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PREFACE

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

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

University of Calcutta  
June, 1938

Manomohan Ghosh
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Thick types (Devanāgarī) in pp. 3-6, 35-44 and asterisks in pp. 7-34 and Arabic numerals on the left of all these pages will indicate the position of the reconstructed text in different recensions.

An asterisk will indicate a spurious passage. When put before the first hemistich the asterisk relates to the entire couplet and it sometimes relates to an entire couplet together with a third hemistich. An Arabic numeral appearing on the left margin between a pair of double danās (e.g., 1131) signifies the position of the passage in the reconstructed text. A number prefixed to hemistich relates to it and the hemistich which precedes it; numbers with 'a' and 'b' after them indicate respectively the first and the second hemistich only of a couplet in the reconstructed text.
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INTRODUCTION

1. The Present Edition. Among the large number of works known as the Śikṣās the Indian tradition accords the position of the Vedāṅga Śikṣā to the one connected with the name of Pāṇini (see §23). Weber in his edition of the Pāṇiniya Śikṣā (Indische Studien, IV) has however remained silent on this point. In his History of Sanskrit Literature too he did not give any decisive opinion in the matter, but later on Max Müller positively denied the validity of the traditional notion about the PŚ. being a Vedāṅga. Since the days of Max Müller his view has been accepted by almost all the scholars without the slightest protest. Prof. Liebich may be said to have been a notable exception in this matter; for he maintains that the PŚ. though late in its present form, is old in its contents. This view however has received very scanty attention from scholars who are otherwise very careful. Even two very recent writers who touched the subject, Mr. C. V. Vaidya and Dr. Siddheshwar Varma, have followed the view of Max Müller. Of these two the opinion of Mr. Vaidya deserves special mention because he is frankly against what he considers to be a late date (c. 1.00 B.C.) for the Rgveda suggested by Max Müller, and is for

3 'History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature,' p. 145.
placing this work as early as 4000 B.C. But Mr. Vaidya does not make any effort to explain why the PS. should not be considered a genuine Vedânga belonging to the great antiquity he assigns to Pâñini and Yâska. Dr. Siddheshwar Varma however gives some arguments to prove the lateness of the PS. But these, as we shall see later on (§§ 25 ff.) do not seem to be based on all available materials which might have given him a different view about the age and character of the work. For he has known the PS. in three recensions only, while the work itself exists in no less that what may be called five recensions which read together critically are to give one a better idea about the age and character of the text. There is yet another scholar who not only considers the PS. to be a late work and hence not a Vedânga, but accords the same position to a Sûtra work ascribed, on very questionable grounds, to Pâñini. We shall see later on (§§ 31-32) why this view is untenable, and this will bring us face to face with the text-history of the PS. for which a critical edition of the work is essentially necessary. Hence no apology need be offered for undertaking such an edition of the work together with that of the two commentaries attached to its two (late) recensions. Reasons which have led us to believe that the PS. is the original Vedânga Sikṣâ will be discussed later on (§§ 28-30) and as such it is, to be placed as early as Pâñini, who in all likelihood was its author (see § 33). This being the oldest treatise on the phonetics of Old Indo-Aryan—and possibly of Indo-European—deserves to be studied carefully for the history of the Vedic as well as Sanskrit sounds.

3 Ibid, pp. 5 ff.
4 The main arguments which Dr. Siddheshwar Varma adduces to show that the PS. is a not the Vedânga Sikṣâ are as follows: (1) The PS. has no claim to be a mûldgama or source of the Prâtiśâkhya, (2) Pîgala, and not Pâñini, is the author of the PS. The first argument has been refuted in §§ 28-30, and the second in § 33.
5 Dr. Raghu Vira, 'Discovery of the Lost Phonetic Sûtras of Pânini' in the JRAŚ, 1931, pp. 653 ff.
2. The Critical Apparatus. It has been mentioned above (§1) that the PŚ. is available in five recensions. Each of these recensions again is available in MSS. or printed texts with more or less varying readings. Hence before reconstructing the PŚ. on the basis of different recensions we shall have to find out the most representative text of each version and its age and special characteristics. For this purpose we have consulted various MSS. and printed texts and are giving below the results together with a description of them all.

(a) The Agni Purāṇa Recension. The Agni Purāṇa contains the shortest available text of the PŚ., which consists of 21½ couplets only. Among these AP. 1b-10, 17-21c correspond to PŚ. 1-3a, 10, 4b-7a, 8-13a, 15a, 16b, 17, 18 (see below the text of the AP. recension). The AP. recension omits one complete couplet (14) and halves of four others (7b, 13b, and 15b-16a) which the PŚ. in all likelihood contained. Grounds for such an assumption will be discussed below in the Notes (26a, 14, 23 and 30). AP. 1a, 11-16, which are late additions to the PŚ. will also be discussed in the Notes (2, 18, 48a, 49a and 38a). Besides these twenty couplets and a half the AP. recension includes the following which may justify us to assume the existence of the AP. 3b-4a.

raṅgaś ca khe araṁ proktah hakāram pañcamair yuktaḥ
antaḥsthābhīḥ samāyuktaḥ 'aurasya' 'kaṇṭhya' eva saḥ

In this couplet we meet with the AP. 3b (italicised in the above quotation) and the two fragments of the second half of the same (put within the inverted commas). The reading vakṣye mukhe' kṣaram (for raṅgaś ca khe araṁ) recorded by some MSS. seems to rule out the possibility of yathā saurāṣṭrikaṁ nārī, etc. (Yaj. 6), ever occurring in the place of the AP. 3b-4a. This interpolation seems to be the work of some late scribe who under the influence of the Yaj. recension supplied the reading raṅgaś ca, etc., to the erroneously repeated AP. 3b-1a. unfortunately without any advantage. From a consideration of the possible
age of the Agni Purāna (c. 800 A.C.) later than Pāṇini by much more than 1000 years we may be justified to make an assumption about its defective tradition.

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


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


(b) The Pañjikā Recension. As the commentary called the Śikṣā-Pañjikā does not contain the particular text, it follows, in a complete form, the Pāñj. recension of the PS. had to be reconstructed to some extent conjecturally from the pratikas of passages handled in the commentary. The compiler of the catalogue of Skt. MSS. in the India Office Library, London, has wrongly considered this to be identical with the Yaj. recension. But on comparing the latter (Yaj. rec.) with this we find that in some important points the two differ. For example, unlike the Yaj. the Pāñj. contains the hemistic anusvāra-yamānāṃ ca nāsikā sthānam ucyate (PS. 11a) and upadhānīya uṣmā ca jīhvā-mūla-nāsikā (PS. 14b) and in this respect it falls in a line with the Prk. recension. Two passages (PS. 9, 10) though not explained in the Pañjikā seems to have existed in the text used by its author1 (see Notes 26a and 28) and for this reason they have been included in the reconstructed text. Except these two, the Pāñj. consists of 21½ couplets of which 4-19, correspond to PS. 1-18, respectively. On comparing

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

A¹. Manuscript of the Sīkṣā-Pañjikā in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, No. 2834.

A². MS. of the Pañjikā in the same Society, No. 1169.

A³. MS. of the Pañjikā in the same Society, No. 4180 C.

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

¹ Ed. SS., II, 8. 5.
² Ed. Suryakanta Sastri, Sūtra 60.
³ Ed. SS., p. 338. See also the same edited below.
⁴ See below on the Prak. recension.
O. The text of the Šikṣā-Pañjikā together with the PŚ. in its Rk recension printed in Benares, 1929 (Haridas Śkt. Series No. 10) [Mr. Suryakanta Sastri mentions one such text printed in Benares in 1837 (op. cit., introd., p. 33n.)]. But we have not seen it. From Mr. Sastri's quotation it seems to agree with HL.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹ See the conspectus of Text-Units of the different recensions given at the end of this Introduction.
² Cases of later Sikṣās can to some extent be compared with those of the later Upaniṣads (cf. Winternitz, History of Ind. Lit., Vol. I, p. 299). In order to give authenticity to their own theory or practice later writers on Vedic phonetics have called their works Śikṣās. These late works are nevertheless important for the study of Indo-Aryan phonetics.
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a study of the interpolated passages it appears that the custodians of the Vedaṅga Śikṣā have at different times made desperate efforts to preserve this small treatise consisting of only eighteen couplets, from extinction. Lest it should fall out of use before later works on the subject, which for the time being gave better guidance to the reciter of the Vedic texts they culled some new materials from these and tagged them on to the PŚ. in different relays. Even this method though resorted to sometimes were not exclusively followed. To supplement this they put it along with other works on similarly important subjects in the body of a big compilation like the Agni Purāṇa. A case which seems to be analogous to this is the alleged interpolation of the Bhagavad-Gītā in the corpus of the Mahābhārata. For a tabular statement of the growth¹ of PŚ. showing the distribution of genuine and interpolated passages in its different recensions,¹ see Table A.

Table A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recensions</th>
<th>Total Number of Hemisticas</th>
<th>Interpolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agni Purāṇa</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pañjikā</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakāśa</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yajuḥ sākhā²</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ūk sākhā</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Compare with this the growth of the text of the Nirukta (Prof. L. Sarup’s Introduction, pp. 19-20; S. Sastri, Ūk-tantra, Lahore, 1933, Introduction, pp. 45, 46) and of the Upanādi-Sūtras (Prof. Goldstücker, Pāṇini: his place in Skt. Literature, London, 1881, pp. 131, 170; Reprint from Allahabad, 1914, pp. 130, 189; S. Sastri, ibid).
² For the meaning of the Sākhā see below (§§ 18ff.).
From a study of the above table as well as the contents of the different recension we can suggest the mutual relation of the different recensions as follows:

*Ur-text of the PS.*

```
Ur-text of the PS.  
<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP. Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rk. Rec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
SIX VEDAŚGAS

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

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


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

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

1 S. K. Chatterji, op. cit., pp. 37f., 170f.
2 Oldenberg places the period of the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads (of course old ones) between 900 B. C.-700 B. C. (Buddha, his Life, his Doctrines, etc., Calcutta, 1927, pp. 14-15). The Brāhmaṇas are characteristically the product of that period in which primitive Indo-Aryans were very much influenced by pre-Aryans of India.
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later on their descendants began to get ashamed of their extra-Aryan origin and wished very much to pass themselves off as thorough-bred Aryans.\(^1\) But a great obstacle in their way was indeed the colour of their skin as well as their language and customs. For the time being difficulties seemed insuperable, but they did not remain so for a long time. Means were gradually discovered for concealing their ethnic and cultural origin.

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

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

---

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

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

---

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

2 Śrāuta Sūtras in fact represented the Kalpa sūtras most. For according to the Śiśu Prakāśa commentary to the Pāṇ. kalpa is the science of rituals.

3 Max Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 211 ff.


6 *Ibid*, p. 268. For the time of Ṛuṣṭaka, see Hertel’s edn., pp. 64ff.
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Dharma sūtra (c. 500 B.C.)¹ too Vedāṅgas have been mentioned twice (I. 10, 28, 21; II. 4, 8, 10). This sūtra work also enumerates the six aṅgas, one of which is of course the Śiksā (II. 4, 8, 10).² In spite of these very early references to Vedāṅgas with or without their number, earlier scholars were not prepared to admit that such references implied 'the existence of six distinct books or treatises intimately connected with the sacred things' and in their opinion these references implied merely the admission of six subjects, the study of which was necessary either for the recitation, the understanding, or the proper sacrificial employment of the Vedic hymns (Max Müller, op. cit., p. 109; Winternitz, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 268). But as we have seen before that conditions favourable for the rise of the Vedāṅgas were probably in existence as early as 1000 B.C. and as the beginning of these studies at the time of the early Brāhmaṇas are attested by reliable references the existence of written treatises on Vedic aṅgas about 600 B.C. can by no means be considered to be impossible. The most one can assume about such works in the absence of suitable evidence, is that they have probably been lost. But to consider them to be non-existent after a lapse of nearly four centuries during which Vedic priests could compose voluminous Brāhmaṇas will indeed be a unique piece of inconsistency. Max Müller's schematic division of the Vedic period into Chandas, Mantra, Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra periods perhaps lie at the back of this kind of unreasonable view. It is not possible that such closely divided ages ever existed; some overlapping has surely occurred; some at least of the Vedāṅga treatises were written in the Brāhmaṇa period—may be towards its end. For it is scarcely possible that when an energetic and intelligent people like the Indo-Aryans were already composing works like the

¹ SBE., Vol. 38, xliii; also Batakrishna Ghosh, 'Apastamba and Gautama' in IHQ., 1907, pp. 607ff.
² J. Charpentier places without any justification the origin of the Vedāṅgas between 300-100 B.C. (see his ed. of the Uttarādhyayanasūtra, pp. 81-82).
Brāhmaṇas, small treatises on the Vedāṅgas which, as we already noticed (§ 5), must have been a vital necessity with them about 1000 B.C. and after, were not then being prepared. Thus we are justified to assume that treatises on different Vedāṅgas might have been in existence between 1000-600 B.C.¹

Sikṣā

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

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

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

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

1 In order to appreciate these we are to take notice of different stages in the phonetic evolution of the Middle Indo-Aryan. See S. K. Chatterji, op. cit.
2 yo vā imām padaśāh svāraśāh kṣaraśāh vācaya vidadhāt sa ārtivijñāh (Mahābhāṣya, Vol. I, p. 3). Pada in this passage does not mean ‘Verstollen’ though in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa this is the meaning (see B. Liebich, Zur Einrückung, II, §§ 3-4) and akṣara does not mean here syllable in connection with metrics but with phonetics, for Patañjali says later on that Vedic words are taught to those who know places of articulation, adjustment of organs and the vocal words. This probably shows phonetics was studied earlier than metrics.
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the sole scope of the Śikṣā at the earliest stage of its development. It is quite possible that there was no written treatise on these topics, the Ācārya teaching the young learner (brahma-cāri)\(^1\) by words of his mouth, and it was only a little later that the earliest manual on different topics of the Śikṣā came to be written down. Now of the two phases of pronunciation that were considered important in the beginning, the proper instruction of the speech-sounds was probably reduced to a system first of all. We do not know what this system was like, but in view of somewhat phonetic arrangement of varṇas in the Varṇa-samāmnāya or the so-called Siva-sūtras \(^2\) we are tempted to assume that this—probably in some earlier form—constituted the first treatise on the instruction of speech-sounds. The word samāmnāya ‘traditional recitation’ probably gives support to this view. Kātyāyana also seems to give it support while he says vṛtti-samā-
vāyārtha upadesah, the enunciation (of the speech-sounds in the Siva-sūtras) is meant for arranging the varṇas in a proper order for (the facility of) recitation.\(^3\)

---

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

2 Prof. B. Paddegon says that the Siva-sūtra as a phonetical classification deserves the highest praise (‘The moenontechies of Pāṇini’s Grammar,’ Acta Orientalia, VII, 1939, p. 54). Mr. K. C. Chatterji is against such a view (see Journal of the Départment of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol. XXIV).

3 In this translation we have ventured to differ from Patañjali on the interpretation of the word vṛtti which he explains as dāstra-pravṛttiḥ (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 13). Our translation of the word as ‘recitation’ has its support from the well-known compot abhyāsārthe dṛutānu vṛttim, etc. (RPr., XIII. 19, Yāj., 29, etc.). Compare also the word āśvetti recitation. If Patañjali has misunderstood Kātyāyana there is no wonder about it; according to his own testimonī Patañjali lived in a decadent age as regards the proper teaching of the Vedas. He says: In the hoary antiquity it was like this: Brahmans after their upanayana studied grammar. And when they have learnt the places of articulation of sounds, the adjustment of organs and vocal chord in producing them, they were given instruction in Vedic words. But to-day it is not so. Readin, the Veda (straight) one quickly becomes a recitor of the same. (Purā kalpa stad ārit, sāṃskārītastirakānaṃ Brahmāṇe varṇakaraṇaṃ smādhiyate, tebhyaḥ tatra sthāna-
karanaupradājāteh kāvya Vaidikā sabād upadiṣyante. tad adyate na tathā, Vedam adhiṣyate tadātā vaktārā bhasant.) The use of the word kalpa is very significant. It literally means 432 million years but is used here in the sense of ‘hoary antiquity.’ This
13. There may however be some objection to the above view on the following grounds: (i) in the Varṇa-samāmnāya long and pluta vowels have been omitted, (ii) unvoiced stops have not been arranged in the same order as the voiced ones, (iii) the absence of yama, anusvāra, visarga, jihvā-mūliya and upadhmāniya in it and (iv) the h of the sūtra ha-ya-va-ra-t and the sūtra ha-l at the end duplicating h, is inexplicable.

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

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

16. The scope of the Śikṣā as given in the Taittiriya Upaniṣad probably brings us to the second stage in the evolution of this Vedāṅga. According to this Upaniṣad (1. 2) the Śikṣā consists of svāra ‘pitch accent,’ mātrā ‘quantity,’ bala ‘stress,’ sāma ‘utterance in a medium tone,’ and santāna (samhitā, ‘euphoric combination.’ While referring to the Śikṣā in his introduction to the Ṛgveda-bhāṣya Sāyāṇa thinks of the developed state of this Vedāṅga even when he says varṇa-svarāduccārana-prakāro yatra upadiśyate sā śikṣā; for he brings in the

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

2 The translation of the terms given above is based on Saṅkara’s Bhāṣya of the Taitt. Up.; cf. the translation of these terms by Prof. Winternitz (A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I, p. 392). Macdonell in pursuance of Sāyāṇa translates these as letters, accents, quality, pronunciation and euphonic rules (see Hist. of Skt. Lit., p. 256). Dr. Siddhāsvarā Varṇa translates varṇa as ‘individual sounds,’ svāra as ‘accent,’ santāna as ‘chanting of the Vedic verses’ and in this connexion he ignores bala totally (see his Critical Studies, p. 4).
passage from the Taitt. Up. (1.2). According to him svara-
varṇādayaḥ means varṇa, svara, mātrā, bala, sāma and
santāna. But the fact that Śāyaṇa in his Veda-bhāṣya
quotes from Prātiṣākhyaṣyas does not invalidate his testimony
about the Vedāṅga Śikṣā which according to him is the
PŚ. For he mentions no less than three couplets (PŚ.
8, 9, 10) of the latter work.¹ As Uvaṭa, one of Śāyaṇa’s
predecessors, in his introduction to the commentary of the Rk
Prātiṣākhya has considered this work to be a Śikṣā² we can
easily believe that Śāyaṇa was fully conscious about the historical
relation between the PŚ. and the Prātiṣākhyaṣyas and he surely
followed a correct tradition in according due honour to each kind
of works on the subject. For the Prātiṣākhyaṣyas, though one of
them has called itself a Vedāṅga,³ were, as we shall see presently,
the Śikṣā manuals belonging to the second stage in the develop-
ment of this Vedāṅga, and Madhusūdana Sarasvati too was aware
of this fact.⁴ The position of the Prātiṣākhyaṣyas in the history of
ancient Indian phonetic literature seems to have been very much
misunderstood.⁵ And in order to appreciate their proper
position as well as that of the Vedāṅga Śikṣa composed by
Pāṇini we must now inquire into the nature and scope of the
Prātiṣākhyaṣyas and their time.

¹ Śāyaṇa evidently used one of the very late recensions of the PŚ. for he says sa
vāṅgabhidhi-śiṣṭa-grantho spaṭṭam udīritaḥ ‘trīṣaṭkā’ catuḥṣaṭṭir vā varṇa sambhavato
matāḥ’ etc. (Pnj. Prak. Yaj. and Āk. 3.)
² tatāpy asyam śiṣṭaḥ śiṣṭaḥ dantyamāṇya iti repho dantyamāṇya ity uktāḥ (ed. Sāmasrāmi,
p. 14). Madhusūdana too calls Prātiṣākhyaṣya Śikṣā; see the Note 5 below.
³ RPr. XIV. 30; Madhusūdana seems to be of opinion that the Prātiṣākhyaṣyas too are
Vedāṅgas.
⁴ tatra sarva-vedāṅghāraṇāśiṣṭa Pāṇinīnā prakāśita prātivedāṅghaḥ ca bhinnarūpā
prātiṣākhyaśaṃśayātā anuśāreṇa munibhūk prakāśita.
⁵ Cf. Max Müller, op. cit., p. 118ff.; Winteritz, Vol. I, p. 283; Kielhorn in I. Ant., 6,
pp. 144, 193 contra which Burnell, Rk-tantra Vyākaraṇa, pp. xli-xi ; S. Sastri, op. cit.,
and the Veda,’ Allahabad, 1935, pp. 81ff.
17. Before entering into any discussion about the origin, nature and scope, etc., of the Prātiśākhyaśas it would be proper to examine the term about the meaning of which there seems to exist some misunderstanding. The word consists of three parts: prati, śākhā and the formative element. Of these, the exact meaning of śākhā should be determined first of all.

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

1 For details see Saśśbhūṣaṇa Vidyālaṅkāra, Śoṣaṅkī (Jīranī-kośa), Calcutta, 1841 B.E., pp. 1060 f. (article on ‘Vedavyāsa’).
Sūtra we learn that one of the reasons which gave rise to sākhās was the manner of reading the Vedas. This being the case we can well say that from one original Veda came out first of all sākhās like Rk, Śāman, Yajus, etc. For, the uttering of Vedic mantras by different classes of priests was different; the Hotṛ recited the Rcas with his normal voice, the Adhvaryu muttered the Yajūṃṣi silently, while the Udgāṭṛ chanted Śāmans loudly.

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

---


2 Max Müller also writes: 'The word (i.e., sākhā) is sometimes applied to the three original Samhitās, the Rgveda-samhitā, Śāma-veda-samhitā and Yajur-veda-samhitā, in relation to one another and without reference to subordinate sākhās belonging to each of them" (op. cit., pp. 123, 124). Yāska's use of singular number with reference to the Veda deserves notice (1. 20). Prof. Sarup however takes this differently. See his transl., p. 221.
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difference of pronunciation of the mantras but also a variation of their sacrificial rules and social laws and customs. Thus the śākhās came to relate also to a difference in such matters, though Prātiśākhya had nothing to do with such śākhās.  

20. Now the exact sense of śākhās having been determined we shall proceed to ascertain the sense of the term Prātiśākhya. According to Max Müller who wrote in 1859, 'Prātiśākhya...does not mean, as has been supposed, a treatise on phonetic peculiarities of each Veda, but a collection of phonetic rules peculiar to one of the different branches of the four Vedas, i.e., to one of those different texts in which each of the Vedas had been handed down for ages in different families and different parts of India.' This view has been subscribed to by Whitney in his edition of the Atharva-veda Prātiśākhya (1862). Since then almost all the scholars have followed this view. But such an opinion seems to have been expressed on very inadequate grounds. For, Mādhava, quoted by Jñānendrapātra in his gloss on the Siddh. Kau. (P. IV. 3. 59), explains Prātiśākhya as pratiśākham bhavam. And Anantabhaṣṭa too in the introduction to his commentary to the Sukla-Yajus Prātiśākhya defines the word similarly and shows, after an elaborate discussion, that Kātyāyana's work relates to all the fifteen śākhās which developed out of the Sukla Yajur-veda. From the testimony of Durga also we learn that the Prātiśākhya related to more schools than one. For in his commentary to the Nirukta (I. 17) he says: kim pārśadāni? svacarana-pārśady eva yaiḥ.

1 See above, footnote 2. 'Sūtra' in Mahādeva's comm. means Kalpasūtras, i.e., Sruta-, Grhya- and Dharma-Sūtras.
2 The word 'śākhā' used hereafter in this essay will mean, unless otherwise qualified, a phonetic śākhā only.
7 Kātyāyana's Vājasaneyī Prātiśākhya, ed. Venkatarāma Sharma, Madras University, 1934, pp. 2-5.
pratiśākhāṃ niyatam eva padavagraha-pragṛhya-krama-samhitā- 
svaraśaṇam ucyate tāni imāni pāṛśadāni pratiśākhyaṁ ity 
arthaḥ.1 ‘Those Pāṛśada books by which in a Pāṛśad of one’s 
own Carana, the peculiarities of accent, samhitā, krama-reading, 
pragṛhya vowels and separation of words are laid as enjoined for, 
and restricted to each śākhā are called Pratiśākhyaḥ.’ Max 
Müller who quoted the above passage may be said to have 
misunderstood it. Pratiśākhāṃ which he translated as ‘to 
certain śākhās’ should be equivalent to ‘to each śākhā.’ It 
should be noticed in this connexion that Max Müller’s transla-
tion of the passage is not in agreement with his own definition of 
the term Pratiśākhya quoted above. However the fault lies 
principally with commentators like the author of the Vaidikā-
bhārana whom Max Müller in all likelihood followed. For in 
the last named work which does not say anything about the 
exclusive phonetic character of śākhās in a Pratiśākhya, it has 
been suggested that the Pratiśākhyaḥ relates to a group of 
śākhās.1 This suggestion seems to give partial support to 
Mādhava’s and Ananta-bhaṭṭa’s testimony referred to above. For 
it does not restrict Pratiśākhyaḥ to one only of the many 
śākhās.

The word Pāṛśada which is a synonym for Pratiśākhya 
seems to give some clue to the solution of the problem whether 
Pratiśākhyaḥ relates to only one or all the śākhās of a Veda. 
In Nārāyaṇa’s commentary to a passage (ācāryam sahariśakham 
bhoyayet sabrahmacārināś-ca in the Gobhila-Grhyasūtra-bhāsa) 
we find the following saha pāṛśadā śisyagānena vartata iti 
sapariśatakham tamam samanam tulyakālam brahmācāritvam yesam ta 
ime anyasākhino’pi sabrahmacārinah savayobhi adhīyante.2 
From this passage we learn that students belonging to different 
Vedic schools could take their lessons from one Ācārya who 
together with his pupils constituted a Pāṛśada or Pāṛśad. Thus

1 Max Müller, op. cit., p. 131; S. Varma translates Mādhava’s words as belonging to 
each individual (prati) śākhā (op. cit., p. 12).
2 On the T. Pr., IV. 11; Siddheshwara Varma, op. cit., p. 13.
Pārśada sūtras evidently related to such Pariṣads comprising different schools of a Veda. Hence it seems justifiable to conclude that Pārśada-sūtras or Prātiṣākhyaśas related to each one or all the śākhās of a Veda.

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

---

1 See p. 427 of Whitney's ed. of this Prātiṣākhya was published in 1871.
2 Whitney, T. Pr. p. 427.
3 The Paippalāda śākhā of the Atharva-veda discovered after Whitney's ed. of the Atharva Pr. should be remembered in this connexion.
requires, in many instances contemplating and providing for combination of sounds which are found nowhere in the body of Vedic scriptures, and for which accordingly the commentator is obliged to fabricate illustrations (p. 583). Now whatever may be said about the genuineness of examples given by the commentator who was possibly very late, it cannot be said that the author of the Prātiṣākhyaas based his rules on non-existing materials. In view of the tradition that Vedas, in different periods, came to be lost and had to be recovered, it will not be difficult to assume that some of the sākhās with their texts perished beyond recovery. Even if his allegation against the commentator in some rare cases may not be untrue, Whitney himself has admitted that ‘there are certain number of sentences among those given by the commentator which have more or less clearly the aspect of genuine citations from Vedic texts; and although some might be regarded as instances of carelessness on his part quoting by memory from another source than his own Veda, we cannot possibly extend this explanation to them all; it must remain probable that, in part at least, they were contained in some hitherto unknown cākhā of the Atharva-veda.’ From these passages one will easily realise the untenable nature of the meaning given to Prātiṣākhya by Whitney, his predecessors and followers.

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

---

1 Hopkins, 'The Great Epic of India,' p. 5.
2 JAOS., VII, p. 588.
3 E.g., Prof. Keith believes with Whitney that the T.Pr. relates to the Taittirīya Mantra-pātha alone. See The Veda of the Black Yajus School, HOS, p. xxxvii.
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Manuscripts of the text agree with the data in the Prātiṣākhya, we may prudently conclude that the text of the Rgveda we possess is the same as seen by the authors of the Prātiṣākhya more than 2000 years ago.'

Along with this should be remembered what he himself wrote in this connexion eleven years earlier. In the History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature (1859) Max Müller wrote: "There is not a single MS. at present existing of the Rgveda in which rules of our Prātiṣākhya are uniformly observed, and the same applies to the MSS. of the other Vedas.'

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


2 Pp. 136, 137.

3 Patañjali's opinion regarding the shortening of e and o in the Sātyamugriya and Rāṇāyanīya śākhā of the Sāma-veda deserves special notice in this connexion. For he is unwilling to recognize such a deviation from the tradition though the Pariṣad gave it sanction. He says, pāreṇakṣitīr eṣā tatrabhasatāṁ naïvā loka nānyasmin vede'rāda ekāro'rdha ekāro vāsati on the Śivasūtra (ai-au-o).

4 adhyāya-bhedāt chākhābheda'nādi quoted by Max Müller, op. cit., p. 127. See also pp. 117-118; pravacanebhedaḥ prativedam bhinnā bhāyavye ca śākhā, says Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in the Prasthāna-bheda.
tion could arise between several groups of Vedic people and did actually arise and thus the process which brought into existence different sākhās was practically without an end. It will be found on a closer study of the various Prātiṣākhya and Śikṣās that the difference of pronunciation among Vedic sākhās owe their origin to the forces which tended to develop the Old Indo-Aryan to the Middle Indo-Aryan and the later to the New Indo-Aryan dialects. But Whitney, Max Müller and Burnell however viewed the matter differently and so did Weber before them.

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

---

1 Mr. Suryakanta Sastri in his Introduction to his new ed. of the Śk-tantra follows Burnell in assigning the work to the Kauthumā sākhā (pp. 2-6). But Mr. Sastri has also given some fresh arguments in support of Burnell’s theory. These, however, are by no means unassailable. That the Jaiminīya text of the Śāma-veda did not give the peculiarities provided for in the Sūrās 58, 94, 112 and 114 can be explained also by the assumption that the phonetic changes in question might have arisen later or the Prātiṣākhya being manuals of pronunciation had not much influence with the scribes, and discrepancy between the written text and its pronunciation can well be assumed to have existed in early times also. From the emphatic manner in which the use of written texts of the Vedas has been discouraged we can well infer this. For the Nārādyā Śikṣā says:

_व्याप्रत्यायामिति नाधितामि गुरुवानवैधानः_ rājate na sabhāmaṇḍine jāragurbhī āva striyaḥ. (II. 8. 10),

and the Yājñavalkya-Śikṣā has the following:

_गुरु दिग्रि इ विश्रामकपी तथा हिःप्र-पाप्काहो_ anarthajñno’ipakṣaṇāḥ ca ṇaṁ ete pāphakādhamoh. (196).

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

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


_Ccontra this, see Winternitz, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 285._
