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The *Paninīya-Sikṣā* ascribed to Panini, 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 *Paninīya-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 *Paninīya-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 Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha of the Skt. MSS. Department, Calcutta University, for kindly helping me in reading the proof of the text portion, and also to the authorities of the India Office, the State Library of Berlin, of Munich, the University of Lund for lending MSS. or supplying rotographic copy of them. It is with great pleasure that I should mention here that the rotograph of the Sikṣā-pañjikā supplied by the University of Lund came as a gift to the Calcutta University. And finally I should offer my most grateful thanks to my teacher Prof. Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji for his kindly making valuable suggestions while he went through this volume in MS. as well as in proof. It however goes without saying that for all views expressed in the work the responsibility remains entirely mine.

University of Calcutta

June, 1938

Manomohan Ghosh
BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Sanskrit Texts

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, ed. M. Haug, Bombay, 1863.
Amoghānanandini Śīkṣā (Śīkṣā-samgraha, pp. 93-106).
Anantabhāṭṭa’s Commentary to the Vājasaneyī Prātiṣākhya, ed. Venkatarama S har m a, Madras, 1934.
Bhagavad-gītā (Śrīmad).
Bhaṭṭojīdikṣita—Sabdakaustubha, Part I, Benares, 1933.
Siddhāntakaumudi, ed. Gadgil, Bombay, 1904
and ed. Pandit Shivadatta, Venkateswar Press.
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, ed. Sitānātha Tattvabhūṣaṇa, Calcutta, 1928.
Bṛhad-devata, ed. A. A. M acdonell. HOS.
Chāndogya Upaniṣad, ed. Sitānātha Tattvabhūṣaṇa, Calcutta, 1925.
Gautamī Śīkṣā (Śīkṣā-samgraha, pp. 450-55).
Kāśikā-vṛtti on Pāṇini (Chowkhamba ed.), Benares, 1898.
Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra, ed. J. J o l y, Lahore, 1923.
Lomāsī Śīkṣā (Śīkṣā-samgraha, pp. 456-62).
Mahābhāṣya (Pāṇiniya), ed. F. Kielhorn, Bombay, 1892.
Māhiṣeya’s Commentary to the Taittirīya Prātiṣākhya, ed.
Venkatarama S har m a, Madras, 1930.
Māṇḍukī Śīkṣā (Śīkṣā-samgraha, pp. 463-78).
Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra (Pūrva).
Mundaka Upaniṣad, ed. J. H e r t e l, Leipzig, 1924.
Nārādiya Śīkṣā (Śīkṣā-samgraha, pp. 394-449).
Nāṭyaśāstra of B h a r a t a (Chowkhamba ed.), Benares, 1929.
THE PANINIYA SIKṢĀ

Nirukta, ed. Laksman Sarup, Lahore, 1927.
Nirukta, with Durga's Commentary (Bombay Skt. Series).
Paniniya Aṣṭādhyāyī, ed. by Devendrakumāra Band yopādhya, Calcutta, 1909.
Sikṣā, ed. Weber (Indische Studien, IV).
Pārāśarī Sikṣā (Sikṣā-samgraha, pp. 52-71).
Prasthānabheda, ed. A. Weber (Indische Studien, I).
Rktantra-Vyākaraṇa, ed. A. C. Burnell, Mangalore, 1879.
Sāyaṇa's Introduction to the Rgveda, ed. P. Peterson, Bombay, 1890.
Siddhānta Kaumudi (sec Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣita).
Sikṣā-samgraha (Śrīmad Yājñavalkyādi-maharṣi-praṇīta), ed. Yugalakīśora Vyāsā, Benares, 1893.
Svarāṅkūṣa-Sikṣā (Sikṣā-samgraha, pp. 161-63).
Svarāṣṭaka-Sikṣā (Sikṣā-samgraha, pp. 362-68).
Taittirīya Upaniṣad, ed. Sītanāthā Tat tvabhūṣaṇa, Calcutta.
Vājasaneyī Prātiṣākhyā, ed. A. W ėber (Indische Studien, IV); ed. Jīvananda Viḍyāsāgara, Calcutta.
Vākyapadīya of Bhaṭṭjarī.
Varṇaratna-pradīpikā (Sikṣā-samgraha, pp. 117-37).
Yājñavalkya-Sikṣā (Sikṣā-samgraha, pp. 1-35).

2. GENERAL

Acta Orientalia.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Charpentier, J., Uttarādhyayana Sūtra, Uppsala, 1922.

Dasgupta, S. N., A History of Indian Philosophy, Cambridge.

Dayānanda, Svāmī, Vedāṅga-Prakāśa, Allahabad.

Deussen, P., Philosophy of Upanisads.

Geiger, W., Pāli Literatur und Sprache.

Ghosh, M., ‘Chando-Vedāṅga of Piṅgala’ in IHQ.

,, ‘Mahārāṣṭrī, a late phase of Sauraseni’ in JDL.

,, ‘Prātiśākhya and Vedic Śākhā’ in IHQ.

Hertel, J., Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, Leipzig, 1924.

Indian Historical Quarterly.


,,,, Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

,,,, Department of Letters, Calcutta University.

,,,, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

Keith, A. B., Religion and Philosophy of Upaniṣads.

Translation of the Yajurveda.

Liebich, B., Pāṇini, Leipzig, 1891.

Zur Einführung der indischen einheimischen Sprachwissenschaft, Heidelberg, 1919.

Lüders, H., Das Vyāsa Śikṣā, Kiel, 1895.


Oldenberg, H., Buddha, His Life, His Doctrines, His Order, Calcutta, 1927.


Sarup, Lakshman, Translation of the Nirukta, London, 1921.

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 dandas (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.

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS, ETC.


Thumb and Hirt, Grammatik der Sanskrit, Heidelberg, 1930.

Thieme, Paul, Pāṇini and the Veda, Allahabad, 1935.

Vaidya, C. V., History of Sanskrit Literature, Poona, 1930.


Wilson, Philological Lectures.


Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Bigger types in the Translation have been for the transcription and translation of passages of the PŚ, which have been considered original, and in Notes on them also such types have been used.

A.C.—After Christ.
AP.—The Agni-Purāṇa recension of the Paññintya-Sikṣā.
B.C.—Before Christ.
DPS.—Dayānanda’s Phonetic Sūtras.
Geschichte—Geschichte der indischen Literatur, Band III (or Vol. III).
HOS.—Harvard Oriental Series.
IAnt.—Indian Antiquary.
IHQ.—Indian Historical Quarterly.
JDL.—Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University.
JRAS.—Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
Māṇḍ. S.—Māṇḍuki Śikṣā.
Miśra.—Paññintya Śikṣā, ed. by Pandit Kāliprasād Miśra, Benares, 1990.
Nār. S.—Nārada-Sikṣā.
Paḻ.—The (Śikṣā) Paṇijikā recension of the Paññintya Śikṣā.
Prk.—The (Śikṣā) Prakāśa recension of the Paññintya Śikṣā.
PŚ.—Paññintya-Sikṣā as reconstructed by the Editor (pp. 1-3).
RPr.—The Rgveda-Prātiṣākhyā.
RT.—The Rk-tantra-Vyākaraṇa.
Sarmā.—Paññintya Śikṣā, ed. Rudraprasād Sarmā, Benares, 1937.
SBE. (S.B.E.)—Sacred Books of the East.
SS.—Śikṣā-samgraha.
Taitt. Pr.—Taittirīya Prātiṣākhyā.
Taitt. Up.—Taittirīya Upaniṣad.
TPr.—Taittirīya Prātiṣākhyā.
Vaj. Pr.—Vājasaneyī Prātiṣākhyā.
Yaj.—The Yajus recension of the Pāṇiniya Sikṣā.
Yv. S.—The Yājñavalkya Sikṣā.
ZDMG.—Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

उ. स.—Unādi-Sūtras.
ऋग्व.—Ṛgveda.
ऋ. प्र.—Ṛgveda-Prātiṣākhyā.
गीता—Srimad-Bhagavad-Gītā.
चांद्यो—Chāndogya Upaniṣad.
न. धि.—Nārādiya Sikṣā.
प्र.—Pāṇiniya Aṣṭādhyāyī.
ष. भा.—Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad
मनु—Manusmṛti.

N.B.—References to the RPr. (ऋ. प्र.) are always to the edition of Patupati Sāstri.
INTRODUCTION

1. The Present Edition. Among the large number of works known as the Siksās the Indian tradition accords the position of the Vedāṅga Siksā to the one connected with the name of Pāṇini (see §28). Weber in his edition of the Pāṇiniya Siksā (Indische Studien, IV) has however remained silent on this point. In his History of Sanskrit Literature too he did not give any decisive opinion in the matter, but later on Max Müller positively denied the validity of the traditional notion about the PS. being a Vedāṅga. Since the days of Max Müller his view has been accepted by almost all the scholars without the slightest protest. Prof. Liebich may be said to have been a notable exception in this matter; for he maintains that the PS. though late in its present form, is old in its contents. This view however has received very scanty attention from scholars who are otherwise very careful. Even two very recent writers who touched the subject, Mr. C. V. Vaidya and Dr. Siddheshwar Varma, have followed the view of Max Müller. Of these two the opinion of Mr. Vaidya deserves special mention because he is frankly against what he considers to be a late date (c. 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.¹ But Mr. Vaidya does not make any effort to explain why the PŚ. should not be considered a genuine Vedaṅga belonging to the great antiquity he assigns to Pāṇini² and Yāska.³ Dr. Siddheshwar Varma however gives some arguments to prove the lateness of the PŚ. But these, as we shall see later on (§§ 25 ff.) do not seem to be based on all available materials which might have given him a different view about the age and character of the work.⁴ For he has known the PŚ. in three recensions only, while the work itself exists in no less than 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 PŚ. to be a late work and hence not a Vedaṅga, but accords the same position to a Sūtra work ascribed, on very questionable grounds to Pāṇini.⁵ We shall see later on (§§ 31-32) why this view is untenable, and this will bring us face to face with the text-history of the PŚ. 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 PŚ. is the original Vedaṅga Śikṣā will be discussed later on (§§ 28-30) and as such it is to be placed as early as Pāṇini who in all likelihood was its author (see § 33). This being the oldest treatise on the phonetics of Old Indo-Aryan—and possibly of Indo-European—deserves to be studied carefully for the history of the Vedic as well as Sanskrit sounds.

³ Ibid., pp. 5 ff.
⁴ The main arguments which Dr. Siddheshwar Varma adduces to show that the PŚ. is a not the Vedaṅga Śikṣā are as follows: (1) The PŚ. has no claim to be a māṭyagama or source of the Prātitākhyas, (2) Pāgala, and not Pāṇini, is the author of the PŚ. The first argument has been refuted in §§ 28-30, and the second in § 38.
⁵ Dr. Raghu Vira, 'Discovery of the Lost Phonetic Sūtras of Pāṇini' in the JRAŚ., 1931, pp. 553 ff.
2. The Critical Apparatus. It has been mentioned above (§1) that the PS. 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 PS. 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 PS., which consists of 21½ couplets only. Among these AP. 1b-10, 17-21c correspond to PS. 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 PS. 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 PS. 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 arām proktah hakāram pañcamair yuktaḥ
taṅḥstābhīh somāyuktah ‘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 arām) recorded by some MSS. seems to rule out the possibility of yathā saurāṣṭrikā nāri, etc. (Yaj. 6), ever occurring in the place of the AP. 3b-4a. This interpolation seems to be the work of some late scribe who under the influence of the Yaj. recension supplied the reading raṅgaś ca, etc., to the erroneously repeated AP. 3b-4a. unfortunately without any advantage. From a consideration of the possible
age of the Agni Purāṇa (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 Purāṇa published from the Ānandāśrama, Poona. MSS. ka, kha, ga, gha and āṇa used for this text have been indicated by a, b, c, d and e respectively.

V. The Agni Purāṇa with Bengali translation published by the Vaṅgavāsī Press, Calcutta.

(b) The Pañjikā Recension. As the commentary called the Sikṣā-Pañjikā does not contain the particular text, it follows, in a complete form, the Pāj. 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 Pāj. contains the hemistich anusvāra-yamānāṁ ca nāsikā sthānam ucyate (PS. 11a) and upadhmāṇīya uśmā ca jihvā-mālaṇā-nāsike (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 Pāj. 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 Shivadatta in his introduction to the Siddhānta-kaumudi (ed. Venkateswara, Bombay, says asya śiṣṭeṣāḥ Rāghavacārya-kṛtam bhāṣyam jagartīti dīk. Now in some MSS. the Pañjikā has been called Bhāṣya (p. 17). It may be that Rāghavacārya 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 Audavrajī of whose exact time we have no information; but as he is mentioned by the Nār. Ś.,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 Śikṣā-prakāśa,³ another commentary to the PŚ. There being no mention of Audavrajī 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 Śikṣā-prakāśa.⁴ Now the time for the Śikṣā-prakāśa being placed tentatively between 1000 A.C. and 1300 A.C. we may consider the lower limit to the date of the Pāj. recension as the 1200 A.C. Along with this should be considered the fact that the Agni Purāṇa recension can be placed at the earliest in 800 A.C. Thus it appears that the Pāj. recension existed between 800 and 1200 A.C. The representative text of this recension of the PŚ. has been worked out from the following MSS. and printed text.

A¹. Manuscript of the Śikṣā-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. 388. See also the same edited below.
⁴ See below on the Prak. recension.
C. The text of the Śikṣā-Pañjikā together with the PŚ. in its Rk recension printed in Benares, 1929 (Haridas Skt. Series No. 10) [Mr. Suryakanta Sastri mentions one such text printed in Benares in 1887 (op. cit., introd., p. 33n.)]. But we have not seen it. From Mr. Sastri’s quotation it seems to agree with HL.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(d) The Yajus Recension. This recension of the PS. has been carefully edited by Weber in his Indische Studien, IV, pp. 345 ff., on the basis of two MSS., B and W, of which W is dated Samvat 1696. Occasional help from three MSS. of the Rk. 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 Rk Recension. This recension has also been edited by Weber (loc. cit.) on the basis of three MSS., C, D and L. Omitting some minor details we have adopted this edition after comparing it with the following:

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

This recension is scarcely much older than the 18th century; for MSS. of this used by Weber are all later than Saṁvat 1833 and we have come across no earlier MS. This is the most inflated version of the PS. and contains nearly 60 stanzas. Only $17\frac{1}{2}$ among these may be taken as genuine. These are Rk 4-11, 13, 16-19, 22-23, 38-40a corresponding to PS. 1-8, 9, 11-13, 14a, 15, 16a, 16b-18, respectively. The nature and source of the remaining 42 couplets have been discussed below (§ 3).

3. Reconstruction. From a very close study of its five recensions eighteen only of the couplets appear to constitute the original PS. Only fourteen among them, however, occur in all the recensions,¹ while the remaining couplets do not so occur. But on internal evidence they appear to be organically connected with the fourteen couplets common to all recensions and hence surely occurring in the original PS. Problems connected with them have been discussed in detail in Notes given along with the translation of the PS. Sources of more than half of the remaining forty-two couplets which we consider to be later additions to the text of the PS. have been traced to different late Sikṣā² works. Of the remaining twenty couplets the source of which we could not explore, at least eight (Rk 1-9, 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 Oases of later Sikṣās can to some extent be compared with those of the later Upaniṣads (cf. Winternitz, History of Ind. Lit., Vol. I, p. 289). In order to give authenticity to their own theory or practice later writers on Vedic phonetics have called their works Sikṣās. These late works are nevertheless important for the study of Indo-Aryan phonetics.
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a study of the interpolated passages it appears that the custodians of the Vedāṅga Śīkṣā 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 Pṛ. in different relays. Even this method though resorted to sometimes were not exclusively followed. To supplement this they put it along with other works on similarly important subjects in the body of a big compilation like the Agni Purāṇa. A case which seems to be analogous to this is the alleged interpolation of the Bhagavad-Gītā in the corpus of the Mahābhārata. For a tabular statement of the growth of Pṛ. showing the distribution of genuine and interpolated passages in its different recensions, see Table A.

Table A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recensions</th>
<th>Total Number of Hemistichs.</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>Yaujuḥ sākha 2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rk sākha</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. Sastrī, Rk-tantra, Lahore, 1933, Introduction, pp. 45, 46) and of the Unādi-Sūtras (Prof. Goldstücker, Pāṇini : his place in Skt. Literature, London, 1861, pp. 131, 170; Reprint from Allahabad, 1914, pp. 130, 189; S. Sastrī, ibid).

2 For the meaning of the Sākhas 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.*

\[ \text{AP. Rec.} \quad \text{Prk. Rec.} \quad \text{Yu. Rec.} \quad \text{Nk. Rec.} \]
Six Vedaṅgas

4. Before taking up the history of growth and development of individual Vedaṅgas 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 new-
comers 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 attract-
ive to the pre-Aryan people of the land, and a progressive
section of them had already been Aryanised as far as their
religion was concerned. And even some blood-mixture with the
new-comers is much likely to have occurred at this stage. It is
quite possible that the six Vedângas partly grew up and partly
took shape under the circumstances demanded by an effort on
the part of these progressive non-Aryans and their descendants
to acquire thoroughly the Vedic culture, a great deal of which
was essentially connected with religious practices.

6. It is conceivable that these neo-Vedic people con-
sisting 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 Brâhmanas and Upaniṣads (of course old ones)
The Brâhmanas are characteristically the product of that period in which primitive Indo-
Aryans were very much influenced by pre-Aryans of India.
later on their descendants began to get ashamed of their extra-
Aryan origin and wished very much to pass themselves off as thorough-bred Aryans. But a great obstacle in their way was indeed the colour of their skin as well as their language and customs. For the time being difficulties seemed insuperable, but they did not remain so for a long time. Means were gradually discovered for concealing their ethnic and cultural origin.

7. The famous Puruṣa-sūkta (Ṛgveda, 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 Varnaśāṅkara 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 (vyākaraṇa) and

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

9. One of the earliest references to the six aṅgas of the Veda occurs in the Śadvimsā Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda which on linguistic grounds has been considered to be pre-Pāṇinian. And in the Mundakopaniṣad (*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 Nighaṭṭu and the Nirukta*, pp. 221-223). He is also unwilling to recognize Pāṇini’s grammar or Nighaṭṭu or similar other works as Vedāṅgas (*loc. cit.*).

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

3 Max Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 211 ff.


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

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


2 J. Charpentier places without any justification the origin of the Vedāṅgas between 300-100 B.C. (see his ed. of the Uttarādhyāyānasūtra, pp. 81-92).
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 Śikṣā-vedāṅga. But, as can very naturally be expected, the word Śikṣā did not continue to mean the same thing during the different stages of its evolution.

11. According to Panini (VII. 4. 58) the word Śikṣā has been derived from the desiderative of śak, 'to be able.' Thus the literal meaning of śikṣā will be 'a desire to be able.' It is very difficult to understand how this rather curious meaning finally developed into 'phonetics.' It is indeed due to this difficulty that Weber and Max Müller have cut the Gordian knot by a bold assumption that śikṣā means originally 'a desire to know' (zu können suchen) though it must be admitted that 'knowing' cannot very well be equated to 'pronunciation.' ¹ But, from the discussion made above of the conditions under which Śikṣā 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 Sīkṣā seems to have embedded in it an important history.

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

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

\(^{2}\) yo vā imān padaśāh svaraśāḥ kṣaraṇa vacam vidadhūti sa ārtvijinaḥ (Mahābhāṣya, Vol. I, p. 3). Pada in this passage does not mean ‘Verstollen’ though in the Altaraya Brāhmaṇa this is the meaning (see B. Liebich, Zur Einübung, II, §§ 3-4) and aṣṭara does not mean here syllable in connection with metrics but with phonetics, for Paññjali 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.


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-
cārī)\(^1\) 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 Vṛṇa-samāmnāya or the so-called Śiva-sūtras \(^2\) we are tempted to assume that this—probably in some earlier form—constituted the first treatise on the instruction of speech-sounds. The word samāmnāya 'traditional recitation' probably gives support to this view. Kātyāyana also seems to give it support while he says vyattisama-
vāyārtha upadesaḥ, the enunciation (of the speech-sounds in the Śiva-sūtras) is meant for arranging the varṇas in a proper order for (the facility of) recitation.\(^3\)

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

\(^2\) Prof. B. Padgegon says that the Śiva-sūtra as a phonatical classification deserves the highest praise ('The mnemonotechnics of Pāṇini's Grammar,' Acta Orientalia, VII, 1939, p. 54). Mr. K. C. Chatterji is against such a view (see Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol. XXIV).

\(^3\) In this translation we have ventured to differ from Patañjali on the interpretation of the word vytti which he explains as āstra-pravittih (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 13). Our translation of the word as 'recitation' has its support from the well-known complete abhyāsārthaka drutān vyttim, etc. (RPr., XIII. 19, Yaṣ., 22, etc.). Compare also the word ārytti recitation. If Patañjali has misunderstood Kātyāyana there is no wonder about it; according to his own testimony Patañjali lived in a decadent age as regards the proper teaching of the Vedas. He says: In the hoary antiquity it was like this: 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. Reading the Veda (straight) one quickly becomes a robot of the same. (Pūrā kalpa stadd āsīt, samkāraṁ karakālaṁ Brāhmaṇā vyakaranaṁ smādhīyate, tebhyaṁ tatra abhāna-
karanānapradājadhyaya Vaidikā śabād upadiyyyante, tad adhyate na tathā. Vedam adhyāya 
trānta vaktāro bhavanti.) 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.'
13. There may however be some objection to the above view on the following grounds: (i) in the Vārṇa-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 Vārṇa-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 Vārṇa-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 Vārṇa-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 ś, s and ṣ, may justify us in making the above assumption. Prof. Sköld has tried to explain this double h by assuming that the Vārṇa-samāmnāya might have been altered since its first formation and the last sūtra has probably been a later creation (Papers on Pāṇini, p. 20).

passage shows that the chronological distance between Patañjali and the early writers on Vedic phonetics as well as Pāṇini might be very great or the progress of Buddhism that preceded Patañjali must have been very detrimental to the Vedic studies or both might be facts.
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15. As for the authorship of the Varna-samāmnāya we have no means of deciding whether it was made by some pre-Pāṇinian authority (Śiva, Maheśvara) or Pāṇini. All we can reasonably assume is that Pāṇini might have adopted the already existing material (the Sīva-sūtras in their original form), with certain changes, as the matrix of his pratyāhāras, and the Śikṣā connected with his name was perhaps the work to which was prefixed this Varna-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 svara ‘pitch accent,’ mātrā ‘quantity,’ bala ‘stress,’ sāma ‘utterance in a medium tone,’ and santāna (sambhūta, ‘euphonic combination.’ While referring to the Śikṣā in his introduction to the Rgveda-bhāṣya Sāyana thinks of the developed state of this Vedāṅga even when he says vārṇa-svarādyuccāraṇa-prakāro yatra upadīṣyate sā śikṣā; for he brings in the

---

1 Prof B. Faddis says: Most likely the Siva Sūtra is of earlier date than the Aṣṭādhāḥṣāryā (op. cit., p. 56). Dr. Mangal Dvn̄a Sastrī too thinks that the Siva-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. 469f.). Mr. K. A. Sūtra-r̃a is another who thinks that the Siva Sūtras are Pāṇini’s own (On the Fourteen Maheśvara Sūtras, ibid., p. 142). Dr. P. Thieme thinks as follows: The idea of some modern scholars that this dogma (i.e., the divine revelation of the Śiva-sūtra) contains as a historical nucleus the fact that Pāṇini did not compose the Śiva Sūtras himself, is nothing short of absurd (op. cit.). But his view that Patañjali took it for granted that the Siva Sūtras are P.’s work, seems to be wrong. Patañjali merely says in this connection that etad jñāpayati acaryāḥ (Pāṇini). The verb jñāpayati (suggested) 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 Saṅkaras Bhāṣya of the Taitt. Up.; cf. the translation of these terms by Prof. Winternitz (A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I, p. 292). Macdonell in pursuance of Sāyana translates these as latter, accents, quality, pronunciation and euphonic rules (see Hist. of Skt. Lit., p. 255). Dr. Siddhāśvar Varma translates vārṇa as ‘individual sounds,’ svara 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 Prātiṣākhyaśas does not invalidate his testimony
about the Vedāṅga Śikṣā which according to him is the
Pñ. For he mentions no less than three couplets (Pñ. 8, 9, 10) of the latter work. As Uvata, one of Śāyaṇa's predecessors, in his introduction to the commentary of the Rk
Prātiṣākhya has considered this work to be a Śikṣā we can
easily believe that Śāyaṇa was fully conscious about the historical
relation between the Pñ. and the Prātiṣākhyaśas and he surely
followed a correct tradition in according due honour to each kind
of works on the subject. For the Prātiṣākhyaśas, though one of
them has called itself a Vedāṅga, were, as we shall see presently,
the Śikṣā manuals belonging to the second stage in the develop-
ment of this Vedāṅga, and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī too was aware
of this fact. The position of the Prātiṣākhyaśas in the history of
ancient Indian phonetic literature seems to have been very much
misunderstood. And in order to appreciate their proper position as well as that of the Vedāṅga Śikṣā composed by Paṇini we must now inquire into the nature and scope of the
Prātiṣākhyaśas and their time.

1 Śāyaṇa evidently used one of the very late recensions of the Pñ. for he says ca
dāgabhūta-śikṣā-granthe spaṭam udārītaḥ 'triṣaṅgī' catuḥṣaṣṭir vā varṇā sambhavato
mātāḥ' etc. (Pñ. Prak. Ya., and lk. 3.)
2 tathāpy asyaṃ śikṣāyāṃ dantyamāṇya iti repho dantyamāṇya ity uktah (ed. Sāmaśrami,
p. 14). Madhusūdana too calls Prātiṣākhyaśas Śikṣās; see the Note 5 below.
3 RPr. XIV. 30 ; Madhusudana seems to be of opinion that the Prātiṣākhyaśas too are
Vedāṅgas.
4 tatra sarva-vedaśādharāyaśiṣṭa Paṇiniṁ prakāṣitā prativedadākham ca bhinnarūpā
prātiṣākhyaśāmipūtā anyaireva munibhū prakāṣitā.
5 Cf. Max Muller, op. cit., p. 116f. ; Winternitz, Vol. I, p. 283 ; Kielhorn in I. Ant., 6,
pp. 144, 198 contra which Burnell, Rk-tantra Vyākaraṇa, pp. xlix-l ; S. Sastri, op. cit.,
Introduction, p. 40. Exceptions are Goldstücker 'Paṇini', p. 184, and Paul Thieme, 'Paṇini
and the Veda,' Allahabad, 1935, pp. 81ff.
17. Before entering into any discussion about the origin, nature and scope, etc., of the Pratiśākhyaśas 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, śakha and the formative element. Of these, the exact meaning of śakha should be determined first of all.

