

A
DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE
OF THE
SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPTS
IN THE COLLECTIONS
OF
THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL.

BY
MAHĀMAHOPĀDHYĀYA HARAPRASĀDA SHĀSTRĪ,
C.I.E., M.A., D.LITT., F.A.S.B.
*Philological Secretary, Asiatic Society of Bengal,
and Honorary Member, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.*

VOLUME VI.
VYĀKARAṆA MANUSCRIPTS.

PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS.
PUBLISHED BY THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL.

CALCUTTA.
1931.

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
1. <i>Synopsis of Contents of Preface</i>	iv—3	(6) <i>Siddhānta-candrikā</i>	144
2. <i>Introduction</i>	v	(7) <i>Samkṣipta-sāra</i>	160
3. <i>Preface</i>	vii	(8) <i>Hema-candra</i>	185
I. Grammar ..	xxxviii	(9) <i>Mugdha-bodha</i>	197
II. Lexicography ..	cxix	(10) <i>Supadma</i> ..	219
III. <i>Chandah-Śāstra</i> (Prosody)	cliv	VI. Grammatical Treatises of	
IV. <i>Alankāra</i> (Rhetoric)	clxviii	no School ..	242
4. <i>Catalogue</i>	1	VII. <i>Prākṛta</i> Grammars ..	274
(A) <i>VYĀKARAṆA</i> ..	1	(B) <i>KOṢA</i> OR LEXICON GENERAL	280
I. Pānini, <i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i> ..	1	I. Lexicon special (<i>Ekākṣa-</i>	
II. Recasts ..	28	<i>radikoṣa</i>) ..	330
III. Philosophy and Technical		II. Spelling Books ..	344
Rules of Pānini ..	55	(C) <i>CHANDAS</i> OR METRE ..	350
IV. Subsidiary Treatises of the		(D) <i>ALANĀKĀRA</i> OR RHETORIC ..	386
School of Pānini ..	70	I. Rasas or Poetic Sentiments	474
V. Later Schools of Grammar	84	II. Letter-writers ..	490
(1) <i>Kalāpa</i>	84	5. <i>Addenda</i>	495
(2) <i>Vararuci</i>	110	6. <i>Index of Works</i> ..	513
(3) <i>Cāndra</i>	115	I. Works with titles ..	513
(4) <i>Cāṅgu</i>	118	II. Works without titles ..	521
(5) <i>Sārasvata</i>	123		

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS OF PREFACE.

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
1. <i>Introduction</i>	v	Conclusion	xlvii
2. <i>Preface</i>	vii	The Cāndra school of Gram-	
I. GRAMMAR	vii	mar	xlviii
Personal History of Pānini ..	xvi	Jinendra school	lii
Literary History of Pānini ..	xvii	Mono-syllabic nomenclature	liii
Pānini's works	xvii	Śakaṭāyana school	liv
Kātyāyana's Vārttikapāṭhs	xix	Accessories of Śakaṭāyana's	
Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya ..	xx	Grammar	lv
Personal History of Patañ-		Hema-candra school of	
jali	xxi	Grammar	lvi
His date	xxii	Accessories to Hema-can-	
The state of language from		dra's Grammar	lviii
B.C. 600 to A.D. 600 ..	xxii	Sub-Commentaries on Hema-	
The Asoka inscriptions ..	xxiii	candra's Grammar	lix
The learning and power of		Manuals	lx
observation of Patañjali ..	xxiii	Commentaries on the Acces-	
The study of the Mahā-		sories	lx
bhāṣya	xxiv	The Saṃkṣipta-sāra School	lx
Accessories to the study		The Vṛtti and its revision ..	lxii
of Pānini	xxx	Age of Jumara's revised Com-	
Dhātu-pāṭha	xxxi	mentary	lxiii
Lingānu-sūsaṇa	xxxii	The age of Goyi-candra ..	lxiv
Pāṇiniya Śikṣā	xxxii	The age of the principal	
Unādi-sūtras	xxxii	commentators of the Saṃ-	
Phiṭ sūtras	xxxiii	kṣipta-sāra School	lxvi
Paribhāṣā sūtras	xxxiii	The Commentaries on Goyi-	
Bhaṭṭa-hari's Vākya-pāṭhya	xxxiv	candra	lxviii
<i>Āndra-Grammar-Kātantra</i>	xxxviii	Gaṇas or words taking the	
Kātantra-pariśiṣṭa and its		same grammatical termi-	
Commentaries	xlii	nation	lxxii
Accessories of Kātantra		Vāraruca School	lxxiv
(1) Kāraka	xliii	Cāngu-School	lxxv
(2) Roots	xliii	The Śārasvata School ..	lxxvii
Conjugation	xliv	Tradition about its origin ..	lxxvii
Rājādi-Vṛtti	xliv	Its diffusion	lxxvii
Rucādi	xliv	Commentaries and Sub-Com-	
Kṛt	xlv	mentaries	lxxviii
Unādi	xlv	Sub-Commentary by Puñja-	
Kāśmīra recension	xlv	rājo	lxxviii
		āsi Sub-Commentaries	lxxix

	Page		Page
The Sārasvata-candrika ..	lxxix	The age of Nirukta ..	cxv
Accessories ..	lxxx	Predecessors of Amara. (1)	
Mugdha-bodha School of		Vara-ruci ..	cxvii
Grammar ..	lxxx	Līnga-vārttika by Jaya-	
Supplements to the Mugdha-		siṃha (Catal. No. 4030) ..	cxvii
bodha ..	lxxxvi	Nāma Lingam ..	cxvii
Accessories of the Mugdha-		Vyādi and others ..	cxvii
bodha ..	lxxxvii	Kātya ..	cxviii
The Uṇādi of Mugdha-bodha	lxxxvii	Bhāguri and Tri-kāṇḍa ..	cxviii
Supadma Grammar	lxxxviii	Ratna-Koṣa ..	cxviii
Genealogy (of the author)	lxxxviii	Amara-mālā ..	cxviii
Commentaries on Supadma		Vācaspati's Koṣa ..	cxviii
Grammar ..	lxxxix	Dhanvantari ..	cxviii
Accessories of Supadma		Amara-koṣa. Its modifica-	
Grammar ..	xc	tions ..	cxviii
Prayoga-ratna-mālā School	xciii	Criticism of Amara ..	cxviii
The extent of its study ..	xciv	Commentaries ..	cxviii
Commentaries ..	xciv	Koṣas after Amara ..	cxviii
Recasts of Pāṇini ..	xcv	Śāśvata ..	cxviii
Date of Prakriyā Kaumudī ..	xcvii	Halāyudha ..	cxviii
His (Author's) Gurus ..	cvi	Yādava-prakāśa ..	cxviii
Siddhānta-Kaumudī with Com-		Visva-prakāśa ..	cxviii
mentaries ..	cix	Anekārtha-koṣa or Maṅkha-	
Abridgements of Siddhānta-		koṣa ..	cxviii
Kaumudī ..	cix	Anekārtha-dhvani-mañjari	
Minor Schools of Grammar ..	cx	by Mahā-kṣapaṇaka of	
Bhāva-siṃha-prakriyā ..	cxiv	Kāśmīra ..	cxviii
Āśubodha ..	cxv	Nānārthāṇava-Saṅkṣepa by	
Suddhaśu-bodha Vyākaraṇa	cxv	Kesava Svāmī ..	cxviii
Sighra-bodha ..	cxv	Hema-candra ..	cxviii
Jñānāmṛta ..	cxv	Medinī-koṣa ..	cxviii
Pada-candrikā (I.O. Catal.		Koṣas after Medinī ..	cxlii
903) ..	cxv	Kṛyā nighaṇṭu ..	cxlix
Prakriyārṇava ..	cxvi	Sārasvatābhidhāna ..	cxlix
Pārijāta-vyākaraṇa ..	cxvii	Nānārtha-ratna ..	cxlix
Ratnāvatī ..	cxvii	Kriyā Koṣa ..	cl
Dīpa-vyākaraṇa ..	cxvii	A dictionary of words with	
II. LEXICOGRAPHY ..	cxix	two or more forms, that is,	
Three groups ..	cxix	spellings ..	cl
Three periods ..	cxix	Śabda-bheda-prakāśa ..	cl
Pre-Amara period. Nighaṇṭu	cxix	Viśeṣāmṛta ..	cl
Yāska's Nirukta ..	cxix	Sarsvati-vilāsa ..	cli
Commentary of Nighaṇṭu by		Vaibhāṣika-koṣa by Kṛṣṇa-	
Devarājā Yojvā ..	cxix	Kavi ..	cli
Durgācārya's Commentary		Dvi-rūpa-dhvani-saṃgraha ..	cli
on Nirukta ..	cxix		

	Page		Page
Spelling book, varṇadesānā ..	cli	The story of Nahuṣa—the	
Varṇa-prakāśa ..	clii	origin of the Naṭas ..	clxxx
III. CHANDAḤ-ŚĀSTRA ..	cliv	Classification of Chandaḥ in	
Prosody ..	cliv	Piṅgala and Bharata ..	clxxx
Vedic chandaḥ is neither		Characteristics of the sūtra	
metre nor prosody ..	cliv	literature ..	clxxx
Vedic and laukika chandaḥ ..	cliv	A treatise, written in regular	
Chandaḥ as a Vedāṅga ..	clv	sūtra form—found in the	
Age of Piṅgala ..	clv	body of the Nāṭya-śāstra ..	clxxxii
Piṅgala's system ..	clvi	Five stages of development	
Vedic prosody of Piṅgala ..	clvi	from the sūtra to the	
The Vedic verses ..	clvii	Śāstra form ..	clxxxiii
Laukika section of Piṅgala's		Enumeration of rasas ..	clxxxiv
Prosody ..	clviii	Literary criticism in Bha-	
IV. ALAṆKĀRA ..	clxviii	rata ..	clxxxiv
Rhetoric ..	clxviii	Doṣas ..	clxxxv
Six kinds of poetic literature ..	clxviii	Guṇas ..	clxxxv
(1) Anibaddha or muktaka ..	clxviii	The drama ..	clxxxv
(2) Business prose, royal		Synthetic criticism of a	
writs, etc. ..	clxix	drama ..	clxxxvi
(3) Language of controversy ..	clxix	KĀVYĀDARŚA OF DAṆḌIN	clxxxvii
(4) Poetry in Prose, kathā		The name—"Kāvya-darśa"	clxxxvii
and ākhyayikā ..	clxix	Definition ..	clxxxvii
(5) Drama ..	clxx	Classification of poetry ac-	
(6) Mahā-Kāvya ..	clxx	cording to form ..	clxxxviii
First Source and the Nirukta	clxxi	Classification of poetry ac-	
Second Source and the Artha-		cording to language	clxxxviii
Śāstra ..	clxxi	New explanation of the	
Third Source and the Tarka-		'mixed' language	clxxxviii
Śāstra ..	clxxii	Rīti ..	clxxxix
Fourth Source ..	clxxiii	Chapter II of Daṇḍin ..	clxxxix
Fifth Source and the Nāṭya		Historical and Geographical	
Śāstra ..	clxxiv	statements in Daṇḍin ..	cxc
The Vedic sacrifice and the		Kāvya-tattva-viveka-kau-	
drama ..	clxxiv	mudi (I.O. 1128) ..	cxcii
Sixth Source ..	clxxvi	Kāvya-darśa-vyākhyā (Mad.	
BHARATA'S NĀṬYA-ŚĀSTRA ..	clxxvii	12834) ..	cxcii
Drama was subsequent to		Hṛdayaṅgamā (Mad. 12833) ..	cxcii
the Vedas ..	clxxvii	KĀVYĀLAṆKĀRA OF BHĀMAHA ..	cxciii
Nāṭya-sūtras ..	clxxvii	Bhāmaha's Kāvya-lankāra ..	cxciii
Bharata's Nāṭya-śāstra ..	clxxviii	Bhāmaha's classification ..	cxciv
Distinction between Sūtra		Bhāmaha, an improvement	
and Śāstra ..	clxxviii	on Daṇḍin ..	cxciv
Bharata's antiquity ..	clxxix	The aim of Daṇḍin ..	cxcv
		Bhāmaha and Kālī-dāsa ..	cxcvi

	Page		Page
Danḍin, Bhāmaha, and Kali-		Division of Kāvya-mīmāṃsā	ccxxiii
dāsa.. ..	cxvii	Chapter I ..	ccxxiii
Bhāmaha's religion ..	cxviii	„ II ..	ccxxiv
Danḍin and Bhāmaha ..	cxix	„ III ..	ccxxiv
Homes of Danḍin and		„ IV ..	ccxxv
Bhāmaha ..	ceii	„ V ..	ccxxv
KĀVYĀLANKĀRA-SŪTRA-VṚTTI OF		„ VI ..	ccxxvi
VĀMANA ..	ceiii	„ VII ..	ccxxvi
Vāmana's work ..	ceiii	„ VIII ..	ccxxvii
Vāmana's age ..	ceiii	„ IX ..	ccxxvii
Vāmana on rīti ..	ceiv	„ X ..	ccxxviii
Vāmana's home ..	cevi	„ XI ..	ccxxix
UDBHATA ..	cevi	Chapters XII and XIII ..	ccxxix
Age of Udbhata ..	cevii	„ XIV .. XV ..	ccxxx
Pratihārendu-rajā's Com-		Chapter XVI ..	ccxxx
mentary ..	cevii	„ XVII ..	ccxxx
KĀVYĀLANKĀRA OF RUDRAṬA ..	ceviii	„ XVIII ..	ccxxxi
Rudraṭa's definition of Kāvya	ceix	THE DHIVANI-KĀRA ..	ccxxxi
His classification of Kāvya	ceix	The Dhvani School has a	
Rudraṭa's Śabdālaṅkāras ..	ceix	tradition ..	ccxxxi
His arthālaṅkāras ..	cexi	The Dhvani-kāra..	ccxxxiv
Rasas dealt with in Rudraṭa	cexi	Ananda-varḍhana, the vṛtti-	
Mahā-Kāvya, Kathā, and		kāra is different from the	
Ākhyāyikā ..	ceyii	Karika-kāra ..	ccxxxv
Time and place of Rudraṭa ..	ceyii	ANANDA-VARḌHANA ..	ccxxxvii
Commentator's of Rudraṭa ..	cexxiii	Time and place of Ananda-	
RUDRA-BHAṬṬA'S ŚRĠGĀRA-		varḍhana ..	ccxxxvii
ṬĪLAKA ..	cexxiii	His ancestry ..	ccxxxviii
Rudraṭa and Rudrabhaṭṭa ..	cexiv	ABHINAVĀ-VṚTTI-MĀTRKĀ BY	
Agni-purāṇa ' ..	cexiv	MUKULA ..	ccxxxix
Sources of Kāvya ..	ce xv	The book ..	ccxxxix
Classification of Kāvya ..	ce xvi	The author and his age ..	ccxxxix
Drama in Agni-purāṇa ..	ce xvi	Abhidha-vṛtti-mātrka a re-	
Rasas in Agni-purāṇa ..	ce xvii	action against the Dhvani	
Rīti in Agni-purāṇa ..	ce xvii	school ..	ccxxxix
Śabdālaṅkāra ..	ce xviii	Mammata refutes Mukula ..	ccxl
Ubhayaṅkāras ..	ce xviii	ABHINAVA-GUPTA ..	ccxl
KĀVYA-MĪMĀMSĀ BY RĀJA-		Time and place of Abhinava-	
SEKHARA ..	ccxx	gupta ..	ccxl
Age of Rāja-Sekhara ..	ccxx	Importance of Abhinava-	
His lineage ..	ccxx	gupta in finally establish-	
Other works of Rāja-Sekhara	ccxxi	ing the Dhvani school.	
Kāvya mīmāṃsā ..	ccxxii	His Commentary on	
Tradition of Kāvya-		Bharata's Nāṭya-sāstra ..	ccxli
mīmāṃsā ..	ccxxii		