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should be called secondary Śikṣās.\(^1\) When judged by the standard set up by the Taitt. Up. for Śikṣā (phonetics), the Prātiśākhyaśas may be found wanting in certain respects.\(^2\) For example, the treatment of sāma and bāla is non-existent in them. But it can well be assumed that as these two topics were exclusively matters of oral instruction the Prātiśākhyas did not discuss them.

24. As for the date of the Prātiśākhyas which as we have seen can be called the secondary Śikṣās, their rise and development, at least of the older ones among them, can be roughly placed between 600-200 B.C.\(^3\) A detailed discussion about the date of the Prātiśākhyas will carry us far beyond the scope of the present work. But in support of the lower limit to the date of the early Prātiśākhyas it may be mentioned that the passages from the Taittirīya Pr. and Atharva Pr. occur in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali (c. 200 B.C.). Patañjali’s loan to the Pr. has already been pointed out by Dr. Siddheshwar Varma but the acquaintance of the Bāhyakāra with the A. Pr. has not been pointed out before. Under the Vārttika to Pāṇini I.1.10. Patañjali\(^4\) quotes spṛṣṭam sparsānāṁ karanaṁ. īṣatspṛṣṭam antaḥsthānāṁ. viivrtaṁ uṣmanāṁ iṣad ity anuvartate. svāraṁ ca [MSS. A B viivrtaṁ iṣad iti niivrtaṁ]. Here we have sūtras 29-32 of the APr. with the difference that the word order of the sūtra uṣmanāṁ viivrtaṁ ca has been changed and ca has been omitted. The accompanying vṛtti in Patañjali’s quotation shows that he has quoted from some sūtra work which was evidently the APr.\(^5\)

---

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

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

---

\(^1\) Some of the additional passages, *e.g.* Ṛk 46, 47 are not in verse. We however, have called them couplets only as a matter of convenience.
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**Table B**
Pāṇini's Classification of Speech-Sounds of the OIA.

1. According to Places of Articulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>anus</th>
<th>kauṭha</th>
<th>jivāmāla</th>
<th>tālu</th>
<th>mūrdhan</th>
<th>danta</th>
<th>danta-oṣṭha</th>
<th>oṣṭha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spṛśa</td>
<td>alpaprāṇa</td>
<td>k g</td>
<td>e j</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>p b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mahaprāṇa</td>
<td>kh gs</td>
<td>eh sh</td>
<td>th ch</td>
<td>th dh</td>
<td>ph bh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anunāśika</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>úṣman</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>(h) h</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lateral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(flapped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(semivowel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| samānākṣara (monophthong) | a a: | i i: | u u: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sandhyākṣara</th>
<th>kaṇṭha-tālu</th>
<th>kaṇṭha-oṣṭha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(diphthong)</td>
<td>e: (=āi=ōē?)</td>
<td>ai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. According to Pratyatana.

| a-sprśa | a a: , i i: , u u: , e: (=? ēē) | ai | o: (=? ōō) | au |
| isat-sprśa | j w r l (h x r) |
| nema-sprśa | ç s |
| sprśa | all stops and h |

1 Terms in Italics have not been used in the PS.
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3. According to Anupradāna.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nādin</th>
<th>µ  n  m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anunāsika</td>
<td>š g ů d ů dř bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an-anunāsika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iṣan-nāda</td>
<td>g ů d d b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śvāsin</td>
<td>kh eh źh th ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iṣac-chvāsin</td>
<td>k e ŏ t p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

1 See Wackernagel, I, p. 263.
in his first Prātiśākhya with the small śloka compilation which
is generally quoted as the Vedāṅga, the difference of old and
modern ślokas will at once be perceived.' ¹ As he has not
expressly laid down the criterion with which to distinguish
between the old and the new ślokas we cannot judge the strength
of his argument; but ślokas which he considered to be modern
in structure might well have been among those which we have
had to consider spurious. Whatever may be the fact, the
anuṣṭubh metre in which the reconstructed PŚ. has been
composed appears by no means younger in age than that in
which works like the Bṛhaddevatā (c. 400 B. C.) has been
composed.

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

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

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

1 mahatā prayatnena śabdam uccaranti vāyur nābher utthitaḥ urasi vistiryaḥ kaṇṭha 
vivartitaḥ mūrdhānam āhatya vaktre vicāraṇa vidvādān śabdān abhināyayati. PŚ. 3-4.
2 vitarkitāḥ purā buddhāḥ kucaidarthe nivesitaḥ 
karaṇebhya vistettanā dhaninā so‘ugṛhyate.
   v.l. karaṇebhyo vistettana is evidently due to confusion.
3 Durgā in his introduction to the Comm. of the Nirukta quotes PŚ. 3. from what he calls the V. dāṅga Śikṣā (see Nirukta in Bomb. Skt. Series, p. 24). The date of the author is about 1300 A.C. (Introduction to the Nirukta, by Sarup, p 59).
4 Max Møller, op. cit., p. 192.
5 Ed. Siomon, p. 42; Siddheshwar Varma, op. cit., p. 6.
6 tatra sarva-vedasūdhārāyāśīkṣā.....atha śīkṣām pravakṣyāmiḥ pañcakhandatāḥ
7 SS. p 60.
8 svarataḥ kālataḥ sthāna-prayatnānuprodānataḥ.
   svaradhyāś ca sā śīkṣā varṣānān pāṭha-śīkṣaṇāt.
29. In the absence of suitable data on the point we may explain this obscurity by the fact that the ancient Indians did not set any value on history as such, their only care being the Sāstra and not its authors or their dates. They however took notice of the most important fact about the PS. that it was a Vedāṅga and concerned all the Vedas.¹

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

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

¹ See notes above.
³ Hist. of Skt. Lit., Vol. I, Sec. I, p. 57; Sec. II, pp. 81, 114, 180, 137, 142, 154. South Indian Skt. MSS. very often interchange ḷ and ɬ without any principle. This probably points to the Dravidian origin of ḷ (vade Wackernagel, loc. cit.).
There seems to be another fact which goes in favour of the view presented above. As we have seen before (§ 25) that the Pr. has a theory of production of the speech-sounds (3-6). The (Taitt. Pr.) surely betrays an acquaintance with it. The acquaintance of the Vāj. Pr. is probably clearer. The Rk. Pr. (I, 18) too seems to have known this. It is not clear if the APr. knew of it. But the silence of the last work may well be explained by assuming that its author did not probably consider it necessary to include the theory in his sutras, for he might well have assumed a knowledge of it on the part of the readers.

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

1 उद्धि मदनम। करः मद्यामस। शिरमि तारस। (XXIII, 10-12. Whitney, XXIII. 10), See foot-note of § 28.

2 चष विषाधिति। सवन्नमनियोरङ्गमुन्थुत्वादी (I, 29-30). By Śikṣā Kātyāyana seems to mean the Pr.

3 कर्णारार: प्रयमप्रकर्षि च हादा राप्षिः चिरिति जर्जरी (I, 18).

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

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

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

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

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

---

1 The Varṇa-sūtras have been given in the Appendix. Dr. Paul Thieme seems to disbelieve that the Pāñini's Sikṣā of Dr. Raghu Vira was quoted by Pāññijali (see op. cit., p. 56)
2 Non-existence of any MS. of the DPS. has also raised a doubt in the mind of Dr. Paul Thieme as regards the authorship of the work (ibid.).
3 J R A S, 1931, pp. 663 ff.
the fourteen sections of the Vedāṅga Prakāśa, a grammar which Svāmī Dayānanda compiled for the use of the Vedic students. It is probably due to inadvertence that Dr. Raghu Vira did not mention this fact in his article. The different sections of the Vedāṅga Prakāśa including the first one have also been issued separately. The first of these sections bears the title of the Varṇoc-cāraṇa-Śikṣā by Pāṇini. This sūtra-work as has been shown by Dr. Raghu Vira (loc. cit.) resembles the Varṇa-sūtras of Candragomin, the Buddhist grammarian, who flourished about 500 A.C.\(^1\) Considering the great influence which Candragomin exercised on the grammarians of Pāṇini’s school (the Kāśikā and the Vākyapadiya showing traces of such influence) it is quite possible that some late grammarian re-edited and amplified the Varṇa-sūtras of Candragomin and fathered this upon Pāṇini, evidently for imparting to it a superior authority. Though there is no sufficient material to prove this we are inclined to suggest that this late grammarian was Svāmī Dayānanda himself who, among other things was a very close student of Sanskrit grammars as his Vedāṅgaprakāśa and the edition of Pāṇini’s Aṣṭā-dhyāyī show. But whatever may be the actual fact about the authorship of the DPS., it is sure that the work is neither from the hands of Pāṇini nor an old one.\(^2\)

33. Its Author. Now if we are sure about the fact that the PS. is the real Vedāṅga Śikṣā we shall have to take up the problem of its authorship. Though the work has probably been drawn upon by very old authors\(^3\) its author has not been

---

1. This date is assigned by S. R. Belvalkar (Systems of Skt. Grammars, p. 58). Dr. Siddheshwar Varma places C. in the 7th century (See his Critical Studies, p. 8) at the latest.

2. Dr. Paul Thieme with a somewhat different line of argument disallows the genuineness of Pāṇini’s Phonetic Sūtras discovered by Dr. Raghu Vira (see his Pāṇini and the Veda, p 88). We do not agree with him on all points.

3. Dr. Paul Thieme thinks that if Patañjali knew the PS. as Pāṇini’s work, he would have referred to it ‘in unambiguous terms’ and would have treated it with the same respect as Pāṇini’s grammar (p. 88). Hence, as the PS. has not been referred to by Patañjali, one may according to Dr. Thieme reject its relation with Pāṇini. But it would be a mistake to place too much confidence on the argument of silence, which may be otherwise explained.
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mentioned till very late (see § 28). The earliest evidence about the existence of the complete work is perhaps the Agni Purāṇa which is usually placed in the 800 A.C. But it does not refer to Pāṇini as the author of the Śikṣā though in case of the metrical version of Piṅgalā’s prosody the source has been mentioned (see Notes on 1). This can well be taken to mean that to the compiler of the Agni Purāṇa the authorship of the PS. was not known. But we have seen before (§ 29) that Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in the 15th century in no unambiguous terms considers Pāṇini to be the author of this Śikṣā though the Śikṣā-Prakāśa, a commentary to the PS. which is possibly earlier (c. 1200 A.C.) than Madhusūdana, ascribes the latter work to Piṅgalā. Thus the problem of the authorship of the PS. with its late and mutually conflicting data seems to possess no dependable means for its solution. But we need not feel hopeless in the matter. External evidence failing we turn to the PS. itself and find some important hints which are being discussed below.

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


² The Aṣṭādhāyī treats of svāra in chapters VI (1. 58-2, 199) and VIII (1. 27-71) and in many other places. The mātrā has been treated in chapter VI (3. 111, 138) and the samhitā in Chapters VI (1. 72 f and 3. 114 f) and VIII (3. 1-4; 43-49).
among the six branches of the Śikṣā or phonetics. Can there be a better evidence of Pāṇini’s masterly knowledge of phonetics? But this evidence alone is not sufficient to identify Pāṇini with the author of the PS. What we may gather from the above is that of the two names Pāṇini and Pingala proposed for the authorship of the PS. the case for the former is stronger.

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

(i) In the PS. Pāṇinian Pratyāhāras, such as ac, car, ghaś, yan, jaś, sar, hal, have been requisitioned.

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

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

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

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

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

¹ Pāṇini’s Śikṣā brought to light by Dr. Raghu Vira lacks similar facts, hence Dr. Paul Tīsne rightly rejects the genuineness of the work (see op. cit., p. 86),
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seen before (§33 a) treated svara, mātrā and santāna (saṃhitā) in his grammar. Of the remaining three branches balā and sāma can scarcely be the fit subject of a theoretical treatise. Hence varṇa (speech-sounds) alone was left without treatment in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Now Pāṇini, who undertook to build up his great Sabdānuśāsana, the Vyākaraṇa-Vedāṅga,¹ could not very naturally think of leaving varṇa without any treatment. This is probably the reason why he wrote the Pāṇini which is as it were a companion to his famous grammar.

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

35. Now this being practically certain that the Pāṇini as re-constructed here, is from the hands of Pāṇini we get some rough idea about the age of the work. But as the Pāṇini seems to offer some fresh data for this purpose we shall discuss below various points of view on Pāṇini’s age and try to suggest some time in which the great Indian grammarian was likely to have flourished. Pāṇini has variously been placed between 800 B.C.-400 B.C.² The view of those who hold that Pāṇini should be placed in about 350 B.C. should be considered first.³ Their main argument against an earlier date is the fact that Pāṇini

¹ Winternitz does not admit (Hist. of Ind. Lit., Vol. III, p. 888) that the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini is a Vedāṅga, but this is against the traditional Indian view. Madhusūdana in his Prasthāṇabheda writes वदेशाय सिद्धनिष्ठाधिक वेदाया भाषाविनिष्ठाधिकारी (ed. Weber, pp. 16-17). In the introduction to the Siddhānta Kaumudi (ed. Venkatesvar, Bombay, 1914) Mahānāhopādhyāya Pandit Shivadatta Shastri discusses the claim of all extant Vyākaraṇas for Vedāṅgatva and concludes पारंपरियत्वाहारपन्थ वेदाण्गत्वपरशु शास्त्र (pp. 8-9).


Dr. Paul Thieme very rightly characterizes the use of this date as ‘due to a common but wholly unproved belief’ (op. cit., p. 88).
used the word *yavana* which they think could not have entered India before Alexander's invasion. But this argument has been very ably refuted by Professors S. K. Belvākar and H. Sköld —Belvākar, Systems of Skt. grammar, pp. 15 ff.; Sköld, Papers on Pāṇini, pp. 24 ff.). The latter has shown very conclusively "that old Indian *yavana* must have entered this language before 520 B.C., and there is no reason at all to locate Pāṇini as late as after Alexander the Great on account of the here-quoted sūtra." "Moreover Prof. Liebich has proved that Pāṇini's rules apply to the language of the Brāhmaṇas, some obsolete (perhaps archaic) forms only separating his language from that of the Brāhmaṇas (Papers on Pāṇini, p. 38)." On the basis of this finding of Prof. Liebich, Prof Sköld thinks that Pāṇini must have belonged to the latter Vedic period of the Indian literature (loc. cit.). Prof. Liebich however is not willing to assign Pāṇini to a period before Buddha (Pāṇini, p. 8; Winternitz, Vol. III, p. 383). But he seems to have been over-cautious in the matter. For he himself admits, according to Prof. Sköld, that Pāṇini seems to be less lax than that of the Sūtras (op. cit., p. 41.)¹ Prof. Sköld concludes on the basis of this view of Prof. Liebich that we could be inclined to place Pāṇini in a period shortly preceding the Sūtra literature proper (loc. cit.) Now the sūtra works which are considered to be among the oldest have been placed in 500 B.C. (Macdonell, India's Past, p. 136).

36. From the above discussion it appears that Pāṇini was most probably earlier than 500 B.C. And there seems to be other facts too which seem to corroborate this view. For example the Aṣṭādhyāyī which mentions the Brāhmaṇa literature no less than four times (II. 3. 60; IV. 7. 66, 3. 103; V. 1. 62) and distinguishes between the old and the new Brāhmaṇas, does not refer to the Āranyaka literature though the word 'āranyaka'

¹ Keith on the doubtful authority of Pāṇini, VI. 1, 157, concludes that the grammarian knew Pāraskara the sūtrakāra. His views about Pāṇini's acquaintance with Kātyāyana the Śrautaśāstraṅkāra, and the Kauśika sūtrakāra also seems to be inadmissible. (Translation of the Yajurveda, p. clix.)
in the sense of 'forest dweller' has once (IV. 1. 1:29) been mentioned. That Kātyāyana composed a Vārttika to extend the use of the word 'araṇyaka' to an adhyāya (most probably of the Brāhmaṇa) may be taken to mean that in Pāṇini's time the Araṇyaka appendices to the Brāhmaṇas were not yet written or even if they might have been written they were not styled as the Araṇyakas. Now accepting the second alternative as being more likely we can place Pāṇini at the close of the Brāhmaṇa period. Along with this we should mark another fact, viz., the non-occurrence of the word 'upaniṣad' in the sense of 'secret instructions' and religio-philosophical texts containing them in Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī (Pāṇini, I. 4. 79, indeed has the word 'upaniṣad' in the compound upaniṣatākrtvā) which literally means 'sitting very close to', i.e., in a private manner. Now we may well conclude that the Araṇyakas which contain Upaniṣads were not old at the time of Pāṇini, for they were not yet known as Araṇyakas or Upaniṣads. Now the oldest among the Upaniṣads are considered to have been compiled about 500 B.C. Hence we should not place Pāṇini later than 500 B.C. It is likely that Pāṇini lived some time earlier than this. The diphthongal character of e and o which Pāṇini has recorded in his Sikṣā (13) shows that the language described by him was in the same stage of evolution as the Old Persian of the Cuneiform Inscriptions (600 B.C.) of Persepolis. For this latter language too has diphthongs corresponding to our e and o (see Meillet, Grammaire du Vieux Perse, pp. 55 ff.). As we have no Old Persian Sikṣā we do not know what the actual phonetic value of diphthongs ai (Skt. e) and au (Skt. o) was. It is likely that the graphic system was ahead of the phonetic development. The fact that Pāṇini has

1 Deussen, Philosophy of Upanishads, pp. 10-15. Dasgupta, History of Indian Philosophy, p. 38.
2 Cf. Keith, Tr. of Yajurveda, HOS., p. clxvii.
3 Dasgupta, op. cit., p. 39.
4 Dr. Paul Thieme seems to support such a conclusion in his following remark: "Pāṇini's grammar must have been composed at a time when the language of the North was yet felt to be necessary" (op. cit., p. 51).
given rules in his grammar of the proper accentuation of the bhāṣā words (VI. 1. 181, vibhāṣā bhāṣāyām; VIII. 2.98, Pūrvam tu bhaṣāyām) shows that the current language of his time was much ahead of the classical Sanskrit (which has lost its accents) and was nearer the Vedic phase (though in its very late form) of the Old Indo-Aryan than the latter. In addition to this we should also reckon the fact that Pāṇini's grammar was originally accented like a Mantra or Brāhmaṇa text (vide ante § 26) and as such it should be assigned at the latest to the close of the period of the Brāhmaṇas.
COMMENTARIES TO THE PŚ.

37. The Sikṣā Pañjikā. The MSS. and the printed text from which the present edition has been re-constructed have been described before (§ 26) in connexion with the text of the Pāj. recension of the PŚ. We are now giving below the main features of the commentary reconstructed. The Pāj. recension of the PŚ, as we have seen before (§ 26) came into existence between 800 and 1100 A.C. Hence the Pañjikā itself may be tentatively placed somewhere in the 12th century. Thus the work which may be as old as seven centuries is sure to contain some old materials. Some of these, such as a reference to Audavraji, has already been pointed out (§ 2b). These materials will be discussed below. According to the Pañjikā, the Sikṣā is the science by which the pronunciation of speech-sounds is learnt (Sikṣyate'nayā varṇoccāraṇam iti Sikṣā, p.8, lines 3-4). This is to be compared with the term varṇaśikṣā occurring in the RPr. (XIV. 30). It is not possible that the author of this work has referred by this term to Prātiśākhya and this being the case varṇaśikṣā relates to the Sikṣā of the early period when it still lacked the later elaboration as observed in the Prātiśākhya (see §§ 16, 23). Hence the RPr. has scarcely any legitimate claim to interpret this word as 'Prātiśākhya', which must have existed considerably earlier than the time when the RPr. was compiled. The Pañjikā in the definition of Sikṣā quoted above seems to have preserved this tradition which agreed so well with the fact that the PŚ. deals merely with the utterance of the speech-sounds of the Old Indo-Aryan as represented in Vedic texts. Besides this it gives us rare informations on the following points:

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

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

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

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

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

\[1\] The corruption is most palpable in the passage at p. 23, lines 22 ff.
(a) It ascribes the authorship of the PS. to Pîngala, the younger brother of Pânini (see p. 23, line 7). The authenticity of this information has been discussed before (§23).

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

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

(d) This commentary ascribes to the Brhaddevata of Śaunaka the following couplet: svaro vargo' ksaraṁ mātraṁ viniyogārtham (?) eva ca, mantraṁ jijñāsāmānena veditavyam pade pade (p. 24, lines 6-7).

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

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

अयोगवाहः: च: दृति विसर्जनीयः। दृति जिद्धास्तूलीयः, △ दृति उपासानीयः।
पं इववृत्तारः नासिकः। इवयोगवाहः।।

This passage occurs in the first Prapāṭhaka of the Rktantra (ed. S. Sastri, p. 2, ll. 11-12) with the difference that the latter reads हुमित्वनासिकः (v.l. हिंत्वनासिकम्, ओनासिकः). In view of the fact that the Rktantra mentions अववृत्तारो not much later, and अववृत्तार as one of the Ayogavāhas, it is evident that the extant Rktantra is corrupt in the passage हुमित्वनास्तिकः. The reading पं इववृत्तारः नासिकः surely goes to the Ur-text of the Audavraji¹ which must have been partially included in his work by the author² or the Vṛttikāra or the Rktantra.

