacher named Devachandra.

When Hemachandra was a boy of five, Devachandra requested Pahini to surrender the son to the service of religion, offering considerable money in compensation. The money was refused, but the boy was given over, who, at Cambay, on the 14th day of the light half of the month of Māgha, being Sunday, was solemnly received into the order of the Jain Priesthood, taking on that occasion the new name of Somachandra. During the twelve years that followed his ordination, and of which our information is very scanty, Somachandra probably devoted himself to learning with great zeal. On the conclusion of his studies he was consecrated as Śūri or Āchārya, once more, and for the last time, changing his name to Hemachandra.

The next glimpse that we have of him is at Anahilla-paṭṭaka as the acknowledged head of the greatest of the many Jain communities there. Jayasimha otherwise called Siddharāja, was then on the throne, ruling from (Anhilvad-) Patan an empire which extended from Abu to Gîrnar and from the western sea to the borders of Malva. He was a munificent patron of learning and an earnest enquirer into religious truth. He never abandoned the worship of Śiva which was traditional with his house, but it was his delight to gather religious men from all quarters and to set them discussing before him the truth of their systems. Hemachandra early attracted his notice and he sought to conciliate, if not actually to convert, his sovereign by the use of clever parables; inculcating suspense of judgment and eclecticism. There are several stories current about Jayasimha and Hemachandra displaying the latter's shrewdness in contending with his Brahman enemies at court.
After the death of Jayasimha (1143 A. D.) Kumārapāla, his nephew, came to the throne. The first ten years of his reign he spent in victorious warfare on the northern frontiers of his kingdom. When he had nothing to fear from his enemies, he settled down to a peaceful and contemplative life. In this case there is no reason to doubt that Hemachandra’s exertions resulted in the king’s conversion. A drama called Moharāja-parājaya is based upon this fact. It is the oldest of our authorities for Hemachandra’s times, being written by Yaśalīpāla, minister to Ajayapāla, Kumārapāla’s successor. According to the drama Kumārapāla’s conversion took place in Saṁvat 1216, the second day of the bright half of the month of Mārgaśirsha. It is at the request of Kumārapāla and in order to establish him in his new faith that Hemachandra wrote the Yogasāstra, just as, are long, he had written the Šabdānuśāsana at the request of Siddharāja or Jayasimha.

During the closing years of Kumārapāla’s reign he, in company with Hemachandra, made many pilgrimages to Jain sacred places in Western India. Hemachandra, who was now an octogenarian, soon felt his end drawing near, and he boldly set out to meet it by means of prāyōpāvijaya. He was 84 at the time of his death. Kumārapāla died only six months after him. With their death the glories of the Jain empire also came to an end, after a brief existence of unparalleled brilliancy.

58. Nature of Hemachandra’s Šabdānuśāsana.—Regarding Hemachandra’s grammar (the full title of which is सिद्धेश्वरचन्द्रामिथिज्ञन्तज्ञशास्त्रदातासार) it consists, like Pāṇini’s work, of eight adhyāyas of four pādas each, the total number of sūtras being about 4,500. Of these nearly a

1 A certain commentator explains the first part of the title thus—
fourth part of śūtras is given by the last adhyāya alone, which deals exclusively with the Prākrit languages which were now in their most flourishing condition. In the remaining adhyāyas the arrangement of subjects is natural, only slightly differing from that of the Kaumudīs.

Hemachandra’s object in writing a new grammar for the benefit of his illustrious patron was to say in the shortest possible manner not only all that his predecessors had said upon the subject, but everything that could be said. Accordingly he has drawn freely upon the works of all the grammarians and commentators that had gone before him: indeed in some cases—especially in regard to Śāka-ṭāyana’s Sabdānuśāsana and the Amoghavṛitti—his dependence is so close as to amount to almost slavish imitation.¹

Hemachandra wrote a commentary on his own śūtras called Sabdānuśāsana-Brihadvṛitti. This commentary is profuse and learned, quoting the views of many writers—always under the general appellation of अपर:, पर:, अस्व:, एक:, काशिरू, etc.—for approval in some cases and refutation in most others. A commentary called Nyāsa on this Brihadvṛitti identifies a large number of these quotations² and if properly edited along with Hemachandra’s Brihad-

---

¹ Some typical instances will be found collected by Professor Pathak in the Indian Anti-quiry for October 1914, page 209. That Hemachandra does now and then add a bit of his own is proved by instances like the śūtra पारे मध्ये दक्षिण वा (Pāṇini ii. 1. 18), which Śāka-ṭāyana gives as पारे मध्ये मेंस्मतः: दक्षिण (वा), while Hemachandra gives as पारे मध्ये मेंस्मतः: दक्षिण वा. ² These are: श्रीमोहित्यम्, उत्तप्न, उपाश्याय, कक्ष, कलायक, काशिरू, काशिकाकार, कर्पसारी, चन्दनोपिनिय, जावलीकार, इंगूसिंह, वेंशेन्द्री, व्या- सकार, पाणिनि, भावकार (otherwise वेंशराज or श्रीशिव), भोज, बागम, शारिककार, भवानशास्त्रिया-धर, शतकरायण, श्रवण, and many others. The उपाश्याय is probably कैव्यव, while श्रवण is probably the same person who is quoted in the Amoghava-ṛtti at iv. 1. 252-3.
vṛtti it is very likely to shed considerable light on many a dubious point in the history of Indian grammar. At the end of each pāda of the vṛtti Hemachandra, by way of a praśasti, has added a stanza in praise of his patron and his family. They are all given together in a note to Dr. Bühler’s pamphlet above referred to, and are written in the usual classical style of flattery.

An abridgment of the Brāhadvṛtti for the first seven chapters of the Śabdānuśāsana is also attributed to Hemachandra, and may probably have been written with his concurrence. It is a mere patchwork, containing nothing new or original. Mss. of it date as far back as cir. 1350 A. D., and one old palm leaf Ms. calls it, instead of Śabdānuśāsana, Laghuvṛtti-Śabdānuśāsana-Rahasya. To illustrate the rules of his grammar, Hemachandra has composed a poem, resembling the Bhaṭṭīkāvya, which is known as Dvāyāśraya-mahākāvya.

59. Treatises accessory to Hemachandra’s Śabdānuśāsana.—It is not necessary to describe in fuller details the treatises accessory to Hemachandra’s Śabdānuśāsana. These are: i. Haima-Dhātupāṭha, which is arranged for the most part like the corresponding treatise of Pāṇini; ii. Uṇādisūtras, numbering a little over 960; iii. Liṅgānuśāsana, a metrical treatise, being an enlargement of the Śakaṭāyana Liṅgānuśāsana and divided into eight sections; 1 iv. Gaṇapāṭha; v. A collection of Paribhaṭḥās; and some others. For the most part these treatises are embodied in Hemachandra’s Brāhadvṛtti, from which they seem to have been subsequently extracted and published in a separate form. It is doubtful whether the vivaraṇas or vṛttis which are given in Mss. of the Liṅgānuśāsana or of the Uṇādisūtras do really come from

1 Namely—पुलिक, नासुस्कारिक, इसरोलिक, आलिक, द्वायास्कारिक, भृकुटि, घिरिक and ग्रालिक.
Hemachandra. Here, as in most of the commentaries on the Śabdānumāsana, the colophons of the original work are mistaken for those of the commentaries themselves.

60. Commentaries on Hemachandra’s Śabdānumāsana.—The most important and extensive of these commentaries or rather sub-commentaries is the Brhadvṛitti-dhunḍhikā. No complete Ms. of this work has been hitherto discovered, the longest extending only up to the fifth adhyāya. The Mss. indifferently call it दीपिका, अवचूरि, अवचूरिणिका and हुण्डिका. Its authorship also is equally uncertain. Many Mss. and reports ascribe it to Hemachandra, which is very probably a mistake. A Ms.¹ from the Deccan College collection, which contains the commentary on adhyāyas vi. and vii, is stated to have been the work of Dhana-chandra. Another² Ms. of the Dhunḍhikā purports to be the work of Jinasāgara, while a third which contains only a fragment from the ākhyāta section gives Nandasundara as its author. These conflicting statements it is very hard to reconcile. The most probable view is that there were two slightly varying versions of the Dhunḍhikā, and consequently there may have been two separate authors. Whether each wrote a commentary on all the seven adhyāyas or only on portions from them it is perhaps impossible to decide. The Dhunḍhikā on the eighth or the Prākrit chapter is the work of Udayasaubhāgya, pupil of Harshakula of the Laghutapāgachchha. It was written in 1533 A.D. during the reign of Bahadur Shah of Gujarat (1525-1537). The object of a Dhunḍhikā is to take the various sūtras of the Śabdānumāsana in order, explain them word by word, and in the majority of cases to quote instances of its application, deriving the several forms step by step by bringing in the necessary sūtras.

Another very useful commentary on the Brhadvṛitti is by Devendrasūri, pupil of Udayachandra of the Chān-

¹ No. 10 of 1877-78. ² No. 119 of 1869-70.
dragachchha. It is called Haimalaghunyāsa and purports to be an abridgment of a larger Nyāsa by Udayachandra, the author’s preceptor.\(^1\) This latter work has not come down to us. The importance of this commentary mainly consists in that it refers many of Hemachandras’s quotations to their sources. A third anonymous commentary calls itself Śabdamahārṇavaṁyāsa. There do not seem to be existing any more commentaries worth the name.

61. Digests and manuals and other miscellaneous works.— Smaller manuals based on Hemachandra’s Śabdānuśāsana have also come down to us, the most famous by far being the Haima-laghuprakriyā by Vinayavijayaganaḥ, pupil of Kīrtivijayaganaḍī. It was composed in Saṁvata 1710=1652 A. D.\(^2\) A commentary on it called Haima-prakāṣa was also written by the author some twenty-five years later.\(^3\) A second digest referred to above,\(^4\) called Haimakaumudi alias Chandraprabhā, was put together in Saṁvata 1725 (=1669 A. D.) by Meghavijaya, one of the sūris who “by the command of the lord of the country (Desapati) were provided with quarters for the rainy season in the palace of Agarāvara.”\(^5\) This work is said to have been the model for the Siddhāntakaumudi. The facts may have been just otherwise.

Of lesser lights we have i. Puṇyasundaraganaṇi who arranged for the school the different Sanskrit roots in their alphabetical order giving after each root its meaning, gana, and other conjugational peculiarities; ii. Srivallabhavāchanāchārya who wrote in Saṁvata 1661,

---

1 Compare the following stanzas from the Praṣasti:—

\[\begin{align*}
\text{उद्योगचरित्रपुस्तिः सिद्धिः संस्करे} & \text{ महत्त्वः स्वरूपः} \\
\text{तद्वालीभवत्रसः स्वाभावः} & \text{महत्त्वः स्वरूपः} \\
\text{संस्करं} & \text{स्वरूपं} \\
\text{सम्बन्धित्} & \text{सम्बन्धित्}
\end{align*}\]

2 Compare: सेंद्रुदुवृद्धितंत्रं विक्रमः

3 Compare: कर्भिक्षुजलिपिःशिष्यतंत्रं

4 See before, page 46, note 3.

5 Peterson’s Report iii, page 10.
during the reign of Sūrasimha alias Siwairāj of Jodhapur, 1594-1619 A. D., a commentary called Durgapadaprabodha on Hemachandra’s Liṅgānuśāsana;¹ iii. Hemahāṃsa-vijaya
gāṇi who put together a collection of about 140 Paribhā-
shās or maxims of interpretation used in Hemachandra’s
grammar, and wrote a commentary on them called 
Nyāyārthamaṇḍūśā, in Sāmvat 1515² or A. D. 1457 at 
Ahmedabad; iv. Amarachandra, a pupil of Jinadattasūri of 
the Vāyaṇagachchha, who lived about the middle of the 
thirteenth century and wrote a work, called Syādisamuch-
chya, on declensions and their irregularities; and v. 
Guṇaratnasūri who wrote a work, called Kriyāratnasam-
muchchaya, on the use and conjugational peculiarities of 
the more important Sanskrit roots. He was the pupil of 
Devasundarasūri and wrote this work in Sāmvat 1466 
(=A. D. 1408).³ At the end of his work, in nearly 80 
stanzas, he gives a succession of spiritual preceptors 
which is of considerable historical importance.

62. Conclusion of the Hemachandra school.—Hemachandra 
was a prolific writer. In nearly every branch of litera-
ture which he touched he has left one or more important 
works behind him. The school of grammar which he 
-founded was not, however, destined to have a very long 
and even career of popularity. After the age of com-
mentators which had its fullest swing in the fifteenth 
century, the work fell more or less into neglect, perhaps 
for lack of originality but more probably because of the 
sectarian character of its founder and followers. Outside 
its circle it has not exerted much influence, while in its 
own circle it had to stand against two predecessors, Jainen-
dra and Śākaṭāyana, and at least one successor, Malayagiri

¹ भीमसरसवर्णे (चूरे दुर्गें) सूतरसिन्- 

महीपलोऽभिः साध्वाके- 

शृणु भास्मेवे। ॥ धूमव्रक्रस्त्रुशी- 

हस्यस्ये वर्णे &c.………

² भीमद्रिद्रानवसरे सतिसतिसिद्धे &c.

³ वालेयक्रमवर्षस्तमिति &c.
who wrote a Śabdānuśāsana of his own and composed a commentary on it during the life-time of Hemachandra himself, if we are to trust the evidence furnished by the instance अद्वैतातीतिन्कुमारपाठ: given in the commentary.¹ This would make Malayagiri flourish between A. D. 1143 and 1174. Malayagiri, unlike Hemachandra, used pratyāhāras and followed on the lines of the Kātatra as well as Śāktaṭāyana. Unfortunately, the only Ms. of this work that has so far come to light is incomplete, and nothing further could be said of this work here.

Regarding the Prākrit chapter of Hemachandra’s Śabdānuśāsana and its subsequent history—for, it had an independent development of its own—we need not discuss it in this place as it is beyond the proper province of our essay, which is limited only to the Sanskrit schools of grammar.

From these sectarian schools of grammar we shall now turn to schools which are rather cosmopolitan in character, being designed mainly to appeal to the masses—to schools whose object was to say just what is sufficient for a proper understanding of the language, to which grammar was considered, and justly considered, as only ancillary—to schools, namely, which go by the names of the Kātatra, and the Sārasvata.

The Kātatra School

63. The Kātatra school.—The name Kātatra, according to the commentators, means a short treatise, a handbook in other words in which the niceties of Pāṇini’s grammar have been dispensed with for the benefit of beginners. This view gains plausibility from a statement in the

¹ See Dr. Kielhorn’s report for 1880-81, page 46.
Vyākhyānaprakriyā¹ which says that this grammar was primarily designed for the use of—

व्याक्य्याः प्रक्रियाः स्तववन्तः प्रायः तत्वं ये।
हंस्यां द्वाइनितिनर्त्यं तत्वं ये॥
गोविन्दस्मापः प्राणं तत्त्वं बोध्यामिद्व सिद्धाम्।
तेन्द्र निर्भेकं प्रर्वववर्षं—

Weber in his history of Indian Literature p. 227 notes that this grammar was meant for those who wished to approach Sanskrit through Prākrit, and that the Pāli grammar of Kāchelāyana was based upon the Kātantra. We have else where (page 10) spoken of the relation which Dr. Burnell discovered between this and the Tamil grammar, and of these again with the ancient Prātiśākyas and other Aindrā treatises. All accounts thus agree in stating that the Kātantra grammar was not the creation of a school, but was rather meant to satisfy a real popular need; and looking to the intrinsic merits of the work itself, as also to the host of commentators that have been attracted towards it, it is clear that the work must have served its purpose pretty well, at least for a time.

64. Traditional account about Śarveśvarman, the founder of the school.—The Kātantra is otherwise known as Kaumāra or Kālāpa, and the traditional explanation² of the genesis of these two names is as follows: There once lived in the Deccan a king called Śatavāhana² who, while one day having jala-keli with his queen, was requested by her “भोजक बेड़ि राजकृ,” meaning “Pray, do not sprinkle anymore

1 Ms. No. 316 of 1875-76 from the Deccan College Library.
2 The tradition is mentioned in Dr. Bühler’s Report for 1875-76, p. 74, and detailed in the कालापणकरोदतिसिद्धलोक by तन-मालक, a Ms. of which is No. 50 of Notices, Second Series, by Haraprasada Shastri.
3 Is he to be identified with the Andhra King of that name mentioned on p. 208 of V. A. Smith’s Early History of India, third edition, published in 1914? In that case the beginning of the Kātantra will have to be put in the first century of the Christian era.
water on me." Thereupon the ignorant king offered her some (मोट्रक्स) sweets. Subsequently, discovering his error and being much ashamed of his ignorance of Sanskrit, he requested his Pandit named Sarvavarman to devise a speedy method of learning grammar. The Pandit in his difficulty besought God Śiva who ordered his son Kārttikeya or Kumāra to accede to his wishes. Accordingly, Kumāra revealed the sūtras of the Kaumāra grammar. As the God’s vehicle, the bird Kalāpin (peacock), was the instrument of communication, the sūtras also obtained their other name. This tradition—like most others of its kind—has probably a germ of truth. The date of the rise of this school as given by the tradition is not at all inconsistent with other ascertained facts. Thus Durgasiṁha the earliest known commentator on this grammar cannot as we shall presently see, be later than 800 A. D., and when we consider that he may not have been the first commentator on the Kātantra, and that, at any rate, the Sūtrapāṭha known to him cannot be necessarily identical with that which was original, seeing that considerable differences are observable between his Sūtrapāṭha and that current, for instance, in Kāśmir since 1100 A. D., we may for the present accept the first century after Christ as the century which witnessed the rise of this grammar.

65. Evidence for later Interpolations in the Kātantra Sūtrapāṭha—Coming now to the work itself we notice that the Sūtrapāṭha which now goes under the name of Sarvavarman is divided into four parts:

i. सन्धिप्रकरण—Consisting of सत्तापाद, स्वरसान्धि (समाल*) पाद, स्वरसान्धिनिषेध (आदुन्त*) पाद, व्यञ्जनसान्धि (बम*)-पाद, विसर्गसान्धिपाद, and [निपातपाद].

1 I adopt this form of the name * The starred names are derived in preference to Sarvavarman. from the first words of the
ii. नामवकरण—Consisting of खरान्त (खृज्यः) पादः, वर्णवान्तपादः, पालिपादः, दुर्म्यापदः, कारकपादः, समासपादः, तत्सिद्धपादः, and [श्रीमययमपादः].

iii. आयातवकरण—Consisting of परस्मयपादः, प्रत्ययपादः, द्विवचनपादः, संप्रसारणपादः, ग्रंथपादः, अनुप्रस्थपादः, इडागमपादः, and ढुढपादः.

iv. क्रत्यकरण—Consisting of शिरिधिपादः, धातुपादः, कर्मणिपादः, कन्तुपादः, [उणाविपादः], and घातस्तन्नथपादः.

In this connection the first question to be raised is: Does the fourth part—the क्रत्यकरण—belong to the authorship of शर्वावरमण himself, or was it only tacked on to his work by a later hand? Most commentators, including Durgasimha, note that the word शिरिधि which begins the first section of this prakaraṇa is महङ्गः. A मान्ग्याण it is true, may come at the beginning of the work as a whole or in the body of it: before commencing the various subdivisions of it. In this particular case Durgasimha tells us शिरिधिपादः भिन्नकरुक्त्वान्तपादः. He elsewhere tells us that the क्रत्यकरण is the work of Kātyāyana.¹ Joga-rāja the author of a work called the Pādaprakarṇasaṅgati² and probably the same person who is alluded to by Māṅkha (circa 1135-45 A. D.) in his Śrīkaṇṭha-charita, agrees in not assigning the क्रत्यकरण to the authorship of Śarva-varman; only he makes Śaṅkāyana their author. Lastly, Raghunandanaśiromani, the author of a commentary on the Durgasimha-vṛitti, credits Vararuci with the authorship of the prakaraṇa in question—अथ क्रत्यः: शार्ववकरणाः.

¹ See note 2 on page 27 before.
² This work gives a topical ana-
lysis of the Kātantra-sūtras. It is printed in Appendix 2 on the basis of the Deccan College Ms. 292 of 1875-76.
³ A Ms. of the work is no. 358 of Notices, Second Series.
Interpolations in Kātantra-Sūtrapāṭha

Whoever be the real author, it is clear that the Kṛtyakaraṇa is a later addition to the original Sūtrapāṭha.

Another clear case of later interpolations in the Kātantra Sūtrapāṭha is furnished by the three sections in rectangular brackets—निपत्तापाद, ध्रीप्रत्ययपाद, and रणादिपिपाद—which are absent in Durgasimha's commentary but which are regularly found included in the Kāśmirian Sūtrapāṭha. And even in the sections which are common to both these there are so many variant readings that we are probably justified in inferring that the Kātantra Sūtrapāṭha was in a very unsettled and changeable form when it reached Kāśmir—probably long before it found an exposer in Durgasimha.

Finally, the तत्त्रित्तपाद belonging to the second prakaraṇa seems likewise to be not of the authorship of Šarvavarman. The Sūtras in this section (like those in the ध्रीप्रत्ययपाद as given by the Kāśmirian tradition) naturally arrange themselves into anushṭubh stanzas; and although some Sūtras here and there from this section have been in Professor Eggeling's edition of the Kātantra printed as such stanzas, still this general fact has not yet received sufficient attention. The inference is obvious. If Šarvavarman did not think it necessary to teach the Kṛtya section to his Royal

1 Vararuchi is often an alias of Kātyāyana. The India office Ms. no. 855 purports to be Vararuchi's com. on his own Kṛtyakaraṇa, which are just these Sūtras.

2 Outside Kāśmir the place of these sections is taken up by a Liṅgāṇusūkṣana in 86 Kṛyas, attributed to Durgātma, who is probably not the same person as Durgasimha; and by an Uṣṇidīptā put together by Durgasimha himself. This latter work differs considerably from the Rṇadīpiṣṭaka included in the regular Kāśmirian Sūtrapāṭhas.

3 A few such are collected in Dr. Bühler's report for 1875-76, page 3xxxiv.
pupil, no more did he care to teach him the तद्वित section (or the स्त्रीयां section). And as it cannot be urged that the तद्वित section formed for the king a harder nut to crack than, for instance, the आवृत्त section, there was no apparent need for Sarvavarman's running into poetry and that for one or two sections only. The facts may have been these: A manual which made the king proficient in grammar in a few months' time must have attracted the early notice of the courtiers and subjects of the king. The omission of तद्वित and other sections may then have been noticed and rectified—either by the original author or some other scholar. And the impetus to such additions being once given, the Kātantra from being a mere handbook issued forth into a full-blown system.

66. Nature of Sarvavarman's work.—The nature of the improvements made by Sarvavarman on the current textbooks of grammar is evident even from that portion of the Kātantra which we have no hesitation in accepting as his own genuine work. These consist in i. dispensing with the artificial arrangement of the letters of the alphabet introduced by Pāṇini, and retaining in their stead their natural arrangement such as is found in the Prātiśākhya. ii. As a consequence the Pāṇiniya pratyāhāras, which result in brevity as well as unintelligibility, are dispensed with, their place being taken by the earlier and simpler Saṅjñās such as स्वर, व्यवन, समान etc. This has saved the system the defining sūtras, of which there is such a number in Pāṇini. iii. In the distribution of the subject matter, in preference to the old artificial arrangement of Pāṇini there has been adopted one which is natural or topical, similar to that of the later Kaumudis. iv. Lastly, as was essential in a work designed for beginners, the

1 The first sūtra of the Kātantra—
taken from the Prātiśākhya.
whole of the Vaidikī prakriyā of Pāṇini and all the other rules of an exceptional or difficult character have been simply omitted. Thus instead of the nearly 4000 sūtras of Pāṇini, Śarvavarman could finish his work in about 855 sūtras, or including the कृत section, 1400 sūtras only.