	Page		Page
VAKROKTI-JIVITA BY KUNTALA ..	cexlii	Contents ..	cclvii
Kuntala's work is a revolt		Unknown poets in the Kavi-	
against the Dhvani school ..	cexlii	kanṭhābharāṇa ..	cclviii
Age of Kuntala ..	cexliii	VYAKTI-VIVEKA BY MAHIMA-	
Dr. S. K. De's edition of		BHATṬA ..	cclix
Vakrokti-jivita ..	cexliii	Vyakti-viveka—a contradic-	
Vakrokti ..	cexliii	tion against the dhvani	
Division of Vakrokti ..	cexlv	theory ..	cclix
Kuntala's idea of rīti ..	cexlv	Date and place of Mahima-	
Vakrokti is essential in all		bhaṭṭa ..	cclix
the alaṅkāras ..	cexlvi	MAMMAṬA'S KĀVYA-PRAKĀŚA ..	cclx
Vakrokti-jivita is the iso-		Date of Mammāṭa	
lated attempt of a great		Story of the joint author-	
thinker ..	cexlvi	ship ..	cclx
Contents ..	cexlvi	His definition of Kāvya ..	cclx
DAŚA-RŪPA BY DHANAÑJAYA ..	cexlvii	The three functions of words	
Age of Dhanañjaya ..	cexlvii	clearly stated ..	cclxi
Daśa-rūpa—based on Bha-		Ullāsa III ..	cclxi
rata ..	cexlvii	Ullāsa IV ..	cclxi
The translation of technical		Explanation of the suggested	
terms are taken from		meaning ..	cclxi
Haas's Daśa-rūpa ..	cexlviii	Kāvya—Pr. N. S. P. 101 ..	cclxii
Dhanañjaya gives 11 forms		Ullāsa V ..	cclxiii
of Nāṭaka as against 27 of		Ullāsa VI ..	cclxiii
the Agni-purāṇa and 28 of		Ullāsa VII—treats of the	
Śahitya-darpana ..	cexlix	various defects ..	cclxiii
BHOJA-RĀJA'S SARASVATĪ-KAṆ-		Ullāsa VIII ..	cclxiv
THĀBHARAṆA AND ŚṚṅGĀRA		Ullāsa IX—treats of the	
PRAKĀŚA ..	ccl	Śabdālankāras ..	cclxiv
Bhoja—King of Dhārā ..	ccl	Ullāsa X—treats of the	
Sarasvatī-kanṭhābharāṇa ..	ccl	Arthālankāras ..	cclxv
Śabdālankāras in Sarasvatī° ..	ccli	Misconceptions about the	
Contents of Chapter V ..	cclii	Kāvya-prakāśa ..	cclxv
Rīti dealt with in Sarasvatī° ..	ccliii	COMMENTARIES ON KĀVYA-	
His Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa ..	ccliii	PRAKĀŚA ..	cclxv
AUCITYA-VICĀRA-CARCĀ BY		Śrī-dhara's Commentary	
KṢEMENDRA ..	cclv	named Kāvya-prakāśa-	
Origin of the idea of Au-		viveka ..	cclxvi
citya ..	cclv	Caṇḍī-dāsa and his lineage	
Age of Kṣemendra ..	cclv	(Catal. No. 4838.) ..	cclxvi
Name of some unknown		Raghu-deva's Artha-prakā-	
poets quoted by Kṣemen-		śikā ..	cclxvii
dra in his Aucitya° ..	cclvi	Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and his	
Kavi-kanṭhābharāṇa, a book		Commentary ..	cclxvii
on the training of poets ..	cclvi		

	Page		Page
Kāvya-prakāśa-nidarśana by		JAYA-RATHA ..	celxxvii
Rājānaka Ānanda ..	celxxiii	Alaṅkārodāharanām ..	celxxvii
Kāvya-pradīpa by Govinda ..	celxxvii	HEMA-CANDRA ..	celxxvii
Kāvya-prakāśa-vistārikā by		Hemacandra's ago ..	celxxvii
Paramānanda ..	celxix	VĀGBHATĀLANKĀRA ..	celxxviii
Kāvya-prakāśa-prakāśa by		Vāgbhatā's ago ..	celxxviii
Kamalā kara ..	celxix	Vāgbhatālaṅkāra ..	celxxix
Kāvya-prakāśa-ṭīkā by		VĀGBHATA II ..	celxxx
Gadā-dhara ..	celxx	. Kāvya-anuśāsana or Alaṅ-	
Tattva-parīkṣā by Mahoś-		kāra-tilaka (I.O. 1157) ..	celxxx
vara Subudhi Miśra		NĀṬYA-DARPAṆA BY RĀMA-	
(Catal. No. 4839) ..	celxx	CANDRA AND GUṆA-CANDRA ..	celxxx
Mahośvara Nyāyālaṅkāra ..	celxxi	Nāṭya-darpaṇa ..	celxxx
Śrī-kṛṣṇā ..	celxxi	The authors, Rāma-candra	
Vaidya-nātha ..	celxxii	and Guṇa-candra ..	celxxx
Rāma-kṛṣṇa ..	celxxii	The characteristic of the	
Śrī-vatsa-lāñchana ..	celxxii	work ..	celxxxii
An anonymous Kāśmīrī Com-		Arrangement ..	celxxxii
mentary ..	celxxii	Special feature ..	celxxxii
Kāvya-mṛta-taranginī ..	celxxii	BHĀVA-PRAKĀŚANA BY ŚĀRADĀ-	
Bāla-cittānurañjinī (I.O.		TANAYA ..	celxxxii
1139) ..	celxxiii	Bhāva-prakāśana ..	celxxxii
Kāvya-prakāśa tilaka (I.O.		The author and his pedigree ..	celxxxiii
1142) ..	celxxxiii	His training ..	celxxxiii
Kāvya-prakāśa vyakhyā		The three works compared ..	celxxxv
(Mad. 12821) ..	celxxiv	Geography of India in the	
Kāvya-prakāśa-līla (Mad.		Bhāva-prakāśa ..	celxxxv
12824) ..	celxxiv	His date ..	celxxxvi
Madhu-matī and Kāvya-		The works and authors	
darpaṇa (I.O. 1144) ..	celxxiv	quoted in the Bhāva-	
Sampradāya-pradarśinī		prakāśana ..	celxxxvii
(Mad. 12826) ..	celxxv	JAYA-DEVA'S CANDĀ-LOKA ..	celxxxviii
Sāhitya-cūḍā-maṇi or Kāvya		Jaya-deva's parentage ..	celxxxviii
prakāśa-vimarṣinī (Mad.		Date of Jaya-deva ..	celxxxviii
12828) ..	celxxv	Characteristics of Candā-	
ALANKĀRA-SARVASVA BY RUCAKA	celxxv	loka ..	celxxxix
Rucaka and his disciple		Pradyotana's Śaradāgama ..	celxxxix
Mankhuka or Maṅkha ..	celxxv	Appaya's Kuvalayananda ..	celxxxix
Samudra-vandha—a com-		Date of Śaradāgama ..	celxxxix
mentator ..	celxxv	Rākāgama by Gāgā-bhaṭṭa ..	celxxxix
Jayaratha, a second com-		Vaidya-nātha's Commen-	
mentator ..	celxxv	tary ..	celxx
Rucaka's date ..	celxxvi	Ekāvalī of VIDYĀ-DHARA ..	celxx
Rucaka and Kuntala		Condition of Sanskrit cul-	
Rucaka and Mahima-		ture after the Muham-	
bhaṭṭa ..	celxxvi	madan conquest ..	celxx

<i>Page</i>	<i>Page</i>
Ekāvalī—written in the wake of Kāvya-prakāśa .. cexci	SĀHITYA-DARPAṆA BY VIŚVA-
Vidyā-dhara's Keli-rahasya .. cexci	NĀTHA ccciii
Malli-nātha's Commentary .. cexcii	Definition of Kāvya in the Sāhitya-darpaṇa .. ccciii
Date of Vidyā-dhara .. cexcii	Chapter I ccciv
Explanation of the word Hambira cexciv	„ II ccciv
Nara-siṃha—his patron .. cexciv	„ III—taken up with rasa ccciv
Evidence of the Rasārṇava- sūdhākara cexciv	Chapter IV—classification of Poetry cccv
RASĀRṆAVA-SUDHĀKARA BY	Chapter V cccv
Śiṅga Bhūpāla cexciv	„ VI—Drāya and Śrāvya cccv
Contents of Chapter I .. cexciv	Different classes of poetry .. cccv
Classification and subdivi- sion of the exciting causes (uddīpana vibhāvas) .. cexcvi	Chapter VII—treats of defects cccvi
Origin of the dramatic vṛttis cexcvi	Chapter VIII cccvii
The pra-vṛttis cexcvi	„ IX cccvi
The sattvika bhavas .. cexcivii	His father cccvii
Contents of Chapter II—The Transitory Emotions .. cexcvi	His ancestor, Nārāyaṇa .. cccvii
The Permanent Emotions .. cexcvi	Date of Viśva-nātha .. cccvii
The 3rd Chapter deals ex- clusively with the Nātakas and their modi- fications cexcvi	Internal evidences .. cccviii
Peculiar feature of Śiṅga Bhūpāla's criticism .. cexcvi	Candī-dāsa cccix
Characteristic of the work .. cexcvi	Dharma-datta cccix
The Recalla family and Śiṅga's ancestors .. cexcvi	Rāma-carana Tarkavāgīśa, —commentator of Viśva- nātha cccx
Date of Śiṅga Bhūpāla .. cexcix	RASĀRṆAVA BY PRAKĀŚA-VARṢA .. cccx
Nātika-paribhāṣā (I.O. Catal 1201) ccc	DEVENDRA OR DEVEŚVARA .. cccxi
PRATĀPA-RUDRĪYA BY VIDYĀ-	Kavi-Kalpa-latā cccxi
NĀTHA ccc	Amara-candra and Arisimha .. cccxii
Pratapa-rudrīya also written in the wake of Kāvya- prakāśa ccc	Date of Deveśvara .. cccxii
His age ccci	Date cccxii
Chronology of authors in the book cccii	APPAYA DIKṢITA cccxiii
Pratāpa-rudra commented upon by Kumārasvāmin .. cccii	Citra-mīmāṃsā cccxiii
	Lakṣya-lakṣaṇa-samgraha .. cccxiii
	Vṛtti-vārtikam cccxiii
	Citra-mīmāṃsā-khaṇḍana .. cccxiv
	Kuvalayānanda-khaṇḍana .. cccxiv
	Commentators on Appaya's works cccxv
	Appaya's date cccxv
	ALAKṢARAS BY THE CATTANYA
	SECT cccxv

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
Rūpa Gosvāmin and Jiva Gosvāmin	cccxv	Sahitya-kautūhala (I.O. 1175)	cccxviii
Kavi-karna-pūra and his works	cccxv	Kāvya-candrikā (I.O. 1193) ..	cccxix
Nāṭaka-candrikā	cccxvi	Another Kāvya-candrikā (I.O. 1194)	cccxix
Alaṅkāra-kaustūbhā (I.O. 1196)	cccxvi	Alaṅkāra-candrodaya (I.O. 1198)	cccxix
Alaṅkāra-kaustūbhā (Mad. 12790)	cccxvii	Natya-darpaṇa (I.O. 1199) ..	cccxix
Alaṅkāra-kaustūbhā (Mad. 12785)	cccxvii	Alaṅkāra-saṁgraha (Mad. 12794)	cccxix
Alaṅkāra-śekhara	cccxvii	Alaṅkāra-saṁgraha (Mad. 12795)	cccxix
RASA-GAṆGĀDHARA BY JAGAN-NĀTHA	cccxix	Alaṅkāra-sañjīvanī (Mad. 12799)	cccxix
Jagan-nātha's Pedigree ..	cccxix	Alaṅkāra-sarvasva (Mad. 12798)	cccxix
Rasa-gaṅgādhara	cccxix	Kavi-samaya-kallola (Mad. 12808), and Kṛṣṇa-rāja-yaśo-ṇiṇḍima	cccxix
Jagan-nātha's definition of Kāvya	cccxix	Kāvya-darpaṇa (Mad. 12809)	cccxix
NAṆJA-RĀJA-YAŚO-BHŪṢAṆA BY NṚ-SIMHA	cccxix	Kāvya-lakṣaṇa (Mad. 12829)	cccxix
Nañja-rāja-yaśo-bhūṣaṇa ..	cccxix	Daśa-rūpaka-vivarana (Mad. 12892)	cccxix
Nṛ-simha, the author. Written in the wake of Pratāpa-rudra-yaśo-bhūṣaṇa ..	cccxix	Rāma-candra-yaśo-bhūṣaṇa (Mad. 12950)	cccxix
Nañja's works	cccxix	Lakṣaṇa-dīpikā (Mad. 12951)	cccxix
Pratāpa-rudra' and Nañja-rāja°	cccxix	Lakṣaṇa-mūlikā (Mad. 12953)	cccxix
The story of the model drama	cccxix	Sāhitya-kallolīnī (Mad. 12994)	cccxix
OTHER WORKS ON ALAṅKĀRA NOTICED IN OUR CATALOGUE ..	cccxix	Sāhitya-cinta-maṇi (Mad. 12965)	cccxix
Sahṛdaya-līlā	cccxix	Alaṅkāra-nikāṣa (Mad. 12976)	cccxix
Alaṅkāra-ratnākara	cccxix	WORKS ON RASA	cccxix
Candra-kārikā	cccxix	Kalyāṇa-kallola	cccxix
Varna-ratnākara	cccxix	Letter-writers	cccxix
Kāma-samūha	cccxix	The study of Alaṅkāra	cccxix
Kāvya-vilāsa	cccxix	Conclusion	cccxix
Alaṅkāra-mañjarī	cccxix		
Short works	cccxix		
Kavi-saraṇi-dīpikā	cccxix		
Sahitya-ratnākara	cccxix		
OTHER WORKS ON ALAṅKĀRA NOTICED IN OTHER CATALOGUES OF MSS.	cccxix		

INTRODUCTION.

In this volume are described MSS. from 4213 to 4944 with a few additional numbers, divided into four sections:—

- (1) Grammar, 4213 to 4628A.
- (2) Koşa or lexicon from 4629 to 4732A.
- (3) Chandaḥ or metre from 4733 to 4786.
- (4) Alaṃkāra or rhetoric from 4787 to 4944.

An attempt has been made in the preface to give a history of these four subjects, specially of grammar.

PREFACE.

It is difficult to say definitely whether in the Samhitās of the Vedas, there was much speculation about the formation of words and the analysis of sentences. Passages which are considered to talk of grammatical speculations may be otherwise explained, or, if they speak of grammar in any sense, it is of the most primitive kind.

In the Brahmanas, however, along with speculations of all sorts, there were undoubtedly speculations on grammar, very primitive, though conscious, efforts. I will give one example from Chāndogya Upaniṣad, which is a part of Chāndogya Brāhmaṇa. There the word 'Udgītha' has been derived as Ud, gī and tha; Sāma from Sā and ama. The derivation is not from roots, but from the syllables constituting the word. Another example I will give from the Samhitopaniṣad of the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka. It embodies the speculation of two or three families of Ṛṣis about saṃhitā or union, but the words and forms employed were all later utilised in grammar. It opens with "अथातः संहिताया उपनिषत् । पृथिवी पूर्वरूपं, द्योः उत्तररूपं, वायुः संहिता, इति भण्डकेय वाक् पूर्वरूपं मनः उत्तररूपं प्राणः संहिता ॥ The words pūrva-rūpaṃ and uttara-rūpaṃ or para-rūpaṃ are still used in the Sanskrit schools at Benares in explaining saṃhitā or sandhi. Pāṇini often says para-rūpa-ekā-deśaḥ or pūrva-rūpa-ekā-deśaḥ that is, the pūrva-rūpa and the para-rūpa combined sometimes leave the purva-rūpa alone or the para-rūpa alone.