18. The śakha, as is well-known, relates to the different Vedic schools; but we do not know whether the śakha 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 Krṣṇa-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 Hotṛ was called Rk and that for the use of the Adhvaryu was called the Yajus while the Udgātṛ’s collection was called the Sāman. Now the principle according to which the particular mantras could be put under different labels was the same as that which has been traditionally at the root of the division of the Vedas into śakhaśas. For, from Mahādeva’s commentary on the Hiranyakesi

\[ \text{For details see Saśibhūṣaṇa Vidyālaṅkāra, भीमनीकर (Jivanī-kosa), Calcutta, 1341 B.E., pp. 1090 f. (article on ‘Vedavyāsa’).} \]
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, Sāman, Yajus, etc. For, the uttering of Vedic mantras by different classes of priests was different; the Hotṛ recited the Ṛgas with his normal voice, the Adhvaryu muttered the Yajurṣi silently, while the Udgāṭr chanted Sāmans 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. Prātiṣākhyaṃ relates 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

---

1 sākhābhedo ahyayayabhedaḥ va sūtra bhedaḥ va. See Max Müller, Ancient Skt. Literature, London, 1859, p. 127.

2 Max Müller also writes: 'The word (i.e., sākhā) is sometimes applied to the three original Samhitas, the Ṛgveda-samhita, Sāma-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). Yāśka's use of singular number with reference to the Veda deserves notice (1.20). Prof. Sirup however takes this differently. See his transl., p. 231.

3 Max Müller, op. cit., pp. 192, 471 f.; Purva-Mūnāṣa-sūtras (II. 1. 35-37).
difference of pronunciation of the mantras but also a variation of their sacrificial rules and social laws and customs. Thus the śākhās came to relate also to a difference in such matters, though Prātiśākhya had nothing to do with such śākhās.\(^1\)

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.'\(^3\) This view has been subscribed to by Whitney in his edition of the Atharva-veda Prātiśākhya (1862).\(^4\) Since then almost all the scholars have followed this view.\(^5\) But such an opinion seems to have been expressed on very inadequate grounds. For, Mādhava, quoted by Jñānendra Sarasvatī in his gloss on the Siddh. Kau. (P. IV. 3. 59), explains Prātiśākhya as prati-śākham bhavam.\(^6\) And Anantabhaṭṭa too in the introduction to his commentary to the Śukla-Yajus Prātiśākhya defines the word similarly and shows, after an elaborate discussion, that Kātyāyana's work relates to all the fifteen śākhās which developed out of the Śukla Yajur-veda.\(^7\) 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 pārṣadāni? svacaraṇa-pārṣady eva yaḥ.

---

\(^1\) See above, footnote 2. 'Sūtra' in Mahādeva's comm. means Kalpasūtras, i.e., Srauta-, Grhyas- and Dharma-Sūtras.

\(^2\) The word 'śākhā' used hereafter in this essay will mean, unless otherwise qualified, a phonetic śākhā only.


\(^7\) Kātyāyana’s Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya, ed. Venkatarama Sharma, Madras University, 1934, pp. 2-5.
pratiśākham niyatam eva padavagraha-prgrhyakrama-samhitā- 
vsvaralaksanam ucyate tāni imāni pārśadāni pratiśākhyāni ity 
arthaḥ. 1 'Those Pārśada books by which in a Pārśad of one's own 
Carana, the peculiarities of accent, samhitā, krama-reading, 
pragrhyā vowels and separation of words are laid as enjoined for, 
and restricted to each sākhā are called Pratiśākhyas.' Max 
Müller who quoted the above passage may be said to have 
misunderstood it. Pratiśākham which he translated as 'to 
certain sākhas' should be equivalent to 'to each sākhā.' It 
should be noticed in this connexion that Max Müller's transla-
tion of the passage is not in agreement with his own definition of 
the term Pratiśākhyā quoted above. However the fault lies 
principally with commentators like the author of the Vaidikā-
bharana whom Max Müller in all likelihood followed. For in 
the last named work which does not say anything about the 
exclusive phonetic character of sākhās in a Pratiśākhyā, it has 
been suggested that the Pratiśākhyas relate to a group of 
sākhās. 1 This suggestion seems to give partial support to 
Mādhava's and Anantabhaṭṭa's testimony referred to above. For 
it does not restrict Pratiśākhyas to one only of the many 
sākhās.

The word Pārśada which is a synonym for Pratiśākhyā 
seems to give some clue to the solution of the problem whether 
Pratiśākhyas related to only one or all the sākhās of a Veda. 
In Nārāyaṇa's commentary to a passage (ācaryam saparishatkaṁ 
bojayet sabrahmacarinaś-ca in the Gobhila-Grhyasūtra-bhāṣya 
we find the following saha pariśadā śisyaganenā vartata iti 
saparishatkaḥ taṁ. samanāṁ tulyakālam brahmacāritvam yesāṁ ta 
ime anyasākhino'pi sabrahmacārīnāḥ savayo'bhi adhiyante. 2 
From this passage we learn that students belonging to different 
Vedic schools could take their lessons from one Ācārya who 
together with his pupils constituted a Parśada or Pariśad. Thus

---

1 Max Müller, op. cit., p. 131; S. Varma translates Mādhava's words as belonging to 
each individual (prati) sākhā (op. cit., 12).

2 On the T. Pr., IV. 11; Siddheshwar 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 uneasiness over naming the Prātiṣākhya of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajur-veda as the Taittirīya Prātiṣākhya. The very fact that this Prātiṣākhya mentioned the Black Yajas schools like Mīmāṃsaka and Āhvaraka as well as Taittirīya, made it very inconvenient for him to attach the Prātiṣākhya to the last named school (Taittirīya) only. But still he considered it prudent to adopt the name Taitt. Pr. for the work, though it did not quite satisfy his great critical acumen. For he confesses that 'we are far from fully comprehending as yet the origin, nature and relation of the "schools" of Vedic study and their accepted texts or śākhās...' 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 Śākhās 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 Prātiśākhyaas based his rules on non-existing materials. In view of the tradition that Vedas, in different periods, came to be lost and had to be recovered, it will not be difficult to assume that some of the śākhās 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 gāthā of the Atharva-veda.’ From these passages one will easily realise the untenable nature of the meaning given to Prātiśākhya by Whitney, his predecessors and followers.

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

1 Hopkins, 'The Great Epic of India,' p. 5.
2 JAOS., VII, p. 589.
3 E.g., Prof. Keith believes with Whitney that the T.Pr. relates to the Taittiriya Mantra-pāṭha alone. See The Veda of the Black Yajus School, HOS, p. xxxviii.
manuscripts of the text agree with the data in the Prātiśākhya, we may prudently conclude that the text of the Rgveda we possess is the same as seen by the authors of the Prātiśākhya 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 Prātiśākhya are uniformly observed, and the same applies to the MSS. of the other Vedas.'"2

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

---

2 Pp. 136, 137.
3 Patanjali’s opinion regarding the shortening of e and o in the Śātyamugrīya and Rāṇāyaniya sākhās of the Sāma-veda deserves special notice in this connexion. For he is unwilling to recognize such a deviation from the tradition though the Pariṣad gave it sanction. He says, परगदक्षितेऽथ तत्रथवसति नावा लोके नायस्मि वेदेऽर्द्धा ṣकोर्दऽहा चावरे वैति on the Śivasūtra (ai-au-o).
4 adhyayanabhedaḥ cākhābhedaḥnādi quoted by Max Müller, op. cit., p. 127. See also pp. 117-118; pravacanabhedaḥ prativedanvant bhinnabhāyasya ca sākhāḥ, says Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in the Prasthāna-bheda.
tion could arise between several groups of Vedic people and did actually arise and thus the process which brought into existence different śākhās was practically without an end.\(^1\) It will be found on a closer study of the various Pratīṣṭākhyaśas and Śikṣās that the difference of pronunciation among Vedic śākhās owe their origin to the forces which tended to develop the Old Indo-Aryan to the Middle Indo-Aryan and the later to the New Indo-Aryan dialects.\(^2\) But Whitney, Max Müller and Burnell however viewed the matter differently and so did Weber before them.\(^3\)

23. The Pratīṣṭākhyaśas 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.\(^4\) From a study of the contents of the Pratīṣṭākhyaśa we find that the scope of the Śikṣā as given in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (I. 2) applies to a considerable extent to the Pratīṣṭākhyaśas which

\(^1\) Mr. Suryakanta Sastri in his Introduction to his new ed. of the Śk-tantra follows Burnell in assigning the work to the Kauthumī śākhā (pp. 2-6). But Mr. Sastri has also given some fresh arguments in support of Burnell’s theory. These, however, are by no means unassailable. That the Jaininiya text of the Sāma-veda did not give the peculiarities provided for in the Sūtrās 58, 94, 113 and 114 can be explained also by the assumption that the phonetic changes in question might have arisen later or the Pratīṣṭākhyaśas 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 Nāradya-Śikṣā says:

\[ \text{Pustakopratyayādhita tadhānāṁ gurusannidhau} \]
\[ \text{rājate na sabhāmadhye jāragbhābo iṣva strīyal.} \]  
(II. 8. 19),

and the Yājñavalkya-Śikṣā has the following:

\[ \text{gūś śīghr i śīrah-kampī tathā līkhitā-pāṭhakaḥ} \]
\[ \text{anarthajjñapākanīḥ ca sa śo ṇaṭe pāṭhaktadharmāḥ.} \]  
(196).

The long quotation which Mr. Sastri has given in support of his connecting the Śk-tantra with the Kauthuma śākhā alone of the Sāma-veda, is not at all convincing. According to this question the Kauthumī śākhā seems to include Nārada, Lomasā, 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.


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 bala is non-existent in them. But it can well be assumed that as these two topics were exclusively matters of oral instruction the Prātiśākhyaśas did not discuss them.

24. As for the date of the Prātiśākhyaśa 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 Prātiśākhyaśas will carry us far beyond the scope of the present work. But in support of the lower limit to the date of the early Prātiśākhyaśas 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 Bhāsyakāra with the A. Pr. has not been pointed out before. Under the Vārttika to Pāṇini I. 1. 10. Patañjali ⁴ quotes spr̥taṁ sparsānāṁ karaṇam. īṣatspraṭam antaḥsthānām. vivṛtam ṛṣaṇāṁ ēṣad ity anuvartate. svarānāṁ ca [MSS. A B vivṛtaṁ ēṣad iti nivṛttam]. Here we have sūtras 29-32 of the APr. with the difference that the word order of the sūtra ṛṣaṇāṁ vivṛtaṁ 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, 1936, 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 Prātiśākhyaśas has rather been overrated. Cf. Winternitz, Vol. I, p. 268.
Paniniya Sikṣa

25. Its contents. The PS. as we have reconstructed it from different recensions, contains only eighteen couplets in anuṣṭubh metre though the longest (Rk) recension includes no less than forty-two additional couplets¹ most of which are in the same metre. The extreme shortness of this Sikṣā-Vedāṅga can well be compared with that of the Chando-Vedāṅga which is embedded in the Chandah-sūtras of Piṅgala and contains only 87 sūtras which will scarcely be much bigger in extent than the PS.² But in spite of its extreme brevity the PS. was more or less a complete manual on the pronunciation of the Vedic speech-sounds in general at the time the work was composed.

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

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

INTRODUCTION

Table B
Pāṇini’s Classification of Speech-Sounds of the OIA.

1. According to Places of Articulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sprśa</th>
<th>uuras</th>
<th>kauṭha</th>
<th>jīlayūmāla</th>
<th>tālu</th>
<th>mārdhan</th>
<th>dana</th>
<th>daṇa</th>
<th>oṣṭha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alpaprāṇa</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahāprāṇa</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anunāsika</td>
<td>ṇ</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>ṇ</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āṣman</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ẓ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antalabha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lateral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(flapped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(semivowel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samānākṣara</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a:</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(monophthong)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svāna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sandhyakṣara</th>
<th>kaṇṭha-tālu</th>
<th>kaṇṭha-oṣṭha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(dīpṭhong)</td>
<td>e: (≡āI=æ?) ai</td>
<td>o: (≡āI=ö?) au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. According to Prayatana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a-sprśa</th>
<th>a a:</th>
<th>i i:</th>
<th>u u:</th>
<th>e: (≡? æ?) ai</th>
<th>o: (≡? ö?) au</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iṣat-sprśa</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>(h x r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nema-sprśa</td>
<td>ẓ</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sprśa</td>
<td>all stops and h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Terms in Italics have not been used in the PS.
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 Kasîkâ follows the Vedic usage (see Note 9 on so’dîrṇâḥ). Thus we may be justified to conclude that the PS. was written in a late form of the Vedic speech. The text of the Rk recension of the PS. as printed in the Sikṣā-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 PS. 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 PS. fell into disuse just as the accent-marks in the Aṣṭādhyāyī and Pāṇiniya Dhatupāṭha did.1 Pāṇini’s sūtras such as svaritenddhikārah, anudāttatahīta atmane-padam (I. 3. 11, 12) clearly indicate that these two works were once accented. This possible existence of accent-marks in the PS. again speaks for its great antiquity.

27. That the PS. 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 Prātiṣākhya he says, ‘By comparing Saunaka’s chapters

---

1 See Wackernagel, I, p. 283.
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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 anuśṭubh metre in which the reconstructed PS. 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 PS. (as reconstructed by us) the 5th syllable of the pāda is long thrice (6a, 15a, c) 2 and the 6th syllable short seven times (4a, 5a, c, 6a, 8c, 11a, c) and the 7th syllable of the first and the third pāda is short seven times (4a, 5a, c, 6a, 11a, c) and the 7th syllable of the 2nd pāda is long once (2b). Considering the fact that the PS. consists of 18 ślokas only these 18 instances of metrical irregularity is enough to show their archaic nature.

28. Its place in the Indian Literature. In his commentary to Jaimini's Pūrva-mīmāṃsā sūtras Sabara (c. 500 A.C.) 3 once (on I. 1.22) mentions the 'authors of the Śikṣā' (śīkṣākārāḥ). 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 namu vāyu-kārayakah syād iti vāyur udgataḥ samyoga-vibhāgaḥ sabdo bhavatiti tathā ca ṣ i k ṣ a-r ā h ā huḥ vāyur āpadyate śabdātām iti. Sabara here does not quote the words of the PS but gives its view.
But he discusses later on (under I. 3. 25) a theory of the production of words, which is identical with that available in the PS. (3-6).\(^1\) Bhartṛhari (c. 650 A.C.) too in his Vākyapadiya (I.47)\(^2\) seems to follow the same theory, though he does not mention any Śiksā or Śiksākāra. But from Śabarā’s or Bhartṛhari’s probable acquaintance with the PS. 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 Śiksā or the Vedāṅga Śiksā. The same may be said of Durga (c.1300 A.C.)\(^3\) the commentator of the Nirukta, and Śāyāna (1400 A.C.), as well as Someśvara\(^4\) and Rāmakṛṣṇa\(^5\) about the date of whom we have no definite idea. But Madhusūdana Sarasvatī\(^6\) (c. 1500 A.C.) as well as the author of the Pārāśarī Śiksā\(^7\) knew the PS. as the Vedāṅga and knew Pāṇini as its author. From the description of the Śiksā given in the Sukraniti\(^8\) it appears that the author of this work too knew of the PS. to be a Vedāṅga. Thus we see that though there might have occurred some break in the tradition about Pāṇini’s authorship of the PS. it was taken as the most important Śiksā or the Vedāṅga by eminent authorities probably from 500 A.C. to 1500 A.C. The question why the authorship of the PS. came later to be obscured is difficult to answer.

\(^1\) maha-t pratyatnena sabdam uccaranti vāyur nābher utthitaḥ urasi vistirṇaḥ kantthe vivartaṁ mūrdayānam śatya vaktre vicarān vividhān śabdān abhiyogāyati. PŚ.3-4.

\(^2\) vitarkitaḥ purā buddhyā kvacidarthē niveśitaḥ karaṇebhyo vijñātena dhwaninā so’maṇgāyat.

\(^3\) Durga in his introduction to the Comm. of the Nirukta quotes PŚ. 3. from what he calls the Vishāṅga Śiksā (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 Möller, op. cit., p. 122.

\(^5\) Ed. Siuon, p. 42; Siddheshwar Varma, op. cit., p. 5.


\(^7\) SS. p 60.

\(^8\) svaratāḥ kāla-taḥ sthāna-pratyatnānuprodānataḥ.

suvanapitā ca sā śīkṣā vartanāṃ pāṇaḥ-śīkṣayāt.
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29. In the absence of suitable data on the point we may explain this obscurity by the fact that the ancient Indians did not set any value on history as such, their only care being the Śāstra and not its authors or their dates. They however took notice of the most important fact about the 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 Prātisākhyaśas and some of the late Śikṣās; and sounds like l (ḷ) and ṭh (ṭṛ) found in some Vedic texts do not occur at all in the PS. though they make casual appearance in the Prātisākhyaśas.

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 l (ḷ) and ṭh (ṭṛ) 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.

Hist. of Skt. Lit., Vol. I, Sec. I, p. 57; Sec. II, pp. 81, 114, 180, 187, 142, 154. South Indian Skt. MSS. very often interchange ṭ and l without any principle. This probably points to the Dravidian origin of ṭ (vide 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 PS. 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 sūtras, for he might well have assumed a knowledge of it on the part of the readers.

31. Thus we can well take the PS. as the Sikṣā-Vedāṅga. This view will be further strengthened when we shall discuss below the relation of the PS. with the Āṣṭādhyāyī 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 PS. and the Āṣṭādhyāyī 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 Sikṣā. 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 तुर्षि सम्प्रदयः। कष्ट्व सम्बन्धम्। विषमि तत्साधुः (XXIII, 10-12. Whitney, XXIII. 10),

See foot-note of § 28.

2 चय शिष्यविविधता। समनकर्मिणोऽर्जउभास्या (I, 29-30). By Sikṣā Kātyāyana seems to mean the PS.

3 कष्ट्वाकारः। सबायस्या अत्राध्यायी अविनित्वा तुर्षिः (I, 18.).

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

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

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

(iii) It has two old commentaries. Thus we see that in marked contrast to the PS. the DPS., the alleged phonetic Sūtras of Pāṇini, have remained in oblivion for about two millennia and a half to be discovered only at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Though such a discovery may not be totally impossible, one need be very cautious in such matters. The discovery of Kauṭilya's and 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 (Samvat 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 dis believe that the Pāṇini's Sikṣā of Dr. Raghu Vira was quoted by Patañjali (see op. cit., p. 88)
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 *Vedânga Prakâśa*, a grammar which Svâmî Dayânanda 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 *Vedânga Prakâśa* including the first one have also been issued separately. The first of these sections bears the title of the Varṇoc-cārana-Sikṣā by Pâṇini. 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 Pâṇini’s school (the Kâśikâ and the Vâkyapadiya 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 Pâṇini, 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 Svâmî Dayânanda himself who, among other things was a very close student of Sanskrit grammars as his Vedâṅgaprakâśa and the edition of Pâṇini’s Aṣṭâdhyâyî 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 Pâṇini nor an old one.²

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

---

¹ This date is assigned by S. R. Belvalkar (*Systems of Skt. Grammars*, p. 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 Pâṇini’s *Phonetic Sûtras* discovered by Dr. Raghu Vira (see his *Pâṇini* and the *Veda*, p. 80). We do not agree with him on all points.

³ Dr. Paul Thieme thinks that if Pañjâli knew the PS. as Pâṇini’s work, he would have referred to it ‘in unambiguous terms’ and would have treated it with the same respect as Pâṇini’s grammar (p. 88). Hence, as the PS. has not been referred to by Pañjâli, one may according to Dr. Thieme reject its relation with Pâṇini. 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 Sikṣā though in case of the metrical version of Piṅgala’s prosody the source has been mentioned (see Notes on 1). This can well be taken to mean that to the compiler of the Agni Purāṇa the authorship of the PS. was not known. But we have seen before (§ 29) that Madhūṣūdana Sarvasvatī in the 15th century in no unambiguous terms considers Pāṇini to be the author of this Sikṣā though the Sikṣā-Prakāśa, a commentary to the PS. which is possibly earlier (c. 1200 A.C.) than Madhūṣūdana, ascribes the latter work to Piṅgala. Thus the problem of the authorship of the PS. with its late and mutually conflicting data seems to possess no dependable means for its solution. But we need not feel hopeless in the matter. External evidence failing we turn to the PS. itself and find some important hints which are being discussed below.

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


2 The Astādhyāyī treat svāra in chapters VI (1. 58-2, 199) and VIII (1. 27-71) and in many other places. The mātra has been treated in chapter VI (3. 111, 135) and the samhitā in Chapters VI (1. 72 f and 3. 114f) and VIII (3. 1-4; 43-46).

G
THE PĂNINIYA SIKṢA

among the six branches of the Sikṣā or phonetics. Can there be a better evidence of Pāṇini's masterly knowledge of phonetics? But this evidence alone is not sufficient to identify Pāṇini with the author of the PS. What we may gather from the above is that of the two names Pāṇini and Pāṅgala proposed for the authorship of the PS. the case for the former is stronger.

(b) Besides this a comparison of the contents of the Aṣṭā-dhyāyi and the PS. further strengthens the claim of Pāṇini to the authorship of the PS. From such comparison we gather the following facts\(^1\) pointing to the handiwork of the same author.

(i) In the PS. Pāṇinian Pratyāharas, such as ac, car, ghaṣ, yan, jaṣ, ṣar, hal, have been requisitioned.

(ii) ku, cu, tu, tu and p\(\)u have been used to indicate respectively k, c, t, t and p groups. This convention has been formulated in the Aṣṭādhyāyi (I. 1. 69) \(\text{aṇu}ḍ\)it savarnasya cā 'pratyayāḥ.

(iii) The PS. (17) includes the Anunāsika into speech-sounds while its definition has been given in the Aṣṭādhyāyi (I. 1. 9.) mukha-nāsika-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 ṇa-tva as laid down in the Aṣṭādhyāyi (VIII. 4.1). n after r and s turns to ṇ. From this we get r as a cerebral sound. According to the PS. (11) too r as well as s is a cerebral sound (Prātiśākhyaśa have r either in the roots of the teeth or close to the teeth (see Varma, op. cit., p. 6).

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

\(^{1}\) Pāṇini's Sikṣā brought to light by Dr. Raghu Vira lacks similar facts, hence Dr. Paul Tiṣaṃa 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 (samhitā) in his grammar. Of the remaining three branches bala and sāma can scarcely be the fit subject of a theoretical treatise. Hence varna (speech-sounds) alone was left without treatment in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Now Pāṇini, who undertook to build up his great Sabdānuśāsana, the Vyākaraṇa-Vedāṅga,1 could not very naturally think of leaving varna without any treatment. This is probably the reason why he wrote the PS. which is as it were a companion to his famous grammar.

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

35. Now this being practically certain that the PS. as reconstructed here, is from the hands of Pāṇini we get some rough idea about the age of the work. But as the PS. seems to offer some fresh data for this purpose we shall discuss below various points of view on Pāṇini’s age and try to suggest some time in which the great Indian grammarian was likely to have flourished. Pāṇini has variously been placed between 800 B.C.-400 B.C.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 Prasthānabheda writes तदेदि विद्विज्ञानार्थं वेदांक माधवरमिश्रायायते (ed. Weber, pp. 16-17). In the introduction to the Śiddhānta Kaumudi (ed. Venkatesvar, Bombay, 1914) Mahānabādhyāyā Pandit Shīvadatta Shastri discusses the claim of all extant Vyākaraṇas for Vedāṅtavā and concludes परिशिष्टवाचरणानि वेदांकलिपयमिन्न स्त्राप (pp. 6-8).


Dr. Paul Thieme very rightly characterizes the use of this date as ‘due to a common but wholly unproved belief’ (op. cit., p. 88).
used the word *yavana* which they think could not have entered India before Alexander's invasion. But this argument has been very ably refuted by Professors S. K. Belvalkar and H. Sköld — Belvalkar, 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. 1. 66, 3. 103; V. 1. 62) and distinguishes between the old and the new Brāhmaṇas, does not refer to the Āraṇyaka literature though the word 'āraṇyaka'  

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 Śrāutaśūtrakāra, and the Kauśika sūtrakāra also seems to be inadmissible. (Translation of the Yajurveda, p. clxix.)
in the sense of 'forest dweller' has once (IV. 1. 129) been mentioned. That Kātyāyana composed a Vārṭtika to extend the use of the word 'āraṇyaka' to an adhyāya (most probably of the Brāhmaṇa) may be taken to mean that in Pāṇini's time the Āraṇyaka appendices to the Brāhmaṇas were not yet written or even if they might have been written they were not styled as the Āraṇyakas. Now accepting the second alternative as being more likely we can place Pāṇini at the close of the Brāhmaṇa period. Along with this we should mark another fact, viz., the non-occurrence of the word 'upaniṣad' in the sense of 'secret instructions' and religio-philosophical texts containing them in Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī (Pāṇini, I. 4. 79, indeed has the word 'upaniṣad' in the compound upaniṣatkṛtva) which literally means 'sitting very close to', i.e., in a private manner. Now we may well conclude that the Āraṇyakas which contain Upaniṣads were not old at the time of Pāṇini, for they were not yet known as Āraṇyakas 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. 88.
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. 81).
given rules in his grammar of the proper accentuation of the bhāṣā words (VI. 1. 181, vibhāṣā bhāṣāyām; VIII. 2.98, Pūrvam tu bhāṣāyām) shows that the current language of his time was much ahead of the classical Sanskrit (which has lost its accents) and was nearer the Vedic phase (though in its very late form) of the Old Indo-Aryan than the latter. In addition to this we should also reckon the fact that Pāṇini’s grammar was originally accented like a Mantra or Brāhmaṇa text (vide ante § 26) and as such it should be assigned at the latest to the close of the period of the Brāhmaṇas.
37. *The Śiksā 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 Pañj. recension of the PS. We are now giving below the main features of the commentary reconstructed. The Pañj. recension of the PS, 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 Audavraj, has already been pointed out (§ 2b). These materials will be discussed below. According to the Pañjikā, the Śiksā is the science by which the pronunciation of speech-sounds is learnt (*Sikṣyate'nayā varṇoccaṇam iti Śiksā*, p.8, lines 3-4). This is to be compared with the term *varṇāśiksā* 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 *varṇāśiksā* relates to the Śiksā of the early period when it still lacked the later elaboration as observed in the Prātiśākhyas (see §§ 16, 23). Hence the RPr. has scarcely any legitimate claim to interpret this word as ‘Prātiśākhya’, which must have existed considerably earlier than the time when the RPr. was compiled. The Pañjikā in the definition of Śiksā quoted above seems to have preserved this tradition which agreed so well with the fact that the PS. 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 Brhadāraṇyaka Up. (p. 15, lines 22-23) occurring in this commentary varies to some extent from the text of this work as received from Śaṅkaraśārya.