67. Early history of the Kātantra school.—The intrinsic merits of the work as also the fact that its author was patronised by a powerful king of the Deccan ensured its rapid circulation even in countries as remote as Kāśmīr and Ceylon. The explanation of this popularity is also partly to be found in the fact that there was an urgent demand for such a work. The text-books in use prior to the advent of this school were intended rather for Pandits and monks than for the merchants and agriculturists, in whom nevertheless the desire to learn the language of the Scriptures and of refined society was not quite absent. This led to the detection of inaccuracies and omissions in the original version of the grammar, which came to be rectified in the course of study, so that the original Sūtrapāṭha of Śarvavarman experienced, in the course of the next two or three centuries, the addition of the तत्त्त्व and अधिमत्व पाद, and the substantial assimilation with Śāktāyana’s or Vararuchi’s कृत्वकरण. During the period of its ensuing extensive circulation other minor changes or additions may have been made from time to time. The text must in any case have been pretty fairly fixed in at least two recensions, the northern and the southern, before it found an able commentator in Durgasimha.

68. Durgasimha and his vr̥tti.—Whether Durgasimha had any predecessors in the task of expounding the Kātantra cannot now be ascertained. His was probably the first systematic attempt where necessary to explain and amplify the Kātantra grammar so as to make it as thorough-

---

1 By means of giving vṛttikas, some of which later commentators have incorporated with the original sūtras. Cf. Eggeling’s edition, Notes, p. 87ª.
going as possible, without running counter to its original object of ease and simplicity. As Durgasimha is quoted by Hemachandra, and as he knew the Chānda Dhātupāthha, on the basis of which he put together another Dhātupāthha for the Kātantra, Durgasimha probably is to be assigned to the eighth century. As the verse introductory to his Uṇādisūtras contains an invocation to God Śiva, Durgasimha probably was not a Bāuddha, and if so, he is distinct from another Durgasimha, the author of a commentary on Durgasimha’s vṛtti, whose invocation points unmistakably to his faith. Durgasimha is also to be distinguished from later writers such as Durga, Durgātma, and Durgāchārya. The last is the author of a commentary on the Nirukta, and one of the first two, if indeed they are two persons, wrote a Liṅgānuśāsana to the Kātantra (see note 2 on page 85).

69. Commentaries on Durgasimha’s vṛtti.—Writers subsequent to Durgasimha have mainly confined themselves to writing commentaries on his masterly vṛtti. The earliest of these is the Kātantravistara by Vardhamāna, whose patron was Karṇadeva, who probably is the same who ruled Gujarat in A. D. 1088. Vardhamāna is often quoted by Bopadeva in his Kāvyakāmadhenu. A writer called Mahāmahopādhyāya Prithvīdhara wrote a sub-commentary on Vardhamāna’s work.

1 नमस्कृत्य शिरे सूरिराक्षसस्मतान्तरणालिङ्ग।
उणादभिष विधासवते भारयुपवासस्त्रोज्ज्ञे॥
2 शिवमेंद्रमदिक पुनर्ह अग्राह्य च स्वयंहरणस्वयम्।
काश्चदैवतिसिद्धीमयं नल्ला हुमेंग रेववित॥

This Durga style is Durgasimha as Mūlaśāstra. Compare Eggeling’s Notes, p. 465.

3 One of them may have been a Bāuddha; compare the verse—
स्रीराधायुलक्षण निऍर नेन चराचरण।

4 Goldsfieldke believed him to be the same as the author of the Goparatnamahodadhi, a work composed (सत्ताचरणाधिकारं हर्नाचरण।
शब्दः सत्ताचरणिसिद्धु) in 1189–40 A. D.
The next in succession comes Trilochananadāsa, who is also cited by Bopadeva and by Viṣṭhala the commentator on the Sārasvata. He may have come very soon after Vardhamāna. His commentary is called Kātantravṛttipancikā, and from it we learn that the author was a Kāyastha, the son of Megha and father to Gadādhara. Trilochananadāsa has been himself commented upon by Jinaprabhasūrī alias Jinaprabodha, by Kuśala, by Rāmachandra, and by other more modern writers.

Mahādeva, the author of a commentary called Śabdāsiddhi, a Ms. of which bears the date Sāṃvat 1340, is chronologically the next writer whom we have to notice. As, however, there is very little known about him either from his own works or from those of others, we shall pass on to later writers.

Of these we have already alluded to Durga or Durgātma, author of a commentary on Durgasāhā’s vṛtтика, who has often been confounded with Durgasāhā himself. An anonymous writer has written a Dhuṇḍhikā on the Kātantravṛtti, probably modelled upon a similarly named commentary on Hemachandra’s Śabdānuṣāsana. No other commentaries on the Kātantra that could be definitely assigned to a period anterior to 1500 A.D., are now extant. See, however, §72.

70. Treatises accessory to the Kātantra.—We have already incidentally spoken above of the treatises accessory to Kātantra. There are not many of them, and the majority of them are much later productions. The earlier ones are the Liṅgānuṣāsana in 88 āryās by Durga, and the

---

1. He is not to be identified with the author of that name who wrote the Kātantrottaraparishāhṭa to Śrīpatidatta’s supplement.
2. For particulars about Jinaprabodha see Peterson’s Report for 1896–92, Index; and Kielhorn’s report for 1880–81, Ms. nos. 35 and 36.
3. Ms. no. 60 of Dr. Kielhorn’s collection for 1880–81.
Uṇādipātha and the Dhātupātha by Durgasimha the author of the vṛtti. The Dhātupātha is modelled upon that of Chandragomin, with only slight modifications. The genuine Kālāpa-Dhātusūtra, which differs considerably from the above, is now reported to exist only in a Tibetan translation.

71. **History of the Kātantra school in Bengal.**—No definite information exists as to when the Kātantra was introduced into Bengal. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there arose in Bengal a host of commentators and writers of supplements to the Kātantra, and the grammar is there to this day most assiduously studied. Some of the most famous of these Bengali writers are: i. Kavirāja who quotes Trilochanadāsa and is quoted by Harirāma; ii. Kulachandra who is quoted by Rāmadāsa; Gopinātha Tarkāchārya who is commented upon by Rāmachandra who also wrote a commentary on the Kātantra-vṛittipañjikā; iii. Śrīpati who wrote a supplement to the Kātantra which is honoured with commentaries written by Gopinātha Tarkāchārya, Rāmachandra Chakravarti, Śivarāma Chakravarti, and Puṇḍarīkāksha; iv. Trilochana (not the older Trilochanadāsa) who wrote an Uttaraparāsishta, giving therein such information on वाहु, तब्रित, and समास as had escaped Śrīpati; and several others. Most of these writers came from the Vaidya community of Bengal, and their object in all cases has been, by partial or wholesale borrowing from all available sources, to make the Kātantra as complete and up-to-date as possible, so as to prevent its being neglected in the course of the struggle for existence which began with the modern revival of Pāṇini under the auspices of the Kaumudikāras, and the simultaneous springing into existence of a large number of other modern schools of grammar. At present, as before observed, the study of the Kātantra is confined to only a few districts of Bengal.
72. History of the Kātantra school in Kāsmīr.—In Kāsmīr the school had a slightly varied development. The Śātra-paṭha received there was, as we saw, considerably different from that known to Durgasirha; and we can hence conclude that the Kāsmīrian Pandits got familiar with the works of Durgasirha much later. Until then they busied themselves with writing original commentaries and digests on the Kātantra which, as Dr. Bühler observes, has been the grammar of the Kāsmīrians from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. Only a few of their works in Mss. have so far been available. There is among others a work called the Bālabodhini by Bhaṭṭa Jñagaddhara with a Nyāsa upon it by a writer called Ugrabhāti, who, if identical with his name-sake who was a teacher of grammar to Ānandapala and whose book (as Alberūnī says) was made fashionable in Kāsmīr by liberal donations from the royal pupil to the Pandits, must be placed in the latter part of the tenth century.1 Another rather well-known book is the Laghuvṛtti by Chhichhuhṛatta, which perhaps belongs to about the same time.2 Of later and less important books there is quite a number. The modern popular books of grammar in Kāsmīr are based on the Kātantra.

The Śārasvata School

73. The Śārasvata school: Its date.—The origin of the Śārasvata school of grammarians cannot be put down to a date very much earlier than 1250 A. D., when Bopadeva the author of the Mugdhabodha flourished, seeing that he

1 See Vincent Smith’s Early History of India, Third edition, p. 382, note.

The Deccan College Ms. of the work brought over by Bühler in 1875-76 contains at the end the following colophon: शाके खातिकिमिति सत्तानेकद्विसे(?) फिन्से &c., which perhaps stands for Śaka 1037 = 1115 A. D.
nowhere refers to the Śārasvata school. If the school existed in his days—if it had attained a sufficient standing in the eyes of scholars—we should naturally expect Bopadeva to mention it, just as he does many other established schools and authors. Nor does the school appear to have been known to Hemachandra. Further, none of the commentaries on the Śārasvata belongs to a date earlier than 1450 A.D., and the majority of them were written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Looking to the native places of the different commentators and the places where the Mss. were copied or discovered, it has to be admitted that the influence of the school, even in the most glorious period or its existence, was mostly limited to Northern India: to Gujarāt, Nagapūr, Udepur, Bikaner, Delhi and Bengal. The school continued in vigour down to the modern revival of Pāṇīni under the auspices of Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣhita and his pupils, when most schools of grammar began to decline and were driven into the corners of Bengal and other out-lying districts. The Śārasvata school was probably the last to go. These facts when taken in conjunction with the extremely simple and brief manner in which the Śārasvata treats its entire subject—700 sūtras\(^1\)—as against the 4,000

---

1 Seven hundred sūtras—i.e., in the original sūtrapāṭha of the school. This assertion is made on the basis of the Deccan College Ms. no. 239 of 1892-95, which gives 597 mūlasūtras plus 91 more vīrtikas or voktāvyas, thus reaching the total of 658. The original order of the sūtras seems to be preserved in this Ms. alone; other Mss. usually follow the order of Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya in his Śārasvata-prakriyā. Thus in two Mss. of the Deccan College Collection (no. 257 of 1885-98 and no. 210 of A. 1882-83) the total number of sūtras is nearly 890, including some sūtras which occur twice and some vīrtikas distinctly given by Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya as such. We have in fact to distinguish clearly between the Śārasvata-mūlasūtrapāṭha and the Śārasvata-prakriyā-sūtrapāṭha.
of Pāṇini—render plausible the inference that the Sārasvata school, like the Kātantra, arose in response to a definite demand. This time the demand probably came from the Muhammedan rulers of India who felt it necessary to promote the study of Sanskrit, were it only for the purpose of criticising works written in that language. Thus Gaisuddin Khilgi the peaceful and enlightened ruler of Mālva, Salemshah (1555 to 1556) the emperor who ruled Delhi during Humayun’s wanderings, and Jahangir, the Conqueror of the world—all these alike encouraged the study of the Sārasvata grammar as being the one calculated to produce greatest results with the least effort. Indian princes like Udayasing of Udepur (1679 A.D.) also found it easier and less likely to interfere with their usual enjoyments to study this grammar. We shall presently consider the special features to which the Sārasvata owed its popularity amongst the aristocracy; in the meanwhile it may be assumed as very probable that the Muhammedan rule of India is to be credited with having produced the demand which eventually led to the rise of the school of grammar with which we are at present concerned.

74. Special features of the Sārasvata.—These special features are not very far to seek; and prominent amongst them is brevity of treatment. When we remember that schools like those of Jainendra and Bopadeva, whose avowed object was to curtail and improve upon Pāṇini as far as practicable, could not conveniently treat of their subject in less than 3000 and 1200 sūtras respectively; or that the school which in current opinion was labelled the short school—Kātantra—has more than 1400 sūtras,

1 It is necessary to emphasise this in order to counteract the tendency to look upon the Islam as a purely destructive force. The instance before us is only one out of many.
it was certainly an achievement for the Sārasvata grammar to compass the whole subject in 700 aphorisms only.

More important than brevity is simplicity; and in this respect also the Sārasvata compares favourably with its predecessors. The Sārasvata uses pratyāhāras but dispenses with the puzzling its so that in its terminology the letters च, ट, त, क, प, for instance, are indicated by the formula चप. This method has the advantage of pointing out at a glance the letters included in the application of a rule, which Pāṇini’s चष fails to do, except to the initiate. The other technicalities adopted by the Sārasvata are of the simplest kind and are such that the meaning is evident from the word itself (सच्चर, सच्च्यक्षर etc.), or is established by the concensus of grammarians (नाद्वित, आध्यात, सम्यकता, स्वर, स्वधान, उष्पच, क्रमत etc.). Accordingly, the Sārasvata very rarely goes out of its way to explain its Sañjñās and thus, without sacrificing simplicity, gains enormously in economy. The order followed is, of course, the natural or the topical one. The language of the sūtras is easy, and in their interpretation we have not to follow the guidance of any paribhāṣhās. No book on paribhāṣhās has come down to us in connection with this school.

This has been made possible, of course, by a studied avoidance of all difficult and out-of-the-way forms, the object being to learn grammar not for its own sake but as a medium for the study of literature. The Vedic irregularities and accents are left out, as also any detailed consideration of the Uṇādis. Sometimes this process was carried too far and then later it was found necessary to insert vārtikas such as पतिरसमास एव सविक्षयस्वदक्षय: or गवा- देवर्णणागमोऽशादौ वक्तयः or again जरायतः स्वराद्रो जरस्वा वक्तयः, where it was discovered that even some of the commoner forms of words remained unnoticed.
75. Traditional founder of the Sārasvata school.—The person who is credited with the authorship of these vārtikas to the Sārasvata is an ascetic called Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya. Tradition goes further and makes him the direct recipient of the revelation of the sūtras from the Goddess Sarasvati, after whom the school gets its name. This does not seem to be, however, the right view. We know that Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya gives in his Sārasvata-prakriyā some vārtikas, and this is incompatible with his being the Sūtrakāra, as there was nothing to prevent him from turning his vārtikas into so many sūtras. Secondly, some of the rules which Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya gives in his commentary are absent in other commentaries. Lastly, though this has hardly much bearing on the question before us, Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya is the spiritual name of a man about whom we know nothing. On the contrary Kshemendra at the end of his commentary on the Sārasvata-prakriyā has the colophon—इतिश्रीनरेन्द्राचार्यसारस्वते श्रमेत्रहर्दिश्यन् समाप्तम्—thereby making Narendra the author of the Sārasvata. Again, Amṛitabhārati another commentator has the following:

यन्नेनवनगिरिप्रभाविते यद्य वैभवसरस्वतीरितम्।
तत्स्यात्र भिन्निते तथाविकं किंचिद्रेव कहिले स्वयं धिया॥

A grammarian Narendra became is also quoted by Viśṭha-lāchārya in his Prakriyākaumudiprasāda. Although as a result of these conflicting facts we are not justified in throwing any doubt upon the historical existence of Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya, still we must admit that he is no more than a name for us, and to set against him we have another—Narendra or Narendra—who must have written some original work on the Sārasvata, no trace of which has, however, been hitherto discovered. We may observe in passing that such a confusion of names is more likely to occur in the case of modern writers, especially obscure writers; and such we might
assume was the person who, in response to a felt demand, produced the Sārasvatasūtras, and thus made it possible even for the foreign rulers of India to get an insight into Sanskrit literature.

76. The Sārasvata-prakriyā of Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya—From this obscure and almost mythical personage, who could not have lived prior to the establishment of Muhammedan rule in India, our next leap in the history of this school is to Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya the author of the Sārasvata-prakriyā. He may have had one or two predecessors in his task. Anyhow when he took up the task, there was probably such a confusion in the order of the Sārasvata-sūtras that he found it necessary to rearrange (क्यू हैं) the whole matter for logical presentation.

Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya could not have lived earlier than 1250 and later than 1450, when Puñjarāja the earliest of his known commentators lived. When the sūtras once received a stereo-typed form at the hands of Anubhūtisvarāpa, the future history of this school is mainly one of commentaries and sub-commentaries; and the fact that very few of the commentators—and they are over fifteen in the course of about 175 years—make any really original contribution, but confine themselves merely to an explanation more or less accurate, only means that the grammar was meant for practical purposes only. That there should have arisen so many commentators at all is to be explained on the ground that the several local Pandits felt it necessary, in vindication of their scholarship, to write for their patrons fresh commentaries rather than take up those already existing.

77. Commentators on the Sārasvata-prakriyā.—We shall now give short notices of these commentators one by one.

Puñjarāja.—He belonged to the Śrīmāla family of Malabar which some time or other settled in Mālva. He
gives his ancestry in the prāṣasti at the end of his commentary, from which we learn that he was a minister to Gaisudin Khilji of Mālva (1469–1500). Punjarāja seems to have carried on the administration very efficiently collecting round him a band of learned admirers, and indulging in numerous acts of charity and relief. He must have lived in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. He also wrote a work on alāṅkāra called Śīṣu-prabodha, and another larger work called Dhvanipradīpā.1

Amṛitabhārati.—As above pointed out, this commentator mentions Narendranagarī as an influential writer on the Sārasvata. Amṛitabhārati was a pupil of Amalasara-svati, and he bears the title परमहंसपरिवाराजकाचार्य. His commentary is called Subodhikā. Unfortunately all the existing mss. of this commentary contain such a confusion as to the name of the author and of his guru, some stating the work to be that of Viśvesvarābdhi, pupil of Advayasarasvati, others that of Satyaprabodhahaṭṭāraka, pupil of Brahmasāgaramuni, that it is hard to get at the truth. As the earliest known ms. of this work is dated Sāṃvat 1554, the author must have lived about the last quarter of the fifteenth century. The work is said to have been composed at the holy place of Purushottama: क्षेत्रे वधायि एकोत्सर्वसंस्कृतेःकस्मिन्।

Kṣemendra.—We next take this commentator not because he comes chronologically next but because he, like Amṛitabhārati, speaks of Narendra. The only personal information we have of him is that he was the pupil of Kṛṣṇāśrama and the son of Haribhaṭṭa or Haribhadra, a fact sufficient to indicate that he was other than the great Kṣemendra of Kāśmir, who lived a full century before Bopadeva. Kṣemendra speaks of some predecessors of his, and he is in turn quoted by Jagannātha, the

---

1 See Dr. Bhandarkar’s Report for 1882-83, p. 12.
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author of Sārapradīpikā, and unfavourably criticised by Bhaṭṭa Dhaneśvara who explicitly calls his own commentary केशमेन्द्रप्रियपरसंधन. As a ms. of this last work is dated Sāṃvat 1653, it clearly follows that Kshemendra could not have lived later than the first quarter of the sixteenth century.

Chandrakīrti.—His commentary is indifferently called Subodhikā or Dīpikā. From the praśasti given at the end of this commentary we learn that the author was a Jain belonging to the Bṛihad-Gachchha of Nagpur, residing in a Jain Tīrtha called Kauṭika, and 15th in succession from the founder of the Gachchha, Devasūri (Saṁ. 1174). He had a pupil called Harshakīrti who wrote this commentary at first hand, and who himself produced a Dhātpāṭha and a commentary for the Sārasvata grammar. From the praśasti of this latter work we learn that Chandrakīrti was honoured by Sāhi Salem¹ (A. D. 1545 to 1553) the emperor of Delhi. Chandrakīrti thus belongs to the second quarter of the sixteenth century.

Maḍhava.—The son of Kāhnu and pupil of Śrīraṅga. He mentions several commentators before him. If the date of a ms. of his commentary (Saṁ. 1591) is correct, he must be placed earlier than Chandrakīrti.

Vāsudevabhaṭṭa.—He calls himself the pupil of Chaṇḍiśvara and gives² the date of his commentary to be Sāṃvat 1634. The commentary is called Sārasvatapraṣāda.

Maṇḍana.—From the colophon at the end of the संधिप्रकरण we learn that Maṇḍana was the Mahā-pradhāna and Saṅghapati to Alpasāhi. His father was named Vāhāda

¹ Compare—भ्रमसाधारितस्मृतिःश्रमितिः सम्मानितः सावर्मयः दुर्विः समस्थिते। शृवाः श्रुण्याविचायम् स्वादेश्यं निष्कपितः।
2 Compare—संवतसौ श्रुवहिद्विषरतःसृष्टिः सम्मानितः सावर्मयः दुर्विः समस्थिते। शृवाः श्रुण्याविचायम् स्वादेश्यं निष्कपितः।
and he belonged to the Kharatara Gachchha. The commentary subsequent to the संप्रकारण seems to have been written by one of his pupils. From one of the mss. of the commentary (Dec. Coll. collection, no. 13 of 1877-78) we gather that Alpasāhi or Alam was a king of Mālva, whose minister (amātya) was known as Padama. Vāhāda, the father of Maṇḍana was a brother to this Padama, and was, besides, himself a Saṅgheśvara or Saṅghapati. Our Maṇḍana accordingly must have inherited his father's office and title. We are not yet certain as to who this Alpasāhi, king of Mālva, was.† Probably he was merely some local chieftain. The earliest dated ms. of the commentary belongs to the year 1574 A. D.

Megharatna.—He was a Jain belonging to the Brihat-Kharatara Gachchha, and the pupil of Vinayasundara. The commentary is called Sārasvatavyākaraṇaḍhunḍhikā or Sārasvatadipikā. A ms. of this work is dated Saṅvat 1614 (A. D. 1556), and this gives the lower limit for Megharatna.

Dhaneśvara. —He wrote his commentary with the avowed object of correcting Kshemendra. As a consequence he comes after Kshemendra and before 1595 A. D., when one of the mss. of Dhaneśvara's commentary was copied. He has written, as mentioned in the praśasti of

1 Professor S. R. Bhandarkar in his Report of a second tour in search of mss. in Rājputāna and Central India (1904-5 and 1905-6) mentions a विचणक on तुर्गसिवकातन्त्रवुत्सिद्धिका, which is written in Saṅvat 1369. This विचणक was made during the reign of Alpakhaṇa who has been identified with the brother-in-law of Sultan Alaudin (Elliot and Dowson, iii. pp. 157 and 206). If this Alpakhaṇa be the same as our Alpasāhi, Maṇḍana will have to be placed even before Puṇjarāja, which however does not appear very likely.

2 He must be distinguished from Bopadeva's preceptor, who was also named Dhaneśvara.
five stanzas at the end of the तत्क्रित section of the commentary, a तिका on the Mahābhāshya called Chintāmani, a new grammar for beginners called Prakriyāmani, and a commentary on a stotra from the Padmapurāṇa.

Jagannātha.—This commentator also quotes and is therefore later than Dhanendra. We know nothing personal about Jagannātha. The commentary bears the name of Sārapradīpikā.

Kāśīnātha.—His commentary is called Sārasvatabhāshya, but is not so diffuse as the name would imply. The author is not communicative about himself and the only thing that can be definitely asserted of him is that he must have lived prior to 1610 A. D., when a ms. (no. 292 of 1880–81) of his commentary was copied down at Barhanpur.

Bhaṭṭa Dopaīla.—Is another commentator who can be similarly disposed of by noting that a ms. of his commentary was copied in A. D. 1615.

Sahajakīrti.—It is a relief to come from these shadowy figures to one who is somewhat less chary of giving us information about himself. Sahajakīrti was a Jain, a Vāchanāchāraya and a pupil of Hemanandanaṇaṇi of the Kharatara Gachchha. The com. is called Sārasvataprakriyāvartika and was composed¹ in A. D. 1623.

Hānśavijayagaṇi.—The contribution of this author is very slight, he having been apparently content to write a very diffuse com. called Ābadārthachandrikā on the introductory verses of the Sārasvataprakriyā. He was the pupil of Vijayānanda and flourished about Samvat 1708 = A. D. 1650.

¹ Compare—बलसे शून्यनिष्ठेश्वर-कालीयमितिश्रये।

मायकथाणा नाक्रघार्यों जिसे पूर्णतामाहक।
Rāmabhaṭṭa.—This author’s com. is a curiosity not so much for its subject matter as for the manner of its compilation. The com. is called Vidvatprabodhini or Rām-bhaṭṭī after the author. At the end of each section of the com. the author gives in one to five stanzas details about himself, his family, his travels, and his literary works, from which we learn i. that the author was an Āndhra coming from the Telaṅgāna country, or more definitely, from the regions around the Uraṅgala hills, where ruled in his days a king called Pratāparudra, in whose court was the great pandit called Uddaṇa or Udayana; ii. that the author’s father was one Narasir̥ha and his mother a very pious lady called Kāmā. Having led a very happy life in his native place and written various literary works—among others, commentaries on the three Kāvyas of the great Kālidāsa—the author in the company of his wife, two sons called Lakshmīdhara and Janārdana, and daughters-in-law starts, at the advanced age of seventy-seven, on a pilgrimage to holy places. During the halts of the journey such leisure moments as the author could command were employed in writing the present commentary. The main interest of the work lies in the record which is kept of the holy places visited on the way. At the conclusion of every section, the incidents of the pilgrimage are versified and written down as a sort of a praśasti, together with a stanza or two in praise of the filial affection and dutifulness of the two sons. Although the diary is not as accurate and detailed as we would wish and the incidents of the journey by no means unusual yet the picture it gives of the real social life some three hundred years ago is by no means void of charm. It is to be regretted that none of the mss. accessible are complete.