Proceeding a little further, the Samhitopaniṣad says अथ खल्वाज्जनिर्मुञ्जवक्त्राः । पूर्वमक्षरं पूर्वरूपमुत्तरमूत्तररूपं योवकाशः पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण सा संहितेति ॥ The last letter of the first word

is called pūrva-rūpa and the first letter of the second word is called uttara-rūpa and the space between these two is samhitā. This is purely grammatical sandhi. The word nirbhuja-vaktra means those whose mouths utter samhitā or sandhi. This is very simple but the dwarfish Māṇḍukeya (a ṛṣi) says, that is all right. The last letter of the first word is pūrva-rūpa and the first letter of the second word is uttara-rūpa and the space between these two by which sandhi is produced, pitches are determined and the time is divided, is samhitā. The former opinion gives the name of samhitā to the space only but the latter says, no, the space is not sandhi, it is the change of pitch and the change of time that is sandhi. This is an advance on the theory of the nirbhuja-vaktra. In the same brāhmaṇa or paragraph another advance is proposed by a third ṛṣi who says that the equation of the pitches (साम) is sandhi.

Thus after defining sandhi the work proceed to give the secret of speech. Consonants are pṛthivī, the sibilants are atmosphere and vowels are heaven. The consonants are fire, sibilants are air and vowels are the sun. Consonants are Ṛg-veda the sibilants are Yajur-veda and the vowels are Sāma-veda. The consonants are the eyes, sibilants the ears and the vowels the mind. The consonants are prāṇa, sibilants are apāna and vowels are vyāna. This human body is a divine *lyre* just as there is a lyre among men. Just as a human lyre, it has a head, it has a belly, it has a tongue and the strings are its fingers. Both the lyres have their consonants, their sibilants and their vowels and both are covered with a skin full of wool.

All this shows that the alphabet was in the making when this work was composed. It treats in the last

paragraph of its second part, of cerebral ṣ and cerebral ṇ. Thus the Saṃhitopaniṣad covers the whole field of the letters of the alphabet, the change of dental s and n into cerebral ṣ and ṇ and of the changes which letters undergo when they come together, *i.e.*, it covers the whole field of the Vedāṅga Śikṣā, which has ceased to be a separate subject of study since the advent of Pāṇini who has included it in his grammar. So it may be taken for granted that the Saṃhitopaniṣad represents an early speculation in grammar.

I have hitherto, spoken only of the Saṃhitopaniṣad of the Aitareya School. The Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa has a Saṃhitopaniṣad. But it is much shorter. But the Saṃhitopaniṣad of the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka is more systematic. It speaks of Śikṣā first as consisting of letters, vowels, time in pronunciation, the effort, the equilibrium of pitches and saṃhitā and then goes on with the Saṃhitopaniṣad, drawing similes from the phenomena of nature, from the human body, and so on. There is a Saṃhitopaniṣad of the Sāma-veda (see our Catal. 1312). The *Catalogue* of the Adyar Library says that there is a Saṃhitopaniṣad for every veda. It deals with sandhi.

So far for the Śikṣā section of grammar, for other sections there were numbers of vedic indices from which the grammarians derived their materials. It is a well known fact that at the close of the vedic period, Indian scholars became veteran writers of indices or Anukramaṇis. They had R̥ṣi.-Anukramaṇis, Chandonukramaṇis and Devatā-nukramaṇis; Sūktānukramaṇis, Anuvākānukramaṇis and other Anukramaṇis. But there are other Anukramaṇis too. These are (1) indices of words occurring in the whole

of the Ṛg-veda ending in visarga called samānas, (2) ending in n, (3) expanding in ay, āv, āy, av, or in a and ā, and (4) and simple non-compound words (see our Catal. 287).

The Pada-pāṭha and Krama-pāṭha afforded opportunities to observe variations in pitch, in pronunciation and in sandhi. These have been fully utilised in works like the Upa-lekha sūtra. The pada-gāḍha is a long register of vedic irregularities or peculiarities.

Our Catalogue Nos. 487 and 488 contain indices of words which drop the visarga after ā in the Black Yayur-veda, indices of vilanghyas *i.e.*, of cases in which e and ai are modified in sandhi. There are lists of words ending in n and t. There are works like Avarṇa and Avarṇi. There are also works in which the stress sounds in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā are registered.

Gāṇī, our number 256, registers words ending in visarga, words ending in vowels, words which are not joined in sandhi, words which do not change their nakāra and words which change ye into ya. It is divided into 65 sections recording lists of sixty five such changes in the Śākala Saṃhitā of the Ṛg-veda.

“How useful these lists were to the subsequent writers of Prāti-śākhya and grammars may be seen from the fact that one of the lists in the Gāṇī has been turned into a sūtra in page 53 of the Śaunaka’s Ṛṅ-prāti-śākhya in the Chaukhamba series.”

From the above it will be apparent how the brahmins in ancient times were anxious to preserve the

purity of the text of the Vedas by drawing up lists of instances of the peculiarities of Vaidika expressions. A glance at the sections of our Catal. Vol. II on the subsidiary treatises of the various Vedas will give more examples of such lists. It would show how inveterate the habit of ancient ṛṣis and Munis was to prepare anukramaṇis of various sorts. That these anukramaṇis were useful, goes without saying. Pāṇini and his predecessors fully utilized them. The Dhātu-pāṭhas and specially the Gaṇa-pāṭhas owe their origin to these Anukramaṇis. Even the sūtras are indebted to them. The Gaṇa-pāṭha and the Dhātu-pāṭha as we find them in Pāṇini, are not the work of one man and even of one generation. The pāṭhas were being accumulated for generations, and Pāṇini may have given a finish to them. But still he left many of them open to fresh additions calling them Ākr̥ti-gaṇas.

Pāṇini had ~~ten predecessors~~ whose opinions he quotes in his sūtras. How much he was indebted to these for his sūtras, for his nomenclature, for his alphabetic arrangement, for his algebraic technical terms we do not know. But there are indications in his sūtras, that he was much indebted to his predecessors. For instance, in one place he says, अड इति प्राचां सञ्ज्ञा, that is, his predecessors used to call the third case-ending singular as अड and not ट as he does.

The grammarians thought that all words cannot be derived from roots, so they gave rules for the formation of ordinary verbal nouns only, from them. But philologists or Nirukta-kāras thought otherwise. They attempted to derive all sorts of nouns from roots. There is only one grammarian who was a philologist, too; he was Śākāṭyāna, the son of ṛṣi, Śakaṭa. He is said to have written the Uṇādi-sūtras (in five chapters and 748 sūtras) which

Pāṇini did not care to embody in his grammar but left them out by saying, उणादयो बह्वन्, that is, there is a good deal of liberty in the formation of such words.

The first work described in this volume is Nandikeśvara-kāśikā, with a commentary. The names of the work and its commentary require an explanation. The Indian alphabet is differently arranged in different schools of grammar, according to the exigencies of its rules. The oldest school of grammar called the Aindra School, of which the modern representative is supposed to be Kātantra or Kalāpa takes the alphabet as it is. Pāṇini arranges it into fourteen sūtras.¹ One of Pāṇini's predecessors Śakaṭāyana seems to have arranged it in thirteen sūtras, as its present representative does the same. The Cāndra School also has thirteen sūtras; later on the illusory letters of the sūtras were dropped one by one, till in the Mugdhabodha we have only ~~three~~ illusory letters in the arrangement of alphabet.

These alphabetic sūtras are called Śiva-sūtras especially in the school of Pāṇini, for tradition has it, that he was a favourite of Śiva and that he got these fourteen sūtras directly from him. But the god, Śiva, is without action and without attributes. His active principle is Nandī, the son of a ṛṣi, named Śilāda. Nandī by his austerities rose to be the commander of Śiva's followers or Gaṇas and a rival of his son, Gaṇeśa. Nandī is often called Nandikeśvara.

In the present work Nandikeśvara is made to write twenty-six verses, giving the highest spiritual interpretation

¹ Each sūtras has an indicatory consonant which forms no part in the arrangement of the letters of the alphabet. These indicatory letters are generally called 'It's or illusive.'

to the fourteen Śiva-sūtras. This is Nandikeśvara-kāśika. Its commentator again is another great favourite of Śiva, named, Upa-manyu, who by his austerities rose to such favour of Śiva, that Kṛṣṇa had to curry favours with him for obtaining a desired boon from Śiva. The commentary is called Nandikeśvara-kaśikā-tattva-vimarṣiṇī, Catal. 4213A.

The work, however, is a modern one. It deals with such modern theories as the monism of Śaṅkara and his theory of illusion. It also speaks of Tāntric values of letters. It was certainly composed after the lexicon of words of one syllable had become popular.

Numbers 4214-4215C contain reading of the sūtras of Pāṇini. The age of Pāṇini is a subject of great controversy. Satya-vrata-sāma-śramī in his *Nirukta-locana* says that Pāṇini wrote before Yāska's *Nirukta* and his age is 2400 B.C. This is impossible, because the *Nirukta*'s classification of words is four-fold, Nāma, Ākhyāta, Upasarga and Nipāta, while Pāṇini's is two-fold only, Suvanta and Tiñanta. This is an advanced theory and therefore later. Yāska is a philologist while Pāṇini is a grammarian. Goldstücker thought that the sūtras were written at least a thousand years before Christ, when the Brāhmaṇas were, according to his theory, composed. Dr. Belvalker, thinks, that he flourished 700 years before Christ. Bühler thought that he wrote his sūtras about 375 B.C. I need not give other theories. Bühler's theory was based on Indian tradition embodied in the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, in which Pāṇini is said to have had a controversy on grammatical points with Kātyāyana, at the court of Nanda, whose dynasty ruled Magadha from 425 B.C. to 325 B.C. But this tradition may be neglected as given in a story-book.

I have to refer to another Indian tradition discovered in a work entitled Kāvya-mīmāṃsā recently published in Gaekwad Sanskrit series. The author of this work, Rāja-śekhara, flourished in the beginning of the 10th century, and gives the tradition thus :

श्रूयते हि पाटलिपुत्रे शास्त्रकारपरौक्षा
अत्रोपवर्ष-वर्षौ इह पाणिनि-पिङ्गलो इह व्याडिः ।
इह वररुचि-पतञ्जली परौक्षिताः ख्यातिमुपजग्मुः ॥

This shows that Pāṇini was tested at Pāṭali-putra. This city was founded in the year of Buddha's Nirvāṇa, when Ajāta-śatru was reigning at Rāja-grha in Magadha. Ajāta-śatru's second successor Udayī transferred the capital from Rāja-grha to Pāṭali-putra and it was only in the capital of Magadha that these great men could be tested. Some of the Purāṇas state the exact date of ~~the transfer~~ as the fourth year of Udayī, others are not so exact. The Yuga-purāṇa ~~in the astronomical treatise~~ called the Garga-saṃhitā, records only two dates as of very great importance in the history of India ; one is the accession of Parikṣit on the throne of the Pāṇḍavas, and the other the transfer of the capital of Magadha from Rāja-grha to Pāṭali-putra in the reign of Udadhi, a misreading for Udayī. So the upper limit of Pāṇini's age must be the reign of Udayī, somewhere in the earlier half of the 5th century B.C. or in the beginning of the 6th century, if we accept the Singhalese chronology.

Some people are disposed not to attach the same importance to the tradition recorded by Rāja-śekhara as I do. The reason why I attach so much importance to it is that it is not given in a story book but by a great scholar and by the tutor of emperors who ruled over the greater part of civilised India. Rāja-śekhara gives

this tradition not as an isolated fact, but in connection with Rāja-sabhā or assemblies held by great kings for the reward in literature and science, and he describes how such an assembly is to be held. In connection with such Rāja-sabhās, he speaks of the scholars that were rewarded at Pāṭali-putra and the poets that were rewarded at Ujjayinī. It is well known that great kings from remote antiquity used to hold quinquennial assemblies for the purpose of rewarding merit. One such assembly was held by Harṣa-varḍhana at Prayāga when Hiun-tsang was here. Aśoka's quinquennial assemblies are well known to scholars. The idea was certainly not original with Aśoka. His predecessors the Śiśu-nāgas and the Nandas used to hold such assemblies. So the quinquennial assembly was an established institution in India, from very remote antiquity. If the holding of such assemblies is a historical institution, why should not these men be tested and rewarded at Pāṭali-putra, say, in course of three or four hundred years ?

Some people say, that the seven men mentioned by Rāja-śekhara were not contemporaries, so how could they be tested at one place ? But, who says that they were contemporaries ? Rāja-śekhara certainly does not say so. He has given these seven names in strict chronological order. Upavarṣa, a great name in Indian literature first, then Varṣa, the teacher of Pāṇini, then Pāṇini himself, then Piṅgala, the aged teacher of Vindu-sāra's sons ; then Vyāḍi who was at least three generations after Pāṇini, as he was a yuvā or young member of Pāṇini's mother's family ; then Kātyāyana, who wrote a supplement on Pāṇini's sūtras and quoted Vyāḍi, and last of all, Patañjali who officiated in the sacrifice of Puṣya-mitra, the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty. From 500 to 150 B.C. there would be 70

assemblies held at Pāṭali-putra, there is nothing to prevent these seven great men, appearing in seven of these assemblies and being tested and rewarded.

There is another great historical event in this connection. Every student of history knows that Darius led an expedition against Greece in 490 B.C. and that there was an Indian contingent in his army. So, Western India was conquered some years before 490 A.D. and Taxila, the great seat of learning in India was at the gate of India for Darius coming from the West. During the whole of the long life of Buddha, Taxila was the centre to which people flocked for superior education, and any one, who received his education at Taxila, was regarded throughout India with respect and reverence. When that seat of learning fell into foreign hands, it is no wonder that aspirants of literary fame should seek some other place for gaining their reputation. ~~Under such circumstances Upa-~~varṣa, Varṣa and Pāṇini who all belonged to Taxila and its neighbourhood flocked to the new capital in Eastern India to be tested and rewarded. Others like Piṅgala, Vyāḍi, Kātyāyana and Patañjali came to subsequent assemblies to be treated in a similar manner either after finishing their education or after writing some strikingly original work.

The residence of the ancestors of Pāṇini was Śālātura, near Attock. His statue was there for a long time as mentioned by Hiun-tsang. His scholarship was tested at Pāṭali-putra, when the Capital of Magadha was transferred there. He and his contemporary scholars were most likely compelled to leave the neighbourhood of Taxila shortly after the conquest of that territory by the Persians. His mother belonged to the family of Dakṣa and Vyāḍi who

Personal history of
Pāṇini.

was a Dākṣāyaṇa was perhaps three or four generations younger than Pāṇini. The Pañca-tantra says that Pāṇini was devoured by a lion and Kathā-sarit-sāgara says that he had a controversy with Kātyāyana at the court of Nanda. Both these traditions are to be accepted with a grain of salt.

Pāṇini quotes from ten of his predecessors in the grammatical line. They were all historical persons because their sūtras were found quoted in authoritative works. Their names are Āpiśali, Āśvalāyana, Kāśyapa, Gārgya, Gālava, Cakra-varmā Bharadvāja, Śākalya Śākaṭāyana and Sphoṭāyana. Some were writers of Śikṣā, others of Vyākaraṇa. Śākaṭāyana wrote both Vyākaraṇa and Nirukta. All these made, I believe, full use of the grammatical Anukramaṇis of the Vedas at their age. Of these Śākaṭāyana seems to have been a follower of the Jaina religion. He is called Śākaṭāyana because his father's name was Śakaṭa. He is called a Śruta-kevali-deśīyācārya and Patañjali says that he was so absorbed in his thoughts that he did not notice a caravan passing by close to him.

The works that go by the name of Pāṇini are—

अष्टकं गणपाठश्च घातुपाठस्तथैव च ।

लिङ्गानुशासनं शिक्षा पाणिनीया अमी क्रमात् ॥

The word Aṣṭaka here means the grammatical sūtras of Pāṇini divided into eight chapters, each divided into four pādas or quarters. The number of sūtras is 3983. I may refer the reader to my work entitled *Magadhan Literature*, page 26, for how this figure has been arrived at. In writing all these works, five in number, Pāṇini fully utilized the anukramaṇis of ancient sages adding to and modifying them according to his own need. As I have

said before the history of these indices would be of the greatest value if they can be found and I am not hopeless yet that much of this literature may yet be recovered.