(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 anusvārāḥ nāsikyaḥ (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 Sikṣā 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 (Pārīṇīyam matam yathā, of the Pāj. version of the Sikṣā). This however weakens the testimony of the author of the Sikṣā-Prakāśa commentary, who considers that Pingala, the younger brother of Pāṇini, was the author of the PS. (p. 23, line 8).

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

1 The corruption is most palpable in the passage at p. 26, lines 22 ff.
It ascribes the authorship of the PS. to Pingala, the younger brother of Panini (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 svaravarnoccarakam 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 Saunaka the following couplet: svara varno' kṣaram mātrā viniyogārtham (?) eva ca, mantram jījñāsamānena 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 Prātiśākhya 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 Pñj. 17 (PS. 14-15) he quotes from Audavraji an entire passage enumerating the Ayogavāhas as follows:

प्रयोगवाहाः ४: दति विसर्जनीयः × दति जिध्वानुपुलीयः, × दति उपपान्नोयः ।

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 हिंद चन्दनानिकः (v.l. हिंद चन्दनानिक्त, नासिक्ता). In view of the fact that the Rktantra mentions चन्दनारो not much later, and चन्दनार as one of the Ayogavāhas, it is evident that the extant Rktantra is corrupt in the passage हिंदचन्दनानिकः. The reading चं इत्युत्तरार: नासिका: surely goes to the Ur-text of the Audavraji¹ which must have been partially included in his work by the author² or the Vyrttikāra 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. 34).
40. Thus it appears that the author of the Pañjikā flourished at a time when the original work of Audavraji was still available in a more or less correct form and in fact he may be older than the Vṛttikāra of the Rktantra who appears by no means to be modern. Thus apart from offering a help in solving certain problems connected with the text of the PS. (see Note) the Sikṣā-Pañjikā has importance on account of the information it gives about Audavraji, who has been mentioned, as far as we know, in four other works:—the Nāradīya Sikṣā (II. 8. 5) and the Sikṣā-Prakāśa commentary to the PS. and the Vamśa Brāhmaṇa of the Śāma 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. ञञञ�性र्थयोषी मयः यमः पूःगुणः (R.T. 2. 14).

ii. ञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञしたこと:ञञञञञ�性म् (R.T. 3. 1).

iii. पञञञञञ�性र्थत च चञञ�性र्थतर्थी, कञञञञञ�性र्थीं दोषञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञञ龅: (R.T. 2. 14. 15).

(b) Occurring with different readings.


The very fact that the Pañjikā does not quote from any of the late Sikṣā works except the Nāradīya Sikṣā probably show that these latter are later in origin than the Pañjikā or at least they were not yet counted as authority at its time. From this fact also we may assume the old age of the Pañjikā.
Besides Audavraji the Pañjikā has laid the following works under contribution: Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, Sruti, Chandogya Sruti (Upaniṣad), Pāṇini’s Āstādhyāyī, Unādi Sūtras, Bhagavad Gītā, Patañjali, Manusamhitā, Rk-Prātiśākhya, Nāradya 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 (=Pnj. 15) may be cited (see Note 23). But in this matter he seems to have been misguided by Uvāṭā if the latter was his predecessor, or both he and Uvāṭa born long after Pāṇini, when the Middle Indo-Aryan speech-habits had already overwhelmed to a certain extent the purity of the Phonetic tradition among the Vedic priests, have independently failed to explain correctly the difference between e and o with ai and au respectively. Other features of the Pañjikā have been discussed in Notes.

42. The Sikṣā-Prakāśa or the Prakāśa does not seem to be a very old commentary to the PS. Some points regarding its date have been mentioned before. The Prakāśa quotes verbatim a passage (p. 23) from Viṣṇumitra’s commentary to the Rk-Prātiśākhya. Now we do not possess any definite evidence about the time of Viṣṇumitra. The fragment of his writing prefixed to the available MSS. of Uvāṭa’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 Uvāṭa’s work. Thus we may assume that Viṣṇumitra was not later than Uvāṭa (11th century A.C.)

1 Uvāṭa (on VPPr. I. 73) is right so far in his analysis of ai and au, a-element of both being taken as equivalent to a māṭra, but his remark चरिते निवें न्याविषिकारी व्याख्याति 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, Nāradīya Sikṣā, Gautamī Sikṣā, Śaunaka, Patañjali and Audavraji. The only quotation from the last authority seems to be taken not from any original work of Audavraji but from some author who quoted him. The case with the author of Pañjikā was different, for he quoted as much as he could (see before). The fact that the Prakāśa does not quote any of the late Sikṣās except the Nāradīya and the Gautamī Sikṣā probably shows that it is not quite modern.
### Table C

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hemistiche</th>
<th>Pr. recension</th>
<th>Yaj. recension</th>
<th>Prâkrt-recension</th>
<th>Prâj. recension</th>
<th>A. r. recension</th>
<th>Reconstructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atha śīkṣaṇa etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śāstrānu-pūrṣyaṃ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prasiddham api</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punar vyaktī</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trīṣaṣṭi catus-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cf 1</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prākṛte Saṃpekṭe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarā vipśātir</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yāḍayaś 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>duḥṣpryāṭa cēti</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ātma buddhyā</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manaḥ kāyāṇghnam</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārutas tūrasi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prāṭah-savanayogap</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaṇṭhe mādhyas-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tārāṃ tātiyasaśavanap</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodirṇo mūrdhna-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varṇā 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>iṣi varṇa-vidāḥ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udātiṣā cāndūtṭaḥ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Table C—(contd.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hrasvo dirghaḥ etc.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td><em>22</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uḍātte niṣāda-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>28</em></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarita-prabhāṣa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>24</em></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aṣṭau śīhānāni</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmālaḥ ca</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obhāva ca</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>27</em></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmālaḥ upadhmā</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td><em>28</em></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yady obhāva</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td><em>29</em></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarāntaṃ</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td><em>30</em></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bakārapaṇadamaḥ</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anaśayaḥ tāṃ</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaṇṭhyāv abā vīcu</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayūr mārhdhanyā</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvāmālaḥ tu</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e sa tu kaṇṭha-</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>ai(o)kāraukārayor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upadhmāniya uṣmā</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saṃvṛtam mātrkaṃ</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āghoṭa vā saṃvṛṭāḥ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svarāṇāṃ umeṣṭāṃ</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṛtehyyopī vīrṭāv</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusvāra-yamāṇāṃ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayogavaha vṛṣeyā</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alābu-vṛgā</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</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>anusvāre vīrṭṭyāṃ</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemistiches</td>
<td>Rk. recension</td>
<td>Yi. recension</td>
<td>Prk. recension</td>
<td>PŚj. recension</td>
<td>A.P. recension</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dvir oṣṭhau tu etc</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vyāghri yathā</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhītā pataśabheda</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yathā saurāśtrīkā</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaṁ raṅgā</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raṅga-varṇāṁ</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirgha-varṇāṁ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydayā caika-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāśīhāyāṁ</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydayāt utkete</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārdaṁ ca dvimātram,</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madiye tu kampayet</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saraṅgām kampayet</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaṁ varṇāḥ</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samyag-varṇa-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhyāṣārthe drutāṁ</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śīyāṣām upadeśārthe</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gīti śighri</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anarthaṇḍo lpa-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mādhuryam akṣara-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhairyaṁ laya-</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śauktim bhṛtam</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kākasaṁvarṇāṁ śirasīgāṁ</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urāṁau-dauṭaṁ</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niśpditiṁ grasta-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prātaḥ pathen</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mādhyandine</td>
<td>72</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)

[वर्णसमाय:]

[चत्र उग्नी कठ लुक्क। ए चोड़। ऐ चो चु।
हँ वर्त्त। लः। अ मुळा न मृ। भे भे भ।
घः ठ ध घ। जङ गङ द ग। खः न कः थ च ठ त।
कः पः। शः सः रः। हः लः।]

[वर्णसंख्या]

खः विंशतिरिक्ष्य स्यार्थाः पञ्चविंशितः।
यादस्य स्रृः ता द्द्वी चलवर्ष यमः स्रृः ताः ||११||
चनुङ्करो विसर्गिः × कः पी चापि पराश्रयो।
दुःखश्रेणिः विशिष्ये खःकारः स्रृः एव च ||२२||

[वर्णितपदी वर्णिविभागः]

चामा बुध्वा समेयार्थाः मनो युक्ते विचया।
मनः कायायामाधिन्ति स प्रेरौति मासेतो ||१२||
मारतल्पुरसि चरणृ मन्द्रः जनयति खराम्।
प्रातः सवन्योः तं कःंद्रो गायत्रमाध्याततः ||३३||
पारिनय-ग्रिहा
कब्र धे साध्वन्दिनयुगं मध्मसं वैष्ठभानुनगम्।
तारं तार्यसवानं शीर्षेऽथं जागतानुगम्॥५॥
सोहै शूतावर्धिती वनमापय माहतः।
वर्षा जनयते तेषां विभागं पद्धथ खः॥६॥
स्त्रतं कालं स्थानात् प्रयवानुप्रदानतः।
इति वर्षविद्या ध्रुवनियुपयं तं निघोधत॥७॥

[करतस्य कालबयच]}
उदात्यानावनानुदानस्य कर्मस्य क्षार्यः।
ऋत्यादीवः सुत इति कालती नियमा चचि॥८॥

[वचारण-श्याननी]
चष्टी स्थानानि वर्षानामुरं कस्तः शिरस्तथा।
जिल्लामूलं च दन्ताश्र नासिकोडः च तालु च॥६॥
हकिरं पञ्चमैयुक्तं अपिष्ठ संयुतम्।
श्रीरं तं विजानियानात् कण्ठामाहुर्कंयुतम्॥१०॥
कण्ठावहीविचुमुहस्ताल्वा बीहाजावपू।
खृम्मूर्धन्या कठरपथा दन्ता चतुरलसा: स्रतः॥११॥
जिल्लामूलं तु कु: प्रोति दन्त्रिज्ञः च स्रत: कुः वृधः।
ए ऐ तु कण्ठाल्वा दो चौ जण्त्रोहोही स्रत: ती॥१२॥
अर्ध्याता तु कण्ठास्य एकारीकार्योम्बेलं।
ऐकारीकार्योम्बेल तर्यविहितसंन्यस्तम्॥१३॥
चनुकास्यनानं च नासिकाशायसमुच्चते।
उपपानीय चृप्रा च जिल्लामूलीयनासिके॥१४॥
योगवाचा विनेत्रा चायवस्यानभागिनः।
चलावीशानिधीविद्यासमूहः स्वराणनः॥२५॥
चनुसारस्तु कर्त्यो निल्यं जोः शष्यसेषेण च।

[ प्रयव-भेदः ]

चाचोवस्तुशा यशस्वीविन्यासस्त्रोः शलः स्मृतः॥१६॥
शेषः सम्भा हृलः प्रोक्तः

[ चतुर्दान-भेदः ]

निीवादनुप्रदानः॥

अभोदनुनासिका नक्षो नान्दिनी हभवः स्मृतः॥१७॥
इष्णुनादः यथो जस्य भवासिनस्तु खपादः।
इष्णुक्रासांश्चरो विद्याद्वे गोर्धमेतलो प्रचंचते॥१८॥

*
II. चविन्युराशान्तगंथा (The Agni-Purāṇa Recension)

क्षेि्म चित्रविषयं स्वतदेषं व सतुरविषयं।
खरा विश्वतिरिक्ष्य स्मर्नां पञ्चविषयं।

11. याद्यथा स्मृता ब्रह्मचार्य यमा; स्मृता।
चनुकारी विसर्गिः × कृपा चापि पराप्रथिती।

22. तुःध्रष्टेि्म ोिन्यो ेकारं मुते एव च॥
9तापं शपमेर्यमंतःक्षरिः संयुतम॥

10. चौरसं तं विजानीयत् काश्माइहरसंयुतम।
आत्मा वुध्रा समेबायांन् 10मनो युङे विवचया॥

33. मनः कायामाहिनि स प्रेरयति मातास।
मायत्सुरसि चरनुः 11मन्नां जनयति खर्मू॥

44. 19प्रातःसवनयोगं तं कह्न्द्रो गायत्राश्रितम्।
कर्त्ते 13माध्यनिन्ययुगं सध्यं वै द्रव्यालुगम॥

1. M. विचारः।
2. M. चनुकारी।
3. M. समा; for यमा।
4. M. दृष्टि for × कृपा।
5. M. पराप्रथिती।
6. M. विश्वतेि।
7. MPbc. एकारं for खर्मू।

8. In all MSS. after 3a occurs the following: रुष्य खे चारं ग्रोआं इत्यादिः पथवंतुः।

9. V. om. See Introduction 2a. 10. M. मनोयुक्ते।

11. M. मल for मनः, Mb. सान्त।
12. M. ेमागु।
13. M. मध्यनिन्ययुगं सध्यं।
15. तारं तारियस्यवनं श्रीसंहं जागतानुगमः ।
सीतीर्ष्णं मूः &भिहि वक्रमापदं मात्रं: ||7a||
16. वर्षान्त्रं जनयते वेषां विभागं: पञ्चाधा स्मृतं: ।
17a. खरतं कालं ख्यानत् प्रथमानुप्रदानत: ||7a||
उद्दात्सात्तुद्दलः श्रिवचं श्रावकः ।
18. चक्षुधां दौरः सुत इति कालो निःमाना चचर्चं ||8.||
चचर्ची ख्यानानि वर्षानामुरः करस्तं श्रवस्थ्या ।
19. जिव्वालूं च द्रिताय नासिकोंकै च तालु च ||9.||
श्रीभावार्थं विभिन्नं श्रवसा रूपं एवं च ।
जिज्ञासुभुमं उपवशं स गतिरत्तिविभोषणं ||11.||
कोवियावप्रस्थानम् उकारदिपमं वदम् ।
सरांसं तारं विवादं यदुक्रमात्मस्वास्म: ||12.||
̄कुविया दागतं द्रपमं अपवर्धि च भविष्यम् ।
5. न तथा पाठं मोचिद्रप्तं पापविधिः किविवर्धत: ||13.||
चुनियादागतं वसं स्त्रारायं सुधविशिष्टम् ।
सुखरेष्म सुन्तकोण प्रयुतं ब्रजं 7राजये ||14.||
न करानि न लम्बोडो नायको नायकाणिक: ।
गवर्दो बहुरिज्जुवं न वर्षानूं वक्ताहंति ||15.||
एवम् वसं: प्रयोगायं नायकायं नातिपोडितत: ।
स्यवविव्यवधियोगिणं ब्रजलोको महीयते. ||16.||

1. P. प्रथमानुप्रदानतः ।
2. M. "नपि."
3. M. समावेश विभिन्नं and P. चनुसारी विभिन्नं for श्रीभावार्थं विभिन्नं.
4. M. जातिविदं. "
5. P. reads एकसारणं पापविवधारणं श्रवसं instead of 13b (न तथा पाठं etc.) and M. एकसारणं......श्रवसं.
6. M. नायकः ।
7. M. राजसि.
8. Phoeb give this couplet preceded by यथा आत्री। प्रेरितं पापार्थं न च पौष मति।—(Yajas. 20a). P. gives 17b-18a as its 18, and 19b-20a as its 20.
पारिलोकिय-शिवाय

1. कस्याऋवंशष्वाच्छलसालव्या चोक्षजावपू

11. सुबर्धना कर्तुणा दल्मा वन्तुलसातः समूता; ||१७||

जिझापूले तु कः प्रीतीको दिन्योष्ट्रो वः समूती बुधे; ||

12. ए ए तु २कस्रतलव्यावोचर काराठङाजी समूती ||१७||

13a. चच्चमाच्छ तु ३कस्रस्य एकारीकारयोभिभवत्।

15a. च्योगवाण्डा विद्येया चाश्यस्यान्याभागिनः ||१७||

16b. चरोस्मता कामस्यवव्यमस्त्ततः। शलः। समूता; ||

शेषा: सच्चा हल: प्रीतीका ३निवोधानुप्रदानतः ||२०||

17. चभोजनानासिका नफः नारिनो हभाघः समूता; ||

रेष्नाद्वा ६वयी जस्त प्रसासिन्न ६क्षात्वः।

18. १०रेष्नासांग्यरो विद्याहु गोर्ध्मेतत् प्रचवते ||२१||

1. P. कस्याऋवंशष्वाच्छलसालव्या.
2. P. "तालव्या ए शी.
3. MV. कस्या खादिकारीकारः।
4. P. नेमा; (अ) खूदा: and M. नी मा:। खूदा: for -नेमश्चुदा।
5. MV. हरः।। for शलः।।
6. PM. निवोधाह प्रधानत; for निवोधानुप्रदानतः।
7. M. बनोजनानासिका नफः नारिनो।
8. P. तस्मेवः, M. प(अ)० यथा।।
9. M. चक्षाद्वः।।
10. P. देश्वा।।
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III. पञ्जिका-सहिता (With the Pañjikā)

**चय शिरां प्रवच्यामि पाणिनीयं मतं यथा ।**

शास्त्रानुसारं तत्तविचारं यथोत्तं लोकविदयोः ॥१॥

'पातु वो निवारयावा मतिनेन सरस्तो।
पाणितर्पल्लिके वच्चित्वेन करौया।
कृत्वा वचनं यथा वत्तात्त्वात्ता विद्योम्यस्यमः।

पृष्ठ शिरां प्रव च्या में तिः। प्रवचनमानन्तरः। वेदार्थवाचनन्तरस्यः। पाठः। किं कारणम्? 'वड़जले 'वेदोऽवधेतयज्' इति शरणात्। तत्र ६ च प्रिष्ठा प्रयमः, चक्रशश्लोकः। सा ६ं वस्तुः इत्यवथेतस्य। ६त्रेद्वे ६सिद्धे वेदः
शाक्तिन्तराय व्यक्तिज्ञातिः शाश्वासनं एव ६, नावीयते। केदारि कलेषु वचीयते
इति चेतु 'ष्ठानोऽविचारः' 'वचेतस्य समाचार्यस्य' इत्योपमादिः 
नेव देवः: सः, १०मृतान्तरः कलः एवः अवधेतस्य नावीयतो।

नियमादिः सः, १०मृतान्तरः कलः एवः अवधेतस्य नावीयतो।

शात्री सम्ययाबेश्याब्योजनानि वहितानि। तत्र १० चात्मिव समन्तः यतस्योऽवश्चः
भायः। १०नियमादिः कश्चात्मानः। भाविष्यं तु चयनियम् वक्यति—वाच
शब्दार्थि विदिमः। विवेजनं सम्ययाबेश्याब्योजनम्।

1. Before this A¹B have श्रीमेशाय नस्ते; A¹ also चैं नस्ते श्रीमेशाय नस्ते, A²H षष्ठ वेदार्थवाचनन्तरः: श्रीमेशाय नस्ते; and B पातु नस्ते।
2. B मिलता'।
3. IB शिखर वचनविरेतार्य वाचानात्ता।
4. A² 'वेदोऽवधेतयज्'।
5. A² omits वः।
6. BHL omit ष,।
7. A¹ omits पर्यं: ... वेदः।
8. चिंचि शांर् for चिंचि वेदार्थप्रार्यः।
9. H. निवीयते।
10. B, चिक्षाया बनानारः।
11. A² omits इति।
12. B omits एवः।
13. HLA² 'वचनं चः चः चः; B. 'वचनं चः चः,
पारिवक्ता-सम्बन्ध

प्रसिद्धमयि शब्दार्थमिनिवातमुद्विब्रि:।
पुनर्वीठोकारियामि वाच उद्धरणो विधिम्॥२॥

"एकादशिः वर्णः सम्यक् प्रमुखः, स्त्रयः लोकः कामधुः भवति" वर्तति। सिद्धान्तमयि वर्णोपारिया विषयं, तत्र प्रकरणं वच्चामि काणवियामि। पि शि नीं यं मं तं ते चित। पारिवक्तयामि "उद्धरणः" (पि ४.२.१४६) उद्धरण:॥ तत् कवित-मिलयांविनिदेशः। म त मिति। "मन धानि" पारिवक्तयं मं तं धानं यथा तथा प्रवचनमयि तैरिव प्रवशारास्वतःं परिभाषित: "सच्चिदान्वणा यथाद्विष्टः" अवयादि ब्रह्मविभि चाचान्यः (पि १.१.५३) उद्धरणः॥ "अधिकारविभि चाचान्यः" उद्धरणः ch। तथा नान्दमणुसम प्रयोगं यत्दु अकरणान् यथा तथा "मोहुनुकरः" (पि ५.२.२१) उद्धरणः॥ ननु अकरणि शब्दिता, चालापि चित। ततच अकरणि नीव शिष्याग्रिथमनास्मि सयम:। दशमोऽ दशमचिता, किनतु अकरणे एतचिन्यानि:—गोविन्दः साधारिमांय साधः। द्व तु गोविन्दी विश्वासूणानाविदयं वहित भेदः। श्रवः लु पूः धीं न दि च धा दि च। श्रवणति धारि: करणे दुनावशय। आपूर्यात्मिः उपार्वेतः॥ तद्वितिः पारिवक्तयामयः॥ "तत् पारिवक्तयामयः विषयं शिष्यावशस्त्र्यात्मात्मापूवे" विश्वास वः बोधमतमां जानीयात्। पारिवक्तयामिन्तस्य यदापूवे यो युधिष्ठिरक्षम: स एवासीर्यं। तथा च वच्चिति—"श्रद्धां श्रद्धार्थं प्रदापात" अवयादि। य यों तां को कः वे दः यो रिति। १० समानायः-मित्रयेः। तथा च ११ भाषाकारः—"व एव बौद्धिकः शब्दात्म एव वैदिकास्त एव वैदिकास्तु" उद्धरणः॥

वन्भाराद्यो वर्णः साधारिमांविशये १८ परशुरानिर्गितास्वलात्। १४ कामयः: शास्त्राः इत्यादिः

15 पि शि च भित। शब्दिमितविशिष्टः प्रसिद्धमयि शब्दार्थमिनिवातं १६ सतं ।

पञ्जिका-साहित्य

*चिपिषिस्मुः प्रमिंद्राणी वर्णीः सम्बः चताः
प्राक्ते संख्ये चापि स्यविशेषतः स्यविशेषता ||२॥
शरा विशेषतिरिंकश स्यांनां पश्चिमिंशशितः।

||१|| याद्युः सः ता चहीः चलारस्य समारः यमः: सः ताः ||४॥

पुनः पपाद्य व्यक्तकारिणामाः स्न्ष्टीकारिणामाः। किमुः? वाच उच्चारणे विचित्र, वाचो
गिरसः उच्चारणे । उच्चारणे । विद्वानमुः।
ननु विद्वर्धलम्प्राप्तो इति सः ता: च।
नानात्वात्रम्प्रक्षितः। उत्त च अवस्थातुः—अवस्थातु वर्णीः शस्त्रान्विवेचितायांको
इति। उच्चाति, यथस्य शस्त्रान्विवेचिताः उच्चारणे तथाप्राप्तसः: ॥ कथनोऽथोऽनुसः—
'प्रदानादिः: एतदौः' विचित्रः।

वाक्यार्थे वर्णीः किंव, कल्जाम्मास्ये इत्यत्व भाष—

तिः य ष्टि तु: य ष्टि वै म ति। सम्बहत इति सम्बहती: सम्बाशनातः: जाता:।
वर्णीः यज्ञोः। वाच यज्ञोः लोकवेदोः' इत्यत्वमुः।
तत सः तोः साधनान्विषय वय वर्णी उत सर्वमाहान्विषय इत्यत्र—प्राक्ते संख्ये चापीति।
अस्यी: प्रम्भादपरश्चात्रदिष्टे: वर्णी: सम्बहेत्तातः: यमः: तैतिः:।
ख यन्त्र त्रृता: ख यन्त्र
'प्रवत्यः । सच्चीस्वादित्र धर्मार्थशोचारितः।

कथं ते लिखितः: कथं वा । 'चतुःपार्षिमायुः

शरा विष य तिः रे रे क वे म ति। शरा इति 'सः यज्ञोपत्यापोः' खायते
श्रद्धालेन अध्यनमिति करौद्वप्रक्षातः।
कथं ते । एकार्यशमिति:? ॥ पत्तात्वुः
श्रद्धाः मयाः वमाप्रप्र स्यविशेषति विवेचितमु—प्र व तृ एती चालारे खस्तिहेम्बित—
मेदन हादसः। खादस्य दृवे वदोऽतः न सन्नीती यारश्च खस्त: एवोपदशिते, ॥ जत एती
वयोऽतः। ए ऐ जो भृः सम्बधारणीः सम्बध्वराणामपि खस्ता न सन्नीती यारश्चातः

1. A¹A² निःस्वादनीकः, 2. B om., विचित्रः। 3. A¹ adds कथं।
4. H मः प्रदानादितिः। 5. A¹ पदार्थाः श्यालि and A² पदार्थाः विचित्रः: for एतदौः विचित्रः:।
6. LA¹A² add च before this। 7. C दर्शण for दर्शणः।
8. L विहनम् ९. B चतुःपार्षिमायुः खस्तिहेम्बितः। 10. B omits नः।
11. A²A¹ omit this word ; before this I ततः: खादस्यः। 12. A¹ व for चतः।
10. पाणिनीय-गिरि

11. खलाहिमेदेशस्थलाप: प्रथमा हादम खुता।
12. याकारो इस्ल एवेचोटी खता एकाविंशति।
13. पदविभित्तिरशाब्दिकः ग्याः: यथार्थयो यमः।
14. वचनुकारो विसम्बरात्रि कथा यो युतेनकारकः।
15. बिनिःशिक्षिन्यन वर्षः यथा खरीदविमिदेहि।