¹ But some of the other quotations in the Pañjikā from Audavraji are corrupt. (See below.)
² Audavraji who has been mentioned in the sūtra 60 of the Rktantra can scarcely be its author. The first Prapāṭhaka which is not counted as an integral part of the Rktantra by the MS. B was in all likelihood a part of the original work of Audavraji (see ed. S. Sastri, Introduction, p. 84).
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40. Thus it appears that the author of the Pañjikā flourished at a time when the original work of Audavraji was still available in a more or less correct form and in fact he may be older than the Vṛttikāra of the Rktantra who appears by no means to be modern. Thus apart from offering a help in solving certain problems connected with the text of the Ps. (see Note) the Sikṣā-Pañjikā has importance on account of the information it gives about Audavraji, who has been mentioned, as far as we know, in four other works:—the Nāradīya Sikṣā (II. S. 5) and the Sikṣā-Frakāsa commentary to the Ps. and the Vamśa Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma Veda (Ind. Stud. IV, pp. 374-386) and the Rktantra (S. 60).¹

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

(a) Occurring in full.

i. धन्वन्तरसंवृत्ती सचे यम्: पूर्वगुणः: (RT. 2. 14).

ii. यथे करणं स्थग्नानम् दु:स्वाभावम्:खानाम् (RT. 3. 1).

iii. गहुवाकों च चाँ द्वनुवाकों, धाकहोजों दीवाजळो वर्णः: (RT. 2. 14. 15).

(b) Occurring with different readings.

i. ही नादांतुपदानि (cf. RT. 3. 3. नादांतुपदानि:) The correct reading seems to have been ही नादांतुपदानि।

ii. सचं वर्गस स्थग्नानम् च ब्रह्मम्। वर्गस प्रह्णं स्थानिचिन्तित:अः; cf. सचं गंधं (३३ वर्गस) प्रह्णं विशेषम्। स्थानिचिन्तित: (RT. 7. 1-2)

The RT. reading seems to be correct.

iii. पवयोगवाहः: अः इति विस्तरोपित: त इति जिज्ञासूनीयं त्य इति उपाख्यायं च इत्तंतुराः। नालिक्यं: इत्ययोगवाहः: (Diff. with RT. shown above).

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

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

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

1 Uvaṭa (on VPr. I. 73) is right so far in his analysis of ai and au, a-element of both being taken as equivalent to a matrī, but his remark चंदनी प्रीती पक्षीरी वाच्याती is not clear and the view of unnamed authority (kecid) quoted by him is misleading.
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This gives us the upper limit to the Prakāśa; the lower limit is to be had from the author's conjectural identity with the commentator of the Pingalacchandah-Sūtras. This is 1300 A.C.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hemistiche.</th>
<th>Rk recension</th>
<th>Yaj. recension</th>
<th>Phk recension</th>
<th>Phj recension</th>
<th>Ap recension</th>
<th>Reconstructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atha śikṣaṃ etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śāstrānu-pūrṇyaṃ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prasiddham api</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punar vyakti-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triṣaṣṭiḥ caṭuṣṭ-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cf 1</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prākṛte Sanskrita</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarā vipāsatir</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yādayā ca</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāro visargaḥ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duḥṣprṛṣṭā cāṭi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ātmā buddhāya</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manaḥ kāyānīm</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārutas tārasi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prātast-savanayogānṛ</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaṇṭhe mādhyaṇ-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tārāṃ tārtiyasavanaphṛ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saviṇḍra mūrdhna-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varṇāṇ janayate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarataḥ kālataḥ</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iti varpa-vidāḥ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udāttaś cānudāttaś</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemistiches</td>
<td>Rāk recension</td>
<td>Yaś recension</td>
<td>Pit. recension</td>
<td>Pit. recension</td>
<td>AP. recension</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrasvo dirghaḥ etc.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udātte niśadā-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarita-prabhava</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aṣṭau sāhānānī</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmūlam ca</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obhāva ca</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>*27</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmūlam upadhma</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>*28</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yady obhāva</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarāntam</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhaktarap pāncamair</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anrasayam tamp</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāṇṭhyāv abhā vicu</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayūr mūrdhanvā</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmule tu</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e si tu kāṇṭha-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ardhamātrā tu</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aṅgokāraukārayor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upadhāmiyā uṣmā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samvṛtamp mātrkaṇṇ</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghaoṣa vā samvṛtāḥ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarāṇām uṣmānāṁ</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tebhāyo' pī vīrtāv</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāra-yamānāṁ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayogavāhayā vīnāyā</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alābu-vīra-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāras-tu</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāra vīrtīyān</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dvir oṣṭhau tu</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vyāghri yathā</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhātā patañabhedā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yathā saurasrīkā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaṃ rāha</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rāga-varṇāṃ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirgha-varṇāṃ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hṛdaye caika-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāśīhāyāṃ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hṛdayē utkāte</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārdavaṃ ca dvimātraṃ,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saṃdhye tu kampayet</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarṣagam kampayet</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaṃ varṇāḥ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saṃyag-varṇā-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhyāsaṭṭhe durtāṃ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śīvāṃ opadesāṭṭhe</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gṛtī gṛghri</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antarthaśo' lipa-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mādhuryam akṣara-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chāryam laya-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saṅkitāṃ bhātām</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kākasvarāṃ śirasāgāṃ</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uvāmo-dāgaṭām</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niśpāṣṭaṃ grātā-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prāṭiḥ pathen</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mādhyandine</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>१</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. संस्कृत सूलम् (The Reconstructed Text)

[ वर्णसमान्यायः ]

[ अ द्र उ ग। क ल झ। ए ओ ड। ऐ ओ घ। ह व र। ल झ। ओ म ड ख न झ। भ भ ड। घ ठ थ घ। ज ब ग ड द श। ख फ क ठ घ च ठ त व। क प घ। घ घ स र। ह ल। ]

[ वर्णसंख्या ]

खरा विंशतिरिक्ष्य स्पर्शनां प्रारंभति।
वाद्यस्य स्मृत ता हस्ती चलवारस् यमा: स्मृत ता:॥१॥
चनुकारो विशेषं कर। पी चापि पराश्रयो।
श्रुष्टेष्विति विस्मेयो खरारः स्मृत एव च ॥२॥

[ वर्णविभागः ]

चात्मा बुद्धा समेत्यार्थान् मनो युक्ते विवचया।
मनः कायामृतमाहत्वम् स प्रेरयति मास्तमु दृश्ये।
मामत्तलूर्षसि चरणू मन्द्रं जनयति खरम्।
प्रातः सत्त्वयोगं तं कन्द्रो गायत्रमाहितम् ॥३॥
पारिनोय-ग्रिः
करणे माध्यन्त्रिनयुगं मध्यमं वैद्यभानुगम्।
तारं तारलोकस्वानं शरीरं जागतानुगम्।५॥
सोद्रींनो सूर्यां ग्रहे सिद्धं वनस्पत्य भावतः।
वर्षार्ज्जुर्ज संयतः तेषां विभाग: पञ्चधा चूर्तः।६॥
स्वरं कालं: स्थानं प्रयत्नानुवक्तः।
इति वर्षविदः: प्राणिनिपुष्पं तं निवृत्तं।७॥

[ स्वरवं काश्यपस: ]
उदात्तयानुदात्त स्वरितं स्वरस्य:।
ऋषिः: द्रैवः: मु: त इति कालं: तिमां चचिः।८॥

[ ज्वारश्रय-श्यानानि ]
चष्टीं श्यानानि वर्षानामुर: करणे: शिरस्तथा।
जिन्दामूलं च: दुनाश्च नासिकोऽह च तालु च।६॥
हकारं च: यशवन्तमानं: श्यामिष्य संयुतम्।
श्रीरं तं विज्ञानीयत: कहितमाहुरसंयुतम्।१०॥
कान्हावहारविवेद्यमानोऽपातः ब्रोऽजालुपु॥
सुर्मूखनव्या मटुरप्रश्च दल्खा चतुरसः: सृüt:।११॥
जिन्दामूली तु कू: प्रतो तांकसृहोऽव: सृृतो वुः।
ए: ऐ: तु कन्ठतालव्या चो ची कर्णोऽहाँ सृृतो।१२॥
शर्माभास: तु कन्ठस्य एकारीकायोभवेत्।
एकारीकायोभोमात: तयाविविहतसंहतम्।१३॥
चनुकारयवमानं च नासिकायानमुच्छति।
उपशानीय ऊप्राः: च: जिन्दामूलीयानासिकी।१४॥
संस्क्रतं मूलम्

चयोगवाहा विलेया चाचययस्यानभागिन्।
चलावतीशानिनिधीपीतदनमूल्यः स्वरानु ॥१५॥
चनुमस्तु कर्त्यो निल्यं जोः शपसेषु च।

[ प्रयज-भेदः ]

चचोरपिष्ठा यशोविष्णुमेषपिष्ठा। शल: समूदा: ॥१६॥
शेषा: सुष्ठा हल: प्रोक्ता

[ यवनयान-भेदः ]

निबोधानुप्रदानम्।

अनोपनासिका नखो नाहिं नानिनो हस्यः समूदा: ॥१७॥
इंशनाद्वा यथो जस्य प्रासिनस्तु कथाद्यः।
इंशच्रासांशरो विद्यादू गोर्धमैतलं प्रचति ॥१७॥

*
II. चन्द्रनुपरमाणवान्त (The Agni-Purāṇa Recension)

कच्चे १शीचां विघटतः स्वरूपाण या २चतुरविचितः।
खंरा विशालरीतिक्ष्य स्मरणां पद्मविग्नितः।

|| 11II याद्यः सुमृता झाड़ी चलायरः ३यमा: समृता:।
चनुवारः विसर्गाः ४× कृपाँ चापि ५पराशिती।

|| 12II दुःख्यातिः ६विनयीः ७खारः मृत एव च।
८हृदारं पद्ममेयतममतः क्षणिग्य संयुतं।

|| 13II चौरस्कं तं विजानीयात्रः कष्टमागुर्समुत्तम।
चामा तुषारा समेल्यार्यन् १०भनो तुषारे विचारया।

|| 14II मनः कायामिमांसिः स प्रेयति माहलम।
माहलसरसि चरन् ११मन्द्र स्नायति खरम्।

|| 14II १९प्रातः समन्योगं तं कन्टो गायलामातितम।
कन्टे १२माध्यन्तिनयुगं सत्यमं वै द्विभानुगम।

4. M. दैवी for कवी। 5. M. पराशिती।
6. M. विघटतः। 7. MPbc. खारः।
8. In all MSS. after 3a occurs the following: रक्षा चे चरं बोधः खारः पथर्यवृत्ति।
   चन्द्रारथिः सनायकः बौरः कस्तं एव स:।
   For रक्षा चे चरं Pao read बखः हूशितचारः and
   for शोभा खारः Pbc read रोमकारः, and for कस्तं एव स: Pbc has कस्त ए रवः।
15. तारं तारीयसवनं शीर्षं जागतानुगम।
16. सोट्रीणं मूर्तं भिन्नतिं वाक्मापयं मानतं।
17. वर्षायो जनयते ते ते विभागं पञ्चक्षा समूत।
18. खरतं कालतं स्थानं अप्रवन्यं उपद्यातं।
19. उदात्तश्चायुद्धश्च सरितश्च खराघय।
20. यथो दौर्यं सुतं इति कालतो निधमा चाच्च।
21. चत्वारी योगानि वर्णानामूर्तं क्रमं ग्यर्षया।
22. जित्त्वमूलं दृष्टाद्य नासिकोऽथ च तालु च।

3. श्रीभावन्तः विनित्तिं मथ्सा रेव एव च।
   जित्त्वमूलं उपपा च गतिरत्विचोविषयं।
   यथोभावप्रस्वालम् उकारादिपरं पदं।
   सरारं ताक्ष्यं विवादं यदन्यंहरात्तैः।
4. 'अत्तिरिक्तानं दृष्टां अपवर्णं च भवितम्।
   5. न स्वर्गवानं मोक्षापि पापाभिरं धन्विषयं।
   सुनीर्देरं लुकृतं प्रधानं ब्रह्मा 7श्रावीं।
6. न करारीं न लभो हो नावः। नावः नानात्तिकं।
   8. गहरं बहुजितं न वर्षानु वस्त्तेकित।
7. एवं वर्षां: प्रयोक्त्या नावः। नावः नातीपिविदित।
   सम्भवायं ग्यर्षया भवलोकों महीयते।

1. P. प्रवाहःप्रदानं।
2. M. 'विषम।
3. M. समानवं विनित्तिं and P. चतुर्वारी विनित्तिं for चोभावं विनित्तिं।
4. M. 'तीर्थद्।
5. P. reads एकायुष्यत्वं पापस्वायुष्यत्वं श्रमं च, instead of 13b (न तस्य पाठं etc.)
   and M. एकायुष्यत्वं...इति।
6. M. नाभायं।
7. M. राजसम।
8. Pbdg give this couplet preceded by वथा आयी चरेर् पुनानुं। दंश्चायं। न च
   प्रेक्षियं।—(Yajus. 20a). P. gives 17b-18a as its 18, and 19b-20a as its 20.
पाशिनियं-गिंत्या

1 कष्ठार्थविचुयशालावया चोढजावपुर ।

11 सुरेर्वद्यां कुटुर्या दन्त्या चतुलसा: स्रूताः ॥१७॥

बिन्दांत्रैहुतुः कु: प्रीता इन्न्वोढ़रो तः स्रूतो तुः ।

12 ए ऐ तु ॥२ कष्ठताला व्यवोधी कष्टोढली स्रूती ॥१८॥

13 चहुमात्रा तु ॥३ कष्ठस्स्य एकारैकारयो भवेत् ।

14 चतागुव्हा विछिया चाष्या अवारम्भानमिन: ॥१५॥

15 चोधोसस्सृता यश्नावीप्रस्समस्सृता: ॥५ शल: ॥

16 शेषा: स्सृता हुल: प्रीता ॥निवियानुप्रदानव: ॥२०॥

17 चहोसुवासिस्सा नन्दी नादिनोम भवघ: स्रूताः ।

18 इष्वस्स धादा ॥नन्दी जस्स प्रासिन्स्स ॥कादाद्य: ॥

19 इष्वस्स चासांस्सरे विद्याद्ध गोर्धमितत् प्रचंचते ॥२१॥

1. P. कष्ठार्थविचुयशालावया.
2. P. "तालवा ए शी.
3. MV. कष्ठा खादिकारीवारः.
4. P. नमा: (स) खृष्टा: and M. नौ ना: खृष्टा: for नैस्सूर्दा:.
5. MV. शर: for शल:.
6. PM. निवियानुप्रदानव: for निवियानुप्रदानव:.
7. M. नन्दीसुवासिस्सा नन्दी नादिनोम भवघ: स्रूताः.
8. P. तम्बैव, M. यव (२) यद्य..
9. M. इष्वमा:
10. P. इष्वस्सादा.
III. पत्तिका-सहिता (With the Pañjikā)

*अयश शिल्ला प्रवच्यामि पश्चिनीयं मतं यथा।
श्रास्तानुप्रवृत्ती तद्विषाण्ड यथोऽत लिखवेद्योऽ॥१॥

"पातु वो निकायाबाबा मतिनाम् सरक्तो।
प्राक्तिरपरिच्छिन्ने वसासैव करोति वा॥
हल्लेवालयङ्कः "मित्तनीन् चूर्णिमिः।
शिल्ला न विषमता यथासांतर्पत्ता विवृत्पथसम्॥

श्य शिल्ला चां प्र व ध्या मे से ति। प्रवचनः यमनन्त्रेऽ।
वेदायणान्तरराघः पाठः। किं कारणमुः? "भड़को वेदोङ्के तथा।' दृति झरणात्। तत्र ६ च शिल्ला
प्रवचनम्, अवमश्र्यदेवश्र्यानात्। सा ६ च बङ्केक्य इत्यादियश्र्यानात् ३वचयः। एतेकैव ६ चिके वेदोङ्के
ध्यानान्त्रेऽ आवकर्णादियश्र्यानात् एव नासीध्यते। केषुभिचतु नासीध्यते दृति चेतु। "ध्यात्वसिगिराः।
"ध्येतस्य समामेमस्य इत्येक्षमादिकू नेष दीः।
निम्यान्त्रेः सः, १० शिल्लान्तः तल्य एवाध्येत्तथो नासीध्यान्तः। मक्खाः वा।
श्राधे सम्बन्धाभिषेकः योजनानि वत्सालानि। तत्र १२ नामेव मेभमो यथात्वादेवकालः
भावः। १२निम्यांभिषेक बहुः बहुक्ष्यिनिः। अभविक्षेयं तु स्वयमेव क्रमति——वाच
ष्ठार्थां विविधिम् दृति। प्रयोजनं सम्बंधानुवाचारैश्च। प्रयोजनमन्यूनति यथेव एव——
पारिनीय-मिथिक

**प्रसिद्धमपि शब्दार्थमविचारातमवुद्धिमः।**
पुनर्वितीकरिष्यामि वाच उच्चारणो विधिम्॥२॥

"एकोपि वर्णः सत्म्कः प्रवुचः, स्त्रूङ्गे लोचे कामधुन्धः भवति" द्वितीय। शब्दस्वरूपन्या
वर्णोधिशमिति शिष्या, ततो प्रकरण्यो वचारमि कथविष्यामि। पा शि नी यं म तं
ए ति। पारिनीयमिति 'द्वारः' (पा. ४.२.१२१) द्विति क्रिययः। तत्त्वेदिनिधिष्ठिनः।
म तः सि ति। "मन धानी' पारिनीयं सतं धानं यथा तथा
प्रवचारमिति तैरव प्रवछारास्तुदैव 'परिवारः बचोहृष्टः रथादि
' बचोहृष्टावर्षी चालयः' (पा. १.१.५६६) द्विति’ 'वचारावर्षी कुंवरयः।' द्विति च।
'तथावर्षी' तस्तानुवर्षी च मर्याधिश्वरात्मा च विशार्दिर्वर्षी वर्षायथे। भूमिकायः' (पा. ४.२.१२२)
द्विति। तनु व्यक्तिः श्रव्यत्रित्वा, चत्वारिः। द्विति। ततथा
व्यक्तिः नीव सिद्धिवादित्वमनास्यम्। सत्म्कः। द्वन्द्वः। श्रव्यत्रित्वा, किन्तु व्यक्तिः
एतत्त्विपरः। गोपालः। श्रव्यात्रिश्वरात्मा चालियः। इति तु गोपाली विद्धायुनिषेधिसाधयितव
र्यः। श्रावः। तस्य तत्र यथा तद्ध तत्र द्विति। श्रावः। भावः। तस्य
इत्युत्तिष्ठीत्वा। अनपुरंस्यसि वस्तुत्वेऽकः। तद्विति पारिनीयमत्परामः।
"तत्
पारिनामस्य महात्मेऽवाचायापि विचाराक्षाश्चास्मात्मापूर्वः।" विचारः। बस्तीपर्यंतः जानीयात्।
पारिनीयमत्तस्य यद्यात्मापूर्वः। यो गुस्वैवकः। स एवावशेषः। चत्वारिः।
तथा च वच्चति।
'श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः। श्रावः।
तथा च भाषायात्। "अ एव भूमिकः। श्रावः। एव वैशिकः। एव चैत्यायात्।।" कृत्य्यः॥१॥

नववाक्यहरू वर्षण समानात्माभिर्वाच्यायं त्वरस्मानिर्ज्ञानाकालः। किमयः
श्रावः। इवाय प्रश्नः।

15. भि शि च भि ति। चिदबिष्मबुद्धिविनः। प्रसिद्धमपि शब्दार्थमविचारात्मा १६सनं
1. HILB एको वर्णः।
2. A² adds च।
3. H नव वाचः।
4. A¹A² शारीर परिभाषा।
5. B adds च।
6. A¹ "बादबादद्वितीयम।
7. A¹ add एव।
8. HLA² omit तत् पारिनीयः... जानीयात्।
9. B द्विति for इत्यर्थः।
10. A² वचनर्मियः।
11. A² भाषायात्।
12. HLV विषम्यः।
13. A¹ परस्पर निर्ज्ञानाकालः।
14. HLA¹ किमयः (?).
15. BA¹ quote the entire sloka २।
16. A¹A² सनं for चत्वारिः।
पञ्चिका-संहिता

*चियपिस्मतः प्रस्तर्वो वर्षः सम्भवते मातः।
प्राक्ते संस्कृते चापि संयं प्रोत्तः क्षरंभुवः॥२॥
क्षर विशेषतिरेकय स्मार्यानां पश्चविश्लेषितः।
॥४॥

याद्यथा समृता चतुर्दी चलाष्ठि यमः; समृताः॥५॥

पुनः पश्चाद्व वलीकरिष्णाम स्वतंत्रिकरिष्णाम। किम् ? वाच उवाचरे विकिष्ट, वाचो गिरसः। उच्यारे "विविधो विविधो विविधानम्। न नियन्त्रितामप्रातो इति सर्वते, न चालायन्तमप्राति। उलं च अवधारयो वर्षः; क्षरानिनिर्गोचरायन्ते इति। उच्यो यथापि क्षरानिनिष्टाः उच्यारन्ते तथाप्रामाणं।" कथनीयोतिषोदुः प्रदानादि, एतद्विभो विचारिद्।॥२॥

वागुवीययाय वर्षः किर्योति, कहि तुम्हाणस्ते इत्यत आदं

तिः स द्वा तु हः स्पष्टेन सः ति। सम्भवत इति सम्भवे। सकाशायता जाताः।।

वर्षः कह्योति। आद "यथोऽतः वलीकरिष्णे" इल्हुकम्। तत्र किं लोके संस्कृत-विषया तथा वर्षः उत्त संवाराष्ट्रिया स्तवायाप्राक्ते संस्कृते चापित। चित्र-शब्दार्थसंस्कृतदिशिशं वर्षः: सम्भभुताणामः संतः तेविषयः। यस थं ग्रह ता: सम्भव-भु वे ति। भर्त्तः ९थमेववाद्यथे प्रकर्षणोक्ष्चारिता:॥५॥

कथं ते विषयः कथं वा ९चतुः प्रस्तर्विरामवर्गः

क्षर रा वि नां ति रे क ज रे ति।।

क्षर इति। क्षरूः "शरीयापतयायो" सर्वं शरीयान्तस्मी शरीयानि संवै च वचस्मिती क्षरेन चुम्बिन्तः। कथं ते१० एकविषयः। ११ततश्चुत्रो शरान् मया यथाप्रतं यथास्वति विश्लेषीयोम्। यथ २ उ त्र एति चहारे वाक्षरयूः नित्तेदिनेन वाक्षरं। चित्रार्थ द्वीपन्यायों न सन्तीति भार्यानां वशस्मातृ एवोपद्धतयाः १२तं अत एति वर्योद्यम। ए ऐ भी श्री सम्भवराणि, सम्भवराणाम्रपि शशास्त्र न सन्तीति भार्यानां

1. A¹A² निर्देश्याक्षरे, 2. B om, वलिषेवे 3. A¹ adds कध.
4. H प्रदानान्तः 5. A¹ पदार्थाय शब्दे and A². पदार्थाय विविधान: for एतद्विभो विचारिद्.
6. LA¹A² add च before this. 7. C द्रष्ट for द्वर्प].
11. A¹A² omit this word; before this I तत्; शरानेन 12. A¹ व for चतुः
पारिवन्य-भिष्णु

dīvānīṣrūta eva bhūkhyo 'tatt etatētīlī pūrvāṅgopādgyāmih: śāhelādvibhāyati: | sṛṣṭi शरीरम् ना य च-विं श ति:। कादयो मावसाना: स्मरो:। जिह्वामृततातुमुद्देरवंचिदिधिमः॥ परसपरं स्वभावमिस्मिष्या भारिविन्यासोऽत्तुतित स्मरोः। 'पूर्ववेदीविश्वास सर्व वधारित्यन। या द य च स्रृ ता च स्र्त द्रष्टा वि ति। यकारादशकार चस्त्रयैं च र ल व श य च हा द्रष्ट।॥ पचस पाठाचार्योऽरवऽस्यं चस्त्र:॥ उपरितना जग्याण:। द्वारवेण्या वर्तचारारित्य। सऽण चतुःपन्नायात्। च ला र क य य य मा: स्रृ ता द्रष्ट। 'यक्तीति यमः॥ स्मर-भववोपरस्तः॥ के ते यमा:। लोके कु ंबं गँगम् वं द्रष्ट।॥ 'भन्त्याम्यंस्यंगोगे

मो यमा: पूर्वकमु:॥ इवौद्ध्रति:। ||

तथा च नारदः—

वनतववः भवेत् पूर्वं प्रक्षम: पररो यदि। तत् मध् यमवसित्वेद स्ववः पूर्ववंशयोऽऽ॥

बाल्क्यनामान् शरसः सार्धोमनस्कृतिपिंसुत्तान।

हस्तिव 14यमा निवत्तने शार्देशिकमविवाहगः॥ (ना. पृ. 2, 2, 5-8)

इत्य 15नारदीद्रव्रौषोधितेऽयो वर्षिणाम इति 16विधोयिते। 17भास्तात् शाश्वात्

1. A2 A2 B चेत।
2. A1 omits द्विमिः।
3. A1 A2 मिथवः।
4. A2 पूर्वः एकः।
5. MB omits चव।
6. H. पूर्वः: षटचारारित्यि:। I चवचारित्य।
7. CA वचनवीति यमा:।
8. 'दोपर्मन्त्र: A2 'दोपरस्तः:परम भोऽके ते।
9. A2 वनमनवोऽस्य: मो यमा:।
10. HBI A2 omit तथा च।
11. I A2 HLB omit this and the two following stotras। 12. A1 हिमेद्वः।
13. H. भवेत् पूर्वः, ज्ञानिमथ, B × × × य पूर्वारित्यमथ। I पूर्वः, ज्ञानिमथ, L पूर्वः, ज्ञानिमथ।
14. A1 वमातवत्तेऽऽ॥
15. IBH 'मल्लिकार्यं मनस्ते, A1 'मल्लिकार्यं ना॥
16. B omits नमक्षुर्वः।
17. B omits एकादः,...,द्रष्ट।
पञ्जिका-संहिता  

अनुसारी विसर्गांश × क वी चापि पराशयो ।  ||2|| दु:स्वर्णित विश्रेयो लकारः सुत एव च ॥5॥

‘चन्द्रचन्द्र यमा: चूर्ता:’ इति वशार्धकवेनोपक्रमः संयोगश्रातः। यथा च चतुर-चरायुसुदायखंचित्वा प्रकारः "गम्बितित गकारी है यमो नकार इकारित । चन्द्र तु यमं वर्णार्थितं मन्यते। तथा च शैवकः—”स्मृति यमानन्यनानिषिद्धा:  

‘क्षानु परेकु ययोगश्रुननिषिद्धे” (क्र. मा. १.६.२) इति। "पूर्वेऽया चतुःपदायता ज्ञातपञ्चामात् ॥4॥

च तु श्रारो वि स में चेति। खरमु भवनतोज्जुलारः [खरम्]  

चन्द्र ‘कारण[४] क्षानम्नातुलारः। वचयित च ‘दसमुखः क्षानुदुः’ इति।  

विशर्य इति। विशवं सुन्धरे विन्याते इति विशर्यः। × क वी चा पि  

प्ररास्याविनियते प्रथो कार्यकार्यो भाष्यान्नु यथोक्ती पराशयो।  

तथा च वचयित—“प्रयोगवज्ञा विश्रेया भाष्यान्नुभागिनः” इति।

चपरः चतुः—× क वी वपिः पररी चरूती। 

चन्द्रसारस्यांगियोऽपियं चतुः।  

चपरोपिः पाठः—× क वी वपियं कार्याविनः। कार्यार्थकारी भाष्यः खानं यथोक्ती  

कार्यायुक्तान्नु विश्रेयाविनियः पराशयो। दु: सृं द से तीति  

हुँसुः इत्यत्त्रः हो वर्णांक्तो म वर्णांक्तस्। वचयित च—‘वचोप्यग्न्ता  

ययोगश्रुननिषिद्धः’ इति। तथा चोद्वरजः—”तत सृंदां कार्यं ययोगश्रुननाम्” दु:सृः दभलः-  

क्षानाम्’ इति। ययोगश्रुन  खारी विनियते। चतो लकारो दु:सृः दभलां  

चन्द्रदात्तः कारारः। इतिश्रवः पादपुर्वायः। ख का र इति। लब्धत्वः

1. B² चन्द्रस्यानु गकारो है, A¹ I गम्बितित गकारी गकारनाशयातिः, A² चवितिः(?)सिति ग  

यम नकार ककाराविनिः, C गम्बितित गकारी गकारी दी नकार।

2. B. खानपरेकु, H खानपरेकु, L खानपरेकु, A¹ खान परेकु I खच्चवानुः

3. BA² दूस्रे चतुःपदायत चदा IH दूस्रे:पदायतिः: चदा

4. A¹A²B. खकारानु, IHL. थकारान, A² खकारानातुभागः

5. B प्रारम्भित।

6. B° प्रारम्भित।

7. B omit कपरोपिः चतुः

8. IB omit तथा, IHLA² कार्यश्रविनिय for प्रस्तावः A adds कार्यश्रविनिय after प्रस्तावः

9. BHL यकारी विनियते, IL have in the margin यथा मस्यिण यकारी विनियते ययोगश्रुननिषिद्ध

कारः ; B यथा मस्य च मस्यिण यकारी विनियते ययोगश्रुननिषिद्ध ह्यवेः।
पाण्यलो-पिवः
चाला बुद्धेचा समयस्वास्थ्याची गृह्वी विवचया।

||३|| मन: कायांमिनाचा स प्रेरणता माहूमः ||६||

कार्यमयः। भूत ए वे वतः। लकारस्थ दोषांद्रेयो न संतोत्वापस्तात् परमातस्वप्नस्तम्, समरं चाह—क्षारः। भूत एव च इति विभागः। चाण्याच्छ लक्षणः। नन्द वर्णान्त्र प्रयस्तुसुपरीक्षणः, विकारम्बृत्तत: प्रयत:। कात्ये ? उध्वते, सुत्र-विधानान्त्र तावत् लक्षार उच्चारितता: उच्चारित स लक्षारं चाष्ट्रायम्बप्रस्तुतार्थिपि प्रयत: उच्चारितः। चुर्णसारादयः। भूत तातः। चक्षु:। “यूप्यावस्तुपत्या-ग्रहता सह विषिदः।” चतुःपदिः: कायद्ध? । अणुसरारी विसर्गने विधायतारात्।

कथा पुनरुस्मारकं धर्मं? । श्रविण्योसे मेनुनिति ब्रम्म:।। तथा चौदग्नाय:-“पशुसारलण
भां द्वृत्तुसारलोऽः दृष्टिः भूनोऽत्ति” इति। अत एव चतुःपदिः: ||५||

चतुःपदिः । यथा वर्णसंस्कारविज्ञानानां भविन्ते को यापुस्तारितता, कथा चौदग्नायति, तेन क्रमेष्ठे चेलाच—

या को वतः। चाला श्रेयसिद्ध्रयमनोमोत्तितिवितरितः। कथा पुनर्देवतवर्गवती
यथा श्रेयसिद्ध्रयमनोमोत्तितिवितरिता चाला? उभयाः—“ृष्टलातू, द्रष्टः हि हृदात
मभति, प्रयोजनः। भूताधीनः कर्त्त्रस्फोटसनी, कर्त्तराधीनः।
कृत्यते। इति न्यायः। प्रवेशः। अज्ञातवर्ज्यातु, अविस्मरणीयात्। अलंकृत्यात् अस्पदात्। धर्मः।
धर्मः।” अतः धर्मः। धर्मः। धर्मः। धर्मः।
नवस्मित्वात्, विसर्गितिस्वात् भूताधीनः। भूताधीनः। कथा विसर्गितिस्वात्।
नवस्मित्वात्, विसर्गितिस्वात्। भूताधीनः। कथा विसर्गितिस्वात्।
नवस्मित्वात्, विसर्गितिस्वात्। भूताधीनः। कथा विसर्गितिस्वात्।
नवस्मित्वात्, विसर्गितिस्वात्। भूताधीनः। कथा विसर्गितिस्वात्।
नवस्मित्वात्, विसर्गितिस्वात्। भूताधीनः। कथा विसर्गितिस्वात्।
नवस्मित्वात्, विसर्गितिस्वात्। भूताधीनः। कथा विसर्गितिस्वात्।
नवस्मित्वात्, विसर्गितिस्वात्। भूताधीनः। कथा विसर्गितिस्वात्।

1. \( \Delta^1 \) omits ओपिः।
2. \( \text{IHL} \Delta^1 \text{A}^2 \) \( \text{पूर्वस्पर्शाण्डीि} \), B पूर्व-रिभः।
3. B भूताधीन बिभागः।
4. BL ब्रह्मादीनी दस्म्हीनी, \( \text{LA}^1 \text{A}^2 \) खण्डदीनी
(वो) दीपेश्वरी (सो), I खण्डदीनी दीपेश्वरी
5. \( \Delta^1 \) omits दर्शनालातू। इति भायातू। \( \Delta^2 \) omits दर्शनालाू। इति काण्यस्त। \( \text{HHL} \ put \)
इति before दर्शनालातू।
6. \( \Delta^1 \text{A}^2 \) वायुरोपकोः, B वायुरोपकोः।
7. \( \text{HHL} \) शरीराणि।
8. B चौदग्ना।
पाठ्यव्यापृति

मात्रत्वौर्षिक चर्चणन्दां जनयोग्यता खऱ्कम्।

॥४॥ प्रातः सतनयोगं तं छन्दो गाययमार्शितम् 

कण्ठे माध्यमन्त्रयुगं मध्यमं वैषुभासानुगम्।