In addition to these names there could be mentioned a few others—such as Ratnākara, Nārāyaṇabhārati,
Kshemaṅkara, Mahīdhara, etc.—but we have had already a wearisome list of them, sufficient to indicate the course of development of the school since its origin in the thirteenth century. It is necessary, however, to mention a few more writers who wrote commentaries on the Sārasvata independently of the Sārasvataprakriyā, although none extant is older than that work.

78 Commentaries on the Sārasvata Independently of the Prakriyā.—The most famous of these, as having given rise to more than one sub-commentaries is the Siddhāntachandrikā by Rāmchandrāśrama. As we possess little information about this author, we at once turn to his commentators. These are i. Lokeśakara, son of Kshemaṅkara and grandson of Rāmakara. He wrote a com. on the Siddhāntachandrikā called Tattvadīpikā in the year १६८३, i.e. A. D. 1683. And ii. Sadānanda who wrote a com. called Subodhinī, which has been published at Benares. Rāmachandrāśrama appears also to have written an abridgment of his own com. called Laghu-Siddhāntachandrikā.

Another independent com. on the Sārasvata sūtras is by Tarkatilakabhaṭṭāchārya, the son of Dvārika or Dvarakādāsa and the younger brother of Mohana Madhusūdana. The author points¹ out many interpolations in the works of Anubhūtisvarupāchārya. He wrote his work in 1614 A. D. in the reign of Jahangir.²

Siddhāntaratna by Jinendu or Jinaratna is yet another. We know nothing about it or its author. The com. is very short and probably very modern.

One more extensive work on the Sārasvata remains to be mentioned. It was undertaken by a pupil of Bha-

---

¹ With the words—स्कन्द परमहेंस-
² Compare—नवनवानिनितियाँ (1672)

रीति नयनै च ठोराइनै। श्रीकृष्ण सिद्ध विजयमणि श्रीजहांगीरे ॥
79. Treatises accessory to the Sārasvata.—Of accessory treatises in connection with the Sārasvata there are very few. There are no works on Uṇādis or Paribhāshas. A Dhātupātha with a com. on it called Taraṅgini was composed, as stated above, by Harshakīrti, pupil of Chandrakīrti. His date, therefore, is cir. 1560 A. D. A writer called Jñānatilaka has put together all the examples of डॅ. तज्जित, and उज्जार affixes based on the Sārasvata chapters dealing with them. A ms. of this work is dated Sālavat 1704. Another writer named Mādhava has attempted a derivation of words according to the Sārasvata. His date is probably 1680; and these are all, or at any rate, all worth noticing.

As the Sārasvata was meant to be the shortest and the easiest manual of Sanskrit grammar, it would seem that no further abridgments of it were called for. The facts are otherwise. Besides the Laghusiddhāntachandrika above noticed, an author called Kalyānasarasvatī has produced बालानं पार्वराधः a small work called Laghusārasvata. He lived probably towards the close of the 18th century.

80. General review of the history of the Sārasvata school.—Taking now a general review of the history of this school it will be perceived that the Sārasvata like the Kātantra, sprang up in response to the felt need of the time, and having once attained a fixity of form, the work continued to be studied in all parts of Northern India by the

3 Compare खनागर(?) सृयसूत्रा—
�ेवने(?) उच्चर तथा। श्रीमें ज्ञेष्टे।
help of the numerous commentaries which came into existence simultaneously and on all sides. Each commentary may be looked upon as having centered within itself the literary longings of the country around its place of nativity. And in later times there were made no attempts to improve or supplement the Sārasvata, simply because the students of the Sārasvata did not wish to be erudite grammarians, considering grammar only as a means to an end. Only one such attempt by a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji has come down to us; but by that time the Kaumudis and the abridgments of Varadarāja and others had fairly ousted the Sārasvata from the field.

It is an interesting coincidence that when the British rulers of India were first actuated by a desire to acquaint themselves more thoroughly with the literature and the ancient traditions of their subjects through the medium of Sanskrit, one of the earliest and the easiest of anglo-sanskrit grammars that was written was Wilkin's, the basis for which was just this same Sārasvata. At present the school has very little following. Its study is mainly confined to the provinces of Behar and Benares.

The School of Bopadeva

81. The school of Bopadeva.—This is a comparatively recent school of grammarians. Consequently there is no tradition of divine revelation attaching to the Mūgdhabodha, the chief text-book of the school, but it is accepted as the work of a real human author called Bopadeva.

82. The date of Bopadeva.—Bopadeva was the son of a physician named Keśava and his teacher's name was Dhaneśa. Bopadeva's birth-place is said to have been somewhere near the modern Daulatabad in the Mahratta country, then ruled by the Yādavas of Devagiri. Bopadeva is quoted by Mallinātha (cir. 1350) in his commen-
tary on the Kumāra, and he is known¹ to have been the protege of Hemādri, who was a minister (श्रीकरणाधिप) to Mahādeva the Yādava king of Devagiri (1260-1271 A.D.), and to his successor Rāmadeva. Bopadeva’s father as well as teacher lived at a place called Sārtha situated on the banks of the Varadā. He was thus a native of the Berars.² Although born of Vaidya parents he bears the surname Gosvāmi or high priest. Bopadeva was a scholar of great renown and a voluminous writer. Besides the Mugdhabodha, Kavikalpadruma, and its commentary—the Kāmadhenu—Bopadeva has written the Muktāphala and Harilīlāvivaraṇa (both dealing with the Bhāgavata-purāṇa), a medical work called Sātaśloki, and a treatise on Dharmāśāstra.³

83. The object of Bopadeva’s Mugdhabodha.—We have seen how various attempts were made quite early to improve upon Pāṇini’s grammar by making his rules more terse and accurate. Where these attempts were made in the way of vārtikas or commentaries, they increased the student’s difficulties rather than simplified them. And where attempts were made to establish a new school independently of Pāṇini, the founders were in most cases the followers of some unorthodox church, so that the need of a fresh manual (as distinguished from a mere recast of old rules and terms) remained as pressing as ever.

¹ Compare—विद्वज्ञानकाशिवायणभिषक्षेते शरद्युतम् हेमाधिचिंपेडेवन सुक्तानाय वत्मचिङ्कित्वां—from the सुक्तानाय, and क्रियाकारस्यकाशिवायणां—भार्तित्वि निस्पृ्यते। विद्वज्ञानकाशिवायण महाकारितावर्णम्—from the हरिलीला विवरणम्.

² Dr. Bhandarkar’s Early History of the Deccan, p. 89.

³ That Bopadeva did not write the Bhāgavata can be proved from various arguments amongst others the following quotation (उक्तौक्वबूताममेहत्कुण्ठं मात्रे शास्त्रेः परं मात्रे दृष्टव्ये हि सः) from the सर्वसाहित्यं संस्थाप्तम्, edited (1909) by Raṅgāchārya, who tries to prove its genuineness.
It was at such a juncture that Bopadeva wrote his Mudrabodha. His object therein was simplicity coupled with brevity. The first he attained by following the natural mode of presentation such as is found in the Kātantra. For the second, the adopted Pāṇini's pratyāhāra-sūtras—making in them the changes necessary for their adoption to his own system. He omits all notices of accents, and the Vedic peculiarities are dismissed in one (the last) sūtra—bhuḥ bhaṣṭraṇī, corresponding to Pāṇini’s oft-repeated bhuḥ bhaṣṭras. Another feature which we notice in this grammar for the first time is its religious element. In the choice of examples illustrating his rules Bopadeva has taken care to use wherever possible the names of Hari Hara, and other gods. Bopadeva is here equally partial to Hari, Hara, or Rāma; but later writers have outdone him in this respect. Even the technical terms of some of these modern grammarians are the names of Kṛishṇa, Rādhā, Śiva, Durgā, etc. We shall have occasion to revert to these later.

Bopadeva’s technical terms often deviate from Pāṇini’s.² Owing to the absence of all the its of the Pāṇinīya system and a slightly varied arrangement of letters, the pratyāhāras or rather the samāhāras of Bopadeva are quite puzzling to a student of Pāṇini; and since all ancient writers and commentators have followed the Pāṇinīya grammar in their writings, this extreme divergence from his system prevented the Mudrabodha from being studied in all parts of India, which its clear and logical method entitled it to be.

---

1 Thus सवैयमणि is illustrated by हरारि, हस्तमि, विष्णुसव; the optional forms एन, एनि, etc. are shown by—हम विष्णु हरेधर्षके विष्णूपरिचितके; अेन दृष्टिः हृणोऽधैर्यन गिरिषोधिषिस् an instance of कारक is—राम: मथ- युणात तसैं लक्षमणोऽवरणात् कारियात्त and so on everywhere.

2 For example, वृ for वादः व for वृजः; जान for जानयूः बिः for सर्वयमन्, etc.
84. Later history of Bopadeva's school.—From what is said just now we are not to conclude that the Mugdhabodha was never widely popular. In the two centuries preceding the rise of the Mahratta power and the revival of Pāṇini it enjoyed a wide currency as well in the land of its origin as elsewhere. This is clear from the statements of Bhaṭṭojī-dīkshita in the Šabdakaustubha and in the Manoramā. In the latter he says—

बोपादेवमहाग्राह्यस्तो वामनदिर्मणः।
कीर्तिर्यक्ष प्रस्तुतेन माधवेन विमृग्नितः।

He is also at great pains to refute the opinions of the author of the Mugdhabodha, which must have dominated the literary world before the advent of Bhaṭṭojī.

It was only in the seventeenth century that like other non-Pāṇinīya systems of grammar this school had to take refuge in a country which was farthest removed from Mahratta influence, that is, Bengal, or rather the neighbourhood of Nadia on both the sides of the Ganges, where it continues to be assiduously studied to the present day.

During the few centuries of its existence the Mugdhabodha has produced quite a bewildering number of digests and commentaries. The most celebrated of the commentaries is that of Rāmatarkavāgīśa, a profound logician and an adept in the grammars of other schools (पाणिन्यादिद्विद्वाक्षोक्तरः), upon whose systems he frequently draws to supply errors or omissions in the Mugdhabodha. He is quoted by Durgādāsa (1639 A. D.) who wrote a commentary on the Kavikalpadruma.

Durgādāsa also quotes Rāmānanda, Devidāsa, and Kāśīvāra and his predecessors, while he is in his turn quoted by Vidyāvāgīśa, Bholānātha, and Rāmabhadranyāyālaṅkāra.
A few more names are given by Aufrecht, but they need not detain us here. Of modern commentaries on the Mugdhabodha there is no end. Most of these are produced in Bengal.

85. **Supplements and accessory treatises of the Mugdhabodha.**—As the aim of the Mugdhabodha was brevity, it was inevitable that it should have omitted several obscure rules. Accordingly we find three attempts made one after another to supply the defects: by Nandakesarabhatā, by Kāśisvara, and by Rāmatarkavāgīśa. The first of these gives his date—गगननवनकाव्यस्माति, that is, A. D. 1398. He was therefore a very early writer. Of other modern attempts we need not speak anything.

As to accessory treatises Bopadeva himself left none, except the Kavikalpadruma, which is a list of roots arranged accordingly to their endings, and a commentary on the same called Kāmadhenu, the chief importance of which for us lies in its numerous quotations. Attempts more or less successful have been since made to give to this school other accessory treatises. Rāmachandravidyābhūṣha (Śaka 1610) wrote a Paribhāshāvṛtti. Rāmatarkavāgīśa put together an alphabetically arranged Uṇādikosa. And there are other minor works attributed, probably by mistake, to Bopadeva himself.

**The Jaumara School**

86. **The Jaumara school of Kramadīśvara.**—The name by which this school is popularly known is a misnomer. It comes from Jumaranandi the most celebrated writer of the school, though we have reason to think that he lived some time after its founder. This was Kramadīśvara styled वादीनित्रचक्राहामणि. Nothing is known of Kramadīśvara’s parentage and nativity. His work is called Saṅkshiaptasāra, indicating by it that it was an epitome or an abridgment of some larger grammar; and as it could be the
abridgment of no other grammar than Pāṇini’s, it is possible that this was the first of its kind, prior to the Pra-kriyā- and Siddhānta-kaumudīs. Aufrecht in fact makes the school even anterior to Bopadeva, though Colebrooke places it immediately after.

87. Special features of the Jaumara — Kramadiśvara seems to have composed his grammar on the model of Bhartṛi-hari’s Mahābhāshya-dipikā, and he has taken most of his illustrations from the Bhaṭṭikāvyā. The work meant as an epitome of the Ashtādhyāyi is about three-fourths as large as that work. The only changes effected by Kramadiśvara were confined to the rejection of a few superfluous or difficult rules of Pāṇini and the adoption of a different mode of arrangement. The work is divided into seven pādas, the eighth dealing with Prākrit being added later.) In the mode of systematising the grammatical material, as also in accuracy and method, the grammars of Bopadeva and others certainly compare favourably with this grammar, which may be due to its being perhaps the first of its kind. Still it is not altogether wanting in correct reasoning, and the erudition displayed by Kramadiśvara is far in advance of that of popular grammarians.

88. Commentaries on the Jaumara.—The Saṅkshiptasāra as it left the hands of Kramadiśvara must have been either incomplete or deficient, and it has undergone a more or less thorough revision at the hands of Jumaranandi who is styled in the mss. महाराजाधिराज. Detractors of the school make much fun of the name Jumaranandi, which they believe belongs to a man of the weaver caste. Jumaranandi’s vṛitti is known as Rasavatī and in consequence the school itself bore the name of Rāsavata under which

1 Namely, सम्भ, तिक्त, क्रम, कारक, लघु, and समास.
title it is quoted by Bharata the commentator on the Bhaṭṭikāvyā. Jumarnandi’s seems to have been the earliest exposition of this system. He has also revised for this school the Pāṇiniya Dhātupāṭha.  

Next to Rasavatī, Goyīchandra’s commentary deserves a brief mention. Goyīchandra styles himself औद्यासनिक, which may be either a patronymic or some religious or political title the significance of which is lost to us. The best part of Goyīchandra’s commentary is that on the fifth or the Kāraka pāda, which along with its able and learned gloss by Abhirāmavidyālaṅkāra is studied even by the students of other schools for the sake of a correct and complete understanding of syntax. Besides this commentary Goyīchandra has also written a work on the Unādis, and a list of some 127 paribhāshās.

Goyīchandra’s commentary is further commented upon by Nyāyapaṇḍitāna, son of Vidyāvinoda, a ms. of which is dated Śaka 1634; by Kesavadeva styled Tarkapaṇḍitāna bhaṭṭāchārya; by Chandraṣekharavidyālaṅkāra; by Varāṇḍana, Harirāma, and many others. Independently of Goyīchandra’s gloss there do not seem to be in existence any notable commentaries on the Jaumara grammar. Colebrooke mentions only one by Gopāla- chakravarti.

89. Present status of the Jaumara school.—Next to the Kāṭantra this grammar has the widest circulation at present in Western Bengal, where it disputes with Mugdhabodha the palm for supremacy. The literary activity of the school—such as it is—is not yet over.

1 Compare ms. no. 196 of Notices, second series, vol. i.
2 Explained as—उपाध्यायसने द्रीपते राजाकिनिति. अन्नविद्विद्य राज्य नामगृहिणयते. असेप आसनमपि क्षिप्ते हस्यायिक्षःसति.
3 The commentary is calledवाकरणोपहार, and regarding it the author says—सोपीचन्द्रस्य सम्य-गुप्तस्य सूचितम तत्त्व। अन्वययथा विबलते-पद्यम तद्यथा प्रकटिकृतम।
The Saupadma School

90. The Saupadma school of Padmanābhadatta.—The originator of this school is a Maithila Brahman named Padmanābhadatta, the son of Dāmodaradatta and grandson of Śrīdatta. This Padmanābhadatta is to be distinguished from another writer of the same name, the son of Gaṇeśvara and grandson of Sripati, who wrote for the school a work called Prishodarādivrītti, which was written, according to the author’s own statement, in Śaka 1297 (A. D. 1375). If this date be correct it follows that the other Padmanābhadatta, the founder of the Saupadma school, was either a contemporary or lived very shortly after Ujjvaladatta, whom he mentions as one of his authorities in his lexicon called Bhūripayoga. His being placed in the last quarter of the fourteenth century does not, at any rate, conflict with any other hitherto ascertained facts.

91. Special features of the Saupadma.—Regarding the work of Padmanābhadatta it is, as he himself states, based upon Pāṇini, some of whose sūtras and technical terms as also his pratyāhāras he has retained verbatim. He has, of course, remodelled a greater part of Pāṇini’s rules and arranged them in a somewhat more methodical form, adding a short explanation of his own after each sūtra. His

1 A ms. of the work is no. 228 of Notices, second series, vol. i. The date looks rather suspicious from the fact that in the beginning of the same work the author has attempted to trace his ancestry from Vararuchi, one of the nine gems in the court of vikramāditya. Needless to say that the attempted genealogy is a failure.

2 Compare—विभिन्नकाशास्मारकोषकारः।
हारावलिमितिकोषकारमप्य्प्राचारकाः।
तिमिः मैत्यत।

3 Thus Pāṇini’s आदिक्षेत्रेण सहेतत सति is changed into आदिक्षेत्रेण समधि।

4 The work consists of five chapters dealing with i. संज्ञा and साध्वि; ii. कारक and declension; iii. आध्यतम; iv. ह्वृ and उणावि suffixes; and v. tāṣ्टि.
treatment of Pāṇini—the fact of his having retained most of the Pāṇiniya terminology—has given the Saupadma an advantage over Bopadeva. Students of the Saupadma have not in their later studies to face the inconvenient necessity of unlearning their own technicalities in order to read the various commentaries and scholia (written to elucidate poems and works of science), most of which use Pāṇini’s terminology.

92. Commentaries on the Saupadma.—Padmanābha, the founder of the school, has himself written a commentary on his grammar, called the Supadmapaṇjikā. Several later commentaries are mentioned by Colebrooke, such as those of Kandarpasiddhānta, Kāśīśvara, Śrīdhara-chakravarti, Rāmachandra, etc. The best of the lot is Vishnunīśra’s Supadma-makaranda in twenty sections called drops or ‘bindus.’

93. Treatises accessory to the Saupadma.—Of accessory treatises to the Saupadma there is also a great number. Works on the Uṇādis, Dhātus, and Paribhāshās were written by the founder himself. At the conclusion of the last work, Paribhāshāvrūtti, the author has given an up-to-date account of his literary activity, which is of considerable value.1 Regarding his work on the Uṇādis (Uṇādivrūtti) it follows a peculiar plan of arrangement. “The treatise is divided into two chapters, the first containing the suffixes that end in a vowel, and the second those in consonants. They are all arranged alphabetically. The sūtras are Padmanābha’s own composition, and in his explanations he usually follows Ujjvaladatta.” The paribhāshās of the Saupadma school are some of them word for word Pāṇini’s, while others are modelled on that basis. The Dhātupāṭha follows Pāṇini’s division into खङाविः, अवाविः etc, and has a com. on it called

1 See India Office Catalogue, Part ii, Ms. no. 890.
Dhātunirṇaya. A Gaṇapāṭha to the Saupadma has been supplied by Kāśīśvara and a com. on it by Ramākānta. There are also minor works on समास and कारक attaching to the school, and a supplement has also later been tacked on to it.

94. Present status of the Saupadma.—At present the influence of the school is limited to parts of central Bengal that is, to Jessore, Khulna and Bharatpur in the Twenty-four Paraganas.

**Later Sectarian Schools**

95. Later Sectarian Schools.—We now come to a class of grammarians who have carried to extremes the tendency, already present, as we saw, in Bopadeva, to make grammar the vehicle of religion; and prominent amongst these are the Vaishṇava grammars called Harināmāmṛita.

96. Harināmāmṛita—There are two works going by this name. The one by Rāpagosvāmin, the companion and disciple of Chaitanya (1484-1527) and the author of several other Vaishṇava works, is perhaps the older of the two. The peculiarity of this work is the employment of various names of Kṛishṇa and Rādhā, and of their acts, not simply by way of illustration but as actual technical terms. Thus the vowels of the pratyāhāra अच्छे are each designated by the different incarnations of Vishṇu, the theory being—

साक्षर्य परिहारस्य या लोक (?) हेतुनमेव।
बैकुण्ठनामकथनमेषपापहरं विद्वः॥

As is to be expected, beyond the introduction of this sectarian element no other improvement on the existing texts of grammar is here to be met with. The whole subject is presented to us in a dull uninteresting manner. 15 [Sk. Gr.]
Jivagosvāmin’s Harināmāmrīta varies only slightly from the above. A third Vaishṇava grammar called Chaitanyāmrīta is likewise mentioned by Colebrooke.¹

Most of these grammars were intended to appeal to a very small community. There are consequently no commentaries or supplements handed down in connection with them. The few that exist do not call for any special mention. These grammars are at present in use among the Vaishṇavas of Bengal.

97. Prabodhprakāśa.—There are reported to have been in existence similar sectarian works of the Śaiva or Śākta schools, of which the Prabodhprakāśa is one. It is uncertain and immaterial as to whether the Vaishṇavas or the Śaivas are to be credited with the invention of this ingenious sectarian device. We may suppose that the beginning having been once made by Bopadeva, who was a हरिहराश्रीत्वादि, little remained but to stretch the thing still further.

The author of the Prabodhprakāśa is Bālarāmapañchnana, probably a Brahman by caste, about whose time and place no information has come down to us. In his works he designated the vowels by Śiva, so that we read in his work of शिष्यनिष्पाद, शास्त्रयन्त्रपृष्ठपाद, शिष्यनिष्पाद, etc. Here is one of his sūtras अस्त्रुधेम्दिम्द्रमणां स्थाने प्रथमवर्ण: स्थायित्रे परे। A Dhātuprakāśa is also attributed to this author. It is clear that works which carry things to such an extreme can claim the only merit of doggedly carrying an idea through. It may therefore be excused if no further attempt is made to sketch out the history of such schools, for the simple reason that they have no history.

Lesser Manuals and School-books

98. Lesser Manuals and School-books.—The age of the really original grammarians was long over. It was succeeded by that of able commentators and critics which continued as long as there was the necessity of understanding and correctly interpreting a great author. When even this became a difficult task, there was nothing to be done but the writing of small and smaller manuals adapted to the comprehension of the lay understanding. We have seen how, in most of the schools of grammarians worthy of the name, the declining age of each witnessed a host of such manuals and manuals of manuals. Even this, it would appear, was not enough. Out of the debris of these schools there grew up a spirit of eclecticism, and now we meet with grammatical handbooks which depend upon no system, and were written merely for a select circle of the uninitiated. These mushroom crops disappeared as fast as they were produced. They were not written for posterity. Before we close this essay we shall take up a few typical works of this class.

1. Prabodhachandrikā—A work not more than a hundred and fifty years old, being an elementary grammar treating in anushṭubh stanzas of the leading topics of grammar, the illustrative examples being connected with the names of Rāma. The author is supposed to be Vijjala-bhūpati, the son of one Vikrama and Chandrāvatī and belonging to the Chauhāna race ruling at Patna. He wrote it for the benefit of his son Hirādhara. A commentary called Subodhini is written upon it by Gopālagiri doubtless a protege of the prince.

2. Bhoja-vyākaraṇa by Vinayasundara—Written for the benefit of a king Bhoja, son of Bhāramalla. This
work, like the above, is metrical in form, following the usual topical arrangement.

3. Bhāvasiṁhaprakriyā by Bhaṭṭa-vināyaka—This is another of what we may call ‘royal’ grammars. It was written for the edification of Bhāvasiṁha the eldest son of a local prince who is styled मेदिनीराष्ट्र (Lord of the Earth).

4. Dipavyākaraṇa by Chidrūpāsrama—The author calls himself परमेसपरिभाजक. The work is independent of the symbolical and intricate terminology of the older schools, giving short rules in an easy form adapted to the capacities of juvenile students.