चन्दरः

2. अम्हेतु पूर्वों पञ्चमम्: परस्तो यदि।
3. तत्र संहो यमसरस्तिः सक्रियोः पूर्ववर्नियोः।
4. वगुणवान् प्रस्त: सार्थकमाचर्योभिरसंहरताः।
5. ह्यथा तत्त्वानुमानिकमवावगम: (नै. मिः. २.२.५-८)

इति १५नारदीद्वारकामौतिते ययो वर्षागम इति १६विहयति।

17. चन्द्रात् शाक्षात्

1. $A^1 A^2$ त भे:।
2. $A^1$ omits $\delta$।
3. $A^1 A^2$ घर्षितः।
4. $A^2$ पूूष स्त्रकः।
5. MB omits च्।
6. इ. पूूष: धन्तुलतालिस्कमं।
7. $CA^1$ चद्यावित्यम।
8. $A^2$ वीपसरस्त्र, $A^2$ वीपसरस्त्र:परस सङ्केते।
9. $A^2$ वानन्दास्वामिः सयो यमः।
10. HBIA दित्य तत्त्व।
11. $A^2$ HLB omit this and the two following slokas।
12. $A^1$ दित्य।
13. $H_e$ भैवत पूूष: शालिमाथ, $B^x \times \times \times$ पूूषामलिमाथ।
14. $A^1$ यमात्वतेन।
15. IBH दित्य, $A^1$ दित्य।
16. $B$ omits वीपसरस्त्र।
17. $B$ omits चन्द्रात्।
चन्द्रशेखरि विसर्गः यक्षी चापि पराशयोः।

|| 2।। दुर्यास्त विमेषोऽखारः मुत एवं च || 5।।

चवाचर यमः स्रजः। इति वर्षीवर्तेनेक्षेत्रः संयोगसार्यात्। यथा चतुर्भुजः
चारणासुदारार्थभिः प्रञालीः अभिनिःतिः गकारी हु यसोऽ नकार इकार्षेठि।
प्रयो तु यमः वर्षीवर्तिः सर्वते। तथा च शीकः—"सर्वं यमानननलानिका:ः
क्षानु परेषु यायेननलानिकेत्" (क्ष. द्राः १.६.५) इति। नूर्येना चतुःपञाच्यता
सहायपञाच्यताः || 4।।

च तु शा रो च वि संगे र्थेः ति। खरस्तु भवतोत्तुस्ताः। [खरस्तु] चतुः
कार्त्ति[य] तुगमनेनानास्ताः। व्यक्तिः च इत्समुखः क्षरानुः इति।
विष्णु इति। विप्रव्य स्वातः विप्रतेः इति विसारः। १ क १ वी च वि
प्र रा ध या भि ति। परायाविभिः पत्रोऽकारकारी चायव्यायः योगीः
परायायोः। तथा च व्यक्तिः—"अयोगवा विश्रेयाः भाष्यस्यानभागिनः।" इति।

पर: पाठः।—क पालविश्वयः पदी श्रोहः। प्रहुक्रार्णस्वर्यः। पाराविश्वः।
प्रवर्तीति पाठः।—क । पालि कपालाः। काव्यभावाः चायव्यायः खान् योगीः
कपालाः। चन्द्रद्वादशांतिकारस्तोत्राविभिः परायायोः।
हु: सखु हे सर्दि ति
हुँकुः दानवतः हो वर्तमांनिः न वर्षानसम्।
व्यक्तिः च—'प्रचारिणी इति
तथा चौद्रविश्वः।—नत सखु हे कराण्य खच्चिनामः। 'हुँकुः दानवतः-
खच्चिनामः। इतिशिष्यः खकारो विविधते। चतोऽखकारो हुँकुः दानवमधः
चन्द्रद्वादशांतिकारः। इतिशिष्यः पादपुरणायः। खः का र सत्ि। व्यक्तिः

1. $B_x$ चधरिति सचारी हि, $A^1 I$ चधरिति सची सचारनकाराचारिः, $A^2$ भधिः($?)रिदि ग
यम नकार कारारिः, $C$ चधरिति सची सचारी हि नकार।
2. $B_x$ खचुपरेड़, $H_x$ खचुपरेड़, $L_x$ खचुपरेड़, $A^1$ खचु परेड़ $I$ खचैवातः।
3. $B^1$ भुः बस्तुःसमाप्ति वद्वः ।$IH$ पशाराधिः: संधः।
4. $A^1 A^2 B$. चकारापः, $IHL$. चकारापः, $A^3$ चकारायुगमाघः।
8. $IB$ omits तव, $IHLA^2$ करण्य for प्रवत्तम $A$ adds करण्य after प्रवत्तम।
9. $BHL$ वकारी विविधत, $IL$ have in the margin यमः भक्तिः लकारी विविधते यष्टकरशः
प्रयः; $B$ वष्ट भक्ति च भक्तिः लकारी विविधते यष्टकरशः प्रयः।
चाला बुद्ध्या समर्थार्थ्यन्नो युक्ते विवचया।

|| सन: कायानिमाङ्कल व प्रेरयति माहतम ॥६॥

कारप्रयायः। ३३, त एः वे ति। लकारसा दौर्यसद्यौ न सन्तोषस्तातृत्व प्रकर्मपञ्चस्तामुः, समर्थ चाचः—लकारः: ३३, त एः व इति विभाषः: चस्मात्रादु जस्तः।

नन्ते वर्णान्ति प्रयवसुप्रसर्थतश्चनवेच, विमथक्ष्मस्मस्तात्: प्रयवः: कांते। उचारी, सुन्तं विनाशानिधि तावृत लकार उचारयित्वः: उचारिति च लकारी भागवार्यमस्तातृतीपि प्रयव उचारिति: दुःख उचारिति। अभुसरायायः: ३३, ताता। पचः। ३३३ बृहत्यास्तपातः: प्रवता सस्त विलयतः। चतुःपदिः: कामः। ३३३ बुज्जः विस्मर्येचिति पाठानरातः।

कथं पुनरुस्तारणस्यम्। ३३३ दौर्यसद्योऽतिशुष्कः। तथा चौद्रजः—"चं भुज्जः धर्मां इत्युज्जः ३३३ दौर्यसद्योऽतिशुष्कः। धर्मां इत्युज्जः ३३३ बुज्जः। धर्मां इत्युज्जः।

1. A$^1$ omits $^6$प्र.।
2. IHL$A^1A^2$ पूर्णप्रसिद्धराय।
3. B चबावरी विकृता।
4. BL ख्रान्तीयों दौर्यसद्योऽ, LA$^1A^2$ ख्रान्तीयों
(तो) सीचिन्धः (तो)। I ख्रान्तीयों दौर्यसद्य दौर्यसद्य।
5. A$^1$ omits दौर्यसद्य ... इति नायान्। A$^2$ omits दौर्यसद्य ... इति अवस्था। HL put
इति before दौर्यसद्य।
6. A$^1A^2$ राज्यरीषेन, B राज्यरीषेन।
7. HL शरीराधिक।
8. B दौर्यसद्य।
माउत्सूरस् चरन्मृद्ग जनयति साधृ ।

II.4 प्रातः सवनयोगन तं कुन्द्रो गायत्रमात्रिभिः ॥

कण्ठे माध्यमप्रिययुग मध्यमं वै हुभानुगम् ।

II.5 तारं तार्तियसवनं शीर्षेक्षु जागतानुगम ॥

वाल्ला न समथे समग्न प्रवयम् ब्रह्मप्रवयाय यदि श्रद्धा उचायति तदा
मनो बुद्धे विवचयः 'वशुस्मित्वा' विवचया तथा।
तच मनो निर्षुक्ते शाबा।
स सः का जा कि मा न नीति।
तच मनो निर्षुक्ते सत्ता कायानिमाति
कायानि श्रृंगारविन अभिमुख्येन विद्रीत।
स प्रेर य ति मा ह स त भि ति।
तो सन्फिनिमहः सन् मारुतः वायुं प्रेरयत् ॥

मा ह त सू र सि च र व क्रंज ज न य ति खर सि ति।
मावतो बालुकोि
रचि 'चरन्मृद्ग' साधृ जयादयति।
मन्दस्मि मन्ते रक्षप्रयः।
प्रा तः स व न-षो ग भि ति।
प्रातः सबनवे सह योगस्योति प्रातः सवनयोगसमुः,
तथा च
एतरेचा वरुणेण 'चरन सन्ते तयति त्रस्मातु मन्द्रया वाचा प्रातः भवानि यमेवत्' (१४.६) नि।
गायत्रे गायतः 'सुतिकम्भणः' ब्राह्मदयति कुन्द्रः ॥

क एह नि।
मार्हत नि 'सनुवत्तीं सवनं कुन्द्रं साधृं चरित्वति, च।
वर्षोन् जनयत्तीति यावत्।
कण्ठे चरन् वार्तूमेथमं सरं जयति।
कण्ठे नि 'कन्देषद्' (उ. छ, १०४) नि त्रस्मात्:।
सन्धि दिने युनः समिति 'मायानिमं
सवनर्मां ब्रह्मकुन्द्रोऽगुनामिनम्।
ता र भि ति।
ताति नवनन्मिति द्रेष्य-सवनर्मां तां सरं शीर्षेक्षमिति
मूलः सन्धि चरन् वायुं जनयङ्गुलिति जागतं
कुन्दोऽगुनामिनम्।
जाग्न कुन्दोऽगुनाहति जागतानुगमः।
शीर्षेक्षमिति
'शीर्षेकःकुन्दसिः' (पा, ६.१.६०) नि गिरश्नेन साधृं शीर्षेकमावः।
तत् मव
शीर्षेकमावः॥

1. L omits दुहुमिष्या विवचया तवा तथा, BH दुहुमिष्या only.
2. A1 चन्त्र for चरमः.
3. BHLIA² तथा च मय्यतः मन्द्रया वाचा प्रातःसवनन्मिति.
4. B has before this गायत्रमहोऽप्रयः।
5. BHL omits सुतिकम्भण; and has ब्राह्मदयति कुन्दः.
6. BHLCA² omit असन्.
7. A²L मायानिमं सवनर्माः.
पाशिनाय-विचार

सदृशिरणी मुख्यार्थित वैश्वसापय मानतः।

||6|| वर्णानुजनयं तेषां विभागः पञ्चाध खृतः।

सरः कालः स्नानात् प्रयवानसार्थानं।

||7|| द्रवीत वर्णाविदः प्राचीनिण्यम् तं निरोधतः।

सो दो घृतः। स वायुदत्रायं जन्तर्गते सुलभः यावदुपयरितम् गतिम्
वल्लभानं: जग्गः-कपालिनावं द्वारात् पुनः प्रवाहः। 'वक्ष्मावावय वर्णानुजनयं
वत्तः। पुनर्मेहत्तयं विविधार्थम्। तेषां विभागः पञ्चाध खृतः।
तेषां वर्णानां जन्ममानानां विमागः विवेकः पञ्चाध पञ्चामारः। 'संस्काराय
विधाय धर' (पा. ५.२.५२) गृहः। 'स्मृतोदायुगः।

वोहैतुमिलोणाः देशां वर्णानं 'पञ्चाध विवेकः इल्लाह—

श र तः गृहः। स्वस्तानं द्वृतू आर्थाक्षमः। 'वर्णानं ग्नातार् एयमाहुः—
पञ्चाध विवेकः वर्णानाम् गृहः। 'सरः त्रिमात्रि विभागः। कालो उश्वि:—
वासां दर्शादृशी। प्रवक्ता पिडः (१)। अनुप्रदानं स्ववानादिकां धीपादिः। अनु
प्रकृतिः दौरात्रे नानुप्रदानम्। 'दी नाद|शासाव|नुप्रदानी| इद्विद्रवः।
पञ्चाध विवेकः वर्णान्तं निर्युगुलवल्लभानं हे वोताः। निवधतं श्रुतेः।

श्रव्यं यस्मिनं भावते विद्युत्प्रवर्धम्। नु त्यदेवमेवददिपपम्। कथम्?
वाक्याय ऋशा सच वर्णान समवेत मनो युक्तः गृहः। आयातमः। भावानान्त
नियोजकानां नोपपपाते दक्षिणस्मरणयुक्तः तथा। तथा च ज्ञाति—'चक्षुः
श्रव्य पुष्यः' (क्रि. पा. ४.२.१५) गृहः। 'अक्षुलमनस्क्रखलसद्विचिंतम्' (क्रि. पा.
२.२.५७) इत्यादिकः। भवतः चेमासास्तिरयं आयातमः। भावानान्त
नियोजकानां चरोद्देशमनोहित्यातितित गृहः ग्रामीद्ययतितित तस्मात

1. HL वस्मावावयः; B. ’पथ जनयः।
2. A1 शृणु॥मुः।.
3. A1 omits पञ्चाध...।
4. BI गृहः विवेकः। प्राप्त निमित्तः न निषोध्यतः before this. H. puts. निषोध्यतः before this.
5. BHL omitted धरतः त्रिमात्रि।...।
6. IA1C omits ’धीर्यः।
युक्तेऽदत्तुपपदम्। उच्छिते, यथामां यज्ञवाौऽप्रभुऽकोणो युक्तेऽदत्तुपपदम्। वेदांनर्वञ्ज-तदांव सूक्ष्मं वच्चियोजकालम्। तथा च मन्त:[शहिताय]—

“योक्षयमानं कार्यिता तं वेदांनर्वञ्ज प्रचारते।
यज्ञ वरेति तु कर्माणं स भूताभोधते वच्चेः।
जीवंपौत्तरावाच्यम् सहंत: सर्वधिशिनाम्।
येन वेदांनर्वञ्ज वसं च सुङ्ख्येऽ च जन्मसु।
तावुभो मृत्युसंपूर्योऽहाऽनु वेदाँनर्वञ्ज एव च।
उज्जवलेऽदितु भूतेऽदितु विरं तं वाच्य तिहत:।” (१२.२२-२४) दर्शति।

तं वाच्येऽति परमात्मानमात्र:। तथा च ब्राह्म: [श्रीमद्भगवद्गीताय]—

“हाविमू वुज्जो लोकोऽदितु चर्चाचर एव च।
चर: सर्वार्थो भूतामि कृष्णोऽदितु उच्छिते।
उत्तम: वुज्जन्या: परमेश्वरलुक्तोऽदितः।
यो लोकतान्तिमाविश्व विभवान्य ईश्वर:।” (१४.१६-१७)

तन्त्र यज्ञां वुज्जां सर्पपाठोऽदितात्मां यो नित्यः चेततु: एवाववाक्याभिमेयोऽदितात्मां भवेत् तद्: चेततु: एव च भाषाशास्त्रं चतिाशास्त्रात् शरीराकृत्रिय्यमोऽविभवितियुतिरिजोऽकाराक्षात् तथा वर्षेनि: स्तम्भः च। उच्छिते, वायुमां वुज्जां शास्त्रावाच्यम्। तैः: चेततु: परमात्मानें विभवान्य यस्तेऽदितात्माः। नेत्रे यज्ञां वुज्जां सर्पपाठोऽदितात्माः।

“भानववान्य तु वुज्जाविभवितं नित्यं भवेत्।
किं कर्माणि ववस्तवोऽदितात्माः। अनुववान्य नु वुज्जाविभवितं नित्यं भवेत्।

तथा च शुद्धिः—“तर्कोऽदितात्मस्तवोऽदितात्माः। चतुर्वत्वं वाच्योऽदितात्मस्तवोऽदितात्माः।

तथा च शुद्धिः—“तर्कोऽदितात्मस्तवोऽदितात्माः। चतुर्वत्वं वाच्योऽदितात्मस्तवोऽदितात्माः।

१. ओऽस तदहस्त, २. MSS. युक्तेऽदत्त, ३. A¹ ज्ञाति च।
बलमतिप्रसङ्गेन: प्रजातमुनसङ्गेन:—

d- दा च या दा च दे ति। खरत: काल इत्यती दी हैतू सिसे चिम्पकृति-
स्क स्वाच्छादव। काल मात्राप्रभुतितितिमात्यवत्यः। दराच इत्युपरिशाखु
परियज्जीतः। बनुदाशसिद्धिनिषेधः। अक्षातः मुखी इत्यतः। खरित्र इति
'न स्वाराष्ट्रम्। खरित्रतः खरितः: बाँधुपिनिधायः यद दराचालुददवविकारः।
तथा च नारदः—

“उद्दाहरणस्तरं नास्ति नीचाचीर्तं तथा।
तेऽखरं स्वारसंस्कारं विस्मां।" खरं उच्चति॥
उवाच देशयोंमें साधारण इति खरितः।
तर स्वरं खरिरसंस्कारं प्रतिज्ञाननिति बैरिकः।” (ना. शि. १.५.६-७)

श्रो श्राय य इति। "ब्रह्म एव कोम्यज्ञविष्णुःपवः।" पद्ध सम च सामसु। फल
एकमात्रे देवीहिमारः। शुरुविश्वामः। "निमेषकाला मात्रा स्वाता"
इत्यदत्रजः। तथा च नारदः—

“निमेषकाला मात्रा खायिस्वारकृतिविच्चारे” (ना. शि. २.२.८) इति।

इतिवदः प्रवाहाः। भरन प्रवाहिन्य काल: हेतुः: स्वरतुविश्वामहाकाल:
निम्बः। तथा च नारदः—

“खरं उच्च: खरी नीच: सम: खरित्र एव च।
विश्वामनुस्युदार्तेने यद तित्तित स खरं।।” (ना. शि. २.२.३) इति १११।

1. B omits m.
2. A1C खर।
3. A* read पद्र after पद्र.
4. B. puts stops after विष्णु; and सामसु।
5. A1C "ब्रह्म हेतुये.,
पञ्चिका-शब्दिता

काल्यावाचारिकोयकसालव्या चोठाजावुपू।

11. समुद्रवन्या कटुरस्य दन्या लूतुलसा: सऽध्वा: || 12.।

जिज्ञासुलि तु कु: प्रेतार्थक्यो व: सऽधऽतै भुजऽः।

12. एएँ तु काल्यावाचार्य चोठी कंप्रोजित्य सऽधऽतै।

13. एकार्याकार्योमांव तथेविविठसंहतम् || 15.।

ख्याते डित् यदेन्तदारः

क पञ्चाव ओ व हि तिः। "काल्यावाचार्याः चोठार्याः कंप्रोजिः तः बारोः जातै।

द जु य शाः तालाः। "इकाराः चवांश्च यक्षार्याः क सः तालाः। तातुः नाई

भवः। द इकुकारालुव्यो वर्गी प्यायतिः। बार्द्वायवायियपु कङ्कुद्दुः इक्षे-

मादिः उक्तः। पदवार्यपरिभ्रमणाय:। तथा च वाचिनः—"संश्वन्न्य

चार्याः" (पा, १, १, ६८) डिति। प्राद्वार्यर्द्विः "स्यांश वाग्नाः, वायुप्रहोषे

च प्रेतेश्वर्ग्यं यहयं खानेविश्विविधिकाः"। डिति। ध वजः यो य पूः उक्तः।

पवार्य सोऽधोजाणीत। समुद्रतिथिः व्या कङ्कुद् र वा डिति। एकारः एकारः

रेवार्याः च सूंईप्यं भवेशुः। द सः ख्याः हृ तु ल सा डिति। म्याकार्यावायवेश

जः कार्यकार्यसारः च हृतः। कार्यां विज्ञासुमुः क्यः।। । द सः क्यः चोः व: सऽधऽतै

तु वचे डिति। बारोः ॐ ताक्यो भवेशुः। एएँ तु काल्यावाचारीय पश्चिमः।।

एकारः एकारः काल्यावाचारी जातै। वी सौचः ॐ वो चो

ख्यातविति। ॥११॥

1. $A^2$ omits.  2. $A^1$ omits.  3. $A^1A^2$ इकारः: C कंप्रोजिः।

4. BLA$^2$ omit पदवार्यपरिभ्रमणः।

5. MSS. स्यांश वाग्नाः वायुप्रहोषे च प्रेतेश्वर्ग्यं यहयं...कारः डिति।

6. L स्यानेविविधिकाः: $A^1$ स्यानेविविधिकाः।

7. B. omit प्राकाराः...डिति। एकारः

8. $A^1$ भावः।

9. BHIL दहमः: ( BH दहमः:) बोहम्याः च जाती भवेशु:। $A^1$ दहम्याः।

10. H बोहम्य, C बोहम्यः।
14. उपभाषानीय अस्वा च जिष्ठामृतीयनासिके
चतुर्वाहिः विभिन्न अश्रुवायनसाधिन: ॥ १५॥

15. अस्वाकाण्ड गतिविधिः निर्यानं ।
चतुर्वाहिः कार्यीय निर्यानं क्रोः: शष्यसीधु च ॥ १६॥

च चैं शा च चति। अश्रुवायातु १ कष्टारयो मवति। कयो: ? २पकार्ष
चोकारयाः । समर्पणग्राहकालाः ३पकार्ष चोकारय हार्षिः।
अतत्तुष्णायमापि साध्यार्थासंयमाः ४कष्टसाधनायनि भवति। ५अथर्व-सार्लोकाध्यायः ॥ १५॥

च चै। अर्थाय परमाय इवतुकाराद्यकारानां उच्चलेः।
अस्वारो विष्णूः × क × गो च कथित्यो। तथा च चोकारयः: "अर्थाय परमायः; 
अर्थाय परमायः; × क × गो च कथित्यो चै। अश्रुवायाः
श्लोकाः: इवतुकाराद्यकाराः। न विचारिते योग: संयोगो वर्णान्तरितः घम्या ते
चतुर्वाहिः। ६अश्रुवायाः अस्वाकाराः । गौतम व यमान्यायोगवाहिः अस्वाकारेः।
तेषाय मतेन चतुर्वाहिः: प्रयासृष्टितयाविषये मधुमेधक्षेत्रेशयेवः ।
अस्वारयाः स्वप्नमाहाः—अस्वारयाः प्रकृतिः पाशिष्कितने क्रियता “मोदक्षुसः”
(प. ४३.२२) इति ॥ १६॥

च चैं शा चति। अस्वाकाण्डोः । १०तथा वीषयाः इव निर्णयः: 
शब्दोऽर्था यथा सोऽस्वाकाण्डोः

1. H. कष्टह्योकर्म्याधिकार्यप्रमेयति कष्टैश्च कष्टाः स्वरूपः स्वरूपां । 
2. OA1 एकार्षीकारिः। A2 एकार्षी कोकारिः।
3. A2 एकार्षी कोकारिः। B. चोकारिः।
4. A2 कष्टाः A3 omiss.
5. H चार्भि चार्भि, B चार्भि चार्भि। अथवा तु से से स्वरूपः।
6. I A3 चं ग्रीष्मादितरुताः। A3 ग्रीष्माः नानिः।
7. HLH put. यह after this. ।
8. A2 अभावम्।
9. A3 omiss अभावयः।
10. L भावुकाण्डाय और H भावुकाण्ड वीषया A1 भावुकाण्डावलिबीषया for तथा वीषया।
11. A8 L भावुकाण्डः।
16. चतोस्सर्षा यवस्तोरोणस्यस्ता: शरस्त्या।
शेषा स्त्रा हल: प्रोता निवोधानुग्रहात।

17. जमोदनासिस्कान्तकः नान्दनी इवध: सृता।
ईङ्गामाद्रा यवस्तंगस्तु प्रातिसनस्तु क्षादियः:

ब्राह्मारावेन चलु भवतीति शेषः। इकारेत्योऽऽ प्रवेषेदं च सदा भवति। तथा
च नारदः—

“आपदति मकारो रेषोषु "प्रलयेवसुहारस्म।
यवलेषु परस्यम् सर्वेणु चोरमाप्ततिम्” (ना. ग्र. 2.8.4) इति १३॥

चतुर्थि श्चारानि वर्षासंसुः: काय: गिरिवताथा। जिज्ञासून्तः च दत्तास्वाधिकारी च तातु च” इति।
इस्म श्रोतंपुत्रवार्त्यूः केदिष्ठि पम्पि।

त्तति: काणात: खाननो मानि: भेदः: कायतोत्सु नाम: प्रयायते भेदः: कथयि।
प्र का पं: एँ यथो वर्षाभार्यः प्रति सभ्यस्यादिभि: स प्रयः।”

अ जि ति। चन्द्रिति प्रवाहारग्रस्थं। च इ उ द ज ए श्रो ए रो एँ चू
एते चतुष्टयः। एष: य व र ला एते इवत्तृष्ठतः। ॐ श्रि इति प्रवाहारग्रस्थम:
शय्या एते नेमस्याः、“चर्यस्य बक्षः: तथतिति पादपराणाः। श्री पा: स्ख एऽ
ह ल: प्रो का इति। हलु इति प्रवाहारग्रस्थम हकारादार्यम् च हकारात्।
शेष इवलुकादानः शेषः। एषः: यवस्तु इववेमस्तस्तस्यापिता: इति। खासाः:
खानान: कायितः। न वा घा घा ता न त इति। अनुप्रदानासि: त्तथानानु-
दिकं चोपापि अनु प्रारम्भेत देयति इति अनुप्रदानम्। “दो नात-[खासाः]जू-
ङ्गावत्रजः। अनुप्रदानानो एतो।” वर्णानां भेदे श्रुतोऽ॥१३॥

अ भि ति प्रवाहारग्रस्थं अ म डः श न मुः। अनु नासि का इति
ख्यातनारेचित्कः “चलु पापात्तु नासिकानुभवतीति अनुनासिका अमोकणम्:

1. A³A³ omit. 2. A¹ प्रवाहमृतयः।
3. BBL read after this जताम्यं च खरान्यं च विस्तं कर्षणं खरस्म। शिवेनिषि (ततोषि विशेषद्रियश्च दशामिष्ठ: भिन्न च; षट्ट only in E).
7. A³A³ omit up to इववेमायित: MSS. श्री नादानुदानायः। (I ६प्रदानम्)।
8. B omits एतो। 9. A¹C चतुर्रता।

*
पाषयनियः शिवा

||१८|| ग्रेक्क्सासन्त्यो विमान्तोर्भोमित्तम् प्रचारते ||२०||

यतादिकत्वं—'सहनासिकावचनोनुसारिका' (प्र. ११.३२) इति। च ज्ञ इति। बधारो रेषा ग्रेक्सासन्त्यो भवत्स्थः, प्रवासारायणः

