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**System of Transliteration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>अ आ इ ई उ ऊ क क घ ङ छ ज झ ञ ट ठ ड ढ ण त थ ध न ढ घ ङ च छ ज झ ञ ट ठ ड ढ ण</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a ā i ī u ū ū ri ri li e ai o au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka kha ga gha ū na cha chha ja jha ū na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta tha da dha ū na ta tha da dha na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa pha ba bha ma ya ra la va ū sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sha sa ha la</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visarga — ḥ ; Nasalized .DAO as in संयम — ōn
Nasalized .DAO as in मीमांसा — ōn
PREFACE

The following essay (with the nom de plume याचारमर्ग वितर) was offered in competition for the Vishwanath Namayan Mandlik Gold Medal of the University of Bombay. It was approved by the Judges with the remark: It deserves to be printed, as it collects together a great deal of interesting historical information. It is now accordingly published with the kind permission of the University of Bombay.

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

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

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

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

Poona,
November 1914.

{ }

S. K. Belvalkar.

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

Deccan College, Poona,
15th July 1915.

{ }

S. K. Belvalkar.
AN ACCOUNT OF THE DIFFERENT EXISTING
SYSTEMS OF SANSKRIT GRAMMAR

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

Early grammatical speculations

2. Grammatical speculations in the Vedas.—The earliest speculations of a grammatical nature are to be met with in the later portions of the Rigveda itself; for, even if we condemn Patañjali’s explanation (Mahābhāṣya: Kielhorn, Vol. 1, p. 3) of चत्वारि श्रद्धा by नामायत्यालोपसर्गविनियता: or his explanation (Ibid. p. 4; Rigveda viii. 69. 12) of सा सिन्धुः by सा विभक्तमः as being too subtle for the Vedic
bards,¹ still passages, such as Rigveda x. 125 or Taittirīya Saṁhitā vi, 4. 7. 3, already evince the consciousness that the study of the forms of speech is of sufficient importance to be pursued by itself independently of the dealings between men and men which are rendered possible by them. It is not, however, necessary for our purpose to put together all the Vedic passages that have or can be made to have a grammatical significance. Suffice it to say that the available data do not warrant the supposition that the ‘Seers of the Mantras’ had made any considerable advance in the science of grammar. Indeed, it was not their business to do that. To observe the silent or violent workings of Nature and to record in fitting verse the feelings and thoughts awakened by their contemplation was enough to employ all their leisure hours. Philosophy arises only when the harmony of life is disturbed from within (or from without) so that the old child-like faith in the world and its laws becomes no longer possible; and grammar is a species of philosophy.

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

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

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

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

1 Dr. Burnett, in his essay on the Aldebar school of Grammarians notes, “without some contact with foreign peoples, and bitter disputes among religious sects at home, such highly developed enquiry into language as Pāṇini’s treatise displays, is contrary to all experience.”

2 Compare the Arctic home in the Vedas, p. 230,
came in mainly by way of illustration, or because no other equally cogent explanation of the Samhita passage in question was at hand. We cannot make much capital out of their stray and half poetic utterances.

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

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

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

1 Goldstücker, Pāṇini: his place in Sanskrit literature, pp. 183 and ff.; Reprint of the same by Pāṇini office, pp. 141 and ff.

2 Primitive: those namely that Pāṇini pre-supposes and uses without explaining them. Dr.

3 Yāska calls his own work a complement to grammar: व्याकरणशास्त्र वाकर्णपृण।
calculation on the one hand, and the later Paninian mode of thought on the other.

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

1. साधारणपरमाण वषयो च भूषणः।

These are the original "Seers of Mantras".

2. तेषुस्मोंसाधारणपरमाणे उप-ज्ञेश्वर सम्बादो।

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

उपदेशायां श्लायनोत्तरे सिद्धार्थ-पायेन सद्य समानानसिद्धु। वेदे च वेदसुपराणे च॥

These are the authors of the Padapatha, the Nighantu, and other allied works, including possibly the prototypes of our modern Pratisakhyas.

2. Thus, for—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yaska uses</th>
<th>while Panini uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>कारित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequentative</td>
<td>चक्रित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>विचकारित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>व्यज्ञन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak-termination</td>
<td>निगुनिचारण</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominative termination</td>
<td>नामकरण</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

There are, however, a few facts which seem to militate against the view that Yāska flourished before Pāṇini. The Sūtras of Pāṇini nowhere make any provision for the formation of words like अपार, which occurs in Nirukta (Bib. Ind. edition, Vol. iv. page 258 &c.). Nor did Pāṇini apparently know Yāska’s explanation of द्वार (Rigveda x. 85, 20) by द्वेषस्य पल्लवी. Pāṇini must, therefore, have preceded Yāska; else how can we account for such omissions in a grammarian of the calibre of Pāṇini? The utter uselessness of these and similar negative arguments can be seen on a closer examination of the instances adduced. To obviate the last of these defects Kātyāyana gives द्वारद्विषतायाः च अन्तः वक्ष्य: as a vārtika to Sūtra iv. 48. Kātyāyana must, therefore, have come after Yāska whose work he here presumably utilises. On the contrary, the first omission is not rectified even by Kātyāyana who gives two vārtikas (no. 7 and 8 to vi. 1. 89) to explain forms like अपार and अद्याधर but not अपार. This would necessitate the supposition that Yāska came after Kātyāyana. A mode of argumentation which leads to such contradictory conclusions is no safe foundation for there is a great distance between Yāska’s definition of निपत्ता as उपास्यवर्तमानुषिन्द्रिय and his giving the meanings for each individually, and Pāṇini’s classification of them into उपस्थित when joined to verbs, गति: if the root develops into a noun, and कार्यवर्त्तनिय. Many more similar illustrations could be found.

1 In Kielhorn’s edition vol. ii. p. 220, this is given not as a vārtika of Kātyāyana but as a part of the Mahābhāṣya. In that case Yāska’s explanation of अर्थपाली as अर्थायेन यस्य and his non-acquaintance with vārtika 1 to Sūtra iv. 1. 49 may be adduced to prove the point at issue.
culation on the one hand, and the later Pāṇiniya mode of thought on the other.

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

1 सासात्तुपर्माणूण नामपयो भुषु:।

These are the original "Seers of Mantras".

पेड़कंपोिसासात्तपर्माणूपुण उप-देवीय सम्मान सम्मानु:।

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

उपदेवीय सासात्तपर्माणूपुण चिन्तामत्त- ापेमें मन्त्र चम्मानासिषु। वेदैं च वेदायुगांशि च॥

These are the authors of the Pada-पाथā, the Nighanta, and other allied works, including possibly the prototypes of our modern Prātiśākhyaās.

2. Thus, for—

Yāṣāka uses—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal</th>
<th>कारित</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequentative</td>
<td>ब्रह्मचारित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>सिकौरित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>मप्लजन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak termination</td>
<td>निस्प्रास्थान</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominative termination</td>
<td>नामकरण</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

while Pāṇini uses—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ग्रिन्नत</th>
<th>ब्रह्मचारित</th>
<th>सिकौरित</th>
<th>मप्लजन</th>
<th>निस्प्रास्थान</th>
<th>नामकरण</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Similarly Yāṣāka defines (rather derives) सर्वेःस्मांसे समापिति as लाभानि प्रत्यूः सर्वोऽऽ्छत्रि नम्माति गच्छति वा। सर्वेःप्राप्ति। It is often used by him otherwise than as a technical term of grammar. Compare vi. 6. 8, viii. 1. 2, vii. 1. 5, &c. Again,
and wording of the rules of grammar that are to be met with in the Āśṭādhyāyī. We have dealt with the question of Pāṇini’s date in another part of this essay, and if that result be accepted, Yāska must be placed about 800 to 700 before Christ.

There are, however, a few facts which seem to militate against the view that Yāska flourished before Pāṇini. The Śūtras of Pāṇini nowhere make any provision for the formation of words like अपाण, which occurs in Nirukta (Bib. Ind. edition, Vol. iv. page 238 &c.). Nor did Pāṇini apparently know Yāska’s explanation of सर्व (Rigveda x. 85.20) by सर्वत्र पल्ली. Pāṇini must, therefore, have preceded Yāska; else how can we account for such omissions in a grammarian of the calibre of Pāṇini? The utter uselessness of these and similar negative arguments can be seen on a closer examination of the instances adduced. To obviate the last of these defects Kātyāyana gives सर्वत्रिव्यायं चावट पत्रव्ययः as a vārtika to sūtra iv. 1. 48. Kātyāyana must, therefore, have come after Yāska whose work he here presumably utilises. On the contrary, the first omission is not rectified even by Kātyāyana who gives two vārtikas (no. 7 and 8 to vi. 1.89) to explain forms like प्रार्थ and प्रपाणण but not अपाण. This would necessitate the supposition that Yāska came after Kātyāyana. A mode of argumentation which leads to such contradictory conclusions is no safe foundation for

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

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

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

1 These are: आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय; आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय।
आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय; आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय।
आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय; आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय।
आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय; आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय।
आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय; आज्ज्वय, आज्ज्वय।
"अ" अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था।
"अ" अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था।
"अ" अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था।
"अ" अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था।
"अ" अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था, अवस्था।
")
ed from a verbal root and meets the various objections raised against it,—a theory on which the whole system of Pāṇini is based, and which is, in fact, the postulate of modern Philology.¹

8. Yāska’s successors.—Many valuable works on grammar subsequent to Yāska’s Nirukta but anterior to Pāṇini’s Ashtādhyāyi have been irrevocably lost to us; for, it cannot be maintained with cogency that the extremely artificial and algebraic style of the Ashtādhyāyi could have been completely evolved by Pāṇini himself in the absence of similar tentative works preceding his. We have got for this the evidence of Pāṇini’s own sūtras, which use many technical words and formulas without having previously explained them—an omission which, as indicated by Pāṇini at i.2.53-57, is to be accounted for on the supposition that they were too well-known or already sufficiently dealt with in other works to need any exposition at his hands.

Some of these works must certainly have been in existence long after the time of the Mahābhidāsya, since we find many quotations from them in later writers. The chief founders of grammatical schools prior to Pāṇini are, Āpiśali and Kāśakṛitsna (compare Pāṇini vi. i. 92). A rule of Āpiśali² is given by the Kāśikā on vii. 3. 95,

1 Compare Max Müller’s History of Ancient Sk. Literature, pp. 161-165.

2 Such as श्रावण, ज्योतिष, व्रतीया, नृत्या, सागृह्या, पद्माणी, भड, सत्तमी, नाजात्स्, नयुक्त, अवद्याभ, वृद्धिदस, दन्त, नमित, &c., occurring respectively in i. 1. 69, ii. 3. 46, ii. 3. 2, ii. 3. 18, ii. 3. 13, ii. 3. 28, ii. 3. 60, ii. 3. 36, ii. 1. 3, ii. 1. 22, ii. 1. 5, ii. 2. 23, iii. 1. 33, iv. 1. 76, and elsewhere. These could not all have been taken from the Prātisūkyas works anterior to Yāska, since some of them appear to be unknown to that author and must have come into vogue since his day. Compare also Pāṇini i. 3. 120, अवद्याभस्याः, मारकसप्तः, where Hānttojī says, आशिति दशस्या पापायः. 3 आपि सुम्बूः सुवस्वायम्: गार्ग्यप्रवृत्तिः व वापसिः पदन्ति।

²[Sk. Gr.]
while elsewhere it gives us the information that the grammar of Kāśakṛitisna consisted of sūtras thrown into three Adhyāyas.¹ Kaiyyaṭa on v. i. 21 actually gives portions of the text of both these grammarians²—and this is about all the information that we possess regarding these two ancient grammarians. To later writers like Bopadeva³ they are probably little more than mere names.

9. The so-called Aindra treatises.—The case stands a little different with Indra or Indragomin. Pāṇini nowhere mentions this name except under the general appellation of ‘the easterners’. An oft-quoted passage from the fourth taraṅgā of the Kathāsaritsāgara informs us that the school which Pāṇini supplanted was known as the Aindra school, and numbered among its adherents Kātyāyana alias Vararuchi, Vyāḍi, and Indradatta. Hiuen Tsang the Chinese pilgrim, and Tārānātha the Tibetan historian, both relate a similar story, the latter adding that the Chāndra vyākaraṇa agrees with Pāṇini, and the Kālāpa vyākaraṇa with the Aindra. Tārānātha also states that God Kārūtika revealed the Aindra vyākaraṇa to Saptakānyā (or Sarva-)varman (compare section 64, below). Further corroborative evidence is furnished by a passage⁴ from the Taittiriya-saṁhitā (vii. 4. 7), which speaks of Indra as the first of grammarians. To all this Dr. Burnell

---

¹ Compare the Kāśikā on v. 1. 58, and iv. 2. 65: निर्माणार्थ।
² चिन्तकोपिनीयसारस्याङ्गणम्।
³ अच्छविद्वारापृष्ठजये।
⁴ अर्थार्थदाना परस्परायोबिज्ञाया।
⁵ तृतीयसौन्दर्यद्वैतिकोपिनी॥
⁶ अविभाजित।
⁷ अविभाजित॥
further adds that the Tolkappiyam, one of the oldest Tamil grammars, represents itself to be full of the Aindra system, and was read in the Pāṇḍya King’s assembly and there met with approval. This Tolkappiyam is closely related to Kātantra, to Kachchhāyana’s Pāli grammar, and to the Prātiṣṭākhyas, all of which are to be regarded as treatises belonging to the Aindra school of grammarians. The conclusion which Dr. Burnell reaches is that the Aindra was the oldest school of Sanskrit grammar, and that Aindra treatises were actually known to and quoted by Pāṇini and others, and that Aindra treatises still exist in the Prātiṣṭākhyas, in the Kātantra, and in similar works, though they have been partly recast or corrected. And again, the Aindra treatises belong to a system older than Pāṇini’s, though there is perhaps reason to believe that not one of them is, as a whole, older than the grammar of the last.

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

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

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

**The School of Panini**

10. **The School of Pāṇini.**—The work which brought to a focus these tentative efforts of the early grammarians² and by its accuracy and thoroughness eclipsed all its predecessors, dominating the thoughts of generations of thinkers even to present times, is the Ashtādhyāyī of Pāṇini. It stands—and it will always stand as long as Sanskrit continues to be studied—as a monument at once of encyclopedic research and technical perfection. The work is also interesting in that it is probably the oldest surviv-

---

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

² In his sūtras Pāṇini refers to the Northern and the Eastern schools of grammarians and to the following ten individual authors: आपिशालि, कादेप, गार्वि, गालम, चालकत्वम, मार्क्य, शाकट, शाक्तिव, सन्तक, and स्त्रोडाय. It would not be far from the truth to assume that in one way or another Pāṇini’s work was an improvement upon those of his predecessors. Some of them may have confined their attention merely to the Vedic and some to the post-Vedic Literature, or, treating of both, must have given less attention to current speech and more to the scriptures. The Vedāṅga spoken of by Yāska must be such a treatise and not the Ashtādhyāyī.
ing specimen of that type of literary activity which found expression in the aphoristic style.

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

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

---

1 That the sūtra-form was not new in Pāṇini’s days is evident from the sūtra v. 1.58: संस्कार-धार संवदासस्यन्तःस्थापत्येदु।
3 Introduction to the Subhāṣitāvali, p. 58.
4 Towards the end of Kṛṣṇa ii.
5 Compare 1.176; See also Indian Antiquary, vol. iv. p. 107.
we are no longer required to connect Patañjali with Subandhu.

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

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

---

1 History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, as quoted by Goldstücker in his note 91, p. 80 (Reprint, p. 60) of Pāñini, His place &c.
2 Goldstücker, loc. cit., p. 243 (Reprint, p. 197). This view of Goldstücker, however, is not strictly accurate. Pāñini must have known some form of the Grīhya and the Dharma sūtras. In his sūtra iv. 4.71 Pāñini mentions prohibited places or times for study:

अश्याचिन्नतेषुरुक्तालब्र. Patañjali in the Mahābhāṣya (vol. ii, p. 386) explains what prohibited places (स्पः स्थान) or times (अस्मतात्मथा ब्रज्ञानी) are meant. These prohibitions are embodied in works of the Grīhya or Dharma sūtra type, and Pāñini must be thinking of some such works existing in his days. I owe this note to Professor Pathak.
the Vedas have done much to throw a doubt over the starting point for Ancient Indian Literature accepted by Professor Max Müller and other writers, the best thing, in the absence of any positive evidence, is a suspension of judgment. In another place (pp. 6-7) we have given reasons for agreeing with Goldsticker in accepting the priority of Yāska over Pāṇini. Perhaps 700 to 600 B.C. would be as near an approximation to Pāṇini’s time as, in our present state of knowledge, or rather want of knowledge, we are likely to get.

12. The view that Pāṇini cannot be placed before B.C. 350 examined.—The fact that Pāṇini in iv. 1.49 (एक्षरसन्तममः पद्धतिः गुर्भविमारणवनमानादनात्मापितामातुम्) mentions Yavanās (and the female formation Yavanāni from the stem) has led most western scholars to put down Pāṇini to a date not earlier than B.C. 350. The underlying assumptions are: i. that ‘Yavanā’ can designate none but the Ionian Greeks, and ii. that India did not have her knowledge of ‘Yavanā’ prior to Alexander’s invasion, B.C. 327. Now regarding point i. the late Dr. Rājendralal Mitra in his ‘Indo-Aryans’ gave ample evidence to prove that for no period of Indian history could we be quite certain that the word Yavana necessarily designated the Ionian Greeks. But even if we agree to wave this consideration for the present, point ii. is by no means a settled fact. The ‘v’ sound in the word ‘Yavana’ represents an original digamma (Ϝ) in Greek; and as the digamma was lost as early as B.C. 800, the Sanskrit word ‘Yavana’ must be at least as old as the ninth century before Christ. The Ionians appear in history long before B.C. 1,000 and it is not at all improbable that the Indians knew them, as well as their neighbouring races,—such as Assyrians (अध्यात्मक-अध्यात्मक), Skythians (शक-शक्करयानिय), Medes (मर-वैद-दवै), Persians (पारसीक), Parthians (पठप), etc.—perhaps centuries before Alexander’s invasion. At any rate if Indian troops are
known to have formed part of the army of Darius in the battle of Plataeæ (B.C. 479), India's knowledge of the Greeks can go back to the middle of the fifth century before Christ. The fact is—and scholars are just beginning to recognise it—that we have been too hasty in condemning the Pauranic accounts of the frontier tribes and races (e.g. those in the Vishṇupurāṇa or in the Mahābhārata, Bīshmaparvan, Chap. xi) as purely imaginative fabrications. We have so far altogether ignored the extensive commerce and interchange of ideas that went on between the Indian Aryans and their brethren beyond the frontiers as far as the Mediterranean—and this long before B.C. 400. So much so that when other independent proofs vouch for the antiquity of an author (in the case of Pāṇini we shall discuss these proofs presently) the burden of proof rests with the person who maintains that some specific reference in that author belongs to a later and not to an earlier time, when, so far as facts go, the reference might just as well be to an earlier period.

Nay, more. In this particular case Pāṇini's reference must certainly belong to the earlier period. Compared with Kātyāyana's knowledge about the Yavanas that of Pāṇini is very slight. Pāṇini did not know that the Yavanas had a script of their own (comp. यवनाहिंस्यम्, Kātyāyana's vārtika 3 to iv. 1.49), or at least in his time there was no current Sanskrit word for that script. Nor was the fact that the Yavanas had a native-place and a kingdom of their own sufficiently known to Sanskrit literature, as is evidenced by Kātyāyana's vārtika कम्बोजादिस्यो हर्षचन्द्र चोडार्थपीत्रि । o. चोडकड्कर्कर्तल (झक्कवन्त)चर्चे to iv. 1.175—supposing of course that झक and यवन form a genuine part of the कम्बोजादिगण. Such slight acquaintance with the Yavanas, therefore, as Pāṇini betrays cannot have belonged to a time subsequent to Alexander's invasion.
But there is also independent evidence to prove that Pāṇini lived before Alexander’s invasion. The internal evidence which compels us to presuppose at least a couple of hundred years between Patanjali and Katyāyana, and Katyāyana and Pāṇini—an evidence which even Vincent Smith finds himself compelled to accept (Early Hist. 3rd. ed., p. 451, note 4)—has been indicated in note 1, page 28 below. The most important of external evidence that has been lately brought forward (by Mr. Vishvanāth Kāshināth Rājvāde in the ‘Kesari’ for 30th August 1910) is Pāṇini’s mention of the town Sāṅgala (Gr. Sāṅgala, Sk. Sāṅkala) in the sūtra ग्रीकसांगलियाः (iv. 2. 75). Pāṇini derives the name of the town from the proper name Sāṅkala. Sāṅkala is a city completed by (Prince?) Sāṅkala. This city Alexander razed to the ground as a punishment for the stout resistance of its defenders (Vincent Smith, loc. cit., page 75), and Pāṇini could not have thereafter spoken of it in the manner in which he does. Pāṇini, therefore, must have lived before Alexander’s invasion.

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

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

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

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

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

1 शालातुरियामक्कला-कल्याणचन्द्रमोही &c, from गणरसमहोदयि stanza 2.
from his native place. Cunningham has identified Śālātura with the present Lahaur in the Yusufzai valley. In the
days of Hiuen Tsang the valley was known as Udyāna
and Śālātura was a prosperous town. To-day it is an obs-
cure deserted village in the North-western Frontier Pro-
vince, near Attock. In his Mahābhāṣyā1 Patañjali gives
another bit of biographical information about Pāñini
whom he calls दस्तिष्टे. Dākshi then was Pāñini's mother.
The Kathāsaritsāgara (tārāṅga 4) makes Pāñini a contem-
porary of Kātyāyana and Vyādhi and Indradatta, along
with whom he studied at the house of वधप्रमाण रंग. Not
succeeding in his studies Pāñini practised penance and
received from God Śiva the fourteen pratyāhāra sūtras.
The story about his death from a tiger2 as recorded in
Pashchatantra, if based on fact, may or may not refer to
our Pāñini. And this is about all that we know of
Pāñini's personality.

14. Character of Pāñini's work.—Pāñini's work consists of
nearly four thousand sūtras thrown into eight adhyāyas
of four pādās each; hence its name Ashtādhyāyī. The text
of the sūtras has come down to us almost intact. A doubt
exists as to the genuineness of only five3 of these sūtras,
and that is because they are given in the Mahābhāṣyā as
vārtikas to the sūtras just preceding them. When we say
that the text has been preserved intact, it is not meant
that it is exactly as we find it in any of our current
editions. The late Dr. Kielhorn drew attention4 to the

1 सर्वसंवृत्तेः सूत्रश्रव्य चापिनि; Kielhorn's ed. vol. i. p. 75.
2 गईरत्रा सत्त्रमांस्क रत्नादिग्रमण्य
वियासपाटिने; Tantra II, stanza 33.
3 Namely, two between iv. 3.131
and 122 and v. 1.36, vi. 1.62,
and vi. 1.100,—the last three
being given in the Mahābhā-
shyā as vārtikas to the sūtras
immediately preceding. The
tendency to regard as sūtra
what is given as vārtika, and
vice versa, has created some
confusion in the exact enumer-
tion of the sūtras. The whole
matter needs to be critically
studied. Compare Goldstücker
page 29 (Reprint, p. 21), note
26.
4 Indian Antiquary, volume xvi,
page 179,
fact that the text of the sūtras has not received from the editors all the care that is necessary. All that we mean is that with sufficient pains we can restore from the vārtikas and the Mahābhāshya the exact words as they were used by Pāṇini himself. Changes have been suggested in more than one place by more than one writer, but they were not actually made until after the times of Chandragomin, the Kāśikākāras, and subsequent writers.

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

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

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

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

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

To simplify matters we must, in the first place, dispose of a large number of nouns which are derived from other nouns by the addition of the so-called taddhita affixes (iv.i.76—v.4). Then it is that we reach the substantive divested of all external wrappings. But may not there be some changes in the very body of the nouns which we can explain? It is only when we have done that (vi.4—vii.4) that we are at liberty to style the residual as ‘अक्षुप्रक्रियात्मक घटितार्थकः’—unless, of course, we intend to step outside the rôle of a mere grammarian, as distinguished from a philologist, and try to trace even these back to some more primitive verb-stems. Pāṇini has made his contribution to philology in the form of the Uṇādi-sūtras (see below, § 16).

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

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

---

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

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

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

1 Compare Mahābhāṣya on vii. 1, 18: अथवा पूर्वस्थलानिद्वेशोषयम्। पूर्वस्थलेषु वेदतत्वम् न तैरिदेशका-पाणि किमयते।

grammars. But for the intrinsic difficulty of the task and for the fact that we have no extant authority earlier than the Mahābhāṣya, which knows the Auḥśūdhayā in practically the same form in which we have it now,—here would be a splendid problem in textual criticism.
class, but rather give merely a few leading types. Pāñini in his sūtras gives only the first word of a gaṇa and they have hence been considerably tampered with since his times. So, although we cannot be certain whether any one word now found in the Gaṇapāṭha existed in Pāñini’s day, still the bulk of our present Gaṇapāṭha may safely be considered as coming from the hands of the grammarian himself.