5. Kārikāvali by Nārāyaṇa surnamed Bhaṭṭāchārya-chakravarti—This elementary grammar was meant originally for the author’s son, who in this case has made a grateful return by writing a commentary on the same.

6. Bālāvabodha by Narahari—This is the last of these little manuals—each typical of a host of others—that we mention. The work is meant to remove the obstacles in the way of students learning the five mahā-kāvyas, arising from the circumstance of their not having learnt grammar before. The author assures us that with the help of his work इत्सनिदिष्टेैैव्याकरणो मवति. In it words and their forms are taken up in the order in which they are required for the study of the Kāvyas in the order in which they are usually studied.

99. Conclusion—We might mention a few more works of a similar kind, bringing the record down to quite recent times, but it would be hardly necessary. These works can by no device be grouped under one school. They merely represent a tendency and as such they do not fall within the province of our essay. Here then we might suppose our account of the different existing systems of Sanskrit grammar to have at last attained its natural termination.
APPENDIX i.

(See note 2 on page 60)

II चान्द्रवर्णसृज्ञाणि II

अच्यूतकाव्य नमः। अच्यूतस्थानकरणअर्थमेव वर्णः जानन्ते। तत्र स्थानम्। कण्ठः अकुञ्जसर्जनीयानाम्। कण्ठलकुमुः इद्धेद्रताम्। कण्ठोऽष्टम्।
ुदवेद्रताम्। मृदुः क्रूररसामाम्। दर्ता: द्वितत्साराम्। नासिका अनुस्वारस्य। स्वस्थानानुसाधिकः। व्याख्यानमा:। तत्तुः इजुप्तशानाम्। ओहोऽ उपभाननीयः। दृत्तीत्व वकरस्य। जिल्हामूले जिल्हामूलीयस्य॥

6 करणम्। जिल्हायां दृत्तानाम्। जिल्हामध्ये तालव्यानाम्। जिल्हापायं शिरः। स्वामानम्। शेषः। स्वस्थानांकः॥

प्रयत्नो द्विधः। आम्ब्रायः। तत्रभाष्यः। संवृतवयः। श्रृंगः ईष्टः प्रर्थः। अकरस्य। बिवृत रथः। स्वरा॥

12 प्रथमहंति प्रयः। शमाहिनियानहिमूलीयोपभानाय विवृतकष्ठा गुहा: नुदानाम। अभो:। प्रथमद्वितीयपकः अनत्स्याभाल्प्याणः। इत्ये। सवेमहापाणः। तुषीयचतुर्थ्यमः। सानुस्मारकत्वः। संवृतकष्ठनुदानः

15 प्रदुः धोषवन्तः। द्वितीयचतुर्थः। शमसहायोपभाणः। कादयो माहत्नाः। स्वांशिः।। अनत्स्याः। वन्तफः।। इच्छय भावः। प्रयतः॥

अतः चारणाः। दूसरो दृष्टः। पुत्रः। हतः। रिजः। भिन्नः। चरेकुमारादनादातः।

18 संरितस्मृत शालुनात्साकिरतुनासिकमेव चालस्देशाः वधिः। अवभिर्वकः। वर्णः। वर्णस्य दृष्टः न सन्ति। तेन द्वाराधाः। भविः॥। एक-मात्रिको नहः।। द्विमात्रिको दृष्टः।। त्रिमात्रिको दृष्टः।। नीचे-
कालप्रमुखलालसादः
कालप्रमुखलालसादः क्रिल शालेरायः
कालप्रमुखलालसादः क्रिल शालेरायः
लोकस्य मोहिनिमिरात्ये व्यधिन
सम्भूश्चेष्योत्पति स्वकरणभित्यालमशास्मू ॥ १ ॥
तन्त्रारभ्यो व्यधिं च वर्णादेशं सन्ध्य
तन्त्रारभ्यो च वर्णादेशं सन्ध्य
तन्त्रानुश्चारिकद्वै बुहुवकारकादि ॥
तन्त्रानुश्चारितंत्रादेशं सन्ध्य-करारणं किरार्यं
तन्त्रानुश्चारितंत्रादेशं सन्ध्य-करारणं किरार्यं
मेतावतैव हि सम्भूथमात्मावामः ॥ २ ॥
संज्ञाश्च परिमाणां धर्ममेऽपि पादु आतिरेतं
संज्ञांश्च परिमाणां धर्ममेऽपि पादु आतिरेतं
द्वितीये स्वरसन्ध्ये च तुतीये तत्क्रस्तेधम् ॥ ३ ॥
द्वितीये स्वरसन्ध्ये च तुतीये तत्क्रस्तेधम् ॥ ३ ॥
वैयक्तं चतुर्थं च सन्धि वैसार्थं परे ॥
वैसार्थं परे ॥ ४ ॥
पृष्ठमध्यमाच्च परं सन्ध्यकारण जागो ॥ ५ ॥
पृष्ठमध्यमाच्च परं सन्ध्यकारण जागो ॥ ५ ॥
नाम्र आदे स्वरान्तत्सप्त्विश्वास्य स्वामिनिर्णयः ॥
नाम्र आदे स्वरान्तत्सप्त्विश्वास्य स्वामिनिर्णयः ॥
स्वरान्तत्सप्त्विश्वास्य द्वितीये युज्मदस्मवः ॥ ५ ॥
स्वरान्तत्सप्त्विश्वास्य द्वितीये युज्मदस्मवः ॥ ५ ॥
तुतीये त्वर्तदीनातित्वं नामपदस्थितं ॥
तुतीये त्वर्तदीनातित्वं नामपदस्थितं ॥ ६ ॥
चतुर्थे कारकस्तेह विनियोगग्नं पञ्चमम ॥
चतुर्थे कारकस्तेह विनियोगग्नं पञ्चमम ॥ ६ ॥
समादीच्छिन्नत्तरत्यादित्वमिति वर्तनम् ॥
समादीच्छिन्नत्तरत्यादित्वमिति वर्तनम् ॥ ७ ॥
पृष्ठमध्यमाच्च परं शक्तिभ्रमान्ते म्ह्वेत्यावतृ खियाम् ॥ ७ ॥
पृष्ठमध्यमाच्च परं शक्तिभ्रमान्ते म्ह्वेत्यावतृ खियाम् ॥ ७ ॥
इदं नामपदं सिद्दं सहस्रामातृ सुमूपादिशत् ॥
इदं नामपदं सिद्दं सहस्रामातृ सुमूपादिशत् ॥ ८ ॥
तदलत्तत्मतो विचं वाहरयोपवृहुणम् ॥ ८ ॥
तदलत्तत्मतो विचं वाहरयोपवृहुणम् ॥ ८ ॥
आस्थात्वात्तिर्दुष्टं कालोपष्ठं नियोजनाः ॥
आस्थात्वात्तिर्दुष्टं कालोपष्ठं नियोजनाः ॥ ९ ॥
न्यायेऽदेशोऽधिकृतं सन्यापितत्वयान्तता ॥ ९ ॥
न्यायेऽदेशोऽधिकृतं सन्यापितत्वयान्तता ॥ ९ ॥
ततो विकारण आल्पनेपरस्त्येविष्ठिणयं ॥
ततो विकारण आल्पनेपरस्त्येविष्ठिणयं ॥ १ ० ॥
अद्वितशार्गमोपाणि पञ्चमे तु गुणगुणा:
तत्रं वाणपदं छं त समे सेवनित्तुकता \ १९ \ ॥
सर्वरूपस्म इत्येव आश्वतिनिःकुमः:
सर्वलाभिस्यो धात्विकालभावद्रविधिःश्रणी: \ २० \ ॥
योगेशार्चः ( ! )जयवेंको च: परोपकाली रतः:
योगी धन्यो धनं धचे सोव्यतें सुखमभुते \ २१ \ ॥
रुतसत्यादयः सोपपदानुसपपाध्य ये:
महिषमयित्सिद्धर्थ्य तात्रू जगों शाकात्यान: \ २२ \ ॥
तत्रायपादः रुतस्त्र पञ्चपापा कला ( ! )विदिः:
सीपः साधनकाराधि विभागोनकति विषयः \ २३ \ ॥
स्वयन्तत्वतः सुसिद्दत्वाः तात्तू सूच्रद्वृष्टविनः
दिष्टः शास्त्रार्थिहिनिसिद्धार्थिरणमु ( ! ) \ २४ \ ॥
भातोः परे रतो वण्तामुद्यस्ते च कर्तरीः
आदित्त तन्यादर्श्चत् रतास्ते भावकरमोः \ २५ \ ॥
अष्णादयः साप्तास्ते च कालकर्ते मतः:
भूते कर्तव्यायो वर्तमाने शान्तसङ्कादयः \ २६ \ ॥
उपादयः सुर्ख्युतः ते ते शास्त्रात्ते स्थितः:
भविष्यतिस्यत्वमानवक्यार्थष्पदा मतः \ २७ \ ॥
पञ्चकार्यस्य भावेण पृथ्वीपुष्कः
संज्ञायां धातवासादा ( ! )विदि च कारके \ २८ \ ॥
करणं चात्मित्तकं चवादिरन्यत्र चेष्टस्या
पञ्चमेऽधातवसमवन्ते कारणस्तु ( ! )विशेषणातः \ २९ \ ॥
कार्ण्यार्थोपण्योपि ज्ञातापूर्वो मतः सताम्:
प्रकार्णमत्रमिनित्येन पादपकरणस्थितः \ ३० \ ॥
यववन्याति कार्णिको पद्धेवेऽु समास्ते
तथा विष्णुस्ति बाहुल्यप्राप्तेऽगितानि हि \ ३१ \ ॥
एवं शास्त्रमिदं सूच्रमार्येण पाठितं सदा
तदेहति कारि सोभायखृष्मः किं नेति शृंगवताम् \ ३२ \ ॥
नामः पादृः कारकस्य स्वरूपः
द्विन्द्ररम्यात्स्थिते श्रेयायाः।
कान्तेष्वलोक्यायाभिधानं क्रमेण
श्लोकायच्चेदवेदने दत्तकणमू। २५॥
श्रुत्वा साहित्यानि सूक्ष्मान्वयादाः
झाल्वा काल्याकूद्रृत्वता श्रवणदानू।
स्वागल्ल्याच्चेतिहारसादिः बुध्वा
कार्याभ्यासे निष्ठताच्छवदयनः। २६॥
वागदेवी सा सर्वतो भ्राजमाना
पारापाठाऽवेक्षणेन प्रसादानू।
कुर्वत्वन्तः कर्ष्यचित् स्वाप्यस्य(१)
स्फीति सूतेष्वेतरस्याय्यश्चकम्॥ २७॥

* At this place a few unimportant stanzas are omitted.
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N. B. References are to page and line, or to page and footnote (n), unless where preceded by § which indicates section. The arrangement is according to the English alphabet, the diacritical marks being ignored.

A

Abhayachandra's recast of (Śūka-
ṭāgyana—) Prakṛtyāsaṅgraha 72-12; its nature 72-17ff.; the date of the author 72-14ff.

Abhayānandīn's version of the Jain-
endra 65-14; later than that of Somadeva 65-23; his date 67-2; his version followed by the Pañ-
chavastu 67-15.

Abhimanyu of Kēmīr restores the corrupt text of the Mahābhāṣya 33-27.

Abhimava—Śūkaṭāgyana, see Śūka-
ṭāgyana (Jaina).

Abhirūmāvidyālaṅkāra's vṛtti on the Kāraka-pāda of Goyichandra's commentary 110-11.

Accessory treatises to Pāṇini's grammar § 16; their later history § 35;—to Chāndra grammar § 45;—to Śūkaṭāgyana grammar § 54;—to Hemachandra's grammar § 59;—to the Kāṇṭhātra § 70;—to the Sārasvatī § 79;—to Mūgchabodha § 85;—to the Saupadma § 93.

Adhikāra-sūtras, how indicated by Pāṇini 24-n2.

Abhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa, com. on, by Nāgęśa 47-21; 49-6.

Advayārasavati 97-18.

Agarāvara 79-21.

Agnikumāra, elder brother of Haradatta 39-12.

Agniśarma, alias of Īśavakṛśṇa 64-n4.

Āgrāyaṇa mentioned in Nirukta 8-n1.

Āgrāyaṇa mentioned in Nirukta 8-n1.

Aindra school, supplanted by Pā-
ṇini 10-15; amongst its follow-
ers Kātyāyana (Vararuci), Vyā-
ḍi and Indradatta 10-16; its ac-
count by Hiuen Tsang and Tūrā-
nātha 10-17; agreeing with Kā-
ṇṭhātra and perhaps identical with it 10-20, 12-1, 84-14; revealed by Kārttikeya 10-22; analogies in the Pāṭhaśākhyas 11-12; its termi-
nology in the Tolkāppiyam 11-3; Burnell's conclusion about it 11-8ff.; post-Pāṇinīya in date and pre-Pāṇinīya in substance 11-32.

Aindra School of grammarians, by Dr. Burnell 3-n1; 5-n2; 11-n1.

Aithihāṣikas mentioned in the Nir-
ukta 8-n1.

Ajayapūla successor of Kumāra-
pāla 75-11.

Ajitaseṇāchārya author of Maṇi-
prakāśikā, com. on the Chintā-
maṇi 72-7.

Ājurikā 67-5.

Akalāṅkadeva 63-n4.

Alaudin, Sultan 99-16.

Alberūnī 91-16.

Alexander 16-5; 16-34; Pāṇini lived before his invasion 17-2; razed Sangala to ground 17-15; 18-8.

Alpakhāna or Sultan Alaudin 99-n1.

Alpasūhi or Alam, patron and mas-
ter of Maṇḍana 98-29ff.; proba-
ably a local chieftain from Mālā 99-12; not the same as Sultan Alaudin 99-n1.

Amalasasravati teacher of Amṛti-
bhārti 97-12.

Amara quoted by name in Bopa-
deva's Mūgchabodha 10-n3.

Amarachandra's Śyādisambhachaya 80-8ff.

Amarakesha, com. on, 111-n2; ly Kṣirasvāmin 52-7.

Amoghavarsa I ( Rāṣṭrakūṭa), patron of ( Jaina ) Śūkaṭāgyana 69-14, 69-n2.

Amoghavṛitti 64-n4; written by

16 [Sk. Gr.]
Art of writing, when introduced 4-26; presupposed by primitive Prātiṣṭhākyas 4.30.  
Ārya-śrutakṛtī author (?) of the Pañcavastu 67-21ff.  
Āryavāja quoted by (Jaina) Śīka ṭayana 70-n5.  
Asaṇḍika a nickname for Chāndra grammar 60-4.  
Asaṭṭhāyī of Paṇini 7-2; 9-7; 9-9; 12-n2; 12-17; oldest surviving work in sūtra style 13-2; 18-26; why so called 19-20; programme of, pp. 20-21, and 22-n1; arrangement of sūtras within it, 24-21ff, 24-n3; treatises accessory to it §16; sometimes its teaching contrary to that of the Uṇādisūtras 26-24, 26-n2; 27-17; 29-20; recasts of §29, 57-2; com. on it by Bhāṣṭoji 47-12; com. on it by Anambaṭṭa 50-24; 56-10; mentions Śākaṭayana 68-26; 109-101; see also Paṇini.  
Asiatic Society of Bengal, Journal of, 33-n1.  
Assyrians not unknown to Indians before Alexander's invasion 15-32; mentioned as mercenary fighters by Paṇini 17-23; blotted out as a political power in 538 B.C., 17-27; 18-9.  
Asuras, see Assyrians.  
Audumbarāyaṇa mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.  
Aufrecht 42-n2; 45-n3; his edition of Uṇādivṛtti 54-11; 68-n1; 108-1; 109-3.  
Aupamanyava mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.  
Aurṇavibha mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.  
Auvāṣaṇanika title of Goyḍhānḍra 110-6, 110-n2.  
Avuṣṭa 42-9ff.  
Avachūri or Avachūrnikā on Hemachandra's Bribadvṛtti 78-9.  
Āvaśyaka-sūtra 73-n1.  

B

Bahadur Shah 78-27.  
Baji 35-n1; 41-19.  
Bhalabodhinī by Bhāṭṭa Jagaddhāra 91-12, with Ugrabhūti's Nyāsa.
on the same 91.14.

Bālamannoravē an abridgment of the Prāṇāhāmanoravē perhaps by the same author 47.8.

Bājamāhaṭṭī, a com. on the Vyavahārakāṇḍa of the Mitakshara, by Vaidyānātha, ascribed to his patroness 50.10.

Bālākramapāṇchānana’s Prabodha-prakāśa 114.19ff; his Bhūtpupaṃka 114.26.

Bela Śūstī, editor of the Kāśīkā 36.83.

Bālavabodha, Chanda recast by Kāśyapa 62.20; superseded all other Chanda treatises in Ceylon 62.23.

Bālvavabodha by Narahari 116.16ff.

Bṛṇa 53.23.

Bendall, Catalogue of Nepal mss. 45.10.

Bṛghavatapuruṣa 105.11, 105.12; not the work of Bopdeva 105.13.

Bhairavamīdā’s com. on the Pari-bhūhemudasekhara 55.9.

Bhandarkar R. G., Report for 1883-84, 36.12; Report for 1882-83, 97.11; on Pāṇīni’s date 14.7; on Patañjali’s date 32.12; Early History of the Deccan 105.2.

Bhandarkar S. R. 99.11.

Bṛṇudikṣita alias Viśvesvara alias Rāmārama, son of Bhaṭṭoji 46.25.

Bṛhadvaṃśa mentioned by Pāṇīni 12.11.

Bṛhadvaṃśiya mentioned by Patañjali 31.110.

Bṛharaṇa, father of Bhoja 115.33.

Bharata, commentator of the Bhaṭṭi-kāvyā 110.2.

Bhartrihari’s account of the vicsisitudes in the text of the Mahābhāṣya 13.26, 13.4; 27.59; author of Vyākpadīya §27, 55.23; Itsing’s date for him 40.17; also author of a com., Drīpa, on the Mahābhāṣya 41.3, 42.11, 109.8; quoted by Viṭṭhalāḥāṛya 45.20; his preceptor Vasuṛa 59.1.

Bṛhasa’s Śvapna-Visavaddanta 13.28.

Viṣṇuyākṣa, see Patañjali.

Bṛhaśāsīmha 116.5.

Bṛhasaṃha-Praekīya by Bhaṭṭa-viśṇyaka 116.3.

Bhaṭṭa Gopala 100.16ff.

Bhaṭṭa-viśṇyaka’s Bhāvasimha-Praekiya 116.3.

Bhaṭṭikīvyā quoted by Haradatta 39.13; 77.16; 109.9; com. on—by Bharata 110.2.

Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita 9.12; distinguishes between the two authors of the Kāṣṭika 36.4, 36.11; acknowledges indebtedness to the Rūpaṃkā 45.11; his model for Siddhānta-kāmuṇḍa the Prakriyākāmuṇḍa of Rāmachandra 45.10; his Siddhānta-kāmuṇḍa and other works §31; authors quoted by him 46.11; his presumed indebtedness to Hemachandra’s Saḍbaddhāṃśa 46.21; disciple of Śeshākṛiṣṇa 46.3; personal details about him 46.29ff; his date 47.3ff; works of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita 47.9ff; 53.3, 53.16, 54.17; genealogical table for Bhaṭṭoji’s family 48.11; his part in modern revival of Pāṇīni 52.17; 103.5; testifies to the domination of Bopdeva 107.7ff.

Bṛhaṇprakṛīka, Vaidyānātha’s com. on the Saḍbaddhāṃśa 50.15.

Bhavishyottara-Puruṣa 39.19; 40.3.

Bṛhamabhaṭṭa’s com. on the Pari-bhūhemudasekhara 55.10.

Bṛhasaṇā 42.8; mentioned as a writer on roots by Saṭyaṇa 53.2.

Bṛhasmaparvan, Mahābhārata, 16.8.

Bhoja quoted by Kṛṣṇardvīmin 52.3; quoted by Hemachandra 76.12.

Bhoja II (Śilākara) 67.4.

Bhoja, son of Bṛharaṇa 115.33.

Bhoja-vyūkaranā by Vinayasaṃdara 115.2ff.

Bholanātha quoting from Durgadāsa 107.32.

Bṛhupravaga of Padmanabhadatta quotes Ujjvaladatta 111.13ff, 111.12.

Bṛṭiibali quoted by Pujaśpa 66.12.

Bombay Branch of the R. A. S., journal of, 35.11.

Bopdeva quotes by name various grammarians 10.7, 10.13, 52.8; quoted by Viṭṭhalāḥāṛya 45.21; mentions Devanāḍ as author of Jainendra grammar 63.22; quotes Vardhamāna 88.23; quotes Trilo-
Chanadīsa 89.2; nowhere refers to Śrāvasaṭta 92.1, 93.26; 97.32; his date 91.27; §82; personal details about him 105.30ff; his works 105.10ff, 105.n3; the religious element in his grammar 106.11ff, 113.13, 114.16, 106.n1; his extreme divergence from Pāṇini’s technical terminology 106.26ff; his opinions refuted by Bhaṭṭoji 107.12; his present limited influence 107.18; 109.4; 109.18; 112.3.

Brāhmaṇas, grammatical speculations in, §3; their language very different from that of the Saṁhitās 3.8, 3.n1; their main interest saсcendental, and grammar only of secondary interest 3.24; 6.n1; 12.6; 56.2.

Brahmasamgāramuni 97.19.

Bṛhad-gaṇḍha of Nāgpar 98.10; founded by Devaśūri 98.12.

Bṛhat-Kharatara-gaṇḍha 99.15.

Bṛhadvṛtti, see Saṁbhavasānasāra-bṛhadvṛtti.

Bhūlā, on introduction of art of writing 4.n3; regards Jayāditya a Kūśmbrīan 36.22, 36.n4; 41.7; 58.6; his pamphlet on Hemachandra 73.12ff; 77.6; 82.n2; 85.n3; 91.8; 91.n2.

Burnell, Essay on Andra School of grammarians, 3.n1; 10.25; 11.n1; 11.8; 12.9; 52.12.

C

Cambay 53.28; 74.9.

Ceylon, Chāndra treatsises in, 61.22; 62.15.

Chichiga father of Hemachandra 73.23.

Chaitanya 113.18.

Chaitanyāśrita, a Vaishnav grammar 114.5.

Chakrvarṇaṇa mentioned by Pāṇini 12.n2.

Chakravarti, Professor Śrīṣh Chandra, 39.n1.

Chālukya 72.25.

Chandāśvara teacher of Vaśudeva-bhāṣa 98.24.

Chandra, see Chandragomin.

Chandradīsa 59.6.

Chāndragomin 20.8; his date 35.19; quoted by name in Bopa-deva’s Mudpahodha 10.n3; mentioned by Vāmaśāhārya 53.30, 53.n2; quoted in Gaṇaratnamahodahdi 18.n1; Chandragomin and his work §22, also §§42 and following; was a Baudha 35.4, 59.5; and wrote primarily for his own Church 35.6; his unorthodox innovations 35.6; the Kūṭārktī largely indebted to him 37.18ff; illustrations 38.n1; his grammar edited by Liebich 38.n1; earliest reference to him and his predecessors 41.19ff; mentioned by Kṣaṇaravāmin as author of some work on roots 52.14, 52.n2; his Dvītpahī incorporated with the Kāṭāntara 52.18; 57.n2; his date 54.3, 58.n2, 54.13; his own vṛtti on the Chāndra sūtras 58.22, 61.9; exists now in fragments 61.10; incorporated by Dharmadīsa 61.12; nature of his work §44; improves upon Pāṇiniya grammar 59.9ff; his Dvītpahī 59.14; his really original contribution 59.19; his object 59.27ff; his terminology mostly Pāṇiniya 60.1; his grammar nicknamed Asāyāṇaka 60.4, 60.n1; other accessory works by him 60.9ff; no Chāndra pari-bhāṣhāsa 61.2; non-grammatical works of, 61.4ff; 69.19; 70.2ff, 70.n2; 70.n3; 70.n4; 71.2; quoted by Hemachandra 76.n2; his grammar said to agree with that of Pāṇini 10.19.