अणुः इति भस्मः च ् तध त प, एते ज्ञादेवो नादिनः क्षयंते। नादिए एषामश्चतित

नादिनः। चतुः पाठः—'च सो तु ना सि का न ज्ञी। अभम् इति प्रवासारः

शक्तम्। च इ उ इ घ ए चो ऐ चो च त य व त ज आ० न मू। एते शुरु

नासिकः। न ज्ञी न तु रेषकासन्त्यो भस्मावधि सन्तो। न दि नो ह भस्मः

शक्तम्। बधारो भवत्स्थः नादिनः भस्मः च ् तध त प। श्रवणः, ¹ पाठनयात्

अणों हेक्कारेक्ष्यक्ष्ज्ञितानां विकल्पनानुसारिकलम्, अणों तु निष्कम्। तथा

च श्रीनाकः—'सचादाय सा विक्रिया विस्वायः नुतोपवल्ला अनुसारिकोपथः।'

(क्र, प्रा. २.३२) इति। तथा 'उक्तार्थेति करण्य मूवो रङ्गः युक्तो

द्वापिनः शाक्षिनः' (क्र, प्रा. १.२४) इति। बधारेक्ष्यकः प्रथमे पाठे नादिवामः,

द्वितीये पाठे हेक्कारेक्ष्यक्ष्ज्ञितानुसारिकलप्रतिवे। ए० च वा द्रा य य ज च आ० इति।

यष्टः श्रीनाकः। जशस्तु जक्कारायाः शक्कारेष प्रवासारः। ज च आ० ज च ज आ०

एते यष्टः जशस्तु ध्रेष्टा नादाः। श्वसिनः स रङ्गः ता द रङ्गः इति।

हेक्कारायाः एते श्रासिनः। श्रासिए एषामश्चतित श्वसिनः। 'श्वासोलोकांपां

[क्र]ऽद्वीयम्यानामः, [नादो] धोषां चार्थ्या-[खोषा] नामा, युवसा सोप्राश्राः;'

इति चौद्वारंजि: ||२०||

इ० च्छ चाँ सांतः च रो वि त्वा इति। च इ इति प्रवासारायणः च टू त

क प श प स दू ईऽरत्माकानः ईऽक्क्सासन्त्यो जानीयात्वः। गो रां मे त रर

च च च इति। गोरवचः धाम श्रानम् एषामश्चमाच्छति वर्णविदः। श्रामक्कु-

पूर्वभिद्वितिय च जतः: ||२०||

1. A² श्राचार्यः।
2. HB omm बार after ह
3. यह नाती धोषां चार्थ्या। प्रवासारम् (°नातीमिवशोषः A²) धोषांमिवशोषः।
4. A²C एतवर्षमः।
*मनो हैन: खरते वर्षतो वा
भिम्यप्रयुक्तो न तमर्क्षमाहः।
स वामचो यज्ञानं हिन्ति
यथेन्द्रशंकु: खरतोपराधात्।॥२०॥
*ग्रहः ग्रहोऽ प्रातारातायुजाय धीमति।
वाच्यवेष्ठ: समाहल्य त्रेवं वाचनमिति स्थिति:।॥२१॥
*भेनारससमाध्यमधिगम्य महेश्वरात्।
कन्तुं व्याकरणं प्रोत्तं तथ्ये पाणिन्ये नमः।॥२२॥

'अथ मन्त्र-व्यासवेष्ठमाहः—
मन्त्र: मन्त्राणाम्: खरत: उदातात्त्विदिरत: वर्षत: चिन्तितरित्वादिरिदित: 
मिथ्याप्रयुक्त: य: स्वरोऽ यो वर्षत्समाध्वाक्ष्म् प्रवृज्ज न तमर्क्षमाह तथ्या धीमति न भोः। स 
श्रेष्ठोऽ मन्त्रो वायुर्वो वज्ञमो यज्ञानं हिन्ति। तथा हटान्तसाहः—यथा 
खरतोपराधातु द्वये वा श्रुतिलाभास्वदिति।॥२०॥

इदानीं श्रुतिवाक्ष्माहः—
श्रवः श्रवति। ग्रहः च सुखे करोतितं ग्रंंकर: सुखकरम्: शानकर्म शुभकर्म 
विधान दानानुसाय ऋषये दानोनानी क्रियाकल्या तत्प्रृत्याय धीमति इवित्य से 
प्रादाहरेत्वान्।॥२१॥

सम्भवित पाणिनिलिपिः स्तोत्रामहः—
ये न तिः। नन्यप्रत्य खुलास्वेय पाणिनेनस्मक्तातिर निमर्थैभूमै। उपाधये, 
पशूपईत्य वयविदिति प्रवाहारै: शिवा प्रविद्वा प्रवाहाराय पाणिनि 
शंकराद्विगम्य जतंभ समभ व्याकरणं प्रोत्तं शिवाय प्रायकाराय 
स्मर्यमिति। प्रविद्वान्त: तद्वर्ण तुलति। अचारससमाध्यमधिगम्य प्रवाहाराद्वान्: 
कठिनख्यातः।॥२२॥

1. IHLB omit यथा मन्त्रायणां……श्रुतिलाभास्वदिति; A¹ omits यथा मन्त्रायणां, etc.
   but puts it after विनित प्रायादात्र।
2. A¹ omits एवं.
3. HL omit यथा सुखे……श्रवः।
पारिवीर-शिवाय

*विनययुक्ति: स्वतामिक्षामां
य इह पठत् प्रयत: सदा हिजः।
स भवति धनाधान्यपुराणीति-
मानतुल्य सुखमय तैसमुदः॥२३॥

*भवति: शिवायाय साधारं तुलितवं धोकमां—
न ये ने नित। वैतानिः सदीक्षा, भज्ज्ञमत्तुल्य सदीक्षा।* विनययुक्ति: शिवायाय साधारं तुलितवं धोकमां—
न ये ने नित। वैतानिः सदीक्षा, भज्ज्ञमत्तुल्य सदीक्षा।
स भवति धनाधान्यपुराणीति—
मानतुल्य सुखमय तैसमुदः॥२३॥

*इति वैदानियुक्ति: योजित्या समासः।

1. BH *omit* भवति: शिवायाय।
2. B विनयमुखिणिःस्वरा and H विनयमुखिणिःस्वरा for विनयमः...न नितः।
3. A¹C परमानन्द-बच्चा°।
4. BMA. जनमाः°; IHL *omit* भवायुक्तिः...फलानि।
5. A¹ शक्ति। सीवृत्त परिमात्कालाविक्रयपरमाणुसङ्कुच: श्रीअवनरोद्योगः सुभाष एवेति।
6. MBHL इति पारिवीर-शिवाय-शिवाया समासः। (B यदी' पुष्करः हष्ण; ताडां निखिलं भव। वदि' श्रुण्येऽया वा सम दोषो न विषये॥ वोकसमः १५८॥ समासः)
   संवत् १७५४ः दिऽस्वति बिखिन्ति ल। संवत् १७५४ः दिऽस्वति अधिकारविधिः विगं विहीविधिः श्रीवास्तव-विधिः। दिऽस्वति बिखिन्ति बिखिन्ति ॥ श्रीवास्तवः। A¹ *after* समासः, पदक्रीशस्वति बिखिन्ति। इह इहान्तु श्रीवास्तवः, श्रीवास्तवः। संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः वीरः श्रीकु परारंभविक्रयान्ति बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
   में। श्रीवास्तवः बीत्याश्रयः। सात्पर्यायीविधिःसृष्टि ॥ संवत् १५२८ः बीतिः स्वयं परारं ष॥
IV. शिचार्यकाम-सहित (With the Śīkṣā-prakāśa)

* अथ शिचा प्रवद्यामि पाणिनीयं मर्थं यथा।
शाश्वानुपूर्णं तन्विययं यथोक्तं लोकविद्यौ। ॥१॥

व्योतिक्घणयं, क्रंदः वधावनिलक्षयं।
नेवार्य-दशी: ।-कार्यं यथा तं सततं नुमः। ॥
व्याक्यविज्ञानाभाजास्वप्वयायो यथायथम्।
शिचा तद्रोभ व्यासाः पाणिनोपासार्थिः। ॥

व्येर्ह्यानिविष्ठेच व्याकरणेतुजस्तम् भगवान् पितुवायस्यस्माब्राह्मणान्यतमनुभावः ॥

शिचा वस्तु प्रतिष्ठानीते—

भः भ दामिन। वेदिकम्ब्राह्मणानातो यथं निद्विद्याधिकरणवान्
इत्यं वैदिक: सीक्षाः। चतुर्गुणाद्वितीये वेदसार्वामानायात्तुतुतु मको
वेदमानः। भत: साचायान्तत्तब्रम्बहिभेदाय: बिनकृत्य पारिवर्तिताय विद्या-
शास्त्रानि प्रवर्तितानि। तत्र शिचा कथो व्याकरणादि कथान् श्लोको व्योतिक्घणां
पुराणं व्याकरणो श्रीमाधवसुपरीचयी। तथा च व्यासवल्लकः
"पुराणायामीमांसा-वर्त्तमानशास्त्रारिथितः।" वेदः शास्त्रानि विद्यानां धम्मखं
च चतुर्यायम्" इति। तथा हि ॥—शिचा शरणंभोज्य शास्त्रम्। कथो
वेदविवदितमारणां भानुपूर्णं मन्नाामालकम्। व्याकरणां शब्दोद्वकमां
चक्रसैमनकारणां शास्त्रम्। नित्यं पदविभाग-मर्गार्थ-देवता-निन्दुमार्गां
शास्त्रम्। कथो गायत्रिविद्यूर्लसां भान्याशास्त्रम्। [व्योतिक्घणः कालपरिवर्तिणि
शास्त्रम्। धम्मथाशास्त्रम्। चारावधारणयां शास्त्रम्।] गुरूनां शिखरितम्वेत्रामि
प्रवाहितिसारं शास्त्रम्। व्याकरणं धम्माः प्रकाशेऽपरीच्याशास्त्रम्। श्रीमाधवश्च वेद-
वाक्यधिक्षेपोऽचाशास्त्रम्। इति। तवच्छिब्यायं यथोदितसर्वाहिताशास्त्रम्।

1. Be. साधी। 2. L वाय for मान्। 3 MSS. दामि व। 4. Be. ओमत ति।
पारिपालन–प्रिच्छन्द

प्रसिद्धिक शब्दार्थमािन्नांतमवर्णनम्।

पुनर्भ ताकिकांग्राम वाच उद्धारणे विचित्रम्॥२॥

अर्थात् प्रवाहायामराण्यूँ। यत: ‘भलो होन: खरोत वर्णनो वा मिथ्या-
प्रयुक्ति न तमथ्यांभाष। ते वाग्योज्य यज्ञां तिनकति यथेति-
शबूँ: खरोतदवारात्’ इति। भवापम् कार्यकर्तव्यांब दक्षेत्रवायां श्रीनकः
“छरो वर्णीःक्षर मात्रा विनियोगार्थेषो” । । भलो जिन्नामानीन बेदितवष
पदे पद:” इति। अर्थात् निकलनु उक्तिर्ग: सि:। यवादी भरक्ष्योगारदय-
वर्णद्वीपो भुक्तार्थ: । आकारणाध्यायानन्तर चतुर्विवा: पदे:।
परा-स्थानी: स्थानम्-वर्णी:-संज्ञाराजो वर्णोपसितिसिद्धांक कियत दसूवदण्डी
शिष्याध्याय[न]ः। शिष्यनन्तर्वा वालेको जलानीः स्तुतादण्डावतादातारसिद्धी:-
Pराधिरोजिज्ञानानन्तर भवानानन्तर वर्णीः स्तुतादण्डावतादातारसिद्धी:-

1. L ऋग्वेदेश्वरः। 2. Be. महाभारतांशः। 3. L Be. शिष्याध्यायः।
7. L भास्त्र। 8. Be. भक्तिवद्रृशयः for भक्ति शा एव।
हतुद्वारा चावलास्वादनारूप कथादिकार्यात विचारा विचारातन्त्र भविष्यति। किमार्गारंयम्
चालिब्रोज्ञातः इत्यादीनन्दनं मित्रि विचारा। पार्श्वार्थातमा: प्रथमोऽतत्तथा यथासमाधिनयमः
तथां विचारात्मा विध्यति। चालित चालितान्वयितुम् गोविंदोऽध्यात्मां, विशेषाधिकारिकम्: प्रथमोऽतत्तथा
चालितान्वयितुम्, विध्यति: विचारात्मा: अव्ययमक्रामां विधि: स चालित मद्यामूलप्रदानात् श्रेयस्; तम् ॥१॥

[तदन्तः] ताबलदुर्बलास्वादनात् विचारात् संशयति विधिर्विद्यति। प्रकारः
संस्कृतं तत्त्व विभावुः प्रकारः कि ते शूरविन्यास्यार्थः ॥ १॥

तत्त्वादारः प्रामाण्यास्वादनात् विचारात् संशयति विधिर्विद्यति। प्रकारः
संस्कृतं तत्त्व विभावुः प्रकारः कि ते शूरविन्यास्यार्थः ॥ १॥

1. MSS. विधिः 2. L मूर्देणक्तदिः 3. Be. “षिति” 4. MSS. ६ राजन्
5. Be. omits चावलास्वादनात् 6. MSS. स्वादीतः 7. Be. स्वादीतः
8. L puts क, चर, चर after this. 9. Be. चरा for चरा 10. L चरान्ति
11. MSS. चन्द्रपरि नौप्रथरं 12. MSS. माना
वर्म उदारणे वर्मना मूर्खिन प्रश्निते गामलापनीत्तिति गाम्यारः। त्य। 'नन्ददासे नामः
कपलार्धसमाखलों राधकर्मवर्धनीति राधभः। रवि प्रमोदनिस्त्राय सन्योगः
दर्ते देवः। त्यति वल्क्यमाओऽ सूर्योदाकमः। [मृदुः] नासाकारसङ्गरसः
जिन्दासलेखनः जानः। रवि, नाथुरोत्तरकालरेखः जानः: गणनया शचमसमाग
पुरुष द्रष्टा वा स्वमः। 7 हुःः: समाखलः नामिन प्रमाणः: स ५ मधमः।; ते उदात्तापि
दिश्य एव, एत्यं प्राद्यायेयेनोदातः व्याख्यातः।। सा श्री न न च च च स च सा।।
पव्विभयविविषः रूपालुकाकम्(1)ः पव्विभयविषः। श्रीमः: तेषा संख्या। तेषा
पव्व संख्याः: कु छ त। क्रमः। च पुनः यत्तोत्तो श्रीता: ते य र जच च च च सा।।
खरा असर्वत्रःः पनकः: यकलालः कुकुद्दानः, जपसतः महेशः।5 “लो नेम
इल्लवकः” (मि, २.२०) इति यासः।। शीतः हलोत्तुःः श्रद्धा प्राच्यः: प्रोक्षकारः
श्रीमः: हललुःः, पुनःकालायो श्रमः: कु छ चुः चुः इति 8।। “वचालाक्षारादरस्तः
सव्यः: ते 7 कुः चुः चुः इति वचनव्यः[ने-]संयोगः[न]लघूमूलाङ्कारचतः व्याख्यान
वर्जितः ततः श्रमः वर्जनीय न सर्वेऽऽ इति” (गौ, चिन. २)।। “पनकश्रीमोऽ सधी यमः: पूर्वः
गुपः; हलोत्तरं, नारदः—“अनंतक्षय मंत्रतु रूपीः द्वाराच परतो यदि।। ततः सधी
यमासेत्तः सव्यः: पूर्ववर्णःः।। वर्गाश्च वश्च: सार्वमःः, श्रीमापि संतुतानः।
हलल यमः निबत्ते नारदःप्राच्यकामिवावः” (नाम, चिन. २.५-२) इति। भाष्मापि
वर्षागमी विद्वानियतः जानकाः।। च ला ि ि य मा इति वर्षान्तरलेखवें: संयोगाः
सहायः।। ततः यमासेत्तः विद्वानियतः नारदः—“वायु तीक्ष्णा विद्वानियतः
श्रीमाः: सव्यः: श्रमाःः, श्रमाःः तृप्तिन प्रमाणमिति।। अनंतः: संयोगश्रीमोऽ विद्वानिये
नोपालितः इति च।। अश्रुरः यमः विद्वानियेश: विन्दुलकः” (गौ, चिन. १) इति
च। 10 यथा पलक्ष्णीतः ककार्कूः: पूर्ववर्णवर्णः: द्वाराच विन्दुलकः: प्रमाणः।
सव्यः: प्रमाणमःः, वसंतः: प्रकारचः: ककार्कूःः।। ततः: ककार्कूः घटनः तः
पलिक्तः जीवकालः।। चक्रञुनुमतिलकः १२ यहाःः।। चरित्रः (अग्रमिनः?) विद्वानिय
गकार्कूः।। जः[च]चतुरश्वस्त्र चकार्कूः।। यथा (यथार्थः?) हित्यान्तः।।

1. L चन्द्रामिनी। 2. MSS. हदुरः। 3. Be. गांधारः। 4. Be. भैरवीनोदारः।
5. Be. omits श्रवणसः शुद्धः। 6. L प्रमाणः। 7. L मन्त्रः।
8. Be. इक्षुः। 9. L adds गौः। 10. This passage is very corrupt।
11. Be. चन्द्रसुनुभा। 12. Be. चरित्रः or चरित्रः।
चन्द्रचूला भिन्न रंग

द्रव्य उपस्थिति विनोबे खाकारः मृत एव च दृष्ट ॥

(गजना ५)। अत्र चवंगोत्तीयो जस्तः संख्यानवर्गं गुर्जारसमावेशः।
वर्णक्रमे यज्ञा-जकार-पूर्ववर्गसमुखः-सवर्णयमगारः-जकारः।
वर्ग्योक्तानिति किम् ? उद्देशः। अतः: श्रेष्ठिः किम् ? कार्यः न, नरवः ॥

अ न्य ख्यात ेति । “मोशुस्वरः” (पा. ३.२२) स्त्रामः चतुष्म भक्तिलोकस्वरः।
विविध स्थलः इति विषयम् जस्तापरसंख्यः ौ। च च तु न सुमन्तरस्य या वी ।
तयारीवाणी दत्तामुखः दत्तसुखानिवः, स्रान्ण भक्तादैवी ौ। चतुष्म वद्विताय प्राती-हम्स घनः।
खरातुगो यथा तथा ‘निवं जीः श्रयेष्ठः’ प्रवेकः परेरु करयः।
नार्दरोपी—“आपवति मकारो रेवौम्ब्राम्ब्यस्मानुसारः” (नाट. २.४.३)।
चन्द्रचूलाय ग्रहणः चतुष्म वर्षिनागामाकर्षिनः
न्यूतायति चपुतायानी । विसंगक्ते पावः।
स च यथा चुरास्त्रेयात्ता श्री शाकुनाकिं
रामि श्री द्रा द्रगः इति वाटमानकांशी दरामानारिप्रमूल । शहवतचरति तहतु यथैः दिनीयम्
चन्द्रचूलां यानियात्। लोकिक प्रदर्शी संख्यामोर्दाणधरणम चहः
“किम चतु संख्य।” तिं।
धो नियमादि चन्द्रचूलारोज्जु गतिः विक्कप्याद्वाणः च च।
तथा “चन्द्रचूलो चतु रान च राहो वा” (१.२२) इति कक्षापवैः शीताकोः।
इस्सी च “हेमः द्विप्रसन्नः” (कक्षा. ४.४.५) “सोमाण मरणम्” (कक्षा. ५.६.२५.२)
ब्रा०दाणुदात् सिधितति। विसंगक्ते चर्चितविधा गति:।
“चोकारमः” युजपेतिम्,
यदि कदाचिदासवैः विसंगादि चन्द्रादि विसंगादि विना चोकारप्रत्येकानां गुणालक्षमेः
जस्तार्थम । सवर्णवस्त्रु गुणस्वरूपः । साहीं विशेषः।
चहार चदियाणां नवम नवमात्रानां च सयं वामः।
लोः।। गौरवः।
चोकरान्ति प्रदन्तात्रां तत्र विसंगान्ततिः। चत्र एव पदकालेवासः।
वि ध पिता विनिविधान;। य हिन्नः।। [शुष्ठा] श्रमानां भावः।। र घ ए व च राजामाहः।
10 दुर्गमः।। निर्बन्धमासः।। धारासोमः।।

1. Be. चन्द्रचूलाः। 2. L कांसः, Be. कांसः। 3. Be. चाराभासः।
4. Be. ६ मानमानः। 5. L परः। 6. Be. उधमसौः। 7. MSS. शकार्यः।
8. MSS. पर्दः। 9. MSS. करवाह। 10. L दृश्य (२५)। 11. Be. निर्बन्धमासः।
पाणिनीय-पिचा

चात्मा वुद्धा समेत्यार्यानन्द मनो युज्यो विवचया।

॥३॥ मनः कायानिमाच्यनि स प्रेरयति मार्तम् ॥४॥
मार्तमसूचिं चर्जन मन्द्रि जनयति खरम्।

॥५॥ प्रातःसवनयोगं तं कन्द्रो गायचमाश्रितम् ॥६॥

सुयवः। जि क्षा सूँ ल सूँ घा चेति। \*कृत्वः कब्जपायकृति।।

चवो यश्नम्। भनुसनारविबंधस्मृति योगवाच चाययमाने

भागिनोः यमातिसत्साक्ष म्यायं भजनितवर्धः।

दुः सूँ दृश्ये तो तित। धैर्यसु

प्रज्ञानिः सशसतं म्यायः। सूँतः। एववासो दौर्विमत्रावतः।

चकााँरङ्ग द्वितीयः

शक्तः कायः। भनुसाराद्यो खुरुतान्तः पद्च म्या वा।

एवमेव तिष्ठदु-क्रमः प्रतिक्रिया व्याख्यातः। ॥६॥

वर्षस्वयम् विधाय सम्बन्धति वर्षोपस्थ सक्षमृ

उद्दार्थाविविचिकसुलामः

चां—पा कीति। अत्तकालः सर्वश्री कालनन्दो वा वयोद्धिन्द्रयात्तितः

कथा(ता)भा “तस्य हैलतः द्वद्यस्यायं प्रस्तुतति तेन प्रशोधतिनया भाषा निर्दः

मति चन्द्रो वा मृत्रो वाजन्यो वा यशार्थीम्” (बड़.भा.४.४.२) इति विभादिः।

“एव्यय सम्प्राप्ता सांच्यायनान्तः समुखाय परं ज्योतिरंपोषं शेषं क्षेत्राभिन्नित्यतं”

(कन्द्रो.४.१२) इतः क प्रायम् उच्चारितवित्त प्रशोधस्तरम्

शा भे ति कान्तोर्जुनु धरितादि सहर्याज्ञेन्द्रियेन धर्मः

एव्यय प्रशोधनानि निविधय मन्त्र इन्द्र्रच वर्षो योजयति प्रेरयति,

तथासन कायान्तः कार्यविषय गायत्रे छन्दः तार्तियं जानेवात्।

मन्द्रा वा वाचा

प्रातःप्रवनस्तिति संस्करञ्चः (भ.भ.२.१२) कथा। ॥७॥

1. L पराशरी। 2. L मधव। 3. Be. वि.विवेकः।
कथने मध्यमनन्युग मध्यमं लोष्णानुगमः

||5|| तारं तातीयसवनं शैरिष्कं जागतानुगमः ||8||
संदीर्णिं मूल्यःभितो वचनमापः मात्रः
||6|| वर्णितं जनयते तेषां विभागं: पञ्चवा समु: ||6||
खरतं: कालतं: स्थानातु प्रथानानुप्रदानः
||7|| इति वर्णितं: प्राचुर्णिणणं तं निवेधतं ||10||
उदास्वानुद्वा दृढः खरितः खराशयः
||8|| ब्रह्मी दृष्टं: मृतं इति कालतो नियमं चरितं ||11||
* उदास्वे निषादगाम्यारावनुद्रात कयमधवति

खरित्रभवा द्विते पडळमध्यमपश्चम: ||11||

क एक इति।। तं मात्रं कथने मध्यमनन्युगम शैरिष्कमर्तव विचुपकन्नलं जानीयात् तियं शैरिष्कं शैरिष्कं भवर्त: “शैरिष्कन्नलं”ति (पा. ६.१.६३०) गिरस: शैरिष्कमान्; तदीयसवनं जागतच्चुपकन्नलं जानीयात् ||8॥

सो दी यथे इति || स वायुसदीर्णो मूल्यं गुर्दा (१) अभिहितं: पालितं: वश्वविभं प्राप्य वर्णनं जनयते। “संहितायां” (पा. ६.१.७२) चार्णक्यं
“सो दोषच संपे चेतु पादपुराणम्” (पा. ६.१.१३४) इति सोलयें: गुणाः। तथा।
“यथाः” मित्रावज्ज्यसदनुङ्गरली विपद्य वर्णिन्यतःप्रकटकर्म: प्राणाश्रयते।
तं पश्चातेत मध्यमसूदितां मध्यस्मां वांकिशां वार्ते ब्रह्मी कर्णविशारदां वैवर्तीं
च प्रपने” इति। तथा च मन्यार्थः। “चवारी” वाक्यपरिवर्तनाधीनति
विच्छिन्नमण्ये च समन्वितं:। गुहा लीणो निविषित निकृष्णा तुरीयं वाचो
मसूदा वदनित” (सक्तं. १.९४.४४) इति ||8॥

तेषां वर्णितं वक्ष्मापणो विभागं: पञ्चप्रकारं: समृतं:। तत्वं दर्शितं—
खरतं इति उदास्वानुद्वा वक्ष्माणिधिम्; कालतं चारागातं, स्थानाद्विभागं,
प्रथास्व चक्कराते, अनुप्रदानं: अनुनासिकारः। अनुप्रदानवपरिभाषात्
व्याख्यायाम: ।” तस्मां वक्ष्मापणं नितरं जानितो ||१०-१२॥

1. Be. omits कथं इति। 2. MSS. after this तथं मवं। 3. MSS. वाह।
पाणिनियान्त्रिक

चोक्त हर्मणानि वचनानामः कस्त: शिष्टतः।
||विर्यासां च दृष्टाय नासकीषी च तालुः। ||।११।।
* चिन्हावकाष्ठ विचलित सापसा रघु एव च।
जिन्हामूलकारः ृविषयर्विधोथः। ||।१२।।
* यथोभावः स्थानान्तरार्दिपः पदमः।
खरान्तः ताषां विद्याः ृविषयर्विधोथः। ||।१५।।
हकारः पञ्चमेऽथतामनः ृविषयाय संयुतं।
||१०।। चौरसं ते विज्ञानावतः कण्ठामाहसंयुतम्। ||।१६।।
कण्ठारचार्यात्रिवियुक्तास्तासः कीर्तिनामः।
||११।। सुमोन्धमः कन्दरः दल्यासार्वकः स्मृताः।
||१२।। जिन्हामूलार्ते तु कु: प्रोक्तो दल्योङ्गो व: स्मृतो बुधः। ||।१७।।