The grammatical activity of the brāhmaṇas did not end with Pāṇini. There were many lesser lights before him and after him. The śloka vārttikas are not the work of one man. Many have contributed their quota to these vārttikas. We hear of Indra-datta, Vyāgra-bhūti and others flourishing between the time of Pāṇini and Pātañjali. But there were many big lights, one of them was Vyāḍi, a descendant of Pāṇini's maternal uncle in the fourth generation, that is, in the third generation from Pāṇini. In our Catalogue there is a short work attributed to him. It is *Pari-bhāṣā-pāṭha* (Catal. No. 4337). But the great work of Vyāḍi was his *Samgraha* in 1,00,000 ślokas and with 14,000 points. Bhartṭ-hāri says that the *Mahā-Bhāṣya* was written after the *Samgraha* had "set." But fragments of it seem to have lasted many centuries, as Jayāditya and Kaiyyata seem to quote from it. Pātañjali was a great admirer of the work. Kātyāyana attributes a few of his Vārttikas to Vyāḍi. Even Padma-nābha in the fourteenth century quotes Vyāḍi. In the koṣa section of this preface will be found some works by Vyāḍi.

The whole of the *Pari-bhāṣā* literature seem to emanate from Vyāḍi (Catal. No. 4337 to 4346). Vyāḍi seems to have collected the nucleus of the *Pari-bhāṣās* and subsequent writers have added to them till their number was fixed by the *Vṛtti* of Sira-deva. The *Pāṇinīya pari-bhāṣā* seems to apply to all schools of grammar. The last word on the *Pari-bhāṣās* have been said by Nāgeśa and his pupil Vaidya-nātha Pāya-guṇḍe.

The *Vārttika-pāṭha* of Kātyāyana is represented in

this catalogue by No. 2416. A comparison of this work with the Vārttika-pāṭha as given by Kāśī-nātha Parava shows that this is a shorter recension of that Vārttika-pāṭha. The printed text gives a much larger number of Vārttikas than the MS. In the catalogue has been quoted the first section from both the printed text, and the MS. for facility of comparison. The number of vārttikas as given in the appendix of Kāśī-nātha's edition of Siddhānta-kāumudī is 5032, but he adds 34 more as spoken by Kaiyaṭa and others. These vārttikas criticise the sūtras of Pāṇini. To each sūtra a number of vārttikas is appended. But all the sūtras have not been criticised, the criticisms are confined to only about 1,500 sūtras.

Kātyāyana is said to have been an inhabitant of Kauśāmbī about 30 miles to the west of Allahabad, on the southern bank of the Yamunā, ~~now called Kosam~~. He belonged to a powerful family, distinguished for writing authoritative works on the Vedas. One Kātyāyana wrote the Sarvānukramaṇī of the Ṛg-veda, another wrote a śrauta-sūtra on the White Yajur-veda. Another a Gṛhya-sūtra with 18 appendices. But Goldstücker says that our Kātyāyana, the vārttika-kāra, was the author of a Prātiśākhya of the White Yajur-veda.

The relation between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana is often misunderstood. Some people think that Kātyāyana was a captious and a hostile critic and others think that he was more learned than Pāṇini. But my idea is that, Pāṇini belonged to Western India and Kātyāyana to Eastern India. Pāṇini belonged to the 5th or 6th century B.C. and Kātyāyana was much later. So Pāṇini's sūtras were open to criticism by an Eastern scholar younger by two or three or more generations. The Vājasaneyā-

saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa were recent in Pāṇini's time, and later they developed into sixteen different schools. Pāṇini is not likely to have taken cognizance of this extensive literature of the Vājasaneyins, which Kātyāyana certainly did. All these facts go to exonerate Kātyāyana of any feeling of hostility towards Pāṇini and of being a captious critic. But Kātyāyana did not write an independent work as he found it more convenient to append vārttikas, *i.e.*, his criticisms, to certain rules of Pāṇini. Kātyāyana was very respectful to Pāṇini, sometime calling him even "Bhagavān."

I have spoken of the authors of śloka-vārttikas. Indradatta is one mentioned in the Kathā-sarit-sāgara. Śakavandī is another name given in our Smṛti volume (see Catal. number 3028).

~~Sanskrit grammar is said to have been settled by three~~
 Munis. There is a dictum 'Tri-muni
 Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya. vyākaraṇam.' The three munies are
 Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Something has been said
 above about Pāṇini and Kātyāyana. Patañjali is said to
 have written the "Great Commentary" or the Mahā-bhāṣya.
 But commentary on what? Certainly not on the rules of
 Pāṇini of which only fifteen hundred are criticised both by
 Kātyāyana and Patañjali. It is not on Kātyāyana's
 Vārttikas, because the first Vārttika is Siddhē-sabdārtha-
 sambandhe while the first sūtra dealt with in the Great
 Commentary is Atha-śabdānu-śāsanam. This may be the
 first sūtra of Vyāḍi's Saṃgraha. Patañjali is an admirer of
 that work. In criticising one of the sūtras of Pāṇini
 (Sūtra II, iii, 66) and the Vārttika II on the same, he says,

शोभना खलु दाक्षायणेन संग्रहस्य कृतिः ।

and here Dākṣāyaṇa means Vyāḍi.

The first section of the Mahā-bhāṣya deals with subjects which are absolutely excluded by Pāṇini and Kātyāyana from grammar. The second section deals with the Śiva-sūtras, which are not the sūtras of Pāṇini. It is from the third section that Pāṇini's sūtras begin. What is the source of the 'Great Commentary' for these two sections. Most probably Vyāḍi, who wrote an extensive work measured in hundred thousand ślokas and which Bhartṛhari says contains fourteen thousand points.

Patañjali's mother's name was Goṇikā. He is often called Goṇikā-putra. He belonged to Gonarda, which Varāha-mihira's Bṛhad-Saṃhitā places along with Cedi

Personal history of
Patañjali.

and Kukura in one instance, and along Daśapura and Kerala, in another. He seems to have been familiar with Ujjayinī and Māhiṣmatī. He often says, ~~setting out from Ujjayinī at sun-rise one could go to the other at sun-set.~~ He was also familiar with Pāṭali-putra, where he came to officiate in one of the great sacrifices held by Puṣya-mitra, perhaps a horse-sacrifice, and settled in its vicinity. Reading through the Mahā-bhāṣya one is struck with Patañjali's familiarity with Pāṭali-putra, its walls, its palaces, roads emanating from it to distant cities, and even with the guides who used to 'teach' Pāṭali-putra. In fact in my Magadhan literature, I have said that, he was full of Pāṭali-putra. He was also familiar with Vātsāyanas and Gārgāyanas of whom the former we know from Harṣa-carita, were settled at Prīti-kūṭa in the hermitage of Cyavana twenty-five miles south west of Patna near the Śona, from remote antiquity. Patañjali says that he resided with his students for a time at Kāśmīra where he ate rice.

He says that he officiated at a sacrifice of Puṣya-mitra.

He also says that in his time the Greeks besieged the Mādhyamikas and Sāketa but he did not see it. It is well known that Puṣya-mitra dethroned the last representative of the Maurya dynasty at Pāṭali-putra and assumed supreme power though under the humble name of Senā-pati. It is also well known that he performed the horse-sacrifice twice. It is also known that Puṣya-mitra fought with the Greeks and defeated them in a great battle. Puṣya-mitra's date, therefore, is well known. It is about 180 B.C. and he reigned for 36 years. So the literary activity of Patañjali will fall between 200 and 150 B.C.

The state of language in Pāṇini's time was not a very complicated one. The literary language was all Brāhmanic and what Pāṇini calls Bhāṣā*. He has about 1600 rules out of, say, 4000 for the obsolete or the obsolescent language of the Vedas. He has separate rules for ṛks., yajus, mantras, brāhmaṇas and the general vaidika language or chāndasa. He had not to guard the language against the inroad of vernaculars, though the vernaculars were getting pretty strong for a century or two before him. Śiśu-nāga is said to have prohibited the use of Ṭa, ṭha, ḍa ḍha, ṇa ṣa, ṣa at the court of Magadha. That shows he was a vernacularist. The literary language at the time of Pāṇini, however, was not much afraid of the inroad of the vernaculars. But in Patañjali's time the case was the reverse of it. The preachings of the Buddhist and Jaina monks had given a literary character to many of the vernaculars, and there was the mixed language in which the books of the Mahā-sāṅghikas were written. Aśoka and his successors issued their edicts in the vernaculars of the provinces.

The state of language
from B.C. 600 to
A.D. 600.

Patañjali had to guard the Brâhmanic language from contamination with these. In the very opening of his Great Commentary, he speaks of the pure word "go" being changed into "gāvi," "goni," etc., but that they are all wrong while "go" is the only correct form. But a keen observer like Patañjali did not fail to perceive that the vernaculars will gather strength and popularity. He therefore confined himself to the language of the Śiṣṭas, that is, of brahmins living in Āryā-varṭta, that is, practically the Madhya-deśa of Manu, who were wealthy enough to have a store of grains for a year, who were experts at least in one of the branches of knowledge of the brahmins; who were disinterested and not avaricious. He made his grammatical rules for this class of men, and he often appeals to their usage. He made his rules for a highly cultured class of brâhmaṇas. Their number, however, dwindled century by century and at last in the 7th century Sanskrit ceased to be a spoken language. Sanskrit grammar in subsequent centuries dropped the pitches of pronunciation altogether and Sanskrit became a purely dead language.

The services of Patañjali as a grammarian are simply invaluable. But his Great Commentary is a store-house of information about ancient India, in all matters social, political, literary, scientific, philosophical and so on. But in this preface I am concerned only with grammar.

Patañjali is said to have consulted the Cūrni-Vṛtti on Pāṇini, a Vṛtti written long before Kāśikā. It is sometimes called Cunni-bhaṭṭi-vṛtti or Culli-vṛtti. Nirtura is said to have been another vṛtti-kāra, (see preface to Nyāsa by Babu Śrīsā Candra Cakravartti).

The study of the Mahā-bhāṣya or the Great Commentary with Pāṇini and Kātyāyana was a very arduous work and therefore, we often hear that the Mahā-bhāṣya disappeared from the field of Sanskrit for many centuries in many places. In Kāśmīra, Abhimanyu is said to have reintroduced the Great Commentary during his reign. Bhartṛhari revived the study of the Great Commentary and Pāṇini in the 7th Century A.D. In the same century an attempt was made by the Buddhist commentators of Pāṇini to deduce every grammatical fact from the sūtras of Pāṇini themselves rejecting the Great Commentary altogether. This produced the Buddhist commentaries Kāśikā, the Nyāsa and others. A further attempt was made to restore the Great Commentary at Kāśmīra by Kaiyaṭa, who wrote the Mahā-bhāṣya-pradīpa, but that made the study of ^{from Pāṇini} Great Commentary still more arduous. During that time the study of the Great Commentary remained in abeyance, smaller works of the nature of school books came to the fore and satisfied the need of ordinary people. But about the time of the Muhammadan conquest paṇḍitas began to have recasts of Pāṇini. The rules were not newly made, but, were differently arranged with omissions of these that are not necessary, for such Sanskrit works as are studied at the time, and at the place of writing these recasts. High class sannyāsīs, however, always stuck to the Aṣṭādhyāyī and to the Great Commentary.

The Marāṭhas, in the 16th and the 17th centuries, made a vigorous attempt to revive these works, and wrote commentaries on the Great Commentary. The last and the most extensive of these is the Bhāṣya-pradī-podyota. But all their attempts failed and the field all over India, is held by the recasts of Pāṇini and some school books.

The next great name after Patañjali in the matter of explaining the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini is Kaiyaṭa. His father was Jaiygaṭa. He was most probably, as the name indicates, a Kāśmīrian. Kaiyaṭa's date is not known, but he probably flourished in the tenth century of the Christian era. There is a gap of nearly 1200 years between Patañjali and Kaiyaṭa, yet Kaiyaṭa is a direct follower of Patañjali in the direct line of orthodox school of Pāṇini. The intermediate writers on Pāṇini were mostly Buddhists. They did not much care for Patañjali. Kaiyaṭa has made use of older grammarians, of these two are Āpiśali and Kāśa-kṛtsna. Āpiśali is quoted by Pāṇini himself and Kāśa-kṛtsna is several times mentioned in the Mahā-bhāṣya. As I have said before in the paragraph dealing with Kātyāyana, Kaiyaṭa has quoted 34 more vārttikas than Patañjali. Kaiyaṭa was a pupil of Maheśvara.

Kaiyaṭa has been commented upon by Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa who was a Mahārāṣṭra brahmin and who derived his livelihood from Rāma, a king, or petty Rājā of Śṛṅgavera-pura, a few miles north of Allahabad. His father was Śiva-Bhaṭṭa and his mother was Satī. He was the pupil of Hari Dikṣit, the grandson of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita. Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa died at Beneras, so the tradition says, on the day Warren Hastings was beset by a furious mob at Beneras in 1775 A.D. Dr. Belvalkar on the authority of Durgā-prasāda, the learned editor of the Kāvya-mālā, in his introduction to the Rasa-Gaṅgādhara, says that Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa was invited by Sevai Jaya-Simha of Jaipore in the year 1714 at his horse-sacrifice. But Nāgojī excused by saying that he has taken a vow not to leave Beneras in his life time.

Anūpa-Simha, the Rājā of Bikaner and one of Aurungjeb's generals, availed of the aid of Nāgojī in

writing a work on Smṛti, the draft of which with interlinear corrections is to be found in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa was a man of great learning and has written commentaries on standard works of various śāstras. His Commentary on Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa is known as Udyota or light.

Nāgojī had a pupil, named Vaidya-nātha Pāya-guṇḍe, another Mahāraṣṭra brahmin of Benares better known as Bālam-Bhaṭṭa. He commented upon the work of his guru and called it 'Chāyā.' Bālam-Bhaṭṭa, too, was a man of great learning and wrote commentaries on works on Dharma; Poetics and Vyākaraṇa.

Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, whose Siddhānta Kaumudī is the standard work on Pāṇini's school of grammar, wrote a commentary on the Great Commentary: This commentary was entitled the Śabda-kaustubha. Aufrecht says, that this commentary went up to the first pāda of the first adhyāya. Dr. Belvalkar says, "This was left probably incomplete though he must have written as far at least as the fourth āhnika of adhyāya three." But our Catal. No. 4224 has a colophon 'the first āhnika of the first pāda of the fourth chapter.' It is in the course of publication in the Chowkhamba series. It is a voluminous work and Bālam-Bhaṭṭa wrote a commentary on it entitled Prabhā, still more voluminous a work it must be.

It is said, by all authorities that Śabda-kaustubha is a commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī, but in the colophons of the MSS. of that work in this Catalogue from 4224-4227 the Āhnikas are always mentioned. Aṣṭādhyāyī has no division in Āhnikas, while the Mahā-bhāṣya has it, therefore, this is a commentary on the Mahā-bhāṣya and not

on the Aṣṭādhyāyī. This is proved by what Bhaṭṭoji says in the preamble of the Śabda-kaustubha—*प्रणिभाषित-भाष्याब्जेः शब्दकौस्तुभमुद्धरे ।* That is, I am picking the jewel of Śabda from the ocean of the Great Commentary spoken by Phaṇi or Patañjali. After completion of that work he wrote 71 Kārikās, commencing with—*प्रणिभाषितभाष्याब्जेः शब्दकौस्तुभ उद्धृतः ।* I have picked up the jewel of Śabda from the ocean of the Great Commentary spoken by Phaṇi or Patañjali. What has been settled there is now being spoken in brief. Thirty-five of these seventy-one kārikās have been commented upon by Vana-māli Miśra who was a direct disciple of Bhaṭṭoji. This ṭīkā is given in our Catal. No. 4229. All the 71, however, were elaborately commented upon by Koṇḍa-Bhaṭṭa, who was the brother's son of Bhaṭṭoji under the title of Vaiyākaraṇa-bhuṣaṇa-sāra or simply Bhuṣaṇa which has been printed in Benares. So the Śabda-kaustubha was a commentary not on the Aṣṭādhyāyī but on the Mahā-bhāṣya and it was finished by Bhaṭṭoji. It has another commentary called Prabhā, Catal. 4228.