Chandrakṛtī author of Subodhikā or Dīpikā on Śrāvasaṭta-prakṛti 98.7ff; personal details about him 98.10ff; his date 98.17ff; patronised by Saḥi Salem, the emperor of Delhi 98.17; 98.n1; 103.11.

Chandrāśokharā-vidyāśālākāra, his commentary on Goychranda’s vṛtti 110.19.

Chāndra sūtras, vṛtti on, probably by Chandragomin himself 58.23; mentions a Gupta victory over Huṇas 58.24; Dharmadīsa’s comment, 61.12; other works now only in Tibetan translations 61.25; or in Ceylon 61.22; their list 61.n1;
General Index

Ceylonese recast superseded them in Ceylon 62.23.
Chandrâvatī mother of Vijjalarakshāpati 115.27.
Chāṇḍagādeva, Hemachandra’s first name 73.25.
Charaṇas, rules for, framed 4.10.
Chārmāśiras mentioned in the Nirukta 8.n1.
Chaulāṇa 115.28.
Chhāyā, Vaidyanātha’s com. on the Mahābhāṣyaapradīpoddyota 50.14.
Chheda-sūtra 73.n1.
Chhichhubhaṭṭa’s Laghuvarṇī 91.19.
Chidāboobā, Vaidyanātha’s com. on Nāgojīhaṭṭa’s Sabendushekharā 50.16.
Chidrūpāśrama’s Dīpavyākaraṇa 116.7.
Chintāmaṇi, com. on Śākāṭyaśāstra-Sabdānuśāsana by Yakṣhavarman 72.3; sub-commentaries on it 72.6ff.
Chintāmaṇi, see Mahābhāṣya-chintāmaṇi.
Chintāmaṇipratipada, Maṅgarasa’s com. on the Chintāmaṇi 72.7.
Choḍa 16.30.
Climatic conditions, causes of dialectical peculiarities, and influencing study of grammar 3.1.
Colebrooke 68.n1; 109.4; 110.23; 112.12; 114.3.
Cunningham identifies Pāṇini’s native place with Labaur 19.2.

D
Dākṣiṇā, name of Pāṇini’s mother 19.8, 19.n1.
Dāmodaradatta father of Padmaprabhadatta 111.4.
Darīn 16.1.
Darśanaṭhāstra, Digambara, 65.3.
Dayāpata’s abridgment, Rūpasiddhi, of Śākāṭyaśāstra-Sabdānuśāsana 72.23; personal details about him 72.23ff; his date 72.26.
Deioces (Diocēses) first king of the Śaks or Skythians, cir. 700 B. C. 18.1.
Devachandra prophecies Hemachandra’s future greatness 74.4; receives him into order 74.11.
Devagiri 104.32, 105.3.

Devanandi author of Jainendra grammar 63.14ff; his new technical terms 66.5, 66.n1, does not acknowledge obligations 66.10; names quoted by him 66.12, 66.n2; 67.16 quoted by Hemachandra 76.n2.
Devārājā mentions Kaṭhavāmīn’s Nighantuvarīti 52.10.
Devasaundarasūri teacher of Guṇaratnasūri 80.15.
Devasaūri founder of the Brihadgaccha of Nagapr 98.10ff.
Devendrasūri author of Haimaghunyāsa and pupil of Udāyachandra 78.33ff, 79.n1.
Devṛāṣa quoted by Durgādasa 107.30.
Dhanachandra 78.14.
Dhanājaya-koṣa 63.21.
Dhanesvara or Dhanes teacher of Bopadeva 99.n2; 104.30, 105.n1.
Dhanesvara, Bhaṭṭa, criticises Kaṭhavāmin 98.2f, 99.21; his date 99.21ff; not same as teacher of Bopadeva 99.n2; his works 100.1ff.
Dharmācāra’s com. incorporates the Chandravarīti 61.12.
Dhurma-sūtras of some kind known to Pāṇini 14.n2.
Dhautiśthā, the Pāṇiniya 25.14, 25.n2; its anubandhas same as those of Pāṇini 25.18, 25.n3; com. by Bhaṭṭoṣi 47.10; com. by Kaṭhavāmin in his Dṛṣṭuvātī 52.6ff; other writers on Pāṇiniya Dhautiśthā: viz. Chandra 52.15, 52.n2; Maṇḍhava or Śaṇaya 52.28; Bhūmasana 53.2; Maitreyrsakshita 53.2; and Nāgoṣa 53.3; the Chandra—was incorporated by Durgāsingha with the Kāṭāntra 52.19, 59.14, 60.10, 60.19; 88.3ff, 90.1ff; Jumaranandi revises Pāṇinya—and adopts it for his own school 110.3ff;—of Saupadma 112.19;—of Śākāṭyaśāstra 71.15;—of Hemachandra 77.21; the genuine—of Kāṭāntra school in Tibetan translation only 90.4—for the Sūtras, by Harshakirti 98.14, with a com. on it called Taraṇini 103.9; the Saupadma—modelled after Pāṇini’s 112.32; com. Dhrutunirṇaya on it 113.1.


Dhātvuṛtti by Kaśirasvāmin 52.6ff; its nature and contents 52.20ff; —by Mādhava or Śāyāna 52.28.

Phuṇḍhikī on Hemachandra's Bṛhadvṛtti 78.10; its nature 78.23ff; its disputed authorship 78.10ff; its probable varying versions 78.20; —on the last chapter of the Bṛhadvṛtti 78.24ff; 89.20.

Phuṇḍhikī on Durgasimha's vṛtti 89.19ff.

Dhunduka, native place of Hemachandra 73.23.

Dhvanipradīpa 97.9.

Dialectical peculiarities cause of shifting climatic conditions, and promoting study of grammar 2.29.

Drkṣita school 48.n1; grammatical works outside it §33.

Dīpa-vyēkaraṇa by Chidrūpaśrama 116.7.

Dīpika on Hemachandra's Bṛhadvṛtti 78.9.

Dīpika or Subodhīkī by Chandrakīrti, with an important prāsastī at the end 88.7ff.

Dowson 99.1.

Dravīḍasaṅgha 65.5.

Durga different from Durgasimha 88.12; 89-16; see Durgatīma also.

Durgāchārya author of com. on Nirukta 88.14.

Durgādīśa author of a com. on Kavikalpadruma 107-28ff; authors quoted by him 107-30ff.

Durgapadaprabodha by Śrīvallabha Vārāhaṅchārya on Hemachandra's Liṅgaṅūsāsana 80.2ff.

Durgasimha mentions Kātyāyana as the author of the Uṇāṣisūtras 27.4, 27.2; quoted by Viśhālakṛṣṇa 45; incorporates Chandrika Dhātvuṛtti with the Kātantra 52-19, 88-3ff, 90.1ff; takes over most of the Paññīrṇa paribhāṣās 55.12; quoted by Hemachandra 76.n2, 88.3; says that the Kṛtprakāraṇa of the Kātantra is by Kātyāyana 84-17ff; Durgasimha and his vṛtti §68; his vṛttikas to the Kātantra 87.n1; his date 83-16, 88.6; not the first commentator of Kātantra 83-17ff; his date 83-16; his sūtrapāṭha differs from the one current in Kāsmin 83.21ff, 87-27, 9-14; 85.5ff; author of an Uṇāṣisūtra 85.n2, 90.1; a Śaiva 88.n1, and distinct from his namesake, a Baudhā 88-2, who wrote a com. on his vṛtti 88-10, and from other later namesakes of his 88-11ff; known in Kāsimin much late 91-6.

Durgasimha, Baudhā, author of a com. on Durgasimha's vṛtti 88-8.

Durgasimha-vṛtti, com. on, by Raghunandanaśiromaṇi 84.26; by another Durgasimha 88-10; other comm. on it §69; a com. (anonymus) on it 99.n1.

Durgatīma (or Durga) perhaps a Vīrāśaiva 88.n3, and author of a Liṅgaṅūsāsana 88-15, 88-n3, 85-n2 distinct from Durgasimha 88.12; 89-16; 89-29.

Durgatīma author of Kātantra Liṅgaṅūsāsana 85-n2; different from Durgasimha above 85-n2.

Dvārakādīśa alias Dvārika father of Tarkatilaka-bhatṭaḥchārya 102.22.

Dvārika, see Dvārakādīśa.

Dvīpaśayamabhāṣya of Hemachandra 66-20; 77-17.

E

Early History of India by Vincent Smith 17-5; 17-16; 82-n3.

Early History of the Decan by Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar 105.n2.

Eastern school mentioned by Pāññi 10.12; 12-n2; 18-33.

Eggeling's edition of the Kātantra 85-22; 87-n1.

Eliot 99.n1.

Epigraphica Indica 69-n2.

F

Family-books of Vedas, compilers of, 6-n1.

G

Gadā by Vaidyanātha, a com. on Paribhāṣhenduṣekharā 50-13.

Gadādhara son of Trilochanadīśa 89-6.

Gaisuddin Khilji of Mālā 93-7; 97-3.
Gâlava mentioned in the Nirukta 8-1; by Pâñini 12-2.

Ganapâtha of Pâñini 23.24ff.; 25-20; §37; com. upon by Kshirasvâmin 53-10; Chândra—60-12; embodied in the sâtravârtti of Chandragomin 60-24; Pâñintya—em bodied in the Kâśika 60-24;—of Śakaṭayana 71-14; —of Hemachandra 77-26; — of the Saupadma 113-1.

Ganapatnamahodadhi quoting Śâlakurtya or Pâñini, Śakaṭayana, Chandragomin, etc. 18-1; 42-n2; 41-5; 41-11; 52-16; with the author's own com. 53-13ff.; 88-n4.

Ganavârtti by Kshirasvâmin mentioned by Vardhamâna 52.11.

Ganâvara father of Padmanâbhodatta 111-6.

Gârgya mentioned by Pâñini 12-n2; mentioned in the Nirukta 8-1.

Gâtgovinda, com. on, by Nagasa 49-7.

Goldsticker: Pâñini, His place in Sanskrit literature, on Primitive Prâtiśâkhya 5-n1; 23-7; on Pâñini's paribhâsha 25-n1; his views as to the authorship of the Upanisâtras 26-25; 26-n3; on Vajasaneyi Prâtiśâkhya 29-n2; 32-n1; 88-n4; on Pâñini's date 14-7; 14-n1; 14-n2; 19-n3; his reasons for assuming considerable interval between Pâñini and Mâtâyâna 28-n1; 54-n1.

Gomâtastrâ, a philosophical work in Prâkrit 72-15.

Gonârdya mentioned in the Mahabhâsha 32-6-n2; quoted by Vîtsyâyana in the Kâmâstra 33-n3; 33-5.

Gopikâputra mentioned in the Mahabhâsha 32-29; 32-n2; quoted by Vîtsyâyana in the Kâmâstra 33-5; 33-n3.

Gopâlaschakravarti's com. on the Jaina 110-23.

Gopâlagiri's subodhini on Vijjâlakâhâpati's Prabodha-prakâsa 115-30.

Gopânjâtha Tarkâchârya writes sub-com. to Srîpati's supplement to Kâtantra 90-16; 90-20.

Gosvâmi, surname of Bopadeva 105-8.

Govardhana's vṛttis on Upanîṣads, quoted by Ujyvaladatta 54-14.

Govardhanabhațâ, grandfather of Jayakrishna 51-12.

Goychandra's com. on the Saṅkśiptasûtra 110-6ff.; his other works 110-14ff.; sub-commentaries on his com. 110-16ff.

Grammar, its study in India 1-8; existing school of—in India 1-10; not treated as science in Vedic times 2-11; its study influenced by contact of different forms of speech, by growth of dialects, or by a change of climatic conditions 2-21ff.; Greek—, influenced by Roman conquest 2-n2; its study as science post-Brahmanic 3-29; 4-6; its really creative period 5-17; philosophy of—, treatises on, 55-16ff.

Grammars, Vaishnava, 113-15.

Grammatical speculations in India: their extent and value §1; early —§§2-4; —in the Vedas §2, in the Brâhmaṇas §3, and in allied works §4; —in the Taittirîyasambhitâ 2-1.

Greeks, Ionian, not always to be identified with Yavana 15-21; their appearance in history long before 1000 B.C. 15-30.

Grihya-sûtras of some kind known to Pâñini 14-n2.

Guṇakara 64-n2.

Guṇanandâ 64-n2.

Gopâratnasûri's Kriyâgranasamuchâya 80-12ff.; his date 80-16, 80-n3; important praśasti at the end of his work 80-16ff.

Gupta victory over Hûnas 58-24; Early—kings 64-24.

H

Haima-Dhâtupâtha 77-21.

Haima Kaumudī by Meghavijaya mentions Bhâṭṭoji's indebtedness to Hemachandra 46-21; otherwise called Chandraprabhâ 79-17; its date 79-17.

Haima-laghunyâsa on Hemachandra's Brihadârviti 79-1ff. abridg-
ment of a larger Nyāsa 79-2ff.

Haima-laghuprakriyā by Vinayavijayagāni 79 12; com., Haimapra-
kīśa, on—79-14.

Haimaprakīśa com. on Haima-
laghuprakriyā 79-14, its date 79-15, 79-n3.

Haima school absorbs Pañinīya Upani-
diśātras 54-8 ; 77-23; see also
Hemachandra.

Haišavijayaganī's Śabdārthachandra-
drikā 100-27; its date 100-30.

Haradatta author of Padamārjīri
§26; personal details 39-10ff; his
original name Sūdarṣaṇā 40-n1;
its date 40 11; quoted by Viṣṇu-
āchārya 45-23.

Haraprabā Shastri 58-8 ; 82-n2.

Harivallī 111-n2.

Hari, see Bhartṛihari.

Haribhadra, see Haribhāṣṭa.

Haribhāṣṭa or Haribhadra father of
Kshemendra 97-29.

Hari-dikshita teacher of Nāgęsa
47-19, 48-n1.

Haridravaka mentioned in the Nir-
ukta 8-n1.

Harilāmṛita by Bopadeva 105-12,
105-n1.

Harināmṛita § 96; two such
grammars 113-16ff; their tech-
nical terms 113-23ff.

Harirūma, a Bengal Kṣatrapa writer,
quoted by Kaviṛśa 90-14.

Harirūma's com. on Goychandra's
vṛtti 110-20.

Harivāma ( Jain ) 63-21.

Harshakṛiti pupil of Chandra-
krtti 98-13; wrote a Dhatupātha
for the Śrāvasa with an im-
portant praśasti at the end 98-15,
and a com. on it called Tarān-
gīti 103-9ff.

Harshakula teacher of Udayasau-
bhāgya 78-26.

Harshavardhana 53-20.

Haryaksha 35-n1 ; 41-20.

Hemachandra 57-n2; mentions De-
vanādi as author of Jainendra
63-22; 66-20; 68-31; his Liṅgānu-
sāsana based on that of Śīkṣaṇa-
na 71-22; biographical material of
—73-n2, collected by Bühler
73-17; his life § 57; his birth-
place 73-23; received into order
47-10; consecrated sūrī or ahaṃ-
yā 74-16; attracts attention of Ja-
yanimha Siddharāja 74-29; writes
Śabdānurasana for him 75-18,
75-n1; converts Kumārapāla 75-8,
writes Yogāśāstra at the instance
of Kumārapāla 75-16; his pilgrim-
age 75-20, and death 75-24; his
indebtedness to the Amoghavṛtta
and to Śīkṣaṇa Śabdānurasana
76-12, 76-n1; gives the
praśasti of his patron in his Bri-
hadvṛtta 77-3ff; author of Dvīva-
raya-mahākavya 77-17; also of
accessory treatises 77-28, but
not of the vivaraṇas or vṛttis on
them 77-30ff; other works of He-
machandra 80-20; does not use
pratīyāśaras 81-6 ; 89-21.

Hemachandra's Śabdānurasana one
of the works presumably used by
Bhaṭṭoji 46-22; its nature § 58;
it object 76-6ff; author's own
com. on it 76-17ff; other comm.
and sub-commentaries on it § 60;
digests, manuals, and miscellane-
ous works § 61; the Prakrit
chapter from it 76-2; its later
independent history 81-12ff;
Phulbhika on it 78-26; 89-21.

Hemādrī minister of Mahādeva
and patron of Bopadeva 105-2ff,
105-n1.

Hemahāsavadīvijayagāni writes on
parībhāṣās for Hemachandra's
school 89-lff; his Nīṣṇārtha-
maṇḍūṣa 80-7.

Hemanandanagāni teacher of Sa-
hajakṛiti 100-22.

Hiriddhara son of Vījñāla-bhūpāti
115-29.

History of: Ancient Indian Litera-
ture, by Max Müller, 4-n1 ; 4-n3 ;
9-n1 ; 12-n1 ; 14-n1.

History of Indian Literature by
Weber 82-7.

Hinen Tseang, his account about the
Aindra school 10-17; 19-3.

Humayun 93-9.

Hūṇa, Gupta victory over, 58-26.

India: what can it teach us, 41-n3.
Indian Antiquary 13-n5; 19-n4; 30-n2; 31-n11; 32-13; 32-n1; 33-n2; 35-n2; 37-n2; 41-n3; 61-n1; 64-n1; 64-14; 67-n2; 69-9; 69-n2; 72-n1; 72-n3; 76-n1.

Indische Studien 12-n1; 33-10.


Indra alias Indragunin quoted by name in Bopadeva’s Mugdhabodha 10-n3; but not so quoted in Paṇini’s Ashtadhyayi; spoken of as the first of grammarians 10-26, 10-n4; quoted by Śiśkaṭyana 70-7, 70-n5; quoted by Hemachandra 76-n2.

Indra (God) reveals grammar to Jina 63-4, 63-n2.

Indradatta said to have been at first a follower of the Andra school 10-16; and a contemporarv of Paṇini 19-10.

Ionian Greeks not always to be identified with Yavana 15-21; their appearance in history long before 1000 B.C., 15-30.

Iṣṭis of Patañjali 33-15, 35-3.

Īśvarakṛṣṇa alluded to in Jainendra-sūtras 64-19; his two aliasses 64-n4.

Īśvararāmā’s Vivaraṇa on Kaiyavaṭa’s Pradipa 43-8.

Itsing’s account of Jayāditya and his work 35-25.

J

Jagaddhara, Bhaṭṭa, author of Brāhabodhini 91.12.

Jagannātha gives personal details about Bhaṭṭojī 46.27ff; pupil of the son of Śeshakṛṣṇa 47.2, 48-n1.

Jagannātha, author of Śrāpraropikā, quoting Kṣemendra 98.1, 100.6.

Jahangir, Emperor, 93.9; 102.26; 102-n2.

Jainendra quoted by name in Bopadeva’s Mugdhabodha 10-n3; 53-n2; mentioned by Vāmanacārya 53-31, 53-n2; Jainendra school §47; its traditional author 62.32f; its sūtrapāthā originally belonged to Digambara Jains, from whom Śvetāmbaras borrowed it 63-n1; its real author Devanandi 63.14f; alias Paṇja-pūda 63.25, 64-n2; date of its foundation §48, 64.16ff; the Jainendra sūtras allude to Śveta-rākṛṣṇa 64.19; character of—grammar §49; its two versions 65.13ff; its want of originality 65.25ff; commentaries on it 67.1ff; its recast 67.12ff; its later neglect and present status 67.26ff; 68.8; 70.5; 70-n4; 80.30; 93.26.

Jaiyāṭa father of Kaiyāṭa 42.6.

Janārādana, son of Rāmabhaṭṭa 101.18.

Jauamara school, absorbs Paṇiniya Upāṇidūtras 54.8; its name a misnomer 108.27ff; its special feature §87; its alternative name 109.32.

Jayāditya his date 35-20; mentioned by Itsing 35.22, 35.26; his work called vṛttī sūtra 35.23; at least a contemporary of the author of the Vākyapādīya 35-n2; his contribution to the Kūṣikā distinguished from that of Vāmana 35-4, 36-n1; refers to Lokayatikas 36-16, 36-n3; perhaps same as Jayā-pūḍa of Kuśmār 36.19; native of Kuśmār 36.22.

Jayākrīṣṇa supplements the Tattvabodhinī by a section on svara and vaidik prakṛiya 48.5; his date 48.8.

Jayākrīṣṇa’s comm. on the Laghusiddhāntakaumudi 51.11; personal details about him 51.11ff.

Jayanta author of Tattvaachandra, an abridgment of the Prakṛiya-kaumudi 51.n1.

Jayantīkāra quoted by Hemachandra 76-n2.

Jayā-pūḍa supposed to be pupil of Kṣhiravāmin 52.2.

Jayasimhā II (Chakrākya emperor) alias Vādirīṣṭa, fellow-student of Dayāpāla 72.24ff.

Jayasimhā-Siddhārṣaṇa patron of Hemachandra 74.20ff; stories about him and Hemachandra 74-32; his death 75.1; the
Śabdhānusārasana written at his request 75-18.
Jina or Mahāvira, traditional author of the Jainendra school 62,32f; 63.4.
Jinadattasūri teacher of Amarakosha 80.8.
Jainamati’s Kumārapālacharita 73.n2.
Jinaprabhasūri alias Jinaprabodha, author of a com. on Kātantra-vṛtti-pañjikā 89.n2; particulars about him 89.n2.
Jinaprabodha, see Jinaprabhasūri.
Jinaratna, see Jinendu.
Jināśagarā 78.16.
Jinendrabuddhi author of Nyāsa on Kāsikī 82, 71.n1; his date 35.n2, 38.12; quoted by Bāhmaha 35.n2, 38.13ff; called sometimes Svabhāva-Jinendra 38.n2; styles himself Bodhisattvadvēṣyāśchārya 38.11; n.t later than 750 A.D. 38.12; quoted by Viṣṇulāchārya 45.20.
Jinendu alias Jasritna author of Siddhāntaratna 102.27.
Jivagosvāmin’s Harināmaratṇa 114.1.
Jānati lakes 103.12.
Jinendra-sarvasvati author of the Tattvabodhinī 47.25.
Jīnapaksas 35.17, 54.27ff, 54.n2, 56.25; see also Paribhāṣas.
Jodhpur (Yodhapura) 80.1, 80.n1.
Jogarāja’s Pādaprakaraṇasaṅgati 84.20, App. 2; mentioned by Māṇika 84.22; assigns the Kātantra Kṛṣṇaprakaraṇa to Śaṅkara-yana 84.24.
Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal 33.n1.
Jumarnandī author of the vṛtti, Rasavati on Kramadīvara’s Saṅkeśhīptasūra 109.27ff; the school receives name (Jamnara) from him 108.28; and (Rasavati) from his vṛtti 109.32; revises Pāṇiniya Dhatupātha for his own school 110.3f.
Jupiter, twelve year cycle of, 61-21, 64-55.