च त्यां वित्त निग्रोदयम्। ||।२५।।

इति कारणवितिः। बगैराष्ट्र तथायेः इत्यज्ञातः। च युनः काव्याः चरवः संयुक्तः।
हकारः चौरसं उरः ृविषयाय संयुक्ताय। चरवः सकेन्त इति इति।
कण्ठामाह साधः। ||।१६।।

क यद्रा- स्वद्रा वितिः। चहौ चरवं इत्यभावः कण्ठे स्वातात्। पुनःनःयाः
स्वातात्। इतर्विश्वागृः यकारः शकारसः साहसमः। [वदा]-यत्थासंसारस्य तृत्यमः।
"यतीतारीसुबन्धः वर्षिकाः वीर्याय जुड़े सिरवृत्तः। इतिमेदिवृहः।
उर्वरक्षाविवशः। इति रकारः यकारः सुमानः। चः।
लक्ष्मणीष्टवः लकारः। सकारसः दल्याएः। स्मृताः।
तु युनः जि यसूः केवः प्राचायंत्तरसः प्रोक्त: "चक्षुष्ट नवयाः जिन्हामूलामः। प्रवेभमः वर्गः।" (कन्द. प्रा. १.१६)
दृष्टि सनातनः। वक्ताः वैमुद्यिक्तोऽहः जातो दल्योङ्गः। स्मृतः। ||।१७।।

1. Be. मातकमधिकारः
2. Be. चालकारीः.
15b. चतावृवीषाणिनिर्धारीश्वरमृत्युः क्षरानुः ।
16a. चतुर्वर्षां कर्त्तव्यो निलं हि: शष्कसिद्धपर: नः॥

* यथा सौराष्ट्रिका नारी तत्र इज्यधिभागवे ।
एवं रज्जा: प्रयोक्तया से चरा इव लित्या ।

12b. एवं तु कर्षकावर्यो बिज्ञानी कर्षकोऽज्ञानी समृती।

13. एकारोकारोमौक्ता तथाऔर्भवितसंहतम् ॥२॥
14b. उपाध्यायीय अज्ञा च जिन्दामूलीयनासिकः ।
15a. चयोगवाहा विज्ञान च चार्यस्थानभागिनः ॥२॥

* स्वरावरामृतं चैव विज्ञानं कर्णं स्मृतम् ।

तेलगापि विनित्वशेषी ताम्भामेची तथेव च ॥२॥

च नु खर र क्विति । चतासारी नासिकः चेयः।
एतेन द्वापि वास्ततो।

वर्गीयं पञ्चमं: ड्रज्ञनमा नासिकः: (१) । भ्रमित्वहितु स्वर्गस्थायीया भविः ॥१॥
कर्षकावर्यां जातविविवक्षेण मृत्ति:। प्रोक्तव्योऽवक्षेण कर्षकोऽज्ञानोऽभागवे जातो स्मृतोः।

चतुर्वर्षां चतुर्वर्षां । तद्विभविनं ॥४॥ का रो का रो: कहां चतुर्वर्षां कर्षकः भवित:। प्रयो लक्ष्मणोऽभागवे।

दकारोकारकार्या चैव च चार्यस्थानभागिन: ॥२॥

अ ज्ञा भा नी न्द्य: । र ज्ञा भा न्द्य: । विश्वासः ॥२॥

1. Be. भवम।
2. Be. लक्ष्मणभवाप्ति।
3. L बतावनिदेशी।
4. L इकारोकारकः।
5. Be. L इकारोकारकाचवेलमानी।
6. Be. L एते।
7. L प्रवत्ती।
8. L प्रवत्ती।
9. Be. तेलार्गाप एते।
10. Be. adds तेलार्गापि ताम्भामेची च प्रूपरावकारी विनित्ताय।
||16b|| चरोपस्य ्धा यशस्वीष्णेनमुस्य ्धा: शलस्या ।
श्रीया: स्य ्धा हल: प्रोक्ता निवोधानुप्रदानतः ॥२३॥

||17|| चसिसुनासिका नक्तो नादिनो हम्बण: स्रुता: ।
ईंप्नारा यशजङ्गश ्धा चरासिनस्य ्धा खफादय: ।

||18|| ईंपच्चा सान्यारो विद्याः गोविरोहित: प्रचच्चते ॥२४॥

* कुतीरंद्रास्तं द्रग्धमपवर्षी च भवितमः ।
 न तस्म पाठ मोतिंगलि पापाणिरिव किलिषात् ॥२५॥

* सुरीरंद्रास्तं व्यतं स्थानायः सुधवस्थितमः ।
 सुखरेण सुविज्ञेण प्रयुक्तं ब्रह्म राजति ॥२६॥

निवोध घा दु प्र दा न त द्रति । अनु पवान प्रदानं अस्मखानादु अन्यस्मान:-
सुधारणमेव द्रौढ़ते तत्स्मातः श्रीया निवोध जानीहि ॥२५॥

पठो तु ना सि का द्रति । च इ त न। । कस बक व। ए भो बक। ।
ऐ भी वृ। । न य व र ट। । ल ण। । अ म ड व न जः एते मोतिनासिका
हरवाजिता: । हन्मष्ट्रहः: नादिन: नादांत्रादाना:। जवम्रदं ईंचटः
किलिषन्सुनातादानत्रादाना: खफ्कठधः: श्वासिनस्य ॥चतुरतःमहसा किलिषन-
न्सुनासासान: जानीयात् । एतद गोविर्चरो धाम ध्वानम मायायाः प्रचच्चते ॥२६॥

शैविविोधापकसुपदिशानु ्धृपदेशवर्ण निन्दिति ्धा तो वर्ण दर्ति । अन्नवृ-
चानातू तोर्यहु युरोः। । "निवादताम्रसोसीथम् ्ध्रिष्टिहरुत जले गुरावि"ति नाम-
लिज्ञातुपासी । प्रासं ्धर्म ्धिनवत गतनस्य ्ध्रिष्टिवर्षम् ्ध्रिष्टिदितष्ठानवर्षम् च
भवितम् ्धा[न]दरादु ्धुत तस्म ध्रिष्टिविदु: परिश्रोत नास्न। । कसेव ्धा
पापाणिरिव, इत्त्तरिव किलिषात् मोतिनो नास्तिति ॥२६॥

स्थीति च ्धु तौ वर्ण दर्ति । सुयुरो: प्रामसु ्ध्रस्यं सुखप्रदाचि ब्रह्म
वेदाद्भ्य राजति श्रीमते ॥२६॥

1. Be. omits नादांत्रादाना: ॥२५॥
2. Be. प्रोक्ति
न करालो न लब्धोति नायतान्तर नामुनासिकः।
गान्दी वद्भिज्ञास्य प्रयोगान् वचनमहत्ति॥२७॥
* यथा व्याती हरेत् पुत्रान् दंग्रामिनि च पीड्येत्।
भीता पतनभेदरायं तदद्व वर्णान् प्रयोज्येत्॥२८॥
* एवं वर्षाः प्रयोत्तव्या नायतान्तर न च पीडिताः।
सम्मवंप्रयोगिणः ब्रह्माणि सहीति॥२९॥
* अभ्यासार्थे दूतां व्रतिः प्रयोगार्थे तु मध्यमाम्।
शिष्याशास्त्रेण वार्तार्थे कुरुर्वा व्रतिः विलिख्यताम्॥३०॥
* श्रद्धः श्रद्धार्थेन प्रादात् दाचीपुराण धीमति।
दाचीपुराणप्रार्थना वैनेंद्र व्याहतं भुविः।
रम्भुरतांत्रं शास्त्रं पृथिव्यां सम्मा काष्ठितम्॥३१॥

न क रा ल चित्। नक्षत्रो नातुनासिकं पदाट ष्ट्रिय योजनीयः॥२७॥
* य च स ति। पतनं च भेदस तो ताम् भीता व्याती शापदजातिः ज्ञाते
पुत्रान् वालान् दंग्रामिनि पीड्येवेन तदद्व वर्णान् वर्णार्थति॥२८॥
* एवं वस ति। एवं नायका; न पीडितात् वर्षाः प्रयोजनीयः।
सम्मवं प्रयोगार्थेण वार्तार्थे कुरुर्वा प्रयोगः ब्रह्माणि प्रयोगार्थे
पुजान् तद् चिति भव॥ एवं सम्मवं प्रायः शास्त्रायां।
* अन्य शम चैं चिति। दुय्यां विलिख्यतां सम्मान अभ्यासार्थां कुरुर्वा।
व्यङ्क्तमयन्तु॥३०॥
* श्राद्ध र चिति। शं सुखं बलक्ष्यादिरोगाणं श्रमं करोतीति श्रद्धः
शिवः श्राद्धकर्षणोऽस्मि श्राद्धाञ्चविधाम्। दाची दशस्यापलं तस्यापवनम्
(पा. ४.१.८२) दिव्यः दित्त्वादिज्ञानः (पा. ४.१.१५) दिव्यादिज्ञानः दीपः
तस्या पुत्राय प्रायः प्रादात्। कोसाह्याकाँक्ष्यायम् चाह्रहच च चै चु च
चिति। यः पाणिनि; पाणिनोऽष्ट्रिय युवायपवनम्। "श्रस्त इच्छ" (पा. ४.१.८५)

1. पाणिनि,
विनयसमूहनः उपासितां य दृढः पठितः प्रयतः सदा हिजः।
स भवति पश्चायुक्तोऽर्तिमानं।
सुखमतुलं च समस्युं ते द्वितिः द्विविदा ॥३२॥

वेन पाशिनिना चर्चं प्रत्यक्षं शन्तशाश्यं वाज्ञततः उक्तम्।
तथी वेन पाशिनियो नम इति सूं पूर्वं साधनः।
पाशिनिय इति पाठं शुभारितं (पा. ४.१.२२) कव्यानम्।
र ज भूत त भित श्वस्तम् ॥३१॥

‘त्रि न य न सुख निः च स भित।
तो हिजो वेदाध्विकारो [प्रयतः]’
साधनः।
सदा निरीक्षण [इसम्] पठितः स [दृढः] पश्चायुक्तोऽर्तिमानं
भवति।
द्विति
सुखम् घटुलं समस्युं सुनवितः,
संग्रं भाविता वा।
द्विनिघचं शिवचास्याय-समाश्रयं।
विज्ञातिस्तु अनंतरप्रक्षकल्पम् “अवधिमभस तथे” (पि. ५.२२)
इथवितय, “अपप्रवणं” नौ लीण्णं जोचा” (पि. ५.४०)विति नवमसुतात्।
इति शिवचाप्रकाशः समासः ॥३२॥

1. L Be. ने।
2. Be. ओमित्र दत्त।
3. L Be. विनयसमूहसमिक्षविनि:स०।
4. L reads also संवत् १५४२ विनायके श्रीरे श्राप्रभाति दक्षश्रायां बिधृषणां
वीरुपविनायकसिद्धो ब्रह्मदामादोविनं विविदसिद्धम्।
6. तीर्थेऽर्तस्तथ समस्यु॥
V. यजुःशाखिया (The Yajus Recension)

पञ्च शिरिः पवित्रसाम्राज्यां प्राणिनायें यथा।

"श्रास्त्रापूर्वे तदुप विभाद्यां च वा वाक्वेदयो: || 12||

प्रतिश्रृष्टमि यजुर्वेदम् अविनासात्मविनिविविविविमिनाः।

पुनवश्वाकोरिवामि वाच द्वारार्यो विनिविविविमिनाः।

विविविहर्षतुःपरिवर्तिती वैर्ष: "समब्रस्ते मत:।

प्राकृते संभूते चापि चूर ब्रोजा: स्क्रयुहु।

खुरा विशिष्टिरिक्रम स्प्राशनं पद्माविष्टिति।

11. यादवश्च स्रूता छायी चत्वारस: यमा: स्रृता:।|| 12.||

अनुसारो विसर्गिः व्यथ्यो चापि अपानवियो।

12. दुःखःविश्रृष्टि विकृतेऽत्र चकारः सुत एव च || 15.||

वधा कीराण्ड्रिका नारो "बरां द्वियाभावते।

एवं "रक्षं विजन्तियान्तु वे बसां द्वार खेदया।

दकारं पञ्चमेयुःतमम् "वन्नां खेदापि संयुतम्।

10. "बौरसं तं विजयायान्तु कर्षाभाश्र संयुतम्।|| 12.||

चावत उद्धा "समार्यायन् मनो द्रव्ये विवचया।

13. मनः कायामिहायति स प्रेरयति मातमम्।|| 15.||

1. B "पूर्वां।
2. C समूलृतेः, L७ समूलृतेः
3. B परार्थविये, L. परार्थनी।
4. CD तव द्वियाभावते, L५ तव द्वियाभावते,
5. CL रहा: प्राचार्य: वे च चां दृव खेदया।
6. CL चला; खेदापि
7. CL बौरसं,
8. CDL समार्यायन्।
पाणिनीद्व-शिखरा

माहत्तुलूरसि चरणः मन्द्रं जनयति स्त्रम् ।

14. प्रातःस्वनयोगं तं छन्दः गायत्रमाश्चितम् ।

कठोऽ माध्यन्दिनयुगं मध्यमं बैठुभानुगम् ।

15. तारं तालीसवानं शोष्येऽं जागजानुगम् ।

सौदीपीया सुपर्श्रभिसतो वाक्यमापयो मारणः ।

16. वर्णां जनयते तैयं विबाहः पढ्यता स्मृतं ।

खरतः कायंतः स्वानात् प्रयोबानुग्रहः ।

17. इति वर्णाविदः पार्श्विनिपुषां तं निविधत ।

चछतो स्वानानिन्वानामुरः करः शिरस्या ।

19. जित्रासुलं च दृतायः नासिकोदुः च तालुः ।

उदात्ते निवादगार्बार्बुदातः ऋषभम्बेवती।

स्वित्राभवं होऽवेव रहणप्रजामनुष्थः ।।

शीरावशं विशिष्टं महतः रेवं च।

जित्रासुलम् उत्थया च गतिरिक्तविधिष्टः ।।

"यथाभावप्रजायनामु निसारादिपं पदमु च।"

श्रावणं ताहस् विदादइ यदू अन्यन्त्र ब्रह्मां जयस्य।

कुलीनाथं च गंगं दोषमु भयवर्णं च भवतं ।

"न तथा परिश्रोतसि पापाधिरि विकलिप्तः ।"

सुवीरसा च गंगं न अर्च व्यायामं सुर्वविधिऽतम्।

सुस्मित्या सुविधेयं प्रयुक्तं ब्रजं राजति ।।

न कारानो न कृपयो नाथको नानानासिनः।

गणदौ वाहिनिश्च प्रयोगानु वक्तमु अस्ति ।।

1. Weber reads सामायमकारादिपं ।
2. CDL न तथा पढ़े सतीदिनिनित।
3. CDL अर्हते श्यावायं।
4. CDL राजति।
यथा व्याख्या हरेत् पुत्रानु कंठासिनं च प्रेयोते।
भोजा पतनीदित्यां तत्र च वर्णानु प्रयोजये।
एवं वर्णं च योतावय नाथनं च व्रत्तिता।
समयम् वर्णोपे व्रज्ञोर्लोिें ।
सम्बृह्यसागरं हर्ति द्रिति प्रवाहार्धि तु मध्यमां।
शिष्याम् उपरिषाधि कुमार्कृ हर्ति विलसितां।
उदात्थानुदात्तां समितं खरांख।

|| 1. CL व्याख्या यथा ...वंशारं न च.
2. CDL न हीयते।
3. A चतुः।
4. CL कर्त्तावयाः।
5. A कपडः। CDL कपडः साह द्वारसी।
6. Weber reads द्वारसी योगी ए ए। CDL द्वारसी योगी योगी से द्वारसी।
7. CL ब्रह्मसिद्धांनि।
8. AL दृष्टं दृष्टं, BW दृष्टं, CW मूळः।
9. CL सरां नृृ।
10. CL सरां मूळ।
11. ABW उपरिषाधि।
12. AW वृद्धि, CL वृद्धि च।
16bh ब्रजज्ञापण ४वादशवन्त्र सत्वत: शल: स्मृताः।
श्रीपत: तुष्टा हि: प्रोता निवृद्धानुप्रदानन्।

17. || यमोऽसुदुः पञ्चो नादिनो ४हक्ष: स्मृताः।
देयन्नारदो ४वादशवन्त्र प्रसादिनलु खाद्यत॥

18. || उष्ठसत्यावरो विद्यात्र गोष्ठीमित् प्रचरति।

शब्दः ४मायीनां गदाण्य दाचीपुत्र माति॥
दाचीपुतः ४पाणिनियो यमदेव वाजित भुवि।
रमनलमु इदै शास्त्रमु कृतिवान्समा कथितवनम्॥
वेनाचरसमास्यायम् अधिवेर्म महेश्वरानू।
कल्याँ अधारिणे प्रोत तत्रे पाणिनिये नमः॥

विनययजुरुभिनु:स्वतामु द्रमां य इह पतेत्।
प्रयत: सदा दिजत।
स भवति ४पशुक्कारातिस्मान्।

12. || खसम ४सचिव च समयुं दिव्य स्वरूप।

1. CL नेवेन; B नेवेन; CL नेवेन; AW नेवेन।
2. CL नेवेन; B नेवेन; (बैपाको sec. m) AW नेवेन।
3. CL नेवेन।
4. B नेवेन; CL नेवेन; CL नेवेन।
5. AW देवधकाबन्दी।
6. B देवधकाबन्दी; C देवधकाबन्दी।
7. ABW नेवेन।
8. CL पाणिनी।
9. CL ब्रह्मान्नभुनु।
10. CL प्रथम।
11. Weber reads वनाधाम before पशुक्का।
12. CL भक्तः च सुखः समश्वयात्।
VI. क्रमशः (The Rk Recension)

[1]

चर्च शिखा प्रवचनां विषयन्य सत्य शत औ शमाः।
भाष्यावसूपीं ताहिदादु यथोत्तरो लोकवेदीौः।
प्रसंगमधी शब्दधार्म अविवातम चतुर्भुजः।
पुनर्वेदोक्षिणांस्व च देवार्षेण विचित्रम्।
क्षत्रियमपुष्टंवशं वशोः शाखुभवे सत्यार्थः।

प्राणी संस्करे चापि संयो योक्ता: श्रयुप्नम्।
क्षर विनिर्तिरेक्ष स्पर्षां यथा विष्णुमिर्तिः।

[2]

वाटनाम्भु युज्यन्ता च महीने चलार्का यमाः। शह्यातः।
चनुलार्केविशालस्य िवसा ब्रह्मचारी चापि पराक्षितो।
वर्णाशिष्येपि विशेषाय खंाराः। शुष्य एवं च।

[3]

स्वामा बुधवा 'समिवारी' मनो युज्ये विचारा।

[4]

मनः कायामिनीमहानि स प्रेयति मातरम्।
माकतसूरसिः चारनू मन्वं जनयति खरम्।

[5]

प्रातःसवनयोगं तं कर्नो गायत्रमातिम्।
कर्तव्यपि मायान्तिनयों मध्यमं तैह्यासुनगम्।

[6]

तारं तात्तियस्वबं श्रीषं यं जागतानुस्तम्भ।

पाषिनीय-शिष्या

सीतिका शूष्काभिष्ठो वज्रारम्भव मात्रं।

॥६॥ वशायज्ञ जनयते वेषां विभागः पद्धतः स्वरूपः ॥६॥

खरतः कालतः ध्यानात् प्रयवानुप्रदानत्।

॥७॥ इत्य वर्णविदः प्राणिनिपुष्पं तं निवोधत ॥१०॥

[३]

उद्दार्थानुदार्थ वर्णितव नरायणः।

॥८॥ ऋषो दौर्घ: स्वत इति कालतो नियमा वचः ॥११॥

उदात्ते नियागान्यानविदात धन्यभवविवती।

वर्णितवर्त्त: इति 'षेन्मज्ञत्वमः' ॥१२॥

षष्ठी ध्यानानि वर्णानामुरः कष्टः शिरस्याः।

॥९॥ जिज्ञासूलें च दुन्द्राय नासिकोधीं च तालु च ॥१२॥

भोमावचव विहासि शपसा रेख एव च।

जिज्ञासूलमु उपथा च गतिरहितविकाशः ॥१३॥

व्रम्भावस्त्रप्रास्यानम् यहाराधिते पदम।

वर्णां लार्ष्ये विद्यादु यदविदु व्यासमु जनम: ॥१४॥

[४]

हकार्य पद्मायुः लक्ष्मी २वन्तःर्वाभिष्ठै संयुतम्।

॥१०॥ शिरोरत्रं तं विज्ञानीयात वर्जारामीरुस्तं ॥१६॥

कण्ठावधानविनुभूमातालावथा चोजनानुपू।

॥११॥ सुभावन्या क्रुरर्धा दन्तः बलुलसा: स्मृताः ॥१७॥

जिज्ञासूलमेव तु कुः प्रकोवी दक्षोषो वः स्मृतिलो बुधेः।

॥१२॥ ए एः तु कष्टतालावथा चो चौ कष्टोषो जी म्वृती ॥१८॥

1. Y पद्मायुःसम्बन्धम्। 2. Y चोजनानुपू। 3. Y प्रकोवी।
रक्षाबीर्या

वर्षामात्र तु ¹क्रमाख्य चिन्तारूपविभेदत्।

॥13॥ चिन्तारूपविभेदात्मकत्वसंहितात् ॥१६॥

संहितं मानवं जयं विहंटं तु हिमालिकम्।
घोषा वा संहितं: सर्वं चधोषा विहंटम्: स्वरत्: ॥२०॥

[५]

ेय स्तरणात् उपरणां देव विहंटं करणं स्वरतम्।
तेजघोषधि विकारणां ताम्रम् ऐंचों तथेव च ॥२१॥

॥14॥ चनुकारंधमानं च नासिकाय ज्ञानमुच्यते।

चयोगवाहा विनेथ्या ६धारयव्याख्यानमित्रम्: ॥२२॥

॥15॥ चलाभीवाणानिधिष्ठो द्वन्द्वयु: ेङ्गानु:।

॥16॥ चनुकारस्तु कर्त्त्वो निलयं द्री: श्रवसिष्टु च ॥२३॥

चनुकारे विओधां तु विषयम चाचरते यी।

यथेऽथो तु विरुक्कियान विचारकमाद्वयोऽयो: ॥२४॥

'वाक्य' यथा: चरतेः प्रवाहवेः एक्ष्माणां न च प्रोिथेतु।
भोता प्रतन्येवत् तदयु: वर्षायन प्रयोज्येतु ॥२५॥

[६]

यथा: सोपाल्या नारी: तका ईडमिथ्येत।

एवं 'रक्षा: प्रयोजतः: खे चरता द्रीप्या ॥२६॥

रक्षणं प्रयुक्तिरन्तो यथात् पूर्वम् अचरम्।

दैर्घ्यां प्रयुक्तिय्यात् पक्षाधिकिकम् भागरेतु ॥२७॥

इत्येव्य देवकामात्सु चार्मात्सु स्वरूपम्।

नासिकाय लावधां च रछेवद हिमाबतात ॥२८॥

1. Ch क्रमाख्य विद्वारोकर°, Y क्रमाख्य एकरोकर°। 2. Y अङ्गवाणं च व्राणां च.
3. Y तरोषिद्रुण°। 4. Y has after this वधानोर्व च निघमायविधिनु।
5. Y °खानमित्रम:। 6. CL. विराणू श्रृणु।
7. Y वधा वाणी...उद्धितमे°। 8. Y रक्षा विज्ञानीयान।
पाषाणिय-शिक्षा

"दद्यादुर्ल्लटे निषन् कांखेन खमबुकरन्।
मात्रवं च हिमसंबं च जघन्यं इति निद्रानान्॥२८॥
मथे तु कम्येतु कम्यस् उभो पाष्ठेऽग्नि अभिवेद्।
सस्तः कम्येतु कम्यं ज्योतित निद्रानान्॥२०॥

[७]

एवं वार्णः प्रयोजन्या नाथवस्त्र न च पोडिता:।
सम्बन्धम् योगेश्वर व्रजालोकेष्व महाषयते॥२१॥
गरौ श्रीप्री शिर:क्रमी तथा लिखितपाठकः।
अनर्थात् लघुकथार्थ पद्द्हति पाठकाधमा:॥२२॥
माधवः च चायर्यति: पदखण्डसु मुखः।
थेपि लगसमयः (?) च पद्धति पाठकः (?) गुः:॥२३॥
शिरस्तम् भोतम् "उदद्वुग्म्र चायक्तम् अनुसासिकम्।
कायस्वरः "रिषिनग्ने तथा खानविरजितम्॥२४॥
अवां दर्श लक्षिते निरस्तं निविस्तं गहितं प्रपोमस।
नियोधितं पुक्कपदाखर्च च चंद्रदेरन्त तु मानसाख्यम्॥२५॥
प्रातः पाठितलम् उँब्रङ्गितेन सरणा भास्वृ वषयोपिण्य:।
मथिनमुनी कायतमेन वेष्टं चक्रास्तव्याधितितमिन्य:॥२६॥
तातु तु विधाता "स्वनि बलीरी गिरीगतं तथ सदा प्रयोजनम्।
"मूर्धनंसाबन्धत्तखरापां तुकेन नाथिन गिर्यक्षितेन॥२७॥

[८]

॥१६॥ वचोस्सुचमु यणस्वीविष्मसुधा: "शर: सम्वतः।
श्रीप: सुधा हलः प्रकटा निबोधानुप्रदानत:॥२८॥
॥१७॥ यमोइनासिका "नको नानिनी हस्तरः सम्वतः।
ईश्वरासा "यनो ज्यो ग्रामानसु प्रफादवः॥२८॥

कथक्याशृणिया

II 18 II ईशच्छु साधनेम विदादनो गोर्ध्मितत् प्रचरते ।
'दाचिनूर: पाणिनिना चेन्ने व्यापिने सुधि II 40 II
बांद: पाठी तु बेदक्ष हस्ती कहोऽध प्रज्ञ्य।
क्ृतिराहु संहनं चचुनिशुश्च शोभम् उच्यन ॥ 41 ॥
शिष्या स्थायं तु बेदक्ष सुखं आकरणं स्थूतम् ।
तपातू साधम् चलोथे ब्रह्मलोके महोान ॥ 42 ॥