The next device to secure brevity was the invention of peculiar technical symbols such as च, पष, छक, छु, छप &c. Some of these may have been known to Pāñini from his predecessors, while others were probably of his own creation. Patañjali distinctly tells us that दि, हु and म were known to him already.¹

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

---

¹ Mahābhūṣāṇa on i. 2. 53, and Kaiyāṭa in the same place.
² Pāñini shows that a particular sūtra is an adhikāra sūtra by i. the word पर्कु followed by a word in the ablative case occurring in a subsequent sūtra to which the adhikāra is to continue; as in i. 4. 56; 2. ³ Pāñini viii. 2.1—पुर्वप्रचारितं द्वितिते गये—c. g. i. 2. 48, where दि has it; 3. giving a numerical value to some mute letter added to the sūtra; c. g. इ (=2) is supposed to be added to व. 1. 30 to show the extent of the adhikāra; and 4. द्वारायांतः विशेषयमन्यिनि; गये.
There is yet one more device serving the same end which remains to be mentioned and of which so much was made in later grammatical speculations: namely, the use of the paribhāṣās or canons of interpretation. Some of them are enunciated by Pāṇini himself, but a larger number he found already current in his day, and so used them tacitly, and the task reserved for later grammarians was to discover what facts in Pāṇini’s sūtras imply the use of what particular paribhāṣās.¹

16. Treatises accessory to Pāṇini’s Ashtādhyāyī.—In addition to the Ashtādhyāyī, Pāṇini put together a Dhātupātha or list of roots, a Gaṇapātha or list of words which behave alike grammatically, and Uṇādi-sūtras in some form or other. Regarding the first, Pāṇini mentions in the sūtras themselves all the ten classes and even some of their sub-divisions just as they occur in the Dhātupātha.² The anubandhas of the Dhātupātha, further, have the same significance³ as those of the Ashtādhyāyī. These facts tend to establish Pāṇini’s authorship of the Dhātupātha. We have already spoken (p. 23 above) about the Gaṇapātha, which also in the main belongs to Pāṇini.

The question as to the authorship of the Uṇādi-sūtras cannot be so easily settled. They are commonly supposed to be the work of Śakaṭāyana on the basis of statements found in the Nirukta⁴ and the Mahābhāshya,⁵ according to which Śakaṭāyana agreed with the रूपकक्रम in deriving

1 For the distinction between the परिभासायु and the शास्त्रकृत्य and the whole question of Pāṇini’s use of paribhāṣās see Goldstücker, pp. 106-118 (Reprint, pp. 81-90).
2 Compare i. 3. 1 ; ii. 4. 72 and 75 ; iii. 1. 26, 55, 69, 73, 77, 78, 79, 81; iii. 3. 104; vi. 1. 15; vii. 1. 59; vii. 2. 45; &c.
3 Westergaard’s Radices Linguæ Sanscritæ, pp. 342, 343.
4 Nirukta i. 4. 1 : नामावधायायानाति शाक्तायानो रूपकक्रमः.

⁴ [Sk. Gr.]
all nouns from roots. Since, however, no work of Śākaṭāyana has come down to us, and since the Śabdānuśāsana which now passes under his name is a comparatively late production (see below, § 52), we cannot say whether this ancient Śākaṭāyana left behind him any work in justification of the views which he doubtless held.

On the other hand the Unādi-sūtras exhibit unmistakeable marks of Pāṇini’s system. They use saññās such as उद्धरण, दौर्धर, प्रभुव, उद्धात, उपपथ, तोप, संप्रत्यारण, and अस्वास in the same sense in which Pāṇini uses them. The anubandhas of the Unādis are also similar to Pāṇini’s. This raises a strong presumption that the Unādi-sūtras are the work of Pāṇini himself; and it is further corroborated by the fact that Kātyāyana in more than one place takes objection to the technical application of a rule in the Ashtādhyāyī urging that it does not hold good in the case of particular Unādi-sūtras—an objection which could not have been urged unless Kātyāyana regarded Pāṇini to be the author of the Unādis; for, Pāṇini was not to be expected to frame rules that would hold good in other people’s works.¹ There is no reason why we should not accept this conclusion.

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

---

¹ Examples are vii. 3, 50, vii. 4, 13, viii. 2, 78, and viii. 3, 59. In most of these cases Kātyāyana has the remark उपासिन पति-पेयोर पत्त्वय: or words to this effect. Patañjali’s defence of Pāṇini is throughout grounded on the fact that उपासिन पति-पेयोर वासिन वासिनि।

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

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

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

1 In the रूपमात्र, the India Office Ms. of which is dated 1381 A.D., we find: रुपाविश्रुवकरणाय प्रसादिता हरसिद्धा पुष्पेषु पुजनानि मण्ड्यानि । तहयाः पुष्पावनि एतेऽनि च.
2 He begins his com. on the द्वार section of the Kātantra with the verse: सुरासिद्धयानि स्वरूपः। द्वाराः प्रवर्ते वतः। वास्तविकषणां हेतु विवेकमार्थतिष्ठते। The kritis in this school also include the Uṇādia, as will be seen later.
3 Śiṅgalavadha xix. 76, and Mallinātha’s commentary upon the same.
4 Compare भागोजिन्द्र on किंवद ॥ २१, where he remarks—हार किंवद्यानो पराणग्नेश्वरा आयुर्विद्याधृतकालिनी परम्योथोपयु।
5 Mahābhāṣya, vol. i. p. 2—हृद शास्त्र एतस्य। स्त्रार ५२— शरस्त्र हीनाः। &c. This stanza, however, forms a genuine part of the Mahābhāṣya, seeing that it is commented upon by Bhūṣṇe in his सहायात्मराज, Kielhorn, vol. ii. preface, p. 18, and is quoted by प्रभुभार in the Tāntravārtika, Benares ed., p. 233.
Between Pāṇini and the next great grammarian, Kātyāyana, came many authors, who attempted, more or less successfully, to emend or justify Pāṇini’s rules, and some of the metrical vārtikas found in the Mahābhāṣya probably belong to these predecessors of Kātyāyana. We must needs assume this, unless we are ready to suppose that the considerable interval of time¹ that exists between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana was altogether barren of grammatical speculations. Whoever these predecessors were, as our knowledge about their works is next to nothing, we must now pass on to Kātyāyana himself.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some of the vārtikas are written in prose, while
others are thrown into a metrical form.³ In a vast number
of cases Kātyāyana has clearly indicated the rules of
Pāṇini to which his remarks refer by repeating the sūtras
verbātim,³ or with slight changes,⁴ or by taking its most
important or introductory word. Cross references to
his own vārtikas he gives by उर्दू देश, उर्दू वा, or उर्दू प्रेषण.⁵

Kātyāyana, in that he meant to write a criticism on
Pāṇini was compelled to adhere to the latter’s termino-
logy. Notwithstanding this fact he has used स्वर for अन्न,

1 For Pāṇini’s—
अद्वैतानिलोप: 1-3-60
तत्तत्मात्रात्सरस्य: 1-3-67
हस्ताक्षरिकालेकनीसिद्धानासिकः: 1-1-5

Kātyāyana in the Prātiśākhya has—
बवर्मक्षाःस्वरस्वरस्य: लोप: 1-1-341
तत्तत्मात्रात्सरस्यादः: 1-3-39
हस्ताक्षरिकालेकनीसिद्धानासिकः: 1-3-64

2 Usually by phrases such as उर्दू वा. Compare Indian Anti-
quary, volume v, Note 2 on
the Mahābhāṣya, where Kiel-
horn discusses the whole sub-
ject.

3 Vārtika 1 to sūtra iii. 1, 33 ;

4 Vārtika 1 to sūtra iii. 1, 34 ;
5 Vārtika 1 to sūtra v. 2, 47 ;
6 Vārtika 1 to sūtra vi. 4, 14 ;
7 Vārtika 2 to sūtra iii. 4, 79 ;
—to give but one instance of
each.
19. Vārtikakārās before and after Kātyāyana.—As observed before (p. 28), Kātyāyana had several predecessors from whose works he may have taken many suggestions. In his Prātiśākhya he refers to Śaṅkāyana and Śākalya, names already quoted by Pāṇini; while in the vārtikas he refers by name to Vājapīyāyana, Vyādi, and Paushkarnasūdī, and designates a number of others under the general appellation of ete, kavita, and so forth. Some of these latter must have been scholars who, like Kātyāyana himself, subjected the wording of the sūtras of Pāṇini to a critical examination. Vyādi we know, was the author of an extensive work called Saṅgraha, referred to in the Mahābhāshya which is in fact based upon it.

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

1 Tarsāgya iv. and elsewhere: He is the Mahābhāshya author of the vārtika 2 Mahābhāshya, vol. 1, p. 8, line 2: viyardikā sākhīpatat 3 iii. 8: abhiṣekato ṣaṅkāyana 4 iii. 9: abhiṣekato āṣaṅkāyana 5 Vārtika 35 to i. 2. 64. 6 Vārtika 45 to i. 2. 64. 7 Vārtika 3 to viii. 4. 46. 8 Vārtika 4 to ii. 1. 1, &c. 9 Vol. i. p. 6, line 2; The Vākya.
some of them at least presuppose Kātyāyana is proved by kārīkā i on Pāṇini iii. 2.118, which quotes one of his vārtikas. Unfortunately none of these successors of Kātyāyana are known to us otherwise than through quotations made by Patañjali in his Mahābhāshya. We must therefore next pass on to Patañjali, with whom ends the first period in the history of the Pāṇiniya school.

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

Regarding the personal history of Patañjali very little is known. He was a contemporary of Pushpamitra and probably much honoured by him for his learning. It is usual to suppose that the epithets Gonardiya and Gonikāputra used in the Mahābhāshya² are his own other names

¹ The references are: Indian Antiquary i. 299–302; ii. 57, 69, 94, 266–10, 238, and 362; xv. 2 Vol. i. pp. 78, 91, 336, &c, 80–84; xvi. 156, 172; and

² Goldstücker, pp. 228–38 (Reprint, pp. 175–183).
derived from his native place and the name of his mother, but it has been shown by Rājendralal Mitra1 and Dr. Kiellhorn2 that they are distinct authors, and as such they are quoted by so early a writer as Vātsyāyana— the author of the Kāma-sūtra.3 The best account of Patanjali's time, if not of his person, is to be found in the Mahābhāṣya itself; and a detailed exposition of the religious, historical, geographical, social, and literary data as resulting from the contents of that work is to be found in the Indische Studien, xiii, pp. 293–502.

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

Regarding the text of the Mahābhāṣya the traditions recorded in the Rājatarangini4 and in the Vākyapadiya5 state that it had become so hopelessly corrupt in the time of king Abhimanyu of Kāśmir that only one authentic Ms. of it existed throughout India, from which all subsequent copies of it have been derived. The work, like

---

1 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. lli, p. 269.
2 Indian Antiquary xiv, p. 40.
3 See Kāma-sūtra, p. 67 (Kāvyana- mala edition).—According to Śāntikāra the nārāyikas are di-
4 Vide note 5 en p. 13 above.
5 [Sk. Gr.]


Pāṇini’s Ashtādhyāyi, is divided into eight adhyāyas of four pādas each, each pāda being further subdivided into from one to nine āhnikas. The Mahābhāshya does not notice all the sūtras of Pāṇini, but only such as were noticed by Kātyāyana, as also such others as Patañjali himself considered incomplete and capable of improvement. Whether the remaining were likewise commented upon by Patañjali or not is more than what we can say.¹

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

22. Chandragomin and his work.—Chandragomin² was a close student of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali, and for his work he utilized all their labours, trying in several places, in the light of the changes that had come over

---

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

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

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

1 Unless it be those of श्रीम, सिन्ध, and द्वार मentioned in the Vākyapāda, Kāśā I second, stanza 497.  
2 Itising's account of the Kāśā by वर्षाधि may not after all refer to the Kāśā. He speaks of a com. on the ग्रन्थिष्ण by Patanjali and writes as if चतुर्वार completed the वस्त्रित. However, we cannot bring the Kaśā any rather than 650 A. D., seeing that only p. 388 it mentions the Vākyapāda by name. Jayāditya then appears to be
The Kāśikā was once believed to be the work of one author variously called Vāmana, Jayāditya, or Vāmana-Jayāditya. It has now been found out that they are two distinct persons. Bhaṭṭoji Dikshita clearly distinguishes between their views, and the concurrent testimony of Mss. from all parts of India assigns to Jayāditya the authorship of the first five chapters of it, while the last three belong to Vāmana, who probably came soon after Jayāditya and certainly before the time of Jinendrabuddhi, who comments upon the whole work.

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

at least a contemporary of Bhaṭṭrihari the author of the Vākyapadīya, Vāmana who probably wrote the last three chapters of the Kāśikā came soon after Jayāditya, and Jinendrabuddhi, the author of the Nyāsa on the Kāśikā came probably before 760, seeing that he is quoted by so early an author as Bhamaha. Compare also J. B. B. R. A. S., for 1909, p. 94; Indian Antiquary, xli, pp. 232-237 and xliii, pp. 253-264.

Pāṇini v. 4, 42; ततु तर यापति-तस्मादेनस्कलयु, यामस्ति, सहव &c.

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

3 See Bāla Śastri’s edition of the Kāśikā, p. 62—चार्यं इति। तत्स्मयमाध्यायध्यायः प्रचारी स घोषायेत शाखे यथार्थत्वम् नयि। उपयोगिति: विषिष्ठेश्वरोपेयम् अङ्गम्। इत्यितिः स्था वर्णाना: सम्मालिता: गृहीता भवलि।

4 Dr. Bühler’s Report for 1875-76, p. 73.

1 Compare the मौट्यामान्यम on
The Kāśikā is a running commentary on Pāṇini's Asthādhyāyī, and its merit consists in the lucid manner in which it has explained the sūtras of Pāṇini, clearly indicating all the anuvṛttis and giving numerous illustrations for each rule. Sometimes the Kāśikā gives us information which we could not possibly have obtained from any other source. Thus on sūtra vii.3.95 it gives us a rule of Apiṣali, the grammarian who preceded Pāṇini and whose work must consequently have been known to the authors of the Kāśikā. On sūtra vii.2.17 it gives us a vārtika of the Saunāgas other than those quoted in the Mahābhāshya. These facts, however scanty by themselves, corroborate the tradition of the existence of a vast number of grammarians prior and subsequent to the time of Kātyāyana.

24. The indebtedness of the Kāśikā to Chandragomin.—The object of the Kāśikā was to embody in the Pāṇinīya system all the improvements that were made by Chandragomin. As the result of an exhaustive analysis of the text of Pāṇini's sūtras as given in the Kāśikā-vṛtti Dr. Kielhorn sums up his conclusions thus: "The text of the Asthādhyāyī as given in the Kāśikā differs in the case of 58 rules from the text known to Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Ten of these 58 rules are altogether fresh additions; nine are a result of separating (by yoga-vibhāga) the original 8 sūtras into 17. In 19 cases new words have been inserted into the original sūtras, while in the rest there are other changes in the wording &c. of the sūtras."

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

1 See above, page 9 note 3.
2 See Indian Antiqury vol. xvi, pp. 179 and following.
from the vārtikas or from the notes in the Mahābhāshya, as well as from some of the added rules. Most of the new matter found in the Kāśikā can, however, be traced to Chandragomin, from whose work he diligently draws his material without anywhere acknowledging his sources.\(^1\) This fact, as before pointed out, settles 470 A. D. as the upper limit for the date of the Kāśikā.

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

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

---

\(^1\) Thus on iv. 2. 138 Kāśikā gives the vārtika वेदव्याकरणामवृत्तयः which is Chāndra sūtra iii. 2.61; the kārikā on v. 4.77 in the Kāśikā embodies sūtras iv. 4. 72 and 73, of Chāndra, the Kāśikā further remarking त्रिवेदव्याकरणवृत्तयः सवे सुगमतिभागे. कृत्य साधयति; Pañjini's sūtra viii. 3. 118, सवेः पत्य हिंदिः, Chāndra changes into सप्तवन्दव्याकरण (vi. 4.98), following herein a vārtika of Kātyāyana (सवे हिंदिः पत्यवसे स्वन्दव्याकरणयो) ; while Kāśikā reads the sūtra itself in conformity with the Chāndra vyākaraṇa.

\(^2\) Govt. Or. Mss. Library, Madras, Ms. no. 941 gives the name as स्याविस्विद्विधानि.

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

\(^4\) Compare—अयते सारसमालय हृदया काशिका यथा। इत्यथिस्तव यथा—सत्त्विन किष्ठे पञ्चिजका तथा॥
possess not a single edition of this ancient commentary. There is no complete Ms. of it in any hitherto known collection, but the several fragments may yield a tolerably complete text. And the commentary is well worth the labours of a critical editor, to judge from such fragments of it as were available to me at the Deccan College Mss. Library.

26. Haradatta's Padamañjari on the Kāśikā.—There is another valuable commentary on the Kāśikā called the Padamañjari by Haradatta. Haradatta was, as he himself informs us, the son of Padma—(or Rudra-)kumāra, and younger brother of Agnīkumāra; while his preceptor was one Aparājita. He was probably a native of the Tamil country and may subsequently have acquainted himself with the Telugu literature, as the instance of a vernacular word (क्रियन्दे) given by him seems to indicate. The Padamañjari is quoted in the Mādhaviya Dhātu-vṛtti and by Mallinātha, and itself quotes Māgha. According to a portion of the Bhavishyottara Purāṇa giving the history of Haradatta (who is considered as an incarnat-
tion of God Śiva,) we learn that he died 3979 years after the beginning of Kali, which corresponds to 878 A.D.

This account of the Bhavishyottara Purāṇa probably does not refer to our Haradatta, seeing that it gives Vāsudeva as the name of Haradatta's father. Moreover, Haradatta's Padamañjari seems to be later than and partly based upon Kaiyyata's Mahābhāshya-Pradīpa, and we cannot assign to Kaiyyata so early a date as cir. 800 A.D., which would be necessary if Haradatta is to be put at 878. Probably, therefore, Haradatta belongs to somewhere about 1200 A.D.

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

1 Mr. Sheshagiri Shastri suggests, loc.cit., that Haradatta's father may have been a Vaishnava to begin with and may have later changed his name and become a Śaiva, just as Haradatta himself changed his original name of Sudaršana into the one which is more generally known. Some such change of name may appear to have been hinted at in the introductory stanza—विन्दु तंतुर्भृतः प्रतारयम्। सूर्यभद्रा भवेऽविन्दु भवेऽविन्दु भवेऽविन्दु॥ All this is ingenious but not convincing, and it must yield to the chronological evidence given below.

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

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

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

---

1. Compare com. on Gaṇaratna-mahodadhi, st.3—भृतरि रागसा भाषाविषयमाणसा।
2 See preface to Kielhara’s ed. of the Mahābhāshya, vol. ii.
was confined to the systems of grammar outside the Pāṇiniya school. These we shall notice in another place. For Pāṇini’s school Kaiyyaṭa’s Pradīpa marks the end of the second period of development.

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

Regarding the nature of Kaiyyaṭa’s performance it is not necessary in this place to say much. He tells us in his introduction that he followed on the lines of Hari, that is, Bhartrihari, and he may be pronounced to have been fairly successful on the whole in the task of interpreting the Mahābhāṣya. His work has been,

1 Śriyān kṛitād avadherśvarajō prastha- 

ratmagalo māvyāśich nāmām yada-

kamaseṣuṣaṣyā contemplānda 11

2 Aufrecht’s Oxford Catalogue, 
p. 247 a.

3 Are we to suppose, therefore, 
that Kaiyyaṭa had a complete 
manuscript of Bhartrihari’s 
commentary on the Mahā-

bhāṣya before him? In that case the ‘Tripadi’ alluded to in the Gaṇaratna-mahodadh (above, p. 41) must be either a distinct work, or may be no other than the Vākyapadīya itself, which is in three chapters.
in turn, commented upon by Nāgojībhatī the author of the Pradīpodyota, by Nārīyāna who has written a Vivaraṇa upon it, and by Īśvarānanda the pupil of Satyānanda who has composed another similarly named commentary. None of these writers seems to be earlier than A. D. 1600. We have already spoken of Haradatta's Padmanārjari, which is based upon Kaiyyaṭa's work.

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

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

The arrangement of the work is in the style of later Kaumudis. After treating of घट्याहार, संज्ञा, and परिभाषा the author deals with सांख्य in four sections: स्वसांख्यिम्य, प्लातातिभाव, श्लोकन्यात, and विश्वसांख्यिम्य; then follows declension in six parts: i. अजन्ततमालव, ii. हस्तन्ततमालव, iii. सखानमालव, iv. सन्त्रामालव, v. अर्थसांख्याम, vi. वद्धाम्यामालव, and vi. वद्धाम्यामालव, श्रीगत्यवथ, and वान्यी relations. The longest section deals with the अस्थायां, the peculiarities of each ग्राम being arranged under separate headings; and as an appendix we have त्वारार्थग्रामालव and तद्विनयत्तिमालव, the last giving the circumstances under which verbs change their पद्ध. The रूप and the तत्त्व occupy the next two sections, the work concluding with a chapter on समास.

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

---

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

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

There are several commentaries extant on Rāmacandra’s Prakriyākaumudi of which the most famous is the Prasāda of Vīṣṭhalāchārya. The earliest Ms. of the Prasāda is dated Śaṃvat 1605-6 = A. D. 1548-9; hence Vīṣṭhalāchārya cannot be later than 1525 A. D. As a grammarian Vīṣṭhala is disparaged by Bhaṭṭoji, who often refers to him. Vīṣṭhala, in his turn, quotes from, among others, Kāyiyaṭa, Trilochanadāsa, Kshīrasvāmin, Durgasimha, Jinendrabuddhi, Bhartṛihari, Vāmana, Haradatta, and Bopadeva.³ Vīṣṭhala tells us that he was the son of Nṛsimhāchārya and grandson of Rāmakṛishṇāchārya, while his own son was named Lakshmīdharāchārya.

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

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

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

Bhaṭṭoṇi was the son of Lakshmīdihara and the brother of Raṅgoṇi Dikshita, while his son was variously known as Bhānu-dikshita, Vīresvara-dikshita or Rāmāśrama. Regarding the other details of Bhaṭṭoṇi’s life Jagannātha, the court pandit of the Emperor Shahajahan, informs us in his Manorāmakuchamardini that Bhaṭṭoṇi was the pupil of Śesha-Krishṇa, to whose memory he does

¹ Other commentaries on मक्किया-कौश्यकोशी are स्तर by काशीप्रसाद, अमृतमुलि by धर्मोपदेशसाधकम्, तपादलि by राज्यमित्वातिसवि &c.  
² An exhaustive list is given in Aufrecht’s Oxford Catalogue, p. 162.  
³ Peterson’s report iii, p. 291. I am not sure about the truth of this statement.
very scant justice in his Prauṣṭha-Manoramā. As Jagannātha himself was the pupil of the son of this Śesha-Krishṇa, this gives us Bhaṭṭoji’s date, which must be about A. D. 1630. This is also confirmed by the fact that a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji wrote a work in Saṁvatsar 1693.2

Bhaṭṭoji himself wrote a commentary on his Siddhānta-kaumudi, called Prauṣṭha-Manoramā to distinguish it from an abridgment of the same called Bāla-Manoramā also by the same author. Besides shorter works such as commentaries on the Pāṇiniya Dhatupātha, Liṅgāṇuśāsana, &c, Bhaṭṭoji wrote the Śabda-kaustubha which is a voluminous commentary on Pāṇini’s Ashtādhīyāyi similar in plan to the Kāśikā. This was left, probably, incomplete; though he must have written as far at least as the fourth āṭhika of adhyāya iii, and not only the first pāṇḍa of the first adhyāya, as is usually supposed.3

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

1 Compare this fādhiṣṭiṣṭaḥ pādhaśtuḥ pādhaśtuḥ...

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

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

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

¹ These relations would be clear from the following genealogical table—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tāktakghr</th>
<th>शेषपूर्वपुर्ण Author of प्रकियामलाकाल</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>श्रोतिदिक्षित</td>
<td>महाजियासिद्धित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वीरेश्वर</td>
<td>शेषपूर्वपुर्ण</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भाणुवि = दरिद्रिशित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जग्बलाधरशिशित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650 A.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वासिक, नामसिद्धिशित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वासिक, नामसिद्धिशित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वासिक, नामसिद्धिशित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वासिक, नामसिद्धिशित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वासिक, नामसिद्धिशित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वासिक, नामसिद्धिशित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. The works of Nāgēśa and of Vālmikīrāṇa-Pāyugunda—Nāgēśa or Nāgoji-bhaṭṭa was a very prolific writer. Besides fourteen great works on Dharma, one on Yoga, three on Alamba, and about a dozen on Vyākaraṇa-sāstra, he has been credited with the authorship of extensive commentaries on Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa and Adhyatma-Rāmāyaṇa as also on Saptacatī, Gitagovinda, Sadhālahārī, and other works. We are here concerned with his grammatical treatises, and prominent amongst these is the Udyota on Kaiyuyu’s Mahābhāshya-pradipa; Paribhāshenduśekhara, a collection of Paribhāshās handed down in connection with Pāṇini’s grammar and followed by a concise explanatory commentary on them called the Śabdenduśekhara (in two editions a major and a minor); a commentary on the Siddhānta-kramudy and intended as a companion to the Manoramā; Śabdaratna, a commentary on the Praction-Manoramā, ascribed by him honoris causa to his teacher Hari-dikṣita; Vishamī a commentary on Bhāṭṭoji’s Śhṛda-kaustubha; and finally the Vyākaraṇa-siddhāntamanjushī (in three editions) on the philosophy of grammar.

The genealogical tree given above exhibits Nāgoji-bhaṭṭa’s spiritual descent from his illustrious predecessors; it also helps us roughly to determine his time. In addition we have a tradition current at Jeypur, and mentioned by the learned editor of the Kāvyamālā in his introduction to Rasagaṅgādhara, which refers to an invitation for a horse sacrifice received in 1714 A. D. by Nāgēśabhāṭṭa from Savāi Jeysinha, ruler of Jeypur (1688 to 1728 A.D.), an invitation which Nāgēśa courteously declined on the ground that he had taken aśheta-sannyāsa and could not, therefore, leave Benares to attend the ceremony. Regarding himself he informs us that he was a Mahratta Brahman surnamed Kāle, the son of Śiva-bhaṭṭa and Satt, a resident of Benares and a protegé of Ś [Sk. Gr.]
Rāmasimha, a local prince of Śrīngaverapura (now Singa-
rour) a few miles north of Allahabad.