K

Kachchhāyana’s Pūli Grammar closely related to Tolkappiyam 11.5; and based on Kātantra 82.10.
Kadainha kings, Early, 64.23.
Kadara 16-30.
Kūhū father of Madhava 98.20.
Kaiyayata quotes from the works of Apiśali and Kūśakritana 10-3, 10-2; 24.n1; the Padamaṅjari based on his Prādīpa 40-7, 40.n2; his Prādīpa marking end of second period in the history of Pāṇiniya school § 28; his probable date 41.29; personal details about him 42-5ff; quoted in the Sarva-darsāṇa-saṅgāraha 42.1, 42.n2; acknowledges indebtedness to Bhartrihari 42.25; quoted by Viṣṇulāchārya 45.19; 50.21; 76.n2.
Kākala quoted by Hemachandra 76.n2.
Kāla, Vaidyānātha’s com. on Nāgeśa’s Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhānta-mañjūśīkha 50.15.
Kulāpa-dhātusūtra 90.4.
Kula-grammar said to agree with the Andra grammar 10.20; also called Kāmāra and Kātantra 82.22f, 83.9f.
Kulāpa quoted by Hemachandra 76.n2.
Kulapravatāropatpattiprastāva by Vamanāli 82.n2.
Kalāpin, the vehicle of Kūmāra 83.9.
Kīlo surname of Nāgojibhaṭṭa 49.34.
Kīlaṇa 36.20.
Kulīṇa 57.22; 58.n2; 101.16.
Kalikēśūṭra 73.n1.
Kalpasūtras, Samayasundara’s com. on, 63.2, 63.n2.
Kalyāṇa, Prince, patron of Śesha-krishna 45.29.
Kāmarasārasvati’s Laghusūrasvata 103.24f.
Kūṃka mother of Rāmaghaṭṭa 101.12.
Kāmādhenu by Bopadeva 68-31; quotes Vardhamāna 88-23; com. on the author’s Kavikalpadruma 105.11.
Kāmasūtra quotes Gonardīya and Gonikāpurīta 33-5, 33-n3.
Kamboja 10-30.
Kandarpasiddhānta’s com. on the Saundaram 112-13.
Kārakas, treatises on, 55-28.
Kārikāvali by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa-chārīya 116-12.
Kārttikeya revealed Aindra grammar to Saptavarman 10-22; see also Kumāra.
Kāṣākritana, founder of a grammatical school, 9-23; his grammar consisted of sūtras in three Adhyāyas 10 3, 10-n1; Kāiyāṭa quotes from his grammar 10-4; 10-n2; quoted by name by Bopa-deva’s Mudgāhabodha 10-7, 10-n3.
Kāśīkā gives a rule of Āpiśali 9-24; tells that Kāṣākritana’s grammar consisted of sūtras in three Adhyāyas 10-3, 10-n1; does not anywhere mention the Aindra school 11-20; 20-3; 28-n1; its date 35-20; a joint work of Jayāditya and Yāmuna § 23; perhaps same as Vṛttiṣūtra mentioned by Itaing 35-24; quotes Vākyapadīya, and so not earlier than 650 A.D. 35-n2; Nārāyaṇa on—by Jīnendrabuddhi § 25, 35-n2; personality of the authors of—35-11ff; Bala-bāṣṭri’s edition of 36-n3; nature of the—37-1ff; quotes a a rule of Āpiśali 37-8, 9 n3; gives a new vārtika of the Sānāgās 37-11; its indebtedness to Chan-tragomin § 46, 62-2, 59-21, as ascertained by Kielhorn 37-20; illustrated 38-n1; Kāśikā does not acknowledge its indebtedness 38-5, 58-18; Haradatta’s Padamanjari on the Kāśikā § 25; 47-18; embodies Pāṇiniya Gana-pāṭha 60-26; apparently knows the Jainendra 64-17, 64-n3.
Kāśikākara quoted by Hemachandra 76-r2.
Kāśikāvivaraṇa-pañjikā, see Nyāsa.
Kāśinātha author of Sūra, a com. on the Prakriyākṣaṃudrī 46-n1.
Kāśinātha, his śārasvata-blāṣya 100-nf; his date 100-13.
Kāśēvāra quoted by Durguḍāśa 107-31; his supplement to the
Mudgāhabodha 108-10.
Kāśīvāra’s com. on the Saundaram 112-13; his Gana-pāṭha to Saundaram 113-1; com. on it by Ramākūṭa 113-2.
Kāśyapa mentioned by Pāṇini 12-n2.
Kāṭāntra, closely related to Tolkappiyam 11-5; absorbs Pāṇiniya Uṇādisūtras 54-8; why so called 81-16ff; traditional account of its origin § 64; its date 82-n3; 83-23ff; its two recensions 87-2ff; Bengal com. m. on—§ 71; its study now confined to a few districts of Bengal 90-22; its history in Kāṃṭha § 72; incorporates Chūndra Dīṅgūpaṃjāna 52-19; takes over most of the Pāṇiniya pariṇāhāna 55-11; 81-7; inter-observations in the—Sūtra-pāṭha § 65; 87-17ff; its early history § 67; 93-2; 93-51; 106-5; 110-26.
Kāṭāntuvistasara, Vardhamāna’s com. on Durgesinīha’s vṛtti, 88-20; a sub-com. on it by Prīṭhvīchāra 88-24.
Kāṭāntuvṛtta-pañjikā, Trilociana-dīṇa’s com. on Durgesinīha’s vṛtti 89-1ff; sub-commentaries on it 89-7ff.
Kāṭārāśīrāgaṇara account about Pāṇini, his predecessors and contemporaries 10-13ff, 10-9ff, 28-12; 29-7; its account about Kāṭyāyana 31-3, 31-n1.
Kāṭhavate, Professor, 63-8.
Kāṭṭhakya mentioned in the Ni-ukta § 81.
Kāṭyāyana 7-17; 7-21; 7-n2; alias Vararuci 85-n1, said to have been at first a follower of the Aindra school 10-15; 12-6; 14-5; his knowledge of the Yavana more exact than that of Pāṇini 16-25; 17-4; 17-30; 18-14; said to be a contemporary of Pāṇini 19-10; he probably regarded the Uṇādisūtras as Pāṇini’s 20-18; 26-n1; he also probably modified them 26-27; mentioned as (the
sole author of the Uṇādisūtra, by Vimalasarvasvalī 27-2, 27-n1; by Durgasimha 27-4, 27-n2; Vārtīkakārīs before him 28-8; considerable interval between him and Pāṇini 27-7, 27-n1, 64-19; his date 17-17; his relation with the Nandas 29-6; nature of his work 18-18; his first work, Vājasaneyi Prāsaṅgikavya 29-13; extent of his criticism on Pāṇini 30-1; his criticism also constructive 30-9, but in places unjust 30-13; did not uniformly follow Pāṇini’s terminology 30-24ff; probably belonging to a different school of grammar from Pāṇini 31-5; called a ‘southerner’ by Patañjali 31-6, 31-n2 refers to Śaṅkāṣṭyana 31-n3, Śākalya 31-n4, Vaiṣayaśānya 31-n5, Vyādi 31-n6, Pañcakāśi 31-n7, and others 31-n8; 38-n1; 54-21; 59-10; 69-18; 70-14.

Kuṭāpura another name of Kātantra 83-8.

Kumudī 104-11; see Siddhāntakaumudī, Prakriyā-kaumudī, and Haima-kaumudī.

Kumudikāras as authors of modern revival of Pāṇini 90-31.

Kauṣṭhālica mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.

Kauṭiya, a Jain Tirtha 93-11.

Kauṭilya 32-16.

Kautsa mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.


Kaviśrīta a Bengal com. on Kātantra 90-13; quotes Trilochanadāsa and is quoted by Harirāma 90-14.

Kṛvyaprakāśa 42-8.

Keralā 16-30.


Kesari, article in, by Mr. Rajavade 17.9ff.

Kesava, father of Bopadeva 104-29; 105-11.

Kesavadevat-arikapuṭhānamabhaṭṭāchārya’s Vyākaraṇadurgāḥatoḍghata on Goytchandra’s com. 110-18, 110-n3.

Kesāvavṛṇi pupil of Abbayachandra 72-13; author of a com. on Gomātaśāstra 72-15.

Kharatara-gauchchāha 99-1; 100-23.

Kielhorn, his ed. of the Mahābhāṣyā 7-n2; 11-31; 19-27; 27-n5; 30-n2; 31-n1; about Patañjali being distinct from Gomātaśāstra and Gaṇapātīpura 33-3; on the indebtedness of the Kāśikā to Chandragomin 37-21ff; about Bhartrihari’s com. on the Mahaṭṭāṣṭāmya 41-2; doubts existence of Pāṇīyapāṇi as a real author 64-1ff, 66-22; doubts existence of Abhinava Śākāṣṭyana 69-1ff; 81-n1; 89-n2; 89-n3.

Kīrtrijuniya quoted by Haradatta 39-n8.


Kondabhaṭṭa nephew of Bhaṭṭoji 48-13, 48-n1; author of Vaiyakaranabhūṣanā 48-n1, 48-14, 55-25.

Kramāṭīvara founder of the Jau-mara school 108-30; his Saṅkaśiptaśāstra probably an abridgment of Pāṇini 108-22ff; takes Bhartrihari’s Mahābhāṣyā-dīpikā for his model 109-8; his illustrations mostly from Bhaṭṭākāśā 109-9; his erudition 109-21; his relation to Pāṇini’s work 109-9ff.

Krīṣṇākāśyana, father of Rāmabhadra 45-7.

Krīṣṇāśrama teacher of Kṣemendra 97-29.

Krīṣṇa-Yajus-Samhitā anterior to Pāṇini 14-12.

Krīṣṇārṇaṇasamucchāya of Guna-ratnasūri 80-12ff.

Kṣapanaśaka’s viṇī on Uṇādīs, quoted by Ujjvaladatta 54-14.

Kṣemākara 102-1; father of Lokākara 102-13.

Kṣemendra of Kāśmīr 97-31.

Kṣemendra’s com. on Sārasvatapraṇākāś mentions Narendra as founder of the Sārasvatī 95-17ff, 97-27; personal details about him 97-28ff; quoted by Jagannātha 97-33; criticised by Dhanaśvara 98-2, 99-21; his date 98-5ff.

Kṣemendraṭīppana-khaṇḍana by Dhanaśvara 98-3.
Kshirasvāmin author of Dhātu-vr̥tti 52-1ff; personal details about him 52-1ff; his date 52-4ff; his works 52-6ff; quotes Chandra Dhātu-pātha 52-16, 60-18; quoted by Hemachandra 76-n2; by Viṣṭha-lakṣārya 45-19.

Kshirasvāmin by Kshirasvāmin 52-9.

Kulachandra quoted by Rāmadāsa 50-15.

Kumāra reveals the Kaumāra or Kālpa or Kātantra grammar 83-8ff.

Kumārapāla 75.2ff; his conversion by Hemachandra 75-8, the theme of Yasahpāla’s drama Moharajaparākṣaya 759-ff; requests Hemachandra to write the Yogasūstra 75-16; his pilgrimage 75-19, and death 75-25; 81-4.

Kumārapāla-charita by Jinamanḍana 73-n2.

Kumārasambhava 105-1.

Kumārila 27.5n.

Kuṇḍavādana mentioned by Paṭanājali 31-n10.

Kuṇḍi, mentioned by Paṭanājali 31-n10.

Kuṣala commentator on Kātantra-vr̥tti-pañjikā 89-8.

L

Laghubhāṣya on the Sārasvata, by Rāghunātha 103-1ff.

Laghusārasvata of Kalyānasarasvati 103-24.

Laghu-siddhāntachandrīka by Rāṣṭracārana 102-20, 103-22.

Laghu-siddhāntakaumudī of Vaḍarāja, an abridgment of the Siddhāntakaumudī 51-4; com. by Jayakṛṣṇa 51-11; 62-21; 72-27.

Laghuvr̥tti by Chhichhubhaṭṭa 51-19.

Laghuvr̥tti-sabdānudāsana-rahasya another name for abridgment of Hemachandra’s Brihadvr̥tti 77-14.

Lahaur same as ancient Śāhāra, the native place of Pāṇini 19-2.

Lakshmīdevī patroness of Vaidya-nātha 50-6.

Lakshmīdhara father of Bhaṭṭoji 46-23, 48-n1.

Lakshmīdhara son of Rāmabhāṭṭa 101-17.

Lakshmīdhārachārya son of Viṣṭhalakṣārya 45-23.

Lakshmī Vallabha’s Upadesamālakārṇikā 53-3.

Liebich, Bruno, editor of Chandra-vyākaraṇa 36-n1; 58-9; his paper on the date of Chandragomin et Kālidāsa 58-n2; 59-n2; 60-11.

Liṅgadhikā or Liṅgānusāsana of Chandragomin 60-12.

Liṅgānusāsana, Pāṇiniya, com. by Bhaṭṭoji 47-10; by Rāmadāsa 53-16; other writers on—53-20ff; Vāmānāchārya’s — 53-29ff; —of Chandragomin 27-15; 60-12; referred to by Vāmānāchārya 53-23; Ujjvaladatta, and Rāyamukta 60-20;—of Śaṭṭayana 71-16, basis for Hemachandra’s work 71-22, 77-25; —of Hemachandra 77-23, 77-n1, with vivaraṇa or vr̥tti on it 77-31; and with a Durgapadaparaboda on it 80-2ff; by Durgātana (Kātantra) 85-n2, 88-n3; 89-29.

Lokānanda, drama by Chandragomin (? ) 61-6.

Lokesākara’s Tattvadiṇīka on the Siddhāntachandrīka 102-14ff; its date 102-16.

M

Mādhava or Sāyana author of the Dhātu-vr̥tti 52-28ff; 107-10.

Mādhava, a commentator on the Sārasvata-prakriyā 98-20ff; his date 98-23.

Mādhava, a writer on Sārasvata, 103-15, his date 103-17; 103-n1.

Mādhavīya-Dhātu-vr̥tti 52-26; quotes Haradatta 39-17; quotes Śrīdeva 55-6.

Madhyamikā besieged by Menander 52-23.

Madhyā-siddhāntakaumudī of Varadarāja, an abridgment of the Siddhāntakaumudī 51-4; com. by Rāmasarman 51-10.
Māgha about authorship of Uṇādi-sūtras 27·6; quoted by Haradatta 39·n3.
Mahaṇaḥkara, Bhishmaparvan, 16·8.
Mahaṇaḥkara ed. of Kielhorn 7·n2; 9·20; does nowhere mention the Aindrā school 11·30; 13·20; 14·n2; gives name of Pāṇini’s mother 19·8; 19·23; 19·n3; 22·n1; 23·n1; 24·n1; 25·25; 25·n5; gives a stanza from the Pāṇiniya Śīkhā 27·15, 27·n5; Bhartrihari’s commentary on—27·n5, 41·6, 41·23, 109·8; mentions Ślokavārttikākāra 28·4; Kielhorn’s Notes on 30·n2, 31·n1; describes as a summary of the Saṅgraha of Vyūḍī 31·n9; describes Kātyāyana as a ‘southerner’ 31·6, 31·n2; mentions a number of vārttikākāras following Kātyāyana 31·n10; 32·5; mentions Gomārdīya and Gogiṅkāputra 32·23, 32·n2; detailed exposition of place of birth in—found in Indische Studien 33·10; text of the—traditions about, 33·24ff, 41·18; does not notice all sūtras of Pāṇini 34·3; fanciful explanation of this fact, 34·n1; it marks end of the first period in the history of Pāṇiniya school §21, 56·13; Chintāmaṇi on—by Dhanesvara 100·2.
Mahaṇaḥkara-chintāmani of Dhanesvara 100·2.
Mahaṇaḥkara-pradipa as the basis of Haradatta’s Padaṇāja 40·7, 40·n2; itself indebted to Bhartrihari 42·24; commentaries on, it by Nāgīrīṇa, Nārāyaṇa, Īśvarāṇanda, and others 43·1ff.
Mahaṇaḥkara-pradipopadhyota of Nāgīrīṇa 43·2; 49·10; a com. on it by Vaibhāṣya, called Cākṣya 50·13.
Mahaṇaḥkara father of Vaidyanaṭha 50·6.
Mahaṇaḥkara, author of Sabdasiddhi, on Durgasimha’s vṛttī 89·10.
Mahaṇaḥkara the Yudhava king of Doṇagiri 105·3.
Mahāvyra, see Jina.
Mahāvyra preceptor of Kaiyyaṭa 42·7.
Mahādhara 102·1.
Mātreyaraksita 39·n1.
Mātreyaraksita mentioned as a writer on roots by Sāyana 53·2.
Malayagiri’s Sabdasiddhi with his own com. 80·31ff; his date 81·4.
Mallinātha, his commentary on the Śisūpālavada 27·n3; quotes Padamaṇāja 39·18; quotes Bopadeva in his com. of the Kuṃḍa 104·33ff; quotes a Chāndra rule 57·21, 57·n2.
Mammata 42·8ff; 42·n1.
Maṇḍana commentator on the Sārasvata-pakriya 98·27ff; personal details about him 98·28ff; patronized by Alpasūhi of Mālva 99·9.
Maṇgarasa author of a com. on the Chintāmaṇi 72·7.
Maṇikya-deva on Pāṇiniya Uṇādi-sūtras 54·17.
Maṇiprakāśika by Ajitasenacharyya, a com. on the Chintāmaṇi 72·6.
Maṇkha author of Śrīkanṭha-chārita 84·22.
Manoramī, see Praulhamanoramī.
Manoramākachāmarkanta of Jagannātha gives some personal details about Īhaṭtoji 46·29ff, 47·n1.
Mantras, Seers of, 6·n1.
Manu mentioned in the Nirukta 8·n1.
Manual of Buddhism by Kern 59·n2.
Manuals, lesser, § 99; characteristic of the declining age of a school 115·11.
Maṭisāgara teacher of Dayāpala 72·24.
Manu family 48·4; 51·12.
Mauryas, their financial expedient mentioned by Patañjali 32·25.
Maximus of interpretation, see Paribhāṣā.
Max Müller, History of Ancient Indian Literature. 4·n1; 4·n3; 4·28; on introduction of art of writing 4·28; 9·n1; on Pāṇini’s date 14·3; 15·3; 28·15.
Medes not unknown to Indians before Alexander’s invasion 15·33.
Medini 111·n2.
Megha father of Trilochanadāsa 89·6.
Meghadūta, Mallinātha’s com. on 87·22.
Megharatana's Sārasvatavyākaraṇa-dhunḍhi or Sārasvata-dhpiṅkā 99-14ff.
Meghavijaya tells of Bhāṭṭojo's indebtedness to Ilema-chantra 46-20.
Meghavijaya author of Haimakamūndri 79-18ff.
Menander, his siege mentioned by Patañjali 32-24.
Meruṭaṅgacaryya's Prabandha-chintāmanī 78-52.
Miscellanea Essays by Colebrooke 68-n1 ; 114-n1.
Mitakṣhārā (law) the Vyavaharakaṇḍa from it commented upon by Vaidyanaṭha 50-59.
Mitra, Rajendralal, on the identification of Yavanaś with Ionian Greeks 15-21 ; shows that Patañjali is not same as Gonardiya or Gonikāputra 33-2.
Mohana Madhusudana brother of Tarkatilakabhaṭṭacārya 102-23.
Moharājanaparaya, drama by Yasaḥpūla, 75-8.
Mugdhabodha quotes by name various gramarians 10-n3 ; 91-28 ; 104-23 ; 105-10 ; the object of—§83 ; its domination prior to Bhaṭṭojo 107-12 ; commentaries on, 107-24ff ; supplements to, 108-9ff ; accessory treatises to, 108-16ff ; 110-27.
Muhammadan incursions as affecting growth of literature 43-15ff ; later Muhammadan rulers as creating a demand for Sanskrit grammar 43-27, 95-44ff ; 96-7.
Muktāphala by Bopadova 105-11, 105-n1.
Muntriprayam 34-12.

N

Nāgesea, see Nāgojībhāṭṭa.
Nāgojībhāṭṭa speaks of Śantana-vāchārya as relatively modern author 27-n4 ; his Uddyota on Kaiyyatha's Pradīpa 43-1 ; his com. on the Praudhamanarāmā 47-18, and on the Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa 47-21 ; his commentary on Bhaṭṭojo's Śabda-kaustubha 47-22 ; his pupil, Vaidyanātha Payagunda 47-23, 48-n1 ; his works §32, 53-4 ; his time 49-24ff ; invited by Savāra Jeyśimha of Jeyapur for an asvamedha 40-3 ; personal details about him 49-33ff ; 55-67.
Naidīnas mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.
Nairuktas mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1 ; 21-14 ; their view as to root-origin of all words 25-26.
Nandus, their relation with Kātyāyana 29-6.
Nandukisorabhāṭṭa's supplement to the Mugdhabodha 108-9 ; his date 108-11.
Nandasundara 78-17.
Nandisaṅgha Pāṭṭavaḷi 64-7, 64n-2.
Narahari's Bālāvadabha 116-8ff.
Narasimha father of Rāmabhāṭṭa 101-12.
Nārāyaṇa's vivaraṇa on Kaiyyatha's Pradīpa 45-2.
Nārāyaṇabhārati 101-35.
Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭacārya's Karika-vāli 116-12.
Narendra or Narendrabhaṭṭa mentioned as founder of Sārasvata by Kaheendra 95-18, by Amritābhaṭṭa 95-22 ; by Viṭṭhaṅkaṇḍa 95-24.
Nighantu 6-n1 ; commented upon by Yāska's Nirukta 8-5.
Nighantu-vṛtti by Kshtrasvāmin, quoted by Devarāja 52-10.
Nilakaṇṭha Śukha, pupil of Bhaṭṭojo 47-n2, 48-n1.
Nipātavayaopasargavyṛtti by Kshtrasvāmin 52-8.
Nirukta of Yāska, its date §6 ; 7-9 ; its nature §7 ; teachers and schools referred to in it 8-n1 ; introduction to, by Pandit Satya-vrata Sāmaśrami 14-17 ; 25-25 ; 25-n4 ; quotes Śukaṅkṣyaṇa 68-25 ; com. on, by Durgacārya 88-14.
Niruktanimravacana by Devarāja 52-10.
Niruykt 73-n1.
Northern school mentioned by Pāṇini 12-n2.
Nṛṣiṁha-bhaṭṭacārya father of Viṭṭhaṅkaṇḍa 45-22.
Nyāsa on Kāśikā by Jindrabuddhi 35-n2, §25; otherwise known as Kāśikā-vivarana-pañjikā 38-9; not a single edition or a complete manuscript of it in existence 39-1, 39-1n; said to have been commented upon by Maitreyarakshita 39-n1; 71-n1; quoted (?) by Hemachandra 76-n2.

Nyāsas (three) on Hemachandra’s Brihadvritti, the first identifies most of Hemachandra’s quotations 76-n2; second by Udayaśandra 79-2, with an abridgment which traces most of Hemachandra’s quotations 76-n2; 79-3ff; 76-21; and the third anonymous Nyāsa called Sādāmahārāja 79-7.

Nyāsa on the Śaṅkāyana-Sabdānusāsana 39-n1; quoted in Mādavīya Dhatuvrīti 71-31; quoted by Hemachandra:76-n2.

Nyāsa, a com. on the Amogha-vrīti quoted by Prabhāchandraśārya 72-2.


Nyāyapāṇchāśāna’s com. on Goyi-chandra’s vrīti 110-17ff.

Nyāyarthamānjūśhā of Hemahāsa-vijayagapi 80-7; its date 80-n2.

O

Oka, Shastri, editor of Kaḥirasvāmin’s com. on Amarakosa 52-n1; 57-n2.

P

Padama brother of Vāhaḍa and minister to Alpasāhi 59-6.


Padapāṭha of Śakalya 4-17; 6-n1.

Padma-(or Rudra-) kumāra, father of Haradatta 39-11.

Padmanābhadatta founder of the Saupadma school 111-2; personal details about him 111-2ff; different from the author of the Prishodarādīvṛitti 111-8; his date 111-15; the arrangement of his work 111-n4; his own com. on it called Saupadinapanājikā 112-11; his other works 112-19ff, 112-n1.

Padmanābhadatta, author of Prishodarādīvṛitti, different from the founder of Saupadma 111-5ff.

Padmapuruṣa 100-4.

Pāhini mother of Hemachandra 73-25; gives her son over for religious service 74-7.

Palhavas, see Parthians.

Pñḍya king, the Tolkappiyam read before, 11-3.

Pañchatantra story about Pañini’s death by tiger 19-15, 19-n2.

Pañchavastu, recast of Jainendra 67-14ff; its introductory part interpolated 67-20.