[५]

उदात्तम् प्राव्याति व्योजासको नृन्दिग्नीसूलूकिनिविद्वेषः ।
उदात्तम् ये स्थरति तु तरं च कनिर्दिकायमुदारसेम ॥ 42 ॥
उदात्त प्रदेयमविदातु प्रचयं मश्यतोन्निर्गुः ।
निहता तु कनिर्दिकायं रूपितोपकनिर्दिकायाम ॥ 43 ॥
प्रतिदात्तम् चास्युदात्तम । उदात्तम । चन्द्रात्तं नोद्वेषितम् ।
मध्यदात्त स्थरितं हुदात्तं हुदात्तरतितं नवपदशया ॥ 45 ॥
भवं: सोम: प्र वो वीरं हविशा खरं बहस्वति: इन्द्राशमतो ।
कनिर्दिकायमोदात्तं सोम: इन्द्राशुदात्तं मृद्युदात्तं
व इन्द्रतुदात्तं वीरं नोद्वेषितम् ॥ 46 ॥
हविशा मध्यदात्त स्थरितं स्थरितं हविशालितं हुदात्तम
इन्द्राशमतो इति ब्रह्मदात्तम ॥ 47 ॥
बुद्धदात: हर्द: इन्द: मृद्युदात्त उदात्ततः ।
स्थरित: कर्मूमूलीयं: सार्वसंहे प्रचयं: स्वृत: ॥ ४८ ॥

[१०]

चाष्टु वदति मातां हिमालं चैव वायसः।
गिरी शैलं बिरामां तु स्वकुलर्वक्रमात्मकम् ॥ ४८ ॥
कृतिराहुसंहनं दशस्मपवायं च महितम: ।
न तथा पाठं मोहोद्विदं पापाश्रवं किलिषात् ॥ ५० ॥

1. Ch वाराणसे, Y. तथा: गायकीयो।
3. Weber reads छत्र। Ch हुनं च।
2. Y तथा सुधि
4. Y परिमोचनिया।
पाणिनीय-शिष्या

चूर्तिंशतां एवं काम्यां सुवर्णिश्चां।
सुखर्षृण सुवण्ड्रे प्रयुक्तं जल्लं प्राजितं ॥५.१॥
मन्त्रो दौनं स्तरतो वर्णतो वा मिल्याप्रयुक्तो न तमस्माद्।
स वर्गेऽव शरीरांन्त विनिक्तं यथिन्द्रश्रवः खर्तोपपाराभात् ॥५.२॥
बर्धरम् (१) अन्नायुं विक्षरं व्याधिपरिवर्तिम्।
अबताष्मलुः (१) वज्म पति मस्तके ॥४.१॥
इस्तादोन्योगधीर्तीं खर्वण्विवर्तिन्तम्।
क्रत्युः सामाश्रयिः विव्योनिः अधिग्रहन्ति ॥४.३॥
इस्तो वेद्योगधितीं खर्वण्विशेषसंयुतम्।
क्रत्युः सामाभि: पूतो ब्रह्मालोकीं मधोयतं ॥५.५॥

[११]

शश्र: शाङ्करी प्रादातु दारिणुष्याय धीमति।
बालविभयं समाश्रयदेवीं वाचिनिति स्थिति: ॥५.६॥
वेनादसामाश्रयम् अधिग्रहम् मक्कखरात्।
कतुपं अवकरणं प्रोतं तब्र सामाहिनये नमः ॥५.७॥
वेन वीचता निरं पुरम् विसने: मद्वारिकः।
तस्मादशानं भिलं तस्माह सामाहिनये नमः ॥५.८॥
अप्पनामेन्तो अवकस् भावांशक्नमानकाया।
चलुष्कालितं वेन तस्माह सामाहिनये नमः ॥५.८॥
"विचरयनमभिसुखिमन:स्तरातिमां\nस इस पठति 'प्रयत्न सदा हितः।"।
संभवति वनछानृपशुशु尼亚तिमान्।
"अनुसः च सुखं समुलिति दिवसीति दिवसीति ॥६.०॥
प्रय मेहाम, बाला, उदात्तत, इत्यादि, शराणां, यथा,\nगङ्गो, अचोत्स्पृष्टा, उदाचे, चायसु, शहुर एकादश॥

इति पाणिनीय-शिष्या समाला॥

1. य जघः। 2. य प्रलः। 3. य विचरयनमभिसुखिमन:स्तरातिमां।
4. य याजव: सदा। 5. य सुसंहुः स च समः।
परिशिष्टम्

चान्द्र-वर्षचुंबाणि
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॥ ऋ विद्यानान्तकाय नमः।।

ख्रैनकरणप्रयोगेऽथ वर्षी जायलेः॥

तव ख्या न म दृश्यते॥

कण्ड: ब्रह्मविषीज्ञानमेनाम्॥

कण्डतालुकम् इदेदैताम्॥

कण्डोढम् उददैताम्॥

सूची कुत्रशायाम्॥

दन्ता: लहुलसानाम्॥

नासिका अनुर्खार्या॥

ख्रैनानुसनासिका: द्वारा: नामा:॥

तातु इत्रयानाम्॥

भ्रोंटो उपभानीयीः॥

उद्धतं वकारस्॥

जिद्धामूलं जिद्धामूलीयस्य (वयो:)॥

क र च म ख्॥

जिद्धार्थं दलानाम्॥

जिद्धामथं तालमानाम्॥

जिद्धोपारं मोत्सानाम्॥

शिष्य: ख्रैनाका(क)पर्वत:॥

प्र य चो विविधः॥

आभ्यन्तरी बालाख॥

तद्व प्रा भ्य न: च॥

संहितार्थं मितटिलं स्पष्टम् इत्यतः प्रभुः च॥

संहितानम् पकारस्य॥
विभत्तम् अष्टाणं खराणं च II.26
तेभी विभत्तम् लेदीतो: (लेदीतो:) II.27
ताभ्याम् ऐदीतो: II.26
ताभ्यामयकारख II.26
खलतं खर्णानं II.25
क्रियधुखलं लन्त:खरानम् II.28

बा ख: II.30
वर्गीयां प्रथमद्रितिया: द्रवसवसर्नीयजन्निजामूलरूपमानोबाच
विभत्तकथा [च-]नादानुप्रदाना चयोखा: II.31
प्रथममितियप्लम्भम् चन्त:खराख्रप्रामा: II.32
इतरे सर्व महाप्रामा: II.32
ढतियचतुर्यपथम्: सातुखाराल्सचरवारां:
बंगलकथा सतानुप्रदाना चयोखा: II.34
ढतियचतुर्यां: द्रवसहायोपाणा: II.35
कायो मारसाना: खर्णी: II.36

शत्य आत्मको वस्त्री दीर्घ: पुरुष इति विद्या भिन्य: प्रत्यक्षम् घदासनुदारां-
खरितमेते सादुनालिकस्तनुरुनासिकस्मेते महादासवा भवति II.56
एवसवस्वैमनी खवर्षें II.56
खवर्षें दीर्घी माति तेन घदासवा भवति II.56
एकमात्रिको वस्त्र: II.56
हिमावत्री दीर्घि: II.56
हिमाब्रिका: पूर्ण: II.56
खबिदाता: II.56
नीचेरदाता: II.56
समासां: खरित: II.56
खराख्रातुनासिको निरुतुनासिक 477
शता:खराहिमेदा रंगवर्यिता: सादुनासिका निरुतुनासिकाचेति II.58

इति चान्द्रवर्षेंसूत्राणि समाप्ति
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With Translation and Notes (Critical and Exegetical)
THE PÂNINĪYA SIKṢĀ

WITH TRANSLATION AND NOTES (CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL)

[a i u-ṇ || r l-k || e o-ṇ || ai au-c || ha ya va ra -t || la-ṇ || ūa ma ūa na-m || jha bha-ū || gha ṇha dha-ś || ja ba ga ḍa ṇa-ś || kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta-v || ka pa-y || śa sa sa-r || ha-l.]

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

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

Atha sikṣāṁ pravakṣyāmi Pāṇinīyāṁ matam yathā ||
śāstrānupūryām tad vidyād yathōktam loka-vedayoh II (1)
Prasiddham api sabdārthan avijnātam abudhhibhiḥ ||
punar vyaktikarisyāmi vāca uccārane vidhim II (2)
Tri-śaṣṭis catuh-ṣaṣṭir vā varṇāḥ sambhavato matāḥ ||
Prākṛte Sanskrte cāpi svayam proktāḥ Svayambhūvā III (3)

Tr. Now I shall give out the Sikṣā according to the views of Pāṇini. In pursuance of the traditional lore, one should learn it with reference to the popular and the Vedic languages. Though words and their meaning are well known, yet these are not within the knowledge of persons intellectually deficient, (hence) I shall dwell once more on the rules regarding the pronunciation of words. That speech-sounds in Prakrit and Sanskrit are sixty-three or sixty-four, according to their origin, has been said by Brahman (Svayambhū) himself. [1-3].

7
a. The expression Pāṇiniyaṁ matalī yathā agrees with the following which occurs later on in all recensions (except the A.P.): Śanākaraḥ Śanākaret prādād Daṅgoputrāya dhīmata. It appears that the compiler of the A.P. did not know who the author of the PS. was. For, though in the introduction of his metrics (ch. 328 A.P. ed. Anândārama) he writes: chando vakṣye mālajais tathā Pīndaloktāṁ yathākramam he is quite silent about the source of the Sīkṣā given by him. It is not so much likely that Pāṇini like later authors would put in his own name in his work, for in his Aṣṭādhyāyī too he does not mention himself. This ignorance of the compiler of the A.P. along with the defective nature of the text of the PS. as given in his work probably goes to show that at his time (c. 800 A.C.) the PS. was not a frequently studied work. The Prātiṣākhyaḥ which are later than PS. must have supplanted it to a considerable extent at that time. That the author of the A.P. leaves out as many as six homistichs out of eighteen couplets shows the damaged condition in which his material had already reached at the time of the compilation of the A.P.

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

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

Svarā viṁśatir ekaś ca sparśānāṁ paṁca-viṁśatih
yādayaś ca smṛtā hy aśtau catvāraś ca yamāḥ smṛṭāh ॥ (4)

Anusvāro visargaś ca χα-φαu cāpi pādraśrayau
duḥśprṣṭaś cēti vijñeyo ṣ-lāraḥ 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 χ and φ are dependent on others and the pluta 1 is duḥśprṣṭa. [4-5].
NOTE 3. The order in which the different groups of speech-sounds have been mentioned seems to be due to exigency of metre. The twenty-one vowels according to the commentaries, the Pañjikā and the Prakāṣa are: a, ā, a; ñ, ñ, ñ; u, ū, ū; r, ṛ, ṛ; l, ū, e, e; o, o; ai, aï; au, aï.

The earliest enumeration of vowels has probably been in the so-called Śiva-sūtras. But there we have only nine vowels, long and pluta ones being altogether omitted. The omission has been discussed before (see Introduction, § 14). The Prātiśākhyaśas 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 Prātiśākhyaśas compared with the vowels of the PS.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>ā</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ī</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>ū</th>
<th>ū</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>ā</th>
<th>APr.</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>ā</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ī</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>ū</th>
<th>ū</th>
<th>u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APr.</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>aï</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>aï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPr.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>aï</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPr.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>aï</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPr.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>aï</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTs</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>aï</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The APr. according to the commentary does not include the pluta vowels in the Varṣa-śamānnāya, 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. 1 (also long 1?) 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. 65). Hence by VPr. we shall understand the first seven chapters, and the chapter VIII will be designated by the name late VPr. or l VPr.

5 The view of the RT. as regards the number of vowels it recognizes has been gathered from its vṛttas which might have been built on Audavrajī's work (see Introduction § 40). The recognition of a long 1 by the RT. is curious. PS. and other Prātiśākhyaśas do not accept this.
The difference between the PŚ. and the Prātiśākhyaśas is due to their originally different character, for the former was a manual for helping the recitation of all the Vedas or it may have belonged to the one undivided Veda that existed at the very beginning (see Introduction, § 18), while the latter (the Prātiśākhyaśas) were treatises related to the peculiar mode of reciting or chanting one particular Veda, or its many recensions (tatra sarva-veda-sādhāraṇī śikṣā...) Pāṇinīna prakāśita. prativeda-śākham ca bhinnarūpā prātiśākhya-saṃjñitā anyaireva munibhiḥ pradarsitā, Prasthāna-bheda, Weber’s Ind. Stud. I, p. 16). The fact that the PŚ. was accessory to the study of all the Vedas, required that it should be a treatise of general kind and in this respect differs from the Prātiśākhyaśas which related to one kind only of the mantra-text in its different sākhās. Hence we find the Atharva and Rk Prātiśākhyaśas 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. Yamas are said to be particular nasal sounds occurring before the nasal stops when plosives precede them. The enumeration of yamas as four in the commentaries appears to be a bit puzzling; for, according to the definition of the Prātiśākhyaśa and the Nār. Ś. the yamas become 20 or 21 in number (see APr. I. 99; TPr. XXI. 12, XXII. 12; RPr. VI. 8). Uvāṭa in his commentary of the RPr. has a defence for both the enumerations. He sums up his first discussion, with evam vimśātir yamā bahv-ṛcānaḥ bhavanti sva-rūpaiḥ catvāra eva tad uttaratra yama-lakṣane vicārayiṣyāmāḥ (on I. 20) and in discussing the character of yama (on VI. 8) he says tasmā iha ‘sparśa yamananunāsikā ity ucyamāne vimśātitvāt sthānīnāṁ ādeśānāṁ api yamānāṁ vimśātitva-prasaṅgāḥ; sa ma bhūt. caturāṇāṁ eva yamānāṁ prathamaḥ prathamaṁ dvitīyā dvitīyam evam ā pāṇcamād āpadyerann ity ucyate. The sum and substance of what Uvāṭa says seems to be that in pronunciation the yamas do
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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 Bāhr-ṛcas 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 APr. I. 99, TPr. II. 51; XXI, 12; XXII, 12. A great deal of his difficulty is due to the peculiar nature of the TPr.). The late Vāj. Pr., i.e., its ch. VIII (29), has recognized four yamas only though curiously enough Uvāṭa explains their number to be twenty. In the Ṛktantra also (ed. Burnell, p. 2) only four yamas have been recognized. (For more information about yamas see Siddheshvar Varma’s ‘Critical Studies’, pp. 99ff.)

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

Note 6. Duḥsprṣṭaḥ. The pluta ṇ has been called the duḥsprṣṭa 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 ṚT. recognizes this (see ibid). Weber was inclined to understand duḥsprṣṭa as a nāsikya (Ind. Stud. IV, p. 349). But his view seems to be untenable. The Pañjikā on the authority of Audavraji takes it in the sense of īsat-sprṣṭa (p. 11). For according to the latter, ṇ partakes of the character of semivowels which are īsat-sprṣṭa according to PS. See also Uvāṭa on ṚPr. XIII. 3.


Tr. Ātmā 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 (mandra) 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 (madhyama) tone and relates to the midday offering (mādhyandina-savana) and follows the Triśūlbh (metre); and the shrill (tāra) tone (which is produced by the breath circulating) in the roof of the mouth relates to the third (i.e., evening) offering (of the day) and follows the Jagati (metre) [8].

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

Note 8. Sirṣanyam. This is a form allowed by Pāṇini, in his grammar, for the Chandas only (sirṣanyamḥ chandasi, 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 Sikṣā which is a Vedāṅga (see also Notes 9 and 18 below).

Note 9. So’dīrṇāh. The peculiar sandhi observable here saḥ+udīrṇah has been supported by Pāṇini (so’ci lope cet pādāpūrṇam. VI. 1. 134). According to the Kāśikā 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. Svarataḥ. The word svara in this place means pitch accents, such as udātta, anudātta and svarita. The translator of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad in the S. B. E. series once translated this word as ‘syllable’ (I. 4). This is indefensible.

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

---

1 For a searching enquiry into the meaning of Chandas as used by Pāṇini, see Dr. Paul Thieme’s ‘Pāṇini and Veda’, Allahabad, 1935, especially pp. 67ff.
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justly called prayatna. This prayatna is included in the āsya-prayatna of the Aṣṭādhyāyī (I. 1. 9). Āsya in this work means 'the place of articulation (sthāna) in the mouth' (āsya). The use of āsya instead of sthāna has been meant for brevity (lāghava): prolixity should always be guarded against in a sūtra. The prayatna in āsya-prayatna has been identified with the ābhyantara-prayatna by Bhaṭṭoji-dīkṣita (on Panini I. 1. 9). According to him it is of four kinds: sprṣṭa, īṣat-sprṣṭa, saṃvṛta and vivṛta. As opposed to the ābhyantara-prayatna, he has bāhya-prayatna, which is another name for Pāṇini's anupradāna, which according to Patañjali consists of the following: vivāra, saṃvāra, śvāsa, nāda, (ghoṣatā, aghoṣatā), alpa-prāna and mahā-prāna (on P. I. 1. 9) Kaiyyaṭa adds to this three more: udātta, anudātta and saṅvita, 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 vṛ (such as saṃvṛta, vivṛta 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 ābhyantara-prayatna, the root vṛ relates to space between the two parts of the mouth, which touching or coming very close to each other, produce speech-sounds; while in the case of the bāhya-prayatna, it relates to the vocal passage where vocal chords are situated.

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

1. Ghoṣatā and aghoṣatā are simply synonymous to nāda and śvāsa respectively. Later grammarians however have taken ghoṣatā and aghoṣatā as something other than śvāsa and nāda. Evidently a marginal gloss crept into the Mahābhāṣya as early as Candragomin (c. 600 A.C.), who in his Varṣa-Sūtras has imitated this in using expressions like nāḍānupradāna ghoṣavantah and [a]nāḍānupradāna 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.
Prātiṣākhyaśas very rarely use the terms prayatna and anupradāna. The APr. never uses prayatna, but anupradāna is used in it once (I. 12). In the RPr. each of these terms occurs once (XIV. 10; XIII. 1). In the VPr. prayatna occurs once (I. 43) and anupradāna never. TPr. coins a new word karaṇa for prayatna (II. 32, 34, 45; XXIII. 6) and uses prayatna once (XVII. 6, 7), but in the next occasion (XXIII. 2) uses for it the word karaṇa-vinaya (adjustment of different articulating organs.) Other Prātiṣākhyaśas too use the term karaṇa (e.g., APr. I. 18; VPr. I. 75; RPr. 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 (abhyantara) 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 abhyantara-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 Sikṣā-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 anuṇāsikas in PS. 17b. (For other points regarding this word see above the Note 12 on prayatna).
Note 14. *Iti varna-vidah prabhuh.* So said those who were versed in the lore of (pronouncing) the speech-sounds. This evidently shows that there were other masters of phonetics (Saiksikas) before Pāṇini wrote his Śikṣā. This hemistich does not appear in the AP. It is possible like the PŚ. 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, 1861, pp. 34ff.).

The theory of producing speech-sounds as given here recognizes three principal places of articulation: chest (*uras*), throat (*kaṇṭha*) and the roof of the mouth (*śiras*). Patañjali too while explaining *catvāri śṛguṇa,* etc., interprets *tridhā baddhaḥ* as *triṣu sṭhānesu baddhaḥ:* *urasī kaṇṭha śīrasīti.* (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 3)

From the fivefold division of speech-sounds mentioned in the PŚ. 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 Rk., Yaj., Pūj. and Prk. recensions without paying any heed to this fact have interspersed passages (treating five divisions) with couplets from different sources.

```
Udāttaḥ cānudāttaḥ ca svaritaḥ ca svarās trayaḥ
hrasvo dīrghaḥ pluta iti kālato niyamā aci || (11)
```

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

Note 15. *Aci.* Ac meaning vowels is a pratyāhāra of Pāṇini. The Yaj. recension reads PŚ. 8 as its 23rd couplet.

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

```
Udātte niśāda-gāndhārav anudātta ṛṣabha-dhaivatau
svarita-prabhavā hy ete śadja-madhyama-paṇcamāḥ || (12) ||
```

12. Of the seven musical notes niśāda and gāndhāra can arise in the high pitch (udāta), ṛṣabha and dhaivata in the low pitch (anudāta), while
sadja, madhyama and p pancama 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 Śāma 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 PS. Its absence from the AP. as well as uncertain position in other versions probably strengthens this presumption. Hence this has not been included in the reconstructed text.

Aṣṭau sthānāni varnaṇām uraḥ kaṅṭhaḥ śiras tathāḥ
jihvā-āśas ca dantāḥ ca nāśikāṣṭhau ca tālu ca

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 Prātiṣākhyaśas admit dantā-mūla as an additional place of articulation (For details see the Table II).

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

O-bhāvaḥ ca vivṛttiḥ ca śa-śa-sā repha eva ca
jihvā-mūlam upadmāḥ ca gatir aṣṭa-viḍhōṣmanah

Yady o-bhāva-prasandhānam ukārdādi-param padam
svardantam tādṛṣṭam vidyād yad anyad vyaktam uṣmanah

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

a. These two couplets, though probably not belonging to the PS., seem to be very old. On the antiquity of the first (14), see B. Liebich, ‘Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft,’ II. § 22. The second couplet is not quite intelligible. Weber is willing to read akārādi against ukārādi of all MSS. (Ind. Stud. IV, p. 852).

b. The APR. according to its commentator recognizes four ṛṣmans ś, ẓ, s and h (I. 81). The VPR. (I. 51) has also the same number. The TPR. adds ŗ and ṇ to these and has six (I. 9). The RPR. has recognized two more: ḫ and ṇ, making altogether eight ṛṣmans (I. 10, 12). The reckoning of anusvāra as an ṛṣman seems to be very strange.

Hakārām pañcamair yuktam antañsthābhiś ca saṁyutam 1
aurāsyam tama vijñāyīt kañṭhyam āḫur asaṁyutam ṭ (16)

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

Note 19. This couplet stands in a wrong place in the Yaj. recension, and the Pañjikā has not commented on it. Besides this it is missing in some MSS, of the AP. Still we have considered it to be belonging to the original PS. on the following grounds: (i) Uras according to the PS. 9 is a place of articulation for some of the speech-sounds, (ii) Indigenous Pali grammarians too have recognized some sounds as aurasa (Pali, orasa sounds; Minayeff, PGr. p. 2; Geiger, Pāli Lit. und Spr., p. 41), (iii) This couplet PS. 10 occurs also in late Śiksās such as the Lomaśi 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. Antañsthābhiś 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 čāpi. But the genuine original reading might well have been *antahsthebhiś ca, and the late redactor probably finding this Chândasa form unexplainable by the grammar of the classical Skt., which he thought to have been the language of the PŚ., changed it to *antahsthabhiś ca and brought it within the control of the ordinary grammar, though the new difficulty which arose escaped his notice. The redactor of *antahsthaiś čāpi made it faultless and removed all trace of the assumed original.

Kanṭhyaś ahāv i-cu-yaśas tālavyā oṣṭhajā vu-pūṣyur mūḍhanyā ṛ-tu-ra-ṣa dantyā l-tu-la-sāḥ smṛṭāḥ \(\text{(17)}\)
Jihvā-mūle tu kuḥ prokto dantyoṣṭhyo vah smṛto budhaiḥ 1 e-ai tu kaṇṭha-tālavyā o-au kaṇṭhaṣṭhajau smṛtau \(\text{(18)}\)
Ardha-māṭrā tu kaṇṭhyasya ekārākārayor bhavet 1 aikārākārayor māṭrā tayor vivṛta-samvṛtam \(\text{(19)}\)

Tr. A and h are throat sounds; i, cu (i.e., c, ch, j, jh and ñ) and ś are palatals; u and pu (i.e., p, ph, b, bh and m) labials; ṛ, tu (i.e., t, th, d, dh and n) and ś 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 ñ) 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 māṭrā and of ai and au is (one) māṭrā; 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 Prātiṣākhyas the speech-sounds of the Old Indo-Aryan did not all retain the places of articulation which they had at the time of Pāṇini.
Table II.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>uras</th>
<th>kaṇṭha</th>
<th>mūrdhnya</th>
<th>jihvā- mūla</th>
<th>danta</th>
<th>danta- mūla</th>
<th>tālu</th>
<th>oṣṭha</th>
<th>kaṇṭha- tālu</th>
<th>kaṇṭha- oṣṭha</th>
<th>danta- oṣṭha</th>
<th>nāsika</th>
<th>nāsika also</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS.</td>
<td>a, h</td>
<td>t, th, d</td>
<td>k, kh, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>o, ch, j, jh, ū, ph, b, bh, m, φ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>p, ph, b,</td>
<td>e, ai</td>
<td>o, au</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>yamas, m, d, n, n, m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR.</td>
<td>a, h</td>
<td>t, th, d</td>
<td>k, kh, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, v</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPR.</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>t, th, d</td>
<td>k, kh, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, v</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPR.</td>
<td>a, h</td>
<td>t, th, d</td>
<td>k, kh, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, ai</td>
<td>u, c, au</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, v, φ</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR.</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>t, th, d</td>
<td>k, kh, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, ai</td>
<td>u, o, au</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, φ</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT.</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>t, th, d</td>
<td>k, kh, gh, n, x</td>
<td>t, th, d, dh, n, l, s</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>i, e, ai</td>
<td>u, o, au</td>
<td>p, ph, b, bh, m, φ, v</td>
<td>yamas, m</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H in combination with n, n, ै, m, y, r, l and v is pronounced in uras.
2 The PS. does not know any mūrdhnya l or lh. This sound is probably a later development due to Dravidian influence (See Introduction § 29, 30).
3 The AP. does not mention the place of articulation of this sound. However the commentator informs us of its articulation.
4 See AP. I. 41. and its commentary on the same.
5 The RPR. says that h and v are aurasya according to others (I, 18). Probably the same authorities place r, l and s in varṣya (I, 30).
6 According to the RPR. Vedamitra is the authority who considers d, gh, l and lh (usually known as cerebral l and lh) as the jihvāmūla sounds (I, 21, 22).
7 The TPR. is silent about the places of articulation for vowels.
8 An does not appear in the sūtra ै of R, 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 Prātiśākhyaśas have been compared with that of the PS.

Among these, typical is the case of r and r. According to the Prātiśākhyaśas the first is velar, while they are not unanimous about r. But Pañini considers r to be cerebral (Siddheshwar Varma, op. cit., pp. 6-7). The fact that r and r cerebralize, according to Pañini (VIII. 4.1) as well as the Prātiśākhyaśas (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 Pañini testifies to the original state rather than the Prātiśākhyaśas which have r as a dental or an alveolar sound.