The orthodox Brahmanical commentaries on Pāṇini's sūtras have come to an end. The Buddhist commentaries will now be taken up. The Buddhists for a long time did not follow Pāṇini. They began writing in the district dialects, then came the mixed language, and after that, Sanskrit of a sort. Even the best of the Buddhist Sanskrit writers, used expressions which are not sanctioned by Pāṇini. Aśva-ghoṣa's Buddha-Carita and Saundarānanda written in the first century of the Śaka era are instances in point. But, in the seventh century they, too, began to study Pāṇini. But, they did not care for Patañjali. They wanted to depend entirely on the sūtras of Pāṇini and in a less degree on the vārttikas of Kātyāyana. Their best

known commentary is the Kāśikā in which all the sūtras of Pāṇini have been commented upon, without any omission and in the order in which they appear in the Sūtra-pāṭha. The authors of the work are Jayāditya and Vāmana. Both flourished in Kāśmīra and in the 7th century. Belvalkar says "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, (Belvalkan p. 36) probably came soon after Jayāditya." Bhaṭṭoji finds difference in the views of these two authors. The orthodox Hindus did not like this new commentary. Māgha in the second canto of Śiṣu-pāla-vadha speaks disparagingly of this sort of commentary. He compares politics without śpaśa, *i.e.*, spies, with grammar without paspaśa or the nine first āhnikas of the Māhā-bhāṣya. Some think that Vāmana, was minister of Jayāpīḍa of Kāśmīra and that the King Jayāpīḍa was Jayāditya himself.

Kielhorn says "The text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī as given in the Kāśikā differs, in 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 nineteen cases new words have been inserted in the original sūtras, while in the rest there are other changes in the wording etcetera of the sūtras." Some of these changes were suggested by Kātyāyana and Patañjali and others were taken from Candragomi's grammar. It is said that Jayāditya died about 660 A.D.

In the Kāśikā the commentary on Pāṇini's sūtras is preceded by a commentary, short though it is, on the fourteen Śiva-sūtras.

Kāśikā had many commentaries, the best of them is by Jinendra-buddhi. The work is called Nyāsa, or Kāśikā-vivaraṇa pañjikā. The Commentator is described as Bodhisattva-deśīy-ācāryya, that is, a teacher little less than a Bodhisattva. This stamps him as a Mahā-yānist writer. The word Pañjikā requires an explanation. There are three classes of commentaries, Ṭikā or laghu-ṭikā; Vṛhaṭ-ṭikā; and Pañjikā. The first two terms require no explanation, one is notes and the other, a running commentary, but the third means sarvārtha-bhañjikā, that is, explaining everything arising out of the text. The Nyāsa is written in the same style as the Mahā-bhāṣya and gives us a good deal of contemporary information as the Great Commentary.

Belvalkar says, “As to his date he can not 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 *Ṭṛc* 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.” But this is unconvincing as there were other works entitled Nyāsa before Jinendra-Buddhi-Bāṇa speaks of one.

The work Nyāsa has been printed and published by the Vārendra-Research Society under the editorship of Paṇḍita Śrīśa Candra Cakravarttī, Reader, Dacca University. He had a good deal of trouble in collecting the MSS. of this work. A complete MS. was nowhere found. He had to pick up different parts of the work from different places throughout India. He has done a good deal for the Buddhist Commentaries on Pāṇini.

There is another commentary on Kāśikā, called Padamañjarī by Hara-datta, a brāhmaṇa of Southern India

son of Agnikumar. He is said to have been an incarnation of Śiva, in a Purāṇa. Hara-datta is to a great extent indebted to Kaiyaṭa so he must come in the 11th century. He is quoted by Mādhavācārya and Malli-nātha. Though a little out of the place here, as I want to finish the Buddhist commentaries on Pāṇini, so I venture to speak something of the Bhāṣā-vṛtti and its commentaries. One of the commentators says that Lakṣmaṇa-Śena, the last King of Bengal, wanted to have a Sanskrit grammar without the Vedic archaisms and their phonology and so he employed a Buddhist scholar of great reputation, named Puruṣottama-Deva, to write such a grammar. This is Bhāṣā-vṛtti. It is Pāṇini's sūtras without svāra and vaidiki. The second pāda of the sixth chapter deals entirely with svāra, so the Bhāṣā-vṛtti omits it altogether. The Bhāṣā-vṛtti was commented upon by a Bengali brahmin, Śṛṣṭi-dhara-Cakravartī in the 17th century A.D. most probably by the middle of it. The commentary is rather diffuse and wanting in originality, therefore the editor Śrīśa Candra did not like to publish it. There is another commentary, by Viśva-rūpa called Pañjikā, which is given in No. 4250 of this Catalogue. Viśva-rūpa says that, the Bhāṣā-vṛtti had many commentaries before him, still he attempts one, because when the parrots and peacocks sing should not the tiṭṭibha chirp?

The accessories to the study of Pāṇini are seven altogether. (1) Gaṇa-pāṭha (2) Dhātu-pāṭha (3) Lingānuśāsana (4) Śikṣā (5) Uṇādi-sūtras (6) Phīṭ-sūtras (7) Paribhāṣā-sūtras.

(1) Gaṇa-pāṭha, Gaṇa means a list of words undergoing a common grammatical change. The formation of

Gaṇas is the direct result of the habit of the ancients in India to write Anukramaṇīs. There is a book in which all these Gaṇas are put together and it is attributed to Pāṇini. Pāṇini might have edited them to serve his own purpose. But tradition has it that even Śākaṭāyana had a Gaṇa-pāṭha. The Gaṇas are of two kinds, complete Gaṇas, and Ākṛti-gaṇas. In the first, all the words in a Gaṇa is enumerated and, in the second, the enumeration is not exhaustive, only a few leading types are given and the student is left to decide from similar grammatical changes whether a word is to be taken in or not. In the Aṣṭādhyāyī, Pāṇini gives only the first word of a Gaṇa and then the word “ādi”. The exhaustive enumeration of words in the Gaṇa is left for the Gaṇa-pāṭha. Many people suspect that these Gaṇas have been tampered with in subsequent centuries. But all agree that, the text as we have it, is settled by Pāṇini. In the ~~Ākṛti-gaṇas the question of~~ tampering does not arise. New words are added by the student from similarity of changes. The Gaṇas are arranged according to the Aṣṭādhyāyī Sūtra-pāṭha. There are altogether 258 sūtras in which the Gaṇas occur. Our Catal. No. 4356 and 4356B are abridgments of Gaṇa-pāṭha, the former by Rāma-Kṛṣṇa and the latter by Geya-deva who gives only the gaṇas of nouns.

(2) Every grammarian had to make his own list of verbal roots from the pre-existing indices. Pāṇini's Dhātu-pāṭha consists of 1944 roots, plus 20 Śrauta dhātus which have to be picked up from the sūtras of Pāṇini. The works on roots of the school of Pāṇini have many commentaries. Our 4350 is by Kṣīra-svāmī, the Kāśmīrian. It gives the meanings of roots. Numbers 4351 to 53 are by Bhīma-sena and 4354 is by Maitreya-rakṣita, one of the Buddhist commentators

Dhātu-pāṭha.

of Pāṇini. It is later than Bhīma-sena. Maitreya flourished according to Śrīśa Babu about 1100 A.D. The greatest work on Sanskrit roots of this school is by the well known Mādhavācāryya. It has been published in the Mysore Sanskrit series. It is of an encyclopedic character. Babu Śrīśa Candra has written a commentary on the Dhātu-Pradīpa by Maitreya in his edition published by Vārendra Research Society.

(3) Pāṇini's Līṅgānuśāsana consists of 187 sūtras.

Līṅgānu śāsana.

Unlike modern languages, Sanskrit has a gender for every noun, not necessarily determined by the sex. The Līṅgānuśāsana gives rules for determining the gender of nouns.

(4) The Pāṇinīya Śikṣā and its commentaries have been

Pāṇinīya Śikṣā.

described in the second volume of this Catalogue from 1500 to 1508. This Śikṣā consists of 58 or 59 couplets, but there is a copy of this work, No. 444 of the I.O. Catalogue, which consists of 21 couplets only. Belvalkar says, the Śikṣā bears, on the face of it, the stamp of modernness, notwithstanding the fact, that a verse from it has found its way into the Mahā-bhāṣya. It seems that there was a short work in 21 verses which was ancient and from the pen of Pāṇini, but much has been added in more modern times. (*Vide* pages 32 and 33 of my Magadhan literature.)

These four are given in an ancient couplet as coming

Unādi-sūtras.

from Pāṇini. The other three seem to be of different authorship. The Unādi-sūtras are attributed to Śākaṭāyana by Kāśī-nātha Pāṇḍuranga Parava, the Bombay editor of the Siddhānta-Kaumudī dated Śaka 1815. It is in five chapters. There are

authorities both Indian and Európean for attributing this work either to Pāṇini or to Kātyāyana, but the Great Commentary says,

अत्र पाणिनिरव्युत्पन्नः ।

that is, Pāṇini was not a Vyutpatti-vādī. That is, he did not hold the view that all the words in the Sanskrit language can be derived from Sanskrit roots. So he did not write the Unādi-sūtras but left them out by saying उणादयो बह्वन् । On the other hand Śākaṭāyana held the view that all Sanskrit words are derivable from Sanskrit roots. So I think Kāśī-nātha is right in attributing the Unādi-sūtras to Śākaṭāyana (*vide* p. 200 of Parav's Siddhānta Kaumudī Pariśiṣṭāni *vide* also my Magadhan Literature, pages 33 and 34). There is a commentary on Unādi-sūtras by Ujjvala-datta. It has two recensions. The lithographed edition has ten sections, while Aufrecht speaks of five. Ujjvala-datta is later than Maitreya-rakṣit whom he enumerates as one of his authorities. Some say the Unādi Sūtras are by Vara-ruci. (*See* section on Vara-ruci.)

The Phiṭ sūtras treat of phonetics. Everybody agrees that these sūtras are the work of Śātanavācārya. The sūtras are divided into 4 chapters and number 87 in all. Max Müller says, that they are pre-Pāṇinian, but Goldstücker says that they are post-Pāṇinian. Some of the Indian commentators support Goldstücker. (*See* Magadhan Literature, p. 34.) It is called Phiṭ-sūtra because the first sūtra is फिषोऽन्त उदात्तः । Phiṣ when coupled with other words will be Phiṭ.

The Pāribhāṣās number 134. These are axioms or rules of interpretation. Such rules must exist from the begining of the sūtra litera-

Paribhāṣā Sūtras.

ture. Whereever there are sūtras, there must be rules for the interpretation of the sūtras. The present Paribhāṣā-pāṭha is a collection made, in later times by some unknown author and their usefulness being apparent, they have repeatedly been commented upon. Paribhāṣā existed before Pāṇini. He made some, Kātyāyana and Patañjali made others, and the unknown author added some. In the present Catalogue there is a Paribhāṣā-pāṭha attributed to Vyāḍi. It is called Vyāḍi-viracita-Pāṇiniya-paribhāṣā. No. 4337. The numbers of Paribhāṣā pāṭha are from 4338 to 4340. Its commentaries are treated of from No. 4341 to 4347. The commentaries are by Śira-deva, Nāgoji-Bhaṭṭa and Vaidya-nātha Pāya-guṇḍe.

The philosophy of grammar was never treated of separately before the time of Bhartṭr-hari, who died according to It-siang, in 650 A.D. He is said to have written a commentary, on the Mahā-bhāṣya. Gaṇa-ratna-mahodadhi says, that Bhartṭr-hari explained only the first three pādas of the Mahā-bhāṣya and Bühler says that, fragments of the commentary are to be found in the Royal Library of Berlin, and in the Deccan. Belvalkar says, that the work has not yet seen the light. We know that in the 17th century Bhaṭṭoji after writing a commentary on the Mahā-bhāṣya wrote 71 verses, on the philosophy of grammar. Bhartṭr-hari, thousand years before, seems to have done the same thing, that is, after writing a commentary on the Mahā-bhāṣya, he wrote a short metrical work, on the philosophy of grammar, in three chapters, called the Vākya-paḍīya. This short work would have no meaning without a commentary on the Mahā-bhāṣya.

The grammarian Bhartṭr-hari is often identified with

the poet Bhartṛhari, the writer of the three or four Śatakas. This is at best very doubtful, for the earliest quotation from the poet Bhartṛhari is by Kṣemendra in the 11th century.

The grammarian Bhartṛhari laments the corruption of the text of the Mahā-bhāṣya, which, he says, Candrācārya re-edited shortly before his time.

Dr. Belvalkar thinks that this Candrācārya and Candra-gomī are one and the same person. This also is extremely doubtful. Candra-gomī, as I will presently show, was an East Bengal man and most probably a Buddhist. But Candrācārya seems to be a Brahmanical writer, and Candra-gomī does not make much use of the Mahā-bhāṣya, though most of his sūtras have been taken from Pāṇini.

The historical informations that we glean from the Vākya-padīya and its commentaries, are these:—Vyāḍi wrote a work in 100,000 ślokas entitled Saṃgraha, but in course of time people anxious to get a knowledge of grammar in a short time, neglected its study, and so the work perished. Patañjali wrote the Great Commentary, containing the germ of all theories, from the Saṃgraha. But ordinary people could not study it all. There were grammarians, Vaijī, Saubhava, and Haryyakṣa and others fond of useless controversy who made the work written by that Ṛṣi from the Saṃgraha, still more difficult. So the Śāstra of Vyākaraṇa was lost to those who wanted to study Patañjali. In course of time that work remained in the Deccan only as a manuscript. Candrācārya, Vasu-rāta and others getting the Śāstra from Parvata (the Commentator says, a part of Telingānā), gave currency to it. The

author's guru Vasu-rāta, prepared for "us" this short work. The commentator says, that Bhartṭṛ-hari attributed his work to his guru. Knowledge becomes clear by the help of Śāstra and philosophy. Mere logic can give very little. Without Purāṇa, without Āgama and without the advice of old people knowledge cannot be clear.

The Vākya-paḍīya should be properly called Varṇa-vākya-paḍīya, for the first Chapter treats of Varṇa or articulate sound, though it is called Brahma-Kāṇḍa. The second Kāṇḍa treats of Vākya or sentence and the third of Pāda or words. In the first Kāṇḍa are given all the various theories about sound, or rather articulate sound, and the relation of words with their meanings. It quotes extensively from Saṃgraha, which, it declared, had perished. These may be second-hand quotations.

The commentary of the first Kāṇḍa, as printed in the Benares Śāṅskṛit Series, is by Hari-vṛṣabha ; the commentary, on the second Kāṇḍa, is by Puṇya-rāja. He says, that Rājānaka Śūra-varmā wrote a commentary on the second Kāṇḍa, by hearing from one, who was extolled by learned men everywhere. Śaśāṅka was perhaps a disciple of Śūra-varmā. From Śaśāṅka Puṇya-rāja got explanations which he has put together in this commentary. The third Kāṇḍa has been printed with the commentary of Helā-rāja, the son of Bhūti-rājā.

There is a work entitled Bhāga-vṛtti. It has not yet been found even in fragments, but it is extensively quoted by Kramadīśvara, Jumara Nandī, Goyī-candra and the Buddhist commentators of Pāṇini. One commentator of the 17th century named Śṛṣṭi-dhara attributes it to Bhartṭṛ-hari and Babu Śrīśacandra Cakra-vartī has tried to

prove that it is by Bhartṭṛ-hari, but the facts and arguments he has put forward are absolutely unconvincing (see his preface to the edition of the Nyāsa, page 14 and note 17).

He says “It-siang in a part of his book, makes भर्तृहरि the author of a commentary on पाणिनि.—He calls it “Pei-na,” which is surmised by the Japanese translator (Mr. J. Takakusu) to be the “Veda-vṛtti” or वेदावृत्ति” (17). Says It-siang—“A person who has studied so far as this book, is said to have mastered Grammatical Science.” Now this “Pei-na” is probably the भागवृत्ति which is a commentary on the “अष्टाध्यायी”.