Vaidyanātha or Bālambhāṭṭā Pāyaguṇḍa, a direct
disciple of Nāgēśabhaṭṭa, wrote like his teacher several
works on Dharma and Vyākaraṇa-śāstra. He was the son
of Mahādeva and Venī, and Lakshmīdevī the wife of king
Chandrasimha of Mithilā was probably his patroness, in
whose honour he is reported to have composed a com-
mentary on the Vyavahāra-kāṇḍa of the Mitāksharā,
which is usually known as Bālambhaṭṭī. His grammatical
labours are mainly confined to writing comments on the
works of his predecessors. Thus he has written a Gadā
on the Paribhāshenduśekhara, a Chhāyā on the Mahā-
bhāṣya-pradīpodyota, a Kalā on Vaiyākaraṇasiddhānta-
mañjūśhā, a Prabhā on the Šabdakaustubha, a Bhāva-
prakāśikā on the Šabdaratna, Chidasthimālā on the Šab-
denduśekhara, and a host of others.

33. Grammatical works outside the Dīkṣṭha school.—Inde-
dependently of the Dīkṣṭha school there are very few
notable names of grammarians belonging to the sev-
teenth century. We may perhaps mention, as belonging
to the early decades of the century, Annambhaṭṭa the
author of the Tarkasaṅgraha, who has written an inden-
pendent commentary¹ on the Ashtādhyāyī, called Mitā-
ksharā. The school of profound grammarians which is
now almost dying out was already on the decline since
the middle of the eighteenth century, as is evidenced by
the numerous easy manuals that have come into existence
during the last two centuries. Some of these popular
epitomes ally themselves to no particular school, and these
will be dealt with in another part of the essay. We now
confine our attention to those belonging to the Pāṇiniya
school.

¹ Published in the Benares Sanskrit Series.
34. Abridgements and Manuals.—Prominent among these are the abridgements of the Siddhānta-Kaumudi itself by Varadarāja. There are three editions of them—a madhya-, a laghu-, and a sūra-Siddhāntakaumudi,—the difference consisting only in the more or less thorough eschewing of unnecessary details. Strange as it may seem, even these epitomes stood in need of commentaries for their further simplification, or rather the reverse of it. The major abridgment was commented upon by Kāmaśarman at the request of one Śivānanda; the middle one by a Jayakrishṇa, son of Raghunātha-bhaṭṭa and grandson of Govardhanabhāṭṭa of the Mauni family.1 There are a few other easy texts framed independently of the Siddhāntakaumudi, but they hardly deserve special mention. The last stage of this progressive simplification is perhaps reached when we come to works such as Rupāvali, Samāsachakra, etc.

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

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

---

1 The विजयित कोशिदर has a similar abridgment called विजयित, the work of one of the pupils of the author, जयंत, and written in A.D. 1631 (?).
Kśīraśvāmin. A Kāsmīrīan tradition makes him teacher to
king Jayāpiḍa, which brings him into the eighth century.
This conflicts with the fact that Kśīraśvāmin quotes
Bhoja, and in so far as he is quoted by Vardhamāna in the
Gaṅaratnamahodadhī, this settles his date, which is roughly
1050 A. D. 1 Besides the Dhatuvṛtti Kśīraśvāmin wrote
five other works: i. commentary on the Amarakosha, ii.
निपतात्‌योपसर्गस्तिनि, iii. अस्तित्वाद्विणिष्ठिनि referred to in the
Dhatuvṛtti (which is more usually known as क्रिरस्तिनिष्ठिनि),
iv. निपितसम्बन्धिति mentioned by Devarāja in his Niruktanirvaluate,
chaṇa, and v. Gaṅavṛtti referred to by Vardhamāna in his
Gaṅaratnamahodadhī, a work presently to be mentioned.

In the introduction to the Dhatuvṛtti Kśīraśvāmin
notes that several people, including the great Chandra,
had essayed before him to write about the roots, but
not always successfully. 2 The Chandra here referred to
must be Chandragomin, the founder of the Chānda school,
whose Dhatupāṭha was subsequently incorporated by
Durgasimha with the Kātantra grammar. About the
nature of the contents of the Dhatuvṛtti Kśīraśvāmin
tells us that one can find therein:

स्त्रयास्याकाखाण्डत: गौतमानं सत्तत्त्वविनियोगस्तिनि: पतंच च।
अप्रत्यायणम् विक्षेपणयोगम प्रातोपर्यतेऽप्परं विनियोगस्तिनि: विक्षेपम्॥

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

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

1 See Introduction to Mr. Oka’s
edition of Kśīraśvāmin’s
com. on Amara.
2 Compare—भाषा: पारावर्णकाश्य-
these may be mentioned, as belonging to the Pāṇinīya school, Bhāmasena and Maitreyarakshita. Of Sāyana's successors we need only specify Bhaṭṭoji and Nāgasa. The Dhātupāṭhas belonging to the other grammatical schools will be found in their proper places elsewhere.

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

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

1 See note 1 on page 39, above.
2 Cambay, No. 266; परदेशस्पष्ट पौराणिक मंगल
   वर्गां मध्य वैश्वनारायणां

विविध विवधानयत्र। हिंदुमहर्ष तत्त्व वि
समस्त विद्याप्रज्ञानों ग्राम परिक्षि
&c. See also Dr. Petersen's
these works prior to 1200 A. D., and, if Dr. Peterson's identification of Vāmanāchārya with the author of the Kāśikā be correct, prior also to 800 A. D.

39. Uṇāḍipāṭha.—The question as to the authorship of the Paṇiniya Uṇāḍi-sūtras has been already dealt with (p. 25, above). These Uṇādis have been very readily absorbed—with only slight modifications—by the various non-Pāṇiniya schools such as Kātāntra, Haîma, Jaumara, Saupadma, &c. In the school of Pāṇini the future development of the Uṇādis has been only by way of commentaries, the best known being Ujjvaladatta's Vṛtti, which, as pointed out by Aufrecht in his introduction to his edition of that work, must be assigned to cir. 1250. Ujjvaladatta quotes the Vṛittis of Kshapaṇaka, Govardhana, Purushottamadeva, and the Sāti-vṛtti,—all of which preceded his own commentary. Later than Ujjvaladatta come Māṇikyadeva, Bhaṭṭoji, and others.

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

Report iii. p. 41. The Jinen- 2 For the distinction between यत्र- dra here mentioned must be भाषासूच्च and ज्ञापकसूच्च and the the founder of the Jainendra- whole theory of paribhāṣās Vyākaranā.

1 Goldstücker: Pāṇini, page 114 see ibidem, pp. 115 (Reprint, (Reprint, p. 87). p. 89) and the following.
paribhāṣās that eventually it has become, for the Pāññiniya student, the hardest nut to crack. This feat has usually been attempted in the body of the commentaries themselves. Regular treatises specially dealing with paribhāṣās come much later. Perhaps the earliest known is that of Siradeva, who is quoted in the Mādhavīya-Dhātu-vṛtti. Nāgēśa’s Paribhāṣhenduśekhara contains the most popular exposition of the paribhāṣās, and it has been commented upon by Pāyaguṇḍa, Bhairavamisra, Śesarasman, Bhimabhaṭṭa, and many others. Non-Pāññiniya schools copied most of their paribhāṣās from Pāñini, the earliest of them being the Kātaṇṭra for which Durgasimha put together a list of paribhāṣās and wrote a commentary on the same.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chāndra School

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

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

2 In the passage cited Mallinātha says that while Pāṇini allows only the form विष्णु Chandra allows विष्णु also. As a matter of fact Chandra allows only one form (Chāndra sūtra vi. 1.42); it is Śēkhaśyana and Hemachandra who allow both the forms, which are indiscriminately used in classical Sanskrit. Presumably, therefore, Mallinātha either had access to a work of the Chāndra school not known to us, or more probably he meant by Chandra Hemachandra, unless the whole is a positive mistake. I owe this note to Mr. Krishnāji Govinda Oka, editor of the Kahrtraraṅgīr.
have had a direct access to the Chāndra vyākaraṇa, seeing that Mss. of the work have been extremely rare, none of the various ‘Searches for Sanskrit manuscripts’ instituted by Government having been able to bring to light any works of the school except a fragment brought by Dr. Bühler from Kāśmir in 1875, and a complete copy of the Chāndra vyākaraṇa written in the Nepalese year 476 (i. e. 1356 A. D.) brought by Haraprasāda Shastri from Nepal. However, by the labours of Dr. Bruno Liebich, the whole system has now been recovered in the original or Tibetan translation. The same scholar has also published the Chāndra vyākaraṇa (Leipzig 1902). The account of the system given below is mostly based on his writings.

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

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

44. Nature of Chandragomin's work.—Chandragomin's grammar was meant as an improvement on that of Pāṇini, Katyāyana, and Patanjali, mainly in the way of greater brevity and precision. Accordingly he has omitted, for obvious reasons, the Pāṇiniya rules about Vedic accent and grammar, although he includes some Vedic roots in his Dhātupātha. He has lessened the number of pratyāśān-sūtras by one (fusing hasyastu and sād into hasyastu), omitted some of the Pāṇiniya pratyāśān and coined others. In many cases, the rules of Pāṇini are recast simply for the sake of securing facility of pronunciation. The really original contributions of Chandragomin amount to about 35 sūtras and these have been incorporated in the Kāśikā. In all these cases Kaiyysa has the remark अवर्गितायां छंये पादः. The total number of the Chandrasūtras is about 5100 as against 4000 of Pāṇini. The work consists of six chapters of four pādas each, the matter of Pāṇini's first two chapters being scattered all through.

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

1 See Vākyapadīya Kāra-la ii, stanzas 489-90 and con.
thereon.

2 Liebich, ibidem, p. 10-11; Kern: Manual of Buddhism, pp. 120,
130; also Ind. Ant. xv, pp. 183-184.

3 For Pāṇini's अंकावर्ग चित्त संप्रभु
(l. 1. 55) Chandra reads सिद्ध-संप्रभु संप्रभु (l. 1.12).
speech.' The Chāndra terminology with slight changes is that of Pañini. The mode of presenting the subject is also artificial, after the fashion of Pañini. The grammar goes by the nickname of असंज्ञक, perhaps because the संज्ञास are not here treated of separately, but probably because wherever in his sūtras Pañini has used the word संज्ञा Chandragomin uses the word नामव.

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

---

1 Compare Chāndra sūtras i. 2.30, ii. 3.77, ii. 2.14, &c, with Pañini's iii. 2.46, iii. 3.174, ii. 1.21 &c. A few cases do occur, however, where Chandra permits the use of the word: e.g. Chandra i. 1. 123=Pañini iii. 1. 112.

2 I take this occasion to publish the work entirely on the basis
the र्यान and प्रयत्न of र्यास. No work on परिभाषाः in connection with the चाँद्रा school has come down to us.

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

46. Later history of the चाँद्रा school.—We have already alluded to Chandragomin's own वृत्ति on his grammar. Fragments from it extending from about व. १. १३ to व. १. १७६ are still extant. This वृत्ति was later incorporated in a commentary by धर्मदास, a complete Ms. of which exists in the Library of the महाराजा of Nepal.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

The Jainendra School

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

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

स्मिरामद्वितीयपदं निराशायामागमति ।
देवनाथारूपेन नमस्तरमेघेविचर्ययूये॥

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

1 The Jainendra-utrapatha belongs to the Digambaras from whom the Svetambaras have borrowed it wholesale. The tradition, therefore, belongs more strictly to the Svetambaras.
2 यदि जिनेन्द्रे भौतिक निर्देश-निर्देशः विद्यादे जीवनात्मिकतिवाहः माधवाचारसमग ॥
3 Except the one above quoted, which gives a different mâyagala.
4 In the opening praśasti of the work there is a reference to the Jainendra-vyûkaraṇa, Akalâkadeva also quotes a Jainendra sutra in the tattvārthârthikā 1. 5.1.
Dr. Kielhorn once believed that Pūjyapāda was a nom de plume assumed by a late writer, with the view all the more readily to make the work pass under the name of the last Tīrthaṅkara. The historical existence of the founder of this school thus doubted by Dr. Kielhorn has been conclusively established by Professor Pathak,¹ who quotes a verse from the Nandisaṅgha Paṭṭāvali² and gives other references to prove that Devanandi was no other personage than Pūjyapāda himself.

48. Date of the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa.—The foundation of this school dates from about the same time as that of the Chāndra. If anything, the Jainendra would come a little before the Chāndra. Professor Pathak in his paper on the Jaina Śākatāyana (Indian Antiquary, Oct. 1914) gives evidence to assign the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa to the latter part of fifth century A. D. Among his arguments are: 1. the fact that the Kāśikā seems to betray a knowledge of the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa³; 2. the circumstance that the Jainendra sūtra⁴ alludes to Īśvarakṛishṇa the author of the Śāṅkhyasaṅgraha (who is assigned by Dr. Takakusu to A. D. 450) and to the twelve year cycle of Jupiter according to the heliacal rising system⁵ a system which was in vogue in the time of the Early Kadamba kings and their contemporaries, the Early Gupta kings; and 3. the collateral evidence to be derived from later references to the Jainendra from the ninth century on. Thus the Śākatā-

¹ Indian Antiquary xii, pp. 19 ff.
² यज्ञाकालिकौत्तमन्त्री देवनन्दी नाह—

यति। श्रीप्रज्ञातारथाय सुनन्दी युगमनेरी युग्मार्दृष्टि। → Contrast Paṇini, iv. 1.102. The Amoghaśuddhi of Śākatāyana explains आत्मसारिणी वार्त्त, the latter being another name for Īśvarakṛishṇa.

³ Kāśikā iii. 3.40 उच्चवस्त्र प्राचीनेऽपि

वक्तव्य: presupposes Jainendra sūtra ii, 3.36 इत्यदेवेणुक्षयस्य

चे से; as Kāśikā could not have derived it from elsewhere.

⁴ Sūtra iii, 3.134—सारद्धानकार्भिनोत्समकुलप्राप्त: भूमिसागरायणाय—

इष्क्यालाक्ष्यवस्त; Contrast Paṇini, iv. 1.102. The Amoghaśuddhi of Śākatāyana explains आत्मसारिणी वार्त्त, the latter being another name for Īśvarakṛishṇa.

⁵ Sūtra iii. 2.5 उच्चवस्त्रायणाय की।
yana Śabdānusāsana (which dates from 1025 A.D., as we shall see) is largely indebted to the Jainendra. A Digambara Darśanaśāstra of 853 A.D. mentions, as stated by Dr. Peterson, a pupil of a certain Pūjyapāda as being the founder of a Draviḍa-saṅgha. Lastly, an inscription from the Śaṅkhābasti temple at Lakshmīśvara records a gift in Śaka 652 (730 A.D.) of Śrī-Pūjyapāda to his house-pupil, although this last is not quite a trustworthy evidence, being not contemporaneous, and there may have been more than one Pūjyapāda.

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

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

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

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

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

---

1 Such as त्य for मलयन, य for कार्ह-घर्ण, म for परमेश्वर, अम for अर्जुयातुः, and so on.
2 Namely, श्रेष्ठ, यशोदा, युतियालि, नाभार्य, सिन्धुसेन, & समलज्जन.
3 प्रेतेराष्ट्रीय(?), राजे मगाधप्रस्थवत्। नेपालिङ्गमतं सीमः प्रसन्नज्ञानविप वेदं। चिन्ताय सचतं। "राजे मगाधप्रस्थवं सीवमात्र।"
been preserved, one by Abhayanandi whose date is probably 750 A.D., and another called Śadbārjāvā-chandrīkā by Somadeva. Somadeva represents himself as the contemporary of the Śilāhāra King Bhojadeva (Bhoja II) and an inhabitant of Ajurikā (which is probably to be identified with अजुर in the Kolhapur State). It is probable that in addition to these two commentaries that have come down to us, some others were written, and possibly the grammar was at one time made the object of diligent study; but our information on this point is extremely scanty.

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

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

---

1 Compare the Colophon—श्रवणमय अनन्येश्वरप्रेमात्राः प्रविष्टः समाज्ञः
   भाषा—जितामरम्—शब्दाकृति—
   राजस्वाधिकारादिक शासनसंहिताः—भूषेर्दीर्घाकृतिपूर्वक अनुसरणमाधिकारकमार्गायम्
2 Indian Antiquity, i, p. 75; Dr. Petrie’s Report for 1883-84, pp. 67 ff.
to be attended to when the original on which it was based came to be studied more and more. It was meant to appeal to a sect and even there it was not without a rival. To this day it draws a solitary student here and there from amongst the Digambara Jains, especially of Southern India.

**The Saktayana School**

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

52. **The founder of the Śākaṭāyana Śabdānuśāsana not the ancient Śākaṭāyana but his modern namesake.**—The name Śākaṭāyana suggests, as we have seen, a very high antiquity in that it is quoted in the Nirukta (i. 3) and in Pāṇini’s Ashtādhyāyī (iii. 4.111, viii. 3.18, viii. 4.50). Here, however, we are dealing not with the ancient Śākaṭāyana—none of whose works have survived even in name—but with a modern or abhinava Śākaṭāyana: with the person who under this appellation is quoted, for instance, in Bopadeva’s Kāmadhenu,1 by Hemachandra, and other later writers.

---

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

53. Character of the Śākataśrama Śabdānuśāsana.—Besides the older grammarians such as Paṇini, Kātyāyana, Patanjali, and Chandragomin, Śākataśrama has freely drawn upon the work of Pañjapāda the author of the Jainendra-vyūkaraṇa. Many sutras of Śākataśrama are identical with those of Paṇini, and in cases where they differ the object has been to say in shorter and fewer words what

1 Carefully but often inaccurately: Thus in sutras iii. 4. 111 and 112, Paṇini tells us that the Imperf. 3rd pers. plur. of यत् is अयत्: only according to Śākataśrama, but not so in his own opinion. This establishes विनयपत्र. Now the modern Śākataśrama also makes the rule optional and allows both forms in his sutra आचित्वपत्र: This is what Paṇini teaches, and not what Paṇini represents Śākataśrama to have taught.

2 The most conclusive proof for this is the use of the instance अयत्वंलेष्योपदक्तस्त्रिर्म to illustrate the use of the imperfect (sutra iv. 3. 207) to describe a well-known past event which the writer might have personally witnessed but did not. There is inscriptive evidence to prove that the event in question took place shortly before Śaka 789 or A. D. 867 (see Ep. Ind. vol. i. p. 51, Ind. Ant. vol. ii. p. 181).

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

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

1 E.g. सात्तेति for आदिरिस्त्वेन सहेता of Pāṇini (i. 1. 71).

2 Instead of Pāṇini’s iv. 4. 29, परिवृत्व चा, Chandra gives वरेप्पूर्वापि and so also does Śākaṭāyana.

3 In giving Chandragomin’s improvement सक्षमिस्तवणिः च on Pāṇini’s सत्तेति (v. 1. 126) Śākaṭāyana economises one syllable by giving the sūtra as सक्षमिस्तवणिः, herein imitating Pījyapāda.

4 For Pāṇini’s हस्तर्जनाति (v. 2. 133), Chandra gives हस्तर्जनात्साहित्याति (iv. 2. 130), Jainendra gives इस्तदृ्स्तकराभ्याति (iii 4. 143), and so also does Śākaṭāyana. The like holds true of Pāṇini’s ii. 1. 18, ii. 3. 34, &c.

5 Namely Śākaṭāyana sūtras ii. 1. 229, i. 2. 13, i. 2. 37 (corresponding to Pāṇini’s v. 4. 154, vii. 1. 79, and vii. 2. 101 respectively), where Śākaṭāyana quotes सिद्ध्वन्द्विः, आचरितम्, and हस्तम्. Whether, these three names are merely पुराङ्क or there were before him grammarians of that name cannot be determined.
Pāṇini’s sūtra v. 2.128, which runs इदंतपतापतामानित्वाद्वारे, Chandra changed this into चार्ध( =दृष्ट) नाग( =उपयोग)गहितात्-त्वसति-वादेद्वृत्तामानित्वाद्, where the substantial change is the addition of the qualifying clause त्वसति. Śākaṭāyana says just what Chandra said, but instead of गहितात् puts a form which is shorter by full two syllables—रूपिन्य. In his technical terminology also he has often taken up Chāndra words in preference to Pāṇini’s wherever the former were shorter. Thus he has used नार्देश, गवार्देश, तर and अत्य, instead of निपत, मच्छमण, तामच्छमण and पमच्छमण of Pāṇini.

34. Other works of the Śākaṭāyana school.—Besides the Śabdāṇusāsana and the Amoghaavritti Śākaṭāyana is credited with the authorship of i. Paribhāṣā-sūtras, ii. Gaṇapātha in sixteen pādas, iii. Dhātupātha, iv. Uṇādi-sūtras in four pādas, and v. Lingāṇuṣasana in seventy śirṣā stanzas. Of these none is older than the corresponding Pāṇinīya treatise. One expects to find in the Uṇādi-sūtras at least traces of the ancient Śākaṭāyana and his works, but he is sure to be disappointed in his expectations. The other treatises also do not call for any special notice. Hemachandra based his own Lingāṇuṣasana on that of Śākaṭāyana, of which, in fact, it is only an enlarged edition.

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

1 The Ma. in the Jain Matha at Śrīvāna Belgoda is not, as reported, a Ma. of the Śākaṭāyana Nyāsa; it is a Ma. of Jivetra-buddhi's Kāśikavi.
no other than the Nyāsa by Prabhāchandrāchārya, which
is in the nature of a commentary on the Amoghavṛtti. 1
And ii. a commentary called Chintāmaṇi by Yakshavar-
man. This was throughout based upon the Amoghavṛtti
and lays no claim to originality. 2 Nevertheless it has been
honoured by many sub-commentaries such as the Maṇi-
prakāśikā by Ajitasenaḥchārya, Chintāmaṇipratipada by
Maṅgarasa, and a Tippani by Samantabhadra.

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

1 Regarding the Amoghavṛtti, Śākaṭāyana's own commentary
on his sūtras, see Professor Pāthak's paper (Ind. Ant. for
October 1914).

2 Compare—वस्त्रातिविवती दृष्टि संक्षे-
त्ये लघुविवती। सम्पूर्णतमादाय दृष्टि-
योजये न्यासस्या॥ Extracts to
prove the dependence of this
commentary on the Amoghavṛtti are given by Professor
Pāthak, loc. cit.

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

The Hemachandra School

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

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

1 That Śakaṭāyana was Svetāmbara Jain is proved by the numerous references to the Āvaśyaka-sūtra, Chheda-sūtra, Nīryukti, Keliṣa-sūtra, and other Svetāmbara works found in the Amoghaśālīti.

2 Besides the sūtras found in Hemachandra’s writings this work is based upon the Bhaṭṭācārya and Mahānūpārā’s (1250 A. D.), Praṭāndikādhyāya by Mahāsūrā (1305-6 A. D.), Praṇādikā by Pṛabandha (1348-9 A. D.), and Pṛabandha by Sūgarcandra (1486-9 A. D.).
good pious woman, and the birth and the greatness of her would-be son was conveyed to her in a dream which was interpreted for her by a religious teacher named Devachandra.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hemachandra wrote a commentary on his own śūtras called Śabdānuśāsana-Bṛihadvṛtti. This commentary is profuse and learned, quoting the views of many writers—always under the general appellation of अत्र, परः, भावः, एकः, कारित्व etc.—for approval in some cases and refutation in most others. A commentary called Nyāsa on this Bṛihadvṛtti identifies a large number of these quotations² and if properly edited along with Hemachandra’s Bṛihad-

¹ Some typical instances will be found collected by Professor Pathak in the Indian Antiquary for October 1914, page 209. That Hemachandra does now and then add a bit of his own is proved by instances like the śūtra परे मध्ये घट्या वा (Pāṇini ii. 1. 18), which Śaṅka-ṭāyana gives as परे नवभेदः पर्वत्या (वर), while Hemachandra gives as परे मध्येभेदः पर्वत्या वा.

² These are: इन्द्रगीमित्व, उष्ण, उत्पाध्याय, कल्लन्त, कलापक, कामिः, काव्यात्, शीरसस्वात्, चन्द्रगीमित्व, जगन्नित्व, नागरित्व, द्रवीत्व, न्यासनित्व, परियम, भाष्यकार (otherwise शब्दराज or श्रीकृष्ण), मोज, वचन, वासिककार, प्रकाष्णविद्या, नित्यानाथेन, तुत्पात्त, and many others. The उपाध्याय is probably कृत्व, while शतायत्त is probably the same person who is quoted in the Amoghavṛtti at iv. 1. 252–3.
vritti it is very likely to shed considerable light on many a dubious point in the history of Indian grammar. At the end of each pada of the vritti Hemachandra, by way of praçasti, has added a stanza in praise of his patron and his family. They are all given together in a note to Dr. Bluhler’s pamphlet above referred to, and are written in the usual classical style of flattery.

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

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

1 Namely—क्लिकिर्तिः, पर्वतमलचर्या, भृषीतिः, भृतिः, उम्बितमपतिः, द्विप्रय, बिरितिः एवं परिप्रयि.\
Hemachandra. Here, as in most of the commentaries on the Śabdānusāsana, the colophons of the original work are mistaken for those of the commentaries themselves.