॥५॥ तारं तारं श्लोकस्वयं शिरास्यं जागतानुगम्।

बाउकानु समर्थं सम्मण्ड प्रवतत्व प्रध्यप्तावर्याय यदि शदा उच्यते तदां
मनो रुपे विचारा 'वद्यमिस्थि' विचारा तथा।
तत्त्व मनो नियुक्ते भावा।

म न: का या भि मा ह नो ति।
तत्त्व मनो नियुक्ते सतू कायानिर्माणिन्ति
कायानिन श्रीरामनिन्त्र आधमुख्येन द्रृति।
स प्रे र य ति मा र त भि ति।

सोिनिरभिषत: सनू मारहत्व वारुं प्रेरयति। ॥६॥

मा र त सूर र सि च च र च ज न य ति सर भि ति।
मातहो वायुष-तिरी ॥चरणाद्वारं खऱ्कम् जत्वाद्यति।
सन्निविद्व सन् रक्षण्य। प्रा तं: स व न्यो ग भि ति।
प्रातः सन्नीन सह योगीक्षणति प्रातः सतनयोगसः, ॥तथा च
ऐतरेर्वाद्वाणि 'यथा मन्त्र तयति तथा नाम वाचा प्रातः सवनि
मंत्रवित्' (१४.४) द्रृति।

'गायत्रे गायत्रे; 'सुतिकम्यं; 'चाच्यादित्यं कण्ठ:' ॥७॥

क गढ़ द्रृति।

मारहु द्रृति 'अनुष्ठित' सवनि कण्ठ: सरं चर्चिति च।

वर्षणूं जनयोग्यतां यावत्। कण्ठेस चरणु वायुष्म्यमं सरं जनयति।
कण्ठेः द्रृति

'कण्ठेः' (उ. छू. १०४) द्रृति त्रप्तय:।

सर्व दिनं युनक्तिः 'साधनिनिन सवनभाजं बनधुकृव्यवुन्गानिनम्।

ता र भि ति।

तारं वायुषन्निविद्व सती-सवनभाजं तारं सरं शृवक्षितिमि
मूनिनं चरणु वारुं जनयतुवादयति तांगं कण्ठोजगानिनम्।

जागतं कण्ठोजगानक्षीति जागतानुगम:।

शृवक्षितिमि

'शृवक्षितिमि' (पा. ६.१.६०) द्रृति शिरस्व शृवक्षिताव:।

तव सवनि

शृवक्षिाम् ॥८॥

1. L omits सतूमिस्थि विचारा तथा तव, BH वद्यमिस्थि only.

2. A1 चरण: for चरण:.

3. BHLIA² तथा च चुर्जन: मन्त्रया वाण: प्रातः सवनभाज.

4. B has before this गाययमार्शितम्.

5. BHL omits शृवक्षिताव: and has चाच्यादित्यं कण्ठ:.

6. BHLCA² omit अत्र.

7. A²L माध्यमन्त्रयुगं चवमाध्यम:.
पाशिष्याय-विचार

सोदौर्यी मूढ़ा प्रभिहितो वक्तमापन मानत:।

|| 6 || वर्णावलिनयं तेषा विभाग: पञ्चाय ख्‍टः।

पररत: कालत: स्थायानु प्रयामानुप्रदानत:।

|| 7 || इति वर्णावलिन: प्राहुनिष्पथं तं निषोधत ॥१०॥

सो दो ग्रंथ। स वासुदेरीशे जाध्यगतो मूढों यावदुपरिनामं गतिसः प्रलयोः। ग्रंथं-जापलिनकमदयूत्तरतु पुनः प्रवत्तिः 'वक्तमापनचिन्द्रणयः' वर्णावलिनयः व्यस्यात्यांसम्। तेषा विभागः पञ्चाय ख्‍टः इति।

तेषा वर्णानां जन्मानानां विभागो विवेकं पञ्चाय पञ्चारकः। 'संज्ञाया विधायचि' इति। (प्र. ३.०२) इति धा। 'सृजातेद्वस्तुगतः' ॥८॥

कोदेवुदस्तेथा वर्णानां 'पञ्चाय विवेक इत्याय—

रत: इति। खानानी इत्यूर्द्ध यास्मानाः। 'वर्णानां भ्रातार एवमाधुः'—

पञ्चाय विवेकी वर्णानाम इति। 'सरसत: उदात्तादिनभेदे।' कालो रसायतः।

खान वर्णादिः। प्रयोगो विधा (१)। चमुप्रदान खानानादिः। नीचादि।

चन्द्रप्रक्षेप दीयते इच्छाप्रदानम्। 'ही नाद[म्यूळहू]प्रदानी' इच्छौद्वस्त्रजः।

पञ्चाय विवेकं वर्णानां निपुःसुभूतमानं हि धोताः, निरंभवतं जपुत।

कथं विचिन्द्रचिते वाहितुष्टप्रवर्षम्। नन्दु समवेतत्तुष्टप्रवर्षम्। कथम्?

भाषा बुद्धा सच्चिन समयः मनो युक्ति इति यास्मातम्। भास्माच्छिन नियोजकभावो नोपप्पती चक्षुसम्राप्यः तस्य।

तथा च इति—''अस्त्रव: शास्त्रे पुषः' (द्व. भा. ४.२.६) इति, 'अश्युलमणक्कम्सदीर्घं' (द्व. भा. २.५.१६) इच्छादिका च। भवताः चेमासक्षैव यास्मातम्। भास्मान नियोजकभावे श्रीरामेण्यमनोविवेकतितिन्ति इति ग्युरादिर्यात्तितिन्ति भास्माः मनो

1. Hλ भास्मावचार्य; B. 'पथ जानति।
2. A१ चूतितःमत:।
3. A१ omits पथचा...�त्याय।
4. BI इति विशेषज्ञः प्राप्त निष्पथः तं निषोधत before this. H. puts. निषोधत before this.
5. Hλ omits करत उदात्तादि...इति।
6. IA१C omits 'दीर्घैः।
पत्रिका-संख्या

युक्ति इत्यदुपन्धम्। उच्चति, भवमाया समाध्याविष्कारी युक्ति इत्यदुपन्धम् विवेकाभि प्रायम्। चेतनसारे-िरदेव िरसुङ्ग वचित्योजकलम्। तथा च मनः[संहिताया]—

"योगस्यायनः कार्यितम् तत् चेतनसारे प्रचयितम्। यः करोति तु कार्यितिः स भूताभोजयते दुःखे। इति। जीवाक्षोष्टरामायणः सहचरः सर्वदेहिनाम्। येन वेदयिते सर्वं सुखं दुःखं च जन्मसु। इति। तवावभूताभोजते महान् चेतनभर्त एव च। उद्घाटिते भूतेऽि िरसे तत् वायु तिह्रतः।" (१२.४३-४४) द्वैत।

तं व्याख्येति परमायानामाहः। तथा च व्यासः [वैभद्वनमहात्माया]—

"हाविंम् पुष्योऽिोऽिचर कर्षिताचर एव च। चरः सर्वादिन भूलाति कुंिशोिोऽि उच्चति। उच्चतः पुष्यान्वनः परमाभिलुिऽारः। यो नियोगाविद्वाति विमिथविय द्रष्टवः।" (१५.१६-१७)

नतु यशाभा वुध्रा समाध्यायां इत्यदुपाष्टिवो यो निःः। चेतन एवावाबाधभि-िराशी भवेत्। ततः चेतनः एव भावशंकस्य चरितार्थालात् शरीरेतिि्र्यमनाहुििविशिष्टलिङ्गः कर्षिकाद्वरः लया वार्षिकों विमाथ च। उच्चते, भाका वुध्रायथ हावायायानि तो चेतनपरमायानाभिविय पापाभिविरीि तबोरंिराविरीि।

tवोिोऽिराशी उिामलादारः। इरवं चेतु ििमयं परमायानो वर्षनिमित्तलम् 'उज्ज्वलः। ततोऽिराशी, नवकर्षिकारसाधनाऽिराशीनिः। भवानन्वाय चायविमोऽारः। शरीरादिष्टिरस्तासमाधिकारः परमायानो बीमा। "अनवैर्यस्य तु न समाधामभिरेकः। भवति। किं तदनननाश्यं यस्य मिथ्ययस्वऽ वर्तिते? उच्चते, वेदा यश्नाऽ।

तथा च दृितः—"तमेव वेदात्वचनिः िििबिधिमयिः ब्रह्मचर्यं तपस्या यश्नाः यज्ञनामीय न च।" (१२.२४-२५) द्वैत। वेदात्वचनं यज्ञएतमालातु ध्यायष्टीिराचारों ियमायायमाप्रीि। विधितय च—'अनुरूपः च सुखं समस्यूः। दृित्। अतुलो सुखं मोऽ एव भवति।" (१०)।

1. C तदेहः 2. MSS. युध्रमः 3. A1 बुधः
पादनीय-शिचा

उदात्त्यानुदात्त्य सरित्य खराखयः।

॥११॥

क्रियादेर्शः सुत व्रत कालतो नियमा चर्चि॥११॥

ब्रह्मी स्थानानि वर्षानामूरः कणः: सिरस्थया।

॥१२॥

जिज्ञासूलं च दुनात्य नासिकोषी च तालु च॥१२॥

यवमतिप्रस्त्रनेन। प्रज्ञेतमुपसरामः—

उ दा च या हु दा च ये ति।। खरतः कालत इत्येती ही हेतु श्रीसे विविधोति

क्षर उदात्त्यः।। कालो मतद्रध्मातितितिमात्रवर्णः।। उदात्य हलुपरिहाद्दू

परिभाषाः; भूनुदात्त्याधिपति:; अध्यादात्त्यक्षरः।। खरन्त इति

न खराखयः।। खरतीति खरतः: भाचेपनियायः य उदात्त्यानुदात्त्यविकारः।।

तथा च नारदः—

"उदात्त्यानुदात्त्य नास्ति नीचाचिनीचतं तथा।।

ब्रैखर्थः खरसंग्रहायां विख्यानः।। खर उच्चती।।

उचनीचखर्थोयमें खरारण इति खरतिः।।

तेन खराण खरसंग्रहायां प्रतिज्ञानिति कैसिका:।। (ना. श्रि. १.५.६-७)

खर रा खर य इति।। त्रयो एव एक्‌मेव विषयः;। पदः सस च सामसः।। खरः

एकमातो इत्येती हिमातः।। चूतितिमातः।। "निमिसकाला माता खाद्

इत्यौद्वर्यः; तथा च नारदः—

"निमिसकाला माता ख्यादिपुलालोति चापेरे।। (ना. श्रि. २.३.५) इति।

इतिहासः प्रकारार्थः।। अनेन प्रकारशी कालतः हेतौ: खरतस्य विषयभाग

नियमः।। तथा च नारदः—

"खर चउः खरो नीचः खर: खरित एव च।।

अख्यानायुवायणः यथ तितिः स खरः।। (ना. श्रि. २.५.२) इति॥११॥

1. B omits न.
2. A¹ C खर।
3. A² read पद्प after पदः.
4. B. puts stops after विषयः and सामसः.
5. A¹ C "यत् वर्तने."
पद्मिनी-शब्दिता

कण्ठागवशाविचल्याशास्त्रालया चाहुर्यावुपुः।

॥११॥ समूर्वन्या कठुर्या दन्व्या लुभुलसा: समृता: ॥१२॥
जिज्ञासुमै तु कुः प्रेतार दल्न्योश्रान्वं समृतिः ती तुः।

॥१२॥ एणै तु कडगतालया चोको कण्ठोऽज चमृती ॥१४॥
चर्च्यारासा तु कण्ठायां एकारीकायोभूवेत्।

॥१३॥ एकारीकायोभूमां तथेविवैत्तसंरचनम् ॥१५॥

खण्डत इति उदयः तदः---

क यथा व च वि ति। 'कण्ठावही चारावर्णक: कण्ठोऽकण्ठोऽ' कण्ठतो जातो।

दु य शा: तालशा: "इकारश चवर्ण यकारश्चारी च ये तालशा: तालुकानेम
भव:। तु इकारसर्वस्य वर्ण ज्ञापित। वर्गीकरणमत्तां उक्तः वेदज्ञानेम
मादिनु उक्तः; 'पत्रञ्चपरिप्रेष्टानां। तथा च वापिनि:—"अरुणदित्तं सवर्णमः
चावलयः" (या. ११६५) इति। चौदर्शुरिरि "नस्ते वर्गेः तस्मिनते
स्यः नस्ते वर्गेः तस्मिनते स्य: बनेत्या नन्तिकाः।" इति। अहो जा तु पू: उक्तः
पवर्गेः चोक्योऽजतः। स्यु मूर्ती न्या कटुर्या वा इति। कारश: तरग्गेः
शेषधार्मी च सूचीबुता भवेत्।। द न्या खु तु ल सा इति। उकारस्त्रवर्गेः
कारस्कारी च दलेणु भवः। ॥१६॥

जि ब्राह्मण सृंग इति। करवेलो जिज्ञासुमैं कवित:। द न्या चो: व: खु: तो
तु ये इति। वकारशः दल्न्योर्वेत्तात: पाणिनी। एणै तु कण्ठ
ताव आ: इति। एकारश: एकारश: कण्ठाततुली जातो। चो कृष्ण कु: हो
स्मृतात्वित। १०चोकारशः चौकारश: कण्ठोऽजयोऽजती ॥१४॥

1. \(\text{A}^2\) omits. 2. \(\text{A}^1\) omits. 3. \(\text{A}^1\text{A}^4\) इकार: \(\text{C} \text{कण्ठोऽ}
4. BLA² omit पवर्गेणपरीपरिप्रेष्ठानां।
5. MSS. स्वामिवेश्वरग्रंथापि च प्रार्थेत वर्गेण ग्रंथां...कार इति।
6. \(\text{L} \text{वापिनि:}; \text{A}^1 \text{वापिनि:वकारशः}।
7. B. omit रेकारशः....इति। उकारश: । ८. \(\text{A}^1\) भवः।
8. BHIL दलेणुः ( \(\text{BH} \) दलेणुः); \(\text{मु} \) रामायां च जानीभवेत:। \(\text{A}^1\) दल्न्योर्वेत्।
9. \(\text{H} \text{चारशः} ; \text{C} \text{चारशः} ।\)

३
चनुसारयमानां च नासिका खानसूचये।

\[14\] उपभाषानिव तथा च जित्त्वामुलीयनासिके
चनुकवाहा विन्यः थायस्यानभाजिनः।

\[15\] अलावुवीचारानिमित्ते द्रत्सूलं: खानानु।
चनुसारसू कर्तव्यो निब्धः क्रोः: श्रविषेष च।

च है मा च देशत। चन्द्रमात्रा तु कष्टः क्षरम् महतं।
कयोः ? \[2\] एकार्षक चीकारस्य च।
सवर्णे चक्कः तु \[3\] एकार्ष कीकारस्य दार्विन् गद्देत।
अत्यंतानुपारिवर्तः श्रवं च। श्रवं च श्रविन्द्रनासि।

च है मा च देशत। अयोगवा द्वनुसरयाद्यप्रकाश्य उच्चते।
चनुसारो विसंगरं तु न धर्मो च काब्योः।
तथा च ब्रम्हार्थः: - ‘अयोगवाहा’, तथा: देशत
विराज्जीगैः; \[X\] तु देशत जित्त्वामुलीयः,

अलावुवीचारानिमित्ते द्रत्सूलं: खानानु।

(पा. ध.३.२६) देशत \[16\]।

अ ला देशत। अलावुवीचारानिमित्ते द्रत्सूलं: खानानु।

1. H. कष्टास्त्वेकारीकारीभैतस्वै खेमाया कष्टाः महतं।
2. CA1 एकार्षकारस्य। A5 एकारस्य कीकारस्य।
3. A5 एकार कीकारस्य। B, \[4\] चीकारस्य।
4. A5 कष्ट A5 omits.
5. H प्रणी तालीः, B चर्चना ताली। I प्रणी तु सेसे खानी।
6. I A5 च वर्णानारोपितसः। A5 चीकारस्य: नाविकः।
7. HLB put सदा after this।
8. A5 भाविन।
9. A5 omits भाविन:……मानिन।
10. L अयोगवा यस्मानः and H अयोगवा तु ब्रह्माय। A1 यस्मादशायवावृत्ताय for ब्रह्माद ब्रह्माय।
11. A8 L द्रत्सूलं:।
[[16]] सचोदसस्ता यशस्वोष्णेमस्त्या: शरस्तथा।
शेषा स्त्या हल: प्रोता निविदाधानुप्रदानत: [[17]]
[[17]] अमोकलुचन्नसिन्हकः नाद्विनो भच्छ: स्त्या:।
द्वन्द्वादा यजुजशस्तु प्रवासिनस्तु खण्डाय:।

पश्चादि क्रमः श्रवण भवतीति ध्रुपः। दक्षार्थेन्वयोः प्रवेशुषु च सदा भवति। तथाच च मार्दः—

"बायनेति मकरो रेवस्थु प्रवेयेवतुत्तत्वादम्।
वर्त्तु परस्परं स्वस्वरं चोत्समाप्तिम्" (ना. ग्र. २.२.४) इति [[17]]

चानी चानानि कर्माणि सुः श्रवः सर्वानिपतितः। निष्काले च दस्तावेन
नायिकासौ मतानुः च चतुरुः च" इति। इमं श्रृवमनवादीर्य कैचित् प्रति इति।

खरतः कालः खरतो वर्णादिवेन मेधः कवितोषुः श्रवः प्रवेशवितो भैरो भति।
प्र कर्म च यथो वर्णयायास्त्रेण प्रति प्रवासहितिः स प्रयाहः।

च जिति। चर्मिन्ति प्रवाहारयाहमः। च इ उ प्रति च यथा भैरो भति चः च।
एते भरुत्सः। यथा: य व ला एते इयुमुद्यः। ५ च रिति प्रवाहारयाहमः,
प्रभसा एति नीमस्त्या: ६ चरुस्त्या इवायः तविति पादपुर्णातः। श्री वा: स्त्र या
हुस्स्तो प्रो का इति। वहु इति प्रवाहारप्रश्नः चकारादशः चा चकारादः।
शेष इसुकालः ध्रुपः। यथा: श्रव इपयेवमस्त्यासुतिजः इति: स्त्राःशः,
स्यासूः: कविता:। शी वो था नु प्र प्रा न त इति। अरुप्रदातमिति ख्याना-
दिक्षोषां चोषां भरु प्रकाशं देवयति इति अरुप्रदातमः। "हो नादाः ख्यासादाः सु-
प्रदातां" इत्यदि। अरुप्रदातो ईतिः वर्णानि भैरो श्रवः ॥१॥

इ भिन्न इति प्रवाहारप्रश्नः अ म ड र न मृ। अ नु न अ निका इति
ख्यानारूपिकः: ६ अनु पाठात् नामिकामुक्तितोतिक अनुनासिका अमधुनामः:

1. A²A³ omit.
2. A¹ प्रवेयेत्वोऽयः
3. BBL read after this अष्टां च खराणा च विस्ते करणां ब्यूतमः। तेबीपि (तीसोऽपि
   विकारघी वाचिकायी तैबादलं च; चर्च औनली in E).
4. HL omit चः। 5. H omits भवति....नीमस्त्या:। 6. L चतुर्युः युः
5. A¹A² omit up to इयुद्यमि: MSS. है नानाप्रदाता। (I ॐप्रदातमः).
8. B omits ईति। 9. A¹C चतुर्युः
पाण्डुलिपिविश्लेषणः

18 || ईश्वरासांश्रो विद्याज्ञोदेशितत् प्रचरती ॥ १६॥

पण्डुलिपिकारामानुसार जानियते। तथा च पाण्डुलिपि—‘सुखासनेविकावचनोऽनुसारिकः’ (प्र. ११०.२) इति। च जो इति। वि कारो रेषक इव कारो भवप्रयत्न, प्रवाहार्ययथं भवो इति भ घ घ ०, एते जास्यो नादिनः अर्थांते। नात्र एवामस्तोती मादिनः। चवरः पाठः—च सो २५ ना सि का न जो। अस्मृ इति प्रवाहार- श्रावणः। च इ उ कर ये यो ऐ ऐ दौ य व र ल । ज म ड ख न म मृ। एते अवस्थानारायणः। न जो न तु रेषकारो अभमाद्यं सन्तो। ना दि नो च भ घ। ख्व्रातः। इवारो भवप्रयत्न नादिनः भवो भ भ घ घ ०। एस्याधः। १ पाठवयात्
चमां इश्वरारेषवर्जितानां विद्याज्ञोदेशितविकल्पम्। नात्र तु नित्यम्। तथा च श्रीनकः—‘सबाद्यो या विधिता विवचयं श्रुतोवाचनः अवस्थास्तिकोपधा’
(कृ, प्रा. २.२२) इति। तथा च ‘इश्वराभिति करणि युक्तो रक्ता त्रूतो
द्रविताः शाख्लेण’ (कृ, प्रा. २.२८) इति। इश्वरारेषिताः प्रवैभो पाठे नादिलम्-
दिरोधै पाठे इश्वरारेषवर्जितविकल्पप्रतिशयः। ई घ बा दा य चु ज य खः खः तित।
यसः काठितः। जगसु इस्करायाः। शाक्षिक प्रवाहारः ज ब ग ड द श श
एते यशः जगसु ईश्वरारनाक्नादः। श्वा सि न खु खः या द य इति।
क्रमावठः। एती शासिनं। त्वम एवामस्तोतिः शासिनः।
‘शासिनोऽवस्थानां [हि] विश्वास्मानाम्, [नादो] वर्षाणां चतुर्भेदः [हे] नामां शुमा शोभाणः’
इति चोदःन्तरः। ॥ १६॥

ई ई च्छा सां च रो विता श्वा इति। चर ईति प्रवाहार्ययथं च ट त
क प य र स र। ‘इवेतत्वाभकानः ईश्वरासांश्रो जानियताः। गोचरः सि त वा-
च चु त इति। कीर्तिरः धाम श्यामस्त एवामाराचर्यं वर्णविदः। शाश्रुतोऽ
पूर्वमिति य छन्ता: ॥ २०॥

1. A² भाषांन.
2. HB omit कार after क
3. IHB शासी विषयः ततितात्र। प्रवाहारः (५.समुदायाशीयः A²) चोष्ठपालानाम्।
4. A²C ऐतवासः
5. IHB यद्वसूत्तानाम् सीधाः इति.
*मन्लो होते खरतो वर्णतो वा
मिथ्याप्रयुक्तो न तमस्यमाहः।
स वाम्बरो यजमानं हिनस्ति
यथं न्द्रशः खरतोपराधात् ॥ २०॥
*शहरः शहरौ प्रादाशीचौधुराय धीमते।
वाङ्मयेः समाह्यः देवो वाचमिति स्थिति:। ॥ २१॥
#ध्यानाशरसामाः जज्ञासिंगम्य महेश्वरात्।
क्तुस्त्वं व्याकरणं प्रोक्तं तस्मै पाणिनीये नमः। ॥ २२॥

'थथ मन्ल-व्याससलचणमाहः—
म स्त्र: मणिमांत्र: खरतः वदाचारादिविदेशं: वर्णतः चिन्तितिलिखितिविदेशः
मिथ्याप्रयुक्तः य: खरो यो वर्णमुखमात्राय विभुः: न तमस्यमाहं तस्माथे न वेदः। स
श्रेष्ठो मन्लो वाप्पो विस्मयो यजमानं हिनस्ति। तद्व द्वादशमाहः—यादा
खरतोपराधादः द्रत्त एव शुद्धमुखाभूमिति। ॥ २०॥

इदानीं गुप्तयुक्तकमाहः—
शहरः शहरः। खरे सुखे करोतिति शंकरः। सुखकरः शंकरीं सुखकरीं
विवान दाचीपुरायः कपये दाचीपुरायः क्रियाकल्पकम् तत्पुरायः धीमते दुविमते
प्रादाशीतवान्। ॥ २१॥

सम्ब्रह्म पाणिनिन्निर्दिष्टिपरं शीक्षकमाहः—
ये ने ति। तत्क्राकृतं स्तुतिपूर्वकः पाणिनिनमस्कारकरणं किममथः? उच्चतेः
पशोःक्रिया यथ्यास्तीतिः प्रायाहारेः मित्ता विषयता प्रायाहारायु पाणिनी
शंकराद्वितिम्यम् समस्तं व्याकरणं प्रोक्तं मित्तोपकाराय श्रवणायां लोके
प्रवर्तिता। तद्वर्त्ती सुखः। ध्यानाशरसामाः जज्ञासिंगमिति प्रायाहारानाः, क्रियाकल्पकः। ॥ २२॥

1. IHLB omit थथ मन्ल-व्याससलचणमाही, etc. but puts it after दुविमते प्रादाशीतवान्.
2. A¹ omits एव.
3. HL omit मा सुखः—शहरः.
पार्श्वनीय-शिचा

#विनयनसूक्तनि;स्तामिसां

य इह पठित् प्रयतः सदा हिजः।
स भवति धनाधान्यपवशुकीति-
मानतुलं सुखमस्तु मेघसुध। ||२३||

'भवति: शिश्नाय भागात् लिन्दिन्यं श्रीकमाँह—
विन य नि ति। वैतालीयं कट्टोरस्य, पद्मास्मुद्रप् कट्टोरसिन्धः।
'विनयन: शिवस्तुष् सुखायिनि;सता यथा गुहा्या: सिंधो निकार्मति तथा निगुहा एतात्वा
विनयनीनायि न ज्ञितविषः। ततो यो हिजः पदेश्वरायोि स [इह] धनादिरिमुक्तेरि
सुखसिदियं "परमानंदे च मोचमु जलप्रकारिणि अनुहृति प्रार्थित् "सुधामुहिनि
लोके। आदिः] धनाधान्यपवशुकीतिमायभाग् भवलान्ति मुखिषब्धाम्।
पवद्यवालांरक्तालिनि
स्मादेनि परिमितकालातदू मोचायध तु परिमितकालाबच्चिनि सुखधुपिमब्धि:। ||२३||

*इति वेदाद्यादिचा-पलिन्हा समासः।

1. B H omit भवति: शिश्नाय.
2. B विनयनसूक्तनि;स्ता और H विनयनसूक्तनि;स्ता for विनयन:...नि;स्ता.
3. A ² C परमानंदे-वधयः.
4. BMA. चबयः ¹ ² ; IHL omit कन्तागुप्तिनि...पलिन्हिणि.
5. A³ श्लोकः। सीवुहु परिमितकालाबच्चिनि परमानंदसुखधुपः सीवाय-नायोिलात् सुखम एवेति.
6. MBHL इति पार्श्वनीय-शिचा-शिच्चा समासाः। (B याधु पुष्करं हन्त; तारांश्
िहितं मयाः। वदि श्लोकः) नाम दीपो न वियते। श्रीकरुणः १५५॥ समासः)
संबत् १६३५ दिवस्य हितिन्त्र इलं संबत् १६३५ धिग्यादेश सौं मिरीवायां सौवायां दुधविनायक-"
स्विती ब्रह्मोपनाशा गीविदेष्यी निहितं। श्रीनिवेशार्थचमादि॥ भ्री:। A³ after समासा, पलिन्हिणा
परमितः शिचचनितयर्थच। इहऽ 'श्लोकः श्लोकः श्लोकः श्लोकः श्लोकः श्लोकः श्लोकः
" अऽ॥ श्रीकंपालोकश्चायाः॥ तामस्यमार्थार्थचमादि॥ संबत् १६२८ भीहुः भू १२ श्री॥ भ्री॥ श्री॥ श्री॥
I इति विचारपसिनि समासः &c. A² इति बिचारः: पलिन्हिणा समासः। संबत् १६०० वर्षासुपी
सुदी २ वार श्रीकंपी विचः॥ समस्याः॥
IV. शिष्याभासकार-सहिता (With the Śikṣā-prakāśa)

* चय सिद्धां प्रवचनाभि पाणिनियं मतं यतां |
शास्त्रानुपेत तत्तिथ्यादृ यथोऽक्षे लोकवादियोः || 1 ||

व्योमितिविरङ्करणं कन्द: कायमित्रविविष्णुः |
नेवासयक्षोऽनि: 1-कम्यं यथं सतंतं सुम: ||
व्याख्याय पिन्डला वायूप्रकाशोऽयोऽयवयम् |
विष्णो तद्वत् वायुर्मृ पाणिनोयाभुसारिषोऽम् ||

व्योमितिबिंबिविहति वाकरणेनुजस्वत भगवानुः पिन्डलार्यचारस्तत्तन्त्रमुभाय 2 |
विषाण्व चतुरः प्रतिज्ञातिः-- |


c 1: L reads for 'भाषा'. 2: MSS. दृष्टि से. 3: Be. omits हि.
प्रसिद्धमपि शब्दार्थमविन्ध्यात्मबुद्धिम्।
पुनष्ठौ तीर्थचिर्यामि वाच उचारणे विधिम्॥२॥

चन्द्रानि प्रव्यायायर्षात्। यतः ‘भक्ति स्नेहः खरोंति वर्णित्वे वा सिद्धा-
प्रस्नुक्तः न तमण्डवणां।’ स वा यूने यजमानं चिनता त्वदेहि-
श्रुः खरोंयुपरावरः’ इति। चावाश्यकप्रकाशयले इद्यश्रेष्ठताण्डाः शीनकः
‘खरों वर्णोदवर’ मात्रा विनियोगर्थेवेनं १ च। मन्वं जिञ्जासामानिन वेदितव्यं
पदेन पदे’ इति। ब्रज्ञी निमलस्मु उकगृः सिद्धम्। ग्रामाद्र वस्तुक्योगाद्वय-
श्रव्य श्रव्यां खानात्रीया सा। याकरणाध्ययनानां चतुर्भवाराः पदेनः
परा-पद्यस्त-मध्यमाः वेश्वरेऽपीलेश्वरेऽ वर्णोदवर्त्ततामनं कियतं दर्जवादृश्यं
२ विशाल्याः।[न]भाष्यम्। निर्मितं निवासं वल्लभेऽ इन्द्रीयं तोढातात्त्वादीक्षरितोऽ
कन्तुमग्री जिञ्जासूलददनानासाह्याणाः यथा नात्र यथा वा शिक्षानिदित्वं
‘हस्तिं यथा चानामार्थिः इति’ (पा.१.१.१३) इद्यस्बन्धाया ‘हस्तिम्’ (पा.४.२.११५)
तथा ‘हस्तिम्’ (पा.३.१.३) ख्यालीर्माट्रेणा२, प्राणिनीयं मतं तथा प्रोक्तविशाल्यम्।
न तु तवां खश्यादिविरोधी भविष्यत्वात् यो त्रि वा भि इति। तद्भ यथा लोकोऽ
वेदयोऽ परोपकृतमुख्यत्राहो खानात्रीयने गुरुपरम्परायुः जानकेयायुः।
‘श्रव्या: श्रव्यो: प्रादानु’ इति तद्युपरिष्टादु ख्यालीर्माय:। “य एव” लोकिकः
‘श्रव्याः एव ’ वेदवादस्त एव तपास्याः’ इति, महाभाषये ७। ‘यथाको वर्षी:
सम्प्रदायः इति: खरों लोके काम्बुः, भवती इति प्रयोजनम्। एव खण्डानामाल्यायुः चिन्तामितः।
‘कोटानणु गावँ द्रोण सन्तोष विनाश्यामनकखोड़ोत्तता गोविर्याः इति विमेदाक्षिकवाच्च इति।
महाबुद्धोऽ
रहस्य स विमयस्ते च स्वरूपमें चतुर्भवाराः प्राणायुः शोकान्तम्।
‘पाद्याः
दुःखक्रम’, (पप.५.८)।
“न प्रयोगात् ब्रह्म” (पप.५.१०) “वात्स्यु” (पप.५.१२)
“य चतुर्थौ” (पप.५.११) “पयो युजोज” (पप.५.१४)।
युज-पाद्या चतुर्थीह्याः-कालोद्वृक्षयाः चित्तम इति लक्षणात्।
‘उदात्ते निवादलम्मानारात्रिः एव प्रयत्नो शुरुक्तः
परापुपादः। हितोत् खसाः ८ ब्रह्मचर्याः। उपायाः पूर्वव्यायः।
‘जमाचिन्मो
नेकिन निर्दुःभृती, हार्यां विरास्याराजः” (पप.२.५.६) इति लक्षणानुसारात्॥१॥

1. L वीपायस्तेवं।
2. Be. शिम्मायस्तेवं।
3. LBe. शिवायस्तेवं।
4. Be. यस्तेवं।
5. L सः एव देवः सः एव।
6. L देवः।
7. L वायस्तेवं।
8. Be. खसाः ब्रह्मचर्याः।


1. MSS
2. L
3. Be
4. MSS
5. Be
6. MSS
7. Be
8. L
9. Be
10. L
11. MSS
12. MSS
यस्य उधारणे श्रव्य यथिन्म प्रसीति गावलुण्यतीति गान्धार: तो। 'भनुदासे नामिः कविशीलसमाहलो क्षत्रभववहलोक्तति क्षत्रमः; वद्दपि खरानाटिक्यम सन्योजयि द्रति वैवलयः तो। एते वत्थमाषा हि खरितोद्वयः। [पद्धोऽ]नासाक्षरोहस्तल्लक्ष्यादन्तेऽयो जातः वद्दः, नाभुरोत्तक्षणोद्दिश्यो जातः वपनया पवित्रमहाद्वर-पूर्व क्षत्र वा क्षत्रभः। २०उदासः समाहीतो नामिः प्रासः स समाहः; ते उदासाधिक्यु एव, एषा प्राधान्यबेरिकीदासि वाच्यायतः। सा श्री नां प व च विं च च ति:— पञ्चिमितिका विंशित्ति: श्रीमातुश्रीनां(१)—पञ्चिमितिः स्मार्थीः तेषां च संख्या:। तेषां पवित्र वग्नीः कु छु तु छु पुः। च पुनः याद्योक्षेत्री स्मार्थः: तेस य ज ज च च भ य शः:। स्वरा अनुप्रयोगः यलवांव चवीन्यहुः, श्रवस्त्र वर्षेक्यहुः। 'दौ निव-निर्युवेर्तः' (वि, २.२०) द्रति यासः:। श्रीवा इत्यादितः स्वेक्यः दाचार्यिः प्रकाशिः स्मार्थः: स्त्रयुव्रयाः, च युवाचरा रममः कु कु यु यु क्रमः। २९ द्रति अनुप्ल्याढीलसे समाधः: तेवः कु कु यु यु क्रमः द्रति अनुप्ल्यः [विने-]संयोगी� [विने-]न्यूनान्यालयो साध्वान-वििलिते तत्र यमा वर्णमी न सत्त्रेडः क्षत्रमः। (मी, पि, २)। 'सन्तसंयोगी मध्ये यमा पूर्व-गुणः' दौल्दद्दोर्तिः, नारदः—'अनुप्ल्या सत्त्रेडः पूर्वी वात्रां परतो यदि: तत्र सम्मो यमासन्तिके सवणीः पूर्ववेषणोऽयः। वर्गायुम यमाः सारःन्या सब्र्यलेअसन्या यस्तुतानू। दद्दा यमा विनतिग्ने चारःकामिवायाम:। (ना-श्रि, र.२, १०) द्रति। भयमपि वर्णन्योग विधियस्त्राक्षास्ताः। च लां च य व मा द्रति वर्णन्यालेकन्याय: संयोगशास्त्रात्। तत्र सम्योगक्षििो घोिमन द्रष्टिः। 'बय विविध: संयोगोग-पिष्को भवस्मस्मिष्को दारापिष्कोस्योमोपिष्को द्रष्टिः। यमासन्तिकम्पिष्को दाचार्यः पिष्को:स्वेक्यः समाधः सक्षात्वे तृतीयपिष्को अन्तः:यमासन्योगी विधियो नीलजलयति द्रति च। अभिजने वस्त्रम विदाहिश्येष: विष्णुयाय:।' (श्रि, पि, १) द्रति च। २५वधा पलिक्ष्निति ककारा: युवाश्च: प्रमाश्च: प्रयास्तकार-स्नेनाय: वर्ण: ककारा: [वि:]: ककारा: [वि]: तकारकारक्षारः अन्तः: [वि:][क्ष:][क्ष]कालितः २२ खकारा:। बर्मि (ब्रज भवमि?) रिवार गकारा:। न जङ्ग(वर्मि?) द्वित जयानः। ।

1. L चहलानि। 2. MSS. हद्दर। 3. Be. सधान्योऽ। 4. Be. भाषणेनीदासोऽ।
5. Be. omits शापस्त्र शुद्धूः;। 6. L चविरितः। 7. L बशानिः।
8. Be. इयन। 9. L adds श्रीमः। 10. This passage is very corrupt.
11. Be. अन्तवृत्तिकालितः। 12. Be. पर्यायः or वर्मिनः।
अनुसारी विसर्गः \( \times \) क \( \rightarrow \) पूर्ण चापि पराशिती।

\\[\text{(गजना: ?)}\] अत्र चवर्गिकायो यज्ञसङ्क सहस्यावर्जः \( सु \) कारसमावेषः।
वर्णक्रमे यज्ञकर-जयकर-पूर्वन्तन्त्राः सर्वयमाविलाय-जकारा। बगीन्यानिति
किम् \( ? \) उद्द्वाकः। अतः \( \text{वर्षंकित् किम्} \) काौऽन। कर्तव्यं नृत्यः।

अ नु छा र इति। "सोतुसः" (पत्रः ३.२६) सारसः \( अ ) भवतील्युक्ते।
विविधः चक्षुत इति विसर्गः यज्ञपरसङ्कः। ती। च ला तृ न सुभीकरः या वी धा
तत्विचर्यो दलमूलः दलमूलसङ्गमायेः। वराण सकारात्मकः \( अ ) वल्लः अङ्गोऽवल्लः प्रासो-
स्वयंवरे। \( चरातुः ) यथा तथा 'निलं जी 'वधेशः' प्रत्येकः परिपूः कर्तवः।
नार्दोपि इति। "अपायति सकारो रोपोऽस्मायोऽक्षमः। वल्लेः परसः सङ्गमः
परिपू वोत्सद्धानिः" (मात्र: २.४.५)। अनुसारः त्वायः चातुः विद्विस्थितमात्रातः
न्ति चनुसारी। विसर्गशिष्यति पादां। स च यथा सूरहः देवसरीत्वा च ती साहिनाचितः
रंगमः चराः इति वायुमानसः पुष्यप्रकृतिः महत्तः रङ्कः हिंदौयः
अनुसारः जानियतः। लोकिकः प्रवेशः समवेतयोऽक्षमः चातुः "किं चातुः एव
अने इति। अतः \( \text{नियमलुत्तमः अनुसारःरोऽगनः विकल्पादम्} \) च भैयः।
तथातः इति। इति (पत्रः ३.२६) इति \( सुह्वः दोषेऽवीधः \) श्रीनिवेचीः।
हृद्धरः "भृदः कश्चिदः" (कड़कः ४.६०.५) "सोमानातः सर्पान्तम्" (कड़कः ५.१५.५)
इल्यादुरुद्वाचलमिति। विसर्गः चट्टविधाः गति। शोकाराभावः। \( युर्दृशः) यथा,
सदा क्रिष्टित्वा विस्मित्वा चतुः विस्मित्वा विना भोभावस्रस्मान्। गुणाः कल्याणः
जापसः सत्त्वोऽद्वयोऽवस्तुतैः परे\( ? \) चोलमः। भावोऽस्मानिः \( गुणः कर्मः) सङ्क्रमानः।
श्रावः \( भ्रजित्वे \) साहिनाः। तत्र \( \text{पूर्वे यथा तत्तचत्रैः कर्तवः भ्रजित्वे कर्तवः।} \)
लोतः। \( \text{प्र्रतिः} \)। बोधिसारांसः सङ्क्रां सः विसर्गान्ततमिति। भैय एव यद्धवः
कर्मः। \( \text{विन्दिते} \) \( \text{विन्दिताभवः}। \) य इति। [श्रावः] श्रावानाः भावः। रे फे
ए व च रक्षाभावः। \( \text{दुर्वसः} \)। निधिशमानः। \( \text{श्रावः} \)। \( \text{कर्ममिति}। \)

1. Be. अरुणधारी। 2. L कांशः, Be. कांशः。 3. Be. छकाईयान।
पाणिनीय-विचा
चात्मा बुध्गा समेखार्यान् मनो युक्ते विवचया।

|| मनः कायानिमाधानिः स प्रेरयति मानमतम् ||€

मानमतमसः चरनू मन्त्र' जनयति खरम्।

|| प्रातः स्वनयंगं तं छन्दो गायत्रमार्गितम् ||7||

खुण्यः। जि हा स्मृत लसुप था चेति। × केवली कहर्फाग्रवी। वित वृंप।

वसो यः पर्यासः। अनुसारविवेगंग्रजन्विवृत्तिस्वानियायाय भयोगवालं चायक्ष्यातन-भागिनो। यमानितात्सन्न थान स्मृतीवधेः। दु: छु थे से ती ति। धृष्टक्-

स्योत्पातात्सन्नस्वास्वही स्मृताः। चक्षुसः एववासो दृश्यमिद्वावतः। चक्षारादु प्रक्षा-

विस्तः कायः। अनुसारादेयो खुण्तानाः। पधं अः वा। एवमेति तिरिघ्दः-

खुण्यः। प्रयंगः त्वायः व्यस्माताः।

वर्षसंख्याः विवाक्षा सम्भवति वर्षोऽस्ति वक्रमः उद्वाािधितुविवेकसुभाषम्

वाङ्ग-था की ति। अतन्याश्चः सर्पंश्रीलो वाणिज्यश्रीलो वा व्यवधिद्विन्द्रातीतः

कर्मोऽत्रः।” तथाः भैतिकः व्रद्द्हवान्यां च रूपोतिकानुमुखः निकासाति

चुषको वा मूर्ती वाणिज्यो वा भ्रोद्रौर्येभ्यः” (इति.प्रा.४.५.४.) इति विवाक्षाः।

“एवमेव सम्प्रारोपनानिक्रमीतात्स समुक्षाय परं ज्योतिरसंस्कृतं यथे एविपालिनि-

निवधादि” (कान्त:ो.२.१२.) इति वर्णं सम्प्रारोपणं द्वारं एवमेव स्वानिवेद्य व्रद्द्ह-प्रावनि

प्रकारसिद्धान्तः तदर्भिपीडितो द्वाराधिमनिर्देशनं चार्यानि

निवर्धा मनं इत्यं वाग्यं वृद्धिवति प्रेयति, ताप्ताः कायान्वर्तिनां जाठार्गमम्

[प्राणिति] प्रेयति। शौमस्विनिमोकेत्तं वायुः प्रेयति ||€

मा हि त्विष्ठ ति। स वायुकुर्णं तथा जबां कान्तेः चरनू मन्त्र' खरम्

“कालायं चो” (श्रे.२.१२.) वाहिना मन्त्रे रक्तम व्याख्या, जनयव्यापारिता।

तं सरं प्रातः स्वनयंगं गायत्रं छन्दो भारितं जातीयात्। मन्त्रयो वाचा

प्रातः स्वनयंगं सोमनवितः (रचिष्यः ?) कथा: ||7||

1. L प्रायम्बोः
2. L भाविनोः
3. Be. "विवेक"
कस्ते माध्यमिन्युङ्ग मध्यमं वैघुमाणुगमः।

यालं तत्तीर्थसवं श्रीमुखं जागतानुगमः॥८॥

सतीर्थि मूलधिमते वन्धमापय तात्त्रत:।

वर्णस्थि जनवते तेषा विभागः पञ्चव्या स्मृतः॥६॥

खर्तः कालतः श्राकास्तु प्रयाबनुप्रदानः।

इति वर्णविवर्दः प्राक्त्वरिण्यं तं निबोधत॥१०॥

उद्रात्तिवानुद्रात्तिर्दश खर्तिदश खराश्यः।

१८॥ ऋशीः दृश्यं मृत इति कालतो नियमा चर्चि॥११॥

* उद्राते निपादगथारावनुद्रात कथमध्येवते॥

खर्तिक्षेत्राः श्रेष्ठं पञ्चममध्यमपञ्चमः॥१२॥

क गड़ इति। तं मारस्य कस्ते माध्यमिन्युङ्ग मध्यमस्यर्धम्

विद्युपकुंडळके जानियात् तं श्रीमुखोऽसीक भवं

"श्रीमुखसेवी" ति (पा. ६.१.४.०)

पिरस: श्रीमानवः; ॥ ततीयस्वनुङ्गः जागतकुंडळके जानियात्॥१॥

सौ दृश्यं दृश्यं इति। स वायुसौदीर्थः मृतं ब्रह्मारे (१) अभिभवत: फालितः

वन्धविवर्ण प्रयाब वर्णानं जनवति।

"संहितायाम" (पा. ६.१.४०) बधिक्कगः

"श्रीमुखं बोधि वेशु पादपुरसः" (पा. ६.१.१२४) इति बोधि गुणं।