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

Note 23. Ardha-mātrā tu, etc. This couplet (PS. 13) has suffered very badly in transmission, and its second half does not occur in the AP. Uvaṭa in his comments on the VPr. I. 73, has wrongly quoted its first half as ardhamātrā tu kaṇṭhasya aikāravukārayor. 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 this couplet became unintelligible and gave rise to variants of perplexing nature. Weber’s reading kaṇṭhasya dīkārāvukārayor spoils the metre, but his conjectural emendation (in translation) of aikāravukārayor was a very happy suggestion and finds actual support from the Pañjikā (p. 18). His reading madhye e-ai for mātrā tayor however cannot be accepted, for it has evidently arisen due to a misunderstanding.

1 It is on the basis of Pañini’s use of pratyāhāras that Dr. Paul Thieme 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 PĀÑINIYA SIKṢĀ

All the sandhyākṣaras being long, consist of two mātrās (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:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{in e (} < a + i \text{)} & a \text{ is } \frac{1}{2} \text{ mātrā, and } i \text{ is } 1\frac{1}{2} \text{ mātrā} \\
\text{,, o (} < a + u \text{)} & a \text{ , } \frac{1}{2} \text{ ,, u , } 1\frac{1}{2} \text{ ,,} \\
\text{,, ai (} < a + i \text{)} & a \text{ , } 1 \text{ ,, } i \text{ , } 1 \text{ ,,} \\
\text{,, au (} < a + u \text{)} & a \text{ , } 1 \text{ ,, u , } 1 \text{ ,,}
\end{array}
\]

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.

Samvṛtam mātrikāṃ jñeyāṃ, vivṛtam tu dvimātrikam
ghoṣā vā samvṛtāḥ sarve, aghoṣā vivṛtāḥ smṛtāḥ #20#

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

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

1 Wackernagel (I. § 39), does not admit that all e and o in OIA were originally sandhyākṣaras, 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. vaedā (Skt. vēḍa) and Av. saothra (Skt. hōtra), as well as e and o arising from a combination of a with and u respectively.

2 The VPr. (I. 76) only among all the Prātiśākhyaś expresssly recognizes the fact that ai and au have one mātrā for a and one mātrā 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 Prātiśākhyā, e and o no longer retained the trace of their diphthongal character which we see in the PS. 13. The VPr. is silent about the production of e and o. The RPr. in its attempt to describe their nature simply mystifies the issue (see XIII. 13-16) Hence it appears that the Prātiśākhyaś in question are later than the PS.
Note 25. Next occurs the following couplet in the Ṛk and the Yajus recensions and it has been commented on in the Prakāśa commentary. But as it appears irrelevant in the present context and contains the term karaṇa which as we have seen before is a term of later origin than Pāṇini (see Note 12) we have considered this couplet to be spurious.

Svarāṇām uśmanām cāiva vīrṭam karaṇāṃ smṛtam
  tebhīyo’pi vīrṭāv eṇau tābhyām aicau tathāiva ca || (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 APr. uśmanāṃ vīrṭam ca, svarāṇāṃ ca, I. 31. 32). But according to this Prāśākhyā, o and a as well as ā are the most open sounds (aikāruhārayor vīrṭatamam, tuto’pyākārasya I. 34. 35) and not ai, au as in the present couplet.

Anusvāra-yamanaṇ ca nāsikā sthānam ucyate |
upadhmanīya uṃā ca jīhvā-mūliya-nāsike |
ayogavāhā vijñeyā āśraya-sthāna-bhāginaḥ || (22)

Tr. Anusvāra and yamas have the nose for their place (of articulation); upadhmanīya, uṃa (i.e., visarjantya), jīhvāmūliya as well as nāsikyas (i.e. the anusvāra 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 anusvāra-yamanaṇ ca etc., does not occur in the Yaj. and the AP. recensions (see Introduction § 2). As anusvāra and yamas have been mentioned earlier in the PS. (1-2) we have to consider this as belonging to the original text.

Note 27. Anusvāra. The ‘anusvāra-nāsikyaḥ’ and ‘anusvāraḥ nāsikyaḥ’ seem to have been synonymous and probably the original name for anusvāra by which the TPr. (I. 34 ; II. 30 ; XVII. 1) understands only a nasal vowel. This meaning of the term was known to the author of Pañjikā too. For he says svaram anu bhavati ity anusvāraḥ, ‘as it arises after the vowel it is (called) the anusvāra’ (5).
The term anusvāra-nāsikya has sometimes been shortened also simply as nāsikya or nāsika. But this shortening seems to have created some misunderstanding. For example, in the APr. (I. 26)¹ and in the RPr. (I. 20) nāsikya has been used to denote sounds pronounced directly from the nose (i.e. yamas and the anusvāra)² as opposed to anunāsikas (nasal stops)³ which are pronounced in the mouth as well as in the nose (APr. I. 27 and P. I. 1. 8). But in spite of such an use of nāsikya some interpolators and commentators of the Prātisākhyaśas have taken anusvāra and nāsikya⁴ to be two different sounds (VPr. VIII ⁵ 25, 27, 29; Uvaṭa on VPr. I. 74; Māhiṣeya on TPr. I. 18). But curiously enough, in his commentary to the RPr. I. 20, Uvaṭa has explained nāsikya as the term including yamas and the anusvāra as well as nāsikya.⁶ Though the later writers on Vedic phonetics at times differed from him about the meaning of the term anusvāra, Pāṇini understood by this a nasalized vowel. For he explains the anusvāra as a nasal sound (PS, 14) and gives directions as to how it should be correctly produced (PS, 15b-16a). The term ‘nāsika’ which is used to denote a nasalized vowel in the Prātisākhya has also been used in the PS, (14b). Among the western philologists a controversy went on for some time about the correct pronunciation of anusvāra; but

¹ The APr. never uses the term anusvāra. It is from the commentator that we learn that the nāsikya is equivalent to yama and anusvāra (see 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 term with a somewhat similarly sounded term ānuṇāsika (=nasality) as used in the Mahābhāṣya, gathā trīṇyās tatāḥ pāṭcāmāḥ adikā guṇāḥ (ed. Kielhorn, I, p 61, line 18, 29). Patañjali is clearly against such a view (see Note 2 above). Among the old authorities who seem at times to identify anunāsika with a nasal vowel is APr. (I. 53). But the relevant sūtra has probably been corrupted. TPr. once understands by anunāsika nasal stops and anusvāra (II. 30. See also III. 129; IV. 8, 9, 13, 51, 90; TPr. V. 26-28, 31; X. 11(?), XV. 1. 6; XXII. 14).
⁵ Weber considers this chapter of the VPr. as a later addition (opp., cit., p. 65).
⁶ ke te nāsikyāḥ? ity asyāṁ apekṣāyāṁ aha nāsikyāḥ yamunāsārāḥ (ed. Śāmasrami, p. 80).
among them all Whitney, in spite of the bewildering opinions of the Prātiśākhyaś or rather the commentaries of such works, could correctly guess the true pronunciation (on TPr. II. 30). Wackernagel however considered him to be mistaken and Thumb did not venture to give any opinion on the matter.

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

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

1 Altindische Grammatik, Vol. I (§ 223), p. 257. In the opinion of Prof. Ilderis the anusvāra of the TPr. is anything but a nasal vowel (see Die Vyāsa-Qikshā, 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.
According to the Pañjikā it means (15) na vidyate yogah varṇāntarena yesām te ayogavāhāḥ: Those
sounds which do not combine with other sounds are ayogavāhas. This
definition does not convey any meaning to us. Uvāṭa says akārādīnā varṇa-samāmnāyena samhitāḥ saktāh etc vahandy ātmalābham prāṇmuṇventy ayogavāhāḥ (on VPr. VIII. 8): They are ayogavāhas because they attain their selves when combined
with sounds like a (i.e. vowels). Similar is the view of the
commentator of the Pratijñā Śūtra on II. 1 (see Benares ed.).
This explanation too does not satisfy us and seems to be rather
decisive. Patañjali who is earlier and more authoritative than
the writers mentioned above defines the term as yad ayukta
'Those sounds which are heard even though they have not been
included in the Varṇa-samāmnāya (or the so-called Śiva-sūtras).'</n
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-viṇā-nirghoṣo’danta-mūlyah svarānugah
anusvāras 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-viṇā, but when it stands before h, ś, ṣ and s this pronun-
ciation is compulsory [23].

Note 30. All the recensions except the AP. contain the
above couplet. The anusvāra being a frequent sound in Vedas
and the classical Skt. it appears very much likely that Pāṇini
gave attention to it. Besides this for interpreting śaṣa-seṣu ca we
must invoke the help of Pāṇini’s Paribhāṣā tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe
pūrvasya (I. 1. 66). This also may be taken to show that this
couplet belongs to the original PS.
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 Panini in his grammar (anusvārasya yayi parasavarnak, 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.

Anusvāre vivṛtyāṁ tu virāme cāksara-dvaye
dvir oṣṭhau tu vigrhṇīyāṁ yatrādukhāra-vakārayoh

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

Note 34. This couplet has been taken from the Lomaśi Ś. (III. 7) where it is fully relevant. The reading atraukāra 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 Prakāśā comments on it though the Pāṭjikā passes over it, and some versions of AP. does not know it.

Vyāghrī yathā haret putrān daṁstrābhyyāṁ na ca pidayet
bhītā patana-bhedābhyyāṁ tadvad varnān prayojayet

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 े, े, े and े is changed to the savarna (homogeneous nasal sound) of the following sound; the possible homogeneous sounds in the above case are े, े, े, े, े and े. 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,¹ was already beginning. This couplet occurs in the Yv. S. (195) and the Māndūki 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 PS. which may go back to a time earlier than 500 B. C. (see Introduction, § 36).

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

Yathā Saurāṣṭrīkā nārī takrāḥ ity abhibhāṣate
|
evaṁ raṅgāḥ prayoktavyāḥ khecarāḥ iva khedayaḥ || (26)

The couplet as it stands in the Rk and the Yaj. recension and in the Prakūṣa 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 Rk recension only.

Raṅga-varṇān prayuṭṭiṣṭan no graset pūrvoṃ akuśaram |
dīrga-svaram prayuṭṭīṣṭat paścan 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 Śīkṣās. It is difficult to say where the couplet originally stood,³ but it is sure that it came in the PS. from another source.

Hṛdaye caikamātras tu ardha-mātras tu mūrdhāni |
nāsikāyāṃ tathārdhāṃ ca raṅgasyaiva dvimātrāt || (28)

¹ See the present writer’s ‘Mahārāṣṭrī, a later phase of Sauraseni,’ Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta, XXIII (1923).

In the Nār. S. (II, 4. 9) this couplet occurs with variants nāry drām ity, raṅgāḥ prayoktavyo Nāradasya matat yathā. In the Māṇḍ. S. (112) it occurs with the variants : nārī arā ity raṅgāḥ prayoktavyāḥ nākāra-parinivartitā. The Yv. S. (190) however reads it almost like the Māṇḍ. S.

³ This couplet occurs in a slight different form in the Yv. S. (189) and the Lomaṭi S. (I, 8). The Māṇḍ. S. 110 can also be compared with this.
**TRANSLATION AND NOTES**

Hṛdayād utkate tīṣṭhan kāṃsyena samanusvaran
mārdavaṃ ca doi-mātraṃ ca jaghanvā 2 iti nidarsanam || (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].

Madhye tu kampayet kampaṁ ubhau pārśvau samo bhavet || sarāngam kampayet kampaṃ rathīvēti nidarsanam || (30)

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

Note 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 varṇāḥ prayoktavya ndvyaktā na ca pīditāḥ || samyag-varṇaprayogena 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].

Note 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 8. 1. 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. (118) 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:

Abhyásārthe drutāṁ vṛttim prayogārthe tu madhyāmāṁ
esisyānām upadeśārthe kuryād vṛttim vilambitāṁ

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

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

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

Giuśīghi śirah-kampī tathā likhita-pāthakeh
Anarthajno 'ipa-kanṭhaś ca saḍ ete pāṭhakādhamāḥ
Mādhuryam aksara-vyaktik padacchedas tu susvaraḥ
dhairyam laya-samartham ca saḍ ete pāṭhake gunāḥ

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

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

Śāṅkitam bhātam udghuṣṭam avyaktam anunāśikam
kāka-svaram śirasīgam tathā sthāna-vivarjitaṁ

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

Shyness, fear, extreme loudness, indistinctness, undue nasalisation, repressed tone, undue cerebralization, non-observance of the places of articulation (in general) and (proper) accent [34], and harshness, creating undue separation between words, uneven tone, hastiness, want of due palatalisation: these are the fourteen faults in the Vedic chant.
Note 41a. These two couplets occur also in the Yv. S. (26-28) but they relate there to faults of recitation (pāṭha-dōṣa) instead of the faults in chant (gīti-dōṣa) of the Nār. S. But as the couplets in this latter work have been preceded by the expression bhavanti ca' tra ślokaḥ they are surely quoted there from some earlier work. It is probable that the couplets in question occurred in the Yv. S. first.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Upāṃśu daśām tvaritaṁ nirastām} & \text{ [35]} \\
\text{vilmabitaṁ gadgaditaṁ pragitaṁ} & \\
\text{nispēditaṁ grasta-paddāksaraṁ ca} & \\
\text{vaden na dīnaṁ na tu sānunāsyam} \\
\text{Prātaḥ paṭhen nityam uraḥ-sthitena} & \\
\text{svareṇa sārālā-rūṭopamena} & \\
\text{madhyan-dīnc kaṇṭha-gatenā caiva} & \\
\text{cakrāhva-saṁkūṭita-sannibhena} & \\
\text{Tāraṁ tu vidyāt savanca tṛtiye} & \\
\text{śiro-gataṁ tac ca sadā prayojyam} & \\
\text{mayūra-hamsānyabhṛta-svarāṇāṁ} & \\
\text{tulyena nādena śirah-sthitena} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

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 (ocasionally) 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 Mànd. S. (41-42) but we are not sure whether they originally belonged to this work.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Aco'sprṣṭā yanas tv tasan nema-sprṣṭāḥ śalāḥ sprṣṭāḥ} & \text{ [38]} \\
\text{śesāḥ sprṣṭā halāḥ proktā nibodbhānupradānātāḥ} & \\
\end{align*}
\]
Tr. The vowels are without touch, semi-vowels slightly touched, ś, ṣ and s are half-touched sounds, and the remaining consonants are touched (i.e. stops) [38].

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

\[\text{Namo' anunāsikā nahro nādino ha-jhasah smrtāḥ} \]
\[\text{iṣan-nādā yan-yaśas ca śvāsinas tu kha-phādayāḥ} (39)\]
\[\text{Īṣac-chvāśāṁś caro vidyād gor-dhāmaītat pracakṣate} \]

Tr. \textit{Nam} (i.e. ŋ, ŋ, m, ŋ, and n) are produced through nose, and h except when it is combined with r ; and \textit{jhas} (i.e., gh, jh, dh, dh, bh) are voiced, semivowels (y, r, l, v) and \textit{jas} (i.e., j, b, g, d, d) slightly voiced, the group beginning with \textit{kh} and \textit{ph} (i.e., kh, ch, ṭh, th and ph) breathed, \textit{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 \textit{Pañjikā} (19) explains the passage first with the reading \textit{ānmo} 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 \textit{Rk-Prātiśākhya}.

Note 44. In the Amoghanandini, S. 40, we have \textit{haṅkāro rephasamyukto nādir bhavati nityāśah} : 'h combined with r is always as a voiced sound. The true nature of the \textit{nahro} has not been marked by the author of the \textit{Pañjikā}. He seems to have been misled by a wrong apprehension of the testimony of the Amoghanandini S.

Note 45. The terms \textit{nādī, iṣannāda, śvāśi, īṣac-chāsa} stand for voiced aspirate, voiced non-aspirated, unvoiced aspirate, unvoiced non-aspirated respectively. The term \textit{iṣan-nāda}
practically mean having śvāsa as well as nāda or ubhayātmaka i.e., śvāsa-nāḍātmaka. Hence in the RPr. (XIII. 2) we have terms like śvāsa, nāda and śvāsa-nāda. The TPr. (II. 9) however uses śvāsanāda in case of ha-kāra and seems to describe it as a sound midway between voiced and unvoiced (II. 6) and at the same time calls it voiced (I. 13).

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

Dākṣiputraḥ Pāpinir yasenedāṃ vyāhṛtam bhūvi || (40)
ratnabhūtam idām śāstrāṇi prthivyāṃ 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 mālāgama in the Indian tradition (S. Varma, op. cit., p. 5). This spurious verse which may be very old seems to follow this. There is scarcely any doubt about the importance attached to phonetics by the ancient Hindus. Patañjali too stresses the importance of the subject in the following terms: tobhyaśa tatra sthāna-karanānu-pradānakñobhyo vaidīkā sabdā 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 i
jyotiśām ayanāṃ caṣṭur niruktam śrōtram ucyate || (41)
Śikṣā ghrānṛtu vedasya mukham vyākaranam smrtam i
tasmāt sāṅgam adhītādīva brahma-loke mahīṣyate || (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 vṛṣoṅgulīnāṁ
prayōṣeśāṁ-mūla-nīviṣṭa-mūrdhā  
upānta-mādhya śvaritaṁ dhṛtaś ca
kaniṣṭhākāyām anudāttaṁ eva ut (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 śvarita and anudātta [43].

Udāttam prayōṣeśāṁ vidyāt pracayām mādhyatōṅgulīm  
nihatām tu kaniṣṭhākāyām śvaritāpakanīṣṭhākām ut (44)

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

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

Antōḍāttam ādyāudāttam udāttam anudāttaṁ nīca-śvaritam  
mādhyaudāttam śvaritam dyudāttam tryudāttam
   iti nava-pada-saṅyās ut (45)

Agniḥ somaḥ pra vo vīryam havisaṁ
śvar Bṛhaspati Indrā-Bṛhaspati  
Agniḥ ity antōḍāttam, soma ity ādyāudāttam, pṛety
udāttam, va ity anudāttam, vīryam nīca-śvaritam ut (46)
Haviṣāṁ mādhyaudāttam, śvar iti śvaritam, Bṛhaspati
   iti dyudāttam, Indrā-Bṛhaspati iti tryudāttam ut (47)

Tr. There are nine kinds of accents in padas: antōḍātta, ādyōḍātta, udātta, anudātta, nīca-śvarita, mādhyaudātta, śvarita, dyudātta, tryudātta. Examples of these are Agniḥ, Somaḥ, pra, vo, vīryam, havisa, svāh, Bṛhaspatiḥ, Indrā-Bṛhaspatiḥ, (Agniḥ, Somaḥ, prā, vo, vīryam, havisa, svār, Bṛhaspatiḥ, Indrā-Bṛhaspatiḥ) [45-47].

Notes 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 hṛdi jñeyo mūrdhṇy udātta udāhyat | svaritaḥ karna-mūliyah, sarvāsyē pracayah smṛtah | (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 mātrāṁ doi-mātrāṁ tv eva vāyasah | sikhī rauti tri-mātrāṁ tu nakulas tv ardhā-mātrakam | (49)

Tr. The cāsa 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 Lomaśī S. (VIII. 9), the RPr. (XIII. 20) and with slight variation in the Yv. S. (15-16) and in the Mānd. S. (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., Rk and Yaj. recensions, and the Prakāśa comments on them.

Kutūrthād āgatam dagdham apuvaraṁ ca bhaksitam | na tasya parimokṣo’sti pāpāher iva kilvijāt | (50)
Sutūrthād āgatam vyaktam svāmnāyam suvyavasthitam | susvarena svavakrena prayuktam brahma rājate | (51)

Tr. In the repetition of that which has come from a bad acārya, 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 acārya, and is distinct, from the good text and is well established, the Veda shines [51].

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

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

Na karālo na lambāṣṭho nāvyakto nānunāsikah | gadgado baddhajihvaś ca prayogāṇ 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 NS. (II. 8. 12), the Māṇḍ. S. (158) 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 Prñj comments on it. Though the Prakāśa quotes it we are not sure whether the author reads it in the text of the Sīkṣā. (For further notes on this point see below.)

\[
\text{Mantro hīnāḥ svarato varṇato vā} \\
\text{mithyā prayukto na tum artham āha } 1 \\
\text{sa vāg-vajro yajamānāṁ hinaśi} \\
\text{yathēndrāśatriḥ svarato 'parādhāt } 2 (52)
\]

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 'Indrāśtruḥ' did on account of its wrong accent [52].

Note 50a. This couplet occurs in the Nār. S. (I. 1. 5) and the Amoghanandinī S. (122). Besides this the couplet occurs in the Mahābhāṣya with a variant duṣṭāḥ śabdaḥ for manṭro hīnāḥ (ed. Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 2).

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

\[
\text{Avāksaram anāgyusyaṁ visvaram vyādhi-piḍitaṁ } 1 \\
\text{aṅkṣata(ṛa?)-śastra-rūpena vajraṁ(?) patati mastake } 2 (53)
\]

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.

\[
\text{Hasta-hīnam yo'ḥīte svara-varṇa-vivarjitaṁ } 1 \\
\text{Ṛg-Yajūḥ-Sāmaḥbir dagdho viyinim adhigacchati } 2 (54)
\]
Hastena vedaṁ yo’dhite svara-varṇārtha-samyutam
Rg-Yajuḥ-Sāmabhīk pūto brahma-loke mahiyate || (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 Sāman 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 Sāman and is placed high in the realm of Brahman [55].

Note 52a. These two couplets with slight variation occur in the Yv. S. (40. 44) and the 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 Prakāśa:

Saṃkarah saṃkarīṃ prādād Dākṣi-putrāya dhiṁate
vaṁmayebhyah samāḥṛtya devīm vācam iti sthitīḥ || (56)
Ycndksara-samāmnāyam adhiṣṭhate Maheśvarat
kṛṣnaṁ vyākaraṇaṁ proktam tasmai Pāṇinaye namaḥ || (57)

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

Homage to that Pāṇini who having received the traditional lore of speech-sounds (Varṇa-samāmnāya) from Siva 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
tamaś cādānājanotpham bhinnam tasmai Pāṇinaye namaḥ|| (58)
Ajñānā藐hasya lokasya jñānāṇājana-sālākayā
cakṣur unmilitam yena tasmai Pāṇinaye namaḥ || (59)
Tr. Homage to that Pāṇini who has washed off the human speech with
pure water of words and has pierced through the gloom of ignorance [58].

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

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

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

Trinayana-mukha-nihsṛtām imām
   ya iha paṭhet prayatah sadā dvijah
sa bhavati paśu-putra-kīrtimān
   sukham atulam ca samaśnute divi divēti || (60)

Tr. Those among the twice-born who always devoutly read this (work)
which has come out of the mouth of Siva (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 Siva, 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 Siva—in
which case it would have had a name like the Saiva or Siva Sikṣā, seems
to give strong grounds for considering this story as an apocryphal one.

—
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abhyantara-prayatna, n13</td>
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ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

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

In his commentary to the Ps. (Benares, Samvat 1990) Pandit Kāliprasād Mišra 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 (Chowkhamba, 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
xxix  ,, 9 for (op. cit.)  ,, (Pāṇini 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 PŚ. to Piṅgala (pp. 1 and 27). Tripāṭhī too does the same (p. 30). Sarmā however refutes the view and quotes Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in his support (p. 23).

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

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

lviii Add to the footnote 2 the following:

It came to my notice afterwards that Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣita ascribes the Ṛktantra-vyākaraṇa to Audavraji. In his Sabdakaustubhā he writes: तथा ऋक्तन्त्रव्याकरणं ऋक्तेऽवर्णं 
सूत्त्यत् अनन्त्यन्त्रसंवेदिने सद्य यमः 
पुर्वः युध्य तिति (Chowkhamba ed., p. 113).

lxi line 3 read Piṅgala’s Chandah-sūtras.

lxii-lxvi for Hemistiches read Hemistiches

9 line 9 for गिर्धः ,

6 , जाता read ‘omit’

10 footnote 5

11 line 14 ,

12 , 15 ,

footnote 5

13 , 5 ,

15 line 16 ,

17 footnote 7

30 line 14 for चारः ,

41 , 13 यथोकार ,

42 , 12 ,

\( \text{Addenda et Corrigenda} \quad 85 \)
Tripāthī suggests that dvih-sprśṭaḥ and not duh-sprśṭha is the correct reading and quotes the Varnaratna-pradīpikā (15) to support this view (pp. 5 f.). Sarma 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). Misra refers to the above-mentioned passage and quotes another view which reckons weakly pronounced y and v as duhspṛṣṭa (p. 4). The RPr. (XIII. 3) however takes y, r, l and v as duhspṛṣṭa, but Dr. Mangal Dev Shastri translates duhspṛṣṭa-karana as imperfect contact (p. 95 of his RPr., Vol. III).

Aftar the Note 15 add the following:

Udāṭta, anudāṭta and svarita arise from the peculiar conditions of the body called āyāma, viśrāmbha and ākṣepa respectively. For the definition of these terms see Misra, p. 7.

Add to the Note 17 the following:

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

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

1 for (out of āsman) 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 foolstop 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 samvṛta 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 upadhmāniya, 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 Alābu-vīnā 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 Alābu-vīnā mentioned in this passage was in all likelihood a very primitive instrument like our modern ekatāra or one-stringed vīnā quite different from its late development the modern vīnā. Its very crudity speaks for its great age.

From what Miśra says we understand that patana (dropping) of letters means spirantizing them and bheda (or differentiating) is de-aspiration of them (अतोवांवेदो-ब्वारणे: वर्णी सुत्ता म्वति न सम्भव) प्रवगता: सन्ति ककार्यं खकारो वा। न च प्रियोधवारेवं वेन खकारोनवि ककार्यत् प्रतीयम् (p. 15).

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

Tripāṭhī explains pīditā as ‘pronounced with more breath which lengthens short vowels’ (p. 17).
who has not practised recitation' (p. 18). So does Sarmā (p. 14) and besides this he considers the couplet No. 33 to be spurious (loc. cit ).

line 5 from the bottom read the place of.

Page 74 line 2 for Š, Š and Š read Š, Š, Š 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 Amogha-
nandini Sikṣā.'

75 line 9 read Pāninir yas tenedam'

76 line 14, add the following :

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

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

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

78 line 6 for the Pñj. read some MSS. of the Pñj.

,, 8 after the fullstop read :

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

79 12, add the following :

Misra considers couplets 54 and 55 to be spurious (p. 27) and so does Sarmā (p. 21).
ADDITIONAL CORRIGENDA

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