And in note 17 he says, “May not the “Vedā-vṛtti” as well be a corruption of the word भेजवृत्ति वा भेदवृत्ति i.e., भागवृत्ति?” Again he says, “हृदिधराचार्य the author of the भाषावृत्त्यर्थविवृति, a commentary on the भाषावृत्ति by पुरुषोत्तमदेव, remarks in the end of the book—भागवृत्तिः भर्तृहरिणा विरचिता श्रीधरसेननरेन्द्रादिष्टा” ।

No reliance can be placed on any historical statements by Sṛṣṭi-dharācārya as he belongs to the 17th Century and to North Bengal. In this very quotation he confounds Bhaṭṭi and Bhartṭṛ-hari, for Śrīdhara-sena was the patron of Bhaṭṭi, the poet, and not of Bhartṭṛ-hari, the grammarian.

Our number 4254A is a fragment of an interesting work refuting the opinion of all previous commentators on Pāṇini and establishing his own. It is by Cakra-pāṇi, the author of Prakriyā-pradīpa and the pupil of Śeṣa Vireśvara. We have not got the first leaf, Eggeling (Catal. No. 728.) has it but he missed the name of the author and of the book which are there. The author is Cakra-pāṇi and work is Paramata-khaṇḍana.

AINDRA-GRAMMAR.

It has already been said that there were grammars before Pāṇini and the first place, among these grammars, is given to the Aindra school. Indra is said to have studied grammar with Vṛhaspati and there were no rules. Vṛhaspati was the teacher, and Indra was his student. Thousand years passed yet they did not go far in their knowledge. So rules were made and a beginning made of the science of language. Sāyana says, in his commentary on the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, that, before Pāṇini, there was a Śrauta Vyākaraṇa. He might have meant the Aindra Vyākaraṇa. No ancient work of this school has come down to us. The only grammar of this school, that is extant, is the Kātantra or the Kalāpa. It takes the alphabet as it is, and attempts at no Śiva-sūtras. Its nomenclature is taken from the ordinary language, and they are not algebrical, like those of Pāṇini, and the subsequent schools. The Prātiśākhya seem to be the ancient representatives of this school. But they do not count as they are not treatises on grammar.

The Kalāpa Vyākaraṇa had its origin in Southern India in the 1st Century A.D. One of the Kings of the Sāta-vāhana dynasty took a wife from Northern India; she spoke Sanskrit which he did not understand, and often made curious and ludicrous mistakes. At last unable to bear the jeerings of his wife, he made up his mind to study Sanskrit, and asked his Paṇḍita Sarva-varmā to write a treatise on grammar, that would give him a workable knowledge of Sanskrit. Sarva-varmā produced a grammar which in six months gave the king what he wanted. This tradition is given in detail in H.P.R., III, 50. The work is called 'Kātantra' or, a short work. It is in fact a Sanskrit grammar for beginners. How short it was, we have no means

of ascertaining ; for being very short many people threw into it rules that were likely to make it more useful. It had no rules for Kṛts or verbal nouns. That chapter was added to it by Kātyāyana. Similarly, sections on Taddhita suffixes were also added. Belvalkar says, “Thus instead of nearly 4000 sūtras of Pāṇini, Sarva-varmā could finish his work in about 855 sūtras or including the Kṛt section, 1400 sūtras only.” The Dacca edition says that the number is 842, Eggeling’s edition gives the number as 829.

How short Kātantra grammar was, may be inferred from the two chapters (Chs. 203 and 204) in Garuḍa-purāṇa devoted to it. Pāṇini’s name was most probably lost at the time when Garuḍa-purāṇa was written. These chapters were written in the form of an interlocution between Kumāra and Kātyāyana ; both the chapters begin with *asars to bēd Siddha*, meaning current and ordinary. Chapter 203 begins with *Siddha-sabda-vivekāya* and chapter 204, with *Siddhodāharanāni*. Chapter 203 treats of conjugation and declension. It simply gives the sūtras of Kātantra made into verses. The Kṛt is treated in one single verse at the end. Chapter 204 gives current examples of sandhi, samāsa and taddhita very briefly though. It gives also similar examples of līṅgānuśāsana and sarva-nāma. Most of the examples are found in the Kātantra. In speaking of Kātantra grammar I am referring to the East Bengal recensions of it.

The inference from my study of these two chapters is that Sarva-varmā being a clever teacher for royal pupils taught some topics of grammar by sūtras and others by examples only. Subsequent redactors added rules for which he gave examples only. So originally as the Kātantra came out from the hand of Sarva-varmā, it did not

is by his namesake, Durga Siṃha, who invokes Buddha in his Maṅgalācaraṇa. This commentary is called Ṭikā. Then comes the Pañji or Pañjikā, by Tri-locana Dāsa, who is quoted by Vopa-deva. The Dacca edition publishes these commentaries in full, and as an appendix adds Kalāpa-candra on the Pañjika, by Suṣena Vidyā-bhūṣaṇa, also called Kavi-rāja.

Durga-vākya-prabodha by Kula-candra is a commentary on the Vṛtti by Durga Siṃha. The writer describes himself as the son of Viśva-mahī-dhara.

Ākhyāta-pañjikā-vyākhyā by Nara-hari aims at setting right, wrong interpretations on the Pañji. (H.P.R., I, 20.)

Kalāpa-pradīpa by Vidyā-sāgara, the son of Mahā-mahopādhyāya Śrikānta Paṇḍita, whose proper name appears to be Puṇḍarikākṣa, is a commentary on the Ṭikā. ~~This Vidyā-sāgara has written a commentary on the Bhaṭṭi the grammatical doctrines of which are given in his~~ Pradīpa, no complete and satisfactory MS. of which, however, has yet been found. (H.P.R., I, 50.)

Vara-ruci, is said to have written a commentary on the Kātantra Sūtra, entitled Kātantra-vṛtti. The Vṛtti seems to have undergone a revision in the hands of Yaśo-māna; but there is a suspicious look about it. The invocation is identical with that of Durga Siṃha, though a comparison shows that this is a different work. (H.P.R., I, 51.)

Hari-rāma wrote a commentary most likely, on Durga Siṃha's Vṛtti. (H.P.R., I, 52.)

Vidyānanda by Vijayānanda, (Catal. No. 4399, Aufrecht in his Catal. vol. II calls it Kātantottara or Siddhānanda) is a commentary on Durga's Vṛtti.

Kātantra, being a very short school book, people wanted to make it a comprehensive work; the standard work of a powerful school. This they accomplished first by writing commentaries; commentaries on commentaries; and even commentaries on the third or fourth remove. Not satisfied with that, people began to write supplements. Of these supplements the most important is by Śrī-pati Datta, who supplemented almost every section of the work, with additional matters. Śrī-pati had a powerful commentator in Gopī-nātha Tarkācārya, son of Ācārya-simha Paśupati; who wrote *Parīṣiṣṭa-prabodha* (Catal. No. 4387C-4390).

Śiva-rāma's *Siddhānta-ratnāṅkura* is a commentary on Śrī-pati's supplement. (Catal. No. 4392.)

Kātantra-candrikā by Rāma-dāsa Cakra-vartti is a commentary on a portion of the supplement of *Kātantra*. The author acknowledges his obligation to Gopī-nātha specially. Rāma-dāsa consulted later works of many schools. He comes after *Vidyā-sāgara*. The same Gopī-nātha had a most appreciative commentator in Śaṅkara Śarmā, who in his *Kātantra-parīṣiṣṭa-prabodha-prakāśikā*, compares grammar to sugar-cane and logic to the machine which extracts juice from it; and recommends his readers to drink plentifully the juice extracted from grammar by logic.

Śrī-pati Datta's supplement (Catal. No. 4385-4387) was further supplemented by Tri-locana, who is to be differentiated from Tri-locana Dāsa, the author of the *Pañjī*. Tri-locana belonged to the Vaidya caste and was the son of Mādhava Dāsa, whose title was Kavindra. Śrī-pati did not

Kātantra-parīṣiṣṭa and
its commentaries.

say anything about dhātu and taddhita ; Tri-locana supplements that defect and adds some sūtras on samāsa.

Kalāpa-tattva-bodhinī (Catal. No. 4391) in three parts, is a dissertation on various parts of Kātantra by Rāma-candra, the son of Hari-hara, belonging to the family of Kāñjī whose later residence was the village Uttaracaiva and whose ancient residence was Śiva-pura-tapāka. Rāma-candra appears to have been a Maithila Brāhmaṇa who invariably mentions the names of two residential villages, one ancient another recent, in giving a description of the family. The three parts of his work treat of sandhi, kāraka and the appendices. The first is an examination of Tri-locana Dāsa's work on sandhi. Here Rāma-candra controverts the explanations of Suṣena Kavi-rāja on the Pañjī. The other two parts are a commentary on the commentary of Gopī-natha Tarkācārya on Śri-pati Datta's commentary.

Kāraka-ratnaṃ is by a Durga ~~Sumana who quotes Kavi-~~
 Accessories of Kātantra. rāja : so he is a different person from
 (1) Kāraka. the author of the Vṛtti or of the
 Tikā.

Ṣaṭ-kārakam by Rabhasa Nandī (Catal. No. 4400 and 4401) is a collection of 14 couplets relating to Kāraka with commentary. It seems to be an ancient work, because the author is quoted by Jumara Nandī.

Dhātu-ghoṣā by Rāma-kānta ; Dhātu-mālā by Ṣaṣṭhī-dāsa Viśārada, and Dhātu-lakṣaṇam
 (2) Roots. by Danokācārya are works on roots of
 the Kātantra school of grammar. It is said that Kātantra is current only in East Bengal. It has already been said, that the Maithilas used the book. Ṣaṣṭhī-dāsa

wrote his work at Gopāla-pura, at the junction of the Ganges and the Mahānandā. Manoramā (Catal. No. 4393) is a Vṛtti on roots by Rāma-nātha Śarmā, son of Veda-garbha Tarkācārya, belonging to the Rāyi family, among the Rādhiya Brāhmaṇas. The Brāhmaṇas of this family had been for a long time regarded so low that any matrimonial connection with them would reduce a Kulina or a noble Brāhmaṇa to their rank. Perhaps the author wrote at a time when the family prestige was not so lowered.

A work on conjugation of the Kātantra school goes by
Conjugation. the name of Vilveśvara Tarkācārya.

It is well known that the Tamādi 31 sūtras, Rājādi 65
Rājādi-Vṛtti. sūtras and Rucādi 67 sūtras, though
included in the Kātantra sūtras, are
not by Sarva-varmā. ~~Eggeling has published these sūtras
in their proper places, the first and the third without a
commentary but the second, Rājādi, with a commentary by
Ratneśvara Cakra-vartī. In Bengal, the same Rājādi has an
anonymous commentary entitled Vṛtti giving examples.~~

Rucādi. The Rucādi has a commentary in
Bengal by Madhu-sūdana.

Rāma-candra Cakra-vartī and Raghu-nandana Śiro-
maṇi gave the meanings of grammatical terminations, and
of verbal roots. Rāma-nātha Cakra-vartī wrote a work on
the declensions of nouns.

Kātantra-kaumudī by Gaṅgeśa Śarmā attempts to
justify various ungrammatical expressions in classical Sans-
krit literature according to the rules of Kātantra grammar.

He seems to have been very proud, for he says that, neither Candra-gomī, nor Durga Siṃha, not even Kātyāyana, knew so much as he did. He had looked into all Śāstras and he was an authority in determining difficult points in Kātantra. His invocation is mysterious; after saluting Śiva, he invokes a Dvi-janmā whose fame is known even in the Vedas.

Kalāpa-tattvārṇava by Śiro-maṇi is on the five chapters of Kṛt. The author quotes from Kṛt. Pañjī and says that Kātyāyana taking the bodily form of Vara-ruci, wrote the Kṛt prakaraṇa of Kātantra. (Catal. No. 4384.)

Kṛn-mañjarī by Siva-rāma-dāsa Śarman (Catal. No. 4402) is a collection of Kārikās numbering 18 and is commented upon by the author himself. The father's name is ~~Gopi-ramāṇa Cakra-vartī~~; The work quotes from Śrī-pati, Hema-kara, Sundara Kavi-rāja, Yadu-nātha and Kamalā-kara Cakra-vartī.

Unādi-vṛtti by Sarva-dhara (Catal No. 4394). It is well known that the Kātantra school Unādi. took the Unādi sūtras from the Cāndra Vyākaraṇa, and adopted them to their own school.

Sāra-nirṇaya, by Ramā-nātha Cakra-vartī, son of Madhu-sūdana Tarka-vāgīśa, explains sūtras foreign to Kalāpa, quoted by commentators of the school.

The Kāśmīra recension seems to be much older than Durga Siṃha's commentary. The Sutra-pāṭha there, differs greatly from that adopted by Durga Siṃha. The Laghu-vṛtti by Chichu Kāśmīra recension.

Bhaṭṭa contains many sūtras not known to Durga Siṃha. Eggeling has in his notes pointed out prominently these additional sūtras, in his edition of the Kātantra. The MS. of the Laghu-vṛtti, however, was obtained by him from Burnell who worked in Southern India. Before Durga Siṃha became familiar to the Kāśmīrian Paṇḍitas, they were busy with original commentaries of their own Paṇḍitas. Bhaṭṭa Jagad-dhara wrote a commentary called Vāla-vodhinī. That commentary was commented upon by Ugra-bhūti called Nyāsa. One Ugra-bhūti was the teacher of grammar to Ānanda-pāla, rājā of Kāśmīra, and his book was popularised in that country by liberal donations from the royal pupil, about the end of the 10th century.

Durghaṭa-vṛtti by Śaraṇa-deva is another work of this school, composed in the Śaka year 1095. Śaraṇa-deva seems to have been a Buddhist, as he invokes Sarvajña, which, without any qualifying word means *all-knowing*. But, ~~the~~ ^{he} ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~allowed~~ ^{allowed} to revise the work for the benefit of students. Stein notices the revised edition in his Kāśmīra Catalogue pages 259 and 260; the same revised edition is also noticed in page 105 of my Nepal Catalogue Volume I. So Śaraṇa-deva's work has still to be discovered. In the extract given by Stein, there are certain passages marked "Iti Rakṣita." It seems, revisions are sometimes marked by the revisor's own name. The authors, Śaraṇa-deva and Rakṣita, note only durghaṭa or difficult and doubtful points in Kātantra.

Another work of this school comes from Nepal. It is known by various names, Pada-sūryya-prakaraṇa, Pada-sūryya-prakriyā and Padārohaṇa. The author is Sāraṅga Upādhyāya Utsava-kīrti. In the present catalogue there are three MSS., (Nos. 4396-4398) all from Nepal. In the

preamble, the author says, that he has consulted the opinions of Sarva-varmā, Guha and others. This raises a nice point. Hitherto, Kātantra was also called Kaumāra and Kalāpa; but, Sāraṅga-deva makes Sarva-varmā, the author of Kātantra, and Guha *i.e.*, Kumāra, distinct authors. Is this the grammar, the abstract of which has been found in the Garuḍa-purāṇa, in which Sarva-varmā's name is not at all mentioned. The Kaumāra vyākaraṇa is distinct from Kātantra? Sarva-varmā takes the alphabet as current, but Garuḍa-purāṇa takes words and examples also as current. Sarva-varmā gives some technical terms and defines them. Garuḍa-purāṇa does not make anything of the kind. Sarva-Varmā teaches by Sūtras only; Garuḍa-purāṇa teaches nāma and ākhyāta by sūtras; sandhis, samāśas and other subjects are taught by examples only. The sūtras given in Garuḍa-purāṇa have all been found in Kātantra, and also the examples given there, in Durga-siṃha-vṛtti. So it may appear that Kātantra and the Kaumāra grammars are not one and the same, and ~~their relation will be an~~ interesting study.

It will be found in the preface to the Lexicon section of this volume that Kāli-dāsa in his Dictionary entitled Nānārtha-śabda-ratna speaks of an ancient school of Sanskrit grammar named after the Sun, and his friend, Nicula, the commentator, adds the names of some other schools. May not the Pada-sūryya-prakriyā be a short work on the *pada i.e.*, the declensions and conjugation of the Sun school of grammar? In that case it seems that there were other schools of grammar now lost altogether.