"यास्ति सतिवर्यमनुजा दुश्चरणी विप्रिष्टे वर्णानम्: प्रकटकारः: प्राचुपगः प्रस्वति।

तां पञ्चः प्रयाबानुआर्थी सतिम सुहस्तं वाचवे पञ्चः करणविशदा वेशकरो

च प्रयोरे" द्वित॥ तथा च मन्नवनः। च वाक्यपितुपदानीि

विदुर्मृगमम भे समोहितः। गुणा तौष्टि निहिता नेन्द्रियति तुरीयं वाचो

मुखा चदितः। (क्रक. १.१५४.४५) इति॥१॥

तेषाः बर्णाः क्षेराङ्गाः विभागः पञ्चप्रकारः: स्मृतः।

तमवेद वर्ष्याचले

इति उद्रात्तिवानुप्रकारः: कालतः वाचारात्, श्राकास्तु विप्रिष्टे,

प्रयाबोि ब्रह्मारः, प्रयाबनुप्रदानः अतुनासिकारः।

उद्रात्तिवानुप्रकारः: ब्रह्माः।

तस्मात् क्षेराङ्गाः मित्यां जानित॥१०-१२॥

1. Be. omits कड़ इति. 2. MSS. after this तत्र मरे. 3. MSS. बाला.
पाणिनीव-शिचा

चौथी स्थानानि वर्णानामुरः कस्मिन्भिन्नत्वः।

२९॥ जिन्धामूलं च दन्तां धारितां नासिकाःचि च तालुं च।

* चोभभावण विधितां शिलसा रेव एव च।

जिन्धामूलमुपथा च गतिरत्नविकर्षणः।।१४॥

* दयोभावण्यानन्दामुकारादिपरं पदस्त।

क्षरां ताणि ताणि विचारः यदन्याढव्यातिमृत्युः।।१५॥

हकारं पञ्चमेत्यतमनं स्वाभिस्थ संयुतम।।१०॥

चौरसं तस्मि विजानीयात् कण्ठामाहसंयुतम्।।१६॥

कण्ठासवधाप्रचुंवयाक्षालया चोड़क्षालुः।।११॥

सुमेर्यन्याभरणं दन्तं चतुरसा: स्नाता:।

२१॥ जिन्धामूले तु कः प्रोक्तो दल्योढ़ो बः: स्नातो बुधे॥।२७॥

त त्वा विचि निगदोरेम्।।२२॥

इ कार्म स्वित। वर्णाणि पञ्चसे; इडम्बरभि: च पुनः चान्तः चिन्ते: यर्थवैः: संयुतः।

हकारं चौरसं चर्यानायां ते विजानीयात्। संयुतं केवलं हकारं

कण्ठामाहसः भादः॥।१६॥

क स्नाता व हा विचि। अन्ये चवर्णमाहकारी काभ्रो वर्णातमः।

पुनः प्रेषिणि वर्णाश्रयं। इवचर्णवर्गमः स्वमर्यादिः।

वकारः शकारे विचारः।। [हद्-वर्णाश्रयादिचित्रं दम्मु: तत्त्वादवेभाष्माभिः।।१६॥

चोरोकरोः वर्षगंवोऽविद्यति उत्तरस्यितः। उवर्षगंवोऽविद्यतः।

कण्ठामाहकारीं रकारः स्वात्माः: च।।१६॥

क्षरसंवर्गोऽऽकारः सकारसं दल्या: स्नाता:।

तु पुनः जि द्वा मूले कवरः: प्राचायरंस्यम् प्रोक्तः।“चर्य गतं जस्मा जिन्धामूलीयाः: प्रवीणमाहसः।”॥(क्र: धार.: १.१६॥)

त्वा विचि विनिमयः।।२३॥

वकारी चोहमिद्युभिधृष्टस्य जाते दल्योढ़ा: स्नात:॥।२७॥

1. Be. मात्रकम्बिधिः।

2. Be. श्रमाणकारीः।
15b. चलावुवीणावा निखर्जुन्यं दनमूल्यं: खराननु।
16a. चनुददारत्स परित्यु हिन्नं हृदं: शवसिष्वपि।

- यथा चाराण्को नारी तनं इवभिमापति।
- एवं रज्जा: प्रयोक्तव्यं कि चराँ इव खंड्या।
12b. यथे तु कपालतालया बौधी कपालेण त्येः समृत्।
18. अध्यायत्ता तु कपाल एकारूपयोगिते।
13. एकारूपयोगियो तथोबित्तसंहतम्।
14b. उपधानीय तदथा च जिह्वामूलैयनासिके।
15a. चयोगवाक्यै बिन्नेऽया चाध्यथ्यास्थानमेगुनः।

- स्वरामुखशां चाव विभंवं कर्षणं स्मृतम्।
- तेष्योपपि विन्तवेयेडी ताभ्यामेची तथैव च।

च नु स्वर्णक्षितहि। अवस्थार्थ नासिको भैयः।
वर्त्तमानतया दक्षरनमा नासिका: (१)। भविष्यन्त्रे श्वर्गस्थानीयो भर्गि।
कपालीया जाति विविधंवंधरं चूँति। भ्रष्टःविबिि समूद्रतालय्यं जाति स्वमृते।
द्रोदि: रूपकोऽपि संबंध: ‘प्रसि’ दस्तिवेत। ततः
विविधकम् ४ए का रो का र चालियतालयं कपालस भवेत्। बुध्या छंदः[च्] छंदः
सात्त्विन्य: चवम्य: दिनय:स्वर्गस्य। इकारोवरायात् ६ इ [ चौः] ६ भ्रमण विन्तवं
संहत्तत्त्यात् ७ भैवो। च प धरी नो धरी उपमु: भाष्यान्।

अष्ट्रा मिति। दशभानानाम: चर्चा विविङ वायु प्रयक्तम् ८ खृतं लिपेण:।
तेष्योऽद्यत एश्वोसङ्गी विन्तवन्यायी ताभ्याम् [एवो] एवो विवितोऽ।
व्याख्यातमय्यम्।

1. Be. भिवम्।
2. Be. लातियवार्त्तियाँ।
3. L तुस्न्यांविव।
4. L इकाराकारः।
5. Be. L इकाराकारवात्वेत्तानी।
6. Be. L एव।
7. L प्रयत्नः।
8. L प्रयत्नः।
9. Be. तेष्योऽशकी एको।
10. Be. adds ततोपिप ताभ्यामुर्थ च युनस्तारी विन्तवायः।
पार्थनीय-शिचा

॥१६॥ बचोस्य त्वा यशस्वीणेनस्मृत्य त्वा: शलस्या।
श्रेष्ठ: स्यः च त्वा हि: प्रीतका निवोधानुप्रदानात्॥२१॥

॥१७॥ अनुमोदनासिका नद्यो नादिनो द्वापनः खृताः।
देशान्न्यं यशस्विनिश्च ख्यासिनस्तु ख्यातन्।

॥१८॥ ईश्वरान्न्यं सत्त्वां विद्यान्न्यं गोर्भामैत्तु प्रच्छन्ते॥२४॥

* कुतीरस्त्रागतं द्रग्धमपवर्णं च मनि तमः।

न तथा पाठि मोक्षोऽसि पपाधृतिर्विभिषिष्टं किलिष्टात्॥२५॥

* सुतीर्थोऽसि त्वं यतः स्वामुखं सुवगविक्षितमः।

सुखरूपं सुवन्दिग्रि प्रयुक्तं ब्रह्म राजितं॥२६॥

नि भो गा भु ग्रं दा न त भर्तिः। जनानयनः मदान्न विमानानुर्घर्भेण द्वीपि जनीति तत्स्मात् शिष्य निबोध्यानि जानीहि।॥२१॥

भ मो ॥ तु ना सि का इति। ग्रं इ उ णः। कृष्य बयः। ए चो जु।
ऐ ची चु। ज य व र ट। ल णः। अर्धं एः न हः। एतिमोदनासिका
हर्षविजयः। हमभवद्वयः नातिनः नादानुप्रदानः। जग्मकड़ा ईश्वरः
किलिष्टात्। नादानुप्रदानः। श्वासिनः। चतुर्वीजनानुप्रदानः। श्वासिनः।
किलिष्टात्। श्वासिनः। एतद्द पङ्खीवो चाम श्वासम् भाचा:। प्रच्छन्ते॥२४॥

शैवेश्वरोऽहस्मापकसुपदेशनु। कृष्यदेशमं निन्दिति जु ती विषा दि ति। अनन्तर
चानानु तौर्यहुं युगोः। "निपाताणिमयोऽवाध्यं कृष्यदेशम: जसे युराविषा"। नाम-
श्वासिकाप्रसः। प्रात्म द्रवय भक्तवर्तमान: गतमहन: यस्मयमुदित्वानवर्णं च
मनि तमः। एन्तद्द पङ्खीव: इति: तथा घोषित्। परिमोऽति नास्ति। कसाहं?
पपाधृतिर, चन्द्रिष्ट किलिष्टात्। भोजोन नास्त्योऽसि।॥२५॥

स्त्रोति च सु ती विषा दि ति। सुहुरोः प्रात्म अस्मसं सुश्वासार्थ ब्रह्म
वेदार्थ: राजिति शोभते॥२६॥

1. Be, omits नादानुप्रदान:…ईश्वरः
2. Be, शैवेश्वरोऽ
न करालो न लक्ष्यातो नाव्यतो नानुमासिकः।
गणरो बहुविन्यस्य प्रयोगानु वाचस्मर्हिति॥२७॥
* यथा व्यासी हरेत् पुजानु दंग्रामिनि च पौड्येत्।
भीता पतनेद्राथ्यं तद्वत् वर्षानु प्रयोज्येत्॥२८॥
* एवं वर्षाः प्रयोज्याया नाव्यता न च पौडितः।
सम्यकंप्रायीविन्य बङ्गालोके महीयते॥२८॥
* चम्ब्रासार्थे दूरां वस्ति प्रयोगार्थे तु मध्यमाम्।
शिवायाशुद्धिशार्थे कुर्वां वस्ति विलिल्लिताम्॥२०॥
* श्रद्धा: श्रद्धारू प्रादास्तु द्राचीपुराण धीमते।
द्राचीपुराणपाणिनी धनेन्द्र व्याहितं भुविः।
रबभूतमिदं शास्त्रं पुष्यियं सम्यकं काशितम्॥१॥

न क रा ल द्रस्त्। नकारे 'नानुमासिक्यपदार्थ भ्रमे योजनीयः॥२७॥
* व धे ति। पतनं च मेंद्रा ती ताभ्यं भीता व्यासे श्चापदज्ञातिस्त यथा
पुजानु वाचानु दंग्रामिते पौडेत तत्तद्व वर्षानु ब्रुयादिति॥२८॥
* एव च मि ति। एवं नाव्यताः न पौडितायं वर्षाः प्रयोज्यनियाः।
सम्यकोऽखानम्यविविधविना यथोक्तम प्रयोगाय बङ्गालोके प्रयोगात पूजार्थे च
पुनर्मूल्यं तद्वति द्रस्ति भावः। एवं सम्यक् भास्त्र खंगकामपुरवाचः स्थाद् इवदाः॥२८॥
* श्रास्त्र श्रास्त्र द्रस्ति। दुःस्तिं विलिल्लितं मध्यमाम् चम्ब्रासार्थे कुर्वाय।
व्याख्यातममत्रं॥२०॥
* श्रास्त्र श्रास्त्र द्रस्ति। श्रास्त्र श्रास्त्र द्रस्ति द्राचा प्रादास्तु "तस्यापयाम्।"
श्रास्त्र श्रास्त्र द्राचे द्राचे "तस्यापयाम्।"
(पा.४.१५.१२) तद्वाय "टिब्बापाणि" (पा.४.१५.१५) इवादिना डीपौ तथा। पुजाय
होतंविषयायम् प्रादास्तु। कोरसातिविविधात्मकायाम् चाचाहृ चौ चौ चतुः
द्रस्ति। यः पारिविनं परिविनोऽयासापाणम्। "तस्यापयाम्।"
(पा.४.१५.१५)

1. इ परिविनोऽयासापाणम्।
पाणिनीय-शिष्य

* विनयनमुखनी:खतामिना

य दृष्ट पठनम् प्रयत्: सदा दिनः।
स भवति पश्च्युल्कोर्तिमान्
मुखमतुल्यं च समस्युन्ते द्रिविद द्रिवीति॥०॥

वेन पाणिनिना चौं त्रयों च शब्दशास्त्रं व्यासतम् उक्तम्। तत्री पाणिनिये नम
इति। पूर्वम् सवम्। पाणिनिय द्रिति पाठे शब्दादिवः (पा. ४.१.१२२) कव्यम्।
र व भू त व ति शास्त्रम्।॥३॥

‘द्रिति न य न सुख नि: स ता मिति । यो हिङ्गो वेदाधिकारो [प्रवत्]’
सावधान: सदा निर्देशम् [इमा] पठत् स [इह] पश्च्युल्कोर्तिमान् भवति। द्रिवि
सुखम् रतुल्यं समस्युं भुजित्, सर्गं वायोति वा। द्रिवचन शिष्याधाय:-
समस्युं। विनितिकृत्यक्षमसमस्युगङ्कर्तम् ‘अयमस्मा अः’ (पि. ५.२२)
इडविकाय, “अपरणां नै लोकसू जोत्य” (पि. ५.४०)विचि लघुस्वातः।
द्रिति शिष्याधायः समासः।॥३॥

1. L Be. वं. 2. Be. omits द्रिति. 3. L Be. विनयनमुखनिःकथिः।
4. L reads also संख्य १५४१ विंग्लाबे उपरे युज्ञाति पदि द्वार्तारंपूर्वे शोकायां
श्रीधराधायकसिद्धो दश्रोपानां शुद्धतावाक्षरसंवर्धिन्देव विविक्तिसिद्धम्। ॥ ॥ श्लोकविशेष रघुस्वातः।
V. यजुः:शाखीया (The Yajus Recension)

चध गिरा प्रवलवाचम रामिने मतं यथा।

1. शास्त्रानुपूर्वं तदु विवादु यजोंसं लोकवेद्योः
2. प्रसिद्धमपि शब्दार्थम् चविवाचतम् अवलब्धिम्।
3. पुनर्मलोकवेद्याम वाच उच्चारणं विधिम्।
4. विषग्रहतुःषदिव्रेव वर्णं: सम्भवतो मतः।
5. प्राकृति संस्कृते चापि सर्वं प्रोज्या: स्थयिन्य।

खरा विशिष्टिक्ष्य स्पर्शानः पञ्चविशिष्टः।

1. यद्यरथ स्रृता ढळौ चलवारश यमाः स्रृता:।
2. अनुसरो विसर्गं खण्डों चापि पराशयो।
3. द्वःस्यशिष्यित विशेषेऽवकारः: सुत एव च।

यथा सीराट्क्का नारो| 4. भरां श्लोक्यमार्थपि।
एवं| 5. रक्ष विज्ञानोपि चेचे परं रक्ष खेद्या।
हर्षां पञ्चमैथुतम्| 6. चन्दःस्यशापि संयुतम्।
7. चारसं तं विज्ञानोपि कस्यमाहुसंयुतम्।
8. चातमा बुद्धा| 6. समाध्यार्थान् मनो बुद्धो विवचया।
9. समाचारानि मनं संस्कृति मातमम्।

1. B सूची।
2. C मथुराती, L श्लोक्यमार्थ।
3. B प्राध्य, L पराध्य।
4. CD तस श्लोक्यमार्थाती, L तस्स प्रचारमार्थाती।
5. CL रक्षप्रयोगेऽच। सर्वं चेचे।
6. CL चन्दःस्यशापि।
7. CL रक्षाक्ष।
8. CDCL विशेषाचारण।
माहतत्तुरसि चरणः मन्द्रं जनयति स्वरूपः।

॥४॥ प्रातः स्वयं चैगं छन्दो गद्यतमास्तितम्।
कष्टे माध्यमन्दिरयुगं मध्यमं तैहत्वभानुगम्।

॥५॥ तारं तारालीशाम्वनं श्रीशंक्यं जागतानुगम्।
सौदीर्गं मूल्यग्रहिती वज्रमपथ मानत्।

॥६॥ वर्णार्थ जनयति तीर्था बिभागः पद्धथा स्मृतः।
करतः कालतः स्वानात् प्रयोजनानुव्रद्धानन्।

॥७॥ इति वर्णाविलेशः प्रायोजनिष्ठमं तं निवैधितम्।
ब्रह्मण्य स्वानानि वर्णानामः कष्टे शिष्याधा।

॥८॥ जिज्ञासूलं च दृव्याय नासिकाप्रेम च तालु।

उदात्ते निषादाग्राभायवुद्दा त्वसंघेश्वति।

स्वरितामविशेष चौते पाण्डुरंगममध्यमः।

शीतावशं विद्विशत मारसा रूपे एक च।

जिष्यामुलम् उपवा च गतिनिर्विवोधशयः।

'यथाभिमानप्रचारणम् उरारादिपं च।

वराणसै नादय विधाता यदु अत्यधु अय्यतम्। जययाद।

कुलोद्त्ति भागतं दख्मम् नयवन्ति च भवितम्।

'न तथय परिस्मरितः पापाविस्तिरं किलिशातु।

सुलोद्दति भागतं अज्ञतं खाल्काय पुरुषविश्वं।

सुखरेष्यं सुविवेधं प्रयुक्तं ब्रह्म राजति।

न वराणसै न ब्रह्मबोधो नाथको नानानामिता।

गण्डले वहिष्ठत्वं प्रयोगानं स्वरूपः अभिषितं।

1. Weber reads ३भानमकारादिपं
2. CDL न तथा पाण्डुरंगममध्यमः
3. CDL चौते पाण्डुरंगममध्यमः
4. CDL राजति।
वसूःशाखिया

यथा वाक्री हरेत् पुत्रान् दंडास्मिन् च पीडितेः।
भीता पतनशिष्ठाणों ताहद वर्षाः प्रयोजितेः॥२०॥
एवं वशी: प्रयोत्तव्या नाथ्यका न च पीडिता:।
सम्यक्षेष्ठ्रमायेण वर्धालोके ॥२१॥
बध्यासारं दुन्तं दृष्टं प्रयोगार्थं तु मध्यमाः।
शिष्याणाम् उपदेशार्थं कुर्यदु हितं विलम्बिताः॥२२॥
उदात्तश्वानुद्रात्त्वं स्वितयश्चरास्यः।

॥८॥ अहो दृश्यः मृतं दृष्टं कालतो नियमं ॥८॥
कष्टावहाविचिनयशास्त्राणि चोछजालु।

॥११॥ सुमृघस्वयं करुणा दल्या वच्चुलसा: समृताः॥२४॥
जिञ्जभूशि तु कु: प्रोको दृश्योऽऽ वः समृतो वुचः।

॥१२॥ ए ऐ तु ॥ कष्टातालव्य चो ची कशोष्ठीस्मृतः॥२५॥
चर्यभाषा तु ॥ कष्टास्य एकारीकार्योपेत्।

॥१३॥ एकारीकार्योपेत: तथोपेतःसुधंततमम॥२६॥

॥१४॥ उच्चारीनय जप्या च जिञ्जभूशि नासिके।
चयोगवाहिन विन्योऽ ॥ चाययस्यानभाविनः॥२७॥

॥१५॥ चलावुःश्रेष्ठानिधीर्गे ॥ दल्मूल्यः ॥ खरानुः।

॥१६॥ चलुक्यास्तु करण्यां निधि श्री: विभेषेत् च॥२८॥

करणां च खराणां व विवर्तं करणं खरात्म।

1. CDL वाक्री यथा...दंडास्मिन् च.
2. CDL न वीरयते.
3. A वधि.
4. CL कष्टावहाव.
5. A कष्टा; CDL, कष्टाया खाइ एकारीकार्योऽपि.
6. Weber reads एकारीकार्योपेत: ए ऐ, CDL चौश्रेष्ठार्योपेत तथोपेतःदल्मूल्यः.
7. CL चाययस्यानभाविनः.
8. AL दल्मूल्यः; BW दलः, CW सूतः.
9. CL सचाराम खतुः.
10. CL सचाराम मात्राणां वैत.
11. ABW विभेषेति.
12. AW वान्यस्ति, CL ताभास्ति च.


161. अचौर्यश्च 1 याकस्त्रोष्णेऽस्मान्यं शत: स्मृत:।
श्रया: सुधा हल: प्रोक्ता निविधमानुप्रदानत। ॥२०॥

171. 2यमोसतुनासिका 2 नः न नामानि 4हवअ: स्मृत:।
ईपन्नादा 5पष्ठाशश्च प्रवासिनः सक्षादवय: ॥२१॥

181. 6स्वष्कां सांस्कृत्या विद्यादृ गोपामित्यत् प्रचन्ति।

शब्दः 7ग्राह्यं प्रादान दायोप्य धीमत: ॥२२॥
दायोप्य: 8पाँचिनियो चेंद्रे व्याख्यते सुवि।
रब्धुतमृ इति शास्त्रं वचयते सम्ब्रह्माविशिष्टम् ॥२३॥
वेदा० विद्यास्मात्वस्मायन्य अविभाव: मद्यमि।
कन्ने व्याकरणं प्रोत्तं तथे पाणिनि नम: ॥२४॥
8विनयसुखनिन्हसक्तामृ स्तर्का
्य इति पत्तनु। 10प्रयत्न: सदा दिज।।
स भवति 11पशुभवायौस्तितमान।

12सुखम् चातुर्लोचनं च समागते दिव दिवीरित। ॥२५॥

1. CL ॰नेमः: गुड्डा मारा; B गुड्डा मारा; शल: ; AW ॰नेमसङ्गसाजवः
2. CL तोः B यथा: (यथा  sec. m) AW तथा। 3. CL नहीं।
4. B यथा; CL वर्य लक्ष: ABW ए यथा।
5. AW श्रव्यक्षानांबरो। 6. B श्रव्यक्षानां; C श्रव्यक्षानाम्। 7. ABW श्रव्यक्षानां।
8. CL पाणिनिय। 9. CL विनयसुखनिन्हसक्तामृ। 10. CL प्रयत्नम।
11. Weber reads धन्यादां before पशुभवायौ। 12. CL चातुर्लोचनं च शुवं समागते।
VI. कल्पार्थो (The Ṛk Recension)

[१]

चतुः विवर्त्त भक्तचर्मम् परशुनीयम् मर्गे यथा।
'प्राच्यातुपूर्वते' तदिवादु विशेषं लोकविद्येष्वः॥
प्रेमचालमेव शब्दाविवर्त् शब्दात्मकम् चतुदिव्यः।
पुनर्विकोटिकरिताम् वाच उच्चारणे विचित्रम्॥
विवर्तिश्चूष्टदविवर्ति वद्यां 'श्रवणे' सत्सः।
प्राक्तेन संहृते चापि सर्बं प्रोक्तम: श्रवणेन॥

खरो विन्दुतिरितिकम् खरोणां परमविन्दुति:॥

[२]

यादयुस्मृत्ता च त्रिष्टी चल्लम्ब यस्मा: समृता:॥
चाल्लारी विसर्गम् ३ × क्रियां चापि पराशिता:॥

[३]

चाल्ला बुद्धा ४ समेत्याचर्यम् मनो युद्धो विच्छिद्।

[४]

मन: कायरूवमाध्यमम् स प्रेरयति मात्राम् ॥
मात्रसूक्षमसि चरितम् मन्त्रे जनयति खरम्।

[५]

प्राय: सवनयोगं तं कष्टे गायत्रमाध्यमितः ॥
कष्टे माध्यमन्दिन्युगं मध्यस्य द्वैष्ट्रभानुगम्।

[६]

तारं तार्तीयसवनं सर्पिण्यं जागतानुगम्॥

वर्णां जनयते वेष्यं विभागः पद्धथा स्मृतः ||
खरतः कालतः स्मानात् प्रयबानां प्रदानतः ।
इति वर्णविदः प्रािनिरियुक्तं तं निवभोधत ॥१०॥

उदात्तानुदात्तं स्मृत खराखयः ।

जिज्ञासूणं दौर्वः स्मृत इति कालतो नियमा चरितः ॥११॥

बोधिसामुलं च द्विताः नासकोटीं च तातुं च ॥१२॥

चकारं पद्धमेयुंतमु ॥चतःस्माभिभ संयुतमः ।

धीरस्यं तं विज्ञानीयात् कण्ठामहांसंयुतम् ॥१३॥

चक्षुविचुल्यां विकाँगांशालया चोष्ठापुरूः ।

चुमुखन्या कठुरा दन्त्या बलुलसः स्मृतः ॥१४॥

जिज्ञासुः तु कः प्रेती दृश्योऽथो व: स्मृती वुधे: ।

ए ऐँ तु कण्ठतालया चो ची कष्ठोऽस्तो स्मृती ॥१५॥

1. य पद्धमेयुः,भमं्यम्
2. य पुनः,गौरायि
3. य धीरस्यं
कृप्याशीर्या

चर्चमाता तु कष्ट्राष्य चेरारिकार्योभेंत्।

||13\| चेरारिकार्योर्मान्तव तयोविन्हतसंहतं।||

सब्दवं माधविन् आद्य विवशं तु हिमालिकम्।

घोषा वा सब्दतः सवैः ग्रंथोऽध्ययनम् विश्वतः।

[५]

क्षराणां जयकां चैव विवशं करणं स्वर्गम्।

भूषोपि विवशविच्छदी तास्मां ऐसी चैव च।

||14a\| अनुसूक्तेसु च नासिका स्थानसुच्यते।||

ययोगवाहा विशेषा आश्रयविश्वामयन।

||15\| अलाबुशणानिंचित्रे उल्लुक्तः।||

अनुसूक्तेः कर्तव्येऽनिलं क्रीः ग्रंथीभृत्र च।

अनुसूक्तेः विवश्या तु विलासे चाचार्येः।

दिरोहिः तु विवश्यायाः यशोकारावर्यः।

'वात्र यथा दृष्टव पुनाः इश्राभां न च वीड़येत।

मोता पतनमेद्रां तदद् वर्णने प्रयोजयेत्।

[६]

यथा सौभाषिकः नारी तथा इत्यभिमापे।

एवं उऽज्ञः प्रयोजनः खिः चारूः द्व ख्यातया।

रस्वां प्रगुज्योरतः नो चाम्येत पूर्वेन अध्यमः।

दिंशुस्वां प्रगुज्योरतः पायाचासिकम् चाचरेत्।

इत्यदृः चैवमात्रलु चर्चमात्रलु मूर्खः।

नासिकायाः लघुदृः च रक्षोऽविधान्त।

1. Ch कष्ट्राष्य चेरारिकारः, Y कष्ट्राष्य एकारिकारः
2. Y जयकां च राष्ट्रां च।
3. Y तमोऽपि च।
4. Y has after this दयपाणीय रूपः च चिन्हासूक्तियोगकर्मः।
5. Y °ख्यानमयनः।
6. CL. सर्वा' च।
7. Y यथा च्यां।
8. Y रक्षोऽविधान्त।
пад्धा त्वम् विधितः नार्यवाक्यम् पथस्थस्य सुखः।
वेदैः लयस्मिन् (?) च यथे पाठाये पाठका (?) गुणः॥२३॥
श्रवीतम् भोजितम् हृदयम् व्रम्णम् अनुनासिकम्।
काव्यं ययमि तथा खण्डविवर्जितम्॥२४॥
हास्य दृष्टं लिपिं निरस्तं निलंबितं गद्यिं प्रगीतम्।
निषोदितं रसमुदारं च वनमेयं न तु सारस्यम्॥२५॥
प्रातः पुढ्धिलम् उर्मिकिते सर्वेष शाशूः लघोपकृष्मेन।
महानिद्धि कशटमिते चेव चक्राय सर्वाणि मधुधितविशेषेन॥२६॥
तारं तु विद्याः सवने रत्नोऽनि श्रीरोगते तत्र सदा प्रयोगम्।
०भोज्यसायनस्तुस्सराणि तुलेन नादिनि गिरायिमिति॥२७॥

॥१६॥
चन्द्रोपवकः यस्मि विविधमं स्तुतमा ॥श्रवः स्मृता: ॥
श्रीपा: स्तुता हृदः प्रोक्तता निबोधानुप्रदानतः॥२८॥
॥१७॥
यमोऽनुसिका नन्दो नादिनो हक्षणः स्मृता: ॥
ईङ्गद्वारः यथो जयः प्रासिनस्तु खषाद्यः॥२९॥

कथकाखोरीया

||18|| ईश्वरा सांतं विदासं गोर्धमितं प्रचारति।

'द्राचीकृत: पाणिनिना वेनिन्द्र व्यापिने सुनि।
ब्रह्म: पादी तु वैद्यक इत्यली कवित्योद्य प्रजाते।
क्षरोवरम अयनं चाचुनिस्यं शोभम उच्चने।
शिवा र्वाणं तु वैद्यक सूत्र आकारणं अभ्यंति।
तामातु साधम् चालोऽव्र ब्रह्मालोके महायते॥

[५]

उदात्तम् यायाधि द्वपोधुङ्कः मन्त्रोपिनीमूलनिविष्मूली।
उपासनां भूतं च वक्तुत्तमायामुद्यात्समव॥४३॥
उदापति प्रदेशिनो विधातां प्रचयं मध्यतोक्षिलिम।
निर्देशं तु कुवितद्वारा सुर्यितपकानिषकाम॥४४॥
प्रनोदातां आयुद्या उदात्तम् दुःखदात नोचस्वरितम।
मध्योदातां वरियं दुःखदातं दुःखदातत्तमिति नवपदशया॥४५॥
क्षरित: सोम: प्र वो वीरं हिवशा खर् वहस्तितं: इदवाच्यताः।
क्षरिविज्ञानोद्वारां सोम इवायुद्वारां प्रेमवदात्पति।
व इववदातं वीरं नोचस्वरितम।॥४६॥
हिवशा मध्योदातां वरियं खरं: वहस्तितं दुःखदातत्तम।
इन्द्राच्ययपति इति ब्राह्मचारम॥४७॥
स्वदत्तो हि वीयो मूषुद्वार उदात्ताम।
खरित: कण्यमूलोत्तर: वरायसे प्रचयं सुनः॥४८॥

[१०]

चाषकु वदे मातां हिमातां वेई वायसः।
पियो शैली हिमातां तु नकलस्वर्गमालकम॥४९॥
क्षरोवरमान्त दशमस्यां च महतम।
न तथा 'पाठे भोजोर्वति पापापिरं विशिष्यात्॥५०॥

1. Ch द्राच्योऽव्र, Y . द्राच्योऽव्र पाणिनि।
2. Y व्यास्यत् सुनि।
3. Weber reads द्राच्योऽव्र. Ch हृत च।
4. Y परिमोचन्द्रिः।
पाण्डुर्कांगतं ्वतं सा। सार्वायं सुवासितंस्य।
सुखरेण सुविधायं प्रयुंतं जस्सा ्राजते॥५१॥
मनो हीन: स्फोटू वर्णतो वा मिथ्याप्रस्य: न तमः सः॥
स वामवत्रो यज्ञां महिष्ठस्य यथेनःसः: स्फोटूपः सः॥५२॥
वचचरम् (१) अनायुः विखरं व्याघोरितम॥
अन्तारास्करण (१) वच्चं पति मस्के॥५३॥
हस्तोहनं योंधेरि सङ्कर्षणजितम॥
क्षग्यजः सामभिरिष्टो वियोजिन्न चालिक्कला॥५४॥
हस्तेन वें बोधेरि सङ्कर्षणसङ्क्षतम॥
क्षग्यजः सामभिः पुतो ब्रजलोके महोर्दल॥५५॥

[११]

श्रवः श्रववित्री प्रातासु दाचीयुवाय धीमते॥
वाचवेच्यं समाहतयं देवीं वाचस्मिति खिति॥५६॥
चेनाचरसमाहतयं श्रविन्नम् सहकरतु॥
कलमुः वाकार्यं प्रिततं तस्की पासिने नम।॥५७॥
चेन चोता गिर: पुसं: विमले: श्रववारिवि:॥
तस्मातानं भित्तं तस्की पासिने नम॥५८॥
ब्रजनामवते शोकस्म भानाभिन्नलकाया॥
चलुष्णोक्तिनं चेन तस्की पासिने नम॥५९॥
"निवयनभिसुखमिवतिः द्वातमिमां
य इस पतेन् ्सर्जतं सदा हिजः:॥
स भविवतिन बनवाल्पवकोविति मान॥
"अतुलं च सुरस्म समस्य: दिविति दिविति॥६०॥
रघु भिक्षाम, भाणा, उदात्ताः, इकारं, स्त्राणा, यादा,
गीतो, अच्छोक्षुदा, उदाराः, चाबल, श्रवः एकादश॥

क्षति पाण्डुर्ण-शिचा समासा॥

1. Y लख्। 2. Y राजते। 3. Y निवयनभिसुखमिवतिः द्वातमिमां
4. Y प्रवश: वदा। 5. Y सुखस्मुः स तमः।
परिशिष्टम्

चान्द-वर्षिकश्राविष

Varna-Sūtras of Candragomin

Ⅲ Ⅲ विन्नवीकाय नग: । Ⅲ Ⅲ

खगोऽकरणमप्रयोऽवेऽन्नण्यायभवे बर्षार्यायवे ॥१॥

तत्र ्धर्म ्न म ॥२॥

कष्ट: ्भवहंविसज्ञनीयानाम् तृा। ॥१॥

कष्टसततातुतात: इद्देतैताम् ॥४॥

कष्टान्त: उदात्तात्त: ॥५॥

मुनिः कर्तरशाश्चाम् ॥६॥

दन्ता: ्इतुलसानाम् ॥७॥

नाविन्का अनुवारस्य ॥८॥

स्मानानुनासिकाः भववनमा ॥९॥

तातु: इहुडायानाम् ॥१०॥

श्रीविषयाणीसि: ॥११॥

दन्तोऽइ स्वरावव्य ॥१२॥

जिंदामूलं जिंदामूलियय्य (श्वै: ) ॥१३॥

व ए म ॥१४॥

जिंदायं दन्तानाम् ॥१५॥

जिंदामूलं तालवयानाम् ॥१६॥

जिंदापार्यं श्रियाख्यानाम् ॥१७॥

शेष: ्खानका(क)रशा: ॥१८॥

प्र य तो हिविध: ॥१८॥

आध्यायनरी बाध्यथ: ॥२०॥

तत्र ्धर्म ्न तै: ॥२१॥

संस्ततांविद्वन्तर्थ: स्तुतम् द्रैषएत्स्तुतल: च ॥२२॥

संस्तताम् चवकारस्य ॥२३॥
पायनीय-गिरचा

विभिन्नम् अयायां स्त्रायां च ||२४॥
तेनके विशिष्ठत्वं लेरौतीः (लेद्रोताः) ||२५॥
ताभायम् पदेतीः ||२६॥
ताभायामयकारख ||२७॥
खुठलं कर्मणांम् ||२८॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं लन्तःस्थानाम् ||२९॥
बा श्राः ||३०॥

वर्णां प्रत्यक्षितायाः प्रष्णसिद्धिीयजिज्ञासूलीयोपभानीवाच
विभ Education [अ-]नादानुप्रदाना चाहोवा: ||३१॥
प्रत्यक्षितोपस्थिता चन्तःस्थानयाप्राष्ट्रा: ||३२॥
ितरे सर्वं महाप्राष्ट्रा: ||३३॥
ितीयचतुर्थप्रायंस्मा: सातुसर्लाल: ख्याविताः
संहतकष्ट[ः] कादानुप्रदाना चाहोवा: ||३४॥
िुतीयचतुर्थाः प्रत्यक्षितोपस्थिता: ||३५॥
काद्यो गायन्ताः स्थानीः ||३६॥
िास्थाय यक्षवा: ||३७॥ नाम काम: प्रमल: ||

शत चारषयो ढूँढ़ो दौरा: श्रुत दृष्टि सबा भवत्: प्रक्षेपम् उदात्साहसा-सूतमेषनं साउनामिकानिगुनानिकमेषनं चाप्
दोषधान्या भवति ||३८॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||३९॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||४०॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||४१॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||४२॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||४३॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||४४॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||४५॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||४६॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||४७॥
ष्ट्रेष्टुष्टलं दौरां भान्ति तेन हास्यधारा भवति ||४८॥

इति चान्द्रवर्षभ्रोच्छेन समासांनि ||
THE PĀṆINĪYA-SIKṢĀ

With Translation and Notes (Critical and Exegetical)
THE PĀṆINĪYA SIḴṢĀ

WITH TRANSLATION AND NOTES (CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL)

[a i u-ṇ || ṛ l-k || e o-ṇ || ai au-c || ha ya va ra -t || la-ṇ || ēna ma na na-na-m || jha bha-ṛ || gha ḍha ḍha-s || ja ba ga ḍa da-s || kha pha cha tha tha ca ta ta-v || ka pa-y || sa sa sa-r || ha-l.]

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

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

Atha siksāṁ pravakṣyāmi Pāṇiniyām matām yathā ||
śastrāṇupūrvyām tad vidyād yathōktām loka-vedayoh || (1)
Prasiddham api śabdārtham avijñātam abuddhibhibh ||
punar vyaktikarisyāmi vāca uccārane vidhim || (2)
Tri-suṣṭiḥ caṭuh-ṣaṭṭir vā varnāḥ sambhavato matāḥ ||
Prākṛte Sanskrte cāpi svayam proktāḥ Svayambhuvā || (3)

Tr. Now I shall give out the Sikṣā according to the views of Panini. In pursuance of the traditional lore, one should learn it with reference to the popular and the Vedic languages. Though words and their meaning are well known, yet these are not within the knowledge of persons intellectually deficient, (hence) I shall dwell once more on the rules regarding the pronunciation of words. That speech-sounds in Prakrit and Sanskrit are sixty-three or sixty-four, according to their origin, has been said by Brahman (Svayambhū) himself. [1-3].
a. The expression Pāṇiniyam maṭanī yathā agrees with the following which occurs later on in all recensions (except the AP.):  
Samkarah śāṅkarin prādād Dākṣiputrāya dhīmate. It appears that the compiler of the AP. did not know who the author of the PS. was. For, though in the introduction of his metrics (ch. 328 AP. ed. Anandāram) he writes: chando vakṣye mālajais taī Pīṅgaloktāṃ yathākramam he is quite silent about the source of the Sikṣā given by him. It is not so much likely that Pāṇini like later authors would put in his own name in his work, for in his Āśtādhyāyī too he does not mention himself. This ignorance of the compiler of the AP. along with the defective nature of the text of the PS. as given in his work probably goes to show that at his time (c. 300 A.C.) the PS. was not a frequently studied work. The Prātiśākhya; which are later than PS. must have supplanted it to a considerable extent at that time. That the author of the AP. leaves out as many as six hemistichs out of eighteen couplets shows the damaged condition in which his material had already reached at the time of the compilation of the AP.

b. The expression tri-ṣaṅṭī catuk-ṣaṅṭir vā shows how the author of these spurious verses felt a difficulty over the meaning of the first two couplets of the PS. and could not say for certain whether 63 or 61 letters were meant by Pāṇini. Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra (c. 300 B.C.) knows only 63 letters (see ed. Jolly, II, 9.14). The AP. contains none of these couplets except the first half of the third in the following form: vakṣye sikṣāṃ triṣaṅṭih syur varten vā catur-adhikāḥ. It is evident that the compiler of the AP. too felt a difficulty over first two couplets of the PS. It cannot be ascertained whether the authors of the other recensions have imitated the indecision of the AP. in this matter or independently had their own confusion.

c. The expression Prākṛte Sanskrita cāpi, scarcely older than the AP. (c. 300 A.C.), has sometimes been erroneously referred to as the earliest mention of the names of Sanskrit and Prakrit languages (e.g. Hari Narayan Apte, Wilson Philological Lectures of 1915, Poona, 1922, p.5).

Svarā vimśatir ekas ca sparśānāṃ pañca-vimśatih ।  
yādayas ca smṛtā hy aśtau caśvāras ca yamāḥ smṛtāḥ ॥ (4)

Anusvāro visargaḥ ca ḵa-phau cāpi parāśrayau ।  
duhṣprṣṭas cēti viṁśego ᵃ-ḥārāḥ pluta eva ca ॥ (5)

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

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

Table I.
Vowels according to the PS. and the Prātiśākhyaḥs.

| PS  | a | ā | ā | i | ī | u | ū | ū | r | ṛ | ṛ | l | l | e | e | o | o | ai | ai | au | au |
| APr.| a | ā | ī | i | ī | u | ū | ū | r | ṛ | ṛ | l | l | e | o | o | ai | ai | au | au |
| RPr.| a | ā | ī | i | ī | u | ū | ū | r | ṛ | ṛ | l | l | e | o | o | ai | ai | au | au |
| TPr.| a | ā | ī | i | ī | u | ū | ū | r | ṛ | ṛ | l | l | e | o | o | ai | ai | au | au |
| VPr.| a | ā | ī | i | ī | u | ū | ū | r | ṛ | ṛ | l | l | e | e | o | o | ai | ai | au | au |
| RT  | a | ā | ī | i | ī | u | ū | ū | r | ṛ | ṛ | l | l | e | e | o | o | ai | ai | au | au |

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