Pañini, 3-n1; his terminology presupposed by present Prātiśākhya 5-2; —, His place in Sanskrit literature, by Goldsticke, 5-n1; his terminology compared with that of Yāska 6-n2; objections to his being placed after Yāska considered 7-6ff; his system based on Yāska’s theory of the verbal origin of every noun 9-3; 9-6ff; uses technical words and formulas of earlier writers, some of whom came after Yāska 9-14; 9-n2; 10-n3; said to have supplanted the Aindra school 10-15; as also other schools 62-26; does not any-where mention Indra by name 10-11, nor the Aindra school 11-28; 12-6; the school of—§§10 to 41; authors quoted by—12-n2; his date §11; posterior to Yāska 14-14; must have known some form of Grihya and Dharma Sūtras 14-28; placed even before Yāska by Pandit Satyavrata Sāmadram 14-18; usually but without sufficient evidence assigned to 350 B.C. §32; lived prior to Alexander’s invasion
17·19; lived prior to 700 B. C.
18·3; 18·16; only a negative conclusion about his date possible
18·27; the known facts about
his life §13; Śākṣātuṛya an alias
of — 18·34; his mother’s name,
Dvāski 19·8; 19·n1; his teacher said
to be Varsha 19·11; has the four-
teen prayāhṛā sūtras revealed to
him 10·13; 23·18; story about
his death by a tiger 19·14; 19·n2;
character of Pāṇini’s work §14;
his contribution to philology in
the Uṇāḍīsūtras 21·31; the tech-
nical devices used by him §13;
his method of indicating adhi-
kāra-sūtras 24·n2; his Parībhā-
shās 25·4; his Dhātupāṭha
25·14ff; his Gaṇapāṭha 23·24,
24·2ff; 25·20; reasons for assign-
ing most of the Uṇāḍīsūtras to
his authorship 26·7ff; his Vārti-
kākas pp. 28·32; considerable
interval separates him from Kātyā-
yana 27·7; 27·n1; criticised by
Kātyāyana first in the Vijāsaneyī
Pṛaśīśīkhyā 29·16; and later in
the Vārtika 29·20; his terminol-
ogy not strictly adhered to by
Kātyāyana 30·24ff; 38·n1; Siddhāntakaumudi the most popular
introduction to his grammar
46·11; he tacitly employed many
Parībhāṣas current before him
54·21; 54·n1; history of his
school, review of, §41; 56·7;
three stages in the later history
of his school 56·11ff; 59·9;
65·28; 69·n1; 69·18; 69·n3;
70·n1-5; 71·1; 75·30; 76·n2;
81·28; 86·21; 86·28; 86·30;
87·4; modern revival of Pāṇini
90·31; 107·4; 92·10; 93·1;
93·27; later attempts to improve
upon him 105·17; 105·22; 109·1;
111·20; 112·1.
Pāṇini, the poet, quoted in Valla-
bhadeva’s Subhāśītabhāvali and
identified with Pāṇini the gram-
mian 13·10.
Parībhāṣas of Pāṇini and of later
grammarians 25·4; 25·n1; no ancient collection has come down
27·19; commonly ascribed to
Vṛyādi 27·21; 54·23; invention of
the system of, 35·10; Parībhā-
shās and Jñāpakas elaborated
between 470-690 A. D. 35·17;
54·27ff; 54·n2; 56·25; §40; Pā-
ṇini tacitly employed many —
current before him 54·21; 54·n1;
Pāṇintya parībhāṣas borrowed
by the Kāśātra and other non-
Pāṇintya schools 55·10; Parī-
bhāṣa-sūtra by Śākāyana
71·14; of Hemachandra 77·26,
collected by Hemahāṃsavijayaga-
pī 80·4ff; none for Sārasvata
94·21; 108·8; a collection of —
by Goychandra 110·15; of Sau-
padma same as Pāṇini’s 112·30;
112·19.

Parībhāṣāvṛtti (to Mugḍhaboda)
by Rāmachandra-vidyābhūṣaṇa
108·21.

Parībhāṣāvṛtti (Saupadma) of
Padmanabhадatta 112·21ff.

Parībhāṣhenduserkhara by Nāgojī-
bhaṭṭa 49·11ff, with the author’s
com. called Śabdenduserkhara
49·14; 55·7; com. on it called Gādē
dby Vaidyanātha 50·13; other
commentaries 55·9.

Parishads, rules for, framed, 4·10.

Parivrājikas mentioned in the Nīr-
ukta 8·n1.

Pāśhadas mentioned in the Nīr-
ukta 8·n1.

Pārsus, see Persians.

Parthians not unknown to Indians
even before Alexander’s invasion
15·33.

Pīṭhaṅjala-charita gives a fanciful
explanation of the fact that the
Mahābhūṣaṇa does not notice all
sūtras of Pāṇini 34·n1.

Pātaṅji 12·6; 13·23; 14·1; 14·n2;
17·4; 18·11; gives the name of
Pāṇini’s mother 19·8; 24·13;
26·n1; 27·21; quotes certain me-
trical Vārtikas preceding those
of Kātyāyana 28·4; mentions a
number of Vārtikakās following
Kātyāyana 31·n10; his date and
personal history §20; main
arguments for assigning him to
150 B. C. 32·19ff; speaks of Pu-
shpamitra as his contemporary
32·21; refers to a siege of Menan-
der 32·24; mentions a financial
expedient of the Mauyas 32·25;
a detailed exposition of his time given in Indische Studien 33:10; 33:11; vindicates Pāṇini against the attacks of Katāyana 33:18; often unfair to Katāyana 33:20; his unparalleled style 33:21; his ishā 33:15; 35:3; 54:22; 59:10; 69:18; 76:n2; 103:3.

Pathak, professor, 10:n1; 14:n2; 39:n1; proves the historical existence of Pūjyapāda 64:6ff; his paper on Jainā Śaṅkara 64:14; 69:ff, 76:n1; his arguments for the date of Jainendra 64:16ff; 65:n2; 67:24; 72:n1; 72:n2; 72:n3.

Patrapuṇja 45:29.


Pauṣkaraśīdi mentioned by Katāyana 31:n7.

Pāṇgaṇḍa, see Vaidyanātha Pāṇgaṇḍa.

Persians not unknown to Indians before Alexander's invasion 15:33; mentioned as mercenary fighters by Pāṇini 17:24; blotted out as a political power in 329 B.C. 17:26.

Peterson on Pāṇini's date 13:ff; 13:n2; 46:n3; 55:n2; 54:1; 65:4; 67:n2; 79:n5; 89:n2.

Philo-sophy, science, of, revolutionized by discovery of Sanskrit by modern Europe 2:24; its postulate Yūska's theory of the root-origin of every noun 0:4.


Phonetics, manuals on, 4:12.

Pischel on the identification of Pāṇini the grammarian and Pāṇini the poet 13:10.

Plato 16:2.

Prabhāchāntāniṇa by Merutaṅgāchārya 73:n2.

Prabhāchānta by Rājaśekhara 73:n2.

Prabhā, Vaidyanātha's com. on Bhāṭṭoṭi's Śabdakacustubha 50:15.

Prabhāchandra quoted by Pūjyapāda 66:n2; attempt to prove that the name is fictitious 66:18; 66:n3.

Prabhāchandra author of Prabhāvakachāritra 73:n2.

Prabhāchāntāchārya author of a Nyāsa on Amoghavṛtti 72:1.

Prabhāvakachāritra by Prabhāchandra and Pradyumnaśūri 73:n2.

Prabodhāchāndrikā by Vījja-bhūpati 115:2ff; com. on it by Gopālagiri 115:30.

Prabodhāprakāśa, a Śūtra grammar by Balarūmapačchānana 114:12, 114:19ff.

Prātīpa, see Mahābhāṣya-prātīpa.

Pradyumnaśūri reviser of Prabhāchandra's Prabhāvakachāritra 73:n2.

Prākrit literature, growth of, as affecting development of Sanskrit 34:20.

Prakriyākaumudi of Rāmacandra §§30; the model for Bhāṭṭoṭi's Siddhānta-kaumudi 45:10; commented upon by Viṭṭhalacārya in the Prasāda 45:14; by Śesha-krishna in the Prakāsa 45:25; and by others 46:n1; an abridgment of it by author's pupil 51:n1; 72:21; 109:3.

Prakriyāmani by Dhanāvavara 100:3.

Prakriyāprakāśa of Śesha-krishna 45:25.

Prakriyāśāṅgara of Abhayachandra, recast of Śaṅkaraṇa Śabdanuvāsana 72:11.

Prasāda of Viṭṭhalacārya 45:14; its date 45:16; quotes Narendracārya 95:24.

Prataparudra of Telaṅgana 101:10.

Prātiṣṭhikhyas, primitive, presuppose art of writing 4:30; present—post-Pāṇinya 5:2; their contribution to science of grammar 5:10ff; their technical terms identified by Dr. Burnell with those of Aindra school 5:n2, 82:13; show Yūska in the making 5:19; 6:n1; 9:n2; closely related to Tolkappiyam 11:6, and to Kātantra 82:13; 12:6; 86:22, 86:n1; Vajasaneyi Prātiṣṭhikhyas the first grammatical work of Katāyana, see under Vajasaneyi.
| Pratyāhāra stūras, fourteen, revealed to Pāññini by God Śiva 19.13; 22.15; means to produce brevity and terseness 22.25; Vaijjasaneyi-Pratīṣṭākhyā Pratyāhāras same as Pāññini’s 29-n2; their number reduced by Chandragomin 59-15; Pāññinya — retained by Jainendra 66-3; — of Śākāyana 70-13; — of Malayagiri 81-6; — not used by Rāmacandra 81-6; Pāññinya — dispensed with by Kātantra 86-23ff; their use without its by the Sārasvata 94-5; 113-23; — of Būḍadeva 106-6; — called Samāhārasūtras 106-23; — of Pāññi retained by Saundarya 111-21. |
| Praudha-manoramā Bhaṭṭoji’s own com. on the Siddhānta-kaumudi 47-7; distinguishes between the two authors of the Kāśikā 36-n1; acknowledges indebtedness to Rāmapāla 45-n1; does scant justice to the memory of Śaṅkara 47-1; its abridgment called Bāla-mānakomā 47-8; Jagannātha’s com. on it called the Manoramākuchamardini 47-18; another com. on it by Nāgacā called Śalabratna 47-18, 49-16; 107-7. |
| Prishodarādīvritti of Padmanābhadatta 111-8; its date 111-9, 111-n1. |
| Prithvīdhara, Mahānāhopadhyāya, author of sub-com. on Vardhamāna’s Kātantra-vistara 88-24. |
| Puṣyapāda an alias of Devanandī 68-25; 64-n2; mentioned as the founder of a Dravidā-saṅgha 65-4; possibility of other namesakes of his 65-10; 69-20; 70-8. |
| Puṇḍarīkakṣha writes sub-com. to Śripati’s supplement to Kātantra 90-21. |
| Puṇḍarīkā the earliest com. on the Sārasvata-prakṛitī 96-15; personal details about him 96-33ff; his date 96-16, 97-7; his works 97-82; 99-n1. |
| Puṇyaśundaragāni 79-24ff. |
| Purushottama 78-23. |
| Purushottamadeva’s vṛttti on Uṇādi quoted by Ujjvaladatta 54-15. |
| Pushpamitra alluded to as contemporary by Patañjali 32-21, and probably Patañjali’s own patron 32-28. |

**R**

| Races, impact of different, as influencing study of grammar 2-31. |
| Raghumandadasa 84-25. |
| Raghunātha author of the Laghubhāṣyā on the Sārasvata 103-1; pupil of Bhaṭṭoji 103-5. |
| Raghunāṭhakṛṣṇa father of Jayakṛishna 48.4; 51-11. |
| Rājadhanyakura 79-n2. |
| Rājasekhara’s Prabandhakosa 73-n2. |
| Rājatarangini account of the vicissitudes in the text of the Mahābhāṣya 13-27, 13-n5; 83-25, 41-17. |
| Rājavade, Vishvanth. K., his paper on Pāññini’s date 17-9 ff. |
| Rajendralal Mitra on the identification of Yavana with Ionian Greeks 15-21; shows that Patañjali is not the same as Goniḍiyā or Goniḍiputra 33-2. |
| Rāmabhadra-nāyikākara 107-32. |
| Rāmabhaṭṭa’s Vidvat-pradodbhi 101-3; personal details about the author 101-6 ff; his works 101-16 ff. |
| Rāmabhaṭṭ, see Vidvat-pradodbhi. |
| Rāmacandra’s Prakṛitīkaumudi §30; his date 45-6; personal details about him 45-6 ff. |
| Rāmacandra, commentator on Kātantra-vṛttitiṇājīka 89-8; 90-16. |
| Rāmacandra’s commentary on the Saundarya 112-14. |
| Rāmacandra-chakravarti writes sub-com. to Śripati’s supplement to Kātantra 90-20. |
| Rāmacandraśrāma’s Siddhāntachandrika 102-11; commentaries on it 102-13 ff; the author’s own abridgment of it 102-19. |
| Rāmaṇḍa 90-15. |
| Rāmadeva the Yadava king of Devagiri 105-4. |
| Rāmākṛṣṇa’s com. on Saundarya-Gaṇapati 113-2. |
| Rāmakara grandfather of Lokesākara 102-14. |
| Rāmakṛishnāchārya grandfather of Viṭṭhaḥāchārya 45-22. |
Ramānanda quoted by Durgādēsa 107-30.
Ramāśarman's com. on the Madhava-Siddhāntakaumudi 51-10.
Ramāsīṁha patron of Nāgojībhāṭṭa 50-1.
Ramākara, see Bhaṭṭo-dikṣita.
Ramatarkavāgīka, commentator on Muguḍhābodha 107-24; his supplement to Muguḍhābodha 108-10; his Uṇāḍikṣa 108-22.
Rāgaḥkāśyaya's edition of Śaṅkara's Sarvasiddhānta-saṅgraha 105-38.
Rāgoji-dikṣita brother of Bhaṭṭoji 46-24; 48-1n.
Rasagāṅḍākara 49-27.
Rāsavata another name for the Jau-nara school 109-32; quoted in Bhaṭṭara's com. on Bhaṭṭikāvya 110-1.
Rāsavatī Jumaranandī's vrittī on Kramadīśvara's Saṅkhīptasāra 109-31.
Rāṭhā 79-3n.
Rāṭhakara 101-35.
Rāyamukta mentions Chāndra Līṅgāṇūsāsana 60-20.
Recasts of Aṣṭādhyāyī § 29; 57-2.
Rīgveda, grammatical speculations in 1-25; its Saṁhitā anterior to Pāṇini 14-12.
Roman conquest, influencing study of Greek grammar 2-2n.
Royal Asiatic Society, the Bombay Branch, Journal of, 35-2n.
Rūpagośvāmin's Harināmāṃśātan 113-17.
Rūpamāḷī of Vimalāsarasvatī mentions Varuṇa alias Kāṭāyana as author of Uṇāśūtras 27-11; it is a recast of Aṣṭādhyāyī 44-2; its date 44-5, 44-1n; its arrangement of topics 44-6 ff; indebtedness to it acknowledged by Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita 45-1n.
Rūpasiddhī, an abridgment of Saṅkaṭāyana Śabdānuśāsana, by Dayāpāla 72-23.
Rūpavali 51-16.
Rudra-(or Padma-)kumāra, father of Haradatta 39-11.
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Sabaraśvāmin 58-20.
Śabdakauṭubha by Bhaṭṭoji, a

com. on the Aṣṭādhyāyī 47-12; probably not completed by the author 47-14, 47-3n; com. on it called Viṣhamb, by Nāgośa 49-18; another com. called Prabhā, by Vaidyānātha 50-15; 107-7.
Śabdānuśāsana by Nāgojī, an anonymous com. on Hemachandra's Brihadvṛitti 79-7.
Śabdānuśāsana of Hemachandra presumably utilised by Bhaṭṭoji for his Siddhāntakaumudi 46-22.
Śabdānuśāsana of Mahāyagiri 80-31 ff.
Śabdānuśāsana of Śaṅkaṭāyana (Jaina) not a very ancient work 26-3; later than Jainendra 68-9; meant for Śvetāmbaras 68-13; mentioned in the Gaṇapatna-mahodadhī 68-16; in the Mādhava-Dhātuvṛtti 68-17; commentaries on it 68-14; accessory treatises on it 68-14; not the same as ancient Śaṅkaṭāyana 52; proof for this 69-1n; quoted as abhināca by Bopādeva 68-31.
Śabdānuśāsana-Brihadvṛitti, Hemachandra's com. on his own Śabdānuśāsana 76-17; three different Nyāsas on the same 76-21, 79-2, 79-7; its quotations mostly identified by the first Nyāsa 76-2; contains Siddhārāja's prāṣṭāti 77-3 ff; its abridgment perhaps by Hemachandra himself 76-8; comprehends also accessory treatises of the school 77-28; Dhūnpīhiṣā on it 78-6 ff; a Lāghn-nyāsa on it 79-1.
Śabdārthacandrikā by Haṇsāvijaya-van 100-27.
Śabdāsiddhi, Mahādeva's com. on Durgāśīṁha's vṛtti 89-10.
Śabdānanda's Subodhini 102-14 ff.
Śāsana, the three, 34-11.
Śāhajakṛti's Śūrasvatapraṇavrētika, 100-21 ff; his date 100-24, 100-1n.
Śahi Salem, emperor of Delhi, honours Chandrakṛti 98-17 ff, 98-1n.
Šaiva grammars 114·10 ff.
Šaka 16·31; 17·31; 18·12; see also Scythians 18·12.
Šākalya, Padapātha by, 4·18; mentioned in the Nirukta 8·n1; mentioned by Pāṇini 12·n2; quoted by Kātyāyana 31·n4.
Śākapūṇi mentioned in the Nirukta 8·n1.
Śākaṭyana (ancient) quoted by name in Bopadeva's Muddabodha 10·n3; mentioned by Pāṇini 12·n2, 68·25; often considered author of the Uṇādīsūtras 25·24; no work of the ancient Śākaṭyana now extant 26·6; quoted by Kātyāyana 31·n3; mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya 25·n5; different from later (Juima) Śākaṭyana § 52; 50·31; 81·8; credited with the authorship of the Kritprakaraṇa as incorporated in the Kramatra 84·24, 87·20.
Śākaṭyana (Jain) Prof. Patilak's paper on, 64·14; 64·n4; his date 65·1, 69·12 ff; his indebtedness to Jainendra 65·2; also author of the Amoghavīti 69·13; was a Śvetāmbara Jain 73·n1; nature of his Šabdānumāsaana § 53; draws freely upon the Jainendra 69·20; many of his sūtras same as Pāṇini's 69·22, 69·n3, or only slightly changed 70·1, 70·n1; indebtedness to Chandragumin 70·2ff, 70 n2; to Jainendra 70·5, 70·n3, 70·n4; quotes Indra 70·7; the extent and arrangement of his Šabdānumāsaana 70·10ff; the authors quoted by him 70·n5; his frantic effort to secure brevity illustrated 71·6; his technical terminology 71·7; other works by Śākaṭyana § 54; comm. on his Šabdānumāsaana 71·30ff; recasts of it 72·10ff; later ousted by Hemachandra's Šabdānumāsaana 73·3, which however freely draws upon it 76·13, 76·n1, 76·n2.
Śākta besieged by Menander 32·23.
Śākta grammars 114·10ff.
Śālūtura Pāṇini's native place 19·1; identified with Lahaur in Yusaftzai valley 19·2; now an obscure and deserted place 19·6. Śālūturiya an alias of Pāṇini 18·34; 18·n1.
Salemshah, Emperor, 93·8.
Śamantabhadra quoted by Pūjya-pāda 66·n2.
Śamantabhadra's Tippani on the Chintamani 72·7.
Śāṃsačakra 51·17.
Śāmaśranti, Satyavrata, on Pāṇini's date 14·17.
Śāmaysundarāsvī's com. on the Kalpasūtras 63·2, 63·n2.
Śāmhihīta, Taṅṭirīya, grammatical speculations in, 2·2; the language of Śāmhihītas different from that of Brāhmaṇas, 3·9; the Śāmhihītas of Rik, Śama, and Krishna-Yajus anterior to Pāṇini 14·12.
Śangoa, a town destroyed by Alexander and mentioned by Pāṇini 17·11ff.
Śāñgīhaṇati or Śāṅgheśvara 98·29; 99·8.
Śāṅghraha, an extensive work of Vyāli 31·18, and described as the basis for Mahābhāṣya 31·n9.
Śānjāna, see Technical terms.
Śāṅkala, see Sangala.
Śāṅkala, Prince who founded the city of Sangala 17·13.
Śāṅkarāchārya's Sarvasiddhāntasaṅghraha edited by Raṅgāchārya 108·n3; his Saṭṭha-bhāṣya 33·22.
Śāṅkhhabasti inscription 65·6.
Śāṅkhya-kārikās 64·20.
Śaṅkhśiptasūtra of Kramādatesvara 108·32; its relation to the Ashtabhyāṣya 109·10 ff; Jumaranandi's varīti on it 109·27ff.
Sanskrit grammar, schools of, nearly a dozen 1·10; writes on, at least three hundred 1·11; treatises on, over a thousand 1·13; see under schools.
Śāntanavāchārya, author of the Phīṣṭāstras 27·12; mentioned as a relatively modern writer 27·n4.
Śaptāṭati, com. on, by Nāgēṣa 49·7.
Śaptavarmen received revelation of Aindra grammar from Kārttikeya 10·22; see also Śarvavarmen.
Sāra by Kūśānātha, a com. on the Prakṛitiśakamudrī 46·n1.
Śrīpradīpikā by Jayagnātha 93·1, 100·8.
Śāra-Siddhāntakāmudrī of Varadāraja, an abridgment of the Siddhāntakāmudrī 51·4.
Śrāvasavata school 43·29; 81·24; its date §73; its original extent 92·n1; two recensions of its Sūtrapātha 92·n1; its special features §74; its technical terms 94·11ff; no paribhāṣas to it 94·21; and no Upanīda 94·29; the school not mentioned by Bopa-deva 92·4, not known to Hemacandra 92·6; its traditional founder §75; vārtikas to it 94·31, 95·2; com. on it by Viśṭhala 93·2; most of the comm. on it later than 1450 A. D. 92·8, and come from Northern India 92·14; comm. on it independently of the Śrāvasvata-prakṛitiya §78; the — school encouraged by Muhammadan rulers of India 93·4ff; its abridgments 103·21ff; a general review of its history §80; no supplements to it 104·6; the school affected by modern revival of Pāṇini 92·20; its present status 104·21.
Śrāvasvata-bhāṣya of Kūśānātha 100·9ff.
Śrāvasvata-dīpikā, see Śrāvasvata-vyākaraṇa-dhundhikā.
Śrāvasvata-mūlaśūtrapātha 92·n1.
Śrāvasvapa-prakṛitiya of Anubhaṭisvarūpābhāṣya 92·n1, §76; its śūtrapātha not the original sūtrapātha 92·n1; commentators on it 96·20ff, §77; commentaries on Śrāvasvata independently of this §78; vārtikas imbeded in its sūtrapātha 95·9ff; com. on it by Kahemendra 95·17; by Amritabharati 95·20.
Śrāvasvapraprakṛitiya-vārtikā by Sahajākirti 100·24; its date 100·24.
Śrāvasvataprasāda by Viśudeva-bhaṭṭa 98·24ff; its date 98·26, 98·n2.
Śrāvasvatyākaraṇa-dhundhikā or Śrāvasvata-dīpikā by Megharatna §9.14ff.