Thus it will be seen that, from a small beginning
 Conclusion. this school of grammar rose to be one
 of the most extensive, and scholarly

systems. Simply from an elementary work on declension and conjugation it rivalled Pāṇini's system with all its accessories. Not content with this, in the past generation, Candra-kānta Tarkālaṅkāra tried to complete it, with a treatise on Vedic grammar and Vedic phonetics entitled Kātantra-chandaḥ-prakriyā. How to develop a school book into a school of grammar has been fully exemplified in the history of the Kalāpa-vyākaraṇa. Moderns do often think this a labour lost. Let a school book be a school book, they think, and let erudite people go to Pāṇini.

Burnell's work entitled the 'Aindra school of Sanskrit grammarians' will always remain an interesting and instructive study for those who care for the history of Sanskrit grammar. It was published in 1875 and even now it has not lost its importance. It has shown that, the Aindra system has been adopted in Tāmil, in Pāli and in other languages of India in making their grammar, and the Prātiśākhya on Vedic phonetics all belong to this school. Burnell thinks, that, the grammatical chapters in the Agni-purāṇa also belong to this school. This, I will presently show, is not tenable.

Vopa-deva in his Kavi-kalpa-druma quotes a verse giving the names of eight ancient schools of Sanskrit grammar. They are :—

The Cāndra school of
grammar.

इन्द्रश्चन्द्रः काशकृष्णापिशली शाकटायनः ।

पाणिन्यमरजैनेन्द्रा जयन्त्यष्टादिशाब्दिका ॥

In this enumeration he makes Candra the second school of Sanskrit grammar. The founder of this school is Candra-gomī, whose birth place was in the Vārendra country or North Bengal, but he lived at Candra-dvīpa, in the Barisal district, where he wrote his grammar. This account of

Candra-gomī is to be found in Pug-Sam-Zom-Zam, a rather late Tibetan authority. His date is to be inferred from the fact that, he mentions the victory of the Guptas over the Huns, as occurring in his time, which he might have seen if he wished; and it is well known that the Huns were defeated by the Guptas in the third quarter of the 5th century; and therefore, Belvalkar has placed him in 470 A.D., which may be accepted as correct if the Vṛtti-kāra is the author himself. This was the period when Candra-dvīpa was an important city. It was invaded by Candra-varmā, who was defeated and killed by Samudra-Gupta, and it was also at Candra-dvīpa about this time, that the Kaula system of Śaivism took its rise. Candra-gomī was a Buddhist and he wrote his work in the interest of his co-religionists. In fact from this period Buddhist Śramaṇas began to write in correct Sanskrit. All Buddhist works before this time were written in what is called Buddhist Sanskrit *i.e.*, ungrammatical Sanskrit. Even the very best of them confounded the participles, in the use of 'ktva' and 'yap.'

As Candra wrote in the interest of the Buddhists, he did not treat of the Vaidik grammar and phonetics. For centuries Candra's grammar remained in India, only as a name, till Bühler from Kāśmīra and Professor Bendall from Nepal recovered fragments of it, and I acquired a complete copy of it, from that interesting and ancient country, Nepal. Dr. Bruno Liebich, then brought the whole system from Tibet in translation. He has published the work in original Sanskrit with some accessories.

In a way Candra is an improvement on Pāṇini and the three sages. He has reduced Pāṇini's fourteen Śiva-sūtras into thirteen; he has modified the system of Pratyāhāras of Pāṇini; he has changed the wording of Pāṇini's

rules and their arrangement ; he has thirty-five sūtras more than Pāṇini's. Jayāditya and Vāmana have incorporated these into the Kāśikā, but Kaiyyaṭa has pronounced them as Apāṇineya. The number of sūtras in Candra is 3060 as against 3983 of Pāṇini.

Candra has not put the Saṃjñās or grammatical technical terms and their definitions in one place but has distributed them over the whole work and they are so few that this grammar is called Asaṃjñā. The arrangement of subjects in his work is suited for scholars and not for beginners.

Chandra-gomī is invariably confounded with Candrācārya mentioned in the second kāṇḍa of Vākya-pāṇīya. Candrācārya is mentioned in verse No. 489 in the word चन्द्राचार्यादिभिः । The Commentator Puṇya-rāja explains:—

‘ चन्द्राचार्य-वसुरात-गुरु-प्रभृति ’ ।

Vasu-rāta was the guru of Bhartṛ-hari, the author of the Vākya-pāṇīya. This we learn from the summary given, at the end of the second kāṇḍa, by Puṇya-rāja. In this summary, he says, Vasu-rāta brought the Bhāṣya from Parvata, while the text says Candrācārya and others did it ; and among the others the commentator includes Vasu-rāta. So Candrācārya and Vasu-rāta must belong to the same generation. Therefore Belvalkar is not justified in saying “That Candrācārya was two generations before Bhartṛ-hari.” He was an elder contemporary ; so Candrācārya must come about 600 A.D., while Candra-gomī, if he has written the Vṛtti himself, would be placed in about 470 A.D., if not earlier. How much earlier, we cannot say. The arguments, that Malli-nātha quotes Candra-gomī about the use of the optional forms, Viśrama and ‘ Viśrāma ’ fails ; because we get no sūtra sanctioning the optional form in Candra-

gomi. The optional forms might have the sanction of Candrācārya.

Agni-purāṇa, chapters 248 to 258 both inclusive, treat of grammar. In this grammar, the alphabet is not taken as it is current. It takes it in the Śiva-sūtra form, so this does not belong to the Aindra school. It treats the greater part of the grammar by examples. But there are more examples in this than are to be found in the Kātantra grammar. The few rules that are given do not belong to Kātantra. In the Taddhita chapter, it derives the word 'Cāndraka' as, one who either knows, or studies the Cāndra grammar. I, therefore, take these eleven chapters of the Agni-purāṇa to belong to the Cāndra grammar.

In this catalogue, Cāndra Vyākaraṇa is described in three numbers, 4411 to 4413; the first two are accompanied with Ānanda-datta's commentary,* and the third with that of Bhikṣu Ratna-mati. But they are so fragmentary that no inference can be drawn from them; so are the descriptions of this Vyākaraṇa in Bendall's Cam. Cat., and in my Nepal Cat. Liebich gives the Sūtra-pāṭha in six chapters divided into four pādas each, the Uṇādi-pāṭha in three chapters, and the Dhātu-pāṭha. The number of Dhātus mentioned are 1182 and the number of Cāndra-sūtras are 3060 and the number of Uṇādi-sūtras are 328. The Liṅgānuśāsana and the Gaṇa-pāṭha of this school are referred to by authoritative writers of other schools. The Upa-sarga vṛtti is found in Tibetan version only, the Varṇa-sūtra is to be found in a MS. in the Deccan College Collection No. 289 of 1875-76. No work on Pari-bhāṣā has yet come down to us. These are the accessories of the Cāndra school of

* Eggeling in page 196, line 19, speaks of two other commentators (1) Vimala-mati (2) Ratna-Śrī-pāda.

grammar. So, it was a school fully equipped with all the accessories, like the Pāṇini school.

The Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa, at one time, had an extensive circulation in Buddhist India, and with the decadence and fall of Buddhism, it has very nearly disappeared from the soil of India. In Ceylon it was much in use at one time, but, the Bālāvabodha, a school book of this school, has completely ousted other works from Ceylon.

Jinendra is one of the eight schools of grammar mentioned in Kavi-kalpa-druma as
Jinendra school.
 ancient. Tradition says, this system of grammar was revealed by Mahā-vira to Indra, therefore, it is known by their joint names. The work was current among the Jainas. In the colophons, however, the work is invariably attributed to Deva-nandī and Deva-nandī is quoted as the author by authoritative works on grammar and lexicon. Deva-nandī has often the title of Pūjya-pāda. In the Nandī-saṃgha-paṭṭāvalī Deva-nandī and Pujya-pāda are one and the same person. It says, Pūjya-pāda was another name of Deva-nandī.

Prof. Pāṭhak, in his paper in the *Indian Antiquary*, October, 1914, assigns this grammar to the later part of the 5th century A.D. His principle reason is that Kāśikā seems to betray a knowledge of Jinendra-vyākaraṇa; that it alludes to Iśvar-kṛṣṇa, the author of the Sāṃkhya-kārikās. It alludes to twelve years' cycle of Jupiter, according to the Heliacal rising system, a system which was in vogue at the time of the early Gupta kings. It has two versions, the shorter one, with about 3,000 sūtras, is commented upon by Abhaya-nandī in what is called the Mahā-vṛtti; while the larger version gives about 700 sūtras more and is commented upon by Soma-deva in his Śabdārṇava-candrikā or Laghu-vṛtti composed in 1205. The commentator

was a contemporary of Śilhāra king, Bhoja II, and an inhabitant of Ajren in Kolhapore State. But Prof. Pāṭhaka says the longer version is the more ancient one. Abhayānandī's date is probably 750 A.D. So the shorter version had an early and elaborate commentary than the longer one. The arrangement of sūtras in the two versions is widely different and they differ even in nomenclature.

There is a recast of the Jinendra-vyākaraṇa entitled Pañca-vastu. It follows the shorter version.

The Jinendra-vyākaraṇa has a poor history. It never had many followers, and at the present days, it has a few. These come from Indore and Beware.

Jinendra-vyākaraṇa seems to be very fond of mono-syllabic nomenclature; for Prathamā he has Va; for Dvitiyā—Ip; Tṛtīyā—Kā,

Caturthī	..	Ap	Vṛddhi	..	Aip
Pancamī	..	Bhā	Guṇa	..	Ep
Ṣaṣṭhī	..	Tā	Pragṛhya	..	Di
Saptamī	..	Ip	Samkhyā	..	Syi
Samāsa	..	Sa	Śānta, Nānta	}	It
Dvandva	..	Dvandva	Ḍatyanta		
Avyayibhāva	..	Ha	Samkhyā		
Tatpuruṣa	..	Ṣa	Sarvanāma	..	Sri ²
Vahu-vṛhi	..	Va	Pratyaya	..	Tya
Karmadhāraya	..	Ya	Anunāsika	..	Ñ
Dvigu	..	Ra	Niranunasika	..	Ña
Upasarga	..	Gi	Prātipadika	..	Mṛt
Gati	..	Ti	Akarmaka	}	Dhi
Hrasva	..	Pra ¹	Dhātu		
Dirgha	..	Dī	Guru	..	Ru
Pluta	..	Pa	Nipāta	..	Ni

¹ Perhaps "hra" which in Brāhmī form may be mistaken for "pra."

² In the shorter recension this does not occur; the Sañjā is Sarva-nāma.

The list may be drawn to any length ; Jinendra seems to be the predecessor of Vopa-deva in this matter.

Śākaṭāyana was a predecessor of Pāṇini and he held views diametrically opposite to that of Pāṇini in the matter of Uṇādi. He is often referred to in the Mahā-bhāṣya, which gives some legends about his life, too.

A Śākaṭāyana-vyākaraṇa was printed in Madras, in which Śākaṭāyana is described as Śruta-kevali-deśiācārya. Śruta-kevalis are the direct disciples of Tirthaṃkaras. They became Kevalis or absolutely emancipated by hearing the doctrines directly, from a Tirthaṃkara. Śākaṭāyana was a Śruta-kevali-deśiya or little less than a Śruta-kevali. So Śākaṭāyana must have been a generation or two younger than the founder of the religion. In my Mgadhan Literature (Pages 29 and 30), I have tried to prove that Śākaṭāyana was a Śruta-kevali-deśiya not to the last Tirthaṃkara, Vardhamāna, but to his predecessor, Pārśva-nātha. I have also shown there, that the quotations in Pāṇini from Śākaṭāyana are to be found in the Śākaṭāyana's work published from Madras. Even Burnell, who tries to show it to be a forgery, and a clumsy forgery too, is constrained to admit "These coincidences prove that our existing treatise is based on the original work."

I think that, as in the Aindra school, the existing treatise is much later than the founder of the school. The Śākaṭāyana grammar may be much later than Śākaṭāyana the founder of the school, though in this case the later work goes in his name. The commentary Amogha-vṛtti was written in the reign of Amogha-varṣa the famous Rāṣṭra-kūṭa King (A.D. 870-877).

If Śākaṭāyana had been so late as the 9th century, Vopadeva would not have given him a place among the ancients. Vopadeva does not regard Hema-candra or Kramadīśvara as ancient.

“The Śākaṭāyana Sabdānuśāsana consists of 4 Adhyāyas of 4 Pādas each, the total number of sutras being 3200” (See Belval. p. 70).

The arrangement of topics is practical as opposed to scientific. Like Jinendra, he does not treat of the Vaidika grammar and its phonetics. He has only 13 Śiva-sūtras and not 14 like Pāṇini.

As this is a distinct school it has (1) Paribhāṣa-sūtras, (2) Gaṇa-pāṭha in 16 Pādas (3) Dhātu pāṭha, (4) Uṇādi-sūtras in 4 pādas, (5) Lingānuśāsana in 70 Āryās. Belvalkar says, of these none is older than the corresponding Pāṇiniya treatise. This is rather bold. Belvalkar does not admit that the Uṇādi-sutras of the Pāṇini school are not by Pāṇini but by Śākaṭāyana; so the Unadi-sūtras of the Madras Śākaṭāyana have nothing to do with Pāṇini.

Accessories of Śākaṭā-
yana's Grammar.

Beside Amongha-vṛtti there is another commentary named Cintāmaṇi by Yaśovarmā, which has many sub-commentaries such as Maṇi-prakāśikā by Ajita-senācārya. Cintāmaṇi-pratipada by Muṅga-rasa and a Ṭippani by Samanta-bhadra. It has many recasts too. One is Prakriyā-saṃgraha by Abhaya-candrācārya who flourished about 1300 A.D.

Another recast of Śākaṭāyana is the Rūpa-siddhi by Dayā-pāla in the beginning of the 11th century.

Śākaṭāyana was current among the Śvetāmbara Jinas. It met with a powerful rival in Hema-candra's Śabdānuśāsana in Northern India and so it hid itself in obscure libraries of Southern India.

I have said before that Śākaṭāyana belonged to Pārśva-nātha sect and Jinendra to the Varddhmāna sect. The followers of Pārśva wore a white garment and those of Varddhamāna wore none. From sixth to the second B.C. the two sects pulled together somehow. But in the latter century there was a split and they resumed their old garments. The fact that the grammar of Śākaṭāyana was regarded as authoritative by the Śvetāmbara and shows that he belonged to the older times and older sect.

Vopa-deva, at the end of the 13th century, calls eight of the schools of grammar as ancient, but Hema-candra school is not included among these eight, though Hema-candra school is furnished with all the accessories of a grammar school. If, Vopa-deva knew that Śākaṭāyana is not more ancient than Amoghna-vṛtti, he would not have included it among the ancients.

Hema-candra was born in 1088 A.D. at a place called Dhunduka near Ahmedabad. His parents were Banias. His mother saw in a dream that her son would be a great man. When Hema-candra was of five years, in age, Deva-candra a Jaina monk asked his mother to make over the child to him, so that he might initiate the boy into a religious life. He studied for twelve years, after which he was made Hema-candra-âcārya or Hema-candra Suri. Shortly after he was made the head of a Gaccha at Anahilapattan, then ruled by Siddha-rāja Jaya-Simha, a power-

ful King and a patron of learning. Hema-candra often had discussions in the matter of religion with the King who was a devoted Śivait. But after the death of Jaya-simha, his successor Kumâra-pāla became a disciple of Hema-candra. The Jainas were favoured by the King and other religions were persecuted. There is a couplet amongst the Vaiṣṇavas about this time ;

उत्पन्ना द्रविडं भक्तिः वृद्धिं कर्णाटके गता ।

कचित् कचित् महाराष्ट्रे गुर्जरे प्रलयं गता ॥

This shows that Vaiṣṇavism was stamped out from Gujerat. Purāṇas are also very bitter against Kumâra-pāla's administration, which confiscated the property of the Brāhmaṇas. The conversion of the king into Jainism was represented in a drama, entitled Mahā-rāja-parā-jaya, by a minister to Kumârapala's successor.