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

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

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

61. Digests and manuals and other miscellaneous works.—Smaller manuals based on Hemachandra's Sabdanusasana have also come down to us, the most famous by far being the Haima-laghuprakriya by Vinayavijayagana, pupil of Kirtivijayagana. It was composed in Samvat 1710 = 1652 A. D. A commentary on it called Haima-prakasa was also written by the author some twenty-five years later. A second digest referred to above, called Haimakaumudi alias Chandraprabha, was put together in Samvat 1725 (= 1669 A. D.) by Meghavijaya, one of the sūris who "by the command of the lord of the country (Desapati) were provided with quarters for the rainy season in the palace of Agarāvara." This work is said to have been the model for the Siddhāntakaumudi. The facts may have been just otherwise.

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

1 Compare the following stanza from the Pradasi:—

2 Compare: śrīh-pauruṣādhipitē vṛttaṇ-
who wrote a Śabdānuśāsan of his own and composed a commentary on it during the life-time of Hemachandra himself, if we are to trust the evidence furnished by the instance of Mahāyāna-pratīyāhāras given in the commentary. This would make Mahāyāna flourish between A. D. 1143 and 1174. Mahāyāna, unlike Hemachandra, used pratīyāhāras and followed on the lines of the Kātantra as well as Śāktāyana. Unfortunately, the only Ms. of this work that has so far come to light is incomplete, and nothing further could be said of this work here.

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

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

The Kātantra School

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

1 See Dr. Kielhorn's report for 1880-81, page 60.
2 (St. Co.)
Vyākhyānaprakriyā\textsuperscript{1} which says that this grammar was primarily designed for the use of—

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
छाल्स: स्वतःपतसतय: \text{शाक्कान्तीरतस्त्रयथे}।
\end{center}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
ईश्वरा \text{व्यागिनिषत्तात्त्वालस्युतात्रथे}।
\end{center}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
वाणिज्यस्पाहिन्दसका \text{दीक्षावाचारदिषु स्थिता}।
\end{center}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
तेनं \text{किंचन प्रवोधार्थम}।
\end{center}
\end{quote}

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

64. Traditional account about Sarvaavarman, the founder of the school.—The Kātantra is otherwise known as Kaumāra or Kālāpa, and the traditional explanation\textsuperscript{2} of the genesis of these two names is as follows: There once lived in the Deccan a king called Sātavāhana\textsuperscript{3} who, while one day having jala-keli with his queen, was requested by her “मानदये देवि राजम्,” meaning “Pray, do not sprinkle any more

\textsuperscript{1} Ms. No. 316 of 1875–76 from the Deccan College Library.

\textsuperscript{2} The tradition is mentioned in Dr. Bübler’s Report for 1875–76, p. 74, and detailed in the शास्त्रार्थार्थयोगिनिषसाहि by बुध-साम्राज्य, a Ms. of which is No. 50 of Notices, Second Series, by Haraprasada Bhaṭṭaṛi.

\textsuperscript{3} Is he to be identified with the Andhra King of that name mentioned on p. 208 of V. A. Smith’s Early History of India, third edition, published in 1914? In that case the beginning of the Kātantra will have to be put in the first century of the Christian era.
water on me." Thereupon the ignorant king offered her some (सिंधुक्स) sweets. Subsequently, discovering his error and being much ashamed of his ignorance of Sanskrit, he requested his Pandit named Āravavarman1 to devise a speedy method of learning grammar. The Pandit in his difficulty besought God Śiva who ordered his son Kārttikeya or Kumāra to accede to his wishes. Accordingly, Kumāra revealed the sūtras of the Kaumāra grammar. As the God's vehicle, the bird Kaḷāpin (peacock), was the instrument of communication, the sūtras also obtained their other name. This tradition—like most others of its kind—has probably a germ of truth. The date of the rise of this school as given by the tradition is not at all inconsistent with other ascertained facts. Thus Durgasimha, the earliest known commentator on this grammar cannot as we shall presently see, he later than 800 A. D., and when we consider that he may not have been the first commentator on the Kātantra, and that, at any rate, the Sūtrapātha known to him cannot he necessarily identical with that which was original, seeing that considerable differences are observable between his Sūtrapātha and that current, for instance, in Kāśmir since 1100 A. D., we may for the present accept the first century after Christ as the century which witnessed the rise of this grammar.

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

1. सन्तिप्रयोगः—Consisting of सहारापादः, स्वराचारिन्त (समान*), पादः,
   स्वराचारिन्तिनिपेत (सभ्यत*) पादः, व्याङ्ग्याचारिन्त (सर्ग*)-
   पादः, विसर्गाचारिन्तिनिपेत: and [निपातपादः].

1 I adopt this form of the name. The starred names are derived in preference to Āravavarman, from the first words of the
ii. नामाकरण—Oonsisting of स्वाराण्ट (तिथु) पाद; यथानान्त-पाद; साधिपाद, तुष्ट्यपाद; कारकपाद; समातपाद; तत्त्विन्यपाद, and [प्रीत्यपाद].

iii. अस्मात्मकरण—Oonsisting of परस्परपाद; प्रत्यपाद, विद्यापाद; सम्प्रसारपाद, उपपाद, अनुपुष्पपाद, इद्रागमपाद, and छुद्दपाद.

iv. कूम्करण—Consisting of सिद्धिपाद, धात्यपाद, कर्मविण्यपाद, द्विधपाद, [उणाध्विपाद], and पात्रस्तुतङ्गपाद.

In this connection the first question to be raised is: Does the fourth part—the कूम्करण—belong to the authorship of Sarvavarman himself, or was it only tacked on to his work by a later hand? Most commentators, including Durgasimha, note that the word सिद्धि which begins the first section of this prakarana is स्त्रालय. A manigala it is true, may come at the beginning of the work as a whole or in the body of it; before commencing the various subdivisions of it. In this particular case Durga-simha tells us सिद्धिग्रहण प्रायक्तन्तरामुद्रालयेष्य. He elsewhere tells us that the कूम्करण is the work of Kātyāyana. Jogrāja the author of a work called the Pādapakarṇasaṅgati and probably the same person who is alluded to by Mānikha (circa 1135–45 A. D.) in his Śrīkantiha-charita, agrees in not assigning the कूम्करण to the authorship of Sarvavarman; only he makes Śākaṭāyana their author. Lastly, Raghunandanaśiromani, the author of a commentary on the Durgasimha-vrītī, credits Vararuchī with the authorship of the prakarṇa in question—अथ कूमक्त: वर्षाष्मण।

sātras commencing the various sections. Alternative names are enclosed within circular brackets.

1 See note 2 on page 27 before.
2 This work gives a topical ana-

lysis of the Kātantra-sūtras.

It is printed in Appendix 2 on
the basis of the Deccan College
Ms. 292 of 1875-76.

3 A Ms. of the work is no. 353 of
Noticea, Second Series.


Interpolations in Kātantra-Sūtrapātha

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

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

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

---

1 Vararuchi is often an alias of Kṛtyāsana. The India office Ms. no. 855 purports to be Vararuchi’s com. on his own दास्यां, which are just these sūtras.

2 Outside Kāśmir the place of these sections is taken up by a लिंगजातिसास in 85 ślokas, attributed to Durgtuna, who is probably not the same person as Durgasishtha; and by an Upādipāna put together by Durgasishtha himself. This latter work differs considerably from the बनावधाप included in the regular Kāśmirian sūtrapātha.

3 A few such are collected in Dr. Bühler’s report for 1875-76, p. 5-66, xxxvi.
pupil, no more did he care to teach him the तद्विद्वादित section (or the बीडीत्विद्वादित section). And as it cannot be urged that the तद्विद्वादित section formed for the king a harder nut to crack than, for instance, the आत्रिक्षिप्त section, there was no apparent need for शरववार्त्तman's running into poetry and that for one or two sections only. The facts may have been these: A manual which made the king proficient in grammar in a few months' time must have attracted the early notice of the courtiers and subjects of the king. The omission of तद्विद्वादित and other sections may then have been noticed and rectified—either by the original author or some other scholar. And the impetus to such additions being once given, the Kātantra from being a mere handbook issued forth into a full-blown system.

66. Nature of Sarvavarman's work.—The nature of the improvements made by Sarvavarman on the current textbooks of grammar is evident even from that portion of the Kātantra which we have no hesitation in accepting as his own genuine work. These consist in i. dispensing with the artificial arrangement of the letters of the alphabet introduced by Pāṇini, and retaining in their stead their natural arrangement such as is found in the Prātiṣākhyaśas.1 ii. As a consequence the Pāṇiniya pratyāhāras, which result in brevity as well as unintelligibility, are dispensed with, their place being taken by the earlier and simpler Sañjñās such as स्वर, व्यक्तिः, समान etc. This has saved the system the defining sūtras, of which there is such a number in Pāṇini. iii. In the distribution of the subject matter, in preference to the old artificial arrangement of Pāṇini there has been adopted one which is natural or topical, similar to that of the later Kaumudi. iv. Lastly, as was essential in a work designed for beginners, the

1 The first sūtra of the Kātantra—taken from the Prātiṣākhyaśas.
सिद्धो वर्जितानानां—is in fact
whole of the Vaidiki prakriya of Pāṇini and all the other rules of an exceptional or difficult character have been simply omitted. Thus instead of the nearly 4000 śūtras of Pāṇini, Śravavarman could finish his work in about 855 śūtras, or including the एद section, 1400 śūtras only.

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

68. Durgasimha and his Vṛtti.—Whether Durgasimha had any predecessors in the task of expounding the Kātāntara cannot now be ascertained. His was probably the first systematic attempt where necessary to explain and amplify1 the Kātāntara grammar so as to make it as thorough-

1 By means of giving वस्त्रिकाः, some of which later commentators have incorporated with the original sūtras. Cf. Eggeling’s edition, Notes, p. 679.
going as possible, without running counter to its original object of ease and simplicity. As Durgasimha is quoted by Hemachandra, and as he knew the Chandra Dhatupatha, on the basis of which he put together another Dhatupatha for the Katantra, Durgasimha probably is to be assigned to the eighth century. As the verse introductory to his Unadisutradas contains an invocation to God Siva, Durgasimha probably was not a Baudhaja, and if so, he is distinct from another Durgasimha, the author of a commentary on Durgasimha’s vritti, whose invocation points unmistakably to his faith. Durgasimha is also distinguished from later writers such as Durga, Durgatma, and Durgacharya. The last is the author of a commentary on the Nirukta, and one of the first two, if indeed they are two persons, wrote a Linganuasana to the Katantra (see note 2 on page 85).

69. Commentaries on Durgasimha’s vritti.—Writers subsequent to Durgasimha have mainly confined themselves to writing commentaries on his masterly vritti. The earliest of these is the Katan travistara by Vardhama, whose patron was Karadheva, who probably is the same who ruled Gujarat in A. D. 1088. Vardhama is often quoted by Bopadeva in his Kavyakamadhenu. A writer called Mahamahopadyaya Prithvidhara wrote a subcommentary on Vardhama’s work.

1 न दस्युवं दिन्द्व वृविषाब्बत्तकारादित्यस्म।
उपास्यत विवासयति वास्तुप्रकाशि
हेतुवे॥

2 जिण्डेलि दुर्दुहो आगाङ च स्वर्यकुमुः।
कांस्तुवातितिधियं सत्वा दुर्गमण रचयेत॥
This Durga styles Durgasimha.

3 यो भवतासु तुर्विकार॥ Compare Eggeling’s Notes, p. 465.

4 Goldschmucker believed him to be the same as the author of the Gauratnabodahabi, a work composed (सत्वनवस्थिक्षितुवा
कादु काठनातितं) in 1139-40.

A.D.
The next in succession comes Trilochanadāsa,\(^1\) who is also cited by Bopadeva and by Viśṭhala the commentator on the Śārasvata. He may have come very soon after Vardhamāna. His commentary is called Kātantravṛttipāñ-jikā, and from it we learn that the author was a Kāyastha, the son of Megha and father to Gacādhara. Trilochanadāsa has been himself commented upon by Jinaprabhasūri alias Jinaprabodha,\(^2\) by Kuśala, by Rāmachandra, and by other more modern writers.

Mahādeva, the author of a commentary called Śabdā-siddhi, a Ms.\(^3\) of which bears the date Sarivat 1540, is chronologically the next writer whom we have to notice. As, however, there is very little known about him either from his own works or from those of others, we shall pass on to later writers.

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

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

---

\(^1\) He is not to be identified with the author of that name who wrote the Kātantrattaraparipratisāya to Śripattidatta’s supplement.

\(^2\) For particulars about Jinapra.

\(^3\) Ms. no. 60 of Dr. Kielhorn’s collection for 1680-81.
Uṇāḍipātha and the Dhātupātha by Durgasimha the author of the vṛitti. The Dhātupātha is modelled upon that of Chandragomin, with only slight modifications. The genuine Kālāpa-Dhātusātra, which differs considerably from the above, is now reported to exist only in a Tibe-
tian translation.

71. History of the Kātantra school in Bengal.—No definite information exists as to when the Kātantra was introduced into Bengal. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there arose in Bengal a host of commentators and writers of supplements to the Kātantra, and the grammar is there to this day most assiduously studied. Some of the most famous of these Bengali writers are: i. Kavirāja who quotes Trilochanadāsa and is quoted by Harirāma; ii. Kulachandra who is quoted by Rāmadāsa; Gopinātha Tarkāchārya who is commented upon by Rāmachandra who also wrote a commentary on the Kātantravṛittipāṇijīkā; iii. Śripati who wrote a supplement to the Kātan-
tra which is honoured with commentaries written by Gopinātha Tarkāchārya, Rāmachandra Chakravarti, Śiva-
rāma Chakravarti, and Puṇḍarikāksha; iv. Trilochana (not the older Trilochanadāsa) who wrote an Uttarapari-
śishṭa, giving therein such information on प्राचु, तत्त्व, and समास as had escaped Śripati; and several others. Most of these writers came from the Vaidya community of Bengal, and their object in all cases has been, by partial or wholesale borrowing from all available sources, to make the Kātantra as complete and up-to-date as possi-
ble, so as to prevent its being neglected in the course of the struggle for existence which began with the modern revival of Pāṇini under the auspices of the Kaumudikāras, and the simultaneous springing into existence of a large number of other modern schools of grammar. At present, as before observed, the study of the Kātantra is confined to only a few districts of Bengal.
History of the Kātakṣa school in Kāśmir.—In Kāśmir the school had a slightly varied development. The Sūtra-paṭha received there was, as we saw, considerably different from that known to Durgasimha; and we can hence conclude that the Kāśmirian Pandits got familiar with the works of Durgasimha much later. Until then they busied themselves with writing original commentaries and digests on the Kātakṣa which, as Dr. Billiter observes, has been the grammar of the Kāśmirians from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. Only a few of their works in Mss. have so far been available. There is among others a work called the Bālabodhīni by Bhāṭṭa Jagaddhara with a Nyāca upon it by a writer called Ugrabhatī, who, if identical with his name-sake who was a teacher of grammar to Anundapala and whose book (as Alberini says) was made fashionable in Kāśmir by liberal donations from the royal pupil to the Pandits, must be placed in the latter part of the tenth century. Another rather well-known book is the Laghu-vṛtti by Chhichhābhatā, which perhaps belongs to about the same time. Of later and less important books there is quite a number. The modern popular books of grammar in Kāśmir are based on the Kātakṣa.

The Sārasvata School

73. The Sārasvata school: its date.—The origin of the Sārasvata school of grammarians cannot be put down to a date very much earlier than 1250 A. D., when Bapadeva the author of the Mudālabodhī flourished, seeing that he

---

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

The Deccan College Ms. of the work brought over by Billiter in 1975-76 contains at the end the following colophon: सुह्रुषायिनिरीयिनिर महामहेनाराजसे(?) नामित्वि ति, which perhaps stands for Saka 1037 = 1115 A. D.
nowhere refers to the Sārasvata school. If the school existed in his days—if it had attained a sufficient standing in the eyes of scholars—we should naturally expect Bopadeva to mention it, just as he does many other established schools and authors. Nor does the school appear to have been known to Hemachandra. Further, none of the commentaries on the Sārasvata belongs to a date earlier than 1450 A. D., and the majority of them were written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Looking to the native places of the different commentators and the places where the Mss. were copied or discovered, it has to be admitted that the influence of the school, even in the most glorious period or its existence, was mostly limited to Northern India: to Gujarāt, Nagapur, Udepur, Bikaner, Delhi and Bengal. The school continued in vigour down to the modern revival of Pāṇini under the auspicces of Bhaṭṭoji Dikshita and his pupils, when most schools of grammar began to decline and were driven into the corners of Bengal and other out-lying districts. The Sārasvata school was probably the last to go. These facts when taken in conjunction with the extremely simple and brief manner in which the Sārasvata treats its entire subject—700 sūtras¹—as against the 4,000

---

¹ Seven hundred sūtras—i. e., in the original sūtrapātha of the school. This assertion is made on the basis of the Deccan College Ms. no. 229 of 1892-95, which gives 597 mūlasūtras plus 91 more vārtikas or vaktavyas, thus reaching the total of 688. The original order of the sūtras seems to be preserved in this Ms. alone; other Mss. usually follow the order of Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya in his Sārasvata-prakriyā. Thus in two Mss. of the Deccan College Collection (no. 257 of 1895-98 and no. 210 of A. 1882-83) the total number of sūtras is nearly 890, including some sūtras which occur twice and some vārtikas distinctly given by Anubhūtisvarūpāchārya as such. We have in fact to distinguish clearly between the Sārasvata-mūlasūtrapātha and the Sārasvataprakriyāsūtrapātha.
of Pāṇini—render plausible the inference that the Sārasvata school, like the Kātantra, arose in response to a definite demand. This time the demand probably came from the Muhammedan rulers of India who felt it necessary to promote the study of Sanskrit, were it only for the purpose of criticising works written in that language. Thus Gaisuddin Khilgi the peaceful and enlightened ruler of Mālva, Salemshah (1555 to 1556) the emperor who ruled Delhi during Humayun’s wanderings, and Jahangir, the Conqueror of the world—all these alike encouraged the study of the Sārasvata grammar as being the one calculated to produce greatest results with the least effort. Indian princes like Udayasing of Udepur (1670 A. D.) also found it easier and less likely to interfere with their usual enjoyments to study this grammar. We shall presently consider the special features to which the Sārasvata owed its popularity amongst the aristocracy; in the meanwhile it may be assumed as very probable that the Muhammedan rule of India is to be credited with having produced the demand which eventually led to the rise of the school of grammar with which we are at present concerned. 

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

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

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

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

यक्षरूपदस्तरितभावितं दन्तक जैसः सहायस्वतिरितम्।
तन्मयात्र विशिष्टं तथापि किंचिनंदेव फरितं स्वयं विषयं॥

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

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

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

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

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

Amṛitabhārati.—As above pointed out, this commentator mentions Narendranagarī as an influential writer on the Sārasvata. Amṛitabhārati was a pupil of Amalasarasvati, and he bears the title परमाधिकायत्वाकार्य. His commentary is called Subodhikā. Unfortunately all the existing mss. of this commentary contain such a confusion as to the name of the author and of his guru, some stating the work to be that of Viśveśvarābdhi, pupil of Advayasarasvati, others that of Satyaprabodhabhaṭṭāraka, pupil of Brahmasāgaramuni, that it is hard to get at the truth. As the earliest known ms. of this work is dated Samvat 1554, the author must have lived about the last quarter of the fifteenth century. The work is said to have been composed at the holy place of Purushottama; हेतुः व्यपारिः इत्येंतः परमसरस्वतेः।

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

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

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

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

Vāsudevabhāṭṭa.—He calls himself the pupil of Chaṇḍi-
svāra and gives² the date of his commentary to be Sam-
vat 1634. The commentary is called Sārasvataprasāda.

Mandana.—From the colophon at the end of the संविध-
प्रकरण we learn that Mandana was the Mahā-pradhāna and
Saṅghapati to Alpasāhi. His father was named Vāhada

¹ Compare—चरीतरपेवतप्रियसृष्टिकोर्ष कलितिकाः अश्वेयन्
धनेषु मुनि संसारितः सादरस्त। सुरि:
मृत्युत्सिद्धिः कालकलितिकाः श्रीचं
न्यूनतारः प्रमुखः।²
and he belonged to the Kharatara Gachchha. The commentary subsequent to the सूचिप्रकाश seems to have been written by one of his pupils. From one of the mss. of the commentary (Dec. Coll. collection, no. 13 of 1877-78) we gather that Alpasāhi or Alam was a king of Mālva, whose minister (amātya) was known as Padama. Vāhada the father of Mandana was a brother to this Padama, and was, besides, himself a Saṅghesvara or Saṅghapati. Our Mandana accordingly must have inherited his father’s office and title. We are not yet certain as to who this Alpasāhi, king of Mālva, was. Probably he was merely some local chieftain. The earliest dated ms. of the commentary belongs to the year 1574 A. D.

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

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

1 Professor S. R. Bhandarkar in his Report of a second tour in search of mss. in Rājpatnā and Central India (1904-5 and 1905-6) mentions a विषयपात्र on दुर्गसिंहदोक्तरत्वसंतिकाव्य, which is written in Saṅvat 1369. This विषयपात्र was made during the reign of Alphakāna who has been identified with the brother-in-law of Sultan Alūndin (Elliot and Dowson, iii. pp. 157 and 208). If this Alphakāna be the same as our Alpasāhi, Mandana will have to be placed even before Pūṇjarāja, which however does not appear very likely.

2 He must be distinguished from Bopadeva’s preceptor, who was also named Dhanesvara.
five stanzas at the end of the तब्दित section of the commentary, a Tikā on the Mahābhāshya called Chintāmaṇi, a new grammar for beginners called Prakriyāmaṇi, and a commentary on a stotra from the Padmapurāṇa.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 With the words—हत् परसारं 2 Compare—न्यन्त्रनिक्षितिपक्षे (1672) श्रीमयुद्धादिकतथा कान्ति नारायण वस्न नगरे व बोधार्थम्। भृतिरिथं सन्त्र सिद्धां निराशिते श्रीमहागीरी।
Treatises Accessory to Sārasvata

By name. It is called Laghu-bhāṣya and aspires to treat of the various grammatical topics after the manner of Patañjali. Raghunātha was a Nāgara, the son of Vināyaka, and belongs, as the pupil of Bhaṭṭoṣi to the middle of the seventeenth century.

79. Treatises accessory to the Sārasvata.—Of accessory treatises in connection with the Sārasvata there are very few. There are no works on Uṇādis or Paribhāsas. A Dhatupātha with a com. on it called Tamāṇgini was composed, as stated above, by Harshakirti, pupil of Chandrakirti. His date, therefore, is cir. 1560 A. D. A writer called Jñānatilaka has put together all the examples of hrd, tāra, and uṇaṭa affixes based on the Sārasvata chapters dealing with them. A ms. of this work is dated Sānivat 1704. Another writer named Mādhava has attempted a derivation of words according to the Sārasvata. His date is probably 1680; and these are nil, or at any rate, all worth noticing.

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

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

3 Compare — खलनार(४) दूरदूराः

रिगी सोची ईलाकांवर गच्चे (१) पुरे

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

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

The School of Bopadeva

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

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

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

1 Compare—विद्मषिस्तेन भिन्नोऽद्वृत्तम् (हैमकम्पब्धवेत्रि सुक्रा-प्रतकार्य) —from the शुक्ल, and श्रीमद्भागवतसंहितायां—विनिमित्तम् निष्पादने। विषया बोधेन्द्रि मांशिवेदार्थेऽद्वृत्तम्—from the हर-शीलाविवरण.

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

3 That Bopadeva did not write the Bhāgavata can be proved from various arguments amongst others the following quotation (उच्चवथयुतसंहिता पुराण-गैरोक्तः प्रति) श्रीमद्भागवतसंहिताः हु यत्रच्या इत्यस्य (पु. 63) of शिकार-चार्यवर, edited (1808) by Raṅgachārya, who tries to prove its genuineness.

14 [Sk. Gr.]
It was at such a juncture that Bopadeva wrote his Mughdhabodha. His object therein was simplicity coupled with brevity. The first he attained by following the natural mode of presentation such as is found in the Kātantra. For the second, the adopted Pāṇini’s pratyāhāra-sūtras—making in them the changes necessary for their adoption to his own system. He omits all notices of accents, and the Vedic peculiarities are dismissed in one (the last) sūtra—चहुँन बहुप्रणि, corresponding to Pāṇini’s oft-repeated चहुँन चन्दसि. Another feature which we notice in this grammar for the first time is its religious element. In the choice of examples illustrating his rules Bopadeva has taken care to use wherever possible the names of Hari Hara, and other gods.¹ Bopadeva is here equally partial to Hari, Hara, or Rāma; but later writers have outdone him in this respect. Even the technical terms of some of these modern grammarians are the names of Kṛishṇa, Rādhā, Śiva, Durgā, etc. We shall have occasion to revert to these later.