2 In his enumeration of vowels, Uvaṭa (e.g., on RPr. I, 14) does not mention pluta ones, though the RPr. recognizes them (see I. 16; II. 32 etc.). In the RPr. l (also long l ?) does not enjoy the full status of a vowel. For it can stand neither at the beginning nor at the end (I. 9, 11).

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

4 This enumeration is according to Uvaṭa. For his view on RPr. vowels see Note 2 above. The first seven chapters of the VPr. are genuine. The last (VIII) chapter seems very much to be a late composition (see Weber, Ind. Stud. IV, p. 66). Hence by VPr. we shall understand the first seven chapters, and the chapter VIII will be designated by the name late VPr. or l VPr.

5 The view of the RT. as regards the number of vowels it recognizes has been gathered from its vṛtti which might have been built on Aṇḍavṛūḍi's work (see Introduction § 40). The recognition of a long l by the RT. is curious. PS. and other Prātiśākhyaḥs do not accept this.
The difference between the PS. and the Prātiśākhyaṣ is due to their originally different character, for the former was a manual for helping the recitation of all the Vedas or it may have belonged to the one undivided Veda that existed at the very beginning (see Introduction, § 18), while the latter (the Prātiśākhyaṣ) were treatises related to the peculiar mode of reciting or chanting one particular Veda, or its many recensions (tatra sarva-veda-sādhāranī śikṣāḥ...Pāṇinīṇā prakāsitaḥ. prativeda-sākham ca bhinnā-rūpa prātiśākhya-saṃjñitā anyaireva munibhiḥ pradarśitā, Prasthāṇa-bhedha, Weber’s Ind. Stud. I, p. 16). The fact that the PS. was accessory to the study of all the Vedas, required that it should be a treatise of general kind and in this respect differs from the Prātiśākhyaṣ which related to one kind only of the mantra-text in its different śākhās. Hence we find the Atharva and Rākṣa Prātiśākhyaṣ omitting from their treatment of vowels the pluta ones which probably arose late in the recitation of their respective mantra-texts. The TPr. includes pluta a, i and u in its treatment of vowels while the diphthongs (e, o, ai, au) as well as r and l have no pluta variety in it.

Note 4. Yamās are said to be particular nasal sounds occurring before the nasal stops when plosives precede them. The enumeration of yamās as four in the commentaries appears to be a bit puzzling; for, according to the definition of the Prātiśākhyaṣ and the Nār. S. the yamās become 20 or 21 in number (see APR. I. 99; TPr. XXI. 12, XXII. 12; RPr. VI. 8). Uvaṭa in his commentary of the RPr. has a defence for both the enumerations. He sums up his first discussion, with evam viṃśatir yamā bahv-rcānām bhaveṇi sva-rūpaiś caiva eva tad uttaratra yama-lakṣane vicārayiṣyāmaḥ (on I. 20) and in discussing the character of yama (on VI. 8) he says tasmād itha ‘sparśa yamānanamunāsikaḥ’ ity ucyamāne viṃśatīvāt sthānīnām ādeśānām api yamānām viṃśatīvā-prasāṅgāḥ; sa mā bhūt. caturṇām eva yamānām prayamāḥ prayamamāḥ dvitiyā dvitiyam evam ā pañcamāḥ āpadyerann ity ucyate. The sum and substance of what Uvaṭa says seems to be that in pronunciation the yamās do
not partake of the characteristics of their respective groups to any considerable extent, hence they are to be called the first yama the second yama and so on, making the yamas four in number. But the Bāhyācas however thought otherwise and gave an extremely logical interpretation to the definition of the Prātiśākhya without caring for its practical aspect (Whitney has a difficulty over the nature and number of the yamas; see his comments on APri. I, 99, TPr. II, 51; XXI, 12; XXII, 12. A great deal of his difficulty is due to the peculiar nature of the TPr.). The late Vāj. Pr., i.e., its ch. VIII (29), has recognized four yamas only though curiously enough Uvaṭa explains their number to be twenty. In the Rktantra also (ed. Burnell, p. 2) only four yamas have been recognized. (For more information about yamas see Siddheshwar Varma's 'Critical Studies', pp. 9ff.)

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

Note 6. Dubhspṛṣṭaḥ. The pluta ṭ has been called the dubhspṛṣṭa or ‘touched-with-difficulty.’ This may be one of the reasons why some Prātiśākhyas did not recognize this sound (see Table I). But the PS. being meant for all the Vedas had to notice this. It should be known that the commentator to the Rśv. recognizes this (see ibid). Weber was inclined to understand dubhspṛṣṭa as a nāṣākyā (Ind. Stud. IV, p. 349). But his view seems to be untenable. The Pañjikā on the authority of Audavraji takes it in the sense of īṣat-sprṛṣṭa (p. 11). For according to the latter, ṭ partakes of the character of semivowels which are īṣat-sprṛṣṭa according to PS. See also Uvaṭa on RPr. XIII. 3.
**Atmā buddhyā samarthyārthān mano yuṅkte vivakṣayā \ manah kāyāgniṃ āhanti sa prārayati mārutam**  
\[6\]

*Mārutas tārasi caran mandrāṃ janayati svaram | prātaḥ savana-yogāṃ tam chando-gāyatram āśritam*  
\[7\]

*Kanṭhe mādhyanandin-yogāṃ mādhyaṃm traṅgubhāṅgum | tārāṃ tārtīya-savanāṃ śīrṣanyāṃ jagatāṅgum*  
\[8\]

*Sōḍīrṇo mūrdhny abhihato vaktreṇ āpadya mārutaḥ | varṇāṇi janayate tēṣāṃ vibhāgaḥ pāncaḥ pāncaḥ smṛtaḥ*  
\[9\]

*Svarataḥ kālataḥ sthānāt prayatnānupradānataḥ | iti varṇa-vidhāḥ prahūr nipunam tam nibodhata*  
\[10\]

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

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

(The same breath circulating) in the throat (produces) the middle (*mādhyama*) tone and relates to the midday offering (*mādhyandina-savana*) and follows the Triṣṭubh (metre); and the shrill (*tārā*) tone (which is produced by the breath circulating) in the roof of the mouth relates to the third (*i.e.*, evening) offering (of the day) and follows the Jagatī (metre) [8].

(The breath which is thus) sent upwards and is checked by the roof of the mouth attains to the mouth and produces speech-sounds (*varṇas*), which have a fivefold classification—according to their pitch, quantity, place of articulation, the primary effort and the secondary effort. So said those who were versed in (pronouncing) speech-sounds. Learn this carefully [9-10].
TRANSLATION AND NOTES

Note 7. Prātah-savanayogam. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa has the following: atha mandram tapati tasmāt mandrayā vācā prātah-savane samset (XIV. 6).

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

Note 9. So’dīrṇah. The peculiar sandhi observable here sah+udīrṇah has been supported by Pāṇini (so’ei lope cet pādāpūraṇam. VI. 1. 134). According to the Kāṣikā this sūtra relates to the foot of a Rk (iha Rk pāda eva grhyate). Hence this also is an indication of the archaic language of the PS. (see also Notes 8 and 20).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note 13. Anupradāna. The term as we have seen above is equivalent to ‘after-effort’ or ‘secondary effort’, which means stiffening or loosening of vocal chords. Whitney translates this as ‘emission’ (APR. I. 12; TPr. XXIII. 2) and Weber has rendered it by ‘Ausstossung’ (Ind. Stud. IV, p. 107). Dr. Siddheshwar Varma translates this as ‘sound-material’, or ‘breath-voice material’ (op. cit., pp. 3, 9); but such translations though not altogether incorrect are not happy. Whitney, Weber and Varma all seem to have missed the etymological implication of the word. The author of the Śikṣā-prakāśa however extends the meaning of anupradāna which according to him includes nasality too (p. 29). This evident innovation seems to have justification from the separate mention of anunāsikas in PS. 17b. (For other points regarding this word see above the Note 12 on prayatna).
NOTE 14. *Iti varna-vidah prahuḥ.* So said those who were versed in the lore of (pronouncing) the speech-sounds. This evidently shows that there were other masters of phonetics (Saikṣikas) before Pāṇini wrote his Śikṣā. This hemistich does not appear in the AP. It is possible like the PS. 14 it has been left out (see Note 28 below). *Varna* also means a ‘written sign’ representing a speech-sound (see Th. Goldstücker, ‘Pāṇini: his place in Skt. literature’, London, 1661, pp. 34ff.).


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

_Udāttaś cānudāttaś ca svaritaś ca svarāś trayāḥ _
hrasvo dīrghāḥ pluta iti kālalo niyamā aci _ (11)_

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

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

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

_Udātte niśāda-gāndhārav anudātta ṛṣabha-dhaivatau _
svarita-prabhavāḥ hy ete śadja-madhyama-poṇcamāḥ _ (12)_

12. Of the seven musical notes *niśāda* and *gāndhāra* can arise in the high pitch (udātta), ṛṣabha and dhaivata in the low pitch (anudātta), while
sandja, madhyama and panchama have their source in the medium pitch (svarita).

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

Aṣṭau sthanāni varṇānām urāh karaṇah śiras tathā
ejhā-mūlāṃ ca dantāś ca nāsikōṣṭhau ca tālu ca II (13)

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

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

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

O-bhāvaḥ ca vivṛttiḥ ca śa-sa-sā repha eva ca
ejhā-mūlam upadhmaḥ ca gatir aṣṭa-vidhōṣmaṇah II 14 II
Yady o-bhāva-prasandhānam ukārā-dī-param padam
svardntam tāḍrśam vidvād yad anyad vyaktam uṣmaṇah II 15 II

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

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

b. The APR. according to its commentator recognizes four Ṿṣmans ś, ṣ, s and h (I. 81). The VPr. (I. 51). has also the same number. The TPr. adds χ and φ to these and has six (I. 9). The RPr. has recognized two more: h and Ṛ, making altogether eight Ṿṣmans (I. 10, 12). The reckoning of anusvāra as an Ṿṣman seems to be very strange.

Hākurām paṅcamair yuktam antaḥsthābhiṣ ca samyutam
aurasyam tām vijāniyāt kunḍhyam āhur asamyutam a (16)

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

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

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

Kānṭhyāv ahāv i-cu-yāsās tālavyā oṣṭhajā vu-pā
syur mūrdhanyā ṛ-tu-ra-ṣā dantyā l-tu-la-sāḥ smṛṭāḥ ∥ (17)

Jīhvā-mālē tu kuḥ prkto dantyāsthyo vah smṛto budhaiḥ
e-ai tu kāṇṭha-tālavyā o-au kāṇṭhāsthajau smṛtau ∥ (8)

Ardha-mātrā tu kāṇṭhyasya ekārāukārayor bhavet
aikārāukārayor mātrā tayor vīrṭa-samvrtam ∥ (19)

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>u ras</th>
<th>kañṭha</th>
<th>mūrdhan</th>
<th>jihva-</th>
<th>danta-</th>
<th>tālu</th>
<th>oṣṭha</th>
<th>kañṭha-</th>
<th>danta-</th>
<th>nāsiṅkā</th>
<th>nāsiṅkā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS.</td>
<td>h, h,</td>
<td>a, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>k, kh,</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>e, ai</td>
<td>o, au</td>
<td>yamas,</td>
<td>n, n, n,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h, bn,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gh, n, x²</td>
<td>n, l, s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m, v</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR.</td>
<td>h, h,</td>
<td>a, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>k, kh,</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ai⁴</td>
<td>au⁴</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPR.</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>a, h, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>k, kh,</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>o, ph, b,</td>
<td>bh, m, v</td>
<td>ak</td>
<td>ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPR.</td>
<td>h, h, h⁵</td>
<td>a, h, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>k, kh,</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, ai</td>
<td>o, ph, b,</td>
<td>bh, m, v</td>
<td>ak⁷</td>
<td>ak⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR.</td>
<td>h, h,</td>
<td>a, h,</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>k, kh,</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, ai</td>
<td>o, ph, b,</td>
<td>bh, m, v</td>
<td>ak⁷</td>
<td>ak⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT.</td>
<td>h, a, h</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>k, kh,</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, ai</td>
<td>o, ph, b,</td>
<td>bh, m, v</td>
<td>ak⁷</td>
<td>ak⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ H in combination with ē, ē, ø, n, m, y, r, l and v is pronounced in u ras. ² The PS. does not know any mūrdhanya or lh. This sound is probably a later development due to Dravidian influence (See Introduction § 39, 30). ³ The APR. does not mention the place of articulation of this sound. However the commentator informs us of its articulation. ⁴ See APR. I. 41, and its commentary on the same. ⁵ The RPR. says that h and n are aurasya according to others (I. 18). Probably the same authorities place r, l and s in varṣaya (I. 26). ⁶ According to the RPR. Vedamitra is the authority who considers d, gh, l and dh (usually known as cerebral l and lh) as the jihva-mūldya sounds (I. 21, 22). ⁷ The TPR. is silent about the places of articulation for vowels. ⁸ Ai does not appear in the sūtra 5 of RT, but it might be due to the corruption of the MSS. As this sound has not been discussed elsewhere in this work we are sure that it existed here.
For details of this variation see the Table II in which views of Prātiśākhyas have been compared with that of the PS.

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

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

Note 23. Ardha-māṭrā tu, etc. This couplet (PS. 13) has suffered very badly in transmission, and its second half does not occur in the AP. Uvāṭa in his comments on the VPr. I. 73, has wrongly quoted its first half as ardhamāṭrā tu kaṇṭhasya aikāraukārayor. It appears that the s a n d h y a k s a r a s (diphthongs) e and o having lost their diphthongal character in later times\(^2\) this couplet became unintelligible and gave rise to variants of perplexing nature. Weber’s reading kaṇṭhasya aikārākārayor spoils the metre, but his conjectural emendation (in translation) of aikārākārayor was a very happy suggestion and finds actual support from the Pañjikā (p. 18). His reading madhye e-ai for māṭrā tayor however cannot be accepted, for it has evidently arisen due to a misunderstanding.

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

\(^2\) See Note 1, in p. 64.
THE PA\NINIYA SIK\A

All the sandhyak\aras\ being long, consist of two m\atr\as (RPr. I. 16; VPr. I. 57; TPr. I. 35; APr. I. 61). Hence from PS. 13 we have the quantitative distribution of the two elements of e, o and ai, au as follows:

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

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

Sam\vrtam m\atrikam j\nney\am, viv\vrtam tu dvim\atrikam
gho\s\a v\a sam\vrt\ah sarve, agho\s\a viv\vrt\ah smrt\ah [20].

Tr. A sam\vra (close) sound is one m\atra long, and a viv\vra (open) sound is two m\atr\as long; voiced sounds are all sam\vra while breathed ones are viv\vra [20].

This couplet like other spurious couplets discussed above must be a borrowing from some unknown source. But the substance of the second half of the couplet occurs in the TPr. (sam\vra-k\äm\the n\äd\ah kriyate, viv\vra sv\vsa\h II. 4-6).

\footnote{Wackernagel (I. \S 39), does not admit that all e and o in OIA were originally sandhyak\aras, i.e., combination of two vowel sounds. His objection is based on e and o not arising out of actual sandhi in OIA. But the Vedic phoneticians in using the term evidently recalled the Indo-Iranian diphthongal character of e and o such as appears in Av. \v\v\v\et\h\a (Skt. \v\v\et\h\a) and Av. \v\v\t\h\r\h\a (Skt. \h\r\h\a), as well as e and o arising from a combination of s with n respectively.}

\footnote{The VPr. (I. 76) only among all the Pr\äti\ś\akh\yas expressly recognizes the fact that ai and au have one m\atra for a and one m\atra for i as well as u. From the direction as to the production of ai and au given in the APr. (I. 41) it appears that this latter work too agrees with the PS. But as regards the pronunciation of e and o the APr. expressly says that they have only one place of articulation (I. 40) and hence we are to understand that at the time of this Pr\äti\ś\akhya, e and o no longer retained the trace of their diphthongal character which we see in the PS. 18. The VPr. is silent about the production of e and o. The RPr. in its attempt to describe their nature simply mystifies the issue (see XIII. 15-16). Hence it appears that the Pr\äti\ś\akh\yas in question are later than the PS.}
Note 25. Next occurs the following couplet in the Rk and the Yajus recensions and it has been commented on in the Prakāśa commentary. But as it appears irrelevant in the present context and contains the term karana which as we have seen before is a term of later origin than Pāṇini (see Note 12) we have considered this couplet to be spurious.

Svarānām uśmanām cāiva vivṛtam karanaṁ smṛtam
	tebhya'pi vivṛtāv anau tābhyām aicau tathāiva ca II (21)

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

Note 26. This couplet like other spurious ones must be a borrowing from some unknown source. The substance of the first half of the couplet is available in the AP. uśmanām vivṛtam ca, svarānām ca, I. 31. 32). But according to this Prātisākhyā, o and a as well as ā are the most open sounds (aikārikārayor vivṛtātamam, tuto'pyākāraṣya I. 34. 35) and not ai, au as in the present couplet.

Anuvāra-yamanām ca nāśikā sthānam ucyate |
upadhmāniya uśmā ca jihvā-mūliya-nāsihke |
ayogavāhā vijñeyā āśraya-sthāna-bhāginaḥ II (22)

Tr. Anuvāra and yamas have the nose for their place (of articulation); upadhmāniya, uśman (i.e., visarjaniya), jihvāmūliya as well as nāśikyas (i.e. the anuvāra and yamas) are ayogavāhas and as such they share the place of articulation of sounds on which they are dependent [22].

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

Note 27. Anuvāra. The ‘anuvāra-nāśikyaḥ’ and ‘anuvāraḥ nāśikyaḥ’ seem to have been synonymous and probably the original name for anuvāra by which the TPr. (I. 34; II. 30; XVII. 1) understands only a nasal vowel. This meaning of the term was known to the author of Pañjikā too. For he says svaram anu bhavati ity anuvāraḥ, ‘as it arises after the vowel it is (called) the anuvāra’ (5).
The term anuvāra-nāsikya has sometimes been shortened also simply as nāsikya or nāsika. But this shortening seems to have created some misunderstanding. For example, in the APR. (I. 26) and in the RPr. (I. 20) nāsikya has been used to denote sounds pronounced directly from the nose (i.e. yamas and the anuvāra) as opposed to anunāsikas (nasal stops) which are pronounced in the mouth as well as in the nose (APr. I. 27 and P. I. 1. 8). But in spite of such an use of nāsikya some interpolators and commentators of the Prātīṣākhya have taken anuvāra and nāsikya to be two different sounds (VPr. VIII 25, 27, 29; Uvaṭa on VPr. I. 74; Māhiṣeyā on TPr. I. 18). But curiously enough in his commentary to the RPr. I. 20, Uvaṭa has explained nāsikya as the term including yamas and the anuvāra as well as nāsikya. Though the later writers on Vedic phonetics at times differed from him about the meaning of the term anuvāra, Pāṇini understood by this a nasalized vowel. For he explains the anuvāra as a nasal sound (PS, 14) and gives directions as to how it should be correctly produced (PS, 15b-16a). The term ‘nāsika’ which is used to denote a nasalized vowel in the Prātīṣākhya has also been used in the PS, (14b). Among the western philologists a controversy went on for some time about the correct pronunciation of anuvāra; but

1 APR. never uses the term anuvāra. It is from the commentator that we learn that the nāsikya is equivalent to yama and anuvāra (see Whitney on APr. I. 26).


3 The TPr. sometimes takes nāsikya in the sense of yama alone (XXI. 12, 14).

4 The view that anunāsika is equivalent to a nasalised vowel arose probably from a confusion of this word with a somewhat similarly sounded term anunāsikya (=nasality) as used in the Mahābhāṣya, gathā prīyās tathā pāṇiṇam...adīśko guṇah (ed. Kielhorn, I, p 61, line 18, 99). Patañjali is clearly against such a view (see Note 2 above). Among the old authorities who seem at times to identify anunāsika with a nasal vowel is APr. (I. 58). But the relevant aśṭa has probably been corrupt. TPr. once understands by anunāsika nasal stops and anuvāra (I. 30. See also III. 129; IV. 8, 9, 13, 51, 90; TPr. V. 26-28, 31; X. 11(7), XV. 1. 6; XXII. 14).

5 Weber considers this chapter of the VPr. as a later addition (opp. cit., p. 68).

6 he te nāsikyaḥ? ity asyam apiḥkṛṣṇam aha nāsikyā yamānuṣavyāḥ (ed. Śāmasrāmi, p. 80).
among them all Whitney, in spite of the bewildering opinions of
the Prātiśākhyaṣ or rather the commentaries of such works,
could correctly guess the true pronunciation (on TPr. II. 30).
Wackernagel however considered him to be mistaken¹ and
Thumb² did not venture to give any opinion on the matter.

Note 28. Upadhmāniya uṣmā ca etc. This hemistich does
not occur in the Ṛk and APr. recensions. Still, upadhmāniya and
visarga being mentioned in the PS, 2,³ we can reasonably expect
the treatment of their mode of articulation in the Sīkṣā. Hence
we have considered this hemistich as a genuine part of the PS
(see Introduction, § 2b). One of the reasons why it came
to be ignored in the Ṛk recension is probably to be sought in
the varying later uses of the term uṣman which in this context
surely means visarga⁴ or the final aspiration preceded by a vowel
(-h). This term meaning visarga as well as final h occurs in the
Ṛk Pr. (I. 22; II. 4). In the VPr. (I. 54), the APr. (I. 20),
the Ṛktaṅtra (16) as well as in some other part of the ṚPr.
(I. 13) the term sōṣman has been used to indicate aspired
stops. It seems that by the earlier acāryas visarga as well as
aspirated stops, due to their almost similar nature, was included
in the term uṣman. Pāṇini, however, does not use this term
because in his grammar, his pratyāhāras evidently served the
purpose. By this term the TPr. however means ś, š, s, h,
χ and φ (I. 9), and curiously enough the ṚPr. also means by the
term same sounds in I. 12; and in the Chapter VIII (considered
to be a late addition by Weber) of the VPr. we understand by
the term ś, š, s and h (sūtra 22, ed. Weber).

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

¹ Altindische Grammatik, Vol. I (§ 223), p. 257. In the opinion of Prof. Irüder the
ānasvāra of the TPr. is anything but a nasal vowel (see Die Vyāsa-Qikṣā, p. 51).
² Handbuch des Sanskrit, § 54.
³ This couplet occurs in all the recensions of the PS, and must have formed a part of
the original work.
(op. cit., p. 354). According to the Pañjikā it means (15) na vidyate yogah varṇāntarena yeśāṁ te ayogavāhāḥ: Those sounds which do not combine with other sounds are ayogavāhas. This definition does not convey any meaning to us. Uvaṭa says akārādinā varṇa-samāmnāyena saṁhitāḥ santaḥ etc vahanty ātmālabhām prāṇuvanty ayogavāhāḥ (on VPr. VIII. 8): They are ayogavāhas because they attain their selves when combined with sounds like a (i.e. vowels). Similar is the view of the commentātor of the Pratijñā Śūtra on II. 1 (see Benares ed.). This explanation too does not satisfy us and seems to be rather fanciful. Patañjali who is earlier and more authoritive than the writers mentioned above defines the term as yad ayuktā vahanty anupadiṣṭāḥ ca śṛūyante (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 28): 'Those sounds which are heard even though they have not been included in the Varṇa-samāmnāya (or the so-called Śiva-sūtras).'