The Śabdānuśāsana was written by Hema-candra at the request of Siddha-rāja Jaya-simha. The work is called Siddha-Hema-candrābhīdhāna - Svopajña - śabdānuśāsana. It joins the name of Siddha-rāja Jaya-simha with that of Hema-candra and declares itself to be Svopajña or original and not borrowed. It is original in this sense that the grammar of the Prākṛta languages was, perhaps included in a Sanskrit grammar. In other matters, too, in Pratyāhāra, in technical terms, etc. he shows originality. Hema-candra's work was something like an imperial encyclopædia of grammar in which all preceding works on grammar available were consulted and collated. Naturally enough as a Jaina and as a Śvetāmvara, he has drawn much on Śākaṭāyana's Śabdānuśāsana and the Amogha-vṛtti. This he has done not so much in his sūtra-pāṭha, but in the commentary made by himself called the Vṛhat-vṛtti, which is an encyclopædic

work. In fact the accessories of this school of grammar are, as a rule, parts of the *Vṛhat-vṛtti*.

Hema-candra's grammar is divided into eight *Adhyāyas* of four *pādas* each. The first six *pādas* are called *prathama-ṣaṭ-pāda*; the next four *pādas* are called *madyama-pāda* and the two together *Daśa-padi* (See catal. No. 4503).

Hema-candra abridged his *Vṛhat-vṛtti* into what is called the *Laghu-vṛtti*. Our No. 4504, 4505, and 4506 deal with the Sanskrit portion of the work. The next six numbers 4507–12 deal with the *Prākṛta* portion, that is, the 7th and the 8th chapters. In two of these, 4508 and 4511, is given a short history of the *Chālukyas* of Gujerat from *Mūla-rāja* to *Siddha-rāja Jaya-siṃha*. It is said that *Jaya-siṃha* was very much troubled, with numerous grammatical works, without the study of which a complete knowledge of it, could not be obtained and so he ordered Hema-candra to write the work. Belvalkar is perhaps not very happy in saying that, the *Laghu-vṛtti* relates to the first seven chapters only of Hema-candra's grammar.

Svopajña-dhātu-pārāyaṇam, No. 4513, gives all roots used in Hema-candra's grammar, with their meanings. The work is by the author himself. It has a commentary by *Harṣa-kīrti-sūrī* entitled *Svopajña-dhātu-pāṭha-vivaraṇam*. This commentator was much honoured by *Māla-deva* of Jodhpore in the middle of the 16th century. His guru obtained from Akbar the village of *Kṣouma*. The previous gurus of his *gaccha*, called the *Nāga-puriya* were honoured by *Hāmbira*, *Rāja* of Mewar, *Alla-ud-din Khilizi*, *Feroj Shah* and others.

Accessories to Hema-
candra's grammar.

The accessory, *Lingānu-śāsana*, is represented in this catalogue by 4515 entitled *Svopajña-lingānuśāsana-vivaraṇam* by Hema-candra and a sub-commentary, *Durgapada-prabodha*, by Śrī-vallabhā. The sub-commentary, was composed at Jodhpore in 1605. Hema-candra's *Lingānu-śāsana* is a metrical treatise based on Śākaṭāyana's work and divided into eight sections.

Guṇa-ratna, a Jaina monk, wrote, at the request of his guru, Deva-sundara, a work entitled *Kriyā-ratna-samuccaya*, No. 4517, in which he gives the conjugation of important roots in Hema-candra's grammar.

For other accessories such as the *Uṇādi-sūtras*, *Gaṇa-pāṭha*, *Pari-bhāsa* etc., see Belvalkar, page 77. He thinks, "For the most part these treatises are embodied in Hema-candra's *Vṛhad-vṛtti*, from which they seem to have been subsequently extracted and published in separate forms.

The *Vṛhad-vṛtti* has a commentary entitled *Vṛhad-vṛtti-dhūṇḍhikā*. Some ascribe it to Hema-candra himself but the colophons of MSS. ascribe it to Dhana-candra, Nanda-sundara and Jina-sāgara. The *Dhūṇḍhikā* on the *Prākṛta* chapters, is the work of Udāya-saubhāgya of the *Laghu-tapā-gaccha* written in 1533 A.D. Udaya-candra and his pupil Devendra-sūri have also written a *Nyāsa* on the *Vṛhad-vṛtti*. The gūru's work was comprehensive while his pupil's work is rather an abridgment. But the comprehensive work has not yet been found.

Śabda-mahārṇava-nyāsa is an anonymous commentary on the *Vṛhad-vṛtti* (see Belval., page 78).

The 17th century saw many digests on Hema-candra's work. In 1652 A.D., Vinaya-vijaya-gaṇi wrote a manual called Haima-laghu-prakriyâ. He wrote a commentary on his own work, twenty-five years later. In 1669, another manual was written entitled Haima-Kaumudī by Megha-vijaya. This work is said to be the model of Siddhānta-Kaumudī. But, that is impossible, because Bhaṭṭoji-dikṣita, the author of Siddhānta-Kaumudī, flourished in the latter half of the 16th century. He was the pupil of Saṃkara-Bhaṭṭa, who died in the early years of the 17th century and the commentator of Vārāṇasī-darpaṇa in 1642 declares that he received his knowledge of Sanskrit grammar from Bhaṭṭoji and his son Rāmāśrama.

The roots of this school of grammar were alphabetically arranged by Pūṇya-sundara-gaṇi. The Lingānuśāsana of Hema-candra was commented upon by Śrī-Vallabha Vacanācārya, in 1605 A.D. at Jodhpore. The Pari-bhāṣās to the number of 140, were put together by Hema-hamsa-vijaya-gaṇi who also wrote a commentary on them in 1457 at Ahmedabad. Works on conjugation and declension according to Hema-candra's grammar were written so far back as the 13th and 14th centuries.

The small community of Jainas had three schools of grammar, Jinendra, Śākaṭāyana and Hema-candra, and so their circulation was limited. But still there was another grammar written by a contemporary and co-religionist of Hema-candra. This was Malaya-giri, who wrote a Śabdānuśāsana with a commentary.

The Saṃkṣipta-sāra
School.

The Saṃkṣipta-sāra had four stages of development before it became a complete school :—

- I. The sūtras of Kramadīśvara.
- II. The commentary called Rasavatī.
- III. Its revision by Jumara Nandī.
- IV. Goyī-candra's Vivaraṇa commentary.

Kramadīśvara has a high sounding title, Vādindra-cakra-cūḍāmaṇi or the 'crest jewel of the circle of controversialists.' The title of Vādindra or Vādirāṭ was very common from tenth to the thirteenth century. The Buddhist Mañjū-śrī had a title Vādirāṭ. Belvalkar says that Jaya Siṃha II, the Chālukya emperor, had a title Vādirāṭ. In the 13th century Ānanda-giri, the commentator of Śaṅkara-bhāṣya was a Vādindra. Kramadīśvara got this title from the Śaivas. He wrote the sūtras. But Kṛt-śeṣa unādi-pāda does not seem to be his work. It seems to be the work of either the author of the Vṛtti or of Jumara Nandī, the revisor of it. The sūtras of the appendix of the taddhita section are by Goyī-candra. Kramadīśvara in the Śanskrit portion of his work follows the arrangement of grammatical subjects by Bharṭṛ-hari, who divides his work Vākya-pādiya in three kāṇḍas. The Brahma-kāṇḍa which treats of articulate sound, and philosophy connected with it. The Vākya-kāṇḍa, the essence of which is verbs, and the Pada-kāṇḍa which treats of nouns. These three kāṇḍas have been split up, by Kramadīśvara into seven pādas, (1) Brahma-kāṇḍa=Sandhi-pāda, (2) Vākya-kāṇḍa=verbs, verbal nouns and other nouns, (3) Pada-kāṇḍa=syntax, declensions and compound words. He does not follow the arrangement of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, for in that arrangement Sandhi comes last of all.

In seven only of his sūtras, he mentions his predecessors, Kātantra and Cāndra. Once he quotes Bhāga-vṛtti, Kāraka-pāda, 101, and once again Anu-pada-kāra=Sandhi-pāda, 224.

Kramadiśvara evidently wrote his work in the interest of the Śaivas of Central India. His name shows that he was a Śaiva and his invocation shows that he was a Śaiva. Śaivas at this period used the Prākṛtas and vernaculars in their propaganda work. The Bengal Śaivas of Candra-dvīpa wrote in the vernacular, traces of which are to be found in later Buddhist works, and the Kāśmīra Śaiva works are almost invariably accompanied with some verses in vernacular at the end of each chapter. Kramadiśvara, therefore, found it necessary to give some grammar of the Prākṛtas and the vernaculars. But, as will be stated later on, wicked people dropped it, and so, the eighth pāda of his work, has neither the vṛtti of Jumara Nandī nor the commentary by Goyī-candra. The only commentary on this section is by Nārāyaṇa Nyāya-pañcānana. In including a section for the Prākṛitas and excluding the Vaidika grammar he seems to be the inspirer of Hemacandra, who boasts that, the whole of his work is original or “Svopajña.”

At the present moment there is no means of distinguishing between the Rasa-vatī
The Vṛtti and its revision. vṛtti and its revision by Jumara Nandī. But, the revised vṛtti shows wide acquaintance with Sanskrit literature, its lexicons and its grammar. Kāli-dāsa, Māgha, Bhāravi are of course there, Murāri is there. The works entitled Jānakī-haraṇaṃ, Sapta-kumārikā and Pañcatantra are there. This is in Kāvya literature. Of lexicons, he quotes from Amara-koṣa, Tri-kāṇḍa and Utpala-mālā. In grammar it quotes from Jayāditya, Vāmana, Nyāsa, Anu-nyāsa, Rakṣita, Bhāga-vṛtti, Dhātu-pārāyaṇa and Bhāttavārtika, he also quotes kajjata a corruption of Kaiyyaṭa. But, Jumara Nandī does not explain the sūtras, he only gives examples and criticises the grammatical and non-

grammatical expressions in Sanskrit literature. He seems to be very much concerned with the opinions of two previous writers Bābhaṭa and Paśupati, perhaps, his predecessors in the Saṃkṣipta-sāra school. Their names are not found anywhere else.

As regards the age of the school, Colebrooke wants to place it after Vopa-deva in the 13th century. But, this theory is not tenable. Vopa-deva in his chapter on nominal roots, in the Sūtra, 'लेः ह्रस्वाख्याने जिः' gives the example

औडिडत् as the correct form, and then says "औजडदित्येके"। that is, he does not agree with the form औजडत्, but in the ṛtti commentary of Saṃkṣipta-sāra, Tīnanta-pāda sūtra No. 299, the commentary says "ऊढं आख्यातवान् औजडत्" as the correct form. This shows that Vopa-deva is posterior to the ṛtti, and therefore much later than the sūtra.

One may think that Kramadīśvara imitated Hemacandra in rejecting the Vaidika grammar and phonetics of Pāṇini and including the Prākṛtas at the end of the grammar. That seems to be very doubtful. Vopa-deva wrote his Mugdha-bodha between 1260 and 1300 A.D. Hemacandra was born in 1088 A.D. and died in 1172 A.D. Can all the three early stages of the development of the Saṃkṣipta-sāra be compressed within a century ?

Rāmāvatāra Śarmā speaks of Utpala-mālīka as a lexicon. He gives the name of Utpala-mālā quoted by Jumara Nandī, several times but has nothing to say about it. Jumara Nandī is called a Mahārājādhirāja. In his court,

engaged in his service, were men like Umā-pati Datta whom he loved to honour. This is the only piece of historical information that we get from his commentator, Goyī-candra. Goyī-candra says that, in course of time, the sūtras and the commentary became corrupt for the fault of the scribes, and so he—Goyī-candra,—undertakes to write a running commentary on all the sūtras and their comments by Jumara Nandī.

The upper limit of Goyī-candra's age is obtained from the fact that he quotes from Puruṣoṭ-
The age of Goyī-candra. tama, whom Sarvānanda Vando-
 pādhyāya quotes in his commentary on Amara-koṣa in 1159 A.D. (see Rāmāvatāra-Śarmā's Introduction to Kalpa-dru-koṣa, p. XXII.)

Goyī-candra is called "Autthāsanika," that is, one to whom, when he approaches the court, the king stands up, and offers a seat. Belvalkar seems to be puzzled at this name, and at this custom. The custom still prevails in Rājputanā, but it has lost its Sanskrit name at present. A noble man, who is honoured by the King in this way, is called a Tazimi omrah. Goyī-candra's commentary is known as Ṭikā or Vivaraṇa-ṭikā. Goyī-candra seems to have been an expert in Logic, especially to that section of it, which treats of the relation of words in a sentence. His commentary on the chapter on Kāraḥ is much appreciated in Bengal.

With Goyī-candra ended the original writers on this school of grammar. The later writers are almost all commentators on Goyī-candra's Vivaraṇa-ṭikā.

Vyākāra-sāra-laharī by Kavi-candra is a commentary on the Sanskrit pādas only. A MS. of this copied in

Śaka 1636, is our number 4493. Kavi-candra writes this commentary in the interests of young people. His main object is the collection of the original sūtras of this school. But he begins with the Sanskrit alphabet as is current at present.

Samkṣipta-sāriya-prākṛta-pāda-tīkā (4494). In L. No. 1594, Rājendra-lāla says, that Goyī-candra did not include the Prākṛta-pāda in his elaborate commentary on the Samkṣipta-sāra, and this is the only commentary and the only MS. of it on the Prākṛta portion of Kramadīśvara which has come to his notice after many years of search. This was said in 1878. After its publication, the text of Prākṛta-pāda of this school, published in the Bibliotheca Indica, was withdrawn from circulation, as that text did not agree with this commentary.

As regards the authorship, Rājendra-lāla says, “By Vidyā-vinoda, son of Nārāyaṇa, grandson of Vāṇeśvara, and great-grandson of Jaṭā-dhara.” But this does not agree with the second verse of the work which says that Nārāyaṇa Vidyā-vinoda was the son of Vāṇeśvara who was the son of Jaṭā-dhara, who again was the brother of Chatrī. Chatrī belonged to the Pūrva-grāmī clan of the Rādhī-śreṇī Brāhmaṇas of the Vātsya-gotra. But in the colophon of 1594 (L.) Vidyā-vinoda is said to be the author of the commentary on the eighth pāda. But from the commentary on other pādas we know that Nyāya-pañcānana was the son of Vidyā-vinoda and that is perhaps the correct description of the commentator.

Belvalkar says that the eighth chapter dealing with Prākṛtas is a later addition. This is not true; for an authoritative commentator like Nyāya-pañcānana says that Kramadīśvara wrote the Prākṛta-pāda but some wicked

people dropped it and he restored it with his commentary (L. 1594)

कृतिना यत् कृतं कर्म तन्निरस्तं दुरात्मना ।
इदानीं तत् समुद्धृत्य संक्षेपेणोच्यते मया ॥

The opinion was that the whole school is later than Vopa-deva, but it has been shown that Vopa-deva does not consider औजडत् as a correct form. But Jumara Nandī says it is correct, he is therefore earlier than the Mugdha-bodha. The commentator of Jumara Nandī, if he had come after Mugdha-bodha, would have resented his disapprobation. But he does nothing of the kind, he simply gives the steps by which the word औजडत् is formed. So, the commentator, Goyī-candra, is earlier than Vopa-deva. This is the lower limit of the age of Goyī-candra. The upper limit is fixed by the fact that Goyī-candra quotes from the Bhāṣā-vṛtti and the Tri-kāṇḍa-śeṣa of Puruṣottama-deva who is quoted by Sarvānanda, the commentator of the Amara-koṣa in the year 1159 A.D. Puruṣottama, therefore, may be placed, at the latest, in the first half of the 12th century; and Goyī-candra in the second half of the same century. Goyī-candra says that, in course of time many misreadings have crept in Jumara Nandī's vṛtti and Kramadīśvara's sūtras; they are all glaring misreadings and they number about fifty. So much misreading cannot be the work of a day; I would, therefore, venture to place Jumara Nandī at least one hundred years before Goyī-candra, that is, in the 2nd half of the 11th century. If so, Kramadīśvara would go earlier than Jumara Nandī, but later than Bhartr-hari, who died in 650 A.D., and whose arrangements he has followed in framing his sūtras. Kramadīśvara quotes only two of the ancient schools of sūtra-kāras namely, Kātantra, 1st century A.D., and

The age of the principal authors of the Samkṣipta-sāra school.