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

1 Thus सब्यसचिन्द्र is illustrated by कुरारि; कक्करि, विघ्नस्वच; the optional forms एरि, एरनि, etc. are shown by—इरि बिघ्नि हरिगृंचि किरिहिंचि सिमारा कर्चि किरिहिंचि सिधियम हियिनि किरिहिंचि। अवें गुलित्: कर्चि किरिहिंचि सिमारा किरिहिंचि। an instance of कारक is—रसं श्रवनस्य मुद्रणात् तस्मां तत्रस्यव्याप्तः।

2 For example, धु for धातु व for व्रज्जि; गान for गानचि, ध्रि for सर्वचिन्द्र etc.
Later history of Bopadeva’s school.—From what is said just now we are not to conclude that the Mugdhabodha was never widely popular. In the two centuries preceding the rise of the Mahratta power and the revival of Pāṇini it enjoyed a wide currency as well in the land of its origin as elsewhere. This is clear from the statements of Bhāṭṭoji-dikṣīta in the Śabdākvaustubha and in the Manoramā. In the latter he says—

शाक्तरथयमादात्राय शास्त्रविविधतेऽः

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Jaumara School

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

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

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

1 Namely, सपथ, विद्वत, द्वसन्त, वशिष्ठ, वासु, द्वसन्त, असमास.
title it is quoted by Bharata the commentator on the Bhaṭṭīkāvya. Jumarnandi’s seems to have been the earliest exposition of this system. He has also revised for this school the Pāṇiniya Dhātupāṭha.¹

Next to Rasavati, Goyīchandra’s commentary deserves a brief mention. Goyīchandra styles himself औष्ठ्यासनित्र, which may be either a patronymic or some religious or political title the significance of which is lost to us.² The best part of Goyīchandra’s commentary is that on the fifth or the Kāraka pāda, which along with its able and learned gloss by Abhirāmavidyālaṅkāra is studied even by the students of other schools for the sake of a correct and complete understanding of syntax. Besides this commentary Goyīchandra has also written a work on the Uṇādis, and a list of some 127 paribhāshās.

Goyīchandra’s commentary is further commented upon by Nyāyapaṇchānana, son of Vidyāvinoda, a ms. of which is dated Śaka 1634; by Keśavadeva styled Tarkapaṇchānanabhāṭṭāchārya;³ by Chandraśekharavidyālaṅkāra; by Varūṇvādana, Harirāma, and many others. Independently of Goyīchandra’s gloss there do not seem to be in existence any notable commentaries on the Jaumara grammar. Colebrooke mentions only one by Gopāla-chakravarti.

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

¹ Compare ms. no. 196 of Notices, second series, vol. i.
² Explained as—उत्थर्यासनं दीयो राजादिविविधिति। अनमुनिदिः श्रण्ना नामप्रधिविधे। अस्ये आसनमये कुशे द्वापाधिविधयमासि।
³ Explained as—चन्द्रिचन्द्रमातं सरपगढ़ दृष्टिः तु यद्य। अनवथा मिष्ठतं यष्ठं तत्यथं यथं नामं यथीथवत्।
The Saupadma School

90. The Saupadma school of Padmanabhadatta—The originator of this school is a Manthila Brahman named Padmanabhadatta, the son of Dāmodaradatta and grandson of Śripati. This Padmanabhadatta is to be distinguished from another writer of the same name, the son of Gayaśvarasa and grandson of Śripati, who wrote for the school a work called Prishodarādivṛitti, which was written, according to the author's own statement, in Śaka 1297 (A.D. 1575). If this date be correct it follows that the other Padmanabhadatta, the founder of the Saupadma school, was either a contemporary or lived very shortly after Ujjvaladatta, whom he mentions as one of his authorities in his lexicon called Bhūripayyoga. His being placed in the last quarter of the fourteenth century does not, at any rate, conflict with any other hitherto ascertained facts.

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

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

2 Compare—मार्गदर्शकमयादंकोषिपत्र—
विशेषदार्शिकोत्सवस्वाभासः।
हरिष्ठोदलितिस्वरूपोपन्यासालोकस्त्र
तांत्रिकः भविष्यतः॥

3 Thus Pāṇini's आदिधिवेश पश्चिमत is changed into आदिविनिर्वेश व्यक्तः।

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

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

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

1 See India Office Catalogue, Part ii, Ms. no. 890.
Later Sectarian Schools

Dhātunirñaya. A Gaṇapātha to the Saupadma has been supplied by Kāśīśvara and a com. on it by Rūmakānta. There are also minor works on Ṛṣabha and Vārak attatching to the school, and a supplement has also later been tackled on to it.

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

Later Sectarian Schools

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

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

"साधुर्व परिधार्य या स्तोत्र (?) हृदन्मेय। ब्रह्मणायक्ष्यमायायायायायायर्ति विद्युः।"

As is to be expected, beyond the introduction of this sectarian element no other improvement on the existing texts of grammar is here to be met with. The whole subject is presented to us in a dull uninteresting manner.

15 [Sk. Gr.]
Jivagosvāmin’s Harināmāmṛita varies only slightly from the above. A third Vaishnava grammar called Chaitanyāmṛita is likewise mentioned by Colebrooke.  

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

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

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

Lesser Manuals and School-books

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

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

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

3. Bhāvasimhāprakriyā by Bhāṭṭa-śrīnāyaka—This is another of what we may call 'royal' grammars. It was written for the edification of Bhāvasimha the eldest son of a local prince who is styled मादिनिनाद (Lord of the Earth).

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

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

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

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

(See note 2 on page 60)

II चान्दर्वर्षेणार्थिनि

1. द्विप्राकाय नमः। 2. श्वेताकमप्यन्तिधरी पण्या जापने।। नमः
   स्वानामः। फ्यः अम्बलेवार्षीवेन्द्रीवान्नामः। फ्यावहन्तरं मूलान्तरं युज्ये।।
3. सूक्ष्णं वेदं प्रांवनामः। ज्ञानं देवं गानामः। नामिका अनुत्भाग्यं
   ज्ञानायानुत्तत्त्वार्थिनि: । द्वांपनामिव: । तानु: । ज्ञानानुमार्गः ।
   गोऽहृ उपाधिमानि-योगः।। तस्यां संकार्य्य: प्रदाृतां निग्राणुपरीङ्गार्यां।।

6. करणमः। निग्राणमः ज्ञानानुमार्गः। निग्राणम् ज्ञानानुमार्गः। निग्राणम् नितारणानुमार्गः। ।
   नेचः वैदिकसङ्कः।।

प्रति 2 विविधिः।। आयस्यरो वास्तव || तत्त्वस्य नातद्: श्रूतवन विरूद्धवन
   1. श्रूतवन श्रूतरूपः।। श्रूतवन अनुचार्यस || श्रूतवन कृत्तिस || श्रूतवन कृत्तिइ
   । नेत्यो श्रुतवन श्रूतवन: ।। नामायेश्वरी:।। नामायानामवार्तार्थः।।
   । श्रूतवन ज्ञानानुमार्गः।। श्रूतरूपः ज्ञानानुमार्गः।। द्वांपनानुपरीङ्गार्यां।।

12. प्रभायती प्रयत्निः।। शब्दविद्यान्तरतीतानुत्तत्त्वार्थिनिः।।
   शृणुमार्गः अनुत्भाग्यमार्गः।।

13. विद्याविद्याय:।। शब्दविद्यान्तरतीतानुत्तत्त्वार्थिनि:।।
   शृणुमार्गः अनुत्भाग्यमार्गः।।

14. भुवनाय प्रेरण:।। द्विविद्यायः।।
   भुवनाय मार्गाय:।। शृणुमार्गः।।

15. शास्त्राय प्रेरण:।। द्विविद्यायः।।
   शृणुमार्गः।।

अन्य वाक्योऽन्यः दृष्टः भुतः प्रियः ।। प्रेमस्वरुपमार्गानुगतः

16. स्धितं भजन:।। सासूनार्थिनितुननार्थिनितुननार्थिनि:।।
   सासू: ।।

17. कृत्यमः।।

18. साधनाय:।।

19. समाहारः।।

|| द्वितै चान्दर्वर्षेणार्थिनि समासानि ||
अथ जोगराजविरचिता पादमकरणसहायति:

अः नमः शिवायो अः

आराध्यः पुण्यमवासवपरसादः
काश्यपुरुणिहृदयः किल्ला शरवंतमि
झोकस्व मोहनिमारहितर्वेच वच्चत
सदृशेपतः शकरणातित्रात्माशास्मि

तत्रादित्वाव्रपितः वर्णिपदेणु सन्धिः
तत्रातुगुणसङ्करुद्ध बुधकारकादि
आर्यातिकं तदनु साधयपर्द्व विचारत्व
मेतवतैव हि समनवामात्रातः

संजाट्रः परिभाषायः प्रथमे पद्ध आदित्िः
द्वितीये स्वरसान्धि च तृतीये तत्तदेशनम्

केदारनं चतुर्थं च सन्धिः वैसिनिनं परे
पचे प्रथमविषये सन्धिध्यकरणं जगोः

नाम्र आदे द्वरान्त्यः लिङ्गस्य स्वादिर्निन्यः
स्वरात्मव्रजनान्त्यस्य द्वितीये युगदुर्दवोः

तृतीये त्युदर्दीनालिनायेः नामपद्धस्थिताः
चतुर्थे कारकस्ये विनियोगोऽपि प्रथमे

समसादृश्चितिसदस्य तद्वित्तेवपि वर्तनम्
पर्यन्त् घने प्रथमे प्रकक्षक्कान्तु हृदिप्रथयातू खियाम्

ह्वः नामपदे सिद्धं सदृशेशात् सभुगाधीरः
तदन्ततत्त्वंतः विचा व्रजमकस्ये पञ्चदशः

आर्यातिकः कालपुरसस्य निष्प्रजनः
न्याद्वृद्धोः (ि)द्वितीयेपि सनादिप्रज्ञात्वांतः

ततो विक्रमण आलमनेपर्रैविनिनिर्यः
तृतीयेवशास्त्रकरणे चतुर्थे सप्तसाराम्
अदेशागमितोपादिप पञ्चमे तु युनासुराण् ।
तन्न्त्र वाणपदं पढ़ि सामेः सेवनिरुक्तः \ ॥ ११ \ ॥

dhr̥tr̥ṣṭam हृद्येव आस्यातिकमः ।
sambhūtadvayādhiśvaro 'dr̥ṣṭo यथा ।

yathābhūto च निःपरस्वनाशितः ॥

yāhī यथा धर्मः धर्म: सत्त्वसः सुरासभुदः ॥ १३ \ ॥

हजत्तम्या यथा: सीप्पद्रुणुपप्रदोः येः ।

chalasatāśvatadvyaः तामु नागः तास्तक्यायः \ ॥ १४ \ ॥

तत्रायुपदे हजत्त्वा पथ्यायोहताः (!) \ ॥
सोऽविष वाणाकालादि विभागे नेतिनेतिनेति निर्योः \ ॥ १५ \ ॥

स्यायान्तवान् सुसिद्धातान् तामु सूत्रहृदयविन्नु ।

dhṛṣṭādhiṣṭāधिनिष्ठनिष्ठनकदृष्टां ग्राम्यम् \ (!) \ ॥ १६ \ ॥

धारोऽर्थसे सतों युनसूजादरस्ते च नितरि ।

आदृश्य पथ्यास्ते छन्त्यास्ते भाववं मोः \ ॥ १७ \ ॥

अहनाद्यः सीप्पद्रुणुपप्रदोः च वालसे \ ॥

मूः हजत्त्वायोह्ये परामाने शुन्धुक्ताद्यः \ ॥ १८ \ ॥

उपाद्यः सुरसूहः ये ते शासीनरे सिद्धः ।

वातिकस्मितप्रत्तनमकियार्थोपधरे ममाः \ ॥ १९ \ ॥

धमन्त्त्वायुक्तात्वा भवे पुंश्रीषुनुपस्तकः \ ॥

संज्ञायां पास्यशास्त्राः (!) \ ॥

रक्तेऽविधिकरणे ध्वादिस्तन्य undermining \ ॥ २० \ ॥

हेयेऽवाणान्तस्वयमेव कांसकः \ (!) \ ॥

कालिन्यायेन्द्रे क्षत्राजुवयी मम सतामु \ ॥

प्रकाण्तन्त्वमिश्रेष्ठे पाद्विषकारणमिथिते \ ॥ २२ \ ॥

पद्यवाणी कार्याणि पाद्विषेषु समास्ते \ ॥

तथायतिव्यवहारोमायायोदितिनिहि \ ॥ २३ \ ॥

एवे शास्त्रों सूक्तमन्ने पंडितं सदा \ ॥

नेत्रित कार्यो सौभाग्यदशीः फ़ि नैति श्रुव्यतामु \ ॥ २४ \ ॥
नामः। पार्ति। कारकस्य स्वर्णः।
खण्डनेत्रस्वस्तिधिनेथ क्रियावः।
कान्तेश्वरोच्चार्यस्माधानं क्रमणः।
लक्ष्यकारत्ववैद्वनेषु दुष्कर्पेणम् ॥ २५ ॥
शुच्या साहित्यानि सुृष्माण्यधारोऽ
झाल्वा काम्याकृत्वतत्सार्थश्रावन्।
स्वागत्याच्चेदितत्सादि हुच्या।
काम्यान्यासे तिष्ठताच्छप्पवति। ॥ २६ ॥
चाण्देवी सा सर्वनो भाजनान्।
पानाप्रामावेश्यनेन प्रसादानुः।
कुवृत्तवत्तः कस्यचिवू भास्यवस्य(१)।
स्फोटं सूत्रेद्वितस्माय्यशक्मिम् ॥ २७ ॥

* At this place a few unimportant stanzas are omitted.
GENERAL INDEX

N. B. References are to page and line, or to page and footnote (n), unless where preceded by § which indicates section. The arrangement is according to the English alphabet, the discirnetical marks being ignored.

A
Abhayachandra's recast of (Sākāṭyaṇa-) Prakṛtyāsaṅgraha 72-12; its nature 72-17ff; the date of the author 72-14ff.
Abhayasannidhin's version of the Jainendra 65-14; later than that of Somadeva 65-23; his date 67-2; his version followed by the Pāṇchavastu 67-15.
Abhinavayu of Kāśmir restores the corrupt text of the Mahābhāshya 33-27.
Abhinava-Śaṅkaraṇa, see Śaṅkaraṇa (Jaina).
Abhidhānasūryāṇa's vṛtti on the Kāraṇa-pāda of Goychandra's commentary 110-11.
Accessory treatises to Panini's grammar §16; their later history §35;—to Chhandan grammar §45;—to Śaṅkaraṇa grammar §54;—to Hemachandra's grammar §59;—to the Kātantra §70;—to the Śāraśātaka §79;—to Mugoḥābodha §85;—to the Saippuaka §83.
Adhikām-sūtras, how indicated by Panini 21-22.
Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa, com. on, by Nāgēśa 47-21; 49-6.
Advayusārasvati 97-18.
Agāṭhāra 79-21.
Agnikumāra, elder brother of Haradatta 39-12.
Agnisarma, alias of Īśvarakṛṣṇa 64-11.
Agrāyaṇa mentioned in Nīrūkt 8-n1.
Agrāyaṇa mentioned in Nīrūkt 8-n1.
Aindrā school, supplanted by Pānini 10-15; amongst its followers Kātyāyaṇa (Vārṇabhūti), Vyādi and Indradatta 10-16; its account by Huien Tsang and Taik-16 [Sk. Gr.]
nātha 10-17; agreeing with Kātantra and perhaps identical with it 10-20, 12-1, 84-14; revealed by Kārttikeya 10-22; analogies in the Prātiṣṭhākyas 11-12; its termin-jogy in the Tolkappiyam 11-3; Burnell's conclusion about it 11-2ff; post-Pāniniya in date and pre-Pāniniya in substance 11-32.
Aindrā School of grammarians, by Dr. Burnell 5-n1; 5-n2; 11-n1.
Aithihyākas mentioned in the Nīrūkta 8-n1.
Ajayapala successor of Kumārapāla 75-n1.
Ājurika 67-5.
Ākalaṅkaka 63-n4.
Ālaudin, Sultan 99-16.
Ālbernt 91-16.
Alexander 15-35; 16-34; Panini lived before his invasion 17-2; razed Sāngala to ground 17-15; 18-8.
Ālkāhāna or Sultan Alaudin 99-n1.
Ālpaṭṭhi or Alam, patron and master of Mandalā 98-29ff; probably a local chieftain from Malva 99-12; not the same as Sultan Alaudin 99-n1.
Āmalasārasvati teacher of Amṛṭa-bhūrati 97-12.
Āmara quoted by name in Bopadeva's Mugoḥabodha 10-n3.
Amarachandra's Syādisamuchchaya 89-8ff.
Amarakosa, com. on., 111-n2; by Kshirasvāmini 52-7.
Amoghabhava 1 (Rāshtrakūta), patron of (Jaina) Śaṅkaraṇa 69-14, 69-n2.
Amoghabṛtiti 64-n4; written by
Art of writing, when introduced 1:26; presupposed by primitive Pratīṣṭhākyas 4:20. 
Ārya-satrakṛiti author (?) of the Patavastu 67:21ff.
Āryavajra quoted by (Jaina) Śaṅkūryāna 70:5.
Aṣāṃjñaka a nickname for Chāṇḍa grammar 60:4.
Ashūḍhyāyī of Pāṇini 7:2; 9:7; 9:9:12:2; 12:17; old-s. surviving work in sūtra style 13:2; 15:26; why so called 10:20; programme of, pp. 20-21, and 22:1; arrangement of sūtras within it, 24:21ff, 24:3; treats accessory to it §16; sometimes its teaching contrary to that of the Unādi-sūtras 26:24, 26:2; 27:17; 29:20; recasts of §29, 57:2; com. on it by Ehattoji 47:12; com. on it by Annabhāṭṭa 50:24; 50:10; mentions Śaṅkūryāna 68:26; 100:101; see also Pāṇini.
Assyrians not unknown to Indians before Alexander's invasion 15:22; mentioned as mercenary fighters by Pāṇini 17:23; hatted out as a political power in 598 B.C., 17:27; 18:9.
Aṣuras, see Assyrians.
Aundhamarāṇya mentioned in the Nirukta 8:1.
Aurcrecht 42:2; 45:3; his edition of Unādi-vṛtti 54:11; 68:1; 108:1; 169:3.
Appamāṇaṇa mentioned in the Nirukta 8:1.
Aurṇavibha mentioned in the Nirukta 8:1.
Ayaśata 42:9ff.
Avadhūti or Avadhūnīka on Hemachandra’s Brihadvīrī 78:9.
Āvaśyaka-sūtra 73:1.

B

Bhabadu Shah 78:27.
Bāli 35:1; 41:9.
Bṛhadāvatī by Bhaṭṭa Jagaddhara 91:12, with Ugrabhūti's Nyāsa.
on the same 91.14.
Balamaneorat an alibi permit of the Pravahanamorat by the same author 57.41.
Palaubhati, a c. on the Vyasah-\nNakshatra of the Dvita, by \nVaidyanath, recited in his \npatrons 59.10.
Balavamanapallavat: Prakriya \napakas 114.197; by Pali \npallav 114.26.
Bala Satra, editor of the Kaaka \n26.3.
Baliyadolu, Chandra recit by \nKalyana 62.23; appears in all \nother Chandra treatises in \nChen 62.23.
Baliyadolu by Narahshri 116 16ff.
Bana 53.23.
Bendall, Catalogue of Nepali \nms. 45.2.
Bhagavata-purana 106.11, 105.12 ; \nnot the work of Popadiva 15.3.
Bhavavamsera's ctm. on the Pati- \nliladevendraikara 55.9.
Bhandarker G. G., Report for 1883- 
84, 38.42; Report for 1882-83, 
97.1; on Patanjali's date 14.7; 
on Patanjali's date 52-12; daily \nHistory of the Decan 105.12.
Bhandarker S R. 59 n.
Bhima-dikshat alien Vyakaranat 
alias Ramasrama, son of Bhatti \n46.25.
Bhadrakarya mentioned by Patni \n12.42.
Bhundaytaya mentioned by Patni \njali 31-10.
Bhramalla, father of Bhota 116.33.
Bhunna, commentator of the Bhra- \ntikavya 110.2.
Bhattacharhi's account of the viti- \nities in the text of the Maha- \nhasvatya 13.25, 13.4; 27.5; au- \ntor of Vakyaapatiya 57.25-23; \nItsr's data for him 40.17; also au- \ntor of a com, Dikpa, on the \nMahabhishya 45.4, 45.26, 105.8; 
quoted by Vishalcharya 45.20; \nhis preceptor Vasumitra 50.9.
Bhany's Sapatpa-Vyasaavatatt 13.28.
Bhanyakshram, see Patanjali.
Bhavasinha 116.3.
Bhavasinha-Prakriya, by Chatta- 
vishayaka 116.3.
Bhata Gopala 100.16ff.
Bhava-vishayaka, Bhavasinh - 
Prakriya 116.3.
Bhattikanyak quoted by Haradatta 
50-8; 77.16; 109.9; com. en- 
by Huhrata 110.2.
Bhaja, ji Kikala 2.22; distingu- 
ishes between the two au- 
thors of the Kaaka 36.4, 36.11; ak- 
nowledged indebtedness to the 
Rasamani 45.31; his model 
for Siddhanta-kumud, the Prak- 
riyakumud of Bhadavakrani 47.10; his Siddhantakumud 
and other works 5.31; witness 
quoted by him 46.12; he pre- 
posed indebtedness to Heman- 
takrani's Samuhavasana 46.21; 
disciple of Sadiakshetra 46.3; 
personal details about him 46.233; his date 47.25; works 
of Bhattiyo Bhnita 47.55, 55.3, 
53.16, 54.17; preceological tale 
for Blattiyo's family 46.11; his 
part in modern revival of Patni 
21.17, 103.5; testifies to the 
domination of Popadiva 1-7.7ff.
Bhavavacika, Vaidya-nita's 
tom. on the Sabathastu 70.15.
Bhavavacikat-Purana 52.19; 40.3.
Bhavavacikat's ctm. on the Pati- 
Liladevendraikara 55.10.
Bhimsera 42.8; mentioned as a \nmaster on the Vasu by Strya 53.2.
Bhishmaparvan, Mahakshata, 16.8. 
Bhaja quoted by Kaliyavasana 52.3; 
quoted by Hemachanda 73.2.
Bhota II (Sabhatra) 67.4.
Bhota, son of Bhramalla 115.33.
Bhota vrisakrama by Vidyasund- 
dara 115.32ff.
Bhaktalika quoting from Durgag- 
dasa 107.32.
Bhurishtrakarma of Padmanabhadatta 
quotes Ujjasvalata 111.13ff.
Bhaktalika quoted by Pujyanada 
60n.2.
Pomboy Panch of the R.A.S., 
journal of, 35.12.
Bopadiva quoted by name various 
grammarians 10.7, 10.8, 22.5; 
quoted by Vishalcharya 45.21; 
mentions Dvinaad ca author of 
Jaitendra grammar 63.22; quotes 
Varnhamana 88.23; quotes Trilo-
Ceylonese receipt superseded them in Ceylon 62.23.

Chandragupt mother of Vijayalakshmi 115.27.

Chāgadēva, Hemachandra's first name 73.14.

Charanasa, rules for, framed 4.10.

Charmaśiras mentioned in the Niraṃkāta 8.u.n.1.

Chauhana 116.28.


Chhetā-sūtra 73.11.

Chīchhukhubbhata's Laghu vṛtti 91.19.

Chīdasthīnākara, Vaidyamati's com. on Nāgajībhata's Sabinduśākara 50.29.

Chidārāma’s Dhāpāyikaṇa 116.7.

Chintāmaṇi, com. on Śaṅkāyana’s Sabinduśākara by Yakshavarman 72.3; sub-commentaries on it 72.6ff.

Chintāmāni, see Mahābhāṣya-chintāmaṇī.

Chintāmaṇipratipada, Maḥāgarasa’s com. on the Chintāmaṇi 72.7.

Chōḍa 16.30.

Climatic conditions, causes of dialectical peculiarities, and influencing study of grammar 3.1.

Colebrooke 68.n.1; 109.4; 110.23; 112.12; 114.3.

Cunningham identifies Pāṇiini’s native place with Lahaur 19.2.

D

Dākeśi, name of Pāṇiini’s mother 19.8; 19.n.1.

Dinodontoratāda father of Padmanabhadatta 111.4.

Darāma 16.11.

Darṣkārṣaṇā, Dīgambara, 65.3.

Dharmapāla’s abridgment, Rupasiddhi, of Śaṅkāyana’s Sabinduśākara 72.23; personal details about him 72.23ff; his date 72.26.

Dececcas (Deccas) first king of the Śakas or Śkythas, cir. 700 B.C. 18.1.

Dhavendra prophecies Hemachandra’s future greatness 74.4; receives him into order 74.11.

Devagiri 104.32, 105.3.

Devanandī author of Jainendra grammar 63.14ff; his new technical terms 66.5, 66.n.1, does not acknowledge obligations 66.10; names quoted by him 66.12, 66.n.2; 67.16 quoted by Hemachandra 76.n.2.

Devanāja mentions Kāhārasvāmin’s Nighaṇṭavṛtti 52.10.

Devanandaraṣṭra teacher of Guppatanāja 80.15.

Devastri founder of the Bhradgacchha of Nagpur 98.10ff.

Devendraṣṭra author of Halinlaghuśākara and pupil of Udayachandra 78.3ff, 79.n.1.

Devīdāsa quoted by Durgādeva 107.30.

Dhanachandra 78.14.

Dhanānja-kōsa 63.21.

Dhanesvara or Dhanesha teacher of Bopadeva 99.n.2; 104.30, 105.n.1.

Dhanesvarā, Bhāṭṭa, criticises Kahe-

menanda 93.22ff, 99.21; his date 99.21ff; not same as teacher of Bopadeva 99.n.2; his works 100.1ff.

Dharmādāsa’s com. incorporates the Chandraśravata 61.12.

Dhārīna-sūtras of some kind known to Pāṇiini 14.n.2.