Besides these there are other interpretations of the term by late authorities, but it will scarcely be of any use to discuss them. The explanation given by Patañjali can be followed without any scruple.

Alābu-vīnā-nirghosodanta-mūlyah svarānugah
anuvāras tu kartavyo nityāṁ hroḥ śa-śa-seṣu ca II (23)

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

Note 30. All the recensions except the AP. contain the above couplet. The anusvāra being a frequent sound in Vedas and the classical Skt. it appears very much likely that Pāṇini gave attention to it. Besides this for interpreting śaṣaseṣu ca we must invoke the help of Pāṇini's Paribhāṣā tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya (I. 1. 66). This also may be taken to show that this couplet belongs to the original PŚ.
Translation and Notes

Note 31. From this passage we derive a hint about an alternative pronunciation which the anusvāra had before stops. This alternative pronunciation has been provided for by Pāṇini in his grammar (anusvārasya yayi parasavanak, vā padāntasya. VIII. 4. 58,59) and it is equivalent to the pronunciation of what according to Prof. S. K. Chatterji is a ‘reduced’ nasal occurring also in the late Middle Indo-Aryan (op. cit., p. 360).

Note 32. Nirghoṣo' danta-mūlya should be taken as nirghoṣo + adantamūlya.

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

\[\text{Anusvāre vivṛtyāṃ tu virāme cāksara-dvaye} 1
\text{dvir oṣṭhau tu vigṛhṇīyād yatṛuḥkāra-vakārayoh} \parallel (24)\]

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

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

\[\text{Vyāghri yathā haret putrān damśrābhhyāṃ na ca pidayet} 1
\text{bhītā patana-bhedaḥbhhyāṃ tado vārṇān prayojayet} \parallel (25)\]

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

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

---

1 'The anusvāra followed by consonants other than š, ā, s and h is changed to the savarna (homogeneous nasal sound) of the following sound; the possible homogeneous sounds in the above case are ū, ū, n, n and m. This rule is optional when the anusvāra stands at the end of a word.'
tendency to drop intervocal stops as in the so-called Mahārāṣṭrī or the late phase of Sauraseni, was already beginning. This couplet occurs in the Yv. S. (195) and the Māṇḍūki S. (43) too. We are not sure whether it originally belonged to the Yv. S. or the Māṇḍ. S., but it is sure that the couplet did not form a part of the PŚ. which may go back to a time earlier than 500 B. C. (see Introduction, § 36).

Note 35. The following couplet occurs next in the R̥k recension and in the Yaj. recension it is no. 6. Of the two commentaries, only the Prakūśa touches it. AP. omits it.

Yathā Saurāṣṭrikā nārī takraḥ ity abhibhāṣate |
evam raṅgāḥ prayoktavāhyā khearaḥ iva khedayaḥ || (26)

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

Note 36. Next occur the four following couplets in the R̥k recension only.

Raṅga-varnān prayuṣāṭran no graset pūrvam aksaram |
dirgha-svaram prayuṣāṭit pasān nāsikyam acaret || (27)

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

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

Hṛdaye caikamāstras tu ardha-mātras tu mūrdhani |
nāsikāyāṁ tathārdham ca raṅgasyaiva dvimātratā || (28)

1 See the present writer's 'Mahārāṣṭrī, a later phase of Sauraseni,' Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta, XXIII (1933).

In the Nār. S. (II. 4. 9) this couplet occurs with variants nāry drīṁ ity, raṅgāḥ prayoktavāyā Nāradaśya matam yathā. In the Māṇḍ. S. (112) it occurs with the variants: nārī arā ity raṅgāḥ prayoktavāhyā nākāra-parinivārjitā. The Yv. S. (190) however reads it almost like the Māṇḍ. S.

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

Hṛdayād utkate tiṣṭhan kāṃsyena samanusvaran ।
mārdavaṁ ca dvi-mātraṁ ca jaghanvā ॥ ॥ ॥ (29)

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

A raṅga sound rising from (lit. existing in) the heart (i.e. chest)
has a sound like that of the bellmetal (bronze), (and it has) softness and
is two mātras long. Its example is jaghanvā 2 [29]4.

Madhye tu kampayet kampam ubhau pārśvau samo bhavet ।
sarangam kampayet kampam rathiveti nidarśanam ॥ (30)

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

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

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

Evam varnāḥ prayoktavyā nāvyaktā na ca pīditāḥ ।
samyag-varnaprayogena brahma-loke mahīyate ॥ (31)

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

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

1 With the above couplet may be compared the Lomaśī S. I. 7. This passage seems
to be corrupt.
2 This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (II, 4, 8) with some variation. In the Mānd. S.
(113) too this occurs in a varying form. Whatever be the true reading of the couplet it is
sure the PŚ. in its original form did not contain it.
Note 39. In the Yaj. recension the above couplet is succeeded by the following one:

Abhyāsārthe drutām vṛttiṃ prayogārthe tu madhyamāṃ
śisyānāṃ upadesārthe kuryād vṛttiṃ vilambitāṃ II (31a)

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

Note 39a. This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (I. 6, 21) and Yv. S. (54) and in a slightly different form it occurs also in the Māṇḍ. S. (9). It seems that the couplet occurred originally in the Nār. S.

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

Gītī śighrī śirah-kampī tathā likhita-pāthakaḥ
Anarthajñō 'ipa-kaṇṭhās ca śad ēte pāthakdāhamāḥ II (32)
Mādhuryam aksara-vyaktiḥ padacchedās tu susvaraḥ
dhairyam laya-samarthaṃ ca śad ēte pāthake gūnāḥ II (33)

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

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

Śāṅkitaṃ bhītam udghuṣtam avyaktam anunāsikam
kāka-svaram śirasigāṃ tathā sthāna-vivarjitaṃ II (34)

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

Shyness, fear, extreme loudness, indistinctness, undue nasalisation, repressed tone, undue cerebralization, non-observance of the places of articulation (in general) and (proper) accent [34], and harshness, creating undue separation between words, uneven tone hastiness, want of due palatalisation: these are the fourteen faults in the Vedic chant.
TRANSLATION AND NOTES

Note 41a. These two couplets occur also in the Yv. S. (20-28) but they relate there to faults of recitation (pātha-dosā) instead of the faults in chant (gīti-dosā) of the Nār. S. But as the couplets in this latter work have been preceded by the expression bhavanti ca' tra ślokaḥ they are surely quoted there from some earlier work. It is probable that the couplets in question occurred in the Yv. S. first.

Upāmśu dāśām tvaritam nirastām
vilambitam gadgaditam pragitam
nispīditam grasta-padāksaraṃ ca
vaden na dīnam na tu sānunāsyam
(35)

Prātaḥ paṭhen nityam uraḥ-sthiteṇa
svareṇa sārdula-rutōpamena
madhyān-dīne kaṇṭha-gatena caiva
cakrāhva-samkujita-sannibhena
(36)

Tāraṃ tu vidyāt savane tṛtye
śiro-gatam tac ca sadā prayaṇam
mayūra-hamsānyabhṛta-svarāṇaṃ
tulyena nādena śiraḥ-sthiteṇa
(37)

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

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

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

Aco’sprṣṭā yonā tva iva nema-sprṣṭaḥ sahā smṛtaḥ
īśeṣāḥ sprṣṭā halah prokta nibodhāṇupradānataḥ
(38)
Tr. The vowels are without touch, semi-vowels slightly touched, ś, ś and s are half-touched sounds, and the remaining consonants are touched (i.e. stops) [38].

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

\[
\text{Namo' annuśikā nādino ha-jhāsakaś smṛtāḥ} \]
\[
\text{īsan-nādā yan-yāsaś ca śvāsinas tu kha-phādayaḥ} \]
\[
\text{Īṣac-chvāsāṁś caro vidyād gor-dhāmaítat pracāṣate} \]

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

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

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

Note 45. The terms nāḍī, īṣannāda, śvāsi, īṣac-chāsa stand for voiced aspirate, voiced non-aspirated, unvoiced aspirate, unvoiced non-aspirated respectively. The term īṣan-nāda
practically mean having svāsa as well as nāda or ubhayātmaka i.e., svāsa-nādātmaka. Hence in the RP. (XIII. 2) we have terms like svāsa, nāda and svāsa-nāda. The TPr. (II. 9) however uses svāsanāda in case of ha-kāra and seems to describe it as a sound midway between voiced and unvoiced (II. 6) and at the same time calls it voiced (I. 13).

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

Dākṣīputraḥ Pāpinir yasenaṁ vyāhṛtam bhuvī n (40)
ratnabhitam idam śāstram prthivyāṁ samprakāśitam (40a)

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

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

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

Chandah pādau tu vedasya hastau kalpo’tha paṭhyate ।
jyotiśāṁ ayaṇam caṣṣur niruktam śrotram ucyate ॥ (41)
Śikṣā ghrāṇam tu vedasya mukham vyākaraṇam smrtam ।
tasmāt sāṃgam adhītyādvā brahma-loke mahīyate ॥ (42)

Tr. (First) Metrics which is the two legs (of the Veda) is read and then the Kalpa which is its two hands. The Science of the Movement of luminaries (Astronomy) is its eyes, and the Nirukta is called its ears; the Śikṣā is the nose of the Veda, and Grammar is its mouth. It is for this reason that one studying the Veda with all its limbs (i.e. accessory studies) attains a high position in the realm of Brāhmaṇ [41-42].


Udāttam ākhyāti vṛṣo’ṅgulīnām
pradeśinī-mūla-nivīśta-mūrdhā
upānta-madhya svaratam dhṛtaś ca
kaniṣṭhikāyām anudattam eva ṇ (43)

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

Udāttam pradeśinīm vidyāt pracayām madhyato’ṅgulim
nihatam tu kaniṣṭhikāyām svaritōpakanīṣṭhikām ṇ (44)

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

Norns 47a. These two couplets have not been traced in any available Sīkṣā.

Antōdattam ādyudāttam udāttam anudattam nīcā-svaratam
madhyōdattam svaratam dvyudattam tryudattam
iti nava-pada-sayyā ṇ (45)

Agnih somaḥ pra vo vīryam haviṣām

svar Brhaspatir Indrā-Bṛhamśapātī ṇ

Agnir ity antōdattam, soma ity ādyudattam, prēty
udāttam, va ity anudattam, vīryam nīcā-svaratam ṇ (46)

Haviṣām madhyōdattam, svar iti svaratam, Brhaspatir
iti dvyudattam, Indrā-Bṛhaspati iti tryudattam ṇ (47)

Tr. There are nine kinds of accents in padas: antōdatta, ādyōdatta, udātta, anudattta, nīcā-svaratī, madhyōdattā, svarita, dyuṭāta, tryuṭāta. Examples of these are Agniḥ, Somaḥ, pra, vo, vīryam, haviṣā, svāh, Bṛhaspatiḥ, Indrā-Bṛhaspatiḥ, (Agniḥ, Somaḥ, pra, vo, vīryam, haviṣā, svār, Bṛhaspatiḥ, Indrā-Bṛhaspatiḥ) [45-47].

Norns 47b. This passage with slight variation occurs in the Nār. S. (II. 7. 5. 6) and seems to be quite relevant there. It is almost certain that the Rk recension took it from there.
Anudātto ārdī jñeyo mūrdhny uddyta udāhṛtaḥ
svaritah karna-mūlīyah, sarvāsyā pracayah smṛtaḥ || (48)

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

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

Cāsas tu vadate mātrām dvi-mātrām tv eva vāyasah
śikhā rauti tri-mātrām tu nakulas tv ardha-mātrakam || (49)

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

Note 47d. This passage occurs in the Lomasī Ś. (VIII. 9), the RPr. (XII. 20) and with slight variation in the Yv. Ś. (15-16) and in the Māṇḍ. Ś. (188), but it seems to have occurred first in some of these Siksās and not in the PS.

Note 48. The following two couplets occur in the AP., Ṛk and Yaj. recensions, and the Prakāśa comments on them.

Kutīrthād āgatam dagdham apavānam ca bhakṣitam
na tasya parimokṣo’sti pāpāher ivā kilviṣat || (50)
Sutīrthād āgatam vyaktam svāmnāyyam suvyavasthitam
susvareṇa susvaktrenā prayuktam brahma rājate || (51)

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

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

Note 48a. These two couplets occur in the Nār. Ś. (II, 8.10, 11) and the Māṇḍ. Ś. (160, 159). It seems that they occurred for the first time in the Nār. Ś.

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

Na karālo na lambōṣṭho nāvyakto nānunāsikah
gadgado baddhajīhvaḥ ca prayogān vaktum arhati || (51a)
Tr. One ought not to repeat mantras with teeth shown, lips unduly protruded and with indistinct, unduly nasalised and half choked-up voice and immobile tongue [51a].

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

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

Mantro hīnah svarato varṇato vā
mithyā prayukto na tam artham āha |
sa vāg-vajro yajamānāṁ hinsti
yathēndrasatruḥ svarato 'parādhatu ṭ (52)

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

Note 50a. This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (I. 1. 5) and the Amoghanandini S. (122). Besides this the couplet occurs in the Mahābhāṣya with a variant duṣṭaḥ sabdaḥ for mano hīnah (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 2).

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

Avāksaram anāyuṣyaṁ visvaram vyādhi-pūḍitam 1
akṣatā(ṛa?)-sastra-rūpaṇa vajraṁ(?) patati mastake ṭ (53)

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

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

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

Hasta-hīnam yo’dhīte svara-varṇa-vivarjitam 1
Ṛg-Yajuk-Sāmabhīr dagdho viyonim adhigacchati ṭ (54)
Hastena vedam yo'dhitte svara-varṇārtha-samyutam
Rg-Yajuk-Sāmabhiḥ pūto brahma-loke mahīyate □ (55)

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

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

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

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

Saṃkaraḥ sāṃkaraṁ prādād Dākṣī-putrāya dhīmate
vāṁmayebhyah samāḥṛtya devīm vācam iti sthitih □ (56)
Ycnāksara-samāmnāyam adhigamyā Mahēśvarāt
kṛṣṇam vyākaraṇaṁ proktam tasmai Pāṇinaye namaṁ □ (57)

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

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

Note 53a. These two couplets do not occur in the AP. rec. and 57 is wanting in the Prk. As to the authorship of the so-called Sivasūtras, which is clearly mentioned in them, there is a great divergence of opinion. But it is possible that even if Pāṇini was not their author he was at least responsible for their present form (for details see Introduction, §§ 12-15).

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

Yena dhautā girāḥ pumsāṁ vimalaiḥ sabda-vāribhiḥ
tamas cājñānajam bhinnam tasmai Pāṇinaye namaṁ □ (58)
Ajñānändhasya lokasya jñānānājana-salākaya
cakṣur unmālitam yena tasmai Pāṇinaye namaṁ □ (59)
Tr. Homage to that Pāṇini who has washed off the human speech with pure water of words and has pierced through the gloom of ignorance [58].

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

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

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

Trinayana-mukha-nishātām imām
   ya iha paṭhet prayataḥ sadā dvijaḥ
   sa bhavati pāṣu-putrā-kārtimān
   sukham atulanā ca samaśnute divī divitī \( \| \) (60)

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

Note 56. This couplet again ascribes the whole work to Śiva, though from some of the spurious couplets we have, already learnt this. But the fact that this work goes in the name of Pāṇini and not in that of Śiva—in which case it would have had a name like the Saiva or Śiva Sikṣā, seems to give strong grounds for considering this story as an apocryphal one.
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Aṣṭāduśaȳya, xiii, xvi, xlvii, xlix, lx, 50, 56, 62
Athaśvaveda (Paippalāda), xxv, xxvi
Athaśvaveda pratiśākhya (A.Pr.), xxxii, xxxvii, xxxviii, 51, 52, 56, 57, etc.
Aūdavrajii, xii, lxx, lx, lxi, 58.

Baidyapānas, 58
Belvalkar, S.K., xlvii, liii
Bhagavād-Gītā, xvii, lx
Bhājījīvāṅguḷa, 56
Bhagavākar, R.G., xlvii
Bhartṛhari, xlvii
Bhāsa, xlvii
Bloomfield, M., xxxviii
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, lx1
Bṛhatadvaita, xlvii, liii
Buddha, lii
Burnell, xxxvi, xxxviii

Candragomin, xlvii, xlvii
Chandabhaṭṭa, xv
Chāndogya Upaniṣad, lx, 55
Charpentié, J., xxiii
Chatterji, K.C., xxvii
Chatterji, S.K., xix, xx, xxxvi, xlvii, li, 69.

Dasgupta, S.N., liii
Dayananda, Śvāmi, xlvii
Deussen, P., liii
Durgaśārī, lx, xxxvii, xlvii
Dhātupāṭha (Pāṇiniya), xliii

Edgerton, xxxviii
Faddemon, B., xxvi, xxix

Gautama Dharmasūtras, xxii
Gautama school of the Śāmaṇa, xxviii
Gelgen, W., 60
Ghose, B., xxvii, xxxvii
Ghosh, M., xl
Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra, xxxiv
Goldstücker, Th., xvii, xxx, li, 58
Gautamī Śīktā, lx
INDEX

Ṛgveda, xxii, xxxvii
Ṛgvedapṛaśākhy (R.Pr.), xv, xxvi, xxx, xxxvii, xliii, lv, lx, 51-53, 57, 59-60, 62, 64
Ṛktaṇtra Vṛākaṇa, xlii, xxxvii, xxxviii, lviii, lx, 51, 53, 60, 62

Ṣākara, xlii
Ṣaḍvīṃśā Brāhmaṇa, xxii
Ṣānasāraṇi, S., xxx
Ṣāmakṛṣṇa, xxviii, 59
Ṣaṅkarācārya, xli
Sarasvatī, Jñānendra, xxxiii
Sarasvatī, Madhusūdana, xv, xxvi, xxx, xxxvii, xlv, xlvii, xlix, li
Sarup, Lakṣhman, xvii, xxxii, xlv, xlix
Santrī, Suryakanta, xvii, xxxix, xxxviii, xlix
Saunakīya Caturāśṭhyāyika, xxxix
Saunaka, xl, lvi, lii
Sāyana, xxix, xxx, xlviii
Shastri, Mangal Dev, xxix
Shabadattī, Pandit, xii, li
Siddhānaktanmuṣūdī, xii, xxxiii
Śīkṣāpājakā, xlii, xlv, lv
Śīkṣāprakāśa, xlii, xlix, lv
Śīkṣāsāmpagraha, lx, lxv
Śimon, xli
Śivaśāstra, xxvii
Śkovād, H., xxvii, xxxix, lii
Śukranītī, xxxiii

Taṇṭārāya Prātiśākhya (T.Pr.), xxxv, xlv, etc., 51-53, 56, 57, 59, 62-64

Taṇṭārāya Upaniṣad, xxxvii
Thieme, Paul, xxix, xxx, lx, lii, 55, 69
Thunb, xix, xlv, 67
Uvaṭa, xxxix, lx, 51, 52, 68, 69
Uṇāḍi Śūtras, lx

Vaidya, C., ix, x, xlv
Vājāsanaṇyī Prātiśākhya (V.Pr.), xxxix, xlv, 51, 53, 57, 62-64
Vākyapadīya, xlv, xlvii
Vṛāṇa Brāhmaṇa, lix
Varna, Sidhāśwar, ix, x, xxvi, xxxiii, xxxiv, xxxv, xxxix, xlv, xlvii, xlix, 1, 53, 60, 67, 68
Vṛāṇa, xl, xlvii
Vidyārthi, Viśvaśendhu, xxxix
Virū, Raghu, x, xlv, xlvii
Viṇṇu, xxv, lx
Vṛāṇa, Kṛṣṇadvaṇḍī, xxxi

Wackernagel, J., ix, xlv, lii, lviii, 64, 67
Weber, ix, xv, xxx, xxv, xxxvii, xl, 52, 57, 60, 68
Whitney, xxxv, xxxviii, lii
Wilson, Philological lectures, 67, 64, 67
Winterułf, ix, xvi, xlv, xxii, xxiii, xxvi, lii, lxxxvii, xxxix, xlviii, xlix, li

Yājñavalkya-Śīkṣā, 59-60, 72, 73, 78
Yāsaka, x, xxxiii, lx
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

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

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

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

xxxiv line 2 ,, (op. cit., p. 12).
xxxviii footnote last line ,, 4. contra
xxxix line 16 for the Pr. ,, the TPr.
Add to the footnote 3 the following:


Page xlix  line 12  after Pingala read:

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

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

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

lviii Add to the footnote 2 the following:

It came to my notice afterwards that Bhaṭṭoṣidhikṣita ascribes the Rāktantra-vyākaraṇa to Audavraji. In his Sabdakauṭubha he writes: तथा क्रक्तनवायकरण्य छादोभ्य-लक्ष्यस्य प्रणिता शौदन्निरंतिप प्रसूतवय्य अनन्तान्तिस्योत्त शधे यम: पूर्वश्च गुष्ठ इति (Chowkhamba ed., p. 113).

lxii-lxvi for Hemistics read Hemistichs

9  line 9 for गिरस्त:  "

," 6 " जाता  "

10 footnote 5  read ‘omit’

11  line 14  "

12  " 15  "

footnote 5  "

13  " 5  "

15  line 16  "

17 footnote 7  "

30  line 14 for छारो  "

41  " 13 " यबोकार  "

42  " 12  "

श्विते
Page 53 Line 14 after pp. 99 ff. read See also Tripāṭhī, p. 5 and Miśra, pp. 28 ff.

65 last line after to PŚ. read:

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

58 After the Note 15 add the following:

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

59 line 20 read ‘dantamūla’

Add to the Note 17 the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Line 6 from the bottom, after the fullstop add:

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

64 Line 15 read vivṛta (open).

,, 21 add after the fullstop the following:

Miśra thinks that the sanvṛta sound mentioned in this couplet relates to half e and half o (i.e., short e and short o) and refers to Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya (pp. 11 f.)

Line 6 in the footnote read i and u respectively.


Last line, add the following:

As Śarmā comments on the Rk. recension (p. 10) he feels a difficulty about the interpretation of the passage and invokes the authority of the Śabdaratna but such a difficulty does not arise when we read upadhmāṇīya, etc., between the two hemistichs of Rk. 22.

66 Line 14 after 'nāsikya' add:


Line 4 from the bottom omit T Pr.

,, 3 from the bottom, add the following:

See also Mangal Dev Shastri, op. cit., pp. 143-44
(Notes on p. 20)

67 Line 4 after the fullstop add:

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

69 line 12 read ‘dvîr oṣṭyau’ and ‘yathaukârau.’
   , , 20 for does , , do
   , , 21 , ‘daṃstrābhyām’

70 2 after the fullstop add the following:

From what Miśra says we understand that patana (dropping) of letters means spirantizing them and bheda (or differentiating) is de-aspiration of them (स्तोत्रावज्जेन
चारणे बधो मुखा भव्वति न स्ब्धम् च्यगता: सन्ति ककारोरयः खकारो
वा। न च प्रवविधारणेवेत् वेन खकारोरिः ककारवत् प्रतीयति
(p. 15).

line 4 from the bottom read ‘arañi’ and ‘rañgāḥ’
   , , 3 from the bottom , , Māṇḍ.

71 , , 14 add the following:

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

line 6 from the bottom, add the following:

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

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

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

    line 5 from the bottom read the place of.

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

74 line 8 from the bottom read the following:

    rephasamyukto' nādir, etc.

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

lines 6-4 omit ‘He seems to have......of the Amoghana-nandini Sikṣā.’

75 line 9 read Pāninir yas tenedam’

76 line 14, add the following:

Šarmā considers the couplet No. 44 to be spurious (p. 18).

77 line 5 ff cancel the Note 47c and read the following:

This passage with a slight variation occurs in a late work named the Svarāṣṭaka Ś. by one Ananta (see SS., p. 365. Tripāṭhi, p. 25).

78 line 6 for the Pñj. read some MSS. of the Pñj.
  , , 8 after the fullstop read:

The original Pñj. probably did not contain this (see p. 22, line 6).

79 12, add the following:

Miśra considers couplets 54 and 55 to be spurious (p. 27) and so does Šarmā (p. 21).

**
ADDITIONAL CORRIGENDA

Page vi  lines 1 and 3 for London read Lund
xxii  line 21 for 700 B.C. read 500 B.C.
lili  ,, 4 from the bottom, for concludes read suggests,
    ,, last, read p. clxvii
liii  ,, 13 insert as if before sitting
55  lines 21-23 omit The translator of.........indefensible.