Sarvasvati reveals Śrāvasvata-sūtras 95·5.
Śrīra-bhāṣya 33·22.
Śrīra 105·5.
Śravasiddhāntasaṅgraha of Saṅka-rūpābhāṣya, ed. by Raṅgāchārya 105·n3.
Śravavarman 10·3; 83·n1; founder of the Katantra §64; his patron Śrāvatāhana 82·25, 83·4, 82·n3; evidence for later interpolations in his original sūtrapātha §65; 87·17ff; the Kṛitaprakaraṇa not by him 84·18ff, as also certain other sections 85·5ff, 85·16ff; nature of his work §65; the extent of his work 87·3ff.
Śaṭabālaṅkṛta mentioned in the Nīruktā 8·n1.
Śaṭasilokī by Bopa-deva 195·13.
Śrāvatāhana, patron of Śravavarman 82·25, 82·n3.
Satī mother of Nāgėśa 49·35.
Satī-vṛitti on Upanīda quoted by Ujjvaladatta 54·15.
Śravāraṇa disciple of Bhāmudikṣhita 48·n1.
Śatyaṇandā, teacher of Īśvarāṇanda the author of Mahābhaṭḥya-praṇīta-vivekaṇā 48·3.
Śatya-prabodhahāṭṭaraka 97·18.
Śrāvatā Śrīsaṁśaṅi on Pāṇini's date 14·17.
Saṅbhāva 35·n1; 41·20.
Saṅgīgas mentioned by Patañjali 31·n10; one of their vārtikas quoted by the Kāśika 37·11.
Śaṇḍma school absorbs Pāṇiniya Upanīdisūtras 54·9.
Śaṇḍma school of Padmanabha-datta §90; its special features §91; its arrangement 111·n4; commentators on it §92; its present status §94.
Śaṇḍma-makaranda by Vīṣṇumīśra 112·15.
Śaṇḍmapaṅjikā, Padmanabha's own com. on the Śaṇḍma 112·10.
Saurabhagavat mentioned by Patañjali 31·n10.
Śavī Jeyśimha invites Nāgėśa for an aṣvamedha 49·29.
Śaṅka or Madhava author of the Dhūtuvṛitti 52·28ff.
Schools of Sanskrit grammar, nearly dozen 1.10; Aindra school of Grammarians by Dr. Burnett 3.n1; the Drāṣṭā school 48.n1, §§3. The school of Pāṇini §§10 to 41; review of its history §41; three stages in its later history 56.11ff. Chāndra school §42 to §46; its branching off from the Pāṇiniya school 56.27; its later history §46; why disappeared from India 61.28ff. The Jainendra school §47—§50; its later history §50. The school of Śakaṭāyana §§51—§55; its later history §55. Early sectarian schools §§42—§62. Rise of popular schools of grammar 56.34; §§63—§80. Hemachandra school §§66—§62; its later history §62; limited influence 80-22ff. The Kātantra school §§63—§72; its early history §67; its history in Bengal §71; in Kāśmir §72. The Sarasvata school §§75—§80; general review of its history §80. The school of Bapadeva §§81—§85; its later history §84. The Jaiminiya school §§86—§89; its present status §89. The Saṃpadma school §§90—94; its present status §94. Later sectarian schools §§95—§97. Scythian invasions as affecting development of Sanskrit 54.20; the people not unknown to Indians before Alexander's invasion 15.33; 17-32; their first king Deioces 18.1. Sectarian schools, early §§42—62; later §§95—97. Senaka mentioned by Pāṇini 12.n2. Śesha-Kṛishna author of Prakāśa on Rāmacandra's Prakriyākāumudi 45.25; personal details about him 45.27ff; the preceptor of Bhaṭṭoji 46.3, who is however not grateful to his memory 46.29; his date circ. 1600 A.D. 46.4; Jagannātha his son's pupil 47.2, 48.n1. Śesha-Nrisinhhasūra father of Śesha-Kṛishna 45.26. Śesha-Kṛishna, see Patañjali. Śesha-Kṛishna, see Patañjali. Śesha-Kṛishna, see Patañjali. Shahajahan patron of Jagannātha 46-27. Sheshagiri Shastri 39.n2; 40.n1. Siddhananda quoted by Śakaṭāyana 70.n5. Siddhāntachandrika by Rāmacandraśastra 102.10; its commentaries 102.13ff; the author's own abridgment of it called Laghu-Siddhāntachandrika with a com. 102.19ff. Siddhāntakaumudi of Bhaṭṭoji modelled upon Rāmacandra's Prakriyākāumudi 45.10; importance of the Siddhāntakaumudi §31; its presumed indebtedness to Hemachandra's Sādānūśasana 46.22; author's own com. on it in two recensions 47.7ff; com. Tattvabodhiṁī by Jānendrārasinga 47.25, with a supplement by Jayakrishṇa 48.4; com. on it by Nāgojibhāṭta 49.15; its abridgments §34; its relation to the Haimakaumudi 78.21ff; 109.3. Siddhāntaratnā by Jīnendrā alias Jīnaratnā 102.27. Siddhārāja, see Jayasimha. Siddhasena quoted by Pāṭiyapāda 66.n2; not a grammarian at all according to Hemachandra 66.22. Śikṣā (of Pāṇini) not a very ancient work 27.12; a stanza from it found in the Mahābhāṣya 27.15, 27.n5; the same commented upon by Bhaṭṛiḥari 27.n5; and quoted by Kumārila 27.n5; 60-30. Śīkṣāra 67.4. Śingarour, see Śrīṅgaverapura. Śrādeva's treatise on Paribhāṣās quoted in the Mādhavīya-Dhītuvṛtti 55.6. Śivayalekha, poem by Chandragomin (?) 61.6. Śīṣupālavadha 27.n3. Śīṣupālavadha 27.n3. Śivabhaṭṭa father of Nāgojibhāṭta 49.34. Śivānanda 51.10.
Śivarāma Chakravarti writes sub-com. to Śṛipati's supplement to Kātantra 90-21.
Śiwairāj alias Śūrasimha of Jodhpur 80-1f, 80-n1.
Skandagupta 58.27.
Śloka-vārtikas, their number 31-23; their authorship discussed 31-n11.
Smith, Vincent, Early History of India, 17.5; 17.16; 82-n3; 91-n1.
Somachandra, second name of Hemachandra 74-12.
Somadeva's version of Jānendrā 65.18; his Subācāra-vāchandrika 65.19, 67.2; his version earlier and truer 65.21ff, 65-n2; personal details about him 67.2ff.
Speeches, contact of different, as influencing study of grammar 2.21.
Sphoṭātyana mentioned by Pāṇini 12-n2.
Śrānta-sūtras of Kātyāyana 29-n1.
Śrīvaṭa Belgoḷa 39-n1; 71-n1.
Śrīdatta quoted by Pājyapāda 66-n2.
Śrīdatta grandfather of Padmanābhadatta 111.5.
Śrīdhara Chakravarti's com. on the Saupadma 112.13.
Śṛkṣaṇṭḥacharita by Mañkha 84.22.
Śrīmāla family 96-33.
Śriṅgaverapura 50-1.
Śṛpitā's supplement to the Kātantra 90-18; sub-commentaries on it 90-20f; further supplement to the supplement 90-24.
Śṛpitī grandfather of Padmanābhadatta 111.7.
Śṛṇgāga teacher of Madhava 98.20.
Śrīśesha, see Pataṇjali.
Śrīvallabha-vāchānāṭhārya's com. on Hemachandra's Liṅgānūśāsana 79.28ff.
Śrūta-pāla quoted by Hemachandra 76-n2; also in the Amoghavṛtti 76-n2.
Śthulāśāntīvi mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.

Śthavira-Jinendra, see Jinendra-buddhi.
Śṭhāramati, translator of Chāndra texts in Tibetan language 61.19.
Subandhu 13-22; 14-1.
Subhāṣītāvalī of Vallabha-deva quotes Pāṇini the poet 13-7, 13-n3.
Subodbhikṣa, Amrītabharti's com. on the Śrāvaṇaprapakṛtyā 97.14; also ascribed to Viśeṣavārbdhi, to Satyaprabhabhaṣṭāraka, etc. 97.17ff.
Subodbhikṣa or Dip'ka by Chandra-krīti with an important pras'asti at the end 98.7ff.
Subodhipati of Sadananda 102.14ff.
Subodhipati by Gopālagiri on Vījajalābhāpti's Prabhadaprapakṣā 115.30.
Sudarśana an alias of Haradatta 40-n1.
Sudhālabarī, com. on, by Nūgeda 49-7.
Śūrasimha alias Śiwairaj of Jodhpur 80-1f; 80-n1.
Śūtra-form not new to Pāṇini 13-n1; possibly due to scarcity of writing material 23-6.
Śvapna-Vāsavadattam of Bhūṣa 13.28.
Śyādisamucholaya of Amarakandra 80.10ff.

T

Taitiki mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.
Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, 4-n2.
Taittirīya Saṁhitā, grammatical speculations in 2-2; speaks of Indra as the first of grammarians 10-24, 10-n4.
Takakusu 64-20.
Tantra-vārtika 2-n1; 27-n5.
Tantarāṇī, his account about the Aindrā school 10-17.
Taranāṇī, Harshakṛitī's com. on his own Dhītyupāṭha for Śrāvavata 103.9.
Tarkasaṅgraha 50-23.
Tarkatīkabhaṭṭāchārya's com. on the Śrāvavata 102-22; his date 102.26.
Tattvabodhini by Jñānendrasarasvati, a con. on Śiddhāntakau- 
mudī 47-25; supplemented by Jayakṛṣṇa 48-4; its nature 
45-2ff, and date 48-8.
Tattvachandra, Jayanta's abridg- 
ment of the Prakṛtiya kaumudī 
51-n1.
Tattvadipika by Lokesakara 102-15.
Tattvārthārāja-vāriśka 63-n4.
Technical devices used by Pāṇini 
§13.
Technical terms (Saṃjñās) of primitive 
Prātiṣṭhākhyas 5-13; identified 
with those of Aindra school by 
Dr. Burnell 5-n2; — of Yāska 
and Pāṇini compared 6-n2; pre-
Pāṇiniya — not all necessarily 
of the Aindra school 11-25; those 
of Kātyāyana not always the same 
as those of Pāṇini 30-24ff; of 
Devanandī 66-5, 66-n1; of Śāka-
ṭāyana 71-85; of the Kātantra 
36-26; of the Sārasvatī 94-6, 
94-11ff; of later sectarian schools 
106-16; of Bopadeva 106-20, 
106-n2; of Saupāma, same as of 
Pāṇini 111-20, 112-2ff; of the 
Harināmārīta 113-23ff; of Pra-
bodhaprakāśa 114-22ff.
Tibetan translations of Chandra 
treatises 59-11; 61-18; of the 
Kālayā-Dhātusūtra 90-5.
Toda 102-n2.
Tolkappiyam, the Tamil grammar, 
full of Aindra terminology 11-3, 
82-12; read in the Pāṇḍya King's 
assembly 11-4; is closely related 
to Kātantra to Kachchhāyana's 
Pāli grammar, and to the Prātiṣṭhā-
kyas 11-7.
Trikāṇḍāsēṣha 111-n2.
Trilocana (not=Trilochananātha) 
author of the Uttaraparīśiṣṭha to 
Śripati's supplement to Kātantra 
90-22ff.
Trilochananātha quoted by Viṭṭha- 
chārya 45-19; his Kātaotravṛtti- 
pājīka 89-1ff; quoted by Bopa-
deva and Viṭṭhala 89-22; per-
sonal details about him 89-55; sub-
com. on his work 89-7ff, 19-16; 
distinct from the author of the 
Kātanṭrottaraparīśiṣṭha 89-n1; 
quoted by Kavirāja 90-14; differ-
ent from Trilocana 90-22.

General Index

U

Udayachandra author of an exten-
sive Nyāsa on Hemachandra's 
Bṛhadvṛtti 79-2, 79-n1; belongs 
to Čhāndrasaṅkha 78-33.
Udayana or Uddana court pandit of 
Pratāparudra 101-11.
Udayasubhāgya author of the 
Dhunāhīka on the Pāṭkrit chap-
ter of Hemachandra's Bṛhadvṛtti 
78-25.
Uddana, see Udayana.
Uddyota, see Mahābhāṣyaprādrīp 
dyota.
Udyāna same as Yuvacai valley 
19-3.
Ugbrahūti author of Nyāsa on Jā-
gaddhara's Bālabodhini 91-14; 
his probable identification with 
his namesake of cir. 1000 A. D. 
91-15.
Ugbrahūti teacher of Anandapāla 
and probably the same as the 
author of the Nyāsa 91-15.
Ujjvaladatta's vṛitti on Pāṇiniya 
Ūṇādiśūtras 54-11; edited by 
Aufrecht 54-12; quotes earlier 
vṛitti 54-14; mentions Čhandra-
Līṅgānūsāsana 60-20; quoted by 
Padmanabhadatta 111-13, 111-n2; 
112-29.
Ūṇādiśūsa (to Mugdhābodha) by 
Rāmatarkavāgīta 108-22.
Ūṇādiśūtha §39, see Ūṇādiśūtras.
Ūṇādiśūtras of Pāṇini 21-31; com-
monly ascribed to Śākaṭṭāyana 
25-24ff, 25-n4; their technical 
terms and analogiae same as 
Pāṇini's 26-10; probably regarded 
as Pāṇini's by Kātyāyana 
26-18, 26-n1; not all belonging 
to Pāṇini 26-23; probably revised 
by Kātyāyana 26-27; tradi-
tionally assigned to Varanūchī 
alias Kātyāyana 27-6; Pāṇini's 
Ūṇādi sūtras absorbed by other 
schools 54-8; Ujjvaladatta's vṛitti 
on them 54-11; other commentators 
54-14ff; Čhāndra Uṇādi 60-10, 
it's mode of presentation 60-14; 
that of Śākaṭṭāyana 71-15; of He-
machandra 77-23, with vivaraṇa 
or vṛitti on it 77-31; of Kātantra 
in two recensions: that of Durga-
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Śakalya 31·n4.  
Vai̊jasaneyi Saṃhita 29·14.  
Vajraṭa 42·13.  
Vai̊kṣyapadiya account of vicissitudes in the Mahabhaṭṭaṇya text 13·26, 13·n4, 33·5 41·15; states that Mahabhaṭṭaṇya was a summary of Vyādiśa Saṅgraha 31·n9; mentions Baiji and others 35·n1; by Bhartrihari §27; its nature 41·11ff; gives the earliest reference to Chandra and mentions his predecessors 41·19ff, 57·20; 42·n3; 55·23; 59·n1.  
Vallabhadeva in the Subhāṣīṭhīvali quotes Pāṇini the poet 15.7.  
Vaiśnava-Rāmāyana, commentary on, by Nāgese 49·6.  
Vāmana, one of the authors of the Kāśika 35·n2, 36·8; his contribution to the Kāśika distinguished from that of Jayāditya 36·4, 36·n1; minister of Jayāditya of Kāśmir, sometimes identified with Jayāditya 36·21; quoted by Viṭṭhalaṭchārya 45·20; identified with the author of a Liṅgaṇīṣasana 54·2, quoted by Hemachandra 76·n2; and by Bhaṭṭoji 107·9; see Jayāditya.  
Vaiśnāvachārya author of a Liṅgaṇīṣasana 53·28; identified with author of the Kāśika 54·2; earlier writers mentioned by him 53·30ff; mentions Chandra Liṅgaṇīṣasana 60·20.  
Vāmanendra-sarasvati 47·26.  
Vaiśnava-dana’s comment on Goytachandra’s vṛtti 110·20.  
Vanamīlī’s Kalāpāvyakaranotpattipraśāva 82·n2.  
Varadarāja author of abridgments of the Siddhāntakaumudi 51·4; 62·21; 104·11.  
Vaiśnavaṇasena author of Amritaśri, a comment on the Prakriyākaumudi 46·n1.  
Vairuchi (alias Kāṭyāyana) said to have been at first a follower of the Aindr school 10·15; mentioned by Vimalasarasvati as author of the Unādiśūtras 27·n1, 27·6; 111·n1; 53·24; 53·30; 59·n2; 85·n1; credited with authorship of the Kātantra-kriṣprakaraṇa

V

Vaiśāvula mentioned by Patañjali 31·n10.  
Vaiḍīrāja alias Jayaśimha II, fellow-student of Dayāpala 72·24, and a Chālukya emperor 72·25.  
Vaiṣāḍa father of Manjana and brother of the minister Padma 99·7.  
Vaiṣṇava community of Bengal as producing many writers on Kāṣṭhanta 90·25.  
Vaiṣṇavaśītha Prajakṣaṇa, pupil of Nāgese 48·n1; comments upon Śaṅka-kanṭhaṭaṇya 47·23; his works §32, 50·3ff, 55·9; personal details about him 50·5ff.  
Vaishnava grammars 113·15, 114·3; now current only in Bengal 114·9.  
Vaiṣṇavaṇa, mentioned in the Nirukta 8·n1.  
Vaiṣṇavaṇaśiḍhāntabhūṣaṇa of Kṣṇa-bhaṭṭa 48·n1, 48·14, 55·24; com. on it by Nāgese 55·26.  
Vaiṣṇavaṇaśiḍhāntamaṇḍūṭa of Nāgese 49·20; a com. on it by Vaiṣṇavaṇa, called Kali 50·14.  
Vaiṣṇavaṇya mentioned by Kāṭyāyaṇa 31·n5.  
Vaiṣṇasenya Prātiṣṭhākhyā, the first grammatical work of Kāṭyāyaṇa 29·11; posterior to and based upon Pāṇini 29·n2; some of its rules repeated in an emended form as ārthikas 30·5, 30·n1; refers to Śkaṭṭaśaṇa 31·n3, and
84-26, 87-23, with a com. on the same 83-n1.
Vardhamāna author of Gaṅaratnamahodadhi 52-12; quotes Kaitrarvasāmin 52-4; his date 53-15, 88-n4; not same as the author of Kātantravistara 88-20ff.
Vardhamāna author of Kātantravistara 88-20; quoted by Bopa-deva 88-23; his probable date 88-22; distinct from author of Gaṅaratnamahodadhi 88-n4; 89-4. Vārṣaṭras of Chandragomin 60-13, 60-29, 60-n2, Appendix I.
Varaṇa, said to be the teacher of Pṛṇipīti 19-11.
Vārṣhayāghya an alias of Īśvarakṛishṇa 64-n4.
Vārṣhayāyana mentioned in the Niruktā 8-n1.
Vārtikas of Kātyāyana 14-5; their number 30-1; some — an emended statement of Vājasaneyi Pratīṣṭākhya rules 30-5, 30-n1; prose and metrical — 30-15.
Vārtikakāra quoted by Hemachandra 76-n2; see Kātyāyana.
Vārtikakāras before Kātyāyana especially the Ślokā-vārtikakāras 28-4; the question about the authorship of these last, discussed 31-n11;—after Kātyāyana 31-20ff, 31-n10.
Vāsavadatta, an Īkhyāyikā mentioned in the Mahābhāshya 13-20.
Vāsudevabhaṭṭa’s Sārasvataprasāda 98-24ff; his date 98-26, 98-n2.
Vāsurātri preceptor of Bhrātrihi and disciple of Chandra 59-1.
Vāṭasyāyana quotes Gonaḍiṇya and Goniḍīputra 33-4.
Vāyudagachchha 80-9.
Vedāṅgasa, 6-n1; 12-n2.
Vedas, grammatical speculations in, §2; Arctic Home in the — 3-n2; collected into family-books 4-9; 6-n1; lists of difficult words from them collected 8-7; nature and utility of their study 8-17.
Vedic Gods, their names 8-9; their cosmological functions 8-18.
Veṇī mother of Vaidyamāthā 50-6.
Vidvatprabodhī or Rāmabhaṭṭa of Rāmabhaṭṭa 101-3; the many pras’astis embodied in it 101-5ff; 101-24ff.
Vidyāvīgīśa quotes Durgādāsa 107-32.
Vidyāvinoda, father of Nyāya pañchāhāna 110-17.
Vijayātānanda teacher of Hāsavijayagāna 100-29.
Vijjala-bhūpati’s Prabodhachandrika 115-22ff; personal details about him 115-27ff.
Vikrama, father of Vijjala-bhūpati 115-27.
Vikramāditya 111-n1.
Vimalasarasvatī mentions Vararuci alias Kātyāyana as author of Uṇādisūtras 27-2; 27-n1; author of Rāmapāla 44-2; his date 44-5; 44-n1; quoted by Amritabāhārati 44-n1.
Vināyaka, father of Raṅgūnāthā 103-4.
Vinayavijayagāna author of Haimalāguptapraṇī 79-12; pupil of Kṛitrivijayagāna 79-13; his date 79-13, 79-n2.
Vincent Smith, Early History of India, 17-5; 17-16.
Vireśvara, preceptor of Jagannāthā 47-n1, and son of Śeakṛisvān 48-n1.
Vishamī by Nūgojībhāṭta, a com. on Bhaṭṭoji’s Śabda-kaustubha 49-18.
Vīṣṇupūrīṣa 16-7.
Vīrāntavidyādhara quoted by Hemachandra 76-n2.
Vīśvakarma, author of Vyākritī, a com. on Prakriyākaumudī 46-n1.
Vīśva-prākāsa 111-n2.
Vīśveśvara-dikṣaṇita, see Bhānu-dṛkṣīta.
Vīśveśvarābdhi 97-17.
Vīṭṭhala, com. on Sārasvata, quotes Trilochanādāsa 89-2.
Vīṭṭhālaṇjīrāya author of Prāsūda the best com. on the Prakriyākaumudī 45-14, 45-n2; his date 45-16; disparaged by Bhaṭṭoji 45-17; the author quoted by him 45-19ff; personal details
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about him 45·21ff; quotes Narendračarya 95·24.
Vivarana of Íśvaraṇa, a comm. on Mahābhāṣyaprāṇidīpa 43·3.
Vivarana of Nārayana, a comm. on Mahābhāṣyaprāṇidīpa 43·3.
Vivarana of Heimachandra’s Liṅga-
uśanas and on Uṇḍisūtras 77·31ff.
Vṛttisūtra mentioned by Itṣing and
perhaps same as the Kaśika 35·20, 35·n2.
Vyādi said to have been at first a
follower of the Āndra school 10·16; said to be a contemporary of Pāṇini 19·10; commonly re-
garded author of the Pariṇāhas 27·20; comes between Pāṇini and Patañjali 27·21; mentioned by Kātyāyana 31·n6; author of the Saṅgraha 31·18. 31·n9; mentioned by Vāmanāčarya 53·30, 53·n2.
Vyākaraṇadurgātodaṅghāṭa by Ke-
swadeva 110 n3.
Vyākhyāna-prakriya 82·1.
Vyākriyā by Viśvakarman, comm. on
the Prakriyākaumudi 46·n1.

W
Weber on Pāṇini’s date 14·3; his
History of Indian literature 82·7.
Westergaard’s Radices Lingusae
sancrtae 25·n3.
Wilkin’s Sanskrit Grammar 104·18.
Writing, art of, when introduced
4·26; presupposed by the primi-
tive Prātiṣākhyaśas 4·30.

X, Y, Z
Yāśavas of Devagiri 104·32, 105·3.
Yājñavalkya looked upon by Kāt-
yāyana as a very ancient writer
27·n1.
Yājñikas mentioned in the Nirukta
8·n1.
Yajurvedasamhitā-bhāshya 42·13.
Yajus, Kriṣṇa, Samhitā anterior to
Pāṇini 14·12.
Yakshavarman’s com. called Chin-
tāmāṇi on Śāktaśāyaṇa Śabdānu-
dasana 72·9.

Yāsākṛiti 64·n2.
Yāsākṛita writes the drama Moha-
rūja-parājaya 75·11.
Yāska, predecessors of, §5; he knew
fourfold classification of words
5·19; 8·25; shows Pāṇini in mak-
ing 5·19, as primitive Prātiṣākh-
yas show Yāska in making 5·19;
Yāska, mainly a philologist 5·26;
forms link between primitive Prātiṣākhyaśas and Pāṇini 5·28;
calls his work a complement to
grammar 5·35; his Nirukta, its
date §6; his account of course
of development of Vedic studies
6·n1; mentions three periods of
Vedic studies 6·n1; his date
depending upon that of Pāṇini
6·14; his technical terms com-
pared with those of Pāṇini 6·n2;
Yāska comes between 800 to 700
before Christ 7·5; objections to
his being placed before Pāṇini
considered 7·6ff; nature of his
Nirukta §7; teachers and schools
mentioned by him 8·n1; his theory
that every noun is derived from
verbal root 9·1, being basis for
Pāṇini and postulate of modern
philology 9·4; Yāska’s succes-
sors §8; 9·n2; 12·5; 12·n2; he
preceded Pāṇini 14·15; made
posterior to Pāṇini by Pandit
Śatyaavrata Śāmśrami 14·17;56·4.
Yadobhadra quoted by Pūjyapāda
66·n2.
Yāsodharma 58·29.
Yāsonandar 64·n2.
Yavanas mentioned by Pāṇini 15·13;
not always to be identified with
Ionian Greeks 15·23; Pāṇini’s
knowledge of them less than that
of Kātyāyana 16·23;16·33; 18·12;
18·22; Menander, called Yavana
32·23.
Yogavibhāga 37·25, 37·31; 38·n1.
Yuanfcai valley 19·2; known as
Udyana in the days of Huien
Tsang 19·3.
ERRATA

Page 1, line 8—*for* calculation *read* calculation.
Page 8, note 1—to the list add कौत्स; and शातबाख़्य;.
Page 8, line 4—*for* commentary *read* commentary.
Page 27, line 4—*for* early centuries *read* eighth century.
Page 29, line 9—*for* are *read* is.
Page 51, line 1—*for* abridgements *read* abridgments.
Page 60, line 3—*for* gra—read gram—.
Page 65, line 1—*for* 1025 *read* 825.
Page 67, line 2—*for* 750 *read* 1250.
Page 73, note column b, line 2—*for* मेहनुज्ञाचार्य *read* मेहनाचार्य.
Page 100, line 6—*for* Dhanendra *read* Kshemendra.

* * A few more misprints (especially regarding diacritical marks) have unfortunately crept in, but have not been here indicated.
D.G.A. 80.
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