Dhātupātha, the Pāṇiiniya 25.14, 25.n.2; its anubandhas same as those of Pāṇiini 25.18, 25.n.3; com. by Bhāṭṭojī 47.10; com. by Kāhārasvāmin in his Nighaṇṭavṛtti 52.6ff; other writers on Pāṇiiniya Dhātupāṭha: viz. Chandra 52.15, 52.n.2; Madhava or Śivya 52.23; Bktmasena 53.2; Maitreyakshita 53.2; and Nāgaca 53.3; the Chandra—was incorporated by Durgeshūba with the Kaṭantra 52.19, 59.14, 60.10, 60.19; 88.3ff, 90.1ff; Jumaranandi revises Pāṇiiniya—and adopts it for his own school 110.3ff;—of Saupadma 112.19;—of Śaṅkāyana 71.15;—of Hemachandra 77.21; the genuine—of Kaṭantra school in Tibetan translation only 90.4;—for the Ś Sarasvata, by Harshaśīkīrti 98.14, with a com. on it called Tāraṅgini 103.9; the Saupadma—modelled after Pāṇiini’s 112.32; com. Bhūmikānāya on it 113.1.
his date 83-16; his sūtrapātha differs from the one current in Kāśmir 83-21f, 87-27, 9-14; 85-5f; author of an Upādiṃṭha 85 n2, 90-1: a Śaiva 88-n1, and distinct from his namesake, a Baudha 88-2, who wrote a com. on his vṛtti 88-10, and from other later namesakes of his 88-11f; known in Kāśmir much late 91-6.

Durgasimha, Baudha, author of a com. on Durgasimha’s vṛtti 88-8.

Durgasimha-vṛtti, com. on, by Raghunandanaśironmani 84-26; by another Durgasimha 88-10; other coms. on it §69; a com., (anonymous) on it 99-n1.

Durgātīna (or Durga) perhaps a Viśvaśiva 88-n3, and author of a Liṅgaśūrīsana 88-15, 88-n3, 85-n2 distinct from Durgasimha 88-12; 89-16; 89-29.

Durgātīna author of (Kūśānta) Liṅgaśūrīsana 83-n2; different from Durgasimha above 85-n2.

Dvārakādīśa alina Dvārika father of Tarkatilaka-bhaṭṭaśchārya 102-27.

Dvārika, see Dvārakādīśa.

Dvāraśrayamukhāśrama of Hemachandra 66-20; 77-17.

E

Early History of India by Vincent Smith 17-3; 17-16, 82-n3.

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

Eastern school mentioned by Paṇini 10-12; 12-n2; 18-33.

Eggeling’s edition of the Kūśānta 85-22; 87-n1.

Elliot 99-n1.

Epigraphica Indica 69-n2.

F

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

G

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

Gadādhāra son of Trilochanadāsa 89-6.

Gaisuddin Khilji of Mālva 93-7; 97-8.
Gāya mentioned in the Nirukta 8-11; by Pañini 12-11.

Ganapatī of Pañini 23-24ff; 25-20; 537; com. upon by Kāśirāṣṭāmin 53-10; Chandra—60-12; embodied in the śūtrakṛtī of Chandragomin 60-24; Pāṇiniya—embodied in the Kāśki 60-24;—of Śakaṭaṁya 71-14;—of Hemachandra 77-26;—of the Ānupadma 113-1.

Ganapatnamahodadhi quoting Śaṅkara or Pañini, Śaṅkara, Chandragomin, etc. 18-1; 42-2; 41-5; 41-11; 52-16; with the author’s own com. 53-13ff; 68-4. Ganapatī by Kāśirāṣṭāmin mentioned by Vārāhamīra 52 11.

Ganesara father of Padmanābha-dutta 111-6.

Gārgya mentioned by Pañini 12-1; mentioned in the Nirukta 8-11.

Gita Govinda, com. on by Nāgase 49-7.

Goldstucker: Pañini, His place in Sanskrit literature, on Primitive Pratisākhyas 5-11; 23-7; on Pañini’s paribhāṣas 23-11; his views as to the authorship of the Upaniṣadāstras 25-25; 26-3; on Vaiṣṇavey Prati-sākhyas 29-2; 32-1; 88-4; on Pañini’s date 14-7, 14-11; 14-2; 19-3; his reasons for assuming considerable interval between Pañini and Kātyāyana 28-11; 64-11.

Gomatasāra, a philosophical work in Prākrit 72-15.

Gomatiya mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya 32-29, 32-2; quoted by Vatsyāyana in the Kāmasūtra 33-3; 33-5.

Gonikaputra mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya 32-29, 32-2; quoted by Vatsyāyana in the Kāmasūtra 33-5; 33-8.

Gopulakravartti’s com. on the Jānuma 110-23.

Gopalagiri’s subcom. on Vija-jabārupati’s Prabodha-prakāsa 115-30.

Gopinatha Tarkaśārya writes sub-com. to Sripati’s supplement to Kātantra 90-16; 90-20.

Govindam, surname of Bopadeva 105-8.

Govardhana’s vṛtti on Uṇādi, quoted by Ujjvaladattya 54-14.

Govardhanabhaṭṭa, grandfather of Jayakrishna 51-12.

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

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


Grammatical speculations in India: their extent and value 81; early—§§2-4;—in the Vedas 82, in the Brāhmaṇa 83, and in allied works 84;—in the Taittirīya-saṁhitā 2-1.

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

Grihya-sūtras of some kind known to Pañini 14-12.

Gṛ王晓 64-2.

Gṛ王晓atri 64-2.

Gṛ王晓stāṇaṭi Xriyaṇḍasamanuṣṭhāya 80-12ff; his date 80-16; 80-3; important praṇātī at the end of his work 80-16ff.

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

II

Haima-Dhātupāṭha 77-21.

Haima-Kaumudy by Meghaviyay mentions Bāṇāṣṭoji’s indebtedness to Hemachandra 46-21; otherwise called Chandra-prabha 79-17; its date 70 17.

Haima-laghuṇyās on Hemachandra’s Bhāvdhrīttī 79-1ff abridg-
ment of a larger Nyāsa 79·2ff.
Haima-laghu-pukriya by Vinayavi-
jayagani 79·12; com., Haimapra-
kāsa, on—79·14.
Haimapракāsa com. on Haima-
laghu-pukriya 79·14, its date
79·15, 79·n3.
Haima school absorbs Pāṇiniya Ṣu-
rdinīśuras 54·8; 77·23; see also
Homachandra.

Haṅśavijayagani’s Ṣabārthachan-
drikā 100·27; his date 100·30.
Haradatta author of Padamānījīt
§26; personal details 39·10ff; his
original name Sudarśana 40·n1; his
date 40·11; quoted by Viśṭha-
lāchārya 45·23.
Haraprasāda Shastri 58·8; 82·n2.
Hārīvalī 111·n2.
Hari, see Bhartihari.
Haribhadra, see Haribhaṭṭa.
Haribhaṭṭa or Haribhadra father of
Kshemendra 97·29.
Hari-dikṣita teacher of Nāgėsa
47·19, 48·n1.
Hārīḍrāvaka mentioned in the Nir-
ukta 8·n1.
Harilāmūrīta by Bopadeva 105·12,
105·n1.
Harināmānīrūta § 96; two such
grammars 113·16ff; their tech-
nical terms 113·23ff.
Harirāma, a Bengal Kāṭanttra writer,
quoted by Kavirāja 90·14.
Harirāma’s com. on Goychandra’s
vṛtti 110·20.
Harīvanśa (Jain) 63·21.
Harṣakṛiti pupil of Chandra-
kṛiti 98·13; wrote a Dḥutupāṭha
for the Sārasvata with an im-
portant prāsasti at the end 98·15,
and a com. on it called Taraṇ-
gīṭ 103·9ff.
Harshaśabha teacher of Udayasa-
bhāga 78·26.
Harshavardhana 53·20.
Harṣyakṣa 35·n1; 41·20.
Homachandra 57·n2; mentions De-
vanandī as author of Jainendra
63·22; 66·20; 68·31; his Liṅgini-
ṇāsana based on that of Śaṅkāṭay-
ma 71·22; biographical material of
—73·n2, collected by Bühler
73·17; his life § 57; his birth-
place 73·23; received into order
47·10; consecrated sūrī or śāh-
īya 74·16; attracts attention of Ja-
yasimha Siddharāja 74·29; writes
Ṣāḍānīsasana for him 75·18,
75·n1; converts Kumārapāla 75·8,
writes Yogāṣṭātra at the instance
of Kumārapāla 75·16; his pilgrim-
age 75·20, and death 75·24; his
indebtedness to the Amoghevrīti
and to Śaṅkāṭayana Ṣāḍānīsa-
sana 76·12, 76·n1; gives the
prāsasti of his patron in his Bri-
hadvrīti 77·3ff; author of Dvyā-
ṛayā-mahābhāratha 77·17; also of
accessory tracts 77·28, but
not of the vivarasā or vṛtti on
them 77·39ff; other works of
Homachandra 80·20; does not use
pratyāhāras 81·6; 89·21.

Homachandra’s Ṣāḍānīsasana one
of the works presumably used by
Bhaṭṭojī 46·22; its nature § 55;
it object 76·6ff; author’s own
com. on it 76·17ff; other comm.
and sub-commentaries on it § 60;
digests, manuals, and miscel-
naneous works § 61; the Prākrit
chapter from it 76·2; its later
independent history 81·12ff;
Ḍhunḍhika on it 78·25; 89·21.

Hemādri minister of Mahādeva
and patron of Bopadeva 105·2ff,
105·n1.

Hemalhīśavijayagani writes on
paribhāṣās for Homachandra’s
school 80·3ff; his Nyāyārtha-
maṇījūṭi 80·7.

Hemanandaganagi teacher of Sa-
hajakṛiti 100·22.

Hirādhara son of Vijjela-bhūpati
115·29.

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

History of Indian Literature by
Weber 82·7.

Huen Tsang; his account about the
Andra school 10·17; 19·3.

Humayun 93·9.

Hūṇas, Gupta victory over, 58·26.

1

India: what can it teach us, 41·n3.
Indian Antiquity 13:15: 120:1; 30:1; 31:11; 32:13; 32:1; 33:2; 36:2; 38:1; 41:1; 68:1; 63:11; 63:14; 63:2; 69:2; 69:2; 70:1; 72:1; 70:41.
Indo-Aryan, by Raj. Mitra, on the
Origin of the Vayusans with
Indische Mitteilungen 1921.
Indra also Indra is quoted by
name in Vayusas Prachanda,
Indra in its earlier stages quoted in
Pandita Adhipatiyayana spoken
of as the first of grammarians
10:27; 10:14 quoted by Sakayana
70:7; 70:8 quoted by
Hemachandra 70:12.
Indra (God) reveals grammar to
Jina 63:4, 63:12.
Indradatta said to have been at
first a follower of the Aima school
10:16; and a contemporary
of Patanjali 19:10.
Indus Greek not always to be
identified with Vayusas 13:21,
their appearance in history be
before 1000 B.C., 19:39.
Isipatana 3:15 35:3.
Jaina-siddhant 64:18.
Jainendra Sutras 64:19; his two
shikshas 65:12.
Jayakrishna has based his
Vivaraṇa on Kay-
yapa's Prakrikā 40:3.
Jayantkāra's account of Jayaditya
and his work 35:25.

J
Jayaddhara, Bhāṣya, author of
Ekaśabdam 91:12.
Jagnāthī gives personal details
about Bhāṣyajī 46:27ff; pupil of
the son of Śeṣa-kṛṣṇa 47:2,
48:1.
Jagnāthī, author of Sarapradhipika,
quotation Kacamanda 98:1,
100:6.
Jahangir, Emperor, 93:9; 162:26;
102:22.
Jainendra quoted by name in
Bhāpadeva's Mūgālābolsa 10:13;
53:1; mentioned by Vaiśnava-
chāryā 53:31, 53:3; Jainendra
school §47; its traditional author
62:52; its etrapāṭha originally
belonged to Digambara Jain,
from whom Śatendrā has
quoted it 61:1; its real author
Devamālā 61:14, alias Pujya-
pāda 61:25, 61:2; date of its
foundation 314, 61:16; the
Jainendra śāstrāmīla to Jayad-
ātha 61:13; character of-
pātra 46; its two versions
61:13; its want of originality
61:24 compared with 67:10;
its verses 69:2; its later stages
Janardana son of Hemachandra
101:18.
Jayaprakash of the Prakriya
University 51:8. Its name a
moniker 104:27ff; its special
status 87, its alternative name
102:32.
Jayaditya has date 35:20; men-
tioned by Jyotirling 35:22, 35:26;
his work called with sūtra
35:23 at last, a contemporary
of the author of the Vaiśāk-
āsya 35:2; his contribution to
the Kālīya distinguished
before 30:34, 35; 35:11; 36:16;
36:13; perhaps same as Jay-
pyala of Kāśmīr 35:19; native
of Kāśmīr 35:22.
Jayakrishna supplements the Tat-
vatsthāvat with a section on āsāra
and valtk prakriya 48:5; his
date 49:8.
Jayakrishna's com. on the Lakhu-
siddhantakanadu 51:11; per-
sonal details about him 51:11ff.
Jayanta author of Tattvachandra,
a treatise of the Prakriyā-
kananda 51:1.
Jayantkāra quoted by Hemachan-
dra 70:2.
Jayāpāla supposed to be pupil of
Kathrasvāmin 52:2.
Jayāsini (I) (Chalukya Empero
) alias Vairāja, fellow-student of
Dayāpāla 72:24ff.
Jayasimha-Siddhārtha patron of
Hemachandra 74:20ff; stories
about him and Hemachandra
74:32; his death 75:1; the
Systems of Sanskrit Grammar

Śabdānusāsana written at his request 75-18.
Jina or Mahāvīra, traditional author of the Jainendra school 62.22f ; 63.4.
Jinadattasūri teacher of Amara-
chandra 80.8.
Jinamanyana's Kumārapālacharita
73.2.
Jinaprabhasūri alias Jinaprabodha, an-
author of a com. on Kātantra-
vṛtti-pañjikā 89 n2; particulars about him 89 n2.
Jinaprabodha, see Jinaprabhasūri.
Jinaratna, see Jinendu.
Jivasāgara 78.16.
Jinendrabuddhi author of Nyāsa
on Kaśika §25, 71.n1; his date 35 n2, 38 12; quoted by Bhāmaha 35r.2, 38-13ff; called sometimes
Śhāvīra-Jinendra 38.n2; styles him as if Bodhisattvadesīyachāra
38.11; n. t later than 750 A.D.
38 12; quoted by Viśthhalačārya 45.20.
Jinendu alias Jinaratna author of Siddhāntaratna 102.27.
Jñavarsvīmin's Harināmānītīta
114.1.
Jūnānīlaka 103.12.
Jinendra-sarasvati author of the Tattvabodhini 47.25.
Jūrāpakas 35.17, 54.27ff, 54n2, 56 25; see also Paribhāshas.
Jodhpur (Yodhapura) 80.1, 80.n1.
Jogarāja's Pādayākaraṇasaṅgati
84.20, App. 2; mentioned by Maṅkha 84.22; assigns the Kā-
tantra Kṛitaprakaraṇa to Śukaṭā-
yana 84 24.
Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal 33.n1.
Jumaranandā author of the vṛtti, Rāsavatt on Kramāndivāra's Saṅ-
keśiptasāra 109.27ff; the school receives name (Janmāra) from him 108.28; and (Rāsavata) from his vṛtti 109.32; revises Pāṇinīya Dīnupārtha for his own school 110.3f.
Jupiter, twelve year cycle of, 61-21, 64.n5.

K
Kachchāyana's Pāli Grammar closely related to Tolkappiyam
11-6; and based on Kātantra 82-10.
Kadamba kings, Early, 64-23.
Kādera 16-30.
Kāhin father of Mādhava 98-20.
Kaiyāyata quotes from the works of Ājīvī and Kāsakrītina 10-3, 10-2; 24.n1; the Pādaṃajjīrī
based on his Prādīpa 40-7, 40.n2; his Prādīpa marking end of se-
cond period in the history of Pāṇinīya school § 28; his prob-
able date 41-29; personal de-
tails about him 42-5ff; quoted in the Sarva-dārsā-saṅgraha
42-21, 42.n2; acknowledges in-
debtedness to Bhārtijāri 42-25;
quoted by Viśthhalačārya 45.19;
59.21; 76.n2.
Kā kalā quoted by Hemachandra 76.n2.
Kāla, Vaidyanātha's com. on Nā-
geśa's Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhānta-
maṇijaśa 50-15.
Kālaśa-dhutasūtra 90-4.
Kālapa grammar said to agree with the Aindra grammar 10-20; also called Kaumūra and Kātantra
82-22f, 83.9f.
Kālapaka quoted by Hemachandra 76.n2.
Kālapavākaraṇottipattiprāstava by
Vamanī 82.n2.
Kālapin, the vehicle of Kumūra
83-9.
Kāte surname of Nāgojibhatta
49-34.
Kalhana 36-20.
Kalidāsa 57.22; 58.n2; 101-16.
Kalikā-sūtra 73.n1.
Kalpasūtras, Samyāsundara's com-
on, 63-2, 63.n2.
Kaliṣya, Prince, patron of Śesha-
krīṣṇa 45-29.
Kālyānasaarasvati's Llaghūsūtrasvata
103-24f.
Kāmā mother of Rāmahūrta
101.12.
Kāmadhenu by Bopadeva 68-31; quotes Vardhamāna 88-23; com-
on the author's Kāvikalpadrumā
105-11.
Kāmasūtra quotes Gomārtya and Gopīkāpurī 33.5, 33.n.3.
Kambhā 10.30.
Kandarpasiddhānta’s com. on the Saupadma 112.13.
Karakas, treatises on, 35.28.
Kārttikāya by Nārāyaṇa Datta-
chātira 116.12.
Kārttikāya revealed Aindra gram-
mor to Saptavarman 10.22; see also Kumāra.
Kāśakrītasa, founder of a grammati-
sical school, 9.23; his grammar consisted of sūtras in three Adhyayas 10.3, 10.n; Kālīyaṇa quotes from his grammar 10.4;
10.n; quoted by name in Pān-
deva’s Mūrgalodhā 10.7, 10.n.3.
Kāśika gives a rule of Āpiśali 9.21; tells that Kāśakrītasa’s grammar consisted of sūtras in three Adhyayas 10.3, 10.n; does not anywhere mention the Aindra school 11.20; 20.8; 28.n; its date 35.20; a joint work of Jayā-
ditya and Vināna § 23; perhaps same as Vṛittiśātra mentioned by Itṣing 35.24; quotes Vākyapadi-
ya and so not earlier than 650 A.D. 35.n; Nyāya on—by Ji-
nendrabuddhi §25.32.n2; personality of the authors of—36.11ff; Bālia-Kṣatri’s edition of 35.n3; nature of the—37.10; Rule a rule of Āpiśali 37.8, 9.n3; gives a new vartika of the Sa-
nīgas 37.11; its indebtedness to Chinārgomin §24, 62.2, 59.21, asascertained by Kleinhorn 37.20; illustrated 38.n; Kāśika does not acknowledge its inde-
Fness 38.5, 58.18; Hordatta’s Padmaśāstra on the Kāśika §20;
47.13; embodies Pānīnaya Gana-
pitha 60.25; apparently knows the Jinnendra 64.17, 61.n.
Kāśikākara quoted by Hemachan-
dra 76.1.2.
Kāśikāvivaranapāṇi, see Nyāsa.
Kāśinātha author of Sura, a com. on the Prakrityākṣamānti 46.n1.
Kāśinātha, his Sārasvata-bhāshya 160.6ff; his date 160.1.12.
Kāśivara quoted by Durgādāsa
107.31; his supplement to the
Mūrgalodhā 108.10.
Kāśivara’s com. on the Saupadma
112.13; his Ganaśāja to Saupadma 113.1; com. on it by Ramākṣāta 113.2.
Kāśyapa mentioned by Pāṇini
12.9.
Kāśyapa author of the Chandra recast, Bālāyodhā 62.20.
Kātantra, closely related to Tolka-
piyam 11.5; absolves Pānīnaya
Ganādīsātra 54.8; why so called? 51.2ff; traditional account of its origin § 64; its date 82.n3;
83.23ff; its two recensions 87.25ff; Pergal comm. on—71; its study now confined to a few districts of Pergal 10.2; its history in Kāpiṇir § 72; in-
corporates Chandra Dhatupāṭha 52.19; takes over most of the Pānīnaya pitheś’s 55.11; 81.7; interpretations in the–
Sārākṣāna § 65; 87.17ff; its early history § 67, 93.2–93.31;
106.5; 110.20.
Kātantravistarā, Vandana’s com.
on Purgānida’s vṛitti, 68.20; a sub-com. on it by Ṣūṣṭar Ṣastra 88.24.
Kātantravṛttiśiṣeṣikā, Trilakara-
dāsa’s com. on Purgānida’s vṛitti 89.10ff; a sub-commentaries on it 89.27.
Kāvilasarṣiga com. about Pāṇini, his predecessors and contem-
poraries 10.15ff, 10.9ff, 26.12–29.7; its account about Kātyā-
yana 31.3, 31.n1.
Kāvahats śrī, Professor, 63.6.
Kāṭalakya mentioned in the Mi-
kta 8.n1.
Kātyānana 7.17; 7.21; 7.n2; alias Varanadhi 85.n1, said to have been at first a follower of the Aindra school 10.15; 12.6; 14.5; his knowledge of the Yavanas more exact than that of Pāṇini 16.55; 17.5; 17.30; 18.4; said to be a contemporary of Pāṇini 19.10; he probably regarded the Upanidāsātras as Pāṇini’s 16.18.
26.n1; he also probably edited them 26.27; mentioned in the
sole author of the Uḍīdisūtra, by Vimalaśāya 27-2, 27-n1; by Durgāśīnā 27-4, 27-n2; Vārṭikācārā b-safe him 28-3; considerable interval between him and Pāṇini 27-7, 27-n1, 54-19; his date 517; his relation with the Nandas 29-6; nature of his work 518; his first work, Vāja- sanayi Prātiśākhya 29-13; extant; of his criticism on Pāṇini 30-1; his criticism also constructive 30-9, but in places unjust 30-13; did not uniformly follow Pāṇini's terminology 30-24ff; probably belonging to a different school of grammar from Pāṇini 31-5; called a 'southerner' by Patañjali 31-6, 31-n2 refers to Śāktaśāstra 31-n3, Śākalya 31-n4, Vājapāyīya 31-n5, Vāmādi 31-n6, Pauṣhakaraśa 31-n7, and others 31-n8; 38-n1; 54 21; 59-10; 69-18; 70-14.

Kauṭāma another name of Kāntantra 53-8.

Kauṭāma 104-11; see Siddhiśa- kaumādī, Pṛakṛtya-kauṇḍī, and Halmakaumādī.

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

Kanśhākīri mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.

Kauṭikā, a Jīna Tirtha 98 11.

Kauṭiliya 32-16.

Kauṭsa mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.


Kaviśāla a Beng I comm. on Kātan- ta 91-13; quotes Trilokahāṃsa 31 and is quoted by Harirāma 99 14.

Kāvya-prakāśa 52-8.

Kārttika 15-29.


Kesari, article in, by Mr. Rajadā 17-57.

Kesāva, father of Bapodeva 101-29; 103-n1.

Kesāva-kavīr vākapūrāṇāmabhā- jī Kṛśna Vākalapāramahākāśa er Gojichandra's comm. 10 18, 110-n3.

Kesāvavarni pupil of Abhayachandra 72-13; author of a comm. on Gomātaśāstra 72-15.

Kharata-gachchha 99-1; 100-23.

Kielhorn, his ed. of the Mahābhā- shya 7-r2; 11-31; 19-27; 27-n3; 30-n2; 31-n1; about Patañjali being distinct from Gomātśa and Gopīkārātra 33-3; on the indebtedness of the Kaśika to Chandragomin 37 21ff; about Bhatrivatī's comm. on the Mahā- bhāshya 41-n2; doubts existence of Pāṇayātī as a real author 64-1ff, 66-22; doubts existence of Abhinava Śāktaśāstra 69-1ff; 81-n1; 89-n2; 89-n3.

Kītārjuniya quoted by Haradatta 39-n3.


Konabhalatā nephew of Bhattoji 48-13, 48-n1; author of Vaiśy- karaśahabhāsha 48-n1, 48-14, 55-25.


Kṛṣṇāchārīrā, father of Kāma- chandra 45-7.

Kṛṣṇāśrama teacher of Kaśme- rī 97-29.

Kṛṣṇa-Yajus-Sūrhitā anterior to Pāṇini 14-12.

Kṛṣṇārtha-savimuchchhaya of Guṇa- rmasūrī 50-12ff.

Kṣapaṇaka's vṛtti en Unāśī; quoted by Ujjvaladatta 54-14.

Kṣayamaṅkara 102-1; father of Lokeśvara 102-13.

Kṣemendra of Kṛṣṇā 97-31.

Kṣemendra's comm. on Sārasvatī- prakāśa mentions Narendra as founder of the Sārasvata 97-17ff, 97-27; personal details about him 97-23ff; quoted by Jagannatha 97-33; criticised by Dharmesāra 91-2, 92-21; his date 94-5ff.

Kṣemodippanakhaṇḍa by Dharmesāra 94-3.
Māgha about authorship of Unādi-sūtras 27-6; quoted by Haradatta 39-nā.  
Mahābhārata, Bhāshmaparvan, 16-8.  
Mahābhāṣya ed. of Kielhorn 7-n2; 9-20; does nowhere mention the Āndra school 11-30; 13-20; 14-n2; gives name of Panini's mother 19-8; 19-23; 19-n3; 22-n1; 23-n1; 24-n1; 25-25; 25-n5; gives a stanza from the Paniniya Śikṣā 27-15, 27-n5; Bhartrihari's commentary on 27-n5, 41-6, 41-23, 109-8; mentions Ślokavārtikakārās 28-4; Kielhorn's Notes on 30-n2, 31-n1; describes the Saṅgraha of Vyādi 31-n9; describes Kātyāyana as a 'southerner' 31-6, 31-n2; mentions a number of vārtikakārās following Kātyāyana 31-n10; 32-5; mentions Gomatiya and Gomikaputra 32-29, 32-n2; detailed exposition of the in—found in Indische Studien 33-10; text of the traditions about 33-24ff, 41-18; does not notice all sūtras of Panini 34-3; fanciful explanation of this fact 34-n1; it marks end of the first period in the history of Paniniya school §21, 56-13; Chintāmani on—by Dhanesvara 100-2.  
Mahābhāṣya-chintāmani of Dhanesvara 100-2.  
Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa as the basis of Haradatta's. Padamañjari 40-7, 40-n2; itself indebted to Bhartrihari 42-24; commentaries on it by Nāgijīhata, Nārāyaṇa, Śivarāmānta, and others 43-nff.  
Mahābhāṣya-pradīpodyota of Nāgijīhata 43-2; 49-10; a com. on it by Vaidyānātha, called Chhītya 50-13.  
Mahādeva father of Vaidyānātha 50-6.  
Mahādeva, author of Śabdvasiddhi, on Durgasimha's vṛtti 89-10.  
Mahādeva the Yādava king of Devasgiri 105-8.  
Mahātīrvula, see Jina.  
Mahāesvara preceptor of Kātyāyaṇa 42-7.  
Mahādāra 102-1.  
Maitreyaraksita 39-n1.  
Maitreyaraksita mentioned as a writer on roots by Sāyaṇa 53-2.  
Malayagiri's Sāndanusīsana with his own com. 80-31ff; his date 81-4.  
Mallinātha, his commentary on the Śiśupālavadana 27-n3; quotes Padamañjari 39-18; quotes Bopa-deva in his com. of the Kumāra 104-33f; quotes a Chándra rule 57-21, 57-n2.  
Mamāsa 42-8ff; 42-n1.  
Māṅgarasa author of a com. on the Chintāmani 72-7.  
Māṇikyadeva on Paniniya Unādi-sūtras 54-17.  
Māṇipurakāśīka by Ajitasesāchārya, a com. on the Chintāmani 72-6.  
Māṅkha author of Śrīkanṭha-chārita 84-22.  
Manorāma, see Prāṇḍhanamorāma.  
Manorāmakuchāmadari of Jagan-nātha gives some personal details about Ehaṭoṣi 46-28ff, 47-n1.  
Mantras, Seals of, 6-n1.  
Manu mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.  
Manuals, lesser, §98; characteristic of the declining age of a school 115-11.  
Maulī family 48-4; 51-12.  
Mauryas, their financial expedient mentioned by Patanājali 32-25.  
Maxims of interpretation, see Paribhāṣā.  
Max Miller, History of Ancient Indian Literature. 4-n1; 4-n3; 4-28; on introduction of art of writing 4-28; 9-n1; on Panini's date 14-3; 15-3; 28-15.  
Medes not unknown to Indians before Alexander's invasion 15-33.  
Medēnā 111-n2.  
Megha father of Trilochanadāsa 89-6.  
Meghādāsī, Mallinātha's com. on 57-22.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>General Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td><em>Meghnadāṇa's Sarvavatya-karana-dhānḍhika</em> or <em>Sarvavatya-dhāpikā</em> 99–147.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meghavijaya author of Haimakan-mard 70:18ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memonial, his siege mentioned by Patañjali 3:24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merutunḍeṭhrīya's Pratāpanandakhin-tamāṇī 73:n2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous Essays by Celebreco 65:n1; 114:n1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitakshārā (law) the Vyavaharika from it commented upon by Vaidyantītha 50:9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miltra, Rajendralal, on the identification of Yavana with Ionian Greeks 15:21; shows that Patañjali is not same as Gonaḍiya or Gonikaputra 33:2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molana Madhusūdana brother of Tarkatīkabhatṭachārya 102:23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moharajapārījaya, drama by Yasyāpala, 75:8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muddhalaṅkodha quotes by names various grammarians 10:n3; 91:28; 104:23; 105:10; the object of—§83; its domination prior to Bhāṣṭoḷī 107:12; commentaries on, 107:24ff; supplements to, 103:9ff; accessory treatises to, 103:15ff; 110:27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muhammadan incursions as affecting growth of literature 43:15ff; later Muhammadan rulers as creating a demand for Sanskrit grammar 43:27, 93:4ff; 96:7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muktaphala by Dāpodeva 105:11, 105:n1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Munnirayam 34:12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>General Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nūgēsa, see Nūgojibhatī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nūgojibhatī speaks of Sāntanavatya-chārya as relatively modern author 27:n4; his Uddyota on Kāiyayata's Pradīpa 43:1; his com. on the Pradūhaṭmanaranāt 47:18, and on the Adhyātim-waṁśya 47:21; his commentary on Bhāṭ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nāīdāna mentioned in the Niruktā 8:n1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nāīruktās mentioned in the Niruktā 8:n1; 21:14: their view as to root-origin of all words 25:26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nāndakīrsīrēbhatī's supplement to the Muddhalaṅkodha 108:9; his date 103:11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nāndasundara 78:17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nārāharī's Bālīvadha 116:16ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nārāsinīda father of Rāmaḥbatī 101:12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nārāyaṇa's vivarana on Kāiyayata's Pradīpa 43:2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nārāyaṇabhārati 101:35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nārendra or Nōrendrāchārya mentioned as founder of Sarvavatya by Kāhemendra 95:16, by Aṃtībhārati 95:22; by Viṣṭabhāṭṛīya 95:24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nīgāhunī 6:n1; commented upon by Yāska's Nirukta 8:5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nīgāhun-vaṛtī by Kāḷravāṁśin, quoted by, Devarājya 52:10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nīṭakanṭha Śukla, pupil of Bhāṭṭoḷī 47:n2, 48:n1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nīpāṭāvyāyopasārāvīrtī by Kāḷravāṁśin 52:8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nīṭukta of Yāska, its date §6; 7:9; its nature §7; teachers and schools referred to in it 8:n1; introduction to, by Pandīt Satyavatya Sāmāranāt 14:17; 25:25; 25:n4; quotes Śāktyāyana 68:25; com. on, by Durgāchārya 88:14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nīrkeṭanirvarāchana by Devarājya 52:10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nīrunkī 75:n1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nōrthern school mentioned by Pāṇini 12:n2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nīśaṁbhāchārya father of Viṣṭabhāṭṛīya 45:22.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nyāsa on Kaśīka by Jyendrabuddhi 35-n2, §25; otherwise known as Kaśīka-vivaraṇa-parijāta 38-9; not a single edition or a complete manuscript of it in existence 39-1, 39-1n; said to have been commented upon by Maitreyarakṣita 39-n1; 71-n1; quoted (?) by Hemachandra 76-n2.

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

Nyāsa on the Śākayāna-Sabhādharma 39-n1; quoted in Madhaviya Dhitavrūti 71-31; quoted by Hemachandra 76-n2.

Nyāsa, a com. on the Amoghavṛtti quoted by Prabhachandrāchārya 72-2.


Nyāyapāṇchāhama’s com. on Goyichandra’s vṛtti 110-17a.

Nyāyārthānunājūśa of Hemalīsā-vijayagani 80-7; its date 80-n2.

O

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

P

Padma brother of Vāhada and minister to Alpasīli 99-6.

Padmānabhadi of Haradatta §26; quoted in the Madhaviya Dhitavrūti and by Mallinātha 30-18; quotes Māgli 30-18, 30-n3; quotes Kṛṣṇa and Bhāṭṭikārāya 30-n3; based upon Kāvyaratha’s Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa 40-7, 40-n2, 43-7.

Padapīṭha of Śakalya 4-17; 6-n1.

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

Padmanabhadiatta founder of the Saṃpadma school 111-2; personal details about him 111-21; different from the author of the Prisahara-ādirvrttī 111-8; his date 111-15; the arrangement of his work 111-n4; his own com. on it called Saṃpadmapāṇijā 112-11; his other work 112-19b, 112-n1.

Padmanabhadiatta, author of Prisahara-ādirvrttī, different from the founder of Saṃpadma 111-5ff.

Padmapurṣa 100-4.

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

Pālavas, see Paṇthians.

Pāṇiṣṭha king, the Tolkappiyam read before, 11-8.

Pānchatantra story about Pāṇini’s death by tiger 19-15 19-n2.

Pāṇḍavaasta, recast of Jñanendra 67-14ff; its introductory part interpolated 67-20.

Pāṇini, 5-n1; his terminology presupposed by present Prātiṣṭhākyas 5-2; —, his place in Sanskrit literature, by Goldstücker, 5-n1; his terminology compared with that of Yāśka 6-n2; objections to his being placed after Yāśka considered 7-6ff; his system based on Yāśka’s theory of the verbal origin of every noun 9-3; 9-6ff; uses technical words and formulas of earlier writers, some of whom came after Yāśka 9-14; 9-n2; 10-n3; said to have supplanted the Aindra school 10-15; as also other schools 62-26; does not anywhere mention Indra by name—10-11, nor the Aindra school 11-28; 12-6; the school of—§§10 to 41; authors quoted by—12-n2; his date §11; posterior to Yāśka 14-14; must have known some form of Grihya and Dharmasūtras 14-n2; placed even before Yāśka by Pandit Satyavṛata Sānasārami 14-18; usually but without sufficient evidence assigned to 350 B.C. §12; lived prior to Alexander’s invasion.
17-19; lived prior to 700 B.C.; 18-19; 18-16; only a negative conclusion about his date possible 18-27; the known facts about his life §13; Śālikurti, an alias of — 18-32; his mother's name, Dāsika 19-8, 19-13; his teacher said to be Varaha 19-11; has the fourteen pratyāhāra sūtras revealed to him 19-13, 23-18; story about his death by a tiger 19-14, 19-2; character of Pāṇini's work §14; his contribution to philology in the Upaniṣadās 21-31; the technical devices used by him §13; his method of indicating adhikāra-sūtras 21-4; his Paribhāṣa 25-4; his Dhītrimitha 25-14ff; his Gotayāna 23-24, 24-29, 25-20; reasons for assigning most of the Upaniṣadās to his authorship 25-7ff; his Vārttikākāra pp. 28-32; considerable interval separates him from Kātyāyana 27-7, 27-1; criticized by Kātyāyana first in the Vaiṣṇava Pratīṣṭhāhya 29-16, and later in the Vārttika 29-22; his terminology not strictly adhered to by Kātyāyana 30-21ff; 38-1; Siddhāntakumudī the most popular introduction to his grammar 46-11; he tacitly employed many Paribhāṣas current before him 54-21, 54-1; history of his school, review of, §41; 56-7; three stages in the later history of his school 56-11ff; 55-9; 65-28; 69-1; 69-18; 69-3; 70-1-5; 71-1; 75-30; 76-2; 81-28; 86-21; 86-28; 86-30; 87-4; modern revival of Pāṇini 30-31; 107-4; 92-16; 93-1; 93-27; later attempts to improve upon him 103-17; 103-22; 103-1; 111-20; 112-4.

Pāṇini, the poet, quoted in Valla-
bhadava's Sāhāçāsrīdādī and identified with Pāṇini the grammarian 13-10.

Paribhāṣa of Pāṇini and of later grammarians 23-4; 25-1; no ancient collection has come down 27-19; commonly ascribed to Vyāki 27-21, 25-23; invention of the system of— 35-10; Paribhā-

[Sk. Gr.]
a detailed exposition of his time
given in Indische Studien 33·10; 33·11; viadicates Pāṇini against
the attacks of Kātyāyana 33·18; often unfair to Kātyāyana 33·20;
his unparalled style 33·21; his
iṣṭiṣis 33·15; 35·3; 54·2; 59·10;
69·18; 76·n2; 103·3.
Pathak, professor, 10·n1; 14·n2;
39·n1; proves the historical exis-
tence of Pūjyapāda 64·6ff; his
paper on Jaina Śākaṭāyana 64·14;
69·8ff, 76·n1; his arguments for
the date of Jainendra 64·16ff;
65·n2; 67·24; 72·n1; 72·n2;
72·n3.
Patrapuṇa 45·29.
Paurenic accounts of frontier tribes
not mere imaginative fabrica-
tions 16·6.
Paushkarasādi mentioned by Kā-
tyāyana 31·n7.
Pāyagaṇḍa, see Vaidyanātha Pāya-
agaṇḍa.
Persians not unknown to Indians
before Alexander’s invasion
15·53; mentioned as mercenary
fighters by Pāṇini 17·24; blotted
out as a political power in 329
B.C. 17·26.
Peterson on Pāṇini’s date 13·5ff;
13·n2; 45·n3; 53·n2; 55·1; 65·4;
67·n2; 79·n2; 89·n2.
Philology, science of, revolutioniz-
ed by discovery of Sanskrit by
modern Europe 2·24; its postu-
lates Yāska’s theory of the root-
origin of every noun 9·4.
Phīṭāstras of Śāntanavācchārya
27·12, 27·n4.
Phoneticians, manuals on, 4·12.
Pischel on the identification of
Pāṇini the grammarian and Pā-
ṇini the poet 13·10.
Platae 16·2.
Prabandhachintāmani by Merutuṅ-
ghāchārya 73·n2.
Prabandhakośa by Rājasekhara
73·n2.
Prabhā, Vaidyanātha’s com. on
Bhaṭṭoji’s Saḍbādakastubha 50·15.
Prabhāchandra quoted by Pūjya-
pāda 66·n2; attempt to prove that
the name is fictitious 66·18;
66·n3.
Prabhāchandra author of Prabhā-
vakachāritra 73·n2.
Prabhāchandrāchārya author of a
Nyāsa on Amoghaśrītī 72·1.
Prabhāvakachāritra by Prabhā-
chandra and Pradyumnaśūri
73·n2.
Prabodhachandrīka by Vījyala-bhu-
pati 115·22ff; com. on it by
Gopālagiri 115·30.
Prabodhaprakāśa, a Śūka grammar
by Balarāmapuṇḍarīka 114·12,
114·19ff.
Pradīpa, see Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa.
Pradyumnaśūri reviser of Prabhā-
chandra’s Prabhāvakachāritra
73·n2.
Prākrit literature, growth of, as
affecting development of Sans-
krit 34·20.
Prakṛitiyākamanḍūr of Rānachandra
830; the model for Bhaṭṭoji’s
Śiddhānta-kumārī 45·10; com-
mented upon by Viṭṭhalaḥchārya
in the Prasāda 45·14; by Śesha-
krīśīna in the Prakāśa 45·25;
and by others 46·n1; an abridg-
ment of it by author’s pupil
51·n1; 72·21; 109·3.
Prakṛitiyamāni by Dhanaśvaram 100·3.
Prakṛitiyaprakāśa of Śeshaṅkrīśīna
45·25.
Prakṛitiyāṅgārāha of Abhayachan-
dra, recast of Śaṅkṛīyana Šaṅ-
dūnāsana 72·11.
Prasāda of Viṭṭhalaḥchārya 45·14;
its date 45·16; quotes Narendra-
chārya 55·24.
Pratypuradra of Telaṅgana 101·10.
Prātiṣākhyas, primitive, presu-
pose art of writing 4·30; present
post-Pāṇini 5·2; their con-
tribution to science of grammar
5·10ff; their technical terms
identified by Dr. Burnell with
those of Aindra school 5·n2,
82·13; show Yāska in the making
5·19; 6·n1; 9·n2; closely related
to Tolkappiyam 11·6, and to Ki-
tantra 82·15; 12·6; 86·22, 86·n1;
Vājasaneyi Prātiṣākhyas the first
grammatical work of Kātyāyana,
see under Vājasaneyī.
### Pratyahara sutras, fourteen, revealed to Pāṇini by God Śiva 19.13; 22.15; means to produce brevity and terseness 23.25; Viśjanaśeṣyapradīkaka Pratyahara sutras same as Pāṇini's 29 n2; their number reduced by Chandragomin 59-15; Pāṇiniya — retained by Jainendra 66:3; — of Śākkāya 70-13; — of Malayagiri 81:6; — not used by Hemachandra 81-6; Pāṇiniya — dispensed with by Kātantra 60-23ff; their use without its by the Sravasa 91-5; 113-23; — of Bopaḍeva 106-6; — called Samāhātesṭra 106-21; — of Pāṇini retained by Saipadma 111-21.

Pradha-manoramā Bhaṭṭoji's own com. on the Siddhānta-kumudī 47.7; distinguishes between the two authors of the Kṛṣṇa 36-n1; acknowledges indebtedness to Bopaḍeva 45-n1; does scant justice to the memory of Śrīkakrīśna 47-1; its abridgment called Bhaṭṭa-manoramā 47-8; Jagannātha's com. on it called the Manoramākhaṇḍamālī 47-18; another com. on it by Nāgda called Subdaratna 47-16; 49-16; 107-7.

Prabhodānadiśivritti of Paddanāhasadatta 111-8; its date 111-9, 111-n1.

Pṛthvyādhara, Mahāmāhāpādhyāya, author of sub-com. on Varāhamīnā's Kātantra-vistarā 83-21.

Pūpyāna an alias of Devanandī 63-25; 64-n2; mentioned as the founder of a Dravida-saṅgha 65-4; possibility of other namesakes of his 65-10; 69-20; 70-8.

Pundarikākha writes sub-com. to Śrīpatī's supplement to Kātantra 59-21.

Pūnjarāja the earliest com. on the Sravasa-prakriyā 90-15; personal details about him 90-33ff; his date 96-16; 97-7; his works 97-8ff; 99-n1.

Punyasundaragupta 79-24ff.

Purnāhottama 97-23.


Pushpamitra alluded to as contemporary by Patañjali 52-21, and probably Patañjali's own patron 52-23.

### R

Races, impact of different, as influencing study of grammar 2-31.

Raghunandana-dronma 84-25.

Raghunāthā author of the Laghu-kārikā on the Sraivas 103:1; pupil of Bhaṭṭoji 103-5.

Raghuśāñbhāṭṭa father of Jaya-kṛishṇa 46-8: 51-11.

Rajadhanyapura 79-n2.

Rajasekhara's Prabandhakakṣa 73-n2.


Rajavade, Vishvanath, K., his paper on Pāṇini's date 17-9 ff.

Rajendrali Mitra on the identification of Yavana with Ionian Greeks 15-21; shows that Patañjali is not the same as Ganaṇidya or Gopīkāṇḍa 33-2.

Rāmānathra-nīyavālaṅkāra 107-32.

Rāmabhatṭa's Vidvat-pradhibhīntī 101-3; personal details about the author 101-6 ff; his works 101-16 ff.

Rāmabhatṭa, see Vidvatpradhibhīntī.

Rāmachandra's Prakṛiti-kumudī 530; his date 45-6; personal details about him 45-6 ff.

Rāmānanda, commentator on Kātantra-vīrtita 89-8; 90-16.

Rāmānanda's commentary on the Saipadma 112-14.

Rāmānanda-chakravarti writes sub-com. to Śrīpatī's supplement to Kātantra 90-20.

Rāmānanda-dronma's Siddhāntachandrīkā 102-11; commentaries on it 102-13 ff; the author's own abridgment of it 102-19.

Rāmaṇāśa 90-15.

Rāmaṇāya the Yādava king of Devagiri 105-4.

Rāmaṇa's com. on Saipadma-Ganapati 113-2.

Rāmaṇa grandfather of Lokeśvara 102-14.

Rāmakriśnāchārya grandfather of Viśbhākṣārya 45-22.
Rāmānanda quoted by Durgādāsa 107-30.  
Rāmārāman’s com. on the Madhyā- 
Siddhāntakaumudi 51-10.  
Rāmasiha patron of Nāgojībhatṭā  
50-1.  
Rāmāśrama, see Bhau-dikshita.  
Ramatarkavūga, commentator on  
Mugdhabodha 107-24; his supple- 
ment to Mugdhabodha 108-10;  
his Uṇādikōṣa 108-22.  
Rāṅgāchārya’s edition of Saṅkara’s  
Śarvasiddhānta-saṅgraha 105’n3.  
Rāṅgojī-dikshita brother of Bhaṭṭo- 
ji 46-24; 43’n1.  
Rasagāndhara 49-27.  
Rasavata another name for the Jau- 
mara school 109-22; quoted in Bha- 
rata’s com. on Bhaṭṭīkāvyā 110-1.  
Rasavati Jumaranand’s vṛtti on  
Kramādīvara’s Saṅkhīptasūra  
Rātālāna 79’n3.  
Rātākara 101-35.  
Rāyamukha mentions Chandra  
Līṅgānūsāna 60 20.  
Recasts of Aśṭādhyāyī § 29; 57-2.  
Rigveda, grammatical speculations  
in 1 25; its Saṅhītā anterior to  
Pāṇini 14-12.  
Roman conquest, influencing study  
of Greek grammar 2’n2.  
Royal Asiatic Society, the Bombay  
Branch, Journal of, 35’n2.  
Rūpagaṇvīmin’s Harināmadīvaṃs  
13-17.  
Rūpaṇḍī of Vinasakarasvāti men- 
tions Varunuchi alias Kātyāyana  
as author of Uṇādisūtras 27’n1;  
it is a recast of Aśṭādhyāyī  
41-2; its date 44’n; 44’n1; its  
arrangement of topics 44’n6 fi;  
independent to it acknowledged by  
Bhaṭṭoji Dikshita 45’n1.  
Rūpaśiddhi, an abridgment of Sa- 
kāyana Saṅhūnsāsana, by  
Dvyāpīla 72-23.  
Rupāvali 51-16.  
Rudr- (or Padma-) Kumāra, father of  
Haradatta 39-11.  

S  
Saṅkaravīmin 53-29.  
Saṅkācāruttuha by Bhaṭṭoji, a  
com. on the Aśṭādhyāyī 47-12;  
probably not completed by the author  
47-14, 47’n3; com. on it  
called Vishamti, by Nāgaśa 49-18;  
another com. called Prabhā, by  
Vaidyanaṇa 50’n5; 107-7.  
Śabdamahārāna-vañya, an anon- 
ymous com. on Hemachandra’s  
Bṛhadvīrti 79-7.  
Śabdānūsaṇa of Hemachandra  
previously utilised by Bhaṭṭoji  
for his Siddhāntakaumudi 46-22.  
Śabdānūsaṇa of Malayagiri  
80’n1.  
Śabdānūsaṇa of Saṅkāyana (Jaina)  
not a very ancient work  
26-3; earlier than Jainendra 68’n9;  
meant for Śvetāmbaras 68’n13;  
mentioned in the Gamaratam-  
mahodādi 68’n16; in the Maṅka- 
vyā-Bṛhadvīrti 68’n17;  
commentaries on it 68’n14; accesso- 
ry treatises on it 68’n14; not the same  
as ancient Saṅkāyana § 52;  
proof for this 69’n1; quoted as  
bhūvabha by Bopadava 68’n1.  
Śabdānūsaṇa-Bṛhadvīrti, Hema- 
chandra’s com. on his own  
Śabdānūsaṇa 76’n17; three  
different Nyāsas on the same  
76’n21, 79’n2, 79’n7; its quota- 
tions mostly identified by  
the first Nyāsas 76’n2; contains  
Śiddharāja’s pras’asti 77’n3 fi; its  
abridgment perhaps by Hema- 
chandra himself 76’n8; compre- 
prehends also accessory treatises  
of the school 77’n25; Pūṇḍhikā  
on it 78’n6 fi; a Laghu-nyāsa on it  
79’n1.  
Śabdaratna, Nāgoji’s com. on the  
Prandhanamorūmi 49’n16; a com.,  
Bhaṭavapraṅkīla, on it by Vaidy- 
naṇa 50’n5.  
Śabdārthachandrika by Haṅsañjā- 
yagīni 100’n27.  
Śabdāśiddhī, Mahādeva’s com. on  
Durgarāmiṇī’s vṛtti 69’n10.  
Śadānanda’s Subaddhī 102’n14.  
Said, the three, 34’n11.  
Sahajkīti’s Saṅkaravātrpākhyā- 
āntika, 100’n21 fi; his date 109’n21,  
109’n11.  
Śahī Safīn, emperor of Delhi,  
honours Chandrabhāti 28’n17 fi;  
28’n11.
Saiva grammar 114-10 ff.
Saka 16:31; 17:31; 18:12; see also Sthitvam 18:12.
Sakalya, Padapātha br., 4-18; mentioned in the Nīkāta 8:11; mentioned by Pāṇini 12:n2; quoted by Kātyāyana 31:n1.
Sākapūni mentioned in the Nīkāta 8:11.
Sākapūrynā (ancient) quoted by name in Bapadeva's Mulabhadra 10:n3; mentioned by Pāṇini 12:n2, 68:25; often considered author of the Upanisdras 25:24; no work of the ancient Sākapūrynā now extant 20:5; quoted by Kātyāyana 31:n1; mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya 25:n5; different from later (Jaina) Sākapūrynā 52:30; 60:31; 61:8; credited with the authorship of the Ketupakaraṇa et incorporated in the Ketupatra 64:2, 67:20.
Sākapūryn (Jain) Prof. Padhak's paper on, 41:14; 41:n4; his date 65:1, 69:12 ff; his indebtedness to Jaimendra 65:2; also author of the Amogha-vīrti 69:13; was a Śvetāmbara Jain 73:11; nature of his Šabdānusāsana 53:4; draws freely upon the Jaimendra 69:20; many of his śūtras same as Pāṇini's 69:22, 69:n3, or only slightly changed 70:1, 70:n1; indebtedness to Chandragūnas 70:2f; 70:n2; to Jaimendra 70:5, 70:n3, 70:n4; quotes Indra 70:7; the extent and arrangement of his Šabdānusāsana 70:10ff; the authors quoted by him 70:n5; his frantic effort to secure brevity illustrated 71:4; his technical terminology 71:7; other works by Sākapūrynā §54; comm. on his Šabdānusāsana 71:30ff; recasts of it 72:10ff; later quoted by Homacandra's Šabdānusāsana 73:3, which however freely draws upon it 76:13, 76:n1, 76:n2.
Śrīketa besieged by Monander 32:23.
Śrīkta grammar 114:10 ff.
Śrīlūdana Pāṇini's native place 19:1; identified with Lahur in Yusufzai valley 19:2; now an obscure and deserted place 19:6.
Śrīlūdana an alias of Pāṇini 18:34; 18:n1.
Salem-šah, Emperor, 43:8.
Samanābhadrade quoted by Pujya-pāda 60:n2.
Samanābhadrade's Tippani on the Chintūmaṇi 72:7.
Samācāśaka 51:17.
Samārāṇa, Satyavatana, on Pāṇini's date 14:17.
Samayavandaramūti's com. on the Kalpa-sūtras 63:2, 63:n2.
Samuhāra, Trattārya, grammatical specifications in, 2:2; the language of Samuhāra different from that of Jāmānārav, 3:9; the Samuhāra of Bīk, Śīma, and Krisna-Yajus anterior to Pāṇini 14:12.
Sangala, a town destroyed by Alexander and mentioned by Pāṇini 17:11ff.
Sānghapti or Sāṅghītavā 68:29; 99:8.
Sāngahāra, an extensive work of Vyāli 31:18, and described as the basis for Mahābhāṣya 31:n9.
Śaṅjñā, see Technical terms.
Śākhala, see Sāṅghala.
Śāhala, Prince who founded the city of Sāṅghala 17:13.
Śākarakarīya's Šarvasiddhānta-saṅgrahā edited by Rāgāchārya 103:n3; his Šṛttra-bhāṣya 33:22.
Śākābalse inscription 65:6.
Śākhya-kārikā 64:20.
Śākhipiṭṭāsura of Kramadāsvara 108:32; its relation to the Aṣṭādhyāyī 109:10 ff; Jumāmanar's vṛtti on it 110:27f.
Sanskrit grammar, schools of, nearly a dozen 1:10; writers on, at least three hundreds 1:11; treatises on, over a thousand 1:12; see under schools.
Śāntanābāchārya, author of the Phīṭṭāturas 27:12; mentioned as a relatively modern writer 27:n4.
Saptavārman received revelation of Aindra grammar from Kārttikāya 10:22; see also Sārvarvārman.
Sāra by Kāśinātha, a com. on the Prakriyākaumudi 46-n1.
Sārapradīpikā by Jagannātha 98-1, 100-8.
Sāra-Siddhānta-kaumudi of Varadāraja, an abridgment of the Siddhānta-kaumudi 51-4.
Sārasvatī school 43-20; 81-24; its date §73; its original extent 92-n1; two recensions of its Sūtrapātha 92-n1; its special features §74; its technical terms 94-11ff; no paribhāṣās to it 94-21; and no Uṇādis 94-29; the school not mentioned by Bopadeva 92-4, not known to Hemachandra 92-6; its traditional founder §75; vārtikas to it 94-31; 95-2; com. on it by Viṭṭhala 89-2; most of the comm. on it later than 1450 A. D. 92-8, and come from Northern India 92-14; comm. on it independently of the Sārasvatī-prakriyā §78; the — school encouraged by Muhammedan rulers of India 93-4ff; its abridgments 103-21ff; a general review of its history §80; no supplements to it 104-6; the school affected by modern revival of Pāṇini 92-20; its present status 104-21.
Sārasvatabhāṣya of Kāśinātha 100-9ff.
Sārasvata-dīpikā, see Sārasvata-vyākaranā-dhūndhikā.
Sārasvatā-mūlsūtrapāṭhā 92-n1.
Sārasvataprakriyā of Anubhūti-svarāpāchārya 92-n1, §76; its sūtrapātha not the original sūtrapātha 92-n1; commentators on it 96-20ff, §77; commentaries on Sārasvatī independently of this §78; vārtikas imbedded in its sūtrapātha 95-9ff; com. on it by Kashemendra 95-17; by Amṛṭabhāratī 95-20.
Sārasvataprakriyavārtikā by Sahajakirti 100-24; its date 100-24.
Sārasvataprasāda by Vasiṣṭhe-bhaṭṭa 98-24ff; its date 98-26, 98-n2.
Sārasvatavyākaranā-dhūndhikā or Sārasvata-dīpikā by Megharatna 99-14ff.

Sārasvatī-reveals Sārasvata sūtras 95-5.
Śātra-bhāṣya 33-22.
Śāstra 105-5.
Sarvasiddhāntasaṅgraha of Saṅkaracārya, ed. by Raṅgāchārya 105-n3.
Sarvavarman 10-3; 83-n1; founder of the Kātantra §64; his patron Śālavahana 82-25, 83-4, 82-n3; evidence for later interpolations in his original sūtrapātha §65; 87-17ff; the Kṛitprakārana not by him 84-18ff, as also certain other sections 85-5ff, 85-16ff; nature of his work §65; the extent of his work 87-3ff.
Śatabalākṣa mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.
Śātaślokī by Bopadeva 195-13.
Śālavahana, patron of Sarvavarman 82-25, 82-n3.
Śātri mother of Nāgēsa 49-35.
Śātri-vṛtīti on Uṇādis quoted by Ujjvaladatta 54-15.
Śatravarāja disciple of Bhāmudikēśita 48-n1.
Śatyānanda, teacher of Īśvarānanda the author of Mahābhūmishyapradipa-vivarana 43-3.
Satya-prabodhabhaṭṭaraka 97-18.
Satyavrata Śaṃśāranti on Pāṇini’s date 14-17.
Saubhaya 35-n1; 41-20.
Saunāgas mentioned by Patañjali 31-n10; one of their vārtikas quoted by the Kāśika 37-11.
Saunapada school absorbs Pāṇiniya Uṇādisūtras 54-9.
Saunapada school of Padmanābhadaṭta §90; its special features §91; its arrangement 111-n4; commentaries on it §92; its present status §94.
Saunapada-makaranda by Viśṇumīśa 112-15.
Saunapada-pañjikā, Padmanābha’s own com. on the Saunapada 112-10.
Sauryabhagavat mentioned by Patañjali 31-n10.
Savāi Jeyśinīha invites Nāgēsa for an aśvamedha 49-29.
Śaṅyana or Madhava author of the Dhātuvṛtī 52-28ff.
Shahajahan patron of Jagannātha 46-27.
Sheshagiri Shastri 30.n2; 40 n1.
Siddhananda quoted by Śaṅkara 70-95.
Siddhāntacakrāṇi by Rāmacandraśrama 102.16; its commentaries 102-18ff.; the author's own abridgment of it called Laghu-Siddhāntacakrāṇi with a com. 102-19ff.
Siddhāntakaumudi of Bhaṭṭoji modelled upon Rāmacandra's Prakriyākaumudi 45-10; importance of the Siddhāntakaumudi 31; its presumed indebtedness to Hemachandra's Šabdānuvāsana 46.22; its own original on it in two recensions 47.7ff.; com. Tattvabodhini by Jñānendrasara vati 47.25, with a supplement by Jayakrishna 48.4; com. on it by Nāgojībhaṭṭa 49.19; its abridgments 54; its relation to the Haimakaumudi 79-21ff.; 109.3.
Siddhāntaratna by Jīnendrāla alias Jīnaratna 102-27.
Siddharāja, see Jayasimha.
Śiddhasena quoted by Pujyapada 65-n2; not a grammarian at all according to Hemachandra 66-22.
Śīkālī (of Pujini) not a very ancient work 27.12; a stanza from it found in the Mahābhāṣya 27.17, 27.5; the same commented upon by Bharṭihari 27.5; and quoted by Kumārila 27.5; 60.30.
Śilabha 67-4.
Singour, see Śīrāgovapura.
Śrīdeva's translation on Paribhāṣās quoted in the Mādhavaḥya-Dhātuvitī 55.6.
Śīsaḥyalekhā, poem by Chandra-gomina (?) 61-6.
Śīsāpalavandha 27-n3.
Śīsūrabodha by Pujjaraja 97-8.
Śiva revealed the prayāhāra sūtras to Pujini 19-13; 23-18; 63-6; (= vowels) 114-22.
Śrīvabhāṭṭa father of Nāgojībhaṭṭa 49-84.
Śivānanda 51-10.
Śivarāma Chakravarti writes sub-com. to Śripati's supplement to Kātantra 90-21.

Śiwairāj alias Sūrasimha of Jodhpur 80-1f, 80-n1.

Skandagupta 58-27.

Śloka-vārtikas, their number 31-23; their authorship discussed 31-n11.

Smith, Vincent, Early History of India, 17-5; 17-16; 82-n3; 91-n1.

Somachandra, second name of Hemachandra 74-12.

Somadeva's version of Jainendra 65-18; his Śabdārvavachandrī 65-19, 67-2; his version earlier and truer 65-21ff, 65-n2; personal details about him 67-2ff.

Speeches, contact of different, as influencing study of grammar 2-21.

Śpatoṭyāna mentioned by Pāṇini 12-n2.

Śrūtā-sūtras of Kātyāyana 29-n1.

Śrīvāsa Belgoja 30-n1; 71-n1.

Śrīdatta quoted by Pūjyapāda 66-n2.

Śrīdatta grandfather of Padmanabhadhatta 111-5.

Śrīdhara Chakravarti's com. on the Saupadma 112-13.

Śrīkṣamāthacharita by Maṅkha 84-22.

Śrīmāla family 96-23.

Śrīgaṅgaveraṇa 50-1.

Śrīpati's supplement to the Kātantra 90-18; sub-commentaries on it 90-20f; further supplement to the supplement 90-24.

Śrīpati grandfather of Padmanabhadhatta 111-7.

Śrīraṅgā teacher of Mādhava 98-20.

Śrīśeṣṭha, see Patañjali.

Śrīvallabha-vachanāchārya's com. on Hemachandra's Liṅgānāsānasana 79-28ff.

Śrūtapāla quoted by Hemachandra 76-n2; also in the Amoghaśrītī 76-n2.

Śrūtaśhātṛi mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.

Śṭhavira-Jinendra, see Jinendra-buddhi.

Śṭhūramati, translator of Chāndra texts in Tibetan language 61-19.

Subandhu 13-22; 14-1.

Subhāṣītāvali of Vallabhadeva quotes Pāṇini the poet 13-7, 13-n3.

Subodhikā, Amrītabhārati's com. on the Śarasvataprakṛti 97-14; also ascribed to Viśveśvarābdhi, to Satyaprab dhaḥṭāraka, etc. 97-17ff.

Subodhikā or Dījīkā by Chandrabhūti with an important prakāśa at the end 98-7ff.

Subodhini of Sadānanda 102-14f.

Subodhini by Gopālagiri on Vijjalaḥbūti's Prabodhaprakāśa 115-30.

Sudarśana an alias of Haradatta 40-n1.

Sudhindari, com. on, by Nāgęśa 49-7.

Sūrasimha alias Śiwairāj of Jodhpur 80-1f; 80-n1.

Śūtra-form not new to Pāṇini 13-n1; possibly due to scarcity of writing material 23-6.


Śyādisamuchahāya of Amaraḥandra 80-10f.

T

Taittiki mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.

Taittirīya Aranyak, 4-n2.

Taittirīya Śaṅkhyā, grammatical speculations in 2:2; speaks of Indra as the first of grammarians 10-24, 10-n4.

Takakusu 04-20.

Tantra-vārtika 2-n1; 27-n5.

Tārāmaṭha, his account about the Aindra school 10-17.

Taraṅgini, Harshaḥkṛti's com. on his own Dhatotpātha for Śrāvastva 103-9.

Tarkasāṅgraha 50-23.

Tarkatilakaḥṭaḥṭehārya's com. on the Śrāvastva 102-22; his date 102-26.
Tattwabodhini by Jūnendrasarasvatī, a com. on Siddhāntakumudī 47-25; supplemented by Jayakrishna 48-4; its nature 48-2ff; and date 48-6.

Tattvavadhāra, Jayanta’s abridgment of the Prātiṣekhāmatmāda 51-n1.

Tattvadhipākī by Lokesakara 102-15.

Tatvānarthārthāvārīka 63-n4.

Technical devices used by Panini §13.

Technical terms (Sājyās) of primitive Prātiṣekhaṇā 5-13; identified with those of Aindra school by Dr. Borell 5-n2; — of Yuska and Panini compared 6-n2; pre-Pāṇīṇya — not all necessarily of the Aindra school 11-25; those of Kātyāyana not always the same as those of Pāṇini 30-24ff; of Devamati 66-5; 66-n1; of Śāktaśāya 71-25; of the Kāṭāvra 86-26; of the Stārsavata 94-6; 94-11ff; of later sectarian schools 100-16; of Bopa-deva 106-20; 106-n2; of Simandul, same as of Pāṇini 111-20; 112-2ff; of the Haiṁśīmārīya 113-23ff; of Prabhodhakāśa 114-22ff.

Tibetan translations of Chāndā treatises 58-11; 61-18; of the Kālapi-Dhūtūsūtra 90-5.

Toda 102-n2.

Tolkāpiyam, the Tamil grammar, full of Aindra terminology 11-8; 82-12: read in the Pandya King’s assembly 11-4; is closely related to Kāṭāvra to Kāṅkṣeyana’s Pali grammar, and to the Prātiṣekhāny 11-7.

Trikaṇḍadeśa 111-n2.

Trilochna, the author of the Uttaraparīśiṣṭa to Śrīpati’s supplement to Kāṭāvra 90-22ff.

Trilochna quoted by Viśṭhātāchārya 45-19; his Kāṭāvantrotti 99-n1ff; quoted by Bopa-deva and Viśṭhāla 89-2ff; personal details about him 89-5ff; sub-com. on his work 89-7ff, 19-16; distinct from the author of the Kāṭāvratrotti 89-n1; quoted by Kāviraśa 90-14; different from Trilochna 90-22.

U

Udyayachandra author of an extensive Nyāsa on Hemachandra’s Brihadvṛtti 79-2; 79-n1; belongs to Chāndravacchāla 78-33.

Udayana or Uddana court pundit of Pratīṣekhaṇā 101-11.

Udayāna Abhayagya, author of the Prabhodhaka in the Prākrit chapter of Hemachandra’s Brihadvṛtti 78-25.

Udayasīng of Udepur 93-13.

Uddana, see Udayana.

Uddyota, see Māulkūśya pradīpadīya.

Udyōna same as Yusufzai valley 19-3.

Ugrahārī author of Nyāsa on Jagaddhara’s Bālabodhini 91-14; his probable identification with his namesake of cir. 1000 A. D. 91-18.

Ugrahārī teacher of Anandaśa and probably the same as the author of the Nyāsa 91-15.

Ujjvaladatta’s vṛtti on Pāṇini’s Uṇḍīśūtras 54-11; edited by Aufrecht 54-12; quotes earlier vṛtti 54-14; mentions Chāndrā-Līṅguṇāśāna 60-29; quoted by Padmanābhaśadatta 111-13, 111-n2; 112-29.

Uṇḍīśūtra (to Meghadhubha) by Ramatarkavāgīśa 108-22.

Uṇḍīśuṭhāna §59, see Uṇḍīśūtras.

Uṇḍīśūtras of Pāṇini 21-31; commonly ascribed to Śāktaśāya 25-23ff, 25-n4; their technical terms and anubandhas same as Pāṇini’s 20-10; probably regarded as Pāṇini’s by Kāṭāvra 26-18, 26-n1; not all belonging to Pāṇini 26-23; probably revised by Kāṭāvra 26-27; traditionally assigned to Vararucch alias Kāṭāvra 27-6; Pāṇini’s Uṇḍīśūtras absorbed by other schools 54-8; Ujjvaladatta’s vṛtti on them 54-11; other commentators 54-14ff; Chāndra Uṇḍī 60-10, its mode of presentation 60-14; that of Śāktaśāya 71-15; of Hemachandra 77-23, with vivaranau or vṛtti on it 77-31; of Kāṭāvra in two recensions: that of Barga-
Sakalya 31-14.
Vijnanesvari Sahibita 29-14.
Vikayupadnya account of vicissitudes in the Mahābhāṣya text 13-26; 13-n, 33-5 41-15; states that Mahābhāṣya was a summary of Vyādi's Saṅgraha 31-19; mentions Bāji and others 35-n; by Bhārtṛhari §27; its nature 41-11ff; gives the earliest reference to Chāndrā and mentions his predecessors 41-19ff, 57-20; 42-n; 55-23; 59-n.
Vallabhadeva in the Saṅkṣhitarāvallī quotes Pañini the poet 13 7.
Vāmanī-Ranāyana, commentary on, by Nāgęsa 49-6.
Vāmana, one of the authors of the Kāśika 35-n2, 36-8; his contribution to the Kāśika distinguished from that of Jayāditya 36-n4, 36-n1; minister of Jayāpida of Kāśmir, sometimes identified with Jayāditya 36-21; quoted by Viṭṭhaliśchārya 45-20; identified with the author of a Līngaṃūdhasana 54-n2, quoted by Hemachandra 76-n2; and by Bhāttoji 107-n; see Jayāditya.
Vāmanīchārya author of a Līṅgaṃūdhasana 53-28; identified with author of the Kāśika 54-n2; earlier writers mentioned by him 53-30ff; mentions Chāndrā Līṅgaṃūdhasana 60-20.
Vāmanendra-sarasvati 47-26.
Vānīśvādana's com. on Goychandra's vṛtti 110-20.
Vānāmali's Kalāpavyakaranotpattiprabhāsya 82-n2.
Varadarāja author of abridgments of the Siddhāntakumudī 51-4; 62-21; 104-11.
Vārāṇavānasa author of Amrutasrī, a com. on the Prakṛyākumudī 46-n1.
Vararuchi (alias Kātyāyana) said to have been at first a followers of the Āndra school 10-15; mentioned by Viṃalārasavati as, author of the Uṇāḍīśātras 27-n1, 27-6; 111-n1; 53-24; 53-30; 55-n2; 85-n1; credited with authorship of the Kāntāntaka-prakaraṇa
84-26, 87-23, with a com. on the same 85-11.
Vardhamana, author of Garathanamahodahalih 52-12; quotes Ksh[kuraya][a in 52-4; his date 53-15, 88-11; not same as the author of Katantravistara 88-20ff.]
Vardhamana, author of Katantravistara 88-20; quoted by Bapa-deva 88-23; his probable date 88-22; distinct from author of Garathanamahodahalih 88-4; 89-4.
Varnagitaras of Chandra-gomin 60-13, 60-29, 60-2, Appendix 1.
Varna, said to be the teacher of Pusni 19-11.
Värsahyagana, an alias of Vyasa-krishna 61-4.
Värsahyagana mentioned in the Nirukta 8-11.
Värtaaka of Kätösana 14-5; their number 30-1; some—an emended statement of Vaiśānikeśvara Pratīkkhyā rules 30-5, 30-11; prose and metrical—30-15.
Värtaikarka quoted by Hemachandra 76-2; see Kätösana.
Värtaikarka before Kätösana especially the Śloka-värtaikakaras 25-4; the question about the authorship of these last, discussed 31-11; after Kätösana 31-20ff, 31-10.
Vänavaddata, an akhyayika mentioned in the Mahabhäha 13-20.
Vända-räha's Sårasvatinr̥ṣa 98-24ff; his date 98-26, 98-2.
Vasuvra, preceptor of Bhaṭṭihari and disciple of Chandra 59-1.
Väṣṭyāyana, quotes Gomädya and Gomäkūpura 33-4.
Vāyaśāgachchha 80-9.
Vedângas, 6-11; 12-2.
Vedas, grammatical speculations in, §2; Artic Home in, the—3-12; collected into family-books 4-9; 6n1; lists of difficult words from them collected 8-7; nature and utility of their study 8-17.
Vedic Gods, their names 8-9; their cosmological functions 8-18.
Veṣa mother of Vaidyanatha 50-6.
Vidvatprabodhinir Rūmabhatṭi of Rūmabhatṭa 101-3; the many prastāsis embodied in it 101-5ff; 101-24ff.
Vidyārgha quotes Durgādīsa 107-32.
Vidyāvinoda, father of Nyāya-paṭalabhāṣana 110-17.
Vijayānanda, teacher of Hañavijayagana 100-29.
Vijjala-bhūpati's Prabodhacandrika 115-25ff; personal details about him 115-27ff.
Vikrama, father of Vijjala-bhūpati 115-27.
Vikramaditya 111-11.
Vimālasarasvatī mentions Vararuci, etc. Kätösana, as author of Upadiśṭas 27-2, 27-1; author of Hāpamāla 44-2; his date 44-5; 41-1; quoted by Amrita-bhāratī 44-1.
Vīntyaka, father of Rāghunātha 104-1.
Vinayakamśa, teacher of Meghārītha 90-15.
Vinayavijayagani author of Pārmalaparikṣya 79-12; pupil of Kṛiti-vijayagani 79-13; his date 79-13, 79-2.
Vincent Smith, Early History of India, 17-5; 17-16.
Vrēsvīra, preceptor of Jāgannātha 47-1, and son of Śrīhārī 48-1.
Vishamti by Nāgoji-bhaṭṭa, a com. on Bhaṭṭoji's Sādura-kānsthubbha 49-18.
Vishnupūrāna 16-7.
Vīśnudvīśyāṅahara quoted by Hemachandra 76-2.
Vīśvakarma, a com. of Vyrūkṣi, a com. on Prakṛtyakamaḍūrdan 46-1.
Vīśavprakāśa 111-2.
Vīśevāvarākhala, see Bhānmārkha.
Vīśdevāvarākhala 97-17.
Vīṭṭha, com. on Sārasvati, quotes Teṣočchāndāsa 89-2.
Vīṭṭhaśākhyā, author of Prasāda the best com. on the Prakṛtyakamaḍūrdan 45-14, 45-2; his date 45-16; disparaged by Bhaṭṭoji 45-17; the authors quoted by him 43-19ff; personal details
about him 45-21ff; quotes Narendracharya 95-24.

Vivarana of Isvarananda, a com. on Mahabhashyapradipa 43-3.

Vivarana of Narayana, a com. on Mahabhashyapradipa 43-3.

Vivarana on Hemachandra's Lingavamsisana and on Uyadisutra 77-31ff.

Vritisutra mentioned by Itsing and perhaps same as the Kasika 35-20, 35-n2.

Vyadi said to have been at first a follower of the Andra school 10-16; said to be a contemporary of Purnini 19-10; commonly regarded as the author of the Paribhashas 27-20; comes between Purnini and Patajali 27-21; mentioned by Katyayana 31-n6; author of the Sanghara 31-18, 31-n3; mentioned by Vamanacharya 53-30, 53-n2.

Vyakaranadurghatdghata by Kesavadeva 110 n3.

Vyakhyana-prakriya 82-1.

Vyakri by Visvakarman, com. on the Prakriyakaumudi 46-n1.

W

Weber on Purnini's date 14-3; his History of Indian literature 82-7.

Westergaard's Radices Linguae sanscritae 25-n8.

Wilkin's Sanskrit Grammar 104-18.

Writing, art of, when introduced 4-26; presupposed by the primitive Pratisakhya 4-30.

X, Y, Z

Yadavas of Devarjiri 104-32, 105-3.

Yajnavalkya looked upon by Katyayana as a very ancient writer 27-n1.

Yajjalikas mentioned in the Nirukta 8-n1.


Yajus, Kriya, Samhitasa anterior to Purnini 14-12.

Yakshavarman's com. called Chinmaani on Sakatayana Sabdantu-sastra 72-3.

Yasaahrata 64-n2.

Yasaahrata writes the drama Maha
draya-parajaya 75-11.

Yaska, predecessors of, §5; he knew fourfold classification of words 5-19, 8-25; shows Purnini in making 5-19, as primitive Pratisakhya show Yaska in making 5-19; Yaska, mainly a philologist 5-26; forms link between primitive Pratisakhya and Purnini 5-23; calls his work a complement to grammar 5-n3; his Nirukta, its date §6; his account of course of development of Vedic studies 6-n1; mentions three periods of Vedic studies 6-n1; his date depending upon that of Purnini 6-14; his technical terms compared with those of Purnini 6-n2; Yaska comes between 800 to 700 before Christ 7-5; objections to his being placed before Purnini considered 7-6ff; nature of his Nirukta §7; teachers and schools mentioned by him 8-n1; his theory that every noun is derived from verbal root 9-1, being basis for Purnini and postulate of modern philology 9-4; Yaska's successors §8; 9-n2; 12-5; 12-n2; he preceded Purnini 14-13; made posterior to Purnini by Pandit Satyavrata Sumanasrami 14-17;56-4.

Yasobhadra quoted by Pujyapada 66-n2.

Yasodharma 58-29.

Yasananda 64-n2.

Yavanas mentioned by Purnini 15-13; not always to be identified with Ionian Greeks 15-23; Purnini's knowledge of them less than that of Katyayana 16-23;16-33;18-12; 18-22; Menander, called Yavana 32-23.

Yogavibhuga 37-25, 37-31; 35-n1.

Yusufzai valley 19-2; known as Udyauna in the days of Huen Tsang 19-3.
ERRATA

Page 1, line 8— for calculation read calculation.
Page 8, note 1—to the list add शराब, and झुमबलाना.
Page 8, line 4— for commentary read commentary.
Page 27, line 4— for early centuries read eighth century.
Page 29, line 9— for are read is.
Page 31, line 1— for abridgements read abridgements.
Page 60, line 2— for gra read gram.
Page 65, line 1— for 1025 read 825.
Page 67, line 2— for 750 read 1250.
Page 73, note column b, line 2— for नितंगुप्ता यापायं read नितंगुप्त कायम पायं.
Page 100, line 6— for Dhanendra read Kshemendra.

* A few more misprints (especially regarding dia-critical marks) have unfortunately crept in, but have not been here indicated.